

September 10, 2025

Change Log

Buddhist Monastic Code 1

Parājika 1 (Full Discussion Replaced)

new text:

As we noted in the Introduction, the first formulation of this rule followed on Ven. Sudinna's having had sex with one of his former wives. His motives, by worldly standards, were relatively noble: He was complying with his mother's desire that he provide the family with an heir. However, in the incident leading to the second formulation of this rule—in which the Buddha added the phrase “even with a female animal”—the instigator's motives were considerably less so.

“Now at that time, a certain bhikkhu living in the Great Wood at Vesāli, having befriended a monkey with food (§), engaged in sexual intercourse with it. Then, dressing (§) early in the morning and carrying his bowl and outer robe, the bhikkhu went into Vesāli for alms. A number of bhikkhus wandering on a tour of the lodgings went to the bhikkhu's dwelling. The monkey saw them coming from afar and, on seeing them, went up to them and wiggled its rear and wiggled its tail and offered its rear and made a sign (§). The thought occurred to the bhikkhus, ‘Undoubtedly this bhikkhu is engaging in sexual intercourse with this monkey.’ So they hid off to one side.

“Then the bhikkhu, having gone for alms in Vesāli, returned bringing almsfood. The monkey went up to him. The bhikkhu, having eaten a portion of the almsfood, gave a portion to the monkey. The monkey, having eaten the almsfood, offered its rear to the bhikkhu, and the bhikkhu engaged in sexual intercourse with it (§).

“Then the bhikkhus said to the bhikkhu, ‘Hasn't a training rule been formulated by the Blessed One? How can you engage in sexual intercourse with this monkey?’

“‘It's true, friends, that a training rule has been formulated by the Blessed One, but that's with regard to a human female, not to a female animal.’”

The full offense here is composed of four factors: effort, object, knowledge, and consent.

Effort. The term *sexual intercourse* refers to the penetration of a penis into a *magga*, or pathway, which—for the purpose of this rule—the Vibhaṅga defines as follows:

A female or a hermaphrodite has three maggas: vagina, mouth, and anus.

A male or a neuter individual has two: mouth and anus.

The Vibhaṅga further states that sexual intercourse has been performed when, in any of the possible combinations covered by this rule, a penis enters a magga even if just to “the extent of a sesame seed.” Whether the penis is the bhikkhu’s entering into another person’s magga, or another man’s penis entering any of the bhikkhu’s maggas, the factor of effort has been fulfilled all the same. The question of whether there is a covering, such as a condom, between the organs is irrelevant, as are the questions of:

- whether the bhikkhu is actively or passively involved,
- whether the bhikkhu is dressed as a bhikkhu, and
- whether any of the parties involved reaches orgasm.

The Vibhaṅga also mentions four scenarios that it does not explain: “One inserts it into a magga via a magga... one inserts it into a non-magga via a magga... one inserts it into a magga via a non-magga... one inserts it into a non-magga via a non-magga.” The first three scenarios entail a pārājika; the last, a thullaccaya.

The first scenario apparently covers the normal insertion of a penis into a magga. As for non-magga, the Commentary identifies it as a wound. This is in reference to two cases in the Vinita-vatthu. In both cases, a bhikkhu comes across the corpse of a woman with a wound around her vagina. In one case, the bhikkhu inserts his penis into the vagina and withdraws it via the wound; in the other, the bhikkhu inserts his into the wound and withdraws it via the vagina. In both cases, the Buddha imposes a pārājika.

If the Commentary is right in its definition of non-magga—and nothing in the Canon would suggest otherwise—then the Vibhaṅga’s summary of four scenarios would cover these two cases, but also go further. If a monk were to insert his penis into a magga via a nearby wound, or to insert it into the wound via the magga, then regardless of how he withdrew it, he would still incur the full offense.

The Vinita-vatthu also contains a case of a monk who, inflamed with lust, inserts his thumb into the vagina of a naked sleeping young girl. In this case, the Buddha imposes a saṅghādisesa under Sg 2.

Object. The full penalty under this rule applies to any voluntary sexual intercourse with a human being, a “non-human” being (a *yakkha*, *nāga*, or *peta*), or a common animal, whether female, male, neuter, or hermaphrodite.

