item of the necessary informations about the activities in different months), “Within the first decade of the 7th month, the monastic manager is to announce to the monks of all apartments the list of Scriptures to be read in the coming Ullambana Ceremony, and at the same time to have contributions collected before-hand for preparation of the bushels of food to be offered as sacrifice. On the 13th, the Léng-yen Assembly is to conclude, and on the 15th the summer retreat expires. In that evening, the Ullambana offering is performed including recitation of Scriptures and giving of food (to ghosts).” Regulations for the same occasion are also found in the Pure Rules of the Huan-chu Monastery composed by Ming-pê of the Yüan dynasty, in which he writes, “On the 15th day of the 7th month, the summer retreat expires. In the evening the holy Ullambana Service is held to deliver the departed souls from the infernal regions in requital of the parental favours they have done us. The list of scriptures to be read in the ceremony should be announced beforehand so that monks may make preparatory pursuals according to their convenience. The ceremony includes an altar-performance of nectar-giving which should be duly observed.” All these records will attest to the fact that the principal items of the Ullambana Service practised at that time consisted in the recitation of Scriptures and the giving of food to spirits.

This performance continued to prevail till the Ming dynasty. Chu-hung in his Writings on the Rectification of Erroneous Practices tried to set the thing straight. “People of to-day” writes he, “generally regard the Ullambana Ceremony held on the 15th day of the 7th month as a rite of giving food to ghosts and spirits. This is a mistake. The Ullambana traces its origin to Maudgalyāyana. It was so prescribed because the 15th day of the 7th month is the day when the monks conclude, their summer retreat and begin to make confessions. Through the past three months of cultivation, there must be many who have achieved enlightenment. Consequently offerings made on this day will reap hundred fold of bliss. It is not meant at all to give food to ghosts and spirits. The rite of food-giving has its own origin, that is, from Ánanda. Moreover, the time of its performance has never been fixed on the 15th of the 7th month, and the utensil to be used is the Magadha bushel, not the Ullambana vessel. The purport of the one is to serve the wise and the saintly, whereas that of the other is to deliver the pretas. The one is motivated by the sense of respect while the other by the sense of compassion. How should acts of so widely different causes be mixed up as the same thing” I-jun of the Ch’ing dynasty attempted to bring about a reconciliation by advocating a dual practice of offering the Ullambana vessel at day as a Pious service to the Triple-gem and giving the bushel of food at night as a universal salvation to the ghosts and spirits. In the 8th fascicle of his Record of the Ascertained Meanings of the Pure Rules of Paltchang, I-jun has an abstract of the important items of the Ullambana Ceremony given in details, saying that the full text is to be found in the Collective Manual of the Ullambana Ceremony. The programme he formulated includes such items as the purification of the altar by chanting Scriptures in processions going around it, the presenting of offerings with the Ullambana vessel, the distribution of food among monks, and other rituals, with 21 regulations for the performance appended at the end. This prescription, however, has not been observed at large among monasteries. In the minds of common people in general, the offering of sacrifices to the departed and the salvation of the ghosts still remain the principal functions of the Ullambana performance. This is the condition that this age-long ceremony has eventually come to.

Chou Shu-chia

UPĀDĀNA stands for “taking up”, “grasping”, “clingning” and “holding on to”, as well as for that which is clung to, in the sense of its “basis”, “sub-strata”, “supply” or “fuel”. As the tendency of the mind to cling or grasp, upādāna constitutes the ninth factor in the twelve-link series of dependent arising, pāticec samuppāda, being the outcome of craving and leading on to becoming or existence, bhava.

