

# 3a

## (Duka) Tapanīya Sutta

The (Twos) Discourse on the Tormenting | A 2.3/1:49 = A 2.1.1.3

Theme: Avoiding practices that torment us

Translated by Piya Tan ©2017

### 3.1 THE 2 KINDS OF TORMENT

**3.1.1 Theme.** The (Duka) Tapanīya Sutta (A 2.3) speaks of 2 states that “conduce to torment” (*tapanīya*) or “tormenting states,” that is, the fruiting of our bad karma. The first kind is the tormenting that we face in this life (*idha*) itself. The second kind is the tormenting that follows us and fruits in the next life, or some future lives.

**3.1.2 Related sutta.** The (Duka) Tapanīya Sutta is closely related to **the (Iti) Tapanīya Sutta** (It 2.1.3) [3b]. They, in fact, give the same teaching regarding someone who habitually does bad, and who, recalling this, is tormented. They differed only slightly in wording, with more variety of terms in the (Iti) Tapanīya Sutta, which also closes with two verses, not found in the (Duka) Tapanīya Sutta.

### 3.2 KARMA

The fruits of bad karma are said to “conduce to torment” or to be “tormenting” because they afflict us with both bodily and mental sufferings. Although we sometimes hear of the consequentialist saying, “As we sow, so we shall reap,”<sup>1</sup> the reality is that **karma** (*kamma*) is better understood as habits, good and bad, that we cultivate. Every single act we commit has the potential of recurring as a habit, which molds personality, which shapes our destiny, which subjects us again to the same fruits, when the conditions obtain.

### 3.3 COMMENTARY

#### 3.3.1 Bodily karma

**3.3.1.1 The Aṅguttara Commentary** mentions only two cases of “tormenting,” that is, that attending bodily karma and that attending verbal karma. For the tormenting fruits of **bodily karma**, the Commentary quotes the stories of the yaksha Nanda (*nanda yakkha*), the brahmin youth Nanda (*nanda, māṇava*), Nanda the cow-slaughterer (*nanda, go.ghātaka*), Devadatta, and the two brothers who killed a cow for its meat. For the tormenting fruits of **verbal karma**, the Commentary mentions the cases of Suppabuddha the Sakya (*suppabuddha, sakka*), the monk Kokālika, and the brahmin girl Ciñcā (*ciñcā, māṇavikā*). (AA 3:93)

Further accounts of “tormenting” karma are given in the Majjhima Commentary and the Iti, vuttaka Commentary. **The Majjhima Commentary** gives a number of cases of those whose bad karma ripens in their present life. Amongst the cases mentioned are those of the youth Nanda, the cow-slaughterer Nanda, and the yaksha Nanda. (MA 4:8)

**The Iti, vuttaka Commentary**—on the (Iti) Tapanīya Sutta (It 2.1.3) [3b]—gives a similar list, mentioning the stories of the same individuals except that of Devadatta (ItA 102 f).

<sup>1</sup> *Isayo Samuddaka S* (S 903\*) + SD 39.2 (2); SD 3,5 (1); SD 4.16 (2.5).

**The Milinda,pañha** similarly mentions the yaksha Nanda, the brahmin girl Ciñcā, Suppabuddha the Sakya and the brahmin youth Nanda, as four of the five persons (including Devadatta), who are swallowed by the earth and fall into hell. (Miln 101)

**3.3.1.2** The origin story of **the yaksha Nanda** (*nanda,yakkha*) or Nandaka is found in **the Juṅha Sutta** (U 4.4), also called the Yakkha,pahāra Sutta (the discourse on the yaksha’s blow). Once, the yaksha Nanda, flying with an unnamed companion, while flying through the air, sees the newly shaven head of Sāriputta, who is sitting, deep in samadhi. Despite the warning of his companion, Nanda decides to hit Sāriputta’s head. Although Sāriputta hardly feels it, the yaksha meets his doom by immediately falling into hell.<sup>2</sup>

**3.3.1.3 The brahmin youth Nanda** (*nanda,māṇava*)—called Ānanda in the Dhammapada Commentary (DhA 2:49)— is the nun Uppala,vaṇṇā’s cousin (*mātula,putta*).<sup>3</sup> He has been long in love with her, even before she renounced. One day, while she is alone in the Blind Forest (*andha,vana*) outside Sāvathī, he hides under Uppalavaṇṇā’s bed when she is out. On her return, he surprises her, and rapes her. Having done his bad deed, he leaves, but the earth opens up and swallows him into Avīci, it is said.

