

Principles to be Respected

Draft only

Bhikkhu Sujato

The term *garudhamma* has suffered much in the hands of modern translators. *Garu* literally means ‘heavy’, and so moderns have called these the ‘heavy’ or ‘important’ or ‘strict’ rules. But the interpretation is handed on a platter in the rules themselves. Each time it says this ‘rule (*dhamma*) should be revered, respected (*garukatvā*), honored, and worshipped for the rest of your life, not to be transgressed’. Clearly, *garudhamma* means ‘Rules to be Respected’, and nothing else. This is confirmed by the standard Chinese rendering, 八敬法 (*ba jing fa*), literally ‘eight respect dhammas’.

The *garudhammas* were a set of rules, which, according to the traditional narrative, were laid down by the Buddha as the pre-conditions before he would, reluctantly, consent to the ordination of his aunt and foster-mother Mahāpajāpati Gotamī as the first bhikkhuni. Later we will examine the narrative background, but for now let us look more closely at the rules themselves. The rules vary slightly between the traditions, but here I will treat the Mahāvihāravāsin as representative, because of the relative linguistic clarity of the Pali, and refer to the others in important cases.

1: Though a bhikkhuni be ordained for a hundred years, she should bow down, rise up, make anjali, and behave properly towards a bhikkhu ordained on that very day.

This rule startles with its abruptness, its immediate and total exclusion of the possibility for any other way in which the male and female monastic communities might relate to one another. It stands in stark and severe contrast with the Buddha’s reasoned and balanced approach throughout the rest of the Vinaya, where he refuses to lay down a rule until it is needed. This is the nature of Vinaya: it is contextual, a contingent and pragmatic means for people to live in community and develop good behavior.

Unlike most of the other *garudhammas*, this rule lacks a direct counterpart in most of the *pāṭimokkhas*. That is to say, in most of the Vinayas, the rule only appears here, and has no independent corroboration. When questioned about this by Mahāpajāpati, however, the Buddha is reported to have repeated himself, and indeed to have affirmed that a bhikkhu should not pay respect in these ways to any woman.¹

The Mahāvihāravāsin Vinaya elsewhere has a group of 10 *avandiyos* (those who should not be paid respects to), which includes women. This is included following the well-known story of the partridge, the monkey, and the elephant, where the three animals lived harmoniously by respecting the eldest among them. This story is found in all Vinayas, but the sequel is very different in each. We notice that the Pali here changes from the specific list ‘bow down, rise up, make anjali, and behave properly’ mentioned in the story, to the general term ‘not respect’. Not only that, but the content sends a completely different message: the whole point of the three animals story is that we should respect elders, but now we are being told to not respect women, even if they are elder. But the different Vinayas each have a very different section here. The Dharmaguptaka has a long section, listing quite different individuals than the Pali, although also including women.² For example, the Dharmaguptaka includes a matricide, patricide, arahant killer, schismatic, etc., none of which are mentioned in the Pali. The Dharmaguptaka also lists those who different people such as novices, trainees, etc., should pay respect to, and adds that one should also pay respect in the same way to their stupas; the emphasis on stupas is characteristic of this Vinaya, and probably evidence of the lateness of this section.³ But the Mahīśāsaka,⁴ Sarvāstivāda,⁵ and Mahāsaṅghika⁶ all say nothing in this place regarding bowing to women.⁷ Thus the fact that the injunction against paying respects to women in this case uses a different terminology from the preceding passage; that it is based on a principle of gender rather than age; that it is absent from most of the Vinayas in this place; and that where it is present in the Dharmaguptaka it speaks of stupas, all adds up to a clear conclusion that the passage is a late interpolation.

Returning to the *garudhamma* and the specific injunction not to bow to a bhikkhuni, the Mahīśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka Vinayas include the rule as a *pācittiya* (‘expiation – a rule which, when transgressed, can be cleared through a confession), and the Sarvāstivāda has a related rule. This is from the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya.

The Buddha was staying at Sāvattthī. Now at that time the Elder Mahā Kassapa, putting on his robes before midday, taking his bowl, went to a householder’s home for almsround. Then at the place he stopped there was a layman’s wife. Seeing Mahā Kassapa in the distance, she got up and greeted him. But Thullanandā was

at that place first. Seeing Mahā Kassapa in the distance, she did not rise to greet him. Then that layman's wife bowed with her head at the feet of Elder Mahā Kassapa. She washed her hands and taking his bowl, offered plenty of rice, with curry over it. Mahā Kassapa received it and left. The lay woman went to Thullanandā and said: 'Are you aware that was the Elder Mahā Kassapa, the Buddha's great disciple, who is greatly revered by the deities as a virtuous field of merit? If you were to rise and greet him, what harm would come of that?' Thullanandā said: 'Mahā Kassapa was originally practicing another religion, [i.e.] Brahmanism. You greatly reverence that, but I do not respect it.' The lay woman was annoyed and scolded: 'These bhikkhunis say, if you do what is good will get merit, but when they see bhikkhus coming they do not rise, as if they were women from another religion.' When the bhikkhunis of few wishes, contented, keepers of ascetic practices heard about this they were not pleased. They went to the Buddha and told him everything. For that reason the Buddha summoned the two-fold Sangha together. Knowing, he asked: 'Is it true that you did that thing, or not?' She answered: 'It is true, Blessed One.' The Buddha for this reason in many ways scolded: 'How can this bhikkhuni see a monk coming and not rise?' Having in many ways scolded for that reason, he said to the bhikkhus: 'For the sake of ten benefits, I lay down this precept for bhikkhunis. From today onwards that precept should be taught: Should any bhikkhuni, seeing a bhikkhu coming, not rise, this is an offense of *pācittiya*. 'Pācittiya' means: burn,⁸ boil, smear, obstruct. If not confessed, it will obstruct the path. This is the offense: if a bhikkhuni sees a bhikkhu and does not rise, this is a *pācittiya*; straightaway seeing and not rising, straightaway at that point there is *pācittiya*.'⁹

A few notes are in order. Thullanandā (Fat Nandā) was Mahā Kassapa's nemesis, and accordingly, a great fan of Ānanda. Her misbehavior and, in particular, animosity towards Mahā Kassapa are well attested in the Suttas and Vinaya, and elsewhere she repeats her allegation that Mahā Kassapa had previously been a non-Buddhist.¹⁰ Thus her behavior on this occasion is just deliberate rudeness. Notice that this rule concerns only rising for a bhikkhu when one sees them, not bowing, etc. We also notice that the criticism by the laywoman specifically invokes the accepted cultural standards of conduct expected of women.

