

Journal of Buddhist Ethics

ISSN 1076-9005

<http://www.buddhistethics.org/>

Volume 18, 2011

Tithiyaparivāsa vis-à-vis Noviciation
in Theravādin Monasticism

Ven. Pandita (Burma)
University of Kelaniya

Copyright Notice: Digital copies of this work may be made and distributed provided no change is made and no alteration of a single copy for private study, requires the written permission of the author. All enquiries to: editor@buddhistethics.org

Tithiyaparivāsa vis-à-vis Noviciation in Theravādin Monasticism

Ven. Pandita (Burma)¹

Abstract

Tithiyaparivāsa is a particular type of probation in Theravādin monasticism that former ascetics of certain heretic groups must undergo if they wish to gain admission to the Buddhist Order. In the extant probation procedure as found in the Pāli Vinaya tradition, there is no explicit accounting for the stage of novicehood. Why? This paper attempts to answer that question and also in the process discovers an unexpected insight into the legally ambiguous status of noviciation.

Tithiyaparivāsa is a four month period of probation in Theravādin monasticism for persons who are, as former members of certain non-Buddhist ascetic groups, somewhat suspect probably because their former beliefs differed radically from those of Buddhism. The probationary period allows the Bhikkhus in authority to judge their sincerity and suitability for Buddhist ordination (Dhirasekera 217).

¹Postgraduate Institute of Pāli and Buddhist Studies, University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka.
Email: ashinpan@gmail.com.

The extant Vinaya texts provide a detailed procedure for ordination in the Buddhist Order for such candidates (Vin I 69–71; Horner 4: 85–89). It can be summarized as follows:

1. Such a candidate should have his hair and beard shaved, cover himself with yellow robes, have his upper robe on one shoulder, salute the feet of monks, sit on his haunches, and declare his taking refuge in the Triple Gem.
2. He should approach the Saṅgha and make a formal request for *upasampadā* (“ordination”).
3. Then the Saṅgha should hold a formal Saṅgha function (*saṅghakamma*) to put him on probation for four months, during which monks would observe whether:
 - a. He abstains from entering the village too early and coming back too late.
 - b. He abstains from frequenting the improper places:
 - i. A place of prostitutes.
 - ii. That of widows.
 - iii. That of spinsters.
 - iv. That of gays.
 - v. That of nuns.
 - c. He has, as regards his duties towards other fellow Brahma-farers, dexterity, vigor, know-how, and the ability to manage himself or direct others.

- d. He has high motivation in learning and discussing the higher morality, the higher thought, and the higher wisdom.
- e. He is pleased by the criticism of his former sect.
- f. He is displeased by the criticism of the Triple Gem.
- g. He is displeased by the praise of his former sect.
- h. He is pleased by the praise of the Triple Gem.

If he succeeds in all those factors, he should be given full ordination.²

The procedure itself as summarized above is clear enough, but we should note that noviciation is never mentioned. Why? Are such candidates exempt from, or ineligible for, noviciation? To answer this question, I will first discuss Buddhaghosa's answer and Dhirasekera's criticism and then use a different approach to provide a plausible answer.

²Regarding the type of ordination conferred upon former alien ascetics, Pāli records maintain that the ordination procedure used to initiate people into the monastic order evolved, during the Buddha's lifetime, through three stages: (a) the stage of *ehi bhikkhu*, the Buddha's personal invitation that means "Come, O monk" (Vin I 12; Horner 4: 18–20); (b) the stage of *tisaraṇagamana*, the candidate's avowal of faith in Triple Refuge under the guidance of individual monks (Vin I 21; Horner 4: 29–30); and (c) the stage of *ñatticatutthakamma*, a monastic procedure performed by the Saṅgha community itself (Vin I 55–56; Horner 4: 71–72). So which type of ordination was prevailing when this procedure came to be established?

It is probably safe to answer that it must be the last type, the ordination by *ñatticatutthakamma* because: (a) The first step of the probation procedure is identical with the ordination by *tisaraṇagamana* (Vin I 21; Horner 4: 29–30), which clearly indicates that the latter was no longer the norm for full ordination and (b) probation is to be conferred by a formal Saṅgha function (*saṅghakamma*). Therefore, we can infer that the full ordination, the objective of probation, would also require an act at least as serious.

