

# Appendix

## 1. Materials for the Study of the Knowledge of Extinction (*Khayañāṇa*) of the Noxious Influxes (*Āsava*): Canonical Pericope and Commentarial Exegesis

### A1.1. Pericope (Basic Formula + Simile)

#### Basic formula

He knows according to reality: “This is suffering”; he knows according to reality: “This is the origin of suffering”; he knows according to reality: “This is the cessation of suffering”; he knows according to reality: “This is the path which leads to the cessation of suffering”; he knows according to reality: “These are the noxious influxes”; he knows according to reality: “This is the origin of the noxious influxes”; he knows according to reality: “This is the cessation of the noxious influxes”; he knows according to reality: “This is the path which leads to the cessation of the noxious influxes”. When he knows and sees in this way, the mind is freed from the noxious influx of the sensual desire, is freed from the noxious influx of the existence, is freed from the noxious influx of the ignorance, in the liberation there is the knowledge “[The mind] is liberated”, he knows: “The birth is exhausted, the holy life has been lived, what had to be done was done, from this life there will be not another one”.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *so idaṃ dukkhaṃ ti yathā-bhūtaṃ pajānāti, ayaṃ dukkha-samudayo ti yathā-bhūtaṃ pajānāti, ayaṃ dukkha-nirodho ti yathā-bhūtaṃ pajānāti, ayaṃ dukkha-nirodha-gāminī paṭipadā ti yathā-bhūtaṃ pajānāti, ime āsavā ti yathā-bhūtaṃ pajānāti, ayaṃ āsava-samudayo ti yathā-bhūtaṃ pajānāti, ayaṃ āsava-nirodho ti yathā-bhūtaṃ pajānāti, ayaṃ āsava-nirodha-gāminī paṭipadā ti yathā-bhūtaṃ pajānāti. tassa evaṃ jānato evaṃ passato kāmāsavā pi cittaṃ vimuccati bhavāsavā pi cittaṃ vimuccati avijjāsavā pi cittaṃ vimuccati, vimuttasmiṃ vimuttam iti ñāṇaṃ hoti, khīṇā jāti vusitaṃ brahmacariyaṃ kataṃ karaṇīyaṃ nāparaṃ itthattāyā ti pajānāti* (D I 83-4).

**Simile**

Just as, great king, in a valley among mountains there is a lake of water which is transparent, pure, undisturbed. There, a man equipped with [good] sight, standing on the shore, would see oyster shells, gravel and pebble, a shoal of fish, which are moving or staying. He would think: “This lake of water is transparent, pure, undisturbed, in this place there are oyster shell, gravel and pebble, a shoal of fish, which are moving or staying”.<sup>2</sup>

**A1.2. Translation of *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* | 224-7**

**‘When the mind is concentrated in this way (*so evaṃ samāhite citte*)’**, in this case, the mind of the fourth *jhāna* which is the basis of the *vipassanā* should be understood.

**‘To the knowledge of extinction of the noxious influxes (*āsavānaṃ khaya-ñāṇāya*)’** means ‘for the sake of arising of the knowledge of extinction of the noxious influxes’. Here, the extinction of the noxious influxes is called path (*magga*), fruit (*phala*), Nibbāna, dissolution (*bhaṅga*). Here [in passages like] “knowledge concerning the extinction [and] the knowledge concerning the non-arising” (D III 214 and D III 274) the path (*magga*) is called ‘the extinction of the noxious influxes’. Here [in passages like]: “he is an ascetic because of the extinction of the noxious influxes” (M I 284) it is the fruit (*phala*). Here [in passages like]:

One who always contemplates the faults of others,  
who always feels like complaining |  
his *āsavas* increase,  
he is far from the extinction of the noxious influxes || (Dhp 253)

It is the Nibbāna. Here [in passages like]: “extinction of the noxious influxes, which is their decay (*vaya*), breaking (*bheda*), impermanence (*aniccatā*), disappearance (*antaradhāna*)” (cf. Nidd I 266) it is the dissolution (*bhaṅga*). And here it refers to the Nibbāna, but the path of the *arahant* (*arahatta-magga*) is also appropriate.

**‘Directs the mind (*cittaṃ abhinīharati*)’** he makes the *vipassanā*-mind bend towards it, converge on it.

Concerning the passage which starts in the following way: **‘he [knows according to reality:] “This is suffering” (*so idaṃ dukkhaṃ*)’**, [225] he knows according to reality, through the comprehension of the characteristics and essential properties, the whole truth concerning suffering: “[There is] this much suffering, but not beyond this”. [He knows] the craving (*taṇhā*) which produces this suffering: **‘This is the origin of suffering (*ayaṃ dukkha-samudayo*)’**. When both (viz. suffering and arising of suffering) reach the state that once is attained ceases, this is the Nibbāna, their non-manifestation: **‘This is the cessation of suffering (*ayaṃ dukkha-nirodho*)’**. And the noble path that leads to this [i.e. the cessation]: **‘This**

<sup>2</sup> *seyyathā pi mahā-rāja pabbata-saṅkhepe udaka-rahado accho vippassanno anāvilo, tattha cakkhumā puriso tīre ṭhito passeyya sippi-sambukam pi sakkhara-kaṭṭhalam pi maccha-gumbam pi carantam pi tiṭṭhantam pi. tassa evam assa: ayaṃ kho udaka-rahado accho vippassanno anāvilo, tatr’ ime sippi-sambukā pi sakkhara-kaṭṭhālā pi maccha-gumbā pi caranti pi tiṭṭhanti pi ti* (D I 84).

is the path which leads to the cessation of suffering (*ayaṃ dukkha-nirodha-gāmiṇī paṭipadā*). This is the meaning of ‘he knows according to reality, through the comprehension of the characteristics and essential properties’.

Having shown the truths in such a form, showing them again figuratively [in terms of] defilements (*kilesa*), He [i.e. the Buddha] said [the passage which starts from] ‘*ime āsavā*’.

‘**When he knows and sees in this way (*tassa evaṃ jānato evaṃ passato*)**’ [it means] when this monk knows and sees in this way. He [i.e. the Buddha] explains the path (*magga*) which has reached perfection (*koṭṭippatta* [maybe synonym of Nibbāna]) in conjunction with the [practice of] *vipassanā*. ‘**From the noxious influx of the sensual desire (*kāmāsavā*)**’ means ‘from the noxious influx of the sensual desire (*kāmasāvato*)’.

‘**[The mind] is freed (*vimuccati*)**’; by this [phrase], He [i.e. the Buddha] shows the moment of the path (*maggakkhāṇa*); by this [phrase] ‘**in the liberation (*vimuttasmiṃ*)**’, He shows the moment of the fruit (*phalakkhāṇa*); and by this [phrase] ‘**there is the knowledge: “I am liberated” (*vimutt’ amhī ti nāṇaṃ hoti*)**’,<sup>3</sup> [He shows] the knowledge of reviewing; by [the phrase] starting as ‘**the birth is exhausted (*khīṇā jāti*)**’ [He shows] its plane [i.e. the plane of the reviewing knowledge]. For when the one who has the noxious influxes destroyed reviews [his liberated-status] through this knowledge, he knows ‘the birth is exhausted, etc.’

**[Query:]** which of his births is exhausted? How does he know [that]? It is not the past birth that is exhausted, because it was exhausted previously; not the future [birth], because of the non-existence of the striving concerning the future; not the present [birth], because of [its] being in existence [right now]. **[Reply:]** the one which would arise because of the absence of the path is the birth consisting of the one, four or five *khandhas*, in one, two or five constituents of being [respectively]; this one has been exhausted through the reaching of the characteristic of not coming into existence caused by the development of the path. The one who has abandoned the defilements for the sake of developing the path, reviewing that, he knows knowing: “The lasting *kamma* concerning the absence of defilements is incapable of rebirth in future”.

‘**It has been lived (*vusitaṃ*)**’ it means lived (*vuttha*), dwelt (*parivuttha*). ‘**Holy life (*brahmacariyaṃ*)**’ means holy life in the path. Seven people in training dwell in the state of holy life together with the virtuous ordinary person, the one who has the noxious influxes exhausted has lived in these stages. Therefore, contemplating his own dwelling in the state of holy life, he knows: ‘**The holy life has been lived (*vusitaṃ brahmacariyaṃ*)**’.

**[226] ‘What had to be done was done (*katam karaṇiyaṃ*)**’. With reference to the four truths, the sixteen-kind of function has been accomplished through the path by means of exact knowledge (*pariññā*), abandoning (*pahāna*), experiencing (*sacchikiriya*), developing (*bhāvanā*)<sup>4</sup> [of the four truths]. The defilements that should be abandoned are abandoned precisely by each path; the meaning is that the root of suffering is extirpated. The virtuous ordinary person, etc., indeed, does this work; the one who has

<sup>3</sup> N.B. in the canon the phrasing is different.

