

Nissāraṇīya:
A Codified Term Updating the Development of the Pāli Vinaya, Part I

Juo-Hsüeh Shih

Abstract

Nissāraṇīya is a term added to conclude the *saṅghādisesa* rules for nuns only in the Pāli Vinaya. It refers to a temporary expulsion of the guilty nun, yet this is beyond the penalty prescribed. A comparative study of the relevant passages in the other Vinayas attests to the controversy hinted at in the Sp. The Pāli Vinaya is alone in asserting the expulsion of the nun, whereas the other traditions are concerned with the nun's release from her offence. The key to such controversy lies in orthographical variation: *nissāraṇīya* vs *nihsaraṇīya*. Our study points to the assumption that the Vinaya may have borrowed a term from the Suttas to supplement the offence name *saṅghādisesa*. It was *nissaraṇīyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ* in the Pātimokkha, which is confirmed by internal evidence from the Sp. *Nissaraṇīya* was later replaced by *nissāraṇīya* and its meaning and reference underwent a dramatic change. Moreover, *nissāraṇīya* then found its way back into the Suttas in which there is some confusion between *nissaraṇīya* and *nissāraṇīya*.

Preliminaries

In the Pāli Vinaya *nissāraṇīya* appears solely in the *Saṅghādisesa* chapter of the Bhikkhunī Vinaya with one exception in the *Parivāra: nissāraṇīyaṃ paññattam*, ‘enactment of expulsion’. Its variant forms *nissāraṇā* and *nissare* make a couple of appearances in the *Mahāvagga* and *Parivāra*, respectively. When a monk violates a *saṅghādisesa* rule, he is said to have committed an offence of *saṅghādisesa*, ‘an offence entailing legal acts of the Saṅgha (for its removal)’, whereas in the case of nuns, the offence now has an additional term qualifying it: *nissāraṇīyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ*.

What does *nissāraṇīya* mean in this context? As we will see, in the canonical commentary (*padabhājana*, ‘Analysis of Words’ = AW), *nissāraṇīyaṃ* is glossed as *saṅghamhā nissāriyati*, ‘she is made to leave the Saṅgha’. The post-canonical commentaries, particularly the *Samantapāsādikā* (Sp), reinforces this position by making the canonical gloss even clearer. With regard to whether there is indeed something extra, there are opinions pro and con. Those who believe that *nissāraṇīya* denotes something extra agree upon the temporality of such expulsion, besides this, however, nothing about how, when and where to put this into practice is found in any Vinaya literature.

The term *nissāraṇīya* gives rise to different interpretations, probably because the term is new (i.e. absent from the *Bhikkhu Pātimokkha* = BhuPām) and the penalty of expulsion is beyond the scope of the mending procedures for an offence of *saṅghādisesa*. Without reliable clues, the meaning and reference of *nissāraṇīya* remain arguable and the problem whether *nissāraṇīya* denotes an extra punishment remains pending.

Despite all these ambiguities and uncertainties, we must not overlook what the Pāli Vinaya has ever said. According to the canonical texts and commentaries, there can be no doubt that for the Pāli tradition *nissāraṇīya* denotes the expulsion of the nun guilty of a *saṅghādisesa* offence. This is the starting point for our investigation.

Section I discusses whether *nissāraṇīya* denotes an extra punishment or involves nothing extra. A brief summary of the penalty for an offence of *saṅghādisesa* will first be presented to show the procedures required of the offenders to escape from their offences. All the procedures take place within the monastery. Nowhere in the texts is there ever an indication that an offender is to be expelled from the Saṅgha. In this respect the Pāli Vinaya is very limited. It is therefore necessary to collate the other Vinayas to advance our understanding of the *saṅghādisesa* offence for nuns.

The Sp's commentary deserves special attention in that it hints at an existing controversy over how the additional term qualifying *saṅghādisesa* was understood. To verify such controversy, a comparison of the closing phrases of the *saṅghādisesa* rules in the other Vinayas will be provided. This comparison demonstrates that none of them suggest anything extra. More importantly, the other texts read *nihsaraṇīya*, derived from a normal stem, whose Pāli correspondence should be *nissaraṇīya*, not *nissāraṇīya* as is seen in the present Pāli Bhikkhunī Vinaya (= BhīVin).

Section II draws the attention back to the Pāli Vinaya to explore further the issue in question. As mentioned above, other traditions read *nihsaraṇīya* whereas the Pāli Vinaya has *nissāraṇīya*. Is the additional term from a normal stem: *nihsaraṇīya/nissaraṇīya*, or is it from a causative stem: *nissāraṇīya*? Which is the right word, or are they just interchangeable? While a difference of terms may not really matter, their interpretation does, especially when the two differing forms of the same word may lead to completely opposite results.

The evidence of the Sp is important in broadening the scope of our investigation and deepening our perspective. It **was** *nissaraṇīya* in the Pātimokkha, in agreement with the reading *nihsaraṇīya* in the other Vinayas available to us. If this is the case, we may infer that once there was full agreement among the various traditions on what the additional term *nihsaraṇīya/nissaraṇīya* refers to.

It is interesting to ask why and when an additional term was added to qualify the offence title *saṅghādisesa*. Section III turns to the Suttas in search of the possible origin of the term added. While *nissaraṇīya* was a later addition in the Vinaya, this term and the variant form *nissaraṇā* are relatively well attested in the Suttas, with a meaning and reference that fits the context of the *saṅghādisesa* offence perfectly. A comparative study also shows that in the Skt texts of both the Sūtras and Vinaya, *nihsaraṇīya* literally means 'going out', hence escape or leading to freedom in a soteriological sense. There is no disagreement on the usage of *nihsaraṇīya/nissaraṇīya* among the Pāli Suttas, Skt Sūtras and Vinaya.

The investigation of Section III leads to the assumption that the Pāli Vinaya may have borrowed the term *nissaraṇīya* from the Suttas, yet as can be seen, the term now is *nissāraṇīya*. Section IV looks further into the phenomenon of the *nissaraṇīya/nissāraṇīya* confusion in the Pāli Suttas. If the Pāli Vinaya had retained the original form of *nissaraṇīya*, the causative derivative *nissāraṇīya* could not have come into being. The Pāli Vinaya is the only source for *nissāraṇīya*, thus it must have contributed to the above-mentioned confusion.

I. *Nissāraṇīya*: Nothing Extra or Something Extra?

To judge whether or not *nissāraṇīya* indicates an extra punishment, it is necessary to see what the penalty for an offence of *saṅghādisesa* is. *Saṅghādisesa* is an offence next to Defeat (*Pārājika*) in gravity, and can be amended. A monk violating a *saṅghādisesa* rule is subject to the penalty of *parivāsa*, literally ‘living apart’ (or ‘probation’), if he conceals his offence, which is followed by a six nights’ penance (*mānatta*). Since a *pārivāsika* monk (a monk undergoing *parivāsa*) is not allowed to share a dwelling under the same roof with regular monks, he has to live alone in separate quarters. A guilty monk undertakes six nights’ *mānatta* straightforwardly without *parivāsa* if he does not conceal his offence.

For nuns there is no *parivāsa*: because staying alone is not befitting for a nun, she is exempted from this.¹ But the duration of *mānatta* is, for nuns, extended to fourteen days. On the completion of *mānatta*, an offender is entitled to request the Saṅgha for rehabilitation (*abbhāna*), through which one becomes purified of guilt and is re-admitted into the Saṅgha as a regular member.

There is no substantial difference between the penalties for *parivāsa* and *mānatta* except that the duration of the latter is fixed, whereas that of the former varies according to the length of concealment. The Cv enumerates ninety-four observances for *parivāsa*, but they also apply to *mānatta* with some variations (Vin II 31ff).

In the first place, a *pārivāsika* monk has to report his case to any incoming monks or to the monks he visits. He is to inform the Saṅgha of his status on the occasions of Pātimokkha-recitation (*Upasatha*) and Invitation (*Pavāraṇā*). There is no way of escaping; in the case of illness, he must have someone report on behalf of him.² A *mānattacārika* monk (a monk undergoing *mānatta*) needs to report his status to the Saṅgha on a daily basis.³ In the case of a nun, she has to make daily report to both Saṅghas.

