

8

Mūla,pariyāya Sutta

The Discourse on the Root Teaching | M 1
 Theme: The nature of primary causes or concepts
 Translated by Piya Tan ©2003

Contents

§§1-2	Sutta introduction
§§3-26	The 1 st cycle: The uninstructed worldling (<i>assutava puṭhujjana</i>).
§§27-50	The 2 nd cycle: The learner on the path (<i>sekha</i>): streamwinner, once-returner, non-returner.
§§51-74	The 3 rd cycle: arhat 1: a general definition.
§§75-98	The 4 th cycle: arhat 2: liberated by the freedom of the undirected (<i>appaṇihita, vimokkha</i>).
§§99-122	The 5 th cycle: arhat 3: liberated by the freedom of the signless (<i>animitta, vimokkha</i>).
§§123-146	The 6 th cycle: arhat 4: liberated by the freedom of the empty (<i>suññata, vimokkha</i>).
§§147-170	The 7 th cycle: The tathagata 1: the pratyeka-buddha.
§§171-194	The 8 th cycle: The tathagata 2: the fully self-awakened buddha.

1 The Sutta and related suttas**1.2 SUTTA SUMMARY**

1.2.1 The Mūla,pariyāya Sutta analyses the conceptualizing processes of different types of individuals. In an important way, it is an exposition of the true nature of the world, a sort of discourse clarifying the popular speculations about the truth of existence and reality, such as what the *lok'āyata* (“nature-lore” or natural philosophy) of the Buddha’s time concerns itself with.¹

1.2.2 The Sutta comprises **8 cycles**—each centering on a subject (a person) [Contents; 4.3.0.2]—and each cycle works through a list of **24 bases** (*vatthu*) of how we may view things (except for the last, which is nirvana) as follows: [4.3.0; §§3-25]

(1) 1-4	the 4 elements: earth, water, fire and wind;	[§3.2 n]
(2) 5-7	the sense-sphere beings: beings, devas [gods], and Prajapati ² [God];	[§§8-9 nn]
(3) 8-12	the 5 form-sphere beings: (1) Brahmā; (2) Ābhassara; (3) Subha, kiṇṇā; (4) Veha-p, phalā, (5) Abhibhū;	[§§10-12 nn]
(4) 13-16	the 4 formless spheres: (1) infinite space; (2) infinite consciousness; (3) nothingness; (4) neither perception nor non-perception;	[§15 n]
(5) 17-20	the 4 modes of perception: (1) the seen; (2) the heard; (3) the sensed; (4) the known;	[§19 header n]
(6) 21-22	the 2 modes of personal identity: (1) unity; (2) diversity;	[§23 header n]
(7) 23	all (“universalism”: a notion that “the whole universe is the Great Soul”); ³	[§25 n]
(8) 24	nirvana.	[§26 n]

¹ On *lok'āyata*, see SD 35.1 (2).

² It is sanskritized to denote a theistic notion (a wrong view).

³ MA 1:38,18 f. See **Titth'āyatana S** (A 3.61/3:173) which mentions these 3 wrong views: (1) all is due to past karma, (2) all is due to God’s creation, (3) all is without cause or condition (SD 6.8). See **Kaccā(ya)na, gotta S** (S 12.-15/2:17) qu at **(Lakkhaṇa) Channa S** (S 22.90/3:135) for the extreme views that “all exist” (*sabbarā atthi*) and “all do not exist” (*sabbarā n'atthi*) (SD 6.13; SD 56.5). Textually, **Sabba S** (S 35.23) speaks of *sabba* as the 6 internal sense-faculties and the 6 external sense-objects (SD 7.1). On the meanings of *sabba*, see SD 7.1 (5.1).

1.2.3 Sutta overview

For an easy overview of the Mūla,pariyāya Sutta, study this table at the start. Here is a suggested study method:

- (1) Start by carefully studying **row 1** *horizontally*: this is the basic pattern or template for the other 4 lines.
- (2) Study **row 2** once through; notice **column 3** is the same for all 4 rows; but see **column 4** (how different is it?); study the remaining 3 columns.
- (3) Repeat for **row 3** (as in 2); and finally **row 4**.

Table 1.2 A schematic table of the Mūla,pariyāya Sutta teachings

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
the 8 cycles⁴	persons	perceptions	perceptive responses	conceptual responses	emotive responses	reasons
1 §§3-26	an ordinary person	perceives x	perceives x as x	<i>conceives</i> x <i>conceives in</i> x <i>conceives from</i> x <i>conceives</i> “x is mine”	delights in x	has <u>not</u> fully understood x
2 §§27-50	the learner	perceives x	directly knows x	should not <i>conceive</i> x should not <i>conceive in</i> x should not <i>conceive from</i> x should not <i>conceive</i> “x is mine”	<i>should not</i> delight in x	<u>so that</u> he may fully understand x
3-6 §§51-146 (4 ways)	the arhat: <i>anicca,</i> <i>dukkha,</i> <i>anattā</i>	perceives x	directly knows x	does not <i>conceive</i> x does not <i>conceive in</i> x does not <i>conceive from</i> x does not <i>conceive</i> “x is mine”	<i>does not</i> delight in x	<u>has</u> fully understood x: free of <i>greed, hate, delusion</i>
7-8 §§147-294 (2 ways)	the buddha: <i>vijjā,carāṇa;</i> <i>sambuddha +</i> <i>pacceka,buddha</i>	perceives x	directly knows x	does not <i>conceive</i> x does not <i>conceive in</i> x does not <i>conceive from</i> x does not <i>conceive</i> “x is mine”	<i>does not</i> delight in x	has understood <u>the root</u> of x: <i>dependent arising</i>

⁴ **The 8 cycles** refer to (1) the suffering of the ordinary person, (2) the progress of the learner, and (3-6) the liberation of the arhats and (7-8) of the buddhas. Each cycle shows how the person (col 2) responds to perception (col 3) of **the 8 grounds** (*aṭṭha bhūmi*). For details of the 8 grounds (each ground has **24 bases** (*vatthu*): 8 x 24 = 192 “**roots**” (*mūla*) of existence) [4.3]. x = any of the 192 aspects or “roots.” On the 8 grounds of knowing: [4.3.3.2].

1.3 CHINESE PARALLEL

It has a very close Chinese parallel in **the Ekottara Āgama** (EĀ 44.6)⁵ with a similar title, “the root of all things” (一切諸法之本 *yī qiè zhū fǎ zhī běn*), which agrees with the Pali version in locating the discourse at Ukkatṭhā (優迦羅 *yōu jiā luó*). A close presentation is also found in a Madhyama Āgama discourse and an individual Chinese translation (outside of the 4 Āgamas), but they differ enough to suggest that they go back to a different original.⁶ As **Analayo** notes, it is likely

that the Buddha gave an exposition similar to the Mūlapariyāya Sutta on another occasion. In fact, another instance of a similar exposition, occurs in **the Brahma,nimantanika Sutta** [5],⁷ indicating that the Buddha undertook a similar type of analysis on more than one occasion.

(2005 ad M 1:6; emphasis added)

1.4 RELATED SUTTAS

1.4.1 We may here also add **the Pañca-t,taya Sutta** (M 102)⁸ as another example of an exposition (albeit shorter and with a different emphasis) given by the Buddha in a manner similar to **the Brahma,jāla Sutta** (D 1).⁹

1.4.2 The Mūla,pariyāya Sutta should be studied with **the Mūla,pariyāya Jātaka** (J 245) and **the Gotamaka Cetiya Sutta** (A 3.123). In his *Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge*, **K N Jayatilleke** states that:

We believe that *mūla*- here means the “root cause” or the primary causes of the world. It is in this sense that the word is used at Aitareya Āraṇyaka 2.1.8.1, where the cosmological theory that water is the first or primary cause of the world is mooted and it is said that “this (water) was the *root* (cause) and that (ie the world) was the shoot (that is, the effect)” (*etad vai mūlam adas tūlam*). In this Sutta we observe that this theory is mentioned along with a number of such cosmological theories. *Pariyāya* means “the nature of” as at Sn 581.¹⁰ Mūlapariyāya Sutta, therefore, probably means “the discourse on the nature of primary causes or concepts.” (1963:55)

1.4.3 As such, this Sutta also has affinity with such suttas as **the Brahma,jāla Sutta** (D 1), which interestingly enough is the first sutta of the Dīgha Nikāya (opening the Sutta Piṭaka), just as the Mūla,pariyāya Sutta opens the Majjhima Nikāya (the 2nd collection of the Sutta Piṭaka). If the Brahmajāla Sutta forms a

⁵ EĀ 44.6 = T2.766a-b, which prob belongs to the Mahāsaṅghika (Mayeda 1985:102), “a tradition that formed a distinct Buddhist school right after the 2nd council and out of which later the Mahāyāna developed. Hence for a discourse from a collection that must have passed on separately since the time of the second council to agree closely with the Pāli version is a strong testimony for the authenticity of the Mūlapariyāya Sutta and the fidelity of the early Buddhist oral tradition” (**Analayo** 2005 ad M 1:16), and in his fn, adds: “The present study there shows that the conclusion drawn by Thich Minh Chau 1991:204 [that the Mūla,pariyāya S was a Mahāyāna text “included in the Pāli Tipiṭaka, perhaps by mere inadvertence”], based on comparing M 1 with MĀ 106, need to be revised once EĀ 44.6 is also taken into account.” (id)

⁶ MĀ 106 = T1.596b-c & T56 = T1.851a-b (tr Dharmarakṣa, 265-316 CE) respectively, and both have Jeta,vana at Sāvattṭhī as their venue. MĀ 106 has the title, “on perception,” 想經 *xiǎng jīng*, and T56 has the title, “on delighting in perception” 樂想經 *lè xiǎng jīng*. MĀ 106 & T56 has been discussed in some detail by Thich Minh Chau 1991:35, 204, 211-214.

⁷ M 49/1:329 (SD 11.7) & MĀ = T1.547b13.

⁸ M 102/2:228-238.

⁹ D 1/1:1-46.

¹⁰ *Tasmā dhīrā na socanti veditvā loka,pariyāyam*. Therefore the wise do not grieve, knowing the cause of the nature of the world. (Sn 581)

philosophical prolegomenon to what Buddhism has to offer as exemplified in the Dīgha texts, then the Mūlapariyāya Sutta is a spiritual prologue to the Majjhima teachings. It should also be studied with **the Aggaññā Sutta** (D 27).

2 Conceit

2.1 THE PRIDE OF LEARNING

2.1.1 Sutta significance

2.1.1.1 The Majjhima Commentary says that the Buddha gave this discourse to dispel the pride and conceit that had arisen in 500 monks, erstwhile brahmin-students of the 3 Vedas, on account of their Vedic learning and intellectual mastery of the Buddha’s teachings. These monks were formerly brahmins learned in Vedic literature. The subtle nuances of this discourse are intended to deconstruct the brahmanical views to which they might be clinging to.

As eternal teachings, the suttas today address our own narrow “brahminical” views of Buddhism whether in regards to the Dharma or the Abhidharma, or Buddhism in general. Their purpose is to remind us of the true purpose of the spiritual life—that of wisdom, liberation and joyful peace.

2.1.1.2 This Sutta is unique in that it is the only one that ends with the monks “**not rejoicing**” of it. The monks were not happy with this discourse because they were faced with an open challenge by the Buddha that they should deal with their own pride and arrogance. The Majjhima Commentary also contains **the Mūla,pariyāya Jātaka**,¹¹ which the Buddha expounds to these 500 monks a short while later. After listening to this Jātaka, the monks thought, “In the past as well we were knocked down because of conceit” and were humbled (MA 1:59).¹²

2.1.2 Why the monks did not rejoice in the Sutta

2.1.2.1 The Majjhima Commentary remarks that the monks did *not* understand the sutta despite the excellent and melodious voice of the Buddha and his well-taught discourse, for it was for them “like delicious food placed before a man with his mouth bound by a thick broad cloth”. The Buddha nevertheless taught it “for the purpose of shattering their conceit” (MA 1:56). What is truly interesting is that the sutta is, on the contrary, not difficult at all (although the subject is profound) but the 500 monks were blinded by their conceit. After all, it was after listening to the Mūla,pariyāya Jātaka, that their conceit is removed, which then allows them to understand the sutta in retrospect.

2.1.2.2 As such, this Sutta should not be summarily dismissed as being “difficult” (which it is not at all) but to be read reflectively just as it is with **the Mūla,pariyāya Jātaka** (J 245) and **the Gotamaka Cetiya Sutta** (A 3.123) (which concludes it) as reminders that we should keep to the “middle” of the Middle Way and keep clear of manufacturing new systems and self-conceived notions. Instead, we should work towards the liberating Dharma as theory, practice and goal. There is also a very short (**Bhagava**) **Mūlaka Sutta**¹³ that answers the question, “What is the root of all things?”

¹¹ J 245; MA 1:57-59.

¹² The introduction to the Jātaka however states that the Jātaka was related not *to* the 500 monks, but *in reference* to them, after they had become arhats.

¹³ A 10.18/5:106 f.

2.2 “THE MONKS DID NOT REJOICE”

The closing of the Mūla,pariyāya Sutta has been a subject of some controversy, for it is unique in closing thus:

This is what the Blessed One said. (Unsatisfied,) the monks did *not* rejoice in the Blessed One’s word.¹⁴ [§194]

This presentation is supported by the sutta’s Ekottara Āgama parallel.¹⁵ This unusually unique ending is known to the Pali Commentaries. They explain that the Buddha has given this discourse to humble a group of 500 monks who, being formerly learned brahmins, have developed conceit on account of their intellectual mastery of the Teaching. They do *not* rejoice in the teaching because they have been unable to understand what the Buddha has taught them.¹⁶ The monks do not rejoice in this Sutta, as such, because: (1) they had pride and conceit (thinking they have mastered the Teaching); and (2) they held on to remnants of brahminical views.

A number of scholars have proposed an alternative interpretation, that is, they are humbled by their understanding of this discourse and this makes them unable to rejoice in it.¹⁷ The Ekottara Āgama version, however, agrees with the Pali Commentary in that the monks are unable to understand the teaching given by the Buddha because their minds are being obstructed by Māra.¹⁸ The Majjhima Commentary states that in due course, when their pride has been humbled, the Buddha teaches them the **Gotamaka Cetiya Sutta**,¹⁹ as a result of which they all attain arhathood (MA 1:59).

3 Delighting in nirvana

3.1 The Mūla,pariyāya Sutta is remarkable (even unique) in stating that it presents nirvana as a phenomenon that is prone to lead to conceivings and the notion of “mine.” This is remarkable enough as to contribute to a discussion in **the Kathā,vatthu**, where the Pubbe,seliyas refer to the Mūla,pariyāya Sutta in order to support their opinion that the deathless (*amata*), that is, nirvana, as an object of the mind can become a fetter (*samyojana*) (Kvu 404). **Analayo** gives helpful feedback here,

The thought provoking inclusion of Nibbāna in the present context is explained by the Pāli commentary to refer to wrong notions of Nibbāna, held by those who mistake sensual enjoyment or attainment of a *jhāna* to be Nibbāna.²⁰ This commentarial explanation is not convincing, since the Mūlapariyāya Sutta instructs the disciple in higher training (*sekha*), the one who already has experienced stream-entry and is practising for the higher stages of awakening, to

¹⁴ Be Ce Na te bhikkhū bhagavato bhāsitaṃ abhinanduntī. Se Na attamanā te bhikkhū bhagavato bhāsitaṃ abhinanduntī. PTS ed has wr: Attamanā te bhikkhū Bhagavato bhāsitaṃ abhinanduntī. As such, only the PTS ed (M 1:6,24) state that the monks delight in the discourse.

¹⁵ EĀ 44.6 = T2.766b15 says “all the monks did not accept that teaching,” 諸比丘木受其教.

¹⁶ MA 1:56; also Intro to **Mūla,pariyāya J** (J 2:260). Analayo (2005 ad M 1:6) notes that a similar episode occurs in **Kaśyapa,parivarta**, purportedly one of the earliest Mahāyāna texts, which reports that 500 monks are unable to understand a teaching, but later receive a teaching that leads them to full awakening (cf Pasadika, “The Kaśyapa-parivarta,” in *The Tibet Journal* 5,4 1980:52).

¹⁷ Bodhi (1980:20); Ñāṇananda 2004:53; Thanissaro 2002a:156; Analayo 2005 ad M 1:6.

¹⁸ EĀ 44.6 = T2:766b15, which adds that the Buddha then admonishes the monks to meditate and not be negligent, followed by the monks delighting in the Buddha’s word.

¹⁹ A 3.123/1:276.

²⁰ These come as the 5 *parama diṭṭha,dhamma nibbāna*, the 5 claims to “ultimate *nibbāna* here and now,” in the Brahma,jāla Sutta, D 1/1:36 (Analayo’s fn).

avoid conceiving and delighting in each phenomenon, and therewith also in regard to Nibbāna [M 1.50/1:4,30]. This instruction would make little sense if the Nibbāna the Buddha had in mind were indeed a wrong notion of Nibbāna. There would have been little need to advise a disciple in higher training, one who has already had a personal and direct experience of the real Nibbāna, to avoid conceivings and delighting in regard to a mistaken notion of Nibbāna, since such conceivings and delight would not occur in the first place.²¹ Therefore it seems that the instruction in the Mūlapariyāya Sutta and its Ekottara Āgama parallel had indeed the real Nibbāna in mind.