<sup>4</sup> See Vibh 426-7 and Gethin 2001, 122.

exhausted the noxious influxes has already done it. Therefore, reviewing his own duty he knows: **'What had to be done was done (*kataṃ karaṇīyaṃ*)'**.

**'From this life there will be not another one (*nāparaṃ itthattāya*)'**, he knows: "Here there is not again for me the obligation of developing the path for the sake of the present existence, or the existence in sixteen-functions or the destruction of defilements". Otherwise, **'itthattāya'** means 'from this existence', because of this arrangement he knows: "I do not have now from the continuity of the existing aggregates another continuity of aggregates. But these five aggregates, which were fully known, endure as trees whose roots were cut off, they cease to exist through the cessation of the last [moment of] consciousness, like fire without fuel; they will go to the indefinable state".

**'In a valley among mountains (*pabbata-saṅkhepe*)'** in the summit of a mountain (*pabbata-matthaka*). **'Undisturbed (*anāvilo*)'** free from mud (*nikkaddama*).

'Oyster and shells' means **'oyster-shell (*sippi-sambukā*)'**, 'gravel and pebble' means **'gravel and pebble (*sakkhara-kāthalaṃ*)'**.

'A shoal of fish, a multitude (*ghaṭa* following Be)' is **'shoal of fish (*maccha-gumbaṃ*)'**.

**'Staying or moving (*tiṭṭhantam pi carantam pi*)'**. In this place gravel and pebble remain still, other things are moving or remaining still.

"But when from time to time they are standing, sitting, walking, according to the moving: 'these cows are moving', and others are also defined as 'moving'. Accordingly, gravel and pebble only remain still, then it is said that "the other couple is also remaining still", [227] and with reference to the other couple which is moving, it is said that "gravel and pebble also is moving".

In this context, the moment of clarification (*vibhūta-kāla*) of the four noble truths of the seated monk who directed the mind to the extinction of the noxious influxes should be regarded as the moment of clarification of the man equipped with [good] sight who sees oyster-shells, etc., standing on the shore.

Ten knowledges (*ñāṇa*) are expressed so far as: 1) *vipassanāñāṇa*; 2) *manomayañāṇa*; 3) *iddhividhañāṇa*; 4) *dibbasotañāṇa*; 5) *cetopariyañāṇa*; 6) *pubbenivāsañāṇa*; 7) *dibbacakkhuñāṇa*, which has the double knowledge of: 8) *yathākammūpaga* and 9) the knowledge of the future (*anāgata*) accomplished through the power of the divine eye; 10) *āsavakkhayañāṇa*. The clarification of their object should be known. In this context, the *vipassanāñāṇa* has an object of seven kinds: limited, exalted, past, future, present, internal, external. The *manomayañāṇa* makes an object which is only a mere form-sphere creation it is: limited, present, and external. The *āsavakkhayañāṇa* has an object which is measureless, external, and unclassifiable. The [other] kinds of object of the remaining [knowledges] are reported in the *Visuddhimagga*.

## 2. The *Sumaṅgalavilāsini* on the *iddhividhā* and the Other *Abhiññās*

*Sumaṅgalavilāsini* on the *iddhividhā*:

In this context, the skilful **adroit potter** should be regarded as the monk who has attained the knowledge of the *iddhividhā*. **The well-prepared**

**clay** should be regarded as the knowledge of the *iddhividhā*. The action of making an **earthenware product** as desired should be regarded as the transformation (*vikubbana*) of the monk.

*tattha cheka-kumbha-kārādayo viya iddhividha-ñāṇa-lābhī bhikkhu daṭṭhabbo. suparikamma-katamattikādayo viya iddhividha-ñāṇaṃ daṭṭhabbaṃ. icchit-icchita-bhājana-vikati-ādi-karaṇaṃ viya tassa bhikkhuno vikubbanaṃ daṭṭhabbaṃ. (Sv I 222-3)*

*Sumaṅgalavilāsini* on the *dibbasotadhātu*:

In the simile of the divine element of ear, since a long road in the wilderness is fearful, frightening, it is not possible for one who is anxious and apprehensive to determine “This is the sound of a drum, this is the sound of a tambour”, therefore not having made reference to the wilderness, indicating a peaceful road, he says, “**Set out on a long road**”. For, having placed a cloth on the head, going slowly along a road that is not frightening and safe, he easily determines sounds of the aforementioned kinds. The time those sounds are clear to him should be regarded as like the time when both the divine and human sounds, differentiated as distant and close, are clear to the yogin.

*dibba-sota-dhātu-upamāyaṃ yasmā kantāraddhānamaggo sāsāṅko hoti sappāṭibhayaṃ tattha ussāṅkita-parisāṅkitaena ayaṃ bheri-saddo, ayaṃ mutiṅga-saddo ti na sakkā vavatthāpetuṃ, tasmā kantāra-gaṇhaṃ akatvā khemaṃ maggaṃ dassento **addhāna-magga-paṭipanno** ti āha. appaṭibhayaṃ hi khemaṃ maggaṃ sise sātakaṃ katvā saṅikaṃ paṭipanno vutta-ppakāre sadde sukhaṃ vavatthāpeti. tassa tesam saddānaṃ āvibhūta-kālo viya yogino dūra-santikabhedānaṃ dibbānañ c’ eva mānussakānañ ca saddānaṃ āvibhūta-kālo daṭṭhabbo. (Sv I 223)*

*Sumaṅgalavilāsini* on the *cetopariyañāṇa*:

The simile of the knowledge by comprehension of the minds [of others]: **young (daharo)** means tender (*taruṇa*). **Youthful (yuvā)** means endowed with youth. **Fond of finery (maṇḍana-jātiko)** means although he is young, he is not indolent and does not have dirty clothes and a dirty body, and then he is naturally fond of ornaments. Having taken a bath two or three times per day, he has the habit of using ornaments and dressing with clean cloths, this is the meaning. **[The face] is with blemishes (sakaṇika)** means it has defect, with some blackheads, flaws, blemishes on the face, boils, etc. In this context, it should be known in this way: when he contemplates his face image, the facial defect is evident to him, in the same way after having directed the mind to the knowledge by comprehension of the minds [of others], the mind of sixteen kinds of others becomes evident to the seated monk.

*ceto-pariya-ñāṇa-upamāyaṃ daharo ti taruṇo. yuvā ti yobbanena samannāgato. maṇḍanaka-jātiko ti, yuvā pi samāno na ālasiyo na kiliṭṭha-vattha-sarīro, atha kho maṇḍanapakatiko. divasassa dve tayo vāre nahāyitvā suddha-vattha-paridahana-alaṅkāra-karaṇa-sīlo ti attho. sakaṇikaṃ ti, kātīlaka-vaṅga-mukhadūsi-pīlakādīnaṃ aññatarena sadosaṃ. tattha yathā*

*tassa mukha-nimittam paccavekkhato mukha-doso pākaṭo hoti, evaṃ cetopariyaññāya cittaṃ abhinīharitvā nisinnassa bhikkhuno paresaṃ soḷasa-vidhaṃ cittaṃ pākaṭaṃ hotī ti vedittabbaṃ. (Sv I 223)*

*Sumaṅgalavilāsini* on the *pubbenivāsānussatiñāṇa*:

The simile of knowledge of recollection of former existences: since it is the actions done that day which are evident, only the three villages gone to that same day are mentioned. In this context, the one who possesses the knowledge of recollection of former existences should be understood as a man who visited the triad of villages. Three existences should be understood as the three villages. The manifestation of the action performed in the three existences to the seated monk after having directed the mind to the knowledge of recollection of former existences should be understood as the manifestation of the action performed during the day in the three villages to the man.

