

13

Jantu Sutta

The Jantu Discourse | S 2.25

Ce **Chantu Sutta** The Chantu Discourse

S 1.2.3.5 Saṃyutta Nikāya 1, Sagāthā Vagga 2, Devaputta Saṃyutta 3, Nānātitthiya Vagga 5

Theme: The gods know about bad monks

Translated & annotated by Piya Tan ©2011, 2019

1 Introduction

1.1 SUMMARY AND SIGNIFICANCE

1.1.0 Contents and parallels

1.1.0.1 SD 54.13 is a comparative sutta study on how the wrong conduct of some forest monks are known by a deity. This chapter studies two closely parallel texts—the **Jantu Sutta** (S 2.25) [the main text] and **the Pākat'indriya Sutta** (S 9.13) [4]—and related verses from **the Phussa Thera, gāthā**: Tha 958 [2.1], 959 [2.2] and 971 [2.4]; and also **the Kuha Sutta** (A 4.26 = It 108) [2.3].

1.1.0.2 The parallel verses of the two Suttas—S 2.25 and S 9.13—are as follows: S 353 = S 791, S 354 = S 792, S 355 = S 793, S 356 = S 794.

1.1.0.3 Besides the main Suttas S 2.25 and S 9.13 [1.1.0.1], this lesson includes translations and notes of related texts: verses from the **Thera, gāthā** and an embedded sutta. [1.2.2]

1.1.1 Bad forest monks

1.1.1.1 **The Jantu Sutta** (S 2.25) and **the Pākat'indriya Sutta** (S 9.13) are brief but profoundly significant texts on how a young deity (*deva, putta*), Jantu [S 2.25,2], who is a forest deity [S 9.13,2], appears to some forest-dwelling monks, “restless, puffed up, vain, foul-mouthed, rambling in speech, unmindful, lacking clear comprehension, lacking concentration, scatterbrained, loose in sense-faculties” [§2]¹ who are thus “dead” (*peta*) to the teaching [§6*].

Not only are they “difficult to support” (like a village headman), they simply “eat and eat, | and sleep” [§5cd*]. He respectfully reminds them of those living as true forest renunciants [§4*], and warns them of their laxity [§5*], which makes them “dead” (*peta*) to the teaching [§6*], showing his concern [§7*].

1.1.1.2 (1) Due to overlapping parallels between **S 2.25** and **S 9.13** [3.0], we should rightly consider them to be two versions or reports on the same incident, or the same teaching given at different times. Hence, putting together what details they give us, we have a fuller narrative of the Sutta, as follows.

(2) **S 2.25** only mentions the devaputra **Jantu** without any further details. **S 9.13** tells us that he is “a deity haunting that same thick wood” and who “out of compassion for the monk, desiring for their own good, wanting to arouse samvega in the monks.” [S 9.13,3].

¹ In this section, a single bracketed ref like this refers to *both* S 2.25 and S 9.13.

S 1.2.3.5 Saṃyutta Nikāya 1, Sagāthā Vagga 2, Devaputta Saṃyutta 3, Nānātitthiya Vagga 5
S 1.9.1.13 Saṃyutta Nikāya 1, Sagāthā Vagga 9, Vana Saṃyutta 1, Vana Vagga 13

1.1.2 The Buddha and devas know our every action

1.1.2.1 The teaching of the Jantu Sutta is both prophetic and psychological in the sense that, as spiritual practitioners, especially those who have vowed to live a celibate and money-free life as monastics. They are defined, not by their social status (which would then make them professional or “class” priests, like the brahmins), but by their spiritual state of moral virtue and insight wisdom directed towards awakening in this life itself.

1.1.2.2 The Ādhipateyya Sutta (A 3.40) warns us, especially the monastics, that we will never get away with any bad deeds that we have done. The Buddha and the devas will know them: the Buddha through his knowledge and mind-reading powers, and the devas as beings capable of observing us in our daily actions.² The devas are watching us, even now:

There is in the world no secret of one who does an evil deed.
You yourself, O human, know what is true and what is false!
Alas! My friend, you, the witness, look down upon your own goodness!
How can you hide the evil that there is in the self from the self?
The gods and the tathāgatas [buddhas thus come] see the fool living falsely in the world.
(**Ādhipateyya Sutta**, A 3.40/1:147-150), SD 27.3

1.1.2.3 This [1.1.2.2] is an oblique reference to **moral shame** (*hiri*), that is, people and posterity will know of both the bad and the good that we have done. Such actions—bad or good—are likely to be emulated and aggravated in later times with their respective results. The good is not interred with their bones, and the bad that we do lives after us.

The bad that we do is likely to spur and fuel worse trends in the future—like sectarianism and worldliness. The good that we do, too, will inspire others to turn directly to the Buddha’s teaching and live noble lives. Monastics, then, are exemplars of the Buddha’s teaching.³

1.2 RELATED TEXTS

1.2.1 The suttas contain numerous passages and verses that warn monastics against **luxury**, especially against indulging in sensual pleasures, engaging with money and wealth, socializing with the laity and other monastics, and caught with worldliness in any way.

These are prophetic suttas that warn us—monastics and the laity—of the dangers that face renunciants and practitioners. These are the unwholesome trend that will certainly bring about an early end to the Buddha’s teaching.⁴

1.2.2 In this lesson (SD 54.13), we have included—besides the main Suttas S 2.25 and S 9.13—translations and notes of the following verses and an embedded sutta [2]:

2.1 Tha 958	Monastics who conduct themselves “like animals.”
2.2 Tha 959	Monastics who lead pretentious religious lives.
2.3 Kuha Sutta (A 4.26 = It 108)	Non-growth and growth in the Buddha’s teaching.
2.4 Tha 971	Those unworthy of the monastic robes.

² **Jhān’abhiññā S** (S 16.9/2:213), SD 50.7; **Puris’indriya, jāṇa S** (A 6.62/3:402-409), SD 61.5.

³ See also SD 4.19 (10.4).

⁴ For such prophetic suttas, see SD 1.10 (3-5).

2 Commentaries on the Phussa Thera,gāthā and the Kuha Sutta

2.0 Phussa was the son of a provincial ruler and was trained in all kinds of skills. After hearing an elder teaching the Dharma, he renounced to become a monk. He practised dhyana and became an arhat. One day, an ascetic named Pandarassa,gotta heard him teach and asked him on the future of the monastic sangha. Phussa’s reply is recorded in **the Phussa Thera,gāthā** (Tha 949-980).

Here, we shall study a few of his verses related to the Jantu Sutta. **§2 and the Sutta verses** should be studied in connection with Phussa’s verses (**Tha 958, 959, 971**) and **the Kuha Sutta** (A 4.26 = It 108), which are given below [2.1.1].

2.1 “LIKE ANIMALS”

2.1.1 Tha 958. MONASTICS WHO ARE WORLDLY TEND TO CONDUCT THEMSELVES “LIKE ANIMALS”

<i>ujjhāna,saññino bālā</i>	Prone to fault-finding, foolish,	
<i>sīlesu asamāhitā</i>	lacking concentration in moral conduct,	
<i>unnaḷā vicarissanti</i>	they wander about, hollow [puffed up],	
<i>kalahābhiratā magā</i>	delighting in quarrelling like animals.	(Tha 958)

2.1.2 Comments on Tha 958

2.1.2.1 (Tha 958a)

(1) Fault-finding (*ujjhāna*) is, by definition, based on falsehood and ulterior motives of personal gain, hatred and wrong views—it is rooted in hate and driven by malice: to bring down the other party for personal reasons. There are, however, significant differences between fault-finding and critical analysis. [2.1.2.2]

The fault-finding here, specifically, refers to the habit of lax “forest” monastics, such as those of our times, who live in comfortable retreats away from the bustling city. These places are sometimes even more luxurious than most laymen’s homes. Where such retreats stress on disciplined life and practice, they are beneficial. But often, due to worldliness and other influences, such “modernized” monastics may disrespect and disregard monastic elders so that they lose touch with their parent forest monastery, get excommunicated or even break away from it.⁵

(2) The suttas record occasions when even the great disciples like Sāriputta⁶ and Ānanda⁷ are rebuked or even verbally abused by others.⁸ They do not react in any negative way to it, but show true equanimity and understand that such rebukes are actually valuable and real-life instructions for us today if we are to stay true to the teaching.