¹ KKh 166,25-26 has it that if a nun conceals her offence against a *saṅghādisesa* rule, she is guilty of a wrong-doing even though there is no *parivāsa* for her. (*bhikkhuniyā hi āpattiṃ chādentiyāpi parivāso nāma n’atthi chādanappaccayāpi pana dukkaṭaṃ āpajjati*.) This verdict is not found in the canonical commentary, nor in the Sp.

² Vin II 32,19-22.

³ Vin II 35,26-30: *mānattacārikaena bhikkhave bhikkhunā āgantukena ārocetabbaṃ, āgantukassa ārocetabbaṃ uposathe ārocetabbaṃ, pavāraṇāya ārocetabbaṃ devasikam ārocetabbaṃ. Sace gilāno hote dūtena pi ārocetabbaṃ.*

Secondly, a *parivāsika* monk may visit monks belonging to his own community if he can reach there on the same day.⁴ He must not go about or visit monks belonging to another community (*nānāsamvāsakā*) without being accompanied by a regular monk unless in an emergency.⁵ The same applies to a *mānattacārika* monk except he is allowed to go out with the Saṅgha.⁶

In addition to the above regulations, one reads among the ninety-four observances that a *mānattacārika* monk should not live away from regular monks, or stay alone in the forest (in order to avoid the embarrassment of being deprived of many privileges granted to a regular monk), or avoid reporting his present status to the monks he meets,⁷ or stay under the same roof as a regular monk, whether it be a residence or not.⁸ A failure to observe these restrictions will incur a “break” (*ratticcheda*).⁹ The above restrictions are to be observed also by a guilty nun. She is not allowed to dwell under the same roof with regular nuns, and is not allowed to live alone or away from nuns belonging to the same community. She is therefore supposed to live with a companion assigned by the Saṅgha in a separate quarter within the nunnery.¹⁰ The foregoing discussion shows that the penalties for an offence against *saṅghādisesa* do not involve the culprit’s expulsion from the Saṅgha.¹¹

As regards the placement of the term *nissāraṇīya* before *saṅghādisesa*, the AW offers the following terse gloss on Saṅgh 1 (N):

Nissāraṇīyan ti saṅghamhā nissāriyati. ‘Expulsion means she is made to leave the Saṅgha.’ (Vin IV 225,7)

⁴ Vin II 33,5-12.

⁵ Vin II 32,22-33,5.

⁶ Vin II 35,32-36,7. Mostly the same as the above quotation, but read *mānattacārika* for *pārivāsika* and *aññatra saṅghena* for *aññatra pakatattena*. Here *Saṅgha* means, according to the Sp (1170,21-23), a chapter of four or more monks.

⁷ Vin II 32,17: *na ārañṇakaṅgaṃ samāditabbaṃ*. Sp 1164,21-23 glosses: *na ārañṇakaṅgan ti āgatāgatānaṃ ārocetum harāyamānena arañṇikadhitaṅgaṃ na samādātabbaṃ*.

⁸ Vin II 33,12-15: *na bhikkhave pārivāsika bhikkhunā pakatattena bhikkhunā saddhiṃ ekacchanne āvāse vatthabbaṃ, na ekacchanne anāvāse vatthabbaṃ, na ekacchanne āvāse vā anāvāse vā vatthabbaṃ*.

⁹ Vin II 36, 21-24: *Cattāro kho Upāli mānattacārikassa bhikkhuno ratticcheda: sahavāso vippavāso anārocanā une gaṇe caraṇan ti*. (There are, Upāli, four kinds of break: living under the same roof as a regular monk, living away from [the regular monks], failing to report [daily his case to the Saṅgha], and going about in less than a group.)

¹⁰ This is confirmed by the tenth chapter of the Cv (Vin II 279,22-24) in which another nun was assigned as a companion (*dutiya*) to a nun who had to undergo *mānatta*.

¹¹ For a detailed discussion on the technical aspects of the *saṅghādisesa* penalties, cf. Nolot 1996, SVTT III, pp. 116-136.

The translation here is based on the traditional position of the Pāli Vinaya, yet this gloss could be interpreted differently. *Nissāraṇīya* is a gerundive of *nissāreti*, derived from the causative stem of *niḥ-√sr*, which means to go out, depart, or withdraw. The passive *niḥsāriyati/nissāriyati* means “being caused to go out, turn out”, and hence to be removed or expelled.

One may take either the offence or the guilty nun as the subject of *nissāriyati*. In the case of the former, it means “the offence is removed (Literally: made to go out) from the Saṅgha. The gloss at Saṅgh 9 for nuns (Vin IV 240,21: *nissāraṇīyan ti saṅghamhā nissāriyati*) could be read in this way. The introductory story to this rule recounts that some nuns lived in close association (*bhikkhuniyo saṃsaṭṭhā viharanti*). While the guilty nuns are in the plural, *nissāriyati* remains singular. If this is the correct reading, the offence must be the subject of *nissāriyati* and hence *nissāraṇīyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ* means: an offence entailing legal acts of the Saṅgha, through which the offence is removed (Literally: ‘the offence is made to go out from the Saṅgha’). It is worthy of note that in the commentarial texts the offence is always the referent (grammatical subject), although the exposition ends up with the nun (grammatical object → logical subject) being expelled.

One may, however, argue that the singular *nissāriyati* could be merely a formalistic error, a certain expression being repeated automatically. Should this be the case, one could read *nissāriyanti* instead of *nissāriyati*. Oldenberg held this opinion,¹² yet no manuscript evidence is adduced. If, however, we take the offence as the subject of *nissāriyati*, the additional expression then adds no new idea; on the contrary, it makes clear the final result of the amending proceedings. It may thus serve as a supplement to the term *saṅghādisesa*, whose meaning is not self-explanatory. If we take the guilty nun to be the subject, as the Pāli commentaries have done, an immediate difficulty comes up. Following the gloss on *nissāraṇīya* is that on *saṅghādisesa*:

An offence entailing legal acts of the Saṅgha means: on account of her offence the Saṅgha inflicts the *mānatta* penalty¹³ [upon her], draws [her] back to the beginning,¹⁴ and rehabilitates [her]. These

¹² Horner agrees with Oldenberg, Cf. BD III xxxvi.

¹³ A summary of this penalty dealt with in the Cv is given in Nolot 1996, “SVTT II” pp. 116ff.

¹⁴ *Mūlāya paṭikassati*. If the offending nun commits another offence of the same category while undergoing the penalty of *mānatta* (six nights’ duration for monks but a fortnight’s duration for nuns), she then has to retake the penalty from the beginning. For more information, cf. the third chapter of the Cv (Vin II 44ff)

things are carried out neither by several nuns nor by one single nun, it is therefore called an offence entailing legal acts of the Saṅgha. Legal act is indeed the name of this class of offence, thus it is called an offence entailing legal acts of the Saṅgha.¹⁵

This exposition is formulated on the model of that for monks, and our foregoing discussion on the penalty for an offence of *saṅghādisesa* has shown that all the mending procedures are carried out within the compound of the Saṅgha, which does not involve expelling the culprit out of the monastery. As the gloss on *nissāraṇīya* comes first indicating expulsion of the guilty nun from the Saṅgha, it is strange that what immediately follows suggests no expulsion at all.

