

16

Udāna Sutta

The Discourse on the Inspired Utterance | S 22.55

Theme: Consciousness works with the aggregates

Translated by Piya Tan ©2006

1 Introduction

1.1 According to the Sutta commentary, the Buddha’s inspired utterance (*udāna*)—“It might not be, it might not be for me; and it will not be, it will not be for me,”¹ resolving thus, that a monk would cut off the lower fetters”² [2]. The first 5 lower fetters (*oram, bhāgiya*) of the 10 fetters³ are so called because they bind us to the lower realms, that is, the sense-world. The remaining 5 are the higher fetters (*ud-dham, bhāgiya*): they bind us to the higher realms, that is, the form world and the formless world. Either way we are thus fettered to samsara.

1.2 An *udāna* is an inspired utterance moved by powerful joy from reflecting on the liberating quality (*niyyānika, bhāva*) of the teaching (SA 2:273). Usually, it is a jubilant, that is, a positive and uplifting, statement (such as those recorded in the Udāna, one of the books of the Khuddaka Nikāya). Broadly, the term includes “lion-roar” (*sīha, nāda*) (a public witnessing of faith in the Buddha and his teaching)⁴ and statements of spiritual urgency (*samvega*).⁵

1.3 The Commentary speaks of three supports by way of necessary condition (*upanissaya*) for spiritual progress, that is,

the support of charity,	<i>dānūpanissaya</i>
the support of moral virtue, and	<i>sīlūpanissaya</i>
the support of mental cultivation.	<i>bhāvanūpanissaya</i>

Of these, says Buddhaghosa, the support of charity is weak (*dubbala*), but the support of mental cultivation is strong (*balava*). Supported by charity and by moral virtue, we attain the paths and the fruits, but only the support of mental cultivation can bring us arhathood. (SA 2:273)

2 No c’assa no ca me siyā, na bhavissati na me bhavissatīti [§2]

2.0 The most difficult sentence in the Sutta clearly is this: **No c’assa no ca me siyā, na bhavissati na me bhavissatīti** [§2], an important statement found in a number of other suttas (see below). This statement is found in the suttas in two forms: (1) the annihilationist [2.1] and the Buddha’s usage [2.2].⁶

¹ PTS: *no c’assa no ca me siyā, na bhavissati na me bhavissatīti*. Be: *no c’assam no ca me siyā, na bhavissa na me bhavissatīti*. Ce Se: *no c’assam no ca me siyā, na bhavissati na me bhavissatīti*. Nālandā ed: *no c’assam no ca me siyā, nābhavissam na me bhavissatīti*.

² See Bodhi’s useful long n, much of which is summarized or quoted here (S:B 1060 n65).

³ **The 10 fetters** (*samyojana*) are: (1) self-identity view (*sakkāya, ditṭhi*), (2) spiritual doubt (*vicikicchā*), (3) attachment to rituals and vows (*sīla-b, bata, parāmāsa*), (4) sensual lust (*kāma, rāga*), (5) repulsion (*paṭigha*), (6) greed for form existence (*rūpa, rāga*), (7) greed for formless existence (*arūpa, rāga*), (8) conceit (*māna*), (9) restlessness (*ud-dhacca*), (10) ignorance (*avijjā*) (S 5:61, A 5:13, Vbh 377). In some places, no. 5 (*paṭigha*) is replaced by ill will (*vyā-pāda*).

⁴ See SD 36.10 (3).

⁵ See SD 9 (7f).

⁶ For a fuller discussion, see S:B 1060 n75.

