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Abstract

Patience and Forgiveness:
The Meaning of Kṣānti (Pali: Khanti) in the Mahābhārata and the Pali Canon

Mansi Agrawal
2021

This dissertation explores the meaning of the Sanskrit term kṣānti in the Mahābhārata and the Pali term khanti in the Pali Canon. There is considerable debate and confusion within the scholarly community as to what these terms mean, and scholars have chosen to translate the verbal root from which they derive using a wide range of terms: “be patient,” “forgive,” “tolerate,” “endure,” “suffer,” “pardon,” “forbear,” “wait,” “allow,” “indulge,” and so on. Through a thorough and close examination of the Mahābhārata and the Pali Canon, this dissertation unveils the precise meanings of these terms in these texts. This dissertation will demonstrate that kṣānti had two distinct meanings in the Mahābhārata which were differentiated based on several factors - varṇa or caste, duration of practice, relationship with anger, classification as virtuous or dharma, and perception as a strength or weakness. On the other hand, khanti in the Pali canon, referred to a specific two-step psychological process – the negation of anger, followed by the cultivation of a positive feeling towards others, mettā. The dissertation then engages in a comparative analysis of the differing treatments of kṣānti and khanti in the Mahābhārata and Pali Canon, respectively, noting major differences, elements of intertextuality and hypothesizing their process of development. Through these findings,
the dissertation will provide a comprehensive and nuanced understanding of the ideas of patience and forgiveness in these early Indian narrative texts.
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INTRODUCTION

This dissertation explores the meaning of the Sanskrit term *kṣānti* in the *Mahābhārata* and the Pali term *khanti* in the Pali Canon.\(^1\) *Khanti* is an important virtue in the Pali canon, espoused in a broad range of texts. Its importance is made evident by the fact that it is one of the perfections (pāramitās) to be cultivated by a *bodhisatta*. Likewise, *kṣānti* (and its related terms) is a prominent term in the *Mahābhārata*. Hiltebeitel (2011b, p. 568) calls *kṣamā* “one of the high *Mahābhārata* virtues”.

Despite its being a frequently recurring and important term, the meaning of *kṣānti* has confounded scholars\(^2\). They opt for different terms to translate *kṣānti* such as “patience,” “forgiveness,” “tolerance,” “endurance,” “suffering,” “pardon,” “forbearance,” “waiting,” “allowing,” “indulging,” and so on, and at present, there is no scholarly consensus on the exact meaning of this term. Despite these pressing issues,

\(^1\) Since the Pali canon uses the Middle Indic word *khanti*, in the rest of the dissertation I will use this term when discussing Pali sources and *kṣānti* when discussing Sanskrit sources. When speaking for both, I will use *kṣānti*.

\(^2\) Several scholars have noted the particular difficulty of translating this term (*kṣānti*) in Buddhist texts, given its broad and ambiguous semantic range (Boucher, 2008, p. 220 n. 283; Lamotte, 1998, p. 143 n. 119; Nattier, 2003, p. 244; Schopen, 1989, pp. 139, n. 120).
the meaning and development of this term have received little and brief scholarly attention.

At present the only notable studies dealing with this topic as it relates to the Mahābhārata or the Pali canon are Hunter (2007) and Vasudha Narayanan et al. (2001). Both studies are preliminary and brief. The meaning of kṣānti has received more attention in Mahayana Buddhism but unfortunately, these studies have neglected or dismissed the study of kṣānti in the Pali canon.

At present, the term kṣānti is most commonly translated as “patience” or “forgiveness.” From this it can be inferred that in general, kṣānti is commonly assumed to denote the ideas of “patience” and “forgiveness.” In this dissertation, I investigate this premise thoroughly by asking what kṣānti means specifically. I do this by answering the following three questions in my dissertation: (1) Does kṣānti invariably mean patience,

3 I will discuss these in further detail below.

4 For instance, Lele (2007) has studied the meaning of kṣānti in Śāntideva’s Bodhicaryāvatāra and the Śikṣāsamuccaya.

5 For instance, Pagel (1995) in his study of the Bodhisattvapiṭaka, briefly discusses the role of kṣānti in in the Pali canon and mistakenly claims that khanti did not play a prominent role in it. He says, in the Pali canon, kṣānti “rarely receives independent treatment, but is generally explained in conjunction with other practices such as benevolence (to which it becomes an important prerequisite) or is cited as a concomitant to morality and discriminative understanding” [182-3]
forgiveness, or something else? (2) Does it have one or multiple meanings? (3) Does it mean the same thing across different texts and traditions?

I will focus my dissertation on two primary sources, both extensive. The first is the widely read Brahmanical epic the *Mahābhārata*, and the second is the *Suttapiṭaka* of the Pali Buddhist canon, the *Tipiṭaka*’s most widely read portion. More specifically, the sources for this dissertation are located across at all eighteen books of the *Mahābhārata* and the suttas and commentaries of the *Dīghanikāya*, *Majjhimanikāya*, *Samyuttanikāya*, *Aṅguttaranikāya*, *Nidānakathā*, *Jātaka-atṭhakathā*, *Dhammapada-atṭhakathā*, *Suttapiṭaka*, and *Khuddakapāṭha*. In the Pali Canon, most sources are stories revolving around the theme of *khanti*. In the *Mahābhārata*, the sources are a mix of narrative episodes, philosophical debates, and didactic lists.

Each of these texts represents a different perspective on the idea of *kṣānti*. These texts belong to and represent different religious and philosophical traditions; the *Mahābhārata* represents the Brahmanical tradition, while the Pali Canon represents the Theravāda Buddhist tradition. Both texts, or perhaps we might say groups of texts, were composed by different groups of authors and at different moments in early Indian religious history. By studying both these sets of texts in contrast, I excavate different meanings and treatments of the term *kṣānti*.

This in turn will lead to a better understanding of the ideas of patience and forgiveness in these texts and more broadly, the traditions they represent. Forgiveness has received
a lot of scholarly attention in Christianity\textsuperscript{6} and Judaism\textsuperscript{7}. More recently, the ideas of forgiveness and patience have also attracted attention from scholars in other disciplines such as psychologists\textsuperscript{8}, scientists,\textsuperscript{9} and philosophers.\textsuperscript{10} Despite this multi-disciplinary burgeoning interest in forgiveness and patience, scholarly studies on the meaning and development of these ideas in Asian religions have been scant (as noted above) and several scholars have noted the need for such scholarship, and the various ways in which it would further enhance their own studies in their respective fields.\textsuperscript{11} My

\textsuperscript{6} Bash (2007); Bock (2019); Voiss (2015)

\textsuperscript{7} Dorff (1998, 2000); Newman (1987)

\textsuperscript{8} Akhtar and Barlow (2018); Davis, Worthington Jr, Hook, and Hill (2013); Wade, Hoyt, Kidwell, and Worthington Jr (2014)

\textsuperscript{9} Scientists such as Farrow and Woodruff (2007); Harris and Thoresen (2005); Lee and Enright (2019); Tsuang, Eaves, Nir, Jerskey, and Lyons (2005) have been engaged in some fascinating studies on forgiveness such as investigating how genetics play a role in forgiving, neuroimaging forgivability, and researching the effect of forgiveness on health and disease.

\textsuperscript{10} Bommarito (2014); Griswold (2007); Moody-Adams (2015)

\textsuperscript{11} Other scholars have also noted the need for further research on this topic in Asian religions. For example, Hunter and Rigby (2009, p. 422) note, “forgiveness has emerged from Christian traditions in the West to become an important topic in psychology, philosophy, and even politics. Despite this new interest in the West, relatively little
dissertation, by virtue of being the first comprehensive investigation on the ideas of forgiveness and patience (क्षान्ति) across the texts of two early Indian traditions, will help fill this gap. It will not only contribute to the fields of Buddhism, Hinduism, and the broader field of Asian Religions, but also to the growing multi-disciplinary field of the study of forgiveness.

Methodologically, my dissertation will draw inspiration from the works of Bowles (2007); Brockington (2004); Fitzgerald (2004a); Gethin (2004); Hiltebeitel (2011a); Olivelle (2004b, 2009) and other authors. These works have all focused exclusively on the meaning of a single term – ‘धर्म’ – and attempted to unravel its meaning across analysis of forgiveness in other faiths has appeared”. Derrett (1997, p. 60) while studying forgiveness and confessions in early Buddhism, notes, “this aspect of Buddhist ethics should be more widely understood.” Yet, as social scientists McCulloch and Worthington Jr (1999, p. 1143) note, the religious understanding of forgiveness and tolerance has largely been overlooked: “most of the empirical treatments of forgiveness that have appeared in the literature in the past decade have tended to overlook the deep religious roots of the concept of forgiveness. We think that this oversight is unfortunate, because basic research on forgiveness could probably be enriched considerably by examining the ways that religious traditions, beliefs, and rituals... influence their interpersonal thoughts, feelings, behaviors, and personality processes...

Thus, we think there is a boon to be gained for basic research on forgiveness by revisiting the religious roots of forgiveness..."
a broad range of traditions and texts. A volume of the *Journal of Indian Philosophy* (Volume 32:4), under the editorship of Phyllis Granoff, was also devoted entirely to this subject. In this dissertation I will be engaging in a similar project, with ‘kṣānti’ as the focus.

Justifying the need for such extensive inquiries into the meaning of dharma, Olivelle (2004a, p. 421) has said that many scholars “note the broad semantic compass of the term, often commenting that the term is ‘untranslatable.’ One is also left with the impression that... this term has not been subject to evolution and change as it was appropriated, challenged, and sometimes even rejected by different groups and traditions.” These observations certainly also hold true for kṣānti – a term also deemed untranslatable and one that has been subject to evolution and appropriation in different texts.

This dissertation consists of three chapters. In chapter one, I explore the meanings of kṣānti in the *Mahābhārata*. I demonstrate that kṣānti in the *Mahābhārata* was a polysemic term that represented two different meanings. Through a close reading of several passages, I will further demonstrate that these two meanings differed based on caste or varṇa, on the duration of their practice, on their relationships with anger, whether they were considered virtue or vice, dharma or adharma, and whether they were perceived as a strength or weakness.

The second chapter shifts the focus to the Pali canon. Here, through a detailed examination of several *suttas* and commentaries, I prove that khanti was understood to
be a two-step process in the Pali canon, where the first step involved the negation of anger, and the second, the cultivation of the positive emotion of *mettā*. Next, I will examine literary conventions of plot, character, and motifs within the corpus of *khanti* texts discussed above and argue that this body of literature has consistent characteristics and follows set conventions. Lastly, I will discuss the implications of these findings in the broader context of the Pali canon, Buddhist narrative literature, the Buddhist ideas of anger and *mettā*, and Pali Buddhist ethics.

In the third chapter I will engage in a comparative analysis of the meanings of *kṣānti* and *khanti* in the *Mahābhārata* and the Pali canon, respectively. I will start by discussing broad differences between their meaning and then tackle the relationship and interaction between the *Mahābhārata* and the Pali canon as it relates to their treatment of *kṣānti* and *khanti*. Lastly, I will discuss the development of these terms based on their intertextuality.

Among various findings of this dissertation, the most striking is that the two sets of texts have remarkably different understandings of *kṣānti*. The *Mahābhārata* has two different meanings of *kṣānti*, while the Pali canon had a singular, well defined meaning. One of the two meanings of *kṣānti* in the *Mahābhārata* closely resembles the contemporary western idea of “forgiveness”, while the second resembles “patience”. In the case of the Pali Canon, however, the meaning and practice of *khanti* does not resonate closely with any contemporary western idea. *Khanti* in the Pali canon was understood to denote a systematic, two-step psychological process that lacks any parallel in the modern world. A comparative analysis of the texts studied here will also suggest that the Buddhist idea
of *khanti* was developed in response to and against the Brahmanical idea of *kṣānti* explored in the *Mahābhārata*. In summation, this thesis will demonstrate, through a close study of a wide range of texts, that in the *Mahābhārata* and the Pali canon the ideas of *kṣānti* and hence, patience and forgiveness, were complex and varied.
1 THE MEANING OF KṢĀNTI IN THE MAHĀBHĀRATA

In this chapter, I explore the meaning of the term kṣānti in the Mahābhārata. I do so by undertaking a critical examination of every single instance of its use in the epic and examining the meaning of kṣānti in each case against the background of the Mahābhārata as a whole. My investigation has led me to an important didactic passage in the Mahābhārata which functions as a key that unlocks the meaning of this term as it was used and understood in the Mahābhārata. Using this key passage as a starting point, I will argue that the term kṣānti in the Mahābhārata contained two distinct meanings. Through an extensive analysis of numerous examples, I will create a typology for the two meanings of kṣānti, elucidate their differences, and highlight their chief characteristics. This analysis will greatly advance the current scholarly understanding of the term kṣānti in the Mahābhārata.

1.1 INTRODUCTION

1.1.1 Prevalence of kṣānti in the Mahābhārata

Kṣānti is a significant virtue in the Mahābhārata, deserving scholarly attention. Kṣam and its various forms are spread across the 18 books and are used over 400 times in the Mahābhārata.

---

12 For example, Hiltebeitel calls kṣamā “one of the high Mahābhārata virtues” (2011b, p. 568).
Kṣānti plays a prominent role in philosophical debates and is mentioned in discussions on political strategy. It is also a popular adjective used to describe the quality of a person and occurs in dozens of lists describing brahmans, kings, ministers, and others. Since kṣānti is a technical term that occurs at critical junctures in the Mahābhārata, it is important to have an accurate understanding of its meaning in order to correctly understand the text. Yet, despite the significance and widespread prevalence of this term in the epic, its meaning has remained elusive.

1.1.2 Current scholarly understanding of the meaning of kṣānti

1.1.2.1 Scholarly journal articles

Little attention has been paid to the meaning of the term kṣānti in the Mahābhārata by modern scholars. In 2001, stimulated by the growing interest in the study of forgiveness in psychology, as noted above, Beck and Narayana (2001) made a few broad remarks on kṣamā as the Sanskrit word for forgiveness in Hindu texts. Their observations were

13 The methodology I used in order to arrive at this number is as follows: I performed a meticulous computer search for the terms “kṣan” and “kṣam.” I then read through all the verses containing these strings of letters and identified the ones that talk about “kṣānti” and its various forms.

14 Their comments were published in a psychology handbook that contained a paper on religious views on forgiveness where representative scholars of the five world religions answered five broad questions about forgiveness very briefly.
cursory and non-specific. Later, Alan Hunter (2007) published a paper that attempted to discuss the meaning of kṣamā in mainstream modern Hindu views. Surprisingly, he claimed that there are “relatively few references” [37] to kṣamā in the epics and suggests that instead one look at four other topics to get a better understanding of kṣamā: śreyas, titikṣā, ahiṃsā, pāpa. The choice of these alternative terms is not explained. Based on his mistaken claim about the scarcity of the word kṣamā in the Mahābhārata, combined with his unsubstantiated methodology, his paper attempts to deconstruct the meaning of kṣamā through śreyas, titikṣā, ahiṃsā, pāpa, ignoring the hundreds of references to kṣam and its verbal forms, resulting in unreliable conclusions. Apart from these cursory articles, scholarly writings dedicated to understanding the meaning of kṣānti in the Mahābhārata are virtually non-existent.

1.1.2.2 Dictionaries

A little more information about the scholarly understanding of the meaning of the term kṣānti can be gleaned from dictionary entries for this term. For this purpose, I will examine two sources: modern Sanskrit to English dictionaries, and an ancient Sanskrit thesaurus, the Nāmalīṅgānuśāsanam, an authoritative lexicon written by the Sanskrit scholar Amarasiṃha c. 400 CE (Mukherjee, 1998, p. 249). The choice of these sources is deliberate and meant to be representative of a broad range of understandings of kṣānti across cultures and time periods. My primary goal here is twofold - to understand what

---

15 The handful of comments made on forgiveness in the Mahābhārata is discussed in relevant sections below.
these two sources conceived the meaning of kṣānti to be and to identify gaps in their understanding.

A survey of five authoritative Sanskrit-English dictionaries\(^\text{16}\) reveals that the term kṣānti has been defined by modern scholars in similar ways. Monier-Williams (2008) defines it as “patience, forbearance, endurance, indulgence.” Wilson (1979, p. 216), Macdonell (1893, p. 78), Apte (1890, p. 435), and Benfey (1866, p. 236) all provide subsets of these same words to describe it. A richer set of definitions is revealed when we look at the verbal root of the word kṣānti – kṣam. Table 1 shows the definition of kṣam cited in five Sanskrit-English dictionaries:

\(^{16}\) The choice of sources in this section is deliberate and based on several reasons. As mentioned above, one of the goals of conducting this survey is to get a sense of what modern scholars today understand “kṣam” to mean. I have chosen Sanskrit-English dictionaries as these dictionaries are the most widely consulted by modern scholars and the most representative. Moreover, one of the secondary aims of this dissertation is to provide insights into the translation of the term “kṣam” in English (as will be seen towards the end of this chapter). Sanskrit-English dictionaries provide the best context for this discussion. I have deliberately chosen not to add more than five dictionaries to my list, as the most common words used to translate “kṣam” are already covered by this list. Adding more data, particularly from Sanskrit to non-English dictionaries would only complicate this list and be redundant, as they would not add any additional value to my discussion here.
Table 1: The definition of *kṣam* in Sanskrit-English dictionaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dictionary</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monier-Williams (2008, p. 326)</td>
<td>• to be patient or composed, suppress anger, keep quiet&lt;br&gt;• to bear patiently, endure, put up with (acc.), suffer&lt;br&gt;• to pardon, forgive anything&lt;br&gt;• to bear anyone, be indulgent to&lt;br&gt;• to ask anyone (acc.) pardon for anything (acc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macdonell (1893, p. 77)</td>
<td>• have patience; submit to (d.);&lt;br&gt;• endure, put up with;&lt;br&gt;• pardon (g. or d. of person, ac. of thing);&lt;br&gt;• grant anything (ac.) to (g.), allow to (pot.);&lt;br&gt;• show indulgence to (ac.);&lt;br&gt;• patient; ask any one's (ac.) pardon or indulgence for (ac.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cappeller (1891, pp. 139-140)</td>
<td>• patient or quiet, endure, suffer, bear, pardon, forgive&lt;br&gt;• ask pardon for (2 acc.);&lt;br&gt;• put up with (acc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Apte, Gode, Karve, &amp; Abhyankar, 1977, p. 622)</td>
<td>• To permit, allow, suffer;&lt;br&gt;• To pardon, forgive (as an offense);&lt;br&gt;• To be patient or quiet, wait;&lt;br&gt;• To endure, put up with, suffer;&lt;br&gt;• To oppose, resist;&lt;br&gt;• To be competent or able (to do anything);&lt;br&gt;• -Caus. To beg pardon, forgive;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benfey (1866, p. 234)</td>
<td>• To endure, To have patience, To pardon, To permit, To be able to&lt;br&gt;• To beg one's pardon for something (with two acc., literally, to cause somebody to endure something)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is most noteworthy about this survey is that a wide range of words is used to define *kṣam*. The same breadth is also observable in modern translations of the
In extant translations of the *Mahābhārata*, forms of the verb *kṣam* are translated loosely and inconsistently with an extremely broad range of terms: forgive, tolerant, patient, quiet, endure, suffer, pardon, forbear, wait, bear, grant, allow, indulge, permit, condone and so on. The choice of terms in most cases is without apparent reason or justification. Terms are changed very frequently and occasionally we also see the use of two terms to translate a single instance of the use of *kṣānti*. The only word that is commonly used to translate *kṣānti* but does not appear in any of these definitions is tolerance. However, the English-Sanskrit dictionaries (Borooah, 1971, p. 715; Monier-Williams, 2001, p. 715) cite *kṣamā* as the Sanskrit equivalent of tolerance, and so we may add that to our list of words used by modern scholars to define *kṣānti*. 

---

17 In extant translations of the *Mahābhārata*, where most of these terms are used to translate *kṣam* and its forms. This suggests that the meaning of *kṣam* was understood to be broad, encompassing several different actions and emotions. In order to understand the contours of this polysemic term, i.e. to decipher what modern scholars understood the scope of the term *kṣānti* to be, we will need to determine what the differences between these words are. This can be done by an examination of the meanings of the five most commonly used terms. Table 2 summarizes the five terms most frequently used to translate *kṣānti* by modern scholars, their definitions according to the Oxford University English Dictionary, and a brief comment on their relevance to my discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>OUE definition</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forgive</td>
<td>“Stop feeling angry or resentful towards”</td>
<td>This is the most commonly used term to translate <em>kṣānti</em>. Its definition implies that it is...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Tolerate**  | “Allow the existence, occurrence, or practice of (something that one dislikes or disagrees with) without interference.”¹⁹ | Contains an element of giving permission (denoted by the use of the word “allow”) and passivity through lack of “interference”.

| **Patient**  | “The capacity to accept or tolerate delay, problems, or suffering without becoming annoyed or anxious.”²⁰ | Has a temporal quality suggested by the keyword “delay”.

| **Forbear**  | “Politely or patiently restrain an impulse to do something; refrain.”²¹ | Since it involves restraining an impulse to do something it implies the pre-existence of an impulse to do something.

| **Pardon**  | “A cancellation of the legal consequences of an offense or conviction.”²² | A legal term with legislative and political connotations.

---

¹⁸ https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/forgive

¹⁹ https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/tolerate

²⁰ https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/patience

²¹ https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/forbear

²² https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/pardon
It must be noted that all of these English terms themselves are complex and their definitions are highly debated among scholars. I present these definitions only for the practical purpose of illustrating the wide range of meanings denoted by these terms, and hence implicit within the understanding of kṣānti modern scholars who are working in English.

The big question that arises is if kṣānti can mean all of these things, and these things have subtle differences, how do we determine the precise meaning of kṣānti in any particular context? Consider this example from the Mahābhārata, where Sahadeva tells an enraged Pārṣata who is trying to kill Drupada, “You kṣama Pārṣata and let Pārṣata kṣamatāṃ you. We will also kṣamayitāraś.” How does a reader determine what kṣam means in each of these cases? Are the characters forgiving, pardoning, tolerating, forbearing, or being patient with one other? Does kṣam here refer to an emotional

23 “Forgiveness” is a particularly debated term among philosophers, psychologists and religious studies scholars, (McCullough, Pargament, & Thoresen, 2001, p. 7). One prominent scholar of forgiveness states, “no consensual definition of forgiveness exists” (Worthington, 1998). For a comprehensive list of sources debating the meaning of forgiveness refer Bash (2013).

24 Droṇaparvan, Chapter 169, Verse 53:

pārṣatasya kṣama tvam vai kṣamatām tava pārṣataḥ
vayaṃ kṣamayitāraś ca kim anyatra śamād bhavet
practice, a physical action, or a legislative decision? The meaning of the passage would change considerably depending on the interpretation of the translator and his choice of word(s) to translate kṣam. Consequently, the reader’s understanding of the text would change and so would the perception of the character and the expectation of future events. Furthermore, the reader is at risk of reading back into the text the modern connotations associated with this term. This is an unresolved issue in the modern scholarly understanding of kṣānti and constitutes a serious problem in current translations of the Mahābhārata. Translators have not given adequate reasons to justify their word choice for kṣam, translating the term variously and inconsistently.

I now turn to the traditional Sanskrit understanding of kṣānti based on the ancient Sanskrit lexicon Nāmaliṅgaṇuśāsanam [Amarakośa]. This represents an understanding of kṣānti closer in culture and time to its use in the Mahābhārata, written by a Sanskrit grammarian and poet. There are two entries for kṣānti in this text:

(1.7.456) kṣāntistitikṣā
(3.1.64) sahiṣṇuḥ sahanaḥ kṣantā titikṣuḥ kṣamitā kṣamī

---

25 For example, if a translator chooses to translate kṣānti as “forgive” in a particular instance, the reader may assume that the action here is congruent with our modern practice of forgiveness which, in several cases, is preceded by an apology or admission of guilt.
These entries indicate that there were two synonyms of kṣam: the verbal root sah and the verbal root tij. Both of these verbal roots are defined in Monier-Williams using the same terms that were used for kṣam. The primary question here is what the relationship between kṣānti and its synonyms is, particularly titikṣā, since that is listed in both lists and is the synonym most closely associated with kṣānti. Do kṣānti and titikṣā mean the same thing, or are there discernable differences between them? This question is important to answer since it could greatly enhance our understanding of the meaning of kṣānti.

The Mahābhārata gives us reason to hypothesize that there are differences between kṣānti and titikṣā in the way that they are used in this text. This can be inferred based on their occurrence together in a list of virtues: “Forgiveness [kṣamā], forbearance [titikṣā], uprightness, control, avowedness to truth, great learning and zeal, compassion as well as authority— Yudhiṣṭhira has all the virtues of kings.”26 (Van Buiten en, 1983, p. 460)

Assuming the author of this list is not being redundant, we can assume some difference between the two terms. This difference between kṣānti and titikṣā constitutes the second gap in our current understanding of kṣānti that I aim to rectify.

Thus far I have established that in order to have a clear understanding of the meaning of kṣānti in the Mahābhārata, two major gaps need to be filled. First, a process must be

26 Udyogaparvan, Chapter 147, Verse 33:

kṣamā titikṣā dama ārjavāṃ ca; satyavratatvaṃ śrutam apramādaḥ
bhūtānukampāḥ hy anuśāsanaḥ ca; yudhiṣṭhīre rājaguṇāḥ samastāḥ
followed to determine the precise meaning of \( kṣānti \) in any given context from within its broad repertoire of meanings, and second, an understanding of the relationship between \( kṣānti \) and \( titikṣā \), its closest related word, must be achieved.

1.1.3 Critical Edition and Translations

Both these questions will be answered through a close examination of the primary source, the \textit{Mahābhārata}, itself. Before I begin my examination of the epic, I want to note a few things about the apparatus at hand – the various editions and translations of the \textit{Mahābhārata}.

Throughout this paper, I will use the critical edition [CE] of the \textit{Mahābhārata} \footnote{There is a long history of debate on the Critical Edition. While on the one hand it has been accepted as a standard edition by prominent scholars such as Granoff (2012), Hiltebeitel (2011a) and translation series such as University of Chicago series, there are still several scholars who disfavour the Critical Edition such as Doniger (2009) and Biardeau (1968, 1970), Dumezil and D. D. Shulman (2001) and Adluri (2011). I believe that some of their objections have successfully been dismissed by scholars such as Hiltebeitel (2011a) and Sutherland (1992), yet I use the Critical Edition only with an acknowledgement of some of the valid objections raised by the latter group of scholars.} \footnote{Defined as “accepting an individual text as it now exists and treating it as a unified whole” (Black & Geen, 2010, p. 10).}.

With regards to the problem of layers and interpolations in the text, I will take the “synchronic approach”\footnote{Defined as “accepting an individual text as it now exists and treating it as a unified whole”} favored by most modern scholars and championed by...
Hiltebeitel (2011a, p. 5). At present, there are four sets of translations for the *Mahābhārata*: two complete and two in progress. The two complete translations are by Ganguli (1883-1896) [12 vols] and Debroy (2015) [10 vols]. The two incomplete translations are by the University of Chicago series (1973-78) which includes 3 volumes by van Buitenen and one by James Fitzgerald, and the Clay Sanskrit Library Translations which contain partial and complete translations of several books by various translators. Of these partial translations, only the translations by the University of Chicago series (1973-78) are based on the Critical Edition. Wherever available I have taken passages from the van Buitenen translations as I find those to be fairly accurate

Debroy’s translation series is relatively new and has not received much scholarly attention. This translation has some obvious merit such as its fidelity to the CE, and its strict literal adherence to the Sanskrit text. Moreover, for parvas such as 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18 it is the only available modern translation and the only translation based on the CE. Yet, it falls short on several accounts: the Hindi translation of Sanskrit words peppered throughout the text, its lack of sophistication in translating technical and philosophical terms, one of them being *ksānti*, and most importantly, the frequent mistranslations based on incorrect parsings of Sanskrit terms.


Fitzgerald (2004b)

and reliable (other than his translation of the term kṣānti, which I will discuss later) and his translations of the Mahābhārata are widely regarded as “authoritative” (Salomon, 2007). Where van Buitenen’s translations are not available I have consulted all alternative translations and decided which one to use, if any, based on their accuracy. Wherever necessary, I have also provided my own translations or modified existing translations. If a translation is not cited, it is to be presumed that it is my own. In some instances, I have intentionally chosen to use existing translations to demonstrate how the current understanding of kṣānti has been influenced by translation choices.

1.2 THE TWO MEANINGS OF KṢĀNTI

1.2.1 Differences between kṣānti and titikṣā

There are two keys to uncovering the precise meaning of kṣānti in the Mahābhārata. These key passages can be found in the Śāntiparva, one in Chapter 103 and one in Chapter 156. The passage in chapter 103 is part of Bhīṣma’s instruction to Yudhiṣṭhira on signs that an army will be victorious and goes as follows:

“Foriveness [kṣamā] is the magical illusion employed by good men [sādhu]; really, good men are never unforgiving.

33 Although authoritative, they are not completely free of errors, as will be discussed later.
Learn to use forgiveness and nonforgiveness, son of Prthā. The glory of a king who forgives after he conquers grows greater, for even those enemies who have committed grievous offenses trust him.”\(^{34}\) (Fitzgerald, 2004b, pp. 425-426)

Several points are important to note here. In the first statement, \(\text{k}\text{ṣamā}\) is described as something that is employed only by good men [\(sādhu\)], thus suggesting that it is not something that is or should be employed by all men. The second half of that statement, we are also told that “good men are never unforgiving.” This clearly means that good men are \textit{always} forgiving, i.e. employing \(\text{kṣamā}\). The second statement, immediately following this states that “Learn to use forgiveness and nonforgiveness, son of Prthā.” At first glance, the two statements may seem contradictory, for we were just told that “good men are never unforgiving” and here Yudhiṣṭhira is being told to be unforgiving. The next line aids our understanding by saying that, “The glory of a king who forgives after he conquers grows greater...” Here, the subject has changed from “good men” [\(sādhu\)] to kings [\(rājño\)]. One way to make sense of these seemingly contradictory statements is to infer that the practice of \(kṣamā\) is differentiated based on the agent –

\(^{34}\) Śānti parvan, Chapter 103, Verses 29-340:

\(kṣamā\) vai sādhumāyā hi na hi sādvakṣamā sadā
\(kṣamāyāścākṣamāyāśca\) viddhi pārtha prayojanam
\(vijītya\) kṣamamāṇasya yaśo rājño 'bhivardhate
mahāparādhā āhyāyasmin viśvasanti hi śatrava
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sadhus are always forgiving, while kings are both forgiving and unforgiving. This would imply there is no singular, universal prescription for the practice of kṣamā. The second passage discussed below illuminates this issue further.

The second key passage, found in chapter 156 of the Śānti parvan, is a didactic passage which explains the definitions of thirteen technical terms, two of them being kṣamā and titikṣā. This key passage helps us overcome the two main issues in the current scholarly understanding of kṣānti identified above (to devise a process to determine what the precise meaning of kṣānti in any given context from within its broad repertoire of meanings is and to understand the relationship between kṣānti and titikṣā).

The passage begins by listing features that are common to all thirteen terms and then describes each of their technical aspects sequentially. This exegesis is invaluable in helping us understand what the authors of the Mahābhārata understood kṣānti and titikṣā to mean and what differences they viewed between these two terms.

35 Śānti parvan, Chapter 156, Verses 7-9:

prāpyate hi yathā satyaṃ tac ca śrotuṃ tvam arhasi
satyaṃ trayodaśavidhaṃ sarvalokeṣu bhārata
satyaṃ ca samatā caiva damaś caiva na saṃśayaḥ
amātsaryaṃ kṣamā caiva hṛīs titikṣānasūyatā
tyāgo dhyānam athāryatvaṃ dhṛtiś ca satataṃ sthīrā
ahiṃsā caiva rājendra satyākārās trayodaśa
The passage starts by describing all thirteen terms as immutable [nityam], constant [avikāri], not opposing any dharma [sarvadharmāvirdhaṃ], obtainable through yoga [yogenaitad avāpyate] and most importantly, distinct from one another [prthak]. The distinctness of all terms is important for the purposes of this investigation because it clearly states that kṣānti and titikṣā are two separate terms and hence have some difference between them.

After describing all thirteen terms in this way, the passage goes on to define each term. It defines kṣamā as follows: “With respect to kṣamā or a lack of kṣamā, a good man

---

36 Śānti parvan, Chapter 156, Verse 10:

satyaṃ nāmāvyayaṃ nityam avikāri tathāiva ca
sarvadharmāvirdhaṃ ca yogenaitad avāpyate

37 Śānti parvan, Chapter 156, Verse 22:

ete trayodaśākārāḥ prthak satyaikalaksanāḥ
bhajante satyam evehā brhmhayanti ca bhārata

The verse also mentions that these thirteen terms are “satyaikalaksanāḥ” meaning that they have the same defining characteristic [lakṣaṇa], namely truth [satya]. The verse also says these terms are “ākāra” meaning forms of satya. Taken in its entirety, I interpret this verse as meaning that there is one truth [satya], of which there are thirteen distinct forms – two of which are kṣānti and titikṣā.
**kṣamate** the pleasant and the unpleasant in all manner." Simply put, this definition of *kṣam* states that a good person tolerates the good and the bad in all situations. This definition informs us that there are two primary characteristics that define it - who practices it and toward what it is practiced. The passage states that *kṣam* is practiced by a *sādhu*, a virtuous person. This delimits *kṣam* to a specific type of agent and eliminates the possibility that every person does or should practice it. Second, the definition emphasizes that the *sādhu* tolerates both the good and the bad [*priyāṇīhāpriyāṇī*], in every type of situation.

Next, the passage gives a definition of *titikṣā*. It says, “When a person practices patience [*kṣam*] for the purpose of *dharma* and *artha*, such patience [*kṣam*] is known as *titikṣā*. It is obtained through steadfastness [*dhairya*], and its purpose is to keep people together [*lokasaṃgrahaṇa*].”

38 I have consciously chosen to leave “*kṣamate*” untranslated at this point, so as not to colour the understanding of this term with the connotations associated with any English word. Later in the thesis, I will discuss translational strategies at length.

39 Śānti parvan, Chapter 156, Verse 14:

akṣamāyāḥ kṣamāyāḥ ca priyāṇīhāpriyāṇī ca
kṣamate sarvataḥ sādhuḥ sādvāḥ āpnoti ca satyavān

40 Śānti parvan, Chapter 156, Verse 16:

dharmārthahetoḥ kṣamate titikṣā kṣāntir ucyate
lokasaṃgrahaṇārthaṁ tu sā tu dhairyena labhyate
This definition of *titikṣā* is highly informative and clearly defines the relationship between *kṣānti* and *titikṣā*. It states that *titikṣā* is a type of *kṣānti* [*dharmārthaheto kṣamate titikṣā kṣāntir ucyate*]. This implies that *kṣānti* is a broader concept, of which one subset is *titikṣā*.

This is the most significant revelation of this definition – the explicit mention of the existence of two meanings of *kṣānti* in the *Mahābhārata*. The first meaning is the one presented in the first definition above and the second is a special type of *kṣānti*, *titikṣā*- *kṣānti*, defined in the second definition.

Additionally, the definition of *titikṣā* states that what differentiates *titikṣā* from other types of *kṣānti* is the motivation or purpose for its practice. According to this definition, *titikṣā* is practiced for the purpose of *dharma*, *artha*, and *lokasaṃgrahaṇa*. In order to understand this motivation clearly, I will briefly unpack these terms keeping in mind the larger context of the *Mahābhārata*.

As is well known, *dharma* is a broad term and encompasses an extraordinarily large range of meanings. Fitzgerald (2004a, p. 674) has examined the meaning of *dharma* in

---

41 *Dharma* is one of the most complex and diverse terms in early Indian religious literature. Its meaning, usage, and translation in Brahmanical and Buddhist texts have attracted substantial scholarly attention. Several scholarly publications provide an excellent, detailed analysis of this term (Bowles, 2007; Brockington, 2004; Fitzgerald, 2004a; Halbfass, 1988; Hiltebeitel, 2011a; Hudson, 2006; Olivelle, 2004b, 2009). Since
the *Mahābhārata* and categorizes it into three broad senses based on its usage in the

*Mahābhārata*:

1) “Normative action that is beneficial to its agent after death” or a “good action appropriate to specific kinds of people” [he translates these are “Law or Merit”]

2) “Abstract quality of correctness, rightness, goodness, or justice” [“Right or Just”]

3) “Universally good character attributes, habits, dispositions” [“Virtue or Piety”].

Each of these categories, in turn, is also broad and ambiguous. Overall, he defines *dharm* as that which is “transcendently good or right to do or be.”

*Artha*, is another polysemic term that has a wide range of meanings depending on the context. Since it is used alongside *dharm* here, I will discuss its meaning in the context of *dharm* and within the larger context of the *Mahābhārata*. In the same paper Fitzgerald (2004a) analyzes the use of *artha* alongside *dharm*, and implies that in such contexts *artha* means “this-worldly self-interest” (p. 672). Monier-Williams (2008, p. 90) also reaches the same conclusion and notes that when *artha* occurs alongside *dharm*, it usually means “advantage, use, utility”.

_________________________

the meaning of the term is nuanced and has subtle difference across traditions and texts, here I have focused on discussing the meaning of *dharm* within the context of the *Mahābhārata*, and hence refer to Fitzgerald (2004a) who has studied the meaning of *dharm* within the context of the *Mahābhārata* comprehensively.
Lastly, we have the term *lokasaṃgrahaṇa* which I will briefly discuss within the context of the *Mahābhārata*. This term appears twice in the *Bhagavad Gīta*\(^{42}\), the most widely read and studied portion of the *Mahābhārata*, and seven times in the rest of the *Mahābhārata*. In chapter 122 of the Śānti parvan we can find an informative albeit brief discussion on *lokasaṃgrahaṇa*. The chapter explores the origin story of punishment \([daṇḍa]\) and equates *lokasaṃgrahaṇa* with *daṇḍa*\(^{43}\). Vasuhoma says, “Learn, king, how the rod of force [\(daṇḍa\)] arose as the protection of the world [\(lokasaṃgraha\)], for the sake of guarding and disciplining creatures [\(prajāvinayarakṣārtha\)]—it is the everlasting

\(^{42}\) Bhīṣmaparvan, Chapter 25, Verse 20, 25:

\[\text{karmaṇaiva hi saṃsiddhim āsthitā janakādayaḥ}\]

\[\text{lokasaṃgraham evāpi sampaśyan kartum arhasi}\]

\[\text{saktāḥ karmaṇy avidvāṃso yathā kurvanti bhārata}\]

\[\text{kuryād vidvāṃs tathāsaktaś cikīrṣur lokasaṃgraham}\]

\(^{43}\) Vasuhoma is asked by a king, “I wish to learn from you how the rod of force originated. Also, how did it first awaken? And why is it said to be supreme? How did the rod of force come to reside among kṣatriyas and get so firmly entrenched?” (Fitzgerald, 2004b, p. 477)

Śānti parvan, Chapter 122, Verses 12-13:

\[\text{tad ahaṃ śrotum icchāmi daṇḍa utpadyate katham}\]

\[\text{kiṃ vāpi pūrvaṃ jāgarti kiṃ vā paramam ucyate}\]

\[\text{kathāṃ kṣatriyasamaṃsthaśca daṇḍaḥ sampratyavasthitāḥ}\]
essence of Law [dharma].”⁴⁴ (Fitzgerald, 2004b, p. 477) Vasuhoma goes on to describe why daṇḍa is important and what once occurred in the absence of daṇḍa:

“After the rod of force disappeared, people became mixed up—people did not know what they should do and what not, what they should eat and what not, what they should drink and what not, nor did they know how to assure the realization of their efforts. They did not know whom they could go with and whom not, and one’s own property and another’s were the same. Lawlessness prevailed, and they harmed one another: They tore at each other like dogs fighting over a piece of meat, the strong killing the weak….

