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Rules for the sīmā Regulation in the Vinaya and its Commentaries and their Application in Thailand

1. One of the prior conditions for the existence and continuance of the Buddhist community is a boundary (sīmā) which defines the space within which all members of a single local community have to assemble as a complete Saṅgha (saṅgha) at a place appointed for ecclesiastical acts (kamma). The completeness of the Saṅgha is a prerequisite for the valid performance of each ecclesiastical act of the Buddhist community. The invalidity of a boundary, therefore, implies the defectiveness of the kamma performed within it. On account of this, rules for the correct determination of the sīmā and for the application of undetermined boundaries (abaddhasīmā) were laid down in the Vinaya. These rules were provided with additional regulations and detailed explanations handed down in the commentarial (atthakathā), and sub-commentarial (tikā) literature.

These texts allow one to outline the development of the sīmā regulations and to point to shifts concerning their application. The period covered stretches from the time of the Vinaya to that of the Vimati-vinodaniṭṭikā, viz. from roughly the 3rd century B.C. (?) to the early 13th century A.D.

These rules, more or less, are the foundation for regulating sīmā questions in all Theravāda countries up to the present. However, in the course of time different countries have developed different methods regarding minor questions. In the present contribution I will first sketch the general developments, basing myself on the Pali Vinaya texts, thereby emphasizing those points which are relevant for the comparison with special features of the Thai tradition. Thereafter I will deal with some of these specific features of the Thai tradition more detailed.

1. The introductory part of this paper (§§ 1-4) is a slightly shortened and modified version of the introduction to my article “Ceremonial Boundaries in the Buddhist Monastic Tradition in Sri Lanka” to appear in the Proceedings of the Wilhelm Geiger Symposium, Colombo 1995. I thank Richard WILSON (Göttingen) for improving my English.
I. Outline of the development of sīmā regulations in the Vinaya literature

2. In the Vinaya the sīmā is introduced to delimit the extension of “one residence” (ekāvāsa) which previously functioned as the standard for defining a complete Saṅgha. With this innovation the rules for determining and removing a sīmā were introduced. First of all marks (nimitta) had to be announced (kitteti) as indications of the course of the boundary. Eight types of marks valid for that purpose are enumerated in the Vinaya. However, the method for their announcement is not described there. After the announcement came the determination of the sīmā, viz. samānasamvāsasīmā, “boundary for the same communion”. As a second step the function of the “not-being-separated from the three robes” (ticīvarena avippavāsa) could be conferred upon this sīmā, allowing the monks to be separated from one of the three robes within the sīmā, without this being counted as an offence.

The overlapping and combining of two determined sīmās was forbidden and an “interspace to (other) sīmās” (simantarikā) prescribed. In the Vinaya we have only one form of a determined sīmā, viz. the samānasamvāsasīmā. The rule of keeping an interspace between sīmās, therefore, must refer to other samānasamvāsasīmās. Since no details are given about the size of this interspace or about how to mark it, one can assume it was, in the beginning, probably only a distance to be kept to other sīmās.

Additionally, three forms of sīmās are mentioned which could come into force if no determined sīmā existed, viz. the boundary of a village (gāmasīmā) in settlements, a distance consisting of seven abbhantaras (sattabbhantara), i.e. ca. 80 m, in the wilderness (arañña), and the boundary consisting of the line constituted by throwing water in all directions (udakukkhepa) around the assembled Saṅgha on natural lakes, rivers, and on the ocean.


3. The sīmā rules are included in the second chapter of the Mahāvagga, the Uposathakhakhhandhaka (Vin I 106, 1-35; 108, 26 – 111, 22); all information given here is based on these passages.

4. Arañña refers to all regions outside of settlements and bodies of water.
The removal of a sīmā was only necessary if one wanted to enlarge or diminish the space enclosed by the sīmā and is not discussed at length in the Vinaya (see below, §3).

In the Vinaya the determined samānasamvāsasīmā represents the primary focus of the rules. The three undetermined boundaries are only provided in case a monk is not inside a determined sīmā when the performance of an ecclesiastical act turns out to be necessary. The description of the carrying out of the determination, removal, etc., is short and straightforward.