Performing sexual intercourse with a dead body—even a decapitated head—also entails the full penalty if the remains of the body are intact enough for the act to be accomplished.

In addition, the Vinita-vatthu lists two examples of “self-intercourse”: A bhikkhu with a supple back takes his penis into his mouth, and a bhikkhu with an unusually long penis inserts it into his anus. Both cases carry the full penalty.

Knowledge & consent. For sexual intercourse to count as an offense, the bhikkhu must know that it is happening and give his consent. Thus if he is

sexually assaulted while asleep or otherwise unconscious, and he remains oblivious to what is happening, he incurs no penalty. If, however, he becomes conscious during the assault or was conscious right from the start, then whether he incurs a penalty depends on whether he gives his consent during any part of the act.

Strangely enough, neither the Canon nor the Commentary discusses the factor of consent in any detail, except to mention by way of passing that it can apply to the stage of inserting, being fully inserted, staying in place, or pulling out. From the examples in the Vinita-vatthu, it would appear that consent refers to a *mental* state of acquiescence, together with its physical or verbal expression. Mere physical compliance does not count, as there are cases where bhikkhus forced into intercourse comply physically but without consenting mentally and so are absolved of any offense. However, there is also a case in which a woman invites a bhikkhu to engage in sexual intercourse, saying that she will do all the work while he can avoid an offense by doing nothing. The bhikkhu does as she tells him to, but when the case comes to the Buddha's attention, he imposes a *pārājika* on the act without even asking the bhikkhu whether he consented or not. The assumption is that complying with a request like this indicates consent, regardless of whether one makes any physical or verbal movement at all.

Taken together, these cases imply that if one is sexually assaulted, one is completely absolved from an offense only if (1) one does not give one's mental consent at any time during the act or (2) one does feel mental consent during at least part of the act but puts up a struggle so as not to express that consent physically or verbally in any way. (As the Commentary notes, drawing a general principle from the Vinita-vatthu to Pr 2, mere mental consent without physical expression is not enough to count as a factor of an offense, for there is no offense simply in the arising of a thought or mental state.) If one puts up no struggle and feels mental consent, even if only fleetingly during the stage of inserting, being fully inserted, staying in place, or pulling out, one incurs the full penalty. This would seem to be the basis for the Commentary's warning in its discussion of the Vinita-vatthu case in which a bhikkhu wakes up to find himself being sexually assaulted by a woman, gives her a kick, and sends her rolling. The warning: This is how a bhikkhu still subject to sensual lust should act if he wants to protect his state of mind.

The Vinita-vatthu contains a case in which a bhikkhu with "impaired faculties"—one who feels neither pleasure nor pain during intercourse—engages in intercourse under the assumption that his impairment exempts him from the rule. The case is brought to the Buddha, who states, "Whether this worthless man did or didn't feel [anything], it is a case involving defeat." From this ruling it can be argued that a bhikkhu indulging in intercourse as part of a tantric ritual incurs the full penalty even if he doesn't feel pleasure in the course of the act.

Derived offenses. Two *thullaccaya* offenses are directly related to this rule. The first is for the fourth of the Vibhaṅga's four scenarios mentioned above: One inserts one's penis into a non-magga via a non-magga. This apparently applies

only to a wound on a corpse, for as we will see below, if a bhikkhu attempts intercourse with any part of a living being's body apart from the three maggas, the case falls under Sg 2.

The second thullaccaya is for the case of a bhikkhu who attempts intercourse with the decomposed mouth, anus, or vagina of a corpse.

To attempt intercourse with any other part of a dead body or with any part of an insentient object, such as an inflatable doll or mannequin, incurs a dukkaṭa. (If this led to an ejaculation, however, the case would be treated under Sg 1.)

The Vibhaṅga states that if a bhikkhu attempts intercourse with any part of a living being's body apart from the three maggas, the case falls under the saṅghādisesa rules—either Sg 1 for intentional ejaculation or Sg 2 for lustful bodily contact. As we shall see below, the penalties assigned in the latter case are as follows: If the partner is a woman, a saṅghādisesa; if a *paṇḍaka* (see Sg 2), a thullaccaya; if a man or a common animal, a dukkaṭa. We can infer from the Vibhaṅga's ruling here that if a bhikkhu has an orgasm while attempting intercourse with the decomposed mouth, anus, or genitals of a corpse, with any other part of a dead body, or with any part of an insentient object, the case would come under Sg 1.