Buddhaghosa's Answer and Dhirasekera's Criticism

Buddhaghosa states: *paṭhamam kesamassun ti ādinā tassa ādito'va sāmaṇera-pabbajjam dasseti* (Sp V 991) (“With the statement ‘Firstly, hair and beard ...’ etc., [The Buddha] indicates his [i.e., the candidate’s] going forth as a novice at the very beginning”). He evidently believes that the extant probation procedure does account for noviciation; that is, the first step of the probation procedure is actually taking on novicehood. However, the Mv text does not explicitly say so. Then what are the grounds for this interpretation? Obviously, as follows:

1. The initial statement of the whole procedure mentions both *pabbajjā* and *upasampadā*:

yo bhikkhave añño pi aññatitthiyapubbo imasiṃ dhamma-vinaye ākaṅkhati pabbajjam, ākaṅkhati upasampadam, tassa cattāro māse parivāso dātabbo. [Emphasis added] (Vin I 69)

But, monks, whoever else was formerly a member of another sect and *desires the going forth* in this *dhamma* and discipline and *desires ordination*, to him you should grant probation for four months. [Emphasis added] (Horner 4: 85)

2. The first step for granting probation is identical with the procedure for conferring novicehood (Vin I 82; Horner 4: 103–104).
3. With all other stages, only full ordination is mentioned, not the novicehood.

If one understands *pabbajjā* in the initial statement as noviciation, one must somehow account for noviciation in the procedure. And the only feasible way to do so seems to be to treat the first step as an act of taking on novicehood. The fact that Buddhaghosa has actually done so shows that he does understand *pabbajjā* in the initial statement as noviciation.

However, such an interpretation apparently raises a serious problem when he has to deal with the typical *sutta* statement describing such probation procedures:

Yo kho Seniya aññatitthiyapubbo imasmiṃ dhammavinaye ākaṅkhati pabbajjaṃ, ākaṅkhati upasampadaṃ, so cattāro māse parivasati. Catunnaṃ māsānaṃ accayena āraddhacittā bhikkhū pabbājenti upasampādentī bhikkhubhāvāya. [Emphasis added] (MN I 391)³

Seniya! a former member of other schools, seeking the going-forth and ordination in this Dhamma and Vinaya, stays four months on probation. At the end of four months, monks whose minds are conciliated⁴ let (him) go forth, and get (him) ordained for the status of monkhood.

In the *sutta* text above, the Buddha describes the general procedure that former ascetics of non-Buddhist schools must follow if they wish for full ordination in the Buddhist Order. And we can see clearly therein that *pabbajjā* (“going forth”) and *upasampadā* (“ordination”) come only after probation. If *pabbajjā* here means noviciation too, it will clearly conflict with Buddhaghosa’s interpretation in Sp, according to which noviciation takes place at the very beginning of probation.

³Texts identical with this except the candidate’s name may be found at DN I 176; SN II 21; Sn 102, etc.

⁴Walsh translates *āraddhacittā* as “who are established in mind” (269) and explains it as “i.e., properly qualified” (574); *Dialogues* renders it as “exalted in spirit” (Rhys Davids and Rhys Davids 2: 168). However, the original Vinaya source has the sentence, *evaṃ kho bhikkhave aññatitthiyapubbo ārādhako hoti, evaṃ anārādhako* (Vin 1: 70) (“Monks, thus is a former member of another sect conciliatory, thus is not conciliatory.”), in which *ārādhaka* means “who conciliates, wins approval; accomplishing, fulfilling; successful” (Cone “ārādhaka”). Since *āraddha* is a past participle derived from the same root as that of *ārādhaka*, namely, from (*ā* √*ād*h), it should be translated as “the one that is conciliated”. Then *āraddhacitta* is a relative compound meaning “the one whose mind is conciliated”. In the context of the MN passage quoted above, being conciliated essentially means gaining confidence in the sincerity and motivation of the would-be renouncer who was a former member of another sect.

Anyhow, Buddhaghosa tries to deal with that problem as follows:

Tattha pabbajanti vacanasiliṭṭhatāvasena vuttaṃ. Aparivasitvā yeva hi pabbajjaṃ labhati. upasampadatthikena pana na atikālena gāmapavesanādīni aṭṭhavattāni pūrentena parivasitabbaṃ. (Ps III 106)

Therein (i.e. in the speech *yo kho Seniya aññatitthiyapubbo*, etc.), the term *pabbajjaṃ* is mentioned by virtue of the adherence of speech.⁵ In fact, (one) gets *pabbajjā* without undergoing probation. One wishing for *upasampadā*, on the other hand, should undergo probation by fulfilling eight practices of not going into the village beyond proper time, etc.

