

CONTENTS

Dhammapada—Tr. <i>B. Ananda Maitreya</i>	57
A Critical Pali Dictionary— <i>Sukomal Chaudhury</i>	69
A Critical Analysis of the Sutta Nipāta— <i>N. A. Jayawickrama</i>	75
(Aggregates and Clinging Aggregates— <i>Bhikkhu Bodhi</i>	91
Note on Solitude/Inwardness— <i>Malcolm Hudson</i>	103
The Kosambī Suttas— <i>John D. Ireland</i>	105
Obituary—Ven Jagdish Kashyap	122
Book Review	123

The *Pali Buddhist Review* is the tri-annual organ of the Pali Buddhist Union.

Annual Subscription : £1.00 (or equivalent currencies) payable to "Pali Buddhist Union"

Editor : Russell Webb

Editorial Address : 51 Wellesley Road,
ILFORD,
Essex IG1 4JZ,
England.

PALI BUDDHIST REVIEW

Vol. 1, No. 2

1976

DHAMMAPADA

(Translated by Ven. B. Ananda Maitreya)

Homage to the Exalted One, the Holy One, the Buddha Supreme!

I

Twins

Thus said the Lord :

1. **Heralded by mind are all actions.**
Headed by mind and mind-made are they.
If one speaks or acts with corrupt mind,
suffering follows one as the wheel of the cart
the hoof of the draught ox.
2. **Heralded by mind are all actions.**
Headed by mind and mind-made are they.
If one speaks or acts with placid mind,
happiness accompanies one as the never leaving shadow.
3. "He abused me, maltreated me,
defeated me or robbed me"—
Whosoever are wont to harbour such thoughts,
in them is hatred never appeased.
4. "He abused me, maltreated me,
defeated me or robbed me"—
Whosoever do not harbour such thoughts,
in them is hatred appeased.
5. Verily, never is enmity appeased
by returning enmity.
Only by amity is enmity appeased.
This is an ancient truth (or eternal Law).
6. "We are here always nearing death"—
This fact others do not notice.
But whosoever of them notice it,
thereby do their quarrels abate.

7. He that lives perceiving things
from a sensual point of view¹,
not restrained in the senses,
immoderate and unmindful in eating,
lazy and slothful,
him verily does the Tempter² overthrow,
just as the wind a weakly tree.
8. He that lives perceiving things
not from a sensual point of view,
restrained in the senses, moderate in meals,
devout and energetic,
him certainly the Tempter² can't overthrow,
just as the wind a rocky mountain.
9. Whoever dons a saffron robe,
himself not yet free from stain,
and devoid of self-control and truthfulness—
such an one deserves not the saffron robe.³
10. Whosoever is free from stain,
well disciplined,
endowed with self-control and truthfulness—
certainly such an one deserves the saffron robe.
11. They who mistake
the non-essential for the essential
and the essential for the non-essential,
will fail to attain the essential,
feeding on wrong thoughts.
12. But they, on the other hand,
perceiving the essential as the essential,
and the non-essential as the non-essential,
will be able to attain the essential,
feeding on right thoughts.
13. As an ill-thatched house
is pervious to rain,
so is an uncultivated mind
pervious to lust.
14. As a well-thatched house
is impervious to rain,
so is a well-cultivated mind
impervious to lust.

1. Literally, observant of the beautiful features of body, etc.
2. Tempter—Kilesa Māra in Pali, i.e., depravities of the mind as passion, lust, anger, etc., personified.
3. Saffron robe. A robe of dark saffron colour was generally used by monks, recluses and ascetics in olden days.

15. He grieves here. He grieves hereafter.
Thus the evil-doer grieves in both states.
He grieves and is afflicted,
beholding his own foul deeds.
16. He rejoices here. He rejoices hereafter.
Thus the doer of good rejoices in both states,
He rejoices and doubly rejoices,
beholding his own pure deeds.
17. The evil-doer suffers here,
he suffers hereafter too.
Thus in both states does he suffer.
He suffers here,
thinking 'I have committed evil'.
But still more does he suffer (after death),
gone to a woeful state.
18. The doer of good feels happy here.
He will be happy hereafter.
He feels happy here thinking,
'I have done good deeds'.
He will rejoice still more,
gone hereafter to a blissful state.
19. A negligent person reciting
much of the scriptural text,
but not practising it,
shares not the fruition of the holy life,
just as a cowherd counts others' cattle
(but tastes not their milk or ghee).
20. Even though one recites but a little
of the scriptural text,
if one works out the instructions,
such a one shunning lust, malice, and delusion,
perfectly knowing the Truth,
with mind perfectly free,
and cleaving to naught here or hereafter,
becomes a sharer of the fruition
of the holy life.

II Vigilance

1. Vigilance is the path to deathlessness.
Negligence is the path to death.
The vigilant never die.
The negligent are, as it were, dead already. (21)
2. Understanding this clearly,
the wise that have advanced in vigilance,
take delight in vigilance,
walking in the way of the holy. (22)
3. Those wise ones, given to meditation,
ever active and strenuously striving,
realize Nirvāna,
the supreme security. (23)
4. Remarkably grows the glory of the man
who is strenuous, wakeful, pure in deed,
acting considerately, self-restrained,
vigilant and leading a righteous life. (24)
5. Let the wise man,
by vigour, vigilance, restraint and self-control,
make for himself an island
which no flood can submerge. (25)
6. The foolish, the unwise,
give themselves up to negligence.
But the wise man guards vigilance
as his best possession. (26)
7. One should not give oneself up to negligence.
One should not give oneself up to sensuality.
It is only the man vigilant and meditative
that can attain to ample happiness. (27)
8. When the wise man removes
negligence by means of vigilance,
then he, ascending the tower of wisdom,
himself being sorrowless,
gazes upon the sorrowing folk.
Being wise himself,
he gazes on the unwise,
as one on the mountain-top,
gazes on those in the plain below. (28)

9. The vigilant amid the negligent,
the wide awake among the sleepy,
proceeds as he is wise,
surpassing all the rest,
like a race horse outstripping a hack. (29)
10. By vigilance did the Maghavat rise¹
to overlordship among the gods.
So, they praise vigilance,
and negligence is ever condemned. (30)
11. A recluse delighting in vigilance,
seeing the fear of negligence,
advances like a fire,
consuming the fetters² both great and small. (31)
12. A recluse who delights in vigilance
and discerns the danger of negligence,
is not liable to fall away
from his perfected state.
He is close upon Nirvāna. (32)

III Mind

1. Just as a fletcher straightens an arrow (with fire),
so the wise man straightens his mind
which is fickle, unsteady,
unguardable and irrepressible. (33)
2. As a fish drawn up
out of its watery abode
and cast upon the dry land,
so does this mind flutter
(due to the Tempter's influence).
Therefore one should quit
the dominion of the Tempter.³ (34)
3. Good is it to curb the mind
which is so unruly, capricious
and rushing wherever it pleases.
The mind so curbed will bring one happiness. (35)

1. Maghavat, according to the Buddhist tradition, was Sakka, in his immediate previous life on earth as an energetic youth, devoted to social service. See the *Kulavaka Jātaka*.
2. Fetters of mind which bar its development.
3. Tempter signifies the passions personified.

4. Let the wise man guard his mind
which is very difficult to perceive,
extremely subtle
and rushing wherever it pleases.
The mind so guarded and curbed
will bring him happiness. (36)
5. Whosoever restrains the mind
which strays far, alone, incorporeal,
dwelling in the cave (of the body),¹
they will be freed
from the thralldom of the Tempter. (37)
6. Wisdom will never attain fullness
in him who is fickle in mind,
ignorant of the Good Law
and of wavering faith. (38)
7. No fear finds its way
into the heart of a vigilant man
whose mind is free from lust and anger,
who has stilled both good and evil.² (39)
8. Let one discern this body
as fragile as an earthen vase,
establish one's mind
as firm as a fortified city,
fight the Tempter with the weapon of insight,
and protect what one has so far conquered
and proceed without attachment to it. (40)
9. Certainly, ere long will this body
lie on the ground,
bereft of consciousness,
discarded like a useless log. (41)
10. An ill-directed mind
will do more harm
than what two treacherous
or hostile men may do to each other. (42)
11. A well-directed mind
will do more benefit
than what one's parents
or relatives can do for one. (43)

1. Here cave refers to the place in which the mind abides. From the Buddhist point of view there is no one thing called mind, only a process of conscious states arising and vanishing which are maintained only through the impingement of an object on a sense-base. Although some commentators thought that the heart was the seat of consciousness, the Buddha never committed himself to this popular Indian view.

2. This refers to an arahant, a perfect one, who has gone beyond the sphere of good and bad, beyond the realm of the law of relativity.

IV Flowers

1. Who will discern this earth (this body),
this world of human beings,
and the realm of unhappy beings
together with the realm of gods?
Who is able to discern the subjects
of well-expounded doctrine
as a skilful garland-maker
selects choice flowers? (44)
2. The trainee (in the Holy Circle)¹
is able to discern this earth,
this human world and the abodes of unhappy beings
together with the realm of the gods.
A trainee (in the Holy Circle) can discern the subjects
of the well-expounded doctrine
even as a skilful gardener selects choice flowers. (45)
3. Let one see this body
as weak and evanescent as foam,
realize it as unsubstantial as a mirage,
and thus destroy the flowery arrows of the Tempter,
and go beyond the range of Death's view. (46)
4. Even as a flood carries off a sleeping village,
so does death carry off a man of distracted mind,
while he is incessantly and uncontentedly searching
for still better flowers of life (i.e., pleasures). (47)
5. Death brings into subjection
the unsated man of distracted mind,
who is searching for still better flowers of life. (48)
6. Let the sage go about a village
as a bee that flies away,
having sucked honey from its flower,
leaving its colour and fragrance uninjured. (49)
7. Let not one pay heed
to the harsh words of others.
Let not one be concerned
of what others have done or left undone.
Let one rather look at
what oneself has done and left undone. (50)

1. Trainee=Sekha; who has entered the Path to Perfection (after he has won The Stream-winner's or *Sotapatti*-stage) until he attains to Perfection is called a Sekha or Trainee.

8. Like a pretty flower,
of brilliant hue but lacking fragrance.
is the word well spoken
which bears no fruit in him
who does not act (as he preaches). (51)
9. Like a pretty flower,
of brilliant hue and full of fragrance,
is the word well spoken
that bears fruit in him
who acts (as he preaches). (52)
10. As one were to make many garlands
from a heap of flowers
so should a mortal that's born to this world
perform many good deeds. (53)
11. No odour of flowers is wafted against the wind,
nor that of sandalwood nor of tagar or jasmine.
But the fragrance (of virtues) of the righteous
is wafted ever against the wind.
The righteous man wafts himself in all directions. (54)
12. The odour of sandalwood,
tagar, lotus or vassiki is (excellent).
Superior to all these is
the fragrance of morality. (55)
13. Faint and slight is the scent
of tagar and sandalwood,
in comparison with the fragrance
of the virtuous, wafted among gods (and men)
as the highest. (56)
14. The Tempter can never find
the way of the virtuous
that are living vigilantly
and emancipated through perfect knowledge. (57)
- 15, 16. As there grows,
unaffected by filth,
a sweet-smelling and beautiful lotus
on a heap of filth
cast away in dirty water,
close beside the highway,
so does the disciple
of the Perfect Buddha
outshine, by his wisdom, the others
the worldlings blind and filth-like. (58, 59)

V

The Fool

1. Long is the night to the sleepless.
Long is the league to the way-worn.
Long is the round of rebirths
to the unwise who know not the Truth. (60)
2. Should a wayfarer fail to find
a companion better or equal,
he should resolutely walk alone.
Have no company with a fool! (61)
3. 'Children have I, wealth have I'—
with such thoughts
the unwise man worries himself.
He cannot rightly claim
even himself his own.
How then children! How then wealth!! (62)
4. A fool who knows his foolishness
is to be taken as wise so far.
A fool who reckons himself wise
may be rightly called a fool. (63)
5. A fool may associate
with a wise man throughout his life,
yet he cannot understand the Norm,
even as the spoon tastes not
the flavour of soup. (64)
6. Even for a moment,
should a thoughtful man
associate with a wise man,
he will soon realize the Norm,
even as the tongue tastes the flavour of soup. (65)
7. The unwise, of little understanding,
behave to themselves as to an enemy,
committing evil deeds
that produce bitter fruit. (66)
8. It is not wise to do such a deed,
the doer of which repents what he did
and endures its evil result
with weeping and tearful face. (67)
9. It is wise to do such a deed,
the doer of which repents not what he did
but enjoys its good result,
happy and delighted. (68)

10. Until his evil deed ripens,
the fool thinks it honey-sweet.
But whenever it ripens,
the fool, its doer, comes to grief. (69)
11. Though the fool may eat his food
with the tip of a blade of kusa-grass,
month after month,
practising rigorous asceticism,
yet he is not worth a sixteenth portion of an Arahant. (70)
12. As milk does not quickly curdle,
so indeed an evil deed does not produce its result at once.
But it follows, in latency, the fool, its doer,
like smouldering fire covered by ashes. (71)
13. Gains of a fool conduce to his ruin.
Cleaving his head,
will it destroy
his bright share of merit. (72)
- 14-15. Should a bhikkhu long for false fame,
front rank among bhikkhus,
authority in the abodes of the clergy
and offerings of the lay families;
and should he wish
“Let both monks and laymen regard me
as the doer of all this;
let them be at my command
in all that is done whether great or small”—
in the fool with such thoughts
both craving and pride increase. (73, 74)
16. One is the way that leads to gains,
and another is the way that takes on to Nirvāna.
Let the bhikkhu, the disciple of the Buddha,
understanding this, not yearn for worldly gains.
Let him give himself over to seclusion. (75)

VI The Wise

1. Were a man to see an intelligent person,
able to show his shortcomings
and administer suitable reproof,
let him associate with such a wise man,
as one would a revealer of hidden treasures.
It fares well and not ill with him
who associates with such a person. (76)
2. Let one advise,
admonish and deter others
from what is base and vile.
He will surely be dear to the good
though despised by the wicked. (77)
3. Resort not to bad friends.
Resort not to persons of mean habit.
Resort to good friends.
Resort to persons of the best type. (78)
4. He that drinks of the nectar of Dhamma
lives happily with mind serene.
The wise man delights ever in the Dhamma
expounded by the Holy Ones. (79)
5. Conduit-makers guide the waters.
Fletchers straighten arrows.
Carpenters shape the wood to their purpose.
The wise subdue themselves. (80)
6. As a solid rock
is not shaken by the wind,
even so is the wise man
not moved by praise or blame. (81)
7. As a deep lake is still and clear,
so do the wise men,
listening to the Teachings,
attain to tranquility of mind. (82)
8. The good, for certain, cling to nothing.
They do not prattle concerned with gains.
The wise, the saintly, whether touched by comfort or discomfort,
show neither elation nor depression. (83)

9. Not for his own or another's sake should one commit an evil deed; should one desire by unfair means neither children, wealth, nor kingdom, nor yet any other kind of success. One should be virtuous, wise and just. (84)
10. Few among men cross to the yonder shore. This other folk but run along the bank this side. (85)
11. But only those men, who follow the Law well expounded, pass to the yonder shore, beyond the dominion of Death, so hard to cross over. (86)
- 12-13. Let the wise man shun the murky way and proceed on the path of light. Let him come from home to homelessness, forsake pleasures of sense, free himself from all obstacles, delight in seclusion which the commonfolk shudder at, and cleanse himself of the blemishes of mind. (87-88)
14. They whose minds are well-cultured in the elements of Enlightenment, who, without grasping, delight in detachment, rid of all taints, and thus resplendent— it is they that are entirely cooled in the world. (89)

(Continued)

A CRITICAL PALI DICTIONARY

Sukomal Chaudhury

The *Critical Pali Dictionary*, hereinafter called CPD, was begun by Prof. V. Trenckner (1824-1891). The first Pali-English dictionary called *Dictionary of the Pali Language* by Childers appeared in 1875. But Trenckner started his work for a Pali dictionary even before that. Seeing the Fausböll's edition of the *Dhammapada* in Roman script in 1855, Trenckner became enthusiastic and engaged himself in editing the Pali texts, most of which were then lying in Mss., in Roman script. Within a short period of about twenty years he edited a good number of Pali texts on the basis of the Sinhalese, Burmese, Siamese and Cambodian Mss. Not only that, as he had a plan to compile a Pali dictionary, he side by side made excerpts from such Pali texts as the *Abhidhānappadīpikā*, *Dhātupāṭha*, *Payogasiddhi*, *Kaccāyana*, *Papañcasūdanī*, *Dhammapada*, *Dhammapada-atthakathā*, *Suttanipāta*, *Paramatthajotikā*, *Udānā*, *Itivuttaka*, *Buddhavaṃsa*, *Cariyāpiṭaka*, *Thera-Therīgāthā*, *Jātaka-Aṭṭhakathā*, *Aṭṭhasālinī*, *Suttasaṅgaha*, *Mahāvamsa*, Vinaya texts, etc. He collected his material for the dictionary on small paper-slips but unfortunately he could not finish his work as death cut short his life in 1891. After his death his entire library was sold but the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters of Copenhagen procured his collection of material for the Pali dictionary. The Academy decided to publish a Pali dictionary on the basis of Trenckner's material and entrusted the editorial work to Prof. Rhys Davids in 1904. Especially for this purpose the International Congress of Orientalists was convened at Copenhagen in 1908 where Rhys Davids appealed to all members present to find out suitable co-operators for such a dictionary.

A ready response came from Prof. Sten Konow who wrote an essay on 'Pali words beginning with 'S'' which was published in the *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, 1909, after having been considerably augmented by means of Trenckner's material. In the same way Dines Andersen wrote an essay on Pali words beginning with 'Y' which was published subsequently. At the Congress of Athens there was a marked tendency in favour of the redaction of the Dictionary taking place at Copenhagen where the work in its progress could constantly be checked by means of Trenckner's material and the Mss. of the Rask Collection. But very soon war broke out in Europe which stood in the way of international co-operation for the Dictionary. In 1916, H. Smith and D. Andersen,

therefore, conceived a plan of editing the Dictionary without the aid of foreign collaborators. In the meantime Rhys Davids started publishing the *Pali Text Society Dictionary* (1921-25) of which he only saw the first two thirds through the press before his death. This however did not discourage Smith and Andersen. They engaged their full time and energy for their editing work, thanks to the Royal Danish Academy which still went on offering its aid and co-operation in the production of Trenckner's dictionary. The Academy started publishing the Dictionary from 1924 and completed the publication of Volume I, consisting of articles with the letter 's' (covering pages 561+99) in 1948. In the meantime, unfortunately Dines Andersen died on 28. 3. 1940.