2.1 ANNIHILATIONISM

2.1.1 The annihilationist (*uccheda, diṭṭhi*) version—*no c’assam no ca me siyā, na bhavissāmi na me bhavissatī ti*,⁷ “If it were not, then there might be not for me, too; neither will it be for me nor will there be for me” (called “the no c’assam passage”)—is found in **the Kosala Sutta 1** (A 10.29), the Buddha declares it to be “the foremost of outside speculative views” (*etad-aggam bāhirakānam diṭṭhi, gatānam*), the reason being that one who accepts such a view would neither be attracted to existence nor be averse to the ending of cessation.⁸

2.1.2 In this connection, **Bodhi** notes:

It is problematic how the optative clause in the annihilationist version should be interpreted; perhaps it can be read as an assertion that personal existence, along with its experienced world, is utterly fortuitous (“I might not have been and it might not have been mine”). The clause in the future clearly asserts that personal existence and its world will terminate at death.

(S:B 1061 n75)

2.1.3 The “*no c’assam passage*” is also found in **the Pārileyya Sutta** (S 22.81), where it is explicitly identified as an annihilationist view,⁹ and where Bodhi follows the Sinhalese and PTS readings¹⁰ (the Burmese MS reads the 3rd negated verb as *nābhavissam*). The Burmese reading goes *no c’assam no ca me siyā, nābhavissāmi na me bhavissati*.

The Saṃyutta Commentary—reading *c’* as *ce*—explains it as: “If I were not to be, neither would there be my belongings; if I will not be in the future, neither will there be my belongings” (*sace aham na bhaveyyam mama parikkhāro pi na bhaveyya ... sace pana āyatim pi aham na bhavissāmi evam mama parikkhāro pi na bhavissati*).¹¹

2.1.4 The Saṃyutta Commentary here takes *c’* as *ce*, that is, *sace* (“if”), and its Porāṇa Tīkā, too, glosses it as *yadī*. However, parallel passages in the Sanskrit have *ca* (“and”)¹² If we take *c’* as *ce*, then this alternate translation is possible: “**If I were not to be, neither it would there be for me; if I will not be in the future, neither will it be for me.**”

This is however reflective more of an idealist viewpoint, when the proponent’s view is that when he ceases to exist, all things would not exist, too. Of course, a materialist could also hold such a view, that is, this is his only life, without any hereafter, and when he dies, the whole world cease for him, at least.

2.1.5 As such, a better translation here would be “I will not be, *and* it will not be for me.” Here, the first “it” can be taken to refer to the personal 5 aggregates, and the second to the world as perceived through the aggregates. Alternately, the first “it” might be taken to refer to craving, and the second to

⁷ Choong identifies this sentence with this Chinese reading at SĀ 64: 法無有吾我，亦復無我所，我既非當有，我所何由生？ (2000:57): see below 2(2) for tr. He thinks, “It is possible that the earlier unsanskritised form, with 8 syllables per line, was: *no c’assam no ca me siyā, nāhessam na me hessati*.” (2000:57 n94). This Chinese reading, however, fits *no c’assa no ca me siyā, na bhavissati na me bhavissati* better: see (2) here.

⁸ A 10.29,12/5:63,29 (SD 16.15).

⁹ S 22.81,26/3:99 (SD 6.1).

¹⁰ Curiously, Bodhi, as a rule, does *not* mention the Siamese Tipiṭaka (Se), throughout his translated works. In significant cases, his translations miss out on vital variant readings found in the Siamese, as in the case of **Bhadraka S** (S 42.11) + SD 55.7 (1.2.2).

¹¹ SA 2:275 = 306.

¹² Eg U 78 || Uv 15.4.

the five aggregates. In this connection, see also **the Eso Attā Sutta** (S 22.152)¹³ and **the So Attā Sutta** (S 24.4),¹⁴ where the statement is regarded as a wrong view.

