

## Comparative Notes on the *Madhyama-āgama* Anālayo

### Abstract:

The present paper offers a survey of some features of the *Madhyama-āgama*, based on a comparison with its extant parallels. After taking up matters related to the structure of the *Madhyama-āgama* collection, selected passages from *Madhyama-āgama* discourses will be examined in order to show the importance of placing the different versions of a discourse, preserved in Chinese and Pāli (and at times also in Sanskrit or Tibetan) side by side, in order to ascertain the implications of certain passages and to avoid being misled by transmission or translation errors.

According to the information that has come down to us, the *Madhyama-āgama* collection was translated towards the end of the fourth century into Chinese under the leadership of the Kashmirian monk Gautama Saṅghadeva. The translation was based on a written Indic original read aloud by Saṅgharakṣa, another Kashmirian monk, and was transcribed by the monk Dào-cí, 道慈, with the assistance of Lǐ-bǎo and Kāng-huà, 李寶 and 康化.<sup>1</sup> The Indian original used for this translation appears to have been in a Prākṛit,<sup>2</sup> and with considerable probability stems from a Sarvāstivāda tradition.<sup>3</sup>

The *Madhyama-āgama* collection contains altogether two-hundred-and-twenty-two discourses, which are assigned to eighteen chapters. Each of these chapters contains a minimum of ten discourses, though a few chapters have considerably more. Its Pāli counterpart, the *Majjhima-nikāya*, contains one-hundred-fifty-two discourses in fifteen chapters, arranged into fourteen chapters with ten discourses each and one chapter with twelve discourses. Hence, in spite of some variations the principle of ten discourses per chapter could be an original characteristic of both collections, a grouping principle that is in fact recurrent in Buddhist literature.

---

<sup>1</sup> T I 809b26: 請罽賓沙門僧伽羅叉令誦胡本, 請僧伽提和轉胡爲晉, 豫州沙門道慈筆受, 吳國李寶, 康化共書 (with a 聖 variant reading for the last as 唐化).

<sup>2</sup> On the language of the *Madhyama-āgama* manuscript cf. Bapat 1969: 5; Enomoto 1986: 20 and von Hinüber 1982: 250.

<sup>3</sup> On the school affiliation of the *Madhyama-āgama* cf. Mayeda 1985: 98 and Minh Chau 1991: 27. Enomoto 1984: 198 explains that the *Madhyama-āgama* translated into Chinese probably represents the earliest of three versions of this collection, the second of the three being the version preserved in some of the Central Asian Sanskrit fragments and the third version being what is found in *sūtra* quotations in later works.

Regarding the chapter division in the two collections, four chapters in the *Madhyama-āgama* and the *Majjhima-nikāya* share the same headings and also have several discourses in common. These are the chapters on kings, on Brahmins, on expositions (*vibhaṅga*), and on pairs; chapters that occur, however, at different places in the two collections.<sup>4</sup> Two Chinese discourses from the chapter on kings; four Chinese discourses from the chapter on Brahmins and from the chapter on pairs; and nine Chinese discourses from the chapter on expositions have a parallel in their Pāli equivalent chapter.

Figure 1:  
Discourse parallels in similarly entitled *Madhyama-āgama* and *Majjhima-nikāya* chapters

Chapters:	王相應品	梵志品	根本分別品	雙品
Discourses:	MĀ 63 / MN 81 MĀ 67 / MN 83	MĀ 150 / MN 96 MĀ 151 / MN 93 MĀ 152 / MN 99 MĀ 161 / MN 91	MĀ 162 / MN 140 MĀ 163 / MN 137 MĀ 164 / MN 138 MĀ 165 / MN 133 MĀ 166 / MN 134 MĀ 167 / MN 132 MĀ 169 / MN 139 MĀ 170 / MN 135 MĀ 171 / MN 136	MĀ 182 / MN 39 MĀ 183 / MN 40 MĀ 184 / MN 32 MĀ 185 / MN 31

During the progress of my research, it has been possible to update the identification of parallels between *Madhyama-āgama* and *Majjhima-nikāya* discourses noted in Akanuma 1990. I differ from Akanuma in regard to MĀ 28; MĀ 86; MĀ 106 and MĀ 168. Akanuma 1990: 171 lists MĀ 28 as a parallel to MN 143. But MĀ 28 agrees with SN 55.26 at SN V 380 as regards Sāriputta's instructions to Anāthapiṇḍika, and in having Anāthapiṇḍika recover, while in MN 143 he passes away and the instructions he receives are also different. Hence, MĀ 28 is better reckoned a parallel to SN 55.26. Akanuma 1990: 171 lists MĀ 86 as a parallel to MN 148. In MĀ 86, Ānanda asks the Buddha how to instruct a group of young monks. The Buddha responds by discussing the five aggregates, the six senses, dependent origination, the four establishings of mindfulness, the four right efforts, the four ways to power and a whole range of other topics. In contrast, in

<sup>4</sup> The 6<sup>th</sup> chapter in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the chapter on sayings "connected with kings" (王相應品), has a counterpart in the 9<sup>th</sup> chapter in the *Majjhima-nikāya*, the *Rāja-vagga*. The 12<sup>th</sup> chapter in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the chapter on "Brahmins" (梵志品), has its counterpart in the *Brāhmaṇa-vagga*, the 10<sup>th</sup> chapter in the *Majjhima-nikāya*. The 13<sup>th</sup> chapter in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the chapter on "expositions" (根本分別品) has its counterpart in the *Vibhaṅga-vagga*, the 14<sup>th</sup> chapter in the *Majjhima-nikāya*. The 15<sup>th</sup> chapter in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the chapter on "pairs" (雙品), has a counterpart in the *Mahāyamaka-vagga*, the 4<sup>th</sup> chapter in the *Majjhima-nikāya*. Cf. also Yin-shùn 1983: 707.

MN 148 Ānanda does not occur at all and the topic of the discourse are only the six senses. Thus, MĀ 86 and MN 148 differ to such a degree that they cannot be reckoned parallels. Akanuma 1990: 169 lists MĀ 168 as a parallel to MN 120. Yet, closer examination shows that the two discourses differ considerably from each other, as MN 120 describes how a mental aspiration can lead to various rebirths, while MĀ 168 describes how jhāna practice leads to the Brahmā worlds. This makes it improbable that the two discourses stem from the same original and can be reckoned as proper 'parallels', as in spite of similarity of topic they seem to go back to different occasions. The same applies also to MĀ 106 (and T 56), which Akanuma 1990: 163 lists as parallels to MN 1. Closer inspection shows that whereas MN 1 discusses worldling, disciple in higher training, *arahant*, and *tathāgata*, MĀ 106 and T 56 discuss two types of recluses/Brahmins and the Buddha. They name a different location for the discourse and differ from MN 1 in not discussing *Nibbāna*, and in not concluding with the monks failing to delight in the exposition. In contrast, EĀ 44.6 agrees with MN 1 on the above points. Therefore, MĀ 106 and T 56 also do not seem to qualify for being parallels in the proper sense. Thus, I would conclude MĀ 28 and MĀ 86 are definitely not parallels to *Majjhima-nikāya* discourses; and in the case of MĀ 106 and MĀ 168 I have strong doubts if these should be reckoned as 'parallels'. In addition to the parallels recognized by Akanuma, MĀ 29 is a parallel to MN 9,<sup>5</sup> and MĀ 208 is a parallel to MN 79.

