Satipaṭṭhāna Vipassanā Meditation

Criticisms and Replies

Satipaṭṭhāna Vipassanā Meditation

Criticisms and Replies

Published by

Buddha Sasana Nuggaha Organization

Thathana Yeiktha

16, Hermitaga Road, Rangoon.

SĀSANA 2523 BE 1341 1979

First Printed November 1979

—

Religious Publications Permission
No. 100079

—

Cover by Chin Twin

—

2000 Copies
11347

Published by– U NYO MAUNG (Regd: 01670)
Buddhasasanānuggaha Organization
No. 16, Hermitage Road, Kokine,,
Rangoon, Burma.

Printed by – U TIN MAUNG (0256–Perm)
Sarpay-paungku press, No. 90, A,B,
Wayzayantar street, (৫) Yat-kwet,
South Okkalapa, Rangoon.

CONTENTS

1 Foreword – by Mahasi Sayadaw

2 Preface – by Myandung U Tin

Part One

Criticisms and Replies

1 Momentary Concentration and Purification of Mind by Kheminda Thera 1

2 A Rejoinder by Sayadaw U Nyanuttara 15

3 Reply to Rejoinder by Kheminda Thera 37

4 Rebuttal of Reply to Rejoinder by Sayadaw U Nyanuttara 129

Part Two

Rising and Falling of the Abdomen

Proper object of Contemplation

1 The Foundations of Mindfulness by Lama Govinda ... 324

2 Corresponaence by Mr Chris Farny and Myanaung U Tin ... 331

FOREWORD

During the Sixth Buddhist Saṅgāyanā (1954–56), the so-called Burmese Satipaṭṭhāna Method spread to Thailand and Ceylon. It was not because it was a Burmese invention but because it was in Burma that this meditation was revived noticeably ever since the beginning of the twentieth century. After I had a course of intensive training under the personal guidance of the Most Venerable Mingun Jetavana Sayadaw at his Thaton Meditation Centre, I began to impart his teaching to my close relatives at my home-village, Seikkhun, near Shwebo, and also to my pupils at Taung-waing-glay Kyaung, Moulmein, where I resided. When the Second World War broke out, I had to return to my home-village, where I continued giving meditation instructions to monks and lay persons alike. I found time there to write two volumes on Vipassanā Meditation, the first dealing with doctrinal matters and the second with practical aspects, namely: practical insight meditation and the progress of insight. I also translated into Burmese Mahā Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta, with copious notes based on the Pāli Canon, Commentaries and Sub-Commentaries. Soon after my return, after the war, to Moulmein, Burma regained her independence. (January 4, 1948)

At the request of the then Prime Minister U Nu and Sir U Thwin, President of the Buddha Sasana Nuggaha Organization, I came to Rangoon in the month of November 1949 to teach Satipaṭṭhāna Method. Starting with Thathana Yeiktha, Rangoon, there are now its branches all over the country. Beginning with 25 yogis, there are now many thousands practising the method throughout the year. They have benefited by this method, the method taught by the Kammathanacariyas, who had a course of training here. This is, however, not the place to dwell at length on the progress made in the period of 26 years.

As I have said, the so-called Burmese Satipaṭṭhana method spread to Ceylon during the Sixth Sangāyanā. "Lessons of Practical Basic Exercises in Satipatthāna Vipassana Meditation" by Mahasi Sayadaw, was published at the request of the Lanka Vipassana Society, by the Lanka Bauddha Mendalaya in the year 1955. A Meditation Centre was opened at Kanduboda near Colombo. Scurrilous attacks were made by tne Ven. Kassapa Thera and the Ven. Soma Thera of Vajirama, Colombo. Their articles and a few others were published in a booklet form by one Mr Henry Herlis, in the year 1957. As advised by me, the Buddha Sasana Nuggaha Organization, of which the Prime Minister U Nu was a leading member, chose to ignore the scurrilous attacks, but took steps to send Kammathanacariyas, one

after another, to Ceylon, In course of time the violent opposition passed off.

In the year 1966, it was brought to our notice that the Ven. Kheminda of Vajirama, Colombo, wrote an article in "World Buddhism", the International Buddhist Magazine, published in Ceylon, criticising my view that "Momentary concentration is included in Access Concentration" which I explained briefly in "The Progress of Insight", being a treatise on Satipaṭṭhāna meditation, written in Pali by me and translated into English by Nyanaponika Thera, the author of "The Heart of Buddhist Meditation". The Ven. Nyanaponika Thera sent us a copy of July, 1966 issue of the magazine in which the article appeared.

I passed it on to the late Ven. Sayadaw U Nyanuttara, Agga Maha Pandita, residing then at Jambudīpa Hall, near the Sacred Cave where the Sixth Saṅgāyanā was held. He wrote a Rejoinder, which was published in that magazine, in two instalments. The Ven. Kheminda wrote a Reply to the Rejoinder which was published in the same magazine, in several instalments. The Ven. Sayadaw U Nyanuttara wrote a Rebuttal of the reply to the Rejoinder, which was also published therein, in several instalments. The whole series took nearly three years. I must mention that the Ven. Sayadaw U Nyanuttara was ably assisted by the Ven. Janakabhivamsa, a Kammathanacariya of this meditation centre, and Myanaung U Tin,

the then vice–President (later the President, and now a Nāyaka) of Buddha Sasana Nuggaha Organization.

In our country two critics appeared, one a layman and another a monk. The latter is Syriam Tawya Sayadaw P.K. U Tilokanyana, who wrote a book (over 800 pages), sparing nobody, not even the Most Venerable Ledi Sayadaw in his criticisms. I wrote an Explanatory Note, which was published as an Appendix to some of my publications. Incidentally, mention may be made that I have written and published well over 30 books, including Burmese translations of rhe Ven. Buddhaghosa's Visuddhimagga (Vols. I to IV) and Burmese translations of the Ven. Dhammapala's Paramatthamanjusara or Maha Tika (Vols I to IV).

It was brought to our notice in the month of January, 1977, that Lama Govinda has criticised our Satipatthana meditation method in his book: "Creative meditation and Multi–Dimensional Consciousness". A photostat of Chapter 5 of that book was sent to me by Mr Christopher Farny of Chicago, U.S.A. I passed it on to Myanaung U Tin, who wrote a reply to his criticisms and sent it to Mr Farny. While he was preparing the reply he received another letter from Mr Farny, with three enclosures: the comments on Lama Govinda's criticism by four Dhamma–friends of his, who evidently have been practising our Satipaṭṭhāna meditation method.

FOREWORD

Myanaung U Tin, who has been helping me in my foreign mission work for more than ten years, is of the opinion, and I agree with him, that it is now right time to publish all these papers in a book form, I must assign the task of printing and publishing the book to the Executive Committee of the Buddha Sasana Nuggha Organization.

I would like to say, in conclusion, that I had seen all these Rejoinders, Rebuttals and Replies before they were sent out, and I have hardly anything to add to or detract from them. My blessings go to all concerned.

I must avail myself of this opporunity to place on record my great appreciation, with a deep sense of gratitude, of the services of the Ven. Nyanaponika Thera, who has spared no pains to spread the Satipaṭṭhāna meditation method to the whole world.

Mahasi Sayadaw

Bhaddanta Sobhana

Mahasi Sayadaw.

22–2–77

PREFACE

In the Foreword, the Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw states: "Myanaung U Tin, who has been helping me in my foreign mission work for more than ten years, is of the opinion, and I agree with him, that it is now the right time to publish all these papers in a book form." The Sayadawgyi and I are of about the same age, septuagenarians, and it is incumbent upon us to keep the Kammathanacariyas and the Buddha Sasana Nuggaha Organization informed of the criticisms made through misapprehension in some cases, and through malice in others.

The Mahasi Sayadaw always advises us to be tolerant, forgiving and patient. He obeys, and enjoins upon us to obey, the dictum of the Buddha: Aviruddhan viruddhesu, attadandesu nibbutan, sadanesu anadanan, tam ahan brumi Brahmanan–He who is friendly amongst the hostile, who is peacful amongst the violent, who is unattached amongst the attached, him I call a Brahman.

The Replies, Rejoinders and Rebuttals contained in this book bear testimony to the fact that we had met the criticisms in an objective manner, with the sole aim of clearing

away the misapprehensions and prejudices. They speak for themselves, and the contents thereof, we believe, would be of use to those who come after us for meeting criticisms and adverse comments relating not only to the Satipaṭṭhāna Vipassanā method, as taught by the Mahasi Sayadaw, but also to allied subjects. The Sayadawgyi's explanatory notes have been published as appendices to some of his books, and they are ready for use for the same purpose, as well as for the detailed study.

Now, mention may be made briefly of the critics: The Ven. Kassapa Thera, the Ven. Soma Thera and the Ven. Kheminda Thera. The Ven. Kassapa Thera was formerly Dr Cassius A. Pereira, L-R.C.P. (London), M.R.C.P. (England). As a doctor he was first in the government service, and then became a private general practitioner for about forty years. Later in life he became a monk, and he was in his seventy--fifth year when he, evidently urged by an ardent desire to protect the sāsanā, made scurrilous attacks on the Mahasi Sayadaw and the Satipaṭṭhāna meditation method taught by him. The Ven. Soma Thera said of him thus: "As a champion of the Theravada, the pristine teaching of the Blessed One, he has wielded his mighty pen with wonderful effect, scattered the enemies of the true teaching, and made the pure word of the August Teacher of the world shine with enhanced splendour and glory."

The Ven. Soma Thera, formerly Victor Emmamual Perera Pulle, and the Ven. Kheminda Thera, formerly G. S. Prelis, received their higher ordination on November 6, 1936, with the Ven. Pandava Mahā Thera of Taung-waing-gyi Shwegyin Kyaung Taik, Moulmein, as teacher- During their short stay, they came to hear of the Venerable Narada Thera, also known as Jetavana Sayadaw. They visited the Sayadaw at Thaton. The Ven. Kheminda Thera wrote thus: "His method was strictly in accordance with the Satipaṭṭhāna Suttas of the Dīgha and Majjhima Nikāya and their commentaries." The Ven. Soma Thera died early in 1960. It was said of him by an old boon friend of his thus: "Meditation, study, teaching the Dhamma, canonical research and his own trials and tribulations in the process produced a vast transformation in Soma Thera. The elan and impulsiveness of the layman turned into serene calm. The combative debater of yesteryear became the sedate teacher and friendly adviser....." The Ven. Kheminda Thera was a very close friend of the Ven. Soma Thera as laymen as well as monks. They were the co-translators of Vimuttimagga (The Path of Freedom) from Japanese into English with Rev. N. R. M. Ehara of Nagasaki, Japan- The Ven. Kheminda Thera wrote in his Preface to the English translation of the Vimuttimagga, when it was published after the death of his co-translators: "This was a fitting occasion to pay a tribute to the memory of the two

senior co-translators of the Vimuttimagga, the Reverend N. R. M. Ehara and the Venerable Soma Mahā Thera...it will be seen that this work was taken up due to sheer force of circumstances and not because of special qualification on my part...Inexpert as I am in scholarly pursuits there is bound to be many a lack in my portion of this work...."

We attribute no malicious motives to the Ven. Kassapa Thera and the Ven. Soma Thera, but we very much regret that they allowed themselves to be carried away by excessive zeal and pugnacity. The Ven. Khemindа is clearly of a mild disposition and modest nature. We believe that he has been convinced by what the Ven. Sayadaw U Nyanuttara had explained most carefully and patiently in reply to his articles. We have the gratification of having read, with much benefit, a number of books written by the three Venerables, who, we believe, would be remembered by the English-speaking readers for a long time.

Regarding Lama Govinda, we have nothing much to say except that we are given to understand he was formerly a Theravāda monk. If so, we cannot help but wonder why and when he became a Lama. We feel that he was labouring under a misapprehension when he criticised the so-called Burmese Satipatthāna method. Had he practised it with faith and ardour he would not have advanced adverse

views. His criticisms have been met and we hope he would now see the method in a new light.

Our grateful thanks are due to all those who took great pains to make this publication a success: Buddha Sasana Nuggaha Organization and Buddha Sasana Council Press.

Myanaung U Tin
Nāyaka,
Buddha Sasana Nuggaha Organization,
Thathana Yeiktha,
Rangoon.
22-2-77

PART ONE

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION
AND
PURIFICATION OF MIND
CRITICISMS AND REPLIES

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION AND PURIFICATION OF MIND

By Kheminda Thera

(Ceylon)

(Abbreviations: A = Aṅguttara Nikāya; M = Manorathapūraṇī (Anguttara Nikāya Commentary); D = Dīgha Nikāya; S = Saṁyutta Nikāya; Vis. Mag = Visuddhimagga (P.T-S.ed); Pm. = Paramatthamañjūsā (Visuddhimagga Commentary), Mahā Tīkā; P.P. = Path of Purification (Ñāṇamoli Thera's translation).

There are three kinds of concentration mentioned in the commentaries: "When bliss is conceived and matured it perfects the threefold concentration, that is, momentary concentration, access concentration, and absorption concentration" (1) Of these, momentary concentration is the shortest in duration; next comes access concentration; and thirdly absorption concentration + which lasts the longest.

By way of occurrence, however, for the jhāna-attainer developing insight, access concentration comes first; next comes fixed or absorption concentration followed by momentary concentration thus:

+ Also translated "fixed concentration,"

1 ↓

1. "And it (access concentration) is the unification that precedes absorption concentration". (2)

2. "Then it (concentration) is of two kinds as access and absorption". (3) On this the *Paramatthamañjūsā* comments: "Applied thought that occurs as though absorbing (appento) associated states in the object is absorption (appanā). Accordingly it is described as absorption" absorbing (appanā vyappana)" (M.III,73). Now since it is most important, the usage of the commentaries is to call all exalted and unsurpassed jhāna states "absorption" (as well as applied thought itself), and likewise to apply the term of common usage "access" to the limited (i.e. sense-sphere) jhāna that heralds the arising of the former, just as the term "village access" etc. is applied to the neighbourhood of a village. (4)

3. (a) "*Concentrating (samādaham) the (manner of) consciousness*; evenly (*samaṁ*) placing (*ādahanto*) the mind, evenly putting it on its object by means of the first *jhāna* and so on. Or alternatively, when, having entered upon those *jhānas* and emerged from them, he comprehends with insight the consciousness associated with the *jhāna* as liable to destruction and to fall, then at the actual time of insight momentary unification of the mind arises through the penetration of the characteristics (of impermanence, and so on)". (5) And the comment of the *Paramatthamañjūsā* is (b)

"*Momentary unification of the mind*": Concentration lasting only for a moment. For that too, when it occurs uninterruptedly on its object in a single mode and is not overcome by opposition, fixes the mind immovably as if in absorption."(6)

4. (a) "These sounds are evident even to the normal consciousness" (7) on which the *Pm.* comments: (b) "This momentary-concentration consciousness, which owing to the fact that the preliminary work contingent upon the sound has been performed, occurs in one who has attained the basic jhāna and emerged for the purpose of arousing the divine ear element."(8)

In a recent publication entitled "The Progress of Insight by Mahāsi Sayadaw U Sobhana Mahāthera of Burma" being "a treatise on Buddhist Satipaṭṭhāna Meditation", and translated from the original Pāli into English by Nyanaponika Mahāthera, there appears on p.5 of that work, the following passage:

"But is it not said in the Commentaries that the term 'Purification of Mind' applies only to Access Concentration and Fully Absorbed Concentration? That is true, but one has to take this statement in the sense that Momentary Concentration is included in Access Concentration. For in the Commentary to the Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta it is said: "The remaining twelve exercises are subjects of meditation leading only to Access Concentrat-

tion." "Now in the case of the subjects dealt with in the sections of the Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta on Postures, Clear Comprehension and Elements, the concentration of one who devotes himself, to these exercises will be definitely only Momentary Concentration. But as the latter is able to suppress the Hindrances just as Access Concentration does, and since it is in the neighbourhood of the Noble-path attainment-concentration, therefore that same Momentary Concentration is spoken of by the name of 'access' (or Neighbourhood), and also the meditation subjects that produce that Momentary Concentration are called 'meditation subjects leading to Access Concentration. Hence it should be taken that Momentary Concentration, having the capacity to suppress the Hindrances, has also the right to the name 'Access' and 'Purification of Mind'. Otherwise 'Purification of Mind' could not come about in one who has made Bare Insight his vehicle, by employing only Insight, without having produced either Access Concentration or Fully Absorbed Concentration'.

Some of the points raised in this paragraph are discussed below:

A. The author, while admitting that the commentaries state that "the term 'Purification of Mind' applies only to Access Concentration and Fully Absorbed Concentration", introduces the view that "Momentary Concentration is included in Access Concentration",

The reader will note that according to the passage quoted at 3(a) and 4(b) above momentary Concentration cannot be included in Access Concentration. Momentary Concentration is shown there definitely, and in plain language, to emerge after *jhāna*-attainment during the actual time of insight practice done by one who has risen from *jhāna*.

In this connection, the author cites on p-4 a passage from the commentary to the *Visuddhimagga* (*Paramatthamañjūsā*)reproduced at 3(b) above, to indicate it seems, the strength of Momentary Concentration. And he mentions without realising the implication, or in spite of it, that the passage he cites is in 'explanation of the Chapter relating to Respiration Mindfulness'. The reader knows that Respiration Mindfulness is a serenity (*samatha*) subject of meditation. And Bare Insight, the author claims, has no truck with *jhāna*. Furthermore, this passage from the *Paramatthamañjūsā* is none other than the comment on this very passage of the *Visuddhimagga*, reproduced at 3 (a) above, which declares that Momentary Concentration emerges "at the actual time of insight" undertaken by the newly risen *Jhāna*-attainer.

B. The author further asserts that "in the case of the subjects dealt with in the sections of the Satipatthāna Sutta on Postures, Clear Comprehension and Elements, the concentration of one who devotes himself to these exercises will be definitely only Momentary Concentra-

tion (*ekantena khaṇikasamādhi yeva nāma*)". In support of this assertion he does not cite any authority. Mere assertions, however, do not carry conviction. They are on the other hand, rejected as unworthy of consideration. It is perhaps helpful to remember here the Buddha's instruction that concentration attained walking up and down lasts long. The commentary explains this as one of the eight attainments (*samāpatti*).(9)

C. "Momentary Concentration having the capacity to suppress the Hindrances, has also the right to the name 'Access' and 'Purification of Mind'." This seems to be a rather poor attempt to counter the charge that the new Burmese method of meditation based on the movement of the abdomen is bereft of the 'Purification of Mind'. In fact the published Sinhala translation of a sermon delivered by U Sujāta Thera, the Burmese pupil and accredited representative in Ceylon recently of U Sobhana Mahāthera, completely ignores the 'Purification of Mind'- It states that there are these six purifications, namely: (1) purification of view (*diṭṭhi-visuddhi*), (2) purification of transcending doubt (*kaṅkhāvitarana-visuddhi*), (3) purification of knowledge (and vision) or what is and is not the path (*maggā-mgagañaňä* (*dassana*) *visuddhi*), (4) purification of knowledge (and vision) of practice (*paṭipādāñāna* (*dassana*) *visuddhi*); (5) purification of virtue (*sīlavissuddhi*), (6) purification of the knowledge of rise and fall (*udayavyayañāṇavisuddhi*). Having produced mun-

dane purification, to convert it to supra-mundane purification, one would produce insight". (10)

This list has only six purifications, and it eliminates the purification of mind or consciousness which is the main subject under discussion here, and the purification of knowledge and vision, the purification of virtue which is the first is shifted to the fifth place; and a new purification, 'the purification of knowledge of rise and fall' is introduced. In addition to these six purifications two more, *viz.* mundane purification and supramundane purification, are mentioned. But though in the treatise here discussed the seven purifications are correctly mentioned in due order a new definition of the purification of mind or consciousness is put forward. And this is done arbitrarily.

D. "And since it is in the neighbourhood of the Noble-path attainment-concentration, therefore that same Momentary Concentration is spoken of by the name of 'Access' (or Neighbourhood), and also the meditation subjects that produce the Momentary Concentration are called 'meditation subjects leading to Access Concentration". But 'neighbourhood of the Noble-path-attainment-concentration' is in the post-*jhāna* sphere. The author, while insisting on tarrying in the non-*jhānic* sphere which he claims for bare insight, tries to appropriate the benefits of the *jhānic* sphere and of those beyond it to which he is not entitled. Since he is

clinging to an imaginary sphere of contemplation he can only expect to reap imaginary results thereby, results which are not in the realm of fact but of fiction.

E. "Hence it should be taken that Momentary Concentration, having the capacity to suppress the Hindrances, has also the right to the name 'Access' and 'Purification of Mind". At D above the author admits that momentary concentration is in the neighbourhood of the path. But one does not go to the neighbourhood of the path to attain 'Purification of Mind'. On the contrary 'Purification of Mind' has to precede the approach to the neighbourhood of the path both for him whose vehicle is serenity (*samathayānika*) and for him whose vehicle is bare insight (*suddhavipassanāyānika*) according to the *Visuddhimagga* at the beginning of the chapter on the purification of view (*diṭṭhivisuddhi*).(11)One whose vehicle is bare insight remains in that category even after attaining the consummate state. (12) One only hopes that the new Burmese method of meditation does not insist further that when he whose vehicle is bare insight attains to the consummate state he is still bereft of *jhāna*, for all first path-attainers (*maggalābhī*) are *jhāna*-attainers. The Buddha says that only one who has the five faculties (*pañcindriya*) at least at minimum strength can attain the plane of the noble ones (*ariyabhūmi*); and he in whom these five faculties are entirely absent is an outsider (*bahiro*), standing amidst the hosts of commoners

(*puthujjanapakkhe thito*), (13)and the fifth of these faculties is that concentration (*samādhindriya*) defined by the Buddha as the four *jhānas*; (14) the power of concentration with which the noble one (*ariya*) is endowed is also defined as the four *jhānas*;(15) and right concentration of the noble one consists of the four *jhānas*.(16)

F. "Otherwise 'Purification of Mind' could not come about in one who has made Bare Insight his vehicle, by employing only Insight, without having produced either Access Concentration or Fully Absorbed Concentration."

Assuming that the 'Purification of Mind' of the doer of pure (or bare) insight comes about 'without having produced either Access Concentration or Fully Absorbed Concentration, the author has tried to show how it is supposed to happen. In this attempt he has dislodged 'Momentary Concentration' from its rightful place, and has succeeded in producing a mist of confusion, which he tries to clear away with a series of arguments. He finally comes to the conclusion embodied in the last sentence of the section on 'Purification of Mind' at p.5 of his treatise and which is reproduced above. But since he begins with the dislodgment, and in the process alters the nature and function of an important term under discussion, the arguments deduced from this position are invalid as is his conclusion. However, some of these arguments are discussed in paragraphs B to E and shown to be

untenable for other reasons as well. Purification of Mind, indeed, could not come about in one who has made Bare Insight his vehicle by employing only Insight, without having produced either Access Concentration or Fully Absorbed Concentration.

According to the Visuddhimagga insight begins only after one has been established in the purification of virtue (*Sīlavisuddhi*) and the purification of consciousness (*cittavisuddhi*). They are compared to the root, and the five purifications of view (*diṭṭhivisuddhi*) are compared to the trunk, of a tree. (17)

One wishing to accomplish the last five purifications, whether he is one whose vehicle is serenity or one whose vehicle is insight, begins doing insight at the purification of view, because this twofold division of serenity and insight manifests itself only at the third purification, i.e., that of view and not before. But on p.2 of his treatise the author says: "When purification of conduct has been established, the meditator who has chosen pure Insight as his vehicle, should endeavour to contemplate the *Body-and-Mind* (*nāma-rūpa*) In doing so, he should contemplate, according to their characteristics the five Groups of Grasping, *i.e.* the bodily and mental processes that become evident to him in his own life-continuity (at his own six sense-doors)". If the meditator follows this method he renders himself incapable of being established in the purification of view

(*diṭṭhivisuddhi*). And the *Pm.* is very clear on this: "By mere knowledge alone one is not established in the purification of consciousness.+ Without being eslablished therein it is not possible to accomplish the higher purification", (18) which is the purification of view. And according to one commentary purification of consciousness is explained as the thoroughly mastered eight attainments which is the proximate cause of insight. (19)

Now it is common knowledge that a proximate cause always precedes and is never preceded by, the thing of which it is the cause. And another commentary, becoming more precise, says that the purification of consciousness means right concentration, and we have seen already that it is explained as the four *jhānas*.(20) But nowhere has purification of consciousness been explained as momentary concentration. To meet this situation the author tries to saddle momentary concentration with a role which never belonged to it, and which it is incapable of fulfilling for each purification has its special place and function. They cannot be interchanged.

NOTES

1. P.P. 150 (=Vis. Mag. 144; Sukhaṁ gabbhaṁ ganhantaṁ paripakaṁ gacchantaṁ tividhaṁ samādhiṁ paripūreti, khaṇikasamādhiṁ, upacārasamādhiṁ, appanāsamādhiṁ ti.)

+ Also rendered "Purification of Mind"

2774

2. P.P. 86. (=Vis. Mag. 85; Yāca appanāsamādhiṁ pubbabhāge ekaggatā-ayaṁ upacārasamādhi).

3. P.P. 85. (=Vis. Mag. 85: Upacāraappanāvasena duvidho),

4. PM. 91: Sampayuttadhamme ārammane appento viya pavattatīti vitakko appanā. Tattha hi so appana vyappna ti nidiṭṭho. Tappa-mukhatavasena pana sabbasmiṁ mahaggatanttare Jhānadhamme appanāti aṭṭhakathāvohāro. tatha tassa anuppatti-ṭṭhānabhūte parittajjhāne upacāravohāro. Gamadinaṁ samipatthane gāmupacarādi samanna vyati aha--upacārappanavasena duvidho ti.

5. P.P. 311-12 (=Vis. Mag 289: Samādahaṁ cittaṁ ti paṭhamajjhānādivasena ārammane cittaṁ samaṁ ādahanto, samaṁ thapento, tāni vā pana jhānāni samāpajjitvā vuhṭṭāya, jhānasampayuttaṁ cittaṁ khayato vayato saṁpassato, vipassanākkhane lakkhana-paṭivedhena uppajjatikhaṇikacitt' ekaggatā evain uppaṇṇāya khamika cittakaggatāya vasena pi ārammane cittaṁ samaṁ ādahanto, samaṁ thapento; samādahaṁ cittaṁ assasissāmi passasissāmi ti sakkhatī ti vuccati.

6. Pm- 278: Khaṇikacittekaggatā ti khaṇamattaṭṭhitiko samādhi. So pi hi ārammaṇe nirantaraṁ ekākārena pavattamāno paṭipakkhena anabhibhūto appito viya cittaṁ niccalaṁ ṭhapeti.

7. P.P. 447 (=Vis. Mag- 408: Tassa te saddā pakatikacittassā pi pākaṭā honti, parikammasamādhicittassa pana ativiya pākaṭā.)

8. PM. 402: Parikammasamādhicittassa ti dibbasotadhātuyā uppadanatthaṁ pādakajjhānaṁ samāpajjitvā vuṭṭhitassa saddaṁ ārabbha parikammakaraṇavasena pavattakkhaṇikasamādhicittassa.

9. A. III, 30: Cankamadhigato samādhi ciratthitiko hoti. (=Cankamadhigato samādhiti cankamaṁ adhitthahantena adhigato atthannaṁ samāpattinaṁ aññatarasamādhi--Mp (Sinh. ed) p. 616).

10, Kanduboda Vipassana Bhavana Magazine, 1956, p. 32:

11. Vis. Mag. 587.

12. Vis Mag. 702: (Referring to the attainment of cessation) (Ke taṁ samāpajjanti ke na samāpajjantī ti sabbe pi puthujjanā sotāpannā sakadāgāmino, sukkhavipassakā ca anāgāmino arahanto na samāpajjanti. Aṭṭha samāpattilābhino pana anāgāmino khīṇāsavā ca samāpajjanti.

13. S.V. 202: Imāsaṁ kho bhikkhave pañcannaṁ indriyānaṁ samatta paripuratta arahaṁ hoti, tato mudutarehi arahattaphalasacchikiriyāya patipanno hoti, tato mudutarehi anāgāmi hoti, tato mudutarehi anāgāmiphalasacchikiriyāya patipanno hoti, tato mudutarehi sakadāgāmi hoti, tato mudutarehi sakadāgāmi hoti, tato

mudutarehi sakadāgāmiphalasacchikiriyāya patipanno hoti, tato mudutarehi sotāpannaphalasacchikiriyāna patipanno hoti. Yassa kho bhikkhave imāni pañcindriyāni sabbena sabbaṁ sabbatha sabbaṁ natthi tamahaṁ bahiro puthujjanapakkhe thito yadami ti.

14. S.V. 196: Kattha ca bhikkhave samādhindriyaṁ daṭṭhabbaṁ Catūsu jhānesu.

15. S.V. 220: Yaṁ saṁādhindriyaṁ taṁ samādhibalaṁ.

16. D.II. 313.

17. Vis. Mag. 443: Ettha pana yasmā imāya paññāya khandh-āyatana-dhātu-indriya-sacca-paṭiccasamuppādādibheda dhammā bhūmi. Silavisuddhi ceva cittavisuddhi ca ti imā dve visuddhiyo mūlaṁ. Diṭṭhivisuddhi ñāṇadassanavisuddhi ti imā pañca visuddhiyo sarīraṁ. Tasmā tesu bhūmibhū tesu dhammesu uggaha-paripucchāvasena ñāṇaparicayaṁ kaṭvā mūlabhūta dve visuddhiyo sampādetvā sarīrabhūtā pañcavisuddhiyo sampādentena bahāvetabbā.

18. Pm. 744: Nahikevalena jānanamattena cittavisuddhiyaṁ patiṭṭhito nāma hoti. Na ca tattha apatiṭṭhāya upari visuddhiṁ sampādetuṁ sakkāti.

19. Sv. III. 1062: PTS-a I, 127

20. PTS-a. III. 609.

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION

A Rejoinder-I

By Sayadaw U Nyanuttara Agga Mahā Paṇḍita+

(*Burma*)

ABBREVIATIONS

A	=	Aṅguttara Nikāya;
AC	=	Manorathapūraṇī, Aṅguttara Commentary;
ASC	=	Sāratthamañjūsā, Aṅguttara Sub-Commentary;
DSC	=	Atthasālini, Dhammasaṅgaṇi Commentary;
M	=	Majjhima Nikāya;
MC	=	Papañcasūdanī, Majjhima Commentary;
MSC	=	Majjhima Sub-Commentary;
Ps	=	Paṭisambhidāmagga;
PsC	=	Saddhammappakāsinī, Paṭisambhidāmagga Commentary;
SC	=	Sāratthappakāsinī, Saṁyutta Commentary;
Vism	=	Visuddhi-magga;
VismC	=	Paramatthamañjūsā, Mahā Tikā, Visuddhi-magga Commentary.

+ The Ven. Sayadaw Nyanuttara is chief Compiler and Examiner *Tripitaka Pāḷi-Burmese Dictionary*, Buddha Sāsana Council, Burma.

SATIPAṬṬHĀNA VIPASSANĀ

It is indeed regrettable that the Ven. Khemindа Thera of Ceylon takes a lopsided view of momentary concentration and purification of mind. (Refer to his article under the above caption in the July 1966 issue of *World Buddhism*). Was he inspired by prejudice? If so, it is certainly detrimental not only to himself but to all those who, in the Buddha Sāsana, are making efforts, in right earnest, to abandon the four wrong courses of life (*agati*), and get rid of all defilements.

In *The Progress of Insight* (page 2), the Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw writes: "Alluding to the latter class of persons (*Suddha-Vipassanā-yānika*), the *Papañca-sūdanī*, commenting on the *Dhammadāyāda Sutta* in the *Majjhima-Nikāya*, says: "Herein some persons proceed directly with the contemplation of the five Groups of Grasping as having the characteristics of being impermanent and so forth,without having previously developed Tranquility as mentioned in the method called "Preceded by Tranquility" (*Samatha-pubbaṅgamā*)(1)

There are, of course, three kinds of concentration: momentary concentration, access concentration and absorption concentration. In the above passage, it is clearly stated that contemplation is done without having previously developed access concentration and absorption concentration, and so purification of mind comes about by momentary concentration,

The Ven. Kheminda Thera takes no notice of this Commentary and allows himself to be carried away by his own bias. It should be noted that the *Papañca-sūdanī*, Majjhima Niąkya Commentary, is not a commentary written in Burma. It is a commentary translated from Sinhalese into Pāḷi by Buddhaghosa over 1,500 years ago. Therefore the contemplation method based on momentary concentration is neither new nor Burmese. It is quite ancient and may even be called the old Ceylon Method. It has stood the test of time.

TWO CONTEMPLATIONS

If the Commentary passage is not clear enough, its Sub-commentary will throw clearer light.

"Of the two contemplations, the first is preceded by *Samatha* and the second by *Vipassanā*". (2)

"Without having previously developed tranquility' precludes access concentration. It does not exclude momentary concentration, because *vipassanā* contemplation is not possible without momentary concentration". (2)

It is surely quite clear from this Sub-Commentary that a *Suddha-vipassanā-yānika* (one who has pure insight as his vehicle) contemplates by means of momentary concentration without having previously developed access

concentration and absorption concentration. The Commentary as well as the Sub-Commentary further shows that *Suddha-vipassanā-yānika* is capable of attaining *arahatta magga-phala*, making abundantly clear that purification of mind is possible by means of momentary concentration.

There should be no doubt about this as the *Papañca-sūdanī* relies on the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* (3). The relevant passage is translated as follows in *Gradual Sayings* (P.T.S.), Part II (page 162). "Again, a monk develops calm preceded by insight. In him developing calm preceded by insight is born the Way. He follows along that Way, making it grow, makes much of it. In him following, developing, making much of that Way, the fetters are abandoned, the lurking tendencies come to an end."

Its Commentary states: " 'Preceded by insight' means insight that precedes, leads to calm, and one who primarily develops insight thereby produces calm." (4)

Its Sub-Commentary states: "In the tenth sutta a man develops insight preceded by calm means *Samatha yānika*. In the *Samatha-yānika* arises first either access concentration or absorption concentration. That concentration is calm. He then contemplates the impermanence and so forth of that calm and the associated states. This contemplation is insight. The development of calm precedes insight, therefore it is said that "a man develops insight preceded by calm."

"A man develops calm preceded by insight" means *Vipassanā-yānika.* Without previous development of calm, he proceeds directly with the contemplation of the five Groups of Grasping as having the characteristics of being impermanent and so forth.... "the fetters are abandoned, the lurking tendencies come to an end" means the fetters are abandoned by mode of progress of the Way and thereby the lurking tendencies are brought to an end." (5)

Thus, the *Aṅguttara* Text, Commentary and Sub-Commentary, clearly show that a *Vipassanā-yānkia* can proceed directly with insight exercises without previous development of access concentration and absorption concentration, and thereby can develop not only *Vipassanā ñāna* but also *Magga-phala ñāṇa.*

The aforesaid *Aṅguttara* passage is explained thus in the *Paṭisambhidāmagga*: "How is the calm, preceded by insight, developed? Contemlation of *anicca* is insight; contemplation of *dukkha*.... *anatta* is insight. At the moment (of realisation of the Way), Nibbāna being the object, calm comes about. Thus insight comes first, and calm follows. It is therefore said, a man develops calm, preceded by insight". (6)

This passage also clearly shows that insight precedes calm. However, a question may be raised whether that calm is *Vipassanā samādhi*, *Ariya-magga-samādhi* or *Lokiya-jhāna-samādhi*? The answer is found in the *Papañca-sūdanī* Commentary and Sub-Commentary.

"Here some persons contemplate the five Groups of Grasping as having the characteristics of impermanence and so forth without having previously developed concentration (access-absorption). A person contemplating in this manner attains *samādhi* at the moment of realisation of the Way, Nibbāna being the object. This (*magga*) *samādhi* is calm." (7)

Its Sub-Commentary states: "The attainment of full insight' means insight of discernment leading to uprising. 'What occurs at that moment' means *Samādiṭṭhi* etc. that occurs at the moment of realisation of the Way. '*Vivssagga* being the object' means Nibbāna being the object. '*Citta-ekaggatā*' means *Magga-sammā-samādhi*". (8)

The Commentary as well as the Sub-Commentary referred to above explains clearly that concentration developed after insight is *Ariya-magga samādhi.*

The *Paṭisambhidāmagga* Commentary states: "One-pointedness of mind, meaning thereby access and absorption concentration, comes about. That is the penetrating concentration that develops after insight." (9)

It appears that this concentration is *Lokiya-jhāna-samādhi* and access concentration that heralds it. If it were so, it will not agree with the sense conveyed by the *Papañca-sūdanī* Commentary and Sub-Commentary. In particular, it will be hard to reconcile with the words "The dhamma that arise at the moment". So

the concentration in this passage should be *Ariya-magga samādhi* that is developed after insight. Whether this concentration is taken to be either access-absorption concentration or *Ariya-magga samādhi*, there is no disagreement on the point that there is no access-absorption concentration before the development of insight. So it is decidedly not open to a controversy that insight development is possible without previous concentration development.

It is also very clear that because insight can be developed without having previously developed concentration, purification of mind is attainable by means of momentary concentration.

At the beginning of *Diṭṭhi-visuddhi-niddesa* of the *Visuddhi-magga* will be seen "one whose vehicle is pure insight", The word "pure" should be noted. By this is meant bare insight or insight without previous concentration (page 680, Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli's translation).

In the *Paramatthamañjūsā*, *Mahā Tīkā*, it is stated: "Concentration is a vehicle. One who has this vehicle is *Samatha-yānika*. It is the name given to one who develops insight after establishing himself either in *jhāna* or access to *jhāna*". (10)

(Please note that this passage clearly shows that the yogi who attains purification of mind by access-concentration or absorption concentration is known as *Samatha-yānika*)

11347

"*Samatha-yānika* develops insight after previous concentration development. *Vipassanā-yānika* proceeds directly with insight without having previously developed concentration; he is therefore defined as "one who has pure insight in his vehicle", and "one who has a vehicle that is not associated with development of concentration i.e. "access concentration or absorption concentration." (10)

NOTES

(1) MC (I,113). Idha pan'ekacco vuttappakāraṁ samathaṁ anuppādetvā'va pañcupādakkhandhe aniccā-dīhi vipassati.

(2) MSC. (I,204) Tattha pathamo samathayānikassa vasena vutto, dutiyo vipassaāyānikassa. Samathaṁ anuppādetvā 'vā' ti avadhāranena upacārasamādhiṁ nivatteti, na khaṇikasamādhiṁ; na hi khaṇikasamādhiṁ vinā vipassanā sambhavati.

(3) A. (I,475) Puna c'aparaṁ āvuso bhikkhu vipassana-pubbaṅgamaṁ samathaṁ bhāveti, tassa vipassana-pubbaṅgamaṁ samathaṁ bhāvayato magga sañjayati. So taṁ maggaṁ asevati bhāveti bahuli-karoti, tassa taṁ maggaṁ asevato bhāvayat bahuli-karoti saṁyojanāni pahīyanti, anusayā vyanti honti.

(4) AC. (II,346) Vipassano-pubbaṅ-gaman'ti; vipassanaṁ pubbangamaṁ purecārikaṁ katvā samathaṁ bhāveti, pakatiyā vipassana-lābhī vipassanāya thatvā samatha uppādetī'ti atthe

(5) ASC. (II,344) Dasame "samatha-pubbaṅgamaṁ vipassanaṁ bhāvetī" ti idaṁ samathayānikassa vasena vuttaṁ. So hi pathamaṁ upacārasamādhiṁ vā appanā-samādhiṁ vā uppādeti, ayaṁ samatho. So taṅca taṁ sampayutte ca dhamme aniccādihi vipassati, ayaṁ vipassanā, Iti pathamaṁ samatho, pacchā vipassanā, 'ena vuccati "samatha-pubbaṅgamaṁ vipassanaṁ bhāvetī" ti. "Vipassanā-pubbaṅgamaṁ samathaṁ bhāvetī" ti idaṁ pana vipassanāyānikassa vasena vuttaṁ. So taṁ vuttappakaraṁ samathaṁ asampādetvā paṅcupādanakkhandhe aniccādihi vipassati—"Saṁyojanāni pahīyanti, anusayā vyanti hontī" ti: maggapaipātiyā pahīyanti, vyanti honti.

(6) Ps. (287). Kathaṁ vipassana-pubbaṅgamaṁ samathaṁ bhāveti? aniccato anupassanatthena vipassanā, dukkhato— anattato anupassanatthena vipassanā. Tattha jātānaṁ dhammānañca vosaggarammanatā cittassa ekaggatā avikkhepo samādhi, Iti pathamaṁ vipassanā, pacchā samatho, tena vuccati "vipassana-pubbaṅgamaṁ samathaṁ bhāvetī" ti, (Yuganaddhakathā).

(7) MC, (I,113) Idha pan'ekacco vuttappakāraṁ samathaṁ anuppādetvā' va paṅcupādanakkhandhe aniccādihi vipassati. Tassa vipassanā-pāripūriyā tattha jātānaṁ dhammānaṁ vosaggarammanato upajjati cittassa ekaggatā, ayaṁ samatho.

(8) MSC. (I,204) Vipassanā-pāri-pūriyā'ti: vipassanāya pāripūriyā vutthāna-gāmini-bhāva-

ppattiyā. Tattha jātāman'ti: tasmiṁ ariya-maggakkhane uppannānaṁ summādiṭṭhi-ādinaṁ dhammānaṁ. Vavasagga-rammanato'ti: vavassagassa ārammanatāya—nibbānassa ārammaṇa-karanenā'ti attho. Cittassa ekaggatā'ti magga sammāsamādhiṁ'āha.

(9) PsC (II, 188). Yo cittassa ekaggatāsaṅkhāto upacār-appanabhedo avikkhepo, so samādhī'ti vipassanato pacchā uppādito nibbedhabhāgiyo samādhi nidditto hoti.

(10) VismC (II,350) Samathova yānaṁ samatha-yānaṁ, taṁ etassa atthi'ti samathayāniko jhāne vā jhānupacāre vā patitthāya vipassanaṁ anuyunjantass'etaṁ nānaṁ. (Ibid 351) Samatha-yānikassa samathamukhena vipassanabhiniveso, vipassana-yānikassa pana samathaṁ anissāyā'ti āha "suddha-vipassana-yāniko'ti, samatha-bhāvanāya amissita-vipassana-yānavā'ti attho.

Letter to the Editor

PURIFICATION OF MIND

With regard to the contribution in your July 1966 issue on the subject of "Momentary Concentration and Purification of Mind" by the Ven. Kheminda Thera, I am surprised to find a Thera of the Ven. Kheminda's scriptural erudition giving the impression of supporting the view that *Jhānic* attainment is an absolute prerequisite for success in *Vipassanā.*

Were he to be right in this assertion, there would not be in the Pāḷi language such expressions as *Vipassanā-yānika* or *Sukkha-vipassaka* or *Suddha-vipassanā-yānika,* which mean the attainment through *Vipassanā* of the *Ariya-magga* (the transcendental Path) directly, without passing through any of the *Jhānic* states.

While it might be usual with most of the Yogavacaras given to 'mental culture' to pass through *Jhānas en route* from the *Puthujjana* state to *Vipassanā*, the fact of some reaching *Vipassanā* and the final state of Bodhi directly has but to be accepted.

I have had the occasion to discuss the above subject with several high-ranking Mahā Theras, who said that *Jhānas* could safely be shunted off in some cases to reach the *Magga* attainment. Also, it is of interest to know

that Shwe Zan Aung in his *Compendium of Philosophy* (Pali Text Society, 1910) emphatically observed: "It must be borne in mind that Jhāna is not absolutely necessary to Arahantship" p.55.

No matter whether the route to Bodhi is through *Samatha-Vipassanā-yuganaddha* or directly through *Vipassanā*, the Purification of Mind is essential. *Sati* is common to all mental culture-to *Samatha* as well as to *Vipassanā*. While the terms *Upacāra* and *Appanā* are used in connection with the former, the term *Khaṇika* is used in connection with the latter. By the time these states of *Samādhi* are reached, the mind is already purified.

Concerning the objection to the use of the term *Khaṇika-samādhi* as a kind of *Upacāra-samādhi*, the objection, technically speaking seems valid, but, really speaking, is not valid. For certainly, as there needs to be a state of 'access' before 'absorption' into the *Lokuttara Path*, *Upacāra* could be used in that general sense. It is obviously in this sense that the Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw has used the term *Khaṇika-samādhi* or Momentary Concentration in his *The Progress of Insight*.

R.L.Soni,
President, W.F.B. Centre,
Mandalay. Burma,

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION:

A Rejoinder- II,

By Sayadaw U Nyanuttara Agga Mahā Paṇḍita
(Burma)

ABBREVIATIONS.

A = Aṅguttara Nikāya;

AC = Manorathapūraṇi, Aṅguttara Commentary;

ASC = Sāratthamañjūsa, Aṅguttara Sub-Commentary;

DhC = Atthasālinī, Dhammasaṅgani Commentary;

M = Majjhima Nikāya;

MC = Papañcasūdanī, Majjhima Commentary;

MSC = Majjhima Sub-Commentary;

Ps = Paṭisambhidāmagga;

PsC = Saddhammappakāsinī, Paṭisambhidāmagga Commentary;

SC = Sāratthappakāsinī, Saṁyutta Commentary;

Vism = Visuddhi-magga;

VismC= Sāratthappakāsinī, Saṁyutta Commentary;

VismC= Paramatthamañjūsā, Mahā Tīkā, Visuddhi-magga Commentary.

The relevant passages taken out of the Pāḷi Texts, Commentaries and Sub-Commentaries have most clearly shown that there are two kinds of yogis: (1) *Samatha-yānika* and (2) *Vipassanā-yānika.* One who primarily develops access-absorption concentration is *Samatha-yānika.* One who proceeds directly with insight without having previously developed the said concentration is *Vipassanā-yānika.*

It must now be considered upon what kind of concentration a *Vipassanā-yānika* relies. That he relies upon momentary concentration is quite obvious. That is why the *Papañca-sūdanī* Sub-Commentary states that "*Vipassanā* contemplation is not possible without momentary concentration". (2) In this connection, the most well-known testimony is the passage cited below from the *Paramatthamanjusā, Mahā Tikā, Nidānādikathāvaṇṇanā,*

Attainment of Lokuttara Dhamma (namely, *Magga-phala-Nibbāna*) is never possible to a *Samatha-yānika* without access-absorption concentration, to a *Vipassanā-yānika* without momentary concentration, and to both without contemplation of the three characteristics of *anicca, dukkha* and *anatta,* the triple gateway to liberation. (II).

This passage states most explicitly that no realisation of *Magga-phala-Nibbāna* is possible to a *Vipassanā-yānika* without momentary concentration, and that a *Vipassanā-yānika* develops insight by means of momentary concentration,

The Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw, relying on the authority of the *Aṅguttara* Text, Ceylon Commentaries and Sub-Commentaries as well as on that of Dhammapāla of South India, writes: "One who begins with access concentration absorption concentration is *Samatha-yānika*, and one who proceeds with insight without these two concentrations is *Vipassanā-yānika*. Of these two kinds, *Vipassanā-yānika* has momentary concentration and attains thereby purification of mind." He is fully aware that in the *Visuddhimagga* the term "Purification of Mind" applies only to concentration and absorption concentration.

However, without countering this definition, he expresses the view that momentary concentration is able to suppress the Hindrances, and cites the authority of the *Visuddhimagga* to show that momentary concentration is spoken of by the name of 'Access' in the Chapter dealing with Purification of Mind. He also cites the authority of the Commentary to the *Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta* to explain this. That a *Vipassanā-yānika* is able to attain purification of mind is dealt with in *The Progress of Insight* in a brief manner, together with the practical experiences of the yogis.

Regrettable

The Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw, on the strength not only of Ceylon Commentaries, etc. but also of the practical experiences of the yogis, has,

with the best of intentions, written the above-mentioned treatise on Buddhist meditation. It is a matter for deep regret that the Ven. Kheminda Thera, apparently without delving seriously into the Pali Texts, Commentaries and Sub-Commentaries, runs away with his pen to express what he inclines to say by dubbing the *Suddha-vipassana-yānika* method as the new Burmese method of meditation. Unhappily this accusation against the author falls not on him but on the Buddha, the Ven. Ānanda, *Yuganaddha Sutta, Anguttara Nikāya*), the Commentators and the Sub-Commentators of Ceylon, as also on Dhammapāla of South India. Why? Because in the *Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta* the Buddha assures that one can attain arahatship by contemplation of any subject described in twenty-one sections.

The exercises on Postures and Clear Comprehension of *kāyānupassanā*, Feeling, Mind and five kinds of *Dhammānupassanā* do not lead to Access Concentration and Absorption Concentration of the forty subjects of meditation mentioned in the *Visuddhimagga*. But, nevertheless, that purification of mind can be attained by the exercises on these nine subjects of meditation has been definitely stated in the Pāli Texts, Commentaries and Sub–Commentaries, which also explain *Vipassanā–yānika* vis–a–vis *Samatha–yānika*. It may be repeated that the Commentary to the *Visuddhimagga*, categorically states that realisation of *Magga–phala–Nibbāna* is not possible to a *Vipassanā-yānika* without momentary concentration. (II).

The Ven. Kheminda Thera asserts that one cannot attain to the consummate state if he is bereft of *jhāna*. In this connection, he should refer again to the eighth sutta, *Mudutara Vagga, Indariya Saṁyutta, Mahavagga Saṁyutta.* In that sutta, the Buddha says that one who has the *Lokuttara* faculties (12) attains arahatship, one who has less attains to the state of *Anāgāmi*, one, at the minimum strength, attains to *Sotāpattimagga.* The Buddha does not say that only those who attain *Lokiya–jhāna* can attain *Samādhindriya*, and that only the *jhāna*–attainers can attain to the plane of the noble ones (*Ariyabhūmi*). Obviously, this sutta which the Ven. Kheminda Thera cites does not support his argument.

In that sutta, the Buddha says that one in whom the five *Lokuttara* faculties are absent are still *Puthujjanās* (commoners). That is to say *Lokiya–jhāna*–attainers like Ālāra and Udaka, *Jhāna–abiññā–attainers* like Devadatta and Sunakkhatta are still *Puthujjanas* because *Lakuttara* faculties are absent in them. This sutta does not exclude *Suddha–vipassanā–yānika.* A *Suddha–vipassanā–yānika* is certainly capable of attaining right up to arahantship like Cakkhupāla Thera.

That is why it is stated thus in the Visuddhimagga as well as in the Aṭṭhasālini:

"According to governance by insight, the path arisen in a bare–insight (dry–insight) worker, and the path arisen in one who has not made *jhāna* the basis for insight, and the path made to arise by comprehending unrelated

formations after using the first *Jhāna* as the basis for insight are the paths of the first *jhāna* only". (*Visuddhimagga*, Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli's translation, chapter xxi, page 779) (13)

"The Path arisen in one of dry insight by the fixing as insight, and the Path arisen without making a base of the *jhāna* of one who has acquired the attainment, and the Path produced by making a base of the First *jhāna* and contemplating particular conditioned things (i.e. other than the basic *jhāna*) are of the First *jhāna*". (*Aṭṭhasālini*, the Expositor II, Maung Tin's translation, page 307) [14]

First Jhāna

These extracts are cited to prove that the path arisen in a bare-insight worker is definitely the path of First *jhāna*. He had no *Lokiya-jhāna* when he was practising Vipassanā but he comes to possess *Lokuttara-jhāna* at the attainment of the Path. It is hardly necessary to point out that he attains *Samādhindriya*, one of the five *Lokuttara* faculties. That *Sukkha-vipassaka* means *Suddha-vipassanā-yānika*, who has no *jhāna*, is explained in the *Paramatthamañjūsā*. [15]

In connection with contemplations on Postures, Clear Comprehension and Elements, the Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw says that the concentration of one who devotes himself to these exercises will be definitely only momentary concentration. The Ven. Kheminda Thera says that the Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw does not cite any authority.

The *Visuddhimagga* states: "As he makes offort in this way it is not long before concentration arises in him which is reinforced by understanding that illuminates the classification of the elements, and which is only access and does not reach absorption because it has stated with individual essences as its object."(Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli's translation, page 385, para 42) [16]

A question arises whether access concentration arisen in one who contemplates the four elements is real access concentration. *Paramattha-mañjūsā*, Commentary to the *Visuddhimagga*, states: "Access concentration should be understood as an applied term. Because the concentration that develops at the access *jhāna* absorption is access concentration, and here *jhāna* is absent. However, being similar in characteristic to access concentration, it is called by that term". [17]

(Please note similar characteristic means that it can suppress the Hindrances.)

This passage clearly supports the view that the so-called access concentration in the case of contemplation which cannot lead to absorption concentration is not real but only applied.

The Ven. Kheminda Thera's assertion that momentary concentration emerges after *jhāna*-attainment is definitely to disparage the Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw's statement in *The Progress of Insight* that *Sudda-vipassanā-yānika* can attain momentary concentration without previous access-absorption concentration. But the Ven. Kheminda

Thera fails to shake the position of the Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw, which is supported by the Pāḷi Texts, Commentaries and Sub-Commentaries, wherein it is clearly stated that a *Samathayānika* attains access-absorption and a *Vipassanā-yānika* attains only momentary concentration.

The Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw cites a passage from the *Paramatthamañjūsā*, Commentary to the *Visuddhimagga*, a passage in explanation of the chapter relating to Respiration Mindfulness. (See page 4 (English) and 41 (Pāḷi), the Progress ot Insight). The Ven. Kheminda Thera should note that in this passage importance is given not to *jhāna* but to momentary concentration as if in absorption.

In the light of these considerations, based on the most authoritative books as well as on the practical experiences of a large number of yogis, the charge that purification of mind is not possible by means of momentary concentration falls to the ground.

