

## Yamaka Sutta

### The Discourse to Yamaka

[The aggregates and the arhat's indefinable state]  
(Saṃyutta Nikāya 22.85/3:109-116)  
Translated by Piya Tan ©2006

#### Introduction

In the **Anurādha Sutta** (S 22.86), the monk Anurādha is troubled by the destiny of the arhat after death—whether he still exists or not—and he attempts to resolve his problem by arguing that it is a state *other than* these four traditional propositions of ancient Indian logic, that is,

he exists	after death, or
he does not exist	after death, or
he both exists and not exist	after death, or
he neither exists nor not exist	after death.

The Buddha dismisses this fifth alternative, declaring that even when still alive, an arhat cannot be identified with any of the five aggregates or anything outside of it.<sup>1</sup>

The Yamaka Sutta records how the monk Yamaka holds the wrong view that arhats cease to be when they die [§2]. Yamaka's view is not exactly annihilationist, since he holds that for the unawakened, some kind of abiding entity goes on transmigrating. Using the same reasoning as that given in the Anurādha Sutta, Sāriputta rebukes Yamaka for his wrong view, and admonishes him into the right path.<sup>2</sup> Sāriputta gives an exposition on the true nature of the five aggregates.

As a result of the teachings here, Yamak becomes a streamwinner [§20b]. The Yamaka Sutta deals with very similar issues and solutions as **the Alagaddûpama Sutta** (M 22)<sup>3</sup> and **the Mahā Taṇhā-saṅkhaya Sutta** (M 38),<sup>4</sup> with which it should be studied.

— — —

---

<sup>1</sup> S 22.86/3:116-119 = S44.2/4:381-384 = SD 21.13.

<sup>2</sup> See also Analayo, *Satipaṭṭhāna: The Direct Path to Realization*, 2003:265.

<sup>3</sup> M 22/1:130-142 = SD 3.13.

<sup>4</sup> M 38/1:256-271 = SD 7.10.

## The Discourse to Yamaka

(S 22.85/3:109-116)

### Yamaka has a wrong view

1 At one time, the venerable Sāriputta was staying in Anātha,piṇḍika's Park in Jeta's Grove near Sāvattihī.

2 Now at that time, an evil false view<sup>5</sup> arose in a monk named Yamaka:

“As I understand the Dharma taught by the Blessed One, a monk whose influxes are destroyed is annihilated and perishes when the body breaks up and does not exist after death.”<sup>6</sup>

3 Then some monks heard that an evil false view had arisen in a monk named Yamaka:

“As I understand the Dharma taught by the Blessed One, a monk whose influxes are destroyed is annihilated and perishes when the body breaks up and does not exist after death.”

4 Then those monks approached the venerable Yamaka. Having approached the venerable Yamaka, they exchanged greetings with him. When this courteous and friendly exchange was concluded, they sat down at one side.

5 Seated thus at one side, the monks said this to the venerable Yamaka,

“Avuso Yamaka, is it true that such a harmful view has arisen in you, thus: [110]

‘As I understand the Dharma taught by the Blessed One, a monk whose influxes are destroyed is annihilated and perishes when the body breaks up and does not exist after death?’”

6 “That is very true, avuso. As I understand the Dharma taught by the Blessed One, a monk whose influxes are destroyed is annihilated and perishes when the body breaks up and does not exist after death.”

Then those monks, desiring to detach him from that harmful view, pressed and questioned him thus:

7 “Avuso Yamaka, do not say so! Do not misrepresent the Blessed One: it is not good to misrepresent the Blessed One. The Blessed One would not speak thus:

‘A monk whose influxes are destroyed is annihilated and perishes when the body breaks up and does not exist after death.’”

### Yamaka holds on to his view

8 Yet although pressed and questioned and cross-questioned by those monks in this way, the venerable Yamaka, still obstinately held on to the harmful view and continued to insist thus:

“As I understand the Dharma taught by the Blessed One, a monk whose influxes are destroyed is annihilated and perishes when the body breaks up and does not exist after death.”

9 But the monks were unable to detach the venerable Yamaka from that evil false view. So they got up from their seats and approached the venerable Sāriputta.

