1 The Bhaggā

The names Nakula, pitā and Nakula, mātā are not their real names (which are not mentioned in the texts); for, they simply mean “father of Nakula” and “mother of Nakula” respectively. Nakula must have been an important person in the Buddhist community but records of him have not come down to us. Nakula, pitā and his wife, Nakula, mātā, were householders of Sūṇīsumāra, giri in Bhaggā country.

Bhaggā (not listed among the 16 major countries of the Buddha’s time)¹ was the name of a tribe and a country, the capital of which was Sūṇīsumāra, giri, which the Buddha visited several times in the course of his wanderings,² and four rules for the monks were laid down there.³ The Bhaggā were probably subjects of king Udena of Kosambī, whose son, Bodhī Rājakumāra, lived there apparently as his father’s viceroy. The Cambridge History of India (1:175) says that the Bhaggā were members of the Vajjī confederacy. The Bhagga country lay between Vesālī and Sāvatthī.

Sūṇīsumāra, giri was so called because it was said that noise made by a crocodile (sūṇīsumāra) in a nearby lake was heard when the town was being built (MA 2:65; SA 2:249). The Buddha spent his eighth rains retreat there (BA 3). It was while sojourning there that Moggallāna was attacked by Māra entering his belly (M 1:332). It was there too that he expounded the Anumāna Sutta (M 15/1:95-100). When the Buddha was at Sūṇīsumāra, giri, he saw (through his divine eye) that Moggallāna was very drowsy while meditating at Kallavā, mutā, appeared before him and admonished him (A 4:85). The elder Sirimāṇḍa, famous for his reflection on the confession of faults, was a brahmin of Sūṇīsumāra, giri (Tha 447-452). Sirimala, pitā (Sīmala’s father) went there for meditation and became an arhat (Tha A 1:70). The Apadāna mentions the Bhaggā along with the Kārusā (Ap 2:359).

2 Nakula, pitā and Nakula, mātā

When the Buddha stayed at Bhesakāla Forest, Nakula, pitā and his wife visited him and immediately fell at his feet, calling him “son” (AA 1:400) and asking why he had been away for so long. It is said that they had been the Bodhisattva’s parents for five hundred births and his near relatives for many more (AA 3:95). The Buddha taught them the Dharma and they became streamwinners.

The Buddha again visited their village when they were old. They entertained him, telling of their devotion to each other in this life and asking for a teaching which should keep them likewise together in the after-life.⁴ The Buddha referred to this event in the assembly of the Order, declaring them to be the most warm and trustworthy of companions (vissāsikā) among his lay disciples.⁵ It is said that Nakula, pitā’s desire for this eminence was first conceived in the time of Padum’uttara Buddha. He was then a viceroy. The rules are as follows: monks are allowed to step on cloth for use after the feet are washed (V 2:127); Pāc 56 on not kindling a fire when not sick (V 4:115 f); Sekh 56 on not accepting a drinking vessel with food-soiled hands (V 4:198); Sekh 56 on not throwing away bowl-washing with rice-grains when amongst houses (V 4:199). Cf V 5:145; VA 1305.

Once, when Nakula, pitā lies grievously ill, his wife notices that he is filled with anxiety. She assures him that he need not feel anxious either for her or for his children. She speaks with such conviction that Nakula, pitā regains his composure of mind and recovers. Later he visits the Buddha and recounts the event and is praised by the Buddha for having such a good wife. (A 3:295 ff)

¹ The 16 great states: see (Tad-ah’) Uposatha S (A 3.70), SD 4.18 App.
² eg V 2:127, 4:115, 198; A 2:61, 4:85.
³ The rules are as follows: monks are allowed to step on cloth for use after the feet are washed (V 2:127); Pāc 56 on not kindling a fire when not sick (V 4:115 f); Sekh 56 on not accepting a drinking vessel with food-soiled hands (V 4:198); Sekh 56 on not throwing away bowl-washing with rice-grains when amongst houses (V 4:199). Cf V 5:145; VA 1305.
⁴ Sama, jīvi S (A 4.55/2:61 f).
The Khandha Sānhyutta of the Sānhyutta Nikāya opens with the Nakula,piṭā Sutta; hence, this opening chapter is called Nakula,piṭā Vagga (S 3.1-21). Both husband and wife are mentioned in lists of eminent disciples.⁶ The Nakula,piṭā Sutta is an example of a teaching where the Buddha speaks in brief, and that brief teaching is expanded by a disciple (Sārīputta).

