



EVAM ME SUTTAṀ

This is how I heard it

by Patrick Kearney

Madhupiṇḍika Sutta & what lies beneath

Introduction

Madhupiṇḍika Sutta, like Mūlapariyāya Sutta, concerns the role of concepts, and how our belief in the concepts we generate imprisons us and causes pain to ourselves and those around us. Understanding how this process works enables us to deconstruct our concepts and arrive at a realm of experience that is beyond concept, and therefore beyond the pain that concepts generate.

Because of the depth of this sutra we cannot analyse it in only one session. Here we will look at the early part of the discourse, examining the two teachings given by the Buddha on what lies beneath our normal, everyday sense of ourselves and our world. We will finish by looking briefly at the issues implied in understanding what is going on in a liberated mind. Subsequently we will examine Venerable Mahā Kaccāna's commentary on these teachings.

Daṇḍapāni's rejection of heartwood

Our sutra begins with a question by Daṇḍapāni, "stick-in-hand," so named because of his golden walking stick. Daṇḍapāni is a wealthy layman who stumbles upon the Buddha practising in the Great Wood and asks him, "What does the *samaṇa* proclaim, what does he assert?" What is the *essence* of the teaching? The Buddha replies:¹

"Friend, I assert and proclaim in such a way that one does not quarrel with anyone in the world with its *devas*, its *māras*, and its *brahmās*, in this generation with its *samaṇas* and *brāhmaṇas*, its princes and peoples; in such a way that perceptions no more underlie [*saññā nānuseti*] that *brāhmaṇa* who lives detached from sensual pleasures, without perplexity, shorn of worry, free from craving [*vīta-taṇhaṃ*] for any kind of becoming [*bhava*]."

Daṇḍapāni does not get it, and leaves. The tradition sees his manner of asking the question as arrogant and provocative, demonstrating a disrespect for the teaching and the teacher. And yet the Buddha reveals everything, with a profound reply that inspires this discourse. The Buddha's answer reveals both his compassion and, possibly, the respect he had for Daṇḍapāni's capacity to understand the teaching, had he been ready to listen. There are two aspects to the Buddha's reply, ethics and depth psychology.

- *Ethics*: Asked *what* he asserts and proclaims, the Buddha speaks of the *ethical result* of his teaching, the condition of one who lives free from compulsion. His teaching is fundamentally *ethical* rather than *ontological*. He is not interested in metaphysical theories - or at least, theories that depend on and posit the existence of metaphysical entities such as *mūla* or *ātman* or *brāhman*. He is interested in what will allow us to live well. In contrast to Daṇḍapāni's attitude, the Buddha's teaching results in an attitude of non-aggression. "I do not dispute with the world; it is the world that disputes with me. A speaker of dharma does not dispute with anyone in the world." (SN 22.94; iii.138). Daṇḍapāni is trapped in his aggressive attitudes, and his way of life is an expression of the compulsions that form these

attitudes. And so the Buddha addresses the question of the underlying source of what moves us, what forms our ethics, our chosen way of life.

- *Depth psychology*: The Buddha works back from ethics to the underlying condition from which our compulsions arise. We are creatures of compulsion, moved by forces that we don't see or recognise as ourselves, for we see ourselves as the one already formed by these forces. While these forces arise from deep within us they also form the external world in which we live. They are universal, operating both internally and externally, and they form the world - or at least the world governed by Māra, the world of sensual obsession. And when the Buddha speaks of the underlying perceptions (*saññā ānuseti*) he is speaking of that which moves us from our depths. But he is *not* asserting the existence of anything beneath those forces. There is no mention here of some universal ground from which these obsessions arise and into which they dissolve. He is interested solely in these obsessions themselves, understanding them and ultimately cutting them off so they no longer arise. Because for the Buddha, these forces are not essential to our nature. They exist only so long as we feed them. If we stop feeding them, they die. Eventually.

Our ethics consists essentially in the choices we make. We live according to our choices. We choose to be happy, but in ways that often - usually - bring us sorrow. Why do we make these choices? Because of our compulsions. We find ourselves making choices we don't want to make. Yet we make them anyway, because at a deeper level, a level at which we don't seem to *have* any choice, we *do* want them. We don't have any choice, it seems, but to want them. And so we choose, and our choices are expressions of the deep impulses that move us. "*We*" don't make these choices, for we are made by them. Yet they are choices, and we are created by these choices.