Of the brahmin youth’s folly, the Buddha declares in an embedded verse in the Dhammapada Commentary:

<i>Madhu’vā maññati bālo yāva pāpaṃ na paccati yadā ca paccati pāpaṃ bālo dukkhaṃ nigacchatīti</i>	Sweet like honey, thinks the fool, when a bad deed ripens not. But when the bad does ripen, the fool sinks into grief. (DhA 69/2:50)
--	---

Later, to dispel the speculations of the unawakened, the Buddha clarifies that an arhat—one who has overcome all his defilements—has neither the desire nor the capacity for enjoying any worldly pleasure, declaring, thus:

<i>Vāri pokkhara,patte’va āragge-r-iva<sup>5</sup> sāsapo yo na limpati<sup>7</sup> kāmesu tam ahaṃ brūmi brāhmaṇan’ti</i>	Like water on a lotus leaf, <sup>4</sup> like a mustard on the needle-point, <sup>6</sup> who clings not to sensual pleasures <sup>8</sup> — him I call a brahmin! (Dh 401 = Sn 625) <sup>9</sup>
--	--

<sup>2</sup> U 8.8/39-41 (SD 24.9). Buddhaghosa quote Sāriputta’s meditation as an example of “success by intervention of concentration” (*samādhi,vipphāra iddhi*) (Vism 12.30/380). Briefly recounted in MA 4:8 & Vism 8.3/229; VismṬ 236.

<sup>3</sup> A son of her mother’s brother.

<sup>4</sup> For image of water and lotus leaf, cf Dh 336.

<sup>5</sup> On this sandhi, *āragge-r-iva*, see Dh:N 160 n338; Sn:N 159 n29.

<sup>6</sup> For image of mustard seed and needle-point, cf Dh 407.

<sup>7</sup> Ce Ee *lippiati*; Be Ke Se *limpati*. For usages of *lippiati/limpati* with ins and loc, cf Dh 336; see Tha:N 121 n10.

<sup>8</sup> On this line, for a different sentiment, cf Skt *na karmaṇā lipyate pāpakena* (Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4.4.28) & (Jain) Uttarādhyayana Sūtra (Charpentier 1922) 7.27.

<sup>9</sup> The story of Nanda’s raping of Uppalavannā is recorded in DhA 5.10/2:48-52. Uppala,vaṇṇā’s life leading up to her renunciation is one of the most remarkable stories in Buddhist literature: see AA 1:345-356 = ThīA 182-190 (ad Thī 11.1) with Apadāna (190-199): both tr ThīA:P 232-251, esp 242 n; *Tibetan Tales* (Schiefner, tr Walston), 1906: ch X (206-215).

The Vinaya mentions the case of Uppalavaṇṇā's rape, and records the Buddha as declaring that she is innocent because she was "unwilling" (*asādiyantiyā*).<sup>10</sup> The Vinaya account does not mention the youth's name, and its Commentary only mentions "a bad person" (*papa, purisa*, VA 1:273).

**Nanda the cow-slaughterer** (*nanda, go.ghātaka*) has been killing cattle for fifty years. One day, having no meat, he cut off the tongue of a living ox, fried it and started eating it. His own tongue, it is said, fell on to his plate. He dies in great agony and is born in hell. (MA 4:8)

**3.3.1.4 Devadatta**, in the early Buddhist texts, is recorded as plotting to usurp the Buddha's position as leader of the monastic community, at a time when it has grown large, established and wealthy. First, Devadatta requests that the Buddha step down in his favour (he is the Buddha's cousin).<sup>11</sup> The Buddha strongly rejects his proposal,<sup>12</sup> since he envisions the sangha as being self-regulated by the Dharma and Vinaya.<sup>13</sup> The Vinaya records that this was the first time that Devadatta feels malice towards the Buddha.<sup>14</sup>

Devadatta, then, using his psychic powers, wins over the young prince Ajāta, sattu. He induces the prince to kill his own father to take over the throne, while he would himself kill the Blessed One and become the Buddha.<sup>15</sup> Ajātasattu makes various attempts by sending his men and archers to assassinate the Buddha, but they are all converted.<sup>16</sup>

