

# Two Legal Judgments on Monastic Boundaries from Nineteenth-Century Burma:

Khañ ma kan charā tau Mañijota's *Simāvinicchaya*  
with an appendix on Aoñ mre rhve bhūṃ charā tau  
Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya*

Petra Kieffer-Pülz and D. Christian Lammerts

## Introduction

The Burmese palm-leaf manuscript accession number 8892 of the Collection of the Library of the Department of the Promotion and Propagation of the Sāsana, Ministry of Religious Affairs (MORA) at Kaba Aye Pagoda, Yangon, is a multi-text manuscript.<sup>1</sup> The bundle contains a formal letter in Pali, written in 1858 by the Burmese Saṅgharāja Ñeyyadhamma (1799–1866) and sent to Sri Lanka with the first delegation of Sinhalese monks that had come to Burma<sup>2</sup> in order to receive a judgment with regard to the dispute about the legal validity of the ‘water-splashing boundary’<sup>3</sup> (*udakukkepasimā*) in Balapitiya, Sri Lanka, in the middle of the 19th century CE (foll. rāḥ-lo).<sup>4</sup> Two parties were involved in this dispute, the confusion-

---

1 Only part of this manuscript is at our disposal. All information concerning the texts contained in this manuscript refer to that part solely.

2 They left Sri Lanka on 5 May 1857 and arrived in Burma on 18 February 1858. They returned to Sri Lanka sometime after their reordination in Burma; according to the *Sāsanavaṃsa* on 5 July 1858 (see Kieffer-Pülz 2023a: 194–195).

3 This translation we borrow from Nagasena & Crosby (2022) because it is shorter, and thus easier to understand as a term for a type of *simā* in the translation. Literally *udakukkepasimā* means ‘boundary [defined] by throwing/splashing water’ or ‘boundary consisting in thrown/splashed water’.

4 As in several Burmese manuscripts of this text, the travelogue of the Sinhalese monks Vaskaḍuvē Dhammakkhandha (ca. 1831) and Pōhaddaramullē Vanaratana (ca. 1834) (foll. rāḥ v-lā r7) is preceding Ñeyyadhamma’s judgment (foll. lā r7–10), and there is no interruption between both texts, either by a colophon or introductory lines. An edition of the

ists (*saṅkaravādin*) who considered the ‘water-splashing boundary’ of *Ba-lapīṭiya* to be connected with a ‘village boundary’ (*gāmasīmā*), and thus legally invalid; and the non-confusionists (*asāṅkaravādin*) who considered it as not connected and legally valid.<sup>5</sup> Ñeyyadhamma’s judgment, bearing the title *Simāvivādavinicchayakathā* (‘Explanation of the judgment on the dispute about the monastic boundary’) in the text, was in favor of the position of the confusionists.

The following text in the manuscript is Kalyāṇa’s *nissaya* (foll. lau–sai r3) to Ñeyyadhamma’s *Simāvivādavinicchayakathā*. Both texts are designated as *Sihalaḍḍipa-udakukkhepasīmāvivādavinicchaya* (‘Judgment on the dispute about the ‘water-splashing boundary’ on the Sinhalese island’; plus *nissaya* in the second case) in the margin of the manuscript (fol. lau v).

After these works comes a short Pāli text (foll. sai r3–so v1) to be dealt with here. It is followed by its *nissaya* (foll. so v1–hā r).<sup>6</sup> Neither the Pāṭha text<sup>7</sup> nor its *nissaya* are introduced by a Burmese statement or by the usual introductory homage (*namo tassa*) or by introductory stanzas as is often the case in treatises of Burmese authorship; and neither has an authorial colophon.<sup>8</sup> Neither contains the title of the text or the name of the author. However, the name of the author of the short Pāṭha text is given in the margin of the manuscript as *Khañ ma kaṃ* (= *Khañ ma kan*) *charā tau*, where we also find the titles: *Sihalaḍḍipa-udakukkhepasīmavinicchaya kyamḥ* (fol. sai) and *Sihalaḍḍipa-udakukkhepasīmavinicchaya nissya* (fol. so) respectively. Whether the scribe who copied these texts into one manuscript knew something about the background of the short text which made him add this marginal title, or whether the title results from the fact that the two preceding texts—Ñeyyadhamma’s formal letter and Kalyāṇa’s

---

judgment (without the travelogue) based on a single manuscript is found in Minayeff 1887: 17–34. A new edition and translation of the judgment is in progress (Kieffer-Pülz forthcoming).

5 For a summary of the background of this dispute, see Kariyawasam 1973: 28–41; Malalgoda 1976: 151–161, Kieffer-Pülz 2016–2017: 134–150.

6 The commentary on the Pāṭha ends on fol. ha r10, thereafter follows Burmese text till to the end of fol. hā r.

7 We refer to this text as the ‘Pāṭha’ text, a term used to describe monolingual Pali texts in general. The usage of the term ‘root’ (*mūla*) text in Burmese materials is restricted to the initial layer of the *tipiṭaka*, and ordinarily does not operate outside of this narrow sense. So, in discussing the relationship between this Pali text and its gloss, we speak of the relation of Pāṭha and *nissaya*.

8 There only follows a scribal colophon after the *nissaya* on which see below, n. 199.

*nissaya* on it—are given a similar title, *Sihaḷadīpa-udakukkhepasīmāvivādavinicchaya* (and *nissya*), also in the margin, is unclear.

The short text deals with the possibility of connections between a ‘water-splashing boundary’ and a ‘village boundary’, and, thus, centers on the same topic as the two preceding texts. Whether it was created in the same context is perhaps likely, given the subject matter and references to Sri Lanka in the marginal title, but ultimately uncertain. Nothing in the Pāṭha text or the *nissaya* (or in Ketudhamma’s *Simāvivicchaya*, on which see below, pp. 61ff.) hints at a direct relation to the Sinhalese case. The short text rather thoroughly analyses the wording and meaning of relevant statements in the *Vinaya* (Vin) and the *Vinayaṭṭhakathā*, i.e. the *Samantapāsādikā* (Sp; ca. 4th/5th c. CE), with the aim of refuting the judgments of some unidentified Theras. These Theras apparently had discussed this topic on the basis of subcommentarial texts such as the *Vimativinodaniṭṭikā* (Vmv; ca. 12th/13th c. CE),<sup>9</sup> without having appropriately considered what the *Vinaya* and its commentary had to say. As is stated in our text, these Elders wrote their opinion down in a ‘short/small<sup>10</sup> treatise’ (*kbuddakagandha*), the identity of which is unknown.<sup>11</sup> From the groups involved in the Balapitīya case, Am̐bagahapitīyē (also Vālitārē or Vālitotē) Vimalasāra-tissa (1825–1889) based his argumentation on a passage of the *Vimativino-*

9 This is a subcommentary to the *Vinaya* which represents a South Indian Vinaya tradition that was very influential in Burma, and often contrasts with the Sri Lankan tradition, for instance, with respect to the drinking of alcohol (Kieffer-Pülz 2005; Gornall 2014: 521ff.), or the connection of a ‘village boundary’ with a ‘determined boundary’ (Kieffer-Pülz 2016–2017: 115–134; 2021: 29–35).

10 Pāli *kbuddakagandha* can refer to the length of a book as ‘small’ or ‘short’, but could also refer to its quality as ‘inferior’. The Niss (fol. so v4) glosses the compound as *cā coṇ pe coṇ ṇay*, ‘short treatise’ or ‘little treatise’, which does not convey any explicitly derogatory meaning.

11 The Saṅgharāja Ñeyyadhamma was Mañijota’s contemporary, and it cannot be excluded yet that Mañijota intends to refer to his *Simāvivādavinicchayakathā* with these words. Ñeyyadhamma often quotes from the Vmv, but also from the Sp, never from the *Vinaya* root-text. There are, however, so many texts on *simā* from 19th c. Burma that it is too early to draw any conclusions. It also must be noted that in comparison to Mañijota’s *Simāvivicchaya* Ñeyyadhamma’s *Simāvivādavinicchaya* was a much longer text, even though only one third of it actually dealt with *simā* questions. In addition, they do not present opposing views. Another of Ñeyyadhamma’s writings in this context is his letter to the non-confusionists (*asaṅkaravādīn*) written on 23 March 1860 (manuscript PPL 4609.2) which too is much longer. It also contains plenty of quotations from the Vmv, and thus could be another candidate for the ‘*kbuddakagandha*’, depending on the date of Mañijota’s *Simāvivicchaya*.

*danīṭika* (Vmv III59.<sup>24–26</sup>), where it is stated that a ‘water-splashing boundary’ arises by it-self, implying that splashing water all around is unnecessary. According to this opinion, there is no connection, if no water is splashed out around the platform, because the bridge which creates the connection between the ‘water-splashing boundary’ and the ‘village boundary’ no longer protrudes into the water splashing area.<sup>12</sup> Since the chronological relation between Mañijota and Vimalasāratissa is unclear, it remains open whether Mañijota directs his remark towards that Sinhalese scholar.

The name of the author of the Pāṭha text given in the margin, Khañ ma kaṃ charā tau, is the best-known title of the monk Mañijota (1788–1865).<sup>13</sup> The title, otherwise spelled Khañ ma kan, is derived from the cavalry village Khañ ma kan which is close to Mañijota’s native village Sa munḥ kuiñḥ in Ta lut mrui. (modern Myingyan area). He was a disciple of Sūriya, Sai aṅḥ sāsanā puiñ charā tau (1763–1839), who was Saṅgharāja from 1837 up to his death in 1839. Mañijota was a senior contemporary of another of Sūriya’s famous disciples, namely of the already mentioned Ñeyyadhamma, who was Saṅgharāja from 1839 to 1845 and from 1853 till to his death in 1866. Though Mañijota did not become Saṅgharāja himself, he was one of the key monastic dignitaries in Amarapura and Mandalay. In terms of literary output, he was one of the most productive and influential scholars of his generation.<sup>14</sup> He received a Rājādhirājaguru title from the king,<sup>15</sup> as is proved by the mention of his name as Mañijota-saddhammālakāramahādhammarājādhirājagurutthera in Paññasāmi’s *Sāsanavaṃsa*, where he is listed as the author of Burmese-language Atthayo-jana commentaries (i.e., *nissayas*) on *Samyuttanikāya* and *Samyuttanikāya-ṭṭhakathā* (Sās 148.<sup>21–23</sup>).<sup>16</sup>

12 Vimalasāratissa, *Sāsanavaṃsadīpa*, vv. 1611–1612, see Kieffer-Pülz 2023b: 81 and n. 20.

13 Born on 21 February 1788, his cremation is recorded as having occurred on 10 May 1865 (information courtesy of Alexey Kirichenko).

14 All information courtesy of Alexey Kirichenko. Four other *Vinicchayas* (nos 29–31, 33) of his are printed in Vin-samūh 2011: II 1041–1045; 1046–1053; 1054–1060; and 1064–1067.

15 King Tharrawady (1837–1846) presented twelve of Sūriya’s disciples with such a title (Ko Ko Naing 2010: 75).

16 According to Maung Maung Nyunt 2003, in addition to *nissayas* on *Sagāthā*- and *Nidānavaggaśamyutta-aṭṭhakathā* (nos. 721–722), he wrote surviving *nissayas* on *Bhikkhupāṭi-mokkha* (no. 650), *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇi-aṭṭhakathā* (no. 892), *Mūlaṭṭhikādvārakathā* (no. 944), as well as a text entitled *Dānaggadīpani* (no. 1185).

Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya*

That this Mañijota actually is the author of our short text is confirmed by Aoñ mre rhve bhuṃ charā tau Ketudhamma's<sup>17</sup> *Simāvinicchaya*.<sup>18</sup> This undated *vinicchaya*, written in vernacular Burmese with copious Pali citations from the *Vinaya* commentaries to support its reasoning, was issued by Ketudhamma in response to a question posed to him by the monk Ariyavaṃsa requesting clarification on Mañijota's comment (in § 14 below, pp. 75, 87) that statements transmitted in the *Vimatiṭikā* (Vmv) are 'confused' (*byākula*) and 'contradictory' (*viloma*) to the Paḷi and *Aṭṭhakathā*. In Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* there are altogether six direct citations from Mañijota's *Simāvinicchaya*,<sup>19</sup> which is said to be authored by Mañijotālaṅkāradhaja mahādhammarājadhiraṅgajaguru Khañ ma kan charā tau (p. 88). This confirms the author's name as given in the margin of our manuscript, but deviates with regard to the marginal text title, in that it does not link that text to the Sinhalese disputing parties.

Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* provides additional testimony not only for Mañijota's text but also for the degree to which the genre of judgment texts occasioned Pali and vernacular legal commentary by the Burmese saṅgha in the 19th century. In Burma, *vinicchaya* treatises on both monastic and non-monastic law often responded to and stimulated ongoing jurisprudential debates concerning matters of legal significance for lay and monastic jurists.<sup>20</sup> This adds an additional layer of difficulty to the study

17 Aoñ mre rhve bhuṃ charā tau is mentioned as author of a *Paññattipakāsani* in a manuscript dated Sakkarāj 1246 (1884) (Peters 2000: 151 [no. 846]; Peters 2004: 84 [948.5c]). According to KBZ (III, 149) he received the royal title Ketudhammavārālaṅkāradhaja mahādhammarājaguru in 1854. The same chronicle (III, 431) mentions him thirty years later in 1884, in connection with another ceremony of bestowing royal titles. Here it is stated that at this time Aoñ mre rhve bhuṃ charā tau, known as 'Ūḥ Ketu', was 78 years old (which would mean he was born in 1806), and received the title Ketudhammābhidhaja-atuladhīpatisīripavaramahādhammarājadhiraṅgajaguru. Rājinda (2004: 147) and Kelasa (1982: II 81) report that early in King Mindon's reign Aoñ mre rhve bhuṃ charā tau Ketudhammavārālaṅkāramahādhammarājaguru was responsible for editing the *Vinaya Mahāvagga-Aṭṭhakathā* on palm leaves for a royal edition of the *tipiṭaka* that was later inscribed on stones at the Kuthodaw Pagoda in Mandalay (for this edition, see Wiles *et al.* 2021: 155–226). A number of other *Vinicchayas* on *Vinaya* topics by Aoñ mre rhve bhuṃ charā tau Ketudhamma are printed in *Vin-samūh* 2011: II 756–906 (nos. 8–16, 18–19).

18 This text is printed in *Vin-samūh* 1976: II 239–250; *Vin-samūh* 2011: II 842–849.

19 Four are quoted under the title *Simāvinicchaya* (below, §§ 5.1, 6.1, 6.3, 7) and two under the title '*Simāvinicchaya* treatise' (*kyambḥ*; §§ 1, 4).

20 Concerning *vinicchaya* (Bur. *acbumḥ aḥbrat*, *phrat thumḥ*) texts related to the Burmese *dhammasattha* tradition see Lammerts 2018: II–12, 53, 170, 203–204.

of *vinicchayas*. Such treatises must wherever possible be assessed within the legal-historical contexts of the preceding debates to which they were issued in response, and the slow pace of research on Burmese legal (and other) manuscripts hampers our ability to discern such connections among texts. Nevertheless, for this reason, we provide an annotated English translation of Ketudhamma's judgment in the appendix. It should be noted that our witness to Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* is far from ideal: we are unaware of any surviving manuscripts of this work, and it is available to us only in a modern published edition and its later reprint, which provides no information regarding the extent of editorial intervention, the quantity or quality of manuscript sources consulted to establish the text, or other details that would be essential for a more secure presentation of the text.<sup>21</sup> In the case of Ketudhamma's work this is especially significant since, as our annotations to the translation in the appendix demonstrate, there are several statements in which the author appears to misconstrue opinions on *simā*-related regulations from the *Vinaya* commentarial tradition. However, it is impossible for us, at this stage, to determine whether these apparent faults in Ketudhamma's legal reasoning could be resolved on the basis of a more critical edition of his text.

For example, in describing the determination (*sammuti*) with a legal procedure (*kamma*) of a *nadīpārasimā*, that is, of a 'determined boundary' (*baddbasimā*) which includes areas on both sides of a river, Ketudhamma states that at the time of the *nadīpārasimā*'s determination with a *kammavācā* the monks in the river need not be brought into arm's length to the assembled Saṅgha, but only the monks in the village district (see below, App. § 5). This only makes sense if one adds that only the monks in the village district that are inside the boundary markers of the future *nadīpāra-*

21 The earliest testimony for Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* currently available to us is that published in vol. II of the 1976 printing of *Vin-samūh* by the Rangoon-Mandalay Book Depot (see below, p. 112). This publication represents itself as a reprint of a 1958 edition of *Vin-samūh* (of which only vols I & III are accessible to us), also by the Rangoon-Mandalay Book Depot, which itself claims to mark the 5th edition of the *Vin-samūh* as such. *Vin-samūh* was first printed in three volumes in 1899 (vol. I), 1900 (vol. II), and 1901 (vol. III) by the Mandalay Times Press (Mandalay), although this edition, held by the British Library, does not contain this text by Ketudhamma. A fourth edition of vol. I, if not also vols II and III, was published by Erāvati Press (Yangon) in 1904. It is evident that there has been significant editorial intervention over the course of these successive printings, although as yet (i.e.: 'most of the earliest editions remain inaccessible ...') the earliest editions remain inaccessible to us. We are grateful to Hlaing Hlaing Gyi (Universities' Central Library, Yangon) and Maria Kekki (British Library) for assistance regarding details of the publication history.

*sīmā* have to be brought into arm's length. It cannot be excluded that the words 'inside the markers' have been omitted in the manuscripts used for the edition.<sup>22</sup>

In the subsequent paragraph (App. § 5.1) Ketudhamma states that in reference to precisely this statement in the *Aṭṭhakathā* (Sp v 1047.30–33)—that is, to the determination of a *nadīpārasīmā*—it is said in Mañijota's *Simāvinicchaya* that there is no duty for the monks who perform a legal procedure on a bridge that is connected with a village to take into account the monks inside the river. Here Ketudhamma connects two different things. First, he refers to the statement of the *Aṭṭhakathā* according to which for a determination of a *nadīpārasīmā* monks in the river need not be taken into account. Second, he quotes another *Aṭṭhakathā* statement, which according to him refers to the first mentioned case (i.e. a *nadīpārasīmā* determination). In this second statement it is said that monks who perform a legal procedure on a bridge that is connected with a village do not need to take the monks in the river into account. This second statement in the *Aṭṭhakathā* refers to a 'water-splashing boundary' with assembly point on a bridge that is connected with the village, because its feet are on the riverbanks. Thus, this second statement deals with an 'undetermined boundary' (*abaddhasīmā*) and has nothing to do with the first described case of a 'determined boundary' (*baddhasīmā*). If the text is correct as we have it, then the stated relation between these two passages is incorrect.

There are further cases where Ketudhamma is in contradiction to the *Aṭṭhakathā*.<sup>23</sup> But most important is that he does not really give an answer to the question initially posed by Ariyāvamsa which asks him to identify the 'confused' passages of the Vmv, even though he declares this to be the purpose of his treatise. He quotes a passage from the Vmv—which is in accordance with the *Aṭṭhakathā*—and qualifies it as only the author's own opinion (*attanomati*). But he quotes only part of the relevant passage, and does not address the content at all (App. § 8). This gives the impression that Ketudhamma was not really aware of which passages of the Vmv Mañijota had in mind when he declared that commentary's statement to be confused. In the end (App. § 9.2) Ketudhamma refers to the conflict between Coliḥas and Sihaḥas concerning the relation of a 'determined boundary' (*baddhasīmā*) and a 'village boundary' (*gāmasīmā*). He refutes

22 It is safe to conclude that Ketudhamma knew this fact, since he quotes the relevant sentence from Sp v 1047.30–33 subsequently (see below, n. 225).

23 These are noted in the footnotes to the translation of Ketudhamma's text.

the South Indian position expressed in the *Vmv*<sup>24</sup> that confusions between these two *simā* types are irrelevant, and follows the Sinhalese interpretation according to which they invalidate legal procedures.<sup>25</sup> But this conflict has nothing to do with the conflict discussed in Mañijota's *Simāvinicchaya*, and therefore, it is improbable that Mañijota's comment about the *Vmv* referred to these passages.

### The Date of Mañijota's *Simāvinicchaya*

Concerning the date of composition of Mañijota's judgment, there is no clarity yet, except that it must have been written before the author's death in 1865.<sup>26</sup> In relative chronology Mañijota's *Simāvinicchaya* must predate Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya*, which itself is not dated. Since the latter is transmitted in the *Vinayasamūhavinicchaya* which was published in an edition by U Nigrodha in Mandalay in 1899–1901 for the first time, this date forms its *terminus ante quem*. In the case of Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* only the name *Aoñ mre rvhe bhuṃ charā tau* is given at the end of the text; none of Ketudhamma's titles he had received in 1854 and 1884 are mentioned.<sup>27</sup> It may be possible that Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* predates 1854, but this needs further investigation. If Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* had been written before 1854, then Mañijota's *Simāvinicchaya* was composed even before that time. This would probably exclude a connection of his text with the Sinhalese dispute about the *simā* of Balapiṭiya (which began in 1851), because this became officially linked with the Burmese clergy only in 1858.<sup>28</sup> It is to be hoped that the investigation of further Burmese

24 This is different from Ñeyyadhamma, who accepts the South Indian position.

25 For this conflict, see Kieffer-Pülz 2021.

26 The manuscript witnesses to Mañijota's text do not contain dates of composition. At the end of the *nissaya* only the copy-date 1251 (1889) is mentioned by the scribe.

27 In 1854 he received the title *mabādhhammarājaguru* (KBZ, III 149) and in 1884 (KBZ, III 431) the title *abhidbaja-atuladbipatisiripavaramabādhhammarājādhvirājaguru*. In his *Dhūmapānavinicchaya* Ketudhamma is mentioned with the title *varālaṅkāradbajamabādhhammarājaguru* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 756), and in the subheading of his *Upāhanavinicchaya* with his title *varālaṅkāradbajamabādhhammarājādhvirājaguru* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 840).

28 Previous attempts of the Sinhalese *saṅkāravādins* to send delegations (in 1852, and 1854) were unsuccessful according to the travelogue of the Sinhalese monks Vaskaḍuvē Dharmakkhandha and Pōhaddaramullē Vanaratana who arrived in Burma 18 February 1858 (see Kieffer-Pülz 2023a: 203–204). It can, however, not be excluded that before that first delegation letters were sent to Burma.



*simā* texts will throw light on Mañijota's treatise's exact position in the context of Burma's 19th century *simā* literature.