That the Ven. Kheminda Thera is inspired by prejudice is further shown by his reference to the sermon of U Sujāta, the Burmese pupil and accredited representative in Ceylon recently of the Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw. He criticised U Sujāta on the basis of an incomplete press report. Leave alone a senior Kammaṭṭhānācariya like U Sujāta of the famous Thathana Yeiktha, the meditation centre of the Ven- Mahasi Sayadaw, in Rangoon, a sāmaṇera or even an

average lay yogi knows that the seven purifications must be dealt with in due order.

The Pāḷi Texts, Commentaries and Sub-Commentaries have explained both *Samatha-yānika* and *Vipassanā-yānika*. Both methods are certainly not new. They have been handed down from generations to generations ever since the time of the Buddha. The Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw writes *The Progress of Insight*, a treatise on *Vipassanā* method, based on his personal experiences as well as on those of a large number of yogis, the attainments which are quite in accord with the most authoritative texts, commentaries and sub-commentaries. This method is not a new invention by him. Of course, *Vipassanā* is contemplation on Five Aggregates. His pupils are taught to be mindful, if possible, of every occurence at the six sense-doors. At the beginning, however, they are instructed to concentrate on the four elements, particularly the rising and falling movements of the abdomen, which are the movements of *Vāyo-dhātu*. *Vāyo-dhātu* being part of the five *khandhas*, the method he employs is certainly not new. Incidentally, it may be mentioned that some of his pupils attain *jhāna*.

In conclusion, a fervent wish may be expressed that the Ven. Kheminda Thera and persons of his ilk do not rest content with the mere knowledge of the *Samatha-yānika* method but instead practise it diligently until they attain *jhāna* together with *abhiññā*, as well as *ariyabhūmi*. May their efforts be crowned with complete success.

NOTES

(11) VismC. (I, 15) Samatha-yānikassa hi upacār–appanāppebhedaṁ samādhiṁ, itarassa khaṇika–samādhiṁ, ubhaye–sam pi vimokkha-mukha–ttayaṁ vinā na kadāci pi lokuttarādhi-gamo sambhavati. (Nidānādi–kathā–vaṇ–ṇanā).

(12) SC. (III, 268). Imasmiṁ sutte lokutta-ran'eva indriyāni kathitāni. (Mudutaravagga, aṭṭhama-sutta-vaṇṇanā.)

(13) Vism (ii, 305) Vipassanā-niyamena hi sukkha-vipassakassa uppannamaggo pi, samāpa-tti-lābhino jhānaṁ pādakaṁ akatvā uppannama-ggo pi, paṭhamajjhānaṁ pādakaṁ katvā pakiṇṇa-ka-saṅkhāre sammasitvā uppādita-maggo pi paṭhamajjhānikā'va honti.

(14) DhC (272) same as above, except pathamajjhāniko'va hoti.

(15) VismC (II, 474). Ajhānalābhī Suddha-vipassanā-yāniko'va sukkha vipassko.

(16) Vism (I, 347). Tass'evaṁ vāyamamā-nassa nacireneva dhātu-ppabhed-āvabhāsana-paññā-pariggahito sabhā vadhammarammaṇattā appanaṁ appatto upacāra-matto samādhi up-pajjati.

(17) VismC (I, 436) Upacārasamādhī'ti ca ruḷhīvasena veditabbaṁ. Appanaṁ hi upecca cārī samādhi upacārasamādhi, appanā c'ettha n'atthi. Tādisassa pana samādhissa samāna-lakkhaṇatāya evaṁ vuttaṁ.

(Note: volumes and pages refer to the 6th Saṁgāyanā Edition).

(Concluded).

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION:

Reply to Rejoinder 1–1.

BY KHEMINDA THERA

(Ceylon)

Referring to my article on the above subject appearing in the July issue of *World Buddhism* of last year, the Venerable Agga Maha Pandita Nyanuttara Sayadaw asks, in his 'Rejoinder I' appearing in the issue of November last, whether I "was inspired by prejudice", and goes on to say: "If so (it) is certainly detrimental not only to himself but to all those who, in the Buddha Sāsanā, are making efforts, in right earnest, to abandon the four wrong courses of life (*agati*), and get rid of all defilements."

I can assure him that I was certainly inspired, not by prejudice as he fears, but by the instruction of the Buddha given in the *Mahāpadesa Sutta* of the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* and included in the *Mahāparinibbāna Sutta*. And, to facilitate reference, I quote the relevant passages: "Here, monks, a monk may say thus: 'Face to face with the Blessed One, friend, have I heard, face to face with him have I received this. This is the Dhamma, this is the Vinaya, this is the message of the Teacher'.

"Monks, the speech of that monk should neither be welcomed nor reviled. Non-welcoming, non-reviling, every word and syllable should be studied, placed before the Sutta and compared with the Vinaya. When placed beside the Sutta and compared with the Vinaya, should they not fit in with the Sutta, nor accord with the Vinaya, you should come to the conclusion: 'Truly this is not the word of the Blessed One, and has been wrongly grasped by that monk'. Thus, monks, you should reject it. If they fit in with the Sutta and accord with the Vinaya, then you should come to the conclusion: 'Truly this is the word of the Blessed One, and has been rightly grasped by that monk'. Monks, understand this as the First Great Appeal to Authority.

"Again, monks, a monk may say: 'In such and such a residence lives a community of monks, with an elder, a leader. Face to face with that community of monks have I heard, face to face with it have I received it. This is the Dhamma, this is the Vinaya, this is the message of the Teacher'. Monks, the speech of that monk should neither be welcomed nor reviled....Monks, understand this as the Second Great to Authority.

"Again, monks, a monk may say: 'In such and such residence live many elder monks, of great knowledge, who have mastered the tradition (*āgama*), Dhamma-bearers, Vinaya-bearers, tabulated summary-bearers. Face to face with these elders have I heard, face to

face with them have I received it. This is the Dhamma, this is the Vinaya, this is the message of the Teacher'. Monks, the speech of that monk should neither be welcomed nor reviled....Monks, understand this as the Third Great Appeal to Authority.

"Again, monks, a monk may say: 'In such and such a residence lives a monk, an elder, of great knowledge, who has mastered the tradition, a Dhamma-bearer, a Vinaya-bearer, a tabulated summary-bearer. Face to face with this elder have I heard, face to face with him have I received it. This is the Dhamma, this is the Vinaya, this is the message of the Teacher'. Monks, the speech of that monk should neither be welcomed nor reviled. Non-welcoming, non-reviling, every word and syllable should be well studied, placed beside the sutta and compared with the Vinaya. When placed beside the Sutta and compared with the Vinaya, should they not fit in with the Sutta, nor accord with the Vinaya, you should come to the conclusion: 'Truly this is not the word of the Blessed One, and has been wrongly grasped by that elder'. Thus, monks, you should reject it. If they fit in with the Sutta and accord with the Vinaya, then you should come to the conclusion: 'Truly this is the word of the Blessed One, and has been rightly grasped by that elder'. Monks, understand this as the Fourth Great Appeal to Authority." (1)

SATIPAṬṬHĀNA VIPASSANĀ

Since the supreme authority in respect of the Dhamma is vested in the suttas by the Blessed One himself, before deciding on any system of contemplation, whether ancient or modern, which claims to lead the practiser to the destruction of ill (*dukkha*), let us pause a while to consider what the suttas teach on the subject. It is with the aim of aiding the reader to come to a conclusion in conformity with the Buddha's instructions that the appropriate sutta passages together with their commentaries are given below.

1. (a) The Venerable Ānanda Thera, answering the wanderer Uttiya's question "Will the whole world, or a half of it, or a third of it realise nibbāna?" says that just as the wise sentinel is not concerned with the question of how many enter the city, but knows that any one entering it does so through its single entrance, so the Tathāgata is concerned only with how nibbāna is realised, and not with the question of how many realise it. And the Venerable Ananda Thera proceeds: "Whosoever have gone out, are going out, or will go out from this world (to Nibbāna), all of them have done so, (are doing so, or will do so) by giving up the five hindrances (*pañca nīvarane pahāya*), those impurities of the heart that weaken wisdom (*cetaso upakkilese paññāya dubbalikaraṇe*), having their thoughts well established in the four foundations of mindfulness (*catūsu satipaṭṭhānesu supatitthacitta*), and having develop-

ed in their real essence the seven factors of wisdom". (2)

(b) Emphasising, as it were, this statement of the Venerable Ānanda Thera, the Venerable Sāriputta Thera tells the Buddha through the knowledge that is in conformity with the Dhamma, that "all the Supremely Enlightened Ones of the past, future, and present, all of them realise supreme enlightenment by getting rid of the five hindrances, those impurities of the heart that weaken wisdom, having their thoughts well established in the four foundations of mindfulness, and having developed in their real essence the seven factors of wisdom". (3) And he repeats this statement on two other occasions, namely, in the *Satipaṭṭhāna Saṁyutta* and in the *Mahāparinibbāna Sutta.* (4)

On the first two occasions the Buddha, discerning the importance of these words of the *Dhammasenāpati*, commended and exhorted him saying: "Excellent, Sāriputta, excellent! Declare this teaching constantly to monks and nuns, and men and women lay disciples, so that should there be among them any foolish people who have doubt and perplexity regarding my method of teachig, having heard this exposition, they might give up their doubts and perplexities." (5) And the respective commentaries explain: (1) "Defilements of the mind=the five hindrances defile, make impure, vex, and plague the mind. Therefore they are called defilements

of the mind. Weakening of wisdom=the hindrances that arise do not allow the unarisen wisdom to arise. Therefore they are called weakeners of wisdom". (6) (ii) "Defilement of the mind=the five hindrances (obstructed) mind defiles, renders impure, vexes, and plagues. Therefore they are called defilements of the mind. Weakening of wisdom = the hindrances that arise do not allow the unarisen wisdom to arise, and do not allow the increase of the arisen wisdom. Therefore they are called weakeners of wisdom". (7) These two commentaries detail to a certain extent the nature of the harm the presence of the five hindrances entail.

A fuller statement is made in the commentary to the *Cūḷahatthipadopama Sutta* which says: "Weakening of wisdom=these five hindrances that arise do not allow the arising of mundane and supramundane wisdom; they cut up and destroy the arisen eight attainments or the five kinds of supernormal knowledge. Therefore they are called weakeners of wisdom". (8) And the second of these commentaries, moved by the spirit of the declarations of the Venerable Sāriputta Thera and the Blessed One's approvel of them, further elucidates: "You should constantly declare = you should say again and again. Saying: 'It was said by me in the morning', do not refrain from saying it at noon and so on. Saying: 'It was said by me today,' do not refrain from saying it the following day and so on, is the meaning."(9)

It will be noted that there is no exception to this requirement; even the Sammāsambodhisattas comply with it by abandoning the five hindrances before developing the four foundations of mindfulness and the seven factors of enlightenment. This is because the five hindrances, as we have just seen, defile, vex, and plague the mind; they prevent the arising of mundane and supramundane wisdom; and they cut up and destroy everything of worth to the yogi striving for the highest. Therefore, unless they are checked, at least temporarily, no insight can be developed.

2. And the abandonment of the hindrances occurs in the first *jhāna* according to the sutta thus: "The first *jhāna*, friend, is the abandonment of five factors and the possession of five factors. Here, friend, in the monk who has attained the first *jhāna* sense-desire is abandoned, ill-will is abandoned, rigidity and torpor are abandoned, agitation and anxiety are abandoned. And there are present applied thought, sustained thought, joy, happiness, and unification of mind". (10)

3. The Bodhisatta initiated contemplation in the Dhamma under the Bodhi tree in just this way. After six years of the most austere forms of ascetic practice he was no nearer the goal than when he began. At this point, remembering his childhood experience of attaining the first *jhāna* under the purple berry tree while his royal father was engaged in the

ploughing festival, he asked himself. "Could this be the way to enlightenment?" And he came to the conclusion, "This, indeed, is the way to enlightenment". Thereafter he sat under the Bodhi tree and attained the first *jhāna*; and in due course attained the second, the third, and the fourth *jhāna*. And in the first watch of the night he attained to the knowledge of remembering his past lives, in the middle watch to the knowldge of the passing away and the arising of beings, and in the last watch to the knowledge of the destructions of the cankers. (11)

NOTES

1. A.II, 168-70, D.II, 124-26; Bhagavā etad avoca: 'Idha bhikkhave Bhikkhu evaṁ vadevya. "Sammukha me taṁ āvuso Bhagavato sutuṁ sammukha patiggahitaṁ, ayaṁ Dhammo ayaṁ Vinaya idaṁ Satthu sāsanan" ti, tassa bhikkave bhikkhuno bhasitaṁ n' eva abhinanditabhaṁ na patikkositabbaṁ. Anabhinanditvā appatikkositvā tāni padavyanjanani sādhukam uggahetva Sutte otaretabbāni Vinaye sandassetabbāni. Tāni ce Sutte otariyamanani Vinaye Sandassiyamanani na c' eva Sutte ataranti na Vinaye sandissanti, nitthaṁ ettha gantabbaṁ: "Addha idaṁ na c' eva tassa Bhagavato vacanaṁ, imassa ca bhikkhuno dugganhitaṁ" ti iti h' etaṁ bhikkhave chaddeye yatha. Tani ce sutte otariyammanani Vinaysandassiyamanani sutte c'eva otaranti Vinaye

ca sandisssanti, nittham ettha gantabbam: "Addha idam tassa Bhagavato vacanam imassa ca bhikkhuno suggahitan" ti. Ibam bhikkhave pathamam mahāpadesam dhareyyātha.

'Idha pana bhikkhave bhikkhu evam vadeyya: "Amukasmim nama avase samgho viharati satthero sapamakkho, Tassa me samghassa sammukkhu sutam sammukha paṭiggahi tam, ayam Dhammo ayam Vinayo idam Sutthu sāsanan" ti' tassa bhikkhave bhikkhuno bhasitam n' eva abhinanditabbam na patikkositabbam.... Idam bhikkhave dutiyam mahāpadesam dhareyyātha.

'Idha pana bhikkhave bhikkhu evam vadeyya: ',Amukasmin nama avase sambahula thera bhikkhu viharanti bahussuta agatagama dhamma-dhara vinaya-dhara mātika-dhara. Tesam me therānum sammukha sutam summukha paṭiggahitam, ayam Dhammo ayam Vinaya ayam Satthu sāsanam" ti . Idam bhikkhave tatiyam mahāpadesam dhareyyātha.

'Idha pana bhikkhave bhikkhu evam vadeyya: "Amukasmim nama avaeteko thero bhikkhu viharati bahussuto agatagamo dhamma-dharo vinayadharo mātika-dharo . Idam bhikkhave catutthaṁ mahāpadesam dhareyyātha. Ime kho bhikkhave cattaro mahā-padese dhāreyyāthāti."

2. A.V.194—95: Yam pan' etam bhavam Gotamo abhinnaya sāvakānam dhammam desesi sattānam visuddhiya sokaparidevanam sāmatikkamāya dukkhadomanassānam atthangamāya

ñāyassa adhigamāya nibbānassa sacchikiriyāya, sabbo ca tena loko niyyissati upaddho va tibhago vā ti? Evaṁ vutte Bhagavā tunhi ahosi.... Atha kho āyasamā Ānando Uttiyaṁ paribbājakaṁ etad avoca: 'Tena h'āvuso Uttiya upamaṁ te karissāmi.... Tatr' assa dovāriko paṇḍito vyatto medhāvī annatanaṁ nivareta natanaṁ paveseta so tassa nagarassa samanta anupariyāyapathaṁ anukkamamano na passeyya pakarasandhim vā pakaravivaraṁ vā antamaso bilaranissakkanamattaṁ pi, no ca khavassa evaṁ nanaṁ hoti 'etthaka pana imaṁ nagaraṁ pavisanti vā nkkhamanti vā'ti. Atha khvassa evaṁ ettha hoti' ye kho keci olarika pana imaṁ nagaraṁ pavisanti vā nikkhamanti vā, sabbe te imink dvārena pavisanti vā nikkhamanti vā 'ti. Evaṁ eva kho avuso Uttiya na Tathagatassa evaṁ ussukkataṁ hoti' sabbo co tena loko niyyissati upaddho vā tibhago va'ti. Atho kha evam ettha Tathagatassa hoti. ' Ye kho kesi lokamha niyyimsu vā niyyanti vā niyyissanti vā, sabbe te pañca nīvarane pahāya cetaso upakkilese paññāya dubbalikarane catūsu satipaṭṭhānesu supatittthitacitta satta bojjhaṅge yathābhūtaṁ bhāvetvā evaṁ ete lokamba niyyimsu vā niyydanti vā niyyissanti vā' ti.

3. D.III, 101.

4. S.V.160—61; D.II,83.

5. D. III, 116; S.V 161; Sādhu, sādhu Sāriputta tasmā ti ha evaṁ Sāriputta imaṁ dhammapariyāyaṁ abhikkhanṁ bhoseyyāsi bhikkhunaṁ bhikkhunīnaṁ upasakānaṁ upasikanaṁ

yesaṁ pi hi Sāriputta moghapurisānaṁ bhavissati Tathagate kaṅkhā vā vimati vā tesaṁ pi maṁ dhammapariyāyaṁ sutvā ya tesaṁ Tathagate kaṅkhā vā vimati vā sā pahiyissati ti.

6. Spk. III, 211: Cetaso upakkilese ti pañca nivarana cittaṁ upakkilissanti, kilitthaṁ karonti, upatopenti, vihethenti. Tasmā cetaso upakkilesā ti vuccanti. Paññāya dubbalikarane ti. nivarana uppajjamāna anupannāya paññāya uppajjituṁ na denti, tasmā paññāya dubbalikaranā ti vuccanti.

7. Sv.III, 880—81: Cetaso upakkilese ti pañca-nivarana-citaṁ upakkilesan ti kilitthaṁ karonti upatapenti. vihethenti Tasmā cetaso upakkilesā ti vuccanti. Paññāya dubbali-karane ti nivarana uppajjamāna anuppannāya paññāya upajjituṁ na denti, uppanāya pannaya vaddhituṁ na denti, tasmā paññāya dubbalikaranā ti vuccanti.

8. PS.II,217: Pannaya dubbalikarane ti ime panca nivarana uppajjamāna anuppannāya lokiya-lukuttaroya pannaya uppajjituṁ na denti. uppannā pi attha samopattiyo, pañca vā abhiñnā ucchinditvo patenti; tasmā paññāya dubbalikaranā ti vuccanti.

9. Spk. III, 212: Abhikkhanaṁ bhāseyyāsi ti, punappunaṁ bhāseyyāsi. 'Pubbanhe me kathitan' ti ma majjhantikadisu na kathayitha, 'Ajja vā me katnitan' ti ma aparajju-divasadisu na kathyitthā ti attho.

10. M.I.294—95: Pathamaṁ kho avuos jhānaṁ paṅcangavippahīnaṁ pañcaṇgasamannāgataṁ: Idh' avúso paṭhamaṁ jhānaṁ samapannassa bhikkhuno kāmacchando pahino hoti, byāpado pahino hoti, thinamiddhaṁ pahīnaṁ hoti' vicikicchā pahīnā hoti, vitakko ca vattati vacaro ca pīti ca sukhaṅ ca cittekaggatā ca.

11. M.I, 246—49: na kho panahaṁ imāya katukāya dukkarakarikāya adhigacchāmi uttariṁ manussodiamma alamariyanandassanavisesaṁ siyā nu kho añño maggo bodhayati. Taasa mayhaṁ Aggivessana etad ahosi: Abhijānāhaṁi kho panāhaṁ pitu Sakkassa kammante sitaya jambucchayaya nisinno vivicc eva kamehi....pathamaṁ jhānaṁ upasampajja viharita, siyā nu kho eso maggo bodhayati. Tassa mayhaṁ Aggivessana satanusari vinnanaṁ ahosi: eso va maggo bodhayati.... So kho ahaṁ Aggivessana olarikaṁ āharaṁ ahīrevta balaṁ gahetvā vivi' eva kamehi .... paṭhanaṁ jhānaṁ upasampajja vihasiṁ .... dutiyaṁ jhānaṁ.... tatiyaṁ jhanaṁ.... cattutthaṁ jhānaṁ upasaṁpajja vihasiṁ .... So evaṁ samīhite citte parisuddhe pariyadāte anaṅgane vigatupakkilese mudubhūte kammaniye thite ānenjjappatte pubhenivasanussatiñānāya cittaṁ abhininnamesiṁ.... rattiya majjhima yāme dutiya vijja odhigatā.... So evaṁ samāhite citte parisuddhe pariyodūte anaṅgane vegatupakkilese muddhūte kammaniye ṭhite anejjappatte asavānaṁ khayañānīya cittaṁ abhininnāmesiṁ .... rattiya pacchiṇe yāme tatiya vijjā adhigatā....

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION

Reply to Rejoinder I–II

By Kheminda Thera

(Ceylon)

4. We have already seen that right concentration is defined in the *mahāsatipaṭṭhāna Sutta* (12) as the four jhānas which the commentary explains: "Monks, this is called right concentration-in the former portion mundane, in the latter portion supramundane, right concentration". (13) And the following sutta shows that it is not possible to attain knowledge and vision of things as they are without right concentration. "Monks, when mindfulness and clear comprehension are not there, in him who lacks mindfulness and clear comprehension, the sufficing condition of conscientiousness and fear of doing evil is destroyed; when conscientiousness and fear of doing evil are not there, in him who lacks conscientiousness and fear of doing evil, the sufficing condition of restraint of the senses is destroyed; when there is no restraint of the senses, in him who lacks restraint of the senses, the sufficing condition of virtue is destroyed; when there is no virtue, in him who lacks virtue, the sufficing condition of right concentration is destroyed; when there is no right concentration, in him who lacks right concentration, the sufficing condition

of knowledge and vision of things as they are is destroyed; when there is no knowledge and vision of things as they are, in him who lacks knowledge and vision of things as they are, the sufficing condition of disenchantment-dispassion is destroyed; when there is no disenchantment-dispassion, in him who lacks disenchantment-dispassion, the sufficing condition of knowledge and vision of freedom is destroyed. Just as, monks, sprouts, bark, periderm, and heartwood do not come to perfection in a tree lacking branches and leaves, so, monks, when no mindfulness and clear comprehension are there, the sufficing condition of consciousness and fear of doing evil is destroyed....

"When there are present mindfulness and clear comprehension, he who is endowed with mindfulness and clear comprehension, he is endowed with the sufficing condition of conscientiouseness and fear of doing evil....when there is right concentration, he who is endowed with right concentration, he is endowed with the sufficing condition of knowledge and vision of things as they are....; when there is disenchantment-dispassion, he who is endowed with disenchantment-dispassion, he is endowed with the sufficing condition of knowledge and vision of freedom. Just as, monks, sprouts, bark, periderm, and heartwood come to perfection in a tree possessing branches and leaves, so, monks, when mindfulness and clear comprehension are there, he who is endowed with mindfulness and clear comprehension, he is endowed with the

sufficing condition of conscientiousness and fear of doing evil...." [14]

The commentary, referring to that of an earlier sutta (15) says: "Destroyed sufficing condition=means cut off; knowledge and vision of things as they are=tender insight; disenchantment–dispassion = strong insight as well as the path; knowledge and vision of freedom= freedom of the consummate state and reviewing." (16)

5. Progress in the Dhamma is gradual. Therefore the Buddha says: (a) "In this Doctrine and Discipline, Paharada, through gradual training, gradual work, and through gradual practice truly penetration of knowledge occurs, not abruptly." (17)

(b) The commentary explains: " Truly penetration of knowledge occurs not abruptly= step by step, and not in the manner of a jumping frog, does a person progress on the noble path. Having fulfilled virtue first then concentration, and after that wisdom, does one attain full sanctitude in the Buddha's Doctrine." (18)

Here this gradual progress is shown to follow a certain order which must not be interfered with either by altering the order prescribed in the suttas or by skipping any item. For instance, after developing virtue it is not possible to develop wisdom skipping concentration "because of the words, 'one who

is concentrated knows and sees correctly' (A.V.3) its proximate cause is concentration." (19) This is well illustrated in the commentary to the following sutta.

6. "Suppose, monks, there is a king who has a border city.... A pair of swift messengers coming from the eastern quarter questions that sentinel thus: "Where, friend, is the lord of this city?" And he replies: "This, sirs, is he sitting in the middle at the cross roads". Then the pair of swift messengers, having presented to the lord of the city the warrant of truth, went along the way they came. In like manner there come a pair of swift messengers each from the western, northern, and the southern quarters and present to the lord of the city the warrant of truth, and return along the way they came. Monks, this is a simile made by me for clarifying the sense; this is the meaning. Monks, 'the city' is a name for this body consisting of the four great primaries, born of mother and father, grown on gruel and sour milk, subject to impermanence, inunction and rubbing off, dissolution, and annihilation. Monks, 'six senses' is a name for the six internal sense-bases. Monks, 'sentinel' is a name for mindfulness. 'Pair of swift messengers' is a name for serenity and insight. 'Lord of the city' is a name for consciousness. 'In the middle at the cross roads' is a name for the four great primaries; extension, cohesion, heat, and motion,

'Warrant of truth' is a name for nibbāna. 'The way they came' is a name for the noble eightfold path: right view.....right concentration." (20)

The commentary expands this simile and applies it as follows: '.....' Six entrances ' = city entrances, one or two, or a hundred, or a thousand; here the Teacher said this for showing the six sense-doors. 'Wise = endowed with distinction. 'Intelligent' = endowed with what is called spontaneous wisdom. 'Eastern-quarter' = the meaning should be understood taking into consideration what was said at the beginning.

"Now, in the magnificent city, the universal king possessed of the seven jewels, ruled the kingdom. He had a certain border city without a royal agent. And people coming said, 'In our city, O king, there is no official. Give us some official". The king, having given a son, said: "Go take him with you, anoint him there, establish courts of law and so on, and dwell". They did accordingly. The prince, by associating with evil friends, became a drunkard, ravaged all the courts of law and so on, and spent his time in the middle of the city surrounded by evil-minded persons, delighting in drinking, dancing, and singing. And they came to th king and told him of it. The king commanded a wise minister: "Go and advise the prince, have the courts of law erected and so on, anoint him, and come". "It is not

possible to advise the prince, 0 king. The fierce prince would even slay me", he said. Then he commanded a powerful warrior: "You go with him; and if he (the prince) does not abide by the advice, cut off his head". Then that minister and that warrior, who are the pair of swift messengers, went there and questioned the sentinel thus: "Where, friend, is the lord-prince". "This who is sitting in the middle at the cross roads drinking, surrounded by evil-minded persons, and enjoying sensual pleasure", he said. Now that pair of swift messengers went there, and the minister said: "Lord, establish the courts of law and so on at once and rule well". The prince sat as not hearing. Then that warrior seized him by the head saying: "If you are executing the king's order, do so; if not, just in this place I shall cut off your head", and drew the sword. Instantly the evil-minded retinue fled in various directions. Terrified, the prince accepted the message. Then they anointed him right there, raised the white canopy saying: "Govern the kingdom rightly", presented the warrant of truth as told by the king, and went along the way they came. To clarify the meaning the Blessed One said, "the eastern quarter" and so forth.

"Now, here is the application of the simile. Like the magnificent city is the city of nibbāna to be regarded. Like the universal king endowed with the seven jewels is he who is endowed with the seven factors of enlighten-

ment. The king of righteousness, the Supremely Enlightened One. Like the border city is the city of individuality. Like tte evil prince in this border city is the evil intention of this monk. Like the time when the evil prince is surrounded by evil-minded persons is when this monk is possessed of the five hindrances. Like the two swift messengers are serenity subject of contemplation and insight subject of contemplation, Like the time of the seizure of the head by the great warrior is when the mind is held back, having quietened it, with the arisen first jhana concentration. Like the distance of the evil – minded persons, who fled in various directions the moment the head was seized by the warrior, is the distance of the five hindrances upon the mere arising of the first jhana. Like the time of the acceptance of advice saying: "I will abide by the king's command", is the time of rising from jhana. Like the raising of the white canopy of him who is anointed right there by them should be known the raising of the white canopy of freedom of the attainer of the consummate state, dependent upon serenity and insight.

"In the words 'Monk', 'the city', is a name for this body consisting of the four great primaries" and so on was told in full before: just the dwelling place of the consciousness-prince: in this case the body is called the city. They being doors the six sense-bases are doors. The state of being constantly established in

mindfulness at these doors is called sentinel. The serenity-insight subject contemplation ordered by the King of Righteousness is the pair of swift messengers. Here it should be understood that like the great warrior is serenity (*samatha*), and like the wise minister is insight (*vipassanā*).... Like that prince in the middle of the city is serenity-insight sitting in the middle of the body at the heart material cross roads, and anointed by the messengers with the consummate state, the insight consciousness prince should be known." [21]

As long as one is possessed of the five hindrances, being in an unfit and unreceptive state of mind, one is unable to develop insight. Therefore in the simile, when the king asked the wise minister to advise the evil-minded prince, he declined to do so saying that he feared that fierce prince would even slay him. In other words, insight has no chance at all as long as the five hindrances are not checked. It is only when the warrior of the first jhāna scatters the evil-minded retinue of the five hindrances that the consciousness-prince is in a fit or sober state of mind to undertake the development of insight.

7. Therefore in the *Sāmaññaphala Sutta* the Buddha says: "So long as these five hindrances are not abandoned one considers himself as indebted, sick, in bonds, enslaved, and lost in a desert track." (22)

NOTES

12. D. II, 343.

13. Sv- III, 804: Ayaṁ vaccati bhikkhave Sammāsamādhi ti ayaṁ pubbabhāge lokiyo apare bhāge lokuttaro sammāsamādhi tivuccati.

14. A. IV, 336-47: Satisampajañňe bhikkhave asati satisampajaňňavipannassa hatupanisaṁ hoti hirottoppaṁ, hirottope asati korottoppavippanna: sa hatupaniso hoti indriyasaṁvaro, indriyasaṁvare asati indriyasasmvaravipannassa hatupanisaṁ hoti sīlaṁ, sīle asati sīlavipannassā hatupaniso hoti sammāsamādhi, sammosamadhimhi asati sammāsaamādhivipannassa hatupanisaṁ hoti yathābhūtaňňaṇadassanaṁ, yathābhūtaňňaṇadassane asati yathabhūtaňňaṇadassaṇavipannassa hatupaniso hoti nibbidāvirāgo, nibbidavirāge asati nibbidāviragovipannassa hatupanisaṁ hoti vimuttikānedasssanaṁ Seyyathā pi bhikkhave rukko sakhapalasavipanno tassa papatika pi na paripuriṁ gacchati, taco pi pheggu pi saro pi na paripuriṁ gacchati, evaṁ eva kho bhikkhave satisampajañňe asati satisampajaňňavipannassa hatupanisaṁ hoti hirottappaṁ .... vimuttiňňāṇadassanaṁ.

Satisampajañňe bhikkhave sati satisampajjaňňasanpannassa upanisasampaňňaṁ hoti hirottappaṁ, hirottappe sati hirottappasampannassa upanisasampanno hoti indriyasaṁvaro, indriyasaṁvare sati indriyasaṁvarasampannassa upanisasampannaṁ hoti sīlaṁ, sīle sati sīlasampannassa upanisasampanno hoti sammāsamādhi sammā-

samādhimhi sati sammāsamādhi sampannassa upanisasampannaṁ hoti yathābhūtakāṇadassanaṁ, yathābhūtañāṇodassane sati yathābnūtatanadassanasampannassa upanisasampanno hoti nibbidāvirāgāsampannassa upanisasampannaṁ hoti vimuttiñāṇadassanaṁ. Seyyathā pi bhikkhave rukkho sakhapalasasampanno, tassa papatikā pi paripūriṁ gacchati, taco pi pheggu pi saro pi paripūriṁ gacchati, evaṁ eva kho bhikkhave satisampajaññe sati satisampajjañña sampannassa upanisasampannaṁ hoti hirottapaṁ....

15, A. IV, 99.

16. Mp. (Sinh. ed) p· 732: Hatupaniso ti chinnapaccayya; yathābhūtaṁ ñāṇadassaran ti tarunavipassana; nibbidāvirāgo ti balavavipassanā ceva maggo ca; vimuttiñāṇādassanan ti arahattavimutti ca paccavekkhaṇā ca.

17. A. IV. 200—I: Seyyathā pi Paharada mahāsamuddo anupubbaninno anupubbapano anupubbapabbhāro na ayataken' eva papato, evaṁ eva kho Paharada imasmiṁ dhammavinaye anupubbasikkhā anupubbakiriyā anupubbapaṭipadā na ayataken' eva annapaṭivedho.

18. MP. (Sinh. ed) p. 762: Na ayatakena annapaiṭivedho ti mandukassa uppatitvā gamanan viya aditova sīlapuranadiṁ aketvā arahartta paṭivedho nāma natthi patipatiya pana sīlasamādhipaññāyo puretvā va sakka arahāttaṁ pattun ti attho. + Soma Thera translation.

19. Vis. Mag. 433: Samāhito yathābhūtaṁ jānāti passati ti vacanato pana samādhi tassa padaṭṭhānaṁ.

20. S. IV, 194—95: Seyyathā pi bhikkhu ranno paccantiamam nagaraṁ dalhuddapaṁ dalhapakaratoranam chadvaraṁ tatrassa dovāriko paṇḍito yyatto medhāvī annatanaṁ nivareta natanam paveseta. Puratthimāya disāya āgantvā sighava butayugaṁ taṁ dovārikaṁ evaṁ vadeyya, kahaṁ bho purisa imassna nagarassa nagarasamiti, so evaṁ vadeyya Eso bhante majjhe singhtake nisinno ti. Atha kho taṁ sighaṁ dutayugaṁ nagarasamissa yathābhūtaṁ vacanaṁ niyyadetyayāthāgatamaggaṁ patipajjeyya, pacchimāya disāya.....utturāya diskya.... dakkhṁnāya disāya ..... yathāgatamaggaṁ patipajjeya.

Upamā kho myāyaṁ bhikkhu kata atthassa viññāpanaya ayañcevettha attho. Nagaran ti kho bhikkhu imassetaṁ catumahābhutikassa kāyassa adhivacanaṁ mātāpettikasambhavassa adanakummasapacayassa aniccucchadana- parimaddana-bhedana-viddhamsana-dhammassa.

Chadvārā ti kho bhikkhu channetaṁ ajjhattikānaṁ āyatanānaṁ adhivacanaṁ. Dovāriko ti kho bhikkhu satiyā etaṁ adhivacanaṁ Sighaṁ dutayugan ti kho bhikkhu samathavipassananetaṁ adhivacanaṁ. Nagarasamiti kho bhikkhu viññānassetaṁ adhivacanaṁ. Majjhe singhātako ti kho bhikkhu catunnetaṁ mahābhūtānaṁ. adhivacanaṁ, pathavidhātuyā .. vayodhātuya. yathābhūtaṁ vacanan ti kho bhikkhu nibbānassetaṁ adhivacanaṁ. Yathagātamaggo ti kho bhikkhu ariyassetaṁ aṭṭhaṁgikassu maggassa

adhivacanaṁ Seyyathidaṁ sammādiṭṭhi yā.... pe..... sammāsamādhissā ti.

21. Spk. III, 60—-6; Chadvāran ti, nagara-dvāraṁ nāma ekaṁ pi hoti dve pi sataṁ pi sahassaṁ pi; idha pana sattha chadvāarika-nagaraṁ dassento evaṁ kha. Paṇḍito ti, pan-diccena samannāgato. Vyatto ti, veyyttiyena samannāgato. Medhavī ti, than' uppatika-sankha-taya paññāya samannāgato. Puratthimāya disāya ti adimhi bhūtaṁ atthaṁ katvā evaṁ attho vedit-abbo.

Samiddhe kira mahānagare sutta-ratana-sampanno rājā-cakkavatti rajjaṁ anusasati. Tass' ekaṁ paccantanagaraṁ rājayuttā-virahitaṁ Atha urisa agantvā amhākaṁ, deva, nagare yattako n'atthi, Dehi no kiñci ayattakan' ti ahaṅsu. Rājā ekaṁ puttaṁ datvā 'gaccantha, etaṁ ādāya tattha abhisincitvā vinicchaya-ṭṭhānādīni katvā vasathā' ti. Te tathā akaṁsu. Raja-putto pāpamittena-samsaggena katipahena sura-sondo hutvā, sabbāni vinicchaya-ṭṭhānādıni haretvā, nagara-mijjhe dhuttehi parivārito suraṁ pivanto nacca-gītabhiratiyā vītināmeti. Atha rañño āgantvā ārocayiṁsu.

Rājā ekaṁ paṇḍitaṁ amaccaṁ aṇāpesi. 'Gaccha, kumāraṁ ovāditvā, vinicchayaṭṭhānādīni kāretvā, puna abhisekaṁ katva, ehi' ti 'Na sakka, deva, kumāraṁ ovadituṁ. Cando kumaro, ghatey-yapi man' it. Ath' ekaṁ bala–sampannaṁ yodhaṁ ānāpesi: 'tvaṁ iminā soddhiṁ gantvā, sace so ovade na titthati, sīsamassa chinda' ti. Iti so

amacca-yodha, tahiṁ idaṁ singhaṁ dutayugaṁ, tattha gantvā dovārikaṁ pucchi: 'Kahaṁ, bho, nagarassa sami-kumaro?' ti.

'Eso majjhe siṅghātake suraṁ pivanto dhutta-parivārito gantvā ratiṁ anubhonto nisinno' ti. Atha taṁ duta-yugaṁ gantvā, amacco 'tava-d-eva, sāmi, vinicchaya-ṭṭhānādini thiraṁ kāritvā sodhukaṁ rajjaṁ anusasahi' ti āha. Kumāro asunanto viya nisīdi. Atha naṁ yodhosise gahetvā, 'sace raññō āṇaṁ karosi, karohi; no ce, etth' eva te sīsaṁ patessami' ti khaggaṁ abbahi. Paravaraka dhutta tava-d-eva disāsu palayiṁsu. Kumaro bhīto sāsanaṁ sampaticchi. Ath 'assa te tatth' eva abhisekaṁ katvā seta-cchattaṁ usaapetva 'samma rajjaṁ anusāsatu' ti raññā vuttaṁ yathābhūtaṁ cavanaṁ niyyādetvā, yathāgata-maggaṁ eva patipajiṁsu. Imaṁ atthaṁ avikaronto Bhagavā purattimāya ti adiṁ āha.

Tatr' idaṁ opamma-samsandamaṁ:-Samiddhaṁ mahānagaraṁ viya hi nibbāna-nagaraṁ datthabbaṁ. Satta-ratana-sampanno rāja cakkavatti viya aatta-bojjhanga-ratana-samannagato. Dhamma-rāja-Sammāsambuddho. Paccantima-nagaraṁ viya sakkāya-nagaraṁ. Tasmiṁ nagare kudda-rāja-putto viya imassa bhikkhuno kuddo-citi' uppādo. Kuddo-rāja-puttassa dhuttehi parivārita-kālo viya imassa bhikkhuno pāncahi nivaranehi samangikālo. Dve sigha-duta viya samatha-kammaṭṭhānañ ca vipassana-kummatthānañ ca. Mahāyodhena sisam-gahita-kālo viya uppanna-paṭhama jjhāna-samādhinā niccalaṁ katvā cittaṁ-gathita-kālo. Yodhena sise gahita-

matte dhuttanaṁ disāsu pālayitvā duri-bhavo viya paṭhama jjhānamhi uppanna-matte nivaranānaṁ duri-bhavo. 'Kari-ssāmi rañño sāsnan' ti. Samputicoḷtakālo viya jhānato vutthita-kālo. Tatth 'ev' assa tehi katabhisekassa seta-cchatta-ussāpanaṁ viya samatha-vipassana-kammaṭṭhānaṁ nissaya arahata-ppattassa vimutti seta-cchāti' ussāpanaṁ veditabbaṁ.

Nigaraṅ ti kho, bhikkhu, imass' etaṁ catummāhābhūtikassa kāyassa adhivacanaṅ ti ādīsu pana, catummahābhūtikassa ti ādīnaṁ padanaṁ attho hettha vitthārito va: Kevalaṁ pana vinnana-rāja-puttassa nivasa tthamatta: ettha kāyo nagaraṅ ti vutto. Tass' eva dvāra-bhūtatta cha āyatanāni dvārānī ti. Tesu dvāresu niccaṁ patitthattá sati dovāriko ti. Kamma-ṭṭhānaṁ ācikkhantena dhamma-rājena pesitatta samatha-vipassanāpi sīgna-duta-yugaṅ ti. Ettha mahāyodho viya samatho, paṇḍitaṁcco viya vipassanā veditabbā, Majjhe singhātakoti, nagaraomajjhe singhatako, Mahābhutānaṅ ti, hadaya-vatthussa nissaya-bhūtānaṁ. Vatthu-rupassa hi paccaya dassan' atthaṁ ev' etaṁ catu-mahābhūta-ggahanaṁ nissayabhūtāni ggahanaṁ kataṁ. Nagara-majjhe so rāja-kumāro viya sarīra-majjhe pana hadaya-rūpa-singhātake nisinno samathavipassanā, dutehi arahattahisekena abhisincitabbo vipassana-viññāna-rajaputto datthabbo.

22. D. I. 73: Evaṅ eva kho mahu-raja-bhikkhu yathā inaṁ yathā rogaṁ yathā bandhanagaraṁ yathā dasavyaṁ yathā kantāraddhanamaggaṁ ime puñca nivarane appahine attani samanupassati.....

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION:

Reply to Rejoinder II–I.

By Khemindа Thera

(Ceylon)

The Venerable Nyanuttara Sayadaw says: "One who primarily develops access–adsorption concentration is a *Samatha-yānika*. One who proceeds directly with insight without having previously developed the said concentration is *Vipassanā-yānika*." After using the words "previously" and "previous" ten times in the first part of his article when the original Pāḷi does not warrant the use of these words, he repeats it here for the eleventh time.

Now if by the above statement is meant that, of the two kinds of yogis who develop insight at Purification of View, one begins the development of insight with "access–absorption concentration" and the other being developing insight direct, I agree. But if by this statement is meant that he who develops insight at Purification of View has never developed "access–absorption concentration" at the previous purification, viz. Purification of Mind or Consciousness, as the word "previously" would imply, I disagree. This is because Purification of Mind or Consciousness which consists of the

eight attainments, is the "proximate cause of insight" for all; and Purification of Mind or Consciousness which is the second purification, as every one knows, precedes Purification of view which is the third purification where insight begins.

12. The Venerable Nyanuttara Sayadaw says that "the Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw relying on the authority of the *Aṅguttara* Text, Ceylon Commentaries and Sub–Commentaries as well as that of Dhammapāla of South India writes:".... Of these two kinds, *Vipassanā-yānika* has momentary concentration and attains thereby purification of mind".

As pointed out in the first article at column 3, page 6, the *Visuddhimagga* says: "Or alternatively when, having entered upon those jhānas and emerged from them, he comprehends with insight the consciousness associated with the jhāna as liable to destruction and to fall, then at the actual time of insight momentary unification of the mind arises through the penetration of the characteristics (of impermanence, and so on). Thus the words 'He trains thus "I shall breathe in....shall breathe out concentrating the (manner of) consciousness," are said also of one who evenly puts it on its object by means of the momentary unification of the mind arisen thus". (34)+ Commenting on this, the *Paramatthamañjūsā* says: "*Momentary unification of the mind*": concentration lasting only for a moment. For that too, when it occurs

uninterruptedly on its object in a single mode and is not overcome by opposition, fixes the mind immovably, as if in absorption'. (35)

It is strange that the Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw, in order to point out a "momentary concentration (that) is able to suppress the Hindrances", has to resort to this momentary concentration which the jhāna-attainer produces "at the actual time of insight (*Vipassanakkhane*)" But this is inapposite. It is th experience of the jhāna-attainer and belongs solely to him. However, this concentration that arises "at the actual time of insight" should not be mistaken for the concentration partaking of penetration which arises after insight (*Vipassanato pacchā uppādito nibbedhabhāgiyo samādhi*) and which is access or fixed concentration (*upacārappanabhedo*). (36) This latter concentration occurs at the path (*magga*) and the former occurs before that. Neither of these constitutes Purification of Mind or Consciousness. They are concerned with insight. But only that concentration which arises through the development of a serenity (*samatha*) subject of contemplation constitutes Purification of Mind or Consciousness. And this occurs before insight development, before the development of the foundations of mindfulness (see section I (a) & (b) above and sections 34 and 35 below). Purification of Mind or Consciousness never occurs during, or after, insight. To teach that it occurs after insight, as the Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw does on page 4 of *The Progress of Insight*

is to disregard the *Rathavinīta Sutta* which says that. "Purification of Mind or Consciousness has for aim as far as Purification of View (*cittavisuddhi yavad eva ditthivisuddhattha*" see sect.8, above), where insight begins; and the *Saddhammappakāsini* and the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* which say: "Purification of Mind or Consciousness is the thoroughly mastered eight attainments, the proximate cause of insight". (37) It also goes against the statement made in the *Paramatthamañjūsā* of "(the Venerable) Dhammapāla (Thera) of South India" on whose authority, accordiug to the Venerable Nyanuttara Sayadaw, the Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw relies, And this is what the Venerable Dhammapāla Thera says there: "By mere knowledge alone one is not established in Purification of Mind or Consciousness: Without being established therein it is not possible to accomplish the higher purification".(38) which is Purification of View where insight begins. Thus neither Sutta, nor commontary, nor even sub-commentary support the Venerable Nyanuttara Sayadaw's statement: They, on the contrary, completely contradict him.

13. According to the passages at 1 (a) and (b) referred to above the abandonment of the hindrances has to take place before the four foundations of mindfulness are developed. There is no exception; not even the Sammāsambodhisattas are exempt from this requirement. And so the Blessed One exhorts the Venerable Sāriputta Thera thus: "Declare this teaching con-

stantly to monks and nuns, men and women lay disciples so that should there be among them any foolish people who have doubt and perplexity regarding my method of teaching, having heard this exposition, they might give up their doubts and perplexities". And the commentary stresses this statement of the Buddha saying that it should be declared in the morning, noon, and the following day and so on. Thus the teaching of the Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw, by postponing the abandonment of the hindrances till after th development of insight, brings the progress of the yogi to an abrupt halt after developing Purification of Virtue.

Further, under the title "The Purification of Mind" on page 2 of his treatise, *The Progress of Insight*, the Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw describes not Purification of Mind but insight. This Chapter begins with the sub-section entitled "(a) The Method of Insight in Brief", and goes on to say: "When Purification of Conduct has been established the meditator who has chosen pure Insight as his vehicle, should endeavour to contemplate the *Body-and-Mind*(*nāmarūpa*). In doing so he should contemplate, according to their characteristics ", which is insight. The second sub-section entitled "(b) the Purification of Mind" on page 3 continues with the development involved in "the abdominal movement" out of which is born this momentary concentration which he dramatically introduces on page 4 saying: "This is called '*Purification of*

Mind'". Then he goes on to link up this momentary concentration with the jhāna-attainer's momentary concentration which rises to jhāna-strength "at the actual time of insight" referred to in paragraph before the last. This is putting the cart before the horse, and worse: it is putting someone else's cart before one's own horse.

14. The Venerable Nyanuttara Sayadaw says: "The Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw....has, with the best of intentions, written the above mentioned treatise on Buddhist Meditation. It is a matter for deep regret that the Venerable Kheminda Thera apparently without delving seriously into the Pāḷi Texts, Commentaries and Sub–Cammentaries runs away with his pen to express what he inclines to say by dubbing the *Suddha-vipassanā-yānika* method as the new Burmese method of meditation". I do not think that anybody questions the good intentions of the Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw. Yet one has to bear in mind that they are not substitutes for the correct presentation of the Dhamma. Hence the Buddha's instructions given in the *Catu Mahāpadesa Sutta* are: to reject a teaching when it does not fit in with the sutta, and to accept it when it does. Further, I have not dubbed the *Suddha-vipassanā-yānika* method as new and or Burmese. What I certainly did was to call the Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw's method new and Burmese, and I have many reasons for doing so. I was there questioning the validity of the credentials of the Vene-

rable Mahasi Sayadaw's *Suddha-vipassanā-yānika* who is supposed to develop insight, which belongs to the third purification, to produce Purification of Mind or Consciousness which is the second purification. Therefore I appeal to the Venerable Nyanuttara Sayadaw to re-read my first article and also to read these articles carefully. I respectfully request him in all sericusness to examine all the references I have given in them and come to a conclusion in accordance with the instructions of the Buddha given in the *Catu Mahāpadesa Sutta.* I would urge him to consider the Venerable Dhammapāla Thera's sub-commentary passage given in my first article on page 9, column I, note 18, and reproduced here in section (12) above for easy reference. This I say because he has chosen to ignore it completely, though he claims that this new method has the blessings of the Venerable Dhammāpāla Thera of South India.

15. The Venerable Nyanuttara Sayadaw says that I "assert that one cannot attain to the consummate state if he is bereft of jhāna", and refers me to the commentary to the eighth sutta of the *Mudutara Vagga, Indriya Saṁyutta.* Then he says: "The Buddha does not say that only those who attain *Lokiya–jhāne* can attain *Samādindriyā* , and that only the jhāna–attainers can attain to the plane of the noble ones (*Ariyabhūmi*). Obviously this sutta which the Ven. Kheminda Thera cites does not support his argument". One need not stress that the

consummate one is possessed of *lokuttara jhāna.* This is obvious enough. But *lokiya jhāna* is necessary to attain the plane of the noble ones for the following reasons. The Buddha has placed the suttas in supreme authority with regard to the doctrine and the vinaya with regard to the discipline.

And describing the last acts of the yogi as a commoner (*puthujjana*) and his first acts as a noble one (*ariya*), the Buddha says in the *Okkantika Saṁyutta*: "Monks, the eye, ear, nose, tongue, body and mind are impermanent (*aniccaṁ*), changeable (*viparināmiṁ*), and fickle (*aññathābhāvi*) One who has faith in this teaching, and is firmly resolved in it, is called faith–striver (*saddhānusāri*). He has entered the right path (*Sammatanniyamaṁ*) entered the plane of the worthy (*Sappurisabhumi*), having transcended the plane of the commoner (*vītivattoputhujjanabhūmiṁ*); he is incapable of doing any action having done which he would be reborn in hell (*niraya*) or in the animal world (*tiracchanayoni*) or in the realm of manes (*pettivisaya*); and he is incapable of passing away without realising the fruit of stream–entrance (*sotāpattiphala*).

"One who with wisdom finds pleasure to an extent in these teachings is called dhamma-striver (*dhammanusāri*). He (too) has entered the right path, entered the plane of the worthy, having transcended the plane of the commoner; he is incapable of doing any action having done

which he would be reborn in hell or in the animal world, or in the realm of the manes: and is incapable of passing away without realising the fruit of stream-entrance." (40)

The commentary explains: "Right path (*sammattaniyama*)=entered the noble path (*ariyamagga*)" (41)

These two persons are further described in the *Papañcasūdanī*, the commentary to the *Majjhima Nikāya*, thus: "There the dhamma-striver and the faith-striver these two who are established in the path of stream-entrance (*sotāpattimaggaṭṭha*). As it is said (in the *Puggala Paññatti* 15): "Which person is dhamma-striver? The controlling faculty of wisdom (*paññindriya*) of the person practising for the realisation of the fruit of stream-entrance (*sotāpatti-phalasacchikiriyāya patipanna*) is very great (*adhimatta*); wisdom-carried (*paññavāhi*), preceded by wisdom (*paññāpubbaṅgamī*), he develops (*bhāveti*) the noble path (*ariyamagga*): this person is called dhamma-striver. The person practising for the realisation of the fruit of stream-entrance is dhamma-striver: when established in the fruit this person is called won to view (*diṭṭhipatta*). Which person is faith-striver? The controlling faculty of faith (*saddhindriya*) of the person practising for the realisation of the fruit of stream-entrance is very great (*adhimatta*); faith-carried (*saddhavahi*), preceded by faith (*saddhapubbaṅgamī*), he develops (*bhāveti*) the noble path (*ariyamagga*); this person is called faith-striver. The person practising for the realisation of the

fruit of stream–entrance is faith–striver; when established in the fruit this person is called faith–freed (*saddhavimutta*)". (42)

The last acts of the yogi, as a commoner, as we saw earlier, was the development of insight by way of impermanence (*anicca*) and so on. This is the culmination of his training as a commoner. The various stages of the "gradual training, gradual work, and gradual practice (*anupubbasikkhu, anupubbakiriyā, anupabbapatipadā*) mentioned in section 5 above, are included in the fuller account given in section 4 above where the following statement occurs: "When there is no right concentration (*sammāsamādhimhi asati*) in him who lacks right concentration (*sammāsamādhi-vipannassa*) the sufficing condition of knowledge-and–vision of things as they are is destroyed (*hatupanisaṁ hoti yathābhūtañāṇadassanaṁ*); when there is no knowledge–and–vision of things as they are (*yathābhūtañāṇadassane asati*) in him who lacks knowledge–and–vision of things as they are (*yathābhūtañāṇadassanavipannassa*), the sufficing condition of disenchantment–dispassion is destroyed (*hatupaniso hoti nibbidavirāgo*)". According to the commentary "knowledge – and – vision of things as they are (*yathābhūtañāṇadassana*" is "tender insight (*taruna vipassanā*)"; and "disenchantment – dispassion (*nibbida-virāga*" is strong insight as well as the path (*balava vipassanā ceva maggo ca*)".

Having explicitly pointed out the harm resulting from the absence of these sufficing

conditions, the Buddha continues, to show equally explicitly the benefits their presence ensures, thus: "When there is right concentration (*sammāsamādhiṁhisati*) he who is possessed of right concentration (*Sammāsamādhisaṁ pannassa*), he is endowed with the sufficing condition of knowledge-and-vision of things as they are (*upnisasaṁpannaṁ hoti yathābhūtañāṇadassanaṁ*); when there is knowledge-and-vision of things as they are (*yathābhūtañāṇadassane sati*), he who is possessed of knowledge-and-vision of things as they are (*yathābhūtañāṇadassanasampannassa*), he is endowed with disenchantment-dispassion (*upanisasampanno hoto nibbidā-virāgo*". (43)

NOTES

34 and 35. See nn. 5 and 6 issue of July 1966.

