

中華佛學學報第 9 期 (pp.309-339) : (民國 85 年),  
臺北 : 中華佛學研究所, <http://www.chibs.edu.tw>  
Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal, No. 9, (1996)  
Taipei: Chung-Hwa Institute of Buddhist Studies  
ISSN: 1017—7132

## A Pre-Buddhist Meditation System and its Early Modifications by Gotama the Bodhisattva (II)

Biswadeb Mukherjee  
Visiting Professor Chung-Hwa Institute of Buddhist Studies

### Summary

In the present article we have mainly studied the Dvedhāvitakka-sutta for evaluating Gotama the Bodhisattva's contribution to the śramaṇa system of meditation. The entire sutta represents an amalgam of two different pieces of teachings, one of which is recorded in the First Part of the translated materials and the other is contained in the Second and Third parts of the same.

The First Part of the materials presents an intermingling of two traditions; one of these traditions is concerned with the Buddha's teaching about the two types of thoughts while the other narrates the actual strivings of Gotama the Bodhisattva regarding the same two types of thoughts. According to the second tradition Gotama got rid of the evil thoughts of desire, malevolence and violence by adversely criticising them and then he developed the opposite good thoughts of renunciation, benevolence and compassion through appreciative deliberations. The contents of both the adverse criticism and the appreciative deliberations are concerned with the wholesome and unwholesome effects of the good thoughts and the evil thoughts respectively, and in no way associated with paññā and nibbāna.

The First Part was originally an independent piece of teaching and cannot be regarded as a prelude to the second and third parts. But we have no reason to doubt the authenticity of the tradition contained in the First Part that Gotama valued the mental morality more than the physical morality. It is one of the points in which Gotama deviated from the traditional spiritual practices of the śramaṇas.

The Second Part and the Third Part give an account of the meditative system by practising which Gotama attained bodhi and other vijjās. The four rūpa

jhānas constituted an important part of this system. The jhāna formulas he followed omit the term parama-dīṭṭhadhamma-nibbānam found in the rūpa jhāna formulas of the Parama-dīṭṭhadhamma-nibbānavādins. This change was first made by the ascetics practising the Ārūpya-samāpattis, and Gotama later accepted it. The rest of the formulas has been preserved unaltered. The term attā was dropped later by Gotama the Buddha when he preached the dhamma. This shows that Gotama followed the traditional meditative techniques and attained identical jhanic states previously realised by the other śramaṇas but his evaluation of the jhanic states was different. He, like the Ārūpyavādins, rejected the interpretation of the various pleasant feelings (vedana) as nibbāna, the ultimate spiritual goal. On the other hand he alone appreciated the mental qualities of purified mindfulness etc. that enabled him to experience the neutral feeling of adukkhamasukham in the fourth rūpa jhāna. This jhanic state he rightly recognised as a means to higher spiritual goal.

He did not value any subjective pleasant experience which was temporarily free from dukkha. So he was able to get detached from the feeling of adukkham-asukham, but unlike the Ārūpyavādins he did not enter into any trance-like state of infinite space etc. Consequently the mental state in which he remained was detached from mental reaction to any object observed and so was fully alert, perfectly mindful and concentrated. This mental state was a unique contribution to the śramaṇa culture and was most valued by him.

This special mental state he applied to gain three knowledges (vijjā), one of which was bodhi, the complete and perfect wisdom. The first expression of the bodhi was the absolutely objective and complete knowledge concerning the āśravas. This knowledge took him out of the cycle of repeated births and deaths. And he knew that he had become liberated, never to be born again. The liberation which Gotama attained may be termed 'cetovimutti'.

By going for and attaining bodhi with the help of the special mental state Gotama completely broke away from the trodden path of the śramaṇas and revolutionised the spiritual world of the śramaṇas.

**Keywords :** 1.A special mental state    2.Three vijjās    3.Paññāvimutti  
4.Cetovimutti

The Theravāda Nikāya [1] and the Āgama of the other Buddhist schools have preserved several accounts regarding the spiritual practices of Gotama the Bodhisattva. These accounts inform us about the aspects of pre-Buddhist śramaṇa meditation which Gotama accepted as well as the aspects which he rejected or modified. By modification we mean both the minor changes introduced by Gotama into the existing meditative system and the novel additions made by him signalling complete break from the earlier systems.

Gotama practised the four rūpa jhānas according to the unanimous tradition recorded in the different sutras of the Nikāya and other Buddhist texts, but it was practised as a part of a larger system of meditation.[2] It differs significantly on various points from the meditative system of the Diṭṭha-dhamma-nibbānavādins. We have to be aware of the possibility that all these modifications could not have been done by Gotama alone. This system of four rūpa jhānas originated with the Diṭṭha-dhamma-nibbānavādins[3] and was later followed by Ārūpyavādins[4] even before Gotama practised it. It is well known that the Ārūpyavādins had rejected the philosophy of the Diṭṭha-dhamma-nibbānavādins and consequently changed the earlier meditation formula to some extent. So some of the modifications of the rūpa jhāna system recorded in the

p. 312

Nikāyas while describing the spiritual exertions of Gotama might have been done by the Ārūpyavādins and later accepted by Gotama. According to the tradition preserved in the commentary of the Majjhima Nikāya Gotama practised the four rūpa jhānas under the direction of the Ārūpyavādin teacher. This is partially supported by their samāpatti formula which shows that this sect attained the sphere of infinite space by transcending the sphere of rūpa. So while studying the modified system of meditation followed by Gotama we would attempt to ascertain which of these modifications were wrought by Gotama and which by the other śramaṇa sect. It is necessary to precisely know the contributions made by Gotama in this respect if we are to have clear idea about the extent and significance of his role in the development of the śramaṇa system of meditation.

We will base our study of Gotama's contribution to śramaṇa system of Gotama's meditation on the Dvedhāvitakka-sutta. [5]This sutta while giving the shortest available account of the entire journey of Gotama to Buddhahood, has provided us with an early account of the four jhānas as a part of a different meditative system practised by Gotama the Bodhisattva.

We may first translate the relevant portions of the sutta and arrange them in three parts to facilitate our study.

## First Part

Before my enlightenment, bhiksus, this thought occurred to me who was still an unenlightened Bodhisattva: "Suppose that I should abide dividing my thoughts into two parts." Then, Bhiksus, whatever was thought of desire[6] (about five sense-objects), whatever was thought

p. 313

of malevolence (byāpāda), whatever was thought of violence (vihimsā) I made into one part. And whatever was thought of renunciation, whatever was thought of benevolence (abyāpāda) and whatever was thought of compassion (avihimsā)[7] I made into a second part.

As a thought of sensual desire (kāma<sup>v</sup>itakka) arose in me who was abiding careful, energetic and concentrated, I knew thus: "This thought of sensual desire has arisen in me. This is injurious to myself, injurious to others, injurious to both: it obstructs the mental state of paññā (paññānirodhiko), [8] belongs to the class of obstacles (vighātapakkhiko), and is not suitable for nibbāna (anibbānasamvattaniko). " When I reflected: "This thought is injurious to myself", it disappeared; when I reflected: "It is injurious to others", it disappeared. When I reflected:

p. 314

"It obstructs the mental state of paññā, belongs to the class of obstacles, and is not suitable for nibbāna", it disappeared.

