



ISSN 1076-9005

Volume 4 1997: 260-280

Publication date: 1 September 1997

The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha. A New Translation of the Majjhima Nikāya. Translated from the Pali. Original Translation by Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli. Translation edited and revised by Bhikkhu Bodhi. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 1995. Pp. 1412. ISBN 0-8617-1072-X, (cloth), \$75.00.

Reviewed by

L.S.Cousins

University of Manchester

Email: L.S.Cousins@nessie.mcc.ac.uk

© 1997 L.S. Cousins

Copyright Notice

Digital copies of this work may be made and distributed provided no charge is made and no alteration is made to the content. Reproduction in any other format with the exception of a single copy for private study requires the written permission of the editors. All enquiries to jbe-ed@psu.edu.

Despite what is claimed on the title page, I do not think this can honestly be called a new translation! Such a claim creates the impression that this is essentially a work of the 1990s. Indeed I have already met comments contrasting “Bhikkhu Bodhi’s new translation” with the “old PTS translation.” This is perhaps further encouraged by the dust jacket and cover which simply say: “Translated by Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli and Bhikkhu Bodhi” instead of the fuller details given on the title page (as above). In fact this is in large part the work of Ñāṇamoli from the early 1950s with only a relatively small contribution from Bhikkhu Bodhi, although I will qualify this remark below. It is possible to see that this is the case from the lightly-edited version of 90 (out of 152) translated *suttas* from Ñāṇamoli’s manuscript which was published in Thailand by Ven. Khantipalo in or after 1976.

From the point of view of strict scholarship there are some serious defects in this translation. The most serious is perhaps the lack of clarity as to which edition is being used as the source text. Although Bhikkhu Bodhi claims that it was the PTS edition that was used by Ñāṇamoli for his original translation, this seems unlikely. In various places the translation actually follows one of the earlier Sinhalese (?) script editions and it seems likely that this was often Ñāṇamoli’s source. Of course, it is impossible to be sure of this, since no indication is normally given as to what readings are actually being followed. The other major defect is a lack of use of more recent scholarship. Bhikkhu Bodhi does sometimes adopt renderings from I.B. Horner’s translation and makes some use of the work of other scholars (e.g., in CPD) but overall there is some tendency to perpetuate old mistakes and even to reinstate them where Ñāṇamoli has corrected them in his draft or in his other works.

On the more positive side, there is no doubt that Bhikkhu Bodhi has made the text much more readable and approachable for the novice reader. He is on the whole a much clearer writer than Ñāṇamoli and has tended to remove slight archaisms and awkwardnesses. In general he moves away from Ñāṇamoli’s rather literal renderings (appropriate to a first draft), although he does also sometimes fail to appreciate the subtleties of Ñāṇamoli’s precision. Although there are obvious advantages to having the whole work in one volume, especially for the newcomer, the disadvantage is the systematic elimination of repetition. Many readers may see this as a gain but it does amount to the deliberate removal of a meditative element from many *suttas*. In the original language, when the *suttas* are chanted rather than read, there is an effect upon the mind which is very much part of their traditional purpose. Moreover, the emphasis is often changed quite critically: when a phrase that is repeated in the original ten times is given only once in translation, it ceases

to be a central part which is always retained in memory. The result is that what the *sutta* tries to stress as important becomes much less noticeable in translation.

Although I referred above to Bhikkhu Bodhi's contribution as a "relatively small contribution," this requires some qualification. My own similar experience with Ñāṇamoli's translation of the *Vibhaṅga* was that a great deal of work was required in editing, correcting, and filling in lacunae—indeed, at times, I felt that it was more work than a complete new translation would have been! Nonetheless, I felt that it remained a version of Ñāṇamoli's translation rather than my own and the title page reflects that. Without doubt much editing by Bhikkhu Bodhi (and Ven. Khantipalo) was necessary to bring this translation of the *Majjhima-nikāya* to a publishable level. But it remains the work of Ñāṇamoli.

Bhikkhu Bodhi indicates in his introduction that he did not aim to conform as closely as possible to the intentions of the original translator. Rather, he had two main objectives: (1) fidelity to the intended meaning of the texts themselves, and (2) "an idiom that would be intelligible to a modern reader seeking in the Pali *suttas* personal guidance in the proper understanding and conduct of life." Obviously he has had considerable success in the second objective but I have considerable reservations as to the first. The major reason for this, apart from a lack of familiarity with some more recent (mostly European) scholarship, is a tendency to accept the interpretation of the commentaries a little uncritically. This is an error which is perhaps unavoidable without considerable knowledge of both Sanskrit and other dialects of Middle Indian than Pali. I suspect it is often unconscious and due to working in the tradition of Nyanatiloka and Nyanaponika. (The American Bhikkhu Bodhi is very much the present-day successor in the lineage of these two German scholar-monks.)

Related to this is Bhikkhu Bodhi's policy in amending Ñāṇamoli's renderings. Here I am of two minds. On the one hand, Ñāṇamoli's attempt at a very precise and consistent rendering of Buddhist terminology is at times rather indigestible and also confusing if one is used to a different rendering. On the other, I have no doubt that Ñāṇamoli was quite correct in seeing that the hitherto standard renderings which he largely followed in his earliest published translation (of the *Visuddhimagga*) are quite unacceptable and promulgate widespread misunderstandings. Contrary to Bhikkhu Bodhi, I believe that it is most important at this stage to discourage the adoption of a standard misrendering; what is needed is much more creativity and variety among translators so as to facilitate the discovery of better ways of expressing the ideas of early Buddhism.