*pubbe-nivāsa-ñāṇa-upamāyaṃ taṃ divasaṃ kata-kiriyā pākaṭā hotī ti taṃ divasaṃ gata-gāma-ttayaṃ eva gahitaṃ. tatha gāma-ttayaṃ gata-puriso viya pubbe-nivāsa-ñāṇa-lābhī daṭṭhabbo. tayo gāmā viya tayo bhavā daṭṭhabbā. tassa purisassa tisu gāmesu taṃ divasaṃ kata-kiriyāya āvibhāvo-viya-pubbe-nivāsāya cittaṃ abhinīharitvā nisinnassa bhikkhuno tisu bhavesu kata-kiriyāya āvibhāvo daṭṭhabbo. (Sv I 223)*

*Sumaṅgalavilāsini* on the *cutūpapātañāṇa*:

Divine eye simile: ‘**Wandering the way**’ (**vītisañcarante** [Be: **vīthiṃ sañcarante**]) means that they are moving to and fro. The reading is also *vidicarante* [Be: *vīthiṃ caranteti*] (‘wandering the way’); this is the meaning. In this context, the physical body (*karaja-kāya*) of the monk should be understood as the lofty palace at a crossroads in the middle of a city. The monk standing who has attained precisely this divine eye is like the man equipped with [good] sight standing in the lofty palace; those entering into the mother’s womb by way of relinking (*paṭisandhi*) are like those entering into the house; those leaving the mother’s womb are like those leaving the house; the beings who are circulating here and there are like those overpassing the road; the beings who are reborn here and there in the three states of existence are like those sitting in the middle of the crossroad, before an open-space; the time when the beings who are reborn in the three states of existence become manifested to the monk sitting with the mind directed to the knowledge of the divine eye should be understood as the time when these men become manifested to the man standing in the terrace of the lofty palace. And this was said for the sake of the ease of instruction, but concerning the formless worlds, the divine eye does not have an action field.

*dibba-cakkhu-upamāyaṃ vītisañcarante ti* [Be: **vīthiṃ sañcarante ti**] *aparāparaṃ carante. vidicarante ti pi pāṭho* [Be: *vīthiṃ carantetipi pāṭho*]. *ayaṃ eva attho. tatha nagara-majjhe siṅghāṭakamhi pāsādo viya imassa bhikkhuno karaja-kāyo daṭṭhabbo. pāsāde ṭhito cakkhumā puriso viya ayaṃ eva dibba-cakkhuṃ patvā ṭhito bhikkhu, gehaṃ pavisantā viya paṭisandhivasena mātukucchiṃ pavisantā, gehā nikkhamantā viya*

*mātukucchito nikkhamantā, rathikāya vītisañcarantā viya aparāparam saṃsaraṇaka-sattā, purato abbhokāsa-tṭhāne majjhe siṅghātake nisinnā viya tīsu bhavesu tattha tattha nibbatta-sattā, pāsāda-tale ṭhita-purisassa tesam manussānaṃ āvibhūtakālo viya dibba-cakkhu-ñāṇāya cittaṃ [abhi-] nīharitvā nisinnassa bhikkhuno tīsu bhavesu nibbatta-sattānaṃ āvibhūta-kālo daṭṭhabbo. idaṃ ca desanā-sukhattham eva vuttaṃ, āruppe pana dibba-cakkhussa gocaro natthī ti. (Sv I 224)*

### 3. The Odd Inversion of the Ablative and Instrumental Cases

An interesting point concerning the *Sāmaññaphalasutta*'s simile is an odd inversion of the order of words that does not change the meaning but does stimulate further reflections.<sup>5</sup> First of all, when dealing with oral literature, some scholars argue that the repetitions of parts of the text are one of the best tools to facilitate the memorisation of texts and their transmission.<sup>6</sup> It is therefore possible that the oral nature of the Buddhist texts has strongly influenced the formal elements present in them.<sup>7</sup> In fact, as Bhikkhu Anālayo (2007, 8) highlights, when the same topic occurs in both the positive and negative form, the sentence in the positive form is repeated with the same words and in the same formulation, adopting only the minimum change necessary to confer a negative meaning; the same thing happens for the pericopes, namely formulaic expressions that constitute a unity of complete meaning, which are used in different texts and adapted with the minimal possible changes to any specific occasion. Given that there is a principle of economy in the structure of the composition of texts, it is of some interest to note that the form in which the *Sāmaññaphalasutta* contains the three similes is not perfectly identical. The Pāli text, in most cases, tries to respect this principle of economy. Hence, the major changes are often due to the need to make adjectives and verbs agree with nouns, which are the only ones that actually change. The only change that is difficult to justify<sup>8</sup> concerns the

<sup>5</sup> Appendix 3 is based on De Notariis 2018, 195-8.

<sup>6</sup> On this topic, Allon writes that: "Verbatim Repetition obviously represents the greatest aid to memory. The greater the percentage of a text that is verbatim repetitive the easier it is to learn and remember" (1997b, 52).

<sup>7</sup> A brief account concerning the formal elements used to facilitate the act of memorising is provided by Sferra, who writes that the *bhāṇakas* 'reciters' "per ricordare gli insegnamenti, si sarebbero giovati delle ripetizioni, ma anche di *stock-phrases*, di liste (*mātikā*), di indici dei contenuti (*uddāna*), della disposizione in progressione numerica (il caso più eclatante è quello dell'*Aṅguttaranikāya*), delle allitterazioni, della composizione nominale di termini opposti mediante la a privativa in funzione di cerniera, e, infine, del cosiddetto Waxing Syllables Principle e cioè l'espedito per cui le parole sono ordinate secondo un numero crescente di sillabe" (2011, 100). An extensive study concerning the stylistic features of the Pāli texts is provided by Allon (1997a). I should highlight that not all scholars endorse such a view of a fixed oral transmission of texts in early periods. In this regard, see the recent overview provided by Shulman (2025, 163-8). Notwithstanding the conundrum concerning the early oral transmission, some stylistic features are nonetheless present in Pāli texts and thus the ensuing discussion will be relevant at least concerning the latter.

<sup>8</sup> There is also a change in the verbs used. While for the first two pairs the combination '*pavāheyya*' and '*pavālhā'o*' (depending on the gender of the noun with which they agree) is used, the combination '*uddhareyya*' and '*ubbhato*' is used for the last pair, i.e. snake/basket. Probably the action of pulling out a snake from the basket is not felt as identical to the action of extracting a sword or a stalk, just as if we have to extract a flower or a mineral from the ground we use two different verbs: 'to mine' the mineral and 'to pick' the flower.

position taken by the names of what is extracted (stalk 'isīkā', sword 'asi', snake 'ahi') and of the containers from which it is extracted (reed 'muñja', scabbard 'kosi', basket 'karaṇḍa'). In fact, the first pair, composed by reed and stalk, is expressed with the phrasing *muñjamhā isīkaṃ* "from the reed the stem [is extracted]", while the other two pairs are inverted: *asi kosiyā* "the sword [is extracted] from the sheath", *ahiṃ karaṇḍā* "the serpent [is removed] from the basket". In the first pair, the ablative is used first and is then followed by the accusative, while in the other two pairs the accusative is written first followed then by the ablative.

An explanation could be that the couple '*muñjamhā isīkaṃ*', with first the ablative and then the accusative, was drawn from a context common to that of *Kaṭhapaniṣad* 6.17,<sup>9</sup> in which the formulation *muñjādiveśikaṃ* (without sandhi '*muñjāt iva iśikaṃ*') occurs. In this passage, indeed, the ablative occurs first, and then the accusative. The formulation, in both texts, differs from the older one recorded in *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* 4.3.3.16,<sup>10</sup> which reports *yatheśikāṃ muñjād vivrhet*, a phrasing in which the accusative precedes the ablative. Although this inversion of cases may seem an insignificant detail, it should not be forgotten that these minor changes in the composition of the text may have implications which, at first sight, may seem irrelevant, but which, if carefully analysed, can provide new insights.<sup>11</sup> The impression is that in dealing with similes which have a flexible nature, these can then

**9** According to Olivelle 1998, 13, *Kaṭhapaniṣad* is the oldest Upaniṣad among a group of Upaniṣads (which consists of: *Īśā*, *Śvetāśvatara* e *Muṇḍaka*) that probably were created during the last centuries before the beginning of the Common Era.

**10** The same simile occurs in *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* 5.1.2.18.

**11** A similar example can be taken from the *Ariyapariyesanasutta* (The discourse of the noble research; M 26), in which the encounter of the Buddha-to-be (namely a Bodhisatta) with the two masters is reported: Ālāra Kāmāla and Uddaka Rāmaputta. In the two episodes the plot is more or less the same: the Bodhisatta goes first to one teacher then to the other to learn the doctrine. After having learned it well, the masters recognise that he has learned it completely and they offer him to stay and lead the group of disciples, but the Buddha-to-be finds these teachings unsatisfactory and distances himself from them. Doctrinally, the Bodhisatta, at first, finds the 'sphere of nothingness' (*akiñcaññāyatana*) taught by Ālāra Kāmāla unsatisfactory and, subsequently, the 'sphere of neither-perception-nor-no-perception' (*nevasaññānāsaññāyatana*) taught by Uddaka Rāmaputta suffered the same fate. The two episodes are narrated in a sequence and form which are identical; the only doctrinal difference concerns the spheres of meditative absorption. Obviously, the other necessary change is the name of the masters to whom the future Buddha goes. However, the report of the event presents details that have nothing to do with the doctrinal message, but are merely descriptive of the episode. In fact, Skilling noted: "the main difference is one of tense change: while in the account of the first meeting Ālāra Kālāma is spoken of in the present tense, in the account of the second meeting Uddaka Rāmaputta is spoken of in the present, but Rāma is spoken of in the aorist or past tense. This tense makes it clear that Uddaka Rāmaputta and Rāma are not one and the same person [...] but that Uddaka is the disciple, either the spiritual or real son (*putta*) of the deceased teacher Rāma" (1981-82, 99). The episode was used by Wynne (2005, 62-5) to show that the Buddhist tradition made a deliberate effort to remember that, when the episode was told, Ālāra Kālāma was alive, Rāma was dead and Rāmaputta had not yet realised the doctrine that he taught (but had been realised by Rāma, his father, in the past). This would seem to indicate that, in addition to the will to transmit a doctrinal message, there was also the effort to hand down a historical account.