Having approached the venerable Sāriputta, they said this to him:

“Avuso Sāriputta, an evil false view has arisen in a monk named Yamaka, thus:

‘As I understand the Dharma taught by the Blessed One, a monk whose influxes are destroyed is annihilated and perishes when the body breaks up and does not exist after death.’

It would be good if the venerable Sāriputta, out of compassion, approach the monk Yamaka.”

10 The venerable Sāriputta consented by his silence.

<sup>5</sup> “False view” (*diṭṭhi, gata*), “recourse to views, field of views: (Ñānamoli, 1994): 6 kinds are given at Pm 1:130, 2 kinds at It 43.

<sup>6</sup> *Tathāhaṃ Bhagavatā dhammaṃ desitaṃ ājānāmi, yathā khīṇāsavo bhikkhu kāyassa bheda ucchijjati vinassati na hoti param maraṇā ti*. This view is not the traditional annihilationist one, he does not claim that all beings are annihilated at death. It appears to be an eternalist view as regards the unawakened (since he has a “lasting self” that is reborn) and an annihilationist view as regards the arhat (since he “totally perishes” at death). Comy: If he had thought: “Formations arise and they also end, that is, merely the process of formations that does not occur,” this would not be a view, but knowledge in keeping with the teaching. But since he thinks, “A being is annihilated and exterminated,” this becomes a view (SA 2:310). The foll passages have parallels in **Alagaddūpama S** (M 22/1:130-142) and **Mahā Taṇhā,saṅkhaya S** (M 38/1:256-271), with which Yamaka S should be studied.

### Sāriputta admonishes Yamaka

**11** Then, in the evening, the venerable Sāriputta emerged from his retreat. He approached the venerable Yamaka. Having approached the venerable Yamaka, he exchanged greetings with him. When this courteous and friendly exchange was concluded, they sat down at one side.

**12** Seated thus at one side, the venerable Sāriputta said this to the venerable Yamaka,

“Avuso Yamaka, is it true that such a harmful view has arisen in you, thus:

‘As I understand the Dharma taught by the Blessed One, a monk whose influxes are destroyed [111] is annihilated and perishes when the body breaks up and does not exist after death?’”

**13** “That is very true, avuso. As I understand the Dharma taught by the Blessed One, a monk whose influxes are destroyed is annihilated and perishes when the body breaks up and does not exist after death.”

### The three characteristics<sup>7</sup>

**14** “What do you think, avuso Yamaka, is form permanent or impermanent?”

“Impermanent, avuso.”

“Is what is impermanent unsatisfactory or satisfactory?”<sup>8</sup>

“Unsatisfactory, avuso.”

“Is what is impermanent, unsatisfactory and subject to change fit to be regarded thus: ‘This is mine, this I am, this is my self.’?”<sup>9</sup>

“No, avuso.”

**15** “Now, what do you think, avuso Yamaka, is feeling permanent or impermanent?”

“Impermanent, avuso.”

“Is what is impermanent unsatisfactory or satisfactory?”

“Unsatisfactory, avuso.”

“Is what is impermanent, unsatisfactory and subject to change fit to be regarded thus: ‘This is mine, this I am, this is my self.’?”

“No, avuso.”

**16** “Now, what do you think, avuso Yamaka, is perception permanent or impermanent?”

“Impermanent, avuso.”

“Is what is impermanent unsatisfactory or satisfactory?”

“Unsatisfactory, avuso.”

“Is what is impermanent, unsatisfactory and subject to change fit to be regarded thus: ‘This is mine, this I am, this is my self.’?”

“No, avuso.”

**17** “Now, what do you think, avuso Yamaka, are formations permanent or impermanent?”

“Impermanent, avuso.”

“Is what is impermanent unsatisfactory or satisfactory?”

“Unsatisfactory, avuso.”

“Is what is impermanent, unsatisfactory and subject to change fit to be regarded thus: ‘This is mine, this I am, this is my self.’?”

“No, avuso.”

**18** “Now, what do you think, avuso Yamaka, is consciousness permanent or impermanent?”

“Impermanent, avuso.”

“Is what is impermanent unsatisfactory or satisfactory?”

“Unsatisfactory, avuso.”

