

Apratipatti and *duṣpratipatti* in the Daṃbadeni Katikāvata and Mahāparākramabāhu Katikāvata

VEN UDAYAGIRIYE DHAMMASIRI THERO

1 Introduction

Polonnaruva period (1055–1232 CE) and Daṃbadeni period (1220–1345 CE) are considered as the most powerful periods in Sri Lankan monarchical history. Rulers of these periods gave their priorities to Buddhism because it had significant capabilities that could effect to the political authority of the country. To safeguard Buddhism was a duty of the kings in Sri Lanka. Katikāvatas, the supplementary rules for the Order (*saṅgha*), has been enacted by the kings in order to preserve Buddhism.

It was various misconducts of the Buddhist monks that caused the kings to enact the Mahāparākramabāhu Katikāvata (1153–1186 CE, MPK) and the Daṃbadeni Katikāvata (1230–1234 CE, DK). The misconducts, which are performed through ignorance or imperfect knowledge, are described in these Katikāvatas either as *apratipatti* (“misbehavior” or “bad behavior”) or *duṣpratipatti* (“inappropriate behavior”).¹

This paper examines various instances of *apratipatti* and *duṣpratipatti* that caused the kings to enact the aforementioned Katikāvatas. The reason that the kings considered each type of misconduct as *apratipatti* and *duṣpratipatti* shall be clarified in this paper.

2 *Apratipatti* and *duṣpratipatti* in Katikāvatas

Both Mahāparākramabāhu Katikāvata and Daṃbadeni Katikāvata mainly focus on diminishing *apratipatti* and *duṣpratipatti*.

[MPK 2; DK 2]

Ajñāna durjñāna mūlaka apratipatti duṣpratipatti viṣa-vega vihata-vā apāyānavana śāsanāvacara kula-putrayan dākā supariśuddha Buddha-śāsanayehi mā-vāni ājñā-cakravarttiyak-hu me vāni kilu-ṭak dākā dākā udāsīna vuva-hot Budu-sasna nassī boho sat-hu-du apāya-bhāg-veti... (Wickremasinghe 1928: 269–270)

“The king having seen the sons of the noble families who were to be born in the *apāya* (purgatory, or bad states in *saṃsāra*)² influenced by misbehaviors (*apratipatti*) and inappropriate behaviors (*duṣpratipatti*) through ignorance (*ajñāna*) and imperfect knowledge (*durjñāna*), thought as follows: Seeing over and over again pollution such as this on immaculate Buddhism, if a mighty emperor like myself remains indifferent, the Buddhist doctrines (*Budu-sasna*) will perish, and many living being will be born in the *apāya*.”

The king states that misbehaviors and inappropriate behaviors cause the destruction of Buddhism, and that they also cause the followers of Buddhism to be born in bad states in *saṃsāra*. Letting Buddhism be

¹Different interpretations of *apratipatti* and *duṣpratipatti* are offered by contemporary scholars. Wickremasinghe (1928: 274) translates *apratipatti* and *duṣpratipatti* as “non-perception and ill-perception,” while Nandasena Ratnapala (1971: 136) explains them as “non-observances and ill-observances.”

²The term *apāya* means transitory status of suffering after death. In the Pāli canons, it is said that there are four *apāyas* (see Chandawimala 1949: 205–210).

destroyed by itself is a king's lethargy. Therefore, the king says that he has a considerable responsibility to protect Buddhism.

As will be shown below, *apratipatti* and *duṣpratipatti* stand for two different meanings. Engaging in something that a monk should not engaged is called having *apratipatti*. For instance, conversation with a woman in a covered place is extremely prohibited by the monastic disciplines, and hence it is regarded in the *Katikāvata* as *apratipatti* (see §2.7). Then, engaging in practices in an inappropriate or violative manner, even if it may not violate the monastic discipline, is called *duṣpratipatti*. For instance, talking while worshipping the *Cetiyas* and Great Bodhi-trees is regarded as *duṣpratipatti* (see §2.6). This implies that an activity that is allowed by the monastic discipline should be performed in a prescribed, and not an inappropriate way.