I, Bhiksus, as the thought of sensual desire arose again and again, I kept on abandoning it, driving it out and made an end of it. As a thought of malevolence arose in me ... a thought of violence arose in me who was abiding careful, energetic and concentrated, I knew thus: "This thought of violence has arisen in me. This is injurious to myself, injurious to others, injurious to both; it obstructs paññā, belongs to the class of obstacles, and is not suitable for nibbāna". When I reflected ... it subsided in me. As the thought of violence arose again and again, I kept on abandoning it and made an end of it. Bhiksus, whatever a bhiksu thinks and reflects much, that becomes the inclination of his mind. Bhiksus, when a bhiksu thinks and reflects (anuvitakketi anuvicāreti)[9] much the thought of sensual desire, he has given up the thought of renunciation; he has multiplied the thoughts of desire and his mind inclines towards the thought of desire. If he thinks and reflects much the thought of malevolence ... thought of violence, he has given up the thought of compassion (avihiṃsāvitakka) ; he has multiplied the thoughts of violence and his mind inclines towards the thought of violence.

Just as ... in the autumn, when the crops thicken, he would guard his cows ... why is that? Because he sees he could be flogged ... blamed (if he let them stray into the crops). Similarly I saw danger, degradation and defilement in unwholesome mental states ; (and I

p. 315

saw) the advantages of cleansing in the renunciation (of these evil states) for the wholesome mental states. [10]

As the thought of renunciation occurred to me who was abiding thus alert energetic and concentrated, I knew thus: "This thought of renunciation has arisen in me ; this is not injurious to myself, is not injurious to others, is not injurious to both ; this is for the growth of paññā (paññābuddhiko), does not belong to the class of obstacles (avighātapakkhiko) and is suitable for nibbāna (nibbānasamvattaniko). If I should think and reflect that (i.e. the thought of renunciation) even for a night ... even for a day ... even for a night and a day I do not see any fear from this source. But if I think and reflect for too long, my body might get tired: when the body is tired, the mind might get impaired ; when the mind is impaired it is far from concentration. (Having thought this) I internally steadied my mind, calmed it, made it unidirectional and concentrated. Why is that? So that my mind might not be impaired. Just as in the last

month of summer season when all the crops have been carried inside the settlement, a cowherd would be guarding the cows ; while staying at the root of a tree or out in the open his duty is to be mindful (satikaraṇīyam) thus: 'These are cows.' Similarly, bhiksus, my duty was to be mindful thus: 'These are mental states.'[\[11\]](#) "My energy that was exerted was fully manifest, the attending mindfulness was not distracted, the body that was calm was imperturbable, and the concentrated mind was one pointed. "

p. 316

## Second Part

"Bhiksus, I having physically separated [\[12\]](#) myself from desirable objects and having separated from unwholesome mental states abided after attaining the first jhāna which is born of separation, characterised by rapturous happiness, and accompanied by thoughts of enquiry and judgemental decision. " (Like the formula of the first jhāna, the account of the other three jhānas is identical with the description of the rūpa jhānas of the Parama-diṭṭha-dhamma-nibbānavādins except on two points, namely, the two terms attā and parama-diṭṭha-dhamma-nibbānavādins, present in the earlier formula, are absent in the formulas described by Gotama the Bodhisattva. For translation, see the first part of the article.) [\[13\]](#)

## Third Part

When my concentrated mind was thus purified, clean, without blemish, without defilement, pliant, workable, steady and immovable, I directed my mind to the knowledge of recollection of past lives (pubbenivāsanussatiñāna). (Now follows an account of innumerable past lives remembered by Gotama with such details as to clan, family, appearance etc. that were also obtained in meditation by Śramaṇas and brāhmaṇas who later became the upholders of the Śāśvatavāda). [\[14\]](#) This was the first knowledge (paṭhamā vijjā) mastered by me in the first watch of the night.

When my concentrated mind ... immovable, I directed my mind to the knowledge of the passing away and rebirth (cutūpapātañāna) of beings. With the purified divine eye surpassing the human, I saw beings passing away and being reborn, inferior and superior, beautiful and ugly, born into

p. 317

good existence and evil existence (sugate duggate). I knew the beings who follow the consequences of their actions thus: "These worthy beings were possessed of bodily wrong conduct, wrong conduct of mind, revilers of noble ones, held a wrong view, performed actions according to the wrong view ; they on the dissolution of the body after death have fallen into misfortune, an evil existence, have arisen in hell. But the (other) worthy beings were possessed of bodily good conduct, possessed of good conduct of speech, possessed of good conduct of mind, not revilers of noble ones, holders of a right view ; they on the dissolution of the body after death are born in a good existence in a heavenly world. "

When my concentrated mind ... immovable, I directed my mind to the knowledge of the destruction of defilements (āsavakhayañāna). I directly knew as it really is: "These are the defilements. " I directly knew as it is really is: "This is the origin of the defilements. " I directly knew as it really is: "This is the cessation of the defilements. " I directly knew as it really is: "This is the way leading to the cessation of the defilements. " When I knew and saw thus, my mind was freed from the defilement of sensual desire (kāmasava), my mind was freed from the defilement of becoming (bhavāsava), and my mind was freed from the defilement of ignorance (avijjāsava). When it (citta) was freed, there came the knowledge: "Birth is destroyed, the holy life has been lived, what has to be done has been done, there is no more any such state of being". Oh brahmin, in the last watch of the night this third knowledge was mastered by me.

## On the arrangement of the textual material in translation

The relevant materials which represent a continuous narrative have been divided in the present article into three parts, each dealing with a separate theme. In the Pali text each of these parts appears to represent a stage in the progression from lower to higher spiritual states. The characterisation of these parts as first, second and third only shows the arrangement of events in the order in which they

p. 318

were believed to have occurred. But this does not necessarily indicate that the earlier stages can be taken as preludes to the later stages. We have later shown that the First Part cannot be taken as a prelude to the Second Part. [15] The arrangement of the material as given in the Pali text has been changed in one place in the present translation. The last few lines of the First Part of the translation beginning with 'My energy' and ending with 'concentrated mind was one-pointed' marks the beginning of the Second Part according to the Pali text, and so appears to be connected with the attainment of the first jhāna. The reasons for this change is that the mental state described in these few lines cannot be identical with the mental state prior to the attainment of the first jhāna. The mental state as described in these lines is definitely higher than the first jhanic state. Before the attainment of the first jhāna the judgemental deliberations (vitakka-vicāra) against kāma and akusaladhammas have not yet come to an end ; these deliberations accompany the first jhāna. But due to the inclusion of such expressions as 'samāhitam cittam ekaggam' and 'upaṭṭhitā sati asammutṭhā' in these lines it is clear that Gotama has got rid of the evil thoughts and consequently the criticism of such thoughts has also come to an end. Moreover, not only the characterisation of the mental state as 'samāhitam cittam ekaggam' reminds one of the second jhāna but also its description as 'upaṭṭhitā sati asammutṭhā' brings out its similarity with the fourth rūpa jhāna which is characterised by 'upekkhā-sati-pārisuddhi.' On the other hand the description of the mental state given at the end of the First Part is in harmony with what has been enunciated in the rest of the First Part, and can be accepted as the concluding statement of the First Part. The final result of the cultivation of morality, as given in the First Part, is the achievement of the perfect mindfulness by getting rid of the immoral thoughts and ensuring the effortless arising of the moral thoughts. The concluding lines of the First Part similarly speaks of

perfect mindfulness together with other mental factors which help one to remain alert and mindful, namely, energy, calmness of body and concentration of mind. These other factors are but the inevitable consequences of the stopping of the ceaseless agitation of mind, and of mindfulness. So the statement about the mental state

p. 319

which is taken to be connected with the first jhāna in the Pali text should be taken as the concluding portion of the First part. [16]