(3) This kind of undisciplined monastic is also said to be “foolish” (*bālā*). *Bāla* literally means “a boy” (n), and as an adjective means “childish, immature.” Quarrelsome monastics are usually immature, too: they lack the training in moral virtue (they do not know how to restrain their actions or speech); in mental cultivation (they are neither mentally focused nor calm inwardly); and they lack wisdom (they lack knowledge or understanding of the Vinaya and the Dharma). [2.4.2.1]

⁵ See, eg, SD 1.9 (7-10).

⁶ On Sāriputta being rebuked, see **Cātumā S** (M 67), SD 34.7; **The Buddha and His Disciples** (BD) 5.21.

⁷ On Ānanda being rebuked, see **Mahā,parinibbāna S** (D 2:115-118), SD 9; BD 10.10. On Mahā Kassapa rebuking Ānanda, see **Cīvara S** (S 16.11), SD 77.5; also BD 6.18.

⁸ On Sāriputta being verbally abused, see **Vuṭṭha Vass’āvāsa S** (A 9.11.6) SD 28.2a; physically abused: **Juṅhā S** (U 34), SD 24.9.

2.1.2.2 (Tha 958b). “Lacking concentration in moral conduct” (*sīlesu asamāhitā*) in the verse-line refers both to the lack of moral restraint in action as well as speech. As a result of this twin immorality, the monk or meditator is unable to mentally focus or stay focused.⁹ Cultivating lovingkindness helps us to keep the precepts and develop moral virtue,¹⁰ which, in turn, helps in attaining joy and focus in our meditation.¹¹ The calm clarity that arises from such a mind prepares us to see true reality with insight wisdom. [3.1.7; 3.1.8]

The elder **Cakkhu,pāla**, for example, pays such careful attention even to a minor rule regarding sleeping, that he places the Dharma above even his own life. In his case, his determination is motivated by the fact that he is approaching awakening. His moral courage should inspire us to try our best to keep to the moral training for the sake of our spiritual development.¹² [3.1.6]

2.1.2.3 (Tha 958c). To be “**hollow**” (*unnalā*) means “to be haughty but empty with conceit” (*samussita,tuccha,mānā*, ThaA 3:86,6 f). False monastics are “hollow” like puffed-up (*uggata*) reed (*naḷa*) (ItA 164,29). Simply, this means being proud and calculative, but having no seriousness in the teaching or practice. In the suttas, we often see the Buddha using the term “hollow man” (*mogha, purisa*) for someone with a serious wrong view and no regard for the training and teaching.¹³ [3.1.2]

They **wander about** (*vicarissanti*) showing empty conceit, hollow like a reed. In our times, we would say they are classy tourists, taking monastic life as a “retirement” rather than renunciation. They do not even observe the basic and formative 5 years of tutelage (*nissaya*) as newly ordained monastics.¹⁴

2.1.2.4 (Tha 958d). Being undisciplined and worldly, such monastics go about “**delighting in quarrelling like animals**” (*kalahābhiratā magā*).¹⁵ They are deeply involved in arguments, trying to outdo others, delighting in quarrels, like animals that care only for their own good, delighting in food, acting foolishly and annoying others (ThaA 3:8-10). [3.1.4]

In the Jantu Sutta (S 2.25), false monks or those who habitually break the precepts are said to be “**dead**” (*petā*, literally, “departed one(s)”) or “pretas” (addictive beings). They are “dead” because they do not live in accordance with the Dharma-Vinaya; they are **pretas**, even in this life itself, because they are living false lives, running after things of this world, instead of letting them go, renouncing for the path of awakening.

2.1.3 Critical analysis (*paṭisambhidā*)

2.1.3.0 Critical analysis is a vital foundation of the Buddhist learning process, as embodied in the 4 analytic skills or insights, which are as follows:¹⁶

⁹ Comy explains this as “mentally unfocused in the fourfold utter purity of moral virtue” (*catu,pārisuddhi,sīlena na asamāhita,cittā*, ThaA 3:86,5 f), ie, in terms of the restraint of the monastic code, the restraint of the senses, the purification of livelihood, and in connection with the requisites (life-supports of almsfood, robes, shelter and health): SD 24.5a (2.3).

¹⁰ On how lovingkindness helps moral virtue, see SD 1.5 (2.9).

¹¹ On how joy helps in meditation, see **Vimuttāyatana S** (A 5.26,2.3), SD 21.5 (2); SD 10.15 (4.4.1+4.4.2).

¹² On Cakkhu,pāla, see SD 48.9 (4.3).

¹³ On hollow man (*mogha,purisa*), see **Udumbarikā Sīha,nāda S** (D 25,24.2), SD 1.4; **Alagaddūpama S** (M 22,6), SD 3.13.

¹⁴ On the monastic tutelage (*nissaya*), see SD 40a.8 (4.2.2.3).

¹⁵ Cf **S 355d*** [Jantu S, S 2.2.5, below] where false monastics are said to be “dead” or are pretas (*petā*).

¹⁶ On paṭisambhidā, see SD 28.4 (4); SD 41.6 (2.2).

The analytic skills in:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| (1) meanings, | <i>attha paṭisambhidā</i> |
| (2) dharma [causes and conditions], | <i>dhamma,paṭisambhidā</i> |
| (3) language, and | <i>nirutti,paṭisambhidā</i> |
| (4) ready wit. | <i>paṭibhāṇa,paṭisambhidā</i> |

2.1.3.1 The analytic skill in meanings (*attha paṭisambhidā*) involves observing, learning and defining the **meanings** (*attha*) of things, especially of our experiences and of events or situations. “Meaning” itself means significance or import of an action (a thought, speech or action), whether done or undone by ourself or by others.

For example, when someone gives a “Buddhist” talk or another presents a “Buddhist” teaching, we need to ascertain what he is really talking about. Wrong views, as a rule, arise from the ignorance, misunderstanding or bias of the speaker, whether he is aware of it or not. Wrong views tend to attract and feed our own wrong views, and so they grow with craving—the blind led by the lame.¹⁷

Views are always unsatisfactory for the simple reason that they represent only *one* way, an imperfect, incomplete, idea of what is *changing, unstable and uncertain* (the world in and around us). A view is an idea—often a projection rather than a vision of something—that tends to attract more views. They are like newspapers: what is news always change even as we turn the pages. Then, the old papers pile up, clutter our lives, and we have to clear them away.

Views, however, tend to stay on because we do not really see how they clutter our mind and constipate it. We are so burdened with views that we feel tight and stressed; we have no time for happiness; we do not even know why! Well, they are rooted in craving and ignorance.

2.1.3.2 The analytic skill in causes and conditions (*dhamma,paṭisambhidā*) comes from a growing understanding of **conditionality**, the nature and working of causes and effects in our minds: our existential nature (*dhamma*). We are all conditioned beings. From the moment we are born, we are conditioned by whomever raise us.

We may have a human body but our human mind is still in progress. With parental warmth, family love and human care, we become progressively more **humanized**. This process is especially vital during our first 7 or so years. When we fail to begin life with a full 7 years of humanization, we are likely to be a nasty or narcissistic subhuman in human form.

The views we hold often reflect the level of **humanity** we dwell in at that time. The more evolved our level of humanity, the clearer it is to us that we are all undergoing a process of change, alteration, becoming other. Even our views change over time, depending on the conditions that shape us. The worst kinds of conditioning to be avoided are those rooted in greed, hate or delusion. Such conditions should be avoided for those moved by charity, love and wisdom.