From the statement “In fact, (one) gets *pabbajjā* without undergoing probation” (*Aparivasitvā yeva hi pabbajjaṃ labhati*), we can infer that Buddhaghosa understands *pabbajjā* here as noviciation. This is why he attempts to dismiss it “out of the context as having no meaning of its own” (Dhirasekera 220) so that no contradiction can arise between the *Sutta* and *Vinaya* traditions.

Dhirasekera is the first to notice that Buddhaghosa’s interpretation results in an apparent difference between the *Vinaya* and *Sutta* traditions and he observes:

On a careful examination of the above two versions of the Tithiyaparivāsa as they appear in the *Sutta* and *Vinaya* Piṭakas, we notice a considerable difference between them. ... This statement of the *Sutta* version is clear enough on the point that both *pabbajjā* and *upasampadā* come after the period of Parivāsa [“pro-

⁵The Pāli term *siliṭṭha* has the Skt. form *śliṣṭa*, of which one sense Apte gives is “Clung, adherence to” (Apte *śliṣṭa*). Then *vacanasiliṭṭhatāvasena* should be literally translated as “by virtue of the adherence of speech.” What Buddhaghosa appears to mean is that because *pabbajjā* and *upasampadā* are commonly used together, *pabbajjā* also appears here because of habitual usage, not because it is really meant.

bation”] ... (219) The details of Khandhakas [in Vinaya Piṭaka] on this point place the Parivāsa on the newcomer after his admission as a *sāmaṇera*. (220)

However, he is not convinced by Buddhaghosa’s attempt to dismiss *pabbajjā* and accordingly he notes:

In this attempt to read into the Suttas an apparently subsequent tradition of the Khandhakas, we see the commentator striving to accord with the tradition of the Vinaya which, in course of time, seems to have overstepped some of the traditions of the Suttas on these monastic matters. (220–221)

To sum up the different positions of Buddhaghosa and Dhirasekera:

1. Buddhaghosa and Dhirasekera agree that noviciation is indicated by the term *pabbajjā* occurring in the probation procedure of *Vinaya*, and consequently that the first step of the procedure should be interpreted as taking on noviciation.
2. They also agree in literally understanding the *Sutta* texts to stipulate that *pabbajjā*, which, in contrast with the *Vinaya*, comes only after probation, also indicates noviciation.
3. They differ regarding the significance of this apparent contradiction. Buddhaghosa believes that the appearance of the term *pabbajjā* in the *Sutta* texts is out of context and has no real significance while Dhirasekera thinks that it shows a considerable difference between the *Sutta* and *Vinaya* traditions.

I do not agree with either of them. This is because:

1. It is questionable whether it is correct to interpret, as both of them do, the first step of the probation procedure in the *Vinaya* as taking on noviciation. The *Mv* text does not mention anything

explicit to this effect. Besides, if a person under probation is a novice, whether or not he sincerely observes the precepts prescribed for novices should be checked. Yet these precepts are not counted as factors observable by monks (see 72-73 above). Here we may be tempted to argue that novice precepts can be counted as part of the factor mentioned earlier, that is, whether “he has high motivation in learning and discussing the higher morality, etc.,” and accordingly need not be mentioned. But this argument does not hold water, for the Buddha had no reason not to mention the novice precepts if *every* candidate must be a novice.

2. They have seemingly been forced to interpret the first step of the probation procedure as taking on novicehood only because they understand noviciation as the sense of *pabbajjā* occurring at the very beginning of the procedure. However, as we will see (83-84, 86-87), this term does not always mean noviciation in the *Vinaya*.
3. Even if they were correct in asserting that the first step of probation is to take on noviciation, it would have led to contradiction between the *Sutta* and *Vinaya* traditions only when we choose, as both of them do, to interpret the term *pabbajjā* in the *Sutta* texts as the legal term for noviciation. That is, only then it will imply that noviciation takes place at the *beginning* of the probation according to the *Vinaya* tradition but only *after* probation according to the *Sutta* tradition—an obvious contradiction. However, *pabbajjā* in the *Sutta* tradition does not always mean noviciation, as we will see (85 ff.).
4. I find it difficult to accept as real the difference between the *Vinaya* and *Sutta* traditions as Dhirasekera claims. Why? We should not forget that the maintainers of both *Vinaya* and *Sutta* traditions are monks belonging to the same Theravādin school and for them, it must have been a common experience to see the mem-

bers of other religious sects getting converted and ordained in the Order. If there was really a wide difference between two traditions regarding the ordination of such converts, it would have certainly produced a legal controversy, which in turn could have led to a schism in the Order. However, there is no historical record of such a controversy or schism. So this ostensible difference seems only to indicate that there must be something wrong with how the texts themselves are understood.

