

Bits and Pieces

Minowani

Prefix

This document contains the posts on minowani.github.io for offline reading.

About

I decided to start with a site for *Knowing*, my book about understanding the Buddha's Dhamma. *Knowing* is a talk I wanted to give but due to its length and depth I never was able to finish. By writing it down one can now go back and forth at one's own pace. Because I am not a writer, nor is English my native language, there are no doubt a lot of grammar and style issues. And a home for *Knowing* should allow me to make those updates swiftly and with ease. Over time there were some points I liked to address, some questions I chose to answer, which led this site turning into what it is now.

And I started to translate some suttas. It can be handy to ponder on different translations so once in a while and I hope to encourage people to read from the suttas for themselves, especially the four *Nikāyā*, without holding the general explanations as true first; this because on crucial points those deviate from the path.

So here are my texts, which I would have preferred to read for myself decades ago. May they aid you on your journey to come to understand things for yourself. Should you have any questions, found errors, or just want to discuss, feel free to contact me: *minowani* on @tutanota.com.

Minowani,
09 May, 2024

PART I. Bits and Pieces

A Marble Floor

Suppose someone is helping a friend cleaning up their new house. A lot has been done already and only some floors are left to do. When their friend goes to the store for some groceries, they decide to start on the old hall which has a nice looking marble floor. After mopping the hall they take a break.

When their friend returns and, to their surprise, starts to clean the part which just got cleaned, they inform their friend they had already been cleaning there. When their friend explains that the marble is actually white and what they probably took as the pattern was is in fact dirt, they might look at the floor differently. Especially when seeing that, with the proper cleaning tools, these patterns do indeed come off. Thus now it is better understood what to do right? When they didn't see the dirt as dirt, they saw no problem in stopping where they did.

It is the same with the mind really. In the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* we find these two sermons:

'This shining, almsmen, mind. And that now is stained from visiting stains. That, not having learned, the commoner essentially not understands. Therefore, for the unlearned commoner, development of mind is absent I say.'
(AN1.51)

'This shining, almsmen, mind. And that now is liberated from visiting stains. That, having learned, the disciple of nobleness essentially understands. Therefore, for the learned disciple of nobleness, development of mind is present I say.'
(AN1.52)

So, in this way it is not a statement about the mind being beautiful as it is, perfect in its nature, that it only needs to be observed, or anything like that. A clean floor is still a floor. With a dirty floor it is about not seeing dirt as dirt, and thus lacking the knowledge, effort, skill, interest, etc., to attain to the job of removing the dirt.

Ājīva

Ājīva is often translated as livelihood.

And it certainly has to do with livelihood. In the discourses particulars of *ājīva* very often includes jobs. But also found are things like: 'With right action, right *ājīva*; with wrong action, wrong *ājīva*'. Thus a foolish person has, despite their job, wrong *ājīva* (AN10.105).

Then, to put a little less emphasis on just income while trying to incorporate 'life' (*jīva*) we could use 'way of life' instead. And it does connect:

With right view, right attitude; with right attitude, right speech; with right speech, right doing; with right doing, right way of life.

Ājīva [ā+jīva] way of life.

Ākiñcañña

Ākiñcañña is often translated as nothingness.

According to the dictionary *ākiñcaññā* means 'state of having nothing', 'absence of any possessions'. Nothingness, stating that nothing really exists, is nihilism. A wrong view involving a view of self: '*nothing really exists and thus neither does a self*'. The sermons do show that with *ākiñcaññāyatanaṃ* (base for "*nothingness*") there are perception and feeling and thus cognition, so there is that. Perhaps by focussing too much on the 'state of' part instead of the 'having' part it got shortened to *nothingness* and thus lost meaning.

As a shorter alternative for 'state of having nothing' *possessionlessness* or *non-ownership* would do, involving 'not self (*anattā*)' instead of 'there is no self'. Of course is a possession not you, your self, it is possessed, owned, taken up, which in turn can thus be taken down, abandoned, as well.

Ākiñcañña (nt.) non-ownership.

Citta

In the *pāli* texts different words are used which in English are often translated as mind. Those words are sometimes said to be synonyms. However, their specific usage seems rather consequently applied and I would like to see if we could keep those distinctions.

It is a bit like when a countryman asks you where you are from, and you might answer with a town's name. But when you are in another country and a local asks you where you are from, you might answer with a country name. Or, if you are from a well known city, the name of the city. It *does* depend on the context, and it *does* mean sometimes both can be used, but it doesn't mean they are synonyms. To me it is similar with mind.

Mind is used for *citta*, *ceto*, *mano* and *viññana*:

Citta

When we talk about the body and mind as duo, they are referred to in *pāli* as *kāya* and *citta*; so let's reserve mind for *citta*.

Ceto

Ceto is connected to the feeling side for which I use mentality, the heart. With then *cetasika* (belonging to *ceto*) as mental, like f.i. a mental feeling:

*Saññā ca vedanā ca cetasikā, ete dhammā
cittapañibaddhā.*

"And perception and feeling are mental, these things are connected with mind."

Mano

Mano seems to be associated with doing, the acting side (e.g. *manokamma*), as in 'thinking-mind', 'doing-mind', for which I use intellect, the head.

Viññana

And for *viññana* I use cognition:

Vijānātīti kho, bhikkhave, tasmā 'viññāṇan'ti vuccatī.

"It cognizes almsmen, now therefor it is called cognition."

One for All

Intellect might feel a bit off when taken on as (being) intellectual, likewise mentality and (being) mental, but here they are just the distinctions as Mind, Mind-that-undergoes, Mind-that-does and Mind-that-discerns; it is just mind. And so, mind (*citta*) can be used for cognition (*viññana*) when it comes to cognizing, or for intellect (*mano*) when the emphasis lies on intention, but neither *ceto* nor *mano* contains *viññana*; they are not that freely exchangeable.

If you ask me, mind (*citta*) = mentality (*ceto*) + intellect (*mano*) + cognition (*viññana*).

Ceto (nt.) mentality.

Citta (nt.) mind.

Mano (nt.) intellect.

Viññana (nt.) cognition.

Dhātu

Dhātu is often translated as element.

Element seems to be a proper translation. However it can be seen in a limited way, as chemical element or organic substance, while when I say ‘there is an element of danger to it’ it is immediately understood differently. And there are those *dhātū* like the beautiful, lustful, aversive, harmful, etc. (f.i. AN6.111).

If you ask me, to avoid confusion we could use *aspect* instead.

Dhātu (f.) aspect.

Dripping Soap

In AN5.3.8 we find the following comparison:

‘He overflows, completely flows, completely fills up, completely spreads this very body with delight and happiness by means of seclusion. There isn’t anything, from all of the body, not spread with delight and happiness by means of seclusion. Just as, almsmen, or a skilled barber or a barber’s apprentice would knead, in a bronze dish, bathing powders with water, sprinkling around and around finishing a ball from oil, affected with oil, from the inside and outside spread with oil and does not drip.’

I have always been intrigued by the last part of not dripping. Why would this matter? If you spread out joy and pleasantness through and through, all over, why would dripping be a concern? Suppose you would paint a whole room, from top to bottom, ceiling, walls, floor everything; why would dripping (not making such a mess that it piles up, just dripping) on the floor matter? And... how would you even drip joy?!

Today I washed my hands in a very tiny washing basin; the soap is on a shelf on another wall. So I wet my hands (closed the crane), picked up de soap, turned it in my hands a few times and was about to put it back when I noticed the soap water dripping. I turned the soap a few times more, which made this soap water a bit thicker, so it wouldn't drip when put back. Then I thought about this sermon. The not dripping is not about not splashing it everywhere all around, it means it is to thin to work with; it can't be put in good use because it falls away. And it needs more of the same work first, to make it thicker, to be able to put it into good use.

Because of the oily ball part in that sermon, the instruction itself was not lost (to thin and the ball itself would fall apart). ‘Establish it’ or ‘Establish it, else it is not workable’ do not differ in ‘what to do’. And there are more sermons stating the same (for example AN9.4.4 where a wise cow establishes her forefeet well before raising her hind feet in an unknown rocky area). Thus though it was not an issue, it is fun seeing this clarified.

Dukkha & Suffering

'Is Dukkha not unsatisfactoriness rather than suffering?'

A treatment for an accidental early discovered severe sickness is not for the not yet manifested symptoms. It doesn't matter if we don't feel sick right now. Thinking a treatment would be just for that would be a misunderstanding.

Unsatisfactoriness and suffering (bearing of pain) are as scales of the same metric system and when entertained, untreated, symptoms like birth, ageing, dying, separated from loved ones, captivity, slaughter, torture are guaranteed; which is why birth shouldn't be even approved of (SN5.6).

And a translation should do just to all this. Since the *Dhamma* is the antidote, suffering is a proper and more beneficial translation. In other words, the divine life could be seen as an overkill for unsatisfactoriness. Yet suffering, while giving more a *sense of urgency*, should not be misunderstood as being exclusive; as if there would be only suffering (SN22.60).

Dukkha (adj. --- n.) suffering.

Ekaggatā

Ekaggatā is often translated as one-pointedness, singleness, unification.

These translations are descriptions for what, in this context, we normally call focus. Focus reminds of holding a lens in such way the sunlight converges, unites, unifies, into a small area in order to create a burning mark or a fire. The light is then concentrated. With focus of mind (*cittassa ekaggatā*) it is then mind what is concentrated; this is what concentration is.

Ekaggatā focus.

Cittassa ekaggatā focus of mind (concentration).