## **Study of the First Part -- Can the First Part be taken as a prelude to the Second Part?**

In the Dvedhā-vitakka-sutta the spiritual exercises for the cultivation of mental morality (and mindfulness) which constitute the First Part of the English translation, are immediately followed by the account of the four rūpa jhānas which marks the beginning of the Second Part of the translation. It appears that the materials have been arranged in the Sutta in this way in order to show that the First Part should be taken as a prelude to the account of the four jhānas. Or it might have been the intention of the compiler of the Sutta merely to point out that the events depicted in the First Part occurred before the attainment of the first jhāna. Due to the following considerations the events in the First Part neither can be taken as a prelude to the First jhāna nor can they be shown to have taken place before the attainment of the first jhāna.:

1) In case of the Parama-dīṭṭha-dhamma-nibbānavādins we have seen that there is a close correspondence between the contents of the Preparatory stage and the first jhāna formula. Both deal with feelings (vedanā) vis-a-vis desirable objects. The spiritual practices of the Preparatory stage smoothly and naturally develops into the mental state of the first jhāna. [17]The Dvedhā-vitakka-sutta, on the other hand, presents a different picture. Here the account of the First Part is different form that of the Preparatory stage,

p. 320

but the description of the meditative experience of the first jhāna remains unchanged. [18] The main burden of the First Part is the development of the mental morality to the exclusion of the immoral thoughts, and the problem of feeling not considered at all. On the contrary the four jhānas are mainly concerned with the feelings. Again, mental morality stands for the relative goodness of thoughts while feeling deals with the quality of agreeableness or disagreeableness of an experience. So neither the immoral thoughts nor the moral thoughts find and mention in the jhāna formulas. For example, the moral thoughts of renunciation, benevolence and compassion the cultivation of which is the main theme of the First Part do not find mention in the first jhāna formula.

2)From our study of the Parama-dīṭṭha-dhamma-nibbānavādins we have seen that the preparatory stage provides us with explanations of technical terms like kāma and akusaladhamma mentioned in the first jhāna formula as well as the contents of the judgemental deliberations. [19]In case of the Dvedhā-vitakka-sutta the account

translated as the First Part and mentioned just before the first jhāna formula, if taken as the prelude to the attainment of the first jhāna, should also explain the technical terms kāma and akusaladhamma.

Now in accordance with the account of the First Part of the Dvedhā-vitakka-sutta 'kāma' should mean desire while the akusaladhammas should stand for the three vitakkas viz. kāma-vitakka, byāpāda-vitakka and vihimśā-vitakka. In this case the term kāma becomes superfluous, for there is no longer any need to mention kāma as distinct from the akusaladhammas. Kāma is included in the akusaladhammas. So it appears that Gotama did not interpret the terms kāma and akusaladhammas in the sense these terms have been used in the First Part of the Dvedhā-vitakka-sutta, but understood these terms in the earlier sense of desirable object and depressive mental states.

3) We may further note that the mental state described in the First Part is similar to the second jhāna and the fourth jhāna, and is free from all

p. 321

judgemental deliberations, concentrated and perfectly mindful. In short it is much higher than the first jhanic state. So the mental state in the First Part could neither have been developed before the first jhāna nor could be taken as a prelude to the first jhāna.

We may therefore conclude that the teachings regarding the cultivation of mental morality as given in the First Part originally formed an independent sutta or a part of such a sutta, and was in no way connected with the enunciation of the four jhānas. That the sutta has been given the name of Dvedhā-vitakka-sutta also supports our conclusion that this sutta originally dealt only with the problem of two types of thoughts and not with the four jhānas. Even now we have a sutta which deals exclusively with the two types of thoughts, viz. the Vitakka-santhāna-sutta. (M. I, 118 ff.) In this connection we may also note that the remaining part of the present version of the Dvedhā-vitakka-sutta comprising four jhānas and the attainment of three vijjās represents a stock piece of teaching which also forms a part of many other suttas. Thus there is no reason to hold that this piece of teaching was originally a part of the Dvedhā-vitakka-sutta. This finding leads to three important conclusions: 1) The present version of the Dvedhā-vitakka-sutta is an amalgam of originally two separate pieces of teachings, the one dealing with the mental morality, and the other with the attainment of four jhānas, and three vijjās. 2) In the spiritual practices followed by Gotama for attaining the first jhāna the terms kāma and akusaladhammas must have been used in the sense in which the Paramadiṭṭha-dhamma-nibbānavādins understood them, viz. the desirable object and the depressive mental states. Gotama also got physically separated from the desirable objects in order to be free from depressive mental states and thereby to attain the first jhāna. 3) The judgemental deliberations with the help of which Gotama got rid of kāma and akusaladhamma must be different from the judgemental deliberations given in the First Part. His deliberations had nothing to do with paññā and nibbāna, but were solely concerned with the disadvantages of the possession of desirable objects and the advantages in the renunciation of such objects. (also see p. 13)

## The meditative process in the First Part

The barest outline of the process of meditation sketched in the First Part may

p. 322

be described as follows: Gotama perceives the arising of good thoughts and evil thoughts in his mind and he stops the arising of evil thoughts. Next he cultivates the good thoughts. He then desists from the cultivation of good thoughts but does not take any step against the spontaneous arising of good thoughts. Finally he remains mindful of the good thoughts which arises without any effort on his part.

The process of meditation as given in the First Part is determined by the observation of some psychological facts and laws as well as by some intellectual understanding. Gotama the Bodhisattva at the beginning of his spiritual journey observed that he had two types of thoughts which we may call good (i.e. the thoughts of renunciation etc.) or evil (i.e. the thoughts of desire etc.), for these thoughts can produce good or bad effects for him. By thought is meant mentally verbalising the reactions of mind to an object observed. He intellectually understands the danger of having bad thoughts and the benefits of good thoughts. He applies the thoughts of bad effects or good effects of his basic thoughts as adverse criticism or appreciative deliberations respectively. He found out that bad thoughts disappeared due to adverse criticism while good thoughts increased due to appreciation. He further observed that whatever one thought and reflected much that became the inclination of mind. It means that the way the mind would automatically react to an object depends on the type of thought one repeatedly had before. An inclined state of mind has been explained thus: "When a bhikkhu thinks and reflects the thought of sensual desire much he has already given up the thought of renunciation ; he has multiplied the thought of desire and his mind inclines the thought of desire. " He also realised the danger of evil thoughts. It should be noted that the danger of having evil thoughts is not explicitly brought into connection with the nonattainment of *prajñā* and *nirvāna* ; it appears more to be result of the operation of the law of karma. Moreover he saw that it was advantageous for him to give up evil thoughts, for then he would be able to cultivate good thoughts. Consequently he made determined efforts to give up evil thoughts. Whenever evil thoughts (i.e. thoughts of desire, malevolence and violence) arose Gotama arranged them into one group. The evil effects of such thoughts intellectually understood were made into four units of adverse criticism viz. it is injurious 1) to oneself 2) to others 3) to both and

p. 323

4) it obstructs the development of intellect (*paññā*) and is not suitable for *nibbāna*. The sutta further states that the thought of desire arose again and again and Gotama had to apply each of these four units of adverse criticism separately. Every time he applied the thought of adverse criticism the basic thought of desire disappeared. This statement of the sutta we may understand in the following way. The basic thought of desire must have been already absent when the thought of criticism arose. Otherwise it would not have been possible for the thought of criticism to appear in the mind, for there can be only one thought at one time. When the thought of criticism takes place, the possibility of the further arising of the basic thought of desire becomes more

remote. This is expressed by the phrase "abbhattham gacchati. " In this way he repeatedly drove the evil thoughts, rejected them and thus finally made an end of them.

