

ISSN 1343-8980

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年報

平成25年度
(第17号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University

for the Academic Year 2013

Volume XVII

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2014・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo・2014

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所・年報
平成25年度（第17号）

Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
(ARIRIAB)
at Soka University for the Academic Year 2013
Vol. XVII (2014)

目次／CONTENTS

#: paper written in Japanese.

● 研究報告 RESEARCH ARTICLES:

Harry FALK:

The first-century Copper-plates of Helagupta from Gandhāra hailing Maitreya 3

Richard SALOMON and Joseph MARINO:

Observations on the Deorkothar Inscriptions and Their Significance
for the Evaluation of Buddhist Historical Traditions 27

ANĀLAYO:

The *Brahmajāla* and the Early Buddhist Oral Tradition 41

Petra KIEFFER-PÜLZ:

Quotatives Indicating Quotations in Pāli Commentarial Literature, II: Quotatives with *āha* 61

Seishi KARASHIMA:

The Language of the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ* — The Oldest Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Text 77

Haiyan HU-VON HINÜBER:

Quotations from earlier Buddhist Texts in the *Poṣadhavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda School 89

Noriyuki KUDO:

The *Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa*: A Transliteration of the Nepalese Manuscript A (6) 95

GUAN Di:

Three Sanskrit Fragments Preserved in Arthur M. Sackler Museum of Peking University 109

Seishi KARASHIMA:

New Research on the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts from Central Asia 119

Akira YUYAMA:

Reviewing *Rgs* XIV 2 & 7: How One Can Rescue Oneself When Shipwrecked in the Ocean
With Some Reference to Haribhadra's Commentary 129

Akira YUYAMA:

A Brief Revisit to *Rgs* XXII.6 Quoted by Candrakīrti in his *Pras* 147

Jonathan A. SILK:

Taking the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* Seriously 157

LI Xuezhū, Kazuo KANO and YE Shaoyong:

A Sanskrit folio of the *Yuktiṣaṣṭikāvṛtti* newly found in Tibet 189

LI Xuezhū:

Diplomatic Transcription of Newly Available Leaves from Asaṅga's *Abhidharmasamuccaya*
— Folios 29, 33, 39, 43, 44 — 195

Michael RADICH:

On the Sources, Style and Authorship of Chapters of the Synoptic *Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra*
T 644 Ascribed to Paramārtha (Part 1) 207

Peter SKILLING and SAERJI:

How the Buddhas of the Fortunate Aeon First Aspired to Awakening:
The *pūrva-praṇīdhānas* of Buddhas 1–250 245

James B. APPLE:		
Fragments and Phylogeny of the Tibetan Version of the <i>Mañjuśrīvihārasūtra</i> : A Case Study in the Genealogy of Tibetan Kanjurs		293
DHAMMADINNA:		
‘ <i>Mahāratnakūṭa</i> ’ Scriptures in Khotan: A quotation from the <i>Samantamukhparivarta</i> in the <i>Book of Zambasta</i>		337
DUAN Qing:		
Puñadatta’s Contract of Sale of an Estate		349
Tatsushi TAMAI:		
The Tocharian <i>Karmavācanā</i>		365
Tatsushi TAMAI:		
Tocharian Syllabary with Uigur Explanations: M34.4 of the Mannerheim Collection in Helsinki		395
Peter ZIEME:		
Collecting of the Buddhist Scriptures: Notes on Old Uigur “annals”		401
Isao KURITA:		
Gandhāran Art (Part 2) [57 figures]		423
Jonathan A. SILK:		
Keeping Up With the Joneses: From William Jones to John James Jones		427
Akira YUYAMA:		
Supplement to ‘A List of Writings with Brief Bibliographical Notes. Appendix: Curriculum Vitae — A Succinct Autobiographical Record’, <i>ARIRIAB</i> , XVI: 2012 (2013), pp. 343-390: <i>Addenda et Corrigenda as of 1 January 2014</i>		443
#辛嶋静志:		
大乘仏教とガンダーラ——般若経・阿弥陀・観音——		449
#[Seishi KARASHIMA: Mahāyāna Buddhism and Gandhāra — On the <i>Prajñāpāramitā</i> , <i>Amitābha</i> and <i>Avalokitasvara</i>]		
#工藤順之:		
(Mahā-)Karmavibhaṅga 所引經典類研究ノート(4): Nandikasūtra, Devatāsūtra 追補		487
#[Noriyuki KUDO: Philological Notes on the Quotations in the (Mahā-)Karmavibhaṅga (4): Supplementary Remarks on <i>Nandikasūtra</i> and <i>Devatāsūtra</i>]		
#湯山 明:		
Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica: Marginal Anecdote (VI)		497
新刊論著紹介		
#[Akira YUYAMA: Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica: Marginal Anecdote (VI) Introducing Some Recent Publications]		
Brief Communication:		
Noriyuki KUDO: Newly Identified Folios in the <i>Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts</i>		517
● 国際仏教学高等研究所彙報 <i>IRIAB BULLETIN</i> :		
活動報告	IRIAB Activities	519
所長・所員の著作	List of Publications of the IRIAB Fellows	522
受贈受入図書	Books Received	523
受贈受入雑誌	Journals Received	526
● EDITORIALS:		
執筆者紹介	Contributors to this Issue / Editorial Postscript	529
既刊案内	<i>Gilgit Manuscripts in the National Archives of India — Facsimile Edition</i> , Vol. I	
● PLATES:		
1 Harry FALK: “The first-century Copper-plates of Helagupta from Gandhāra hailing Maitreya”	PLATES	1–6
2 GUAN Di: “Three Sanskrit Fragments Preserved in Arthur M. Sackler Museum of Peking University”	PLATES	7–8
3 Seishi KARASHIMA: “New Research on the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts from Central Asia”	PLATES	9–10
4 Akira YUYAMA: “Reviewing <i>Rgs XIV 2 & 7</i> : How One Can Rescue Oneself ...”	PLATES	11–12
5 Peter ZIEME: “Collecting of the Buddhist Scriptures: Notes on Old Uigur “annals””	PLATES	13-14
6 Tatsushi TAMAI: “Tocharian Syllabary with Uigur Explanations: M34.4 of the Mannerheim Collection	PLATE	15
7 Isao KURITA: “Gandhāran Art (Part 2)”	PLATES	16-32

The *Brahmajāla* and the Early Buddhist Oral Tradition

ANĀLAYO

Introduction

In what follows, I study some aspects of the early Buddhist oral tradition as exemplified by the different versions of the *Brahmajāla*. I begin with the significance of the introductory phrase "thus have I heard" (1). Then I examine the opening narration (2) and the exposition on morality in the first part of the discourse (3). In the final part of the paper, I attempt a general assessment of the nature of the early Buddhist oral tradition (4).

1. The Introductory Phrase of the *Brahmajāla*

The standard phrase at the opening of a discourse introduces what follows with the phrase: "thus have I heard". The relationship of this in itself innocuous marker of orality to what follows has led to considerable discussion among scholars.¹ The point at stake is if the subsequent phrase "at one time" should be considered as qualifying the preceding phrase "thus have I heard", or rather what follows in the text.²

¹ Cf., e.g., Burnouf 1925: 286, Staël-Holstein 1933: iv and xiii notes 7 and 8, Brough 1950, Samtani 1964, von Hinüber 1968: 84–87, Samtani 1971: 68f, Wayman 1974, Kajiyama 1977, Schopen 1978: 162–164, Silk 1989, Harrison 1990: 5 note 3, Bongard-Levin 1996: 90 note 1, Galloway 1991, Tatz 1993/1997, Vetter 1993: 65 note 48, Galloway 1997, Tola and Dragonetti 1999, Klaus 2007, Sander 2007: 174–176, and Nattier 2013. Several of these contributions examine relevant information in *śāstra* and commentarial literature, which in the context of my present survey I am not able to cover. My ignorance of Japanese has also prevented me from benefitting from research published in that language on this or other topics taken up in this paper.

² The first to have broached the subject appears to be Burnouf 1925: 286, reasoning that "si on supprime la formule complète, y compris les mots *ekasmin samayê*, on a le commencement d'un *Avadāna*, classe de livres qui ... ne diffère guère de celle des *Sūtras* que par l'absence de la formule, 'Il a été ainsi entendu par moi' ... ne peut-on pas dire que les mots *ekasmin samayê* ne se trouvant pas en tête des *Avadānas*, appartiennent forcément à la formule *evam mayā crutam?*" The same point has then been made again by Staël-Holstein 1933: xiii note 7, pointing out that in several *avadānas* "evam mayā crutam is missing, and wherever *evam mayā crutam* is missing *ekasmin samaye* is also absent ... this seems to indicate that the words *evam mayā crutam ekasmin samaye* constitute *one* phrase." Staël-Holstein 1933: iv also notes that "in all Tibetan and Mongolian preambles known to me a punctuation mark separates the equivalent of *ekasmin samaye* from the following words. The question as to whether *ekasmin samaye* belongs to *crutam* or to *viharati* is discussed in a number of Buddhist commentaries attributed to Indians, and most of them seem to regard *ekasmin samaye* as belonging to the preceding words *evam mayā crutam*." A full paper dedicated to a detailed discussion of the same issue then concludes with Brough 1950: 426 stating that "from every point of view, then, it seems to me that the punctuation as preserved in the Tibetan is to be preferred." That is, according to him the specification "at one time" should qualify the phrase "thus have I heard".

This discussion is of relevance to the *Brahmajāla*, as a variant in some editions of a full discourse quotation of the *Brahmajāla* in the *Abhidharmakośopāyikā-ṭīkā* presents a slight but significant difference in formulation. The Narthang and Peking editions of this discourse quotation read 'di skad bdag gis thos pa'i dus gcig na instead of just 'di skad bdag gis thos pa dus gcig na.³ Taking the addition of the particle -'i (*kyi*) to *thos pa* here to be indicative of the genitive,⁴ the discourse in these two editions would begin by qualifying the hearing to have taken place "at one time" (or "at a certain time"). This raises the question whether the specification "at one time" in the introductory phrase of the *Brahmajāla*, and by implication in other early discourses, should indeed be understood in this way.

