YATHĀBHŪTAṆĀDASSANA could be said to be "oneself". Whether the mode adopted for developing yathābhūtānaṁ ṇādassana is based on the five aggregates of clinging, or on the six sense-spheres etc., the real point of developing such knowledge is to know and see the true nature of oneself as it "has come to be" and "according to reality". To truly know and see oneself requires maintaining the perspective of impermanence, unsatisfac- toriness and not-self throughout all aspects and moments of subjective experience, thereby withstanding the pressure of the affective in-vestment inherent in one's self-image and in the way one's perceptions tend to construct an image of the 'world'. In the ordinary case, witnessing one's own shortcomings easily leads to unconscious attempts at re-ducting the resulting feeling of discomfort by avoiding or even altering the per-ceived information so as to make it more congruent to one's view of one-self. Yathābhūtānahādassana, however, requires seeing and knowing "ac-cording to reality", remaining aloof from the influence of projections and ex-pectations.

The relevance of knowledge that accords with reality to self-inspection is reflected in the Anaṅgana Sutta, which points out that one who does not know according to reality that a blemish is present within him or her will not strive to overcome it; and one who does not know according to reality that he or she is free from blemishes will not take the appropriate measures in order to protect this level of purity (M. I, 25). These two cases can be compared to a dirty bronze dish that is not being cleaned and to a clean bronze dish that, by not being cleaned or used, becomes dirty. Thus, from the perspective of the Anaṅgana Sutta, the presence of knowledge according to reality is the crucial factor that gives self-inspection the power to recognize the presence or ab-sence of mental blemishes "as they have come to be", forming the indis-pensable ba-sis for adopting the appropriate type of conduct in regard to both situations.

In fact, overwhelmed by ignorance one does not know according to reality if a particular way of undertaking things will result in future suffering (M. I, 311). Again, those who do not know according to reality the nature of per-ception, failing to distinguish between the types of perception that lead down-wards and those that uplift, will be unable to reach liberation (A. II, 167). Hence the development of at least some degree of knowledge and vision that is in accordance with reality is of considerable importance for being able to avoid unwholesome conduct and for progress on the path to awakening.

To clearly see according to reality and with proper wisdom is also the means to go beyond views (M. I, 40), in fact speculative views about the future existence of a liberated being can only arise for those who do not know or see the five aggregates of clinging according to reality (S. IV, 386). By seeing ac-cording to reality and with proper wisdom dependent arising, paññāsa samppañña, one will leave behind all speculation about the existence of a self in past and future times (S. II, 26). Hence the wise, who see dependent arising, see karma as it has come to be and are knowledgeable in matters relating to its frui-tion (Sn. 653). The world by and large is entangled in affirming or denying existence, but those who have seen according to reality and with proper wis-dom the arising and passing away of the world, have gone beyond these two ex-tremes (S. II, 17). Being endowed with proper view, they stand on the thresh-old to the deathless (S. II, 80).

Those who have been quenched in the world,
Had insight in accordance with reality.

ye cāpi nibbatāloke
yathābhūtam vipassissam (D. III, 196).
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Anālayo

YODHĀJĪVA SUTTA is the title of a discourse found in the Gānaṇa Samyutta of the Samyutta Nikāya (S. IV, 308), which has two Chinese parallels in the two extant Samyutta Agama translations (T. II, 227b and T. II, 420b). The Yodhājīva Sutta records the Buddha's reply to an inquiry by a professional soldier, yodhājīva, if on being killed in battle while performing his duty as a warrior he will be reborn in heaven. The Buddha denies, informing his visitor that on that account he will rather end up in hell. The simple reason is that at the time of fighting the mind is full of desire to harm, kill and destroy, which will inevitably conduce to a hellish rebirth. Holding the wrong view that soldiers who die in battle will be reborn in heaven is another condition for a lower rebirth, conducive to a life in hell or in an animal realm. The same inquiry is posed again by a warrior specialized on riding an elephant and by one specialized on riding a horse in the two discourses that follow the Yodhājīva Sutta in the Samyutta Nikāya, only to receive the same reply by the Buddha (S. IV, 310).

The unequivocally clear stance taken in these three discourses against warfare is remarkable, as it leaves little scope for endorsing warfare or developing the concept of a holy war. The position taken in these discourses stands "in sharp opposition to the dominant view of the time, according to which it was the particular duty of a kṣatriya, a member of the warrior caste, to fight and, if at all possible, to die on the battlefield".

The Yodhājīva Sutta thus expresses with particular clarity the implications of the first precept incumbent on any Buddhist — abstaining from killing — adherence to which would make participation in a war impossible. In fact, according to the Abhidharmakosa Sūtra even in case of conscription a soldier is nevertheless guilty of killing, as is anyone who kills in self-defence or for the sake of defending others.

The detailed treatment of the first precept in the Sākya Sutta indicates that adherence to this precept involves abstaining from killing, laying aside stick and sword, being conscientious, showing kindness, and dwelling full of compassion towards any living being, pāṇḍitaṁ pariṇāmato hoti, niheṣādanta niheṣu adhi jayyapaṇno sahappāṭhākārako nambikampīvāhari (M. I, 287). The principle that inspires such conduct is the maxim, "just as I am, so are these; just as these are, so am I; comparing oneself with others in this way, one would not kill or cause to kill", yathā aham tathā ete, yathā evo tathā aham, attānaṁ upamaṁ kaival, na ṣānyāṁ na ghiṇaye (Sn. 705).

For a monk or a nun, killing a human being will cause loss of their monastic status. This applies even in case of merely encouraging the act of killing, without directly participating in it (Vin. III, 71). Hence a Buddhist monastic who advocates war risks loosing the right to be reckoned a bhikkhu or a bhikkunī. The degree to which warfare was seen as censurable in early Buddhism can also be seen in other Vinaya regulations, which make it an offence to watch an army in combat or even just to witness an army review (Vin. IV, 105 and 107). The same disdain for warfare is also reflected in the circumstance that armies and battles are topics on which one should not even converse (M. III, 113).

To encourage others to kill involves a loss of ethical purity for a lay follower of Buddhism as well. This is so since to fully undertake the precept of abstaining from killing requires not only refraining oneself from such deeds, but also to discourage others from killing and to praise abstention from killing (S. V, 354). Only if undertaken in this way will the precept be kept entirely pure in all these three respects, tīkātīparissuddha.