

The *Ekottarika-āgama* account concludes with the Buddha encouraging the monks to hold Mount Isigili in high regard, as even at the time of Maitreya Buddha this mountain will still have the same name.⁸⁹

Instead of this tale, the *Majjhima-nikāya* version describes the qualities of several Paccekabuddhas in a set of stanzas.⁹⁰ Thus, whereas the *Ekottarika-āgama* version is predominantly narrative, the *Majjhima-nikāya* version is a discourse with little doctrinal or narrative content. Its listing of the names and qualities of Paccekabuddhas is still in use nowadays as a protective chant, a *paritta*.⁹¹

MN 117 *Mahācattārīsaka-sutta*

The *Mahācattārīsaka-sutta*, the “discourse on the great forty”, examines the noble eightfold path from the perspective of its eighth and final factor, right concentration. This discourse has a parallel in the *Madhyama-āgama*.⁹² Another parallel can be found in a discourse quotation in Śamathadeva’s commentary on the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, extant in Tibetan.⁹³ A few lines of this discourse have also been preserved in Sanskrit fragments.⁹⁴

⁸⁹ EĀ 38.7 at T II 723b29.

⁹⁰ MN 116 at MN III 69-71; cf. also Franke 1912: 211. Winternitz 1920/1968: 37 considers this listing in MN 116 of names in prose and then in verse to be a sign of lateness, as this type of pattern recurs more frequently in later Buddhist Sanskrit literature; cf. also Barua 1971/2003: 530. Skilling 1996a: 182 note 112 points out that these stanzas end with an injunction to pay homage to the Paccekabuddhas, MN 116 at MN III 71,3: *paccekabuddhā ... vandatha*. Wiltshire 1990: 7 comments that this listing “would seem to imply that paccekabuddhas held or were intended to hold some special significance for those to whom the Buddha’s discourse was addressed. It therefore indicates that some form of ‘cultus’ must have existed in respect of them”.

⁹¹ Kloppenborg 1983: 42 explains that “images of Paccekabuddhas were used for the purpose of protection. This could well be the outcome of their reputation for extended practice of *mettā*, popularly believed to be a protective power which counteracts inimical influences”, a protective power she then suggests to also stand behind the use of the *Isigili-sutta* as a *paritta*; cf. also Cooray 2004: 246.

⁹² The parallel is MĀ 189 at T I 735b-736c and has the title “discourse on the noble path”, 聖道經. As already noted by Skilling 1997a: 341, Abhidh-k-ṭ at D (4094) *mngon pa, ju* 235b4 or Q (5595) *tu* 269a5 agrees with MN 117 on the title “great forty”, *chen po bzhi bcu*, cf. also the **Mahāvibhāṣā*, T 1545 at T XXVII 911c1: 大四十法門經. While MN 117 has Jeta’s Grove by Sāvatthī as its location, MĀ 189 takes place at Kammāsadhamma in the Kuru country. MĀ 189 has been translated into English in Anālayo 2010i and into German in Meisig 1987a.

⁹³ Abhidh-k-ṭ at D (4094) *mngon pa, nyu* 43b7-47b4 or Q (5595) *thu* 83a7-87b2; cf. also Abhidh-k 6:75 in Pradhan 1967: 387,14, paralleling MN 117 at MN III 76,7, with its Chinese counterparts in T 1558 at T XXIX 6c2 and in T 1559 at T XXIX 166c24. For further discourse quotations in Abhidh-k-ṭ cf. below notes 95 and 105.