### The Contents of Mañijota's *Simāvinicchaya*

Both *Simāvinicchaya*<sup>29</sup> texts presented here belong to the large group of Pali and vernacular texts that deal with a multitude of aspects of the monastic boundary (*simā*).<sup>30</sup> A *simā* defines the space within which monks must assemble for the performance of legal procedures (*kamma*) such as ordination (*upasampadā*), the observance (*uposatha*), and so on. Each legal procedure must be performed by a complete (*samagga*) community (*saṅgha*). The completeness of the community is measured by the *simā*. All monks who are within the *simā* must be within arm's length (*batthapāsa*) of each other. If this is not the case, the congregation is counted as incomplete (*vagga*) and the legal procedure as invalid. It is therefore of utmost importance that the *simā* clearly delineates an area and is not connected with other boundaries either directly or by objects.<sup>31</sup> There are a number of different types of *simās* which can be roughly divided into two groups, the 'determined boundaries' (*baddhasimā*) which are determined by a local community in a legal procedure (*kamma*), and the 'undetermined boundaries' (*abaddhasimā*) for which no legal procedure is required. The latter group is again subdivided into three types, a 'village boundary' (*gāmasimā*), a 'seven-*abbhantara*-boundary' (*sattabbhantarasimā*) used in the wilderness (*arañña*), and a 'water-splashing boundary' (*udakukkhepasimā*) used in specific bodies of water, namely, a river, an ocean or a natural lake.

A 'village boundary' is the worldly boundary of any type of settlement, be it a town, village, or market town.<sup>32</sup> Such boundaries define the limits of settlements and, therefore, usually extend over solid earth. 'Village boundaries' can serve as monastic boundaries for a Buddhist community that does not have a 'determined boundary'. Therefore, a community can assemble within a 'village boundary' and perform legal procedures there.

29 There are large numbers of different texts with the title *Simāvinicchaya* (Kieffer-Pülz 2022: 3.1; 2023c: App. 1). Since *vinicchaya* may mean 'judgment, regulation, and so on', it can be used for any investigation into a subject. And the word *simā* can be used for all types of *simā*. Thus the title *Simāvinicchaya* does not indicate which specific aspect of *simā* an author tackles in his treatise.

30 For an overview over the *simā* titles known to date, see Kieffer-Pülz 2023c: App. 1.

31 For a recent overview of the basic *simā* regulations, see Nagasena & Crosby 2022: 18–40.

32 Sometimes the terms *nagarasimā* or *nigamasimā* are used as well, but mostly *gāmasimā* stands for all of them.

Although it is not possible to determine a monastic boundary in bodies of water, a community can assemble within a river, an ocean or a natural lake, and define a monastic boundary by throwing water all around the assembled community. Alternatively, sand can be used. This boundary called ‘water-splashing boundary’ extends to the location where the water or sand thrown by a man of average strength with all his power meets the water surface.<sup>33</sup> The banks however are considered ‘village boundary’-areas.

Since ‘village boundary’ and ‘water-splashing boundary’ come into being upon or in different kinds of terrain, a direct overlap or connection of the two types of boundaries is impossible. But they might be connected by various objects. It is on these connections that Mañijota concentrates in his *Simāvinicchaya*. Mañijota’s central statements are summarised briefly as follows:

- § 1 The starting point for Mañijota’s *Simāvinicchaya* is the judgment on the ‘water-splashing boundary’ by some unidentified Theras. They presented an interpretation—not shared by Mañijota—that was not compatible with Vin and Sp. Apparently they had it written down in a yet untraced treatise mentioned as ‘short treatise’ (*kbuddakagandha*, see above, n. 10). Their judgment prompted Mañijota to present his own investigation which he characterises as having the proper intended meaning (*adhippāya*) and being in agreement with Vin and Sp.
- § 2 Mañijota states that performing legal procedures within a ‘water-splashing boundary’ is not restricted to staying inside a river or being in a boat tied to a tree, but also is possible on a platform set up in a river, and so on, or on a tree growing inside a river, and so on.

33 Nagasena & Crosby (2022: 34; Nagasena 2012: 233) describe the water-splashing boundary in present day Burma as only an imagined space, because the activity of splashing water around the assembled is no longer practiced since at least the second half of the 19th century CE. Interestingly the person they mention as the one who insisted on this practice, namely the Saṅgharāja Ñeyyadhamma, was the person involved in the dispute about the *simā* of Balapitiya in Sri Lanka, where water was still splashed all around the assembled community. And in his first formal letter to the Sinhalese, which shows that he shared the interpretation of the confusionists (*saṅkaravādin*), he mentions the splashing of water (Minayeff 1887: 21f). Nowhere does he state that one should not splash water all around the community. The assumption that the splashing of water was unnecessary was an argument of the non-confusionists (*asankaravādin*) (see n. 12).

- § 3 A platform may serve for legal procedures as long as it is not connected with a ‘determined boundary’ (*baddhasīmā*)<sup>34</sup> or an ‘undetermined boundary’ (*abaddhasīmā*)<sup>35</sup> outside the river. The same is valid for a tree that grows inside the river.
- § 4 In the case of a platform there is no uncertainty concerning possible connections, because the platform is intentionally set up by non-monastics<sup>36</sup>) for that purpose. In contrast, there may be uncertainty in the case of a tree within the river, because it grows on its own, and its branches may or may not touch ‘determined’ or ‘undetermined boundaries’ outside the river. Because of this uncertainty, a legal procedure may be performed, after either purifying the boundary area or removing the connecting parts of the tree.
- § 5 The two possible measures are then mentioned explicitly: (1) ‘purification of a boundary’ (*simāsodhana*) or (2) destroying the tree’s being established outside the river. Concerning purification, either (a) one leads the monks who are within the connected boundaries into arm’s length to the community that is assembled to perform a legal procedure, or (b) one excludes them from the connected boundary areas.
- § 6 Possible connections of a platform have to be seen in the light of the connections described in the Sp for a community assembled in a boat tied to a tree that grows outside the river—i.e., on the bank (= *gāmasīmā*)—or tied to a post driven into the bank.
- § 7 For a platform set up inside a river and for a bridge built in a river, the following questions are investigated: (1) whether or not legal procedures can be performed, (2) whether or not a monastic boundary is connected, and (3) whether or not either needs to be purified.
- § 8 A bridge can serve as a meeting place for a community within a ‘water-splashing boundary’ when it is not connected with a village, because it then has a ‘water-splashing boundary’-condition. It cannot serve for that purpose when it is connected with a village, because it then has a ‘village boundary’-condition. Following this state-

34 Basing himself on the Sp he mentions as a representative of a ‘determined boundary’ a ‘monastery boundary’ (*vihārasīmā*), see below, n. 116. For other types of *baddhasīmās*, see Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B Einl. 7, 8, 11; 242–259, 296–307; 2021: 91.

35 Basing himself on the Sp he mentions as a representative of an ‘undetermined boundary’ a ‘village boundary’ (*gāmasīmā*). For other types of *abaddhasīmās*, see Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B Einl. 7, 82–86, 327–355; 2021: 91.

36 We assume that Manijota mentions ‘non-monastics’ here, because it was in accordance with the actual customs that non-monastics, and not monks, built such platforms. The real point here, however, is that this platform did not come into being by chance, as is the case with trees, but was deliberately set up as a platform for legal procedures of a Buddhist community.

ment, Mañijota lists two possible objections: (1) Have not the two possible conditions of a bridge—‘water-splashing boundary’-condition or ‘village boundary’-condition—already been dealt with in Sp in connection with a bridge? And, (2) why must these two different conditions of a bridge be known at all?

To this Mañijota responds: (1a) the Blessed One has allowed a ‘water-splashing boundary’ only in a body of water. (1b) From this it follows that a bridge staying completely within the river is a river itself. (1c) Sp, stating that such an unconnected bridge may serve as a meeting place within a ‘water-splashing boundary’, has illuminated the ‘water-splashing boundary’-condition of such a bridge. Furthermore, (2a) the Blessed One has allowed a ‘village boundary’ as a monastic boundary. (2b) A bridge that has connected with a village thus is a village, and, therefore, (2c) the bridge has a ‘village boundary’-condition.

The Sp not only forbids performing legal procedures inside a ‘water-splashing boundary’ on a bridge that is connected with villages, but it also shows a way to perform a legal procedure there anyway, namely by purifying the connected boundary.

- § 9 Concerning places that have to be purified, or not to be purified, Mañijota states that only monks within the ‘water splash’—which in the case of a connected bridge also includes the monks within the ‘village boundary’—need to be led into arm’s length of the assembled monks or to be excluded from the boundary area, but not monks staying elsewhere outside the ‘water splash’.
- § 10 He then refers to a statement in the *Kaṅkabhāvitaraṇī* (Kkh; ca. 5th c. CE) according to which a monk who is outside the ‘water-splashing boundary’, but within a further splash of water from that boundary, also disturbs the legal procedure. This would mean that this monk would also have to be led into arm’s length or removed from the area. Mañijota says that this statement should be accepted in the *Sāratthadīpanī* (Sp-ṭ; 12th c. CE). Actually, this statement of the Kkh is very controversial, and the Sp-ṭ does not accept it in general, but only under certain premises.<sup>37</sup> By his comment, however, Mañijota reveals himself as one who accepts it.
- § 11 Despite this attitude, Mañijota declares that in the case of the performance of legal procedures on a bridge that is connected with a village there is no necessity to exclude monks staying elsewhere in the river.

37 See Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 177f. n. 412.

- § 12 Only the monks in the connected village need to be excluded. The reason for this is that the ‘water-splashing boundary’ and the ‘village boundary’ are limited by their own nature. As long as there is a distance of one cubit, one span or four finger breadth between them,<sup>38</sup> there is no fault of combining them.
- § 13 Thereafter, Mañijota states that his remark about the ‘water-splashing boundary’-condition of a bridge that is not connected with villages, and the ‘village boundary’-condition of a bridge that is connected with villages also is to be understood in the context of the Sp statement concerning a platform set up inside a river.
- § 14 Mañijota concludes his *Simāvinicchaya* by referring again to the unidentified Theras mentioned in § 1, who had given a wrong judgment, because they did not rely on Vin and Sp. He now states that they based themselves on the Vmv and other texts. This for him was the reason to present a judgment based only on Vin and Sp as the more authoritative texts. By having compared earlier and later statements his judgment is proper and conforms to what is right.

## Mañijota’s *Simāvinicchaya*-Edition

### Witnesses

- Mañijota’s *Simāvinicchaya* is accessible to us in the single manuscript mentioned above (MORA 8892 foll. sai r3–so v1). Burmese script palm-leaf manuscript, 2 punch holes, 11 lines per folio; copy date 1875.<sup>39</sup>
- *nissaya* to Mañijota’s *Simāvinicchaya* (MORA 8892 foll. so vi–hā r).
- Quotations from Mañijota’s *Simāvinicchaya* in Aoñ mre rhve bhuṃ charā tau Ketudhamma’s *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 1976: II 239–250; 2011: II 841–849).
- Quotations from Vin.
- Quotations from Sp.

38 These measures are given in Sp for the distance between *baddbasimās*. Concerning *abaddbasimās* Sp gives only measures for distances between the same sort of *abaddbasimā*. See Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B 15.2.2 for the *sattabbhantarasimā*. Here the distance between two *sattabbhantarasimās* is seven *abbhantara* (ca. 80 m); B 15.4.3 for the *udakukkhepasimā*; the distance between two *udakukkhepasimās* is another ‘splash of water’ (*udakukkhepa*) which according to estimation is about 6 m. There are no statements in Sp concerning the distance between different types of *abaddbasimās*.

39 Fol. hā r11. In the preceding text, the *Sibāladīpasandesakatthā*, the copy date is given as 10 waxing Tazaungmon, 1275 (= 7 November 1913 on fol. lo v8). Photos of this manuscript have been made by Alexey Kirichenko who kindly put them at our disposal.

## General Remarks

In order to enable the reader to check the wording of the text in the manuscript, the folio numbers and lines in the manuscript are inserted into the text within round brackets. Relevant variants in the quoted sources, in the *nissaya* gloss, and in the quotations from Mañijota's *Simāvinicchaya* transmitted in Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* are given in the footnotes. In our edition and translation, as well as in the Appendix, Burmese is transliterated diplomatically as written without standardization. References for the quoted sources are given in round brackets after the quotations. Quotations from Vin and Sp as well as names of texts are put in italics. In order to facilitate cross referencing the text is divided into paragraphs inserted by us from the point of view of content. In Burmese manuscripts *simā* is mostly written as *simā*. This also is the case in the present manuscript.

## Mañijota's *Simāvinicchaya*-Text

§ 1 (SAI R<sub>3</sub>) dvinnaṃ baddhābaddhasimānaṃ vinicchayo *Pāli-Atṭhakathāsu* (R<sub>4</sub>) pākaṭo yeva. atha ca pana abaddhasimāsu tisu udakukkhepasimaṭṭhāne ekacce therā *Pāli-Atṭhakathāya* ananulomāyuttaṃ atthavinicchayaṃ vadanti c' eva *Kbuddakagandhaṃ* likhanti ca. tasmā tasmīṃ simaṭṭhāne<sup>40</sup> āgate  
5 'antona<sub>(R5)</sub>diyaṃ baddhe' ty (Sp v 1053.29–30) ādi-*Atṭhakathā*-pāṭhe sānusandhiko *Pāli-Atṭhakathāya*<sup>41</sup> yuttānulomādhippāyo evaṃ vuccamānavacanena jānitabbo.

§ 2 nadiyā kammaṃ karontehi na kevaḷaṃ antonadiyaṃ yeva vā antonadiyaṃ jā<sub>(R6)</sub>tarukkhādimhi baddhanāvāya eva<sup>42</sup> vā kammaṃ kātabbaṃ, api  
10 ca kho *antonadiyaṃ baddhe aṭṭake pi antonadiyaṃ jātarukkhe pi ṭhitehi*<sup>43</sup> kammaṃ kātabban ti imassatthassa dassanattham āha:

*antonadiyaṃ baddhe ... la ... ṭhitehi* (R<sub>7</sub>) *kammaṃ kātuṃ vaṭṭati* ti  
(Sp v 1053.29–31).

§ 3 tattha uposathādikammakaraṇatthāya antonadiyaṃ baddhaṭṭassa bahi-  
15 naditire viharasimāya vā gāmasimāya vā kenaci vatthunā asambandhe<sup>44</sup> sati

40 So Niss fol. so v5; Pāṭha text *simiṭṭhāne*.

41 Niss (fol. so v7) °*kathāyaṃ*.

42 Niss (fol. so v8) *evaṃ*.

43 Sp v 1053.29–30.

44 Pāṭha and Niss (fol. sau r2) read *asambaddhe*. A nomen, *asambandhe*, would be expected, because of the genitive *baddhaṭṭassa*. *Sambandha* and *sambaddha* are sometimes confused in this manuscript. We translate accordingly.

tasmim̄ aṭṭake pi ṭhitehi kammaṃ kātuṃ (R8) vaṭṭati. antonadiyaṃ jātarukkhassa sākḥā vā tato nikkhantapāroho vā bahinaditīre vihārasimāya vā gāmasimāya vā (Sp v 1053.31–1054.2) apatiṭṭhite sati tasmim̄ pi rukkhe ṭhitehi kammaṃ kātuṃ vaṭṭatī ti<sup>45</sup>veditabbo.

§ 4 etesu ca dvīsu pubbavā<sup>(R9)</sup>kye uposathādikammakaraṇatthāya antonadiyaṃ baddhaṭṭassa anupasampannādihi bandhitattā vihārasimāya vā gāmasimāya vā sambhedabhāve saṅkā yeva natthi. paravākye pana rukkḥassa sayam̄jātattā sākḥā vā tato ni<sup>(R10)</sup>kkhantapāroho vā bahinaditīre vihārasimāya vā gāmasimāya vā phusitvāpi tiṭṭheyya, aphasitvāpi. evaṃ ubhayathā ‘patiṭṭhite jātarukkhe pi kammaṃ kātappaṃ siyā nu kho no’ ti vā ‘simasambhedo siyā nu kho no’ ti vā (R11) saṅkā bhaveyya. tasmā taṃ<sup>46</sup> pariharanto sace pi rukkḥassa ty (≠ Sp v 1053.31) ādim āha.

§ 5 tatta rukkḥassa sākḥā vā tato nikkhantapāroho vā bahinaditīre vihārasimāya vā gāmasimāya vā patiṭṭhito (Sp v 1053.31–1054.2). sace pi hoti (=) evaṃ sati, si<sup>(S11 V1)</sup>maṃ asodhetvā vā sākḥaṃ achinditvā vā tasmim̄ rukkhe ṭhitehi kammaṃ kātuṃ na vaṭṭati. sambhedadoso hoti. tena vuttaṃ:<sup>47</sup>

sace pi rukkḥassa sākḥā vā ... la ... simaṃ vā sodhetvā sākḥaṃ vā chinditvā kammaṃ<sup>48</sup> kātappaṃ ti (≠ Sp v 1053.31–1054.3).

<sup>a</sup>–ettha ca (v<sub>2</sub>) simasodhanaṃ nāma (1a) vihārasima-gāmasimāsu ṭhitānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ hatthapāsānayanavasena ca (1b) tato bahikaraṇavasena ca patiṭṭhāpanaṃ,<sup>49</sup> (2) sākḥaṃ vā chinditvā tassa rukkḥassa bahipatiṭṭhitabhāvena nāsanakaraṇāṇā cā ti<sup>50</sup>daṭṭha(v<sub>3</sub>)bbo<sup>51</sup>.<sup>–a</sup>

§ 6<sup>b</sup>–bahinaditīre jātarukkḥassa antonadiyaṃ pavīṭṭhasākḥāya vā pārohe vā<sup>–b</sup> <sup>c</sup>–naditīre<sup>52</sup> kbāṇukaṃ koṭetvā<sup>–c</sup> tatta vā baddhanāvāya kammakaraṇe sambandhādibhedo vuttānusārena jānitabbo.

45 Niss (fol. sau r6) adds *adhippāyo* as subject to *veditabbo*.

46 Niss (fol. sau v4) explains *taṃ* as *saṅkaṃ*.

47 Niss (fol. sau v9) adds *ācariyena* as subject.

48 So Niss (fol. sau v9) and Sp; Pāṭha *kamma*<sup>o</sup>.

49 So Niss (fol. sau v11), Ketudhamma’s *Simāvinicchaya*; Pāṭha *patiṭṭhāpana*.

50 Niss (fol. sau r2) adds *adhippāyo* as subject to *daṭṭabbo*.

51 Ketudhamma’s *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 842.22): *daṭṭhabbā*.

52 So Niss (fol. sau r3) <sup>o</sup>*tīre*; Pāṭha *tīre*.

<sup>a</sup>Quoted in Ketudhamma’s *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 842.20–22; App. § 4, n. 217).

<sup>b</sup>This corresponds to Sp v 1054.3–4. <sup>c</sup>This corresponds to Sp v 1054.6–7; Mañijota here has combined two subsequent sentences of Sp.

§ 7 yathā *antonadīyaṃ* (v<sub>4</sub>) *baddhe* ty (≠ Sp v 1053.29–30) ādi-vākye kammaṣṣa kattabbākattabbabhāvo ca simāya simaṃ sambandhāsambandhabhāvo ca sodhitabbāsodhitabbabhāvo ca jānitabbo, tathā *nadīyaṃ setuṃ karonti* ty (Sp v 1054.7–8) ādi-vākye pi ti adhippāyo.

- 5 § 8 api c' ettha (v<sub>5</sub>) gāmādihi asambaddhasetuno udakukkhepasimabhāvo ca tāhi sambaddhasetuno gāmasimabhāvo ca jānitabbo.

‘nanu ca *nadīyaṃ setuṃ karonti* ... la ... *vaṭṭatī* ti (Sp v 1054.7–9) purimavākyena gāmādihi asambaddhase(v<sub>6</sub>)tuno udakukkhepasimabhāvo<sup>53</sup> ca sambaddhasetuno gāmasimakammaṣṣa<sup>54</sup> kattabbaṭṭhānabhāvo yeva ācariyena dassito. *sace pana* ... la ... *na vaṭṭatī* ti (Sp v 1054.9–11) uttaravākyena ca sambaddhasetuno<sup>55</sup> aka(v<sub>7</sub>)ttabbaṭṭhānabhāvo<sup>56</sup> yeva<sup>57</sup> dassito.

atha kasmā gāmādihi asambaddhasetuno udakukkhepasimabhāvo ca<sup>58</sup> sambaddhasetuno gāmasimabhāvo ca jānitabbo' ti ce.

- 15 *vuccate*:<sup>59</sup>

*nadīyā vā bhikkhave samu*(v<sub>8</sub>)*dde vā jātassare vā* ti (Vin I III.4–5) ādinā bhagavatā nadi-ādīsu yeva udakukkhepasimāya anuññātattā gāmādihi asambaddhasetu<sup>60</sup> pi nadipariyāpanno hoti. tassetuno nadipariyāpannattā *Aṭṭhakathāyaṃ a*(v<sub>9</sub>)*ntonadīyaṃ* ... la ... *vaṭṭatī* ti (Sp v 1054.8–9) purimavākyena antonadīyaṃ gāmādihi asambaddhasetuno<sup>61</sup> kammaṣṣa kattabbaṭṭhānabhāvaṃ dassentena tassetuno pi udakukkhepasimabhāvo ca dīpito hoti ti.

