

BMC2, Chapter 10:

*In the section on wrong livelihood, in the paragraph beginning, “To prevent a bhikkhu from pursuing gain with gain...”*

*The sentence:*

To do so is called a theft of faith.

*Should be replaced with this sentence:*

To do so is called bringing a gift of faith to waste.

BMC2, Chapter 23:

*In the section on communal relations, the fourth paragraph, beginning, “In other areas, however,” should be replaced with the following:*

In other areas, however, the bhikkhus continued to play a role in the bhikkhuni’s Community transactions. If the bhikkhunis were planning to impose a disciplinary transaction on another bhikkhuni, they were to consult with the bhikkhus as to what the precise punishment should be and were bound by the bhikkhus’ decision. The Commentary to Cv.X.7 notes that if they imposed a different transaction from that determined by the bhikkhus, they incurred a dukkaṭa under Mv.IX.6.3.

*Immediately prior to the section on Exhortation, this section should be inserted:*

*Ordination.* After receiving full Acceptance, Mahāpajāpati Gotamī approached the Buddha and asked him what should be done with the 500 Sakyan women who had followed her in requesting ordination. The Buddha’s reply was to allow that bhikkhunis be given full Acceptance by bhikkhus (Cv.X.2.1).

When this allowance was first given, it obviously meant that bhikkhus could give full Acceptance to lay women. Over time, however, as the Bhikkhuni Saṅgha developed, the pattern for full Acceptance changed until it arrived at the pattern set forth in the sixth rule of respect (Cv.X.17). In other words, the candidate for full Acceptance first formally requested training from the Bhikkhuni Saṅgha, after which she underwent a training period in which she was not to break any of the first six of the ten precepts for two years. (Apparently she did this as a novice nun, although this point is controversial.) If she broke any of these six precepts, the two-year training period was begun again. When she had completed two full years of this training without break, the Bhikkhuni

Saṅgha—after authorizing her as having completed the training—would give her full Acceptance (Bhikkhuni Pc 63, 64, 66, 67, 72, & 73).

Unlike the Bhikkhu Saṅgha, where two or three candidates sharing the same preceptor could be ordained with a single transaction statement, only one candidate could be accepted as a bhikkhuni in a single transaction statement, inasmuch as one sponsor (*pavattani*), the female equivalent of a preceptor, could not take on more than one student within a span of two consecutive years (Bhikkhuni Pc 82 & 83).

Immediately after her Acceptance in the Bhikkhuni Saṅgha, the candidate was to be taken to the Bhikkhu Saṅgha, where she was to be given full Acceptance a second time (Cv.X.17.8). If, however, there were dangers in taking her to the Bhikkhu Saṅgha, a messenger—an experienced, competent bhikkhuni—could be sent in her place (Cv.X.22). In either event, only when the candidate's Acceptance had been ratified by the Bhikkhu Saṅgha was she considered fully ordained.

In establishing these procedures, the Buddha retained the earlier allowance for bhikkhus to give full Acceptance for bhikkhunis but altered it so that it applied only to a candidate who had properly followed all the preliminary procedures, from requesting training to being given Acceptance by the Bhikkhuni Saṅgha (Cv.X.17.2).

It has been argued that because the original allowance for bhikkhus to ordain bhikkhunis was never explicitly rescinded, it is still in place, and so bhikkhus may ordain bhikkhunis without the candidates' having to go through the preliminary procedures. This argument is based on drawing a parallel to the way in which the Acceptance of bhikkhus changed in the early years of the Teaching, in which the allowance for the Community to give Acceptance by means of a transaction with one motion and three proclamations (Mv.I.28.3) explicitly rescinded the earlier allowance (Mv.I.12.4) for groups of bhikkhus to give the Going-forth and Acceptance by means of the three goings for refuge. This, the argument claims, establishes a pattern that can be applied to bhikkhuni ordination as well. If the Buddha had meant for the allowance in Cv.X.2.1 to be fully rescinded, he would have said so in Cv.X.17.2.

However, this argument ignores the fact that the Buddha followed two different patterns in changing Community transactions, depending on the type of changes made. Only when withdrawing permission for something he had earlier explicitly allowed (as in Mv.I.28.3 and Cv.X.7) did he follow the pattern of explicitly rescinding the earlier allowance or imposing an offense on taking advantage of it. When keeping an earlier allowance while adding new conditions to it, he followed a second pattern, in which he merely stated the new conditions for the allowance and gave directions for how the new form of the transactions should be conducted. Examples for this second pattern include the changes in the Community transaction for the Acceptance of bhikkhus (Mv.I.38.3-5; Mv.I.76.10-12) and the authorization of areas where one is not apart from one's robes (Mv.II.12.1-2; Mv.II.12.3-4). When a Community transaction is modified in this way, the rescinding of the earlier transaction pattern is made clear by the fact that the revised directions state explicitly, "this is how it should be agreed upon,"

“this is how the Saṅgha is to be informed.” This, in effect, means that the older procedures should no longer be used.

Because Cv.X.17.2, the passage allowing bhikkhus to give full Acceptance to a candidate who has been given Acceptance by the Bhikkhuni Saṅgha, simply adds new conditions to the earlier allowance given in Cv.X.2.1, it follows this second pattern. This automatically rescinds the earlier allowance.

The valid reasons for rescinding the earlier allowance are not hard to see. As long as the Bhikkhuni Saṅgha was still in existence, Cv.X.17.2 ensured that bhikkhus could not add new members to the Bhikkhuni Saṅgha without the consent of the latter. In other words, the bhikkhus could not force the bhikkhunis to accept into their Community new members they didn’t want. In the event that the original Bhikkhuni Saṅgha died out, Cv.X.17.2 prevents bhikkhus from granting Acceptance to women when they are unable to provide them with a properly trained Community of bhikkhunis under which to train.

*In the Rules section of the chapter:*

*This paragraph:*

“I allow that bhikkhunis be given full Acceptance by bhikkhus.”—Cv.X.2.1 “I allow that one who has been given full Acceptance on one side and purified (of the 24 obstructing factors) in the Bhikkhuni Saṅgha be given full Acceptance in the Bhikkhu Saṅgha.”—Cv.X.17.2

*should be placed before this paragraph:*

Procedure and transaction statement for the acceptance of women into the Bhikkhuni Saṅgha—Cv.X.17

*This last paragraph should be changed to this:*

Procedure and transaction statement for the acceptance of women into the Bhikkhuni Saṅgha—Cv.X.17 (See also Bhikkhuni Pc 63, 64, 66, 67, 72, 73, 75, 82, & 83.)