The title given to this dictionary is *A Critical Pali Dictionary*. It is a dictionary from Pali to English. The editors gave their reasons in the preface why they so-called this dictionary: "We have called this work a *Critical Pali Dictionary* both because Trenckner's material was from the first arranged on a critical basis and because the nature of many of the modern editions of the texts imposes on us the obligation of re-testing the readings. The dictionary thus professes to be critical, but its criticism comes under the head of the 'lower criticism' only, inasmuch as we are working exclusively on the Pali Canon and the younger books appertaining to it. Our plan has simply been to supply verified material for that higher criticism which checks the canon of the Theravāda with the documents left by other Buddhist schools as well as with the deeper strata of Jain lore." The motto of the Dictionary is also given by the editors in the following sentence: "Thus we have attempted to show what may be achieved by means of Pali alone, but must leave it to others to draw the conclusions of further comparative study." In this dictionary Trenckner's references to the Mss. are substituted by the references of the Pali Text Society's editions.

After the death of H. Smith in 1956, the Royal Danish Academy formed an Administrative Commission for the CPD consisting of the following members: L. L. Hammerich (Chairman), K. Barr, and L. Hjelmslev. Subsequently a supervisory committee was formed with the following members: L. Alsdorf, H. Hendriksen, I. B. Horner and H. Humbach. The first fascicule of Volume II came out in 1960. It was edited by an international body of Pali scholars, viz. L. Alsdorf, C. E. Godakumbura, Ivo Fiser and Mrs. E. Pauly. Subsequently six other fascicules have been published. These seven fascs. of Vol. II contained articles from ā to *ugghātima* covering 344 pages. The 8th fasc. of Vol. II is now in the press.

In the meantime the Supervisory Committee met four times in Copen-

hagen: September, 1958, November, 1963, September, 1968, and October, 1973. Now for the last seven years or so Prof. Dr. L. Alsdorf has been working as the Editor-in-Chief of the CPD. The important cost of the CPD work is covered partly by a grant from UNESCO, partly by the Rask-Orsted Foundation, partly by the Carlsberg Foundation, and the like. This apart, the cost of the centres for the CPD and individual collaborators in different parts of the globe, viz. Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Germany, Great Britain, Japan and The Netherlands are borne by different Academies, Organisations and Institutes of the respective states. In 1960 the Indological Section of the XXVth International Congress of Orientalists at Moscow adopted a resolution in favour of the CPD, especially requesting the Governments of Ceylon, India, Burma, Thailand, Cambodia and Laos to give financial assistance. Thanks are due to the Government of India which readily responded to the request and assured to render all possible help in the interest of the CPD. Being invited by the Government of India, F. Möller-Kristensen, the then-Editor-in-Chief of the CPD, visited India and suggested two names for the CPD Project in India. They are: Govt. Sanskrit College, Calcutta, and Navanālandā Mahāvihāra, Patna. But the Government of India selected the Government Sanskrit College, Calcutta, as the only Indian Centre for the CPD and granted a suitable amount for the same for a period of ten years for the first time. Now the Government of India appointed an *ad-hoc* Advisory Board with the following members to supervise the work of the Indian Centre: Dr. Gaurinath Sastri (Chairman), Rev. Bhikkhu J. Kashyap, ex-Director, Navanālandā Mahāvihāra (died, 28. 1. 76), Dr. P. L. Vaidya, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, Dr. R. C. Pandeya, Head of the Department of Buddhist Studies, University of Delhi (ex-officio) and Principal, Govt. Sanskrit College, Calcutta (ex-officio Secretary—now Prof. Sri Bishnupada Bhattacharyya is the Principal). Prof. Dr. Biswanath Banerjee, ex-Professor and Head of the Department of Pali, Sanskrit College, and now Professor and Head of the Departments of Sanskrit, Pali and Prakrit, Visvabharati and Prof. Dr. Herambanath Chatterjee, Professor and Head of the Department of Pali, Sanskrit College, Calcutta, have been working as the Director and the Jt. Director respectively of the Indian Centre for the CPD. Prof. Dr. Alsdorf, Editor-in-Chief, again came to India and requested the Govt. of India to grant another suitable amount for the Indian Centre so that it may run smoothly for at least another period of fifteen years from April, 1976. For Dr. Alsdorf is of opinion that the Sanskrit College Centre is the only centre in the East where the unit of CPD has been working satisfactorily on the right track.

How an article for CPD is prepared:

The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, Copenhagen, has various collections of materials at her disposal. They are as follows :

1. *The Trenckner Collection (nomina and radices)* containing a good selection of quotations from large parts of the canonical literature and the commentaries. The collection can only be utilised with the help of a special concordance called "Key to Trenckner's references", as the references are to Trenckner's own transcripts mostly prepared from Mss.
2. *Trenckner-Andersen (radices)* which is based on Trenckner's collection, but arranged somewhat better.
3. *The Andersen-Smith Collection* containing material originating from Trenckner, Andersen, Smith and other later collaborators.
4. *The Geiger Collection* containing material mostly from the historical literature.
5. *The Franke Collection* exclusively containing material from the metrical parts of the Pali literature.

Material from these collections are submitted to the author of the articles to be written by him. But this material is not adequate for the writing of the articles. The author is to supplement the material received with material from the following scholarly works :

1. Pali Text Society's *Pali Tipiṭaka Concordance*.
2. H. Smith's *Saddanīti-index*.
3. Andersen's *Pali Glossary*.
4. Childer's *Dictionary of the Pali Language*.
5. Pali Text Society's *Pali-English Dictionary*.
6. Kern's additions to Childer's Dictionary.
7. *Abhidhānappadīpikā*.
8. G. P. Malalasekera's *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*.
9. Geiger's *Pali Literature and Language*.
10. Mayrhofer's *Pali Grammar*.
11. Mayrhofer's *Etymological Sanskrit Dictionary*.
12. Monier-Williams *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*.
13. Edgerton's *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary*.
14. Turner's *Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Language*.
15. *Aṭṭhakathāsūci* (Sinhalese edition).

Apart from this, the author has to collect new material from non-canonical texts published later on. Now various collections of material are at the author's disposal. What will he do now? The author then finds his own collection of slips on the basis of material received and collected as above, checks quotations and references, compares canonical

quotations against the commentaries, establishes forms and meanings. Finally the author makes a wise selection of quotations so that a thorough description of the use of the word treated may be given. The author is competent enough to see if his selection of quotations has been "historical" (i.e. whether the word in a certain meaning is used in all the linguistic periods, or whether it is limited to a single period) and "statistical" (i.e. to reflect the comparative frequency of a word in a certain meaning in early or later strata of the language).

Now the author starts writing his article. He has to follow a fixed pattern approved by the Supervisory Committee for the CPD. First of all he has to make an entry of the word in bold-faced type. Then he has to determine the gender or genders of the word in italics. This is followed by etymology of the word in square brackets. In this group the corresponding Sanskrit form is given. Sometimes the corresponding Buddhist Sanskrit and Prakrit forms also are added. If the word is a Tatsama word the word 'ts' is to be inserted within square brackets. Then meanings are given in italics. All principal meanings are grouped with figures (bold-faced type) 1. 2. 3. etc. Sometimes sub-groups are also made within the principal groups. The author quotes the quotations within these groups and sub-groups which in the best way illustrate the word in question in its various uses. Each quotation is followed by one or more references showing the number of the page and line/number of verses/number of chapter and section/number of chapter, section and verse. Then there is a grouping called 'ifc' where the entry word occurs as last member of a compound. The author lists them alphabetically. One or two references is or are given without quotation. This is followed by a list of less important compounds which require no independent treatment. In the category of "less important compounds" are included all fairly long compounds' and combinations with °-ādi, °-vasa, °-matta, °-attha, °-tthāna, °-kāla, °-hetu, °-paccaya, and like. All other compounds are called "important compounds" and they are treated as independent articles. If an adjective or past participle is used as a substantive, it is treated as an independent article. Similarly derivatives from substantives or objectives are also treated as independent articles.

The patterns applied to substantives are applied also to verbs. But while treating with a verb the author has to do something more. He shows whether the verb is used both transitively and intransitively, and whether the verb is connected with accusative or genitive or locative, and the like. The author further lists all the verbal forms used in the literature of a particular verb treated (e. g. 3 sg., 2 pl., 1 sg., part., imper., pot., aor., fut., and the like). The past participles, causatives, gerundives

are treated as independent articles. If there is no present form of a verb, the entry word is put in brackets.

In the CPD proper names are also included, i. e. names of persons, localities, titles, and the like, each person, locality, title being treated as independent article. All indeclinable words, pronouns, numerals, original roots are treated independently.

The names of the texts quoted are given in abbreviated forms, e. g. D (for *Dīghanikāya*), M (for *Majjhimanikāya*), S. (for *Samyuttanikāya*), A (for *Āṅguttaranikāya*), Dp (for *Dhammapada*), Mp (for *Manorathapūraṇī*) Ps (for *Papañcasūdanī*, Mhv (for *Mahāvamsa*), Dhs (for *Dhammasaṅgaṇī*), Mhv-t (for *Mahāvamsa-ṭīkā*), and the like. Different editions are indicated as E° (for Roman edition); C° (for Sinhalese edition); B° (for Burmese edition) S° (for Siamese edition). K° (for Cambodian edition). This apart, there are some typographical and other rules (regarding signs, symbols, technicalities, etc.) which we would not mention here to bore the readers of this article any more.

Under the editorship of L. Alsdorf the CPD work has been running smoothly for the last few years. Professor Alsdorf is no doubt the most competent scholar for the work. But still there is no certainty when the CPD work will come to an end, and there is cent percent doubt if the work will at all come to an end in the present century. We should request the members of the Royal Danish Academy to find out means to expedite the progress of the CPD work so that it may come to an end within the span of the present century. We can suggest to find out scholars to work in their individual capacity, apart from the centre or centres, in different countries of the world and if possible, to set up more and more centres where the retired college and university teachers will work as whole-timers with the assistance of the whole-timer research assistants and collaborators. Of course this would be possible if suitable grants are available from UNESCO and other Foundations and Institutions.

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE SUTTA NIPĀTA

N. A. Jayawickrama

(We are grateful to Prof. Jayawickrama for permission to serialise his doctoral thesis which was accepted by the University of London in 1947 under its full title of "A critical analysis of the Pali Sutta Nipāta illustrating its gradual growth". It was subsequently serialised in the *Ceylon University Review*—1943-67—in its issues January 1948 to April 1951.)

Abbreviations

- A—*Āṅguttara Nikāya* (PTS, 6 vols. 1885-1910, 1956-61)
BSk—Buddhist Sanskrit
DA—*Dīgha Nikāya* (PTS, 3 vols. 1889, 1903, 1910; 1967, 1967, 1960)
H. O. S.—Harvard Oriental Series
I.H.Q.—the *Indian Historical Quarterly* (Calcutta, 1925-63)
M—*Majjhima Nikāya* (PTS, 4 vols. 1887-1925, 1960-74)
Miln—*Milindapañha* (PTS, 1880, 1963)
Pj—*Paramatthajotikā* II (= *Suttanipāta Commentary* II, PTS, 1917, 1966)
Pug—*Puggalapaññatti* (PTS, 1883, 1972)
Pv—*Petavatthu* (PTS, 1889)
S—*Samyutta Nikāya* (PTS, 6 vols. 1884-1904; 1960-73)
S.B.E.—Sacred Books of the East series
Sn—*Suttanipāta* (PTS, 1913, 1965)
SnA I—*Suttanipāta Commentary* I (PTS, 1916, 1966)
Th. 1—*Theragāthā*; Th. 2—*Therīgāthā* (PTS, 1883, 1966)

The Criteria for the Analysis of the Sutta Nipāta

1

The *Sutta Nipāta* contains older and younger material side by side. The *Aṭṭhaka* and the *Pārāyana Vaggas* preserve, on the whole, older compositions. Many suttas included in the other three *vaggas* too can be established, without doubt, to belong to an equally old, or perhaps older stratum.

It is our present task to investigate whether the compilation of the *Sutta Nipāta* (as a separate work) was done by gradual stages or was the work of a single editor. It is certain that at least its last two *vaggas* had a separate existence prior to their being incorporated in the *Sutta Nipāta*, for there are numerous references to them in Pali, Buddhist

Sanskrit and Chinese works, with no mention of the *Sutta Nipāta* at all. Parts of the rest of the *vaggas* too appear to have existed in separate groups, but the *Sutta Nipāta*, as it is preserved now, is a compilation of a comparatively later date. The lateness of the compilation has no bearing whatsoever on the date of its constituent *suttas*. Chalmers, in his translation of the *Sutta Nipāta* entitled, *Buddha's Teaching* in H.O.S. Vol., 37, p. xvi, remarks, "the ascertained stages of growth of a compiled 'book' by no means settle the relative date of composition of its contents, a question for solution of which internal evidence must be invoked, for what it is worth." The internal evidence which helps to establish the relative date of composition of the *suttas* is primarily linguistic, but this alone is not sufficient. A study of the contents of the *Sutta Nipāta* along with its metre and style, doctrinal developments, and social conditions depicted in them will greatly supplement whatever information linguistic evidence yields. Whenever external evidence is available in support of internal evidence more definite results can be achieved.

2

Linguistic evidence consists mainly of an analysis of words in their form and use, of tenses, of syntax and of vocabulary. As early as 1880 Fausböll (Translation to *Sutta Nipāta*, S. B. E. vol. X, pp. xi. ff.) has pointed out, "We not only find here what we meet with in other Pali poetry, the fuller Vedic forms of nouns and verbs in the plural. . .the shorter Vedic plural and the instrumental singular of nouns. . .Vedic infinitives, . . .contracted (or sometimes old) forms, . . .by the side of protracted forms, but also some unusual (sometimes old) forms and words. . .We also find tmesis as in the Vedas. . .Sometimes we meet with difficult and irregular constructions, and very condensed expressions." He also notes that the parts of the *Sutta Nipāta* containing these "irregularities" are much older than the *suttas* in which the language is fluent and the verses are melodious. This practically covers the whole field of linguistic evidence that can be gleaned in the *Sutta Nipāta*.

A comparison of the linguistic peculiarities of the various parts of the *Sutta Nipāta* with Vedic, the language of the *Brāhmaṇas*, Pali of the *gāthā*-literature, Canonical prose, and Classical Sanskrit helps in some degree to fix the relative dates of the *suttas*. It has been already stressed that the importance of linguistic data should not be over-estimated, for, these alone without other corroborative evidence are not of very great value. More definite conclusions can be drawn when they are supported by other internal and external evidence.

3

Other internal evidence consists of metre and style, doctrinal developments and ideology, and social conditions. As a rule, *metre* is no proper criterion of judgment in assigning relative dates to Pali poetry. The majority of the metres employed in Pali is to be met with in earlier literature both Vedic and early Sanskritic. The developments and modifications that earlier existing metres have undergone in Pali may lead to some valuable information; but such changes invariably have their parallels in earlier Sanskritic literature. This minimises the importance of any evidence from this source. The changes in metre from which somewhat definite inferences could be drawn are to be met with only in very late Pali poetry; e.g., the Ceylon Chronicles.

4

The most popular metre in the *Sutta Nipāta* is *Anuṣṭubh Śloka*. There are no less than 562 stanzas in *anuṣṭubh* metre, in addition to 54 modified *anuṣṭubh ślokas* in the *Vatthu-gāthā* of the *Pārāyana*, making a total of 616 stanzas. (Vide Helmer Smith: "Metres of *Sutta Nipāta*". Pj. II. 3, pp. 637-644). Next comes *triṣṭubh* metre, which is employed in 374, stanzas. There are also 29 stanzas in *āryā* metre, and 117 in *vaitāliya* and its allied metres, *aupacchandāsika* and *vegavatī*. Of these 117 stanzas only 15 are in pure *vaitāliya*, 41 are in *aupacchandāsika*, 16 in *vegavatī* and the other 45 in mixed *vaitāliya*.

Chalmers, (ibid, p. xvii) maintains that *anuṣṭubh* is later than *triṣṭubh* and quotes the example of the four *Aṭṭhakas* in *triṣṭubh* metre preceded by the *Kāma Sutta* in *anuṣṭubh śloka*, stating that it "manifestly forms a late preface to the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* as a re-edited whole." He notes the change of metre in *Sāriputta Sutta* and remarks that "the equally edifying *ślokas* Nos. 955-62 suggest an editorial preamble to the vigorous *triṣṭubhs* with which the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* ends." He refers to the only *Triṣṭubh* verse in *Dvayatānupassanā Sutta* (Sn. 728), and the *triṣṭubhs* that are freely distributed in the *Pārāyana* as being much older than the rest of the stanzas in those sections which he calls "scholastic accretions." He advances another hypothesis that "the longer the metrical line the later is the composition likely to have been." (ibid).

Keith (*A History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 417), too, believes that the longer metrical line is a later development in Classical Sanskrit. Thus, it may be possible, purely on theoretical grounds, that those verses

of the *Sutta Nipāta* in *āryā*, *vaitālīya*, *aupacchandasika*, *vegavatī* and mixed *vaitālīya* metres belong to a later stage of composition. Yet, there is no reason to assume that all the stanzas in the historically earlier *triṣṭubh* and *anuṣṭubh* metres are anterior to those written in later metres.

Unlike other metres *āryā* and *vaitālīya* are measured by the number of morae. (Vide Macdonell, *A Vedic Grammar for Students*, p. 436 n. 2). These metres in which the sum-total of morae was absolutely fixed probably developed from popular poetry according to Keith (*op. cit.* p. 418) and belong to the Classical epoch. Thus, Chalmers' hypothesis is generally applicable to the verses of the *Sutta Nipāta* though he is not quite correct in the application of his hypothesis to *triṣṭubh* and *anuṣṭubh* metres.

Both *triṣṭubh* and *anuṣṭubh* metres can be traced back to Vedic. About 40 per cent. of the stanzas in the *Rgveda* are written in *triṣṭubh*, whereas *anuṣṭubh* constitutes only about 8 to 9 per cent. (Vide Macdonell, *op. cit.* pp. 438 ff.). Though the former is very popular in the *Rgveda* the latter is the most predominant metre in the post-Vedic period (Macdonell, *ibid*). Thus, generally *anuṣṭubh ślokas* in the *Sutta Nipāta* may be expected to be later than the *triṣṭubh* verses. Here, the hypothesis regarding the length of the metrical line is inapplicable, as *triṣṭubh* which is considered older has a longer metrical line (4 X 11) than *anuṣṭubh* (4 X 8). Moreover, over 86 per cent. of the stanzas in the *Sutta Nipāta* are written in these two metres, and the number of stanzas written in other metres is just under 14 per cent. This being the case, Chalmers' suggestion, however true it may be, is of no great practical importance.

The historical order of these metres occurring in the *Sutta Nipāta* would be 1. *triṣṭubh* and *anuṣṭubh*, 2. *āryā*, *vaitālīya*, *aupacchandasika*, *vegavatī* and mixed *vaitālīya*. There is no guarantee whatsoever that stanzas written in older metres are necessarily earlier than those in later metres. Therefore, metre by itself is no sound criterion for fixing relative dates, and it only forms a very useful source of confirmatory evidence.