<sup>7</sup> §§15-18 are stock = **Anatta,lakkhaṇa S** (S 22.59.12-22/3: 67 f) = SD 1.2.

<sup>8</sup> *dukkhaṃ vā sukhaṃ vā*, lit “suffering or happiness?”

<sup>9</sup> The notion “This is mine” arises through craving (*taṇhā*); the notion “This I am” arises through conceit (*māna*); the notion “This is my self” arises through views (*diṭṭhi*). See Peter Harvey, *The Selfless Mind*, 1995:32 f.

“Is what is impermanent, unsatisfactory and subject to change fit to be regarded thus: ‘This is mine, this I am, this is my self.’?”

“No, avuso.”

### Universality of not-self

**19a** “Therefore, avuso Yamaka, any kind of form whatsoever, whether past, future or present, internal or external, gross or subtle, inferior or superior, far or near<sup>10</sup>—all forms should be seen as they really are with right wisdom thus:

‘This is not mine, this I am not, this is not my self.’<sup>11</sup>

**19b** Therefore, avuso Yamaka, any kind of feeling whatsoever, whether past, future or present, internal or external, gross or subtle, inferior or superior, far or near—all feelings should be seen as they really are with right wisdom thus:

‘This is not mine, this I am not, this is not my self.’

**19c** Therefore, avuso Yamaka, any kind of perception whatsoever, whether past, future or present, internal or external, gross or subtle, inferior or superior, far or near—all perceptions should be seen as they really are with right wisdom thus:

‘This is not mine, this I am not, this is not my self.’

**19d** Therefore, avuso Yamaka, any kind of formations whatsoever, whether past, future or present, internal or external, gross or subtle, inferior or superior, far or near—all formations should be seen as they really are with right wisdom thus:

‘This is not mine, this I am not, this is not my self.’

**19e** Therefore, avuso Yamaka, any kind of consciousness whatsoever, whether past, future or present, internal or external, gross or subtle, inferior or superior, far or near—all consciousness should be seen as they really are with right wisdom thus:

‘This is not mine, this I am not, this is not my self.’

### Disenchantment & liberation

**20a** Seeing thus, Anurādhā, the learned noble disciple is revulsed [disenchanted] with form, is revulsed with feeling, is revulsed with perception, is revulsed with formations, is revulsed with consciousness.

Through revulsion, he becomes dispassionate.

Through dispassion, his mind is liberated.

**20b** When it is liberated, there arises the knowledge: ‘Free am I!’ He understands: ‘Destroyed is birth. The holy life has been lived. What needs to be done has been done. There is no more of this state of being.’<sup>12</sup>

<sup>10</sup> See S 22.48/3:47. This classification of the Aggregates is explained in detail in the Vibhaṅga and briefly in the Visuddhimagga: “**internal**” = physical sense-organs; “**external**” = physical sense-objects; “**gross**” = that which impinges (physical internal and external senses, with touch = earth, wind, fire); “**subtle**” = that which does not impinge (mind, mind-objects, mind-consciousness, and water); “**inferior**” = unpleasant and unacceptable sense-experiences [sense-world existence]; “**superior**” = pleasant and acceptable sense-experiences [form & formless existences]; “**far**” = subtle objects (“difficult to penetrate”); “**near**” = gross objects (“easy to penetrate”) (Vbh 1-13; Vism 14.73/450 f; Abhs 6.7). “Whether or not the details of the Vibhaṅga exposition are accepted as valid for the *nikāyas*, it seems clear that this formula is intended to indicate how each *khandha* is to be seen as a class of states, manifold in nature and displaying a considerable variety and also a certain hierarchy” (Gethin 1986:41).