Let us look now at the second appearance of this rule in the *pātimokkhas*, this time the Vinaya of the Mahīśāsakas. The rule here is similar to Dharmaguptaka *pācittiya* 175, but in that case there is no proper origin story. It is merely said that the Buddha laid down the rule while at Sāvathī (sic! not Vesālī), but the bhikkhunis did not keep it, so he laid it down again as a *pācittiya*.¹¹

Now at that time bhikkhunis did not bow to monks, did not greet them, did not receive them, did not invite them to a seat. The bhikkhus were annoyed, and did not return to teach. Then the bhikkhunis were foolish, without knowledge, and not able to train in the precepts. The senior bhikkhunis saw this, looked down on it, and scolded in many ways. The matter was therefore told to the Buddha. For that reason the Buddha summoned together the two-fold Sangha. He asked the bhikkhunis: 'Is this true or not?' They replied: 'It is true, Blessed One.' The Buddha in many ways scolded them: 'Did I not already teach the eight garudhammas as suitable etiquette regarding bhikkhus? From today onwards, that precept should be thus recited: "Should any bhikkhuni, seeing a bhikkhu, not rise up, bow down, and invite him to a seat, this is an offense of *pācittiya*. For trainees and novices, it is an offense of wrong-doing. If sick, if previously there is anger and suspicion, with no shared speech (recitation?), there is no offence.'¹²

Here there is no developed story, only a formulaic background that is very similar to the backgrounds for several of the other *pācittiya*/garudhammas we shall see below. There is no common ground between this origin story and the Sarvāstivāda version. There is a valid reason for the rule in the context: it is a good thing to respect one's teachers. This rule is not an arbitrary imposition, but came from a genuinely problematic situation. One might question whether the monks were being a little precious in refusing to teach; but any teacher knows how hard it is if the students don't display a positive attitude. In ancient India, as indeed throughout Asia today, bowing to one's teachers was a simple and universally observed sign of respect and gratitude.

The story refers to the garudhammas as already existing, but there is no question of an offense arising from them. It is as if the status of the garudhammas at the time this rule was formulated was of some recommended trainings in etiquette, like, say, the *sekhiya* rules, with no specific penalty attached. Notice how the rule has been extended: whereas the Sarvāstivāda speaks only of 'rising up', there are now three acts that must be done. Doubtless these three must be similar to the four elements recorded in the Pali garudhamma, which we will look more closely at next.

Here is the Pali: *abhivādanam paccuṭṭhānam añjalikammaṃ sāmīcikammaṃ*, which I render as 'bow down, rise up, make anjali, and behave properly'. This phrase occurs twice elsewhere in contexts crucial for understanding the garudhammas. First is when the Sakyan princes, including Ānanda, asked for Upāli, the former barber and Vinaya expert-to-be, to ordain first, so they can reduce their Sakyan pride by bowing to him. Elsewhere, we are often told of the problems caused in the Sangha by the Sakyans and their pride: Nanda, who famously went forth on account of 500 pink-footed celestial nymphs, and who wore make-up as a monk; Channa, the Buddha's incorrigible charioteer,

who on the Buddha's deathbed was given the 'Supreme Punishment' (i.e., the silent treatment); Upananda, who constantly harassed the lay supporters for fine requisites; and of course Devadatta, who tried to kill the Buddha. Tradition says their pride caused them to grievously insult Viḍūḍabha, king of Kosala, who in revenge destroyed the Sakyan republic and scattered the clan. Thus the Sakyan pride has become legendary in the traditions of the Buddha's clan.

The second time this phrase is relevant for understanding this garudhamma is when the Buddha said, in speaking to Mahāpajāpati, that it was not easy through bowing, etc., to repay one who has given the gift of Dhamma. The chief message of the opening of the Dakkhināvibhaṅga Sutta is that Mahāpajāpati must give the Sangha its due, and not confine her worship to the Buddha alone. May we be forgiven if we were to wonder whether this rule was not imposed arbitrarily on all nuns for all time, but on Mahāpajāpati alone, for the curbing of her Sakyan pride and personal love of Siddhartha? Is it surprising that here she is again being reminded of the importance of respecting all the Sangha?

Mahāpajāpati herself confirms that this particular rule was hard for her to keep. After accepting the garudhammas, she says she will treasure them like a youth would bear an adornment of flowers. Hardly has she gone, however, when she exhibits yet another womanly weakness, changing her mind and getting Ānanda to ask a special little privilege from the Buddha: that they forget this rule, and allow paying respect according to seniority. The Buddha refuses, adding rather oddly that other, badly expounded religions do not allow paying respects to women, so how could he? If badly taught religions do not allow respect for women, I would have thought this was a good reason for well taught religions to encourage it.

In this case, it seems the Buddha was quite correct, for this exact rule is in fact found in Jain scriptures. The following is taken from the the Yuktiprabodha with the Svopajnavrtti of the Svetambara Upadhyaya Meghavijaya. Dated from the 17th Century, this presents an argument on the status of women between the two main Jain sects. The work is from the Svetambara perspective, although here we hear the voice of the Digambara opponent. The work that is quoted, the Svetambara text Upadesamala, appears to date from around the 8th Century:

#18 Moreover, when nuns and other women greet a monk, a blessing is uttered by him in such words as, "Let there be meditation; let your karmas be destroyed"; they do not engage in the etiquette of mutual reverential greeting that takes place between monks. If indeed, as you believe, nuns do assume the mahavratas, then how is it that between your monks and nuns there is no mutual reverential greeting of one another according to rank [as there is between monks]? Indeed, this has been prohibited even in your scripture. As is said in the Upadesamala :

Even if a nun were initiated for a hundred years and a monk were initiated just this day, he is still worthy of being worshiped by her through such acts of respect as going forward in reverential greeting, salutation, and bowing down.¹³

The identical wording makes it obvious that here we are seeing not just a generic similarity but a direct copy. While Jainism is older than Buddhism, the texts are, as here, typically younger; so it is not easy to decide whether this rule, as it stands, was copied by the Buddhists from the Jainas or vice versa. Nevertheless, the main point remains: this rule is one that, as claimed by the Buddha, is found among other Indic traditions. The key thing to notice is that the Buddha specifically invokes contemporary social conventions to justify his position, in exactly the same way that the laywoman in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya story did.

