Introduction

A survey of early Buddhism can be carried out by means of comprehensive literature and other historical and monumental sources like inscriptions, architecture and arts, etc. Among the literary sources, the Pāli literature preserves the earliest and most authentic form of the teachings of the Buddha, whose prime inquiry is centered around the nature of human existence. Furthermore, based on the Tipiṭaka and developed up to the Atthakathās and the Tikās, this enormous literature has been maintained in a carefully designed and well coordinated form in the Pāli language, and is quite helpful in studying the entire picture of early Buddhism which embodies the Theravāda tradition.

With the Four Noble Truths (cattāri ariyasaccāni) as the focal point, the teachings of the Buddha reveal that His investigation is predominantly focused on the physical and mental phenomena of an individual. What he realizes through his own experience is the nature of dhammas in mutual relation to certain causes and conditions. Such nature of dhammas is reflected by the three characteristics, that is, anicca, dukkha and anattā which are repeatedly emphasized from the earliest literary stage of the Pāli literature. It is fundamentally aimed at the development of wisdom (paññā) by realization of the nature of dhammas. The supreme goal of Buddhism, as the Four Noble Truths signify, lies in the liberation from suffering (dukkha) and the development of wisdom is the only path to cut off the root of ignorance and craving, the two fundamental causes of suffering.
As a multi-meaningful term, dhamma\(^1\) has been characterized in various contexts. The definition 'nissatta-nijjiva'\(^2\) (the absence of a being or a soul) in the commentarial exegesis\(^3\) is of prime importance in our research. This meaning represents the nature of dhammas depicted from the early Sutta and the Abhidhamma\(^4\) onwards as 'certain phenomena' which are dependently arisen (paticcasamuppanna) by certain causes and conditions.

From the psycho-ethical standpoint, dhammas are technically categorized as threefold (i.e. kusala, akusala and abyākata) within the Abhidhamma perspective. These are technical devices of the Buddha's teachings for the realization of the nature of human existence. In a practical sense, the Buddha's teachings on kusala and akusala dhammas are the embodiment of instructions on the Four Noble Truths. In other words, the teachings of akusala dhammas are meant for removing the causes of suffering in the circle of transmigration while the teachings of kusala dhammas stand for strengthening the supporting factors of enlightenment technically represented as 'bodhipakkhiyadhammas'.\(^5\)

In this regard, the akusala dhammas, in the sense of obstructing spiritual progress, always bear negative values. However, as per its dual nature, the investigation on akusala dhammas is in a way a paradoxical approach to kusala dhammas. Both the approaches are crucial in understanding the true nature of dhammas.

Akusala dhammas are collectively defined as dhammas rooted in ignorance (avijjāmūlaka).\(^5\) The nature of akusala dhammas is specifically characterized from the

---

\(^1\) For a detailed discussion on dhamma, see EB IV, pp. 438-469.
\(^3\) The other definitions of dhammas:

- 'Attano lakkhanam dhārenti ti dhammā'\(^<\)MN-a I, p. 17>\(^>\)
- 'Attano pana sabbhāvam dhārenti ti dhammā. Dhāriyanti vā paccaeyhi, dhāriyanti vā yathāsabhāvato ti dhammā'\(^<\)Dhs-a p. 40>\(^>\)
- 'Sāmaṇṇam vā sabbhāvo vā dhammānām lakkhaṇam mataṃ'. \(^<\)Abhvt (Vri) p. 81>\(^>\)

\(^4\) For the general outline of the Abhidhamma perspective on 'dhammas', see Bhikkhu Bodhi, CMA, pp. 2-5. Also see Editor's introduction of Bhikkhu Bodhi in “Abhidhamma Studies” written by Nyanaponika Thera, pp. xv-xviii; Y. Karunadasa, “The Dhamma Theory”, pp. 3-27.

\(^5\) SN II, p. 263: ...ye keci akusalā dhammā sabbe te avijjāmūlakā avijjāsamosaranā.
earliest literary stage through various technical terms such as āsavas, upādānas, etc.

constituting their own specific concepts. These technical terms have been developed within
the categories of twelve akusala cittas and fourteen akusala cetasikas from the
Abhidhamma period onwards. The significance basically lies in the fact that understanding
the nature of these specific akusala dhammas represented by certain technical terms is

crucial in approaching kusala dhammas, and it is pivotal in realizing the nature of human
existence. In this regard, akusala dhammas would be, in a broader sense, referred to as a
counterpart of bodhipakkhiyadhammas, and their conceptual origins are primarily based
on the early literary sources. Therefore, “akusala dhammas in early Buddhism” are hereby
conceptually investigated in the sense of ‘psychological phenomena’ that bear negative
values in cultivating the spiritual progress as reflected in the Pāli sources of the Theravāda
tradition.

