

14

(Chakka) Vivāda,mūla Sutta

The (Sixes) Discourse on the Roots of Dispute | A 6.36

Theme: 6 conditions that promote discord

Translated & annotated by Piya Tan ©2008, 2014

1 Sutta significance

1.1 THE 6 ROOTS OF DISPUTE are the basic negative qualities that bring about disputes and strife in a community or amongst people, even friends. This seems to be an ancient list which was expanded upon to form longer lists, as we would notice below [2].

(1) <i>kodhano hoti</i>	<i>upanāhī</i>	[§2]	the angry,	the resentful;
(2) <i>makkhī hoti</i>	<i>paḷāsī</i>	[§10]	the mean,	the spiteful;
(3) <i>issukī hoti</i>	<i>maccharī</i>	[§16]	the envious,	the selfish;
(4) <i>saṭho hoti</i>	<i>māyāvī</i>	[§23]	the crafty,	the deceitful;
(5) <i>pāp'iccho hoti</i>	<i>micchā,diṭṭhi</i>	[§30]	one with bad desire,	with wrong views;
(6) <i>sandiṭṭhi,parāmāsī hoti</i>	<i>ādhāna-g,gāhī duppaṭinissaggī</i>	[§37]	one who is stuck to his own views,	tenaciously holding on to them, unable to let them go.

1.2 DEALING WITH THE 6 ROOTS. The (Chakka) Vivāda,mūla Sutta follows a simple instruction cycle of mentioning each pair of roots, following by the statement that those who are caught up in them would disrespect the 3 jewels and the training [eg §3]. A person with such disrespect would cause disputes in the sangha [eg §4].

1.3 THE 4 RESPECTS.

1.3.0 Context. The theme of the (Chakka) Vivāda,mūla Sutta is the 4 kinds of respect (*gāravatā*), that is, towards the Buddha, the Dharma, the sangha, and the training. These 4 kinds of respect are sometimes expanded into the 6 kinds of respect, which are the conditions for non-decline (*aparīhāniya dhamma*), that is,

(1) respect for the Teacher	<i>satthu,gāravatā,</i>
(2) respect for the Dharma	<i>dhamma.garavatā,</i>
(3) respect for the sangha	<i>saṅgha,gāravatā,</i>
(4) respect for the training	<i>sikkhā,gāravatā,</i>
(5) respect for heedfulness	<i>appamāda,gāravatā,</i>
(6) respect for hospitality	<i>paṭisanthāra,gāravatā.</i> ¹

These 6 kinds of respect have been discussed in some detail in the Introduction to **the (Upagantabba) Kula Sutta** (A 9.17).² Here, we shall only briefly examine them in the context of the (Chakka) Vivāda,mūla Sutta, that is, as the roots of disputes.

Respect, in practical terms, means accepting a person as he really is or situation as it really is. This is an unconditional acceptance, that is, it is rooted in lovingkindness. On a deeper level, respect means we that our unconditional acceptance is rooted in the vision that this person or state is worthy of that respect because of their inherent goodness—that is, we rejoice in that person or state.

Hence, here—in the case of the 3 jewels and Dharma training—our respect is rooted in lovingkindness and gladness, which moves us to see the Buddha as the ideal of awakening, the Dharma as the path to awakening which we follow, the sangha (the community of saints) as spiritual exemplars and our inspiration, and the training, the method of personal development which we practise for the sake of awakening in this life itself.

¹ See Love, SD 38.4 (6).

² A 9.17/4:387 f @ SD 37.11 (1-7).

1.3.1 Do not disrespect the Buddha

1.3.1.1 We disrespect the Buddha when we worship other “Buddhas,” because the historical Buddha is the first and only fully self-awakened one, and there is only one such being, just as there is only one captain of a ship, and we need only one Buddha. In the **Bahu,dhātuka Sutta** (M 115), the Buddha is recorded as declaring that if a person is “skilled in the possible and the impossible,” then

He understands that it is impossible, there is no chance, that *two worthy fully self-awakened ones (arahatā sammā,sambuddhā)* would simultaneously³ arise in the same world system—this is not possible.⁴

And he understands that it is possible, there is the chance, one worthy fully self-awakened one would arise in one world system—this is possible. (M 115,14/3:65), SD 29.1a

It also means that we neither worship nor seek refuge in another other “Buddhas,” past, present or future. The stories of past buddhas are meant to remind us that every world period or historical period has its own buddha, but only one such buddha each time. There are no present Buddhas, whether from south or southeast Asia, Tibet, China, Japan, or anywhere else, as we are still living in the dispensation of our historical Buddha, Gotama. We do not worship the future Buddha, simply because he is not yet Buddha!

Furthermore, we do not *worship* the Buddha because he does not want to be worshipped, as it is not really helpful, and even goes against the Dharma. In the **(Pañcaka) Iṭṭha Sutta** (A 5.43), for example, the Buddha declares that praying and wishing for various benefits or blessings do not really help, but we should live a life that conduces to the good that we desire, that is, to at least live a morally virtuous life.⁵

In the **Mahā,parinibbāna Sutta** (D 16), the Buddha, in one of his last instructions, points out that even when the gods rain down heavenly flowers, fill the air with fragrance and sweet divine music, and make other displays, this is *not* the way to “worship” the Buddha, The supreme worship (*paramā,pūjā*) of the Buddha is to practise his teachings and work for awakening in this life itself.⁶

1.3.2 Do not disrespect the Dharma

1.3.2.1 The worst way to disrespect the Dharma is neither to study nor practise it. Instead, we are caught up the ways of the world, of “having” things, or collecting more and ever more things of the world, and neglecting our personal and spiritual growth. The Dharma teaches us to bail out our boat so that we sail more safely and speedily (Dh 369). This means letting go of negative thoughts, avoiding negative people, stop watching negative shows. Go into the light of the Dharma by studying the suttas, cultivating lovingkindness, and breathing happily and peacefully.