As the conditioning force for bhava, upādāna stands for clinging to sensual pleasures, to views, to vows and observances, and to a doctrine of self, kāmupādāna, diṭṭhipādāna, sīlabbatupādāna and avattavādhopādāna (M. I, 51). According to the register of terms given in the detailed treatment of the four types of upādāna in the Dhammasamghani, the first of these four, clinging to sensual pleasures, is similar in nature to sensual desire, sensual lust and sensual craving, kāmacchanda, kāmarūga, kāmatan̄hā (Dhs. 212). That is, whether manifesting as clinging, desire, lust or
Clinging to sensual pleasures

The lure of kāma causes the arising of sensual desire, kāmacchanda, which constitutes one of the lower fetters, (D. III, 234). The same lure is also responsible for sensual lust, one of the underlying tendencies, kāmaragānasaya. This tendency is already present in a new-born baby (D. III, 254). The dire results of craving for sensuality, kāmaññā, are similar to the case of a leper who cauterises his wounds over a fire and scratches them, experiencing momentary relief through an act that aggravates his condition (M. I, 507; See also TANHĀ). Hence kāmupādāna, clinging to sensual pleasures, has a broad compass and its removal is a central task for being able to progress on the path to liberation.

A series of stark imageries in the Pottalia Sutta compares sensual pleasures to meatless bones that are not able to satisfy a dog’s hunger; to a bird that is attacked by other birds because it has gotten hold of a piece of meat; to holding a blazing torch against the wind and therefore getting scorched; to being thrown into a glowing charcoal pit; to illusory images seen only in a dream; to borrowed goods that have to be returned to their owner; and to climbing a tree in search of fruit, only to find that someone else is cutting down the tree and one risks severe injury unless one descends quickly (M. I, 364). The predicament that results from sensual pleasures is also taken up in the Mahādikkahakkhandha Sutta, which depicts in detail the toil and suffering, as well as the quarrel and warfare, that result from the pursuit of their satisfaction (M. I, 85).

Clinging to views

The resultant evils of the second of the four types of upādāna, clinging to views, dīṭṭhpādāna, are a prominent theme in the Atīthakavaggo of the Sutta Nipāta. The Duṭṭhältthaka Sutta highlights how attachment to one’s own views makes it difficult to relinquish them (Sn. 781 and 785). According to the Paramatthaka Sutta, the cause for unending quarrelling is high esteem for one’s own view and the consequent looking down on any other view (Sn. 796-797). Thus some will delight in verbal debate and treat others as fools, the Pasūra Sutta points out, hoping to gain victory and fearing defeat (Sn. 824-828). Yet, if one were a fool simply by dint of holding another view, the Cūḷavīraha Sutta remarks, then all debating recluses should be reckoned fools (Sn. 880 and 890). As the same discourse points out, such dogmatic upholding of one’s own view is but a manifestation of conceit and lust for one’s own view (Sn. 889 and 891).

The problem behind clinging to views is that “what incites a person to cling passionately to his own view is more often his consciousness and esteem of the self, rather than the consciousness of truth. The dogmatist wishes to safeguard his view at whatever cost, because the refutation of his views means to him defeat and self degradation”. Thus it is precisely the degree of clinging to and identification with a particular view that leads to dogmatic adherence and various measures to protect it, to unwillingness to let go of it even when faced with compelling evidence. As a discourse in the Aṅguttara Nikāya explains, it is due to being bound by views and being obsessed by them that recluses continue to quarrel with each other (M. I, 66). Since to hold any view dogmatically will inevitably lead to conflict with those that have different views, the only solution is to let go of clinging to views (M. I, 499). The need to let go of clinging might even be of relevance in relation to right view, in the sense of letting go of any dogmatic adherence and identification with it.

Clinging to vows and observances

The implications of sīlabbata, the object of the third type of upādāna, can best be ascertained by turning to the Kukkura-vatika Sutta. This discourse describes contemporary ascetics that were engaged in behaving like a dog or a cow, the kukkura-vata, kukkura-sīla or else the go-vata, go-sīla (M. I, 387). Such and other types of vows and observances were apparently undertaken in ancient India in the belief that they would lead to purification or to rebirth in heaven. However, in a verse in the Dhammapada the Buddha enjoined his own monks to go beyond vows and observances, which indicates that this type of clinging could also become a problem for Buddhist monastics (Dhp. 271). In fact a discourse in the Aṅguttara Nikāya points out that vows and observances in themselves can be either wholesome...
or unwholesome (A. I, 225), hence here too the problem is to be found in the act of clinging to them.

