

taṃ vāpi dhīrā muniṃ vedayanti (Sn. 215). Another discourse in the *Saṃyutta Nikāya* describes how the development of *dhammavicayasambojjhaṅga* involves investigating *dhammas* internally as well as externally, *ajjhataṃ dhammesu ... bahiddhā dhammesu* (S. V, 111). Here, too, "phenomena" in general are being investigated.

The interrelation between these two aspects of investigation - theoretical inquiry and direct meditative examination - also underlies a set of three types of wisdom described in the *Saṅgīti Sutta*. These comprise the type of wisdom that arises from reflecting, *cintāmayā paññā*, from hearing or learning, *sutamayā paññā*, and from practicing, *bhāvanāmayā paññā* (D. III, 219). Hence to cover the whole range of wisdom one needs to proceed from an investigation of a more theoretical type to a practical investigation during actual contemplation.

That mere theoretical investigation on its own will not suffice for developing liberating wisdom can be seen from the exposition given in the *Brahmajāla Sutta*, according to which theoretical investigation can become a basis for mistaken views, described as being "hammered out by reason" and as "following up one's own line of inquiry", *takkapariyāhataṃ vīmaṃsānucaritaṃ sayam paṭibhānaṃ* (D. I, 16). Such one-sided investigation can result in confusion instead of wisdom.

In fact, according to the *Vibhaṅga* commentary *dhammavicayasambojjhaṅga* stands in particular for insight knowledge, *vipassanañāṇa* (*VibhA.* 312). The *Peṭakopadesa* then explains that to understand in accordance with reality when being concentrated is the task of the awakening factor of investigation-of-phenomena, *yaṃ samāhito yathābhūtaṃ pajānāti, ayaṃ dhammavicayasambojjhaṅgo* (*Peṭ.* 187). The definition given in the *Peṭakopadesa* draws attention to another aspect that is of considerable relevance for investigation, namely the presence of concentration (see also SAMĀDHI). A mind that is not concentrated will not be fit for properly executing the task of investigation.

The relationship of investigation to concentration is also a theme that underlies the fourth "road to spiritual power", *iddhipāda*. This is the *vīmaṃsāsamādhīpadhānasa jkhārasamānāgata iddhipāda*, the "road to spiritual power that possesses concentration due to investigation and volitional

effort". To implement this *iddhipāda* requires a type of *vīmaṃsā* that is well balanced, being neither in excess nor in deficiency (S. V, 264), in the sense of being neither lax nor restless, neither overcome by sloth-and-torpor nor excited by the attraction of sensual pleasures (S. V, 280). Based on such balanced investigation, concentration arises, *vīmaṃsaṃ nissāya labhati samādhīṃ labhati cittassa ekaggataṃ, ayaṃ vuccati vīmaṃsāsamādhī* (S. V, 269). Developed in this way, this *iddhipāda* can become the means to supernormal powers as well as to the destruction of the influxes.

The last of these benefits, namely the destruction of the influxes, is the central purpose of investigation in early Buddhism, which leads from a theoretical type of inquiry to an examination of all aspects of experience during meditative contemplation, and culminates in liberation.

"One who vigilant, mindful and clearly comprehending, Concentrated, joyful and with clarity, In due time properly investigates the Dhamma With unified mind, will destroy the darkness [of delusion]".

*Yo jāgaro ca satimā sampajāno,
samāhito mudito vippasanno ca,
kālena so sammā dhammaṃ parivīmaṃsamāno,
ekodibhūto vihane tamaṃ so* (It. 42).

Anālayo

VĪMAṂSAKA SUTTA, the "discourse on the inquirer", is the forty-seventh discourse in the *Majjhima Nikāya* (M. I, 317-320). A parallel to this discourse can be found in the *Madhyama Āgama* (T. I, 731a-732a),¹ which corresponds closely to the Pāli version.

The theme of the *Vīmaṃsaka Sutta* and its Chinese parallel is an open invitation by the Buddha to a prospective disciple to investigate in a detailed manner his teacher. The first step in this investigation is to find out through observation if the mental states of the Buddha are really of an entirely pure nature. Other topics for investigation are if the Buddha has succumbed to the dangers inherent in becoming a famous teacher; if his outward behaviour is an ex-pression of true aloofness from defilements or only a façade; and whether he shows any parti-ality towards some disciples. Once observation in regard to these various manners has been conducted successfully, the

prospective disciple is encouraged to approach the Buddha and directly ask if any unwholesome states were found in him.