⁹⁴ The fragments are SHT V 1125 (p. 120) and SHT VIII 1919A (p. 100, identified in SHT XI). SHT V 1125R1-2 has part of the summing up of the exposition into two sets of twenty, found in MN 117 at MN III 77,21-24, while R3 has preserved part of the shift from the eightfold noble path of the disciple in training to the tenfold noble path of the arahant, found in MN 117 at MN III 76,7, cf. also SHT VIII 1919A1-2, although this exposition in the Sanskrit version seems to have been formulated in a manner that dif-

MN III 71 The *Mahācattārīsaka-sutta* and its parallels approach their subject by defining right concentration as one-pointedness of the mind that is supported by the other seven factors of the noble eightfold path.⁹⁵ This definition, unlike the more common definition of right concentration by way of the four *jhānas*,⁹⁶ highlights the importance of developing concentration as part of a comprehensive practice of the noble eightfold path.⁹⁷

Before coming to this definition of right concentration, the *Madhyama-āgama* version introduces right concentration as the “single way” for the purification of beings,⁹⁸ thereby making use of a qualification that the *Madhyama-āgama* parallel to the *Satipaṭṭhāna-sutta* uses in relation to the four *satipaṭṭhānas*.⁹⁹ The discourse quotation in Śamathadeva’s commentary has a similar passage, although it speaks of the “single vehicle” for the purification of beings.¹⁰⁰

The *Madhyama-āgama* discourse follows its definition of right concentration by describing the conditional dependence of each path factor on the preceding one, a statement found at a later point also in the Pāli and Tibetan versions.¹⁰¹ At the conclusion of this conditioned sequence, the *Madhyama-āgama* and Tibetan versions declare that a noble disciple, who has acquired right concentration in this way, will soon reach awakening.¹⁰²

The three versions highlight the role of right view as a precursor to the other path factors, since based on right view and with the support of right effort and right mindfulness the other path factors can be developed. The task of right view is to differentiate between right and wrong manifestations of the first five path factors. Right effort is the actual endeavour to overcome wrong path factors and to develop their right counterparts, while right mindfulness is the presence of mindfulness required for this task.¹⁰³

fers from the presentation in MN 117 and also appears to have stood at a different point in the Sanskrit version, namely right after the summing up of the exposition into two sets of twenty.

⁹⁵ A discourse quotation paralleling the definition of right concentration, given in MN 117 at MN III 71,20, can be found in Abhidh-k 8:8 in Pradhan 1967: 438,5; cf. also T 1559 at T XXIX 298a20 and Abhidh-k-ṭ at D (4094) *mngon pa, nyu* 72b4 or Q (5595) *thu* 117a7.

⁹⁶ E.g., DN 22 at DN II 313,12, a definition also found in MĀ 189 at T I 736b16.

⁹⁷ The same definition can also be found in DN 18 at DN II 217,1 and SN 45:28 at SN V 21,15. DN 33 at DN III 252,4 and AN 7:42 at AN IV 40,20 implicitly refer to the same type of presentation; cf. also the *Yogācārabhūmi*, Delhey 2009a: 202,2 and T 1579 at T XXX 340a4.

⁹⁸ MĀ 189 at T I 735c1: 一道.

⁹⁹ MĀ 98 at T I 582b9: 一道, being the counterpart to *ekāyano maggo* in DN 22 at DN II 290,8 and MN 10 at MN I 55,31, and to 一入道 in EĀ 12.1 at T II 568a2, cf. also above p. 75 note 245. Meisig 1987a: 224-225 suggests that the 一道 passage was subsequently introduced into MĀ 189 from its original occurrence in the *satipaṭṭhāna* context.

¹⁰⁰ D (4094) *mngon pa, nyu* 44a2 or Q (5595) *thu* 83b1: *theg pa ni gcig*; on the similar rendering 一乘 in Chinese translations cf. the study by Nattier 2007.

¹⁰¹ MĀ 189 at T I 735c8, MN 117 at MN III 76,1, and D (4094) *mngon pa, nyu* 46b1 or Q (5595) *thu* 86a6, a presentation also found in DN 18 at DN II 217,4 and SN 45:1 at SN V 2,1; for a comparable statement cf. also SĀ 748 at T II 198b8.

¹⁰² MĀ 189 at T I 735c10 and D (4094) *mngon pa, nyu* 46b3 or Q (5595) *thu* 86a7.