<sup>11</sup> *N’etaṃ mama, n’eso ’ham asmī, na mēso attā ti*. This threefold formula is the contrary of “the 3 graspings” (*ti, vidhā gāha*), that is, of view (*diṭṭhi*), of craving (*taṇhā*), of conceit (*māna*) (MA 2:111, 225): here applied to the 5 aggregates [17-21]. A brief version, “There can be no considering that (element) as ‘I’ or ‘mine’ or ‘I am’” (*ahan ti vā maman ti vā asmī ti vā*) is found in **Mahā Hatthi, padōpama S** (M 28/1:184-191 §§6b-7, 11b-12, 16b-17, 21b-22). These three considerations represent respectively the 3 kinds of **mental proliferation** (*papañca*) of self-view (*sakkāya diṭṭhi*), of craving (*taṇhā*) and of conceit (*māna*) (Nm 280; Vbh 393; Nett 37 f). In **Anatta, Jakkhaṇa S** (S 22.59.12-16/3:68), the formula is applied to the 5 aggregates & in **Pārileyya S** (S 22.81/ 3:94-99) to the 4 primary elements. See also **Rāhula S** (A 4.177/2:164 f). See **Pārileyya S**, SD 6.16 Introd (5).

### The nature of the Tathagata

21 What do you think, avuso Yamaka, do you regard form as the Tathagata?"

"No, avuso."

22 "Do you regard feeling as the Tathagata?"

"No, avuso."

23 "Do you regard perception as the Tathagata?"

"No, avuso."

24 "Do you regard formations as the Tathagata?"

"No, avuso."

25-26<sup>13</sup> "Do you regard consciousness as the Tathagata?"

"No, avuso."

27 What do you think, avuso Yamaka, do you regard the Tathagata as in form?"

"No, avuso."

"Do you regard the Tathagata as apart from form?"

"No, avuso."

28 "Do you regard the Tathagata as in feeling?"

"No, avuso."

"Do you regard the Tathagata as apart from feeling?"

"No, avuso."

29 "Do you regard the Tathagata as in perception?"

"No, avuso."

"Do you regard the Tathagata as apart from perception?"

"No, avuso."

30 "Do you regard the Tathagata as in formations?"

"No, avuso."

"Do you regard the Tathagata as apart from formations?"

"No, avuso."

31 "Do you regard the Tathagata as in consciousness?"

"No, avuso."

"Do you regard the Tathagata as apart from consciousness?"

"No, avuso."

32 "What do you think, avuso Yamaka, do you regard form, feeling, perception, formations, consciousness (taken together) as the Tathagata?"

"No, avuso." [112]

33 "What do you think, avuso Yamaka, do you regard the Tathagata as one who is without form, without feeling, without perception, without formations, without consciousness?"<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Comy: At the end of the teaching on the 3 characteristics, Yamaka becomes a streamwinner. Sāriputta asks the foll questions to ascertain that he has given up his wrong view. (SA 2:309). **Bodhi:** "{SA] glosses *tathāgata* here as 'a being' (*satta*), which I think does not quite hit the mark. I take the subject of the discussion to be, not a being in general, but the arahant *conceived as a being*, as a substantial self. Thus the catechism will show that Yamaka has abandoned his identity view (*sakkāyadiṭṭhi*) regarding the arahant, and therewith his view of the arahant as a self that undergoes annihilation. We find a similar transition from the arahant (*vimuttacitta bhikkhu*) to the Tathāgata at [M 1:140,3-7 and 1:486-488]." (S:B 1079 n152)

<sup>13</sup> So PTS numbering.

<sup>14</sup> The sequence here—(1) conceiving the aggregates *individually* as the Tathagat, (2) the Tathagata as *within* the aggregate, and (3) the Tathagata as being *apart* from the aggregate—follows the first 3 modes of conceiving as presented in **Mūla,pariyāya S** (M 1:1), and which are presented in terms of the sense-bases in **Sārappa S** (S 35.30/-4:21-23), **Sappāya S 1** (S 35.31/4:23 f) and **Sappāya S 2** (S 35.32/4:34 f).

“No, avuso.”

**34** “But, avuso Yamaka, when the Tathagata is not being apprehended by you as true and real<sup>15</sup> here in this very life,<sup>16</sup> is it fitting for you to declare:

‘Avuso, when a Tathagata is describing a Tathagata—the highest person, the supreme person, the attainer of the supreme—he describes him apart from these four grounds:

the Tathagata exists after death, or  
the Tathagata does not exist after death, or  
the Tathagata both exists and not exist after death, or  
the Tathagata neither exists nor not exist after death.’?”