5

Style like metre, is closely allied to linguistic evidence. As the *Sutta Nipāta* is not a homogeneous work, its style varies in its different sections. Its poems range from simple popular ballads like the *Dhaniya* and *Kasibhāradvāja Suttas* to scholastic compositions like the *Dvayatānupassanā Sutta*. It also contains simple narratives like the *Pabbajjā* and *Paḍhāna Suttas* or the *Vatthu-gāthā* of the *Nālaka Sutta* and *Pārāyana Vagga* as well as dialogue-ballads of various types, besides didactic poems like the *Kiṃsīla* or *Dhammacariya Suttas* in which the editorial

hand is keenly felt.¹ A simple and easy style unhampered by poetic embellishments, excessive rhythm and metrical perfection suggests an early composition rather than a later one. The use of excessive alliteration, assonance, and *śleṣa* (word-play) and all such accompaniments of a 'heavy style' is generally a sign of lateness. The use of such poetical devices is greatly limited in the sections of the *Sutta Nipāta*, which from other evidence can be classed as very early.

The oft recurring refrain belongs to the field of popular poetry of all periods. It is also probable that the ballads in which the dialogue element predominates (e.g., *suttas* like the *Dhaniya* and *Hemavata*; and not the quasi-dialogue ballads in which an interlocutor asks a question and the Buddha is seen replying with a long uninterrupted discourse), were dramatised and became widely popular. These two facts do not lead to any clue regarding the relative dates of poems, but it could be noticed that style goes hand in hand with metre to support linguistic data, and that it is very useful as a criterion for fixing relative dates for these ballads.

The form in which these *suttas* are found (viz., entirely in verse, or mixed verse and prose, etc.) is sometimes helpful as a criterion.

6

Doctrinal developments, generally, are a good index to the time of composition of individual sections, rather than of a work as a whole. This is true of the majority of the works of the Pali Canon, as they contain material drawn from more than one stratum. No well-defined *developments* as such are to be noticed in the older ballads of the *Sutta Nipāta*, but a gradual change can be marked in the later ones. Some fundamental concepts already found in the earlier ballads and other early literature are seen undergoing a gradual crystallisation in the later ballads. New ideas are also seen finding their way. One such instance is the concept of *vāsana* (which will be discussed later on).

7

Closely connected with doctrinal developments is *the growth of ideas*. In as much as the doctrinal emphasis lay on the earliest tenets of

1. There are at least 6 *suttas* (viz. the *Hiri*-, *Dhammacariya*-, *Kiṃsīla*-, *Uṭṭhāna*-, *Subhāsita*-, and *Attadaṇḍa*) which derive their names from their opening words. The *suttas* that are named after a word or simile in the body of the text are more numerous. There are 11 *suttas* (viz. the *Ālavaka*-, *Muni*-, *Hiri*-, *Kiṃsīla*-, *Rāhula*-,—the *Vatthu-gāthā* are in irregular *anuṣṭubh*—*Subhāsita*-, *Kokāliya*-, *Vatthu-gāthā* of *Nālaka*-, *Dhotaka pucchā* *Todeyya pucchā*, and *Jatukaṇṇi pucchā*) in which the opening lines are written in a different metre from that (or those) of the rest of the poem. In five of these the opening stanza (or stanzas) is in *anuṣṭubh*. Less numerous are the poems in which the concluding stanzas are written in a metre different from that of the rest of the poem: e. g. the *Dhaniya*-, *Sabhiya*-, *Vaṅgisa*-, *Sundarikabhāradvāja* and *Pasūra Suttas*.

Buddhism—which Mrs. Rhys Davids prefers to call “*Sākya*”—in the majority of these ballads, so also could be noticed the gradual formation of definite ideas and concepts which in course of time came to play an important role in later Buddhism. Along with this appear standard technical expressions which too in course of time became fixed. Some terms are seen in the transitional stage of being crystallised in these ballads. The later ballads mark the gradual drift from primitive “*Sākya*” to monastic Buddhism which replaced it. The trend of development, if successfully traced, will enable one to place these *suttas* in some sort of chronological arrangement.

8

Social conditions depicted in the *Sutta Nipāta* reflect an age when Brahmanism held sway and caste exerted great influence. The ballads show that in spite of the effort of the Buddha to break down these barriers he was obliged to give new values to what was best in Brahmanism; (e.g., the Buddhist connotation of *brāhmaṇa*, etc.), in order to make his message universally acceptable. Society was mainly agricultural and there lived rich herdsmen like Dhaniya (a *Vaiśya*?) and brahmin farmers like Bhāradvāja. The *samaṇas* and *paribbājakas* are accepted institutions and many *paribbājakas* are represented as getting their individual problems solved by the Buddha.

The older ballads reflect a time when Buddhism had not developed into a full-fledged monastic (coenobitic) system. It is the *muni*, the *bhikkhu*, or the *samaṇa*, that these ballads are concerned with. There are only two references to *thera* in the whole of the *Sutta Nipāta*, both occurring in introductory prose at pp. 59 and 92 respectively. The latter reference is not to Buddhist *theras*, but to those who are “firmly established in their own religious beliefs.” The conditions among the *bhikkhus* were most probably far different from those prevalent during the time of the composition of the *Thera*- and *Therī-gāthās*. There appears no organised monastic body; but on the contrary there were the *munayo* (ascetics in general) or the *bhikkhus* who were expected to lead the life of a *muni*.

The social conditions reflected in the *Sutta Nipāta* regarding peoples and castes, countries and towns, brahmins and sacrifice are no different from those reflected in the prose *Nikāyas*. It is probable that the majority of the Pali works generally depict conditions prevalent at the time of their composition, but the difference of a century or two hardly makes any fundamental difference in the structure of society and mode of life in those far-off days.

Incidental references to contemporary history would enable one to draw some conclusions regarding the time of composition. Often such references are not made directly. They occur as anachronisms. One such instance is to be noticed in *mandira*—a political division; which probably came into being after the formation of a large empire. Thus, any evidence gathered from this source too will be seen to supplement what has already come to light from other sources.

9

External evidence is of utmost importance. Several Canonical works make reference to, and quote from certain *suttas* and sections in the *Sutta Nipāta*. This necessarily proves that the sections of these works which refer to and quote from the *Sutta Nipāta* are decidedly later than those respective *suttas* of the *Sutta Nipāta*. The references made to the *Aṭṭhaka* and the *Pārāyana Vaggas* will be discussed later. Equally numerous are the references made to these sections in the later BSk. and Chinese Buddhist literature. The *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* occurs in full in Chinese (i.e., No. 198 *Thai Shu Tripiṭaka*). Besides these references in literature there is important inscriptional evidence in Asoka’s Bhābra edict. All these external data are connected with individual *suttas* and there is no specific mention of the *Sutta Nipāta* in any early work. It is mentioned for the first time in the *Milinda Pañha*.

10

Another criterion is the *indirect evidence* from the position of the *suttas* as they occur in the *vaggas*. Some *suttas* are placed at the head of the *vagga* for their outstanding merit (e.g., the opening *suttas* of the *Uraga Vagga*) while other opening *suttas* bear definite signs of lateness (e.g., *Ratana*). Of equal importance are the *suttas* occurring at the end of the *vagga*. The *Muni Sutta*, in spite of its being an old piece is placed at the end of the *Uraga Vagga* after a relatively younger piece *Vijaya Sutta*. On the other hand, the late *Dvayatānupassanā Sutta* concludes the *Mahā Vagga*.

In the light of all these conflicting data it is not possible to formulate a working principle to be guided by. However, it will be seen that some of these *suttas* are younger in time and in general tone. When older *suttas* in similar positions are also taken into account these younger pieces point to a redaction of the *suttas* subsequent to an earlier collation rather than to their being interpolations.

A striking similarity is to be seen in the Vinaya. The popular tradition has been embodied in the opening chapters of the *Mahā Vagga*, while

nikāya it is comparatively late, and is much later than the other four *Nikāyas* (*vide* Winternitz, *op. cit.* Vol. II, pp. 77 ff.). The Sarvāstivādins speak of only the four earlier *Nikāyas* (which they call *Āgamas*), and the Theravādins themselves had reached no general agreement regarding the number of works in the *Khuddaka Nikāya*. Even at the present day in countries where Pali Buddhism prevails the number of books which should constitute this *nikāya* is not agreed upon.

14

The *Jātakas* which form the tenth book of the *Khuddaka Nikāya* in the Theravāda Canon are also considered as a separate *aṅga* (lit. limb, i.e. division) in the descriptive classification known as the *navāṅga-satthusāsana* (the Ninefold Dispensation of the Teacher) which occurs in many places in the Canon itself e.g. *M.* I, 130; *A.* II, 103, 178, III, 86 ff.; 177 ff., *Pug.* 43, *Miln.* 344 etc. Although this classification is necessarily old (*vide* E. J. Thomas: *Life of Buddha* p. 167, where he considers the division into *aṅgas* as earlier than that into *nikāyas*) it does not speak of any definite works, for, a *jātaka* may be included in a *sutta*, an *udāna* in a *veyyākaraṇa* etc. Like the *Udāna* and the *Itivuttaka*, the name *Jātaka* coincides with that of an actual work in existence. But there is nothing to say that by this *aṅga* was meant the present *Jātaka*. As Dr. E. J. Thomas (*History of Buddhist Thought*, p. 227) says “the probability is that the terms were used...to describe the character of the composition” rather than signify actual works. He points out that there are numerous instances of *udānas* and *jātakas* in various parts of the Canon which are not included in the works known by these respective names; (*ibid*) e.g., the *Mahāsudassana Sutta* in the *Dīgha Nikāya*, *jātakas* in *Cariyā Piṭaka*, *Sivi Jātaka* called *Sivi Sutta* in *Miln.*, etc. So is also the case with the *Itivuttaka*.

Taking up the division of the Pali *Navāṅga*, its first *aṅga*, *Sutta*, is said to include the Vinaya, certain *suttas* in *gāthā*, and other sayings of the Buddha classed as *sutta*. It is noteworthy that Commentaries considered these sections of the *Sutta Nipāta* which did not fall into the category of *sutta*, as *gāthā*, the fourth *aṅga* (*vide* *DA.* I, 23); but *gāthā* primarily consisted of verses in *Dh. Th.* 1 and *Th.* 2 (*vide* Thomas, *op. cit.*). The Commentary says that the *Sutta Nipāta* consists of *gāthā* (verse), *geyya* (mixed prose and verse) and *veyyākaraṇa* (expositions) which, on account of their informative, instructive and expository nature are called *suttas*, and that the work is called the *Sutta Nipāta* because it contains such *suttas* grouped together (*SnA.* I—*Pj.* II introduction). From these statements it is clear that at least some *suttas*, if not the

majority of them in the *Sutta Nipāta*, can be said to belong to the *Sutta Aṅga* (*vide* Thomas, *op. cit.*).

Of the known instances of *nipātas* in the Pali Canon, the *Aṅguttara* as a work has nothing corresponding to it in the *Navāṅga* division, the *Jātaka* may have been considered to correspond to the seventh *aṅga*, *Jātaka*, and it is probable that the *Sutta Nipāta* was only a *nipāta* of a similar *aṅga*. This only implies that the *Sutta Nipāta* consists of some *suttas* representative of the type *Sutta* and therefore is a *nipāta* of *suttas*.

15

This collection should consist entirely of pieces which could be designated as *Sutta* if the title *Sutta Nipāta* were to be justified. The Commentary (*SnA.*) states that the three types *gāthā*, *geyya* and *veyyākaraṇa* can be again called *sutta* and therefore the *gāthā* in the *Sutta Nipāta* are *suttas* as well. It is not possible to draw a line of demarcation between *gāthā* and *sutta*. Of the 72 pieces found in the *Sutta Nipāta* as many as 54 i.e. those forming *vaggas* I-IV, are called *sutta* by name, irrespective of whether they would strictly be categorised as *sutta* or *gāthā*, if such a division were possible. (The other 18 pieces form the *Pārāyana* consisting of the prologue—*vatthu-gāthā*, the 16 *pucchās* and the epilogue respectively). This fact probably furnishes a clue to this problem. During the time of the arrangement of this collection the distinction between *gāthā* and *sutta* may not have been strictly observed, and things may have existed in a rather fluid state.

In the first 54 pieces a growing tendency towards standardisation can be seen. Every piece, whether ballad or discourse, is termed a *sutta*. The stanzas of the so-called *suttas* are often referred to as *gāthā*; e.g. *Sn.* 429 ed,

Imā gāthā bhanaṃ māro aṭṭhā Buddhassa santike
(Uttering these stanzas Māra stood near the Buddha); *Sn.* 251c,

citrāhi gāthāhi muni-ppakāsaya
(the sage declared in colourful verse) in the narrative section of the *Āmagandha Sutta*; *Sn.* pp. 13, 32, 46 and 48 in the narrative prose of the *Kasibhāradvāja*, *Ālavaka*, *Mahāmaṅgala* and *Sūciloma Suttas* respectively,

Atha kho...Bhagavaṃ gāthāya ajjhabhāsi. (Then indeed, N. N. addressed the Bhagavā in a stanza); *Sn.* p, 78,

Sāruppāhi gāthāhi abhitthavi (extolled him with appropriate stanzas) in the prose of the *Subbhāsita Sutta*. It also occurs at *Sn.* 81=480 in the phrase, *gāthābhigīlaṃ* (what is obtained by reciting stanzas) and *Sn.* 1131 a, *pārāyanaṃ anugāyissaṃ* (I shall sing the *Pārāyana*).

nikāya it is comparatively late, and is much later than the other four *Nikāyas* (vide Winternitz, *op. cit.* Vol. II, pp. 77 ff.). The Sarvāstivādins speak of only the four earlier *Nikāyas* (which they call *Āgamas*), and the Theravādins themselves had reached no general agreement regarding the number of works in the *Khuddaka Nikāya*. Even at the present day in countries where Pali Buddhism prevails the number of books which should constitute this *nikāya* is not agreed upon.

14

The *Jātakas* which form the tenth book of the *Khuddaka Nikāya* in the Theravāda Canon are also considered as a separate *aṅga* (lit. limb, i.e. division) in the descriptive classification known as the *navāṅga-satthūsāsana* (the Ninefold Dispensation of the Teacher) which occurs in many places in the Canon itself e.g. *M.* I, 130; *A.* II, 103, 178, III, 186 ff.; 177 ff., *Pug.* 43, *Miln.* 344 etc. Although this classification is necessarily old (vide E. J. Thomas: *Life of Buddha* p. 167, where he considers the division into *aṅgas* as earlier than that into *nikāyas*) it does not speak of any definite works, for, a *jātaka* may be included in a *sutta*, an *udāna* in a *veyyākaraṇa* etc. Like the *Udāna* and the *Itivuttaka*, the name *Jātaka* coincides with that of an actual work in existence. But there is nothing to say that by this *aṅga* was meant the present *Jātaka*. As Dr. E. J. Thomas (*History of Buddhist Thought*, p. 227) says “the probability is that the terms were used . . . to describe the character of the composition” rather than signify actual works. He points out that there are numerous instances of *udānas* and *jātakas* in various parts of the Canon which are not included in the works known by these respective names; (*ibid*) e.g., the *Mahāsudassana Sutta* in the *Dīgha Nikāya*, *jātakas* in *Cariyā Piṭaka*, *Sivi Jātaka* called *Sivi Sutta* in *Miln.*, etc. So is also the case with the *Itivuttaka*.

Taking up the division of the Pali *Navāṅga*, its first *aṅga*, *Sutta*, is said to include the Vinaya, certain *suttas* in *gāthā*, and other sayings of the Buddha classed as *sutta*. It is noteworthy that Commentaries considered these sections of the *Sutta Nipāta* which did not fall into the category of *sutta*, as *gāthā*, the fourth *aṅga* (vide *DA.* I, 23); but *gāthā* primarily consisted of verses in *Dh. Th.* 1 and *Th.* 2 (vide Thomas, *op. cit.*). The Commentary says that the *Sutta Nipāta* consists of *gāthā* (verse), *geyya* (mixed prose and verse) and *veyyākaraṇa* (expositions) which, on account of their informative, instructive and expository nature are called *suttas*, and that the work is called the *Sutta Nipāta* because it contains such *suttas* grouped together (*SnA.* 1—Pj. II introduction). From these statements it is clear that at least some *suttas*, if not the

majority of them in the *Sutta Nipāta*, can be said to belong to the *Sutta Aṅga* (vide Thomas, *op. cit.*).

Of the known instances of *nipātas* in the Pali Canon, the *Aṅguttara* as a work has nothing corresponding to it in the *Navāṅga* division, the *Jātaka* may have been considered to correspond to the seventh *aṅga*, *Jātaka*, and it is probable that the *Sutta Nipāta* was only a *nipāta* of a similar *aṅga*. This only implies that the *Sutta Nipāta* consists of some *suttas* representative of the type *Sutta* and therefore is a *nipāta* of *suttas*.

15

This collection should consist entirely of pieces which could be designated as *Sutta* if the title *Sutta Nipāta* were to be justified. The Commentary (*SnA.*) states that the three types *gāthā*, *geyya* and *veyyākaraṇa* can be again called *sutta* and therefore the *gāthā* in the *Sutta Nipāta* are *suttas* as well. It is not possible to draw a line of demarcation between *gāthā* and *sutta*. Of the 72 pieces found in the *Sutta Nipāta* as many as 54 i.e. those forming *vaggas* I-IV, are called *sutta* by name, irrespective of whether they would strictly be categorised as *sutta* or *gāthā*, if such a division were possible. (The other 18 pieces form the *Pārāyana* consisting of the prologue—*vatthu-gāthā*, the 16 *pucchās* and the epilogue respectively). This fact probably furnishes a clue to this problem. During the time of the arrangement of this collection the distinction between *gāthā* and *sutta* may not have been strictly observed, and things may have existed in a rather fluid state.

In the first 54 pieces a growing tendency towards standardisation can be seen. Every piece, whether ballad or discourse, is termed a *sutta*. The stanzas of the so-called *suttas* are often referred to as *gāthā*; e.g. *Sn.* 429 ed,

Imā gāthā bhaṇaṃ māro aṭṭhā Buddhassa santike
(Uttering these stanzas Māra stood near the Buddha); *Sn.* 251c,
citrāhi gāthāhi muni-ppakāsaya
(the sage declared in colourful verse) in the narrative section of the *Āmagandha Sutta*; *Sn.* pp. 13, 32, 46 and 48 in the narrative prose of the *Kasibhāradvāja*, *Ālavaka*, *Mahāmaṅgala* and *Sūciloma Suttas* respectively,

Atha kho. . . Bhagavantaṃ gāthāya ajjhabhāsi. (Then indeed, N. N. addressed the Bhagavā in a stanza); *Sn.* p, 78,

Sārubbhāhi gāthāhi abhithavi (extolled him with appropriate stanzas) in the prose of the *Subbhāsita Sutta*. It also occurs at *Sn.* 81=480 in the phrase, *gāthābhigīlaṃ* (what is obtained by reciting stanzas) and *Sn.* 1131 a, *pārāyanaṃ anugāyissaṃ* (I shall sing the *Pārāyana*).

