On *adhikaraṇa*-*

Masanori SHŌNO

0. Something called *adhikaraṇa*- is prescribed in the Vinaya. In the Chinese translations of the Vinaya ‘諍 (dispute)’ is generally given as the translation of *adhikaraṇa*-. Today it is regarded as dispute¹⁾. On the other hand, the following view is held: “The word *adhikaraṇa*- does not always mean dispute. The word may be translated merely as matter”[Hirakawa 1953, 3]. For this reason, I would like to consider whether *adhikaraṇa*- means dispute in Pāli literature²⁾.

I. Concerning *adhikaraṇa*-, four types are prescribed, that is *vivādādhikaraṇa*-, *anuvādādhikaraṇa*-, *āpattādhikaraṇa*- and *kiccādhikaraṇa*- [Vin II 88, 17-20; MN II 247, 3-6]. First, focusing on *āpattādhikaraṇa*-, I will examine its definition[1.1] and one method of its settlements[1.2].

1.1. “Among these, what is *āpattādhikaraṇa*-? The five groups of offences are *āpattādhikaraṇa*-, and the seven groups of offences are also *āpattādhikaraṇa*-³⁾. This is called *āpattādhikaraṇa*-” [Vin II 88, 35-89,1].

In this description, it is not the dispute over offences which is *āpattādhikaraṇa*-, but the five or seven groups of offences themselves which are *āpattādhikaraṇa*-⁴⁾.

1.2. “Here a monk has fallen into a minor offense. ... Monks, that monk, having approached an Order, having arranged his upper garment over one shoulder, having honored the feet of the elder monks, having squatted down on his heels, having stretched forth his joined palms, should speak as follows: ‘I, honored sirs, having fallen into such and such an offence, show it.’ The Order should be notified by an intelligent and able monk saying: ‘Honored sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk So-and-so remembers an offence, discloses it, reveals it, shows it. If it seems the right time for the Order, I would receive the monk So-and-so’s offence.’ He should say: ‘Do you see it?’ ‘Yes, I see it.’ ‘You should restrain yourself in the future.’ This, monks, is called *adhikaraṇa*- which has been settled. How has [it] been settled? By face-to-face procedure(*sammukkhāvinaya*-) and by punishment for the acknowledged [offence] (*paṭiññātakaraṇa*-)” [Vin II 102, 17-103, 19. Cf. von

Hinüber 1991, 29f.; MN II 248, 21-31].

This passage, which prescribes the settlement of *āpattādhikaraṇa-*, has nothing to do with dispute over a committed offence.

Next in this connection, I will examine how one who commits *Nissaggiya-Pācittiya* 1 is expected to behave.

“*A nissaggiya-* occurs to him who goes beyond that means: a *nissaggiya-*, which should be abandoned to an Order, to a group, or to an individual, occurs on the eleventh day at sunrise. And, monks, it should be abandoned as follows: that monk, having approached the Order, ... should speak as follows: ‘Honored sirs, ten days having passed, my this robe should be abandoned. I abandon it to the Order.’ **Having abandoned it, the offence should be shown. The offence should be received by an intelligent and able monk**, the abandoned robe should be given. ...” [Vin III 196, 22-31].

Having made reference directly to the *Khandhaka*, Sp cites the above description of the settlement of *āpattādhikaraṇa-* in the following way: “*Having abandoned it, the offence should be shown* means: how should it be shown? This is just how it is stated in the *Khandhaka*, but how is it stated there? Monks, that monk, having approached an Order, ... (Vin II 103, 10f.) ... *The offence should be received by an intelligent and able monk* means: it should be received in the very manner stated in the *Khandhaka*. For it is stated there as follows: The Order should be notified by an intelligent and able monk saying: ... (Vin II 103, 11-16; 102, 34-103, 6; 102, 17-22) ... ‘You should restrain yourself in the future.’ ” [Sp 640, 1-641, 5. Cf. Kkh (ed. K.R. Norman and W. Pruitt) 97, 6-98, 23; 229, 1-5]. Accordingly, it is clear that one who commits *Nissaggiya-Pācittiya* 1 carries out the settlement of *āpattādhikaraṇa-*. If *adhikaraṇa-* were necessarily the case with dispute, one who commits *Nissaggiya-Pācittiya* 1 would usually dispute over the committed offence. However, such a usual dispute is not described in this case⁵⁾.

1.3. As far as the definition of *āpattādhikaraṇa*-[1.1] and its settlement[1.2] is concerned, *adhikaraṇa-* does not signify dispute.

2. Next, I will examine the meaning of *adhikaraṇa-*. It is explained in the *Suttavibhaṅga* as follows: “*An adhikaraṇa-* leading to a split means: eighteen matters (*vatthūni*) causing a split” [Vin III 173, 11f.]. In this passage, *adhikaraṇa-* is explained by *vatthu*-⁶⁾, meaning ‘a subject-matter, a question’.

Secondly, it is described in Sp as follows: “Concerning that, since the *adhikaraṇa-* is one with the meaning of *adhikaraṇa-* but becomes various by matters, ‘four *adhikaraṇas*, namely *vivādādhikaraṇa-* etc.’ is said to indicate this variety. But what is the meaning of *adhikaraṇa-* by which this, it is said, is one? That is the quality of what ought to be aimed at(/superintended) by settlements(*samathehi adhikaraṇīyatā*). Therefore, such a matter to be aimed at(/superintended) that after taking upon, depending on, and concerning it, settlements proceed(*vattanti*) should be known as *adhikaraṇa-*” [Sp 593, 27-32. Cf. Sp 1196, 4-5; 1197, 8-10; 1359, 14-18; Ps IV 42, 7-8]. In this passage, *adhikaraṇa-* means ‘a matter to be aimed at / superintended’.