+ Ñāṇamoli Thera's translation.

36. See n. 32

37. Sv. III, 1062: Cittavisuddhī ti vipassanāya padaṭṭhānabhuta attha paguna -samāpattiyo.

38. See n. 18 in issus of July 1966.

39. See nn. 5 and 9.

40. S III, 225: Cakkhuṁ bhikkhave aniccaṁ viparinamiṁ aññathābhāvī, sotaṁ . ghānaṁ .. Jivhā...Kāva .., mano anicco viparināmi aññathābhāvī. Ya bhikkhave ime dhamme evaṁ saddahati adhimucchati ayaṁ vuccati saddhānu-

sārī okkanto sammattaniyamaṁ sappurisabhū miṁ okkanto vītivatto puthujjanabhūmiṁ, abha bbo taṁ kammaṁ kātuṁ yaṁ kammaṁ hatva niryamvā tiracchanayoniṁ vā pettivisayaṁ va uppajjeyya, abhabbo ca tava kālaṁ kātuṁ yāvā na sotāpattiphalaṁ sacchikarati. Yassa kho bhikkhave ime dhamma evaṁ paññāya mattaso nijjhānaṁ khamanti ayaṁ vuccati dhammānusārī okkanto sammattaniyamaṁ sappurisabhūmiṁ okkanto vītivatto puthujjanabhūmiṁ, abhabbo taṁ kammaṁ kātuṁ yaṁ kammaṁ katvā nirayaṁ vā tiracchanayamiṁ vā pettivisayaṁ vā upajjeyya, abhabbo ca tāva kālaṁ kātuṁ yāva na sotāpattiphalaṁ sacchikaroti.

41. Spk. II, 346: Okkanto sammattaniyaman ti, pavittho ariyamaggaṁ.

42. Ps. II, 120: Tattha dhammānusārino, saddhānusārino ti ime dve sotāpattimaggattha honti. Yath' āha: "Katamo ca puggalo dhammānusārī? Yassa puggalassa sotāpattiphalasacchikiriyāya patipannassa paññindriyaṁ adhimattaṁ hoti paññāvāhi, paññāpubbaṅgamaṁ ariyamaggaṁ bhāveti, ayaṁ vuccati paggalo dhammānusārī. Sotāpattiphalasacchikiriyāya patipanno puggalo dhammānusārī; phale thito ditthippatto. katamo ca puggalo saddhānusārī? Yassa puggalossa sotāpattiphalasacchikiriyāya patipannassa saddhindriyaṁ adhimattaṁ hoti soddhavahi saddhapubbaṅgamaṁ ariyamaggaṁ bhāveti ayaṁ vuccati puggalo saddhā–nusāri Sotāpattiphalasacchikiriyāya patipanno puggalo saddhānu–sārī, phale thito saddhāvimutto." ti. (Pug. (15)

43. See n. 14

44. A. V. 312–13: Sīlavato bhikkhave sīlasampannassa na cetanāya karaniyam 'avippatisāro me uppajjatu' ti. Dhanmatā esa bhikkhave, yaṁ sīlavato sīlasampannasso avippatisāro uppajjati. Avippatisārissa bhikkhave na cetanāya karaniyam 'pāmujjaṁ me uppajjatu' ti. Dhammatā esa bhikkhave, yaṁ avippatisārissa pamujjaṁ uppajjati. Pamuditossa khikkhave na cetanāya karaniyam 'pīti me uppajjatu' ti. Dhammatā esa bhikkhave, yaṁ pamuditassa pīti uppajjati. Pītimānassa bhikkhave na cetanāya karaniyaṁ 'kāyo me passambhatu' ti. Dhammata esa bhikkhave, yaṁ pitimanassa kayo passambhati. Passaddhakāyassa bhikkhave na cetanāya karanīyaṁ 'sukhaṁ vediyani' ti. Dhammatā esa bhikkhave, yaṁ passadhakāyo sukhaṁ vediyati. Sukhino bhikkhave na cetanāya karanīyaṁ 'cittaṁ me samīdhiyatu' ti. Dhammatā esa bhikkhave, yaṁ sukhino cittaṁ samādhiyati. Samīhitassa bhikkhave na cetanāya karaniyam 'yathābūtaṁ pajānīmi passani' ti. Dhammatā esa bhikkhave, yaṁ samāhito yathābhūtaṁ pajānīti passati. Yathābhūtaṁ bhikkhave jānato passato na cetanāya karanīyam 'nibbindami' ti. Dhammatā esa bhikkhave, yaṁ yathābhūtaṁ jānaṁ passaṁ nibbindati. Nibbindassa bhikkhave na cetanāya karinīyaṁ 'virajjāmi' ti. Dhammatā esa bhikkhave, yaṁ nibbindo virajjati. Virattassa bhikkhave na cetanīya karanīyaṁ 'vimuttiñāṇadassanaṁ sacchikaromi' ti. Dhammatā esa bhikkhave, yaṁ viratto vimuttiñānadassanaṁ sacchikaroti.

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION

Reply to Rejoinder II–II

By Kheminda Thera

(Ceylon)

The absence of these sufficing conditions perpetuates the round of birth and death while their presence ensures the hastening out of this cycle. While this is the clear statement of this sutta, it derives an added significance from the fact that this portion of the sutta we are now discussing is included in the sutta of the "the invariable sequence", where the Buddha declares that it transports the practiser from this to the other shore, thus: "Monks, a virtuous man, one who is possessed of virtue, need not think, 'Let there be absence of remorse in me'. Monks, invariably there is absence of remorse in a virtuous man, in one who is possessed of virtue.

"Monks, one who is free from remorse need not think, 'Let there be gladness in me.' Monks, invariably there is gladness in one who is free from remorse.

"Monks, one who is glad need not think, 'Let there be joy in me'. Monks, invariably there is joy in one who is glad.

"Monks, one who is joyous need not think, 'Let my body be tranquil'. Monks, invariably the body of one who is joyous is tranquil.

"Monks, one with a tranquil body need not think, 'Let me feel comfort. Monks, invariably one with a tranquil body feels comfort.

"Monks, one who feels comfort need not think, 'Let my mind become concentrated." Monks, invariably the mind of one who feels comfort is concentrated.

"Monks, one with a concentrated mind need not think, 'Let me understand, see phenomena as they are'. Monks, invariably one with a concentrated mind understands, sees phenomena as they are.

"Monks, one who understands, sees pheno mena as they are need not think, 'Let me weary of phenomena'. Monks, invariably one who understands, sees phenomena as they are wearies of phenomena.

"Monks, one who wearies of phenomena need not think, 'Let me estrange myself from phenomena'. Monks, invariably one who wearies of ph nomena estranges himself from phenomena.

"Monks, one who estranges himself from phenomena need not think, 'Let me realise the knowledge of emancipation'. Monks, invariably one who estranges himself from phenomena realises the knowledge of emancipation.

"Thus, monks, estrangement has knowledge of emancipation for aim and profit, weariness has estrangement from aim and profit, understanding has weariness for aim and profit, concentration has understanding for aim and profit, comfort has concentration for aim and profit, tranquillity has comfort for aim and profit, joy has tranquillity for aim and profit, gladness has joy for aim and profit, absence of remorse has gladness for aim and profit, virtue has absence of remorse for aim and profit. Thus, monks, phenomena flow on to phenomena, and phenomena fulfil phenomena, in the journey from here to the goal." (44)

And when the *Netti-pakaraṇa* at page 67 calls this invariable sequence "supramundane dependent arising (*lokuttara paṭiccasamuppāda*)", it heightens one's appreciation of the value of these, and similar, suttas.

Of these suttas, the one from the *Okkanta Saṁyutta* describes briefly the process of the translation of the yogi from the state of commoner (*puthujjana*) to that of the noble one (*ariya*); the other from the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* given in section 4 above, describes this process with the utmost brevity, in the expression: "disenchantment–dispassion (*nibbidā-virāga.*") This occupies the middlemost position from which can be seen (a) a series of stages in the mundane (*lokiya*) sphere receding backwards to the very beginning of the yogi's training, and (b) another series in the supramundane (*lokuttara*) sphere procceed-

ing as far as the fruit of the consummate state (*arahattaphala*)

17. It was stated earlier that when the yogi leaves the plane of the commoner (*puthujjanabhūmi*), he does so either as dhamma-striver (*dhammānusārī*) or as faith-striver (*saddhānusārī*). They are described further in the following sutta thus: "Here, Mahānāma, a certain person, though he is not possessed of even intelligent faith in the Buddha, the Dhamma, and the Sangha (*na heva kho Buddhe aveccappasādena samannāgato hoti, na dhamme, na sanghe*), nor is possessed of joyous wit (*na hāsapaññe*), nor quick wit (*na javanapaññe*), nor freedom (*na cavimuttiyā*); yet has the controlling faculties of faith (*saddhindriyā*), energy (*viriyindriya*), mindfulness (*satindriyā*), concentration (*samādhindriyā*) and wisdom (*paññaindriya*); he is one who with wisdom is moderately pleased with the teachings proclaimed by the Tathāgata. Even he shall not go (*aganta*) to hell (*niraya*), the animal world (*tiracchānayoni*), the realm of the manes (*pettivisaya*), and the states of regress (*apāyaduggativinipāta*). Here, Mahānāma, a certain person, though he is not possessed of even intelligent faith in the Buddha, the Dhamma, and the Sangha, and is neither possessed of joyous wit, nor quick wit, nor freedom, yet has the controlling faculties of faith, energy, mindfulness, concentration, and wisdom; and he has mere faith in (*saddhamattaṁ*) and mere affection for (*pemamattam*), the Tathā-

gata. Even he, too, shall not go (*aganta*) to hell, the animal world, the realm of the manes, and the states of regress." (45)

The commentary explains: "Moderately pleased with (*mattaso nijjhanaṁ khamati*)=viewing with approval to an extent only (*pamanena vā olokanaṁ khamati*). By this the dhamma–striver, the person standing upon the path (*maggattha puggala*) is shown....". "Has mere faith in (*saddhamattaṁ*) and mere affection for (*pemamattaṁ*)= by this the faith–striver, the person standing upon the path (*maggattha puggala*), is shown."(46)

18. The reader would have noted that the attainment of the first path, either as dhamma–striver (*dhammānusārī*) or as faith–striver (*saddhānusāri*), consists of the five controlling faculties (*pañcindriya*) one of which is that of concentration (*samādhindriya*). It was elsewhere shown that this faculty of concentration consists of the four jhānas. And we also know that it is supramundane (*lokuttara*). Further, we have seen (a) that this process of change from the state of the commoner to that of the noble one is tersely expressed in the words "disenchantment–dispassion (*nibbidā-virāgā*)"; (b) that the sufficing condition of disenchantment–dispassion is "knowledge–and–vision of things as they are (*yathābhūtañāṇadassana*) which is mundane (*lokiya*); and (c) that the sufficing condition of knowledge–and–vision of things as they are is "right concentration (*sammāsamādhi*)" which consists of the four mundane (*lokiya*)

jhāna has to precede supramundane (*lokuttara*) jhāna, whether considered by way of the controlling faculty of concentration (*samādhindriya*) as in the present case, or by way of right concentration of the path (*magga sammāsamādhi*). or by way of the power of concentration (*samādhibala*) and so on.

19. Again, purification of mind or consciousness is "the thoroughly mastered eight attainments, the proximate cause of insight". And insight is twofold: "tender insight (*taruna vipassanā*) which is "knowledge-and-vision of things as they are (*yathābhūtañāṇadassana*)", also rendered "understanding and seeing phenomena as they are"; and "strong insight (*balava vipassanā*)" which is "disenchantment (*nibbida*)" also rendered "weariness". These are the two highest attainments of the yogi in the mundane sphere. Prior to this when he developed mundane right concentration (*sammāsamādhi*) which consists of the four jhānas, the yogi joined the mundane portion of the way of "invariable sequence", also called the supramundane dependent arising (*lokuttara paṭiccasamuppāda*) because it emerges from the mundane only to plunge into the supramundane, thus transporting the yogi from the state of commoner (*puthujjana*) through the seven stages of the learner (*sekha*) to the final one of the learning-ender or adept (*asekha*), the consummate one (araha). But before this way of invariable sequence, after carrying him to the highest mundane attain-

ment, namely, disenchantment (*nibbida*), could usher him into the presence of the noble ones (*ariya*) with the attainment of the next stage, namely, dispassion (*virāga*) which is the first path (*magga*), the Blessed One steps in to emphasise the great importance of this achievement. This he does by declaring that the yogi at this stage, though still a commoner (*puthujjana*), is worthy of the salutations proper to the noble ones (*ariya*). He says: "Monks, these nine persons are worthy of offerings, worthy of hospitality, worthy of gifts, worthy of respectful salutations, the world's incomparable field of merit. What nine? The consummate one, he who is practising for the realisation of the fruit of the consummate state, the non-returner, he who is practising for the realisation of the fruit of non-return, the once-returner, he who is practising for the realisation of the fruit of once-return, the stream-entrant, he who is practising for the realisation of the fruit of stream-entrance, and the changer-of-lineage." (47)

The commentary explains: "Changer-of-lineage (*gotrabhū*) = endowed with the summit of attainment in strong insight (*balava vipassanā*) with immediate condition for the path of stream-entrance attainment". (48)

Now the yogi, transcending the mundane, develops at the next stage dispassion (*virāga*) which is the path (*magga*) where jhāna of (a) the controlling faculty of concentration (*samā-*

dhindriya) (b) the power of concentration (*samādhibala*) and (c) right concentration (*sammāsamādhi*), occurs.

20. In the mundane sphere, too, there occurs jhāna of (a) right concentration (*sammāsamādhi*), (b) purification of mind or consciousness (*cittavisuddhi*) which consists of "the thoroughly mastered eight attainments, the proximate cause of insight (*vipassanāya padaṭṭhānabūta aṭṭha paguna-samāpattiyo*)", and (c) the concentration (*samādhi*) which is the second member of the three aggregates which comprise the noble eightfold path. Here "virtue=the purified fourfold virtue; concentration - the eight attainments which are the basis of insight (*vipassanāpādaka aṭṭha samāpattiyo*) wisdom=mundane and supramundane knowledge". (See above section 8).

21. It was shown in section 10 above that (a) mundane jhāna arises when one of the thirty subjects of contemplation "capable of producing' jhāna together with access" is developed, and (b) supramundane jhāna arises when insight is developed by making giving up of the compounded (*saṅkhatavossagga*), or nibbāna, the object (*nibbānārammaṇa*). This statement of the *Saddhammappakāsinī*, the commentary to the *Paṭisambhidāmagga*, finds confirmation in the following two suttas: (1) "Monks, the noble disciple having made 'giving up' the object acquires concentration, acquires unification of mind. Monks, this is called the controlling faculty of

concentration". (49) The previous sutta uses these same words to describe the controlling faculty of concentration, and adds that the concentration or unification mind thus acquired consists of the four jhānas. (50) The commentary explains: "Having made 'giving up' the object= having made nibbāna the object....In this sutta the controlling faculties of faith, mindfulness, and wisdom are the former portion (*pubbabhāgāni*); that of energy, mixed; that of the concentration produced is said of the supramundane only." (51)

22. Now the foregoing can be summarized thus: Mundane (*lokiya*) jhāna is (i) by way of right concentration (*sammāsamādhi*) the sufficing condition (*upanisa*), (ii) by way of purification of mind or consciousness (*cittavisuddhi*) the proximate cause (*padaṭṭhāna*), and (iii) by way of the second member of the three aggregates in which the eightfold path is included the basis (*pādaka*), of insight. This insight, being knowledge–and–vision of things as they are (*yathābhūtañāṇadassana*), is tender insight (*taruna vipassanā*) which is the sufficing condition of strong insight (*balava vipassanā*). This latter, also called disenchantment (*nibbida*), is the sufficing condition of dispassion (*virāga*) which is the path (*magga*). Of the many things present at this first stage of the supramundane are these three: (i) the controlling faculty of concentration (*samādhindriya*), (ii) the power of concentration (*samādhibala*) and (iii) right con-

centration (*sammāsamādhi*), all of which is jhāna of the supramundane (*lokuttara*).

Thus mundane (*lokiya*) jhāna always precedes supramundane (*lakuttara*) jhāna according to the suttas and Commentaries.

Again (i) we saw in section 3 above that the Bodhisatta, inaugurating contemplation in the Dhamma, referred to the first mundane jhāna he had attained as a child thus: "This, indeed, is the way to enlightenment": (ii) the following sutta says: "Just as the Ganges flows, slopes, inclines to the east, just so does a monk, by developing and practising the four jhānas, flow, slope and incline to nidbāna."(52)

NOTES.

44. (continued) Iti kho bhikkhave virāgo vimuttiñānadassanattko vimuttiñānadassanānisaṁso, nibbida virāgattha virāga-nisama, vathābhūtañānadassanaṁ nibbidattham nibbidanisamsam, samadhi yathadhutanadassanattko yathabhutanana-dassananisamso; sukham samadhatthham samadhanisamsam, passaddhi sukhattha sukhanisamsa, piti passaddhattka passaddhanisamsa, pamujjam pitattham pitanisamsam, avippatisaro pamujjattko pamujjanisamso, kusalani silani avippatisaratthani avippatisarani samsani. Iti kho bhikkhave dhamma ca dhamme abhihsandenti dhamma ca dhamme paridurenti apara parangamanaya ti. + Soma Thera's Translation,

45. S. V. 377: Idha panna Mahanama ekacco puggalo na heva kho Buddhe aveccappasadena samannagato hoti na dhamme na sanghe na hasapanno na javanapanna na ca vimuttiya samannagato, api cassa ime dhamma honti, saddhindriyam viriyindriyam satindriyam samadhindriyam pannindriyam, tathagata-pavedita cassa dhamma pannaya mattaso nijjhanam khamanti. Ayam pi kho Mahanama puggalo aganta nirayam aganta tiracchaniyonim aganta pittivisayam aganta apayaduggativinipatam.

Idha pana Mahanama ekacco puggalo na heva kho Buddhe aveccappasadena samannagato, na Dhamme, na Sanghe, na hasapanno na javanopanno na ca vimuttiya samannogato, api cassa ime dhamma honti saddhindriyam.... pannindriyam tathagate cassa saddhamattam hoti pemamattam. Ayam pi kho puggalo aganta nirayam aganta tiracchanayonim aganta pittivisayam aganta apayaduggativinipatam.

46. Spk. III, 288: Mattaso nijjhanam khamati ti pamanena va olokanam khamti. Imina dhammanusarim magga-ttha-pggaulam dasseti.....

Saddha-mattam hoti pema-mattan ti, imina saddhanusarim magga-ttha-puggalan desseti.

47. A. Iv, 373: Nava yime bhikkhave puggala ahuneyya pahuneyya dakkhineyya anjalikaraniya anuttaram punnakkhettam lokassa. Katame nava?

Araha, arahattaya, patipanno, anagamiphalasacchikiriyaya patipanno, sakadagami, saka-

dagamiphalansacchiriya patipanno. sotapanno, sotapattiphalasacchikiriyaya patipanno, gotrabhu.

48. Mp. (Sinh. ed), 791: Gotrabhu ti sotapattimaggassa anantarapaccayena sikhappattabalavavipassanacittena saman-nagato.

49. S. V, 200: Idha bhikkhave ariya-savako vossaggarammanam karitva labhati samadhim labhati cittassa ekaggatam. Idam vuccati bhikkhave samadhinriyam.

50. S. V, 198: Idha bhikkhave ariya-savako vassaggarammaam karitva labhati samadhim labhati cittassa ekaggatam. So vivicceva kamehi vivicca akusalehi dhammehi savitakkam savicaram vivekajam patisukham pathamajjhanam upassampajja vihariti .. Sukhassaca pahana dukkhassa ca pahana catuttham jhanam upasampajja viharati. Idam vuccati bhikkave samadhrindriyam.

51. Spk, III, 234: vossaggarammanam karitva ti, nibbanarammanam katva Imasmim sutte saddha-sati- pann' indriyani pubba-bhagani, viriy' indriya -missakam, samadh' indriyam nibbattitam lokuttaram eva kathitam.

52. S. V. 307-8: Seyyathapi bhikkhava Ganga nadi pacinaninna pacinapona pacinapabbhara, evam keva kho bhikkhave bhikkhu cattaro jhane bhavento cattaro jhane bahulikaronto nibbananinno hoti nibbanapono nibbanapabbharo.

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION:

Reply to Rejoinder II–III.

By Kheminda Thera

(Ceylon)

23. In view of this body of evidence provided in the suttas and Commentaries, when the Venerable Nyanuttara Sayadaw says: "The Buddha does not say that only those who attain *Lokiya-jhāna* can attain *Samādhindriya*, and that only *jhānā*-attainers can attain to the plane of the noble ones (*Ariyabhūmi*)", it makes no sense- This is particularly so when we consider the following passage from the sutta cited in section 4 above: "When there is no right concentration, in him who lacks right concentration, the sufficing condition of knowledge–and–vision of things as they are is destroyed; when there is no knowledge–and–vision of things as they are, in him who lacks knowledge–and–vision of things as they are, the sufficing condition of disenchantment–dispassion is destroyed; when there is no disenchantment–dispassion, in him who lacks disenchantment – dispassion, the sufficing condition of knowledge–and–vision of freedom is destroyed". Then the sutta goes on to say that the opposite is true: "When there is right concentration, he who is endowed with right

concentration, he is endowed with the sufficing condition of knowledge-and-vision of things as they are" and so on. It will be remembered that right concentration here consists of the four mundane jhānas. Now this statement of the sutta is not an isolated instance. This sutta is repeated several times with some variation of detail elsewhere in the *Anguttara Nikāya*. The sutta now discussed begins with the words "When there is mindfulness-and-clear-comprehension (*satisampajañňe sati*)"; a second omits this stage and begins with the next: "When there is shame-and-fear to do evil (*hirottappe sati*)", (53) a third and a fourth begin with "Good character (*sīlavato*)" and goes on to "remorselessness (*avippatisāra*)",(54) a fifth and a sixth, i. e. the two previous suttas, contain the supramundane dependent arising discussed earlier. They too begin with "Good character" and go on to "Remorselessness (*avippatisāra*)",(55) a seventh and an eighth begin with "Good character (sīlavato)" and go on direct to "right concentration (sammāsamādhi)", (56) and a ninth begins with "Restraint of the controlling faculties (*indriyasaṁvara*)" and goes on to "virtue (*sīla*)". (57) And every one of these ultimately arrives at right concentration (*sammāsamādhi*) which is mundane (*lokiya*) jhāna, pass through the mundane stages of knowledge-and-vision of things as they are (*yathābhūtañāṇadassana*) and disenchantment (*nibbidā*) before reaching the plane of the noble ones (*ariyabhūmi*) with the attainment of dispassion (*virāga*).

This teaching is found elsewhere, too, for instance, in the *Saṁyutta Nikāya*: III (*dukkha*) is the sufficing condition of faith (*saddhā*)" and goes on to gladness (*pāmojja*) and so on up to concentration (*samādhi*), knowledge-and-vision of things as they are (*yathābhūtañānadassana*) disenchantment (*nibbida*) and dispassion (*virāga*) which is the path (*magga*). (58)

24. The Venerable Nyanuttara Sayadaw cites the *Paramatthamañjusā* which describes the *suddhavipassanāyānika* as a *non-jhāna*-attainer, "one who has no *jhāna* (*ajhānalābhī*)". Why the Sub-commentary does so is because, unlike the *samathayānika*, the *suddhavipassanāyānika* does not enter into, and emerge from, jhāna to develop insight of the third purification. Here the Venerable Sayadaw overlooks the fact that at the previous purification, viz. the second purification, which is "the proximate cause of insight", both the would-be *samathayānika* and the would-be *vipassanāyānika* developed jhāna to qualify for insight development at the third purification. While the *samathayānika* repeats this jhāna attainment at the third purification, the *suddhavipassanāyānika* does not do so. Hence the *suddhavipassanāyānika* is rightly called "non-jhāna-attainer" when discussing the development of insight; not that he has not developed jhāna before.

The *samathayānika* and the *vipassanāyānika* are not two kinds of yogis who just arrive from nowhere ready to develop insight. They are

those who have qualified themselves to develop insight with care and preparation, the ingredients of which are: mindfulness and clear comprehension, shame and fear to do evil, restraint of the senses, virtue, and right concentration, each one of these being the basis of the next. Right concentration, we saw in section 4 above, is defined as the four jhānas which the commentary explains as mundane in the former portion and supramundane in the later portion. And it is this mundane jhāna of the former portion which is the final qualifying attainment a yogi has to have before he could undertake the development of insight. With this qualification he is free to decide to be either a *samathayānika* or a *vipassanāyānika*. At this stage, considered by way of the three aggregates, he has fulfilled the aggregate of concentration; and considered by way of the purification, he has fulfilled the second purification.

25. Regarding the postures, clear comprehension, and elements, the Venerable Nyanuttara Sayadaw repeats the Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw's statement that "the concentration of one who devotes himself to these exercises will be definitely only momentary concentration". When asked to cite authority, he produces two passages, one from the *Visuddhimagga* and the other from its commentary. The *Visuddhimagga* passage is from chapter XI entitled "Description of Concentration Conclusion (Samādhi-Niddesa)" Since the new method of meditation ignores the

second purification by overpassing it to develop insight, in spite of the fact that this second purification is the "proximate cause of insight", it of necessity must also ignore this chapter, for chapters III to XI deal only with concentration, or Purification of Mind or Consciousness. Consistency demands that it overpass these chapters too and not rely on any statement found in them to support its teachings. Besides it is claimed that the concentration of one who devotes himself to these exercises "will be definitely only momentary concentration", and this excludes other forms of concentration. Therefore in the first article I cited the *Aṅguttara Sutta* and commentary which teach that the concentration attained walking up and down, which is also a posture, lasts long, and that it is one of the eight attainments. This was done to indicate that though momentary concentration arises during these contemplations, other forms of concentration too arise with the development of these contemplations.

26. It is interesting to note that the *Paramatthamañjūsā* makes a distinction between access that arises with jhāna and access that arises without jhāna. This second kind of concentration is called access owing to the similarity of characteristic. If there is any benefit accruing to this concentration owing to this similarity, it belongs to the *samathayānika* and the *vipassanāyānika* as described in the *Visuddhimagga*, but certainly not to the access-and-jhāna-rejecting *vipassanā-*

yānika as described in the Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw's new method of meditation, since "access without jhāna" just as "access with jhāna" arise for the first time only when a serenity (*samatha*) subject of contemplation is developed. In this case it, i. e. access without jhāna, arises when the contemplation called Defining of the Four Elements (*catudhātuvavāṭṭhāna*) is developed. This kind of access occurs in ten of the serenity (*samatha*) subjects of contemplation given in the *Visuddhimagga*. (59)

27. Further, "contemplation on Postures, Clear Comprehension and Elements" occur in the four foundations of mindfulness (*satipaṭṭhāna*). And according to the sutta and the commentaries, given in section 1 (a) & (b) above, no beginner is qualified to develop these four foundations of mindfulness without first abandoning the five hindrances. He has to abandon the five hindrances to develop the four foundations of mindfulness. The new method, however, would require him to develop the four foundations of mindfulness to abandon the five hindrances. It is again a case of putting the cart before the horse. This is yet another reason for calling this method new.

28. The Venerable Nyanuttara Sayadaw seems to be hurt when he says: "The Venerable Kheminda Thera's assertion that momentary concentration emerges after *jhāna*-attainment is definitely to disparage the Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw's statement in *The Progress of Insight* that

the *Suddha-Vipassanā-yānika* can attain momentary concentration without previous access–absorption concentration. But the Venerable Kheminda Thera fails to shake the position of the Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw, which is supported by the Pāli Texts, Commentaries and Sub–Commentaries, wherein it is clearly stated that a *Samatha-yānika* attains access–absorption and *Vipassanāyānika* attains only momentary concentration". In support of the claim that the *Vipassanāyāyanika* attains momentary concentration which for him constitutes Purification of Mind or Consciousness, the Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw cites on page 4 of his treatise the following passage from the *Paramatthamañjūsā*: "Momentary unification of mind means the concentration of mind lasting only for a moment. For that (type of concentration), too, when it occurs uninterruptedly with its respective object in a single mode and is not overcome by opposition, fixes the mind immovably as if in absorption". Referring to this passage I and at column 2, page 7 in my first article of July last year (i) that "he mentions, without realising the implication, or in spite of it, that the passage he cites is in explanation of the Chapter relating to the Respiration Mindfulness', to use his own words; (ii) that "the reader knows that Respiration Mindfulness is a serenity (*samatha*) subject of meditation"; (iii) that " Bare Insight, the author claims, has no truck with jhāna"; (iv) that "furthermore this passage from the *Paramatthamañjūsā* is none other than the comment

on this very passage of the *Visuddhimagga* reproduced at 3 (a) above, which declares that momentary concentration emerges 'at the actual time of insight' undertaken by the newly risen jhāna-attainer". In short the Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw produced a sub-commentary passage in support of his statement; but the *Visuddhimagga* passage on which this comment is made, states absolutely and clearly that this momentary concentration arises when the jhāna-attainer develops insight after emerging from jhāna. The Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw, by kicking against the pricks, hurts himself, and the Venerable Nyanuttara Sayadaw blames me for it.

29. The Venerable Nyanuttara Sayadaw began the first part of this article by declaring that I was inspired by prejudice. I assured him that I was certainly inspired, not by prejudice, but by the *Catu-Mahāpadesa Suttas* of the Blessed One. Now, coming to the end of this part of his article, he says for the second time that I am "inspired by prejudice". This time it is in "reference to the sermon of U Sujāta". And this is how he says it: "That the Venerable Kheminda Thera is inspired by prejudice is further shown by his reference to the sermon of U Sujāta, the Burmese pupil and accredited representative in Ceylon recently of the Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw. He criticised U Sujāta on the basis of an incomplete press report. Leave alone a senior *Kammaṭṭhānī-chariya* like U Sujāta of the famous Thathana Yeiktha, the meditation centre of the

Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw in Rangoon, a sāmaṇera or even an average lay yogi knows that the seven purifications must be dealt with in due order". Here he says that I criticised U Sujāta "on the basis of an incomplete press report". Even though in note 10 in my first article I had mentioned that the translation of the sermon appeared in "Kanduboda Vipassana Bhavana Magazine, 1956, p. 32", and did not speak of a press report, he has somehow come to the conclusion that it was a press report, and an incomplete one at that. Here are the facts. The size of this publication is 7 in. by 10 in. and contains 82 pages of good quality paper; it has 9 photographs, including one of the Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw and one of U Sujāta; the cover page has a picture of the Buddha and the publication is priced at Rs 1.50. It contains, among other articles, translations in Sinhala of 31 sermons of U Sujāta delivered from 25. 3. 56 to 16. 12. 56 contained in 43 pages. The editor says that these are sermons delivered by the Venerable U Sujāta Thera, interpreted in Sinhala by Mr Rerukane, and recorded by him (the editor). He further says that this being so there may be shortcomings in this record.

Now, this is by no means "an incomplete press report". Further, Mr Rerukane is well versed in Pāḷi, Sinhala, and Burmese; he is also learned in the Dhamma, having been for long a member of the Order. It may also be mentioned

here that this publication carries an article on "Vipassanā" specially written by the Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw at the request of the editor.

Again, this sermon of U Sujāta was criticised in a Sinhala treatise entitled *A Criticism of Burmese Meditation* by the Venerable Paṇḍita Weligama Nararatana Mahā Thera, and published in 1959. Up to date no clarification or correction has been issued either by U Sujāta or Mr Rerukane, or by the editor, or by anyone else.

The Venerable Sayadaw claims that the new method is supported by the suttas, commentaries, and sub commentaries, which we have already seen is in fact not the case; on the other hand it goes directly against them which teach that Purification of Mind or Consciousness precedes insight since it is its "proximate cause", whereas the new method teaches that it follows insight. It is this sort of attitude, and not mine, that is "inspired by prejudice". This position can be aptly summed up in these words of Locke: "If, after all his professions, he cannot forbear any opposition to his opinion, he cannot so much as give a patient hearing, much less examine and weigh the arguments on the other side, does he not plainly confess it is *prejudice* that governs him?"

Reference is also made to "*senior kammaṭṭhānā-chariya*" and the "famous Thathana Yeiktha, in Rangoon". Well, what of seniority and fame

when the teaching of the suttas, and commentaries and sub-commentaries which "fit in with the suttas", is disregarded?

The Venerable Sayadaw says that "a samaṇera or even an average lay yogi knows that the seven purifications must be dealt with in due order". The strange thing about this so very common knowledge is that when it comes to applying it, it is the Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw who promptly forgets it. In his treatise the names of the purifications though given in due order, are not "dealt with in due order", for here a serious problem arises for the new method which requires the yogi, after he has developed the first purification, to skip the second purification in order to develop the third purification. The *Visuddhimagga* and the commentaries define Purification of Mind or Consciousness as (a) "the eight attainments together with access", (b) "the thoroughly mastered eight attainments, the proximate cause of insight", respectively; and chapters III to XI of the *Visuddhimagga* deal solely with the forty serenity (samatha) subjects of contemplation. This is clearly in the way of the new method of meditation which teaches that Purification of Mind or Consciousness arises by way of momentary concentration when insight is being developed. And the Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw, equal to the occasion, knows a way out. He would perform a surgical operation on Purification of Mind or Consciousness which is serenity

(*samatha*). There is plenty of insight (vipassanā) available in Purification of View. Why, he can graft a little of this on to Purification of Mind or Consciousness by way of momentary concentration. And this is just what he does. Now, if anybody is sceptical let him refer to page 2 of *The Progress of Insight* under the title "II Purification of Mind". There the description begins with insight (*vipassanā*) under the first sub-title "(a) The Method of Insight in brief", which after nearly two pages of instruction on *vipassanā* gives way to the second sub-title "(b) The Purification of Mind" under which two pages are devoted to detail the new method of meditation connected with the movement of the abdomen. From this process, it is claimed, results this strangely new kind of Purification of Mind or Consciousnesss by way of momentary concentration. The Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw sure enough knows "the due order" of the purifications, but in developing them he interferes with that order and the contents of both Purification of Mind or Consciousness and Purification of View.

NOTES

53. A. IV, 99
54. A. V, 4: 314
55. A. V, 1-6
56. A. III, 20: 200
57. A. III, 360

58. S. II, 32: Dukkhupanisa saddha, saddupanisam pamajjam, pamojjupanisa piti, pitupanisa passadhi, passaddhu–panisam sukham, sukkhupaniso samadhi, samadhupanisam yathabhutananadassanam, yathabhutananadassanupanisa nibbida virago, viragapanisa vimutti....

59. Vis. Mag. III: Upacarappanavahato ti thapetva kayagatasatin ca anapanassatin ca anapanassatin ca avasesa attha anussatiyo, ahare patikulasanna, catudhatuvavatthanam ti iman' eva h' ettha dasa kammatthanani upacaravahani; sesani appanavahani ti evam upacarappanavahato.

Carrection

In the July 1967 issue, page 339 col. 1, line 23, insert "before, not" after" "occurs", and insert a comma after "at".

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION

Reply to Rejoinder II–IV

By Khemindа Thera

(Ceylon)

The Venerable Nyanuttara Sayadaw says: "The Pāḷi Texts, Commentaries and Sub–Commentaries have explained both *Samatha-yānika* and *Vipassanā-yānika*. Both methods are certainly not new." I fully agree with this statement. Again he says: "The Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw writes *The Progress of Insight*, a treatise on *Vipassanā* method, based on his personal experiences as well as on those of a large number of yogis, the attainments which are quite in accord with the most authoritative texts, commentaries and sub-commetaries." This statement does not accord with facts for, as we have already seen, this treatise teaches: (i) that the *Vipassanāyānika* skips Purification of Mind or Consciousness to develop insight, whereas the *Visuddhimagga*, a "most authoritative commentary", teaches that he fulfils Purification of Mind or Consciousness to develop insight at Purification of View; (ii) that Purification of Mind or Consciousness arises when insight is being developed, whereas the *Sumaṅgala-Vilāsinī*, another "most authoritative commentary", says that Purification of Mind or Consciousness is "the proximate cause of Insight;" (iii) that Purification of Mind or Consciousness consists of momentary concentra-

tion, whereas (a) the *Visuddhimagga* teaches that it consists of "the eight attainments together with access", and (b) the *Sumaṅgala-Vilāsinī*, and the *Saddhamma-ppakāsinī* explaining further, teach that it consists of "the thoroughly mastered eight attainments, the proximate cause of insight"; and (iv) that "when Purification of Conduct has been established, the meditator who has chosen pure Insight as his vehicle, should endeavour to contemplate the *Body-and-Mind* (*nāmarūpa*). In doing so, he should contemplate, according to their characteristics, the five Groups of Grasping" and so on which is the function of Purification of View, whereas the *Rathavinīta Sutta* teaches: "Purification of Virtue (rendered above as 'Conduct'), has for aim as far as Purification of Mind or Consciousness; Purification of Mind or Consciousness has for aim as far as Purification of View" and so on.

31. And the Venerable Nyanuttara Sayadaw continues: "Incidentally it may be mentioned that some of his (the Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw's) pupils attain *jhāna*". Indeed! That would seem to indicate that they have departed from his new method of meditation. But in the absence of more information no definite conclusion can be reached.

Finally I wish to thank the Venerable Nyanuttara Sayadaw for his solicitude when he says that it is his "fervent wish" that "the Venerable Kheminda Thera and persons of his ilk do not rest content with the mere knowledge

of the *Samatha-yānika* method but instead practise it diligently until they attain *jhāna* together with *abhiññā*, as well as ariyabhūmi. May their efforts be crowned with complete success". At the same time I would like to remind him that it is we, i. e. I and those of my ilk, and we alone that are in a position to decide which method we are to develop. It seems that the Venerable Sayadaw is trying to reserve the *vipassanāyānika* method for himself and persons of his ilk, while making available to us the other. He need not resort to such measures. While we are content to leave him and persons of his ilk, not only to follow their new method but also to dole it out to anyone in need of it, we also claim the right to follow either of the two methods taught in the *Visuddhimagga*. And should at any time we happen to choose the *vipassanāyāna*, the Venerable Sayadaw may rest assured that we will not be following the Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw's new interpretation of the *vipassanāyāna* which, contrary to the instructions of the suttas, commentaries, and sub-commentaries, teaches that Purification of Mind or Consciousness follows insight development, and that it consists of momentary concentration. But we will be following the method as set forth in the *Visuddhimagga* which teaches that Purification of Mind or Consciousness consists of "the eight attainments together with access" which always precedes insight development for both the *samathayānika* and the *Vipassanāyānika*.

32. The Venerable Sayadaw speaks of "mere knowledge", which reminds one of the Bhadantaacariya Dhammapāla Thera's comment in the *Paramatthamañjūsā* on Purification of Mind or Consciousness (*cittavisuddhi*) mentioned at the beginning of *Diṭṭhivisuddhi-niddesa* in the *Visuddhimagga* (see sec. 9 (b) above), thus: "By mere knowledge alone one is not established in Purification of Mind or Consciousness. Without being established therein it is not possible to accomplish the higher purification", which is Purification of View where insight begins. I have mentioned this statement of the *Paramatthamañjūsā* more than once since it is the way to abandon the hindrances without which no development of the four foundations of mindfulness (*satipaṭṭhāna*) or insight is possible. This is a requirement which all have to comply with, not excluding the Sammāsaṁbodhisattas. And the Buddha's instructions are to "declare the teaching constantly to monks and nuns, men and women lay disciples, so that should there be among them any foolish people who may have doubt and perplexity regarding my method of teaching, having heard this exposition, they might give up their doubts and perplexities", given in full in section 1 (b) above.

Further, in accordance with these instructions of the Buddha, the commentary to the *Kiṁsuka Sutta*, given in section 6 above, through the simile of the powerful warrior and the wise minister identified as the first jhāna and

insight respectively, stresses the importance of abandoning the five hindrances by means of the first jhāna before developing insight which, if unsupported by the first jhāna, is powerless before a mind obstructed by the five hindrances.

33. In the following sutta the Buddha declares what the five hindrances are and why they should be abandoned.

"Sense-desire, monks, is an obstruction (*āvaraṇo*), a hindrance (*nīvaraṇo*); ill-will is an obstruction, a hindrance; rigidity-and-torpor is an obstruction, a hindrance; agitation-and-anxiety is an obstruction, a hindrance; and uncertainty is an obstruction, a hindrance.

"Monks, there are the five obstructions and hindrances which grow in and up over the mind (*cetaso ajjhāruhā*) and weaken the mind. 'Surely, monks, that a monk without abandoning these five obstructions and hindrances which grow in and up over the mind and weaken wisdom would, (thus) enfeebled (*abalāya*) and weakened (*dubbalāya*) in wisdom, know his own welfare, another's welfare, or the welfare of both and realise the excellence of knowledge and vision befitting the noble ones, transcending the human state, is not possible. "Surely, monks, that a monk after abandoning these five obstructions and hindrances which grow in and up over the mind and weaken wisdom would, (thus) strong with wisdom, know his own welfare, another's welfare, or the welfare

of both and realise the excellence of knowledge and vision befitting the noble ones, transcending the human state, is possible". (60)

The commentary explains: "Grow in and up over the mind (*cetaso ajjhāruhā*) = grow in and up over the mind [as a parasite plant splitting and choking a tree] (*cetaso ajjhārulhā*); weaken wisdom=in the sense of preventing the arising of insight–wisdom (*vipassanāpaññā*) and path–wisdom (*maggapaññā*) they weaken wisdom; what wisdom arises mixed together with these (hindrances), ... that they weaken = weaken wisdom-

"Enfeebled=the state of being wrapped up in the five hindrances (*pañcanīvaraṇapariyonaddhatta*), with strength departed (*apagatabalāya.*)

"Excellence of knowledge and vision befitting the noble ones transcending the human state=excellence of knowledge and vision able to realise the state of the noble ones transcending the human state called the ten good ways of action (*dasa kusala-kammapatha.*) (67)

To state in other words, the five obstructions and hindrances grow in and up over the mind, and enfeeble and weakn it in the way a parasite plant splits and chokes a tree; they prevent the arising of (i) mundane insight–wisdom (*vipassanāpaññā*) consisting of (a) knowledge–and–vision of things as they are (*yathābhūtañāṇadassana*), also called tender insight (*tarunavipassanā*) and (b) disenchantment

(*nibbidā*), and also called strong insight (*balavavipassanā*); and (ii) supramundane path-wisdom (*maggapaññā*) which is dispassion (*virāga*); further, they weaken any wisdom left by wrapping themselves round, and smothering, it. Thus, "with strength departed", one is incapable of knowing "his own welfare, another's welfare, or the welfare of both" and, unable to rise higher than "the human state called the ten good ways of action (*dasa kusala-kammapatha*)", fails to realise "the excellence of knowledge and vision befitting the noble ones".

And according to the *Saṅgīti Sutta*, "The ten good ways of action are: (1) abstention from killing, (2) abstention from taking what is not given, (3) abstention from sexual misconduct, (4) abstention from lying, (5) abstention from slander, (6) abstention from harsh speech, (7) abstention from gossip, (8) non-covetousness, (9) non-ill-will, and (10) right view" (61 a.)

In short, until one abandons these five hindrances no progress beyond these ten good ways of action is possible for him; no insight (vipassanā) attainment, and consequently, no path (*magga*) attainment.

But the opposite is possible. With the five hindrances abandoned, and hence "strong with wisdom", one is able to "know his own welfare, another's welfare, or the welfare of both and realise the excellence of knowledge and vision befitting the noble ones" by "transcending the

human state called the ten good ways of action" with the attainment of insight–wisdom (*vipassanā-paññā*) and path–wisdom (*maggapaññā*).

34. The Blessed One begins the *Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta* with these words: "Monks, the sole way of purity for beings, of overcoming sorrow and misery, of destroying pain and grief, of finding the right path, and of reaching extinction, is this road, that is to say, the four foundations of mindfulness.

"What four?

"Monks, here a monk practising body–contemplation on the body, dwells ardent, fully aware, and mindful, having got rid of covetousness and grief concerning the world; practising feeling–contemplation on feelings, dwells ardent, fully aware and mindful, having got rid of covetousness and grief concerning the world; practising mind–contemplation on the mind, dwells ardent, fully aware, and mindful, having got rid of covetousness and grief concerning the world; or practising phenomenon–contemplation on phenomena, dwells ardent, fully aware, and mindful, having got rid of covetousness and grief concerning the world." (62+)

It will be noted here that one has to practise each foundation of mindfulness "having got rid of covetousness and grief". And this is how the commentary explains these words: "Covetousness stands for sensual desire, and

grief, for anger. As sensual desire and anger are the principal hindrances the abandoning of the hindrances is stated by the overcoming of covetousness and grief". (63++)

Thus in the *Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta*, too, provision is made for the abandonment of the five hindrances before the development of the four foundations of mindfulness. However, in explaining phenomenon-contemplation (also rendered contemplation of mental things), the commentary says that five hindrances are "cast out" and are "incapable of arising, in the future" with the attainment of the four paths. This is attained gradually thus: (i) "The sensuality cast out by these six things becomes incapable of arising, in the future, through the attainment of the path of saintship";(64++)(ii) "The anger cast out by these six things, however, is finally destroyed by the attainment of the (path) stage of the Anāgāmi, the Never returner";(65++)(iii) "The sloth (also rendered rigidity) and torpor cast out by these six things are stopped from arising for ever in the future by the attainment of the path of saintship";(66++)(iv) "The flurry (also rendered agitation) cast out by these (six) things finally ceases to arise in the future through the attainment of the path of saintship, and the worry (also rendered anxiety) cast out by these (six) things finally ceases to arise in the future through the attainment of the path of the Non-returner"; (67++) (v) "The scepsis (also rendered doubt or uncertainty) cast ont

by these six things does not ever arise in the future only when it is destroyed by the attainment of the first stage of the saint".[1] (68++)

35. The occurrence is stated in other words in the following sutta thus: "Monks, a monk who has abandoned five factors and is endowed with five factors is called in this doctrine and discipline one who is fully accomplished (*kevali*), perfected (vusitavā), the highest of persons (*uttamapuriso*).

"How, monks, is a monk one who has abandoned five factors?

"Here, monks, a monk has abandoned sense-desire, ill-will, rigidity and torpor, agitation and anxiety, and doubt. Thus, monks, has a monk abandoned five factors.

"How, monks, is a monk endowed with five factors?

"Here, monks, a monk is endowed with the aggregates of virtue, concentration, wisdom, freedom, and knowledge and vision of freedom." (69)

The final and definitive abandonment of the five hindrances takes place here at the highest level.

Since that abandonment which precedes the four foundations of mindfulness is temporary, the hindrances are liable to arise again when the opposing factors are absent. Therefore when they happen to arise again they

are considered by way of presence (*santaṁ*), and when absent, by way of absence (*asantaṁ*), in the contemplation of mental things (also rendered phenomenon–contemplation).

NOTES

60. A. III, 63–64; Panc' ime bhikkhave avarana nivarana cetaso ajjharuha pannay dubblikarana. Katame panca?

Kamacchando bhikkhave avarano nivarano cetaso ajjharuho pannaya dubbalikarano, vyapado bhikkhave avarano nivarano cetaso ajjharuho pannaya dubbalikarano, thinamiddham bhikkhave avaranam nivaranam cetaso ajjharuham pannaya dubbalikarnam, uddhaccakukkucam bhikkeave avaranam nivaranam cetaso ajjharuham pannaya dubbalikaranam, vicikiccha bhikkhave avarana nivarana cetaso ajjharuha pannaya dubbalikarana.

Ime kho bhikkhave panca avarana nivarana cetaso ajjharuha pannaya dubbalikarana.

So vata bhikkhave bhikkhu ime panca avarane nivarane cetaso ajjharuhe pannaya duabbalikarane appanaya abalaya pannaya dubbalaya attattham va nassati parattham va nassati ubhayattham va nassati uttarim va manussaddhamma alamariyananadassamavisecam sacchikarissati ti n'etam thanamvijjati.

"So vata bhikkhave bhikkhu ime panca avarane nivarane cetaso ajjharuphe pannaya

dudbalikarane pahaya balavatiya pannaya attattham va nassati parattham va nassati ubhayattham vā nassati uttarim va manussadhamma alamariyananadassanavisesam sacchikarissati ti thanametam vijjati.

61. Mp. III, 256: Cetaso ajjharuha ti cettaso ajjharulha. Vipassanapannaya ca maggapannaya ca uppattinivaranatthena dubbalam karonti ti pannaya dubbalikarana; ya va etehi saddhim vokinnapanna uppajjati tam dubbalam karonti ti pannaya dubbalikarana.

Abalaya ti pancanivaranapariyonaddhatta apagatabalaya.

Uttarim va manussadhamma alamariyana nadassanavisesam ti dasakusala–kammapathasamkhata manussanam dhamma uttarim ariyabhavam katum samattham nanadassanavisesam.

61. A. D. III, 269: Dasa kusala–kammapatha· Panatipata veramani, adinnadana veramani, kamesu micchacara veramani, musavada veramani, pisunaya vacaya veramani, pharusaya vacaya veramani, samphappalapa veramani, anabhijjha, avyapado, sammaditthi.

62. M. I, 55–56: Ekayano ayam bhikkhave maggo sattanam visuddhiya sokaparidevanam samatikkamaya dukkhadomanassanam atthgamaya nayassa adhigamaya nibbanassa sacchikiriyaya, yadidam cattaro satipatnana, katame cattaro: Idha bhikkhave bhikkhu kaye kayanuis spaviharati atapi sampajano satima vineyya

loke abhijjhadomanassam, vedanasu vedananupassi viharati atapi sampajano satima vineyya loke abhijjhadomanassam citte cittanupassi viharati atapi sampajano satima vineyya loke abhijjhadomanassam, dhammesu dhammanupassi viharpti atapi sampajano satima vineyya loke abhijjhadomanassam, + Soma Thera's translation in Foundations of Mindfulness, Free Publications Society, Colombo 1955.

63. Ps. I. 244: Yasma pan'ettha abhijjhagahanena kamacchando, domanassagahanena vyapado sangham gacchati, tasma nivaranapariyapanna, balavadhammadvayadassanena nivaranapnahanam vuttam hoti ti veditabbam.

+ + Soma Thera's translation in The way of Mindfulness, published by Mrs B. Moonesinghe, Colombo (1949).

64. PS. I, 282: Imehi pana chahi dhammehi pahinassa kamacchandasssa arahattamaggena ayatim anuppado hoti ti pajanati.

65. Ps. I, 83: Imehi pana chahi dammhehi pahinassa vyapadassa anagamimaggena ayatim anuppado hoti ti pajanati.

66. Ps. I, 284: Imehi pana chahi dammehi pahinassa thinamiddhassa arahattamaggdna ayatim anuppado hoti ti pajanati.

67. Ps. I, 285: Imehi pana chahi dhammehi pahine uddhaccakukkucce uddhaccassa arahattamaggena, kukkuccassa anagamimaggena ayatim anuppado hoti ti pajanati.

68- Ps. I, 286: Imehi pana chahi dhammehi pahinaya vicikicchaya sotapattimaggena ayatim anuppado hoti ti pajanati.

69. A. V. 16: Pancangavippahino bhikkhave bhikkhu pancangasamannagato imasmim dhammavinaye "kevali vusitava uttamaporiso" ti vuccati.

Kathan ca bhikkhave bhikkhu pancangavippahino hoti?

Idha bhikkhave bhikkhuno kamacchando pahino hoti, vyapado pahino hoti, thinamiddham pahinam hoti, uddaccakukkucam pahinam hoti, vicikiccha pahina hoti. Evam kho khikkhave bhikkhu pancangavippahino hoti.

Kathan ca bhikkhave bhikkhu pancangasamannagato hoti?

Idha bhikkhave bhikkhu asekhena silakkhandhena samannagato hoti, asekhena samadhikkhandhena samannagato hoti, asekhena pannakhandhena samannagato hoti, asekhena vimuttikkhandhena samannagato hoti, asekhena vimuttinanadassanakkhandhena samannagato hoti. Evam kho bhikkhave bhikkhu pancangasamannagato hoti.

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION:

Reply to Rejoinder II–IV.

By Kheminda Thera

(Ceylon)

Here it may be mentioned that the *Netti Pakarana* explains the passage "Ardent, fully aware, and mindful, having got rid of covetousness and grief concerning the world" thus: "Ardent=the controlling faculty of energy. Fully aware=the controlling faculty of wisdom. Mindful=the controlling faculty of mindfulness. Having got rid of covetousness and grief concerning the world=the controlling faculty of concentration".(70) And we know that the controlling faculty of concentration is composed of the four jhānas. Now, the reader would have noted that the words "Having got rid of covetousness and grief" placed immediately before the four foundations of mindfulness are explained (a) negatively, representing the abandonment aspect, and (b) positively, the possession aspect. The abandonment is that of the five hindrances; and the possession, that of the factors of the four jhānas which constitute the controlling faculty of concentration. And since "The abandonment of the hindrances by suppression occurs in him who develops the first jhāna". (71) The first jhāna is indicated by the words "Having got rid of covetousness and grief". Further, as

access cannot be described as the controlling faculty of concentration, these words refer not to the abandonment of the hindrances that occur in access, but to that which occurs in jhāna; and the first jhāna is the lowest attainment that can be described both as an abandonment of the five hindrances and as a possesion of jhāna factors,

The following sutta, unlike the other suttas dealing with the foundations of mindfulness hitherto discussed, (a) describes the event, i.. e. the acquirement of this prerequisite of the four foundations of mindfulness, not negatively as an abandonment, but positively as an attainment, thus confirming the explanation given in the *Netti Pakarana*; (b) classifies those who develop the foundations of mindfulness into three groups, and (c) states precisely why they develop them.