Kamma

Kamma is often translated as *action*.

Kamma has a (different) meaning outside the *Buddhā Dhamma*, and this now finds its way in.

Kamma in our context *does* mean action. And there are just these three ways in which we can do things: by body, by speech and by intellect. We can only do something just now right this moment and of course, what we do leads to result; we do something precisely *because* of an expected result. That the exact 'result' (the ripening of an action) is not found out is one thing, it is one of the four unthinkableables, but that there is ripening is to be understood. Action is not a matter of believing.

Do yourself a favour and don't use *kamma* but use *action* instead, so that a misunderstanding is more easily spotted by yourself.

Kamma (nt.) action.

Letting Go

Very often it can be heard one should not attach; one should let go.

I am not to found of this letting-go. Not that we should not let go, but without proper understanding I find it not to helpful. Often a very rigid letting-go is viewed. While there is the case were it can also be seen as 'no worries', 'relax', 'just let it go', which already make things lighter. Perhaps a more beneficial approach is not to take it as an instruction but seeing it as a result from developing understanding. The more wisdom is developed the more letting-go will naturally follow.

But it can work as a reminder. Before engaging or when separation sets in it can be handy to remind yourself it might not be worth the trouble to hang on to things-that-follow-their-own-agenda to such an extend they will cost you your own happiness. Letting your happiness depend on things you don't have control over might not be the wisest thing to do. Unguarded this can still go the rigid way but perhaps it helps comparing it with enjoying a bird in the wild vs capturing that bird and put it in a cage so you can hold on to it even longer. The free bird flying away doesn't come at the cost of your enjoyment at all, it does its thing and you can be happy about it even when that bird is already out of sight.

This letting-go is not seen by others as a form of disinterest or anything negative, quite contrary, by letting go there is more room for kindness, generosity, compassion, etc. So just keep it light (loose) instead of heavy (attached). Be wise about it. Let it go... *free*.

Māna

Māna is translated as conceit.

In the sermons we can find there are ten bindings. The first three are cut with stream-entry, the next two weakened by once-returning, the first five with non-returning, and the remaining five on worthiness. *Māna* is one of those last bindings, so as long as we are not enlightened we have *Māna*, conceit.

Conceit is excessive pride in oneself. But when we see someone acting selflessly would we then say this person is acting with/because/out of conceit? That feels a bit weird right? So how can we let this make sense?

'I was', 'I saw', 'I did', 'I want', 'I said', 'I feel', 'I think', ... If someone would use these in several sentences within a short period of time, we could think that this person is really full of him/her self. We could say that he/she is 'making it about him/her self' hence conceit. But suppose someone was asked a lot of questions like 'Where were you?', 'What did you see?', 'What did you do?'. Then answering them with 'I was', 'I saw', etc. wouldn't automatically mean this person must be full of him/her self. So, conceit is more about 'making it about you while it is not about you'.

At stream-entry not-self is understood but the sense of self is left. And this sense of self is regarding things which are not-self (*pañc'upādānakkhandhā*), so this too is 'making it about self while it is not about self'. In this way it got the characteristics of conceit, hence conceit.

Conceit, arrogance, pride, self-esteem and so on, are all manifestations of this principle of conceit. The most subtle one is this sense of self; it is the conceit 'I am' (*asmimāna*).

Māna conceit.

Mind is Matter

Recently, well not so recently now, I had a few encounters with people claiming mind to be matter, as a product of the brain. I was unaware of people having this view but the for me interesting part was to discover I had not questioned my own view on this matter at all. As long as I can remember I took for granted we have a mind, as the non-matter part of a being.

In support for their view they claimed to have gotten it from someone or somewhere else and asserted that with the right equipment we can see things lighting up in the brain, explained as the mind thus originating from the brain. Which to me is an odd conclusion. After all, what is looked at is matter (it is matter that is seen), how would this say anything about the non-matter part to begin with?

In terms of language mind and matter are two things, so there is that difference, but lets reason a bit further.

If two things are the same, there must be some sameness, at least within a certain context. A house differs from a store, so these are two different things. But on a more general level we can say that since both are buildings they can be seen as occurrences of a same thing. So we have two particulars (house & store) of a (more) general (building). A house differs from a cave and caves aren't necessarily called buildings, so to see if they are particulars of a same thing we would have to go to an even more general level. Then we might end up with something like shelters. In the end the highest form of generalization of matter is a combination of hardness, cohesion, temperature and motion. These four great essences can be discovered by us through our senses and to some extent they can be shared; the tree I see can be seen by others too.

Thus if mind is matter then it must be possible to generalize it with these same qualities as well. So lets take anger for example. When we are angry we know that. But is it tangible? Visible (does light reflect)? Can it be tasted? Smelled or heard? Can it be shared?

When someone is angry there often are signs to see but again, that is just the matter part not the anger itself. And it might become more difficult to notice things like knowledge,

trustworthiness, and so on. We can see that any of those things do not behave what we know of matter to be like at all. Not discoverable through our five senses and not shareable, not having this sameness on a very general level, then thus not the same thing. And being different things they then can't be derived or originated from one another.

Now some might say 'Well, then it is all energy'. If energy is assumed to be an even more general level then care should be taken because sooner or later we think of atoms, electrons, etc. which is just matter. Also it would then open the view to 'matter is mind' while 'mind is matter' was really meant to deny any non-matter in the first place. And if you are willing to let energy to be just an abstract, without anything concrete, then the question remains 'to what end'?

Stating that mind is matter is really implying something about life-and-death, which in the end forms an excuse of why we live our lives the way we do. However we understand life to be, that forms our justification. In a way we could say the Buddha did view a more general level: Suffering. But then gave us the antidote for it as well.

Nibbāna

Nibbāna is often left untranslated and/or is unclear.

Translations for *nibbāna* can sometimes be found in glossaries yet they may not get used in the texts themselves, this tends to make things a bit abstract and unclear. Or if an explanatory part is used (extinction, extinguishing, unbinding) it doesn't make it clear enough. When it comes to translating *nibbāna* there are a few points to take into account:

1. It is a word which would be ordinarily used. People do have a perception of what *nibbāna* is even when they don't directly know it for themselves.
2. It is seen as positive.
3. It has to do with stilling, stopping, specifically regarding greed, hate and delusion.
4. It is a highest goal; it comes after freedom, emancipation.

Now *nibbāna* translates to me as peace:

1. People know what peace is, even though they might not have experienced it directly or fully by themselves.
2. Peace is seen as positive.
3. It can be understood that with greed, hate and delusion it isn't peaceful; then there is no real peace.
4. Freedom, but for what purpose? For doing what you like? Then you are not really free; but freedom in order to have ultimate peace? now that surely is the highest.

Many today's questions on *nibbāna* are not careful or valid. If instead of "*isn't nibbāna boring?*", "*isn't peace boring?*" was asked, it would already be easier to see that with boredom peace would be lacking. In this way this translation clarifies while covering the points taking into account as well.

Nibbāna (nt.) peace.

Nīvaraṇā

A popular translation for *nīvaraṇā* is hindrances.

Language is a bit ambiguous so understand that they don't feel as a hindrance to you, quite the contrary, but they are showstoppers to wisdom.

There are these five obstructions:

1. Kāmacchanda
2. Byāpāda
3. Thinamiddha
4. Uddhaccakukkucca
5. Vicikicchā

1. Kāmacchanda

Kāmacchanda is a compound of *kāma* (lust) and *chanda* (desire) and stands for desire-with-lust or lustful desire. Desire with lust is what normally drives one to find happiness when engaged with the world, not when drawn back from it. It depends on improper attention to a sign of attractiveness (SN46.2). The more that keeps being fed, the more it grows. The analogy given in SN46.55 is about a bowl of water mixed with various dyes which when used as a mirror gives a distorted view. Thus when fed it consumes, obsesses, giving less room for more beneficial things. Under its influence we turn away from doing what is wise to do.

2. Byāpādassa

Byāpāda is an obstruction which depends on a sign of resistance (*paṭigha*) or friction if you will. With improper attention to this it appears and develops. The analogy given is about a bowl of water heated up which when used as a mirror gives a distorted view. The more heated up we are the less room we give for wise things. Heated up, out of friction, is generally an image for the display of anger. So lets call it just that.

3. Thinamiddha

Thinamiddha is a compound of *thīna* + *middha*. *Thīna* is to congeal, and *middha* is 'to be fat', torpor. They *describe* this one obstruction (not a conjunction; AN1.13). As obstruction it gets fed by the improper attention to things such as dislike or discontentment, weariness, yawning, drowsiness after a meal, mental sluggishness. The analogy given is a bowl of water covered up with weeds which couldn't be used as a mirror. Weed takes time to grow so one had *no interest* in keeping it tidy. Thus being bored or lazy; which makes you dull. Taken all together this obstruction seems to stand for that dullness. It wouldn't be too difficult to see dullness being a showstopper for wisdom.

4. Uddhaccakukkucca

Uddhaccakukkucca is a compound of *uddhacca* and *kukkucca*, describing this one obstruction. *Uddhacca* means something like agitation, excitement, and *kukkucca* bad doing, misconduct, bad character. Further is this obstruction fed by improper attention to mental unrest. Agitation over bad doings, fed by mental unrest, describes what we could call remorse. The analogy is a bowl of water being stirred (agitated) which when used as a mirror would give a distorted view. Being stirred with too much unrest to leave it alone. To busy crying over spilled milk which is already generally understood as not being helpful for anything, let alone wisdom.