⁴⁴ Śānti parvan, Chapter 122, Verse 14:
śṛṇu rājan yathā daṇḍaḥ sambhūto lokasaṃgrahaḥ
prajāvinayarakṣārthaṁ dharmasyātmā sanātanaḥ

⁴⁵ Śānti parvan, Chapter 122, Verse 18-21:
tasmin pravṛtte satre tu brahmaṇaḥ pārthivarṣabha
hrṣṭarūpapracāratvād daṇḍaḥ so 'ntarhito 'bhavat
tasmin antarhīte cātha prajānāṁ saṃkarō 'bhavat
naiva kāryaṁ na cākāryaṁ bhojyābhоjyaṁ na vidyate
peyāpeyāṁ kutaḥ siddhir hiṁsanti ca parasparam
gamyāgamyāṁ tadā nāsīt parasvaṁ svāṁ ca vai samam
parasparam vilumpante sārameyā ivāmiṣam
Similar descriptions are also given by Bhīṣma for what happens in the absence of *danda*:

If the rod of force did not exist in this world, beings would be nasty and brutish to each other. Because they fear punishment, beings do not kill each other, Yudhiṣṭhira. As they are preserved by the rod of force day after day, king, his subjects make the king grow greater; therefore the rod of force is what is most important. It puts this world into a stable order quickly, king...46 (Fitzgerald, 2004b, p. 474)

We are also told repeatedly that *danda* is important to keep the world functioning: “the rod of punishment is the one thing in this world upon which everything depends...”47 It was sent forth by Brahmā for the protection of the world and for the establishing of

________________________

abalaṁ balino jaghnur nirmaryādam avartata

46 Śānti parvan, Chapter 121, Verse 33-35:

na syād yadīha daṅḍo vai pramatheyuh parasparam
bhayād daṅḍasya cānyonyaṁ ghnanti naiva yudhiṣṭhira
daṅḍena rakṣyamāṇā hi rājann aharahaḥ prajāḥ
rājānāṁ vardhayantiha tasmād daṅḍah parāyaṇām
vyavasthāpayati kṣipram imaṁ lokaṁ nareśvara

47 Śānti parvan, Chapter 121, Verse 8:

śṛṇu kauravya yo daṅḍo vyavahāryo yathā ca saḥ
yasmin hi sarvam āyattam sa daṅḍa iha kevalaḥ
people’s proper duties. 

Lastly, these verses specify that it is the duty of the kṣatriya to enforce daṇḍa – “Punishment, the essence of which is the same for all, was given by the Lord to the careful keeping of kṣatriya...”

Simply put, we are told that daṇḍa is essential to keep the world in order. Without daṇḍa, people of different castes would not know their proper duties [svadharma], and the world would descend into chaos. People would not make a distinction between what they are allowed to do and what is forbidden. Maintaining social order is thus essential for lokasamgrahaṇa, the welfare of the world. The meaning of this term in the context of the Mahābhārata has also been studied by Gelblum (1992) and Malinar (2007b, p. 88). Gelblum has argued that it means the “preservation and promotion of social-moral-cosmic mutual co-operation” (p. 121). He argues, “the term sangraha, literally ‘the holding together’, here may be best rendered by the German Zusammenhang, i.e. inter-connectedness, cohesion, mutual dependence, consolidation of the parts participating in a harmonious whole.” (p. 121) However, based on the analysis above, I would argue that lokasamgrahaṇa has a closer meaning to keeping the

---

48 Śānti parvan, Chapter 121, Verse 48:

brahmaṇā lokarakṣārthaṁ svadharmasthāpanāya ca

49 Śānti parvan, Chapter 121, Verse 46:

rājyasya daṇḍa evāṅgaṁ daṇḍaḥ prabhava eva ca

īśvareṇa prayatnena dhāraṇe kṣatriyasya hi
world together, which is in fact done by keeping people apart and separate in their caste divisions, rather than bringing people together in a sense similar to the new-age idea of harmonious co-existence. Malinar has also studied this term in the context of the Mahābhārata and notes that this term is connected specifically to kṣatriyas since it is the duty of kṣatriyas to protect the world and maintain the kingdom’s prosperity. The connection between kṣatriyas and the concept of lokasamgrahaṇa comes across clearly in the verses discussed above. In the next section I will discuss how this connection with kṣatriyas is also a defining characteristic of titikṣā.

Taking the three terms together, dharma, artha, and lokasamgrahaṇa, helps us to gain a much better understanding of titikṣā. The presence of these terms as the motivation for titikṣā suggests that that the motivation of titikṣā is worldly, as opposed to otherworldly. Since dharma, artha, and lokasamgrahaṇa taken together have worldly implications, there is a contrast being made between practical, this worldly goals such as (maintaining law and order, keeping people of different castes separate, gaining

50 To further support her thesis Malinar cites parallel passages from the Manusmṛti and also notes that Dhadphale (1978) has noted a similar usage of the term lokasamgrahaṇa in Pali texts.

51 For example, in the Bhagavad Gīta (06,025.020) Kṛṣṇa tells Arjuna that he should follow the ideal of other kings such as Janaka and act with the goal of keeping the world together [lokasamgrahaṇa]. Other passages include MBh 12.58.19; 12.122.14; 12.150.16; 12.251.25; 14.46.37; 12.88.1; 12.88.2.
advantage etc.) and otherworldly goals. Lokasamgrahaṇa, in particular with its association with punishment, also suggests that it is kings who practice this type of kṣānti. The definition of titikṣā may now be understood as follows: the type of kṣānti that is practiced primarily for the purpose of achieving this worldly goals and is obtained through steadfastness [dhaīrya].

The existence of these technical definitions of kṣānti and titikṣā suggests that the authors of the Mahābhārata understood these two terms to have a different, specific, precise meanings and considered it important to convey their definitions to the audience of this literature. In order to differentiate between the two terms, 1) kṣānti and 2) titikṣā (which we have been told is a subtype of kṣānti), I will refer to them as K₁ and K₂ respectively, throughout the rest of this dissertation. The defining features of kṣānti and titikṣā based on these definitions are classified in Table 3 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kṣānti [K₁]</th>
<th>Titikṣā [K₂]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Practiced by sadhus, brāhmaṇas, mendicants, brahmacārins, vanacārins</td>
<td>• A type of kṣānti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Practiced in every situation – with respect to what is agreeable and disagreeable</td>
<td>• Practiced for the purpose of dharma, artha, and lokasamgrahaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Obtained through dhaīrya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.2.2 Differentiation by varṇa

The definitions of K₁ and K₂ also allude to another distinguishing characteristic of these terms. The definition of K₁ specifies that it is practiced by a sādhu, while the definition of K₂ specifies that it is practiced for the purpose of lokasamgrahaṇa, which is ascribed
primarily to kṣatriyas (as discussed above). This distinction suggests that there may be a
difference between the varṇa of those who practice K₁ and K₂. In this section, I will
demonstrate that congruent with the definition of K₁, which specifies that it is practiced
by a sādhu, in descriptive passages across the Mahābhārata K₁ is advocated for
brāhmaṇas, vanacarins, and brahmacārins. Simultaneously, in line with its purpose of
lokasamgrahaṇa, K₂ is advocated for kṣatriyas – kings, ministers, and advisers.

I will begin with passages that describe K₁ as a virtue for brāhmaṇas. In a passage in the
Bhagavadgīta kṣānti is presented as a natural action of brāhmaṇas and not included in
the parallel list for kṣatriyas or the other varṇas:

The acts of brahmins [brāhmaṇas], barons [kṣatriyas], commoners 
[vaiśyas], and serfs [śudras], enemy-burner, divide [pravibhaktāni]
themselves according to the guṇas that spring from nature. Tranquility,
self-control, austerity, purity, patience [kṣānti], honesty, insight,
knowledge, and true faith are the brahmin's task, which derives from his
nature. Gallantry, energy, fortitude, capability, unretreating
steadfastness in war, liberality, and the exercise of power are the baron's
task, which springs from his nature. Husbandry, cattle herding, and trade
are the commoner's task, which derives from his nature; while the
natural task of the serf's to serve.⁵² (J. A. Van Buiten, 1981)

---

⁵² Bhīṣmaparvan, Chapter 40, Verses 41-44:
In this list, kṣānti is listed as a task of a brāhmaṇa but is not included in the list of three other varṇas. It is noteworthy that kṣānti and all other items in the brāhmaṇa list are described as tasks or duties [karma], rather than virtues or qualities. Furthermore, these brāhmaṇa karmas are equated with the trade or professions [vānijyam] of the vaiśyas and śūdra. This puts the karma of kṣānti on par with a trade or profession [vijñānam], implying that kṣānti is more than just a duty of the brāhmaṇa – it is the brāhmaṇa’s profession.

The same pattern can be observed in several lists describing brāhmaṇas. For example, in another list, a brāhmaṇa is described as one who is “self-restrained, is a soma sacrificer, has a noble character, is compassionate, tolerates everything [sarvasaho], has no desires, is simple, gentle, kind and endowed with kṣamā [kṣamāvān].”

\[\text{Śānti parvan, Chapter 63, Verse 8:} \]

\[
\text{yāḥ syād dāntaḥ somapa āryaśīlaḥ; sānukroṣaḥ sarvasaho nirāśīḥ}
\]
Bhrigu describes a *brāhmaṇa* as one who, among other things, has the qualities of "truthfulness, charity, self-control, lack of treachery, kindness, *kṣamā*, aversion, and austerities."\(^{54}\)

In other passages, *kṣānti* is attributed as a quality of those who practice *bhaiṣya*\(^{55}\), vanacārins, and brahmaćārins, groups that are closely related to *brāhmaṇas*. In one passage Bhīma censures Yudhiṣṭhira by saying that *kṣamā* is not a quality for *kṣatriyas*, but for mendicants: "Forbearance [*kṣamā*], sympathy, compassion, kindliness – no member going on the *kṣatra* way possesses these except you! Had we learned that your mind was disposed this way, we would not have taken up weapons, we would not have killed anyone. We would have lived on handouts [*bhaiṣyam*] until we left our bodies behind..."\(^{56}\) (Fitzgerald, 2004b, p. 187) This passage is explicitly stating that *kṣamā* is not

\[^{54}\] Śānti parvan, Chapter 182, Verse 4:

satyaṃ dānam damo 'droha ānṛśaṃsyam kṣamā ghṛṇā
tapaś ca ṛṣyate yatra sa brāhmaṇa iti smṛtaḥ

\[^{55}\] Monier-Williams (2008, p. 766) defines *bhaiṣya* as the practice of "living on alms, subsisting by charity."

\[^{56}\] Śānti parvan, Chapter 10, Verses 3-5:

kṣamānukampā kāruṇyaṃ ānṛśaṃsyam na vidyate
kṣatram ācarato mārgam api bandhos tvadantare
yadīmāṃ bhavato buddhiṃ vidyāma vayam īḍrīm
a quality possessed by those who are \textit{kṣatriyas}. Further, it implies that \textit{kṣamā} is to be practiced by those who live on alms [\textit{bhaikṣya}]. Similar statements can be observed across several passages in the epic.

In another episode, after Yudhiṣṭhira learns that Karṇa was his brother, he blames the conduct of \textit{kṣatriyas}, and in particular their anger. He says:

\begin{quote}
Damn the \textit{kṣatra} way! Damn the power of the mighty chest! Damn the unforgiving stubbornness that brought us to this disaster! Good are the tolerance [\textit{kṣamā}], self-control, sincerity, harmonious disposition, unselfishness, harmlessness, and truthful speech that are the constant traits of those who dwell in the forest [\textit{vanacārıṇām}].\textsuperscript{57} (Fitzgerald, 2004b, p. 180)
\end{quote}

In another discourse, Bhīṣma lists \textit{kṣamā} as the quality of those established in the \textit{brahmacarya āśrama} in response to Yudhiṣṭhira’s question asking about the four śastraṃ naiva grahīṣyāmo na vadhiṣyāma kaṃ caṇa

bhaikṣyam evācariṣyāma śaṅīrasyā vimokṣaṇāt

\textsuperscript{57} Śānti parvan, Chapter 7, Verses 5-7:

dhig astu kṣatram ācāraṃ dhig astu balam aurasam
dhig astv amarṣaṃ yenemām āpadaṃ gamitā vayam
sādhu kṣamā damaḥ śaucam avairodhyam amatsaraḥ
ahiṁsā satyavacanaṃ nityāni vanacārıṇām
āśramas: “Regular study of the Vedas, patience [kṣamā], honoring one’s teacher, and obedience to one’s teacher would constitute the Life-Pattern of the brahman [brahmacarya].” 58 (Fitzgerald, 2004b, p. 330) In the verses following this, kṣānti does not appear in the list of qualities for any of the three other āśramas. This suggests that the practice of kṣānti was not only differentiated by varṇa but also by āśrama.

Furthermore, in lists that describe the qualities of kings, ministers, and advisors [kṣatriyas], the text uses the word titikṣā. For example, when describing the qualities of a king’s advisor Bhīṣma says that such a person must be “forbearing [titikṣur] and free of resentment [anasūyakah]...” 59 (Fitzgerald, 2004b, p. 373) A few verses later he tells Yudhiṣṭhira what kind of men he should appoint as advisers and once again these men are described as “forbearing [titikṣur] and not resentful.” 60 (Fitzgerald, 2004b, p. 373)

58 Śānti parvan, Chapter 66, Verse 10:
vedādhyayananityatvaṃ kṣamāthācāryapūjanam
tathopādhyāyaśuśrūṣā brahmāśramapadaṃ bhavet

59 Śānti parvan, Chapter 81, Verse 21:
rūpavarṇasvaropetas titikṣur anasūyakah
kulīnḥ śīlasampannah sa te syāt pratyanantaraḥ

60 Śānti parvan, Chapter 81, Verses 28-29:
śūraś cāryaś ca vidvāṃś ca pratipattiviśāradah
kulīnḥ śīlasampannas titikṣur anasūyakah
ete hy amātyāḥ kartavyāḥ sarvakarmasv avasthitāḥ
Later, Bhīṣma says that the best minister of the assembly “should be from a good family, be truly accomplished, patient [titikṣur], industrious, self-possessed, assertive, knowledgeable, and truthful.”61 (Fitzgerald, 2004b, p. 381)

In some cases, the term kṣānti is also used in connection with kṣatriyas. However, this does not invalidate the thesis presented above. The definition of titikṣā states clearly that titikṣā is a type of kṣānti – a subcategory. Hence, the term kṣānti can also be used in place of titikṣā. In such cases, the reader needs to use the criteria gleaned from the normative definitions of K₁ and K₂ to judge which of the two is meant.

Consider the following example where Dhrṣṭadyumna kills Droṇa unjustly when the latter has laid his weapon down. Arjuna thinks that this was adharma and condemns the act saying all the Pāṇḍavas deserve to die for it. Hearing this Bhīma gets angry and defends the act as dharmic. He says, “O Pārtha! You speak words that are endowed with dharma, like a sage who has retired to the forest, or like a brāhmaṇa who has laid down the rod and is adhering to a vow. Protecting [others] from fights, living by fighting, being kṣānta towards women and the virtuous62, a kṣatriya quickly obtains the world, dharma,

61 Śānti parvan, Chapter 84, Verse 14:

kulīnaḥ satyasampannas titikṣur dakṣa ātmavān
śūraḥ kṛtajñāḥ satyaś ca śreyasaḥ pārtha lakṣaṇam

62 Here I have chosen to translate sādhuṣu as the “virtuous” but it may be noted that as with most technical Sanskrit terms, the term could also have other meanings and could refer to religious practitioners. I have chosen to translate the term more broadly, as in
fame, and success. O one who is going to extend the lineage! You are endowed with all the qualities of kṣatriyas. It is not right for you to now speak words like the ignorant.”

Here kṣānti is listed as a virtue for kṣatriyas. The reader is left with the task of deciphering whether K₁ or K₂ is being referenced here. A close examination of the passage will reveal that it gives a clear marker that in this instance kṣānti means K₂ [titikṣā]. The passage states that a kṣatriya must practice kṣānti only towards women and the virtuous. It is not extended towards all beings, a key characteristic marker of K₁.

This indicates that the kṣānti in this case is K₂ [titikṣā-kṣānti].

My experience with verses discussing kṣānti I found this to be the more commonly intended meaning rather than the specific meaning of a religious practitioner.

Additionally, this also fits the normative definition of titikṣā noted above.

63 Drona Parvan, Chapter 168, Verses 3-5:

munir yathāraṇyagato bhāṣase dharmasaṃhitam
nyastadaṇḍo yathā pārtha brāhmaṇaḥ saṃśitavrataḥ
kṣatāt trātā kṣatāj jīvan kṣānta striṣv api śādhuṣu
kṣatriyaḥ kṣitim āpnoti kṣipraṃ dharmaṃ yaśaḥ śriyam
sa bhavān kṣatriyaguṇair yuktāḥ sarvaiḥ kulodvahāḥ
avipaścid yathā vākyam vyāharan nādyā śobhase

64 Here, I would argue that although there is a distinction between situations and people, and in this example, people including women and sādhus are the objects of kṣānti, the characteristics of the definition of kṣānti still apply if one includes situations
The same process can also be followed with other passages where kṣānti is used in connection with kṣatriyas. As another example, in one episode, Draupadī censors Yudhiṣṭhira saying:

Most excellent of kings, friendliness towards all creatures, generous giving, study, asceticism – all this may be Law for a brahmin, but is not for a king. Restraining the wicked and protecting the pious, and not fleeing in war – this is the highest Law of kings. The man who has both patience [kṣamā] and anger, both fear and fearlessness, who both gives and takes, who both withholds and confers benefits, that man is regarded as one who knows Law [dharma].  

(Fitzgerald, 2004b, p. 194)

Here we see Draupadī describing the dharma for a king using the polysemic term kṣānti. Using the normative definitions of K₁ and K₂ kṣānti, it can be inferred that the kṣānti, in involving particular people within the broader and widely defined group of agreeable and disagreeable situations.

Śānti parvan, Chapter 14, Verses 15-17:

mitratā sarvabhūteṣu dānam adhyayanaṁ tāpah
brāhmaṇasyaiṣa dharmaḥ syān na rājño rājasattama
asatāṁ pratiṣedhaś ca satāṁ ca paripālanam
eṣa rājñāṁ paro dharmaḥ samare cāpalāyanam
yasmin kṣamā ca krodhaś ca dānādāne bhayābhaye
nigrahāṇugrahau cobhau sa vai dharmaṁ ucyate
this case, is $K_2$ kṣānti. Draupadī says that the king must be discriminatory in his action – for instance, he must be both patient and angry. This violates the definition of $K_1$ which is a non-discriminatory practice by virtue of being prescribed in all situations. This relationship between kṣānti and anger will be discussed in detail in a later section.

The examples above constitute only a small representative sample of cases where we see this distinction occur. Several more examples will be seen through the rest of the thesis which will further support these claims. These findings help make the distinction between the two types of kṣānti clearer. Based on the examples above it can be seen that $K_1$ is, in most cases, practiced by sādhus which includes brāhmaṇas, mendicants, brahmacārins, and vancārins, while $K_2$ kṣānti is practiced by kṣatriyas. There are exceptions, of course, as is to be expected from a text as large and heterogeneous as the Mahābhārata. But these exceptions are a minority. In an overwhelming majority of cases, this systematic differentiation between the two types of kṣānti is maintained.

This differentiation is important to note for it not only enhances our current scholarly understanding of the difference between kṣānti and titikṣā in terms of how they are used in the Mahābhārata but also demonstrates that the difference between kṣānti and titikṣā described in a technical passage noted above was, in fact, more than just an abstraction; the usage of these terms throughout the epic reflects closely the definitions given there. Based on the findings of this section, the characteristics of $K_1$ and $K_2$ can now be updated:
Table 2: The differences between kṣānti [K1] and titikṣā [K2] (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kṣānti [K₁]</th>
<th>Titikṣā [K₂]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Practiced by sadhus, brāhmaṇas, mendicants, brahmačārins, vanacārins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Practiced in every situation – with respect to what is agreeable and disagreeable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A type of kṣānti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Practiced for the purpose of dharma, artha, and lokasamgrahaṇa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Obtained through dhairya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Practiced by kṣatriyas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.3 Difference in duration

Armed with this powerful rubric to differentiate between K₁ and K₂, upon closely examining all instances of the use of the terms kṣānti and titikṣā in the Mahābhārata, four additional differences between them became clear. These differences are significant and further enhance our understanding of these two terms. In this section, I will discuss the first of these – the differing relationship of K₁ and K₂ with time - and delve into the rest of the differences in subsequent sections.

A significant difference between K₁ and K₂ is the duration of the act: K₁ is a permanent relinquishment of negative feelings while K₂ is the temporary control of one’s anger while waiting for the right moment to strike back. Consider the following list of substantive examples that illustrate how this polarity is reflected in the Mahābhārata. I begin with examples of K₂ where the temporariness of the act is clear and prominent. Once this has been established, I will present examples of K₁ which suggest that it is a permanent act.

Consider the example where after the Pāṇḍavas leave for the forest, Dhṛtarāṣṭra asks Vidura for his advice on what he should do. Vidura counsels him that he should return
the kingdom to the Pāṇḍavas and condemn the deceit that took place in the dice game.

Dhṛtarāṣṭra accuses Vidura of siding with the Pāṇḍavas and dismisses him from the court. Vidura comes to the Pāṇḍavas and informs them of his conversation with Dhṛtarāṣṭra. He then counsels the Pāṇḍavas saying:

“The man who, sorely oppressed by his rivals,
Exerts his kṣamāṃ and bides his time [kālam upāsate],
Slowly feeding his means as he feeds a fire,
That self-possessed man rules the earth by himself!" (J. A. B. van Buitenen, 1981, p. 233)

Here kṣamā occurs in conjunction with the words kālam upāsate (to bide one’s time).

The implication here is that the practice of kṣamā is a temporary practice that the Pāṇḍavas need to engage in while they bide their time, waiting for their period of forest exile to be completed. Furthermore, the passage gives us two clear indications of this case of kṣamā being K2. First, the reason for practicing kṣamā is laid out clearly – to rule the earth. This reason falls within the category of artha and fits the definition of K2. Second, based on the characteristics of K2, we know that it is K2 that is most commonly

66 The term used by van Buitenen to translate kṣam has been omitted purposefully for the aforementioned reasons.

67 Vanaparvan, Chapter 6, Verse 19

kleśais tīvrai yujyamānaḥ sapatnaiḥḥ; kṣamāṃ kurvan kālam upāsate yaḥ
saṃ vardhayan stokam ivāgnim ātmavān; sa vai bhūṅkte prthivīm eka eva
being referred to in the context of *kṣatriyas*. In this passage, since *kṣamā* is being prescribed by one *kṣatriya* to another, the thesis of this case of *kṣamā* being $K_2$ is further supported. The same two qualifications apply to all subsequent examples of $K_2$ in this section and will not be repeated in each case.

In another episode, Yudhiṣṭhira asks Bhīṣma how a king should behave towards his enemies. Bhīṣma replies, among other things, “After putting up with him for a long time [dīrghakālam api kṣāntvā], he may attack the enemy’s forces; while he waits for the right time, he should keep tight control over his own forces, so that his enemies might relax.”68 (Fitzgerald, 2004b, p. 428) Here, *kṣānti* occurs in conjunction with time [*kāla*] again and it is undoubtedly being prescribed only temporarily. Based on Bhīṣma’s words, it can be inferred that *kṣam* here has the meaning of temporarily ignoring an enemy. Clearly, in this case, $K_2$ is not a permanent act, but a temporary one. This instance of the use of *kṣamā* is also a case of $K_2$ based on the same criteria used in the previous example.

Similarly, in a scene paralleling the climax of the dice match in the *Sabhāparvan*, Draupadī is once again dragged to court in the middle of a dice match and assaulted. Again, her husbands look on and she urges them to do something. This incident occurs during the thirteenth year of the Pāṇḍava’s exile, which they spend incognito. Upon

---

68 Śānti parvan, Chapter 104, Verse 17:

dīrghakālam api kṣāntvā vihanyād eva śātravān
kālākāṅkṣī yāmayec ca yathā visrambhaṁ āpnuṣuḥ
seeing Draupādi’s pain, Bhīma says, “Don’t grieve, kṣama69 this short time [kālam] that is left, just a month and a half. When the thirteenth year is full you shall be a king's queen!”70 (Van Buitenen, 1983, p. 56) Once again there is no ambiguity here that Bhīma is urging Draupādi to practice kṣamā for a short time [adīrghaṁ kālaṁ], the remaining period of their exile.

Lastly consider the episode where Bhīṣma tries to mitigate a quarrel between Droṇa, Aśvatthāman, Kṛṇa, and Kṛpa saying: “let the Teacher’s son be patient towards [kṣamatāṁ] it, for a great task is at hand. You, the Teacher, and Kṛpa must be patient towards [kṣantavyaṁ] everything, for this is no time [nāyam kālo] for strife when the Kaunteya is at hand!71... Let the Teacher’s son be patient [kṣamatāṁ]; this is not the

69 The term used by van Buitenen to translate this word has been omitted.

70 Virāṭa parvan, Chapter 20, Verses 13
mādīrghaṁ kṣama kālaṁ tvam māsam adhyardhasaṁmitam
pūrne trayodaśe varṣe rājño rājñī bhaviṣyasi

71 Virāṭa parvan, Chapter 46, Verses 5-6 (Translation from Van Buitenen (1983, p. 96) with modifications):
ācāryaputraḥ kṣamatāṁ mahat kāryam upasthitam
nāyam kālo virodhasya kaunteya samupasthite
kṣantavyaṁ bhavatā sarvam ācāryena kṛpeṇa ca
time [nāyaṃ kālaḥ] for us to break up...”72 Over the course of his speech, twice Bhīṣma says that the reason why kṣam should be practiced at this point is that this is not the time for strife. We can infer from this that he is not asking his interlocutors to practice kṣam forever, but only temporarily, until the time for strife arises. Applying the criteria above, we can infer that this is a case of K₂ kṣānti. Such examples illustrate the repeated association of kṣānti with waiting and demonstrate that K₂ kṣānti is a temporary act.

In contrast, K₁ kṣānti can be inferred to be a permanent act or emotion. For example, consider the episode where Virāṭa and Yudhiṣṭhira argue during the Pāṇḍava’s time in disguise. Uttara, the son of Virāṭa has defeated Droṇa, Bhīṣma, Aśvatthāman, Kṛpa, Duryodhana, Karṇa due to Arjuna being his charioteer. King Virāṭa, still unaware of the Pāṇḍava’s true identity, praises his son for this victory. Yudhiṣṭhira, dicing with the king, continually praises Uttara’s charioteer (Arjuna in disguise). Virāṭa warns Yudhiṣṭhira to stop doing it, but Yudhiṣṭhira keeps doing it. Virāṭa strikes Yudhiṣṭhira in the face with his dice and threatens him to not do it again. Yudhiṣṭhira’s nose bleeds but he catches the blood in his hands so that it does not fall to the ground. After Virāṭa learns of the true identities of the Pāṇḍavas he says: “O lord of men, whatever has been said by us out of ignorance, it is appropriate for you to kṣantum all that, for this Pāṇḍava is a sage

72 Virāṭa parvan, Chapter 46, Verse 10 (Translation from Van Buitenen (1983, p. 96) with modifications):

ācāryaputraḥ kṣamatāṃ nāyaṃ kālaḥ svabhedane
[dharmātmā].” Here we have a clear marker of this case of the use of kṣānti being K₁ despite the context being an interlocution between kṣatriyas. Virāṭa is explicitly overriding Yudhiṣṭhīra’s status as a kṣatriya by calling him a dharmātmā – a righteous person - thereby categorizing him in the group of sādhus, the group that practices K₁. Virāṭa says that by virtue of Yudhiṣṭhīra being a dharmātmā, it is appropriate for Yudhiṣṭhīra to kṣantum whatever wrong has been said. Based on this we can qualify this case of kṣānti as a case of K₁ kṣānti. Contrast this implied meaning of kṣānti here with all the examples of K₂ we have seen above where the practice of kṣānti was essentially temporary and a prelude to violence; in this case, we see no such indication. Instead, based on the context it seems like Virāṭa is requesting Yudhiṣṭhīra to practice kṣānti towards him in perpetuity, not just temporarily.74

Another example of a king asking someone else to practice K₁ can be seen when Dhṛtarāṣṭra asks his subjects to practice kṣānti towards him. He says, “O fortunate ones! O sinless ones! I have served you carefully. Whether those services have been good or bad, you must forgive [kṣantavyam] me.”75 Here Dhṛtarāṣṭra asks his subjects to forgive

73 Virāṭa parvan, Chapter 66, Verses 20

yad asmābhīr ajānadbhiḥ kim cūd ukto narādhipaḥ
kṣantum arhati tat sarvaḥ dharmātmā hy eṣa pāṇḍavaḥ

74 It is perhaps noteworthy that throughout the epic Yudhiṣṭhīra is associated with K₁ and admonished not to embrace it.

75 Āśramavāsikaparvan, Chapter 14, Verse 3
him [kṣantavyam]. In his plea for kṣānti, Dṛtarāṣṭra repeatedly calls his subjects “sinless” [anaghāḥ] and “immensely fortunate ones” [mahābhāgās]. These adjectives place the subjects closer to the normative category of the practitioners of K₁ - sādhus – than to kṣatriyas and helps us interpret the use of kṣānti in this passage as K₁. Having established that, we can now consider the question of whether K₁ in this case is a permanent or temporary action. Similar to the example above, we see no indication in this case that Dṛtarāṣṭra is asking his subjects to forgive him temporarily; the context allows us to interpret the meaning of kṣānti here as a permanent and lasting act. Several more examples of the duration of K₁ and K₂ will be seen in subsequent sections, further strengthening this observation.

The examples seen in this section demonstrate that the duration of the practice of K₁ and K₂ kṣānti is a critical point of difference between them. While K₁ is a permanent act involving the end of negative feelings, K₂ is a temporary act with an element of waiting or biding time. These characteristics not only significantly advance our understanding of kṣānti but also inform us of the expansive range of acts included in this Sanskrit term.

Based on this point of difference we can update the list of differences between K₁ and K₂ kṣānti as follows:

Table 3: The differences between kṣānti [K₁] and titikṣā [K₂] (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kṣānti [K₁]</th>
<th>Titikṣā [K₂]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mayā ca bhavatāṃ samyak chuśrūśā yā kṛtānaghāḥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asamyag vā mahābhāgās tat kṣantavyam atandritaiḥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2.4 Different relationships with anger

Another notable difference between the two types of kṣānti is their differing relationship with anger. Anger was conceived to be the opposite of K₁ kṣānti and K₁ kṣānti and anger are frequently represented as mutually exclusive. Anger, however, has a more complex relationship, with K₂. In K₂, anger is suspended temporarily, lying dormant in wait. They are not mutually exclusive and can co-exist. In fact, as the examples below will illustrate, K₂ carries a fit of dormant anger along with it, and when one practices K₂ one incurs a debt towards that anger that eventually needs to be paid.

I begin with a representative example of K₁ and its mutually exclusive relationship with anger. This episode tells the story of Gautamī, a virtuous lady, whose son is bitten by a serpent and dies. An angry fowler named Arjunaka catches the serpent and asks the lady how it is to be punished. Gautamī replies, “There is no anger [kopo], in brāhmaṇas because anger leads to pain. O good man [sādho]! Forgive [kṣamyatām] and release this serpent out of compassion.” In this case, kṣānti clearly refers to K₁ since Gautamī’s

---

76 Anuśāsanaparvan, Chapter 1, verse 20
clear reason for practicing $kṣānti$ towards the serpent is that this is what virtuous people do [$brāhmaṇānām, sādho$]. Additionally, this statement establishes a clear relationship between $K_1$ and anger. Gautamī tells the fowler to practice $kṣamā$ towards the snake and simultaneously says that there is no anger [$kopa$] among virtuous people who practice $kṣamā$. This suggests a mutually exclusive relationship between anger and $K_1$.

Moreover, note the permanency implied in the practice of $kṣānti$ here, by the mention that the serpent should be released [$mucyatām$].

Contrary to this, the relationship between $K_2$ and anger is complex. Consider the following verse that was spoken by Yayāti when Indra questioned him about Puru:

"When abused, do not abuse. The wrath [$manyur$] of a forbearing [$titikṣataḥ$] man burns the abuser and reaps all his good deeds."\(^7\)\(^7\) (van Buitenen, 2011, p. 197) The use of the term $titikṣā$ makes it clear that this is $K_2$. The phrase “wrath [$manyur$] of a forbearing [$titikṣataḥ$] man” suggests that a forbearing man, or one who practices $K_2$, also possesses anger. This suggests a co-existence between anger and $K_2$.


\[^7\] Ādiparvan, Chapter 82, verse 7

na brāhmaṇānāṃ kopo 'sti kutaḥ kopāc ca yātanā
mārdavāt kṣamyatāṃ sādho mucyatām eṣa pannagaḥ
ākruṣyamāno nākroṣen manyur eva titikṣataḥ
ākroṣṭāraṃ nirdahati sukṛtam cāṣya vindati

---

\[^7\] Ādiparvan, Chapter 82, verse 7
Take another example of $K_2$, where Arjuna describes himself as follows: “Is there anyone who is like me in $kṣamā$? There is no one who is my equal in anger $[krodha]$.” Once again, this shows that anger and $K_2$ are not mutually exclusive and can co-exist.

Moreover, in this case, both anger and $K_2 kṣānti$ are presented as virtues.

Another passage sheds further light on their relationship and further makes clear that anger that is controlled will in the end claim its due. Before killing Karṇa, Arjuna says:

“O Kṛṣṇa! Today, I will be rid of the debt $[anṛṇaḥ]$ I owe to all my bowmen, to my anger $[krodhasya]$, to the Kurus, to my spears, and to Gāṇḍiva. Today, I will be free from the sorrow I have borne for thirteen years...” We have already examples above of how the Pāṇḍavas practiced $K_2 kṣānti$ temporarily while waiting in the forest for thirteen years. In this passage, we learn that while doing so, Arjuna believes he accrued a debt towards his anger which was finally repaid at this moment.

Yudhiṣṭhira holds the same belief, for after he learns that Bhīma killed Duryodhana, he tells Bhīma, “King Suyodhana has ceased his hostility and has been slain! We have conquered the earth by following Krishna’s advice! How marvelous that you have paid

______________________________

78 Karṇaparvan, Chapter 52, Verse 30:

ko vāpy anyo matsamo 'sti kṣamāyām; tathā krodhe sadṛśo 'nyo na me 'sti

79 Karṇaparvan, Chapter 52, Verse 23-24:

adyāham anṛṇaḥ kṛṣṇa bhaviṣyāmi dhanurbḥṛtām
krodhasya ca kurūṇām ca śarāṇām gāṇḍivasya ca
adya duḥkhham aham mokṣye trayodaśasamājitam
off your debt [ānṛṇyaṃ], to both your mother and your anger [kopasya]!"\(^{80}\) (Meiland, 2007, p. 341) Here, once again we see the idea that one accrues a debt towards one’s suppressed anger. Hence, we get a sense that K₂ carries anger along with it, and when one practices K₂, one must in the end give that anger its due.

Lastly, consider another example where the same phenomenon occurs when Vaiśampāyana narrates a summary of the Mahābhārata at Vyāsa’s order:

“The sons of Pṛtha dwelled there for many years and brought other kings under their sway by the might of their swords. And thus they lived, always bent solely upon the Law, faithful in their promises, arising with alertness, forbearing [kṣāntāḥ], and punishing [pratapanto] their ill-wishers.”\(^{81}\) (van Buitenen, 2011, p. 128)

\(^{80}\) Śalya parvan, Chapter 59, verse 43-44:

gataṁ vairasya nidhanaṁ hato rājā suyodhanah
krṣṇasya matam āsthāya vijiteyam vasumdhārā
diṣṭyā gatas tvam ānṛṇyaṁ mātuḥ kopasya cobhayoh

\(^{81}\) Ādiparvan, Chapter 55, Verse 26-27

tatra te nyavasan rājan saṃvatsaragaṇan bahūn
vaše śastrapratāpena kurvanto 'nyān mahikṣitaḥ
evaṁ dharmapradhānās te satyavrataparāyaṇāḥ
apramattotthitāḥ kṣāntāḥ pratapanto 'hitāṁs tadā
Once again, it can be seen that the Pāṇḍavas, all of whom are kṣatriyas, being described as both - kṣántaḥ and pratapanto. This implies that kṣānti and pratapana are both expressing virtues for a kṣatriya and co-exist. Additional examples of this dyadic relationship between the two types of kṣānti and anger will be seen later.

These findings are not only consistent with the typology of K₁ and K₂ we have seen so far but lend further support to it. The relationship between K₁ and anger complements its characteristic of involving the permanent annihilation of negative emotions seen in the previous section. The relationship between K₂ and anger complements K₂’s characteristic of being a temporary act with an element of waiting or biding time. Based on these additional findings, the updated list of characteristics of K₁ and K₂ is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kṣānti [K₁]</th>
<th>Titikṣā [K₂]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Practiced by sadhus, brāhmaṇas, mendicants, brahmacārins, vanacārins</td>
<td>• A type of kṣānti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Practiced in every situation – with respect to what is agreeable and disagreeable</td>
<td>• Practiced for the purpose of dharma, artha, and lokasaṃgrahaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A permanent act</td>
<td>• Obtained through dhairyas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mutually exclusive with anger</td>
<td>• Practiced by kṣatriyas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A temporary act characterized by waiting or biding time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not mutually exclusive with anger, violence, and punishment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.5 Different relationships with dharma

Furthermore, in the Mahābhārata, there are two different types of relationships between kṣānti and dharma. The practice of K₁ kṣānti is always considered dharmic,
while the practice of $K_2$ kṣānti is not always dharmic, sometimes it is adharmic. I will illustrate this dichotomy through the use of a few examples.

The relationship between K1 kṣānti and dharma can be seen clearly in Yudhiṣṭhira’s speech during the forest debate. In the following examples, notice the emphasis on the word “always”:

Thus both the strong and the weak, they say, should always [nityadā] forgive [kṣantavyaṃ], even in distress, when they have this knowledge.

For the good [sādhavaḥ] praise in this world the suppression of anger, Kṛṣṇā! Victory belongs to the good man [sādhor] who possesses ksamā. This is the opinion of the virtuous

... a man when insulted, beaten and angered by a stronger man forbears [kṣamate] it, and always [nityam] keeps his anger under control, he is a sage and a superior person [vidvān

---

82 This is a widely discussed debate that occurs between Draupadī, Yudhiṣṭhira and Bhīmasena in the Aranyakaparvan [Mbh 3.28 – 3.37] where kṣānti is a recurring and prominent theme. The entire debate will be analysed in detail in a later section.

83 03,030.013a Vanaparvan, chapter 30, verses 13-14
A man of wisdom [vijñatā] should always [sarvaṃ] forgive [kṣantavyam]: for when he bears everything, he becomes Brahman...

This is the way of those who have mastered themselves [ātmavatāṃ], this their eternal [sanātanaḥ] Law, to be patient [kṣamā] and gentle, and thus I shall act!(J. A. B. van Buitenen, 1981, pp. 278-279)

Throughout this speech, it is clear that Yudhiṣṭhira is referring to K₁ kṣānti since he is proclaiming this in the context of sages, as can be inferred by his usage of words like sādhavaḥ, sādhor, vijñatā, vidvān, uttampūruṣah, ātmavatāṃ and so on. These examples illustrate that the practice of K₁ was advocated in every case, at all times, and towards all people. It is always dharmic to practice K₁. There is no instance in which the practice of K₁ becomes adharmic.

84 Vana parvan, chapter 30, verse 33

ākruṣṭas tādītaḥ kruddhaḥ kṣamate yo baliyasā yaś ca nityaṃ jitakrodho vidvān uttampūruṣah

85 Vana parvan, chapter 30, verse 41

kṣantavyam eva satataṃ puruṣena vijñatā yadā hi kṣamate sarvaṃ brahma sampadyate tadā

86 Vana parvan, chapter 30, verse 50

etad ātmavatāṃ vṛttam eṣa dharmaḥ sanātanaḥ kṣamā caivānṛṣaṃsyāṃ ca tat kartāsmy aham añjasā
This is not the case, however, with K₂. We have already seen plenty of examples of K₂ being time-sensitive and temporary. Consider the following cases where kṣānti is explicitly called adharmic. In one dialogue Bhiṣma tells Yudhishthira,

> Not taking what has not been given, making gifts, the recitation of texts, asceticism, not injuring others, truthfulness, having no anger, forbearance [kṣamā], worshiping the Gods with sacrifices—this is a specification of Law. But what is Lawful [dharma] and Meritorious may be Unlawful [adharma] when it is applied at the wrong time or in the wrong place; and tradition teaches that stealing, lying, and doing injury [hiṃsā] to others are Lawful [dharma] in some specific circumstances...  