The Commentary disagrees with the Vibhaṅga on these points, however, saying that the derived offenses under this rule can include only dukkaṭa and thullaccaya penalties. In its explanation of Sg 1, it sets forth a system of eleven types of lust in which the lust for the pleasure of bringing about an ejaculation, lust for the pleasure of bodily contact, and lust for the pleasure of intercourse are treated as completely separate things that must be treated under separate rules. Thus, it says, if a bhikkhu aiming at intercourse takes hold of a woman's body, it is simply a preliminary to intercourse and thus entails only a dukkaṭa, rather than a saṅghādisesa for lustful bodily contact. Similarly, if he has a premature ejaculation before beginning intercourse, there is no offense at all.

These are fine academic distinctions and are clearly motivated by a desire to draw neat lines between the rules, but they lead to practical problems. As the Commentary itself points out, if a bhikkhu commits an act that falls near the borderline between these rules but cannot later report precisely which type of lust he was feeling in the heat of the moment, there is no way his case can be judged and a penalty assigned.

At any rate, though, there is no basis in the Canon for the Commentary's system, and in fact it contradicts not only the Vibhaṅga's ruling mentioned above, but also its definition of *lustful* under Sg 2, 3, & 4, which is exactly the same for all three rules and places no limits on the type of lust involved. All of this leads to the conclusion that the Commentary's neat system for classifying lust is invalid, and that the Vibhaṅga's judgment holds: If a bhikkhu attempts intercourse with any part of a living being's body apart from the three maggas, the case falls under the saṅghādisesa rules—either Sg 1 for intentional ejaculation or Sg 2 for lustful bodily contact or both—rather than here.

Blanket exemptions. In addition to bhikkhus who do not know they are being assaulted or do not give their consent when they do know, the Vibhaṅga states that there are four special categories of bhikkhus exempted from a penalty under this rule: any bhikkhu who is insane, possessed by spirits, delirious with pain, or the first offender(s) (in this case, Ven. Sudinna and the bhikkhu with the monkey) whose actions prompted the Buddha to formulate the rule. The Commentary defines as *insane* anyone who “goes about in an unseemly way, with deranged perceptions, having cast away all sense of shame and compunction, not knowing whether he has transgressed major or minor training rules.” It recognizes this as a medical condition, which it blames on the bile. A bhikkhu under the influence of a severe psychosis-inducing drug would apparently fall under this exemption, but one under the influence of a more common intoxicant would not. As for spirit possession, the Commentary says that this can happen either when spirits frighten one or when, by distracting one with sensory images, they insert their hands into one’s heart by way of one’s mouth (!). Whatever the cause, it notes that insane and possessed bhikkhus are exempt from penalties they incur only when their perceptions are deranged (“when their mindfulness is entirely forgotten and they don’t know what fire, gold, excrement, and sandalwood are”) and not from any they incur during their lucid moments. As for a bhikkhu delirious with pain, he is exempt from penalties he incurs only during periods when the pain is so great that he does not know what he is doing.

These four categories are exempted from penalties under nearly all of the rules, although the first offender for each rule is exempted only for the one time he acted in such a way as to provoke the Buddha into formulating the rule. I will only rarely mention these categories again, and—except where expressly stated otherwise—the reader should bear them in mind as exempt in every case.

Related cases. The Vinita-vatthu to this rule contains three cases that formed the basis for additional rules.

The first two cases are a pair. In one, a bhikkhu discovers that he has undergone a spontaneous sex change (!) and is now a woman; in the second, a bhikkhuni spontaneously undergoes the reverse transformation and is now a man.

In the first case, the Buddha says that the bhikkhu is now a bhikkhuni and should be escorted to join a bhikkhuni community. Her original ordination remains valid, she has the same preceptor as before, and her seniority is to be counted from the time of her original ordination (and not from the time of the sex change). As for any offenses she incurred while a bhikkhu that have not yet been dealt with: If they involve rules that the bhikkhus have in common with the bhikkhunis, they are to be dealt with by the bhikkhuni community. If they involve rules that the bhikkhus do not have in common with the bhikkhuni community, they no longer count as offenses (§).