**35** “Formerly, avuso Sāriputta, when I was ignorant, I held that evil false view, but now that I have heard this Dharma teaching of the venerable Sāriputta, I have abandoned that evil false view, and have attained to the Dharma.”<sup>17</sup>

**36** “If, avuso Yamaka, they were to ask you,

‘Avuso Yamaka, when a monk is an arhat whose influxes are destroyed, what happens to him when the body breaks up, after death?’—

being asked thus, what would you answer?”

**37a** “If, avuso, they were to ask me,

‘Avuso Yamaka, when a monk is an arhat whose influxes are destroyed, what happens to him when the body breaks up, after death?’—

being asked thus, avuso, I would answer thus:

**37b** <sup>18</sup>**Friends, form is impermanent; what is impermanent is suffering; what is suffering has ended and gone away.**

**Feeling is impermanent; what is impermanent is suffering; what is suffering has ended and gone away.**

**Perception is impermanent; what is impermanent is suffering; what is suffering has ended and gone away.**

**Formations are impermanent; what are impermanent are suffering; what are suffering have ended and gone away.**

**Consciousness is impermanent; what is impermanent is suffering; what is suffering has ended and gone away.’**

Being asked thus, avuso, I would answer thus.<sup>19</sup>

### Sāriputta’s simile

**38** “Sadhu [excellent], sadhu, avuso Yamaka! Now, avuso Yamaka, I will use a simile here to so that you will know its meaning better.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>15</sup> “As true and real,” *saccato thetato*; as at **Alagaddūpama S** (M 22.25/1:138; cf 22.36/1:140); **Yamaka S** (S 22.85.34/3:112); **Anurādha S** (S 22.86.21/3:118 = S 44.2.21/4:384); **Titth’āyatana S** (A 3.61.2-4/1:174 f x3); Vbh 376 f (×4), 382 (×6); Pug 3.17/38 (×12); Kvu 67 f (×13). Vbh:T tr *staccato thetato* as “firmly as truth” (Vbh:T 487).

<sup>16</sup> Be Ce Ke Se: *Diṭṭheva dhamme saccato tathato tathāgate anupalabbhiyamāne*; Ee *Diṭṭheva dhamme saccato thetato tathāgate anupalabbhiyamāno*. Cf **Alagaddūpama S** (M 22): “And bhikkhus, since in truth and in reality, one can find neither self nor what belongs to a self” (*attani ca bhikkhave attaniye ca saccato thetato anupalabbhamāne*, M 22.25/1:138,5-6 = SD 3.13) & “one thus gone, I say, is untraceable even here and now” (*diṭṭh’evāhaṃ bhikkhave dhamme tathāgataṃ ananuvejjo ti vadāmi*, M 22.36/1:140,6-7).

<sup>17</sup> *Dhammo ca me abhisameto*. Comy: He has penetrated the four noble truths with wisdom, and become a streamwinner (SA 2:308). The n for *abhisameto* (“has penetrated”) is *abhisamaya*: see S:B 729 n13.

<sup>18</sup> *Rūpaṃ kho āvuso aniccaṃ...< Vedanā aniccaṃ...Saññā aniccā...Saṅkhārā aniccā...Viññāṇaṃ aniccaṃ...> yad aniccaṃ taṃ dukkhaṃ, yaṃ dukkhaṃ taṃ niruddhaṃ tad atthagatan ti*.

<sup>19</sup> **Bodhi**: “This passage can be read as a gloss on the Buddha’s famous dictum, ‘I make known just suffering and the cessation of suffering’.” (S:B 1079 n156). See end of **Anurādha S** (S 22.86.21/3:119) = SD 21.13.



39 Suppose, avuso Yamaka, there were a householder or a householder's son, rich, with great riches, with great wealth, with great property, and is guarded by a body guard.<sup>21</sup> Then there were to be a certain person who wishes to ruin him, who wishes to destroy him, who wishes to endanger him, who wishes to take his life. [113] He would think:

'This householder or householder's son is rich, with great riches, with great wealth, with great property, and is guarded by a body guard. It would not be easy to take his life by force. What now if I were to take his life, having encroached on him.'<sup>22</sup>

Then he would approach that householder or householder's son. Having approached him, he would say:

'I would like to serve you, venerable sir.'<sup>23</sup>

Then the householder or householder's son would employ him. The man would serve by rising before him, retiring after him, doing whatever he wishes, agreeable in conduct, endearing in speech. The householder or householder's son would regard him as a friend,<sup>24</sup> a bosom friend, and would trust him.<sup>25</sup>

And, avuso, when he knows that the householder or householder's son fully trusts<sup>26</sup> him, then, finding him alone, he takes his life with sharp knife.