When examined from the viewpoint of Pāli grammar, the assumption that "at one time", *ekaṃ samayaṃ*, qualifies the expression "thus have I heard", *evaṃ me sutāṃ*, is problematic, since one would not expect an accusative of time to stand after the verb.⁵ This would also hold for instances where the discourse itself is not attributed to the Buddha.⁶ In fact the

³ N *mngon pa, tu* 151a6 and Q *mngon pa'i bstan bcos, tu* 162b7: 'di skad bdag gis thos pa'i dus gcig na, whereas C *mngon pa, ju* 142a4 and D *mngon pa, ju* 141b5 read: 'di skad bdag gis thos pa dus gcig na; this is Up 3050 in Honjō 1984, who also identifies partial citations of the *Brahmajāla* as follows: Up 2035, Up 2036, Up 2045, Up 3007, and Up 5005. The reading in C and D is also found in the discourse version preserved in Tibetan, Weller 1934: 6,4 (§1): 'di skad bdag gis thos pa dus gcig na. On the first part of the Tibetan expression in general cf. Hahn 2006: 237f; other occurrences of the formulation *thos pa'i* have been noted by, e.g., Silk 1989: 160, Harrison 1990: 5 note 3, and Klaus 2007: 314 note 17; cf. also Galloway 1991: 92. The corresponding expressions in the other discourse versions of the *Brahmajāla* (all given on purpose without punctuation) are as follows: DN 1 at DN I 1,1: *evaṃ* (B° and C°: *evaṃ*) *me sutāṃ ekaṃ samayaṃ*, DĀ 21 at T I 88b13: 如是是我聞一時, and T 21 at T I 264a23: 聞如是一時; on the standard Chinese renderings of this expression cf. also Qingzhi 2010: 494 and Nattier 2013; on some formal aspects of the Pāli formulation cf. Allon 1997b: 195 and 246f.

⁴ According to Galloway 1991: 92, "the *kyi* is verbal and indicates a general connection between *thos pas* (*śrutam*) and the whole following sentence, whose verb is *viharati*, and not with *dus gcig na* alone." Klaus 2007: 314f note 17 in reply argues that this would only work if *kyi* were to follow directly after the bare verb *thos*, but not for the present case, where it follows *thos pa*: "diese Auffassung scheidet jedoch daran, daß die Partikel nicht auf den bloßen Verbalstamm *thos*, sondern auf das Verbalnomen *thos pa* folgt". Moreover, even if *kyi* were to follow *thos* directly, it would still have to be considered as a genitive particle, "selbst wenn die Variante nicht *thos pas'i*, sondern *thos kyi* lautete, wäre *kyi* ... trotzdem als Genitivpartikel zu betrachten", with reference given to the discussion of the genitive particle in Hahn 1996: 133f.

⁵ This point has already been clarified by von Hinüber 1968: 86 (§72) who, after noting that, e.g., in Vin II 296,26 *ekaṃ ... samayaṃ* occurs on its own, without being preceded by *evaṃ me sutāṃ*, points out that it would conflict with Pāli word order if the accusative of time were to come after the verb, "zudem würde die Stellung des acc. der Zeit nach dem Verb gegen die Worstellungsregeln des Pāli verstoßen ... alles spricht also dafür, im Pāli in *evaṃ me sutāṃ* einen abgeschlossenen Satz zu sehen." On the accusative of time cf. also, e.g., Duroiselle 1906/1997: 156, Wijesekera 1936/1993: 56–58, and Warder 1963/1991: 18. Brough 1950: 423 sees an instance corroborating the possibility of positioning the accusative of time after the verb in MN 21 at MN I 124,7: *ārādhayimsu vata me, bhikkhave, bhikkhū ekaṃ samayaṃ cittaṃ*. In reply, Klaus 2007: 311 note 8 comments that due to the initial position of the verb this is not a conclusive precedent, "ist wegen der Initialstellung des Prädikats in diesem Zusammenhang nicht beweiskräftig."

⁶ DN 34 at DN III 272,1 begins with the standard introduction, followed by referring to the location where the Buddha was dwelling, and then at DN III 292,6 concludes by indicating that the discourse was spoken by Sāriputta. Schopen 1978: 164 comments that "this makes it clear that what the speaker heard, and was reporting, was not that 'at one time the Blessed One dwelt at Campā, etc.', but what Sāriputta [sic] said when he and the Buddha were there. In this case – and by extension all other cases – *ekaṃ samayaṃ* could be attached to either what precedes or what follows it without affecting the meaning." Yet, even when the discourse was believed to have been spoken by Sāriputta in the presence of the Buddha, the introductory indication that at the time of the discourse's delivery the Buddha was living at Campā has the same function. Thus, to take *ekaṃ samayaṃ* to qualify *evaṃ me sutāṃ* in the case of DN 34 would face the same problems as for DN 1 or any other discourse

phrase "at one time", *ekam samayaṃ*, occurs in some Pāli discourses without being preceded by "thus have I heard". In such contexts it must be referring to the time of the event reported.⁷ The same suggests itself also from a standard pattern in the Pāli discourses where after the phrase "thus have I heard", *evaṃ me sutāṃ*, and "at one time", *ekam samayaṃ*, the next sentence begins with "at that time", *tena kho pana samayena*. It seems safe to assume that in such cases both references to *samaya* intend the time of the event described in the discourse.⁸

Moreover, in some Pāli discourses the expression "thus have I heard" stands for hearsay in contradistinction to what one has personally experienced.⁹ This makes it improbable that the function of this phrase at the outset of a discourse is to designate that an eyewitness "at one time heard thus". Instead, the phrase "thus have I heard" simply has the function of highlighting that the discourse is something that has been heard thus, *evaṃ*, in this form, instead of being the product of one's own creative improvisation.

Several *Vinayas* report that the expression "thus have I heard" was already used by Ānanda at the time of the first *saṅgīti* that according to tradition took place soon after the Buddha's demise,¹⁰ whereas according to other *Vinayas* he did not use this expression.¹¹ In the

attributed to the Buddha or to a disciple.

⁷ Klaus 2007: 312 notes that "im *Sutta-* und *Vinaya*piṭaka der Theravādin sind zahlreiche Stellen enthalten, an denen ein Bericht über eine Begebenheit in der jüngeren oder fernerer Vergangenheit mit einem Satz eröffnet wird, der mit *ekam samayaṃ* beginnt und mit *viharati* oder *viharāmi* endet"; for which he provides the examples MN 5 at MN I 31,27 and AN 3.90 at AN I 237,18. In the case of MN 5, the parallel MĀ 87 at T I 569b15 has the corresponding expression 一時, whereas two other parallels instead speak of the reported event being "in the past"; cf. T 49 at T I 841c27: 昔時 and EĀ 25.6 at T II 633c17: 昔. In the case of AN 3.90, the corresponding phrase in the parallel SĀ 830 at T II 213a20 differs and thus does not give any temporal specification. Another example that also has a Tibetan parallel would be MN 121 at MN III 104,6: *ekamidam, bhante, samayaṃ bhagavā sakkesu viharati*, with counterparts in MĀ 190 at T I 737a2: 世尊一時遊行釋中, and in the Tibetan parallel in Skilling 1994: 148,1: *dus gcig na bcom ldan 'das shā kya rnams kyi nang na shā kya rnams kyi grong rdal grong khyer zhes bgyi ba na bzugs pa*.

⁸ As pointed out by von Hinüber 1968: 144 (§134): "ekam samayaṃ und tena samayena meinen denselben Zeitabschnitt, der verschieden gesehen wird. Der acc. bezeichnet den gesamten Zeitabschnitt, der instr. bestimmt die Zeit einer Handlung, die mit dem Verlauf dieser Zeit eintritt." The need to consider the significance of *ekam samayaṃ* in relation to the subsequent *tena kho pana samayena* has also been highlighted by Tola and Dragonetti 1999: 55.

⁹ This has already been pointed out by Klaus 2007: 318, who mentions as examples DN 5 at DN I 143,16 and MN 127 at MN III 152,7, where the fact that the speaker does not use the expression "thus have I heard" leads to the conclusion that he must have personally witnessed it. The parallels to DN 5 convey a similar sense, but without using the expression "thus have I heard"; cf. fragment 408r2, von Criegern 2002: 35, and DĀ 23 at T I 100b21. In the case of MN 127, the parallel MĀ 79 at T I 551c7 proceeds differently.

¹⁰ According to the Mahāsāṅghika *Vinaya*, T 1425 at T XXII 491c2, the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, T 1451 at T XXIV 406c1, and the Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, T 1435 at T XXIII 448b13, Ānanda used the expression 如是我聞 followed by 一時, which then each time led to an indication of the location where the Buddha was believed to have been dwelling at that time. Brough 1950: 419 refers to Przyluski 1926: 18, 84 and 128 for accounts of the *saṅgīti* that do not have a reference to such a location (as well as to the exegesis on the introductory phrase in T 1509 at T XXV 66a27, translated by Lamotte 1944/1981: 80ff). Two of the texts mentioned by Przyluski provide a location: T 384 at T XII 1058b16 (here given in general terms as 說佛所居處) and T 2027 at T XLIX 6c13 (reference given to Vārāṇasī). Of the remaining two instances (which are two parallels to DN 16), T 6 at T I 191a17 indeed has only "thus have I heard" together with "at one time", without mentioning a location. T 5 at T I 175b26 then also does not mention "at one time" and has only "thus have I heard". In both cases, the audience interrupts at this point by acclamation or by breaking out in tears. Thus both are abbreviations caused by the reaction of the audience, without a deeper implication for the significance of the phrase itself.