2.1.3.3 The analytic skill in language (*nirutti,paṭisambhidā*) refers to our vital development of communication skills, especially language. Here, “**language**” refers to 4 important areas of skills we need to cultivate.

(a) We must master at least two **global** or **useful** languages: the language we *think* in (this may or may not be our mother tongue) and one other language to help us *see* a different perspective from our thinking language.

(b) We should understand the nature of communication and develop this in terms of **wholesome [right] speech**—one that promotes *truth*, sounds *pleasant*, inspires unity and *benefits* everyone. We

¹⁷ On craving being lame and ignorance blind, see SD 18.7 (9.1.5.9).

should also understand the nature of body language and silence, and be skilled in observing human behaviour to better *understand* others' minds and *communicate* better with them.

(c) We should be confident in speaking before a gathering to express our opinion clearly and convincingly to move others in a wholesome manner. When speaking in this way, we should respect both ourself (present ourself in a dignified yet unassuming manner) and the audience (speak at its level). Speaking before a gathering, especially on the Dharma, our speech should be timely (reflecting the occasion), true (Dharma-based), pleasant (inspiring joy and peace), connected with the goal (Dharma-centred), and moved with lovingkindness.

(d) Our speech should, in some way, reflect our mind for **truth** and heart for **beauty**. We should communicate what is true—reflecting life and reality, and their *meaning*—and what is beautiful—inspiring others with a vision of the real *meaning* and the true *purpose* of life, and how to realize it.

2.1.3.4 The analytic skill in ready wit (*paṭibhāṇa, paṭisambhidā*) is especially vital effectively presenting the Dharma and when we are counselling others.¹⁸ Ideally, we should know the mind of our audience, or we should communicate in a such a positive manner so as to inspire or convince others to respond positively to us. Very often, this simply means invoking the principle of common sense, that which is so naturally right and good, it makes no good sense to think or act otherwise.

Often **humour** helps, that is, to laugh at our weakness and errors rather than find someone to blame for them. Humour should help us see such disadvantages as a learning process, a learning that brings joyful change and betters us as a person.¹⁹

2.2 A PRETENTIOUS RELIGIOUS LIFE

2.2.1 Tha 959. This verse by the elder Phussa describes those forest monks as leading worldly lives, charlatans, pretending to be holy men, a familiar situation, even today:

*uddhatā ca bhavissanti
nīla, cīvara, pārutā
kuhā thaddhā lapā singī
carissanty ariya, viya*

and they become restless,
dressed in grey [blue]²⁰ robes
deceitful, stubborn, loose-tongued, posturing—
they pretend to be noble [holy].²¹ (Tha 959)

2.2.2 Comments on Tha 959

2.2.2.1 (Tha 959a). “And they become restless” (*uddhatā ca bhavissanti*). The elder Phussa [2.0] further warns us of monastics who “become restless.” They are far from having any mental oneness (*citt’ek’aggatā, rahitā*, ThaA 3:8611). In other words, these bogus monastics, despite living in the forest, pretending to pursue the holy life, are, in fact, unable to meditate, not to mention attaining any mental concentration. [3.1.1]

2.2.2.2 (Tha 959b). “Dressed in grey [blue] robes” (*nīla, cīvara, pārutā*). The Commentary informs us that these false monastics have forsaken their traditional robes of yellow or saffron (*kāsāva*), and donned robes dyed with an unallowable colour, *nīla*, a colour ranging from grey to blue: the hues of rain-clouds. In other words, these monastics have made changes even to their proper Vinaya-prescribed appearance

¹⁸ Here, “counselling” is used in a general sense of guiding others into wholesome language and response.

¹⁹ On humour in Buddhism, see SD 2.19 (5).

²⁰ *Nīla* is a colour ranging from blue, blue-green, to cloud-grey: SD 15.1 (9.2.2).

²¹ Lit, “the conduct (themselves) as if they were nobles (saints of the path).”

keeping in fashion with what would be more “presentable” or “fashionable” in their times.²² Or, they are simply being vain. [Cf 3.1.3]

It is, of course, allowable for **monastics outside of India**, living under different climatic conditions, to make proper adjustment to their robes in keeping with the spirit of the usage of the 4 supports and the Vinaya. They are *not* “robes” of *power, status or worldliness*, but of renunciation. These robes remind us that our purpose is to diligently work our way closer to the path of awakening in this life itself.

2.2.2.3 (Tha 959c)

(1) “Deceitful, stubborn, loose-tongued, posturing” (*kuhā thaddhā lapā siṅgī*) [2.3]. The Commentary explains “**deceitful**” (*kuhā*) as deceiving others by way of the bases of deceit (*kuhana, vatthu*) such as suggestive talk and so on; conning and deceiving others on account of the wish to mislead them into thinking that they (the false monks) have good qualities when they totally lack goodness.²³

Being “**stubborn**” (*thaddhā*) means a mind of stubbornness on account of anger and conceit, hard-heartedness.²⁴ These false monastics roam about with an air about them, “as if standing after swallowing an iron needle” (*ayo, salākaṃ gilitvā thitā viya*), not saluting teachers worthy of respect, on account of anger, in the manner mentioned in **the Mallikā Sutta** (A 4.197): “(Here, Mallikā, a certain woman, is) angry, often irritable.”²⁵ Even over a trivial remark, she is cross, shaken, vexed, stubborn, and shows her temper, anger and sulkiness.”²⁶

This problem with such false monastics arises from their being difficult to speak to, as mentioned in **the Anumāna Sutta** (M 15): “He is difficult to speak to and has qualities that makes him difficult to speak to, is impatient and does not take instruction rightly.”²⁷ And such conduct may also arise from the intoxication (*mada*) with one’s birth, clan [gotra], craft, health, youth, or life. (Vbh 345)²⁸

(2) To be “**loose-tongued**” (*lapā*) is to chat others up (*upalāpaka*), meaning to verbally manipulate, exploit and parasite on families who are benefactors or who show them favour²⁹ by clever and pretentious talk about wrong livelihood. Or, the clever talk to induce the donors of the life-supports (robes, etc) in saying, “This, bhante, is for your benefit!”; mere talk for the sake of getting life-supports through jugglery with words, even by belittling the supporters.³⁰ “Belittling” probably means giving the impression, such as that the laity is duty-bound to donate to an illustrious monastic or that it would be bad karma not to do so.³¹

²² On the prophecy that such false monastics came to be called “yellownecks” (*kāsāva, kaṅṭha*) on account of the fact that they have even forsake the robes altogether, have families, and are identifiable only by a yellow thread around their necks, see **Dakkhiṇa Vibhaṅga S** (M 142,8) SD 1; **Dh 307a** SD 19.1(6.3); SD 49.3a(2.1.3); SD 28.9b.

²³ *Kuhā’ti sāmanta, jappan’ādīnā kuhana, vatthunā kuhakā, asanta, guṇa, sambhāvan’icchāya kohaññāṃ katvā paresaṃ vimhāpakā.* (ThaA 3:86,14 f; ItA 164,10-12)

²⁴ *Thaddhā’ti kodhaṃ mānena ca thaddha, mānasā, kakkhala, hadayā* (ThaA 3:16). The foll comy, with quotes from the suttas, is from ItA 164,13-21.

²⁵ *Idha mallike ekacco mātu, gāmo kodhanā hoti upāyāsa, bahulā.*

²⁶ *Appam pi vuttā samānā abhisajjati kuppāti vyāpajjati patitthiyati, kopaṇ ca dosaṇ ca appaccayaṇ ca pātukaroti.* (A 4.197,2/2:203), SD 39.10.

²⁷ M 15,2/1:95 (SD 59.3).

²⁸ The comy here and in the prec para are paraphrased from ItA 164,13-21.

²⁹ *Kula, saṅgāhakā; AAT 2:261 kula, saṅgāhakā.* Cf VbhA 333.

