

7

Anaṅgaṇa Sutta

The Discourse on the Blemish-free | M 5/1:24-32

Theme: A monastic's right livelihood

Translated by Piya Tan ©2007, 2011

1 Sutta summary and comments**1.1 SUTTA SUMMARY AND HIGHLIGHTS**

1.1.1 The 4 kinds of persons. The **Anaṅgaṇa Sutta** (M 5)¹ is a discourse by Sāriputta, the Buddha's right hand monk, declared to be the foremost of the monks with "great wisdom" (*mahā,paññā*).² He opens the teaching by mentioning the four kinds of persons [§2] with regards to "blemish" (*aṅgaṇa*), that is, a fault [1.2], thus:

- | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| (1) one who has a blemish but | does not truly know it, |
| (2) one who has a blemish but | truly knows it, |
| (3) one who has no blemish but | does not truly know it, |
| (4) one who has no blemish but | truly knows it. [§2a] |

Of the first pair of persons, the one who *has* a blemish but truly knows it is the superior (*seṭṭha*) person, that is, the better person. Of the last pair, too, the one who does *not* have a blemish but truly knows it is the superior. The answer is obvious: the second person in both pairs have *self-knowledge*.

1.1.2 Self-knowledge. Moggallāna, the Buddha's left-hand disciple,³ immediately questions Sāriputta as to the reason for his statement. Sāriputta answers using the parables of the bowls, explaining that those who lack self-knowledge are unlikely to do anything about their blemish, while those with self-knowledge are more likely to put in effort to better themselves. Hence, the former would die "with a defiled mind, with greed, with hate, with delusion," while the latter would die without a defiled mind. [§§4-6].

1.1.3 "The spheres of bad unwholesome wishes." Again, when asked by Moggallāna, Sāriputta defines "blemish" (*aṅgaṇa*) as "the spheres of bad unwholesome wishes" (*pāpaka akusala icchā'vacara*) [§9], exemplified as "anger and upset" (*kopa appaccaya*) (MA 1:143), as mentioned in the refrain [§10 etc]. The term *akusala icchā'vacara* is found only here in the Anaṅgaṇa Sutta, but it is more common in the Commentaries.⁴ Such a usage, as well as the subject matter, suggests the lateness of the Sutta, that it was composed clearly for new monks yet to attain sainthood or those in training.

1.1.4 The 19 cases. Sāriputta then gives a total of 19 examples of false recluses who show "anger and upset," that is,

- | | | |
|---------|---------|---|
| §§10-12 | (1-3) | through committing offences, |
| §§13-16 | (4-7) | through desire to be treated as the foremost, |
| §§17-20 | (8-11) | through desire for honour through teaching, |
| §§21-24 | (12-15) | through desire for honour, |
| §§25-28 | (16-19) | through desire for fine material support, |

Sāriputta then warns that even if a monastic were to take up any of the strict ascetic practices, if he still were to have the "blemish" of anger and upset, he would not be respected by his fellow practitioners. Such a false recluse is like a clean bowl containing a carcass [§29].

¹ M 4/1:24-32 = SD 37.7. Referred to at MA 2:246; Vism 377. **Anaṅgaṇa Vatthu** mentioned at VA 1:158 prob refers to the same sutta.

² A 1.14.1/1:23.

³ Sāriputta and Moggallāna are traditionally regarded as being the 2 chief disciples (*agga,sāvaka*) of the Buddha. However, this fact is not mentioned in the early strata of the suttas, but found only in the later texts (**Mahā'padāna S**, D 14.1.9/2:5; B 26.18/98; **Ap** 1.114/22, 1.121/23, 23.6/74, 51.17/1:102; V 2:199; Miln 193) and mostly in comys (DA 1:173, 248, 3:875, 878; MA 1:153, 2:200, 3:135; SA 1:216 f; SA 1:217, 3:208; AA 1:140, 150-154, 4:171; DhA 1:96 f, 106, 110, 2:111, 3:236; ThaA 3:93; ThīA 3; ApA 90, 238, 209, 229; VvA 2; VA 5:976; CA 4; J 1:85).

⁴ Eg Nett 27; MA 1:139, 148-150 (all M 5 comy); BA 175; PmA 1:232; NmA 2:358; VA 1:158.

1.1.5 Not strict ascetics but true recluses. The true recluse, on the other hand, even if he does not take up the ascetic practices, but lives with the benefits of a settled monastic life (such as living outside the village, not as a forest monk), accepting invitation meals and robes donated by the laity (basically, not living as a forest monk), he would still be respected by his peers [§30]. All this clearly suggests that the sutta addresses a more settled monastic community and its problems [2.3].

The list of strict ascetic practices here [§29a] is interesting. At first blush, like other translators, I thought that they are quite straight forward, and could be rendered as “a forest dweller, a frequenter of remote abodes, an almsfood eater, a house-to-house seeker, a refuse-rag wearer, a wearer of rough robes” (M:ÑB) as Ñāṇamoli and Bodhi have done (and similarly I B Horner, too, in M:H). However, when I came to §30.3 where only the three practices allowed by the Buddha are mentioned, I realize that this Sutta must have some connection with the story of Devadatta’s attempt to introduce the “five points” (V 2:197), and it makes good sense to translate the list of strict ascetic practices to reflect this fact. [3.3]

1.1.6 Moggallāna’s parable. Moggallāna then proposes his own parable, one based on his own experience in Rājagaha of observing how an ajivijka, Paṇḍu,putta, an erstwhile cartwright, watching a cartwright, Samīti, working, so that the former thinks that the latter knows his heart, since Samīti does exactly what Paṇḍu,putta merely thinks [§31b]. Although it is possible that here Paṇḍu,putta might think that he has the power of controlling Samīti’s mind, the truth is that Moggallāna is simply using this event as a figure to show how Sāriputta has spoken his (Moggallāna’s) own mind, as evident from Moggallāna’s jubilant remarks.

1.1.7 Moggallāna’s teaching. Moggallāna, supporting Sāriputta’s teaching, adds that those who have renounced the world for selfish gains or out of personal weakness are full of blemishes. In other words, while Sāriputta lists only two, Moggallāna gives a comprehensive list of them [2.1], along with the wholesome qualities of a true renunciant. He praises Sāriputta for teaching by way of speaking Moggallāna’s own mind, as it were [§32]. He compares Sāriputta’s teaching to a feast of words and thoughts that lifts people out of unwholesomeness, putting them on a wholesome course. Moggallāna compares the monastics to well-dressed youths and Sāriputta’s teaching to a flower garland crowning their heads [§33].

1.2 AṄGAṆA. This is the Sutta’s key term, which means “dirt” in both the literal and figurative sense.⁵ Here it is translated as “blemish,” where it is defined as anger (*kopa*) and upset (*appaccaya*), and which is applied to a total of 19 examples [§§10-28].

In the **Vibhaṅga**, “blemish” (*aṅgaṇa*) is one of the names given to the three unwholesome roots, namely: “The blemish that is lust, the blemish that is hate, the blemish that is delusion. These are the three blemishes” (*rāgo aṅgaṇaṃ doso aṅgaṇaṃ moho aṅgaṇaṃ, imāni tīṇi malāni*, Vbh 368).⁶ **The Sammo-ha,vinodanī**, the Vibhaṅga Commentary, gives a range of meanings of aṅgaṇa, as follows:

- (1) in the phrase, *ud’aṅgane tattha papaṃ avindun ti*, “there they found water in open ground,” *aṅga-ṇa* means “a piece of ground” (*bhūmi-p,padesa*) (J 1:109,20);
- (2) in the phrase, *tass’eva rajassa vā aṅgaṇassa vā pahānāya vāyamatī ti*, “he perseveres to abandon that very stain or dirt,”⁷ it is a kind of dirt (*mala*) or mud (*paṅka*);
- (3) in the phrase, *sāṅgaṇo’va samāno’ti*, “having a blemish,”⁸ it is a variety of strong defilements (*nāna-p,pakāro tibba,kilesa*). (VbhA 498; see also MA 1:139 f)

Elsewhere, *aṅgaṇa* includes the sense of a “birth-mark or pimple”⁹ or, a “black mole as a birth-mark.”¹⁰

⁵ Prob der from √AṅJ, to anoint: see Pischel, *A Grammar of the Prakrit Language*, §234. M 1:24,18 f; A 5:92,16, 94,22, 97,21, 103,25; Vbh 368,7. It appears in cpds as *niraṅgaṇa* (BA 1*), *sāṅgaṇa* (M 1:24,18; Sn 279), and of course *anaṅgaṇa* (D 1:76,14; Dh 125; Sn 517; J 5:302,3*; B 8.10; V 3:14,18).

⁶ Other names given by Vbh to the 3 unwholesome roots are “something” (*kiñcana*), “stain” (*mala*), “unevenness” (*visama*), “disharmony” (*do*), “fire” (*aggi*), “astringent” (*kasāva*) (Vbh 368). Qu at MA 1:139 = BA 175. Cf SnA 2:427.

⁷ M 1:100,16+17+18 = A 10.51/5:92,17.

⁸ M 1:24-26 ×8.

1.3 SUTTA STYLE. The Anaṅga Sutta is basically a dialogue between the two chief disciples, the arhats Sāriputta and Moggallāna. It might, at first, appear rather curious that Moggallāna, as an arhat, is asking the questions on the four kinds of people, which he should have known about anyway. However, the duo is speaking in dialogue before an assembly of monks.

In other words, the two of them are “rehearsing” the Dharma for the benefit of the congregation. While Sāriputta is acting as the clarifier (*vissajjaka*), Moggallāna is the questioner (*pucchaka*). This is traditionally known as the “rehearsal” (*saṅgāyaṇā*) or catechical method of teaching.¹¹ Apparently, **the Anaṅga Sutta** (M 5) is the only record we have of a catechical teaching by the two great elders before an assembly. However, we have many such dialogues between Sāriputta and Mahā Koṭṭhita, who is declared to be the foremost of monks who are masters of the analytic skills (*patīsambhida-p.patta*) (A 1:24).¹²

Instructive dialogues between Sāriputta and Moggallāna, reflecting their close spiritual friendship are found in such discourses as:

Ghaṭa Sutta	S 21.3/2:275	Spiritual friendship of the two great elders,
Sāriputta Moggallāna Sutta 1	A 4.167/2:154 f	On Moggallāna’s mode of progress,
Sāriputta Moggallāna Sutta 2	A 4.168/2:155	On Sāriputta’s mode of progress,
Juṇhā Sutta	U 4.4/39-41	They praise one another’s special qualities.

The Sacca Vibhaṅga Sutta (M 141) is a record of Sāriputta’s detailed analysis (*vibhaṅga*) of the four noble truths on the Buddha’s instruction. Although Moggallāna does not appear in the Sutta itself, the Buddha, early in the Sutta, encourages the monastics to cultivate the spiritual friendship of the two great elders, comparing, in spiritual cultivation, Sāriputta to a mother who brings forth a child (training monks to attain streamwinning), while Moggallāna to a nurse (who unrelentingly trains the monks right to the attainment of arhathood).¹³

A conversation between the two monks, and other great elders, is recorded in **the Mahā Gosīṅga Sutta** (M 32).¹⁴ We see them both being admonished by the Buddha in **the Cātumā Sutta**.¹⁵

2 Qualities of renunciants

2.1 FALSE RENUNCIANTS’ QUALITIES. Only two “blemishes” (*aṅga*) are identified in the Anaṅga Sutta, that is, anger (*kopa*) and upset (*appaccaya*)¹⁶ [1.2]. These are the qualities of those monastics who have the wrong attitude towards their life of renunciation. Amplifying on this, as it were, Moggallāna give a more definitive description of a false renunciant [2.3.4], as follows:

(A)¹⁷ ...there are people who are without faith, those who have left home for the homeless life, not out of faith, but for the sake of a living, who are false, crafty, fraudulent,

⁹ *Jātakam tilakam vā piḷakam vā* (MA 2:67,9).

¹⁰ *Jātaka, aṅga, kāḷa, tilak’ādim* (AA 5:41).

¹¹ DhsA 2 f; Miln 295. This is a popular didactic method on the radio in its heyday,

¹² See (**Saṃyojana**) **Koṭṭhita S** (S 35.232/4:162-165) & SD 28.4 (1.2); also MA 2:336; AA 1:2851.

¹³ M 141/3:248-257 = SD 11.11.

¹⁴ M 32.8-9/1:214 f, 218 = SD 44.12.

¹⁵ M 67/1:456-462 = SD 34.7.

¹⁶ Cf “anger and despair” (*kodh’upāyāsa*), figured as the “fear of waves” (*ūmi, bhaya*) for new monks regarding training in personal decorum, fearing which they might return to lay life: see **Cātumā S** (M 67.16/1:460) = SD 34.7.