At the end of Bhikkhu Bodhi's introduction he lists major changes in

the terminology used for translation. Some of these are clear improvements. Some are simply Bhikkhu Bodhi's preference and there is no real need for them. Others incorporate commentarial interpretations or misunderstandings of the commentary. Still others are simply wrong. I give some examples here in tabular form with some comments.

<i>Pali Term</i>	<i>Ñāṇamoli</i>	<i>Bodhi</i>	<i>Comments</i>
<i>iddhi</i>	success	(1) supernormal power (2) spiritual power (3) success.	To give three different renderings of the same word, wrongly introduces modern values.
<i>thīna-middha</i>	lethargy and drowsiness	sloth and torpor	Why alter?
<i>nāma</i>	name	mentality	Had the Buddha wanted to say "mentality," he had a number of possible terms available.
<i>Nibbāna</i>	extinction	Nibbāna	It is certainly better not to translate this
<i>Nibbidā</i>	dispassion	disenchantment	Bhikkhu Bodhi's rendering is correct
<i>Paññā</i>	understanding	wisdom	why alter?
<i>papañca</i>	diversification	proliferation	why alter?
<i>bhāvanā</i>	maintaining in being	development	Ñāṇamoli's version is perhaps better here
<i>muditā</i>	gladness	appreciative joy	why alter?
<i>rūpa (arūpa)</i>	form (formless)	(1) form (2) material form, materiality (3) fine material being (immaterial)	The notion of rūpa as fine-material is perhaps later. More probably, rūpa in such contexts means "meditation object," cp. the later usage of nimitta.
<i>vicāra</i>	pondering	sustained thought	Vicāra does not mean "sustained." This is a frequent misunderstanding of what the commentaries say. "Sustaining" is an effect of gently exploring the object, not a possible translation.
<i>sakkāya</i>	embodiment	personality	Embodiment renders the basic sense. It is difficult to see how this can mean "personality."
<i>saṅkhāra</i>	determinations	formations	Determinations indicates the intentional element.
<i>sekha</i>	the disciple	the initiate in higher training	Neither of these is at all satisfactory. The introduction of "higher" seems to be precisely opposite to the Buddha's intent.

A complete translation of the *Majjhima-nikāya* invites criticism and such criticism certainly draws attention to what still needs to be done. We must also remember that it is not all that long since Pali texts first began to be translated into English and we still do not really have adequate tools for the job. There is no doubt that Bhikkhu Bodhi's work will be helpful and of real value to many readers. In that context one can only welcome it and appreciate the long labors that necessarily go into such work.

I append notes on three randomly selected discourses and also some corrections from Bhikkhu Bodhi himself which have been circulated on the Internet.

Detailed Notes on Sample *Suttas*

Bo = the volume reviewed here.

E° = Trenckner, V and Robert Chalmers, eds., *Majjhima-nikāya*, Pali Text Society, 1964, 1977, 1960 [1888–99].

Kh = Nyanamoli, Ven. Thera, trans., *A Treasury of the Buddha's Words*, ed. Phra Khantipalo, Mahāmakut, Bangkok, n.d., three volumes.

IBH = Horner, I.B., trans., *Middle Length Sayings*, Pali Text Society, London, 1954–59, repr. 1975–57, three volumes.

KRN = Norman, K.R., trans., *The Group of Discourses II*, Pali Text Society, Oxford, 1992.

NB = rendering found in both Bo and Kh (minor orthographic differences are ignored).

Page numbers are those of the PTS edition of the text. Paragraph numbers are those used in Bo (and usually Kh).

SUTTA 12—the *Mahā-sīha-nāda-sutta* (Bo 164–78 ; Kh III 238–56; IBH I 91–110)

§1 and §42 *vanasaṇḍe-*

NB has “grove” in the first case and “wood” in the second. This is less exact than IBH “woodland thicket” or “forest thicket” and confuses the difference from *vana-* (also rendered “grove”). Both versions obscure the link between the location of the *Sutta* and the simile.

§2 *uttari(ṇ)manussadhamma-*

Bo “superhuman states”; Kh “higher than the human state (*dhamma*)”; IBH “states of further men.” The issue is whether it is the *dhammas* or the *manussa* who are *uttari-*. Since forms of *uttarimanussa-* occur in both senses, there is a case for both, although it is likely that the older interpretation is that

adopted by Bo.

§2 *yassa ca khvāssa atthāya*

Bo “when he teaches the *Dhamma* to anyone”; Kh “whoever is taught that *dhamma* for his benefit”; IBH “and says that *dhamma*, taught for the sake of something specific.” Bo is certainly the best rendering, but none translate *assa*. Literally: “the one for whose sake his *dhamma* is taught,” but more idiomatically: “when he teaches his *dhamma* to anyone.” (The speaker is not a follower of the Buddha.)

§2 *so niyyāti takkarassa sammādukkhakkhayāyā ti*

All three follow the commentary in making *so* refer back to *dhammo*. This creates a number of problems as Buddhaghosa obviously recognized. (He solves them by claiming that Sunakkhatta did not dare to say what he intended to say, because of fear of criticism by the large number of enlightened followers of the Buddha in the city.) More probably, *takkarassa* is for *takkaro assa*. Sunakkhatta intended to say: “When he teaches his *dhamma* to anyone, the person who puts that into practice is setting out for the complete destruction of his suffering.” But the Buddha either chooses to take it as Buddhaghosa does or, more probably, takes *niyyāti* as meaning “exits” i.e., departs *samsāra*. (Cf. MW s.v. NIRYĀ + dative.)

§2 and below *parisatim*

NB “before the Vesālī assembly”; IBH “to a group (of people) at Vesālī”. It could equally be rendered “in an assembly at Vesālī.” It is not clear why Kh omits this at the second occurrence, unless it was thought that Sāriputta would not have heard Sunakkhatta speaking at the assembly. Presumably that is also the reason for IBH’s rendering.