¹⁰³ For the first path factor this treatment can be found in MN 117 at MN III 71,24, with its counterparts in

When examining individual path factors, the *Majjhima-nikāya* version expounds the path factors view, intention, speech, action, and livelihood in a threefold manner, by distinguishing between manifestations of these path factors that are:

- wrong,
- right,
- supramundane.

The presentation of the wrong and right manifestations of these path factors is fairly similar in the three versions. A noteworthy difference is that the *Madhyama-āgama* version does not mention the denial of the existence of spontaneously arisen beings in its exposition of wrong view, nor does it stipulate belief in their existence when describing right view.¹⁰⁴ Occurrences of similar listings in the *Madhyama-āgama*, in the *Ekottarika-āgama* and in several Chinese *Vinayas* also do not mention spontaneously arisen beings.¹⁰⁵ Thus, according to these versions, to believe in the existence of spon-

MĀ 189 at T I 735c13 and D (4094) *mngon pa, nyu* 44b4 or Q (5595) *thu* 84a5. While MN 117 continues in the same way, MĀ 189 differs in as much as its exposition of the relation of right view to each path factor does not conclude that the distinction between right and wrong factors is an implementation of right view, but rather of the respective factor itself. Thus in the case of right action, for example, MĀ 189 at T I 736a15 indicates that “when he sees wrong action as wrong action, this is reckoned right action, when he sees right action as right action, that is also reckoned right action”, 若見邪業是邪業者, 是謂正業, 若見正業是正業者, 亦謂 正業. As Meisig 1987a: 238 note 27 points out, this is obviously a textual error. A comparable error occurs also in Abhidh-k-ṭ, which in the context of describing the role of effort and mindfulness for abandoning wrong intention and arousing right intention speaks of ‘view’, when ‘intention’ would instead be required, D (4094) *mngon pa nyu* 45a2 or Q (5595) *thu* 84b4, thereby confusing *log par rtog pa* and *yang dag pa’i rtog pa* with *log par lta ba* and *yang dag pa’i lta ba*. This error differs from the one found in MĀ 189, as it replaces the path-factor with view, whereas MĀ 189 replaces view with the path-factor. Nevertheless, the similarity in type of this error shows how in such a repetitive exposition such confusion can easily arise during the transmission of the texts.

¹⁰⁴ MN 117 at MN III 71,29 (wrong view:) *n’ atthi sattā opapātikā* and MN III 72,11 (right view): *atthi sattā opapātikā*, a stipulation not found in the corresponding sections in MĀ 189 at T I 735c17+20. On *sattā opapātikā* cf. also Manné 1995: 78-80 and Windisch 1908: 184-194.

¹⁰⁵ MĀ 15 at T I 437c28, MĀ 124 at T I 613b25, EĀ 26.5 at T II 636b4, EĀ 28.1 at T II 647a11, EĀ 29.1 at T II 655a28, EĀ 35.7 at T II 700a7, EĀ 42.1 at T II 747a26, T 127 at T II 835a1, T 212 at T IV 639b2, the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya*, T 1421 at T XXII 133b6, the Mahāsāṅghika *Vinaya*, T 1425 at T XXII 427c4 (this seems rather abbreviated), the Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, T 1435 at T XXIII 241c25 (not taking into account occurrences that are explicitly attributed to one of the six heretical teachers, but only occurrences where this listing functions as an instance of wrong view). Spontaneously arisen beings are also not mentioned in a definition of right view in the *Arthavinīścaya-sūtra* in Samtani 1971: 35,5. Another relevant instance is SĀ 1039 at T II 271c14, which in what is the counterpart to a reference to spontaneously arisen beings in AN 10:176 at AN V 265,23 has the statement: “there are no living beings born in the world”, 無眾生世間, a formulation that leaves it open to interpretation if it refers to beings being reborn in general or in a ‘spontaneous’ manner. That the point at stake would indeed be spontaneous rebirth can be seen from the Tibetan parallel to the same type of reference, albeit in the positive mode, found in SĀ 784 at T II 203a7 to 有眾生, in which case the corresponding passage in Abhidh-k-ṭ at D (4094) *mngon pa, ju* 206a5 or Q (5595) *tu* 235a7 reads *sems can rdzus te byung ba yod do*. The same expression 有眾生 in MĀ 71 at T I 525b15, however, appears to rather intend rebirth as such, as becomes clear from its use throughout the discourse, even though the parallel DN 23 at DN II 318,18 does