3. The extensive and detailed explanations in the commentary to the Vinaya (4th/5th century A.D.), viz. the Samantapāsādikā (Sp 1035.23-1048.32; 1049.27-1056.30), show that the need for more detailed rules was at hand. Out of the simple rule in the Vinaya of announcing the marks (nimitta) developed a detailed description of the method of announcing nimitta (Sp 1035.23-1036.31; 1040.16-23). Accordingly it was necessary to choose exactly defined marks from the eight objects allowed in the Vinaya (and defined in Sp 1036.31-1040.16), to announce them, proceeding clockwise, and, finally, to announce the first announced nimitta a second time to connect it with the previous one. Probably based on this method a new verb was introduced for the determination of the boundary. Whereas in the Vinaya the verb sam-man had been used, in the Samantapāsādikā the usage alternates between bandh and sam-man. Out of the use of this verb the term baddhasiṃā (t. phaṭṭhasiṃā) developed as an expression for each determined boundary, and in conformity with this the three undetermined boundary types were called abaddhasiṃā (t. apatṭha or akatasīmā). The detailed explanations for how to determine a boundary in a village or one enclosing several villages (Sp 1040.23-1041.10), etc., show the complexity of the procedure of the determination of a boundary and the ease with which a mistake during the ceremony could render a sīmā invalid. It is, then, no wonder that the undetermined boundaries (abaddhasiṃā) gained ground (see below, §11).

In the course of time the number of monks increased and monasteries developed. In some of the larger ones resided many more monks than previously, which entailed the performance of more ecclesiastical acts (viz. pabbajjā, upasampadā, and kammas regulating offences). Owing

5. Cf. KIEFFER-PÜLZ, Simā, B Einl. 7, fn. 98.
to the fact that for each kamma all monks inside a simā had to assemble, the daily life of the community could be disturbed frequently. Therefore smaller simās, i.e. by-simās (called khandasimās), were introduced, which were determined additionally within the space of the monastery. With the introduction of this new simā type the term simantarikā, “simā-interspace”, received an additional meaning. Whereas at the time of the Vinaya it was probably an undefined distance to be kept to other simānasamvāsasimās (see above, §2), it was now to be applied to the khandasimā as well. The simā-interspace now had to be marked by stone marks and had to have a minimum standard of one ratana (ca. 40 cm), one vidatthi (ca. 20 cm) or four aṅgulas (ca. 7.2 cm) (Sp 1056.24-27). The simānasamvāsakasimā enclosing the whole monastery was then called mahāsimā in contrast to the small simās. In determining a khandasimā and a mahāsimā a certain order had to be observed: first the nimitta for the khandasimā(s) were announced, then the nimitta for the surrounding simā-interspace (simantarikā), and finally the nimitta for the simā for the whole monastery, viz. the mahāsimā. Thereafter one could determine which simā one wanted to determine first, but normally one started with the khan&simī (Sp 1042.21-24). The method for determining a khandasimā was the same as for the simānasamvāsakasimā with the exception that as marks for the khandasimā only stone marks are mentioned (Sp 1041.19-1042.31, cf. KIEFFER-PULZ 1992, B 6).

Whereas in the Vinaya the removal of a simā is only briefly mentioned (Vin I 110.12-14), and the kammavācās are given (Vin I 110.14-36), it is discussed in detail in the Samantapāsādikā. On account of the introduction of the khandasimā a certain order of the individual steps now has to be observed not only if one wants to determine khandasimā and mahāsimā (see above), but also in the case of their removal, when the reverse order has to be complied with. Moreover, it is, according to the Samantapāsādikā, not possible to remove an unknown khandasimā. The removal of an unknown simānasamvāsakasimā, however, is possible, since there are places within a simā which are definitely part of it, viz. the uposathagāra, the cetiya, the bodhi tree, the senāsana etc. (Sp 1051.8-22). Assembling at these places, therefore, is a guarantee for being located within the mahāsimā, and this in turn is one condition for the correct performance of the kamma. Where neither khandasimā nor mahāsimā are known the removal of neither of them should be performed, since the determination of the new simās might result in the overlapping of the newly determined simānasamvāsakasimā with an
already existing unknown \textit{khaṇḍasimā}. This rule is important since it was changed at a later date (cf. below, §§ 4 & 10).

Another important feature is the development of the so-called \textit{abaddhasimās}. These had been introduced in the \textit{Vinaya} in the event that no determined boundary existed at a certain place. The detailed commentary to these \textit{simā} forms in the \textit{Samantapāśādikā} (Sp 1051.27-1056.8) shows that they gained ground. This is especially true for the \textit{udakukkhepasimā}.