¹⁷ *Ye te puggalā assaddhā, jīvik’atthā na saddhā agārasmā anagāriyam pabbajitā, saṭhā māyāvino ketabhino* [Ee; Be *ketabhino*; Ce *Se keṭubhino*] *uddhatā unnaḷā capalā mukharā vikiṇṇa, vācā indriyesu agutta, dvārā, bhojane amat-tañṇuno, jāgariyam ananuyuttā, sāmāññe anapekkhavanto, sikkhāya na tibba, gāravā, bāhulikā, sāthalikā, okkama-ne pubbaṅgamā, paviveke nikkhitta, dhurā, kusitā hīna, vīriyā muṭṭha-s, satī asampajānā asamāhitā vibbhanta, cittā duppaññā eḷa, mūgā: M 5.32a/1:32,16, 107.15/3:6,19; A 5.167.11+12/3:198 f. Cf M 69/1:469-473; S 4.2/4:104; A 6.17/3:300 f; Pug 4, 20 f. For positive versions of this list see, eg **D 33.1.9(20)/3:213**; **M 53.5-18/1:354-356**; **A***

(B) haughty,¹⁸ insolent, fickle, garrulous, of loose speech,¹⁹

(C) the sense-doors unguarded, lacking moderation in food, not devoted to wakefulness, with no regard for recluseship, with no deep respect for the training, living in abundance, lax, prone to distractions,²⁰ neglecting the task of seclusion, lazy, lacking effort, confused, lacking full awareness, unconcentrated, a wandering mind, lacking wisdom, unintelligent. [§32a]

This whole passage [§32a] is stock, which means that it often appears, in identical or very similar form, elsewhere in the suttas. Section (A) is explained in the Sutta's commentary (MA 1:152). Sections (B+C) are found, wholly or in part, in the following suttas, and all, if not many, of the terms explained in their respective commentaries:

	<u>Texts</u>	<u>Commentaries</u>
Dhamma,dāyāda Sutta	M 3/1:12-16	MA 1:101,
Bhaya Bherava Sutta	M 4.4-19/1:17-20	MA 1:116-118,
Gulissāni Sutta	M 69.7-16/1:470-472	MA 3:184 (very brief),
Jantu Sutta	S 2.25/1:61 ²¹	SA 1:115 f,
Pākat'indriya Sutta	S 9.13/1:203	SA 1:297 refers to S 2.25,
(Pasāda Kampana) Moggallāna Sutta	S 51.14/5:269 ²²	SA 3:257.

These commentaries (and others) explain the related terms in some detail, paraphrased here, as follows:

<i>uddhatā</i>	haughty , of restless temperament on account of perceiving what is unallowable and blameworthy as allowable and blameless, and vice versa (according to the Vinaya). ²³
<i>unnaḷā</i>	insolent , puffed up, full of conceit like a stiff hollow reed. ²⁴
<i>capalā</i>	vain , on account of decorating one's robes, bowl, lodging, etc. The Vibhaṅga explains "vanity" as the decorating of one's robes, bowl, lodging; decorating, beautifying, taking pride in, adorning, fondness, being fond of, acting in vanity, vanity towards this putrid body and for external requisites: this is called vanity. ²⁵

2.15.7/1:94, 5.150.4/3:173, 7.26.4/4:25, 8.79.2/4:331; Nm 1:144, 2:480; Dhs 7, 231 f; Vbh 249; Pug 25; Kvu 616. Cf A 6.31.4/3:330.

¹⁸ From this (*uddhatā*) to the end (see foll n), as at **Jantu S** (S 2.25/1:61,4), but replaces the last quality with *pāka-t'indriyā*, "loose in faculties."

¹⁹ *Evam eva kho, āvuso, ye te puggalā assaddhā, jīvik'atthā na saddhā agārasmā anagāriyam pabbajitā, saṭhā māyāvino ketabhino uddhatā unnaḷā capalā mukharā vikiṇṇa,vācā:* **M 5.32a/1:32, 107.15/3:6; A 5.167.11+12/3:198** f: all these refs link up with the foll para (see n below).

²⁰ *Okkamane pubbaṅgamā*, ie "letting transgressions be the leader." Comy explains these as the conditions for "going down," ie going astray or transgressing, ie, the 5 mental hindrances (MA 1:101.26, 3:108,3). See **M 1:14, 16 f = 3:5,15 = A 1:71,3 = 2:148,30 = 3:108,3; M 1:32,21; A 1:243,3 f. M:ÑB, foll M:H, has "leaders in backsliding,"** which fails to reflect Comy which is helpful here. See CPD: ²o-kkamana.

²¹ **S 2.25/1:61,4 f = 1:203,34 = S 51.14/5:270,1.**

²² **S 2.25/1:61,4 f = 1:203,34 = S 51.14/5:270,1.**

²³ *Uddhatā'ti akappiye kappiya,saññitāya ca kappiye akappiya,saññitāya ca anavajje sāvajja,saññitāya ca sāvajje anavajja,saññitāya ca uddhaccapakatikā hutvā* (SA 1:115 = 3:257). *Uddhata* (ts), pp *ud* (up, upwards, expressing intensity) + √HAN (to smite), from which comes *uddhacca* (restlessness): see **Uddhacca,kukkucca = SD 32.7 (2.1)**. See CPD sv; DPL sv *uddhata*¹. Kaccv 640, Sadd 863,29 wrong deriv fr *ud-dhū*, Sadd 864,1 correct: *uddhatassa bhāvo ~am*.

²⁴ *Unnaḷā'ti uggata,naḷā, uṭṭhita,tucchamānā ti vuttam hoti* (MA 1:152 = SA 1:115 = 3:257)

²⁵ *Capalā'ti patta,cīvara,maṇḍan'ādīnā cāpallena yuttā* (S 5:269,26 ≠ A 1:70,7; MA 1:152 = SA 1:115 = 3:257). *Tattha katamaṃ cāpalyam?* *Cīvara,maṇḍanā patta,maṇḍanā senāsana,maṇḍanā imassa vā pūti,kāyassa bāhirānam vā parikkhārānam maṇḍanā vibhūsanā keḷanā parikeḷanā giddhikatā giddhikattam capalatā cāpalyam: idaṃ vuccati cāpalyam* (Vbh 351,28). *Capalatā ti alankāra,karaṇam* (Nm 2:413).

mukharā	<u>garrulous</u> , literally, “sharp-tongued” (<i>mukha,kharā</i>), that is, rough speech and sharp words. ²⁶
vikīṇṇa,vācā	<u>of loose speech</u> , or rambling in talk, that is, verbally unrestrained, chattering aimlessly all day. ²⁷
indriyesu agutta,dvārā,	<u>the sense-doors unguarded</u> , that is, the six sense-doors (eye, ear, nose, tongue, body and mind) unrestrained; the sense-doors, with the mind as the sixth, are “shut.” ²⁸
bhojane amattaññuno jāgariyaṃ ananuyuttā	<u>lacking moderation in food</u> , that is, where one should know one’s limits concerning food, instead one is caught up in its quest, obtaining and relishing it. ²⁹ <u>not devoted to wakefulness</u> . “Devotion to watchfulness,” on the other hand, means having divided a whole night and day into 6 parts, one spend 5 of them in a waking state, meaning that one is devoted to watchfulness. ³⁰ The suggestion here is that one sleeps for only 4 hours.
sāmaññe ana- pekkhavanto	<u>with no regard for recluseship</u> , meaning that one pays no attention to spiritual practice and duties (<i>samaṇa,dhamma</i>), that is, one foresakes the practice of the Dharma in accordance to the Dharma. ³¹
sikkhāya na tibba,gāravā bāhulikā sāthalikā okkamane pubbaṅ,gamā	<u>with no deep respect for the training</u> , meaning that there is not much respect for training, but one commits numerous lapses and offences. ³² <u>living in abundance</u> , that is, one lives luxuriously with numerous robes, etc. ³³ <u>lax</u> , that is, taking the teaching lightly. ³⁴ <u>prone to distractions</u> : here, “distraction” (<i>okkamana</i>) is understood as having the sense of the 5 mental hindrances, meaning that they lead one astray, mentally. ³⁵
paviveke nikkhitta,dhurā	<u>neglecting the task of seclusion</u> . Here, “seclusion” means the nirvana that is the solitude from acquisitions (<i>upadhi,viveka</i>). ³⁶ “Neglecting the task” means not working on attaining that realization. This means that as far that the “solitude from acquisitions” is concerned, one does not fulfill it. One has aside the task of <u>the 3 kinds of solitude</u> (<i>viveka</i>), ³⁷ which are the solitudes of the body (<i>kāya,viveka</i>), the mind (<i>citta,viveka</i>), and acquisitions (<i>upadhi,viveka</i>). ³⁸

²⁶ *Mukharā* 'ti mukha,kharā, khara,vacanā ti vuttaṃ hoti (MA 1:152 = SA 1:115 = 3:257).

²⁷ *Vikīṇṇavācā* 'ti asaṃyata,vacanā, divasam pi niratthaka,vacana,palāpino (MA 1:152 = SA 1:115 = 3:257).

²⁸ *Indriyesu agutta,dvārā* ti chasu indriyesu asaṃvuta,kamma,dvārā (MA 1:152). *Indriyesu gutta,dvāro* 'ti manasa,chaṭṭhesu indriyesu pihita,dvāro (AA 2:184).

²⁹ *Bhojane amattaññunoti bhojane yā mattā jānitabbā pariyesana,paṭiggahaṇa,paribhogesu yuttatā, tassā ajānanakā* (MA 1:152)

³⁰ *Jāgariyaṃ ananuyuttā* ti jāgare ananuyuttā. (MA 1:152). *Jāgariyaṃ anuyutto* 'ti rattin,divaṃ cha koṭṭhāse katvā pañcasu koṭṭhāsesu jāgaraṇa,bhāvaṃ anuyutto, jāgaraṇe yeva yutta-p,payuttoti attho (AA 2:185).

³¹ *Sāmaññe anapekkhavantoti samaṇa,dhamme nirapekkhā, dhammānudhamma-p,paṭipatti,rahit* 'ti attho (MA 1:152).

³² *Sikkhāya na tibba,gāravā* ti sikkhāpadesu bahula,gāravā na honti, āpatti,vītikkama,bahulā vā (MA 1:152)

³³ *Bāhulikā* ti cīvar'ādi,bāhullāya paṭipannā (MA 1:101 = AA 2:144). Comy here refers us to comy on **Dhamma Dāyāda S** (M 3): *Bāhulikā* ti, ādi dhamma,dāyāde vuttaṃ (MA 1:152)

³⁴ *Sāsanam sithilam gaṇhantī ti sāthalikā* (MA 1:101 = AA 2:144).

³⁵ *Okkamane pubbaṅgamā* ti ettha okkamaṇam vuccanti avagaman'atṭhena pañca nīvaraṇāni, tena pañca,nīvarana,pubbaṅ,gamā ti vuttaṃ hoti (MA 1:101 = AA 2:144).

³⁶ “Acquisitions,” *upadhi*, substrates of existence, essentials of being, worldly possessions as a source of rebirth. Comy mentions 4 kinds of acquisitions: the aggregates (*khandh'upadhi*), defilements (*kiles'upadhi*), volitional formations (*abhisankhār'upadhi*), and the cords of sense-pleasure (*kāma,guṇ'upadhi*) (MA 2:112, 3:169, 5:60). It is also possible to take this as the “nirvana with remains” (*sōpadhisesa nibbāna*) (A 9.12.4/4:379; It 2.2.7/38 f; ItA 165), ie, full awakening here and now.

³⁷ *Nikkhitta,dhurā* ti oropita,dhurā, tad adhiḡamāya ārambham pi akurumānā ti, ettāvataṃ upadhi,vivekam na paripūrentī ti vuttaṃ hoti (MA 1:101). *Nikkhitta,dhurā* ti ti,vidhe'pi viveke oropita,dhurā (AA 2:144).

<i>kusītā</i>	<u>lazy</u> , that is, tendency to idleness, including laziness is going on almsround. ³⁹
<i>hīna, vīriyā</i>	<u>lacking effort</u> , that is, low in exertion, bereft of energy, without strength. Here “laziness” refers to bodily sloth, while “lacking effort” refers to the lack of initiating mental effort. They are not to work on focussing on the meditation-object itself. All this inability to focus on the mental objects thus keeps them only in the preliminary stage. ⁴⁰ One does not exert oneself in both the ways of effort, that is, by way of the body nor of the mind. Here, “lacking effort” refers especially to the lack of mental effort in monastic and spiritual training. ⁴¹
<i>muṭṭha-s, satī</i>	<u>confused</u> , “muddle-headed,” that is, bereft of mindfulness, without mindfulness; forgetting what has been done right here. ⁴²
<i>asampajānā</i>	<u>without full awareness</u> , that is, bereft of wisdom, which is opposite to when one says, “Established in mindfulness am I” in terms of just that mindfulness. Yet here it should be explained that wisdom is still weak in the mindfulness. For there are two kinds of mindfulness wisdom, namely, mindfulness associated with wisdom (<i>sati paññā, sampayuttā</i>) and mindfulness dissociated from wisdom (<i>sati paññā, vippayuttā</i>). Here, the former is strong, the latter is weak. As such, they may have mindfulness, they are not fully aware. Indeed, they are muddle-headed, the weakness being on account of not working on mindfulness with mindfulness. Thus the meaning of “without full awareness” should be shown. All this muddle-headedness and lack of full awareness thus prevents one from fixing the meditation-object, keeping it all ever in the preliminary stage. In short, one lacks wisdom. ⁴³
<i>asamāhitā</i>	<u>unconcentrated</u> , lacking concentration, meaning, without access and full concentrations, like a ship caught in fierce currents. One is unable to attain one-pointedness of mind. ⁴⁴
<i>vibbhanta, cittā</i>	a <u>wandering mind</u> , that is, of bewildered mind. Lacking concentration, one gives an opening to restlessness. His lack of concentration reels his mind around the various mental objects like a forest monkey springing restlessly from one branch to another. As we have previously seen, all this lack of concentration

³⁸ UA 231; Nm 26, 140, 157, 341. Cf MA 1:85, where the 5 kinds are identical with the 5 kinds of liberation (*vimutti, pahāna* or *nirodha*) (UA 32; Pm 27, 220 f; Vism 13.13/410, cf 4.82/140, 22.109-129/693-697): see also Pm 2:219-224 (items 1 and 2 reversed). The fivefold list is prob an abridgement of Nm 26 f. On the 3 kinds of solitude (*viveka*), see **Viveka, nissita** = SD 20.4 (4.2). On the 5 kinds of liberation (ie through suppression, displacement, cutting off, stilling and escape), see **Viveka, nissita** = SD 20.4 (4.3) & SD 13.1 (4.2c) on *vineyya*.

³⁹ “On *kusita* etc, see comy on Bhaya Bherava S (M 4)” (***kusītāti, ādi bhaya, bherave***, MA 1:152). *Kusītā’ti kosaj-jānugatā* (MA 1:117). *Bhikkhā, cariyāsu’pi kosajja, yogato kusītā* (ThaA 3:87).