¹¹ The Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya*, T 1428 at T XXII 968b19, the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya*, T 1421 at T XXII 191a19,

case of the *Brahmajāla*, to take the phrase "thus have I heard" as expressing the hearing of the discourse by Ānanda at the time of its original delivery would in fact not work so well, since the events described in the introductory narration would have been directly experienced by him, instead of being something he heard.¹² Again, in the final part of the discourse Ānanda poses a question.¹³ The narrative description that introduces him as well as the words he is believed to have spoken would both not be something he could himself refer to as "thus have I heard".¹⁴ Similarly, the concluding section's report that the monks delighted in what the Buddha had taught would have to be considered something Ānanda directly experienced and took part in, and thus also not something he merely heard.

For Ānanda to use the expression "thus have I heard" to introduce a discourse that has any kind of introductory narration or conclusion would only work if he had not been present at that time, but had heard the discourse from someone else. In the case of a discourse like the *Brahmajāla*, the "I" in the phrase "thus have I heard" therefore needs to be understood to stand for the various members of the lineage of reciters that according to tradition was started by Ānanda's original recital of the text.

Now in the case of these subsequent generations of reciters a problem arises if "at one time" is taken to qualify "thus have I heard". In the case of a long discourse like the *Brahmajāla*, it seems highly improbable that an average reciter heard the discourse only at *one* time, simply because it requires more than one hearing to be able to learn such a complex discourse in an oral setting. Except for an exceptionally gifted case like Ānanda, who in the tradition features as foremost among outstanding disciples for being of much learning (which in an oral setting of course requires excellent memory),¹⁵ to master a discourse like the

and the Theravāda *Vinaya*, Vin II 287,16, report that Ānanda's recital of the discourses at the first *saṅgīti* was prompted by a question regarding the location, in reply to which he then gave the required indications. Thus in these versions he does not use the standard phrase, which Klaus 2007: 321 note 29 sees as probably reflecting an earlier form of presentation. The use of the standard phrase by Ānanda at the first *saṅgīti* when reciting the *Brahmajāla-sutta* is then reported in the commentary on the discourse, however; cf. Sv I 26,1.

¹² This problem has already been noted by Klaus 2007: 317, who points out that "es muß ja doch einfach jeder, der die Worte *evaṃ me sutāṃ (ekaṃ samayaṃ)* hört, glauben, daß der gesamte folgende Bericht und nicht nur die in ihm enthaltene Lehrdarstellung das ist, was da 'so gehört' wurde"; cf. also Przyłuski 1926: 346, who makes a similar observation regarding the concept of what is considered canonical: "dans un *sūtra* commençant par ces mots: 'Ainsi j'ai entendu. Une fois le Buddha demeurait à ...', le cadre même du récit ne peut avoir été prononcé par le Buddha." Brough 1950: 425 takes the fact that parts of the discourse could not have been heard by those present at its original delivery to support a combining of "at one time" with "thus have I heard", but as pointed out by Galloway 1991: 97 in reply, this issue is independent of how one relates "at one time" to what precedes and follows it.

¹³ Ānanda is on record for inquiring after the name of the discourse in DN 1 at DN I 46,19, Weller 1934: 64,31 (§220), C *mngon pa*, ju 154a3, D *mngon pa*, ju 153b4, Q *mngon pa'i bstan bcos*, tu 177a6, and N *mngon pa*, tu 165b2, DĀ 21 at T I 94a10, and T 21 at T I 270c15.

¹⁴ Already Franke 1913: 1 note 3 commented on the phrase *evaṃ me sutāṃ* in DN 1 that "dieser 'ich' kann nicht Buddha's Lieblingsjünger Ānanda sein, wie die einheimische Überlieferung annimmt", followed by pointing to another passage in which Ānanda is referred to in the third person singular.

¹⁵ AN 1.14.2 at AN I 24,32 and its parallel EĀ 4.7 at T II 558a26; cf. also the *Divyāvadāna*, Cowell and Neil 1886: 396,18 and the *Saṅghabhedavastu*, Gnoli 1978: 54,18. Nyanaponika and Hecker 1997: 151 summarize the traditional belief regarding Ānanda as follows: "he could immediately remember everything, even if he had heard it only once. He could repeat discourses of the Buddha flawlessly up to sixty thousand words, without leaving out a single syllable"; cf. also Th 1024 and the *Avadānaśataka*, Speyer 1909/1970: 155,7.

Brahmajāla can safely be expected to require several hearings.

Given the length of the discourse in terms of recitation time, such hearings would probably not be continuous, but rather be spread out over several days, with the prospective reciter being allowed time to rehearse what has already been learned before proceeding to learn new material. Even after having mastered the text, a reciter would still from time to time participate in group recitation with other reciters who know the same discourse collection,¹⁶ thereby again coming to hear the discourse earlier learned and hopefully getting lapses of memory rectified in this way. Thus, at least in as much as the *Brahmajāla* and discourses of comparable length are concerned, it would not make much sense for an average reciter to qualify his hearing as taking place "at one time".

In sum, it seems to me that while with later texts the alternative interpretation that relates "at one time" to "thus have I heard" certainly needs to be taken into account,¹⁷ in the case of the early discourses,¹⁸ preserved in the *Nikāyas* and *Āgamas*, it can safely be assumed that the qualification "at one time" begins a new sentence introducing the events described in the discourse.¹⁹ The variant reading *thos pa'i*, found in some Tibetan editions of the *Abhidharmakośopāyikā-ṭīkā* quote of the *Brahmajāla*, is best considered the result of later influences.

2. The Introductory Narration of the *Brahmajāla*

After the standard introductory phrase the *Brahmajāla* proceeds with an introductory

^{16.} Such group recitation is reflected in Vin II 75,31 which, as part of a description of the task of allotting accommodation to incoming monks, indicates that those who recite the *sūtras* are allocated together so that they can do group recitation with each other, *aññamaññaṃ suttantaṃ saṅgāyissanti*. The need to have those who recite and teach the *sūtras* stay together is also reflected in the corresponding passage in the Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya*, T 1428 at T XXII 587b21, the Mahāsāṅghika *Vinaya*, T 1425 at T XXII 394c12 (correcting the punctuation in the Taishō edition to read 經唄經唄共, etc.), the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya*, T 1421 at T XXII 15a28, the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, T 1442 at T XXIII 695c9, and the Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, T 1435 at T XXIII 22a12.

^{17.} According to Brough 1950: 421 and von Hinüber 1968: 87 note 1, the use of the accusative *ekaṃ samayaṃ* would be earlier than the locative *ekasmiṃ samaye* found regularly in Sanskrit texts. Vetter 1993: 65 note 48 then suggests that "the accusative was the older expression and was replaced by the locative in order to repair a long felt shortcoming, viz. that hearing the tenets a text contained was not sufficiently marked as also having happened at the time when the Lord dwelt there and there and met this or that person, etc." In line with the suggestion by Vetter, the Mahāsāṅghika, Mūlasarvāstivāda, and Sarvāstivāda *Vinayas*, mentioned above in note 10, appear to reflect the same need for authentication. This would explain a gradual shift in meaning, whereby the phrase "at one time" was increasingly seen as qualifying not only the event reported, but also the hearing of the discourse, resulting in what Harrison 1990: 5 note 3 has referred to as an "*apo koinou* construction".

^{18.} For a more detailed discussion of the notion of "early discourses" cf. Anālayo 2012.

^{19.} Klaus 2007: 320 concludes his detailed study by stating that the Pāli phrase *evaṃ me sutam* originally did not function as an indicator that one was present personally at the time of the discourse. Instead, it served to mark that the text originated from oral transmission, instead of being the speaker's own composition, "all das zusammen macht es unmöglich, die Worte *evaṃ me sutam* als eine Formel zu betrachten, mit der man kundtat, Ohrenzeuge der im folgenden Bericht enthaltenen Lehrdarlegung gewesen zu sein. Diese einleitenden Worte können ursprünglich nur als Hinweis darauf gemeint gewesen und ursprünglich auch nur so verstanden worden sein, daß es sich bei dem folgenden Bericht nicht um einen vom Sprecher selbst verfaßten, sondern um einen überlieferten Text handelt."

narration. According to this narration, found with considerable similarity in the parallel versions,²⁰ the Buddha and his monks were on a journey and were being followed by a teacher and his pupil. This teacher kept speaking in dispraise of the Buddha, the Dharma and the Community, whereas his pupil spoke their praise. The monks entered into a discussion about this contrasting behavior. Having become aware of that, the Buddha decided to join them. Once he had joined the monks, according to all versions he asked what they had been discussing.

A minor but noteworthy difference at this juncture can be found in a version of the *Brahmajāla* preserved under the title *Fàndòng jīng* (梵動經) in the Dharmaguptaka *Dīrgha-āgama*.²¹ The *Fàndòng jīng* differs from its parallels in so far as it indicates that when the Buddha asked the monks what they had been discussing, he did so knowingly.²² While the fact that the Buddha had become aware of the monks' topic of discussion is anyway clear from the context in all versions, none of the other versions accompanies the description of the Buddha's actual inquiry with an explicit specification that he knew. Instead, they merely report that he sat down and asked the monks what they had been talking about.²³

Such a specification can be found, however, in the Pāli commentary on the *Brahmajāla-sutta* of the *Dīrgha-nikāya*, which indicates that the Buddha asked knowingly.²⁴ The point of making such a qualification would be to make it unmistakably clear that the Buddha did not ask out of ignorance. Instead, his question should be understood as merely an expedient means in order to start a conversation with the monks. The felt need to make such an additional qualification would be related to the growing tendency to consider the Buddha as omniscient,²⁵ leading to the concern that even circumstantial information be presented in such a way as to leave no doubt about the Buddha's all-knowing condition.

Since among the discourse versions only the *Fàndòng jīng* has such an explicit qualification at this point, it seems probable that this remark is a later addition. This impression finds confirmation in the fact that the same expression occurs regularly in other discourses in

²⁰ The similarity between the introductory narrations in DN 1 and DĀ 21 had been noted already by Beal 1884: 34–36.