Thus, according to my reckoning ninety-five *Majjhima-nikāya* discourses have counterparts in the *Madhyama-āgama*, which, as two *Madhyama-āgama* discourses are counterparts to a single *Majjhima-nikāya* discourse,<sup>6</sup> count up to ninety-six discourses. These parallels are arranged in the two collections in rather different ways. This difference in arrangement can best be illustrated by placing the *Majjhima-nikāya* discourses in the order their parallels occupy in the *Madhyama-āgama*, as done in figure 2. Even a cursory glance at figure 2 shows the extent to which the arrangement of discourses differs in the two collections. These differences support the impression that the location of the discourses was the outcome of a process specific to each of the two collections, though the similarities exhibited in figure 1 could be the remnants of a common starting-point.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>5</sup> See Yin-shun 1983: 709.

<sup>6</sup> MĀ 107 and MĀ 108 are both parallels to MN 17.

<sup>7</sup> In a similar vein, in regard to the *Samyutta-nikāya* and *Samyukta-āgama* collections Glass 2006: 6 comes to the conclusion that while the "shared principle of arrangement is likely to be very old, important differences between the content and arrangement of the extant versions show that they followed separate developments". Norman 1992: 40 explains that "the sects ... had the same names for the groups of texts, but were not ... in general agreement about their contents, or the order of the contents".

Figure 2:  
*Majjhima-nikāya* discourses arranged in the sequence of their *Madhyama-āgama* parallels

MĀ chapters:	MN discourses:										
1 <sup>st</sup> chapter	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24 <sup>th</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	
2 <sup>nd</sup> chapter	-	-	-	61 <sup>st</sup>	-	-	-	-	101 <sup>st</sup>	-	
3 <sup>rd</sup> chapter	-	-	-	-	-	69 <sup>th</sup>	97 <sup>th</sup>	-	9 <sup>th</sup>	28 <sup>th</sup>	141 <sup>st</sup>
4 <sup>th</sup> chapter	123 <sup>rd</sup>	-	124 <sup>th</sup>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5 <sup>th</sup> chapter	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
6 <sup>th</sup> chapter	-	-	-	-	-	81 <sup>st</sup>	130 <sup>th</sup>	-	-	83 <sup>rd</sup>	
7 <sup>th</sup> chapter	128 <sup>th</sup>	-	-	106 <sup>th</sup>	-	68 <sup>th</sup>	49 <sup>th</sup>	127 <sup>th</sup>	-	119 <sup>th</sup>	113 <sup>th</sup>
8 <sup>th</sup> chapter	5 <sup>th</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>	15 <sup>th</sup>	-	8 <sup>th</sup>	-	7 <sup>th</sup>	-	-	-	
9 <sup>th</sup> chapter	-	10 <sup>th</sup>	13 <sup>th</sup>	14 <sup>th</sup>	20 <sup>th</sup>	19 <sup>th</sup>	11 <sup>th</sup>	-	6 <sup>th</sup>	-	
10 <sup>th</sup> chapter	17 <sup>th</sup>	17 <sup>th</sup>	-	-	-	-	-	-	18 <sup>th</sup>	-	
11 <sup>th</sup> chapter	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
11 <sup>th</sup> chapter	-	50 <sup>th</sup>	82 <sup>nd</sup>	56 <sup>th</sup>	-	-	-	-	-	-	
12 <sup>th</sup> chapter	-	-	107 <sup>th</sup>	108 <sup>th</sup>	27 <sup>th</sup>	-	-	-	96 <sup>th</sup>	93 <sup>rd</sup>	
12 <sup>th</sup> chapter	99 <sup>th</sup>	75 <sup>th</sup>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	91 <sup>st</sup>	
13 <sup>th</sup> chapter	140 <sup>th</sup>	137 <sup>th</sup>	138 <sup>th</sup>	133 <sup>rd</sup>	134 <sup>th</sup>	132 <sup>nd</sup>	-	139 <sup>th</sup>	135 <sup>th</sup>	136 <sup>th</sup>	
14 <sup>th</sup> chapter	-	126 <sup>th</sup>	45 <sup>th</sup>	46 <sup>th</sup>	-	-	25 <sup>th</sup>	78 <sup>th</sup>	142 <sup>nd</sup>	115 <sup>th</sup>	
15 <sup>th</sup> chapter	39 <sup>th</sup>	40 <sup>th</sup>	32 <sup>nd</sup>	31 <sup>st</sup>	47 <sup>th</sup>	112 <sup>th</sup>	-	117 <sup>th</sup>	121 <sup>st</sup>	122 <sup>nd</sup>	
16 <sup>th</sup> chapter	66 <sup>th</sup>	21 <sup>st</sup>	65 <sup>th</sup>	70 <sup>th</sup>	104 <sup>th</sup>	-	125 <sup>th</sup>	129 <sup>th</sup>	22 <sup>nd</sup>	38 <sup>th</sup>	
17 <sup>th</sup> chapter	-	54 <sup>th</sup>	26 <sup>th</sup>	64 <sup>th</sup>	16 <sup>th</sup>	77 <sup>th</sup>	79 <sup>th</sup>	80 <sup>th</sup>	44 <sup>th</sup>	43 <sup>rd</sup>	
18 <sup>th</sup> chapter	90 <sup>th</sup>	89 <sup>th</sup>	88 <sup>th</sup>	-	87 <sup>th</sup>	52 <sup>nd</sup>	-	-	-	63 <sup>rd</sup>	

A structural similarity can be found in the cross-tradition relationship between the middle collections and the numerical collections. The percentage of *Āṅguttara-nikāya* parallels to *Madhyama-āgama* discourses is almost the same as the percentage of *Ekottarika-āgama* parallels to *Majjhima-nikāya* discourses.<sup>8</sup>

Another pattern of similarity can be found in relation to the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Dīrgha-āgama* collection, preserved in Sanskrit fragments, as the number of parallels to *Majjhima-nikāya* discourses found in this *Dīrgha-āgama* collection corresponds to the number of parallels to *Dīrgha-nikāya* discourses found in the *Madhyama-āgama*, both being ten, as can be seen in figure 3 below.<sup>9</sup> In spite of this parallelism, a closer look at figure 3 shows that the actual order in which these parallels occur in both cases does not seem to follow a specific pattern, nor do these two sets of ten parallels appear to be related to each other.

<sup>8</sup> A survey of the parallels noted by Akanuma 1990: 7-25 suggests that about 37% of the discourses in the *Madhyama-āgama* collection have a parallel in the *Āṅguttara-nikāya*; while about 35% of the discourses found in the *Majjhima-nikāya* have a partial or a full parallel in the *Ekottarika-āgama* (the second figure is based on my own research into *Majjhima-nikāya* parallels).

<sup>9</sup> Of these ten *Dīrgha-āgama* discourses, eight do not appear to have a parallel in any of the four Chinese *Āgamas*. Only DĀ<sup>2</sup> 11 has an *Āgama* parallel, which is EĀ 31.1; while DĀ<sup>2</sup> 12 has a parallel in an individual translation outside of the *Āgamas*, T 757.