The Commentary adds here that if the new bhikkhuni undergoes another sex change and reverts to being a man, he reverts to being a bhikkhu and must rejoin

the bhikkhus, but the past offenses that were declared non-offenses remain non-offenses.

In the second case, the same principles apply but in reverse.

As for the third case:

“At that time a certain bhikkhu had gone to the Gabled Hall in the Great Wood at Vesāli to pass the day and was sleeping, having left the door open. His various limbs were stiff with the ‘wind forces’ (i.e., he had an erection) (§). Now at that time a large company of women bearing garlands and scents came to the park, headed for the dwelling. Seeing the bhikkhu, they sat down on his male organ (§) and, having taken their pleasure and remarking, ‘What a bull of a man, this one!’ they picked up their garlands and scents, and left.”

The bhikkhu incurred no penalty, but the Buddha gave formal permission to close the door when resting during the day. From this permission, the Commentary formulates a prohibition—that a bhikkhu incurs a dukkaṭa if he does *not* close the door when sleeping during the day—but if the Buddha had intended a prohibition, he surely would have stated the rule in that form himself. In other words, one may sleep during the day without being penalized for whether the door is open, but as the origin story indicates, it would be wise to keep it closed.

Pārājika 2

old text:

None of the texts mention the scenario in which Bhikkhu A tells Bhikkhu B to take an item for him without letting B know that he is committing a theft—for instance, telling B that the item belongs to him (A), that it is ownerless, or letting B come to either conclusion on his own. Nevertheless, it would appear that if B then actually takes the item as told, all of the factors for an offense would be fulfilled for A: He gives the command to take (the imperative the Vibhaṅga uses in illustrating commands to “steal”—*avahara*—can also simply mean to “take”), he knows that the item belongs to someone else, he intends to have it taken, and it is taken as a result of his command. As for B, he would not be committing an offense, as his state of mind would not fulfill the factors of perception and intention for a theft.

new text:

None of the texts mention the scenario in which Bhikkhu A tells an accomplice to steal an item entailing a pārājika but then disrobes before the accomplice takes the item as requested. If the accomplice actually takes the item in line with the request, the factors for the full offense would be fulfilled. That would mean that A cannot reordain in this lifetime.

Another scenario not mentioned in the texts is one in which Bhikkhu A tells Bhikkhu B to take an item for him without letting B know that he is committing a

theft—for instance, telling B that the item belongs to him (A), that it is ownerless, or letting B come to either conclusion on his own. Nevertheless, it would appear that if B then actually takes the item as told, all of the factors for an offense would be fulfilled for A: He gives the command to take (the imperative the Vibhaṅga uses in illustrating commands to “steal”—*avahara*—can also simply mean to “take”), he knows that the item belongs to someone else, he intends to have it taken, and it is taken as a result of his command. As for B, he would not be committing an offense, as his state of mind would not fulfill the factors of perception and intention for a theft.

Pārājika 3 (change 1)

old text:

Not aiming at death is used in cases where the bhikkhu deliberately does an action but does not intend that action to result in death. Relevant examples include trying to help a bhikkhu who is choking on food by slapping him on the back and inadvertently causing his death; telling a bhikkhu to stand on a piece of scaffolding while helping with construction work, only to see the scaffolding collapse; describing the joys of heaven to a listener, only to have a member of the audience decide to commit suicide in hopes of going there.

Thus, to fulfill the factor of intention here, a bhikkhu must be acting intentionally, knowingly, and aiming at death.

new text:

Not aiming at death is used in cases where the bhikkhu deliberately does an action but does not intend that action to result in death through the cutting of the life-faculty. Relevant examples include trying to help a bhikkhu who is choking on food by slapping him on the back and inadvertently causing his death; telling a bhikkhu to stand on a piece of scaffolding while helping with construction work, only to see the scaffolding collapse; describing the joys of heaven to a listener, only to have the listener will himself to die in hopes of going there.

Here it is important to note that telling a dying patient not to fight death, in hopes that the patient would simply allow the life-faculty to end on its own, would not count as “aiming at death” in the context of this rule. However, it is often difficult in cases like this to be sure of one’s intentions, so a wise policy would be to avoid advice of this sort as much as possible and to focus instead on encouraging the patient to develop a skillful state of mind.

