

2

Anatta Lakkhaṇa Sutta

The Discourse on the Non-self Characteristic | S 22.59 ≈ Mv 1.6.38-47 (V 1:13 f)

Pañca Sutta The Discourse on the Five

Theme: The 3 characteristics, the 5 aggregates, and non-self

Translated by Piya Tan ©2010

1 Sutta highlights

1.1 SUTTA SEQUENCE

This is said to be the second discourse delivered by the Buddha to the 5 monks (the Buddha’s first disciples) who were still learners (*sekha*), that is, any of the 7 kinds of saints¹. At the end of the discourse, however, they became arhats.² It should be noted that the first three suttas—the **Dhamma,cakka Pavatana Sutta** (S 56.11),³ the **Anatta Lakkhaṇa Sutta** (S 22.59) and the **Āditta Pariyāya Sutta** (S 35.28)—are not only closely related but flow coherently in that sequence.

The 1st discourse is a statement of the Buddha’s discovery of “suffering and its ending,” and what is merely mentioned—“in short, the 5 aggregates of clinging⁴ are suffering” [§5]—is elaborated in the 2nd discourse, the **Anatta Lakkhaṇa Sutta** (S 22.59), where the 5 aggregates are given in detail. In the 3rd discourse, the **Āditta Pariyāya Sutta** (S 35.28),⁵ the focus shifts to the “all,” that is, the 6 sense-bases, a teaching specifically given in the **Sabba Sutta** (S 35.23).⁶

1.2 SUTTA BACKGROUND

The Saṃyutta Commentary says that the Anatta Lakkhaṇa Sutta was delivered on the fifth day of the following fortnight after the teaching of the First Discourse (S 56.11), on the full-moon day of Āsāḷha (June-July). With the awakening of the 5 monks, the noble sangha is established and the Dispensation begins: Buddhism is born.

The Sutta is also called the **Pañca Sutta** (the Discourse on the Five) for two reasons: it teaches about the 5 aggregates, and secondly, the audience comprises the group of 5 monks (*pañca,vaggiya*). The main teachings of the **Anatta Lakkhaṇa Sutta** (S 22.59) and of the **Assaji Sutta** (S 22.88) are practically identical, except that in the former the syntax is in the plural (to the 5 monks), while in the latter it is singular (to Assaji).⁷

¹ That is, streamwinner-to-be, streamwinner-become, once-returner-to-be, once-returner-become, non-returner-to-be, non-returner-become, and arhat-to-be. See **Aṭṭha Puggala S 2** (A 8.60), SD 15.10a(2).

² V 1:14; S 3:66; cf M 3:19.

³ See SD 1.1.

⁴ *Pañc’upadāna-k,khandha*, viz, form, feeling, perception, formations and consciousness (S 3:47 Vbh 1).

⁵ See SD 1.3.

⁶ See SD 7.1.

⁷ For the significance of this in terms of the origins of Anatta Lakkhana S (S 22.59), see **Assaji S** (S 22.88) @ SD 42.8 (2.3).

1.3 SUTTA SIGNIFICANCE

1.3.1 The first 5 monks

1.3.1.1 The *Vinaya* records the first awakening—the attaining of streamwinning—of each of the 5 monks (Koṇḍañña, Vappa, Bhaddiya, Mahānāma, and Assaji). Koṇḍañña is the first to attain streamwinning,⁸ and upon his request is admitted by the Buddha by the “Come, bhikshu” (*ehi, bhikkhu*) formula.⁹ Then, Vappa and Bhaddiya become streamwinners, while the other 3 monks go on almsround.¹⁰ Finally, it is Mahānāma and Assaji who become streamwinners, while the other two monks go on almsround.¹¹ They are all admitted as renunciants with the same “Come, bhikshu” formula.

