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[MN 24:14.1–14.2](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY) M I 145
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Sunyo 2021
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For example Ñāṇananda 2016 p.71: “What the Arahants have done is to bring consciousness to such a state where it gets no footing on name-and-form. In other words, it is the state of unestablished consciousness (appatiṭṭhita viññaṇa).”
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For example Harvey 1995 p.202, Ṭhānissaro 2008a p.118, Pasanno p.155, Cintita p.179
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See Bodhi 2000 p.840 “The five aggregates are so called because they each unite under one label a multiplicity of phenomena that share the same defining characteristic.”
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[SN 22.82:6.1–6.7](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [MN 109:8.1–8.7](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY) M III 17
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For example [SN 22.59:10.1](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)
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As Ṭhānissaro 2018 p.6
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[MN 49:25.1](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY) M I 330. For a discussion see Sunyo 2021
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See [SN 22.56:13.1–14.2](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), where in context of the five aggregates, the aggregate of consciousness is also defined as that of the six senses.
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[SN 12.2:12.1–12.4](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 12.27:3.9](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 12.28:3.9](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 12.33:9.9](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)

12

[SN 56.28](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY) explains: “They are called ‘noble one’s truths’ (ariya-sacca), because in this world […] the Truth­finder (tathāgata) is the noble one (ariya).” Norman 1997 p.16 wrote: “My own feeling is that it is very likely that ‘the truth of the noble one (the Buddha)’ is the correct translation.” See also Norman 2008 and Harvey 2009
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Tatra tatra, ‘in various realms’. [MN 2:8.8](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY) and [MN 38:5.11](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY) use tatra tatra (more literally ‘in various places’) explicitly for rebirth in different realms. That this is also the intended meaning in the second truth is indicated by it being about the craving that leads to a next life. Sujato 2023 translates “in various different realms”.
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[SN 56.13:3.1–3.4](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)
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See also Piyadassi p.5, Bodhi 1984 p.5 n.2, Bodhi 2015 p.19

16

[AN 3.61:15.1–15.14](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)

17

Paṭiccasamuppādaṁ, ‘the dependent arising of things’. By this I mean the actual principles existing in nature, rather than the Buddha’s teachings on these principles, which I call ‘Dependent Arising’.

The term is sometimes translated as ‘dependent co-arising’, but the prefix saṁ- in samuppāda is simply a redundancy for the following prefix up- (=ud-). As PED says under saṁ-: “very often merely pleonastic, esp. in comb[inatio]n with other prefixes.” Therefore, under samuppajjati it simply has, “to arise, to be produced”. No other dictionary suggests ‘co-arising’ either. To give some examples of the word samuppāda in a daily-life context: [SN 3.25:2.14](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY) mentions the arising (samuppanne) of a great peril, namely a mountain that crushes everything; [AN 8.54:6.1, 6.7, 7.1, 7.7](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY) mentions wealth that has arisen (samuppannānaṁ); [Kp 8:1.3](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYYhttps://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato%23YYY) mentions the arising (samuppanne) of a need to use stored up wealth; [Thag 1.30:1.3](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY) mentions the arising (samuppanno) of sickness; and [Iti 43:3.1](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY) uses ‘arisen’ (samuppannaṁ) as a synonym for ‘born’ (jātaṁ) and ‘came to be’ (bhūtaṁ). We do not speak of a co-arising of sickness or wealth, nor does there seem to be a good justification, certainly not on a linguistic basis, to speak of a co-arising of death, for instance. Samupajjati is simply a synonym for upajjati, including in the context of Dependent Arising. There is also no such thing as “saṁ-nirodha” (“co-cessation”) but only nirodha (cessation), which indicates “co-” is not intended in samuppāda either. See also Jones 2021 p.234: “When translating the expression paṭicca-samuppāda in the Pāli Canon, it therefore seems inappropriate to use words like ‘co-arising’ or ‘co-production’.” Schmithausen 1997 n.73 similarly concluded: “It is not probable that the prefix saṁ- was, from the outset, intended to convey such a heavy meaning.”
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[MN 28:28.5–28.9](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY) M I 191
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[SN 22.5:2.1–4.10](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)
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[SN 22.30](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)

21

As glossed by PED, CPD, CPED, DOP, DPD. I translate it as ‘production’ primarily to illustrate the simile of the painter, which uses the same word for producing a painting. See also note 166
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For example Bodhi 2012, [AN 10.65](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)
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[Ud 8.9:5.1–5.4](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)

24

For the meaning of ‘fuel’ see for example [SN 44.9:6.5–6.6](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY): “When a being laid down their body and is not yet reborn in another body, I say craving is their fuel (upādāna), because craving is what fuels them at that time.” For the meaning of ‘taking up’ see for example [MN 75:24.6–24.8](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY) M I 512: “I have long been tricked, cheated, and deceived by this mind. For what I have been taking up was just form, sensation, perception, will, and consciousness. And dependent on that taking up (upādāna) of mine, there was existence.”