Thus, to summarize the discussion thus far: To fulfill the factor of intention here, a bhikkhu must be acting intentionally, knowingly, and aiming at death.

Pārājika 3 (change 2)

old text:

c) *Describing the advantages of dying*. This, the third type of act covered by this rule, can include berating a sick person (“Why do you keep hanging on to life

like this? Don't you realize what a burden you are to others?") or simply telling a person of the miseries of life or the bliss of dying and going to heaven in such a way that he/she might feel inspired to commit suicide or simply pine away to death. The *Vinita-vatthu* also includes under this type of act any statements that a nurse might make out of compassion to shorten the miseries of an illness by encouraging a patient to let go of life so as not to dawdle in the face of death. Thus, the Commentary notes, a bhikkhu talking to a dying patient should be very circumspect in how he chooses his words, focusing not on how to speed up the dying process but on how to inspire the patient with the following thoughts: "The attainment of the paths and fruitions is not out of the ordinary for a virtuous person. So, having formed no attachment for such things as your dwelling, and establishing mindfulness in the Buddha, Dhamma, Saṅgha, or the body, you should be heedful in your attention." The *Vinita-vatthu* to Pr 4 contains a number of stories in which bhikkhus comfort a dying bhikkhu by asking him to reflect on what he has attained through the practice, which was apparently a common way of encouraging a dying bhikkhu to focus his thoughts on the best object possible. The suttas also contain advice on how to encourage patients facing death. See, for example, MN 143, SN 36.7, and AN 6.16. In all of these cases, the advice is aimed not at precipitating death but at inspiring calm and insight.

new text:

c) Describing the advantages of dying. This, the third type of act covered by this rule, covers cases where a bhikkhu describes the pleasures of heaven to a man of good actions so that the latter will speed up his own death in hopes of going to heaven. In the case covered by the origin story, the man takes foods and liquids bad for his health and dies of a resulting disease. In a case in the *Vinita-vatthu*, the man speeds up death, cutting his life faculty simply through an act of will. In both cases, the factor of effort has been fulfilled.

The *Vinita-vatthu* also contains a case in which a bhikkhu describes the pleasures of heaven to a man of good actions but without aiming at the man's death. In that case, there is no offense even if the man wills himself to die. And in SN 55.54, the Buddha expressly advises his cousin, Mahānāma, when counseling a discerning layperson—i.e., a stream-winner—as the latter is dying, to recommend that the person set his mind on the pleasures of heaven so as not to be attached to human sensual pleasures.

This means that there are cases where describing the pleasures of heaven is actually skillful, even when one's listener is approaching death. However, as noted above, it is often difficult in cases like this to be sure of one's intentions. For this reason, the Commentary notes that a bhikkhu talking to a dying patient should be very circumspect in how he chooses his words, focusing not on how to cut the patient's life-faculty before its natural end but on how to inspire the patient with the following thoughts: "The attainment of the paths and fruitions is not out of the ordinary for a virtuous person. So, having formed no attachment

for such things as your dwelling, and establishing mindfulness in the Buddha, Dhamma, Saṅgha, or the body, you should be heedful in your attention.”

The Vinita-vatthu to Pr 4 contains a number of stories in which bhikkhus comfort a dying bhikkhu by asking him to reflect on what he has attained through the practice, which was apparently a common way of encouraging a dying bhikkhu to focus his thoughts on the best object possible. The suttas also contain additional advice on how to encourage patients facing death. See, for example, MN 143, SN 36.7, and AN 6.16. In all of these cases, the advice is aimed not at precipitating death but at allaying the dying person’s worries, and inspiring calm and insight.

Pārājika 3 (change 3)

old text:

—Telling a person to go to a dangerous place where he/she might die of the dangers.

new text:

—Telling a person to go to a dangerous place where he/she might die of the dangers.

—Telling a person destined to hell—say, for having killed a parent—of the terrors of hell in hopes of frightening him to death.

Chapter 5, end of Saṅghādisesas

old text:

2) He has not been suspended and perceives that he has not been suspended. (If a bhikkhu has been suspended, he cannot accost other bhikkhus, and thus he cannot tell them until after his suspension has been lifted.)

new text:

2) He has not been suspended and perceives that he has not been suspended. (If he *has* been suspended, he is not in affiliation with any bhikkhus, and so cannot undergo the procedure for making amends for the offense.)