1.3.1.2 The Commentaries give us more details. It is well known that at the end of the exposition of the *Dhammacakkapavattana Sutta* (S 56.11), Koṇḍañña awakens as a streamwinner. Then, the Buddha and the 5 monks enter into the rains-retreat that very day itself, a day famously known as Āsālha Pūjā.¹²

1.3.1.3 The Commentaries, however, say that the remaining 4 monks, each attain streamwinning on a successive day after that: Vappa, on the following day, on the 1st day of the waning fortnight;¹³ Bhaddiya, on the 2nd day; Mahānāma, on the 3rd day, and Assaji, on the 4th day (AA 1:147).¹⁴ All the 5 attained arhathood at the end of the teaching of the *Anatta Lakkhaṇa Sutta* (S 22.59),¹⁵ on the 5th day of the waning fortnight (J 1:82).¹⁶

1.3.2 The oldest monk

The *Anatta Lakkhaṇa Sutta* closes with the 5 monks—Koṇḍañña,¹⁷ Vappa, Bhaddiya, Mahānāma and Assaji—attaining arhathood [§11]. While it is true that Koṇḍañña is the first of the monks to attain streamwinning, all the 5 monks attain arhathood, the highest liberation, at the same time, that is, at the end of the exposition of the *Anatta Lakkhaṇa Sutta*.

Technically speaking, then, we cannot say that Koṇḍañña is the “foremost” (*agga*) of those monks who have seniority (*rattaññū*), that is, those who have lived the most days (literally, “nights,” *ratta*). If we speak of the noble sangha (*ariya, saṅgha*), the first arhats (after the Buddha) would be the group of 5 monks, who are of equal seniority, since they awaken as arhats at the same time.

Hence, it is more likely that *rattaññū* here does not mean “seniority” in terms of ecclesiastical rank or number of rains that the monk has rightly observed. Rather it simply means “seniority” in the literal sense, that is, the oldest of the monks, which Koṇḍañña indeed is.¹⁸ This interpretation also makes sense when we note that Mahā Pajāpatī Gotamī is declared as the foremost of the nuns in terms of

⁸ Mv 1.6.29 (V 1:11,32) & Mv 1.6.32 (V 1:12); also in *Dhammacakkapavattana S* (S 56.11,20), SD 1.1.

⁹ Mv 1.6.32 (V 1:12,28); also in *Dhammacakkapavattana S* (S 56.11,20), SD 1.1.

¹⁰ Mv 1.6.33-34 (V 1:12,28-13,2).

¹¹ Mv 1.6.35-37 (V 1:13,6-17).

¹² On Āsālha Pūjā, see SD 1.1 (1.2).

¹³ In the forenoon, J 1:92.

¹⁴ See SD 1.1 (2.3.4.1).

¹⁵ S 22.59/3:68 (SD 1.2); V 1:13 f.

¹⁶ On the admission of the 5 monks as renunciants, see SD 45.16 (1.1).

¹⁷ On Koṇḍañña, see *Naḷaka, pāna S* (M 68) @ SD 37.4 (1.2.2).

¹⁸ For further details on the 5 monks, see SD 1.1 (1).

seniority (A 1:25,18), that is, she is literally, the oldest of the nuns, and one who has awakened as an arhat.¹⁹

2 Why there is no soul

2.1 The Anatta Lakkhaṇa Sutta gives two arguments against the notion of an abiding self. The first [§3-11] is that we are merely the 5 aggregates, and none of these aggregates can come under our control (*avasa, vattitā*). If anything is to be regarded as our self, we should be able to willfully control it, but this is not the case. We only have the delusion that we are in control, or desire to be in control, but in reality, we are blindly led on by our latent tendencies.²⁰

2.2 The second argument against the self-notion [§12-16] is in connection with the 3 characteristics: impermanence, unsatisfactoriness and non-self. Non-self is demonstrated on the basis of the other two characteristics, impermanence and suffering. A fuller analysis of this non-self doctrine is given in **the Cūḷa Saccaka Sutta** (M 35,11-21).