Besides these there are three instances of introductory verses called *Vatthugāthā* viz. 1. A short introduction to the *Rāhula Sutta* (*Sn.* 335-336), 2. the introduction to the *Nālaka Sutta* (*Sn.* 679-698) and 3. the prologue to the *Pārāyana* (*Sn.* 976-1031).

Again in the Bhābru (or Bairat) Minor Rock Edict of Aśoka (*vide* Hultsch: *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, Vol. 1, p. 172) the fourth *dhammapaliyāya* (section of the Scriptures) which is identified with the *Muni Sutta* of the *Sutta Nipāta* (*vide* Dharmānanda Kosambi: *Indian Antiquary* 1912 pp. 37 ff.) is called *Muni-gāthā* (Stanzas on a Sage). The sixth which is identified with the *Sāriputta Sutta* of the *Sutta Nipāta* (*ibid.*) is called *Upatisapasine* (the question of Upatissa). Here too is noticeable the tendency towards standardisation, for, what were known to Aśoka as *gāthā* and *pasine* are called *suttas* in the *Sutta Nipāta*. Thus, it can be seen that an attempt has been made to designate as *suttas*, as many pieces of the *Sutta Nipāta* as possible. Hence the compiler has found no difficulty in classifying this work as a *nipāta* in a larger group of *suttas*. It is very unlikely that he had the *Sutta Piṭaka* in mind, and it is quite probable that the *Sutta Nipāta* was meant to be a *nipāta* among *suttas* in general, if not in the *aṅga* of *Sutta*, although finally it came to be considered as a *nipāta* of the *Khuddaka Nikāya*.

16

The Form of the Sutta Nipāta

The *suttas* of the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* and the *Pucchās* of the *Pārāyana Vagga* are entirely in verse, whereas *suttas* of the other three *vaggas* are of two different types, one in pure verse, the other partly in verse and partly in prose. The 20 *suttas* in *vaggas* 1-111 which are entirely in *gāthā* form and called "Verse Ballads" (*vide*, S. M. Katre: *Early Buddhist Ballads and their Relation to Older Upanishadic Literature*) are distributed in the following manner: 7 in *Uruga Vagga*, 9 in *Culla Vagga* and 4 in *Mahā Vagga*. The "Mixed Ballads" (in prose and verse) occur as 5, 5 and 8 in the three respective *vaggas*. The absence of Mixed Ballads in the *Aṭṭhaka* and *Pārāyana Vaggas* and the ascending order in which they occur in the other three *vaggas* may furnish valuable data in discussing the relative chronology of these *suttas*.

The prose in these *suttas* is not an essential factor in the dialogue or discourse as the case may be. It is employed as an aid to the narrative or to describe the *nidāna* (the context). The only prose in seven¹ of these eighteen Mixed Ballads is the passage describing the circumstances

1. *Parābhava*, *Ālavaka*, *Mahāmaṅgala*, *Sūciloma*, *Vaṅṅisa*, *Dhammika* and *Kokāliya*.

leading up to the dialogue or discourse in verse. Six *suttas*² contain an additional prose passage, following the verse, which is very similar to one another in five instances describing the confession of faith by the Buddha's interlocutors. The other five *suttas*³ contain three or more prose passages many of them interspersed with the verses.

17

A close examination of the prose passages shows that they did not, as a rule, form an essential part of the ballad to begin with. In four of the last category of *suttas* i.e. except the *Dvayatānupassanā*, it serves merely as a connecting thread running through the whole ballad linking up the various parts. Generally, when what is stated in the stanzas is not sufficient for the listener to grasp what has transpired between the end of one part and the beginning of the next part of the ballad, prose is introduced giving the necessary details; e.g. *Sn.* p. 14,

Atha Kho Kasibhāradvājo brāhmaṇo mahatiyā kamsapātiyā pāyāsam vaḍḍhetvā Bhagavato upanāmesi (Then the brahmin K. served out milk-rice in a large bronze bowl and offered it to the Bhagavā). Also see *Sn.* p. 110. Sometimes with the change of speaker prose is introduced; e.g. *Sn.* p. 79, in the *Subhāsita Sutta*; and often for both the above reasons; e.g. *Sn.* p. 111 *Sela* and pp. 94-100 *Sabhiya Suttas*.

The language of the prose is quite similar to that of the prose *Nikāyas* in idiom, syntax and style. The stereotyped expression in the prose of the *Sutta Nipāta* does not permit one to infer that it preserves the exact words of the narrators or reciters of these ballads. Generally, ballad-reciters state *in their own words*, such facts as are necessary for the listeners to follow the narrative in the ballads. Here the prose states the same facts though clothed in the standard Canonical garb; and probably this standardisation has taken place long after the composition of the ballads themselves.

Narrative prose should be compared with verse employed for narration, found in abundance in the *Sutta Nipāta*. The Commentator himself attributes several stanzas to the *saṅgītikārā* (reciters at a *Samigīti* or "Council", i.e., compilers); e.g. *Sn.* 30, 251-252, 355d, 401d, 429cd, 449 and the epilogue of the *Pārāyana* at (*SnA.* 42, 292, 351, 377, 387, 394 and 603 respectively). In addition to these he attributes to the *saṅgītikārā*, such repertory phrases as, *iti Bhagavā* (*Sn.* 355 etc.), *iti brāhmaṇo* (*Sn.* 459 etc.) and prose elements in the *Sabhiya*, *Sundarika-bhāradvāja*, *Māgha*, *Sela* and *Dvayatānupassanā Suttas* (at *SnA.* 351,

2. *Vasala*, *Brāhmaṇadhammika*, *Sundarikabhāradvāja*, *Māgha* and *Vāseṭṭha*.
3. *Kasibhāradvāja*, *Subhāsita*, *Sabhiya*, *Sela* and *Dvayatānupassanā*.

405, 394, and 398, 400, 414, 456 and 504 respectively). The *vatthu-gāthā* of the *Nālaka Sutta* and *Pārāyana Vagga* also belonged to the *saṅgītikārā* according to the Commentary (*SnA.* 483 and 580 respectively).

On a broad basis, the language, metre and style of the passages which are attributed to the *saṅgītikārā* are no different from those of the other parts of the ballads to which they belong, for, their language, like that of the rest of the *gāthās* in the *Sutta Nipāta* preserves an earlier phase of Pali than the standard Canonical expression of the prose of the *Sutta Nipāta*. (Also *vide* Geiger, *Pali Literatur und Sprache*, p. 1.). It is quite probable that in most cases this "narrative element" in verse goes back to the time of the composition of the ballads themselves.

On the other hand, the narrative prose in its present form cannot, in any way, date back earlier than the period when the Canonical prose idiom was gradually being fixed and acquired an accepted standard form. It is not improbable that this prose dates back only to the time of the arrangement of the *Sutta Nipāta* as a separate work. Prior to that time no fixed prose narrative may have been attached to these ballads, and the reciters used their own words when necessary. Thus, the prose in the *Sutta Nipāta* can be considered as being much younger than the *gāthās*.

18

The poetical pieces in the *Sutta Nipāta* are of three main types:—1. Simple didactic verse, 2. Dialogue in verse and 3. (Didactic) discourse or dialogue following a prose introduction. Type 2 can be further subdivided into (a) pure dialogue in verse, (b) dialogue consisting of a discourse in answer to a question.

There are 21 *suttas* belonging to type I, *viz.* I, 1, 3, 8, 11, 12; II, 1, 3, 6, 8, 10; III, 8; IV, 1-6, 8, 12, 13 and 15. Some of these *suttas* like I, 1 (*Uraga*) and I, 3 (*Khaggavisāṇa*) etc. are simple ballads with a regular refrain running through them. Others like I, 8 (*Metta*), II, 1 (*Ratana*) and II, 3 (*Hiri*) etc. dilate on certain topics of religious or doctrinal importance; still others such as some of the *suttas* from the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* (included in the above list) show the attitude of a true follower of the Buddha to certain then-current issues. The last two sub-types are more in the nature of discourses rather than simple ballads.

There are 30 pieces belonging to type 2; 20 of which *viz.* I, 2, 5, 9; IV, 9 and V, 2-17 (the sixteen *pucchās*) can be said to belong to type 2(a) i.e. dialogues in verse. Class 2 (b) consists of the 10 *suttas*, II, 2, 9, 11, 13; III, 11; IV, 7, 10, 11, 14 and 16 in which a discourse in verse is given in reply to a question asked by an interlocutor.

Type 3 consisting of the so-called "Mixed Ballads" includes 16 *suttas*; *viz.* I, 6, 7, 10; II, 4, 5, 7, 12, 14; III, 3-7, 9, 10 and 12. Some of the *suttas* like I, 7 (*Vasala*), II, 4 (*Mahāmaṅgala*), III, 3 (*Sundarikabhāradvāja*), III, 5 (*Māgha*) etc. are discourses in the form of ballads; while others like I, 6 (*Parābhava*) I, 10 (*Āḷavaka*) and II, 12 (*Dhammika*) are dialogues on matters of doctrinal importance.

The other 5 pieces which are not included in the above classification are I, 4 (*Kasibhāradvāja S.*), a prose and verse mixed narrative with dialogue, V, 18 (the epilogue to the *Pārāyana*) a prose and verse mixed narrative, and III, 1 (*Pabbajjā S.*) III, 2 (*Padhāna S.*) and V, 1 (the *Vatthu-gāthā* of the *Pārāyana*, simple narratives in verse.)

19

The ballads of the *Sutta Nipāta* are popular in character, though they describe incidents connected with the Buddha and his teaching. There is a great deal of popular lore incorporated in the *gāthās* e.g. *Sn.* 137-141, 667-678, etc. There are also many popular teachings in some of the *suttas*, e.g., 1, 6, 7, 8 and the late *Ratana Sutta* (II, 1); but all of them are at the same time characteristically Buddhist. The ballads also contain many passages and ideas common to the earlier *Upaniṣads* and the Epics; (*vide* Katre, *op. cit.*).

Besides these similarities that the *Sutta Nipāta* bears to the earlier *Upaniṣads* and epic literature, it has much in common with the earlier Sanskrit literature even in form. The narrative-ballads, *viz.* *Pabbajjā*, *Padhāna* and *Nālaka (vatthu-gāthā only) Suttas* have their counterpart in the *ākhyāna* (ballad) literature in Sanskrit. Their common characteristic is the alternation of dialogue stanzas with narrative stanzas. Discussing these *suttas* Winternitz (*op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 96) remarks that they are "precious remnants of that ancient sacred ballad-poetry from which the later epic version of the life of Buddha grew, in the same way as the heroic epic grew out of the secular ballads or *ākhyānas*."

In the same way, the riddle poetry found in the *Sutta Nipāta*, such as the *Āḷavaka* and *Hemavata Suttas* in which a *yakkha* asks a question has parallels in the *Mahābhārata* (*vide* Winternitz, *ibid.* Vo. I, p. 352 and P.V. Bapat, The nāgarī edition of the *Sutta Nipāta*, p. XVII). The poetical riddles or *brahmodya* of the *Rgveda*, e.g. I, 164, VIII, 29 are not very different from the riddle-poetry of the *Sutta Nipāta* (*cp.* *Kasibhāradvāja S.*). The mixed prose and verse narrative dialogues of the *Brāhmanas* are an exact parallel to the "Mixed-Ballads" of the *Sutta Nipāta*. From these it is evident that the early Buddhists not only used the same traditional floating literary material, but also made use of the same literary modes common to the earlier Sanskrit literature.

The dramatic element which is not rare in the *Sutta Nipāta* has its parallels in the earlier literature. It is clearly noticeable at I. 2. (*Dhaniya S.*), I. 9 (*Hemavata S.*), III. 2 (*Padhāna S.*) and IV. 9 (*Māgandīya S.*). It may be said that the majority of the dialogue ballads can be dramatised; but in the absence of any positive evidence it cannot be established with certainty that any of them were dramatised in early times. There is only a certain degree of probability.⁴

There is no doubt that these ballads were sung. The internal evidence of the *Sutta Nipāta* itself testifies to it; e.g. Sn. 81=480 *gāthābhigītam* (what is obtained by singing stanzas), Sn. 682a, *Seḷenti gāvanti ca vādiyanti* (they cry exultantly, sing and play instrumental music). As suggested by Katre (*op. cit.*) it is probable that these stanzas were sung to the accompaniment of music (cp. Sn. 682a); but the only evidence he puts forward is the occurrence of the word *viṇā* (lute) at Sn. 449b, *viṇā kacchā abhassatha* (the lute dropped from under his arm lit. arm-pit). Judging from the fact that a *viṇā* (which is usually associated with his three daughters) was incongruous with the early Māra-legend and that the parallel line in *Mahāvastu* reads, *vināsaṃ gacchi ucchriti* (His pride was all shattered—*Māvastu*. II. 240) much significance cannot be attached to this line. However, the very form of the *gāthās* suggests that they were sung, and it is probable that the regular dialogue ballads were sung on suitable occasions (*samajjas?*) by two or more reciters, each singing the respective words spoken by the characters in the ballad.

In the *Dhaniya Sutta* for instance, two reciters would sing the alternate stanzas representing the dialogue between the herdsman Dhaniya and the Buddha, a third would introduce Sn. 30, the words of the narrator, while Māra appears singing Sn. 33. Here is a regular dramatic piece. Such ballads can be compared with the *ākhyāna*-hymns of the *Rgveda* (e.g. the hymn about Saramā and the Panīs, *Rv.* X. 108, or the dialogue between Yama and Yāmī, *Rv.* X. 10), which are regarded by some as the earliest forms of dramatic literature in India and by others as ballads (*vide* Ghate's *Lectures on Rgveda*, p. 121 n. 1). In fact, the *ākhyāna*-hymns of the *Rgveda*, on account of their dual characteristic of being ballads and dramatic pieces at the same time, can be said to bear a very close resemblance to the dialogue ballads of the *Sutta Nipāta*.

(Continued)

4. There are numerous references in the *Nikāyas* to dramatic performances, e.g., *naṭa*, *nacca*, *visūkadassana*, *pekkhā*, *samajja* and *sobhanika*: vide O. II. de A Wijesekera, "Buddhist Evidence for the Early Existence of Drama." I.H.Q. XVII, where he has analysed the data giving many references. It is probable that Buddhist ballads were dramatically recited at *Samajjas* and similar occasions.

AGGREGATES AND CLINGING AGGREGATES

(Khandha/Upadanakkhandha)

Bhikkhu Bodhi

I

The Buddha's Teaching is concerned with a single problem, the problem of *dukkha* or suffering, and the task it imposes is likewise of a single nature—the task, namely, of bringing *dukkha* to an end.

In the standard formulation of the Four Noble Truths, the Buddha defines the truth of *dukkha*, the first Noble Truth, thus:

"What, monks, is the Noble Truth of *Dukkha*? Birth is *dukkha*, decay is *dukkha*, death is *dukkha*; sorrow, lamentation, pain, displeasure and despair are *dukkha*; union with the unpleasant is *dukkha*, separation from the pleasant is *dukkha*, not to get what one wants is *dukkha*; in brief, the five aggregates of clinging are *dukkha*. This, monks, is the Noble Truth of *Dukkha*."¹

The five aggregates of clinging (*pañcupādānakkhandhā*) present a complete epitome of *dukkha*, both extensively by way of range and intensively by way of essence. Since this is so, we sometimes find that the formula for the first truth deletes the specific instances of *dukkha* and defines its subject matter directly as the aggregates:

"What, monks, is the Noble Truth of *Dukkha*? The answer is: the five aggregates of clinging; that is, the clinging aggregate of material form, the clinging aggregate of feeling, the clinging aggregate of perception, the clinging aggregate of volitional determinations, and the clinging aggregate of consciousness. This, monks, is the Noble Truth of *Dukkha*."²

The five clinging aggregates, in their assemblage, constitute *sakkāya*, the "existing body" or empirical personality. Therefore, on the grounds that things, i.e. personality and *dukkha*, equal to the same thing, i.e. the five clinging aggregates, are equal to each other, the structural formula of the four truths is occasionally stated in terms of *sakkāya* rather than *dukkha*.³ Again, since all the five aggregates arise in connection with

1. D. 22.

2. S. V. 12. 2. 3. *Katamañ ca bhikkhave dukkhaṃ ariyasaccam? 'Pañcupādānakkhandhā' ti'ssa vacanīyaṃ seyyathidaṃ: rūpupādānakkhandho vedanupādānakkhandho saññupādānakkhandho sañkhārūpādānakkhandho viññānupādānakkhandho. Idam vuccati bhikkhave dukkhaṃ ariyasaccam.*

3. M. 44.

each of the six internal sense bases—the visual, auditory, olfactory, gustatory, tactile, and conceptual bases—the Noble Truth of Suffering may be explained as the six internal bases (*cha ajjhattikāni āyatanāni*).⁴

In order to reach a proper understanding of the Buddha's Teaching, it is necessary to discover exactly what is meant by the five aggregates of clinging. For these are, as we see, *dukkha*, and it is just *dukkha* and the cessation of *dukkha* that the Buddha teaches. But our concern here is not to spell out in detail the content of each aggregate. That can readily be gleaned from the *suttas*, especially the *Khandhasamyutta* of the *Samyuttanikāya*. Our concern, rather, is to determine what precisely is intended by calling the aggregates “the five clinging aggregates,” and to see what implications this has for our understanding of *dukkha*. While such an investigation may appear initially as a trifling enterprise, just one more instance of scholastic hair-splitting raising an unnecessary cloud of dust, further thought will show that, to the contrary, an exact determination of the meaning of the term *pañcupādānakkhandhā* is of prime importance in arriving at a correct grasp of the Dhamma. For it is these aggregates, as the categories of *dukkha*, that provide the Dhamma with its irreplaceable point of departure, and their remainderless fading away and cessation that stands as its final consummation.

The take-off point for any inquiry into the significance of the term “clinging aggregates” will naturally be the import of the qualifying attribute “clinging” (*upādāna*). The word *upādāna*, an intensification of the noun *ādāna*, “taking,” indicates a mental attitude of firm grasping or holding (*daḥgahaṇa*). When used as a prefix to form the compound term *upādānakkhandha*, it might first be taken to imply that each aggregate is a form of clinging, and hence that the five clinging aggregates are the aggregates which are modalities or activities of clinging. But an analytical breakdown of *upādāna* shows that not all the aggregates are forms of clinging, but only two components of the *sankhārakkhandha*, the aggregate of volitional determinations or mental formations. According to the *suttas* there are four types of clinging: clinging to sense-pleasures (*kāmapādāna*), clinging to wrong views (*diṭṭhupādāna*), clinging to rules and observances (*silabbatupādāna*), and clinging to a belief in self (*attavādupādāna*).⁵ The first is a mode of the mental factor of greed (*lobha*), the latter three of the mental factor of wrong views (*diṭṭhi*).⁶ Both these mental factors belong exclusively to the *sankhārakkhandha*. Hence to regard the aggregates as five forms of clinging cannot be correct.

