

**UTTARAVINICCHAYA.** The *Uttaravinicchaya* is one of the two Pali treatises wherein the *Vinaya Piṭaka* is summarized in verse, to be used as mnemonic verses. It is always coupled with the first part of the *Vinayavinicchaya*, of which it is the supplementary volume. Both the *Vinayavinicchaya* and the *Uttaravinicchaya* were written by the same author, Ven. Buddhadatta of Uragapura, a contemporary of Buddhaghosa as recorded in the colophons of the two books. The colophon of the *Uttaravinicchaya* giving the name of the author says:

*Tambapaṇṇiyena paramaveyyā karaṇena..... uragapurena Buddhadattena racito uttaravinicchayo niṭṭhito*<sup>1</sup> "Here ends the *Uttaravinicchaya* written by Buddhadatta, the supreme grammarian of Uragapura in Tambapanni."

According to the *Vinayasāratthadīpanī*, the *Ṭikā* on the *Vinayavinicchaya* of Vācissara Mahāsāmi and also the *Buddhaghosuppatti*, Ven. Buddhadatta who was returning from Lanka and Ven. Buddhaghosa proceeding to Lanka met on the way on the high sea. When Ven. Buddhadatta learnt that Buddhaghosa was going to Lanka to translate the Sinhala commentaries to Pali, he requested Buddhaghosa to send the commentaries he was writing to him in order to summarize them. Thus the tradition says that the *Vinayavinicchaya* and the *Uttaravinicchaya* have been written by Buddhadatta, summarizing Buddhaghosa's *Samantapāsādikā*, the *Vinaya* Commentary. Though there is a great similarity between the *Samantapāsādikā* and the *Vinayavinicchaya*, scholars<sup>2</sup> do not accept the view that they were based on the *Samantapāsādikā*. Scholars believe that the similarity has occurred as a result of both Buddhadatta and Buddhaghosa were basing their works on the Mahāvihāra sources (*Sihala atṭhakathā*).

Scholars point out that Buddhaghosa's name is not mentioned in Buddhadatta's work at least once. They say that Buddhadatta had never seen commentaries written by Buddhaghosa. Buddhadatta did not live till Buddhaghosa returned to Jambudīpa after writing the commentaries.

The colophon of the *Uttaravinicchaya* says that Ven. Buddhadatta wrote it, on an invitation of Ven. Saṅghapāla of sublime virtues. It is thought that this Saṅghapāla Thera who invited Ven. Buddhaghosa to

write the *Visuddhimagga* is the same Thera who invited Ven. Buddhadatta to write the *Uttaravinicchaya*.

The *Vinayavinicchaya* consists of three main sections, *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*, *Bhikkhunivibhaṅga* and the *Kandhakas*, while the *Uttaravinicchaya* has *bhikkhu-bhikkhuni Vibhaṅgas* only. The *Vinayavinicchaya* covers the first four books of the *Vinaya Piṭaka Pārājikā*, *Pācittiya*, *Mahāvagga* and *Cullavagga* and the *Uttaravinicchaya* covers *Parivāra*. As per the colophon the *Uttaravinicchaya* should have only 950 verses. But the present *Uttaravinicchaya* has 969 verses.

The *Vinayavinicchaya* and the *Uttaravinicchaya* have been published in one volume by the PTS. in 1927 under the title "Buddhadatta's Manuals, Part II. the *Vinayavinicchaya* and the *Uttaravinicchaya* were edited by A.P. Buddhadatta.

K. Arunasiri.

#### References

- 1 Scholars think Tambapanni does not refer to Sri Lanka but to a province in the basin of the river Tāmraparni in South India.
- 2 Buddhadatta's Manual Part II- *Vinaya vinicchaya* and *Uttaravinicchaya* ed. A.P. Buddhadatta, London, 1927. Introduction page I- XI.