(Fitzgerald, 2004b, p. 250)

In another instance Bhiṣma reiterates the same line of thinking, saying:

> But you must not be indulgent [kṣāntena] all the time, most excellent of men. A gentle king [mṛdā] is not a Lawful king; he is like an elephant that is gentle [kṣamāvān]... A lowly person might humiliate a king who is

---

87 Śānti parvan, Chapter 36, Verses 7-8:

adattasyānupādānaṁ dānam adhyayanaṁ tapaḥ

ahīṃsā satyam akrodhaḥ kṣamejyā dharmalakṣaṇam

ya eva dharmaḥ so 'dharma 'deśe 'kāle pratiśṭhitaḥ

ādānam anṛtam hiṃsā dharmaḥ vyāvasthikaḥ smṛtaḥ
always indulgent [kṣamamāṇaṁ], like the elephant driver who will mount his elephant by climbing right up on its head.\textsuperscript{88} (Fitzgerald, 2004b, p. 298)

Here the implication is that a king who is always practicing kṣamā would be unlawful or adharmic. Bhiṣma clearly espouses that at certain times and certain occasions, it is actually adharmic for a king to practice K\textsubscript{1} kṣānti. Instead he should only practice K\textsubscript{2} kṣānti, which is necessarily a temporary act and leaves room for violence and anger (as seen above).

Several more examples of the dichotomous relationship between the two meanings of kṣānti and dharma will be discussed in subsequent sections.

Based on these findings the list of characteristics of K\textsubscript{1} and K\textsubscript{2} kṣānti can be updated as follows:

\textsuperscript{88} Śānti parvan, Chapter 56, Verses 37-40:

na ca kṣāntena te bhāvyam nityam puruṣasattama
adharmyohi mṛdū rájā kṣamāvān iva kuñjaraḥ
bārhaspatyeca śāstre vai ślokā viniyatāḥ purā
asminn arthe mahārāja tan me nigadataḥ śṛṇu
kṣamamāṇam nṛpaṁ nityaṁ nīcaḥ paribhavej janaḥ
hastiyaṁtā gajasyeva śira evārurukṣati
tasmān naiva mṛdur nityaṁ tīkṣṇo vāpi bhaven nṛpaḥ
vasante 'ṛka iva śrīmān na śīto na ca gharmaḍaḥ
Table 5: The differences between kṣānti [K1] and titikṣā [K2] (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kṣānti [K₁]</th>
<th>Titikṣā [K₂]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Practiced by sadhus, brāhmaṇas, mendicants, brahmaçārins, vanacārins</td>
<td>• A type of kṣānti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Practiced in every situation – with respect to what is agreeable and</td>
<td>• Practiced for the purpose of dharma, artha, and lokasamgrahaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagreeable</td>
<td>• Obtained through dhairyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A permanent act</td>
<td>• Practiced by ksatriyas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mutually exclusive with anger</td>
<td>• A temporary act characterized by waiting or biding time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Always considered Lawful [dharmic]</td>
<td>• Not mutually exclusive with anger, violence, and punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can be lawful [dharmic] or unlawful [undharmic] based on the circumstances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.6 Different perceptions of kṣānti as a strength or weakness

Lastly, there is also a difference between the perceptions of K₁ and K₂ kṣānti as a strength or weakness. While the practice of K₁ kṣānti is always considered a strength, the practice of K₂ kṣānti can sometimes be considered a weakness depending on the specific circumstances.

Examples of statements where kṣamā is cited as a strength are numerous. Consider the story in which Kauśika (a brahman) preaches, “Kindliness is the highest Law, forbearance the greatest strength [kṣamā ca paramaṃ balam], self-knowledge the highest knowledge, the vow of truthfulness the highest vow.”89 (J. A. B. van Buitenen,

---

89 Vana parvan, chapter 203, verse 41

ānṛṣaṃṣyaṃ paro dharmaḥ kṣamā ca paramaṃ balam
1981, p. 632) In another instance Vidura preaches, “Of the evil, harm is the strength; of kings authority; of women obedience; of the virtuous forgiveness \([kṣamā gunavatām balam]\)”\(^{90}\) (van Buitenen, 2011, p. 264). A third example can be found in the well-known episode of Vasiṣṭha, Nandinī and Viśvāmitra, where Viśvāmitra, the prince of Kanyakubja, is out hunting when he comes across Vasiṣṭha’s hermitage and sees his cow Nandinī. He offers to buy the cow but Vasiṣṭha refuses to sell her even in exchange for the whole kingdom. Vasiṣṭha, the brahmin, describes himself as “a forgiving \([kṣamāvān]\) brahmin”\(^{91}\) and says, “a baron's strength is his energy, a brahmin's strength his forbearance \([kṣamā]\). Forbearance \([kṣamā]\) possesses \([bhajate]\) me; therefore, go if you wish”\(^{92}\) (van Buitenen, 2011, p. 332). All the above examples are in the context of

\[ātmajñānaṃ paraṃ jīnānaṃ paraṃ satyavrataṃ vratam\]

\(^{90}\) Udyoga parvan, chapter 34, verse 72

\[hiṃśa balam asādhūnāṃ rājñāṃ daṇḍavidhir balam\]

\[śuśrūṣā tu balam strīnāṃ kṣamā guṇavatāṃ balam\]

\(^{91}\) Ādi parva, chapter 165, verse 24

\[balād dhriyasi me nandi kṣamāvān brāhmaṇo hy aham\]

\(^{92}\) Ādi parva, chapter 165, verse 26-28

\[pāṣaṇaḍāḍābihatāṃ krandantīṃ māṃ anāthavat\]

\[viśvāmitrabalair ghorair bhagavan kim upekte\]

\[gandharva uvāca\]

\[evaṃ tasyāṃ tadā partha dharṣitāyāṃ mahāmuniḥ\]
brahmans, hence implying that they referring to K₁ kṣānti, and in all these examples, kṣamā is cited as a strength.

In the case of kṣatriyas, we see the notion that kṣānti is perceived as a weakness. For example, Vidura’s says to Dhṛtarāṣṭra, “The forgiving [kṣamāvatām] have one flaw, none other is found: people think that the forgiving man is incompetent [aśaktam]”93 (Van Buitenen, 1983, p. 124).

While in this case the perception of kṣānti being a weakness is stated directly, in some cases the assumption of its being a weakness is implied indirectly. For example, when Śalya tells Karṇa he will be killed if he battles Arjuna and Kṛṣṇa, Karṇa says, “I can kill a hundred people like you, but I forgive [kṣamāmi] you due to these circumstances [kālayogāt].”94 Here we see Karṇa making it clear before forgiving Śalya that he is

______________________________

na cukṣubhe na dhairyāc ca vicacāla dhṛtavrataḥ

vasiśṭha uvāca

kṣatriyāṇāṃ balaṃ tejo brāhmaṇāṇāṃ kṣamā balam

kṣamā māṃ bhajate tasmād ganyatāṃ yadi rocate

93 Udyoga parva, chapter 33, verse 47

ekaḥ kṣamāvatāṃ doṣo dvitiyo nopalabhyate

yad enaṃ kṣamayā yuktam aśaktaṃ manyate janaḥ

94 Karṇaparvan, Chapter 29, Verse 20:

hanyām aham tādṛśānāṃ satāni; kṣamāmi tvāṃ kṣamayā kālayogāt
stronger and can easily kill him. This suggests that there is an implicit assumption of forgiveness being linked with weakness, which Karṇa feels the need to deny.

Based on these findings, the characteristics of $K_1$ and $K_2$ $kṣānti$ can be updated, resulting in a detailed and nuanced understanding of the differences between the two meanings:

Table 6: The differences between $kṣānti$ [K1] and titikṣā [K2] (6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$Kṣānti$ [K1]</th>
<th>Titikṣā [K2]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Practiced by sadhus, brāhmaṇas, mendicants, brahmacārins, vanacārins</td>
<td>• A type of $kṣānti$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Practiced in every situation – with respect to what is agreeable and disagreeable</td>
<td>• Practiced for the purpose of dharma, artha, and lokasamgraṇaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A permanent act</td>
<td>• Obtained through dhairya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mutually exclusive with anger</td>
<td>• Practiced by $kṣatriyas$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Always considered Lawful [dharmic]</td>
<td>• A temporary act characterized by waiting or biding time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Considered a strength</td>
<td>• Not mutually exclusive with anger, violence, and punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can be lawful [dharmic] or unlawful [undharmic] based on the circumstances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Perceived as a weakness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.7 Summary

It is remarkable that across a work as textured and layered as the Mahābhārata, the dual meanings of $kṣānti$ are so consistently discernable. It is furthermore remarkable that the various characteristics of the two types of $kṣānti$ unraveled here complement each other. Based on the extensive analysis in the section, $K_1$ $kṣānti$ can be summarized as a permanent, dharmic act which is practiced by sādhus in every situation, is mutually exclusive with anger, and is a strength. On the other hand, $K_2$ $kṣānti$, is a type of $kṣānti$ practiced by $kṣatriyas$ which involves waiting for the right time; it is not mutually
exclusive with anger or violence, can be *dharmic* or *undharmic* based on the circumstances and is often perceived as a weakness.

Having elucidated the meanings of $K_1$ and $K_2$ *kṣānti* comprehensively, I will now discuss issues that arise when scholars attempt to translate the term *kṣānti* in several English translations of the *Mahābhārata* and share my perspective on how best to navigate such issues in future translations.

1.2.8 Translating *kṣānti*

The analysis above hopefully makes it clear that when *kṣānti* is used in the *Mahābhārata* it could be referring to one of two different things. Hence, to understand the text correctly, the reader needs to know which of the two meanings of *kṣānti* is being intended in the given context. In extant translations of the *Mahābhārata*, this difference does not come across clearly as a large number of terms are being used to translate *kṣānti* and there is no consistency or logic behind the erratic and frequent change of terms used to translate *kṣānti*. This is regrettable since the meaning of the passage changes greatly based on the choice of English word used to translate it. To overcome these challenges persistent across all extant translations of the *Mahābhārata*, I propose a logical and simple method for choosing and applying an English word to translate *kṣānti* based on the context where it appears. The suggestions made in this
section are based on the principles of translation theory\textsuperscript{95} and draw primarily from my study of the term *kṣānti* and *titikṣā* across the *Mahābhārata*.

There are several approaches a translator could take for translating the technical term ‘*kṣānti*’ in the *Mahābhārata*. I classify these broadly into four categories: (1) leaving *kṣānti* untranslated, (2) using a single English word to translate *kṣānti* across the epic, (3) using a few (two-three) different words to translate *kṣānti*, (4) or using several (more than four) words to translate it across the epic.

I begin by discussing the option of leaving *kṣānti* untranslated and argue that this approach is sub-optimal and impractical. This approach has been adopted occasionally by scholars such as Barbara Nelson (2011) who chose to leave ‘*kṣānti*’ untranslated in her translation of the *kṣāntipāramitā* of the *Bodhicaryāvatāra*. She justified her decision saying that “[a]s one aim of the thesis was to determine the scope of *kṣānti*, it seemed premature to burden it with an English equivalent that would not encompass the range of meanings that *kṣānti* has in Mahayana Buddhism.” [88] Theoretically, if one were to capture the precise meaning of the word *kṣānti* in English, one would have to do what Nelson did, for it is nearly impossible for any word in a foreign language to capture the exact meaning of a technical term in another language. But in practice, translation is more subjective and when translating texts like the *Mahābhārata* it would be impractical to leave every technical term such as *kṣānti* untranslated. Since the analysis

\textsuperscript{95} For an overview of translation theory and its application to a Sanskrit text, see Nelson (2011).
above on the two meanings of kṣānti in the Mahābhārata has revealed important insights, I disfavor the use of this approach by translators of the Mahābhārata and instead favor an approach where the term is translated and the English word used to do so effectively communicates as close as is possible the precise meaning of this term.

The optimal solution, in my opinion, is to consistently use two different terms to translate kṣānti in the Mahābhārata – one word to translate K₁ and a second to translate K₂. Using two different terms to translate each of the two meanings of kṣānti would make it easier for readers to differentiate between the two meanings of kṣānti and avoid the considerable confusion that has stemmed from them being translated with the same English word in several translations. At the same time, limiting the range of words used to translate kṣānti would make the use of this term across the Mahābhārata easier to track, and make arguments involving kṣānti easier to follow.⁹⁶

Having examined a wide range of English words to fit the two meanings of kṣānti, I propose that “forgiveness” be used to translate K₁ and “patience” be used to translate K₂.

Forgiveness is generally defined by dictionaries as to “stop feeling angry or resentful towards (someone) for an offense, flaw, or mistake.”⁹⁷ There are two keywords in this definition, each of which captures one unique characteristic of K₁ kṣānti. The first is

---

⁹⁶ This is particularly true for lengthy and complex arguments involving the term kṣānti such as the “kṣānti” debate which will be analysed in detail in the next section.

⁹⁷ https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/forgive
“stop” and it implies that forgiveness entails the permanent end of negative feelings. In the previous section, we have discussed how one of the defining characteristics of K₁ is that it is “a permanent act involving the relinquishment of negative feelings.” This permanency inherent in K₁ is captured well by this aspect of forgiveness. The second keyword in the definition of forgiveness is “anger.” Forgiveness is defined as the cessation of “anger” and this reflects the key characteristic of K₁ – the exclusion of anger. These two factors make “forgiveness” the perfect choice for the translation of K₁.

“Forgiveness,” however, would not be a suitable candidate to translate K₂ for two reasons. First, the permanent abolishment of negative feelings contradicts K₂’s temporal aspect. Since K₂ clearly means waiting for the right time or biding time, forgiveness would convey a wholly different meaning to the act. Second, by definition, since forgiveness involves the abolishment of anger and retaliation, it would be inaccurate in all instances where we see K₂ occurring alongside anger, violence, punishment, and war.

Despite these inaccuracies, I have observed that “forgiveness” is one of the most popular words used to translate K₂ in all extant translations of the Mahābhārata. Such cases of translation are problematic and imprecise, for they distort the meaning of the text grossly.

When it comes to translating K₂, I propose two different options – “tolerance” and “patience” - each of which has its own merits. “Tolerance” means to “allow the existence, occurrence, or practice of (something that one dislikes or disagrees with)
without interference.”^98 This definition states that tolerance has two essential characteristics: first, that the thing being tolerated is considered disagreeable, and second that its objectionableness is countered by some acceptance (denoted by the words “allow” and “without interference”), which does not nullify the negative judgment towards the thing considered objectionable, but simply trumps the negative reasons in the present context. This implies that the meaning of tolerance is very different from the meaning of forgiveness I discussed above which involves nullifying the negative attitudes towards the thing considered wrong or bad. Since in the case of “tolerance” the agent finds the deed disagreeable and still “allows” it without “interfering,” the act of tolerance implies the existence of a reason for the passive acceptance of the objectionable deed. This reason for acceptance which trumps the objectionableness of the wrong deed parallels the first characteristic of K2 – that it is practiced for a particular purpose.

The second alternative for translating K2 is “patience.” “Patience” is semantically similar to tolerance, as it also contains a component of acceptance that warrants a temporary suspension of negative judgment towards the thing being considered objectionable. Patience is commonly defined as “the capacity to accept or tolerate delay, problems, or suffering without becoming annoyed or anxious.”^99 Inherent in the meaning of “patience” is the element of time denoted by the word “delay”, which forms the most

---

^98 https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/tolerate

^99 https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/patience
essential component of its definition. This makes “patience” another viable candidate for the translation of $K_2$, particularly potent in capturing the temporal aspect of $K_2$. It may be further noted that forgiveness, on the other hand, is bound by permanency. Hence, on a scale of temporality, forgiveness and patience are on opposing ends of the spectra. I recommend the translator make a choice between “tolerance” and “patience” based on which aspect of $K_2$ is being highlighted in the given context. If the agent’s act of restraining himself is most prominent in the given context, I recommend the use of “tolerance,” while if the temporariness of the act of $K_2$ is the main element of the context, “patience” would be a more suitable choice.

Yet one needs to be careful in using these terms to translate $kṣānti$. There are some important differences that need to be noted in order to prevent a cultural appropriation of the western understanding of these terms into the *Mahābhārata* which can lead to misunderstandings. For example, the western understanding of “forgiveness” is usually conditional, i.e. it is usually given by the agent after an apology or show of remorse by the wrongdoer. Forgiveness in the *Mahābhārata*, however, seems to be unconditional – there are no conditions placed on the wrongdoer prior to the practice of $kṣānti$. Yet, in western philosophy “unconditional forgiveness” is a relatively new concept and it was not until recently that Garrard and McNaughton (2003) coined the term “unconditional forgiveness” to refer to “morally positive forgiveness that doesn’t depend on the actions or attitudes of the wrongdoer.” If a reader were to assume that the conditionality often implicit within the western notion of forgiveness can also be applied to the *Mahābhārata*, it would likely lead to a misunderstanding of the text. Take, for example,
Narayana’s (2001) analysis of kṣānti in the Mahābhārata, where she says “in the epic Mahābhārata, when the Kaurava princes dishonor the queen Draupadī in a royal court and exult about it, she does not forgive them. Nor is there expectancy that she would forgive them when there is no repentance on their side.” Her assumption of Draupadī not forgiving the Kaurvas due to a lack of repentance on their part is baseless since this reason is not given anywhere in the practice of kṣānti in the Mahābhārata. More importantly, “tolerance” and not “forgiveness” would be a more accurate term to describe the Pāṇḍava’s practice of kṣānti towards the Kauravas, since the practice is temporary.

In the rest of my thesis, I will use the translation rubric set forth above and translate all instances of K₁ kṣānti as “forgiveness” and instances of K₂ kṣānti as “patience” or “tolerance” depending on the context.

1.3 Reevaluating the “Kṣānti Debate”

Having examined the two meanings of kṣānti as it is used in the Mahābhārata, in this section I will demonstrate the immense usefulness of these findings by re-evaluating a long and important debate that occurs between Draupadī, Yudhiṣṭhira and Bhīmasena in the Āranyaka parva where kṣānti is a recurring and prominent theme. This debate has received a lot of scholarly attention (Bailey, 1985, pp. 150-157; Biardeau, 2002, pp. 423–426, 437–444; Hill, 2001, pp. 168-178; Hiltebeitel, 2001, 2011a; Malinar, 2007) with scholars focusing on different elements of the debate. A common challenge faced by scholars is the translation of the term kṣānti in this debate. For example, indicating the
difficulty in translating kṣamā in this debate, in one instance Biardeau translates kṣamā as “patience” but says it could mean “forgiveness” as well.\textsuperscript{100} Following this, throughout her translation she straddles between forgiveness and patience, not following any apparent pattern. In one odd instance, she also uses both terms together to translate kṣamā \cite{426}. Van Buitenen similarly uses a wide range of words to translate kṣānti, without consistency or apparent patterns. Using the findings above, I will translate kṣānti more accurately in each instance of its occurrence in this debate and subsequently re-evaluate the current scholarly understanding of this debate.

1.3.1 Draupadī’s plea [Mbh3.28 and 3.29]

The “kṣānti debate” starts in chapter 28 of the third book of the Mahābhārata and goes on in the subsequent nine chapters, all the way through chapter 37. The debate takes place in the forest while the Pāṇḍavas are in exile, planning their next move. Draupadī starts this debate by debating with Yudhiṣṭhira, and eventually, Bhīmasena joins the debate too, taking Draupadī’s side. Despite receiving ample scholarly attention, the crux of the debate itself is highly misunderstood by scholars.

The debate starts with Draupadī narrating all the hardships faced by the Pāṇḍavas in the forest and asking Yudhiṣṭhira why he does not get angry:

\begin{quote}
She says “une sorte d’hymne à la patience – kṣama -, qui peut être aussi le pardon....” (Biardeau, 2002, p. 423).
\end{quote}
“Surely there is no anger [manyur] left in you, you the best of the Bharatas, if you can look at your brothers and at me, and your heart feels no qualms! But there is no baron [kṣatriyo] known in the world without anger [nirmanyuḥ], without challenge; in you, a baron [kṣatriye], I now see the opposite. A baron [kṣatriyah] who does not show his authority [tejah] when the moment comes [kāla āgate] all creatures will despise forever after, Pārtha! Don't show patience [kṣamā] to your enemies under any conditions, for with authority alone you can cut them down, no doubt of that! Even so, the baron [kṣatriyo] who does not give in when it is time for forgiveness [kṣamākāle] is hated by all creatures and perishes here and hereafter.”101 (J. A. B. van Buitenen, 1981, p. 275)

101 Vana parvan, chapter 28, verses 33-37

नुनामः क तव नैवास्तi भरतसृष्टा मन्युर भरतसात्तामा
यत ते भ्रात्रिः स साम्र जैवत्र द्रष्टृवा ना व्यात्ते मानाह
ना निर्‌मन्युहो धेरात्रियो 'स्ति लोके निर्वचानः स्मर्ताम
तद आद्या तवयि पाश्यैंमि धेरात्रिये विपरित्तावत
यो ना दर्शायते तेजाः धेरात्रियाः काला अगेत
सर्वभृतानि तम पर्था सादी परिभावन्त्य उता
तत तवाया ना क्षामाः कार्याः शत्रूः प्रति कथाम चाना
tetasaiva hi te śakyā nihantuṁ nātra samśayaḥ
Here, it can be inferred that Draupādi is describing K₂ based on three strong indications.

First, the context is that of kṣatriyas, and more importantly, Draupādi’s main emphasis is on the fact that Yudhiṣṭhira is a kṣatriya. In this small passage itself, she mentions Yudhiṣṭhira’s varṇa four times. Her argument here is that Yudhiṣṭhira must not practice kṣānti because he is a kṣatriya. Second, the temporal aspect of K₂ kṣānti is explicitly emphasized by her. She says that there is a time for kṣamā [kṣamākāle] and vice versa.

Third, this passage records anger as a virtue, for Draupādi taunts Yudhiṣṭhira saying “Surely there is no anger [manyur] left in you.”¹⁰² Therefore, a good translation of kṣānti in this verse would be “tolerance”, not “forgiveness”, which is what van Buitenen has chosen. Re-reading Draupādi’s argument by substituting “forgiveness” with “tolerance” will make the passage more coherent and clearer:

Surely there is no anger left in you, you the best of the Bharatas, if you can look at your brothers and at me, and your heart feels no qualms! But there is no kṣatriya known in the world without anger, without challenge; in you, a kṣatriya, I now see the opposite. A kṣatriya who does not show his fierceness when the moment comes all creatures will despise forever after, Pārtha! Don't show even a trace of tolerance to your enemies, for

__________________________

tathaiva yaḥ kṣamākāle kṣatriyo nopaśāmyati
apriyaḥ sarvabhūtānāṃ so 'mutraḥ ca naśyati

¹⁰² Malinar (2007, p. 81) also observes that for Draupādi “manyu” is positive in this context.
with authority alone you can cut them down, no doubt of that! Likewise, the kṣatriya who does not give in when it is time for tolerance is hated by all creatures and perishes here and hereafter. (modification of J. A. B. van Buitenen, 1981, p. 275)

Further evidence to support the reading of kṣānti here as K₂ comes from Malinar’s analysis of the use of the word manyu in this passage. Citing Malamoud (2016) she says that “manyu is not just another word for krodha or kopa, that is, anger as a passion or transient emotion. Rather, manyu is regarded as an essential quality and capacity of (royal) gods like Indra or Varuna, which allows them to maintain their status and enact their power... in this sense it can also be applied to warriors.” If Malinar and Malamoud’s arguments are correct, and in this case, I think they are, manyu here is an essential kṣatriya quality. Malinar also rightly observes that the point of emphasis in this passage is the kṣatriya varṇa of Yudhiṣṭhira to which he is not adhering.¹⁰³

However, unaware of the two different meanings of kṣānti, Malinar is left confused by certain statements made by Draupadī and incorrectly analyses them. For instance, she calls the last sentence (“Even so, the baron [kṣatriya] who does not give in when it is time for forgiveness [kṣamākāle] is hated by all creatures and perishes here and

¹⁰³ She says, “at the very end of the paper, in the last śloka (3.28.37), Draupadī’s complaint is suspended by the authors, or later redactors, by her statement that sometimes forgiveness (kṣamā) is called for.” [83]
hereafter.”) uttered by Draupādi “unexpected” [81] and mistakenly assumes that it contradicts the rest of Draupādi’s speech.\textsuperscript{104} Her confusion is a result of taking the statement out of context. This statement needs to be read along with the previous line. The use of the connecting word \textit{tathaiva} supports the interpretation of reading the two lines together. Since \textit{tathaiva} means “likewise” (as I have translated it) or “in a similar way,” the two sentences clearly complement each other, as I have interpreted them, rather than contradict each other, as Malinar assumes. In fact, the two lines put together constitute the conventional meaning of \textit{K}_{2} for they state that at certain times \textit{kṣatriyas} should practice \textit{kṣānti}, and at certain times they should not. Similar descriptions of the situational use of \textit{kṣānti} have been seen above.

The same misunderstanding also leads Malinar to misinterpret 3.29 which contains the story of Prahlāda and Bali Vairocana. In 3.29 Bali asks his father, "What is better, father, to tolerate\textsuperscript{105} [\textit{kṣamā}] or to be fierce?"\textsuperscript{106} (modification of J. A. B. van Buitenen, 1981, p. 104 Vana parvan, chapter 28, verse 37

tathaiva yaḥ kṣamākāle kṣatriyo nopaśāmyati

apriyāḥ sarvabhūtānāṃ so 'mutreha ca naśyati

\textsuperscript{105} In this verse van Buitenen translates \textit{kṣama} as “forgiveness.” But it amply clear that the two warriors are discussing \textit{K}_{2} based on the context. Hence I have left van Buitenen’s incorrect translation out and replaced it with “tolerance.”

\textsuperscript{106} Vana parvan, chapter 29, verse 3
The father says, “Revenge is not always better, but neither is tolerance \([kṣamā]\); learn to know them both, son, so that there be no problem.”\(^{107}\) (modification of J. A. B. van Buitenen, 1981, p. 276) Malinar interprets this as a “diplomatic answer” \([81]\) given by Prahlāda. However, as is well established at this point, this presentation of \(kṣānti\) is the normative understanding of \(K_2\) and completely consistent with its characteristics. \(K_2\) is a characteristically temporary act. Since it involves biding time or waiting for the right moment to strike one’s enemies, there is no contradiction, confusion, ambiguity, or diplomacy in what Prahlāda is saying. He is simply telling his son that he needs to learn tolerance and revenge, as there is a right time for both.

Most concerning of all is the conclusion drawn by her about the historicity of this section, based on this misunderstanding of \(kṣānti\). She says

“From a text-historical perspective 3.29 could be regarded as an interpolation because the last verse of the previous section (3.28.37)\(^{108}\) is

\[
\begin{align*}
kṣamā svic chreyasī tāta utāho teja ity uta \\
etan me saṃśayaṃ tāta yathāvad brūhi prcchate
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{107}\) Vana parvan, chapter 29, verse 6

\[
\begin{align*}
na śreyāḥ satataṃ tejo na nityaṃ śreyasī kṣamā \\
itī tāta vijāṇīhi dvayam etad asaṃśayam
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{108}\) Vana parvan, chapter 28, verse 37

\[
\begin{align*}
tathaiva yaḥ kṣamākāle kṣatriyo nopaśāmyati \\
apriyāḥ sarvabhūtānāṃ so 'mutreha ca naśyati
\end{align*}
\]
anti-climactic: it contradicts Draupadī’s emphasis in the previous verse, in which kṣamā is definitely ruled out. A change in terminology also points in this direction since throughout chapter 3.29 tejas, not manyu, is regarded as the opposite of kṣamā.” [94]

I find Malinar’s objections problematic. Firstly, Draupadī is quoting someone and secondly it is common for synonyms to be used across sections. The use of a synonym does not in and of itself constitute valid grounds for an interpolation. Moreover, in this section, the antonym of kṣānti is not anger but tejas. The Monier-Williams (2008) dictionary has a special entry for the meaning of tejas in this particular passage: “(opposed to kṣamā) impatience, fierceness, energetic opposition”109 Based on my examination of the meaning of kṣānti above, a better interpretation of 3.29 is that it gives us a detailed list of times to be patient [kṣamākālāms], and times when one should not.110 This also supports my reading of the meaning of kṣānti as “patience” or “tolerance” in this section, as opposed to “forgiveness”.

“Even so, the baron [kṣatriyo] who does not give in when it is time for forgiveness [kṣamākāle] is hated by all creatures and perishes here and hereafter.”

109 The dyadic occurrence of kṣānti and tejas has also been discussed by Paolo Magnone (2009).

110 Vana parvan, chapter 29, verse 24

kṣamākālāms tu vakṣyāmi śṛṇu me vistareṇa tān ye te nityam asaṃtyājyā yathā prāhur maniṣināḥ
Draupadī ends this section by saying, “There is no more time to ply the Kurus with tolerance [kṣamākālo]; and when the time for authority has come, the authority must be employed. The meek are despised, but people shrink from the severe: he is a king [mahīpatiḥ] who knows both when their time has come.”¹¹¹ (modification of J. A. B. van Buiten, 1981, p. 277)¹¹² These words add further weight to the reading of the last two verses in 3.28 together, as opposed to viewing the last verse in isolation, specifically the word dvayaṃ meaning “both.” Moreover, in this section it can once again be seen that Draupadī is citing Yudhiṣṭhira’s varṇa and position as a king as the reason for his practice of K₂, providing yet another clue about the correct interpretation and translation of kṣānti as K₂ in these two sections.

Based on the re-evaluation of sections 3.28 and 3.29, Draupadī’s argument can be understood more clearly – she is simply asking Yudhiṣṭhira to exact revenge based on his

¹¹¹ Vana parvan, chapter 29, verse 34-35

na hi kaś cit kṣamākālo vidyate 'dya kurūn prati
tejasaś cāgāte kāle teja utsraṭṭum arhasi
mṛdur bhavaty avajñātas tīkṣnād udvijate janaḥ
kāle prāpte dvayaṃ hy etad yo veda sa mahīpatiḥ

¹¹² Once again van Buiten has incorrectly translated kṣam as “forgiveness.” Based on the same reasons discussed above, since it means “tolerance” in this case, I have made that substitution.
varṇa as a kṣatriya, by stating that for a kṣatriya there is a right and a wrong time to practice Kṅ kṣānti and hence he cannot practice tolerance forever.

1.3.2 Yudhiṣṭhira’s response [Mbh3.30 – 3.32]

The next section discusses Yudhiṣṭhira’s response to Draupadī. He says:

Why should a man like me indulge an anger that the wise [ḍhīraiḥ] avoid\(^{113}\)... Likewise the powerful man who does not anger, if he is wise [vidvāṁś], under harassment will destroy his oppressor and rejoice in the next world. Thus both the strong and the weak, they say, should always [nityadā] forgive [kṣantavyaṃ], even in distress, when they have this knowledge. For the good [sādhavaḥ] praise in this world the suppression of anger, Kṛṣna, for to the forgiving [kṣamāvato] and good [sādhor] is victory, thus hold the strict.\(^{114}\) (J. A. B. van Buitenen, 1981, pp. 277-278)

\(^{113}\) Vana parvan, chapter 30, verse 8
taṁ krodhaṁ varjitam dhīraiḥ katham asmadvidhaś caret

\(^{114}\) Vana parvan, chapter 30, verse 12-14
vidvāṁś tathaiva yaḥ śaktaḥ kliśyamāno na kupyati
sa nāśayitvā klesiṣṭāram paraloke ca nandati
tasmād balavatā caiva durbalena ca nityadā
kṣantavyaṃ puruṣeṇāhur āpatsv api vijānatā
Here Yudhiṣṭhirā refutes Draupadī’s argument by saying that one must always \textit{nityadā} forgive. Most importantly, Yudhiṣṭhirā’s reasons for preaching this are that this is what the wise \textit{[dhīraiḥ, vidvāṁs, sādhavah, sādhōṛ]} do. In this short selection itself, he can be seen emphasizing this point four times. Based on this it can be inferred that he has changed the referential point in the argument from \textit{kṣatriyas} to the \textit{sādhus}, thereby shifting the discourse from \textit{K}₂ to \textit{K}₁.

Furthermore, he says: “This much is certain that it is better that a man forsake his own Law \textit{[svadharma]} than that he fall prey to anger.”\textsuperscript{115} (J. A. B. van Buitenen, 1981, p. 278) This suggests that he recognizes that he is forsaking his \textit{svadharma} - the \textit{kṣatriyadharma} - when he denounces \textit{K}₂ \textit{kṣānti}. This is extremely important to note for it means that he agrees with Draupadī’s point that the \textit{kṣatriyadharma} entails being selectively tolerant \textit{[K}₂\textit{]}, but wants to follow the \textit{dharma of sādhus} \textit{[K}₁\textit{]} regardless. This statement is the key to understanding this complex and nuanced debate for it implies that his argument is not about \textit{what} the prescribed \textit{dharma} for kings is. Instead, it is that he does not want to follow the \textit{dharma of kings}, the \textit{kṣatriyadharma}, but that of

\begin{flushleft}
manyor hi vijayaṁ kṛṣṇe praśaṁsatīha sādhavah
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
kṣamāvato jayo nityaṁ sādhor iha satāṁ matam
\end{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{115} Vana parvan, chapter 30, verse 23

\begin{flushleft}
śreyān svadharmānapago na kruddha iti niścitam
\end{flushleft}
sādhus instead. Hence, there is no debate on the nature of kṣānti; they instead debate which dhārma is applicable to him.

Following this, he sings the hymn of those who are possessed with kṣamā that was sung by Kāśyapa:

\[Kṣamā\] is Law and rite, Vedas and learning,

He who knows \[kṣamā\] thus can \[kṣantum\] anything.

\[Kṣamā\] is brahman, the truth, the past, and the future,

Austerity and purity: \[Kṣamā\] upholds the world.

Beyond the worlds of the brahman-wise \[brahmavidām\] and ascetic \[tapasvinām\],

Beyond those of the knowers of rites \[yajñavidām\], go the practitioners of \[kṣamā\] to theirs.

The might \[tejaḥ\] of the mighty is \[kṣamā\], the brahman of hermits \[tapasvinām\],
The truth of the truthful is kṣamā, the gift and the glory.\textsuperscript{116} (modification of J. A. B. van Buitenen, 1981, p. 279)\textsuperscript{117}

Once again, note the repeated references made to the world of ascetics and brahmins [yajñāḥ, vedāḥ, śrutam, brahma vidām, tapasvinām, yajñavidām]. In this hymn on kṣānti, Yudhiṣṭhira does not talk about kingship, war, or kṣatriyas\textsuperscript{118}. Kṣam in this hymn would

\begin{verbatim}
116 Vana parvan, chapter 30, verse 36-39

kṣamā dharmah kṣamā yajñaḥ kṣamā vedāḥ kṣamā śrutam
yas tām evaṁ vijānāti sa sarvaṁ kṣantum arhati
kṣamā brahma kṣamā satyaṁ kṣamā bhūtaṁ ca bhāvi ca
kṣamā tapah kṣamā śaucaṁ kṣamayā coddhrtaṁ jagat
ati brahma vidāṁ lokān ati cāpi tapasvinām
ati yajñavidāṁ caiva kṣaminaḥ prāpnuvanti tān
kṣamā tejasvināṁ tejah kṣamā brahma tapasvinām
kṣamā satyaṁ satyavatāṁ kṣamā dānaṁ kṣamā yaśaḥ
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{117} I have left kṣamā untranslated in this hymn as van Buitenen translates it as “patience” which I will demonstrate below is incorrect.

\textsuperscript{118} The comment, “The might [tejah] of the mighty [tejasvināṁ] is patience” is also not necessarily a reference to the power of ksatriyas. Tejasvin is defined as “brilliant, splendid, bright, powerful, energetic” in the Monier-Williams Dictionary which could refer to any person with these qualities [p 454].
therefore be best translated as “forgiveness”, and not “patience,” as van Buitenen has chosen to do in this case.

Yudhiṣṭhira ends by saying, “This is the way of those who have mastered themselves [ātmavatāṁ], this their eternal [sanātanah] Law, to be forgiving and gentle, and thus I shall act!”\(^{119}\) (modification of J. A. B. van Buitenen, 1981, p. 279)\(^ {120}\) Once again, the reference to wise people helps us correctly interpret his point as being advocacy for K1. Malinar also observes the shift in the referential framework\(^ {121}\) but misses the main point of the shift of varṇa. Moreover, her assumption of Yudhiṣṭhira’s reasons for changing the referential framework is incorrect. She says that Yudhiṣṭhira does so because “to accept Draupadi’s point of view Yudhiṣṭhira would need to take a look at himself, but

\[^{119}\] Vana parvan, chapter 30, verse 50

etad ātmavatāṁ vṛttam eṣa dharmaḥ sanātanaḥ

kṣamā caivāṁśaṁsyām ca tat kartāśmy aham añjasā

\[^{120}\] I have replaced van Buitenen’s incorrect translation of kṣam as “patience” with “forgiveness” based on the reasons described above.

\[^{121}\] “Thus, Yudhiṣṭhira’s line of argument changes not only the vocabulary, but also the referential framework. Although concrete situations were adduced in the discourse of Prahlāda in order to explain the different contexts that demand from the king a display of either anger or endurance, Yudhiṣṭhira interprets both as matters of principle, and assesses their metaphysical or even ontological value without applying it to any of those concrete situations.” \(^{[84]}\)
this is not desirable when the gaze of the queen, which serves to define him according to the norms of their social position, is unfavorable. He, in turn, does not deal directly with her line of thought. Instead, he re-frames her whole argument.” [86] According to Malinar’s interpretation, Yudhiṣṭhira is deflecting the argument on purpose and not answering her question directly. However, in my view, this interpretation is incorrect.

After Draupadī argued that Yudhiṣṭhira should practice K₂ because of his varṇa as a kṣatriya, here Yudhiṣṭhira replies that he does not want to follow the kṣatriya dharma, but wants to do what the sādhus prescribe – which is K₁ kṣānti. This is a direct response to Draupadī, in line with what Draupadī has said before. Yudhiṣṭhira does not go off on a tangent, as Malinar hypothesizes, but instead responds directly to Draupadī’s argument by saying that the sādhu dharma, and not the kṣatriya dharma applies to him.

Furthermore, Malinar calls Yudhiṣṭhira’s argument “abstract” [86]. Yet based on the characteristics of K₁, his argument is a concrete and consistent description of the normative understanding of K₁. Further support for this interpretation over Malinar’s comes from the next section, 3.31, where Draupadī says, “While you should carry on in the way of your father and grandfather, your mind has gone another way!”[122] (J. A. B. van Buitenen, 1981, pp. 279-280) Here Draupadī notes that Yudhiṣṭhira is not following the dharma of his ancestors – the kṣatriya dharma, and is looking to follow another dharma.

[122] Vana parvan, chapter 31, verse 1

pitṛpaṁāhe vr̥tte voḍhavye te 'nyathā maṁtiḥ
In 3.32 Yudhiṣṭhira goes back to the ascetics once again: “Krṣṇā, do not cast doubt on the Law that is observed by the learned [śiṣṭair], the ancient Law proclaimed by the all-knowing, all-seeing seers [ṛṣibhih].”\(^{123}\) (J. A. B. van Buitenen, 1981, p. 282) Once again Yudhiṣṭhira calls out to the dharma of sages and proclaims those as superior. Throughout this argument, the issue is clear - Draupadī is trying to convince Yudhiṣṭhira to follow the kṣatriya dharma, according to which he would have to follow K2 kṣānti which is time-dependent, while he wants to practice K1 kṣānti which is practiced by sādhus.