<sup>d-</sup>*asammatāya bhikkha*(v<sub>10</sub>)*ve simāya aṭṭhapitāyā* ti (Vin I II0.36) ādinā pana bhagavatā gāmakhettam eva gāmasimā ti anuññātattā

25

53 Pāṭha °tāvo.

54 Niss (fol. saṃ 110) *kammaṣṣa* (om. *gamasima*).

55 Niss (fol. saṃ 111) adds *gāmādihi* before this word.

56 Niss (fol. saṃ 111) adds *kammaṣṣa* before this word.

57 Niss (fol. saṃ 11) adds *ācariyena* as subject to *dassito*.

58 Niss (fol. saṃ 112) adds *gāmādihi*.

59 Niss (fol. saṃ 112–3) explains *parihāro* ... *mayā* ... *vuccate*.

60 From here on the Pāṭha ms. reads °*sambandha*° for °*sambaddha*°; Niss (fol. saṃ 112) °*sambaddha*°.

61 So Niss (fol. saṃ 112); Pāṭha °*sambandha*°.



gāmādihi<sup>62</sup> sambaddhasetu<sup>63</sup> gāmapariyāpanno hoti. tassetuno gāmapariyāpannattā setu pi gāmasimabhā<sup>(v11)</sup>vaṃ gato<sup>-d</sup>

<sup>e</sup>yadi pana *Aṭṭhakatthāyaṃ sace pana setu vā ... la ... na vaṭṭatī* ti (Sp v 1054.9-11) uttaravākyena gāmasimādihi<sup>64</sup> sambaddhasetuno<sup>65</sup> kammaṃ kaṭṭabbatthānabhāvo yeva dassito hoti, evaṃ kammakattabbatthānapaṭi<sup>(so r1)</sup>sedhena *sace pana ty* (Sp v 1054.9) ādi-vacanena niṭṭham katvā vattabbaṃ siyā. 5

na pana sannitthānaṃ *simaṃ sodhetvā kammaṃ kātabban* ti (Sp v 1054.11) vacanaṃ vattabbaṃ siyā. vuttañ ca. tasmā tena vacanena padantarasaṃniṭṭhānena tamhi yeva setumhi simasodhanena ka<sup>(R2)</sup>mmakattabbatam<sup>66</sup> dassentena gāmassa niyamenā aṭṭhatvā<sup>67</sup> hāyana-vaḍḍhanasabhāvattā tassetuno pi gāmasimabhāvo ca dipito va hoti ti<sup>-e</sup> 10

§ 9 sodhetabbāsodhetabbatṭhāne pana antonadiyaṃ ca<sup>68</sup> ṭhitasetumhi ca<sup>69</sup> ka<sup>(R3)</sup>mmaṃ karontehi bahitire gāmādisu ṭhitānaṃ sodhetabbakiccaṃ natthi. tena<sup>70</sup>vuttaṃ: 15

*antonadiyaṃ setum karonti. sace<sup>71</sup> antonadiyaṃ yeva setu vā setupādā vā honti, setumhi ṭhitehi kammaṃ kātuṃ vaṭṭatī* ti (≠ Sp v 1054.7-9<sup>72</sup>).

- 
- 62 Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 844.12; App. § 6.1): *gāmāsimādihi*.  
 63 So Niss (fol. saṃ v9); Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya sambaddhasetu*; Pāṭha *sambandhi setu*, obviously with an attempt to correct something.  
 64 Niss (fol. saṃ v11) *gāmādihi*.  
 65 Niss (fol. saṃ v11); Pāṭha *sambandha*<sup>o</sup> corrected to *sambaddha*<sup>o</sup>.  
 66 Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 845.13; App. § 6.3) *kammaṃ kat-tabbatam*.  
 67 Niss (fol. sāh v5-6) *Aṭṭhakatthā*.  
 68 *ca* does not fit into this sentence, but it is contained in the Pāṭha as well as in the Niss (fol. sāh v8). The *nissaya* adds a *ca* after *ṭhitasetumhi* (see n. 69) as well. This is a possible solution, see below, n. 171.  
 69 Pāṭha text missing; Niss (fol. sāh v8) adds *ca*.  
 70 As subject the Niss (fol. sāh v 10-11) mentions *ācariyena*, i.e., the Sp author.  
 71 Pāṭha adds *na*; this is not quoted and commented on in the Niss (fol. sāh v10), and since the passage in part is a quotation from Sp, it would also contradict the source text. From the point of view of content *na* also would contradict Manijota's own statements.  
 72 See translation, § 9, n. 148.

<sup>d</sup>Quoted in Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 844.11-13; App. § 6.1).

<sup>e</sup>Quoted in Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 845.8-14; App. § 6.3). Here and in Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* marked by *iti*. That this does not indicate a quotation is clear from the *nissaya* which explains this *iti* as the final point of the response (introduced by *vuccate*) to the preceding objections.

(R4) api ca kho anto-udakukkhepe yeva t̥hitānaṃ hatthapāsānayanādinā sodhetabbā, na udakukkhepato bahi t̥hāne. kasmā? udakukkhepasimāya attano sabhāvena baddhasimāsadisattā. tenāha bhagavā: (R5)

5 *nadiyā vā bhikkhave samudde vā jātassare vā yaṃ majjhimassa purissassa samantā udakukkhepā, ayaṃ tattha samānasamvāsā ekuposathā ti* (Vin I III.4-6),

*Aṭṭhakathāyaṇī* ca

10 *tassa anto hatthapāsāṃ vijāhitvā*<sup>73</sup> (R6) *t̥hito kammaṃ kopeti ti* (Sp v 1052.34-1053.1) <sup>74</sup>vuttaṃ.

§ 10 imasmiṃ t̥hāne *Mātikāṭṭhakathāya*<sup>75</sup> āgatavinicchayo *Sāratthadīpanī-tīkādisu* gahetabbo.

§ 11 <sup>8-</sup>gāmādihi pana sambaddhasetumhi<sup>76</sup> kammaṃ karontehi nadī-ādisu t̥hi(R7)tānaṃ<sup>77</sup> sodhetabbakiccaṃ natthi. tena <sup>78</sup>vuttaṃ:

15 *sace pana setu vā setupādā vā babhitire*<sup>79</sup> *patiṭṭhitā*,<sup>80</sup> *kammaṃ kātum na vaṭṭati, simam sodhetvā kammaṃ*<sup>81</sup> *kātabban ti* (≠ Sp v 1054.9-11).

§ 12 <sup>f-</sup>api ca kho gāmādisu yeva t̥hitānaṃ hatthapā(R8)sānayanādinā sodhetabbā, na<sup>82</sup> setuno<sup>83</sup> samipaṭṭhe<sup>84</sup> udakatale.<sup>85</sup> kasmā?<sup>86</sup> udakukkhepagā-

73 Niss (fol. s̥āḥ v 4); Pāṭha: *vidbabhitvā*.

74 Niss (fol. s̥āḥ v4) adds *ācariyena* as subject to *vuttaṃ*, which refers to the Sp author.

75 Niss (fol. s̥āḥ v5) °ayaṃ. This reference refers to Kkh 12.20-23, see below, n. 179.

76 Pāṭha text, and Niss (fol. s̥āḥ v6); Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 843.19; App. § 5.1): *sambandha*°.

77 Niss (fol. s̥āḥ v6); Pāṭha °*kānaṃ*.

78 Niss (fol. s̥āḥ v8) adds *ācariyena* as subject to *vuttaṃ*, which refers to the Sp author.

79 Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 843.21; App. § 5.1): *babi naditire*.

80 Sp here adds *tattha t̥hitehi*, see below, n. 153.

81 So Niss (fol. s̥āḥ v7), and Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 843.20; App. § 5.1).

82 Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 845.21; App. § 5.1) quotes as follows: *sambaddhesu pana gāmasimādisu yeva || na*.

83 Om. in Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 845.21; App. § 5.1).

84 Pāṭha and Niss (fol. s̥āḥ v8) *samipaṭṭhe*; Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 845.21; App. § 5.1): *samīpe*.

85 Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 845.21; App. § 5.1): *udakapiṭṭhe*.

86 Om. in Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 845.21; App. § 5.1).

masimānaṃ<sup>87</sup> sakabhāvaparicchinnā<sup>88</sup> añña 'ñña<sup>89</sup> ratana-vidatthi-catur-  
aṅgulamattam pi antarite sambhedadoso natth' eva. tato a<sub>(R9)</sub>dhikanta-  
rite<sup>90</sup> pana vattabbam eva natthi,<sup>-f</sup> tasmā na sodhetabbā. tenāha bhagavā:

*asam<m>atāya bhikkhave simāya aṭṭhapitāya yaṃ gāmaṃ vā nigamaṃ  
vā upanissāya viharatī, yā tassa<sup>91</sup> gāmassa gāmasimā nigamassa<sup>92</sup> niga- 5  
masimā, (R10) ayaṃ tattha samānasaṃvāsā ekuposathā ti (Vin I 110.36–  
111.).<sup>-g</sup>*

§ 13 *api c' etthā* ti<sup>93</sup> ādinā vutto atthavinicchayo *antonadiyaṃ baddhe* ty (Sp  
v 1053.29)<sup>94</sup> ādinā yathāvutte *Aṭṭhakathāpāṭhe* pi netabbo.

§ 14 <sup>h-</sup>imasimim ṭhāne ekacce therā *Pāḷi-Aṭṭhaka*(R11)*thāya* atthasabhāvaṃ 10  
asamapekkhitvā *Vimatiṭṭhādisu* āgatavacaṇaṃ bahuṃ āharitvā byākula-  
vacaṇaṃ vilomādhippāyaṃ atthavinicchayaṃ<sup>95</sup> dipenti.<sup>-h</sup> tasmā *Ṭikā*-va-  
canaṃ anāharitvā *Pāḷi-Aṭṭhakathāya* eva āgataṃ (so v1) pubbāparaṃ<sup>96</sup> va-  
canaṃ saṃsanditvā apy ākulavacaṇaṃ yuttānulomādhippāyaṃ atthavini-  
cchayaṃ saṅkhepato mayā dassitaṃ. taṃ<sup>97</sup> attano hitesīno kulaputtā 15  
dhukaṃ nāṇena upaparikkhitvā sallakkhanti.<sup>98</sup>

87 Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 843.23; 845.21–22; App. § 5.1): °gā-  
masimādinā ca.

88 So Niss (fol. sāh v9) and Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 843.23–24;  
App. § 5.1); Pāṭha *sakabhāga*<sup>a</sup>; (Vin-samūh 2011: II 845.22; App. § 7): *sakabhāvaparicchin-*  
*natā*.

89 Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 843.25; App. § 5.1): *añña*; (II 845.22;  
App. § 7): *añña asambaddhe sati*.

90 Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 843.25; App. § 5.1): *adbikarantarite*.

91 Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 843.27; App. § 5.1) and Vin ad vā.

92 Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 843.28; App. § 5.1) and Vin ad vā.

93 We assume that this takes up Mañijota's statement from above (§ 8) *api c' ettha* (5)  
*gāmādīhi asambaddhasetuno udakukkhepasimabbāvo ca tāhi sambaddhasetuno gāmasima-*  
*bbāvo ca jānitabbo*.

94 Quoted above, § 2; see also n. 119.

95 Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 841.8; App. § 1) *atthasabbhāvaṃ*.

96 Niss (fol. ha r7) *pubbāpara*<sup>a</sup>.

97 Niss (fol. ha r8–9) add *atthavinicchayaṃ*.

98 Niss (fol. ha r10) *sallakkhantu*.

<sup>f</sup>Quoted in Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 845.21–24), App. § 7. Though  
the *Simāvinicchaya* is given as the source, the text here deviates from the one traceable in the  
Pāṭha text and the *nissaya*. So it cannot be excluded that it comes from some other, similar  
*Simāvinicchaya*. <sup>g</sup>Quoted in Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 843.19–28;  
App. § 5.1). <sup>h</sup>Quoted in Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 841.6–8; App. §  
1).

## Manijota's *Simāvinicbaya*-Translation

§ 1 The judgment<sup>99</sup> concerning the two [types of monastic boundary, i.e. of] the 'determined boundary' and the 'undetermined boundary' in the root text (Vin) and the commentary (Sp) is straightforward indeed. And yet, with regard to the place of a 'water-splashing boundary', [which is one] of the three 'undetermined boundaries', some Elders<sup>100</sup> state a judgment on the sense,<sup>101</sup> that is improper and not in accordance with the root text (Vin) and the commentary (Sp), and they write 'a short treatise'.<sup>102</sup> Therefore,<sup>103</sup> the intended meaning (*adbippāya*) that is proper and in accordance with the root text (Vin) and the commentary (Sp), [and] that is related<sup>104</sup> to the reading of the commentary (Sp)—'on [a platform] set up inside a river',<sup>105</sup> etc.—which is handed down with regard to this monastic boundary place (i.e. to the *udakukkhepasīmā*), is to be known by the statement that is going to be stated thus:<sup>106</sup>

§ 2 [Bhikkhus<sup>107</sup>] who perform a legal procedure in a river, may perform the legal procedure not only inside the river, or only in a boat tied to a tree, and so on, that grows inside the river,<sup>108</sup> but rather they may perform a legal procedure staying on a platform set up inside the river as well as on a

99 *vinicbaya*. Niss (fol. so v2): *vinicbaya = acbumḥ aḥbrat*, 'judgment'. *Acbumḥ aḥbrat* is frequently employed in the sense of a legal judgment, ruling, or regulation, but may also refer to a non-legal 'decision' or 'opinion'.

100 Niss (fol. so v4): *ekacce therā = akyui. kun so mather tui. sañ*, 'some mahātheras'.

101 *atthavinicbayam*. Niss (fol. so v4): = *anak acbumḥ aḥbrat kui*, 'judgment on the sense.' Throughout we translate *attha* as 'sense' so as to disambiguate with *adbippāya*, 'intended meaning'.

102 *kbuddakagandha*. For the translation of *kbuddakagandha*, see above, n. 10.

103 Niss (fol. so v5): *tasmā = thui sui. pāḷi atṭhakatḥā nḥaṇ. ma lyau ma sañ so atthavinicbaya kui pro chui reḥ sāḥ kra kun so kroṇ.*: 'Therefore, because they have stated and written that judgment regarding the sense that is improper and not in accordance with the Pali [i.e., 'root'] text and the commentary'.

104 *sānusandhiko*. See, for instance, the usage of *sānusandhika* in As 135.19 (*DdB* 243). Glossed as *anusandhe nḥaṇ. ta kva so* (Niss fol. so v6).

105 Sp v 1053.29–30, see n. III.

106 *vuccamānavacanena* We understand this as an introduction to Manijota's own judgment which is subsequently explained.

107 *Bhikkhūhi = rabaṇḥ tui. sañ* ('monks'), is supplied by the Niss (fol. so v7) as the subject.

108 This takes up the measures described in Sp v 1053.19–29 (Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B 15.5.1).

tree growing inside the river.<sup>109</sup> In order to show [the essence] of this meaning, [the author of Sp<sup>110</sup>] says:

‘It is suitable that [those staying on a platform] set up inside a river [...] perform a legal procedure.’<sup>111</sup>

§ 3 In that passage (<sup>112</sup>) [the intended meaning<sup>113</sup>] is to be understood [as follows]<sup>114</sup>—if there is no connection<sup>115</sup>—by any object—between the platform set up inside the river for performing a legal procedure such as the observance (*uposatha*), and so on, and a ‘monastery boundary’<sup>116</sup> or a ‘village boundary’<sup>117</sup> on the bank outside the river,<sup>118</sup> [then] it is suitable

- 
- 109 This takes up the measures described in Sp v 1053.29–31 which is also subsequently quoted.
- 110 This is also stated in the Niss (fol. so v11), where *ācariyo āha* is glossed as *aṭṭhakathā charā sañ min. sa tañh*, ‘the teacher [who composed] the *Aṭṭhakathā* says’.
- 111 Sp v 1053.29–31: *antonadiyaṃ baddhe aṭṭake pi antonadiyaṃ jātārukke pi ṭhitebi kātuṃ vaṭṭati*. ‘It is suitable that [those] staying on a platform set up inside a river as well as [those staying] on a tree grown inside a river perform a [legal procedure].’ See Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B 15.5.1. Here only the first part of this statement is at stake, as the omissions in the quoted passage show.
- 112 *tattha*, Niss (fol. so v11): = *thui antonadiyaṃ baddhe ca so aṭṭhakathā pāṭh n\**, ‘in that *aṭṭhakathā* text beginning with *antonadiyaṃ baddhe*’. Thus this paragraph is meant as an explanation of the preceding quotation from Sp. It is common in commentarial literature to introduce such explanations by *tattha*, see for instance Kkh 2.12.20.27, etc.
- 113 *Adhippāyo* is supplied in the Niss (fol. sau r6) as the word related to *veditabbo*.
- 114 Niss (fol. so v11): following the gloss of *tattha* adds *iti veditabbo mhā svāh* (lit., ‘going in regard to “*iti veditabbo*”’) thus indicating that *tattha* ... *iti veditabbo* are considered a syntactical unit.
- 115 The text has ‘if it is not connected’ (*asambaddhe sati*), but the related subject in this sentence stands in the genitive, and therefore a reading as *asambandhe sati* is to be assumed. In the next sentence, however, also a verbal construction is used (*apatiṭṭhite sati*, see below, n. 120), thus it cannot be excluded that the author intended the verbal expression in both cases. However, it cannot be constructed, neither with the genitive (first case), nor with the nominative (second case). The *nissaya*’s (fol. sau r2) gloss for *asambaddhe sati* mirrors the verbal construction with *ma cap kbrañh sañ rhi sau*, ‘if there is no connection’.
- 116 A *vihārasīmā* is a specific ‘determined boundary’ (*baddhasīmā*) which encloses the monastery (*vihāra*; see Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B Einl. 10). By mentioning this type of boundary, the author covers the connection of an ‘undetermined boundary’ (*abaddhasīmā*), namely the ‘water-splashing boundary’, with a ‘determined boundary’ (see Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B 15.8).
- 117 By mentioning the ‘village boundary’, the author covers a connection of two different ‘undetermined boundaries’ (*abaddhasīmā*), namely ‘village boundary’ and ‘water-splashing [boundary]’, (Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B 15.8).
- 118 The relevant factor here is that these *sīmās* are outside the river. A ‘determined boundary’ (*baddhasīmā*) generally cannot be determined within a body of water, and the bank of a river generally counts as ‘village boundary’.

that those staying on the platform perform a legal procedure. [There is] <sup>i</sup>‘a branch of a tree’ that grows inside the river<sup>119</sup> ‘or a twig that sprouts from that [branch]’;<sup>-i</sup> if it (i.e. either the branch or the twig) is not established.<sup>120</sup>

§ 4 And<sup>121</sup> with regard to the former passage<sup>122</sup> of these two<sup>123</sup> there is no uncertainty indeed with respect to the state [of a ‘water-splashing boundary’s’] connection with a ‘monastery boundary’ or a ‘village boundary’ due to the fact that the platform set up inside a river for performing legal procedures such as the observance, and so on, has been set up by [people] not

119 In Sp v 1053.31, the tree is not characterized as growing inside a river, but this is evident from the context, since it is mentioned in the preceding sentence.

120 As in the preceding sentence here too a verbal form is used (*apatiṭṭhite*). In the present sentence, however, the related subjects stand in the nominative, probably because parts of it are borrowed from Sp. This cannot be constructed with the absolute locative used here. So we divided the sentence. *Apatiṭṭhite* is glossed by Niss (fol. sau r5) as *ma tañ ma thi sañ*, ‘not established (*tañ*) [and] not touching (*thi*)’; Niss, thus, here takes *apatiṭṭhite* to cover mere contact as well. However, below, *patiṭṭhite*, *patiṭṭhito*, and so on are glossed as simply *tañ so*, *tañ sañ* ‘established’ (e.g., fol. sau v2, sau v6). ‘either in a “monastery boundary” or a “village boundary” on the bank outside the river’, it is suitable that [those] staying on that tree perform a legal procedure. It is not to be assumed that the parts of the sentence Mañijota takes from Sp are an unnoticed quotation, because he combined portions from two sentences, and expressed in the positive what was stated in the negative in Sp v 1053.29–1054.3, see below, n. i.

121 Niss (fol. sau r6–7): *ca = antonadiyaṃ baddhe ca so rbeḥ nbac vākya e\* anusandhe nhai. ta kva | adhiṭṭhāya kui pra sañ mba ta pāḥ sace pana ca so nok vākya e\* anusandhe nhai. ta kva adhiṭṭhāya kui pra cui luik aṃ..* ‘In addition to explaining the intended meaning and relation of the former [of] two sentences starting with *antonadiyaṃ baddhe*, I shall explain [in what follows] the intended meaning and relation of the latter sentence beginning *sace pana*.’

122 I.e. the one dealing with the platform set up in a river, quoted above § 2. This is confirmed by the Niss (fol. sau r7–8), where *pubbavākya* is glossed as *antonadiyaṃ baddhe aṭṭake pi hū so rbeḥ vākya n\**, ‘with regard to the former statement “*antonadiyaṃ baddhe aṭṭake pi*”.’

123 ‘Two’ refers to the former statement concerning the platform (above § 2) and the latter statement concerning the tree that grows inside a river (above § 3).

<sup>1</sup>The present sentence is an amalgamation of two sentences of the *Samantapāsādikā*, Sp v 1053.29–1054.3: *antonadiyaṃ baddhe aṭṭake pi antonadiyaṃ jātarukkhe pi ṭṭhite katum vaṭṭati. sace pana rukkbassa sākhā vā tato nikkhantapārobo vā bāhinaditire vihārasimāya vā gāmasimāya vā patiṭṭhito, simaṃ vā sodhetvā sākhāṃ vā chinditvā kammaṃ kātabbāṃ.* ‘It is suitable that those staying on that very platform that has been set up inside the river as well as [those staying] on a tree grown inside a river perform [a legal procedure]. But if a branch of [that] tree or a twig that sprouts from that [branch], is established either in a “monastery boundary” or in a “village boundary” on the bank outside the river, [then] a legal procedure may be performed either having purified the boundary or having cut the branch.’ Perhaps it is because of this amalgamation that this sentence is not constructed properly.

ordained [as bhikkhus],<sup>124</sup> and so on (i.e. did not arise randomly). But with regard to the later passage,<sup>125</sup> a branch [of a tree grown in the river] or a twig that sprouts from [that branch] may either be touching<sup>126</sup> [something<sup>127</sup>] in a ‘monastery boundary’ or a ‘village boundary’ on the bank outside the river, or even not touching it, because the tree has grown on its own.<sup>128</sup> Thus, in both [these<sup>129</sup>] cases uncertainty may arise [in the following manner]: ‘Can a legal procedure be performed even on a tree grown [on its own and] established [there] or [must it] not [be performed]; is there a combination of boundaries or [is it] not?’ Therefore, avoiding this [uncertainty],<sup>130</sup> the commentator says the [sentence] beginning [with]: ‘Even “if of a tree”.’<sup>131</sup>

§ 5 There<sup>132</sup> [this intended meaning<sup>133</sup> is to be shown:<sup>134</sup> ‘A branch of a tree or a twig that sprouts from that [branch], is established either in a ‘monastery boundary’ or in a ‘village boundary’ on the bank outside the river’].<sup>135</sup> Even if

124 Niss (fol. sau r8): *anupasampannādīhi = lū sāmaṇe ca so sū tui sh*, ‘laypeople, novices, and so on.’ This interpretation of the Sp statement does not target on non-monastics versus monastics, but on the directed process of creating a place for the assembly (erection of a platform) versus an accidental origination (growth of a tree). See also n. 36.

125 Niss (fol. sau r10): *paravākye pana = antonadiyaṃ jātarukkhe pi ca so nok vākya n\* mū kāh*, ‘but with regard to the latter passage beginning with *antonadiyaṃ jātarukkhe pi*.’

126 *phusitvāpi tiṭṭhēyya*; in this connection of absolute and finite verb, *tiṭṭhati* to our opinion expresses duration.

127 *phusati* normally goes with the accusative; thus here an object is to be added which must cover everything that is within a *simā* (whether the ground, a building, a plant, and so on) or comes from that *simā* (like a creeper, robe, and so on; in that case the object is itself considered to be *simā*).