4. S. V. 12. 2. 4.

5. M. 9.

6. *Dhammasaṅgaṇī* (DhS). §§ 1219-1223. (*Chatṭhasaṅgīti ed.*)

As a second alternative, one might take the compound term “clinging aggregates” to mean “aggregates which are the abode of clinging.” In such a case one would then go on to identify the clinging aggregates with the aggregates of the non-arāhat, in whom clinging in some form and to some degree is always present, at least dormant, while the aggregates of the arāhat would become bare aggregates but not clinging aggregates, since the arāhat has extinguished all clinging. Such a move would imply that the range of *dukkha* is to be circumscribed by the experience of the non-arāhat, and the experience of the arāhat to be left fully exempt from the category of *dukkha*. This interpretation has, at first glance, a presumptive plausibility, especially if *dukkha* is understood in the sense of experiential suffering; for the arāhat, the *suttas* leave no doubt, has gone beyond the possibility of any experience of suffering except bare bodily pain, and even that arouses in him not antipathy. Nevertheless, this interpretation too is not correct. But before going on to examine the issue at a deeper level, let us first fix our definitions of terms.

The only *sutta* to our knowledge where two sets of aggregates are explicitly defined, (not contrasted, it should be observed), is the *Khandha Sutta*. The definitions of the two sets, in a condensed translation, are as follows:

(1) **The five aggregates (*pañcakkhandhā*):** “What, monks, are the five aggregates? Whatever material form, feeling, perception, volitional determinations, consciousness there may be—past, present, or future, internal or external, coarse or subtle, inferior or superior, far or near—these are the aggregates of material form, feeling, perception, volitional determinations, and consciousness. These, monks, are the five aggregates.”

(2) **The five clinging aggregates (*pañcupādānakkhandhā*):** “And what, monks, are the five clinging-aggregates? Whatever material form, feeling, perception, volitional determinations, consciousness there may be—past, present, or future, internal or external, coarse or subtle, inferior or superior, far or near, that are subject to the cankers, subject to clinging (*sāsavaṃ upādāniyaṃ*)—these are the clinging aggregates of material form, feeling, perception, volitional determinations, and consciousness. These, monks, are the five clinging aggregates.”⁷

7. S. III. 1. 5. 6. *Katame ca bhikkhave pañcakkhandhā? Yaṃ kiñci bhikkhave rūpaṃ (... viññānaṃ) atītānāgata-paccuppannaṃ ajjhattaṃ vā bahiddhā vā olārikaṃ vā sukhumaṃ vā hīnaṃ vā paṇītaṃ vā yaṃ dūre santike vā, ayaṃ vuccati rūpakkhandho (... viññānakkhandho). Ime vuccanti bhikkhave pañcakkhandhā. Katame ca bhikkhave pañcupādānakkhandhā? Yaṃ kiñci bhikkhave rūpaṃ (... viññānaṃ) atītānāgata-paccuppannaṃ ... yaṃ dūre santike vā sāsavaṃ upādāniyaṃ, ayaṃ vuccati rūpupādānakkhandho (... viññānupādānakkhandho). Ime vuccanti bhikkhave pañcupādānakkhandhā.*

Now because the five clinging aggregates are each individually instances of material form, feeling, perception, volitional determinations, and consciousness, they are each individually included *in toto* among the five aggregates, in their respective categories; that is, any material form comprised in the clinging aggregate of material form will necessarily also belong to the aggregate of material form, and so with the rest. But the fact that a differentiation is drawn between the two sets with the phrase *sāsava upādāniya* implies that a genuine difference in range does exist: that there are, in other words, aggregates of each sort which are *anāsava anupādāniya*. These we may call “the bare five aggregates,” though we will see shortly that this phrase must be qualified in one respect. The question is then: what are these bare five aggregates? One might be tempted, in line with the interpretation sketched above, to equate the bare five aggregates with the arahat’s aggregates in all his experience. But this is an equation which does not find support in a single *sutta*, and, moreover, even appears to be negated by at least one *sutta* passage, repeated in two consecutive *suttas* by the venerable Sāriputta:

“Even the arahat, friend Koṭṭhita, should wisely consider the five clinging aggregates as impermanent, suffering, a disease, a boil, a dart, a flaw, an affliction, as alien, disintegrating, empty, and not-self. For the arahat who has completed his task there is no higher achievement. But these practices, cultivated and developed, conduce to his pleasant abiding in the present state and to mindfulness and clear comprehension.”⁸

Thus the arahat, this text implies, is also composed of the five clinging aggregates. In what sense this is true we will soon see. Here we should note that the “pleasant abiding” referred to is not mundane *jhāna*, for that does not require prior insight work on the aggregates; nor is it the attainment of cessation (*nirodha-samāpatti*), for that cannot be achieved by every arahat whereas the text gives a general prescription. It is, rather, the special attainment, accessible only to the arahat, called the *arahattaphalasamāpatti*, the attainment of the fruit of arahatship, in which the world disappears and Nibbāna remains, yielding the arahat the experience of the bliss of emancipation, the taste of the deathless, even in the midst of this mortal world. And it is in this attainment, we will see, as well as in the other supramundane states of consciousness, that the clinging aggregates cease and the bare aggregates alone stand.

In order to discover the denotations of the two terms “the five clinging

8. S. III. 1. 12. 10-11. *Arahatā pi kho āvuso Koṭṭhika ime pañcupādānakkhandhā aniccato dukkhato rogato gaṇḍato sallato aghato ābādhatto parato palokato suññato anattato yoniso manasikātabbā. Natthi khvāvuso arahato uttari karaniyam, katassa vā paticayo. Api ca ime dhammā bhāvitā bahulikāṭā dīṭṭhadhammasukavihārāya c’eva samvattanti satisampajaññāya ca.*

aggregates” and “the bare five aggregates” we must first determine the exact meanings of the two terms that distinguish them, *sāsava* and *upādāniya*. The latter term is used in the *suttas* in connection with the aggregates to mean “subject to clinging,” in the sense that the things they denote are capable of being taken as the objects of clinging or *upādāna*. For example, the *Upādāniya Sutta* says: “Material form, . . . feeling, . . . perception, . . . volitional determinations, . . . consciousness, monks is a state subject to clinging. The desire-and-lust for that, that is the clinging to it.”⁹ The word *sāsava* is not, to our knowledge, used specifically in relation to the five aggregates in the *suttas*, except in the *Khandha Sutta*, but one may assume it to be the equivalent to *upādāniya* in terms of the *āsavas* or cankers; that is, to denote things capable of being taken as the objects of the *āsavas*. This assumption is borne out by the commentary to the above *sutta*. The commentary says: “*Sāsava*: a condition for the cankers as an object. *Upādāniya*: a condition of the same type for the clings. The meaning of the term *sāsava* is a state occurring in conjunction with the cankers which take it as their object.”¹⁰

To find an exact and detailed breakdown of the two groups, *sāsavā dhammā* and *upādāniyā dhammā*, we must turn to the first book of the Abhidhammapiṭaka, the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī*, which sets itself the special task of fully spelling out in terms of ultimate, actually existent states, the precise denotations of such technically significant expressions. According to the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī*, all material form (*rūpa*) is *sāsava* and *upādāniya*,¹¹ since all material form may become the object of the cankers and clings. Thus the contents of the aggregate of form (*rūpak-khandha*) and the clinging aggregate of form (*rūpupādānakkhandha*) completely coincide. There is no bare aggregate of material form. When, henceforth, we speak of a “bare five aggregates,” it is only figurative, for there at most four aggregates which are *anāsava* and *anupādāniya*. But more important, according to the same work, the immaterial aggregates of the arahat which are resultant (*vipāka*) as well as active (*kiriya*) in the mundane sphere, either sensuous or jhānic, are also *sāsava* and *upādāniya*.¹² This is so not in the sense that they are still pregnant with the cankers and clinging, for it is plain that all defilements are abandoned by the arahat, but in the sense that they can become the objects of the defilements of others. Any feeling, perception, volitional determination,

9. S. III. 1. 12. 9. *Rūpaṃ, . . . vedanā, . . . saññā, . . . saṅkhārā, . . . viññāṇaṃ upādāniyo dhammo, yo tattha chandarāgo taṃ tattha upādānaṃ.*

10. SA., II p. 249, (*Chaṭṭhasaṅgīti ed.*). *Sāsavaṇ ti āsavānaṃ ārammaṇa-bhāvena paccaya-bhūtaṃ. Upādāniyaṇ ti tath’eva ca upādānaṃ paccayabhūtaṃ. Vacanaṭṭho paṇ’ettha: ārammaṇaṃ katvā pavattehi saha āsavehi ti sāsavaṇ. Upādātabban ti upādāniyaṃ.*

11. DhS §594.

12. DhS §1108, 1225, 1467, 1555.

or consciousness, *internal or external (ajjhataṃ vā bahiddhā vā)*, that can become the object of the cankers and clinging is *sāsava upādāniya*. And further, since all *sāsava upādāniya* aggregates are clinging aggregates (*upādānakkhandhā*), this means that the arahat's mundane experience is still five clinging aggregates, though of course no clinging will be found therein. There is actually no such thing as "one's own aggregates" or "the aggregates of others," differently classifiable according to the perspective. There are only aggregates internal and external, and all aggregates internal or external that can become objects of the cankers and clings are to be classified as the five clinging aggregates. The bare aggregates, then, will be those aggregates which cannot become objects of the defilements either internally or externally. And what are those aggregates? They are, in the classification of the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī*, the immaterial aggregates—feeling, perception, volitional determinations, and consciousness—of the supramundane states of consciousness, the ariyan paths and fruits; for these states of consciousness cannot be apprehended by a mind defiled with the *āsavas* and *upādāna* due to their sublime purity, a purity flowing from the absolute purity of their object, Nibbāna.¹³

This point is not made explicitly in the *suttas*, but it is implied by a number of passages showing the inability of the gods to discern the consciousness of the arahat when he is in the *phalasaṃpatti*,¹⁴ as also by the texts urging the arahat to contemplate the unsatisfactoriness of the five clinging aggregates in order to withdraw from them and "abide pleasantly in this present state." In the *Aṭṭhasālīni*, however, the commentary to the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī*, the issue is directly confronted. In order to explain why the Abhidhamma text classifies the mundane aggregates of the arahat as *upādāniya* and the aggregates of the noble paths, fruits, and Nibbāna as alone *anupādāniya*, the commentator writes: "Although the aggregates of the arahat who has destroyed the cankers become conditions for clinging in others, when they say, for example, 'Our senior uncle the Thera! Our junior uncle the Thera!', the noble paths, fruits, and Nibbāna are not grasped, misapprehended, or clung to. Just as a red-hot iron ball does not provide a resting-place for flies to settle, so the noble paths, fruits, and Nibbāna, due to their abundant spiritual sublimity, do not provide a condition for grasping through craving, conceit, and wrong views."¹⁵

Thus the mundane aggregates of the arahat, no less than those of a worldling, pertain to the five clinging aggregates. The five aggregates will include all states, those subject to clinging and those not subject

to clinging; the five clinging aggregates will include only those subject to clinging, i.e. the potential objects of clinging; and the "bare aggregates" will refer to the immaterial aggregates of the supramundane paths and fruits which elude the grasp of clinging.

It may be objected that our conclusion drawn from the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī* is contradicted by the *Cūlavedalla Sutta*, where we read in the Pali: *Yo kho āvuso Visākha pañcupādānakkhandhesu chandarāgo taṃ tattha upādānaṃ*.¹⁶ This text one might be tempted to translate: "The desire-and-lust that is in the five clinging aggregates, that is the clinging therein." Such a translation, however, is quite incorrect and leads to a wrong construction of the meaning of the passage and consequently of the concept of *dukkha*. In Pali grammar the objects of desire are generally set in the locative case—whether nominal or pronominal—and this principle is exemplified in the above statement. It is not the desire-and-lust contained *within* the five clinging aggregates that is the clinging *therein*, (though clinging will surely be present at least incipiently in all non-arahats). Rather, it is the desire-and-lust *for* the five clinging aggregates that is the clinging *to* them. The *Upādāniya Sutta* cited above should be recalled, where it is said: "Material form. . . consciousness is an *upādāniya dhamma*," and *yo tattha chandarāgo taṃ tattha upādānaṃ*, "the desire-and-lust for that, that is the clinging to it." Clinging is not contained within the form, feeling, perception, and consciousness aggregates, but only within part of the aggregate of volitional determinations, the *saṅkhārakkhandha*. But the desire-and-lust *for* form, *for* feeling, *for* perception, *for* the volitions, *for* consciousness, that is the clinging *to* them. And each aggregate is itemized separately in relation to clinging, leaving no suspicion that a collective meaning ("the clinging within the set of five") might be intended. Other *suttas* teach the same lesson with regard to other categories of states, as for example: *Cakkhuṃ, bhikkhave upādāniyo dhammo, yo tattha chandarāgo taṃ tattha upādānaṃ* "The eye, monks, is a state subject to clinging; the desire-and-lust for that, that is the clinging to it."¹⁷ Again, desire-and-lust, or clinging, is certainly not contained within the eye, but takes the eye as its object; and so with the remaining sense-faculties and their objects. In the same way, clinging is not necessarily contained within the five clinging aggregates, (though it very well may be), but it takes the five clinging aggregates, either internally or externally, as its object. The meaning of the phrase "there is no clinging apart from the five clinging aggregates" (*na pi aññatara pañcupādānakkhandhesu upādānaṃ*) is that there is no clinging that does not have the clinging aggregates as its objective reference.

16. M. 44.

17. S. IV. 1. 11. 7.

13. DhS §1109, 1226, 1468, 1556.

14. See M. 22, A. IX. 1.9, etc.

15. *Aṭṭhasālīni*, p. 382, (*Chaṭṭhasaṅgīti ed.*)

Whatever can be clung to is classified within the five aggregates of clinging. Thence there is no contradiction between the designation of the arāhat as five clinging aggregates and the recognition of his freedom from clinging: the term ‘five clinging aggregates’ denotes the aggregates that provide the objective range for clinging, not the aggregates that contain clinging.¹⁸

II

The conclusion reached above—that the five clinging aggregates are to be construed as the potential objects of clinging rather than as the abode of clinging—paves the way to a correct understanding of the statement of the first Noble Truth: “in brief, the five aggregates of clinging are *dukkha*.” The Four Noble Truths are formulated with a specific purpose in view. They are taught as a practical and deliberate course of instruction designed to lead onward, by the very pattern of their arrangement, to the achievement of a particular end. The end they are designed to lead to is the end of the Buddha’s Dispensation itself—disenchantment, detachment, cessation, peace, comprehension, enlightenment, and Nibbāna.¹⁹ Now the primary impediment to the realisation of Nibbāna is craving (*taṇhā*). In the metaphorical language of the *suttas*, craving is the seamstress that binds the evolving consciousness to the round of repeated existence, obstructing the entrance to the courseway to liberation. To reach deliverance, therefore, craving must be abandoned. When craving intensifies, it turns into clinging (*upādāna*), which springs up and thrives upon an objective field provocative of clinging. This objective field, potentially identical with the mundane world in its totality, can be classified for pedagogical purposes into five basic categories, namely, the five aggregates of clinging. To remove clinging, and its underlying root, craving, the mind must be made to turn away from the objective field of clinging. Such an inward revulsion can only come about when the objective field of clinging, always beckoning with the lure of gratification, is seen in true perspective, as essentially suffering. Thence the Buddha’s reduction of the mundane world to the five aggregates of clinging, and the equation of the aggregates themselves with *dukkha*.

The Buddha’s aim, then, in formulating the first Noble Truth in the way stated is to lead people to deliverance by getting them to put away craving for all things capable of arousing craving, that is, for the five

18. See *Visuddhimagga*, XIV. 215: “Aggregates that are the resort of clinging are aggregates of clinging” (*upādānagocārā khandhā upādānakkhandhā*). Bhikkhu Nānamoli, *The Path of Purification*, (Kandy, 1975), p. 543.

19. See, e.g., *M.* 63: ‘*Idaṃ dukkhan’ti. . .’ayaṃ dukkhanirodhagāminī paṭipadā’ti. . . etaṃ nibbidāya virāgāya nirodhāya upasamāya abhiññāya sambodhāya nibbānāya saṃvattati.*

aggregates. The *puthujjanā*, the common people of the world, are impelled by their desire and false thinking to perceive pleasurable in the aggregates, internal and external. Thence, with their perception, thought, and outlook twisted by the perverse apprehension of pleasure in what is truly suffering, they relish the aggregates and cling to them with desire-and-lust. Through their clinging they generate a chain of kammic formations that fetters them to the round of repeated births, and entering into birth they reap all the suffering consequent upon birth.

“When one dwells, contemplating gratification in things subject to clinging (*upādānīyesu dhammesu assādānupassino vihārato*), craving increases; conditioned by craving, clinging comes to be; conditioned by clinging, existence; conditioned by existence, birth; conditioned by birth, decay and death, sorrow, lamentation, pain, displeasure, and despair come to be. Such is the origination of this entire mass of suffering. It is just as if, monks, a great mass of fire were to be blazing upon ten, twenty, thirty, or forty loads of fire-wood, and a man were from time to time to throw upon it dry grass, cowdung, and logs. That great mass of fire, with such nutriment, with such a stock of fuel, would continue blazing for a long, long time.²⁰

In order to help the common people get free from this mass of suffering, the Buddha must induce them to give up their desire for the objects provocative of desire with which they are enthralled; for it is this desire—craving nourished by ignorance—that turns the wheel of the round. To get people to give up desire, the Buddha points out that the things they take to be pleasurable, i.e. the five clinging aggregates, are really unpleasurable, *dukkha*, when seen with right understanding as they really are—as impermanent, insecure, perilous, masterless, coreless, and egoless. Whatever can be seized upon with desire as pleasurable must now be contemplated with insight (*vipassanā*) as unpleasurable. Thus the five aggregates which are the range of clinging are also defined, implicitly in the *suttas* and explicitly in the commentaries, as the aggregates which are the soil of insight.²¹ When the people to be guided hear the Dhamma, acquire faith, undertake the training, develop insight, and reach the noble path, they see with right view for themselves that all the objects of desire, potential and actual, are *dukkha*. Equipped with this right view, they are able to cut through their confusion, extinguish the fire of craving, and achieve deliverance from birth-and-death.

“But when, monks, one dwells contemplating the unsatisfactoriness

20. *S.* II. 1. 6. 2.