4. Of the four \textit{ṭikās} to the \textit{Vinaya} the \textit{Vimativinodaniṭīkā} is the most innovative. A very important new rule concerns the removal of unknown boundaries, which in the \textit{Vinaya} was not discussed at all and which in the \textit{Samantapāśādikā} is explained as being impossible for an unknown \textit{khaṇḍasimā} and very difficult for an unknown \textit{samāna-saṃvāsakasimā}. The \textit{Vimativinodaniṭīkā} (Vmv II 156.1-14) introduces a method for removing such unknown boundaries which is valid till today in Sri Lanka, in Burma and also in Thailand.

\textit{The applications of \textit{simā} rules in Thailand.}

5. In the Thai tradition the course of the \textit{simā} is indicated by marks as prescribed in the \textit{Vinaya}. These \textit{nimitta} are called \textit{pai simā}, “flat stone”, in Thai, and \textit{slīk simā} in Khmer (BIZOT 1988, § 86; Na Paknam 1981, p. 57). Three features are peculiar to the Thai tradition: firstly, the stone boundary markers visible above the ground are not real \textit{nimitta}, but only objects placed upon the \textit{nimitta} which protrude above ground; secondly, as the actual \textit{nimitta} (which are completely buried), only stones seem to have been used, though according to the Pali tradition one could choose among eight natural objects; and, thirdly, in addition to the \textit{nimitta} indicating the course of the boundary in the cardinal directions, a ninth mark called \textit{simākil} is buried in the centre of the space enclosed by the \textit{simā} (BIZOT 1988, § 9; WELLS 1975, p. 180).

The true \textit{simā} stones are of unhewn rock buried in the ground at the four cardinal points and four intermediate points of the compass. Above these are placed stones or other materials which are visible to the eye to mark the sites. These stones, slabs of concrete or pillars of brick, are decorative and may depict

the Wheel, or a leaf, or have little niches within where candles may be placed. Simā stones can also be embedded in the Uposatha walls. There is a ninth and most important simā stone in the center of the consecrated soil under the floor of the Uposatha hall. With this is sometimes placed articles of value and the name of the donor of the building together with the date. The ceremony of consecration starts from this central point. (WELLS 1975, p.180).

Neither of these features is documented in the Pali Vinaya texts, including the tikās, up to the 13th century.

The oldest pai simā are from the northeastern region of Thailand and belong to the Dvaravati Period (6th to 9th cent. A.D.; NA PAKNAM 1981, pp.57-62). As early as in the 6th or 7th centuries they can be observed also in the southern, northern and central Thai provinces, and in parts of Burma and Cambodia (BIZOT 1988, § 87). This usage was therefore already customary before the Sinhalese nikāya was introduced into Thailand. Though we have comparable simā stones during the Polonnaruva period (1017-1235 A.D.) in Sri Lanka, this is not the same phenomenon, since these stones are real nimitta and not only decorative markers.

The method of burying the marks for the simā reminds one of the custom of Hindu societies of marking their village boundaries by invisible, i.e. buried, marks and of placing visible marks, such as trees, etc., above the ground. The purpose of this measure was to prevent shifting of the boundaries and to keep evidence of the real course of a village boundary in case another group tried to shift it. Since, however, the destruction of the marks of a ceremonial boundary of the Buddhist Sangha does not render the simā itself invalid (Sp 1043.9-11), there would be no need for this procedure.

The fact that only stones are used as nimitta reminds one of the usage connected with the khandasimā. Though the khandasimā is only a special form of a baddhasimā and on account of this the eight objects allowable as marks of a simā could have been used for the khandasimā as well, only stones are mentioned as its nimitta in the Pali texts. This

8. Later texts have not yet been edited or examined.
9. It should be mentioned that these decorated stone slabs were not only used to demarcate the simā but also other buildings within the monastery. To be certain that a simā was indicated, one therefore has to dig below these relief stones for the actual nimitta.
supports the assumption that the Thai sīmā originates in the khaṇḍasīmā (see below).

Whereas according to WELLS (see above) unhewn rocks are used as nimitta, VAJIRAṆĀṆAVARORASA (1983, p.14 fn.1) mentions round stone balls. This tallies with the observation by WIJEYEWARDENE, who describes the nimitta as consisting of “black granite, round, with a diameter of about two feet” (1986, p.96).