Figure 3:<sup>10</sup>Parallels to DN discourses found in MĀ and parallels to DĀ<sup>2</sup> discourses found in MN

<i>Dīgha-nikāya</i>	<i>Madhyama-āgama</i>	Skt. <i>Dīrgha-āgama</i>	<i>Majjhima-nikāya</i>
DN 15	MĀ 97	DĀ <sup>2</sup> 7	MN 60 <sup>11</sup>
DN 17	MĀ 68	DĀ <sup>2</sup> 10	MN 105
DN 21	MĀ 134	DĀ <sup>2</sup> 11	MN 4
DN 22	MĀ 98	DĀ <sup>2</sup> 12	MN 12
DN 23	MĀ 71	DĀ <sup>2</sup> 17	MN 102
DN 25	MĀ 104	DĀ <sup>2</sup> 19	MN 95
DN 26	MĀ 70	DĀ <sup>2</sup> 20	MN 36
DN 27	MĀ 154	DĀ <sup>2</sup> 21	MN 85
DN 30	MĀ 59	DĀ <sup>2</sup> 22	MN 100
DN 31	MĀ 135	DĀ <sup>2</sup> 43	MN 55

To sum up, the patterns of similarity that can be discerned are:

1) The percentage of *Madhyama-āgama* parallels in the *Āṅguttara-nikāya* mirrors the percentage of *Majjhima-nikāya* parallels found in the *Ekottarika-āgama*.

$$M\bar{A} \Leftrightarrow AN \approx MN \Leftrightarrow E\bar{A}$$

2) The number of *Madhyama-āgama* parallels in the *Dīgha-nikāya* is the same as the number of *Majjhima-nikāya* parallels in the Sanskrit *Dīrgha-āgama* collection.

$$M\bar{A} \Leftrightarrow DN = MN \Leftrightarrow D\bar{A}^2$$

While it cannot be excluded that such similarities are a product of chance, they are striking enough and one would not expect to come across such similarities unless the basic four-fold division into four *Nikāyas* or *Āgamas* stems from a common source.<sup>12</sup>

The supposition that the *Madhyama-āgama* and the *Majjhima-nikāya* stem from a common starting point is also a prominent impression to be gained when individual discourses in these two collections are compared to each other. It is

<sup>10</sup> The second part of this table has been adopted from Hartmann 2004: 126-127.

<sup>11</sup> Hartmann 2000: 365 note 20 indicates that this identification still needs to be corroborated.

<sup>12</sup> While Bechert 1991: 9 believes that "the compilations available to us hardly go back to any 'Ur-Āgamas', but originated as the result of local applications of the same principles of organisation", suggesting that the similarities among the extant collections then "lead to the erroneous assumption that there might have been an original form of the corpus as a whole"; Norman 1989: 33 suggests that "probably ... from the earliest period of Buddhism the collection of sermons was made on the basis" of these four basic groups, which "was probably the beginning of the system of *bhāṇakas* ('reciters'), who shared out the recitation of the various sections of the Buddha's teaching among themselves". Prasad 1985: 137 comments on the arrangement of discourses in the canons of various schools that "the criteria for such distribution were clear but the discourses are by nature such that they satisfy more than a single criteria. In [the] course of time the position of those discourses ... changed in different schools".

quite amazing to find that the version of a discourse recited and written down perhaps four centuries after the Buddha's passing away by Sri Lankan monks can be so closely similar,<sup>13</sup> even in small circumstantial details, to a discourse handed down by a different Buddhist school and translated another four centuries later into Chinese. At times, such similarities even involve sharing the same mistakes. Yet, at the same time there are undeniably quite a number of differences and variations, as is only to be expected of orally transmitted material.

Another striking impression that can be gained from a comparative study of the *Madhyama-āgama* is the relatively high quality of its translation. Though this translation still falls into the early phase of translation activity in China, on reading this collection one gets the strong impression that the team around Saṅghadeva knew what they were doing and endeavoured to render the Indic text at their disposal to the best of their abilities. Thus, the *Madhyama-āgama* collection is certainly a good instance to corroborate the statement made Lancaster (1979: 224) that "in the Chinese canon we have an invaluable source of evidence ... with some assurance that those translators knew their craft and practiced it with vigour and accuracy". Thus, as de Jong (1968: 15) points out, "no student of Buddhism, even if he is interested only in Indian Buddhism, can neglect the enormous corpus of Chinese translations".

Nevertheless, translation errors inevitably occurred, and a description of what appear to be such errors, together with what may be transmission errors that affected either the Chinese version or its Pāli parallel, will be the theme of the remainder of my presentation.

The first example I would like to take up stems from the 羅云經, the 14<sup>th</sup> discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama*. This discourse records an instruction given by the Buddha to his son. As part of this instruction, the Buddha tells his son that he should refrain from a bodily action that is "pure"<sup>14</sup> and at the same time unwholesome and results in affliction; whereas a bodily action that is "not pure" but at the same time is wholesome and does not result in suffering can be undertaken.

- 1) 「彼身業淨。或自爲。或爲他。不善與苦果受於苦報」<sup>15</sup>  
 「彼身業不淨。或自爲。或爲他。善與樂果受於樂報」<sup>16</sup>

This presentation is surprising, since to qualify an action as wholesome and at the same time as impure seems contradictory. Minh Chau (1991: 34 and 132)

<sup>13</sup> Regarding the date of the Buddha's passing away, the research collected in Bechert 1995 suggests a reasonable date to be approximately 400 B.C. (allowing a latitude of +/- twenty years).

<sup>14</sup> Lévi 1896: 480 renders 淨 in the present context as "pur".

<sup>15</sup> MĀ 14 at T I 436c11.

<sup>16</sup> MĀ 14 at T I 436c14.

suggests that the character 淨 in this context could refer to actions that are "permissible" according to the monastic code of discipline but have unwholesome results, as opposed to actions that are not permissible but that have wholesome results. He then concludes that this instruction allows a more liberal attitude towards the interpretation of monastic regulations. Minh Chau's reasonable attempt to make sense out of this passage by assuming that 淨 may have a meaning different from its more usual meaning of "purity" receives support from the Chinese-Sanskrit dictionary compiled by Hirakawa (1997: 728), who in addition to *śuddha*, *śuddhi*, *pariśuddhi*, *viśuddhi*, *pariśodhayati*, *śubha*, *vyavadāna*, *prasanna*, *vimāla* also lists *kalpika*, "proper", and *kalpa*, "proper, practicable, feasible, possible", as equivalents for 淨. A problem with Minh Chau's interpretation, however, is that according to the instruction for a past bodily action in the 羅云經 a "permissible" (淨) bodily deed should be confessed, while a "not permissible" (不淨) bodily deed leads to the arising of joy.<sup>17</sup> This statement makes no sense, since for a "permissible" bodily deed there would be no need for confession. In fact, the idea to give precedence to other's welfare over the requirements of moral conduct belongs to a later phase of Buddhist thought and does not yet seem to be found in the early discourses.

The 羅云經 of the *Madhyama-āgama* has a parallel in the *Ambalaṭṭhikārahulovāda-sutta* of the *Majjhima-nikāya*. The corresponding passage in the Pāli version reads differently, since it does not envisage that a bodily action could be pure and unwholesome at the same time, but simply classifies such an unwholesome bodily deed as a deed that results in affliction.<sup>18</sup> The same is also the case for another parallel to the 羅云經 found in the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Vinayavibhaṅga*, preserved in Chinese and Tibetan.<sup>19</sup> A *sūtra* quotation from the present discourse in the *Vyākhyāyukti-ṭīkā*, preserved in Tibetan,<sup>20</sup> and a paraphrase of the present passage in the *Śrāvakabhūmi*, agree with the Pāli discourse and the *Vinayavibhaṅga* version that the present instructions are to refrain from a bodily deed that is harmful and unwholesome,<sup>21</sup> without envisaging that such a deed could be reckoned as pure.

In fact, if the instruction to Rāhula had offered such an ambivalent instruction, one would not expect it to feature among King Aśoka's explicit recommendations, a choice that might well be due to the straightforward and practical ethical instruc-

<sup>17</sup> MĀ 14 at T I 436c27.