Our choices are formed by our "underlying perceptions." We have already discussed "perception" (*saññā*), the *recognition* of a given situation as being this or that. Perception is formed by our habits, and we find ourselves locked into particular perceptions: "I am like this, and the world is like that." These habits are expression of the "underlying tendencies"

"Underlying tendency" is *anusaya*, from *anu* + $\sqrt{shī}$, to "lie down along with." The verb *anuseti* means "to dwell on; to harp on; to obsess." *Anusaya*, "underlying tendency," indicates the determination of the mind to obsess on certain things given the opportunity. The *anusayas* are unconscious predispositions which, while possibly lying dormant for a long time, are always ready to arise again given the appropriate conditions. And the appropriate conditions will manifest sooner or later, given the nature of dependent arising. The idea of the "underlying tendencies" is the closest the Buddha gets to our concept of an "unconscious." Certainly we are unconscious of these tendencies, and this absence of consciousness is an aspect of our delusion (*avijjā*). This is where we will discover our defining obsessions; this is where we are bound. What we don't know and see controls us, because what we don't know and see forms who we are.

These underlying perceptions generate a craving (*taṇhā*) for becoming (*bhava*). We have seen this topic discussed in Mūlapariyāya Sutta. Craving indicates the urge for something, something other than this, that moves us to grasp at what we think can finally satisfy. We seek to convince ourselves of our own solidity and reality, and the corresponding reality of our world. This unquenchable "thirst" (the literal meaning of *taṇhā*) provides the energy that works the raw material of the underlying perceptions into an identity-within-a-world, someone in some situation that we can identify with as "me" and "mine."

So the Buddha's teaching and training (*dhamma-vinaya*) is designed to take us to these depths and tame, if not destroy and "uproot," these forces that form us and our world. Yet while deeper than ourselves, and in that sense universal, they remain just psychological forces. The Buddha sees no need to posit anything *beneath* or *grounding* them.

For to posit such a thing - some kind of essence, however abstract or subtle - is to invite the clinging that is, fundamentally, the problem. Clinging to something - for example, some concept - entails solidifying it into something real. And when we have something to cling to as solid and real, this gives life to some-one solid and real who is doing the clinging, who believes that “This is what I love/hate,” “This is who I am.” And these two poles of experience - a real and solid entity in relationship with a real and solid concept - guarantees suffering, and the quarrelling, perplexity, worry and craving that the Buddha refers to.

Daṇḍapāni, meanwhile, blows his chance to be transformed by this teaching. Not by his initial arrogance, but by his failure to stay and ask a question. He responds to his own inability to understand what is going on by concluding that this is not worth taking seriously, and leaving. This is a common reaction, for all too often we respond to that we do not (yet) understand with indifference at best or rejection at worst. The Buddha’s response seems to drive off Daṇḍapāni, but it is his own aggression that pushes him away, not the Buddha. The Buddha’s answer exposes Daṇḍapāni’s ignorance, an uncomfortable experience at the best of times, but had he stayed and asked for an explanation – had he been ready to learn – the Buddha would have taught him further. One must approach a teacher and the dharma with respect, and a willingness to accept that we don’t know what is happening, and need to find out.

Heartwood explained

The Buddha sees this encounter as sufficiently important to relate to his students. The bhikkhus are equally confused, but one of them asks the question that Daṇḍapāni failed to. The bhikkhus, unlike Daṇḍapāni, are prepared to ask for clarification when they don’t understand. They are ready to learn, which means they can be taught.

Bhante, how does the Blessed One assert and proclaim in such a way that he does not quarrel with anyone in the world with its *devas*, its *māras*, and its *brahmās*, in this generation with its *samaṇas* and *brāhmaṇas*, its princes and peoples; in such a way that perceptions no more underlie that *brāhmaṇa* who lives detached from sensual pleasures, without perplexity, shorn of worry, free from craving for any kind of becoming.”

The Buddha replies, expanding on his initial statement.