5. Vicikicchā

Vicikicchā comes from *vicikacchati* which is lit. "dis reflect". The analogy says one can't use a bowl with muddy water in the dark as mirror. Thus a visual distinction can't be made. All look the same; without clarity, obscure, vague. When this as binding is uprooted then there is that clarity and *then* there is no doubt. With doubt things might not be so clear, but at least they are clear enough to have doubt about them; they can be seen or considered (there is just no certainty about it) but when vague, lacking distinction, then as such it isn't even considered thus then there is not that doubt. Unseen it will not be reflected on. This obstruction is fed by the improper attention to clarity lacking principles.

In common

These five obstructions are all fed (either to appear or grow) by improper attention:

- lustful desire by improper attention to a sign of attraction.
- anger by improper attention to a sign of resistance.
- dullness by improper attention to dislike, weariness, drowsiness, etc.
- remorse by improper attention to mental unrest.
- unclarity by improper attention to clarity lacking principles.

Nīvaraṇā obstructions.

Kāmacchanda lustful desire.

Byāpāda anger.

Thinamiddha dullness.

Uddhaccakukkucca remorse.

Vicikicchā unclarity.

Opportunity

In AN8.3.9 (*Akkhaṇasuttam*) we find people thinking the world had a chance, an opportunity, to benefit from the Buddha, because he was then there in the world.

But we find the Buddha stating people mistake his being then there in the world for an opportunity. Even with him there, those in hell can't benefit from his Teaching, or animals, or some certain gods, or those living to far away, or those close enough but with to strong wrong views and to confused, or those simply to dumb. For those it is a miss.

There is also the case when a person is capable but the *Dhamma* is not available, then too it will be a miss. Thus with the teaching from the Buddha now available for us, don't miss out on the opportunity. Study from the sermons so now and then.

Parimukhaṃ

Parimukhaṃ is used in the context of *ānāpānasati*. It is found in the phrase *parimukhaṃ satim upaṭṭhapetvā* and is a compound with *pari* (around) and *mukha* (mouth, entrance). According to the dictionary *pari* also means '(lit.) away from, off' and *mukha* 'face, entrance, front, top'.

Ānāpānasati is a compound of *ānāpāna* and *sati*. While *sati* is memory (mindfulness would be *sampajañña* see SN26.7) it is a bit unfit for the usage in english where recollection fits better. And *ānāpāna* is about the breathe not breath if that distinction helps. Recollection is something we need to develop and here we hone this *on* the breathe.

We are told to recollect on the breathe knowing whether it is in or out and long or short, and whilst knowing this train with body, feeling, mind and principles (SN54.1). *Parimukhaṃ* describes this way of attending (*upaṭṭhapetvā*). We can describe it as 'away from the front', 'around the front', etc. to indicate what is at the centre of our attention and what is at the side, or at the foreground and the background. What we train gets to be the centre of our attention, the foreground, and the knowing of the breathe as in or out and long or short then surrounds that, as the context, the background. And this manner is covered by the english word peripheral, with peripherally (*parimukhaṃ*) being the adverb. Recollection of the breathe is a recollection *on* the breathe but advised is to develop recollection in full (SN54.6). By training with body, feeling, mind and principles while *peripherally* attending to the recollection on the in and out breathe neither background nor foreground are forgotten.

Parimukhaṃ (adv.) [pari+mukha] peripherally.

Perfections

Ever so now and then I hear about (the) perfection(s) and I would like to make a general remark.

Hearing perfection(s) some feel they then understand what needs to be done. However when one understands what needs to be done then one has entered the stream, till then things are not quite so understood. Now more things are not clear till they are but perfection has a ring to it of something pretty much flawless from each and every angle, or maxed-out; something quite out of reach. If you need to judge your own actions along what you consider to be perfect then it is seldom good enough.

To them I would emphasize the words *good enough*. Good enough for the goal gives some more room, air, right? Your conduct does not have to be perfect, just good enough. Your concentration does not have to be perfect, just good enough. Your wisdom does not have to be perfect, just good enough.

This view is not just a trick to get some air in. In the sermons we see virtuous ones (*arahants*) behaving in a way which others saw as rude or careless etc. To those it did not look like the perfect behaviour at all. We also see the virtuous ones differ in concentration. Some had supernatural abilities, others not, yet their concentration was developed good enough. Likewise there were differences in wisdom, yet the developed wisdom was good enough to uproot ignorance. Those developments were of a much higher degree than what is needed to enter the stream for which less conduct, less concentration and less wisdom are good enough. In any case, when good enough, well... that is just perfect.

Rebirth and Reincarnation

We don't need to consult many buddhist texts to read that according to them death is not the end of it all. Were it so a knife would then already have been a far more easier tool. Rebirth and reincarnation don't have this problem but share the idea that a certain something is carried over, or remains, from one life to another and that is there the problem.

Eternalism (*sassatavādā*) and nihilism (*ucchedavādā*) are two extreme (worldly) views on existence. Eternal is seen as lasting forever and forever means until the end of time. Eternalism opposes nihilism and must thus first hold time as never ending (eternal). The breaking up, disintegration, perishing, of this existing-through-time is nihilism. And although somewhat masked, both rebirth and reincarnation are actually based on these same misconceptions [1]. They are sometimes used as argument against nihilism but this is really just only a delayed nihilism: existing-through-time until no more, which just shows *birth* not being understood.

If rebirth and reincarnation were to be redefined to imply dependent-co-arising (a buddhist version of rebirth or reincarnation? why such horrible construct) it would still solve nothing. Rooted in wrong view they don't disentangle anything but build further on top what is not understood. It added another concept to the confusion thus requiring *more* explanation not less [2]. With rebirth and reincarnation beings are seen as reborn or reincarnated, yet beings are born. Both views must at least acknowledge birth. And it is precisely *birth* which is not being understood. It didn't solve a thing.

The sutta's themselves speak of birth, next birth, a following existence, etc., showing rebirth and reincarnation are here just translational liberties. And unlike them, birth is not just a view. Birth already includes the possibility for a next birth (birth is birth) for it too is dependently-co-arisen. Thus depending on the context the usage of birth, next birth, future birth, further existence, etc. will do perfectly fine; there is no need to seek shelter in wrong views.

The world fares towards extremes (eternalism, nihilism); it was the Buddha who taught by the middle and a middle simply *can not* be grouped with either extreme.

Notes:

1. For something you have never experienced, heard of, etc. you have no name. If you do have a name it is for a certain experience, but when this is misunderstood the name includes the misunderstanding. Things can be remembered (SN22.79), thought out, perceived, yet misunderstood. Rebirth and reincarnation do not just indicate life after dead, they must also include a certain *how*. And depending on this *how* these views can be seen different or as synonyms, but what these outsiders' views didn't include is dependent-co-arising.
2. Like with eating. It doesn't matter how often you eat it stays eating (eating is eating). You wouldn't then suddenly *re-eat* which would also require more explanation, not less (is it about vomit?). This redefinition comes with the danger of creating more misunderstandings, not less. It engraves and masquerades the already underlying wrong views, which now forms support for pernicious explanations like dependent-co-arising with lifetimes. But dependent-co-arising explained as existing through time (across lifetimes, rebirth) still stays to be *sassatavādā* & *ucchedavādā*.

Sabbe Dhammā Anattā

Sabbe saṅkhārā aniccā
Sabbe saṅkhārā dukkhā
Sabbe dhammā anattā

A common explanation is that since the third line talks about *dhammā*, instead of *saṅkhārā*, it includes both *saṅkhārā* and *asaṅkhārā*. And *Nibbāna*, being *asaṅkhārā*, is thus included. But is this a valid inference?

A stream-enterer has understood *anattā*, then the last line is clear. Till then *anattā* is misunderstood (idem the others). To come to understand *anattā* we need to train. And what is there to train? In this context we can look at SN22.15 where is said that the five masses (*khandhā*) are impermanent (*anicca*). And what is impermanent is suffering (*dukkha*). What is suffering is not-self (*anattā*) and should be seen with wisdom as it really is: 'This is not mine, this I am not, this is not my self (*attā*)'. Which leads to getting fed up and with being fed up comes dispassion. Through dispassion liberation and with liberation there is that knowledge.

That the masses are impermanent is here a given, a statement; it is not explained. And in order to understand we need to learn to see for ourselves how this is so, which requires a thorough grasping of their principle. When we understand the principle of f.i. matter, we can even say something about matter which we have never ever encountered before. To look at this principle we need to look for, investigate, a more general level. What do all manifestations of matter have in common? That what it is, is then its characteristics and all matter behave accordingly. Thus when wood is understood then to that extend all wooden things are understood. Likewise, when *saṅkhārā* are understood (impermanence) then all *dhammā* are understood (as not-self). And that is what those three lines say. This way they can be seen as a very compact instruction.

But would that rule out Nibbāna?

By implying *Nibbāna* as being included, it must also imply impermanence (*anattā* is seen *because* impermanence is seen) and with impermanence suffering, which simply can't be. The

line '*sabbe dhammā anattā*' does not justify making such (atta or anattā) claims about the *asaṅkhāta* at all.

Saṅkappa

Saṅkappa is often translated as thought.

We got thoughts all over the path... it seems so vague.

What we can read is that there are the three wholesome (*nekkhammasaṅkappa*, *abyāpādasāṅkappa*, *avihiṃsāsaṅkappa*) and the three unwholesome ones (*kāmasaṅkappa*, *byāpādasāṅkappa*, *vihiṃsāsaṅkappa*) so at least it doesn't mean all thoughts.