I.B. Horner takes the guilty nun as the subject and remarks: “*Nissāraṇīya*, involving being sent away, adds nothing to the *saṅghādisesa* penalty incurred by a nun, and hence makes no difference in the penalty imposed on monks and nuns for having committed such an offence. Only the words, as found in each ‘rule’ of the Nuns’ Saṅghādisesas, is extra.”¹⁶ (BD III xxxvii)

By “being sent away” Horner means a temporary exclusion (BD III xxxvi), but it is not clear what that exactly refers to and how it will be put into practice; this disagrees with the gloss on *saṅghādisesa* that immediately follows. Nevertheless, later on she shifted her position. In rendering the phrase *saṅghamhā dasa nissare*, she takes the offence to be the subject: ‘ten are to be escaped from by means of the Order’ (BD III xxxvi). We shall come back soon to this subject (see below p. 147). In commenting on the term *nissāraṇīya*, the Sp writes:

Expulsion means it (her offence) causes the nun to be expelled from the Saṅgha. But in the AW, to expound this meaning, ‘expulsion’ is explained as ‘she is expelled from the Saṅgha’. Here the meaning should be understood in this way: the offence, having committed which the nun is expelled from the Saṅgha, that is to be removed. It

¹⁵ Vin IV 225,8-12: *Saṅghādisesan ti saṅgho ‘va tassā āpattiya mānattaṃ deti mūlāya paṭikassati abbheti na sambahūla na ekā bhikkhunī vuccati saṅghādiseso ti. tass’ eva āpattinikāyassa nāma kammaṃ adhivacanaṃ tena pi vuccati saṅghādiseso ti.*

¹⁶ Édith Nolot concludes her detailed discussion on *nissāraṇā/nissāraṇīya* with two hypotheses posited by others reflecting opinions pro and con: nothing extra vs something extra. Nolot 1999, “SVTT V”, pp. 54-55.

is indeed not that very offence which is removed from the Saṅgha [by anyone], but it is the nun who is expelled from the Saṅgha because of that offence. Therefore “expulsion” means that [offence] causes (her) to be removed.¹⁷

The first commentary on the Sp, the *Vajrabuddhi-ṭīkā*, is silent on this subject, perhaps because the Sp has made what *nissāraṇīya* refers to clear enough. In commenting on the phrase *bhikkhuniṃ saṅghato nissāretī*, the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī-purāṇaṭīkā* reinforces the standpoint that the offence, as the agent, is indeed the cause for *nissāraṇā*, and so it reads *nissāraṇīyo* to explain the reason why the nun is expelled: her offence causes her to be expelled.¹⁸

The following information can be extracted from the Sp’s commentary: 1. There exists a controversy over what is to be removed from the Saṅgha: the guilty nun or the offence committed; 2. The opponents consider the offence as the referent; 3. The Sp also takes the offence as the referent but explains that the offence causes the nun to be expelled.¹⁹ Note that a grammatical concern is involved here, and that there is a consensus among the Pāli and other Vinayas that the added word refers to the offence.

In view of the controversy, one would expect the Sp to have an opinion on the referent different from its rivals’. Surprisingly it was not the case. The logic of the Sp’s interpretation precludes the possibility of the nun as the agent. The added word in the Pāli reads *nissāraṇīya*, a causative derivative. If the nun is taken as the referent, *nissāraṇīya* would mean: [A] The nun (grammatical subject) causes the offence (grammatical object → logical subject) to be removed. This will happen after the nun has undergone required amends. But if the offence is taken as the referent, the interpretation in the passive voice will lead to a result which the Sp desires: [B] The offence (grammatical subject) causes the nun (grammatical object → logical subject) to be expelled.

¹⁷ Sp 908,5-11: *bhikkhuniṃ saṅghato nissāretī ti nissāraṇīyo, taṃ nissāraṇīyaṃ padabhājane pana adhipāyyamattaṃ dasettuṃ saṅghamhā nissārīyati ti vuttaṃ. tattha yaṃ āpannā bhikkhunī saṅghato nissārīyati so nissāraṇīyo ti evaṃ attho daṭṭhabbo, na hi so eva dhammo saṅghamhā nissārīyati, tena pana dhammena bhikkhunī nissārīyati. tasmā so nissāretī ti nissāraṇīyo.*

¹⁸ *Bhikkhuniṃ saṅghato nissāretī ti āpannaṃ bhikkhuniṃ bhikkhunisaṅghamhā nissāretī. Hetumhi cāyaṃ kattuvohāro “nissāraṇahetubhūtaḍḍhammo ‘nissāraṇīyo’ ti vutto” katvā.* (Chaṭṭha Saṅgāyana online edition)

¹⁹ Edith Nolot argues that in the Pāli texts, *nissāraṇa/nissāraṇīya* refer “exclusively to persons, not to objects.” (Nolot, “SVTT IV-X”, p. 52). Noting “that [offence] causes to expel [her]”, the Sp’ exposition shows that the guilty nun is an indirect referent of *nissāraṇīya*.

Grammatically speaking, both are all right, but in terms of connotation, they make a great difference. [B] suggests that the expulsion must take place in the beginning, in that the prescribed mending procedures conclude with the nun's being reinstated. This may explain why most of the discussants on the *nissāraṇīya* problems focus their attention on the *mānatta* penalty, taking *nissāraṇīya* as referring to some sort of “dismissal” or “isolation” during the period of undergoing *mānatta*.²⁰ Nevertheless, our subsequent discussion will demonstrate that *nissāraṇīya* can be something really extra to the traditional set of the *saṅghādisesa* proceedings. As [A] is not favored by the Pāli tradition, the Sp, in support of [B], must comply with the traditional view on the referent. Despite the dictional variation, the core of the controversy seems to be a matter of interpretation, yet to reach a desired interpretation, a corresponding wording has a role to play.

A comparison of the *Saṅghādisesa* chapters of other extant Vinayas finds the Sp to have stood firm but alone, arguing against almost all traditions. Three Vinayas, the *Mahāsaṅghika* (Mā), Chinese and Tibetan *Mūlasarvāstivādin* (= CMū and TMū, respectively), contain no additional expression qualifying the term *saṅghādisesa*. It is evident that there exists no expulsion of the guilty nun in these traditions.

In the *Mahīśasaka* (= Mī) and *Sarvāstivāda* (= Sa) Vinayas, one does read an additional expression.

Mī, T22[1421]79a16-17: 是比丘尼初犯僧伽婆尸沙，可悔過。 This nun commits a first-offence *saṅghāvaśeṣa*, [which is] a repentable fault.²¹

Sa, T23[1435]b4: 是法初犯僧伽婆尸沙，可悔過。 This is a first-offence *saṅghāvaśeṣa*, [which is] a repentable fault.

Waldschmidt in his work *Bruchstücke des Bhikṣuṇī-Prātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādin* reconstructs *niḥsaraṇīya* for the Chinese rendering “a repentable fault”. His reconstruction is in fact corroborated by a tiny bit of evidence from a Sanskrit text of the *Bhikṣuṇī Prātimokṣa*. It is a four-line fragment of *Saṅghavāśeṣa* 8-9, and the third line reads: “[D]harmah Pratthamāpattiḥ saṅghavāśeṣa niḥsa...”²²

²⁰ Nolot, “SVTT IV-X”, pp. 54-55.

²¹ Ann Heirman renders 可悔過 as “it has to be confessed”. Heirman 2002, Part II, p. 388, fn. 10.

²² Finot, *PrMoSū*(Sa), p. 549.

The ending phrase of the corresponding rules of the Dharmaguptaka (= Dha) is the closest version to that of the Pāli.

Dha, T22[1428]1032a10f: [是]比丘尼犯初法，應捨，僧伽婆尸沙。[T]his nun commits a first-offence, [which/who] should be abandoned/removed, and this entails legal acts of the Saṅgha.

There is some ambiguity in the Chinese rendering, that is to say, the referent of the additional term could be the guilty nun herself or the offence. I shall deal with this problem in the following discussion. (See below pp. 148-149)

It is obvious that in the Mā, CMū, TMū, Mī and Sa, no expulsion is indicated by the additional expression, and the word order in the Mī and Sa is different: *niḥsaraṇīya* comes after *saṅghavāśesa*. As is shown above, the Sp's commentary holds a strong position against an opposite opinion: it is the offence that is to be removed from the Saṅgha. This is exactly what is spelt out in the *Bhikṣuṇī Vinaya* of the *Mahāsāṅghika-Lokottaravādin* (= BhīVin(Mā-L)).

Bhī(Mā-L) 103,5-7: *ayaṃ dharmo prathamāpattiko saṃghātīśeso upādiśeṣo saṃgho saṃghaṃ evādhīpati kṛtyā niḥsaraṇīyo*.