This raises the contentious issue of to what degree may Vinaya rules and procedures be adapted according to time and place. As a practicing bhikkhu, I believe that, in general, the essential aspects of the Vinaya remain as true and relevant today as they were 2500 years ago. I do not think we should use, as a blanket excuse, changes in social customs to justify abolishing or ignoring Vinaya rules, even if they may be inconvenient, or we don't understand their purpose. But in specific instances where social conventions are explicitly invoked in the rule itself, and where the relevant custom has demonstrably changed, we must question whether such a rule should be kept. And when, in addition, the rule causes unnecessary suffering, I think it is unjust and cruel to insist upon keeping it.

Here we would do well to remind ourselves of the fundamental ethical principles embodied in the United Nations 'Declaration on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women':

Article 1: Discrimination against women, denying or limiting as it does their equality of rights with men, is fundamentally unjust and constitutes an offence against human dignity.

Article 2: All appropriate measures shall be taken to abolish existing laws, customs, regulations and practices which are discriminatory against women, and to establish adequate legal protection for equal rights of men and women...

Article 3: All appropriate measures shall be taken to educate public opinion and to direct national aspirations towards the eradication of prejudice and the abolition of customary and all other practices which are based on the idea of the inferiority of women.

This garudhamma, and some others, are manifestly ‘laws, customs, regulations and practices which are discriminatory against women’. Discrimination against women is ‘fundamentally unjust and constitutes an offence against human dignity.’ If bhikkhus wish to maintain the ethical standards expected in our international community, they must take ‘all appropriate measures’ to abolish these practices.

So now the rude shock of this rule has been softened a little. This garudhamma, if it is authentic at all, is best seen in context as a curb for the pride of Mahāpajāpati. The status of this as a rule in general for the bhikkhunis is dubious, since it is only occasionally found in the *pāṭimokkhas*, and where it is found it is in very different forms and settings. But those stories do at least demonstrate a reasonable context within which such a rule would make sense.

2. A bhikkhuni should not spend the vassa [rains residence] in a monastery where there are no bhikkhus.

This rule is equivalent to the Mahāvihāravāsīn bhikkhuni *pācittiya* 56. According to the background story for that rule, some bhikkhunis spent the vassa without bhikkhus, so were unable to get teachings. The good nuns complained, and the Buddha responded by requiring they spend vassa with bhikkhus.

Here there is no mention that this rule had already been laid down as a garudhamma. If the garudhamma had existed, the text would say the case should be dealt with ‘according to the rule’, which is the standard procedure in such cases. Since this clause is lacking, we can only conclude that the relevant garudhamma did not exist at the time this *pācittiya* was laid down. It must therefore have been included in the Mahāpajāpati story at a later date. A similar logic applies to the other cases where a garudhamma is found in the *pācittiyas*; that is, garudhammas 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7.

‘Living without bhikkhus’ is defined by the Mahāvihāravāsīn Vinaya as ‘not able to teach, or not able to go into communion’. This suggests that it is alright if the bhikkhus are close enough for the bhikkhunis to travel to them for teaching. In pre-car days, this would have been a few kilometers, but now it would apply over a large distance. As always, there is no offence for the first offender, confirming the non-existence of the garudhamma at this time.

3. Each fortnight the bhikkhunis should expect two things from the bhikkhu Sangha: questioning regarding the *uposatha* [observance], and being approached for teaching.

This is identical to Mahāvihāravāsīn bhikkhuni *pācittiya* 59. There, the origin story is stock, merely instantiating the rule. This time it is the monks who complain. The Dharmaguptaka Vinaya origin story says that the nuns had heard that the Buddha had laid down a rule requiring the fortnightly teaching.¹⁴ Just below, the same thing is said of the requirement for the invitation at the end of the rains residence.¹⁵ Obviously, then, these rules cannot have been laid down at the start of the bhikkhuni order. As always, this is confirmed when the text says that there is no offence for the first offender.

This rule, like the previous, was intended to ensure the proper education of the bhikkhunis: it is about what the monks should do for the nuns. We have already seen that this was the reason given also for the paying respects to monks, so that they would return to give teaching. There is a corresponding rule in the monks’ *pācittiyas*. This was prompted by the group of six who, for the sake of gains, went to teach the bhikkhunis. But after just a little Dhamma talk, they spent the rest of the day indulging in frivolous chit-chat. When asked by the Buddha whether the teaching was effective, they complained about the monks’ conduct (as shown below, this is just one of many places that show that the bhikkhunis were quite able to criticize monks, despite the garudhamma that apparently forbids admonition). The Buddha then laid down a rule ensuring that the bhikkhu who was to teach the bhikkhunis was competent, specially noting that he must also be liked and agreeable to the bhikkhunis.

This is one case where the cultural context is clearly relevant. Traditional cultures usually make little provision for women’s education, and some, like certain of the Brahmanical scriptures, prohibit it. Even today, nuns in many traditional Buddhist countries are illiterate and uneducated. Thus this rule can be seen as a special ‘affirmative action’ provision to ensure that the bhikkhus would share their knowledge with the bhikkhunis.

The Vinayas of the Vibhajjavāda group agree in defining ‘teaching’ as the garudhammas here. Apparently the most edifying thing these Vinayas can imagine for the bhikkhunis is that they be told, again and again, of how they must be subservient to the bhikkhus. However, the Mahāsaṅghika Vinaya says that the instruction should be regarding abhidhamma or Vinaya; the Mūlasarvāstivāda says it should be on ethics, samadhi, wisdom. The Sarvāstivāda Gotamī Sutra says the bhikkhunis are to learn ‘sutra, vinaya, and abhidhamma’;¹⁶ the mention of the abhidhamma here is

obviously in its developed sense as one of the three baskets of the Tipitaka, and hence is a clear sign of lateness. As an example of correct teaching, the Lokuttaravāda gives the famous verse known as the 'Ovāda Pāṭimokkha':

Not doing all evil, undertaking the skiful
Purifying one's own mind – This is the teaching of the Buddhas.¹⁷

The bhikkhu is then supposed to inform the bhikkhunis that they are to have some discussion about this teaching. Whoever wishes may stay, whoever wishes may listen.