In the field of akusala dhammas, a scholastic attention has not been much paid till the
present day even though their significance is fundamentally related with the main purpose
of realizing the nature of dhammas and to achieve the ultimate goal, that is, nībbāna.

Its proximate reasons can be assumed as follows:

i) The negative values confine the akusala dhammas to the backseat against the

bodhipakkhiyadhammas that are much more emphasized in the process of wisdom.

ii) Even if one is interested in this particular field, he has to dive into the enormous

ocean of study to trace the original sources that are scattered far and wide in the

entire Pāli literature.

6 In the Dhammasangani commentary, the term akusala is explained to be the opposite to the term kusala
which is defined as follows:

"...kucchite pāpa ke dhamme salayanti calayanti kampenti viddhamseti ti kusalā. Kucchi tena va ākārena
sayanti ti kusā. Te akusalasankhāte kuse lunantti chindanti ti kusalā. Kucchi tāna va sānato tanakaranato
osānakaranato rōnaṁ kusam nāma. Tena kusena lāgabhi ti kusalā; gaheabhi pa vattetabhāti atto. Yathā
va kusā ubhayabhāgagatam hatthappadesam lunantti, evamipēti uppannānuppannabhāvena
ubhayabhāgagatam kilesapakkham lunanti. Tasmaṁ kusā viya lunantti tipi kusalā.

...Na kusalā akusalā. Mitrapakka bhūtā amittā viya, lobhādipakka bhūtā alobhādayo viya ca,
kusalapatipakkhāttho.”<see p. 39>
Against the backdrop of this situation, the field of akusala dhammas, particularly the conceptual investigation of certain technical terms of akusala dhammas, remains a new scope of study not attempted heretofore. Hence, the present thesis is an original attempt of this kind marking a new conceptual approach to the akusala dhammas.

My interest in this particular field has been developing through the years ever since Venerable Ho-jin, the former Prof. in the Department of Buddhist studies, Dongguk University (Korea), first hinted at the relation between suffering (dukkha) and defilements (kilesas) while I was pursuing the M.A. degree course (in Pāli). While reading the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya with Dr. J. R. Joshi, the present supervisor of this research, he rightly pointed out the fact that, unlike the Abhidharmakośa and its bhāṣya which systematize the category of kilesas under the concepts of anusayas, the Pāli canon specifically treats certain technical terms that distinguish them from kilesas. Hence the idea duly stemmed from the point that the conceptual approach to different technical terms would be an ideal investigation. Eventually, the methodology to approach this particular field was explained by my supervisor from the literary perspective. Any ideal view, if found in this thesis, is duly attributed to his wisdom.

The present study is solely related to certain technical terms of akusala dhammas with their specific nature. This thesis has been devoted to examine the conceptual aspects of the selected technical terms from the literary perspective of Theravāda Buddhism. The six terms chosen as the subject matter for inquiry in this regard are: āsāvas, upādānas, nīvaranās, samyojanas, anusayas and kilesas/upakkilesas. Before giving a brief outline of the history of the Pāli literature, I wish to specify the aims, methodology and sources of this research.
(1) Aims, methodology and sources

The aims of the present thesis can be short-listed as: (i) to trace the conceptual origin of the selected technical terms which are specifically applied to certain akusala dhammas, and to examine their conceptual development throughout different literary stages in the Pāli literature. It also aims at (ii) pursuing the unique nature of those technical terms in the categories of akusala dhammas and (iii) examining the conceptual affiliation between different technical terms. In observing the arising and abandoning of the concepts of each selected technical term, it is attempted (iv) to clarify as to how those technical terms bear positive values in approaching the kusala dhammas which lead to the ultimate emancipation from their counterpart akusala dhammas.