⁴⁰ ***Hīna, vīriyā*** *ti hīnā vīriyena virahitā viyuttā, nibbūriyā ti vuttam hoti. Tattha kusītā kāyika, vīriy’ārambha, virahitā honti, hīna, viriyā cetasika, vīriy’ārambha, virahitā. Te ārammaṇa, vavatthāna, mattam pi kātum na sakkonti. Tesam avavatthit’ārammaṇānan ti sabbam pubba, sadisam eva* (MA 1:117).

⁴¹ ***Na vīriyam ārabhanā*** *ti duvidham pi vīriyam na karonti* (AA 2:144). ***Duvidham pi vīriyam*** *ti kāyikam cetasikaṅ ca vīriyam* (AAT:Be 2:41). *Samaṇa, dhammam kātum cittassa ussāhābhāvena hīna, viriyā* (ThaA 3:87).

⁴² ***Muṭṭha-s, satino’ti*** *naṭṭha-s, satino sati, virahitā* (MA 1:117 = SA 1:116), *idha katam ettha pamussanti* (SA 1:115 = 3:257).

⁴³ ***Asampajānā*** *ti paññā, rahitā, imassa ca paṭipakkhe “upaṭṭhita-s, satīham asmī ti vacanato sati, bhājanīyam ev’-etam. Paññā pan’ettha sati, dubbalya, dīpan’attham vuttā. Duvidhā hi sati paññā, sampayuttā paññā, vippayuttā ca. Tattha paññā, sampayuttā balavatī, vippayuttā dubbalā, tasmā yadā’pi tesam sati hoti, tadā’pi asampajānantā muṭṭha-s, satī yeva te, dubbalāya satiyā sati, kiccābhāvato’ti etam attham dīpetum “asampajānā ti vuttam. Te evam muṭṭha-s, satī asampajānā ārammaṇa, vavatthāna, mattam pi kātum na sakkonti ti sabbam pubba, sadisam eva* (MA 1:117). ***Asampajānā*** *ti nippaññā* (SA 1:115 = 3:257)

⁴⁴ ***Asamāhitā*** *ti upacār’ appanā, samādhi, virahitā* (MA 1:117). ***Asamāhitā’ti*** *appanā, upacāra, samādhi, rahitā, caṇḍa, sote baddha, nāvā, sadisā* (SA 1:115 = 3:257). ***Asamāhitā*** *ti citt’ekaggatā, mattassāpi alābhino* (AA 2:144).

	thus prevents one from fixing the meditation-object, keeping it all ever in the preliminary stage. The unsettled mind is like a foolish grown deer on a path. ⁴⁵
duppaññā	<u>lacking wisdom</u> , which means “without wisdom,” but wisdom has no bad name. ⁴⁶
ela,mūgā	<u>unintelligent</u> , meaning <i>ela,mukha</i> , “saliva-mouth”: the <i>ga</i> becomes <i>kha</i> ; meaning a driveller (<i>lāla,mukha</i>). For, the foolish speak with saliva trickling from their mouths. <i>Ela</i> and <i>lāla</i> mean “saliva.” Thus it is said: “Look at the saliva-mouthed double-tongued snake!” (J 3:347). Thus, they are called drivellers. ⁴⁷
[pākat’indriyā]	<u>loose in faculty</u> , meaning, lacking in restraint, (of monastics) of “open” faculties due to non-restraint like when they were still laymen. One’s faculties are untrained. By nature, one remains overwhelmed by faculties that are unguarded, uncovered. ⁴⁸

2.2 TRUE PURPOSE OF RENUNCIATION. After stating the characteristics of a false recluse, Moggallāna goes on to speak on the true recluse. He is someone who, despite not taking up strict ascetic practices [§29a], does *not* have any blemish, so that he is respected by his peers [§32c]. The true recluse is defined by Moggallāna as follows:

- (A) ...there are sons of family who have left home for the homeless life out of faith, who are not false, not crafty, not fraudulent,
 (B) not haughty, not insolent, not fickle, not garrulous, not loose in speech, with sense-doors restrained, moderate in food,
 (C) devoted to wakefulness, intent on recluseship, has deep respect for the training, not living in abundance, not lax, bent on removing distractions, giving priority to seclusion, exerting effort, resolute, of stable mindfulness, fully aware, concentrated, one-pointed in mind,
 (D) wise, not unintelligent.⁴⁹ [§32c]

Section (A) basically refers to the “wise faith” (*avecca-p,pasāda*) of the renunciant, who renounces the world, as reflected in this passage from **the Naḷaka,pāna Sutta** (M 68):

And indeed, Anuruddhā,⁵⁰
 you have gone forth from home into homelessness *not* because of being forced by the king;⁵¹
 you have gone forth from home into homelessness *not* because of being forced by robbers;⁵²

⁴⁵ **Vibbhanta,cittā** ti ubbhanta,cittā. Samādhi,virahena laddh’okāsenā uddhaccena tesam samādhi,virahānaṃ cittam nānārammaṇesu paribbhamati, vana,makkaṭo viya vana,sākhāsu uddhaccena ek’ārammaṇe vipphandati. Pubbe vutta,nayenena te evaṃ asamāhitā vibbhanta,cittā ārammaṇa,vavatthāna,mattam pi kātum na sakkontī ti sabbam pubba,sadisam eva (MA 1:117). **Vibbhanta,cittā**’ti anavaṭṭhita,cittā, panthā,rulha,bāla,miga,sadisā. (SA 1:116).

⁴⁶ **Duppaññā** ti nippaññānam etaṃ adhivacanam. Paññā pana duṭṭhā nāma n’atthi (MA 1:117).

⁴⁷ **Ela,mūgā** ti ela,mukhā, kha,kārassa ga,kāro kato. Lāla,mukhā ti vuttaṃ hoti. Duppaññānañ hi kathentānaṃ lālā mukhato galati, lālā ca elā ti vuccati. Yathāha “pass’elamūgaṃ uragaṃ dujjivhan ti. Tasmā te “elamūgā ti vuc-canti. “Ela,mukhā ti’pi pāṭho (MA 1:117).

⁴⁸ **Pākat’indriyā**’ti samvarābhāvena gihī,kāle viya vivata,indriyā (SA 1:115). **Pākat’indriyā**’ti asamvut’indriyā (SA 3:257). **Pākat’indriyā**’ti pakatiyā ṭhitehi vivatehi arakkhitehi indriyehi samannāgatā. (AA 2:144).

⁴⁹ Indriyesu guttadvārā, bhofane mattaññuno, jāgariyam anuyuttā, sāmāññe apekkhavanto, sikkhāya tibba,gāra-vā, na bāhulikā na sāthalikā, okkamane nikkhitta,dhurā, paviveke pubbaṅgamā, āradhha,vīriyā, pahit’attā upaṭṭhi-ta-s,satī sampajānā samāhitā ek’agga,cittā paññavanto aneḷa,mūgā. For nn & refs, see §32a nn ad loc.

⁵⁰ The rest of this section is stock: M 68.5d/1:463 = SD 37.4; S 22.8/3:93 (SA 2:301 f); It 5.2/89 (ItA 2:113); Miln 32; SnA 1:340; UA 106.

⁵¹ N’eva rājābhinitā agārasmā anagāriyam pabbajitā, ie a king, having caught a wrong-doer, tells him, “If you go forth, you will be free.” (MA 3:180).

you have gone forth from home into homelessness *not* because of debts;⁵³
 you have gone forth from home into homelessness *not* because of fear;⁵⁴
 you have gone forth from home into homelessness *not* for the sake of livelihood.⁵⁵
 But rather you have done so, thinking,⁵⁶

‘I am immersed in birth, decay, death, sorrow, lamentation, physical pain, mental pain, and despair; overwhelmed by suffering, overcome by suffering.

Perhaps, there is a making an end of this whole mass of suffering to be found!⁵⁷

(M 68.5/1:463) = SD 37.4⁵⁸

Sections (B), (C) and (D) refers respectively to the three trainings of moral virtue, mental cultivation and wisdom. Section (B) refers to the restraint of body and speech, that is, disciplining the five sense-doors so that they do not distract us from directing all our energies to mental cultivation. This training of moral virtue includes keeping the body healthy and manageable, entailing moderation in food.

Section (C), on mental cultivation includes single-mindedness towards fully living a recluse’s life of outer and inner stillness. Once external distractions are removed, it becomes easier to work at removing internal distractions and focussing the mind. Once the mind begins to settle and blissful stillness arises, we simply enjoy it as long as we need to so that we are familiar with it.

Once we are truly familiar with cultivating blissful peace in our hearts, we are ready to use it for the training in wisdom. We begin this phase by getting out of our familiar stillness and immediately reflect on the true nature of reality,⁵⁹ that all conditioned things are impermanent and sufferings, and that all things are not self.⁶⁰ This is the training in wisdom (D).

2.3 A SETTLED MONASTIC COMMUNITY.

2.3.1 To whom is the Sutta addressed? In the *Anaṅgana Sutta* (M 5), Sāriputta opens his teaching by saying that self-knowledge, whether we have a blemish or not, is vital for spiritual growth. If we have a blemish but are not aware of it, we are unlikely to correct it. On the other hand, if we do not have any blemish, and still is unaware of this, we are unlikely to make any effort to better ourselves, too. In short, self-knowledge spurs us into wholesome practice [§§2-8].

The question now is to whom is this instruction directed: who is Sāriputta’s audience? We know that Sāriputta is addressing “the monks” [§1], but what kind of monastic community is this? Is it a quiet forest retreat, or a more settled and crowded community? Let us examine a few more clues from the Sutta itself for an answer.

2.3.2 The list of 19 cases. The first important clue is a long list of 19 examples of how a monk can have a blemish [§§10-28], that is, to show anger and upset on account of:

⁵² *Na corābhinītā agārasmā anagāriyam pabbajitā*, ie, having being caught by robbers, plead to them that one is on the way to joining the monastery, so as to escape being killed by them (MA 3:180; SA 2:302; ItA 2:113).

⁵³ *Na iṇaṭṭā agārasmā anagāriyam pabbajitā*, ie, where the creditor releases the debtor if he becomes a monk (MA 3:180), or if he goes forth to flee from creditors (ItA 2:113). The figure of the debtor is often used for one caught up with sensual pleasure: see **Te,vijja S** (D 13.6/1:72) = SD 8.10; MA 2:318; see also *Nīvaraṇa* = SD 32.1 (3.2.1).

⁵⁴ *Na bhayaṭṭā agārasmā anagāriyam pabbajitā*, ie, SA says that these are the “fears” of kings, thieves, hunger, illness and debt (SA 2:302; MA 3:180).

⁵⁵ *N’ājīvikā,pakatā agārasmā anagāriyam pabbajitā*, ie, during famines or difficulties, one goes forth so that one does not have to earn a living (MA 3:180).

⁵⁶ As at **Piṇḍolya S** (S 22.80.18c/3:93) = SD 28.9a.

⁵⁷ Last 2 paras: *Api ca kho ’mhi otiṇṇo jātiyā jarāya maraṇena sokehi paridevehi dukkhehi domanassehi upāyāsehi, dukkho,tiṇṇo dukkha,pareto; appeva nāma imassa kevalassa dukkha-k,khandhassa anta,kiriyā paññāyethāti.*

⁵⁸ = S 22.80/3:93 (v1 *otiṇṇ ’amhā*) (SA 2:301 f) = A 3.40/1:147-149 ×3 (sg). Pl: S 22.80/3:93 (v1 *otiṇṇo ’mhi*) = It 3.5.2/89 (ItA 2:113); Miln 32; SnA 1:340; UA 106. Omitting *api ca kho ’mhi*, and beginning instead with *otiṇṇo ’mhi* ...: **Mahā Sārôpama S** (M 29/1:192-202 ×15) = **Cātumā S** (M 67/1:460-462 ×4).

⁵⁹ See **The Buddha discovered dhyana** = SD 33.1b (6).

⁶⁰ See **Dhamma Niyāma Sutta** (A 3.134/1:285) = SD 26.8.

§§10-12	having committed an offence.	This shows that the monastic code (Pāṭimokkha) has already been instituted (clearly after the first 20 years of the ministry).
§§13-16	a desire to be treated as the foremost.	This shows that there are numerous other monks, mostly unawakened if they have such an inclination.
§§17-20	a desire for honour through teaching.	To have the opportunity to teach others, especially the laity, means one build up one's reputation and attracts honour and support from others.
§§21-24	a desire for honour.	Although this suggests the monk having a big ego, socially it means there are the ambience or occasions for such a desire, namely, a crowd.
§§25-28	a desire for fine material support.	This clearly refers to a well-established community with rich lay supporters but many monastic vying for their patronage.

2.3.3 Primacy of moral virtue. Sāriputta then warns that even if a monastic were to take up any of the strict ascetic practices, if he still were to have the “blemish” of anger and upset, on account of the weakness mentioned, he would not be respected by his fellow practitioners. Such a false recluse is like *a clean bowl containing a carcass* [§29]. It looks attractive outside, but within lurks some dangerous weakness.

The true recluse, on the other hand, even if he does not take up the ascetic practices, but lives with the benefits of a settled monastic life, such as living outside the village, (not a forest monk), accepting invitation meals and robes donated by the laity (basically, not living as a forest monk), he would still be respected by his peers [§30].

This point is very interesting as it shows that the Sutta was composed at a time when the strict ascetic practices (*dhutaṅga*) were beginning to be popular. Although there were attempts to impose such rules on the whole community, the Buddha rejected this proposal, declaring that they are optional practices⁶¹ [3.3]. There are at least four important reasons for not fully instituting such strict practices: firstly, they are unnecessary and painful.

Secondly, such strict practices (especially living under trees, and not accepting alms invitation or donated robes) would effectively distance the laity from regularly receiving teachings and attending Dharma assemblies. And thirdly, those monks who *appear* to be stricter might be perceived as being “better” than those who are less strict. In other words, it becomes a matter of appearances and ritualism.