³⁰ This comy is a paraphrase of ThaA and ItA as follows. *Lapā’ti lapanakā kuhana, vuttikā pasanna, dāyakānaṃ vadāpanakā, payutta, vācā, vasena nippesikatā, vasena ca paccay’atthaṃ lapakā’ti attho* (ThaA 3:86,17-20). *Lapā’ti upalāpakā micchājīva, vasena kula, saṅgāhakā, paccayatthaṃ payutta, vācā, vasena nippesikatā, vasena ca lapakā’i vā attho* (ItA 164,23-25).

³¹ On “belittling” (*nippesikatā*), an obscure comy term, see ItA:M 2:764 n1.

(3) The term *siṅgī* is rare in the suttas. Apparently, it occurs only *once* in its literal sense of “horn” (such as rhinoceros horn) as something precious in **the (Tad-āh’) Uposatha Sutta** (A 3.70).³² Then, it occurs twice, in its metaphorical sense of “posturing” or “pretence,” in **the Kuhā Sutta** (A 4.26) and in a reprise of the passage in **It 108** (It 4.9) [2.3].

The Commentary on the Kuhā Sutta (ThaA 3:86,20 f) explains *siṅgī* (literally, “horn-like, horny”) quotes **the Vibhaṅga** for its definition of *siṅgī*. It adds that *siṅgī* refers to possessing worldly or vulgar defilements, “just like a horn” (“horny”); that is, of an erotic or posturing temperament (*siṅgāra, carita*).³³

The Vibhaṅga explains *siṅgi* as the adjective of the abstract noun, *siṅga*, that is, “that which is posturing, pretence, cleverness, suavity, foppery, dandyism”³⁴ (Vbh 851,21-23). Its Commentary says that it should be understood as a characteristic of bad wishes, of not knowing one’s limits arising from a lack of good qualities (or satisfaction). (VbhA 476,20-23)

The Vibhaṅga Commentary adds that *siṅga* should be understood in the sense of “piercing (or getting pierced)” (*vijjhan’atthena*). Possibly, this refers to the traditional habit of piercing one’s ear/s, nose, etc, for the sake of adorning oneself. It looks like a Pali idiom for efforts in beautifying oneself. It is the defilement-based foppery in special reference to urban (city) dwellers (*nāgarika, bhava, saṅkhatassa kilesa, siṅgass’etaṃ nāmaṃ*). (VbhA 476,23 f) [3.1.3]

2.2.2.4 (Tha 959d). “They pretend to be noble [holy]” (*carissanty ariya, viya*). The Commentary says that this pretension is just that of seeing the benefits from it (ThaA 3:86,23-25). This and the above descriptions are an ominous allusion and warning against the rise of “**urbanized**” and “**urbane**” clerics who act and live like refined upper-class elites, accessible almost only by the rich and powerful. They resort to the cloth as a status symbol of wealth, power and privilege. In short, the robes are no more reminders of renunciation or moral virtue or mental cultivation or insight wisdom.

These religious pretenders use money (with large bank accounts), accumulate wealth and property, enjoy sensual pleasures and live worldly lives well beyond the range of most of their pious lay supporters and devotees. They have turned renunciation on its head and are living a karmic lie, which is likely to bring them into the subhuman states in no time. [2.1.3.2]

2.3 KUHA SUTTA (A 4.26 = It 108): ABOUT NON-GROWTH AND GROWTH IN THE BUDDHA’S TEACHING

SD 54.13(2.3)

Kuha Sutta

The Discourse on the Deceitful | **A 4.26/2:26 = It 108/4.9/112 f**

Ce **Kuhaka Sutta** The Discourse on the Deceitful

Traditional: **A 4.1.3.6** Aṅguttara 4, Catukka Nipāta 1, Paṭhama Paṇṇāsaka 3, Uruvela Vagga 6

It 4.9 or **It 4.1.9** Khuddaka Nikāya: Itivuttaka 4, Catukka Nipāta 9

Theme: The false religious life

1 [This was indeed spoken by the Blessed One, spoken by the arhat [worthy one], thus have I heard.]³⁵

³² *Siṅgī*, “horn”: **(Tad-āh’) Uposatha S** (A 3.70/1:215*), SD 4.18;

³³ ThaA 3:86,22 f; ItA 164,26-28.

³⁴ *Tattha katamaṃ siṅgaṃ. Yaṃ siṅgaṃ siṅgārātā caturatā caturatiyaṃ parikkhattatā parikkhattiyaṃ. Idaṃ vuccati siṅgaṃ.*

³⁵ Only in It: *Vuttam h’etaṃ bhagavatā. Vuttam arahatā’ ti me sutam.* This is said to be spoken by the laywoman **Khujj’uttarā**: see SD 16.14 (1).

2 “Those,³⁶ bhikshus, who are **deceitful,³⁷ stubborn,³⁸ loose-tongued,³⁹ posturing,⁴⁰ puffed up, lacking concentration,⁴¹**

they, bhikshus, are not my monks,⁴²

3 They, bhikshus, have strayed from this Dharma-Vinaya, and they⁴³ do not [113] undergo *growth, progress, full maturity [abundance]*, where this Dharma-Vinaya is concerned.⁴⁴

4 Those,* bhiksus, who are not **deceitful, not loose-tongued, steadfast, not puffed up, well concentrated,** [honest, sincere, steadfast, compliant, well-concentrated,] they, bhikshus, are my monks.

5 These monks, bhikshus, have not strayed from this Dharma-Vinaya, and they* undergo growth, progress, full maturity [abundance], where this Dharma-Vinaya is concerned.”

6 [This is the meaning of what the Blessed One said. The meaning here is spoken thus:]⁴⁵

7 *kuhā thaddhā lapā siṅgī unnaḷā asamāhitā na te dhamme viruhanti sammā,sambuddha,desite* The deceitful, posturing, stubborn, mere talkers,⁴⁶ hollow, mentally unconcentrated— they grow not in the Dharma that the fully self-awakened has taught.

8 *nikkhuḥā nillapā dhīrā atthaddhā susamāhitā te ve dhamme virūhanti sammā.sambuddha,desite’ti* Not deceitful, not talkers, steadfast, not puffed up, well concentrated— they, indeed, grow in the Dharma that the fully self-awakened has taught.

9 [This matter [meaning] too was spoken by the Blessed One. Thus I have heard.]⁴⁷

— evaṃ —

³⁶ Woodward, in his *Āṅguttara tr* (S:W 2:29) apparently does not see that the opp of *siṅgī* (pretensions) and *unnaḷā* (haughty) do not recur in the “mirror” half of Sutta, which also has a different word-sequence. On “mirroring” or **mirror pattern**—a teaching method where a sutta or teaching comprises 2 complementary aspects, usu the first negative followed by the second positive—see SD 53.15 (11.2).

³⁷ On “deceitful” (*kuhā*) and the other qualities [2.2.2.3 (1)]. On “frivolous” (*unnaḷā*) [2.1.2.3]; on “lacking concentration” (*asamāhitā*) [2.1.2.2].

³⁸ “Stubborn,” *thaddhā*, which Comy glosses with “anger and arrogance” (*kodhena ca mānena ca thaddhā*, AA 3:42,17): [2.2.2.3 (1)].

³⁹ “Talkers,” *lapā*, which Comy glosses with *upalāpakā* (AA 3:42.18), which ItA explains as “being intimate with families through wrong livelihood” (*upalāpakā’ti micchā,jīva,vasena kula,saṅgaṇhakā*, ItA 2:164,23 = AAT:Be=Ee).

⁴⁰ “Posturing” (*saṅgī*) [2.2.2.3 (3)].

⁴¹ *Ye te* [It *keci* instead of *te*] *bhikkhave bhikkhu kuhā thaddhā lapā siṅgī unnaḷā asamāhitā*. On the keywords: [2.1.2.2; 2.1.2.3; 2.2.2.3].

