

Udāna Sutta

The Discourse on the Inspired Utterance

[Consciousness works with the aggregates]

(Sāmyutta Nikāya 22.55/3:55-58)

Translated by Piya Tan ©2006

1. Introduction

According to the Sutta Commentary, the Buddha’s inspired utterance (*udāna*)—“It might not, it might not be for me; and it will not be, it will not be for me,”¹ resolving thus, that a monk would cut off the lower fetters”² [2]—is based on the powerful joy while reflecting on the liberating quality (*niyyānika*, *bhāva*) of the Teaching (SA 2:273). The first five lower fetters (*oram*, *bhāgiya*) of the ten fetters³ are so called because they bind one to the lower realms. The remaining five are the higher fetters (*uddham*, *bhāgiya*): they bind one to the higher realms. Either way one is caught in samsara.

The Commentary speaks of the three supports by way of necessary condition (*upanissaya*), that is, the support of charity (*dānūpanissaya*), the support of moral virtue (*sīlānūpanissaya*), and the support of mental cultivation (*bhāvanānūpanissaya*).

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

2. *No c’assa no ca me siyā, na bhavissati na me bhavissatī ti*

The most difficult sentence in the sutta clearly is this: *No c’assa no ca me siyā, na bhavissati na me bhavissatī ti* [§2], an important statement found in a number of other suttas (see below). This statement is found in the Suttas in two forms.⁴

(1) ANNIHILATIONISM. The annihilationist (*uccheda*, *diṭṭhi*) version—*no c’assam no ca me siyā, na bhavissāmi na me bhavissatī ti*⁵ (“the no c’assam passage”)—is found in the **Paṭhama Kosala Sutta** (A 10.29), the Buddha declares it to be “the foremost of outside speculative views” (*etad-aggam bāhirakānam diṭṭhi, gatānam*), the reason being that one who accepts such a view would neither be attracted to existence nor be averse to the ending of cessation.⁶ In this connection, **Bodhi** notes:

It is problematic how the optative clause in the annihilationist version should be interpreted; perhaps it can be read as an assertion that personal existence, along with its experienced world, is

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

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

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

⁴ For a fuller discussion, see S:B 1060 n75.

⁵ Choong identifies this sentence with this Chinese reading at SĀ 64: 法無有吾我，亦復無我所，我既非當有，我所何由生？(2000:57): see below 2(2) for tr. He thinks, “It is possible that the earlier unsanskritised form, with eight syllables per line, was: *no c’assam no ca me siyā, nāhessam na me hessati*.” (2000:57 n94). This Chinese reading, however, fits *no c’assa no ca me siyā, na bhavissati na me bhavissatī* better: see (2) here.

⁶ A 10.29.12/5:63 = SD 16.15.

utterly fortuitous (“I might not have been and it might not have been mine”). The clause in the future clearly asserts that personal existence and its world will terminate at death. (S:B 1061 n75)

The statement is also found in **the Pāṛileyya Sutta** (S 22.81), where it is explicitly identified as an annihilationist view,⁷ and where Bodhi follows the Sinhalese, Siamese and PTS readings (the Burmese MS reads the 3rd negated verb as *nābhavissam*). The Saṃyutta Commentary—reading *c*’ as *ce*—explains it as: “If I were not to be, neither would there be my belongings; if I will not be in the future, neither will there be my belongings” (*sace ahaṃ na bhaveyyaṃ mama parikkhāro pi na bhaveyya...sace pana āyatim pi ahaṃ na bhavissāmi evam mama parikkhāro pi na bhavissati*).⁸

An alternate translation is possible: “**If I were not to be, neither it would there be for me; if I will not be in the future, neither will it be for me.**” The Saṃyutta Commentary here takes *c*’ as *ce*, that is, *sace* (“if”), and its Porāṇa Tīkā, too, glosses it as *yadi*. However, parallel passages in the Sanskrit have *ca* (“and”)⁹ As such, a better translation here would be “I will not be, *and* it will not be for me.” Here, the first “it” can be taken to refer to the personal five aggregates, and the second to the world as perceived through the aggregates. Alternately, the first “it” might be taken to refer to craving, and the second to the five aggregates. In this connection, see also **the Eso Attā Sutta** (S 22.152)¹⁰ and **the So Attā Sutta** (S 24.4),¹¹ where the statement is regarded as a wrong view.