Then, Devadatta decides to kill the Buddha himself. First, he hurls down a large rock from the top of Mount Vulture Peak at the Buddha below. The rock shatters against another, but splinter cuts into the Buddha's toe, causing it to bleed.<sup>17</sup> This entails another heinous act—that of maliciously causing the Buddha to bleed.<sup>18</sup>

Failing to kill the Buddha, Devadatta then lets loose the drunken bull elephant Nālāgiri on a narrow street where the Buddha is walking. The elephant is tamed by the Buddha's lovingkindness, gently bows to him.<sup>19</sup>

Devadatta, following Kokālika's suggestion [3.3.2.3], uses a subtler means—this time, he attempts to undermine the Buddha's reputation. He approaches the Buddha and publicly proposes that the Buddha institutes the 5 strict ascetic rules for monastics to keep all their life, knowing that he would reject them (to discredit the Buddha).<sup>20</sup> Through this scheme, Devadatta manages to win over 500 novice monks<sup>21</sup> to

<sup>10</sup> Pār 1.10.5 (V 3:35,11). See V:H 1:53 n5 & Miln:H 1:141 n6.

<sup>11</sup> Cv 7.2 (V 2:184-188).

<sup>12</sup> Cv 7.3.1-3 (V 2:188-190).

<sup>13</sup> On how the sangha is self-regulating, see **Go, paka Moggallāna S** (M 108,1-23), SD 33.5.

<sup>14</sup> *Ayañ ca tarahi devadattassa bhagavati paṭhamo āghāto ahoṣi* (Cv 7.3.1 @ V 2:189,3-4). There are stories of childhood rivalries between Siddhattha and Devadatta (such as the popular story of how young Siddhattha saves a swan shot down by Devadatta). Such stories could be late, or we can understand the Vinaya statement here as meaning that this is the start of Devadatta's animosity towards the Buddha, ie, for Devadatta as a monk.

<sup>15</sup> *Tena hi tva kumāra pitaraṃ hantvā rājā hohi, ahaṃ bhagavantaṃ hantvā buddho bhavissāmīti* (Cv 7.3.4 @ V 2:190,19).

<sup>16</sup> Cv 7.3.6-8 (V 2:191-193).

<sup>17</sup> For related teachings on this incident, see **Sakalika S 1** (S 1.38/1:27-29), SD 61.4.

<sup>18</sup> Cv 7.3.9 (V 2:193). The 5 heinous deeds bringing immediate results (*anantariya, kamma*) are: (1) parricide, (2) matricide, (3) killing an arhat, (4) maliciously drawing the Buddha's blood, (5) causing schism in the sangha: **Pari-kuppa S** (A 5.129/3:146), SD 40b2(2.8).

<sup>19</sup> Cv 7.3.11-12 (V 2:194-196).

<sup>20</sup> These proposed strict ascetic rules, or **the "5 points"** (*pañca vatthu*), are that all life-long monastics should (1) be forest-dwellers, (2) live only on alms-food, (3) wear dust-heap robes, (4) live at the foot of trees, and (5) eat neither meat nor fish (Cv 7.3.14-15 @ V 2:196 f; DhA 1.12/1:141 f).

<sup>21</sup> Vinaya refers to their country, ie, as "Vajjī monks" (Cv 74.1 @ V 2:199), while Buddhaghosa refers to their clan, "Licchavī" (DhA 1:143).

his side—thus causing a schism in the sangha.<sup>22</sup> Sāriputta and Moggallāna, however, manage to instruct the misguided monks who return to the fold. On learning this, Devadatta coughs up hot blood (out of violent anger and frustration).<sup>23</sup> The Buddha then declares that Devadatta will suffer in hell for his misdeeds.<sup>24</sup>

The Dhammapada Commentary records that 9 months after the schism incident, the sick Devadatta wishes to see the Buddha. He is borne on a litter to Jetavana. On reaching the lotus tank outside the park, he steps down to wash in the tank. At once, the earth opens up, swallows him, and he is reborn in Avīci. The Buddha, however, predicts that at the end of 100,000 world-periods, he will become a pratyeka-buddha<sup>25</sup> called Aṭṭhissara. (DhA 1:147)