A fourth reason is that such strict practices would severely restrict the nuns, who would have great difficulty living in lonely forest lives and seeking basic supports. Understandably, the Buddha places greater emphasis on moral virtue and mental cultivation than on strict ascetic practices.⁶² Another interesting reason for the rejection of making strict ascetic practices compulsory is discussed below [3.3.1].

2.3.4 Social control. Moggallāna categorically and jubilantly approves of Sāriputta's teaching on the importance of *self-knowledge* in spiritual training [1.1.2]. Then Moggallāna goes on to show the difference between a false renunciant and a true one, enumerating their qualities in great detail. Indeed, these are their most detailed definitions in the suttas [2.1]. What is the purpose of such a careful analysis?

The most obvious answer would be that this serves as a guideline for the training of unawakened monastics, that is to say, they do not fall into the wrong path, but direct all their efforts to the proper spir-

⁶¹ On Devadatta's “five demands,” see Cv 7.3.14-17 @ V 2:196-198. See Piya Tan, *The Buddha and His Disciples*, 2004: 7.8 & **Devadatta** = SD 71.4.

⁶² See **Rūpa S** (A 4.65/2:71) in **The teacher or the teaching?** = SD 3.14 (7). On the 26 occasions for conceit, see **Sappurisa S** (M 113) @ SD 23.7 (1.1).

itual training. After all, it is clear from such discourses as **the Cātumā Sutta** (M 67), that it is the duty of the two great disciples to “look after” (*pariharati*) the community of monks.⁶³

The phrase “**community of monks**” (*bhikkhu, saṅgha*) is very significant. It shows that there is now a sizeable community of renunciants, not all of whom, it is clear, have joined for spiritual reasons. The Buddhist order has by now become so well known, respected and established that it commands great respect and attracts much wealth. Even if the community is located in the sprawling country-side, it is so well populated that it might look like a small village or even town, as some of the more successful monasteries and temples that we see today in much of Buddhist Asia today. In other words, we are speaking of the later years of the Buddha’s ministry, certainly during the last 25 years, or any time up to Asoka’s reign, when the suttas were closed.

Such suttas, in other words, are vital tools for disciplining a large community of unawakened monastics, and to filter out undesirable candidates. Indeed, from the number of such texts, especially the “prophetic” suttas,⁶⁴ we can surmise that this is indeed the case. Yet the purpose of the Dharma and the community are clearly to turn the lives of such people around. In short, such teachings provide at least some level of *social control* for the sake of spiritual growth.

3 The four supports

3.1 THE FOUR BASIC SUPPORTS. Although all the world religions, as a rule, began with their founders humbly living simple lives, often in close communion with nature, and teaching publicly by way of peripatetic gatherings, their teachings, methods and lifestyle changed with their success. Clearly, a religious community, especially one as successful as the Buddhist sangha, cannot live on faith alone. Everyone needs basic sustenance, especially food, clothing, shelter and health.

Almost as soon as the Buddha begins teaching the people, donations of these basic supports of life quickly flow and flood into the monastic community. However, even as the community attract such enthusiastic support from the faithful, the Buddha, for that very reason (and also for sake of the solitary forest monks), lays down the ground rules on how the monastics should simply sustain themselves without burdening, much less exploiting, society.

From the start, the Buddha has taught monastics how not to be too dependent on society for their needs, or to be prepared for situations where they might not be able to get certain support. He exhorts the early monastics to rely on the four basic supports (*paccaya*) of life, namely:

- (1) Almsfood (*piṇḍa, pāta*), that is, almsfood of scraps gathered on almsround (*piṇḍiya, lopa, -bhojana*).
- (2) Robes (*cīvara*), that is, discarded cloth taken from the refuse heap or the charnel ground (that is, shrouds), that is, rag-robos (*pāmsukula, cīvara*).
- (3) Tree-foot lodging (*sen’āsana*), that is, dwelling at the foot of a tree (*rukkha, mūla, senāsana*).
- (4) Support for the sick and medical requisites (*gilāna.paccaya, bhesajja.parikkhāra*), that is, medicine of fermented cow’s urine (*pūti, mutta, bhesajja*). (Mv 1.30 @ V 1:58)

These four supports are to be “reflectively” used, that is, neither accumulating them nor delighting in them, but taking them merely as external supports for an internal spiritual quest. **The Sabb’āsava Sutta** (M 2), for example, records the Buddha as teaching monastics on how to abandon mental fetters through *use* by way of the four reflections on the supports.⁶⁵

⁶³ M 67.13/1:459 = SD 34.7.

⁶⁴ They incl **Cakka, vatti Sīhanāda S** (D 26/3:58-79), the 3 **Ovāda Ss** (S 16.6-8/2:203-210), **Saddhamma Paṭirūpaka S** (S 16.13/2:223-225), **Āṇi S** (S 20.7/2:266 f), the 2 **Adhamma Ss** (A 1.10.34-42, 1.11.1-10/1:18-20); **Saddhamma Sammosā S** (A 2.2.10/1:58 f); the 3 **Kimbila Ss** (A 5.201, 6.40, 7.56). See also **The Dharma-ending age** = SD 1.10 (3-5).

⁶⁵ See M 2.13-17/1:10 = SD 30.3.

3.2 THE EXTRA ALLOWANCES. Besides these basic life-supports, the Buddha gives extra allowances (*atireka, lābha*) as the occasion arises (V 1:58). For example, besides *alms scrap*, the extra allowances include invitation meals and ticket meals (distributed by drawing lots); besides *rag-rob*es, robes of cotton or wool are also allowed; besides *tree-foot lodging*, a residence (*vihāra*) or a cave are allowed; and besides *fermented cow's urine*, ghee, fresh butter, oil, honey and molasses are allowed.⁶⁶

In fact, there are no rules against monastics seeking any kind of proper medical treatment. However, all such are to be regarded as only supports for living the spiritual life, so that they should be used in a proper reflective manner.⁶⁷

3.3 STRICT ASCETIC PRACTICES ARE OPTIONAL

3.3.1 Devadatta's five points. Despite the Buddha's permitting the extra allowances [3.2], as we have seen, there is at least one major attempt at rejecting such concessions and keeping the monastic order as a strictly ascetic order resorting only to the four basic supports. The Culla, vaggā of **the Vinaya** records the influential monk **Deva, datta**⁶⁸ and his followers as presenting the "five points" (*pañca vatthu*) [2.3.3], that is,

- (1) that monks should be forest-dwellers (*ārañṇaka*) all their lives; those who live in the vicinity of a village (*gām'anta*) would be committing an offence;⁶⁹
 - (2) that they should resort to almsfood (*piṇḍa, pāta*); those who accept invitation meals (*nimantana*) would be committing an offence;⁷⁰
 - (3) that they should resort to dust-heap cloth (*paṃsu, kūla*); those who accept robes from householders (*gahapati, cīvara*) would be committing an offence;⁷¹
 - (4) that they should resort to the foot of a tree (*rukka, mula*); those who resort to a covered place (*channa*) would be committing an offence;⁷²
 - (5) that they should not eat fish and meat (*maccha, māmsa*); those who eat them would be committing an offence.⁷³
- (Cv 7.3.14 @ V 2:197)

The Vinaya presents the Buddha as warning Devadatta not to insist on these five points, as it might bring about a schism. Such practices are optional, depending on personal inclination. In the case of the last, however, fish or meat is pure if one has not seen, heard or suspected that it has specially been killed for one.⁷⁴

We can see that the three strict ascetic practices [§29a] concur with the first three of the five points. The fourth point can be included in the first. The fifth point, regarding a non-meat diet, has been fully dealt in such discourses as **the Amagandha Sutta** (Sn 2.2).⁷⁵ We can also see that the other three practices, which are allowed by the Buddha, are their counterpoints.

Hence, we can surmise that the Anaṅgaṇa Sutta, at least the sections on the false and the true recluses spoken by Moggallāna [§§29-30] must surely address Devadatta's attempt to cause a schism in the early

⁶⁶ Mv 1.30.4 @ V 1:58.

⁶⁷ See **Sabb'āsava S** (M 2.13-17/1:10) & SD 30.3 (2.3.1) & **Anubaddha Bhikkhu S** (S 47.3) @ SD 24.6a (2.3.1-2)).

⁶⁸ On the Thera, vāda attitude to Deva, datta, see **Devadatta** = SD 72.4.

⁶⁹ *Bhikkhū yāva, jīvaṃ ārañṇakā assu, yo gāmantam osareyya vajjam nam phuseyya.*

⁷⁰ *(Bhikkhū) yāva, jīvaṃ piṇḍa, pātikā assu, yo nimantanam sādīyeyya vajjam nam phuseyya.*

⁷¹ *(Bhikkhū) yāva, jīvaṃ paṃsu, kūlikā assu, yogahapati, cīvaṃ sādīyeyya vajjam nam phuseyya.* Elsewhere, a certain monk proposes to the Buddha that monks should reject all clothing, ie go naked (*naggiya*). The Buddha rebukes him saying that this would make the monks be just like heterodox sectarians, esp the naked ascetics (Mv 8.28.1 @ V 1:305). The rule is that a monk may use either dust-heap cloth or robes donated by the laity (Mv 8.1.35 @ V 1:280 f).

⁷² *(Bhikkhū) yāva, jīvaṃ rukka, mūlikā assu, yo channam upagaccheyya vajjam nam phuseyya.* Dwelling under a tree, however, is expressly prohibited during the 3-month rains (Mv 3.12.5 @ V 1:152).

⁷³ *(Bhikkhū) yāva, jīvaṃ maccha, māmsam na khādeyyum, yo maccha, māmsam khādeyya vajjam nam phuseyya.*

⁷⁴ Cv 7.3.14 @ V 2:197; Mv 6.31.14 @ V 1:238.

⁷⁵ Sn 2.2/239-252 = SD 4.24.

sangha, or some similar attempt. The Sutta, as such, aims to remind us of keeping to the middle of the middle way.

3.3.2 Foregoing the extras. The Buddha, it is said, refuses to make compulsory the five points of strict ascetic practice proposed by Devadatta [3.3.1]. Since they are optional, there are those who actually choose to observe them or some of them. Amongst the best known examples of those who have opted for living a strict ascetic life are the elders Mahā Kassapa, Revata Khadira, vaniya, Piṇḍola Bhāra, dvāja and Bakkula.

Mahā Kassapa is recorded in the Aṅguttara as being the foremost of those who live an ascetic life.⁷⁶ **The Cīvāra Sutta** (S 16.11) tells a famous story where the Buddha exchanges his own worn-out hempen rag-ropes (*sāṇā paṃsukūlā nibbasanā*) for Mahā Kassapa's patch-cloak (*paṭa, pilotikā*).⁷⁷ Since then, he wears only rag-ropes, and only on almsfood.⁷⁸ He lives to be very old and, when he dies, has not slept on a bed for 120 years, that is to say, he has been keeping to the rule of sleeping only in the sitting posture (*nesajjik'āṅga*).⁷⁹

Sleeping in a sitting posture is common enough amongst the great elders of the Buddha's time. The Dīgha Commentary reports that, besides Mahā Kassapa, the following elders, too, sleep without lying down on a bed:⁸⁰ both Sāriputta and Moggallāna, for 30 years; Anuruddha 50 years; Bhaddiya 30 years; Soṇa 18 years; Raṭṭhapāla 12 years; Ānanda 15 years; Rahula 12 years; Bakkula 80 years (DA 3:736).

The elder **Revata Khadira, vaniya**, the acacia forest dweller, is renowned for his solitary life style, and is the foremost of those monks who are forest-dwellers (*ārañṇika*).⁸¹ Yet, he would still make a point of proclaiming that he feels himself a friend and comrade to all, being compassionate towards all brings.⁸²

Piṇḍola Bhāra, dvāja is best known as the foremost of monks who are lion-roarers (A 1:23), that is, he is the best model of one who is an allayer of doubts in a monk. **The Piṇḍola Sutta** (U 4.6) records that he is praised by the Buddha as an exemplary ascetic monk, that is,

a forest-dweller, one who goes on almsround, a dust-heap robe user, a three-robe user;⁸³ of few wishes, content, secluded [reclusive], not socializing, intent on spiritual effort, a proponent of the ascetic life,⁸⁴ devoted to the higher mind.⁸⁵
(U 4.6/42 f) = SD 27.6a(2.3)

In the Bakkula Sutta (M 124), Bakkula is presented as an exemplary, even ideal, monk who observes a number of of the ascetic practices (*dhutaṅga*) throughout his monk-life of 80 years. From his statements, we deduce that Bakkula, during his 80 years as a monk, uses only robes made from dust-heap cloth, never accepting any robe from the laity,⁸⁶ has nothing to do with any invitation meal,⁸⁷ and does not sleep on a bed or use a reclining-board.⁸⁸

⁷⁶ *Dhuta, vādānaṃ* or *dhutaṅga, dharānaṃ* (A 14.1/1:23).

⁷⁷ S 16.11/2:217-222 = SD 77.5.

⁷⁸ See **Beggars can be choosers** = SD 71.2.

⁷⁹ DA 3:736; Vism 2.85/81: see also **Bakkula S** (M 124) @ SD 3.15 (2.1).

⁸⁰ "Without lying down on a bed," *mañce piṭṭhiṃ na pasāresi*.

⁸¹ A 1.14/1:24; cf M 32/1:213; MĀ 184 = T1.727b3; EĀ 37.3 = T2.710c24; T154 = T3.81a27, which record his praises in favour of living in seclusion.

⁸² In **Revata Khadira, vaniya Tha**, he declares that he is "a friend to all, a companion to all, compassionate to all beings, | And I cultivate a heart of lovingkindness, always delighting in being free from anger" (*sabba, mitto sabba, -sakhō sabba, bhūtānukampako | mettaṃ cittaṃ ca bhāvēmi avyāpajjha, rato sadā*, Tha 648).