<sup>18</sup> MN 61 at MN I 415,29: *akusalaṃ idaṃ kāyakammaṃ dukkhudrayaṃ dukkhavipākaṃ*.

<sup>19</sup> T 1442 at T XXIII 761a11: 是不善事, 是苦惡業, 能於未來感苦異熟. D 'dul ba cha 217a56 or Q je 201a6: *bdag dang gzhan la gnod par 'gyur ba mi dge ba (D: ba'i) sdug bsngal 'byung ba rnam par smin pa sdug bsngal ba*.

<sup>20</sup> Q *sems tsam i* 71a5: *gnod pa dang ldan pa mi dge ba sdug bsngal 'byung ba dang*.

<sup>21</sup> T 1579 at T XXX 405b5: 自損及以損他是不善, or Shukla 1973: 55,16: *vyābhādhikaṃ ... ātmano vā parasya vā akusalaṃ*.

tion given in this discourse.<sup>22</sup> A king would quite probably not recommend a discourse that enjoins doing what is not permitted because one believes it to be wholesome. Thus, it seems that this part of the *Madhyama-āgama* version might have suffered from a translation error. Such an error could have occurred due to misinterpreting a *sandhi* in the Indic original to imply that a particular word has, or else does not have, the negative prefix *a-*. A similar error can be found in the 194<sup>th</sup> discourse of the *Madhyama-āgama*,<sup>23</sup> and Karashima (1992: 263) notes the occurrence of this type of error in Dharmarakṣa's translation of the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra*, confirming that such mistakes did take place.

The next example is related to the translation terminology employed in the *Madhyama-āgama*, taken from the 25<sup>th</sup> discourse, the 水喻經. This discourse refers to a forest dweller, *araññaka/araṇyaka*, in a way that seems to be quite unique in the *Madhyama-āgama* collection, namely as, 阿練若,<sup>24</sup> instead of the more usual rendering of the same as "no thing", 無事.<sup>25</sup> This variation from the usual *Madhyama-āgama* translation vocabulary is interesting in so far as the transcription 阿練若 occurs with considerable frequency in the *Ekottarika-āgama*.<sup>26</sup> This detail thus could be of relevance to the relationship between the translations of these two discourse collections. The identity of the translator of the *Ekottarika-āgama* is not an unequivocal matter, since it is not entirely clear if the translation now extant in Chinese has only been revised by Gautama Saṅghadeva, or whether it is an actual retranslation undertaken by him, a retranslation that then replaced Dharmānandī's earlier translation.<sup>27</sup>

A problem with this suggestion is that in general the translation terminology in these two collections differs considerably, and that to such an extent that makes it difficult to assume how the two collections could have been translated under the same person.

It is also not clear on what Gautama Saṅghadeva would have based such a

<sup>22</sup> This recommendation refers to the *Lāghulovāda*, "spoken by the Blessed One, the Buddha, concerning falsehood", *musā vādaṃ adhigichya bhagavatā budhena bhāsita*, cf. Hultsch 1925: 173.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. below quote number 13 (MĀ 194).

<sup>24</sup> MĀ 25 at T I 454a19.

<sup>25</sup> Noted by Minh Chau 1991: 327 as the standard *Madhyama-āgama* rendering for *arañña*.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. e.g. EĀ 12.5 at T II 569c14; EĀ 12.6 at T II 570a25; EĀ 13.1 at T II 571b2; EĀ 25.6 at T II 633b16; EĀ 37.3 at T II 711a8; EĀ 38.6 at T II 721a1; EĀ 39.10 at T II 734a9; EĀ 49.2 at T II 795a26.

<sup>27</sup> The 出三藏記集, T 2145 at T LV 71b29; the 眾經目錄, T 2146 at T LV 127c29; the 大周刊定眾經目錄, T 2153 at T LV 422b6; and the 開元釋教錄, T 2154 at T LV 511b15, attribute the *Ekottarika-āgama* translation to Dharmānandī; while according to the 歷代三寶紀, T 2034 at T XLIX 70c5, Gautama Saṅghadeva retranslated the *Ekottarika-āgama*; cf. also Anālayo 2006; Bagchi 1927: 159 and 337; Enomoto 1986: 19; Lamotte 1967: 105; Lü 1963: 242; Mayeda 1985: 102; Waldschmidt 1980: 169 note 168; and Yin-shun 1983: 93.

retranslation, since whereas in the case of the *Madhyama-āgama* his translation was based on a written original, Dharmanandī translated the *Ekottarika-āgama* based on an original he had memorized,<sup>28</sup> and there is no indication that Gautama Saṅghadeva had also memorized this collection or had otherwise access to an original corresponding to what Dharmanandī had committed to memory.

Nevertheless, the occurrence of the term 阿練若 in the *Madhyama-āgama* points to some form of relationship between the translation of these two collections, in fact we know that Dharmanandī had earlier also translated a *Madhyama-āgama* into Chinese, though it seems that this translation was subsequently lost. The present finding thus leaves open the possibility, suggested by Lü (1963: 242), that some of the renderings employed by Dharmanandī in his earlier *Madhyama-āgama* translation were re-employed in Saṅghadeva's *Madhyama-āgama* translation.

The next example I would like to take up appears to be a simple translation error, found in the 26<sup>th</sup> discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 瞿尼師經. In a description of proper behaviour for monks in regard to seats, this discourse instructs that one should not encroach on elder monks and younger monks should not be "scolded", 訶.

2) 「當學知坐取善坐也。不逼長老坐。爲小比丘訶」<sup>29</sup>

That when taking a seat one should not incommode elder monks is certainly reasonable, but why there should be any scolding of younger monks is less easy to understand. According to the Pāli parallel, the *Gulissāni-sutta*, the instruction in the present case it to not "keep off" young monks from their seats, *nave ca bhikkhū na āsanena paṭibāhissāmi*.<sup>30</sup> This suggests the possibility of a translation error, which could have happened due to mistaking *paṭibāhati/pratibādhatē*, "to keep off", for *paṭibhāsati/pratibhāṣate*, "to retaliate".

The next discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 梵志陀然經, describes a visit paid by Sāriputta to a Brahmin. According to the *Madhyama-āgama* discourse, when Sāriputta arrived he found that this Brahmin was outside of his house by the side of a spring and was "inflicting pain on the resident people".

3) 「梵志陀然從其家出。至泉水邊苦治居民」<sup>31</sup>

In this case, too, a translation error appears to have happened. According to the

<sup>28</sup> T 2145 at T LV 10b25.

<sup>29</sup> MĀ 26 at T I 455c6.

<sup>30</sup> MN 69 at MN I 469,18.

<sup>31</sup> MĀ 27 at T I 456c9.

Pāli parallel, the *Dhānañjāni-sutta*, when Sāriputta arrived this Brahmin was at his cowshed getting his cows milked, *gāvo goṭṭhe dohāpeti*.<sup>32</sup> The idea of "inflicting pain", 苦治, could to be due to a mistaking of √*duh*, "to milk", for √*dru*, "to harm" or "to hurt". The occurrence of "resident people", 居民, is less easily explainable, though perhaps the idea that someone is being harmed or hurt might have led to a misinterpretation of *goṭṭha/goṣṭha*, "cow-pen", for *gotta/gotra*, "clan". Alternatively, the reference to the "resident people" could be a gloss introduced by the translator.

A mistaking of √*duh* for √*dru* could occur more easily in a Prākṛit in which, like in Pāli, the two forms are not distinguishable by the occurrence of an *r* in the latter, whereas such a mistaking would seem less probable in Sanskrit. Thus, this translation error would support the assumption that the original used for translating the *Madhyama-āgama* was in a Prākṛit.