21. “The states subject to the cankers are designated the ‘clinging aggregates’ for the purpose of pointing out the soil of insight” (*vipassanābhūmisandassanattamaṃ pana sāsavā va upādānakkhandhā ti*). *Abhidhammattha-Vibhāvīnī-Tīkā*, p. 202 (Varanasi, 1965).

in things subject to clinging (*upādānīyesu dhammesu ādīnavānupassino vihārato*), craving ceases. With the cessation of craving, clinging ceases, with the cessation of clinging, existence, . . . birth, . . . decay and death, sorrow, lamentation, pain, displeasure, and despair cease. Such is the cessation of this entire mass of suffering. It is just as if, monks, a great mass of fire were to be blazing upon ten, twenty, thirty, or forty loads of firewood, and nobody would throw dry grass, cowdung, and logs upon it from time to time. That great mass of fire, due to the exhaustion of its original stock of fuel and the non-acquisition of any more fuel, devoid of nutriment, would be extinguished.²²

Now because the arahat's mundane aggregates can be made into objects of desire-and-lust, they too enter into the five aggregates of clinging. They cannot be clung to by the arahat himself, for in the arahat all clinging has been uprooted, made of a nature never to arise again. But they can be clung to and evoke clinging in others. Only the immaterial aggregates of the supramundane states of consciousness, the ariyan paths and fruits, together with Nibbāna, cannot be taken as objects by the defilements: these, therefore, alone constitute the "bare aggregates." The arahat's aggregates in his mundane experience, however, are still five clinging aggregates. They are still *sakkāya* and still *dukkha*. They can no longer cause any mental sorrow or suffering in the arahat, for they are totally devoid of any subjective significance for him. But they remain *dukkha* for others in the sense that they can lead to suffering when held to with desire-and-lust, and for the arahat in the deeper sense that they are felt as inherently unsatisfactory compared to their temporary cessation in the *phalasamāpatti*, when the arahat experiences the bliss of Nibbāna, and compared especially to their final cessation in the *anupādisesanibbānadhātu*, the Nibbāna-element without residue, when the aggregates will cease, never to arise again.

Thus the arahat understands that all the disturbances due to the *āsavas* have finally ceased for him; but a measure of disturbance (*daraṭhamatta*), subjectively indifferent, continues, dependent only on the body with its six sense-faculties which remain intact until the end of his life-span.²³ So long as the arahat remains alive, so long his sense-faculties operate and so long he experiences, by means of his sense-faculties, feelings that are pleasant, painful and neutral. But "whatever is felt, that is included in *dukkha*."²⁴ The feelings are impermanent, and "whatever is impermanent is *dukkha*."²⁵ The great arahat disciple Sāriputta compares the oppression he feels from his own body to the oppression of snakes and corpses, and the maintenance of his body to

22. S. II. 1. 6. 2.

24. S. II. 1. 4. 2. - ११९

23. M. 121.

25. *Ibid.*

that of fatty excrescences.²⁶ And the *Vibhaṅga* of the Abhidhammapiṭaka, in confirmation of our conclusion that the arahat's experience is still *dukkha*, incorporates the resultant (*vipāka*) and functional (*kiriya*) aggregates which comprise the totality of the arahat's mundane experience in each one of its diverse expositions of the *dukkhasacca*.²⁷ Thence when the arahat does pass finally away, one with right view understands: "Material form, feeling, perception, volitional determinations, and consciousness are impermanent. What is impermanent is *dukkha*. It is *dukkha* that has ceased, *dukkha* that has come to an end."²⁸ And the Buddha Himself certifies the *parinibbāna* of the arahat disciples with the words: "He cut off craving, severed the fetters, and by fully penetrating conceit, he has made an end to *dukkha*."²⁹

The fact that the arahat's mundane experience is also to be comprised within the range of *dukkha* implies that the term *dukkha* has a deeper, more difficult to grasp meaning than is suspected even by those who have overcome the hurdle of identifying *dukkha* with experienced suffering. The word *dukkha* seems to be used in four distinct yet intertwined senses in the *suttas*. In one sense it is physical pain, or painful feeling arisen through bodily contact, and as such is contrasted with *domanassa*, mental pain, or painful feeling arisen through mind contact. In a second sense *dukkha* embraces all unpleasant feeling, both physical and mental, *dukkha* and *domanassa*, as well as the broader experiences these feelings dominate—sorrow, lamentation, pain, grief, despair, etc. These first two senses together constitute *dukkha-dukkhatā* or experiential suffering. In a third sense *dukkha* indicates whatever is capable of issuing in suffering; that is, various things and experiences which, though pleasurable in their immediacy, may lead to suffering as their consequence, when they change or become otherwise. This is the meaning of *vipariṇāma-dukkhatā*, suffering due to change, which signifies not the suffering following upon change (this is already included under *dukkha-dukkhatā*), but the pleasurable experience itself, in its concrete immediacy, as a potential source of suffering. The fourth—the deepest and most philosophical meaning of *dukkha*, completely divorced from any overtone of felt suffering whether actual or potential—is *dukkha* as inherent unsatisfactoriness. This is the *saṅkhāra-dukkhatā*, the *dukkha* that inheres in all the conditioned phenomena of mundane existence. This aspect of *dukkha* takes in all phenomena included in the three planes of becoming; it lays claim to the experience of the arahat no less than that of the worldling. *Dukkha* in this last sense is a philosophical, not a psychological, category. It is a world-embracing thought, the ultimate pronouncement

26. A. IX. 2. 1. - ?

28. S. III. 1. 9. 3.

27. *Vibhaṅga*, IV. 2.

29. S. IV. 10. 9.

made on the world of conditioned experience by one who has escaped from the world and gained access to the unconditioned. It is this meaning of *dukkha* that is intended by such statements as ‘all formations are *dukkha*,’ ‘whatever is impermanent is *dukkha*,’ ‘whatever is felt is included in *dukkha*,’ and by the statement of the first Noble Truth: ‘in brief, the five aggregates of clinging are *dukkha*.’ *Dukkha* here derives its significance entirely from its contrast with what is not conditionally produced, not impermanent, not subject to arising and passing away, i.e. with *Nibbāna*, the unconditioned element. That is why it is only the ariyan disciple who has seen *Nibbāna* for himself with the eye of noble wisdom, who can understand through direct penetration this last meaning of *dukkha*. For he alone has accessible to his vision a reality transcendent to the aggregates that are *dukkha* with which he can contrast them and see for himself that ‘in brief, the five aggregates of clinging are *dukkha*.’

NOTE ON SOLITUDE/INWARDNESS

Malcolm Hudson

‘Sensuous objects are the cause of calamity, excrescence, danger, disease, a dart and a fear to me.’ Observing this danger resulting from sensuous objects let one live alone like a unicorn’s horn. (*Sn.* v. 51)

Detachment, loneliness, separation, seclusion, scission, aloofness,—*viveka* has two main descriptive divisions: *Kāyaviveka* is the initial environmental and physical condition, the physical (bodily) separation from sensuous objects; it is the abiding at ease in conditions suited to growth in the Dhamma—‘If no-one is found in front or behind, it is very pleasant for one dwelling alone in the wood.’ (*Theragāthā* v. 537.). *Cittaviveka* is that very growth in the Dhamma, the inner, mental, detachment from sensuous things—‘Herein, Elder, whatever is past, that is abandoned, whatever is yet-to-come, that is relinquished, and the desire-and-lust for the present modes of personality is well under control. It is thus, Elder, that lone-dwelling becomes fulfilled in all its details.’ (S. II, 282). This solitude is not loneliness of lack (*tanhā*), the craving of the crowd, it is abiding in strength and ease, independent and aloof. This solitude becomes the path and the goal to the one with clear vision who apprehends *samsāra*, and his own being as *samsāric*, who thus develops estrangement (*nibbidā*) to *samsāra*—‘...pushed to the extreme this feeling (estrangement) becomes even, at times, not only the resort but also the goal of philosophy: *to exile*,’ (Grenier).

One seeks solitude because one seeks truth, and the crowd is untruth: ‘But the thing is simple enough: this thing of loving one’s neighbour is self-denial; that of loving the crowd, or of pretending to love it, of making it the authority in matters of truth, is the way to material power, the way to temporal and earthly advantages of all sorts—at the same time it is the untruth, for a crowd is the untruth.’ (Kierkegaard). And this is very important for the way of the crowd is the way of *samsāra*, and the cultural political social constructs of society can never lead from *samsāra*, for *samsāra* is their origin, their meaning and goal. Cultures are particular to time and place, there are ‘Buddhist’ cultures but these are not the Dhamma, though inspired by, for culture is within time—the residue of the historic process—the Dhamma is *akālika*, not involving time. One does not obtain *sīla* (the ethical) let alone the Dhamma from the historical process, from majority opinions. The Dhamma is approachable by the wise (*pañḍita*) and each for *himself* (*paccattaṃ*:

separately, individually, that is in *solitude*). Therefore the Dhamma is not 'progressive' within the historical process, within the mass of human kind. Real progress (of the individual) is linear, but *samsāra* is a revolving about, a repetition, the wheel of birth and death that merely reflects the inner revolving (*vaṭṭa*)—the centripetal vortex of name-and-form (*nāmarūpa*) about consciousness (*viññāna*). The Dhamma is not involved in the illusory 'progress' of *samsāra*—the politico-economic ideals of a linear advancement within *samsāra*; there is no linear progress within *samsāra* this straight line of 'progress' is a result of myopia, a viewing too closely a particular section of curvature of the historic cycle. Real progress is against the centripetal attraction of *samsāra*—against the stream—a tangent directly away from the enveloping vortex into calmness and this is *kāyaviveka*. *Cittaviveka* is that gradual journey from the *samsāra* within that fuels the outer—the revolving about of *nāmarūpa* (feeling, perception, intention, contact, attention and matter) with *viññāna* (consciousness)—the progress through *nibbidā* (estrangement) to Nibbāna. These two vortices are the 'tangles within and tangles without' (*antojaṭā bahijaṭā*—S. I. 13) the solution and unravelling of which is the Buddha's teaching and the two tools for this process are *kāya* and *cittaviveka*. This progress is only to the individual in his subjective solitude cut off from the crowd and the process of history—for between the historic process and the ideal of social progress the individual is dissipated and confused. Only by solitude, a cutting-off and estrangement, can one truly approach the Dhamma in its immediacy as having meaning only to the individual who has become subjective—and thus aware of anguish (*dukkha*) as personal and existential and the problem of existence as an individualization of the process of *taṇhā* (lack/need). Only within this subjective solitude does one realize the problem and start toward ultimate solitude—Nibbāna: the cutting-off of all factors of existence.

'Flee society as a heavy burden, seek solitude above all.'

(M. 3)

THE KOSAMBĪ SUTTAS

John D. Ireland

Introduction

An investigation was undertaken in the Sutta Piṭaka of the Pali Canon to discover whether evidence could be found of anything connecting or of significance with regard to the various *suttas* or discourses delivered at a particular place. The *suttas* are scattered throughout the Nikāyas with little or no systematisation and only by collecting and collating together those with an identical introductory source (*nidāna*) could it be seen whether or not, by this method of investigation, any further light could be shed on the history, personalities, teachings and so forth, of Buddhism at its earliest period.

The Distribution of Place Names in the Sutta Piṭaka

A typical Buddhist *sutta* commences with the words: "Evam me sutam . . .", "Thus have I heard", the 'I' referring to the Ven. Ānanda who, it is said, recited the whole of the Buddhaword (*Buddhavacana*) soon after the decease of the Buddha (*parinibbāna*) at the first *mahāsaṅgīti* or 'great council'.¹ After these words there follows a brief summary of the circumstances leading to the delivery of the *sutta*, where it was, spoken and to whom. This introduction is called the *sutta-nidāna* or 'source' of the *sutta*.

On making a survey of the place-names recorded in these *nidānas* it will be noticed that Sāvattihī occurs more frequently than any other place. Although on making an actual count marked differences will be found between the Nikāyas. The following shows the number of *suttas* delivered at some of the more important places mentioned in the four main Nikāyas:

<i>Nidāna</i> references to:	Sāvattihī	Rājagaha	Vesāli	Kapila-vatthu	Kosambī	Sumsu-māragira
In Dīgha Nikāya . .	5	8	1	1	1	0
In Majjhima Nikāya	76	22	6	5	3	3
In Saṃyutta Nikāya	2,091	82	21	11	12	2
In Aṅguttara Nikāya	56	27	29	10	13	5

It must be concluded that these figures are an unreliable guide, especially

1. For a detailed commentarial description of the events of the first Council see *Paramatthajotikā* I. p. 89f. A brief description is also contained in the *Vinaya Cullavagga*, section XI.

for Sāvattī, and to a lesser extent for Rājagaha and the other places. This is for the following reasons: (1) because of the scarcity of *nidānas* in the Aṅguttara (and Khuddaka) Nikāya; (2) the difficulty of accurately assessing the total number of *suttas*, especially for the Aṅguttara; (3) the repetition of *suttas* in the Piṭaka; and (4) the difficulty of defining the divisions between *suttas*, which is sometimes quite arbitrary. These complaints all hold for the Aṅguttara Nikāya, by far the worse offender. It is interesting to note that in the Dīgha Nikāya Rājagaha is the more popular setting for its 34 *suttantas* than Sāvattī, but the Majjhima Nikāya has exactly half of its 152 *suttas* set at Sāvattī.

Although the Saṃyutta (7,762 *suttas*) and Aṅguttara (9,557 *suttas*)^{1a} Nikāyas are roughly equal in size there is a great difference in the number of Sāvattī *suttas*. This difference is only apparent however, due to the great absence of *nidānas* in the Aṅguttara.

Out of the fifteen works of the Khuddaka Nikāya only two have *nidānas*, the *Udāna* which has a complete set, and the *Sutta Nipāta* with only seventeen out of a possible sixty-five. Of the 80 *suttas* in the *Udāna*, 54 are set at Sāvattī and 9 at Rājagaha.

The Twenty Year Tradition

A study was made of the list of places where the Buddha was said to have spent the rains-retreat (*vassa*) for the first twenty years after the Enlightenment, before making Sāvattī his place of retreat for the rest of his teaching career, the next twenty-five years. This tradition is recorded in the *Madhuratthavilāsini*² and is also found, with only slight differences in a Tibetan work.³ On examining the *suttas* given at these various places little connection could be found between the list and the *suttas* delivered there, except for the ninth and tenth years, when it is said the Buddha left Kosambī for Pārileyyaka. In any case the Buddha must have visited several of these places at other times, not mentioned in the list, which only records the rains-retreats. For instance, tradition says he visited **Kapilavatthu in the second year**, although spending the retreat at Rājagaha (*Madhuratthavilāsini*, p. 4).⁴ See also the end of

1a. These are the traditional figures for the number of *suttas* in these Nikāyas according to *Samantapāsādikā* I, p. 27.

2. The *Buddhavamsa* Commentary. The list also occurs in *Manorathapurani* II p. 124-5.

3. *The Blue Annals*, translated by G. N. Roerich, RAS Bengal, 1949, vol. I pp. 21-22.

4. The *Madhuratthavilāsini* is a late commentary however, and patently unhistorical. The site of the city of Kapilavatthu has not so far been located with certainty, and it is doubtful whether it ever existed as such. The Chinese pilgrim Fa Hien found the site deserted in the 4th cent. A.C. cf. Legge: *A Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms*, reprinted by Dover Publications, 1965, p. 64.

the *Bodhirājakumāra Sutta* (M. 85).⁵ It might be concluded that the compilation of the list was nothing more than inspired guesswork on the part of the commentator,⁶ although it cannot be ruled out that it may have been a tradition handed down from the earliest times.

Here is a translation of the relevant passage from the *Madhuratthavilāsini* (pp. 3-4):

'For twenty years, from the time when he first gained Enlightenment, the Lord did not live anywhere continuously. Having gone wherever he pleased, he lived there. How was that? The first year (*vassa*), having turned the Dhamma-wheel at Isipatana and caused eighteen *koṭis* of *brahma*(-world) beings to drink of the Deathless, he lived at Isipatana in the Deer Park depending upon Benares (for support). The second year he lived in the Bamboo Grove Mahāvihāra depending upon Rājagaha; and also the third and fourth years he spent there. The fifth year was (spent) at the Kuṭāgāra in the Mahāvana depending upon Vesālī. The sixth on Maṅkula Mountain; the seventh in the Heaven of the Thirty-three; the eighth amongst the Bhaggās at Bhesakalā Grove depending on Sumsumāragira; the ninth at Kosambī; the tenth in the Pārileyya forest; the eleventh at the brāhmaṇa village of Nālā; the twelfth at Veraṅja; the thirteenth on Cāliya Mountain; the fourteenth at the Jetavana Mahāvihāra; the fifteenth at the great city of Kapilavatthu. Having tamed Ālavaka and causing eighty-four thousand beings to drink of the Deathless, the sixteenth (he spent) at Ālavaka. The seventeenth at Rājagaha; the eighteenth and also the nineteenth on Cāliya Mountain; the twentieth year he lived at Rājagaha (again). Therefore it was said that "for twenty years, from the time when he first gained Enlightenment, the Lord did not live anywhere continuously. Having gone wherever he pleased, he lived there". But afterwards, depending only upon Sāvattī (for support), he lived continuously at the Jetavana Mahāvihāra and Pubbārāma.'

Places such as Nālā, Veraṅja, Cāliyapabbata, Ālavaka and Pārileyyaka had only one or two *suttas* spoken at them, too few to assist this enquiry. Veraṅja is mentioned twice in the Aṅguttara (A. VIII II, 19) and Cāliyapabbata once (A. IX 3). Ālavaka occurs once in the Saṃyutta (S. X 12) and is identical with the *Ālavaka Sutta* of the *Sutta Nipāta*. Nālā was a village not far from Rājagaha,⁷ where Sāriputta was born and also died. It is mentioned in the Saṃyutta (S. IV 251, V 161) and the Aṅguttara.

5. This *sutta* records a conversation between the Buddha and Prince Bodhi at Sumsumāragira. Here the prince says that before he was born his mother went to see the Buddha at Ghositārāma and caused her unborn child to go for refuge.

6. This is the view of E. J. Thomas. See his *Life of Buddha as Legend and History*, p. xxi.

7. Half a *yojana* according to the *Mahāvastu* (translation by J. J. Jones, PTS, vol. III p. 56).

tara (A. V 120-1). Rājagaha replaces Nālā in the *Blue Annals* list. Mañkulapabbata is mentioned in the commentaries, but there are no references to it in the Sutta Piṭaka.

A close examination was made of those places where comparatively few *suttas* were delivered, such as Kapilavatthu (27 *suttas*), Kosambī (32 *suttas*), Sumsumāragira (10 *suttas*) and Vesālī (58 *suttas*). Only the Kosambī *suttas* appeared to show anything of significance, therefore we shall be examining these in detail. The Sumsumāragira, Kapilavatthu and Vesālī *suttas* have nothing like the features of the Kosambī *suttas* but served to highlight those aspects of the Kosambī *suttas* that are of interest in this investigation.

All the *suttas* delivered at Kosambī, except one (S. LVI 31), occurred at the Ghositārāma. The commentaries give the names of four monasteries at Kosambī: the Kukkuṭārāma, Ghositārāma, Pāvārikārāma and Badarikārāma. Except for S. LVI 31 which was delivered in the Sīmsapāvana, a grove near Kosambī, all the *suttas* are set at Ghositārāma. Although S. XXII 89 occurs at Ghositārāma there is a mention in it of the Badarikārāma and the action of the *sutta* takes place between these two monasteries. But apart from this one instance there is no other reference to it, nor any reference to the two other monasteries in the Sutta Piṭaka.