Clinging to a doctrine of self

The fourth type of upādāna, clinging to a doctrine of self, attavādānapādāna, is according to the Cūlasaṅhāra Sutta a mode of clinging and grasping that is beyond the ken of other recluses and Brahmins. Though these may recognize the predicament inherent in the other three types of clinging, the problem posed by clinging to a self is characteristic of the Buddha’s teaching alone (M. I, 67). The exposition given in the Dhammasaṅgani explains clinging to a doctrine of self with the help of altogether twenty modes of construing a sense of identity, twenty modes also regularly listed in the discourses (Dhs. 212). These proceed by taking any of the five aggregates to be a self, the self to be possessed of the aggregate, the aggregate to be part of the self; or the self to be part of the aggregate (See SAKKAYADITTHI).

Within the context of the twelve-link scheme of dependent arising, paccayā samuppādā, the above listed four types of upādāna should account for any clinging that leads to any type of bhava. Yet, on closer inspection it seems as if the four types of clinging might not completely cover all types of clinging. Clinging to sensuality, kāmupādāna, would be left behind with the attainment of non-returner, when the fetter of sensual desire, kāmacchanda, will be eradicated. Clinging to views, diṭṭhupādāna, should according to the Dhammasaṅgani be understood to stand for clinging to wrong views, sabbaṃ micchādiṭṭhi diṭṭhupādānaṃ (Dhs. 212). Such clinging would thus be overcome already with streamentry. The same would be the case for clinging to views and observances and for clinging to a doctrine of self, sīlabhatupādānaṃ attavādānapādānaṃ, which with the removal of the two fetters of personality view and of dogmatic adherence to views and observances would similarly be left behind at streamentry. From this perspective, then, it would seem as if a non-returner has already successfully overcome all four types of upādāna.

Hence “this traditional fourfold division of clinging is not quite satisfactory. Besides kāmupādāna we should expect either rūpupādāna and arūpupādāna, or simply bhavupādāna. Though the Anāgāmi is entirely free from the ... four kinds of upādāna, he is not freed from rebirth, as he still possesses bhavupādāna.” In fact, the remainder of upādāna of a non-returner comes up explicitly in several passages that depict how a certain mode of practice has the potential of leading either to non-returning or else to arahant-ship. Such passages indicate that in the case of a non-returner final knowledge here and now is not won since there is a remainder of clinging left, sattī vā upādīsesu (e.g. M. I, 63).

A solution to this problem could be found by turning to the Chinese Āgamas. The Chinese parallels to the analysis of upādāna given in the Sammāditthi Sutta and in the Cūlasaṅhāra Sutta differ so far from the Pāli versions as, instead of referring to clinging to “a doctrine of self”, they simply speak of clinging to ‘a self’ (T. I, 463a7; T. I, 591a22; T. II, 644a16). Clinging to a self would indeed be a form of clinging that is only overcome with the attainment of arahant-ship. Thus on adopting the reading found in the Chinese Āgamas, which speak only of clinging to a self, the four types of clinging would cover all the forms of upādāna responsible for any type of bhava.

The persistence of a subtle type of clinging to a sense of ‘I’ even in a non-returner is the theme of the Khemaka Sutta, which clarifies that even though a noble disciple may have overcome the five lower fetters and thereby become a non-returner, still a trace of the sense of ‘I’ in regard to the five aggregates of clinging remains (S. III, 130). By way of illustration, this discourse describes how a dirty and soiled cloth can be cleaned with the help of cleaning salt, lye and cow dung. Though after rinsing the cloth in water it would be clean, yet, a remainder of the smell of the cleaning salt, lye and cow dung still pervades the cloth, and it is only after the cloth has been kept in a perfumed casket that this remainder will also disappear.