⁴² *Na me te bhikkhave bhikkhū mamaka*. Comy: “They are not my monks; they do not belong to me.” (*te mayhaṃ bhikkhū mama santakā na honti*, AA 3:43,1-3; ItA 2:165,2-5)

⁴³ Here and below, Be:Ka Ee Ke Ce Ee has *bhikkhave bhikkhu*; but A Be Se:SR omit. See below.

[*] The asterisks signify annotations in the “mirror” passage above.

⁴⁴ *Na ca te bhikkhave bhikkhu* [It 4.9, only in Be:Ka Ce Ee] *imasmim dhammavinaye vuddhim virūḷhim vepul-laṃ āpajjanti*.

⁴⁵ Only in It: *Etam atthaṃ bhagavā avoca, tatth’etaṃ iti vuccati*.

⁴⁶ On the words in this line, see §2 + nn.

⁴⁷ Only in It: *Ayam pi attho vutto bhagavatā. Iti me sutan ti*.

2.4 WORLDLINESS IN ROBES

2.4.1 Tha 971

2.4.1.1 ON THOSE UNWORTHY OF THE MONASTIC ROBES. Some of the negative qualities of false monastics are mentioned in **the Jantu Sutta** (S 2.25,3). A large number of forest monks were said to be “**restless, puffed up, vain, foul-mouthed, rambling in speech, unmindful, lacking clear comprehension, lacking concentration, scatterbrained, loose in sense-faculties**” (*uddhatā unnaḷā capalā mukharā vikiṇṇa, vācā muttha-s, satino asampajānā asamāhitā vibbhanta, cittā pākat’indriyā*). The qualities highlighted in **bold** are identical or similar to those mentioned in this verse, and they can be read together:

2.4.1.2	<i>vipanna, sīlo dummedho pākaṭo kāma, kāriyo vibbhanta, citto nissukko na so kāsavaṃ arahati</i>	Devoid of moral virtue, of bad wisdom, unrestrained, acting in desire, scatterbrained, lacking energy— he is unworthy of the yellow robe.	(Tha 971)
----------------	---	--	-----------

2.4.2 Comments on Tha 971

2.4.2.1 (Tha 971a). “Devoid of moral virtue” (*vipanna, sīlo*) means that they have breached their moral training (*bhinna, sīlo*, ThaA 3:86,26). They have no regard for the Vinaya and monastic training. Even when they are still 5 years or less in the order, they wander about and do not observe the tutelage (*nissaya*) of training with a suitable teacher or teachers. In other words, they are no different from the laity in conduct, only they look different and do not work for a living but live off the country’s alms or are engaged with the world economically, and yet do not pay taxes. In short, the sad truth is that they are neither renunciants nor good citizens.⁴⁸

While in **Tha 958a**, the elder Phussa [2.0] speaks of the monks as being “foolish” (*bālā*) [2.1.2.1] “of bad wisdom” (*dummedho*),⁴⁹ the opposite of which is “of good [great] wisdom” (*sumedha*). Such monks may be qualified in worldly or “professional” wisdom, but these are simply a means of living, a status symbol, a wrong livelihood. They may even have an academic status claiming to be scholars of the suttas and Vinaya, but they lack moral virtue (they are unconscionably immoral).⁵⁰ Their wisdom has nothing to do with Dharma practice as taught by the Buddha or for renouncing the world for the path of awakening. In this sense, they are actually “of little wisdom.”

2.4.2.2 (Tha 971b). Such monastics are “unrestrained” (*pākaṭo*) because they have been laicized or domesticated—they have become used to the way of the laity and the world—so that they are effectively laymen who masquerade as celibate, money-free and renounced monastics. We see them visiting areas outside the monastery or retreat, especially urban areas, which are off-limits and improper for renunciants (*agocara*),⁵¹ taking food at the forbidden times (*vikāla, bhojana*),⁵² indulging in the “bonds of sexuality”: enjoying physical contact, socializing, lusting for physical forms; distracted by pleasurable sounds,

⁴⁸ On “laicization” or “domestication” of monastics, see SD 21.3 (5.2).

⁴⁹ *Dummedho’ti nippañño, sīla, visodhana, paññāya virahito* (ThaA 3:88,26).

⁵⁰ Meaning they live worldly and luxurious lives and lack moderation in their conduct.

⁵¹ On “what is not pasture” (*agocara*), see SD 31.7 (2.2), esp (2.2.3-2.2.5).

⁵² On “untimely eating” (*vikāla, bhojana*), see SD 11.1 (2).

delighting in frivolities, approving of others indulging in sensual pleasures and living for the sake of attaining heavenly life.⁵³ [3.1.10]

Such a false monk is one habitually “acting in desire” (*kāma, kāriyo*). He acts unwisely, without due consideration of consequences and effects of bad karma, or how it negatively affects others: in this sense, he has symptoms of narcissism, he cares only about his own benefits and pleasures. Morally, he seems to act “as he wills,” but in reality, he lacks any good will, but acts only in bad will.

Psychologically, as an unawakened being unguided by the Dharma, he has *no* will in the sense that his actions are reflexive, reactive, even instinctive (like those of an animal), seeking only to fulfill bodily needs and wants. He is driven and compelled by past conditionings, that is, rooted in the latent tendencies.⁵⁴ In short, he is a creature of the past, dead to the present (S 355d*).⁵⁵

2.4.2.3 (Tha 971c). A false monastic is “scatterbrained” (*vibbhanta, citto*), one who is forgetful (especially of the Dharma), disorganized or unable to think or focus clearly, who lacks mindfulness. This unhelpful condition is likely to have arisen from the habits of being worldly (presence of strong lust, hate and delusion) and a lack of proper meditation (including mindfulness) practice. When we are too worldly, it is difficult to meditate or our meditation is ineffective, which in turn does not help in lessening or stopping the worldliness: it is like a snake eating its own tail. Even one who seems to be a good meditator or teacher, who is worldly, will often actually be scatterbrained. [3.1.9]

The Commentary explains “**lacking energy**” (*nissukko*) as being literally “not white” (*asukka*), said of bad karma,⁵⁶ one lacks wholesome states, or this state is bereft of zeal on account of unwholesomeness arising from a lack of moral shame and moral fear.⁵⁷ In simple terms, this means that one lacks past supporting karma⁵⁸—that we need to create more good karma (especially by practising generosity and cultivating lovingkindness) now, and put in extra effort in our spiritual training. Even when we are slow but steady, we will eventually reach the path of awakening in this life itself when we put our mind and heart into aspiring for streamwinning.

2.4.2.4 (Tha 971d). “**He is unworthy of the yellow robe**” (*na so kāsāvaṃ arahati*): this describes a monastic who habitually has all, or even some of, the negative qualities described above. The Commentaries say that a false monk eats the country’s alms as a *thief*, while a good monk, who eats without reflecting on it, is a *debtor*. A saint on the path takes his almsfood as an *heir*, while an arhat is the *owner* of his almsfood.⁵⁹ [Cf 3.5]

In **the (Arahatta) Susīma Sutta** (S 12.70), the elder Susīma confesses to the Buddha that he is “a thief of the Dharma,” and turns over a new leaf. After going into a solitary retreat, he attains arhathood.⁶⁰

⁵³ See **Methuna S** (A 7.47), SD 21.9. On the scorn over monks attaining heavenly birth, see **Sakka, pañha S** (D 31, 1.11-12) + SD 54.8 (5.3, 5.4).

⁵⁴ On latent tendencies (*anusaya*), see **Anusaya**, SD 31.3.

⁵⁵ On such monks’ attitude towards women and sexuality, see SD 3.13 (1.3.2).

⁵⁶ See eg **Kukkura, vatika S** (M 57,7 f/1:389,25). In **Saṅgīti S** (D 33), it is said of karmic conditions (“black” refers to bad karmic conditions of life), and of nirvana as being “neither black nor white” (D 3:251.3+8).