In order to trace the origin and gradual conceptual development of the selected technical terms, emphasis is given to presenting the literary sources, leaving room for a future study on the exclusive philosophical aspects. The investigation, since the Pāli literature evolved gradually, has been pursued as a whole through generally accepted chronological divisions.

The grammatical discussion and similes are presented at the outset as they reflect a general implication of each of the selected terms. Then, the origin of each of the selected technical terms is surfed through the selected gāthās presumably belonging to the oldest sources as well as the four Nikāyas. On this basis, the conceptual development is studied through the later texts belonging to the Khuddaka-nikāya, the Abhidhamma texts, the sub-canonical texts, and the commentaries. In the case of the Tikās, the references have been rather selective yet could not have been neglected while dealing with some ambiguous points.

The concepts of each of the selected technical terms have been traced independently and systematically with careful observation in different chapters. Therefore, the nature of the present thesis stands as an independent essay in respective chapters, but the concepts of
each technical term in different chapters are duly interrelated with regard to the *akusala dhammas*. This point has been supported by the cross-references in the footnotes.

Primary sources are solely based on the *Tipitaka*, the sub-canonical texts and the *Atthakathās* while the *Ṭikās* are selectively used. The *Abhidhammatthasangaha* and its *Vibhāvanī-ṭikā* are also selectively referred to in order to observe the latest views in relevant cases. Though the PTS edition is extensively used, the Vri. edition is taken into consideration as per the case may be. As for the secondary sources, references are made principally to available translations of the relevant primary sources along with some other related works.

(2) An outline of the literary history

As this study concerns the conceptual origin and development of certain *akusala dhammas* in the *Pāli literature*, it seems necessary to prefix a brief outline of the overall literary history of the *Theravāda* tradition. The discussion will focus precisely on the traditional classification and the related chronological divisions of the *Pāli literature* directly relevant to the present theme.

The *Pāli literature* is broadly classified into two groups: the *Pāli* canon and the non-canonical works. The third council held during the reign of Asoka is the point of demarcation between these two divisions. According to the *Theravāda* tradition, the compilation of the *Pāli* canon began immediately after the Buddha’s *Mahāparinibbāna* about 483 B.C., at the council of *Rājagaha*. In a hundred years’ time, there was an inflow of heretical views into the monastic disciplines, thus forcing a cleansing act with a second council held at *Vesālī*. The growing schisms among the *Sāṅgha* was the main reason behind the third council held under the patronage of Emperor *Asoka* (264-227 B.C.). By
this time, the Canon in all its essential parts seems to have been brought to a formal completion.\(^7\)

Scholars’ views on these traditions are varied.\(^8\) What they generally agree on is that the formation of the canon was practically completed during the reign of Asoka and it had been preserved with the oral tradition. The chronicles of Ceylon, the *Dīpavāmsa* and the *Mahāvamsa* inform us that the *Tipiṭaka*, along with its commentary, was written down on palm leaves in Ceylon during the reign of king *Vaṭṭagāmaṇि* in the first century B.C.\(^9\)

The *Pāli* canon consists of *Tipiṭaka* (three baskets) which is further classified as follows:

(i) *Vinaya-piṭaka*: *Suttavibhaṅga* (pārājika and pācittiya), *Khandhakas* (Mahāvagga and Cullavagga), and *Parivāra*.

(ii) *Sutta-piṭaka*: *Dīgha-nikāya*, *Majjhima-nikāya*, *Sāmyutta-nikāya*, *Aṅguttara-nikāya* and *Khuddaka-nikāya*;

*Khuddaka-nikāya*:\(^{10}\)

- *Khuddakapāṭha*, *Dhammapada*, *Udāna*, *Itivuttaka*, *Suttanipāta*
- *Vimānavatthu*, *Petavatthu*, *Theragāthā*, *Therīgāthā*, *Jātaka*, *Niddesa*, *Patisambhidāmagga*, *Apadāna*, *Buddhavaṃsa* and *Cariyāpiṭaka*.

(iii) *Abhidhamma-piṭaka*: *Dhammasaṅgani*, *Vibhaṅga*, *Dhātukathā*, *Puggalapaññatti*, *Kathāvatthu*, *Yamaka* and *Paṭṭhāna*\(^{11}\)

---

\(^7\) Wilhelm Geiger, *PLL*, p. 9.


\(^9\) See below fn.36.