²¹ On the school affiliation of the *Dīrgha-āgama* collection preserved in Chinese translation as Taishō no. 1 cf., e.g., Demiéville 1951: 252f, Brough 1962/2001: 50, Lü 1963: 242, Bareau 1966, Waldschmidt 1980: 136, Mayeda 1985: 97, Enomoto 1986: 25, Hirakawa 1987: 513, Schmithausen 1987: 318, Oberlies 2003: 44, Salomon 2007: 354 note 14, and Willemen 2008: 60. Regarding the title 梵動經, Karashima 2006: 361 explains that "the translator(s) confused *-jāla* ('net') with *-cāla* ('moving'), both of which may become *-yāla* in the underlying language, as is common in Middle Indic, including Gāndhārī"; cf. also Weller 1971: 207, who introduces his translation of DĀ 21 as a "Verdeutschung des Brahmācālasūtra".

²² DĀ 21 at T I 88b29: 大眾前坐, 知而故問.

²³ DN 1 at DN I 2,23: *nisajja kho bhagavā bhikkhū āmantesi*, Weller 1934: 8,8 (§6): *bzhugs nas kyang dge slong rnams la bka' stsal pa, C mngon pa, ju 142b3, D mngon pa, ju 142a4, Q mngon pa'i bstan bcos, tu 163a7 and N mngon pa, tu 151b6: dge slong gi dge 'dun gyi dbus su gdan bshams pa la bzhugs te, bcom ldan 'das kyes dge slong rnams la bos te, and T 21 at T I 264b6: 佛則坐, 佛問諸比丘言.*

²⁴ Sv I 49,18: *evam nisinnō pana jānanto yeva kathāsamuṭṭhāpanattham bhikkhū pucchi*.

²⁵ For a discussion of the attribution of omniscience to the Buddha, based on a survey of relevant early discourses and publications on this issue, cf. Anālayo 2014a.

the same *Dīrgha-āgama*, where again the parallels do not have such an indication.²⁶ Thus the addition of such a specification seems to be characteristic of the Dharmaguptaka *Dīrgha-āgama*.

Now the circumstance that such a specification is found in the Pāli commentary on the *Brahmajāla* makes it possible that a similar remark could have been found in a Dharmaguptaka commentary on the *Dīrgha-āgama* as well. Both traditions can be expected to have incorporated in their respective commentaries material from a common ancient Indian commentarial tradition that would since a relatively early time have begun to develop alongside the discourses.²⁷ In this case, it would not be surprising if such a remark eventually came to influence the wording of the discourse. This would be in line with a general tendency discernible elsewhere in the early discourses, where during the course of oral transmission commentarial material appears to have become part of the discourse on which it commented.²⁸

3. The Exposition on Morality in the *Brahmajāla*

The influence of commentarial exegesis on the actual discourse can also be discerned in the next portion of the discourse, which takes up the topic of the Buddha's moral conduct.²⁹

In the discourse version of the *Brahmajāla* preserved in Tibetan translation, the relatively short exposition on morality lists the first two precepts, followed by an abbreviation which gives the impression that the remaining precepts should be supplemented. Then it briefly describes how some recluses and brahmins gain their livelihood in wrong ways. Even after supplementing the precepts that appear to have been abbreviated, the whole exposition is still

^{26.} The expression 知而故問 occurs also in DĀ 1 at T I 1b24, DĀ 2 at T I 19a29 and T I 25c1, and DĀ 30 at T I 114b14 (the last has no known parallel; cf. Anālayo 2014b). In the case of DĀ 1, the corresponding passages in the discourse parallels describe the Buddha's inquiry without an explicit indication that he asked knowingly; cf. Fukita 2003: 32,11: *niṣadya bha(ga)vā(m) bhikkṣūn āmantrayati*, DN 14 at DN II 1,12: *nisajja kho bhagavā bhikkhū āmanesi*, T 2 at T I 150a14: 世尊問曰 (preceded by describing that the monks paid respect to him), T 4 at T I 159b4: 佛即到, 諸比丘所問言, EĀ 48.4 at T II 790a15: 在中央坐, 爾時世尊告諸比丘. The same holds for the discourse parallels to the first passage in DĀ 2 at T I 19a29 (reading 我知而故問), where again the corresponding passages do not mention that the Buddha asked knowingly; cf. Waldschmidt 1951: 274 (§28.28): *(tam aham evam ā)mantraye*, DN 16 at DN II 131,32: *taṃ purisaṃ etad avocaṃ*, T 5 at T I 168b16: 我問, T 6 at T I 183c27: 吾問, T 7 at T I 198a24: 我即問言. These sources follow the same pattern for the second instance in DĀ 2 at T I 25c1 (reading just 知而故問), Waldschmidt 1951: 296 (§32.15): *bhagav(ā)n bhikkṣūn āman(t)r(ayate)*, DN 16 at DN II 143,24: *bhagavā bhikkhū āmanesi*, T 5 at T I 169b13: 佛問比丘, T 6 at T I 184c25: 佛問比丘, T 7 at T I 200b9: 世尊問餘比丘. In this case, however, an exception can be found in another parallel to this particular passage, EĀ 42.3 at T II 751a23, where the corresponding passage does mention that he asked the monks knowingly, 世尊知而告諸比丘曰 (while the above-mentioned EĀ 48.4 does not have such a remark, another comparable instance can be found in the same discourse collection in EĀ 40.5 at T II 739b16: 知而問阿難曰, of which no discourse parallel appears to be known). On such formulations in *Vinaya* texts cf. Waldschmidt 1926: 47.

^{27.} For a study of the Indian source material of the Theravāda commentaries cf. Endo 2005 and 2009.

^{28.} For a detailed discussion with further references and a critical reply to the suggestion by Norman 1997: 158–160 that the commentaries were transmitted independently from the discourses cf. Anālayo 2010.

^{29.} For a comparative study of the subsequent examination of sixty-two standpoints for views in the parallel versions, including a discourse quotation in T 1548 at T XXVIII 656b19 to 661a7, cf. Anālayo 2009.

rather short.³⁰ The same holds for the discourse quotation in the *Abhidharmakośopāyikā-ṭīkā*, which in fact only refers to the first precept and then abbreviates.³¹ It seems fairly clear that the exposition of morality in the Mūlasarvāstivāda version of the *Brahmajāla* could not have been as long as what is now found in their Dharmaguptaka and Theravāda parallels.

The considerably longer coverage of the same topic of morality in the Dharmaguptaka and Theravāda discourse versions falls into three distinct parts. The *Brahmajāla-sutta* of the *Dīgha-nikāya* explicitly introduces these three as a "short" (*cūla*) exposition on morality, followed by a "middle length" (*majjhima*) exposition, and then a "great" (*mahā*) exposition.³²

The short exposition on morality starts in the Dharmaguptaka and Theravāda versions, the *Fàndòng jīng* (梵動經) and the *Brahmajāla-sutta*, with the first four of the five precepts. In both versions, following the fourth precept on abstention from falsehood come other forms of wrong speech, thereby completing the standard set of wrong forms of speech: divisive speech, harsh speech, and frivolous speech.³³ The *Fàndòng jīng* then continues with the fifth precept regarding abstention from alcohol, instead of which the *Brahmajāla-sutta* takes up the need to refrain from harming seeds (§10).³⁴ Both versions continue with the remaining eight precepts, presented together with several basic aspects of ethical conduct incumbent on a recluse in the ancient Indian setting (such as not possessing animals, abstaining from barter, etc.). Such a basic listing of the precepts together with a few aspects of the proper livelihood of a recluse appears to have been a common starting point of the parallel versions, including the Mūlasarvāstivāda discourse preserved in Tibetan translation. This much in fact corresponds to the compass of the section on morality in the gradual path exposition in the *Cūlahatthipadopama-sutta* of the *Majjhima-nikāya* and its *Madhyama-āgama* parallel, whose extent corresponds to what the *Brahmajāla-sutta* reckons the short exposition on morality.³⁵

The middling section on morality in the *Brahmajāla-sutta* of the *Dīgha-nikāya* then works in detail through the topics of injuring seeds and plants (§11), storing up food (§12), visiting shows and games (§§13 and 14), using luxurious beds, etc. (§15), and various adornments (§16).³⁶ The same or closely related topics occurred already towards the end of the smaller section on morality (§10).³⁷ The smaller section on morality mentions not harming seeds,

³⁰ Weller 1934: 12,6 to 12,30 (§§18 to 21).

³¹ C *mngon pa*, ju 143a7 to 143b1, D *mngon pa*, ju 143a1 to 143a2, Q *mngon pa'i bstan bcos*, tu 164a6 to 164a8, and N *mngon pa*, tu 152b4 to 152b6.

³² The smaller section on morality in DN 1 ranges from DN I 4,1 to 5,26, the middle length section then goes from there up to DN I 8,33, and the long section from there up to DN I 12,14.

³³ DN 1 at DN I 4,13 and DĀ 21 at T I 88c24; the same is also the case for T 21 at T I 264b28.

³⁴ DĀ 21 at T I 89a5: 沙門瞿曇捨離飲酒; cf. also T 21 at T I 264c5: 不飲酒. The absence of such a reference in the corresponding section in DN 1 is in line with the observation by Reat 1996/1998: 49f that "abstinence from intoxicants is not included in elucidations of right action in the Pali *sūtras*, and is thereby not nearly as prominent an ethical issue as it came to be in later Buddhism"; cf. also the discussion in, e.g., Schmithausen 1991: 8f note 42, Nattier 2003: 109 note 11, and Anālayo 2011: 190f note 245.

³⁵ MN 27 at MN I 179,22 to 180,19 and MĀ 146 at T I 657a14 to 657b27.

³⁶ DN 1 at DN I 5,28 to 7,26, following the paragraph numbering given in E°.