taneously arisen beings would not be required for establishing right view. The Tibetan counterpart to the *Mahācattārīsaka-sutta*, however, does mention spontaneously arisen beings in its presentation of wrong and right view.¹⁰⁶

Another and rather major difference is that the *Madhyama-āgama* discourse and the Tibetan version do not have the supramundane manifestations of the path factors, found in the *Majjhima-nikāya* version, at all (see below table 12.6).¹⁰⁷ Notably, the *Mahācattārīsaka-sutta* is the only discourse in the Pāli *Nikāyas* that features such a presentation of the path factors defined as “supramundane”.¹⁰⁸

According to the preamble found in all versions of the discourse, the main intent of the present exposition was to show the supportive function of the other seven path factors for right concentration. That is, the point at stake does not seem to have been an exposition of the path factors individually, but rather their interrelation as a basis for developing right concentration, and in particular the function of right view, right effort, and right mindfulness as means of correction and support for the other path factors.¹⁰⁹ This intent of the exposition would not require a supramundane description of the path factors. Hence, it seems quite possible that the exposition of the supramundane path factors is a later expansion of the present discourse. Perhaps an early commentary on the *Mahācattārīsaka-sutta* developed such a treatment of the path factors from the supramundane perspective of path attainment. What originally may have been only an alternative mode of explanation preserved in an oral commentary, during the process of transmission could then have become part of the discourse itself.

refer to spontaneously reborn beings. An explicit reference to the existence of spontaneously arisen beings can be found in a description of wrong view in the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, T 1442 at T XXIII 692c8: 無化生有情於此世間 . A reference to spontaneously arisen beings occurs also in Abhidh-k 9 in Lee 2005: 90,1 or Pradhan 1967: 468,9, which reads *nāsti sattva upapāduka iti mithyādr̥ṣṭiḥ*, paralleling MN 117 at MN III 71,29, cf. also T 1558 at T XXIX 155b10, T 1559 at T XXIX 306c9, and Abhidh-k-ṭ at D (4094) *mngon pa, nyu* 86a4 or Q (5595) *thu* 132b7.

¹⁰⁶ D (4094) *mngon pa, nyu* 44a6 and 44b2 or Q (5595) *thu* 83b7 and 84a3: *sems can rdzus* (Q: *brdzus*) *te byung ba rnam*s.

¹⁰⁷ For a more detailed discussion of this difference cf. Anālayo 2005c: 98-100.

¹⁰⁸ The importance of this unique supramundane description of the path factors can be seen in a discussion on the nature of the supramundane noble path, depicted in the commentary on the *Vibhaṅga* at Vibh-a 320,26, according to which a monk should ask another monk if he is a “reciter of the ‘great forty’”, *tvam tāva mahācattārīsakabhāṇako hosi?* This question shows the significance of the present discourse, whose recall the commentaries consider an indispensable requirement for being able to engage in a discussion on the supramundane noble path. Mori 1990: 125 takes the expression *mahācattārīsakabhāṇaka* to be an example of “Bhāṇakas who further specialized in some particular suttas” (Adikaram 1946/1994: 31 and Goonesekera 1968: 689, in their surveys of the *bhāṇaka* tradition, simply list the *mahācattārīsaka-bhāṇaka* without attempting an explanation). Alternatively, the expression *mahācattārīsakabhāṇaka* may also be just a form of inquiring if the other monk remembered the exposition given in this particular discourse, equivalent to asking him: *mahācattārīsakaṃ dhāresi?* Be that as it may, the use of the term *mahācattārīsakabhāṇaka* definitely highlights the importance of the exposition of the noble eight-fold path given in MN 117, which due to its uniqueness in the Pāli discourses would have been (and still is) an important reference point for discussions on the supramundane path.