**UTTARĪMANUSSADHAMMA** is a "state" (in the sense of an attainment or ability) that is "beyond [the power of ordinary] men". A detailed listing of such states can be found in the *Vinaya* in the context of the fourth pārājikā regulation (Vin. III, 91), which defines *uttarimanussadhamma* to stand for attainment of:

- a meditative absorption, *jhāna*;
- a deliverance, *vimokkha*;
- a concentration, *samādhi*, on emptiness, signlessness, or desirelessness;
- an attainment, *samāpatti*, of emptiness, signlessness, or desirelessness;
- knowledge and vision, *nāpadassana*, where knowledge stands for the three higher knowledges;

- the development of the [thirty-seven constituents of the] path [to awakening], *maggabhāvanā*;
- the realization of a [supramundane] fruit, *phalāsacchikiriyā*;
- the eradication of defilements, *kilesapahāna*;
- and delighting in empty places with a mind free from the hindrances, *vinīvaraṇa-tā cittassa suññāgāre abhirati*, in the sense of attainment of a *jhāna*.<sup>1</sup>

fourth The rationale for this detailed treatment of *uttarimanussa-dhamma* in the Vinaya is to clarify the implication of the ~~first~~ *pārājika* regulation, according to which a monk who falsely lays claim to any such state beyond the power of ordinary men irrevocably loses his status as a bhikkhu. The fact that falsely claiming *uttarimanussadhamma* is thus treated on a par with engaging in sex, theft and murder, highlights the seriousness of such behaviour. According to the background narration to this regulation, at a time of famine some monks had resorted to such false claims in order to ensure that they would get sufficient alms.

fourth The theme of claims to *uttarimanussadhamma* comes up again in another Vinaya regulation of less grave consequences, namely in the eighth *pācittiya* rule (Vin. IV, 25). The background narration to this rule is the same as in the case of the ~~first~~ *pārājika* regulation, the only difference being that here the monks who made claims in order to ensure food supplies had indeed attained a state beyond the power of ordinary men. Nevertheless, their behaviour was considered blameworthy and censurable.

These Vinaya regulations highlight two aspects of *uttarimanussadhamma*, namely the high esteem that was accorded in ancient India to anyone who could claim or even display some kind of supernormal ability, and the early Buddhist disdain towards making such claims and displays for worldly purposes. A quite explicit instance of such disdain can be found in the *Kevaddha Sutta*, according to which the householder Kevaddha wanted Buddhist monks to display *uttarimanussadhamma* and perform extraordinary feats of psychic power, *iddhipāṭihāriya*, in order to convert the inhabitants of Nāḷandā (D. I, 211). In reply to this suggestion, according to the *Kevaddha Sutta* the Buddha explained that he would not tell his monks to make any public display of supernormal abilities,

followed by differentiating between three types of extraordinary feats that the Buddha had realized by himself: supernormal powers such as multiplying oneself, walking on water etc.; the telepathic ability to read the mind of others; and instructions on how to train one's own mind.

According to the *Kevaddha Sutta*, the Buddha then clarified that in the case of the first two types of extraordinary feats, an account of such abilities might meet with sceptic remarks that cause a faithful believer to lose his or her faith. This possible outcome stands in contrast to the third type of extraordinary feat, which the *Kevaddha Sutta* illustrates with the help of a full account of the gradual path up to liberation. The implication of this presentation appears to be that instructions on how to develop and liberate the mind will enable faithful believers to come to realization by themselves. In this way the *Kevaddha Sutta* indicates that, instead of trying to amaze the multitude with exhibitions of supernormal powers, the way the Buddha wanted his teachings to impress themselves on the public was through the power of instructions that lead to selfrealization.

In contrast to such self-realization, according to the *Kevaddha Sutta* the Buddha disapproved, rejected and disdained the other two types of extraordinary feats, *aṭṭiyāmi harāyāmi jigucchāmi* (D. I, 213). Since according to the same *Kevaddha Sutta* the Buddha proclaimed to be himself endowed with all three of these extraordinary feats, the message conveyed by this passage would not be a wholesale rejection of supernormal powers and telepathy as such, but rather of their public display as a means to arouse faith.<sup>2</sup>