40 What do you think, avuso Yamaka, when the man approached that householder or householder's son, saying, 'I would like to serve you, venerable sir,' is he not a murderer then, even though he is not known as 'My murderer!'?

41 And when he is serving him by rising before him, retiring after him, doing whatever he wishes, agreeable in conduct, endearing in speech—is he or was he not a murderer then, even though he is not known as 'My murderer!'?

42 And when he knows that the householder or householder's son fully trusts him, then, finding him alone, he takes his life with sharp knife—is he not a murderer then, even though he is not known as 'My murderer!'?<sup>27</sup>

"Yes, avuso."

---

<sup>20</sup> *Tena hāvuso Yamaka upamaṃ te karissāmi etass'eva atthassa bhīyyoso, mattāya ñāṇāya.* The more common stock is "Regarding that, avuso, I will give you a simile; for, some wise persons understand the meaning of what is said by means of a simile" (*tena hāvuso, upamaṃ te karissāmi; upamāya p'idh'ekacce viññū purisā bhāsitassa attham ājānanti*): **Pāyāsi S** (D 23.9/2:324); **Ratha,vinīta S** (M 24.14/1:148), **Mahā Vedalla S** (M 43.-22/1:295), **Upāli S** (M 56.26/1:384), **Sandaka S** (M 52/1:523), **Anuruddha S** (M 127.16/3:151); **Naḷakalāpī S** (S 12.67/2:114), **Uttara,vipatti S** (A 8.8.5/4:163), **Uttiya S** (A 10.95.4/ 5:194); in verse: **Soṇaka J** (J 529/5:255) & **Mahā Narada,kassapa J** (J 544/6:234) [given as J 544 in World Tipiṭaka],

<sup>21</sup> *Ārakkha,sampanno.*

<sup>22</sup> *Yan nūnāham anupakhajja jīvītā voropeyyan ti*, CPD, *anupakhajja* (from *anupakkhandati*, "he encroaches on"): "to kill him after having insinuated myself with him."

<sup>23</sup> "Venerable sir," *bhante*. See **Dhānañjāni S** (M 97) = SD 4.9(5).

<sup>24</sup> *Ee Ke Se daheyya; Be Ce saddaheyya* (preferred).

<sup>25</sup> *Tassa so gahapati vā gahapti,putto vā mittato pi nam daheyya suhajjato pi nam daheyya tasmiṃ ca vissāsam āpajjeyya.*

<sup>26</sup> "Fully trusts," *samvissattho* (*sam + vissattha*, pp of *vissasati*).

<sup>27</sup> Comy says that the uninstructed worldling attached to samsara is like the foolish householder, the five fragile aggregates like the murderous enemy. When the enemy comes up to the householder and offers to serve him, that is like the time of arising of the aggregates at the moment of rebirth. When the householder gullibly takes the enemy to be his friend, that is like the time when the foolish worldling grasps the aggregates, thinking, "They are mine!" The honour that the householder confers upon the enemy, thinking, "He is my friend!" is like the honour a worldling confers on the aggregates by bathing them, feeding them, etc. The murder of the householder by the enemy is like the destruction of the worldling's life when the aggregates break up. (SA 2:312)

The ignorant ordinary person

43 “Even so,<sup>28</sup> avuso Yamaka, an ignorant ordinary person,<sup>29</sup> who has no regard for noble ones and is unskilled and undisciplined in their Dharma, who has no regard for the true individuals and is unskilled and undisciplined in their Dharma,

regards form as self, or self as possessing form, or form as in self, or self as in form.

He regards feeling as self, or self as possessing feeling, or feeling as in self, or self as in feeling.