Though disciples in higher training would certainly not delight in wrong notions of Nibbāna, one might wonder why the Mūlapariyāya Sutta should instruct them to avoid delighting in the real Nibbāna, which is the goal of their aspirations. The same discourse also proclaims that an *arahant* does not delight in Nibbāna, yet of *arahants* one would similarly expect that they continue to delight in Nibbāna. A Dhammapada verse refers to such delight with the almost contradictory expression: “affection for the destruction of craving,”²²

The rationale behind the need to refrain from delighting, the Mūlapariyāya Sutta explains, is that delight is a root cause for the arising of *dukkha*.²³ Yet to delight in Nibbāna would seem to lead the disciple in higher training onwards on the path and therewith out of *dukkha*. Moreover the expression “to delight,” *abhinandati*, as such does not necessarily carry negative connotations. It recurs, for example, as part of the standard conclusion of a discourse, reporting the monks “delighting” in what the Buddha had said. Such instances indicate that “to delight” need not necessarily become a root cause for the arising of *dukkha*. (2005 ad M 1:4)

3.2 In the Mūlapariyāya Sutta, **delight** (*abhinandana*; verb, *abhinandati*) is presented as the climax of various conceivings and imaginings immediately following the perception of nirvana as “mine.” This evidently shows that such a delight is tainted with craving, for which reason, the trainee should avoid, but why the arhat is beyond such delight. The corresponding Ekottara Āgama passage does, in fact, speak of not being attached to nirvana,²⁴ instead of not delighting in it, confirming that here the Pali version’s “delight” is used in a mostly negative sense. However, the wholesome context is evident in the case of the trainee and the arhat, since spiritual growth can only occur with the suppression and ending of craving.

4 The 3 types of full understanding

4.1 The Majjhima Commentary mentions the Niddesa doctrine of **the 3 types of full understanding** (*pariññā*) as the framework of the sutta, that is,

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| (1) the full understanding through the known (or diagnosis as knowledge); | <i>ñāta, pariññā</i> |
| (2) the full understanding through scrutinization (that is, diagnosis as cultivation); ²⁵ and | <i>tīraṇa, pariññā</i> |
| (3) the full understanding through abandonment. | <i>pahāna, pariññā</i> |
- (Nm 53; Vism 606)

²¹ See K Ñāṇananda 2004:48 (Analayo’s fn).

²² *Taṇha-k, khaya, rato hoti, sammā, sambuddha, sāvako* (Dh 187) 48 (Analayo’s fn).

²³ *Nandī dukkhassa mūlaṃ* (M 1/1:6,11) 48 (Analayo’s fn).

²⁴ EĀ 44.6 = T2.766b4: 不著於涅槃 *bùzháo yú nièpán*.

²⁵ “Scrutinization,” *tīraṇa* here is syn with *kiicca* (that which should be done) (PED).

4.2 The example of the reflection on **the earth element**, the Commentary says, shows that one who fully understands earth does so by defining *the earth element* by way of its unique characteristic, function, manifestation and proximate cause. The full understanding of the scrutinizing of earth is the contemplation of it as having **the 3 universal characteristics** of impermanence, unsatisfactoriness and non-self. The full understanding through abandonment of earth is realized through the letting go of *lustful* desire for it, leading to the path of arhathood (MA 1:29).

The 3 types of **full understanding** (*pariññā*) closely parallel the canonical 3 phases (*ti,parivaṭṭa*) of **the 4 noble truths** as given in **the Dhamma,cakka-p,pavattana Sutta** (S 56)—namely: (1) the knowledge of each truth (*sacca,ñāṇa*), (2) the knowledge of the task to be done regarding each truth (*kicca,ñāṇa*), and (3) the knowledge of the accomplishment of these tasks (*kata,ñāṇa*)—as applied to the 1st noble truth, that is to say, the statement of (1) the truth (*sacca*); (2) the fact that it should be fully understood (*pariññeyya*); and (3) the fact that it has been fully understood (*pariññāta*) (S 56.11.9-12).

4.3 THE 8 TYPES OF “PERSONS”

4.3.0 How we view or know the world

4.3.0.1 As regards its subjects, the Sutta describes how **the 8 kinds of persons** look at the world. The 8 kinds of persons are as follows:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| (1) the ordinary person, | [4.3.1] |
| (2) the learner, | [4.3.2] |
| (3) the arhat (who sees directly into suffering, impermanence, or nonself) and | [4.3.3] |
| (4) the Tathagata (his wisdom (<i>vijjā</i>) and his compassion (<i>caraṇa</i>)) | [4.3.4] |

Each of these persons have their views or vision—wrongly for 1; closer to true reality for 2; and rightly for 3+4—as they see things by way of **the 8 grounds** (*aṭṭha bhūmi*) of knowledge (J 245.2).

4.3.0.2 The 8 grounds (*aṭṭha bhūmi*) refer to the 8 categories of things that can be known, that is, perceived (through the senses) or conceived (in the mind), that is, our imaginations, views or understanding of them. The 8 categories or cycles of knowables comprise the following: [1.2.2]

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| (1) the 4 elements | the 4 bases of existence | |
| (2) the sense-sphere and | the 3 kinds of beings therein | SD 57.10 (3.2) |
| (3) the form sphere and | the 5 kinds of beings therein | SD 57.10 (6.1.2) |
| (4) the formless sphere | the 4 kinds of beings therein | SD 57.10 (6.1.3) |
| (5) the 4 modes of perception | through the senses | SD 53.5 |
| (6) the 2 modes of personal identity | through the mind (conception) | SD 29.10 (3) |
| (7) all (<i>sabba</i>) | the sensed; sense-objects; sense-consciousness | SD 7.1 |
| (8) nirvana | as concepts and as the unconditioned | SD 50.1 (3.3.2) |

All the subcategories or “bases” (*vatthu*) of each of these 8 grounds total **24 bases** [1.2.2]. In fact, these 24 bases are the “roots” of being and existences, fully understanding which frees us from suffering and rebirth.

4.3.1 The ordinary person (*assutavā puthujjanā*) [§§3-26] is one who lacks a full understanding (*apariññāta*) of true reality, who, at best, has only a basic theoretical knowledge of the noble truths (*sacca,-ñāṇa*).

4.3.2 The learner on the path (*sekha*) [§§27-50]

The “learners,” ie, who know and see directly into true reality, and are on the path to arhathood, are the streamwinner, the once-returned and the non-returned—they will develop full understanding (*pariññeyya*) of the 4 noble truths for certain in due time. The streamwinner will be reborn for only 7 more births; the once-returned only once more; and the non-returned will arise in the pure abodes,²⁶ no more arising in this world. As for the learners, they will never fall into any of the subhuman states (the asura, preta, animals or hell-beings).

4.3.3 The arhat [§§51-146]

4.3.3.1 An arhat is one liberated from the 3 unwholesome roots—greed, hate and delusion—through gaining full understanding (*pariññāta*) of the noble truths. These 4 categories of arhats do not seem to be the 4 kinds of arhat well known in the Commentaries—that is, the 6-knowledge arhat, the 3-knowledge arhat, the arhat freed both ways, and the wisdom-freed arhat.²⁷

4.3.3.2 From the Sutta Commentary, the 1st kind arhat [§51-74] is simply a general definition of one who has overcome *all* the 3 unwholesome roots—lust, hate and delusion (MA 1:44 f). The Sutta tells us that the arhat does *not* conceive any ideas in terms of the 24 bases (*vatthu*)²⁸ [1.2.2] listed for **2 reasons**: he has fully understood the bases, and he has totally removed the 3 unwholesome roots²⁹ [4.3.3.1]. Apparently, this is what describes **Arhat 1** [3rd cycle: §§51-74].

4.3.3.3 Arhat 2 [4th cycle: §§75-98] refers to one who frees himself from lust (*rāga*) by seeing its dangers by dwelling in the contemplation of suffering (*dukkhānupassī*). With this, he develops **the freedom of the undirected concentration** (*appaṇihita, vimokha*) (MA 1:44,20 f). With this freedom, he also fully understands the dangers of the other 2 roots, and so becomes an arhat (MA 1:44,29-34).

4.3.3.4 Arhat 3 [5th cycle: §§99-122] refers to one who frees himself from hate (*dosa*) by seeing its dangers by dwelling in the contemplation of impermanence (*aniccānupassī*). With this, he develops **the freedom of the signless** (*animitta, vimokha*) (MA 1:44,22 f). With this freedom, he also fully understands the dangers of the other 2 roots, and so becomes an arhat (MA 1:44,29-34).

4.3.3.5 Arhat 4 [6th cycle: §§123-146] refers to one who frees himself from delusion (*moha*) by seeing its dangers by dwelling in the contemplation of non-self (*anattā'nupassī*). With this, he develops **the freedom of the empty** (*suññata, vimokha*) (MA 1:44,23-25). With this freedom, he also fully understands the dangers of the other 2 roots, and so becomes an arhat (MA 1:44,29-34).

4.3.4 The tathagata [§§147-194]

4.3.4.1 The Sutta lists 2 kinds of buddhas. **Tathagata 1** [7th cycle: §§147-170] seems to be a generic description of a buddha, awakened one. The Sutta simply says in its refrain: “Because he has the Tathagata’s full understanding of it [the root of existence], I say.” We can take this description as an explana-

²⁶ See SD 10.16 (13.1.6); SD 23.14 (Table 3).

²⁷ SD 1.8 (2.2.3); SD 4.25 (6.3) summary.

²⁸ The 24 bases (*vatthu*) are: the 4 elements, beings, the 3 kinds of beings and gods, the 5 form spheres, the 4 formless spheres, the 4 modes of perception, the 4 modes of personal identity. [1.2.2]

²⁹ *Vatthussa ca pariññātattā akusala, mūlānañ ca samucchinnattā* (MA 1:44,15-18).

tion of the 3rd of the Buddha's 9 virtues (*navāraha,guṇa*): “accomplished in wisdom and conduct” (*vijjā,-caraṇa,sampanno*).

While **Tathagata 1** represents the Buddha “as he is (what he knows),” that is, in terms of his liberating wisdom (*vijjā*), that is, of “what he knows,” **Tathagata 2** [4.3.4.2] describes the Buddha in terms of his conduct of compassion, that is, of “what he does”: teaching the Buddha Dhamma for our benefit and being the exemplar or ideal for our spiritual life.³⁰

4.3.4.2 Tathagata 2 [8th cycle” §§171-194] describes the buddha—that is, Gotama Buddha—who, like the arhats, has *both* fully understood (*pariññāta*) the noble truths and also won full self-awakening. The only difference is that the Buddha is *the first* to arise in the world, *followed* by the arhats,³¹ and his wisdom and compassion are incomparable.³²

This is the Buddha who understands that “delight is the root of suffering.” This is the essence of the teaching of **the Mūla,pariyāya Sutta**, “the discourse on the root teaching,” which goes right down into the root of all existence.

4.3.4.3 Technically, the 2 sections on the “Tathagata” may be taken as describing the 2 kinds of buddhas who appear in the world. **The fully self-awakened buddha** (*sammā,sambuddha*) is fully endowed with *the wisdom, compassion and skillful means* of giving teachings so that there are disciples (*sāvaka*), liberated just like him, following him. On account of this historical Buddha, we have to this day his teachings that leads us to the path of awakening, so that we, too, are able to be liberated in the same way.

The 2nd kind of self-awakened one is **the pratyeka-buddha** (*pacceka,buddha*) who arises “self-awakened” (*sambuddha*) just like the *sammā,sambuddha*, but does not effectively teach the Dhamma to establish a dispensation. The usual reason for this is that he arises at a time when the conditions do not conduce to spiritual cultivation, such as the human lifespan is either too long (beyond 100,000 years) or too short (less than 100 years).

5 Brahma,nimantanika Sutta

5.1 The Mūla,pariyāya Sutta and **the Brahma,nimantanika Sutta** (M 49) were given by the Buddha at the Subhaga Grove, outside Ukkaṭṭhā. The similarity in formulation and theme between these 2 suttas—along with the **Mūla,pariyāya Jātaka** (J 245), perhaps the only suttas recorded as originating at Ukkaṭṭhā—is striking.

The Brahma,nimantanika Sutta may be taken as a *dramatic* narration of the same ideas presented in the Mūla,pariyāya Sutta in *abstract* philosophical terms. In this case, Brahmā Baka represents a *being* (*bhava*) or personality (*sakkāya*) in his most eminent existential form, blindly engaged in the activity of **conceiving** (*maññanā*), sustaining himself by delusions of *permanence, pleasure and selfhood*. Underlying being is *craving*, symbolized by Māra—seemingly inconspicuous in the assembly, yet he is the real creator of all the conceivings, the one who holds the entire universe—the sense world, the form world and the formless world—in his grip.

5.2 Alliance between Brahmā and Māra, God and the Devil, an unimaginable union from the perspective of Western theism—but real enough when we consider divine politicking (struggle for power)—points to

³⁰ See SD 15.7 (2.2; 3.3).

³¹ See **Sambuddha S** (S 22.58), SD 49.10; **Pavāraṇā S** (S 8.7), SD 49.11.

³² See **Buddhānussati**, SD 15.7 (3).

the thirst for *continued being* as the hidden root of all world-affirmation, whether theistic or non-theistic.

In the Brahma, nimantanika Sutta itself, the superficial theoretical contest between Baka and the Buddha soon gives way to a gripping deep-level confrontation between Māra and the Buddha—Māra (as craving) demanding an affirmation of being, the awakened one (as liberation) pointing to the cessation of being through the uprooting of delight.

6 Saṅkhyā

6.1 CLINGING TO VIEWS

The Buddha teaches that **clinging to views** is one of the 4 forms of clinging that holds the mind to suffering.³³ As such, he recommends that we renounce such clinging, not only to views in their full-blown form by way of a strong mindset, but also in their rudimentary form as the categories and connections that the mind project as experience and reality (that is, as virtual reality).

6.2 REJECTING UPANISHADIC VIEWS

6.2.1 Brahmin monks

Although the Mūla, pariyāya Sutta reveals nothing of the background of his audience, the Commentary informs us that before his audience of 500 became monks, they were **brahmins**, and that even after their ordination they continued to interpret the Buddha's teachings in light of their brahminical learning, which was thus some kind of early Upanishadic or proto-Sāṅkhyā philosophy. Understandably, then, the Buddha opens his teaching by saying: "I will teach you the sequence of the root of all phenomena," which prepares them to hear his analysis of their views.

In fact, the list of topics covered by the Buddha in the Sutta reads like a Buddhist "Sāṅkhyā." As in classical Sāṅkhyā, it contains **24 topics** or "bases" (*vatthu*), beginning with the physical world (here, the 4 primary elements), which is then analyzed into more refined and inclusive levels of being and experience, culminating in the ultimate unconditioned: nirvana (*nibbāna*). In Sāṅkhyā terms, nirvana then would be the ultimate "root" or ground of being immanent in all things and out of which they all emanate.

In fact, these 24 bases are the "roots" of being and existences, fully understanding them frees us from suffering and rebirth.

6.2.2 Upanishadic teachings

6.2.2.1 Clearly, the thesis of the Mūla, pariyāya Sutta is the Buddha's response and rejection of brahminical ideas evolving in his time, that is, Upanishadic philosophy, especially the roots of **the Saṅkhyā** (Skt *sāṅkhyā*) or classification school. Philosophers who held this view offered a variety of theories, based on logic and meditative experience, regarding the nature of the ultimate root and about the hierarchy of the emanation.

Many of their theories were recorded in the Upanishads and eventually developed into the classical Sāṅkhyā-system around the time of the Buddha. As a school, Sāṅkhyā was formulated by the ideas of **Uddālaka Āruṇī**, a 9th-century BCE Indian philosopher, who held that a "root" was an abstract principle out of which all things emanated and which was immanent in all things.

³³ The 4 kinds of clinging (*upādāna*) are those to: (1) sense-pleasures (*kāmūpādāna*), (2) views (*diṭṭhūpādāna*), (3) vows and rituals (*sīla-b, batūpādāna*), and (4) the self-doctrine (*atta, vādūpādāna*): see **Mahā, nidāna S** (D 15.6), SD 5.17; **Sammā Diṭṭhi S** (M 9.34), SD 11.14.

6.2.2.2 We see a close parallel of the style and content of the Mūlapariyāya Sutta in **the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad**, one of the oldest Upanishads, where, when Yajñavalkya questions his pupil, Āruṇī about the “inner controller,” the latter gives a long reply beginning thus:

Who is present but is different from the earth, whom the earth knows not, whose body is the earth, and who controls the earth from within—he is this self (*ātman*), the inner controller, the immortal. (Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 3.7.3)

He then goes on to say the same of water, fire, the intermediate quarters, the wind, the sky, the sun, the quarters, the moon, space, darkness, light, all beings, the breath, speech, sight, hearing, the mind, skin, perception and semen. (BĀU 3.7.3-23).

The Buddha rejects all such ideas as “conceivings” of the uninstructed worldling, one ignorant of true reality. Hence, the Buddha addresses the very heart of these monks’ mindset, the remnants of their brahminical training. Understandably, they do *not* rejoice in this!

6.3 REMOVING THE ROOT

Rejecting the Upanishadic views, the Buddha attacks them at their very roots: the abstract idea of a principle, the “in” (immanence) and “out of” (emanation) projected onto our experiences. Only an uninstructed, ignorant person, declares the Buddha, would see experience in this way. A person undergoing proper training would look for a different kind of “root”—the root of suffering that arises in the present—in the act of delight itself.

Applying dispassion towards that delight, the practitioner would then understand the true nature of the process of coming-into-being, not participating in it at all, and so gaining true awakening.³⁴ Hence, we can also see the Mūlapariyāya Sutta as a grand discourse on **non-self**, uprooting all the bases this insidious wrong view can arise from.

6.4 WHY THE MONKS DID NOT UNDERSTAND THE SUTTA

6.4.1 We have noted that the Buddha’s audience are the 500 brahmin monks, overcome with **conceit** [2]. Having heard the Buddha’s discourse, they “did *not* rejoice in the Blessed One’s word” [§196]. The Commentary explains why. They are unable to understand the discourse at all! It was like delicious foods placed before them but their mouths are gagged with a thick broad cloth!