2.1 Manners in front of the elder monks

It is known that there was no rule legislated for the Order in the first twenty years after the enlightenment of the Buddha Śākyamuni, during which the Order was ruled only by the *pāṭimokkha* in the form of instruction (*ovādapāṭimokkha*).³ As can be seen in many passages from the *Vinaya Piṭaka*, monks were merely advised to behave in a way that was pleasing to others.⁴ However, in the course of time, the misconducts of the monks that caused the destruction of purity of Buddhism came to be considered as the major problem of the Buddhist Order. In *Daṃbadeṇiya* period of Sri Lanka too, there were many cases where the misbehaviors of the monks affected the well-being of Buddhism. One problem is the contemptuous manner of young monks towards senior monks. It is mentioned in both MPK and DK as follows:

[MPK 25; DK 59]

*“Idh’ ekacco saṅgho’pi acittikāarakato there bhikkhu ghaṭṭayanto’pi nisīdati thitako’pi bhaṇati bāhā vikkhepako’pi siraṃ parāmasati”*⁵ *yī anācāra nirdeśayehi vadāla bāvin saṅga mādaṭa eḷabiyahu visin sabramsarun verin evu sivuren evu no-ghāṭiyā yutu. Mahalu saṅgun hā biṇuva manā karuṇak āta ādara dakvā no-lam-va nāmī-siṭa at no-vanā biṇiya-yutu.* (EZ II 267)

“It is said in the *Anācāranirdeśa*:⁶ “A certain member of the Order who having gone to an assembly of the Order stands and sits rudely brushing against the senior brethren, speaks while standing and while stretching out his arms and strokes the head of a boy [thereby commits misdemeanor].” Therefore, also those [bhikkhus] who move amidst the Order should not brush against them either with their bodies or with their robes. If there is a matter that has to be discussed with senior bhikkhus they [namely, the juniors] should converse with them with proper respect standing not too close, with body bent [in veneration] and without any gesticulation. At any place he [namely, a bhikkhu] should

³DhP 183: *Sabbapāpassa akaraṇaṃ kusalassa upasampadā, sacittapariyodapanaṃ etaṃ Buddhāna sāsanaṃ.* (Fausbøll 1900: 42: “To avoid all the evils, to cultivate the good, and to cleanse one’s mind—this is the teaching of the Buddhas.”)

⁴Vin I 45.5: *N’etaṃ bhikkhave appasannānaṃ vā pasādāya pasannānaṃ vā bhiyyobhāvāya, atha kho taṃ bhikkhave appasannānaṃ c’eva appasādāya pasannānaṃ ca ekaccānaṃ aññathattāyā’ ti.* (Oldenberg 1879: 58: “It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased, nor for increasing (the number of) those who are pleased, but it is, monks, for displeasing those who are not (yet) pleased as well as those who are pleased, and for causing wavering in some.”)

⁵Vism 18.14-17.

⁶The *Anācāranirdeśa* is a section of *Sīlaniddeso* (chap. 1) from the *Visuddhimagga*, which deals with the topics pertaining to misconducts (*anācāra*).

not touch the body of a boy and console him.”⁷

One thing that is clear from this passage is that at that period there existed young monks who did not show their respect to elder monks. They lacked the knowledge of how to behave in front of elder monks. Acting in a rude manner in front of elder monks is considered as a violation of the monastic disciplines, and hence a misbehavior (*apratipatti*).⁸

2.2 How to smile

Misbehaviors and inappropriate behaviors of monks are further described in the Katikāvatas. Let us consider the following instances from MPK and DK.