⁵⁷ **Nissukko’ti asukko, sukka, dhamma, rahito: hiti, ottappa, vajjato kusala, dhamma, sampādana, ussuka, rahito vā.** (ThaA 3:88,31f)

⁵⁸ **Maṅgala S** (Sn 2.4 = Khp 5/6) speaks of “having done good [merit] in the past” (*pubbe ca kata, puññatā*) (Sn 259b = Khp 5,2b*) as being a “supreme blessing” since it helps in our present spiritual endeavours.

⁵⁹ MA 5:32; SA 2:199; cf SA 1:100 thieves are those who cause ruin in the world. See SD 49.2 (1.1.3).

⁶⁰ S 12.70,58 (SD 16.8). See also SD 45.18 (2.3.3.2) almsfood.

3 The Jantu Sutta (S 2.25) and the Pākat'indriya Sutta (S 9.13)

3.0 The Jantu Sutta (S 2.25) and the Pākat'indriya Sutta (S 9.13) are identical in teaching. In their short narrative introduction, too, they have the identical **pākat'indriya** stock passage [§2], and the same closing verses [§§3-7]. The two Suttas differ only in their respective narrative introduction. Here is a collation table on the two Suttas:

- §1 S 2.25 has *evam me sutam*, while S 9.13 does not. A number of monks are dwelling in Kosala country: S 2.25 says “in forest-huts on the slopes of the Himalayas” (*hīmavanta, passe arañña, - kuṭṭikāyaṃ*), while S 9.13 says “in a certain thick wood” (*aññatarasmim vana, saṇḍe*).
- §2 Both Suttas give the *pākat'indriya* stock passage: *uddhatā ... pākat'indriyā*.
- §3 The details differ. S 2.25 says that the devaputta Jantu approaches the monks on a fullmoon day. S 9.13 does not name the devaputta, saying only that he is a forest-dwelling deity. He approaches the monks out of compassion to arouse samvega in the monks.
- §§4-7 The closing verses are identical.

Since the Sutta details do not conflict—even though they each probably came from a different ancient source—they can be taken to complement the introductory narrative. Their close relationship is confirmed by **the Saṃyutta Commentary**. The commentary on **S 9.13** simply refers to that of **S 225** (SA 1:297,22).

The Sutta references in this section apply to both S 2.25 and S 9.13.

3.1 EXPLANATIONS OF THE KEY WORDS

3.1.1 Restless (*uddhatā*) [§2]. The false monastics are of a restless temperament because of mistaking (regarding the Vinaya) the unallowable as allowable, and the blameworthy as blameless, and vice versa (SA 1:115,2-6). Their unhelpful restlessness and confusion arise from an ignorance of the Vinaya due to the lack of training (such as not observing the 5-year tutelage) [2.1.2.3]. Without a strong moral foundation, it will be difficult for them to experience good meditation, not to speak of attaining dhyana—hence, their restlessness. [2.2.2.1]

3.1.2 Hollow (*unnaḷā*) [§2]. The false monastics are puffed up with hollow conceit like an erect but pithless reed. Lacking the Dharma spirit, they go about quarrelling with other monks [2.1.2.1; 2.1.2.4], even disrespecting the elders and the sangha itself. (SA 1:115,7 f) [2.1.2.3]

3.1.3 Vain (*capalā*) [§2]. Out of vanity, false monks adorn their bowls and robes, etc (SA 1:115,7 f). This vanity arises from their lack of the Dharma spirit of renunciation (hence, having strong lust, hate and delusion), and also from the impulse to impress others for various reasons. [Cf 2.2.2.2, 2.2.2.3 (3)]

3.1.4 Foul-mouthed (*mukharā*) [§2]. The term *mukharā* is explained as “rough-mouthed” (*mukha, kharā*), that is, crude in speech. Basically, this means that they are lacking in right speech (SA 1:115,8 f). [2.1.3,3 (b); 2.1.2.4; cf 2.2.2.3 (2)]

3.1.5 Rambling in speech (*vikinṇa, vācā*) [§3]. Weak and bad monastics have little or no control over their speech, chattering away pointlessly all day long (SA 1:115,9 f). Again, this is characteristic of wrong speech [3.1.4]. The ceaseless chattering occurs because they are always socializing, in some kind of company, but not a Dharma assembly. Even when he is involved in some kind of event of faith and peace, he

will find something to chatter about just to win the support and admiration of the gullible. This habit often worsens because those who come to him are gullible and foolish themselves. Hence, blind ignorance is led by the nose by lame craving.⁶¹ [Cf 2.2.2.3 (2)]

3.1.6 Muddle-minded (*muttha-s, satino*) [§2]. When we do not understand the moral precepts, we will not be able to keep them properly. It becomes attachment to ritual and vows (*sīla-b, bata parāmāsa*),⁶² not a step in training (*sikkhāpada*).⁶³ It cannot be as a basis for mental cultivation and focus; then, we will lose mindfulness, be devoid of mindfulness (SA 1:115,10 f). Without mindfulness, we are forgetful of whatever we have done, especially the good; we often forget the bad we have done, too, and keep repeating wrongs.⁶⁴

Our training is to watch out for such moments, notice how unhelpful and false they are. This should inspire us to cultivate mindfulness.⁶⁵ Noticing what is unhelpful and false is part of our wisdom training. **Lovingkindness** reminds us of the roots for cultivating moral virtue—the values of life, labour, love, truth and lucidity.⁶⁶ In this sense, moral virtue arises and grows with wisdom and lovingkindness.⁶⁷ [2.1.2.2]

3.1.7 Without clear comprehension (*asampajānā*) [§2]. When we habitually lack mindfulness, we are also without clear awareness, which the Commentary glosses with wisdom (*nippaññā*) (SA 1:115,12). When we are not mindful, we will not see the true nature of our actions and events; we will not appreciate their impermanence, unsatisfactoriness and non-self. On the contrary, we tend to be distracted by our experiences regarding pleasure taking it to be permanent, desirable and good in themselves. The truth is just the contrary. Another word for this is being “of low wisdom” [2.4.2.1].

3.1.8 Unconcentrated (*asamāhitā*) [§2]

3.1.8.1 The Commentary explains that a person unconcentrated in meditation is like a ship caught in a very strong (“angry,” *caṇḍa*) ocean-current. It takes this as technically as referring to the lack of neighbourhood concentration (*upacāra, samādhi*) and access [full] concentration (*appanā, samādhi*) (SA 1:115,12 f). These are terms relating what we today call “**calmness**” meditation (*samatha, bhāvanā*), that is, when we work to clear the mind of mental hindrances⁶⁸ (free it from the body) and calm it down into dhyana⁶⁹ (let it brighten up as “pure mind”). One possible contributing condition for this is the lack of moral disciplines. [2.1.2.2]

3.1.8.2 The 2 kinds of concentrations mentioned [3.1.8.1] are best understood in the context of the levels of mental images (*nimitta*) and meditative concentration (*samādhi*). The Commentaries explain these images as follows:

⁶¹ On craving working with ignorance, see SD 40a.8 (2.1.1.1).

⁶² On attachment to rituals and vows, see **Emotional independence**, SD 40a.8 (3); SD 51.5 (5.2.4.2-5.2.4.5).

⁶³ On moral virtue as a step of training, see SD 54.2e (2.3.2.5).

⁶⁴ On mindfulness, see SD 54.2e (2.3.4).

⁶⁵ On the types of mind to avoid and those to cultivate, see eg **Satipatthāna S** (M 10,34), on contemplation of the mind (*cittānupassanā*), SD 13.3.

⁶⁶ Love is the 3rd value in the sense that sexuality must be an expression or fruit of love. It also has the twin value of liberty: we should respect the *freedom* of others when they say no to our advances. On the 5 values, see SD 1.5 (2.7+2.8); SD 51.11 (2.2.3.4); SD 54.2e (2.3.2.5).