3 Puthujjana

3.1 MEANING OF PUTHU. The Commentaries⁷ distinguish between two kinds of “worldlings” (puthujjana), namely, the “un tutored ordinary person” or “uninstructed worldling” (assutava puthujjana) and the “good ordinary person” (kalyāna puthujjana), both of which, as such, have not reached stream-winning. The un tutored ordinary person has neither theoretical knowledge of the Dharma nor training in mental development. The good ordinary person, however, has both and is striving to reach the path.

The Commentaries give some details. By assutava (ignorant, un instructed) is meant lacking in learning, question ing and discriminating the aggregates, the elements, the sense-bases, cause-and-effect, the stations of mindfulness, etc. Puthujjana (ordinary person, worldling) literally means “a thick or dense person, part of a crowd,” so called because such a one generates much and various defilements—a crowd or mass of defilements—etc (puthūna māna-p, pākāraṇam kiles’ādāna janan’ādāna janan’ādi, kāratehi puthujjano); and also because he is amongst the masses (puthūna janānānānto, ghadattā), in numbers beyond reckoning, engaged in low Dharma contrary to the Dharma of the noble ones. Or else, puthu means “counted as separate”: the ordinary person is one apart from the noble ones who possesses such qualities as virtue, learning, etc (puthu va āyāna visuṁ y’eva sankham gato, visanisaṭṭho sīla, sut’ādi,-gaṇa, yuttehi ariyehi jano ti puthujjano).⁸

In his Sānhyutta translation, Bodhi notes that this twofold etymology stems from a twofold understanding of the Pāli puthu as representing either Vedic prthu (numerous, many) or prthak (separate, distinct). The Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit form prthagjana indicates a preference for the latter, but the Pali Commentators tend to favour the former (prthu, jana) as etymology. (S:B 769 n153)⁹

3.2 TWO KINDS OF WORLDLINGS. As already stated [3.1], the Commentaries generally speak of two kinds of worldlings: the blind worldling (andha puthujjana) and the good worldling (kalyāna puthujjana). The blind worldling is an unawakened being who does not review [reflect on], nor remember, nor listen to, nor question about, nor learn about the five aggregates, the four elements, the six sense-bases and related teachings, while the good worldling does so.¹⁰

The Commentaries also use the expression “foolish worldling” (bāḷa puthujjana) here.¹¹ Bāḷa has a range of related meanings: a young boy, a fool, an immature person. Such a person is “apart, separate” (puthu) from the wise. This separateness is not exactly a fixed category as it is a dynamic phase, that is, it is possible for the immature worldling to mature in due course into a wise person.

The good worldling, although still unawakened, is open to the Dharma, and reflects and reviews on the true nature of things, especially that of impermanence. While the blind worldling is one who goes with the worldly flow (amusota, gāmi), the good worldling goes against worldly currents (paṭisota, gāmi). In this model, the learners on the path are said to be the “stable-minded” (thī’tta), and beyond this is the non-learner, the arhat.¹²