If we were to take this rule literally as interpreted by the Vibhajjavāda group, we would expect that the monks would be approaching the nuns each fortnight and telling them to bow to monks, etc. Surely this constant activity would have left some remnant in the texts. But what does the evidence tell us? The Nandakovāda Sutta¹⁸ features Venerable Nandaka going for the regular teaching of the nuns. When he gets there he tells them that he will teach by questioning. If they understand, they are to say so, if they do not understand, they are to say so. The nuns are happy with this mode of teaching, so Nandaka proceeds to give a profound exposition on the six senses. The nuns are delighted, and so is the Buddha: he tells Nandaka to return and teach the nuns again. Nandaka is so clever at teaching the nuns that he is appointed the foremost in that category. One time when Ānanda visited the nuns, they didn't wait for a teaching, but told him of their success in satipatthana practice.¹⁹ Another time he taught four things to be abandoned: food, craving, conceit, and sex.²⁰ When Mahā Kassapa teaches the nuns, the subject is not specified, but it is a 'talk about Dhamma' rather than Vinaya.²¹ These are the only examples I can find in the Suttas of the monks teaching the nuns, and the garudhammas are conspicuously absent. So it would seem that the Mūlasarvāstivāda preserves the most reasonable tradition on this point: the bhikkhunis are to be taught ethics, samadhi, and wisdom. When this definition of the exhortation is changed to the eight garudhammas, a rule intended to ensure support for bhikkhunis' education becomes trivial, if not repressive.

4. After the rains, the bhikkhunis should invite [*pavāraṇā*] both Sanghas for regarding three things: [wrong-doings that were] seen, heard, or suspected.

Equivalent to Mahāvihāravāsin bhikkhuni *pācittiya* 57. The origin story echoes *pācittiya* 56. Again, the rule is laid down in response to the nun's complaints. There is a non-offence if they seek but cannot find; this would apply if they were living in a district where there were no bhikkhus who were keeping a compatible standard of Vinaya. No offence for the first offender.

This rule establishes a link between the two Sanghas, based on the humility of requesting guidance. It only occurs once a year, and is usually treated in a formalistic manner. It is not so much the actual ceremony that matters, as the attitude of mind it engenders. While the rules as they stand are clearly unbalanced, still there is no rule preventing the bhikkhus from inviting the bhikkhunis to admonish them.

5. On transgressing a [heavy offence], a bhikkhuni must undergo *mānattā* [penance] before both Sanghas.

This is not included in the *pācittiyas*. I put the offence itself here in square brackets, as there are crucial differences between the traditions here. It is an important statement, since the performance of a *mānattā* is a serious and inconvenient penalty, involving temporary suspension from one's status, exclusion from normal activities, and requiring a Sangha of 20 for rehabilitation. Normally it is used for *saṅghādisesa*, which is the second most serious class of offense. The Mahāvihāravāsin here, however, has 'garudhamma': thus this rule appears to be saying that the garudhammas are equivalent in weight to *saṅghādisesas*. In this respect, the Lokuttaravāda is in agreement.²² But the Dharmaguptaka, Mahīśāsaka, Sarvāstivāda, and Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinayas all say *saṅghādisesa* here, not garudhamma; while the Mahāsaṅghika includes both.²³ In addition, two non-Mahāvihāravāsin (probably Sarvāstivāda) Sutta versions of the story, the Gotamī Sūtra at MA 116 and T 60,²⁴ also say *saṅghādisesa*. One Sutta of uncertain affiliation just says 'transgressing precepts', without further explanation.²⁵ Thus the overwhelming weight of tradition here has it that the bhikkhunis must be rehabilitated from *saṅghādisesas* before both communities, which is the normal situation for nuns in the *saṅghādisesa* procedure anyway. The important consequence of this conclusion is that, as suggested by the fact that special *pācittiya* rules had to be laid down covering the same ground as the garudhammas, there was no penalty for breaking a garudhamma.

There are a few places in the Vinaya that mention a bhikkhuni who has transgressed a garudhamma, and who therefore must undergo *mānattā*.²⁶ This would seem to reinforce the likelihood that *mānattā* is indeed the appropriate penalty for a garudhamma. But a closer examination gives the opposite impression. In the Vassūpanāyikakkhandha, a list of reasons is given why a bhikkhuni may need to request the presence of bhikkhus to come, even though it is the rains retreat.²⁷ These include if she is ill, suffering dissatisfaction, etc. One of the reasons is if she has transgressed a garudhamma and needs to do *mānattā*. But, although our passage is evidently striving for completeness, there is no mention of the case where a bhikkhuni has fallen into *saṅghādisesa* and requires bhikkhus for a *mānattā*. This glaring omission would be easily explained if garudhamma had been substituted for *saṅghādisesa*.

This usage in fact happens occasionally in unrelated Vinaya passages. There is a case discussed if the upajjhāya has transgressed a garudhamma and is deserving of probation.²⁸ Here, garudhamma obviously refers to a saṅghādisesa. It seems that garudhamma in this sense is a non-technical term that would occasionally substitute for saṅghādisesa; the usage probably fell out of favor with the rise of the more specialized use of garudhamma to refer to the eight special rules for bhikkhunis. But this would explain why there is an ambiguity in the garudhammas themselves as to the meaning of the term.

6. A trainee must train for two years in the six precepts before seeking full ordination from both Sanghas.

This is equivalent to Mahāvihāravāsin bhikkhuni *pācittiya* 63. The origin story speaks of nuns who ordained without training and were therefore unskilled and uneducated. The good bhikkhunis complained, and so the Buddha laid down a two year training period. Here the six rules are defined in the Mahāvihāravāsin and Dharmaguptaka as the five precepts (including celibacy as the third), and not eating after noon. Other schools differ considerably. In the garudhamma, however, the six rules are undefined. Since they are not a standard group, appearing nowhere but in this context, how could the nuns have known what was meant? Clearly, the laying down of the garudhammas was dependent on the *pācittiya* context, and hence could not have happened at the start of the bhikkhuni Sangha.

It should not need repeating that if this rule was really followed as described in the garudhamma story, ordination would have been impossible. The nuns need to train for two years, and then receive ordination; but if they are all trainees, who can they get ordination from? This rule clearly presupposes the existence of a bhikkhuni Sangha, and a developed ordination procedure, neither of which is possible if the rule was really laid down at the start of the bhikkhuni Sangha's existence.

As the rule stands, it is a good one. It is true that there is no corresponding requirement for the bhikkhus, but many traditions today require a similar period of training before bhikkhu ordination anyway. As always, no offense for the first offender.