³⁷ DN 1 at DN I 5,4: *bījagāmahūtagāmasamārambhā paṭivirato ... ekabhattiko ... naccagītavādītavisūka-dassanā paṭivirato ... mālāgandhavilepanadhāraṇamaṇḍanavibhūsanatṭhānā paṭivirato ... uccāsayana-mahāsayanā paṭivirato.*

which corresponds to the topic taken up again in §11. Next the smaller section takes up eating a single meal at the right time, which can be seen to stand in a close thematic relationship to the storing up of food in §12. Then the smaller section refers to not visiting shows, not using adornments, and refraining from high beds and seats, which correspond to §§13 to 16 on visiting shows and games, using high beds and seats, and various adornments (with a difference in sequence in so far as adornments and high seats are in the opposite order).

A comparable pattern of relationship can also be observed in the *Fàndòng jīng*, where the middle length section on morality describes lack of contentment with food and robes, undertaking commercial transactions and seeking for profits, adorning oneself, and engaging in various forms of recreation. These themes have already been briefly mentioned in the preceding section.³⁸

In this way the middle length sections in the *Brahmajāla-sutta* and its counterpart in the *Fàndòng jīng* appear to have their origin in a commentary on the preceding smaller section.³⁹ This impression is further strengthened if one turns to the commentary on the *Brahmajāla-sutta* as well as the commentary on the *Cūlahatthipadopama-sutta* of the *Majjhima-nikāya* (whose entire exposition of morality corresponds to the smaller section on morality in the *Brahmajāla-sutta*). In both cases the commentarial gloss on the need to refrain from harming seeds lists precisely those five types of seeds that are also mentioned at the outset of the middle section on morality in the *Brahmajāla-sutta* itself, when taking up the topic of injuring seeds and plants (§11).⁴⁰ Thus this middle section does indeed seem to stem from a commentarial gloss.

That this apparent commentary is an addition to an already existing shorter exposition of morality finds support in a shift to a different introductory phrase employed in the middle length section. In both versions this phrase refers to others whose wrong conduct provides a contrast to the proper behavior of the Buddha,⁴¹ a reference not made in the preceding shorter

^{38.} After the reference to alcohol (cf. above note 34), DĀ 21 at T I 89a6 mentions not using adornment, not seeing shows, not sitting on high seats, not eating at the wrong time, and not taking gold and silver, 不著香華, 不觀歌舞, 不坐高床, 非時不食, 不執金銀. The topics of eating at the wrong time and taking gold and silver can be seen to receive a more detailed treatment at T I 89a16 in terms of discontentment with food and robes, 衣服飲食無有厭足, undertaking commercial transactions, 自營生業, and seeking for profits, 求諸利養, which also refers to high seats, 高廣大床. The problems of adornment and seeing shows recur in T I 89a23 in terms of trying to adorn oneself, 求自莊嚴, and engaging in various forms of recreation, 嬉戲. Similar correspondences can be observed in the individual translation T 21, where the corresponding section at T I 264c4 begins with the topic of not sitting on high seats, 不坐高綺好牀, a topic then taken up in more detail at T I 264c17.

^{39.} This has already been suggested by Franke 1913: 7 note 2, who comments that the degree of repetition found "spricht wohl dafür, daß die Listen von verwerflichen Beschäftigungen in unseren Paragraphen aus allerlei vorhandenen Schemata zusammengelesen sind. Manche Elemente treten ja auch mehr als einmal, in verschiedenen Paragraphen auf, vielleicht deshalb, weil sie in verschiedenen Schemata vorkamen." In relation to the same section, Weller 1935: 41 note 46 similarly comments that "wahrscheinlich liegen kommentarielle Erweiterungen vor, die einem älteren, einfacheren Textbestande zugewachsen sind." The same has also been proposed by Meisig 1987: 59f, based on a comparison of the smaller and middle length sections on morality.

^{40.} Ps II 208,23 lists *mūlabīja*, *khandhabīja*, *phalubīja*, *aggabīja* and *bījabīja* as the five types of seed not to be harmed (the corresponding passage in Sv I 77,6 differs in so far as it has *aggabīja* as its third and *phalubīja* as fourth); the same five seeds recur at the outset of the middle section on morality in DN 1 at DN I 5,31.

^{41.} In the case of DĀ 21 at T I 89a15 the phrase reads: 如餘沙門, 婆羅門, 受他信施. Similarly the middle

section on morality. Moreover, the *Brahmajāla-sutta* of the *Dīgha-nikāya* explicitly marks the end of the preceding section by indicating that the smaller section on morality is concluded.⁴² Since the context of the discourse would not require a subdivision of the section on morality, it seems that this division is the result of the relevant textual pieces having different origins.

In sum, the introductory narration and the exposition on morality appear to be examples for a general tendency where during the process of oral transmission commentarial exegesis could at times influence the wording of the discourse, or even become part of it.

4. The Early Buddhist Oral Tradition

The above surveyed features of the *Brahmajāla* exemplify patterns at work in the early Buddhist oral tradition in general, where at times major variations can be found between parallel versions. This can at first sight give the impression that improvisation is characteristic of the oral transmission of the early discourses themselves.

A considerable degree of improvisation is in fact a feature of the oral transmission of the ancient Greek and modern Yugoslavian epic.⁴³ Applying the research findings in relation to this type of oral tradition to the early Buddhist case, perhaps variations between parallel versions should simply be seen as the result of different creative performances, instead of being divergent versions of a text committed to memory?⁴⁴

A problem with applying the findings made in relation to the oral tradition of the ancient Greek and modern Yugoslavian epic to the transmission of the early Buddhist discourses, however, is that the characteristics of the respective oral traditions differ rather substantially.⁴⁵ From a methodological viewpoint, it is questionable if research done on the

length section on morality in DN 1 at DN I 5,28 starts with *yathā va paṇ' eke bhonto samaṇabrāhmaṇā saddhādeyyāni bhojanāni bhuñjivā*. In the discourse version preserved in Tibetan, Weller 1934: 12,14 (§20) this reads: *ji ltar 'di na dge sbyong dang bram ze kha cig dad pas byin pa yongs su spyod cing*, and in T 21 at T I 264c19: 譬有異道人, 受人信施食. In relation to the phrasing in DN 1, Franke 1913: 7 note 4 comments: "die folgenden Paragraphe fangen eigentlich alle mit *yathā* 'wie' an. Dieses 'wie' erklärt sich wohl daraus, daß sie teilweise Erläuterungen, Beispielsanführungen zu § 10 enthalten."

⁴² DN 1 at DN I 5,27: *cūlasīlam niṭṭhitam* (B^s and S^c: *cūlasīlam*, C^c: *cullasīlam*).

⁴³ Lord 1960/2000: 4f describes that in the case of the Yugoslavian epic literature studied by Parry and himself, "in a very real sense every performance is a separate song; for every performance is unique, and every performance bears the signature of its poet singer". Thus "improvisation is not a bad term for the process, but it too must be modified by the restrictions of the particular style", i.e., by the use of fairly fixed formulas that help the singer to compose his song rapidly during performance. However, as Lord 1960/2000: 36 points out, the singer "does not 'memorize' formulas" in the sense of "repeating something that one regards as fixed." Instead, he learns to employ these creatively for his performance purposes, somewhat similar to learning the words of a language.

⁴⁴ Cousins 1983: 2 and 5f argues that "if we compare the Pali recensions of the nikayas with other surviving versions, the differences we find are exactly those we might expect to discover between different performances of oral works", "these divergences ... are too frequent to arise from the natural variation of a manuscript tradition or even from a rigidly memorized oral tradition"; cf. also McGovern 2013: 364–401.

⁴⁵ Allon 1997a: 42 points out that "many factors can influence the character of an oral literature and its

oral performance of epic material can just be applied to the oral transmission of material that is not epic and which has been passed on in a different cultural setting.⁴⁶

Looking for precedents for the early Buddhist oral tradition within the ancient Indian cultural setting, a rather different mode of oral transmission comes into view, namely the transmission of Vedic texts through memorization.⁴⁷ In methodological terms, it would certainly be preferable if the early Buddhist oral tradition were to be approached from the perspective of its Vedic predecessor,⁴⁸ given that the two share the general cultural setting of ancient India and both are concerned with texts considered sacred, whose correct wording matters, and recitation is undertaken by religious professionals whose primary aim is not entertainment.⁴⁹

Comparing the Vedic and early Buddhist oral traditions, an important difference between these two is that Brahmins were trained from their childhood onwards in memorizing, whereas training as an early Buddhist reciter could have begun only after ordination, which in

method of composition and transmission: the nature of the information being relayed; the attitude towards this material and the extent to which accuracy is required; the character of the performers or composers, their status in society, the type of training they have undergone and the circumstances under which they perform; the nature of the audience and its expectations and therefore its demands on the performer or performers; the medium used (verse or prose) and whether the performance requires musical accompaniment. The Buddhist and Yugoslav-Homeric traditions differ in virtually all of these factors." Thus the problem of applying the findings by Parry and Lord to the early Buddhist case is not merely one of using research done on verse for texts that are predominantly in prose, pace Cousins 2013: 99f. In fact Lord 1960/2000: 5 himself clearly recognizes that oral epic differs from the oral transmission of material where exact transmission matters, commenting that "if the reader interprets oral learning [of the epic type] as listening to something repeated in exactly the same form many times, if he equates it with oral memorization by rote, then he will fail to grasp the peculiar process involved in learning oral epic." So "if we understand thereby the transmission of a fixed text or the kind of transmission involved where A tells B what happened and B tells C and so on with all natural errors of lapse of memory and exaggeration and distortion, then we do not fully comprehend what oral transmission of oral epic is."

^{46.} Graham 1987: 138 warns that the "oral use and even oral transmission of scripture should not be confused with folk oral tradition in which verbatim accuracy is not aspired to (i.e., in which 'formulaic composition' predominates: see, for example, Albert B. Lord, *The Singer of Tales* ...)". As Gombrich 1990: 21 points out, "the early Buddhists wished to preserve the word of their great teacher ... the precise wording mattered." Norman 1997: 49 sums up that contrary to "oral literature which ... is essentially of an epic nature where ... no two performances are ever identical because the reciter is free to insert, at any point, material", in the case of "the great majority of Pāli canonical texts, however ... complete accuracy of reproduction is required at each recitation. In these circumstances the findings of modern investigators of oral epic literature seem to have little relevance."