⁶⁷ On how lovingkindness helps us keep the precepts, see SD 1.5 (2.9).

⁶⁸ The 5 mental hindrances (*pañca, nīvaraṇa*) are sensual lust, ill will, restlessness and worry, sloth and torpor, and doubt: see **Nīvaraṇa**, SD 32.1.

⁶⁹ See **Dhyana**, SD 8.4.

- (1) The preparatory image (*parikamma nimitta*) or the meditation-object perceived at the start of our meditation.
- (2) The acquired image (*uggaha nimitta*), when this image has reached some degree of focus, albeit still unsteady and unclear. With deeper focus, there is a clear and steady counter-image (*paṭibhāga nimitta*), meaning that the meditator has attained access (or neighbourhood) concentration (*upacāra samādhi*).
- (3) Full concentration (*appanā samādhi*) is attained by letting go of the counter-image naturally at the right time.⁷⁰ Then, the mind is free of all sense-experiences; hence, free from the mental hindrances [3.1.8.1].

When the mind is free from the mental hindrances, it is in full concentration, it is fully focused on itself, powerfully radiant, profoundly still and crystal clear: it is dhyana (*jhāna*).⁷¹

3.1.9 Scatterbrained (*vibbhanta,citta*) [§2]

3.1.9.1 This compound literally means “with wandering mind.” The Commentary glosses “scatter-brained” with “unsteady mind” (*anavaṭṭhita,cittā*) (meaning that the meditation image cannot be stabilized into focus), and describes such a person to be “like a foolish deer on a pathway” (SA 1:115,13 f). In our times, we usually think of such a deer as being blinded by a vehicle’s headlights, but the commentarial context seems to suggest that the deer is lost without its familiar cover of trees, undergrowth and so on.

The “foolish deer” is the clueless meditator, especially his unstable mind; the “pathway” is our meditation itself. We are blinded by the bright headlights right in the path of oncoming vehicles, so there is the certain danger of being knocked down by any of them. Since we lack focus (“blinded”), we are likely to be assailed by lust or ill will, or any of the mental hindrances [3.1.8.1].

3.1.9.2 The **context** of *vibbhanta,citta* should be noted. It occurs in a number of phrases related to the meditating mind.⁷² In **the Jantu Sutta** (S 2.25), it appears in this sequence: “unmindful, lacking clear comprehension, lacking concentration, scatterbrained, loose in the sense-faculties” (*muṭṭha-s,satino asampajānā asamāhitā vibbhanta,cittā pākat’indriyā*) [§2].

In this stock-phrase, *muṭṭha-s,satino asampajānā asamāhitā*, “unmindful, lacking clear comprehension, lacking concentration” (that is, the first 3 components of the phrase) refer to the ascending severity of an unfocused mind during meditation, thus:

- (1) Being “**unmindful**” (*muṭṭha-s,sati*) can also be rendered as “of confused mind”; which leads to:
- (2) our “**lacking clear comprehension**” (*asampajāna*) (we neither understand nor know what to do with the mind); this results in:
- (3) our “**lacking concentration**” (*asamāhita*); there is no mental focus; which, in turn, results in:
- (4) our being “**scatterbrained,**” that is, having a wandering mind.

Even more interesting, there follows the compound, *pākat’indriya*, “**loose in the sense-faculties.**” To our modern non-Pali eye—reading the phrase in its “normal” sequence—it is strange that *an unconcentrated mind* should lead to being “loose in sense-faculties.” In fact, we are misreading the Pali passage

⁷⁰ On full concentration, see SD 15.1 (9.3); SD 33.1a (3.1).

⁷¹ See **Nimitta**, SD 19.7 (3); **Dhyana**, SD 8.4 (7) What happens when we attain dhyana?

⁷² On the sutta contexts of *vibbhanta,citta*, see SD 54.2h (2.2.1.4).

when we do so: this last phrase should be understood as informing us how these negative states have arisen. Hence, it should be “semantically” placed at the start of this stock phrase: it is when we are “loose in the sense-faculties” that leads to an unconcentrated mind. This semantic displacement is a Pali idiomatic feature I call “the reverse verb sequence” or simply, “Pali reverse verb-sequence.”⁷³ [2.4.2.3]

3.1.10 Loose in the sense-faculties (*pākat'indriyā*) [§2]. We have just noted that being “loose in the sense-faculties” leads to an unconcentrated mind [3.1.9]. The Commentary explains how this looseness occurs: the weak-minded monastics have kept “open sense-faculties due to lack of restraint, just as when they were laymen” (*saṃvarābhāvena gihī, kāle viya vivaṭ'indriyā*, SA 1:115,15 f).

Here, “open” (*vivaṭa*) or “uncovered,” is, ironically, used in a negative sense of being *open* to the influences and under the power of the mental hindrances [3.1.8.1]. Its wholesome opposite is the metaphor of **a tortoise** that, on sensing danger, draws its “5 limbs” (its legs and head) into its shell and stays totally still. The predator (such as a jackal) noticing that the tortoise is impregnable, leaves it alone and departs.⁷⁴

In the case of the forest monks, they are “loose in the sense-faculties” so they are unmindful, which makes them lack clear comprehension, which, in turn, prevents mental concentration, so that they become *scatterbrained* [3.1.9.2]. To remedy this situation, they need to go back to the Buddha or their teachers

, and ask for appropriate teachings. On their own, they have to strengthen their moral virtue as the basis for mental concentration. [2.4.2.2; Cf 2.2.2.4]

3.2 THE DEVAPUTRA [§3]. The Commentary says that the young deva knows that these monks have received teaching from the Buddha and are supposed to be meditating in solitude. Realizing that his exhortation will not be effective if he were to approach each monk individually, he approaches them as a community when they have assembled for the precept-day observance (*uposatha*).⁷⁵ (SA 1:115,20-24)

3.3 “THEY ARE INFATUATED WITH OTHERS’ HOUSES” (*parāgāresu mucchitā*) [S 354d*]. The Commentary explains that their infatuation arises by way of defilements [The Subcommentary says that this defilement is craving, SAPT:Be 158,15.] They are infatuated with the daughters-in-law and so on in these houses. (SA 1:115,10-12).

3.5 “THE DEAD” (*PETA*) [S 355d*]. The Commentary to S 2.2.5 says that the deva warns the monks that when they do not keep to the proper training and live the true Dharma, they are without refuges and are “dead” or “departed” (*petā*). Just as dead bodies, thrown into the charnel ground, are eaten by various predators, and even their relatives cannot protect or guard them, even so, bad monastics are as if rejected, without a protector, since they get no instruction or advice from their preceptors and teachers. They are just like the dead. (SA 1:115,13-18). [Cf 2.4.2.4]

— — —

⁷³ (**Ceto, vimutti**) **Anuruddha S** (M 127,8.1), SD 54.10; SD 54.12 (2.2.1).

⁷⁴ See **Kummōpama S** (S 35.240/4:177 f), SD 19.17.

⁷⁵ On the *uposatha* day, see SD 49.11 (2.1); **Tad-ah'uposatha S** (A 3.70), SD 4.18; **Dhammika S** (A 4:254 f = Sn 400 f), SD 27.3(2.1).

Jantu Sutta

The Jantu Discourse ^[3.0]

S 2.25

1 Thus have I heard.

At one time, a large number of monks were dwelling in forest-huts on the slopes of the Himalayas in Kosala country.