be applied to various contexts.<sup>12</sup> These similes were part of a shared *milieu* and it is not to be excluded that in a given period they acquired a stereotyped form of expression that was, therefore, inserted verbatim within the Buddhist oral literature, giving rise to this singularity. In fact, what can be inferred from texts later than the *Sāmaññaphalasutta* is that this ablative and accusative inversion was not normality. An excellent example occurs within the *Visuddhimagga*. In this text (Vism 406), within a few of lines, the simile is mentioned twice. The second time it is cited, it appears as a quotation from the canon and, therefore, it is quoted word by word, maintaining the odd ablative/accusative inversion.<sup>13</sup> However, the first time the simile occurs, it is paraphrased by the commentator: *so taṃ muñjamhā ṛiṣikāṃ viya kosiyaṃ asiṃ viya, karaṇḍāya ahiṃ viya ca abbāhati* (Vism 406). It is worth noting that, in conditions of wider compositional freedom, an author of the calibre of Buddhaghosa, with an undisputed knowledge of the Pāli language, amended the exposition of the three similes by conforming the position of the ablative and accusative. Thus, if on the one hand the sensitivity of an expert connoisseur of the language seems, let us say, hurt by this inversion of cases, on the other hand the commentator shows a certain care in the re-use of the canonical material that is mentioned verbatim. An adjustment of the ablative and accusative position is also present in the Sanskrit version of the *Sāmaññaphalasutta* (*Śrāmaṇyaphalasūtra*) occurring within the *San̄ghabhedavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins. In this text, we can see how the simile is reported more regularly: *muñjād iṣikāṃ āvr̥hyāt [...]* *karaṇḍād ahiṃ āvr̥hyāt [...]* *koṣād asiṃ āvr̥hyāt*.<sup>14</sup> It should also be noted that in the Sanskrit version a single verb is used for all three of the similes to indicate the extraction (*contra* the Pāli version). However, when Sanskritised texts are compared with the equivalent Pāli texts, it is not always possible to systematically claim that the Sanskrit version is the wrong one (Norman 1997, 103).

The singularity of this ablative and accusative inversion found in the Pāli texts and the treatment it received from the *Visuddhimagga* reveals a certain fidelity in the transmission of the canonical text. How this singularity came into being can only be subject to conjecture. Assuming that this phrasing arose in the period of the oral transmission, the parallelism

**12** Part of this simile is also present in a Jain text: the *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*. The passage in which it occurs was translated by Jacobi: "Those who maintain that the soul is something different from the body, do not see the following (objections): [...] 'As a man draws a sword from the scabbard and shows it (you, saying): "Friend, this is the sword, and that is the scabbard," so nobody can draw (the soul from the body) and show it (you, saying): "Friend, this is the soul, and that is the body." As a man draws a fibre from a stalk of Muñja grass and shows it (you, saying): "Friend, this is the stalk, and that is the fibre;"' ([1895] 1964, 340). The simile is used in this case with another meaning. The use of this simile in different contexts is also discussed by Norman ([1976] 1991, 102).

**13** The passage is introduced by '*tena vuttam*', which often introduces a quotation from the root text (*mūla*) or from another canonical text (Kieffer-Pülz 2015a, 439-41).

**14** *tadyathā puruṣo muñjād iṣikāṃ āvr̥hyāt; taṃ cakṣuṣmān puruṣo dṛṣṭvā jānīyād <ayaṃ muñja iyaṃ iṣikā, muñjād iṣikāṃ āvr̥hatīti evam e>va\*sa tasmāt kāyāt mānasam̄ vyutthāpyānyam̄ kāyam̄ abhinirmimite rūpiṇam̄ manomayam̄ avikalam̄ ahinendriyam̄; tadyathā puruṣāḥ karaṇḍād ahiṃ āvr̥hyāt; taṃ cakṣuṣmān puruṣo dṛṣṭvā jānīyād ayaṃ karaṇḍaḥ ay<am̄ ahiḥ, karaṇḍād ahiṃ āvr̥hatīti; evam̄ eva sa> tasmāt kāyāt mānasam̄ vyutthāpyānyam̄ kāyam̄ abhinirmimite rūpiṇam̄ manomayam̄ avikalam̄ ahinendriyam̄; tadyathā puruṣāḥ koṣād asiṃ āvr̥hyāt; taṃ cakṣuṣmān puruṣo dṛṣṭvā jānīyād ayaṃ koṣo'yam̄ asiḥ koṣād asiṃ āvr̥ha<tīti; evam̄ eva sa tasmāt kāyāt māna>sam̄ vyutthāpyānyam̄ kāyam̄ abhinirmimite rūpiṇam̄ manomayam̄ avikalam̄ ahinendriyam̄ (SBhV II 246).*

with *Kāthopaniṣad* 6.17 could be relevant and the later adjustment would be due to a process of trivialisation. From this point of view, it might seem a classic case of *lectio difficilior potior*.<sup>15</sup> In fact, it makes more sense to assume that it was the tradition preserved in Sanskrit that adapted a version that presented difficulties, rather than assuming that the Pāli tradition affected an already linear and symmetrical exposition. Whether or not this hypothesis is true, the *Visuddhimagga* nevertheless demonstrates that once the Pāli version of the text reached a stable form, there was particular care in passing it down without amending it.

#### 4. The Odd Exposition of the *Niddesa*

The creation of a mind-made body appears within both *Mahā-* and *Cullā-niddesas*, in a passage which is almost identical in the two texts (Nidd I 340 and Nidd II 209). Now, I will take into account the *Mahāniddesa*'s version. The explanation provided by the *Niddesa*, in which a mind-made body appears, regards the first word of Sn 915. Since the verse starts with *pucchāmi taṃ Ādiccabandhuṃ* [...], the *Mahāniddesa* begins its explanation by illustrating various kinds of questions (*pucchā*), introducing them three at a time. The body made of mind appears within the question regarding the query of the creation (*nimmita*):

What is the question from a creation? The Blessed one creates a form which is mind-made, with all limbs and [bodily] parts, without defect of any faculties. This creation, having approached the Buddha who is the Blessed one, asks a question. The Blessed one answers to it. This is the question from a creation.<sup>16</sup>

What is unusual in this account is the behaviour of the mind-made body creation. We do not really know what the function of the mind-made body is and the method to attain it is not explained in the early canonical texts, only in later texts.<sup>17</sup> What is surprising is that the *Niddesa* seems to describe a mind-made body which becomes independent from its creator, and so it is able to ask questions to the creator. In this report, creation and creator appear as two independent entities which could have a sort of dialogue. The most widespread relationship between creation and creator, according to what is possible to extrapolate from the other Pāli texts, is exactly the opposite. The creation seems to be dependent on the creator, mirroring his actions. This is evident, for instance, within the *Paṭisambhidāmagga*

<sup>15</sup> This principle of textual criticism has often been used by Gombrich (e.g. 1990, 8-9; [1996] 2006, 11-12; 2009, 217, endnote 27).

<sup>16</sup> *katamā nimmitapucchā? yaṃ bhagavā rūpaṃ abhinimmināti manomayaṃ sabbaṅgapaccaṅgaṃ ahīndriyaṃ, so nimmito buddhaṃ bhagavantaṃ upasaṅkamitvā pañhaṃ pucchati, bhagavā tassa visajjēti; ayaṃ nimmitapucchā* (Nidd I 340). On the creation (*nimmita*) in the *Niddesa*, see Skilling 2020, 724-5.