He regards perception as self, or self as possessing perception, or perception as in self, or self as in perception.

He regards formations as self, or self as possessing formations, or formations as in self, or self as in formations.

He regards consciousness [113] as self, or self as possessing consciousness, or consciousness as in self, or self as in consciousness.

44 He does not understand impermanent form, as it really is, as impermanent form.<sup>30</sup>

He does not understand impermanent feeling, as it really is, as impermanent feeling.

He does not understand impermanent perception, as it really is, as impermanent perception.

He does not understand impermanent formations, as they really are, as impermanent formations.

He does not understand impermanent consciousness, as it really is, as impermanent consciousness.

45 He does not understand unsatisfactory form, as it really is, as impermanent form.

He does not understand unsatisfactory feeling, as it really is, as impermanent feeling.

He does not understand unsatisfactory perception, as it really is, as impermanent perception.

He does not understand unsatisfactory formations, as they really are, as impermanent formations.

He does not understand unsatisfactory consciousness, as it really is, as impermanent consciousness.

46 He does not understand selfless form, as it really is, as selfless form.

He does not understand selfless feeling, as it really is, as selfless feeling.

He does not understand selfless perception, as it really is, as selfless perception.

He does not understand selfless formations, as they really are, as selfless formations.

He does not understand selfless consciousness, as it really is, as selfless consciousness.

47 He does not understand conditioned form, as it really is, as conditioned form.

He does not understand conditioned feeling, as it really is, as conditioned feeling.

He does not understand conditioned perception, as it really is, as conditioned perception.

He does not understand conditioned formations, as they really are, as conditioned formations.

He does not understand conditioned consciousness, as it really is, as conditioned consciousness.

48 He does not understand murderous form, as it really is, as murderous form.

He does not understand murderous feeling, as it really is, as murderous feeling.

He does not understand murderous perception, as it really is, as murderous perception.

He does not understand murderous formations, as they really are, as murderous formations.

He does not understand murderous consciousness, as it really is, as murderous consciousness.

49 He is engaged with form, clings to it, determines form as ‘my self.’<sup>31</sup>

He is engaged with feeling, clings to it, determines feeling as ‘my self.’

He is engaged with perception, clings to it, determines perception as ‘my self.’

He is engaged with formations, clings to it, determines formations as ‘my self.’

<sup>28</sup> For a similar parable in the same context of the aggregates, see **Asivisopama S** (S 35.238) = SD 17.2(6.2).

<sup>29</sup> On def of *puthujjana*, see **Nakula,pita S** (S 22.1/3:1-5) Intro (3).

<sup>30</sup> *So aniccaṃ rūpaṃ “aniccaṃ rūpaṃ ti yathā, bhūtaṃ na pajānāti.* The next 4 paras are also in **Udāna S** (S 22.55.5-8/3:56).

<sup>31</sup> As in **Kaccāna,gotta S** (S 12.15.6/2:17) = SD 6.13. See S:B 736 nn31-32.



He is engaged with consciousness, clings to it, determines consciousness as ‘my self.’

These very same five aggregates of clinging, that he is engaged to and that he clings to, bring about his harm and suffering for a long time.

### The wise noble disciple

**50** The wise noble disciple, avuso, who has regard for noble ones and is skilled and disciplined in their Dharma, who has regard for the true individuals and is skilled and disciplined in their Dharma, does not regard form as self, or self as possessing form, or form as in self, or self as in form.

He does not regard feeling as self, or self as possessing feeling, or feeling as in self, or self as in feeling.

He does not regard perception as self, or self as possessing perception, or perception as in self, or self as in perception.

He does not regard formations as self, or self as possessing formations, or formations as in self, or self as in formations.

He does not regard consciousness as self, or self as possessing consciousness, or consciousness as in self, or self as in consciousness. [115]

<b>51</b> He understands <u>impermanent</u> form, as it really is, as	impermanent form. <sup>32</sup>
He understands impermanent feeling, as it really is, as	impermanent feeling.
He understands impermanent perception, as it really is, as	impermanent perception.
He understands impermanent formations, as they really are, as	impermanent formations.
He understands impermanent consciousness, as it really is, as	impermanent consciousness.