These few examples already show the importance of studying the early discourses in conjunction, in the sense of reading the different versions available alongside each other. This is certainly the case in both ways, that is, not only does a reading of a *Madhyama-āgama* discourse benefit from examining its Pāli parallel, but similarly a reading of a Pāli discourse benefits from an examination of its Chinese counterpart.<sup>33</sup> This is because errors are not only to due translation, but can also be the outcome of lapses of memory during oral transmission. An example for this potential can be found in the 63<sup>rd</sup> discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 鞞婆陵耆經. This discourse describes a situation where the former Buddha Kassapa sent some of his monks to the house of one of his supporters in order to procure grass for thatching his roof. When the monks arrive, the supporter himself was out and only his blind parents were at home. The *Madhyama-āgama* version reports that the blind parents asked who had come, and the monks replied by explaining who they are.

4) 「父母 ... 聞已。問曰。誰 ... 耶。比丘答曰。長老。我等是 ... 比丘」<sup>34</sup>

The Pāli version of this exchange differs in so far as it reports that the monks addressed the blind parents with the word "sister", *bhagini*.<sup>35</sup> According to the *Madhyama-āgama* version, however, they instead used the address 長老, corresponding to *āyasmant/āyuśmant*, a respectful form of address regularly used to refer to monks, but also appropriate towards elders in general. In a patriarchal society like ancient India, where the wife played a subordinate role comparable to

<sup>32</sup> MN 97 at MN II 186,2 (B<sup>e</sup>-MN II 396 and S<sup>e</sup>-MN II 624 read *dūhāpeti*).

<sup>33</sup> A survey of examples for this potential of the Chinese *Āgamas* can be found in Anālayo 2005.

<sup>34</sup> MĀ 63 at T I 502b24.

<sup>35</sup> MN 81 at MN II 53,25.

a servant,<sup>36</sup> one would not expect that monks who speak to a couple would only address the woman, so that the form of address given in the *Madhyama-āgama* is clearly the preferable reading.

My next example is from the 78<sup>th</sup> discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 梵天請佛經, and its parallel in the *Brahmanimantaṇṇika-sutta*. This discourse describes an encounter between the Buddha and a conceited Brahmā, who mistakenly thought himself to be eternal. In order to dispel this deluded assumption of Brahmā, the Buddha pointed out that he knew where Brahmā had come from and where Brahmā was going to, thereby showing that Brahmā's present existence was far from being eternal.

5) 「梵天。我知汝所從來處·所往至處」<sup>37</sup>

In the *Brahmanimantaṇṇika-sutta*, however, the Buddha told Brahmā that he knew Brahmā's destiny and "splendour", *te ahaṃ, Brahme, gatiṅca pajānāmi jutiṅca pajānāmi*.<sup>38</sup> The occurrence of *juti*, "splendour", is puzzling, since though the Buddha would know all about Brahmā, and therewith also all that is to be known about Brahmā's splendour, to display such knowledge would not be as effective a challenge to Brahmā's belief in being eternal as the *Madhyama-āgama* version's proposal that the Buddha knew where Brahmā was going to. Knowledge of where Brahmā was going to would indeed undermine Brahmā's belief in being eternal, whereas knowledge of Brahmā's splendour would not seem to be so pertinent to the point at stake in the present context.

The *Madhyama-āgama* version receives support from a variant reading found in the PTS and the Sinhalese edition, which reads *cuti*, "passing away".<sup>39</sup> In view of the context this appears to be the preferable reading. In this way, the *Madhyama-āgama* version helps us to decide in favour of a reading found only as a variant in the Pāli editions.

An aspect of the early discourses that shows considerable variations between different versions of the same discourse is the title. This is not only the case for versions from different reciter traditions, since even between Pāli editions of the

<sup>36</sup> Von Hinüber 1993: 102 draws attention to Vin IV 21,3, where a mother-in-law addresses her daughter-in-law with *je*, an address elsewhere used to address a female slave, cf. e.g. MN 21 at MN I 125,18. This form of address reflects the low social position of a daughter-in-law in the household of her in-laws. Horner 1990: 1 explains that in ancient India a married women's "life was spent in complete subservience to her husband and his parents. She was allowed little authority at home and no part in public activities."

<sup>37</sup> MĀ 78 at T I 548a8.

<sup>38</sup> MN 49 at MN I 328,25.

<sup>39</sup> PTS edition at MN I 557 and C<sup>e</sup>-MN I 768 note 5; cf. also Horner 1967: 391 note 5, who comments that *juti* "seems to be faulty for *cuti*".

same discourse a considerable degree of variation can be found in regard to titles. In the *Majjhima-nikāya* collection, for example, more than ten discourses have a substantially different title in another Pāli edition.<sup>40</sup>

In view of such variations, it is not surprising that at times the title of a *Madhyama-āgama* discourse appears to be preferable to the title of its *Majjhima-nikāya* parallel. Such a case can be found in the 101<sup>st</sup> discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 增上心經.<sup>41</sup> Its counterpart is the *Vitakkasaṅṭhāna-sutta* in the *Majjhima-nikāya*. Now *vitakkasaṅṭhāna*, "stilling the thought-formation",<sup>42</sup> is only one of the five methods described in this discourse for overcoming unwholesome thoughts, whereas all five methods are for the purpose of developing the "higher mind", *adhicitta*, 增上心.<sup>43</sup> Thus in as much as a title for the whole discourse is concerned, the *Madhyama-āgama* version's title seems to fit better than its Pāli counterpart.

Another aspect of the early discourses that shows considerable variations between different versions is the sequence in which otherwise similar aspects or teachings are presented. A case in point is the 102<sup>nd</sup> discourse of the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 念經, which describes how the Buddha, during the time before his awakening, handled the arising of unwholesome thoughts. This discourse describes that whenever an unwholesome thought arose, the future Buddha would quickly dispel such thoughts, as he was aware of the danger inherent in them. The *Madhyama-āgama* discourse compares this to a cowherd who would stop the cows from straying into the ripe crop, as he knows that he will incur trouble if he does not prevent them from eating the crop.<sup>44</sup> After explaining this method, according to the *Madhyama-āgama* discourse the Buddha turned to the general nature of the mind, explaining that whatever one frequently thinks about will eventually lead to a corresponding inclination of the mind.<sup>45</sup>

Its Pāli counterpart, the *Dvedhāvitakka-sutta*, however, presents these topics in a

<sup>40</sup> These are the *Vatthūpama-sutta*, MN 7, where B° has the title *Vattha-sutta*; the *Ariyapariyesana-sutta*, MN 26, where B° and S° have the title *Pāsarāsi-sutta*; the *Sekha-sutta*, MN 53, where S° has the title *Sekhapaṭipadā-sutta*; the *Upāli-sutta*, MN 56, where S° has the title *Upālivāda-sutta*; the *Ambalaṭṭhikārāhulovāda-sutta*, MN 61, where S° has the title *Cūḷarāhulovāda-sutta*; the *Cūḷamāluṅkiya-sutta*, MN 63, where S° has the title *Cūḷamāluṅkiyovāda-sutta*; the *Tevijjavacchagotta-sutta*, MN 71, where B° has the title *Tevijjavaccha-sutta* and S° the title *Cūḷavacchagotta-sutta*; the *Aggivacchagotta-sutta*, MN 72, where B° has the title *Aggivaccha-sutta*; the *Mahāvaccagotta-sutta*, MN 73, where B° has the title *Mahāvacccha-sutta*; the *Bakkula-sutta*, MN 124, where S° has the title *Bakkulatherachariyabbhūta-sutta*; and the *Mahāsaḷāyatanika-sutta*, MN 149, where S° has the title *Salāyatanavibhaṅga-sutta*.

