

# On the Six Sense-spheres (2) — A Translation of *Samyukta-āgama* Discourses 230 to 249\*

Bhikkhu Anālayo

Professor, Numata Center for Buddhist Studies

University of Hamburg, Germany

## Introduction

In this article I translate the first half of the ninth fascicle of the *Samyukta-āgama*, which contains discourses 230 to 249.<sup>1</sup>

---

\* 2018/8/25 收稿，2018/12/1 通過審稿。

<sup>1</sup> After an interruption due to needing to attend to other work, with this article I continue my translation of fascicles of the *Samyukta-āgama*, published from 2012 to 2016. In what follows, I depart from the approach adopted in those previous instalments by taking up only half of a fascicle at a time. I also no longer supplement a title for each discourse. Titles can be reconstructed for the first five fascicles, as *uddānas* are preserved. But for the remainder of the *Samyukta-āgama* there is really no proper basis for giving a title. I also no longer quote all relevant Sanskrit fragment parallels in full, but only provide a full quote when this seems to me to be of relevance from a comparative perspective. Another change is that I translate equivalents to *bhikkhu/bhikṣu* as “monastic”, rather than as “monk”, in order to reflect the fact that the usage of the original term is not necessarily a referent to fully ordained males, but often has a broader sense; cf. Collett and Anālayo 2014. The translated text is found at T II 56a24 to 60a21, which

230)<sup>2</sup>

Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was staying at Sāvattḥī in Jeta’s Grove, Anāthapiṇḍika’s Park.

Then a monastic by the name of Samiddhi approached the Buddha, paid respect with his head at the Buddha’s feet, withdrew to sit to one side, and said to the Buddha: “Blessed One, it is said: ‘the world’. What is called ‘the world’?”

The Buddha said to Samiddhi: “That is, the eye, forms, eye-consciousness, eye-contact, and feeling arisen in dependence on eye-contact and experienced within, be it painful, pleasant, or neutral, [that is called ‘the world’].”

“The ear ... the nose ... the tongue ... the body ... the mind,

---

is the first part of the ninth fascicle in the Taishō edition corresponding to the ninth fascicle in the reconstructed order of this collection. In what follows, my identification of Pāli parallels is based on Akanuma 1929/1990 and Yinshùn 1983; in the case of Sanskrit fragment parallels. I am indebted to Chung 2008. Here and elsewhere, I adopt Pāli for proper names and doctrinal terms in order to facilitate comparison with the Pāli parallels, except for terms like Dharma and Nirvāṇa, without thereby intending to take a position on the original language of the *Samyukta-āgama* manuscript used for translation.

<sup>2</sup> Parallel: SN 35.68 at SN IV 39,28. An extract from SĀ 230 has already been translated by Choong 2000: 85.

mental objects, mind-consciousness, mind-contact, and feeling arisen in dependence on mind-contact and experienced within, [56b] be it painful, pleasant, or neutral, that is called ‘the world’. Why is that? With the arising of the six sense-spheres there is the arising of contact, *in this way ... up to ...* the arising of this entire great mass of *dukkha*.<sup>3</sup>

“Samiddhi, if there is not that eye, no forms, no eye-consciousness, no eye-contact, and no feeling arisen in dependence on eye-contact and experienced within, be it painful, pleasant, or neutral, [then there is no world and also no designating of a ‘world’].”

“[If] there is no ear ... [no] nose ... [no] tongue ... [no] body ... [no] mind, [no] mental objects, [no] mind-consciousness, [no] mind-contact, and [no] feeling arisen in dependence on mind-contact and experienced within, be it painful, pleasant, or neutral, then there is no world and also no designating of a ‘world’. Why is that? With the cessation of the six sense-spheres there is the cessation of contact, *in this way ... up to ...* therefore there is the cessation of this entire great mass of *dukkha*.”

---

<sup>3</sup> SN 35.68 does not continue from defining the world by way of the six senses (a definition that does not mention contact and the three feelings) to the dependent arising (or later cessation) of *dukkha*.

When the Buddha had spoken this discourse, hearing what the Buddha had said the monastics were delighted and received it respectfully.

*Just as for ‘the world’, in the same way [discourses] are also to be recited in the same way for ‘a living being’ and in the same way for ‘Māra’.*

231)<sup>4</sup>

Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was staying at Sāvattḥī in Jeta’s Grove, Anāthapindika’s Park.

Then a monastic by the name of Samiddhi approached the Buddha, paid respect with his head at the Buddha’s feet, withdrew to sit to one side, and said to the Buddha: “Blessed One, it is said: ‘the world’. What is called ‘the world’?”

---

<sup>4</sup> Parallel: SN 35.82 at SN IV 52,3 and SN 35.84 at SN IV 53,10 (which have as their protagonists an unnamed monastic or Ānanda respectively), and a discourse quotation in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, Pradhan 1967: 5,16, and in Śamathadeva’s *Abhidharmakośopāyikā-ṭīkā*, Up 1010 at D 4094 *ju* 12b3 or Q 5595 *tu* 13b8; translated by Dhammadinnā 2018: 88–90. Of the two Pāli versions, SN 35.84 could be considered a closer parallel insofar as it explains the world to be “of the nature” to be broken up, whereas SN 35.82 just speaks of the world being broken up, without employing the phrase “of the nature” (given that SĀ 231, although irregularly, does employ the phrase “of the nature”).

The Buddha said to Samiddhi: “What is [of a nature to be] broken up and destroyed is called ‘the world’.<sup>5</sup> What is [of a nature to be] broken up and destroyed? Samiddhi, the eye is of a nature to be broken up and destroyed, likewise forms, eye-consciousness, eye-contact, and feeling arisen in dependence on eye-contact and experienced within, be it painful, pleasant, or neutral, all that is also [of a nature] to be broken up and destroyed.

“The ear ... the nose ... the tongue ... the body ... the mind *is also like that*. This is said to be of a nature to be broken up and destroyed; this is called ‘the world’.”

When the Buddha had spoken this discourse, hearing what the Buddha had said the monastic Samiddhi was delighted and received it respectfully.

232)<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> In the Pāli parallels, the explanation involves a playful etymology, where the world, *loka*, is explained with the term *lujjati*, “to break up” (SN 35.82), or else with the term *palokadhamma*, “of the nature to be broken up” (SN 35.84).

<sup>6</sup> Parallel: SN 35.85 at SN IV 54,1 (which has Ānanda as its protagonists), a quotation in the *Catuḥśatakaṭīkā*, Lamotte 1944/1976: 2113 note 1, and a quotation in the *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*, Wogihara 1932: 181,9. SĀ 232

Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was staying at Sāvattḥī in Jeta's Grove, Anāthapiṇḍika's Park.

Then a monastic by the name of Samiddhi approached the Buddha, paid respect with his head at the Buddha's feet, withdrew to sit to one side, and said to the Buddha: "Blessed One, it is said: 'the world is empty'. Why is it called 'the empty world'?"

The Buddha said to Samiddhi: "The eye is empty of being permanent and of being everlasting, it is empty of being of an unchanging nature, and it is empty of being 'mine'.<sup>7</sup> Why is that?"

---

has already been translated and studied by Lamotte 1973: 319–322 (see also Lamotte 1944/1976: 2112f) and Choong 1999: 89–91 and 2004: 72–74.

<sup>7</sup> The Buddha's statement in SN 35.85 at SN IV 54,5 just speaks of the world being empty of a self and of what belongs to a self. Schmithausen 1987/2007: 479 note 1215 points out that the *Vastusamgrahaṇī*, T 1579 at T XXX 812a10, see also Yinshùn 1983: 277, does define emptiness by mentioning the absence of a self, making it probable that the lack of such a reference in SĀ 232 is the result of a textual corruption. The self is also mentioned in the quotation in the *Catuḥśatakaṭīkā*, Lamotte 1944/1976: 2113 note 1: *ata evoktaṃ bhagavatā: cakṣuḥ samṛddhe śūnyam ātmanā ātmīyena ca nityena dhruveṇa śāśvatenāvipariṇāmadharmmeṇe ti*. The same holds for the *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*, Wogihara 1932: 181,9: *cakṣuḥ samṛddhe śūnyam nityena dhruvena śāśvatena avipariṇāmadharmeṇa ātman'ātmīyena ca*; see

This is its intrinsic nature.<sup>8</sup> Likewise forms, eye-consciousness, eye-contact, and feeling arisen in dependence on eye-contact [and experienced within], be it painful, pleasant, or neutral, that is also empty of being permanent and of being everlasting, it is empty of being of an unchanging nature, and it is empty of being ‘mine’. Why is that? This is its intrinsic nature.