¹⁰⁹ Meisig 1987a: 233.

A somewhat similar exposition of the path factors in their supramundane manifestation can be found in a discourse in the *Samyukta-āgama*, which distinguishes all eight path factors into worldly and supramundane manifestations.¹¹⁰ The description of the first five supramundane path factors in this *Samyukta-āgama* discourse is similar to the corresponding sections in the *Mahācattārīsaka-sutta*.

Unlike the *Mahācattārīsaka-sutta*, however, this *Samyukta-āgama* discourse only takes up right path factors in their worldly and supramundane manifestations, without covering wrong manifestations of the path factors. The *Samyukta-āgama* discourse also does not mention the role of right view, right effort, and right mindfulness in relation to each path factor. These differences make it clear that this *Samyukta-āgama* discourse would not be a parallel to the *Mahācattārīsaka-sutta*.

Nevertheless, the occurrence of an exposition of the supramundane path factors in a *Samyukta-āgama* discourse shows that different Buddhist traditions gave importance to this type of presentation. Its occurrence further supports the assumption that this type of treatment could stem from an early Indian exegetical tradition, which during the course of transmission could have made its way into the *Mahācattārīsaka-sutta* in the case of the Pāli tradition and into the *Samyukta-āgama* discourse in the case of the reciter tradition that transmitted this particular discourse collection.

Another difference between the *Mahācattārīsaka-sutta* and its parallels is that the Chinese and Tibetan versions extend their treatment to the path factors right effort, right mindfulness, and right concentration, with the *Madhyama-āgama* version also mentioning right liberation and right knowledge (see table 12.6).¹¹¹

Yet, in all versions right concentration has already been defined as one-pointedness of the mind endowed with the other seven path factors, while right effort and right mindfulness have been defined as the effort and the mindfulness required for establishing the right manifestations of the other path factors. Hence, it seems redundant to treat these path factors once more.

Moreover, whereas in regard to the earlier path factors the Chinese and Tibetan versions invariably conclude each treatment by highlighting the cooperative action of right view, right effort, and right mindfulness, the same is absent from their exposition of the remaining three path factors. Nor do they provide a contrast to wrong manifestations of these path factors.

The Chinese and Tibetan versions also differ in the definitions they employ. Whereas the Chinese version uses the standard descriptions of the four right efforts, the four *satipaṭṭhānas*, and the four absorptions, the Tibetan version instead defines these three path factors by listing several synonyms for effort, mindfulness, and concentration in turn.

This makes it highly probable that the additional treatment of these three path factors was added during the process of transmission, with the reciter(s) supplying the ‘miss-

¹¹⁰ SĀ 785 at T II 203a21, for a translation cf. Anālayo 2010i; a small section of a parallel to SĀ 785 has been preserved in Uighur, cf. fragment Ga6-7 in Kudara 1983: 302.

¹¹¹ MĀ 189 at T I 736b8.

ing’ parts, perhaps even unintentionally, from the standard treatment of this subject found elsewhere in the discourses.¹¹² This impression is further strengthened by the circumstance that the *Madhyama-āgama* stands alone in mentioning right liberation and right knowledge at this point.