We can think about renunciation, good-will, harmlessness but when we are (trying to be) harmless, now that is a bit different.

If you ask me, *saṅkappa* just means attitude.

Saṅkappa attitude.

Saṅkhārā

Saṅkhārā is often seen translated as (volitional) formations, fabrications, etc.

It is certainly understandable how certain *aspects* of *saṅkhārā* got to be translated as *saṅkhārā*, but in doing so it also got a bit abstract and unclear.

Important is to remember that all what is grasped on as 'me, this I am, etc.' which do not fall into one of the other masses-with-grasping, fall into this one. And what do you think, do you sense you to be (volitional) formations or fabrications?

Saṅkhārā translates as inclinations. When we say one is wired in such way or one is of such or so character it relates to this mass. And when something goes against 'how you are wired', thus inclined, *then* you'll quickly notice how strongly this goes against your 'sense of being', 'you'.

For a more in-depth explanation on *saṅkhārā* see *Knowing*.

Saṅkhārā (pl.) inclinations.

Sīla

Sīla is often translated as virtue.

A virtue is a trait, quality, that is deemed morally good.

Would you consider right concentration to be a virtue? Or right effort? And what about right view?

I do, yet those are not *sīla*.

And what to think of bad virtue... a bad quality which is deemed morally good? This is rather strange right? Yet *sīla* can be good or bad.

If you ask me, *sīla* simply means conduct.

Sīla (nt.) conduct.

Taking Refuge

Everyone thinks they are right, there is no one thinking they are wrong. When it turned out later you were wrong, you are then *now* right about being *then* wrong. And even if you think 'This action is bad, I shouldn't be doing this' it is mere a double right: you already know it is a bad action so you are right about that, and for some reason it is still the right thing for you to do now.

Basically you can't do things which on all levels are seen by you as wrong, which is already covered by the words right and wrong which do have some relation to you. We can't directly see our wrong view but we can try to understand it indirectly f.i. with the thought: 'I am not awakened therefore I must have wrong view' however, this comes from taking that view as right first; so you are then still, first right. Things are thus met with certain blindfolds on; they are in a blind corner and are not seen.

Taking refuge is basically accepting another one's proclamation to see what is *more* true; it is like using mirrors to be able to see what is in your blind spot. When some took refuge and ask in how far the *dhamma* is in agreement with science it usually shows their refuge lies foremost in science. Or when concerned whether it is confirm their school, foremost their school. And refuge to the Buddha does have its own problems, for the question remains 'Which Buddha?' Some say the texts, within and across schools, are in contradiction, some argue it is all the same, in any case when taking refuge you still already decided what you hold as true first. A safer approach then is to investigate what you hold as true and then go by what you 'understand to be true for yourself'. Without accepting and denying things you don't understand, else you would just imply you do understand which just shows where your refuge lies foremost. It can be handy not to take to big chunks all at once but to work with smaller steps. The more you work with what you really know the deeper and wider your understanding grows. Till someday you can be your own refuge without the blindfolds, without ignorance.

The Desire Paradox

"Isn't the desire to end desire a paradox?"

Suppose you grab a log and you caught a splinter. This splinter is a sharp foreign object and it would be wise to remove it (it could lead to an infection). To remove it we could make use of a (disinfected) needle. A needle is another sharp foreign object. So, we use a sharp foreign object to remove a sharp foreign object. Do you see any paradox in there?

We don't just stick a needle in there and leave it there too, that would not be skilful. When the splinter has come out that needle is easily cleaned and put away.

Desire or attachment to the path can be compared to the holding to (and skilful making use of) the needle. Letting go of that is more about implying what will be done, instead of something that you need to focus on as 'need to do'; skilful desire leads to the ending of desire.

Tree Types of Dukkha

In the sermons (e.g. SN38.14, SN45.165, DN33) three types of suffering are named, but I have not seen them there explained. They are explained outside the sermons, but in so far I have seen them they led to weird implications. Let me then offer an alternative.

1. Dukkhadukkhatā

Dukkha due to *suffering* (*dukkha*). And what is suffering? Birth, oldness and death. This doesn't mean one must feel sorrow or have an unhappy life. One can be very happy and joyful in this life. The point is that when there is no security from them, sooner or later, grievous things will happen for sure.

2. Saṅkhāradukkhatā

Dukkha due to *inclination* (*Saṅkhāra*, see 'Knowing'). Sometimes people keep making bad decisions and suffer the consequences. It might seem as if they just can't help themselves, *as if they are wired that way* (*inclined*). They are more inclined to act out of greed, hatred and delusion.

3. Vipariṇāmadukkhatā

Dukkha due to *change for the worse* (*vipariṇāma*). We might get robbed, our environment may have to deal with severe weather conditions, we might get sick, our countries might get into war, etc. All these sort of things, when run out of luck (so to speak) or in case of force majeure, fall under change-for-the-worse.

Free from Suffering

Normally when suffering from a painful bodily or mental feeling both *and* a bodily *and* a mental feeling are felt. Which might give the impression of this inseparable blob of suffering. Even so, that is not what suffering is. Just like happiness is not defined by happy feelings (whatever happiness there is, that is the happiness), so is suffering not defined by painful feelings. A virtuous one (*arahant*) can still feel bodily feelings (feelings are one of the five masses) but without the suffering that comes from being attached to it. Or to any of the other *khandhā* for that matter.

Then for a virtuous one there is no:

- *Dukkhadukkhata*; Birth, ageing and dying has stopped; the deathless has been reached.
- *Saṅkhāradukkhata*; Unwholesome choices can't be made since greed, hatred and delusion are uprooted; there is thus no such inclination.
- *Vipariṇāmadukkhata*; Since there is no appropriation, no regarding 'things' as 'for me', or 'mine' or as 'happening to me', etc. there is no suffering depending on this.

Void

No core, yet real

There is a lot confusion about void, emptiness. It is often taken as nothing to be really existing, that everything is an illusion, even when this directly goes against the very first Noble Truth. And how can that be, right? So, lets look at another take on things.

The first Noble Truth states that there is suffering; suffering is real. And what is suffering? In short attachment to matter, feeling, perception, inclinations and cognition, five masses-with-grasping (*Pañc'upādānakkhandhā*), which means we take these things to be (part of) me, myself. Or that this 'me' is in them. Basically we are hijacking these things, forcing the conceit 'I am' (see *Māna*) upon them.

Now matter seen as everlasting, not subject to change, does indeed not exist, but matter which is not permanent and subject to change, does. As is the same with the other four masses. In the sermons we can find these five *compared* to respectively foam, bubbles, illusions, weed, and magic; lets look at these comparisons first.

1.1 At The Beach

Matter compared to foam

Take a look at sand, it is matter. But you don't see this matter originating nor changing or dissolving. Perhaps you understand that grain of sand existing long before you and will still do so after you are gone (though not likely to stay at the same place). Water and air too are matter but for many, when they think of matter, a first thought might be about something more 'tangible'. Foam might look more tangible. And with foam we do see it coming to shore, staying there behind and dissolving. And not only that, but foam also consists of foam. Matter consists just of matter, there is nothing else found *in* there. Take an onion for example. If you remove the outer layer you see another layer, which you can peel off till nothing else is found. If you peel an avocado you do find a core but

that core is just matter too. When you cut an onion you don't only find layers, you find fluid, smell etc. too, these things are also matter. Matter is matter through and through. Thus how matter behaves (arises, changes, decays) it does so through and through too. In this way it is void, void from anything else that is matter. When understood you don't have to make more of that; there is no 'holiness' in matter for example, nor are there feelings in matter, etc.

1.2. A Rainy Day

Feelings compared to bubbles

Feelings are not tangible like matter. But they are just as real. Feelings are just feelings, they too are void of anything else. And like bubbles, when popped they are gone.

1.3. A Rainbow

Perceptions compared to illusions

Another translation had something to do with 'beam of light' which reminded me of a rainbow. There is no tangible arc 'hanging' there, you can search for its end (for that pot of gold) forever. It is not that it isn't real, but it is a perception. Another thing to think of are optical illusions. Two lines can be perceived as different in length while they are of equal size. The perception is real, but it too is only perception, not lasting forever and it can change by adopting your viewpoint/understanding.

1.4. The Garden

Inclinations compared to weeds

When not addressed, weeds can creep all over the place. Left, right, under or over things. They grow and grow, and grow to cover places you don't want to be covered. It is the same with inclinations, they go all over the place. And when not held in check we get covered, overwhelmed, by them. Weeds need constantly be dealt with until they are uprooted. And like the others, inclinations don't contain matter, or feelings, etc., they are void of anything else.

1.5. Not Out Of My Ear!

Cognition compared to magic

In magic shows often things, not seldom coins, are appearing and disappearing (while normally these things wouldn't). The trick is very quickly done so you don't really see what is going on. But once you know how it works you are not enchanted by that magic any more. You don't see the magician as magical, or the appearing and disappearing coin as special. You might think the magician is a good trickster. And cognition appears and disappears fast too. So it is here, then it is gone. Not understanding, we are enchanted, tricked, by it. But cognition just does cognition; there is no matter, feelings, perceptions or inclinations in there. It leeches on those things and quickly appears and disappears, void of anything else.

2.0 The Lesson

Getting to the core of things

Whether things got a core or not is not really what we are talking about. What we assume, believe, see, think, is that there is an 'I', 'me', 'soul' or 'self' in these things; something that is 'me' at its core. But here we are taught that things are empty, void, of 'self'. When we are told whether it is or isn't so, it is not that much helpful; it doesn't make it wisdom, it remains 'book knowledge'.