As the evil thoughts were not arising any more, it was possible for Gotama to cultivate good thoughts. In this case also he observed the arising of the three types of good thoughts (e.g. thoughts of renunciation, benevolence and compassion) and put them into one group. Then instead of adversely criticising them he thought of them appreciatively. This thought of appreciation which is just the opposite of adversely critical thoughts, was also divided into four units. He applied each of these appreciative thoughts to the basic good thought. Consequently he did not see any danger even if he developed good thoughts for a long time. So the basic good thoughts increased.

But he found out that it was not good to develop good thought for too long a time, for in that case he got tired and consequently his mind became impaired. An impaired mind was not good for concentration. So he stopped his strivings for the cultivation of good thoughts and made his mind calm, unidirectional and concentrated. Here the adverse criticism is against the continual cultivation of good thoughts but not against the good thoughts themselves. With this concentrated mind he remains only mindful of the good thoughts, as these thoughts arise without any effort on his part.

The deliberations on the two types of thoughts also come to an end at this stage. The deliberations on the evil thoughts automatically stops when the evil thoughts cease to arise due to adverse criticism. On the other hand the deliberations on good thoughts ended when he found out that continual cultivation

p. 324

of good thoughts harms concentration. And when he stopped the cultivation of good thoughts, the deliberations against such cultivation also ended.

But what were the contents of the deliberations concerning the basic good thoughts and the basic evil thoughts. They cannot be connected with the paññā and nibbāna. We can form some idea of the contents of these deliberations if we pay attention the parable of cows in the sutta. Here the cows represent the thoughts. A cowherd prevents the cows from straying into fields and destroying the crops. For he is afraid that if the crops are destroyed, he would be flogged or punished in other ways. Similarly one should have control over his evil thoughts, otherwise he would suffer the ill effects of such thoughts. The punishment spoken of here is actual, positive. It is not just that he would be deprived of something good that would have resulted if the cows were properly controlled. The effects of evil thoughts thus cannot be connected with the non-attainment of paññā and nibbāna ; they are rather to be connected with the actual punishment which he has to suffer. Thus the judgemental deliberations against evil thoughts should refer to the actual ill effects that evil thoughts can produce. Similarly the merits that follow the good thoughts should form the contents of the appreciative deliberations regarding the good thoughts. The characterisation of good and evil thoughts also should change accordingly. The goodness or evilness of a thought should not be connected with the attainment or non-attainment of paññā and nibbāna, but should refer to the good or ill effects of a thought.

## **Meditative process -- an amalgam of two different traditions**

The First Part of the Dvedhā-vitakka-sutta represents an intermingling of two different traditions: one tradition is about the Buddha's teachings regarding the two types of thoughts while the other is about the actual strivings of Gotama the Bodhisattva concerning the two types of thoughts.

The sutta opens with the statement that the Bodhisattva observed that he had two types of thoughts which he divided into two groups: one group consisting of harmful thoughts like thoughts of desire etc. and the other group comprising beneficial thoughts like thoughts of renunciation etc.

Next we read about two types of judgemental deliberations, one adversely criticising the harmful thoughts while the other appreciating the beneficial

p. 325

thoughts. Both these deliberations contain references to paññā and nibbāna. But what can paññā and nibbāna mean in the present context? According to the sutta the thoughts of paññā and nibbāna are occurring to the Bodhisattva who is still suffering from evil thoughts of kāma etc. It is obvious, therefore, that -- if we accept the sutta tradition -- this paññā and nibbāna cannot be the paññā and nibbāna preached by the Buddha. Moreover these two concepts cannot be associated with the other śramaṇa philosophies with which the Bodhisattva came into contact. The nibbāna of the Parama-ditṭha-dhamma-nibbānavādins is a pleasant mental state which could be attained without consciously cultivating the mental morality and paññā.

The Ārūpyavādins on, the other hand, were striving to remain absorbed in an infinite mental state, and so it was not necessary for them to cultivate paññā and nibbāna reflect the teachings of the Buddha and is not an autobiographical detail in the life of Gotama the Bodhisattva.

If we study the process of meditation concerning thoughts as given in the First Part, we find that this leads to a mental state free from judgemental deliberations and characterised by concentration and mindfulness. This type of mental state is indispensable for the attainment paññā, but cannot be accepted as the mental state of a Bodhisattva who is at the beginning of his spiritual journey. Actually the judgemental deliberations here represent a piece of Buddha's teaching about the attainment of paññā and realisation of nibbāna through the cultivation of moral thoughts. It appears that the compilers of the sutta have intentionally placed the two judgemental deliberations in the beginning in order to give an outline of the entire spiritual journey of Gotama up to the attainment of enlightenment and the ultimate realisation of nibbāna. In fact the sutta ends with an account of the attainment of bodhi which leads to nibbāna.

If we now omit the judgemental deliberations, only the cultivation of mental morality—not through this type of judgemental deliberations involving paññā and nibbāna—remains. The remaining part contains what came to be known as sammā

vyāyāma (right exertion) and sammā sati (right mindfulness). This also explains why the stock piece of teaching beginning with four jhānas came to be added to the First Part. The four jhānas belong to the category of sammā samādhi which follows that of sammā sati according to the Buddhist tradition of

p. 326

eightfold path. It may be concluded that the compilers of this sutta were influenced by the scheme of eightfold path developed by the Buddha. We may even reasonably conclude that the judgemental deliberations became a part of the First Part after the stock piece of teaching comprising the four jhānas, bodhi etc. was added to the First Part.

## Reliability of the tradition in the First Part

What we have discussed before shows that the account combining the two traditions is of comparatively later origin. But this does not prove that these two traditions themselves are of later origin and, therefore, unreliable as a source of information about the meditative practices of Gotama the Bodhisattva. There are, rather, reasons to believe that the informations contained in the First Part and the account of the four jhānas etc. belong to the earliest strata of the Buddhist tradition. Let us first discuss the antiquity of the account of the First Part. The considerations which suggest the antiquity of this account may be enumerated as follows:

- 1) If we compare the First Part of the Dvedhā-vitakka-sutta with the similar accounts given in the other suttas we find that it is free such typical Buddhist terms as pañcakāmagunā, pañcanīvaraṇa etc. introduced by Gotama the Buddha in the system of meditation. [20] We may also note that the absence of technical terms like samatha, vipassanā, sammā vyāyāma, sammā sati also suggests the antiquity of the account of the First Part.
- 2) While the Dvedhā-vitakka-sutta gives only one method to eradicate evil thoughts and to cultivate good thoughts, the Buddha in the Vitakka-santhana-sutta teaches six such methods. [21]
- 3) There is no attempt to glorify Gotama ; he is depicted as a person who is constantly struggling to keep his mind free from immoral thoughts.

p. 327

- 4) In the Dvedhā-vitakka-sutta the two terms byāpāda and vihiṃsā are distinctly separate and their opposite mental states are mentioned as abyāpāda and avihimsā. In later days byāpāda and vihiṃsā appear to have lost their distinctiveness, and consequently vihiṃsā is dropped. Only vyāpāda finds mention. Moreover the term abyāpāda is later replaced by the typical Buddhist term mettācitta. [22]

The stock piece of teaching consisting of the Second Part and Third Part of our translation have been mentioned in many suttas and are mostly free from later additions. So this should be taken as an authentic tradition. We may note that the Third Part do not mention such technical terms as paññā or bodhi, though these concepts are dealt with in this part.