"Monks, those monks, recently gone forth, new comers to this doctrine and discipline, should be spurred on to, advised, and made firm, in the development of the foundations of mindfulness. Which four and how? (Thus:) 'Come brothers, (a) ardent, fully aware, singleminded (*ekodi-bhūta*), with thought quite purified (*vippasanna-citta*), concentrated (*samāhita*), and unified of mind (*ekagga-citta*), dwell practising body-contemplation on the body (for the purpose of attaining to) the knowledge of the body as it really is; (b) ardent, fully aware, singleminded with thought quite purified, concentrated, and unified of mind dwell

practising feeling–contemplation on feelings for (the purpose of attaining to) the knowledge of feelings as they really are; (c) ardent, fully aware, singleminded, with thought quite purified, concentrated, and unified of mind, dwell practising mind–contemplation on the mind for (the purpose of attaining to) the knowledge of the mind as it really is; (d) ardent, fully aware, singleminded, with thought quite purified, concentrated and unified of mind, dwell practising phenomenon–contemplation on phenomena for (the purpose of attaining to) the knowledge of phenomena as they really are.

"Monks, those who are learners (*sekhā*), who with non–negligent minds, and aspiring for the peerless freedom from all bonds, they too, (a) ardent, fully aware, singleminded with thought quite purified, concentrated, and unified of mind, dwell practising body-contemplation on the body for (the purpose of attaining to) full knowledge of the body; (b) ardent, fully aware, single–minded, with thought quite purified, concentrated, and unified of mind, dwell practising feeling–contemplation on feelings for (the purpose of attaining to) full knowledge of feelings; (c) ardent, fully aware, singleminded, with thought quite purified, concentrated, and unified of mind, dwell practising mind–contemplation on the mind for (the purpose of attaining to) full knowledge of the mind; (d) ardent, fully aware, singleminded, with thought quite purified, concentrated, and unified of mind,

dwell practising phenomenon-contemplation on phenomena for (the purpose of attaining to) full knowledge of phenomena.

"Monks, those who are consummate ones, who have destroyed the cankers, perfected, who have done what has to be done, who have laid down the burden, who have won to the goal, who have destroyed the fetters of the states of existence, and are freed by uttermost knowledge, they too, (a) ardent, fully aware, singleminded, with thought quite purified, concentrated, and unified of mind, dwell practising body-contemplation on the body detached from the world as regards the body; (b) ardent, fully aware, singleminded, with thought quite purified, concentrated, and unified of mind, dwell practising feeling-contemplation on feelings detached from the world as regards feelings; (c) ardent, fully aware, singleminded, with thought purified, concentrated, and unified of mind, dwell practising mind-contemplation on the mind detached from the world as regards the mind; (d) ardent, fully aware, singleminded, with thought quite purified, concentrated, and unified of mind, dwell practising phenomenon-contemplation on phenemona detached from the world as regards phenomena." (72)

The commentary explains: "Singleminded= collected with momentary concentration, concentrated; unified of mind=well-established unified mind by way of access and full concentration.

In this sutta the foundations developed by the younger monks (*navaka-bhikkhūhi*) as well as by the destroyers of the cankers (*khīnāsavehi*) are those of earlier portion (*pubba-bhāga*). Those developed by the seven learners (*Sattahi Sekhehi*) are mixed". i.e., composed of the earlier portion (*pubba-bhāga*) and the later portion (*aparu-bhāga*). (73)

In common with the *Satipaṭṭhāna* and other suttas thus far discussed, this sutta contains the terms "ardent, fully aware". But instead of "mindful, having got rid of covetousness and grief concerning the world", it has "single-minded, with thought quite purified, concentrated, and unified of mind". Where the other suttas formulate the approach to the four foundations of mindfulness as an abandonment, i. e. that of the hindrances, this sutta does so as an attainment, i. e. that of concentration.

Now, since the younger monks mentioned in this sutta are commoners (*puthujjana*), and therefore the foundations of mindfulness they develop are those of the earlier portion, the faculty of concentration (*Samādhindriya*) equated with the getting rid of the covetousness and grief in the *Netti Pakaraṇa* is also mundane (*lokiya*). Thus mundane controlling faculty of concentration (*lokiya-samādhindriya*) of the former portion (*pubba-bhāga*) precedes the supramundane controlling faculty of concentration (*lokuttara samādhindriya*) of the later portion (*apara-bhāga*).

The following sutta shows that there are two other groups of persons who develop the four foundations of mindfulness. "Thus monks, here a certain, foolish, inexperienced, unskilful monk dwells practising body-contemplation on the body, ardent, fully aware, and mindful, having got rid of covetousness and grief concerning the world. As he so dwells practising body-contemplation on the body, his mind is not concentrated (*cittaṁ na samādhiyanti*), the impurities are not abandoned (*upakkilesā na pahiyānti*), and he does not acquire the sign (*So taṁ nimittaṁ na ugganhāti*). Thus with feelings....mind. He dwells practising phenomenon-contemplation on the phenomena, ardent, fully aware, and mindful, having got rid of covetousness and grief concerning the world. As he so dwells practising phenomenon-contemplation on phenomena, his mind is not concentrated, the impurities are not abandoned, and he does not acquire the sign.

"In this manner, monks, this foolish, inexperienced, unskilful monk is neither an obtainer of the abidings in happiness here and now, nor an obtainer of mindfulness and full awareness. What is the reason for that? Because, monks, this foolish, inexperienced, unskilful monk, does not acquire his own mental sign (*sakassa cittassa nimittaṁ na ugganhāti*).....

"Thus, monks, here a certain wise, experienced, skilful monk dwells practising body-contemplation on the body, ardent, fully aware,

and mindful, having got rid of covetousness and grief concerning the world. As he so dwells practising body-contemplation on the body his mind is concentrated (*cittaṁ samādhiyanti*), the impurities are abandoned (*upakkilesā pahīyanti*) and he acquires the sign (*So taṁ nimittaṁ ugganhāti*). Thus with feelings... mind. He dwells practising phenomenon-contemplation on phenomena, ardent, fully aware, and mindful, having got rid of covetousness and grief concerning the world. As he so dwells contemplating phenomena, his mind is concentrated, the impurities are abandoned and he acquires the sign.

"In this manner, monks, this wise, experienced, skilful monk abides in happiness here and now, and is mindful and fully aware as well. What is the reason for that? Because, monks, this wise, experienced, skilful monk acquires his own mental sign (*sakassa cittassa nimittaṁ ugganhāti*)" (74)

The commentary explains: "The impurities= the five hindrances. Does not acquire the sign= he does not know "For me this subject of contemplation stands knocking at 'conformity (consciousness)' or at 'change-of-lineage'"; he is unable to acquire his own mental sign. In this sutta is given insight of the former portion of the foundations of mindfulness." (75)

Since this is the description of the foolish, inexperienced, unskilful monk, the opposite is true of the wise, experienced, skilful monk. He

acquires the sign and knows when he stands knocking either at 'conformity (consciousness)' or at 'change-of-lineage'. Further, there is the statement of the sutta, that he attains the abidings in happiness here and now (*lābhī hoti diṭṭheva dhamme sukhaviharanaṁ*); and this the foolish, inexperienced, unskilful monk does not attain.

Though the commentary is silent here, we know from other sutta passages and their commentaries that the expression "Abidings in happiness here and now", is one of the descriptions of the four jhānas. For instance, the passage: "The four jhānas which are of the clearest consciousness, and which are the abidings of happiness here and now" is explained in the commentary thus: "Abidings in happiness here and now=abidings in happiness in the world. This world=is called the living beings perceptible to the senses. Here being abidings in happiness is the meaning. It is an "approximate synonym" for the form plane jhānas. The contemplators who sit having attained those (jhānas) experience the untarnished happiness of renunciation in this very life. Therefore they are called abidings in happiness here and now". (76)

The foregoing shows that when the former portion of the four foundations of mindfulness is developed the four jhānas arise, and for these reasons: (i) the mind is concentrated (*cittaṁ samādhiyati*); (ii) the impurities which are

the five hindrances, are abandoned (*upakkilesa* (=*pañca nīvaraṇa*) *pahīyanti* (iii) the sign is acquired (*nimittaṁ uggaṇhāti*). The sign is either "conformity (*anuloma*)" or "change-of-lineage (*gotrabhu*)"; and (iv) the abidings in happiness here and now are attained (*labhi hoti diṭṭheva dhamme sukhavihāraṇaṁ*), which is an "approximate synonym" for the form plane jhānas (*rūpāvacarajjhānānaṁ etaṁ adhivacanaṁ*).

What is stated in these suttas regarding the arising of the four jhānas as the four foundations of mindfulness are being developed is partially stated in the commentary to the *Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta* thus: "Indeed to that yogī training in respiration-mindfulness according to the method taught thus: "He, thinking 'I breathe in long', understands when he is breathing in long ... Calming the activity of the body ... I breathe out, thinking out, he trains himself, the four absorptions (*cattāri jhānāni*) arise in the respiration sign". (77+)

It was said in section 1 (a) & (b) that the abandonment of the five hindrances precedes the development of the foundations of mindfulness. This we have seen in section 35 is not the mere abandonment which occurs in access, but that which occurs with the arising of the jhāna factors.

At this point one is entitled to say that sufficient material has been placed before the reader in support of the orderly procedure of

the teaching of "gradual training, work and practice". This procedure is inviolable since it is the word of the Saṁbuddha. It consists in the main of virtue, concentration, and wisdom as taught in the suttas, and commentaries and sub-commentaries that "fit in with the suttas", in compliance with the instructions of the Buddha given in the *Catu Mahāpadesa Sutta*. Here virtue is the basis of concentration, and concentration is the basis of wisdom. Therefore the order of practice or development is also the order in which they are mentioned. It is at this third and last stage, namely wisdom, that insight is developed. Considered by way of the purifications this corresponds to the five purifications beginning with purification of View, where insight begins.

We saw (1) in section 8 that "concentration=the eight attainments which are the basis of insight"; (2) in section 9 that "Purification of Consciousness is the eight attainments together with access"; (3) in section 15, (a) that "when there is right concentration, he who is possessed of right concentration, he is endowed with the sufficing condition of knowledge-and-vision of things as they are", and (b) that knowledge-and-vision of things as they are is tender insight; and (4) in section 4 that right concentration is defined as the four jhānas.

Any rearrangement or alteration of this procedure is to interfere with the clearly

formulated instructions of the Buddha, there being no short cuts or alternate roads to nibbāna. There is but one way to it.

NOTES

70. Netti Pakarana 31: Tasam ti ha tvam bhikkhu kaye kayanupassi viharahi atapi sampajano satima viyeyya loke abhijjhadomanassam.

Atapi ti viriyindriyam. Sampajano ti pannindriyam. Satima ti satindriyam. Vineyya loke abhijjhadomanassan ti samadhindriyam.

71. Pts. I, 27: Vikkhambhanapphanan ca nivaranananam pathamajjhanam bhavayato.

72. S. V, 144–45: Ye te bhikkhave bhikkhu nava acirapabbejita adhunagata imam dhammavinayam te ve bhikkhave bhikkhu catunnam satipatthananam bhavanaya samadapetabba nivesetabba patitthapetabba, katamesam catunnam.

Etha tumhe avaso kaye kayanupassino viharatha, atapino sampajana ekodibhuta vippasannacitta samahita ekaggacitta kayassa yathabhutam nanaya. Vedanasu vedannanupassino viharatha, atapino sampajana ekodidhuta vippasannacitta samahita ekaggacitta vedananam yathabhutam nanaya. Citte cittanupassino viharatha atapino sampajana ekodibhuta vippasannacitta samahita ekaggacitta cittassa yathabhutam nanaya, Dhamnesu dhammanupassino viharatha, atapino sampajana ekodibhuta vippa-

sannacitta samahita ekaggacitta dhammanam yathabhutam nanaya.

Ye te bhikkhave bhikkhu sekha appattamanasa anuttaram yogakkhenam patthayamana viharanti, te pi kaye kayanupassino viharanti, atāpino sampajana ekodibhuta vippasannacitta samahita ekaggacitta kayassa parinnaya, Vedanasu vedananupassino viharanti,.... pe .... vedananam parinnaya. Citte cittanupassino viharanti, (....pe ...), cittassa parinnaya. Dhammesu dhammanupassino viharanti, atapino sampajana ekodibhuta vippasannacitta samahita ekaggacitta dhammanam parinnaya.

Ye pi te bhikkhave bhikkhu arahanto khinasava vusitavanto katakaraniya ohitabhara anuppattasadattha parikkhinabhavasamyojana sammadanna vimutta, te pi kaye kayanupassino viharanti, atapino sampajana ekodibhuta vippasannacitta samahita ekaggacitta kayena visamyutta. Vedanasu vedananupassino viharanti. (....pe....), vedanahi visamyutta. Citte (....pe....), cittena visamyutta. Dhammesu dhammanupassino viharanti, atapino sampajana ekodibhuta vippasannacitta samahita ekaggacitta dhammehi visamyutta.

73. Spk. III, 200: Ekodibhuta ti, khanika–samadhina ekaggabhuta, samahita, Ekagga–citta ti, upacan' appana–vasena samma thapita–citta ca ekagga–citta ca. Imasmim sutte navaka–bhikkhuhi c'eva khinasavehi ca bhavita–satipatthana pubbabhage, sattahi sekhehi bhavita missaka.

74. S. V. 150–52. Evam eva kho bhikkhave idhekącco balo avyatto akusalo bhikkhu kaya kayanupassi viharati, atapi sampajino satima vineyya loke abhiljhadomanassam, tassa kaye kayanupassino viharato cittam na samadhiyati upakkilesa na pahiyyanti, so tam nimittam na uggan–hati. Vedanasu....Citte....Dhammesu dhammanupassi viharati, atapi sampajano satima vineyya loke abhijjhadmanassam, tassa dhommesu dhammanupassino vlharato cittam na samadhiyati upakkilesa na pahiyyanti so tam nimittam na ugganhati.

Sa kho so bhikkhave balo avyatto akusalo bhikkhu ra ceva labhi dittheva dhamme sakhaviharanam, na labhi satisampajannassa, tem kissa hetu? Tatha hi so bhikkhave balo avyatto akusalo bhikkhu sakassa cittassanimittam ugganhati.

Evam eva kho bhikkhave idhekacco pandito vyatto kusalo bhikkhu kaya kayanupassi viharati, atapi sampajano satima vineyya loke abhijjhadomanassam, tassa kaye kayanupassino viharrato cittam samadhi -yati upakkilesa pahiyanti, So tam nimittam uggan- hati. Vedanasu (.., pe ...). Citte (p)Dha mmesu dhammanupassi viharati, atapi sampajano satima vineyya loke abhijjhadomanassam, tassodhammanupassino viharato cittam samādhiyati upakkilesa pahiyanti, so tam nimittam ugganhati.

Sa kho so bhikkhave pandito vyatto kusalo bhikkhu labhi ceva hoti dittheva dhamme

sukhaviharanam labhi hoti satisampajannassa, tam kissa hetu. Tatha hi so bhikkhave pandito vyatto kusalo bhikkhu sakassa cittassa oimittam ugganhati ti.

75, Spk. III, 201: Upakkilesa ti, panca nivarana. Nimittam na ugganhati ti, imam me kammatthanm anulomam va gotrabhun; va ahacca thitkn ti na janati: attano cittassa nimittam ganhitum na sakkoti. Imasmim sutte pubha–bhaga–vipassana satipatthana va kathita.

76. M. I. 33: A. II, 23: Catunnam jhananam abhicetasiaunam ditthadhammasuaharanow (=Ps. I. 161; MP. III, 29: Ditthadhammasuahaviharanan ti ditthadhamme sukkhavihoranam. Ditthadhammo ti paccakkho attabhavo vuccati; tattha suahaviharabhutanan ti attho. Rupavacarajjananam ctam aphivacanam; tani hi appetva nisinna jhayino imasmim yeva attabhave assamkilittha–nekkhammasukham vindanti, tasma ditthadhammasukhaviharani ti vuccanti.

77. Ps. I, 748–49: Tassa panna imesam digham va assasanto digham assasami ti pajanati....pe....possambhayam kayasinkharam passasissami ti sikkhati ti evam vuttanam assasapassasanam vasena sikkhato assasapassasa–nimitte cattari jhanani uppajjanti. + Soma Thera's translation, The Way of Mindfulness, 1949.

(Concluded)

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION

Rebuttal of Reply to Rejoinder I–I

By Sayadaw U Nyanuttara Agga Mahā Paṇḍita

(Burma)

I have read carefully the Ven. Khemindа Thera's Reply to my Rejoinder I–I, II, III and IV in the March, April, May and June, 1967, issues of *World Buddhism*.

I have also read the Ven. Khemindа's Reply to my Rejoinder II, in the July, August and September issues. I shall deal with his Reply II in due course. Here I shall confine myself to his Reply to my Rejoinder I–II, III and IV.

In these articles the Ven. Khemindа makes, in the main, the following allegations and assertions:

I. That he is inspired, not by prejudice, but by the instruction of the Buddha given in the *Mahāpadesa Sutta*.

2. (a) The Five Hindrances are the weakeners of wisdom and so *vipassanā* insight is possible only when they are abandoned. (b) The four foundations of mindfulness should be developed only after the abandonment of the hindrances. They can be abandoned only by means of *jhāna* and so *vipassanā* contemplation should be begun only after the development of *jhāna*.

3. (a) Any yogi, *samathayānika* or *vipassanāyānika*, develops *samatha* at the stage of Purification of Mind, and *vipassanā* begins with Purification of View, and (b) only at the latter stage the terms *samathayānika* and *vipassanāyānika* occur for the first time.

4. The development of the Noble Eightfold Path is described in two ways: (i) by way of the three aggregates of virtue, concentration and wisdom; (ii) by way of the seven purifications. In both these methods the development of insight begins at the third stage of Purification of View. Meanwhile the first two stages have already been developed.

5. After developing virtue it is not possible to develop wisdom, skipping concentration. Should *vipassanā* be developed without *samatha* the stages of Purification of Mind and Purification of View would be reversed.

6. *Vipassanā* cannot be developed before the development of Purifications of Virtue and Mind.

7. Because (a) Purification of Mind arises after insight; (b) Purification of Mind is given a new definition; (c) Purification of Mind takes the place of Purification of View; (d) The Ven. Ñāyanaponika says that this has been introduced into the practice by the Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw; it is called a new method.

8. In translating "vuttappa'kāraṁ samathaṁ anuppādetvā va, ti" the word "previously" is an unjustified introduction because the phrase means "just without producing the said serenity", *eva* meaning "just".

9. Only *jhāna* concentration is Right Concentration (*sammāsamādhi maggaṅga*). Without this concentration the knowledge and vision of things as they really are (*yathābhūtañāṇa-dassana*) is not possible.

10. Concentration developed after insight is called *vipassanā sampayutta samādhi* or *nibbedhabhāgiya samādhi*. It is not called *citta visuddhi*.

11. *Upacāra* (access), *appanā* (fixed) and *khaṇika* (momentary) concentrations do not arise after insight.

12. The Commentary to the *Dhammadāyada Sutta* describes only that area of development of the yogi's practice which begins with insight. It does not cover the whole range of his development. It does not even touch the first two stages of the yogi's development. The confusion that seeks to include in the term Purification of Mind all forms of concentration that arise in the course of development of contemplation is due to the failure to locate this area of development.

13. *Cittāṁ Samādahanto* is explained in the Commentary to this Sutta as being concerned only with *samathayānika*, not with *suddhavipassa-*

nāyānika. So *khaṇika cittekaggatā* referred to therein is not concerned with *suddhavipassanā-yānika.*

14. Purification of Mind is the proximate cause of insight, and without this proximate cause, can its result, i. e. Purification of View where insight begins, even come to be? It is a fictitious insight that this new teaching speaks of. What it does for the yogi who accepts its method is to halt his progress at the end of Purification of Virtue.

Now I am going to deal with the points raised by the Ven. Kheminda in serial order.

ANSWER TO NO. 1

The Ven. Kheminda assures me that he is inspired, not by prejudice but by the instruction given in the *Mahāpadesa Sutta.* Referring to his lop-sided view of Momentary Concentration and Purification of Mind, I asked: "Was he inspired by prejudice?" I cannot see any reason how he can justify his lop-sided view by an appeal to the *Mahāpadesa Suttā.* As a matter of fact, his Reply to my Rejoinder I, II, III and IV contain contentions that, by and large, go against the Buddha's instruction in this Sutta. This will become more clear in my answers to his allegations.

Judging by his wholesale quotation of this Sutta, he shows no clear comprehension of the

passage that constitutes its essence, in which the Buddha instructs that, one must accept as his words if they fit in with the Dhamma (Ti-piṭaka) and accord with the Vinaya, which destroy defiling passions such as *rāga*, and reject them if they do not, as described in the *Mahāpadesa Sutta*, *Sañcetaniyavagga*, *Catukka Nipāta*, *Aṅguttara Nikāya* and *Mahāvagga*, *Dīgha Nikāya*.

ANSWER TO NO. 2 (a)

The Ven. Kheminda writes that five hindrances are the weakeners of wisdom and so *vipassanā* insight is possible only when they are abandoned. This is in accord with the instruction in the *Mahāpadesa Sutta*, and must be accepted without any reservations. Neither the Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw nor I have ever written to the contrary. Although it is quite clear that our writings are in consonance with the Buddha's teachings, the Ven. Kheminda not being able to comprehend them, is inclined to allege that we write to the contrary. This allegation reveals his weak point.

ANSWER TO NO. 2 (b)

The Ven. Kheminda asserts that the four foundations of mindfulness should be developed only after the abandonment of the hindrances, and that they can be abandoned only by means of

jhāna, and so *vipassanā* contemplation should be begun only after the development of *jhāna*. These assertions do not fit in with the Buddha's instruction in the *Mahāpadesa Sutta*. As they are diametrically opposite to the Buddha's instruction I cannot accept them.

I shall answer both points together. Bereft of *jhāna*, many a disciple of the Buddha became an arahant after abandoning the five hindrances by means of the contemplation of the four foundations of mindfulness. This fact is well-known, being in accordance with thc discourses of the Buddha. However, as the Ven. Kheminda is not aware of even this well-known fact, I feel it is my duty to explain it.

There are many discourses in which the Buddha enjoined upon his disciples, awaiting to hear instructions on contemplation to establish themselves first in virtue and then develop the four foundations of mindfulness. Considering that in these discourses the Bnddha did not say that the disciples must develop concentration after establishing themselves in virtue, it is obvious that the hindrances can be abandoned while developing *vipassanā* without *samatha*. When the hindrances are abandoned, Purification of Mind is surely attained.

The Ven. Kheminda should ponder well the following passage taken from *Bhikkhu Sutta, Ambapāli Vagga. Satipaṭṭhāna Saṁyutta,* The Buddha said thus to the bhikkhu asking for contemplation instruction:

"Well then, monk, you must purify the rudiments in good states. And what are the rudiments in good states? They are virtue that is truly pure, and straight view. Now, monk, when your virtue shall be truly pure and your view straight, thenceforward, monk, leaning on virtue, established in virtue, you can cultivate the four stations of mindfulness in a threefold way. What four? Herein monk, as regards your own self, in body contemplating body (as transient) do you abide ardent, composed and mindful, having restrained the dejection in the world that arises from coveting. Or, as regards externals, in body contemplating body in feelings contemplating feelings ...in mind contemplating mind...in mind-states contemplating mind states do you abide ardent, composed and mindful, having restrained the dejection that arises in the world owing to coveting And that monk was yet another one of the Arahants. (*The Book of Kindred Sayings* V.P.T.S. pages 121 and 122. III, I III. Monk), Again, in the *Bāhiya Sutta. Nālanda Vagga, Satipaṭṭhāna Saṁyutta.* the Buddha said:

"In such case, Bahiya, you must purify the rudiments in good states. And what are the rudiments in good states? It is virtue that is truly pure and straight view. Now, Bahiya, when your virtue shall be truly pure and your view straight, then-

ceforward, leaning on virtue, established in virtue, you can cultivate the four stations of mindfulness....And Bahiya was yet another (one) of the Arahants. (*The Book of Kindred Sayings*, V, page 145 XLVII, II, V. Bahiya." (2)

The Buddha said likewise in *Uttiya Sutta, Nālanda Vagga, Satipaṭṭhāna Saṁyutta* (ibid, page 146) (3)

Yet again in the *Pātimokkha Sutta, Amata Vagga, Satipaṭṭhānā Saṁyutta*, the Buddha said:

"Herein, monk, do you dwell self-controlled according to the self-control of the Obligations, well equipped in your range of practice, seeing danger in minutest faults, and, undertaking the precepts, do you train yourself therein....Now, monk, when you have dwelt self-controlled...., then leaning on virtue, established in virtue, you should cultivate the four stations of mindfulness....And that monk was yet another (one) of the Arahants, (*The Book of Kindred Sayings*, V, pages 163 & 164, XLVII, III, V, VI, obligation). (4).

The Ven. Kheminda should not fail to note, and bear in mind, that these discourses do not contain any inkling of the necessity of developing *samatha* to abandon the hindrances before one develops the four foundations of mindfulness.

In the *Duccarita Sutta, Amata Vagga, Satipaṭṭhāna, Saṁyutta,* the Buddha said that the disciples ought to develop virtue by avoiding evil conduct, and by cultivating good conduct, and having established in virtue, to develop the four foundations of mindfulness. It is shown therein that those who carried out the Buddha's instructions attained to Arahantship. (5)

In all the discourses mentioned above the Buddha instructed his disciples to establish themselves in virtue first, and having established in virtue, to develop the four foundations of mindfulness. The Buddha did not instruct, as maintained by the Ven. Kheminda, to develop *jhāna* with a view to abandoning the hindrances before the development of the four foundations of mindfulness is begun.

Judging by this, it is crystal clear that the generally accepted view that, virtue having been established, the hindrances are abandoned in the course of contemplation of the four foundations of mindfulness resulting in Purification of Mind, is in accord with the teachings of the Buddha. The Ven. Kheminda's view that the hindrances can be abandoned only by *jhāna,* not by contemplation of the four foundations of mindfulness, is not in accord with the aforesaid discourses as well as with the *Mahāpadesa Sutta,* and so runs counter to the Buddha's teaching.

The Ven. Kheminda, clinging to his ill-conceived view and reiterating it in his writings,

is defying the Buddha's authority. To such persons who points out what is not Dhamma as Dhamma, what is Dhamma as not Dhamma, the Buddha said categorically thus in *Pamadhadi Vagga II*, *Eka Nipata*, *Aṅguttara Nikaya*: "Such conduct of theirs is to the loss of many folk.... They beget great demerit and cause the disappearance of this true Dhamma". *"The Baok of Gradual Saying* I page 13, 1, 10, 33. Not-Dhamma (a) (b)

In the discourses referred above, it is stated in unmistakable terms that monks, such as Bahiya and Uttiya, who, having established themselves in virtue and developed the four foundations of mindfulness, attained to Arahantship. Therefore, it is manifest that, having established in virtue, one can begin contemplation of the four foundations of mindfulness straightaway, without having to develop concentration by any other means; and that momentary access and fixed concentration can be aptly developed in the course of contemplation of the four foundations of mindfulness resulting in Purification of Mind and realisation of *magga-phalañāṇa*.

In this regard, that momentary, access and fixed concentration can be developed in the course of contemplation of the four foundations of mindfulness is positively stated in *Sāla Sutta*, *Ambapāla Vagga*, *Satipaṭṭhāna Saṁyutta*, as well as in its Commentary and Sub–Commentary:

"Monks, those who are novices, not long gone forth (from home) late-comers into this Norm and Discipline, such monks should be aroused and admonished for, and established in, the cultivation of the four stations of mindfulness. Of what four and how? (Ye should say this:)

"Come ye, friends do ye abide contemplating body (as transient) ardent, composed and one-pointed, of tranquil mind, calmed down, of concentrated mind, for insight into body as it really is. In feelings in mind in mind-states as they really are".

(*Book of Kindred Sayings*; *V. page* 123, III, I, IV, Sāla (7) Its Commentary explains thus:

"One-pointed" means being one-pointed by momentary concentration. "Calmed-down, of concentrated mind" means being calmed down, of concentrated mind, by access and fixed concentration. In this Sutta, the foundation of mindfulness developed by the newly-ordained monks as well as by the arahants is that preceding *ariya magga phala* (*pubbabhāga*), and the foundation of mindfulness developed by the seven *sekha* (those who are in training) is mixed (*missaka*)-(8)

NOTES

(1) S. (III, 124) Tasmat'iha tvam bhikkhu adim'eva visodhehi kusalesu dhammesu. Ko c'adi kusalanam dhammanam? Silanca suvisudddam

ditthi ca ujuka. Yato kho te bhikkhu silanca suvisuddham bhavissati ditthi ca ajuka, tato tvam bhikkhu silam nissaya sile patitthaya cattaro satipatthane tividhena bhaveyyasi..... Annataro ca pana so bhikkhu arahatom ahosi.

(2) S, (III, 43), Tasmat'iha tvam bahiya adim,eva visodhehi kusalesu dhammesu....tato tvam bahiva silam nissaya sile patitthaya cattato satipatthane bhaveyyasi....Annataro ca pana-ayasma bahiyo arahatam ahosi.

(3) S. (III, 144). The same Pali as above.

(4) (III, 163) Tasmat,iha tvan bhikkhu aim'eva visodhehi kusalesu dhammesu. Ko c'adi kusalanam dhammanam? Idha tvam bhikkhu patimokkhasamvarasamvuto viharahi acaragocaa-sampanno anumattesu vajjesu bhayadassavi samadaya sikkhati sikkhapadesu. Iato kho tvam bhikkhu patimokkhasamvarasamvuto viharissasi acaragocarasampanno anumattesu vajjesu bhaya-dassavi samadaya sikkhissasi sikkhapadesu, tato tvam bhikkhu silam nissaya sile patitthaya cattaro satipatthane bhaveyyasi....Annataro ca pana so bhikkhu arahatam ahosi.

(5) S. (III, 164) Yato kho tvam bhikkhu kayaduccaritam pahaya kayasucaritam bha-vessasi, vaciduccaritam....manoduccaritam pa-haya manosucaritam bhavessasi tato tvam bhikkhu silam nissaya sile patitthaya cattaro satipatthane bhaveyyasi....Annataro ca pana so bhikkhu arahatam ahosi.

(6) A. (I, 18) Ye te bhikkhave bhikkhu adhammam 'dhammo'ti dipentiad hamman'ti dipenti, bhikkhave bhikkhu bahujanaahitaya patipanna bahujanaasukhaya bahuno janassa anatthaya ahitaya dukkhaya devamanussanam,bahunca te bhikkhava bhikkhu apunnam pasavanti, te c'iman saddhammam anataradhapenti.

(7) S. (III), 125) Ye tebbhikkhave bhikkhu navo acirapabbajita adhunagata imam dhammavinayam, te vo bhikkhave bhikkhu catunnam satipattha namam bhavunaya samadapetabba nivesetabba patitthapetabba: "etha tumhe avuso kaye kayanusupassino viharatha atapino sampajana ekodiauta vippassanacitta samahita ekaggacitta kayassa yathabhutam nanaya, vedanasu vedanupassino .. ....vedananam yathabhutam nanaya, dhammesu dhammanupassano .... dhammanasem yathabhutum nanaya" ti.

(8) SC. (III), 234) Ekodiduta ti ahunikasamadina ekaggabhuta. Samahita ekaggacitta ti upucarappanavasena samma thapirecittu ca ekaggacitta ca. Imasmim sutte navakabhikkhuhi c'eva khinasavehi ca bhavith satipattha na. pubbabagu sekhehi bhavita missaka.

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION

Rebuttal of Reply to Rejoinder I–II

By Sayadaw U Nyanuttara Agga Maha Pandita

(Burma)

Judging by the *Sela Sutta*, *Ambapāla Vagga*, *Satipaṭṭhāna Saṁyutta* and Commentary, the Ven. Kheminda cannot help but accept that momentary, access and fixed concentrations, all three, can be developed in the course of contemplation of the four foundations of mindfulness. Nevertheless, the Ven. Kheminda, who is very skilful in transferring momentary concentration from one place to the other, may, of his own accord, like to mix up the momentary concentration explained in this Commentary with the concentration partaking of penetration (*nibbedhabhāgiya samādhi*), and, in a flurry of confusion, assign it close to *magga*.

Considering that this Sutta also makes mention of the newly ordained monks beginning to contemplate on the four foundations of mindfulness with a view to seeing things as they really are, the Ven. Kheminda ought to understand that he cannot transport, as he may like, the momentary concentration from its rightful place of Purification of Mind. That it is not transferrable in the off–hand manner is

made clear by the Sub-Commentary to the Sutta, which explains further thus:

By "one-pointed" is meant preliminary concentration producing access *jhāna*. By "calmed down" is meant access concentration. By "of concentrated mind is meant well-developed and fully-mastered concentration. (9)

The momentary concentration producing access *jhāna* mentioned in this Sub-Commentary can be developed by means of contemplation of any of the twenty one sections of the *Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta*. Fixed concentration can be developed only by means of contemplation of respiration and repulsiveness, because the Commentary to the *Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta* specifically determines thus: "Only two sections are meditation-subjects producing fixed concentration (*appanā kammaṭṭhānāni*), and the remaining sections are meditation-subjects producing access concentration (*upacāra kammaṭṭhānāni*)" (10)

I notice that Ven. Khemindа accepts the view expressed in the *Visuddhimagga* that the hindrances can be abandoned by access concentration. Therefore, the Ven. Khemindа cannot deny that the hindrances can be abandoned by means of contemplation of any of the twenty one sections of the *Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta*, because any of them can develop access concentration. With the abandonment of the hindrances Purification of Mind is attained, Purification of Mind would surely lead to five

Purifications pertaining to wisdom, namely Purification of View, etc. If so, is there any necessity to develop *jhāna* in order to abandon the hindrances before one begins contemplation of the four foundations of mindfulness?

Especially, I should like to point out that the five hindrances are still present in the yogi until he begins to practise contemplation of the four foundations of mindfulness by which they are dispelled, and that this fact is most explicitly proved by the following passages in the Outline and the Five Hindrances Sections of the *Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta* and its Commentary.

> "Herein, a monk dwells practising body–contemplation on the body, ardent, clearly comprehending and mindful, having dispelled covetousness and grief concerning the world... feeling contemplation....mind–contemplation ..... mind–objects–contemplation....."

(*The Heart of Buddhist Meditation*, Nyanaponika-Thera, page 117). (11)

> "Herein, monks, when sense–desire is present in him, the monk knows, 'there is sense–desire in me', or when sense–desire is absent, he knows, 'there is no sense–desire in me'. He knows how the arising of non–arisen sense–desire comes to be; he knows how the rejection of arisen sense–desire comes to be; and he knows how the non–arising in the future of the rejected

sense–desire comes to be...anger...sloth and torpor...agitation and worry...doubt..." (ibid, page 123) (12)

The Commentary to the Outline of the *Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta* explains: "Covetousness stands for sensual desire, and grief, for anger. As sensual desire and anger are the principal hindrances the abandoning of the hindrances is stated by the overcoming of covetousness and grief." (13)

The Commentary adds: "The fruit of contemplation is stated by the overcoming of covetousness and grief." (14)

If only the Ven. Khemindа can grasp fully the letter and the spirit of the passages culled from the *Satipaṭṭhāna Saṃyutta*, its Commentary and Sub-Commentary, and also from the *Mahā-Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta* and Its Commentary, he should be able to understand that although *samatha* is not developed, the hindrances can be abandoned by means of contemplation of the four foundations of mindfulness, and *magga-phalañāna* can be attained. If he understands so, he should regret that because he could not grasp fully the relevant Pali Texts, their Commentaries and Sub-Commentaries, he had said in a hazy manner that the hindrances could be abandoned only by means of *jhāna*. In any case his view, being not in line with the relevant Pali Texts, their Commentaries and Sub-Commentaries, must be considered, to use his own words, to be "not in the realm of fact but of fiction".

The Ven. Kheminda quotes a few Suttas to prove that the hindrances can be abandoned only by means of *jhāna*. As a matter of fact, they are not relevant to the matter under discussion. Some of the Suttas he quoted are concerned only with *Samathayānika* and others do not even deal with the order of progress in contemplation. I shall explain further.

As regards the Buddha's discourses explaining the practice leading to Nibbāna, the *Visuddhimagga* states as follows:

In some instances (first category) this path of purification is taught by insight alone, according as it is said:

"*Formations are all impermanent*:
"*When he sees thus with understanding*
"*And turns away from what is ill,*
"*that is the path to purity*" (Dh. 227)

And in some instances (second category) by jhāna and understanding according as it is said:

"*He is near unto Nibbāna*
"*In whom are jhāna and understanding*'
(Dh. 362) Bhikkhu Nanamoli: *The Path of Purification*, (page 2 & 3), (15)

In the above translation, 'insight alone' stands for '*Vipassanā mattava-sen'eva*'. Here it must be pointed out that the word *eva* emphasises the exclusion of *samatha* because *samatha* is the

opposite number in the pair: *samatha vipassanā*. It is not meant to exclude virtue which is not the opposite number of *vipassanā*. Again, because the word *matta* conveys the sense of distinction, it also emphasises the exclusion of access and fixed concentration, which are distinctive. It does not exclude simple concentration, for no insight comes about without momentary concentration. (16)

The discourses such as the *Kimsukopama Sutta*, *Hiri-ottapa Sutta* and *Uttiya Sutta* belong to the second category. Therefore, I say that they are not all relevant to the matter under discussion, the question of *vipassanayānika* and *khaṇika-samādhi*. It appears that the Ven. Kheminda has not come across the Suttas treating with pure *vivipassanā*, such as the *Māluṅkyaputta* and *Bahiya (Daruciriya) Suttas*, which belong to the first category. Granted that he has come across them, he does not seem to have grasped their import fully. I would like to urge him to find out more discourses of this kind and study them.

To show that the hindrances can be abandoned only by means of *jhāna* and *vipassanā* is developed only after the attainment of *jhāna*, the Ven. Kheminda refers to a sentence in the *Kimsukopama Sutta*: "*Sigham dutayuganti kho bhikkhu samathavipassanānetam adhivanam.*" But I have pointed out that this sutta belongs to the second category and, therefore, is not relevant to the issue.

The Ven. Kheminda cites the *Mahāsaccaka Sutta.* If, as he thinks, this sutta purports to show the order of progress in contemplation, it is tantamount to saying that after the development of *jhāna*, one must have also developed special knowledges of recollection of past lives and divine sight before one can begin *vipassanā* contemplation.

As a matter of fact, it is common knowledge that special kowledges (*abhiññas*) are not at all necessary for *vipassanā* contemplation. The Ven. Kheminda should have known that the order of progress described in this sutta is not meant for every yogi. In this sutta the Buddha was telling Saccaka the order of his progressive realisation of Truth, and it is not meant to be taken as the order of progress for all types of yogis. It is a matter for great pity that the Ven. Kheminda fails to analyse the sutta as a whole but instead picks out a passage that suits him and commits thereby such an error.

Again, referring to *anupubbasikkhā, anupubbakiriyā*, and *anupubbapatipadā* of the *Pahārada Sutta*, the Ven. Kheminda points out that "through gradual training gradual work and through gradual practice truly penetration of knowledge occurs, not abruptly". The order of progress, as he points out is correct, but that the *samādhi* referred to here covers not only *upacāra samādhi* and *appanā samādhi* but also *khaṇika samādhi* is testified by the existence of *suddha-vipassanāyānika* arahants and *sukkha-vipassaka* arahants.

As a matter of fact, in the *Pahārada Sutta* the Buddha makes a comparison of his Sāsana with the ocean; it does not purport to have been given with an emphasis on the progressive order of *Sīla*, *Samādhi* and *Paññā*. As the Ven. Kheminda maintains, if it purports to show such an order of progress, it will amount to saying that before the development of concentration and insight, *dhutangas* must be practised in accordance with the Commentary which explains thus: "*anupubbakiriyā* (gradual work) means 13 *dhutaṅgas*".

The Ven. Kheminda cites a passage from the *Cūḷahatthipadopama Sutta* commentary, a passage that, as he believes, fits in with his one sided view. It appears that he feels this *Sutta* purports to show the order of progress in contemplation. He should have known that this Sutta treats with going forth, observance of virtue of *Pātimokkha*, restraints of sense faculties, mindfulness with clear comprehension, development of *jhāna* to abandon the hindrances, special knowledge of recollection of past lives and divine sight and finally with knowledge of extinction of cankers, comparing the consummation to a footprint of an elephant. If this order of progress were to be followed by one and all, it is obvious that one must renounce the world before one begins contemplation, and also that no layman can ever hope to tread the noble path.

It may be observed that Ven. Kheminda's lay disciples might not be able to accept this incorrect interpretation of this Sutta because he has virtually closed the path to *magga-phalañāṇa* as far as they are concerned. It must be pointed out that in this order of progress *asammoha sampajañña vipassanā* (mindfulness with clear comprehension contemplation) precedes *samatha*, and so the Ven. Kheminda's assertion that *samatha* must precede *vipassanā* falls to the ground. (The Ven. Kheminda who takes the sutta literally cannot possibly deny this point).

Again, to show that the four foundations of mindfulness should be developed after the abandonment of hindrances, the Ven. Kheminda quotes a paragraph from the *Nālanda Sutta*. But the teachings in this Sutta deal with the order of progress followed by those who have to cover the whole range of development for reaching the highest stage of Buddhahood. That is why it contains a specific practice, "after the abandonment of the hindrances," in accordance with that of *Samathayānika*. The readers must have understood that every Buddha is *Tevijja samathayānika* and that there are no *suddhavipassanayānika* Buddhas, no *sukkhavipasska* Buddhas, and no Buddhas, bereft of *abhiññas* (special knowledges). (17)

The *suddhivipassanayānika* yogi, the subject under discussion, is the lowest of several types of yogis, and he needs not develop *jhāna* parti-

cularly to dispel the hindrances before the contemplation of the four foundations of mindfulness. He dispels them while contemplating on the four foundations of mindfulness. He has to do so because he is not possessed of special powers. He is like a person, who having no boat to cross by, has to swim across the river. (18)

In point of fact, this Sutta shows the manner in which the Venerable Sāriputta came to know how the Buddhas attained omniscience and also his address to the Buddha that he could only by inference know the equality of the Buddhas in all respects. The Buddha, at the conclusion of his discourse to the Venerable Sāriputta, said to the effect that when the *puthujanas* (worldling) came to hear this *Nālanda Sutta*, they would be able to overcome their doubts about the Buddha by thinking in this wise: "Even the sharp-witted Sāriputta, recognised as the highest in knowledge by the Buddha himself among his disciples, cannot probe the mind of the Buddha, and so the Buddha is incomparable". (19)

I do not know how the Ven. Kheminda understands this Sutta, because in the March and July issues of *World Buddhism* he has boldly but wrongly translated the word *tathāgata* in the phrase "*tathagate kaṅkha vā vimati vā*" as "method of teaching." While I have no intention to allege that the Ven. Kheminda does not even know the meaning of the word *tathāgata*,

I must place before the readers his translation of this word "tathāgata" and that of the Pāli Text Society.

The Ven. Kheminda translates thus: "Excellent, Sāriputta, excellent!....Should there be among them any foolish people who have doubt and perplexity regarding my method of teaching, having heard this exposition, they might give up their doubts and perplexities." (March issue, *World Buddhism*, page 225, middle column, and July issue, *World Buddhism*, page 339, middle column)

The P. T. S. translates thus: "Well said, Sāriputta!....Whatsoever silly fellows have any doubt or perplexity about the Tathāgata, when they hear my method of Norm-teaching, all such doubt and perplexity shall be abandoned." (*The Book of Kindred Sayings*, V, page 140, XLVIII, III, ii, Nālanda).

"Wherefore thou, Sāriputta... Whatever foolish ones there be who feel doubt and hesitation concerning the Tathāgata, when they have heard such discourse, even they too will banish their hesitation and their doubt." (*Dialogues of the Buddha*, Part III, *The Faith That Satisfied*, page 109)

The readers will now see the Ven. Kheminda's erroneous translation of the word *tathāgata*, as 'method of teaching'.

NOTES

(9) SSC (II, 496) Ekodidhutta ti etena upacarajjhanavaho pubbabhagiyo samadhi vutto. Samahita ti etena upacarasamadhi. Ekaggacitta ti etena subhavito vasippatto appanasamadhi vutto ti veditabbo.

(10) D. C. (II, 291) Dve'yeva appanakammatthanani sesani upacarakammatthanani.

(11) D. (II, 231) Indha bhikkhave bhikkhu kaye kavanupassi viharati atapi sampajano satima vineyya loke abbijjhadomanassam. Vedanasu vedananupassi...Citte cittanupassi... Dhammesu dhammanupassi...

(12) D. (II, 238) Idha bhikkhave bhikkhu santam va ajjhattam kamacchandam 'atthi me ajjhattam kamacchando'ti pajanati, asantam va ajjhattam kamacchandam 'natthi me ajjhattam kamacchando'ti pajanti, yatha ca anuppannassa kamacchandassa uppado hoti tan-ca pajanati, yatha caan uppannassa kamacchandassa pahanam hoti tan-ca pajanati, yatha ca pahinassa kamacchandassa ayatim anupado hoti tan-ca pajanati. Santam va ajjhattam byapadam... thinamidham... uddhacco-kukkuccam.....vicikiccham.....

(13) DC. (II, 319) Yasma pan'ettha abhijjhaggahanena kamacchando, domanassaggahanena byapado sangaham gacchati, tasma nivaranapdriyapanna-balavadhamma-dvayadassanena nivaranappahanam vuttam hoti ti veditabbam.

(14) DC (II, 350) Abhijjiha–domanassavinayena bhavanaphalam vuttam–ti vedittibbam.

(15) Vism (I, 2). So pan'ayam visuddhimaggo katthaci vipassanamattavasse'neva desito, yath'aha: Sabbe sankhara anicca ti,yada pannaya passati, atha nibbindati dukkhe, esa maggo visuddhiya–ti. Katthaci jhanapannavasena, yath'aha: Yamhi jhananca panna ca, so va nibbanasantike–ti.

(16) Vism C (I, 11) Vipassanamatta vasen–eva ti avadharanena samatham nivatteti so hi tassa patiyogi na siladi. Mattasaddena ta visesanivattiattnena savisesam samadhim nivatteti, so upacarappanabedo vipassanayanikassa desana–ti katva na samadhimattam, na hi khanikasamadhim vina vipassinana sambhavati.

(17) M. (II, 149) "Tevijjo samano gotame' ti kho vaccha byakaramano vuttavadi c'eva me assa, na ca mam abhutena abbhacikkheyya.

(18) MC. (Iv, 44–45) Sampattim tava padatthanam katva vipassanam vaddhetva arahattam ganhanto bhikkhu navam va ulumpadini va nissaya mahogam taritva param gacchanto viya na kilamati. Sukkha vipassako panna pakinnakassankhara, sammasitva arahattam ganhanto bahubalena sotam chindiva param gacchanto viya kilamati.

(19) S. (III, 139) Tasmat'iha tvam sariputta imam dhammapariyayam abhikkhanam bhaseyyati bhikkhunam bhikkhuinam upasakanam

upasikanam. Yesam–pi hi sariputta moghapurisanam bhavissati tathagate kankha va vimati va, tesam–p'imam dhammapariyayam sutva ya tathagate kankha va evimati va, sa pahiyissati.

SC. (III, 245) Phaiyissati–ti "sariputta–sadiso pi nama nanajavanasampanno savako buddhanam cittacaram janitum na sakkoti, evam appameyya tathagata" ti cintentanam ya tathagate kaakha va vimati va, sapahiyissati.

(Concluded)

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION

Rebuttal of Reply to Rejoinder I–III

By Sayadaw U Nyanuttara, Agga Mahā Paṇḍita
(Burma)

The Ven. Kheminda asserts in his Reply to Rejoinder I–III that any yogi, samathayānika or vipassanāyānika, develops samatha at the stage of Purification of Mind, and vipassanā begins with Purification of View. His assertion is correct as far as samathayānika is concerned, whereas it is not true in the case of vipassanāyānika.

If a yogi develops samatha at the stage of Purification of Mind, he is called samathayānika whether he has basis in samatha or not at the stage of Purification of View. Here it may be reminded that although, for the sake of brevity, the term vipassanāyānika is used sometimes vis–a–vis the term samathayānika, it is, in full, known as suddhavipassanāyānika. The prefix suddha in this term conveys the meaning that it is quite apart from samatha. So a yogi who develops samatha at the stage of Purification of Mind can, in no way, be called suddhavipassanāyānika.

Herein, suddha–vipassanāyānika yogi is, in fact, that kind of yogi who develops contempla-

tion mentioned in the Section dealing with the Attention Given to the Elements, Mahā Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta. Why? Because in the Section dealing with Mindfulness of the Body, the *Visuddhimagga* states: "Herein, the three, that is to say, the sections on postures on the four kinds of full awareness (See MA, i, 253 f.) and on attention directed to elements, as they are stated (in that sutta), deal with insight....So there are only the two, that is, the sections on breathing and on directing attention to repulsiveness, that, as stated there, deal with concentration. (The P. of P., B. Ñāṇamoli, Chap VIII. Para 43) (20)

"In the *Mahā Hatthipadopama Sutta*, in the *Mahā Rāhulovāda Sutta*, and the *Dhātu-vibhaṅga*, it (repulsiveness) is expounded as elements.... Herein, it is an insight meditation subject that is expounded as elements." (The P. of P., B. Ñāṇamoli, Chap VIII, Page 263, Para 60)(21) If so, why can't attention directed to elements, expounded as elements, be insight meditation subject? Therefore, the yogi practising this particular meditation is obviously vipassanā-yānika.

I have already pointed out that the suddha-vipassanāyānika yogi does not develop samatha with a view to attaining Purification of Mind before he begins vipassanā contemplation. In this connection the Ven. Kheminda may question whether a suddhavipassanāyānika yogi attains Purification of View, skipping Purification of Mind, because he clings to his one-sided view

that Purification of Mind is attainable only by means of jhāna.

To such a question, I would readily answer thus: "No, a suddhavipassanāyānika yogi does not skip Purification of Mind. He attains, first of all, Purification of Mind while developing vipassanā, and later attains, while so doing, five Purifications pertaining to wisdom such as Purification of View, one after another."

I shall explain how Purification of Mind is attained in the course of vipassanā contemplation. (The Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw has explained this particular point in *The Progress of Insight* in a suitable way for the clear understanding of the people in general, but the Ven. Kheminda fails to see Purification of Mind in its rightful place and what is worse, transfers it to the wrong place.)

When a yogi contemplates by way of Attention Given to Elements, as mentioned in the *Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta*, should he not begin straightaway with contemplation elements as insight meditation subject? In so doing, will he be able to attain access concentration only when he contemplates with a view to attaining samādhi? Will he not be able to attain access concentration if he contemplates with a view to attaining vipassanā? Is there any difference in the matter of contemplation for vipassanā and that for samādhi? No, there is no difference in so far as the attainment of access concentra-

tion is concerned. That is why in the Chapter on Description of Purification of View, the *Visuddhimagga* states thus:

"But one whose vehicle is pure insight, or that same aforesaid one whose vehicle is serenity, discerns the four elements in brief or in detail in one of the various ways given in the Chapter on the Definition of the Four Elements." (The P. of P, B. Ñāṇamoli, Chap. XVIII, Page 680, Para 5) (22)

Paramatthamañjūsā states: "By 'Of the various ways discerning the elements' is meant 'of the thirteen ways discerning the elements, stated as giving attention to in brief, etc., in the manner beginning with what has characteristics of hardness is the earth element.' (23) Herein, although in regard to the definition of the Four Elements the number of thirteen ways is shown as nineteen, the remaining six must be considered as having been included in the thirteen. That a beginner in meditation should thus begin to contemplate in brief is shown in a passage of the Sub-Commentary to *Uparipaṇṇāsa, Majjhima Nikāya.*

"When the Buddha discourses on meditation he shows the way in which meditation should be begun as far as it is appropriate to the bhikkhu's conditions and capacity. When the bhikkhu's insight becomes more developed in due course, he discerns the dhamma completely." (24)

How a yogi, who contemplates the four elements in accordance with the way given in the Chapter on the definition of the Four Elements, attains access concentration is shown in the *Visuddhimagga* as follows:

"Ae he makes effort in this way it is not long before concentration arises in him, which is reinforced by understanding that illuminates the classification of the elements, and which is only access and does not reach absorption because it has states with individual essences as its object." (The P. of P., B.Ñāṇamoli, Chap. XI, Page 385, para 44) (25)

"Herein, it must be noted: 'Attention Given to Elements', 'The Meditation Subject Consisting of Elements' and 'Defining of the Four Elements' all mean the same thing." (The P. of P., Ñāṇamoli, Chap. XI, page 380, para 27) (26)

As regards the access concentration mentioned in the above passage of the *Visuddhimagga*, Paramatthamañjūsā explains thus: "Although access concentration comes about by way of Attention Given to Elements, in the matter of Attention Given to Elements it is contemplation that is extremely keen. Therefore, the Ven. Buddhaghosa Mahāthera writes that Attention Given to Elements is expounded by the Buddha as insight meditation subject." (27)

The Buddha expounds, "Attention Given to Elements" as insight meditation subject. Accor-

dingly, to a yogi, who contemplates the elements for insight, comes about access concentration naturally. With this access concentration in view, the *Visuddhimagga* includes "Attention Given to Elements" in the forty samatha meditation subjects. Not that it is included therein because it is a proper samatha meditation subject. Why? Because the Buddha does not expound 'Attention Given to Elements' merely for serenity, and also because the *Visuddhimagga*, in dealing with Mindfulness Occupied on the Body, states, as pointed above, that even repulsiveness, if expounded as elements, is an insight meditation subject.