1.3.3 Bhīmasena’s argument [Mbh3.34]

Next, Bhīmasena joins the debate and echoes Draupadī’s arguments saying, "Travel the lawlike roadway of kingship [rājyasya], which is used by the strict!\(^{124}\)" (J. A. B. van Buitenen, 1981, p. 286) Further he lays out their agenda, “If we are to observe our own Law [svadharmam], if we wish to win plentiful fame, if we are to counter enmity, it is in war that our task clearly lies.”\(^{125}\) (J. A. B. van Buitenen, 1981, p. 287) He urges

\(^{123}\) Vana parvan, chapter 32, verse 21
\[^{124}\text{Vana parvan, chapter 34, verse 2}\]
\[^{125}\text{Vana parvan, chapter 34, verse 19}\]
Yudhiṣṭhira to be more ksatriya-like saying, “Make your heart a baron’s [kṣātraṃ] heart, shed the weakness [śithilam] of your mind, show bravery, Kaunteya, and carry the yoke like a beast of burden. No king [rājan] has ever conquered earth by being solely lawminded, nor have they thus won prosperity and fortune.”¹²⁶ (J. A. B. van Buitenen, 1981, p. 289) These statements show how Bhīmasena was clearly echoing Draupadi’s argument. He is urging Yudhiṣṭhira to observe his svadharma, the kṣatriya dharma, and hence implying that he should practice K2 – the prescribed form of kṣānti for a kṣatriya.

Further, Bhīmasena says, “Whether renunciation or success is a greater good for those who want happiness, scion of Kuru, is a question on which you should decide with every means, and then at once carry out the former, or proceed to success, king, for life is a sick man’s misery for the one who vacillates between the two.”¹²⁷ (J. A. B. van Buitenen, 1981, p. 289)

¹²⁶ Vana parvan, chapter 34, verse 55-56

sarvathā kāryam etan naḥ svadharmam anutiṣṭhatām
kāṅkṣatām vipulāṃ kīrtim vairam praticikṛsatām

¹²⁷ Vana parvan, chapter 34, verse 42-43

mokṣo vā paramaṃ śreya eṣa rājan sukhārthinām
prāptir vā buddhim āsthāya sopāyaṃ kurunandana
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The two options Bhīma gives Yudhiṣṭhira – mokṣa and prāpti – indicate that Draupadī and Yudhiṣṭhira’s argument preceding this was indeed vacillating between these two ends, as I had interpreted it. Draupadī’s argument was goading Yudhiṣṭhira towards prāpti, while he was advocating for a form of kṣānti that leads to mokṣa. Since both use the dual-meaning term kṣānti in their argument, the distinction can be difficult to unravel, unless one is well acquainted with the two meanings of kṣānti and engages in a close reading of the text to correctly interpret which meaning of kṣānti is being intended in each case. In fact, Bhīmasena’s distillation of the argument is further evidence for the existence of two different meanings of kṣānti.

1.3.4 Yudhiṣṭhira’s rebuttal [Mbh3.35]

Next, Yudhiṣṭhira agrees with what Bhīma has said, saying:

They are doubtless true, O Bharata,
Your biting words that hurt and destroy me.
I do not blame you for your bitterness,
For my wrong course brought this misery on you....

I do not demur at your words, Bhīmasena,

128 Vana parvan, chapter 35, verse 1

128 Vana parvan, chapter 35, verse 1

na tvā vigarhe pratikūlam etan; mamānayād dhi vyasanaṃ va āgāt
But I think that it thus was fated to be.\(^{129}\) (J. A. B. van Buitenen, 1981, pp. 290-291)

Here Yudhiṣṭhira can be seen conceding to Bhīmasena’s argument by saying that Bhīmasena’s words are “doubtless true.” Furthermore, Yudhiṣṭhira says:

> Having sworn to the treaty before honest men,
> Who would want to break it, for the prize of a kingdom?
> For a noble I think it is graver than death
> To transgress the Law and hold sway over earth.\(^{130}\) (J. A. B. van Buitenen, 1981, p. 291)

This implies that Yudhiṣṭhira agrees with Bhīma’s argument that he should follow the *kṣatriya* dharma, for he does not argue with his point that they should wage war, but gives a reason for why he cannot wage war at this time. He says he had made a promise to honor the pact and he cannot back down from his word. In fact, he asks Bhīma why he did not say this at the time of the dice match:

> Why did you not earlier, when we contracted,
> Speak out like this, displaying your manhood?

---

\(^{129}\) Vana parvan, chapter 35, verse 5

\[na \text{ te } vācaṃ \text{ bhīmasenābhyasūye; } \text{manye } \text{ tathā } \text{ tad bhavitavyam } \text{āsīt}\]

\(^{130}\) Vana parvan, chapter 35, verse 14

\[tāṃ \text{ sāṃdhiṃ } \text{āsthāya } \text{satāṃ } \text{sakāśe; } \text{ko } \text{nāma } \text{jahyād } \text{iha } \text{rājyahetoḥ } \text{āryasya } \text{manye } \text{maranād } \text{gariyo; } \text{yad } \text{dharman } \text{utkramya } \text{mahīṃ } \text{praśīṣyāt}\]
Now you’ve found your time, but far too late,
You berate me now, and beyond your time!^{131} (J. A. B. van Buiten, 1981, p. 292)

This confirms that Yudhiṣṭhira agrees with the argument that Bhīma has made.

Yudhiṣṭhira ends with:

\begin{quote}
We can do nothing at present \textit{[adya]}, hero;
We must wait for the time \textit{[kālaṃ pratīkṣasva]} that our luck reappears,
After filling the pledge we made to the Kurus,
As the sower waits for his crop to ripen.
When a man, brought down before by deceit
And aware that the feud shoots blossoms and fruit.
Bears many times more with the strength of his manhood.
He lives like a hero in the world of the living!^{132} (J. A. B. van Buiten, 1981, p. 292)
\end{quote}

^{131} Vana parvan, chapter 35, verse 16
prāg eva caiva samayakriyāyāḥ; kiṃ nābravīḥ pauṛuṣam āvidānāḥ
prāptaṁ tu kālaṁ tv abhipadya paścāt; kiṃ mām idānīm ativelam āttha

^{132} Vana parvan, chapter 35, verse 18-19
na tv adya śakyaṁ bharatapraśāra; kṛtvā yad uktaṁ kuruviramadhye
kālaṁ pratīkṣasva sukhodayasya; paktiṁ phalānāṁ iva bijavāpaḥ
This further confirms that Yudhiṣṭhira agrees with Bhīma’s argument which is for him to follow the *kṣatriya dharma*, but disagrees on the fact that this is the right time for them to wage war.

This section clearly answers the question about why Yudhiṣṭhira changes his mind and decides that he will act like a king. It is not the case that he was unaware of the protocol for king. In fact, we are told that he agrees with Bhīma that Bhīma’s argument was correct all along (he says, “They are doubtless true, O Bharata, Your biting words that hurt and destroy me.”) The key reason that Yudhiṣṭhira changes his mind and decided to act like a king is that he says that he cannot break a contract that he has made (he says, “Having sworn to the treaty before honest men, who would want to break it, for the prize of a kingdom?”).

In addition, the themes of waiting and biding time denoted by the phrase *kālaṃ pratīkṣasva* are also very prominent here. Yudhiṣṭhira suggests they wait for the right time to attack and exercise tolerance, thus implying that he is now talking about K2 *kṣānti* - the very type of *kṣānti* a *kṣatriya* should practice. Note, there is no disagreement here that they will retaliate. All Yudhiṣṭhira is saying is that they must be patient and wait for the right time to act.

\[
yādā hi pūrvaṃ nikṛto nikṛtyā; vairaṃ sapuṣpaṃ saphalam viditvā
ymahāguṇaṃ harati hi pauruṣena; tadā vīro jīvati jīvaloke
\]
1.3.5 Conclusion of the debate [Mbh 3.37]

Bhīma then argues that they would not be able to win the incognito challenge, so they might as well wage war now. Yudhishthira once again agrees saying, “It is as you say”\textsuperscript{133} but “I do not think they can be defeated, even by the Gods led by Indra”\textsuperscript{134} (J. A. B. van Buitenen, 1981, p. 294). Here there is a clear shift in the attitude of Yudhiṣṭhira. From citing moral reasons for not retaliating, he cites practical and strategic political reasons. He explicitly agrees with Bhīma’s reasons that it is best not to wage war now since they will not win. This confirms his agreement with Bhīmasena and Draupadī beyond a doubt that he must adopt the \textit{ksatriya dharma} and seek revenge but thinks they should wait for the right time when they have the upper hand and can win. Bhīmasena agrees with him because the narrator says, in no unclear words, “Bhīmasena, indignant though he was, understood the truth of what he was saying and became upset and alarmed; and he had no reply to make.”\textsuperscript{135} (J. A. B. van Buitenen, 1981, p. 294)

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{133} Vana parvan, chapter 37, verse 3
\textit{evam etan mahābāho yathā vadasī bhārata}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{134} Vana parvan, chapter 37, verse 15
\textit{ajeśyāś ceti me buddhir api devaiḥ savāsavaiḥ}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{135} Vana parvan, chapter 37, verse 19
\textit{etad vacanam ājñāya bhīmaseno 'tyamarśaṇaḥ}
\textit{babhūva vimanās trasto na caivovāca kim cana}
\end{flushleft}
At this point, it is helpful to contrast my new interpretation of the debate with existing scholarly interpretations of this debate, such as Malinar’s. To Malinar, “The dialogue between Bhīma and Yudhiṣṭhira gets stuck in 3.37... A remarkable feature of this sequence of arguments is that there is no clear solution to the conflict addressed in the debate between king and queen” (Malinar, 2007, p. 81). This is not true, for the characters in the debate have clearly reached a conclusion - they have decided not to act at present because they would lose; they have decided to wait for the right time. Therefore, one could say that they agreed to practice $K_2 kṣānti$ for the time being by being patient and waiting for the right moment to act.

Next, Vyāsa enters the scene. “Thereupon Pārāśara’s son took Yudhiṣṭhira aside, and, a master of words, he spoke to him this word full of import: "The time shall come of your fortune, best of the Bharatas, when Dhanamjaya the Pārtha overpowers the enemies in battle."”\(^{136}\) (J. A. B. van Buitenen, 1981, p. 295) Vyāsa prophesizes that the Pāṇḍava’s practice of $K_2 kṣānti$ will be temporary; eventually, the time will come when they will be able to defeat their enemies. Malinar draws a completely different conclusion from Vyāsa’s words. She says “if one takes Vyāsa’s word as final, both of their positions are

---

\(^{136}\) Vana parvan, chapter 37, verse 25-26

tata ekāntam unniya pārāśarya yudhiṣṭhiram

abravid upapannārtham idam vākyaviśāradaḥ

śreyasas te paraḥ kālaḥ prāpto bharatasattama

yenābhībhavitā sātrūn raṇe pārtho dhanamjayaḥ
partially accepted: one should put up with the situation, but meanwhile get ready to fight” (Malinar, 2007, p. 81). Firstly, I would argue that Vyāsa does not add anything to the conflict resolution, as it has already been resolved before he arrives. He is in agreement with their conclusion and simply prophesizes that their plan will work. Secondly, Vyāsa could not have resolved the debate since he spoke to Yudhiṣṭhira privately, away from the others. All other characters are unaware of what he says. Vyāsa’s primary goal was to give Yudhiṣṭhira a mantra, which he does after saying the above words.

Hence, based on my re-evaluation of the debate, which is facilitated by an understanding of the dual meanings of ksānti, it seems that the debate is not about the meaning of the word ksānti137, but rather which type of dharma Yudhiṣṭhira should follow – the dharma of ksatriya [his svadharma] - inherent to which is a practice of K₂, or the dharma of brahmans, inherent to which is the practice of K₁. It seems that the two meanings of ksānti and their spheres of applicability are known to all interlocutors and accepted by all. This can be gleaned from the fact that there is no debate about whether sādhus preach the dharma of always practicing ksānti [i.e., whether sādhus advocate K₁]. Similarly, no one questions the fact that ksatriya dharma requires one to practice ksānti only temporarily. Instead, the debate is about which dharma is most suited to Yudhiṣṭhira – the ksatriya dharma which corresponds to the varṇa he is born in

137 For example, Corduan describes this debate as “a lengthy debate on the topic of forgiveness in the Mahābhārata” [113].

or the sādhu dharma, which appeals to his philosophical ideals and is such an important aspect of his personality. At the beginning of this chapter, I had presented a list of qualities describing Yudhiṣṭhira where both terms, kṣānti, and titikṣā, were used\(^\text{138}\). I would argue that Yudhiṣṭhira has a unique personality - he is a kṣatriya with certain qualities of a sādhu. This internal conflict seems to be the basis of the debate, not the meaning of the term kṣānti. Armed with a nuanced understanding of the two meanings of kṣānti, this critical point can be gleaned through a close reading of the text, making the crux of the debate abundantly clear.

This conclusion significantly enhances the current scholarly understanding of this complex debate. Modern scholars who have studied this debate have not been able to reach the same conclusion, owing to the lack of understanding of the meanings of kṣānti.\(^\text{139}\) Additionally, the striking consistency with which the two meanings of kṣānti

\(^{138}\) “Forgiveness [kṣamā], forbearance [titikṣā], uprightness, control, avowedness to truth, great learning and zeal, compassion as well as authority— Yudhiṣṭhira has all the virtues of kings.” (Van Buitenen, 1983, p. 460)

\(^{139}\) In addition to Malinar (2007) and J. A. B. van Buitenen (1981), whose works were critically reviewed throughout this chapter, Hill (2001), Carpenter (1979), and Corduan (2019) have also incorrectly interpreted this debate. Unaware of the dual meanings of kṣānti, they have translated kṣānti with a single word across the debate. Hill uses “patience” throughout, while Carpenter and Corduan use “forgiveness”, which has led them to incorrectly interpret the debate as a debate on kṣānti. For example, Corduan
are used throughout this complex and lengthy debate is certainly noteworthy and lends further credence to my conclusions about the dual meanings of *kṣānti* in the *Mahābhārata*. At no point throughout the debate is a meticulous reader left confused about which meaning of *kṣānti* the interlocutors are referring to. There is complete fidelity in the text to the normative definitions of each type of *kṣānti*. This analysis hence also serves as an indisputable case in point about the importance and effectiveness of knowing and applying the knowledge of the dual meanings of *kṣānti* to gain a nuanced understanding of the subtle arguments made within the text.

### 1.4 Summary

In this chapter I have examined the meanings of *kṣānti* in the *Mahābhārata*. Through a careful analysis of every instance of the occurrence of the word *kṣānti* in the *Mahābhārata*, I have demonstrated how this term had two distinct meanings. First, I found a key passage in the Śāntiparvan, which presented a normative definition of *kṣamā* and *titikṣā* and explained that *titikṣā* was one of the types of *kṣānti*. For the sake of clarity and convenience, I decided to refer to the two types of *kṣānti* as K₁ and K₂ throughout the rest of the dissertation. Then, using the knowledge gained from the normative definitions of the two types of *kṣānti* I was able to uncover additional differences between them. First, they differed based on *varṇa*; K₁ was prescribed for

_____________________________
says, “The point of disagreement is whether one must always forgive or whether there are occasions when forgiveness is not appropriate.” [128]
brahmins while K₂ was prescribed for kṣatriyas. Second, they differed based on the duration of their practice; K₁ was prescribed to be practiced forever while K₂ was an essentially temporary act, practiced while one waited for the right time to take revenge. Third, K₁ and K₂ had different relationships with anger. K₁ was mutually exclusive with anger, while K₂ co-existed with it. Fourth, K₁ was considered the perennial dharma of brahmins while K₂ was at times considered dharma and at other times considered adharma. Lastly, K₁ was perceived as a strength for brahmins while K₂ was seen at times as a weakness for kṣatriyas.

This analysis, backed by a large body of examples, helped significantly enrich our current understanding of the meaning of the term kṣānti in the Mahābhārata. Rather than being a vaguely defined idea that was loosely translated using a wide range of interchangeable terms, kṣānti can now be understood to be a technical term in the Mahābhārata that contained two precise definitions, each of which had clearly discernable characteristics. Based on this, I then provided my perspective on how best to translate and interpret kṣānti in all future translations and readings of the Mahābhārata. I suggested that K₁ be translated as “forgiveness” while K₂ be translated as “patience” or “tolerance.”

I ended the chapter by re-evaluating the so-called “kṣānti debate.” This close analysis of a long and complex debate in the Mahābhārata containing several discussions surrounding kṣānti served three purposes. First, the analysis of the “kṣānti debate” served as a model example of how a scholar could use the findings presented above to critically analyze and translate any instance of kṣānti in the Mahābhārata. Second, my
analysis demonstrated the pervasiveness and rigidity with which the normative definitions of the two types of *kṣānti* were known and used throughout the text. Throughout this lengthy debate it was seen that the interlocutors were aware of the dual meanings of *kṣānti* and all references to \( K_1 \) and \( K_2 \) were consistent with their normative definitions. Third, my analysis of the debate demonstrated the value of the findings presented above; by applying the findings of the preceding sections to this debate, the meaning of the debate was made clear and its interpretation made easier.

Having examined the meaning of *kṣānti* in the *Mahābhārata*, I will now turn to examining the meaning of the Pali term *khanti* in the Pali Canon. As will be seen, the meaning and treatment of *khanti* in the Pali Canon differed considerably from that of *kṣānti* in the *Mahābhārata*. 
This chapter will systematically investigate the meaning of the term \textit{khanti} in the Pali canon. Undoubtedly, the first basic problem that needs to be addressed in order to do this is to decide what sources need to be considered from within the Pali canon and to define a corpus of texts which clearly and comprehensively illustrate \textit{khanti}\textsuperscript{140}. I will start by methodically selecting my sources, giving reasons, and defining clear criteria for their selection. Once the sources for studying \textit{khanti} have been defined, I will delve into a close reading of these sources to reveal the precise, technical meaning of \textit{khanti}. Here, through a thorough examination of a plethora of \textit{khanti} sources, I will argue that \textit{khanti} is a systematic, two-step process of ‘purification’ of negative emotions, specifically anger, followed by ‘cultivation’ of complementary Buddhist virtues, specifically goodwill (\textit{mettā}).

Next, I will examine conventions of plot, character, and motifs within the \textit{khanti} texts. I will illustrate that this body of literature has consistent characteristics and conventions in its narrative arcs, characters, motifs, and even the use of formulaic expressions. I will divide these \textit{khanti} texts into two groups according to their plotlines and characters, and each group can be seen to serve its own distinct purpose. This analysis, it is hoped, will greatly enhance our understanding of the early Buddhist treatment of \textit{khanti}.

\textsuperscript{140} This corpus of texts will collectively be referred to as “\textit{khanti} texts” for the rest of this thesis.
Lastly, I will discuss the implications of these findings in the broader context of the Pali canon, Buddhist narrative literature, the Buddhist ideas of anger and mettā, and Pali Buddhist ethics.

2.1 SOURCES FOR KHANTI\textsuperscript{141}

To determine the sources for this study, I adopt the methodology used by Gethin (2004) in his exposition of the meaning of dhamma in the Pali Canon. Gethin turns to the Pali commentaries to see what their understanding of the term dhamma is. His rationale is that although these commentaries offer a more developed understanding of dhamma than that found in the Nikāyas and early Abhidhamma, “their understanding represents a tradition of interpretation that is still relatively close to the earlier texts and provides us with important points of references for plotting the development of the usage of the term in early Buddhist thought.” (521) Gethin further notes how this methodology has also been used by T. W. Rhys Davids and William Stede in the Pali Text Society’s Pali-English Dictionary, as well as other scholars such as Carter (1976, 1978). I agree with the logic of using this methodology and find the commentarial passages very helpful in guiding us toward illustrative sections of the Pali canon that best describe its understanding of khanti. For this reason, I now turn to the Pali commentaries and see

\textsuperscript{141} Translations of Pali texts included in the rest of this thesis are mine, unless noted otherwise.
how the commentators Buddhaghosa and Dhammapāla explain the meaning of \textit{khanti} and what suttas they reference in their explanation of \textit{khanti}\textsuperscript{142}.

\subsection{Commentarial and exegetical literature}

I have identified four passages from the Pali commentaries and exegetical works that provide expositions on the meaning of \textit{khanti} by first listing its synonyms and then proceeding to cite illustrative passages from the Nikāya. These passages occur in the (1) \textit{Sarīradhātuvibhajanavaṇṇanā} in the \textit{Mahāparinibbānasuttavaṇṇanā} by Buddhaghosa\textsuperscript{143}, (2) \textit{Uddānagāthāvaṇṇanā} of the \textit{Cariyāpiṭakaṭṭhakathā} by Buddhaghosa

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{142} For an introduction to the Pali commentaries and their authors, see Hinüber (2014).

\textsuperscript{143} Ahu khantivādoti buddhabhūmiṃ appatvāpi pāramiyo pūrento khantivāditāpasakāle dharmapālakumārakāle chaddantahatthikāle bhūridattanāgarājakāle campeyyanāgarājakāle saṅkhapālanāgarājakāle mahākapikāle aṇñesu ca bahūsu jātakesu paresu kopaṃ akatvā khantimeva akāsi.

[Dīgha Nikāya, mahāvaggaṭṭhakathā, 3. mahāparinibbānasuttavaṇṇanā, sarīradhātuvibhajanavaṇṇanā para. 7]

Translation: He spoke about \textit{khanti}: Even before he attained the ground of Buddhahood, he, while fulfilling the perfections he practiced \textit{khanti} without getting angry, at the time when he was the ascetic Khantivādi, at the time when he was the prince Dhammapāla, at the time when he was the elephant Chaddanta, at the time when he was the Nāga king Bhūridatta, at the time when he was the Nāga king Campeyya, at the time when he
Dhammapāla\textsuperscript{144} (3) \textit{Māṅgalasuttavaṇṇanā} by Buddhaghosa\textsuperscript{145} and (4) the authoritative non-canonical text, \textit{Visuddhimagga} authored by Buddhaghosa.\textsuperscript{146} I summarize their references below:

was the Nāga king Saṅkhapāla, at the time when he was Mahākapi and in many other births.

\textsuperscript{144} Here Dhammapala explains the perfection of \textit{khanti} by citing the Mahākapi Jātaka [JA516], Mahiṃsarāja Jātaka [JA278], Rurumigarāja Jātaka [JA482], Dhammadevaputta Jātaka [JA457] and the Khantivādi Jātaka [JA313].

[Khuddaka Nikāya, cariyāpiṭaka-ṭṭhakathā, uddānagāthāvaṇṇanā, para. 23]

\textsuperscript{145} This passage can be found in the Khuddaka Nikāya, khuddakapāṭha-ṭṭhakathā, 5. \textit{maṅgalasuttavaṇṇanā}, \textit{khantīcātigāthāvaṇṇanā}. In this long exposition Buddhaghosa glosses the term \textit{khanti} by comparing the practitioner of \textit{khanti} to the protagonists of several Buddhist narratives and quoting from them: \textit{Khantivādi Jātaka} [JA313], \textit{Puṇṇovādasuttaṭṭh Jātaka} [MN3.267], \textit{Sarabhanga Jātaka} [JA522], \textit{Vepacitti Sutta} [SN 11.4], \textit{Akkosakabharadvaja Vatthu} [Dhp 399] and \textit{Akkosuttam} [SN 7.2].

\textsuperscript{146} This treatise authored by Buddhaghosa contains a section called “Getting Rid of Resentment” in which Buddhaghosa presents a structured program for alleviating anger and cultivating patience. Buddhaghosa presents many ways of doing so – practising \textit{mettā}, \textit{karuṇā}, reviewing the disadvantages of anger, reflecting on the ownership of \textit{kamma}, and then says: “But if it still does not subside in him when he reviews ownership of deeds in this way, then he should review the special qualities of the
Table 7: References to khanti suttas in the commentaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narratives</th>
<th>Mahā-parinibbāna-sutta-vaṇṇanā</th>
<th>Cariyā-piṭak-āṭṭhakathā</th>
<th>Visuddhi-magga</th>
<th>Maṅgala-sutta-vaṇṇanā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khantivādi Jātaka [JA313]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaddantahatthi Jātaka [JA514]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhūridattanāgarāja Jātaka [JA543]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campeyyanāgarāja Jātaka [JA506]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saṅkhapālanāgarāja Jātaka [JA524]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahākapi Jātaka [JA516]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahiṃsarāja Jātaka [JA278]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rurumigrāja Jātaka [JA482]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Master’s former conduct” (Ñāṇamoli, 2011, p. 297) and lists the following Jātakas:


Buddhaghosa also interprets the Buddha’s actions in each of these Jātakas. For a succinct summary of this section in the Visuddhimagga see Heim, Gereboff, Green, and Cates (2009).

147 A brief note regarding the use of diacritical marks in the Pali words - I will be using the old romanizations in the old Pali translations in this thesis.
It is important to note that all these lists are explicitly open-ended. They end with “ādi” thus clearly stating that they do not provide an exhaustive list of sources on khanti. Since most sources cited in these commentaries are from the Jātaka collection, I first examine the Jātaka collections more closely for additional sources.

The Jātakatthavaṭṭanā contains the following additional stories that shed further light on the meaning of khanti: Khanti-Vaṭṭanā-Jātaka (JA225), Cūla-Nandiya-Jātaka

---

148 For example, the Mahāparinibbānasuttavaṭṭanā list ends with “aññesu ca bahūsu jātakesu paresu kopaṭvā khantimeva akāsi” and the Cariyāpiṭakaṭṭhakathā list ends with “evamādīsu.”

149 For an excellent introduction to this text, see Appleton (2010).
(JA222), Daddara Jātaka (JA304), Kassapamandiya Jātaka (JA312), Mahāsīlava Jātaka (JA51), Ekarāja Jātaka (JA303), Rajovada Jātaka (JA151), Campeyyanāgarāja Jātaka (JA506), Sarabha-Miga-Jātaka (JA483), Mahisa-Jātaka (JA278). The relevance and reason for inclusion of each of these are discussed in Appendix I.

2.1.2 Additional sources

I have also identified an extensive list of additional suttas related to the concept of khanti in the Pali canon. These stories can be found in the Majjhimanikāya, Samyuttanikāya, Aṅguttaranikāya, Nidānakathā, Dhammapada-āṭṭhakathā150, Suttanipāta, and Khuddakapāṭha. The relevance and reason for the inclusion of each are also discussed in Appendix I.

The Majjhimanikāya contains three important references to khanti: the Mahahatthipadopama Sutta (MN 28), Vāseṭṭhasuttaṃ Sutta (MN 98), and Kakacūpama Sutta (MN 21). Several suttas from the Samyuttanikāya will also be added to my corpus of relevant khanti texts. These include the Akkosa Sutta (SN 7.2), Vepacitti Sutta (SN 11.4), Subhāsitajaya Sutta (SN 11.5) and Maha-mangala Sutta (SN 2.4). From the Dhammapada-āṭṭhakathā the following are relevant verses and stories which I will

150 Although this text is a rich resource of over 400 narratives and is the companion text to the Dhammapada, one of the most popular Buddhist texts, it has received surprisingly little scholarly attention. For a brief introduction, refer Appleton (2012).
include in my dissertation: DhpA 222 and DhpA 223. Lastly, I will also examine the
\textit{Karaṇīyamettā sutta} (Khp 9) from the \textit{Khuddakapāṭha}.

\section*{2.2 Meaning of \textit{khanti}}

The Sanskrit and Pali dictionaries present a broad and imprecise meaning of the term \textit{khanti}. The Pali-English Dictionary by T. W. R. Davids and Stede (1993, p. 261) defines it as: “patience, forbearance, forgiveness” and the Sanskrit-English Dictionary by Monier-Williams (2008, p. 326) defines it as: “patient waiting for anything”, “patience, forbearance, endurance, indulgence” and “the state of saintly abstraction.” The more recent Princeton Dictionary of Buddhism which draws on sources from all the major canons (Sanskrit, Pali, Tibetan, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean) echoes this definition: \textit{khanti} is ““patience,” “steadfastness,” or “endurance”; alt. “forbearance,” “acceptance,” or “receptivity.”” (Buswell Jr, 2013, p. 1109) In the previous chapter I discussed how these words can mean different things and have subtle differences between them. One can imagine that the meaning of the passage would change considerably depending on the interpretation of the translator and her choice of word(s) to translate \textit{khanti}. Consequently, the reader’s understanding of the text would also change and so would her perception of the agent and the expectation of future events. This is an unresolved issue in our modern scholarly understanding of \textit{khanti} and constitutes a serious problem
in current translations of the Pali suttas. Translators have not given adequate reasons to justify their word choice for khanti, translating the term variously and inconsistently\textsuperscript{151}.

The meaning of khanti has received more attention in Mahayana Buddhism.\textsuperscript{152} However, unfortunately, even studies on Mahayana Buddhism have neglected or

\textsuperscript{151} For example, in their modern translation of the Mahānipīta of the Jātakatthavāṇṇanā, Shaw and Appleton (2015) do not discuss the ambiguity surrounding the translation of the term khanti. Their glossary simply lists “khanti” as “Forbearance or patience; one of the ten perfections” [642]. This is no doubt a result of the format of a glossary, which requires a simple meaning even for a complex term.

\textsuperscript{152} Several scholars who have attempted to translate this term in Mahayana texts have noted that there is great difficulty in translating kṣānti and understanding what is meant by this term. For instance, Boucher (2008, p. 220 n. 283) says, “Kṣānti is notoriously difficult to translate” and he opts for translating it as “tolerance.” Similarly, Lamotte (1998, p. 143 n. 119) says, “The problem of kṣānti, sometimes 'patience' and sometimes 'certainty', is one of the most complicated ones for scholasticism.” Nattier (2003, p. 244) in her translation of the Ugraparipṛcchā translates kṣānti as “endurance” and includes a footnote to this stating: “The third perfection (Skt. kṣānti) is most commonly translated into English as "patience," but in my view this is far too mild a word to convey the sense of the term in Sanskrit Buddhist sources...” In his translation of the Vajracchedika, Schopen (1989, pp. 139, n. 120) translates kṣānti as “composure” and notes: “Kṣānti is normally translated as "patience." ... It is, however, possible that "patience" is not
mistakenly dismissed the study of *khanti* in the Pali Canon. For instance, as noted in my introduction, Pagel (1995) in his study of the *Bodhisattvapitaka*, briefly discusses the role of *khanti* in the Pali canon, and mistakenly claims that *khanti* did not play a prominent role in it\(^{153}\). He gives no evidence for this claim and completely dismisses the always the best translation for *kṣānti*, especially if "patience" is used with the implication of "to endure." As I understand the term, it more commonly means not "to endure" or "to accept" but to remain "unaffected by"." In their translation of the *kṣāntipāramitā* chapter of the Śāntideva’s *Bodhicaryāvatāra*, Kate Crosby and Andrew Skilton note “It appears that, despite the traditional association of the term *kṣānti* with the verbal root *kṣam*, ‘to be patient, to endure, etc.’ from which *kṣānti* itself is derived, the term *kṣānti* probably results from an incorrect ‘back-formation’ of a Prakrit term, *khanti*, into Sanskrit. This not uncommon phenomenon meant that the connotations of the root *kṣam* were thereby mingled with those of the true root of *khanti, kham*, meaning ‘to be pleased, to be willing to’, with the result that one frequently finds *kṣānti* employed in contexts where connotations of willingness seem more appropriate than those of forbearance. The term *kṣamā*, however, remains firmly unambiguous…” (Crosby, Skilton, & Williams, 2003, p. 49)

\(^{153}\) He says, “It rarely receives independent treatment, but is generally explained in conjunction with other practices such as benevolence (to which is becomes an important prerequisite) or is cited as a concomitant to morality and discriminative understanding” [182-3].
Khanti Jātakas as a valuable resource for the understanding of khanti in early Buddhism based on this unsubstantiated claim. As seen in the previous section, the Jātakas are the primary source for understanding khanti in Pali canon and even the Pali commentaries and exegetical literature cite them in their treatment of khanti.

In what follows I examine the corpus of khanti texts in the Pali canon defined above to unearth more precise meanings of this term. I start by examining the commentarial tradition and look for cases where commentators have provided a gloss of the term. I then undertake a close and detailed examination of the khanti texts and demonstrate how these texts consistently portray khanti as a highly developed and systematic process that involves two steps.

2.2.1 Commentaries

The commentaries are helpful in providing us with synonyms of khanti but do not describe its process. In the commentaries attributed to Buddhaghosa khanti is described through its two synonyms – adhivasana and titikkhā. The Mahāpadānasuttavānṇanā states that adhivasana and titikkhā are both synonyms of khanti\textsuperscript{154} and the

\textsuperscript{154} Dīgha Nikāya, mahāvaggaṭṭhakathā, 1. mahāpadānasuttavānṇanā, cārikāanujānanavaṇṇanā, para. 10. Here, the commentator defines “khanti” as “adhivāsanakhanti.” By using the compound “adhivāsanakhanti” the commentator is indicating that there are other types of “khanti,” but the khanti meant here is adhivāsana.
Maṅgalasuttavaṇṇanā of the Khuddakapāṭha-āṭṭhakathā makes a similar equivalence between adhivāsana and khanti. Dhammapala, in the Uddānagāthāvaṇṇanā of the Cariyāpiṭaka-āṭṭhakathā also glosses khanti with adhivāsana. The glosses in these commentaries are not very helpful in understanding the specific meaning and process involved in the practice of khanti. Adhivāsana and titikkhati like khanti, are also:

---

155 Khuddaka Nikāya, khuddakapāṭha-āṭṭhakathā, 5. maṅgalasuttavaṇṇanā, khantićātigāthāvaṇṇanā, para. 2

156 Khuddaka Nikāya, cariyāpiṭaka-āṭṭhakathā, uddānagāthāvaṇṇanā, para. 23

157 This is a complex term that could have originated from multiple different Sanskrit roots. Rhys Davids (1993) says that it originates from the Sanskrit root vās and gives two meanings for the term – “assent” and “forbearance, endurance”. It is clearly used in the sense of the second meaning here. However, I am grateful to Prof. Aleksandar Uskokov for pointing out to me that it could also have come from the 10th class root vās, to perfume [from where we get vāsanā - impression/scent in the mind]. Cone (2001) has also noted this connection. Prof. Uskokov further notes that adhivāsana is generally a ritual involving immersion of deities and hence, adhivasana can also be from 2nd class vās (meaning to put on clothes; adhi√vas meaning to put over). Lastly, he also notes that adhivāsana could be related to adhyavasāna, which means, among other things, perseverance.

158 Titikkhati [Sk. titikṣ is the desiderative stem] comes from the root tij which means to bear or endure. Rhys Davids (1993, p. 339) defines the word as “endurance, forgiveness,
defined with a broad range of terms in Pali-English Dictionaries, reflecting the fact that they too have different connotations in different contexts.

Hence, in order to unravel the meaning of khanti, and the process entailed in its practice, one must undertake a close examination of the corpus of khanti narratives. In the narratives khanti refers to a very specific, two-step process involving a series of mental actions that have to be undertaken by its practitioner. These steps can be broadly divided into two stages: ‘purification’ and ‘cultivation’. Purification involves ensuring that the mind (citta) is free of negative emotions (dosa), specifically anger, and cultivation involves the practice of the positive emotions, specifically metta. In some suttas we see these two stages presented systematically and sequentially, while in others, just one attribute in one of the two stages is emphasized. Nevertheless, across the khanti texts the description of the mental process involved in practicing khanti is fairly consistent.

2.2.2 Purification

The first step in practicing khanti involves ensuring that the mind is free of any impurities. There are a few different interpretations of this process in various texts,
nonetheless they agree in the end goal which is to keep the mind pure and not let any impurities enter.

2.2.2.1 Kakacūpamasutta

The Kakacūpamasutta gives us the clearest and most emphatic description of the two steps in the process of khanti. In this sutta the Buddha reprimands a monk who is known to have frequent disagreements with nuns. He then also narrates the story of an ill-tempered woman who gained a bad reputation because of her temperament.

Throughout this lengthy sutta, the Buddha gives us a formulaic description of the mental process that a monk should follow when verbally or physically assaulted. This formula is repeated eight times in this sutta, in the context of different types of offenses\(^\text{159}\). After describing various types of attacks, the Buddha says, "Herein, monks, you should train yourselves thus: “Neither will our minds [cittam] become perverted [vipariṇataṃ] nor will we utter an evil speech, but kindly and compassionate [hitānukampī ca viharissāma] will we dwell with a mind of friendliness [mettacittā] void of hatred [dosantarā]; and we will dwell having suffused that person with a mind of friendliness [mettāsahagatena cetasā]; and, beginning with him, we will dwell having suffused the whole world with a

\(^{159}\)The first four instances are abbreviated versions of the last four. The abbreviated version is: tatrāpi te, phagguna, evaṃ sikkhitabbo ‘na ceva me cittaṃ vipariṇatam bhavissati, na ca pāpiṃ vācaṃ nicchāressāmi, hitānukampī ca viharissāmi mettacitto, na dosantaro’ti. evaṃhi te, phagguna, sikkhitabbaṃ. The unabbreviated version is in the next footnote.
mind of friendliness \textit{[mettāsahagatena cittena]} that is far-reaching, widespread, immeasurable, without enmity, without malevolence." This is how you must train yourselves, monks."\textsuperscript{160} (Horner, 1954, p. 164)

Several aspects of this rich description are noteworthy. First, it clearly suggests a sequence: first one’s mind must be unaffected and then one must cultivate \textit{metta} towards the offender and the whole world. Second, the commentary to the \textit{sutta} strongly emphasizes the first step, ensuring that the mind is free of impurities. Here the commentator, Buddhaghosa, glosses the word \textit{vipariṇata} and says, “As for \textit{viparītata}, a mind filled with passion is \textit{viparītata}; or one filled with hatred, or one deluded. In the

\textsuperscript{160} \textit{tatrāpi vo, bhikkhave, evaṃ sikkhitabbaṃ — ‘na ceva no cittaṃ vipariṇatam bhavissati, na ca pāpikaṃ vācaṃ nicchāressāma, hitānukampī ca viharissāma mettacittā, na dosantarā. taṅca puggalaṃ mettāsahagatena cetasā pharitvā viharissāma, tadārammaṇaṅca sabbāvantaṃ lokāṃ mettāsahagatena cittena vipulena mahaggatena appamāṇena averena abyābajjhena (abyāpajjhena (sī. syā. pī.), abyāpajjena (ka.) aṅguttaratikaniṇaṭiṅkā oloketabbā) pharitvā viharissāmā’ti. evaṃhi vo, bhikkhave, sikkhitabbaṃ. [Majjhima Nikāya, mūlapaṇṇāsapāli, opammavaggo, kakacūpamasuttaṃ (MN 21), paragraph 227]
present case, the mind is filled with passion because of the flaw of desire; and filled with hatred because of anger."\[161\]

Third, this is a highly prescriptive order dictated to monks in a normative *sutta*: monks are told what they must do [*sikkhitabbaṃ*]. As such, it is a good representative of the normative and systematic process of *khanti* to be followed by monks. Fourth, the repetition of this formulaic process eight times in the *sutta* emphasizes its importance. Fifth, each time, the context for reciting this verse differs slightly – verbal abuse, physical abuse, etc. Since this prescription is applicable as the appropriate response in each situation\[162\], it highlights the universal applicability of this process.

Additionally, it is very curious that although the process described here is clearly that of *khanti* and is very similar to what is seen in all other *khanti* texts, the word *khanti* is not used explicitly in this *sutta*, but only in the commentary. The ideal monk in this *sutta* is described as *sorata*, another term that like *khanti* lacks a single precise English

---

\[161\] *viparīnatanti rattampi cittaṃ viparīnataṃ. duṭṭhampi, mūḷhampi cittaṃ viparīnataṃ. idha pana taṇhāchandavasena rattampi vaṭṭati, paṭīghachandavasena duṭṭhampi vaṭṭati. [Majjhima Nikāya, mūlapaññasā-ṭṭhakathā, (dutiyo bhāgo), opammavaggo, kakacūpamasuttavaṇṇanā, paragraph 224]*

\[162\] The situations include being insulted, being hit with a hand, stone, knife or rod. Further, it includes being addressed by someone at the wrong time, with false words, in a harsh way, in an unbeneficial way or with inner hatred.
equivalent easily available from the dictionary. The PTS dictionary defines it as “gentle, kind, humble, self-restrained”, and remarks that it is often combined with *khanti*. While glossing “sorato” Buddhaghosa explains that such a monk stands firm in *adhivāsanakhanti*.[163] Hence, this sutta also makes it clear that the concept of *khanti* is expressed by several different words.