The account of the Bodhisattvas cultivation of the mental morality, thus, seems to belong to quite an early strata of tradition, and there is no reason to doubt its authenticity.

## **Mental morality and the śramaṇa system of meditation**

We have seen that the First Part of the Dvedhā-vitakka-sutta can be taken as a reliable source of information regarding the meditative practices of Gotama the Bodhisattva. From the account of the First Part it appears that the recognition of mental morality as an indispensable element to be consciously cultivated for the attainment of bodhi and nibbāna as well as the method of its cultivation should be regarded as contributions made by Gotama to the śramaṇa system of meditation. We think that this idea of the Dvedhā-vitakka-sutta is well founded and can be accepted. It is true that the Parama-ditṭhadhamma-nibbānavādins strove to get physically separated from the desirable objects in order to be free from grief (dukkha) and experience a pleasant feeling which was to them nibbāna. But this was only an expedient means to be free from attachment to desirable objects,

p. 328

and should be taken as an example of physical morality. The members of this sect following a type of spiritual hedonism as their ideal could not have been much interested in the development of mental morality. As the tradition is silent on this point, we need not assume that they did consciously try to develop mental morality.

In case of the Ārūpyavādins the situation is more complex and less clear. Personal enjoyment of a pleasant feeling was not the highest goal for them. Different teachers belonging to this sect attained different formless mental states, each of which was deemed to be satisfactory by a particular teacher. There can be little doubt that they were also trying to attain that state which is eternally free from grief, whatever that state might have been called. It is also certain that none of them had attained bodhi, as each of the teachers considered a formless mental state to be the highest. They do not have even tried for bodhi, for they went straight for ārūpyasamāpattis after the four rūpa jhānas.

Again to the Jainas and the Ājīvikas the cultivation of physical morality and not that of mental morality was of vital importance. (M I, 238) The Ājīvikas valued kāyabhāvanā and not cittabhāvanā. The Mahāsaccaka-sutta gives us a list of bodily ascetic practices which Gotama followed at the beginning of his spiritual quest without paying attention to the mental morality. Bronkhorst has shown such ascetic practices were followed by the Jainas. [23] So the tradition that credits Gotama with the innovation of purposive cultivation of mental morality for the sake of higher spiritual stages seems to be trustworthy.

The shifting of emphasis from physical morality to mental morality as a factor of spiritual development as well as the method of cultivation of mental morality might be regarded as Gotama's contribution to the śramaṇa culture of India.

## Study of the Second Part

According to the tradition preserved in the Dvedhā-vitakka-sutta the two  
p. 329

terms of philosophical import viz. attā and nibbāna, mentioned in the jhāna formulas of the Parama-dit̥ṭha-dhamma-nibbānavādins are absent from the formulas of the same jhānas followed by Gotama. These jhāna formulas were also followed by the Ārūpyavādins teachers under whose direction Gotama for some time practised spiritual exercises. The term nibbāna was surely dropped by them. This term is missing from the jhanic formula followed by them. They did not accept any agreeable feeling as nibbāna, so they omitted nibbāna from the jhāna formula, and went beyond the rūpa jhānas to attain the ārūpyasamāpattis. But they retained the term attā in their formula, as they had not realised the truth of anattā. It was the Buddha who must have dropped the term attā from the rūpa jhāna formulas for the first time. But it is reasonable to conclude that while he was practising the rūpa jhānas as a Bodhisattva under the direction of his Ārūpyavādins teachers, he followed, like his teachers, a jhāna formula which included the term attā. The Dvedhā-vitakka-sutta version of the rūpa jhānas without the term attā does not, therefore, truly reflect the spiritual strivings of Gotama the Bodhisattva but represents a later and perfect version of the jhāna formulas as taught by Gotama the Buddha. The terms rejected by the Buddha are all of doctrinal imports, and form a part of the theory fully accepted by the Parama-dit̥ṭha-dhamma-nibbānavādins and partially accepted by the Ārūpyavādins. These terms -- attā and nibbāna -- represent subjective interpretation of an actual meditative experience. It is true that agreeable feelings are truly experienced in jhanic states. But to state that attā experiences these feelings or to hold that each of these experiences can be equated with the highest nibbāna is a case of wrong interpretation foisted on genuine meditative experience.

The Buddha on the other hand, preserved the rest of the jhanic formula informing us of the actual experience one has in this type of meditative state (i.e. a feeling), the mental instruments necessary to enjoy this experience (i.e. concentration of mind, indifference etc.) as well as the meditative technique necessary to create the entire jhanic state (i.e. physical separation from desirable objects etc.). This fact leads us to further conclude that the entire jhanic state sans its subjective interpretation is conducive to the spiritual goal Gotama aspired to attain, and that Gotama followed the same meditative technique of merely negating an undesirable mental state formerly practised by the Ārūpyavādins and

p. 330

the Parama-dit̥ṭhadhamma-nibbānavādins.

The Parama-dit̥ṭhadhamma-nibbānavādins remained attached to the feeling of adukkhamasukham, so they did not search for higher stages beyond this. The Ārūpyavādins, on the other hand, did not regard an agreeable feeling as nibbāna and went beyond the fourth rūpa jhāna in order to remain absorbed in an infinite mental state. Later Gotama also rejected vedanā (feeling) as nibbāna, the most desirable goal

of spiritual life, but he did it for a different reason. As we will see in our discussion of the Third Part, he became detached from vedanā so that he could remain fully alert and perfectly mindful of the objective world.

## Study of the Third Part

The Third Part, for the sake of analysis, may be held to be discussing two different items. The first item contains a description of a special mental state which Gotama developed after attaining the fourth rūpa jhāna. The other item deals with the three types of knowledges which Gotama attained with the help of this mental state.

## The special Mental State

The specific mental state which is indispensable for the attainment of the three knowledges has been described in an identical manner in connection with all the three types of knowledges mastered by Gotama. In order to get a clear idea of this mental state of Gotama we may quote the Pali passage regarding the attainment of the first knowledge: "So evam samāhite citte parisuddhe pariyodāte anaṅgane vigatūpakkilese / mudūbhute kammaniye ṭhite ānejjapatte pubbenivāsānussatiñānāya cittam abhininnāmesim. "

The qualifying words indicating the purity of mind viz. parisuddhe pariyodāte, anaṅgane and vigatūpakkilese may be taken to mean the purity of thought and mindfulness. In this connection we may refer to the phrase "upekkhā-sati-pārisuddhi" in the fourth jhāna formula [24] where upekkhā means indifference to the feelings of dukkha and sukha.[25] Again Gotama's mental

p. 331

concentration and mindfulness are also, indicated by such terms as samāhite, ṭhite, and ānejjapatte. The adjective "mudūbhute" should indicate the characteristic of non-attachment, for only when the mind is free from all attachment, it can be flexible and directed towards any object of choice.