7. Bhikkhunis should not in any way abuse or revile bhikkhus.

Equivalent to Mahāvihāravāsin bhikkhuni *pācittiya* 52. The origin story is at Vesālī. An elder of the group of six nuns dies. They make a stupa for her, and hold a noisy mourning ritual. Upāli's preceptor, Kappitaka, who was living in the cemetery, was annoyed at the sound, and smashed the stupa to bits – somewhat of a distasteful overreaction, one might think. Anyway, the group of six nuns say: 'He destroyed our stupa – let's kill him!' Kappitaka escapes with Upāli's help, and the nuns abuse Upāli, thus prompting, not a rule against noisy funerals, or smashing stupas, or attempted murder, but against abusing monks. Other Vinayas tell the story differently. Again, the end of the rule specifies that there was no offence for the original transgressor. This origin story has much of interest, and has been exploited by Gregory Schopen in his essay 'The Suppression of Nuns and the Ritual Murder of Their Special Dead in Two Buddhist Monastic Codes',²⁹ an essay which delivers almost as much as the title promises. One of the stories in that essay will reappear in the discussion of the next rule. We will examine the story of the destruction of a nuns' stupa by monks more closely later.

8. From this day on, it is allowed for bhikkhus to admonish bhikkhunis, but it is not allowed for bhikkhunis to admonish bhikkhus.

This rule appears to have no counterparts in the *pācittiyas* of any school. It also appears to be absent from the garudhammas of the Mūlasarvāstivāda.³⁰ It is, however, found in the garudhammas in most of the Vinayas, as well as the Sarvāstivādin Gotamī Sūtra.³¹

The fact that this rule starts with 'from this day on...' is most curious. This is the only garudhamma to be formulated in this way. It is scarcely possible to make sense of this without accepting the implication that *before this time* it was allowable for bhikkhunis to admonish bhikkhus. But of course, if this was the case, there must have been bhikkhunis to do the admonishing, and so Mahāpajāpati could not be the first bhikkhuni. This statement is not found in the Dharmaguptaka,³² Mahīśāsaka,³³ or Sarvāstivāda.³⁴ The Mahāsaṅghika abbreviates the story of Mahāpajāpati's request, then prefaces the detailed description of the garudhammas by having the Buddha declare that: 'From this day forward, Mahāpajāpati sits at the head of the bhikkhuni Sangha: thus it should be remembered.'³⁵ This again seems highly unusual, without precedent that I am aware of in the bhikkhu Vinaya. This seems to confirm the suggestion we made above, of a power struggle as the newly ordained Mahāpajāpati establishes her authority over the already ordained Elder bhikkhunis. As usual, this should not be interpreted as a literal power struggle at that time, but as an attempt by the later tradition to establish their own version of events at a time of conflicting interpretations.

The mainstream position of the Suttas and Vinaya on admonishment is that an admonisher should be seen as a gem; one should always follow them and never leave. The two *aniyata* rules found in the bhikkhu *pāṭimokkhas* establish a protocol enabling a trustworthy female lay disciple to bring a charge of serious misconduct against a bhikkhu, which must be investigated by the Sangha and the appropriate punishment levied. This protocol is only established for the female lay disciples, not the male. Are we to believe that the Buddha made one rule supporting admonishment by lay women, and another prohibiting it by nuns?

Saṅghādisesa 12 lays down a heavy penalty for bhikkhus or bhikkhunis who refuse to be admonished, saying that ‘Thus there is growth in the Blessed One’s following, that is, with mutual admonishment and mutual rehabilitation.’³⁶ The last garudhamma so directly contradicts this it is a wonder it was ever given any credence.

Nevertheless, though we cannot ethically acquiesce with this rule in any form, it is possible that it’s original meaning was much more restricted. We have seen that the bhikkhunis were to approach the bhikkhus every fortnight to request teaching, and that this should be seen as a pro-active measure to ensure the nuns received education. When they came to the bhikkhus, they did so as students. The bhikkhus, if they knew of offences of the bhikkhunis, were to formally inform the bhikkhunis of these, and were to leave the bhikkhunis to carry out their own disciplinary measures. Thus it may be the case that the rule about admonition was meant to apply solely to a formal procedure within the Sangha (which is how the Vinaya usually treats admonition), and this procedure happened only on the fortnightly teaching. If the bhikkhunis were so unscrupulous as to not clear up their offences as required each fortnightly *uposatha*, this would show they did not have the proper attitude necessary to receive the teaching.

We should hardly be surprised to find several stories where the bhikkhunis do in fact admonish the bhikkhus, and nothing is seen as untoward about this. Perhaps the earliest example occurs in the Mahāvihāravāsin Therīgāthā in this dialogue between the bhikkhu Vaḍḍha and his mother. While this is not strictly speaking an admonishment for an offence committed, still it is a strong and stirring exhortation.

‘Do not, Vaḍḍha, ever have craving for the world
Do not, my son, share in craving again and again.
Happy indeed are the sages, unperturbed, with doubts cut off
Cooled, tamed, they dwell without defilements.
That path practiced by the seers, for the attaining of vision
And for the ending of suffering: Vaḍḍha, you should devote yourself to that.’

‘Mother, you speak of this matter with confidence indeed
I think, mother, that craving is not found in you.’

‘Whatever activities there are, Vaḍḍha, whether low, medium, or high,
Not a skerrick or a jot of craving is found in me for them.
All my defilements are ended, as I diligently practice jhana
I have obtained the three realizations – done is the Buddha’s teaching.’

‘Amazing, indeed, was that goad my mother applied to me,
With those verses connected with the highest goal, because of her compassion.
When I heard that teaching, the instruction of my mother,
I was enthused for the Dhamma, the attainment of rest from exertion
So I, resolutely striving, not lazy by day or night,
Being urged on by my mother, experienced the supreme peace.’³⁷

Other cases occur in the Vinaya narratives. In *nissaggiya pācittiya* 5, Uppalavaṇṇā witnesses some thieves placing meat on the ground, saying that any ascetic who sees it may take it. She took it and, the next day, flew to where the Buddha was staying. She saw Udāyin in the monastery and asked him where the Buddha was. Udāyin said that he had gone for alms. Uppalavaṇṇā asked Udāyin to offer the meat to the Buddha. Udāyin replied: ‘The Buddha will be pleased with your gift. And I too will be pleased if you gave me your lower robe!’ Uppalavaṇṇā begged off, saying it was her only lower robe, and hard to come by for women. But Udāyin insisted, so she gave it to him and returned to her monastery. When the other nuns saw her they asked where her robe had gone, and criticized Udāyin for taking a bhikkhuni’s robe. Similarly, though less colorfully, in the origin story to *pācittiya* 23, the group of six monks are criticized for entering the nun’s quarters for giving the teaching.

