

to come to a place of preaching the Dhamma. As such it was a great loss for both of them to have passed away before meeting the Buddha. Anyway, since there is no clear information about his spiritual attainments in the texts, these commentarial remarks could be regarded as later speculations based on the confusion with regard to the identity of Rāma and his son or pupil Uddaka. However there is always the possibility that Uddaka Rāmaputta attained the *Nevasaññānāsaññāyatana* between the Recluse Gotama leaving him and his decision to proclaim to the world the truths he had realized with Buddhahood.

C. Witanachchi.

References

- 1 *Middle Length Sayings* tr. I.B. Horner, Pali Text Society, London, 1976 Vol. I. p. 209
- 2 *Mahavastu*, tr. J.J. Jones, Pali Text Society London, 1976, Vol. II p. 117
- 3 *Ibid.* 1978 Vol. III. p. 115

UDESAVIBHAṄGA SUTTA, the “discourse on an exposition of a summary”, is the hundred-thirty-eighth discourse in the *Majjhima Nikāya* (M. III, 223-229). The *Uddesa-vibhaṅga Sutta* begins with the Buddha announcing a summary and exposition. According to the summary statement, a monk should avoid being scattered externally or getting stuck internally in order to reach liberation. This summary statement by the Buddha then received a detailed treatment by Mahākaccāna, who explained that due to the gratification provided by sense-objects one might be scattered externally, and due to attachment to *jhāna* experiences one could get stuck internally. This explanation by Mahākaccāna was subsequently reported by the other monks to the Buddha, who expressed his approval of Mahākaccāna’s exposition.

A slightly puzzling circumstance of this discourse is that according to the *Uddesa-vibhaṅga Sutta* the Buddha had announced that he would give the exposition himself, but then withdrew after giving just the summary statement. A similar situation recurs in the case of the *Mahākaccāna-bhaddeka-ratta Sutta*,

where the Buddha was requested to teach a summary and its exposition, to which he agreed, but then withdrew after delivering only the summary (M. III, 192). In both cases, the Chinese parallels differ in that according to them the Buddha had not announced or agreed to teach an exposition (T. I, 694b16 and T. I, 697a13).¹ This leaves open the possibility that the contradictory situation in the two Pāli discourses could be the outcome of an error that occurred during oral transmission.

Whether the Buddha initially announced an exposition or not, the Pāli and Chinese versions of the *Uddesa-vibhaṅga Sutta* (and of the *Mahākaccāna-bhaddeka-ratta Sutta*) agree that the actual exposition of the Buddha’s summary was given by Mahākaccāna, who according to the *Āṅguttara Nikāya* was outstanding among the Buddha’s disciples precisely in this respect, namely in the delivery of detailed expositions of short sayings (A. I, 23). The *Uddesa-vibhaṅga Sutta* can thus be seen as documenting an early beginnings of the commentarial tradition (See also ATṬHAKATHĀ), in the sense of exegesis provided by the disciples of the Buddha. In the case of the *Uddesa-vibhaṅga Sutta*, through his approval the Buddha endorsed the commentary provided by Mahākaccāna with sufficient authenticity for it to be included in the canonical collection of discourses.

The case of the *Uddesa-vibhaṅga Sutta* shows the degree to which what originally was a comment by a disciple on a short saying by the Buddha was subsequently considered as canonical and included as a discourse in the Pāli *Nikāyas*. In fact, other discourses spoken by disciples were included even without having received an explicit approval by the Buddha, such as e.g. the *Mahāvedalla Sutta* (M. I, 292-298), a discourse that records the expositions given by one of the Buddha’s disciples in reply to a series of questions by another disciple.

The pattern of following a summary with its exposition is a feature found regularly in discourses spoken in their entirety by the Buddha, such as the *Araṇa-vibhaṅga Sutta* or the *Dhātu-vibhaṅga Sutta*, two discourses that immediately follow the *Uddesa-vibhaṅga Sutta* in the *Majjhima Nikāya* collection (M. III, 230-247). These discourses exhibit the same pattern as the *Uddesa-vibhaṅga Sutta*, with the

difference that the more detailed exposition is in both cases given by the Buddha himself.