In addition to the simile of the cleaned cloth, the Khemaka Sutta also presents another simile to illustrate how a subtle clinging to a sense of ‘I’ can remain even when the selfless nature of each of the five aggregates is well understood and realized. This simile involves the scent of a lotus. Just as the sense of ‘I’ remains even though it cannot be identified as belonging to any of the five aggregates, so too the scent of a lotus cannot be identified as belonging to the petals or the stalk or the pistils, as it belongs to the flower as a whole (S. III, 130).
That even the most subtle sense of an ‘I’ should be reckoned as a form of clinging comes to the fore in another simile that forms part of a penetrative instruction that led to the stream-entry of Ananda (S. III, 105). According to this instruction, the sense of ‘I’ arises only when there is clinging or grasping, upādāya ‘āsmiti hoti, no anupādāya, just as it is only by grasping a mirror that one is able to see one’s own face. This simile conveys how “it is when one looks into a mirror that one suddenly becomes self-conscious... one gets the notion ‘this is me’... the moment one looks into a mirror one is suddenly reminded of it, as if to exclaim: ‘Ah, here I am!”

What is grasped or clung to, according to this discourse, are none other than the five aggregates of bodily form, feeling, perception, volitional formations and consciousness. This, then, discloses another important perspective on upādāna, namely its role in relation to the “five aggregates of clinging”, or perhaps better the “five aggregates affected by clinging”, pañc c’upādānakkhandhā.

Clinging and the five aggregates

The role of upādāna in the context of the pañc c’upādānakkhandhā is of considerable importance, since according to the standard definition of the first noble truth, these pañc c’upādānakkhandhā are the succinct manifestation of the truth of dukkha. This is the case to such an extent that one discourse even dispenses with the other explanations usually given, according to which birth, old age, death etc. are dukkha, and simply states that the five aggregates affected by clinging are the first noble truth, kāmaavāca dukkham ariyasaccam? Pañc c’upādānakkhandhā ‘ti’ssa vacanñyām (S. V, 425).

The eminent role of upādāna in this respect is reflected in some shortened versions of the dependent arising of dukkha that set in directly with clinging, without mentioning the preceding eight links and then follow up the chain of dependent arising through the remaining links of the series. A case in point is the Māgandiya Sutta, which takes off from grasping at the five aggregates and proceeds via becoming and birth to old age and death (M. I, 511). A discourse in the Saṁyutta Nikāya begins by describing the arising of delight in relation to the five aggregates, followed by equating delight with clinging, ṭhānañc ṭad upādānam, and then filling in the rest of the series (S. III, 14).

According to the Cūḷavedallī Sutta, upādāna is not the same as the five upādānakkhandhas, nor is it something apart from them. Rather, upādāna stands for desire and lust in regard to them, pañc’s upādānakkhandhas chan-darāgo tathā upādānam (M. I, 300). Another discourse introduces the five aggregates as “things that can be clung to”, upādāniya dhamma, again explaining that desire and lust are what is meant by the term “clinging” in this context (S. III, 167). This would make it clear that the expression pañc’upādān-khan-dhā refers to five aggregates as the objects of clinging. In fact, aggregates such as the body would in themselves not be able to cling. As the Vibhaṅga points out, only the aggregate of volitional formations is capable of clinging, upādāna, while the other aggregates can only be clung to, upādāniya (Vibh. 67).

Without such clinging, the pañc’upādānakkhandhā then become the bare five aggregates, pañcakkhandhā. The distinction between these two is made in the Khandhā Sutta in the Saṁyutta Nikāya, which explains that the content of the pañcakkhandhā and the pañc c’upādānakkhandhā is the same, in as much as they cover any possible instance of bodily form, feeling, perception, volitional formations and consciousness (S. III, 47). What makes the difference between them is that in the case of the pañc’upādānakkhandhā, the five aggregates are clung to, upādāniya, and hence related to the influxes, sāsava.