Yet, did the Buddha not fulfil the perfections (*pāramī*) for 4 immeasurables and a 100,000 aeons and attain omniscience just for the purpose of teaching the Dharma to others so that they are able to understand it? The reason for this has been given in the Commentary, that is, he gave this teaching for the sake of shattering the conceit of the 500 brahmin monks, erstwhile students of the 3 Vedas, in whom the conceit of learning had arisen. (MA 1:56,5-14)

6.4.2 They thought that, on account of their erudition, they understood everything that the Buddha teaches, and so they are as good as the teacher [MA 1:16,23-17,9]. However, when they heard the Mūlapariyāya Sutta, they failed to understand it. They thought: “Previously, we understood whatever the Buddha taught. But now we cannot make anything out of this! The buddhas are indeed immeasurable and unfathomable!”

Thus, they became humble like snakes with their fangs extracted. They now respectfully attended to the Buddha and listened to the Dhamma. Hence, in not understanding the Sutta, these arrogant brahmins learned humility, which is, after all, the purpose of the Sutta teaching. (MA 1:56,5-14)

³⁴ Bh Ṭhānissaro, Mūlapariyāya S tr, 2001 Intro.

6.5 In this connection, the Buddha then related **the Mūla,pariyāya Jātaka** (J 245), they were 500 brahmin youths who were pupils of the Bodhisattva. At that time, too, they were arrogant and despised their teacher. However, they were taught a lesson in due course, after which they respected their teacher.³⁵ (MA 1:57-59)

— — —

Mūla,pariyāya Sutta

The Discourse on the Root Teaching

M 1

[1]

1 Thus have I heard.

At one time the Blessed One was staying at the foot of the royal sal tree in the Subhaga Grove³⁶ near Ukkaṭṭhā.³⁷

There, the Blessed One addressed the monks, “Bhikshus!”

“Venerable sir! [IBhadante]” the monks answered the Blessed One in assent.

The Blessed One said:

2 “I will show you, bhikshus, **the exposition³⁸ on the root of all things.**³⁹

Listen, pay close attention to it, I will speak.”

“Yes, bhante.” The monks answered the Blessed One in assent.

The Blessed One said:

³⁵ See **Mūla,pariyāya J** (J 245), SD 11.9.

³⁶ “Grove,” *vana*. Comy says there are 2 kinds of groves: one that is planted and one that is self-sown or growing on its own (ie cultivated or wild). The cultivated groves were the Bamboo Grove (*veḷu,vana*), Jeta’s Grove, etc; the wild groves were the Dark Woods (*andha,vana*), the Great Grove (*mahā,vana*), Añjana Grove, and Subhaga Grove (MA 1:11). The Chinese version of the sutta agrees on this venue, 優迦羅 *yōu jiā luó* (EĀ 44.6 = T2.766a-b).

³⁷ Ukkaṭṭhā was a town in Kosala near the Himalayas. It was given as a fief (*brahma,deyya*) to Pokkharasāti by Pasenadi of Kosala in recognition of the former’s skills. It was densely populated and had much grassland, woodland and maize (D 1:87; DA 1:245). When the Buddha was staying in the Icchā,naṅgala woods nearby, Pokkharasāti first sent his pupil Ambaṭṭha and then went himself to see the Buddha (D 3/1:87 ff). Ukkaṭṭha was connected by road to Setavyā (A 2:37), along which the youth Chatta of Setavyā travelled to learn from Pokkharasāti at Ukkaṭṭhā (Vv 5.3; VvA 229). The same road also led to Vesālī (J 2:259).

³⁸ “Exposition,” *pariyāya*. Comy: The word occurs in the texts in the sense of teaching (*desanā*), cause (*karaṇa*), and occasion, time or turn (*vāra*). Here it has the meaning of **teaching and cause**. Ñāṇamoli’s *Glossary* gives the following definitions: (1) metaphor, figure of speech; (2) manner, way, method; (3) presentation, discourse [def. MA 1:18, 89]; (4) p[accatta]-vacana [nominative case]—paraphrase: KhpA 16.

³⁹ “The exposition on the root of all things,” *sabba,dhamma,mūla,pariyāya*. This is the sutta’s full title (MA 1:16 f). It refers to the special condition that maintains the continuity of the process of cyclic existence. The Majjhima Tīkā explains this to be craving, conceit and views, that is, the roots of mental conceiving (*maññanā*) or mental proliferation (*papañca*) (Nm 280; Vbh 393; Nett 37 f). PED defines *maññanā* as “conceit”; Ñāṇamoli (1994:83): “conceit, conceiving”; CPED: “imagination, illusion.” See **Madhu,piṇḍika S** (M 18,15-19/1:111-113) & Bodhi 1980:49 f.

THE 1ST CYCLE: THE IGNORANT ORDINARY PERSON (*has not fully understood x*)

3 “Here, bhikshus, **an ignorant ordinary person** [uninstructed worldling]⁴⁰ who has no regard for noble ones,⁴¹ is unskilled in the dharma of the noble ones, undisciplined in the Dharma of the noble ones, who has no regard for the true persons,⁴² is unskilled in the dharma of the true persons, undisciplined in the dharma of the true persons,

The 4 elements (1)

3.2 [1] ⁴³ perceives ⁴⁴ earth as	earth. ⁴⁵
Having perceived <u>earth</u> as	earth. ⁴⁶
he <u>conceives</u> ⁴⁷ (himself as)	earth;

⁴⁰ “The ignorant ordinary person,” *assutavā puthujjana*, is the common person of the world who has neither learning nor spiritual maturity in the Dharma of the noble ones, and allows himself to be dominated by the various defilements and wrong views. Cf M 1:7, 135, 3:17; S 3:3, 113; Dhs 1003, 1217. See Bodhi 1980:40-46.

⁴¹ “The noble ones,” *ariya*, that is, buddhas, pratyeka-buddhas, and the saints of the path. See foll n.

⁴² “True persons,” *sappurisā*, usually refer to the pratyeka-buddhas and the saints (SA 2:251). In this case the buddhas alone are regarded as the “noble ones” (MA 1:21, 24; Nc 76; DhsA 349). On a worldly level, virtuous disciples such as those who respect their parents are called “true persons” (AA 3:251).

⁴³ These number in [square brackets] refer to **the 24 bases** (*vatthu*) of each the 8 cycles in this Sutta [1.2.2].

⁴⁴ “Perceives,” *sañjānāti*, refers to a sense-experience before the mind filters, shapes and colours it. However, in the case of one who is spiritually weak, even at this stage, such a conscious experience is often biased by wrong view, esp taking the impermanent to be permanent, the painful as pleasurable, the nonself as having an abiding entity. However, this negative tendency becomes strongly habituated at the “**conceiving**” (*maññanā*) level. While the ordinary person is said to “perceive” (*sañjānāti*) each of the elements or the spheres, the noble learner (*sekha*) [27n] is said to “directly know” (*abhiñānāti*) them. The learner knows them as they really are through direct knowledge that they are *impermanent, unsatisfactory and nonself*. See foll 3 nn.

⁴⁵ “He perceives earth as earth.” *paṭhavim paṭhavito sañjānāti*. Although perceiving ‘earth as earth’ refers to seeing an object as it really is, in the context of insight, it is clear that the ordinary person’s perception of ‘earth as earth’ already introduces some distortion of the object, that will profoundly distort the cognitive process into ‘conceiving.’ Comy explains that the ordinary person seizes upon the conventional expression “it is earth,” and applying this to the object, perceives it through a “perversion of perception” (*saññā vipallāsa*) (MA 1:25). The term *vipallāsa* refers to the perceiving of the impermanent as permanent, the painful as pleasurable, the not-self as self, and the foul as beautiful (A 4.49/2:52). See M 1:185, 329, 421; Vism 352.

⁴⁶ Comy says that there are 4 wrong ways of regarding the body due to mental conceivings and false views: (1) he sees physical form as self; (2) he sees self in physical form; (3) he thinks self is other than physical form; (4) he sees self as having physical form or physical form as in self (MA 1:31). The first is an annihilationist view; the rest are eternalist views. A simpler (and more common) application of these 4 self-views is found in such suttas as **Pāruleyya S** (S 22.81/3:94-99).

⁴⁷ “He conceives,” *maññati*, “he thinks.” This is the predominant verb here. The verb *maññati* is often used in the suttas to refer to distorted thinking, that is, ascribing to an object or experience characteristics and significance that are not derived from that object or experience, but from one’s own subjective imaginings (*maññanā*). “The cognitive distortion introduced by conceiving consists, in brief, in the intrusion of the egocentric perspective into the experience already slightly distorted by spontaneous perception.” (M:ÑB 1162 n6). Comy explains that **the 3 types of conceiving** (*maññanā*) can be applied here in this manner: (1) when a person is attached to beings as a result of sight, hearing, etc or desires rebirth in a certain class of beings, this is conceiving due to craving; (2) when he regards himself as “superior,” “inferior” or “equal” with others, this is conceiving due to conceit; (3) when he thinks, “Beings are

he conceives (himself) in earth;
 he conceives (himself apart) from earth;
 he conceives, 'Earth is mine.'
 —He delights in earth.
 Why is that? Because he **lacks full understanding**,⁴⁸ I say.

4 [2] He perceives **water** as water.
 Having perceived water as water:
 he conceives (himself as) water;
 he conceives (himself) in water;
 he conceives (himself apart) from water;
 he conceives, 'Water is mine.'
 —He delights in water.
 Why is that? Because he *lacks* full understanding of it, I say.

5 [3] He perceives **fire** as fire.
 Having perceived fire as fire:
 he conceives (himself as) fire;
 he conceives (himself) in fire;
 he conceives (himself apart) from fire;
 he conceives, 'Fire is mine.'
 —He delights in fire.
 Why is that? Because he *lacks* full understanding of it, I say.

6 [4] He perceives **wind [air]** as wind [air].
 Having perceived wind as wind:
 he conceives (himself as) wind;
 he conceives (himself) in wind;
 he conceives (himself apart) from wind;
 he conceives, 'Wind is mine.'
 —He delights in wind.
 Why is that? Because he *lacks* full understanding of it, I say. [2]

Beings and gods (1)

7 [5] He perceives **beings**⁴⁹ as beings.
 Having perceived beings as beings:
 he conceives beings;
 he conceives (himself) in beings;
 he conceives (himself apart) from beings;
 he conceives, 'Beings are mine.'
 —He delights in beings.
 Why is that? Because he lacks full understanding of it, I say.

permanent, stable, etc," this is conceiving due to views. (MA 1:26, 32). For a shorter version of this teaching, see for example **Nakula, pitā S** (S 22.1/ 3:1-5).

⁴⁸ "Lack of full understanding," *apariññāta*. See Intro (3).

⁴⁹ "Beings," *bhūta*. Comy says that here "beings" signifies only living beings below the heaven of the 4 great kings, the lower the sense-sphere heavens. The higher levels of beings are designated by the terms that follow. Qu Vbh 354. See §3 & n.

THE SENSE-SPHERE GODS

8 [6] He perceives **gods**⁵⁰ [devas] as gods.
 Having perceived gods as gods:
 he conceives gods;
 he conceives (himself) in gods;
 he conceives (himself apart) from gods;
 he conceives, 'Gods are mine.'
 —He delights in gods.
 Why is that? Because he *lacks* full understanding of it, I say.

9 [7] He perceives **Prajāpati**⁵¹ as Prajāpati [God].
 Having perceived Prajāpati as Prajāpati:
 he conceives Prajāpati;
 he conceives (himself) in Prajāpati;
 he conceives (himself apart) from Prajāpati;
 he conceives, 'Prajāpati is mine.'
 —He delights in Prajāpati.
 Why is that? Because he *lacks* full understanding of it, I say.

THE 4 FORM-SPHERE GODS (1)

THE 1ST-DHYANA SPHERE

10 [8] He perceives **Brahmā**⁵² as Brahmā.
 Having perceived Brahmā as Brahmā:
 he conceives Brahmā;
 he conceives (himself) in Brahmā;
 he conceives (himself apart) from Brahmā;
 he conceives, 'Brahmā is mine.'
 —He delights in Brahmā.
 Why is that? Because he *lacks* full understanding of it, I say.

⁵⁰ "Gods," *devā*. Comy says that "gods" here refers to the 6 sense-sphere heavens, except for Māra and his retinue in the Para, nimmita, vasavatti heaven. On cosmology, see SD 57.10; also M:ÑB Intro 45-48.

⁵¹ "Pajāpati" (Skt *prajā, pati*, "lord of progeny"). Comy says this refers to **Māra** (*ettha pana māro pajāpatīti vedītabbo*, MA 1:33,31) [below]. "Several hymns of the tenth book of the Ṛgveda deal with the creation or evolution of the cosmos through entities or divinities newly devised to account for it. Among such entities we meet a Golden Embryo (Hiraṇya, garbha) out of whom the universe emanated, a god called All-Maker (Viśva, karman), a feminine entity called Voice or Sound (Vāc), and Time (Kāla). The first two divinities were consolidated into a new god called **Prajāpati**, the lord of progeny, conceived of as the father of the gods and of all things whatever." (Basham 1989: 22). In due course, by the time of the Mahābharata, Prajāpati's position was taken over by Brahmā who was generally recognized as the creator and protector of the world" (Basham 1989:74). Comy however says that Pajāpati here is a name for Māra the bad one [above] because he is the ruler of this generation (*pajā*) made up of living beings (MA 1:33 f). In contemporary terms, this would include the belief in a theistic **creator-God**.

⁵² "Brahmā" (*brahman*) here refers to Mahā Brahmā, the first deity to be reborn into the newly (re-)evolved universe at the beginning of the world-cycle (*kappa*) and whose life-span lasts for the entire cycle or world-period. Here, however, it is used in a generic sense (a synecdoche) that includes Brahmā's ministers (*brahma, purohitā*) and Brahmā's assembly (*brahma, pārisajja*) (MA 1:35). These 3 classes of beings are reborn according to their respectively strong, medium and full experience of the 1st dhyana (BDict: deva).

THE 2ND-DHYANA SPHERE

11 [9] He perceives **the gods of Ābhassarā [streaming radiance]**⁵³ as gods of Ābhassarā.
 Having perceived the Ābhassarā gods as Ābhassarā gods:
 he conceives Ābhassarā gods;
 he conceives (himself) in Ābhassarā gods;
 he conceives (himself apart) from Ābhassarā gods;
 he conceives, ‘Ābhassarā gods are mine.’
 —He delights in Ābhassarā gods.
 Why is that? Because he *lacks* full understanding of it, I say.

THE 3RD-DHYANA SPHERE

12 [10] He perceives **the gods of Subha,kiṇṇā [radiant glory]**⁵⁴ as gods of Subha,kiṇṇā.
 Having perceived the Subha,kiṇṇā gods as Subha,kiṇṇā gods:
 he conceives Subha,kiṇṇā gods;
 he conceives (himself) in Subha,kiṇṇā gods;
 he conceives (himself apart) from Subha,kiṇṇā gods;
 he conceives, ‘Subha,kiṇṇā gods are mine.’
 —He delights in Subha,kiṇṇā gods.
 Why is that? Because he *lacks* full understanding of it, I say.

THE 4TH-DHYANA SPHERE

13 [11] He perceives **the gods of Vaha-p,phalā [abundant fruit]**⁵⁵ as Vaha-p,phalā gods.
 Having perceived the Vaha-p,phalā gods as Vaha-p,phalā gods:
 he conceives Vaha-p,phalā gods;
 he conceives (himself) in Vaha-p,phalā gods;
 he conceives (himself apart) from Vaha-p,phalā gods;
 he conceives, ‘Vaha-p,phalā gods are mine.’
 —He delights in Vaha-p,phalā gods.
 Why is that? Because he *lacks* full understanding of it, I say.

14 [12] He perceives **the overcomers [Abhibhū]**⁵⁶ as the overcomers.
 Having perceived the overcomers as the overcomers:

⁵³ “The gods of streaming radiance” (*ābhassarā*). Comy: By mentioning these gods, all gods of the plane of the 2nd dhyana—that is, the gods of limited radiance (*paritt’ābhā*) and the gods of immeasurable radiance (*appamāṇ’ābhā*)—should be included, since they all occupy the same single plane. (MA 1:35). See **Saṅkhār’upapatti S** (M 120,19-22), where the generic term *ābhā devā* (gods of radiance) is used for all the 3 classes of gods here: see SD 3.4.

⁵⁴ “The gods of radiant glory” (*subha,kiṇṇā* or *subha,kiṇṇā*), alt tr “the gods of refulgent glory.” By mentioning these gods, all gods of the plane of the 3rd dhyana—that is, the gods of limited glory (*paritta,subhā*) and the gods of Immeasurable glory (*paritta,subhā*)—should be included, since they all occupy the same single plane (MA 1:35). See **Saṅkhār’upapatti S** (M 120.23-26), where the generic term *subhā deva* (gods of glory) is used for all the 3 classes of gods here (SD 3.4).

⁵⁵ “The gods of abundant fruit,” (*veha-p,phalā*) abide in the 4th dhyana plane.

⁵⁶ *Abhibhū* is the name of a deity (the overcomer or vanquisher) as well as a class of gods (the overcomers) in Vaha-p,phalā. Comy says that this is a designation for the non-percipient beings (*asañña,sattā*) who abide in the 4th dhyana form plane. The realm is so called because “it overcomes” (*abhibhavati*) the 4 formless aggregates [feeling, perception, mental formations, consciousness] (MA 1:35 f). M:ÑB however remarks that “The identification sounds contrived, especially because the word *abhibhū* is a masculine singular noun. [In **Brahma,nimantanika S**, M 49,5/1:327] the word appears as part of Baka the Brahmā’s claim to theocratic hegemony, yet MA rejects identifying the Abhibhū with Brahmā here as a redundancy.” (M:ÑB 1165 n15). See (5) above.

he conceives the overcomers;
 he conceives (himself) in the overcomers;
 he conceives (himself apart) from the overcomers;
 he conceives, 'The overcomers are mine.'
 —He delights in the overcomers.
 Why is that? Because he *lacks* full understanding of it, I say.

THE 4 FORMLESS SPHERES (1)

15 [13] He perceives **the sphere of infinite space**⁵⁷ as the sphere of infinite space.
 Having perceived the sphere of infinite space as the sphere of infinite space:
 he conceives the sphere of infinite space;
 he conceives (himself) in the sphere of infinite space;
 he conceives (himself apart) from the sphere of infinite space;
 he conceives, 'The sphere of infinite space is mine.'
 —He delights in the sphere of infinite space.
 Why is that? Because he lacks full understanding of it, I say.