Therefore, I have attempted to use a different approach as follows.

An Alternative Approach

In *Mv*, the topic of probation for former alien ascetics comes before the topic of noviciation. Assuming that this fact is chronologically significant and taking into account the fact that noviciation is not mentioned in the probation procedure, I hypothesize that noviciation did not exist yet when this probation procedure was established. According to this hypothesis, the extant probation procedure should be interpreted as “it is.”

Therefore, the first step of the procedure is not meant to confer novicehood upon the candidate but rather to make him appear like a monk so that he can live together with monks who will observe and evaluate him during the probation period. During that period, he is neither a monk nor a novice; he is only a person under probation, no more, no less. This is also the reason why novice precepts are not mentioned as factors to be observed.

Now, if this hypothesis is to work, we need to answer two inevitable questions:

1. How should we account for the role of noviciation, after it has been established, in the probation procedure?

2. How should we understand the apparent contradiction that *pabbajjā* appears at the beginning of probation in *Vinaya* but comes at the end of probation in the *Sutta* texts?

I will attempt to answer these questions one by one.

Noviciation vis-à-vis the probation procedure

I argue that there is no need to account for the status of noviciation regarding the probation procedure for former alien ascetics because noviciation is not a legally compulsory step towards ordination nor is probation necessary for former ascetics if they aspire to novicehood only. To elaborate:

1. Noviciation appears to have never been a legally compulsory step towards ordination, which we can infer from the fact that *Pāli sources nowhere mention novicehood as a requirement for full ordination* (See Vin I 85–91; Horner 4: 108–115), even though the custom of direct ordination might have disappeared in real practice after the novitiate system had been introduced.
2. Probation appears to be unnecessary for novicehood because:
 - a. Former asceticism in another school is never mentioned as a factor in judging a would-be novice. (See Vin I 91; Horner 4: 115–116)
 - b. Novicehood itself can be viewed as a sort of probation because novices are not full-fledged members of the Order and always have to live under the supervision of monks.

Therefore, I cannot see any reason for dealing with noviciation in the extant probation procedure. However, it does not mean that former alien ascetics are not eligible for novicehood, for there is no rule in the

Pāli *Vinaya* to force ordination upon a candidate if he is content with novicehood only. Therefore, we can deduce from this hypothesis three legally possible paths for a former ascetic to achieve ordination in the Order:

1. A candidate can follow the path exactly described in the probation procedure to bypass the novice stage and get direct ordination.
2. He can officially become a novice first and request for probation. (In his case, the first step of the probation will actually be taking on the novicehood just as Buddhaghosa and Dhirasekera maintain.) Then he would be observed not only regarding the factors officially stated in the procedure but also regarding his observance of novice precepts. If he can satisfy the observer monks on both accounts, he can get ordained at the end of the probation. Here we may be tempted to object that novice precepts are not parts of the factors to be observed. However, at a time when the novice status has already been established, monks can choose to interpret these precepts as part of the factor (d) (“higher morality”, etc.). As the observing monks have the final authority to give or deny ordination to a candidate, they will certainly be not “conciliated” if a candidate does not care for novice precepts despite his novicehood.
3. He can go through the exact probation procedure and at its end, he can choose to get novicehood first and ordination later.

Which path has the highest probability to be in real practice at the Buddha’s time? If we look at the conditions that have forced the status of novicehood on certain candidates to monkhood, we can see that these were their youth and immaturity (Vin I 78–79; Horner 4: 98–99), which would not usually be the case for those who had already been ascetics in

other schools. Therefore, I believe that it was the first path that was in actual practice during the Buddha's times. In other words, the candidates usually bypassed the novice stage and got direct ordination after undergoing the probation procedure.

The sense and usage of pabbajjā

In the typical probation procedures (403-408), the terms *pabbajjā* and *upasampadā* are usually found together. Therefore, we should consider these terms together to get their meanings appropriate to such contexts.

First, I would look at the non-religious meanings of these terms, from which I would attempt to see how legal meanings have evolved in *Vinaya*. *Pabbajjā* has the Skt. form *pravrajyā*, among the meanings of which "Immigration, going abroad" (Apte *pravrajyā*) is closest to that of the Pāli form, which is usually rendered as "going forth." On the other hand, *upasampadā* means "arrival, coming to" because it is derived from *upa + sam + √pad*, which means "1. To come to, to arrive at ... 2. To get, to obtain" (*upasampad*).