⁸³ These are 4 of the 13 optional ascetic practices: see Vism ch 2 & also **Bakkula S** (M 124/3:124-128) & SD 3.15 Intro (2.1).

⁸⁴ *Dhuta, vāda*, more commonly said of Mahā Kassapa (**Caṅkanta S**, S 14.15/2:155 f), who is the foremost of those monks who practice asceticism (A 1:23).

⁸⁵ "Devoted to the higher mind" (*adhicittam-anuyutto*), constantly meditating in dhyana. The higher mind here refers to the third of the three trainings, ie, "training in the higher mind" (*adhi.citta, sikkhā*): see **(Ti) Sikkhā S** (A 3.88/1:235) = SD 24.10c. On dhyana, see **Dhyana** = SD 8.4.

⁸⁶ M 124.9-15/2:126 = SD 3.15.

These are examples of exceptional monks who keep to various forms of strict ascetic practices. Most of the other monks of the Buddha's times, even the great elders, do not follow these strict practices. However, on occasions, they might go on a solitary retreat for that duration to observe some such rules. The point is that these practices are *optional*, useful when we have an inclination for them and they help to expedite our meditation and spiritual practice.

In the **Kassapa Sīha,nāda Sutta** (D 8), the Buddha explains the nature of ascetic practices, that Kassapa is the foremost practitioner of such practices. His success here arises from the fact that he finds complete satisfaction in them and has attained the highest goal. In other words, this is the Buddha's own lion-roar regarding the practice of strict asceticism.⁸⁹

— — —

The Discourse on the Blemish-free

M 5/1:24-32

1 Thus have I heard.

At one time the Blessed One was staying in Anātha,piṇḍika's monastery-park, in Jeta's grove, near Sāvattihī.

Then the venerable Sāriputta addressed the monks,

“Avuso bhikshus [Brother monks]!”

“Avuso,” the monks replied to the venerable Sāriputta in assent.

The venerable Sāriputta said this:

The four types of person in terms of blemish

2a “Avuso, there are these four kinds of persons⁹⁰ to be found in the world.⁹¹ What are the four?”

(1) Here, avuso, a certain person *has* a blemish,⁹² but does *not* know for himself just as it is, ‘There is a blemish in me.’

(2) Here, too, avuso, a certain person has a blemish, but *knows* for himself just as it is,

⁸⁷ M 124.16-19/2:126 = SD 3.15.

⁸⁸ Suggesting that he sleep in a sitting (meditating) posture: M 124.35-36/2:127 = SD 3.15.

⁸⁹ D 8/1:161-177 = SD 73.12.

⁹⁰ Comy makes a careful analysis of *puggala* here. First, it simply says that *puggalā* (pl) refers to “beings, men, persons” (*sattā narā posā*), and rejects the view of the “great elders of the Puggala,vāda” (*puggala,vādī mahā,therā*). It points out that the Buddha teaches in two ways (*duvidhā desanā*), ie, in terms of conventional truth (*sammuti desanā*), such as “individual, being, woman, man, kshatriya, brahmin, deva, Māra,” and in terms of the ultimate truth or goal (*paramattha desanā*), such as “impermanence, suffering, not-self, the aggregates, the elements, the planes, the focusses of mindfulness.” The Buddha teaches in either manner so that the listener would, “by understanding its meaning or goal (*attha*), dispel delusion and attain distinction (sainthood)” (MA 1:137). The 4 kinds of person, it says, are to be understood in the conventional way, rejecting any notion or an abiding self or entity (*atta*). (MA 1:137-139; AA 1:194 f; ItA 1:82 f; cf DA 382 f; KvUa 34; Nett 903/1:176). The **Pudgala,vāda** (Skt) was a group of 5 of the early schools of Buddhism, known for their distinct doctrine of the reality of the self, comprising the Vātsīputrīya, the original Pudgalavāda school (rising around early 3rd-middle of 2nd cent BCE), and 4 others derived from it: the Dharmottarīya, the Bhadravānīya, the Sāmmītiya, and the Śannagarika. For details, see <http://www.iep.utm.edu/pudgalav/>

⁹¹ Comy notes that here “world” (*loka*) refers to “the world of beings” (*satta,loka*) (MA 1:139). Clearly, this is an allusion to the 3 kinds of worlds, ie the world of formations (*saṅkhāra,loka*), of beings (*satta,loka*), and of space (*okāsa,loka*), mentioned by Buddhaghosa (Vism 7.37/204 f; DA 1:173; MA 1:397, 2:200). See **Brahma Nimantan-ika S** (M 49) @ SD 11.7 (4) & **Rohitassa S** (S 2.26/1:61 f ≠ A 4.45/2:47-49) & SD 7.1 (1).

⁹² “With a blemish,” *sāṅgaṇa* = *sa* + *āṅgaṇa*, on this sutta's key terms, see Intro (1.2).

‘There *is* a blemish in me.’

(3) Here, avuso, a certain person has *no* blemish, but does *not* know for himself just as it is, ‘There is no blemish in me.’

(4) Here, too, avuso, a certain person has no blemish, but *knows* for himself just as it is, ‘There is *no* blemish in me.’

2b Here, avuso, that person with a blemish who does *not* know for himself just as it is, ‘There is a blemish in me,’ is said to be *the inferior* of the two persons with a blemish.⁹³

Here, avuso, that person with a blemish who *knows* for himself just as it is, ‘There is a blemish in me,’ is said to be *the superior* of the two persons with a blemish.⁹⁴

Here, avuso, that person without a blemish [25] who does *not* know for himself just as it is, ‘There is no blemish in me,’ is said to be *the inferior* of the two persons without blemish.

Here, avuso, that person without a blemish who *knows* for himself just as it is, ‘There is no blemish in me,’ is said to be *the superior* of the two persons without a blemish.

Moggallāna’s question

3 When this was said, the venerable Mahā Moggallāna said this to the venerable Sāriputta, “What now, avuso Sāriputta, is the cause, the condition, that the person with a blemish who *knows* for himself just as it is, ‘There is a blemish in me,’ is said to be *the superior* of the two persons with a blemish?”

What now, avuso Sāriputta, is the cause, the condition, that the person without a blemish who *knows* for himself just as it is, ‘There is a blemish in me,’ is said to be *the superior* of the two persons without a blemish?”

The ones with blemish

4.1 HE WHO KNOWS *NOT* HIS BLEMISH. “Here, avuso, as for the person with a blemish who does *not* know for himself just as it is, ‘There is a blemish in me,’

it is *not* to be expected that he would exert zeal, nor make an effort, nor arouse energy, for the abandoning of that blemish.⁹⁵

He would *die* with a defiled mind, with lust, with hate, with delusion.⁹⁶

4.2 THE DIRTY BOWL MORE DEFILED. Suppose, avuso, a bronze bowl brought back from a shop or the smithy is enveloped in dust and dirt,⁹⁷

and the owners neither use it nor have it cleaned, but have it put away in a dusty corner.⁹⁸

Avuso, would the bronze bowl thus become more defiled, on account of its gathering dirt over time?”⁹⁹

“Of course, avuso.”

“Even so, avuso, for the person with a blemish who does *not* know for himself just as it is, ‘There is a blemish in me,’

it is not to be expected that he would exert zeal, nor make an effort, nor arouse energy, for the abandoning of that blemish.

He would die with a defiled mind, with lust, with hate, with delusion.

⁹³ *Tatr’āvuso, yvāyam puggalo sângaṇo’va samāno “atthi me ajjhataṃ aṅgaṇan’ti yathā, bhūtaṃ na-p, pajānāti, ayaṃ imesaṃ dvinnāṃ puggalānaṃ sângaṇānaṃ yeva sataṃ hīna, puriso akkhāyati.*

⁹⁴ *Tatr’āvuso, yvāyam puggalo sângaṇo’va samāno “atthi me ajjhataṃ aṅgaṇan’ti yathā, bhūtaṃ pajānāti, ayaṃ imesaṃ dvinnāṃ puggalānaṃ sângaṇānaṃ yeva sataṃ settha, puriso akkhāyati.*

⁹⁵ *Tass’etaṃ pāṭikāṅkham: na chandaṃ janessati na vāyamissati na vīriyaṃ ārabhissati tass’aṅgaṇassa pahānāya.*

⁹⁶ *So sa, rāgo sa, doso sa, moho sângaṇo saṅkiliṭṭha, citto kālaṃ karissati.*

⁹⁷ *Seyyathā’pi, āvuso, kaṃsa, pāti ābhatā āpaṇā vā kammāra, kulā vā rajena ca malena ca pariyonaddhā.*

⁹⁸ *Tam enaṃ sāmikā na c’eva paribhuñjeyyūṃ na ca pariyodapeyyūṃ, rajā, pathe ca naṃ nikkhipeyyūṃ.*

⁹⁹ *Evañ hi sā, āvuso, kaṃsa, pāti aparena samayena saṅkiliṭṭha, tarā assa mala-g, gahitā’ti?*

5.1 HE WHO KNOWS HIS BLEMISH. Here, avuso, as for the person with a blemish who *knows* for himself just as it is, ‘There is a blemish in me,’

it is to be expected that he would exert zeal, make an effort, arouse energy, for the abandoning of that blemish.

He would die *without* a defiled mind, without lust, without hate, without delusion.

5.2 THE DIRTY BOWL CLEANED. Suppose, avuso, a bronze bowl brought back from a shop or the smithy is enveloped in dust and dirt,

and the owners would use it and have it cleaned, and not have it put away in a dusty corner. [26]

Avuso, would the bronze bowl thus become more pure, on account of its being cleaned over time?”¹⁰⁰

“Of course, avuso.”

“Even so, avuso, for the person with a blemish who *knows* for himself just as it is, ‘There is a blemish in me,’

it is to be expected that he would exert zeal, make an effort, arouse energy, for the abandoning of that blemish.

He would die without a defiled mind, without lust, without hate, without delusion.

The ones without blemish

6.1 HE WHO KNOWS NOT HE HAS NO BLEMISH. “Here, avuso, as for the person without a blemish who does *not* know for himself just as it is, ‘There is no blemish in me,’

it is to be expected that he would pay attention to a sign of the beautiful,¹⁰¹

so that by his paying attention to the sign of the beautiful, lust would corrupt his mind.

He would *die* with a defiled mind, with lust, with hate, with delusion.

6.2 THE CLEAN BOWL DEFILED. Suppose, avuso, a bronze bowl brought back from a shop or the smithy is pure and clean,

and the owners neither use it nor have it cleaned, but have it put away in a dusty corner.

Avuso, would the bronze bowl thus become more defiled, on account of its gathering dirt over time?”

“Of course, avuso.”

“Even so, avuso, for the person without a blemish who does *not* know for himself just as it is, ‘There is no blemish in me,’

it is to be expected that he would pay attention to the beautiful sign,

so that by his paying attention to the beautiful sign, lust would corrupt his mind.

He would die with a defiled mind, with lust, with hate, with delusion.

7.1 HE WHO KNOWS NOT HE HAS NO BLEMISH. “Here, avuso, as for the person without a blemish who *knows* for himself just as it is, ‘There is no blemish in me,’

it is to be expected that he would *not* pay attention to the sign of the beautiful,

so that by his not paying attention to the sign of the beautiful, lust would not corrupt his mind.

He would die *without* a defiled mind, without lust, without hate, without delusion.

7.2 THE CLEAN BOWL CLEANER. Suppose, avuso, a bronze bowl brought back from a shop or the smithy is pure and clean,

and the owners use it, have it cleaned, and not have it put away in a dusty corner.

Avuso, would the bronze bowl thus become more purified, on account of its being cleaned over time?”

“Of course, avuso.”

¹⁰⁰ *Evañ hi sā, āvuso, kaṃsa,pāti aparena samayena parisuddha,tarā assa pariyodātā’ti?*

¹⁰¹ This and foll lines: *Subha,nimittam manasi karissati, tassa subha,nimittassa manasi,kārā rāgo cittam anud-dhamsessati.* “A sign of the beautiful” (*subha,nimitta*) is a mental object we take to be desirable, as so becomes the basis for lust, explained in the suttas, thus: “Frequently giving unwise attention to it is food for the arising of unarisen lustful desire and for the growth and abundance of arisen lustful desire.” (S 46.2/5:64 = 46.51.3/5:103). See further *Nimitta* = SD 19.7.

“Even so, avuso, for the person without a blemish who *knows* for himself just as it is, ‘There is no blemish in me,’

it is to be expected that he would *not* pay attention to the beautiful sign,
so that by his not paying attention to the beautiful sign, lust would not corrupt his mind.
He would die without a defiled mind, without lust, without hate, without delusion.

8 This, avuso [27] Moggallāna, is the cause, the condition, why, of these two persons with a blemish, one is said to be the *inferior person*, the other is said to be *the superior person*.

This, avuso Moggallāna, is the cause, the condition, why, of these two persons without blemish, one is said to be the *inferior person*, the other is said to be *the superior person*.

Definition of “blemish”

9 “‘Blemish, blemish,’ avuso, it is said. What now, avuso, does this term ‘blemish’ refer to?”¹⁰²
“This term ‘blemish’ (*aṅgana*), avuso, is a term for the spheres of bad unwholesome wishes.”¹⁰³

HOW BLEMISHES ARISE

Through committing offences

10 (1) It is possible, avuso, that a wish might occur to a certain monk here, thus:
‘Now, if I were to have committed an offence, let no monk know that I have committed it!’¹⁰⁴
But it is possible, avuso, that the monks would know that this monk *has* committed an offence.
Thinking, ‘The monks know that I have committed an offence!’ he is angry and upset.¹⁰⁵
This anger and this upset, avuso—they are both blemishes.¹⁰⁶

11 (2) It is possible, avuso, that a wish might occur to a certain monk here, thus:
‘Now, if I were to have committed an offence, let them reprove¹⁰⁷ me *in private*, not in the midst of the sangha.’¹⁰⁸

But it is possible, avuso, that the monks would reprove this monk *in the midst of the sangha*, not in private.