We disrespect the Dharma when we think of it in terms of things and quantity. We disrespect the Dharma when we see it as being outside of ourselves: we falsely see Dharma as large impressive buildings, as famous or “powerful” teachers, or glossy religious books that we do not really read, or powerful or magical prayers and objects, as wealth, beauty or comfort. Instead, we should spend quiet time reflecting on the Buddha sitting all alone and radiant under the Bodhi tree, neither afraid of nor needing anyone or anything in the world or outside of it. The Buddha never gives up, even when the 5 monks leave him to meditate all alone under the Bodhi tree. We, too, should sit alone and radiant under our Bodhi tree.

Instead of saying that the suttas and teachings are deep and difficult, we should look at those parts of the suttas and teachings that we understand and can connect with. It’s like taking a healthy meal a mouthful at a time: we do not look at the food-plate and dishes, and resign ourselves, saying that it is too much or too little) for us. We take our food a mouthful at a time, chewing it mindfully and enjoyably. Good

³ *Apubbam acarimam*, lit “not before, not after” (D 2:225,5; A 1:28,1; Pug 13,26; Miln 40,30; DhA 1:12,17).

⁴ As in **Mahā Govinda S** (D 19,13/2:224). **Sampasādaniya S** (D 28,19/3:114), **Bahu,dhātuka S** (M 115,14/-3:65), **Aṭṭhāna Vagga** (A 1.15,10/1:27 f), Vbh 335. Comy says that the arising of another Buddha is impossible from the time the Bodhisattva takes his final conception until his dispensation (*sāsana*) has completely disappeared (MA 4:113). For a discussion, see Miln 236-239.

⁵ A 5.43/3:47-49 @ SD 47.2.

⁶ D 16,5,1-3/2:138 + SD 9 (7.2).

food and good meal habits keeps us physically healthy; respect for the Dharma keeps us mentally healthy and ready for awakening.

1.3.3 Do not disrespect the sangha

1.3.3.1 The word *saṅgha* is always used throughout the early Buddhist suttas to refer to the monastic sangha, never to laity. We would disrespect the Buddha's sangha if we use it to refer to any other group, especially lay Buddhist group.⁷ The word "sangha" is respectfully reserved for the community of saints (the streamwinners and so on, monastic and lay) and for the order of monastics, or conventional sangha. We do not go for refuge to the conventional sangha (who are not awakened), but to the noble sangha, because they are really the ones who are authentic examples of those who walk path or have attained arhat-hood.

Not every important-looking Buddhist who wear robes, especially ornate ones, is a monastic (celibate monk or nun). The word **monastic** comes from the late Greek *μοναστικός* (monastikos) which means "pertaining to solitary life," or *μονάζειν* (monazein) meaning "to live alone," both of which in turn comes *monos*, meaning "one." Properly and historically speaking, a monastic then is celibate and keeps to holy vows, and in the case of Buddhism, live a life of renunciation, working for awakening in this life itself.

Legally speaking, there are no monastics in Japanese Buddhism since 1st May 1872, when **the *niku-jiki saitai*** 肉食妻帯 ("meat-eating and marriage") law was passed. The law says: "[F]rom now on Buddhist clerics shall be free to eat meat, marry, grow their hair, and so on. Furthermore, they are permitted to wear ordinary clothing when not engaged in religious activities."⁸

In Korea, at the height of the Japanese occupation of Korea, by mid-20th century, virtually all Korean temple abbots were married.⁹ After independence in 1945, efforts to revive the celibate order started and today more than half of Korean monastics are celibate again.¹⁰ However, no such efforts have been made in Japan to this day. However, apparently, there are Japanese priests who live celibate lives quietly on their own today.

Even where there are traditional monastics, such as in the ethnic Buddhisms of Sri Lanka and south-east Asia, there seems to be a growing secularization and laxity amongst its members. Many, if not most, such traditional monastics, furthermore, tend to be inclined to lead worldly lives (for example, earning salaries as academics), with large personal bank accounts and so on.¹¹ All this is, of course, against the Vinaya. Such clerics then are properly called "priests," and not monastics, as they lack respect for the Vinaya.

Such negative trends can be stopped and corrected if the Theravāda elders convene to decide on some proper course of ecclesiastical action, in other words, some kind of monastic reform. Meantime, due to this monastic anomie, the laity are increasingly taking over the roles of study and teaching the suttas and meditation, and to serve as contemporary spiritual exemplars where virtuous monastics are lacking.

The authentic monastic sangha should be preserved to uphold the spirit of early Buddhism, where the life of renunciation is the direct path of awakening in this life itself, that is, as non-returner or as arhats. As for the laity, we should work at least to attain streamwinning, if not once-return,¹² in this life itself, although it is still possible, if we are up to it, to work for higher goals.¹³

1.3.4 Disrespecting the training

1.3.4.1 When we doubt that we can help ourselves, especially in terms solving personal problems or becoming a better person, we are not really aware of the spirit of the Buddha's teaching, which clearly

⁷ A proper term for such a group would be "community," or even the oxymoron, "lay sangha." This is simply out of respect for the third of the 3 jewels, to which we go for refuge, not to the conventional sangha,

⁸ R M Jaffe, *Neither Monk Nor Layman*, Princeton, 2001:72. See SD 66.13 (2.4).

⁹ See Piya Tan, *History of Buddhism* 4, Buddhism in Korea, Singapore: The Minding Centre, 2004: (19).

¹⁰ See Piya Tan, op cit, 2004: (22).

¹¹ See **Money and monastics**, SD 4.19.

¹² See **Entering the stream**, SD 3.3.

¹³ On lay arhats, see SD 37.4 (4).

means that we have not made proper effort in understanding the Dharma as preserved in the suttas. Then we depend on the teachings of worldly teachers and worldly ways.

Or, we look for answers to our inner issues *outside* of ourselves, seeking guidance and answers in the occult (such as fortune-telling) and magic. Or, we turn to believing in some external agency¹⁴—such as God, gods, demons and spirits—seeking succour or solutions from them. In short, we become superstitious.

Or, we might be caught up with rituals and vows, habitually going through repetitive behaviour, even with religious faith, that such rituals or vows can solve our problems, or bring us rebirth in some paradise, or become Buddha. This is called attachment to ritual and vows, which hinders us from even attaining streamwinning. Holding a wrong view, or teaching such a false view is only likely to bring us a subhuman rebirth.