§§5–8 *iti pi so Bhagavā*

This is better rendered by Kh, but wrongly by both IBH and Bo. The phrase means “He is a *Bhagavat* for the following reasons, too:” (cf. CPD II p. 278). This of course explains the double occurrence of *Bhagavā*.

§5 *Sugato*

It is doubtful if this can mean “sublime” (NB).

§6 *iddhividhā*

Bo “supernormal power”; IBH “psychic power”; cp. CPD “magic power.” All of these gratuitously introduce the word “power.” Much better is Kh “(supernormal) success,” although even that introduces the word supernormal for no good reason. The original simply says: “experiences manifold kinds of achievement.”

§6 *āvibhāvaṃ tirobhāvaṃ*

NB “he appears and vanishes”; IBH “manifest or invisible.” More probably this refers to the capacity to make things appear and disappear (to his own vision?) cf. *Paṭis* II 207.

§8 *cetasā ceto paricca*

NB “encompasses with his (own) mind the minds of . . .”. This is better than: IBH “by mind the minds of.”

§10 *ṭhānaṃ ca ṭhānato*

NB “the possible as possible”. This is much better than IBH “causal occasion.”

§12 *sabbatthagāminiṃ paṭipadam*

Bo “the ways leading to all destinations”; Kh “whither all ways lead”; IBH “the course leading to all bourns”; cf. BHSD s.v. *pratipad* “courses of conduct which may lead to any result.” There is a tendency in the commentaries to interpret this in terms of the five *gati* (probably following the *Abhidhamma* cf. *Vibh* 339), although *Vibh-a* 400 specifies “both those leading to (one of) the *gati* and those not leading to a *gati*.” It may be that *sabbattha* was sometimes interpreted as *sabba* + *attha*. Edgerton is probably right to argue that *paṭipadā* does not mean “way” but “course of conduct, behavior.” So perhaps literally: “he understands behavior, whithersoever it leads.”

Note that without the *abhidhamma* rendering there would be no obstacle to translating: “he understands the all-pervading (universal) course of conduct.” Also, *Peṭ* 34-35 seems to understand as “behavior that can lead anywhere” as opposed to behavior which leads necessarily to *nibbāna* or an *apāya*.

§15 *indriyaparopariyattam*

NB “the disposition of the faculties”; IBH is clearer: “higher or lower state of the faculties.”

§21 *maṃ evaṃ jānantam evaṃ passantam*

Bo “when I know and see thus” corrects both Kh “knowing and seeing me thus” and IBH “knowing me thus, seeing me thus.”

§21 *yathābhatam nikkhitto*

Bo “as [surely as if he had been] carried off and put there he will wind up” (Kh is similar). This is more plausible than IBH “he is consigned to . . . just as a burden is laid aside.” Cf. *Nett* 131.

§22 the four *vesārajja*

NB “intrepidity”; IBH “convictions.” Since this certainly refers to four matters in regard to which the Buddha could have no valid reason to fear criticism, the former is more to the point, if a little clumsy.

§25 *antarāya*

Bo “obstructions”; Kh “obstructive”; IBH “stumbling blocks.”

§29 *Māra-parisā*

Bo “an assembly of Māra’s retinue”; Kh “a Māra’s assembly”; IBH “Māra’s assemblies.” Here Bo is not a translation, but incorporates, perhaps wrongly, the explanation of the commentary.

§32 the four *yoni*

NB “kinds of generation” is clearly better than IBH “modes of life,” since *yoni* must mean “source” or “place of birth.”

§33 *vatthikosa*

NB “caul” is no doubt better than IBH “membraneous sheath.”

§35 the five *gati*

NB “destination” is certainly better than IBH “bourn.”

§35 *pittivisaya* (vl. *pettivisayo*)

NB “realm of ghosts” obscures the difference between *peta-* and *pitti-/petti-*; IBH “realm of the departed” is more accurate.

§36 *yathāpaṭipanno*

Bo “how one who has entered this path”; Kh “whereon he who has entered”; IBH “according to how one is faring along.” Better: “behaving in accordance with which” or “practicing in accordance with which” (despite *PED*).

§37 *tathā . . . yathā*

NB “so . . . that” is correct here, as against IBH “As . . . so.”

§37 *ekantadukkhā*

Bo “extremely painful”; Kh “unremitting, painful”; IBH “exclusively painful.” Despite CPD, Bo is incorrect here and below.

§37 *ekāyanena*

NB “going in one way only” is undoubtedly correct, as against IBH “by the one sole way.”

§38 *dukkhā*

Here Bo translates erroneously as “extremely painful,” thus obscuring the difference between *niraya* and animal rebirths. Kh and IBH are correct.

§41 *pāsādo*

NB “mansion”; IBH “long house.” This is often rendered “palace.” It may sometimes refer to a single, multi-storied building with many rooms, but (more often) it probably refers to a number of adjoining but more or less separate mostly single-storied buildings on the same site.

§41 *kūṭāgāraṃ*

NB “upper chamber”; IBH “building with a gabled roof.” Originally, this was a “gabled house” i.e., one with a horseshoe-shaped gable—probably outside a village and used for ritual purposes. Later, the same type of design was used for (Buddhist) shrine halls and even for palanquins and elaborate biers and (in a secular context) for any chamber in a *pāsāda* with a gable of similar design. See: Bollée, Willem B., “The *kūṭāgāra* or From Men’s House to Mansion in Eastern India and South-East Asia,” in *Shastric Traditions in Indian Arts*, eds., Anna Libera Dallapiccola, Christine Walter-Mendy and Stephanie Zingel-Avé Lallemand, Vol. 1. Texts, pp. 143–149; XXXVI–

XLI, Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GMBH, Stuttgart, 1989.