Judging by the aforesaid passages from the *Visuddhimagga* and its Commentary, Paramatthamañjūsā, the Ven. Kheminda should be able to understand how access concentration comes about to a vipassanāyānika yogi prior to Purification of View. When Access Concentration comes about Purification of Mind is attained, as also Analytical Knowledge of Body and Mind and Purifications pertaining to wisdom such as Purification of View. Therefore, the Ven. Kheminda should remember, once and for all that Purification of Mind comes about in this manner to a suddhavipassanāyānika yogi prior to attainment of Purification of View in the course of vipassanā contemplation.

The Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw deals wilh this point in *The Progress of Insight*. Can the Ven. Kheminda insist on saying that in *The Progress*

of Insight Purification of Mind is not mentioned, and that Purification of View comes about, skipping Purification of Mind? Now that I have explained this point at length, with the support of authoritative texts and commentaries, the Ven. Kheminda should be able to understand what the Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw writes therein.

The above-mentioned Concentration is said to be access concentration, but it is, in fact, not proper access concentration, being not in the neighbourhood of absorption jhāna. It is access concentration only in name. Paramatthamañjūsā states: "Access concentration is to be understood as an applied term or as being nominal. The concentration that arises at the access to absorption is access concentration and here (the Meditation Subject consisting of Elements) absorption is absent. However, being similar in characteristic to access concentration it is called by that term." (28)

If, as stated by Paramatthamañjūsā, this concentration can be called access cancentration nomially, how will it be called in the proper sense? Has this concentration no proper term? Not so. In the matter of every samatha concentration and vipassanā concentration there are proper terms for common usage. The aforesaid access concentration is "Kāmāvacara samādhi reaching the highest peak." This kāmāvacara samādhi is of two kinds: access and momentary. If concentration cannot be properly termed

access concentration, it only remains to be called momentary concentration. This explanation is borne out by Paramatthamañjūsā and Mūlapaṇṇāsa Sub-Commentary which state: "Insight is not possible without momentay concentration". (29)

As is amply testified by these Sub-Commentaries, an immense number of momentary concentrations come about in the course of vipassanā contemplation. Of all these momentary concentrations, the Visuddhimagga (Section on Definition of the Four Elements) calls only that momentary concentration, which overcomes, in the first instance, the hindrances, by the name of access concentration otherwise called nominal access concentration.

This point will be further clarified by the following passages of Paramatthamañjūsā:

"To a samathayānika no lokuttara-attainment is ever possible without access and absorption concentration" (30) Herein, it is not meant that lokuttarā is attained by a samathayānika as soon as access or absorption concentration comes about. It is, however, meant to say that Purification of Mind which is fundamental to lokuttarā attainment is not possible without access or absorption. Again, Paramatthamañjūsā states: "To a vipassanāyānika no lokuttarā attainment is ever possible... without momentary concentration." (30) Herein also, it is not meant that lokuttarā is attained

as soon as momentary concentration comes about. It is, however, meant to say that Purification of Mind which is fundamental to lokuttarā attainment is not possible without momentary concentration. Of these two passages, the Ven. Kheminda has accepted the import of the former passage. If so, he has no alternative but to accept the import of the latter passage, which is similar in wording to the former.

The above explanations, given unbiased and earnest consideration in quest of truth, will be found to have proved sufficiently that to a vipassanāyānika Purification of Mind comes about by means of momentary concentration in the course of vipassanā contemplation; Purification of Mind is attained before Purification of View; and samatha development is not necessary for Purification of Mind before vipassanā contemplation.

To put in another way, momentary concentration, being in the neighbourhood of magga-phala samādhi, can surely be termed proper access concentration. I shall explain. In the matter of samatha development there are two kinds of access concentration: (1) that of the same ad-verting. (*ekavajjana-upacāra*), (2) that of a different ad-verting (*nanavajjana-upavara.* "Access concentration is the unification of mind that precedes absorption concentration." (31) (*The Path of Purification*, Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli, Chap. III, Page 84, 6-2)

"The phrase 'unification of mind that precedes' states the inclusion of access concentration of a different ad-verting conducive to absorption concentration, but not access concentration of the same ad-verting only." (32) "Herein, the unification of mind in the case of ten meditation subjects and in the consciousness preceding absorption (in the case of the remaining meditation sudjects) is access concentration." (33) (The P. of P, B. Ñāṇamoli, Chap. XI, Page 406, 119). The unification of mind is that unification of mind in the process of thought (*vithi*) having the same ad-verting as well as in the process of thought having a different ad-verting." (34)

In accordance with the above passages of the *Visuddhimagga* and its Commentary, Paramatthamañjūsā, the unification of mind that goes by the name of access concentration in the jhānic process of thought having the same ad-verting with the absorption in the same process, and being in the neighbourhood of absorption is called access concentration having the same ad-verting. If the unification of mind named access concentration is in a different process of thought prior to jhānic process, the access and absorption concentrations are obviously not in the same process and not having same ad-verting. So, in this case, access concentration is termed access concentration having a different ad-verting.

The unification of mind named access concentration having a different ad–verting, although not in the immediate neighbourhood of absorption, is considered to be in the neighbourhood of absorption because it is conducive to absorption. Therefore, Paramatthamañjūsā states thus: "The access concentration having a different ad–verting conducive to absorption." (35) 'Conducive to absorption' means 'the overcoming of hindrances.' When the hindrances are overcome the yogi reaches the neighbourhood of absorption. So, the unificaton of mind having a different ad–verting, being conducive to absorption by overcoming the hindrances, is called the access concentration having a different ad–verting from the moment of overcoming the hindrances. That is why Paramatthamañjūsā states: "The hindrances, being diametrically opposed to the constituent parts of jhāna, must be overcome, together with immoralities which are associated with them. Thereby, this yogi bhikkhu should have attained access-jhāna, having as the object the characteristics of elements." (36)

NOTES

20. Vsm. (I, 232) Tattha yasma iriyapatha pabbam catusampajannapabbam dhatumana–sikarapabban'ti imani tini vipassanavasena vuttani....Anapanapabbam pana patikkulamanasikarapabbana–ca iman' ev'ettha dve samadhivasena vuttani.

21. Vism. (I, 235) Mahahatthipadopama-maharahulovadadhatuvibhangesu dhatuvasena kachitam....Tattha bhatuvasena katthitam vipassanakammatthanam hoti.

22. Vism. (II, 222) Suddhavipassanayaniko pana ayam'eva va samathayanika catudhatuvavatthane vuttanam tesam tesam dhatuparigga-hamukhanam annataramukhavesena sankhepato va vittharato va catasso dhatuya parigganhati.

23. Vism C, (II, 353). Tesam tesam dhatu-pariggahamukhan'ti yam thaddhalakkhanam ayam pathavidhatu'ti–adina sankhepamanasikar aradivasena vuttesu terasasu dhatupariggaha. mukhesu.

24. MSC. (III, 255) Bhagava hi kammatthanam kathento kammatthanikassa bhikkhuno karanabalanurupam' eva pathamam bhavana-bhinivesam dasseti. So paccha nane vipulam (vepullam?) gacchante anavasesato dhanumam ganhati.

25. Vism, (I, 347) Tass'evam vayamamanassa niciren'eva dhatuppabhedavabhasana–pannapariggahito subhavadhammarammanatta appanam appatto upacaramatto samadhi uppajjati.

26. Vism. (I. 342) Dhatumanasikaro, dhatukammatthanam, catudhatuvavatthana, ti atthato akam.

27. Vism C. (I, 298) Dhatumanansikara-kammatthanena yadi–pi upacarasamadhi ijjhati, sammassanacaro panatattha satisayo'ti dhatuma-

nasikarapabbam–pi 'vipassanavasena vuttan'ti vuttam.

28. Vism C. (I, 436) Upacarasamadhi'ti ca fulhivasena veditabbam. Appanam hi upecca cari samadhi upacarasamadhi; appana c'ettha natthi. Tadisassa pana samadhisaa samana-lakkhanataya evem vuttam.

29. Vism C. (I, 11) MSC, (I, 204) Na hi khaṇikasamādhiṁ vinā vipassanā sambhāvati.

30. Vism C. (I, 15). Samathayanikassu hi upacarappanappabhedam samadhim, itarassa khanikasamadhim, ubhayesam–pi vimokkha–mukkhattayam, ubhayesam–pi vimokkha–mukhat-tayam vina na kadaci–pi lokuttara dhigmo sambbayati.

31. Vism. (I. 82) Ya can appanasamadhinam pubbabhage ekaggata, ayam upacara–samadhi.

32. Vism C. (I, 110) Pubbabhage ekaggata–ti imina appanaya upakaraka–nanavajjanupa-carassa–pi sangaho datthabbo.

33. Vism C. (I, 368) Dasasu kammatthanesu, appanapubhabhagacittesu ca ekaggata upacara-samadhi.

34. Vism C. (I, 459) Ekaggata–ti ekava-jjanavithiyam, manavajjanavithiyan–ca ekaggata.

35. see Note 32.

36. Vism C. (I. 435) Tesam ujuvipaccani-kataya nivaranani vikkambhitani" yeya honti sadddhim tadekatthehi papadhammehi, Ettavata ca'nena upacarajjhanam samadhigatam hoti dhatulakkhanarammanam.

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION

Rebuttal of Reply to Rejoinder I–IV

By Sayadaw U Nyanuttara Agga Mahā Paṇḍita
(Burma)

As in the case of samatha, so in the case of vipassanā, the unification of mind (one pointedness of mind) in the neighbourhood of *magga-phala* is access concentration. However, as the predominant feature of vipassanā is knowledge–insight, only that knowledge-insight is described in Pāli Texts and Commentaries such as Analytical Knowledge of Body and Mind, Knowledge by Discerning Conditionally, etc. As concentration is not predominent in vipassanā, it is not described. If it were described, it should have been pointed out that, as in the case of samatha, access concentration comes about from the moment of overcoming of hindrances.

The access concentration, being in the same *magga* process of thought with *magga-phala*, is termed concentration having the same ad-verting. The unification of mind named access concentration, being in a different process of thought prior to *maggu* process, is termed access concentration having a different ad-verting. With (the preliminary part of) this access concentration having a different ad–verting in

view, I have pointed out above that access concentration explained in the *Visuddhimagga*, section dealing with Definition of the Four Elements, can surely be termed proper access concentration. After the attainment of Purification of Mind by (the preliminary part of) access concentration having a different ad-verting, the five purifications pertaining to wisdom are attained one after another.

If such is the case, it may be asked as to why the access concentration having a different ad-verting, being not in the neighbourhood of *magga-phala*, could be termed proper access concentration. In the case of samatha, the access concentration having a different ad-verting, being conducive to absorption from the moment of overcoming of hindrances (notwithstanding the lapse of a number of days between access and absorption) is considered as being in the neighbourhood of absorption. In the same manner, in the case of vipassanā the access concentration having a different ad-verting, being conducive to *magga phala* from the moment of Purification of Mind by overcoming hindrances (notwithstanding the four purifications between access concentration and *magga-phala*) is considered as being in the neighbourhood of *magga-phala*.

That, as in the case of samatha, jhāna can as well be attained a number of days after the attainment of access concentration, is indicated in the *Visuddhimagga*, which in explain-

ing that the counterpart-sign is guarded by means of seven days, states: "If a monastery has many abodes he can try that one by one, living in each for three days, and stay on where his mind becomes unified." (The P. of P., B. Ñāṇamoli, Chapter IV, page 113, 36) (37)

Not knowing anything about the access concentration having a different ad-verting, the Ven. Khemindа has alleged that "the author admits that momentary concentration is in the neighbourhood of the path". Then he observed: "But one does not go to the neighbourhood of the path to attain Purification of Mind!"

If only the Ven. Khemindа can manage to comprehend what I have explained above, he should be able to understand that when the Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw writes, in *The Progress of Insight*: "Since it (access concentration) is in the neighbourhood of the Noble-path-attainment-concentration," the author refers to the (preliminary part of) access concentration having a different ad-verting and not to the access concentration having the same ad-verting. If the Ven. Khemindа understands so, he should also understand that the Purification of Mind attained by means of the said access concentration having a different ad-verting, termed proper access concentration, comes about not in the immediate neighbourhood of *ariya-magga* but before Purification of View.

As explained above, just as Purification of Mind is attained by means of access concentra-

tion capable of overcoming the hindrances in the course of contemplation of elements in accordance with Attention Given to Elements, so also Purification of Mind is attained by means of access concentration in the course of vipassanā contemplation in accordance with the Postures of the Body, Mindfulness with Clear Comprehension, Feeling, Mind and Mind-States. Why? Because in the Commentary to the *Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta* the above-mentioned contemplations are described together with Attention Given to Elements as access meditation-subjects.

In my answer to No 2 (b), paras 9–14, I have pointed out that momentary, access and fixed concentration can be developed in the course of contemplation of the Four Foundations of Mindfulness as stated in the *Sāla Sutta*, *Ambapāli Vagga*, *Satipaṭṭhāna Samyutta*, as well as in its Commentary and Sub-Commentary. Judging by that too, it is quite evident that momentary concentration, access concentration, as also Purification of Mind, is attained in the course of *vipassanā* contemplation.

Now that I have explained, quoting most reliable passages from Pāli Texts, Commentaries and Sub-Commentaries, the Ven. Kheminda should be able to understand that samatha is not developed separately by a vipassanāyānika to attain Purification of Mind, and that Purification of Mind is attained by means of momentary concentration overcoming the

hindrances, (the momentary concentration which is termed nominal access concentration according to Paramatthamañjūsa, and which is termed proper access concentration according to the method of defining access concentration having a different ad-verting.) Nevertheless, I propose to cite more passages from Pāli Texts, Commentaries and Sub-Commentaries, which the Ven. Khemindа should ponder carefully so that he would be able to comprehend the verity of the aforesaid statement, as also to know that momentary concentration is called basic concentration as well.

"However, the bhikkhu possessed the potentiality for the attainment of Arahantship, and so he (the Blessed One) advised him once again, saying 'Therefore, bhikkhu, you should train thus: "My mind shall be steadied, quite steadied, internally and arisen evil unprofitable things shall not obsess my mind and remain. You should train thus.' (A iv 299). 'But what is stated in that advice is basic concentration consisting in mere unification of mind internally in the sense of in oneself.' (The P. of P., B. Ñāṇamoli, Chap. IX, para 114, page 319) (38)

Paramatthamañjūsā states: 'Internally' means at *gosarajjhattu*! The sense of 'Internally' is 'At the object of meditation'. 'My mind shall be steadied' means 'mind shall not wander, remains fixed at an object'. Therefore it is quite steadied. 'Quite steadied' means 'mind shall be well placed.' 'Arisen' means 'not overcome yet.' 'Evil'

means 'low'. 'Unprofitable things' means 'unprofitable things such as sense-desire, in the sense that they arise from ignorance". 'Mere unification of mind' means 'concentration attained but not well developed yet by the yogi'. That mere unification of mind is called basic concentration because it is the basis of the distinctive concentrations. That will be dealt with later. That mere unification of mind is regarded as momentary concentration as in the passage: 'I subjectively steadied the mind, I calmed it, I made it one-pointed, I concentrated'. In certain discourses, after saying, 'Monks, I was full of energy. I was resolute. My mind was well placed and collected, (The Blessed One) went on, beginning with the words aloof from sense-desires.' For this reason, just as one-pointedness of mind mentioned at the very beginning is regarded as momentary concentration, so also it should be regarded as such in the discourse. (Paramatthamañjūsā, 387). (39)

A careful consideration of the above-mentioned passages of the *Sankhitta Sutta, Bhūmicāla Vagga, Aṭṭhaka Nipāta, Aṅguttara Nikāya* and its Commentary, *Visuddhimagga* and Paramatthamañjūsā, will elicit the fact that momentary concentration, otherwise known as basic concentration, is capable of overcoming the hindrances such as sensual desire.

The Ven. Kheminda's assertion that "momentary concentration emerged after jhāna-

attainment during the time of actual insight practice done by one who has risen from jhāna" is diametrically opposite to what is stated in Paramatthamañjūsa." "Mere unification of mind' means concentration attained but not well developed yet by the yogi. That mere unification of mind is called basic concentration because it is the basis of distinctive concentrations that will be dealt with later. That basic concentration is regarded as momentary concentration." (10)

I do not know whether the Ven. Kheminda strives or not to attain jhāna, but his articles disclose his desire to do vipassanā contemplation only after jhāna-attainment. Therefore, it appears that he pays no attention to Pāli Texts, Commentaries and Sub-Commentaries which state that yogis, established in virtue, although bereft of jhāna, can overcome the hindrances in the course of vipassanā contemplation and attain *magga-phala-ñāna*, and also that he, for this very reason, misunderstands and misinterprets them. I would now cite for his consideration some more discourses of the Buddha and the Commentaries thereof, which clearly state that, without jhāna attainment, yogis can overcome the hindrances by vipassanā contemplation.

"And again, monks, when a monk is walking, he comprehends, 'I am walking'; or when he is standing still, he comprehends, 'I am standing still'; and when he is sitting down, he comprehends, 'I am sitting down' or when he

is lying down, he comprehends, 'I am lying down' so that however his body is disposed, he comprehends he is like that. While he is thus diligent, ardent, self–resolute, those memories and aspirations that are worldly are got rid of; by getting rid of them the mind itself is inwardly settled, calmed, focussed, concentrated. Thus too, monks, does a monk develop mindfulness of the body." (41) (*The Middle Length Sayings*, III, 90–91, page 130).

In the Commentary to this Sutta, 'that are worldly' means 'that are associated with five sensual pleasures.' 'Memories and Aspirations' means 'wandering thoughts'. Because they are wont to wander they are termed 'sara', 'Saranti, means to wander'. 'Inwardly' means 'At the object of meditation'. 'Concentrated' means 'to be well placed', 'as if fixed meditation is attained'. (42)

NOTES

(37) Vism. (I, 124). Yasmin vihare bahu avasa honti, tattha ekamekasmin tini tini divasani vasitva yatth'assa cittam ekaggan hoti, tattha vasitabbam.

(38) Vism, (I, 316). Yasma so arahattassa upanissayasampanno, tasma nam avadanto aha: "Tasmat'iha te bhikkhu evam sikkhitabbam: 'ajjhattam me cittam thitam bhavissati susamthitam, na c'uppanna papaka akusala dhamma cittam pariyadaya thassanti' ti. Evan–hi te

bhikkhu sikkhitabban" ti. (A. III, 121) imina pan'assa ovadena niyakajjhatavasena citteka-ggatamatto mudasamadhi vutto. (see also A.C. III, 241–2)

39. Vism C. (I, 386–7) Ajjhattan–ti gocara-jjhatte, kammatthanarammane–ti attho...Cittam thitam bhavissati–ti bahiddha avikkhippamanam ekggabhave thitam bhavissati. Tato eva susan-thitam, sutthu samahitan'ti attho. Uppanna–ti avikkhambhita. Papaka–ti lamaka. Akusala dhamma–ti kamacchandadayo akosallasambhu-tathena akusala dhamma...Cittekaggatamatto–ti bhavanam' anuyuttena patiladdhamattam nati-subhavtiam samadhanam. Tam pana upari vuccanananam samadhivisesanam mulakarana-bhavato 'mulasamadhi' ti vutto. Sv'sayam citte-kaggatamatto "Ajhattam'eva cittam santha-peni sannisademi ekodim karomi samadhumi"ti (M°, I, 163) - adisu viya khanikasamadhi adhi-ppeto, Yath'eva hi annatthu'pi "Aruddhum kho pana me bhikkhave viriyam ahosi asallinam... Samahaitam cittam ekaggan'ti vatva "Vivicc'eva kamehi" ti. (M°, I, 26-164, A III, 22)—adiva-canato pathamam vuttacittekaggata 'khanika samadhi'ti vinnayati, Evam 'idho' pi.

40. See note 39.

41. M (III, 132) Puna ca'pnram bhikkhave bhikkhu gecchanto va "gacchami" ti pajanati. Thito va "thito 'mhi' ti pajanati Nisinno va "nisinno'mhi" ti pajanati. Sayano va "sayano 'mhi"ti pajanati. Ytha yatha va pan–assu kayo

panihito hoti' tatha tatha nam pajantia. Tassa evam appamattassa atapino pahitattassa viharato ye te gehasita sarasankappa, te pahiyanti. Tesam pahana ajjhattam'eva cittam santitthati sannisidati ekodi hoti samadhiyati. Evam-pi bhikkhavo bhikkhu kayagatasatim bhaveti.

42. MC. (IV, 102) Gehasita-ti pancakamagunanissita. Sarasankappa-ti dhavanasankappa, saranti-ti hi sara, dhavanti'ti attho. Ajjhattam,eva-ti gacarajjhattasmim'yeva. (Ibid-101) Samadhiyati-ti samma thapiyati appuna, pattam viya hoti.

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION

Rebuttal of Reply to Rejoinder I–V

By Sayadaw U Nyanuttara Agga Mahā Paṇḍita
(Burma)

In the Putta Sutta, Macala Vagga, Catukka Nipāta, Anguttara Nikāya, a suddha-vipassanāyānika arahant or a sukkhavipassaka arahant is compared to a pundarika lotus, whose petals do not come up to a hundred. "And how, monks, is a person a blue lotus recluse? Herein a monk, by destroying the *āsavas*, has reached the heart's release, the release by wisdom that is free from *āsavas*, and having realised it abides therein. Yet he does not abide experiencing with his own person the eight deliverances. "Thus, monks, is a person a blue lotus recluse." (43) (VII (87) Kinds of Recluses (a), page 96&97, *The Book of Gradual Sayings* II, PTS)

(Note: Pundarika is a white lotus, not blue lotus. See D III 2, 223. *Dialogues of the Buddha*, Part III, 224)

Its Commentary explains thus "Samaṇa puṇḍarika' means 'a samaṇa comparable to a puṇḍarika lotus'; 'a puṇḍarika lotus' means 'a lotus with less than a hundred petals.' Samaṇa puṇḍarika' means 'sukkha-vipassaka arahant; such an arahant, bereft of jhāna and abhiññā (*jhānābhiññānaṁ abhāvena*), is not complete in qualities and is, therefore, termed samaṇa-puṇḍarika. (44)

Here 'Jhānabhiññānaṁ' should not be construed as "*jhānena nibbata jhanassa vā abhiññā jhānabhiññā*" in the form of tappurisa compound. Because, if it is so construed 'jhānabhiññā' will mean only abhiññā and not jhāna, contradicting thereby the *aṭṭha vimokkha* (eight deliverances) mentioned in the Putta Sutta.

I shall explain further. In this Sutta, the Buddha expounded specifically the eight Samāpatti or eight deliverances. He made no reference to abhiññā. However, the Commentator couples lokiya abhiññā with jhāna for the reason that when jhāna is stated, by it is also meant its by-product lokiya abhiññā. Nevertheless jhāna is the predominant factor. So, to be in keeping with the textual word: "aṭṭha vimokkha', 'jhānabiññā' must be construed as '*jhānāni ca abhiññāyo ca jhānabhiññāyo*' in the form of dvanda compound. Again, it should be noted that in this Commentary, jhāna does not mean lokuttara jhāna. Just as jhāna means lokiya jhāna, so also abhiññā means lokiya abhiññā. Because this Commentarial explanation refers to the qualities of the arahant it does not permit of any consideration whether it includes lokuttara abhiññā.

In the above Commentary, judging by the phrases 'bereft of jhāna and abhiññā' and 'not complete in qualities', it is clear that sukkha-vipassaka arahant is not a jhāna-attainer. If he is not a jhāna-attainer, it is undeniable that he attains Purification of Mind not by means of

absorption concentration (jhānasamādhi), but by means of momentary concentration in the course of vipassanā contemplation. That being so, is there any necessity to develop jhāna at the stage of Purification of Mind? Certainly not. With all that, if anybody interprets 'bereft of jhāna–abhiññā' as meaning 'vipassanā contemplation is done without jhāna as basis, in spite of jhāna–attainment' he is running counter to the Buddha's teachings as well as the Commentaries thereof.

Samādhi Sutta II, Asura Vagga, Catuka Nipāta, Aṅguttara Nikāya, also bears a striking testimony to the existence of suddhavipassanāyānika. "Herein, monks, a certain person is one who gains (*lābhī*) mental calm of the self, but does not gain (*na lābhī*) the higher wisdom of insight into things.

"Herein, again, monks, a certain person is one who gains (*lābhī*) the higher wisdom of insight into things, but does not gain (*na lābhī*) mental calm of the self....."Then, monks, he who has gained the higher wisdom of insight into things but not mental calm in himself, should make an effort to establish the one and attain the other. Then at some future time he is one who has gained both." (45) (ii (92) Concentration (a) and iii 93 Concentration (b) pages 101–102. *The Book of Gradual Sayings*, II, PTS)

It must be pointed out that the English translation of the last paragraph is not correct,

because the Pāli Text means...."Then, monks, he who has gained the higher wisdom of insight into things, but not mental calm in himself, should, established in higher wisdom of insight, make effort to attain mental calm." The same translator (F. L. Woodward) translated 'patiṭṭhāya' in this wise in Bāhiya Sutta: "Indeed, Bāhiya, when you, established in virtue, shall have thus cultivated the four stations of mindfulness...." (*The Book of Kindred Sayings* V, Book III, Chapter II (V), page 145, P. T. S) This translation agrees with Pāli Text.

The Commentary to the Samādhi Sutta II explains thus: 'Mental calm in himself' means 'mental calm associated with appanācitta." The higher wisdom of insight into things (saṅkhāra)' means 'vipassanañāṇa penetrating into saṅkhāra.' It is higher wisdom that gains an insight into saṅkhāra or five khandhās. It is, therefore, termed higher wisdom capable of penetrating into saṅkhāra. (46)

In this Sutta, the words *lābhi* and *na lābhī* refer respectively to the attainment or otherwise of jhāna–samādhi and vipassanā. They do not refer to the attainment or otherwise of pādaka jhāna. This point should be carefully noted.

That sukkha–vipassaka is not jhāna–attainer, the Uparipaṇṇāsa Commentary states thus: If the extent of *samāpattilābhī adhimānikā* (one who has undue confidence in himself as an arahant

possessed of samāpatti) is stated, it covers that of a *sukkhavipassaka adhimānika* (dry insight worker who thinks he is an arahant). If the extent of an arahant possessed of samāpatti is stated, it covers that of a sukkhavipassaka arahant. (47) (Majjhima Commentary, IV, 36)

In this Commentary, pairing of *samāpattilābi adhimānika* and *sukkha-vipassaka adhimānika*, and pairing of samāpattilābī arahant and sukkha-vipassaka arahant point up the fact that sukkha-vipassaka is not a jhāna-attainer. If sukkha-vipassaka were a jhāna-attainer, pairing should not have been done in this manner.

The attention of the Ven. Kheminda may be invited to the Susima Paribbājaka Sutta, Mahāvagga, Nidānavagga Saṁyutta, wherein the Blessed One most explicitly stated that sukkha-vipassaka arahant does not attain jhāna. Paribbājaka Susima joined the Order of the Brethren to learn the Buddha's teachings so that he and his company could preach them for the sake of worldly benefits.

One day he asked the monks who had attained arahantship whether they attained five lokiya abhiññā and arūpajhāna. The Arahants replied that they had been freed by insight. Susima said: "I do not know fully the matter stated concisely by the venerable ones." The Arahants said: "Whether you know it or not, we have been freed by insight."

Not being satisfied with their answer, he approached and told all to the Buddha. The Buddha explained the matter thus: "Whether you come to know it, Susima, or whether you do not, first comes knowledge of the law of cause (and effect)....(*dhammathitiñāṇa*).....and afterwards comes knowledge about Nibbāna. Now what think you, Susima? Is the body permanent or impermanent? Impermanent, Lord... Old age and dying are conditioned by birth. Susima, seest thou this? Even so, Lord....When ignorance ceases, activities cease. Susima, seest thou this? Even so, Lord. Then, surely thou, Susima, thus knowing, thus seeing, dost enjoy diverse mystic powers? Not so, Lord". (48) (See *Kindred Sayings*, II 88–89 PTS).

Considering the circumstances in which Susima became a monk, what Susima said in reply to the Buddha's questions, and while doing so he attained arahantship in the very presence of the Buddha, the Ven. Kheminda should be able to understand that Susima was not a jhāna-attainer and realised the truth in the presence of the Buddha. It is quite clear, then, that the Ven. Kheminda's assertion that suddha-vipassanāyānika attained Purification of Mind by means of jhāna is wrong. Again, considering the Arahants' reply: "We have been freed by insight", it is quite clear that Ven. Kheminda's view is wrong. That he is wrong will be more clear by judging the following Commentary.

"We have been freed by insight" means "We have not attained jhāna, so we sukkhavipassaka have been freed by insight."

"Dhammathitiñāṇa" means 'vipassanāñāṇa'. That vipassanāñāṇa comes first. 'Knowledge about Nibbāna' means 'maggañāṇa that comes about at the conclusion of vipassanā contemplation'. That maggañāṇa comes afterwards. So the Buddha said thus.

"Why did the Buddha say the word beginning with 'Whether you come to know it.'? He said so to show that ñāṇa can come about thus without jhāna–samādhi as well. What the Buddha meant was this: "Susima, magga and phala are not the effects of samādhi, not the fruition of samādhi, not the consummation of samādhi; magga and phala are the effects of vipassanā, the fruition of vipassanā, the consummation of vipassanā. So, whether you come to know it or whether you do not, vipassanāñāṇa comes first and knowledge about Nibbāna comes afterwards."

"Now, knowing the potentiality of Susima, the Buddha discoursed on the three characteristics of life, beginning with, What think you Susima, is body permanent or impermanent? At the end of the discourse, Susima attained arahantship. The Buddha, then, desiring to examine Susima, put questions to him, such as 'Old age and death are conditioned by birth. Susima, seest thou this?" Why did the Buddha

ask Susima questions such as, 'Dost thou enjoy (mystic powers)?' Because the Buddha wanted to emphasise the fact of sukkhavipassaka arahant, bereft of jhāna. It conveys the sense 'You are not the only sukkhavipassaka who is bereft of jhāna. So too are those monks." (49)

In this Sutta, it is clearly shown that Susima as well as the arahants who answered his questions did not attain five lokiya abhiññas and arūpa jhānas. From this, it should not be construed that they attained rūpa jhānas. Lokiya abhiññas are the by-product of rūpa jhānas. When it is stated that lokiya abhiññās are not attained, by this is also meant that rūpa jhānas are not attained. As a matter of fact, because Susima did not put a direct question to the arahants whether they attained rūpa jhānas, no direct reference is made in this Sutta to rūpa jhānas. Even if he had done so, the arahants had no alternative but to answer thus: "We have been freed by insight."

That is why, in the Commentary to this Sutta, the sentence: "We have been freed by insight" goes to show that the arahants were nijjhānaka (having no jhāna) sukkhavipassaka. Here, the word nijjhānaka should be defined thus: *Natthi jhānāṅ etesan-ti nijjhāna, eva nijjhānaka*! This qualifying word nijjhānaka is not a byavacchedaka epithet that excludes the irrelevant sense of the word qualified, but bhutakathana epithet that confirms the meaning of sukkhavipassaka which it qualifies. There-

fore, nijjhānaka should not be construed to be of the same sense with nijjhānaṁ of the phrase nijjhānaṁ khamanti in the Alagaddūpama Sutta. It is not found in any Pāli Text, Commentary, and Sub–Commentary that nijjhānaka bears the same meaning as nijjhānaṁ.

Judging by the above–mentioned Commentarial statement: 'the Buddha said so to show that ñāṇa can come about thus without jhāna–samādhi as well,' it is clear that this word nijjhānaka is to be understood as meaning 'having no jhāna.'

The correctness of this interpretation is confirmed by the following explanation of 'without jhāna–samādhi as well' in Paramattha–pakāsinī. 'Without jhāna–samādhi as well' means 'bereft of samādhi as well, developed previously (*purima-siddhaṁ*), reaching up to samatha–lakkhaṇā. This is said in reference to vipassanāyānika." (50)

Judging by this Sub–Commentary, it is also clear that vipassanā–ñāna is possible without jhāna–samādhi developed previously, reaching up to Samādhi–lakkhaṇā, and so nijjhānaka must be interpreted as 'having no jhāna'. That is why the Sub–Commentator points out that 'Without jhāna–samādhi as well' is said in reference to vipassanāyānika (sukkhavipassaka).

The Commentary and Sub–Commentary most clearly point out that sukkhavipassaka or suddhavipassanāyānika individuals do not attain

jhāna. Therefore, the Ven. Kheminda's assertion that vipassanāyānika, having attained Purification of Mind by means of jhāna, begins vipassanā contemplation to attain Purification of View etc is opposed to the Commentary and the Sub-Commentary.

NOTES

43. A. (I, 399). Kathañ-ca bhikkhave puggalo samanapundariko hoti? Idea bhikkhave bhikkhu āsavānaṁ khaya anāsavaṁ cetovimuttim paññāvimuttiṁ ditth'eva dhamme sayaṁ abhiññā sacchikatvā upasam pajja viharāti, no ca kho attha fimokkhe kāyena phusitvā biharati. Evaṁ kho bhikkhave puggalo samanapundariko hoti.

44. AC. (II, 322) Samanopandariko-ti pundarikasadiso samano, Pundarikam name unasatapattam sararoham, Ihina sukkharivapassakakhinasavam dasseti, so hi jhanabhinnanam abhavena aparipunnagunatta samanapundariko nama hoti,

45. A. (I. 405) Idha pana bhikkhave ckacco puggalo lobi adhipannadhamma-vipassanaya, na labhi ɛjjhattan cetossamathassa....Tara bhikkhave yv'ayam puggalo labhi abhi abhipanadhamma-vipassanaya na labhi ajjhattam cetosamathassa, tnea bhikkhave puggalena adhipannadhamma-vipassanaya pattithaya ajjhattam cetosamathe yogo karaniyo. Sa aparena samayenɛ labhi e'eva hoti abhipanadhamma-vipassanaya, labhi ca ajjhattam cetosamathassa.

46. AC. (II, 325) Ajjhattam cetosamathassa–ti niyakajjhatte appanacittassmadhssa. Adhipannadhamma–vipassanaya–ti. sankharigga-hakavipassananassa. Tan–hi adhipannasankhatan–ca pancrkkhandhssankhatesu ca dhammesu vipassanabhutam, tasma adhipannadhamma–vipassan'ti vuccati.

47. MC. (IV, 36) samapattilabhino hi adhimanikassa nighamse kathite sukkhavipassa-kassa–pi adhimanikassa kathito'va hoti. Samapattilabhino ca khinasavassa kathite sukkhavipassakasso kathito'va hoti.

48. S. (I, 344) Ajaneyyasi va tvam susima na va tvam ajaneyyasi, atha kho dammatthitinanam pubbd paccha nibbane nanam. Tam kim mannasi susima rupam niccam va aniccam va–ti? Aniccam bhante..... "Jatipaccaya jarmaranan" ti susima passasi–ti? Evan bhante..."Avijjaniaodho–ti susima passati–ti? Evam bhante. Apipana tvam susima evam jananto evam passanto anekavihitam iddhividham paccanubhosi...? No hemam ohante.

49. SC. (II. 117) Pannavimutta kho mayam avuso–ti avuso mayam nijjhanaka sukkhovipassaka pannamatte'eva vimutto'ti desseti..... Dhammatthitinanan–ti vipassananam, tam pathamatarrm uppajjati. Nibbene nanan–ti vipassanoya cinnante pavattamagganam, tam paccha uppajjati. Tasma bhagava evam'aha.

Ajaneyyasi va–ti–adi kasma vittam? vittam? Vina–pi samadhim evam nanuppatti–dassanat-

tham. Idam hi vuttam hoti: "susima maggo va phalam va na samadhinissando, na samadhi-anisamso, na samadhissa nipphatti vipassanaya pan 'eso nissando, vipassanaya anisamso, vipassanaya nipphatti. Tasma janeyyasi va tvam, na va tvam janeyyasi atha kho dkammatthina-nam pubbe pacca nibbane nanan'ti.

Idani-ssa pativedhabhabbatam natva teparivattam dhamma-desanam desento "Tam kim mannasi susima repam niccam va aniccam va" ti-adim'ana. Teparivatta-desanavasane pan thero arahattam patto. Idani'ssa anuyagam aropento "Jatipaccaya jaramaranan-ti susima passasi" ti-adim' aha. "Api pana tvam susima" ti idam kasma arabhi? Nijjhanakonam sukkha-vipassa-kabhikkhunam pakatakaranatham. Ayamh ettha adhippayona kevalam tvam'eva nijjhanako sukkh-vipassako, ete-pi bhikkhu evarvpa'yeve-ti-

50. SSC. (II, 124) Vina-pi samathalakkha-nappattam purimasiddham vina-pi samadhin'ti vipassanayanikam sandhana vuttam.

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION

Rebuttal of Reply to Rejoinder I–VI

By Sayadaw U Nyanuttara, Agga Mahā Paṇḍita (Burma)

Judging also by ths fact that many a person attained maggaphalañāṇa while listening to the discourses of the Buddha, it is undeniable that Purification of Mind can come about to one without having attained jhāna. It is not to be doubted that while those persons were reflecting on what they heard, the hindrances were overcome. Purification of Mind attained, vipassanañāṇa arose in the progressive order, culminating in the realisation of magga–phala–ñāṇa. This fact is borne out by Pāli Texts, some of which will be shown below.

Upāli Sutta, Majjhima Paṇṇāsa, Majjhima Nikāya, shows how Upāli realised the truth. "Then the Blessed One discoursed to him (Upāli) a graduated sermon....When the Blessed One perceived that the mind of Upāli, the householder, was prepared, pliant, *free from obstacles*, elevated and lucid, then he revealed to him that exalted doctrine of the Buddhas, viz: Suffering, its Cause, its Ceasing and the Path. Just as a clean cloth, free from stain, would take the dye perfectly, even so, to Upāli, the householder, whilst seated in that place, there arose the spotless, the stainless vision of Truth. He knew:

"Whatsoever has causally arisen must inevitably pass utterly away." (51) (*The Wheel*, Nos. 98–99 B. P. S. Translated by Nārada Thera and Mahinda Thera).

In the Commentary to this Sutta, it is explained thus: 'Vision of Truth' means 'Three maggas (Sotāpatti magga, Sakadāgāmi magga and Anāgāmi magga)' in the forthcoming Brahmāyu Sutta and 'āsavakkhayañāṇa (arahatta magga)' in Cūla Rāhulovāda Sutta, whereas it means 'sotāpatti magga' in this Upāli Sutta. (52)

This Sutta and its Commentary show vividly that Upāli overcame the hindrances and attained Sotāpattimagga while listening to the Buddha's sermon. Considering the overcoming of the hindrances and the attainment of Purification of Mind at the beginning, and the attainment of Sotāpattimagga at the end, it should be understood by the method of miga-padavaḷañjana (the footprints of a deer) that vipassanañāna such as nāma-rūpa-paricchedañāṇa arose in the mind progressively. Judging also by the fact that Upāli was a close disciple and supporter of Nigantha, and that he came to the Buddha for a wordy battle and realised the truth on the spot, his overcoming of the hindrances and attainment of Purification of Mind was not because of jhāna–samādhi.

Let us now see how Sāriputta Paribbājaka realised the truth after hearing a stanza from

the Ven. Assaji, a disciple of the Buddha. Sāriputta asked the Ven. Assaji whose dhamma he professed. The Ven. Assaji uttered this terse expression of dhamma:

"Those things which proceed from a cause,
Of these the Truth-finder has told that Cause,
And that which is their stopping....
the great recluse has such a doctrine."

When the Ven. Sāriputta had heard this stanza, there arose dhamma-vision, dustless, stainless, that 'whatsoever is of the nature to uprise, all that is of the nature to stop."

When Moggalāna Paribbājaka heard this dhamma from the Ven. Sāripūtta, there arose in him dhamma-vision in the same manner."(53)

(See *Book of Discipline*, Part IV, Page 53–54. Sacred Books of the Buddhists, Vol XIV).

"Again, the Lord knowing by mind the reasoning in the minds of these twelve myriad brahmins and householders of Māgadha, talked a progressive talk....When the Lord knew that their minds were ready, malleable, *devoid of hindrances*, uplifted, pleased, then he explained to them the teaching on dhammas which the Awakened Ones have themselves discovered: ill, uprising, stopping, the Way. As they were (sitting) in those very seats, dhamma–vision, dustless, arose to them, that 'whatever is of the nature to uprise, all that is of the nature to stop.' (The remaining) one myriad declared themselves to be lay–followers"(54) (ibid, Pages

48–49)' 'Dhamma-vision' means 'Sotāpatti-maggañāṇa' (55)

King Bhimbisāra and his people of Māgadha... one hundred and ten thousand all told... did not attain jhāna but overcame the hindrances, attained Purification of Mind and finally Sôtāpatti magga by reflecting on the dhamma while listening to the Buddha's discourses.

Again, there arose to Yasa, the young man of a rich family, his parents, his wife, his fifty friends dhamma-vision in the same manner. (56) (ibid, Pages 23–28)

Let us now see how Bāhīya Dāruciriya realised the truth. "Bāhiya of the Bark Garment... being esteemed, honoured, thought much of, worshipped and with deference paid to him .... got plenty of robes and alms-food, bed and seat, comforts and medicines for sickness". Bāhiya wondered whether he was an arahant. So a devatā, who was formerly a dhamma-friend of his, came to where he was, and told him that he was not an arahant. Bāhiya was filled with remorse and then went in a great hurry to the Exalted One and requested him to teach him.

"The Exalted One admonished Bāhiya with this concise teaching. 'Bāhiya, then you must train yourself: In the seen, there will be just the seen, in the heard just the heard ....." Thereupon, Bāhiya, thanks to this concise

dhamma–teaching of the Exalted One, by not clinging, thenceforth released his mind from the cankers."(57) (Udāna: Pages 8–9, Sacred Books of the Buddhists).

"Bāhiya, while listening to the discourse of the Buddha, established in virtue and mental calm, developed vipassanā contemplation, and possessed of swift direct knowledge (khippa abhiññā), overcame all cankers and became a paṭisambhidāpatta arahant," (58) (Commentary to Udāna, 58)

This Bāhiya Sutta and its Commentary also show vividly that Bāhiya Dāruciriya, although bereft of jhāna, overcame the hindrances, and attained Purification of Mind and gained vipassanā, magga and phala ñāṇas while listening to the Buddha's terse discourse. As a matter of fact, innumerable individuals, although bereft of jhāna, overcame the hindrances and realised the truth while listening to the discourses of the Buddha.

I have placed before the Ven. Kheminda a number of most reliable Pāli Texts, Commentaries and Sub–Commentaries for his consideration, and if he understands them, I hope he will give up his obviously wrong view that vipassanāyānika also develops samatha at the stage of Purification of Mind.

ANSWER TO 3 (b)

The Ven. Kheminda asserts that the terms samathayānika and vipassanāyānika appear only at the stage of Purification of View. To use his own words, "In support of this assertion he does not cite any authority. Mere assertions, however, do not carry conviction." In fact, his assertion is but a figment of his imagination.

This wrong assertion deserves no special treatment because my answer to 3 (a) covers the point also. I have pointed out there that samathayānika attains Purification of Mind by means of samatha and vipassanāyānika attains Purification of Mind by means of vipassanā. So, samathayānika and vipassanāyānika are differentiated at the stage of Purification of Mind. These two terms come into use at the very first stage, and not at the stage of Purification of View.

If, as the Ven. Kheminda takes it, vipassanāyānika, like samathayānika, develops samatha at the stage of Purification of Mind and develops vipassanā only at the stage of Purification of View, on the ground that samatha precedes vipassanā, he must then be regarded as samathayānika, and not vipassanāyānika. If what the Ven. Kheminda asserts were true, it is opposed to what is stated in Paṭisambhidāmagga: "Thus, vipassanā comes first, samatha afterwards." (59) I wonder whether the Ven. Kheminda interprets this sentence in this manner:

"Thus, samatha comes first, vipassanā comes in the middle, and samatha comes afterwards." If the Ven.Kheminda's assertion holds any water there cannot possibly be any vipassanāyānika: all shall have to be classified as samathayānika. It could not, certainly, be so. Therefore, the Ven. Kheminda's assertion that vipassanāyānika develops concentration at the stage of Purificr-tion of Mind cannot happen, to use his own words again, "in the realm of fact - but of fiction."

This being so, the Ven. Kheminda's view that the terms samathayānika and vipassanāyā-nika appear only at the stage of Purification of View is diametrically opposite to the Buddha's teachings. To be convinced that my observation is correct, he should make a careful review of my lengthy answer to 3 (a).

NOTES

51. M. (II, 43) Atha kho bhagava upalissa gahapatim kallacittam muducttam vinivarana-cittam udaggacittam pasannacittam, atha ya buducttam samukkamsika dhammadesana, tam pakasesi dukkam samudayam nirodham maggam. Seyyathapi nama suddham vattham apagataka-lakam sammad'eva rajanam pattiganheyya, evem'eva upalissa gahapatissa tasmin'–yeva asane virajam vitamalam dhammacakkhum udapadi" yam kin–ci samudayadhammam, sabbam tam nirodha–dhamman" ti.

52. MC. (III, 65) Dhammacakkhun–ti upari brahmayusutte tinnam magganam, culaarahulovade asavakkhayass'etam namam. Idha pana sotapattimaggo adhippeto.

53. Vin. (III, 51) Atha kho ayasma assaji sariputtassa paribbajakassa imam dhammapariyayam abhasi.

> Ye dhamma hetuppabhava, tesam hetum tathagato aha, tesan–ca yo nirodho, evam–vadi mahasamano–ti.
>
> Athakho sariputtassa paribbajakassa imam dhammapariyayam sutva virajam dhammacakkhum udapdi "yam kin–ci samudayadhammam subbam tam nirodhadhamman" ti. Atha kho moggallanassa paribbajakassa imam dhammapariyayam sutva virajam ... nirodhadhamman" ti.

54. Vin. (III, 47). Atha kho bhagava tesam dvadasanahutanam magadhikanam brahmano–gahapatikanam cetasa cetoparivitakkam annaya anupubbim katham kathesi....Yada te bhagava annasi kallacite muducitte vinivaranacitte udaggacitte pasannacitte, atha ya buddhanam sumukkamsika dhammadesana, tam pakasesi dukkam samudayam nirodham maggam ..ekadasa–nahutanam magadhikanam brahmana– gahapatikanam bimbisarappamukhanam tasmim'yeva asane virajam vitamalam dhammacakkhum udapadi "yam kin-ci samadayadhammam sabbam tam nirodha–dhamman" ti. Ekanhutam upasakattam pativedesi.

55. VinC (III, 254). Dhammacakkun–ti sotapattimagganam.

56. Vin. (III,22) Yasassa kulaputtassa bhagava anupubbin katham kathesi...Yada bhagava annasi yasam kulaputtam kallacittam muducittam vinivaranacittam udaggactittam pasannacittam... yasassa kulaputtassa tasmin'yeva asane virajam vitamalam dhammacakkhum udapadi "yam kin–ci samudayadhammam sabbam tam nirodhadhamman" ti.

(Ibid. 23) Setthisa gahapatissa... (ibid,25) Tasam (ayasmato yasassa matapuranadutiyikanam) ... (ibid,26) Tesam (ayasmato yassassa catunnam gihisshayakanam) ... (ibid, 27) Tesam (pannasa-mattanam gihisahayakanam) tasmin= yeva asane virajam vitamalam dhammacakkhum udapadi "yam kinci samudayadhammam sabbam tam nirodhadhamman" ti.

57. Udn (85) Tasmat'iha te bahiya evam sikkhitabbam: "hitthe ditthamattam bhavissati, sute sutamattam bhavissati, mute mutamattam bhavissati, vinnate vinnata–mattam bhavissati" ti. Evan–hi te bahiya sikkhitabbam. Atha kho bahiyassa daruciriyassa bhagavato imaya dhamma–desanaya tavadeva anupadaya asavehi cittam vimucci.

58. UdnC. (84–85) So hi satthu dhammam sunanto eva silani sodhetva yathaladdham cittasamadhim nissaya vipassanam patthapetva khippabhinnataya tavadeva sabbasave khepetva saha patisambhidahi arahattam papuni.

59. Ps. (287) Iti pathamam vipassana, pcacha samatho.

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION

Rebuttal of Reply to Rejoinder I–VII

By Sayadaw U Nyanuttara, Agga Mahā Paṇḍita (Burma)

ANSWER TO NO. 4

In my Rebuttal I–I, I have mentioned that the Ven. Kheminda makes, in the main, fourteen allegations and assertions in his Reply to my Rejoinder. I have already given answers to Nos. 1, 2 and 3.

The Ven. Kheminda writes: "The development to the Noble Eightfold Path is described in two ways: (i) by way of the three aggregates of virtue, concentration and wisdom; by way of the seven purifications. In both these methods the development of insight begins at the third stage of Purification of View. Meanwhile the first two stages have been already developed."

It is hardly necessary to rebut this assertion, because this matter has been fully dealt with in the answers to Nos. 2 and 3. Therein I have explained at length, quoting the relevant passages from Pāḷi Texts, Commentaries and Sub–Commentaries, that a vipassanā–yānika, established in virtue, practises satipaṭṭhāna contemplation and attains first of all Purification of Mind, comprised in the aggregate of concentration, and only after that, in due order, five purifications beginning with Purification of View, comprised in the aggregate of wisdom.

If the Ven. Kheminda understands this explantion he will also realise that his assertion that to a Suddha–vipassanāyānika vipassanā contemplation does not begin at the stage of Purification of Mind but only at the stage of Purification of View is absolutely wrong. I shall not go further but instead urge the Ven. Kheminda to make a careful review of my answers to Nos. 2 and 3.

I may as well make a gift of the Dhamma by quoting a paragraph from the *Maggaṅga Dīpanī* by the Most Venerable Ledi Sayadaw of revered memory.

> "According to the method of Sukkha–vipassaka Puggala (one who practises Insight only), samatha (calm) and ānāpāna (Exhaling and Inhaling), etc. are not practised separately. After observing the three constituents of the Morality–group of the Eightfold Path, the practice of the Wisdom–group of the Eightfold Path is undertaken. The three constituents of the Concentration–group of the Eightfold Path come along together with the two constituents of the Wisdom–group of the Eightfold Path, and these two sets are termed Pañcaṅgikamagga (the five constituents of the Eightfold Path). These five form one group and together with the aforesaid three constituents of the Morality–group of Eightfold Path."–*Maggaṅga Dīpanī*, The Manual of the Constituents of the Noble Path, Page 62–

63, as translated, revised and edited by the English Editorial Board of the Union of Burma Buddha Sāsana Council.

The name of the Most Venerable Ledi Sayadaw is surely not unknown to the Ven. Kheminda. As a matter of fact the Ledi Sayadaw was a distinguished luminary in the Buddhist world for more than half a century, a shining light not only in the East but also in the West. He was deeply respected by Mrs. Rhys Davids and other pioneers of the Pāḷi Text Society, London, for his profound knowledge of the Tipiṭaka. He was the author of a considerable number of Buddhist Treatises, notably on Vipassanā. His works are held in high esteem both by the Saṅgha and the laity. He had categorically stated that it is not necessary for a sukkha–vipassaka to develop samatha separately as he, established in virtue, can begin vipassanā contemplation.

The Ven. Kheminda should now be able to clear his doubt and have a correct view. In case he is still unable to see from the right angle, his attention must be drawn to the following passage taken from *The Path of Freedom* (*Vimuttimagga*), page 310, of which he is one of the joint translators.

"Bare Insight: One overcomes the hindrances through understanding–strength. One discerns name after form has been penetrated by way of the bodily formations. Beginning with insight, he develops serenity."

I should like to analyse the passage. "Beginning with Insight, he develops serenity" surely means that a suddhavipassanā–yānika puggala begins with insight as soon as he starts contemplation. It does not certainly mean that he makes an effort to acquire jhāna by means of samatha with a view to attaining Purification of Mind and then begins vipassanā contemplation only at the stage of Purification of View. That he does not develop samatha in order to attain Purification of Mind is all the more clear because of the words: "one overcomes the hindrances through understanding-strength."

These words explain how Purification of Mind is attained. In explaining this point, it is clearly shown that the hindrances are overcome "through understanding–strength" and not "through jhānic samādhi". Judging by this, it is very clear that a suddhavipassanā–yānika puggala does not develop to attain Purification of Mind, and also that he overcomes hindrances and attains Purification of Mind while developing vipassanā.

"One overcomes the hindrances through understanding–strength." This sentence is quite in agreement with the Ledi Sayadaw's statement: "The three constituents of the Concentration–group of the Eightfold Path come along together with the two constituents of the Wisdom–group of the Eightfold Path."

It is quite evident that the Ven. Kheminda accepted the above mentioned view of suddhavipassanā as expressed in *Vimuttimagga* while he was translating the particular passage thereof. Why? Because there is no note of dissent in this respect in the footnotes but instead the translators had thought it fit to reproduce complete passages of the Paṭisambhidāmagga, showing insight that precedes serenity. I really cannot understand why the Ven. Kheminda is now opposing with tenacity the correct view which he himself had accepted with satisfaction, a view which is quite in accord with the authoritative Pāḷi Text.

ANSWER TO No. 5

The Ven. Kheminda writes: "After developing virtue it is not possible to develop wisdom skipping concentration. Should vipassanā be developed without samatha the stages of Purification of Mind and Purification of View would be reversed." Answers to Nos. 2 and 3 have, in fact, covered this point. However, I shall explain it again briefly here.