According to Buddhaghosa (MA 2:113 f), the Buddha proves the fact of non-self in 3 ways:

- (1) by showing that something is not eternal (*anicca*);
- (2) by showing that it is unsatisfactory (*dukkha*);
- (3) by showing both.

2.3 In **the Anatta Lakkhaṇa Sutta**, the Buddha shows that the 5 aggregates of existence (*pañca-k, khandha*)—form, feeling, perception, mental formations, and consciousness—are *dukkha*. In **the (Anicca) Sīha Sutta** (S 22.78), he speaks of the aggregates as being impermanent.²¹ In **the Cha, chakka Sutta** (M 148)²² he shows that the 6 senses (eye, etc), are *anattā* (non-self). In **the Arahantā Sutta 1** (S 22.76), he shows that the 5 aggregates are both and *anatta* (non-self):

Bhikshus, visual form is impermanent: whatever is impermanent is unsatisfactory; whatever is unsatisfactory is non-self. Whatever is non-self is not mine, I am not that, that is not my self.
(S 22.76/3:82 f; see Dh 277-79 = Tha 676-78, Pm 2:106 for simplified versions)

2.4 The Anatta Lakkhaṇa Sutta comprises these 3 cycles:

- | | | |
|--|---|-----------|
| (1) the 5-aggregate non-self pericope: | the non-self nature of the 5 aggregates; | [§§3-11] |
| (2) the aggregate-characteristic pericope: | the 3 characteristics of the 5 aggregates; | [§§12-16] |
| (3) the non-self totality pericope: | non-self as the underlying principle of all states. | [§§17-21] |

It then closes with the “revulsion cycle” [§22.1]; the “liberation cycle” (the arhat’s review knowledge) [§22.2]; and finally the Conclusion [§23], which mentions arhathood.

— — —

¹⁹ There is no clear internal evidence to support the tradition that Gotamī is the first nun, although her admission has the most interesting history, considering the social status: see SD 45.16 (1.2).

²⁰ For a discussion on the will (incl free will), see **Atta, kāri S** (A 6.38), SD 10.10 Intro.

²¹ S 22.78,7/3:85 (SD 42.10).

²² M 148,10-15/3:282-284 (SD 26.6).

Anatta Lakkhaṇa Sutta

The Discourse on the Non-self Characteristic

S 22.59 ≈ Mv 1.6.38-47

1 [Thus have I heard.]²³

At one time the Blessed One was staying in the Deer Park at Isīpatana near Benares.

2 [Mv 1.6.38] Then,²⁴ the Blessed One addressed the group of 5 monks:

“Bhikshus!”

“Bhante!” the monks replied. The Blessed One said:

The 5-aggregate non-self pericope²⁵

3 (1) “Bhikshus, **form**²⁶ is non-self.²⁷

For, bhikshus, if form were *self*, this form would not bring about *illness* [affliction], and it would be possible to tell the form: ‘Let my form be such. Let my form not be such.’²⁸

4 But, bhikshus, because form is non-self, form brings about *illness* [affliction], and it is *not* possible to say of form: ‘Let my form be such. Let my form not be such.’ [Mv 1.6.39]

5 (2) Bhikshus, **feeling**²⁹ is non-self. [67]

For, bhikshus, if feeling were *self*, this feeling would not bring about *illness*, and it would be possible to tell the feeling: ‘Let my feeling be such. Let my feeling not be such.’

6 But, bhikshus, because feeling is non-self, feeling brings about *illness*, and it is *not* possible to say of feeling: ‘Let my feeling be such. Let my feeling not be such.’ [Mv 1.6.40]

7 (3) Bhikshus, **perception**³⁰ is non-self.

For, bhikshus, if perception were *self*, this perception would not bring about *illness*, and it would be possible to tell the perception:

‘Let my perception be such. Let my perception not be such.’

8 But, bhikshus, because perception is non-self, perception brings about *illness*, and it is *not* possible to say of perception: ‘Let my perception be such. Let my perception not be such.’

9 (4) Bhikshus, **formations**³¹ are non-self.