§41 *nivātaṃ*

NB “shut off”; IBH “protected from the wind.”

§41 The various words for kinds of furnishings are more accurately rendered by IBH, but more readable in NB.

§42 *pokkharāṇī*

NB “pond”; IBH “lotus pool.”

§44 *abhijānāmi . . . caritā*

Bo “I recall having lived” is more accurate than KH “I have had direct knowledge of . . . as one who has lived it” or IBH “I . . . , as one who fares, fully know.”

§44 *tapassī homi (parama-tapassī)*

IBH “I became an ascetic” is better than Bo “I have practised asceticism.”

§44 *lukho*

NB “coarseness”; IBH “loathly.”

§44 *jegucchī*

NB “scrupulousness” is better than IBH “a detester.” The meaning must be “one who seeks or desires to guard (living beings from harm)” i.e., desiderative noun from GUP. Here and below (*jegucchismiṃ*) it refers to a person behaving in a particular way rather than to a practice.

§45 *me idaṃ . . . tapassitāya*

NB “Such was my asceticism . . .”; IBH “there was this for me through asceticism” (parallels show the case to be locative). Literally, “I had the following by way of asceticism.”

§45 has a long list of ascetic practices. IBH is often better than Kh. Bo usually follows Kh with only a few exceptions, apart from a missing sentence.

§47 *yāva uda-bindumhi pi me dayā paccupaṭṭhitā hoti*

Bo “I was full of pity even for [the beings in] a drop of water”; Kh omits the words between square brackets; IBH “there was set up in me kindness even towards a drop of water.” I think Bo is probably wrong here and the commentary right to suppose that it is a question of where one lets water drops fall rather than of beings in a water drop. Literally, “(I was mindful while going back and forth) to such an extent that my pity was manifested even in the case of a drop of water.”

§48 *pavivittasmim*

NB “seclusion”; IBH “aloofness.” Literally, “this was my (behavior) as a solitary.” All of these (from §46 to §51) literally refer to people rather than practices.

§52 *oṭṭhapadaṃ*

NB “camel’s hoof”; IBH “bullock’s hoof.” Probably here *oṭṭha* means

“buffalo” as in Vedic rather than “camel” as in Classical Sanskrit; cf. CPD.
 §52 *gopānasiyo oluggaviluggā*

NB “juttled out as gaunt as the crazy rafters”; IBH “my gaunt (ribs) became like the crazy rafters.” CPD has “broken down, collapsed” for the second word. Neither “gaunt” nor “crazy” seem appropriate here.

§52 *akkhitārakā*

NB “the gleam of my eyes,” but IBH “pupils of my eyes” is better.

§52 *akkhitārakā*

NB “gleam of water,” but IBH “sparkles of water” is better. CPD has: “a sparkling bubble,” following a gp.

§52 The penultimate sentence is missing in Bo, but not Kh.

§53 Bo always substitutes brahmins for Kh “divines.”

§60 *yaṭṭena*

NB “sacrifice” is better than IBH “oblation.”

§62 *niddā-kilamatha-paṭivinodanā*

NB “rest in order to remove sleepiness and tiredness” seems to introduce unnecessary complication; cp. IBH “dispelling fatigue by sleep.”

§62 *paṭha-paṭibhānaṃ*

NB “replies to questions”; IBH “ways of putting questions.” NB’s translation follows Buddhaghosa’s *paṭha-vyākaraṇaṃ*. This perhaps slightly misunderstands him. *Paṭibhāna* (cf. BHSD) refers to readiness in speech, quick-wittedness, inspiration. Of course, as Buddhaghosa indicates, this could manifest here precisely in the manner of replying.

§63 *lokānukampāya*

Bo “out of compassion for the world” = IBH; Kh has “pity.” It is regrettable that both Bhikkhu Bodhi and Miss Horner have rendered both *anukampā* and *karuṇā* by the same English word; this obscures some important differences in usage.

SUTTA 21—the *Kakacūpama-sutta*
 (Bo 217–23 ; Kh II 6–14; IBH I 159–67)

§2 *adhikaraṇaṃ pi karoti*

NB “would rebuke him”; IBH “made a legal question.” The latter is certainly better. Perhaps render “made an issue of it.”

§6 *gehasitā chandā*

Bo “desires . . . based on the household life”; Kh “any wish based on the home life”; IBH “worldly desires.” Kh is perhaps more accurate. Buddhaghosa explains as both wishes based upon craving and those based on aversion.

§6 *vipariṇatam*

NB “unaffected” is certainly better than IBH “perverted.”

§6 *pāpikam*

Rendered by all as “evil,” but it is unlikely that such a concept had developed at this date. The meaning is rather something like “ill-fortuned.”

§6 *hitānukampī*

NB “compassionate for (his) welfare”; IBH “kindly and compassionate.” A case can be made for each of these.

§6 *mettā*

NB “loving-kindness.” Probably IBH “friendliness” renders the etymological connotations more accurately. Buddhaghosa (*Ps* II 96) has “suffusing with goodwill (*hitena pharamāno*).”

§6 *na dosantaro*

Bo “without inner hate” cp. Kh; better than IBH “void of hate.”

§7 *ārādhayimsu . . . me . . . cittaṃ*

NB “satisfied my mind” is better than IBH “my (monks) were indeed accomplished in mind.”

§7 *lah'-uṭṭhānam*

Bo “health”; Kh “lightness”; IBH “buoyancy.” Bo is probably correct here; cp. *Ps* II 97 and BHSD s.v *laghūtthāntā*.

§7 *sārathi*

Bo “charioteer” = IBH; Kh “driver.”