^{47.} Gombrich 1990: 23 notes that "the Buddhist canon has left us more clues that it is modelled on Vedic literature than has been generally recognized"; cf. also Lévi 1915: 441 and von Hinüber 1991: 123.

^{48.} This methodological problem is particularly relevant to the case of McGovern 2013: 364–401 who, in spite of the overall theme of his study being the relationship between early Buddhists and Brahmins, does not evaluate the early Buddhist oral tradition in the light of its Indic antecedents, but instead turns to the culturally and genre-wise unrelated Greek and Yugoslavian oral epic.

^{49.} Yugoslavian oral epic is instead performed by singers who come from various walks of life; cf. Lord 1960/2000: 18: "no particular occupation contributed more singers than any other". The actual performance then relies heavily on the singer's ability to entertain; cf. Lord 1960/2000: 17 "the length of the song depends upon the audience", as at times "the singer will realize shortly after beginning that his audience is not receptive, and hence he will shorten his song so that it may be finished within the limit of time for which he feels the audience may be counted on. Or, if he misjudges, he may simply never finish the song."

the average case would have taken place at a later age.⁵⁰ As I have shown elsewhere, the differing memory abilities that result from this basic dissimilarity do indeed explain why even a considerable degree of variation between parallel versions of a discourse could come into existence in an oral tradition that aims at correct and accurate transmission.⁵¹

Nevertheless, perhaps we should at least consider improvisation characteristic of the earliest phase of the coming into being of the early discourses?⁵² To be sure, the degree of formalization now found in some of the early discourses would indeed have come into being gradually, but some degree of formalization must have been used right from the outset when a particular discourse came to be orally transmitted. In fact, even the original delivery of a discourse in an oral setting can be expected to employ some degree of formalization.⁵³

Besides, we simply have no evidence that would support a shift from an early period of fairly free improvisation to a subsequent period of strictly formalized transmission, except for variations found between parallel versions of a discourse.⁵⁴ Yet in the case of the *Brahmajāla*, for example, a rather substantial difference in the exposition of morality appears to have come into being only at a time when the Mūlasarvāstivāda version of this discourse was transmitted independently from the Dharmaguptaka and Theravāda versions. Such a difference could not result from a very early period of improvisation.

In fact at times substantial differences can even be found between discourses of the same Theravāda tradition. Thus pericope descriptions of the same event in versions of the same Pāli discourse found in different *Nikāyas* can show quite substantial variations.⁵⁵ Another and particularly telling example can be found in the two versions of the *Kasibhāradvāja-sutta*, found in the *Samyutta-nikāya* and the *Sutta-nipāta*, which differ in the effect the otherwise same instruction had on its Brahmin protagonist: in the *Samyutta-nikāya* he takes refuge as a lay follower, but in the *Sutta-nipāta* he goes forth and becomes an arahant.⁵⁶ Such variations appear to have come into being within the Theravāda transmission lineage and thus would not be just the result of an early improvisation period.

^{50.} This has already been pointed out by von Hinüber 1989: 67f.

^{51.} Anālayo 2011: 867–876. As already noted by Allon 1997b: 366, "there is, however, scope for considerable change to occur within a tradition of the transmission of fixed, memorized texts." Similarly, in relation to variations between DN 34 and its parallels Wynne 2004: 106 points out that such "differences could just as easily have been produced by the natural variations of a relatively fixed oral transmission."

^{52.} Cousins 1983: 9f proposes "in the early period ... the possibility of a strong improvisatory element. This can be confirmed by comparisons between the surviving versions derived from different sects", which was then followed by "the gradual fixation of the material at a later period."

^{53.} Ong 1982/1996: 34f explains that "in a primary oral culture ... you have to do your thinking in mnemonic patterns, shaped for ready oral recurrence. Your thought must come into being in heavily rhythmic, balanced patterns, in repetitions or antitheses, in alliterations and assonances, in epithetic and other formulaic expressions", because "in an oral culture, to think through something in non-formulaic, non-patterned, non-mnemonic terms, even if it were possible, would be a waste of time, for such thought, once worked through, could never be recovered with any effectiveness."

^{54.} As pointed out by Wynne 2004: 106, "it is hard to imagine that oral improvisation in the transmission of literature was the norm in the early period of sectarian Buddhism".

^{55.} Cf. Anālayo 2011: 18f.

^{56.} SN 7.11 at SN I 173,22 and Sn 1.4 at Sn 15,23 (reference is to the page, as this occurs in a prose section).

Instead of giving any evidence that during an early period improvisation was considered acceptable, the texts themselves tend to emphasize the importance of accurately memorizing the Dharma. Thus, for example, the *Pāsādika-sutta* reports an instruction by the Buddha that the teachings given by him should be recited together [comparing] meaning with meaning and phrasing with phrasing.⁵⁷ The *Dirgha-āgama* parallel to this discourse takes up the same issue in more detail, describing how the monks should behave if there is a disagreement regarding the meaning and the phrasing, regarding only the meaning, only the phrasing, or regarding neither.⁵⁸ In both versions the teachings referred to are those that constitute the thirty-seven qualities or practices that are conducive to awakening (*bodhipākṣikā dharmāḥ*).

A concern with correct phrasing is also evident in a *prātimokṣa* rule which prohibits teaching a layman recitation of the Dharma. Such recitation is qualified in the *prātimokṣas* of the Lokottaravāda-Mahāsāṅghika, Mūlasarvāstivāda, Sarvāstivāda, and Theravāda traditions as being done "word by word".⁵⁹ The fact that monks should not teach a lay person in this way of course implies that this was precisely the way they would teach recitation to each other: word by word.⁶⁰

The *prātimokṣa* is in fact perhaps the best example one could choose for assessing the nature of the early Buddhist oral tradition, since its regular recital can safely be expected to have had a determining influence on the early Buddhist oral tradition. The recital of the *prātimokṣa* obviously involves a text with fixed wording, as is the case for all group recitals, making it clear that an improvisatory model cannot be applied to this text.⁶¹

Nevertheless, the different versions of the *prātimokṣa* that have come down to us show the same type of variation as found between parallel versions of the early discourses: the rules often come in a different sequence, they show variations in terminology, and at times rules can be found in some traditions that are not found in others.⁶² The degree of variation between parallel versions of the *prātimokṣa* clearly requires an explanation that goes beyond the

⁵⁷. DN 29 at DN III 127,16: *atthena atthaṃ vyañjanena vyañjanaṃ saṅgāyitabbaṃ*.

⁵⁸. DĀ 17 at T I 74a19: 說句不正, 義理不正, followed by the alternatives 說句不正, 義正, then 說句正, 義不正, and finally 說句正, 義正.

⁵⁹. Tatia 1975: 19,16: *padaśo dharmam vāceya*, Banerjee 1977: 32,11: *padaśo dharmam vācayet*, von Simson 2000: 205,3: *padaśo dharmam vācayet*, and Norman and Pruitt 2001: 46,12: *padaso dhammam vāceyya*. The Dharmaguptaka and Mahīśāsaka *prātimokṣas* preserved in Chinese translation do not specify that such recitation is word by word; cf. T 1429 at T XXII 1018b15: 共誦者 and T 1422 at T XXII 197a13: 經並誦者. The background narration in the Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya* reports that the promulgation of this rule was occasioned by monks teaching recitation in the manner of Brahmins, T 1428 at T XXII 638c22: 如婆羅門誦書聲無異, while according to the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya* the problem was that the monks who taught recitation came from different parts of the country and thus some did not recite the phrases correctly, T 1421 at T XXII 39c15: 誦讀經偈音句不正; cf. also Lévi 1915: 436f. Thus in these two *Vinayas* the basic issue at stake seems to be the same, even though they do not use the specification "word by word" in the actual rule.

⁶⁰. Wynne 2004: 109 comments that this rule implies that "Sutta portions of the early Buddhist literature were learnt verbatim among the ordained."

⁶¹. As already noted by Wynne 2004: 108, the two "*pātimokkhas*, for example, can hardly have been subject to an improvisational method of oral transmission, for their content (monastic rules) is hardly the sort of material suitable for improvisation."

⁶². Cf., e.g., the study by Pachow 1955.

parameters of the oral transmission of the Greek and modern Yugoslavian epic. Since the *prātimokṣa* was transmitted by members of the same Buddhist monastic reciter circles that were responsible for the transmission of the early discourses, it is also clear that similar mechanisms must have been at work. Not only the *prātimokṣa*, but also the discourses could be performed in group recitation, which makes improvisation a practical impossibility.⁶³

In relation to the recitation and transmission of the *prātimokṣa*, keeping in mind the Vedic background is again helpful. In the case of a *bhikṣu* from a Brahmin background transmitting the *prātimokṣa* it is quite possible that he was trained in memorization in his youth.⁶⁴ The case of a *bhikṣuṇī* would be different, however. Even if she should stem from a Brahmin family, as a woman she would not have stood a comparable chance to receive such training. As one might expect, the different versions of the *prātimokṣa* for *bhikṣuṇīs* exhibit more pronounced differences between each other than in the case of the *prātimokṣas* for *bhikṣus*.⁶⁵ An important factor influencing this would quite probably have been the lack of memorization training among *bhikṣuṇīs* responsible for transmitting their own *prātimokṣa*.

The emphasis on accurate transmission, word by word, in the early Buddhist oral tradition can even be seen in some of the transmission errors that emerge through comparative study, which appear to be the result of lapses of memory rather than being the outcome of improvisation. This is particularly evident in those cases where the counterpart to a particular term shows close phonetic similarity, but has a considerably different meaning.⁶⁶ Such errors can only occur in a tradition that aims at accurate memorization of texts.