‘This is a first-offence *saṃghātīśeso*.²³ Having remainder in the Saṅgha; with the Saṅgha having acted as an authority, this offence should be removed.’

With *dharmo* (the offence) as the subject and qualified by *niḥsaraṇīyo*, the statement, formulated in this way, leaves no room for any other interpretation. But this does not necessarily mean the Mā-L also accepted the additional term *niḥsaraṇīya*. This term together with its explanation as quoted above appears only in the first and the last rule; this presumably means the explanatory phrase is to be carried throughout the entire chapter. The text as we have it now is a complete version of the BhīPām, and it would seem that when the text was compiled, the redactor(s) must have been aware of the controversy over *nissāraṇīya/niḥsaraṇīya*. Being a sub-sect of the Mā, which added no term to *saṅghātīśeso*, the Mā-L may have interpolated the term *niḥsaraṇīya* with a precise explanation. This can be seen as an opponent's response to the Pāli tradition.

²³ In fn. 4 (BhīVin(Mā-L) , 103), Roth suggests a translation of *upādiśeṣo saṃgho*: “groups of offences (*saṃgha*) which is the supplement (*śeṣa*) to the first group (*upa+ādi*) [the group of the *Pārājika*-offences]”.

The Pāli Vinaya insists that *nissāraṇīyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ* means the guilty nun should be expelled from the Saṅgha, whereas in the Mā-L Vinaya, *niḥsaraṇīyo* means the offence should be removed from the Saṅgha. The Vinayas having an additional expression are all the Sthāvira-affiliated schools, this fact betrays the possibility that the additional expression most likely originated from the Sthāvira side with the wording *niḥsaraṇīya/nissaraṇīya*. *Nissaraṇīya* had later been replaced by *nissāraṇīya* in the Pāli and its reference had undergone dramatic change from removing the offence to expelling the guilty nun. It cannot be more evident that the Mā-L took a position opposite to the Pāli.

Now we notice that instead of *nissāraṇīya*, what the other Vinayas read is a different word *niḥsaraṇīya*. As is mentioned previously, the variant form of this word must have contributed to the controversy. The Pāli Vinaya alone reads *nissāraṇīya*, insisting that the guilty nun should be expelled from the Saṅgha. Given the expulsion is temporary, it is something extra to the traditional prescription. For the other Vinayas which reads *niḥsaraṇīya*, there is nothing extra in that this term is supplementary. Why is there such controversy? Which is the right word in the Pāli Vinaya, *nissaraṇīya* or *nissāraṇīya*? Now we turn to this very issue.

II. *Nissaraṇīya* or *Nissāraṇīya*

To remove the offence or to expel the nun? It indeed was the addition of a new term that had given rise to such controversy. Why and when was the term added? As is understood, those rules for nuns were originally embedded in the BhuVin, and from which the rules for nuns were latter extracted to form an independent BhiVin. It was presumably around this time that a new term may have been attached to qualify the word *saṅghādisesa*, presumably for the purpose of refining the text. The BhuPāms of the various traditions agree to a great extent in terms of the numbers and contents of the rules and their sequential order. On the contrary, the BhīPāms vary to a great extent in every aspect, which may suggest a poor textual transmission or free composition (?) during the sectarian period. Moreover, from the fact that not all the Vinayas (i.e. Mā, CMū and TMū) have a term added to *saṅghādisesa*, one may infer that sometime in early history of the BhīPāms a certain school innovated to add a new term; some schools followed but some did not.

All traditions that have an additional expression reads *niḥsaraṇīya*, but it is *nissāraṇīya* in the Pāli text alone. It is interesting to further explore whether *nissāraṇīya* is the original form of the additional term in the Pāli Vinaya.

Nissāraṇīya/nissāraṇā appears only in some contexts concerning penalties. Throughout the Pāli Vinaya one reads the form derived from a causative stem consistently with one exception. In the eighth chapter (*Gāthāsaṃgaṇika*: Collection of Stanzas) of the *Parivāra* (Vin V 144ff), stanzas 10-30 form a passage relating how many Pātimokkha rules are shared or not shared by nuns and so on. When it comes to the training rules peculiar to nuns, the text says: *pārājikāni cattāri saṅghamhā dasa nissare*: ‘There are four Defeats and ten should go out from the Saṅgha’ (Vin V 147,23).

Nissare is an optative form of *niḥ-√sr* derived from the normal stem, hence “ten should go out” here must refer to the ten offences committed, which should be removed by means of the legal acts of the Saṅgha. In glossing this stanza, the Sp writes:

Ten should go out from the Saṅgha: in the *Vibhaṅga* it is said that [she] is made to leave the Saṅgha, but in the *Pātimokkha* ten have come down to us with the wording: *nissaraṇīyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ*.²⁴

The Sp here spells out that although in the *Vibhaṅga* it is interpreted in the sense of expulsion (*nissāraṇīya*), in the *Pātimokkha* it is *nissaraṇīyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ*, which means ‘an offence entailing legal acts of the Saṅgha, through which the offence should be escaped’.

It should be noted that *nissaraṇīyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ* in this context records no variant reading, and this means the Sinhalese and Burmese manuscripts and printed texts consulted by the PTS editors fully agree upon the form of *nissaraṇīyaṃ*. Moreover, from a syntactic point of view, *nissaraṇīyaṃ* should be the correct wording. Should this be the case, *nissāraṇīyaṃ* as we have it now in the BhīPām must be a later change, and there must be reason(s) for such change.

As is pointed out above (see above pp. 140-142), the Pāli canonical commentary (Vin IV 225,7; 240,21; 225,8-12) glosses *nissāraṇīya* first and then *saṅghādisesa*. Amending a *saṅghādisesa* offence involves no expulsion, nor are the proceedings carried out outside the compound of the monastery. It would be odd to say of expelling the nun first but in what follows no expulsion is indicated, unless the gloss (*nissāraṇīyan ti saṅghamhā nissāriyati*) was inserted here later at a certain time when the added word *nissaraṇīya* has been changed

²⁴ Sp 1350,4-6: *Saṅghamhā dasa nissare ti saṅghamhā nissāriyatī ti evaṃ Vibhaṅge vuttā mātikāyaṃ pana nissaraṇīyaṃ saṅghādisesan ti evaṃ āgatāni dasa*.

into *nissāraṇīya*, which points to the culprit's expulsion outside of the normal procedures.

None of the Vinaya texts that contain a new expression offers a gloss on it. It would be no wonder if this new term brings no new idea beyond what is connoted in the title *saṅghādisesa*. The text of the Dha is important in this context. The Pāli and Dha Vinayas resemble each other in many ways, and we find a remarkable similarity of wording and phrasing in the closing part of the *saṅghādisesa* rules.²⁵

Pāli, Vin IV 224,27-8: *ayaṃ bhikkhunī paṭhamāpattikaṃ dhammaṃ āpannā nissāraṇīyaṃ saṅghādisesan ti.*

[T]his nun commits a first-offence, which entails legal acts of the Saṅgha involving expulsion.

Dha, T22[1428]1032a10f: [是]比丘尼犯初法，應捨，僧伽婆尸沙。

[T]his nun commits a first-offence, [which/who] should be abandoned/removed, and this entails legal acts of the Saṅgha.

In the case of the Dha, with the referent unindicated, there is some ambiguity in the expression 應捨 (‘should be abandoned/removed’). What should be abandoned/removed? The guilty nun or the offence committed?

An examination of the Dha's renderings for technical terms indicates that banishment is rendered as 擯 (T22[1428]891a6), and expulsion as 驅出 (T22[1428]889a10). If expulsion of the guilty nun is meant here, we would not expect to read the character 捨 (‘abandoned/removed’). In view of the Dha's terminology, it seems plausible to take the offence as the referent.²⁶

As can be seen, the passages of the Pāli and Dha are word-for-word verbatim. Because of such resemblance, one would expect to read in the Dha the same gloss on *nissāraṇīya* as is seen in the Pāli text. But the Dha, like the Mī and

²⁵ For a detailed discussion on the concluding phrases of the *saṅghādisesa* rules in the various Vinayas, cf. Shih 2003, pp. 213-218.