The teachings are set up to *train* so we can understand for ourselves. With these five being all void, we know the necessary things we need to know about them. Thus we can play with that. As example, if we look at the characteristics of these comparisons we see that:

- they arise, change-while-they-are and decay, all through and through (like foam).
- they can be popped, dispelled (like bubbles).
- through understanding, changing views, we come to look at them differently (like illusions).
- to stop them entirely they must be uprooted (like weed).
- when full understanding arises, there is no more getting tricked again (like a magic show).

Looking at it this way, we see it can be a lesson, instruction, showing us a bit about how-and-what-to-do; in fact it is about Dependent-Co-Arising. Emptiness is in this way a very condensed form of a *teaching instruction*. Don't just admire the label on the medicine bottle; read the instruction and apply to treat the threat.

PART II. Translations

Bindable

Saṃyutta Nikāya
khandhavaggo
khandhasaṃyuttaṃ
dhammakathikavaggo
saṃyojanīyasuttaṃ
SN22.120

Situated at Sāvatti.

'I shall point out, almsmen, *and* the bindable principles *and* the binding. So listen.

And what are, almsmen, the bindable principles, what is the binding?

Form, almsmen, is a bindable principle; any desire and passion there, that there is the binding. Feeling ... pe ... Perception ... Inclinations... Cognition is a bindable principle; any desire and passion there, that there is the binding.

These are called, almsmen, the bindable principles; *this* the binding.' [1]

Note

1. Some things are capable to be binded. And what makes a thing a thing? What is the thingness in things? If we ponder on this, we will eventually arrive at its principle, which *is* a principle (*dhamma*). And here we learn that there are such bindable principles as form, and with desire-*and*-passion (*chandarāga*) for them there is the binding. Passion stops with the abandoning of the five higher bindings (*saṃyojāni*) and is thus not to be confused with lust (*kāma*); desire-*with*-lust (*kāmacchanda*) is an obstruction (*nīvaraṇa*).

Calm and Insight

Āṅguttara Nikāya
Dukanipātapāḷi
Paṭhamapaṇṇāsakaṃ
AN2.32

These two, almsmen, principles have a share in knowing. What two?

And calm and insight.

Calm, almsmen, when developed, what gain does it partake in?
Mind is developed.

Mind developed; what gain does it partake in?
What is passion, that is gotten rid of.

Insight, almsmen, when developed, what gain does it partake in?
Wisdom is developed.

Wisdom developed; what gain does it partake in?
What is ignorance, that is gotten rid of.

Or, depraved by passion, almsmen, mind is not emancipated,
or, depraved by ignorance, wisdom is not developed.

Thus now, almsmen,
with passion fading away: emancipation through mentality,
with ignorance fading away: emancipation through wisdom.

Cessation of Action

Samyutta Nikāya
Saḷāyatana Saṃyutta
Kammanirodhasutta
SN35.146

“I shall point out, almsmen, new and old action, cessation of action, the way leading to cessation of action. So listen and pay attention thoroughly, I shall speak.

And which, almsmen, old action?

Eye, almsmen, is to be seen as old action, arranged, intended, to be felt.... Tongue, almsmen, is to be seen as old action, arranged, intended, to be felt.... Intellect, almsmen, is to be seen as old action, arranged, intended, to be felt. This is called, almsmen, old action.

And which, almsmen, new action?

Now which, almsmen, action one does at present by body, speech, intellect. This is called, almsmen, new action.

And which, almsmen, cessation of action?

Now that, almsmen, is to touch emancipation, by cessation of action-by-body, action-by-speech, action-by-intellect. This is called, almsmen, cessation of action.

And which, almsmen, the way leading to cessation of action?

This very noble eightfold path viz. right view, right attitude, right speech, right doing, right way of life, right effort, right recollection, right concentration. This is called, almsmen, the way leading to cessation of action.

Thus now, almsmen, taught, by me, is old action, taught is new action, taught is cessation of action, taught is the way leading to cessation of action.

Now what, almsmen, should be done by a teacher for the welfare of disciples, with empathy, out of empathy, so is done by me for you. These, almsmen, are roots of trees, these are empty places. Radiate, almsmen, don't be negligent, don't become remorseful afterwards. This is our instruction to you.”

Concise on Emptiness

Majjhima Nikāya
Uparipaññāsapāḷi
Suññātavaggo
Cūlasuññātasuttaṃ
MN121

Thus I learned:

At one time the Exalted One he dwells in Sāvatti, at the eastern park, at Migāramātupāsāda. Now then senior Ānanda at evening time returned from seclusion, went by there where the Exalted One was. Having gone up to the Exalted One, saluted, he sat down at one side. At one side seated now senior Ānanda said this to the Exalted One:

'At this one time, venerable, the Exalted One he dwells amongst the Sakyans at a market town of the Sakyans, named Nagaraka. There I, venerable, learned face to face, received face to face from the Exalted One: "By dwelling by emptiness I, Ānanda, at present dwell a lot". I hope this is by me, venerable, well learned, well grasped, well attended to, well retained?'

'Surely you got this, Ānanda, well learned, well grasped, well attended to, well retained. I formerly also, Ānanda, also at present, by dwelling by emptiness I dwell a lot. Just as, Ānanda, this Migāramātupāsāda is empty of elephants, cows, horses and meres, empty of gold and silver, empty of female and male assemblies and so this is the non-emptiness viz. the generalization depending on the order of almsmen. Thus so now, Ānanda, an almsmen not attending to the perception of the village, not attending to the perception of men, pays attention to the generalization depending on the perception of the forest. For him on the perception of the forest the mind jumps at, reconciles, settles, is drawn to. So he knows: "*What might be the wearinesses depending on the perception of the village, here those are not. What might be the wearinesses depending on the perception of men, here those are not. And so this is the moderation of weariness viz. the generalization depending on the perception of the forest.*" He knows: "*This is empty; from the perception of the village the perception is gone*", knows: "*This is empty; from the perception of men the perception is gone*", "*And so this is the non-emptiness viz. the*

generalization depending on the perception of the forest". So now for what is not there, by that he sees that is empty but what is left there here he knows: "Soothed this is". Thus also for him this, Ānanda, exists being as it is; the undistorted clear entry into emptiness [1].

And again further, Ānanda, an almsmen not attending to the perception of men, not attending to the perception of the forest, pays attention to the generalization depending on the perception of the earth. For him on the perception of the earth the mind jumps at, reconciles, settles, is drawn to. Just as, Ānanda, a bull's hide, well spread by a hundred pegs, is having the folds gone away, thus so then, Ānanda, an almsmen which of this earth's highs and lows, rivers with difficult passages, places with stumps and thorns, irregular rocks, is not attending to that all; he pays attention to the generalization depending on the perception of the earth. For him on the perception of the earth the mind jumps at, reconciles, settles, is drawn to. So he knows: *"What might be the wearinesses depending on the perception of men here those are not. What might be the wearinesses depending on the perception of the forest, here those are not. And so this is the moderation of weariness viz. the generalization depending on the perception of the earth."* He knows: *"This is empty; from the perception of men the perception is gone"*, knows: *"This is empty; from the perception of the forest the perception is gone"*, *"And so this is the moderation of weariness viz. the generalization depending on the perception of the earth."* So now for what is not there, by that he sees that is empty but what is left there here he knows: *"Soothed this is"*. Thus also for him this, Ānanda, exists being as it is; the undistorted clear entry into emptiness.

And again further, Ānanda, an almsmen not attending to the perception of the forest, not attending to the perception of the earth, pays attention to the generalization depending on the perception of the base of boundless-sky. For him on the perception of the base of boundless-sky the mind jumps at, reconciles, settles, is drawn to. So he knows: *"What might be the wearinesses depending on the perception of the forest here those are not. What might be the wearinesses depending on the perception of the earth, here those are not. And so this is the moderation of weariness viz. the generalization depending on the perception of the base of boundless-sky."* He knows: *"This is empty; from the perception of the forest the perception is gone"*, knows: *"This is empty; from the perception of the earth the perception is gone"*, *"And so this is*

the moderation of weariness viz. the generalization depending on the perception of the base of boundless-sky." So now for what is not there, by that he sees that is empty but what is left there here he knows: "*Soothed this is*". Thus also for him this, Ānanda, exists being as it is; the undistorted clear entry into emptiness.

And again further, Ānanda, an almsmen not attending to the perception of the earth, not attending to the perception of the base of boundless-sky, pays attention to the generalization depending on the perception of the base of boundless-cognition. For him on the perception of the base of boundless-cognition the mind jumps at, reconciles, settles, is drawn to. So he knows: "*What might be the wearinesses depending on the perception of the earth here those are not. What might be the wearinesses depending on the perception of the base of boundless-sky, here those are not. And so this is the moderation of weariness viz. the generalization depending on the perception of the base of boundless-cognition.*" He knows: "*This is empty; from the perception of the earth the perception is gone*", knows: "*This is empty; from the perception of the base of boundless-sky the perception is gone*", "*And so this is the moderation of weariness viz. the generalization depending on the perception of the base of boundless-cognition.*" So now for what is not there, by that he sees that is empty but what is left there here he knows: "*Soothed this is*". Thus also for him this, Ānanda, exists being as it is; the undistorted clear entry into emptiness.