Table 12.6: Survey of Path Factors in MN 117 and its Parallels

MN 117	MĀ 189	Abhidh-k-ṭ
wrong view (1)	wrong view (→ 1)	wrong view (→ 1)
right view (2)	right view (→ 2)	right view (→ 2)
supramundane right view (3)	wrong intention (→ 4)	wrong intention (→ 4)
wrong intention (4)	right intention (→ 5)	right intention (→ 5)
right intention (5)	wrong speech (→ 7)	wrong speech (→ 7)
supramundane right intention (6)	right speech (→ 8)	right speech (→ 8)
wrong speech (7)	wrong action (→ 10)	wrong action (→ 10)
right speech (8)	right action (→ 11)	right action (→ 11)
supramundane right speech (9)	wrong livelihood (→ 13)	wrong livelihood (→ 13)
wrong action (10)	right livelihood (→ 14)	right livelihood (→ 14)
right action (11)	right effort	right effort
supramundane right action (12)	right mindfulness	right mindfulness
wrong livelihood (13)	right concentration	right concentration
right livelihood (14)	right liberation	
supramundane right livelihood (15)	right knowledge	
	(≠ 3, 5, 9, 12, 15)	(≠ 3, 5, 9, 12, 15)

MN III 76 The *Mahācattārīsaka-sutta* and the Tibetan version continue by depicting the conditional dependence of each path factor on the preceding one, a treatment that the *Madhyama-āgama* version already took up at an earlier point. In all versions, this exposition is complementary to their earlier depiction of right view, right effort, and right mindfulness as necessary conditions for the implementation of the path factors right speech, right action, and right livelihood, thereby highlighting the conditional interrelatedness of the factors of the noble eightfold path.

The *Mahācattārīsaka-sutta* and its parallels extend their examination to the ten-factored path of an arahant, followed by indicating that each of the ten right factors serves the purpose of overcoming its wrong counterpart.¹¹³

¹¹² Cf. also Meisig 1987a: 230. In fact, whereas the earlier part of MĀ 189 at T I 735c3 was concerned with a definition of “noble right concentration”, 聖正定, just as its counterpart MN 117 at MN III 71,16: *ariyo sammāsamādhī*, the present part in MĀ 189 at T I 736b16 speaks merely of “right concentration”, 正定, a change of terminology that supports the impression that this part of the discourse may be a later expansion or addition. The Tibetan version, however, speaks from the outset only of “right concentration”, without further qualifying it as “noble”, cf. D (4094) *mngon pa, nyu* 44a2 or Q (5595) *thu* 83b1: *yang dag pa’i ting nge ’dzin*.

¹¹³ A description of how the right path factors overcome their wrong counterparts can also be found in DN 34 at DN III 291,13 and in AN 10:106 at AN V 215,1, cf. also the *Daśottara-sūtra* fragment 679 folio 23R in Schlingloff 1962a: 12 and its Chinese counterpart DĀ 10 at T I 57b14.

Another difference between the parallel versions can be found in the sequence in which they present the final two factors, as right knowledge precedes right liberation in the Pāli version,¹¹⁴ whereas in the Chinese and Tibetan versions right knowledge follows right liberation.

The *Madhyama-āgama* version also offers an explanation of right knowledge. According to its presentation, right knowledge stands for the retrospective knowing that right liberation has been reached by becoming free from lust, anger, and delusion.¹¹⁵

The *Mahācattārīsaka-sutta* and its parallels sum up their exposition by adding up the ten wholesome factors, the ten wholesome states originating from them, the ten un-