§7 *sāreyya pi paccāsāreyya pi*

NB “might drive out and back”; IBH “might drive up and down.”

§8 *vepullaṃ*

NB “fulfillment”; IBH “maturity.”

§8 *yoga-kkhemam*

Bo “protection”; Kh “surcease of bondage”; IBH “security from bonds.” All three are following the commentaries. Its usual meaning in canonical texts must in fact be “rest from exertion”; often amounting to “spiritual peace” (so BHSD). The simile must be intended to call to mind such a meaning.

§8 *ojā-paharāṇiyo*

NB “that robbed the sap.” IBH “crushed by the strength (of the creepers)” must be wrong. Perhaps better is CPD: “sapping the strength.”

§8 *anto-vanaṃ suvisodhitam visodheyya*

NB “clean up the interior of the grove”; IBH “thoroughly clear the inside of the wood.” These phrases are intended in the simile to recall the process of purification in the path to which the simile refers.

§8 *sammā parihareyya*

NB “tended”; IBH “tend properly.” Again *sammā* (omitted completely by NB) must be intended to relate to the well-known *sammā* of the path

factors.

§9 *gaha-patānī*

NB “housewife”; IBH “lady householder.” This term refers to the female head of an extended family i.e., a person of some standing in the community.

§9 *anālasā*

NB “nimble” must be wrong. IBH “diligent.”

§9 *santam yeve . . .*

NB is correct here where IBH mistranslates the second and third occurrences of this sentence. NB omits part of the repetition the third time.

§9 *aggala-sūci*

NB “rolling-pin” is rather grossly anachronistic. IBH “pin for securing the bolt (of a door).” Probably in fact a wooden bar, used to secure the door from the inside.

§9 *anupasanto*

NB “merciless” is rather excessive; IBH “not tranquil” is closer.

§10 *suvaco* etc.

Bo “easy to admonish”; Kh “easy to correct”; IBH “easy to speak to.”

§10 *gilānapaccayabhesajja*

Bo “medicinal requisites”; Kh “the requisite of medicine”; IBH “medicines for the sick.” Probably *gilāna* does not have the meaning of “sick” but refers rather to tiredness that may come late in the day for those who do not eat after noon. Literally, then, “medicine (required) because of fatigue.”

§11 *tad-ārammaṇaṅ*

Bo “starting with him”; Kh “extending over the all-encompassing world as its object”; IBH “beginning with him.” This must in fact mean “based upon that.” Kh follows Buddhaghosa who is using the later meaning of *ārammaṇa* as the support or object of consciousness, but that would be anachronistic here.

§11 *mahaggatena*

NB “exalted”; IBH “widespread.” The commentary takes this in its *abhidhamma* sense i.e., the *rūpa* or *arūpa* levels of consciousness.

§14 *ākāse*

NB “empty space”; the introduction of the word “empty” introduces connotations not present in the original.

§14 *rūpāni*

NB “pictures”; IBH “material shapes.” This obscures the link to *arūpī* “formless” below which IBH keeps with “without shape.” Both perhaps lose the link to an object perceived in meditation.

§21 *ca*

Bo and IBH rightly “if.” Kh “and.”

SUTTA 92—the *Sela-sutta*

(Bo 755–62; Kh I 183–92; IBH II 332–39; KRN I 94–100; KRN II 61–67)

§3 *sandassesī*

NB “instructed”; IBH “delighted”; KRN “instructed.” Literally, “showed.” IBH is wrong here.

§3 *samādapesī*

NB “urged”; IBH “roused”; KRN “roused.” Literally, made to undertake. Probably the meaning is that the hearer is brought to commit himself to keep the precepts or practice the path.

§3 *samuttejesī*

NB “roused”; IBH “inspired”; KRN “excited.” Literally, to enflame or fire with enthusiasm.

§3 *sampahaṃsesī*

NB “encouraged”; IBH and KRN “gladdened.” This is too weak—the meaning is more like “delighted.” So the sequence is that (1) the *dhamma* is shown; (2) the hearer is led to commitment; (3) he is aroused to enthusiasm; (4) he is filled with joy.

§3 *abhippasanno*

Bo “place full confidence in”; Kh “place all your confidence in”; IBH/KRN “favourably disposed towards”.

§4 *kāya-veyyāvāṭikaṃ*

NB “necessary purchases and preparations”; IBH “personal service”; KRN “the menial duties”; the meaning must be to perform service on Keṇiya’s behalf, using their bodies.

§5 The rendering of the stock account of the knowledge of a Vedic specialist differs in all four cases.

§10 *ghoso*

Bo “word” = KRN; Kh “news”; IBH “sound.” “Word” is probably misleading. Either of the other renderings would be possible, but, given Sanskrit usage, probably “news” is in fact best.

§10 *mantesu*

NB “hymns”; IBH = KRN “*mantras*.” Whatever the oldest *Vedas* may originally have been, “hymns” is certainly not right for the time of the Buddha and after.

§10 *dhammiko dhammarājā*

Bo “a righteous king who rules by the *Dhamma*”; Kh “an ideal king of *Dhamma*”; “a *dhamma*-man, a king under *dhamma*”; KRN “righteous, a

king of righteousness.”

§10 *gahapati-ratana*

Bo “steward-treasure”; Kh “Householder Treasure” cf. IBH; KRN “householder jewel.” Bo is perhaps better here.

§10 *vivattacchaddo*

NB “draws aside the veil in the world” cf. IBH; KRN “of widespread fame in the world” but now see KRN pp. 217–18: “with deceit removed.”

§13 *kosohite vatthagahye*

Bo “the male organ being enclosed in a sheath”; Kh “what should be hidden by a cloth being enclosed in a sheath”; IBH “what is cloth-hid is sheath-cased”; KRN “the male organ being ensheathed.” The original seems to be deliberately vague; so introducing precision rather subverts the intent.