---

⁷ For example, DA 1:59, MA 1:21, SA 2:97, AA 1:62, SnA 2:536.
⁸ DA 1:59 = SA 2:97.
¹⁰ Tattha yassa khandha, dhātu, āyatan’ādi suggaha, paripucchā, savana, dhārana, paccavekkhanāni n’āththi, āyām andha, puthujjana. Yassa tānī atthi, so kalyāṇa, puthujjana. (DA 1:59 = PmA 1:266; cf PmA 1:205)
¹² NettA (Be 248 = VRI 364).
In simple terms, these two categories of people, or more correctly, these two tendencies in a person, refer to their willingness and ability to seek and understand the Dharma. There were no concepts of “Buddhist” during the Buddha’s time and in the early after-centuries. The notion of “statistical Buddhist” probably arose with communal politics and secular administration. There was also no concept of a “nominal Buddhist.” There are only 3 categories of those who understand and practise the Buddha’s teachings, that is,

1. the good worldlings (kalyāṇa puthujjana) or those capable of keeping to the Buddhist training;
2. the learners (sekha) or the saints (ordained and lay) on the path to awakening; and
3. the non-learners (asekha) or arhats, who have fully attained to the goal of awakening.

The minimum standard for a “Buddhist” is that of being a streamwinner (sotāpanna), or at least, the effective aspiration to be one.

4 The self-identity view

The Sāriyutta Commentary gives a helpful explanation of the self-identity view [§12].

1. The phrase “he regards form as self” (rūpaṁ attato samanupassati) means that he regards form and the self as identical, just as the flame of an oil lamp and its colour are inseparable.
2. The phrase “self as possessing form” (rūpavantam attānam) means he takes the formless (ie the mind or mental factors) as a self that possesses form in the way an object such as a tree possesses a shadow.
3. The phrase “form as in self” (attani rūpaṁ) means that he takes the formless (the mind) as a self within which form is located like the scent is in a flower.
4. The phrase “self as in form” (rūpasmin attānam) means that he takes the formless (the mind) as a self located in form like a jewel in its casket.

“He lives obsessed by the notions, ‘I am form, form is mine’” (ahaṁ rūpaṁ mam rūpan ti pari-yutthaṭṭhāyino) means having swallowed these ideas, he takes his stand on them and holds on to them (SA 2:254 f).

The Commentary goes on to say that the identification of each aggregate with the self is the annihilationist view (uccheda,diṭṭhi), while the other views are variants of the eternalist view (sassata,diṭṭhi). Thus there are 5 types of annihilationism and 15 of eternalism (SA 2:255). Bodhi however disagrees,

To my mind this is unacceptable, for eternalist views can clearly be formulated by taking the individual mental aggregates as the self. It also seems to me questionable that a view of self must implicitly posit one (or more) of the aggregates as self; for a view of self to have any meaning or content, it need only posit a relationship between a supposed self and the aggregates, but it need not identify one of the aggregates as a self. According to the Buddha, all such positions collapse under analysis. See the “consideration of self” section of the Mahānidāna Sutta (D 2:66-68), translated with commentary in Bodhi, The Great Discourse on Causation, [1984] pp 53-55, 92-98.

The nature of self-identity has been discussed at length elsewhere.

See “I” : the nature of identity, SD 19.1 (7.1).
Comys often qu an untraced ref: “The Buddha, the Kinsman of the Sun, speaks of these two worldlings: one is the blind worldling, the other the good worldling” (Duve puthujjana vuttā Buddhena Ādicca,bandhunā andho puthujjano eko kalyāṇe eko puthujjano ti): DA 59 = MA 1:21 = SA 2:97 = AA 1:62 = Nm 2:273 = Nc 76 = PMa 1:205 = 266. See also: MA 1:40; ItA 1:61; UA 269,29 = ItA 2:35,13.
On kalyāṇa,puthujjana, sekha & asekha, see Indriya Bhāvanā S (M 12), SD 17.13.
See Entering the stream, SD 3.3 & (Anicca) Cakkhu S (S 25.1), SD 16.7.
See “I” : the nature of identity, SD 19.1.
5 Healthy mind

The Vibhaṅga Commentary states that “the ordinary person is like one mad” (ummattako viya hi pathujjano) because without considering what is right [connected] or not right [unconnected], he, due to the force of clinging, creates karma out of desire for existence\(^{18}\) (VbhA 186). In short, the untutored ordinary person is mad because he acts out of greed, hate and delusion.