“The ear ... the nose ... the tongue ... the body ... the mind *is also like that*. Thus ‘the world’ is called ‘empty’.”

When the Buddha had spoken this discourse, hearing what the Buddha had said the monastic Samiddhi was delighted and received it respectfully. [56c]

---

also the *Yogācārabhūmi*, Delhey 2009: 184 (§4.1.2.1.1.2) and the *Abhidharmadīpa & Vibhāṣāprabhāvṛtti*, Jaini 1959: 254,3.

<sup>8</sup> Such a remark is not found in SN 35.85; but see the *Abhidharma-kośavyākhyā*, Wogihara 1932: 181,10: *tat kasya hetoh? prakṛtir asyaiṣe ti*, and the *Catuḥśatakaṭīkā* quote, Lamotte 1944/1976: 2113 note 1: *tat kasya hetoh? prakṛtir asyaiṣe ti*. Regarding this phrase in SĀ 232, Lamotte 1973: 321 note 23 and 1944/1976: 2114 note 1 reasons that this could be an interpolation by a Mahāyānist, given that this expression occurs regularly in *Prajñāpāramitā* texts. For reservations regarding another instance where Lamotte considers a certain description found in the *Ekottarika-āgama* as reflecting Mahāyāna influence because the same can be found in *Prajñāpāramitā* texts see Anālayo 2013: 6ff.

## 233)<sup>9</sup>

Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was staying at Sāvattthī in Jeta’s Grove, Anāthapiṇḍika’s Park.

At that time the Blessed One said to the monastics: “I will now teach you the world, the arising of the world, the cessation of the world, and the path to the cessation of the world, listen carefully and pay proper attention.

“What is the world? That is, it is the six internal sense-spheres. What are the six? They are the internal sense-sphere of the eye ... the ear ... the nose ... the tongue ... the body ... and the internal sense-sphere of the mind.

“What is the arising of the world? That is, it is craving for future becoming, which is conjoined with lust and enjoyment,

---

<sup>9</sup> Parallel: Akanuma 1929/1990: 41 mentions SN 35.107 at SN IV 87,9; see also Chung 2008: 76. Yet SN 35.107 differs in several respects from SĀ 233, it does not define ‘the world’ nor does it take up the path to the world’s cessation, and the definitions given in SN 35.107 for the arising and the cessation of the world are quite different from those in SĀ 233. Thus it seems better to consider SN 35.107 and SĀ 233 as distinct expositions of the same topic. An extract from SĀ 233 has already been translated by Choong 2000: 84.

⟨delighting⟩ with attachment here and there.<sup>10</sup>

“What is the cessation of the world? That is, it is the abandoning without remainder of that craving for future becoming, which is conjoined with lust and enjoyment, ⟨delighting⟩ with attachment here and there; its having been given up, its having been vomited out, its having been eradicated, its fading away, its cessation, its ending, and its disappearance.

“What is the path to the cessation of the world? That is, it is the noble eightfold path of right view, right intention, right speech, right action, right livelihood, right effort, right mindfulness, and right concentration.”

When the Buddha had spoken this discourse, hearing what the Buddha had said the monastics were delighted and received it respectfully.

234)<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> The translation is based emending 集 to read 樂, following Yinshùn 1983: 277 note 1.

<sup>11</sup> Parallels: SN 35.116 at SN IV 93,5 and SHT VI 1404+1411, Bechert and Wille 1989: 120 (see also SHT V 1442, Sander and Waldschmidt 1985: 257f).

Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was staying at Sāvattḥī in Jeta's Grove, Anāthapiṇḍika's Park.

At that time the Blessed One said to the monastics: “I do not say that a person reaches the end of the world by travelling, and I also do not say that without travelling one reaches the end of the world and the unsurpassed transcendence of *dukkha*.”<sup>12</sup> Having spoken like this, he entered his hut to sit in meditation.

Then, soon after the Blessed One had left, a group of many monastics together discussed it: “The Blessed One has proceeded by expounding a teaching in brief, saying: ‘I do not say that a person reaches the end of the world by travelling, and I also do not say that without travelling one reaches the end of the world and gains the unsurpassed transcendence of *dukkha*.’”<sup>13</sup> Having spoken like this, he has entered his hut to sit in

---

<sup>12</sup> The corresponding passage in SN 35.116 at SN IV 93,5 states that the end of the world is not reached by travelling, *gamana* (perhaps a reference to the *Rohitassa-sutta*, AN 4.45 at AN II 47,22), yet making an end of *dukkha* requires having reached the end of the world. SĀ 234 has 行 (as its counterpart to *gamana*) in both statements; judging from the verses by Ānanda at the end of SĀ 234, the second occurrence seems to be the result of a textual error.

<sup>13</sup> The corresponding Sanskrit fragment abbreviates this part; see SHT VI 1404+1411 V2, Bechert and Wille 1989: 120: *nā[haṃ] gama[n]e[na lo]kasyāṃtamanuprāptavyaṃ va[d]āmi pūrvavadyāvātpratisaṃla*.

meditation.

“Now we do not understand the meaning concerning the teaching which the Blessed One has expounded in brief. Who among the venerable ones here has the capability to expound to us in detail the meaning concerning the teaching which the Blessed One has expounded in brief?”

They further said: “The only one is the venerable Ānanda, who is wise and has good memory, who constantly attends on the Blessed One as his assistant and who is praised by the Blessed One for being a learned practitioner of the holy life. He has the ability to expound to us in detail herein the meaning concerning the teaching which the Blessed One has taught in brief. Let us now approach the venerable Ānanda and request him so that he will expound it.”

Then the group of many monastics approached the venerable Ānanda and, having exchanged polite greetings with each other and sat to one side, they requested Ānanda *as fully [described] in the above episode in detail.*

Then Ānanda said to the monastics:<sup>14</sup> “Listen and pay proper attention to what I will now say. Whatever there is of a ‘world’, of naming a ‘world’, of experiencing a ‘world’, of designating a ‘world’, of a linguistic expression of a ‘world’, it all enters into being counted as a ‘world’.<sup>15</sup> Venerable friends, [57a] that is, the eye is a ‘world’, a naming of a ‘world’, an experiencing of a ‘world’, a designation of a ‘world’, a linguistic expression of a ‘world’; it all enters into being counted as a ‘world’.

“The ear ... the nose ... the tongue ... the body ... the mind *is also like that.*

“A learned noble disciple understands as it really is the arising of the six sense-spheres, their cessation, their gratification, their

---

<sup>14</sup> In SN 35.116 at SN IV 94,<sup>24</sup> Ānanda tells the monastics that they should have asked the Buddha directly, comparing their coming to him instead to someone who, being in quest of heartwood, takes instead the branches and leaves of a tree. Similar to the case of SĀ 211 (see Anālayo 2016: 35 note 65), given that the Buddha had withdrawn into his hut, it could hardly be expected that the monastics ask him for an explanation. This makes the presentation in SĀ 234, where Ānanda does not censure the monastics for not having asked the Buddha himself, fit the narrative context more naturally.

<sup>15</sup> SN 35.116 at SN IV 95,<sup>27</sup> only takes up the two topics of being a perceiver of the world and a conceiver of the world, *lokasaññin* and *lokamānin*.

danger, and the escape from them.<sup>16</sup> This is called a noble disciple who reaches the end of the world, who understands the world and who, having been burdened by the world, has transcended the world.”

At that time the venerable Ānanda further spoke in verse:

“It is not by travelling  
that one is able to reach the end of the world.  
[Yet] without reaching the end of the world  
one is unable to escape from the mass of *dukkha*.

“For this reason, the venerated sage  
is called a knower of the world.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Ānanda’s explanation in SN 35.116 at SN IV 95,29 just mentions the six sense-spheres and does not cover the need to understand their arising, etc. The Sanskrit fragment does mention the need to understand the arising, etc., of the six sense-spheres; see SHT VI 1404+1411 R3, Bechert and Wille 1989: 120: *yata [ā]ryaśravakah ṣaṇṇāṃ spa[rś]āyatanānāṃ samudayaṃ cā*; and R4: *[ca niḥsaraṇaṃ] ca yathā[bh](ūtaṃ) prajānā*.