Believing in some kind of “permanent” self or state of things (such as thinking, “I’m like that,” or “He’s always like that!”) are signs that we are emotionally insecure. To constantly have self-doubt and not work on self-effort are signs of emotional dependence. To rely on outside help for internal problems, and get caught up in rituals and vows betrays signs of emotional lack.

We need to practise renunciation (*nekkhamma*), even humility, on the simplest level, that is, beginning with ourselves. First, we must let go of the notion of permanence. We should reflect and remind ourselves that everything in this world is impermanent: our problems are impermanent, they arise from various conditions, and not caused by any one person or thing.

Secondly, we must give up the notion that we are helpless; we must let go of self-doubt. We must silence that inner voice which keeps telling us that we are “sinful,” or evil or bad by nature, or unlucky, and so on. We need to forgive ourselves, simply by allowing ourselves to say it: “I forgive myself completely! I accept myself completely!” Make every effort to understand the nature of lovingkindness, and to cultivate it.¹⁵

Thirdly, live a wholesome life, constantly recalling happy memories and being fully present to happy occasions and happy people. Learn about the 5 precepts, and how to keep them. Use lovingkindness to unconditionally accept others, too, so that this helps us to live a moral life. Such a life, in turn, helps us to free ourselves from our guilt and false views, and become more calm and clear in our hearts.¹⁶ Best of all, at least aspire to attain spiritual awakening by way of streamwinning in this life itself. It’s easier than you think.¹⁷

1.3.5 Beyond disrespect

1.3.5.1 With the separation of state and church, the rise of political freedom, and the availability of education and information (including Buddhist knowledge and practices), we see religion generally, and Buddhism particularly, thrown into a global and competitive market. Buddhist teachings have become profitable products, religious people are salesmen (note how many of them are dressed, titled and employed), religious rituals are sales pitches, and everything religious used as memes¹⁸ to attract a clientele and control the market.

In such a situation, worldly monastics and priests are more likely to at least put up a front of civility and respect towards the Dharma and to each other, and even go about with a sense of ecumenism, despite the palpable differences in lineage, tradition and background. But the calm is only on the surface of things. **The Kāraṇḍāva Sutta** (A 8.10) records the Buddha as astutely observing such false monastics, thus:

With a calm [dulcet] voice, like a recluse, | he speaks amidst the people;
in secret, holding | bad views, with no regard for others.¹⁹ (A 8.10/4:173*), SD 106.5 [2.4.1]

¹⁴ On quasi-theistic faith-based Buddhism, see SD 66.13 (2.1.4.5).

¹⁵ See **Brahma, vihāra**, SD 38.5, esp (3).

¹⁶ See **Emotional independence**, SD 40a.8.

¹⁷ See **Entering the stream**, SD 3.3.

¹⁸ See **Memes**, SD 26.3.

¹⁹ On *anādāra*, see **Amagandha S** (Sn 247c) n, SD 4.24.

How Buddhism has fared thus far has been conditioned by various factors, especially our local history, rising modernism, and globalism. Yet, by these very same exigencies, Buddhism has become more available to a wider community and world, even to other religions and to the non-religious. Like all else in this world, even religion, even the Buddha's teaching, is subject to rise and fall. The numerous prophetic suttas and teachings only remind us of such religious fortunes and spiritual challenges, which have to be addressed.

Any decline in the Dharma, the Buddha reminds us, is not driven from outside, but from our own inaction or wrong actions.²⁰ If we disrespect the 3 jewels and the training, then the Dharma will decline and eventually disappear. If we respect them, then they will continue to live and prosper, at least within us.²¹ It takes only one of us, buddha-like, to be courageous in our practice and example, and to speak out, with neither fear nor favour,²² against any disrespect towards the 3 jewels and the training. Even a single voice will be heard and heeded: if the Buddha has done this, it behooves us, out of respect for him, to go on speaking Dharma. We will be heard and there will be hearers.

2 Related suttas

2.1 RECURRENCES OF THE VIVĀDA,MŪLA SUTTA

2.1.1 Vinaya. The teaching on “the 6 roots of disputes” (*vivāda,mūla*) in the Vivāda,mūla Sutta (A 6.36), besides appearing in the Āṅguttara, also recurs, almost verbatim, in **Culla,vagga 4**, the chapter on legal questions (*adhikaraṇa*), in the Vinaya. There the set is said to be “the roots of legal questions” (*vivādādhikaraṇassa mūlam*).²³

The PTS edition of the text lays out only the first root in full, but abridges the rest, mentioning only the keywords (the root of dispute themselves), as *peyyāla* (abridgement or abridgement cycle, like “etc” in English). I B Horner's *Book of Discipline* (1952), too, following the PTS text, gives an abridged translation. The SD translation here, however, lays out all the passages in full, with the *peyyāla* given in italics.

2.1.2 Saṅgīti Sutta. The Vivāda,mūla Sutta is quoted by Sāriputta verbatim in **the Saṅgīti Sutta** (D 33). Most of the other teachings in the Sutta are given only in brief point form, but the Vivāda,mūla Sutta is repeated in full here. This clearly attests to the significance of the Vivāda,mūla Sutta in the Buddha's teaching.²⁴

2.2 RECURRENCES OF THE 6 ROOTS OF DISPUTE

2.2.1 The Anumāna Sutta (M 15), a record of a teaching by Moggallāna, describes all the 6 roots of dispute (in his full list of 16 qualities) in the same sequence, in addition to a seventh one, that of being “obstinate, arrogant” (*thaddho hoti atimānī*), inserted between roots (4) and (5) of the Vivāda,mūla Sutta. There the 7 states are called “qualities that make one difficult to admonish” (*dovacassa,karaṇā dhammā*). He describes the negative effects of anger in four ways, that is, nos (3-6); those of retaliation to being reproved, in four ways (7-10).²⁵

In the second cycle of the Sutta, Moggallāna explains that overcoming these 16 negative qualities make one easy to admonish. The third cycle describes how a monk should use inference (*anumāna*) to effect the abandoning of these negative qualities. This is, in fact, a reflection on the golden rule.²⁶ The Sutta

²⁰ See **Saddhamma Paṭirūpaka S** (S 16.13), SD 1.10 (5.3.1); (**Kassapa**) **Ovāda S 3** (S 16.8), SD 88.5 (full), SD 1.10 (4.5) (quote). Further on the dangers of internal decay, see **Cosmic Buddhas and Paradises**, SD 40b.3 (3.4).