Thinking, ‘The monks reprove me in the midst of the sangha, not in private!’ he is angry and upset.
This anger and this upset, avuso—they are both blemishes.

12 (3) It is possible, avuso, that a wish might occur to a certain monk here, thus:
‘Now, if I were to have committed an offence, let someone who is *an equal* reprove me, not someone who is an unequal.’¹⁰⁹

¹⁰² *Aṅgaṇaṃ aṅgaṇaṃ ti, āvuso, vuccati. Kissa nu kho etaṃ, āvuso, adhivacaṇaṃ yad idaṃ aṅgaṇaṃ ’ti?*

¹⁰³ *Pāpakānaṃ kho etaṃ, āvuso, akusalānaṃ icchā ’vacarānaṃ adhivacaṇaṃ, yad idaṃ aṅgaṇaṃ ’ti.* Qu at BA 175.

¹⁰⁴ See **Iṇā S** (A 6.45.10-12/3:353) = SD 37.5, where such a conduct is compared to accumulating “interest” to a bad deed (“debt”) already done, ie, aggravating the situation. Instead the offender should confess his offence to an elder or before the sangha. Cf V 2:32.

¹⁰⁵ *‘Jānanti maṃ bhikkhū āpattiṃ āpanno ’ti iti so kupito hoti appatīto. Appatīta = a + patīta (pati + √ī, “to go”; Skt pratīta), discontented, dissatisfied, displeased, disappointed (cf appaccaya, DA 1:52,2), V 3:163; M 1:27 (= do-manassābhībhūto, “overcome by displeasure,” MA 1:143), 3:221; J 5:155 (cf comy J 156); DA 1:52; SnA 423. See CPD: a-ppatīta. See **Khaluṅka S** (A 8.14/4190-195) = SD 7.9.*

¹⁰⁶ *Yo c’eva kho, āvuso, kopo yo ca appaccayo: ubhayam etaṃ aṅgaṇaṃ.*

¹⁰⁷ “Let them reprove,” *codeyyum*, or, “that they would reprove” (M 1:27×2; **Codana S** (A 5.167/3:198), pot 3 sg of *codeti*, “he reproves” (V 1:176×3, 322-325 passim, 2:6, 8, 15, 20, 24, 25, 28, 82-84 passim, 101, 3:163-170 passim, 4:148; M 1:230-234 passim, 1:27, 2:249).

¹⁰⁸ Alt: “...I should be reprovved in private, not before the sangha.” *Āpattiṃ ca vata āpanno assaṃ, anuraho maṃ bhikkhū codeyyum, no saṅgha, majjhē ti.* Here *assaṃ* is pot 1 sg (M 1:27,15, 451,5; S 3:205,32 = A 5:63,29; A 2:-241,18; J 3:165,25*, 4:35,28*, 470,24*, 6:482,24*, 573,2*; DhA 3:92.17; Ap 98,1: see Warder, *Introduction to Pali*, 1974:86 & CPD 1:113 f. (*assaṃ*).

But it is possible, avuso, that someone who is *an unequal* would reprove this monk, not one who is an equal.

Thinking, ‘Someone unequal reproves me, not one who is an equal!’ he is angry and upset.
This anger and this upset, avuso—they are both blemishes.

Through desire to be treated as foremost

13 (4) It is possible, avuso, that a wish might occur to a certain monk here, thus:

‘Oh that the teacher would teach the Dharma to the monks, *questioning and counter-questioning me*; that the teacher would not teach the Dharma to the monks, questioning and counter-questioning another monk!’¹¹⁰

But it is possible, avuso, that the teacher would teach the Dharma to the monks, [28] questioning and counter-questioning *another monk*; that the teacher would teach the Dharma to the monks without questioning and counter-questioning that monk.

Thinking, ‘The teacher does not teach the Dharma to the monks, questioning and counter-questioning me, but the teacher teaches the Dharma to the monks, questioning and counter-questioning another monk!’ he is angry and upset.

This anger and this upset, avuso—they are both blemishes.

14 (5) It is possible, avuso, that a wish might occur to a certain monk here, thus:

‘Oh that the monks would enter the village for alms, *having put me in the front*; that they would not enter the village for alms, having put some other monk in the front!’¹¹¹

But it is possible, avuso, that the monks would enter the village for alms, having put *some other monk* in the front; that they would enter the village for alms, not putting that monk in the front.

Thinking, ‘The monks have entered the village for alms, having put some other monk in the front. They have entered the village for alms, not putting me in the front!’ he is angry and upset.

This anger and this upset, avuso—they are both blemishes.

15 (6) It is possible, avuso, that a wish might occur to a certain monk here, thus:

‘Oh that I would surely get *the foremost seat, the best water, the best almsfood in the refectory*;¹¹² that some other monk would not get the foremost seat, the best water, the best almsfood in the refectory!’¹¹³

But it is possible, avuso, that *some other monk* would get the foremost seat, the best drink, the best almsfood in the refectory; that that monk would not get the foremost seat, the best drink, the best almsfood in the refectory.

Thinking, ‘Some other monk has gotten the foremost seat, the best drink, the best almsfood in the refectory; I have not gotten the foremost seat, the best drink, the best almsfood in the refectory!’ he is angry and upset.

This anger and this upset, avuso—they are both blemishes.

16 (7) It is possible, avuso, that a wish might occur to a certain monk here, thus:

¹⁰⁹ *Āpattiñ ca vata āpanno assaṃ, sappatipuggalo maṃ codeyya, no appatipuggalo ’ti.* Comy says that here “an equal” (*sappatipuggala*), is “an equal person, that is, one with an offence” (*samāno puggalo, samāno ti sâpattiko*), thinking that the reprover (*paṭipuggala*), who himself has an offence, should confessed it first before reproving him. Or, he wishes that the reprover would be someone from the same class (*jāti*, “birth”), clan, learning, ability, ascetic practice, etc (MA 1:144), in other words, someone compatible or a peer. This is an example of *conceit (māna)*, or measuring of others against oneself: see **Udakūpama S** (A 7.15) @ SD 28.6 (1.2.8) & **Anusaya** = SD 31.3 (4).

¹¹⁰ *Aho vata mam eva satthā paṭipucchivā paṭipucchivā bhikkhūnaṃ dhammaṃ deseyya, na aññaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ satthā paṭipucchivā paṭipucchivā bhikkhūnaṃ dhammaṃ deseyyā ti.*

¹¹¹ *Aho vata mam eva bhikkhū purakkhatvā purakkhatvā gāmaṃ bhattāya paviseyyuṃ, na aññaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ bhikkhū purakkhatvā purakkhatvā gāmaṃ bhattāya paviseyyun ’ti.*

¹¹² Note that the presence of a “refectory” (*bhatt’agga*) is evidence of a more organized, settled, community.

¹¹³ *Aho vata aham eva labheyyaṃ bhatt’agge agg’āsanam agg’odakam agga.piṇḍam, na aññaṃ bhikkhu labheyya bhatt’agge agg’āsanam agg’odakam agga.piṇḍan ’ti.* Cf (**Brahma, vihāra**) **Subha S** (M 99.19.2/2:204) = SD 38.6. See V 2:161, for a list of those monks fit for such a meal.

‘Oh that it would be *I* who, having had my meal, *would give thanks in the refectory*; it would not be some other monk who, having had his meal, *would give thanks in the refectory!*’¹¹⁴

But it is possible, avuso, that *some other monk* who, having had his meal, would give thanks in the refectory; it is not that monk who, having had his meal, would give thanks in the refectory.

Thinking, ‘Some other monk, having had his meal, has given thanks in the refectory; it is not I who, having had my meal, who gives thanks in the refectory,’ he is angry and upset.

This anger and this upset, avuso—they are both blemishes.

Through desire for honour through teaching

17 (8) It is possible, avuso, that a wish might occur to a certain monk here, thus:

‘Oh that it would be *I* who would *teach the Dharma* to monks who have come to the monastery; that some other monk would not teach the monks who have come to the monastery!’¹¹⁵

But it is possible, avuso, that *some other monk* would teach the Dharma to monks who have come to the monastery; that that monk is not the one [29] who would teach the monks who have come to the monastery.

Thinking, ‘Some other monk is teaching the Dharma to the monks who have come to the monastery; I am not the one who teaches the monks who have come to the monastery,’ he is angry and upset.

This anger and this upset, avuso—they are both blemishes.

18 (9) It is possible, avuso, that a wish might occur to a certain monk here, thus:

‘Oh that it would be *I* who would *teach the Dharma* to nuns who have come to the monastery; that some other monk would not teach the nuns who have come to the monastery!’

But it is possible, avuso, that *some other monk* would teach the Dharma to nuns who have come to the monastery; that that monk is not the one who would teach the nuns who have come to the monastery.

Thinking, ‘Some other monk is teaching the Dharma to the nuns who have come to the monastery; I am not the one who teaches the nuns who have come to the monastery,’ he is angry and upset.

This anger and this upset, avuso—they are both blemishes.

19 (10) It is possible, avuso, that a wish might occur to a certain monk here, thus:

‘Oh that it would be *I* who would *teach the Dharma* to laymen who have come to the monastery; that some other monk would not teach the laymen who have come to the monastery!’

But it is possible, avuso, that *some other monk* would teach the Dharma to laymen who have come to the monastery; that that monk is not the one who would teach the laymen who have come to the monastery.

Thinking, ‘Some other monk is teaching the Dharma to the laymen who have come to the monastery; I am not the one who teaches the laymen who have come to the monastery,’ he is angry and upset.

This anger and this upset, avuso—they are both blemishes.

20 (11) It is possible, avuso, that a wish might occur to a certain monk here, thus:

‘Oh that it would be *I* who would *teach the Dharma* to laywomen who have come to the monastery; that some other monk would not teach the laywomen who have come to the monastery!’

But it is possible, avuso, that *some other monk* would teach the Dharma to laywomen who have come to the monastery; that that monk is not the one who would teach the laywomen who have come to the monastery.

Thinking, ‘Some other monk is teaching the Dharma to the laywomen who have come to the monastery; I am not the one who teaches the laywomen who have come to the monastery,’ he is angry and upset.

This anger and this upset, avuso—they are both blemishes.

¹¹⁴ *Aho vata aham eva bhadd’agge bhuttāvī anumodeyyaṃ, na añño bhikkhu bhadd’agge bhuttāvī anumodeyyā ti.*

¹¹⁵ *Aho vata aham eva ārāma, gatānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ dhammaṃ deseyyaṃ, na añño bhikkhu ārāma, gatānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ dhammaṃ deseyyā ti.*

Through desire for honour

21 (12) It is possible, avuso, that a wish might occur to a certain monk here, thus:

‘Oh that it is *me* that the monks would *honour, respect, esteem, worship*; that the monks would not honour, respect, esteem, worship some other monk!’¹¹⁶

But it is possible, avuso, that the monks would honour, respect, esteem, worship *some other monk*; that the monks would not honour, respect, esteem, worship that monk.

Thinking, ‘It is some other monk the monks honour, respect, esteem, worship; it is not me that the monks honour, respect, esteem, worship,’ he is angry and upset.

This anger and this upset, avuso—they are both blemishes.

22 (13) It is possible, avuso, that a wish might occur to a certain monk here, thus:

‘Oh that it is *me* that the nuns would *honour, respect, esteem, worship*; that the nuns would not honour, respect, esteem, worship some other monk!’

But it is possible, avuso, that the nuns would honour, respect, esteem, worship *some other monk*; that the nuns would not honour, respect, esteem, worship that monk.

Thinking, ‘It is some other monk the nuns honour, respect, esteem, worship; it is not me that the nuns honour, respect, esteem, worship,’ he is angry and upset.

This anger and this upset, avuso—they are both blemishes.

23 (14) It is possible, avuso, that a wish might occur to a certain monk here, thus:

‘Oh that it is *me* that the laymen would *honour, respect, esteem, worship*; that the laymen would not honour, respect, esteem, worship some other monk!’

But it is possible, avuso, that the laymen would honour, respect, esteem, worship *some other monk*; that the laymen would not honour, respect, esteem, worship that monk.

Thinking, ‘It is some other monk the laymen honour, respect, esteem, worship; it is not me that the laymen honour, respect, esteem, worship,’ he is angry and upset.

This anger and this upset, avuso—they are both blemishes.

24 (15) It is possible, avuso, that a wish might occur to a certain monk here, thus:

‘Oh that it is *me* that the laywomen would *honour, respect, esteem, worship*; that the laywomen would not honour, respect, esteem, worship some other monk!’

But it is possible, avuso, that the laywomen would honour, respect, esteem, worship *some other monk*; that the laywomen would not honour, respect, esteem, worship that monk.

Thinking, ‘It is some other monk the laywomen honour, respect, esteem, worship; it is not me that the laywomen honour, respect, esteem, worship,’ he is angry and upset.

This anger and this upset, avuso—they are both blemishes.

Through desire for fine material supports

25 (16) It is possible, avuso, that a wish might occur to a certain monk here, thus:

‘Oh that *I would receive fine robes*; that some other monks would not receive fine robes!’

But it is possible, avuso, that *some other monk* would receive fine robes; that that monk would not receive fine robes.

Thinking, ‘Some other monk is receiving fine robes; it is not I who am receiving fine robes!’ he is angry and upset.¹¹⁷

This anger and this upset, avuso—they are both blemishes.

26 (17) It is possible, avuso, that a wish might occur to a certain monk here, thus:

‘Oh that *I would receive fine almsfood*; that some other monks would not receive fine almsfood!’

But it is possible, avuso, that *some other monk* would receive fine almsfood; that that monk would not receive fine almsfood.