The Ghositārāma Suttas

A) *Digha Nikāya*:

1) *Jāliya Suttanta* (no. 7). The Buddha was staying at the Ghositārāma and had a discussion with two *pabbajitas*, Maṇḍissa and his companion Jāliya concerning the relationship of the 'soul' and the 'body'. In the *Mahāli Suttanta* (D. 6) the Buddha refers to his talk with Maṇḍissa and Jāliya, *Ekam idāham Mahāli samayaṃ Kosambiyaṃ viharāmi Ghositārāme* ... (D. I p. 157).

B) *Majjhima Nikāya*:

2) *Kosambiya Sutta* (no. 48). The Buddha was staying at Ghositārāma and the monks of Kosambī were quarrelling. The Buddha talks to them and they listen.

3) *Sandaka Sutta* (no. 76). Ānanda converts the wandering ascetic Sandaka and his company. The Buddha does not come into it at all except that the *nidāna* states he was staying at the Ghositārāma.

4) *Upakkilesa Sutta* (no. 128). When the Buddha was staying at Ghositārāma the monks of Kosambī were quarrelling (as in *sutta* 48). The Buddha speaks to them but makes no impression, so he leaves after

reciting some verses of condemnation on 'fools', schism in the order and that it is better to live in solitude. He proceeds to Bālakaloṇakāra where the Ven. Bhagu is staying, and then on to Pācīnavamsadaya to meet the Vens. Anuruddha, Nandiya and Kimbila. Their harmonious way of life is contrasted with that of the Kosambī monks.

C) *Samyutta Nikāya*:

5) XII 68. Four monks: Musīla, Saviṭṭha, Nārada and Ānanda are staying in the Ghositārāma and have a discussion on *paṭicca-samuppāda* (dependent-arising) and Nibbāna. No mention of the Buddha being there.

6) XXII 81. The Buddha is staying at Ghositārāma, but leaves without giving notice to the Saṅgha and proceeds to Pārileyya. Later the monks question Ānanda as to the whereabouts of the Buddha, they then proceed to where he was staying and the Buddha discourses to them. No reason for the departure is given, but see no. 4 above.

7) XXII 89. A number of unnamed *theras* are staying at Ghositārāma and send messages by way of the Ven. Dasaka to the Ven. Khemaka who is sick and living in Badarikārāma. Khemaka finally visits them and discourses on Dhamma. No mention of the Buddha being there.

8) XXII 90. The Ven. Channa, who was at Benares, could not get suitable instruction, so he travels to see Ānanda at Ghositārāma. Ānanda repeats to him the *Kaccayānagotta Sutta* (S. XII 15) 'as he had heard it' from the Buddha. The Commentary says this was after the *parinibbāna*.

9) XXXV 127. Records a conversation between Piṇḍola Bhāradvāja and *rāja* Udena at Ghositārāma. No mention of the Buddha being present.

10) XXV 129. Records a conversation between Ānanda and the householder Ghosita at Ghositārāma. No mention of the Buddha.

11) XXXV 192. Records a conversation between Ānanda and the Ven. Kāmabhū. No mention of the Buddha. The contents of this *sutta* are identical to S. XXXV 191, but there the conversation is between Sāriputta and Mahākoṭṭhika at Benares.

12) XXXV 193. Records a talk between Ānanda and the Ven. Udāyī. No mention of the Buddha being present.

13) XLVI 8. A discussion between Sāriputta and the Ven. Upavāṇa at Ghositārāma. No mention of the Buddha.

14) XLVIII 49. The Buddha is staying at Ghositārāma. The monks come to question him concerning the Ven. Piṇḍola Bhāradvāja's attainment of gnosis (*aññā*).

15) XLVIII 53. The Buddha is staying at Ghositārāma. He gives a discourse to the monks on the method of assuring that one's assessment of one's attainment is correct.

16) LI 15. Records a conversation between Ānanda and a *brāhmana* named Unnabha at Ghositārāma on the reasons for practising *brahmācariyā* under the Samaṇa Gotama. The Buddha is not present.

D) *Aṅguttara Nikāya*:

17) III 72. Ānanda is staying at Ghositārāma and has a discussion with a householder disciple of the Ājīvikas who at the end becomes an *upāsaka*. The Buddha is not mentioned.

18) IV 80. The Buddha is staying at Ghositārāma and answers a question put to him by Ānanda.

19) IV 159. Ānanda is staying at Ghositārāma and visits a sick nun. No mention of the Buddha.

20) IV 170. Ānanda is staying at Ghositārāma and discourses to the monks on ascertaining if someone has become an arahant. No mention of the Buddha. Compare with no. 15 above.

21) IV 241. The Buddha is staying at Ghositārāma and speaks with Ānanda concerning the reasons for a bad monk (*pāpabhikkhu*) causing a schism in the Order. One such monk is named: Bāhiya who resided with the Ven. Anuruddha. He apparently took a prominent part in the Kosambī dispute, thus incurring the Buddha's displeasure. The *sutta* commences with the Buddha asking Ānanda if that dispute has been settled or not and also records Anuruddha's disinterest in interfering or mediating.

22) V 100. The Buddha is staying at Ghositārāma. A disciple of the Ven. Mahāmoggallāna who had died and become a *deva* visits Mahāmoggallāna and tells him that Devadatta wishes to become the leader of the Order. Mahāmoggallāna goes to the Buddha and tells him of this. The Buddha discourses on teacher-disciple relationship.

23) V 106. The Buddha discourses to Ānanda at Ghositārāma on the conditions for the Order living harmoniously.

24) V 159. The Buddha is staying at Ghositārāma. Udāyī is preaching to a crowd of laymen in Kosambī and Ānanda sees this and informs the Buddha, who discourses on the conditions one should have within one to preach to others, and says it is not easy to preach to others.

25) V 170. Ānanda, while at the Ghositārāma, instructs the Ven. Bhaddaji. No mention of the Buddha.

26) VII 40. The Buddha is staying at Ghositārāma. Ānanda visits

a group of wandering ascetics. He returns and reports his conversation to the Buddha.

27) VIII 46. The Buddha is staying at Ghositārāma. Anuruddha is visited by some companies of *devas* and later he goes to the Buddha and tells him of it.

28) IX 37. Ānanda, while at Ghositārāma, preaches to the monks and is questioned by Udāyī. No mention of the Buddha.

29) IX 42. Ānanda at Ghositārāma is approached and questioned by Udāyī on some points of Dhamma and the Buddha's teaching concerning the same. No mention of the Buddha being present.

E) *Udāna*:

30) IV 5. The Buddha is staying at Ghositārāma. Being harassed by monks, nuns, etc., he leaves and retires to Pārileyya and the Rakkhita-vanasaṇḍa (forest). There he is looked after by a bull-elephant who has in similar circumstances left the herd.

31) VII 10. The Buddha is staying at Ghositārāma. The women's quarters of *rāja* Udena's palace catch fire and 500 die, including the queen Sāmāvatī. The monks tell the Buddha who says many of the women were lay-disciples, *Sotāpannas*, etc.

There are no other direct references to the Ghositārāma and Kosambī in the Sutta Piṭaka. Three *Jātakas* were supposed to have been preached there (nos. 428, 409, 81). Also the location of the *Māgandiya Sutta* (*Snp.* vv. 835-847) was Kosambī according to the commentary, but is not mentioned in the actual text. Further, the whole of the *Itivuttaka* was preached over a period of time to the laywoman disciple Khujjuttarā at Kosambī according to the commentary (*ItA.* 24f.). She then repeated the *suttas* to the 500 women of the palace (cf. no. 31 above), prefacing each with the words, *vuttaṃ h'etaṃ Bhagavatā*. . . to make clear they were the Buddha's words and not her own.

References to Kosambī in the Vinaya Piṭaka

In the Vinaya *Mahāvagga* details of the Kosambī schism are given and this was the occasion for the laying down of rules concerning schism in the Order. The Buddha fails to reconcile the monks and leaves as recorded in M. 128 (no. 4 above) for Bālakaṇṇakāra and Pācīnāvamsadaya. The discourse with the Anuruddhas is different, but the same as that in the *Cūḷagosiṅga Sutta* (M. 31). From there he proceeds to Pārileyya as recorded in the *Udāna* (no. 30 above). Later the quarrel is settled at Sāvattihī.

In the *Cullavagga* (I 25) whilst the Buddha is at Kosambī the Ven. Channa refuses to see that he has fallen into an offence nor make amends for it; eventually he does so (I 28). Channa is mentioned a number of times in the ancient commentary to the *Pātimokkha* when he is the occasion for the formulation of a number of rules. He is obstinate and disrespectful, becomes annoyed when criticised, he shelves a question by asking another, or is silent and refuses to answer when questioned, etc. (Vin. XII 1, 2; LIV 1; LXXI 1; etc.). Channa is always said to be living at Kosambī in the Vinaya. There were about ten *Pātimokkha* rules occasioned by incidents at Kosambī, most of them instigated by Channa.

Again from the *Cullavagga* (VII 2), when the Buddha was at Kosambī Devadatta conceived the idea of approaching and impressing Prince Ajātasattu and thereupon left for Rājagaha. Mahāmoggallāna came to hear of it as in A. V 100 (no. 22 above), and the Buddha later leaves for Rājagaha where the main events of Devadatta's abortive schism occurred.⁸

Cullavagga XI gives details of the first council, at the end of which Ānanda is sent from Rājagaha to Kosambī with 500 monks to impose the *brahmadaṇḍa* (supreme penalty) upon Channa. Finally, *Cullavagga* XII records events that took place 100 years after the *parinibbāna* when Yasa Kākaṇḍakaputta, establishing himself at Kosambī, gathered support to help subdue the Vajjian monks of Vesāli.

The Kosambi Schism

An incident of significance was the occurrence of a schism in the Buddhist Saṅgha located at Kosambī. This is directly or indirectly referred to in a number of the *suttas*. The monks of Kosambī are quarrelling amongst themselves, the Buddha is unsuccessful in calming them down and leaves in disgust, but there is little to go on as to what the actual quarrel was about in the *suttas* themselves. However, there are further details given in the Vinaya Piṭaka (*Mahāvagga* X). Here it is said a certain monk (unnamed) had fallen into an offence, but the other monks persuaded him to regard it as no offence. Then those other monks change their minds and eventually suspend him (*ukkhepaniyakamma*) for not seeing his offence. Meanwhile the suspended monk gains the support of his friends in Kosambī and the surrounding countryside. The two parties cannot agree, they hold separate *uposatha-meetings*, quarrel and even come to blows. The Buddha, to prevent division in the Saṅgha, speaks

8. However Devadatta may not have been entirely unsuccessful, as there is evidence to suggest that a Devadatta sect existed for several centuries. cf. Legge *op. cit.* p. 62. They worshipped the three previous Buddhas, but not Gotama.

to both parties separately, but is unable to make them change their views and one monk even asks the Buddha not to interfere. The Buddha then tells the story of Prince Dīghāvu who forbears to take revenge on King Brahmadaṭṭa of Benares for killing his parents, Dīghīti, the King of Kosala and his consort, but this still has no effect and the Buddha is again told not to interfere. The Buddha then leaves, as mentioned above, for Pāṇḍeyya. The Vinaya account then continues with the Buddha proceeding from Pāṇḍeyya to Sāvathī. Meanwhile the lay-followers of Kosambī, who are annoyed with the monks for causing the Buddha to leave, withdraw their support. This is what finally decides the monks to settle their dispute and they set out in a body to see the Buddha at Sāvathī. There is alarm at Sāvathī amongst the four groups, monks, nuns, male and female lay-followers, when they hear that the monks of Kosambī are coming, "...makers of strife, makers of quarrels, makers of disputes, makers of brawls, makers of legal questions in the order..." (Miss I. B. Horner's translation), and they ask the Buddha how to behave towards these difficult monks. However, while at Sāvathī, that monk who was suspended changes his mind and decides he actually had committed an offence. The two parties come together and finally settle their differences.

Out of the fifteen *suttas* actually delivered by the Buddha at Kosambī at least six are directly or indirectly connected with the Kosambī schism. There are three *suttas* that deal with the attainment of Arahantship and how to tell whether a person has attained it or not. This may possibly have been a side issue in the Kosambī dispute that has not been developed in the texts. By studying these Kosambī *suttas* there can be seen a gradual development of the theme of schism which is finally found in the extended Vinaya version.

The first stage is seen in the Saṃyutta reference (S. XXII 81, no. 6 above). Here the Buddha merely leaves Kosambī for Pāṇḍeyya because he wishes to go into retreat for meditation. The next stage is found in the *Udāna* (no. 30 above) where the reason is given that he is harassed by people generally and wishes for solitude. In the third stage the Buddha is not merely harassed by being surrounded by people, but because they are actually quarrelling (M. 48, no. 2 above). And then they are not only quarrelling but refuse to desist when the Buddha rebukes them for it (M. 128, no. 4 above). Finally the quarrelling becomes an actual schism in the Order because a certain monk believes he has been wrongly suspended for an offence (Vinaya).

The Dīgha and Saṃyutta Nikāyas know nothing about a Kosambī schism or quarrel. In the verses of condemnation the Buddha speaks

in M. 128 and repeated in the Vinaya *Mahāvagga*, there is a reference to living in solitude like a bull-elephant which reminds one of the *Udāna* story (no. 30 above), but it is difficult to say which could be the earlier. A. IV 241 (no. 21 above) is the only place where an actual Kosambī schismatic is named. As the whole schism episode could be a gradual elaboration it is difficult to confidently fit it between the ninth and tenth years after the Enlightenment. The Devadatta schism probably occurred later and was not connected with the Kosambī events just described, although apparently conceived at Kosambī. So a connection cannot be entirely ruled out, but there is no evidence to support such a theory.

The Ānanda Discourses

An interesting fact that arises from the analysis of these Kosambī *suttas* is the number of times the Buddha is absent from the scene. Out of 32 *suttas* 16 are delivered by disciples. Such a high proportion cannot be paralleled for any other place. For example, Kapilavatthu has only two of its 27 *suttas* given by disciples (S. LIV 2.2 and S. LV 6.2). Vesāli (57 *suttas*) and Rājagaha (139 *suttas*) have a similar negligible proportion. Excluding Sāvattthī, all other places mentioned in the Sutta Piṭaka have too few *suttas* attributed to them to afford a comparison. Another aspect of the Kosambī *suttas* is the high proportion of them delivered by the Ven. Ānanda. He dominates the scene and out of the 16 *suttas* where the Buddha is absent he preaches 12 of them and is stated to be present in one other (S. XII 68). To demonstrate that this is also unusual all the *suttas* spoken by Ānanda in the absence of the Buddha were collected from the Sutta Piṭaka. A breakdown of these 'Ānanda discourses' according to place-names is as follows :

Delivered at Kosambī	13 <i>suttas</i>
(M. 76; S. XII 68, XXII 90, XXXV 129, 192, 193, LI 2.5; A. III 72, IV 159, 170, V 170, IX 37, 42).	
Delivered at Sāvattthī	10 <i>suttas</i>
(D. 10; S. VIII 4, XVI 10, 11. XXI 2, XXII 83, XXVIII 1-9, LV 1.4, 2.3; A. III 71).	
Delivered at Pāṭaliputta	6 <i>suttas</i>
(S. XLV 2.8—10, 3.1—3).	
Delivered at Rājagaha	4 <i>suttas</i>
(M. 108; S. XLVII 3.9, 3.10; A. X 96).	
Delivered at Vesāli	3 <i>suttas</i>
(M. 52; A. III 74, XI 17).	
Delivered at Sāpūga	1 <i>sutta</i>
(A. IV 194).	
Delivered in 'a forest retreat in Kosala'	1 <i>sutta</i>

(S. IX 5).

No source given

6 *suttas*

(A. IV 174, 179, V 169, VI 51, X 5, XI 5).

These 44 *suttas* record discourses given by Ānanda or where he has dialogues with others, when the Buddha is *not* present. In S. XXVIII 1—9 Ānanda puts a series of questions to Sāriputta on his attainments and can be regarded as a single *sutta*. The six Pāṭaliputta discourses, although separated into two sets of three, can also be regarded as a single episode, as they are all questions put to Ānanda by the Ven. Bhadda. The six *suttas* with no source were possibly given at Sāvattthī. It will be seen from these references that Kosambī again dominates the picture, for although Sāvattthī has ten (or sixteen) 'Ānanda *suttas*' it should be borne in mind that this is negligible, as well over 2,000 discourses were delivered there compared with a mere 32 for Kosambī. That there is such a large proportion is highly suggestive that Ānanda is specifically associated with Kosambī.

The Post-parinibbāna Period

A question arises with regard to those *suttas* spoken by Ānanda in the absence of the Buddha as to the proportion that were delivered after the *parinibbāna*. Occasionally this is actually stated in the *sutta* itself, in several others the information is supplied by the commentaries. A few *suttas* say the Buddha was living elsewhere at the time. Sometimes it can be inferred, e.g. when Ānanda speaks with Sāriputta. If it is accepted as true the tradition that Sāriputta predeceased the Buddha then these *suttas* must be prior to the *parinibbāna*. Others can be inferred to have probably been given after the *parinibbāna*, e.g. those connected with Pāṭaliputta which was being constructed when the Buddha passed by on his way to Kusinārā and the *parinibbāna*.

It appears most likely to be the case that many of those *suttas* attributed to disciples (other than Sāriputta and Mahāmoggallāna) record events after the passing away of the Buddha and were considered by the compilers of the Canon to be of sufficient importance to be included in the collection. The majority of those by Ānanda appear, from their internal contents, to have been delivered in his old age and after becoming arahant, which also happened after the *parinibbāna*, and it is the *suttas* in just this category that predominate at Kosambī (ie. nos. 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 17, 19, 20, 25, 28 and 29 above). After the decease of Sāriputta and Mahāmoggallāna and in the immediate post-*parinibbāna* period it was Ānanda and Mahakassapa who became the outstanding leaders of the Buddhist community. The other famous disciples still alive had little impact, as far as we are aware, on the course of history

at least with regard to the transmission of the Canon as it has come down to us. Some had probably removed themselves to distant places, such as Kaccāyana who is recorded as being in Madhurā after the *parinibbāna* (cf. *Madhura Sutta*, M. 84). It was Mahākassapa who presided over the first council at Rājagaha and Ānanda recited the Buddha-word as he had heard and understood it.

Incidentally, Mahākassapa lived to a great age and was said to be 120 at the time of the Council (SA II p. 173). According to Tāranātha he lived for ten years after the *parinibbāna*, whereas Ānanda, according to the same source, survived Mahākassapa by a further 30 years.⁹ The *Blue Annals* (vol. I p. 20) states Ānanda was born at the time when the Buddha attained Enlightenment, which would make him 45 at the time of the first council and dying at the age of 85. That Ānanda was much younger than Kassapa makes sense of the remark by Kassapa that he (Ānanda) is 'a mere boy' (*kumārako*, S. XVI 11). However Pali sources say Ānanda was born at the same time as the Buddha, although this still makes him Kassapa's junior by many years. Details of Ānanda's death are related in *DhA*. II 99f., which also states that he lived to be 120.¹⁰ Curiously enough this agrees exactly with Tāranātha in that he lived for another 40 years after the *parinibbāna*.