The rationale behind the Buddha's disapproval appears to be that faith based on any external display will always remain a type of faith that can be shaken by others. The third of the three extraordinary feats discussed in the *Kevaddha Sutta* leads to a different type of faith or confidence, however, as it is not based on external display by others, but on having realized within one-self the truth and efficacy of the instructions given by the Buddha. The point made in the *Kevaddha Sutta* is thus not a rejection of *uttarimanussadhamma* as such, but only of their public display for ulterior motives. This much could also be

gleaned from the above-mentioned passages in the Vinaya. In fact, according to a discourse in the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* not only the Buddha himself, but a considerable number of his disciples were similarly endowed with all three of these extraordinary feats (*A. I*, 172). Other discourses proclaim that a monk endowed with ability in these three extraordinary feats deserves to be reckoned as supreme among gods and men (*A. I*, 292 and *A. V*, 327). These passages further support the impression that what is rejected are not such supernormal abilities in themselves, but only their public display for the sake of worldly benefits.

A distinction in regard to the motivation behind performing a supernormal feat can also be seen when comparing two other supernormal performances recorded in the Vinaya. In the first of these two cases, the monk Pilindavaccha had changed a piece of grass into a golden chaplet in order to assuage the grief of a little girl in the house of his supporters, who due to poverty was not able to adorn herself like the other girls in the village (*Vin. I*, 208). When the king found out that the poor family was in possession of a golden chaplet he had the whole family arrested, suspecting them to be thieves. Pilindavaccha then visited the king and changed the whole palace into gold in order to prove that the poor family could come to possess a golden chaplet without thievery. As a result of this display of supernormal abilities, the family was released. The Vinaya does not record any reproach by the Buddha of these two instances of exhibition of supernormal abilities, but rather tackles the problem of how his fellow monks should handle the abundant supplies that as a result of Pilindavaccha's displays had accrued to them.

The second case in the Vinaya, however, involves a display of supernormal feat for the sake of self-exhibition. Here the monk Piṇḍolabhāradvāja had performed a feat of supernormal power that involved levitation in order to obtain a costly sandalwood bowl that was hanging at the top of a high pole (*Vin. II*, 111). The bowl had been set as a prize by a merchant for any recluse or Brahmin able to reach it through supernormal power. Piṇḍolabhāradvāja's act incurred the Buddha's censure, who compared it to a woman who exhibits her private parts for payment. The difference in treatment between the magical feats performed by Pilindavaccha and Piṇḍolabhāradvāja further corroborates the impression that the criticism

is levied at public exhibition for the sake of worldly benefits, not at magical feats perse.

In fact, the performance of wondrous and supernormal feats is a recurrent feature in the early discourses and other Vinaya passages. These depict how the Buddha performed a magical feat in order to hide Yasa from the sight of his father (*Vin. I*, 16); or how the Buddha miraculously hid himself from the sight of a Brahmā (*M. I*, 330). Through another supernormal feat the Buddha was able to keep Aṅgulimāla at bay, who was in hot pursuit intending to kill the Buddha (*M. II*, 99); and a whole series of miracles happened when the Buddha was staying with Uruvelakassapa (*Vin. I*, 24). Among the Buddha's disciples, Mahāmoggallāna was apparently particularly gifted in this respect, able to shake the palace of the thirty-three gods as well as a monastic building with his toe (*M. I*, 253 and *S. V*, 270). A discourse in the *Samyutta Nikāya* reports how another monk conjured up a cool breeze to enable his fellow monks to return comfortably to the monastery after a heavy dinner on a hot day (*S. IV*, 289). When the donor of the meal asked for further performances, the same monk produced fire that burnt grass piled on top of the donor's cloth, without harming the cloth. Another monk by the name of Cūlapanthaka was apparently able to multiply himself (*Thag.* 563), and the Vinaya reports that Devadatta magically changed his appearance in order to impress king Ajātasattu (*Vin. II*, 185). These few examples already suffice to show the degree to which supernormal feats and wonders are an integral part of the thought world of early Buddhism.

In fact, the ability to perform various supernormal feats is part of the account of the gradual path given in the *Sāmaññaphala Sutta* and several other discourses in the *Dīgha Nikāya* (*D. I*, 77). The *Mahāsakuludāyī Sutta* similarly includes such abilities in its description of the Buddha's teachings (*M. II*, 18), as does the *Sampasādaniya Sutta* (*D. III*, 112). The same discourse also makes the pertinent point that, when contrasted to mastery over the mind's tendency to react with likes and dislikes, such supernormal powers are clearly inferior.