For, bhikshus, if formations were *self*, these formations would not bring about *illness*, and it would be possible to tell the formations:

‘Let my formations be such. Let my formations not be such.’

²³ S 3:66,24 *Bārāṇasīyaṃ nidānaṃ migadāye*, “originating in the deer park at Benares.”

²⁴ S 3:66,25 *tatra kho*; V 1:13,18 *atha kho*.

²⁵ On the 5 aggregates, see SD 17. On the 4 self-views (*attā’nudittī*) leading to our identifying with any of these aggregates, see SD 2.16 (15).

²⁶ See *Rūpa*, SD 17.2a.

²⁷ The usage of “non-self” as an adj here may sound a bit awkward to some. It helps as we read it to recall its definition as “bereft or any permanent entity.” See **Is there a soul?**, SD 2.16 esp (1.2) on the tr “non-self.”

²⁸ This is the first argument against the self-notion, that is, the nature of the 5 aggregates are not subject to our control (*avasa,vattitā*), but they are all subject to illness [affliction], and as such cannot be our self. See Steve Collins, *Selfless Persons*, 1982:97-103 for the 3 arguments against the self or soul.

²⁹ See *Vedanā*, SD 17.3.

³⁰ See *Saññā*, SD 17.4.

³¹ See *Saṅkhārā*, SD 17.6.

10 But, bhikshus, because formations are non-self, formations lead to illness, and it is *not* possible to say of formations: ‘Let my formations be such. Let my formations not be such.’

11 (5) Bhikshus, **consciousness**³² is non-self. [Mv 1.6.41]

For, bhikshus, if consciousness were *self*, this consciousness would not bring about illness, and it would be possible to tell the consciousness:

‘Let my consciousness be such. Let my consciousness not be such.’

11.2 But because consciousness is non-self, consciousness brings about illness, and it is *not* possible to say of consciousness:

‘Let my *consciousness* be such. Let my *consciousness* not be such.’ [Mv 1.6.42]

The aggregate-characteristic pericope³³

12 Now, what do you think, bhikshus,

(1) is **form** permanent or impermanent?”

“Impermanent, bhante.”

“Is what is impermanent unsatisfactory [suffering] or satisfactory [pleasurable]?”³⁴

“Unsatisfactory, bhante.”

“Is what is impermanent, unsatisfactory and subject to change fit to be regarded thus:

‘This is mine, this I am, this is my self.’?”³⁵

“No, bhante.” [Mv 1.6.42]

13 (2) “Is **feeling** permanent or impermanent?”

“Impermanent, bhante.”

“Is what is impermanent unsatisfactory or satisfactory?”

“Unsatisfactory, bhante.”

“Is what is impermanent, unsatisfactory and subject to change fit to be regarded thus:

‘This is mine, this I am, this is my self.’?”

“No, bhante.”

³² See *Viññāṇa*, SD 17.8a.

³³ A shorter version of this and foll sections are given as **Arahatā S 1** (S 22.76/3:82 f @ SD 26.7) = **Arahatā S 2** (S 22.77/3:84, without verse).

³⁴ *Dukkhaṃ vā sukhaṃ vā*. Here, the alternative tr, “painful,” reminds us that whatever brings us pain or discomfort (bodily or mentally) is not liked by us. When the pain is gone, we feel some pleasure. However, even the pleasurable is impermanent, and when it is gone, we feel pain. Hence, both the painful and the pleasant are “suffering” (*dukkha*). It is useful to understand this difference between pain and suffering. Simply put, pain is natural (we have a physical but conscious body, so we feel pain, whether tolerable or intolerable, which is a sign of irritability or sensitivity of our experiences); suffering is optional (we can train our minds not to be attached to what is pleasant or to reject what is unpleasant, and to regard even the neutral as being impermanent, changing, becoming otherwise.)