NP 2

Under the heading: 4. A field, orchard, garden (park), or threshing floor:

old text:

b. Enclosed and multi-kula (e.g., many fields, etc., within a single enclosure): Having kept the robes within the enclosure, greet dawnrise in the enclosure, at the entrance to the field, etc., where the robe is kept, or in the area one hatthapāsa around either (§).

new text:

b. Enclosed and multi-kula (e.g., many fields, etc., within a single enclosure): Having kept the robes within the enclosure, greet dawnrise at the entrance to the field, etc., at the spot where the robe is kept, or in the area one hatthapāsa around either (§).

Pācittiya 1**old text:**

In doing so, it conforms to a famous passage from MN 61 where the Buddha shows an empty water dipper to Rāhula, his son, telling him that anyone who feels no shame at uttering a deliberate lie is as empty of the virtues of a contemplative as the dipper is empty of water, and then advises Rāhula to train himself: “I will not utter a deliberate lie, even for a laugh.”

new text:

In doing so, it conforms to two passages in the suttas that class falsehoods meant to entertain, rather than to deceive, as lies. The first passage is in SN 42:13, where the Buddha, in making the point that some people are rewarded in the present life for breaking the five precepts, cites the case of the man who is rewarded for making a king laugh with a lie. The second passage is more famous. In MN 61, the Buddha shows an empty water dipper to Rāhula, his son, telling him that anyone who feels no shame at uttering a deliberate lie is as empty of the virtues of a contemplative as the dipper is empty of water. Then he advises Rāhula to train himself: “I will not utter a deliberate lie, even for a laugh.”

Pācittiya 5 (change 1)**old text:**

If both parties get up and then lie down again, the bhikkhu incurs another pācittiya.

new text:

If either party gets up and then lies down again, the bhikkhu incurs another pācittiya.

Pācittiya 5 (change 2)**old text:**

If a bhikkhu has been lying down in the same dwelling with an unordained person for two nights running but then skips a night—for example, getting up before dawn at the end of the third night—the consecutive series is broken.

new text:

If a bhikkhu has been lying down in the same dwelling with an unordained person for two nights running but then skips a night—for example, leaving the dwelling before dawn at the end of the third night and staying outside it until dawnrise has passed—the consecutive series is broken.

Pācittiya 5 (change 3)**old text:**

However, once he has been lying down in the same dwelling with an unordained person three nights running, then if after sundown on the fourth night he is lying down in the same dwelling in which a lay person is lying down—even if only for a moment—he incurs a pācittiya.

new text:

However, once he has been lying down in the same dwelling with an unordained person three nights running, then if after sundown on the fourth night—and, apparently, any time until sundown on the fifth night—he is lying down in the same dwelling in which a lay person is lying down—even if only for a moment—he incurs a pācittiya.

Pācittiya 5 (change 4)**old text:**

If, after lying down in the same dwelling with an unordained person for two nights running, one gets up before dawn at the end of the third night, one may resume lying down in the same dwelling with an unordained person the next night.

new text:

If, after lying down in the same dwelling with an unordained person for two nights running, a bhikkhu lies down in the same dwelling with an unordained person after sundown on the third night, that night doesn't count if either of the two gets up, leaves the dwelling before dawn at the end of the third night, and stays outside the dwelling until dawnrise has passed. The bhikkhu may then resume lying down in the same dwelling with an unordained person the next night.

Pācittiya 5 (change 5)**old text:**

The Vinaya-mukha comments that although this rule as it presently stands no longer fulfills its original purpose, bhikkhus should keep the original purpose in

mind and avoid sleeping in the same place with an unordained person whenever possible. It would also be a wise policy to avoid sleeping out in a public park, on a public beach, in an unwallled pavilion, etc., in full view of the public, even though no offense would be involved.

It is also worth noting that this rule encourages bhikkhus to get up and meditate before dawn every day so that they can know for sure they haven't committed the offense here.

new text:

The Vinaya-mukha makes two points here that appear to have no basis in the Canon but have become common practice in Thailand. The first is that this rule does not apply during daytime, even though the Canon makes no reference to daytime in its non-offense clauses. Here the author was probably misled by the Canon's way of referring to a 24-hour period as a "night" that begins at sundown.