In the Bāhiya and Uttiya Suttas, Ambapāli Vagga, Mahāvagga Saṁyutta, the Buddha exhorts thus: "Monk, leaning on virtue, established in virtue, you can cultivate the four stations of mindfulness." (See Notes 1 and 2). This exhortation clearly shows that, if one is not samathayānika, he can contemplate vipassanā, when he is established in virtue,

Nevertheless, as explained in my answer to No. 2 (b) with reference to the Sāla Sutta and its Commentary, momentary, access or fixed concentration, as the case may be, can be developed in the course of contemplation of the four stations of mindfulness and Purification of Mind attained. After the attainment of Purification of Mind, Purification of View can be attained.

How can it be said that contemplation by this method skips concentration? That is why the Ledi Sayadaw pointed out thus: "The three constituents of the Concentration–group of the Eightfold Noble Path come along together with the two constituents of the Wisdom–group." Because of the fact that by means of concentration arisen while developing vipassanā, hindrances are overcome and Purification of Mind attained, and thereafter Purification of View is attained, it cannot be said that the two stages are reversed.

This order of progress is stated in *The Progress of Insight*, page 4. "While thus practising the exercise of noticing with unhindered mind, the noticing mind will get more close to and fixed at whichever object is noticed, and the act of noticing will proceed without break. At that time there arises in him, in uninterrupted succession, "the concentration of mind lasting for a moment", directed to each object noticed.' This is called 'Purification of Mind'."

The attainment of Purification of View is stated thus on page 7 thereof.

"When that knowledge has come to maturity, the meditator understands thus: 'At the moment of breathing–in there is just the rising movement of the abdomen and the knowing of the movement, but there is no self besides'. Understanding it thus in these and other instances, he knows and sees for himself by noticing thus: 'There is only that pair: a material process as object, and a mental process of knowing it; and it is to that pair alone that the terms of conventional usage 'being', 'person' or 'soul', 'I' or 'another', 'man' or 'woman' refer. But apart from that dual process there is no separate person or being, I or another, man or woman. This is called Purification of View."

From these passages, the Ven. Khemindа should be able to see clearly that the stages of Purification of Mind and View are not reversed.

ANSWER TO No. 6

The Ven. Khemindа writes: Vipassanā cannot be developed before the development of Purification of Mind and Virtue. This point has been covered by the answers to Nos. 2 and 3. However, a brief explanation may be made here. Neither the Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw nor I have ever said or written to the effect that

samatha or vipassanā can be developed without Purification of Virtue. It is true that a samathayānika yogi, established in virtue, attains Purification of Mind by means of serenity and then develops insight. But as for a vipassanāyānika yogi, he established in virtue, does not develop serenity but develops insight straightaway, and thereby attains Purification of Mind. That this practice is quite in accord with the Bāhiya, Uttiya and Bhikkhu suttas of Mahāvagga Saṁyutta, I have explained at length in my answers to Nos. 2 and 3. If the Ven. Kheminda could understand them, the point contained in No. 6 would be cleared.

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION

Rebuttal of Reply to Rejoinder I–VIII

By Sayadaw U Nyanuttara, Agga Mahā Paṇḍita
(Burma)

ANSWER TO No. 7 (a)

Referring to the quotation from the Commentary to the *Visuddhimagga* reproduced on page 4 of *The Progress of Insight*, the Ven. Kheminda alleges that "it is this concentration that the Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw claims to be Purification of Mind or Consciousness which the vipassanāyānika develops". If the Ven. Kheminda has chosen to say "this type of concentration" instead of "this concentration", it can be said that he understands Purification of Mind as described in *The Progress of Insight*. Why? Because the Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw did not quote that particular passage from the Commentary to the *Visuddhimagga* to point out that momentary unification of mind, as stated in the chapter relating to Respiration Mindfulness of the *Visuddhimagga* means Purification of Mind, but to show that momentary Concentration, called Purification of Mind, has that type of power (strength) contained in the said momentary unification of mind.

Undoubtedly, the author of *Paramatthamañjūsā* explained momentary unification of mind, accepting the explanation of "Samādhiyati" of Ānāpānassati Sutta in the Commentary to Uparipaṇṇāsa. It is only natural that the Commentators and Sub-Commentators of a later age adopt, if they think it fit, the words of those who had gone before them. That "Samādhiyati" is also mentioned in the succeeding Kāyagatāsati Sutta, but there being no difference in meaning between it and "Samādhiyati" of the previous Ānāpānassati Sutta, no explanation is given again therein.

The explanation of that word "samādhiyati" is thus: "Samādhiyati" means "well-placed, as if fixed concentration is attained". (See Note 42) "Samādhiyati" of Sections on the Modes of Deportment, Four Kinds of Clear Comprehension and Reflection on the Modes of Materiality in the Kayagatāsati Sutta means momentary concentration only. Because in those Sections, it is not possible to attain proper access concentration and fixed concentration, in accordance with the passage of the Commentary to the Mahā Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta: "The remaining twelve exercises are subjects of meditation leading only to Access Concentration". (Note 60) Judging by this fact, there is no room for doubt that, in showing the strength of momentary concentration of a vipassanāyānika, Paramatthamañjūsā explained, accepting the explanation: "as if fixed concentration is attained" from the Commentary to Uparipaṇṇāsa.

In case, as alleged by the Ven. Kheminda, the Mahasi Sayadaw wished to say that the said momentary unification of mind is Purification of Mind, he would have quoted directly the passage from the *Visuddhimagga*, chapter relating to Respiration Mindfulness, containing the phrase, "momentary unification of mind". Here, instead of doing so, he quoted only the passage from the Commentary to the *Visuddhimagga*, dealing with momentary unification of mind, which goes to show clearly that he never meant to say the said momentary unification of mind is Purification of Mind, as also that he meant to show momentary concentration of mind, called Purification of Mind, has that type of power (strength) in the said momentary unification of mind.

As a matter of fact, I had thought that the Ven. Kheminda understood the Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw's object in making that quotation. Because in his first article: Momentary Concentration and Purification and Purification of Mind (World Buddhism, 1966, July, page 7, middle column), he had written thus: "In this connection the author cites on page 4 a passage from the commentary to the *Visuddhimagga* (Paramatthamañjūsā), reproduced at 3 (b) above, to indicate it seems, the strength of Momentary Concentration." Notwithstanding what he had said in his very first article, the Ven. Kheminda had apparently used the words "it seems" with the definite purpose of driving home his point.

That he cannot put any other construction than what it originally conveys will be made clear after a careful re-reading of the following paragraphs from *The Progress of Insight.*

> "At that time there arises in him, in uninterrupted succession 'the concentration of mind lasting for a moment' directed to each object noticed. This is called Purification of Mind.
>
> "Though that concentration has only momentary duration its power of resistance to being overwhelmed by opposition corresponds to that of Access Concentration.
>
> "In the Commentary to the *Visuddhi-magga,* in the explanation of the chapter relating to Respiration Mindfulness, it is said thus: 'Momentary unification of Mind' means the concentration of mind lasting only for a moment. For that type of concentration, too, when it occurs uninterruptedly with its respective object in a single mode and is not overcome by opposition, fixed the mind immovably, as if in absorption."

The orderly arrangement of the said paragraphs clearly shows (1) how momentary concentration arises at the moment of Purification of Mind, (2) that momentary concentration is called Purification of Mind, (3) that momentary concentration has the same power

as that of access concentration, and to emphasise that power of resistance of momentary concentration, a relevant passage from the Commentary to the *Visuddhi magga* has been evidently quoted. It must be repeated that it was not meant to point out by that quotation that momentary unification of mind in the chapter relating to Respiration Mindfulness is Purification of Mind. This momentary unification of mind as commented upon in the Commentary to the *Visuddhi magga*, is cited because the relevant passage shows clearly the power of that type of momentary concentration arisen while developing vipassanā.

Although the Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw is well aware that Respiration Mindfulness is samatha kammaṭṭhāna, he alluded to the commentarial passage dealing with Respiration Mindfulness, in connection with Purification of Mind attained by a vipassanāyānika, not to show that momentary unification of mind is Purification of Mind but obviously to show that momentary concentration, having the same strength as that of momentary unification of mind, is called Purification of Mind.

Having made an unfair allegation that the Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw claims momentary unification of mind to be Purification of Mind, the Ven. Kheminda arbitrarily passed a judgment: "Thereby he says in other words that Purification of Mind or Consciousness of the

vipassanāyānika arises after insight at the third purification, whereas Purification of Mind or Consciousness is the second purification."

There is not the slightest indication in *The Progress of Insight* that Purification of Mind arises after insight, or Purification of Mind arises at the third purification. But the Ven. Kheminda quotes a sentence from the *Visuddhimagga*: "at the actual time of insight arises momentary unification of mind" (chapter relating to Respiration Mindfulness) to be in accord with the above-mentioned allegation. Relying on this sentence he had made not only an unfair allegation but also passed a judgment arbitrarily.

As a matter of fact, it is the Ven. Kheminda himself who draws the wrong inference that Purification of Mind arises after insight, or Purification of Mind arises at the third purification. It is certainly not the Purification of Mind stated in *The Progress of Insight*, because nowhere therein it has been stated that momentary unification of mind described in the chapter relating to Respiration Mindfulness, is Purification of Mind. Therefore, the view that Purification af Mind and Purification of View are reversed, that "the second is preceded by the third", that "the proximate cause is preceded by its result" is that of the Ven. Kheminda, not the statement of *The Progress of Insight*.

ANSWER TO No. 7 (b)

Again, referring to the passages dealing with Purification of Mind in *The Progress of Insight*, the Ven. Kheminda has made another allegation that Purification of Mind is given a new definition. This allegation is made also because he fails to grasp the explanation therein. Holding fast to the view that jhāna-samādhi alone is sammāsamādhi, he understands only how Purification of Mind is attained by means of jhāna, and it is no wonder that he understands the explanations in *The Progress of Insight* how Purification of Mind is attained by means of momentary concentration, or nominal access concentration, as described in the Mahā Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta, sections on the Modes of Deportment, the four Kinds of Clear Comprehension and Reflection on the Modes of Materiality.

Of course, the Ven. Kheminda would surely understand the direct statement that Purification of Mind is attained by means of jhāna. It is a matter for conjecture whether he will understand even if it is directly stated that Purification of Mind is attained by means of access concentration, for he is addicted to the view that jhāna-samādhi alone is sammā-samādhi.

Although the Ven. Kheminda holds the view that Purification of Mind is attained by means of jhāna, it appears that, if the word

"jhāna" is not directly used to describe the mental process of a samathayānika at the stage of Purification of Mind; he would not accept that explanation. He may allege that this is just a new definition given to Purification of Mind. Therefore, the Ven. Kheminda is perhaps not to blame when he fails to understand the explanation in a practical manner of the mental process of a vipassanāyānika at the stage of Purification of Mind, with no particular reference to the samādhi by which it is attained. The author appears to be responsible for the act of omission, for he has not mentioned the name of the particular samādi.

However, it must be observed that although the Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw has not named a particular concentration at the stage of Purification of Mind, he has clearly explained on pages 4 and 5 of *The Progress of Insight*, in accordance with the Commentaries and Sub-Commentaries, that the said Purification of Mind is momentary concentration, otherwise called access concentration.

I should like to explain a little further. Out of the meditation subjects leading to access concentration explained in the Commentary to the Maha Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta, *The Progress of Insight* deals briefly with three of them, namely: The modes of Deportment, the Four Kinds of Clear Comprehension and Reflection on the Modes of Materiality. Contemplation of one of them leads to access concentration and thereby

Purification of Mind is attained. *The Progress of Insight* explains this point. So, how can it be said with any justification that a new definition is given to Purification of Mind which is attained by means of access concentration explained in accordance with the Commentary to the Mahā Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta.

However, it must be added that although it is called access concentration, these meditation subjects not being those leading to absorption concentration, it is not that access concentration that arises in the neighbourhood of jhāna. It is nominal access concentration, but properly it is momentary concentration. I have explained this fact in my answer to No. 3 (a). Reference may be invited to the first and second columns, page 183, *World Buddhism*, February, 1963.

To say that Purification of Mind is given a new definition is obviously not fair, in view of the above explanations which are quite in consonance with Pāḷi Texts, Commentaries and Sub-Commentaries, but on the other hand one who says so reveals that he is wanting in learning as well as in practical meditation experience.

NOTE

(60) DC. (11, 363) Sesāni dvādasāpi upacārakammaṭṭhānāneva.

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION

Reply To Rejoinder I–IX

By Sayadaw U Nyanuttara, Agga Mahā Paṇḍita

(Burma)

ANSWER TO No. 7 (c)

The Ven. Kheminda's allegation that Purification of Mind takes the place of Purification of View appears to have been made without a careful reading of *The Progress of Insight*. In my answer to No. 5 I have already explained that Purification of Mind is at its rightful second place, Purification of View at its rightful third place in *The Progress of Insight*. I have also explained this point at length in my answer to No.3 (a). Nevertheless, in order that the readers may be able to decide for themselves whether the Ven. Kheminda's allegation is justified or not, I propose to reproduce from *The Progress of Insight* a paragraph relating to Purification of Mind, and the whole section dealing with Purification of View.

> "While thus practising the exercise of noticing with 'unhindered mind', the noticing mind will get more close to and fixed at whichever object is noticed, and the act of noticing will proceed without break. At that time there arises in him in

uninterrupted succession, 'the concentration of mind lasting for a moment', directed to each object noticed. This is called 'Purification of Mind."

"Endowed with the 'Purification of Mind, and continuing the practice of noticing' the meditator now gets to know body-and-mind analytically as follows: 'The rising (i. e. upward movement of the abdomen) is one process; the falling (i. e. downward movement) is another, sitting is another; touching is another, etc.' In that way he gets to know how to distinguish each bodily process that he notices. Further: the knowing of the rising movement is one process; the knowing of the falling movement is another. 'In that way he gets to know each mental act of noticing. Furthermore: 'the rising movement is one process; the knowing of it is another. The falling movement is one process; the knowing of it is another", and so on. In that way he gets to know how to distinguish each bodily and mental process. All that knowledge, indeed, comes from simple noticing, not from reasoning; that is to say: it is knowledge by direct experience arrived at by the mere act of noticing, and not knowledge derived from ratiocination.

Thus when seeing a visual object with the eye, the meditator knows how to distinguish each single factor involved:

'the eye is one; the visual object is another; seeing is another, and knowing it is another'. The same manner applies in the case of the other sense functions.

"For, at that time, in each act of noticing, the meditator comes to know analytically the mental processes of noticing, and those of thinking and reflecting, knowing them for himself through direct knowleage, by his experience; thus: 'they have the nature of going towards an object, inclining towards an object, cognizing an object'. On the other hand, he knows analytically the material processes going on in the whole body, which are here called by the names of the 'rising and falling movements of the abdomen', 'sitting' etc., knowing them thus: 'these have not the nature of going or inclining towards an object, or of cognizing an object'. Such knowing is called 'knowing matter (or the body) by the manifestation of nondetermining'. For it is said in the Mūla–Ṭīkā, the "Principal Sub–Commentary' to the Abhidhamma Vibhaṅga; in other words 'non–determining' (as in the passage quoted) should be understood as having no faculty of cognizing an object.

"Such knowledge as this, which analyses in each act of noticing both the bodily process noticed and the mental process engaged in noticing, according to their

true essential nature, is called 'Analytical knowledge of Body and Mind.'

"When that knowledge has come to maturity, the meditator understands thus: 'at the moment of breathing-in, there is just the rising movement of the abdomen and the knowing of the movement, but there is no self besides; at the moment of breathing-out, there is just the galling movement of the abdomen and the knowing of the movement, but there is no self besides'. Understanding it thus in these and other instances, he knows and sees for himself by noticing thus: 'there is here only that pair, material process is object, and a mental process of knowing it, and it is to that pair alone that the terms of conventional usage 'being', 'person' or 'soul', 'I' or 'another', 'man' or 'woman' refer. But apart from that dual process there is no separate person or being, I or another, man or woman'. This is called 'Purification of View'."

If one carefully makes an analysis of the above passages, it will be vividly seen that (1) Purification of Mind is first attained, (2) then at the beginning of the section dealing with the Purification of View the yogi who has attained Purification of Mind continues to contemplate, (3) gains analytical knowledge of Body and Mind, (4) and finally when that knowledg has come to maturity, gets rid of

the belief in "self" and attains Purification of View, one step after another as experienced in the practical contemplation. Purification of Mind and Purification of View are thus in their rightful places.

ANSWER To No. 7 (d)

The Ven. Kheminda writes: "The Venerable Nyanaponika Thera says ..... in *The Heart Of Buddhist Meditation*...it has been introduced into the practice by the Venerable U Sobhana Mahāthera as it was found to be very effective.... This is the third reason for saying that this method is new."

Whether the Ven. Kheminda's allegation is true or not, I cannot do better than reproduce the following passage from *The Heart of Buddhist Meditation*. They speak for themselves.

> "It was in Burma, in this twentieth century, that a deep–reaching change was effected in that situation by monks who, by their searching spirit, clearly outlined again the singular features of the Way of Mindfulness. Through their own energetic meditative effort they removed for others many obstacles to the correct understanding and practice of the Only Way. And there were many in Burma, and soon also in other countries, who followed them with earnest endeavour.

"It was at the beginning of this century that a Burmese monk, U Nārada by name.... developed the principles and details of the practice which formed the basis for those who followed him as his direct or indirect disciples.

"In order to give a name to the Venerable U Nārada's method of training in which the principles of Satipaṭṭhāna are applied in such a definite and radical way, we propose to call it here the Burmese Satipaṭṭhāna Method; not in the sense that it was a Burmese invention but because it was in Burma that the practice of that ancient Way had been so ably and energetically revived.

"The pupils of the Venerable U Nārada spread the knowledge of his method in Burma as well as in other Buddhist countries, and many were greatly benefited by it in their progress on the Path. The Venerable U Nārada Mahāthera, widely known in Burma as the Jetavan (or Mingun) Sayadaw, passed away on the 18th March 1955, aged 87. Many believe that he attained to final Deliverance (Arahatta).

"It is a cause of deep gratification that, in present–day Burma, the practice of, and instruction in, Satipaṭṭhāna is flourishing and to a remarkable extent bearing results, thus providing a striking contrast to the

waves of materialism surging throughout the world. Satipaṭṭhāna is to-day a strong force in the religious life of Burma. There are numerous training centres in the country, where many thousands have undergone courses of strict Satipaṭṭhāna practice. These courses are attended by monks and lay people alike. It was a sign of mature wisdom that the Government of Burma, under the leadership of Prime Minister U Nu, soon after the country achieved independence, encouraged and supported these centres of meditation, appreciating that minds that have been trained there will be an asset to the country in any walk of life.

"Prominent among the teachers of Satipaṭṭhāna today is the Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw (U Sobhana Mahāthera) who, through his personal instruction in meditation courses, and through his books and lectures, has contributed much to the development of the practice in Burma. Many thousands have been benefited by his wise and experienced guidance. Men and women, young and old, poor and rich, learned and simple folk have taken up the practice with great earnestness and enthusiasm. And results are not lacking.

"Primarily, thanks to the efforts of the Venerable Mahāsī Sayadaw and his pupils, the practice of this method of meditation

has spread to Thailand and Ceylon, and preparations are being made for a meditation centre in India.

"In the following pages, information will be given about a course of strict meditative practice according to the Satipaṭṭhāna method. The course was held at the Thathana Yeiktha, at Rangoon (Burma) under the guidance of the Venerable Mahāsi Sayadaw (U Sobhana Mahāthera)".

I should like to reproduce also a paragraph from the *Way of Mindfulness* by Bhikkhu Soma.

"It would greatly benefit most people to go in for the training in mindfulness in an intensive way from time to time in a suitable place, under the direction of a good meditation master, if such a person is available, and instil into themselves the habits of recollection, carefulness, discrimination and consideration. In Siam and especially in Burma there are meditation monasteries (kamatan kyaungs) to which recluse and layman go in search of solitude, periodically, to walk along this way, under the guidance of meditation (kamatan saya).

The above mentioned passages testify to the fact unmistakably that meditation in accordance with Mahā Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta has been in vogue in Burma since ancient times,

practised all over the country by the Sangha as well as by the laity. It is quite understandable that methods vary at different places, under different teachers. Some prefer Respiration Mindfulness and others respectively practice contemplation of Modes of Deportment, Four Kinds of Clear Comprehension and Reflection on the Modes of Materiality, Feeling and Mind, according as it suits them.

In respect of Reflection on the Modes of Materiality, some focus their attention on the crown of their heads or a focal point just below the breast where caloricity (*tejo*) mani fests. Some contemplate on the manifestation of oscillation (*vāyo*) at the focal point just below the breast. The Ven. Mahāsi Sayadaw contemplates on the body and mind beginning with the rising and falling of the abdomen. He teaches his pupils to contemplate by this method. Here the oscillation, called the rising and falling of the abdomen, is the winds in the belly" (*Kucchisayavāyo*) one of the six kinds of air or wind, described in the Section on the Development of the Definition of the Four Elements. This method is taught because it is found to be most effective in the contemplation of elements in accordance with Reflection on the Modes of Materiality and the Development of the Definition of the Four Elements.

With this in view, the Ven. Nyanaponika Thera writes: 'It has been introduced into the practice by the Venerable U Sobhana Mahāthera

(Mahāsī Sayadaw) as it was found to be very effective." No allegation should be made that contemplation of oscillation (*vāyo*), in accordance with the above-mentioned methods described in the Mahā Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta and *Visuddhimagga*, is a new method. Should such an allegation be made, it is obviously a baseless one.

The Ven. Kheminda states: "There are other venerable sayadaws and theras in Burma who do not acknowledge this teaching." I have explained above that methods vary and those who have been contemplating by other methods that suit them have no reason to change them. But there have been a considerable number of learned sayadaws, sixty to seventy years old, not to say of thousands of theras, who elect the method as taught by the Ven. Mahāsī Sayadaw. The venerable sayadaws who acknowledge the teaching of the Ven. Mahāsī Sayadaw can be seen at his meditation centre, called Thathana Yeiktha,

It is true that methods vary in Burma and the yogis practice meditation according to the method that suits them, but there is consensus of view among them all, both the Sangha and the laity, that a vipassanā-yānika is capable of attaining magga-phala-nibbāna without developing concentration separately. In Ceylon, a difference of opinion prevails on this very point. Although the Ven. Kheminda holds fast to the view that a vipassanā-yānika deve-

lops concentration before he begins to develop insight, Mr S. E. de Silva and the personages of light and leading, cited in his article, "Insight or Vipassanā Meditation–I" (*World Buddhism* , January. 1968), hold the view that a vipassanāyānika does not develop concentration separately. Mr. S. E. de Silva writes:

> "Insight Meditation is commenced in one of two ways, as a follow up of Serenity Meditation (Samādhi Bhāvanā), which develops Jhānas (Absorptions) or as Insight before Serenity (Vipassanā Pubbaga Samata), as given in the texts, without attempting to develop *jhānas*, by looking at Mind and Matter and all other compounded formations from the angle of view of *anicca* (Impermanence), *dukkha* (Infelicity or Ill) and *anatta* (No–self), which process develops Insight and Serenity together.
>
> "This latter method, known in the texts as Sukkha Vipassanā (Dry–vision), popularly called the Burmese method, in Ceylon, because it was re–introduced to Ceylon by Burma recently, in accordance with the traditional custom of revival of Buddhist practices between Burma, Thailand and Ceylon, when any such practice went into disuse in one of these countries.
>
> "Centuries of foreign domination, at this time, had woefully degenerated the Budd-

hist way of life in Ceylon, whereas in Burma, this Sukkha Vipassanā method having been in regular practice, it had transpired that some of the devotees had gained Magga Phala (Sainthood) through this method.

At the personal request of U Nu, the then Prime Minister of Burma, a very ardent Buddhist, and the late Sir U Thwin, who was President of the Buddha Sāsanānuggaha Association, the Ven. Agga Mahā Paṇḍita Mahāsi Sayadaw, who is believed to have gained Magga Phala (Sainthood), it is recorded, came down from Shwebo, in November 1940, to the Thathana Yeiktha Centre, in Rangoon and opened a meditation centre, Mahāsi Sayadaw himself accepting the Meditation Mastership there.

"It is to this source that Ceylon's revival of this Vipassanā method is to be traced.

"And Mahāsī Sayadaw commends this Sukkha Vipassanā (Dry–vision) method in the following terms: It is desirable to work for Lokuttara Samādhi, which is nothing but Magga Samādhi and Phala Samādhi (sainthood). To possess this Samādhi it is essential to cultivate *Paññā* (Wisdom). To develop this *Paññā* it is necessary to carry on the mere practice in Vipassanā Bhāvanā. When the virtue of *Paññā* is duly developed, the necessary qualities for *Sila* and *Samādhi* are also acquired."

(This quotation indicates that Samādhi Bhāvanā can be dispensed with, when jhānas are not being sought.)

The Ven. Nārada Mahā Thera, incumbent of Vajirārāma, Colombo, who has recognised this Sukkha Vipassanā method in his writings, in introducing Mahāsi Sayadaw to a Colombo audience, referred to him as an undoubted Magga Phala Lābhi (Sainthood achieved) yogāvacara bhikkhu.

"The Ven. Hendiyagala Seelaratna Mahā Thera of Ceylon, the chief organiser of the Ariya Samaja Society, in its monthly magazine, Vol. I, October 1949, commends this method as follows. Nibbāna is attainable, just as Arahat Sukkha Vippassaka Cakkhupāla did, without any Jhānas."

"The Path of Freedom (*Vimuttimagga*) page 319 (Joint authors, Rev. N. R. H, Ehara, lecturer, Risho University, Japan; Soma Mahā Thera and Kheminda Thera of Vajirarāma, Colombo,) describes this method tersely: beginning with insight, he develops Serenity."

"Shwe Zan Aung in his *Compendium of Philosophy*, (Pāli Text Society, 1910) emphatically observes: It must be borne in mind that Jhāna is not absolutely necessary to Arahatship. (It is not postulated anywhere in the texts that Jhānas and supernormal Powers vest the holder with quicker or

easier access to Nibbāna or to a higher status there.)"

The Ven. Mahāsī Sayadaw and his pupils contemplate not only on the rising and falling of the abdomen but also on the Modes of Deportment, Four Kinds of Clear Comprehension, Reflection on the Modes of Materiality, Feeling, Mind and Mind States, on whatever occurs at the six sense doors in accordance with the *Mahā Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta*, and the *Visuddhimagga*. Therefore, it is quite patent that the method taught by the Ven. Mahāsī Sayadaw is in full accord with the teachings of the Buddha.

ANSWER To No. 8

The Ven. Kheminda points out that in translating '*vuttappakāraṁ samathaṁ anuppādetvā*, the word 'previously' is an unjustified introduction, because the phrase means 'just without producing the said serenity', *eva* meaning 'just'. This shows that the Ven. Kheminda fails to understand what those words meant.

As a matter of fact, in translating *anuppādetvā* , the insertion of the word 'previously' is not only in consonance with (a) grammar and (b) context, but also helpful to make the meaning more clear. (a) In regard to grammar it should be noted that the suffix '*eva*' is used to denote a very prior to the main verb (*pubbakāla*), a very posterior to the main verb (*aparakāla*), and a verb of the same time with

the main verb (*samānakāla*), '*Tvā*' in the sentence *kasitvā vapati* (he sows after he has ploughed), the suffix denotes *pubbakāla*. In the sentences *dvāraṁ aritvā pavisati* (he comes in after he has closed the door), *dvāraṁ āvaritvā nikkhamati* (he goes out after he has closed the door), the suffix denotes *aparakāla*. In the phrase *andhakāraṁ nihantvāna uditoyaṁ divakāro* (the sun rises dispelling darkness), the suffix denotes *samānakāla*.

In translating *samathaṁ anuppādetvā*, to treat *anuppādetvā* as *aparakāla* is not appropriate. Because the Commentary to Dhammadāyada Sutta explains thus: "When to a vipassanāyānika yogi vipassanā comes to completion, samādhi is attained at the moment of realisation of the Way, Nibbāna being the object. This (samādhi) is samatha". (61)

Again, to treat *anuppadetvā* as *samanakāla* is not appropriate either, because it is not possible to develop both samatha and vipassanā at the same moment of consciousness. This fact is so very patent that it leaves no room for any doubt.

Aparakāla and *samanakāla* being inappropriate, it remains to say that *pubbakāla* is appropriate. The translation 'without having previously developed tranquility' is therefore quite correct, and it is not fair to say that the word 'previously' is an unjustified introduction.

(b) With reference to the context, it is also quite correct. It has been stated earlier in respect of samathayānika: "A person first

develops either Access Concentration or Full Concentration." (62).

In opposition to this statement, in respect of vipassanā–yānika, it is definitely stated 'without having developed tranquility.' Being opposed to the phrase 'first develops' in the previous sentence the phrase 'without developed tranquility' means 'without having first developed tranquility.' To make it more clear 'first' has been replaced by 'previously'. The translation as it stands is, therefore, quite correct with reference to the context.

The Ven. Kheminda writes "The '*va* '(eva) used here for emphasis I have rendered by 'Just'. But the Mūlapaṇṇāsa Ṭīkā explains thus: "By the preclusive term (eva' of) *samathaṁ anuppādetvā va* ,' access concentration is precluded but not momentary concentration, because vipassanā is not possible without momentary concentration." (63)

NOTES

(61) MC. (I, 113) Tassa vipassanāpāripūriyā tattha jātānaṁ dhammānaṁ vossaggārammaṇa to upajjati cittassa ekaggatā. Ayaṁ samatho.

(62) MC. (I, 112) Idhekacco pathamaṁ upacārasamādhiṁ vā appanāsamādhiṁ vā uppādeti.

(63) MSC. (I ,204) Samathaṁ anuppādetvāvā–ti avadhāraṇena upacāra–samādhiṁ nivatteti, na khaṇikasamādhiṁ, Na hi khaṇikasamādhiṁ vinā vipassanā sambhavati.

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION

Rebuttal of Reply to Rejoinder I–X

By Sayadaw U Nyanuttara, Agga Mahā Paṇḍita

(Burma)

ANSWER To No. 9

The Ven. Kheminda writes: "After developing virtue it is not possible to develop wisdom, skipping concentration. Should vipassanā be developed without samatha the stages of Purification of Mind and Purification of View would be reversed." He would not have written in this manner if he could only interpret rightly the relevant passages of Pāli Texts and Commentaries.

I shall explain. The Buddha's discourses admit of two kinds of interpretations: (1) Those which are to be interpreted directly or as they stand, known as nitattha desanā; (2) those which, if interpreted as they stand, are likely to be in conflict with one another and are, therefore, weighed one against another to get the correct interpretation, known as neyyattha desanā.

The Buddha gives a discourse to stress this point in the Aṅguttara Nikāya, Duka Nipāta, Bala Vagga- (See *Gradual Sayings*, Part II, Chapter III (5): "Monks, these two misrepresent the Tathāgata. What two? He who proc-

laims as already explained a discourse which needs explanation; and he who proclaims as needing explanation a discourse already explained." (64)

Commentators and Sub-Commentators make use of these two methods. The Suttas I reproduced in the previous article as well as in this article are nītattha desanā. The Mahā Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta passage showing sammāsamādhi as four jhānas is neyyattha desanā. The Ven. Khemminda, perhaps, not knowing these two methods, has hastily interpreted the Satipaṭṭhāna passage directly or as it stands, as if it were nītatṭha desanā,

The Ven. Kheminda's attention is also invited to a similar passage in Sacca Vibhaṅga, Sammohavinodanī Commentary (page 113), where sammāsamādhi is shown as four jhānas. However, both passages referred to should not be interpreted in a direct manner or as nitattha desanā. If they were so interpreted, upacāra samādhi may as well be considered to be not sammāsamādhi. If so considered, it will be at variance with the Suttas showing that upacāra samādhi leads right up to Ariya magga phala. It will also disagree with such Commentaries as Visuddhimagga which definitely states that Purification of Mind is attained by means of upacāra samādhi.

Therefore, the Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta passage showing sammāsamādhi should be considered as neyyattha desanā, as in the case of

'*ayameva ariyo aṭṭhaṅgiko maggo.*' I shall explain. If aṭṭhaṅgiko is literally interpreted, only the eightfold path associated with the first jhāna would be magga saccā; the sevenfold path associated with the second jhāna etc. would not be magga saccā. As a matter of fact, it is not so. The path associated with the second and other jhānas is also magga saccā. This point is clearly explained by the following passage from Papancasūdanī, Commentary to Majjhima Nikāya, Mūla Paṇṇāsa.

"This middle way is sometimes the eightfold noble path, sometimes the sevenfold noble path. I shall expand. This middle way, when associated with lokuttara first jhāna, is the eightfold path. When it is associated with the remaining jhānas, it is the sevenfold noble path. In this Dhammadāyada sutta, however, by stating the maximum the eightfold path is meant." (65)

As stated above, although to show the maximum the eightfold path is shown, the sevenfold path is also to be considered as the noble path. In the same way, in the passage showing appanā, being the superior development, upacāra samādhi, being the inferior development, should be considered to be sammāsamādhi by including it in the jhāna having five component parts.

Because upacāra samādhi should be considered to be sammāsamādhi as aforesaid, vipassanā khaṇika samādhi which is of the same status

as upacāra samādhi, by reason of its capacity to overcome the hindrances, should be considered to be sammāsamādhi. That it should be so considered is shown thus in the Saṁyutta Commentary:

" 'The jhāna axle' means the axle made of jhāna having five component parts of jhāna, associated with vipassanā." (66)

In this Commentary, judging by the words: 'five component parts of jhāna, associated with vipassanā', it is clear what vipassanā samādhi is jhāna having five component parts of jhāna. Because it is jhāna having five component parts of jhāna, vipassanā samādhi is included in sammāsamādhi.

Again, in the Chapter on Cittuppāda Dhammasaṅgaṇī (page 17), ekaggatā (self-collectedness), associated with kāmāvacara-kusala-citta (Good States of Consciousness), is shown as sammāsamādhi. (67)

Furthermore in the *Visuddhimagga*, knowledge of Contemplation of Rise and Fall is shown as the mundane path. "And his seeing of the rise and fall becomes evident to him as the Truth of the Path thus: 'This is the mundane path' owing to abolition of confusion about it." (page 737, *Path of Purification* by Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli)(68) In showing thus, just as the Knowledge of Contemplation of Rise and Fall is regarded as sammādiṭṭhi, samādhi associated with that knowledge should be regarded as sammāsamādhi. The Ven. Kheminda

should, therefore, understand that vipassanā samādhi also is sammāsamādhi.

In the Chapter on Description of View, *Visuddhimagga*, access concentration is shown as Purification of Consciousness. (see page 679, 'P. of P'). In the Commentary to Mahā Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta, Contemplations on Postures etc., not leading to jhāna attainment, are shown as upacāra kammaṭṭhāna. In showing thus it is clear that upacāra kammaṭṭhāna is the meditation subject leading to the attainment of access concentration, otherwise regarded as sammāsamādhi. From the foregoing explanations, it cannot be claimed, as the Ven. Khemindā asserts, that the four jhānas alone are entitled to the term of sammāsamādhi.

I shall explain further. In the Sila sutta, Pabbata Vagga,Mahāvagga Saṁyutta, the Buddha says: "Monks, whatsoever monks are possessed of virtue, possessed of concentration, possessed of insight, of release by knowlege and insight, the very sight of such brings much profit, I declare." To point out samādhisambojjhaṅga, the Buddha added: "Now, monks, when a monk who is zestful has body and mind tranquillized, then it is that the limb of wisdom which is tranquillity is established in him. When he cultivates this, at such time, by his culture of it, it comes to perfection in him. Happy is he whose body is tranquillized. Of him that is happy the mind is concentrated." (*The Book of the Kindred Sayings*, V, pages 55–56). (69)

In the Commentary to this Sutta, it is stated thus: "Herein, the vipassanā that precede arahatta magga, that comprise different characteristics, that occur simultaneously at a single moment of consciousness, are factors of enlightenment (bojjhanga)." (79)

In the Sammohavinodani Commentary, dealing with Bojjhanga Vibhaṅga, it is stated thus: 'Mind is tranquillized' means mind is kept well, fixed at an object, as if it has reached absorption. 'It is said' means 'it is said that this tranquillity of mind, associated with vipassanā leading to factors of enlightenment, is samādhi–bojjhanga.'..... What is meant by this? This means 'the vipassanā that precede Arahatta magga, that comprise different functions and characteristics, that occur simultaneously at a single moment of consciousness, are factors of enlightenment. (71)

All these textual and commentarial passages clearly show that pubbabhāga samādhi is samādhi–sambojjhaṅga. If it is samādhi–sambojjhanga, it is surely sammāsamādhi–maggaṅga.

Considering all the points which have been explained above, it is abundantly clear that the Mahā Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta passage showing four–jhāna–samādhi as sammā-samādhi is not nitattha desanā, but neyyattha desanā. Therefore, the Ven. Khemindā's view, held ever so tenaciously, that four–jhāna–samādhi alone is sammā–samādhi is obviously not correct.

Like the said Mahā Satipaṭṭhāna passage, there are several passages which should not be treated as nitattha desanā. Daṭṭhabba Sutta, Suddhika Vagga, Indriya Saṁyutta, contains a sentence: "From what point of view should the controlling power of concentration be regarded ? From that of the four jhānas." (72)

If this sentence is treated as nitattha, the following sentences contained in the same Sutta must be treated as such; "From what point of view, monks, should the controlling power of faith be regarded? From that of the four limbs of stream-winning. From what point of view should the controlling power of energy be regarded ? From that of the four supreme effects. From what point of view should the controlling power of mindfulness be regarded? From that of the four stations of mindfulness. From what point of view should the controlling power of insight be regarded? From the point of view of the four Ariyan truths." (*Kindred Sayings* V, pages 171-172) (73)

If they are treated as nitattha desanā four jhānas having nothing to do with sotāpattiyanga, satipaṭṭhāna and saccā, it must be regarded that four jhānas do not comprise the controlling powers of faith, mindfulness and insight. As a matter of fact, it must not be so regarded. Why? Because five controlling powers are comprised in all Kāma (sensual), Mahaggata (sublime) and Lokuttara (supramundane) Kusala (good) states of consciousness.

That they comprise five controlling powers is explained thus in the Commentary to the first Sutta of Suddhika Vagga: "The controlling powers of faith concentration and wisdom are comprised in kusala (good) and vipāka (resultant) mental states of four bhūmis and kriya (inoperative) mental state, and the controlling powers of energy and concentration are comprised in kusala mental state of four bhūmis akusala (bad), vipāka and kriya mental states." (74)

In Dhammasaṅgaṇī, it will be seen that in the section dealing with Good States of Consciousness, it is stated thus: When a good thought....has arisen...then there is the faculty (controlling power) of faith, the faculty (controlling power) of energy, the faculty (controlling power) of mindfulness, the faculty (controlling power) of concentration, the faculty (controlling power) of wisdom (insight). (See page 3, *Buddhist Manual of Psychological Ethics* by Mrs. Rhys Davids.) (75)

It is, therefore, evident that four jhānas comprise the controlling powers of faith, mindfulness and insight. Nevertheless, in the Daṭṭhabba Sutta, particular mention is made of each of the five controlling powers to emphasise its power in its own sphere. That is why, in the Commentary to this Sutta, it is explained thus: "This discourse is given to emphasise the controlling powers in their own spheres."(76)

Therefore, it must be said that this Suṭta is not 'nītattha desanā but neyyattha desanā.

In the same way, the Mahā Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta passage showing four jhānas as sammā-samādhi is not nītattha desanā but neyyattha desanā. Why? Because as I have explained above, not only four jhāna-samādhi but also vipassanā momentary samādhi and access samādhi are regarded as sammā-samādhi. Therefore, the Ven. Kheminda's assertion that knwledge of seeing things as they really are is not possible without sammā-samādhi, born of four jhānas, has no substance.

NOTES

(64) A. (I, 61) Dve'me bhikkhave tathāgataṁ abbhācikkhanti. Katame dve? yo ca neyyatthaṁ suttantaṁ 'nītattho suttanto' ti dīpeti; yo ca nītatthaṁ suttantaṁ 'neyyattho suttanto' ti dīpeti.

(65) MC. (I, 112) Ayaṅ-hi majjhima paṭipadā kadāci ariyo aṭṭhaṅgiko maggo hoti, kadāci sattaṅgiko. Ayaṅ-hi lokuttara-pathamajjhānavasena uppjjamāno aṭṭhaṅgiko maggo hoti, avasesajjhānavasena sattaṅgiko, Ukkaṭṭhaniddesato pan'idha aṭṭhaṅgiko-ti vutto.

(66) SC (III, 158) Jhānakkho-ti vipassanāsampayuttānaṁ pañcannaṁ jhānaṅgānaṁ vase na jhānamaya-akkho.

(67) Dhs. (17) sammāsamādhi hoti.

(68) Dism. (II, 268) Yañc'assa udayabbaya-dassanaṁ, maggo 'v'ayaṁ lokoko–ti maggasaccaṁ pakataṁ hoti tatra sammohavigatato.

(69) S, (III, 62) Yasmiṁ samaye bhikkhave bhikkhu tathā vūpakaṭṭho taṁ dhammaṁ anussarati anuvitakketi....Yasmiṁ samaye bhikkhave bhikkhuno passaddhakāyassa sukhino cittaṁ samādhiyati, samādhisambojjhaṅgo tasmiṁ samaye bhikkhuno āraddho hoti, Samādhisambojjhaṅgaṁ tasmiṁ samaye bhāvanā-pāripūriṁ gacchati.

(70) SC. (III, 182) Imasmiṁ sutte apubhaṁ acarimaṁ ekacittakkhaṇikā nānālakkhaṇā arahattamaggassa pubbabāga vipassanā bojjhangā kathitā.

(71) VbhC. (299). Samādhiyatī–ti sammā ādhiyati, niccalaṁ hutvā ārammane thapiyati, appanāppattaṁ viya hoti. Ayaṁ vuccati–ti ayaṁ bojjhaṅgasamuṭṭhāpikā vipassanāsampayuttā cittekaggatā samādhi=sambojjhango nāma vuccati...Ettāvatā kiṁ kathitaṁ nāma hoti ? aubbaṁ acarimaṁ ekacittakkhaṇe... nānārasalakkhṇa pubbabhāgavipassana–bojjhangā kathitā honti.

(72) S. (III, 172) kattha ca bhikkhave samadhindriyaṁ daṭṭhabbhaṁ? Catūsu jhānesu ettha samādhindriyaṁ daṭṭhabbaṁ.

(73) Ibid. (172) Kattha ca bhikkhave saddhindriyaṁ daṭṭhabbam? Catūsu sotāpattiyangesu ettha saddhindriyaṁ daṭṭhabbaṁ. Katt-

ha ca bhikkhave vīriyindriyaṁ daṭṭhabbaṁ? Catūsu sammappadhānesu ettha vīriyindriyaṁ daṭṭhabbaṁ. Kattha ca bhikkhave satindriyaṁ daṭṭhabbaṁ? Catūsu satipaṭṭhānesu ettha satindriyaṁ daṭṭhabbaṁ.....Kattha ca bhikkhave Paññindriyaṁ daṭṭhabbaṁ? Catūsu ariyasaccesu ettha paññindriyaṁ daṭṭhabaṁ.

(74) S C (III, 264) Indriyasaṁyuttassa pathame saddhindriyaṁ satindriyaṁ paññindriyan–ti imāni tiṇi catubhūmaka–kusala–vipākesu c'eva kiriyāsu ca labbhanti. Vīriyindriya–samādhindriyāni catubhūmakakusale akusale Vipāke kiriyāyā–ti sabbattha labbhanti.

(75) Dhs. (17) Yasmiṁ samaye kāmavacaraṁ kusalaṁ cittaṁ uppannaṁ hoti.....tasmiṁ samaye....saddhindriyaṁ hoti, vīriyindriyaṁ hoti satindriyaṁ hoti, samādhindaiyaṁ hoti, paññindriyaṁ hoti.

(76) SC (III, 264) Kattha ca bhikkhave suddhindriyaṁ daṭṭhabbaṁ, catūsu sotāpattiyangesū–ti–ādi imesaṁ indriyānṁ savisaye jeṭṭhakabhāva–dassanatthaṁ vuttaṁ.

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION

Rebuttal of Reply to Rejoinder I–XI

By Sayadaw U Nyānuttara, Agga Mahā Paṇḍita
(Burma)

ANSWER TO No. 10

The Ven. Kheminda writes to the effect that concentration developed after insight is called vipassanā samyutta samādhi or nibbedhābhāgiya samādhi, it is not called cittavisuddhi. Neither the Ven. Mahāsī Sayadaw nor I have ever stated that the said samādhi, mentioned in Patisambhidāmagga, is cittavisuddhi, and yet the Ven. Kheminda writes in the above vein as if we have stated to that effect perhaps because he could not grasp what I wrote in my article published in the November, 1966, issue of *World Buddhism.* (page 101).

In that article I had explained vipassanā pubbaṅgama samatha bhāvanā in accordance with the Aṅguttara Commentary and Sub–Commentary, Paṭisambhidāmagga and its Commentary. Then, I had made a definite statement that the concentration developed after insight is Ariya–magga samādhi. Relying on the Papañca–sūdanī commentary and Sub–Commentary, I wrote: "The Commentary as well as the Sub–Commentary referred to above explain

clearly that concentration developed after insight is Ariya–magga samādhi." From the foregoing statement, the Ven. Kheminda will realise that I have stated that the concentration developed after insight is citta–visuddhi.

Again, to point out that nibbedabhāgiya samādhi mentioned as upacāra–appanā samādhi in the Paṭisambhidāmagga is Ariya–magga samādhi, although it appears to be Lokiya-jhāna samādhi, I wrote that "It appears that this concentration is lokiya–jhāna–samādhi and access concentration that heralds it. If it were so, it will not agree with the sense conveyed by the Papañacasūdanī Commentary and Sub–Commentary. In particular, it will be hard to reconcile with the words 'the dhammas that arise at the moment'. So the concentration in this passage should be Ariya–magga–samādhi that is developed after insight.

My explanation will convince even a casual reader that I have never stated that the above–mentioned nibbedabhāgiya samādhi is citta visuddhi (Purification of Mind). So the Ven. Kheminda should realise that purification of mind attained by momentary concentration does not convey any suggestion of nibbedabhāgiya samādhi.

(In my Rebuttal of Reply to Rejoinder I, I stated: "In these articles the Ven. Kheminda makes, in the main, the following allegations and assertions: 1 to 14". Point No 11

has been included through oversight. So I shall now deal with point No. 12)

ANSWER TO No. 12

The Ven. Kheminda states: "The Commentary to the Dhammadāyāda Sutta describes only that area of development of the yogi's practice which begins with insight....It does not cover the whole range of his development. It does not even touch the first two stages of the yogi's development". This statement is not correct.

In the said Commentary the samathayānika's development is described thus: "Here a person first develops either upacāra samādhi or appanā samādhi. This is samatha. He contemplates on samādhi and all those associated with it by way of anicca ond so forth. This is vipassanā." (Note 77)

If these commentarial words were to be interpreted literally, it would appear to mean that, after Purification of Mind, skipping Analytical Knowledge of Body and Mind and Purification of View, as also Knowledge by discerning Conditionality and Purification by Overcoming Doubt, vipassanā is described beginning with knowledge by Comprehension and Purification by knowledge and Vision of What is Path and Not-Path. Why?

Because contemplation of body and mind by way of anicca and so forth is possible only

at the stage of Knowledge by Comprehension and Purification by knowledge and Vision of What is Path and Not–Path. In fact, it should not be interpreted that Purification of View and Purification by Overcoming Doubt are skipped. As Purification by knowledge and Vision of What is Path and Not–Path is described, it should be interpreted that its causal factors Purification of View and Purification by Overcoming Doubt are also virtually described.

In the same way, in regard to the Commentarial statement: "A vipassanāyānika contemplates on the five aggregates that are objects of clinging by way of anicca and so forth, without developing samatha," it should be interpreted that because it describes vipassanā, Purification of Mind, an essential factor thereof, is also virtually described. In the said statement, although it is simply stated that contemplation is made on the five aggregates by way of anicca and so forth just as it can be known that its causal factor, Analytical Knowledge of Body and Mind, has been attained, so also it can be known that while contemplating on Body and Mind, vipassanā momentary concentration, otherwise called access concentration, that can overcome the hindrances, has been developed before the attainment of the Analytical Knowledge of Body and Mind. Therefore, the Ven. Kheminda's assertion that the Commentarial statement, referred to above, describes the insight beginning with Purification of View is clearly not correct.

If contemplation by way of anicca and so forth is interpreted as it stands, it would mean that the description begins with Knowledge by Comprehension and Purification by Knowledge and Vision of What is Path and Not–Path, not with Purification of View, as asserted by the Ven. Kheminda. As a matter of fact, those who are well versed in Buddhist scriptures know the interpretation, as I have stated above, that Purification of Mind, Purification of View and Purification by Overcoming Doubt are also virtually described.

Again, quoting Rathavinīta Sutta, the Ven. Kheminda takes that when Purification of Mind is attained, Purification of Virtue is no more, when Purification of View is attained, Purification of Mind is no more, and alleges that the confusion that seeks to include in the term Purification all forms of concentration that arise in the course of development of contemplation is due to the failure to locate the area of development of insight.

In this connection I should like to ask the Ven. Kheminda, if, as he takes it, the preceding Purifications are no more when the succeeding Purifications are attained, whether Purification of Virtue lapses when Purification of Mind is attained. My answer is: "Certainly not. Virtue is purified all the more with the attainment of Purification of Mind."

In fact, the statement in the Rathavinita Sutta that Purification of Virtue is of purpose

as far as Purification of mind means that effort to attain Purification of Virtue ceases with the attainment of Purification of Mind. By that statement, it is not meant that Purification of Virtue lapses at the stage of Purification of Mind. In the same way, when it is stated that Purification of Mind is of purpose as far as Purification of View, it means that no effort needs be made to attain Purification of Mind on the attainment of Purification of View. It does not mean that Purification of Mind lapses. Therefore, Purification of Mind stands intact on the attainment of Purification of View and subsequent Purifications.

That is why Paṭisambhidā Magga, Virāga Kathā, clearly shows that Purification of Mind is sustained at the moment of Ariya Magga by stating thus: "By virtue of its restraints, Purification of Virtue is Virāga (Noble Path). By virtue of its absence of distractions Purification of Mind is Virāga. By virtue of its power of insight, Purification of View is Virāga. (Note 78). In the Commentary to Paṭisambhidā Magga, it is stated thus: "Purification of Virtue means Right Speech, Right Deed and Right Livelihood, Purification of Mind means Right Concentration. Purification of View means Right View and Right Thought." (Note 79).

Judging by the above-mentioned passages of Paṭisambhidā Magga, and its Commentary, seven Purifications remain intact from the moment of their respective attainments throughout the development of insight.

NOTES

(77) MC. (I, 112) Idh'ekacco pathamaṁ upacārasamādhiṁvā appanāsamādhiṁvā uppādeti, ayaṁ samatho. So taṁ-ca taṁsampayutte ca dhamme aniccādīhi vipassati, ayaṁ vipassanā.

(78) Ps. (327) Saṁvaratthena sīlavisuddhi virāgo. Avikkhepatthena cittavisuddhi virāgo: Dassanatthena diṭṭhivisuddhi virāgo.

(79) PsC. (II, 213) Silavisuddhī-ti sammāvācākammantājīvā. Cittavisuddhī-ti sammāsamādhi. Diṭṭhivisuddhī-ti saṁmā samādhi. Diiṭṭhivisuddi-ti sammādiṭṭhi-saṁkappā.

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION

Rebuttal of Reply to Rejoinder I–IIX

By Sayadaw U Nyānuttara, Agga Mahā Paṇḍita

(Burma)

ANSWER To No. 13

The Ven. Kheminda states that the passage beginning with samādahaṁ cittaṁ in the Visuddhimagga is concerned only with samatha–yānika, not with suddhavipassanāyānika. I accept his view. The Ven. Mahāsī Sayadaw has never stated that this passage refers to vipassanāyānika. But nevertheless, "momentary unification of mind at the actual time of insight" contained in that passage is also concerned with that of vipassanāyānika, because momentary unification of mind attained by a samathayānika in the course of vipassanā contemplation is in essence the same as momentary unification of mind attained by a vipassanāyānika in the course of vipassanā contemplation.

Verily it is so, because both of the momentary unification of mind attained by a samathayānika in the course of vipassanā contemplation and that attained by a vipassanāyānika in the course of vipassanā contemplation are kāmāvcara bhāvanā samādhi. Here, both of the said samādhi, being attained in the

course of vipassanā contemplation, are not proper access concentration: they are only momentary concentration. If the Ven. Kheminda can appreciate this point, he will be able to appreciate that just as the samatha attained by a samathayānika in the course of vipassanā contemplation is called momentary concentration, the samādhi attained by a vipassanāyānika in the course of vipassanā contemplation is called momentary concentration.

That such kāmāvacara bhāvanā samādhi is called momentary concentration has been explained at length in the December, 1967, issue of *World Buddhism*, page 119, by quoting the relevant passages of the Sala Sutta, its Commentary and Sub-Commentary. However, for the convenience of the Ven. Kheminda, a passge from the Sala Sutta Commentary may be restated here: "'One-pointed' means being one-pointed by momentary concentration. 'Calmed down, of concentrated mind' means being calmed down, of concentrated mind, by access, and fixed concentration."