The same pattern also recurs in relation to the *pātimokkha*, where the rules that come up for recitation at the fortnightly meeting of the monks on observance days are accompanied in the *Suttavibhaṅga* of the Vinaya by a commentary that itself has attained canonical status (*Vin.* III - IV). A similar pattern also underlies the *Jātaka* collection, where, however, only the verses themselves are canonical, whereas the tales that provide an exposition of the background to the verses have been assigned to the category of commentary. Thus the pattern set by the *Uddesa-vibhaṅga Sutta* of following a summary by the Buddha with an exposition by a disciple can be seen to highlight a significant stage in the development of early Buddhist exegesis and of the concept of canonicity in early Buddhism.

Anālayo

Reference

1 *T.* stands for the Taishō edition.

UDDHACCAKUKKUCCA, “restlessness-and-worry”, (Skt. *audhatya-kaukr̥tya*), is the fourth in the standard listing of the five hindrances that obstruct the meditative development of the mind (See also NĪVARAṆA). The expression *uddhacca-kukkucca* actually covers two hindrances, one of which is restlessness, while the other is worry (*S.* V, 110). The rationale for treating them together as a single hindrance may be the similar effect that restlessness and worry have on the mind.

Restlessness

The first of these two, *uddhacca*, is “restlessness” in the sense of mental agitation, distraction and excitement, and thus by its very nature is the opposite of mental calm and tranquillity. According to the *Visuddhimagga*’s explanation, restlessness has lack of calmness as its characteristic, *avūpasama-lakkhaṇa*, its function is unsteadiness, *anavatthāna-rasa*, its manifestation is confusion, *bhantatta-paccupatthāna*, and its proximate cause is unwise attention to [things

that cause] lack of calmness in the mind, *cetaso avūpasame ayonisomanasikāra-padatthāna* (*Vism.* 469).

Such restlessness can arise through excessive striving, a situation the discourses compare to a goldsmith who keeps on blowing on gold that is on the fire, as a result of which the gold will get burnt (*A.* I, 257). Here a less pushy approach would be the appropriate remedy, and perhaps also a less goal-oriented attitude. In fact, the discourses indicate quite explicitly that *chanda*, in the sense of “desire” for progress on the path, can be in excess, *atipaggahīta chanda*, and in such a case will cause restlessness (*S.* V, 277). The same is the case for excess of energy or of the other *iddhipādas*. Hence even though desire for progress or energy are required for the development of the path, if they become too prominent in the mind the hindrance of restlessness will arise and thereby obstruct further progress. As long as restlessness remains, it will be impossible to reach the final goal (*A.* III, 421).

The need for balance in this respect can be seen from the case of Soṇa, who had put forth excessive energy and was in a state of depression because he had not progressed. In order to drive home to him the lesson that the all important middle path of balance gets lost with too pushy an attitude, the Buddha employed the imagery of a lute, an instrument with which Soṇa would have been familiar from his earlier years as a layman (*A.* III, 375). Though the strings of a lute need to be taut in order to produce sound, if they are over tight, the sound will become shrill. Just as the lute’s strings need to be adjusted to a middle position between laxity and tension, similarly Soṇa had to find the middle point of balance between these two extremes in order to be able to progress. In his case this required giving up excessive striving and its resultant restlessness. It is perhaps no surprise that, after this clarification, Soṇa was soon enough able to reach the final goal, which earlier had eluded him due to his excessive striving.

A more mundane source for the arising of restlessness can be the speaking of provocative words (*A.* IV, 87), which lead to much talking and arguing, as a result of which restlessness will arise in the mind and concentration will be lost. Restlessness could also arise in relation to begging alms, as on receiving nothing

ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF BUDDHISM

Founder Editor-in Chief

G. P. MALALASEKERA, M. A., Ph. D., D. Litt., Professor Emeritus

Editor-in Chief

W. G. WEERARATNE, M. A., Ph. D.

VOLUME VIII

FASCICLE 2 : Taiwān–Uttarīmanussadhamma



2008