This formulaic prescription from the *Kakacūpamasutta* is also referenced in the *Mahahatthipadopamasutta*, whose interpretation of it can provide further insight into how this prescription was viewed: “But this was said by the Lord in the Parable of the Saw (*Kakacūpamasutta*): If monks, low-down thieves should carve you limb from limb with a two-handled saw, whoever sets his heart at enmity [*mano padūseyya*][164], he, for this reason, is not a doer of my teaching.” Unsluggish energy shall come to be stirred up by me, unmuddled mindfulness [*sati*] set up, the body tranquilized, impassible, the mind...

---


[164] We are going to see the term “*mano padūseyya*” used frequently in *suttas* to describe this step of *khanti*. Different translators have chosen to translate this phrase differently. While, Horner chooses to translate it as enemity in the heart, in the next section I choose to translate it as pollutants in the mind. Since I am referencing various translations by different translators, including providing my own when no satisfactory translation exists, there are some challenges in translating this phrase (and others) uniformly.
composed and one-pointed. Now, willingly, let blows from hands affect this body, let blows from clods of earth . . . from sticks . . . from weapons affect it, for this teaching of the Awakened Ones is being done.”¹⁶⁵ (Horner, 1954, p. 232)

In this interpretation, the prescription from the Kakacūpamasutta is summarized by quoting the prohibition against harboring anger in the mind, suggesting that this step is the most important and foundational step in the process. Also noteworthy is the role of the meditative practice of memory or mindful alertness [sati] in this process.

2.2.2.2 Visuddhimagga

In the Visuddhimagga, one can find an indication of Buddhaghosa’s interpretation of the mental process involved in the practice of khanti through his description of the Bodhisatta’s thought process while practicing khanti in the khanti Jātakas.

¹⁶⁵ Vuttaṃ kho panetaṃ bhagavatā kakacūpamovāde – “ubhatodaṇḍakena cepi, bhikkhave, kakacena corā ocarakā aṅgamaṅgāni okanteyyuṃ, tatrāpi yo mano padūseyya na me so tena sāsanakaro’’ti. Āraddhaṃ kho pana me vīriyaṃ bhavissati asallīnaṃ, upaṭṭhitā sati asammuṭṭhā, passaddho kāyo asāraddho, samāhitaṃ cittam ekaggam. Kāmaṃ dāni imasmiṃ kāye pāṇīsamphassāpi kamantu, leḍḍusamphassāpi kamantu, daṇḍasamphassāpi kamantu, satthasamphassāpi kamantu, karīyati hidaṃ buddhānaṃ sāsana’nti.

[Majjhima Nikāya, mūlapaṇṇāsapāli, opammavaggo, mahāhatthipadopamasuttaṃ (MN 28), paragraph 305]
2.2.2.2.1 Mahakapi Jātaka [JA516]

The first relevant Jātaka analyzed by him is the Mahakapi Jātaka [JA516]. In this story, a farmer gets lost in a forest and falls into a deep pit. The Bodhisattva, a monkey in this life saves the farmer’s life with great difficulty. The farmer, however, is ungrateful towards the Bodhisattva and tries to kill him by hitting him on the head with a rock. Interpreting the Bodhisattva’s thought process in the Mahakapi Jātaka after he is hit on the head with a rock, Buddhaghosa says, “Without polluting his mind \[appadūsetvā\] and without thinking of his own sorrow, regardless of his own pain, he made sure that the man reached a safe place.”\(^{166}\)

2.2.2.2.2 Sankhapala Jātaka [JA524]

In the Sankhapala Jātaka [JA524] the Bodhisattva is born in the Nāga world. He grows weary of his royal life and returns to earth as a snake. Here he encounters a group of ruffians who torture him in grotesque ways and the Boddhisattva practices khanti towards them. Buddaghosa analyses the thought process of the Bodhisattva while he was practicing khanti and says, “Although he was capable of turning those residents of

\(^{166}\) tasmiṃ purise cittaṃ appadūsetvā attano ca dukkhaṃ acintetvā tameva purisaṃ khemantabhūmiṃ sampāpesi.

[Visuddhimagga, (paṭhamo bhāgo), 9. brahmavihāraniddeso, mettābhāvanākathā para. 97]
the Bhoja country into ashes with just a glance, he did not show even the faintest trace of anger \([paduṭṭhākāramattampi na akāsi]\) when he opened his eyes...”

2.2.2.2.3 Bhuridatta Jātaka [JA543]

In the *Bhuridatta Jātaka* [JA543] the Bodhisattva once again lives in the *Nāga* kingdom. This long and episodic *sutta* is filled with several disparate incidents in the Bodhisattva’s life. Once, the *Nāga* king becomes a victim of an intoxicated man’s wrath who tortures him ruthlessly. The *Bodhisattva*, however, practices *khanti* and does not get angry. Buddhaghosa says that although the Bodhisattva was being tortured, he “did not have even a little impurity in his heart \([manopadosamattampi]\) towards that brahman.”

---

167 saṅkhapālanāgarājā hutvā tikhiṇāhi sattihā aṭṭhasu thānesu ovijhitvā pahāramukhehi sakaṇṭakā latāyo pavesetvā nāsāya dalṭūṃ rajjuṃ pakkhipitvā solasahi bhojaputtehi kājenādāya vayhamāno dharanītale ghamāsiyamānasarīro mahantaṃ dukkhaṃ paccanubhonto kujhitvā olokitamatteneva sabbe bhojaputte bhasmaṃ kātuṃ samatthopī samāno cakkhumī ummīletvā paduṭṭhākāramattampi na akāsi.

[Visuddhimagga, (paṭhamo bhāgo), 9. brahmavihāraniddeso, mettābhāvanākathā, para. 110]

168 bhūridatto nāma nāgarājā hutvā uposathaṅgāni adhiṭṭhāya vammikamuddhani sayamāno kappuṭṭhānaggisasidena osadhena sakalasarīre siṃciyamānopi pelāya pakkhipitvā sakalajambudīpe kilāpiyamānopi tasmiṃ brāhmaṇe manopadosamattampi na akāsi.
2.2.2.2.4 Campeyya Jātaka [JA506]

In the *Campeyya Jātaka [JA506]* the Bodhisattva is once again born as a Nāga king. He gets caught by a snake charmer who mercilessly tortures him, while the Bodhisattva practices *khanti*. Buddhaghosa interprets and describes the *Campeyya Jātaka* thusly:

“And when he was the royal nāga Campeyya he let no impurity\textsuperscript{169} spring up [\textit{manopadosamattampi nuppādesi}] in his mind while he was being cruelly treated by a snake charmer.”\textsuperscript{170}

\textsuperscript{169} \textit{Dosa} is a complex word in Pali having multiple meanings: blemish, fault, anger, ill-will, hatred etc. (T. R. Davids & Stede, 2004) This is due to the fact that the sanskrit \textit{doṣa} and \textit{dveṣa} are both the same word (\textit{dosa}) in Pali. Here I have chosen to translate it using the broader term, impurity, while acknowledging that its meaning could be more specific such as anger or hatred. I will demonstrate in the next section that the impurity most frequently combatted by practitioners of *khanti* in the \textit{jātakas} is anger.

\textsuperscript{170} *Campeyyopi nāgarājā hutvā ahituṇḍikena viheṭhiyamāno manopadosamattampi nuppādesi.*

[Visuddhimagga, (paṭhamo bhāgo), 9. brahmavihāranidde, mettābhāvanākathā, para. 98]

[Visuddhimagga, (paṭhamo bhāgo), 9. brahmavihāranidde, mettābhāvanākathā, para. 101]
2.2.2.2.5 Chaddanta Jātaka [JA514]

Buddhaghosa likewise emphasizes the cleansing of the mind as the main point of the Chaddanta Jātaka. In the Chaddanta Jātaka [JA514] the Bodhisattva is a royal elephant who has two wives. One of the wives develops a grudge against the other and when she is reborn as a queen plots to have the Bodhisattva killed. She feigns an illness and tells the king her only remedy is the tusk of the Bodhisattva. A hunter is sent to capture and kill the Bodhisattva. He shoots the Bodhisattva with a poisoned arrow and the Bodhisattva practices *khanti*. Buddhaghosa analyzes the Bodhisattva’s thought process and says that even after the Bodhisattva was shot with a poisoned arrow, “He did not let his mind be polluted \[cittaṃ nappadūsesi\] towards the evil-doing hunter. Therefore, it is said, “The elephant, pierced by an arrow and filled with an uncorrupt heart \[aduṭṭhacitto\], spoke to the hunter.”\[172\] After receiving the tusks of the Bodhisattva the queen is filled with remorse and dies.

\[171\] The PTS defines *duṭṭha* as “spoilt, corrupt; bad, malignant, wicked etc.” (T. R. Davids & Stede, 2004) There is similar ambiguity in translating *duṭṭha* as there is in translating *dosa*. While I have chosen to translate it as “corrupt” here, it could also mean “hostile”.

\[172\] tāva anatthakārimhi luddake cittaṃ nappadūsesi. yathāha —

“samappito puthusallena nāgo,
aduṭṭhacitto luddakaṃ aįjhabhāsi

[Visuddhimagga, (paṭhamo bhāgo), 9. brahmavihāraniddeo, mettābhāvanākathā, para. 83]
In all these examples, the process of khanti is described as not having padosa [fault or corruption] in the mind and not letting the mind be defiled. But what padosa are they specifically referring to? As we shall see, the khanti Jātakas clearly show that anger [kodha] is the impurity [padosa\textsuperscript{173}] that a khanti practitioner’s mind should remain pure of.

2.2.3 Anger

2.2.3.1 Khantivādin Jātaka [JA313]

The Khantivādin Jātaka, the most often cited text on khanti, gives us a clear definition of khanti. In this story, the Bodhisattva is an ascetic who preaches khanti. An intoxicated king stumbles upon him and mistaking him to be a false ascetic assaults him brutally and fatally. Soon after killing the Bodhisattva the king also dies and goes to hell. During the assault, while hacking the Bodhisattva’s limbs one by one, the king asks the Bodhisattva, “What is this thing called khanti?”\textsuperscript{174} and the Bodhisattva replies, “Not being angry [akujjhanabhāvo] when abused, defamed and beaten.”\textsuperscript{175} This clear and precise

\textsuperscript{173} Padosa is another term that has the same ambiguity. It can mean flaw or hatred.

\textsuperscript{174} “kā esā khanti nāmā”ti? [Khuddaka Nikāya, jātaka-aṭṭhakathā, (tatiyo bhāgo), 4. catukkanipāto, 2. pucimandavaggo n, [313] 3. khantivādījātakavaṇṇanā, para. 4]

\textsuperscript{175} “akkosantesu paribhāsantesu paharantesu akujjhanabhāvo”ti.

[Khuddaka Nikāya, jātaka-aṭṭhakathā, (tatiyo bhāgo), 4. catukkanipāto, 2. pucimandavaggo n, [313] 3. khantivādījātakavaṇṇanā, para. 4]
definition of *khanti* in the most authoritative text on *khanti*, highlights the most important aspect of the process of *khanti* – the negation of anger.

The *paccuppannavatthu* (opening frame) of the *Khantivādin Jātaka* further reinforces that the primary process of *khanti* involves the negation of anger. While narrating the event that stimulated the Buddha’s narration of the *Khantivādin Jātaka*, the *paccuppannavatthu* says that the Buddha once learned of a wrathful monk and asked him, “Why, O monk, having taken refuge under the teaching of the Buddha who is free of anger [*akkodhanassa*], do you show anger [*kodhaṃ*]? Wise men in ancient times did not get angry [*kodham*] with another person, even when a thousand blows fell on their body, and their hands, feet, ears, and nose were cut off.”¹⁷⁶ The *paccuppannavatthu* implies that the reason for narrating the *Khantivādin Jātaka* was to demonstrate the practice of not being angry [*akkodhana*], further suggesting an equivalence between the practice of *khanti* and the practice of non-anger [*akkodhana*].

Buddhaghosa also interprets the *Khantivādin Jātaka* story similarly: “In the *Khantivādin Jātaka*, when asked by the foolish king of Kāsi, “What do you preach, O ascetic?”, he said, “I am called the preacher of *khanti*.” Having been beaten by a whip with spikes and

¹⁷⁶ “kasmā, tvāṃ bhikkhu, akkodhanassa buddhassa sāsane pabbajitvā kodham karosi, porāṇakapanditā sarīre pahārasahasse patante hatthapādakaṇṇanāsāsu chijjamānāsu parassa kodhaṃ na kariṃsū”ti

[Khuddaka Nikāya, jātaka-aṭṭhakathā, (tatiyo bhāgo), 4. catukkanipāto, 2. pucimandavaggo n, [313] 3. khantivādijātakavaṇṇanā, para. 1]
having his hands and feet cut off, he did not create the slightest amount of anger 
[kopamattampi].”

Summarizing the *Khantivādin Jātaka* in the *Visuddhimagga*, he
highlights the centrality of non-anger in this story by describing the Buddha’s endurance
of the king’s assault with the words *kopamattampi nākāsi*. To him, practicing *khanti* is
analogous to not having any anger *[kopa]*.

### 2.2.3.2 Bhūridattanāgarāja Jātaka [JA543]

The same equivalence between *khanti* and non-anger is also seen in other *khanti*
Jātakas. In the *Bhūridattanāgarāja Jātaka* [JA543], where the Bodhisattva is a *nāga* who
is captured and tortured, we find a narration of the Bodhisattva’s thoughts while he is
being mutilated which gives us a glimpse into his mental process of *khanti*. In this
description, the absence of anger is repeated five times: “if I get angry *[kujjheyyaṃ]* with
him for his treachery, my morality *[sīlaṃ]* will break... I must not get angry
*[kujjhissāmī]* with him.” If I look at him, he will explode. Even if he hits me, I will not get

---

177 khantivādi jātakā dummedhena kāsiraṇṇā “kiṃvādī tvam samanā” ti puṭṭho
khantivādi nāmāhan’ti vutte sakaṇṭakāhi kasāhi tājetvā hatthapādesu chijjamānesu
kopamattampi nākāsi.

[Visuddhimagga, (paṭhamo bhāgo), 9. brahmavihāraniddeso, mettābhāvanākathā, para.
78]

178 sacāhaṃ imassa mittadubbhino kujjheyyaṃ, sīlaṃ me khaṇḍam bhavissati.

bhūridattajātakavaṇṇanā, kīlana khaṇḍam, para. 114]
angry [*na kujjhissāmi*] at him or look at him. Thinking this, he closed his eyes, and completing the perfection of resolution[^179], he placed his head between his hoods and lay perfectly motionless [*niccalova*][^180]... The pure [*sucijātiko*] Nāga king did not get angry [*akujjhitvā*] for fear of violating the moral precepts, and did not open his eyes[^181]... The

[^179]: *adhiṭṭhānapārami* is one of the ten prefections to be cultivated by a Bodhisatta.

(Shaw, 2006)

[^180]: *alampāyano maṃ chindatu vā pacatu vā, sūlena vā vijjhatu, nevassa kujjhissāmi”ti cintetvā “sace kho panāhaṃ ime olokessāmi, bhasmā bhaveyyum. maṃ pothentepi na kujjhissāmi na olokessāmi””ti akkhīni nimīletvā adhiṭṭhānapāramiṃ purecārikaṃ katvā bhogantare sīsaṃ pakkhipitvā niccalova hutvā nipajji.


bhūridattajātakavāṇṇanā, kīlanakanḍaṃ, para. 114]

[^181]: *sucijātiko nāgarājā sīlabhedabhayena akujjhitvā akkhīnīpi na ummīlesi.


bhūridattajātakavāṇṇanā, kīlanakanḍaṃ, para. 115]
Great Being felt no anger [kujjhi] even though he suffered such pain [dukkham].\(^{182\text{a}}\)\(^{183}\) (Cowell & Rouse, 1907, p. 97)

Four points are noteworthy in this passage. First, throughout the passage, we see the Bodhisattva’s khanti and his power to retaliate being presented simultaneously. The statement about the nāga’s open eyes killing the attacker is clearly a reference to his power. Through this statement, we are told that the Bodhisattva had the power to kill his offender but chose not to. Therefore, his khanti was not a sign of weakness or inability. Second, the passage does not negate the existence of physical pain. We are told that the Bodhisattva experienced pain (dukkham), no doubt physical pain because of the mutilations, but he did not get angry (kujjhi). Third, the reason for practicing khanti is the preservation of sīla. This creates a relationship between khanti and sīla. And lastly, note the poignant metaphor of the Bodhisattva’s physical stillness which accompanies his mental stillness. Not only was the Bodhisattva’s mind undisturbed by the torture, but even his body remained still [niccalova].

\(^{182}\) mahāsatto evarūpaṃ dukkham anubhavantopi neva kujjhi.


bhūridattajātakavāṇṇanā, kīlanakāṇḍañ, para. 115]

\(^{183}\) The redacted parts contain graphic descriptions of horrific mutilations being done to Bhuridatta.
2.2.3.3 Campeyyanāgarāja Jātaka [JA506]

Similarly, in the Campeyyanāgarāja Jātaka [JA506], where the Bodhisattva is once again born as a nāga and gets caught by a snake charmer when he comes to the human realm to observe uposatha, the text narrates his thought process: “Then he thought, "My poison is powerful, and if I am angry [kujjhitvā] and send forth the breath of my nostrils his body will be shattered and scattered like a fist-full of chaff; then my virtue will be broken... the Great Being so feared lest he break his virtue, that he bore [adhivāsento] all this torment and never so much as opened an eye to glance at him.”\(^{184}\) (Rouse, 1901, p. 283)

2.2.3.4 Mātuposaka Jātaka [JA455]

In the Mātuposaka Jātaka [JA455] the Bodhisattva is a white elephant whose mother is blind. One day a man is stranded in that area and the elephant helps him find his way back. The man then tells the king of the elephant’s splendour and comes with the king’s men to capture him. The Bodhisattva realizes that the man he saved has betrayed him and thinks: “...angered [kujjhitvā], I am able to destroy the royal beasts of burden who

\(^{184}\) ahituṇḍikaṃ disvā cintesi “mama visaṃ mahantaṃ, sacāhaṃ kujjhitvā nāsavātāṃ vissajjessāmi, etassa sarīraṃ bhasmamuṭṭhi viya vippakirissati, atha me sīlaṃ khaṇḍaṃ bhavissati, na dāni taṃ olokessāmi”’ti. .... mahāsatto attano sīlabhedabhayena evarūpaṃ dukkhaṃ adhvāsento akkhīni ummīletvā olokanamattampi nākari.

[Khuddaka Nikāya, cariyāpiṭaka-aṭṭhakathā, 2. hatthināgavaggo n, 3. campeyyanāgacariyāvaṇṇanā, para. 6]
carry the army. But if I get angry [kujjhissāmi], my moral practice [sīlaṃ] will be broken. Therefore, today I will not get angry [na kujjhissāmi] even if I am cut by knives.” With this resolve, having bowed down his head, he stayed motionless [niccalova].” Here the Bodhisattva’s practice of khanti is described exclusively in terms of not getting angry. Furthermore, the text offers this same description again - the steadiness of Bodhisattva’s mind is mirrored in the steadiness of his body.

2.2.3.5 Mahāsīlava Jātaka [JA51]

In the Mahāsīlava Jātaka [JA51] the virtuous king is captured by a rival king and bound up by followers. Describing the king’s thoughts at the time of his capture, the Jātaka says, “Even at that time, the great ethical king [or King Sīlava] did not have even a small amount of anger [āghāta] towards the thieves.” Here it must be noted that anger is

---

185 bodhisattopī hatthācariyaṃ disvā “idaṃ bhayaṃ na aññato uppannaṃ, tassa purisassa santikā uppannaṃ bhavissati, aham kho pana mahābalo hatthisahassampi viddhamsetum samattho homi, kujjhitvā saratthhakam senāvahanam nāsetum, sace pana kujjhissāmi, sīlaṃ me bhijissati, tasmā ajja sattihi koṭṭiyamānopi na kujjhissāmi”ti adhiṭṭhāya sīsaṃ nāmetvā niccalova aṭṭhāsi.

[Khuddaka Nikāya, jātaka-aṭṭhakathā, (cattatho bhāgo), 11. ekādasakaniñṇīto, [455] 1. mātuposakajātakavāṇṇanā, para. 3]

186 tasmimpi kāle sīlavamahārājā corarañño āghātamattampi nākāsi.

[Khuddaka Nikāya, jātaka-aṭṭhakathā, (paṭhamo bhāgo), 1. ekakaniñṇīto, 6. āsīsavaggo, [51] 1. mahāsīlavajātakavāṇṭanā, para. 5]
not the only possible translation of āghāta. It could also mean to be hurt, have ill-will, hatred, or even to strike back. However, anger seems to be the best translation, since later in the story, when the king and his ministers are buried in the sand up to their necks and left to die, the king tells his ministers, “without getting angry [kopaṃ] at the thieves, cultivate only goodwill [metta].” Here he is clearly describing the thought process of khanti as not having kopa and cultivating metta.

Buddhaghosa interprets the Bodhisattva’s process of khanti in this narrative similarly, saying, “Again, when he was buried up to his neck in a hole dug into the earth in a charnel grove, along with a thousand companions, he did not pollute his mind even a little bit [cittappadosamattampi akatvā]... And when he went to his own bedroom with the help of a spirit and saw his enemy sleeping on his bed, without getting angry [kopaṃ akatvāva], without swearing an oath in return, he established him in the place of a friend [mittaṭṭhāne ṭhapayitvā].” Here, note once again that the two stages are

187 tadā sīlavamahārājā amacce āmantetvā “corarañño upari kopaṃ akatvā mettāṃ eva bhāvetha, tātā”ti ovadi.

[Khuddaka Nikāya, jātaka-aṭṭhakathā, (paṭhamo bhāgo), 1. ekakanipāto, 6. āsīsavaggo, [51] 1. mahāsīlavajātakavaṇṇanā, para. 5]

188 i.e. taking an oath of revenge towards his enemy, as his enemy had done previously in the jātaka

189 puna saddhiṃ amaccasahassena āmakasusāne galappamānaṃ bhūmiṃ khanītvā nikhaññamāno cittappadosamattampi akatvā kuṇapakhādanatthāṃ āgatānaṃ
presented clearly and sequentially. First, the king does not get angry at his enemy
\([\text{kopa}\text{m akatvāva}]\) and then thinks of him as a friend (i.e. produces goodwill towards
him).

The most noteworthy aspect in all of these stories is that the process of \text{khanti} involves
ensuring that anger does not arise in the mind in the first place. The emphasis is on
keeping the mind pure and unshaken. But what if anger arises? Can one still practice
\text{khanti}? What does one do then?

2.2.3.6 \textit{Dhammapada}\text{-}aṭṭhakathā 222

In story 222 of the \textit{Dhammapada}\text{-}aṭṭhakathā, we see the mental process of \text{khanti} in a
tree-spirit, a \textit{rukkhadeva} in whom anger has already arisen. In the story, a monk cuts a
tree and harms a \textit{rukkhadeva}. “Furious with anger \([\text{uppannalavakodhā}]\), the tree-
spirit raised both her hands and exclaimed, "I will strike him dead." In an instant,
however, the thought came to her, "This monk is a righteous man; if I kill him, I shall go
to Hell. Moreover, if other tree-spirits see monks cutting down their own trees, they will
say to themselves, ‘Such and such a tree-spirit killed a monk under such circumstances,’
and will follow my example and kill other monks. Besides, this monk has a master; I will

\[
\text{siṅgālānaṃ paṃsuviyūhanaṃ nissāya purisakāraṃ katvā paṭiladdhajivito}
\]
\[
yakkhānubhāvena attano sirigabbhām oruyha sirisayane sayitaṃ paccatthikam disvā
\]
\[
kopaṃ akatvāva aññamaññaṃ sapathāṃ katvā taṃ mittaṭṭhāne ṭhapayitvā
\]

\[\text{Visuddhimagga, (paṭhamo bhāgo), 9. brahmavihāraniddeso, mettābhāvanākathā, para.}\]

75]
therefore content myself with reporting this matter to his master."190 (Burlingame & Lanman, 1921, pp. Vol 3, p 98) So, she went weeping to the Buddha and told him what had happened. The Buddha commends her for having controlled herself and says:

“Whoever controls his anger [uppatitam kodham] like a swift-speeding chariot, when it is aroused — Him I call a charioteer; other folk are merely holders of reins.”191 (Burlingame & Lanman, 1921, Vol 3, p 99).

Hence, in cases where anger has already arisen, the Buddha advocates a similar cognitive process for “reigning it in” as quickly as possible. The end result is the same – the mind is purified and steady. However, we may note that this narrative is an

190 devatā uppanabalavakodhā “paharitvā naṃ māressāmi”ti ubho hatthe ukkhipitvā evaṃ tāva cintesi — “ayaṃ bhikkhu sālavā. sacāhaṃ imaṃ māressāmi, nirayagāminī bhavissāmi. sesadevatāpi attano rukkhaṃ chindante bhikkhū disvā ‘asukadevatāya evaṃ nāma mārito bhikkhū’ti maṃ pamānaṃ katvā bhikkhū māressantī. ayaṅca sasāmiko bhikkhu, sāmikasseva naṃ kathessāmī”ti ukkhittahatthe apanetvā rodamānā satthu santikaṃ gantvā vanditvā ekamantaṃ āṭṭhāsi.

[Khuddaka Nikāya, dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā, (dutiyo bhāgo), 17. kodhavaggo n, 2. Aaññatarabhikkhuvatthu, para. 2]

191 Yo ve uppatitam kodham ratham bhantamva varaye tamaham sarathim brumirasmiggahotaro jano.

[Khuddaka Nikāya, dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā, (dutiyo bhāgo), 17. kodhavaggo n, 2. Aaññatarabhikkhuvatthu, para. 2]
exception on two accounts. It is the only case where the practitioner of *khanti* has anger arisen in the mind at all; in every other case anger is explicitly quelled before it can enter the mind. Furthermore, it is interesting that this is also the only case where the practitioner of *khanti* is not the Bodhisattva. In every case where the Bodhisattva practices *khanti*, the process is clearly described as not letting anger pollute the mind in the first place.

2.2.3.7 *Samyuttanikāya*

As a last example of anger, let us look at the *Samyuttanikāya* where we find a formulaic description of anger which is repeated in four suttas: *Akkosasuttaṃ* (SN 7.2), *Asurindakasuttaṃ* (SN 7.3), *Vepacittisuttaṃ* (SN 11.4) and *Subhāsitajayasuttaṃ* (SN 11.5): “One who gets angry with an angry person, is even worse than the one who is angry at him. By not getting angry with one who is angry, one wins a difficult battle. He practices for the welfare of both, his own and the others. Having realized the angered state of another, practicing mindfulness, he calms his mind. When he cures both, himself and the other, the people who consider him a fool are unskilled in the *dhamma*.\(^{192}\)

\(^{192}\) \textit{“tasseva tena pāpiyo, yo kuddhāṃ paṭikujjhati. kuddhāṃ appaṭikujjhanto, saṅgāmaṃ jeti dujjayaṃ. “ubhinnamatthaṃ carati, attano ca parassa ca. \textit{param} saṅkupitaṃ ṅatvā, yo sato upasammati. “ubhinnam tīkichchantānaṃ, attano ca parassa ca.}
Several points in these verses are noteworthy. First, the verse does not contain an explicit reference to *khanti* though it is describing the same process. The commentary, however, contains a helpful gloss of *sato upasammati* (Mindful, he becomes peaceful) which tells us something about *khanti*. It says, *satiyā samannāgato hutvā adhivāseti* (Possessed of mindfulness, he endures it). This gives two helpful connections. The first is a connection between the practice of *sati* (mindfulness) and *adhivāsana* (endurance), something we have observed before. This statement suggests that establishing oneself in a state of *sati* is a prerequisite to practicing endurance. Second, it suggests that *upasammati* and *adhivāseti* are synonyms. In the commentaries, we have seen *adhivāseti* being presented as a synonym for *khanti*. This creates an equivalence between *upasammati* and *khanti*.

Second, the Pali verses contain the word, *tikicchatī* (healing), a word that sounds similar to *titikkhati* (forbearance). One possibility is that this is clever wordplay, as has been suggested by Olendzki.193 Another possibility is that this may have been an error of verbal transmission, and the original word intended here was *titikkhati* (forbearance). Lastly, the emphasis in these verses is primarily on self-benefit. Non-anger is presented as an option that works for one’s own welfare and cures oneself. It also does the same

_____

janā maññanti bāloti, ye dhammassa akvidā”ti.

[Samyyutta Nikāya, sagāthavaggo, 7. brāhmaṇasamyyuttaṃ, 1. arahantavaggo, 2. akkosasuttaṃ (SN 7.2), para. 6]

to the victim, but since the first reason given is to practice non-anger in order to not make things worse for oneself, that seems to be the primary motivation here. This is also similar to the several Jātakas seen above where a character stills his anger in order not to break his own sīla. A detailed analysis of the reasons presented for practicing khanti will be presented later in this chapter.

It is also helpful to examine the context for the recitation of these verses in each of the four suttas above. In the Akkosasuttaṃ (SN 7.2) the Buddha equates not getting affected when someone reviles you to not accepting food from someone, that is, not entering an exchange. To return anger in this logic is literally to take on the abuser’s vice and incorporate it within oneself\(^{194}\): “So too, brahmin, we - who do not abuse anyone, who do not scold anyone, who do not rail against anyone - refuse to accept from you the abuse and scolding and tirade you let loose at us. It still belongs to you, brahmin! It still belongs to you, brahmin! "Brahmin, one who abuses his own abuser, who scolds the one who scolds him, who rails against the one who rails at him - he is said to partake of the meal, to enter upon an exchange. But we do not partake of your meal; we do not enter upon an exchange.”\(^{195}\) (Bodhi, 2000, p. 256) This clarifies another step in the

\(^{194}\) Cf. Ingalls (1962) which discusses the Pāśupatas who deliberately provoked people, based on the idea that the abuser would take on the bad karma of the abused.

\(^{195}\) “evameva kho, brāhmaṇa, yām tvām amhe anakkosante akkosasi, arosente rosesi, abhaṇḍante bhaṇḍasi, taṃ te mayaṃ nappatīggaṇhāma. tavevetam, brāhmaṇa, hoti; tavevetam, brāhmaṇa, hoti.”
process of *khanti*. One must not take the offense that is given and by doing so it remains with the giver.

Based on the Buddha’s response, the king and his men assume that the Buddha has gotten angry. They ask him how he got angry despite being an *arahan*. The Buddha replies: "How can anger arise in one who is angerless, in the tamed one of righteous living, in one liberated by perfect knowledge, in the Stable One who abides in peace?"¹⁹⁶ (Bodhi, 2000, p. 256) This important passage highlights that once one has become free of anger [*akkoda*], anger cannot arise. Hence the Buddha asks “*akkodhassa kuto kodho*”? This also explains why, in every single *khanti* narrative examined above, anger does not arise in the Buddha when he is offended - he is *akkoda* and there is no possibility of anger arising within him. The only narrative in which anger is quelled after

---

¹⁹⁶ “*akkodhassa kuto kodho, dantassa samajīvino.*

sammadañña vimuttassa, upasantassa tādino.

[Samyutta Nikāya, sagāthavaggo, 7. brāhmaṇasaṁyutta, 1. arahantavaggo, 2.

akkosasuttaṁ (SN 7.2), para. 2]

[Samyutta Nikāya, sagāthavaggo, 7. brāhmaṇasaṁyutta, 1. arahantavaggo, 2.

akkosasuttaṁ (SN 7.2), para. 2]
it arises is DhpA 222, discussed above, in which the person in whom the anger arises is a tree spirit *rukkhadeva*, not the Buddha.

Lastly, the commentary provides a helpful explanation for why the brahman assumed that the Gotama got angry when he said the first few verses. “When he heard the buddha say, "It still belongs to you, brahmin! It still belongs to you, brahmin!", fear arose in him and he thought “I think the recluse Gotama has cursed me” because he had heard of the tradition of angry ascetics such as Kisavacchā giving curses.” This reference to curses highlights another recurring motif in *khanti* narratives, discussed in detail later in this chapter.

In the *Asurindakasuttaṃ* (SN 7.3), Asurindaka, of the Bharadvaja *gotra*, gets angry with the Buddha and insults him. The Buddha stays silent. Asuri interprets this as his victory and says, “I won!”. The Buddha says: "The fool thinks victory is won by screaming when instead the wise know that endurance [*titikkhaḥ*] is victory." He then narrates the formulaic verses on anger above. The *Vepacitti sutta* and *Subhāsitajaya Sutta* are very similar in structure and content and differ only in minor details. Both *suttas* discuss the right response to an offense set amidst a battle between Sakka and Vepacitti. The

---

197 “jayaṃ ve maññati bālo, vācāya pharasaṁ bhaṇaṁ.

jayañcevassa taṁ hoti, yā titikkha vijānato.

[Samyutta Nikāya, sagāthāvaggo, 7. brāhmaṇasamyyuttaṃ, 1. arahantavaggo, 3.

asurindakasuttaṃ (SN 7.3), para. 2]
argument here is about enduring offense by someone who is weaker and how that
might be seen as a sign of weakness and fear. In the Vepacitti Sutta, Sakka says: “Let him
believe, “That one just tolerates [titikkhati] me out of fear. I don’t care. Among the
highest good ideals for one’s own welfare, there is none better than tolerance [khanti].
When the one who is strong endures [titikkhati] the weak, that they call the highest
tolerance [khanti], the weak must always be tolerant [khamati].” 198

The same verses can be found in the Subhāsitajaya Sutta and in both, the formulaic
verses on anger cited above follow. These verses seem to suggest that khanti is a
necessity rather than a virtuous choice for the weak but is the virtue of choice among
those who are strong. This verse seems to be a polemic against passages like those we
have reviewed from the Mahābhārata which under some circumstances classify khanti
as a practice of the weak. I will return to this below.

2.2.4 Cultivation

The second step in the process of khanti is the cultivation of positive emotions. Once the
mind has been purified of anger, the practitioner of khanti frequently takes his practice

198 “kāmaṁ maññatu vā mā vā, bhayā myāyaṁ titikkhati. sadatthaparamā atthā,
khantyā bhiyyo na vijjati. “yo have balavā santo, dubbalassa titikkhati. tamāhu paramaṁ
khantim, niccaṁ khamati dubbalo.

[Samyutta Nikāya, sagāthāvaggo, 11. sakkasāmyuttaṁ, 1. paṭhamavaggo, 4.
vepacittisuttaṁ (SN 11.4), para. 13]
of *khanti* a step further, by consciously cultivating positive emotions towards his
offender.

Most commonly, the process of *khanti* involves the victim sending forth *metta* to the
offender. *Metta* is an extremely complex technical Buddhist term, which is in dire need
of systematic and comprehensive study. It has been translated in various ways –
friendliness, benevolence, kindness, good-will, and in popular mass-media as ‘loving-
kindness’\(^\text{199}\). In this paper, I choose to translate it as good-will as I believe this makes the
most sense given the context. Without entering into a debate over the meaning of the
term, here I note its relationship to the process of *khanti*.

We have already seen three examples of *metta* being listed as the second step in the
process of *khanti*: in the *Kakacūpamasutta (MN21)*, the *Mahāsīlava Jātaka [JA51]* and
Buddhaghosa’s analysis of *Mahāsīlava Jātaka [JA51]* in the *Visuddhimagga*.

2.2.4.1 *DhpA 223*

Another example of the cultivation of *metta* in the process of practicing *khanti* can be
seen in the narrative linked with Dhp 223. In this story, a hired consort gets jealous of
the wife and unable to control herself, pours a ladleful of boiling butter on the wife’s
head. The wife sees this coming but bears no ill will towards the consort. As a result, the

\(^\text{199}\) The term has become increasingly popular in the recent decade. For example, in
2011, the famous NBA basketball player Ronald William Artest Jr. was so inspired by this
Buddhist word that he legally changed his name to “Metta World Peace.” (Bolch, 2011)
boiling butter doesn’t burn her, and seeing this, the consort becomes remorseful and apologizes. When the Buddha hears about this he asks the wife what her thought process was when the consort was coming toward her with boiling butter. The wife, Uttara, explains, “Reverend Sir, I cultivated goodwill [mettāya] towards her, thinking, “the universe is crowded, the brahma world is low, but my friend’s qualities are great. For I got the opportunity to hear the dhamma and give alms only with her help. If I get angry [kopo] at her, may this [the ghee] burn me. If not, may it not burn me.” The Buddha replies, “Well done, well done, Uttara! That is the right way to overcome anger [kodham]. For anger [kodho] should be overcome with non-anger [akkodhena].” Here

200 “tayā kiṃ cintitan”ti?

[Khuddaka Nikāya, dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā, (dutiyo bhāgo), 17. kodhavaggo n, 3. Uttarāupāsikāvatthu, para. 14]

201 “cakkavāḷaṃ atisambādhāṃ, brahmaloko atinīcako, mama sahāyikāya guṇova mahanto. ahañhi etaṃ nissāya dānañca dātuṃ dhammañca sotum alatthaṃ, sace me imissā upari kopo atthi, idaṃ maṃ dahatu. no ce, mā dahatū”ti evaṃ cintetvā imaṃ mettāya phariṃ, bhanteti.

[Khuddaka Nikāya, dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā, (dutiyo bhāgo), 17. kodhavaggo n, 3. Uttarāupāsikāvatthu, para. 14]

202 satthā “sādhu sādhu, uttare, evaṃ kodhaṃ jinitum vaṭṭati. kodho hi nāma akkodhena, akkosakaparibhāsako anakkosantena aparibhāsantena, thaddhamaccharī
we see how both stages of the process of *khanti* are described in Uttara’s thought process: the purified mind free of anger and a mind filled with *metta*. It is noteworthy that Burlingame and Lanman (1921, Vol 3, p. 106) chose to translate *akkodhena* in this case as “kindness” despite its literal meaning being the absence of anger. They are not entirely incorrect; they have carried over the positive connotation from Uttara’s response to the Buddha, in which she stresses her positive feelings of good-will (*metta*). We have already seen the equivalence between *khanti* and non-anger firmly established in several texts. *Suttas* such as this one suggest that the definition of khanti can be taken a step further by associating it with positive virtues as well.

2.2.4.2 *Ekarāja Jātaka [JA303]*

Another good example of the cultivation of *metta* in the process of *khanti* can be seen in the *Ekarāja Jātaka [JA303]* which presents an alternative course of events between the Bodhisattva and the king of Kosala [Dabbasena] from that which is seen in the *Mahasīla Jātaka [JA51]* discussed above. In this version, Dabbasena captures the Bodhisattva and ties him with a cord to the lintel of the door. At this time, we are given insight into his thought process: “The king cultivated goodwill [*mettām*] towards the thieving prince, and having performed the preliminary duties that should be performed

______________________________
attano santakassa dānena, musāvādī saccavacanena jinitabbo“ti vatvā imaṃ gāthamāha...

[Khuddaka Nikāya, dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā, (dutiyo bhāgo), 17. kodhavaggo n, 3. Uttarāupāsikāvatthu, para. 14]
before meditation, he was absorbed in meditation \( jhānaṃ \), and bursting his bonds sat cross-legged in the air."\(^{203}\) (Francis & Neil, 1897, p. 9) Here, the process of \( khanti \) focuses on the cultivation of \( metta \) and climaxes with the Bodhisattva’s absorption into \( jhāna \).

In some Jātakas, \( metta \) is closely tied to \( khanti \) by occurring adjacent to it in compounds. For example, in the \( Mahiṃsa Jātaka \) [JA278], where the Bodhisattva is a virtuous buffalo who is tortured by a monkey, the Bodhisattva is described as, “being full of patience, kindliness, and mercy [\( khantimettānuddayasampadāya \)], took no notice at all of his misconduct.”\(^{204}\) (Rouse, 1895, p. 263) Similarly, in the \( Culadhammapāla Jātaka \) [JA358], the Bodhisattva’s reaction to being mutilated is described as: “The boy, when his hands were cut off, neither wept nor lamented, but moved by patience and good-will

\(^{203}\) rājā corarājānaṃ ārabba mettāṃ bhāvetvā kasinaparikammaṃ katvā jhānaṃ nibbattesi, bandhanaṃ chijji, tato rājā ākāse pallaṅkena nisīdi.