As to the source [*nidāna*] through which perceptions and notions born of proliferation [*papañca-saññā-saṅkha*] beset a person: if nothing is found there to delight in [*abhinandati*], welcome [*abhivadati*] and hold to [*ajjhosati*], this is the end of the underlying tendency [*anusaya*] to passion [*rāga*], of the underlying tendency to aversion [*paṭigha*], of the underlying tendency to views [*ditṭhi*], of the underlying tendency to doubt [*vicikicchā*], of the underlying tendency to conceit [*māna*], of the underlying tendency to desire for becoming [*bhava-rāga*], of the underlying tendency to delusion [*avijjā*]. This is the end of resorting to rods and weapons, of quarrels, brawls, disputes, recrimination, malicious words, and false speech. Here these evil unwholesome states cease without remainder [*aparisesā nirujjhanti*].²

The Buddha is concerned with the “source” from which delight (*nandī*), holding (*ajjhosāna*), passion (*rāga*), aversion (*paṭigha*), delusion (*avijjā*), conceit (*māna*), view (*ditṭhi*) and becoming (*bhava*) all arise, and cease. In this, Madhupiṇḍika Sutta is similar to Mūlapariyāya Sutta. Both are concerned to go to the depths, the very foundation of the human predicament. Elsewhere the Buddha says the dharma is “profound,” *gambhīra*. The Great Ocean is also described as *gambhīra*, “deep, unfathomable,” as is the *tathāgata*. This tells us that we must go to the depths. Never mind the branches, just go to the root. Don’t be side-tracked; don’t get stuck anywhere.

“As to the source through which perceptions and notions [born of] mental proliferation beset a person ...” What is this source? In Mūlapariyāya Sutta it is *mūla*, “root.” In Madhupiṇḍika Sutta it is *nidāna*, here translated as “source.” *Nidāna* is derived from the verb *dyati*, “to bind,” and the prefix *ni*, denoting downward direction. Literally “tying down to,” *nidāna* means “ground, foundation,

cause, condition.” The choice of this word is significant because it places the discourse firmly in the context of dependent arising (*paṭiccasamuppāda*), the Buddha’s central teaching. To understand dependent arising there are three key terms we must be aware of.

- *Idappaccayatā* (specific conditionality): the general principle that any given phenomenon is contingent. Each phenomenon that we experience arises because of something other than itself and ceases because of something other than itself. All things depend on each other for their existence.
- *Paṭiccasamuppāda* (dependent arising): the patterns of arising and cessation. What is central here is the *behaviour* of phenomena rather than their identity; the conditional relationships *between* phenomena, that *form* phenomena, rather than the phenomena themselves. Together, specific conditionality and dependent arising comprise the enduring state of ourselves and our experienced world, the natural order.
- *Paṭiccasamuppanna dhammas* (the dependently arisen): *what* arises and ceases. There are no “things,” only our-experience-of-things, which are events in infinite and endless process. These events are phenomena only, experienced events, and all phenomena are contingent, radically dependent upon other phenomena.

Dependent arising teaches the radical contingency of experience. As Stephen Batchelor explains:

Whatever is contingent depends on something else for its existence. As such, it need not have happened. For had one of those conditions failed to materialize, something else would have occurred. ... Contingency reveals a chaotic freedom at the heart of causally ordered events. ... [E]mbracing contingency requires a willingness to accept the inexplicable and unpredictable instead of reaching for the anaesthetic comfort of metaphysics.³

Dependent arising teaches that all life is contingent process, with nothing beyond or beneath to support it, or enable it, or provide someone to whom contingency occurs. There is just the flow of experience, and nothing else. “The source” (*nidāna*), in other words, does not refer to some metaphysical or transcendental ground of being. “The source” is whatever contingent event is, at this moment, conditioning the arising or cessation of another contingent event. There is no solid ground. This is the Buddha’s anti-ontology.

Papañca & papañca-saññā-saṅkhā

“As to the source through which perceptions and notions born of proliferation beset a person ...” What is proliferation (*papañca*), and perceptions and notions born of proliferation (*papañca-saññā-saṅkhā*)? These are the key technical terms of our sutra. “Proliferation” (or “mental proliferation”) is a translation of *papañca*. Nāṇananda explains *papañca* in this way:

Being derived from “*pra + √pañc* it conveys such meanings as “spreading out,” “expansion,” “diffuseness,” and “manifoldness.” The tendency towards proliferation in the realm of concepts may be described in any one of those terms, and this is probably the primary meaning of “*papañca*.”⁴

Papañca refers to our obsessive mental processing of experience, which results in an addictive relationship to uncontrolled thoughts and perceptions, and to the reality that we invest in these thoughts and perceptions. *Papañca* is very close to *maññanā* (“conceiving”), and like *maññanā* appears in the form of craving, conceit and views. *Papañca* is active. We are *doing papañca* right now, forming our sense of ourselves and our world from moment to moment. To get a sense of the power of *papañca*, tell yourself to stop thinking. Can you? For how long? And what is the nature of this determination to think? Does it have a quality of restlessness, a rush from one topic to another? And do these thoughts appear real? Do you think you really are the star of these dramas? If you can feel the force of this restless determination to create yourself as the star of

your own personal melodrama, then you can feel the power of *papañca* and the enormity of the task of cutting it off.