The use of a ninth nimitta in the centre of the place – not found in any Pali Vinaya text so far known to me – is also attested to for Java (BIZOT 1988, § 88). This nimitta plays a role within the ordination ceremony of the Mahānikāya, and probably also the other nikāyas, since the upajjhāya, i.e. the monk leading that ceremony, sits in front of it (BIZOT 1988, § 10).

The ceremony of announcing the nimitta (called dak nimitta) deviates from that described in the Samantapāsādiṭṭa in so far as the ninth mark has to be included. Instead of beginning in the east and of moving around clockwise till they again reach the east, the main body of monks remains in the middle of the place while four monks go to the eastern, southeastern, southern, etc., and eastern nimitta, where they, in question and answer, establish each nimitta, and then return to the middle (WELLS 1975, p.183; WIJEYEWARDENE 1986, p.97). This simple ceremony corresponding to what is prescribed in the Atṭhakathā is embedded in a ritual in which lay people also participate. The most important feature in this connection is that the stone balls serving as nimitta hang over the holes dug in advance, supported by a tripod and suspended by threads. Only after the dak nimitta has taken place and in the presence of a great number of lay people are these threads cut, and the stone nimitta fall into their respective holes (WIJEYEWARDENE 1986, pp.96, 98f.).

6. Before a monastery can be built in present-day Thailand royal permission must be obtained. The same is true if one wishes to determine a sīmā (WELLS 1975, p.180; ISHII 1986, p.74). Two types of monasteries are differentiated: monasteries which have obtained a royal grant of visuṅgāmasīmā, i.e. which have permission to establish a sīmā and build an uposatha house within it; and monastic residences (t. samnak saṅgha) which do not possess an uposatha house (WELLS 1975, p.27; ISHII 1986, p.104).

The place granted by the government within the precincts of the monastery is called visuṅgāmasīmā and is generally not larger than
260 x 130 feet (i.e. ca. 80 x 40 m). This area is to be marked off by nimitta and determined as sīmā space. Thereafter, normally within that area, the uposatha hall is erected. This serves for all ecclesiastical acts of the community – not only for the uposatha ceremony. The area granted by the government can only be recalled if the sīmā determined there is removed by the monks in an ecclesiastical act (WELLS 1975, p.179).

The visuṅgāmasimā is explained as: "... given to the Sangha as visuṅgasimā land, – removed from the status of government land, being a special place devoted to Sangha ceremonies according to the Vinaya." (WELLS 1975, p.179).

In the Pali commentary to the Vinaya the term visuṅgāmasimā, “boundary of a village (having been) separately (given to someone)”, is used as the antithesis of pakatigāmasimā, “boundary of a common village” (Sp 1052.1-4). There the term visuṅgāmasimā describes an area given to a certain person, monastery, etc., who then receives all taxes, etc., originating from this area. The land can be recalled by the king whether or not a ceremonial boundary (sīmā) of the Saṅgha has been determined within it. In the Samantapāsādikā the visuṅgāmasimā is enumerated together with other types of the same sīmā form, i.e. a non-determined boundary (abaddhasimā) consisting of the boundary of a settlement, viz. gāmasimā, nigamasimā, and nagarasimā. This indicates that the visuṅgāmasimā is named there as a possible abaddhasimā only. The question whether or not the determination of a baddhasimā within this area is possible, is not dealt with. But in analogy to the rules for the pakatigāmasimā this should be no problem. Thus the questions of who the visuṅgāmasimā is given to, whether it is used as an abaddhasimā by any community or whether a community determines a sīmā there are irrelevant in this respect. The sīmā determined by a Buddhist community has nothing to do with any boundary indicating ownership. Thus, if a person were granted a visuṅgāmasimā and one or more baddhasimās existed within this area, this did not at all affect that person’s right to receive taxes, etc. This seems to be different in Thailand. There the land given as visuṅgāmasimā cannot be recalled by the king or government if a ceremonial boundary of the Buddhist community has been determined within it. Only after the ecclesiastical act for the regular removal of a ceremonial boundary is the king or government able to withdraw the land.

Among the monasteries with an uposatha house, there are some which do not possess an area granted by the government. These monasteries are
called *baddhasimā wat*, and it is assumed that they received their original grant from some past ruler (WELLS 1975, p.28). They only differ from the *visuṅgāmasimā wat* in that they do not own a written document regarding the area used as *sīmā* compound.