³⁵ *Etam mama, eso’ham asmi, eso me attāti*. These are “**the 3 graspings**” (*ti, vidha gāha*), ie, of view (*diṭṭhi*), of craving (*taṇhā*), of conceit (*māna*) (MA 2:111, 225). The notion “This is mine” arises through craving; the notion “This I am” arises through conceit; the notion “This is my self” arises through views. These 3 considerations represent respectively the 3 kinds of mental proliferation (*papañca*) of self-view (*sakkāya diṭṭhi*), of craving (*taṇhā*), and of conceit (*māna*) (Nm 280; Vbh 393; Nett 37 f). The opposite formula, *n’etaṃ mama, n’eso ’ham asmi, na mēso attā ti*, is applied below to the 5 aggregates [§§17-21]. See §17 n. See Peter Harvey, *The Selfless Mind*, 1995:32 f. For detailed studies, see **I: The nature of identity**, SD 19.1; **Me: The nature of conceit**, SD 19.2a; **Mine: The nature of craving**, SD 19.3.

14 (3) “Is **perception** permanent or impermanent?”

“Impermanent, bhante.”

“Is what is impermanent unsatisfactory or satisfactory?”

“Unsatisfactory, bhante.”

“Is what is impermanent, unsatisfactory and subject to change fit to be regarded thus:

‘*This is mine, this I am, this is my self.*’?”

“No, bhante.”

15 (4) “Are **formations** permanent or impermanent?”

“Impermanent, bhante.”

“Is what is impermanent unsatisfactory or satisfactory?”

“Unsatisfactory, bhante.”

“Is what is impermanent, unsatisfactory and subject to change fit to be regarded thus:

‘*This is mine, this I am, this is my self.*’?”

“No, bhante.”

16 (5) “Is **consciousness** permanent or impermanent?”

“Impermanent, bhante.”

“Is what is impermanent unsatisfactory or satisfactory?” [68]

“Unsatisfactory, bhante.”

“Is what is impermanent, unsatisfactory and subject to change fit to be regarded thus:

‘*This is mine, this I am, this is my self.*’?”

“No, bhante.” [Mv 1.6.43]

The non-self totality pericope³⁶

17 “Therefore, bhikshus,

(1) any kind of **form** whatsoever,

whether past, future or present,

internal or external,

gross or subtle,

inferior or superior,

far or near³⁷—

³⁶ This whole section is mutatis mutandis at **Cūḷa Saccaka S** (M 35.24b/1:234 f) = SD 26.5. These are the characteristics of a learner (*sekha*). The arhat, on the other hand, not only has the right view of non-self, but has also abandoned all clinging, as the Buddha explains in the foll §22. The “specific non-self formula” is the line, “This is not mine, this I am not, this is not the self.” The combined “aggregate characteristics pericope” [§12-16] and the “non-self totality pericope” [§17-21] is called the “general non-self pericope.”

³⁷ *Atītānagata, paccupannaṃ ajjhataṃ vā bahiddhā vā oḷarikaṃ vā sukhumāṃ vā hīnaṃ vā paṇītaṃ vā yaṃ dūre santike vā*. See **(Dve) Khandha S** (S 22.48/3:47) + SD 17.1a (3.2). This classification of the aggregates (by way of the totality pericope or formula) is expl in detail in Vibhaṅga and briefly in Visuddhimagga: “**internal**” (*ajjhata*) = physical sense-organs; “**external**” (*bahiddhā*) = physical sense-objects; “**gross**” (*oḷarika*) = that which impinges (physical internal and external senses, with touch = earth, wind, fire); “**subtle**” (*sukhuma*) = that which does not impinge (mind, mind-objects, mind-consciousness, and water); “**inferior**” (*hīna*) = unpleasant and undesirable sense-experiences [sense-world existence]; “**superior**” (*paṇīta*) = pleasant and desirable sense-experiences [form & formless existences]; “**far**” (*dūre*) = subtle objects (“difficult to penetrate”); “**near**” (*santike*) = gross objects (“easy to penetrate”) (Vbh 1-13; Vism 14.73/450 f; Abhs 6.7). “Whether or not the details of the Vibhaṅga exposition are accepted as valid for the *nikāyas*, it seems clear that this formula is intended to indicate how each

all forms should be seen as they really are with right wisdom, thus:

‘This is not mine, this I am not, this is not my self.’³⁸ [Mv 1.6.44]

18 (2) Any kind of **feeling** whatsoever—*whether past, future or present, internal or external, gross or subtle, inferior or superior, far or near*—all feelings should be seen as they really are with right wisdom, thus:

‘This is not mine, this I am not, this is not my self.’