(2) THE BUDDHA’S USAGE. By replacing the 1st person verbs with their 3rd person counterparts, the Buddha changed this formula into a Dharma-based “*no c’assa*” statement: ***no c’assa no ca me siyā, na bhavissati na me bhavissati***. Bodhi notes, “The change of person shifts the stress from the view of self implicit in the annihilationist version (‘I will be annihilated’) to an impersonal perspective that harmonizes with the *anattā* doctrine.”¹² This usage is found in **the Udāna Sutta** (S 22.55).¹³

Apparently, the “*no c’assa* passage” has a Saṃyukta Āgama counterpart (the only one, according to CHOONG Mun Keat, who identified it)¹⁴ in this Chinese translation:

法無有吾我，亦復無我所，我既非當有，我所何由生？

Dharmas (phenomena) are not-self, and not belonging to self. Since self will not be, whence will there be belonging to self? (T2.16c)¹⁵

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

In **the Āneñja, sappāya Sutta** (M 106), we find this formula with a rider, *yad atthi yaṃ bhūtaṃ, taṃ pajahāmi*, “I abandon that which is, that which has come to be.”¹⁶ This contemplation leads to equanimity. If one practises (based on the full formula and the rider) but clings to equanimity, one gains rebirth in the base of neither-perception-nor-non-perception, or, if there is no clinging to equanimity, one attains nirvana.¹⁷ The Sutta Commentary explains the passage in terms of the annihilationist view as follows:

⁷ S 22.81.26/3:99 = SD 6.1.

⁸ SA 2:275 = 306.

⁹ Eg U 78 || Uv 15.4.

¹⁰ S 22.152/3:182 f.

¹¹ S 24.4/3:205 f.

¹² S:B 1061 = n75.

¹³ S 22.55/3:55.

¹⁴ CHOONG Mun Keat 2000:57.

¹⁵ Choong qu from 雜阿含經論會編 *Combined Edition of Sūtra and Śāstra of the Saṃyuktāgama* 1983 1:102. Choong orig identifies this passage with the one in **Udāna S** (S 22.55/3:55) = SD 17.16.

¹⁶ **Āneñja, sappāya S** (M 106.8/2:264); **Purisa, gati S** (A 7.52/4:70-74, passim).

¹⁷ M 106.11-12/2:265.

If the fivefold¹⁸ round of karma had not been accumulated by me, now there would not be for me the round of results: if the fivefold round of karma is not accumulated by me now, in the future there will not be the rounds of results. (MA 4:65 f)

In the **Purisa,gati Sutta** (A 7.52), a resolution, guided by the formula and the rider, brings one to one of the five levels of non-return or to arhathood itself.¹⁹

A shorter formula is applied in **the Kaccāna Sutta** (U 7.8) to the mindfulness of the body, and one who dwells thus gradually goes beyond attachment, that is, gains arhathood.²⁰

(3) BODHI'S INTERPRETATIONS. Regarding these usages, **Bodhi** (in *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha*, 2000) makes the following important and instructive note:²¹

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

[SA] explains the formula in [**the Udāna Sutta**, S 22.55] on the basis of the questionable reading *c' assaṃ*, though its second alternative conforms to the superior reading *c'assa*. I translate here from [SA] very literally, rendering the lemma in the way favoured by the explanation: "If I were not, it would not be for me: If I were not (*sace ahaṃ na bhavēyyaṃ*), neither would there be my belongings (*mama parikkhāro*). Or else: If in my past there had not been kammic formation [*kammābhisaṅkhāro*],²² now there would not be for me these five aggregates. *I will not be, (and) it will not be for me*: I will now so strive that there will not be any kammic formation of mine producing the aggregates in the future; when that is absent, there will be for me no future rebirth."