128 This means that it has not been deliberately created in a way which suits the *simā* rules.

129 Niss (fol. sau v1–2): *ubhayathā = ti sañ ma tañh sañ nhac pāḥ so akbrañh arā pbrañ.*, ‘in the two cases of touching [and] not [being] established’.

130 This follows the explanation of the Niss (fol. sau v4) *taṃ saṅkaṃ*.

131 Sp v 1053.31; the commentary actually has *sace pana rukkhassa* (see above, n. i), not *sace pi rukkhassa*. The same statement is quoted again in the subsequent sentence.

132 Niss (fol. sau v5): = *thui sace pi rukkhassa ca so ca kāh n\**, ‘in this statement beginning with *sace pi rukkhassa*.’ This gloss of *tattha* is followed by *iti daṭṭhabbo mbā svāḥ* (lit., ‘going in regard to “*iti daṭṭhabbo*”’) indicating that *tattha ... iti daṭṭhabbo* comprise a syntactical unit. Compare above, n. 114.

133 See n. 50, Niss adds *adhippāyo* as the word related to *daṭṭhabbo* (fol. sam r2).

134 Ketudhamma’s *Simāvinicchaya* reads *daṭṭhabbā* (above, n. 51). This would belong to the two measures (*patitṭhāpanaṃ* or *nāsanakaraṇaṃ*) for purification of a *simā* listed before (see below), and would have to be translated as ‘[These measures] have to be shown.’ The *nissaya*, however, glosses *daṭṭhabbo* and adds *adhippāyo* as related subject (see above, n. 50) and thus confirms this variant.

135 Sp v 1053.31–1054.3: *sace pana rukkhassa sākā vā tato nikkhantaṭṭhāro vā babinaditṭre vīhārasimāya vā gāmasimāya vā patitṭhito, simaṃ vā sodhetvā sākhaṃ vā chinditvā kammaṃ*

it is [so]<sup>136</sup> (=) if it is thus,<sup>137</sup> it is not suitable that those staying on that tree,<sup>138</sup> perform a legal procedure without having purified the boundary or cut the branch. [It] is a fault of combination (i.e. of boundaries). Therefore it is stated [in the *Samantapāsādikā*]:

*Even*<sup>139</sup> ‘if a branch of [that] tree [grown inside a river] or [a twig that sprouts from that branch, is established either in a ‘monastery boundary’ or in a ‘village boundary’ on the bank outside the river, then] a legal procedure may be performed either having purified the boundary or having cut the branch.’<sup>140</sup>

┆ And in this context<sup>141</sup> (*ettha*), ‘purification of a monastic boundary’ (*simā-sodhana*)<sup>142</sup> means:

- (1a) Establishing (*patiṭṭhāpana*) [the purification] either by virtue of leading into arm’s length the bhikkhus staying in the ‘monastery boundary’ or the ‘village boundary’,
- (1b) or by virtue of excluding [them] from that [boundary area];<sup>143</sup> or
- (2) by cutting the branch destroying this tree’s state of being established outside [the river].<sup>┆</sup>

---

*kātabbaṃ*. See above, n. i. Mañjota here only quotes the first part of the Sp sentence, and then proceeds saying that legal procedures may not be performed without having implemented the measures mentioned in Sp for such a case.

136 Here Mañjota shows that from the point of view of meaning, the sentence which he has cited from Sp should start with *sace pi*. This is confirmed by the Niss (fol. sau v8), where simply the same Sp sentence preceded by *sace pi* is quoted. Though the text of Sp does not contain an ‘if’ (*sace*), it needs to be translated as if one were there. Therefore, Mañjota’s explanation is correct.

137 Here Mañjota simply gives an alternative expression for his inserted *sace pi hoti*.

138 Niss (fol. sau v7): *tasmīṃ rukke = thui vibārasim gāmasim n\* thi kkuik so sac pañ n\**, ‘on that tree which injuriously comes into contact with [or injuriously touches] a *vibārasimā* or *gāmasimā*’. The compound verb *thi kkuik* implies that the touching or contact has negative consequences or causes injury.

139 *pi* instead of *pana*, see n. i.

140 Sp v 1053.31–1054.3, see above, n. i.

141 The Niss (fol. sau v9–10) says *ī simaṃ vā sodhetvā hū so ca kāḥ n\**, ‘in this statement “*simaṃ vā sodhetvā*”’, which takes up part of the preceding sentence quoted from Sp.

142 For more details, see Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B 8.6.

143 At least from the commentarial layer of the *Aṭṭhakathās* onwards it is not only required that all monks assemble at one place within the monastic boundary, but in addition those who are within the boundary must be within arm’s length (*battapāsa*). If a bhikkhu is within the *simā* but beyond the *battapāsa* distance, the Saṅgha is said to be incomplete and valid legal procedures may not be performed. See Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B Einl. 13. Hence the bhikkhus either need to come into arm’s length to the assembled bhikkhus or they have to leave the areas which are connected with the *simā* area.

---

<sup>┆</sup>Quoted in Ketudhamma’s *Simāvinichaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 842.20–22; App. § 4).



§ 6 The sort of connection (*sambandha*), and so on, needs to be known in accordance with [what] is stated [in the *Vinayaṭṭhakathā*] in regard to the performing of legal procedures ‘in a boat tied’ either ‘to a branch or twig that has entered inside the river of a tree grown on the bank outside the river’,<sup>144</sup> or ‘tied to a post having driven it into the bank of the river’.<sup>145</sup>

§ 7 As in regard to the sentence: ‘On [a platform] set up inside a river’,<sup>146</sup> and so on, the condition of whether a legal procedure should be performed or should not be performed, the condition of whether there is a connection or non-connection of a boundary with a[nother] boundary,<sup>147</sup> and the condition of whether [a boundary] should be purified or should not be purified, must be known, [so] likewise [it must be understood] also in regard to the sentence beginning with: ‘[If] they set up a bridge in a river’, and so on.<sup>148</sup> [This is the] intended meaning.<sup>149</sup>

§ 8 Moreover, in this [passage] (*ettha*)<sup>150</sup> (i.e., ‘[If] they set up a bridge in a river’), the ‘water-splashing boundary’-condition of a bridge that is not connected with villages, and so on, and the ‘village boundary’-condition of a bridge that is connected with them, must be known. If [someone objects]:

144 Sp v 1054.3-5: *babinaḍḍire jātarukkhaṣṣa antonadiyaṃ pavitṭhasākhāya vā pārōhe vā nāvamaṃ bandhivā kammaṃ kātuṃ na vaṭṭati*. ‘Having tied a boat to a branch or a twig that has entered inside the river of a tree grown on the bank outside the river, it is not suitable to perform a legal procedure.’

145 Sp v 1054.6-7: *nadīṭṭire pana khāṇukaṃ koṣetvā tattha baddhanāvāya na vaṭṭati yeva*. ‘But having driven a post into the bank of the river, it is by no means suitable [to perform a legal procedure] in a boat tied there.’

146 ≠ Sp v 1053.29-30: *antonadiyaṃ baddha-aṭṭake pi antonadiyaṃ jātarukkhe pi ṭhitehi kātuṃ vaṭṭati*. ‘It is suitable that [those] staying on a platform set up inside a river as well as [those staying] on a tree grown inside a river perform [a legal procedure].’

147 *simāya simaṃ sambandhāsambandhabhāvo; simāya simaṃ* is taken over from the expression ‘to combine *simā* with *simā*’ (*simāya simaṃ sambbindanti*) also it grammatically goes not together with *sambandhāsambandhabhāvo*.

148 Sp v 1054.7-9: *nadiyaṃ setuṃ karonti, sacce antonadiyaṃ yeva setu vā setupādā vā, setumbi ṭhitehi kammaṃ kātuṃ vaṭṭati*. ‘[If] they set up a bridge in a river, [and] if the bridge or the feet of the bridge are only inside the river, [then] it is suitable that those staying on the bridge perform a legal procedure.’

149 The Niss (fol. saṃ 17-8) also relates *jānitabbo* to *°bhāvo*. Thus, *ti adbippāyo* stands separately.

150 According to the Niss (fol. saṃ 18) this refers to the second of the two examples mentioned in § 7. *Ettha* is glossed as *ī antonadiyaṃ setuṃ karonti a ca rhi so vākya n\**, ‘in the sentence beginning *antonadiyaṃ setuṃ karonti*’.

‘Has not,<sup>151</sup> by means of the former statement: “[*If*] they set up a bridge in the river ... it is suitable”,<sup>152</sup> the Ācariya shown the “water-splashing boundary”-condition of a bridge that is not connected with villages, and so on; and [has he not shown] solely the condition of “[being] a place where a legal procedure is to be performed in a ‘village boundary’ of a bridge that is connected [with villages, and so on]”; and [has he not] by means of the latter statement: “*But if ... it is not suitable*.”,<sup>153</sup> shown solely the condition of “[being] a place where [a legal procedure] is not to be performed” of a bridge that is connected [with villages, and so on]?

But why should the “water-splashing boundary”-condition of a bridge that is not connected with villages, and so on, and the “village boundary”-condition of a bridge that is connected [with villages, and so on] be known [at all]?’

[Then this] is conveyed (*vuccate*) [by me]:<sup>154</sup>

Because with [the statement]: ‘*Monks, in a river, in a sea or in a natural lake*’,<sup>155</sup> and so on, a ‘water-splashing boundary’ was permitted by the Blessed One only in a river, and so on,<sup>156</sup> [therefore,] even a bridge that is not connected<sup>157</sup> with villages, and so on, is included

151 *Nanu ca* often introduces objections in commentarial literature. The Niss (fol. saṃ 19) adds *codemi* (‘I object’) and glosses *nanu ca codemi* as *codanā ūḥ aṃ*. ‘if I/one may object.’

152 Sp v 1054.7-8, see above, n. 148.

153 Sp v 1054.9-11: *sace pana setu vā setupādā vā bahiṭṭire patiṭṭhitā, tattha ṭhitehi kammaṃ kātuṃ na vaṭṭati, sīmaṃ soḍhetvā kammaṃ kātappaṃ*. ‘But if the bridge or the feet of the bridge are established on the bank outside [the river], it is not suitable that [those] staying there perform a legal procedure. A legal procedure can be performed after having purified the boundary.’

154 *Vuccate* regularly introduces answers to objections. The additions follow the explanation of the Niss *parihāro ... mayā ... vuccate*, ‘A reply is conveyed by me’, ‘[This] refutation is stated by me’ (see above, n. 59). For this meaning of *parihāra*, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 232-235.

155 Vin I 111.4-6: *nadiyā vā bhikkhave samudde vā jātassare vā yaṃ majjhimaṃ purisassa samantā udakukkhepā, ayaṃ tattha samānasamvāsā ekuposathā ti*. ‘Monks, in a river, in a sea or in a natural lake, which [water] is thrown all around by a man of average [strength] this in that case is [the boundary] for the same communion, for one observance.’

156 The ‘and so on’ refers to the other bodies of water within which a ‘water-splashing boundary’ can be used, namely, a natural lake (*jātassara*), and an ocean (*samudda*).

157 The Pāṭha here and subsequently reads *asambandhasetu* instead of *asambaddha*, though the latter is meant. The *nissaya* also has *asambaddha*° (see above, n. 60). We translate accordingly.

in ‘a river’. And because such a bridge is included in a river, [therefore,] the ‘water-splashing boundary’-condition of even such a bridge is illuminated [by the author of the *Vinayaṭṭhakathā*], showing with the former statement in the commentary: ‘*Inside a river ... it is suitable*’,<sup>158</sup> that a bridge inside a river, that is not connected with villages, and so on, has the condition of [being] a place where a legal procedure may be performed.<sup>159</sup>

<sup>k</sup>But because with [the statement:] ‘*Monks, if a boundary has not been agreed upon, not been established*’,<sup>160</sup> and so on, it was permitted by the Blessed One that a ‘village district’<sup>161</sup> indeed [is] a ‘village boundary’, [therefore] a bridge that is connected with villages, and so on, is included in a village. Because such a bridge is included in a village, [therefore,] even a bridge obtains the condition of a ‘village boundary’.<sup>-k</sup>

<sup>l</sup>But, if it was (lit. is) shown by the latter statement in the commentary: ‘*But if the bridge or ... it is not suitable*’,<sup>162</sup> that a bridge that is connected with a ‘village boundary’, and so on, only has the condition of [being] a place where a legal procedure is not to be performed, [and if it were] so,<sup>163</sup> [then] it should [have been] (lit. be)

158 Sp v 1054.8–9: *sace antonadiyaṃ yeva setu vā setupādā vā, setumbi ṭṭhitehi kammaṃ kātuṃ vaṭṭati*. ‘If the bridge or the feet of the bridge are only inside the river, [then] it is suitable that [the monks] staying on the bridge perform a legal procedure.’

159 The Niss (fol. sam v7–8) at this point adds as a gloss of *iti* and the subsequent *pana*: *iti | i kāḥ | purimaṃpucchā e\* visajjanā aprīḥ tañ | pana | uttarapucchā e\* visajjanā kui pra chui luik aṃ*. = ‘*iti* | this is the conclusion of the answer of the former question | *pana* | I shall now explain the answer of the latter question.’

160 Vin I 110.36–111.1: *asammatāya bhikkhave simāya aṭṭhapitāya yaṃ gāmaṃ vā nigamaṃ vā upanissāya viharati, yā tassa vā gāmassa gāmasimā nigamassa vā nigamasimā, ayaṃ tattha samānasamvāsā ekuposathā*. ‘Monks, when a boundary is not agreed upon, not established, whatever village or market town [a monk] lives depending on, whatever is the village boundary of that village or the market town boundary of that market town, this in that case is [the boundary] for the same communion, for one observance.’

161 *gāmakkhetta*. *Gāmakkhetta* is used synonymously with *gāmasimā* in the commentarial literature (Kkh 10.8–19, see Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B 15.1.1).

162 Sp v 1054.9–11, see above, n. 153.

163 The text only reads *evaṃ*, not *evaṃ sante* or *yadi evaṃ sante*. But according to the nissaya and to Ketudhamma (below, § 6.2), *evaṃ* is used here in the sense of *evaṃ sante*. We follow this interpretation, since it does not make sense to connect the *evaṃ* to the subsequent compound. This would lead to a translation as ‘a place where a legal procedure can be performed in this way’, but the way how to perform the *kamma* is not at stake here.

<sup>k</sup>Quoted in Ketudhamma’s *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 844.11–13; App. § 6.1).

said by concluding with the statement ‘*But if*’,<sup>164</sup> and so on, which is a prohibition [of it] as a place where a legal procedure can be performed.

However, the statement: ‘*A legal procedure can be performed after having purified the boundary*’,<sup>165</sup> should not be said as a verdict.<sup>166</sup> But it has been said.<sup>167</sup> Therefore, [the *Aṭṭhakathā Ācariya* in] showing with this statement—[which is] a verdict concerning another matter (*pada*)<sup>168</sup>—the fact that by means of purifying the boundary a legal procedure can be performed on that very bridge, moreover (*ca*) has illuminated the ‘village boundary’-condition of even such a bridge due to [its] condition of decreasing and increasing,<sup>169</sup> without stopping with the restriction to a village<sup>170–1</sup>

164 Sp v 1054.9, see above, n. 153.

165 Sp v 1054.11: *simam sodhetvā kamman kātabbam*. This sentence directly follows the text cited in the preceding paragraph (see above, n. 153). It thus shows an option how people on a bridge that is connected with a village might nevertheless perform a legal procedure, namely by purifying the boundary.

166 *Sanniṭṭhānaṃ*, ‘conclusion, concluding statement, consummation; resolve; conviction’, is often used in commentarial literature either with forms of *karoti*, *gacchati* or *gaṇhati* in the sense of ‘to make or come to or reach a conclusion or verdict, and so on’; it also marks a concluding statement after some discussion (It-a 1 141.30; Kkh 12.23; Sv-pt 1 151.14; and so on) or especially the conclusion of some earlier ācariyas (*atthakathācariyaṇaṃ idaṃ sanniṭṭhānaṃ*, Vjb 227.7–8). It also is used as an explanation for *pariyosāna* (end, finish, conclusion; Mp 11 201.16; Pp-a 213.24) or *vavatthāpanaṃ* (skt. *vyavasthāpana*; deciding, laying down a law, and so on, MW s.v.) which also is used in the sense of *nicchaya* (resolution, determination, and so on). It also is used in an explanation of *vinicchaya* (as ‘doubt-destroying-resolution’, *samsayachedakaṃ sanniṭṭhānaṃ*, Sv-pt 1 156.12). Niss (fol. sāh r2): *sanniṭṭhānaṃ = chumḥ pbrat kroṇḥ pbrac so*, paralleled in Ketudhamma (App. § 6.3). *Chumḥ pbrat* is the verbal form of the nominal compound *acumḥ apbrat* which is the standard gloss of *vinicchaya* (see above, n. 101). Thus here *sanniṭṭhānaṃ* is equated with *vinicchaya*. We therefore translate *sanniṭṭhāna* as ‘verdict’.

167 Namely in the *Aṭṭhakathā*.

168 Niss (fol. sāh r3–4): *padantarassanniṭṭhānena = pud ta pāḥ tui. pbrāṇi. chumḥ pbrat kroṇḥ pbrac so*, ‘which reaches a verdict by reference to (inst.) different matters (pl.)’. For the equation of *sanniṭṭhāna* with *vinicchaya*, see n. 166

169 This refers to the fact that such *abaddhasimās* increase and decrease depending on the size of the assembly. Thus the areas which need to be taken into account if there exist mutual connections of monastic boundaries can vary. See Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B 15.2.3 (*sattabbhantarasimā*), B 15.3.3 (*udakukkhepasimā*).

170 I.e. not having restricted his statement to a regular village boundary, but having extended the definition of a village boundary by allowing its decrease or increase depending on connections with other areas. The Niss (fol. sāh r7) at this point again (see above, n. 159) adds as a gloss of *iti*: *i kāḥ uttarapucchā e\* visajjanā apriḥ tañ*, ‘this is the conclusion of the answer of the latter question.’

<sup>1</sup>Quoted in Ketudhamma’s *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: 11 845.8–14; App. § 6.3). Here and in Ketudhamma’s *Simāvinicchaya* the *iti* marks the end of the response to the objections.

§ 9 But with regard to a place that has to be purified or not to be purified, for those who perform a legal procedure inside a river or on a bridge that stands inside a river,<sup>171</sup> there is no duty to purify (i.e., to exclude) those staying in a village, and so on, on the bank outside [the river].<sup>172</sup> Therefore it is said:<sup>173</sup>

Inside ‘a river they build a bridge. If the bridge or the feet of the bridge are inside the river,<sup>174</sup> it is suitable that [those] staying on the bridge perform a legal procedure’.<sup>175</sup>

Besides, [a monastic boundary] is to be purified by leading into arm’s length, and so on, those staying inside the ‘water splash’ only;<sup>176</sup> not [by leading into arm’s length those staying] in a place outside the ‘water splash’. Why? Because a ‘water-splashing boundary’ is like a ‘determined boundary’ by virtue of its own nature. Therefore the Blessed One says:

‘Monks, in a river, in a sea or in a natural lake, which [water] is thrown all around by a man of average [strength] this in that case is [the boundary] for the same communion, for one observance.’<sup>177</sup>

And in the commentary it is said:

171 The Pāṭha has a *ca* after *antonadiyaṃ* which is confirmed by the *nissaya* (see above, n. 68) This does not fit the sentence as it is written. However, *Niss* indicates a second *ca* after *ṭhitasetumbi*. In that case a second *antonadiyaṃ* before *ṭhitasetumbi* would have to be added or *antonadiyaṃ* would have to be understood as applying to both: *antonadiyaṃ ca [antonadiyaṃ] ṭhitasetumbi ca kammaṃ karontebi*, ‘those who perform a legal procedure inside a river and on a bridge that stays [inside a river]’. This is precisely how the *nissaya* interprets the passage, while noting the supplied repetition of *antonadiyaṃ*: *antonadiyaṃ ca | mrac e\* atvañh n\* lañh | antonadiyaṃ | mrac e\* atvañh n\* | 4ñh pud luik sañ | ṭhitasetumbi ca | tañ so taṃ tāh n\* 4ñh* (fol. sāh r8).

172 Since there is no connection between the two areas, no measure is due.

173 *Tena vuttaṃ* indicates that the author here quotes an authoritative source (Kieffer-Pülz 2015: § 2.3). The *nissaya* with *ācariya* refers to the Sp author (see above, n. 70). Nevertheless, the quotation is not literal, unlike in an earlier case, see above § 7–8, and n. 148.

174 The Pāṭha here inserts a *na*. This is not confirmed by the *nissaya*, and it also is not contained in Sp. See above, n. 71.

175 ≠ Sp v 1054.7–9, see above, n. 148.

176 If the ‘water-splashing [boundary]’ is connected with a place outside the river, be it a ‘determined boundary’ or an ‘undetermined boundary’, then also bhikkhus in these areas count as being within the ‘water-splashing [boundary]’, and the purification thus consists in bringing all the bhikkhus from these other boundaries to the saṅgha assembled on the platform.

177 Vin I III.4–6, see above, n. 155.

‘One who stays inside that [splash of water] having left arm’s length [to the other bhikkhus], disturbs the legal procedure’.<sup>178</sup>

§ 10 The judgment that is transmitted in the *Mātikāṭṭhakathā*<sup>179</sup> with regard to this matter<sup>180</sup> should be accepted in the *Sāratthadīpanīṭikā*,<sup>181</sup> and so on.<sup>182</sup>

§ 11 <sup>m-</sup>But there is no duty that those performing a legal procedure on a bridge that is connected with a village, and so on, have to purify (i.e. exclude) those [monks] staying in the river, and so on. Therefore<sup>183</sup> it is said [in the *Aṭṭhakathā*]:

‘But if the bridge or the feet of the bridge are established on the bank outside [the river], it is not suitable to perform a legal procedure. A legal procedure can be performed after having purified the boundary’<sup>184</sup>

§ 12 But why should [the boundary] be purified by leading into arm’s length, and so on, those staying only in the village, and so on; should not [be purified by leading into arm’s length those staying<sup>185</sup>] in the water area close to

178 Sp v 1052.34–1053.1, see Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 335, 337.

179 This refers to Kkh 12.20–23: *paricchedabbhantare batthapāsaṃ vijāhitvā ṭhito pi paricchedato bahi aññaṃ tattakaṃ yeva paricchedaṃ anatikkamitvā ṭhito pi kammaṃ kopeti, idaṃ sabba-Aṭṭhakathāsu sanniṭṭhānaṃ ti*. ‘[A bhikkhu] who is inside the exact determination (that is, inside the *sīmā*), [but] who has left [the distance of] an arm’s length [between himself and the other bhikkhus], as well as [a bhikkhu] who is outside the exact determination, [but] has not gone beyond another exact determination of exactly such a size, invalidates a legal procedure. This is the verdict in all the commentaries.’ (Based on Norman *et al.* 2018: 26); see also Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 178–179 n. 412.