<sup>17</sup> SN 35.116 has no stanzas and instead continues with the monastics reporting Ānanda’s explanation to the Buddha, who approves of it. A counterpart to the present stanza can be found in SHT VI 1404+1411 R5, Bechert and Wille 1989: 120: *lokāntaṃ duḥkhasyāntakaro bhavet\* tasmāṃ [mu]nirlokavettā*.

One is able to reach the end of the world,  
by having become established in all [aspects] of the holy life.

“The end of the world is only for those who  
with right knowledge are able to apprehend the truth.  
Who penetrates with awakened wisdom the world,  
for this reason, is said to have crossed over to the other shore.

“In this way, venerable friends, I have now analysed and  
expounded in detail for you the brief teaching the Blessed One  
had proceeded to expound [before] he entered his hut to sit in  
meditation.”

When the venerable Ānanda had expounded this teaching,  
hearing what he had said the group of many monastics were  
delighted and received it respectfully.

235)<sup>18</sup>

Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was staying at  
Sāvattthī in Jeta’s Grove, Anāthapiṇḍika’s Park.

At that time the Blessed One said to the monastics: “To be  
dwelling alone is [constantly] painful on having a ‘teacher’ and

---

<sup>18</sup> Parallel: SN 35.150 at SN IV 136,4.

a disciple who ‘dwells close by’.<sup>19</sup> To be dwelling alone is [constantly] pleasant on having no ‘teacher’ and no disciple who ‘dwells close by’.<sup>20</sup>

“Why is dwelling alone [constantly] painful on having a ‘teacher’ and a disciple who ‘dwells close by’? In dependence on the eye and forms, evil and unwholesome thoughts arise together with lust, anger, and delusion. If that monastic engages in these states, [then] one is reckoned to be having a ‘teacher’. If one dwells on this side [of what is unwholesome], one is called a disciple who ‘dwells close by’.



---

<sup>19</sup> In SN 35.150 at SN IV 136,7 the issue at stake is just dwelling in pain or pleasure, without a relationship to dwelling alone.

<sup>20</sup> The passage is based on a double intender. Bodhi 2000: 1420 note 148 explains that the corresponding phrasing in SN 35.150 “is a riddle which turns upon two puns difficult to replicate in English. A ‘student’ (*antevāsī*) is literally ‘one who dwells within’, and thus (as the text explains below) one for whom defilements do not dwell within (*na antovasanti*) is said to be ‘without students’. The word ‘teacher’ (*ācariya*) is here playfully connected with the verb ‘to assail’ (*samudācarati*); thus one unassailed by defilements is said to be ‘without a teacher’.” SĀ 235 involves a similar pun, in that to have a ‘teacher’ and to be a disciples who ‘dwells close by’ represents being under the influence of lust, anger, and delusion in regard to what is experienced through the eye, etc.

“The ear ... the nose ... the tongue ... the body ... the mind *is also like that.*

“In this way dwelling alone is constantly painful on having a ‘teacher’ and a disciple who ‘dwells close by’.

“Why is dwelling alone constantly pleasant on having no ‘teacher’ and no disciple who ‘dwells close by’? In dependence on the eye and forms, evil and unwholesome thoughts arise together with lust, anger, and delusion. If that monastic does not engage in these states, [then] one is reckoned to have no ‘teacher’. If one does not dwell in dependence on that [which is unwholesome], one is called a disciple who does not ‘dwell close by’.

“[The ear ... the nose ... the tongue ... the body ... the mind *is also like that*].

“This is called a constantly pleasant dwelling alone on having no ‘teacher’ and no disciple who ‘dwells close by’.

“If that monastic has no ‘teacher’ and no disciple who ‘dwells close by’, I say, that one gains the merits of the holy life.<sup>21</sup> Why is that? In the holy life established by me, a monastic who has

---

<sup>21</sup> This statement and what follows has no counterpart in SN 35.150.

no ‘teacher’ and no disciple who ‘dwells close by’ is capable of rightly eradicating *dukkha* and making a complete ⟨end⟩ of *dukkha*.”<sup>22</sup> [57b]

When the Buddha had spoken this discourse, hearing what the Buddha had said the monastics were delighted and received it respectfully.

236)<sup>23</sup>

Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was staying at Sāvattḥī in Jeta’s Grove, Anāthapiṇḍika’s Park.

At that time, in the morning, the venerable Sāriputta put on his robes and took his bowl to enter the town of Sāvattḥī to beg for food. Having begged for food [and partaken of it], he returned to the monastery, stored away the robe and the bowl and, having washed his feet, he took his sitting mat and entered a grove for the daytime’s sitting in meditation. Then, rising from his meditation, Sāriputta approached the Blessed One, paid respect

---

<sup>22</sup> The translation is based on emending 集 to read 邊, following a suggestion in Yinshùn 1983: 280 note 2.

<sup>23</sup> Parallel: MN 151 at MN III 293,27 (which also has a partial parallel in EĀ 45.6 at T II 773b20). SĀ 236 has already been translated by Choong 2004: 5–9; for comparative studies see Choong 1999: 11–13 and Anālayo 2011: 846–848.

with his head at [the Buddha's] feet, and withdrew to sit to one side.<sup>24</sup>

Then the Buddha said to Sāriputta: “Where are you coming from?”<sup>25</sup>

Sāriputta replied: “Blessed One, I am coming from the daytime's sitting in meditation in a grove.”

The Buddha said to Sāriputta: “What meditative abiding did you enter today?”

Sāriputta said to the Buddha: “Blessed One, today in that grove I entered the meditative abiding of the concentration on emptiness.”

The Buddha said to Sāriputta: “It is well, it is well, Sāriputta. Today in your seated meditation you have entered the meditative

---

<sup>24</sup> MN 151 at MN III 293,28 sets in with Sāriputta emerging from seclusion and approaching the Buddha, without reporting that before that he had gone to beg for alms.

<sup>25</sup> In MN 151 at MN III 294,1 the Buddha's inquiry is preceded by a reference to the purity of Sāriputta's faculties.

dwelling of elders.<sup>26</sup> If monastics wish to be those who enter the meditative [dwelling] of elders, they should train in this way: When entering the town, when walking to beg for alms, when leaving the town, they should reflect on this: ‘On seeing forms with the eye, did I now give rise to desire, to affectionate craving, to thoughts of craving and attachment?’

“[The ear ... the nose ... the tongue ... the body ... the mind *is also like that*].<sup>27</sup>

“Sāriputta, when monastics engage in [self-]examination in this way, if on cognizing forms with the eye there are thoughts with craving and they are defiled by attachment, in order to abandon what is evil and unwholesome those monastics should diligently be willing to make an effort in, and be capable of, training with collected mindfulness.

“It is just as if a person’s turban is burning with fire. In order to extinguish it, one will arouse superior effort and diligently

---

<sup>26</sup> In MN 151 at MN III 294,<sup>6</sup> the Buddha speaks of a “dwelling of a great man”, *mahāpurisavihāra*.

<sup>27</sup> MN 151 at MN III 294,<sup>31</sup> also mentions the other sense-doors. This seems to be required, since while begging for and partaking of alms a monastic might come across sounds, odours, flavours, and tangibles that could provoke unwholesome reactions.

compel it to cease.

“Those monastics are also like that who diligently arouse superior willingness to make an effort in training with collected mindfulness.

“Suppose when examining the monastics [know] that, when on the road, when walking to beg for alms in the village, when leaving the village, and in between, on cognizing forms with the eye there are no thoughts with craving and being defiled by attachment. Those monastics should for this reason rejoice in their wholesome roots and practice day and night with energy and collected mindfulness.<sup>28</sup> These are called monastics who, when walking, standing, sitting, and reclining, purify the begged food. For this reason, this is called the Discourse on Being Established in the Purification of the Begged Food.”<sup>29</sup>

When the Buddha had spoken this discourse, hearing what the

---

<sup>28</sup> MN 151 at MN III 295,<sup>1</sup> continues at this point with a series of additional reflections. Judging from the context, this appears to be a case of an expansion of an originally more concise presentation; see Anālayo 2005: 96f and 2011: 848.

<sup>29</sup> MN 151 at MN III 297,<sup>35</sup> has the title “purification of almsfood”, *piṇḍapātāpārisuddhi*; a title not introduced in the discourse itself or attributed to the Buddha.