<sup>41</sup> MĀ 101 at T I 588a3.

<sup>42</sup> Adopting the rendering used in Ñānamoli 2005: 212.

<sup>43</sup> MN 20 at MN 119,3 introduces the five methods with *adhicittam anuyuttēna ... bhikkhunā*.

<sup>44</sup> MĀ 102 at T I 589a25.

<sup>45</sup> MĀ 102 at T I 589b5.

different sequence, as it first takes up the dispelling of unwholesome thought, then describes how the mind follows the course set by whatever one frequently thinks about, and only after that comes out with the simile of the cowherd.<sup>46</sup> Here the *Madhyama-āgama* discourse present a more straightforward sequence, since the purpose of the cowherd's simile is to illustrate fear of unwanted consequences, not to illustrate that frequent thoughts lead to a mental inclination. Thus, the simile of the cowherd finds its best placing right after the exposition of unwholesome thoughts, as an illustration of this exposition.

My next example is from the 145<sup>th</sup> discourse of the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 瞿默目捷連經, records a remark by Ānanda, in which he pointed out that the delighted in living in the Bamboo Grove because of the protection given by the Blessed One. Since according to the same discourse the Buddha had already passed away by the time Ānanda made this remark, one might wonder what the implications of this protection could be.

6) 「佛般涅槃後不久」<sup>47</sup>

「我樂住竹林加蘭哆園中。所以者何。以世尊擁護故」<sup>48</sup>

According to the Pāli version, however, Ānanda remarked that the conducive conditions in the Bamboo Grove were due to the protection given by Vassakāra, a minister of King Ajātasattu.<sup>49</sup> The Pāli commentary then explains that Vassakāra gave particular care to the Bamboo Grove, as according to a prediction he was going to be reborn in his next life as a monkey in this grove, a rebirth prospective also referred to in the *Karmavibhaṅga*.<sup>50</sup> Thus, in this case it seems as if the reference in the *Madhyama-āgama* version to the protection given by the Blessed One, who had already passed away, may just be a simple transmission or translation error, and the protection spoken of in the present context appears to intend merely the mundane type of protection a minister might give to a park.

Another passage of interest to the present topic can be found in the 162<sup>nd</sup> discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 分別六界經, lists and examines five types of feeling tones that can be experienced, which are happiness, pain, mental pleasure, mental displeasure and equanimity, but then summarizes these as three types of feelings.

---

<sup>46</sup> MN 19 at MN I 115,29.

<sup>47</sup> MĀ 145 at T I 653c22.

<sup>48</sup> MĀ 145 at T I 655b14.

<sup>49</sup> MN 108 at MN III 13,20.

<sup>50</sup> Ps IV 73 and Kudo 2004: 72,5 and 73,4.

7) 「樂覺 ... 苦覺 ... 喜覺 ... 憂覺 ... 捨覺 ... 此三覺」<sup>51</sup>

Its Pāli parallel, the *Dhātuvibhaṅga-sutta*, however, lists only three types of feelings in the corresponding passage, *sukha*, *dukkha* and *adukkhamasukha*.<sup>52</sup> In the present case this reading is confirmed by the *Madhyama-āgama* discourse itself, as in its summary of the present exposition it speaks of three types of feelings, so that the five-fold presentation appears to be a later expansion of what originally was only a treatment of three types of feelings. Further confirmation can be gleaned from another version of the same discourse, preserved as an individual translation by Zhī-qīan, 支謙, which also refers only to three feelings.<sup>53</sup> The present instance is interesting in so far as it documents the beginning stages in the development of a tendency towards ever more detailed analysis, a tendency that eventually led to the rise of the different *Abhidharmas*.

The next discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama* collection, the 163<sup>rd</sup> discourse entitled 分別六處經, takes up a related topic, as it examines the six types of pleasure, of displeasure and of equanimity, presenting each set of six as either related to sensuality or else not related to sensuality. The resultant thirty-six fold presentation receives the rather puzzling heading of being "thirty-six knives".

8) 「三十六刀 ... 有六喜依著。有六喜依無欲。有六憂依著。有六憂依無欲。有六捨依著。有六捨依無欲」<sup>54</sup>

The corresponding Pāli passage, however, speaks of "thirty-six positions of beings", *chattimsa sattapadā*.<sup>55</sup> This suggests that the expression "thirty-six knives", 三十六刀, could be due to mistaking *satta/sattva*, "being", for *sattha/śastra*, "knife", or could perhaps be a copyist's mistake, confusing 句 with 刀.<sup>56</sup> The corresponding expression in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* reads *ṣaṭtriṃśac chāstrīpadāni*, "thirty-six positions [set forth] by the teacher",<sup>57</sup> which thus has *satthar/śāstrī*; "teacher", instead of *satta/sattva*, "being". This expression recurs in Xuán-zàng's (玄奘) translation as 三十六師句,<sup>58</sup> while Paramārtha's

<sup>51</sup> MĀ 162 at T I 691b5-c5.

<sup>52</sup> M 140 at M III 242,11.

<sup>53</sup> T 511 at T XIV 780b29.

<sup>54</sup> MĀ 163 at T I 692c16.

<sup>55</sup> MN 137 at MN III 217,8.

<sup>56</sup> The same expression recurs in Saṅghabhūti's *Vibhāṣā* translation in T 1547 at T XXVIII 435c29: 三十六刀, with 勾 as a 聖 variant for 刀.

<sup>57</sup> *Abhidh-k* 3:36 in Pradhan 1967: 150,8, rendered by Pruden 1988: 437 as "thirty-six points of the Master".

<sup>58</sup> T 1558 at T XXIX 54b12, cf. also Hirakawa 1978: 97, who gives the Tibetan equivalent as *ston pa'i bka'*, the "teacher's pronouncement(s)". The *Mahāvibhāṣā* in T 1545 at T XXVII 718a25 also speaks of 三十六師句.

translation speaks of 三十六寂靜足,<sup>59</sup> which suggests ~ *sāntapadāni*, "peaceful positions", or perhaps "paths of tranquillity".

The next example is from the 171<sup>st</sup> discourse of the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 分別大業經, which begins a treatment of karma with an announcement by the Buddha, in which he told Ānanda that if he (and the other monks) would hear this great exposition on karma, they would develop increasing mental tranquillity and happiness in regard to the *Tathāgata*.

9) 「阿難。若汝從世尊聞分別大業經者,於如來倍復增上心靖得喜」<sup>60</sup>

In the Pāli counterpart, this sentence does not seem to have been preserved in full, as the passage just reads "if you, Ānanda, would hear the detailed great exposition on karma by the *Tathāgata*", '*sace tumhe, Ānanda, suṇeyyātha tathāgatassa mahākammavibhaṅgaṃ vibhajantassā'ti*, at which point the sentence ends.<sup>61</sup> The way this sentence reads one has the impression that it could have been truncated, since even though it begins with the hypothetical indeclinable "if", *sace*, it ends without explaining what will happen "if" the monks and Ānanda hear the detailed great exposition on karma.

Here the *Madhyama-āgama* version offers a more complete version of the Buddha's statement, and with its help the Pāli sentence could be restored to something like: *sace tumhe, Ānanda, suṇeyyātha tathāgatassa mahākammavibhaṅgaṃ vibhajantassa, tatra vo, Ānanda, tathāgate cittaṃ bhiyyosomattāya pasīdeyya pāmojjaṃ labheyya*.