¹¹⁶ *Aho vata mam eva bhikkhū sakkareyyum garuṃ kareyyum māneyyūṃ pūjeyyūṃ, na aññaṃ bhikkhūṃ bhikkhū sakkareyyum garuṃ kareyyum māneyyūṃ pūjeyyūṃ ’ti.*

¹¹⁷ On the proper use of robes, see **Sabb’āsava S** (M 2.13/1:10) = SD 30.3.

Thinking, ‘Some other monk is receiving fine almsfood; it is not I who am receiving fine almsfood!’ he is angry and upset.¹¹⁸

This anger and this upset, avuso—they are both blemishes.

27 (18) It is possible, avuso, that a wish might occur to a certain monk here, thus:

‘Oh that *I would receive fine lodgings*; that some other monks would not receive fine lodgings!’

But it is possible, avuso, that *some [30] other monk* would receive fine lodgings; that that monk would not receive fine lodgings.

Thinking, ‘Some other monk is receiving fine lodgings; it is not I who am receiving fine lodgings!’ he is angry and upset.¹¹⁹

This anger and this upset, avuso—they are both blemishes.

28 (19) It is possible, avuso, that a wish might occur to a certain monk here, thus:

‘Oh that *I would receive fine support for the sick and medical requisites*; that some other monks would not receive fine support for the sick and medical requisites!’¹²⁰

But it is possible, avuso, that *some other monk* would receive fine support for the sick and medical requisites; that that monk would not receive fine support for the sick and medical requisites.

Thinking, ‘Some other monk is receiving fine support for the sick and medical requisites; it is not I who am receiving fine support for the sick and medical requisites!’ he is angry and upset.¹²¹

This anger and this upset, avuso—they are both blemishes.

These, avuso, are the spheres of bad unwholesome sphere of wishes, the term for which is ‘blemish.’¹²²

The false recluse

29.1 In whatever monk, avuso, these spheres of bad unwholesome wishes are seen and heard not to have been abandoned by him,¹²³

even if he were

a forest-dweller who resorts to a remote lodging,¹²⁴

one who lives on almsfood, faring from house-to-house without omitting any,¹²⁵

one who wears coarse robes, made from dust-heap cloth,¹²⁶

fellow brahmacharis [fellows in the holy life] would still not honour, respect, esteem, worship him.

¹¹⁸ On the proper use of almsfood, see **Sabb’āsava S** (M 2.14/1:10) = SD 30.3.

¹¹⁹ On the proper use of lodging, see **Sabb’āsava S** (M 2.15/1:10) = SD 30.3.

¹²⁰ *Aho vata aham eva lābhī assaṃ pañītānaṃ gilāna-p.paccaya,bhesajja,parikkhārānaṃ, na añño bhikkhu lābhī assa pañītānaṃ gilāna-p.paccaya,bhesajja,parikkhārānaṃ ti.*

¹²¹ On the proper use of support for the sick, see **Sabb’āsava S** (M 2.16/1:10) = SD 30.3.

¹²² *Imesaṃ kho etaṃ, āvuso, pāpakānaṃ akusalānaṃ icchā’vacarānaṃ adhivacanaṃ, yad idaṃ aṅgaṇaṃ ti.*

¹²³ *Yassa kassaci, āvuso, bhikkhuno ime pāpakā akusalā icchā’vacarā appahīnā dissanti c’eva sūyanti ca.*

¹²⁴ “A forest-dweller who resorts to a remote lodging,” *ārañṇiko panta,sen’āsano*, here I take the final phrase as qualifying the initial one. This is to counterpoint the true recluses’ 3 kinds of lighter practice [§30.3]. For a fuller expl, see Intro (1.1.5).

¹²⁵ *Sa,padāna,cārī*, “moving from a house one has arrived at, moving on to another successively” (*sampatta,gharaṃ anukkamma paṭipāṭiyā caranto*, SA 1:205), going to every house, whether rich or poor, without a break (SnA 1:118; ApA 193; NcA 144); cf MA 3:240. M:H wrongly equates this with Sekh 33: *sa,padānaṃ piṇḍapātaṃ bhuñjissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā*, “I shall eat almsfood uninterruptedly: this should be my training.” While in *sa,padāna,-cārī*, the adv *sapadāna* refers to the manner of going from house to house, here in the Vinaya rule, it simply refers to the manner of eating.

¹²⁶ *Kiñcāpi so hoti ārañṇiko panta,sen’āsano piṇḍa,pātiko sa,padāna,cārī paṃsu,kūliko lūkha,cīvara,dhara*. These practices seem to form an early list, which later was standardized to a list of 13 strict ascetic practices (*dhutaṅga*): see **Bakkula S** (M 124/3:124-128) & SD 3.15 (2). Similarly here (as in the case of the first), I treat *paṃsu,-kūliko lūkha,cīvara,dhara* as a single phrase: see Intro (1.1.5). On the coarse robes, Comy says that they may become “coarse” (*lūkha*) in any of 3 ways: by being cut with a knife, being sewn with a thick long thread, or being stained by dust (MA 1:149).

What is the reason for this?

It is because these spheres of bad unwholesome wishes are seen and heard not to have been abandoned by him.

29.2 THE CLEAN BOWL CONTAINING A CARCASS. Suppose, avuso, a bronze bowl brought back from a shop or the smithy is pure and clean,

and the owners were to put a snake carcass, or a dog carcass, or a human carcass in it, and covering it with another bronze bowl, and were to take it to the middle of a market.

Then people, seeing it, would say:

‘Hey, what is this you are carrying about that’s like a very fine thing?’¹²⁷

Having raised (the lid) and opening it, so that they would look into it.¹²⁸

As soon as they see, they were struck with displeasure, with disgust, with loathing, so that even the hungry have no wish to eat, not to speak of those who have eaten their fill!¹²⁹

29.3 Even so, avuso, in whatever monk these spheres of bad unwholesome wishes are seen and heard not to have been abandoned by him,

even if he were a forest-dweller, one who resorts to a remote dwelling, one who lives on almsfood, one who fares from house-to-house on almsround, one who wears dust-heap robes, one who wears coarse robes,

fellow brahmacharis would still not honour, respect, [31] esteem, worship him.

What is the reason for this?

It is because these spheres of bad unwholesome wishes of the venerable one are seen and heard not to have been abandoned by him.

The true recluse

30.1 In whatever monk, avuso, these spheres of bad unwholesome wishes are seen and heard to have been abandoned by him,

even if he were one who dwells just outside a village, one who accepts invitations, one who dons robes given by householders,¹³⁰

fellow brahmacharis would still honour, respect, esteem, worship him.

What is the reason for this?

It is because these spheres of bad unwholesome wishes are seen and heard to have been abandoned by him.

30.2 THE CLEAN BOWL CONTAINING A FINE FOOD. Suppose, avuso, a bronze bowl brought back from a shop or the smithy is pure and clean,

and the owners were to put sali rice,¹³¹ free of black specks, with various curries, various sauces¹³² in it, and covering it with another bronze bowl, and were to take it to the middle of a market.¹³³

¹²⁷ *Ambho, kim ev’idaṃ harīyati jañña, jaññaṃ viyā ti?*

¹²⁸ *Tam enaṃ uṭṭhahitvā apāpuritvā olokeyya. Uṭṭhahitvā*, “raising up (the lid)” (V 4:20,4; M 3:183,30; J 4:244,27; Thī 410, 436; Miln 304,40; Vism 40,4; UA 412,19), abs of *uttiṭṭhati*, *uṭṭhahati*, *uṭṭhāti*, *uṭṭheti*, “stands up, arises, appears, rouses oneself, recovers (from sickness): (see DP sv). *Apāpuritvā* (M 1:30,30; Thī 494), abs of *apāpurati*, “opens (a door)” (V 1:5,31* = M 1:68,27* = S 1:137,23*; It 80,5*).

¹²⁹ *Tassa saha, dassanena amanāpatā ca saṅghaheyya, pāṭikulyatā ca saṅghaheyya, jegucchatā ca saṅghaheyya; jighacchitānam pi na bhottu, kamyatā assa, pag’eva suhitānam*. Here *saha* has the sense of “at the same time, as soon as.” *Saṅghaheyya* (V 2:11; S 5:321), pot of *santiṭṭhati*, “(of the mind, *citta*) to stick to, to be fixed or fixated, to be established (in), to be settled) (V 1:9, 15; D 2:206, 3:239; S 5:321; It 43); but here in a negative sense.

¹³⁰ *Kiñcāpi so hoti gāmantā, vihārī nemantaniko gahapati, cīvara, dharo, atha kho naṃ sa, brahmacārī sakkaronti garuṃ karonti mānenti pūjenti*. Compared with the strict ascetic practices listed in §29a, these here are clearly less ascetic and much milder, but allowed by the Buddha as “extras” (*atireka*): see Intro (1.1.5).

¹³¹ Rice as *vīhi* (Skt *vrīhi*; Tamil *arise*) (*Oryza sativa*), or broadcast rice, had its origins in India around 3000 BCE and was certainly known to later Vedic people. It was a rainy season crop ripening in autumn but whose yield was limited. This form of rice when cooked is called *odana* (ts), ie boiled rice. The change came when the people learn-

Then people, seeing it, would say:

‘Hey, what is this you are carrying about that’s like a very fine thing?

Having raised (the lid) and opening it, so that they would look into it.

As soon as they see, they were struck with pleasure, with non-disgust, with no-loathing, so that even those who have eaten their fill would wish to eat it, not to speak of the hungry!¹³⁴

30.3 Even so, avuso, in whatever monk these spheres of bad unwholesome wishes are seen and heard to have been abandoned by him,

even if he were

one who dwells just outside a village,

one who accepts invitations,

one who dons robes donated by householders,¹³⁵

fellow brahmacharis would still honour, respect, esteem, worship him.

What is the reason for this?

It is because these spheres of bad unwholesome wishes of the venerable one are seen and heard to have been abandoned by him.”

Moggallāna’s parable

31.1 When this was said, the venerable Mahā Moggallāna said this to the venerable Sāriputta:

“A parable, avuso Sāriputta, is evident¹³⁶ to me!”¹³⁷

“Let it be evident, avuso Moggallāna!”¹³⁸

31.2 SAMĪTI AND PAṆḌU,PUTTA. “At one time, avuso, I was staying on Giribbaja¹³⁹ in Rāja,gaha. Then, avuso, when it was morning, having dressed and taking robe and bowl, I entered Rāja,gaha for alms.

Now, at that time, Samīti, the wheelwright’s son, was working away¹⁴⁰ at a cart’s fellow [rim]¹⁴¹ in the presence¹⁴² of the ajivaka¹⁴³ Paṇḍu,putta, the former wheelwright’s son.

ed and used the art of paddy transplantation or wet paddy production, which was grown as a winter crop. This better quality rice was known as “shali” (P *sālī*; Skt *śālī*) (RS Sharma, *Material Culture and Social Formations in Ancient India*, 1983:96, 161f). See Piya Tan, *The Buddha and His Disciples*, 2004 §4b.

¹³² For a longer list of such foods, which become obstacles to the brahmins, see **Ambaṭṭha S** (D 3.2.10a/1:105) = SD 21.3;

¹³³ *Tam enaṃ sāmikā sālīnaṃ odanaṃ vicita,kālakaṃ aneka,sūpaṃ aneka,vyañjanaṃ racayitvā aññissā kamsa,-pātiyā paṭikujjivā antar’āpaṇaṃ paṭipajjeyyūṃ*: as at **M 5.30b/1:31** = 7.12/1:38×2; cf D 3.2.10/1:105; M 77/2:8.

¹³⁴ *Tassa saha dassanena manāpatā ca sañṭhaheyya, appāṭikulyatā ca sañṭhaheyya, ajegucchatā ca sañṭhaheyya, suhitānaṃ pi bhottu,kamyatā assa, pag’eva jighacchitānaṃ*.

¹³⁵ *Kiñcāpi so hoti gāmana,vihārī nemananiko gahapati,cīvara,dhara, atha kho naṃ sa,brahmacārī sakkaronti garuṃ karonti mānenti pūjenti*. The three key terms here are uncommon, clearly late but canonical, found only in a few suttas and the Vinaya. **Gamanta,vihārī** occurs only in **Anaṅgaṇa S** (M 5.30/1:31×2), **Goliyāni S** (M 69.20/-1:473×2; **Nāgita S** (A 6.42/3:341, 343×2, 344), **Dāru,kammika S** (A 6.59/3:391×2), **Yasa S** (A 8.86/4:343×2, 344×2); also see MA 1:150, 151; AA 3:367. **Nemantanika** occurs only in **Anaṅgaṇa S** (M 5.30/1:31×2), **Dāru,kammika S** (A 6.59/3:392×2); see also VA 4:815; MA 1:150; AA 3:400. **Gahapati,cīvara,dhara** is found only at **V 3:169**×3; **Anaṅgaṇa S** (M 5.30/1:31×2), **Dāru,kammika S** (A 6.59/3:392×2). These 3 practices are “extraneous” (*atireka*) to the traditional practices and as such optional: see Intro (1.1.5).

¹³⁶ *Paṭibhāti*, which Comy glosses as “presents (itself), is present, appears” (*upaṭṭhāti*), meaning, “You speak!” (*vada tvaṃ ti adhippāyo*) (MA 1:151).

¹³⁷ *Upamā maṃ, āvuso sārīputta, paṭibhātī ti*, alt, “Avuso, I would like to present a parable.”

¹³⁸ *Paṭibhātu taṃ, āvuso moggallānā ti*.

¹³⁹ **Giri-b,baja** (“cow-pen hill,” so called because it was surrounded or protected, like a cow-pen, by 5 hills, VvA 52; see M:H 1:39 n3; PED sv): Tha 1097; V 1:43; M 1:31; S 2:185; MA 1:151,10; SA 2:159,2 f; UA 265). Rāja,-gaha, the capital of Magadha, was apparently two distinct towns: the older one, an ancient hill fortress, properly called Giri-b,baja, said to have been built by Mahā Govinda, a skilled architect (VvA 82; cf D 2:235, where he is said to have founded 7 cities). The later town, at the foot of the hills, was built by Bimbi,sāra.