[MPK 20]

Sināvaṭṭa nisi karuṇek’hi-du haṅḍa no-vihidā muva vasā satuṭu pamaṇak dākviya-yutu. (Ratnapala 1971: 150)

“Even in a matter of laughter, they should have a smile that shows only happiness by closing the mouth without showing teeth.”

[DK 54]

Sināvaṭṭa nisi karuṇek’hi bālayan-se dat-vāhārā haṅḍa-vihidā sinā no-sī muva satuṭu pamaṇak dākviyā-yutu. (Ratnapala 1971: 150)

“Even if there is just a cause for laughter, [a monk] should only show his pleasure with closed mouth without showing teeth and laughing like children, making a great noise.”

Monks can show their happiness only in the occasion where they should show it. Laughing with a large noise is considered as *duṣpratipatti*. Although there is a slight difference between these texts, both MPK and DK prohibit laughing indecently and state that monks should only smile to show their feeling of happiness and pleasure. This is in line with the statement of the *Āṅguttaranikāya*, where immediate laughter that displays teeth is reckoned as childishness.⁹

2.3 Touching children

The Buddha advises the monks not to have a close relationship with lay people, saying that a relationship between the monk and the lay people should always be a new one.¹⁰ For a close relationship with lay people can be a hinderance to the monk’s development of spiritual life.¹¹

[MPK 25; DK 59]

Kisi tāneki’hi-du komarun verā atlā no-sānaviya-yutu.

“They should not touch and calm lay children at all.”

⁷Cf. Ratnapala 1971: 51.

⁸Vin I 44.2

⁹AN I 261.4–5: *komāarakam idaṃ bhikkhave ariyassa vinaye yad idaṃ ativelaṃ dantavidamaṣakam hasitaṃ.* (“Monks, this is reckoned as childishness in the discipline of the Aryas, namely, excessive laughter that displays the teeth.”)

¹⁰SN II 197.29–198.1: *Candupamā bhikkhave kulāni upasaṅkamatha, apakasseva kāyam apakassa cittaṃ...* (“Monks, approach the householders with the alienated body and the alienated mind like the moon...”)

¹¹See Rerukane 1960: 202.

According to the passage quoted above, we can assume that several monks did misbehavior by brushing the heads and bodies of children. These conducts are considered as *apratipatti* in which a monk should not engage at all.

2.4 Relationship with lay people

Katikāvatas also provide rules to enhance interpersonal relationships between monks and laities. Blaming helpful laities who have faith in Buddhism is an ecclesiastical offense. Katikāvatas recommend monks to protect the dignity of the laities in order to secure the relationship between them.¹² Let us examine the following sentences from MPK and DK:

[MPK 15]

Hāma-velehi-ma kipi-sitin-vat keḷi-sitin-vat no-sarup tepul kisivak’hu hā no-biṇiya-yutu. (Ratnapala 1971: 40)

“[Monks] should not talk with anger or in jest anytime. At all the times, they should refrain from talking either with thoughts of anger or in jest.”

[DK 82]

Gihī-paṭisaṇṇiyuktaya-nam gihīn kṣamā-karavā desuva-manā bāvin yaṭat-piriseyin samīpayehi vasana abhiyuktayāṭat jātyādīn ghaṭā no-biṇiya yutu. (Ratnapala 1971: 59)

“As the *Gihī-paṭisaṇṇiyukta-kamma*¹³ should be performed only after obtaining pardon from laymen, even an *abhiyukta*¹⁴ who lives in one’s own proximity should not be rudely addressed by mentioning his birth etc.”

The quotations mentioned above deal with misbehaviors of monks in relation to laities. Criticizing a laity on unjustifiable matters is an inappropriate behavior. In the Buddha’s days, a monk named Sudhamma, who resided at Macchikāsaṇḍa, criticized a householder named Citta on an insignificant matter like sesame balls.¹⁵ It was considered as a despicable activity which should not be done by a monk. Katikāvatas provide details about similar misconducts that were conducted by the monks in Daṁbadeṇi period.