While the first part of this statement is generally accepted, the second, not found in Vin or Sp, is discussed extensively in later literature. Here, however, it is only referred to the fact that the respective regulation of the Kkh should be accepted by the Sp-ṭ (12th c. CE), which it is not, at least not in general.

180 Niss (fol. sāḥ v4–5): *imasmiṃ ṭhāne = tassa anto batthapāsaṃ ca saññā phraṇi. lā so i vinicchaya arā n\**. ‘In the matter of this judgment which is transmitted with regard to “tassa anto batthapāsaṃ”...’

181 Sp-ṭ III 274.11–27, has borrowed the quotation from Kkh, and subsequently states that the second part of this sentence (*tattakaṃ yeva paricchedaṃ anatikkamitvā ṭhito pi kammaṃ kopeti*) is to be found neither in Vin nor in Sp.

182 The ‘and so on’ refers to other *Vinaya* commentaries which discuss this topic.

183 Niss (fol. sāḥ v6–7): *tena = thui sui. mrac ca sañ tui. n\* tañ kun so rabaṇṭh tui. kui | sut sañ bhvay kicca ma rbi pñiḥ so kroṇi*. ‘Therefore, because there is no duty to purify the monks staying in the river, and so on.’

184 Sp v 1054.9–11, see above, n. 153.

185 This addition is confirmed by the Niss (fol. sāḥ v9).

the bridge? Because a ‘water-splashing[-boundary]’ and a ‘village boundary’ are [each] limited<sup>186</sup> by their own nature,<sup>187</sup> if they are mutually separated by one cubit,<sup>188</sup> one span,<sup>189</sup> or even [only] four finger [breadths]<sup>190</sup> there is really no fault of combination.<sup>191</sup> But if they are separated by more than this, nothing needs to be said at all. Therefore [such boundaries] need not to be purified. Therefore, the Blessed One said:

*‘Monks, when a boundary is not agreed upon, not established, whatever village or market town [a monk] lives depending on, whatever is the village boundary of that village or the market town boundary of that market town, this in that case is [the boundary] for the same communion, for one observance’* (Vin I 110.<sub>36</sub>–111.1).<sup>m</sup>

§ 13 The judgment on the sense (*atthavinicchaya*) stated by ‘moreover in this passage’, and so on,<sup>192</sup> is to be understood even with regard to the reading of the commentary as stated by ‘on [a platform] set up inside a river’,<sup>193</sup> and so on.<sup>194</sup>

§ 14 <sup>n</sup>–With regard to this matter [i.e. the ‘water-splashing boundary’]<sup>195</sup> some Theras,<sup>196</sup> inconsiderate of the true sense (*atthasabbhāvaṃ*) of the root text (Vin) and the commentary (Sp), citing many statements transmitted

186 <sup>o</sup>*paricchinnā* here is ablative singular; compare the similar description in Ketudhamma’s *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 845.22) <sup>o</sup>*bbāvaṃparicchinnattā*, where the ablative is clearly recognizable.

187 A ‘water-splashing [boundary]’ is restricted to a river, a sea and a natural lake; a ‘village boundary’ is restricted to land.

188 One *ratana* is one *hattha*. See Norman *et al.* 2018: 595 s.v. *hattha*.

189 One *vidatthi* is half a *hattha*, see Norman *et al.* 2018: 603 s.v. *vidatthi*.

190 See Norman *et al.* 2018: 591 s.v. *aṅgula*.

191 Mañjota here borrows statements from Sp v 1056.24–27, made there with respect to the distance to be kept between determined boundaries (*baddhasimā*). See above, n. 38.

192 See Mañjota’s statement (above, § 8) where he in objection and reply explains the two natures of a bridge depending on whether or not it is connected with a village.

193 Sp v 1053.29–31: *antonadiyaṃ baddhe ... la ... ṭhitehi kammaṃ kātuṃ vaṭṭatī ti*; cited above, n. 111.

194 Thus, Mañjota says that the same rules valid with respect to a bridge need also to be applied to a platform.

195 According to the Niss (fol. ha r3–4) the matter refers to the ‘water-splashing [boundary]’: *imasmīṃ ṭhāne = udakukkhepa sim kui pra chui so ī arā n\**, ‘with regard to this matter explaining the *udakukkhepa simā*.’

196 Niss (fol. ha r4): *ekacce therā = akyui. so mather tui. sañ*, ‘some mahātheras.’

<sup>m</sup>Quoted in Ketudhamma’s *Simāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 843.19–28; App. § 5.1).

in the *Vimatiṭṭikā*, and so on, illuminate a judgment on the sense (*atthavinicchaya*) with a contradictory intended meaning, that is a confused statement.<sup>197–n</sup> Therefore, not having cited the statement of the *Ṭikā*, but having discussed earlier and later statements which are transmitted only in the root text (Vin) and commentary (Sp), a judgment on the sense (*atthavinicchaya*), [which is] a statement that is not confused, with an intended meaning (*adhippāya*) that is proper and in conformity [with the root text and commentary], has been shown by me in brief. Having thoroughly examined it with wisdom, sons of good families seeking their own prosperity<sup>198</sup> understand it.<sup>199</sup>

### Appendix [Vin-samūh 2011: 841]

#### Aoṇ mre rhve bhūṃ charā tau [Ketudhamma] *Ṣimāvinicchaya*<sup>200</sup>

Homage to the Blessed One, the Exalted One, the Fully Awakened One  
(*Namo tassa bhagavato arahato sammāsambuddhassa*)

[Question asked by Ariyāvamsa:]

Benefactor, Teacher, your disciple Rhañḥ Ariyāvamsa<sup>201</sup> reverently petitions you:

§ 1 In the *Ṣimāvinicchaya* treatise composed by Khañ ma kan charā tau, recipient of the title Mañijotālañkāradhajamahādhammarājadhiguru,<sup>202</sup> it

197 Niss (fol. ha 15): *byākulavacanāṃ = nbok nbak sa ca kāḥ hi so*, ‘having a confused statement.’

198 Niss (fol. ha 19): *acīḥ apvāḥ kui chañḥ phūḥ rhā mbīḥ kun so*, ‘seeking to accumulate (*chañḥ phūḥ*) prosperity (*acīḥ apvāḥ*).’ See for this meaning of *bīta*, Lammerts 2018: 249, n. 38.

199 Following the end of the gloss, the glossator or copyist has written: *iti | ī sañ lbyañ | udakukkhepa sim kui chumḥ phrat so ca kāḥ apriḥ sat tañḥ*, ‘Thus is concluded the discourse which is a judgment on the “water-splashing boundary” (fol. ha 110).’ The copyist’s colophon follows (foll. ha 110–ha 111), and concludes with the copy-date: *sakkarāj 12[7]5 kbu nbac priḥ sañ*, ‘[copying] finished in *sakkarāj 12[7]5*.’

200 Thus Vin-samūh 2011; Vin-samūh 1976: II 239: *ṣima*<sup>o</sup>.

201 This monk remains unidentified.

202 This refers to the above published text by Mañijota, see pp. 21–30 (text), 31–51 (translation).

<sup>n</sup>Quoted in Ketudhamma’s *Ṣimāvinicchaya* (Vin-samūh 2011: II 841.6–8; App. § 1).



has been explained that statements transmitted in the *Vimatiṭṭikā*, and so on, are confused, not in accordance with the true sense of the Pāli and *Aṭṭhakathā*:<sup>203</sup>

With regard to this matter (i.e. the ‘water-splashing-boundary’) some Theras, inconsiderate of the true sense of the root text (Vin) and the commentary (Sp), citing many statements transmitted in the *Vimatiṭṭikā*, and so on, illuminate a judgment on the sense (*atthavinicchaya*) with a contradictory intended meaning, that is a confused statement.<sup>204</sup>

§ 2 [Mañijota] did not explain with detail the confused textual passages that are said to be confused and not in accordance with the true sense of the Pāli and *Aṭṭhakathā* among whichever textual passages. I wish to know the textual passages that are confused, not in accordance with the truth of the Pāli and *Aṭṭhakathā*. Having been asked concerning the confused textual passages that are not in accordance with the true sense of the Pāli and *Aṭṭhakathā*, I want you, Benefactor, Teacher, to write an answer so that future monks understand.

§ 3 [Response:]

According to the petition, having been asked I will write an answer so that future monks understand. Regarding [the question]: in the text of the *Aṭṭhakathā* it says:

*‘But if the bridge or the feet of the bridge are established on the bank outside [the river], it is not suitable that those staying there (i.e. on the bridge) perform a legal procedure. A legal procedure can be performed after having purified the boundary.’*<sup>205</sup>

203 Mañijota possibly has added the sentence quoted as follows because there were groups which discussed the ‘water-splashing-boundary’ on the basis of statements transmitted in the *ṭikās*. Mañijota himself deliberately did not do this.

204 This is the first citation of Mañijota’s *Simāvinicchaya* to appear in Ketudhamma’s *Simāvinicchaya* (see above, § 14, pp. 75, 87). Subsequent citations provide the page numbers where the relevant parallels in Mañijota may be located, although we do not duplicate notes to the text or translation.

205 Sp v 1054.9–11: see above, n. 153. In Mañijota’s *Simāvinicchaya* (§ 11, above, pp. 74, 86) quoted without the words *tattba ṭhitebi*. This passage comes from the Sp section that tackles the manner in which legal procedures are to be performed inside a ‘water-splashing-boundary’. A bridge is considered a place where monks may assemble for performing a legal procedure inside a ‘water-splashing [boundary]’. But if the feet of the bridge stand on the banks of a river, the bridge is connected with the ‘village dis-

§ 3.1 With respect to the interpretation of ‘*after having purified the boundary*’ (*sīmaṃ sodhetvā*), is it suitable [for monks on a bridge] to perform a legal procedure upon a bridge, having brought into arm’s length [to the monks assembled on the bridge] the very monks who are staying both in a ‘river boundary’<sup>206</sup> (*nadī sim*) and a ‘village boundary’ (*gāma sim*)? *Vajira-buddhiṭikā* says:

‘*The bridge or the feet of the bridge* [...] (Sp v 1054.9–10): And here purification of the boundary means leading into arm’s length those who stay in the ‘village boundary’.<sup>207</sup>

In accordance with *Sārattbadāpīṇīkā*.<sup>208</sup>

‘*Or after having purified the boundary* (Sp v 1054.2): here purification of the boundary means leading into arm’s length those staying in the ‘village boundary’, and so on’,<sup>209</sup>

---

trict’ or ‘village boundary’ (*gāmakkhetta* = *gāmasīmā*), since the banks of a river are considered as *gāmakkhetta* = *gāmasīmā*. Therefore, it is stated that those staying on that bridge must not perform a legal procedure. But thereafter, Sp shows a way out, viz. to perform the legal procedure after having purified the boundaries, i.e. the connected ‘village boundary’ (i.e. an ‘undetermined boundary’) or ‘monastery boundary’ (i.e. a ‘determined boundary’) (Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B 15.5.2). For the purification of *simās*, see above, § 5 and n. 176.

206 ‘River boundary’ (*nadīsīmā*) is a designation used in Pali texts (since the *Aṭṭhakathā*) for the worldly boundaries of a river, not for a monastic boundary (see below, n. 249). In the Sp the monks on the bridge are assembled to perform a legal procedure in a ‘water-splashing boundary’. Thus, the bridge has the same purpose as a platform or a boat in a river. If that bridge is connected to the banks of the river it connects river and village. It seems that Ketudhamma here uses the term *nadīsīmā* to refer to the monks in the water in opposition to those in the village.

207 Vjb 459.6–7: *setu vā setupādā vā* [...] *ti* (Sp v 1054.9–10) *ettha ca simasodhanaṃ nāma gāmasiṃṇiṭṭhe hatthapāsānayanam*.

208 The Sp-ṭ passage quoted by Ketudhamma does not comment on Sp v 1054.9–10 which is commented upon by the Vjb (see above, n. 207), but refers to Sp v 1053.31–1054.3, which deals with the purification of a *simā* when a tree that grows in a river is connected with a ‘monastery boundary’ or a ‘village boundary’ on the banks of the river. This situation is similar to that of a bridge, with one difference, namely that in the case of a tree there are two possible measures of purification, leading the monks into arm’s length or removing the connecting branches. In accordance with this, the Sp-ṭ reads *hatthapāsānayanādi*, which in Ketudhamma’s text has been changed into *hatthapāsānayanam*.

209 Sp-ṭ III 275.10–11: *sīmaṃ vā sodhetvā ti* (Sp v 1054.2) *ettha ‘sīmasodhanaṃ’ nāma gāmasiṃṇiṭṭhe hatthapāsānayanam* (Sp-ṭ *hatthapāsānayanādi*). The reading in Sp-ṭ ends in ‘*ādi*’, and thus indicates that the second option, namely to remove the connecting parts of the tree, is intended there as well. This is because the quotation comes from a different context (see above, n. 208).

having brought into arm's length just those monks staying in the 'village district' (*gāmakhet*), without having brought into arm's length the monks staying in the river, [the monks on the bridge] should perform a legal procedure upon the bridge. In 'in the "village boundary", and so on' (Sp-ṭ III 275.11: *gāmasimādisu*) we accept by the word 'and so on' (*ādi*) [that this includes] a 'monastery boundary' (*vihārasim*).<sup>210</sup> That which is called a 'monastery boundary' is indeed a 'determined boundary' (*baddhasim*). Therefore it is stated in *Sāratthadīpanīṭīkā*:

"Monastery boundary" (Sp v 1054.34) is said with regard to a 'determined boundary'.<sup>211</sup>

§ 4 In the text of the *Aṭṭhakathā* beginning with this [phrase] 'But if the bridge or',<sup>212</sup> by the text 'it is not suitable to perform a legal procedure',<sup>213</sup> as in the former sentence beginning 'If they erect a bridge in a river',<sup>214</sup> since the foot of a bridge (*taṃ tāḥ khre* [i.e., *setupādā*]) is connected with a village district [that] shows the condition of a legal procedure that is not to be performed as regards the condition of a 'river boundary' and a 'water-splashing boundary'.<sup>215</sup> By the text 'A legal procedure can be performed after

210 This conforms to Sp v 1054.1-2, where the two *simās* mentioned as being connected with a 'water-splashing boundary' are the 'monastery boundary' (as a representative of a *baddhasimā*), and the 'village boundary' (as a representative of an *abaddhasimā*).

211 Sp-ṭ III 275.17-18: *vihārasiman ti* (Sp v 1054.34) *baddhasimaṃ sandhāya vadati*. This quotation is taken again from another context, namely from the discussion of a *simā* that is flooded by water. In the case of a 'monastery boundary', its flooding does not lead to a change of its *simā* status. Being a 'determined boundary' (*baddhasimā*), a 'monastery boundary' persists until either it is annulled with a *kammavācā* or the Buddha *sāsana* perishes (Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B Einl. 10). At the time of Sp these were the only options how a 'determined boundary' could become annulled. But at the time of the Vmv a legal procedure was developed for annulling even an unknown 'determined boundary' (Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B 14.3 and n. 590), and since then it has become quite common to first perform the legal procedure of annulling a *baddhasimā* before one determines a new one (Nāgasena 2012: 331-347).

212 *sace pana setu vā*, Sp v 1054.9-10, see above, n. 153.

213 *kammaṃ kātuṃ na vaṭṭati*, Sp v 1054.10-11, see above, n. 153.

214 *nadiyaṃ setuṃ karonti*, Sp v 1054.7-8, see above, n. 148.

215 It seems Ketudhamma discusses the connection of a river with a 'village boundary' under two aspects: if monks want to perform a legal act (1) in a river (without a 'water-splashing boundary'), and (2) if they want to perform it in a 'water-splashing boundary'. The first option is not discussed in Sp. Based on the Vmv Ketudhamma later explains that connections between a river (without a 'water-splashing boundary') and a 'village boundary' do not disturb [the legal procedure] (see below, § 9).

having purified the boundary’,<sup>216</sup> since a bridge upon which a legal procedure is desired to be performed is included in the village because that bridge is connected with the village district, bringing into arm’s length or placing outside of the village district those monks staying in the village district shows the condition of a legal procedure that can be performed. Understand the intended meaning in this way. Therefore, in the *Simāvinicchaya* treatise, it is said:

‘And in this context, ‘purification of a monastic boundary’ (*simāso-dhana*) means:

- (1a) Establishing (*patiṭṭhāpana*) [the purification] either by virtue of leading into arm’s length the bhikkhus staying in the ‘monastery boundary’ or the ‘village boundary’,
- (1b) or by virtue of excluding [them] from that [boundary area]; or
- (2) by cutting the branch destroying this tree’s state of being established outside [the river].<sup>217</sup>

And also:

‘Not on a platform, and so on, that is connected [with a ‘village boundary’ or a ‘monastery boundary’],<sup>218</sup> for [if] they perform [a legal procedure] there, the legal procedure may be performed [only]

- (1a) either having purified the boundary by leading the bhikkhus staying in the ‘village boundary’, and so on, into arm’s length [to the bhikkhus assembled for the legal procedure] or
- (1b) by virtue of making them ones [being] outside of it (i.e. of the ‘village boundary’, and so on), or
- (2) by cutting the branch,
- (3) or by destroying its condition of staying outside.<sup>219</sup> [2011: 843]

216 *siṃaṃ sodhetvā kammaṃ kātappaṃ*, Sp v 1054.11, see above, n. 153.

217 Mañjota’s *Simāvinicchaya*, § 5: *ettha ca siṃasodhanaṃ nāma vibhārasima-gāmasimāsu ṭhitānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ hatthapāsānayanavasena ca tato bahikaraṇavasena ca patiṭṭhāpanaṃ, sākhāṃ vā chinditvā tassa rukkhassa bahipatiṭṭhitabhāvena nāsanakaraṇāṇā cā ti datṭhabbā*. See above, pp. 71, 79f., and n. 143.

218 It makes the impression as if the *na sambaddha-aṭṭādisu* is a separate sentence or the rest of a longer one, only quoted in part. If we separate the sentence after *aṭṭādisu*, the passage is in agreement with the *Aṭṭhakathā* and Mañjota’s *Simāvinicchaya*.

219 The syntax of Ketudhamma’s text would appear to attribute this passage to Mañjota, although it is not found in our witness: *na sambaddha-aṭṭādisu, tattha karonti hi gāmasimādisu ṭhitānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ hatthapāsānayanavasena <ca> tato bahikaraṇavasena ca siṃaṃ sodhetvā vā sākhāṃ vā chinditvā tassa <rukkhassa> bahi<patiṭṭhā>ṭhitabhāvena*

§ 5 Regarding [the question]: referring to what state is it to be known that a legal procedure should be performed upon a bridge having brought into arm's length just those monks staying in the village thus?

“*Or where [there is] a regular bridge*” (Vin I 106.<sup>34-35</sup>): *where there is a bridge consisting of trees joined together or planks bound together, or a bridge for foot caravans, or a large bridge suitable for the crossing of elephants, horses, and so on; even a narrow footpath bridge suitable for the crossing of people [consisting of] a tree that has been cut that very moment, is called a regular bridge.*<sup>220</sup>

In accordance with [this text from] *Mahāvā[ggā]-Uposathakkhandhaka-Āṭṭhakathā* it might be a bridge composed of a timber raft, or a bridge made of timber planks, or a bridge over which groups of people go, or a large bridge big enough for the passage of elephants, horses, and so on, or minimally a bridge just a foot long, suitable for the passage of people, [consisting of] a tree that has been cut down just at that moment.<sup>221</sup>

It is to be known by referring to the state of success of a legal procedure (*kammasampatti*) at a river that has some permanent (*mrai* [i.e. *dhuvā*]) bridge among bridges that have been described thus,<sup>222</sup> if [the boundary is] determined by a *kammavācā*, having brought into arm's length just those monks in the village district [who are within the marks of the future

---

*nāsetvā vā kammaṃ kātappaṃ.* The portions in <> are added based on the wording of the *Āṭṭhakathā*. Whether this portion was transmitted as it is in some text or whether it was quoted from a slightly distorted manuscript, remains unclear. By and large this definition of *simāsodhana* is nearly identical with the one Ketudhamma quoted from Mañjota's *Simāvinicchaya* just before.

220 Sp v 1047.9-13: *dhuvasetu vā ti* (Vin I 106.<sup>34-35</sup>) *yattha rukkhasaṃghātamayo vā padara-baddho vā jaṅgbāsattbasetu vā hattbi-assādinam saṅcaraanayoggo mahāsetu vā atthi antamaso taṃ khaṇaṃ yeva rukkhaṃ chinditvā manussānaṃ saṅcaraanayoggo ekapadikasetu dhuvasetu tv eva saṅkhaṃ gacchati.* This passage of Sp stands in direct connection to the determination of a *nadīpārasimā* ('monastic boundary [stretching] to the other [side of a] river'). This is a special type of 'determined boundary' (*baddhasimā*), because it stretches over two banks of a river. One of the conditions for such a *simā* is the existence of a regular boat or permanent bridge, which enables the monks to meet on one bank.

221 This description is a paraphrase of the cited Sp passage (see above, n. 220).

222 It seems as if this explanation serves the purpose to make clear in which context this *dhuvasetu* has been used.

boundary],<sup>223</sup> without bringing into arm's length those monks staying in the river, at the time of the determination of the *nadīpāra* boundary.<sup>224</sup>

§ 5.1 Therefore, in the *Mahāvā[ggā]-Uposathakkhandhaka-Aṭṭhakathā* it is stated:

*Then having caused the bhikkhus that are inside all of the marks [of the nadīpārasimā] to having gone into arm's length [to the assembled bhikkhus,] the boundary (i.e. nadīpārasimā) is to be agreed upon with the formula for the legal procedure [for determining a simā]. Those who stay in the river do not disturb the legal procedure, even if they do not come [into arm's length to the assembled bhikkhus].*<sup>225</sup>

Alluding to precisely this statement transmitted in the *Aṭṭhakathā*,<sup>226</sup> in [Mañijota's] *Simāvinicchaya* it is stated:

‘But there is no duty that those performing a legal procedure on a bridge that is connected with a village, and so on, have to purify

223 At the time of the determination of a *nadīpārasimā* the *nadīpārasimā* does not yet exist as a measure for the completeness of the assembled Saṅgha. In the Sp (v 1047.30–33, see below, n. 225) it is stated that all monks that stay within the marks of the *nadīpārasimā* should assemble in arm's length. This means that the monks on both banks and a possibly included island, who stay inside the marks of the future *nadīpārasimā* have to assemble. This implies that other monks on the bank who are outside the marks, need not come. Therefore the statement ‘by bringing into arm's length just those monks in the “village-boundary”’ is not sufficient in relation to the determination of a *nadīpārasimā*. Possibly these words have been omitted in the manuscript used by the editor. Another possibility is that these words are not stated, because the juxtaposition of village and river area is in the foreground.