²⁶ Ann Heirman's translation reads: the *bhikṣuṇī* violates an immediate rule, a *saṅghāvaśeṣa*, that has to be given up. She has a subsequent discussion on this expression, quoting the corresponding phrases from the other Vinaya recensions. Heirman, 2002, Part II, 388-389, fn. 10. In an article (Heirman 2003, p. 17) she further points out that “In the *Dharmaguptakavinaya*, the character 捨 is never used when one excludes (滅、擯) or suspends (舉) a *bhikṣuṇī*, but is used when one gives up bad behavior.”

Sa, offers no explanation of the new term. A newly added term requires no exposition only when its meaning is already known or is readily understandable. The reason why the Pāli inserted an explanation is probably that the new term had been changed from *nissaraṇīya* to *nissāraṇīya*, and the latter indicated a new institution.

It is not surprising to read an additional term in the Pātimokkha, as many instances have demonstrated where the Pāli BhiVin seems to be more advanced in wording and phrasing, compared to its Bhikkhu counterpart.²⁷ The additional *nissaraṇīya* supplements *saṅghādisesa* in its meaning, and the new phrase *nissaraṇīyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ* would therefore mean: an offence entailing legal acts of the Saṅgha, through which the offence should be removed or the guilty nun should be released from her offence. The latter is exactly what the Chinese commentarial text, the 毗尼母經 *Pi-ni-mu Jing (Vinayamātrka-sūtra)*, says in explaining how the Saṅgha helps the offenders remove their offences by means of *parivāsa* (lit. living apart), *mānatta*, and then reinstatement: Having been reinstated, an offender becomes pure and is “released from the offence” (於所犯處得解脫 T24[1463]842c27).

III. Where may have *Nissaraṇīya* Come from?

The internal evidence studied above has shown that originally it was *nissaraṇīya* in the Pātimokkha, and through comparison, the external evidence demonstrates that it is *nihsaraṇīya* in some of the other Vinayas. It becomes clear why *nissaraṇīya* is employed here when we look it up in the Suttas, where the term *nissaraṇīya/nissaraṇa* occurs in a specific soteriological context. The *Itivuttaka* records a discourse on *tisso nissaraṇīyā dhātuyo*:

There are, monks, these three elements that should be escaped. Which three? This is the escape from sensuous desires, that is, renunciation. This is the escape from forms, that is, formlessness, while cessation is the escape from whatever has come into being, conditioned, and dependently arisen. These, monks, are the three elements that should be escaped.²⁸

²⁷ Cf. Shih 2000, p. 24.

²⁸ Iti 61,2-7: *tisso imā bhikkave nissaraṇīyā dhātuyo. katamā tisso? kāmānaṃ etaṃ nissaraṇaṃ yad idaṃ nekkhamaṃ. rūpānaṃ etaṃ nissaraṇaṃ yad idaṃ ārupaṃ. yaṃ kho pana kiñci bhūtaṃ saṅkhataṃ paṭiccasamuppannaṃ nirodho tassa nissaraṇaṃ. imā kho bhikkave tisso nissaraṇīyā dhātuyo ti.*

In the commentary, *nissaraṇa* is glossed as “departing” (Iti-a 42,5: *nissaraṇan ti apagamo.*), and *nissaraṇīya* as “connecting with *nissaraṇa*” (Iti-a 40,24: *nissaraṇīyā ti nissaraṇapaṭisaṃyuttā*). The canonical text read *nissaraṇīya* with a variant reading of *nissāraṇīya* recorded. The commentary, however, reads *nissāraṇīya*. It is evident that there is some confusion between *nissaraṇīya* and *nissāraṇīya* in the Pāli texts.

The idea of *nissaraṇa* is well attested in the Suttas, particularly the *Samyutta-Nikāya*. In the context when the Blessed One recounts his pre-enlightenment practice, one reads a triple expression of “gratification, danger, escape” (*assāda, ādīnava, nissaraṇa*). The triad is a series of subjects to work on, which leads to final liberation. This formula of praxis is applied to the four elements, five aggregates, six internal sense bases, and so on. Whatever the subject may be, *nissaraṇa* of that subject means the “removal and abandonment” of it. For instance:

The pleasure and joy that arise in dependence on form, this is the gratification in form. That form is impermanent, unsatisfactory, and subject to change; this is the danger in form. The removal and abandonment of desire and lust for form; this is the escape from form.²⁹

A similar account with a slightly differing wording recurs in the beginning of the *Sambhodhi-vagga* in the AN. Here the triad of “gratification, danger, escape” is expressed with *loke* added: “What is the satisfaction in the world? What is the danger, and what is the escape?” (AN I 258,25-26: *ko nu kho loke assādo ko ādīnavo kiṃ nissaraṇan ti*).

Still, another instance shows a differing usage of *nissaraṇa* with the ablative: “If there were no escaping from the world, beings in this world could not escape. But as there is in the world escaping, that is why beings do escape therefrom.”³⁰

²⁹ SN III 28,2-6: *yaṃ kho rūpaṃ paṭicca uppajjati sukhaṃ somanasaṃ ayaṃ rūpassa assādo. yaṃ rūpaṃ aniccaṃ dukkhaṃ vipariṇāmadhammaṃ ayaṃ rūpassa ādīnavo. yo rūpasmiṃ chandarāgavinayo chandarāgapahānaṃ idaṃ rūpassa nissaraṇaṃ.*

³⁰ AN III 260,6-8: *no ce taṃ bhikkhave lokamhā nissaraṇaṃ abhavissa na-y-idaṃ sattā loke nissareyyuṃ, yasmā ca kho bhikkhave atthi loke nissaraṇaṃ tasmā sattā lokamhā nissaranti.*

The terms *pañca niḥsaraṇīya dhātavaḥ* and *ṣaḍ niḥsaraṇīya dhātavaḥ* appear in both the Skt *Saṅgīti-sūtra* and *Daśottara-sūtra*.³¹ Their corresponding *sūtras* in the Chinese *Dīrgha-Āgama* read 五出要界 (five factors leading to freedom from bondage; T1[1] 51b27) and 六出要界 (six factors leading to freedom from bondage; T1[1]52a9) respectively. The character 要 (*yao*) means bondage or debarring, and 出要 (*chu-yao*; freedom from the bondage) is the rendering for *nissaraṇa*.

In the *Udumbarika-Sīhanāda-Suttanta* (DN III 43,29; 46,28), we read a pair of contrasting expression *nissaraṇa-pañño* (knowing the means of escaping) and *anissaraṇa-pañño* (not knowing the means of escaping). The latter occurs in one of the contexts in which the Blessed One presents his insight into the possible subsequential defilements (*upakkilesa*) resulting from ascetic praxis (*tapa*). This is one of the subsequential defilements:

Moreover, Nigrodha, an ascetic who undertakes a course of austerity makes distinctions about foods: “This pleases me; this does not please me.”³² Because he rejects with desire whatever is not pleasing to him, and whatever pleases him, being bound to it, infatuated, going too far, blind to the disadvantage (in doing so), not knowing the means of escaping, he enjoys it... etc. This, Nigrodha, also becomes a [kind of] subsequential defilement.³³

In a soteriological context, “knowing the means of escaping” (*nissaraṇa-pañño*) usually means to get rid of one’s desires, which keep one going round the *samsāra* world. The way out of *samsāra* is doubtless to “escape” from those desires. In the *Saṅghīti-suttanta*, one reads a passage on *pañca nissaraṇīyā dhātuyo*. For example, the first *nissaraṇa* reads:

Herein, friends, when a monk is contemplating sensuous desires, his heart does not spring forward to them, nor does he feel satisfied with them, dwell on or become attached to them. However, when he is contemplating renunciation of them, his heart springs forward to,

³¹ Karashima 2014, p. 208.

³² Sv III 837,8: *khamatī ti ruccati. na khamatī ti na vuccati* (misprint for *ruccati*).