Buddha had said the venerable Sāriputta was delighted and received it respectfully.

237)<sup>30</sup>

Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was staying at Vesālī in the Hall with the Peaked Roof by the side of the Monkey Pond.

Then a householder by the name of Ugga approached the Buddha, [57c] paid respect with his head at the Buddha's feet, withdrew to sit to one side, and said to the Buddha: “Blessed One, why is it that one monastic attains Nirvāṇa here and now? Why is it that [another] monastic does not attain Nirvāṇa here and now?”<sup>31</sup>

The Buddha said to the householder: “If on cognizing forms with the eye a monastic has thoughts with craving and is defiled by attachment, then because of having thoughts with craving and being defiled by attachment one constantly depends on [such] cognizing. Because of that bondage and because of that clinging,

---

<sup>30</sup> Parallel: SN 35.124 at SN IV 109,1 and a quote in the *Abhidharma-kośabhāṣya*, Pradhan 1967: 93,21 (see also Pāsādika 1989: 44 §126).

<sup>31</sup> Ugga's inquiry in SN 35.124 at SN IV 109,9 concerns a “being”, *satta*, whereas the Buddha's reply takes up a monastic, *bhikkhu*. SĀ 237 is more consistent in this respect, as inquiry and reply both concern monastics, 比丘.

one does not attain Nirvāṇa here and now.

“The ear ... the nose ... the tongue ... the body ... cognizing mind-objects with the mind *is also like that*.

“If on cognizing forms with the eye a monastic does not delight with craving, being defiled by attachment, [then because of] not delighting with craving and being defiled by attachment, one does not depend on [such] cognizing, and because of not being affected by it, not attached to it, and not clinging to it, this [type of] monastics attain Nirvāṇa here and now.

“The ear ... the nose ... the tongue ... the body ... cognizing mind-objects with the mind *is also like that*.

“Householder, for this reason there are monastics who attain Nirvāṇa here and now and there are those who do not attain Nirvāṇa here and now.”

*Just as for the discourse [in reply] to a question by a householder, in the same way a discourse is also to be recited as above [in reply] to a question by Ānanda and a discourse in*

which the Buddha on his own addressed the monastics.<sup>32</sup>

238)<sup>33</sup>

Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was staying at Vesālī in the Hall with the Peaked Roof by the side of the Monkey Pond.

Then a certain monastic approached the Buddha, paid respect with his head at the Buddha's feet, withdrew to sit to one side, and said to the Buddha: "Blessed One, what is the cause, what is the condition for the arising of eye-consciousness? What is the cause, what is the condition for the arising of ear ... nose ... tongue ... body ... mind-consciousness?"

The Buddha said to the monastic: "The eye and forms are the cause and condition for the arising of eye-consciousness.<sup>34</sup> Why

---

<sup>32</sup> A similar repetition of the present exposition can be seen in SN 35.118 at SN V 101,27, which corresponds to SN 35.124 except for the fact that, instead of Ugga, the visitor is Sakka.

<sup>33</sup> Parallel: a quote in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, Pradhan 1967: 464,11 (see also Pāsādika 1989: 123 §500 and the *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*, Wogihara 1936: 703,7), and a discourse quotation in Śamathadeva's *Abhidharmakośopāyikā-ṭīkā*, Up 9003 at D 4094 *nyu* 78a2 or Q 5595 *thu* 123b1; translated in Dhammadinnā 2018: 90–92.

<sup>34</sup> The translation is based on emending 眼因緣色 to read 眼色因緣, in line with the phrasing found in SĀ 238 for the other sense-doors; see also the

is that? Whatever eye-consciousness arises, it all is because of the cause and condition of the eye and forms.

“The ear and sounds are the cause and condition ... the nose and odours are the cause and condition ... the tongue and flavours are the cause and condition ... the body and tangibles are the cause and condition<sup>35</sup> ... the mind and mental objects are the cause and condition for the arising of mind-consciousness. Why is that? Whatever mind-consciousness arises, it all is because of the cause and condition of the mind and mental objects.

“Monastic, this is called the cause and condition for the arising of eye-consciousness ... *up to* ... the cause and condition for the arising of mind-consciousness.”

When the Buddha had spoken this discourse, hearing what the Buddha had said that monastic was delighted and rejoiced. He paid respect and left.

239)<sup>36</sup>

Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was staying at Vesālī

---

parallel phrase in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, Pradhan 1967: 464,11: *caḥsur bhikṣo hetū rūpāṇi pratyayaś caḥsurvijñānasyotpādaya*.

<sup>35</sup> The translation is based on adopting a variant that adds 身觸因緣.

<sup>36</sup> Parallel: SN 35.109 at SN IV 89,1.

in the Hall with the Peaked Roof by the side of the Monkey Pond.

At that time the Blessed One said to the monastics: “I will now teach you things bound by a bondage and things that are a bondage. What things are bound by a bondage? The eye and forms ... the ear and sounds ... the nose and odours ... the tongue and flavours ... the body and tangibles ... the mind and mental objects; these are reckoned things bound by a bondage.<sup>37</sup>

“What things are a bondage? That is, desire and lust. These things are reckoned to be a bondage.”

When the Buddha had spoken this discourse, hearing what the Buddha had said the monastics were delighted and received it respectfully. [58a]

240)<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> The corresponding exposition in SN 35.109 at SN IV 89,6 only mentions the senses, without referring to their objects.

<sup>38</sup> Parallel: SN 35.110 at SN IV 89,12 and a quote in the *Abhidharma-kośabhāṣya*, Pradhan 1967: 140,17 (see also Pāsādika 1989: 62 §211 and Wogihara 1932: 300,20) and Pradhan 1967: 308,5, with corresponding discourse quotations in Śamathadeva’s *Abhidharmakośopāyikā-ṭīkā*, Up 3053 at D 4094 *ju* 155b2 or Q 5595 *tu* 179b1 and Up 5025 at D 4094 *ju* 280b6 or Q 5595 *thu* 25a6, translated by Dhammadinnā 2018: 92–95.

Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was staying at Vesālī in the Hall with the Peaked Roof by the side of the Monkey Pond.

At that time the Blessed One said to the monastics: “I will now teach you things that are clung to and things that are clinging. What things are clung to? The eye and forms ... the ear and sounds ... the nose and odours ... the tongue and flavours ... the body and tangibles ... the mind and mental objects; these are reckoned things that are clung to.”<sup>39</sup>

“What things are clinging? That is, desire and lust. These things are reckoned to be clinging.”

When the Buddha had spoken this discourse, hearing what the Buddha had said the monastics were delighted and received it respectfully.

241)<sup>40</sup>

Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was staying at Vesālī in the Hall with the Peaked Roof by the side of the Monkey Pond.

---

<sup>39</sup> The corresponding passage in SN 35.110 at SN IV 89,17 only mentions the senses, without referring to their objects.

<sup>40</sup> Parallel: SN 35.194 at SN IV 168,10 and Hoernle fragment Or 15009/537 and Or 15009/539, Nagashima 2015: 368–370.

At that time the Blessed One said to the monastics: “Monastics, for a foolish and unlearned worldling it would be preferable for the eye to be burnt with the help of a burning hot piece of copper so that it is scorched, rather than grasping the sign of forms and grasping their secondary characteristics (*anuvyañjana*) with eye-consciousness. Why is that? Because of grasping the sign of forms and grasping their secondary characteristics [with eye-consciousness, at the breaking up of the body at death] one will fall into an evil realm like a sinking iron ball.<sup>41</sup>

“For a foolish and unlearned worldling it would be preferable for the ear to be drilled into with a burning iron drill, rather than grasping the sign of sounds and grasping the secondary characteristics of sounds with ear-consciousness. Why is that? [Because of] grasping the sign of sounds and grasping the secondary characteristics of sounds with ear-consciousness, when the body breaks up at the end of life one will fall into an evil realm like a sinking iron ball.

“For a foolish and unlearned worldling it would be preferable for the nose to be cut off with a sharp knife, rather than grasping

---

<sup>41</sup> Here and below SN 35.194 at SN IV 168,20, specifies the realms to be hell and the animal realm. Another difference is that SN 35.194 does not employ the simile of a sinking iron ball.

the sign of odours and grasping the secondary characteristics of odours with nose-consciousness. Why is that? Because of grasping the sign of odours and grasping the secondary characteristics of odours [with nose-consciousness], when the body breaks up at the end of life one will fall into an evil realm like a sinking iron ball.