While the early discourses themselves would not have been considered the proper place for personal creativity, such would have been possible in relation to the commentarial explanations that a reciter might give alongside the main text in an oral teaching situation. The giving of a commentary on the discourse would of course have been open to and influenced by personal notions and ideas. Once in the course of time such a commentary has become to some degree fixed and is passed on alongside the discourse, it is easy to see how such material could eventually become part of the discourse itself. This would explain how even substantial differences can come into being, such as the exposition on morality in the different versions of the *Brahmajāla*, namely as the result of the integration of commentarial material into the discourse.

Another aspect that clearly was open to some degree of creativity was the allocation of discourses to and within a particular collection. Thus relatively similar discourse parallels are

^{63.} As already pointed out by Allon 1997b: 366, "communal or group recitation or performance requires fixed wording. It is not possible for more than one individual to perform at the same time in the manner described by Parry and Lord without producing utter chaos, for in that method each individual creates his compositions anew each time he performs." Thus for the reciters of the *sūtras* to perform together in the way described in the *Vinaya* passage cited above in note 16 would not allow for personal improvisation.

^{64.} The presence of a rather substantial percentage of Brahmins among the Buddhist monastic community suggests itself from the surveys in Sarao 1989: 93–139, Chakravarti 1996: 198–220, and Nakamura 2000: 360–362.

^{65.} Cf., e.g., the study by Kabilsingh 1984.

^{66.} For examples cf. von Simson 1965: 136–138.

regularly found in substantially different positions in the same or even in different discourse collections. Just as the giving of a commentary, the grouping of discourses for memorization purposes was clearly open to personal preference.⁶⁷

In sum, a proper appreciation of the oral legacy of the early discourses needs to be based on contextualizing their transmission within the ancient Indian setting, taking into account the precedent set by Vedic reciters and the limitations faced by the early Buddhist reciters in their attempt to preserve sacred texts as accurately as possible. The resultant understanding of early Buddhist orality can accommodate even substantial variations between parallel versions, without needing to resort to foreign models based on improvisation. Such understanding in a way draws out the significance of the phrase found at the beginning of a discourse, which with the terms: "thus have I heard" signals that what follows is not the product of personal improvisation, but much rather results from an attempt to transmit a text as it has been heard.

Abbreviations

AN	<i>Aṅguttara-nikāya</i>
B ^c	Burmese edition
C ^c	Ceylonese edition
C	Cone edition
D	Derge edition
DĀ	<i>Dirgha-āgama</i>
DN	<i>Dīgha-nikāya</i>
E ^c	PTS edition
EĀ	<i>Ekottarika-āgama</i>
MĀ	<i>Madhyama-āgama</i>
MN	<i>Majjhima-nikāya</i>
N	Narhang edition
Ps	<i>Papañcasūdanī</i>
Q	Peking edition
S ^c	Siamese edition
SĀ	<i>Saṃyukta-āgama</i>
SN	<i>Saṃyutta-nikāya</i>
Sn	<i>Sutta-nipāta</i>
Sv	<i>Sumaṅgalavilāsinī</i>
T	Taishō edition
Th	<i>Theragāthā</i>
Up	<i>Abhidharmakośopāyikā-ṭīkā</i>
Vin	<i>Vinaya</i>

⁶⁷. A study of this phenomenon in the case of the *Brahmajāla* is at present under preparation.

References

- Allon, Mark 1997a: "The Oral Composition and Transmission of Early Buddhist Texts", in *Indian Insights: Buddhism, Brahmanism and Bhakti, Papers from the Annual Spalding Symposium on Indian Religions*, P. Connolly and S. Hamilton (ed.), 39–61, London: Luzac Oriental.
- Allon, Mark 1997b: *Style and Function: A Study of the Dominant Stylistic Features of the Prose Portions of Pāli Canonical Sutta Texts and their Mnemonic Function*, Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies.
- Anālayo 2009: "Views and the Tathāgata – A Comparative Study and Translation of the Brahmajāla in the Chinese Dīrgha-āgama", in *Buddhist and Pali Studies in Honour of the Venerable Professor Kakkapalliye Anuruddha*, K.L. Dhammajoti et al. (ed.), 183–234, Hong Kong: Centre of Buddhist Studies, University of Hong Kong.
- Anālayo 2010: "The Influence of Commentarial Exegesis on the Transmission of Āgama Literature", in *Translating Buddhist Chinese, Problems and Prospects*, K. Meisig (ed.), 1–20, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Anālayo 2011: *A Comparative Study of the Majjhima-nikāya*, Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation.
- Anālayo 2012: "The Historical Value of the Pāli Discourses", *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 55, 223–253.
- Anālayo 2014a: *The Dawn of Abhidharma*, Hamburg: Hamburg University Press (forthcoming).
- Anālayo 2014b: "Three Dīrgha-āgama Discourses Without Parallels", in *Research on the Dīrgha-āgama*, Dhammadinnā (ed.), Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation (forthcoming).
- Banerjee, Anukul Chandra 1977: *Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts in Sanskrit, Prātimokṣa Sūtra and Bhikṣu-karmavākya*, Calcutta: World Press.
- Bareau, André 1966: "L'origine du Dīrgha-Āgama traduit en chinois par Buddhayaśas", in *Essays Offered to G.H. Luce by his Colleagues and Friends in Honour of his Seventy-fifth Birthday*, B. Shin et al. (ed.), 49–58, Switzerland, Ascona: Artibus Asiae.
- Beal, S. 1884: *Buddhism in China*, London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
- Bongard-Levin, Grigorij Maksimovic et al. 1996: "The Nagaropamasūtra: An Apotropaic Text from the Saṃyuktāgama, A Transliteration, Reconstruction, and Translation of the Central Asian Sanskrit Manuscripts", in *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon, Folge 3*, 7–103, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Brough, John 1950: "Thus Have I Heard ...", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 13: 416–426.
- Brough, John 1962/2001: *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada, Edited with an Introduction and Commentary*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Burnouf, M.E. 1925 (vol. 1): *Le Lotus de la Bonne Loi, traduit du Sanskrit, accompagné d'un commentaire et de vingt et un mémoires relatifs au Bouddhisme*, Paris: Librairie Orientale et Américaine.
- Chakravarti, Uma 1996: *The Social Dimensions of Early Buddhism*, Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- Cousins, L.S. 1983: "Pali Oral Literature", in *Buddhist Studies: Ancient and Modern*, P. Denwood (ed.), 1–11, London: Curzon.
- Cousins, L.S. 2013: "The Early Development of Buddhist Literature and Language in India", *Journal of the Oxford Centre for Buddhist Studies*, 5: 89–135.
- Cowell, E.B., and R.A. Neil, 1886: *The Divyāvadāna, a Collection of Early Buddhist Legends, Now First Edited from the Nepalese Sanskrit Mss. in Cambridge and Paris*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Criegern, Oliver von 2002: *Das Kūtatāṇḍyasūtra, Nach dem Dīrghāgama Manuskript herausgegeben und übersetzt*, MA thesis, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München.
- Demiéville, Paul 1951: "A propos du concile de Vaiśālī", *T'oung Pao*, 40: 239–296.
- Duroiselle, Charles 1906/1997: *A Practical Grammar of the Pāli Language*, Buddha Dharma Education Association Inc.
- Endo, Toshiichi 2005: "The 'Aṭṭhakathā' as Source-Material of the Pāli Commentaries, An Inquiry into the Date of their Compilation", in *Dhamma-Vinaya, Essays in Honour of Venerable Professor Dhammavihari (Jotiya Dhirasekera)*, A. Tilakaratne et al. (ed.), 33–53, Colombo: Sri Lanka Association for Buddhist Studies (reprinted in Endo 2013: 15–32).
- Endo, Toshiichi 2009: "The Mahā-aṭṭhakathā-s, Some Observations on the Date of Their Compilation", in *Buddhist and Pali Studies in Honour of the Venerable Professor Kakkapalliye Anuruddha*, K.L. Dhammajoti et al. (ed.), 169–181, Hong Kong: Centre of Buddhist Studies, University of Hong Kong (reprinted in Endo 2013: 33–45).
- Endo, Tochiichi 2013: *Studies in Pāli Commentarial Literature, Sources, Controversies and Insights*, Hong Kong: Centre of Buddhist Studies, University of Hong Kong.
- Enomoto, Fumio 1986: "On the Formation of the Original Texts of the Chinese Āgamas", *Buddhist Studies Review*, 3.1: 19–30.
- Franke, R. Otto 1913: *Dīrghanikāya, Das Buch der langen Texte des buddhistischen Kanons, in Auswahl*