Then, avuso, this thought occurred to the ajivika Paṇḍu,putta, the former wheelwright's son:

‘Oh that this Samīti, the wheelwright's son, would work away this bend, and this crookedness, and this fault, from the fellow.¹⁴⁴

so that this fellow, with the bend removed, the crookedness removed, the fault removed, would be presented as pure heartwood!’¹⁴⁵ [32]

Indeed, just as the thought came to the ajivika Paṇḍu,putta, the former wheelwright's son's mind, so did Samīti, the wheelwright's son, work on the fellow, work away the bend, work away the crookedness, work away the fault, from the fellow.¹⁴⁶

Then, avuso, the ajivika Paṇḍu,putta, the former wheelwright's son, glad at heart expressed his gladness:

‘He works it out, I must say, knowing the heart with the heart [knowing my own heart with his]!’¹⁴⁷

The false renunciants

32.1 ¹⁴⁸Even so, avuso, there are people who are without faith,¹⁴⁹ those who have left home for the homeless life, not out of faith, but for the sake of a living,¹⁵⁰ who are false, crafty, fraudulent,¹⁵¹ haughty,¹⁵² insolent, fickle, garrulous, of loose speech,

¹⁴⁰ “Was working away (at),” *tacchati*, also *taccheti*, a word with pregnant senses: “cuts, splits, planes, pares, chisels; forms, fashions; reduces, makes thin” (M 1:31,31 f, 3:166,26 ≠ Nm 404,11; J 1:211,2, 247,12, 6:348,14; Nm 114,25 ≠ Miln 383,3*, 413,11). See DP sv.

¹⁴¹ *Tena kho pana samayena samīti yāna,kāra,putto rathassa nemim tacchati.*

¹⁴² “In the presence of,” *paccupaṭṭhito*, pp of *paccupaṭṭhahati*, “(re)presented, offered, at one's disposal, imminent, ready, present” (PED) (D 3:218; It 95, 111; Sn p105; Kvu 157, 280; Miln 123).

¹⁴³ An ajivika (*ājīvaka* or *ājīvika*) is a member a sect of naked recluses (*nagga,samaṇa*) (MA 1:151), founded by Makkhali Gosāla: see **Apaṇṇaka S**, M 60.21-28/1:407-411 & SD 35.3 (2.2.3). He advocated the doctrine of non-conditionality (*ahetuka,vāda*), a form of fatalism, and of samsaric purification (*samsāra,suddhi*, D 2.21/1:54). The name, given by their opponents, was derived from *ājīva*, meaning “livelihood appropriate to one's class,” suggesting that they resorted to their faith as a livelihood, not for salvation. See V 1:8; M 1:483; Sn 381; J 2:384, 6:225; Ap 358; DhA 2:55; UA 340. See A L Basham, *History and Doctrines of the Ājīvikas*, London, 1951.

¹⁴⁴ *Aho vatāyam samīti yāna,kāra,putto imissā nemiyā imañ ca vaṅkaṃ imañ ca jimhaṃ imañ ca dosam taccheyya.*

¹⁴⁵ *Evāyam nemi apagata,vaṅkā apagata,jimhā apagata,dosā suddhā assa sāre patitṭhitā ti.*

¹⁴⁶ *Yathā yathā kho, āvuso, paṇḍu,puttassa ājīvakkassa purāṇa,yāna,kāra,puttassa cetaso parivitakko hoti tathā tathā samīti yāna,kāra,putto tassā nemiyā tañca vaṅkaṃ tañca jimhaṃ tañca dosam tacchati.*

¹⁴⁷ *Hadayā hadayam maññe aññāya tacchatī ti*, meaning that Samīti acts in response to exactly what Paṇḍu,putta thinks. Although it is possible that here Paṇḍu,putta might think that he has the power of controlling Samīti's mind, the truth is that Moggallāna is simply using this event as a figure to show how Sāriputta has spoken his (Moggallāna's) mind.

¹⁴⁸ This whole para is stock: *Evam eva kho āvuso ye te puggalā assaddhā, jīvik'atthā na saddhā agārasmā anagāriyam pabbajitā, saṭhā māyāvino ketabhino* [Ee; Be *ketabino*; Ce Se *ketubhino*] *uddhatā unnaḷa capalā mukharā vikiṇṇa,vācā indriyesu agutta,dvārā, bhojane amattaññuno, jāgariyam ananuyuttā, sāmāññe anapekkhavanto, sikkhāya na tibba,gāravā, bāhulikā, sāthalikā, okkamane pubbaṅgamā, paviveke nikkhitta,dhurā, kusitā hīna,vīriyā muṭṭhasatī asampajānā asamāhitā vibbhanta,cittā duppaññā eḷa,mūgā*. For def of key words, see Intro [2.1].

¹⁴⁹ *Ie bereft of faith in the Buddha, the Dharma and the Sangha (Assaddhā'ti buddha,dhamma,saṅghesu saddhā, -virahitā*, MA 1:152)

¹⁵⁰ *Ie earning a living here because he is unable to earn a living outside, on account of being oppressed by the fear of debts, etc (jīvik'atthā'ti iṇa,bhay'ādīhi pīḷiā bahi jīvitum asakkontā idha jīvik'atthikā hutvā*, MA 1:152).

¹⁵¹ *Fraudulent, ie a trained fraudster, whose craftiness is of accomplished strength. It is called “deceit” because it is the craftiness of seeing non-existent virtues, of making objects show qualities that are absent of (ketabhino'ti sikkhita,kerāṭikā, nipphanna,thāma,gata,sāṭheyā ti vuttam hoti. Sāṭheyāñ hi abhūta,guṇa,dassanato abhūta,bhaṇḍa,guṇa,dassana,samaṃ katvā “kerāṭiyan ti vuccati*, MA 1:152)

¹⁵² This line (see foll n), as at **Jantu S** (S 2.25/1:61,4), but replaces the last quality with *pākat'indriyā*, “loose in faculties.” See Intro [2.1].

their sense-doors unguarded, lacking moderation in food, not devoted to wakefulness, with no regard for recluseship, with no deep respect for the training, living in abundance, lax, prone to distractions,¹⁵³ neglecting the task of seclusion, lazy, lacking effort, confused, lacking full awareness, unconcentrated, a wandering mind, lacking wisdom, unintelligent.

32.2 Venerable Sāriputta works at them with this Dharma exposition, I must say, works all these out, having understood the heart with the heart [my own heart with his heart]!¹⁵⁴

The true renunciants

32.3 However, there are sons of family who have left home for the homeless life out of faith, who are not false, not crafty, not fraudulent,

not haughty, not insolent, not fickle, not garrulous, not loose in speech,

with sense-doors restrained, moderate in food, devoted to wakefulness, intent on recluseship, has deep respect for the training, not living in abundance, not lax, bent on removing distractions, giving priority to seclusion, exerting effort, resolute, of stable mindfulness, fully aware, concentrated, one-pointed in mind, wise, not unintelligent.¹⁵⁵

Moggallāna rejoices in Sāriputta's teaching

32.4 SĀRIPUTTA IS LIKE A FEAST. Those who have heard this Dharma exposition of the venerable Sāriputta, as it were, have drunk, as it were, have feasted by way of words and by way of thoughts!¹⁵⁶

Good indeed it is, sir, that he, having caused fellow brahmacharis to rise out¹⁵⁷ of the unwholesome, he establishes them in the wholesome!¹⁵⁸

33.5 PARABLE OF THE WELL-DRESSED PERSON. Suppose, avuso, a woman or a man, young, youthful, fond of ornaments, with head washed, having obtained a lotus garland, or a jasmine garland, or a madhav lata garland, taking it with both hands, would place it on the crown of the head.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵³ *Okkamane pubbaṅgamā*, ie “letting transgressions be the leader.” Comy explains these as the conditions for “going down,” ie going astray or transgressing, ie, the 5 mental hindrances (MA 1:101.26, 3:108,3). See M 1:14, 16 f = 3:5,15 = A 1:71,3 = 2:148,30 = 3:108,3;M 1:32,21; A 1:243,3 f. M:ÑB, foll M:H, has “leaders in backsliding,” which fails to reflect Comy which is helpful here. See CPD: ²o-kkamana.

¹⁵⁴ *Tesaṃ āyasmā sāriputto iminā dhamma,pariyāyena hadayā hadayaṃ maññe aññāya tacchati.*

¹⁵⁵ *Indriyesu guttadvārā, bhojane mattaññuno, jāgariyaṃ anuyuttā, sāmaññe apekkhāvanto, sikkhāya tibba,gāra-vā, na bāhulikā na sāthalikā, okkamane nikkhitta,dhurā, paviveke pubbaṅgamā, āradhha,vīriyā, pahit'attā upaṭṭhi-ta-s,satī sampajānā samāhitā ek'agga,cittā paññavanto aneḷa,mūgā.* For nn & refs, see §32a nn ad loc.

¹⁵⁶ *Te āyasmato sāriputtassa imaṃ dhamma,pariyāyaṃ sutvā pivanti maññe, ghasanti maññe vacasā c'eva manasā ca.*

¹⁵⁷ “Having caused...to rise out (of),” *vuṭṭhāpetvā*, alt “having caused to turn away from,” ie to rouse out of (abl), to turn away from (A 3:115); caus of *vuṭṭhahati* and *vuṭṭhāti*, “to rise out of (abl), to emerge from, to come back” (S 4:294). Here, it is a non-technical sutta term. In **Vinaya**, *vuṭṭhāpeti* has the sense of “to ordain, rehabilitate (V 4:226, 317 f = *upasampādeti*, “to ordain”).

¹⁵⁸ *Sādhu vata bho sa,brahmacārī akusalā vuṭṭhāpetvā kusale patiṭṭhāpeti ti.*

¹⁵⁹ *Seyyathā'pi, āvuso, itthī vā puriso vā daharo yuvā maṇḍanaka,jātiko sīsam,nhāto uppala,mālam vā vassika,-mālam vā atimuttaka,mālam vā labhitvā ubho hi hatthehi paṭiggahetvā uttam'aṅge sirasmim patiṭṭhāpeyya.* This is stock: **Anaṅgaṇa S** (M 5.33/1:32); **Gotamī S** (A 9.51/4:378); **V** 2:255. Elsewhere, this figure is used in terms of mindfulness and meditation. Cf **Mahā Sakul'udāyi S** (M 2:19); **Ānanda S** (S 22.83/3:105); (**Satthā**) **Sacitta S** (A 10.51/5:92); **Sāriputta S** (A 10.52/5:94); **Samatha S** (A 10.54/5:98); **Parihāna S** (A 10.55/5:103). For a neg application of a similar parable: **Vitakka Saṅṭhāna S** (M 1:119); **Sīha,nāda S** (A 9.11/4:376); **V** 3:68, 69. **Flowers:** *Uppala* (Skt *utpala*), *Nymphaea caerulea*, the blue lotus, or any lotus. *Vassika* (Skt *varṣikā*) is *Jasminum sambac*, jasmine, the most fragrant of flowers. *Atimuttaka* (Skt *atimuktaka*; cf *atimukta*) is prob *Hiptage madablota*, Gaertn, or the “madhav lata” (madhav creeper): other identifications are *Dalbergia ujjensis* (CPD); *Ougeinia oojeinensis* (DP); *Gaertnera racemosa* (PED), which DP gives for *atimutta*.

33.6 even so, avuso, are these sons of family who have left home for the homeless life out of faith, who are not false, not crafty, not fraudulent, not haughty, not insolent, not fickle, not garrulous, not loose in speech,

with sense-doors restrained, moderate in food, devoted to wakefulness, intent on recluseship, has deep respect for the training, not living in abundance, not lax, bent on removing distractions, giving priority to seclusion, exerting effort, resolute, of stable mindfulness, fully aware, concentrated, one-pointed in mind, wise, not unintelligent.

Conclusion

33.6 Those who have heard this Dharma exposition of the venerable Sāriputta, as it were, have drunk, as it were, have feasted, by way of words and by way of thoughts!

33.7 Good indeed it is, sir, that he, having uplifted fellow brahmacharis [fellows in the holy life], he establishes them in the wholesome!”

34 Thus indeed in this manner, these two great nagas¹⁶⁰ mutually rejoice in one another’s well spoken words.¹⁶¹

— evaṃ —

111104; 111111; 111125; 111215; 120419; 120427

¹⁶⁰ *Nāga*, mythically, ref to a class of dragon-like beings habiting deep below the earth, and are believed to be the guardian of treasure and knowledge. The term is commonly used in early Buddhist texts to refer serpents, esp those of great strength and powers (D 1:54; S 3:240 f, 5:47, 63; B 1:30; J 1:64; DhA 2:4, 3:231, 242 f; PvA 272), and it often refers to the cobra, the most venomous and revered of Indian snakes (cf “serpent king,” *nāga,rāja*, Sn 379 & SnA 368; DhA 1:359, 2:231, 242 f, 4:129 f; J 2:111, 3:275). It also refers to a noble tusker (D 2:266; M 1:415; A 2:116; Dh 329; Thī 49; J 4:395, 5:259, 6:61; Ap 53). Fig, *nāga* means “hero, saint,” symbolizing great spiritual strength and endurance. A popular etym of the naga’s excellence is that “he does no bad” (*āgun na karoti*) (**Nāga S**, A 6.43/3:346; **Sabhiya S**, Sn 522; Tha 693), ie, he is faultless. In this sense, *nāga* is often used as an epithet of the Buddha and the arhat: see Dh ch 23 (**Nāga Vagga**). See further MA 1:153; SA 1:77; ThaA 3:8-11; SnA 2:410, 428; Nm 201 = Nc 337; Tha 693; PvA 57. See Tha:N 177 n289 for details.

¹⁶¹ *Itiha te ubho mahānāgā aññam-aññassa subhāsitaṃ samanumodimsu.*