³³ DN III 43,25-31: *puna ca paraṃ Nigrodha tapassī tapaṃ samādiyati, bhojanesu vodāsaṃ āpajjati – “Idaṃ me khamati, idaṃ me na-kkhamatīti.” so yaṃ hi kho ‘ssa na kkhamati taṃ sāpekho pajahati, yaṃ paṇ’assa khamati taṃ gathito mucchito ajjhāpanno anādīnavadassāvī anissaraṇa-pañño paribhuñjati ... pe ... ayam pi kho Nigrodha upakkilesa hoti.*

is satisfied with, dwells on and is inclined to renunciation. His heart is blissful, well developed, well lifted up, well freed and detached from sensuous desires. He is released from those intoxicants, distress, and fever [of passion], which arise in consequence of sensuous desires. He does not experience that kind of feeling. This is called the escape from sensuous desires.³⁴

Some variant readings are recorded and the spelling in both the Burmese manuscript and printed edition read *nissaraṇīyā* and *nissaraṇiyā*, respectively.³⁵ Later in the same Sutta, another set of *cha nissāraṇīyā dhātuyo* is given with more variants recorded. The texts seem to be struggling between the two forms, whereas the Burmese versions are more consistent in the form derived from the normal stem.³⁶ One reads within the paragraph of exposition a stereotyped sentence with variation of key words. To give just one example: ‘Because, my friend, it is the escape from malevolence that is [called] emancipation of heart through benevolence’ (DN III 248,10-11: *nissaraṇaṃ h’etaṃ āvuso vyāpādassa, yadidaṃ mettā ceto-vimutti.*)

Now I shall draw attention to the term *nissāraṇīyā* in the *Saṅghīti-suttanta*. As *nissaraṇa* is consistently used in the context meaning “escaping”, it would seem etymologically correct to emend *pañca nissāraṇīyā dhātuyo* (DN III 239,18) to *pañca nissaraṇīyā dhātuyo*. In fact, the PTS text has been changed intentionally. In this very passage, the first edition (1911) of the DN reads *nissāraṇīyā*, but the 1960 reprint reads *nissaraṇīyā* instead.³⁷ It is discernable that the word *nissaraṇīyā* in the reprint is “in a slightly different typeface from the other words”, and hence this suggests a conscious decision to change the text.³⁸ It is interesting to note that in the Skt *Saṅgīti-sūtra* and *Daśottara-*

³⁴ DN III 239,18-240,4: *idh’āvuso bhikkhuno kāme manasikaroto kāmesu cittaṃ na pakkandati nappasīdati na santiṭṭhati na vimuccati, nekkhammaṃ kho pan’assa manasikaroto nekkhamme cittaṃ pakkhandati pasādati santiṭṭhati vimuccati, tassa taṃ cittaṃ sugataṃ subhāvitam suvuṭṭhitam suvimuttam viṣamuttam kāmehi, ye ca kāmapaccayā uppajjanti āsavā vighātā pariḷāhā, mutto so tehi, na so taṃ vedanaṃ vedeti, idam akkhātaṃ kāmānaṃ nissaraṇaṃ.*

³⁵ DN III 239, fn. 8.

³⁶ DN III 247, fn. 9.

³⁷ DN III 239,18 and 247,21 (the editions of 1960 and 1992, perhaps since 1960 onwards) show the same alteration, but elsewhere (p. 275,13) *nissāraṇīyā* remains the same and p. 278,21 reads *nissāraṇīya* (misprint for *nissāraṇīyā*). Perhaps the person who was responsible for this change was unaware of the other occurrences in these places and therefore did not repeat changing.

³⁸ I am indebted to Professor K.R. Norman for pointing out, through the observation of the

sūtra, one reads consistently *pañca niḥsaranīyā dhātavaḥ* and *ṣaḍ niḥsaranīyā dhātavaḥ*, respectively.

In the Pāli Suttas, the usage of *nissaraṇa/nissaraṇīya* focuses specifically on the issue of freedom or release from negative or undesired elements, which is one of the factors leading to final liberation. In the Skt and Chinese Vinaya texts, *nissaraṇa* is used in the same sense as that in the Pāli Suttas, although articulating a more specific disciplinary concept of release from a monastic offence. The following are some citations of the stock phrase from the Skt and Chinese texts in contrast with the Pāli Cv:

Cv Vin II 15,12-13: *sammā vattāmi, lomaṃ pātemi, **netthāraṃ** vattāmi, pabbājanīyassa kammaṣṣa paṭippassaddhiṃ yācāmi ti.*

‘I am comporting myself properly; I am subdued, and I am proceeding towards release [from the offence]. So now I request a revocation of the legal act of banishment.’

BhīVin (Mā-L) 164,3-4: *sā vartaṃ vartayati, lomaṃ pātayati, **niḥsaraṇaṃ** pravartayati.*

‘She comports herself properly; she is subdued; she proceeds towards release [from her offence].’

MSV (Pāṇḍ-v & #167; 1.12): *utkacaprakacāḥ saṃghe roma pātayanti **niḥsaraṇaṃ** pravartayanti sāmīcīm upadarśayanty antaḥsīmāyāṃ sthitvā osāraṇāṃ yācante.*

‘They are in full-blown awe, they are subdued towards the Saṅgha; they proceed towards release [from the offence]; they pay homage; staying within the bounded area, they request for reinstatement.’

BhīKavā (28b1): *saṃghe roma pātayantan **niḥsaraṇaṃ** pravartayantaṃ sāmīcīm upadarśayantaṃ antaḥsīmāyāṃ sthitam osāraṇāṃ yācantam.*

different typeface of words in the text, the deliberate changing of the text.

They are subdued towards the Saṅgha; they proceed towards release [from the offence]; they pay homage; staying within the bounded area, they request for rehabilitation.³⁹

CMū-Kavā (T24[1453]487a12-14): 極現恭勤，於僧伽處不生輕慢，希求拔濟，恆申敬禮，界內而住，請乞收攝法。

‘[He] displays extreme respect and sincerity; [he] yields no irreverence towards the Saṅgha; [he] wishes for **rescue**; [he] constantly pays homage; [he] stays within the bounded area and requests for reinstatement.’

The Chinese text reads “wishing for rescue” (希求拔濟), identical in meaning with *niḥsaraṇaṃ pravartayati* (proceeding towards release [from the offence]). *Netthāraṃ* in the Cv in fact conveys the same meaning but the wording is different. As can be seen, there is full agreement on the meaning of *niḥsaraṇa/nissaraṇa* between the Suttas and Vinaya in different languages except for the Pāli Vinaya.

The above discussion has shown that in the Pāli Suttas the application of *nissaraṇa* prevails, with the non-person as the referent, e.g. *kāmānaṃ nissaraṇaṃ* (escape from sensuous desires), *nissaraṇaṃ ... vyāpādassa* (escape from malevolence), *loke nissaraṇaṃ* (escape from the world), *lokamhā nissaraṇaṃ* ([such thing as] escape from the world). In the case where the subject is the person, the verb is derived from the normal stem and the sentence is construed with the active voice: *na-y-idaṃ sattā loke nissareyyuṃ* (‘Beings in this world could not escape’); *atthi loke nissaraṇaṃ tasmā sattā lokamhā nissaranti* (‘There is in the world escaping, that is why beings do escape therefrom’). In this specific context, no passive structure with causative derivations is seen. Confusion between the normal/causative derivations occurs only in the particular expression *nissaraṇīya/nissāraṇīya*. Such confusion is highly likely to have resulted from the introduction of *nissāraṇīya* in the Vinaya into the Sutta. (See discussion below in Section IV)

³⁹ This text was first edited by C.M. Ridding and L. de la Vallée Poussin in “*A Fragment of the Sanskrit Vinaya: Bhikṣunikarmavācāna*”, who regarded it as a work of the *Sarvāstivāda*, yet M. Schmidt has re-identified it as belonging to the *Mūlasarvāstivāda* (M. Schmidt, “*Zur Schulzugehörigkeit einer nepalesischen Handschrift von Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavācānā*”, SWTF Beiheft 5. This quotation is taken from GRETIL.