A monk should not blame anyone based on race or caste. Buddhaghosa details how Sudhamma blamed Citta on his race.¹⁶ According to Katikāvatas quoted above, monks are not allowed to blame even an *abhiyukta*, a servant in the monastery. Such a conduct is completely prohibited and considered as *apratipatti*.

One of the important objectives of Katikāvatas is to protect the rights of laities. The monks should live in such a way as to preserve the dignity of the laities. If they blame a householder, they are to be punished in accordance with the monastic disciplines.

¹²See Ratnapala 1971: 59

¹³*Paṭisārnīyakamma* “formal act of reconciliation” is carried out for the monks who blame the faithful householders in Buddhism. See Vin II 18.5–20.

¹⁴A person who lives in a temple for the service of the monks. In modern Sinhalese, *abhiyuktaya* is called *ābittayā*.

¹⁵See Vin II 17.5–18.

¹⁶See Sp VI, 1158.14–20.

2.5 Daily conversations

MPK and DK show that the monks who lived in both Polonnaruva period and Daṃbadeṇi period were verbally undisciplined. We find in the Katikāvatas evidences that the monks lived by having “an animal talk” (*tiraścīnakathā*).¹⁷

[MPK 13; DK 97]

Sannipatitānaṃ “vo bhikkhave dvyam karaṇīyam: dhammī vā kathā ariyo vā tunhī-bhāvo”¹⁸ yi vadāla bāvin dharmma kathā manaskāra dekin piṭat tiraścīna-kathā hā kāma vitarkkādi pāpa vitarkkayen no-yeidī... (Ratnapala 1971: 40, 62)

“It is said thus: ‘O bhikkhus! there are two things that should be done by the monks: religious conversation and noble silence’. So the monks should not dwell with having despicable talks and evil thoughts such as sensual thoughts except religious talks and fixed thoughts.”

[MPK 24; DK 58]

Āt-gamhi gihi-minisun hā pasa piḷibaṇḍa kathā-da visabhāga kahā-da no-kaṭa-yutu. (Ratnapala 1971: 41, 55)

“They should not talk with the laities of the villages about requisites and improper subjects.”¹⁹

The Katikāvata prohibits talks about requisites (*pasa piḷibaṇḍa kathā*) as well as despicable talks (*anna kathā* and *itthi kathā*) since they should be refrained by the monks.²⁰ Although having conversation with co-residents does not violate the monastic disciplines, having such inappropriate discussion is considered as *duṣpratipatti*.

2.6 Manners in worshipping

Performing religious rituals are one of the main daily activities of the monastic life. The Katikāvatas demand that they should be performed in a respectful manner towards the holy places in the monastery, as can be seen in the following quotation:

[MPK 23; DK 57]

Dahaḡab mahaṃbo ä vandimin ganda dum-mal ä pudamin dāvaṭu vaḷaṇḍamin pā kassehi lamin no-biniyā-yutu. (Ratnapala 1971: 41, 56)

“They should not talk while worshipping the Cetiya, the Great Bodhi-tree, etc., or while making

¹⁷Pāli: *tiraścīnakathā*. A despicable talk that should not be made by a monk. DN I 178.3–4: *rājakathaṃ corakathaṃ mahāmatkathaṃ senākathaṃ bhayakathaṃ yuddhakathaṃ annakathaṃ pānakathaṃ vatthakathaṃ sayanakathaṃ mālākathaṃ gandhakathaṃ ñātikathaṃ yānakathaṃ gāmakathaṃ nigamakathaṃ nagarakathaṃ janapadakathaṃ itthikathaṃ purisakathaṃ sarakathaṃ visikhākathaṃ kumbhaṭṭhānakathaṃ pubbaṭṭakathaṃ nānattakathaṃ lokakkhāyikaṃ samuddakkhāyikaṃ iti bhavābhavakathaṃ* (“Tale of kings, of robbers, of ministers, of state; tale of war, of terrors, of battles; talks about foods and drinks, cloths, beds, garlands, perfumes, talks about relationships, equipages, villages, town, cities and countries; tales about women and about heroes; gossip at street corners, or places whence water is fetched; ghost stories: desultory talks; speculations about the creation of the land or sea, or about existence and nonexistence, which is not appropriate for monks.”)