“For a foolish and unlearned worldling it would be preferable for the tongue to be cut off with a sharp knife, rather than grasping the sign of flavours and grasping the secondary characteristics of flavours with tongue-consciousness. Why is that? Because of grasping the sign of odours and grasping the secondary characteristics of odours [with tongue-consciousness], when the body breaks up at the end of life one will fall into an evil realm like a sinking iron ball.

“For a foolish and unlearned worldling it would be preferable for the body to be pierced with a sharp and hard iron javelin, rather than grasping the sign of tangibles and grasping the secondary characteristics of tangibles with body-consciousness. Why is that? Because of grasping the sign of tangibles and grasping the secondary characteristics of tangibles [with body-consciousness], when the body breaks up at the end of life one will fall into an evil realm like a sinking iron ball.

“Monastics, to be asleep is a foolish way of life, it is a foolish

way of living that is without benefit and without merit. Yet, for monastics it would be preferable that they would sleep, rather than arousing thoughts in relation to forms, thoughts that, if they arise, will certainly give rise to bondage and quarrel, being capable of leading to the detriment of many in the community, not being capable of benefitting the peace and happiness of *devas* and humans.<sup>42</sup>

“Learned noble disciples train like this: [58b] ‘Now I would prefer for my eye to be pierced by a burning iron javelin, rather than grasping the sign of forms [and their secondary characteristics] with eye-consciousness, [like those foolish worldlings who]<sup>43</sup> fall into the three evil realms and experience *dukkha* for a long time.’<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> SN 35.194 at SN IV 169,32 specifies that the problem is creating a schism in the monastic community.

<sup>43</sup> The supplementation seems required, as a learned noble disciple should be beyond the prospect of falling into the three evil realms.

<sup>44</sup> The reflection in SN 35.194 at SN IV 170,6 no longer takes up the topic of a bad rebirth. The three evil realms are mentioned in the Sanskrit fragment version; see Nagashima 2015: 369f, Or 15009/537 v4: *[ṇ]āṃ d. r.a[t]ī[n]āṃ anyatamānyatamāṃ durgatīm*, Or 15009/539 r6: *tisṛṇāṃ durgatīnāṃ anyatamānya*, and Or 15009/539 v3: *kariṣyāmi yat tisṛṇāṃ durgat[ī]*.

“From now on I will pay careful attention, contemplating the eye as impermanent, conditioned, thought out, a dependently arisen state.<sup>45</sup> Likewise forms, eye-consciousness, eye-contact, and feeling arisen in dependence on eye-contact that is experienced within, be it painful, pleasant, or neutral, that is also impermanent, conditioned, thought out, a dependently arisen state.

“[In relation to] the sense-sphere of the ear ... the nose ... the tongue ... the body one trains like this: ‘[Now] I would prefer for my body to be pierced by an iron javelin, rather than grasping the sign of tangibles and the secondary characteristics of tangibles with body-consciousness and [be like those foolish worldlings who] fall into the three evil realms because of that [and experience *dukkha* for a long time].

“From now on I will pay careful attention, contemplating the

---

<sup>45</sup> SN 35.194 at SN IV 170,8 only takes up the topic of impermanence. A presentation closer to SĀ 241 can be found in the Sanskrit fragment; see Nagashima 2015: 369f, Or 15009/537 v2: *apy a[n]i[t]yaṃ saṃskṛtaṃ ce[t]ayitaṃ pra[t]īṭaysa*, Or 15009/539 r5: *p[r]atīṭyasamutpannaṃ tatra śrutav*, Or 15009/539 r7: *[n]ityaṃ saṃskṛtaṃ cetayit*, and Or 15009/539 v2: *hvāvijñānam apy anityaṃ saṃskṛt*. The Sanskrit fragment also helps appreciate that in the phrase 無常, 有為, 心, 緣生法, the term 心 (a standard rendering of *citta*) here apparently translates *cetayita*.

body as impermanent, conditioned, thought out, a dependently arisen state. Likewise tangibles, body-consciousness, body-contact, and feeling arisen in dependence on body-contact that is experienced within, be it painful, pleasant, or neutral, that is also impermanent, conditioned, thought out, a dependently arisen state.

“A learned noble disciple trains like this: ‘To be asleep is a foolish way of life, it is a foolish way of living that is without fruit, without benefit, and without merit. Not being asleep, I will also not arouse thoughts and arouse perceptions whose arising will lead to bondage and quarrel, causing the detriment of many people and not leading to their peace and happiness.’<sup>46</sup>

“A learned noble disciple who contemplates like this arouses disenchantment for the eye, and likewise also arouses disenchantment for forms, eye-consciousness, eye-contact, and feeling arisen in dependence on eye-contact that is experienced within, be it painful, pleasant, or neutral. Because of disenchantment there is no delight. Because of not delighting, one is liberated. Being liberated, one knows and sees:

---

<sup>46</sup> SN 35.194 at SN IV 171,3 just contrasts sleeping with attending to the impermanent nature of the mind, etc.

‘Birth for me has been eradicated, the holy life has been established, what had to be done has been done, I myself know that there will be no receiving of any further existence.’

“The ear ... the nose ... the tongue ... the body ... the mind *is also like that.*”<sup>47</sup>

When the Buddha had spoken this discourse, hearing what the Buddha had said the monastics were delighted and received it respectfully.

242)<sup>48</sup>

Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was staying at Vesālī in the Hall with the Peaked Roof by the side of the Monkey Pond.

At that time the Blessed One said to the monastics: “If one does not understand the eye, does not discern it, does not abandon it, does not become dispassionate towards it, one is unable to eradicate *dukkha* properly.

“If one understands the eye, if one discerns it, if one abandons it, if one becomes dispassionate towards it, one is able to

---

<sup>47</sup> SN 35.194 at SN IV 171,16 concludes with the Buddha referring to the discourse as *ādittapariyāya* and *dhammapariyāya*.

<sup>48</sup> Parallel: SN 35.111 at SN IV 89,23.

eradicate *dukkha* properly.”<sup>49</sup>

When the Buddha had spoken this discourse, hearing what the Buddha had said the monastics were delighted and received it respectfully.

*Just as the four discourses on the eye, in the same way up to the mind [altogether] twenty-four discourses are to be recited as above.*

243)<sup>50</sup>

Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was staying at Vesālī in the Hall with the Peaked Roof by the side of the Monkey Pond.

At that time the Blessed One said to the monastics: “If monastics are gratified by the eye, it should be understood that these recluses and brahmins do not gain independence and release

---

<sup>49</sup> SN 35.111 at SN IV 89,24 follows the exposition of the eye with an abbreviated reference to the other senses.

<sup>50</sup> Parallels: SN 35.114 at SN IV 91,18 and SN 35.115 at SN IV 92,15. Akanuma 1929/1990: 41 mentions SN 35.15 at SN IV 8,27 as a parallel. Yet this discourse (together with a parallel in a discourse quotation in the *Dharmaskandha*, fragment 10r7 to 10v2, Dietz 1984: 48f) is a report of the Buddha’s own experience and thus, in spite of sharing the topic of gratification, not really a parallel.

from Māra's hands [58c], they are bound by Māra's tethers, they have entered into Māra's bondage.<sup>51</sup>

“The ear ... the nose ... the tongue ... the body ... the mind *is also like this*.”

“If recluses and brahmins are not gratified by the eye, it should be understood that these recluses and brahmins do not follow Māra, they are freed from Māra's hands, they have not entered into Māra's bondage.

“[The ear ... the nose ... the tongue ... the body ... the mind *is also like this*.]”

When the Buddha had spoken this discourse, hearing what the Buddha had said the monastics were delighted and received it respectfully.

*As for gratification, in the same way for delighting ... praising ... being defiled with attachment ... being firmly established in ...*

---

<sup>51</sup> SN 35.114 and SN 35.115 have throughout a monastic as their subjects, whereas SĀ 243 shifts from a first mention of monastics, 諸比丘, to recluses and brahmins for the remainder of the exposition, 沙門婆羅門. Another difference is that SN 35.114 and SN 35.115 qualify the sense objects as desirable and enticing etc.

craving with delight ... having resentment ... [*discourses*] are also to be recited in this way.