When, in the Pāli tradition, a separate BhīPām was being compiled, the redactor(s) had the concern with refining the text by coining new or special terms, for instance, four technical designations are assigned to the offenders against the four Defeats peculiar to nuns. They are “above the knee-caps” (*ubbhajānumaṇḍalikā*), “a fault-concealer” (*vajjapaṭicchādikā*), “a follower of the suspended one” (*ukkhittānuvattikā*), and “an offender by the eight conditions” (*aṭṭhavatthukā*). Such technical designations are not found in any of the other Vinaya tradition except for the Dha.

Special treatment has given to the first grave offence (i.e. Defeat) and would it not be natural to try to make the second class (i.e. *Saṅghadisesa*) more comprehensible? In view of the meaning and reference of *nissaraṇa/nissaraṇīya* in the Suttas, the *Saṅghadisesa* chapter would seem to be just the right place for this word and its variant *nissaraṇīya*. It is therefore plausible to assume that the Vinaya redactor(s) may have borrowed from the Suttas *nissaraṇīya* to supplement *saṅghadisesa* in its meaning and reference.

IV. The Confusion between *Nissaraṇīya* and *Nissāraṇīya* in the Pāli Suttas

We assume that the Suttas were highly likely to be the source of *nissaraṇīya*, yet the present BhīPām reads *nissāraṇīya*. This suggests a later change of the wording to suit an intended new institution. In the Vinaya, there is no problem at all in that the original form *nissaraṇīya*, once being changed, has ceased to appear throughout the canonical Vinaya. Nevertheless, the variation between either *nissaraṇīya* or *nissāraṇīya* occurs unexpectedly in the Suttas. Where *nissaraṇīya* is read, *nissāraṇīya* is usually recorded as a variant, and vice versa.

It is not possible to date the confusion, nor are we able to tell how it actually happened. There is, however, a clue found in the *Atthavasa-vagga* of the AN (I 99,13-14), where one finds the phrase *osāraṇīyaṃ paññattaṃ* (‘Enactment of reinstatement’) paired with *nissāraṇīyaṃ paññattaṃ* (‘Enactment of expulsion’). This is the only occurrence, and in the Chinese *Ekottarika-Āgama* one finds no Sūtra parallel to the Pāli Suttanta where the above dyad appears. It would seem that once *nissaraṇīya* had been borrowed by the Vinaya, and having been changed, it had found its way back into the Suttas. This two-way borrowing may have interfered with the consistency in wording and the transmitters’ perceptions of what the correct reading should be.

Apart from the Pāli tradition, we have not yet found any case of *nissāraṇīya* in any other texts, be them in the Sūtras or Vinaya. We therefore infer that *nissaraṇīya* must be the original form in the Pāli Suttas, and later it became confused with the causative form *nissāraṇīya* in the Vinaya. The discussion in Section III has exemplified some cases of such confusion. This may have resulted in a conscious change of the word according to what one deems to be correct (see above pp. 152). These changes were then replicated in the commentarial tradition.

When commenting on the expression *pañca nissāraṇīyā dhātuyo*, the post-canonical commentary, the *Sumaṅgala-vilāsinī*, writes:

Sv III 1031,31: *Nissāraṇīyā ti nissaṭā visaññuttā.*

‘*Nissāraṇīyā* means gone out, detached from.’

Later in the same text we read another gloss on *cha nissāraṇīyā dhātuyo*:

Sv III 1036,13: *nissāraṇīyā dhātuyo ti nissaṭā dhātuyo va.*

‘*Elements of escape* means just elements which have gone out.’

As the above quotations show, although the text adopts the reading of *nissāraṇīya*, it explains in the sense of *nissaraṇīyā*. Nevertheless, the sub-commentary has corrected *nissāraṇīya* back to *nissaraṇīyā*:

After shortening [*ā*], the exposition should read: *Escape* means they go out. Because this word *-aṇīya* is used of the agent, just like *niyyāṇīyā* (leading to salvation). Therefore “gone out” is said. But from what have they gone out? From their respective opposites.⁴⁰

⁴⁰ Sv-ṭ III 324,21-24: *nissaraṇī ti nissaraṇīyā ti vattabbe rasam katvā niddeso. kattari h’ esa aṇīya-saddo yathā niyyāṇīyā ti. ten’ āha nissaṭā ti. kuto pana nissaṭā ti? yathā sakam paṭipakkhato.* (For *rasam*, the text has *dīgham*, read with the v.l.)

Another passage, which comments on the expression *kāmānaṃ nissaraṇaṃ* (escape of the sensuous desires), further explains:

Escape means they go out from there. What go out? Sensuous desires. And having so construed it, the genitive case fits well in the sense of agent: “of sensuous desires”.⁴¹

The explanation offered here suggests the change by the commentator is based on the traditional sentence structure with non-person as the agent in the active voice. It is only in the Vinaya that a causative derivative *nissāraṇīya* is applied. Although the Sp also takes the offence as the agent but its object (the guilty nun) is construed in the passive.

Semantic divergency is what distinguishes *nissaraṇīya* from *nissāraṇīya*. They are not interchangeable. It may cause considerable loss to change the text without a firm grasp of the divergent denotations between these two forms. Now we have a case of this. As has been pointed out in Section II (above, p. 147), the Sp states that “[I]n the *Vibhaṅga* it is said that [she] is made to leave the Saṅgha, but in the *Pātimokkha* ten have come down to us with the wording: *nissaraṇīyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ (mātikāyaṃ pana nissaraṇīyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ ti evaṃ āgatāni dasa)*. Nevertheless, the Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana electronic edition (<https://tipitaka.sutta.org>) has changed *nissaraṇīyaṃ* to *nissāraṇīyaṃ* (*mātikāyaṃ pana “nissāraṇīyaṃ saṅghādisesa”nti evaṃ āgatāni dasa*). It is thanks to the PTS edition, which has preserved the text as it was, this valuable evidence of *nissaraṇīyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ* would otherwise never see the light of day!

⁴¹ Sv-ṭ III 325,16-18: *nissaranti tato ti nissaraṇaṃ. ke nissaranti? kāmā. evañ ca katvā kāmānan ti kattari sāmivaccanaṃ suṭṭhu yujjati.*

Concluding Remarks

The customary mending procedures for an offence of *saṅghādisesa* are explained in detail in the Vinaya literature, which involve no expulsion of the culprit out of the monastery. It is therefore bewildering when a new term *nissāraṇīya* appears in the *saṅghādisesa* rules for nuns, possibly denoting expulsion, but without explanation except for a gloss terse enough for differing interpretations.

The commentarial literature has unambiguously confirmed the nuns' expulsion rather than their release from the offence. However, a hint at an existing controversy over such polemic views can be discerned in the Sp. This hint proves to be true. A comparative examination of the related passages in the other Vinayas demonstrates that the other traditions either contain no additional expression to the offence name *saṅghādisesa*, or that the additional expression was a supplement. Thus it is evident that the Pāli Vinaya is unique in applying the causative form of *nissāraṇīya* and asserting its denotation of the nun's expulsion.

The four Vinayas (Pāli, Dha, Mī, and Sa) containing an extra expression attached to the term *saṅghādisesa* belong to the schools affiliated with the Sthavira. This suggests that such an addition may have taken place early in the sectarian period, originating in the Sthavira tradition.

The new term added was originally *nissaraṇīya*, a term which makes sense in the Suttas within a specific soteriological context, and which fits the nature of the *saṅghādisesa* rules. It seems plausible to assume that the Vinaya may have borrowed this term to make explicit this class of offence as remediable. The evidence from the *Parivāra* and the Sp's commentary proves that in the Pātimokkha the wording was originally *nissaraṇīyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ* "an offence entailing legal acts of the Saṅgha leading to the removal of the offence".