25

For the ten powers and four reasons to be self-confident see [MN 12:9.1–27.1](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY) M I 69
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[SN 12.21](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)
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Imasmiṁ sati idaṁ hoti, ‘There will be this (idaṁ hoti), only if there is that (imasmiṁ sati)’. The clause imasmiṁ sati forms a locative absolute. There have been discussions whether this implies that the factors of Dependent Arising happen simultaneously or whether it allows for a separation in time (e.g. Brahmavamso 2002). But this misses the fact that the locative absolute, although it can have temporal connotations, can also form a conditional. Wijesekera 1993 §184 states: “the temporal notion is not the only idea expressed by the loc[ative] absolute. […] It may also signify a condition that exists or should exist for the fulfilment of the main action, which may be rendered by such expressions as ‘if, on condition, provided that’ etc.” See also Duroiselle §603 iii: “Sati, the locative singular of santo […] may also often be translated by ‘if, such being the case’.” This conditional meaning applies here. The clause imasmiṁ sati describes a general principle of dependency without any temporal implications.

By “a condition that exists or should exist” Wijesekera means the locative absolute can denote either a sufficient or a necessary condition. A necessary condition can be indicated with ‘provided that’, as Wijesekera suggests, but also with ‘only if’, as I have done. It is a subtle difference, but I think imasmiṁ sati idaṁ hoti should not be translated as “there will be this if there is that” (omitting ‘only’), because this forms a sufficient condition, and sufficiency does not apply to all the links—yet this statement is individually applied to all links, as in §11.

To give a general example first, “there will be rain if there are clouds” would mean it always rains whenever there are clouds. Clouds are sufficient for rain. However, “there will be rain only if there are clouds”, just means it cannot rain without clouds. Clouds are necessary for rain. In the context of Dependent Arising “there will be craving if there are sensations” would mean there will be craving whenever there are sensations. Sensations would be sufficient for craving. This is incorrect, because enlightened beings still experience sensations yet don’t have craving, and even when you’re not enlightened, you can experience sensations without craving, like in deep meditation. However, the translation “there will be craving only if there are sensations” instead means sensations are just a necessary condition for craving. Likewise, birth is not a sufficient condition for old age, since beings can die young. So there will be old age only if there is birth, not if there is birth. Or, if in §83 we were to translate the mutual dependency between consciousness and the immaterial aspects and body as “there will be the immaterial aspects and body if there is consciousness [and] there will be consciousness if there are the immaterial aspects and body”, we would technically say that the two factors keep each other in existence, since there are two statements of sufficiency. However, “there will the immaterial aspects and body only if there is consciousness [and] there will be consciousness only if there are the immaterial aspects and body” leaves room for ignorance and wilful actions to also be required. This mutual dependency is of course exactly what the simile of the bundles of reeds portrays (§95). The idea is that one bundle can stand only if the other stands; not that if one stands, the other also stands automatically.

Furthermore, if the links in Dependent Arising were translated as sufficient conditions (that is, using ‘if’ instead of ‘only if’) technically there could also be other sufficient conditions that lead to the same results. For example, wilful actions could then logically have been the result of something other than ignorance—knowledge, let’s say. For it would then be possible to say: “There will be wilful actions if there is ignorance, and there will be wilful actions if there is knowledge.” With ‘only if’ this does not work (as it shouldn’t): “There will be wilful actions only if there is ignorance, and there will be wilful actions only if there is knowledge.” The two statements conflict, because they are necessary conditions with opposing requirements. The whole point of the sequence of dependent arising is that all links are necessary conditions. Otherwise suffering could technically have been brought about through something other than ignorance.

The underlying issue is, this difference between ‘if’ and ‘only if’ does not exist in Pāli. The locative absolute can be translated as either, depending on the context. However, the context of Dependent Arising demands the latter. It demands necessary conditions. See also Jayatilleke p.449 on this phrase: “B does not occur unless A is present and occurs *only* when A is present.” (emphasis added)
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See also Shulman p.299