²¹ Further, see the numerous prophetic suttas: **The Dharma-ending age**, SD 1.10.

²² On spiritual courage (*vesārajja*), see SD 28.9a (3).

²³ Cv 4.14.3 @ V 2:89.

²⁴ D 33,2.2(15)/3:246.

²⁵ A more detailed study based on similar negative reactions (in 8 ways) is found in **Khaluṅka S** (A 8.14), SD 7.9.

²⁶ Basically, the reflection goes thus: A person who has this negative quality is “displeasing and disagreeable to me” (*ayam me puggalo appiyo amanāpo*). Paraphrased: “If I were to have such a quality, I would be displeasing and disagreeable to others. Aroused by this reflection, I am moved to abandon that quality.” On the golden rule, see **Veḷu,dvāreyya S** (S 55.7,6-12), SD 1.5.

closes with self-review (*paccavekkhaṇa*) (paraphrased): “Do I have such and such a negative quality? If yes, then I should work to abandon it. If no, then I should dwell zestful and glad, training night and day in wholesome states (meditate).”²⁷

2.2.2 The Sāma,gāma Sutta (M 104) contains similar themes and teachings as **the Pāsādika Sutta** (D 29). In fact, the former is a sort of shorter version, even summary, of the lengthy latter discourse. Both these Suttas record the early Buddhists’ response to the death of the Jain leader, the nirgantha Nāta,putta, which is followed by chaos and dissension in the Jain community. An important point to note is that the Sutta stresses that while it is vital to ensure a correct understanding of the meaning of the true Dharma, any dispute of the wording is trivial.

The Sāma,gāma Sutta (M 104) is an important discourse on monastic discipline and solidarity. It gives various methods of settling disciplinary issues and maintaining solidarity, that is to say, an instructive definition of the 6 roots of dispute, the 4 kinds of litigation, the 6 kinds of settlement of litigation, and the 6 conditions for conciliation. The 6 roots of dispute, as we know, appear on their own in the Vivāda,mūla Sutta.²⁸ The Sāma,gāma Sutta, however, gives a broader perspective of the roots of dispute.²⁹

2.3 LISTINGS OF THE 6 ROOTS OF DISPUTE

2.3.1 Qualities of a “disgusting person.” The **Mahā Niddesa**, in its commentary on the word “not disgusting” (*ajeguccho*) Sn 852a, calls a person with the 6 roots of dispute (amongst other negative qualities) a “disgusting person” (*puggala jeguccha*) (Nm 1:231). The verse, from **the Purābheda Sutta** (Sn 4.10), runs thus:

<i>Paṭilīno akuhako, apihālu amaccharī</i>	Withdrawn, not a liar, not covetous, not selfish,
<i>appagabbho ajeguccho, pesuneyye ca no yuto</i>	unobtrusive, <u>not disgusting</u> , and not given slander.
	(Sn 852)

2.3.2 Imperfections of an ascetic. The **Udumbarikā Sīha,nāda Sutta** (D 25) lists 5 of the 6 roots of dispute, but with a bit of variation. Roots (1-4) and (6) recur in D 25. The root pairs in (5)—“one with bad desire, with wrong views”—however, is split into two “imperfections” (*upakkilesa*) of asceticism, as they are called there. The two imperfections here are:

- (1) “an ascetic has bad desires and is under their sway” (*pāp’iccho hori pāpakānaṃ icchānaṃ vasaṃ gato*) and
- (2) “an ascetic holds wrong views and given to extreme opinions” (*micchā,diṭṭhiko hoti anta-g,gāhikāya diṭṭhiyā samannāgato*). (D 25,11/3:45 f), SD 1.4

These descriptions do, in fact, apply to the “root of dispute” (5) in the Vivāda,mūla Sutta, that is, as its details.

2.3.3 The Sallekha Sutta (M 8) describes a list of 44 “modes of effacement” (*sallekha*). Amongst these 44 are the first four roots of dispute (1-4), and the last (6). In other words, only (5) is omitted. Here, the Buddha treats these pairs of negative qualities separately, but keeping to the same sequence, as in the Vivāda,mūla Sutta. The last pair, however, is treated as one item (as *sabdūthi,parāmāsi,ādhāna.gāhi,duppaṭinissaggi*) [1.1.1].

In this Sutta, the Buddha declares, “Cunda, even an arising in the mind of wholesome states is of great benefit, I say! What more to say of acting bodily and verbal in conformity to it.” (*citt’uppādam pi kho ahaṃ cunda kusalesu dhammesu bahu,kāraṃ vadāmi, ko pana vādo kāyena vācāya anuvidhīyanāsu*). In other words, good begins in the mind: when we think it, we are more likely to act it and speak it. Such actions and words, being rooted in wholesome states, are in themselves wholesome, too. The Buddha then goes on to instruct how this spiritual self-effacement is done.³⁰

²⁷ M 15,3(15)/1:96 etc, SD 59.3.

²⁸ M 104,6-11/2:245 f @ SD 62.4.

²⁹ M 104/2:243-251 @ SD 62.4.

³⁰ M 8,12(24-31, 44)/1:42 f @ SD 51.2.