224 This refers to the monks staying inside the marks of a *nadīpārasimā*, but within the river, not on land.

225 Sp v 1047.30–33: *atha* (ms. *aṭṭha*) *sabbanimittānaṃ anto ṭhite bhikkhu hatthapāsagate* (ms. *kate*) *katvā kammavācāya simā samannitabbā* (ms. °*tabbo*). *nadīyaṃ ṭhitā anāgatā pi kammaṃ na kopenṭi*. The misreading of *aṭṭha* for *atha* probably has to do with the fact, that in case of a regular *baddhasimā*, there are mostly eight (*aṭṭha*) marks for a *simā*. But in the case of a *nadīpārasimā*, there will have been many more, since the structure of this *simā* is more complex (see Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B 11.2). Also it is clear from the context, that ‘*atha*’ is the correct reading.

226 In stating that the subsequent quotation from Mañijota's *Simāvinicchaya* refers to the above-mentioned case, Ketudhamma connects two different things: the above-mentioned statement of the *Aṭṭhakathā* (Sp v 1047.30–33, n. 225) refers to the determination of a *nadīpārasimā*, for which monks in the river need not be taken into account; the below-mentioned statement in Mañijota's *Simāvinicchaya* refers to an *udakukkhepasimā* with assembly point on a bridge that is connected with the village, because its feet are on the river banks. This latter case is dealt with in Sp nearly six pages later (Sp v 1054.9–11). Both cases are completely independent, and Mañijota's statement does not refer to Sp v 1047.30–33, n. 225.

those [monks] staying in the river, and so on. Therefore it is said [in the *Aṭṭhakathā*]:

“But if the bridge or the feet of the bridge are established on the bank outside [the river], it is not suitable to perform a legal procedure. A legal procedure can be performed after having purified the boundary” (≠ Sp v 1054.9–11).

‘But why should [the boundary] be purified by leading into arm’s length, and so on, those staying only in the village, and so on; should not [be purified by leading into arm’s length those staying] in the water area close to the bridge? Because a ‘water-splashing[-boundary]’ and a ‘village boundary’ are [each] limited by their own nature; if they are mutually separated by one cubit, one span, or even [only] four finger [breadths] there is really no fault of combination. But if they are separated by more than this, nothing needs to be said at all. Therefore [such boundaries] need not to be purified. Therefore, the Blessed One said:

“Monks, when a boundary is not agreed upon, not established, whatever village or market town [a monk] lives depending on, whatever is the ‘village boundary’ of that village or ‘the market town boundary’ of that market town, this in that case is [the boundary] for the same communion, for one observance” (Vin I 110.36–111.1).<sup>227</sup> [2011: 844]

§ 6 Regarding [the question]: that bridge whose post’s foot (*tuiñ kbre*)<sup>228</sup> reaches the riverbank is included where? Is it included in the river? Or included in the village?

It should be understood that it is included in the village by referring to the statement of the *Aṭṭhakathā* which says that the monks staying in the river within the area determined as a *nadīpāra* boundary, in<sup>229</sup> the river

<sup>227</sup> Mañjota’s *Simāvinicchaya*, §§ 11–12 (see above, pp. 74ff., 86ff.).

<sup>228</sup> Above (§ 4) only *kbre* (‘foot’) is used by Ketudhamma, whereas here and below we find *tuiñ kbre*. *Tuiñ* refers to the post or pillar of a bridge, and *kbre* is the foot of the post. In actual function there probably is no difference between the two. By ‘foot’ (*kbre*) the Burmese intends the location where the posts or supports connect with the ground.

<sup>229</sup> The portion of the river which lies inside the marks of the *nadīpārasimā*, nevertheless does not count as *simā* area, because within a body of water no *simā* can be determined. Thus only the land area within the marks of the *nadīpārasimā* form the *simā* area.

that has a permanent bridge (*dhuvasetu*), even if they do not come [into arm's length], do not invalidate a legal procedure.<sup>230</sup>

§ 6.1<sup>231</sup> Or, because the Excellent Lord, by [the statement] ‘*Monks, if a boundary has not been agreed upon*’,<sup>232</sup> and so on, permitted that a ‘village district’ indeed is a ‘village boundary’, a bridge that is connected with villages, and so on, is included in a village. Due to the condition of being included in a village of a bridge that is connected with villages, and so on, a bridge also attains the condition of a ‘village boundary’. This is to be known by referring to [Mañijota’s] *Simāvinicchaya* that explains:

‘But because with [the statement:] “*Monks, if a boundary has not been agreed upon, not been established*”, and so on, it was permitted by the Blessed One that a ‘village district’ (*gāmakkhetta*) indeed [is] a ‘village boundary’ (*gāmasimā*), [therefore] a bridge that is connected with villages, and so on, is included in a village. Because such a bridge is included in a village, [therefore,] even a bridge obtains the condition of a ‘village boundary’.<sup>233</sup>

§ 6.2 Regarding [the question]: if it is said that [a bridge] attains the condition of a ‘village boundary’ because of the condition of being included in a village of that bridge, by the latter statement in the *Aṭṭhakathā*: ‘*But if the bridge or ... it is not suitable*’,<sup>234</sup> is it not shown only the condition of not being a place where a legal procedure is to be performed of a bridge that is connected with a ‘village boundary’, and so on? So, how is the statement suitable that says ‘[a bridge] attains the condition of a ‘village boundary’ due to the condition of being included in a village of a bridge that is connected with that village’?<sup>235</sup>

230 This refers to Sp v 1047.32, where in the course of the description of how a *nadipārasimā* is to be agreed upon, it is stated that all bhikkhus within the marks of the *nadipārasimā* have to come into arm's length, except for those who are in the water. The reason is that a *nadipārasimā* as a *baddhasimā* only covers area on land, and this land is part of a settlement = village (*gāma* stands as representative for any type of settlement). Even though there is water included in that area, the *simā* condition does not extend to that water areas. Thus whoever is in the water does not count for the legal procedure of the *nadipārasimā*, whereas the monks on land = in the ‘village boundary’ count. It needs to be said, however, that the relation created here by Ketudhamma is not mandatory, and is not created in any of the commentaries to our knowledge.

231 This section comprises a nearly verbatim parallel with the *nissaya* to the passage from Mañijota cited immediately following (Niss, fol sam v8–10).

232 Vin I 110.36: *asammatāya bhikkhave simāya*.

233 Mañijota's *Simāvinicchaya*, § 8, see above, pp. 72f., 81.

234 Sp v 1054.9–11: *sace pana setu vā ... pa ... na vaṭṭati*, see above, n. 153.

235 The reference here is to the statement in § 6.1 above.



§ 6.3<sup>236</sup> If it has been shown by the latter statement in the *Aṭṭhakathā*: ‘*But if the bridge or . . . it is not suitable*’,<sup>237</sup> only the condition of not being a place where a legal procedure is to be performed of a bridge that is connected with a ‘village boundary’, and so on, when this was [shown] it should have been said making a conclusion (*apriḥ sat*) with the statement: ‘*But if the bridge or . . . it is not suitable*’,<sup>236</sup> which is a prohibition of [it as] a place where a legal procedure may be performed. The statement ‘*A legal procedure can be performed after having purified the boundary*’<sup>238</sup> should not be said as a verdict.<sup>239</sup> But the author of the *Aṭṭhakathā* has said it.<sup>240</sup> Therefore, because the author of the *Aṭṭhakathā* says the statement ‘*A legal procedure can be performed after having purified the boundary*’ as a verdict, the author of the *Aṭṭhakathā*, showing by the statement of this ‘*A legal procedure can be performed after having purified the boundary*’ [2011: 845], which is a verdict concerning a different matter,<sup>241</sup> the fact that by means of purifying the boundary a legal procedure can be performed on that very bridge which is connected to a village; [and] the author of the *Aṭṭhakathā* shows the ‘village-boundary’-condition indeed of the bridge connected with a village due to [its] condition of decreasing or increasing without stopping with the restriction of a village. Therefore, the statement ‘a bridge attains the condition of ‘village boundary’ due to the condition of being included in a village of a bridge which is connected to a village’ is said to be a statement that is suitable. This is to be known referring to [Mañijota’s] *Simāvinicchaya* that explains:

236 This section also comprises paraphrases of the final two paragraphs of Mañijota § 8 cited below. Ketudhamma’s Burmese is largely parallel with the *nissaya* on Mañijota’s text.

237 Sp v 1054.9–11, see n. 153.

238 Sp v 1054.11: *simāṃ sodhetvā kammaṃ kātappaṃ*. This sentence directly follows the text given above in n. 153. It thus shows an option how people on a bridge that is connected with a village might nevertheless perform a legal procedure, namely by purifying the boundary.

239 Here Ketudhamma’s statement parallels the gloss without the inclusion of *pana*, although the gloss is slightly abbreviated (Niss, fol sāḥ r2–3). Here and in the *nissaya* (fol sāḥ r2) *chumḥ pbrat kroṇḥ*, ‘judgement, verdict’ stands for *sanniṭṭhānaṃ*. On *sanniṭṭhāna* as ‘verdict’, see above, n. 166.

240 A verbatim parallel with the gloss of *vuttañ ca* (Niss, fol sāḥ r3).

241 Here Ketudhamma’s text is mostly parallel with the gloss for *tena vacanena padantarasanṭṭhānena* (Niss, fol sāḥ r3–4, n. 168 above), although Ketudhamma has *pada°* as singular and *padantara°* in an accusative relation to *sanniṭṭhāna* (*pud ta pāḥ kui*) whereas the *nissaya* takes *pada°* as plural and *padantara°* in an instrumental relation (*pud ta pāḥ tui. pbrañ.*).

‘But, if it was (lit. is) shown by the latter statement in the Aṭṭhakathā: “*But if the bridge or . . . it is not suitable*”, that a bridge that is connected with a ‘village boundary’, and so on, only has the condition of [being] a place where a legal procedure is not to be performed, [and if it were] so, [then] it should [have been] (lit. be) said by concluding with the statement “*But if*”, and so on, which is a prohibition [of it] as a place where a legal procedure can be performed.

However, the statement: ‘*A legal procedure can be performed after having purified the boundary*’, should not be said as a verdict. But it has been said. Therefore, [the Aṭṭhakathā Ācariya in] showing with this statement—[which is] a verdict concerning another matter (*pada*)—the fact that by means of purifying the boundary a legal procedure can be performed on that very bridge, moreover (*ca*) has illuminated the ‘village boundary’-condition of even such a bridge due to [its] condition of decreasing and increasing, without stopping with the restriction to a village.<sup>242</sup>

§ 7 Regarding [the question]: should it not invalidate a legal procedure not having brought into arm’s length monks who are staying in a river since [a bridge] is included in the river because a certain [bridge’s] post’s foot falls in the river? Although a post’s foot falls in the river, because a ‘village boundary’ and ‘river boundary’ are demarcated as a result of their own nature, a legal procedure is not invalidated even though the monks staying in the river are not brought into arm’s length. This is to be known referring to [Mañijota’s] *Simāvinicchaya* that explains:

‘But why should [the boundary] be purified by leading into arm’s length, and so on, those staying only in the village, and so on; should not [be purified by leading into arm’s length those staying] in the water area close to the bridge? Because a ‘water-splashing[-boundary]’

242 Mañijota’s *Simāvinicchaya*, § 8 (above, pp. 72f., 81f.) *yadi pana Aṭṭhakathāyaṃ ‘sace pana setu vā . . . la . . . na vaṭṭati’ ti* (Sp v 1054.9–11) *uttaravākyena gāmasimādīhi sambaddhassetuno* (thus Vin-samūh 2011. Vin-samūh 1976 has *sammaddha*<sup>o</sup>.) *kammassa akattabbhānabhāvo yeva dassito hoti. evaṃ kammakattabbhānāpaṭisedhena ‘sace pana’ ty* (Sp v 1054.9) *ādi-vacanena niṭṭhaṃ katvā vattabbaṃ siyā. na pana sannīṭṭhānaṃ ‘simāṃ sodhetvā kammaṃ kātabbān’ ti* (Sp v 1054.11) *vacanavattabbaṃ* (Vin-samūh 2011 agrees with Mañijota: *vacanaṃ vattabbaṃ*) *siyā*, (Comma from Vin-samūh 2011, no punctuation in Vin-samūh 1976) *vuttañ ca. tasmā tena vacanena padantarasanīṭṭhānena tampi yeva setumbi simasodhanena kammaṃ kattabbataṃ dassentena gāmassa niyāmena aṭṭhatvā* (thus Vin-samūh 1976; Vin-samūh 2011, *aṭṭhatvā*) *hāyanavaḍḍhanasabbhāvattā tassetuno pi gāmasimabhāvo ca dipito va hoti ti*.

and a ‘village boundary’ are [each] limited by their own nature; if they are mutually separated by one cubit, one span, or even [only] four finger [breadth] there is really no fault of combination. But if they are separated by more than this, nothing needs to be said at all.<sup>243</sup>

§ 7.1 Regarding [the question]: since [the boundaries] are thus demarcated as a result of their own nature, the condition of not invalidating a legal procedure is to be known referring to what state?<sup>244</sup> It is to be known referring to the state of success of a legal procedure (*kammasampatti*) in a short river<sup>245</sup> that has a permanent bridge,<sup>246</sup> while saṅghas perform the legal procedure for the observance from the source to the river’s mouth, [for] the monks who determine a *nadīpāra* boundary [2011: 846], although they determine [the boundary] without bringing into arm’s length the monks in the river.

243 Mañjota’s *Simāvinicchaya* § 12 (pp. 74, 86): *sambaddhesu pana gāmasimādisu yeva. na samīpe udakapīṭṭhe. udakukkhepaḡāmasimādīnañ ca sakabbhāvaparicchinnattā añño aññe-na asambaddhe sati ratanaividatthīcaturāṅgulamattam pi antarīte sambbedadoso natth’eva. tato adbhikantarīte pana vattabbam eva natthi.*

244 This question aims to discern in which cases a legal procedure is valid, although the worldly boundaries of a territory are used as a measure of the completeness of the assembled, rather than one of the specific monastic boundaries.

245 This refers to the only instance where a short river has ever been mentioned in the *Aṭṭhakathā*, Sp v 1053.4–7; Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B 15.4.1

246 This refers to Sp v 1047.9–15 (n. 220); Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B 10.3. In his sentence Ketudhamma combines two different things mentioned in Sp, and in this manner creates a new case: first, a short river (*nāvidīghā nadi*) in which monks can perform legal procedures without a ‘water-splashing boundary’ if they are so many that they fill the entire river (Sp v 1053.4–7), and, second, a river that has a permanent bridge (Sp v 1047.9–15), which is a precondition for the determination of a *nadīpārasimā* and discussed only in this context (Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B 10).

Ketudhamma sets up the scenario that a group of monks establishes a *nadīpārasimā* at such a ‘short river’ that—as prescribed for a *nadīpārasimā*—has a permanent bridge. Simultaneously the river is used by other monks for the performance of the observance (*uposatha*). Since it is a short river, if the saṅgha consists of many monks and fills the entire river, it can perform the *uposatha* according to the worldly boundaries of that river (that is, without creating a ‘water-splashing boundary’). Due to the fact that for determining a *nadīpārasimā*, monks within the river need not be taken into account, the legal procedure (*kamma*) for the determination of the *nadīpārasimā* is successful (*sampatti*), and so is the *kamma* with which the *uposatha* has been performed.

With this scenario Ketudhamma obviously wants to show that the determination of a *nadīpārasimā* at a short river with a permanent bridge, even though filled with monks, is a successful legal procedure (*kammasampatti*).

If it is said it is to be known referring to the success of a legal procedure in the area of the determined *nadīpāra* boundary at a river that has a permanent bridge, the statement that says there should be success of a legal procedure is suitable because ‘river [boundaries]’ and ‘village [boundaries]’ are, respectively, [types of] ‘foundation boundaries’<sup>247</sup> and because they are [mutually] ‘heterogenous boundaries’ (*[vi]sabbhāga[simā]*)<sup>248</sup>.<sup>249</sup>

§ 7.2 Regarding [the question]: because monks performing a legal procedure in a river while a *nadīpāra* boundary is being determined are in need (*ñai. kbraṇḥ*)<sup>250</sup> of a ‘water-splashing boundary’ near the bridge, is there

247 *nissayasimā*. Kieffer-Pülz 2021: 155. This statement is correct if it is understood that the river is a ‘foundation boundary’ (*nissayasimā*) in relation to the ‘water-splashing boundaries’ (*udakukkhepasimā*) which are created in it, and the village is a ‘foundation boundary’ in relation to ‘determined boundaries’ (*baddhasimā*) agreed upon in the village areas. It is not correct that the river and the village are mutually ‘foundation boundaries’.

248 The editions read *sabbhāga* ‘homogenous’ which is wrong according to all texts that deal with the *sabbhāga-visabbhāga* condition of *simās*. Therefore, it is likely that here there is a mistake in the manuscript basis or a typo.

249 Whereas the words ‘village’ (*gāma*) and ‘boundary’ (*simā*) are connected as *gāmasimā* (‘village boundary’) from the earliest sources onwards (Vin I 110.38), it is not usual to speak of a ‘river boundary’ (*nadīsimā*) in the root layer of the *tipīṭaka*, and it comes up only once in the *Aṭṭhakathā* layer (Sp v 1048.1). But in the Vmv *simā* is added to *nadī*, analogous also to a ‘wilderness’ (*arañña*), and so on, to describe their worldly boundaries (Vmv II 148.19; 150.10; 163.30; 165.21–22; 167.13). Since the Vmv was very influential in the Burmese cultural area—probably also via Tipitakālaṅkāra’s *Vinayalāṅkāraṭīkā* (Pālim-ṅṅ), 17th c. CE—the usage of the compound *nadīsimā* for the worldly boundaries of rivers may have gained wider acceptance. But one should not merge the terms *nadīsimā* and ‘water-splashing boundary’ (*udakukkhepasimā*), since the *udakukkhepasimās* are created within *nadīsimās*. Therefore, it also is not relevant for the present context, that in § 7.4 Ketudhamma declares that *gāma* and *udakukkhepasimā* are ‘heterogenous’ (*visa-bhāga*). The *gāma* is heterogenous with the *nadī* (alternatively called *nadīsimā*) and the *udakukkhepasimā*. For the *sabbhāga-visabbhāga* relations, see Kieffer-Pülz 2021: 155–156.

250 Although the compound *simāpekkhā* is not used anywhere in this text, this statement clearly invokes the technical sense of the compound as used in later vinaya commentaries, where it is ordinarily glossed as *sim kui ñai*, literally ‘to be partial to a *simā*’, or ‘to favor a *simā*’. Cf. Vmv II 160.4 = Pālim-ṅṅ I 330.22 *apare pana: simāpekkhāya kiccaṃ natthi*—Vmv-niss, II 323: *simāpekkhāya = sim kui ñai. kbraṇḥ pbraṇ*; Vmv II 167.2–3 = Pālim-ṅṅ I 342.1–2: *simāpekkhānantaram eva sattabbhantarasimāya sambhavato*—Vmv-niss, II 340: *simāpekkhānantaram eva = sim kui ñai. saññ e\* akbraṇḥ mai. n\* sā lhyāñ*.

In fact, there are only few references for *simāpekkhā*, and these are in the Vmv and in the passages borrowed from it in the Pālim-ṅṅ as well as in the 16th c. *Simāvisodhanī* (Simāvis). ‘Need for a boundary’ is used in the sense that a monastic boundary—whether a *sattabbhantarasimā* or an *udakukkhepasimā*—is required for a saṅgha in order to avoid an incomplete monastic community during a legal procedure. According to the Vmv such a need for a monastic boundary does not exist if a saṅgha fills an entire wilderness or an entire river up to their natural boundaries (for example, Vmv II 158.24–159.4). Again others quoted in the Vmv think that there is generally no need for creating a monastic boundary in a wilderness or a body of water, since the *sattabbhantarasimā*

not a failure of a legal procedure (*kammavipatti*) [i.e., the determination of the *nadīpāra* boundary] if the boundary enters within the bridge's post's foot?<sup>251</sup>

In the *Aṭṭhakathā*, since ‘those staying in the river do not disturb the legal procedure even though they have not come [into arm's length (*batthapāsa*)]<sup>252</sup> is transmitted just in general (*sāmañña sā lā ra kāh*),<sup>253</sup> in this context it is suitable to accept both *udakukkhepāpekkha nadī* (‘a river in need of a ‘water-splashing [boundary]’) [and] *apekkha nadī* (‘a river not in need [of a “water-splashing boundary”]).<sup>254</sup> This ‘short river’ is the one called here a ‘river not in need of a “water-splashing boundary”’ whereas all other rivers are those in ‘need of a “water-splashing boundary”’. Although the ‘water-splashing boundary’ reaches within the bridge's post's foot, there can be success of a legal procedure, not a failure [of a legal procedure].<sup>255</sup>

§ 7.3 Regarding [the question]: if it is said that there is not a failure of a legal procedure, has this not contradicted the statement transmitted in *Vimati* that there is a failure of a legal procedure due to a fault of combination (*sambhedadosa*) because a ‘village boundary’ is heterogenous (*visa-bhāga*) with respect to a ‘water-splashing boundary’ and it (i.e. the ‘village boundary’) is a foundation (*nissaya*) [boundary, and the ‘water-splashing boundary’ is] a dependent (*nissita*) [boundary]?<sup>256</sup>

---

used in a wilderness, and the *udakukkhepasimā* used in a body of water, arise all by themselves without any activity required by the monks (Vmv II 160.4ff).

251 Here Ketudhamma wants to know whether the different legal activities performed simultaneously by two saṅghas in close vicinity, lead to the invalidity of their legal procedures.

252 Sp V 1047.32–33: *nadiyaṃ thitā anāgatā pi kammaṃ na kopenti* (n. 225).

253 That is, it is transmitted in the ‘general’ or ‘common’ (*sāmañña*) sense without any specification. As the subsequent explanation shows, what Ketudhamma means is that the ‘river’ in this passage is not specified as one which needs or does not need a ‘water-splashing boundary’.