And again further, Ānanda, an almsmen not attending to the perception of the base of boundless-sky, not attending to the perception of the base of boundless-cognition, pays attention to the generalization depending on the perception of the base of non-ownership. For him on the perception of the base of non-ownership the mind jumps at, reconciles, settles, is drawn to. So he knows: "*What might be the wearinesses depending on the perception of the base of boundless-sky, here those are not. What might be the wearinesses depending on the perception of the base of boundless-cognition, here those are not. And so this is the moderation of weariness viz. the generalization depending on the perception of the base of non-ownership.*" He knows: "*This is empty; from the perception of the base of boundless-sky the perception is gone*", knows: "*This is empty; from the perception of the base of boundless-cognition the perception is gone*", "*And so this is the moderation of weariness viz. the generalization depending on*

the perception of the base of possessionlessness." So now for what is not there, by that he sees that is empty but what is left there here he knows: "*Soothed this is*". Thus also for him this, Ānanda, exists being as it is; the undistorted clear entry into emptiness.

And again further, Ānanda, an almsmen not attending to the perception of the base of boundless-cognition, not attending to the perception of the base of non-ownership, pays attention to the generalization depending on the perception of the base of neither-perception-nor-non-perception. For him on the perception of the base of neither-perception-nor-non-perception the mind jumps at, reconciles, settles, is drawn to. So he knows: "*What might be the wearinesses depending on the perception of the base of boundless-cognition, here those are not. What might be the wearinesses depending on the perception of the base of non-ownership, here those are not. And so this is the moderation of weariness viz. the generalization depending on the perception of the base of neither-perception-nor-non-perception.*" He knows: "*This is empty; from the perception of the base of boundless-cognition the perception is gone*", knows: "*This is empty; from the perception of the base of non-ownership the perception is gone*", "*And so this is the moderation of weariness viz. the generalization depending on the perception of the base of neither-perception-nor-non-perception.*" So now for what is not there, by that he sees that is empty but what is left there here he knows: "*Soothed this is*". Thus also for him this, Ānanda, exists being as it is; the undistorted clear entry into emptiness.

And again further, Ānanda, an almsmen not attending to the perception of the base of non-ownership, not attending to the perception of the base of neither-perception-nor-non-perception, pays attention to the generalization depending on the signless mental-concentration. For him on the signless mental-concentration the mind jumps at, reconciles, settles, is drawn to. So he knows: "*What might be the wearinesses depending on the perception of the base of non-ownership, here those are not. What might be the wearinesses depending on the perception of the base of neither-perception-nor-non-perception, here those are not. And so this is the moderation of weariness viz. just this body depending on the hexad-base support for life*". He knows: "*This is empty; from the perception of the base of non-ownership the perception is gone*", knows: "*This is empty; from the perception of the base of neither-perception-nor-non-perception the perception is*

gone", *"And so this is the non-emptiness viz. just this body depending on the hexad-base support for life."* So now for what is not there, by that he sees that is empty but what is left there here he knows: *"Soothed this is"*. Thus also for him this, Ānanda, exists being as it is; the undistorted clear entry into emptiness.

And again further, Ānanda, an almsmen not attending to the perception of the base of non-ownership, not attending to the perception of the base of neither-perception-nor-non-perception, pays attention to the generalization depending on the signless mental-concentration. For him on the signless mental-concentration the mind jumps at, reconciles, settles, is drawn to. So he knows: *"Now also this signless mental-concentration is arranged, intended"*, knows: *"But now anything what is arranged, intended, that is impermanent; the principle of cessation"*. For him thus from knowing, thus from seeing, *and* the mind emancipated from the drain of lust, *and* the mind emancipated from the drain of existence, *and* the minded emancipated from the drain of ignorance, upon emancipation, thus emancipated, the knowledge is. He knows: *"Exhausted is birth, fulfilled is the divine life, done is what ought to be done, no further for such a state"*. So he knows: *"What might be the wearinesses depending on the drain of lust, here those are not. What might be the wearinesses depending on the drain of existence, here those are not. What might be the wearinesses depending on the drain of ignorance, here those are not. And so this is the moderation of weariness viz. just this body depending on the hexad-base support for life."* He knows: *"This is empty from the drain of lust"*, knows: *"This is empty from the drain of existence"*, knows: *"This is empty from the drain of ignorance, And so this is the non-emptiness viz. just this body depending on the hexad-base support for life."* So now for what is not there, by that he sees that is empty but what is left there here he knows: *"Soothed this is"*. Thus also for him this, Ānanda, exists being as it is; the undistorted clean, farthest no higher, entry into emptiness.

Also what for, Ānanda, in times gone by, recluses and divine men, obtaining the clean, farthest no higher, emptiness, they all dwelt obtaining just this clean, farthest no higher, emptiness. Also what for, Ānanda, in times to come, recluses and divine men, obtaining the clean, farthest no higher, emptiness, they all will dwell obtaining just this clean, farthest no higher, emptiness. Also what for, Ānanda, at present, recluses and divine men, obtaining the clean, farthest no

higher, emptiness, they all dwell obtaining just this clean, farthest no higher, emptiness. Thus from that here, Ānanda, "*We shall dwell obtaining the clean, farthest no higher, emptiness*" for so by you guys, Ānanda, it should be trained.'

Thus spoke the Exalted One.

Notes

1. Here is shown the method by emptying where with proper attention right view follows going all the way up to right concentration (the drawn into, settling) indicating the practise of the whole noble eightfold path. It describes calm (*samatha*) and insight (*vipassanā*), all in a way known and affirmed by oneself (undistorted, clear). If through this we get to experience that calmness and understanding, we then have obtained for ourselves a nice atmosphere to dwell in. And thus can we speak of dwelling in emptiness, and thus can we speak of an entry into emptiness as well.

Exertion of Restraint

Āṅguttara Nikāya
Catukkanipāṭapāḷi
Paṭhamapaṇṇāsakaṃ
Caravaggo
Saṃvarasuttaṃ
AN4.14

"These four, almsmen, exertions.

Which four?

- exertion of restraint.
- exertion of rejection.
- exertion of development.
- exertion of preservation.

And which, almsmen, exertion of restraint?

Here, almsmen, an almsman, seeing a form by eye, is not a holder of signs nor a holder of details by reason of which there to, the power of the eye abiding unrestrained, he would befall to avarice and distress, evil, unwholesome principles. To restrain that he goes against; he guards against the power of the eye. The power of the eye undergoes the restraint. Hearing a sound by ear ... re .. Smelling a scent by nose ... re ... Tasting a taste by tongue ... re ... Touching a tangible by body ... re ... Knowing a principle by intellect, is not a holder of signs nor a holder of details by reason of which there to, the power of the intellect abiding unrestrained, he would befall to avarice and distress, evil, unwholesome principles. To restrain that he goes against; he guards against the power of the intellect. The power of the intellect undergoes the restraint. This is called, almsmen, exertion of restraint.

And which, almsmen, exertion of rejection?

Here, almsmen, an almsman does not give in, get rids of, dispels, destroys, annihilates arisen lustful thoughts. ... re ... arisen angry thoughts ... re ... arisen cruel thoughts ... re ... does not give in, gets rid of, dispels, destroys, annihilates whichever arisen evil, unwholesome principles. This is called, almsmen, exertion of rejection.

And which, almsmen, exertion of development?

Here, almsmen, a almsman develops the awakening factor of recollection, bent on seclusion, bent on fading away, bent on cessation, resulting in relinquishment ... re ... the awakening factor of investigation into principles ... re ... the awakening factor of vigour ... re ... the awakening factor of joy ... re ... the awakening factor of calmness ... re ... the awakening factor of concentration ... re ... the awakening factor of neutrality, bent on seclusion, bent on fading away, bent on cessation, resulting in relinquishment. This is called, almsmen, exertion of development.

And which, almsmen, exertion of preservation?

Here, almsmen, a almsman preserves an arisen auspicious sign for concentration: the perception of a skeleton, the perception of a maggot infested cadaver, the perception of a discoloured cadaver, the perception of a festering cadaver, the perception of a fissured cadaver, the perception of a bloated cadaver. This is called, almsmen, exertion of preservation.

These now, almsmen, are the four exertions".

*“Restraint and rejection and development and preservation
these four exertions are taught by the Kinsman of
the Sun
by which the here ardent almsman,
ought to attain the passing away of suffering.”*

Forerunner

Āṅguttara Nikāya
Ekakanipāṭapāḷi
Accharāsaṅghātavaggo

AN1.56

Whatever is unwholesome, associates with the unwholesome, sides with the unwholesome, all that is directed by intellect; intellect arises first, unwholesomeness follows.

AN1.57

Whatever is wholesome, associates with the wholesome, sides with the wholesome, all that is directed by intellect; intellect arises first, wholesomeness follows.

Successive Cessations

Āṅguttara Nikāya
Navakanipātapāli
Paṭhamapaṇṇāsakaṃ
Sattāvāsavaggo
Anupubbanirodhasuttaṃ
AN9.31

'These are nine, almsmen, successive cessations. Which nine?

- First radiance, when engaged in, lust perception has ceased.
- Second radiance, when engaged in, thoughts and thinking have ceased.
- Third radiance, when engaged in, delight has ceased.
- Forth radiance, when engaged in, breathing in and breathing out have ceased.
- Base of boundless-sky, when engaged in, perception of form has ceased.
- Base of boundless-cognition, when engaged in, perception of the base of boundless-sky has ceased.
- Base of non-ownership, when engaged in, perception of the base of boundless-cognition has ceased.
- Base of neither-perception-nor-non-perception, when engaged in, perception of the base of non-ownership has ceased.
- Cessation of perceptions and feelings, when engaged in, *and* perceptions *and* feelings have ceased.