Another example is found in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, which I retell here from Schopen’s translation.³⁸ This occurs in part of the story, found in various forms in other Vinayas, about the destruction of nuns’ stupas by monks. In the Mūlasarvāstivāda version, the group of twelve nuns (= the group of six nuns, who are notorious in the Mahāvihāravāsin Vinaya) build a stupa for Venerable Phalguna, despite the fact that Phalguna had been far from an

exemplary monk, and in fact came in for some serious scolding by the Buddha for his conduct with the nuns. The stupa becomes a popular pilgrimage site, leading to the following unseemly events.

Once the Venerable Udakapāna was moving through the countryside with a retinue of five hundred and arrived at Sāvattihī. Now, since arahants do not enter into knowledge and vision without focusing their minds, when he saw that stupa from a distance he thought to himself: 'Since this is a new stupa for the hair and nails of the Blessed One, I should go and pay reverence!'

They went there, and the two attendant nuns gave them earth and water for washing their hands and feet. Then the monks paid reverence to the stupa by presenting flowers and incense and the singing of verses. Having paid reverence there, Udakapāna left.

Not very far from that stupa a nun, the Venerable Uppalavaṇṇā, was sitting at the root of a tree for the purpose of spending the day. Having watched them, she said: 'Venerable Udakapāna, you should focus your mind when you pay reverence to someone's stupa!'

The Venerable Udakapāna thought to himself: 'Why would the Venerable Uppalavaṇṇā say, "Venerable Udakapāna, you should focus your mind when you pay reverence at someone's stupa?"' Having thought that, he said: 'There is something here I should concentrate on.' When that thing entered into his mind, and he saw that the stupa was a stupa for the bones of the monk Phalguna, he was infected with a passion that was totally engulfed by hostility and went back and said to the Venerable Uppalavaṇṇā: 'When an abscess has appeared in the teaching, you have sat there and ignored it!'. She sat there, saying nothing.

This story raises too many questions to even begin to go into them here; and the rest of it gets even more colorful. Anyway, Uppalavaṇṇā is clearly admonishing an arahant – even if he is an irascible one – and the admonishment itself does not seem to be a problem. The problem is, rather, that she was too slow in making the unacceptable situation known.

There is another example in the *Dharmapāda-avadāna Sūtra,³⁹ although here it is complicated by the remarkable fact that the nun is really the Buddha in disguise. He takes the form of a bhikkhuni wandering through the mountains (thus, incidentally, breaking the *saṅghādisesa* rule prohibiting bhikkhunis from travelling alone), replete with powdered face and painted eyebrows and bestrewn with golden necklaces, in order to admonish a straying monk. This monk had taken for his own a treasure left by travelers who had died crossing the mountains. When he meets the tarted-up bhikkhuni the monk, unsurprisingly, admonishes her, giving her the perfect chance to make her retort:

'Is this then the way of an ascetic? He leaves his relatives, applies himself to the path, dwells in the mountains, and appeases his mind. Why then take what is not yours? In your greed you are forgetful of the path and quick to leave your noble intentions behind. You do not reckon with impermanence. Your birth in the world is like a journey, but the retribution for your evil is long-lasting!'

The Buddha then revealed himself in his true form, and the monk was, of course, saved. Again, although the story is rather more kinky than historical, there is no suggestion that admonishment of a bhikkhu by a bhikkhuni was in any way unusual or improper. By the standards of the time it would seem to have been perfectly acceptable for a bhikkhuni to wander alone, and to admonish bhikkhus.

I shall spare time here for one last example, this time from the Aśokarājasūtra.⁴⁰

There was then living in that country an arhat *bhikkhuni*. She observed in her meditation whether Devarakṣita would safely return from the seas or not, and she saw that he would safely return. She also saw that after his return he would sponsor the quinquennial assembly of the Buddha-dharma. She again tried to see how many monks would join in the assembly, and she saw that the number would be eighteen thousand arhats, twice as many learners, and innumerable ordinary persons. Who would be the Presiding Elder of the assembly? She saw that the Elder would be named Asadha. Then she observed whether the Elder Asadha would be an arhat, an *anāgamin*, a *sakadāgamin*, or a *sotāpanna*, and she saw that he would be an ordinary person. She again observed whether that person would be energetic or indolent and saw that he would be energetic. Then she contemplated with the intention of inquiring whether he was acting for his own benefit or for the benefit of others, and she saw that he was acting for his own benefit.

So she went to the monk's monastery, and after arriving there she worshipped the monks in due order and said to the Elder, 'Most Virtuous One, you are not in strict propriety'. The Elder thought to himself. 'Why am I deemed to be not in strict propriety?' When he looked at himself and saw that his beard and hair were long, he asked a young *bhikkhu* to shave his beard and hair. When he had been shaved, the *bhikkhuni*

thought, 'Does this Most Virtuous One understand my words?' Then she saw that the most virtuous monk did not understand the meaning of her words, and so she went again to the monastery, worshipped the monks in due order, and said, 'Most Virtuous One, you are not in strict propriety.' The Elder reflected, 'I have shaved my beard and hair. Why am I still not in strict propriety?' He looked at himself again and saw that his garments were coarse and shabby, and so he asked a young disciple to have them washed and dyed. After having his garments dyed and tidied, he wore them and sat straight. The *bhikkhuni* thought again, 'Does the Most Virtuous One understand my words?' And she saw that the most virtuous monk did not understand what she meant. For the third time the arhat *bhikkhuni* went to the monastery, worshipped the monks in due order, and said, 'Most Virtuous One, you are not in strict propriety.' The most virtuous monk said angrily, 'I have shaved my beard and hair and have washed and dyed my garment. Why do you say I am not in strict propriety?' The *bhikkhuni* said to the most virtuous monk, 'How can you think that these are the proprieties of the Buddha-dharma? If you can attain the four fruitions, then they are the proprieties of the Buddha-dharma. Furthermore, Most Virtuous One, the master merchant Devarakṣita has made an announcement like a lion's roar: "When I return safely from the seas, I shall sponsor the quinquennial assembly of the Buddha-dharma." Have you heard that?' The most virtuous monk said in reply, 'I have heard it.' She asked again, 'Most Virtuous One, do you know the number of monks who will join in the assembly?' 'I do not know,' was the reply. Then the *bhikkhuni* said of her own accord that the number of monks would be eighteen thousand arhats, twice as many learners, and innumerable ordinary persons. 'Most Virtuous One, an ordinary person will be the Presiding Elder and will be the first to receive offerings in the assembly of arhats. Will this be fitting behavior?' Upon hearing these words, the most virtuous monk wept sorrowfully. The *bhikkhuni* said, 'Why do you weep?' 'Sister', answered the monk, 'I am getting old. I am not competent to do anything.' The *bhikkhuni* uttered the following stanza:

'The Tathagata's Dharma can be perceived
At no fixed season and occasion.
If one wishes to obtain liberation,
He may get the fruit at any moment.