2.2 THE BUDDHA'S USAGE

2.2.1 By replacing the 1st person verbs with their 3rd person counterparts, the Buddha changed this formula into a Dharma-based "*no c'assa*" statement: ***no c'assa no ca me siyā, na bhavissati na me bhavissati***. Bodhi notes, "The change of person shifts the stress from the view of self implicit in the annihilationist version ('I will be annihilated') to an impersonal perspective that harmonizes with the *anattā* doctrine."¹⁵ This usage is found in **the Udāna Sutta** (S 22.55).¹⁶

2.2.2 Apparently, the "*no c'assa* passage" has a Saṃyukta Āgama counterpart (the only one, according to CHOONG Mun Keat, who identified it)¹⁷ in this Chinese translation:

法無有吾我，亦復無我所，我既非當有，我所何由生？

(*fǎ wú yǒu wú wǒ, yì fù wú wǒ suǒ, wǒ jì fēi dāng yǒu, wǒ suǒ hé yóu shēng*)

Dharmas (phenomena) are not-self, and not belonging to self. Since self will not be, whence will there be belonging to self? (T2.16c)¹⁸

In short, the Chinese translation takes it as "neither self nor belonging to self" (Choong 2000:57). For our discussion thus far, it is evident that the Chinese passage is actually the counterpart of the "*no c'assa* passage" (of the Buddha's usage) rather than the "*no c'assam* passage" (of the annihilationists).

2.2.3 In **the Āneñja, sappāya Sutta** (M 106), we find this formula with a rider, *yad atthi yaṃ bhūtaṃ, taṃ pajahāmi*, "I abandon that which is, that which has come to be."¹⁹ This contemplation leads to equanimity. If one practises (based on the full formula and the rider) but clings to equanimity, one gains rebirth in the base of neither-perception-nor-non-perception, or, if there is no clinging to equanimity, one attains nirvana.²⁰

2.2.4 The Sutta commentary explains the passage in terms of the annihilationist view as follows:

If the fivefold²¹ round of karma had not been accumulated by me, now there would not be for me the round of results: if the fivefold round of karma is not accumulated by me now, in the future there will not be the rounds of results. (MA 4:65 f)

2.2.5 In **the Purisa, gati Sutta** (A 7.52), a resolution, guided by the formula and the rider, brings one to one of the five levels of non-returning or to arhathood itself.²²

¹³ S 22.152/3:182 f.

¹⁴ S 24.4/3:205 f.

¹⁵ S:B 1061 = n75.

¹⁶ S 22.55/3:55.

¹⁷ CHOONG Mun Keat 2000:57.

¹⁸ Choong qu from 雜阿含經論會編 *Combined Edition of Sūtra and Śāstra of the Saṃyuktāgama* 1983 1:102. Choong orig identifies this passage with the one in **Udāna S** (S 22.55/3:55), SD 17.16.

¹⁹ **Āneñja, sappāya S** (M 106,8/2:264); **Purisa, gati S** (A 7.52/4:70-74, passim).

²⁰ M 106.11-12/2:265.

²¹ Here "fivefold" (*pañca, vidha*) refers to the 5 aggregates (MAṬ:Be 2:257).

²² A 7.52/4:70-74.

2.2.6 A shorter formula is applied in **the Kaccāna Sutta** (U 7.8) to the mindfulness of the body, and one who dwells thus gradually goes beyond attachment, that is, gains arhathood.²³

2.3 BODHI'S INTERPRETATIONS. Regarding these usages, **Bodhi** (in *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha*, 2000) makes the following important and instructive note:²⁴

It may be significant that in the Nikāyas the precise meaning of the formula is never replicated, which suggest it may have functioned as an open-ended guide to reflection to be filled in by the meditator through personal intuition. As to the actual word meaning, the commentaries take the opening particle *c'* to represent *ce*, "if," glosses *sace* by [SA] and *yadi* by [SAṬ]. On this basis they interpret each part of the formula as a conditional.

[SA] explains the formula in [the **Udāna Sutta**, S 22.55] on the basis of the questionable reading *c'assam*, though its second alternative conforms to the superior reading *c'assa*. I translate here from [SA] very literally, rendering the lemma in the way favoured by the explanation: "If I were not, it would not be for me: If I were not (*sace aham na bhaveyyam*), neither would there be my belongings (*mama parikkhāro*). Or else: If in my past there had not been kammic formation [*kammābhisankhāro*],²⁵ now there would not be for me these five aggregates. I will not be, (and) it will not be for me: I will now so strive that there will not be any kammic formation of mine producing the aggregates in the future; when that is absent, there will be for me no future rebirth."