“Perceptions and notions born of proliferation” is one possible translation of the compound *papañca-saññā-saṅkhā*. Bhikkhu Bodhi follows Ñāṇananda in translating *saṅkhā* as “notion” or “concept.” Ñāṇananda explains that “*saṅkhā*” (*saṃ* + $\sqrt{khyā}$ - “to call”) may be rendered by such terms as “concept, reckoning, designation or linguistic convention.”⁵ *Saṅkhā* refers to the innumerable mental calculations that are necessary for us to create a coherent, meaningful world. *Saṅkhā* refers to the impositions of names or definitions on things. In this sense it is very similar to *nāma*, “name,” that we looked at while reading *Mūlapariyāya Sutta*. *Nāma* is the process of reaching out to the sensed universe in order to construct a meaningful world through language, and *saṅkhā* has a similar function. And of course, *saññā* is the habitual recognition of this world that is learned through language and other behaviours.

Further, while *papañca* is active, *papañca-saññā-saṅkhā* is not. *Papañca* is the cause, and *papañca-saññā-saṅkhā* is the result. This again places the teaching of *papañca* in the context of dependent arising, and the idea of *kamma-vipāka*, action and its “fruition,” or result. *Papañca* is the action; *papañca-saññā-saṅkhā* is the result. *Papañca* is how we are responding to this situation now; *papañca-saññā-saṅkhā* is this situation as we have inherited it; this situation as it is given, now. And so *papañca* feeds *papañca-saññā-saṅkhā*, and *papañca-saññā-saṅkhā* feeds *papañca*. And on it goes.

The key point in *papañca* and *papañca-saññā-saṅkhā* is that this process of constructing a sense of an identity functioning within a meaningful world is out of control, for these perceptions and notions arise through a process of uncontrolled proliferation. The details of this process are explained later in our sutra by Mahā Kaccanā. For the moment we shall continue unpacking the Buddha’s brief teaching.

“... if nothing is found there to delight in, welcome and hold to, this is the end of the underlying tendency to passion ...” The condition of delusion from which we suffer is not inevitable, because it is formed by contingent, not necessary, events. If nothing is found at this source “to delight in, welcome and hold to,” then the “underlying tendencies” naturally come to an end. In *Mūlapariyāya Sutta* the Buddha declared that “delight is the *mūla* of suffering.” “Delight” (*nandī*) indicates our compulsive grasping after a satisfaction that is never enough, which always contains within it the need to reach for something else. This delight is associated with “being” or “becoming” (*bhava*), the blind reaching out for something, anything, to fill the void we sense within us. If there is no delight, then there is no compulsion to reach out and hold something as “I” and “mine,” and so no need for “quarrels, brawls, disputes and recrimination.” If delight dies, then the “underlying tendencies” will also die.

Ñāṇananda suggests that the three relationships of “delighting,” “welcoming” and “holding to” correspond respectively to *taṇhā* (craving), *māna* (conceit) and *diṭṭhi* (view), the three “conceivings” (*maññanā*) that are the subject of *Mūlapariyāya Sutta*.⁶ He points out that “I” and “mine” are expressions of craving. And as these inevitably entail “not-I,” - “you” and “yours” - they involve conceit, measuring and comparison. Generating a coherent concept of “I” and “mine” in turn involves view. So craving (*taṇhā*), conceit (*māna*) and view (*diṭṭhi*) are three aspects of a single process. In other places the Buddha refers to them in terms of “mine-ness,” or attachment (*mamatta*), the conceit “I am” (*asmi-māna*) and the view of the reality of the person (*sakkāya-diṭṭhi*). Or he refers to the three basic movements of “This is mine” (*etaṃ mama*), “I am this” (*eso’ham asmi*), and “This is my self” (*eso me attā*). These are all different names for the three main channels of *papañca*, “proliferation.”⁷

This richness of technical terms we find in the Buddha’s teaching raises the question of whether they refer to different things, or whether they constitute different labels for the same thing? However, in the context of *paṭiccasamuppāda* (dependent arising) there are no things, only

different aspects of the same infinitely complex and profound network of processes. The Buddha is speaking about the nature of human experience when we subject it to close examination. Since experience is a unified flow of events, a difference in perspective gives a difference in experience. The same “thing” seen from a distance is quite different when seen close up. Do we have two different things here? Or two different views of the same thing? The Buddha rejects both possibilities. From his perspective we have two different events, each one of which arises dependent upon a number of factors, one of which is the distance between the eye and the visual form in the moment of the visual event.