According to the Dhammasaṅgani, the five aggregates are free from clinging and being clung to only at the time when someone experiences the supramundane paths and fruits, aparītyāpannā maggā ca maggaphalāni ca asankhatā ca dhītā, ime dhammā upādānavippayuttā anupādāniyā (Dhs. 214). From the perspective of this presentation, even the five aggregates of an arahant are related to clinging (since they can be clung to), as long as the arahant is not experiencing path and fruit. Conversely, already the five aggregates of a stream-enterer can be considered as free from clinging and being clung to when the latter is experiencing path and fruit. The Atīrasaṅlīlī follows up this presentation in the Dhammasaṅgani by explaining that though an arahant will no longer cling to anything, others may cling to him or her (DhsA. 347). In contrast, the supra-mundane fruits and path, as well as Nibbāna, cannot become the object of clinging, just as a fly is not capable of settling down on a red-hot burning iron ball.
This mode of presentation seems to some extent to bypass the import of specifying the five aggregates as paṭicca upādānakkhandhā, whose purpose is to reveal the predicament of one’s own clinging to different aspects of oneself, not the problem of the clinging that others may have. Moreover, it is not entirely clear why the five aggregates cannot be clung to during the time of the experience of the supramundane fruits and paths. As long as an arahant can become the object of clinging during his or her everyday life, as envisaged by the Āthasūlīni, why should it be no longer possible to cling to this arahant when he or she is experiencing the supramundane paths and fruits? The person who clings to the arahant, described in the Āthasūlīni as entertaining such notions as “our senior Elder”, amhikkamp marulathero, stands little chance of knowing when this elder is experiencing the supramundane path and fruit and thus should no longer be clung to.

In regard to Nibbāna, one might also wonder why it should be impossible to develop clinging in regard to it. That outsiders had mistaken notions of Nibbāna and would cling to them can be deduced from the survey of views given in the Brahmajāla Sutta, which counts altogether five modes of proclaiming the attainment of Nibbāna here and now, diṭṭhadhamma-nibbāna-vāda (D. I, 36). An instance of one of these mistaken notions is recorded in the Māgandiya Sutta, according to which a wanderer thought that Nibbāna stands for bodily health and wellbeing (M. I, 509). Not only such mistaken notions, but apparently even the Buddhist idea of Nibbāna might become an object of clinging. This much seems to be implicit in the exposition given in the Mūlaparipatīya Sutta, according to which a disciple in higher training, a sekha, should take care to avoid conceiving Nibbāna in various ways typical for a worldling, and beware of appropriating it as ‘mine’ (M. I, 4). Though the commentary holds that the Nibbāna spoken about in this context refers to wrong notions held by outsiders (MA. I, 38), the fact that this instruction is given to a disciple in higher training, and thus to someone who has already had personal and direct experience of Nibbāna, makes it clear that this is not the case. A disciple in higher training would not need to be instructed on avoiding conceiving wrong notions of Nibbāna, which would not arise in the first place.

Hence it seems as if the gloss offered in the Āthasūlīni is not entirely convincing. From the perspective of the early discourses, it appears more straightforward to assume that once an arahant has destroyed clinging, his or her five aggregates can be considered as bare aggregates, as just paṭiccaakkhandhā, precisely because he or she no longer clings in any way at them. A disciple in higher training, in contrast, would fall under the heading of paṭice upādānakkhandhā, independent of whether this disciple is experiencing the supramundane paths and fruits or anything else.