<sup>17</sup> This fate is shared with the psychophysical powers (*iddhividhā*) and the higher knowledges (*abhīññā*). Clough ([2010] 2011, 418; 2012, 78-9) notes that only the later manuals provide some information concerning the techniques that should be used to attain these abilities. In particular, the technique to create a mind-made body is reported in the *\*Vimuttimaggā* (from T1648.32.0442c22 to T1648.32.0443a04) and *Vism* 406 (see §§ 6.4.4 and 6.4.5); see also Clough (2012, 83).

where an explanation concerning a passage which states the possibility to go as far as the Brahmā world wielding bodily mastery can be found (*yāva Brahmālokā pi kāyena vasaṃ vatteti*; Paṭis II 209). The last part of this explanation concerns the possibility of going to the Brahmā world with an invisible body, after having changed the body in accordance with the mind.<sup>18</sup> Therefore, it is stated that:

He creates, in front of Brahmā, a physical form which is made of mind, with all limbs and [bodily] parts, without defect of any faculties. If the possessor of the psychic power walks up and down, then the creation as well walks up and down; if the possessor of the psychic power stands, then the creation as well stands; if the possessor of the psychic power sits, then the creation as well sits; if the possessor of the psychic power lies down on the bed, then the creation as well lies down on the bed; if the possessor of the psychic power emits smoke, then the creation as well emits smoke; if the possessor of the psychic power flames, then the creation as well flames; if the possessor of the psychic power expounds the Doctrine, then the creation as well expounds the Doctrine; if the possessor of the psychic power asks a question, then the creation as well asks a question; if the possessor of the psychic power answers to the asked question, then the creation as well answers to the asked question; if the possessor of the psychic power stands in front of Brahmā, talks with him, enters into a conversation with him, then the creation as well stands in front of Brahmā, talks with him, enters into a conversation with him; therefore, whatever the possessor of the psychic power does, verily, the creation does the same.<sup>19</sup>

This account reflects the mainstream attitude concerning the relationship between the creator and mind-made creation in the Pāli texts. The *Niddesa* shows a mind-made body's behaviour, which is unexpected if compared with this latter passage. In order to shed light on the odd account, it is useful to note *where* it appears and *what* it regards.

First of all, starting with the location of the account, it is possible to observe that it appears in a canonical text which is, however, a commentary. Although the *Niddesa* was included in the canon, and so at a certain point it did not receive any more changes, it is possible to suppose that, as a commentarial text, it suffered from a sloppier transmission and was more open to interpolations. The later Pāli commentarial texts, written from Buddhaghosa onwards, show that the commentarial literature was used to include stories which were not regarded as canonical within the Pāli

**18** *cittavasena kāyaṃ pariṇāmetvā cittavasena kāyaṃ adhiṭṭhahitvā sukhasaññaṃ ca lahasaññaṃ ca okkamitvā adissamānena kāyena Brahmālokaṃ gacchati* (Paṭis II 209).

**19** *so tassa Brahmuno purato rūpaṃ abhinimmināti manomayaṃ sabbaṅgapaccāṅgaṃ ahinindriyaṃ. sace so iddhiṃ caṅkamati, nimmito pi tattha caṅkamati; sace so iddhiṃ tiṭṭhati, nimmito pi tattha tiṭṭhati; sace so iddhiṃ nisīdati, nimmito pi tattha nisīdati; sace so iddhiṃ seyyaṃ kappeti, nimmito pi tattha seyyaṃ kappeti; sace so iddhiṃ dhūpāyati, nimmito pi tattha dhūpāyati; sace so iddhiṃ pajjalati, nimmito pi tattha pajjalati; sace so iddhiṃ dhammaṃ bhāsati, nimmito pi tattha dhammaṃ bhāsati; sace so iddhiṃ pañhaṃ pucchati, nimmito pi tattha pañhaṃ pucchati; sace so iddhiṃ pañhaṃ puṭṭho vissajjeti, nimmito pi tattha pañhaṃ puṭṭho vissajjeti; sace so iddhiṃ tena Brahmunā saddhiṃ santiṭṭhati sallapati sākacchaṃ samāpajjati, nimmito pi ti tattha tena Brahmunā saddhiṃ santiṭṭhati sallapati sākacchaṃ samāpajjati; yaṃ nāda eva so iddhiṃ karoti, tan tad eva hi so nimmito karoti ti* (Paṭis II 209-10, quoted also in *Vism* 402).

canon (and so they were omitted), but were considered canonical in other traditions.<sup>20</sup> Therefore, the commentarial literature could have been a useful tool to include in the Pāli literature texts and ideas that, at first, were not considered orthodox.

Secondly, it is also important to consider that the *Niddesa*'s passage concerns a concept, namely 'the body made of mind',<sup>21</sup> which has not one single interpretation. The concept of *manomaya*, for instance, is also connected with the concept of 'intermediate existence' (*antarābhava*) in some Buddhist traditions.<sup>22</sup> However, as Lee (2014, 70-1) pointed out, the *antarābhava* does not appear within the Pāli canon as an individual topic. Since there could be other employments of the concept of 'mind-made body', it might be possible that the *Niddesa*'s account reports a trace of an ancient interpretation of this concept which was rejected by the mainstream Theravāda tradition (represented by the Pāli canon), and so it only found place within a commentarial text (in this case an ancient one, but still a commentary).

An account similar to the one reported in the *Niddesa* is found in another commentary, the *Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā*.<sup>23</sup> In this account, the Buddha, after having performed the twin miracle (*yamaka-pāṭihāriya*; alternative form: *yamaka-pāṭihīra*), having seen that there is no one able to ask another question, creates a copy of himself (*nimmitabuddha*) and engages in a dialogue with this creation (*nimmita*):

Since the Teacher, with the mind [focused] on the assembly, did not see anyone capable to ask another question, he created a Buddha's replica; the replica asked a question and the Teacher answered. In the time of walking up and down of the Blessed one, the replica performs another [action] such as standing etc. In the time of walking up and down of the replica, the Blessed one performs another [action] such as standing etc.<sup>24</sup>

In spite of the fact that the word *manomaya* does not appear in this account, it is undeniable that the account follows the same pattern of the *Niddesa*. Therefore, both passages involve the Buddha, who creates a new entity (*nimmita*) which is able to ask questions to the Buddha himself, and the

<sup>20</sup> See Norman 1997, 140.

<sup>21</sup> It does not appear within the *Niddesa* the term *kāya* (body) but in its place is the term *rūpa* (form). However, it is not unusual that the term *rūpa* might have the meaning of 'body' (as, for instance, within the compound *nāma-rūpa*). Moreover, the wording of the passage (*yaṃ bhagavā rūpaṃ abhinimmināti manomayaṃ sabbaṅgapaccaṅgaṃ ahīndriyaṃ*; Nidd I 340) follows the standard formulation which explains the creation of the body made of mind (*so imamhā kāyā aññaṃ kāyaṃ abhinimmināti rūpiṃ manomayaṃ sabbaṅga-paccaṅgiṃ ahīndriyaṃ*; D I 77). Finally, if it were not a body, there would be no need to state that it is with all limbs and [bodily] parts (*sabbaṅgapaccaṅga*), without defect of any faculty (*ahīndriya*).

<sup>22</sup> This connection appears, for example, within the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* written by Vasubandhu: "mind-made, desiring to come in existence, Gandharva, intermediate existence and coming into being; thus *antarābhava* is uttered with these expressions by the Blessed one" (*manomayaḥ sambhavaḥi gandharvaś cāntarābhavaḥ | nirvṛttis ca antarābhavo hy ebhir abhidhānair ukto bhagavatā*; Abhidh-k-bh 153).

<sup>23</sup> In this regard, see Fiordalis [2010] 2011, 401-2.

<sup>24</sup> *Satthā pana tasmīṃ samāgame attano manaṃ gahetvā aññaṃ pañhaṃ pucchitum samatthaṃ adisvā nimmitabuddhaṃ māpesi, tena pucchitaṃ pañhaṃ Satthā vissajjesi. Bhagavato caṅkamanakāle nimmito ṭhānādisu aññataraṃ kappesi, nimmitassa caṅkamanakāle Bhagavā ṭhānādisu aññataraṃ kappesi* (Dhp-a III 216).

Buddha answers these questions. Another characteristic of this creation is that it behaves differently from the Buddha: when the Buddha walks, for instance, the creation remains seated. A similar passage in which a creation (*nimmita*) acts differently from the Buddha is present in Paṭis I 126 in a section concerning the exposition of the twin miracle (*yamaka-pāṭihīra*). Therefore, the creation of a Buddha's replica seems a very important event in the narration of the twin miracle, so much so that some authors argued that the name 'twin miracle' is not due to the double appearance of fire and water, but is due to the ability of the Buddha to create a double of himself.<sup>25</sup> This replica created by the Buddha acts differently from the one created by the monk, according to the interpretation found in Paṭis II 209-10 on the exposition of the *iddhividhā* present within the *Dīghanikāya*.