16 [14] He perceives **the sphere of infinite consciousness** as the sphere of infinite consciousness.
 Having perceived the sphere of infinite consciousness as the sphere of infinite consciousness: **[3]**
 he conceives the sphere of infinite consciousness;
 he conceives (himself) in the sphere of infinite consciousness;
 he conceives (himself apart) from the sphere of infinite consciousness;
 he conceives, 'The sphere of infinite consciousness is mine.'
 —He delights in the sphere of infinite consciousness.
 Why is that? Because he *lacks* full understanding of it, I say.

17 [15] He perceives **the sphere of nothingness** as the sphere of nothingness.
 Having perceived the sphere of nothingness as the sphere of nothingness:
 he conceives the sphere of nothingness;
 he conceives (himself) in the sphere of nothingness;
 he conceives (himself apart) from the sphere of nothingness;
 he conceives, 'The sphere of nothingness is mine.'
 —He delights in the sphere of nothingness.
 Why is that? Because he *lacks* full understanding of it, I say.

18 [16] He perceives **the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception** as
 the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception.
 Having perceived the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception as
the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception:
 he conceives the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception;
 he conceives (himself) in the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception;
 he conceives (himself apart) from the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception;
 he conceives, 'The sphere of neither perception nor non-perception is mine.'

⁵⁷ "The sphere of infinite space" (*ākāsānañ, c'āyatana*). This and the next three sections [§§15-18] deal with mental conceiving in relation to the formless realms, the cosmological counterpart of the 4 formless attainments. The division on conceiving by way of planes or sphere (*āyatana*) ends with §18.

—He delights in the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception.
Why is that? Because he *lacks* full understanding of it, I say.

THE 4 MODES OF PERCEPTION⁵⁸ (1)

19 [17] He perceives **the seen** as the seen.
Having perceived the seen as the seen:
he conceives (himself as) the seen;
he conceives (himself) in the seen;
he conceives (himself apart) from the seen;
he conceives, ‘The seen is mine.’
—He delights in the seen.
Why is that? Because he *lacks* full understanding of it, I say.

20 [18] He perceives **the heard** as the heard.
Having perceived the heard as the heard:
he conceives (himself as) the heard;
he conceives (himself) in the heard;
he conceives (himself apart) from the heard;
he conceives, ‘The heard is mine.’
—He delights in the heard.
Why is that? Because he *lacks* full understanding of it, I say.

21 [19] He perceives **the sensed**⁵⁹ as the sensed.
Having perceived the sensed as the sensed:
he conceives (himself as) the sensed;
he conceives (himself) in the sensed;
he conceives (himself apart) from the sensed;
he conceives, ‘The sensed is mine.’
—He delights in the sensed.
Why is that? Because he *lacks* full understanding of it, I say.

22 [20] He perceives **the known** as the known.
Having perceived the known as the known:
he conceives (himself as) the known;
he conceives (himself) in the known;
he conceives (himself apart) from the known;
he conceives, ‘The known is mine.’
—He delights in the known.
Why is that? Because he *lacks* full understanding of it, I say.

⁵⁸ The 4 passages of this section deal with conceiving through the objects of the 4 means of perception—the seen (*diṭṭha*), the heard (*suta*), the sensed (*muta*) and the known (*viññāta*)—that is, by way of seeing, hearing, sensing and cognizing. Here, the “**sensed**” (*muta*) comprises the data of smell, taste and touch; the “**known**,” the data of introspection, abstract thought and imagination. The objects of perception are “**conceived**” when they are known in terms of “This is mine,” “I am this” and “This is my self” or in other ways that generate craving, conceit and views, which, in turn, fuel such conceivings. See *Diṭṭha suta muta viññāta*, SD 53.5.

⁵⁹ “Sensed,” *muta*, see prec n.

THE MODES OF PERSONAL IDENTITY⁶⁰ (1)

23 [21] He perceives **unity** as unity.
 Having perceived unity as unity:
 he conceives (himself as) unity;
 he conceives (himself) in unity;
 he conceives (himself apart) from unity;
 he conceives, 'Unity is mine.'
 —He delights in unity (as identity).
 Why is that? Because he *lacks* full understanding of it, I say.

24 [22] He perceives **diversity** as diversity.
 Having perceived diversity as diversity:
 he conceives (himself as) diversity;
 he conceives (himself) in diversity;
 he conceives (himself apart) from diversity;
 he conceives, 'Diversity is mine.'
 —He delights in diversity (as identity).
 Why is that? Because he *lacks* full understanding of it, I say.

25 [23] He perceives **all** as all.⁶¹
 Having perceived *all* as all:
 he conceives (himself as) all; **[4]**
 he conceives (himself) in all;
 he conceives (himself apart) from all;
 he conceives, 'All is mine.'
 —He delights in all (as identity).
 Why is that? Because he *lacks* full understanding of it, I say.

⁶⁰ In the first 2 sections [§§23-24] of this division, the perception of personal identity is dealt with in 2 ways: by way of *unity* and of *diversity*. Comy explains that the emphasis on **unity** or oneness (*ekatta*) is characteristic of one who attains the dhyanas (*jhāna*) in which the mind occurs in a single mode on a single object. The emphasis of **diversity** (*nānatta*) is characteristic of the non-attainer who lack the profound experience of dhyana (MA 1:37 f). Conceiving that are centred around diversity are expressed in philosophies of *pluralism*; conceptions focused on unity are rooted in philosophies of *monism*.

⁶¹ "All as all" (*sabbam sabbato*), lit "all from all." In this section, all perceptions of personal identity are shown as singlefold. Such an idea can be the basis for pantheistic ("God is everywhere") or monistic ("everything is one") notions, depending on the relationship perceived between the self and all. **Thānissaro** makes an interesting observation here: "Although at present we rarely think in the same terms as the Samkhya philosophers, there has long been—and still is—a common tendency to create a 'Buddhist' metaphysics in which the experience of emptiness, the unconditioned, the Dharma-body, Buddha-nature, rigpa, etc, is said to function as the ground of being from which the 'all'—the entirety of our sensory and mental experience—is said to spring and to which we return when we meditate. Some people think that these theories are the inventions of scholars without any direct meditative experience, but actually they have most often originated among meditators, who label (or in the words of the discourse, 'perceive') a particular meditative experience as the ultimate goal, identify with it in a subtle way (as when we are told that "we are the knowing"), and then view that level of experience as the ground of being out of which all other experience comes." (M 1 tr Intro <http://www.accesstosight.org/canon/sutta/majjhima/mn001-tb0.html>) [1.2.2]

26 [24] He perceives **nirvana** as nirvana.⁶²
 Having perceived nirvana as nirvana:
 he conceives (himself as) nirvana;
 he conceives (himself) in nirvana;
 he conceives (himself apart) from nirvana;
 he conceives, 'Nirvana is mine.'
 —He delights in nirvana (as identity).
 Why is that? Because he *lacks* full understanding of it, I say.

THE 2ND CYCLE: THE LEARNER ON THE PATH⁶³ (should not delight in)

27 Here, bhikshus, a monk who is a **learner** [one in the higher training],⁶⁴
 who has not won mental perfection,⁶⁵
 and who still dwells aspiring to win the supreme security from bondage,⁶⁶

The 4 elements (2)

27.2 [1] directly knows earth as earth.⁶⁷
 Having directly known earth as earth:
 let him not conceive⁶⁸ (himself as) earth;
 let him not conceive (himself) in earth;
 let him *not* conceive (himself apart) from earth;
 let him not conceive, 'Earth is mine.'

⁶² "Nirvana as nirvana" (*nibbāṇam nibbānato*), lit "nirvana from nirvana." Comy says that nirvana here refers to the 5 kinds of "supreme nirvana here and now" (*parama, diṭṭha, dhamma, nibbāna*) of the 62 grounds for wrong view listed in **Brahma, jāla S** (D 1,3.19-25/1:36-38), ie, nirvana identified with the total enjoyment of sense-pleasures or with each of the 4 dhyanas. Craving causes us to enjoy this state or to lust after it. Conceit causes us to pride oneself as having attained it. Views make us imagine an illusory nirvana that is permanent, pleasurable and an abiding self. (MA 1:38).

⁶³ "Learner on the path," **sekha**, alt tr "trainee," that is, a noble learner, a disciple in the higher training, a saint on the path to awakening. Simply, the term applies to any of the 3 types of saints not yet an arhat, ie the stream-winner, the once-returned and the non-returned. Technically, in terms of the path and fruition, there are 7 such learners or saints, except for the arhat who has won fruition (*arahatta, phala*), who is "beyond training" (*asekha*, ie "non-learner"). The ordinary person is in this context called "one who is neither learner nor non-learner" (*ne'va sekha nāsekha*) [1st cycle]. Cf Pug 23-25.

⁶⁴ The learner—a streamwinner, a once-returned or a non-returned—is on the path of "higher training" (*adhisikkhā*), ie, the true training in moral virtue, concentration and wisdom (heading for nirvana): **Sekha S** (M 53/1:353-359), SD 21.14.

⁶⁵ *Appatta, mānaso anuttaram* (as complement to *sekha*). Comy: "one with a mind that has not attained arhat-hood" (*appattam mānasam etena ... appattārahattam*, MA 1:40,34 f = 41,5).

⁶⁶ *Yoga-k, khemaṃ patthayamāno viharati*.

⁶⁷ While the ordinary person is said to "perceive" (*sañjāṇāti*) each of the elements or bases, the noble learner is said to "directly know" (*abhiñāṇāti*) them. The learner knows them as they really are, through wisdom, that they are *impermanent, unsatisfactory and non-self*. How the learner's "direct knowledge" has yet to fully penetrate into true reality and nirvana. See §3 n on "perceives."

⁶⁸ "Let him not (ie, he should not) conceive," *mā maññi* throughout: the Buddha instruct him directly, as it were, since he is amenable; cf §51.2 ad loc n.

—He *should not* delight in earth.
Why is that? So that he would have full understanding (*pariññeyya*) of it, I say.⁶⁹

28 [2] He directly knows **water** as water.
Having directly known water as water:
let him not conceive (himself as) water;
let him not conceive (himself) in water;
let him not conceive (himself apart) from water;
let him not conceive, 'Water is mine.'
—He *should not* delight in water.
Why is that? So that he *would have full understanding* of it, I say.

29 [3] He directly knows **fire** as fire.
Having directly known fire as fire:
let him not conceive (himself as) fire;
let him not conceive (himself) in fire;
let him not conceive (himself apart) from fire;
let him not conceive, 'Fire is mine.'
—He *should not* delight in fire.
Why is that? So that he *would have full understanding* of it, I say.

30 [4] He directly knows **wind** as wind [air as air].
Having directly known wind as wind:
let him not conceive (himself as) wind;
let him not conceive (himself) in wind;
let him not conceive (himself apart) from wind;
let him not conceive, 'Wind is mine.'
—He *should not* delight in wind.
Why is that? So that he *would have full understanding* of it, I say.

Beings and gods (2)

31 [5] He directly knows beings [§6] as beings.
Having directly known beings as beings:
he should *not* [let him not] conceive beings;
let him not conceive (himself) in beings;
let him not conceive (himself apart) from beings;
let him not conceive, 'Beings are mine.'
—He *should not* delight in beings.
Why is that? So that he *would have full understanding* of it, I say.

⁶⁹ *Taṃ kissa hetu. Pariññeyyam tassā ti vadāmi. Conceiving and delighting* should be avoided because the dispositions connected with such mental processes linger on within us. The learner on the path refrains from such conceiving and delighting so as to gain a full understanding (*pariññā*) of the noble truths. On attaining streamwinning, we eradicate the fetter of self-identity view (*sakkāya diṭṭhi*) and thus no longer conceive in terms of wrong view (esp greed and hate). However, the subtler defilements of craving and conceit are only uprooted when we attain arhathood. As such, the learner might still fall into mental conceiving. Like the arhat, the learner has direct knowledge (*abhiññā*), but only the arhat has fully understood (*pariññā*), which entails the total abandonment of all defilements (greed, hate and delusion). See MA 1:42.

THE SENSE-SPHERE GODS

32 [6] He directly knows **gods** as gods.
 Having directly known gods as gods:
 let him not conceive gods;
 let him not conceive (himself) in gods;
 let him not conceive (himself apart) from gods;
 let him not conceive, ‘Gods are mine.’
 —He should not delight in gods.
 Why is that? So that he *would have* full understanding of it, I say.

33 [7] He directly knows **Prajāpati** [§9] as Prajāpati.⁷⁰
 Having directly known Prajāpati as Prajāpati:
 let him not conceive Prajāpati;
 let him not conceive (himself) in Prajāpati;
 let him not conceive (himself apart) from Prajāpati;
 let him not conceive, ‘Prajāpati is mine.’
 —He should not delight in Prajāpati.
 Why is that? So that he *would have* full understanding of it, I say.

THE 4 FORM-SPHERE GODS (2)**THE 1ST-DHYANA SPHERE**

34 [8] He directly knows **Brahmā** as Brahmā.
 Having directly known Brahmā as Brahmā:
 let him not conceive [let him not] Brahmā;
 let him not conceive (himself) in Brahmā;
 let him not conceive (himself apart) from Brahmā;
 let him not conceive, ‘Brahmā is mine.’
 —He should not delight in Brahmā.
 Why is that? So that he *would have* full understanding of it, I say.

THE 2ND-DHYANA SPHERE

35 [9] He directly knows **the Ābhassarā gods** as Ābhassarā gods.
 Having directly known Ābhassarā gods as Ābhassarā gods:
 let him not conceive Ābhassarā gods;
 let him not conceive (himself) in Ābhassarā gods;
 let him not conceive (himself apart) from Ābhassarā gods;
 let him not conceive, ‘Ābhassarā gods are mine.’
 —He should not delight in Ābhassarā gods.
 Why is that? So that he *would have* full understanding of it, I say.

THE 3RD-DHYANA SPHERE

36 [10] He directly knows **the Subha,kiṇṇā gods** as Subha,kiṇṇā gods.
 Having directly known Subha,kiṇṇā gods as Subha,kiṇṇā gods:
 let him not conceive Subha,kiṇṇā gods;

⁷⁰ This means that he well understand such a concept. Pajāpati here clearly (from the context) represents what we would today construe as some kind of “God” (creator, etc). See §9 n.

let him not conceive (himself) in Subha,kiṇṇā gods;
 let him not conceive (himself apart) from Subha,kiṇṇā gods;
 let him not conceive, 'Subha,kiṇṇā gods are mine.'
 —He should not delight in Subha,kiṇṇā gods.
 Why is that? So that he *would have* full understanding of it, I say.

THE 4TH-DHYANA SPHERE

37 [11] He directly knows **the Vaha-p,phalā gods** as Vaha-p,phalā gods.
 Having directly known Vaha-p,phalā gods as Vaha-p,phalā gods:
 let him not conceive Vaha-p,phalā gods;
 let him not conceive (himself) in Vaha-p,phalā gods;
 let him not conceive (himself apart) from Vaha-p,phalā gods;
 let him not conceive, 'Vaha-p,phalā gods are mine.'
 —He should not delight in Vaha-p,phalā gods.
 Why is that? So that he *would have* full understanding of it, I say.

38 [12] He directly knows **the overcomers** [§13] as overcomers.
 Having directly known the overcomers as overcomers:
 let him not conceive overcomers;
 let him not conceive (himself) in overcomers;
 let him not conceive (himself apart) from overcomers;
 let him not conceive, 'Overcomers are mine.'
 —He should not delight in overcomers.
 Why is that? So that he *would have* full understanding of it, I say.

The formless spheres (2)

39 [13] He directly knows **the sphere of infinite space** as the sphere of infinite space.
 Having directly known the sphere of infinite space as the sphere of infinite space:
 let him not conceive [let him not] the sphere of infinite space;
 let him not conceive (himself) in the sphere of infinite space;
 let him not conceive (himself apart) from the sphere of infinite space;
 let him not conceive, 'The sphere of infinite space is mine.'
 —He should not delight in the sphere of infinite space.
 Why is that? So that he *would have* full understanding of it, I say.

40 [14] He directly knows **the sphere of infinite consciousness** as the sphere of infinite consciousness.
 Having directly known the sphere of infinite consciousness as the sphere of infinite consciousness:
 let him not conceive the sphere of infinite consciousness;
 let him not conceive (himself) in the sphere of infinite consciousness;
 let him not conceive (himself apart) from the sphere of infinite consciousness;
 let him not conceive, 'The sphere of infinite consciousness is mine.'
 —He should not delight in the sphere of infinite consciousness.
 Why is that? So that he *would have* full understanding of it, I say.

41 [15] He directly knows **the sphere of nothingness** as the sphere of nothingness.
 Having directly known the sphere of nothingness as the sphere of nothingness:

let him not conceive the sphere of nothingness;
 let him not conceive (himself) in the sphere of nothingness;
 let him not conceive (himself apart) from the sphere of nothingness;
 let him not conceive, 'The sphere of nothingness is mine.'
 —He should not delight in the sphere of nothingness.
 Why is that? So that he *would have full understanding* of it, I say.

42 [16] He directly knows **the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception** as the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception.

Having directly known the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception as

let him not conceive the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception;
 let him not conceive (himself) in the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception;
 let him not conceive (himself apart) from the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception;
 let him not conceive, 'The sphere of neither perception nor non-perception is mine.'
 —He should not delight in the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception.
 Why is that? So that he *would have full understanding* of it, I say.

THE 4 MODES OF PERCEPTION⁷¹ (2)

43 [17] He directly knows **the seen** as the seen.
 Having directly known the seen as the seen:
 let him not conceive [let him not] (himself as) the seen;
 let him not conceive (himself) in the seen;
 let him not conceive (himself apart) from the seen;
 let him not conceive, 'The seen is mine.'
 —He should not delight in the seen.
 Why is that? So that he *would have full understanding* of it, I say.