The mental characteristics of purity, concentration, non-attachment, and the pliant nature of mind indicated in the above mentioned passage all contribute to the perfection of mindfulness. [26] It is the pure mindfulness that is most important for knowing the true nature of the conditioned.[27] In this connection we may note the verbal form "abhininnāmesim" which means "bent (the mind) towards" or "directed (the mind) towards". In other words the use of the verbal form "abhininnāmesim" does not indicate mental absorption in an object but it means paying attention to the object under observation, being mindful of the object.

p. 332

In the Mahā-vedalla-sutta (M. I, No.43) also we read of paññā as a mental state that leads to direct and complete knowledge. "Intellect (paññā) is indeed for the sake of direct knowledge, complete knowledge and for the sake of abandoning. " (paññā kho ... abhiññattha pariññattha pahanattha ti). By paññā one not only gains complete

knowledge but also gives up what is conditioned. By the eye of intellect (paññācakkhu) one can know any knowable (neyya-dhamma) . The difference between paññā and viññāna is that paññā is to be developed while viññāna is to be understood (paññā bhāvetabbā viññānam pariññeyam). Paññā as a factor of the path is to be cultivated. Viññāna as one of the five aggregates is already there, it is to be understood as anicca, dukkha and anattā. It is thus obvious that paññā here has been described as a mental state, as a faculty of mind which is necessary for attaining the true knowledge of the conditioned. Is it this paññā which has been mentioned in the Dvedhā-vitakka-sutta as a mental state necessary for the attainment of true knowledge.

The paññā is a mental state which is conducive to the intellectual investigation into the true nature of the Conditioned. It gradually destroys attachment for the Conditioned, and thus helps to realise bodhi or insight into the true nature of the object observed. In the Mahāvedalla-sutta no specific mention is made of sati in connection with paññā, not to speak of the "supreme mindfulness through indifference" which is a characteristic of the special mental state described in the Dvedhāvitakka-sutta.[28] So these two mental states are not identical.

Again we have seen in the same sutta that this special mental state not only leads the bodhi (i.e. the third vijjā) but also to the first two vijjās. In the Samannaphala-sutta[29] we read that the same mental state is necessary also for the attainment of iddhis and abhiññās. But paññā is not connected with any of these iddhis and abhiññās. The Susima section of the Samyutta Nikāya states[30] that the arhats who were paññāvimutto (liberated through paññā) also had bodhi

p. 333

and the same knowledge of liberation, viz. birth is destroyed etc. but they do not possess the iddhis or the two vijjās or any other abhiññā. They told that they do not possess these special knowledges or powers for they are liberated through paññā. By liberation is meant the liberation due to the realisation of bodhi, for they are talking of paññāvimutti only after stating that they have bodhi. It is the bodhi which has liberated them from the cycle of repeated births and deaths.

Gotama also had realised the bodhi and attained the same knowledge of liberation, but before this he had already attained the special mental state after the fourth rūpa jhāna and the two other vijjās through it. We may therefore conclude that this special mental state is different from the mental state of paññā and that he was following a path of liberation which is different from the path of paññāvimutti. Here in the Dvedhāvitakka-sutta we have one of the earliest accounts describing what came to be known as cetovimutti [31] in a comparatively later period.

The question that arises is why Nikāya-Āgama tradition always records the development of a special mental state and the attainment of perfect knowledge after the attainment of the fourth rūpa jhāna. The solution to this problem emerges if we pay attention to the mental state and the mode of application of it for the attainment of true knowledge. This mental state is characterised by freedom from attachment, perfect mindfulness and mental concentration. This is exactly the mental state a person would have if he attains the fourth jhāna or any other samāpatti higher than the

fourth jhāna, and yet remains unattached to the vedanā. So it was not necessary to attain any higher formless samāpatti for the sake of developing this mental state.[32]

p. 334

As for the application of this mental state in order to attain complete knowledge it is only necessary that it should be directed towards the object under observation. In order to gain insight into the true nature of an object only mindfulness is necessary in case of a person having this mental state.

For the Parama-ditṭha-dhamma-nibbānavādins and the followers of the formless samāpattis it was not possible to develop this mental state. To the former, the enjoyment of an agreeable feeling was the most desirable goal while the latter discarded vedana as the desired goal but still regarded absorption into an infinite formless state as the highest spiritual goal. They do not appear to have any interest in gaining insight into the true nature of things. They were interested in creating a mental state which was free from the experience of dukkha. So it was not possible for the followers of the rūpa jhānas and the formless mental states to develop this mental state which is not attached to anything but is mindful of everything.[33]

p. 335

## Three knowledges

Gotama applied the special mental state to three different phenomena and obtained one after another three different knowledges in the first, middle, and last watches of the same night. Although all these knowledges are obtained with the help of the mental state this by merely being mindful of the three different knowable objects, these knowledges, as it will be shown later, do not belong to the same category. Whether Gotama obtained these knowledges in the same night or not, we need not doubt that he obtained the first two knowledges before his enlightenment.

The first knowledge (paṭhama vijjā) obtained by Gotama regarding the recollection of the various details of his past life is similar to the knowledge gained in meditation by the ascetics who later preached the philosophy of eternalism (śāśvatavāda). The second knowledge (dutiya vijjā) on the other hand, is beyond the range of the śāśvatavādins and deals with the repeated deaths and rebirths (cutūpapātañāna) of other beings according to the law of karma. This knowledge could have been realised by other ascetics also provided they had the knowledge of karma and rebirth, e.g. the Jainas. These first two knowledges cannot be regarded as belonging to the category of bodhi or the third knowledge as they do not teach the truth of anattā.

The way the three vijjās are obtained shows that the three vijjās are independent of each other. So the path to enlightenment need not include the first two vijjās. This, however, does not prove that these two vijjās are later additions to the sutta or that Gotama the Bodhisattva did not realise them. We may be sure that according to the earliest traceable tradition these two vijjās were mastered by Gotama before enlightenment and not after enlightenment, for such is the unanimous testimony of the different suttas.

The sutta now proceeds to give an account of the knowledge regarding the defilements. It states that Gotama bent his mind towards the knowledge of the destruction of defilements (asavānam khayañānam). Then suddenly the topic of the knowledge of dukkha in all its details is discussed. Next again the original topic of āsavānam khayañānam is followed and completed. It is obvious that the topic of dukkha is later interpolation. The description of the attainment of the

p. 336

knowledge of destruction of the āsavas (defilements) brings out quite clearly the Buddhist point of view.

The knowledge of destruction of the āsavas is divided into four units: 1) existence of āsava, 2) its origin, 3) its cessation and, 4) the path leading to its cessation. Each of these knowledges he knew as it really is (yathābhutam abbhaññāsim). The expression yathābhutam abbhaññāsim conveys that the knowledge obtained by Gotama is pure objective knowledge of the existing phenomena without any subjective colouring. The account moreover shows that to destroy āsava utterly one must first have a clear, distinct knowledge of the existence of āsava in mind and then the knowledge of the other three units one after another. Here Gotama was not practising adverse criticism of āsava in order to stop the arising of āsava, he was trying to gain analytical, systematic and objective knowledge of āsavas in order to destroy them. This knowledge is called bodhi or sambodhi in other suttas.[34] It is because of this knowledge Gotama destroyed āsavas and he again knew that the āsavas had been destroyed.