**3.3.1.5 Two butchers named Nanda.** One day they killed a cow, and the younger asks that he might take the head and the tail as he has many children. The elder refuses and is killed by the other. However, the murderer has no peace of mind, and his health deteriorated. When a monk asks about his health, the murderer relates his act. The monk confirms that it is a grave deed. In due course, the murderer dies and is born in hell.<sup>26</sup>

### **3.3.2 Verbal karma**

**3.3.2.1** As examples of those who suffer the “tormenting” fruits of **verbal karma**, the Commentary quotes the cases of the Sakya Suppabuddha (*suppabuddha,sakka*) [3.3.2.2], the monk Kokālika [3.3.2.3], and the brahmin girl Ciñcā (*ciñcā,māṇavikā*) [3.3.2.4].

**3.3.2.2 Suppabuddha the Sakya**<sup>27</sup> is a prince,<sup>28</sup> the son of Añjana and Yasodharā, and has a brother, Daṇḍa,pāṇī, and two sisters, Mahā,māyā and Pajā,patī. He is married to Amitā and has two children, Bhadda,kaccāna (called Rāhula,mātā, “mother of Rāhula”) and Deva,datta. Hence, he is father-in-law to the Buddha.<sup>29</sup> He is offended by the Buddha for leaving his daughter and for being hostile to Devadatta.

One day, being drunk, he blocks the Buddha’s path, and refuses to give way, charging that “He is no older than I am!” Despite the monks’ appeal, he persists. The Buddha turns back and then smiles. When Ānanda asks about his smile, the Buddha tells him that Suppabuddha would, in seven days, be swallowed up by the earth at the foot of his stairway. On learning of this, he has all stairways removed, closes all doors, and deploys guards.

On the seventh day, one of Suppabuddha’s state charger breaks loose. Only he is able to manage the horse. Instinctively, he rushes to the door, which opens, and stairway returns in place, and the guard

<sup>22</sup> **Chindi S** (S 17.31/2:239 f), SD 46.24; Cv 7.3 (V 2:196-198); DhA 1:141 f. Causing a **schism** entails an offence to be dealt with the sangha’s initial and subsequent meetings: Saṅgh 10 + 11 (V 3:172-175). Schism also constitutes the last of the **5 heinous deeds** bringing immediate results (*anantariya,kamma*): **Parikuppa S** (A 5.129/3:146), SD 40b2-(2.8) [see n above]. For def, see Dictionary of Early Monastic Terms: saṅghabheda.

<sup>23</sup> Cv 7.4.1-3 (V 2:198-200); DhA 1:142 f.

<sup>24</sup> Cv 7.4 5-8 (V 2:201-203. On **Devadatta’s career**, see Cv 7.1-4 (V 2:180-206); DhA 1.12/1:133-150, esp 147 f; Miln 205.

<sup>25</sup> *Pacceka,buddha* or individual buddha, ie, who does not establish a teaching or dispensation: SD 22.5 (2.1); SD 34.8 (2.3); SD 36.2 (2.2.2); **Dakkhiṇa Vibhaṅga S** (M 142,5(2)) n, SD 1.9.

<sup>26</sup> ItA 103; alluded to, AA 2:93.

<sup>27</sup> He should be distinguished from the virtuous Suppabuddha the leper of Rājagaha, who, listening to the Buddha teaching, becomes a streamwinner. (U 5.3; UA 279-294)

<sup>28</sup> Evidently, he is also called Mahā Suppabuddha (eg AA 1:340; ThīA 1:141).

<sup>29</sup> Mahv 2.19, 21.

throws him down the stairs. When he lands at the bottom of the stairway, the earth opens up and swallows him, and he is reborn in Avīci.<sup>30</sup>

**3.3.2.3 Kokālika** or Kokāliya is one of the leading partisan monk followers of Devadatta [3.3.1.4]. Knowing the Buddha's popularity, he is, at first, reluctant to join in Devadatta's plot against him, but on learning of Devadatta's plot, decides to support him (V 2:196, 3:171). When the monks blame Devadatta for his misdeeds, Kokālika readily defends him (V 3:174). When Devadatta's gains diminished, Kokālika goes about praising him, his birth, accomplishments and holiness, and many believe him (J 2:438 f). He is a close friend of the ruffian nun Thulla,nandā, who often abuses even the elder monks like Mahā Kassa-pa (V 4:335).