- übersetzt*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Fukita, Takamichi 2003: *The Mahāvādānasūtra: A New Edition Based on Manuscripts Discovered in Northern Turkestan*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Galloway, Brian 1991: "Thus Have I Heard: At One Time ...", *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 34: 87–104.
- Galloway, Brian 1997: "[Brief Communication] A Reply to Professor Mark Tatz", *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 40: 367–371.
- Gnoli, Raniero 1978 (vol. 2): *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu, Being the 17th and Last Section of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*, Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- Gombrich, Richard F. 1990: "How the Mahāyāna Began", *The Buddhist Forum*, 1: 21–30.
- Graham, William A. 1987: "Scripture", in *Encyclopedia of Religion*, M. Eliade (ed.), 133–145, New York: Macmillan.
- Hahn, Michael 1996: *Lehrbuch der klassischen tibetischen Schriftsprache, Siebte korrigierte Auflage*, Swisstal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica.
- Hahn, Michael 2006: "Miscellanea etymologica tibetica VII", in *Jaina-Itihāsa-Ratna, Festschrift für Gustav Roth zum 90. Geburtstag*, U. Hüsken et al. (ed.), 237–257, Marburg: Indica et Tibetica.
- Harrison, Paul 1990: *The Samādhi of Direct Encounter with the Buddhas of the Present, An Annotated English Translation of the Tibetan Version of the Pratyutpanna-Buddha-Saṃmukhāvasthita-Samādhi-Sūtra with Several Appendixes Relating to the History of the Text*, Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- Hinüber, Oskar von 1968: *Studien zur Kasussyntax des Pāli, besonders des Vinaya-Piṭaka*, München: Johannes Gutenberg Universität.
- Hinüber, Oskar von 1989: *Der Beginn der Schrift und Frühe Schriftlichkeit in Indien*, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Hinüber, Oskar von 1991: "Das buddhistische Recht und die Phonetik des Pāli, Ein Abschnitt aus der Samantapāsādikā über die Vermeidung von Aussprache Fehlern in kammavācās", *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik*, 13/14: 101–127.
- Hirakawa, Akira 1987: "Buddhist Literature: Survey of Texts", in *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, M. Eliade (ed.), 2: 509–529, New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Honjō, Yoshifumi 1984: *A Table of Āgama Citations in the Abhidharmakośa and the Abhidharmakośopāyikā*, Kyoto.
- Kabilsingh, Chatsumarn 1984: *A Comparative Study of Bhikkhunī Pāṭimokkha*, Delhi: Chaukhambha Orientalia.
- Kajiyama, Yuichi 1977: "Thus Spoke the Blessed One ...", in *Prajñāpāramitā and Related Systems: Studies in Honor of Edward Conze*, L. Lancaster and L.O. Gómez (ed.), 93–99, Berkeley: University of California.
- Karashima, Seishi 2006: "Underlying Languages of Early Chinese Translations of Buddhist Scriptures", in *Studies in Chinese Language and Culture: Festschrift in Honour of Christoph Harbsmeier on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*, C. Anderl and H. Eifring (ed.), 355–366, Oslo: Hermes.
- Klaus, Konrad 2007: "Zu der formelhaften Einleitung der buddhistischen Sūtras", in *Indica et Tibetica 65, Festschrift für Michael Hahn zum 65. Geburtstag von Freunden und Schülern überreicht*, K. Konrad and J. U. Hartmann (ed.), 309–322, Wien: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien.
- Lamotte, Étienne 1944/1981 (vol. 1): *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāsāstra)*, Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut Orientaliste.
- Lévi, Sylvain 1915: "Sur la Récitation Primitive des Textes Bouddhiques", *Journal Asiatique*, 11.5: 401–447.
- Lord, Albert B. 1960/2000: *The Singer of Tales, Second Edition*, S. Mitchell and G. Nagy (ed.), Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Lü, Cheng 1963: "Āgama", in *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, G.P. Malalasekera (ed.), 1.2: 241–244, Sri Lanka: Department of Buddhist Affairs.
- Mayeda, Egaku 1985: "Japanese Studies on the Schools of the Chinese Āgamas", in *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur, Erster Teil*, H. Bechert (ed.), 1: 94–103, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- McGovern, Nathan Michael 2013: *Buddhists, Brahmans, and Buddhist Brahmans: Negotiating Identities in Indian Antiquity*, PhD dissertation, Santa Barbara: University of California.
- Meisig, Konrad 1987: *Das Śrāmaṇyaphala-Sūtra: Synoptische Übersetzung und Glossar der chinesischen Fassungen verglichen mit dem Sanskrit und Pāli*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Nakamura, Hajime 2000 (vol. 1): *Gotama Buddha, A Biography Based on the Most Reliable Texts*, Tokyo: Kosei Publishing Co.
- Nattier, Jan 2003: *A Few Good Men: The Bodhisattva Path according to The Inquiry of Ugra (Ugrapariprocchā)*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Nattier, Jan 2013: "Now You Hear It, Now You Don't: The Phrase 'Thus Have I Heard' in Early Chinese Buddhist Translations", in *Buddhism Across Asia: The Role of Buddhism in Intra-Asian Interactions*, T. Sen (ed.), 39–64, Singapore: Institute of South-East Asian Studies.

- Norman, K.R. 1997: *A Philological Approach to Buddhism, The Bukkyō Dendō Kyōkai Lectures 1994*, London: School of Oriental and African Studies.
- Norman, K.R. and W. Pruitt 2001: *The Pātimokkha*, Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- Nyanaponika Thera and H. Hecker 1997: *Great Disciples of the Buddha, Their Lives, Their Works, Their Legacy*, Bhikkhu Bodhi (ed.), Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society.
- Oberlies, Thomas 2003: "Ein bibliographischer Überblick über die kanonischen Texte der Śrāvakayāna-Schulen des Buddhismus (ausgenommen der des Mahāvihāra-Theravāda)", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens*, 47: 37–84.
- Ong, Walter J. 1982/1996: *Orality & Literacy, The Technologizing of the Word*, London: Routledge.
- Pachow, W. 1955: *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa, on the Basis of its Chinese, Tibetan, Sanskrit and Pali Versions*, Santiniketan: Sino-Indian Cultural Society.
- Przyluski, Jean 1926: *Le concile de Rājagṛha, introduction a l'histoire des canons et des sectes bouddhiques*, Paris: Paul Geuthner.
- Qingzhi, Zhi 2010: "On Some Basic Features of Buddhist Chinese", *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 31.1/2: 485–504.
- Reat, Noble Ross 1996/1998: "The Historical Buddha and His Teachings", in *Encyclopaedia of Indian Philosophies, Vol. VII: Abhidharma Buddhism to 150 AD*, K.H. Potter et al. (ed.), 3–57, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Salomon, R. 2007: "Recent Discoveries of Early Buddhist Manuscripts and Their Implications for the History of Buddhist Texts and Canons", In *Between the Empires: Society in India 300 BCE to 400 CE*, P. Olivelle (ed.), 349–382, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Samtani, N.H. 1964: "The Opening of the Buddhist Sūtras", *Bhārati, Bulletin of the College of Indology*, 8.2: 47–63.
- Samtani, N.H. 1971: *The Arthaviniścaya-Sūtra & Its Commentary (Nibandhana), (Written by Bhikṣu Vīrya-śrīdatta of Śrī-Nālandāvihāra), Critically Edited and Annotated For the First Time With Introduction and Several Indices*, Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Sander, Lore 2007: "Preliminary Remarks on Two Versions of the Āṭānāṭīya (Āṭānāṭika)-Sūtra in Sanskrit", *Journal of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies*, 11: 159–196 (152–115).
- Sarao, K.T.S. 1989: *The Origin and Nature of Ancient Indian Buddhism*, Delhi: Eastern Book Linkers.
- Schmithausen, Lambert 1987: "Beiträge zur Schulzugehörigkeit und Textgeschichte kanonischer und post-kanonischer buddhistischer Materialien", in *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur, Zweiter Teil*, H. Bechert (ed.), 2: 304–403, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Schmithausen, Lambert 1991: *The Problem of the Sentience of Plants in Earliest Buddhism*, Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- Schopen, Gregory 1978: *The Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra and the Buddhism of Gilgit*, PhD thesis, Australian National University.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 1989: "A Note on the Opening Formula of Buddhist Sūtras", *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 12.1: 158–163.
- Simson, Georg von 1965: *Zur Diktion einiger Lehrtexte des buddhistischen Sanskritkanons*, München: J. Kitzinger.
- Simson, Georg von 2000: *Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins Teil II, Kritische Textausgabe, Übersetzung, Wortindex sowie Nachträge zu Teil I*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Skilling, Peter 1994 (vol. 1): *Mahāsūtras: Great Discourses of the Buddha*, Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- Speyer, J.S. 1909/1970 (vol. 2): *Avadānaçataka, A Century of Edifying Tales Belonging to the Hīnayāna*, Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag.
- Staël-Holstein, A. von 1933: *A Commentary to the Kāçyapaparivarta, Edited in Tibetan and in Chinese*, Peking: National Library of Peking and National Tsinghua University.
- Tatia, N. 1975: *Prātimokṣasūtram of the Lokottaravādimahāsāṅghika School*, Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Tatz, Mark 1993/1997: "Thus have I heard, At One Time", *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 40: 117–118.
- Tola, Fernando and C. Dragonetti 1999: "Ekaṃ Samayaṃ", *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 42: 53–55.
- Vetter, Tilmann 1993: "Compounds in the Prologue of the Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens*, 37: 45–92.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst 1926: *Bruchstücke des Bhikṣuṇī-Prātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins, Mit einer Darstellung der Überlieferung des Bhikṣuṇī-Prātimokṣa in den verschiedenen Schulen*, Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst 1951 (vol. 2): *Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra, Text in Sanskrit und Tibetisch, verglichen mit dem Pāli nebst einer Übersetzung der chinesischen Entsprechung im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins, auf Grund von Turfan-Handschriften herausgegeben und bearbeitet*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst 1980: "Central Asian Sūtra Fragments and their Relation to the Chinese Āgamas", in *The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition*, H. Bechert (ed.), 136–174, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck &

Ruprecht.

- Warder, A.K. 1963/1991: *Introduction to Pali*, Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- Wayman, Alex and Hideko 1974: *The Lion's Roar of Queen Śrīmālā, A Buddhist Scripture on the Tathāgatagarbha Theory*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Weller, Friedrich 1934: *Brahmajālasūtra, Tibetischer und Mongolischer Text*, Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Weller, Friedrich 1935: "Das tibetische Brahmajālasūtra", *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik*, 10: 1–61.
- Weller, Friedrich 1971: "Das Brahmajālasūtra des chinesischen Dīrghāgama", *Asiatische Studien*, 25: 202–264.
- Wijesekera, O.H. de A. 1936/1996: *Syntax of the Cases in the Pāli Nikāyas*, Colombo: Postgraduate Institute of Pali and Buddhist Studies, University of Kelaniya.
- Willems, Charles 2008: "Kumārajīva's 'Explanatory Discourse' about Abhidharmic Literature", *Journal of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies*, 12: 37–83 (156–110).
- Wynne, Alexander 2004: "The Oral Transmission of Early Buddhist Literature", *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 27.1: 97–127.