Suppose we bring these two terms together in a certain context, in which *pabbajjā* means "going abroad" and *upasampadā* means "arrival in the foreign country destined for." Then we can find three facts as regards the relationship between these two terms:

1. When there is no real distance between the departure and destination points, like in the case of one just crossing the border between two adjacent countries, *pabbajjā* and *upasampadā* are two facets of the same event.
2. When there is a real distance between the departure and destination points, *pabbajjā* technically subsumes *upasampadā* because *pabbajjā* covers the whole state that starts when one leaves, and

ends when one comes back into, the borders of one's own country, whereas *upasampadā* means the state which will begin only when one lands in the country destined for, and will end as soon as one leaves its borders.

3. The term *upasampadā* always implies *pabbajjā* because one cannot “arrive” in a foreign country without “going abroad.”

In the context of *Vinaya*, *pabbajjā* will naturally mean “leaving one's original environment.” In the case of *Yasa* (Vin I 15–18; Horner 4: 21–26), for example, it would mean giving up a lay person's life and environment while in the case of *Pañcavaggiya* monks (Vin I 12–13; Horner 4: 18–19), who were already ascetics when they were converted, it would mean giving up their former beliefs, practices and institutions. On the other hand, *upasampadā* will come to mean “getting a full-fledged membership in the Order.”

Now we have to consider the relationship of these two terms when they occur together in the *Vinaya* context. Here also we can find similar mutual relationships:

1. For those who got directly ordained without passing through the novice stage, *pabbajjā* and *upasampadā* are two different aspects of the same event. For such persons, direct ordination means both giving up their former state of laity or different religious beliefs as well as gaining full membership in the Order.

atha kho āyasmā Aññātakoṇḍañña ... bhagavantaṃ etad avoca: labheyyāhaṃ bhante bhagavato santike pabbajjāṃ [Emphasis added] *labheyyāṃ upasampadan ti.* (Vin I 12)

Then the venerable Aññāta Koṇḍañña ... spoke thus to the Lord: “May I, Lord, receive the *going forth* [Emphasis add-

ed] in the Lord's presence, may I receive ordination?"
(Horner 4: 18)

The Buddhist Order was born with the ordination of the venerable Aññāta Koṇḍañña, at the time of which noviciation was still unheard of. Yet when he requested the Buddha for ordination, he used the term *pabbajjā*, which certainly must refer to ordination, not noviciation.

anujānāmi bhikkhave tumheva dāni tāsu-tāsu disāsu tesu-tesu janapadesu pabbājettha upasampādettha. evañ ca pana bhikkhave pabbājetabbo upasampādetabbo ... anujānāmi bhikkhave imehi tīhi saraṇagamehi pabbajjaṃ upasampadan ti. [Emphasis added] (Vin I 22)

"I allow, monks, that you yourselves may now let go forth, may ordain in any quarter, in any district. And thus, monks, should one let go forth, should one ordain: ... I allow, monks, the *going forth* and the ordination by these three goings for refuge." [Emphasis added] (Horner 4: 30)

When the Buddha permitted monks to give ordination by means of the Triple Refuge formula (*tisaraṇagamanūpasampadā*), noviciation did not yet exist. However, we can see here the Buddha using the term *pabbajjā* and its variants (*pabbājettha*, *pabbājetabbo*) to refer to that particular type of ordination.

2. When there are two distinct stages of renunciation, i.e., noviciation and ordination, the term *pabbajjā* technically covers *upasampadā* and more. *Pabbajjā* covers the period beginning at the noviciation and ending at death (or, if one chooses, coming back to lay life) whereas *upasampadā* covers only the period beginning at the ordination and ending at death (or returning to novicehood or lay life).

One *Sutta* example wherein *pabbajjā* refers to the general state of being a recluse instead of the specific state of novicehood is as follows:

Yassa kassaci bhikkhave bhikkhuno abhijjhālussa abhijjhā appahīnā hoti, ... imesaṃ kho ahaṃ bhikkhave samaṇamalānaṃ ... appahānā na samaṇasāmīcipaṭipadaṃ paṭipanno ti vadāmi. Seyyathāpi, bhikkhave, matajaṃ nāma āvudhajātaṃ ubhato-dhāraṃ pītanisitaṃ. Tadassa saṅghāṭiyā sampārutaṃ sampāli-veṭhitaṃ. Tathūpamāhaṃ, bhikkhave, imassa bhikkhuno pabbajjaṃ vadāmi. (MN I 281)