2.3.4 The Kin'ti Sutta (M 103) is an instructive discourse on dealing with disputes over differences in views on the Dharma, and how they should be amicably dealt with and settled. The same truth, properly understood, may have variant readings in its textual form, which should not cause any dispute. The packaging may differ as long as the content is the same in goodness and quality.³¹

The Kin'ti Sutta mentions only two of the 6 roots of dispute, that is, the first (anger and resentment) and the last, regarding hold wrong views. The Sutta advises us not to show anger or resentment (*akkodhano anupanāhi*) whether another “is firmly attached to his views and abandons them easily” (*dandha, diṭṭhī duppaṭinissaggi*) or not (*adandha, diṭṭhī suppaṭinissaggi*). Note that the sixth root of dispute is more briefly stated.³²

2.3.5 The Puggala Paññatti

2.3.5.1 The Puggala Paññatti (“designation of persons”) is the fourth book of the Pali Abhidhamma, dealing with types of persons, explaining in numerical sets, similar to the Aṅguttara Nikāya. It mentions the first four pairs of roots of disputes. They are first listed in the “**matrix**” (*māṭikā*) at the start of the book, as follows:

(1) anger and resentment,	<i>kodhano ca upanāhi ca</i>	
(2) meanness and spitefulness	<i>makkhī ca paḷāsī ca</i>	
(3) envy and selfishness	<i>issukī ca macchārī ca</i>	
(4) craftiness and deceit	<i>sāṭho ca māyāvī ca</i>	(Pug 3)

2.3.5.2 A **matrix** (*māṭikā*; Skt *māṭṛkā*) is a systematic list or contents of topics, given at the start of a sutta or text (in this case, the Puggala Paññatti), and which are then elaborated in the work. These lists or matrices serve as the forerunner the Abhidharma (that is, including the Pali Abhidhamma), which thus represents an elaboration and analysis of these lists. In some early accounts, these lists were essentially synonymous with the Abhidharma, and both terms are used in differing accounts of the first recitation of the Buddhist canon following the Buddha's death. Indeed, sometimes, the Abhidhamma Piṭaka is sometimes referred to as the Māṭikā Piṭaka.³³

2.3.5.3 The Puggala Paññatti, after listing the first 4 pairs of roots of disputes in its matrix [2.3.5.1], then, each section opens with the following questions:

<i>Katamo ca puggalo kodhano?</i>	“What is an angry person?”	Pug 2.1/18
<i>Katamo ca puggalo upanāhī?</i>	“What is a resentful person?”	Pug 2.1/18
<i>Katamo ca puggalo makkhī?</i>	“What is a mean person?”	Pug 2.2/18
<i>Katamo ca puggalo paḷāsī?</i>	“What is a spiteful person?”	Pug 2.2/18
<i>Katamo ca puggalo issukī?</i>	“What is an envious person?”	Pug 2.3/18
<i>Katamo ca puggalo maccharī?</i>	“What is a selfish person?”	Pug 2.3/18
<i>Katamo ca puggalo sāṭho?</i>	“What is a crafty person?”	Pug 2.4/18
<i>Katamo ca puggalo māyāvī?</i>	“What is a deceitful person?”	Pug 2.4/18

After each question, it is answered by way of an explanation in the Abhidhamma technical style, just as in **the Vibhaṅga** (“analysis”), the second book of the Abhidhamma. These explanations here should be studied alongside their Vibhaṅga parallels (Vbh 356 f).

2.3.6 The Vibhaṅga. Unlike the other older Abhidhamma books (the Dhamma,saṅganī, the Puggala Paññatti and the Paṭṭhāna), the Vibhaṅga does *not* have a *māṭikā*, or opening list. This list, however, can

³¹ M 103/2:238-243 @ SD 85.14.

³² M 103,10-13/2:241 f @ SD 85.14.

³³ On the origin and history of the Abhidharma of the Theravāda and other schools, see the works of E Frauwallner (O von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*, Berlin, 1996 §131). Also see A K Warder (Mohv xix-xxvii), Intro to Moha, vicchedanī (a comy on the *māṭikā* of all 7 canonical Abhidhamma texts; hence, also called Abhidhamma, māṭik'attha, vaṇṇana, “commentary on the meaning of the Abhidhamma lists”) (op cit §354).

be reconstructed by comparing parallel texts of other schools.³⁴ The Vibhaṅga topics are very old, such as the 5 aggregates (*pañca-k,khandha*), the 12 sense-bases (*dvā,dasa āyatana*), and so on, which are frequently discussed in the suttas. Hence, the Vibhaṅga is regarded as the oldest Abhidhamma book.³⁵

2.4 MENTIONS OF THE VIVĀDA,MŪLA SUTTA OR ITS TEACHING

2.4.1 The Kārandāva Sutta (A 8.10) recounts how once, while the Buddha is staying on the shore of Gaggarā Lake in Campā, a monk, charged by his colleagues with an offence, reviles them. The Buddha, hearing of it, insists that the person should be expelled, lest the rest of the community should suffer by his presence. He points out the gravity of the situation with various parables, one of which is that of the owner of a barley-field who, seeing among his crop a diseased plant (*yava,kārandāva*) which fails to ripen, would uproot it and throw it away lest the rest of his crop should be affected. The Sutta closes with the verse, which mentions some of the roots of dispute:

*Saṁvāsāyaṃ vijānātha
pāp'iccho kodhano iti
makkhī thambhī palāsī ca
issukī maccharī satho*

*Santa,vāco jana,vati
samaṇo viya bhāsati
raho karoti karaṇaṃ
pāpa,diṭṭhi anādaro*

By living together, know this one:
one of bad desires, who has anger,
mean, obstinate, and spiteful,
envious, selfish, crafty.

With a calm [dulcet] voice, like a recluse,
he speaks amidst the people;
in secret, holding
bad views, with no regard for others.³⁶

(A 8.10/4:173*), SD 106.5

2.4.2 Siri Kāla,kanni Jātaka. The Siri Kāla,kanni Jātaka (J 382) mentions some of the roots of dispute in its two of its canonical verses. The first verse (J 43*) mentions two of the roots of dispute pairs (2-3) and one of the roots (*sathā*) (4), in the mouth of the unworthy Kāla,kanni, daughter of Virūpakka (celestial guardian king of the west), in reference to a pious merchant (the Bodhisattva), thus:

*Makkhī palāsī sārambhī
issukī maccharī satho
so mayhaṃ puriso kanto
laddhaṃ yassa vinassatīti*

The mean, the spiteful, the impetuous,
the envious, the selfish, the crafty—
that person is dear to me.³⁷
whatever he obtains is destroyed.

(J 43* @ J 382/3:259)

The second verse only mentions the first pair of roots (1-2), thus:

*Kodhano upanāhi ca
pisuno hi vibhedako
aṇḍaka,vāco pharuso
so me kanta,taro tato*

The angry, the resentful,
the slanderer, who brings about disunity,
the speaker of harsh unkind words—
he is even more dear to me.