In short, the untutored ordinary person is mad with greed, hate and delusion. The (Dve) Roga Sutta (A 4.157,1) has an important connected teaching here:

Bhikshus, there are these 2 kinds of illnesses [diseases]. What are the two?

Illness of the body and illness of the mind.

Bhikshus, there are to be seen beings who can claim to be physically healthy [illness-free] for a year, …two years, …three years, …four years, …five years, …ten years, …twenty years, …thirty years, …forty years, …fifty years, …who can claim to be healthy for a hundred years.

But bhikshus, hard to find are those beings who can claim to be mentally healthy for even a moment except for those [arhats] whose mental cankers are destroyed. (A 4.157.1/2:142 f), SD 42.16

The Sall’atthena Sutta (S 36.6), similarly speaks of the 2 kinds of pain—physical and mental—and how to deal with them.\(^{19}\)

A connected teaching regarding old age and infirmity is given by the Buddha to Piṅgiya Māṇava,\(^{20}\) found in the Piṅgiya Sutta (Sn 5.16) of the Sutta Nipāta:

\[\text{Piṅgiya:} \]
Old am I, frail, complexion gone,
(thus said the venerable Piṅgiya,)\(^{21}\)
My eyes are dim, my hearing poor.
May I not perish confused meanwhile [in between].\(^{22}\)
Teach me the Dharma that I might know
The abandoning of birth and decay here.

\[\text{[The Buddha:]} \]
Seeing the suffering on account of forms,
(O Piṅgiya, replied the Blessed One,)
(Seeing) the heedless generation oppressed by forms,\(^{23}\)
As such, Piṅgiya, be you heedful—
Let go of form for the sake of no more rebirth!

\[\text{Piṅgiya:} \]
The four quarters, the quarters in between,

---

\(^{18}\) So idāṁ yuttaṁ idāṁ ayuttan ti avicāretvā yassa kassaci upādānassā vasena yaṁ kiñcī bhavaṁ pattthetvā yaṁ kiñcī kammaṁ karoti yeva.

\(^{19}\) S 36.6/4:207-210 = SD 5.5.

\(^{20}\) Māṇava lit means “youth,” but Piṅgiya, nephew of Bāvari, here 120 years old and feeble. As such, this is probably an early name of him that has stuck, or a name fondly given to him as he is one of the 16 “youths,” students of Bāvari. See SnA 413.

\(^{21}\) This bracketed line and the rest below are added by the reciters. See SnA 44.19, & see Sn:N n19-29 (reciters’ remarks).

\(^{22}\) Mā haṁ nassāṁ momuho antarā va. Here antarāyya means “obstacle, hindrance, (and as euphemism for) an (imminent) accident, misfortune, danger, or destruction, ruin, death” (CPD). I follow Norman: “Ne:Ne 199.5* (verse) and 199.22 (lemma) read antarā vā. This is glossed antarāyeva, doubtless to be divided antarāyā eva (cf manasā yeva, Sn 1004), but perhaps taken as antarāy eva. SnA 603,1-2: māhaṁ nassāṁ momuho antarāyā ti māhaṁ tuyham dhammaṁ asacchikatvā antarā eva avidvā hutvā anassāṁ. The presence of (y)eva in both explanations make it clear that the correct reading is antarā vā. (Sn:N n120, citations normalized). Moreover, antarā fits the context better if we accept that Piṅgiya is probably referring to the “intermediate state” (antarā). This could of course be a pun.

\(^{23}\) Ruppanti rūpesu janā pamattā.
Above and below—these are ten directions.
There is nothing in the world that you\textsuperscript{24} have not seen, heard, sensed, or known.
Teach me the Dharma that I might know the abandoning of birth and decay here.