We can find different “flavours” in experience, depending in how we approach it, and depending also on our conditioning. Mental events such as craving, conceit and views are called *cetasika*, “belonging to” (-ika) mind (*cetas*). *Cetasika* may be translated as “mental concomitant,” “mental property” or “mental factor.” But it is important not to treat these *cetasikas* as referring to “things,” and the analysis of them as science. They are *views* that are possible when we attend to ourselves, and the literature that describes them is more akin to poetry than to science.

Our delighting, welcoming and holding are expressions of our underlying tendencies, which we looked at above. The Buddha here lists seven underlying tendencies. Passion (*rāga*), which is an aspect of attraction (*lobha*), aversion (*paṭigha*) and delusion (*avijjā*) are known as the three *akusala mūla*, “unwholesome roots,” the fundamental forces that shape us and our world. Often translated as “greed, hatred and ignorance,” together they sum up all the underlying tendencies. Desire for becoming (*bhava-rāga*) is another aspect of attraction. Doubt (*vicikicchā*) is an aspect of delusion. And conceit (*māna*) and view (*ditṭhi*), linked with passion, are aspects of the conceivings (*maññanā*), the subject of Mūlapariyāya Sutta.

The aim of the practice taught by the Buddha is reach the point where “these evil unwholesome states cease without remainder (*aparisesā nirujjhanti*). The verb *nirujjhati* means “to be broken up, to be dissolved, to be destroyed, to cease, die.”⁸ This definitely suggests a *permanent* state of cessation, a point where these states will not ever arise again. How could this work?

Fire, fuel & the failure of language

Final liberation is possible because of dependent arising. This teaches us that every aspect of experience is contingent rather than necessary. Nothing is permanent; nothing is fixed. There is no solid ground to experience, and so there is no condition that can permanently trap us. So although we are driven by unconscious forces, these forces exist and have power only because of conditions other than themselves. Change the conditions, and we change the movements they give rise to.

Identity, for example, is not a thing, something already given, but a project, a process, fuelled by desire. The Buddha compares identity with fire:

Fire is named [*saṅkhā*] by the particular condition dependent on which it burns - when fire burns dependent on logs, it is named a log fire; when fire burns dependent on sticks, it is named a stick fire; when fire burns dependent on grass, it is named a grass fire; when fire burns dependent on cow-dung, it is named a cow-dung fire; when fire burns dependent on chaff, it is named a chaff fire; when fire burns dependent on rubbish, it is named a rubbish fire. (M38 Mahātaṇhāsankhaya Sutta)

What is a fire? A thing? Or a process? A fire is always in motion, never still. Furthermore, a fire is “fed” by its “fuel,” and what feeds a fire is what *defines* it, and so what *limits* it. If what feeds a fire is gas, then the fire *is* (named) a “gas fire.” If what feeds a fire is the bush, then the fire *is* (named) a “bushfire.” And so on. A fire’s identity *is* “the particular condition dependent upon which it burns,” its “fuel,” what “feeds” it.

In Pāli the word for “fuel” is *upādāna*, which is also the word for “clinging” or “attachment.” A fire is defined by what fuels it, its *upādāna*; by its clinging to something, its *upādāna*. We are defined by what feeds us, by what we cling to – which is also that by which we limit ourselves. As a fire is defined by its “fuel” (*upādāna*), its “nutriment” (*āhāra*), when that fuel is gone, there is nothing by which one can define it. There is nothing one can say about it. And a fire *will* die if we stop feeding it. It does not exist independently of conditions. It is not permanent.

What, then, can we say of the consciousness (*viññāna*) of one without clinging, the *arahat*? Normal consciousness becomes settled on and supported by, fed by, nutriment (*āhāra*); and its nutriment is what defines it, what makes it what it is. Or we could say that consciousness is fuelled by (*upādāna*) what it clings to (*upādāna*). But what of consciousness that does not do so? What of consciousness that is not stuck anywhere, and so not defined by anything (in particular)? The Buddha questions his students:

“A roofed building or hall has windows to the north, the south and the east. When light enters a window at sunrise, where would it be established (*patiṭṭhita*)?”