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

On this basis, I would interpret the formula thus: "The five aggregates can be terminated, and the world presented by them can be terminated. I will so strive that the five aggregates will be terminated, (and) so that the world presented by them will be terminated." Alternatively, the first "it" might be taken to refer to craving, and the second to the five aggregates arisen through craving. In the additional rider, "what exists, what has come to be" [*yad atthi yaṃ bhūtaṃ*] denotes the presently existent set of five aggregates, which are being abandoned through the abandonment of the cause for their continued re-manifestation, namely, craving or desire-and-lust [*chanda,-rāga*]. (S:B 1062 f = n75; refs normalized)

— — —

¹⁸ Here "fivefold" (*pañca,vidha*) refers to the five aggregates (MAṬ:Be 2:257).

¹⁹ A 7.52/4:70-74.

²⁰ U 7.8/78,2-3.

²¹ Bodhi's n runs about 2½ pages, and here only the latter half is quoted: for full n, see S:B 1060 n75.

²² Bodhi's orig reading: *kammābhi-saṅkhāro*.

The Discourse on the Inspired Utterance (S 22.55/3:55-58)

1 At Sāvathī.

THE UNINSTRUCTED WORLDLING

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

“‘It might not be, it might not be for me; and it will not be, it will not be for me,’²³ [56] resolving thus, that a monk would cut off the lower fetters.”²⁴

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

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

4 “Here, bhikshu, one is an uninstructed worldling [ignorant ordinary] person, who has no regard for the noble ones and is unskilled and undisciplined in their Dharma, who has no regard for the true individuals and is unskilled and undisciplined in their Dharma:²⁵

he regards form as **self**, or self as possessing form, or form as in self, or self as in form;

he regards feeling as self, or self as possessing feeling, or feeling as in self, or self as in feeling;

he regards perception as self, or self as possessing perception, or perception as in self, or self as in perception;

he regards formations as self, or self as possessing formations, or formations as in self, or self as in formations;

he regards consciousness as self, or self as possessing consciousness, or consciousness as in self, or self as in consciousness.

The aggregates are impermanent

5 He does not understand that form is **impermanent**, as it really is, that ‘Form is impermanent.’

He does not understand that feeling is impermanent, as it really is, that ‘Feeling is impermanent.’

He does not understand that perception is impermanent, as it really is, that ‘Perception is impermanent.’

He does not understand that formations are impermanent, as it really is, that ‘Formations are impermanent.’

He does not understand that consciousness is impermanent, as it really is, that ‘Consciousness is impermanent.’

The aggregates are unsatisfactory

6 He does not understand that form is **unsatisfactory**, as it really is, that ‘Form is unsatisfactory.’

He does not understand that feeling is unsatisfactory, as it really is, that ‘Feeling is unsatisfactory.’

He does not understand that perception is unsatisfactory, as it really is, that ‘Perception is unsatisfactory.’

He does not understand that formations are unsatisfactory, as it really is, that ‘Formations are unsatisfactory.’

²³ *No c’assa no ca me siyā, na bhavissati na me bhavissatī ti.* On problems regarding its reading, see Introd (2).

²⁴ Here the attainment of non-return (*anāgāmitā*) is meant. On the lower fetters, see Introd (1).

²⁵ These are the 4 basic modes of self-identity view: for a full passage on how rejecting these 4 modes in terms of the aggregates leads to “immediate destruction of the cankers,” see **Pārileyya S** (S 22.81.14-27/3:96-99) = SD 6.1, The **Paṭisambhidā, magga** explains the 4 modes in connection with form with the following analogies: form as self = a burning oil-lamp’s flame and its flame are identical; self as possessing form = the shadow of a tree possesses; form as in self = the scent in the flower; self as in form = a jewel in a casket (Pm 2.50, 74, 77, 90 = 1:143-145).

He does not understand that consciousness is unsatisfactory, as it really is, that ‘Consciousness is unsatisfactory.’