This use of *nissaraṇīya* is not isolated. The relevant passages in the Sūtras and Vinayas of the other schools available to us read *niḥsaraṇīya* consistently; only the Pāli Vinaya reads *nissāraṇīya*. What is interesting is that in the Pāli tradition *nissāraṇīya* also appears in the Suttas. The discussion in Section IV has shown that the confusion between the two forms interfered not only with the consistency in wording but also the readers' judgement of what is correct, based on which changes (either by the ancient transmitters or the PTS editors, see above pp. 150, 152, fn. 38, 155-157) had in fact been made. In some cases changes may have recovered the correct form, but in other cases it may have caused the loss of valuable textual evidence.

As to whether there exists an extra punishment for nuns offending against a *saṅghādisesa* rule, Part I of this study has demonstrated that the key lies in the difference between *nissaraṇīya* and *nissāraṇīya*, and that the former was later on replaced by the latter. The most curious is why and how such replacement may have taken place. This is the issue to be addressed in Part II.

Abbreviations and References

All Pāli texts refer to the editions of the Pali Text Society.

Abbreviations

AN	<i>Aṅguttara-Nikāya</i>
AW	Analysis of Words (= <i>Vinaya padabhājana</i>)
BD	<i>The Book of the Discipline</i> (Horner, 1938-1966)
BhīKavā	<i>Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavācanā</i>
BhīPr	<i>Bruchstücke des Bhikṣuṇī-Prātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins.</i> (Waldschmidt, 1979)
BhīPām	<i>Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha</i>
BhīVibh	<i>Bhikkhunī Vibhaṅga/Bhikṣuṇī Vibhaṅga</i>
BhīVin	<i>Bhikkhunī Vinaya/Bhikṣuṇī Vinaya</i>
BhīVin(Mā-L)	<i>Mahāsāṅghika-Lokottaravādin Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya</i> (Roth, 1970).
BhuPām	<i>Bhikkhu Pātimokkha</i>
CMū-Kavā	<i>The One Hundred and One Karmavācanā of the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya</i> (根本說一切有部百一羯磨), T24, No. 1453.
DN	<i>Dīgha-Nikāya</i>
Dha	<i>Dharmaguptaka-Vinaya</i> , T22, No. 1428.
Dutt	<i>Gilgit Manuscripts</i> , Vol. III (1943).
Kkh	<i>Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī</i>
Mā	<i>Mahāsāṅghika-Vinaya</i> , T22, No. 1425.
Mā-L	<i>Mahāsāṅghika-Lokottaravādin-Vinaya</i>
Mi	<i>Mahīśāsaka-Vinaya</i> , T22, No. 1421.
Mp	<i>Monoratha-pūraṇī</i>

MSV	<i>Mūlasarvāstivādin-Vinayavastu</i>
Mū	<i>Mūlasarvāstivādin-Vinaya</i> , T23-24, Nos. 1442-1451.
Mv	<i>Mahāvagga (Vinaya-Piṭaka)</i>
Pāṇḍ-v	<i>Pāṇḍulohitakavastu</i>
PrMoSū (Sa)	Le Prātimokṣasūtra des Sarvāstivādins (Finot and Huber)
Sa	<i>Sarvāstivāda-Vinaya</i> , T23, No. 1435.
Saṅgh	<i>Saṅghādisesa</i>
Saṅgh (N)	<i>Saṅghādisesa</i> rules for nuns.
Skt	Sanskrit
Sp	<i>Samantapāsādikā</i>
Sv	<i>Sumaṅgalavilāsinī</i>
Sv-ṭ	<i>Dīghanikāya-aṭṭhakathā-ṭīkā</i>
SVTT I-III	Édith Nolot (1996)
SVTT IV-X	Édith Nolot (1999)
T	<i>Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō</i> 大正新修大藏經
Vin	<i>Vinaya-Piṭaka</i>
Vmv-ṭ	<i>Vimativinodanī-ṭīkā</i>

References

- Dutt, N. (ed.). 1943. *Gilgit Manuscripts, Vol. III: Mūla-sarvāstivādivinayavastu*. Srinagar.
- Finot, Louis and Huber, É. 1913. “Le Prātimokṣasūtra des Sarvāstivādins,” texte Sanskrit par M. Louis Finot, avec la version chinoise de Kumārajīva traduit en Français par M. Édouard Huber”. *Journal Asiatique*, Novembre-Décember.
- Hardy, E (ed.). 1885- 1900. *Aṅguttara-Nikāya*, 5 Vols. London: Pali Text Society.
- Heirmann, Ann. 2002. *Rules for Nuns according to the Dharmaguptakavinaya*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- . 2003. “A Lexicographical Research: Technical Terms of Vinaya Texts” (漢語律本名相詞彙研究). *Universal Gate Buddhist Journal*, Issue 18, Offprint Edition.
- Horner, I. B. 1938-1966. *The Book of the Discipline (Vinaya-piṭaka)*, 6 Vols. Sacred Books of the Buddhists 10, 11, 13, 14, 20, 25. London.

- Karashima, Seishi. 2014. “The Sarvāstivādins’ “encroachment” into the Chinese Translation of the *Daśottara-sūtra* in the *Dīrgha-āgama* of the Dharmaguptakas”. *Research on the Dīrgha-āgama*, ed. Dhammadinnā. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation, pp. 197-235.
- Kassapa, Coliya. 1960. *Vimativinodanī-ṭīkā*, 2 Vols. Rankun (ChS).
- Maskell, Dorothy (ed.). 1956. *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī nāma mātikaṭṭhakathā*. London: Pali Text Society.
- Nolot, Édith. 1996. “Studies in Vinaya Technical Terms I-III”. *Journal of the Pāli Text Society*, Vol. XXII, pp. 73-150.
- . “Studies in Vinaya Technical Terms IV-X”. *Journal of the Pāli Text Society*, Vol. XXV, 1999, pp. 1-111.
- Oldenberg, Hermann (ed.). 1879-1883. *Vinaya-Piṭaka*, 5 Vols. London : Pali Text Society.
- Rhys Davids, T. W., Carpenter, J. E., Stede, W. (eds.). 1886-1932. *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī, Dīghanikāya-aṭṭhakathā*, 3 Vols. London: Pali Text Society.
- Rhys Davids, T. W. and Carpenter, J. E. (eds.). 1890-1911. *Dīgha-Nikāya*, 3 Vols. London: Pali Text Society.
- Roth, Gustav (ed.). 1970. *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya, including Bhikṣuṇī-Prakīrṇaka and a summary of the Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇaka of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin*. Tibetan Sanskrit Work Series, 12. Patna.
- Schmidt, Michael. 1993. “Bhikṣuṇī Karmavācanā: Die Handschrift Sansk. c. 25 (R) der Bodleian Library Oxford”. In *Studien zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde. Festgabe des Seminars für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde für Professor Dr. Heinz Bechert, zum 60. Geburtstag am 26. Juni 1992. Herausgegeben von Reinhold Grünendahl, Jens-Uwe Hartmann und Petra Kieffer-Pülz*. Bonn, pp. 239-288.
- Shih, Juo-hsüeh. 2000. *Controversies over Buddhist Nuns*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.
- . 2003. “What should be Relinquished: Problems in the Saṅghādisesa Chapter of the Pāli Bhikkhunī Vinaya”. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences of Tzu Chi University*, No. 2, pp. 199-236.
- de Silva, Lily (ed.). 1970. *Dīghanikāya-aṭṭhakathā-ṭīkā, Līnatthavaṇṇanā*, 3 Vols. London: Pali Text Society.
- Takakusu, J., Nagai, M. (eds.). 1924-47. *Samantapāsādikā, Vinaya-aṭṭhakathā*, 7 Vols. London: Pali Text Society.

- Takakusu, J., Watanabe, K. (eds.) 1924-1935. *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經. Tokyō.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst. 1979. *Bruchstücke des Bhikṣuṇī-Prātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins. Kleinere Sanskrit-Texte*, 3. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner. First Published 1926, Leipzig.
- Yamagiwa, Nobuyuki. 2001. *Das Pāṇḍulohitakavastu, Über die verschiedenen Verfahrensweisen der Bestrafung in der buddhistischen Gemeinde, Neuauflage der Sanskrit-Handschrift aus Gilgit, tibetischer Text und deutsche Übersetzung*. Indica et Tibetica 41, Marburg.