[Khuddaka Nikāya, jātaka-āṭṭhakathā, (tatiyo bhāgo), 4. catukkanipāto, 1. kāliṅgavaggo, [303] 3. ekarājaṭakavatāvanā, para. 16]

\(^{204}\) bodhisatto khantimettānuddayasampadāya tāṁ tassa anācāraṁ na manasākāsi, makkato punappunāṁ tattheva kari.

[khantiṇca mettāṇca] bore [adhibāsesi] it with resignation.”

2.2.4.3 Visuddhimagga

The exegetical literature also notes the role the cultivation of mettā plays in the process of khanti. In the Visuddhimagga, Buddhaghosa says, “If anger [paṭigha] arises in his mind when he focuses his mind on the enemy and remembers the transgressions done by him, then having meditated on goodwill [mettā] towards any of the aforementioned people, and having emerged from the meditation, he should remove his anger towards that person by directing goodwill towards that person.” Further, the Visuddhimagga implies a reciprocal relationship between metta and khanti. It says that a practitioner who wants to develop goodwill [mettāṃ] should “start by contemplating disadvantages

205 so dvīsu hatthesu chijjamānesu neva rodi na paridevi, khantiṇca mettāṇca purecārikaṃ katvā adhibāsesi.

Khuddaka Nikāya, jātaka-aṭṭhakathā, (tatiyo bhāgo), 5. pañcakanipāto, 1. maṇikuṇḍalavaggo, [358] 8. cūladhammapālajātakavanṇanā, para. 8

206 sace panassa verimhi cittamupasamharato tena katāparādhānussaraṇena paṭighamuppajjati, athānena purimapuggalesu yattha katthaci punappunaṃ mettāṃ samāpajjītvā vuṭṭhahitvā punappunaṃ taṃ puggalaṃ mettāyantena paṭigham vinodetabbaṃ.

Visuddhimagga, (paṭhamo bhāgo), 9. brahmavihāraniddeso, mettābhāvanākathā, para. 28
of hatred, and the advantages of tolerance [khantiya].” As all of these examples illustrate, metta is inextricably linked to khanti, forming part of the process.

### 2.3 Literary Conventions

Having explored the meaning and process of khanti, I turn to the plots and characters of the khanti texts in this section. Careful examination of these texts reveals that these khanti stories have consistent conventions of plot and character. The plot of most khanti texts follows one of two standardized narrative arcs and contains standardized characters who serve a defined purpose. They are similar in their plotlines, characters, and motifs. In this section, I will present these two narrative arcs and discuss the distinctive features of each.

These conventions of plot and character strongly suggest that these stories are part of a literary tradition. They suggest that the khanti stories were crafted carefully and

---

207 anussatikammaṭṭhānānantaraṃ uddiṭṭhesu pana mettā, karuṇā, muditā, upekkhāti imesu catūs brahmavihāresu mettāṃ bhāvetukāmena tāva ādikammikena yogāvacarena upacchinnapalibodhena gahitakammaṭṭhānena bhattachiccaṃ katvā bhattachammadāṃ pāṭivinodetvā vivitte padese supaṅṅatte āsane sukhanisinnena ādito tāva dose ādīnavo, khantiyaṅca ānisamso paccavekkhitabbo. kasmā? imāya hi bhāvanāya doso pahātabbo, khanti adhigantabbā.

[Visuddhimagga, (patthamo bhāgo), 9. brahmavihāraniddeso, mettābhāvanākathā, para. 1]
intentionally and that these consistently recurring features are hence meaningful and require attention and interpretation. As we will see below, defining the conventions of this corpus helps make sense of several details that seem odd, brings to light small details that might go unnoticed otherwise, and assists a reader in gaining a closer understanding of what the author(s) agenda might be. This is not to say that all stories follow the conventions strictly. There are deviations, of course, but these deviations also become meaningful once we note the conventions

2.3.1 Conventions of plot

The most consistent feature in these narratives is the plot. Besides the plot point of the protagonist (the Bodhisattva in most cases) practicing \textit{khanti}, which is obviously common to all these narratives, the events that lead to this moment and the subsequent events which occur as a consequence of the practice of \textit{khanti} also follow conventional narrative arcs. Two distinct narrative arcs are seen in a majority of \textit{khanti} stories and they can be distinguished based on the fate of the Bodhisattva/Buddha, i.e. whether he lives or dies.

\footnote{In her doctoral dissertation, Ohnuma (2006) has similarly worked on the literary conventions of \textit{dehadāna Jātakas}, which have stimulated my thinking on this topic. Her analysis is very valuable for understanding the corpus of \textit{dehadana Jātakas} and her methodology, robust. I believe the corpus of \textit{khanti Jātakas} likewise benefits from such an analysis.}
In the first of the two plotlines, plotline (A), the bodhisattva is described as a virtuous being. An offender attacks the Bodhisattva. The Bodhisattva practices *khanti*, but eventually dies. Soon enough, the offender also dies. The Bodhisattva goes to heaven, and the offender goes to hell.

The best example of a *Jātaka* belonging to category (A) is the *Khantivādin Jātaka*. Other prominent *Jātakas* following this plotline are: *Chaddantahatthi Jātaka* [JA514], *Culadhammapāla Jātaka* [JA358], *Cūla-Nandiya-Jātaka* [JA222], *Dhamma-Jātaka* [JA457], and the *Mahākapi Jātaka*\(^\text{209}\) [JA516].

In plotline (B), the bodhisattva is described as a virtuous being. An offender attacks the Bodhisattva. The Bodhisattva practices *khanti*. Viewing the Bodhisattva’s virtuous behavior reforms the offender. He is apologetic, repentant and makes material offerings to the Bodhisattva. The Bodhisattva rejects these offerings and preaches the *dhamma*. The offender is converted and practices this *dhamma*.

Examples of text that follow this plotline include the *Sarabhamiga Jātaka* [JA483], *Daddara Jātaka* [JA304], *Mahāsīlava Jātaka* [JA51], *Ekarāja Jātaka* [JA303], *Māti-Posaka-Jātaka* [JA455], *Rurumiga Jātaka* [JA482], *Rajovada Jātaka* [JA151], *Campeyyanāgarāja Jātaka* [JA506], *Bhūridattanāgarāja Jātaka* [JA543], *Uttara Upasika Vatthu* [DhpA 223] and *Akkosa Sutta* [SN 7:2].

\(^{209}\) Here the monkey’s death is not explicitly stated, but implied.
As is clear from the analysis above, the two plotlines are quite distinct, and each of them emphasizes very different themes. The defining feature of plotline (A) is the death of the Bodhisattva which demonstrates the perfection of the Bodhisattva’s *khanti*. It highlights the extreme, limitless and absolute nature of his *khanti* – that it is unwavering even in the face of death. It is proof of the bodhisattva’s *khantipāramitā*. Furthermore, it emphasizes that there is no wrong time for *khanti* and that its practice is unconditional.

On the other hand, the defining plot point of plotline (B) is the reconciliation of the Bodhisattva and his offender. In most cases, the offender surrenders to the Bodhisattva, apologizes, and even makes a material offering (usually his kingdom, if he is a king). This plotline thus emphasizes the strategic nature of *khanti*. It presents *khanti* as a potent means for the appeasement of one’s enemies and hence has political undertones. In some stories that follow this plotline, *khanti* is also explicitly stated to be the most effective political strategy. For example, the *Sarabhanga Jātaka* [JA522] contains a telling statement which positions *khanti* as the ultimate political strategy. Here Sakka asks the Bodhisattva to declare what blessing is found in *khanti* and the Bodhisattva says:

No royal force, however vast its might,
Can win so great advantage in a fight
As the good man by patience [*khantimā*] may secure:
Strong patience [khantibala] is of fiercest feuds the cure.²¹⁰ (Francis, 1905, p. 76)

Here khanti is declared more powerful than any army and so strong that it can reconcile any feud. This statement can also be read as a repositioning of khanti, whose effectiveness as a political strategy is often discussed in the Mahābhārata (which was discussed in the previous chapter), as an effective political strategy by the Buddhists. These stories seem to want to establish khanti as a practical and effective political strategy for kings [kṣatriyas] and use the narrative arc (B) to demonstrate the efficacy of peaceful kingship. I will explore the significance of presenting khanti as a political strategy in a comparative context to the Mahābhārata in the next chapter.

Secondarily, plotline (B) also emphasizes the transformative power of the Bodhisattva - his ability to pacify and convert sinners, for, at the conclusion of this group of Jātakas, the offender is often converted to the path of Buddhist dhamma preached by the Bodhisattva.

In addition to their different thematic emphases, the goals of both narrative arcs are also very different. The goal of plotline (B) is clear – to motivate the reader to imitate ²¹⁰“na hetamatthāṃ mahatīpi senā, sarājikā yujjhamānā labhetha. yaṃ khantimā sappuriso labhetha, khantibalassūpasamanti verā”ti.

[Khuddaka Nikāya, jātakapāḷi (dutiyo bhāgo), 17. cattālīsanipāto, 522. sarabhaṅgajātakaṃ (2) (KN 15.522), para. 57]
the Bodhisattva’s *khanti* to achieve reconciliation. It presents the Bodhisattva as a figure to be emulated, whose actions we must learn from and apply in our own lives. This is largely because his actions are practical and reap positive results like peace, reconciliation, a gift, words of praise, and *karmic* merit.

The stories in plotline (A), however, are not so simple. Orzech (1994, p. 152), in his analysis of the *Khantivādin Jātaka* in this article on Buddhist self-sacrifice in relation to Rene Girard’s theory of violence, theorizes that stories like the *Khantivādin Jātaka* “invite us to identify with and to emulate the behavior of the victims as a way of stopping victimage.” His theory is that these stories stop “the process of reciprocal violence” (138) and are hence mimetic models for readers. Orzech’s interpretation is plausible. However, it could also be theorized that stories in (A) are intended to be devotional and glorifying in nature. I would argue that the goal of these stories is not to present the Bodhisattva as an exemplary character whose actions we must imitate, but as a glorified and perfect being whom we should be devoted to. This interpretation is supported by the interpretation of scholars who have analyzed such stories from different perspectives. First, Ohnuma (2006) has noted that in their volume on sainthood, Denny, Kieckhefer, and Bond (1988) have theorized that sainthood is a mixture of “otherness” and “imitability”. I believe the stories in (A) highlight the first and the stories in (B) the latter211. The perfection of the Bodhisattva and the lengths he would

211 Ohnuma has also found this classificatory criterion useful in her analysis of *dehadana jātakas*. [p 63]
go to, to preserve his *khanti* highlight his “otherness” from the reader and are hence devotional in nature. Second, Heim (2003) approaches these stories from the perspective of emotions and discusses the ambiguity of morality in stories such as the *Vessantara Jātaka*\(^\text{212}\) which are said to stimulate excessive emotion. She argues that in such stories, emotion is used to engender awe for the Bodhisattva’s perfection and evoke moral consciousness in the reader/audience. Both these scholarly perspectives tend to favor my interpretation of these stories as glorifying the Bodhisattvas rather than presenting him as a mimetic model.

Another point of distinction between these two groups is the tone and genre. Stories in (A) have a tragic ending with the Bodhisattva and his attacker (and occasionally some secondary characters too) dying, while those in (B) have a “happy ending” with reconciliation, reformation of the offender, his establishment on the path of *dhamma* and forgiveness from the Bodhisattva. Stories in (A) can be squarely classified as “tragedies” as they meet all the popular criteria of this genre. In his genre classification of the *Vessantara Jātaka*, Collins uses three criteria for establishing the *Vessantara Jātaka* as a tragedy, which are also useful criteria to judge the *Jātakas* in group (A). First, they fit the dictionary definition of a tragedy: “A play or other literary work of a serious

\(^{212}\) In this story, the Bodhisattva is a prince who is devoted to giving gifts boundlessly. He is banished from his kingdom when he gives away a magical elephant. He sets out into the forest with his family where he gives away everything he has left, including his two children wife. Eventually the children are set free.
or sorrowful character, with a fatal or disastrous conclusion.... That branch of dramatic art which treats of sorrowful or terrible events, in a serious and dignified style.”

Second, Collins notes “the plot involves numerous instances of what an author dealing with Western tragedy calls “a feeling of the inevitability of the avoidable.” This can be seen in the Jātakas belonging to group (A). For example, in the Khantivādin Jātaka, the king slowly dismembers the Bodhisattva, cutting one limb at a time and giving the Bodhisattva an opportunity to save himself after each dismemberment. However, the readers know that the Bodhisattva is not going to waver in his khanti and is eventually going to die. Third, Collins quotes D. Shulman (1991) in relation to the Rāmāyana saying “[it] illustrates the tragedy always consequent on perfection or the search for perfection, just as the work as a whole could be characterized by ... the ‘poetics of perfection.’ It creates a sustained, lyrical universe peopled by idealized heroes whose very perfection involves them—and the audience—in recurrent suffering.” This is as true of the Khantivādin Jātaka as it for the Vessantara Jātaka, both stories that exemplify the bodhisattva’s perfection, in which we see this playing out very clearly. I summarize the differences between group (A) and group (B) in Table IV below:

Table 8: Differences between narrative arcs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Narrative arc (A)</th>
<th>Narrative arc (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>End</strong></td>
<td>Bodhisattva dies</td>
<td>Reformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme</strong></td>
<td>Perfection</td>
<td>Conciliatory power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Goal</strong></th>
<th>Devotional, glorification</th>
<th>Inspirational, figure to emulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality emphasized</strong></td>
<td>Bodhisattva’s otherness</td>
<td>Bodhisattva’s relatability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tone</strong></td>
<td>Tragedy</td>
<td>“Happy ending”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides these differences, there are certain plot points that are emphasized in each category. An important point of plotline (A) is the retributive justice at the end of the story. Once the attacker kills the Bodhisattva, by an act of “moral naturalism”\(^\text{214}\) the attacker is also killed and justice is served. These occurrences are stereotypical in content and we see the same phraseology being repeated in several stories. It serves to highlight the graveness of the offender’s crime. In most instances, the earth is unable to bear the weight of the attacker’s sin and swallows the offender. This is significant, for the earth is known for its firmness, immovability, and most importantly, its ability to endure (hence, its name \(kṣamā\)). This in turn further highlights the Bodhisattva’s patience – even though the earth (whose name is \(khamā\)) cannot bear the crime, the Bodhisattva can – how great his perfection of \(khanti\) must be! Furthermore, the contrast in the afterlife fate of the Bodhisattva and the attacker conveys the different karmic consequences of \(khanti\) and its opposite, \(kodha\).

In plotline (B), the ends of the stories have a formulaic structure. In most, after the practice of the bodhisattva’s \(khanti\), its effect on the offender is described. The offender

---

\(^{214}\) This term was coined by Heim (2003, p. 541) to describe this popular recurring motif.
is usually filled with remorse and requests for forgiveness. He also offers a large gift to the Bodhisattva (if the offender is a king, it is usually his entire kingdom). The Bodhisattva refuses the gift and instead asks for the offender to follow the dhamma. He gives a sermon and the offender takes the five precepts. The story ends with their conciliation and the reformation of the sinner.

These conventions are helpful to note for they help us make sense of details that would otherwise seem odd. For example, the analysis of the importance of the Bodhisattva’s death in narrative arc (A) helps us make sense of a remark in the Khantivādi Jātaka [JA313] which states that the versions where the Bodhisattva did not die are incorrect:

“And the Bodhisatta died on that same day. And the king's servants and the citizens came with perfumes and wreaths and incense in their hands and performed the Bodhisatta's obsequies. And some said that the Bodhisatta had gone straight back to the Himālayas. But in this they said the thing that was not.”215 (Francis & Neil, 1897, p. 28)

215 bodhisattoti taṁ divasameva kālamakāsi. rājaparisā ca nāgarā ca gandhamālādhūmahatthā āgantvā bodhisattassa sarīrakiccaṁ acaṁsu. keci panāhu “bodhisatto puna himavantameva gato”ti, taṁ abhūtaṁ.

[Khuddaka Nikāya, jātaka-aṭṭhakathā, (tatiyo bhāgo), 4. catukkanipāto, 2. pucimandavaggo [313] 3. khantivādiāṭakavanṇanā para. 16]
Further in the gloss of the words, the commentator says, “Some say that his hands, legs, nose, and ears were put back on, that too is false.”

While this comment may come across as baffling, the commentator’s insistence is a signal that something rather important is at stake. Since we find the same conventional plot in other Jātakas, it becomes clear that the commentator’s remark precisely reinforces this conventional plot point – the Bodhisattva’s death – without which the story’s agenda of conveying the Bodhisattva’s perfection would not be achieved.

The same story may also be told more than once and in such a way that each version adheres to a different plot arc. Two Jātakas in particular offer an interesting case study for they are similar in content, but their plots have been changed to fit the two narrative arcs: the *Dhamma-Jātaka* [JA457] and *Rajovada Jātaka* [JA151]. Both Jātakas have the same plot – the Bodhisattva is riding on a chariot when he comes face to face with another king who is also on a chariot. Neither king agrees to give way to the other and they mutually decide that the winner of the battle will give way to the other’s chariot.

216 ekacce pana “bodhisattassa puna hatthapādakaṇṇanāsā ghaṭitā”ti vadanti, tampi abhūtameva.

[Khuddaka Nikāya, jātaka-āṭṭhakathā, (tatiyo bhāgo), 4. catukkanipāto, 2. pucimandavaggo [313] 3. khantivādi jātaka vāṇanā para. 16]

217 The motif of two chariots facing each other and engaging in a battle with the agreement that the loser will give way to the winner was common. For a discussion on chariots and their symbolism in debates refer to Manne (1990) and Bodewitz (1974).
In both cases, the Bodhisattva wins and gets his way. Yet, the climax of both stories is different and we can see that it is inspired by the conventions of the two narrative arcs.

In the *Dhamma-Jātaka* [JA457], “at the very moment when the *Bodhisatta* repeated this stanza, *Adhamma* could no longer stand in his car, but head-foremost plunged into the earth which gaped to receive him, and was born again in nethermost hell.”\(^{218}\) (Rouse, 1901, p. 65) The end of this Jātaka thus conforms to the conventions of plotline (A). On the other hand, in the *Rajovada Jātaka*, the opposing king takes the Bodhisattva’s instructions [*ovādaṃ gahetvā*], engages himself in merit-making [*dānādīni puññāni katvā*] and goes to heaven at the end of his life [*jīvitapariyosāne saggapurameva pūresi*]. Additionally, the identification of characters at the end of the two Jātakas is modified according to the goals of each category. In the former, the opposing king who goes to hell is Devadatta, while in the latter the opposing king who reconciles with the Bodhisattva is identified as Ananda. I elaborate on the conventions of character in the next section.

\(^{218}\) *bodhisattena pana imāya gāthāya kathitakkhāneyyeva adhammo rathe ṭhātuṁ asakkonto avaṃsiro pathaviyāṃ patitvā pathaviyā vivare dinne gantvā avicimhiyeva nibbatti.*

[Khuddaka Nikāya, jātaka-āṭṭhakathā, (catuttho bhāgo), 11. ekādasakanipāto, [457] 3. dhammadevapatattajātakavāiṇaṇa, para. 27]
2.3.2 Conventions of character

There are two main characters in the Khanti Jātakas – the Bodhisattva and the offender.

In this section, I ask the following questions: what is the characterization of the Bodhisattva in these stories? Who are the offenders in the story? How do conventions of character differ between plotlines (A) and (B)? What purpose does the offender serve? What strategies are used to contrast the offenders with the Bodhisattva? Who are the tertiary characters, what are their conventions, and what purpose do they serve?

2.3.2.1 Bodhisattva

We may begin with the first question - who is the Bodhisattva in the story? There is no discernable pattern in category (A). The Bodhisattva is cast as a different character in each of the stories belonging to this group. He is an ascetic, elephant, baby, monkey, god, and ape in the Khantivādin Jātaka, Chaddantahatthi Jātaka, Culadhammapāla Jātaka, Cūla-Nandiya-Jātaka, Dhamma-Jātaka and Mahākapi Jātaka respectively.

Likewise, in category (B) he is a deer, nāga, kṣatriya, elephant, deer, kṣatriya, nāga and nāga in the Sarabhamiga Jātaka, Daddara Jātaka, Mahāsīlava Jātaka, Ekarāja Jātaka, Māti-Posaka-Jātaka, Rurumiga Jātaka, Rajovada Jātaka, Campeyyanāgarāja Jātaka and Bhūridattanāgarāja Jātaka respectively.

Clearly, there is no pattern in the Bodhisattva’s characterization across the two groups. Without reading too much into this, we could speculate that this diversification demonstrates the universality of khanti and its applicability across varṇas, humans, animals and nāgas. Yet, although we cannot categorize the Bodhisattva’s
characterization across groups A and B, we can discern some patterns overall. Across the two groups, whenever the Bodhisattva is an ascetic, he is depicted as a *brahman*, who is born to a wealthy family, is well educated and knowledgeable, and has enough power to curse. The last point serves two important functions. First, it contrasts the Bodhisattva’s character with that of other sages who actually do exercise their power to curse, and second, it shows that *khanti* is a power and not a weakness. It clarifies that the Bodhisattva is not practicing *khanti* due to any weakness or inability to retaliate. He has the ability to curse and defeat his attacker but chooses to practice *khanti* instead.

In contrast, stories where the bodhisattva is a *kṣatriya* occur primarily in group (B)\(^{219}\). This is significant and in line with the observation made above that Jātakas in this category aim to demonstrate *khanti* as a viable and practical strategy for conciliation, peace, and political stability.

It is perhaps surprising that in the largest number of *khanti* Jātakas the Bodhisattva is an animal. What do we make of this fact, given the inferior status of animals in the Buddhist hierarchy of beings? We might expect the stories to underplay the animality of these animals in these stories and present them as stand-ins for humans, but contrary to this expectation, the stories emphasize the animality of these animals and make it part of their rhetoric. For example, in the *Sarabhamiga Jātaka* (*JA 483*) where the

\(^{219}\) The only exception to this Culadhammapāla Jātaka where he is a baby who was born to the king. However, as the baby does not have political agency, we can disregard this case for the point I am about to make.
Bodhisattva is an animal, we see the importance of his being an animal emphasized. In this story, a king goes hunting and while chasing a deer (the Bodhisattva), falls into a pit. The Bodhisattva practices khanti towards the king and rescues the king from the pit. The king is remorseful for his actions and offers his kingdom to the Bodhisattva out of gratitude. When the king offers the Bodhisattva his kingdom, the Bodhisattva (who is a deer in this text) says, “Great king, I am one of the animals, and I want no kingdom.”

Behind the rhetoric employed in these animal stories is the notion that ‘if animals can be so good, how much better must men be’. The same rhetoric is also seen in the Visuddhimagga, where Buddhaghosa uses the animality of the Bodhisattva in these stories as a tool to motivate monks to practice khanti: “And it is perhaps not so wonderful that one who had become a human being should have acted in that way; but also as an animal he did so. For while the Bodhisattva was the elephant called Chaddanta...”

2.3.2.2 Offender

Unlike the characterization of the Bodhisattva, the characterization of the offender is much more defined and there is a clear distinction between the two groups of stories in

---

220 “mahārāja, mayaṃ tiracchānagatā, na me rajjenattho...”


221 idaṃcāpi anacchariyameva, yaṃ manussabhūto evamakāsi. tiracchānabhūtopi pana chaddanto nāma vāraṇo hutvā
terms of who the offender is in each group. In every single case in group (A), the attacker is Devadatta. On the other hand, in group (B), the offender is either a king or a hunter\textsuperscript{222}. In a majority of stories in group (B) the offender is a king: \textit{Sarabhamiga Jātaka}, \textit{Mahāsilava Jātaka}, \textit{Ekarāja Jātaka}, \textit{Rurumiga Jātaka}, and \textit{Rajovada Jātaka}. In two cases, even though the offender is not a king, the exposition on \textit{khanti} is given to a king: the \textit{Daddara Jātaka} and \textit{Māti-Posaka-Jātaka}. In three cases the offender is a hunter: \textit{Māti-Posaka-Jātaka}\textsuperscript{223}, \textit{Campeyyanāgarāja Jātaka}, \textit{Bhūridattanāgarāja Jātaka}.

What purpose does the offender serve in each case? The offenders in group (A) and (B) serve very different purposes. In all stories in group (A), the offender Devadatta kills the Bodhisattva in gruesome ways. These stories highlight his cruelty, which is also the impetus for the narration of some Jātakas in group (A) according to their \textit{paccupanavatthu}. For example, in the \textit{Culadhammapāla Jātaka}, the \textit{paccupanavatthu} says, “This story the Master, when dwelling in the Bamboo Grove, told concerning the going about of Devadatta to slay the Bodhisatta.”\textsuperscript{224} (Francis & Neil, 1897, p. 117).

Furthermore, Devadatta’s characterization also serves as a contrast for the Bodhisattva’s character. We can also see a clear connection between the casting of

\textsuperscript{222} I include snake charmers in the same category as hunters.

\textsuperscript{223} This story straddles both categories since the attack is done by a hunter but the exposition on \textit{khanti} is given to a king.

\textsuperscript{224} \textit{idāṃ satthā veḷuvene viharanto devadattassa vadhāya parisakkanaṃ ārabbha kathesi.}
Devadatta as the offender and the agenda of these stories in group (A) to glorify the Buddha, for Devadatta’s cruelty gives occasion for the glory of the Bodhisattva to be highlighted.

The agenda of stories in group (B) is to encourage the audience to practice \textit{khanti} in the same way that the hero of the story has done. The message being emphasized is reconciliation. The fact that the offender is often a \textit{ksatriya} provides further support for my hypothesis that this group of stories aims to establish \textit{khanti} as a political strategy. In this group of stories, \textit{khanti} is demonstrated as a political strategy that is realistic, ethical, practical, and which should be imitated, and hence, what better way to demonstrate this than through an aggressive king whose heart is warmed by the Bodhisattva’s practice of \textit{khanti} to the extent that he is willing to give up his entire kingdom?

The relationship between the Bodhisattva and the offender in the two groups is also different. In group (A), the contrast between the Bodhisattva and the attacker is made absolutely clear by the way in which their paths diverge at the end - the Bodhisattva goes to heaven and the offender goes to hell. In group (B), however, after initially contrasting the Bodhisattva and his offender, we see a convergence in their characters and destinies, by the offender undergoing a transformation and becoming a practitioner of the \textit{dhamma} preached by the Bodhisattva and in some cases, both going to heaven at the end of their lives.
Two additional strategies are employed by the *khanti Jātakas* to contrast the offenders with the Bodhisattva. In some stories, the Bodhisattva is made the embodiment of *khanti* and Devadatta of *akhanti*. These characters become paradigmatic stand-ins of the religious beliefs they represent. This strategy can be seen most clearly in the *Dhamma Jātaka* where the Bodhisattva is named *Dhamma* and Devadatta, *Adhamma*—leaving no doubt as to what religious beliefs they represent.

In some *Jātakas* a contrast between the Bodhisattva and Devadatta is also made by casting them in opposing *varṇas*. The Bodhisattva is a *brahman* while the offender is a *kṣatriya*—a king. In these situations, we can discern a specific purpose of casting the characters in these contrasting *varṇas*—to show the superiority of ascetic ideals over *kṣatriya* ideals. As an ascetic, the Bodhisattva is a master of the inner world, while the king dominates the external world. MacQueen (1981) has argued that this contrast between internal and external mastery, which is a common theme in Buddhist literature that can be seen in the Buddha’s biography and verses in the *Dhammapada*, is also a prominent theme in the *Khantivādin Jātaka*. Although I do not fully agree with his reading of the *Khantivādin Jātaka*\(^{225}\), I agree that this theme features prominently in the *Khantivādin Jātaka* and other stories in group (A).

---

\(^{225}\) Macqueen claims that “Having presented these two figures, the text has them engage in what may justly be called a "battle," wherein each of the combatants is threatened and is moved to make a powerful response.” [248] It is clear from the story that the king is threatening and challenging Kṣāntivadin. But the author also gives two
Besides these two main characters, in several stories, we also see what I would call “foil characters” whose function I will discuss only briefly. This foil character reacts in the opposite way as the Bodhisattva, highlighting the unique aspects of the Bodhisattva’s *khanti*. Good examples of this foil character are the Bodhisattva’s mother in the *Culadhammapala Jātaka* and the harem women in the *Khantivādin Jātaka*. In these examples, the foils become distressed and wail loudly when the offense takes place, while the Bodhisattva practices *khanti* and stays silent. These foil characters also act as reasons why he thinks Kṣāntivadin is doing the same to the king. I find his interpretation of Kṣāntivadin’s “threats” to the king unconvincing and believe that here he is missing the main point of the Kṣāntivadin Jataka. First, he says: “The ascetic is thus in a position to defy the king, and this is exactly what he does. His reply to the king’s question as to what "forbearance" means, namely, that it means "being without anger when people curse or strike or revile you," is a direct challenge. The king accepts the challenge and the battle begins.” [249] I do not find this response to be defiant. Its just a simple definition of *kṣānti* and could be included for expositional purposes. Second, he adds: “The king has mislocated his forbearance, failed to find it, failed to touch it. This is virtually a taunt, and it provokes the king to further acts of violence and ensures the continuance of the battle.” [250]. If we read this as taunts, we would not be accepting the story’s main point: that Kṣāntivadin was friendly and compassionate to the king even up to the point of death.
the voice of opposition. They object to the crime taking place and play the voice of reason against the offender’s *kodha*.

### 2.4 Implications

This chapter explored the meaning and development of the idea of *khanti* in the Pali Canon. The examination of *khanti* in the Pali canon revealed some fascinating and surprising insights. In this section, I will summarize these findings and discuss their implications on the larger world of Buddhist literature, and the even broader context of early Indian religions, to which these *khanti* narratives belong. I hope that this analysis will not only offer new perspectives into the study of *khanti* but also fresh insights into several larger issues and topics of Buddhist studies that have been unstudied or understudied.

#### 2.4.1 Narrative texts

First, it is noteworthy that while compiling the sources of *khanti*, I found that *khanti* is discussed primarily in the narrative texts of the Pali canon, rather than normative or didactic texts. Even the commentarial traditions of Buddhaghosa and Dhammapala pointed us towards these narratives as the most authoritative sources of *khanti*. Interestingly, when these commentators gloss the term *khanti*, they did not offer any direct definition. Additionally, they also did not point us toward any normative *suttas* which may have contained a straightforward definition. This was the case in all the glosses of the term *khanti*, and was done consistently by both commentators. This
suggests that the commentators viewed *khanti* as a complex term, devoid of a simple straightforward definition, that is best illustrated through a story.

This fact has important implications. It reveals the importance of narrative literature in expounding the meaning of important Buddhist virtues. The authors of the Pali canon clearly opted to take advantage of the possibilities offered by narratives to demonstrate the meaning of *khanti* in different contexts and scenarios, rather than prescribing a normative process of *khanti* through prescriptive texts.

This data supports the scholarly view that narrative literature is a serious source for understanding early Buddhism Appleton (2016, p. 11); Collins (1998, p. 121); (Collins, 2020); Heim (2003); Strong (1989, pp. 14-15; 2017); Hallisey and Hansen (1996); G. Obeyesekere (1991, p. 231)\(^{226}\) and R. Obeyesekere (1992, p. x). As Collins (1998) rightly noted, “It is, surely, no more than common sense to recognize that people react to

\(^{226}\)G. Obeyesekere notes that stories "were once the lifeblood of everyday Buddhism, yet... [they] are almost never part of the scholarly discussion in the modern literature of Buddhism. [Their] almost total neglect in Buddhist Studies is because they have been relegated as unimportant folktales that have little to do with the profoundly philosophical corpus" (231). Similarly, R. Obeyesekere says, "Looking back on my childhood, I realize we were never given religious instruction as such, either in school or at home. We participated in Buddhist rituals and ceremonies . . . and listened to many, many Buddhist stories. That was how we learned to be Buddhists" (x)
problems, ideas and events by telling stories about them...” and that seems to be exactly what the Buddhist did when it came to the idea of khanti.

Despite the importance of narrative literature to the Buddhist tradition, there have been only a few comprehensive studies on the stories of the Pali Canon\textsuperscript{227}. Hallisey and Hansen (1996) lament, “We... find ourselves in the position of having to ask (as if for the first time after a century of intensive, productive scholarship), “What did Buddhists learn from their stories and how did they learn from them?”” The findings presented in this chapter, provide an answer to Hallisey and Hansen’s questions.

The findings of the chapter imply that stories in the Pali canon are far from being inferior sources of knowledge. Rather than being mere vehicles of entertainment or a disparate collection of folk tales, these stories were crafted carefully and served an

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{227} Collins (1998, p. 121) noted “there has been little serious work on Buddhist stories beyond the vital task, still scarcely begun, of providing editions and translations of them.” Similarly, Strong (1989, pp. 14-15) noted, “there has been a tendency by these authors to dismiss them as more or less the fabrications of biased Buddhist.” He imagines these scholars saying “we should not, therefore, take them seriously since they are nothing but the “mendacious fictions of unscrupulous monks” (as though that somehow made them less interesting or important).”
\end{quote}
They were instruments of communicating Buddhist ideals and illustrating complex concepts like *khanti*.

My analysis above has revealed that even the commentators of the Pali canon recognized these narratives as authoritative and important sources for the understanding of complex Buddhist ideas. Hence, Buddhist narrative literature must be given as much consideration as normative *suttas* as they carried an equivalent authority within the tradition. They must be recognized as “fertile ground” (Heim, 2008), and excavated for insights into Buddhist concepts, just as I did with *khanti*.

---

228 This finding supports Collins’ (2020, p. xxix) view that one should avoid “the common assumption that Stories merely “express” or “illustrate” Doctrines, or give voice to some simplistic moral, as do (though only apparently) folklore and “didactic” (children’s) literature (lower-case l). Many of the Birth Stories recounted in [this book] will be seen to be very much more sophisticated, in both Literary (capital L) and ethical senses than Systematic Thought, requiring emotional as well as cognitive intelligence to appreciate.

. . . [these stories were not the content of ] “popular Buddhism,” still less “morality tales” for children, as is so often alleged. . . . Even educated and sophisticated people like stories. And many of the Birth Stories are very complex and sophisticated, as I shall try to show.”

229 In Collin’s last book, *Wisdom as a Way of Life*, he goes as far as to say that narratives are superior to systematic literature. He says, “I am making a large claim: it is that
Furthermore, the fact that *khanti* was illustrated through the medium of narratives, also tells us something about the nature of *khanti* itself. It implies that *khanti* was understood to be a practical and universal practice within the Pali canon. In my analysis above we have seen *khanti* being explained through a wide range of diverse narratives. In these stories we see monks, nuns, laymen, laywomen, ascetics, kings and even animals practice *khanti*. Sometimes the occasions for its practice are relatively small everyday squabbles, and sometimes they are deadly fatal attacks. We see examples of all types of people (and animals) practicing *khanti* in a myriad variety of circumstances. This suggests that *khanti* was presented as a practical solution for everyone, in every situation. Thus, in the Pali canon, *khanti* was not only an abstract concept that was supposed to be perfected through introspection; instead, it was a practical action that had several applications and had to be enacted every day in various life situations.

### 2.4.2 *Khantijatakas* as a subgenre

The consistency and richness inherent in the meaning of Buddhist *khanti* can also be seen in the plots, characters, and motifs of *khanti* narratives. We have seen how the majority of the *khanti* corpus can be divided into two groups, each having its own distinct plotline, theme, goal, tone, characters, and recurring motifs. Through the use of narratives rather than texts of systematic thought (“doctrine”) are the heart and humanity of the Pali tradition, and what is standardly presented nowadays as the “Theravāda.” (2000, p. 2)
several examples above we saw how defining the conventions of this corpus helped us make sense of several details that seem odd, brought to light small details that might go unnoticed otherwise, and assisted us in gaining a better understanding of what the author(s) agenda might be.

These conventions of plot and character suggest that the khanti stories were crafted carefully and could be classified as a recognizable subgenre of their own. This observation builds on and supports the findings made by Reiko Ohnuma (2006) in “Head, Eyes, Flesh, and Blood: Giving Away the Body in Indian Buddhist Literature,” that examined dehadāna narratives to reach similar conclusions. Ohnuma convincingly proves that “gift-of-the-body jātakas constitute a separate and identifiable grouping of texts marked by consistent features and conventions that make it meaningful to speak of them as a subgenre... In plotline, characters, structure, imagery, and even the use of stereotypical phraseology, all gift-of-the-body jātakas share a certain “family resemblance” that immediately recalls the category to mind.” (52) From my analysis above it is clear that the same can be said about khanti narratives.

2.4.3 Anger

My examination of the Buddhist idea of khanti has also revealed fascinating insights into the Buddhist idea of anger. In the Pali canon, khanti was seen as the opposite of anger. If anger was the disease, khanti was the antidote. Even the Khantivādin Jātaka defines khanti as the state of not being angry [akujjhanabhāvo]. Anger is an unstudied subject in
Buddhist studies and I hope that the insights presented in this section serve as a starting point for further research on this topic.

One of the central concerns of the *khanti* narratives is the question of how to deal with anger. Even Buddhaghosa's analysis of *khanti* narratives in the *Visuddhimagga* is undertaken as a response to the question of how one should deal with their anger. One of the unique aspects of the Buddhist idea of anger is the zero-tolerance policy towards anger; in the Buddhist view, the goal was to not let even a tiny amount of anger arise in the mind. For instance, Buddhaghosa interprets the *Khantivādin Jātaka* by saying that even while being mutilated fatally, the Bodhisattva, “did not create the slightest amount of anger [kopamattampi].”

Similarly, in the *Mahāsīlava Jātaka* [JA51] when the virtuous king is captured by a rival king and bound up by followers, the *Jātaka* says, “Even at that time, the great ethical king [or King Sīlava] did not have even a small amount of anger [āghāta] towards the thieves.”

---

230 *khantivādin jātaka dummedhena kāsiraññā “kimvādī tvam samañā”ti puṭṭho kopamattampi nākāsi.*

[Visuddhimagga, (paṭhamo bhāgo), 9. brahmavihāraniddeso, mettābhāvanākathā, para. 78]

231 *tasvimpi kāle sīlavamahārājā corarañño āghātamattampi nākāsi.*

[Khuddaka Nikāya, jātaka-aṭṭhakathā, (paṭhamo bhāgo), 1. ekakanipāto, 6. āsīsavaggo, [51] 1. mahāsīlavajātakavaṇṇanā, para. 5]
in the Pali canon. The goal was to nip this vice in the bud and keep the mind completely free of anger.

Furthermore, the *khanti* stories also give us specific reasons as to why the Buddhists viewed anger negatively. They tell us that anger breaks one’s morality. For example, consider the *Bhūridattanāgarāja Jātaka* [JA543] in which the Bodhisattva is a *nāga* who is captured by a snake charmer. During his period of captivity, the Bodhisattva thinks, “If I were angry [*kujjheyyaṃ*] with him for his treachery, my moral character [*sīlaṃ*] would be injured [*khaṇḍaṃ*].”232 Similarly, in the *Campeyyanāgarāja Jātaka* [JA506] too the Bodhisattva is born as a *nāga* and is caught by a snake charmer. “Then he thought, "My poison is powerful, and if I am angry [*kujjhitvā*] and send forth the breath of my nostrils his body will be shattered and scattered like a fist-full of chaff; then my virtue [*sīlaṃ*] will be broken... But the Great Being so feared lest he break his virtue [*sīlabhedabhayena*], that he bore all this torment and never so much as opened an eye to glance at him.”233 Following the same pattern, in the *Māti-Posaka-Jātaka* [JA455] the

232 sacāhaṃ imassa mittadubbhino kujjheyyaṃ, sīlaṃ me khaṇḍaṃ bhavissati.

[Khuddaka Nikāya, jātaka-āṭṭhakathā, (sattamo bhāgo), 22. mahānipāto n, [543] 6. bhūridattajātakavaṇṇanā, kīlanakaṇḍaṃ para. 114]

233 ahitunḍikaṃ disvā cintesi “mama visam mahantaṃ, sacāhaṃ kujjhitvā nāsavātaṃ vissajjessāmi, etassa sarīram bhasmamuṭṭhi viya vippakirissati, atha me sīlaṃ khaṇḍaṃ bhavissati, na dāni taṃ olokessāmī”ti... mahāsatto attano sīlabhedabhayena evarūpaṃ dukkhaṃ adhvāseṇto akkhīni ummīletvā olokanamattampi nākari.
Bodhisattva is a white elephant who is captured by the king’s men. He thinks, “if I give way to anger [kujjhissāmi], my virtue [sīlaṃ] will be marred. So today I will not be angry, not even though pierced with knives.”