Another example where the Chinese translation is of help to clarify a Pāli passage can be found in the 174<sup>th</sup> discourse of the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 受法經. This discourse illustrates the danger of indulgence in sensual pleasures with the example of a *sāla* tree that is gradually overgrown by a creeper. The Pāli version of this simile describes that when at first the seed of this creeper falls down in the vicinity of the *sāla* tree, the worries of the *deva* that lives in the tree will be appeased by his friends who tell the *deva* that the seed will probably be eaten by some animal, or carried away, or else the seed of such a creeper might become a

<sup>59</sup> T 1559 at T XXIX 211b13.

<sup>60</sup> MĀ 171 at T I 707a19: (adopting the 宋, 元, and 明 variant reading 聞 for 問)

<sup>61</sup> MN 136 at MN III 209,12. The same pattern recurs again in regard to a similar proclamation made by the Buddha according to AN 6:62 at AN III 404,5: '*sace tumhe, Ānanda, suṇeyyātha tathāgatassa purisindriyañāṇāni vibhajantassā'ti*, where again the *Madhyama-āgama* counterpart in MĀ 112 at T I 601a15 completes the sentence in a way closely resembling MĀ 171: 若汝從如來聞大人根智分別者,必得上信如來而懷歡喜, a reading which in this case is, moreover, found similarly in another parallel, the individual translation T 58 at T I 854b7: 汝阿難,當從如來聽,分別大人根相當增上,於如來有信樂意歡喜生.

"no-seed", *abījaṃ vā pan' assa*.<sup>62</sup> The last of these possibilities is not entirely clear, since one might wonder what the implications could be of a seed becoming a "no-seed". Here the *Madhyama-āgama* parallel helps to clarify the implication of this imagery, as it describes how this seed might "rot and not be a seed [any more]".

10) 「或敗壞不成種子」<sup>63</sup>

The next example stems from the 190<sup>th</sup> discourse of the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 小空經, which treats a series of meditative experiences that lead to the realization of emptiness in its ultimate and supreme sense. In the context of this series of meditative experiences, this discourse speaks of an "unconscious concentration of the mind", but then continues to describe a form of practice that is based on "knowing" the nature of this attainment.

11) 「當數念一無想心定。彼如是知 ... 然有不空。唯一無想心定」<sup>64</sup>

Its Pāli and Tibetan parallels, however, speak instead of a "signless concentration of the mind", *animittaṃ cetosamādhim*,<sup>65</sup> or of the signless element, *mtshan ma med pa dbyings*,<sup>66</sup> a reading that would fit the context much better.

The appearance of a reference to "unconscious", 無想, in a context where this meaning does not fit too well seems to be a recurrent issue, since several similar cases can be found. One such case is the 大拘絺羅經, which refers to an "unconscious concentration",<sup>67</sup> while its Pāli parallel speaks of "signless concentration" instead.<sup>68</sup> In this case, the Pāli version's reading is supported by a quotation from the same discourse in the *Karmasiddhi-prakaraṇa*, which indeed speaks of "signless" concentration.<sup>69</sup>

Quite a number of similar occurrences can be found in other Chinese discourse translations,<sup>70</sup> which indicate that the two characters 相 and 想 were prone to

<sup>62</sup> MN 45 at MN I 306,12.

<sup>63</sup> MĀ 174 at T I 711c11.

<sup>64</sup> MĀ 190 at T I 737c3.

<sup>65</sup> MN 121 at MN III 107,29.

<sup>66</sup> Skilling 1994: 172,5.

<sup>67</sup> MĀ 211 at T I 792b12: 無想定. Notably, subsequent occurrences of this expression in MĀ 211 have a 聖 variant reading as 無相定.

<sup>68</sup> MN 43 at MN I 296,32.

<sup>69</sup> T 1609 at T XXXI 784b18: 入無相界定.

<sup>70</sup> Choong 1999: 116 note 220 draws attention to another instance found in SĀ 272 at T II 72a26, where a counterpart to *animitta* in SN 22:80 at SN III 93,23 reads 無相, "signless", but has a variant reading as 無想, "unconscious". The reverse case occurs in MĀ 146 at T I 657c4 as part of a description of sense-restraint, which in the Pāli version MN 27 at MN I 180,27 speaks of the "sign", *nimitta*, but in the Chinese reads 想, "perception", with the variant reading 相, "sign". A

being confused with each other, so that the correct reading needs to be established in each case based on the context. A confusion of 相 and 想 could easily happen during translation, as the two characters are not only fairly similar in writing, differing only on the presence or absence of the heart radical, but also had a rather similar pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, as they do still today.<sup>71</sup> Due to the related meaning of the two terms, such an error would then easily escape being noticed during a later checking of the translation. Thus, this finding corroborates the suggestion made by Master Yin-shùn (1986: 61), who based on his extensive readings in the Chinese Tripiṭaka, comes to the conclusion that the "unconscious concentration of the mind" should simply be treated as an alternative rendering for the signless concentration of the mind.<sup>72</sup>

An instance where the *Madhyama-āgama* version helps to better understand a Pāli passage can be found in the 192<sup>nd</sup> discourse, the 加樓烏陀夷經. The Chinese and Pāli versions of this discourse describe a situation where a monk goes begging during a stormy night. During a flash of lightning, a woman suddenly sees this monk searching for alms and is thoroughly terrified, believing him to be

---

complementary case is MĀ 187 at T I 733c19+22, which uses the character 相, "sign", to describe the practice of sense-restraint, but then notes 想, "perception", as a variant reading for the same context. Again in MĀ 169 at T I 701c1 the expression "not connected with benefit", 無義相應, has 想 as a variant for 相, on adopting which the expression 相應 as a rendering of ~ *saṃ* + *vyuj*, or *saṃ* + *bandh* would lose its sense. MĀ 34 at T I 475b8+16 refers to the absence of pride with the expression 貢高者, 都無是相, while the same discourse MĀ 34 at T I 475b2 refers to the same absence of pride with the expression 貢高者, 都無是想, yet another instance where the characters 相 and 想 appear to have been confused with each other. Another instance is T 92 at T I 916c8, where the character 相, "sign", occurs in a description of overcoming all perceptions of form in order to reach the immaterial attainments, with the better fitting 想, "perception", as a variant reading. Again, EĀ 24.8 at T II 629b1 refers to the fourth immaterial attainment as 有想無相, with the better fitting 有想無想, as a variant reading, a reading confirmed in EĀ 24.8 at T II 629b3+22+24. Another example occurs in a description of a meditation practice undertaken regularly by the Buddha in T 76 at T I 884b17, according to which he practised "unconscious" concentration, 無想之定, with the better fitting "signless concentration", 無相之定, as a variant reading. Yet another example can be found in T 6 at T I 180a16, which speaks of the *samādhi* used by the Buddha to overcome an illness as 不念眾想之定, "concentration of not giving attention to numerous perceptions", while the corresponding Sanskrit fragment S 360 folio 171 V4 in Waldschmidt 1950: 18 and the Tibetan version in Waldschmidt 1951: 195,1 speak instead of "not giving attention to any signs", *sarvanimi(ttānām amanasikārād)* and *mtshan ma thams cad yid la mi bya bar*. The idea to not give attention to "signs", *sabbanimittānam amanasikārā*, occurs also in the corresponding Pāli passage in DN 16 at DN II 100,16, though not explicitly as the means used by the Buddha to overcome his illness. The (Mūla-)sarvāstivāda *Vinaya* similarly speaks of the "signless concentration" at this point, T 1451 at T XXIV 387a22: 無相三昧.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Pulleyblank 1991: 337 and 338 or Unger 1989: 89.