The aggregates are not self

- 7 He does not understand that form is **not self**, as it really is, that ‘Form is not self.’
 He does not understand that feeling is not self, as it really is, that ‘Feeling is not self.’
 He does not understand that perception is not self, as it really is, that ‘Perception is not self.’
 He does not understand that formations are not self, as it really is, that ‘Formations are not self.’
 He does not understand that consciousness is not self, as it really is, that ‘Consciousness is not self.’

The aggregates are conditioned

- 8 He does not understand that form is **conditioned**, as it really is, that ‘Form is conditioned.’
 He does not understand that feeling is conditioned, as it really is, that ‘Feeling is conditioned.’
 He does not understand that perception is conditioned, as it really is, that ‘Perception is conditioned.’
 He does not understand that formations are conditioned, as it really is, that ‘Formations are conditioned.’
 He does not understand that consciousness is conditioned, as it really is, that ‘Consciousness is conditioned.’

The aggregates will be exterminated

- 9 He does not understand that form is **exterminated** [finally perish], as it really is, that ‘Form is exterminated.’²⁶
 He does not understand that feeling is exterminated, as it really is, that ‘Feeling is exterminated.’
 He does not understand that perception is exterminated, as it really is, that ‘Perception is exterminated.’
 He does not understand that formations are exterminated, as it really is, that ‘Formations are exterminated.’
 He does not understand that consciousness is exterminated, as it really is, that ‘Consciousness is exterminated.’ [57]

THE INSTRUCTED NOBLE DISCIPLE

10 Bhikshu, the instructed noble disciple, who has regard for the noble ones and is skilled and disciplined in their Dharma, who has regard for the true individuals and is skilled and disciplined in their Dharma:

- he does not regard form as **self**, or self as possessing form, or form as in self, or self as in form;
 he does not regard feeling as self, or self as possessing feeling, or feeling as in self, or self as in feeling;
 he does not regard perception as self, or self as possessing perception, or perception as in self, or self as in perception;
 he does not regard formations as self, or self as possessing formations, or formations as in self, or self as in formations;
 he does not regard consciousness as self, or self as possessing consciousness, or consciousness as in self, or self as in consciousness.

²⁶ *Rūpaṃ vibhavissati*, which Comy glosses as *rūpaṃ bhijjissati*, “Form will break up” (SA 2:275), and Subcomy uses *vinasissati*, “will perish” (SAṬ:Be 2:224). Apparently, these commentators regard *vibhavissati* here as the momentary cessation of the aggregates, but **Bodhi** comments, “I believe the verb refers to the final cessation of the aggregates with the attainment of the *anupādisesa, nibbāna, dhātu*. This meaning harmonizes better with the opening formula, and also seems supported by Tha 715cd: *saṅkhārā vibhavissant, tatha kā paridevanā*, “formations (only) will be exterminated, so what lamentation can there be over that.” (S:B 1063 n76)

The aggregates are impermanent

11 He understands that form is **impermanent**, as it really is, that ‘Form is impermanent.’
He understands that feeling is impermanent, as it really is, that ‘Feeling is impermanent.’
He understands that perception is impermanent, as it really is, that ‘Perception is impermanent.’
He understands that formations are impermanent, as it really is, that ‘Formations are impermanent.’
He understands that consciousness is impermanent, as it really is, that ‘Consciousness is impermanent.’

The aggregates are unsatisfactory

12 He understands that form is **unsatisfactory**, as it really is, that ‘Form is unsatisfactory.’
He understands that feeling is unsatisfactory, as it really is, that ‘Feeling is unsatisfactory.’
He understands that perception is unsatisfactory, as it really is, that ‘Perception is unsatisfactory.’
He understands that formations are unsatisfactory, as it really is, that ‘Formations are unsatisfactory.’
He understands that consciousness is unsatisfactory, as it really is, that ‘Consciousness is unsatisfactory.’

The aggregates are not self

13 He understands that form is **not self**, as it really is, that ‘Form is not self.’
He understands that feeling is not self, as it really is, that ‘Feeling is not self.’
He understands that perception is not self, as it really is, that ‘Perception is not self.’
He understands that formations are not self, as it really is, that ‘Formations are not self.’
He understands that consciousness is not self, as it really is, that ‘Consciousness is not self.’