29

More literally, ‘dependency (paccayatā) on something (idap)’. The term idappaccayatā is sometimes translated as ‘causality’, which may work too. However, to many people ‘to cause’ means “to actively produce as a result” (Wiktionary.com s.v. ‘cause’)—think of billiard balls bouncing against one another—and in context of Dependent Arising this kind of causality does not always apply. Birth does not actively produce death, for example. It is heart attacks and car crashes that do so, arguably. Neither do sensations actively produce craving: it is ignorance that does. Also, consciousness and nāmarūpa, which are mutually dependent, do not cause one another in an active way. They just rely on one another, as the simile of the reeds at §95 illustrates, both being in a sense “actively produced” by wilful actions. Jones 2022 p.135 agreed: “To understand them as a causal sequence, whereby ignorance is the cause of the inherited conditioning factors (saṅkhārā), feeling (vedanā) is the cause of craving, birth is the cause of ageing and death, and so on, leads to obscurity and contradiction. But to understand each of these conditionally-arisen phenomena as necessary and sometimes sufficient conditions for the arising of the next in the sequence allows for interpretations that are truer to the teachings.”

In everyday contexts the words paṭicca and paccaya also do not indicate what we normally call ‘causes’. It is said that the body depends on (paṭicca) food, and will die without it. ([SN 46.2:1.2](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYYhttps://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato%23YYY)) Food is not the cause of the body: it is just one condition necessary for its continuance. In context of Dependent Arising itself, the Longer Discourse on the Ending of Craving mentions that fire depends on (paṭicca) fuel. (§102) Fuel by itself does not really cause fire either. As to paccaya, a noble disciple is said to be ‘not dependent on others’ (aparappaccaya). These and other everyday uses of the words also indicate that Dependent Arising is about dependencies, not causalities, at least not in the way the word ‘cause’ is sometimes understood.

The word nidāna is sometimes also translated as ‘cause’, particularly in the title of the Mahānidāna Sutta, then called ‘The Great Discourse on Causality’. But a common translation for the word itself is ‘source’, which I think is more accurate. See for example Sujato 2023 at [AN 3.34](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), Nidāna Sutta, titled ‘Sources’. As another example, discourses stemming from Sāvatthi are called Sāvatthi-nidānaṁ. In this light, the Mahānidāna Sutta should be called something like ‘The Great Discourse on the Sources [of things]’, although that definitely doesn’t sound as good. Schmithausen 2000 calls it the Great Discourse on the Underlying Factors (*Großen Lehrrede von den zugrundeliegenden Factoren*). In this book I just refer to the discourse by its Pāli name.

All that said, ‘causality’ is not wrong per se. There are various ways to define the term, some of which do not differ much from dependency, if at all. Pragmatically the difference between the two may have limited relevance as well, because whether we say death depends on birth or death is caused by birth, the fundamental problem remains the same. Many of the links are also causal no matter how we interpret it. I also use the word ‘cause’ in the main text, although in the translations I stuck to ‘condition’ for hetu and ‘requirement’ for paccaya. The words have a range of meaning that does not match a single English word, so these translations are not applicable throughout the canon, but they do work in the present context.
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See also Brahmavamso 2002
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[DN 15:1.8](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY) D II 55
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[SN 12.10](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)
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[SN 12.23:4.3–4.5](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)
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See Collins p.109
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[Wikipedia s.v. ‘presentism’](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Presentism_(historical_analysis)).
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Norman 1997 p.21
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For traditional interpretations see for example Wayman 1971
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Vism 523. See also Nyanatiloka p.7
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For example Frauwallner 1953/1973 p.156 & 167, Bernhard p.56, Wayman 1971 p.186, Collins p.108, Vetter 1988 p.46, Vetter 1994, Mejor p.123, Schmithausen 2000 p.45, Jurewicz p.177, Ronkin n.43 p.238, Shulman p.89 n.71, Gombrich 2009 p.138
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Vetter 1988 p.46
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Bernhard p.56, translation mine
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[MĀ 97](https://suttacentral.net/ma97), [T 14](https://suttacentral.net/t14), and [T 52](https://suttacentral.net/t52). As also observed by Vetter 1994
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[DĀ 13](https://suttacentral.net/da13)
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[SN 12.43](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYYhttps://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato%23YYY)

45

Arguing for a late construction of the twelvefold sequence are for example Vetter 1994 and Bucknell. On the other hand, Frauwallner 1953/1973 p.156, although he suggests two separate sequences were later joined together, believes it was the Buddha who did so. Wayman 1971 p.185 is also of this opinion.
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See Bernhard
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Vism 525
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See also Ronkin n.43 p.238
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See for example SN 15 on transmigration having no discernable beginning. For the synonymity see for example [AN 3.66:11.1–13.1](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY): “‘Salha, is there delusion?’—‘Yes, venerable sir.’—‘That is what I mean by ignorance.’”
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[Snp 3.12:12.1–13.4](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)
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[Iti 14](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)