In another group of suttas, the reason for not getting angry is that it is beneficial to the self. Four suttas in the Saṃyuttanikāya - Akkosuttaṃ (SN 7.2), Asurindakasuttaṃ (SN 7.3), Vepacittisuttaṃ (SN 11.4) and Subhāsitajayasuttaṃ (SN 11.5) – contain a formulaic verse that emphasizes the selfish reasons for the practice of khanti: “One who repays an angry man with anger thereby makes things worse for himself.”

In another group of suttas, the reason for not getting angry is that it is beneficial to the self. Four suttas in the Saṃyuttanikāya - Akkosuttaṃ (SN 7.2), Asurindakasuttaṃ (SN 7.3), Vepacittisuttaṃ (SN 11.4) and Subhāsitajayasuttaṃ (SN 11.5) – contain a formulaic verse that emphasizes the selfish reasons for the practice of khanti: "One who repays an angry man with anger thereby makes things worse for himself." (Bodhi, 2000, pp. 256-257). The Vepacitti Sutta also contains a verse that echoes the same reason: “Of goals that culminate in one's own good none is found better than patience [khantyā].” (Bodhi, 2000, p. 324).

---

234 sace pana kujjhissāmi, sīlaṃ me bhijjissati, tasmā ajja sattih koṭṭiyamānopi na kujjhissāmi”ti adhiṭṭhāya sīsaṃ næmetvä niccalova aṭṭhāsi.

235 “tasseva tena pāpiyo, yo kuddham paṭikujjhati.

236 sadatthaparamā atthā, khantyā bhiyyo na vijjati.
Another unique feature of the Buddhist idea of anger is that it was viewed very differently from pain. Within the Pali canon’s worldview, one could experience pain without experiencing anger. For example in the Bhūridattanāgarāja Jātaka [JA543] it is said “The Great Being felt no anger [kujjhi] even though he suffered such pain [dukkham]." (Cowell & Rouse, 1907, p. 97). This is interesting because it suggests that anger was not a type of pain. Pain was seen as a physical sensation while anger was seen as an optional emotional response to it. The ideal Buddhist would feel pain without feeling any anger.

My analysis has also shed some light on the question of how one should quell their anger. Above, I have discussed a formulaic description of anger which is repeated in four suttas of the Saṅyuttanikāya. I have noted how the commentary to these verses

[Samyutta Nikāya, sagāthāvaggo, 11. sakkasamīyuttaṃ, 1. paṭhamavaggo, 4. vepacittisuttaṃ, para. 14]

mahāsatto evarūpaṃ dukkham anubhavantopi neva kujjhi.

[khuddaka Nikāya, jātaka-atṭhakathā, (sattamo bhāgo), 22. mahānipāto n, [543] 6. bhūridattajātakavanṇanā, kīlanakaṇḍaṃ, para. 115]

The redacted parts contain graphic descriptions of horrific mutilations being done to Bhuridatta.

“tasseva tena pāpiyo, yo kuddham paṭikujjhati.

kuddham appaṭikujjhanto, saṅgāmaṃ jeti dujjayaṃ.

“ubhinnamattham carati, attano ca parassa ca.
states that “satiyā samannāgato hutvā adhivāseti” which translates to “possessed of mindfulness, he endures it”. This statement tells us that in order to quell one’s anger, one needs to be mindful. Hence, my analysis suggests that mindfulness is the way to keep one’s mind anger-free.

Lastly, another unique aspect of the Buddhist worldview on anger is that once one has quelled their anger it cannot occur in that person again. In the Akkosasutta, the king and his men assume that the Buddha has gotten angry and they ask him how he got angry despite being an arahant. The Buddha replies: "How can anger arise in one who is

param saṅkupitam ūtvā, yo sato upasammati.

“ubhinnam tikicchantānam, attano ca parassa ca.

Janā maññanti bāloti, ye dhammassa akovidā”ti.

[Samyutta Nikāya, sagathavaggo, 7. brāhmaṇasaṃyuttaṁ, 1. arahantavaggo, 2. akkosasuttaṁ (SN 7.2), para. 6]

This passage is found in the Akkosasuttaṁ (SN 7.2), Asurindakasuttaṁ (SN 7.3), Vepacittisuttaṁ (SN 11.4) and Subhāsitajayasuttaṁ (SN 11.5) and can be translated as follows: “One who gets angry with an angry person is even worse than the one who is angry at him. By not getting angry with one who is angry, one wins a difficult battle. He practices for the welfare of both, his own and the others. Having realized the angered state of another, practicing mindfulness, he calms his mind. When he cures both, himself and the other, the people who consider him a fool are unskilled in the dhamma.”
angerless, in the tamed one of righteous living, in one liberated by perfect knowledge, in the Stable One who abides in peace?” (Bodhi, 2000, p. 256) This important passage highlights that once one has become free of anger [akkodha], anger cannot arise.

2.4.4 Mettā

Parallely, khanti also sheds some much-needed light on the Buddhist idea of mettā. Mettā is a popular240, pervasive, and yet, obscure Buddhist concept in the Pali canon that is in dire need of scholarly attention. Although one of the Buddhist perfections, it is an unstudied concept that continues to confound scholars.

My analysis above has revealed that mettā is an integral part of the process of khanti and has a symbiotic relationship with it. Specifically, mettā is the second step in the process of khanti. This implies that khanti is a larger process that includes mettā; one half of khanti is mettā. The close association between mettā and khanti helps us gain a greater understanding of both these unique Buddhist ideas.

240 This term has become popular in pop culture. For example, former professional basketball player Ron Artest officially changed his name to “Metta World Peace” in 2011 and then to “Metta Sandiford-Artest” in 2020 (Baer, 2020). Additionally, the concept of mettā has also attracted a lot of scholarly attention from the scientific community who has been interested in exploring the therapeutic potention of mettā meditation (Carson et al., 2005; Galante, Galante, Bekkers, & Gallacher, 2014; Hofmann et al., 2015; Mehan & Morris, 2018; Zeng, Chiu, Wang, Oei, & Leung, 2015).
First, the findings from this chapter allow us to correct a major misconception about *khanti* – that the practice of *khanti* means remaining unaffected by what is happening. This perception can be seen in one commentarial description of *khanti* and has also been proposed in modern scholarship. In the *Mangalasuttavaṇṇanā* of the *Khuddakapāṭha-aṭṭhakathā*, we get an *atthavaṇṇanā* of *khanti* which says: “*Khanti* is tolerance as endurance. A monk who is endowed with it, when abused with the ten types of abuse, or when injured, executed, imprisoned, etc., he is unchanged [nibbikāro] like a person who has neither heard [asuṇanto] nor seen it [apassanto], like Khantivādi.”241 Here the commentary states that a monk who possesses *khanti* remains so unaffected by an offense that it is as though he did not hear or see it. This statement interprets the process of *khanti* as being impassive [nibbikāro], and unaffected by an offense. A similar interpretation of the process of *khanti* has also been suggested by Schopen (1989, pp. 139, n. 120), who says, “As I understand the term, it more commonly means not "to endure" or "to accept" but to remain "unaffected by".” This interpretation does not do justice to the examples studied above. As we have seen, in most *khanti* narratives, the practitioner is greatly affected by the offense committed

\[241\] khanti nāma adhīvāsanakkhanti, tāya samannāgato bhikkhu dasahi akkosavatthūhi akkosante vadhabandhādihi vā vihesante puggale asuṇanto viya apassanto viya ca nibbikāro hoti khantivādi viya.

[Khuddaka Nikāya, khuddakapāṭha-aṭṭhakathā, 5. maṅgalasuttavaṇṇanā, khantīcātigāthāvaṇṇanā, para. 2]
against him. The offense acts like a stimulus or a catalyst to produce the complementary positive emotions of metta thereby bringing about a change – a positive one - in the practitioner.

Additionally, the integration of mettā into khanti takes the definition and process of khanti beyond the simple practice of tolerance – a solitary endeavor – to a social practice which now also involves others. The practice of tolerance is limited to the victim, but when the cultivation of goodwill is added to the process of khanti, it crosses the boundary between the victim and the offender and makes the offender part of the process. This act of making solitary practices social can also be seen in other Buddhist processes, like tapas. Kloppenborg (1990, pp. 59-60) has noted how the addition of goodwill [mettācittā] to the redefinition of the term ‘tapas’ “seems to be a first attempt to incorporate social emotions in the - formerly and by nature - rather anti-social practice of asceticism.” When the practitioner of khanti engages in the conscious act of cultivating goodwill towards the offender and the rest of the world, he is consciously shifting his focus from himself to others. This act, of including others in the practice of khanti, suggests that it is closer to being a social practice, rather than an asocial practice.

Third, my findings imply that to study mettā, a scholar would need to look into the concept of khanti. Since the khanti narratives present mettā as an integral part of khanti, no serious examination of mettā can ignore this corpus. Additionally, my findings also point to a strong link between mettā and anger. They present mettā as a
replacement for the emotion of anger and as a way to conquer it. For instance, in the
Visuddhimagga, Buddhaghosa says that the way to negate one’s anger towards a certain
person is to develop mettā for him - “If anger [paṭigha] arises in his mind when he
focuses his mind on the enemy and remembers the transgressions done by him, then
having meditated on goodwill [mettā] towards any of the aforementioned people, and
having emerged from the meditation, he should remove his anger towards that person
by directing goodwill towards that person.” This straightforward exposition helps clarify
the relationship between these three intricately linked concepts – khanti, mettā, and
anger. It suggests that another way of understanding the process of khanti is to view it
as a replacement of anger with mettā.

2.4.5 Khanti as a universal Buddhist ethic

The Theravāda Buddhists can also be seen including their idea of khanti into their
system of ethics, thereby making it an integral part of their ideology. This can be
gleaned from the Pali khanti narratives where one of the main reasons for the practice
of khanti is the preservation of ethics [sīla]. This has already been seen above in the
examples from the Bhūridattanāgarāja Jātaka [JA543], the Campeyyanāgarāja Jātaka

242 While sīla is another complex term that can refer to a wide range of things, I will
argue that in the context of these narratives it likely means a code of conduct or ethical
code.

243 sacāham imassa mittadubbhino kuṭṭheyyaṃ, sīlaṃ me khaṇḍaṃ bhavissati. mayā kho
pana paṭṭhamaññeva caturaṅgasamannāgato uposatho adhiṭṭhito, so yathādiṭṭhitova
These examples clearly demonstrate that the khanti narratives emphasize that the reason for the Bodhisattva’s practice of khanti is maintaining his sīla. This suggests that khanti was an integral part of the Theravāda Buddhist idea of ethics [sīla]; failing to practice khanti results in a breach of the Buddhist code of conduct.

Furthermore, I will argue that khanti was not only an ethic for the Theravāda Buddhists, but a universal Buddhist ethic. In the Mahābhārata the two practices of kṣānti are

hotu, alampāyano maṃ chindatu vā pacatu vā, sūlena vā vijjhatu, nevassa kujjhissāmi”ti

cintetvā “sace kho panāhaṃ ime olokessāmi, bhasmā bhaveyyum.


bhūridattajātakaṇṭanā, kīlanakaṇḍaṃ, para. 114]

244 ahitunḍikaṃ disvā cintesi “mama vissajjessāmi, etassa sarīraṃ bhasmamumuṭṭhi viya vippakirissati, atha me sīlaṃ khaṇḍaṃ bhavissati, na dāni tam olokessāmi”ti... mahāsatto attano sīlabhedabhayena evarūpaṃ dukkhaṃ adhivāsento akkhīni ummīletvā olokanamattampi nākari.


campeyyajātakaṇṭanā para. 6]

245 sace pana kujjhissāmi, sīlaṃ me bhijjissati, tasmā ajja sattihi koṭṭiyamānopi na kujjhissāmi”ti adhiṭṭhāya sīsaṃ nāmetvā niccalova aṭṭhāsi.


mātuposakajātakaṇṭanaṇaṇa, para. 3]
advocated for different varnas. There is no universal notion of kṣānti which applies to everyone in the epic. By contrast, in the Pali canon there is no differentiation in the prescription of its practice by varṇa or any other categorization. Without being overly reductive, the Mahābhārata can arguably be interpreted as a story of kings and a book on the nature of kingship and kingship advice. Within this broad context, kṣānti was presented as one of many duties of a king and clear limits were set on when and why a king ought to practice this virtue. The Pali canon, with its broad scope and non-exclusive focus on kingship, situates its idea of khanti as an important universal virtue that ought to be practiced without any limits by all beings regardless of their varṇa, gender or even species. Above, I have discussed several examples of the Pali khanti narratives where khanti is espoused for ascetics, kings, women, and even animals. These findings suggest that one can make a broader argument that the ethics of the Mahābhārata are essentially an agent-based virtue ethics, whereas Pali Canon’s Buddhist ethics tends to be universal. Hence, the differences in khanti and kṣānti can be seen as a result of the affirmation and rejection of varṇa, respectively, in these two bodies of texts.

2.4.6 Khanti as an alternative political strategy

In my discussion of the Mahābhārata, I have demonstrated how one of the recurring and prominent reasons given for kṣānti is a political and strategic advantage. This is evident in the normative definition of K₂ where the explicit motivation for the practice of K₂ is dharma, artha and loksamgrahana and this reason was also seen being given repeatedly in several discussions related to K₂ in the “kṣānti debate.” Overall, it can be
said that the *Mahābhārata* prescribed *kṣati* as an effective political strategy for kings and *kṣatriyas*.

In several *khanti* narratives, the Theravāda Buddhists can be seen presenting *khanti* as the most effective political strategy. Furthermore, their discussion of *khanti* in these texts is rooted in rich political imagery and has strong political undertones. Several examples of this have already been discussed above in my analysis of *khanti* narratives with plotline (B), all of which present *khanti* as the most effective political strategy. Below I discuss a few more examples.

In the *Sarabhanga Jātaka* [JA522], Sakka asks the Bodhisattva, “Holy sir, declare to us the blessing to be found in this patience,” and the Great Being says, “Not even a strong army [*mahatīpi senā*] is as advantageous in a war [*yujjhamānā labhetha*] as *khanti* is to a good man during hostilities [*verā*].”246 This verse says that *khanti* should be practiced because it is the greatest advantage that a good man can have during a fight, greater than the advantage of a strong army to a king during a war. In other words, for a person who has *khanti* as his army, hostilities cease to exist. This analogy equates *khanti* with a strong royal army and touts it as an astute and effective tactical strategy. The context

246 “*na hetamatthāṃ mahatīpi senā, sarājikā yujjhamānā labhetha. yaṃ khantimā sappuriso labhetha, khantībalassūpasamanti verā”*ti.  

[Khuddaka Nikāya, jātakapāḷi (dutiyo bhāgo), 17. cattāḷisāṇipāto, 522.  
sarabhaṅgajātakaṃ (2) (KN 15.522), para. 57]
for the use of *khanti* here is also important to note – hostilities [*verā*]. The *bodhisattva* in this verse is hence preaching that *khanti* is the best way to win a fight and should be practiced when one is in a contentious situation; it is also a way to void fights altogether. The war analogy, along with the extensive use of political terminology [*mahatīpi senā, yujjhamānā, verā*] supply strong political undertones to this verse. This suggests that the presentation of the *khanti* as the ultimate strategy to win a fight might be influenced, at least in part, by the *Mahābhārata*’s treatment of K2 as an effective political strategy.

Another example is the following verse which can be found in the *Rajovada Jātaka* [JA151] where the Bodhisattva’s charioteer praises the Bodhisattva by saying the following words about him: “He conquers anger with non-anger, evil with goodness, the miserly with charity, and lies with truth. Such is this king. Therefore, O driver! Get out of the way!”247 Here the charioteer is implying that the Bodhisattva uses *akodha*, for conquering those who are angry. I have already demonstrated above how the Theravāda Buddhists defined *khanti* as *akodha*, making the allusion to *khanti* clear in

247 akkodhena jine kodhaṃ, asādhum sādhunā jine.

jine kadariyam dānena, saccenālikavādinam.

etādiso ayaṃ rājā, maggā uyyāhi sārathīti.

[Khuddaka Nikāya, jātakapāḷi (paṭhamo bhāgo), 2. dukaniṇāto, 1. daḷhavaggo n, 151.
 rājovādajātakaṃ (2-1-1) (KN 14.151), para. 6]
this case. The repeated use of the term conquers [jine] as well the context of a battle (of words) against a rival king, imparts a subtle political subtext to this verse.

Similarly, the political effectiveness of khanti can also be discerned from four suttas of the Saṃyuttaniķeya: Akkosasuttaṃ (SN 7.2), Asurindakasuttaṃ (SN 7.3), Vepacittisuttaṃ (SN 11.4) and Subhāsitajayasuttaṃ (SN 11.5). All four suttas make the following assertion: “One wins a battle that is difficult to win by not repaying an angry man with anger.”248 Once again, this verse, rich with political imagery, presents khanti as a political strategy to win difficult battles [saṅgāmaṃ]. Moreover, in the Asurindakasuttaṃ (SN 7.3), when a Bharadvaja gets angry with the Buddha and insults him, the Buddha stays silent and the Bharadvāja interprets this as his victory and says, “I won!”. The Buddha says: “The fool thinks he is victorious when he uses harsh words. But for one who is wise titikkhā is the only victory.”249 Once again, the Bodhisattva is presenting titikkhā, the most common synonym of khanti, as the only path to victory [jaya].

248 kuddham appaṭikujjhanto, saṅgāmaṃ jeti dujjayaṃ.

249 “jayaṃ ve maññati bālo, vācāya pharusaṃ bhaṇaṃ.

jayañcevassa taṃ hoti, yā titikkhā vijānato.”

[Saṃyutta Nikāya, sagāthavaggo, 7. brāhmaṇasamyuttaṃ, 1. arahantavaggo, 3. asurindakasuttaṃ n (SN 7.3), para. 2]
Hence, in all of these examples khanti is being described using rich political imagery of war, victory, armies, and kings. Its benefits and the reasons for its practice are contextualized within a political setting. In the next chapter, I will revisit this point and discuss how it relates to the Mahābhārata.

2.4.7 Translating khanti

Lastly, understanding the meaning and process of khanti also has vital implications for translating the term khanti in Pali Buddhist texts. I started this chapter by discussing scholarly issues with the translation of khanti. I will now revisit this issue knowing what we know now about the meaning of khanti.

The most common semantic equivalent of khanti in English is “forgiveness.” However, based on my analysis of the Buddhist meaning of khanti, there is a major problem in using this term to denote Buddhist khanti. The OED defines the verb “forgive” as “stop feeling angry or resentful towards (someone) for an offense, flaw, or mistake.” This definition implies a state of being angry as a precursor to the act of forgiveness, for in order to “stop feeling angry,” one would have to be in a state of anger prior to that. Yet, as we have seen in the khanti Jātakas, the first and most foundational step in the practice of khanti is keeping the mind pure and not letting it get angry in the first place. In that sense, the Buddhist practice of khanti is thus very different from the meaning implied by the English word “forgiveness”.

https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/forgive
Other common scholarly translations of *khanti* are “endurance”, “tolerance” and “patience.” To “endure” is defined as “[to] suffer (something painful or difficult) patiently.”\(^{251}\) The practitioner of *khanti* does suffer, but as the texts we examined above specify, the suffering is only physical and not mental. Moreover, this term does not capture the rich mental process of keeping the mind pure and cultivating positive emotions. Next, to “tolerate” is to “allow the existence, occurrence, or practice of (something that one dislikes or disagrees with) without interference.”\(^{252}\) Once again, this definition fails to be an accurate equivalent for *khanti*. Not only does it not capture the process of keeping the mind pure and cultivating positive emotions, but it also specifies that the process of tolerance occurs without interference. In several *Jātakas*, the Bodhisattva does try to intervene in the sinner’s attack and try to persuade the sinner from not committing the crime, such as the *Khantivādin Jātaka*, where the Bodhisattva makes various exhortations to the king to stop him from committing a crime. Hence, both these terms fail to capture the essence of Buddhist *khanti*.

The third option, “patience” is defined as “the capacity to accept or tolerate delay, problems, or suffering without becoming annoyed or anxious.”\(^{253}\) “Suffering without becoming annoyed or anxious” resembles the first step in the Buddhist process of *khanti*, however, it fails to incorporate the second step completely. Also, in order to

\(^{251}\) https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/endure

\(^{252}\) https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/tolerate

\(^{253}\) https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/patience
apply this definition to the first step of khanti, we would have to specify that the suffering is physical and not mental, a distinction that is not made in this definition. Furthermore, there is another danger in using this term in the translation of khanti. One of the meanings of patience is “the capacity to accept or tolerate delay,” which imparts a sense a temporariness to its practice. This meaning suggests that the practitioner of khanti is tolerating a delay and once the delay has ended, so would the tolerance. This interpretation grossly misunderstands the “perfection” of khanti which strips it of any temporariness and makes it an everlasting, eternal state of being.

Lastly, I examine “composure” as a possible candidate for translating khanti, as suggested by Schopen (1989). “Composure” is defined as “the state or feeling of being calm and in control of oneself.”254 This term also fails to encapsulate the complexity of either of the two steps involved in the process of khanti.

Based on the above analysis, I would argue that being a complex, multi-stage process, no single word in English is an accurate semantic equivalent of khanti. The richness of its process is severely diminished when this term is translated as any of the above. Yet, for the practical purposes of translating, if one were forced to choose a term I would suggest that the translator acknowledge the limitations of whichever term he uses from the candidates discussed above and include a disclaimer of the limitations of that English term for the reader.

254 https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/composure
Failing to caveat the English translation of khanti in Pali texts will severely limit the reader’s understanding of the meaning of the text and diminish its richness. Consider the Khanti-Vaṇṇana-Jātaka [JA225] as an example. As the name of this Jātaka suggests, khanti is a central concept in this Jātaka. Yet, in this Jātaka, we are not given any explanation of the meaning or process of khanti. Khanti is simply mentioned in one verse uttered by a king to his courtier who is having troubles with his attendant. The king says, “I too have a zealous servant; and here he stands. Good men are difficult to find, so I prefer khanti.”\textsuperscript{255} Cowell and Rouse (1907) translate khanti as patience here. However, another scholar could choose to translate it differently: forgiveness, endurance, tolerance, composure, etc. Each of these alternatives would significantly change the meaning and moral of the story. Having unraveled its meaning and the systematic mental process inherent in this term, we now know what exactly is being expounded by this verse – keeping the mind pure (without anger) and cultivating complementary positive virtues like mettā. Regardless of the English term, the translator uses to translate khanti in this case, it would be very helpful to address the precise meaning of khanti in the translation and caveat the limitations of the English term used to translate it.

\textsuperscript{255} amhākampatthi puriso, ediso idha vijjati. dullabho aṅgasampanno, kantirasmāka ruccatīti.

[Khuddaka Nikāya, jātakapāḷi (paṭhamo bhāgo), 2. dukaniṇāto, 8. kāsāvavaggo n, 225. khantivaṇṇajātakaṃ (2-8-5), para. 5]
2.5 **Summary**

This chapter investigated the precise meaning of the term *khanti* in the Pali canon. I started the investigation by methodically selecting my sources and consulting a wide range of suttās and commentaries from the Dīghanikāya, Majjhimanikāya, Saṃyuttanikāya, Āṅguttaranikāya, Nidānakathā, Jātaka-aṭṭhakathā, Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā, Suttanipāta, and Khuddakapāṭha that discussed and presented the Pali Buddhist idea of *khanti*. Through a thorough examination of these sources, I proved that *khanti* is a systematic, two-step process of ‘purification’ of negative emotions, specifically anger, followed by ‘cultivation’ of complementary Buddhist virtues, specifically goodwill (*mettā*).

Next, I examined literary conventions of plot, character, and motifs within the corpus of *khanti* texts discussed above and argued that this body of literature has consistent characteristics and follows set conventions. I divided the *khanti* texts into two groups (A) and (B) according to their plotlines and characters, and demonstrated how each group served its own distinct purpose – the former of glorifying and edifying the Bodhisattva while the latter of presenting him as a relatable figure who should be emulated.

Lastly, I discuss the implications of these findings in the broader context of the Pali canon, Buddhist narrative literature, the Buddhist ideas of anger and *mettā*, and Theravāda Buddhist ethics.
3 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF KṢĀNTI AND KHANTI

In this section I will engage in a comparative analysis of how the terms kṣānti and khanti are used and treated in the Mahābhārata and the Pali canon. I will start by discussing broad differences between their meaning and usage in the two bodies of texts. I will then discuss the relationship and interaction between the Mahābhārata and the Pali canon as it relates to their treatment of kṣānti and khanti. Lastly, based upon this intertextuality I will present a hypothesis on how the particular meanings of the terms kṣānti and khanti developed in the Mahābhārata and the Pali canon respectively.

3.1 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN KṢĀNTI AND KHANTI

3.1.1 Breadth of meaning

Foremost it is noteworthy that there is a stark difference in the breadth of meaning of the terms kṣānti and khanti in the Mahābhārata and the Pali canon. The meaning of khanti in the Pali canon is narrow and specific. It is a precisely defined, monosemic term that means the absence of anger and the addition of mettā. Conversely, the term kṣānti in the Mahābhārata is broader and encompasses a wider range of meanings. It is a polysemic term that is differentiated based on several factors noted above such as the agent’s varṇa. Hence, it can be surmised that the term kṣānti has a significantly broader range of meanings in the Mahābhārata than khanti does in the Pali canon.
3.1.2 Importance in the tradition

There is also a significant difference in the importance given to the practice of kṣānti and khanti in the Mahābhārata and the Pali canon. The Pali canon gives great importance to the virtue and practice of khanti, a fact which is evident given the status of khanti as one of the perfections [pāramitā] of a Bodhisattva. As a perfection, the practice of khanti is prescribed to be extreme, limitless, and absolute. It must be unwavering in the practitioner even in the face of death (as seen in several narratives above). In addition to being limitless, the perfection of khanti is also prescribed as unconditional. Several examples discussed in the previous chapter emphasize the fact that the Theravāda Buddhist virtue of khanti must be practiced in every situation, without exception.

The treatment of kṣānti, in the Mahābhārata, is quite different, however. In the Mahābhārata, Kṣaṇīya has some resonance with the Buddhist idea of khanti due to its normative definition in which its object is everything – the pleasant and the unpleasant. However, kṣānti is only one of many virtues of a brahman and does not have any extraordinary significance. It is not emphasized to the same extent as it is in the Pali Canon, and the theoretical prescription of it being practiced in every situation by a brahman is seldom followed in practice.²⁵⁶

²⁵⁶ This can be gleaned from the several instances of brahmins in the Mahābhārata being enraged and exacting revenge upon their wrongdoers in the form of curses. Examples include the episode of Rṣyaśṛṅga (Āranyakaparvan, chapters 110-113), the
The second type of *kṣānti* in the *Mahābhārata*, *K₂*, is even more contrasting to the Buddhist idea of *khanti*. Its practice has clear limits (as was discussed in length in the “*kṣānti* debate”) and it is conditional on several accounts - who practices it, towards whom it is practiced, for how long it is practiced, and why. Hence, one can see a clear distinction between the Theravāda Buddhist’s and *Mahābhārata*’s idea of *khanti/kṣānti* in terms of its importance in the philosophical ideals of the tradition and the extent of its practice.

### 3.1.3 Relationship with *mettā*

Another major difference between the Theravāda Buddhist’s and *Mahābhārata*’s idea of *khanti/kṣānti* is the inclusion or exclusion of *mettā*. In the Pāli canon *khanti* is a two-step, sequential process of ‘purification’ and ‘cultivation’ where the first step involves “purification” of negative emotions, specifically anger, which is followed by the cultivation of the complementary Buddhist virtue of *mettā*. In the *Mahābhārata* *K₁* has similar properties to the ‘purification’ element of Buddhist *khanti* as it involves the relinquishment of negative feelings. However, it does not take the next step of the inclusion of cultivation of positive feelings in its practice. *K₂* on the other hand does not include either process. Rather than purify anger, it co-exists with it. The inclusion of *mettā* to the Theravāda Buddhist process of *khanti* is hence an important distinction.

---

episode of *Sautānkaparvan* (chapter 16) where Kṛṣṇa curses Aśvatthāman, the episode of sage Kiṃdama cursing Pāṇḍu (*Ādiparvan*, Chapter 109), and the episode involving a cow-owning sage cursing Karṇa (*Śāntiparvan*, Chapter 2).
3.1.4 Relationship with dharma

In a previous chapter, I have also discussed how the Mahābhārata held an equivocal view on whether kṣānti is considered dharma. Depending on the practitioner and the situation, kṣānti was at times considered adharma or the wrong thing to do. The Pali canon, however, takes an affirmative stand on this issue and claims that khanti is always the right thing to do and that it is an integral part of dhamma. It emphasizes that the practice of khanti is absolute and omnipotent; after all, it is a “perfection,” to be practiced in every situation without any limits.

Consider the illustrative example of the Dhamma-Jātaka [JA457] which makes this point clearly. In this Jātaka the Bodhisattva is called Dhamma and Devadatta, Adhamma. Dhamma and Adhamma, each on their own chariot, engage in a battle of words with the agreement that the winner of the battle will give way to the other’s chariot. Expectedly, Adhamma loses, falls into the earth, and goes to Avici hell. The Bodhisattva then recites the following verses: “Adhamma, whose strength was war, was killed and subdued by dhamma, whose strength (bala) is khanti. He is swallowed by the earth while the other who is happy, very strong (atibalo) and exerts himself in truth, ascended his chariot and went forth on the path.”

257 khantibalo yuddhabalaṃ vijetvā, hantvā adhammaṃ nihanitva bhūmyā.
pāyāsi vitto abhiruyha sandanaṃ, maggeneva atibalo saccanikkamo.
[Khuddaka Nikāya, jātaka-aṭṭhakathā, (catuttho bhāgo), 11. ekādasakanipāto, [457] 3. dhammadevaputtajātakavaṇṇanā, para. 32]
In these verses, *dhamma* is described as one whose strength is *khanti*. Moreover, this verse uses *khantībalo* as a substitute for *dhamma*\(^{258}\). This implies that the Theravāda Buddhists were attempting to equate their idea of *khanti* with their idea of *dhamma*. This contrasts with the *Mahābhārata* where this equation was explicitly denied by virtue of claiming that *kṣānti* can occasionally be *adharma*.

### 3.1.5 Strength or weakness

In a previous chapter I have also discussed how *kṣānti* in the *Mahābhārata* had an ambivalent position as a strength or weakness. While \(K_1\) was mostly considered a strength of brahmins, \(K_1\) was perceived to be a weakness of *kṣatriyas* and \(K_2\) to be of limited strategic use.

The Theravāda Buddhists, however, took a definitive position on this issue and interpreted *khanti* as a strength, particularly that of *brahmans*. Consider this illustrative verse which occurs in the *Vāseṭṭhasuttaṃ* of the *Majjhima Nikāya* [MN 98] and states, “He who endures *[titikkhati]*, verbal abuse, blows and imprisonment without any ill will *[akkosam]* in his mind, whose power is the power of *khanti* *[khantībalaṃ]*, him I call a

---

\(^{258}\) Also note that this verse describes *adhamma* as one who is skilled in war. This equivalence suggests that proficiency in war was *adhammic*, which suggests that the broad Pali Buddhist view of war was negative.
In this verse, *khanti* can clearly be seen described as a strength (*bala*) based on its occurrence in the compound *khantibalam*. In this verse, a *brahman* is redefined as one who practices *khanti* by forgoing ill will (*akkosam*), enduring abuse (*titikkhati*), and having the strength of patience (*khantibalam*) – all typical characteristics of the systematic Buddhist definition of *khanti* I have discussed above. This suggests that, far from being an expression of weakness, the Buddhist viewed the practice of *khanti* as a strength. Additionally, it may also be noted that in the *Dhamma Jātaka* discussed above, *Dhamma* was described as one whose strength is *khanti* (*khantibalo*). Reiterating this in the next verse was the affirmation that *Dhamma* is “very strong” (*atibalo*).

__________________________

259 *akkosam vadhabandha ca aduṭṭho yo titikkhati, khantibalam balānīkaṃ tam ahaṃ brūmi brāhmaṇaṃ.* [Majjhima Nikāya, majjhimapaññasapāli, 5. brāhmaṇavaggo n, 8. vāseṭṭhasuttaṃ n (MN 98), para 69]

260 This is the Pali word for the Sanskrit term ‘*titikṣā*’. Here, the Pali text seems to be using it as a synonym of *khanti* while the Mahabharata endeavored to distinguish the terms *titikṣā* and *kṣānti*.

261 *khantibalo yuddhabalam vijetvā, hantvā adhammaṃ nihanitva bhūmyā. pāyāsi vitto abhiruyha sandanaṃ, maggeneva atibalo saccanikkamo.*
3.2 Intertextuality

These broad differences might give the impression that the treatments of *kṣānti* and *khanti* were disparate and unrelated in the *Mahābhārata* and Pali canon. However, a comparative analysis of the two bodies of texts reveals hints of intertextuality between them. In this section, I will investigate how the different ideas of *khanti* and *kṣānti* in the Pali Canon and the *Mahābhārata* relate to and interacted with one another.

It has been well established by several prominent scholars262 (Appleton, 2016; Black, 2010; Black & Geen, 2010; Gombrich, 1992; Granoff, 1991, 2005; McGovern, 2018;

dhammadevaputtajātakavanṇanā, para. 32]

262 One of the firsts to emphasize it, Granoff (1991), in her comparative study of Buddhist narratives and episodes from the *Mahābharata*, notes how early Indian narrative literature shares a common pool of motifs and characteristics. The following year, in a paper which effectively illustrates the importance of intertextual studies, Gombrich (1992) argued that “we cannot understand the original meaning of the AS [Agganna Sutta] (to its first speaker and audience) unless we realize that it makes several allusions, at crucial points, to Brahmanical scriptures.” Two additional noteworthy studies followed in the next decade. Söhnen-Thieme (2009) in her paper on parallel stories in the Mahābhārata and Jātakas listed several Jātakas that have shared motifs with the *Mahābhārata* and argued that comparison of these texts “may allow insights into the ways whereby motifs have been adapted to a particular context or
Söhnen-Thieme, 2009) that early Indian narrative literature had a “shared narrative universe.” These scholars have explored the literary connections between the Brahmanical and Buddhist texts, noting that the meaning and development of their ideas cannot be understood without contextualizing them. In this section, I build upon their insightful works and engage in an intertextual analysis by analyzing the meaning of kṣānti and khanti in the Mahābhārata and the Pali canon within the context of each other.

3.2.1 Pali canon’s overarching attitude towards the Mahābhārata

Before I delve into the khanti narratives of the Pali canon and discuss their interaction with the Mahābhārata, it is important to note the overall context of these khanti narratives. This is because the corpus of khanti narratives is an integral part of the Pali canon and the overarching attitude of the Pali canon towards the Mahābhārata is also cultural background”. These benefits were more clearly demonstrated by Granoff (2005) who compared Buddhist and Jain narratives and concluded that the contrasts between the stories “serve an important function of clearly marking Buddhist practice as different from the practices of its Jain rivals” [131] and hence play an important role in “clearly defining Buddhist practices and defining Buddhism itself as a distinctive entity with its own unique identity.” [137] More recent intertextual studies include Black and Geen (2010), Black (2010), Appleton (2016); McGovern (2018).

263 This helpful phrase was coined by Appleton (2016) to describe the “complex dynamic of commonality and exchange” [179] in early Indian narratives.
reflective of the general attitude of the Pali Buddhist *khanti* narratives towards the *Mahābhārata*. I will argue that the Pali Buddhist texts are explicitly derogatory towards the *Mahābhārata* in five different ways. This can be gleaned from the several telling statements that occur across the Pali canon criticizing or ridiculing the *Mahābhārata*.

In the Pali texts, the *Mahābhārata* is referred to as the *bhāratayuddha*, meaning the Bhārata war. This is a direct and unambiguous reference to the *Mahābhārata*. There are five main criticisms that the Pali commentaries levy against the *Mahābhārata*.

First, the *bhāratayuddha* is deemed as idle chatter or frivolous conversation (*samphappalāpa*). Examples of such cases can be found in the Dīgha Nikāya
commentaries, Majjhima Nikāya commentaries, and Saṃyutta Nikāya commentaries.

264 anatthaviññāpikā kāyavacīpapayogasamuttothāpikā akusalacetaṁ samphappalāpo. so āsevanamandatāya appasāvajjo, āsevanamahantatāya mahāsāvajjo, tassa dve sambhārā — bhāratayuddhasitāharanādiniratthakakathapurekkhārataṁ, tathārūpī kathā kathanañca.

[Dīgha Nikāya, sīlakkhandHAVGATTHAKATHĀ, 1. brahmajālasuttavaṇṇanā, cūlasilavaṇṇanā para. 126] Gombrich (1985) has also noted this reference.

265 anatthaviññāpakakāyavacīpapayogasamuttothāpikā akusalacetaṁ samphappalāpo. so āsevanamandatāya appasāvajjo, āsevanamahantatāya mahāsāvajjo, tassa dve sambhārā bhāratayuddhasitāharanādiniratthakakathapurekkhārataṁ, tathārūpīkathā kathananti.

[Majjhima Nikāya, mūlapaṇṇāsa-atṭhakathā, (paṭhamo bhāgo), 1. mūlapariyāyavaggo, 9. sammādīṭṭhisuttavaṇṇanā, akusalakammapathavaṇṇanā para 9]

266 anatthaviññāpikā kāyavacīpapayogasamuttothāpikā akusalacetaṁ samphappalāpo. so āsevanamandatāya appasāvajjo, āsevanamahantatāya mahāsāvajjo. tassa dve sambhārā — bhāratayuddha-sītāharanādi-niratthakakathā-purekkhārataṁ, tathārūpikathā kathanañcāti.

[Saṃyutta Nikāya, nidānavagga-atṭhakathā, 3. dhātusāmyuttaṁ, 3. kammapathavaggo n, 3-5. pañcasikkhāpadasuttādivaṇṇanā para. 12]
Secondly, the *Mahābhārata* is also ridiculed as a childish story (*tiracchānakathā*) across the commentaries of the *Dīgha Nikāya*\(^{267}\), *Majjhima Nikāya*\(^{268}\), *Saṃyutta Nikāya*,\(^{269}\) and *Aṅguttara Nikāya*\(^{270}\). It is noteworthy that the term *tiracchāna* is a term that literally

\(^{267}\) yuddhepi bhāratayuddhādisu asukena asuko evaṃ mārito, evaṃ viddhoti kāmassādavaseneva kathā *tiracchānakathā*.

[Dīgha Nikāya, sīlakkhandhavaggaṭṭhakathā, 1. brahmajālasuttavaṇṇanā, majjhimasilavaṇṇanā, para. 21]

\(^{268}\) yuddhepi bhāratayuddhādisu “asukena asuko evaṃ mārito evaṃ viddho”ti kāmassādavaseneva kathā *tiracchānakathā*.

[Majjhima Nikāya, majjhimapaṇṇāsa-aṭṭhakathā, 3. paribbājakavaggo n, 6. sandakasuttavaṇṇanā, para. 3]

\(^{269}\) yuddhepi bhāratayuddhādisu “asukena asuko evaṃ mārito evaṃ viddho”ti kāmassādavaseneva kathā *tiracchānakathā*, “tepi nāma khayaṃ gatā”ti evaṃ pavattā pana sabbattha kammaṭṭhānameva hoti.

[Saṃyutta Nikāya, mahāvagga-aṭṭhakathā, 12. saccasaṃyuttaṃ, 1. samādhivaggo n, 10. tiracchānakathāsuttavaṇṇanā, para. 1]

\(^{270}\) yuddhesupi bhāratayuddhādisu “asukena asuko evaṃ mārito evaṃ viddho”ti kammaṭṭhādavaseneva kathā tiracchānakathā, “tepi nāma khayaṃ gatā”ti evaṃ pavattā pana sabbattha kammaṭṭhānameva hoti.