I part with the commentaries on the meaning of *c'*, which I take to represent *ca*; the syntax of the phrase as a whole clearly requires this. The [Sanskrit] parallels actually contain *ca* (eg at Uv 15.4, parallel to U 78). If we accept this reading, then [in the Udāna Sutta] the first "it" can be taken to refer to the personal aggregates, the second to the world apprehended through the aggregates. For the worldling this dyad is misconstrued as the duality of self and world; for the noble disciple it is simply the duality of internal and external phenomena.

On this basis, I would interpret the formula thus: "The five aggregates can be terminated, and the world presented by them can be terminated. I will so strive that the five aggregates will be terminated, (and) so that the world presented by them will be terminated." Alternatively, the first "it" might be taken to refer to craving, and the second to the five aggregates arisen through craving. In the additional rider, "what exists, what has come to be" [*yad atthi yam bhūtam*] denotes the presently existent set of five aggregates, which are being abandoned through the abandonment of the cause for their continued re-manifestation, namely, craving or desire-and-lust [*chanda, rāga*].

(S:B 1062 f = n75; refs normalized)

— — —

²³ U 7.8/78,2-3.

²⁴ Bodhi's n runs about 2½ pages, and here only the latter half is quoted: for full n, see S:B 1060 n75.

²⁵ Bodhi's orig reading: *kammābhi-sankhāro*.

Udāna Sutta

The Discourse on the Inspired Utterance

S 22.55

1 At Sāvattthī.

THE UNINSTRUCTED WORLDLING

2 At that time, the Blessed One uttered an inspired utterance:

“**It might not be, it might not be for me; and it will not be, it will not be for me,**”²⁶ [56] resolving thus, that a monk would cut off the lower fetters.”²⁷

3 When was this said, a certain monk said to the Blessed One:

“But how, bhante, can a monk, resolving thus: ‘It might not be, it might not be for me; and it will not be, it will not be for me,’ cut off the lower fetters?”

4 “Here, bhikshu, one is an uninstructed worldling [ignorant ordinary] person, who has no regard for the noble ones and is unskilled and undisciplined in their Dharma,

who has no regard for the true individuals and is unskilled and undisciplined in their Dharma:²⁸

he regards **form** as self,

or self as possessing form,

or form as in self,

or self as in form;

he regards **feeling** as self,

or self as possessing feeling,

or feeling as in self,

or self as in feeling;

he regards **perception** as self,

or self as possessing perception,

or perception as in self,

or self as in perception;

he regards **formations** as self,

or self as possessing formations,

or formations as in self,

or self as in formations;

he regards **consciousness** as self,

or self as possessing consciousness,

or consciousness as in self,

or self as in consciousness.

The aggregates are impermanent

5 He does not understand that <u>form</u> is	impermanent , as it really is:	<i>form</i> is impermanent. ²⁹
He does not understand that <u>feeling</u> is	<i>impermanent</i> , as it really is:	<i>feeling</i> is impermanent.
He does not understand that <u>perception</u> is	<i>impermanent</i> , as it really is:	<i>perception</i> is impermanent.
He does not understand that <u>formations</u> are	<i>impermanent</i> , as it really is:	<i>formations</i> are impermanent.
He does not understand that <u>consciousness</u> is	<i>impermanent</i> , as it really is:	<i>consciousness</i> is impermanent.

The aggregates are unsatisfactory

6 He does not understand that <u>form</u> is unsatisfactory ,	as it really is:	<i>form</i> is unsatisfactory.
He does not understand that <u>feeling</u> is unsatisfactory ,	as it really is:	<i>feeling</i> is unsatisfactory.

²⁶ *No c’assa no ca me siyā, na bhavissati na me bhavissatī ti.* On problems regarding its reading, see Intro (2).