44 [18] He directly knows **the heard** as the heard.
 Having directly known the heard as the heard:
 let him not conceive (himself as) the heard;
 let him not conceive (himself) in the heard;
 let him not conceive (himself apart) from the heard;
 let him not conceive, 'The heard is mine.'
 —He should not delight in the heard.
 Why is that? So that he *would have full understanding* of it, I say.

45 [19] He directly knows **the sensed** as the sensed.
 Having directly known the sensed as the sensed:
 let him not conceive (himself as) the sensed;
 let him not conceive (himself) in the sensed;
 let him not conceive (himself apart) from the sensed;
 let him not conceive, 'The sensed is mine.'
 —He should not delight in the sensed.
 Why is that? So that he *would have full understanding* of it, I say.

⁷¹ For details, see n at subheader [§19].

46 [20] He directly knows **the known** as the known.
 Having directly knowN the known as the known:
 let him not conceive (himself as) the known;
 let him not conceive (himself) in the known;
 let him not conceive (himself apart) from the known;
 let him not conceive, 'The known is mine.'
 —He should not delight in the known.
 Why is that? So that he *would have* full understanding of it, I say.

THE MODES OF PERSONAL IDENTITY⁷² (2)

47 [21] He directly knows **unity** as unity.
 Having directly known unity as unity:
 he should not [let him not conceive (himself as) unity;
 let him not conceive (himself) in unity;
 let him not conceive (himself apart) from unity;
 let him not conceive, 'Unity is mine.'
 —He should not delight in unity (as identity).
 Why is that? So that he *would have* full understanding of it, I say.

48 [22] He directly knows **diversity** as diversity.
 Having directly known diversity as diversity:
 let him not conceive (himself as) diversity;
 let him not conceive (himself) in diversity;
 let him not conceive (himself apart) from diversity;
 let him not conceive, 'Diversity is mine.'
 —He should not delight in diversity (as identity).
 Why is that? So that he *would have* full understanding of it, I say.

49 [23] He directly knows **all** as all.
 Having directly known all as all:
 let him not conceive (himself as) all;
 let him not conceive (himself) in all;
 let him not conceive (himself apart) from all;
 let him not conceive, 'All is mine.'
 —He should not delight in all (as identity).
 Why is that? So that he *would have* full understanding of it, I say.

50 [24] He directly knows **nirvana** as nirvana.
 Having directly known nirvana as nirvana:
 let him not conceive (himself as) nirvana;
 let him not conceive (himself) in nirvana;
 let him not conceive (himself apart) from nirvana;
 let him not conceive, 'Nirvana is mine.'
 —He should not delight in nirvana (as identity).
 Why is that? So that he *would have* full understanding of it, I say.

⁷² In the first 2 sections [§§47-48] of this division, the perception of personal identity is dealt with in 2 ways: by way of *unity* and of *diversity*: for details, see §§23-24.

THE 3RD CYCLE: THE ARHAT 1 (who has fully understood)

51 Here, bhikshus, a monk who is an arhat,⁷³
with mental influxes destroyed,⁷⁴
who has lived the holy life,
done what has to be done,
laid down the burden,⁷⁵
reached his own goal,
destroyed the fetters of being,
liberated through right knowledge,⁷⁶

The 4 elements (3)

51.2 [1] He directly knows **earth** as earth.
Having directly known earth as earth:
he does *not* conceive⁷⁷ (himself as) earth;
he does *not* conceive (himself) in earth;
he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from earth;
he does *not* conceive, 'Earth is mine.'
—He does *not* delight in earth.
Why is that? Because he has fully understood (*pariññāta*), I say.⁷⁸

52 [2] He directly knows **water** as water.
Having directly known water as water:
he does *not* conceive (himself as) water;
he does *not* conceive (himself) in water;
he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from water;
he does *not* conceive, 'Water is mine.'
—He does *not* delight in water.
Why is that? Because he *has fully understood*, I say.

⁷³ On the Arhat 1, see (4.3.3.2).

⁷⁴ "Mental influxes destroyed," *khīṇ'āsava*. The term *āsava* (lit "influxes") comes from *ā-savati* "flows towards" (ie either "into" or "out" towards the observer). It has been variously translated as taints ("deadly taints," RD), corruptions, intoxicants, biases, depravity, misery, evil (influences), or simply left untranslated. The Abhidhamma lists four *āsava*: the influx of (1) sense-desire (*kām'āsava*), (2) (desire for eternal) existence (*bhav'āsava*), (3) views (*diṭṭh'āsava*), (4) ignorance (*avijjāsava*) (D 16.2.4, Pm 1.442, 561, Dhs §§1096-1100, Vbh §937). These 4 are also known as "floods" (*ogha*) and "yokes" (*yoga*). The list of 3 influxes (omitting the influx of views) [43] is prob older and is found more frequently in the Suttas (D 3:216, 33.1.10(20); M 1:55, 3:41; A 3.59, 67, 6.63). The destruction of these *āsavas* is equivalent to arhathood. See BDict under *āsava*.

⁷⁵ "Laid down the burden," *ohita, bhāra*. Comy mentions 3 kinds of burden: the aggregates (*khandha*); the mental defilements (*kilesa*); and formations (*abhisankhāra*) (MA 1:43). We are nothing but the 5 aggregates (form, feeling, perception, mental formations, consciousness); the mental defilements cause us suffering; the formations are karma that fuel our lives and rebirth.

⁷⁶ The preceding portion of this sentence is a stock description of the arhat. "Right knowledge" (*samma-d-aññā*), alt tr "final knowledge," ie liberating wisdom that is the basis for arhathood.

⁷⁷ "He does not conceive," *nā abhijānāti* throughout. Cf §27 ad loc n.

⁷⁸ The arhat's liberating knowledge is total in the sense that he fully understands the four noble truths through direct knowledge or higher self-knowledge (*abhiññā*). In this way, he eradicates even the subtlest disposition to craving and conceit, and as such no longer falls into conceiving and delighting.

53 [3] He directly knows fire as fire.
 Having directly known **fire** as fire:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) fire;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in fire;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from fire;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Fire is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in fire.
 Why is that? Because he *has fully understood*, I say.

54 [4] He directly knows **wind** [air] as wind [air].
 Having directly known wind as wind:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) wind;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in wind;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from wind;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Wind is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in wind.
 Why is that? Because he *has fully understood*, I say.

Beings and gods (3)

55 [5] He directly knows **beings** [§6] as beings.
 Having directly known beings as beings:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) beings;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in beings;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from beings;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Beings are mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in beings.
 Why is that? Because he *has fully understood*, I say.

THE SENSE-SPHERE GODS

56 [6] He directly knows **gods** as gods.
 Having directly known gods as gods:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from gods;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Gods are mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in gods.
 Why is that? Because he *has fully understood*, I say.

57 [7] He directly knows **Prajāpati** [§8] as Prajāpati.
 Having directly known Prajāpati as *Prajāpati*:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) Prajāpati;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in Prajāpati;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Prajāpati;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Prajāpati is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in Prajāpati.
 Why is that? Because he *has fully understood*, I say.

THE 4 FORM-SPHERE GODS (3)

THE 1ST-DHYANA SPHERE

58 [8] He directly knows **Brahmā** as Brahmā.
 Having directly known Brahmā as Brahmā:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) Brahmā;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in Brahmā;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Brahmā;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Brahmā is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in Brahmā.
 Why is that? Because he *has fully understood*, I say.

THE 2ND-DHYANA SPHERE

59 [9] He directly knows **the Ābhassarā gods** as Ābhassarā gods.
 Having directly known the Ābhassarā gods as Ābhassarā gods:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) Ābhassarā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in Ābhassarā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Ābhassarā gods;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Ābhassarā gods are mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in Ābhassarā gods.
 Why is that? Because he *has fully understood*, I say.

THE 3RD-DHYANA SPHERE

60 [10] He directly knows **the Subha,kiṇṇā gods** as Subha,kiṇṇā gods.
 Having directly known the Subha,kiṇṇā gods as Subha,kiṇṇā gods:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) Subha,kiṇṇā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in Subha,kiṇṇā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Subha,kiṇṇā gods;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Subha,kiṇṇā gods are mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in Subha,kiṇṇā gods.
 Why is that? Because he *has fully understood*, I say.

THE 4TH-DHYANA SPHERE

61 [11] He directly knows **the Vaha-p,phalā gods** as Vaha-p,phalā gods.
 Having directly known the Vaha-p,phalā gods as Vaha-p,phalā gods:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) Vaha-p,phalā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in Vaha-p,phalā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Vaha-p,phalā gods;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Vaha-p,phalā gods are mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the Vaha-p,phalā gods.
 Why is that? Because he *has fully understood*, I say.

62 [12] He directly knows **the overcomers** [Abhibhū] [§13] as the overcomers.
 Having directly known the overcomers as the overcomers:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the overcomers;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the overcomers;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the overcomers;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The overcomers are mine.'

—He does *not* delight in the overcomers.
Why is that? Because he *has fully understood*, I say.

THE 4 FORMLESS SPHERES (3)

63 [13] He directly knows **the sphere of infinite space** as the sphere of infinite space.
Having directly known the sphere of infinite space as the sphere of infinite space:
he does *not* conceive (himself as) the sphere of infinite space;
he does *not* conceive (himself) in the sphere of infinite space;
he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the sphere of infinite space;
he does *not* conceive, ‘The sphere of infinite space is mine.’
—He does *not* delight in the sphere of infinite space.
Why is that? Because he *has fully understood*, I say.

64 [14] He directly knows **the sphere of infinite consciousness** as the sphere of infinite consciousness.
Having directly known the sphere of infinite consciousness as the sphere of infinite consciousness:
he does *not* conceive (himself as) the sphere of infinite consciousness;
he does *not* conceive (himself) in the sphere of infinite consciousness;
he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the sphere of infinite consciousness;
he does *not* conceive, ‘The sphere of infinite consciousness is mine.’
—He does *not* delight in the sphere of infinite consciousness.
Why is that? Because he *has fully understood*, I say.

65 [15] He directly knows **the sphere of nothingness** as the sphere of nothingness.
Having directly known the sphere of nothingness as the sphere of nothingness:
he does *not* conceive (himself as) the sphere of nothingness;
he does *not* conceive (himself) in the sphere of nothingness;
he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the sphere of nothingness;
he does *not* conceive, ‘The sphere of nothingness is mine.’
—He does *not* delight in the sphere of nothingness.
Why is that? Because he *has fully understood*, I say.

66 [16] He directly knows **the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception** as the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception.
Having directly known the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception as the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception:
he does *not* conceive the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception;
he does *not* conceive (himself) in the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception;
he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception;
he does *not* conceive, ‘the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception is mine.’
—He does *not* delight in the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception.
Why is that? Because he *has fully understood*, I say.

THE 4 MODES OF PERCEPTION⁷⁹ (3)

67 [17] He directly knows **the seen** as the seen.
 Having directly known the seen as the seen:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the seen;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the seen;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the seen;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The seen is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the seen.
 Why is that? Because he *has fully understood*, I say.

68 [18] He directly knows **the heard** as the heard.
 Having directly known the heard as the heard:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the heard;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the heard;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the heard;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The heard is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the heard.
 Why is that? Because he *has fully understood*, I say.

69 [19] He directly knows **the sensed** as the sensed.
 Having directly known the sensed as the sensed:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the sensed;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the sensed;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the sensed;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The sensed is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the sensed.
 Why is that? Because he *has fully understood*, I say.

70 [20] He directly knows **the known** as the known.
 Having directly known the known as the known:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the known;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the known;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the known;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The known is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the known.
 Why is that? Because he *has fully understood*, I say.

THE MODES OF PERSONAL IDENTITY⁸⁰ (3)

71 [21] He directly knows **unity** as unity.
 Having directly known unity as unity:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) unity;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in unity;

⁷⁹ See n at subheader [§19].

⁸⁰ The first two sections [§§71-72] of this division refer to the perception of personal identity in 2 ways: by way of *unity* and of *diversity*. See §§23-24.

he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from unity;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Unity is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in unity.
 Why is that? Because he *has fully understood*, I say.

72 [22] He directly knows **diversity** as diversity.
 Having directly known diversity as diversity:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) diversity;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in diversity;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from diversity;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Diversity is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in diversity.
 Why is that? Because he *has fully understood*, I say.

73 [23] He directly knows all as all.
 Having directly known all as all:
 he does not conceive (himself as) all;
 he does not conceive (himself) in all;
 he does not conceive (himself apart) from all;
 he does not conceive, 'All is mine.'
 —He does not delight in all (as identity).
 Why is that? Because he *has fully understood*, I say.

74 [24] He directly knows **nirvana** as nirvana.
 Having directly known nirvana as nirvana:
 he does not conceive (himself as) nirvana;
 he does not conceive (himself) in nirvana;
 he does not conceive (himself apart) from nirvana;
 he does not conceive, 'Nirvana is mine.'
 —He does not delight in nirvana (as identity).
 Why is that? Because he *has fully understood*, I say.

THE 4TH CYCLE: THE ARHAT 2 (*has fully understood, free from the 3 roots*)

75 Here, bhikshus, a monk who is **an arhat**,⁸¹ [§51]
 with mental influxes destroyed,
 who has lived the holy life,
 done what has to be done,
 laid down the burden,⁸²
 reached his own goal,
 destroyed the fetters of being,
 liberated through right knowledge, [5]

⁸¹ On the Arhat 2, see (4.3.3.3).

⁸² "Laid down the burden," *ohita, bhāra*. See §51 n ad loc.

The 4 elements (4)

75.2 [1] directly knows **earth** as earth.
 Having directly known earth as earth:
 he does not conceive (himself as) earth;
 he does not conceive (himself) in earth;
 he does not conceive (himself apart) from earth;
 he does not conceive, 'Earth is mine.'
 —He does not delight in earth.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from lust through the destruction of lust.⁸³

76 [2] He directly knows **water** as water.
 Having perceived water as water:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) water;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in water;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from water;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Water is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in water.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from lust through the destruction of lust.

77 [3] He directly knows **fire** as fire.
 Having perceived fire as fire:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) fire;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in fire;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from fire;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Fire is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in fire.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from lust through the destruction of lust.

78 [4] He directly knows **wind** [air] as wind [air].
 Having directly known wind as wind:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) wind;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in wind;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from wind;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Wind is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in wind.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from lust through the destruction of lust.

⁸³ "Freed from lust through the destruction of lust," *khayā rāgassa vīta, rāgattā*. This phrase emphasizes the fact that the arhat is free from lust (*rāga*) not merely temporarily but *permanently*, leading to his spiritual freedom (*nissaraṇa nirodha*, Pm 1:27; Vism 410). This permanent ending refers to the other 2 unwholesome roots (hate and delusion) in the next 2 sections. Through full understanding, the arhat permanently destroys these 3 roots (by uprooting them), and as such does not fall into mental conceiving. **Paṭisambhidā, magga** speaks of 5 kinds of extinction (*nirodha*) of mental defilements and distraction: (1) extinction by suppression (*vikkhambhana nirodha*); (2) extinction by substitution of opposites (*tad-aṅga nirodha*); (3) extinction by cutting off of destruction (*samuccheda nirodha*), ie at the moment of attaining the Path; (4) extinction by tranquillization (*paṭipassaddhi nirodha*), ie at the moment of the fruition on the supramundane path; (5) extinction by escape or liberation (*nissaraṇa nirodha*), ie, the attainment of nirvana. (Pm 1:27, 220 f; Vism 410; cf Vism 693). These 5 are also called abandonment (*pahāna*), liberation (*vimutti*), solitude (*viveka*), detachment or dispassion (*virāga*) or letting go or relinquishing (*vossagga*).

Beings and gods (4)

79 [5] He directly knows **beings** [§6] as beings.
 Having directly known beings as beings:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) beings;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in beings;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from beings;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Beings are mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in beings.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from lust through *the destruction of lust*.

THE SENSE-SPHERE GODS

80 [6] He directly knows **gods** as gods.
 Having directly known gods as gods:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from gods;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Gods are mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in gods.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from lust through *the destruction of lust*.

81 [7] He directly knows **Prajāpati** [§8] as Prajāpati,
 Having directly known Prajāpati as Prajāpati:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) Prajāpati;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in Prajāpati;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Prajāpati;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Prajāpati is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in Prajāpati.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from lust through *the destruction of lust*.

THE 4 FORM-SPHERE GODS (4)**THE 1ST-DHYANA SPHERE**

82 [8] He directly knows **Brahmā** as Brahmā.
 Having directly known Brahmā as Brahmā:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) Brahmā;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in Brahmā;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Brahmā;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Brahmā is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in Brahmā.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from lust through *the destruction of lust*.

THE 2ND-DHYANA SPHERE

83 [9] He directly knows **the Ābhassarā gods** as Ābhassarā gods.
 Having directly known the Ābhassarā gods as *Ābhassarā gods*:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) Ābhassarā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in Ābhassarā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Ābhassarā gods;

he does *not* conceive, 'Ābhassarā gods are mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in Ābhassarā gods.
 Why is that? Because he *is freed from lust* through *the destruction of lust* of it.

THE 3RD-DHYANA SPHERE

84 [10] He directly knows **the Subha,kiṇṇā gods** as Subha,kiṇṇā gods.
 Having directly known the Subha,kiṇṇā gods as *Subha,kiṇṇā gods*:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) Subha,kiṇṇā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in Subha,kiṇṇā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Subha,kiṇṇā gods;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Subha,kiṇṇā gods are mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in Subha,kiṇṇā gods.
 Why is that? Because he *is freed from lust* through *the destruction of lust*.

THE 4TH-DHYANA SPHERE

85 [11] He directly knows **the Vaha-p,phalā gods** as Vaha-p,phalā gods.
 Having directly known the Vaha-p,phalā gods as *Vaha-p,phalā gods*:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) Vaha-p,phalā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in Vaha-p,phalā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Vaha-p,phalā gods;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Vaha-p,phalā gods are mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in Vaha-p,phalā gods.
 Why is that? Because he *is freed from lust* through *the destruction of lust*.