“On the west wall, bhante.”

“If there was no west wall, where would it be supported?”

“On earth.”

“If there was no earth, where would it be supported?”

“On water.”

“If there was no water, where would it be supported?”

“It would be un-supported (*a-patiṭṭhita*).” (Nidāna Saṃyutta)

What is light that does not strike anything? That is not supported by anything? What can we say about it? And what of a consciousness that is unsupported? In the Nikāyas we find the term *appatiṭṭhita citta*, which could be translated as “a mind which does not take its stand on anything.” A mind that is not stuck anywhere, and so is free. How do we know what is in our mind? By the object upon which consciousness – knowing – rests, and depends. It may be physical, like a sight or a sound; or non-physical, like an emotion or an idea. But in every instance, this is where it is stuck; what feeds it; what defines it. How do we know what is going on in the minds of others? We recognise their behaviours as indicating the object of their consciousness, where, at that moment, their consciousness stands. If we see someone smiling, we “know” they are happy, and the characteristics of their happiness, because we have experienced the same internal objects, and the same relationship to those internal objects, that make up “happiness.” And this relationship consists of some degree of clinging; this is what is making *me* happy; so this is what I *must* have. But if consciousness does not cling to any object, how can it be known? What is there to know? If consciousness is not dependent on any object, there is no thing by which it can be known, so the independent or unsupported consciousness of an *arahat* cannot be known. Of course, if I have experienced this independence, then I can recognise the mind of an *arahat*. But even then, how could I then express it?

Or as the Buddha explains to Upasīva:

It is like a flame struck by a sudden gust of wind. In a flash it has gone out and nothing more can be known about it. It is the same with a wise person freed from mental existence: in a flash she has gone out and nothing more can be known about her.

When one has gone out, then there is nothing by which you can measure her. That by which she can be talked about is no longer there; you cannot say that she does not exist. When all phenomena are removed, all ways of description have also been removed. (Sn 5.6)⁹

So there is a realm that can be experienced, but not described – that of *nibbāna*. Such a realm cannot be described as impermanent. But then, it cannot be described as permanent, either. It cannot be described, because it is beyond language, beyond concept, beyond conceiving. Whatever the state of the liberated one might be, that is where we can find it.

Conclusion

What lies beneath? Fundamentally, nothing at all, and this is what makes liberation possible. There is nothing fixed, nothing that does not move. Delusion and suffering are movements; Awakening and happiness are movements. And there is nothing beneath these movements. It is the fact that everything moves that makes freedom possible. Or, perhaps freedom is the absence of anything that stands in the way of movement.

When we cling, we are stuck, no longer able to move. We are most deeply stuck on our sense of identity, of who we think we are and what we think the world is. Madhupiṇḍika Sutta is designed to expose that condition of stuckness, and show how it, too, is the product of movements, how it too is contingent. Deconstructing the movements that result in bondage opens up the movements that result in liberation. We will see more of the nature of these movements as we continue to read Madhupiṇḍika Sutta.

-
1. In these notes I have modified Bhikkhu Bodhi's translation of Madhupiṇḍika Sutta.
 2. yatonidānaṃ bhikkhu purisaṃ papañcasaññāsaṅkhā samudācaranti, ettha ce natthi abhinanditabbaṃ abhivaditabbaṃ ajjhositabbaṃ, es'ev'anto rāgānusayānaṃ, es'ev'anto paṭighānusayānaṃ, es' ev' anto diṭṭhānusayānaṃ, es' ev' anto vicikicchānusayānaṃ, es' ev' anto mānānusayānaṃ, es' ev' anto bhavarāgānusayānaṃ, es' ev' anto avijjānusayānaṃ ... etth'ete pāpakā akusalā dhammā aparisesā nirujjhantīti. [M1.109-110]
 3. Stephen Batchelor. *Living with the devil: A meditation on good and evil*. New York: Riverhead Books, 2004: 8-9.
 4. Bhikkhu Ñāṇananda. *Concept and reality in early Buddhist thought. An essay on papañca and papañca-saññā-saṅkhā*. Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society, 1971: 4.
 5. Ñāṇananda (1971): 5.
 6. Ñāṇananda (1971): 11.
 7. Ñāṇananda (1971): 11-12.
 8. T. W. Rhys Davids & William Stede (editors). *The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary*. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1998 reprint: 370.
 9. Saddhatissa: 123. (Translation modified.)