By going for and attaining bodhi with the help of a special mental state Gotama completely broke away from the trodden path of the śramaṇas and revolutionised the spiritual world of the śramaṇas. To the Parama-diṭṭha-dhamma-nibbānavādins and the Ārūpyavādins the Conditioned was not frightful and the highest goal of the spiritual life viz. the freedom from dukkha, is to be realised within the Conditioned. The Parama-diṭṭha-dhamma-nibbānavādins accepted an agreeable feeling (vedanā) as nibbāna while the Ārūpyavādins were satisfied with one or the other infinite mental state. To Gotama the absolute end of dukkha lies beyond the Conditioned. Attachment to the Condition is a source of danger. Non-attachment to everything conditioned ultimately led to the realisation of nirvaṇa, the supreme security in the freedom from bondage to the Conditioned. The path to the freedom from dukkha ran not through the enjoyment of the Conditioned but through the proper understanding of the nature

p. 337

of the Conditioned. It is Gotama who for the first time properly understood the role of mindfulness and the mental elements essential for the proper development of mindfulness viz. concentration and non-attachment, in the realisation of enlightenment. The bodhi or the analytical, objective knowledge can be realised only in a state of perfect mindfulness and not in a state of trance.

p. 338

# 論四禪——喬達摩菩薩如何改定此一 佛教前已有的法門（下）

穆克紀

中華佛學研究所客座教授

## 提要

本文主要透過 (雙念經) (Dvedhāvitakka-sutta) 的研究以評估喬達摩 (Gotama) 於菩薩時期對於沙門禪修體系的貢獻。整部經是二篇不同教說的組合體，其一篇文中所譯資料的第一部份，另外是第二和第三部份。

資料的第一部份呈現出二種傳承的混融，傳承之一是佛陀關於二類心念的教說，第二種述說喬達摩於菩薩時期對於這二類心念的實際奮鬥過程。依據第二種傳承，喬達摩對欲念、恚念、害念諸種惡念進行負面批評 (adversely criticising)，因而捨棄諸種惡念；然後透過正面評價以開發相對的出離念、無恚念、無害念三種善念。負面批評和正面評價二者的內容分別是關於善念和惡念之有利影響和有害影響，並且與般若 (paññā)、涅槃 (nibbāna) 沒有關連。

第一部份原本為一篇獨立的教說，而且不能視為第二和第三部份的前行序章。但我們沒有理由懷疑在包含於第一部份的傳承中，喬達摩重視意戒甚於身戒的真實性，這是喬達摩偏離於傳統沙門禪定修習的一點。

第二和第三部份說明喬達摩修習以獲得覺悟 (bodhi) 和其他諸明 (vijjā) 的禪修體系。四種色禪 (rūpa jhāna) 是此體系的重要組成部份。他依循的禪定公式 (jhāna formular) 略去了發現於最上現法涅槃論者 (Parama-dīṭṭhadhamma-nibbānavādin) 之色禪公式中的「最上現法涅槃」一詞，這項改變最早是由修習無色定 (Ārūpya-samāpatti) 的苦行者所提出的，後來喬達摩接受了這項改變，公式的其他部份則保留不變。「我」(attā) 一詞是後來喬達摩成佛之後，於說法時捨去。這顯示了喬達摩依循傳統的禪修方法，並且獲得相同於先前由其他沙門所體證到的禪定狀態，但他對禪定狀態的評估有所不同。他像無色禪者 (Ārūpyavādin) 一樣，拒絕了將各種樂受 (vedanā) 作為涅槃 -- 最終極的精神目標 -- 的解釋，相反地，他只重視淨念等心靈特質，它們能夠讓他在第四禪中經驗到不苦不樂的捨受。他正確地辨識出這種禪定狀態為到達較高精神目標的方法。

他不重現任何暫時離苦的主觀快樂經驗，所以他能夠捨棄對不苦不樂受的執著，但不像無色禪者一樣，他並未進入空無邊處等禪定狀態。因此，他保持的心靈狀態是捨棄對任何所觀對象之心靈反應的執著，因而是完全覺醒的，全然專注的。這種心靈狀態是對沙門文化的特殊貢獻，而且是他最重視者。

他應用這種心靈狀態以獲得三明 (vijjā)，其中之一是覺悟 (bodhi) 完滿的智慧。覺悟的第一種表達是關於漏 (āsrava) 之絕對客觀的和完全的了知，這種了知使他脫離一再重覆的生死輪迴，而且他知道自己已獲得解脫，永不再生。喬達摩獲得的這種解脫可以稱為「心解脫」(cetovimutti)。

透過特定的心靈狀態之助，以趨進和獲致覺悟，喬達摩完全離開了沙門們走過的道路，並且革新了沙門的精神世界。

**關鍵詞：** 1.特殊的心靈狀態 2.三明 3.慧解脫 4.心解脫

[1] Bhayabherava sutta, M. I, p. 17-23; Mahāsaccaka-sutta, ibid. 240-49 (PTS, London 1979); Sangārava sutta, M. II, pp. 211-12 (PTS, London, 1977) etc.

[2] In Kandaraka sutta, M. I, pp. 347-48, Bhayabherava sutta, ibid. Sangārava-sutta, ibid. Mahāsaccaka-sutta, ibid. the four rūpa jhānas are preceded by some ascetic practices and followed by the attainment three vijjās. See also the Bhaddāli-sutta, M. I, pp. 440-42. Thus the four rūpa jhānas form only a part of the entire meditative system followed by Gotama.

[3] From the Brahmajala-sutta it appears that the Parama-diṭṭhadhammanibbānavādins represent the earliest sect to be associated with the four rūpa jhānas and they flourished before the Buddha, D. I, p. 37. (PTS, London, 1975); see also the first part of the present article, Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal, No. 8, July 1995, p. 460.

[4] The formless states can be attained only after transcending the worlds of rūpa. In D. I, pp. 34-35, 183 ff. D. II, p. 156; M. I, pp. 33, 454-55 the formless samāpattis follow the four rūpa jhānas; see also the first part of the present article, pp. 457-59.

[5] M. I, p. 114 ff.

[6] As pointed out before (p.468 of the first part of the present article) kāma may mean either desire or desirable object. We have seen that kāma has been used in the sense of desirable object in the formula of the first jhāna (ibid.) This interpretation is supported by the Atthasalinī, pp. 165-65, 219 (PTS, London, 1979) which explains kāma as vatthukāma, and kāmehi vivicca as being physically separated from the desirable objects. In the Dvedhā-vitakka-sutta kāma is compounded with vitakka and in the present context it means desire. Here the term kāma-vitakka occurs together

with byāpāda-vitakka and vihiṃsā-vitakka in a series, and vihiṃsā and byāpāda can never mean object of violence and object of malevolence respectively.

[7] The prefix "a" of the terms abyāpāda and avihimsā may mean either negation or contrariness. Here it should be taken in the sense of contrariness. So the terms abyāpāda and avihimsā should be understood in the opposite, positive meanings of benevolence and compassion respectively. The meditative process in the present sutta also supports this interpretation. We find that first the thoughts of byāpāda and vihiṃsā are made to stop from arising in mind, and then the thoughts of abyāpāda and avihimsā are cultivated with appreciative deliberations. It is obvious that the thoughts of abyāpāda and avihimsā cannot mean mere absence of byāpāda and vihiṃsā. We may also note that in the Bhayabherava-sutta, p. 18, mettācitta is given as the opposite of byāpannacitta. Again in the Kandaraka-sutta (M. I, p. 345) and the Sāmaññaphala-sutta (D. I, 63) we read that one, gentle and kindly, desists from the killing of living beings and abides compassionate to all living beings.