19 (3) Any kind of **perception** whatsoever—*whether past, future or present, internal or external, gross or subtle, inferior or superior, far or near*—all perceptions should be seen as they really are with right wisdom, thus:

‘This is not mine, this I am not, this is not my self.’

20 (4) Any kind of **formations** whatsoever—*whether past, future or present, internal or external, gross or subtle, inferior or superior, far or near*—all formations should be seen as they really are with right wisdom, thus:

‘This is not mine, this I am not, this is not my self.’

21 (5) Any kind of **consciousness** whatsoever—*whether past, future or present, internal or external, gross or subtle, inferior or superior, far or near*—all consciousness should be seen as they really are with right wisdom, thus:

‘This is not mine, this I am not, this is not my self.’ [Mv 1.6.45]

Revulsion

22 Seeing thus, bhikshus, the tutored noble disciple		<i>evaṃ passaṃ bhikkhave sutavā ariya, sāvako</i>
is revulsed [disenchanted] ³⁹ with	<u>form</u> ,	<i>rūpasmim pi nibbindati</i>
is revulsed with	<u>feeling</u> ,	<i>vedamāya pi nibbindati</i>
is revulsed with	<u>perception</u> ,	<i>saññāya pi nibbindati</i>
is revulsed with	<u>formations</u> ,	<i>saṅkhāresu pi nibbindati</i>
is revulsed with	<u>consciousness</u> .	<i>viññāṇasmim pi nibbindati</i>

Liberation

22.2 THE ARHAT’S REVIEW KNOWLEDGE

Through revulsion ,	he becomes <u>dispassionate</u> .	<i>nibbindati virajjati</i>
Through <i>dispassion</i> ,	he is <u>free</u> .	<i>virāgā vimuccati</i>
<i>Freed</i> ,	there arises <u>the knowledge</u> : ‘Free!’ ⁴⁰	<i>vimuttasmim vimuttam iti ñāṇam hoti</i>

khandha is to be seen as a class of states, manifold in nature and displaying a considerable variety and also a certain hierarchy” (Gethin 1986: 41).

³⁸ *N’etaṃ mama, n’eso ’ham asmi, na mēso attā ti*. A brief version, “There can be no considering that (element) as ‘I’ or ‘mine’ or ‘I am’” (*ahan ti vā maman ti vā asmī ti vā*) is found in **Mahā Hatthi, padōpama S** (M 28/1:184-191 §§6b-7, 11b-12, 16b-17, 21b-22). This is opp of “the 3 graspings” (*ti, vidha gāha*) formula: *etaṃ mama, eso ’ham asmi, eso me attā ti* [§§12-16]. In **Anatta Lakkhaṇa S** (S 22.59, 12-16/3:68), this formula is applied to the 5 aggregates & in **Pārileyya S** (S 22.81/3:94-99), SD 6.1, to the 4 primary elements. See §12 n. See also (**Dhātu**) **Rāhula S** (A 4.177/2:164 f). See **Pārileyya S**, SD 6.1 (5). See Peter Harvey, *The Selfless Mind*, 1995a:32 f.

³⁹ On revulsion, see **Nibbidā**, SD 20.1.