It would certainly be interesting to search more systematically in the future, within texts of other Buddhist traditions, if there is another mental creation that can acquire independence from its creator, acting as a separate entity.<sup>26</sup> In Theravāda tradition, it seems that only a creation made by a Buddha can be independent from its creator. In this regard, there is an interesting passage in the *Visuddhimagga* that clearly highlights the particular status of a Buddha's creation: "the creation of a Buddha does whatever the Blessed one does, and it does other [things] according to the Blessed one wishes".<sup>27</sup>

## 5. Translation of *Saddhammappakāsinī* II 656-63

[656] [The author of the commented text] says in the beginning: '**What is the power of resolution? (*katamā adhiṭṭhāna iddhi?*)**'. In this context, the meaning of the words indicated was explained only with reference to the analytic interpretation of the knowledge of the variety of psychophysical powers. '**Here the monk (*idha bhikkhu*)**', the monk with reference to this teaching. By all means, it [i.e. the text] illustrates the non-existence of the performer of the variety of psychophysical powers elsewhere [i.e. in another context]. The explanation (*niddesa*) of these two words is the meaning (*attha*) explained above. And, therefore, [657] he is endowed with factors consisting of grounds, bases, steps, and roots of the psychic power, and within the *Visuddhimagga* (374-ff.), both the state of having a mind completely tamed (*paridamitacittatā*) through fourteen or fifteen methods, and the state of having a mind which has become malleable and workable (*mudukammaññakatacittatā*) by means of passing through the predominant [elements] one by one starting with the impulse (*chanda*), etc., and through the state of mastering, starting with the adverting (*āvajjana*), etc. are explained. The monk who is endowed with factors beginning with grounds, etc., is also defined in this way: "one who is perfected in previous

<sup>25</sup> This theory is sustained, for instance, by Foucher (1917, 156-7) and more recently by Strong ([2004] 2007, 177).

<sup>26</sup> Guang 2009, 402, for instance, reports an account taken from a Chinese translation of the *\*Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā* in which a Buddha has created another Buddha who lived his life independently. Furthermore, a good deal of references concerning 'creations' among various Buddhist traditions and sources have been provided by Skilling (2020).

<sup>27</sup> *Buddhanimmito pana yaṃ yaṃ Bhagavā karoti, taṃ tam pi karoti, Bhagavato rucivasena aññam pi karoti* (*Vism* 405).

lives (*pubbayoga*)<sup>28</sup> and powerful, who has a virtue starting with the higher knowledges obtained only through the attainment of the state of *arahant* which is a fortune due to the previous lives”.

“**He adverts to multiplicity (*balulaṃ āvajjati*)**”, having attained the fourth *jhāna* that is the foundation of the higher knowledges and has the earth *kaṣiṇa* as object, emerged [from it], if he desires [to be] hundred, he adverts through making the preparatory work “Let me be hundred, let me be hundred!”. “**Having adverted, he resolves with the knowledge (*āvajjitvā ñāṇena adhiṭṭhāti*)**” having done the preparatory work in this way, he resolves with the knowledge of the higher knowledges. Here, having done the preparatory work, the attainment of the *jhāna* which serves as foundation is not stated another time. Although it is not stated [in the *Paṭisambhidāmagga*], [it is stated] in the commentary (*aṭṭhakathā*):

Then, in this context as well ‘*āvajjati*’ is said precisely on account of the preparatory work (*parikamma*). ‘*āvajjitvā ñāṇena adhiṭṭhāti*’ is said on account of the knowledge of the higher knowledges, that is why he adverts to the multiplicity. Then, he also attains [the *jhāna*] at the end of these *parikammacittas*. Having emerged from the attainment (*samāpatti*), having adverted again to “Let me be many”, after this, he resolves with only one higher knowledge (*abhiññāṇā*), which comes to be called ‘*adhiṭṭhāna*’, on account of the fact that it brings [the process] to completion (*sanniṭṭhāpanavasena*), which arises between the three or four preceding consciousnesses (*pubbabhāgacitta*) that occurred. Here, the meaning should be understood in this way. (Vism 387)<sup>29</sup>

As when it is said “Having eaten, he lies down (*bhujjivā sayati*)”,<sup>30</sup> the meaning is not that “Having not drunk the beverage, having not washed the hands, he lies down immediately after eating”, but what is said is that “Although there are other closely following activities in the interval [between the two actions], he lies down after having eaten”. Here also it should be understood in this way. For although the first is the attainment of the *jhāna* which serves as foundation, this was not stated in the text (*pāli*). Therefore, he becomes a hundred only together with the knowledge of the resolution (*adhiṭṭhānaṇā*). This is also the method with reference to a thousand etc. (cf. Vism 387)

If he does not succeed (*ijjhati*) in this way, having done again the preparatory work (*parikamma*), having attained also for the second time [the *jhāna* that is the foundation of the higher knowledges], emerged, he should resolve a second time. Therefore, it is stated within the *Samyuttaṭṭhakathā*: “He continues to attain [the *jhāna*] once, twice”. In this context, the consciousness of the *jhāna* which serves as foundation (*pāḍakajjhānacitta*) has the sign (*nimitta*) as the object. But

28 See *pūrvayoga-saṃpanna* within the s.v. “pūrvayoga” in BHS.

29 It is interesting that the *Saddhammappakāsinī* attributes to a commentary (*aṭṭhakathā*) a quotation from the *Visuddhimagga*. There are probably two possible explanations: 1) the term ‘*aṭṭhakathā*’ is commonly used within the *Saddhammappakāsinī* to indicate the *Visuddhimagga*; 2) the quotation was taken from an ancient source used by both Buddhaghosa (to write the *Visuddhimagga*) and Mahānāma (to write the *Saddhammappakāsinī*).

30 Undetected quotation.

the consciousnesses of the preparatory work (*parikammacitta*) have hundred as objects or thousand as objects in this way. And these are with reference to the appearance, not to the concept. Also the *adhiṭṭhānacitta*, likewise, has hundred as object or thousand as object in this way. This [the *adhiṭṭhānacitta*],<sup>31</sup> is like *appanācitta*, which immediately follows the *gotrabhū* which arises once only, as stated previously, and belongs to the fourth *jhāna* in the sphere of the pure form (*rūpāvacaracatutthajjhānika*). (Vism 387)

**‘Just as the venerable Cūlapanthaka having been one, he becomes many (yath’ āyasmā Cūlapanthako eko ‘pi hutvā bahudhā hoti)’** was said in order to point out a physical witness of this state of multiplicity (cf. Vism 387). But, here, the present tense (*vattamānavacana*) is used because of the nature of doing it in the way of the Elder, and because it was the time in which he was alive. [658] Thus, it should be understood. Also on the occasion [of the phrasing:] **‘he becomes one (eko hoti)’**, this is indeed the method. Then, this is the plot (*vatthu*):

**[Beginning of the story]**

There were two Elders who were said to be brothers and received the name ‘Panthaka’ since they were born on the street (*pantha*). The eldest among them, Mahāpanthaka, became a monk and reached the state of *arahant* together with the [four] discriminations (*paṭisambhidā*).<sup>32</sup> After having become an *arahant*, he made Cūlapanthaka become a monk. He gave him this stanza:

Just as the [red] redolent Lotus Kokanada  
would blossom in the morning not without its fragrance,  
see He who emits rays from all members (Āṅgīrasa)<sup>33</sup> while shines,  
like the sun blazing in the atmosphere.

He was not able to learn it in four months. Then, the Elder said: “You are incapable regarding this teaching, go away from here!”. At this time, the Elder was the food assigner. Jīvaka Komārabhacca, having taken a perfumed ointment and a garland, went by himself to the Mango Grove (*ambavana*), revered the Teacher, listened to the Doctrine (*Dhamma*), paid homage to the One endowed with ten powers (*Dasabala*), approached the Elder and said: “O Sir, tomorrow, after having taken five hundred monks headed by the Buddha, take alms in our house!”. Yet, the Elder answered: “With exception of Cūlapanthaka, I consent to the remaining ones”. Having heard thus, Cūlapanthaka became even more dejected. The morning of the following day he went away from the monastery, remained at the gateway of the monastery despairing because of his affection to the teaching. The Blessed one, having seen his qualification for the spiritual attainments (*upanissaya*), approached him and asked: “Why are you despairing?”. He told him what had happened. The Blessed one, touching his head with the hand which has a palm marked by the [characteristic mark of the] wheel, [said]: “O Panthaka,

<sup>31</sup> Since this is a quotation from the *Visuddhimagga*, I followed its *ṭīkā*: see *taṃ adhiṭṭhānacittam* (Vism-mhṭ II 21).