3. To sum up, *adhikaraṇa-* means ‘a subject-matter or a question to be aimed at or to be superintended (in the whole organization of the Order)⁷⁾, but not dispute⁸⁾ in Pāli literature.

*I would like to thank Mr. Anthony R. Black and Mrs. M. Tomita for correcting my English. The abbreviations follow the Epilegomena to CPD. All references are to the PTS editions. [Bibliography] O. von Hinüber, *The Oldest Pāli Manuscript*, Mainz 1991. A. Hirakawa “The Trial Organization in the Early Buddhist Order,” *Palaeologia* 2.1, 1953, pp.1-19 (in Japanese). É. Nolot, “Studies in Vinaya Technical Terms I-III,” JPTS 22, 1996, pp.73-150. M. Satō, *A Study of the Early Buddhist Order in the Vinaya Piṭaka*, Tokyo 1963 (in Japanese).

1) “Only when a person’s assertion contradicts the criticism of others against the person or contradicts the unfair punishment of the Order on the person, it is *adhikaraṇa-* ...” [Satō 1963, 397]. “no disputes but those involving monks/nuns may be termed *adhikaraṇa-*” [Nolot 1996, 92 fn.1].

2) Since the Vinayas of the various sects vary quite a lot in the description of *adhikaraṇa-*, we must first understand properly each description found in the Vinayas instead of their simple comparison. Therefore I will treat only Pāli literature in this paper. I will not deal with the 善見律毘婆沙 (the so-called Chinese translation of Sp), for it has been pointed out that, in being translated into Chinese, it came under the influence of another sect.

3) ‘five groups of offences’ and ‘seven groups of offences’ are those prescribed to monks/nuns [Vin V 91, 16-18; 26-27].

4) Vin V 111, 35-37: “The five groups of offences are *āpattādhikaraṇa-*, ... This is called *āpattādhikaraṇa-*. The Order quarrels over *āpattādhikaraṇa-*, [in that case] *vivādādhikaraṇa-* [arises].” Vin II 88, 20-30: “Monks, here monks quarrel, saying: ‘it is *dharma*’ or ‘it is

not *dharma*’ or ‘it is *Vinaya*’ or ‘it is not *Vinaya*’ or ... ‘it is an offence’ or ‘it is not an offence’ or ‘it is a minor offence’ or ‘it is a grave offence’ or ‘it is an offence with the rest’ or ‘it is an offence without the rest’ or ‘it is a wicked offence’ or ‘it is a non-wicked offence’. Concerning that, whatever is *wrangle(bhaṇḍanaṃ)*, *strife(kalaho)*, *controversy(viggaho)*, *quarrel(vivādo)*, various opinions, different opinions, expression for quarrel, opposition, this is called *vivādādhikaraṇa-*.” Therefore, when the Order quarrels over *āpattādhikaraṇa-*, or an offence, it is *vivādādhikaraṇa-*.

5) However, I am not saying that this description applies only to the case without dispute, but that this description applies to the case where, be there dispute or not, *Nissaggiya-Pācittiya* 1 is committed.

6) ‘eighteen matters’ concerned with a split is described in Vin II 204, 10-25, and it is virtually identical with the contents of *vivādādhikaraṇa-*.

7) A quarrel among monks over an offence etc. is ‘*vivāda-* and *vivādādhikaraṇa-*’, but a general quarrel between a parent and a son, etc. is ‘*vivāda-* but not *adhikaraṇa-*’ [Vin II 92, 8-15. For *anuvāda-* and *adhikaraṇa-*, Vin II 92, 24-30]. Also an Order’s deed etc. are ‘a deed(*kicca-*) and *kiccādhikaraṇa-*’, but ‘a deed to a teacher, a deed to a preceptor’ etc. are ‘a deed(*kicca-*) but not *adhikaraṇa-*’ [Vin II 93, 14-19]. Therefore, it is clear that *adhikaraṇa-* concerns the whole organization of the Order.

8) “*of [monks] engaged in wrangles, engaged in strife, having come to quarrels* means: of [monks] engaged in *adhikaraṇa-* (*bhaṇḍanaṃjātānaṃ kalahajātānaṃ vivādāpannānaṃ ti adhikaraṇajātānaṃ*)” [Vin IV 150, 25f.] has led modern scholars to understand that *adhikaraṇa-* means dispute [cf. CPD s.v. *adhikaraṇa-jāta*]. However, this passage has nothing to do with the definition of the term *adhikaraṇa-*. It, especially the word *adhikaraṇa-*, indicates that in this case the words *vivāda-* etc. do not mean a general quarrel, but a particular question concerned with the Order [cf. notes 7 and 4]. In this way this passage is not opposed to my conclusion. If one takes *adhikaraṇa-* for *vivāda-* etc., it is impossible to explain the following passage appropriately: “Among these, what is *adhikaraṇa-* and not *vivāda-*? *Anuvādādhikaraṇa-*, *āpattādhikaraṇa-*, *kiccādhikaraṇa-*. This is *adhikaraṇa-* and not *vivāda-*. Among these, what is *adhikaraṇa-* and *vivāda-*? *Vivādādhikaraṇa-* is *adhikaraṇa-* and *vivāda-*” [Vin II 92, 16-19]. Furthermore, the meaning *Disput/dispute* is not registered under *adhikaraṇa-* in PW, pw and MW.

(Key Words) *Vinaya*, *adhikaraṇa*, *āpattādhikaraṇa*-, dispute

(Graduate Student, Osaka University)