MN III 77

¹¹⁴ The sequence found in MN 117 at MN III 76,6 appears to be standard in the Pāli discourses, some of which indicate that right knowledge is the factor that leads to right liberation. This suggests that right knowledge stands for penetrative insight, for seeing things as they truly are, which then issues in realization, in fact DN 18 at DN II 217,10 explicitly indicates that *sammāñāṇassa sammāvimutti pahoti*. *Ñāṇa* similarly precedes *vimutti* in DN 17 at DN II 217,10, DN 33 at DN III 271,9, DN 34 at DN III 292,2, MN 8 at MN I 44,15, MN 65 at MN I 447,2, MN 78 at MN II 29,9, SN 55:26 at SN V 384,1, AN 3:140 at AN I 292,8, AN 4:89 at AN II 89,35, AN 4:206 at AN II 222,12, AN 4:208 at AN II 223,28, AN 4:210 at AN II 225,15, AN 10:103-166 at AN V 212-249, AN 10:218 at AN V 310,12, and AN 11:11 at AN V 327,15. The Chinese *Āgamas* usually follow the sequence found in MĀ 189, with right knowledge coming only after right liberation, cf., e.g., DĀ 10 at T I 57b17, DĀ 11 at T I 59a25, DĀ 12 at T I 60a22, SĀ 481 at T II 122c6, and SĀ 750 at T II 198c10. An exception can be found in DĀ 9 at T I 52c8, where right knowledge precedes right liberation. Yet, DĀ 9 at T I 52c7 also has right mindfulness before right effort, which suggests that the presentation in this discourse may have suffered from a transmission or translation error. The sequence found in MĀ 189 recurs also in the Sanskrit fragments of the *Saṅgīti-sūtra* and the *Daśottara-sūtra*, cf. fragment K 484m2Rb in Stache-Rosen 1968: 35 and fragment 679 folio 23R4 in Schlingloff 1962a: 12. Notably, the Pāli discourses that refer to right knowledge do not seem to specify the implications of right knowledge or to offer further explanations on its significance. The type of knowledge that in the discourses usually precedes liberation is insight into the four noble truths. Such insight, however, could also be considered as an instance of right view, which the discourses in fact explicitly define as insight into the four noble truths, cf., e.g., DN 22 at DN II 312,1. On *sammā ñāṇa* in the Pāli discourses cf. also Bucknell 1984: 9-10, 15, and 31 and id. 1986: 6-7.

¹¹⁵ MĀ 189 at T I 736b19: “knowing that the mind has been liberated from sensual desire, knowing that the mind has been liberated from anger and from delusion, this is reckoned right knowledge”, 知欲心解脫, 知恚癡心解脫, 是謂正智也; for a similar definition cf. also SĀ 750 at T II 198c11. This explanation squares well with the Pāli commentaries, according to which right knowledge represents reviewing knowledge, cf. Ps I 189,1: *paccavekkhaṇāñāṇaṃ sammāñāṇaṃ ti vuccati*, cf. also Ps IV 134,24, which glosses the occurrence of *sammāñāṇa* in MN 117 with *maggapaccavekkhaṇa* and *phalappaccavekkhaṇa*. On this commentarial explanation, right knowledge should indeed be placed after right liberation, not before it. Such retrospective knowledge of liberation is part of the standard description of realization in the Pāli discourses, which invariably speak of knowing that birth has been destroyed, the holy life has been lived, what had to be done has been done, etc., cf., e.g., DN 2 at DN I 84,10. The same is also reflected in another type of presentation in the Pāli discourses, where the aggregate of liberation is followed by the aggregate of “knowledge and vision of liberation”, cf., e.g., SN 3:24 at SN I 100,2 (or SN² 135 at SN² I 222,16), SN 6:2 at SN I 139,18 (or SN² 173 at SN² I 304,22), SN 47:13 at SN V 162,20, AN 3:57 at AN I 162,7, AN 5:107 at AN III 134,15, AN 5:250 at AN III 271,12, AN 10:12 at AN V 16,25, and It 4:5 at It 108,3. In the same type of presentation, however, the aggregate of liberation is preceded by the aggregate of wisdom, which would thus mirror the position given in the Pāli discourse to right knowledge in respect to right liberation.

wholesome factors, and the ten unwholesome states originating for them, thereby arriving at a final count of forty.¹¹⁶

The *Majjhima-nikāya* version proclaims that the Dharma instruction on the great forty has been set rolling and cannot be stopped from rolling by any recluse or Brahmin,¹¹⁷ with the *Madhyama-āgama* and Tibetan versions referring to this Dharma instruction on the forty as a divine wheel (literally: Brahmā's wheel).¹¹⁸