<b>52</b> He understands <u>unsatisfactory</u> form, as it really is, as	unsatisfactory form.
He understands unsatisfactory feeling, as it really is, as	unsatisfactory feeling.
He understands unsatisfactory perception, as it really is, as	unsatisfactory perception.
He understands unsatisfactory formations, as they really are, as	unsatisfactory formations.
He understands unsatisfactory consciousness, as it really is, as	unsatisfactory consciousness.

<b>53</b> He understands <u>selfless</u> form, as it really is, as	selfless form.
He understands selfless feeling, as it really is, as	selfless feeling.
He understands selfless perception, as it really is, as	selfless perception.
He understands selfless formations, as they really are, as	selfless formations.
He understands selfless consciousness, as it really is, as	selfless consciousness.

<b>54</b> He understands <u>conditioned</u> form, as it really is, as	conditioned form.
He understands conditioned feeling, as it really is, as	conditioned feeling.
He understands conditioned perception, as it really is, as	conditioned perception.
He understands conditioned formations, as they really are, as	conditioned formations.
He understands conditioned consciousness, as it really is, as	conditioned consciousness.

<b>55</b> He understands <u>murderous</u> form, as it really is, as	murderous form.
He understands murderous feeling, as it really is, as	murderous feeling.
He understands murderous perception, as it really is, as	murderous perception.
He understands murderous formations, as they really are, as	murderous formations.
He understands murderous consciousness, as it really is, as	murderous consciousness.

<sup>32</sup> So aniccaṃ rūpaṃ “aniccaṃ rūpaṃ ti yathā, bhūtaṃ na pajānāti.

56 He is not engaged with form, clings not to it, does not determine form as ‘my self.’<sup>33</sup>  
 He is not engaged with feeling, clings not to it, does not determine feeling as ‘my self.’  
 He is not engaged with perception, clings not to it, does not determine perception as ‘my self.’  
 He is not engaged with formations, clings not to it, does not determine formations as ‘my self.’  
 He is not engaged with consciousness, clings not to it, does not determine consciousness as ‘my self.’

These very same five aggregates of clinging, that he is not engaged to and that he does not cling to, bring about his welfare and happiness for a long time.”

### Yamaka is liberated

57 “So it is, indeed, avuso Sāriputta. For these venerable fellow brahmacharis, such as them, are compassionate advisors and admonishers, wishing one benefit. Now that I have heard the venerable Sāriputta’s Dharma teaching, my mind is, through non-clinging, liberated from the influxes.”<sup>34</sup> [116]

58 The venerable Sāriputta said this. The venerable Yamaka, rejoicing, approved of the venerable Sāriputta’s word.<sup>35</sup>

— evaṃ —

060405; 071129; 090827

<sup>33</sup> Cf §49 (which is the reverse).

<sup>34</sup> Be omits this last line. “Influxes,” *āsava*. The term comes from *ā-savati* “flows towards” (ie either “into” or “out” towards the observer). It has been variously translated as taints (“deadly taints,” RD), corruptions, intoxicants, biases, depravity, misery, evil (influence), or simply left untranslated. The Abhidhamma lists 4 *āsava*: the influx of (1) sense-desire (*kām’āsava*), (2) (desire for eternal) existence (*bhav’āsava*), (3) wrong views (*diṭṭh’āsava*), (4) ignorance (*avijjāśava*) (D 16.2.4, Pm 1.442, 561, Dhs §§1096-1100, Vbh §937). These 4 are also known as “floods” (*ogha*) and “yokes” (*yoga*). The list of 3 influxes (the influx of views in subsumed under the influx of existence, MA 1:67) is probably older and is found more frequently in the Suttas (D 3:216, 33.1.10(20); M 1:55, 3:41; A 3.59, 67, 6.63). The destruction of these influxes is equivalent to arhathood. See BDict under *āsava*.

<sup>35</sup> Cf **Anatta,lakkhaṇa S** (S 22.59) ending: “This is what the Blessed One said. The monks, rejoicing, approved of the Blessed One’s word. And while this discourse was being spoken, the minds of the five monks were, through non-clinging, freed from the influxes.” (S 22.59.23-24/3:68) = SD 1.2.