52

The meaning of ‘craving as a spouse’ is explained in [SN 35.63](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY): like the mendicant wanderers should be solitary, without a spouse, they should dwell free from craving.
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[Iti 15](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)

54

Avijjānīvaraṇānaṁ sattānaṁ taṇhāsaṁyojanānaṁ sandhāvataṁ saṁsarataṁ, more literally ‘the transmigration and roaming around of beings who are obstructed by ignorance and chained by craving’, for in example §33, [SN 15.1](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 15.2](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 15.3](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 15.4](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 15.5](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 15.6](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 15.7](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 15.8](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 15.9](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 15.10](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 15.11](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 15.12](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 15.13](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 15.14](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 15.15](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 15.16](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 15.17](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 15.18](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 15.19](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 15.20](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), and [SN 56.33](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)
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§24; §108
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[DN 33:1.9.5](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY) D III 212. See also [SN 45.159:2.7](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [AN 4.254:3.2](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [MN 149:11.6](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY) M III 289
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[AN 4.50:9.1–12.4](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)
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The four knots are explained in [DN 33:1.11.169–1.11.170](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY) as longing, ill will, attachment to precepts and observances, and dogmatism.
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[Thag 10.5:5.1–10.4](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)
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For example §62, [Dhp 337](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [Dhp 338](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)
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§26, §79. See also [SN 12.11](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), which first goes through the ignorance sequence in reverse order, from sensations back to ignorance, but then through the whole twelvefold sequence in forward order, from ignorance down to old age and death.

62

[AN 10.62:1.1–2.3](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)
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For example in [SN 15.1–SN 15.20](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)
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[SN 7.18:5.1–5.4](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)

65

See for example [SN 12.24:4.1](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY): “The Buddha said suffering arises dependently. Dependent on what? Dependent on sense impressions.” Or [Snp 3.12:21.3](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY): “Whatever suffering there may be, all comes to be dependent on sense impression.”
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Bodhi 2000 p.520
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As e.g. Ñāṇavīra p.19, Ñāṇananda 2015 p.56, Brasington p.67, Jones 2009 p.244. See Bodhi 1998 p.172 for a further response to such ideas.
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For example Harvey 2013 p.71, Jones 2011 p.73, Amaro p.44

69

[MN 141:11.1–11.3](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY) M III 249 and [MN 9:24-26.2–24-26.9](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY) M I 50. Also in the Mahā­sati­paṭ­ṭhā­na Sutta, [DN 22:18.3–18.5](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY) D II 305
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[SN 12.2:3.1–4.3](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY). Similar at [SN 12.27:2.1–3.1](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 12.28:2.1–3.1](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 12.33:3.1–4.2, 9.1](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)
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For the translation of the discourse title see note 29
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[DN 15:4.1–4.4](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY) D II 57
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See Dhammika 2022 p.58
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[DN 14:2.18.2–2.18.3](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY) D II 26. Also at [SN 12.4](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY). The other Buddhas have the same reflections at [SN 12.5](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 12.6](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 12.7](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 12.8](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 12.9](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 12.10](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)

75

The dual explanation of bhava is found e.g. at Vism 571. In contrast, Vism 414 explains ‘birth’ as the continuity of the khandhas in a single existence (ekabhava) ending with death, where bhava doesn’t include karma. See also Bodhi 2000 n.4 at [SN 12.2](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY).

76

Shulman n.18. One of the earliest scholars to equate bhava to existence in English scholarship was Thomas 1933/1953 p.61: “It is this grasping after the things (upādāna) [which results in] passing into a new existence (bhava).”

77

Schmithausen 2000 p.52
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Bodhi 2012 n.503 at [AN 3.76](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY) (§71). See also Rhys Davids p.53, referring to the same text: “Bhava [here] is meant to convey the more special concrete sense both of a particular span of life and of a particular world or mode of existence wherein that span is lived.”
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[SN 12.2:5.1–5.4](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 12.27:3.2](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 12.28:3.2](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [SN 12.33:9.2](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)
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[Arv 5](https://suttacentral.net/arv5)
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[MĀ 97](https://suttacentral.net/ma97), similar at [T 14](https://suttacentral.net/t14)
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[AN 4.131:3.1](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYYhttps://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato%23YYY)
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See Somaratne p.142 and note 479
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MMK 26.8, using the Sanskrit form skandha instead.
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[Thag 2.1:1.1–1.4](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)
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[MN 127:9.1–9.11](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY) M III 147
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[Kp 6:9.1–9.4](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY), [Snp 2.1:9.1–9.4](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)
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[Iti 44:5.5–5.6](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)
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See Sunyo 2022
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[SN 12.64](https://suttacentral.net/XXX/en/sujato" \l "YYY)

91
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