[The Buddha:] Seeing humans gripped by craving,
(O Piṇīya, replied the Blessed One,)
Tormented by birth, overcome by decay,\textsuperscript{25}
Therefore, Piṇīya, be you heedful!
Let go of craving for the sake of no more rebirth!  (Sn 1120-1123)

In terms of the Nakula,piṭā Sutta, the mind is said to be “sick” or afflicted (ātura, citta) when it is associated with the defilements, that is, greed, hate and delusion. Conversely, the mind is not sick, that is, healthy, when it is free of greed, hate and delusion. The whole world is said to be afflicted in both body and mind but the arhat or adept (asekha) is only afflicted in body but unafflicted in mind.

The seven learners (sekha), that is, the 4 saints of the path and the 3 saints at fruition stages, are said to be neither entirely afflicted nor unafflicted in mind, but they are pursuing non-affliction of mind (anātura, citta yeva bhajanti) (SA 2:255 f).

— — —

The Discourse to Nakula’s Father
S\textsuperscript{22.1}

[1]
1 Thus have I heard.
At one time the Blessed One was staying in the deer park\textsuperscript{26} in the Bhesakaḷa Forest\textsuperscript{27} at Suṇsumāra,-giri\textsuperscript{28} in the Bhaggā country.
2 Then the houselord Nakula,piṭā went up to the Blessed One, saluted him\textsuperscript{29} and sat down at one side.

\textsuperscript{24}This line and next: Na tuyha adiṭṭham asutaṁ mutaṁ vā | atho aviññataṁ kiñci n’atthi loke. I take na... kiñci as “nothing.” Tuyha is dative (to you) or genitive (for you, of you, yours), but freely tr here. Muta here refers to the activities of the remaining physical senses: smelling, tasting, touching (“feeling”), all sharing the same manner of “sensing” where the molecules impact the sensing area (phusan’araham, SnA 498) (M 1:3; Sn 714, 812; S 1:186 = S: 1:237 n; S 4:73; Tha 1216). Norman (Sn:N) renders muta here as “thought” which clearly does not fit the context here. Free tr, “There is nothing in the world that you | Have not seen, heard, sensed, or known by you.”

\textsuperscript{25}Santāpa, jāte jarasā parete.

\textsuperscript{26}“Deer park,” miga, dāya, the best down of which is this one outside Benares (S 5:421), where the first discourse is given, as recorded in Dhamma,cakkha Pavatanna S (S 56.11,1/4:420), SD 1.1; another in Bhesakāla forest, near where Nakula,piṭā and Nakula,mātā live: see Anumāna S (M 15,1/1:95) SD 59.3; Māra Tajjaniya S (M 50,1/-1:332), SD 36.4; Nakula,piṭā S (S 22.1/3:1), SD 5.4; Sama,jīvi S (A 4.55,1/2:61), SD 5.1; Nakula S (A 6.16/3:-295), SD 5.2; Nakula,mātā S (A 8.48,1), SD 5.3; and another outside Nādiśa [Nātikā]: see Cūla Gosīṅga S (M 31,1), SD 44.11, Mahā Gosīṅga S (M 32,1), SD 44.12. For other refs, search CSCD using “migadāya***”.

\textsuperscript{27}So called because it is the home of the yakshini Bhesakāla (SA 2:249). The house of Nakula,piṭā and Nakula,-mātā is nearby.

\textsuperscript{28}Suṇsumāra,giri: see Intro (1).

\textsuperscript{29}“Saluted him,” abhidetvā, stock phrase omitted in PTS ed.
“Let not the mind be sick”

3 Sitting thus at one side, the houselord Nakula, pitā said this to the Blessed One:

“I am now old, bhante, aged, elderly, my time has gone, I have reached the term of my life, sick in body, always ill.30 Rarely, bhante, do I get to see31 the venerable Blessed One32 and the monks who are worthy of esteem.33 Advise me, venerable Blessed One, teach me, venerable Blessed One, for my own good and happiness for a long time.”