²⁷ Here the attainment of non-returning (*anāgāmitā*) is meant. On the lower fetters, see Intro (1).

²⁸ These are the 4 basic modes of self-identity view: for a full passage on how rejecting these 4 modes in terms of the aggregates leads to “immediate destruction of the x,” see **Pārileyya S** (S 22.81.14-27/3:96-99), SD 6.1. **Paṭisambhidā, magga** explains the 4 modes in connection with form with the following analogies: form as self = a burning oil-lamp’s flame and its flame are identical; self as possessing form = the shadow of a tree possesses; form as in self = the scent in the flower; self as in form = a jewel in a casket (Pm 2.50, 74, 77, 90 = 1:143-145).

²⁹ The whole sentence: *So aniccaṃ rūpaṃ aniccaṃ rūpaṃ’ti yathā, bhūtaṃ na pajānāti.*

He does not understand that perception is *unsatisfactory*, as it really is: *perception* is unsatisfactory.
 He does not understand that formations are *unsatisfactory*, as it really is: *formations* are unsatisfactory.
 He does not understand that consciousness is *unsatisfactory*, as it really is: *consciousness* is unsatisfactory.

The aggregates are not self

7 He does not understand that form is **not self**, as it really is: *form* is non-self.
 He does not understand that feeling is *not self*, as it really is: *feeling* is non-self.
 He does not understand that perception is *not self*, as it really is: *perception* is non-self.
 He does not understand that formations are *not self*, as it really is: *formations* are non-self.
 He does not understand that consciousness is *not self*, as it really is: *consciousness* is non-self.

The aggregates are conditioned

8 He does not understand that form is **conditioned**, as it really is: *form* is conditioned.
 He does not understand that feeling is *conditioned*, as it really is: *feeling* is conditioned.
 He does not understand that perception is *conditioned*, as it really is: *perception* is conditioned.
 He does not understand that formations are *conditioned*, as it really is: *formations* are conditioned.
 He does not understand that consciousness is *conditioned*, as it really is: *consciousness* is conditioned.

The aggregates will cease

9 He does not understand, as it really is, that form **will cease to be**.³⁰
 He does not understand, as it really is, that feeling *will cease to be*.
 He does not understand, as it really is, that perception *will cease to be*.
 He does not understand, as it really is, that formations *will cease to be*.
 He does not understand, as it really is, that consciousness *will cease to be*. [57]

THE INSTRUCTED NOBLE DISCIPLE

10 Bhikshu, the instructed noble disciple, who has regard for the noble ones and is skilled and disciplined in their Dharma,
 who has regard for the true individuals and is skilled and disciplined in their Dharma:
 he does *not* regard **form** as self, nor self as possessing form,
 nor form as in self, nor self as in form;
 he does *not* regard **feeling** as self, nor self as possessing feeling,
 nor feeling as in self, nor self as in feeling;
 he does *not* regard **perception** as *self*, nor self as possessing perception,
 nor perception as in self, nor self as in perception;
 he does *not* regard **formations** as *self*, nor self as possessing formations,
 nor formations as in self, nor self as in formations;
 he does *not* regard **consciousness** as *self*, nor self as possessing consciousness,
 nor consciousness as in self, nor self as in consciousness.

³⁰ *Rūpaṃ vibhavissati*, which Comy glosses as *rūpaṃ bhijjissati*, “Form will break up” (SA 2:275), and Sub-comy uses *vinasissati*, “will perish” (SAṬ:Be 2:224). Apparently, these commentators regard *vibhavissati* here as the momentary cessation of the aggregates, but **Bodhi** comments, “I believe the verb refers to the final cessation of the aggregates with the attainment of the *anupādisesa, nibbāna, dhātu*. This meaning harmonizes better with the opening formula, and also seems supported by Tha 715cd: *saṅkhārā vibhavissant, tattha kā paridevanā*, “formations (only) will be exterminated, so what lamentation can there be over that.” (S:B 1063 n76)