[Aṅguttara Nikāya, dasakanipāta-aṭṭhakathā, 2. dutiyapañṇāsakaṃ, (7) 2. yamakavaggo, 9-10. kathāvatthusuttadvayaṇṇanā para. 1]
means animals and the term *tiracchānakathā* is also used to describe stories or talks about animals. Since animals were looked down upon in the Pali Buddhist ideological universe, the use of this phrase is hence derogatory on two levels. Elsewhere in the Pali Canon we can also find a detailed list of all the types of the stories the Buddhists considered to be childish talk. This is a standardized list that occurs in several

---

271 This suggests that the text could also be referring to stories such as the *Pañcatantra* which are primarily about animals.

272 While the normative position of animals in the Buddhist hierarchy of beings is below that of humans and considered lowly, in practice their position is more complex given their proliferation in Buddhist literature and specially the Jātakas where the Bodhisattva is often cast in the role of an animal character. The study of animals in Buddhist narrative literature is still in its infancy and several scholars have noted the need for more attention on this subject (Appleton, 2014, p. 200; Ohnuma, 2017).

273 “*yathā vā paneke bhonto samaṇabrāhmaṇā saddhādeyyāni bhojanāni bhuñjitvā te evarūpaṁ tiracchānakathaṁ anuyuttā viharanti, seyyathida — rājakathāṁ corakathāṁ mahāmattakathāṁ senākathāṁ bhayakathāṁ yuddhakathāṁ annakathāṁ pānakathāṁ vatthakathāṁ sayanakathāṁ mālākathāṁ gandhakathāṁ nātikathāṁ yānakathāṁ gāmakathāṁ nigamakathāṁ nagarakathāṁ janapadakathāṁ itthikathāṁ sūrakathāṁ visikhākathāṁ kumbhaṭṭhānakathāṁ pubbapetakathāṁ nānattakathāṁ lokakkhāyikāṁ samuddakkhaṭṭhikāṁ itibhavābhavakathāṁ iti vā iti evarūpāya

195
suttas. It includes talk about: kings, thieves, chief ministers, armies, fear, war, food, drinking, clothes, garlands, smells, relatives, vehicles, villages, towns, cities, provinces, women, heroes, streets, places of water pots, deceased spirits, gossip, nature, cosmogony, and such pointless talks.

Thirdly, in several of the examples noted above, the comments regarding the bhāratayuddha feature in a section that glosses the term corakathā. This term means talk of thieves or stories of thieves, another direct criticism of the Mahābhārata.

tiracchānakathāya paṭivirato samāno gotamo’ti — iti vā hi, bhikkhave, puthujjano tathāgatassa vaṇṇam vadāmāno vadeyya.

[Dīgha Nikāya, silakkhandhavaggapāli, 1. brahmajālasuttaṃ n, majhimasīlaṃ (DN 1.3), para. 7]

274 (DN 2.14), para. 7; (DN 9.1), para. 3; (DN 25.1), para. 2; (DN 25.8), para. 3; (MN 76.1), para. 1; (MN 77.1), para. 1; (MN 78.1), para. 2; (MN 79.1), para. 2; (SN 56.10), para. 1; (AN 10.69), para. 1; (AN 10.69), para. 3; (AN 10.70), para. 1

275 aniyyānikattā saggamokkhamaggānaṃ tiracchānabhūtā kathāti tiracchānakathā.

tattha rājānaṃ ārabbha mahāsammato mandhātā dhammāsoko evaṃ mahānubhāvotīdinā navena pavattā kathā rājakathā. esa nayo corakathādisu. tesu asuko rājā abhirūpo dassaniyotīdinā navena gehassitakathāva tiracchānakathā hoti...
yuddhepi bhāratayuddhādisu asukena asuko evaṃ mārito, evaṃ viddhoti kāmassādavaseneva kathā tiracchānakathā.
Dasame anekavihitanti anekavidham. tirachchánakathanti aniyánikattā
saggamokkhamaggānaṃ tirachchānabhūtaṃ kathāṃ. rājakathantiādīsu rājānaṃ ārabbha
“mahāsammato mandhātā dhammāsoko evaṃ mahānubhāvo”tiādinā nayena
pavattakathā rājakathā. esa nayo corakathādīsu. tesu “asuko rājā abhirūpo
dassaniyo”tiādinā nayena gehasitakathāva tirachchānakathā hoti.... yuddhepi
bhāratayuddhādīsu “asukena asuko evaṃ mārito evaṃ viddho”ti kāmassādavaseneva
kathā tirachchānakathā, “tepi nāma khayaṃ gatā”ti evaṃ pavattā pana sabbattha
kammaṭṭhānameva hoti.

[Saṃyutta Nikāya, mahāvagga-āṭṭhakathā, 12. saccasaṃyuttaṃ, 1. samādhipavattā n, 10.
tirachchānakathāsuttavaṇṇanā, para. 1]
navame tirachchānakathanti aniyánikattā saggamokkhamaggānaṃ tirachchānabhūtaṃ
kathāṃ. tattha rājānaṃ ārabbha “mahāsammato mandhātā dhammāsoko
evaṃmahānubhāvo”tiādinā nayena pavattakathā rājakathā. esa nayo corakathādīsu.
tesu “asuko rājā abhirūpo dassaniyo”tiādinā gehasitakathāva tirachchānakathā hoti...
yuddhesupi bhāratayuddhādīsu “asukena asuko evaṃ mārito evaṃ viddho”ti
kammassādavaseneva kathā tirachchānakathā, “tepi nāma khayaṃ gatā”ti evaṃ pavattā
pana sabbattha kammaṭṭhānameva hoti.

[Aṅguttara Nikāya, dasakanipāta-āṭṭhakathā, 2. dutiyapaṇṇasakaṃ, (7) 2. yamakavaggo,
9-10. kathāvatthusuttadvayavaṇṇanā para. 1]
Fourthly, the Pali commentaries also explicitly state that the Buddha did not recite the *Mahābhārata*. In a Dīgha Nikāya commentary\(^{276}\), the commentator gives examples of stories that the Buddha does not recite, among which the *Mahābhārata* can be found, alongside the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

Lastly, the *Mahābhārata* (and *Rāmāyaṇa*) are also referred to as “aniyyānika”\(^{277}\) which means that they have no salvific value. This suggests that the epics were seen as

\(^{276}\) na tam tathāgato byākarotīti tam bhāratayuddhasitāharanaṇasadisaṁ aniyyānikakathanā tathāgato na katheti.

[Dīgha Nikāya, pāthikavaggaṭṭhakathā, 6. pāsādikasuttavaṇṇanā, pañhabyākaṇaṇavaṇṇanā para. 2]

\(^{277}\) tam bhāratayuddhasitāharanaṇasadisaṁ aniyyānikakathāṁ tathāgato na katheti.

[Dīgha Nikāya, pāthikavaggaṭṭhakathā, 6. pāsādikasuttavaṇṇanā, pañhabyākaṇaṇavaṇṇanā, para. 2]

aniyyānikattā saggamokkhhamaggānaṁ tiracchānabhūtā kathāti tiracchānakathā. tattha rājānaṁ ārabha mahāsammato mandhātā dhammadūsoko evaṁ mahānubhāvotiādinā nayena pavattā kathā rājakathā. esa nayo corakathādīsu. tesu asuko rāja abhirūpo dassanīyotādinā nayena gehassitakathāva tiracchānakathā hoti. sopi nāma evaṁ mahānubhāvo khayaṁ gatoti evaṁ pavattā pana kammaṭṭhānabhāve tiṇṭhāti. coresu mūladevo evaṁ mahānubhāvo, meghamālo evaṁ mahānubhāvoti tesāṁ kammaṁ paṭicca aho sūrāti gehassitakathāva tiracchānakathā. yuddhepi bhāratayuddhādīsu asukena asuko evaṁ mārito, evaṁ viddhoti kāmassādavaseseva kathā tiracchānakathā.
tiracchānakathanti aniyyānikattā saggamokkhamaggānaṁ tiracchānahūtāṁ kathaṁ.

rājakathantiādīsu rājānaṁ ārabbhā “mahāsammato mandhātā dhammadoko evām mahānubhāvo”tīdīnā nayena pavattakathā rājakathā. esa nayo corakathādīsu. tesu “asuko rājā abhirūpo dassaniyo”tīdīnā nayena gehasitakathāva tiracchānakathā hoti.

“sopi nāma evaṁ mahānubhāvo khayaṁ gato”ti evaṁ pavattā pana kammaṭṭhānabhāve titṭhati. coresupi “mūladevo evaṁ mahānubhāvo meghamālo evaṁ mahānubhāvo”ti tesaṁ kammaṁ paṭicca “aho sūrā”ti gehasitakathāva tiracchānakathā. yuddhepi bhāratayuddhādisu “asukena asuko evaṁ mārito evaṁ viddho”ti kāmassādavaseneva kathā tiracchānakathā, “tepi nāma khayaṁ gatā”ti evaṁ pavattā pana sabbattha kammaṭṭhānenameva hoti.

[Samyutta Nikāya, mahāvagga-aṭṭhakathā, 12. saccasamyuttam, 1. samādhivaggo n, 10. tiracchānakathāsuttavāṇṇanā, para. 1]

navame tiracchānakathanti aniyyānikattā saggamokkhamaggānaṁ tiracchānahūtāṁ kathaṁ. tattha rājānaṁ ārabbhā “mahāsammato mandhātā dhammadoko evaṁ mahānubhāvo”tīdīnā nayena pavattakathā rājakathā. esa nayo corakathādīsu. tesu “asuko rājā abhirūpo dassaniyo”tīdīnā gehasitakathāva tiracchānakathā hoti, “sopi nāma evaṁmahānubhāvo khayaṁ gato”ti evaṁ pavattā pana kammaṭṭhānabhāve titṭhati. coresupi “mūladevo evaṁmahānubhāvo, meghadevo evaṁmahānubhāvo”ti tesaṁ kammaṁ paṭicca “aho sūrā”ti gehasitakathāva tiracchānakathā. yuddhesupi
literature (that was read for pleasure) and criticism here can be taken as a more general criticism of *belle lettres* as a whole; i.e. literature that is read for pleasure and does not lead to salvation was condemned in Pali Buddhist commentaries.

It is important to note that the *Rāmāyaṇa*, which is called the “*sītāharana*” (the kidnapping of Sita) in the Pali commentaries, faces all of the same criticisms levied on the *Mahābhārata*, thus implying that the critical attitude of the Pali Buddhists towards the *Mahābhārata* had less to do with the particularities of that text and more to do with their general attitude towards Brahanical narrative texts which were deemed to have no value for the Buddhist religious quest.

Having established the overarching critical and derogatory attitude of the Pali Buddhists towards the *Mahābhārata*, I will now discuss how the meaning and development of *khanti* was also influenced by a well-known phenomenon of intertextuality between the *Mahābhārata* and the Pali canon - the Pali Buddhist redefinition and appropriation of Brahanical terminology.

__________________________________________

bhāratayuddhādīsu “asukena asuko evaṃ mārito evaṃ viddho”ti kammaśādavaseneva kathā tiracchānakathā, “tepi nāma khayaṃ gatā”ti evaṃ pavattā pana sabbattha kammaṭṭhānameva hoti.

[Āṅguttara Nikāya, dasakanipāta-aṭṭhakathā, 2. dutiyapaṭṭhasakā, (7) 2. yamakavaggo, 9-10. kathāvatthusuttadvayavaṇṇanā para. 1]
3.2.2 Redefinition and appropriation

In a previous section, I discussed how the Pali Buddhist definition of *khanti* was equated with the Pali Buddhist idea of *dhamma*. The Pali Buddhist interpretation of the term *dhamma* has been studied carefully by Gethin (2004) and as part of his examination, Genthin also studied reinterpretations of the term *dhamma* in Buddhist texts and noted that such reinterpretations were consistent with “the general tendency of early Buddhist thought to appropriate Brahmanical terminology and reinterpret it in its own terms...” (2004, p. 532). This phenomenon can also be observed in the examples discussed above, such as the *Dhamma Jātaka*, where the Brahmanical idea of *dharma* has been reinterpreted by the Pali Buddhists as being synonymous with their definition of the term *khanti*. By equating “*dhamma*” with “*khanti*,” an equation that the *Mahābhārata* explicitly denies by virtue of claiming that *kṣānti* can occasionally be *adharma*, the Pali Buddhists seem to be attempting to redefine the omnipresent and critical Brahmanical term “*dharma*” by infusing it with the Buddhist practice of *khanti*.\textsuperscript{278} The same phenomenon can also be observed in the case of the *Vāsetṭhasutta* discussed

\textsuperscript{278} This relationship between *khanti* and *dhamma* also suggests the importance of *khanti* in Pali Buddhist thought. *Dhamma* is arguably one of the most important and pervasive technical terms in Brahmanical religious literature such as the *Mahābhārata*. By redefining the term *dharma* and equating it with *khanti* in the Pali canon, the Pali Buddhists are thrusting a great level of importance to their idea of *khanti* – far greater than the *Mahābhārata* confers on its idea of *kṣānti*.
above where the Pali Buddhists redefine the highest and most respected class in society, the ‘brahmans’, as those who practice the Buddhist virtue of *khanti*. 279

279 This instance of the Buddhist redefinition of the term ‘brahman’ is part of a larger trend which has been studied by Bailey (1991, 2011); Norman (1991) and most recently, McGovern (2018). Bailey argues that for the Buddhists, the *brahmin* constituted “a ready-made symbol system possessing a high level of social legitimacy that could be appropriated as a target of criticism, while simultaneously being a vehicle of communication” (1991, p. 19). He argues that the Buddhists made abundant use of this symbol as a rhetorical device to establish their own identity and redefined what it meant to be an ideal brahmin by listing a large number of ‘Buddhist’ qualities that should be possessed by him279. Norman (1991) also analyzed several terms that were re-interpreted by the Buddha and hypothesized three different reasons for the existence of this trend – the convenience of using terms that were well known to the audience, to prove Brahmanism wrong, and to prove the correctness of Buddhism over Brahmanism. I find all these reasons very plausible and applicable to the narratives discussed above. Mostly recently, McGovern (2018) wrote a monograph titled ‘The Snake and the Mongoose: The Emergence of Identity in Early Indian Religion’ where he argues “Buddhism, Jainism, and Brahmanism/Hinduism emerged out of a period of contestation over the category Brahman, which all of them sought to claim.” [4] He argues that “‘the Brahman’” was not a “stable and self-evident agent in Indian history” and that in some narratives the Buddhists describe monks as Brahmans, not with the
3.2.3 Development of kṣānti and khanti

Based on the intertextuality noted above, I will end this section by presenting a few hypotheses on the development of the ideas of kṣānti and khanti in the Mahābhārata and the Pali canon. I want to emphasize the word hypotheses here: it is impossible to prove conclusively how complex religious ideas such as kṣānti and khanti developed in bodies of texts as large as the Mahābhārata and the Pali canon, for that would require being privy to the thought process of the authors of these texts and a comprehensive knowledge of all texts that influenced their thinking. Hence, the theories presented in this section are simply my hypotheses based on the evidence available at this time and

[129] He notes that this is true of only certain instances of the usage of this term (Brahman) in Buddhist literature and not true of later texts such as “encounter dialogues” between the Buddha and various brāhmaṇas where the Buddhists are clearly critical of Brahmsans, whom they view as the “other” and attempt to redefine the term. The example of the Vāseṭṭhasutta noted above is clearly part of the “encounter dialogues,” as it details the encounter between two brahmsans arguing about what the characteristics of a true brahman are, and the Bodhisattva intervening and giving a detailed description of what a true brahman is and is not. It is a clear example of a case where the Buddhists are employing the familiar rhetorical strategy described by Bailey (1991, 2011); Norman (1991).
constitute what I believe to be the most likely scenario as to how these ideas developed based on my extensive study of kṣānti and khanti for this thesis.

I believe that the examples presented above suggest that the Buddhists developed their idea of khanti in conversation with and against the prevailing Brahmanical ideologies of kṣānti. In this section, I will hypothesize that the Buddhist idea of khanti was developed as a response to the Mahābhārata’s idea of kṣānti and was used by the Pali Buddhists as an identity marker to differentiate themselves and their philosophical ideas from those of the Mahābhārata.

I discussed above how the Pali Buddhists defined the term khanti by redefining the Brahmanical terms dharma and brahmin and infusing them with their idea of khanti. I have also discussed, in the previous chapter, how the Pali Buddhists presented khanti as an effective political strategy and a universal virtue to be practiced by all beings. I now hypothesize that the Pali Buddhists’ repeated insistence on khanti being an effective political strategy can be interpreted as a response to the Mahābhārata’s presentation of K2 as a political strategy for kṣatriyas. The Theravāda Buddhists were likely aware of the idea of K2 kṣānti and responded to that, critically, through stories that contained “Plotline B” (discussed above) where khanti was overtly presented as an effective and better political strategy.

In the previous chapter I have also discussed how the Theravāda Buddhists presented khanti as a universal virtue to be practiced by all beings. Here, I hypothesize that their presentation of khanti as a universal ethic for all beings can be seen as their rejection of
the Mahābhārata’s system of varna. The Pali canon’s idea of kṣānti seems to refute the caste bifurcation created by the Mahābhārata’s idea of kṣānti and presents a universal model of kṣānti that is applicable to all varnas (and works equally well as a religious ethic and political strategy). This hypothesis is lent further support by the fact that in several stories there is an opposition between the Bodhisattva being a brahman and the offender being a kṣatriya. In these situations, one can discern a specific purpose of casting the characters in these contrasting varṇas – to show the superiority of ascetic ideals over kṣatriya ideals, and once this superiority is established, to make it universally applicable.

Additionally, I hypothesize that the Buddhist definition of khanti was influenced by the Mahābhārata’s definition of K₁ and was a modification of it. The Pali Buddhists embellished K₁’s characteristic of non-anger and added the aspect of the cultivation of mettā to their reinterpretation of khanti. In addition, khanti was made universal and a perfection (limitless and unconditional in its practice). These changes made the Pali Buddhist’s idea of khanti distinct from the Mahābhārata’s definition of K₁.

Lastly, I hypothesize that the Pali Buddhists had three main agendas in mind while developing their idea of khanti - to further their critical agenda towards the Mahābhārata (as discussed above), to differentiate their ideology from the ideology of the Brahmans propagated through the Mahābhārata, and to establish their own unique religious identity. I noted above that the Pali Buddhist literature and Brahmanical epics including the Mahābhārata were created and consumed in a shared narrative universe.
Shared plotlines, characters, and motifs suggest that these narratives represented traditions that shared a common religious setting where they likely competed against one another on many levels. From this one can infer that forming distinct identities and creating boundaries between the traditions would have been one of the primary agendas of these traditions. The Pali Buddhist *khanti* narratives can be seen as participating in this identity-forming process by making the Pali canon’s philosophical ideas distinct from that of the *Mahābhārata’s*.

I must reiterate that a trajectory different from the hypothesis I presented above is also plausible (that the *Mahābhārata* was influenced more by the Pali materials rather than the other way). The presentation of my hypothesis above does not mean that I am negating the possibility of any alternatives. It is simply the trajectory that I believe, based on my research for this thesis, is the likely scenario for what could have occurred.

**CONCLUSION**

When reading about the brutal and merciless mutilation of the ascetic *Khantivādi* in the *Khantivādi jātaka*, one cannot help but feel certain emotions. The text is often graphic when describing the violence and injustice done to the *Bodhisatta*. In the *Khantivādi jātaka* we are told, “the *Bodhisatta’s* outer and inner skins were cut through to the flesh, and the blood flowed... the blood flowed from the extremities of his hands and feet like lac juice from a leaking jar... His whole body was now covered with
blood...” (Francis & Neil, 1897, pp. 27-29). In the *Culadhammapālajātaka*, where the Bodhisatta is a little baby who is violently hacked into pieces and murdered by his father, the text says, “when the Bodhisatta was only seven months old, he had his hands and feet and head cut off and his body encircled with sword cuts, as it were with a garland.” (Francis & Neil, 1897, p. 118) The text describes in graphic detail, as the king hacks the baby’s limbs one by one until he chops him up into little pieces and scatters the bits on the floor. It would be unusual for a reader to not feel any emotion while reading these graphic descriptions. For me, the emotion was undoubtedly the feeling of anger towards the perpetrator of these heinous, vicious crimes.

280 bodhisattassa chavi bhijji. cammaṃ bhijji, maṃsaṃ chijji, lohitam paggharati...

hatthapādakoṭīhi ghaṭachiddehi lākhāraso viya lohitam paggharati... sakalasarīre lohitam aholi.

[Khuddaka Nikāya, jātaka-āṭṭhakathā, (tatiyo bhāgo), 4. catukkanipāto, 2. pucimandavaggo n, [313] 3. khantivāḍijātakavaṇṇanā]

281 bodhisattassa sattamasikakāle hatthapāde ca sīsānca chedāpetvā asimālakaṃ nāma kāresi.

[Khuddaka Nikāya, jātaka-āṭṭhakathā, (tatiyo bhāgo), 5. pañcakanipāto, 1. manikundalavaggo n, [358] 8. cūḷadhammapālajātakavaṇṇanā]

282 Here, it is worth noting that Collins (2020) has argued that reading Pali narratives with Emotional Intelligence (EQ) is important in order to correctly understand them. He says, “The capacity to understand and empathize with characters within a narrative, to
Yet, in both stories, the Bodhisatta reacts very differently towards the atrocities committed against him. In the Khantivādijātaka he says, “Long live the king, who cut off my hands, legs, nose and ears! For, one such as me does not get angry.”\(^{283}\) and in the Culadhammapālajātaka we are told, “The boy, when his hands were cut off, neither wept nor lamented, but moved by khanti and mettā, bore it with resignation.”\(^{284}\)

(Francis & Neil, 1897, p. 118 with modifications) The Bodhisatta, thus, has a diametrically opposite reaction to that of the readers. He feels no anger while experiencing these gruesome crimes and instead practices the emotion\(^{285}\) of khanti. The

see the psychological and moral complexity of their actions and relations, to feel (and I do mean feel) the kinds of ethical and practical difficulties which they face, certainly requires a significant capacity for Emotional Intelligence…” (p. xxvii).

\(^{283}\) yo me hatthe ca pāde ca, kaṇṭanāsaṇaṅca chedayi. ciraṁ jivatu so rājā, na hi kujjhanti mādisāti.

[Khuddaka Nikāya, jātaka-aṭṭhayakathā, (tatiyo bhāgo), 4. catukkanipāto, 2. pucimandavaggo n, [313] 3. khantivādijātakavāṇanā]

\(^{284}\) so dvīsu hatthesu chijjamānesu neva rodi na paridevi, khantiṁca mettaṅca purecārikam katvā adhivāsesi.

[Khuddaka Nikāya, jātaka-aṭṭhayakathā, (tatiyo bhāgo), 5. pañcakanipāto, 1. manikundalavaggo n, [358] 8. culadhammapālajātakavāṇanā]

\(^{285}\) I argue that in the stories of the Pali canon, khanti can be understood as both a skill and an emotion. Its status as a skill can be attributed to the fact that it is practiced by

208
reader, upon reading this, might at first be surprised and even shocked, but soon learns that this is the right emotion to feel in the face of such situations. As one reads several of these khanti narratives, the message become stronger, and the reader is thoroughly conditioned. Having read these khanti stories over and over again for the purpose of this dissertation, I can attest to this; I feel my own angry reactions receding, and the feeling of khanti strengthening.

I would argue that the khanti narratives had an ethical function of not only preaching about khanti, but evoking and instilling the emotion of khanti in the readers. This is done by showing the Bodhisattva’s emotional reaction of khanti in each situation, glorifying the emotion of khanti and giving reasons for its practice. One can fathom that the ethical goal of these narratives is to fashion devotees who are instilled with and practice khanti. These findings also suggest that the khanti narratives in the Pali canon

the bodhisattva in several lifetimes until it is perfected by him and constitutes one of the pāramitās. Its status as an emotion is less obvious but equally important. This notion comes from the antonym of khanti – kodha (anger). Anger is defined as “a strong feeling of annoyance, displeasure, or hostility.” The Oxford English Dictionary similarly defines the broad category of “emotion” as “a strong feeling deriving from one’s circumstances, mood, or relationships with others.” Based on the status of anger as an emotion, and khanti as its antidote, we can view khanti as its opposing emotion.

https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/anger
were sophisticated literary works crafted intentionally. The *khanti* narratives were textual instruments for emotionally conditioning ethical readers.

Furthermore, it is worth noting in the Pali canon, *khanti* is presented as a positive, desirable Buddhist emotion. The tradition wanted its followers to cultivate the emotion of *khanti* and practice it in their own lives. In popular culture, Buddhism is often viewed as a religious tradition that viewed emotions as undesirable and that the goal of a Buddhist practitioner is to be indifferent or unaffected by emotions. The findings presented here reject this assumption and suggest that the Pali Buddhist authors of the *khanti* narratives viewed only certain emotions such as anger negatively, but others such as *khanti* as productive and desirable. Overall, I would argue that the degree to which certain emotions such as *khanti* were considered ethically productive in Pali Buddhism has been underestimated so far.

The field of Buddhist ethics has only recently encountered an interest in the topic of Buddhist emotions whose study is still in its infancy.\(^{286}\) My personal anecdotal

\(^{286}\) In 1995 Marks, Ames, and Solomon (1995) argued that emotions “lie at the very heart of ethics, determining our values, focusing our vision, influencing our every judgment, giving meaning to our lives.” But the study of emotions is only now gaining momentum. In 2003 there was a series of articles in the Journal of the American Academy of Religion (JAAR) centered on the question of how religious traditions produce distinctive emotions. Three of these articles focused on the importance and role of emotions in Buddhist narrative literature.
experience shared above has resonance with the observations of Berkwitz (2003); Collins (2020); Heim (2003); Rotman (2003)\textsuperscript{287}. I would like to join these scholars in their

Scholars have noted that the subject of emotions is still in its infancy in the study of South Asian Buddhism and in need of further scholarly attention (Keown, 2016; Trainor, 2003). Urging more scholarship on emotions Heim (2008, pp. 17, 31) says, “Buddhism deals directly with the emotions as a chief concern of its doctrine and practice... Scholars of religion and ethics do well then to investigate emotions, because through them we can detect the things religious traditions care most about.” Most recently, Collins (2020, p. xxx) also emphasized the importance of emotions in Pali literature and argued that “the Buddhist educational project” had the goal of creating “wise and emotionally intelligent people.”

An excellent case in point for the study of the emotions in narrative literature is Mrozik (2006) who has explored the role of Buddhist narrative literature, particularly Ārya Sura’s Jātakamālā, in “fostering the cultivation of ethically valorised emotions.” (91) Her essay focuses on the emotion of astonishment and its valorisation in the aforementioned text and leads to fascinating insights into the role of emotions in Buddhist literature.

\textsuperscript{287} Berkwitz (2003) has argued that emotions are “cultural products” that are instilled via narratives to spur ethical action. Through a close reading of medieval Buddhist histories, he showed how these texts were “preoccupied with transforming how people felt and lived in the world” [581]. He argued that these narratives did not simply “elicit”
advocacy for scholarship that looks beyond the didactic quality of narratives and focuses on the emotional and ethical components which motivated the production and reception of these narratives.

The same, however, cannot be said of the kṣānti narratives in the Mahābhārata. The Mahābhārata has different prescriptions for people based on their varṇa. The prescription for brahmins is similar to the contemporary western practice of forgiveness, as discussed above. The prescription for kṣatriyas, however, is different. 

Heim (2003) similarly argued that emotions can spur moral insight and lead to ethical action. She said that Buddhist literature supports the view that “emotions and mental states can be cultivated and trained in ways that can make them reliable and useful as moral guides.” Urging more scholarship on this, she said “the study of Buddhist ethics holds out considerable potential for genuine advances in the exploration of moods and motivations as they impact moral as well as religious lives.” [552]

Rotman (2003) also noted that emotions can compel one towards ethical action, even against one’s will. It is noteworthy that all three scholars - Berkwitz (2003); Heim (2003); Rotman (2003) - chose narrative literature as the locus of their discussion on emotions.

However, it must be noted that these were only the theoretical prescriptions for the different classes in the Mahābhārata. As discussed above, the prescriptions were seldom followed by brahmins.
Forgiveness is perceived as a weakness among this royal class. For them, patience is a royal virtue which essentially entails ‘biding time’ or ‘waiting for the right moment to strike.’ Being a war epic centered on ksatriya protagonists, the Mahābhārata is rich with discussions of this kṣānti [K2]. One of the Mahābhārata’s central themes is revenge and recurring topics include whether to seek revenge, how and when. Within this context, K2 features prominently as a sound political strategy for times when one does not have the upper hand. Its importance and efficacy can be fathomed by the fact that if a ksatriya is weak and attacks a strong enemy, he not only risks defeat but also the loss of his life.

Despite the differences between the meanings and treatments of kṣānti in the Pali canon and Mahābhārata, I was able to discern links between them which enabled me to formulate a theory on their development. Noting this process of development helped contextualize the Pali canon’s treatment of khanti to a great extent, as discussed above.

The findings of this dissertation also make significant contributions to the interdisciplinary scholarly understanding of the ideas of forgiveness and patience. We now know what these ideas looked like in the Pali canon and the Mahābhārata, how they differed from the contemporary western ideas of forgiveness and patience and what they shared in common with it. There are major differences between kṣānti and the Western ideas of forgiveness. Two key differences are worth noting. First, kṣānti does not require apologies and is independent of the words and actions of the perpetrator. This is in contrast to the modern western where the idea of “unconditional forgiveness” is a relatively recent and novel concept (Garrard & McNaughton, 2003). Second, in my study of kṣānti in the Pali canon and the Mahābhārata I did not encounter any ideas
linked to the concept of “divine forgiveness”, as is often talked about in certain other religious traditions.

Lastly, the conclusions of my dissertation on the different ways of translating kṣānti in the Pali canon and Mahābhārata serve as a cautionary tale for all future translations of the Mahābhārata and other early Indian texts which contain technical terms that could potentially have multiple meanings within the same text and/or different meanings across two or more texts. It demonstrates the importance of differentiating between these different meanings and being careful in choosing the right word to translate it in every instance of its use.

The methodology exercised in this paper also has implications for future scholarship. It demonstrates that a close analysis of technical terms such as kṣānti in individual texts can be very fruitful. While this has recently been done for the term “dharma” (Bowles, 2007; Brockington, 2004; Fitzgerald, 2004a; Hiltebeitel, 2011a; Olivelle, 2004b), my dissertation is the first one to focus on “kṣānti.” Implying the novelty and significance of such studies, Olivelle (2004a, p. 421) has described them as “a new genre of literature.” My dissertation also contributes to this “new genre” and I would like to propose that kṣānti be next frontier for such studies with its meaning and development being investigated in Jain texts, Mahayana Buddhists texts and other Brahmanical narratives such as the Rāmāyana. Alternatively, a similar project could also be undertaken with a focus on the Sanskrit term “maitri” (Pali: mettā) in the Pali canon and the Mahābhārata. Based on my preliminary analysis of it during this dissertation, I believe such an endeavor would yield interesting insights.
4 APPENDIX

4.1 JĀTAKATTHAVAṆṆANĀ

4.1.1 Khantivādin Jātaka [JA313]

The Khantivādin Jātaka, the most often cited text on khanti, gives us a clear definition of khanti. In this story the Bodhisattva is an ascetic who preaches khanti. An intoxicated king stumbles upon him and mistaking him to be a false ascetic assault him brutally and fatally. Soon after killing the Bodhisattva the king also dies and goes to hell.

4.1.2 Chaddanta Jātaka [JA514]

Here the Bodhisattva is a royal elephant who has two wives. One of the wives develops a grudge against the other and when she is reborn as a queen plots to have the Bodhisattva killed. She feigns an illness and tells the king her only remedy is the tusk of the Bodhisattva. A hunter is sent to capture and kill the Bodhisattva. He shoots the Bodhisattva with a poisoned arrow and the Bodhisattva practices khanti. After receiving the tusks of the Bodhisattva the queen is filled with remorse and dies.

4.1.3 Mātuposaka Jātaka [JA455]

In this story the Bodhisattva is a white elephant whose mother is blind. One day a man is stranded in that area and the elephant helps him find his way back. The man then tells the king of the elephant’s splendor and comes with the king’s men to capture him. The Bodhisattva realizes that the man he saved has betrayed him and practices khanti
towards him. Eventually the king releases him, touched by the Bodhisattva’s love for his mother.

4.1.4 Sankhapala Jātaka [JA524]

Here the Bodhisattva is born in the Nāga world. He grows weary of his royal life and returns to earth as a snake. Here he encounters a group of ruffians who torture him in grotesque ways and the Bodhisattva practices khanti towards them. He is rescued by a rich householder who the Bodhisattva invites to his Nāga kingdom.

4.1.5 Bhuridatta Jātaka [JA543]

In this story the Bodhisattva once again lives in the Nāga kingdom. This long and episodic sutta is filled with several disparate incidents in the Bodhisattva’s life. Once, the Nāga king becomes a victim of an intoxicated man’s wrath who tortures him ruthlessly. The Bodhisattva, however, practices khanti and does not get angry.

4.1.6 Campeyya Jātaka [JA506]

In this Jātaka the Bodhisattva is once again born as a Nāga king. He gets caught by a snake charmer who mercilessly tortures him, while the Bodhisattva practices khanti.

4.1.7 Mahāsīlava Jātaka (JA51)

In this Jātaka a virtuous king refuses to sanction war and is captured by a rival king. The king and his followers are buried alive but the king practices khanti and advocates that his followers do the same. Eventually they escape and the king manages to regain his kingdom.
4.1.8 **Ekarāja Jātaka** (JA303)

This story is similar to the *Mahāsīlava Jātaka* (JA51). Here too, the virtuous king, the Bodhisattva is taken as a prisoner and tortured. He practices *khanti* which eventually turns his enemy remorseful.

4.1.9 **Mahākapi Jātaka** [516]

In this story, a farmer gets lost in a forest and falls into a deep pit. The *Bodhisattva*, a monkey in this life saves the farmer’s life with great difficulty. The farmer, however, is ungrateful towards the Bodhisattva and tries to kill him by hitting him on the head with a rock. The Bodhisattva practices *khanti* and the farmer is struck with leprosy.

4.1.10 **Mahiṃsa Jātaka** [JA278]

Here the Bodhisattva is a virtuous buffalo who is tortured by a monkey. The Bodhisattva does not retaliate and practices *khanti* instead. Eventually the monkey is killed due to his wicked deeds.

4.1.11 **Culadhampapāla Jātaka** [JA358]

A king is jealous of his wife’s affection for their baby boy, the Bodhisattva. Enraged he has the baby mutilated and killed. The Bodhisattva practices *khanti* while being killed. The king is eventually punished and goes to hell.

4.1.12 **Sarabhanga Jātaka** [JA522]

In this story a skillful archer, the Bodhisattva, declines offers made to him by a king and retires to live in a hermitage. Here he answers a series of questions posed to him by
various people and converts them all to the ascetic life. One of the questions asked by Sakka is what blessing is found in khanti.

4.1.13 Dhamma-Jātaka [JA457] and Rajovada Jātaka [JA151].

Both Jātakas have the same plot – the Bodhisattva is riding on a chariot when he comes face to face with another king who is also on a chariot. Neither king agrees to give way to other and they mutually decide that the winner of the battle will give way to the other’s chariot. In both cases the Bodhisattva wins and gets his way.

4.1.14 Sarabhamiga Jātaka (JA 483)

Here the Bodhisattva is an animal, we see the importance of his being an animal emphasized. In this story a king goes hunting and while chasing a deer (the Bodhisattva), falls into a pit. The Bodhisattva practices khanti towards the king and rescues the king from the pit. The king is remorseful for his actions and offers his kingdom to the Bodhisattva out of gratitude.

4.1.15 Khanti-Vaṇṇana-Jātaka (JA225)

A short story of a king who reforms his courtier through passive aggressive words aimed at him.

4.1.16 Cūla-Nandiya-Jātaka (JA222)

The Bodhisattva is a monkey who lived in the forest with his brother and blind mother. He leaves his herd to take care of his mother. One day a cruel man spots the mother and decides to kill her. The brothers offer themselves to the hunter and ask him to spare the
mother. One by one, the cruel man kills them all. Forces of nature soon kill this cruel man and his family and the man learns his lesson.

4.1.17 *Daddara Jātaka (JA304)*

Here the Bodhisattva is a Nāga, who along with his brother is banished from the kindgdom by their father. Outside the kingdom they face abuses and physical violence. Their pride is humbled by this treatment and after a few years their father calls them back home.

4.1.18 *Kassapamandiya Jātaka (JA312)*

A father and his son set out on a journey. On the way, the father looses his patience with the young boy and reprimands him. The Bodhisatta admonishes the father and the father gets reformed.

4.2 *Majjhimanikāya*

4.2.1 *Kakacūpama Sutta (MN 21)*

The Kakacūpamasutta gives us the clearest and most emphatic description of the two steps in the process of khanti. In this sutta the Buddha reprimands a monk who is known to have frequent disagreements with nuns. He then also narrates the story of an ill-tempered woman who gained a bad reputation because of her temperament. Throughout this lengthy sutta, the Buddha gives us a formulaic description of the mental process that a monk should follow when verbally or physically assaulted. Although the
term *khanti* is not used in the *sutta* itself it is used in the commentary to this *sutta* by Buddhaghosa.

**4.2.2 Mahahatthipadopama Sutta (MN 28)**

This is a technical sutta that describes the four elements. The sutta connects the four noble truths and the twelve links of dependent origination of the five aggregates. For the purposes of this dissertation, only the reference to the *Kakacūpamasutta* is relevant.

**4.2.3 Vāseṭṭhasuttaṃ [MN 98]**

A long sutta where two brahmins argue about what the characteristics of a true brahmin are. Since neither can convince the other, the Bodhisattva intervenes and gives a detailed description of what a true brahmin is and is not.

**4.3 SāṂYUTTANIKAyü**

**4.3.1 Akkosa Sutta (SN 7.2)**

In this *sutta*, the Buddha discusses anger and answers the best response when someone is angry with one. He equates not getting affected when someone reviles you to not accepting food from someone, that is, not entering an exchange. To return anger in this logic, is literally to take on the abuser’s vice and incorporate it within oneself.

**4.3.2 Asurindakasutta (SN 7.3)**

In the *Asurindakasutta* (SN 7.3), Asurindaka, of the Bharadvaja *gotra*, gets angry with the Buddha and insults him. The Buddha stays silent. Asuri interprets this as his victory
and says that he won. The Buddha says that the fool thinks victory is won by screaming, when instead the wise know that tolerance is true victory.

4.3.3 Vepacitti Sutta (SN 11.4) and Subhāsitajaya Sutta (SN 11.5)

The Vepacitti sutta and Subhāsitajaya Sutta are very similar in structure and content and differ only in minor details. Both suttas discuss the right response to an offense set amidst a battle between Sakka and Vepacitti. The argument here is about enduring offense by someone who is weaker and how that might be seen as a sign of weakness and fear. The Buddha argues that tolerance is a necessity rather than a virtuous choice for the weak but is the virtue of choice among those who are strong.

4.3.4 Maha-mangala Sutta (SN 2.4)

In this sutta the Buddha answers the question about what the greatest blessing is. Among a long list of things he says are blessings, khanti is included.

4.4 Khuddakapāṭha

4.4.1 Karaṇīyamettā Sutta (Khp 9)

This is a popular sutta has been discoursed by the Boddhisattva to monks for their protection from tree deities. The discourse details the right conduct for monks and the method to practice metta.
4.5 Dhammapada-Atthakathā

4.5.1 DhpA 222

In this story, a monk cuts a tree and harms a rukhadeva (tree diety). The rukhadeva is angered and plans to attack the monk but stops thinking that he will get a bad reputation and other rukhadevas will follow suit. He decides to report the matter to the monk’s master, the Buddha. The Buddha commends the rukhadeva and condemns anger.

4.5.2 DhpA 223

In this story a hired consort gets jealous of the wife and unable to control herself, pours a ladleful of boiling butter on the wife’s head. The wife sees this coming but bears no ill will towards the consort and practices khanti instead. As a result, the boiling butter doesn’t burn her and seeing this, the consort becomes remorseful and apologizes. When the Buddha hears about this he asks the wife what her thought process was when the consort was coming toward her with boiling butter. The wife, Uttara, explains, she practiced khanti. The Buddha commends her.
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