A problem with this interpretation could seem to be found in a discourse in the Samyutta Nikāya, according to which a worldling or any of the four types of noble ones should engage in the same mode of contemplation that reviews the five aggregates of clinging from a variety of perspectives, such as impermanence etc. (S. III, 167). The instruction given in each instance, even in relation to an arahant, speaks of contemplating the paṭicca upādānakkhandhā. This appears to imply that even the aggregates of an arahant are paṭicca upādānakkhandhā, not just the five bare aggregates, paṭiccaakkhandhā. Yet, the instruction speaks throughout of “these five aggregates of clinging”, ime paṭicca upādānakkhandhā, without providing a direct grammatical relation to the different type of nobles one mentioned as part of the instruction. Hence it would also be possible to interpret this passage to be intending the paṭicca upādānakkhandhā of the monk to whom the discourse was given, who apparently had come for instructions on how to progress on the path.

Clinging and Nibbāna

Another passage of relevance to the theme of upādāna and the status of an arahant can be found in the Itivuttaka, which distinguishes between the sa-upādāsesa nibbānadatthu and the amupādīsesa nibbāna-datthu (It. 38). The former, the “element of Nibbāna with a residue remaining”, stands for the arahant while he or she is still alive. The latter, the “element of Nibbāna without residue remaining”, refers to the passing away of an arahant. This much can be seen from the verses that accompany this discourse, which qualify the amupādīsesa nibbānadatthu as being related to the future, samparāyikha, when all forms of existence cease, yamhi nirujjhanti bhavāni sabbaso.

To appreciate the implications of the distinction drawn in this Itivuttaka discourse, it needs to be born
in mind that upādāna can also have the sense of a "basis", "substrata", "supply" or "fuel". This sense comes to the fore in the context of a fire simile in a discourse in the Sammūtikka Nikāya, which indicates that fire burns only as long as it has some fuel or basis for burning, saupādāna, not without such fuel, anupādāna (S. IV, 399). The imagery is telling, since it is by 'grasping' its upādāna, its 'fuel', that fire continues to burn. This sense of "substrata" or "residue" also underlies the very expression saupādāsesa in the context of a simile of a doctor who treats a wound caused by a poisoned arrow, given in the Sunakkhatta Sutta (M. II, 257). Here saupādāsesa refers to a "residue" of poison left in the wound.

Applied to the case of the above Ālivuttaka passage, saupādāsesa thus indicates that the 'substrata' of the five aggregates is still in existence. Though this 'substrata' is the product of former clinging, it continues in existence even when clinging itself has already been removed. In the case of distinguishing between a nonreturner and an arahant, however, the qualification saupādāsesa does imply a remainder of 'clinging' (e.g. M. I, 63: sati vā upādāsesa anāgāmītā).

Freedom from clinging

A prominent method for developing freedom from clinging takes the five aggregates of clinging as its object. This mode of contemplation focuses on their impermanent nature in particular, on their arising and passing away, a mode of practice that results in establishing a clear appreciation of the objectionable nature of any clinging, pañcasa upādānakkhandhesu udayabhyāmayamāppattino viharato upādāne pañcākāyata saṃbhūti (A. III, 32).

To contemplate the rise and fall of the five aggregates is a mode of practice given considerable prominence in the discourses as a form of meditation that issues in awakening. This may well be the reason why instructions on this form of meditation practice are reckoned to be the Buddha's lion's roar (S. III, 85). The same form of contemplation features among the mindfulness practices described in the Satipatthāna Sutta as the direct path, ekāyana magga, to the final goal (M. I, 61). According to the Ag-giveccagottā Sutta, the Buddha's aloofness from views, diṭṭhi, was the direct outcome of his having seen, diṭṭhībhāvā, the rise and fall of the five aggregates of clinging (M. I, 486).

Even the former Buddha Vipassī reached awakening by contemplating the rise and fall of the five aggregates of clinging (D. II, 35).