§13 *nādhimuccati na sampasīdati*

NB “not decide and make up his mind”; IBH “was . . . uncertain, not satisfied”; KRN “was not sure, he was not convinced.”

§14 *anumasi paṭimasi*

NB “repeatedly touched”; IBH “stroked it backwards and forwards”; KRN “licked . . . backwards and forwards.” NB is incorrect here.

§15 *ācariyānaṃ pācariyānaṃ bhāsamānānaṃ*

Bo “who speak according to the lineage of teachers”; Kh “who preach according to the line of teachers”; IBH “said by . . . , teachers of teachers”; KRN “said by . . . , teachers and teachers of teachers.” KRN is the most accurate.

§15 *attānaṃ pātukaronti*

Bo “reveal themselves as such”; Kh “manifest themselves as such”; IBH “reveal the self”; KRN “reveal themselves.” IBH is incorrect.

§15 *buddho vā no vā*

Bo and KRN “a Buddha or not”; Kh “enlightened or not”; IBH “an Awakened One or not.” Obviously buddha here can be either a noun or a past participle. Similarly in §19.

§16 *suruci*

NB “well-favoured”; IBH “gleaming”; KRN “shining.” Buddhaghosa too takes this as a reference to the radiance of the Buddha’s body.

§16 *sujāto*

NB “well-fashioned”; IBH “finely-proportioned”; KRN “of an excellent nature.” NB and IBH follow Buddhaghosa’s rather etymological explanation (from *su* + *jāta*). KRN follows the Sanskrit parallels. Perhaps just: “beautiful.”

§16 *susukkadanto*

Bo “white your teeth”; Kh “white are thy teeth”; IBH “lustrous your teeth”; KRN “very white teeth.” The last is more literal.

§16 *sujātassa*

NB “well born”; IBH and KRN as above. Probably Nāṇamoli is right to suppose that the meaning here is intentionally different to that above.

§16 *patāpavā*

NB “(erect) as a flame”; IBH and KRN “splendid.”

§16 *kalyāṇadassano*

IBH and KRN rightly take this as a separate sentence.

§16 *rathesabho*

NB “lord of chariots”; IBH “a bull of charioteers”; KRN “a bull among heroes.” Here *ratha* has its secondary meaning of warrior, rather than chariot.

§16 *bhojarājāno*

KRN and Buddhaghosa read *bhojī* or *bhojā* and take as two items: “minor kings and kings.” NB “great princes.”

§16 *rājābhirājā manujindo*

Only KRN correctly interprets these as nominative.

§17 *appativattiyam*

Bo “that none can stop”; Kh “that none can stay”; IBH “that cannot be turned back”; KRN “which is not to be rolled back.”

§18 *sambuddho*

NB “full enlightenment”; IBH “Self-Awakened”; KRN “to be fully-enlightened.”

§18 *sāvako Satthu-d-anvayo*

Bo “that disciple who follows in the Master’s own way”; Kh “thy disciple who follows in the Master’s way”; IBH “the disciple second to the teacher”; KRN “the disciple who is the successor to the teacher.”

§19 *anujāto Tathāgataṃ*

Bo “the Tathāgata’s son”; Kh “the viceroy of the Tathāgata”; IBH “heir born to the Tathāgata”; KRN “taking after the Tathāgata.” It must mean either “follows after” or “takes after” here.

§19 *abhiññeyyaṃ abhiññātaṃ*

Bo “What must be known is directly known”; Kh “What must be directly known, is known”; IBH and KRN “What is to be known is known.” So the latter two take ABHI + ÑÑĀ as non-technical in meaning. Clearly in some contexts this is correct, but it cannot be right in a stanza which must refer to the four truths. The commentaries rightly recognize that “abandoning” and “bringing into being (developing)” are technical terms for the activities of the second and fourth truths. They then argue that since these are the two causal truths, then the results of those causes i.e., the truths of suffering and stopping are necessarily implied. Then they interpret *abhiññeyyaṃ* as referring to the results of the four noble truths as a whole i.e., *vijjā* and liberation. This is too complicated. It is simpler than this. In the *Dasuttarasuttanta*

(DN III 274) we find that the two things to be known by higher or direct knowledge are the constructed (*saṅkhata*) and the unconstructed element. These are precisely the first and third truths. Something like this must be intended here. In this way the three verbs cover the four truths. Of course, some scholars would doubt that a technical understanding of the four truths precedes the creation of this *sutta*, but I don't believe they can be correct about this.

§19 *adhimuccassu*

NB “let decision take their place”; IBH and KRN “have faith.”

§19 *abhiṅhaso*

NB “always”; IBH and KRN “repeatedly.”

§19 *sallakatto*

NB and IBH “physician”; KRN “barb-remover.” Literally, this is a surgeon (“arrow-remover” cf. EV I 830), but the reference must be to the Buddha's removal of the barbs of greed, etc.

§19 *brahmabhūtaṃ*

Bo “the holy one”; NB “Divine”; IBH “Brahma-become”; KRN “having become Brahmā.”

§20 *api kaṅhābhijātiko*

NB “even though of outcaste birth”; IBH “even a base-born black”; KRN “even one who is base-born.” All follow Buddhaghosa here, but the editors of *Ps* III 405 and *Pj* II 455 rightly refer to *Sv* I 162. If such a doctrine of six *abhijāti* was current and adopted by Sela, then we should translate: “even one of the lowest kind of behavior.”

§20 *Mārasena-*

Bo “Māra's teeming hordes”; Kh “Māra's hordes”; IBH “Māra's hosts”; KRN “Māra's armies.” The introduction of “teeming” seems unnecessary.