4 “So it is, houselord; so it is, houselord. Sick is this body, houselord, burdened,34 hampered (by suffering). Houselord, anyone, caring for this body, who claims even a moment’s health would be nothing but foolishness.35 Therefore, houselord, you should train yourself thus:

“My body may be sick but my mind will not be sick,”36 Thus you should train yourself, houselord.

5 Then the houselord Nakula, pitā joyfully approved of the Blessed One’s word. [2] Standing up, he saluted the Blessed One keeping him to the right, and then approached the venerable Sāriputta. Having approached the venerable Sāriputta, he saluted him and sat down at one side.

Nakula, pitā meets Sāriputta

6 As the houselord Nakula, pitā was sitting there at one side, the venerable Sāriputta said this to him:

“Clear are your senses, houselord, pure is your countenance. You must have received a Dharma talk in the presence of the Blessed One today, have you not?”

“How could it be otherwise, bhante? Only just now37 I was anointed with the ambrosia of the Blessed One’s Dharma talk.”38

“With what kind of ambrosia of a Dharma talk did the Blessed One anoint you, houselord?”

---

30 *Aham asmi bhante jīvaṇu vaṭṭhā mahaṅhāko āddhā gato vayo, anupatātu ātūra, kāyo abhikkhaṇā, taṇko.*

31 “Rarely…do I get to see,” *adhičca, dassāvī,* lit “(I am) one who rarely sees,” (for Be, Se, PTS reading *anicca, dassāvī,* “not always do I see”). See CPD & S:B 1043 n2.

32 “Venerable Blessed One,” bhante Bhagavato. This double vocative reflect Nakula, pitā’s devotion to the Buddha. In *Poṭṭhāpāda S* (D 9.5), Poṭṭhāpāda addresses the Buddha with the same words (D 9.5/1:179).

33 “Worthy of esteem” and “esteemed,” *mano, bhāvaniyo or -bhāvaniyo* often used in apposition with *bhikkhū* (D 2:140; M 2:23, 3:261; S 3:1, 5:369, 371; A 3:317-322, 5:185, 189; Vv 34.13/49; Miln 129); used of the Buddha, *mano, bhāvānyam buddham,* at *Sovanna, kattarika Ap* (Ap 427.1/2:389). SA comments that “those great elders such as Sāriputta and Moggallāna are called ‘worthy of esteem because the mind grows in wholesome qualities whenever they are seen’” (SA 2:249 f). See DA 3:832; MA 3:17, 266. *Bodhi* notes that “the expression is a gerundive meaning literally ‘who should be brought to mind,’ i.e who are worthy of esteem” (S:B 1043 n2). *Sadda, nīti* (Dhātū, mālā), however, gives both meanings of *mano, bhāvānyāya:* (1) one who is worthy of being greeted and asked after his health; (2) one who develops his mind (Sadd: Be 330).

34 “Burdened,” *āddhā, bhūṭo,* alt tr “weighed down” (S:B 853, 11144), for Be *aṇḍa, bhūṭo,* “become as an egg,” a metaphor explained by Comy: the body is fragile like a newly laid egg of a chicken or a peacock (SA 2:249).


36 Cf *Maḥā, nāma* Gilāyana S (S 4.157.1): “Bhikshus, there are to be seen beings who can claim to be *physically healthy* [illness-free] for a year, …who can claim to be healthy for a hundred years. But, bhikshus, hard to find are those beings who can claim to be *mentally healthy* for even a moment besides those [arhats] whose mental influxes are destroyed.” (A 4.157.1/2:142 f). See Intro (5).

37 “Just now,” *idāni,* i.e a short while ago.

38 “Only just now…Dharma talk,” *evān khvāhām,* bhante, bhagavatā dhammiyā kāthāya amatena abhisitto ‘ti.
7 “Here, bhante, I went up to the Blessed One…[Nakula, the charioteer, relates all that had happened]…
‘Therefore, houselord, you should train yourself thus: “My body may be sick but my mind will not be sick.” Thus you should train yourself, houselord.’