\(^{10}\) For the different order of the books belonging to the *Khuddaka-nikāya*, which is accepted by the *Dīgha- and Majjhima-bhānakas*, see Oskar von Hinüber, *HPL*, p. 42.

\(^{11}\) This is the order of the books in *Abhidhammapiṭaka* given in the records of the *Theravādins*. The Chinese recension of the *Samantapasādikā* gives the following order: (1)*Dhammasaṅgani*, (2)*Vibhaṅga*, (3)*Dhātukathā*, (4)*Yamaka*, (5)*Paṭṭhāna*, (6)*Puggalapaññatti* and (7)*Kathāvatthu*. See Étienne Lamotte *HIB*, pp. 181-182; M. Winternitz, *HIL*, p. 157, fn. 338\(^8\).
The *Vinaya-pitaka* contains the rules and regulations of the Buddhist Order. The *Suttavibhaṅga* is an old commentary of the *Pātimokkha* which certainly belongs to the oldest constituents of the Buddhist literature. The *Khandhakas* form a kind of supplement to the *Sutta-vibhaṅga*. The both had a lengthy process of development with mutual influence. The *Parivāra* is a later addition in Ceylon. Not surprisingly, the *Vinaya-pitaka* is more or less irrelevant to this study apart from one or two passages, yet still important.

The *Sutta-pitaka*, divided into the five *Nikāyas*, is the cardinal source of our knowledge of the teachings of the Buddha. The first four *Nikāyas* mainly comprise of the discourses of the Buddha and His discussions with disciples and heretics alike. The last *Nikāya* differs from the first four because it comprises of a large number of heterogeneous texts. The four *Nikāyas* are the collections of a large number of *suttas* in diverse nature and types. Even though the four *Nikāyas* contain early and later stratifications, they represent, by and large, the early phase of the *Pāli* literature. Likewise, out of the *Khuddaka-nikāya* texts, the *Suttanipāta*, the *Udāna*, the *Dhammapada*, the *Theragāthā*, the * Therīgāthā*, etc. are generally regarded as the oldest parts of the *Pāli* canon. The *Niddesas* (Mahā-and Cūla) and the *Paṭisambhidāmagga* of the *Khuddaka-nikāya* are regarded as later works apparently due to their late literary features.

The *Mahā-niddesa* is a commentary upon the *Atthakavagga* of the *Suttanipāta* while the *Cūla-niddesa* is a commentary of the *Pārāyanavagga* and the *Khaggavisāna-sutta* of the same text. Referring to S. Lévi who suggests its date as the second century A.D. with

---

13 Wilhelm Geiger, PLL, p. 16.
15 In his book “Studies in the Origin of Buddhism” (1957), G. C. Pande has attempted to investigate a chronological stratification of the *Nikāya* material.
17 See Wilhelm Geiger, PLL, pp. 19-22.
18 Oskar von Hinüber, HPL, p. 58.
certain geographical data, K. R. Norman argues that the beginning of the third century B.C. would be the probable date of its composition. The *Patisambhidāmagga* belongs rather to the *Abhidhamma* literature both in form and contents even though it quotes some passages from the *Vinaya-piṭaka* and the *Sutta-piṭaka*. With regard to the literary features of the *Patisambhidāmagga*, A.K. Warder considers that it is probably not all of the same date; it may have grown mostly by accretion of treatises, but surely it had also grown organically with some expansion of its *mātikās*. He further figures out the hypothetical date to be from B.C. 349 up to B.C. 100. Oskar von Hübner regards the *Patisambhidāmagga* as the only *Abhidhamma* text; it was included in the *Khuddaka-nikāya* because it was composed too late (perhaps 2nd century A.D.) to be included into the *Abhidhamma-piṭaka* which had already been closed by then.

The *Abhidhamma-piṭaka*, consisting of seven books, is considered as relatively later than the *Sutta-piṭaka* and the *Vinaya-piṭaka*; it evolved out of the *Mātikās* and is a systematization and development of the doctrines of the *Suttas* and the *Vinaya*; their growth belongs to the Post *Nikāya* period. As per the tradition, six other books along with the *Kathāvatthu*, existed already in the 3rd century B.C. and were duly incorporated in the *Theravāda* canon.