The point behind this practice is that it directly undermines all clinging to a sense of 'I', pañca sa upādānakkhandhesu udayabhyāmayamāppattino viharato yo pañcas' upādānakkhandhesu asminmāno so pañhyāti (M. III, 115). Once the sense of 'I' that lurks behind the pañc' upādānakkhandhā has been fully understood and abandoned, they stand, as it were, with their root cut, pañcakkhandhā pariṇāṇā tiṭṭhāti chinnamālakā (Thig. 106), the root being desire for them, chandamālaka (S. III, 100). Such desire for the five aggregates of clinging can take various forms, as it could be directed to future instances of each of the five (M. III, 16), imagining the way one would like them to be. Through perceiving gratification in things that can be clung to, upāṇiyesu dhammesu assiṭṭhānappassino, craving will grow, just as a fire will burn ever more when additional fuel is added to it, or as a tree will grow as long as it is well nourished through its roots (S. II, 85 and S. II, 87; see also TANHĀ). In short, one who clings is bound by Māra, upādiyāmānā bhaddho Mārassu (S. III, 73).

Due to clinging to a world that is but the product of the six senses, one's experience of the world becomes subject to affliction, channam eva upādāya, chassu loko vihaṇṇatti (S. 169). Such clinging is the condition for becoming and thus for the perpetuation of dukkha, upādānakkhandhassu bhava, bhūta dukkhattham nigacchati (S. 742). But those who see clinging as fearful, upādāne bhavaṁ disvā, will reach liberation through not clinging, anupādā vimuccanti (A. I, 142), attaining the internal freedom, ajjhatta vimokkha, of having destroyed all clinging, sabbupādānakkhyāya (S. II, 54).

To reach the destruction of all clinging requires to let go even of the most sublime type of experiences, such as the attainment of neither-perception-nor-nonperception, which can be reckoned supreme among objects of clinging, upādānaseththā (M. II, 265).

Hence practising mindfully one should dwell free from any dependences and from clinging to anything in the world, anissito viharati, na ca kīcchā loke upādiyati (M. I, 56). In particular at the time of death it is of considerable importance to avoid clinging to any aspect of experience, be this any of the sensedoors or their
objects, any element or meditative experience, this world or another (M. III, 259). Freedom from clinging is freedom from agitation, *anupādīyaṃ na paritassati,* and will issue in liberation, *aparittassam paccatā yeva parinibbāyatī* (M. I, 67). One who has reached final liberation, has thereby fully understood the nature of clunging, *pariṇāmaṃ me upādānan iti pajānāti* (S. IV, 33). In fact, the total absence of clunging is the final goal itself:

“Having nothing, clunging to nothing ... This I call Nibbāna.” *Akiñcaṇṇaṃ anādānaṃ ... nibbānam iti nām brūmi* (Sn. 1094).
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**Upagupta.** A great arahant sthavira with high psychic potency, famed as a great meditator, preacher of the dharma and instructor, said to have lived in a forest hermitage in Mathurā, one hundred years after the demise of the Buddha. Probably due to his capabilities he was able to excite the imagination of Buddhists, so that the name of Upagupta became the centre of a wide variety of legends around which grew up a vast literature, especially in the circles of the northern Buddhist tradition. But what is significant is that the name of Upagupta has been able to cut across the traditional divisions in Buddhism to penetrate into the Theravāda tradition in South East Asia with the Pali form of his name as Upagutta or its local derivative, Shin Upāgo, in Myanmar or Pira Uppakut in Thailand and Laos, and remain there up to date as an unorthodox cultic belief and practice in popular Buddhism.

**Predictions of the Buddha**

Once the Buddha, while on tour in the Śūrasena Janapada, arrived in Mathurā with Ananda ther. There pointing at the distant bluish forest line he told Ananda that, one hundred years after his demise, two brothers of Mathurā, Nāta and Bhāta by name, will establish a monastery there on the Mount Urumunda, which will be named Nāṭabhatika after them. It will be foremost among such institutions with facilities conducive for both tranquility (*samatha*) and insight (*vipaśyanā*) meditations. Making a second prediction the Buddha told Ananda that, at the same period, will live one
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