The aggregates are impermanent

11 He understands, as it really is, that <u>form</u> is impermanent :	<i>'Form is impermanent.'</i>
He understands, as it really is, that <u>feeling</u> is impermanent:	<i>'Feeling is impermanent.'</i>
He understands, as it really is, that <u>perception</u> is impermanent:	<i>'Perception is impermanent.'</i>
He understands, as it really is, that <u>formations</u> are impermanent:	<i>'Formations are impermanent.'</i>
He understands, as it really is, that <u>consciousness</u> is impermanent:	<i>'Consciousness is impermanent.'</i>

The aggregates are unsatisfactory

12 He understands, as it really is, that <u>form</u> is unsatisfactory :	<i>'Form is unsatisfactory.'</i>
He understands, as it really is, that <u>feeling</u> is unsatisfactory:	<i>'Feeling is unsatisfactory.'</i>
He understands, as it really is, that <u>perception</u> is unsatisfactory:	<i>'Perception is unsatisfactory.'</i>
He understands, as it really is, that <u>formations</u> are unsatisfactory:	<i>'Formations is unsatisfactory.'</i>
He understands, as it really is, that <u>consciousness</u> is unsatisfactory:	<i>'Consciousness is unsatisfactory.'</i>

The aggregates are not self

13 He understands, as it really is, that <u>form</u> is not self :	<i>'Form is not self.'</i>
He understands, as it really is, that <u>feeling</u> is not self:	<i>'Feeling is not self.'</i>
He understands, as it really is, that <u>perception</u> is not self:	<i>'Perception is not self.'</i>
He understands, as it really is, that <u>formations</u> are not self:	<i>'Formations are not self.'</i>
He understands, as it really is, that <u>consciousness</u> is not self:	<i>'Consciousness is not self.'</i>

The aggregates are conditioned

14 He understands, as it really is, that <u>form</u> is conditioned :	<i>'Form is conditioned.'</i>
He understands, as it really is, that <u>feeling</u> is conditioned:	<i>'Feeling is conditioned.'</i>
He understands, as it really is, that <u>perception</u> is conditioned:	<i>'Perception is conditioned.'</i>
He understands, as it really is, that <u>formations</u> are conditioned:	<i>'Formations are conditioned.'</i>
He understands, as it really is, that <u>consciousness</u> is conditioned:	<i>'Consciousness is conditioned.'</i>

The aggregates will cease to be

15 He understands, as it really is:	<u>'Form</u>	will cease to be. ³¹
He understands, as it really is:	<u>'Feeling</u>	will cease to be.'
He understands, as it really is:	<u>'Perception</u>	will cease to be.'
He understands, as it really is:	<u>'Formations</u>	will cease to be.'
He understands, as it really is:	<u>'Consciousness</u>	will cease to be.'

When the aggregates have ceased

16 With the ceasing of	form,
with the ceasing of	feeling,
with the ceasing of	perception,
with the ceasing of	formations,
with the ceasing of	consciousness,

that monk, resolving thus: 'It might not be, it might not be for me; and it will not be, it will not be for me,' would cut off the lower fetters."³²

³¹ *Rūpaṃ vibhavissati yathā, bhūtaṃ pajānāti*: see §9 n above.

³² According to Comy this is attained by seeing the extermination, together with insight. For the 4 paths together with insight are called "the seeing of extermination of form, etc." (SA 2:275). **Bodhi**, however, interprets this as

THE ARHAT

17 “Resolving thus, bhante, that monk would cut off **the lower fetters.**

But how, bhante, should one see, so that there is the immediate³³ destruction of the influxes?”³⁴

18 “Here, bhikshu, the uninstructed worldling trembles at what does not cause trembling [is terrified at what does not terrify].³⁵

For, bhikshu, the uninstructed worldling trembles at the thought,

‘It might not be, it might not be for me; and it will not be, it will not be for me.’