O monks, whoever monk is covetous and has (his) covetousness not yet abandoned ... has not practised the way proper to recluses, I say, because of his failure to abandon these stains of a recluse ... Monks, by way of simile, there is a type of weapon named *mataja*, double-edged, golden-coloured and well-whetted. Suppose such a weapon is well-wrapped and well-covered by an outer (monastic) cloak. I say such a monk's going forth is comparable to that (i.e., a deadly weapon wrapped in robes).⁶

⁶Is this a sword wrapped in robes or kept in a sheath? Cf.:

For so long as a bhikkhu who is covetous has not abandoned covetousness, ... for so long he does not practise the way proper to the recluse, I say, because of his failure to abandon these stains for the recluse ... Suppose the weapon called a *mataja*, well whetted on both edges, were enclosed and encased in a patchwork sheath. I say such a bhikkhu's going forth is comparable to that. (Ñānamoḷi and Bodhi 372–373)

They have seemingly done a somewhat free translation by ignoring *yassa kassaci* and by adding “for so long as”, which has no Pāli counterpart in the *Sutta* text. However, I believe they need not have done so. For the indeclinable *ci* (Skt. *cit*) is “a particle added to *kiṃ* and its derivatives ... to impart to them an indefinite sense; *kutr*cit somewhere; *kecit* some & c.” (Apte s. v. *cit*); so *kassaci bhikkhuno* means “any monk” while the relative pronoun *yassa* will be correlated to the definite pronoun *so*, the implicit subject of *paṭipanno*. Therefore, the long sentence *Yassa kassaci ... paṭipanno ti vadāmi* can be simply

In the quoted text above, the term *bhikkhuno* refers to a fully-ordained monk, and *pabbajjā* in this context clearly refers to his present state of being a recluse, not the past state of noviciation.

On the other hand, one example from *Vinaya* is as follows:

anujānāmi bhikkhave upasampādentena cattāro nissaye ācikkhituṃ: ... rukkhamūlasenāsanam nissāya pabbajjā, tattha te yāvajīvaṃ ussāho karaṇīyo ... (Vin I 58)

I allow you, monks, when you are ordaining, to explain four resources: ... That going forth (exists) depending upon⁷ a lodging at the root of a tree; in this respect effort is to be made by you for life.

interpreted as showing the Buddha's statement that any monk having failed to discard such defilements has failed to practice properly.

And their rendition of *saṅghāṭiyā* as “patchwork sheath,” is based on the commentary: *saṅghāṭiyā ti vāsiyā* (Ps I 325) (“*saṅghāṭiyā* means ‘by a sheath’”). However, I believe a literal interpretation can be more effective. How?

The Pāli word has the Skt. counterpart (*saṅghāṭi* or *saṅghāṭī*) meaning “a kind of garment, a monk's robe” (Monier-Williams *saṅghāṭa*), which agrees with the following *Vinaya* text: *Anujānāmi bhikkhave ticīvaraṃ diguṇaṃ saṅghāṭiṃ, ekacciyam uttarāsaṅgaṃ, ekacciyam antaravāsakaṃ ti.* (Vin I 289) (“I allow you, monks, three robes: a double outer cloak, a single upper robe, a single inner robe.” [Horner 4: 411]) And it also agrees with the text that follows in the same sutta: *Nāhaṃ bhikkhave saṅghāṭikassa saṅghāṭidhāraṇamattena sāmāññaṃ vadāmi.* (MN I 281) (“I do not say that the recluse's status comes about in a patchwork-cloak wearer through the mere wearing of the patch-work cloak” ... [Nāṇamoḷi and Bodhi 373]).

Therefore, *saṅghāṭiyā* here literally means a monastic robe. Then the sentence *Tadassa saṅghāṭiyā*, etc., refers to a weapon wrapped in robes. The whole simile, then, means the Buddha is comparing a monk unable to discard defilements to a sword wrapped in monastic robes—outwardly harmless and peaceful but dangerous at the inner core. The simile interpreted in this way appears to be more effective.

⁷Does *nissāya* mean “on account of” or “depending upon”? Horner translates *nissāya* as “on account of” (4: 75). It means that a candidate is attracted to monkhood by these four resources of living under a tree, etc., which certainly does not suit the context here. On the other hand, *nissāya* has the Skt. counterpart *nīśrāya*, which is a gerund derived from *ni* √*śri* meaning “to lean on or against” (Monier-Williams *nīśri*). Therefore,

The quoted text above is meant in this context for a candidate to ordination, so the term *pabbajjā* therein must mean the general state of recluseship, not the specific state of novicehood.