Regarding the term khaṇika samādhi, khaṇika, unlike upacāra and appanā samādhi, does not denote a length of time: it lasts only for a moment of contemplation. So the said term of khaṇika has no special quality. Nevertheless this term is used not only for the samādhi attained in the course of vipassanā contemplation. That this term is also used for the Buddha's phalasamāpatti, on the ground of its mo-

mentary duration by the Commentators is shown thus in the Commentaries to Digha and Samyutta Nikāyas. "Did not the Buddha enter into phala-samāpatti from then backwards? Yes; he did. But that phala-samāpatti was momentary. Momentary samāpatti does away with feeling in its duration." (Note 80)

Again, the Ven. Kheminda states that momentary concentration is possible only to one who rises from jhāna and contemplates vipassanā. By that statement, the Ven. Kheminda appears to say that mind can be stabilised only by that momentary concentration. Perhaps, he could not appreciate the spirit of the Commentaries and Sub-Commentaries showing the power of the vipassanā momentary concentration. As a matter of fact, the said Commentaries and Sub-Commentaries show up the power of the momentary concentration attained by both samathayānika and vipassanāyānika in the course of vipassanā contemplation. Paramatthamāñjūsā states thus: "When it (momentary concentration) occurs uninterruptedly with its respective object in a single mode and is not overcome by opposition, it fixes the mind immovably, as if in absorption". (Note 81)

In this Sub-Commentary the words: "When it occurs uninterruptedly with the respective object in a single mode," and the words: "is not overcome by opposition, it fixes the mind immovably, as if in absorption" should be specially noted. These words do not purport to

show that, because one develops insight after rising from jhāna, one's momentary concentration has the power that stabilizes the mind, as if in absorption. In fact, they show up that because momentary concentration occurs uninterruptedly with the respective object in a single mode and is not overcome by opposition, it has the same power as that of absorption or fixed concentration.

When in the Buddhist scriptures a certain dhamma is explained clearly, any other dhamma having the same characteristics can be interpreted in the same manner. That this port of interpretation is called lakkhṇāhāra is shown in Netti. "When a dhamma is explained all the dhammas having the same characteristics are to be regarded as explained in the same manner. This hāra is called lakkaṇāhāra." (Note 82)

The Ven. Mahāsī Sayadaw explains the power of the momentary concentration in *The Progress of Insight* by this lakkhaṇāhāra. I shall explain. The momentary concentration attained in the course of vipassanā contemplation according to Ānāpānasatikathā is directly shown in the Commentaries and Sub-Commentaries. In *The Progress of Insight* the power of the momentary concentration attained in the course of vipassanā contemplation on Body and Mind according to Dhātumanasikārapabba etc, is explained and in this explanation the concentration directly shown in the Commentaries and

Sub-Commentaries is shown likewise on account of both being vipassanā contemplation.

This explanation is made according to lakkhanāhāra method and is in accord with the spirit of the relevant Commentaries and Sub-Commentaries. If this method is not employed or, in other words, if only direct statements are to be adhered to, even in Ānāpānasatikathā, contemplations other than that prescribed by the passage beginning with samādahaṁ cittaṁ will not lead to development of a samādhi by which mind can be stabilised. As a matter of fact, it is not so. Vipassanā samādhi attained by means of all the sixteen methods prescribed in Ānāpānasatikathā can stabilise the mind. In the same way, vipassanā samādhi attained by other methods prescribed in the Buddha's teachings can also stabilise the mind. Therefore, the yogis who contemplate by these other methods can achieve gradual progress of insight and attain maggaphalañāṇa.

ANSWER To No. 14

The Ven. Kheminda makes an unfair allegation, and that in a strong language, thus: Purification of Mind is the proximate cause of insight, and without this proximate cause, can its results, i. e, Purification of View where insight begins, even come to be? It is a fictitious insight that this new teaching speaks of. What it does for the yogi who accepts its method is to halt his progress at the end of

Purification of Virtue". The Ven, Kheminda has made a groundless allegation, nay, an accusation because in *The Progress of Insight* (page 4) the Ven. Mahāsī Sayadaw has explained very clearly how Purification of Mind is attained. In this treatise, the Ven. Mahāsī Sayadaw has explained Purification of Mind, Purification of View etc. not only in accordance with knowledge gathered from the scriptural books.

As a matter of fact, the progress of insight achieved by thousands of yogis who contemplated in accordance with this method is explained with careful reference to the scriptural books, emphasis being laid on the practice and the results. So the allegation that it is a fictitious insight is certainly unfair and unkind.

The Ven. Kheminda states that the progress of the yogis who accepts its method will halt at the end of Purification of Virtue. This statement amounts to holding back those who believe him from vipassanā contemplation. In spite of his misleading statement, the yogis who contemplate in accordance with the method as explained in *The Progress of Insight* are, in fact, contemplating in accordance with the Buddha's teaching: "Leaning on virtue, established in virtue, you can cultivate the four stations of mindfulness", and as the result of their effort and perfections (pāramita), they will surely realise magga-phalañāṇa, being directly experienceable by the wise each in himself. The achieve-

ments of these yogis have been accordingly incorporated in *The Progress of Insight.*

Here, I wish to cite the instance of Upāli, a close disciple of Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta. Upāli went to the Buddha to discuss some points of controversy. After hearing a discourse of the Buddha, Upāli realised the Four Noble Truths and became a sotāpanna.

Nigaṇṭaha Nāṭaputta came to know about the conversion of Upāli. He did not believe but nevertheless sent his trusted disciple Dīghatapassi to go and enquire at the house of Upāli. Dīghatapassī came back to tell him that it was true. Not believing yet, he went himself to Upāli's house. Upāli received him but not with the same respect as before. He became enraged and used strong language against Upāli.

He said: "You, householder, are you out of mind, you are idiotic....You were enticed by the 'enticing device' of the recluse Gotama." (Note 83)

Upāli replied..."Auspious, revered sir, is the 'enticing device'. If my dear kith and kin could be enticed by the 'enticing', for long it would be for the welfare and happiness of my dear kith and kin. If all the nobles... brahmaṇas... merchants....workers, if the world with its devās, its Māras, its Brahmas, its recluses, its men could be enticed by this 'enticing', for long it would be for their welfare and happiness." (see *Middle Length Sayings* II, pages 48 & 49) (Note 84).

In the manner Upāli said to Nāṭaputta, the yogis, who have successfully undergone a full course of contemplation in accordance with the method as explained in *The Progress of Insight*, would surely tell the Ven. Kheminda that the said method is right and is for the welfare and happiness of those who contemplate zealously in accordance with it.

The Ven. Mahāsī Sayadaw has boldly stated as follows at the end of *The Progress of Insight*. "In the beginning it was mentioned that this treatise has been written for those who have already obtained distinctive results in their practice, others may perhaps read it with advantage, too.

"Now these are my concluding good wishes for the latter type of readers: Just as a very delicious, appetizing, tasty and nutritious meal can be appreciated fully only by him who has himself eaten it, and not without partaking of it, in the same way, the whole series of developments of knowledge described here can be understood fully only by one who has himself seen it by direct experience, and not otherwise. So may all good people reach the stage of indubitable understanding of this whole series of khnowledge- developments! May they also strive to attain it!"

The Ven. Kheminda will be well advised to ponder these noble words.

NOTES

(80) DC (II, 137), SC (III, 236) Kiṁ pana bhagavā ito pubbe phalasamāpattiṁ na samāpajjatī–tī? Samāpajjati, sā pana khaṇika–samāpatti, khaṇikasamāpatti ca antosomāpattiyaṁ yeva vedanaṁ vikkhambheti.

(81) Vism C (I, 342) sopi hi ārammane nirantaramekakaṇena pavattamāno paṭi–pakkhena anabhibhūto appito viya cittaṁ nicealaṁ ṭhapeti.

(82) Netti (3) Vuttamhi ekadhamme, ye dhammā ekalakkhaṇāke–ci; vuttā bhavanti sabbe, so hāro lakkhaṇo nāma.

(83) M. (II, 46) Ummatto'si tvaṁ gahapati, datto'si tvaṁ gahāpati....Avatto'si kho tvaṁ gahapati samaṇena gotamena āvaṭṭaniyā–ti.

(84) M. (II, 46) Bhaddikā bhante āvattani māyā, kalyāṇī bhante āvattanī māyā. Piyā me bhante ñāti–sāḷohitā imāya āvaṭṭaniyā āvaṭṭeyyuṁ, piyānaṁ pi me assañātisalohitānaṁ dīgharattaṁ hitāpa sukāya. Sabbe ce–pi bhante khattiyā.... brahamaṇā....vessā..... suddā imāya āvaṭṭaniyā āvaṭṭeyuṁ, sabbesānaṁ pissa suddānaṁ dīghara, ttaṁ hitāya sukhāya. Sadevakoce–pi bhante loko samārako sabrahmako sasamaṇa–brahmaṇī pajā sadevamunussā imāyā āvaṭṭaniyā āvaṭṭeyuṁ sadevakassa pi'ssa lokassa.... sadeva– manussāya dīgharattaṁ hitāya sukhāyā–ti.

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION

Rebuttal of Reply to Rejoinder II–I

By Sayadaw U Nyānuttara, Agga Mahā Paṇḍita

(Burma)

The Ven. Kheminda's Reply to my Rejoinder I–I, 2, 3 and 4 was published in the March, April, May and June issues of *World Buddhism*. I have dealt with the fourteen points which, I felt, must be answered, and my Rebuttal is being published, beginning from December 1967. It is hardly necessary to say that my Rebuttal is solidly based on Pāli Texts, Commentaries and Sub-Commentaries, meeting point by point.

Now I am going to deal with the Ven. Kheminda's Reply to my Rejoinder II–1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, but I do not propose to rebut point by point. It will certainly suffice to deal with this Reply in a general way, referring only to certain points. As a matter of fact, this Reply hardly deserves a special treatment because it contains quite a lot of repetitions of the points I have already dealt with in my Rebuttal to his Reply to my Rejoinder I. Nevertheless, I must make further explanations with a view to putting him on the right path.

The Ven. Kheminda asserts that a sukkha-vipassaka, otherwise called a suddhavipassanāyānika, is a jhāna-attainer (jhāna-lābhī). His assertion is diametrically opposite to the explanation in the *Paramatthamañjūsā*: "Non-jhāna-attainer (a-jhānā-lābhī) suddhavipassanāyānika is sukkhavipassaka. (Note 85) The Ven. Kheminda quite wrongly interprets that this means: "why the sub-commentary does so is because, unlike the samathayānika, the suddhavipassanā-yānika does not enter into, and emerge from, jhāna to develop insight at the third purification." (*World Buddhism*, September 1947, page 35). His assertion is based on no authority whatsoever and so must be deemed to be his own view which is clearly in conflict with the *Visuddhimagga* and the *Paramatthamañjūsā* which describe sukkha-vipassaka or suddhavipassanāyānika as non-jhāna-attainer.

In this connection, he advances an argument that "both the would-be samathayānika and the would-be vipassanāyānika developed jhāna to qualify for insight development at the third purification". In no Pāḷi Text, Commentary or Sub-Commdntary has it ever been stated that a suddhavipassanāyānika develops jhāna at the stage of Purification of Mind. It is therefore no wonder that the Ven. Kheminda cannot quote any reliable authority in support of his view.

Of course, the Ven. Kheminda cites such suttas as *Kiṁsukopama* and *Satisampajañña* to reinforce his argument, but I have already pointed out that these suttas concern only the samathayānika, quoting the authority of the *Visuddhimagga.* I have also cited a few suttas referring to the Vipassanāyānika so that the Ven. Kheminda can weigh the pros and cons of the matter under discussion. (See second and third columns of page 147, *World Buddhism*, January, 1968). Again he quotes the *Okkantika Saṁyutta*, which regrettably does not support his wrong view in the least.

The Ven. Kheminda feels that he is making his case stronger by saying that while the samathayānika repeats this jhāna–attainment at the third purification, the suddhavipassanāyānika does not do so. Hence the suddhavipassanāyānika is righty called 'non–jhāna–attainer' when discussing the development of insight; not that he has not developed jhāna before. Here, the Ven. Kheminda rightly translates the word 'lābhī' of the term a–jhāna–lābhī as 'attainer' but strangely enough interprets this very word as, 'one who has developed' or 'one who has entered into, and emerged from' as evidenced by his statement: the suddhavipassanāyānika does not enter into, and emerge from, jhāna. No Pāḷi Text, Commentary or Sub–Commentary contains any passage in which the word 'lābhī' bears the meaning as interpreted by him. It is therefore not a matter

for surprise that he cannot quote any authority to support his interpretation.

Here, in fact, the word 'lābhī' means attainer, and nothing but the attainer, and 'a-jhāna-lābhī' can be interpreted in no other sense than 'non-jhāna-attainer. As the Ven. Kheminda has interpreted, it must not be misconstrued as 'one who, having attained jhāna, develops insight without it as basis thereof'. It is clear enough, as mentioned above, that his interpretation does not agree in any way with the Pāḷi usage as well as with the *Visuddhimagga*. To distinguish from jhāna-attainers, a sukkhavipassaka is specifically described as a non-jhāna-attainer in the *Visuddhimagga*.

"According to governance by insight, the path arisen in a bare-insight (dry insight) worker, and the path arisen in one who possesses a jhāna attainment but who has not made jhāna the basis for insight, and the path made to arise by comprehending unrelated formations after using the first jhāna as the basis for insight are the paths of the first jhāna only." (*The Path of Purification*, by Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli, Chapter xxi, page 779). (Note 86)

In the aforesaid passage, three types of persons are distinguished: (1) Sukkhavipassaka. (2) One who, having attained jhāna, develops insight without it as basis thereof. (3) One who develops insight making the first jhāna as its basis.

This passage clearly states that the path arisen by developing insight in all these three cases is the path of first jhāna. Judging by the fact that the second and the third types are jhāna-attainers, it is abundantly clear that the first type, sukkhavipassaka, is a non-jhāna-attainer (a-jhāna-lābhi). The Ven. Kheminda's assertion that a sukkhavipassaka is a jhāna-attainer is probably made through misunderstanding of this *Visuddhimagga* passage or perhaps in defiance of it.

If a sukkhavipassaka were a jhāna-attainer, as asserted by the Ven. Kheminda, the *Visuddhimagga* would have described only two types and not three types, for a sukkhavipassaka, as interpreted by the Ven. Kheminda, would be of the same type as the second type described therein. He asserts that a sukkhavipassaka attains jhāna but develops insight without it as basis thereof. The *Visuddhimagga* states that the second type, having attained jhāna, develops insight without it as basis thereof. So, the sukkhavipassaka, as interpreted by him, is the same as the second type.

In point of fact, the sukkhavipassaka, as understood by him, cannot possibly be of the same type as the sukkhavipassaka described as the first type in the *Visuddhimagga*. In other words, the Ven. Kheminda's sukkhavipassaka and the *Visuddhimagga s* sukkhavipassaka are different persons altogether. Why? Because the sukkavipassaka as understood by him, is a jhāna-

attainer whereas the sukkhavipassaka of the *Visuddhimagga* is not a jhāna–attainer.

It requires no effort to see that the Ven. Kheminda, of his own accord, dubs the second type of the *Visuddhimagga* as sukkhavipassaka, and accordingly the sukkhavipassaka has to become a jhāna–attainer. He holds, as it were, the monopoly of this special type of sukkhavipassaka; it has nothing to do with that type of sukkhavipassaka as described in the *Visuddhimagga*.

It my be repeated that a sukkavipassaka, as clearly distinguished from the jhāna–attainers of the second and third types in the *Visuddhimagga*, is definitely a non–jhāna–attainer. That is why the author of the *Paramatthamañjūsā* , who fully grasps the spirit of the *Visuddhimagga*, explains in unmistakable terms that a sukkhavipasssaka is a suddhavipassanāyānika who does not attain jhāna.

The foregoing paragraphs, given an unbiased consideration, are adequate to convince the Ven. Kheminda that (1) the sukkhavipassaka, otherwise called suddha–vipassanāyānika, as described in the *Visuddhimagga*, is not a jhāna–attainer; the *Paramatthamañjūsā* explains that the sukkhavipassaka is a–jhāna–lābhi; (3) the word 'lābhī' of the term a–jhāna–lābhi means 'attainer', and the whole term means a non–jhāna–attainer; (4) a–jhāna–lābhi if interpreted as meaning one, having attained jhāna, develops

insight without it as the basis thereof, will be diametrically opposed to the *Visuddhimagga*, and that, for these reasons, he has been holding on to an absolutely wrong interpretation and misunderstanding. (Reference is invited to my Rebuttal in the April issue of *World Buddhism*, pages 229 to 232).

Surely, the Ven. Kheminda is not unaware of the fact that a-jhāna-lābhī of the *Paramatthamañjūsā* is the explanatory term of the sukkhavipassaka of the *Visuddhimagga*. If he reconsiders the words of the *Visuddhimagga*, "the path arisen in a bare-insight (dry insight) worker etc," he will not fail to realise that a sukkhavipassaka is decidedly not a jhāna-attainer. It is a matter for regret that the Ven. Kheminda interprets a-jhāna-lābhī, the word that explains, as he thinks fit, without a reference to the sukkhavipassaka, the word that is explained, of the *Visuddhimagga*.

I have fully explained in accordance with the *Visuddhimagga* that a sukkhavipassaka is not a jhāna-attainer. The sukkhavipassaka as described in the *Visuddhimagga* is an ariya of the same type with Bāhiya (Dhāruciriya) Thera, King Bimbisāra, Upāli, the Rich Man etc. (See *World Buddhism*, May, 1968, pages 261 and 262). The sukkhavipassaka of the *Visuddhimagga* is certainly capable of attaining magga-phala although he is not a jhāna-attainer. Therefore, it is stated in the *Visuddhimagga*: "The path arisen in a bare-insight

worker....is the path of First Jhāna only". If so, how does a sukkhavipassaka, a non-jhāna attainer, develop Purification of Mind? Certainly not by means of jhāna-samādhi but only by means of upacāra samādhi. This upacāra samādhi is of two kinds: proper upacāra samādhi and nominal upacāra samādhi. Of these two, the sukkhavipassaka, otherwise called suddhavipassanāyānika, "having vipassanā vehicle and associated with samatha bhāvānā" (Note 87), as stated in the *Paramatthamañjūsā*, cannot develop Purification of Mind by means of proper upacāra samādhi. This matter has been dealt with at length in *World Buddhism*, December, 1967, January to April, 1968.

NOTES.

(85) VismC. (II, 474) Ajhānalābhi suddhavipassanāyāniko'va sukkhavipassako.

(86) Vism. (II, 305) Vipassanāniyamena hi sukkhavipassakassa uppannamaggo pi, samāpattilābhino hjānaṁ pādakaṁ akatvā uppannamaggo pi, pathamajjhānaṁ pādakaṁ katvā pakinnakasankhāresammasitvā uppāditamaggopi paṭhamajjhānika'va honti- (see also DhsC. 272).

(87) VismC (ll. 351) Samathabhāvanāya amissitavipassaṅāyānāvā.

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATOIN

Rebuttal of Reply to Rejoinder II–II

By Sayadaw U Nyānuttara, Agga Mahā Pandita
(Burma)

In support of his assertion that a sukkhavipassaka, otherwise called suddhavipassanāyānika, develops jhāna before he develops insight, the Ven. Kheminda repeatedly quotes from the *Visuddhimagga* that "concentration is the proximate cause of insight". He persists in the view that samādhi mentioned therein is jhāna samādhi only. His wrong view leads him to insist that a vipassanāyānika too attains Purification of Mind by means of jhāna and then develops insight; that without having got rid of hindrances by means of jhāna, Satipaṭṭhāna contemplation cannot be made. If only the Ven. Kheminda could appreciate that samādhi mentioned in the *Visuddhimagga* includes also upacāra samādhi and khaṇika samādhi, he would surely arrive at the right view that "upacāra samādhi as well as khaṇika samādhi is the proximate cause of vipassanā."

The Ven, Kheminda's quotation comes from the *Visuddhimagga*, Part III Understanding, Description of the Aggregates. There it runs thus: "Because of the words 'One who is concentrated knows and sees correctly', its

proximate cause is concentration." (*The Path of Purification*, Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli Page 481) (Note 88) In this passage no samādhi has been specifically defined. Taking full advantage of its unspecified nature, the Ven. Kheminda cites it as authority to be in line with his wrong view that by the said concentration is meant jhāna samādhi only. That his view is wrong is borne out by the following passage of the *Visuddhimagga*, Part II, Concentration, Description of Concentration, Page 407:

> "When ordinary people and Trainers develop it, thinkng 'after emerging we shall exercise insight with concentrated consciousness', the development of absorption concentration provides them with the benefit of insight by serving as the proximate cause for insight, and so too does access concentration as a method of arriving at wide open (conditions) in crowded (circumstances). Hence the Blessed One said: 'Bhikkhus, develop concentration; a bhikkhu who is concentrated understands correctly." (Note 89)

.This passage as well as the passage quoted by the Ven. Kheminda comes from the *Visuddhimagga*. A comparative study of these two passages will enable the Ven. Kheminda to know rightly which samādhi is meant in his quotation.

In the above-mentioned passage, it is meant to say that absorption concentration as well as access concentration provides the benefit of insight by serving as its proximate cause. In other words, it means to say that "jhāna samādhi is the proximate cause of vipassanā and so is upacāra samādhi". Therefore, it is very clear that in the passage quoted by the Ven. Kheminda: "Concentration is the proximate cause of insight", concentration is, as interpreted by him, not jhāna samādhi only, and by that samādhi is meant both jhāna samādhi and upacāra samādhi. That the word "samāhito" (concentrated) in the passage of the original Pāḷi Text refers also to upacāra samādhi leaves no room for doubt.

Here, by upacāra samādhi is meant both the access concentration with jhāna and the access concentration without jhāna. The former is proper access concentration and the latter is nominal access concentration. The nominal access concentration attained by means of the development of insight is properly called vipassanā khaṇika samādhi (insight momentary concentration). (See *World Buddhism*, February, 1968, page 183, 1st and 2nd columns). The interpretation that 'momentary concentration too is the proximate cause of insight' is clearly quite in accord with the *Visuddhimagga*. These facts go to prove that Purification of Mind is attained by means of nominal access concentration or momentary concentration, and

so the assertion of the Ven. Kheminda that Purification of Mind is attainable only by means of jhāna is quite in conflict with the *Visuddhimagga.*

That access concentration in the passage I have cited above from the *Visuddhimagga* is the proximate cause of insight is explained in the *Paramatthamañjūsā* as follows:

> "Arriving at wide open conditions, a person becomes seized with dread and a sense of urgency and, without lingering on to attain absorption, establishes himself in access concentration; with a determination 'I would strive to go beyond miserable samsaric circumstances speedily,' he develops insight." (Note 90)

Here, the Ven, Kheminda will not fail to find that Purification of Mind is attained by just access concentration and insight is developed. Judging by this *Paramatthamañjūsā* explanation, it is quite clear that the Ven. Kheminda's view: "Purification of Mind is attained only by means of jhāna together with access concentration, and not by just access concentration" is not at all in accord with the Pāḷi Texts, Commentaries and Sub-Commentaries.

I have stated that insight momentary concentration too is the proximate cause of insight. It may be asked how this momentary concentration becomes the cause of insight. I shall give a fuller answer.

The readers will remember that I have explained in my Answer to No. 3 that Attention Given to the Elements, *Mahā Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta* is vipassanā contemplation (See *World Buddhism*, February 1968, page 179, 2nd and 3rd columns). My explanation is made on the authority of the *Visuddhimagga*. In the section dealing with Mindfulness of the Body, the *Visuddhimagga* states: "Herein, the three, that is to say, the sections on postures on the four kinds of full awareness (see MA, i. 253 f.) and on attention directed to elements, as they are stated (in that sutta), deal with insight....So there are only the two, that is, the sections on breathing and on directing attention to repulsiveness, that, as stated there, deal with concentration." (*The Path of Purification*, B. Ñāṇamoli, Chap. VIII, para 43) (See Note 20)

Just as Attention Given to Elements is Vipassanā contemplation, so is Defining of the Four Elements, which means the same thing as the former, vipassanā contemplation, (See *World Buddhism*, February, 1968, page 182, 3rd column). This statement is made on the authority of the *Visuddhimagga*.

'Attention Given to Elements', 'The Meditation Subject Consisting of Elements' and 'Defining of the Four Elements' all mean the same thing". (*The Path of Purification*, P. B. Ñāṇamoli, Chap. XI, page 380, para 27) (See Note 26)

By the above explanation it is already clear that Defining of the Four Elements is vipassanā contemplation. It has, however, been included as one of the forty samatha meditation subjects in the *Visuddhimagga*. I have already explained that the inclusion by the author of *Visuddhimagga*, who describes Attention Given to Elements as insight meditation subject, of Defining of Four Elements, which is the same thing as the former, in the samatha meditation subjects, is not because it is a proper samatha meditation subject. (See *World Buddism*, Feb, 1968, page 183, 1 st column).

Now I would like to repeat that Defining of Four Elements is vipassanā contemplation. Dealing with Defining of Four Elements, the *Visuddhimagga* describes how "the nominal access concentration becomes the proximate cause of insight" from the beginning of insight contemplation as follows:

> "So firstly, one of quick understanding who wants to develop this meditation subject should go into solitary retreat. Then he should advert to his own entire material body and discern the elements in brief in this way. 'In this body what is stiffness or harshness is the earth element, what is cohesion or fluidity is the water element, what is maturing (ripening) or heat is the fire element, what is distension or movement is the air element,' and he should advert and give attention to it and review

again and again as 'earth element, water element', that is to say, as mere elements, not a being, and soulless.

"As he makes effort in this way it is not long before concentration arises in him, which is reinforced by understanding that illuminates the classification of the elements, and which is only access and does not reach absorption because it has states with individual essences as its object." (*The Path of Purification*, Chap. XI, page 385, paras 41 & 42) (Note 91)

Here, the author of the *Visuddhimagga*, having to deal only with Concentration, describes up to the development of access concentration in the course of contemplation of the Four Elements. Then, when he deals with Purification of View, he refers back to the said contemplation (that is, Four Elements), and continues to describe how Purification of View is attained.

But one whose vehicle is pure insight or that same aforesaid one whose vehicle is serenity, discerns the four elements in brief or in detail in one of the various ways given in the chapter on the Four Elements. (chap. XI, para 27 ff.) Then when the elements have become clear in their correct essential characteristics, firstly, in the case of head hair originated by kamma there become plain ten instances of materiality

(rūpāni) with the body decad thus: the four elements, colour, odour, flavour, nutritive-essence, and life, and body-sensitivity..... This in the first place is the method in the case of the thirty-two bodily aspects." (*The Path af Purification*, Chap. XVIII, pages 680 & 681, para 5) (Note 92)

Thus and so forth is shown at length contemplation beginning with discernment of materiality right up to attainment of Purification of View.

The two passages of the *Visuddhimagga* quoted above, combined together, will enable the Ven. Kheminda to appreciate that while contemplating the Four Elements, access concentration comes about, and then, in the course of continued contemplation, analytical knowledge of materiality is attained, culminating in attainment of Purification of View. He will surely appreciate also that hindrances are overcome and Purification of Mind attained by means of access concentration. He will not fail to realise that "access concentration is the proximate cause of insight."

I have reason to believe that by now the Ven. Kheminda will understand that the said access concentration, being not in the neighbourhood of absorption concentration, is not proper access concentration but nominal access concentra-

tion, judging by the following passage of *Paramatthamañjūsā*.

> "Access concentration is to be understood as an applied term or as being nominal. The concentration that arises at the access to absorption is access concentration and here (the Contemplation of Elements) absorption is absent. However, being similar in characteristic to access concentration it is called by that term." (See Note 28)

As a matter of fact, this nominal access concentration is momentary concentration. That is why I have stated: "Momentary concentration, otherwise called nominal access concentration, is the proximate cause of insight."

Considering all the points I have explained with reference to authoritative passages, it has been proved beyond any reasonable doubt that (1) in the *Visuddhimagga* passage: "samādhi is the proximate cause of vipassanā", by the word samādhi is meant all the three kinds of appanā samādhi, upacāra samādhi and khaṇika samādhi; (2) the Ven. Kheminda's view that the said samādhi is only appanā samādhi is wrong (I have explained in my Answer to No. 9 that by the word 'sammā samādhi 'magganga,' appanā samādhi alone is not meant; (3) therefore, appanā samādhi, upacāra samādhi and khaṇika samādhi are respectively the proximate cause of vipassanā, and (4) for this very reason, Purification of Mind is attained also by means of upacāra samādhi and khaṇika samādhi.

Thus, it becomes crystal clear that the Ven. Kheminda's repeated quotation: "Concentration is the proximate cause of insight" in support of his jhāna-attainer suddhavipassanāyānika not only fails to support his view but also goes counter to it. However, in the phrase: "the proximate cause of insight" the word "insight" needs a brief explanation.

In this respect, the Ven. Kheminda has evidently determined that "insight" begins only with Purification of View. That is why he takes that the contemplation at the foregoing stage of Purification of Mind is just samatha. In the above paragraphs it will be noticed that I confine myself to that part of 'insight' beginning with Purification of View so that I do not confuse the issue in the course of my discussion of his wrong view. In truth, it is not because I subscribe to the view that insight begins with Purification of View.

Once again, it must be pointed out that only a samathayānika begins insight contemplation only after the attainment of Purification of Mind by means of samatha. It is not so in the case of vipassanāyānika. Established in virtue, he begins vipassanā contemplation straightaway from the very beginning. While doing so he overcomes hindrances and attains Purification of Mind. His insight contemplation is quite in accord with such suttas as *Bāhiya*, *Uttiya* etc., wherein it is definitely stated: "Leaning on virtue, established in virtue, you

can cultivate four stations of mindfulness." (See Notes 2 and 3)

It is also in accord with the *Visuddhimagga* passage dealing with Contemplation of Defining of Four Elements, wherein it is shown how Upacāra Samādhi is attained while contemplating four elements. In the chapter dealing with Purification of View, it is further shown how, in the course of continued contemplation of four elements, analytical knowledge of mind and body is attained and Purification of View as well. All the facts adduced above testify that the Ven.Kheminda's assertions: (1) Purification of Mind is not attainable in the course of vipassanā contemplation; (2) Vipassanā contemplation begins with Purification of View, are decidedly ill-conceived and so absolutely wrong.

NOTES

(88) Vism. (II, 68) Samāhito yathābhūtaṁ jānāti passati-ti vacanato pana samādhi tassā padaṭṭhānaṁ.

(89) Vism. (I, 368) Sekkha-putthujjanānaṁ "samāpattiṭo vuṭṭhāyā samāhitena cittena vipassissāmī" ti bhāvayataṁ vipassanāyā padaṭṭhānattā appanāsamādhibhāvanā pi, sambādhe okāsādhigamanayena upanārasamādhibhaāvanā pi vipassanānisaṁsā hoti ten' āha bhagavā "Samāhdiṁ bhikkhave bhāvetha, samāhito bhikkhave bhikkhu yathābhūtaṁ pa'ānāti" ti.

(90) Vism C. (I, 459-460) Okāsadhigamanayenā-ti atthapatilābhayogoassa navamakha-

ṇasankhātassa okāsassa adhigama nayena. Tassa hi dullabhatāya appanādhi-gaman-pi anadhigamayamāno (anagama-yamāno, old Ceylon book) saṁvegabahulo puggalo upacārasamādhimhi-yeva, ṭhatvā vipassanāya kammaṁ karoti "sīghaṁ saṁsāradukkhaṁ samatikkamissāmī" ti.

(91) Vism. (I, 346-7). Imaṁ kammaṭṭhānaṁ bhāvetukāmena tikkhapaññena tāva rahogatena paṭisallīnena sakalam-pi attano rūpakāyaṁ āvajjetvā "yo imasmiṁ kāye thaddhabhāvo vā kharabhāvo vā, ayaṁ pathavīdhātu; yo ābandhanabhāvo vā dravabhāvo va, ayaṁ āpodhātu; yo pripācanabhāvo va uṇhabhāvo va, ayaṁ tejodhātu; yo vitthambhanabhāvo vā samudīraṇabhavo va, ayaṁ vayodhātū"ti evaṁ saṁkhittena dhātuyo pariggahetvā punappunaṁ 'pathavīdhātu āpodhātū'ti bhātumattato nissattato nijjīvato avajjitabhaṁ manāsikātabbaṁ paccavekkhitabbaṁ; Tass' evaṁ vāyam-amānassa niciren' eva dhātuppabhedāvabhā-sanapaññāpariggahito sabhāvadhammārtmmaṇattā appanaṁ appatto upacāramatto samādhi uppajjati.

(92) Vism. (II, 222-3) Suddhavipassanāyāniko pana ayam' eva vā samathayāniko catudhātuvauatthāne vuttānaṁ tesaṁ tesaṁ dhātupariggahamukhānaṁ aññātaramukhavasena sankhepato vā vittherato vā catasso dhātuyo parigganhāti. Ath' assa yāthāvasarasalakkhaṇato āvibhū dhātūsu kammasamuṭṭhānamhi tāva kese "catasso dhātuyo, vanno, gandho, raso, ojā, Jīvitaṁ, kāyappasādo" ti eveṁ kāyadasakavasena dasa rṅpāni"....Esa tāva dvattiṁsākāre nayo.

SATIPAṬṬHĀNA VIPASSANĀ

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION

Rebuttal of Reply to Rejoinder II–III

By Sayadaw U Nyānuttara, Agga Mahā Pandita
(Burma)

The Ven. Kheminda observed: "It will be noted here that one has to practise each foundation of mindfulness 'having got rid of covetousness and grief." What he meant by this observation is that Satipaṭṭhāna can be practised only after hindrances have been overcome by jhāna. It appears that he does not understand the usage of 'ya' in the word 'vineyya' in the introductory passage of Mahā Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta. This 'ya' in the word 'vineyya' (having overcome) is used to denote a verb prior to the main verb or a verb of the same time with the main verb.

In this particular context, it does not denote 'prior' but 'at the same time', because the practice of Satipaṭṭhāna and overcoming of covetousness and grief take place at the same time. Here 'vineyya' is used according to the Pāḷi grammatical usage and it means 'overcoming', not 'having overcome'. That it is to be taken in this sense is made clear by the explanation of 'there arises in him knowledge after reflecting on the sign' (a sentence in *Paṭisambhidāmagga*) in the Commentary to *Paṭisam bhidāmagga*) as well as in *Visuddhimagga.*

"At this point, knowledge of reflexion has arisen in him, with reference to which it is said: 'When he brings to mind as impermanent, there arises in him knowledge after reflecting on what? When he brings to mind as painful....as not-self, there arises in him knowledge after reflecting on what? When he brings to mind as impermanent, there arises in him knowledge after reflecting on the sign. When he brings to mind as painful, there arises in him knowledge after reflecting on occurrence. When he brings to mind as not-self, there arises in him knowledge after reflecting on the sign and occurrence." (Ps. ii, 63) (*Path of Purification*, page 761, 51) (Note 93)

In the above *Paṭisambhidāmagga* passage, 'there arises in him knowledge after reflecting on the sign,' if it were to be taken as it stands, will mean 'there arises in him knowledge having reflected on the sign'. As a matter of fact, it must not be taken in that sense, because arising of knowledge and reflecting on the sign take place at the same time. And yet the word 'after' is used according to usage as if one takes place before the other. That is why *Visuddhimagga* explains as follows:

"And here *after reflecting on the sign*(means) having known the sign of formation by means of the characteristic of impermanence as unlasting and contemporary. Of course, it is not

that, first having known, subsequently knowledge arises; but it is expressed in this way according to common usage, as in the passage beginning 'Due to (lit. having depended upon) mind and mental object, mind consciousness arises' (M. i, 112), and so on. Or alternatively it can be understood as expressed according to the Method of Identity by identifying the preceding with the subsequent. The meaning of the two expressions (that is, 'occurrence' and 'the sign and occurrence'.) should be understood in the same way." (*Path of Purification*, page 761, 52) (Note 94)

Paṭisambhidāmagga Commentary also explains in this wise. (PsC 2, 166)

From the foregoing passages it is quite clear that 'reflecting on the sign' and 'knowledge' occur at the same time. To support this interpretation, Paramatthamañjūsā cites a sentence from *Paṭiccavāra*, *Paṭṭhāna*: "Dependent on kusalā dhammā, by way of hetu (root), kusalā dhammā arises."

Considering these Pāli and Commentarial passages, it should be understood that the dhammas that take place simultaneously are often stated according to common usage as if they take place one after the other. Therefore, in the Maha Satipaṭṭhāna passage, contemplation of the four foundations of mindfulness and overcoming of hindrances are to be understood as taking place at the same time. It means that

hindrances are overcome while contemplating the four foundations of mindfulness. This interpretation is confirmed by the Mahā Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta Commentary which states: "By overcoming covetousness and grief is meant the fruit of contemplation." (Note 95) It means that Satipaṭṭhāna contemplation brings about the riddance of covetousness and grief. So the Ven. Kheminda's observation "one has to practise each foundation of mindfulness "having got rid of covetousness and grief" is also not in accord with this commentarial passage.

The view that samatha must be practised to overcome hindrances before Satipaṭṭhāna contemplation is patently not in line with the said Pāḷi Text and Commentarial passages. The Mahā Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta Commentary further clarifies as follows that overcoming of covetousness and grief means riddance of hindrances.

"Covetousness stands for sensual desire, and grief for anger. As sensual desire and anger are principal hindrances, the abandoning of the hindrances is stated by the overcoming of covetousness and grief." (See Note 13)

It must be pointed out that in the introductory passage of the Mahā Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta covetousness and grief are not the factors to be overcome (pahānanga) by any kammaṭṭhāna other than Satipatthāna. The Mahā Satipaṭṭ-

hāna Sutta Commentary states thus: "Having treated Kāyānupassanā Satipaṭṭhāna and the factors associated with it, 'overcoming covetousness and grief' is stated in order to treat the factors to be overcome." (Note 96)

Judging by the Commentarial statement, it is clear enough that here covetousness and grief are not got rid of by any kammaṭṭhāna other than Satipaṭṭhāna.

Again, if one would carefully examine the words: "having overcome, in this world, covetousness and grief", it is evident that the Buddha meant the overcoming of covetousness and grief that arise while contemplating kāya, vedanā, cittā, and dhammā. It is obvious that he was not referring to covetousness and grief that arise in the course of any other contemplation. That 'in the world' means kāya, vedanā, cittā and dhammā as the object of Satipaṭṭhāna contemplation is explained in the Mahā Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta Commentary as follows:

"'In the world' means just this body. Here, by the body is meant the world in the sense of a thing crumbling. As a matter of fact, the yogāvacara has to overcome them also in feeling etc. Therefore it is stated in Vibhanga that the five aggregates of existence which form objects of clinging are the world....It is to be understood that covetousness and grief are overcome in the world in that sense." (Note 97)

This Commentarial passage shows that covetousness and grief arisen concerning body, feeling, mind and mind-objects are overcome while contemplating them. So it is undeniable that it is not necessary for a vipassanāyānika to practise any other contemplation to overcome hindrances before Satipaṭṭhāna contemplation. Because it has shown that covetousness and grief are overcome while contemplating Satipaṭṭhāna, it shows also that "having overcome covetousness and grief" does not denote 'prior'.

A careful study of the section dealing with the Contemplation of Consciousness in the Mahā Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta will confirm the fact that overcoming of hindrances does not take place before Satipaṭṭhāna contemplation. It is clearly shown therein how to contemplate when consciousness with hate, ignorance, distraction and so forth arise.

"Here, O bhikkhus, a bhikkhu understands the consciousness with lust, as with lust;.... the consciousness with hate, as with hate;.... the consciousness with ignorance, as with ignorance;....the shrunken state of consciousness as the shrunken state, the distracted state of consciousness as the distracted state."(Note 98)

In the above-mentioned states of consciousness are included respectively five hindrances. The consciousness with lust includes sensuality. The consciousness with hate includes anger,

The consciousness with ignorance includes scepsis. Shrunken state of consciousness includes sloth and torpor. Distracted state of consciousness includes flurry and worry. Contemplation of these states of consciousness is virtually contemplation of hindrances associated with them.

It is, therefore, clear that a yogāvacara, engaged in contemplation of consciousness, if he is not a samathayānika, has not, obviously, overcome the hindrances before he begins Satipaṭṭhāna contemplation. So, in the phrase 'having overcome covetousness and grief', there is no room for doubt that overcoming takes place at the same time with Satipaṭṭhāna contemplation, and not before it.

If it were true that the Buddha meant to teach Satipaṭṭhāna contemplators to overcome the hindrances before they begin contemplation, he would not have taught in the aforesaid manner in the section dealing with consciousness. But he did. It is, therefore, to be understood without any doubt that a vipassanāyānika has not overcome the hindrances before Satipaṭṭhāna contemplation, that he overcomes them while contemplating Satipaṭṭhāna, and that contemplation and overcoming take place simultaneously.

Again, considering the manner in which the Buddha taught the contemplation of hindrances, in the section dealing with the contemplation of five hindrances, it is abundantly clear that a yogāvacara, who is not a samathayānika, has

not overcome the hindrances before he begins Satipaṭṭhāna contemplation.

"Here, O bhikkhus, when sensuality is present, a bhikkhu with understanding knows: 'I have sensuality', or when sensuality is not present, he with understanding knows: 'I have no sensuality.' He understands how the abandoning of the arisen sensuality comes to be and he understands how the non-arising in the future of the abandoned sensuality comes to be..... Anger....Sloth and Torpor...Flurry and Worry.... Scepsis." (See Note 12)

In this passage, judging by the words 'When sensuality is present, a bhikkhu with understanding knows: 'I have sensuality' and so forth, a vipassanāyānika has surely not overcome the hindrances before he begins Satipaṭṭhāna contemplation. Therefore the Ven. Kheminda's view that one has to practise each foundation of mindfulness 'having got rid of covetousness and grief', which are the principal hindrances, is diametrically opposed to this Pāḷi Text passage. If his view were correct, the Buddha would not have taught the Contemplation of the Five Hindrances in the Mahā Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta. But he did. Therefore, it is indisputable that 'having overcome covetousness and grief' does not denote 'prior', and that a yogāvacara, not being a samathayānika, has not overcome the hindrances before he begins Satipaṭṭhāna contemplation.

In connection with the abandonment of the five hindrances, the Ven. Kheminda states: "Since that abandonment which precedes the four foundations of mindfulness is temporary, the hindrances are liable to arise again when the opposing factors are absent. Therefore when they happen to arise again they are considered by way of presence, and when absent, by way of absence." (pages 63 & 64, October issue of *World Buddhism*, 1967)

In this statement, one should carefully note the words 'the hindrances are liable to arise again when the opposing factors are absent' and the words 'therefore when they happen to arise again they are considered by way of absence.' The Ven. Kheminda, has asserted: "The abandonment of the hindrances has to take place before the four foundations of mindfulness are developed. There is no exception." His assertion amounts to saying that no Satipaṭṭhāna contemplation is possible while the hindrances are present in a yogāvacara. This assertion is certainly contradicted by his own words: 'When they (the hindrances) happen to arise again they are considered by way of presence.' Obviously, he is stating that 'since the abandonment which precedes the four foundations of mindfulness is temporary, the hindrances are liable to arise again' and when 'sensuality is present, a bhikkhu with understanding knows: 'I have sensuality'.

If, as the Ven. Kheminda has asserted, contemplation of the four foundations of mindfulness is not possible while the hindrances are present, how can a yogāvacara contemplate them when they arise? If his view were correct, the yogāvacara can in no way contemplate: 'I have sensuality.' Why? Because such a contemplation is Satipaṭṭhāṇa bhāvanā, and also because the Ven. Kheminda has stated already that the Satipaṭṭhāna bhāvanā is not possible while the hindrances are present. His view is opposed by his own words: 'When they happen to arise again they are considered by way of presence.'

Further, if his view were correct, it appears that when the hindrances happen to arise again, a yogāvacara will have to practise samatha again because their presence will not enable him to practise Satipaṭṭhāna vipassanā. But, then, when the hindrances have been overcome by samatha, the yogāvacara can no longer contemplate 'I have sensuality' in on resumption of Satipaṭṭhāna contemplation.

NOTES

(93) Vism. (II, 291) Yaṁ sandhāya-vuttaṁ-"aniccato manasikaroto kiṁ paṭisankhā ñāṇaṁ uppajjati? Dukkhato... Anattato manasikaroto kiṁ paṭisankhā ñāṇaṁ uppajjati? Aniccato manasikaroto nimittaṁ paṭisankhā ñāṇnṁ uppajjati. Dukkhato manasikaroto pavattaṁ paṭisankā hñāṇaṁ uppajjati. Anattato manasikaroto nimittañ-capavattañ-ca paṭisankhā ñāṇaṁ uppajjati" ti.

(94) Vism. (II, 291) Ettha ca 'nimittaṁ paṭisankhā' ti sankhāranimittṁ addhuvaṁ tāvakā ikan' ti aniccalakkhaṇavasena jānitvā. Kāmañ–ca na paṭhamaṁ jānitvā pacchā ñāṇaṁ uppajjati, vohāravasena pana'manañca paṭicca dhamme ca uppajjati manoviññānan' ti–ādīni viya evaṁ vuccati. Ekattanayena vā purimañ–ca pacchimañ ca ekaṁ katvā evaṁ vuttan–ti veditabbaṁ. Iminānayena itarasmim–pi padadvaye attho veditabbo.

(95) D. C. (II, 350)M. C.(I, 249) Abhijjhā–damanassavinayena bhāvanābhalaṁ vuttaṁ.

(96) D. C. (II, 349) M. C. (I, 248) S. C. (III, 216) Iti kāyānupassana–satipaṭṭhānaṁ, sampayo–gangañ–ca'ssa dassetvā idāni pahāna-ngaṁ dassetuṁ 'vineyya loke abhijjhādomanassan' tt vuttaṁ.

(97) D. C. (II, 349) M. C. (I, 248) S. C. (III, 216). Loke–ti tasmimyeva kāye. Kāyo hi idha lujjana–palujjanaṭṭhena 'loko' ti adhippeto. Yasmā pan'ssa na kāyamat teyeva abhijjhā–domanassaṁ pahīyati, vedanādīsu–pi pahīyati–yeva. Tasmā 'pañca–pi upādānakkhandhā loko' ti vibhange vuttaṁ....Tasmin loke abhijjā–domanassaṁ vineyyā–ti evaṁ sambandho daṭṭhabbo.

(98) D. (II, 237) Idha bhikkhave bhikkhu sarāgaṁ vā cittaṁ 'sarāgaṁ cittan'ti pajānāti.... sadosaṁ vā cittaṁ 'sadosaṁ cittan' ti,....samo-haṁ vā cittaṁ samohaṁ cittan'ti....saṁkhittaṁ vā cittaṁ saṁkhittaṁ cittan'ti....vikkhittaṁ vā cittaṁ 'vikkhittaṁ cittan'ti pajānāti,

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION

Rebuttal of Reply to Rejoinder II–IV

By Sayadaw U Nyānuttara, Agga Mahā Paṇḍita
(Burma)

I have explained at length that the Ven. Khemindа's view, namely, Satipaṭṭhāna contemplation is to be begun only after the overcoming of the hindrances, is not at all in line with the Contemplation of Consciousness and Contemplation of Five Hindrances as taught by the Buddha. So it will but be proper to take that Satipaṭṭhāna contemplation and overcoming of hindrances occur at the same time. Only when rightly so interpreted, contemplation of consciousness and contemplation of five hindrances will be possible. Such an interpretation must be considered to be correct and consistent. It may be repeated that 'having overcome covetousness and grief' most clearly bears no meaning of previous occurrence but that hindrances are overcome in the course of Satipaṭṭhāna contemplation.

The Ven. Khemindа quoted a passage from the *Paṭisambhidāmagga*: "The abandonment of the hindrances by suppression occurs in him who develops the first jhāna", and stated: "the first jhāna is indicated by the words 'having got

rid of covetousness and grief'." (*World Buddhism*, November 1967, page 90, column 2). He meant to say by this that hindrances can be got rid of only by means of jhāna. The *Paṭisambhidāmagga* passage is a pointer to the utmost possibility (Okkaṭṭha niddesa). This is borne out by the following passage from the Paṭisambhidāmagga Commentary.

Of the five kinds of abandonment, doing away with the opposing states such as the hindrances, like moving away moss by a pot on the moss-filled water, by any of the mundane kinds of concentration is called abandonment of suppression." (Note 99)

In this passage, considering the general reference to 'the mundane kinds of concentration', it is clear that not only jhāna samādhi but also other kinds of lokiya samādhi can do away with hindrances in their own way.

In the same Commentary, that by means of upacāra and appanā samādhi hindrances can be overcome is stated thus:

"Overcoming of hindrances etc. by means of upacāra and appanā samādhi...is called abandonment by suppression." (Note 100)

Similar statements are made in the Paramatthamañjūsā. (Note 101)

Judging by the above passages, it is clear enough that samādhi that can overcome hindrances is not jhāna samādhi only. So it is

further clear that the *Paṭisambhidāmagga* passage the Ven. Kheminda quoted is Okkaṭṭha niddesa. Therefore, his conclusion: "the first jhāna is indicated by the words 'having got rid of covetousness and grief'" is obviously not correct in that he has so interpreted as to suit his view.

Mahā Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta Commentary clarifies this point thus: "Having overcome" refers to the discipline of knocking out an evil quality by its opposite good (that is by dealing with each category of evil separately) or through the overcoming of evil part by part (tadangavinaya) and through the disciplining or the overcoming of the passions by suppression in absorption (vikkhambhanavinaya)". (*The Way of Mindfulness* by Bhikkhu Soma, page 36) (Note 102)

In the above mentioned commentarial passage, the word 'tadangavinaya' should be carefully noted. By this word is meant overcoming by upacāra samādhi and khaṇika samādhi, and not overcoming by jhāna samādhi. Attention may also be drawn to the words: "tadangavinayena vā vikkhambhanavinayenavā' in this commentarial passage. By the words 'vā' is meant 'either....or' (vikappana). It does not mean 'together' (samuccaya). So it means that covetousness and grief are overcome either by kāmāvacara samādhi (upacāra samādhi and khaṇika samādhi) or jhāna samādhi. This fact being well known by every Pāḷi scholar, I believe that the Ven. Kheminda is also aware of it. And

yet he makes bold to say just the opposite as follows:

"Further, as access cannot be described as the controlling faculty of concentration, these words refer not to the abandonment of the hindrances that occur in access; and the first jhāna is the lowest attainment that can be described both as abandonment of the five hindrances and as a possession of jhāna factors." (*World Buddhism*, November, 1967, page 90, column 2)

Here, 'these words' refer to 'having overcome covetousness and grief' of the Pāli Text. In saying that these words refer not to the abandonment of the hindrances that occur in the access, he could not cite any authority, but appears to have been carried away by his own imagination.

His statement that 'access cannot be described as the controlling faculty of concentration' is also not correct. That this kāmāvacara samādhi is a controlling faculty of concentration I have explained at length by quoting relevant Pāḷi Texts as well as passages from Commentaries such as Dhammasaṅgaṇī in my Rebuttal of Reply to Rejoinder I, Answer to No. 9

The Ven. Kheminda's view that the words 'having got rid of covetousness and grief' do not refer to the overcoming of the hindrances by means of access concentration is also opposed

to the Mahā Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta Commentary which states thus:

"Mindfulness on Breathing and Reflecting on the Repulsiveness of the Body alone are absorption meditation subjects...The remaining twelve sections deal with access meditation subjects." (Note 103)

As the Ven. Kheminda cannot accept that covetousness and grief can be overcome by means of access concentration, there will be, according to him, no access meditation subjects in the Mahā Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta. But as stated above, the Commentary to this Sutta has clearly stated that twelve of the fourteen sections deal with access meditation subjects. That is why I say that his view is not in accord with this Commentary.

Again, it must be pointed out that the jhāna that overcomes covetousness and grief, according to him, is the jhāna attained by means of other kammaṭṭhāna before the contemplation of Satipaṭṭhāna. If it is, as he says, imperative that samatha must be developed to attain jhāna before Satipaṭṭhāna contemplation, it will surely be necessary to develop samatha and attain jhāna before one practises Mindfulness on Breathing included in Kāyānupassanā Satipaṭṭhāna. In that case, it would mean that a kind of samatha must be practised with a view to developing another kind of samatha for the attainment of jhāna. To say the least, it leaves much to be desired.

As a matter of fact, it is not at all necessary to develop samatha to practise Mindfulness on Breathing in the Satipaṭṭhāna-manner. While developing mindfulness on breathing, hindrances are overcome and jhāna developed. This fact is testified by a passage in the Mahā Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta Commentary.

"Indeed, to that yogin training in respiration mindfulness according to the method taught thus: "He, thinking 'I breathe in long,' understands when he is breathing in long.... Calming the activity of the body....I breathe out thinking thus, he trains himself" (*Dīgham vā assasanto dīgham assasamīti pajānāti....passambhayam kāyasankhāram passasi'ssamiti sikkhatin*, the four absorptions (cattāri jhānāni) arise in the respiration sign (*assasapassasa nimitte uppajjanti*)" (*The Way of Mindfulness* by Bhikkhu Soma, page 48) (Note 104)

Judging by this passage, it is not to be doubted that hindrances are abandoned while contemplating Satipaṭṭhāna. This fact is confirmed by the Ven. Kheminda himself.

"When the former portion of the four foundations of mindfulness is developed, the four jhānas arise." (*World Buddhism*, November 1967, page 92, column 2)

"What is stated in these suttas regarding the arising of the jhānas as the four foundations of mindfulness are being developed is partially stated in the commentary to the Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta". (Ibid, column 3)

These two statements of the Ven. Kheminda are quite in agreement with the Pāḷi Texts, Commentaries and Sub-Commentaries. Now, it can be assumed that, after all, the Ven. Kheminda understands that samatha needs not be developed separately to overcome hindrances before Satipaṭṭhāna contemplation.

And yet, the Ven. Kheminda has stated such as follows several times.

"The abandonment of the hindrances has to take place before the four foundations of mindfulness are developed. There is no exception". (*World Buddhism*, July 1967, page 339, column 2). I have taken pains to point out that statements like this are opposite to the relevant passages of Pāḷi Texts, Commentaries and Sub-Commentaries. This statsment of the Ven. Kheminda appeared in *World Buddhism*, July 1967, which is quite inconsistent with his statements mentioned above, which appeared in *World Buddhism*, November, 1967.