These now, almsmen, are nine successive cessations.'

The First on Existence

Āṅuttara Nikāya
Tikanipātapāli
Dutiyapaṇṇāsakaṃ
Ānandavaggo
Paṭhamabhavasuttaṃ
AN3.77

Now then senior Ānanda approached there where the exalted one was. Approaching the Exalted One, saluting, he sat down at one side. Now seated at one side, senior Ānanda said this to the Exalted One:

"Existence, existence", venerable, it is said.
Now then in what respect, venerable, existence is?'

'*And* in regard to the aspect with lust and its ripening, Ānanda, if not existed the action then now on to existence with lust, could it be distinguished?'

'Course not, venerable.'

'Now here, Ānanda, is action the field, cognition the seed, longing the moisture. Ignorant to the obstructions, for beings with bindings of longing for lower aspects, cognition found support. Thus is in the future a following existence produced.

And in regard to the aspect with form and its ripening, Ānanda, if not existed the action then now on to existence with form, could it be distinguished?'

'Course not, venerable.'

'Now here, Ānanda, is action the field, cognition the seed, longing the moisture. Ignorant to the obstructions, for beings with bindings of longing for medium aspects, cognition found support. Thus is in the future a following existence produced.

And in regard to the aspect without form and its ripening, Ānanda, if not existed the action then now on to existence without form, could it be distinguished?'

'Course not, venerable.'

'Now here, Ānanda, is action the field, cognition the seed,

longing the moisture. Ignorant to the obstructions, for beings with bindings of longing for higher aspects, cognition found support. Thus is in the future a following existence produced.

Now thus, Ānanda, existence is.'

The Mass

Samyutta Nikāya
Mahāvaggo
Saccasamyuttam
Dhammacakkappavattanavaggo
Khandhasuttam
SN56.13

“These four, almsmen, noble truths.

Which four?

- Suffering; a noble truth.
- Rise of suffering; a noble truth.
- Cessation of suffering; a noble truth.
- The way leading to cessation of suffering; a noble truth.

And which, almsmen, *Suffering; a noble truth*?

‘The five-masses-with-grasping’ is to this to be answered; viz. the mass-of-form-with-grasping, the mass-of-feeling-with-grasping, the mass-of-perception-with-grasping, the mass-of-inclinations-with-grasping, the mass-of-cognition-with-grasping. This is called, almsmen, suffering; a noble truth.

And which, almsmen, *Rise of suffering; a noble truth*?

The going on of longing, accompanied by joy and passion finding its delight in this and that, pertaining to further existence; viz. the longing for lust, the longing for existence, the longing for non-existence. This is called, almsmen, rise of suffering; a noble truth.

And which, almsmen, *Cessation of suffering; a noble truth*?

What, with complete fading away and cessation of just this longing, is the giving up, the forsaking, the release, the doing away with. This is called, almsmen, cessation of suffering; a noble truth.

And which, almsmen, *The way leading to cessation of suffering; a noble truth*?

This very noble eightfold path; viz. right view, right attitude, right speech, right doing, right way of life, right effort, right

recollection, right concentration. This is called, almsmen, the way leading to cessation of suffering; a noble truth.

Now these, almsmen, are four noble truths. Therefor, almsmen, '*This; suffering*' is the effort to be made. '*This; rise of suffering*' is the effort to be made. '*This; cessation of suffering*' is the effort to be made. '*This; the way leading to cessation of suffering*' is the effort to be made."

The Spike

Samyutta Nikāya
Saḷāyatanavaggo
Vedanāsamyuttaṃ
Sagāthāvaggo
Sallasuttaṃ
SN36.6

"Not having learned, almsmen, a commoner feels feeling, even a happy one. He feels feeling, even a sufferable one. He feels feeling, even a neither-sufferable-nor-happy one. Having learned, almsmen, a disciple of nobleness feels feeling, even a happy one. He feels feeling, even a sufferable one. He feels feeling, even a neither-sufferable-nor-happy one. In this, almsmen, what is the distinction, what is the peculiarity, what is making the difference for a learned disciple of nobleness with a not learned commoner?"

"Rooted in the exalted one are our, venerable, principles ... pe ..."

"Not having learned, almsmen, a commoner being touched by a sufferable feeling grieves, is in misery, wails, beats the chest, laments, meets with bewilderment. He feels two feelings: *and* a bodily *and* a mental. Just as if, almsmen, a man would be pierced with a spike. That with this, along the piercing, he would be pierced by a second spike. Because so, almsmen, that man feels the feeling by two spikes. Thus so, almsmen, not having learned a commoner being touched by a sufferable feeling grieves, is in misery, wails, beats the chest, laments, meets with bewilderment. He feels two feelings: *and* a bodily *and* a mental. Just like that but now being touched by a sufferable feeling; resistance is. That with this, with sufferable feeling, resistance; what to sufferable feeling the tendency for resistance is, that lies dormant. He, being touched by a sufferable feeling, is pleased with happiness by lust.

Of what is that the root?

For he doesn't, almsmen, know. A commoner has not learned the going out of sufferable feeling other than from happiness by lust. For that he has been pleased with happiness by lust and what to happy feeling the tendency for passion is, that lies

dormant. He essentially not knows '*and* the rise', '*and* the setting', '*and* the sweetness', '*and* the wretchedness', '*and* the going out' of those feelings. For he essentially not understood '*and* the rise', '*and* the setting', '*and* the sweetness', '*and* the wretchedness', '*and* the going out' of those feelings, what to neither-sufferable-nor-happy feeling the tendency for ignorance is that lies dormant. That if happiness is the feeling he feels, he feels this one linked. If suffering is the feeling he feels, he feels this one linked. If neither-suffering-nor-happiness is the feeling he feels, he feels this one linked. This is called, almsmen, a commoner who has not learned: linked 'with birth', 'with oldness', 'with death', 'with sorrows', 'with lamentations', 'with sufferings', 'with distresses', 'with unrests'; 'linked from suffering' I say.

But now having learned, almsmen, a disciple of nobleness being touched by a sufferable feeling grieves not, is not in misery, wails not, not beats the chest, laments not, not meets with bewilderment; he feels one feeling: bodily, not mental. Just as if, almsmen, a man would be pierced with a spike. That with this, after piercing, he would not be pierced by a second spike. Because so, almsmen, that man feels the feeling by one spike. Thus so, almsmen, having learned a disciple of nobleness being touched by a sufferable feeling grieves not, is not in misery, wails not, not beats the chest, laments not, not meets with bewilderment; he feels one feeling: bodily, not mental. Just like that but now being touched by a sufferable feeling; resistance is not. That with this, with sufferable feeling, no resistance; what to sufferable feeling the tendency for resistance is, that does not lie dormant. He, being touched by a sufferable feeling, is not pleased with happiness by lust.

Of what is that the root?

For he does, almsmen, know. A disciple of nobleness has learned the going out of sufferable feeling other than from happiness by lust. For that he has not been pleased with happiness by lust; what to happy feeling the tendency for passion is, that does not lie dormant. He essentially knows: '*and* the rise', '*and* the setting', '*and* the sweetness', '*and* the wretchedness', '*and* the going out' of those feelings. For he essentially understood '*and* the rise', '*and* the setting', '*and* the sweetness', '*and* the wretchedness', '*and* the going out' of those feelings, what to neither-sufferable-nor-happy feeling the tendency for ignorance is that does not lie dormant. That if happiness is the feeling he feels, he feels this one unlinked. If

suffering is the feeling he feels, he feels this one unlinked. If neither-suffering-nor-happiness is the feeling he feels, he feels this one unlinked. This is called, almsmen, a disciple of nobleness who has learned: unlinked 'with birth', 'with oldness', 'with death', 'with sorrows', 'with lamentations', 'with sufferings', 'with distresses', 'with unrests'; 'unlinked from suffering' I say.

This now, almsmen, is the distinction, this is the peculiarity, this is making the difference for a learned disciple of nobleness with a not learned commoner."

The wise feels no feeling, even a happy one, even a sufferable one, he is very learned indeed. And this, of the steadfast with a commoner, is the great distinction of wholesomeness.

For the very learned of the inclined principle clearly seen is this world and beyond. For pleasant principles not shake the mind, from the unpleasant no resistance comes.

For those compliances and/or non-compliances are scattered, they are gone; not 'they are'. Acquainting with the path and the stainless, sorrowless, he rightly knows the going beyond of existence.

To be Concluded

Samyutta Nikāya
Devatāsamyuttaṃ
Upaniyati suttaṃ
SN1.3

Situated at Sāvatti.

Standing apart now that deity said in presence of the Exalted One this verse:

It is to be concluded, life is short-lived.
Concluded to age, no shelters exist.
Considering this fear in death,
one should build merits bearing happiness.

The Exalted One:

It is to be concluded, life is short-lived.
Concluded to age, no shelters exist.
Considering this fear in death,
appeasement is to be looked for in giving up the
world's bait.

Two Happinesses

Aṅguttara Nikāya
Dukanipātapāḷi
Dutiyapaṇṇāsakaṃ
Sukhavaggo
AN2.66

"These are two, almsman, happinesses. Which two?
And happiness by lust, *and* happiness by renunciation.
These now, almsmen, are two happinesses.

The top, almsmen, of these two happinesses which is this:
happiness by renunciation."

Way of Wording

Aṅguttara Nikāya
Dukanipātapāḷi
Paṭhamapaṇṇāsakaṃ
AN2.20

'These two principles, almsmen, lead to obscurity, disappearance, of a good principle. Which two? *And* ill-arranged way of wording *and* ill-inferred meaning. For ill-arranged, almsmen, way of wording, meaning *also* is ill-inferred. Now these two principles, almsmen, lead to obscurity, disappearance, of a good principle.