§23 *akāliko*

NB “not delayed”; IBH and KRN “timeless”. NB follows the interpretation of the commentaries (based upon an interpretation of the late canonical *abhidhamma*).

§23 *appamattassa*

Bo “with diligence”; NB “with zeal”; IBH “diligently”; KRN “for a vigilant man.” The last must be correct.

§24 *sapariso*

Bo “and his assembly”; Kh “with his following”; IBH “and his company”; KRN “with his company.” “Assembly” does not seem right here.

§25 *bho Gotama*

NB “Master”; IBH “good Gotama”; KRN “venerable Gotama.”

§25 *onītapattapāṇim*

Bo and IBH “withdrawn his hand from the bowl”; Kh “no longer had

the bowl in his hand”; KRN “had . . . washed his hands and bowl.” The last is probably correct; see note to KRN.

§25 *anumodi*

NB “gave him his blessing”; IBH “thanked”; KRN “gave thanks.” None of these is exactly right. In principle, the discourse of a monk after receiving *dāna* is to encourage in the listener a joyful approval of the *puṭṭakamma* (that approval is itself a further *puṭṭakamma*). So it is ideally a recommendation of *dāna* but in practice may be some other kind of *dhammadesanā* too.

§26 *aggihuttamukhā yaññā*

NB “Burnt offerings are the glory of fires”; IBH “Sacrifice is chief in fire-worship”; KRN “The *aggihutta* is the foremost among sacrifices.” The meaning of this is that the chief or best sacrifice is the libation to or with fire or to the god Agni. NB’s rendering seems far astray and introduces unnecessary overtones.

§26 *puṭṭaṃ ākaṃkhamānaṃ saṃgho ve yajataṃ mukhan ti*

NB “Merit is glory of all who aspire;
The *Sangha*, glory of those who give”;
IBH “For those giving alms, desiring merit,
The Order is indeed the chief.”

KRN “the Order is indeed the foremost for those who sacrifice looking for merit.”

Possibly: “for those who want good fortune, it is the *Sangha* which is the best of those who perform sacrifice” i.e., the act of receiving *dāna* is seen as an act of performing sacrifice (on behalf of others). In any case, without Ñāṇamoli’s (?) note (literally, “of sacrificers”) the rendering in NB destroys the connexion between *yaññā* and *yajataṃ* and hence the whole point of the paragraph. The Buddha is recommending *dāna* as the truer sacrifice to Keniya, the fire-worshipper.

§27 *pahitatto*

Bo and KRN “resolute”; Kh “strenuous”; IBH “self-resolute.”

§27 *diṭṭhe va dhamme*

NB and IBH “here and now”; KRN “in (this) world of phenomena.”

§27 *nāparaṃ itthattāya*

Bo “no more coming to any state of being”; Kh “no more of this to come”; IBH “no more of being such or so”; KRN “nothing more for this state.” It is unclear whether this is related to *ettha* “here” or to *itthaṃ* “thus.” So it could mean “no more of being here” or “no more of anything like this.” In either case it is clear that the term is intentionally non-specific; so Bo’s rendering goes against that intention.

§27 *sapariso*

KRN omits.

§28 *añjalim*

Bo “his hands in reverential greeting”; Kh “palms together”; IBH “with joined palms”; KRN “with cupped hands.” Probably KRN is correct here.

§28 *sattarattena*

NB and IBH “seven nights”; KRN “for seven days.” The construction must be: “in seven days we have been tamed in your teaching i.e., reached arahatship.” The commentaries understand this as a verse declaring the attainment of arahatship (*aññā*).

§28 *anusaye*

NB “evil tendencies”; IBH and KRN “latent tendencies.”

§28 *upadhī*

Bo “attachments”; Kh “the essentials of all being”; IBH “the basis (for rebirth)”; KRN “acquisitions (which lead to rebirth).”

§28 *nāgā*

Bo and IBH “great beings.”

Corrections to *Majjhima Nikāya*

(Bhikkhu Bodhi, circulated on the Internet, December 1996)

p.192, l.34 (15:7): “praise” > “laud”

p.219, l.29 (21:9): “The Mistress” > “Then Mistress”

p.230, l.3 (22:16), l.30 (22:20): “This is self, this the world;”

> “The self and the world are the same;”

Same change comes on p.232, l.6 (22:25).

p.231, l.7 (22:21): “This is self” > “The self and the world are the same”

p.260, ls.19-20 (26:19): “worldliness” > “adhesion” (3x)

p.261, l.35 (26:21). Read: “. . . who dwelt seeing fear and blame in the other world.”

p. 262, l.10. (Same change . . .)

ls.16-17. Read: “Then the Brahmā Sahampati thought: ‘The Blessed One has consented to my request regarding the teaching of the Dhamma.’”

p.283 (28:27): “corresponding class” > “corresponding section” (3x)

p.284 (28:37): Same change (also 3x).

p.340, ls. 28-32 (36:33): “bread” > “porridge” (3x)

p.355, ls.28-29 (38:18): Read: “With ignorance as condition, volitional constructions.”

p.392 (43:22): Delete top five lines.

p.395 (43:34): Close gap between lines 3 and 4.

p.421, l.13 (48:7). Read: “Of these six memorable qualities . . .”

p.422, ls.5-6 (48:9). Read: “. . . do I personally obtain serenity, do I person-

ally obtain quenching?”

l.8: “I personally obtain serenity, I personally obtain quenching.”

p.427, l.22 (49:11), l.34 (=F512-13), p.428, l. 2 (=F524), ls. 7,8,9 (=F525):
“commensurate with” > “partaken of by”

p.428 (49:27, second line of verse). Read: “And in becoming about to disbecome”

p.437 (50:29). Lines 6-7 should read: “Do you see in the Brahma-world/A radiance of surpassing lustre?”