¹⁸MN I 161.31–33.

¹⁹Cf. Ratnapala 1971: 134.

²⁰See DN I 178.3–4.

offerings of fragrance, flowers, etc., or while partaking of *dāvutu*,²¹ or while slipping the begging-bowl in its case.”²²

The statement from MPK and DK indicate that the monks of Polonnaruva period and Daṃbadeṇi period acted in rude manners when they commit with religious practices. Talking while engaging in religious practices does not violate the monastic discipline but it is strictly prohibited.²³ Furthermore, having an unnecessary conversation while worshiping holy places such as Cetiya and Bodhi tree is considered as a disrespectful manner towards such places. These conducts are regarded as *duṣpratipattis*. The monks are expected to live showing respect not only for the holy places but also for the teachers, preceptors, and the monks who are living with him. Respecting each other is stated as an important factor in the Katikāvata, where the monks are instructed to worship each other and to show their respect three times in a day.²⁴

2.7 Personal relationships

Having personal relationships even with his own former families and having conversation with them in a covered place are not acceptable for a monk.

[MPK 16]

Mavunu-du vuva vi'sa bhāgayan hā-da malaku-du-vuva ḷadaru bālayaku hā-da (rahas'hi) no-biṇiya-yutu. (Ratnapala 1971: 11)

“No secret conversation should be carried on with women even if [the women with whom one converses] is his own mother, or with a youth even if [he is] his own younger brother.”²⁵

[DK 45]

Mavunu-du-vuva piḷisan tenaka-vat piḷiyehi-vat visabhāgayan hā tani-vā siṭā no-biṇiya-yutu. (Ratnapala 1971: 55)

“They should not converse with member of the opposite sex all alone in a covered place or in the backyard of a house even if [the person with whom one converse is] his own mother.”

MPK forbids the monks to talk even with children even if they are own brothers, while in DK this prohibition is removed. We may assume therefore that, during the time from the Polonnaruva period to the Daṃbadeṇiya period, some misconducts of the monks toward children must have disappeared. That being said, it is clear that in both periods the monks sometimes behaved immorally toward women.

As a practitioner of spiritual life, a monk is expected to give up worldly affairs. Especially, he is not allowed to have any relationship with women. Private talks with women are completely prohibited by the monastic disciplines also.²⁶ Such misconducts are considered to be *apratipattis*.

²¹The leaf of an Asian evergreen climbing plant that is used as a mild stimulant. Parings of areca nut, lime, and cinnamon are wrapped in the leaf, which is then chewed, causing the saliva to go red, and with prolonged use, the teeth to go black.

²²Cf. Ratnapala 1971: 151.

²³See Sp VI 1233.2–4.

²⁴See Ratnapala 1971: 163–162.

²⁵Cf. Ratnapala 1971: 132.

²⁶See Vin IV 96.1.

2.8 Leaving monastery at inappropriate times

Leaving a monastery at inappropriate times could be dangerous to the lives of monks and it could bring a bad reputation for them. Therefore, the king tried to manage such conducts of the monks by enacting the following rules:

[MPK 9]

“*Mevun häme-denāge no-hämmena vādumav-piya de-denā hā ek-kusa-hot kaṇvāndaṁbu naṅgun būnun hā sabramsarun hā mehekaruvan piṇisa ahara siṅgā-yana gamanak hā me-kīvaun-mā rogīvuva behedak hā sabramsaruṅṭa behet-pasa siṅgā-yana gamank hā (pāvarū tānakaṭa) piritāṭa yana gamank mut meyin piṭat kaṭayuttakaṭa kāla vikālayehi āt-gamaṭa samu no-diya-yutu.*” (Ratnapala 1971: 39)