(J 44* @ J 382/3:260)

From such words, the Bodhisattva at once knows her real character, and favoured the virtuous Sirī, daughter of Dhata,raṭṭha (celestial guardian king of the east). He then invites her to sit on the special seat prepared for someone more virtuous than he is.

2.4.3 Psychological root of dispute

2.4.3.1 **The Taṇhā,mūlaka Sutta** (A 9.23) traces, through 9 stages, the evolution of **disputes** and social problems down to its psychological root, craving (*taṇhā*), as follows:

³⁴ See E Frauwallner, “Abhidharma-Studien II. Die kanonischen Abhidharma-Werke,” WZKSO 8,59-99, 1964:77; 1“Abhidharma-Studien IV. Der Abhidharma der anderen Schulen,” WZKS 15,102-121, 16,95-152, 1971:107 f.

³⁵ See Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*, 1996:68 f (II.3.2).

³⁶ On *anādāra*, see **Amagandha S** (Sn 247c) n, SD 4.24.

³⁷ *Kanta*, pp of *kāmeti* (see DP) (cf Skt *kānta*; Amg *kaṁta*) “pleasant, agreeable; dear beloved.” See PED: kanta.

craving → seeking → gain → decision-making → desire-and-lust → attachment → possessiveness → avarice → safe-guarding,

and from safe-guarding, there arise bad unwholesome states—“the taking up of the rod (violence), the taking up of the sword (killing), conflicts, quarrels, disputes, back-biting, harsh speech, false speech.”³⁸

This 9-stage formula recurs in **the Das’uttara Sutta** (D 34), where they are called “the 9 conditions rooted in craving” (*nava taṅhā,mūlaka dhammā*) which are described as “the 9 things to be abandoned” (*nava dhammā pahātabbā*),³⁹ and also in **the Vibhaṅga**, where they are also called “the conditions rooted in craving” (*taṅhā,mūlaka dhammā*) (Vbh 390).

2.3.4.2 **The Mahā,nidāna Sutta** (D 15) takes the 9-stage process leading up to various social problems back one more stage, and traces the root of craving itself as **feeling** (*vedanā*), giving this 10-stage process showing how disputes and social conflicts arise, thus:

Thus, Ānanda,

(1) dependent upon <u>feeling</u>	(<i>vedanā</i>),	there is craving;
(2) dependent upon <u>craving</u>	(<i>taṅhā</i>),	there is seeking;
(3) dependent upon <u>seeking</u>	(<i>pariyesanā</i>),	there is gain;
(4) dependent upon <u>gain</u>	(<i>lābha</i>),	there is decision-making; ⁴⁰
(5) dependent upon <u>decision-making</u>	(<i>vinicchaya</i>),	there is desire and lust; ⁴¹
(6) dependent upon <u>desire and lust</u>	(<i>chanda,rāga</i>),	there is attachment;
(7) dependent upon <u>attachment</u>	(<i>ajjhosāna</i>),	there is possessiveness;
(8) dependent upon <u>possessiveness</u>	(<i>pariggaha</i>),	there is avarice;
(9) dependent upon <u>avarice</u>	(<i>macchhariya</i>),	there is safe-guarding;
(10) dependent upon <u>safe-guarding</u>	(<i>ārakkha</i>),	there arise various bad unwholesome states —taking up of the rod, taking up of the sword, conflicts, quarrels, <u>disputes</u> [strife], back-biting, harsh speech, false speech. ⁴² (D 15,9/2:58 f), SD 5.17

The Mahā,nidāna Sutta then goes on to elaborate on each of these 10 stages, but working backwards, that is, beginning with (10), how safe-guarding brings about various social conflicts; how (9) avarice brings about safe-guarding, and so on back to (1).

In the well known **dependent arising** (*paṭicca samuppāda*) formula, we have “contact → feeling → craving.” Here, however, the formula starts with feeling as the condition for craving, then *successively followed by 9 other factors*, the last being a list of social problems. The Commentary labels the 2 sides of craving (*taṅhā*) as “the craving which is the root of the rounds” (*vaṭṭa,mūla,taṅhā*) and “obsessional craving” (*samudācāra,taṅhā*) (DA 2:500).⁴³

2.5 OTHER ROOTS OF DISPUTES

2.5.1 The Vivāda,mūla Sutta 1 (A 10.42) is the first of two suttas dealing with the 10 roots of Dharma disputes, taught by the Buddha to the elder Upāli, whom he declares to be the foremost of those monks who are Vinaya experts (*vinaya,dhara*).⁴⁴ The 10 roots of Dharma disputes (**dhamma,vivāda,-mūla*) are as follows:

³⁸ A 9.23/4:400 f @ SD 59.12.

³⁹ D 34,2.2(4)/3:288 f.

⁴⁰ “Decision-making,” *vinicchaya*, lit “decision, deliberation, examination, investigation.”

⁴¹ “Desire and lust,” *chanda,rāga*, here treated as dvandva (so Ñāṇamoli/Bodhi), “desire and passion” (Rhys Davids); sometimes treated as karmadharaya: “lustful desire” (Walshe).

⁴² *Ārakkhā’dhikaraṇam daṇḍ’ādāna,saṭṭh’ādāna,kalaha,viggaha,vivāda,tuvaṃtuva,pesuṇṇa.musāvādā aneke pāpakā akusalā dhammā sambhavanti.*

⁴³ See SD 5.17 (3.2). On dependent arising being applied to the rise of social disorders, see **Dependent arising**, SD 5.16 (19.5).

⁴⁴ V 1:25.

(1) what is not the Dharma is explained as	the Dharma; ⁴⁵
(2) what is the Dharma is explained as	not the Dharma;
(3) what is not the Vinaya is explained as	the Vinaya;
(4) what is the Vinaya is explained as	not the Vinaya;
(5) what is not spoken by the Buddha is explained as	spoken by the Buddha;
(6) what is spoken by the Buddha is explained as	not spoken by the Buddha;
(7) what is not a habit of the Buddha's is explained as	a habit of the Buddha's;
(8) what is a habit of the Buddha's is explained as	not a habit of the Buddha's;
(9) what is not promulgated by the Buddha is explained as	promulgated by the Buddha;
(10) what is promulgated by the Buddha is explained as	not promulgated by the Buddha.