MN III 78 The three discourses conclude by proclaiming that anyone who rejects this discourse will only incur censure, since by doing so one would speak in praise of those endowed with the wrong manifestations of the ten factors.¹¹⁹

MN 118 *Ānāpānasati-sutta*

The *Ānāpānasati-sutta*, the “discourse on mindfulness of breathing in and out”, offers a detailed exposition of mindfulness of breathing and of its relation to the four *sa-tiṭṭhānas*, to the seven factors of awakening, and to knowledge and liberation. This discourse has a parallel in the *Samyukta-āgama*.¹²⁰

¹¹⁶ A discourse quotation from this section can be found in the **Mahāvibhāṣā*, T 1545 at T XXVII 911c1.

¹¹⁷ MN 117 at MN III 77,26: *mahācattārīsako dhammapariyāyo pavattito appaṭivattiyo samaṇena vā brāhmaṇena vā* (C^e-MN III 220,34: *mahācattārīsako*). The use of the verb “rolling” in this context is unusual, as elsewhere the Pāli discourses use this term in relation to rolling the wheel of the Dharma, but do not speak of “rolling” in relation to a discourse or an instruction, cf. DN 16 at DN II 140,25, MN 111 at MN III 29,15, MN 141 at MN III 248,6, SN 8:7 at SN I 191,13 (or SN² 215 at SN²I 412,4), SN 56:11 at SN V 423,16, AN 1:13 at AN I 23,10, AN 3:14 at AN I 110,26, AN 5:131 at AN III 148,10, AN 5:132 at AN III 149,3, AN 5:133 at AN III 151,8, and Sn 3:8 at Sn 557.

¹¹⁸ MĀ 189 at T I 736c2: 梵輪 and D (4094) *mngon pa, nyu* 47a6 or Q (5595) *thu* 87a4: *tshangs pa'i 'khor lo*. The usage of the wheel imagery fits the idea of “rolling”, suggesting that perhaps this image has been lost in the Pāli version.

¹¹⁹ MN 117 and MĀ 189 mention followers of the doctrine of non-action who nevertheless would not dare to contradict this exposition. MN 117 at MN III 78,13 refers to these as *Okkalā Vassa-Bhañṇā* (C^e-MN III 222,25 and S^e-MN III 189,6 read *Ukkalā*). The commentary at Ps IV 136,4 explains that Vassa and Bhañṇā are the proper names of two individuals who were inhabitants of the country of Okkala. The *Ukkalā-Vassa-Bhañṇā* as proponents of a doctrine of non-action recur in SN 22:62 at SN III 73,3 and in AN 4:30 at AN II 31,21; cf. also Kv 141,28. MĀ 189 at T I 736c19 instead speaks of “the squatters and advocates [of the practice] of squatting”, 蹲踞說蹲踞 and a little later refers to being “cut off and destroyed”, 斷絕破壞. Bareau 1981b: 3 concludes that MĀ 189 “makes no allusion to the Ukkalas”, but Meisig 1987a: 245 note 93 and 99 suggests that the translator may not have recognized these proper names and instead rendered them as the activities of “squatting” and being “cut off and destroyed”.

¹²⁰ The parallel is SĀ 815 at T II 209b-210a and takes place in Jeta's Grove, while MN 118 takes place in the Hall of Migāra's Mother in the same Sāvattthī. Akanuma 1929/1990: 77 gives “observance day”, 布薩, as a tentative title for SĀ 815. According to ibid. p. 169, another parallel should be the individual translation T 96 at T I 919a-b. Apart from a single sentence that relates the practice of mindfulness of breathing to the acquisition of knowledge and liberation, however, this discourse has nothing in common with MN 118. Zürcher 1995: 166 note 8 comments that T 96 “appears to be an independent treatise ... not based upon the prototype of the Pāli *ānāpāna-sati-sutta*”. For a Sanskrit fragment with instructions on mindfulness of breathing cf. below note 140.