“No permission should be given to any of these [bhikkhus] to enter the village at improper times on any business other than on account of a journey begging food for the unsupported parents who had given birth to them, likewise for their consanguineous widowed elder and younger sisters, for the fellow bhikkhus, and for servants; or on account of a journey to procure medicine for the above-mentioned persons when they are ill, or to beg the five medicinal requirements for the fellow bhikkhus; or on account of a journey to recite *Paritta* at an appointed place.”²⁷

[DK 40]

“*Sthavira nava madhyama häma-denā visin-mā vādū mavu-piyan dennāṭa hā ek-kusehi-hot kaṇvāndaṁbu naṅgun būnanaṭa hā sabramsarun mehekarun piṇisa ahara siṅgā-yana gamanak hā me-kīvun rogīvuva unṭa behet hā sabramsaruṅṭa behet-pasa siṅgā-yana gamanak hā pāvarū tānakaṭa piritāṭa yana gamanak mut an-kisi kaṭayuttakaṭa kāla-vikālayehi āt-gamaṭa no-yā-yutu.*” (Ratnapala 1971: 54)

“All the bhikkhus—the senior *theras*, the junior ones, and those of the middle grade—should not visit a village at wrong times on any business except on account of a journey begging foods for the unsupported parents who had given birth to them, for those born of the same parents if there are any, for their consanguineous widowed elder and younger sisters, for the fellow bhikkhus, and servants; or on account of a journey in case of illness to procure medicinal requirements for the fellow bhikkhus; or on account of a journey to recite *Paritta* at an appointed place.”²⁸

During the early period of Buddhism, monks lived an itinerant life. They were advised to carry out their religious activities as travelers.²⁹ In the Daṁbadeniya period in Sri Lanka also, monks are allowed to enter a village and engage in religious activities. However, at that period, they sometimes misused aforementioned freedom. They engaged in suspicious activities other than religious activities. This implies that the monks often entered the village and engaged in immoral activities, which the king needed to control.

Entering a village on account of an unnecessary matter without a prior consent of a responsible monk

²⁷Cf. Ratnapala 1971: 131

²⁸Cf. Ratnapala 1971: 148.

²⁹SN I 105.1–5: *caratha bhikkhave cārikaṇ bahujanahitāya bahujanasukhāya lokānukampāya atthāya hitāya sukhāya devamanussānaṇ;* (“Walk, monks, on tour for the blessing of the many people, for the happiness of the many people out of compassion for the world, for the welfare, the blessing, the happiness of gods and men.”)

is prohibited by the monastic discipline.³⁰ This conduct is therefore considered as *apratipatti*.³¹

2.9 Walking in public

A monk should be self-restrained in all ways and his foremost aim should be *nibbāna*.³² Controlling both bodily and verbal activities are the primary factors of the self-restraint. Monks should be careful not to be unrestrained when they are wandering the village.

[MPK 19]

Gaman yannak’hu visin mahalu saṅgunge temī nasnaṭa sudusu pirikarak tamā at’hi āta mut aturehi vāsi āva-da piyavi gamanin-mā no-temena tān eḷābiyā-yutu; ebandu pirikarak āta sarup vele viyekin-mā yā-yutu. (Ratnapala 1971: 41)

“A bhikkhu, bound on a journey, carrying with him the elders’ requisites that are liable to be damaged by rain, should continue his normal gait and seek shelter even in the event of a rainfall. When he has such requisites, he should walk in an appropriate speed.”³³

[DK 53]

Gaman yannak’hu visin mahalu sabramsarungē temī nasnaṭa nisi pirikarak at’hi āt-mut aturehi vāsi āta-da piyavi gamanin-mā no-temena tenakaṭa eḷābiyā-yutu; e-baṇḍu pirikarak āta-da sarup veleviyakin-mā yā-yutu. (Ratnapala 1971: 55)

“A bhikkhu, bound on a journey, carrying with him the elders’ requisites that are liable to be damaged by rain, should continue his normal gait and seek shelter in the event of rainfall. When he has such requisites he should walk at an appropriate speed.”³⁴

The rules quoted above emphasize that the monk should be restrained even in the rain. This implies that there were instances of monks running on the road indecently. Running indecently in public is not an appropriate conduct.