Another, according to WELLS (1975, p.28) comparatively rare, type of monastery is the *mahāsīmā wat*. This *wat* owns a great *sīmā* (*mahāsīmā*) enclosing the whole monastic area. If we consider these different types of monasteries with *uposatha* houses, it is evident that the *mahāsīmā wat* represents the monastery which according to the Pali texts is the regular one, since normally the residence where the monks lived (*āvāsa*) was included within the *sīmā* along with all buildings belonging to the monastery. The problem that, on account of this, all monks had to assemble for each ecclesiastical act was alleviated by the introduction of the “*by-sīmā*” (*khaṇḍasīmā*; see above, § 3).

The *visuṅgāmasimā wat*, which seems to be the regular type of monastery in Thailand, is not represented in the Pali texts at all – the term *visuṅgāmasimā* being used in a slightly modified sense in the Pali texts as indicated above. Whereas in the Pali texts a place for the *uposatha* house is provided within the *sīmā* enclosing the whole monastery, the Thai *sīmā* generally has become so small (except in *mahāsīmā wats*) that it often includes only the *uposatha* house itself. As a consequence, the *uposatha* house is the place for all ecclesiastical acts of the community, whereas according to the Pali texts at least *uposatha* and *upasampadā* may be performed in different places, viz. within the *uposatha* house and within the *khaṇḍasīmā* respectively.

7. In Thailand *sīmās* are found with a single and with a double line of marks (*nimitta*) (BIZOT 1988, § 87). Whereas the single line of *nimitta* is easily explained, the double line presents some problems. BIZOT, basing himself on DAMRONG, suggested that they could be the sign of a renovation by the Sinhalese *nikāya* (BIZOT 1988, § 87). This assumption is most improbable. For, if even the destruction of the real *nimitta* of a *sīmā* is unimportant with respect to the validity of that *sīmā* (see above, § 5), how much less would the disappearance of only the decorative flat stones count. The doubling of the *pai sīmā* as a renovation measure also seems strange, since in the case of renovation one normally only restores something already existing, but does not double it.

A *sīmā* enclosing the whole monastery, i.e. a *mahāsīmā*, only has a single line of *nimitta*. Contrary to this the *khaṇḍasīmā*, which is situated
within the māhasimā and separated from it by a simā interval (simantarikā), seems at first sight to have a double line of nimitta. In reality the inner line of stones indicates the course of the khandasimā, whereas the outer line points to that of the simantarikā (this at least is valid for all Theravāda traditions). The earliest traces of the institution of the khandasimā go back to the Dipavamsa (4th century A.D.). Thus this simā type could well have been known in Thailand by the 6th century.

There is one possible explanation for the phenomenon of the double line of nimitta which would agree not only with present-day usage, but also with the information drawn from the Jinakālamāli: The simās with these double lines of nimitta could have been khandasimās, situated within a mahāsimā enclosing the whole monastery (this would fully correspond with the prescriptions in the Pali AtJhakathā). The marks for the mahāsimā might have been chosen in accordance with the Pali Aṭṭhakathā from among natural objects such as rivers, trees, hills, etc. Possibly the khandasimā had mostly been used for the various ecclesiastical acts, so that the mahāsimā fell into oblivion and, since it had only natural boundary markers, nothing remained to remind one of its existence. Another possibility is that the inhabitants of such a monastery left and later newcomers did not know of the existence of a mahāsimā at all. All that survived visibly for others then would have been a small simā marked by a double line of boundary markers. One should also keep in mind that the possibility of removing old and unknown simās was introduced only after the time of the Aṭṭhakathā, i.e. after the 5th and before the 13th centuries, so that in earlier times there would have been no way of removing such simās. With this hypothesis information from the Jinakālamāli (1529 A.D.), a chronicle of Northern Thailand, agrees fully. The only form of a baddhasimā mentioned in this text is the khandasimā. This khandasimā enclosed the uposatha house as is the case in Thailand up to the present. Nothing is said about a mahāsimā,

11. Other Vinaya traditions do not have such an interspace, e.g. the Mūlasarvāstivādin, cf. Jin-il CHUNG and Petra KIEFFER-PÜLZ, “The karmavācanās for the determination of simā and ticīvarena avippavāsa”, Dharmadīta, Mélanges offerts au Vénérable Thich Huyên-Vi à l’occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire, ed. by Bhikku Tampalawela DHAMMARATANA and Bhikkhu PĀSĀDIKA, Paris 1997, pp. 13-55.

the existence of which would be a prerequisite for the existence of a khaṇḍasimā. Furthermore in present-day Thailand only few monasteries with a mahāsimā exist (see above, § 6). The fact that only stone nimitta are used for the Thai simā also point in this direction.