In the *Kassapa Samyutta* (S. XVI 10, 11) there is evidence of tension between Kassapa and Ānanda. A certain nun, the bhikkhūṇī Thullatissā, criticises Kassapa for presuming to take precedence over Ānanda in knowledge of the teaching. And Kassapa, hearing of this, hints at Ānanda having an improper relationship with a nun or nuns, or at least the possibility of a rumour of it.¹¹ Then Kassapa criticises the uncontrolled behaviour of a group of Ānanda's followers, blaming Ānanda for it, and again Kassapa is regarded as presumptuous.¹² These *suttas* are

9. Tāranātha's *History of Buddhism in India*, translated from Tibetan by Lama Chimpa and Alaka Chattopadhyaya, Simla, 1970. pp. 21, 25, 357.
10. See also Legge p. 75f who records a similar story regarding Ānanda's death. For references to the legends regarding the passing away of Mahākassapa, see Dr. Saddhatissa's introduction to *The Birth Stories of the Ten Bodhisattas*, PTS 1975, pp. 43-5.
11. Ānanda is often associated with the bhikkhūṇī-saṅgha and women disciples generally (cf. *Cullavagga* XI 14). It was he who persuaded the Buddha to allow women to be ordained and he was accused of this at the first council as a fault to be confessed, as well as allowing the Buddha's body to be soiled by the tears of women. See Legge p. 45 where Fa Hien observes that nuns make offerings at the stupa of Ānanda as the founder of their order.
12. This time by the nun Thullanandā. In *Kindred Sayings* II pp. 145, 148 the translators did not notice there are two different nuns involved and they call both 'Fat Tissa'. For another version of this episode cf. *Mahāvastu* translation III p. 45f.

In both the *Kassapa Samyutta* and *Mahāvastu* Thullanandā refers to Ānanda as *Vedehamuni*. This title is explained by the *Samyutta Commentary* as *pañḍita-muni*, deriving *vedeha* from *vedeti*: to know. However the *Apadāna* commentary (i 106) gives an alternative explanation, saying that he was so called because he

said by the commentary to have occurred soon after the *parinibbāna*. Further, at the first Council, Ānanda is accused of various faults and is made to confess them as such, although not fully convinced he was to blame (*Vinaya Cullavagga* XI 10). After the Council Ānanda is sent to Kosambī with 500 monks to impose the *brahmadanda* on the Ven. Channa according to the instruction of the Buddha in the *Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta* (vi 4) just before he passed away. The punishment of *brahmadanda* consisted of subjecting the offender to a complete social boycott; he should neither be spoken to, instructed or taught by other members of the Order (*Vin. Cullavagga* XI 12). Apparently it was imposed only on this one occasion.¹³

The significance of this episode is that Ānanda goes to Kosambī after the *parinibbāna*, and if there was this tension between Ānanda (or Ānanda's followers) and Kassapa it is most likely that he did not leave there immediately but stayed on at Kosambī and the Ghositārāma. Which lends support to the idea that Ānanda may have made Kosambī his base, already suggested by the preponderance of the 'Ānanda discourses' located there that appear to be post-*parinibbāna*.

When Ānanda arrives at Kosambī he is presented with 500 robes by the harem of king Udena (but see *Udāna* VII 10) who describe him as "our teacher the Ven. Ānanda" (*Cullavagga* XI 14), a description that is surely significant. After the imposition of *brahmadanda* Channa exerts himself and becomes an Arahant and Ānanda tells him this attainment automatically revokes the punishment imposed on him. However, there is an interesting addition to this incident in S. XXII 90 (no. 8 above). In this *sutta* Channa visits several monks at Benares, but does not get satisfactory answers in his search for the teaching. Finally he decides to visit Ānanda at Kosambī, finds what he is looking for and becomes a *Sotāpanna*. There is no mention of *brahmadanda* in this *sutta*, but the commentary says all this happened after the *parinibbāna* and the reason for Channa going to Benares was the imposition of *brahmadanda* at Kosambī. Apparently the restrictions on Channa did not apply at Benares, or else the monks there did not know of it, although neither

was born in the country of Videha. Although not confirming that he was born there the *Mahāvastu* (III p. 172) connects Ānanda with Videha also, where it is said he went to live there when his mother would not give him permission to go forth. It is probable, however, that the title *Vedehamuni* as 'the wise sage' was conferred on Ānanda in his old age or posthumously after he had become a famous teacher and leader of the community, and then later was confused with the country of Videha because of his disciples' influence there. At the period around 100 years after Ānanda's death Mithilā in Videha became an important centre of Buddhist activity for the western branch of the Saṅgha which was gradually separating from the eastern branch located at Vesālī.

13. It is not quite clear exactly why this punishment was imposed on Channa. Earlier an act of suspension (*ukkhapaniyakamma*) was made regarding him (*Cullavagga* I 25) which apparently is not quite so severe as *brahmadanda*.

alternative seems at all likely. Further, that Ānanda should instruct him seems wrong, unless the *brahmadāṇḍa* had been revoked, but this would conflict with the Vinaya account. There are also conflicting reasons for the actual imposition of *brahmadāṇḍa* on Channa: one commentary says it was for repeatedly reviling Sāriputta and Moggallāna (DhA. ii 110), elsewhere it was because he deliberately sided with the nuns in a dispute they had with the monks. This one incident of *brahmadāṇḍa* and its true nature and purpose presents a perplexing problem.¹⁴

The Kosambī Monks

Besides Channa there are a number of other monks named in the Ghositārāma *suttas*. The single *sutta* mentioning Sāriputta (and Upavāna, who was the Buddha's attendant before Ānanda) may possibly be mistakenly located there. Nowhere else is he connected with Kosambī and is usually shown as being close to the Buddha and living mainly at Sāvatti, Rājagaha and Vesālī. Moggallāna is mentioned as coming to inform the Buddha concerning Devadatta's intentions (no. 22 above and repeated in Vinaya *Cullavagga*), but he is not said to have resided there.

The case of Anuruddha is rather different. Although not actually living in Kosambī he resides not too far away, at least one of his disciples is named as one of the Kosambi schismatics (Bāhiya) and another disciple, Abhiñjika, quarrelled with Ānanda's disciple Baṇḍa,—Mahākassapa complains to the Buddha about them (S. XVI 6). This raises the possibility that the two factions in the Kosambī quarrel were the disciples of Ānanda and Anuruddha. Both Ānanda and Anuruddha are of the Sākya clan, as was the Buddha, and this may give a clue to their relationship. They could have been closer than to, say, Kassapa.¹⁵ Channa is a Sākyan, and Udāyī also. There are four Ghositārāma *suttas*

14. The Channa we have been discussing is identified with Channa the charioteer who accompanied Gotama when he left home to become an ascetic, but this is doubtful as the whole episode of the going forth is a late legend. However, the troublesome behaviour of Channa is explained by the commentary (SA II p. 317) as being because of his pride at being with the Buddha when he left home which made Channa feel superior and possessive. There are two other Channas to be found in the Sutta Piṭaka. In *Kindred Sayings* III p. 112 footnote, our Channa is mistakenly identified with another Channa who commits suicide during the Buddha's lifetime (S. XXXV 87). If the Channa who visited Benares is a different Channa from the one who received *brahmadāṇḍa* this would resolve some of the difficulties, however the commentary does not support this idea.

15. Kassapa was a *brāhmaṇa* and before his conversion a member of another sect (*aññatiṭṭhiya*). The nun Thullatissā uses this fact in contrasting him unfavourably with Ānanda. Many of the leading nuns were also Sākyans. The Sākyans were said to be a proud and independent people, jealous of the purity of their descent from an ancient line of warrior kings. According to the Vinaya *Cullavagga* Ānanda and Anuruddha became monks at the same time, together with other Sākyans, including Devadatta, when the Buddha visited Kapilavattu in the second year after the Enlightenment. *Mahāvastu* III says Ānanda did not go forth at this time and apparently supports an alternative tradition that Ānanda came from Videha instead of Kapilavattu (see note (12) above).

that mention Udāyī, but there were several monks with this name and it is probable that there are at least two different Udāyīs to be found here.

Piṇḍola-Bhāradvāja is mentioned twice and it was in Kosambī that he fetched down a costly sandalwood bowl from the top of a pole, causing the rule against exhibiting psychic powers to be made (Vin. *Cullavagga* V 8). He was a *brāhmaṇa* born in Kosambī, so it is natural that he should find a place in the *suttas*.

The remaining monks, Bhaddaji, Musila, Saviṭṭha, Nārada, etc., mentioned in those Ghositārāma *suttas* that were most probably post-*parinibbāna*, are associated with Ānanda and are likely to have been his disciples. They are represented as being earnest and learned monks and are not able to be linked with the Kosambī schism that must have occurred much earlier.

The Council of Vesālī

The final reference to Kosambī from the Vinaya (*Cullavagga* XII) is in the context of the events leading up to the Council of Vesālī, which occurred 100 (or 110) years after the *parinibbāna*. Yasa Kākaṇḍakaputta went to Kosambī when the Vajjian monks of Vesālī attempt to suspend him for causing the lay-followers of Vesālī to turn against them. Yasa was supposed to confess to the laity his fault in not being willing to accept their gifts of money, instead he convinces them that the acceptance of gold and silver was not allowed by the Buddha and it was the Vajjian monks who were at fault and perverters of the Vinaya rules. That Yasa goes to Kosambī implies that it was a centre where orthodoxy was most likely to prevail. While at Kosambī Yasa gains the support of monks from the west (Pāvā) and the south (Avantī). They hold a preliminary meeting then proceed to Vesālī where the whole matter is apparently cleared up and the ten points, of which the acceptance of money is only one, put forward by the Vajjian monks, were rejected.

In the *Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta* Mahākassapa is the leader of the monks of Pāvā, and elsewhere in the Sutta Piṭaka (eg. *Udāna* V. 6) another of the great disciples, Mahākaccana, is specifically associated with Avantī. Yasa is said to be a disciple of Ānanda and his going to Kosambī is a further indication of Ānanda's connection with that place. At the Council of Vesālī a committee of eight senior and distinguished elders is set up to settle the dispute. Four of them representing the Vesālī monks and the other four, one of whom is Yasa himself, representing the western (Pāvā) monks. The eight are designated as follows,

For the eastern (Vesāli) faction:

Sabbakāmin	(a disciple of Ānanda)
Sāḷha	(a disciple of Ānanda)
Khujjasobhita	(a disciple of Ānanda)
Vāsabhaḡāmika	(a disciple of Anuruddha)

For the western (Pāvā) faction:

Revata	(a disciple of Ānanda)
Sambhuta	(a disciple of Ānanda)
Yasa	(a disciple of Ānanda)
Sumana	(a disciple of Anuruddha)

Sabbakāmin is described as the most senior monk alive. He had shared a cell with Ānanda and it was 120 years since his ordination. Tāranātha¹⁶ says Yasa was his disciple, and hence only indirectly a disciple of Ānanda. Sambhuta is also called Sāṅavāsika and as such is named in the lineage of the teachers of the Sarvāstivāda school (Mahākāsyapa, Ānanda, Sāṅavāsika, Upagupta, etc.)¹⁷

It is interesting to note the association of two of Anuruddha's disciples with those of Ānanda and may be related to Anuruddha's connection with Kosambī mentioned above. As Ānanda lived so long and had so many disciples, apparently the former pupils of other leading elders, such as Anuruddha and then Mahākassapa, came under the influence and were absorbed within the traditions propagated by Ānanda and his followers. In fact, although Buddhism began to split up into a number of schools fairly early, even from around the time of the Council of Vesāli, there is no tradition that traces its authenticity and lineage other than through Ānanda. All *suttas* (and later Mahāyāna *sūtras*) are authenticated by the ascription that they were recited and handed down by Ānanda, and there are only traces to be found of possible textual traditions other than these. The list of the nine *Angas: sutta, geyya*, etc.¹⁸ might be a starting point for such an investigation. Did Ānanda actually recite only the 'sutta collection', and not the other parts (*ariga*) of the Buddha-word, meaning *sutta* in only this limited sense? But of course the term *sutta* became predominant¹⁹ and the other forms were incorporated within it, such as the *Udāna*-verses which were made into *suttas* by the addition of the prose introduction and the *nidāna: evaṃ me sutam*.

16. *op. cit.* p. 360.

17. *ibid.*

18. The nine are: *sutta, geyya* (mixed prose and verse), *veyyākaraṇa* (extended explanation), *gāthā* (stanzas), *udāna* (inspired utterances), *itivuttaka* ('thus-it-was-saids'), *jātaka* (moral tales of the past), *abbhutadhamma* (wonders, marvels) and *vedalla* (answers to questions).

19. Was it because of the overwhelming influence of Ānanda and his followers that the *sutta* form became the norm, and that the Buddha-word was arranged into Nikāyas (or *āgamas*) and Pitakas as we know it today?

However this process never happened with the *Jātaka* verses and the story portion is understood to be commentary (*aṭṭhakathā*) and not explicitly an utterance of the Buddha.²⁰ The *Itivuttaka* text with the curious *vuttam h'etaṃ bhagavatā... introduction to its discourses may be an example of a work that by-passed the evaṃ me sutam recital of Ānanda and was too highly valued to be altered or excluded from the Sutta Piṭaka.*

Conclusion

The most important single fact to emerge from the examination of the Kosambī *suttas* is the association of Ānanda with that place, an association that was not previously suspected. And this in turn suggests other lines of enquiry which could be made into the role played by Ānanda and others in the formation of the early Buddhist community and the form its teachings took prior to the expansion of Buddhism during the reign of the Emperor Asoka.

This preliminary investigation into the references to Kosambī has, it is hoped, shown that much useful information may be extracted from Pali canonical and commentarial literature. And that by this method of collecting and collating material yet more remains to be discovered with regard to the historical background, personalities, teachings and so forth, of Buddhism at the period when this literature was being formed. Pali literature is a rich source of information on numerous facets of this remote period of Indian history, including the origins of Buddhism itself, and much work still remains to be done towards resolving the many problems, both historical and doctrinal, posed by the Tipiṭaka and commentaries.

20. This lends support to the theory that the *Jātakas* are older than is often thought. cf. Gokuldas De: *Significance and Importance of Jātakas*, Calcutta, 1951, p. 46ff.

OBITUARY

Ven. Jagdish Kashyap

The leading Indian Pali scholar-monk, Ven. Jagdish Kashyap Mahāthera, passed away on 28th January, aged 67.

Born in 1908 at Ranchi in Bihar, the influence of his grandfather, Shri Ayodhya Prasad, led him to study Buddhism. After mastering the fundamentals he went to the Vidyalankara Pirivena in Ceylon and later entered the Sangha under Ven. L. Dhammananda.

On completion of his studies, he spent a year in Penang, a period of retreat in the Salgala forest hermitage in Ceylon, and in 1937 returned to India. Having already obtained M.A.'s in Sanskrit and Philosophy from Patna and Banares Hindu Universities respectively, he acted as Principal of the Maha Bodhi College, Sarnath, for three years and from 1940-49 taught Pali and Theravāda Buddhism at Banares Hindu University. At the end of this period he undertook a Dhammaduta tour on foot of Bihar, teaching in the local dialect, Māgahī (the modern variant of Māgadhī).

In 1951 the Bihar Government invited him to re-establish the ancient university of Nālandā. And the Nava Nālandā Māhāvihāra or "Magadh Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Pali and allied languages and Buddhist learning" is a thriving reality today, attracting graduates from all over the world.

As India's main contribution of Buddha Jayanti Year (1956,) Ven. Kashyap was appointed Editor-in-Chief of the Pali Tipiṭaka in Devanāgarī script by the Government of India. This monumental work was completed in record time and the set of 41 volumes is still available for Oriental institutions. His other literary contributions include: *Samyutta Nikāyā*, *Udāna* (1938), *Milindapañha* (1937) and *Moggallāna-Vyākaraṇa* (1940) in Hindi together with *The Abhidhamma Philosophy* (Benares, 1942-3; Patna, 1954).

Ven. Kashyap retired from active service in the Sāsana due to a severe diabetic condition and finally succumbed to a heart attack at Rajgir. His body was cremated on the premises of the Nava Nālandā Mahāvihāra with which his name will forever be associated.

May he attain Nibbāna!

BOOK REVIEW

Pali Buddhist Texts explained to the beginner. Rune E. A. Johansson. Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies Monograph Series No. 14, Copenhagen. 152 pp. £3.30.

For the study of Pali this is a very useful companion and supplement to A. K. Warder's *Introduction to Pali* (PTS) : both aim to lead quickly and directly into the texts—Warder by consolidating grammar later giving minimal structure and vocabulary en route, Johansson by direct presentation of text with translation and a word by word grammatical analysis. 52 fairly brief texts are studied followed by a 25 page summary of grammar, including a Pali/Sanskrit comparison; in addition there is a brief general introduction to the language and a note on *sandhi*. Restricted to this size it is difficult to say whether this book alone would be sufficient for a working knowledge of Pali—certainly a dictionary would be a necessity for further study of texts—but I would recommend it as a valuable accessory to a larger work or introduction to further study with such books.

However, this work is more than an introduction to Pali, it is also an introduction to the Dhamma—the 52 texts are selected for what they contain, not merely the container's structure. These texts are selected to indicate essential things—the *tilakkhaṇā*, *pañcakkhandhā*, path factors, *kamma* and rebirth—a cluster of those essential things (*dhammā*) the Buddha saw and knew and then transferred into time, and for us, as a thread of speech (*suttam*).

Malcolm Hudson

THE LIFE OF THE BUDDHA

By

Ven. Dr. H. Saddhātissa, M.A., PH.D.

Head of the London Buddhist Vihāra

This extremely compassionate and sensitive account of the Buddha's life, based on his own teachings, by one of the foremost living Buddhist scholar-monks, fulfils the longfelt need for a popular, inspiring and non-academic survey of the salient features of an unique spiritual career.

Published by George Allen & Unwin, London, in their new *Mandala Books* series on religion.

This book is available at £ 1.50 plus postage from the British Mahābodhi Society, 5 Heathfield Gardens, London, W4 4JU, and all good bookshops.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE PALI CANON

by

Russell Webb

120pp. 40p. (BPS, Kandy: *The Wheel*, nos. 217—220)

This book includes:

1. A survey of the contents of the Pali Canon—the sacred texts of early Buddhism (Theravāda).
2. An index of the main sections (including individual *suttas*) of the Canon.
3. An exhaustive bibliography of all texts, anthologies, studies based on Pali sources, Pali grammars, etc., that have appeared in English.
4. A list of post-canonical and commentarial works, published in English translation.
5. Some useful names and addresses of those who are promoting the study of Pali literature, with a description of the main societies concerned.

To both Buddhist layman and scholar this book will serve as a constant companion in their studies and will help them to explore the treasures of Pali literature.

(This is also available from the British Mahābodhi Society.)