The second point is an endorsement of what it says is an old Siamese tradition, that the act of cutting the sequence of nights before dawn of the third night can be accomplished simply by getting up, even if one stays in the dwelling. This, however, is not in accordance with the verb used by the Vibhaṅga in the relevant non-offense clause, *nikkhamitvā*, which clearly means "leaving" or "having left."

Still, the Vinaya-mukha is wise in saying that although this rule as it presently stands no longer fulfills its original purpose, bhikkhus should keep the original purpose in mind and avoid sleeping in the same place with an unordained person whenever possible. It would also be a wise policy to avoid sleeping out in a public park, on a public beach, in an unwallled pavilion, etc., in full view of the public, even though no offense would be involved.

Pācittiya 13 (change 1)

old text:

Object. This factor is fulfilled only by (1) a bhikkhu who (2) has been properly authorized as a Community official and (3) does not habitually act out of the four causes for bias: desire, aversion, delusion, or fear. With regard to the first two of these sub-factors, other people—and the Vibhaṅga's list of "others" here is interesting—are grounds for a dukkaṭa. The list is: an ordained person who has been improperly authorized to act as a Community official, an ordained person who hasn't been authorized to act as a Community official, and an unordained person, regardless of whether he/she has been authorized to act as a Community official or not. With regard to the third sub-factor, anyone who would otherwise be grounds for a pācittiya or a dukkaṭa is not grounds for an offense if he/she behaves in a biased way.

new text:

Object. This factor is fulfilled only by (1) an ordained person who (2) has been properly authorized as a Community official and (3) does not habitually act out of the four causes for bias: desire, aversion, delusion, or fear. With regard to the first two of these sub-factors, the Vibhaṅga does not state whether “ordained person” would include bhikkhunīs in addition to bhikkhus, but the Commentary treats it as including bhikkhus only. The Vibhaṅga does state that the following people who act as Community officials are grounds for a dukkaṭa: an ordained person who hasn’t been formally authorized, an ordained person who has been improperly authorized, and an unordained person, regardless of whether he/she has been formally authorized, improperly authorized, or not authorized at all. With regard to the third sub-factor, anyone who would otherwise be grounds for a pācittiya or a dukkaṭa is not grounds for an offense if he/she behaves in a biased way.

Pācittiya 13 (change 2)**old text:**

Effort. The Vibhaṅga defines criticizing as criticizing or complaining about a Community official to a fellow bhikkhu with the desire of making the official lose face, lose status, or feel abashed.

new text:

Effort. The Vibhaṅga defines criticizing as criticizing or complaining about a Community official to an ordained person with the desire of making the official lose face, lose status, or feel abashed.

Pācittiya 13 (change 3)**old text:**

According to the Vibhaṅga, the penalty for criticizing or complaining about a Community official is a pācittiya if one’s listener is a fellow bhikkhu, and a dukkaṭa if one’s listener is an unordained person (§).

new text:

According to the Vibhaṅga, the penalty for criticizing or complaining about a Community official is a pācittiya if one’s listener is ordained, and a dukkaṭa if not (§).

Pācittiya 40

old text:

The Commentary to Pr 1, in its discussion of what to do when a bhikkhu's sex changes spontaneously (!), lists seven actions

new text:

The Commentary to Pr 1, in its discussion of what to do when a bhikkhu's sex changes spontaneously, lists seven actions

Pācittiya 51

old text:

In addition, the non-offense clauses contain a phrase that can be read in two different ways. The first way would be, "With regard to molasses and emblic myrobalan, (there is no offense) if he drinks unfermented *ariṭṭha*." This is the way the Commentary interprets the phrase, which it explains as follows: *Ariṭṭha* is the name of an aged medicine, made from emblic myrobalan, etc., whose color, taste, and smell are like alcohol, but which is not alcoholic. This item, however, would seem to come under the first non-offense clause. Another way to read the phrase would be to take *ariṭṭha* as an adjective, which would yield, "With regard to molasses and emblic myrobalan, (there is no offense) if he drinks what has not fermented and not turned bad." Perhaps the mixture of emblic myrobalan and molasses was used to make a type of toddy, in which case the allowance would grant permission for the mixture to be drunk before it had fermented. This allowance could then be extended to liquids like apple cider consumed before it has turned alcoholic.

new text:

In addition, the non-offense clauses state, "With regard to molasses and emblic myrobalan, (there is no offense) if he drinks unfermented *ariṭṭha*." The Commentary explains this as follows: "There is no offense for non-alcoholic *ariṭṭha*. They reportedly make *ariṭṭha* with the juice of such fruits as emblic myrobalan, which has the color, smell, and taste of alcohol but is not alcoholic: This is what is meant. That which has the starter thrown in, however, is alcoholic, and even the mother (of this kind of *ariṭṭha*) is unallowable."