*As the seven discourses on the inner sense-spheres, seven discourses on the outer sense-spheres are also to be recited in this way.*

244)<sup>52</sup>

Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was staying at Vesālī in the Hall with the Peaked Roof by the side of the Monkey Pond.<sup>53</sup>

At that time the Blessed One said to the monastics: “There are six hooks of Māra. What are the six? Attachment to the gratification of forms [cognized by] the eye is a hook of Māra. Attachment to the gratification of sounds [cognized by] the ear is a hook of Māra. Attachment to the gratification of odours [cognized by] the nose is a hook of Māra. Attachment to the

---

<sup>52</sup> Parallel: SN 35.189 at SN IV 158,18.

<sup>53</sup> In the PTS edition, SN 35.189 starts with a verse that appears to belong instead to the previous discourse, as pointed out by Bodhi 2000: 1422 note 164. The verse is then followed in SN 35.189 at SN IV 158,26 by a simile that describes a fish swallowing a fisherman’s hook; similarly the six senses are six hooks for beings in the world. Thus it is only after this introductory part that SN 35.189 can be reckoned a parallel to SĀ 244.

gratification of flavours [cognized by] the tongue is a hook of Māra. Attachment to the gratification of tangibles [cognized by] the body is a hook of Māra. Attachment to the gratification of mind-objects [cognized by] the mind is a hook of Māra.

If recluses and brahmins are attached to the gratification of forms [cognized by] the eye, it should be understood that these recluses and brahmins have swallowed the hook, Māra's hook, and they do not gain independence from Māra.<sup>54</sup>

*[Discourses on] impure teachings and pure teachings should be recited in detail as above.*

245)<sup>55</sup>

Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was staying among the Kurus in the village of Kammāsadamma.

At that time the Blessed One said to the monastics: “I will now

---

<sup>54</sup> The exposition in SN 35.189 concerns monastics and also covers the case of not swallowing Māra's hook.

<sup>55</sup> Parallels: SN 35.114 at SN IV 91,18 and SN 35.115 at SN IV 92,15 (cf. above SĀ 243) and a discourse quotation in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, Pradhan 1967: 30,22 (see also Pāsādika 1989: 26 §34), and in Śamathadeva's *Abhidharmakośopāyikā-tīkā*, Up 1047 at D 4094 ju 44b7 or Q 5595 tu 48b3, translated by Dhammadinnā 2018: 96–99.

teach you the Dharma which is good in the beginning of being taught, good in the middle of being taught, and good in the end of being taught, which is good in its meaning and good in its expression, [teaching you] an entirely complete and pure holy life, that is, a discourse with a teaching in four parts. Listen carefully and pay proper attention to what I shall teach you.”

“What is the discourse with a teaching in four parts? There are forms cognizable by the eye which can be craved for, can be [fondly] recollected, can be delighted in, can be attached to. Having seen them, a monastic is pleased, commends them, delights in them with attachment, and becomes firmly established on them.

“There are forms cognizable by the eye which cannot be craved for, cannot be [fondly] recollected, cannot be delighted in with attachment, which are painful and dislikeable. Having seen them, a monastic is averse to them, detesting them and being contemptuous.

“In this way the monastic does not gain independence from Māra ... *up to* ... is not liberated from Māra’s bondage.

“The ear ... the nose ... the tongue ... the body ... the mind *is also like that.*

“There are forms cognizable by the eye which can be craved for, can be [fondly] recollected, can be delighted in, can be attached to. Having seen them, a monastic understands them and is [not] pleased, does not commend them, does not delight in them with attachment and become firmly established on them.

“There are forms cognizable by the eye which cannot be craved for, be [fondly] recollected, and be delighted in with attachment, [which are painful and dislikeable]. Having seen them, a monastic is not averse to them, detesting them or being contemptuous.

“In this way the monastic does not follow Māra and gains independence from him ... *up to* ... is liberated from Māra’s bondage. [59a]

“The ear ... the nose ... the tongue ... the body ... the mind *is also like that*.

“Monastics, this is reckoned the discourse with a teaching in four parts.”

246)<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> Parallels: SN 4.19 at SN I 114,26 (and for the last verses SN 4.24 at SN I 123,14) and SHT V 1141, Sander and Waldschmidt 1985: 256f.

Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was staying in Rājagaha on Mount Vulture Peak. At that time, in the morning, the Blessed One put on his robes and took his bowl to enter Rājagaha to beg for food.<sup>57</sup>

At that time the celestial Māra, the Evil One, thought: “In the morning the recluse Gotama has put on his robes and taken his bowl to enter Rājagaha to beg for food. I will now approach him and confound the pathways of his mind.”<sup>58</sup>

Then Māra, the Evil One, transformed himself into the likeness of a charioteer who is searching for his oxen, holding a goad, wearing tattered clothes and dishevelled hair, and having cracked hand and feet. Holding in his hand the goad for oxen, he went in front of the Blessed One and asked: “Gotama, have you seen my oxen?”

The Blessed One thought: “This is the evil Māra who has come with the wish to confound me.”

---

<sup>57</sup> According to SN 4.19 at SN I 114,27, the Buddha was at Sāvathī giving a teaching on Nirvāṇa to the monastics.

<sup>58</sup> T II 59a7: 道意, which in its general use in Chinese translations conveys the sense of *bodhicitta*. This is hardly appropriate for the present context, hence my rendering as “pathways of the mind”.

He said to Māra: “Evil Māra, where are your oxen? What use do you have of oxen?”

Māra thought: “The recluse Gotama understood that I am Māra.” He said to the Buddha: “Gotama, the sphere of contact of the eye is my vehicle, the sphere of contact of the ear ... the nose ... the tongue ... the body ... the mind is my vehicle.”

He asked again: “Gotama, where do you wish to go to?”

The Buddha said to the evil Māra: “Yours is the sphere of contact of the eye, the sphere of contact of the ear ... the nose ... the tongue ... the body ... the mind. Where there is no sphere of contact of the eye, no sphere of contact of the ear ... the nose ... the tongue ... the body ... the mind, that is not in your reach. I have arrived at and reached that.”<sup>59</sup>

At that time the celestial Māra, the Evil One, spoke in verse:<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> In SN 4.19 the Buddha does not explicitly affirm that he has reached that, although the same would be implicit.

<sup>60</sup> The verse exchange in SN 4.19 only parallels the first stanza by Māra and the reply to that by the Buddha.

“Suppose a self is ⟨spoken⟩ of,<sup>61</sup>  
All of that is mine,  
All of it belongs entirely to me.  
Gotama, where else can you go?”

At that time the Blessed One spoke a verse in reply:

“Suppose a self is spoken of,  
That speaking of a self is wrong.  
For this reason, Evil One, know  
You have fallen into defeat.”

Māra again spoke a verse.<sup>62</sup>

“If you state you know the path  
That safely leads to Nirvāṇa  
Proceed by yourself alone.  
Why bother teaching others?”

---

<sup>61</sup> The translation is based on emending 常 to 言, in keeping with the first line of the Buddha’s reply, which repeats what Māra said; see also the parallel SN 4.19 at SN I 116,8, where the corresponding lines in the verse by Māra and the reply by the Buddha share the use of *vadanti*.

<sup>62</sup> The ensuing verse exchange has a parallel in SN 4.24 at SN I 123,14 (which is preceded by a similar verse exchange on the topic of ‘mine’).

The Blessed One again spoke a verse in reply:

“If on being freed from Māra  
One is asked for the crossing over to the other shore of  
awakening,  
One teaches with equipoise  
The truth of what is forever without residue.  
Then those, cultivating it without negligence,  
Are forever freed from Māra and become independent.” [59b]

Māra again spoke in verse:

“There was a stone resembling a piece of meat  
and a hungry crow came wishing to eat it,  
having a perception of it as tender  
and wishing to nourish the vacuity of its hunger.

In the end it did not get that taste,  
With broken beak it rose up into the sky.  
I am now like the crow  
and Gotama is like the manifestation of a stone.”

Without a way in, he left in shame,  
Like the crow that rose up into the void to depart.  
Harbouring grief within the mind,

That [Māra] disappeared and was no longer seen.

247)<sup>63</sup>

Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was staying in Rājagaha on Mount Vulture Peak.

At that time the Blessed One said to the monastics: “If recluses and brahmins become habituated to drawing close to forms with the eye, then they follow Māra’s domain ... *up to* ... they do not gain freedom from Māra’s bondage. The ear ... the nose ... the tongue ... the body ... the mind ... *are also like this*.