Based on a comprehensive inquiry undertaken in this manner, which combines observation and direct questioning of the teacher, one may place confidence or faith in the Buddha and accept him as a teacher. Such faith or confidence, the *Vīmaṅsaka Sutta* concludes, is rooted in reason and of such firmness that no one could possibly shake it (*M. I, 320: ākāravatī saddhā*).

The type of attitude that this discourse depicts is noteworthy indeed. Examinations of early Buddhism often present the *Kālāma Sutta* as the example par excellence for the early Buddhist advocacy of a principle of free inquiry in relation to spiritual and moral issues, expressing a non-authoritarian and pragmatic attitude (*A. I, 188; see also KĀLĀMA SUTTA*). But compared with the *Kālāma Sutta*, the *Vīmaṅsaka Sutta* may lay even greater claim to being a remarkable instance of the advocacy of free inquiry and of a non-authoritarian attitude. The room given in this discourse to inquiry stands in stark contrast to the Indian concept of a teacher as a guru invested with an unquestionable authority, where no inquiry into his (or her) abilities or conduct should be undertaken at all. Instead, according to the *Vīmaṅsaka Sutta* the Buddha made himself available to the most searching type of scrutiny. This discourse shows that common standards of ethical purity were applicable to the Buddha just as much as they were applicable to anyone else, that there were no double moral standards, as the deeds of the Buddha should be measured and examined in order to ascertain their concordance with general standards of proper conduct.

The Buddha could afford such an open attitude, since through his attainment of final liberation he had overcome the mental roots for any immoral behaviour, so that there was no deed of his that required covering up in order to avoid that others might come to know of it (*D. III, 217*). As a teacher, the Buddha exemplified his teachings through his deeds and what he taught was in complete conformity with his behaviour, *yathāvādī tathāgato tathākārī, yathākārī tathāgato tathāvādī* (*It. 122*).

Anālayo

References

¹ *T.* stands for the Taishō edition.

VĪMATIVINODANĪ ṬĪKĀ: *Vīmativinodani* (Dispeller of Doubts) is the third *ṭīkā* written for the *Samantapāsādikā*, the *Vinaya* commentary of Buddhaghosa (the first and second *Vinaya ṭīkā*s being *Vajirabuddhi* and the *Sāratthadīpanī*). It is written by Coliyakassapa Mahathera. The name Coliyakassapa reveals that he was of South Indian origin. But the name of his teacher etc. is not known. This is due to non availability of the relevant information usually found at the end of a book. His name is seen among those who invited Vācissara Mahāsāmi to write the *ṭīkā* on the *Vinayaviniccaya*. Vācissara Mahāsāmi was a pupil of Sangharāja Sāriputta. Therefore it is clear Ven. Coliyakassapa was posterior to Sangharāja Sāriputta. But the gap was short between them.

It is possible to gather some information about Ven. Coliyakassapa from the colophon of his *Mohavicchedani* the commentary on *Abhidhamma matikā*. It is clear that he was a Brahmin by birth. He was living in the city Nāgānana in Colādhinātha in the centre of the Cola country, when he was writing the *Mohavicchedani*. Ven. Coliyakassapa appears to have been an expert of *Vinaya* as well as of *Abhidharma*. Further he was an *aṭṭhakathācāri* in addition to being a *ṭīkācāri*.

In the same way Sāriputta Sangharāja criticized certain views expressed in the *Vajirabuddhi ṭīkā* in his *Sāratthadīpanī*, Ven. Coliyakassapa in his *Vīmativinodani* has criticized some views found in the *Sāratthadīpanī* of Sāriputta Sangharāja.

The *Vīmativinodani* is supposed to contain fifty *bhānavaras* and nearly half the size of the *Sāratthadīpanī*. The *Vīmativinodani* has been held in great esteem in Burma, though hardly known in Sinhala. It is among the standard authorities of *Vinaya* quoted in the Kalyani inscriptions of the Burmese king Dhammaceti (1460-1491 A.C.). It was one of the authorities used as guide lines, when king Dhammaceti carried out his reforms in the 15th century in Burma. During the debate on "Pārupana" (correct way of wearing the robe) in Burma The *Vīmativinodani* was cited as an authority.

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 3 : Vācā – Z hong a-han



2009