8. The question of when the tradition of determining a simā including only the uposatha house had its starting point cannot be answered. Possibly it is a consequence of the tradition that the relevant area had to be granted by the government or king (though we do not know when this usage dates from either). Since this piece of land was henceforth alienated from the crown or government it was in the interest of these institutions to grant only small areas. Considering the great number of monasteries and the tendency among the lay population to prefer the erection of new ones instead of repairing older ones (because more merit would so accrue) this can easily be understood.

9. In the secondary literature it is stated that “... traditionally, there appear to have been no bod (uposatha-house) in the monasteries within the city walls. The entire city being consecrated, ordination could be conducted, technically, anywhere within the city.” (WIJEYEWARDENE 1986, p.91). One reason for this could have been that in the Thai tradition the uposatha-house itself was enclosed by a simā in most cases, so that if a great simā was to be determined, the bod within the city was avoided in order not to mingle or overlap one simā by another one.

A determined simā enclosing a whole city like Anurādhapura or Chiang Mai (WIJEYEWARDENE 1986, p.91) is a mahāsimā. It could therefore include various khaṇḍasimās. Though the simā enclosing the uposatha house is called khaṇḍasimās, it seems not to have been understood as khaṇḍasimā in the sense in which this word is used in the Pali Vinaya texts. Otherwise it would have been no problem to place a bod encircled by a simā (khaṇḍasimā) within a city enclosed by a simā (mahāsimā)

The Jinakālāmāli shows the same understanding of the term khaṇḍasimā as that prevalent in present-day Thailand, in that it is used for the place, where the uposatha house is situated, though no mahāsimā exists.
10. It has already been mentioned above that the Vimativinodanītikā contains a rule on how to remove baddhasimās whose course is unknown (above, § 4). This now generally accepted method is also adhered to in Thailand (Vajirānānavarorasa 1983, p. 30; Wells 1975, p. 181f.; Wijeyewardene 1986, p. 97). The removal of the simā (pa. simāsamugghāta; t. suot thon) is performed previous to any simā determination. The ceremony described by Wijeyewardene goes as follows:

The monks form two rows from the stone inside the building to the one at the entrance and then to the one on the right. Two named senior monks chant at the central stone and, without the rows of monks moving, two others, also named, chant at the stone at the entrance (east). When these two are completed, the row of monks between the centre and the entrance move, and take up positions between the stone in the southeastern corner and the one in the southern position. The chant is then made at the southeastern stone. They go round the building in this fashion, repeat the chant at the eastern stone (at the entrance) and back into the building (Wijeyewardene 1986, p. 97).

It is obvious that the course followed in performing this ceremony is the same as that used for the announcement of the marks, i.e. the goal is to connect all marks. The same is stated by Vajirānānavarorasa (1983, p. 31) "the chanting ... is done once at the centre, such as in the Uposatha hall, and then at each corner, corresponding to the nimitta, ...". The method for the removal of a simā resembles that described in the Vimativinodanītikā (Vmv Be (Chs) II 156.1-14; Kieffer-Pülz 1992, p. 327 fn. 590). However, Vajirānānavarorasa relates that he has heard "that in former times, the head of that ceremony used a bamboo lattice with spaces big enough to accommodate each monk, linking them together within a forearm's length throughout the area." (Vajirānānavarorasa 1983, p. 30).

11. In the introductory part (above, § 3) it was mentioned that the abaddhasimās gained ground from the time of the commentaries onward (5th century A.D.). This is confirmed for the Thai tradition by the Jinakālamāli. Here various udakukkhapesimās are mentioned. Obviously this has been the most common simā form, being replaced by a determined simā, viz. a khandasimā, only in certain cases. It is, however, evident from secondary literature that in present-day Thailand this simā form is no longer used. Wijeyewardene (1986, p. 99ff.) quotes a

sermon given the evening previous to the determination of the sīmā. This sermon consists of a dialogue between two monks. The one asks the other what “ubosat on the water” is, and receives the reply that it is an uthak'ukkhepana sīmā form, which was popular in ancient times (WIJEYEWARDENE, p.102f.).
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