“If recluses and brahmins do not become habituated to drawing close to forms with the eye, [then] they do not follow Māra’s domain ... *up to* ... they gain freedom from Māra’s bondage. The ear ... the nose ... the tongue ... the body ... the mind ... *are also like this*.”

When the Buddha had spoken this discourse, hearing what the Buddha had said the monastics were delighted and received it respectfully.

---

<sup>63</sup> Parallel: for a section of a commentary on the present passage in the *Paryāyasamgrahaṇī* of the *Yogācārabhūmi* see Matsuda 1994: 98f (§II.4).

*As for* “become habituated to drawing close to”, *in the same way for* “being bound by”, “being attached to”, “relishing”,<sup>64</sup> “drawing near to”, “getting together with”, “having an underlying tendency for”, “upholding”, “being bound by attachment to”, “[making] mine”, “being in quest of”, “wishing for”, “being naïve about”, “focusing on”, and “not abandoning” [discourses] *should also be recited as above.*<sup>65</sup>

248)<sup>66</sup>

Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was staying in Kukkuṭa’s Park at Pāṭaliputta.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup> The translation is based on deleting two additional instances of 如是 and one instances of 若, following Yinshùn 1983: 296 note 1.

<sup>65</sup> The count of terms for which discourses should be recited is not easily determined in the original; the translation follows the identification of such terms by Yinshùn 1983: 296. The *Paryāyasamgrahaṇī* of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, Matsuda 1994: 98f, lists the following terms: *ālīyante, avalīyante, āsvādayanti, nigamayanti, upayanti, anuśerate, adhitiṣṭha(n)ti, abhīni(viśanti), mamāyante, manyamte, prārthayante, ghanīkurvanti, rasīkurvanti, pratiniḥsrjanti*. A to some extent comparable list of various terms to expand an original instruction on becoming habituated can be found after SĀ 131 at T II 41c4, although here related to the five aggregates instead.

<sup>66</sup> Parallel: SN 35.193 at SN IV 166,15.

<sup>67</sup> T II 59b17 gives the location as 波吒利弗多羅國雞林園; presumably the same location is referred to at T II 146b25 as 波羅利弗妬路雞林精舍, in

At that time the venerable Ānanda approached the venerable Mahācunda and, having exchanged friendly greetings, sat to one side.<sup>68</sup> At that time the venerable Ānanda said to the venerable Cunda: “I would like to ask a question. Would you have free time to show me the answer?”

The venerable Cunda said to the venerable Ānanda: “Friend, on knowing what you are asking, I shall reply accordingly.”

The venerable Ānanda asked the venerable Cunda: “As the Blessed One, the Tathāgata, the arahant, the fully awakened one, on having known and having seen it, has taught that form is made of the four great [elements] and has designated and has disclosed that this form, [made of] the four great [elements], is not self. Has the Tathāgata, the arahant, the fully awakened one, on having known and having seen it, also taught that consciousness is not self?”

The venerable Cunda said to the venerable Ānanda: “Friend, you are most learned. I would come from afar to approach the

---

relation to which Akanuma 1930/1994: 324 identifies 雞林精舍 as corresponding to Kukkuṭārāma.

<sup>68</sup> Instead of Ānanda approaching Mahācunda, in SN 35.193 Udāyin approaches Ānanda, who then explains the matter to Udāyin.

venerable one for the sake of asking for this teaching. Venerable, may you now explain its meaning.”

The venerable Ānanda said to Cunda: “Venerable, I will now ask you, show me the answer according to your understanding. Venerable Cunda, do the eye, forms, and eye consciousness exist?” [59c]

[Cunda] replied: “They exist.”

The venerable Ānanda asked him again: “Does eye-consciousness arise in dependence on the eye and forms?”

[Cunda] replied: “It is like this.”

The venerable Ānanda asked him again: “With eye-consciousness arisen in dependence on the eye and forms,<sup>69</sup> are those causes, those conditions, permanent or are they impermanent?”

[Cunda] replied: “They are impermanent.”

The venerable Ānanda asked him again: “As for those causes, those conditions for the arising of eye-consciousness, when

---

<sup>69</sup> The translation is based on adopting the variant 緣 instead of 若.

those causes, those conditions are impermanent and change, does that [eye-]consciousness remain?”<sup>70</sup>

[Cunda] replied: “No, venerable Ānanda.”

The venerable Ānanda asked him again: “What do you think, that which can be known to have the nature of arising and of ceasing, would a learned noble disciple herein regard it as the self, as distinct from the self [in the sense of being owned by it], as existing [within the self, or the self] as existing [within it]?”

[Cunda] replied: “No, venerable Ānanda.”

[*In the same way for*] the ear ... the nose ... the tongue ... the body ... the mind and mind objects.

[Ānanda asked him again]: “What do you think, do the mind, mind-objects, and mind-consciousness exist?”

[Cunda] replied: “They exist.”

---

<sup>70</sup> The argument in SN 35.193 does not bring in impermanence. Instead, the point is simply that with the complete cessation of the causes, the corresponding type of consciousness is not discerned.

[Ānanda] asked him again: “Does mind-consciousness arise in dependence on the mind and mind-objects?”

[Cunda] replied: “It is like this, venerable Ānanda.”

[Ānanda] asked him again: “As for mind-consciousness arisen in dependence on the mind and mind-objects, are those causes, those conditions, permanent or are they impermanent?”

[Cunda] replied: “They are impermanent, venerable Ānanda.”

[Ānanda] asked him again: “As for those causes, as for those conditions for the arising of mind-consciousness, when those causes, those conditions are impermanent and change, does that mind-consciousness remain?”

[Cunda] replied: “No, venerable Ānanda.”

[Ānanda] asked him again: “What do you think, that which can be known to have the nature of arising and of ceasing, would a learned noble disciple herein regard it as the self, as distinct from the self [in the sense of being owned by it], as existing [within the self, or the self] as existing [within it]?”

[Cunda] replied: “No, venerable Ānanda.”

The venerable Ānanda said to Cunda: “Venerable, for this reason the Tathāgata, the arahant, the fully awakened one, on having known and having seen it, has taught that consciousness is also ⟨not self⟩.<sup>71</sup>

“It is just as if a person were to enter a mountain, carrying an axe. On seeing a plantain tree, thinking that it could be used as timber, he chops it down at the root and cuts off the leaves. He takes off the skin in search of solid heart[wood], taking it off until it is used up, [yet] it is totally without a solid essence.

“In the same way learned noble disciples rightly contemplate eye-consciousness ... ear- ... nose- ... tongue- ... body- ... mind-consciousness. When rightly contemplating it, there will be nothing at all for them to be grasped. Because there is nothing to be grasped, they are not attached. Because of not being attached, they themselves realize Nirvāṇa: ‘Birth for me has been eradicated, the holy life has been established, what had to be done has been done, we know ourselves that there will be no receiving of further existence.’”

When this teaching had been spoken, those ⟨two⟩ worthy ones

---

<sup>71</sup> The translation is based on emending 無常 to read 非我, in keeping with the original statement at T II 59b25.

kept on delighting in it and returned to their respective places.<sup>72</sup>

249)<sup>73</sup>

Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was staying at Sāvathī in Jeta’s Grove, Anāthapiṇḍika’s Park.

At that time the venerable Ānanda approached the venerable Sāriputta. He said to the venerable Sāriputta:<sup>74</sup> “I would like to ask a question. Would you have free time to explain it to me?” [60a]

Sāriputta said: “Friend, on knowing what you are asking, I shall reply accordingly.”

The venerable Ānanda asked the venerable Sāriputta: “When the six spheres of contact have been eradicated, faded away, ceased, appeased, and disappeared, is there something that still remains?”

The venerable Sāriputta said to Ānanda: “You should not ask this question: ‘When the six spheres of contact have been

---

<sup>72</sup> SN 35.193 has no comparable concluding statement. The translation is based on emending 一 to read 二, which is clearly required by the context

<sup>73</sup> Parallel: AN 4.174 at AN II 161,1.

<sup>74</sup> In AN 4.174 Mahākoṭṭhita approaches Sāriputta with this question, followed by Ānanda approaching Mahākoṭṭhita with the same question.

eradicated, faded away, ceased, appeased, and disappeared, is there something that still remains?”