3. The term *upasampadā* always implies *pabbajjā* because one cannot gain a full-fledged membership in the Order without giving up the former environment of laity or non-Buddhist asceticism.

Now does it mean that it is not justifiable to interpret *pabbajjā* as the intermediate stage of noviciation (*sāmaṇerapabbajjā*), as Buddhaghosa and Dhirasekera do? It is in fact justifiable in some contexts where the state of *upasampadā* must surely be counted out.

One example in *Vinaya* will be thus: *na upasampādetabbakavīsativāraṃ niṭṭhitam ... na pabbājetabbadvattiṃsavāraṃ niṭṭhitam*. (Vin I 91) (“Told is the Portion on Twenty (Cases) where one should not ordain ... [Horner 4: 115] Told is the Portion on Thirty-two (Cases) where one should not let go forth [4: 116]”)

As shown above, after the section on non-ordainable persons comes the section on persons disqualified for going forth. The only way to prevent confusing these two categories is to interpret “going forth” here as referring to noviciation only.

In *Sutta* texts, on the other hand, *pabbajjā* in the following verse clearly means noviciation only:

Satthā ca maṃ paṭiggayha, ānandaṃ etad abravi; Pabbājehi imaṃ khippaṃ, hessaty ājāniyo ayaṃ (Th 476)

And the teacher receiving me said this to Ānanda, “Send him forth quickly; this one will be a throughbred.” (Norman 49)

the correct rendition of *nissāya* should be, “depending upon” or “being dependent upon,” etc.

Why? The following verses show how the Buddha went into the temple after letting Bhadda go forth, how he achieved liberation before sunset, and how the Buddha came out of his solitary meditation to invite him “Come, Bhadda,” which is his ordination (Th 477–478; Norman 49). Therefore, “sending forth” that occurred before the Buddha’s entrance into the temple must certainly mean noviciation.

And we cannot complain of inconsistency here; just as the term *soldier* in the phrase “generals and soldiers” can refer to lower-rank soldiers even though generals are technically also soldiers, so also can *pabbajjā* refer to the intermediate stage of noviciation in some contexts even though *upasampadā* is also technically covered by the state of *pabbajjā*. But I have already shown above that this is not always the case.

Now it is time to consider the sense of *pabbajjā* and *upasampadā* in the probation procedures as depicted in *Vinaya* and *Sutta* texts. I have already shown how Buddhaghosa and Dhirasekera interpret these terms and how their interpretation has led to an apparent contradiction between these two text traditions. Therefore, what I am giving now is the meaning of the terms in accord with my hypothesis, which maintains that, at the Buddha’s time, former ascetics aspiring to monkhood in the Buddhist Order usually bypassed the novice stage and were directly ordained after probation.

First of all, we should look at the procedure in *Vinaya*. Both the terms *pabbajjā* and *upasampadā* appear at the very beginning of the procedure as part of the Buddha’s description of a candidate as one who was “formerly a member of another sect and desires *pabbajjā* in this Dhamma and discipline and desires *upasampadā*.” Therefore, the state of *pabbajjā* begins when the candidate is formally recognized as having withdrawn from his old ascetic school and the state of *upasampadā* begins when he achieves full ordination in the Buddhist Order. Because noviciation is not involved here, both these states start when he gets full ordination.

In the *Sutta* procedure, on the other hand, these terms in verbal forms (*pabbājenti* and *upasampādentī* respectively) appear at the end of probation, showing how a candidate who is successful in probation is promoted to the status of a monk. Therefore, *pabbājenti* (“let [someone] go forth”) refers to the permission given by monks to the candidate for leaving the probationary status, but *upasampādentī* (“get [someone] ordained”) refers to the monks’ conferment of ordination on the candidate. Here also both terms refer to the same event of ordination.

In short, I argue that there is no real contradiction between *Vinaya* and *Sutta* texts as far as the probation procedure of former alien ascetics is concerned.