86 [12] He directly knows **the overcomers** [§13] as overcomers.
 Having directly known the overcomers as overcomers:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) overcomers;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in overcomers;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from overcomers;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Overcomers are mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in overcomers.
 Why is that? Because he *is freed from lust* through *the destruction of lust*.

THE 4 FORMLESS SPHERES (4)

87 [13] He directly knows **the sphere of infinite space** as the sphere of infinite space.
 Having directly known the sphere of infinite space as *the sphere of infinite space*:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the sphere of infinite space;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the sphere of infinite space;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the sphere of infinite space;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The sphere of infinite space is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the sphere of infinite space.
 Why is that? Because he *is freed from lust* through *the destruction of lust*.

88 [14] He directly knows **the sphere of infinite consciousness** as the sphere of infinite consciousness.
 Having directly known the sphere of infinite consciousness as the sphere of infinite consciousness:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the sphere of infinite consciousness;

he does *not* conceive (himself) in the sphere of infinite consciousness;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the sphere of infinite consciousness;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The sphere of infinite consciousness is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the sphere of infinite consciousness.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from lust through *the destruction of lust*.

89 [15] He directly knows **the sphere of nothingness** as the sphere of nothingness.
 Having directly known the sphere of nothingness as the sphere of nothingness:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the sphere of nothingness;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the sphere of nothingness;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the sphere of nothingness;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The sphere of nothingness is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the sphere of nothingness.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from lust through *the destruction of lust*.

90 [16] He directly knows **the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception** as the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception.
 Having directly known the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception as the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception:
 he does *not* conceive the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The sphere of neither perception nor non-perception is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from lust through *the destruction of lust*.

THE 4 MODES OF PERCEPTION⁸⁴ (4)

91 [17] He directly knows **the seen** as the seen.
 Having directly known the seen as the seen:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the seen;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the seen;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the seen;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The seen is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the seen.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from lust through *the destruction of lust*.

92 [18] He directly knows **the heard** as the heard.
 Having directly known the heard as the heard:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the heard;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the heard;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the heard;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The heard is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the heard.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from lust through *the destruction of lust*.

⁸⁴ See n at subheader [§19].

93 [19] He directly knows **the sensed** as the sensed.
 Having directly known the sensed as the sensed:
 he does not conceive (himself as) the sensed;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the sensed;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the sensed;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The sensed is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the sensed.
 Why is that? Because he *is freed from lust* through *the destruction of lust*.

94 [20] He directly knows **the known** as the known.
 Having directly known the known as the known:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the known;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the known;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the known;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The known is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the known.
 Why is that? Because he *is freed from lust* through *the destruction of lust*.

THE MODES OF PERSONAL IDENTITY⁸⁵ (4)

95 [21] He directly knows **unity** as unity.
 Having directly known unity as unity:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) unity;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in unity;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from unity;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Unity is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in unity.
 Why is that? Because he *is freed from lust* through *the destruction of lust*.

96 [22] He directly knows **diversity** as diversity.
 Having directly known diversity as diversity:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) diversity;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in diversity;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from diversity;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Diversity is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in diversity.
 Why is that? Because he *is freed from lust* through *the destruction of lust*.

97 [23] He directly knows **all** as all.
 Having directly known all as *all*:
 he does not conceive (himself as) all;
 he does not conceive (himself) in all;
 he does not conceive (himself apart) from all;
 he does not conceive, 'All is mine.'
 —He does not delight in all (as identity).
 Why is that? Because he *is freed from lust* through *the destruction of lust*.

⁸⁵ The first 2 sections [§§95-96] of this division refer to the perception of personal identity in 2 ways: by way of *unity* and of *diversity*. See §§23-24.

98 [24] He directly knows **nirvana** as nirvana.
 Having directly known nirvana as nirvana:
 he does not conceive (himself as) nirvana;
 he does not conceive (himself) in nirvana;
 he does not conceive (himself apart) from nirvana;
 he does not conceive, 'Nirvana is mine.'
 —He does not delight in nirvana (as identity).
 Why is that? Because he is freed from lust through the destruction of lust.

THE 5TH CYCLE: THE ARHAT 3 (FREED FROM HATE)

99 Here, bhikshus, a monk who is **an arhat**,⁸⁶ [§51]
 with mental influxes destroyed,
 who has lived the holy life,
 done what has to be done,
 laid down the burden,⁸⁷
 reached his own goal,
 destroyed the fetters of being,
 liberated through right knowledge,

The 4 elements (5)

99.2 [1] directly knows **earth** as earth.
 Having directly known earth as earth:
 he does not conceive (himself as) earth;
 he does not conceive (himself) in earth;
 he does not conceive (himself apart) from earth.
 he does not conceive, 'Earth is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in earth.
 Why is that? Because he is **freed from hate** through the destruction of hate.

100 [2] He directly knows **water** as water.
 Having perceived water as water:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) water;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in water;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from water;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Water is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in water.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from hate through the destruction of hate.

101 [3] He directly knows **fire** as fire.
 Having perceived fire as fire:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) fire;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in fire;

⁸⁶ On the Arhat 3, see (4.3.3.4).

⁸⁷ "Laid down the burden," *ohita, bhāra*. See §51 n ad loc

he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from fire;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Fire is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in fire.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from hate through *the destruction of hate*.

102 [4] He directly knows **wind** [air] as wind [air].
 Having directly known wind as wind:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) wind;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in wind;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from wind;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Wind is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in wind.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from hate through *the destruction of hate*.

Beings and gods (5)

103 [5] He directly knows **beings** [§6] as beings.
 Having directly known beings as beings:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) beings;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in beings;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from beings;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Beings are mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in beings.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from hate through *the destruction of hate*.

THE SENSE-SPHERE GODS

104 [6] He directly knows **gods** as gods.
 Having directly known gods as gods:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from gods;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Gods are mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in gods.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from hate through *the destruction of hate*.

105 [7] He directly knows **Prajāpati** [§8] as Prajāpati.
 Having directly known Prajāpati as Prajāpati:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) Prajāpati;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in Prajāpati;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Prajāpati;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Prajāpati is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in Prajāpati.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from hate through *the destruction of hate*.

THE 4 FORM-SPHERE GODS (5)

THE 1ST-DHYANA SPHERE

106 [8] He directly knows **Brahmā** as Brahmā.
 Having directly known Brahmā as Brahmā:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) Brahmā;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in Brahmā;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Brahmā;
 he does *not* conceive, ‘Brahmā is mine.’
 —He does *not* delight in Brahmā.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from hate through *the destruction of hate*.

THE 2ND-DHYANA SPHERE

107 [9] He directly knows **the Ābhassarā gods** as Ābhassarā gods.
 Having directly known the Ābhassarā gods as Ābhassarā gods:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) Ābhassarā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in Ābhassarā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Ābhassarā gods;
 he does *not* conceive, ‘Ābhassarā gods are mine.’
 —He does *not* delight in Ābhassarā gods.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from hate through *the destruction of hate*.

THE 3RD-DHYANA SPHERE

108 [10] He directly knows **the Subha,kiṇṇā gods** as Subha,kiṇṇā gods.
 Having directly known the Subha,kiṇṇā gods as Subha,kiṇṇā gods:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) Subha,kiṇṇā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in Subha,kiṇṇā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Subha,kiṇṇā gods;
 he does *not* conceive, ‘Subha,kiṇṇā gods are mine.’
 —He does *not* delight in Subha,kiṇṇā gods.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from hate through *the destruction of hate*.

THE 4TH-DHYANA SPHERE

109 [11] He directly knows **the Vaha-p,phalā gods** as Vaha-p,phalā gods.
 Having directly known the Vaha-p,phalā gods as Vaha-p,phalā gods:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) Vaha-p,phalā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in Vaha-p,phalā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Vaha-p,phalā gods;
 he does *not* conceive, ‘Vaha-p,phalā gods are mine.’
 —He does *not* delight in Vaha-p,phalā gods.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from hate through *the destruction of hate*.

110 [12] He directly knows **the overcomers** [§13] as overcomers.
 Having directly known the overcomers as overcomers:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) overcomers;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in overcomers;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from overcomers;
 he does *not* conceive, ‘Overcomers are mine.’

—He does *not* delight in _____ overcomers.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from *hate* through *the destruction of hate*.

THE 4 FORMLESS SPHERES (5)

111 [13] He directly knows **the sphere of infinite space** as _____ the sphere of infinite space.
 Having directly known the sphere of infinite space as _____ *the sphere of infinite space*:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) _____ the sphere of infinite space;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in _____ the sphere of infinite space;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from _____ the sphere of infinite space;
 he does *not* conceive, _____ ‘The sphere of infinite space is mine.’
 —He does *not* delight in _____ the sphere of infinite space.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from *hate* through *the destruction of hate*.

112 [14] He directly knows **the sphere of infinite consciousness** as _____ the sphere of infinite consciousness.
 Having directly known the sphere of infinite consciousness as _____ the sphere of infinite consciousness:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) _____ the sphere of infinite consciousness;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in _____ the sphere of infinite consciousness;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from _____ the sphere of infinite consciousness;
 he does *not* conceive, _____ ‘The sphere of infinite consciousness is mine.’
 —He does *not* delight in _____ the sphere of infinite consciousness.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from *hate* through *the destruction of hate*.

113 [15] He directly knows **the sphere of nothingness** as _____ the sphere of nothingness.
 Having directly known the sphere of nothingness as _____ the sphere of nothingness:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) _____ the sphere of nothingness;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in _____ the sphere of nothingness;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from _____ the sphere of nothingness;
 he does *not* conceive, _____ ‘The sphere of nothingness is mine.’
 —He does *not* delight in _____ the sphere of nothingness.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from *hate* through *the destruction of hate*.

114 [16] He directly knows **the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception** as _____ the sphere of neither- perception-nor-non-perception.
 Having directly known the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception as _____ the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception:
 he does *not* conceive _____ the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in _____ the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from _____ the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception;
 he does *not* conceive, _____ ‘the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception is mine.’
 —He does *not* delight in _____ the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from *hate* through *the destruction of hate*.

THE 4 MODES OF PERCEPTION⁸⁸ (5)

115 [17] He directly knows **the seen** as the seen.
 Having directly known the seen as the seen:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the seen;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the seen;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the seen;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The seen is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the seen.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from hate through *the destruction of hate*.

116 [28] He directly knows **the heard** as the heard.
 Having directly known the heard as the heard:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the heard;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the heard;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the heard;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The heard is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the heard.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from hate through the destruction of hate.

117 [19] He directly knows **the sensed** as the sensed.
 Having directly known the sensed as the sensed:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the sensed;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the sensed;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the sensed;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The sensed is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the sensed.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from hate through *the destruction of hate*.

118 [20] He directly knows **the known** as the known.
 Having directly known the known as the known:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the known;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the known;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the known;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The known is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the known.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from hate through *the destruction of hate*.

THE MODES OF PERSONAL IDENTITY⁸⁹ (5)

119 [21] He directly knows **unity** as unity.
 Having directly known unity as unity:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) unity;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in unity;

⁸⁸ See n at subheader [§19].

⁸⁹ The first two sections [§§95-96] of this division refers to the perception of personal identity in two ways: by way of *unity* and of *diversity*. See §§23-24.

he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from unity;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Unity is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in unity.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from *hate* through *the destruction of hate*.

120 [22] He directly knows **diversity** as diversity.
 Having directly known diversity as diversity:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) diversity;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in diversity;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from diversity;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Diversity is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in diversity.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from *hate* through *the destruction of hate*.

121 [23] He directly knows **all** as all.
 Having directly known all as *all*:
 he does not conceive (himself as) all;
 he does not conceive (himself) in all;
 he does not conceive (himself apart) from all;
 he does not conceive, 'All is mine.'
 —He does not delight in all (as identity).
 Why is that? Because he is freed from *hate* through *the destruction of hate*.

122 [24] He directly knows **nirvana** as nirvana.
 Having directly known nirvana as *nirvana*:
 he does not conceive (himself as) nirvana;
 he does not conceive (himself) in nirvana;
 he does not conceive (himself apart) from nirvana.
 —He does not conceive, 'Nirvana is mine.'
 Why is that? Because he is freed from *hate* through *the destruction of hate*.

THE 6TH CYCLE: THE ARHAT 4 (FREED FROM DELUSION)

123 Here, bhikshus, a monk who is **an arhat**,⁹⁰ [§51]
 with mental influxes destroyed,
 who has lived the holy life,
 done what has to be done,
 laid down the burden,⁹¹
 reached his own goal,
 destroyed the fetters of being,
 liberated through right knowledge,

⁹⁰ On the Arhat 4, see (4.3.3.5).

⁹¹ "Laid down the burden," *ohita, bhāra*. See §51 ad loc.

The 4 elements (6)

123.2 [1] directly knows **earth** as earth.
 Having directly known earth as earth:
 he does not conceive (himself as) earth;
 he does not conceive (himself) in earth;
 he does not conceive (himself apart) from earth.
 He does not conceive, 'Earth is mine.'

—He does not delight in earth.

Why is that? Because he is **freed from delusion** through the destruction of delusion.

124 [2] He directly knows **water** as water.
 Having perceived water as water:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) water;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in water;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from water;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Water is mine.'

—He does *not* delight in water.

Why is that? Because he is **freed from delusion** through *the destruction of delusion*.

125 [3] He directly knows **fire** as fire.
 Having perceived fire as fire:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) fire;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in fire;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from fire;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Fire is mine.'

—He does *not* delight in fire.

Why is that? Because he is **freed from delusion** through *the destruction of delusion*.

126 [4] He directly knows **wind [air]** as wind [air].
 Having directly known wind as wind:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) wind;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in wind;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from wind;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Wind is mine.'

—He does *not* delight in wind.

Why is that? Because he is **freed from delusion** through *the destruction of delusion*.

Beings and gods (6)

127 [5] He directly knows **beings** [§6] as beings.
 Having directly known beings as beings:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) beings;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in beings;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from beings;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Beings are mine.'

—He does *not* delight in beings.

Why is that? Because he is **freed from delusion** through *the destruction of delusion*.

THE SENSE-SPHERE GODS

128 [6] He directly knows **gods** as gods.
 Having directly known gods as gods:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from gods;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Gods are mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in gods.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from delusion through *the destruction of delusion*.

129 [7] He directly knows **Prajāpati** [§8] as Prajāpati.
 Having directly known Prajāpati as Prajāpati:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) Prajāpati;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in Prajāpati;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Prajāpati;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Prajāpati is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in Prajāpati.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from delusion through *the destruction of delusion*.

THE 4 FORM-SPHERE GODS (6)**THE 1ST-DHYANA SPHERE**

130 [8] He directly knows **Brahmā** as Brahmā.
 Having directly known Brahmā as Brahmā:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) Brahmā;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in Brahmā;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Brahmā;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Brahmā is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in Brahmā.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from delusion through *the destruction of delusion*, I say.

THE 2ND-DHYANA SPHERE

131 [9] He directly knows **the Ābhassarā gods** as Ābhassarā gods.
 Having directly known the Ābhassarā gods as *Ābhassarā gods*:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) Ābhassarā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in Ābhassarā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Ābhassarā gods;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Ābhassarā gods are mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in Ābhassarā gods.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from delusion through *the destruction of delusion*, I say.

THE 3RD-DHYANA SPHERE

132 [10] He directly knows **the Subha,kiṇṇā gods** as Subha,kiṇṇā god.
 Having directly known the Subha,kiṇṇā gods as *Subha,kiṇṇā gods*:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) Subha,kiṇṇā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in Subha,kiṇṇā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Subha,kiṇṇā gods;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Subha,kiṇṇā gods are mine.'

—He does *not* delight in Subha,kiṇṇā gods.
Why is that? Because he is freed from delusion through *the destruction of delusion*.

THE 4TH-DHYANA SPHERE

133 [11] He directly knows **the Veha-p,phalā gods** as Veha-p,phalā gods.
Having directly known the Veha-p,phalā gods as Veha-p,phalā gods:
he does *not* conceive (himself as) Veha-p,phalā gods;
he does *not* conceive (himself) in Veha-p,phalā gods;
he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Veha-p,phalā gods;
he does *not* conceive, 'Veha-p,phalā gods are mine.'
—He does *not* delight in Veha-p,phalā gods.
Why is that? Because he is freed from delusion through *the destruction of delusion*.

134 [12] He directly knows **the overcomers** [§13] as overcomers.
Having directly known the overcomers as overcomers:
he does *not* conceive (himself as) overcomers;
he does *not* conceive (himself) in overcomers;
he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from overcomers;
he does *not* conceive, 'overcomers are mine.'
—He does *not* delight in overcomers.
Why is that? Because he is freed from delusion through *the destruction of delusion*.

THE 4 FORMLESS SPHERES (6)

135 [13] He directly knows **the sphere of infinite space** as the sphere of infinite space.
Having directly known the sphere of infinite space as the sphere of infinite space:
he does *not* conceive (himself as) the sphere of infinite space;
he does *not* conceive (himself) in the sphere of infinite space;
he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the sphere of infinite space;
he does *not* conceive, 'The sphere of infinite space is mine.'
—He does *not* delight in the sphere of infinite space.
Why is that? Because he is freed from delusion through *the destruction of delusion*.

136 [14] He directly knows **the sphere of infinite consciousness** as the sphere of infinite consciousness.
Having directly known the sphere of infinite consciousness as the sphere of infinite consciousness:
he does *not* conceive (himself as) the sphere of infinite consciousness;
he does *not* conceive (himself) in the sphere of infinite consciousness;
he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the sphere of infinite consciousness;
he does *not* conceive, 'The sphere of infinite consciousness is mine.'
—He does *not* delight in the sphere of infinite consciousness.
Why is that? Because he is freed from delusion through *the destruction of delusion*.