---

19 K.R. Norman, Pl., p. 86. Oskar von Hübner remarks: it is, however, certain that *Niddesa* do not belong to the old canonical texts and that also a date after *Aśoka* does not seem unlikely. See Oskar von Hübner, HPL, p. 59.
21 See POD, pp. xxix-xxxix.
22 Oskar von Hübner, HPL, pp. 59-60.
24 G.C. Pande, SOB, p. 2. Oskar von Hübner states, “the *Abhidhamma-piṭaka* is considerably younger than both *Vinaya*- and *Sutta-piṭaka*, and originated, according to Frauwallner, between 200 BC and 200 AD”. See HPL, p. 64.
With regard to the sub-canonical texts, the *Nettipakaraṇa* and the *Peṭakopadesa* are treatises on the textual and exegetical methodology. The literary features of both the texts are similar with the subjects schematically designed while illustrating them with quotations from the canonical texts. However, the Burmese Buddhists include both the texts along with the *Milinda-pañha* into the *Khuddaka-nikāya*. According to tradition, they were composed by *Mahākaccāyana*, one of the most prominent disciples of the Buddha. The scholars, however, consider that this is certainly not true. As for the origin of these two works, considering both the internal and external evidences, E. Hardy assigns them a date about the beginning of the Christian era. Bhikkhu ṁnāṇamoli considers the *Nettipakaraṇa* as older than the 5th century A.D. since Ācariya Buddhaghosa does quote from the *Nettipakaraṇa*, and apparently from the *Peṭakopadesa*. Oskar von Hinüber argues that the *Nettipakaraṇa* and the *Peṭakopadesa* were intruded from outside into the *Theravāda* as handbooks to understand and to explain Suttaṇas. The *Milinda-pañha* is another sub-canonical text and contains a dialogue between the King *Milinda* and the *Thera Nāgasena* that represents the orthodox *Theravādin* point of view. In comparison to the Chinese version composed between 100 B.C. and 200 A.D., the scholars consider that the first three chapters are original and the remaining four chapters were completed by the time of the *Āṭṭhakathās* also quoting from those chapters.

The commentaries are the outcome of a substantial development based on the older sources. At the beginning of several of his commentaries, Ācariya Buddhaghosa states that the *Āṭṭhakathās* were recited at the first council and the subsequent councils, and

---

26 B.C. Law, HOPL, p. 344.  
28 Étienne Lamotte, HIB, p. 159.  
30 Ibid.  
32 Oskar von Hinüber, HPL, p. 82.  
33 Wilhelm Geiger, PLL, pp. 26-27.  
34 Oskar von Hinüber, HPL, pp. 85-86. See also K.R. Norman, PL, pp. 110-114.
afterwards brought out to Ceylon by Mahinda (the third century B.C.) and were translated into the Sinhalese language for the benefit of the inhabitants of the island.\(^\text{35}\) It is also said that the commentaries were put into writing in Ceylon along with the Pāli canon during the reign of Vattagāmanī Abhaya in the first century B.C.\(^\text{36}\)

Scholars usually accept these traditional accounts on the origin of the Atthakathā with certain reservations. The present version of the Pāli commentaries was probably not fixed, as it is at the first council itself. However, equivocal points must have been definitely discussed and clarified with definite expositions and meanings to be attached to them. These interpretations would have formed the basis of the commentaries of later times.\(^\text{37}\)

They have been gradually developed through the second and third councils. The commentaries that Mahinda brought to Ceylon along with the canon probably consisted of the completed version at the Third Council. After their arrival at Ceylon, the Atthakathās were translated into Sinhala language and they were received extensive treatment and further development at the hands of the Ceylonese monks. It was this commentarial literature that Buddhaghosa and others later translated into Pāli\(^\text{38}\)

The Pāli commentaries are to be dated at the first half of the fifth century AD.\(^\text{39}\) Most of the commentaries beginning with the Visuddhimagga were, on the base of the Mahāvihāra tradition, composed by Buddhaghosa who came to Ceylon during the reign of king Mahānāma (406-28 A.D.).\(^\text{40}\) Buddhadatta, who wrote the commentary of the Buddhavamsa


\(^\text{36}\) L.R. Goonesekere notes that this account occurs in the chronicles of Ceylon, the Dipavaṃsa and the Mahāvamsa. See BCL, p. 2. Also see K. R. Norman, PL, p. 10.