Kokālika is often resentful that he has never been asked to teach or recite the texts. He is delighted when one day the monks invite him to do so. He drinks his favourite soup, and at dusk, wearing a blue lower robe and a white outer robe of white, and carrying an elegantly carved fan, and appears in the assembly. However, when he tries to recite, sweat pours from his body and is simply confused. Henceforth the monks know that his claim to learning is mere pretence (J 2:65 f).<sup>31</sup>

**3.3.2.4** However, we are not informed of Kokālika's karmic fate, just as in the case of the heretical teachers of Okkalā, **Vassa and Bhaññā** (ItA 103),<sup>32</sup> quoted as examples of those with mental misconduct, that is, wrong views, without any mention of their karmic fate. Understandably, they are mentioned as examples of those who will surely face the fruits of their bad karma, both in this life and those to come.

**3.3.2.5 Ciñcā Māṇavikā** is a young female wanderer of surpassing beauty. The wanderers of Sāvathī, noticing their influence and fortune dwindling on account of the popularity of the Buddha and his monastic community, uses Ciñcā in a plot to discredit the Buddha.

When the lay congregation are leaving Jetavana after listening to the Buddha, Ciñcā, well dressed and bearing perfumes and garlands, shows herself going into the monastery. Then, early in the morning, she is seen leaving the same monastery. When people ask, she would say that she knows the Buddha and spends time with him.

In due course, Ciñcā feigns pregnancy, and publicly blames the Buddha for being the child's father. Her ruse, however, is exposed by Sakra, king of the gods, and four devas. Turning themselves into mice, and entering her clothing chew through the cords that held a wooden disc on her belly. A gust of wind blows open her clothing, whereupon the disc falls and cuts her toes. Exposed, she is chased out of the monastery. The ground then opens and swallows her up.<sup>33</sup>

— — —

<sup>30</sup> DhA 9.12/3:44-47; alluded to at AA 2:93.

<sup>31</sup> Cv 7.3.14-17 (V 2:195-197); DhA 1.12b/1:142-143. For Jātaka stories related to Kokālika, see DPPN: 1. Kokālika.

<sup>32</sup> *Okkalā vassa,bhaññā* (Ce Se *Ukkalā* ...). Mentioned in **Mahā Cattārisaka S** (M 117,38), SD 6.10. Its comy only says that these two teachers lived in Okkala country (ie, modern Orissa) without further comment (MA 4:138). They are again mentioned in identical words in **Nirutti,patha S** (S 22.62/3:73), SD 68.1, and (**Catukka**) **Paribbājaka S** (A 4.30/2:31), SD 82.17. Cf Kvu 141 (quotes S 22.63), which seems to be a stock passage on those who hold extreme views. The duo are mentioned by Dhammapāla as examples of those of "wrong mental karma" (ItA 103). CPD: Okkala (sv) as referring to modern Orissa.

<sup>33</sup> DhA 13.9/3:178-182; J 4:187 f (story of present almost identical to J 472 intro); referred to ItA 86 f (ad It 1.3.5). Ciñcā's story of falsely accusing the Buddha is very similar to that of Sundarī Nandā: see **Sundarī S** (U 4.8), SD 49.23 & SD 49.12 (2.3). For Chin parallels, see Analayo 2011:507 n321.

## The (Twos) Discourse on the Tormenting

A 2.3

- 1 “Bhikshus, there are these two states that conduce to torment. What are the two?”
- 2 (1) Here, bhikshus, someone
 

has committed bodily misconduct;	he has not committed any pure bodily conduct;
he has committed verbal misconduct;	he has not committed any pure verbal conduct;
he has committed mental misconduct;	he has not committed any pure mental conduct.
- 3 (2) Thinking, ‘Bodily misconduct has been committed by me!’ he is tormented.  
 Thinking, ‘No purity of bodily conduct has been committed by me!’ he is tormented.  
 Thinking, ‘Verbal misconduct has been committed by me!’ he is tormented.  
 Thinking, ‘No purity of verbal conduct has been committed by me!’ he is tormented.  
 Thinking, ‘Mental misconduct has been committed by me!’ he is tormented.  
 Thinking, ‘No purity of mental conduct has been committed by me!’ he is tormented.
- 4 These, bhikshus, are the two states that conduce to torment.”

— evaṃ —

170527 170623 170801 170923r