The aggregates are conditioned

14 He understands that form is **conditioned**, as it really is, that ‘Form is conditioned.’
He understands that feeling is conditioned, as it really is, that ‘Feeling is conditioned.’
He understands that perception is conditioned, as it really is, that ‘Perception is conditioned.’
He understands that formations are conditioned, as it really is, that ‘Formations are conditioned.’
He understands that consciousness is conditioned, as it really is, that ‘Consciousness is conditioned.’

The aggregates will be exterminated

15 He understands that form is **exterminated** [finally perish], as it really is, that ‘Form is exterminated.’²⁷
He understands that feeling is exterminated, as it really is, that ‘Feeling is exterminated.’
He understands that perception is exterminated, as it really is, that ‘Perception is exterminated.’
He understands that formations are exterminated, as it really is, that ‘Formations are exterminated.’
He understands that consciousness is exterminated, as it really is, that ‘Consciousness is exterminated.’

When the aggregates are exterminated

16 With the extermination of form,
with the extermination of feeling,
with the extermination of perception,
with the extermination of formations,
with the extermination of consciousness,
that monk, resolving thus: ‘It might not, it might not be for me; and it will not be, it will not be for me,’
would cut off the lower fetters.”²⁸

²⁷ *Rūpaṃ vibhavissati*: see §9 n above.

THE ARHAT

17 “Resolving thus, bhante, that monk would cut off the lower fetters. But how, bhante, should one see, so that there is the immediate²⁹ destruction of the cankers?”³⁰

18 “Here, bhikshu, the uninstructed worldling trembles at what does not cause trembling [is terrified at what does not terrify].³¹

For, bhikshu, the uninstructed worldling trembles at the thought, ‘It might not, it might not be for me; and it will not be, it will not be for me.’

19 But, bhikshu, the instructed noble disciple does not tremble at the thought, ‘It might not, it might not be for me; and it will not be, it will not be for me.’ [58]

The proliferation of consciousness

20 Consciousness, bhikshu, while standing [while it exists], would stand stuck to form [taking it as its object], fixed around [supported by] form, devoted to delight— it would come to growth, increase, abundance.³²

21 Consciousness, bhikshu, while standing, would stand stuck to feeling, fixed around feeling, devoted to delight—

²⁸ According to Comy this is attained by seeing the extermination, together with insight. For the four paths together with insight are called “the seeing of extermination of form, etc.” (SA 2:275). **Bodhi**, however, interprets this as referring to “the ultimate cessation of the aggregates in nirvana, and thus the realization that such cessation takes place functions as the spur implicit in the meditation formula that inspires the bhikkhu to break the five fetters.” (S:B 1063 n77)

²⁹ “Immediate,” *anantarā*, ie in an uninterrupted manner. Also “immediately after.” Alt tr: “...so that there follows the immediate destruction of the mental cankers.” Comy explains that there are 2 types of immediacy (*anantara*), proximate and distant. Insight is the proximate immediate cause for the path (because the supramundane path arises when insight peaks), and the distant immediate cause for the fruit (because the fruit directly follows the path) (SA 2:275 f). Here, it refers to “the fruit of arhathood immediately following the path” (*magg’anantaram arahatta, phalam*) (SA 3:306). Bodhi: “However, as in the commentarial system the fruit inevitably occurs in immediate succession to the path. I think the monk is really asking how to attain arahantship swiftly and directly, without being detained at any lower stage of awakening.” (S:B 1075 n131). See **Pāṛileyya S** (S 22.81.10/3:96) = SD 6.1.