Conclusion

I have argued that there is *no need* to account for noviciation in the extant probation procedure. This argument is partly based on the concept of novicehood being only a legally optional step towards full ordination for persons otherwise qualified. *Seen the other way around, the extant probation procedure itself can be viewed as the proof of this concept.* And this concept is actually not new. Burmese monasticism has always believed that it is legally possible to ordain qualified lay persons directly even though it does insist culturally that all candidates pass through the novice stage before ordination. (I cannot comment on other traditions.) If this concept is sound, it might provide solutions to the legal problems of the Buddhist novitiate system. Which kind of problems? Juo-Hsüeh Shih says:

Unlike for nuns, no probationary training was imposed on a man who wished to join the *Saṅgha*. So a youth under twenty could receive lower ordination (i.e., go forth), become a novice, and take higher ordination as soon as he reached twenty. But what happened if he was over twenty, normal and healthy, and had no

need to undertake preliminary training? Did his going forth and ordination take place simultaneously through the *ñatticatutthakamma*? Or, following the changes which had taken place (*tīhi saraṇagamana* for *pabbajjā* and *ñatticatutthakamma* for *upasampadā*), did a man over twenty have to go through both stages? ... (Juo-Hsüeh 369)

With these questions, Juo-Hsüeh Shih opens the Pandora's box regarding the novitiate system (369–370). But all the questions she has raised are based upon the seeming legal ambiguity of the system: i.e., “there is no indication in the texts that someone over twenty should [or should not] begin as a novice” (370). However, if my hypothesis is correct, the texts have no explicit answer to this question because novicehood has always been purely optional for non-novice persons who are otherwise qualified. If a youth is over twenty, normal, healthy and has no need to undertake preliminary training, whether or not to take on novicehood before ordination would be only a culturally dictated choice for him and his master, not a legal necessity. Therefore, if noviciation has become the mandatory stage before full ordination nowadays, it is only a cultural choice *permitted, but not insisted upon*, by the *Vinaya* texts.

Works Cited

Primary Sources

(The Pāli text titles are abbreviated per the Critical Pāli Dictionary system.)

DN T. W. Rhys Davids and J. Estlin Carpenter, eds. *The Dīgha Nikāya*. 3 vols. London: The Pāli Text Society, 1966-1976.

MN V. Trenckner and Robert Chalmers, eds. *Majjhima-Nikāya*. 3 vols. London: The Pāli Text Society, 1977-1979.

- Ps J. H. Wood, D. Kosambi, and I. B. Horner, eds. *Papañcasūdanī: Majjhima-Nikāyaṭṭhakathā of Buddhaghosācariya*. 4 vols. London: The Pāli Text Society, 1976-1979.
- SN M. Léon Feer, ed. *The Saṃyutta Nikāya of the Sutta-Piṭaka*. 5 vols. Oxford: The Pāli Text Society, 1975-1991.
- Sn Dines Andersen and Helmer Smith, eds. *Sutta-Nipāta*. London: The Pāli Text Society, 1984.
- Sp J. Takakusu and M. Nagai, eds. *Samantapāsādikā: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Vinaya Piṭaka*. 7 vols. London: The Pāli Text Society, 1966-1982.
- Th "Theragāthā." *Thera- and Therī- Gāthā*. Ed. K. R. Norman and L. Alsdorf. 2nd ed. London: The Pāli Text Society, 1966. ix-115.
- Vin Hermann Oldenberg, ed. *Vinaya Piṭaka*. 5 vols. Oxford: The Pāli Text Society, 1982-1997.

Secondary Sources

- Apte, Vaman Shivram, comp. *A Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. Delhi: Sri Satguru, 1989.
- Cone, Magaret, comp. *A Dictionary of Pāli: Part I*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 2001.
- Dhirasekera, Jotiya. *Buddhist Monastic Discipline*. 2nd ed. Colombo, Dehiwala, Nedimala (Sri Lanka): Buddhist Cultural Centre, 2007.
- Horner, I. B., trans. *The Book of the Discipline (Vinaya Piṭaka)*. 6 vols. Oxford: The Pāli Text Society, 1938-66.
- Juo-Hsüeh, Shih. *Controversies over Buddhist Nuns*. Oxford: The Pāli Text Society, 2000.

Monier-Williams, Monier. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1951.

Ñāṇamoḷi, Bhikkhu and Bhikkhu Bodhi, trans. *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha: A New Translation of the Majjhima Nikāya*. Kandy, SL: Buddhist Publication Society, 1995.

Norman, K. R., trans. *The Elders' Verses I: Theragāthā*. Pāli Text Society Translation Series 38. London: The Pāli Text Society, 1969.

Rhys Davids, T. W. and C. A. F. Rhys Davids, trans. *Dialogues of the Buddha: Translated from the Pāli of the Dīghanikāya*. 4th ed. 2 vols. London: The Pāli Text Society, 1977.

Walshe, Maurice, trans. *The Long Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Dīghanikaya*. 2nd ed. Somerville: Wisdom Publications, 1995.