Ānanda asked the venerable Sāriputta again: “When the six spheres of contact have been eradicated, faded away, ceased, appeased, and disappeared, is there nothing that still remains?”

The venerable Sāriputta said to Ānanda: “It is also not proper to ask in this way: ‘When the six spheres of contact have been eradicated, faded away, ceased, appeased, and disappeared, is there nothing that still remains?’”

Ānanda asked the venerable Sāriputta again: “When the six spheres of contact have been eradicated, faded away, ceased, appeased, and disappeared, is there something that remains and nothing that remains, or neither something that remains nor nothing that remains?”

The venerable Sāriputta said to Ānanda: “It is also not proper to ask in this way: ‘When the six spheres of contact have been eradicated, faded away, ceased, appeased, and disappeared, is there something that remains and nothing that remains, or neither something that remains nor nothing that remains?’”

The venerable Ānanda asked Sāriputta again: “The venerable

has said that when the six spheres of contact have been eradicated, faded away, ceased, appeased, and disappeared it is not proper to speak of existence, it is also not proper to speak of non-existence, it is also not proper to speak of existence and non-existence, and it is also not proper to speak of neither existence nor non-existence. What is the meaning of this statement?”

The venerable Sāriputta said to the venerable Ānanda: “This is indeed baseless talk:<sup>75</sup> ‘When the six spheres of contact have been eradicated, faded away, ceased, appeased, and disappeared, is there something that remains?’ This is indeed baseless talk: ‘Is there nothing that remains?’ This is indeed baseless talk: ‘Is there something that remains and nothing that remains?’ This is indeed baseless talk: ‘Is there neither something that remains nor nothing that remains?’ If one says: ‘When the six spheres of contact have been eradicated, faded away, ceased, appeased, and disappeared, one attains Nirvāṇa and is apart from all that is baseless and false, then this is indeed what the Buddha taught.’”

Then the two worthy ones kept on delighting in it and returned

---

<sup>75</sup> In AN 4.174 at AN II 161,28, Sāriputta explains that with such statements one proliferates what is not to be proliferated, *appapañcaṃ papañceti*, followed by explaining that the range of the six sense-spheres corresponds to the range of proliferation and with their cessation, proliferation ceases as well.

to their respective places.

## Abbreviations

AN	<i>Aṅguttara-nikāya</i>
D	Derge edition
EĀ	<i>Ekottarika-āgama</i> (T 125)
MN	<i>Majjhima-nikāya</i>
Q	Peking edition
SĀ	<i>Samyukta-āgama</i> (T 99)
SN	<i>Samyutta-nikāya</i>
T	Taishō edition, CBETA
Up	<i>Abhidharmakośopāyikā-ṭīkā</i>

## References

- Akanuma, Chizen 1929/1990: *The Comparative Catalogue of Chinese Āgamas & Pāli Nikāyas*, Delhi: Sri Satguru.
- 1930/1994: *A Dictionary of Buddhist Proper Names*, Delhi: Sri Satguru.
- Anālayo 2005: “Some Pāli Discourses in the Light of Their Chinese Parallels (2)”, *Buddhist Studies Review*, 22.2: 93–105.
- 2011: *A Comparative Study of the Majjhima-nikāya*,

- Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation.
- 2012: “Mahāyāna in the Ekottarika-āgama”, *Singaporean Journal of Buddhist Studies*, 1: 5–43.
- 2016: “On the Six Sense-spheres (1) — A Translation of Saṃyukta-āgama Discourses 188 to 229 (Fascicle 8)”, *Dharma Drum Journal of Buddhist Studies*, 18: 1–61.
- Bechert, Heinz and Wille, K. 1989: *Sanskrihandschriften aus den Turfanfunden, Teil 6*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Bodhi, Bhikkhu 2000: *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha, A New Translation of the Saṃyutta Nikāya*, Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Choong Mun-keat 1999: *The Notion of Emptiness in Early Buddhism*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- 2000: *The Fundamental Teachings of Early Buddhism, A Comparative Study Based on the Sūtrāṅga Portion of the Pāli Saṃyutta-Nikāya and the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- 2004: *Annotated Translations of Sutras from the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama relevant to the Early Buddhist Teachings on Emptiness and the Middle Way*, Malaysia: Penang: Chee Khoon Printings.
- Chung, Jin-il 2008: *A Survey of the Sanskrit Fragments Corresponding to the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama*, Tokyo:

Sankibo.

Collett, Alice and Anālayo 2014: “Bhikkhave and Bhikkhu as Gender-inclusive Terminology in Early Buddhist Texts”, *Journal of Buddhist Ethics*, 21: 760–797.

Delhey, Martin 2009: *Samāhitā Bhūmiḥ, Das Kapitel über die meditative Versenkung im Grundteil der Yogācārabhūmi*, Wien: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien.

Dhammadinnā, Bhikkhunī 2018: “A Translation of the Quotations in Śamathadeva’s Abhidharmakośopāyikā-ṭīkā Parallel to the Chinese Samyukta-āgama Discourses 231, 238, 240, 245, 252 and 255”, *Dharma Drum Journal of Buddhist Studies*, 22: 85–109.

Dietz, Siglinde 1984: *Fragmente des Dharmaskandha, Ein Abhidharma-Text in Sanskrit aus Gilgit*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Jaini, Padhmanabh S. 1959: *Abhidharmadīpa with Vibhāṣāprabhāvṛtti, Critically Edited with Notes and Introduction*, Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.

Lamotte, Étienne 1944/1976 (vol. 4): *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñā-pāramitāśāstra)*, Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut Orientaliste.

—— 1973: “Trois Sūtra du Saṃyukta sur la Vacuité”, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 36: 313–323.

Matsuda Kazunobu 1994: “Yugaron Shōimonbun no bonbun dakan (Sanskrit Fragments of the Paryayasamgrahaṇī of the Yogācārabhūmi)”, *Hokkaidō Journal of Indological and Buddhist Studies*, 9: 90–108.

Nagashima Jundo 2015: “The Sanskrit Fragments Or. 15009/501–600 in the Hoernle Collection”, in *Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia, The British Library Sanskrit Fragments, Volume II*, Karashima S., Nagashima J., and K. Wille (ed.), 347–418, Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.

Pāsādika, Bhikkhu 1989: *Kanonische Zitate im Abhidharma-kośabhāṣya des Vasubandhu*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Pradhan, Pralhad 1967: *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.

Sander, Lore and E. Waldschmidt 1985: *Sanskriithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden, Teil V*, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

Schmithausen, Lambert 1987/2007: *Ālayavijñāna, On the Origin and the Early Development of a Central Concept of Yogācāra Philosophy*, Tokyo: The International

Institute for Buddhist Studies.

Wogihara Unrai 1932: *Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā* by *Yaśomitra, Part I*, Tokyo: The Publishing Association of Abhidharmakośavyākhyā.

———1936: *Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā* by *Yaśomitra, Part II*, Tokyo: The Publishing Association of Abhidharmakośavyākhyā.

Yīnshùn 印順 1983 (vol. 1): 《雜阿含經論會編》, Taipei: 正聞出版社 (page references are to the actual edition, not to the front matter).



## Acknowledgement:

I am indebted to Bhikkhunī Dhammadinnā, Mike Running, Shi Synchen, and Ken Su for commenting on a draft version of this article.

## 〈六根品〉(2) — 漢譯《雜阿含經》230 至 249 經英文譯注

無著比丘英譯，「中文摘要」為蘇錦坤代擬

本文為《雜阿含經》英譯系列論文的第八篇，前面七篇已發表在《法鼓佛學學報》11-17期。

鑑於漢譯《雜阿含經》(T 99)尚未出現完整的英譯，此為歐美學者閱讀、研究或引用此一漢譯文獻的障礙；此一系列論文的英譯、註解及比較研究應可減低這樣的隔閡。

對漢語世界而言，此一系列的英譯可以當作經文的白話翻譯，可以參考當代的《雜阿含經》白話譯本而取長捨短，部分註解可以用來追溯可能的巴利用字，並參酌巴利註釋書的字義解釋。相關的論文不僅提示漢巴對應經典之間主要的差異，也徵引了部分梵文殘卷與寂止天(Śamathadeva)的《俱舍論附隨·疏》(*Abhidharmakośopāyikā-ṭīkā*)所抄錄的《雜阿含經》經文。