A 10.42/5:78 @ SD 97.8

2.5.2 The Vivāda,mūla Sutta 2 (A 10.43) is the secone of two suttas dealing with the 10 roots of Vinaya disputes, taught by the Buddha to the elder Upāli, whom he declares to be the foremost of those monks who are Vinaya experts (*vinaya,dhara*).⁴⁶ The 10 roots of Vinaya disputes (**vinaya,vivāda,mūla*) are as follows:

(1) what is not an offence is explained as	an offence;	<i>āpatti</i>
(2) what is an offence is explained as	not an offence;	<i>anāpatti</i>
(3) what is a light offence is explained as	a grave offence;	<i>lahuka</i>
(4) what is a grave offence is explained as	a light offence;	<i>garuka</i>
(5) what is a serious offence is explained as	not a serious offence;	<i>aduṭṭhulla</i>
(6) what is not a serious offence is explained as	a serious offence;	<i>duṭṭhulla</i>
(7) what is a remediable offence is explained as	an irreparable offence; ⁴⁷	<i>sāvasesa</i>
(8) what is an irreparable offence is explained as	a remediable offence;	<i>anavasesa</i>
(9) what is an offence with redress is explained as	an offence without redress;	<i>appaṭikamma</i>
(10) what is an offence without redress is explained as	an offence with redress. ⁴⁸	<i>sappaṭikamma</i>

(A 10.43/5:78 f), SD 97.9

2.5.3 The 18 bases for a speaker of not-Dharma. These two sets of roots of disputes combine to form the “18 bases for a speaker of not-Dharma” (*aṭṭhārasa vatthu adhamma,vādī*), listed in **the Vinaya** and **the Commentaries** give a list of 18 bases of speaker of not-Dharma” as the bases for a split (*bheda*) in the sangha. In this combined list, the last pair—regarding the offences with redress and those without redress—have been omitted, or implicit in bases (15-16), that is, the reversible offence and the irreversible offence.⁴⁹

— — —

⁴⁵ The context here is clearly the monastic discipline. As such, it is possible to tr *dhamma* as “the rule,” ie, “he explains what is not the rule as being the rule,” etc. “Vinaya” (in the foll points) then refers to general discipline, right livelihood, etc.

⁴⁶ V 1:25.

⁴⁷ “Remedial offence” refers to *saṅgh’ādi,sesa* offences (those entailing a sangha conclave at the start and at the end) and lesser ones, while those “irremedial” are the “defeat” offences (*pārājika*).

⁴⁸ *Sappaṭikamma*, (an offence) that can be corrected, ie, all the offences other than *pārājika*. It is synonymous with *sāvasesa āpatti* (VA 3:1419).

⁴⁹ For details, see SD 46.19 (3.2.2).

The (Sixes) Discourse on the Roots of Quarrels

A 6.36

1 Bhikshus, there are these 6 roots of dispute. What are the six?

(1) Anger and resentment

2 Here, bhikshus, a monk is **angry, resentful** [hostile] (*kodhano hoti upanāhī*).⁵⁰

3 A monk who is *angry, resentful*,
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Teacher;⁵¹
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Dharma, too;
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Sangha, too;
and he does not fulfill the training, too.⁵²

4 A monk who is *angry, resentful*,
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Teacher;
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Dharma, too;
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Sangha, too;
and he does not fulfill the training, too—
he causes a dispute in the sangha.⁵³

5 That dispute is neither for the good nor happiness of the many; it is for the harm, the loss of many people, the ill of devas and humans.⁵⁴

6 Bhikshus, if you were to see such a root of dispute within yourself, or without [in others], then you, bhikshus, should strive to abandon that very bad root of dispute.⁵⁵

7 Bhikshus, if you were not to see any such root of dispute within yourself, or without [in others], then you, bhikshus, should practise so that this very bad root of dispute does not overwhelm (you) in the future.⁵⁶

8 This is how that bad root of dispute is abandoned.⁵⁷ This is how that bad root of dispute does not overwhelm (you) in the future.⁵⁸

(2) Meanness and spitefulness

9 Furthermore, bhikshus, a monk is **mean, spiteful** (*makkhī hoti paḷāsī*).⁵⁹

10 A monk who is *mean, spiteful*,
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Teacher;
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Dharma, too;
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Sangha, too;

⁵⁰ *Idha bhikkhave bhikkhu.*

⁵¹ *So satthari'pi agāravo viharati appatisso,*

⁵² *Sikkhāya'pi na paripūra,kārī hoti.*

⁵³ *So saṅghe vivādam janeti.*

⁵⁴ *Yo hoti vivādo bahu.janāhitāya bahu.janāsukhāya bahuno janassa anattāya ahitāya dukkhāya deva,manussā-nam.*

⁵⁵ *Eva,rūpañ ce tumhe bhikkhave vivāda,mūlam ajjhataṃ vā bahiddhā vā samanupasseyyātha, tatra tumhe bhikkhave tass'eva pāpakassa vivāda,mūlassa pahānāya vāyameyyātha.*

⁵⁶ *Eva,rūpañ ce tumhe bhikkhave vivāda,mūlam ajjhataṃ vā bahiddhā vā na samanupasseyyātha, tatra tumhe bhikkhave tass'eva pāpakassa vivāda,mūlassa āyatim anavassavāya paṭipajjeyyātha.*

⁵⁷ *Evam etassa pāpakassa vivāda,mūlassa pahānam hoti.*

⁵⁸ *Evam etassa pāpakassa vivāda,mūlassa āyatim anavassavo hoti.*

⁵⁹ *Puna c'aparam bhikkhave bhikkhu makkhī hoti paḷāsī.* The 2 negative qualities—*makkhī* and *paḷāsī*—recur in **Sallekha S** (M 8,12(26-27)/1:43), SD 51.2: see above Intro [2.3.3].

and he does not fulfill the training, too.