2.10 Monastery property

Another key point of *Katikāvatas* is how to secure and manage monastery properties. The properties of the monastery are considered as the public property that should be utilized by all monks residing in the monastery. Giving them away for the use of another monk from another monastery is prohibited in the *Vinaya* as well.³⁵ *Katikāvata* also provides similar rules to secure the monastery properties.

[MPK 18; DK 52]

*Tamā ayatīyaku-du mahallan anu-no-danva annaṭa*³⁶ *nodiyā-yutu.* (Ratnapala 1971: 41, 55)

³⁰See *Vin* IV 165.2.

³¹This conduct falls into the category of *pācittiya*, which can be freed from the offense by confessing.

³²*Dhp* 361: *Kāyena saṅvaro sādhu, sādhu vācāya saṅvaro, manasā saṅvaro sādhu, sādhu sabbattha saṅvaro, sabbattha saṅvuto bhikkhu sabbadukkhā pamuccati* (“Restraint in body is good, good is restraint in speech; restraint in mind is good, good is restraint in all the senses. A bhikkhu restrained in all the senses is freed from all ills [of *samsāra*].”)

³³Cf. Ratnapala 1971: 133.

³⁴Cf. Ratnapala 1971: 150.

³⁵See *Vin* II 170.1–2.

³⁶*annaṭa*] MPK; *anunṭa* DK. Cf. Ratnapala 1971: 150.

“Even an article belonging to oneself should not be given to others except with prior consent of the elders.”³⁷

A monk should not give anything to anyone which belongs to the monastery; for it is prohibited by the monastic disciplines.³⁸ Accordingly, it is considered as *apratipatti*. A monk has no personal properties other than the bowl and the robe. If a monk owns something other than the bowl and the robe, it belongs to all the monks. Therefore, he should have the permission of elder monks when he wants to give it to someone.

It must be noticed, however, that giving one’s own belongings to his own parents is not a violation of the monastic disciplines.³⁹ The Buddha allowed monks to take care of their own parents. Therefore, it is not an obligatory requirement to have a permission when a monk gives his own belongings to his own parents.

2.11 Perceptual management

Except the behavioral management of the monks, Katikāvatas provide some rules for the perceptual management, which is the most important aspect of the monastic life. The following passage from MPK and DK suggests monks to manage their perceptual conducts that can affect their spiritual life.

[MPK 22; DK 56]

Kāpa pasayehi-du lol bav(a) nokaṭa yutu. (Ratnapala 1971: 41, 56)

“A monk should not hanker after the requisites even if they are allowed [by the monastic disciplines]”.

What is emphasized here is the importance of controlling mental habits of a monk, while most of the monastic rules are prescribed for controlling the bodily and verbal conducts. It means that the king tried to control not only aforementioned bodily and verbal conducts of the monks but also the perceptual habits. In both Katikāvatas, the kings emphasize that the monks should not be desirous of anything even if they are permitted by the monastic disciplines.

3 Conclusion

All the passages quoted above reveal the disgraceful behaviors of monks, which are divided into two categories: misbehaviors and inappropriate behaviors. An important role of the Katikāvatas is to protect Buddhism by controlling the conducts of Buddhist monks. The fact that the same rules were set in two different eras shows the naughty nature of the monks of that time.