Pācittiya 62

old text:

Summary: Using water, or getting others to use it, knowing that it contains living beings that will die from that use, is a pācittiya offense.

new text:

Summary: Using water knowing that it contains living beings that will die from that use is a pācittiya offense.

Under IX. Thullaccaya Offenses

old text:

A bhikkhu engages in mouth-to-mouth penetration with another human being or animal: a thullaccaya offense.

new text:

A bhikkhu inserts his penis into a wound on a corpse: a thullaccaya offense.

Under Rule Index

old text:

Using water, or getting others to use it, knowing that it contains living beings that will die from that use, is a pācittiya offense. (Pc 62)

new text:

Using water knowing that it contains living beings that will die from that use is a pācittiya offense. (Pc 62)

Buddhist Monastic Code 2

Chapter 2 (change 1)

old text:

Mv.VIII.12.2 notes that Ven. Ānanda sewed the pieces of cloth together with a rough stitch, so that the robes would be appropriate for contemplatives and not provoke thieves, but this is not a required part of the pattern.

change:

(The above paragraph should be omitted.)

Chapter 2 (change 2)

old text:

“I allow that a rough stitch be made I allow that the uneven edge be removed I allow that a border and a binding (for the edge of the border) be put on.... I allow that a network [of stitches] be made.”—Mv.VIII.21.1

new text:

“I allow that a thread patch (darning) be made I allow that the uneven edge be removed I allow that a border and a binding (for the edge of the border) be put on.... I allow that a network [of stitches] be made.”—Mv.VIII.21.1

Chapter 14

old text:

There is a peculiar passage in the Commentary in which this category is said to apply to a bhikkhu, novice, or bhikkhuni who, thinking of disrobing, tries on lay clothing (either white clothing or monastic robes worn in the style of lay clothing) beforehand to see how they will look. If he/she decides that they look good, then from that moment on he/she is in affiliation through theft. This seems baseless, for the simple act of wearing lay clothing is only a dukkaṭa (Cv.V.29.4), and the factors for disrobing are not complete.

change:

(The above paragraph should be omitted.)

Chapter 19 (change 1)

old text:

1. (a) One has committed a saṅghādisesa offense and (b) knows that it is an offense.
2. (a) One has not been suspended and (b) knows that one has not been suspended. (If one has been suspended, one may not accost a regular bhikkhu, so one may not approach him to inform him. See pair (4), below.)
3. (a) There are no obstructions and (b) one knows that there are none.
4. (a) One is able to inform another bhikkhu (who is suitable to be informed) and (b) knows that one is able to.

new text:

1. (a) One has committed a saṅghādisesa offense and (b) perceives that it is an offense.
2. (a) One has not been suspended and (b) perceives that one has not been suspended. (If one *has* been suspended, one is not in affiliation with any bhikkhus, and so cannot undergo the procedure for making amends for the offense.)
3. (a) There are no obstructions and (b) one perceives that there are none.
4. (a) One is able to inform another bhikkhu (who is suitable to be informed) and (b) perceives that one is able to.

Chapter 19 (change 2)

old text:

Under pair 1: As long as the offense is a saṅghādisesa and one knows that it is an offense, this pair of factors is fulfilled.

new text:

Under pair 1: As long as the offense is a saṅghādisesa and one perceives that it is an offense, this pair of factors is fulfilled.

Chapter 20

old text:

on seeing a regular bhikkhu he should get up from his seat; he should not accost a regular bhikkhu inside or out (of the monastery, says the Commentary).

new text:

on seeing a regular bhikkhu he should get up from his seat; he should not accost (insult, criticize) a regular bhikkhu inside or out (of the monastery, says the Commentary).