2 They were restless,⁷⁶ puffed up, vain, foul-mouthed, rambling in speech, unmindful, lacking clear comprehension, lacking concentration,⁷⁷ scatterbrained,⁷⁸ loose in sense-faculties.⁷⁹

3 Then, the devaputra **Jantu**, on the observance day, the 15th, approached the monks, and uttered these verses to them:

The deva Jantu's verses

4	<i>Sukha,jīvino pure āsum bhikkhū gotama,sāvakā. anicchā piṇḍam esanā anicchā sayan'āsanam loke aniccataṃ ñatvā dukkhass'antaṃ akaṃsu te⁸⁰</i>	(S 353)	Happily they lived in the past, the monks of the recluse Gotama. Without a wish, they seek alms, without a wish for bed or seat. Understanding the world's impermanence, they made an end of suffering.	
5	<i>Dupposam katvā attānam gāme gāmaṇikā viya. bhutvā bhutvā nipajjanti parāgāresu mucchitā.⁸¹</i>	(S 354)	But now, some of them, I say, make themselves difficult to support, like the headman in a village, they eat and eat, and sleep—they are infatuated with others' houses.	7b a b b
6	<i>Saṅghassa añjalim katvā idh'ekacce vadām'aham⁸² apaviddhā anāthā te yathā petā tath'eva te⁸³</i>	(S 355)	With palms together to the sangha, I say of <i>some monks here</i> : they've become rejects, without a refuge— just like the dead [pretas] ⁸⁴ are they!	

⁷⁶ Here, "restless" (*uddhattā*) has a negative sense: SD 50.12 (2.4.4). As a mental hindrance, "restlessness and worry," see **Uddhacca,kukkucca**, SD 32.7 (2.1), esp (2.1.4). On "Dharma restlessness" (*dhamm'uddhacca*), see SD 41.5 (5); SD 32.7 (2.1.4, 2.2.3); SD 41.4 (2.2.1).

⁷⁷ "Lacking concentration" (*mutṭha-s,sati*): see SD 54.2h (2.2.1); cf [2.1.2.2].

⁷⁸ On "scatterbrain," see (2.4.2.3).

⁷⁹ *Uddhatā unnaḷā capalā mukharā vikiṇṇa,vācā mutṭha-s,satino asampajānā asamāhitā vibbhanta,cittā* pākat'-indriyā*. *Ce *vibbhanta-*; Be Ee Se *vibbhatta-*. *Vibbhanto* is past pres of *vibbhamati*, "roaming, straying; strayed, confused" (M 1:171, 247; often as *vibbhanta,citta*: S 1:61,204, 393, 5269; A 170, 2:30, 3:391; It 90; J 4:459; Miln 324. *Vibbhatta* seems unattested. On **vibbhanta**, see [3.1.9] + PED sv. On the stock and its key-words; SD 54.2h (2.2.1.4).

⁸⁰ Se *dukkhass'antam-akaṃsu*.

⁸¹ *Mucchita*, past part of *mucchati*, (fig), to become dull or stupid (through infatuation or possession) (see Luders in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* (KZ) 1909:42.194a). See PED: *mucchati*.

⁸² Be Ce Ee2 *vadām'aham*; Be:Ka Ee1 *vandām'aham*. The Ee1 reading, *vandām'aham*, is found in the parallel S 794b*.

⁸³ Be Ee *te*; Se *ca*.

⁸⁴ Such false monastics also live like "animals" [2.1.2.4; 2.4.2.2].

- 7 *ye kho pamattā viharanti*
te me sandhāya bhāsitaṃ
ye appamattā viharanti
namo tesarṃ karom’ahan’ti (S 356) Of those who dwell negligently,
in their connection, this is said by me:
As for those who dwell diligently,
I pay homage to them.

— evaṃ —

4 The Pākat’indriya Sutta (S 9.13) [3.0]

SD 54.13(4)

Pākat’indriya Sutta

The Discourse on “Loose in the Sense-faculties” | S 9.13/1:203 f
Traditional: S 1.9.1.13 Saṃyutta 1, Sagāthā Vagga 9, Vana Saṃyutta 1, Vana Vg 13
Theme: The false religious life

- 1 [85] At one time, a large number of monks were dwelling in a certain thick wood in Kosala country.⁸⁶
2 They were restless,⁸⁷ puffed up, vain, foul-mouthed, rambling in speech, unmindful, lacking clear comprehension, lacking concentration,⁸⁸ scatterbrained,⁸⁹ loose in sense-faculties.⁹⁰
3 Then, a deity haunting that same thick wood, out of compassion for the monks, desiring for their own good, wanting to arouse samvega⁹¹ in the monks,⁹² approached them and uttered these verses to them:

The forest deity’s verses

- 4 *Sukha,jīvino pure āsum*
bhikkhū gotama,sāvaka.
anicchā piṇḍam esanā
anicchā sayan’āsanaṃ
loke aniccataṃ ñatvā
dukkhass’antaṃ akaṃsu te⁹³ (S 791) Happily they lived in the past,
the monks of the recluse Gotama.
Without a wish, they seek alms,
without a wish for bed or seat.
Understanding the world’s impermanence,
they made an end of suffering.
- 5 *Dupposarṃ katvā attānaṃ*
gāme gāmaṇikā viya.
bhutvā bhutvā nipajjanti
parāgāresu mucchitā.⁹⁴ (S 792) But now, some of them, I say, make 7b
themselves difficult to support, a
like the headman in a village, they eat and eat, b
and sleep—they are infatuated with others’ houses. b

⁸⁵ *Evam me sutarṃ* is omitted [3.0].

⁸⁶ *Ekam samayaṃ sambahulā bhikkhū kosalesu viharanti aññatarasmim vana,saṇḍe.*

⁸⁷ *Uddhattā*: see [3].

⁸⁸ “Lacking concentration” (*muṭṭha-s,sati*): see [3]; also SD 54.2h (2.2.1); cf [2.1.2.2].

⁸⁹ On “scatterbrain,” see [3] + [2.4.2.3].

⁹⁰ *Uddhatā unnaḷā capalā mukharā vikiṇṇa,vācā muṭṭha-s,satino asampajānā asamāhitā vibbhanta,cittā* pākat’indriyā.* See n in tr of S 2.25 ad loc. On *vibbhanta*, see [3.1.9] + PED sv. On the stock and its key-words; SD 54.2h (2.2.1.4).

⁹¹ *Samvega*, “spiritual urgency”: see SD 1.11 (3); SD 9 (7.6).

⁹² *Atha kho yā tasmim vana,saṇḍe adhivatthā devatā tesarṃ bhikkhūnaṃ anukampikā attha,kāmā te bhikkhū sarṃvejetu,kāmā.* This purpose of the deity is not stated in S 2.25 [§3].

⁹³ See tr of S 2.25 ad loc.

S 1.2.3.5 Saṃyutta Nikāya 1, Sagāthā Vagga 2, Devaputta Saṃyutta 3, Nānātitthiya Vagga 5
S 1.9.1.13 Saṃyutta Nikāya 1, Sagāthā Vagga 9, Vana Saṃyutta 1, Vana Vagga 13

- 6 *Saṅghassa añjalim̐ katvā
idh'ekacce vadām'aham̐⁹⁵
apaviddhā anāthā te
yathā petā tath'eva te⁹⁶* (S 793) With palms together to the sangha,
I say of *some monks here*:
they've become rejects, without a refuge—
just like the dead [pretas]⁹⁷ are they!
- 7 *ye kho pamattā viharanti
te me sandhāya bhāsitaṃ
ye appamattā viharanti
namo tesam̐ karom'ahan'ti* (S 794) Of those who dwell negligently,
in their connection, this is said by me:
As for those who dwell diligently,
I pay homage to them.

— evaṃ —

190330 190408 190901

⁹⁴ *Mucchita*, past part of *mucchati*, here (fig), to become dull or stupid (through infatuation or possession): See tr of S 2.25 ad loc.

⁹⁵ Only Ee1 reads *vandām'aham̐*, “I salute (you).” The context actually reads better with *vadām'aham̐*, as tr here. See tr of S 2.25 ad loc.

⁹⁶ See tr of S 2.25 ad loc.

⁹⁷ Such false monastics also live like “animals” [2.1.2.4; 2.4.2.2].