Again, Most Virtuous One, you should go to Naṭabhaṭika Monastery, where lives the *bhikkhu* Upagupta, whom the Buddha predicted would be the foremost in edification among his disciples.'

The Elder monk, rather than criticizing the nun for admonishing a monk, takes her good advice, seeks out Upagupta, and becomes an arahant. When he returns, the nun comes to see him again saying:

'Most Virtuous One, you are today in strict propriety.' The *bhikkhu* said in reply: 'Sister, it is all due to your effort.'

While these stories may not all be strictly historical, they tell us about how Buddhist monastics interpreted the rules at different times. Given the nature of actual relationships between groups of people, the rule prohibiting admonishment of bhikkhus by bhikkhunis can never have been anything other than a dead letter. The fact that the rule books tell a different story is unsurprising. Rule books, ancient and modern, tell us what the rule-writers wanted, not what was actually done. What is perhaps more remarkable is that I cannot find a single example where a nun is criticized or disciplined for admonishing a monk. The conclusion seems inescapable that either this rule was an alien interpolation, or its original scope was very narrow. In any case, the mainstream of the traditions tells us that it is perfectly okay for a bhikkhuni to teach, exhort, or admonish a bhikkhu in a general way.

The Garudhammas – an Assessment

Bearing in mind our serious reservations about the rules regarding bowing and admonition, these 'heavy rules' are not as heavy as all that. They are either simple principles of good manners, or procedures for ensuring the proper education and support for the nuns. They are certainly not a charter for domination of the nuns by the monks. The nuns are left to rely on their own discretion in making most of their everyday lifestyle choices: how to build their monasteries; when to go for alms; how is the day structured; what meditation to pursue; and so on.

The garudhammas make provision for points of contact between the bhikkhu and bhikkhuni Sanghas at key Vinaya junctures: *upasampadā*, *saṅghādisesa*, *pavāraṇā*, *vassa*, and *uposatha*. None of these occasions give the bhikkhus any leeway to control the bhikkhunis. Both the bhikkhus and the bhikkhunis are under the overarching authority of the Vinaya, and the Vinaya determines what is to happen at these times. No power of command is involved, just a shared responsibility to respect and follow the Vinaya. We should also bear in mind that, while these are significant Vinaya procedures, they do not happen very often. *Upasampadā* happens once in a bhikkhuni's life; *saṅghādisesa* happens rarely if ever in the career of most monastics; *pavāraṇā* and *vassa* happen once a year; *uposatha* is once a fortnight.

Taking these rules as the entrance point, most writers have concluded that the bhikkhuni Vinaya is generally discriminatory against the nuns. But a closer look reveals that this is not the case. Yes, the nuns have many more rules. But many of these rules are required for the monks also, except they are not counted in the *pāṭimokkha*, so the appearance of extra rules is largely illusory. This is the case in several of the ordination regulations. Or take the *pāṭidesanīyas* for example, where the four rules for monks are expanded to eight for nuns. But these eight are simply a prohibition against asking for eight kinds of fine foods, except when sick. Similar rules apply elsewhere to the monks. But the monks' *pāṭidesanīyas* don't appear to apply to the bhikkhunis. Thus while the bhikkhunis appear to have more *pāṭidesanīyas*, in practice they have less.

More important are *saṅghādisesa*s 3 and 4, which are serious offences for lewd speech. The bhikkhunis do not appear to have any corresponding rules. There is instead a special *pārājika* offence for bhikkhunis for speaking lewdly with a man: but in that case, both the bhikkhuni and the man must be overwhelmed with lust, which pre-supposes a much more advanced stage of developing an intimate relationship. A bhikkhu, on the other hand, can fall into a *saṅghādisesa* simply through an offhand lewd comment provoked by lust. Another example is the first bhikkhus' *saṅghādisesa*, for masturbation, which is treated much more mildly as a *pācittiya* in the nun's Vinaya.

Some of the bhikkhunis' rules which do appear draconian may be questioned on the textual evidence. For example, it is a *saṅghādisesa* for bhikkhunis to travel alone, enter a village alone, stay the night alone, or cross a river alone. But the Mahāsaṅghika, Lokuttaravāda, and Mahāśāsaka traditions allow certain exceptions if a bhikkhuni is without lust. It would seem as if this was generally followed, for the Vinayas themselves are full of cases where bhikkhunis go into town, with no mention of a companion. I will look at this rule in more detail in the next chapter.

In addition to these, there are several other rules that deal with particularly feminine issues, such as pregnancy and menstrual hygiene. Others provide for the safety and education for the nuns.

It is easy to forget that several of the bhikkhus' rules are clearly intended not for the exploitation, but the protection of the nuns. For example, it is an offence for a bhikkhu to treat a bhikkhuni as a domestic servant, having them sew and wash robes, and so on. It is also an offence for a bhikkhu to accept food from a bhikkhuni, a rule that was prompted by the difficulty for women to get alms. Curiously enough, many modern Theravāda nuns spend most of their days cooking, shopping, cleaning, sewing, and washing for the monks. Despite the bhikkhus' avowed commitment to the Vinaya, and insistence that this is the real reason for opposing bhikkhunis, for some unexplained reason most bhikkhus don't seem to see this as a problem. This is, however, not always the case, for some respected Theravādin teachers insist that the monks actually practice such rules, and not treat the *mae chis* (eight precept nuns) as domestic servants.

Now, I mentioned earlier that the Buddha is supposed to have said that the acceptance of these rules was Mahāpajāpati's full ordination. We tend to skip over details, ignoring the obvious in our certainty of rightness, so I must bodily lift the next fact into consciousness: nowhere in this narrative are the bhikkhunis explicitly told they have to keep these rules. The rules are for Mahāpajāpati. Yes, I realize that the rules are phrased in the general sense of all bhikkhunis, and I realize that elsewhere the Vinaya expects the bhikkhunis to keep these rules. But in the primary narrative, it is never directly said that these rules are a part of general bhikkhuni ordination. I believe this stands as direct textual support for our thesis that these rules were originally intended for Mahāpajāpati alone.