That was how, bhante, I was anointed with the ambrosia of the Blessed One’s Dharma talk.”

8 “But, houselord, did it not occur to you to further ask the Blessed One in return as regards how one is sick in body and also sick in mind, and how one is sick in body but not sick in mind?” [3]

9 “Bhante, we would even come from afar to the venerable Sāriputta’s presence to know the meaning of this statement. It would be good if the venerable Sāriputta would clarify the meaning of this statement.”

The untutored ordinary person

10 “In that case, houselord, listen, pay close attention to it, I will speak.”

“Yes, bhante,” the houselord Nakula, the charioteer, answered to the venerable Sāriputta.

11 The venerable Sāriputta said this:

“And how, houselord, is the body sick and the mind sick, too?

12 (1) Here, houselord, an untutored ordinary person who sees not the noble ones, unskilled in the way of the noble ones, untrained in the way of the noble ones, who sees not the true individuals and is untrained in the way of the true individual
—regards form as self, or self as possessing form, or form as in self, or self as in form;
—he lives obsessed by the notions, ‘I am form. Form is mine.’

As he lives obsessed by these notions, that form changes and alters. With the change and alteration of form, there arise in him, sorrow, lamentation, (physical) pain, (mental) displeasure and despair.

13 (2) He regards feeling as self, or self as possessing feeling, or feeling as in self, or self as in feeling;
—he lives obsessed by the notions, ‘I am feeling. Feeling is mine.’

As he lives obsessed by these notions, that feeling changes and alters. With the change and alteration of feeling, there arise in him, sorrow, lamentation, (physical) pain, (mental) displeasure and despair.

14 (3) He regards perception as self, or self as possessing perception, or perception as in self, or self as in perception;
—he lives obsessed by the notions, ‘I am perception. Perception is mine.’

As he lives obsessed by these notions, that perception changes and alters. With the change and alteration of perception, there arise in him, sorrow, lamentation, (physical) pain, (mental) displeasure and despair.

39 “Ignorant ordinary person,” assutava puthajjana. See Intro (3).
40 “The noble ones,” arīya, that is, Buddhās, Pratyekabuddhas, and the saints of the Path. See foll n.
41 “True individual,” sappurisa, also “true individual,” “virtuous person,” “ideal person,” The term usu refers to a Pratyekabuddha or a saint (SA 2:251). In Mūla-pariyāya S (M 1.3/1:1), the Buddhās alone are regarded as the “noble ones” (MA 1:21, 24; Ne 76; DhsA 349). On a worldly level, virtuous disciples such as those who respect their parents are also called “true individuals” (AA 3:251). The qualities of a sappurisa are given at D 33.2.2(6)/3:252, 34.1.8(7)/3:283; M 113; A 7.64/4:113, 8:38/4:144 f & at M 110.14-24/3:23 f.
42 The Paññasambhid, maṇga illustrates the four basic modes of self-identity view in connection with form (rūpa) in this manner. One might wrongly regard form as self in the way that the flame of a burning oil-lamp is identical to the colour of the flame. Or one might wrongly regard self as possessing form just as a tree possesses a shadow. Or one might wrongly regard form as in self as the scent is in the flower. Or one might wrongly regard self as in form, as a jewel is in a casket (Pn 2.50, 74, 77, 90 = 1:144 f).
43 Beginning here are the 20 types of self-identity (or personality) view (sakkāya, diṭṭhi), ie, the 4 views of self is each posited to each of the 5 aggregates constituting a self-identity (sakkāya): see Sakkāya S (S 22.105/3:159). Self-identity view is the very first of the 10 fetters; self-identity view (sakkāya, diṭṭhi), persistent doubt (vickicchā), attachment to rules and rites (siḷa-b, bata, parāmāsa), sensual lust (kāma, rāga), repulsion (patigga), greed for form existence (rūpa, rāga), greed for formless existence (ariūpa, rāga), conceit (māna), restlessness (uddhaccā), ignorance (avijjā) (S 5:61, A 5:13, Vbh 377). When the first 3 fetters are broken, one becomes a streamwinner. See Intro (4).
15 (4) He regards formations as self, or self as possessing formations, or formations as in self, or self as in formations;
—he lives obsessed by the notions, ‘I am formations. Formations are mine.’
As he lives obsessed by these notions, those formations change and alter. [4] With the change and alteration of formations, [4] there arise in him, sorrow, lamentation, (physical) pain, (mental) displeasure and despair.