137 [15] He directly knows **the sphere of nothingness** as the sphere of nothingness.
Having directly known the sphere of nothingness as the sphere of nothingness:
he does *not* conceive (himself as) the sphere of nothingness;
he does *not* conceive (himself) in the sphere of nothingness;
he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the sphere of nothingness;

he does *not* conceive, 'The sphere of nothingness is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the sphere of nothingness.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from *delusion* through *the destruction of delusion*.

138 [16] He directly knows **the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception** as
 the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception.
 Having directly known the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception as
 the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception:
 he does *not* conceive the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception;
 he does *not* conceive, 'the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from *delusion* through *the destruction of delusion*.

THE 4 MODES OF PERCEPTION⁹² (6)

139 [17] He directly knows **the seen** as the seen.
 Having directly known the seen as the seen:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the seen;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the seen;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the seen;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The seen is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the seen.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from *delusion* through *the destruction of delusion*.

140 [18] He directly knows **the heard** as the heard.
 Having directly known the heard as the heard:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the heard;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the heard;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the heard;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The heard is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the heard.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from *delusion* through *the destruction of delusion*.

141 [19] He directly knows **the sensed** as the sensed.
 Having directly known the sensed as the sensed:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the sensed;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the sensed;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the sensed;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The sensed is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the sensed.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from *delusion* through *the destruction of delusion*.

142 [20] He directly knows **the known** as the known.
 Having directly known the known as the known:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the known;

⁹² See n at subheader [§19].

he does *not* conceive (himself) in the known;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the known;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The known is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the known.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from *delusion* through *the destruction of delusion*.

THE MODES OF PERSONAL IDENTITY⁹³ (6)

143 [21] He directly knows **unity** as unity.
 Having directly known unity as unity:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) unity;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in unity;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from unity;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Unity is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in unity.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from *delusion* through *the destruction of delusion*.

144 [22] He directly knows **diversity** as diversity.
 Having directly known diversity as diversity:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) diversity;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in diversity;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from diversity;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Diversity is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in diversity.
 Why is that? Because he is freed from *delusion* through *the destruction of delusion*.

145 [23] He directly knows **all** as all.
 Having directly known all as *all*:
 he does not conceive (himself as) all;
 he does not conceive (himself) in all;
 he does not conceive (himself apart) from all;
 he does not conceive, 'All is mine.'
 —He does not delight in all (as identity).
 Why is that? Because he is freed from *delusion* through *the destruction of delusion*.

146 [24] He directly knows **nirvana** as nirvana.
 Having perceived nirvana as nirvana:
 he does not conceive (himself as) nirvana;
 he does not conceive (himself) in nirvana;
 he does not conceive (himself apart) from nirvana;
 he does not conceive, 'Nirvana is mine.'
 —He does not delight in nirvana (as identity).
 Why is that? Because he is **freed from delusion** through the destruction of delusion.

⁹³ The first two sections [§§143-144] of this division refers to the perception of personal identity in two ways: by way of *unity* and of *diversity*. See §§23-24.

THE 7TH CYCLE. THE TATHAGATA 1 (who has fully understood the root)

147 Bhikshus, **the Tathāgata** [Buddha Thus Come],⁹⁴
 worthy (*araham*) [the arhat],
 fully self-awakened,

The 4 elements (7)

147.2 [1] directly knows earth as earth.
 Having directly known earth as earth:
 he does not conceive (himself as) earth;
 he does not conceive (himself) in earth;
 he does not conceive (himself apart) from earth;
 he does not conceive, 'Earth is mine.'
 —He does not delight in earth. [6]
 Why is that? Because the Tathagata **has fully understood it**, I say.⁹⁵

148 [2] He directly knows **water** as water.
 Having perceived water as water:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) water;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in water;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from water;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Water is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in water.
 Why is that? Because the Tathagata has fully understood it, I say.

149 [3] e directly knows **fire** as fire.
 Having perceived fire as fire:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) fire;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in fire;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from fire;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Fire is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in fire.
 Why is that? Because the Tathagata has fully understood it, I say.

⁹⁴ "**Tathāgata.**" This is the most common way in which the Buddha refers to himself. Comys (eg MA 1:45) usually give 8 explanations of this epithet, two of which are most common: (1) "thus come" (*tathā āgata*), that is, one who *comes* into our midst with the message of the death-free; (2) "thus gone" (*tathā gata*), that is, one who has *gone* that same way by his own practice of the path. However, technically, we may understand this as referring to a pratyeka-buddha. See also M:ÑB 24 & Bodhi (tr), *Discourse on the All-embracing Net of Views*, 1978:331-344. See (4.3.4.1).

⁹⁵ "The Tathāgata's full understanding," *pariññātan taṃ tathāgatassa*. PTS ed omits *taṃ*. Comy glosses *pariññāta* as "fully understood to the conclusion, fully understood to the limit, fully understood without remainder." While the Buddhas and arhat disciples are alike in abandoning all defilements, there is a distinction in their range of full understanding. While the disciple attains nirvana after understanding with insight *only a limited number* of formations, Buddhas fully understand *all* formations without exception (MA 1:52).

150 [4] He directly knows **wind** [air] as wind [air].
 Having directly known wind as wind:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) wind;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in wind;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from wind;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Wind is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in wind.
 Why is that? Because the Tathagata has fully understood it, I say.

Beings and gods (7)

151 [5] He directly knows **beings** [§6] as beings.
 Having directly known beings as beings:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) beings;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in beings;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from beings;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Beings are mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in beings.
 Why is that? Because the Tathagata has fully understood it, I say. [§147.2]

THE SENSE-SPHERE GODS

152 [6] He directly knows **gods** as gods.
 Having directly known gods as gods:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from gods;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Gods are mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in gods.
 Why is that? Because the Tathagata has fully understood it, I say. [§147.2]

153 [7] He directly knows **Prajāpati** [§8] as Prajāpati.
 Having directly known Prajāpati as Prajāpati:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) Prajāpati;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in Prajāpati;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Prajāpati;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Prajāpati is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in Prajāpati.
 Why is that? Because the Tathagata has fully understood it, I say.

THE 4 FORM-SPHERE GODS (6)

THE 1ST-DHYANA SPHERE

154 [8] He directly knows **Brahmā** as Brahmā.
 Having directly known Brahmā as Brahmā:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) Brahmā;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in Brahmā;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Brahmā;

he does *not* conceive, 'Brahmā is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in Brahmā.
 Why is that? Because the Tathagata has fully understood it, I say. [§147.2]

THE 2ND-DHYANA SPHERE

155 [9] He directly knows **the Ābhassarā gods** as Ābhassarā gods.
 Having directly known the Ābhassarā gods as Ābhassarā gods:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) Ābhassarā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in Ābhassarā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Ābhassarā gods;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Ābhassarā gods are mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in Ābhassarā gods.
 Why is that? Because the Tathagata has fully understood it, I say. [§147.2]

THE 3RD-DHYANA SPHERE

156 [10] He directly knows **the Subha,kiṇṇā gods** as Subha,kiṇṇā gods.
 Having directly known the Subha,kiṇṇā gods as Subha,kiṇṇā gods:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) Subha,kiṇṇā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in Subha,kiṇṇā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Subha,kiṇṇā gods;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Subha,kiṇṇā gods are mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in Subha,kiṇṇā gods.
 Why is that? Because the Tathagata has fully understood it, I say. [§147.2]

THE 4TH-DHYANA SPHERE

157 [11] He directly knows **the Vaha-p,phalā gods** as Vaha-p,phalā gods.
 Having directly known the Vaha-p,phalā gods as Vaha-p,phalā gods:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) Vaha-p,phalā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in Vaha-p,phalā gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Vaha-p,phalā gods;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Vaha-p,phalā gods are mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in Vaha-p,phalā gods.
 Why is that? Because the Tathagata has fully understood it, I say.

158 [12] He directly knows **the overcomers** [§13] as overcomers.
 Having directly known the overcomers as overcomers:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) overcomers;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in overcomers;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from overcomers;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Overcomers are mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in overcomers.
 Why is that? Because the Tathagata has fully understood it, I say.

THE 4 FORMLESS SPHERES (7)

159 [13] He directly knows **the sphere of infinite space** as the sphere of infinite space.
 Having directly known the sphere of infinite space as the sphere of infinite space:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the sphere of infinite space;

he does *not* conceive (himself) in the sphere of infinite space;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the sphere of infinite space;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The sphere of infinite space is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the sphere of infinite space.
 Why is that? Because the Tathagata has fully understood it, I say. [§147.2]

160 [14] He directly knows **the sphere of infinite consciousness** as

the sphere of infinite consciousness.
 Having directly known the sphere of infinite consciousness as the sphere of infinite consciousness:
 he does not conceive (himself as) the sphere of infinite consciousness;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the sphere of infinite consciousness;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the sphere of infinite consciousness;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The sphere of infinite consciousness is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the sphere of infinite consciousness.
 Why is that? Because the Tathagata has fully understood it, I say.

161 [15] He directly knows **the sphere of nothingness** as the sphere of nothingness.

Having directly known the sphere of nothingness as the sphere of nothingness:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the sphere of nothingness;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the sphere of nothingness;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the sphere of nothingness;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The sphere of nothingness is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the sphere of nothingness.
 Why is that? Because the Tathagata has fully understood it, I say.

162 [16] He directly knows **the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception** as

the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception.
 Having directly known the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception as
 the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception:
 he does *not* conceive the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The sphere of neither perception nor non-perception is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception.
 Why is that? Because the Tathagata has fully understood it, I say.

THE 4 MODES OF PERCEPTION⁹⁶ (7)

163 [17] He directly knows **the seen** as the seen.
 Having directly known the seen as the seen:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the seen;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the seen;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the seen;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The seen is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the seen.
 Why is that? Because the Tathagata has fully understood it, I say. [§147.2]

⁹⁶ See n at subheader [§19].

164 [18] He directly knows **the heard** as the heard.
 Having directly known the heard as the heard:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the heard;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the heard;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the heard;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The heard is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the heard.
 Why is that? Because the Tathagata has fully understood it, I say.

165 [19] He directly knows **the sensed** as the sensed.
 Having directly known the sensed as the sensed:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the sensed;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the sensed;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the sensed;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The sensed is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the sensed.
 Why is that? Because the Tathagata has fully understood it, I say.

166 [20] He directly knows **the known** as the known.
 Having directly known the known as the known:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the known;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the known;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the known;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The known is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the known.
 Why is that? Because the Tathagata has fully understood it, I say.

THE MODES OF PERSONAL IDENTITY⁹⁷ (7)

167 [21] He directly knows **unity** as unity.
 Having directly known unity as unity:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) unity;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in unity;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from unity;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Unity is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in unity.
 Why is that? Because the Tathagata has fully understood it, I say. [§147.2]

168 [22] He directly knows **diversity** as diversity.
 Having directly known diversity as diversity:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) diversity;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in diversity;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from diversity;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Diversity is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in diversity.
 Why is that? Because the Tathagata has fully understood it, I say.

⁹⁷ The first 2 sections [§§167-168] of this division refers to the perception of personal identity in 2 ways: by way of *unity* and of *diversity*. See §§23-24.

169 [23] He directly knows **all** as all.
 Having directly known all as all:
 he does not conceive (himself as) all;
 he does not conceive (himself) in all;
 he does not conceive (himself apart) from all;
 he does not conceive, 'All is mine.'
 —He does not delight in all (as identity).
 Why is that? Because the Tathagata has fully understood it, I say.

170 [24] He directly knows **nirvana** as nirvana.
 Having perceived nirvana as nirvana:
 he does not conceive (himself as) nirvana;
 he does not conceive (himself) in nirvana;
 he does not conceive (himself apart) from nirvana;
 he does not conceive, 'Nirvana is mine.'
 —He does not delight in nirvana (as identity).
 Why is that? Because the Tathagata has fully understood it, I say.

THE 8TH CYCLE. THE TATHAGATA 2 (who is fully self-awakened)

171 Bhikshus, **the Tathāgata** [Buddha thus come], [4.3.4]
 worthy (*araham*) [the arhat],⁹⁸ fully self-awakened,

The 4 elements (8)

171.2 [1] directly knows earth as earth.
 Having directly known earth as earth:
 he does not conceive (himself as) earth;
 he does not conceive (himself) in earth;
 he does not conceive (himself apart) from earth;
 he does not conceive, 'Earth is mine.'
 —He does not delight in earth.

171.3 Why is that? Because he knows thus: 'Delight is the root of suffering.'
 And that on account of being, there is birth; that having come into being, there is decay and death.⁹⁹

REFRAIN: THE BUDDHA'S FULL SELF-AWAKENING

171.4 Therefore, bhikshus,
 through **the complete destruction of craving,**

⁹⁸ If we take the *tathāgata* [S147] in the 7th cycle as referring to a pratyeka-buddha (*pacceka, buddha*), then, this refers to a fully self-awakened buddha (*sammā, sambuddha*).

⁹⁹ This sentence is the gist of 12-linked dependent arising (*paṭicca samuppāda*, eg **Mahā Taṇhā, saṅkhaya S**, M 38). Comy explains that "**delight(ing)**" (*nandī*) is past-life craving, bringing about the suffering of the 5 aggregates in the present life; "**being**" (*bhava*), the karmically determinative aspect of the present life causing future birth, followed by future decay and death. This passage shows that the Buddha destroys mental conceiving by his penetration of dependent arising on the night of his awakening (MA 1:52 f). The mention of "delight" (*nandī*) as the root of suffering reflects the Sutta's title. "Moreover, by referring to the earlier statement that the ordinary person delights in earth, etc, it shows suffering to be the ultimate consequence of delight." (M:ÑB 1168 n29).

through fading away (of lust),¹⁰⁰
 through cessation (of suffering),¹⁰¹
 through letting go (of defilements),¹⁰²
 the Tathāgata has attained **full self-awakening**, I say!¹⁰³

172 [2] He directly knows **water** as water.
 Having perceived water as water:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) water;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in water;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from water;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Water is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in water.

172.3 Why is that? Because he knows thus: 'Delight is the root of suffering.'
 And that on account of being, there is birth; that having come into being, there is decay and death. [171.3]

REFRAIN: THE BUDDHA'S FULL SELF-AWAKENING

172.4 Therefore, bhikshus, [§171.4]
 through the complete destruction of craving,
 through fading away (of lust),
 through cessation (of suffering),
 through letting go (of defilements),
 the Tathāgata has attained full self-awakening, I say!

173 [3] He directly knows **fire** as fire.
 Having perceived fire as fire:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) fire;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in fire;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from fire;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Fire is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in fire.

173.2 Why is that? Because he knows thus: 'Delight is the root of suffering.'
 And that on account of being, there is birth; that having come into being, there is decay and death. [171.3]

REFRAIN: THE BUDDHA'S FULL SELF-AWAKENING

173.3 Therefore, bhikshus, [§171.4]
 through **the complete destruction of craving**,
 through fading away (of lust),
 through cessation (of suffering),
 through letting go (of defilements),
 the Tathāgata has attained full self-awakening, I say!

¹⁰⁰ "Fading away [of lust]" (*virāga*), alt tr "dispassion" [§21].

¹⁰¹ That is, "cessation of suffering" (*nirodha*) ([§21]).

¹⁰² MA says that there are 2 kinds of letting go or relinquishment (of suffering) (*vossagga*): "giving up" (*pariccāga*), ie., the abandonment of defilements, and "entering into" (*pakkhandana*), ie, culminating in nirvana.

¹⁰³ Comy says that the Tathāgata does not conceive earth and does not delight in earth because he has understood that delight is the root of suffering. Further, by understanding origination dependent arising, he has completely destroyed craving here called "delight," and awakened to full self-awakening (MA 1:54).

174 [4] He directly knows **wind** [air] as wind [air].
 Having directly known wind as wind:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) wind;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in wind;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from wind;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Wind is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in wind.

174.2 Why is that? Because he knows thus: 'Delight is the root of suffering.'
 And that on account of being, there is birth; that having come into being, there is decay and death. [171.3]

REFRAIN: THE BUDDHA'S FULL SELF-AWAKENING

174.3 Therefore, bhikshus, [§171.4]
 through the complete destruction of craving,
 through fading away (of lust),
 through cessation (of suffering),
 through letting go (of defilements),
 the Tathāgata has attained full self-awakening, I say!

Beings and gods (8)

175 [5] He directly knows **beings** [§6] as beings.
 Having directly known beings as beings:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) beings;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in beings;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from beings;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Beings are mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in beings.

175.2 Why is that? Because he knows thus: 'Delight is the root of suffering.'
 And that on account of being, there is birth; that having come into being, there is decay and death. [171.3]

REFRAIN: THE BUDDHA'S FULL SELF-AWAKENING

175.3 Therefore, bhikshus, [§171.4]
 through the complete destruction of craving,
 through fading away (of lust),
 through cessation (of suffering),
 through letting go (of defilements),
 the Tathāgata has attained full self-awakening, I say!

THE SENSE-SPHERE GODS

176 [6] He directly knows **gods** as gods.
 Having directly known gods as gods:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in gods;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from gods;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Gods are mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in gods.

176.2 Why is that? Because he knows thus: 'Delight is the root of suffering.'
And that on account of being, there is birth; that having come into being, there is decay and death. [171.3]

REFRAIN: THE BUDDHA'S FULL SELF-AWAKENING

176.3 Therefore, bhikshus, [§171.4]
through the complete destruction of craving,
through fading away (of lust),
through cessation (of suffering),
through letting go (of defilements),
the Tathāgata has attained full self-awakening, I say!

177 [7] He directly knows **Prajāpati** [§8] as Prajāpati.
Having directly known Prajāpati as Prajāpati:
he does *not* conceive (himself as) Prajāpati;
he does *not* conceive (himself) in Prajāpati;
he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Prajāpati;
he does *not* conceive, 'Prajāpati is mine.'
—He does *not* delight in Prajāpati.