Lines 12–15 should read: “I see in the Brahma-world/A radiance of surpassing lustre;

I disclaim my prior claim/That I am permanent, eternal.”

p.593, l.34 (72:20): “unfathomable” > “hard to fathom”

p.594, l.8: (Same change.)

p.599, l.9 (73:14): “merges with the sea” > “extends all the way to the sea”

l.12: “merges with Nibbāna” > “extends all the way to Nibbāna”

p.608, l.39 (75:8): “in sounds”

p.610, l.36 (75:11): “heavenly” > “divine”

p.611, last line (75:15): “brought” > “would bring”

p.622, l.25 (76:16). Read: “forty-nine hundred kinds of wanderers”

p.640, l.4 (77:23). Read: “Not perceiving form internally, one sees forms externally”

p.759, last line (92:19): “the Blessed”

p.840, l.16 (102:4). Read: “since [the perception] ‘there is nothing’”

l.19. Read: “the formless, of unity or of diversity”

p.911, l.8 (113:20). Read: “But a true man considers thus:”

p.954, l.23 (119:21): “no part of his whole body”

p.1039, l.2: “A Single Excellent Night”

l.8: “One Who Has Had a Single Excellent Night”

l.26: “Who has had a single excellent night”

p.1041, l.6: Same change as at 1039, l.26.

l.9: Same change as at 1039, l.8.

N.B. In *Suttas* 132, 133, 134, the same changes should be made.

p.1055, l.7 (135:10): “criticized a little” > “criticized a lot”

p.1056, l.36 (135:17). Read: “Here, student, some man or woman, when visiting a recluse or a brahmin, does not ask:”

p.1057, l.7 (135:18). Read: “Here, student, some man or woman, when visiting a recluse or a brahmin, asks:”

p.1092, l.2 (140:19): “of these” > “of those”

p.1118 (145:5): “kind, truly kind” > “excellent, truly excellent” (5x)

p.1119, ls. 6–10 (145:5): Read: “There have been disciples of the Blessed One who, being repelled, humiliated, and disgusted by the body and by life,

have sought an assailant. But I have obtained this assailant even without a search.”

p.1150, l.8 (152:10). Read: “he is repelled, humiliated, and disgusted.”

Corrections to Notes

p.1209, n.259: From line 4 of note read:

“. . . false view of self. This view seems to reflect the philosophy of the *Upanishads*, which assert the identity of the individual self (*ātman*) with the universal spirit (*brahman*), though it is difficult to determine on the basis of the texts whether the Buddha was personally acquainted with the early *Upanishads* themselves.”

p.1217, n.306: “worldliness” > “adhesion”

p.1246–47, n.511: “commensurate with” > “partaken of by” (2x)

p.1247, n.514. Add at end:

“The second line of the verse, which reads *bhavañ ca vibhavesinaṃ*, is enigmatic. MA glosses *vibhavaṃ gavesamānaṃ*, ‘seeking non-being,’ but I have translated in accordance with K.R. Norman’s suggestion that *vibhavesinaṃ* is an instance of the (rare) future active participle in Pāli. (See his *Elders’ Verses I: Theragāthā*, PTS 1969, n.527; see too Wilhelm Geiger, *A Pāli Grammar*, PTS 1994, =F5193A.)”

p.1337, n.1210: (This note needs to be revised.)

p.1349, n.1291: An interesting anachronism in this *sutta* was brought to my notice by Ven. Ajahn Sucitto of Cittaviveka Monastery: While the *sutta* depicts Mahāpajāpati Gotamī as a devout lay Buddhist, and the Buddha refers to the *Bhikkhunī Sangha* as if it were an existing reality, the canonical account of the founding of the *Bhikkhunī Sangha* shows Mahāpajāpati to have been the first historical *bhikkhunī*. Thus the *Bhikkhunī Sangha* could not have existed at the time the *sutta* was spoken if Mahāpajāpati was still a lay woman! We might resolve the discrepancy (unnoticed by the commentator) by supposing that the original discourse was later modified after the founding of the *Bhikkhunī Sangha* to bring the latter into the scheme of offerings to the *Sangha*.

p.1383, s.v. Desireless: 49.20 > 44.20

Changes in terminology:

(NB: This list is tentative and incomplete and has not yet been worked through systematically)

appamāṇa: “immeasurable” > “measureless” (“immeasurable” should be

reserved for *appameyya*)

saṅkhārā: in general usage (as referring to all temporal phenomena): “constructions”; in the specific context of the five aggregates (as fourth aggregate) and dependent origination (as the second factor): “volitional constructions”

saṅkhata: “conditioned” > “constructed”

asaṅkhata: “unconditioned” > “unconstructed”

nāmarūpa: “mentality-materiality” > “name-and-form” (with *nāma* alone name, and *rūpa* alone form (see MN 9 for their separate occurrence); also the *rūpakkhandha* becomes the aggregate of form, the adjective *rūpī* “having form”)

bhava: “being” > “becoming”; *kāma bhava* sense-sphere becoming; *rūpa bhava* form-sphere becoming; *arūpa bhava* formless sphere becoming
punabbhava: “renewal of being” > “re-becoming”

vimutti: “deliverance” > “liberation”

vimokkha: “liberation” > “deliverance”

For the expression “the deliverance of mind and deliverance by wisdom that are taintless with the destruction of the taints” read: “the liberation of mind, liberation by wisdom, that is taintless with the destruction of the taints” (as at 6.19, 12.36, 12.42, 38.40, 40.14, etc.). The two expressions are complementary ways of describing the same state, not two different states jointly attained.