254 In Sp there is, however, no such differentiation. In general within a river legal procedures are performed in ‘water-splashing boundaries’. The only exception mentioned is the short river (*nāvidiḅhā nadī*). In that case the space inside the river is not sufficient to create a water splashing boundary. If the saṅgha fills the entire river a legal procedure can be performed according to the worldly boundaries of the river (see above, n. 245)

255 Since a ‘water-splashing boundary’ only comes into being within a body of water, it must be assumed that in the case described by Ketudhamma, the bridge's posts' feet are inside the river. Thus the bridge counts as river as well since it is not connected with the banks of the river. The *nadīpārasimā*, on the other hand, cannot extend over bodies of water, and therefore the two legal procedures performed in the *nadīpārasimā* area and in a ‘water-splashing boundary’ respectively have no mutual effect on each other.

256 Since in the case described above, there is no connection of the ‘water-splashing boundary’ and the ‘village boundary’, there is no fault. So there is also no contradiction to the Vmv.

Because a ‘village boundary’ is heterogenous with respect to a ‘water-splashing [boundary]’ and it is a foundation (*nissaya*), [and the ‘water-splashing boundary’ is] dependent (*nissita*), a legal procedure is invalidated due to a fault of combination.<sup>257</sup>

§ 8 Statements like this and others transmitted in *Vimati* are not all-inclusive (*sabbasaṅgahaka*) statements (i.e. statements covering everything) that are entirely in accordance with the true sense of the Pāli and *Aṭṭhakathā*. Some are in accordance, some are not in accordance. Because these are confused statements, they are mere opinion (*attanomati*). Therefore, the author of *Vimatiṭīkā* has himself admitted in the explanation of the mixing of homogenous and heterogenous boundaries, having stated:

‘[There are boundaries]<sup>258</sup> with respect to which there is no fault, even if they are mutually connected by trees, and so on.<sup>259</sup> 262– But with regard to which [boundaries] there is [a fault, there it is] not [right];<sup>260</sup> concerning these [i.e.] (the last mentioned type of *simās*),

257 This seems to be just a restatement of the preceding question. May be one of them is a quote from *Vmv*, but thus far we have not located a passage that contains all the words used here. One possible reference passage could be: *Vmv* II 164.17–29 (see below, n. 292) (*Ketudhamma* § 9.1)

258 *Ketudhamma* has left out a passage before his quote which he, however, touches upon, due to the fact that he quotes part of its concluding sentence. The omitted passage runs as follows, *Vmv* II 152.29–153.5: *keci pana ‘sace dve pi simāyo pūretvā nirantaram’ ṭhitesu bhikkhūsu kammaṃ karontesu ekissā eva simāya gaṇo ca upasampadāpekkho ca anussāvako ca ekato tiṭṭhati, kammaṃ sukataṃ eva hoti. sace pana kammārāho vā anussāvako vā simantaraṭṭho hoti, kammaṃ vipajjati’ ti vadanti, tañ ca baddhasimā-gāmasimādī-sabhāgasimāsu eva yujjati, yāsu aññamaññaṃ rukkhādīsambandhesu pi doso natthi.* ‘Some, however, say: “If the bhikkhus, staying without interval [between them], filling both [monastic] boundaries, are performing a legal procedure, [and if] the group (*gaṇa*), the one who desires ordination, and the one who recites the formula for the legal procedure stand together in only one [monastic] boundary, the legal procedure is performed well indeed. But if the one liable to a legal procedure and the one who recites the formula for the legal procedure stay in the other [monastic] boundary, the legal procedure fails.” This, however, fits in only with respect to homogenous boundaries, such as a “determined boundary” and a “village boundary”, with respect to which there is no fault, even if they have mutual connections by trees, and so on.’

Thus the author of the *Vmv* rejects this opinion for two *baddhasimās*, but accepts it for *baddhasimā* and *gāmasimā*—the latter is the foundation of the former—where according to the South Indian tradition (but not to the Sri Lankan tradition) connections between these *simās* do not render the legal procedures invalid (for this problem, see above, n. 9).

259 This is the accepted South Indian position concerning the relation of *baddhasimā* and *gāmasimā*, see below, n. 264.

260 *Neyyadhamma*, who also quotes this passage in his *Simāvivādavinicchayakathā* (Minayeff 1897: 21), does not cite this sentence, and neither does the *Simānayaḍappana* (Simānd 62). This sentence only makes sense in the *Vmv* context, but not in the context to

the ‘heterogenous boundaries’ (*visabhāgasīmā*), if there is a connection by trees, and so on, a [bhikkhu] who stands in one [boundary] indeed disturbs the legal procedure in the other place, because in the *Aṭṭhakatthā* the purification has been stated in a general manner.<sup>261</sup> This is our conviction.<sup>262</sup>

In this way the author of *Vimatiṭṭikā*, on account of having doubt (*saṃsaya*) regarding his own words, without reaching his own verdict (*sannīṭṭhān*), says: ‘[This is] our conviction. Having pondered it, it should be accepted.’<sup>263</sup> [His statement] should be understood as mere opinion (*attanomati*), not as an all-inclusive statement entirely in conformity with the true sense of the Pāli and *Aṭṭhakatthā*, by referring to this exhortation (*uyyojana*).<sup>264</sup> [2011: 847]

§ 9 Regarding [the question]: without needing (*ma nai. mū r\**)<sup>265</sup> a ‘water-splashing boundary’ because of being able to gather the saṅgha in a short river and because the saṅgha fills [the river] from its source to the river’s

---

which it was transferred by the 19th century authors. For a discussion of this passage in the various texts, see Kieffer-Pülz forthcoming.

261 That is, there is no purification that would be specific for only some of the various *sīmā* types.

262 *yāsu aññamaññaṃ rukkhādisambandhesu pi doso natthi. yāsu pana atthi, (na)* (om. in Vin-samūh 1976, added in parentheses in Vin-samūh 2011), *tāsu visabhāgasīmāsu rukkhādisambandhesu* (B<sup>c</sup>: *rukkhādisambandhe*) *sati ekattha ṭhito itaraṭṭhānaṃ kammaṃ koṭeti eva, aṭṭhakatthāyaṃ* (\*ṃ om. in Vin-samūh 1976) *sāmaññato sodhanassa vuttatā ti ambakaṃ kbanti, vimaṃsitvā gabettabbaṃ* (Vmv II 153; Vmv-niss II 305–306). Actually the Vmv author states that one should accept his opinion having investigated it.

The citation in Ketudhamma is difficult to understand, because its context in Vmv is no longer visible due to the excerpt quoted. However, this passage has been similarly cut out for quotations in the *Simāvivādavinicchayakatthā* and the *Simānayadapana* (see above, n. 260).

263 *ambakaṃ kbanti vimaṃsitvā gabettabbaṃ*. Ketudhamma does not discuss the content of this quotation, but simply takes offense at the phrase “This is our conviction. . .”, because it characterizes the statement as a personal opinion of the Vmv author, rather than a generally accepted verdict.

264 The point which could have been understood differently is the statement that the spread of a saṅgha over two *sīmās* is suitable in connection with *baddha-* and *gāmasīmā*. As we know, this is the South Indian position not shared by the Sinhalese, nor shared by Dhammaceti in 15th c. Burma, but later accepted in Burma (at least by the Saṅgharāja Ñeyyadhamma in his *Simāvivādavinicchayakatthā*) and in Thailand (by the then Saṅgharāja Vajirañāṇavarorasa). See Kieffer-Pülz 2021: 17–21.

265 See the comment on *simāpekkhā* (n. 250).

mouth,<sup>266</sup> is there failure of a legal procedure due to a fault of combination when performing a legal procedure upon a boat having tied its rope to a timber stake that has been driven into the bank?<sup>267</sup> Or, can there be [success of a legal procedure]<sup>268</sup> because there ought not to be a fault of combination?

As regards the intention of the author of the *Vimatiṭikā*, it is suitable to understand [him] as saying that there is no fault of combination because a river [boundary] is homogenous<sup>269</sup> with respect to a village [boundary] and each are foundation boundaries.<sup>270</sup>

Therefore it is stated in *Vimati*:

‘But the five boundaries, which are defined in common language, [i.e.] a village[-boundary], a wilderness[-boundary], a river[-boundary], an ocean[-boundary] or a natural lake[-boundary], do not meet

266 This takes up the possibility mentioned in Sp to perform a legal procedure in a river (see above, n. 245) filling it with monks up to its natural boundaries, without the need to use a ‘water-splashing boundary’.

267 Here Ketudhamma again draws a scenario combining two things not related in Sp. On the one hand he again takes up the short river filled with monks from its origin to its mouth, who perform a legal procedure taking the natural boundaries of the river as monastic boundary (see above, n. 245). The second case he mentions is a saṅgha assembled in a boat in a river that is fixed by tying it to a stake driven into the bank of the river. This case is mentioned in Sp v 1054.6–7 to show the fault of connection between a ‘water-splashing boundary’ (the monks in the boat) and the ‘village boundary’ (the stake at the bank of the river) (Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B 15.5.1).

Taking the statements of Sp literally, the combination of these two cases should not be possible, since the ‘short river’ case only occurs when the entire river is filled with monks. Thus there would not be any place for a boat with a different saṅgha who fixes that boat by tying it to the stake on the bank of the river.

But if Ketudhamma assumes that part of the same saṅgha is assembled in a river, part in a boat that is connected to the bank of the river, he creates a new scenario. For that case the question whether or not a connection is relevant is not answered by the commentaries. But in taking from the Vmv what has been reported for worldly boundaries Ketudhamma assumes that there is no fault.

268 The editions read ‘failure of a procedure’ (*kammavipatti*). But this does not make sense, since this case obviously is intended as the alternative to the preceding case.

269 Normally one would not classify a ‘river boundary’ as ‘homogenous’ with a ‘village boundary’. Ketudhamma probably describes them as *sabhāga* because they are both ‘foundation boundaries’ (*nissayasīmā*) and because of the quotation from the *Vimativinodanīṭika* which he quotes subsequently and which states that in a worldly context a connection between a ‘river boundary’ and a ‘village boundary’ are not considered as creating a connection. None of the earlier legal commentaries known to us describes the relation between the two as *sabhāga*.

270 It seems as if Ketudhamma here takes a position concerning the Vmv quotation above, which he characterized as Vmv’s ‘own opinion’ (*attanomati*).



with a fault [of combination] even if there [is] a mutual connection by a tree, and so on; similarly because of [its] absence from common language. For [people] in the world do not say that through the mere combination with a tree, and so on, villages, and so on, are combined with other villages, and so on, and with rivers, and so on.<sup>271</sup>

The statement that has said that in the connection of a ‘river [boundary]’ with a ‘village [boundary]’ there is no fault of combination [means] there should be no fault of combination in only a river that does not need a ‘water-splashing boundary’.<sup>272</sup> <sup>273</sup>But in a river that needs a ‘water-splashing boundary’ the author of *Vīmatīṭikā* has the opinion that there should be a fault of combination.<sup>274</sup>

§ 9.1 Regarding [the question]: is this opinion of the author of *Vīmatīṭikā* indeed a doctrine that accords with the passage transmitted in the *Aṭṭhakathā*?

*‘But having driven a post into the bank of the river, it is by no means suitable [to perform a legal procedure] in a boat tied there.’<sup>275</sup>*

271 Vmv II 165.5-7: *yā paṇ’ etā lokavohārasiddhā* (om. in Vin-samūh 1976, added in parenthesis in Vin-samūh 2011) *gāmārañña-na>disamudda-jātassarasimā pañcā, tā aññamañña-rukkhādīsambandhe pi sambbedadosaṃ nāpajja-na>ti, tatthā lokavohārābhāvato. na hi gāmādayo* (thus Vin-samūh 2011. Vin-samūh 1976 reads *nadīgāmādayo*) *gāmantarādīhi nadi* (Vin-samūh 1976: *nadi*<sup>o</sup>)-*ādīhi ca rukkhādīsambandhamattena sambhinā ti.*

The first part of this passage is also cited in Ñeyyadhamma’s writing to the Asaṅkaravādins, in his rejection of the sixth Sinhalese Thera’s opinion. Based on this statement of the Vmv which is concerned only with worldly boundaries, not with monastic ones, this Thera considered that practice valid for monastic *simās* as well. The same argument is later taken by the Asaṅkaravādins in the 1880s. But the final sentence in Vmv, not quoted here, clearly shows that the author of the Vmv did not have the opinion that the worldly practice was valid for monastic boundaries. See below, n. 272.

272 This the author of the Vmv explains with regard to worldly boundaries only, as is obvious when one looks at the entire passage. After the lines quoted above, Vmv states (II 165.9-12): *lokavohārasiddhānañ ca lokavohārato va sambbedo vā asambbedo vā gabetabbo, nāññato. ten’ eva Aṭṭhakathāyaṃ tāsāṃ aññamaññaṃ kattvaci sambbedanayo na dassito, sāsana-vohārasiddho yeva dassito.* ‘And for those defined by common language a combination or not combination is to be grasped due to the common language, not due to something else. Exactly therefore in the *Aṭṭhakathā* the method of their mutual combination anywhere has not been shown, it has been shown only as defined in the language of the Teaching.’

273 This Ketudhamma assumes based on the Vmv’s discussion of the meaningless connections of worldly boundaries. That the Vmv author explicitly refers to the difference between worldly and monastic boundaries (see above, n. 272), he does not mention.

274 This latter falls under the regulations for the monastic boundaries, and in stating this the Vmv author follows the regulation in the *Aṭṭhakathā*.

275 Sp v 1054.6-7: *nadītīre pana khāṇukam koṭetvā tattha baddhanāvāya na vaṭṭati yeva.*

In [this statement in] the *Aṭṭhakatthā*, *udakukkhepāpekkhanadī* ('a river in need of a "water-splashing [boundary]"') is not transmitted. Since just [the word] 'river' is transmitted in general (*sāmañña*),<sup>276</sup> it could be a river that needs a 'water-splashing boundary', or a river that does not need [one].<sup>277</sup> Having tied a boat in either type of river with a rope to a timber stake that has been driven into the bank, without purifying the boundary, if a legal procedure is performed upon that boat, there is a failure of a legal procedure due to a fault of combination.<sup>278</sup> Since it is suitable to accept that, it is suitable to understand that the doctrine of the author of *Vimatiṭṭikā* is not a doctrine that is in accordance with the *Aṭṭhakatthā*.<sup>279</sup>

Because the doctrine is thus not in accordance with the statement transmitted in the *Aṭṭhakatthā*, monks who perform a legal procedure upon a boat

276 See above, n. 253.

277 This argumentation is anachronistic insofar as the differentiation into a river in need of a 'water-splashing boundary' and one that is not in need of it, is not yet discussed at the time of the *Aṭṭhakatthā*. At that time a saṅgha that wanted to perform a legal procedure in a body of water generally had to create a 'water-splashing boundary'. The only exception mentioned, and this only once, is the short river which is so short that the saṅgha when it enters the river fills it from its origin to its mouth (see above, n. 245). In such a river there is no more space within the body of water to mark a 'water-splashing boundary', since the water splash would come down on the banks of the river. Thus, river in the *Aṭṭhakatthā* in general, and in this passage especially, clearly refers to a river within which a 'water-splashing boundary' can be generated. This becomes obvious from the subsequent mention of a boat which is tied to a stake at the bank of the river. In the case of the short river no boat, platform, and so on are used for the assembling Saṅgha, but the Saṅgha members are within the river.

278 And this is also the case according to the *Vimativinodaniṭṭikā*, as stated in the chapter on the 'water-splashing boundary', see Vmv II 150.1-8: '*vihārasimāya vā gāmasimāya vā patiṭṭhitō*' ti (Sp v 1054.1-2) ca, '*naditire pana kbāṇukaṃ koṭṭetvā tattha baddhanāvāya vā na vaṭṭati*' ti (Sp v 1054.6-7) ca '*sace pana (5) setu vā setupādā vā bābitire patiṭṭhitā, kammaṃ kātuṃ na vaṭṭati*' ti (Sp v 1054.9-11) ca *evaṃ visabbhāsu gāmasimāsu sākādi-  
naṃ phusanam eva saṅkaradosakāraṇattena vuttam, na bhikkhūphusanam*. " [If a branch of a tree grown inside the river] is established in a 'monastery boundary' or a 'village boundary'", and "having driven a stake into the bank of the river, it is not suitable [to perform a legal procedure] in a boat tied there", and "but if the bridge or the feet of the bridge are established on the bank outside [the river], it is not suitable to perform a legal procedure", and thus only the touching of branches, and so on, in 'village boundaries' which are heterogenous (i.e. in comparison to the 'water-splashing boundaries'), is mentioned as a cause for the fault of confusion, not the touching of the bhikkhus."

279 It is to be assumed that Ketudhamma here has the Vmv statement in mind which he has previously quoted, because after its quotation he poses the question whether this is in agreement with the *Aṭṭhakatthā*. He states a contradiction between the Vmv and *Aṭṭhakatthā*. But this contradiction only exists because Ketudhamma ignores that the author of Vmv makes this statement solely with respect to worldly usage, not with regard to monastic boundaries. As is explained elsewhere in the Vmv (see above, n. 278), Vmv and *Aṭṭhakatthā* are completely in agreement concerning this question.

as formerly described, should perform a legal procedure having brought into arm's length just the monks who are staying in the village district.<sup>280</sup> [This is] because the location of a boat which is tied to a tree which stands on the bank is the village, in accordance with *Vajirabuddhiṭikā*:

‘With regard to a boat tied to a tree that stands on the bank [of the river] the village is the basis.’<sup>281</sup>

Or, [this is] because the boat, on account of being connected with a village, is included in the village district, in accordance with *Mahāvā[ḡga]*, *Uposathakkhandhaka-Pāḷi*:

‘Monks, if no boundary is agreed upon, is established ... for one uposatha’.<sup>282</sup> [2011: 848]

Therefore [the following] is transmitted in the discussion on the confusion of boundaries (*simāsaṅkarakathā*) in *Vimatiṭikā*:

‘For as a mutual connection by trees, and so on, of these [‘determined boundaries’] is not suitable because (*iti*) a ‘determined boundary’ agreed upon in a ‘determined boundary’ is a defective boundary (*vipattisimā*),<sup>283</sup> so it is proved that a connection by trees, and so on, of this [‘determined boundary’] even with them (i.e. river, ocean, lake) is not suitable, because a ‘determined boundary’ even though agreed upon in a river, and so forth, is only a defective boundary.’<sup>284</sup>

According to this method the non-suitability (*na vaṭṭanaka*)<sup>285</sup> of a connection by trees, and so on, must be known for a ‘seven-

280 Since the contradiction of Vmv to Sp stated by Ketudhamma does not exist, both texts completely agree with the conclusion drawn here by Ketudhamma.

281 Vjb 459.9-10: *tīraṭṭhe rukkhe baddhanāvāya gāmo ābhāro*. See Kieffer-Pülz 2013: III 1925, 1932-1935.

282 Vin I 110.36-111.1: *asammatāya bhikkhave simāya aṭṭhapitāya ... pa ... ekuposathā*. For the complete sentence see above, n. 160.

283 This statement is based on Vin I 111.7-22 where it is declared that in overlapping or confusing a second determined boundary with an earlier one, the second does not come into being.

284 This is based on Vin v 221.8, where boundaries determined in a river, an ocean or a natural sea are listed as defective *simās* (Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 142-143).

285 The words *na vaṭṭanakabbāvo* (v.l. *vattakabbāvo*) appear only here and in the parallel passage in Palim-ṅ, where the text is borrowed from the Vmv. We understand it here as a noun to *vaṭṭati*.

The ‘water-splashing boundary’ and the ‘seven-*abbantara*-boundary’ both are valid only for as long as the legal procedure lasts; also, these *simās* do not have definitive shapes, because their size depends on the size of the assembled saṅgha. Therefore, it is not possible to indicate definite connections for them.

*abbhantara*-boundary' with a village, a river, and so on,<sup>286</sup> and of a 'water-splashing-boundary' with a wilderness, and so on.

Thus, the 'determined boundary', the 'seven-*abbhantara*-boundary' and the 'water-splashing boundary' allowed by the Blessed One, meet with the fault of combination if there is a connection by trees, and so on, mutually (i.e. between these various types of boundaries), and with the boundaries of the foundations of the one or the other (i.e. of all) [boundaries]<sup>287</sup> exempt from the [respective] own foundation. Therefore (*ti*) the method 'in conformity to the Sutta (Vin)' (*suttānuloma*) must be known indeed.

It should be shown that In conformity to the combining and overlapping allowed<sup>288</sup> by the Blessed One at the time of the arising of the three [boundaries], 'determined boundary', and so on,<sup>289</sup> with the village, and so on,<sup>290</sup> which are each [boundary's] respective own foundation, even<sup>291</sup> a connection by trees, and so on, [of these boundaries with their respective foundations] is allowed indeed.<sup>292</sup>

286 The 'and so on' stands for the other bodies of water within which a 'water-splashing boundary' can come into being, that is, the ocean and the natural lake.

287 This refers to the areas within which these boundaries come into being. Instead of 'foundation boundaries' (*nissayasimā*) we also find simply 'foundations' (*nissaya*) being used.

288 The *Vinaya* does not contain an explicit statement of this type. But from the fact that each of these *simās* is established in a specific area (foundation = *nissaya*), and this is not considered a problem for the validity of the *simā*, the Vmv author concludes that also connections between *simās* and their foundations do not lead to problems.

289 I.e. 'seven-*abbhantara*-boundary' and 'water-splashing-boundary'.

290 The village is the foundation of a 'determined boundary'; the 'and so on' refers to the foundations of the other two boundaries, that is, to the wilderness (*arañña*) and a body of water (*nadī, samudda, jātasara*).

291 The Vmv reads *pi* 'even'.

292 Vmv II 164.17-29: *tatrīdaṃ suttānulomato nayaggabaṇamukhaṃ: yathā hi baddhasimāyaṃ sammatā vipattisimā hotī ti tāsāṃ aññamaññaṃ rukkhādisambandho na vaṭṭati. evaṃ nadi-ādisu sammatā pi baddhasimā vipattisimā va hotī ti tāhi pi saddhiṃ tassā rukkhādisambandho na vaṭṭati ti sījhati. iminā nayena sattabbhantarasimāya gāma-nadi-ādīhi saddhiṃ, udakukkhepasimāya ca araññādīhi saddhiṃ rukkhādisambandhassa na vaṭṭana-kabbāvo (Vin-samūh 1976: vattakabbāvo) nātabbo. evam etā bhagavatā anuññatā baddhasimā sattabbhantara-udakukkhepasimā aññamaññaṃ c' eva attano nissayavirahitāhi itaritarāsaṃ (Vin-samūh 1976: 'taṃ) nissaya simāhi ca rukkhādisambandhe sati sambhedodasaṃ āpajjati ti suttānulomanayo nātabbo (Vin-samūh 1976: nñātabbo) va. attano attano pana nissayabhūtagāmādīhi saddhiṃ baddhasimādināṃ tissannaṃ uppattikāle bhagavatā anuññātassa sambhedajjibbottharaṇassa anulomato rukkhādisambandho pi anuññāto va hotī ti daṭṭhabbam.*

These are not all-inclusive statements entirely in accordance with the true sense of the Pāli and *Aṭṭhakathā*. Some are in accordance, some are not in accordance. Because they are confounded and confused statements, they are mere opinion.