177.2 Why is that? Because he knows thus: 'Delight is the root of suffering.'
And that on account of being, there is birth; that having come into being, there is decay and death. [171.3]

REFRAIN: THE BUDDHA'S FULL SELF-AWAKENING

177.3 Therefore, bhikshus, [§171.4]
through the complete destruction of craving,
through fading away (of lust),
through cessation (of suffering),
through letting go (of defilements),
the Tathāgata has attained full self-awakening, I say!

THE 4 FORM-SPHERE GODS (8)

THE 1ST-DHYANA SPHERE

178 [8] He directly knows **Brahmā** as Brahmā.
Having directly known Brahmā as Brahmā:
he does *not* conceive (himself as) Brahmā;
he does *not* conceive (himself) in Brahmā;
he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Brahmā;
he does *not* conceive, 'Brahmā is mine.'
—He does *not* delight in Brahmā.

178.2 Why is that? Because he knows thus: 'Delight is the root of suffering.'
And that on account of being, there is birth; that having come into being, there is decay and death. [171.3]

REFRAIN: THE BUDDHA'S FULL SELF-AWAKENING

178.3 Therefore, bhikshus, [§171.4]
through the complete destruction of craving,
through fading away (of lust),
through cessation (of suffering),

through letting go (of defilements),
the Tathāgata has attained full self-awakening, I say!

THE 2ND-DHYANA SPHERE

179 [9] He directly knows **the Ābhassarā gods** as Ābhassarā gods.
Having directly known the Ābhassarā gods as Ābhassarā gods:
he does *not* conceive (himself as) Ābhassarā gods;
he does *not* conceive (himself) in Ābhassarā gods;
he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Ābhassarā gods;
he does *not* conceive, ‘Ābhassarā gods are mine.’
—He does *not* delight in Ābhassarā gods.

179.2 Why is that? Because he knows thus: ‘Delight is the root of suffering.’
And that on account of being, there is birth; that having come into being, there is decay and death. [171.3]

REFRAIN: THE BUDDHA’S FULL SELF-AWAKENING

179.3 Therefore, bhikshus, [§171.4]
through the complete destruction of craving,
through fading away (of lust),
through cessation (of suffering),
through letting go (of defilements),
the Tathāgata has attained full self-awakening, I say!

THE 3RD-DHYANA SPHERE

180 [10] He directly knows **the Subha,kiṇṇā gods** as Subha,kiṇṇā gods.
Having directly known the Subha,kiṇṇā gods as Subha,kiṇṇā gods:
he does *not* conceive (himself as) Subha,kiṇṇā gods;
he does *not* conceive (himself) in Subha,kiṇṇā gods;
he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Subha,kiṇṇā gods;
he does *not* conceive, ‘Subha,kiṇṇā gods are mine.’
—He does *not* delight in Subha,kiṇṇā gods.

180.2 Why is that? Because he knows thus: ‘Delight is the root of suffering.’
And that on account of being, there is birth; that having come into being, there is decay and death. [171.3]

REFRAIN: THE BUDDHA’S FULL SELF-AWAKENING

180.3 Therefore, bhikshus, [§171.4]
through the complete destruction of craving,
through fading away (of lust),
through cessation (of suffering),
through letting go (of defilements),
the Tathāgata has attained full self-awakening, I say!

THE 4TH-DHYANA SPHERE

181 [11] He directly knows **the Vaha-p,phalā gods** as Vaha-p,phalā gods.
Having directly known the Vaha-p,phalā gods as Vaha-p,phalā gods:
he does *not* conceive (himself as) Vaha-p,phalā gods;
he does *not* conceive (himself) in Vaha-p,phalā gods;
he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from Vaha-p,phalā gods;

he does *not* conceive, 'Veha-p,phalā gods are mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in Veha-p,phalā gods.

181.2 Why is that? Because he knows thus: 'Delight is the root of suffering.'
 And that on account of being, there is birth; that having come into being, there is decay and death. [171.3]

REFRAIN: THE BUDDHA'S FULL SELF-AWAKENING

181.3 Therefore, bhikshus, [§171.4]
 through the complete destruction of craving,
 through fading away (of lust),
 through cessation (of suffering),
 through letting go (of defilements),
 the Tathāgata has attained full self-awakening, I say!

182 [12] He directly knows **the overcomers** [§13] as overcomers.
 Having directly known the overcomers as overcomers:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) overcomers;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in overcomers;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from overcomers;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Overcomers are mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in overcomers.

182.2 Why is that? Because he knows thus: 'Delight is the root of suffering.'
 And that on account of being, there is birth; that having come into being, there is decay and death. [171.3]

REFRAIN: THE BUDDHA'S FULL SELF-AWAKENING

182.3 Therefore, bhikshus, [§171.4]
 through the complete destruction of craving,
 through fading away (of lust),
 through cessation (of suffering),
 through letting go (of defilements),
 the Tathāgata has attained full self-awakening, I say!

THE 4 FORMLESS SPHERES (8)

183 [13] He directly knows **the sphere of infinite space** as the sphere of infinite space.
 Having directly known the sphere of infinite space as the sphere of infinite space:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the sphere of infinite space;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the sphere of infinite space;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the sphere of infinite space;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The sphere of infinite space is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the sphere of infinite space.

183.2 Why is that? Because he knows thus: 'Delight is the root of suffering.'
 And that on account of being, there is birth; that having come into being, there is decay and death. [171.3]

REFRAIN: THE BUDDHA'S FULL SELF-AWAKENING

183.3 Therefore, bhikshus, [§171.4]
 through the complete destruction of craving,

through fading away (of lust),
 through cessation (of suffering),
 through letting go (of defilements),
 the Tathāgata has attained full self-awakening, I say!

184 [14] He directly knows **the sphere of infinite consciousness** as

	the sphere of infinite consciousness.
Having directly known <u>the sphere of infinite consciousness</u> as	the sphere of infinite consciousness:
he does <i>not</i> conceive (himself as)	the sphere of infinite consciousness;
he does <i>not</i> conceive (himself) in	the sphere of infinite consciousness;
he does <i>not</i> conceive (himself apart) from	the sphere of infinite consciousness;
he does <i>not</i> conceive,	‘The sphere of infinite consciousness is mine.’
—He does <i>not</i> delight in	the sphere of infinite consciousness.

184.2 Why is that? Because he knows thus: ‘Delight is the root of suffering.’
 And that on account of being, there is birth; that having come into being, there is decay and death. [171.3]

REFRAIN: THE BUDDHA’S FULL SELF-AWAKENING

184.3 Therefore, bhikshus, [§171.4]
 through the complete destruction of craving,
 through fading away (of lust),
 through cessation (of suffering),
 through letting go (of defilements),
 the Tathāgata has attained full self-awakening, I say!

185 [15] He directly knows **the sphere of nothingness** as the sphere of nothingness.
 Having directly known the sphere of nothingness as the sphere of nothingness:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the sphere of nothingness;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the sphere of nothingness;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the sphere of nothingness;
 he does *not* conceive, ‘The sphere of nothingness is mine.’
 —He does *not* delight in the sphere of nothingness.

185.2 Why is that? Because he knows thus: ‘Delight is the root of suffering.’
 And that on account of being, there is birth; that having come into being, there is decay and death. [171.3]

REFRAIN: THE BUDDHA’S FULL SELF-AWAKENING

185.3 Therefore, bhikshus, [§171.4]
 through the complete destruction of craving,
 through fading away (of lust),
 through cessation (of suffering),
 through letting go (of defilements),
 the Tathāgata has attained full self-awakening, I say!

186 [16] He directly knows **the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception** as
 the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception.
 Having directly known the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception as
 the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception:
 he does *not* conceive the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception;

he does <i>not</i> conceive (himself) in	the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception;
he does <i>not</i> conceive (himself apart) from	the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception;
he does <i>not</i> conceive,	‘The sphere of neither perception nor non-perception is mine.’
—He does <i>not</i> delight in	the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception.

186.2 Why is that? Because he knows thus: ‘Delight is the root of suffering.’
And that on account of being, there is birth; that having come into being, there is decay and death. [171.3]

REFRAIN: THE BUDDHA’S FULL SELF-AWAKENING

186.3 Therefore, bhikshus, [§171.4]
through the complete destruction of craving,
through fading away (of lust),
through cessation (of suffering),
through letting go (of defilements),
the Tathāgata has attained full self-awakening, I say!

THE 4 MODES OF PERCEPTION¹⁰⁴ (8)

187 [17] He directly knows **the seen** as the seen.
Having directly known the seen as the seen:
he does *not* conceive (himself as) the seen;
he does *not* conceive (himself) in the seen;
he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the seen;
he does *not* conceive, ‘The seen is mine.’
—He does *not* delight in the seen.

187.2 Why is that? Because he knows thus: ‘Delight is the root of suffering.’
And that on account of being, there is birth; that having come into being, there is decay and death. [171.3]

REFRAIN: THE BUDDHA’S FULL SELF-AWAKENING

187.3 Therefore, bhikshus, [§171.4]
through the complete destruction of craving,
through fading away (of lust),
through cessation (of suffering),
through letting go (of defilements),
the Tathāgata has attained full self-awakening, I say!

188 [18] He directly knows **the heard** as the heard.
Having directly known the heard as the heard:
he does *not* conceive (himself as) the heard;
he does *not* conceive (himself) in the heard;
he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the heard;
he does *not* conceive, ‘The heard is mine.’
—He does *not* delight in the heard.

188.2 Why is that? Because he knows thus: ‘Delight is the root of suffering.’
And that on account of being, there is birth; that having come into being, there is decay and death. [171.3]

¹⁰⁴ See n at subheader [§19].

REFRAIN: THE BUDDHA'S FULL SELF-AWAKENING

188.3 Therefore, bhikshus, [§171.4]

through the complete destruction of craving,

through fading away

through cessation

through letting go

(of lust),

(of suffering),

(of defilements),

the Tathāgata has attained full self-awakening, I say!

189 [19] He directly knows **the sensed** as the sensed.
 Having directly known the sensed as the sensed:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the sensed;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the sensed;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the sensed;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The sensed is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the sensed.

189.2 Why is that? Because he knows thus: 'Delight is the root of suffering.'
 And that on account of being, there is birth; that having come into being, there is decay and death. [171.3]

REFRAIN: THE BUDDHA'S FULL SELF-AWAKENING

189.3 Therefore, bhikshus, [§171.4]

through the complete destruction of craving,

through fading away

through cessation

through letting go

(of lust),

(of suffering),

(of defilements),

the Tathāgata has attained full self-awakening, I say!

190 [20] He directly knows **the known** as the known.
 Having directly known the known as the known:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) the known;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in the known;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from the known;
 he does *not* conceive, 'The known is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in the known.

190.2 Why is that? Because he knows thus: 'Delight is the root of suffering.'
 And that on account of being, there is birth; that having come into being, there is decay and death. [171.3]

REFRAIN: THE BUDDHA'S FULL SELF-AWAKENING

190.3 Therefore, bhikshus, [§171.4]

through the complete destruction of

through fading away

through cessation

through letting go

craving,

(of lust),

(of suffering),

(of defilements),

the Tathāgata has attained full self-awakening, I say!

THE MODES OF PERSONAL IDENTITY¹⁰⁵ (8)

191 [21] He directly knows **unity** as unity.
 Having directly known unity as unity:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) unity;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in unity;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from unity;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Unity is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in unity.

191.2 Why is that? Because he knows thus: 'Delight is the root of suffering.'
 And that on account of being, there is birth; that having come into being, there is decay and death. [171.3]

REFRAIN: THE BUDDHA'S FULL SELF-AWAKENING

191.3 Therefore, bhikshus, [§171.4]
 through the complete destruction of craving,
 through fading away (of lust),
 through cessation (of suffering),
 through letting go (of defilements),
 the Tathāgata has attained full self-awakening, I say!

192 [22] He directly knows **diversity** as diversity.
 Having directly known diversity as diversity:
 he does *not* conceive (himself as) diversity;
 he does *not* conceive (himself) in diversity;
 he does *not* conceive (himself apart) from diversity;
 he does *not* conceive, 'Diversity is mine.'
 —He does *not* delight in diversity.

192.2 Why is that? Because he knows thus: 'Delight is the root of suffering.'
 And that on account of being, there is birth; that having come into being, there is decay and death. [171.3]

REFRAIN: THE BUDDHA'S FULL SELF-AWAKENING

192.3 Therefore, bhikshus, [§171.4]
 through the complete destruction of craving,
 through fading away (of lust),
 through cessation (of suffering),
 through letting go (of defilements),
 the Tathāgata has attained full self-awakening, I say!

193 [23] He directly knows **all** as all.
 Having directly known all as all:
 he does not conceive (himself as) all;
 he does not conceive (himself) in all;
 he does not conceive (himself apart) from all;
 he does not conceive, 'All is mine.'
 —He does not delight in all (as identity).

¹⁰⁵ The first two sections [§§167-168] of this division refers to the perception of personal identity in two ways: by way of *unity* and of *diversity*. See §§23-24.

193.2 Why is that? Because he knows thus: ‘Delight is the root of suffering.’
And that on account of being, there is birth; that having come into being, there is decay and death. [171.3]

REFRAIN: THE BUDDHA’S FULL SELF-AWAKENING

193.3 Therefore, bhikshus, [§171.4]
through the complete destruction of craving,
through fading away (of lust),
through cessation (of suffering),
through letting go (of defilements),
the Tathāgata has attained full self-awakening, I say!

194 [24] He directly knows **nirvana** as nirvana.
Having perceived nirvana as nirvana:
he does not conceive (himself as) nirvana;
he does not conceive (himself) in nirvana;
he does not conceive (himself apart) from nirvana;
he does not conceive, ‘Nirvana is mine.’

194.2 Why is that? Because he knows thus: ‘Delight is the root of suffering.’
And that on account of being, there is birth; that having come into being, there is decay and death. [171.3]

REFRAIN: THE BUDDHA’S FULL SELF-AWAKENING

195 Therefore, bhikshus, [§171.4]
through the complete destruction of craving,
through fading away (of lust),
through cessation (of suffering),
through letting go (of defilements),
the Tathāgata has attained full self-awakening, I say!

196 This is what the Blessed One said. The monks did not rejoice in the Blessed One’s word.¹⁰⁶

— evaṃ —

Bibliography

- Analayo
2005 *A Comparative Study of the Majjhima Nikāya*. Draft digital version.
- Basham, A L
1989 *The Origins and Development of Classical Hinduism*. [Orig lecture nn] Ed & annot Kenneth G. Zysk. Boston: Beacon Press, 1989.
- Bodhi, Bhikkhu
1980 →Mūla,pariyāya Sutta 1980.
- Buddhadatta, A P
1968 [CPED] *Concise Pāli-English Dictionary*. Ahangama: U Chandradasa de Silva, 1968.

¹⁰⁶ Se *Na attamanā te bhikkhū Bhagavato bhāsitaṃ abhinandun ti*. Be omits *attamanā*. PTS ed has wr: *Attamanā te bhikkhū Bhagavato bhāsitaṃ abhinandun ti*. See (6.5).

- Horner, I B
1954 →Mūla,pariyāya Sutta 1954.
- Jayatilleke, K N
1963 *Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge*. London: Allen & Unwin 1963; repr Delhi: MLBD, 1980. [Śramaṇa movement, 1963:69-168.] Bk rev: Robinson, Richard H.P., 1969. Cf A.B. Keith, 1963.
- Jayawickrama, NA
2003 (MA:J) → Mūla,pariyāya Sutta Commentary (MA) 2003.
2004 (MA:J) → Mūla,pariyāya Sutta Commentary (MA) 2004.
- Mayeda, Egaku
1985 “Japanese Studies on the Schools of the Chinese Āgamas,” in *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*, Bechert (ed), vol 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985:94-103.
- Mūla,pariyāya Sutta**
1954 [M:H] *The Collection of The Middle Length Sayings (Majjhima Nikāya)*. Vol 1 (of 3 vols). Tr I B Horner. London: Pali Text Society, 1954. Since repr.
1980 *The Discourse on the Root of Existence: The Mūlapariyāya Sutta and its Commentarial Exegesis*. Tr Bhikkhu Bodhi. Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society, 1980.
2001 [M:ÑB] *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha: A translation of the Majjhima Nikāya*. [1995] Tr Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli & Bhikkhu Bodhi. 2nd ed. Boston: Wisdom Publication, 2001.
2002a *Mūlapariyāya Sutta: The Root Sequence*. Tr Ṭhānissaro Bhikkhu. Digital ed 17 May 2002. <http://www.accesstoinight.org/canon/majjhima/mn001.html>
- Mūla,pariyāya Sutta Commentary (MA:J)**
2003 (MA:J) “Papañcasūdanī: The Commentary on the Majjhimanikāya” [part 1 of 2], tr NA Jayawickrama. *Journal of the Centre for Buddhist Studies, Sri Lanka* 2, Jan 2004:73-119.
2004 (MA:J) “Papañcasūdanī: The Commentary on the Majjhimanikāya” [part 2 of 2], tr NA Jayawickrama. *Journal of the Centre for Buddhist Studies, Sri Lanka* 2, Jan 2004:1-57.
- Ñāṇamoli, Bhikkhu
1994 [PEG] *A Pali-English Glossary of Buddhist Technical Terms*. Ed Bhikkhu Bodhi. Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society, 1994.
- Ñāṇananda, Bhikkhu K
2004 *Nibbāna: The mind stilled* vol 2. Sri Lanka: Dharma Grantha Mudrana Bhāraya, 2004.
2005 *Nibbāna: The mind stilled* vol 3. Sri Lanka: Dharma Grantha Mudrana Bhāraya, 2005: 267-297. Recommended reading.
- Ṭhānissaro Bhikkhu
2002a →Mūla,pariyāya Sutta 2002.
2002b *Handful of Leaves* vols 1-4. Santa Cruz: Sati Centre for Buddhist Studies, 2002.
- Thich Minh Chau
1991 *The Chinese Madhyama Āgama and the Pāli Majjhima Nikāya: A comparative study*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1991.

050225 rev060603 071219 090814 100104 110909 120928 160318 180718 190419 211108 220415
220826