Although the Katikāvatas were enacted by the Sri Lankan kings of that period, they had no authority to command monks. Therefore, the kings were helpless in some occasions as it is mentioned at the beginning of MPK, which says that the previous kings were unable to unite the Order even though they supported numerous virtuous monks.⁴⁰ Enacting similar rules twice within forty-four years of that

³⁷Cf. Ratnapala 1971: 150.

³⁸See Vin II 170.1–2

³⁹See Vin I 297.36–298.1.

⁴⁰See MPK 4; Ratnapala 1971: 38.

period shows the helplessness of the kings in front of the monks in spite of the fact that the kings were “the defenders of the faith.” Their political governance was subservient to the authority of the Order.⁴¹

The kings had no authority to punish a monk. In order to punish a monk on account of his *apratipatti* or *duṣpratipatti*, the kings had to enlist the help of responsible chief monks. They can only suggest what kind of punishment should be given to the monk who violated the rules of *Katikāvatas*. The history of *Katikāvatas* shows the kings’ great efforts to preserve Buddhism, which are now made by the present Sri Lankan government that is responsible to protect the Buddhist Order in contemporary Sri Lanka.

Abbreviations and Literature

(1) Pāli

The system of abbreviations of Pāli texts follows *A Critical Pali Dictionary*.

(2) Sinhalese

Dhammavisuddhi, Yatadolavatte.

1995 *Poḷonnaru Hā Daṁbadeṇi Katikāvat*. Kelaniya: Pāli hā Bauddha Adhyayana Paścāt Upādhi Āyatanaya, University of Kelaniya.

Jayatilaka, D. B.

2002 *Katikāvat Saṅgarā Nam vū Saṅgha Sammata Vyavasthā*. Colombo: S. Godage and Sons.

Suraweera, A. V.

1971 *Sinhala Katikāvat hā Bhikṣu Samājaya*. Colombo 11: M. D. Gunasena.

(3) English

Rahula, Walpola

1966 *History of Buddhism in Ceylon*. Colombo: M. D. Gunasena.

Ratnapala, Nandasena

1971 *The Katikāvatas: Laws of the Buddhist Order of Ceylon from the 12th Century to the 18th Century*. München: Kitzinger.

Wickremasinghe, Don Martino de Zilva

1928 *Epigraphia Zeylanica: Being Lithic and Other Inscriptions of Ceylon*. Vol. II. London: Published for the Government of Ceylon by H. Frowde.

(Ven Udayagiriye Dhammasiri Thero, Ph.D. candidate, Hiroshima University [Indian philosophy])

⁴¹See Rahula 1956: 68.

Apratipatti and *duṣpratipatti* in the Daṃbadeni Katikāvata and Mahāparākramabāhu Katikāvata

VEN UDAYAGIRIYE DHAMMASIRI THERO

This paper investigates various aspects of monastic life in Sri Lanka, specifically by considering monks' misbehaviors (*apratipatti*) and inappropriate behaviors (*duṣpratipatti*) that caused the enactment of the Katikāvatas of both Polonnaruwa and Daṃbadeniya periods. It is recorded that the Sri Lankan monks in those periods, engaging in corrupt practices, ignored and misused certain rules of the monastic disciplines, as a result of which the Order (*saṅgha*) underwent rapid changes. Under such circumstances, due to the corruption of monastic discipline, kings were unable to control the Order, so that they had to resort to the assistance of the chief monks by enacting Katikāvatas, which were aimed at regulating the monks' life according to the monastic discipline as taught in the Vinaya Piṭaka. Both Daṃbadeni Katikāvata and Mahāparākramabāhu Katikāvata emphasize that the monks should be careful when they associate with lay people and behave in a good manner both inside and outside the monastery. Managing the property of monasteries is also the important point that is mentioned in these Katikāvatas. The fact that the kings enacted similar rules in these two different periods indicates the existence of consistent misbehaviors of monks and helplessness of the kings who were unable to administrate monasteries. Furthermore, these Katikāvatas show the political influence on the Buddhist Order in mediaeval Sri Lanka.