[8] Paññā in the present context does not stand for true knowledge. Here it means a special mental state which is essential for gaining an insight into the true nature of the conditioned. See p. 14-16.

[9] The phrase "anuvitakketi anuvicāreti" does not have any sense of judgement like vitakka and vicāra in the formula of the first jhāna. Not only the good thoughts of nekkhamma etc. but also the basic evil thoughts of kāma and the like increase as a result of anuvitakka and anuvicāra. The phrase simply means thinking again and again the same type of thought.

[10] This statement indicates that the cleansing of mind due to the renunciation of evil thoughts is suitable for the cultivation of the good thoughts.

[11] The dhammas or mental states of which Gotama is mindful should refer to good thoughts, for the evil thoughts are no longer arising. A few lines before Gotama speaks of making his mind concentrated. The object of concentration also should be good thought.

[12] See note No.6.

[13] See Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal, Taipei, No. 8, pp. 460-463.

[14] See Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal, Taipei, No. 6, pp. 402-403.

[15] See, the present article, pp. 319-321.

[16] In a number of suttas, e.g. the Sāmaññaphala-sutta (PTS, London, 1975) D. I, p. 75, Kandaraka-sutta and Mahāsaccaka-sutta M. I, pp. 347, 247 (PTS, London, 1979), Sangārava-sutta, M. II, p. 212 (PTS, London, 1977) the stock of piece of teaching comprised of four jhānas, the special mental state and bodhi is not preceded by the two types of thoughts. In these suttas also the description of the mental state beginning with "ārabdham viriyam" is missing. This shows that this statement regarding the mental state originally was not connected with the four jhānas but with

the two types of thoughts. Hence we are justified in taking this statement as the concluding lines of the First Part.

[17] See, Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal, Taipei, No. 8, 1995, pp. 463 ff. 468-472.

[18] See, present article, p. 316; first issue of the article, pp.460-461.

[19] See Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal, Taipei, No. 8, 1995, pp. 468-469.

[20] For example, pañcanīvaranā is mentioned in the Sāmaññaphala-sutta, D. I, p. 73, Kandaraka-sutta, M. I. p. 347; pañcakāmagunā in Raṭṭhapāla-sutta, M. II, p. 74; Ariyapasena-sutta, M. I. p. 173; Vekhanassa-sutta, M. II, pp. 42 ff.

[21] M. I, (PTS, London, 1979), 119 ff.

[22] In many suttas vihiṃsā has been dropped and only byāpāda is mentioned. For example, D. II, p. 269 only mentions byāpāda. Kandaraka-sutta, M. I, p. 345 and Sāmaññaphala-sutta, D. I, p. 71 also record byāpāda-dosam (ill-will and hatred) and gives abyāpannacittam as the opposite mental state. In Bhaya-bherava-sutta (M. I, p. 18) mettācitta is given as the opposite of byāpanna-citta.

[23] Mahāsaccaka-sutta, M. I, pp. 237-38; Johannes Bronkhorst: "These two traditions of meditation in Ancient India" (Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1993) pp. 1 ff. 242-46; Upāli-sutta, M. I, p. 372 ff.

[24] See, Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal, Taipei, No. 8, 1995, p. 463.

[25] Ibid., p. 475.

[26] In course of the four rūpa jhānas the reaction to any object has been gradually reduced to the enjoyment of the feeling (vedanā) of adukkhamasukham in the fourth rūpa jhāna. The moment one gets detached from this vedanā one becomes free from the influence of the Conditioned. Consequently his knowing faculty of perfect mindfulness becomes the fittest instrument to gain insight into the true nature of the Conditioned. The Parama-dīṭṭhadhamma-nibbānavādins claimed that they experienced the perfection of mindfulness through indifference (upekkhā-sati-parisuddhi) in the fourth rūpa jhāna. Gotama as a bodhisattva also experienced this state in the fourth jhāna. But in this state a śramaṇa remains attached to the vedanā of adukkhamasukham. Indifference only refers to the feelings of dukkha and sukha. So the purification of mindfulness is not perfect and therefore the Parama-dīṭṭhadhamma-nibbānavādins could not attain the special mental state. Gotama saw fear in this vedanā and became detached from it. So he was no longer influenced by it (see, Mahāsaccaka-sutta, M. I, pp. 242-243, 247-249; Sangārava-sutta, M. II, p. 212; Culatanhāsankhaya-sutta, M. I, p. 255). Consequently the purification of mindfulness became really perfect in case of Gotama and he attained bodhi. This mindfulness is anuttarāupekkhā-sati-parisuddhi in contrast to the upekkha-sati-parisuddhi of the fourth rūpa jhāna. For reference, see the next note.

[27] The Sekha-sutta, M. I, pp. 357-358 states that one attains the three knowledges through the anuttarāupekkhā-sati-pārisuddhi.

[28] See, pp. 330-331 and notes no. 26, 27 of the present article.

[29] D. I (PTS, London, 1975), pp. 76-84.

[30] S.N. II (PTS, London, 1970), pp. 119-127.

[31] By cetovimutti one also attains paññāvimutti (see, Sekha-sutta, M. I, 357), but by realising paññāvimutti one does not automatically attain ceto-vimutti.

[32] See note no. 26. Also note that in any Ārūpyasamāpatti a meditator experiences one of the infinite mental states and the rest of the Conditioned is not perceived. When out of such a samāpatti trance he still remains attached to that mental state as the highest attainable release from dukkha. So neither is it possible for him to go beyond that mental state nor can he attain the special mental state. In order to attain this state he must give up attachment to that infinite mental state. But he can also attain this state just after the fourth rūpa jhāna by giving up attachment to vedanā. So it is not necessary to practise the Ārūpyasamāpattis after the rūpa jhānas for the sake of attaining this special mental state.

[33] It should be noted, that the realisation of nibbāna in this very world is always associated with the Ārūpyasamāpattis, and never recorded after the four rūpa jhānas. The nibbānic experience always comes after the samāpatti of nevasaññānāsaññāyatana in the form of saññā-vedayita-nirodha samāpatti. For example, see Anupada-sutta (M. III, pp. 25-28), Latukipamo sutta (M. I, pp. 455-56). In Ariyapariyesanā-sutta (M. I, 167) the realisation of nibbānic consciousness is recorded in place of saññā-vedayita-nirodha samāpatti. The reason for such a tradition is that in nibbāna no trace of the Conditioned remains. So paññā which remains mindful of anything conditioned and reveals its true nature cannot be the immediate cause of the realisation of nibbāna. On the other hand, in Ārūpyasamāpattis one gradually gets rid of the impressions of the Conditioned from the consciousness. In the Nevasaññānāsaññāyatana samāpatti only a slight trace of the perception still remains. When that perception is wiped out in the saññā-vedayita-nirodha samāpatti, no trace of the Conditioned remains. In this trance state the Condition does not exist for the meditator and he has the experience of nibbāna, the Unconditioned.

[34] In this connection we may note that in D. III, p. 134 (PTS, London, 1976) the declaration "birth is destroyed..." is called 'bodhija', born of enlightenment. According to the Mahāsaccaka-sutta (M. I, pp. 246-249) the third vijjā was called "bodhi".