19 But, bhikshu, the instructed noble disciple does *not* tremble at the thought,

‘It might not be, it might not be for me; and it will not be, it will not be for me.’ [58]

The proliferation of consciousness

20 Consciousness, bhikshu, while standing [while it exists], would stand³⁶

stuck to form (taking it as its object),

rūp’ārammaṇaṃ

fixed around [supported by] form,

rūpa,patiṭṭhaṃ

devoted to delight—

nand’upasevanaṃ

would come to growth, increase, abundance.³⁷

vuddhiṃ virūḷhiṃ vepullaṃ āpajjeyya

referring to “the ultimate cessation of the aggregates in nirvana, and thus the realization that such cessation takes place functions as the spur implicit in the meditation formula that inspires the bhikkhu to break the five fetters.” (S:B 1063 n77)

³³ “Immediate,” *anantarā*, ie in an uninterrupted manner. Also “immediately after.” Alt tr: “ ... so that there follows the immediate destruction of the mental x.” Comy explains that there are 2 types of immediacy (*anantara*), proximate and distant. Insight is the proximate immediate cause for the path (because the supramundane path arises when insight peaks), and the distant immediate cause for the fruit (because the fruit directly follows the path) (SA 2:275 f). Here, it refers to “the fruit of arhathood immediately following the path” (*magg’anantaram arahatta,phalam*) (SA 3:306). Bodhi: “However, as in the commentarial system the fruit inevitably occurs in immediate succession to the path. I think the monk is really asking how to attain arahantship swiftly and directly, without being detained at any lower stage of awakening.” (S:B 1075 n131). See **Pārileyya S** (S 22.81.10/3:96), SD 6.1.

³⁴ “**Mental influxes**,” *āsava*. The term *āsava* (lit “cankers”) comes from *ā-savati* “flows towards” (ie either “into” or “out” towards the observer). It has been variously translated as influxes, 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 (*kām’āsava*), (2) (desire for eternal) existence (*bhav’āsava*), (3) views (*diṭṭh’āsava*), (4) ignorance (*avijj’āsava*) (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 x (omitting the influx of views) [43] is probably 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: *āsava*.

³⁵ Comy: The worldling becomes afraid with the arising of weak insight (*dubbala,vipassanā*) because he is unable to overcome self-love, and so becomes afraid, thinking, “Now I will be annihilated and will not exist any more.” He sees himself falling down a precipice [**Alagaddūpama S**, M 22,20/1:136,30-137,4, SD 3.13]. But when strong insight occurs to the instructed noble disciple, he is not afraid but thinks, “It is only formations that arise, only formations that cease.” (SA 2:276). For such a case of fearfulness, see eg the youth Yasa’s spiritual experience: V 1:15-18 = SD 11.3(7.1-6). “Knowledge of appearance as fearful” (*bhayat’upaṭṭhāna,ñāṇa*) refers to an advanced stage of insight that reveals the fearful nature of formations in the three periods of time: see **Bhāvanā**, SD 25.1.11(6)(3) (on the 7 purifications) & Vism 21.29-34/645-647. See also S:B 1064 n78 & 1084 n181.

³⁶ This phrase and the rest: *Rup’upāyaṃ va bhikkhu viññāṇaṃ tiṭṭhamānaṃ tiṭṭheyya rūp’ārammaṇa,rūpa,patiṭṭhaṃ nand’upasevanaṃ vuddhiṃ virūḷhiṃ vepullaṃ āpajjeyya.*

³⁷ *Rūpūpayam vā bhikkhu viññāṇam tiṭṭhamānam tiṭṭheyya | rūp’ārammaṇam | rūpa,patiṭṭham | nand’upasevanam vuddhiṃ virūḷhiṃ vepullam āpajjeyya.*

- 21** Consciousness, bhikshu, while standing, would stand stuck to feeling,
fixed around feeling,
devoted to delight—
it would come to growth, increase, abundance.
- 22** Consciousness, bhikshu, while standing, would stand stuck to perception,
fixed around perception,
devoted to delight—
it would come to growth, increase, abundance.
- 23** Consciousness, bhikshu, while standing, would stand stuck to formations,
fixed around formations,
devoted to delight—
it would come to growth, increase, abundance.