<sup>32</sup> It is worth noting that the commentary is commenting on the *Paṭisambhidāmagga*.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. *sabbe aṅgato rasmīnaṃ nikkhantattā aṅgīrasā* (Sv III 963).

do not despair! One who is not able to learn by heart my teaching is not called ‘incapable’”. He takes him by the arm, enters in the monastery, and makes him sit in front of the perfumed room (*gandhakuṭī*). When a clean bit of rag was created through the psychic power (*iddhi*), he said: “O Panthaka, sit down wiping this rag with the hand [saying]: ‘Removing dirt, removing dirt’”. He gave him a bit of rag and when the time [for the dinner] was announced, he went, surrounded by the group of monks, to the house of Jīvaka and sat down on the designed seat. Wiping in this way, his bit of rag became stained and gradually became dark. He got this perception: “This is a cleaned bit of rag, there is not fault (*dosa*) here, but there is fault leaning on the selfhood (*attabhāva*)”. He made the knowledge descending on the five aggregates and cultivated insight (*vipassanā*). Then, the Blessed one emitted splendour, and the form became visible just as he was seated in front [of him, i.e. Cūlapanthaka], thereafter he uttered these enlightening stanzas:

**[659]** Passion (*rāga*) is dirt (*rajas*), which is not called dust (*reṇu*),  
this ‘dirt’ is a synonym for ‘passion’.

The monks having abandoned this dirt,  
dwell in the teaching of the one who is without dirt  
Hatred (*dosa*)...

Delusion (*moha*)...

For he who has a superior intellect, who is zealous,  
for the sage, the one who trains in the paths of the sages,  
there are no sorrows, such as for him

who is pacified and always mindful. (Vism 388, except the last four verses)

When the stanzas were concluded, the Elder attained the state of *arahant* together with the [four] discriminations (*paṭisambhidā*). He became one who has attained *manomaya* [*kāya*] and *jhānas* (*manomaya-jhāna-lābhin*), he became able to become many after having been one, and one after having been many. Only through the *arahant* path he came to know the three baskets and the six higher knowledges (*abhiññā*). Although Jīvaka offered consecrated water to the One who is endowed with ten powers (*Dasabala*), the Teacher covered the bowl with his hand. “Why Lord?” Jīvaka asked. He answered: “O Jīvaka, there is a monk in the monastery”. Then, the man ordered: “Go! Having taken the Noble, come back quickly!”. The Elder Cūlapanthaka, just because of the arrival of this man, since he had the desire to make known his extraordinary state of the attainment to the brother, created a thousand monks, each one different to the other and for each one he made a difference through a different ascetic occupation and a different arrangement of robes, etc.<sup>34</sup> The man went, he saw many monks in the monastery and when he came back reported: “O Lord, there were many monks in the monastery, I did not see the Noble that should be summoned”.

Jīvaka questioned the Teacher. [Jīvaka] having told him [i.e. to the monk] the name [of Cūlapanthaka] sent him forth again. He went [to the monastery] and asked [to the monks]: “O lords, which one is called Cūlapanthaka?” At once, a thousand mouths replied: “I am Cūlapanthaka, I am Cūlapanthaka”. He went [back] again and said: “Since I heard everybody saying [to be] Cūlapanthaka, I do not know which one I should summon”. As Jīvaka penetrated the truth, he

**34** Here, I followed Be: *cīvaravicāraṇādisāmanakammaṃ*.

knew in this way: “The monk is one who possesses psychic power”. Then, the Blessed one said: “Go and after having taken the edge of the garment of the first one that you see, bring back him saying that the Teacher invites him”. He went and did in this way. Instantly, all creations disappeared. He let him go, he performed the bodily needs such as washing the face, etc., he went as soon as possible and sat down on the designed seat (cf. Vism 389). At that moment, the Teacher took the offered water, made his meal, made the Elder Cūlapanthaka tell a discourse about the Doctrine (*Dhamma*) which blesses the meal. [660] The Elder told a discourse about the Doctrine, whose duration is either that of a long or an intermediate text (*Dīgha-Majjhimāgamappamāṇa*).

### **[End of the story]**

Other monks, having created a body made of mind (*manomaya*) through the resolution (*adhiṭṭhāna*), create three or four [mind-made bodies]. Having made only many identical ones, they create [creations that] perform only one type of action. But the Elder Cūlapanthaka, turning [the mind] (*āvajjana*) only once, created a thousand of monks. He did not make any two people identical and they did not perform only one type of action. For this reason, he has become the foremost among the monks who create a body made of mind (cf. A I 24).

But many other creations, having not been defined, are identical to the possessor of psychic powers. Standing and sitting down, etc., speaking and in silence, etc. Whatever the possessor of psychic powers does, [the creations] do the same. But if he desires to create different forms (*nānāvaṇṇa*), some in the young age, some in the middle, some in the old age, some with long hairs, some half shaved, some shaved, some with mixed hairs (perhaps half grey; *missakakesa*), some with a half red robe, some with a yellow robe, or if he is one who wants [them] to perform manifold [actions] such as preaching the words [of the scriptures], expounding the Doctrine, intoning, asking questions, answering questions, boiling the dye, sewing and washing the robe, then having emerged from the *jhāna* that is the foundation, having done the preparatory work in this way “Let all these monks be in the young age”, having attained again [the *jhāna*], emerged from it, he should resolve. The strongly desired kinds [of creations and actions] occur only together with the *adhiṭṭhānacitta*.

This is the method concerning ‘**having been many, he becomes one** (*bahudhā ‘pi hutvā eko hoti*)’. But this is the difference: ‘**naturally many** (*pakatiyā bahuko*)’ [means that] there are many [replicas] naturally created within the time of the creation. And having created the condition of abundance for this monk he thought: “Having been again one, I will walk up and down, I will study, I will ask a question”, or meanwhile, because of the moderation of desires, [he might think]: “This monastery has few monks, if some [people] would arrive [would ask] whence all these many identical monks are from. They will think of me: ‘Certainly, this is the luminous power of the Elder!’”. He attained the *jhāna* that is the foundation wishing “Let me be one” and emerged from it, having done again the preparatory work “Let me be one”, he attained and emerged [from the *jhāna*] and should resolve “Let me be one”. He becomes one only together with the *adhiṭṭhānacitta*. But when one does not do it in this way, he becomes one by himself because the time [of the creations] has been limited [in advance]. (Vism 389-90)

Selecting [first] the word ‘**manifested (āvibhāvaṃ)**’, the meaning is defined as the state of evidence of the word ‘āvibhāvaṃ’ through the phrase ‘*kenaci anāvaṭa*’ because of being defined ‘it is not veiled by something (*kenaci anāvaṭaṃ hoti*)’. The remaining part of the reading conveys ‘*karoti*’ through the word ‘*hoti*’. Being evident is, indeed, when the manifestation is made (*āvibhāve kate*). ‘**It is not veiled by something (kenaci anāvaṭaṃ)**’, it is not veiled by something such as a wall, etc., it is without obstacles. ‘**Not covered (appaṭicchannaṃ)**’, it is not covered on the top. This is **exposed (vivaṭaṃ)** because of the state of not being veiled (*anāvaṭattā*),<sup>35</sup> is **evident (pākaṭaṃ)** because of the state of not being covered (*appaṭicchannaṃ*).

[661] ‘**Concealed (tirobhāvaṃ)**’, he becomes encased (*antarika*). It is **hidden (pihitāṃ)** since it is veiled by an obstacle. It is **enclosed (paṭikujjitaṃ)** since it is **covered (paṭicchannaṃ)** by a covering (*paṭicchādāna*).

‘**Through the attainment of the space *kaṣiṇa* (ākāsakaṣiṇasamāpattiyā)**’ through the attainment of the fourth *jhāna*, which is produced with the restriction of the space *kaṣiṇa*. **An attainer (lābhin)** is an attainer since he has the attainment (*lābho assa atthi*). ‘**Where there is not enclosure (aparikkhitte)**’, in a region without enclosure everywhere for anyone. Here, given that only the space *kaṣiṇa* was mentioned, the *jhāna* is developed only in this way; the space *kaṣiṇa* is the foundation, not another [*kaṣiṇa*]. This should be regarded in this way. Later (*upari*), only the *jhāna* that has an object such as the water *kaṣiṇa*, etc. should be regarded; not another one. He adverts to the earth, water... space... adverts to the natural form of the earth, water, and space. ‘**In the atmosphere (antaḷikkhe)**’ illustrates the state of the empty space that is distant (*dūrākāśabhāva*), from the earth to the sky (*ākāsa*). Having not established a limitation to a [particular] *kaṣiṇa* regarding the stroking of the moon and sun, and because it is stated without a peculiar distinction that ‘**the possessor of psychic powers who has attained mastery over the mind (iddhimā cetovasippatto)**’, there is not, here, limitation on the attainment of [a meditative absorption caused by a specific] *kaṣiṇa*. This should be known in this way.