He understands:	
‘Destroyed is birth.	<i>khīṇā jāti</i>
The holy life has been lived.	<i>vusitaṃ brahma, cariyaṃ</i>
What needs to be done has been done.	<i>katam karaṇiyaṃ</i>
There is no more of this state of being.’” [Mv 1.6.46]	<i>nâparam itthattâyâti pajânâtîti</i>

Conclusion: Arhathood of the 5 monks⁴¹

23 The Blessed One said this. Satisfied, the group of 5 monks rejoiced in the Blessed One’s word.

24 And while this discourse was being given,⁴² the minds of the group of 5 monks were, through non-clinging, freed from the influxes.⁴³

[**25** At that time, there were **6 arhats** in the world.]⁴⁴ [Mv 1.6.47]

— *sattamaṃ* —

Bibliography

[See SD 1 Main Bibliography]]

Wynne, Alexander

- 2009a “Early evidence for the ‘no self’ doctrine? A note on the second *anâtman* teaching of the Second Sermon.” *Thai International Journal for Buddhist Studies* 1 2009:64-84.
- 2009b “Miraculous transformation and personal identity: A note on the first *anâtman* teaching of the Second Sermon.” *Thai International Journal of Buddhist Studies* 1 2009:85-113.

120803 130306 141016 151006 161109 171107 180630 200705

⁴⁰ *Vimuttismim vimuttam iti ñāṇam hoti*, or “When free, there is the knowledge, it (the mind) is free.” Note that the self is not addressed here. On “Free!” see SD 50.1 (3.1.2.2).

⁴¹ Comy says that the elder Koṇḍañña attained streamwinning on the Āsāḷha full-moon day; on the 1st day (after the full moon) Bhaddiya; on the 2nd day Vappa; on the 3rd day Mahānāma, and on the 5th day Assaji. All 5 attained arhathood at the end of the teaching of Anatta Lakkhaṇa Sutta (*Iti therō āsāḷhi, puṇṇamāyaṃ sotāpatti, phale patiṭṭhito, pāṭipada, divase bhaddiya-t, therō, dutiya, pakkha, divase vappa-t, therō, tatiya, pakkha, divase mahānāma-t, therō, pakkhassa catutthiyaṃ assaji-t, therō sotāpatti, phale patiṭṭhito. Pañcamiyā pana pakkhassa anatta, lakkhaṇa, suttanta, desanā, pariyosāne sabbe pi arahatte patiṭṭhitā*, AA 1:147).

⁴² On the nature of listening as the basis for arhathood, see **Assaji S** (S 22.88) @ SD 42.8 (2.3.3).

⁴³ “Influxes,” *āsava*. The term 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 (influence), or simply left untr. The Abhidhamma lists 4 *āsava*: the influx of (1) sense-desire (*kāma’ āsava*), (2) (desire for eternal) existence (*bhav’āsava*), (3) views (*diṭṭh’āsava*), (4) ignorance (*avijjā’sava*) (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) is probably older and is found more frequently in the Suttas: **Saṅgīti S** (D 33, 1.10(20)/-3:216); **Sammā, diṭṭhi S** (M 9.70/1:55), SD 11.14; **Āsava S** (S 38.8/4:256); **(Te, vijja) Jāṇussoṇi S** (A 3.59.4/1:167); **Nibbedhika Pariyāya S** (A 6.63/3:410), SD 6.11. The destruction of these influxes is equivalent to arhathood. See BDict under *āsava*.

⁴⁴ *Tena kho pana samayena cha loke arahanto honti*. This parenthesis is only in Mv 1.6.47 (V 1:14,36).



©2017 Piya Tan. The text of this page ("Anatta Lakkhaṇa Sutta (S 22.58), SD 1.2" by Piya Tan) is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/). To view a copy of the license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>. Documents linked from this page may be subject to other restrictions. Transcribed from a file provided by the translator. Last revised 7 November 2017. **How to cite this document** (a suggested style): "Anatta Lakkhaṇa Sutta (S 22.58), SD 1.2" translated from the Pali by Piya Tan. Singapore: The Minding Centre, 7 November 2017, <http://dharmafarer.org/tipitaka/s/s22.58/sd1.2.piya.html>.