

Having explained *arising by causal condition*, the Buddha, goes on to explain *dharmas arisen by causal condition*. According to SN 12. 20 he says:<sup>15</sup>

And what, bhiksus, are *dharmas arisen by causal condition*?

Ageing-and-death is impermanent (aniccaṃ), compounded (saṅkhaṭṭaṃ), arisen by causal condition (paṭicca-samuppannaṃ), having the nature of destruction (khayadhammaṃ), having the nature of decay (vayadhammaṃ), having the nature of fading away (virāgadhammaṃ), having the nature of cessation (nirodhadhammaṃ).

Bhiksus, birth, becoming, attachment, craving, feeling, contact, the six sense spheres, name-and-material form, consciousness, activities, ignorance – each of these too is impermanent, compounded, arisen by causal condition, having the nature of destruction, of decay, of fading away, of cessation. These, bhiksus, are called *dharmas arisen by causal condition*.

The corresponding SA 296 is rather different:<sup>16</sup>

What are *dharmas arisen by causal condition*? They are: ignorance, activities, ... Arising thus according to causal condition (隨順緣起),<sup>17</sup> these are called *dharmas arisen by causal condition*, that is to say: ignorance, activities, consciousness, name-and-material form, the six sense spheres, contact, feeling, craving, attachment, becoming, birth, ageing-sickness-death, [along with] grief, lamentation, pain, distress and despair. These are called *dharmas arisen by causal condition*.

Thus, the SA version merely says that *dharmas arisen by causal condition* are the twelve factors, while SN 12. 20 adds that each of the twelve is “impermanent, compounded, arisen by causal condition, having the nature of destruction, of decay, of fading away, of cessation”. The shared teaching is, then, that *dharmas arisen by causal condition* (paṭicca-samuppannā dhammā) are the twelve factors themselves.

15 SN ii, p. 26.

16 T 2, p. 84b (CSA ii, p. 35).

17 Skt. pratīyasamutpādānulomatā, Tripāṭhī, p.149.

Finally, both versions have the Buddha state the effect of fully knowing *arising by causal condition* and *dharmas arisen by causal condition*:

SN 12. 20<sup>18</sup>SA 296<sup>19</sup>

Now, bhiksus, because the noble disciple has, by right insight (*sammāpaññāya*), well seen (*sudittā*) as they really are (*yathā-bhūtam*) both *arising by causal condition* and *dharmas arisen by causal conditions*, it surely never happens that he will run back to the past, thinking: Did I indeed exist in time past? Did I indeed not exist in time past? What did I indeed exist as in time past? How did I indeed exist in time past? From being what did I indeed become what in time past?

Or that he will run toward the future, thinking: Shall I indeed exist in future time? Shall I indeed not exist in future time? As what shall I indeed exist in future time? How shall I indeed exist in future time? From being what, shall I indeed become what in future time?

Or that he will now become uncertain within himself as to the present time, thinking: Do I indeed exist? Do I indeed not exist? As what do I indeed exist? How do I indeed exist? From where did this being (i.e. I) come? Where will it go?

Now, bhiksus, because the much learned noble disciple has, by right insight (正智), well seen (善見)<sup>20</sup> both the *dharma of arising by causal condition* and *dharmas arisen by causal condition*, he will not look backwards into time past, saying: Did I exist in time past, or did I not? What was I in time past? How was I in time past?

Nor he will look toward to future time: Shall I exist in future time, or shall I not? What shall I be? How shall I be?

Nor does he inwardly hesitate (be uncertain within himself), thinking: What is this (i.e. I)? Why does it exist? Who was this in the past? What will it become in the end? Where do all these beings come from? What will they become when they die?

18 SN ii, pp. 26-27.

19 T 2, p. 84b-c (CSA ii, p. 35). Cf. Tripāṭhī, pp. 150-151.

20 The Skt. terms are: *samyakprajñāyā*, *sudṛṣṭā* (Tripāṭhī, p. 150).

	<p>If in a recluse or a brahmin there arise worldly views (凡俗見), namely view connected with self (我見所繫), view connected with a being (衆生見所繫), view connected with a soul/life (壽命見所繫), view connected with auspicious rituals and ceremonies (忌諱吉慶見所繫),<sup>21</sup> then these are completely cut off, completely known; they are cut off at the root, like the cut-off stump of a palm-tree, never to arise again in the future.</p>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Thus, the SA version in the first three sections states almost the same as the SN version, but then continues into a fourth section. It is possible that this extra section in SA 296 represents a later addition. What the two versions say in common is that one who has fully known both *arising by causal condition* and *dharmas arisen by causal condition* is no longer assailed by doubts about his existence in the three times (past, future, and present).

In summary, the versions agree regarding the identity of *arising by causal condition* and of *dharmas (or phenomena) arisen by causal condition*. Although there are some unshared components, the two versions show no evidence of significant sectarian divergence.

## 2. The summary formula

The teaching of *arising by causal condition* is frequently presented in the following short formula:

This existing, that comes to exist  
 (imasmim sati idaṃ hoti);  
 From the arising of this, that arises  
 (imassuppādā idaṃ uppajjati);

---

21 The Skt. terms are: pṛthalloke dṛṣṭigatāni, ātmavāda-pratisaṃyuktāni, sattvavāda-pratisaṃyuktāni, jīvavāda-pratisaṃyuktāni, kotūhalamaṅgalavāda-pratisaṃyuktāni (Tripāṭhī, p. 151).