§ 9.2 On account of it being mere opinion, unable to endure (*a[k]khama*) the statement by the author of *Vimatiṭṭikā* that there should be no combination [of boundaries] at the site of connection between a ‘village boundary’ and a ‘determined boundary’ (*baddha sim*),<sup>293</sup> the Sinhalese (*sibalaṅvāsī*) Vācissaramahāthera, who endeavored the contrary (*paṭikkhepa*), has stated in the treatise *Śimālankāra*:

‘21.–22. A [monastic boundary] free of any of the failures of the [monastic] boundary among the eleven failures [listed in the *Vinaya*] is connected with the three successful attainments [of a monastic boundary], because (*bi*) a ‘determined boundary’ (*baddha-simā*) that [remains] unconfused also with other [monastic] boundaries through trees, branches, and so on, is considered suitable for all legal procedures of the Buddhist community.

23. It has been said in the *Aṭṭhakathā* indeed (*bi*) that, when a confusion arises [between monastic] boundaries but [a legal procedure] is performed without [first] having purified [the monastic boundary], the legal procedure of a Buddhist monastic community is disturbed. [2011: 849]

24. Some [persons] (*keci*; i.e. the Coḷīyas) declare that, even if [there] exists a confusion (*saṅkara*) of some [monastic] boundaries, this [does not] spoil a legal procedure performed [therein] without having [previously] purified the [monastic boundary].

25. ‘If [there exists] a connection (*sambandha*) of a “determined boundary” (*baddha-simā*) with a “village boundary” (*gāma-simā*) by branches, and so on, [this] is not a confusion (*saṅkara*).’ This is the opinion of the Coḷīyas.<sup>294</sup>

293 That a connection between a ‘determined boundary’ and a ‘village boundary’ are considered as not creating a confusion of these boundaries is due to the fact that the South Indians put the function of the ‘village boundary’ as a foundation for a ‘determined boundary’ in the foreground. As in the case of the other boundaries, here too, they consider connections between a boundary and its foundation irrelevant. See above, n. 9.

294 *Śimāl* vv. 21–25: for an edition and translation, see Kieffer-Pülz 2021: 70–71, 96–98:

And so on.

The excellent master by the name Munindasāra,<sup>295</sup> a native of Ññiō Kan village, *dharmācariya* of Paṭhama auṭh kyoṅḥ charā tau,<sup>296</sup> Dutiya auṭh kyoṅḥ charā tau,<sup>297</sup> and Praññ charā tau,<sup>298</sup> as a result of his fondness for the judgment (*vinicchaya*) transmitted in the *Simālaṅkāra* treatise among the two statements, [i.e.,] the judgement transmitted in the *Vimativinodanī* treatise and the judgment transmitted in the *Simālaṅkāra* treatise, in *Vinayasāraṅḡṭhi*,<sup>299</sup> which was composed by him, stated:

‘The excellent vinayadhara masters who are modest, well-behaved and desiring training say that because all the authors of *Ṭikās* and *Ḡaṅṡhis* do not accept the opinions that are only accepted by the teachers who live in Cola [Country] (*colavāsi charā*), such as the opinion of the author of the *Vimativinodanīṭika*, and because [those opinions] are not in conformity with the Pāli and *Aṭṡhakathā*, performing [a legal procedure] in accordance with [what is] transmitted in *Vimativinodanī* results in failure (*vipatti*).’<sup>300</sup>

*Ekādasaviṡṡattinaṡ yāyam aññatarāya pi*  
*Simaviṡṡattiyaṡ muttā tisamṡṡattihi samyuttā* (21)

*Rukkāsākābhādināññāhi simāhi pi asaṅkarā*  
*Baddbasimā hi sā sabbasaṅghakammārāhā matā.* (22)

*Saṅkare sati simānām asodbetvā kathamṡ pana,*  
*Kuppate samṡghakammanti vuttam Aṭṡhakathāya hi* (23)

*Keci kāsaṅci simānaṡ vijjamāne pi saṅkare*  
*Katassa tamṡ asodbetvā kammassākopam abravuṡ.* (24)

*Ġāmasimāya sambbandhe baddbasimāya saṅkaro,*  
*Sākbādbihi na boti ti Coliyānam idaṡṡ matam.* (25)

295 Munindasāra (1769–?). Some details about him are recorded in Kelasa 2010: 162–168. We are indebted to Alexey Kirichenko for assistance with the identification and dates of the figures mentioned in this paragraph.

296 Puññaraṡsi, also known as Ūḥ Puiḥ (1778–1830). Some details about him are recorded in Kelasa 2009: 157–159.

297 Jambudhāja, also known as Cakkinda and Ūḥ Put/Budh (1787–1842). Some details about him are recorded in Kelasa 2009: 182–191.

298 Medha, also known as Medhālaṅkāra (1788–1864). Some details about him are recorded in Kelasa 2010: 192–207.

299 This treatise was completed on 5 waxing Tawthalin in *sāsana* year 2346 (= 1 September 1802). An edition was prepared by Charā Ññāṅ and published in Yangon by Sudhammavati Press in 1933.

300 This comprises a verbatim citation from *Vinayasāraṅḡṭhi* (Ññāṅ 1933, 340)—aside from the minor addition of *ḡaṅṡhi charā* (*‘ḡaṅṡhi authors’*) by Ketudhamma—where this statement follows Munindasāra’s discussion of vv. 1–26 of *Simāl*. After commenting on each stanza individually, and immediately before the passage cited here, Munindasāra remarks: ‘With regard to this matter of the confusion of boundaries (*simasambheda*), it is

Having investigated with wisdom these statements that have been said, by keeping in mind whichever textual passages are textual passages that are confounded and confused, and not in accordance with the true sense of the Pāli and *Aṭṭhakathā*, modest, well-behaved monks, desiring training [and being] scrupulous (*kukkuccaka*) should carry out legal procedures such as higher ordination (*upasampada*), and so on, in a ‘water-splashing boundary’ having accepted [this] judgment indeed which is in accordance with the true sense of the Pāli and *Aṭṭhakathā*.

*Simāvinicchaya*,  
the judgment of Aoṇ mre rhve bhuṃ charā tau bhurāḥ kriḥ,  
is concluded.

**Open Access** This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made.

## Abbreviations

The abbreviations of Pāli texts follow the abbreviations suggested in Helmer Smith, *A Critical Pāli Dictionary, Epilegomena to vol. 1*, Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1948 <<https://cpd.uni-koeln.de/intro/>>. The texts are quoted according to the editions of the Pali Text Society as far as available, for the rest the Burmese Chaṭṭhasaṅgiti editions are quoted.

App.	Appendix in the present article
CSCD	Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana CD-Rom, Version 4.0 (Igatpuri; Vipassana Research Institute).
fol(s).	folio(s)

---

a very difficult matter indeed, as the doctrines of authors of treatises (*kyamḥ charā*) are divergent. In the present time, some authors record a verdict (*sammitṭhān*) reached in accordance with *Vimativinodanīṭika*. The author of *Vinayālaṅkāraṭīkā* [i.e., *Tipiṭakālaṅkāra*], also, speaks firmly in accordance with [the doctrine] transmitted in *Vimativinodanīṭika*. Although, [this] should be noted and considered because [he] speaks having subscribed to the wisdom of the author of *Vimativinodanīṭika* by his own opinion (*attanomati*) [...]’ (Ñāṇ 1933: 339–340). This is interesting insofar as Dhammaceti in his Kalyāṇi Inscriptions clearly opts for the Sinhalese interpretation, see above, n. 264.

- DdB *Darlegung der Bedeutung (Attbasālini). Der Kommentar zur Dhammasaṅgani*, übersetzt von Bhikkhu Nyānaponika, redaktionell bearbeitet und ediert von Sven Bretfeld und Rainer Knopf (Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2005).
- KBZ Moñ Moñ Tañ [Maung Maung Tin], *Kuñḥ bhoñ cak mabārājavan tau kriḥ* [Extended Royal Chronicle of the Konbaung Dynasty]. 3 vols, 4th edn (Yangon: Universities' Historical Research Centre, 2004).
- Kkh *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇi* by Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa, ed. by Kenneth Roy Norman and William Pruitt (Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2003).
- MORA Ministry of Religious Affairs.
- Niss *nissaya*; here used for the *nissaya* to Mañjota's *Simāvinicchaya*.
- Pālim-nt Tipiṭakālaṅkāra, [*Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayanavaṭṭikā*] *Vinayālaṅkāraṭṭikā*, 2 vols (Yangon: Buddhasāsanasamiti, 1962).
- Pāṭha text, here: Mañjota's *Simāvinicchaya*
- r recto
- Sās [*Sāsanavaṃsa*] Paññasāmi, *Sāsanavaṃsa*, ed. by Mabel Bode (London: Pali Text Society, 1897).
- Simāl *Simālaṅkārasaṅgaha*, see References: Kieffer-Pülz. 2021.
- Simā-nd [*Simānayaḍḍappana*] [*Saddhammavaṃsamahānikāyika Sugatasāsanaḍḍajavinayācariya*] Dhammālaṅkāra [Abhidhāna Saṅghanāyakaṭṭhara], *Simānayaḍḍappana*, [with a Pāli preface and an English summary of it by L. Corneille Wijesinha (Mudaliyar); print caused by the minister Tomas Māndis Vijayavikkama Sirivaḍḍhana in Kolambanagare and by the Thānantarika named Arondābrev Vijayasīha in Vālukātittagāma in the year] 2428 = 1885.
- Simāvis [*Simāvisodhanī*] Sāgarabuddhi, *Simāvisodhanī*, CSCD.
- Sp *Samantapāsādikā Vinayaṭṭhakatthā*, 7 vols, ed. by J. Takakusu, M. Nagai (and K. Mizuno in vols v and vii) (London: Pali Text Society, 1924–1947).
- Sp-ṭ [*Sāratthadīpanīṭikā*] Sāriputta [of Poḷonnaruva], *Sāratthadīpanī*, 3 vols (Yangon: Buddhasāsanasamiti, 1960).
- v verso
- Vin *Vinaya Piṭaka*, 5 vols, ed. by Hermann Oldenberg (London: Williams and Norgate, 1879–1883).
- Vin-samūh *Vinayasamūhavinicchaya*, ed. Ūḥ Nigrodha 1899–1901 [1st ed.] *Vinayasamūhavinicchaya*, 3 vols (Mandalay: Mandalay Times Press).  
1904 [4th ed.] *Vinayasamūhavinicchaya*, vol. 1 (Yangon: Erāvati).  
1958 [5th ed.] *Vinayasamūhavinicchaya*, vol. 1 § 3 (Mandalay: Rangoon-Mandalay Book Depot).  
1976 [repr. of 1958] *Vinayasamūhavinicchaya*, vol. 2 (Mandalay: Rangoon-Mandalay Book Depot).



- 2011 [6th ed.] *Vinayasamūhavinicchaya*, 3 vols (Yangon: Buddha cā pe aphvai).
- Vmv Coliṃya Kassa, *Vimativinodaniṭṭika*, 2 vols (Yangon: Buddhasāsana-samiti, 1960).
- Vmv-niss Indāsabha, *Vimativinodaniṭṭika-nissaya*, 2 vols (Yangon: Piṭākabyū-hā, 1983–1984).

## References

- Gornall, Alastair. 2014. ‘How Many Sounds are in Pāli?’, *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 42.5, 511–550.
- Kariyawasam, Tissa. 1973. ‘Religious Activities and The Development of a New Poetical Tradition in Sinhalese, 1852–1906’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of London) <<https://eprints.soas.ac.uk/29003/1/10673247.pdf>> [accessed 8 March 2022].
- Kelasa. 1982. *Mantaleḥ Sāsanaṃvaṇ*, vol. 11 (Yangon: Ministry of Religious Affairs).
- . 2009. *Aṇḥ Va Sāsanaṃvaṇ* (Yangon: Ministry of Religious Affairs).
- . 2010. *Amarapūra Sāsanaṃvaṇ* (Yangon: Rhve Praññ. Cuṃ).
- Kieffer-Pülz, Petra. 1992. *Die Simā. Vorschriften zur Regelung der buddhistischen Gemeindegrenze in älteren buddhistischen Texten*. Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie, 8 (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag).
- . 2005. ‘Die Klassifizierung des Alkoholverbots in der buddhistischen Rechtsliteratur der Theravādin’, in *Im Dickicht der Gebote. Studien zur Dialektik von Norm und Praxis in der Buddhismusgeschichte Asiens*, ed. by Peter Schalk and others. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Historia Religionum, 26 (Uppsala: Universitet): 153–223.
- . 2013. *Verlorene Gaṇṭhipadas zum buddhistischen Ordensrecht. Untersuchungen zu den in der Vajirabuddhiṭṭikā zitierten Kommentaren Dhammasiris und Vajirabuddhis*, 3 vols, Veröffentlichungen der Indologischen Kommission, 1 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag).
- . 2015. ‘Quotatives indicating quotations in Pāli commentarial literature, 1. *Iti/iti* and quotatives with *vuttam*’, in *The Reuse in Indian Philosophical texts*, ed. by Elisa Freschi. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 43.4, 427–452.
- . 2016–2017. ‘Translocational Debates and Legal Hermeneutics. Early Pali Vinaya Texts in the Adjudication of Simā Procedures c. 1200–1900 CE’, *Buddhism, Law and Society*, 2, 103–158.
- . 2021. *A Manual of the Adornment of the Monastic Boundary: Vācīsara’s Simālaṅkārasaṅgaha, Edition and Annotated Translation*. Veröffentlichungen der Fächergruppenkommission für Außereuropäische Sprachen und Kulturen, 8 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag).
- . 2023a. ‘The *Sāsanaṃvaṃsa*’s dates of the Sinhalese delegations that traveled to Burma because of the dispute about the monastic boundary (*simā*) of Balapitiya’, in *Śāntamatīḥ: Manuscripts for Life—Essays in Memory of Seishi Karashima*, ed. by N. Kudo. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica,

- 15 (Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University), 191–206
- . 2023b. ‘Vimalasāratissa’s *Sāsanavaṃsadiṭṭhā* on the dispute about the monastic boundary (*simā*) of Balapitṭiya’, *Annual Report of the International Research Institute of Advanced Buddhism*, 24, 77–96.
- . 2023c. ‘*Simā* treatises with a focus on illustrated manuscripts’, in *Proceedings of the Third International Pali Studies Week, Paris 2018*, ed. by Claudio Cicuzza. Materials for the Study of the Tripitaka, 18 (Bangkok and Lumbini: Fragile Palm Leaves and Lumbini International Research Institute).
- . forthcoming. *The Dispute about the Validity of the simā of Balapitṭiya in 19th c. Sri Lanka, 1: Nēyyadhamma’s Simāvivādavinicchayakathā. Edition and Translation*. Studia Indologica Universitatis Halensis, 26 (Halle: Universitäts-Verlag Halle-Wittenberg).
- Ko Ko Naing. 2010. ‘Buddhism in the Late Konbaung Period (1819–1885)’, (unpublished doctoral thesis, Department of History. University of Mandalay, Myanmar. June). <<http://tinyurl.com/36r5h8s8>> [accessed 8 March 2024].
- Lammerts, D. Christian. 2018. *Buddhist Law in Burma. A History of Dhammasattha Texts and Jurisprudence, 1250–1850* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press).
- Malalgoda, Kitsiri. 1976. *Buddhism in Sinhalese Society 1750–1900. A Study of Religious Revival and Change* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Maung Maung Nyunt. 2003. *Mran mā nuiṅ. ṇaṃ pāli nbaṅ. piṭakat cā pe samuiṅṅ sac* (Yangon: Cā pe bimān).
- Minayeff, J. P. 1887. ‘*Simā-vivāda-vinicchayā-kathā*’, *Journal of the Pāli Text Society*, 2, 17–34.
- Nagasena, Bhikkhu. 2012. ‘The monastic boundary (*simā*) in Burmese Buddhism: authority, purity and validity in historical and modern contexts’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, School for Oriental and African Studies, University of London) <<http://eprints.soas.ac.uk/17369>> [accessed 25 march 2024].
- Nagasena, Bhikkhu & Kate Crosby. 2022. ‘*Simā* Basics from Buddha to Burma’, in *Simās: Foundations of Buddhist Religion*, ed. by Jason A. Carbine and Erik W. Davis (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press), 18–40.
- Ñāṇ. 1933. *Vinayasāraṅgaṅṅhi kyambḥ* (Yangon: Sudhammavati).
- Norman, Kenneth Roy, Petra Kieffer-Pülz, and William Pruitt (transl). 2018. *Overcoming Doubts (Kaṅkḥāvitaraṅṅi)*, vol. 1: *The Bhikkhu-Pātimokkha Commentary* (Bristol: Pali Text Society).
- Peters, Anne. 2000. *Burmese Manuscripts, Part 4: Catalogue Numbers 736–900*. Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, xxiii, 4 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag).
- . 2004. *Birmanische Handschriften, Teil 5: Die Katalognummern 901–1015*. Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland xxiii, 5 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag).
- Rājinda. 2004 [1st ed. 1928]. *Sāsanabāhussutappakāsani* (Yangon: Mī khaṅ erāvati).

Wiles, Royce, Chris Clark, Tamara Dittrich, Mark Allon. 2021. 'The Pāli Tipiṭaka Recension Carved on the Kuthodaw Pagoda Stelae and Its Relation to Other Burmese Versions', *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, 34, 155–226.

## List of Subjects, Titles and Technical Terms

- abaddbasimā* ('undetermined boundary') 63, 65, 67; notes 35, 38, 116, 117, 169, 210
- achumḥ apbrat* see *vinicchaya*
- adhippāya* ('intended meaning') note 101
- Aṅbagahapīṭiyē Vimalasāratissa 59, 60
- anak achumḥ apbrat kui* see *atthavinicchaya*
- Aoṅ mre rhve bhuṃ charā tau (Ketudhamma) 61, 64, 69, 88, 111; note 17, see also Ketudhamma
- Ariyāvamsa 61, 63, 88
- asaṅkaravādins* ('non-confusionists') 58, notes 11, 33
- attha* ('sense') note 101
- atthavinicchaya* ('judgment on the sense'; Burmese *anak achumḥ apbrat*) 87–89, note 101
- baddhasimā* ('determined boundary') 62–63, 65, 67; notes 34, 38, 116, 118, 191, 210–211, 220, 225, 230, 247, 258–259, 264
- chumḥ pbrat kroṅḥ* ('judgment, verdict') note 239
- 'confusionists' see *sankaravādins*
- 'determined boundary' see *baddhasimā*
- gāmakkbetta* notes 161, 205
- gāmasimā* ('village boundary') 58–60, 63, 65–69; notes 9, 32, 35, 117–118, 120, 138, 160–161, 170, 187, 205, 208, 210, 215, 230, 249, 256, 258–259, 264, 267, 269, 278, 293; note i; 'village boundary-condition' 67–69, 82, 84, 97, 98
- batthapāsa* ('arm's reach') note 143
- 'Judgment' see *vinicchaya* 6; 'judgment on the sense' see *atthavinicchaya*
- Ketudhamma 59, 61–63, notes 17, 27; Ketudhamma's *Simāvinicchaya* 59, 61–62, 64–66, 69–70, 88–111; note 21; notes a, d, f, g, h, j, k, l, m;
- Khaṅ ma kaṃ (= Khaṅ ma kan) charā tau 58, 60–61, 88, see also Mañijota
- kbre* ('foot') note 228
- khuddakagandha* 59, 70; notes 10–11, 102
- Mañijota (Khaṅ ma kan charā tau) 59–61, 63–66, 68–69, notes 11, 36; Mañijota's *Simāvinicchaya* 63–66, 69–88, note 11
- 'monastery boundary' see *vihārasimā*
- nadīpārasimā* ('*nadīpāra* boundary') 62–63, 94, 95, 99–101, notes 220, 223–226, 229–230, 246, 255,
- nadīsīmā* notes 206, 249
- nanu ca* note 151
- Ñeyyadhamma, Saṅgharāja 57–58, 60, notes 4, 11, 24, 33, 260, 264, 271
- nissaya* note 287
- nissayasimā* ('foundation boundary') notes 247, 269, 287
- 'non-confusionists' see *asaṅkaravādins*
- 'Purification of a boundary' see *simā-sodhana*
- sabbāga* ('homogenous') notes 248–249, 269; *-simā* ('homogenous boundary') 102, note 258
- sankaravādins* ('confusionists') 57–58; notes 28, 33

*sannitṭhānaṃ* 103, notes 166, 168, 239, 241, 300  
*Sibhaladīpa-udakukkhepasīmāvinicchaya* *kyamaḥ* and *nissya* 58  
*Sibhaladīpa-udakukkhepasīmāvivādivinicchaya* 58  
*simā* ('boundary') 62, 64–65, 70, notes 3, 11, 29–31, 127, 143, 211, 220, 225, 229–230, 249  
*simāsodhana* ('purification of a boundary') 67, notes 134, 208  
*Sīmānayadapana* note 262  
*simāpekkha* note 250  
*Simāvinicchaya* note 19, 29, see also *Ketudhamma*; *Mañijota*; *Ñeyyadhamma*  
*Sīmāvivādivinicchayakathā* 58, 260, 262, 264, note 11  
*Sūriya*, *Saṅgharāja* 60, note 14  
*tena vuttaṃ* note 173  
*udakukkhepasimā* ('water-splashing boundary') 57, 59–60, 63, 65–66,

68–69, 76; 'water-splashing boundary-condition' 68, 69, notes 3, 38, 247, 249–250,  
'undetermined boundary' see *abaddhasimā*  
*vihārasimā* ('monastery boundary') 77–80, 91–92, notes 34, 116, 120, 138, 205, 208, 210–211, 278; note i  
'village boundary' see *gāmasimā*  
*Vimativinodaniṭṭikā* 59, 110, notes 269, 300  
*vinicchaya* ('judgment', Burmese *achumḥ aḥbrat*) 66, 69, notes 20, 29, 99, 166  
*visabhāga* notes 248–249, 278  
*visabhāgasimā* ('heterogenous boundary') 100, 102–103  
*vuccate* note 154  
'water-splashing boundary' see *udakukkhepasimā*