In fact, there was some doubt expressed at the time as to whether these rules could have functioned as an ordination even for Mahāpajāpati. After her ordination, she asked if the 500 Sakyan ladies could also receive ordination, so the Buddha allowed the bhikkhus to perform ordination for the bhikkhunis. After they had received their (presumably *ñatticatutthakamma upasampadā*) ordination from the bhikkhus, they said to Mahāpajāpati that she was not really ordained.⁴¹ This is a very odd passage, suggestive of at best and over-zealous attitude towards procedural niceties, and at worst a degree of disrespect and ingratitude. Perhaps we have here a faint echo of a power struggle among the bhikkhunis: if there were indeed bhikkhunis ordained before Mahāpajāpati, no doubt the entrance of such a powerful matriarchal figure would have posed a challenge to the authority of the Elder bhikkhunis, a challenge which Mahāpajāpati would seem ultimately to have won. The strangeness of the statement is because at the time when the Buddha supposedly gave the garudhammas, just a little previous in our narrative, he clearly states that this is Mahāpajāpati's full ordination.⁴² How could the bhikkhunis have not known of this?

¹ Vinaya 2.258

² 一切女人不應禮 (CBETA, T22, no. 1428, p. 940, b1)

³ 如是等人塔一切應禮 (CBETA, T22, no. 1428, p. 940, b7)

⁴ 如是奉行 (CBETA, T22, no. 1421, p. 121, a25)

⁵ 有三人不如。何等三。一切未受大戒人。不如受大戒人。一切下座不如上座。一切受事說非法人雖作上座。不如下座。不受事人說如法者。一切受大戒人。勝不受戒人。一切上座勝下座。佛勝眾聖。 (CBETA, T23, no. 1435, p. 242, c13-17)

⁶若見上座來。不起迎和南恭敬者。越毘尼罪。(CBETA, T22, no. 1425, p. 446, c2-3)

⁷ Incidentally, the '[Yogacāra] Bodhisattva Precepts' say one should pay respects to neither a woman nor a lay person: 不應禮白衣。一切女人不應禮 (CBETA, T40, no. 1814, p. 683, c15-16).

⁸ This explanation is evidently derived from a folk etymology connecting *pācittiya* with *pacati*, to cook.

⁹ Sarvāstivāda Vinaya, bhikkhuni *pācittiya* 103, T23, no. 1435, p. 324, b29-c22

¹⁰ SN 16.11/SA 1144/SA² 119

¹¹ Heirmann, pg. 955

¹² Mahīśāsaka Vinaya, bhikkhuni *pācittiya* 179; T22, no. 1421, p. 97, c20-28

¹³ Jaini, Chapter 6 #18.

¹⁴ Heirmann, pg. 869

¹⁵ Heirmann, pg. 873

¹⁶ 《中阿含經》卷28：「比丘尼則不得問比丘經。律。阿毘曇」(CBETA, T01, no. 26, p. 606, a17)

¹⁷ Roth, pg. 65

¹⁸ MN 146/SA 276

¹⁹ SN 47.10/ SA 615

²⁰ AN 4.159/SA 564

²¹ SN 16.10/SA 1143/SA² 118

²² Roth, pg. 17

²³ Heirmann, pg. 97-8

²⁴ MA 116 is Sarvāstivāda; T 60 is of uncertain affiliation, but it is so similar it may well be an alternative translation of the same text.

²⁵ 七者比丘尼。自未得道。若犯戒律。當半月詣眾中。首過自悔。以棄憍慢之態。(中本起經 'Zhong ben qi jing', T04, no. 196, p. 158, c27-29)

²⁶ Eg. Vinaya 2.279

²⁷ Vinaya 1.144

²⁸ Pali Vinaya 2.226: *sace upajjhāyo garudhammaṃ ajjhāpanno hoti parivāsāraho*

²⁹ Schopen 2004, pp. 329-359.

³⁰ Rockhill, pp 61, 62

³¹ According to Heirmann pg. 96, note 8 this rule is absent from the Pali, Mahāsaṅghika, Lokuttaravāda, and Sarvāstivāda Vinayas. Here, however, she has gone astray, for the rule is in fact found in most or all of these texts.

³² 《四分律》卷48：「比丘尼不應呵比丘。比丘應呵比丘尼」(CBETA, T22, no. 1428, p. 923, b6-7)

³³ 《彌沙塞部和醯五分律》卷29：「比丘尼不[29]得舉比丘罪。而比丘得呵比丘尼」(CBETA, T22, no. 1421, p. 185, c25-26)

[29]得 = 應【宋】【元】【明】【宮】。

³⁴ 《中阿含經》卷28：「比丘尼不得說比丘所犯。比丘得說比丘尼所犯」(CBETA, T01, no. 26, p. 606, a20-21)

³⁵ 《摩訶僧祇律》卷30：「從今日大愛道瞿曇彌比丘尼僧上坐。如是持」(CBETA, T22, no. 1425, p. 471, a27-28)

³⁶ All the Vinayas agree on this point. Here, for example, is the Dharmaguptaka:

如是佛弟子眾得增益。展轉相諫。展轉相教。展轉懺悔 (CBETA, T22, no. 1429, p. 1016, c20-21).

³⁷ Thī 204-212. Translation adapted from K. R. Norman.

³⁸ Schopen 2004, pg. 341.

³⁹ Willems pp. 61-63 (T 211, pg. 584a).

⁴⁰ Li, pp. 154-156

⁴¹ Pali Vinaya 2.257: *atha kho tā bhikkhuniyo mahāpajāpatīm gotamīṃ etadavocum -- ``ayyā anupasampannā, mayaṅcamhā upasampannā; evaṅhi bhagavatā paññattam bhikkhūhi bhikkhuniyo upasampādetabbā''ti*

⁴² Pali Vinaya 2.255: *sace, ānanda, mahāpajāpatī gotamī attha garudhamme paṭiggaṇhāti, sāvassā hotu upasampadā.* Mahīśāsaka:

《彌沙塞部和醯五分律》卷29：「佛言。今聽瞿曇彌受八[28]不可越法。便是出家得具足戒」(CBETA, T22, no. 1421, p. 185, c19-20)

[28]不可越法 ~ Garudhamma.。