‘**Sitting or lying down (nisinnako vā nipannaṃ vā)**’, with these [terms] ‘seated, laid down’, indeed, two postures (*iriyāpatha*) are expressed, and also the others. ‘**Let it be at hand (hatthapāse hotu)**’, let it be close to the hand (*hatthasamāpe hotu*) (‘Let it be on the hand side’ is another reading). This is said on account of the one who desires to perform in this way. He, having gone in that place, raises the hand, touches. ‘**He touches (āmasati)**’ [means] he slightly (*īsakaṃ*) touches (*phusati*). ‘**He touches (parāmasati)**’ [means] he strongly (*bālhaṃ*) touches (*phusati*). ‘**He strokes (parimajjati)**’ [means] he touches (*phusati*) everywhere (*samantato*). ‘**Material object (rūpagata)**’ is only the object that stays within hand’s reach.

‘**Although far, he resolves on closeness (dūre pi santike adhiṭṭhāti)**’, having emerged from the *jhāna* that is the foundation, he adverts to the world of the gods (*devaloka*) or to the world of Brahmā (*brahmaloka*) [and he resolves:] ‘**Let it be close! (santike hotu)**’. Having adverted, made the preparatory work, attained again [the *jhāna*], emerged, he resolves with the

35 I followed Be *tadeva anāvaṭattā vivaṭaṃ*, whereas Ee has *tad eva āvaṭattā vivaṭaṃ*.

knowledge “Let it be close!” and **it becomes close (*santike hoti*)**. This is also the method for the other passages.

But, having explained the transformation of the distance into vicinity with regard to the one who desires to go to the world of Brahmā (*brahmaloka*), although it is not helpful for the journey to the world of Brahmā, he said **“although close (*santike pi*)”**, showing the extraordinary state of succeeding (*ijjhamāna*) through this psychic power. In this context, there is not only the performance [of becoming] many or [becoming] few, but also whatever he desires – such as “Let what is not sweet become sweet”<sup>36</sup> – all these [desires] are successful for the possessor of psychic powers.

Another interpretation: **‘Although far, he resolves on closeness (*dūre pi santike adhiṭṭhāti*)’**, when there is the far world of Brahmā, he resolves on closeness of the human world. **“Although close, he resolves on farness (*santike pi dūre adhiṭṭhāti*)”**, when there is the close human world, he resolves on the farness of the world of Brahmā.

**‘Although many he resolves on the paucity (*bahukam pi thokam adhiṭṭhāti*)’**, if many brāhmaṇas come together, due to the great egotism, they lose [their good] visual and hearing conducts. Having withdrawn in the same place visual and hearing conducts, although many, he resolves on the paucity. **‘Although few he resolves on the abundance (*thokam pi bahukan ti adhiṭṭhāti*)’**, if [662] he desires to go with a great retinue, being few due to the loneliness, having resolved on many themselves, he goes having a great retinue. Here, the meaning should be understood in this way. When it is so fourfold, there is benefit concerning the journey to the world of Brahmā.

**‘He sees this physical form of Brahmā with the divine eye (*dibbena cakkhunā tassa Brahmuno rūpaṃ passati*)’**; remaining here, after having extended the light, he who desires to see the physical form of Brahmā, sees the physical form of Brahmā with the divine eye. Therefore, remaining precisely here, **he hears the sound of Brahmā** who is speaking **with the divine element of ear, he knows the mind of Brahmā with the knowledge by comprehension of the minds [of others] (*dibbāya sotadhātuyā brahmuno bhāsamānassa saddaṃ suṇāti, cetopariyaññena tassa brahmuno cittaṃ pajānāti*)**. **‘Visible (*dissamānena*)’** [means that it] is seen by the eye. **‘He changes the mind according to the body (*kāyavasena cittaṃ pariṇāmeti*)’**; he changes the mind according to the physical body. With the *pāḍakajjhānacitta* ‘he changes the mind according to the physical body’ he puts it on the body. [When] light perception belongs to the body, the journey is slow; the journey through a [physical] body is, indeed, slow. **‘He fixes (*adhiṭṭhāti*)’** this is a synonym of it [i.e. *pariṇāmeti*], the meaning is ‘he puts together (*sanniṭṭhāpeti*)’. **‘Having reached perceptions of pleasure and lightness (*sukhasañña ca lahusañña ca okkamitvā*)’**, having reached, entered into, experienced, attained perceptions of pleasure and lightness concomitant with the *iddhicitta* which has the support of the *jhāna* that is the foundation (*pāḍakajjhānārammaṇa*). The perception of happiness (*sukhasañña*) is called the perception associated with the equanimity (*upekkhāsampayuttasañña*). Therefore, equanimity is defined as the peaceful (*santa*) happiness. The perception (*sañña*) should also be understood as light (*lahu*) because it is freed from oppositions such as

36 I followed Be: *amadhuraṃ madhuraṃ ti ādīsu pi*.

the initial application of the thought (*vitakka*), etc., and the five obstacles (*nīvaraṇa*). The body of one who reaches [these perceptions] becomes light just as a cotton wool. He is like a cotton wool thrown by the wind and, lightly, **he goes to the world of Brahmā with a visible body (*dissamānena kāyena Brahmaloḥam gacchati*)**. And, when he is going, if he desires, after having created a road into the space through the power of the earth *kaṣiṇa*, he goes on foot. If he desires, having created a lotus in the space for each foot through the power of the earth *kaṣiṇa*, he goes on foot lying the foot on the various lotuses. If he desires, having resolved upon the wind through the power of the wind *kaṣiṇa*, he goes through the wind just as a cotton wool. Moreover, here, only the desire to go is the limit (*pamāṇa*). Therefore, when there is the desire to go in this way, one who has made the mental resolution goes visible as thrown by the force of resolution just as an arrow thrown by the force of a bow.

**'He changes the body according to the mind (*cittavasena kāyam pariṇāmeti*)'**, having taken the physical body, he put it on the *pāḍakajjhānacitta*, it follows the mind and the journey is quick; indeed, the mind's movement is quick. **'Having reached perceptions of pleasure and lightness (*sukhasaññaṇ ca lahusaññaṇ ca okkamitvā*)'** [he reached perceptions of] pleasure and lightness concomitant with the *iddhicitta* which has the support of the physical body (*rūpakāyārammaṇa*). The remaining part should be understood in the way already explained. But there is only the mental journey (*cittagamana*). When it was asked: "When he is going in this way, with an invisible body (*adissamānena kāyena*), does he go at the arising moment of his *adhiṭṭhānacitta*? Or [does he go] in the moment of stability or in the moment of dissolution?" An Elder answered: "He goes in all three moments". [It has been asked:] "But does he go by himself or he send a creation?" [663] He does as he likes. But here, only the journey made by himself is handed down.

**'Mind-made (*manomayam*)'**, it is mind-made because it is created by the mind in resolution (*adhiṭṭhānamana*). **'Has all limbs and [bodily] parts (*sabbaṅgapaccaṅgam*)'**, it is endowed with all limbs and [bodily] parts (*sabba-āṅgapaccaṅgavant*). **'Without defect of any faculty (*ahinindriyam*)'** this is said due to the configuration of the eyes, ears, etc., but there is not sensitivity concerning the created form. **'If the possessor of psychic powers walks up and down, the creation as well walks up and down (*sace so iddhimā caṅkamati, nimmito 'pi tattha caṅkamati*)'** is said with reference to the creation of the disciple(s). But the creation of the Buddha does whatever the Blessed one does, and also does something else according to the thought of the Blessed one.

**'He emits smoke... he flames (*dhumāyati... pajjalati*)'** through the power of the fire *kaṣiṇa*. The three [situations] starting from **'he preaches the Doctrine (*dhammaṅ bhāsati*)'** [occurred when there was something] not explained in detail. **'He stands (*santiṭṭhati*)'**; having met up, he stands (*saṅgamma tiṭṭhati*). **'He talks (*sallapati*)'**; having met up, he talks (*saṅgamma lapati*). **'He enters into a conversation (*sākaccham samāpajjati*)'**; he makes a conversation on account of giving answers and rejoinders each other. And in this case, only the possessor of psychic powers that stays here sees the physical form with the divine eye, hears the sound with the divine element of ear, knows the mind with the knowledge by comprehension of the minds [of others], and also, he who stays here, remains together with that Brahmā, talks to him, enters into a conversation

with him, he also has the resolution such as “Although far, he resolves on closeness, etc.”, and although he goes to the world of Brahmā with a visible or an invisible body; so far he has not yet exercised the bodily power. When he undergoes the explained variety [of powers] through the method “He creates, in front of Brahmā, a physical form etc.”, at this point he exercises the bodily power. The remaining part has been said in order to show the part before the exercising of the bodily power. **This (ayaṃ)** much is the **success of resolution (adhiṭṭhānā iddhi)**.