Now these two principles, almsmen, lead to non-obscurity, non-disappearance, of a good principle. Which two? *And* well-arranged way of wording *and* well-inferred meaning. For well-arranged, almsmen, way of wording, meaning *also* is well-inferred. Now these, two principles, almsmen, lead to non-obscurity, non-disappearance, of a good principle.'

PART III. Transicalities

About Transicalities

Here I address some *pāli* words I head to deal with while their meaning is for me not directly discoverable or is not unambiguously following from the context but to which, because of some oddities, I could not commit to the known translations.

The inferences made here are based on the grammar and context, by looking at what could technically and logically fit. Now language doesn't *need* to work like that, however since these inferences did tackle the oddities *while* bringing up some positive points as extras, I decided to use them instead.

Ariyasāvaka

Ariyasāvaka is often found translated as noble disciple.

It is a compound formed with the words *ariya* and *sāvaka*. *Ariya* is said to refer to the generally approved and esteemed customs and ideals of the *Aryan* clans. It covers the racial, social and ethical aspects, translated as noble. *And sāvaka* means hearer or disciple.

Noble disciple, though grammatically correct, seems to indicate the disciple as the noble one. But note that for a virtuous one (an *arahant*, also a disciple) 'just' *sāvaka* is being used, which makes it a little odd; first be named noble and then not is normally not seen as a good thing. Another rendering is *disciple of the noble ones* but again, for the virtuous ones 'just' *sāvaka* is being used. In other words, if for virtuous ones 'noble' falls off it is a bit odd to then use it in 'disciple of the noble one(s)'. Thus both translations leave some oddness by trying to assign noble to a person.

But noble here stood for the social and ethical direction. It is about the hearer, learner of *the good, the highest, righteousness*, of all of those traits for which *Aryan* stood example. *Ariya* is here used as brand generification so to speak. *Ariyasāvaka* then means something like 'disciple of the good', and how lovely is that? Even when the Buddha's words are gone you can set things as nobler, higher, not to admire but to advance to. Since a virtuous one is done with going, that direction towards the good does not apply.

To stay close to common translations I use *disciple of nobleness*.

Ariya (adj. --- n.) noble.

---**sāvaka** disciple of nobleness.

Sitting Cross-Legged

Sitting cross-legged has never been that clear to me. Is it about the full lotus position? Or that position where you sit with your knees up high? And doesn't this automatically devalue the half lotus position, or the position where you lay your legs bent in front of you, or sitting on a chair, basically by putting down this part of the instruction? My advise was not to worry about it and just sit stable. But now, while working on a translation, I had to deal with it. So far all the translations I have seen say the same thing. But lets see if an "alternative" without the instruction to sit cross-legged can be made.

'Idha, bhikkhave, bhikkhu araññagato vā rukkhamaḷagato vā suññāgāragato vā nisīdati pallaṅkaṃ ābhujitvā...'

This usually gets translated into something like:

'Here, almsmen, an almsman gone to a forest, or gone to the foot of a tree, or gone to an empty home, sits down having bent the legs crosswise...'

To avoid sitting crosswise I need to look at the phrase '*pallaṅkaṃ ābhujitvā*'. *Pallaṅkaṃ* is said to mean sitting cross-legged. It also means divan, sofa, couch, seat and it is used this way. To keep things consequent and uncomplicated lets try that here too then. And *ābhujitvā* is the aor.ger. of *ābhujati* and *ābhujati* = 3pers. of 'ā' + 'bhujā'. *Bhujā* can mean bend, with *ābhujitvā* then as 'having bent' or 'having folded'.

A quick peek outside the four Nikayā learns that *pallaṅka*:

- Is used as something to sit on. So far I have not yet seen a conclusion it *must* be a manner in which to sit. Just like that in this context there is not spoken of a manner to keep your hands or eyes. There is spoken of a manner to sit as in aspiring, directing, the body straight, which could then thus be followed even if your body isn't straight.
- Is used by those traveling in the air. It is a strong image, flying through the air sitting crosswise but here I am reminded of the story of the flying carpet; it isn't that a rug or carpet would here then not make sense.
- Shelters the knees from the rain. Sitting crosswise would

then have to protect the knees from getting wet. The knees are a weak spot and having them protected from rain and cold by means of folding some cloth to tuck them in would seem to make sense. The covering function reminds me of sermon AN3.63 where the Exalted One collected some grasses and leaves into a pile and then sat down on it folding his legs crosswise, which could also be read as having folded a cover (over that pile) in order to make a cushion to sit on.

More and more *pallaṅka* here seems to me just related to some kind of mat, rug, cover. It is found in a combination with animal skin (e.g. hair *vāla* removed from a *pallaṅka*). Yet a spread, rug, mat is *santhata*, a sitting cloth. Then again, a sitting cloth functions as a cover. There is an example of a body *covered* with veins and also a *pallaṅka covered* with a woollen rug, thus the sitting cloth as *cover (santhata)* fits well. Suppose you don't have a sitting cloth but a friend lends your one so you both can have your own seats. Then when asked if that is your seat, you could answer this by saying that it is your seat but not your sitting cloth. And if you would clean it and hang it to dry, it is the sitting cloth (*santhata*) that hangs and not the seat (*pallaṅka*). It is in this way that I look at their relation.

Thus a cloth can be folded to also protect the knees, it can be spread over a pile of leaves to fold a cushion, it can be folded to get some difference in height for hips and knees. All in all I think that 'folding a seat' could make sense. Then, putting it grammatically in the same form as it is used in *pāḷi* and without using sitting cross-legged we could get:

'Here, almsmen, an almsman gone to a forest, or gone to the foot of a tree, or gone to an empty home, having folded a seat he sits down...'

Thus if you ask me this instruction doesn't need to say you must sit cross-wise. Which doesn't mean you can't sit 'cross-wise' but if you do perhaps do so for the right reasons. Perhaps you don't need to damage your legs thinking you must sit in a certain way, perhaps you don't need to train to sit this way to impress or take it as a measurement of improvement and perhaps you don't need to feel unable to follow 'that sitting instruction'; what if you even don't have two legs to begin with.

PART IV. Glossary

Glossary

PALI

ājīva

ākiñcañña

anattā

arahant

ariyasāvaka

āsava

avijjā

āvuso

āyasma

bhante

bhava

bhāvanā

bhikkhā

bhikkhu

bhikkhunī

bhūta

byāpāda

ceto

cetanā

chandarāgo

citta

cittassa ekaggataṃ

dhamma

dhātu

dosa

dukkha

ekaggatā

jhāna

kamma

ENGLISH

way of life

non-ownership

not self

virtuous one

disciple of nobleness

drain

ignorance

friend

senior

venerable (used by junior almsmen towards seniors and by lay towards almsmen and wanderers/ascetics from other sects)

existence

development

alms

almsman

almswoman

essence (from *esse* 'be': become, ghost, being, result of becoming)

anger

mentality

intention

desire and passion

mind

focus of mind (=concentration)

principle

aspect

hate

suffering

focus

radiance

action

<i>kāma</i>	lust
<i>kāmacchanda</i>	lustful desire
<i>kāya</i>	body
<i>khandha</i>	mass
<i>lobha</i>	greed
<i>māna</i>	conceit
<i>manasi karoti</i>	pay attention to
<i>manasikāra</i>	attention
<i>mano</i>	intellect
<i>manosañcetanā</i>	willpower (one of the foods to carry on)
<i>micchā</i>	wrong
<i>moha</i>	delusion
<i>ñāṇa</i>	knowledge
<i>nāmarūpa</i>	name and form
<i>nibbāna</i>	peace
<i>nidāna</i>	situation
<i>nimitta</i>	sign
<i>nīvaraṇa</i>	obstruction
<i>paccaya</i>	support
<i>pañc'upādānakkhandhā</i>	five masses-with-grasping
<i>parimukha</i>	peripheral
<i>paṭigha</i>	resistance (as in friction)
<i>phala</i>	fruit
<i>phassa</i>	contact
<i>punabbhava</i>	following existence
<i>rāga</i>	passion
<i>saḷāyatana</i>	hexad base (ṣaḍ° ordinarily chal°: see cha (=six); ṣaḍ reminds of hextad (hēk'sād'); hexad or sextet, indicating a group of six)
<i>samādhi</i>	concentration
<i>sammā</i>	right
<i>sampajañña</i>	awareness (mindfulness, consciousness)
<i>saṃyojana</i>	binding
<i>saññā</i>	perception
<i>suññatā</i>	emptiness
<i>saṅkappa</i>	attitude

<i>saṅkhāra</i>	inclination
<i>sati</i>	recollection
<i>sīla</i>	conduct
<i>somanassa</i>	contentment
<i>taṇhā</i>	drought, thirst; fig. longing, craving
<i>thera</i>	elder (vs senior: an elder is more looked upon for guidance with wisdom and a senior is more used about the position in an organisation. One can be a elder without being senior, AN2.38)
<i>thinamiddha</i>	dullness
<i>uddhacca</i>	agitation
<i>uddhaccakukkucca</i>	remorse
<i>vedanā</i>	feeling
<i>vicāra</i>	thinking
<i>vicikiccā</i>	unclarity
<i>viññāṇa</i>	cognition
<i>vipāka</i>	ripening
<i>vipariṇāma</i>	change for the worse
<i>vitakka</i>	thought