16 (5) He regards consciousness as self, or self as possessing consciousness, or consciousness as in self, or self as in consciousness;
—he lives obsessed by the notions, ‘I am consciousness. Consciousness is mine.’
As he lives obsessed by these notions, that consciousness changes and alters. With the change and alteration of consciousness, there arise in him, sorrow, lamentation, (physical) pain, (mental) displeasure and despair.

17 Thus, houselord, is the body sick and the mind sick, too.\textsuperscript{44}

The learned noble disciple

18 And how, houselord, is the body sick, but the mind not sick?

19 (1) Here, houselord, the learned noble disciple, who sees the noble ones, skilled in the way of the noble ones, trained in the way of the noble ones, who sees the true individuals and is skilled in the way of the true individual, trained in the way of the true individual,\textsuperscript{45}
—does not regard form as self, nor self as possessing form, nor form as in self, nor self as in form;
—he does not live obsessed by the notions, ‘I am form. Form is mine.’
As he lives not obsessed by these notions, that form changes and alters. With the change and alteration of form, there do not arise in him, sorrow, lamentation, (physical) pain, (mental) displeasure or despair.

20 (2) He does not regard feeling as self, nor self as possessing feeling, nor feeling as in self, nor self as in feeling;
—he lives not obsessed by the notions, ‘I am feeling. Feeling is mine.’
As he lives not obsessed by these notions, that feeling changes and alters. With the change and alteration of feeling, there do not arise in him, sorrow, lamentation, (physical) pain, (mental) displeasure or despair.

21 (3) He does not regard perception as self, nor self as possessing perception, nor perception as in self, nor self as in perception;
—he lives not obsessed by the notions, ‘I am perception. Perception is mine.’
As he lives not obsessed by these notions, that perception changes and alters. With the change and alteration of perception, there do not arise in him, sorrow, lamentation, (physical) pain, (mental) displeasure or despair. [5]

22 (4) He does not regard formations as self, nor self as possessing formations, nor formations as in self, nor self as in formations;
—he lives not obsessed by the notions, ‘I am formations. Formations are mine.’
As he lives not obsessed by these notions, those formations change and alter. With the change and alteration of formations, there do not arise in him, sorrow, lamentation, (physical) pain, (mental) displeasure or despair.

23 (5) He does not regard consciousness as self, nor self as possessing consciousness, nor consciousness as in self, nor self as in consciousness;
—he lives not obsessed by the notions, ‘I am consciousness. Consciousness is mine.’

\textsuperscript{44} Comy: Even the bodies of Buddhas fall sick, but the mind is only sick when it is associated with greed, hate or delusion (SA 2:255).

\textsuperscript{45} This whole section is a stock passage, descriptive of the streamwinner, ie one who has destroyed the 3 lower fetters of self-identity view, doubt and attachment to rules and rituals: see Emotional independence, SD 40a.8.
As he lives not obsessed by these notions, that consciousness changes and alters. With the change and alteration of consciousness, there do not arise in him, sorrow, lamentation, (physical) pain, (mental) displeasure or despair.

24 Thus, houselord, is the body sick but the mind not sick.  

25 This is what the venerable Sāriputta said, and the houselord Nakula, pitā joyfully approved of the venerable Sāriputta’s word.

— evam —
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See Intro (5).