The keen interest among ancient Indians in a display of supernormal abilities is also reflected in the *Pāṭika Sutta*, according to which Sunakkhatta decided to leave

the Buddhist order because he thought that the Buddha had not shown him any *uttarimanussadhamma* (D. III, 3).<sup>3</sup> According to the same discourse, the Buddha clarified that he had never promised to make any such display, and that his teaching leads to freedom from *dukkha* independent of any supernormal performances. The same discourse then continues by reporting several occasions when the Buddha did avail himself of supernormal abilities, culminating in an account of how the Buddha rose up into the air and emitted flames (D. III, 27; See also YAMAKAPĀṬIHĀRIYA).

The importance given to the possession of supernormal abilities in ancient India is also reflected in the *Susīma Sutta*, according to which a wanderer by the name of *Susīma* had become a Buddhist monk in order to spy out the Buddha's teaching. When other monks declared to have won final knowledge, *Susīma* was surprised to find that they would make such claims in spite of being unable to avail themselves of supernatural powers; or of telepathic knowledge of the mind of others etc. (S. II, 123; See also VIMUTTI).

The attainment of *uttarimanussadhamma* was held by the Buddha's contemporaries to require the undertaking of ascetic practices (M. I, 172). According to the Buddha, however, ascetic practices are not required for being able to realize an *uttarimanussadhamma* (S. IV, 337). In fact, in spite of undertaking a range of ascetic practices he had failed to reach the supreme type of *uttarimanussadhamma* that he had been searching for: total liberation (M. I, 246). Instead of asceticism and self-mortification, the six qualities that from the early Buddhist perspective are required in order to be able to attain *uttarimanussadhamma* are mindfulness; clear comprehension; sense restraint; moderation with food; honesty; and restraint in regard to speech (A. III, 430).

Though some contemporaries of the Buddha, like the Brahmin *Pokkharasāti*, apparently thought that humans are not able to reach any *uttarimanussadhamma* at all (M. II, 201), a discourse in the *Samyutta Nikāya* indicates that even lay followers of the Buddha, like the householder *Citta*, had been able to reach a whole range of *uttarimanussadhammas*, comprising the four *jhānas* and realization of the first three stages of awakening (S. IV, 301).

These are in fact the types of *uttarimanussadhamma* that stand at the very heart of early Buddhism, and it would be these types of states or attainments that a discourse in the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* has in view when listing altogether ten reflections that a monk or nun should regularly undertake (A. V, 88), the tenth of which is to question oneself if an *uttarimanussadhamma* has been attained, a distinction in knowledge and vision worthy of noble ones, *alamariyañāṇadassanavisesa*.

In sum then, early Buddhism recognizes the ability to perform supernormal feats and, according to the early discourses and the *Vinaya*, the Buddha himself and various disciples repeatedly availed themselves of such abilities. Yet, the public display of such abilities for worldly motives is censured as unbecoming. The same censure also covers public proclamation of attainment of *uttarimanussadhamma* in the more restricted sense of a *jhāna* or one of the stages of awakening, even though to attain such type of *uttarimanussadhamma* is central to the undertaking of the Buddhist path to liberation.

Anālayo

#### References

1. It is perhaps worthy of note that this listing does not include the attainment of cessation, an attainment apparently not mentioned in the *Vinaya* at all. A listing of *uttari-manussa dhammas* in the *Cūḷagosiṅga Sutta* (M. I, 209), however, includes the attainment of cessation, together with the *jhānas* and the immaterial attainments.
2. In fact the Chinese counterpart passages at *T. I, 101c22* and *T. I, 102a7* do not mention any rejection of these two types of extraordinary feats, but only point out that because of the possible reaction by disbelievers, the Buddha would not tell his monks to make public displays of such abilities.
3. *M. I, 68* then reports that after disrobing he would spread the rumour that the Buddha had not attained any *uttarimanussadhamma*. In reply to this allegation, according to the *Mahāsīhanāda Sutta* the Buddha then gave a detailed account of his abilities and powers.

# 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