\(^\text{37}\) K.R. Norman states, the existence of the Old commentary in the Vinaya-piṭaka and the canonical status of the Nīdāsas prove that some sort of exegesis was felt to be needed at a very early stage of Buddhism. See PL, p. 119.


\(^\text{39}\) L.R. Goonesekere, BCL, p. 15. Also cf. K. R. Norman, PL, p. 130.

\(^\text{40}\) Ibid. There are different views on the date of king Mahānāma. See Wilhelm Geiger, PLL, p. 28; Oskar von Hinüber, HPL, p. 102.
and others, was supposedly contemporary to Buddhaghosa.\textsuperscript{41} The \textit{Paṭisambhidāmagga} commentary entitled as \textit{Saddhāmappakāsini}, and the \textit{Niddesa} commentary, the \textit{Saddhāmappajotikā} are ascribed to Mahānāma and Upasena respectively, who are dated in the sixth century A.D.\textsuperscript{42} Dhammapāla is another figure who wrote a commentary upon the \textit{Nettipakaraṇa}, and upon the commentaries called \textit{Paramatthadīpanī} which are comprised of (i) \textit{Udāna}, (ii) \textit{Itivuttaka}, (iii) \textit{Petavatthu}, (iv) \textit{Vimānavatthu}, (v) \textit{Theragāthā}, (vi) \textit{Therīgāthā} and (vii) \textit{Cariyāpiṭaka}.\textsuperscript{43} K. R. Norman assumes that Dhammapāla composed his works in about the middle of the sixth century A.D.\textsuperscript{44}

(See Appendix I for the authors of the commentaries of the \textit{Pāli} canon)

The \textit{Tikās} are called secondary commentaries. It is stated that the \textit{ṭikās} came to be written after a conference held under the presidency of the \textit{Thera} Mahā-kassapa with the patronage of king Parakkamabāhu I (A.D. 1153-86), but there is an evidence for the existence of \textit{ṭikās} at a much earlier date than this. In his commentary upon the \textit{Udāna}, Dhammapāla refers to a \textit{ṭikā} upon the \textit{Kathāvatthu}. It is said that Ānanda was the first to write the \textit{ṭikās}. This has been understood as a reference to Ānanda’s \textit{Mūla-ṭikās} upon the \textit{Abhidhamma-piṭaka}. Dhammapāla was the author of the \textit{ṭikās} upon the \textit{Visuddhimagga}, and the other \textit{ṭikās} on the \textit{Dīgha-nikāya} and three other \textit{Nikāyas} along with the \textit{ṭikā} on the \textit{Nettipakaraṇa}.\textsuperscript{45}

As a later \textit{Abhidhamma} text, the \textit{Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha} is attributed to Anuruddha, supposedly a Ceylonese monk. His date is assumed to the end of the eleventh century or to the beginning of the twelfth century A.D. The \textit{Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī-ṭikā} was written

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid. p. 16.
\textsuperscript{42} K.R. Norman, PL, pp. 132-133.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid. pp. 133-134.
\textsuperscript{44} Ibid. p. 137.
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid. pp. 148-149.
by Sumangalasami, a pupil of the eminent Sri Lankan elder Sāriputta Mahāsāmi, who is also dated in the twelfth century.\(^{46}\)

As has been briefly discussed so far, the Pāli literature has a very long lineage of relative chronology comprising of compilations and compositions from the fifth century B.C. onwards (see Appendix II for the relative chronology of the Pāli literature). Even if the scholars have attempted to provide a detailed chronology of the evolution of the Pāli literature, there are diverse views on various points. Besides, we are aware of the fact that there are certain passages and suttas definitely older than certain others, and it would be unsound simply to isolate them. As R.M.L Gethin states, we do not know whether the Buddhist tradition ever regarded precisely these texts as embodying a proper or meaningful expression of 'Buddhism'.\(^{47}\)

Thus, the Pāli texts for the present study are divided into five groups which are generally accepted for the convenient treatment of the conceptual investigation of the selected technical terms: (i) the four primary Nikāyas (ii) the Khuddaka-nikāya (principally focused on the later texts), (iii) the Abhidhamma texts (iv) the sub-canonical texts and (v) the commentaries along with the tikās, etc.

\(^{46}\) Bhikkhu Bodhi, CMA, pp. 15-17.
\(^{47}\) R.M.L Gethin, BPA, p. 15.