- 11 *A monk who is mean, spiteful,
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Teacher;
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Dharma, too;
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Sangha, too;
and he does not fulfill the training, too—
he causes a dispute in the sangha.*

12 *That dispute is neither for the good nor happiness of the many; it is for the harm, the loss of many people, the ill of devas and humans.*

13 *Bhikshus, if you were to see such a root of dispute within yourself, or without [in others], then you, bhikshus, should strive to abandon that very bad root of dispute.*

14 *Bhikshus, if you were not to see any such root of dispute within yourself, or without [in others], then you, bhikshus, should practise so that this very bad root of dispute does not overwhelm (you) in the future.*

15 *This is how that bad root of dispute is abandoned. This is how that bad root of dispute does not overwhelm (you) in the future.*

(3) Envy and selfishness

16 Furthermore, bhikshus, a monk is **envious, selfish** (*issukī hoti maccharī*).

- 17 *A monk who is envious, selfish,
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Teacher;
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Dharma, too;
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Sangha, too;
and he does not fulfill the training, too.*

- 18 *A monk who is envious, selfish,
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Teacher;
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Dharma, too;
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Sangha, too;
and he does not fulfill the training, too—
he causes a dispute in the sangha.*

19 *That dispute is neither for the good nor happiness of the many; it is for the harm, the loss of many people, the ill of devas and humans.*

20 *Bhikshus, if you were to see such a root of dispute within yourself, or without [in others], then you, bhikshus, should strive to abandon that very bad root of dispute.*

21 *Bhikshus, if you were not to see any such root of dispute within yourself, or without [in others], then you, bhikshus, should practise so that this very bad root of dispute does not overwhelm (you) in the future.*

22 *This is how that bad root of dispute is abandoned. This is how that bad root of dispute does not overwhelm (you) in the future.*

(4) Craftiness and deceitfulness

23 Furthermore, bhikshus, a monk is **crafty, deceitful** (*saṭho hoti māyāvī*).

- 24 *A monk who is crafty, deceitful,
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Teacher;
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Dharma, too;
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Sangha, too;
and he does not fulfill the training, too.*

- 25 *A monk who is crafty, deceitful,
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Teacher;⁶⁰*

⁶⁰ *So satthari'pi agāravo viharati appatisso,*

*dwells without respect, without deference, for the Dharma, too;
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Sangha, too;
and he does not fulfill the training, too—
he causes a dispute in the sangha.*

26 *That dispute is neither for the good nor happiness of the many; it is for the harm, the loss of many people, the ill of devas and humans.*

27 *Bhikshus, if you were to see such a root of dispute within yourself, or without [in others], then you, bhikshus, should strive to abandon that very bad root of dispute.*

28 *Bhikshus, if you were not to see any such root of dispute within yourself, or without [in others], then you, bhikshus, should practise so that this very bad root of dispute does not overwhelm (you) in the future.*

29 *This is how that bad root of dispute is abandoned. This is how that bad root of dispute does not overwhelm (you) in the future.*

(5) Bad desires and wrong views

30 Furthermore, bhikshus, a monk is **one with bad desire, with wrong views** (*pāp'iccho hoti micchā,diṭṭhi*).

31 A monk who is one with bad desire, with wrong views,
*dwells without respect, without deference, for the Teacher;
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Dharma, too;
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Sangha, too;
and he does not fulfill the training, too.*

32 A monk who is one with bad desire, with wrong views,
*dwells without respect, without deference, for the Teacher;
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Dharma, too;
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Sangha, too;
and he does not fulfill the training, too—
he causes a dispute in the sangha.*

33 *That dispute is neither for the good nor happiness of the many; it is for the harm, the loss of many people, the ill of devas and humans.*

34 *Bhikshus, if you were to see such a root of dispute within yourself, or without [in others], then you, bhikshus, should strive to abandon that very bad root of dispute.*

35 *Bhikshus, if you were not to see any such root of dispute within yourself, or without [in others], then you, bhikshus, should practise so that this very bad root of dispute does not overwhelm (you) in the future.*

36 *This is how that bad root of dispute is abandoned. This is how that bad root of dispute does not overwhelm (you) in the future.*

(6) Caught up in views and tenaciously so

37 (6) Furthermore, bhikshus, a monk is **one who is stuck to his own views, tenaciously holding on to them, unable to let them go** (*sandiṭṭhi,parāmāsī hoti ādhāna-g,gāhī duppaṭinissaggī*).⁶¹

38 A monk who is stuck to his own views, tenaciously holding on to them, unable to let them go,
*dwells without respect, without deference, for the Teacher;
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Dharma, too;
dwells without respect, without deference, for the Sangha, too;*

⁶¹ Comy on the expression at **Sallekha S** (M 8,12(44)/1:43), SD 51.2 explains that such a person is one who holds firmly to the views, whether these are Dharma-based or contrary to the Dharma, that have come to them, thinking, “This has been spoken by our teachers! This is what we have heard!” They do not abandon them even after the Buddha and others has spoken to them with reasoning. They hold on to these like a tortoise with all its limbs in its shell or a crocodile that seizes [jaws] him and does not let go. (MA 1:190). On vll here, see A:H 3:235 n5.

and he does not fulfill the training, too.

39 *A monk who is stuck to his own views, tenaciously holding on to them, unable to let them go, dwells without respect, without deference, for the Teacher;*

dwells without respect, without deference, for the Dharma, too;

dwells without respect, without deference, for the Sangha, too;

and he does not fulfill the training, too—

he causes a dispute in the sangha.

40 *That dispute is neither for the good nor happiness of the many; it is for the harm, the loss of many people, the ill of devas and humans.*

41 *Bhikshus, if you were to see such a root of dispute within yourself, or without [in others], then you, bhikshus, should strive to abandon that very bad root of dispute.*

43 *Bhikshus, if you were not to see any such root of dispute within yourself, or without [in others], then you, bhikshus, should practise so that this very bad root of dispute does not overwhelm (you) in the future.*

44 *This is how that bad root of dispute is abandoned. This is how that bad root of dispute does not overwhelm (you) in the future.*

45 **These**, bhikshus, are the 6 roots of dispute.

— evaṃ —

141101 141105 141119r