The ending of consciousness

24 Bhikshu, one might say this:

'Apart from form,
apart from feeling,
apart from perception,
apart from formations,
apart from consciousness,

I will declare the coming and going of consciousness, or its passing away and re-arising [rebirth], or its growth, increase, abundance'—this is impossible.

- 25** Bhikshu, if a monk has abandoned lust for the form element,³⁸
with the abandoning of lust, the basis is cut off—
there is no support for consciousness.³⁹
- 25** Bhikshu, if a monk has abandoned lust for the feeling element,
with the abandoning of lust, the basis is cut off —
there is no support for consciousness.
- 26** Bhikshu, if a monk has abandoned lust for the perception element,
with the abandoning of lust, the basis is cut off—
there is no support for consciousness.
- 27** Bhikshu, if a monk has abandoned lust for the formation element,
with the abandoning of lust, the basis is cut off—
there is no support for consciousness.
- 28** Bhikshu, if a monk has abandoned lust for the consciousness element,
with the abandoning of lust, the basis is cut off—
there is no support for consciousness.⁴⁰

³⁸ "Element," *dhātu*; here it refers to the sense-objects as the bases for perception.

³⁹ The whole sentence: *Rūpa, dhātuyā ce bhikkhu bhikkhuno rāgo pahīno hoti rāgassa pahānā vocchijjat'ārammaṇam patitṭhitā viññāṇassa na hoti*. The word *vocchijjata* is the passive form of *chindati*, "he cuts off, destroys, remove" (both lit & fig), from √CHID (to cut up).

⁴⁰ Here, the first "consciousness" (*viññāṇa*) refers to "cognitive consciousness" (the consciousness arising at the sense-doors), while the second refers to "existential consciousness," ie the rebirth consciousness. In other words,

Liberation

29 That consciousness that has no support would not increase, would not be formed—
this is liberation:⁴¹

on account of being freed,	it is steady.	<i>vimuttattā ṭhitam</i>
on account of being steady,	it is contented.	<i>ṭhitattā santusitam</i>
on account of being contented,	it is not agitated.	<i>santusitattā na paritassati</i>
on account of being unagitated,	he himself attains nirvana. ⁴²	

29.2 He understands:

‘Destroyed is birth. The holy life has been lived. What needs to be done has been done. There is (for me) no more of arising in any state of being.’

30 Bhikshu, it is for one who knows thus, who sees thus, that there is the immediate destruction of the influxes.”

— evaṃ —

Bibliography

Choong, Mun-keat [Wei-keat]

2000 *The Fundamental Teachings of Early Buddhism: A comparative study based on the Sūtrāṅga portion of the Pāli Saṃyutta-Nikāya and the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama.* [Beiträge zur Indologie 32.] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2000.

060716 090804a 121127 130514 130519 160921 200202 200717

when there is clearly no more attachment to sense-experiences, then rebirth is abandoned. On the 2 kinds of consciousnesses, see **Viññāṇa**, SD 17.8a (6.1).

⁴¹ The foll 3-4 lines recur in **(Khandha) Anicca S 1** (S 22.45/3:45,13-14), SD 93.22; **(Khandha) Anicca S 2** (S 22.46/-3:46,4-5), SD 93.23; **Upāya S** (S 22.53/3:54,1-2), SD 29.4; **(Viññāṇa) Bija S** (S 22.54/3:55,34-35), SD 8.3(9); **Udāna S** (S 22.55,29/3:58,23-24), SD 17.16; **(Navaka) Ānanda S** (A 9.37,9+10), see esp SD 55.19 (2.1).

⁴² *Aparitassam paccattañ ñeva parinibbāyati.* On the nature of “meditative language” here, see SD 55.19 (2.1.1).