³⁰ “**Mental cankers**,” *āsava*. The term *āsava* (lit “cankers”) comes from *ā-savati* “flows towards” (ie either “into” or “out” towards the observer). It has been variously translated as influxes, taints (“deadly taints”, RD), corruptions, intoxicants, biases, depravity, misery, evil (influence), or simply left untranslated. The Abhidhamma lists four *āsava*: the canker of (1) sense-desire (*kām’āsava*), (2) (desire for eternal) existence (*bhav’āsava*), (3) wrong views (*diṭṭh’āsava*), (4) ignorance (*avijjāsava*) (D 16.2.4, Pm 1.442, 561, Dhs §§1096-1100, Vbh §937). These four are also known as “floods” (*ogha*) and “yokes” (*yoga*). The list of three cankers (omitting the canker of views) [43] is probably older and is found more frequently in the Suttas (D 3:216, 33.1.10(20); M 1:55, 3:41; A 3.59, 67, 6.63). The destruction of these *āsavas* is equivalent to arhathood. See BDict: *āsava*.

³¹ Comy: The worldling becomes afraid with the arising of weak insight (*dubbala, vipassanā*) because he is unable to overcome self-love, and so becomes afraid, thinking, “Now I will be annihilated and will not exist any more.” He sees himself falling down a precipice [**Alagaddūpama S**, M 22.20/1:136,30-137,4 = SD 3.13]. But when strong insight occurs to the instructed noble disciple, he is not afraid but thinks, “It is only formations that arise, only formations that cease.” (SA 2:276). For such a case of fearfulness, see eg the youth Yasa’s spiritual experience: V 1:15-18 = SD 11.3(7.1-6). “Knowledge of appearance as fearful” (*bhayat’upatthāna, ñāṇa*) refers to an advanced stage of insight that reveals the fearful nature of formations in the three periods of time: see **Bhāvanā** = SD 25.1.11-6(3) (on the 7 purifications) & Vism 21.29-34/645-647. See also S:B 1064 n78 & 1084 n181.

³² *Rūpūpayamā vā bhikkhu viññānam tiṭṭhamānam tiṭṭheyya rūp’ārammaṇam rūpa, patīṭṭham nand’upasevanam vuddhim virūḥim vepullam āpajjeyya.*

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

The ending of consciousness

- 24 Bhikshu, one might say this:
‘Apart from form, apart from feeling, apart from perception, apart from formations, apart from consciousness, I will declare the coming and going of consciousness, or its passing away and rebirth, or its growth, increase, abundance’—this is impossible.
- 25 Bhikshu, if a monk has abandoned lust for the form element,³³ with the abandoning of lust, the basis is cut off—there is no support for consciousness.³⁴
- 26 Bhikshu, if a monk has abandoned lust for the feeling element, with the abandoning of lust, the basis is cut off—there is no support for consciousness.
- 27 Bhikshu, if a monk has abandoned lust for the perception element, with the abandoning of lust, the basis is cut off—there is no support for consciousness.
- 28 Bhikshu, if a monk has abandoned lust for the formation element, with the abandoning of lust, the basis is cut off—there is no support for consciousness.
- 29 Bhikshu, if a monk has abandoned lust for the consciousness element, with the abandoning of lust, the basis is cut off—there is no support for consciousness.

Liberation

- 30 That consciousness that is has no support would not increase, would not be formed—it is liberated.
- Through being liberated, it remains steady.
Through remaining steady, it is contented.
Through contentment, it is not agitated.
Through not being agitated, he personally attains nirvana. He understands:
‘Destroyed is birth. The holy life has been lived. What needs to be done has been done. There is (for me) no more of arising in any state of being.’
- 31 Bhikshu, it is for one who knows thus, who sees thus, that there is the immediate destruction of the cankers.”

— evaṃ —

³³ “Element,” *dhātu*; here it refers to the sense-objects as the bases for perception.

³⁴ *Rūpa, dhātuyā ce bhikkhu bhikkhuno rāgo pahāno hoti rāgassa pahānā vocchijjat’ārammaṇam patitṭhitā viññāṇassa na hoti.* The word *vocchijjata* is the passive form of *chindati*, “he cuts of, destroys, remove” (both lit & fig), from √CHID (to cut up).

Bibliography

Choong, Mun-keat [Wei-keat]

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

060716; 090804a