Considering this change of view, there is reason to believe that the Ven. Kheminda refreshes and improves his knowledge of the Pāḷi Texts, Commentaries and Sub-Commentaries, and accordingly discovers that hindrances can be overcome in the course of Satipaṭṭhāna contemplation. It may be further assumed that with his change of view comes his change of mind and attitude, which is, indeed, highly commendable.

NOTES

(99) PsC. (I, 114) Pañcasu pahānesu yaṁ sasevāle udake pakkhittena gahṭena sevālassa viya tena lokiyasamādhinā nīvaraṇādīnaṁ paccanīkadhammānaṁ vikkhambhanaṁ dūrīkaraṇaṁ, idaṁ vikkhambhanappahānaṁ nāma.

(100) PsC. (II. 53) Yaṁ pana upacārappanābhedena samādhinā...tesaṁ tesaṁ nivaranādidhammānaṁ pahānaṁ, idaṁ vikkhambhanappahānaṁ nāma.

(101). VismC. (I, 21) Samādhinā vikkhambhanappahānavasenā – ti upacārappanābhdena samādhinā...tesaṁ tesaṁ nivaranādidhammānaṁ pahānavasena.

(102) DC. (II, 349) Vineyyā– ti tadangavina yana vā vikkhambhana – vinayena vā vinayitvā (The same Pāli MC. I, 248, SC. III 216)

(103) DC. (II, 363). Ānāpānapabbaṁ paṭkūlamanasikārapabban– ti imān'eva dve appanākammaṭṭhānāni... Sesāni dvādasā– pi upacārakammṭṭhānāni ... Sesāni dvādasā–pi upacārakammaṭṭhānān'eva. (The same Pāli in MC. I, 279).

(104) DC. (II, 355) Evaṁ ayam–Pi bhikkhu addhānavasena ittaravasena ca pavattānaṁ assāsapassasānaṁ vasena dīghaṁ vā assasanto 'dīghaṁ assasāmī' ti pajānāti.... passasissāmī' ti sikkhatī– ti. Tass'evaṁ sikkhato assāsapassāsanimitte cattāri jhānāni uppajjanti.

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION

Rebuttal of Reply to Rejoinder II–V

by

Ven. Sayadaw U Nyānuttara, Agga Mahā Paṇḍita
(Burma)

Here the Ven. Kheminda's view regarding Purification of Mind must be further examined. He had stated: "Purification of Mind indeed could not come about in one who has made Bare Insight his vehicle by employing only Insight without having produced either Access Concentration or Fully Absorbed Concentration." (*World Buddhism*, July, 1966, Page 8, 3rd column). It amounts to saying that Purification of Mind can come about by producing either Access Concentration or Absorbed Concentration. But then the Ven. Khemindal pointed out: "Purification of Consciousness is the eight attainments together with access." (*World Buddhism*, November 1967, Page 93, 1st column)

A comparison of his two statements is called for. In the first statement, it amounts to saying that Purification of Mind comes about either by access concentration or absorbed concentration. In the second statement, it amounts to saying that Purification of Mind cannot come about only by access concentration, and that it is absorbed concentration together with access. It further means that absorbed

concentration alone cannot bring about Purification of Mind, and that when it does so it is together with access concentration. Considering that his two statements are not consistent, it is obvious that the Ven. Kheminda has no clearly definite view of Purification of Mind.

If it be asserted that the eight attainments or absorbed concentration together with access produce Purification of Mind, it is contradictory to what is stated in *Sumangalavilāsinī* and *Saddhammappakāsinī* Commentaries: "Purification of Mind is the eight well-developed attainments which are the proximate cause of vipassanā." (Note 105) From this it is quite clear that Purification of Mind is just the eight attainments and not together with access.

The Ven. Kheminda's view that Purification of Mind does not come about only by access concentration or absorbed concentration may be due to the fact that he cannot properly grasp the meaning of what is stated in the *Visuddhimagga* and *Saddhammappakāsinī* Commentaries: "Purification of Mind is the eight attainments, together with access concentration." (Note 106) What is meant by this statement is that Purification of Mind is either access concentration or eight attainments. When so interpreted, it will agree with the *Sumangalavilāsinī* and *Saddhammappakāsinī* stating purification of Mind as the eight attainments which is not associated with access concentration.

Again the author of *Saddhammappakāsinī*, who, in explaining Abiññeyya dhamma, stated "Purification of Mind is the eight attainments with access", stated, in explaining Bhāvettaba dhammā, thus: "Purification of Mind is th eight well-developed attainments, which are the proximate cause of vipassanā." In view of this explanatory statement, it is clear that access concentration and eight attainments separately bring about Purification of Mind.

As a matter of fact, the reason why the Commentators explain Purification of Mind in two different ways is because the Buddha teaches in accordance with the inclinations of the hearers. There are quite a number of such teachings. For instance, in respect of purifications, it is stated in *Sumangalavilāsinī* that Purification by Knowledge, and Vision of the Course of Practice, is Insight leading to Emergence in Rathavinita Sutta. Here (Dasuttara Sutta) Purification by Knowledge and Vision of the Course of Practice is Tender Insight. (Note 107)

In the Sub-Commentary to this passage, here (Dasuttara Sutta) it means tender insight according to the inclinations of the monks. Because Insight leading to Emergence will presently be shown at Purification by Knowledge and Vision of the Course of Practice. (Note 108)

In the same way, eight fully-developed attainments are shown as Purification of Mind

according to the inclinations of the monks. In case only eight fully-developed attainments are meant and not just eight attainments, it will surely go counter to the statement in *Visuddhimagga* and *Saddhammappakāsinī* itself that eight attainments with access are Purification of Mind.

Special attention may be drawn to the following two passages respectively of *Visuddhimagga* and *Paramatthamañjūsā.*

"When ordinary people and Trainers develop it...the development of absorption concentration provides them with the benefit of insight by serving as the proximate cause for insight, and so too does access concentration as a method of arriving at wide open (conditions) in crowded (circumstances)." (*Visuddhimagga*, Part II, Concentration, Description of Concentration, Page 407) (Note 109)

"A person is seized with dread and a sense of urgency and, without lingering on to attain absorption concentration, establishes himself in access concentration;.... he develops insight." (*Paramatthamañjūsā*) (Note 110)

Furthermore, *Paramatthamañjūsā* states with particular reference to access concentration thus: "Access concentration, like absorption concentration, being the basis of vipassanā, is Purification of Mind too. So, it is said to be with access. (Note 111) This statement further clarifies that access concentration by itself can bring

about Purification of Mind. Again, *Paramattha-mañjūsā* points out that jhāna and access respectively are the basis of vipassānā. "This (samathayānika) is the name applied to one who, established either in jhāna, or access to jhāna, contemplates vipassanā." (Note 112) This statement confirms the fact that jhāna and access separately, not together, can produce Purification of Mind.

Here, the following statement dealing with samathapubbangama vipassanā in Papañcasūdanī Commentary should be noted.

"Here (this sāsanā) some person first of all develops either access or absorbed concentration. This concentration is samatha. Such a person contemplates on the samādhi so developed or its associated states by way of anicca, etc... Path comes about in such a person who, having developed samatha, contemplates vipassanā... Following the path, developing it, making much of it, fetters are abandoned, the lurking tendencies come to an end." (Note 113)

A similar statement is also found in the commentary of Yuganaddha Sutta in the Anguttara Sub-Commentary.

The above statement clearly shows that those who, having developed either access or absorbed concentration, contemplate vipassanā are capable of destroying all the anusayas and attain right up to arahattaphala. Here by showing the last stage of arahattaphala the

first stage of cittavisuddhi (Purification of Mind) is also shown as having been already reached. Purification of Mind comes about before the progress of insight and so it must be understood that it is brought about either by access or absorbed concentration. It means that it is not brought about by them together.

In view of the above explanations, the Ven. Kheminda should be able to understand that Purification of Mind can come about by means of access concentration, and having developed it, one who contemplates vipassanā can reach right up to Arahattaphala. It being so, he ought to modify his statement, made on the authority of Okkantika Saṁyutta etc: "Thus mundane (lokiya) jhāna always precedes supramundane (lokuttara) jhāna according to the suttas and commentaries." It would be in the rightness of things if the word 'always' is replaced by 'also'. It will then read thus: "Thus mundane jhāna also precedes supramundane jhāna according.... commentaries."

The Ven. Kheminda points out that in "The Progress of Insight" Purification of Mind comes after vipassanā contemplation. It appears that he does not understand rightly what is stated in "The Method of Insight in brief." In that short treatise will be seen two sub-headings under the heading "Purification of Mind." Under the sub-heading "(1) The Method of Insight in brief", vipassanā contemplation is briefly shown only as far as penetration into

rising and passing away of body and mind and their characteristics. This brief showing cannot be taken as the showing of the order of Purifications. This is only the introductory passage of what is to follow. The order of Purification is dealt with under the second sub-heading: "(2) The Purification of Mind." It is regrettable that the Ven. Kheminda hastily jumps to the wrong conclusion that the order of Purifications is shown under the first sub-heading"(1)The Method of Insight in brief" and hence the unfair allegation that Purification of Mind comes after vipassanā contemplation in the treatise.

If only the Ven. Kheminda carefully re-reads "The Progress of Insight" with a sincere view to understanding it, he will have to admit that "The Method of Insight in brief" is not the beginning of the order of Purification but, as the sub-heading states, is the introduction of the Method of Insight. When he so understands, he would regret having made the unfair accusation: "The Venerable Mahāsī Sayādaw sure enough knows "the due order" of the Purification, but in developing them he interferes with that order and the contents of both Purification of Mind or Consciousness and Purification of View." (*World Buddhism*, September, 1967, page 38, Column 3)

The method explained in "The Progress of Insight" is the method of contemplation of and for the vipassanāyānikas. I have already dwelt

at great length on the most reliable authorities that while contemplating vipassanā, Purification of Mind is achieved by means of momentary concentration. The Ven. Mahāsī Sayādaw is at one with me on this particular point. That is why he has stated in no uncertain terms under the sub-heading "Purification of Mind" in "The Progress of Insight" that momentary concentration, while developing insight, can bring about Purification of Mind. There being insight in Purification of Mind of vipassanāyānika there is no reason whatsoever to conclude that in "The Progress of Insight" a little of insight in Purification of View is grafted onto Purification of Mind. The Ven. Kheminda had made a most unfair accusation thus: "There is plenty of insight (vipassanā) available in Purification of View. Why, he can graft a little of this on to Purification of Mind or Consciousness which will produce the new Purification of Mind or Consciousness by way of momentary concentration." (*World Buddhism*, September 1967, page 38, columm 2). Obviously his accusation had been prompted by his misunderstanding of "The Progress of Insight."

Again the Ven. Kheminda had, with apparent gleeful satisfaction, made a reference to the Sayadaw U Sujāta's sermon, as reported in the Sinhalese language magazine *Khanduboda Vipasiana Bhāvanā Magazine*, stating the exact size, the number of page and the quality of paper. Then, the Ven. Kheminda stated: "The editor says that these are sermons delivered by the

Venerable U Sujāta Thera, interpreted into Sinhala by Mr. Rerukane, and recorded by him (the editor). He further says that this being so there may be shortcomings in this record." (World Buddhism, September, 1967, page 37, column 3) The Ven. Kheminda's very statement bears ample testimony to the fact that the editor had never acknowledged the accuracy of the reports of the sermons of Sayādaw U Sujāta. The Ven. Kheminda's reference to the detailed facts of the magazine and the report contained therein does in no way help him to discredit the sermons of Sayadaw U Sujāta. As a matter of fact, because he failed to appreciate the editor's qualified statement he rushed to make unfair accusations.

Sayadaw U Sujāta is not conversant with the Sinhalese language and therefore could not edit the Sinhalese translations of his sermons for publication in a Sinhalese language magazine. It is quite obvious that he cannot be responsible for the report of the sermons published in such a magazine, the sermons which he had never edited, because he could not know the accuracy or otherwise of the translations, or for that matter, the interpretations also, of his sermons reported therein. The Ven. Kheminda should concede this point.

NOTES

105. DC. (III,247) Cittavisuddhi–ti Vipassanāya padaṭṭhānabhūta aṭṭha paguṇasamāpattiyo.

PsC (I, 119) Cittavisuddhī- ti vipassanāya padaṭṭhānabhūta paguṇattha samāpattiyo.

106. Vism. (II, 222). Cittavisuddhi- nāma Sa- Upacāra aṭṭha samapattiyo, PsC (I, 99) Cittavisuddhi-ti sa-upacārā aṭṭha samāpattiyo.

107, DC. (III, 247), Patipadāñāṇadassana-visuddhī-ti rathavinīte vuṭṭhāna-gāminivipassanā kathitā, idha truṇavipassanā.

108. DSC. (III, 288) Idha truṇavipassanā kathitā tesaṁ bhikkhūnaṁ ajjhāsayavasena, ñeṇadassanavisuddhi vuṭṭhānagāminiyā vipassanāya vucccamānattā.

109. Vism. (I, 368) Sambādhe okāsādhigamanayena upacārasamāḥdi-bhāvanā-pi vipassanānisaṁsā hoti.

110. VismC. (I, 460) Appanādhigamam-pi anadhigamayamāno saṁvegabehulo puggalo upacārasamāhdimhiyeva thatvā vipassanāya kammaṁ karoti.

111. VismC. (II, 350) Upacārasamādhi-pi appanāsamādhi viya vipassanāya adhitthī-nabhāvato cittavisddhiyevā-ti āha "sa-upacārā" ti.

112. Ibid. Jhāne, Jhānupacāre vā patiṭṭhāya vipassanaṁ anuyuñ jantass' etaṁ nāmaṁ.

113. MC. (I, 112) Idh'ekacco paṭhamaṁ upacārasamādhiṁ vā appanāsamādhiṁ vā uppādeti, ayaṁ samatho. So tañ-ca taṁ sampayutte cadhamme aniccādīhi vipassati, ayaṁ vipassanā... Tassa samathapubbangamaṁ vipassanaṁ bhāvayato maggo sañjāyati.... tassa taṁ maggaṁ āsevato bhāvayato bahulikaroto saṁyojanāni pahiyanti, anusayā byantī honti.

MOMENTARY CONCENTRATION

Rebuttal of Reply to Rejoinder II–VI

by

Ven. Sayadaw U Nyānuttara, Agga Mahā Paṇḍita
(Burma)

I should like to raise a point, a vital one at that, for the consideration of the Ven. Kheminda. Which of the two will be able to develop insight more easily and speedily, between one who believes that insight can be developed only after attainment of jhāan, and one who believes that insight can be developed without having attained jhāna. This point is clear enough to those who understand rightly the teachings of the Buddha.

One who believes that insight can be developed only after attainment of jhāna will have to develop jhāna for quite a long time, and as long as he has not attained it so long he shall be away from development of insight. As long as he is away from development of insight so long he shall be away from insight–knowledge, penetrating the rising and passing away of mind and body, and far away from magga–phala–ñāṇa.

"Seen in the morning a number of persons are no more in the evening. Seen in the evening a number of persons are no more on the morrow." (Jātaka ii, 139) (Note 114)

"Swelter at the task this very day
Who knows whether he will die tomorrow?
There is no bargaining with the great hosts of Death.
Thus abiding ardently, unwearied day and night...."
(*The Middle Length Sayings* III, 131, page 233) (Note 115)

In this woeful times when life span is very short it would spell utter disaster if one be snatched away by Death while indulging in samatha prior to development of insight without comprehending rising and passing away of mind and body.

The *Dhammapada* (113) says: "Though one should live a hundred years, without comprehending rising and passing away, yet better, indeed, is the single day's life of one who comprehends rising and passing away." (Note 116)

If anyone, persisting in the belief that vipassanā can be developed only after attainment of jhāna, fails to attain jhāna, he would surely lose his life's opportunity to develop vipassanā. This merits the particular attention of the Ven. Kheminda and persons of his way of thinking.

A careful consideration of the point I have raised will surely make clear the pros and cons of the case of one who believes that insight can be developed only after attainment of jhāna.

One who believes that insight can be developed without having attained jhāna can, if he so wishes, develop insight straightaway ardently and come near to attainment of insight-knowledge and realisation of magga-phala-ñāṇa. To one who had built up pāramitā in the previous existences sufficiently will come comprehension of rising and passing away after seven days, attaining arahatship or the state of anāgāmi, as evidenced by the following passage of Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta.

"O bhikkhus, let alone half-a-month. Should any person make become these Four Arousings of Mindfulness in this manner for a week, then by him one of two fruitions is proper to be expected: Knowledge (Arahatship) here and now, or if some form of clinging is yet present, the state of Non-Returning (anāgāmi)." (Note 117)

A careful consideration of the point I have raised will further make clear the pros and cons of the case of one who believes that insight can be developed without having attained jhāna.

CONCLUSION

I have placed before the Ven. Kheminda and the readers his wrong comprehension and misinterpretation of the Purification of Mind as explained in the Ven. Mahāsī Sayādaw's *The Progress of Insight*, as also the lengthy explanations of certain points in his articles,

with reference to relevant passages in the Pāḷi Texts, Commentaries and Sub-commentaries. In doing so, I have all along been prompted by a single desire to make clear the truth of the Buddha Dhamma or, in other words, the correct views or interpretations of what the Buddha teaches, and incidentally I have to point out somebody's mistakes or erroneous interpretations of the Buddhist teachings, an unpleasant task indeed, although unavoidable for the sake of truth, for which I really feel sorry.

As a matter of fact, it is not in me to get involved in a controversy on any matter. So I have avoided contentions, bearing in mind the Buddha's advice: "Knowing contentions as a danger and avoidance of them as no-danger, be in concord and sweet in speech." (Apadana I, 7) (Note 118). That is why I have kept silent, concerning myself in no way with the deviations from the Buddha's teachings either in the speeches or writings of any person. In this matter the Ven. Mahāsī Sayādaw maintains silence more strictly than myself.

However, in regard to the allegations and accusations of the Ven. Kheminda concerning Momentary Concentration and Purification of Mind I could not possibly remain silent. Unavoidably I was drawn to making a rejoinder and then a rebuttal. If silence were maintained, as is my wont, some of the readers are bound to get confused in their minds over the method

of insight meditation, the method which has been rightly shown in accordance with the teachings of the Buddha by a Mahāthera, well-versed both in pariyatti and paṭipatti, thereby taking the right to be wrong, and the wrong to be right. It is also my duty to reason with the Ven. Kheminda to return to the right path.

The Ven. Kheminda's misapprehensions remind me of Sāti Thera, to whom a pernicious view had accrued: "In so far as I understand Dhamma taught by the Lord it is that this consciousness itself runs on, fares on, not another." (Note 119)

Although the monks repeatedly explained to him that the Lord never taught so, he refused to accept the explanation and adhered to his Eternity-belief (Sassata-diṭṭhi). When the Lord came to know about it, he sent for Sāti and asked him whether he had such a wrong view. When he replied that he had, the Lord admonished him thus:

"But to whom, foolish man, do you understand that Dhamma was taught by me thus? Foolish man, has not consciousness generated by conditions been spoken of in many a figure by me, saying: Apart from condition there is no origination of consciousness? But now you, foolish man, not only misrepresent me because of your wrong grasp but you also injure yourself and give rise to much demerit which,

foolish man, will be for your woe and sorrow for a long time." (*Middle Length Sayings*, I, 313) (Note 120)

I really feel compassionate towards any person who dubs as wrong either by speech or writing a discourse or a treatise of a learned or wise man, which is in accord with the teachings of the Buddha. Certainly, he should not, like Sāti, injure himself. Because I have a genuine loving-kindness and compassion for the Ven. Kheminda, I put aside, perforce, a good deal of Sāsanā work, and take good care and time to reply at great length to the unfair criticisms and allegations. In fact, my explanations are quite in consonance with the exhortations of the Buddha. The Lord put blame on any of his disciples who remained silent when the Dhamma was misrepresented.

On one occasion, the Venerable Sāriputta said: "Herein, a monk, who has achieved virtue, achieved concentration, achieved insight, may both completely enter the ending of perception and feeling and may emerge therefrom—this is so: if here among visible things he make not the gain of gnosis, he will surely go beyond the deva-community that feed on solid food and arise in a mind-pictured body, provided he enter and emerge from the ending of perception and feeling this is so." (*Gradual Sayings* III, page 141, "Ending") The Venerable Laludāyī said that it could not be. The Venerable Sāriputta explained to him thrice,

aud yet he maintained his wrong position. As if it were not their concern the monks nearby did not support the right view of the Venerable Sāriputta. In the presence of the Buddha, the Venerable Sāriputta explained to the monks the same point three times. The Venerable Laludāyi contradicted thrice. The monks remained silent. Referring to the monks who remained seated in silence although they knew that the Venerable Sāriputta was right, the Buddha said to the Venerable Ānanda: "How could you all be so indifferent to the ill-treatment being meted out to a Mahāthera?" (Note 121)

Here, by the word manomaya kāya (mind-pictured body), the Venerable Sāriputta meant that anagama and the arahata of Suddhavāsa Rūpa Brahma realms. The Venerable Laludāyī mistook them to be of Arūpa Brahma realms. Wrongly interpreting, the latter flatly contradicted the former. The Ven. Kheminda should bear this point in mind. The Buddha does not countenance the blind opposition of a person with small intellect like the Venerable Laludāyi to the Venerable Sāriputta, who was proclaimed as Number One in Paññā among his disciples. That was why he put blame on the monks who remained indifferent to the correct exposition of the Dhamma.

Remembering this illustrious instance, I have to undertake the task of writing this long article to explain how wrong the Ven. Kheminda is to make allegations and accusa-

tions against the author of a treatise which is the correct exposition of the Dhamma. I could no longer remain indifferent to the contradiction of the truth.

I strongly feel that my long article contains all the facts and reasons to convince a person of his honest mistakes and to right them. But I am not so sure if I would succeed in taking him to the right path if he is not free from honest motives. Whatever it may be, I am satisfied that I have placed before the readers what I have to say in all sincerity with a view to arriving at the truth of the matter under discussion. This is the end, and I am not going to take any notice of further allegations and accusations, if any.

I have such a lot of sāsanā work to do and I cannot afford any more time to reply to any further allegations and accusations directed against a noble monk who is recognised and respected as a teacher of Buddhist meditation in many lands besides his homeland.

Nevertheless, I must express my sincere thanks to the Ven. Kheminda for the great opportunity afforded to us to learn from his articles in *World Buddhism* that there is a person who cannot rightly grasp what is meant by Momentary Concentration and Purification of Mind. Hence this long article, which, I fervently hope, will not fail to help him as well as the readers to comprehend what they are,

and follow the right path. I must now conclude with many thanks and mettā for the Ven. Kheminda, *World Buddhism* and the readers.

NOTES

(114) J. (II, 150). Sayani–Eke nadissanti pato diṭṭha bahu janā; pato eke nadissanti -sayaṁ diṭṭha bahu janā.

(115) Ibid & M. (III, 256). Ajj'eva kiccam' ātappaṁ, ko jaññā maraṇaṁ suve; na hi no sangaraṁ tena, mahāsenena maccunā.

(116) Dh. (113 stanza) Yo ca vassasataṁ jīve, apassaṁ udayabbayaṁ; ekāhaṁ jīvitaṁ seyyo, passato udayabbayaṁ.

(117) D. (II, 252) M. (I, 90) Tiṭṭhatu bhikkhave aḍḍhamāso, Yo hi ko ci bhikkhave ime cattāro satipaṭṭhāne evaṁ bhāveyya sattāhaṁ, tassā dvinnaṁ phalānaṁ aññataraṁ phalaṁ pātikankhaṁ dittheva dhamme aññā, sati vā upādisese anāgāmitā.

(118) Ap. (I, 7) Vivādaṁ bhayato disvā, avivādañ–ca khemato; samaggā sahhilā hotha, esā buddhānusāsanī.

(119) M. (I, 323) Evarūpaṁ pāpakaṁ diṭṭhigataṁ uppannaṁ hoti "Tathā" haṁ bhagavatā dhammaṁ desitaṁ ājānāmi, yathā tad'evidaṁ viññāṇaṁ sandhāvati saṁsarati anaññan"ti,

(120) M. (I, 325). Kassa nu kho nāma tvaṁ moghapurisa mayā evaṁ dhammaṁ desitaṁ ājānāsi. Nanu mayā moghapurisa aneka.

pariyāyena paṭicca samuppannaṁ viññāṇaṁ vuttaṁ "Aññatra paccayā n'atthi vlññāṇassa sambhavo"ti. Atha ca pana tvaṁ moghapurisa attanā duggahitena amhe c'eva abbhācikkhasi, attānañ-ca khaṇasi, bahuñ-ca apuññaṁ pasavasi. Taṁ hi te moghapurisa bhavissati dīgharattaṁ ahitāya dukkhāyā-ti.

(121) A. (II, 168-171) Tatra kho āyasmā sāriputto bhikkhū āmantesi: Ihdāvuso bhikhu sīlasampanno samādhisampanno paññāsampanno saññāvedayitanirodhaṁ samāpajjeyyā-pi vuṭṭhaheyyā-pi atth'etaṁ ṭhānaṁ. no ce diṭṭhe'va dhamme aññaṁ ārādheyya, atikkamm'eva kabaḷīkārāhāra-bhakkhānaṁ devānaṁ sahabyataṁ aññataraṁ manomayaṁ kayaṁ upapanno saññāvedayitanirodhaṁ samāpajjeyyā-pi vuṭṭhaheyyā-pi, atth'etaṁ ṭhānan-ti. Evaṁ vutte ayasmā udāyi āyasmantaṁ sāriputtaṁetd'avoca: Aṭṭhānaṁ kho etaṁ....natth'etaṁ ṭhānan-ti. Dutiyam-pi kho....Tatiyam-pi kho āyasmā sāriputto bhikkhū āmantesi: idh'āvuso ... atth'etaṁ ṭhānan-ti. Tatiyam-pi kho āyasmā udāyi...natth'etaṁ ṭhānan-ti. Atha kho āyasmato sāriputtassa Etd'ahosi "yāvatatiyakam-pi kho me āyasmā udāyi paṭikkosati, na ca me koci bhikkhu anumodati, yaṁnūn'āhaṁ yena bhagavā ten'upasankameyyan"ti.... Eknmantaṁ nisinno kho āyasmā sāriputto bhikkhū āmantesi: Idh'āvuso bhikkhu sīla-sampanno.... atth'etaṁ ṭhānan-ti.... tatiyam-pi kho āyasmā udāyi .... natth'etaṁ thānan-ti. Atha kho āyasmato sāriputassa etd'ahosi "Bhagavato-pi kho me sammukhā

āyasmā udāyi yāvatatiyakaṁ–paṭikkosati, na ca me koci bhikkhu anumodati, yaṁnūn'āhaṁ tuṇhī assan''ti, Atha kho. āyasmā sāriputto tuṇhī ahosi.... Atha kho bhagavā āyasmantaṁ ānandaṁ āmantesi: Atthi ñama ānanda theraṁ bhikkhuin vihesiyamānaṁ ajjhupekkhissatha, na hi nāma ānanda karuññam–pi bhavissati theramhi bhikkhumhi vihesiya mānamhī–ti.

(Concluded)

PART TWO

RISING AND FALLING OF THE ABDOMEN

PROPER OBJECT OF CONTEMPLATION

NEWSWEEC 1343 N. State Pkwy
Chicago, IU., 560610
From U.S.A.
CHRISTOPHER FARNY Dec. 27, 1976.

Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw,

Dear Sir,

I am enclosing a stat regarding Lama Govinda's book, "Creative Meditation and Multi-Dimensional Consciousness," published by The Theosophical Publishing House, Wheation, Ill, U.S.A. and London, England. (1976). Although the quoted Satipatthana technique is one I have used in Soto Zen practice for many years–it's called shikan taza–and although I've practiced Satipatthana meditations and mindfulness techniques, with Krishnamurtain flavoring, for some years as well, for the good of my sadhana, and possibly others as well, I hope you might care to comment on Govinda's criticisms of this practice. Incidentally, Govinda doesn't give the name of the book in question, but I know it to be "an Experiment in Mindfulness," by Admiral E. H. Shattock, published by Dutton, 300 Park Ave. South, New York 10, N. Y.

Yours in the Dharma,
C. FARNY

CREATIVE MEDITATION AND MULTI-DIMENSIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS

(Author – Lama Govinda)

Chapter 5

THE FOUNDATIONS OF MINDFULNESS

To be fully conscious in all situations and conditions of life is what the Buddha meant when he said that we should be mindful while sitting, standing, lying down, or walking. But "fully conscious" does not mean to be conscious of only one aspect or function of our body or mind, but to be conscious with and of our whole being, which includes body and mind and something that goes beyond body and mind: namely that deeper reality at which the Buddha hinted in the term *Dharma* and which he realised in the state of Enlightenment.

The most effective way to become conscious of our whole being and to dwell in a state of perfect concentration and equanimity is as we have seen, the practice of ānāpānasati. This is the basis of all meditation, because it is through breathing that we are able to come in contact with and connect all our physical and psychic faculties with our conscious mind. Through breathing we achieve the synthesis of all our functions and realise the dynamic and universal nature of life and the impossibility of the idea of a separate and unchangeable egohood, as expressed in the Buddha's anatma-doctrine. Only on this basis can the subse-

quent steps of the Satipatthana-meditation have any meaning and prevent its deterioration into a mere intellectual analysis and negation of all positive aspects of human life.

It is characteristic and significant for the negative and prejudiced attitude of those who propagate a modern Burmese Satipatthana practice, that they suppress precisely that part of the original Satipatthana upon which the Buddha laid the greatest stress. They replace it by the most superficial of all methods, namely the observation of the rising and falling of the abdomen—thus diverting the attention of the meditator from the real experience of the breathing process. If one needs such desperate methods of focussing one's attention, it is better to abandon the practice and fix one's concentration on something more inspiring, something which holds our interest naturally and spontaneously without the use of force or sheer wlll power, which only strengthens our ego-sense.

To concentrate on the visible mechanism of moving, the functions of limbs and muscles, i.e., the merely materal side of one's body, is focusing one's consciousness on the lowest form of illusion and purely intellectual analysis. It does not bring us one step nearer the truth, but misleads us into believing that we have isolated certain facts, which in reality we have only forced our materialistic interpretation upon them. The deception consists in overlooking

the fact that we cannot isolate any sense impression, since each sense impression is already an enormously complicated process. We can only reduce it to the point of emphasising its most superficial aspect of suppressing all other factors. It is ridiculous to call this an act of unprejudiced observation or awareness, because the intentional exclusion of the spiritual factor, namely the force that moves or causes movement, the will—and equally important, the mind which observes its own actions and reactions—and finally the conditions which make the movement possible: the universal forces which form the background and the *conditio sine qua non* for all phenomena of matter and movement, of consciousness and will power, of life and death, inerial and flux.

The falsification of the Buddha's Satipatthana can be seen in the artificiality of such phrases as "touching, touching, touching"—"lifting, lifting, lifting" etc, by which each movement is verbalized—as if the lifting, the touching, the putting down, etc. were something that happened by itself. The Buddha was free from such deceptive devices of narrow dogmatism. He was not afraid of using the word "I" or the first person singular of the verb expressing individual action. He, for instance, simply and naturally said: "When making a long inhalation, I know that I am making a long inhalation, when making a short inhalation, I know that I am making a short inhala-

tion; and similarly, as the case may be: I go, I stand, I sit, I lie down."

The fact that all movements are related to a central force to an individual consciousness, does not mean that this force is an absolute, unchangeable and personal ego. Quite the contrary: he who has realized the fundamental significance of the breathing process—which is a continuous taking and giving back, assimilation and transformation, acceptance and release—knows that the essence of individual life cannot be a stagnant, immobile ego or separate entity—separate from the body which it inhabits, as well as from the world in which it lives—but a dynamic force, a focus of infinite relationships. The effort to separate various functions and to look upon them as if they were autonomous, unrelated to anything else, is a gross violation of truth and reality. If there is visible movement, its reality does not lie in the object that is moved, but in the force which moves it.

If a stone falls, no amount of analytic investigation as to the nature of the stone can explain the reason for its fall. Only when we realize the force and principle of gravitation do we begin to understand the universal significance of that simple phenomenon observed in the falling of a stone.

By suppressing one half of the fact, namely the conscious process of our subjective act of willing, which miraculously (and what greater miracle could there be, than the direct action

of the mind upon matter) causes the movement of our limbs–by suppressing this fact, I say, we violate the truth and degrade reality to a mechanical and perfectly senseless phenomenon. Apparently, Admiral Shattock had come to a similar conclusion when he asked Mahasi Sayadaw the question: "What is the connection between the mind that thinks and gives orders, and the physical brain that carries them out in the body; and how does it work?" Here he touched upon one of the most profound mysteries of life–the interrelationship of mind and matter (*mano–maya*), which leads to the understanding that the body is not only a tool, an instrument of the mind, different from or even foreign to the essential nature of the mind, but that it is a crystallization of our consciousness, built up through aeons of organic evolution in harmony with universal laws, which reveal themselves in every function of the body and its organs. Instead of taking this opportunity to give some hints concerning the true nature of the mind and its creative power (*mano pubbangamā dhammā*), the Sayadaw gave the following amazing reply: "The Sayadaw cannot possibly give you an opinion about a matter which has not been included by the Buddha as one for instruction: it would be impossible for him to have an opinion on such a thing." The Buddha never forbade his disciples to think for themselves nor did he establish a dogma that excluded such questions.

Mr C. Farny
1353 N. State Pkwy,
Chicago, Ill, 60610
U.S.A.

Thathana Yeiktha,
16. Hermitage Road,
Rangoon, Burma.
January 21, 1977.

Dear Mr Farny,

I am directed by the Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, dated December 27, 1976, on the 11th instant–with the enclosure: photostat of Chapter 5, "The Foundations of Mindfulness", of Lama Govinda's book "Creative Meditation and Multi–Dimensional Consciousness".

We are much obliged to you for bringing to our notice the criticism of Lama Govinda regarding the Satipatthāna Vipassanā method as taught by the Mahasi Sayadaw. As a matter of fact, his criticism is quite mild compared to the scurrilous attacks made by a few critics, two of whom belonged to Ceylon, and two or three others are of this country. The Mahasi Sayadaw wrote and published an Explanatory Note, covering about 15 pages. I propose to translate it into English and send you a copy in due course.

It appears that Lama Govinda has neither studied the Satipatthana method in all its aspects, nor has he practised it with saddha (trustful confidence) and energy required for success.

The Mahasi Sayadaw always advises us to be tolerant, patient and forgiving. We hope that after you have read our next letter you will be good enough to clear away the misunderstanding.

With metta (loving-kindness),

Yours in the Dhamma,

Myanaung U Tin.

1353 N. STATE PKWY February 2, 1977
CHICAGO, Ill, 60610
USA.

Dear Ven. Myanaung U Tin,

Thank you so much for your excellent letter of January 21, which I received this morning. Enclosed are stats of three letters re Lama Govinda's article that I thought might be of interest. You'll be happy to see that all three correspondents have well absorbed the Sayadaw's teachings: they have nothing but pity and compassion for the Lama as they, as well as you and I know that had the Lama practised the Burmese method he too would have benefited and realized piti–sambojjhango–contentedness, rejoicing, jubilation, enthusiasm, exultation, and other high transports of the spirit. They are all fine examples of metta and loving–kindness and tolerance towards one who criticizes their own marga. We must direct our thoughts of loving–kindness for all beings.

I myself have practised Satipaṭṭhāna vipassana meditation technique, "Burmese Method", for over 15 years with great benefit. I hope to visit you and the Thathana Yeiktha in five years with my wife who is also benefiting from these meditations. At that time I will have retired from NEWSWEEK after 25 years at age 53. We then plan to spend a number of years in the Orient.

Looking forward to your translation. Metta.

Yours in the Dhamma,
Chris Farny.

13 Jan, 77 H

Dear Christopher,

Thank you for your letter of 30 Dec.

I read with great interest the enclosed article "The Foundations of Mindfulness" by Lama Govinda.

It is a great pity that, at the evening of his life, the Lama has not found it appropriate to be more constructive.

I feel that rather than disproportionately re-acting to the mind ticking of an old man, we could be more constructive in contributing to Universal Harmony by wishing him peace and happiness and full enlightenment in this very life.

May All Beings be Enlightened,
With kindest regards and Metta.

Yours in the Dharma,
John E. Coleman.

9 Altwood Road,
Maidenhead, Berks. SL 64 IB,
England.

NOTE John E. Coleman is the author of "The Quiet Mind"; first published by Rider and Company, London, in 1971. In Chapters 5, 6 and 17, he recounted his experiences in Sati-patthana vipassana meditation at Bangkok and Rangoon.

STILLPOINT

Dear Chris, Jan 21, 1977

Thank you for your letter and a copy of Lama Govinda's article.

The statement that the attention cannot be placed on the rising and falling (of the abdomen) is proven untrue by the students whom I have personally taught, and who have made distinctive progress. I have practised both places on the belly and at the nostril area, and find they both work quite well. So my point is that I know his statement is false, but I do not in any way criticise him. Perhaps intentions are good, and the information is not complete for him to make an accurate statement.

(As to) the issue of his dramatic attack on the Ven. Mahasi Sayadaw's understanding, I will not get involved with it. Let it be. Practise with love and compassion. The Dhamma is clearly taught for the release of your suffering. Practice is my advice.

Enclosed is a brochure that describes our work here. Financial arrangements can be made to meet everyone's situation. If your interest is as you say for a month retreat, you will find the brochure valuable to you. I am not giving courses in April or May. In June there is a large course given here when

Anagarika Munindra from India will be here visiting. He studied with Mahasi Sayadaw and is a competent Meditation Master, who is my teacher and friend. Space is limited for that retreat, and if it is your first, Feb or March would be better. Please notify us of your plans. I close wishing you joy and peace to you in the unfolding of your understanding.

Anagarika Sujata

604 SOUTH FIFTEENTH STREET,
SAN JOSE, CA 95112,
Telephone: (408) – 5307.

UNITY PRESS, INC. 118 New Street,
Santa Crux, CA 950060, (408) 4272020

January 27, 1977

Christopher H. Farny
1353, North State Pkwy
Chicago, Ill, 60610
Dear Chris,

I am returning your check (enclosed) for Satipatthana Vipassana Meditation as it is out of print. I suggest, if you have not already done so, that you purchase Joseph Goldstein's EXPERIENCE OF INSIGHT (U.S. dollar 3.95,Unity Press)as well as Jack Kornfield's LIVING BUDDHIST MASTERS (U.S. dollar 5.95, Unity Press, Available May 77.)

Joseph and I discussed the passage from the Lama's book and, as Joseph said, "The Lama should try it and experience the method before he makes judgements. He obviously misunderstands what the process entails." To which I would add, it is pretty clear to me that the Lama is misunderstanding yet more deeply the process that Mahasi Sayadaw and other Burmese have suggested—that indeed in following the breath, one is following the sense of touch, the sensation that accompanies the breath during the breathing process. If the mind is not following sensation, it is conceptualizing and just more mind trips one being

spun out. The Buddha's first foundation of mindfulness was in the body as sensation itself following and accompanying the processes of breathing, walking, moving, chewing, etc. I think the Lama is missing the point in this particular instance and not living up to his normal acquity and perceptions of clear thought. He seems stuck a bit high up in the head, not quite able to get into the mind body process in this particular instance. The real path is finding out who we are and being with things as they are during their unfolding. Seeing consciousness and objects arise and pass away frees us from the concepts of self and permanence, We need do nothing more than be awake and not conceptualizing our experience, aware of the arisiug and passing away of all phenomena, just letting it all be more grist for the mill of our awakening.

Let it shine.

Stephen Sevine

SL: als

enclosure (catalog)

NOTE: Joseph Goldstein is a pupil of Anagarika Munindra who studied Buddha-dhamma, and practised Satipatthana vipassana meditation at Thathana Yeiktha, Rangoon, for a number of years, both as a layman and as a monk.

SATIPAṬṬHĀNA VIPASSANĀ

Jack Kornfield is a pupil of the Burmese Sayadaw U Arsabha of Cholburi, Thailand, where he practised Satipatthana vipassana meditation for several years, as a monk, Bhikkhu Santi Dhammo. The Venerable Sayadaw U Arsabha was a Kammathanacariya at Thathana Yeiktha, Rangoon, before he left for Thailand about 20 years ago.

Stephen Levine published these books in Mindfulness Series:

1. The Satipatthana Vipassana Meditation by the Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw.
2. Practical Insight Meditation by the Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw.
3. The Power of Mindfulness by the Venerable Nyanaponika Thera.

Mr Christopher Farny
1355, N. State Parkway,
Chicago, Illinois, 60610,
U.S.A.

Thathana Yeiktha,
16, Hermitage Road,
Rangoon, Burma.
February 19, 1977

Dear Mr Farny,

I believe you received my previous letter, dated 21st January. Therein I mentioned that Lama Govinda's criticism is quite mild compared to the scurrilous attacks made by a few critics upon the Venerable Mahasi Sayadaw on account of the Satipatthana meditation method taught by him. Two critics belonged to Ceylon (now Sri Lanka). They were learned and respected monks, who were evidently motivated by a sincere "wish to see to it that a Pure Sasana continues for the good of posterity". Most regrettably their criticisms were couched in a virulent language, which defeated their own purpose. These criticisms were made in the year 1957, the year after the conclusion of the Sixth Buddhist Sangayana, held at Rangoon, attended by the representatives of Theravada countries, including, of course, Ceylon. It may be recalled that the Mahasi Sayadaw was the Puccaka (Questioner) of that august assembly. As advised by the Mahasi Sayadaw, no action whatsoever was taken to counter, obviously for the sake of continued harmony between two Theravad countries, Ceylon and Burma. Instead, the Mahasi Sayadaw and the Buddha Sasana Nuggaha Organisation sent out Meditation teachers, as requested by a number of monks and lay persons of that country, to

teach the Satipatthana technique. The meditation centres they taught at are still there.

About seven years later, there appeared a critic in our country, a learned monk, presiding over the yogis (yogins) of his own at a meditation centre at Syriam (an old Portugese settlement) across the Rangoon River. The language he used was no less vehement, but the Mahasi Sayadaw was not the only victim of his fault-finding. Among others, the Most Venerable Ledi Sayadaw, who was (and still is) recognised as a great authority on the Buddha-dhamma, doctrinal and practical, was also criticised rather severely. The Syriam Sayadaw's book ran to over 800 pages. He had also two henchmen, newspaper-columnists at that, who took great delight in making jibes. The Syriam Sayadaw and his henchmen are no more heard of publicly. Before the curtain fell over them, the Mahasi Sayadaw issued an Explanatory Note on his meditation practice (the rising and falling of the abdomen in particular) with references to Pali Texts, Commentaries and Sub-Commentaries.

In my previous letter I promised to send you a copy of the English translation of the Mahasi Sayadaw's Note, which covers about 14 or 15 pages. As I began to translate, it occurred to me that it would be better to meet the criticisms of Lama Govinda, making use of the salient points of the Mahasi Sayadaw's Note and references to one or more books.

It is quite clear that the distinguished Lama based his criticism on the Rear–admiral E.H. Shattock's book: "An Experiment in Mindfulness". But then, that book should not be considered as containing full instructions on the Mahasi Sayadaw's method. Surely, it is not fair to rely solely on that book, which is also a travelogue. "The Heart of Buddhist Meditation" by Nyanaponika Thera is an authoritative book on Satipatthana Meditation. It may, therefore, be assumed that the distinguished Lama has read it, where the so–called Burmese Satipatthana Method is explained in very clear terms. I take it that you and your Dhamma–friends have read it too. Nevertheless, I must ask you to read again Chapter 5 of Part One (The Burmese Satipatthana Method) with the care it deserves.

The crux of the matter of criticism of the learned Lama is the movement of the abdomen. He asserts: "They replace it (anapana–sati) by the most superficial of all methods, namely, the observation of the rising and falling of the abdomen–thus diverting the attention to the meditator from the real experience of the breathing process.

This assertion is based upon a misapprehension. The rising and falling of the abdomen is not designed to replace the respiration process. Far from excluding it, the former supplements it. Here, I would like to refer you to the last paragraph of Chapter 5 of

Nyanaponika Thera's book. If a yogi prefers the breathing contemplation he can go along with it. But if he finds it difficult to do so he is advised to observe the rising and falling of the abdomen which has its own advantages.

The Buddha's Discourse on Satipatthana Meditation deals with four main kinds of mindfulness. The first of the four is Body Contemplation. Section One deals with Breathing. Section Two deals with Postures of the Body, or Modes of Deportment. The last line of first para of Section Two is "just as his body is disposed, so he understands it". It is also translated thus: "he knows any other position of the body". Please read again the third paragraph from the bottom of Chapter 5. Nyanaponika Thera says: "It shares that circumstance with many other physical and mental processes which likewise are not expressly mentioned in the scriptures, but belong nevertheless to the all-comprehensive domain of mindfulness." It may be pointed out that "just as his body is disposed, so he understands it" is an all-inclusive term. The Mahasi Sayadaw explains, in his Note referred to above, that the abdominal movement is not a replacement of breathing process but a physical process covered by the all-inclusive term, which is called "sabba sangahika" in Pali commentaries and sub-commentaries.

The Mahasi Sayadaw points out that the abdominal movement, like any other position of

the body, belongs to Section Two. The Leḍi Sayadaw, in his Anatta Dipani, had explained that all the physical movements besides the four main Postures of the Body (Modes of Deportment) are covered by the above-mentioned all-inclusive term, and they are objects of contemplation. The Ledi Sayadaw's interpretation is based upon the relevant commentaries and Sub-Commentaries, namely, Dīgha Nikāya Commentary 2-538, Majjhima Nikāya Sub-Commentary 1-353. (Volumes and pages refer to the books recognised by the Sixth Buddhist Sangāyanā). It is true that there are two alternative Sub-Commentary interpretations in this regard. According to Sub-Commentary I interpretation, the all-inclusive term covers only the four main Postures of the Body. Sub-Commentary II advances the view that the all-inclusive term covers all the movements of the body, besides the four main positions. Here it must be noted that the Sub-Commentator places before the readers two alternative interpretations, but it is not unusual for a Sub-Commentator to put more emphasis on the second or latter interpretation. Therefore the Ledi Sayadaw, after weighing both the Commentarial and Sub-Commentarial interpretations, accepted the view that the all-inclusive term (sabba sangahika) covers all body movements other than the four main postures. Relying on the said Commentarial and Sub-Commentarial views, the Mahasi Sayadaw is convinced that the rising and falling of the abdomen, being

a physical process, is covered by the all-inclusive term.

The Mahasi Sayadaw contends that even if it be not covered by the all-inclusive term and so cannot belong to Section Two of the Chapter I, dealing with the Contemplation of the Body, nobody can deny that it is a legitimate object of contemplation, in the sense that "it shares that circumstance with other physical and mental processes which likewise are not expressly mentioned in the scriptures, but belong to the all-comprehensive domain of mindfulness." The learned Lama's words come to my mind as I am typing: "The Buddha never forbade his disciples to think for themselves, nor did he establish a dogma that excluded such questions." (Last two sentences in the photostat). That the Mahasi Sayadaw does think for himself is amply proved by the inclusion of the rising and falling of the abdomen as an object of contemplation; but certainly not to the exclusion of breathing practice. Incidentally, it may be mentioned that BRAIN as a part of the body was not found in the discourses of the Buddha, but it was included as such in the Patisambhidāmagga, which is believed to be the work of Sāriputta Thera, the chief disciple.

(Before I proceed I must take this opportunity to observe that the learned Lama finds fault with the Mahasi Sayadaw, relying solely on a paragraph from Admiral Shattock's book,

in which was stated a question about a connection between the mind and the physical brain, and an answer thereto. Surely, the Māhasi Saysdaw should not have been discredited as lacking the knowledge of the working of the mind in relation to the body, both doctrinal and insight into them in the course of meditations for a considerable number of years. We could not help but laugh at the learned Lama's gratuitous aspersion. We are given to understand that Lama Govinda was once a Theravada monk, and if so, we wonder why and when he became a Lama. We are also intrigued by the title of his book: "The Creative Meditation and Multi-Dimensional Consciousness". We also note that the book was published by the *Theosophical Publishing House*, U.S.A. and London.)

The learned Lama appears to be labouring under a misapprehension when he criticises thus: "touching, touching, touching.....lifting lifting, lifting, etc. by which each movement is verbalised.....as if the lifting, the touching, the putting down, etc. were something that happened by itself." That there is always mind-body relationship is obvious. A person, with no, to use the learned Lama's words, "negative and prejudiced attitude" would not fail to appreciate that these detailed movements are involved in the four main postures. Please read the explanation in Chapter 5 of Nyanaponika Thera's book.

We have no desire to join issue with the learned Lama in regard to the interpretation of "fully conscious" in the first para of his criticism. Fully aware as we are of what is implied in the second para of Section Two, dealing with the Postures of the Body, the learned Lama would, we hope, appreciate that a meditator must start with four movements mentioned in the first para thereof. As he goes on, "the knowledge will arise by itself" (ñāṇaṁ sayameva uppajjissati).

Now I must conclude. Two learned and respected monks of Ceylon, who criticised, most regrettably, in a virulent manner, were dead and gone. Apart from the virulent criticism, we feel that their demise was a great loss to the Theravada cause. They left a number of writings (articles as well as books), which are well worth reading, studying and preserving. We also feel that they were motivated by a sincere desire to protect the sāsanā but were carried away by excessive zeal and pugnacity. As to the Syriam Sayadaw of this country, the less said the better. Judging by what he said of a number of learned Sayadaws, he must be considered to be censorious by nature, and filled with self-confidence of exceptional degree. The Syriam Sayadaw and his henchmen are still living but no longer much alive and kicking. It appears that the opposition has died down here.

Now, through your kindness, we come to know of the distinguished Lama Govinda's book–Chapter 5. Credit must be given where credit is due. He is, indeed, a good writer, and the title of his book is, indeed, intriguing. We very much appreciate your deep interest in the Satipaṭṭhāna meditation, and we believe that you will do what you can to explain away the misapprehensions. Our mettā goes as much to you as to the distinguished Lama Govinda. We have a feeling that misapprehensions in his mind would disappear if only he is afforded an opportunity to read our explanations and, better still, to practise intensively Satipaṭṭhāna meditation as taught by the Mahāsi Sayadaw. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Thousands of his disciples have greatly benefitted by this method and found confirmation through actual practice, of the definite advantages, outlined in the last paragraph of Chapter 5 of Nyanaponika Thera's book. May the distinguished Lama Govinda be progressing steadily and surely as a Bodhisatva! May you be physically fit and mentally alert to achieve further progress in Satipaṭṭhāna Vipassana meditation, leading to the final liberation!

Yours in the Dhamma,

Myanaung U Tin,
Nāyaka,

Buddha Sasana–Nuggaha Organization,
Thathana Yeiktha

P.S. Many thanks for your second letter, dated February 2, with three enclosures. Anagarika Sujata, Mr Stedhen Levine and Mr Joseph Goldstein are well known to us; we cannot recall Mr John E. Coleman. We very much appreciate your observations and their comments. I wonder whether you can arrange to give them a copy each of this letter. Thanking you.

Myanaung U Tin

(a layman, not a monk).

Note – This letter was written on February 19, 1977. The Ven. Syriam Tawya Sayadaw P.K:U. Tilokanyana passed away on March 9, 1977, at East Rangoon Hospital.

NEWSWEEK 1353, N. State Parkway,.
From Chicago, Ill, 60610, U.S.A.
Christopher Farny March 12, 1977.

Dear Ven. Nayaka Myanaung U Tin,

Thank you so much for your most excellent and complete letter of Feb. 19. I have sent copies to all Dhamma–friends you suggested, including the Lama Govinda. Curiously, Lama G. used to be a guru of mine, although I haven't seen or contacted him or his wife, Li Gotami, in several years. In his "The Way of the White Clouds" (now available in paperback), a most beautiful book recounting his experiences in Tibet, he explains how he shifted over from Theravada to Vajrayana (he was much influenced by the psychic mind–reading qualities of several Buddhist gurus he met–truly extraordinary experiences). Oddly, my "trip" has been the reverse; from Vajrayana to Theravada (in the sense of the "Burmese method"). The Burmese method was not entirely new for me when I started it some years ago, as for some 20 years prior I had practiced G.I. Gurdjieff's "self–remembering" (was in one of his groups) and Krishnamurti's (choiceless self–awareness". I had practiced zazen at Soto Zen monastery but I have never anywhere in "Zen" seen anything dealing specifically with s(S)elf observation as in the "Burmese method".

I am, of course, well familiar with Nyanaponika Thera's *The Heart of Buddhist Meditation* and the very words you cited in it came to mind as soon as I read Lama G's criticism of the "Burmese Method"–even before I entered into correspondence with you, but I do thank you for reminding me of it, and accordingly I have re–read his Chapter 5. His explanation is certainly masterly.

Should I receive a response from Lama Govinda–I wrote him C/o his publisher, The Theosophical Publishing House in Wheaton, Ill,–I will let you know. I do hope your letter will help his Sadhana.Who knows, maybe he will take up Satipatthana Vipassana meditation again; I do believe your masterly letter should do much to clear up his misapprehension. I too am curious as to the real reason why he left the Theravada fold.

Keep up the good work!

Kindest regards to you and the Mahasi Sayadaw,
Mettā.

Chris.

MAHASI PUBLICATIONS IN ENGLISH

Name of Publication		*Price*
1. Satipatthana Vipassana Meditation 2. Practical Insight Meditation	In a single volume	Kts. 8
3. Practical Vipassana Meditational Exercises (with a biographical sketch of Mahasi Sayadaw's life and work)		Kts. 4
4. Practical Basic Exercises in Satipatthana Vipassana Meditation		Kts. 1
5. Mahasi Abroad (Lectures by Mahasi Sayadaw on his World Missionary Tour)		Kts. 4

(Available at Mahasi Thathana Yeiktha,
16, Hermitage Road, Kokine, Rangoon)