<sup>72</sup> 無想定是無相心定的異譯。

an evil spirit. According to the Pāli, the frightened woman makes a rather cryptic remark, exclaiming that the mother and father of this monk have died, *bhikkhussa ātu māri, bhikkhussa mātu māri*.<sup>73</sup> As it stands in the Pāli version, this remark is not easily intelligible.

According to the commentary, the intended meaning is that if the monk's parents were still alive, he would not need to go in search for food during the night.<sup>74</sup> This commentarial explanation does not seem to fit the situation too well, as it was a general custom for monks and recluses in ancient India to subsist on begging food as part of their way of life. Thus, the idea that they should be fed by their parents instead of begging their food would not be the type of reasoning to be expected of a woman in ancient India.

The solution to this cryptic passage can be found in the *Madhyama-āgama* version, where the reference to the monk's parents comes as part of a set of curses spoken by the frightened woman, in which she expressed her anger by wishing that his mother and father may pass away, and that his whole clan may meet with destruction

12) 「令此沙門父母早死。令此沙門種族絕滅」<sup>75</sup>

In this way the *Madhyama-āgama* discourse clarifies that the reference to the death of the monk's parents was part of a curse spoken by the frightened woman, a presentation that seems to fit the context better than the explanation offered in the Pāli commentary.

Continuing with another example related to the conduct of monks, the 194<sup>th</sup> discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 跋陀和利經, describes the behaviour of a monk who is investigated for some misdeed. According to its description, one type of monk displays anger and then says that he wants to act in accordance with the wishes of the *saṅgha*, while another type of monk does not display anger and does not say that he wants to act in accordance with the wishes of the *saṅgha*.

13) 「瞋恚憎嫉。發怒廣惡 ... 作如是說。我今當作令眾歡喜而可意」<sup>76</sup>  
「不瞋恚憎嫉。發怒廣惡 ... 不如是說。我今當作令眾歡喜而可意」<sup>77</sup>

The Pāli version has these in a different manner, as according to its presentation

<sup>73</sup> MN 66 at MN I 449,1: (B<sup>o</sup>-MN II 112 reads *māri*). Trenckner 1993: 567 comments that "the text no doubt purports to make the woman speak a sort of patois". Ñāṇamoli 2005: 552 renders this passage as "a bhikkhu whose ma's died and whose pa's died", with Bodhi in *ibid.* p. 1270 note 672 explaining that "the utterance ... appears to be a very colloquial Pali".

<sup>74</sup> Ps III 165.

<sup>75</sup> MĀ 192 at T I 741b16.

<sup>76</sup> MĀ 194 at T I 748b28.

<sup>77</sup> MĀ 194 at T I 748c18.

the monk who displays anger is the one who is also unwilling to act in accordance with the wishes of the *saṅgha*, and the one who does not display anger is the one who says that he is willing to act in accordance with the wishes of the *saṅgha*.<sup>78</sup> This is in fact what one would expect, so that the present instance could be another instance, similar to the first example given above, where a misunderstanding of a *sandhi* may have led to a confusion between the positive and the negative versions of a statement.

My next example comes from the 211<sup>st</sup> discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 大拘絺羅經, which explains that when someone enters the attainment of cessation, first the bodily formations cease, then the verbal formation, and then the mental formation. To understand this proposition it needs to be kept in mind that in the early discourses the bodily formation stands for breathing in and out, the verbal formation for initial and sustained mental application, and the mental formation for perception and feeling.

14) 「比丘入滅盡定時。先滅身行。次滅口行。後滅意行」<sup>79</sup>

According to the parallel, the *Cūḷavedalla-sutta* of the *Majjhima-nikāya*, however, first the verbal formation ceases (initial and sustained mental application), followed by the bodily formation (breathing in and out), and finally the mental formation ceases (perception and feeling).<sup>80</sup>

In relation to the emergence from cessation, the same difference recurs, though obviously in the reverse order. According to the Pāli version the verbal formation is the last to arise, while according to the Chinese presentation the bodily formation arises last.

In relation to the sequence in which the three formations ceases, it seems that when proceeding through the *jhānas* in order to attain cessation, the verbal formation of initial and sustained mental application will be left behind on attaining the second *jhāna*, while the bodily formation of in- and out-breathing will only cease with the attainment of the fourth *jhāna*.<sup>81</sup> This would correspond to the sequence proposed in the Pāli version of the *Cūḷavedalla-sutta*. This sequence receives further support from a discourse in the *Samyukta-āgama* and its Pāli parallel. According to these two discourses, on attaining cessation the first forma-

<sup>78</sup> MN 65 at MN I 442,31 and MN I 443,10.

<sup>79</sup> MĀ 211 at T I 792a8, on the different roles taken by its protagonists in the Chinese and Pāli versions cf. Anālayo 2007.

<sup>80</sup> MN 44 at MN I 302,4. For an examination of the difficulties involved in explaining emergence from the attainment of cessation and how different Buddhist schools attempted to tackle this problem cf. Griffith 1991.

<sup>81</sup> DN 33 at DN III 270,18 and AN 10:20 at AN V 31,25 speak of the tranquillisation of the bodily formation with the fourth *jhāna*, at which point according to SN 36:11 at SN IV 217,8 all breathing ceases.

tion to cease is indeed the verbal formation of initial and sustained mental application.<sup>82</sup> Besides, the *Mahāvibhāṣā* also agrees with the sequence proposed in the Pāli version of the *Cūḷavedalla-sutta*.<sup>83</sup> Thus this part of the *Madhyama-āgama* discourse appears to offer the less probable reading. It could easily be imagined how the present reading in the *Madhyama-āgama* version could have come into being due to an error during oral transmission. The standard triad body-speech-mind, which is such a recurrent feature in the early discourses, could easily have influenced the memory of the reciters and caused them to recite the passage in the standard sequence to which they were used to, instead of adopting the unusual sequence verbal-bodily-mental, even though in the present context this sequence would be the correct presentation.

The 213<sup>th</sup> discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 法莊嚴經, describes that the Buddhist monks were independent and free from wishes and would live the holy life for as long as their body would last, a description in which the same discourse also explains that the monks would "protect food from others' wives, like deer".

15) 「無爲無求。護他妻食如鹿。自盡形壽修行梵行」<sup>84</sup>

As it stands, this description is difficult to understand. According to the Pāli version, however, the monks are "dependent on others with a mind like deer", *paradavutta migabhūtena cetasā*.<sup>85</sup> This suggests that the *Madhyama-āgama* version's reference to "others' wives" may be due to a mistaking of *parada* for *paradāra*, "the wife of another", while the idea of "protection" could be due to mistaking *vutta* for *vṛta*, "stopped", "checked", "held back", or else 護 could be a scribe's error for 獲, "to get". Even though the translator(s) appear(s) to have misunderstood the expression *paradavutta*, perhaps through knowledge of some commentarial explanation he/they knew that the idea of "depending on others" was involved, an idea he/they may then have attempted to bring out with the imagery of "food from others' wives". The difficulties of the translator(s) are understandable, as the expression *paradavutta* is difficult and while the commentaries explain it to mean "dependent on others",<sup>86</sup> the PTS dictionary renders it literally as "fond of being prepared" and then explains it to mean "apt, active, alert".<sup>87</sup> A version of this passage in the *Kṣudrakavastu* of the (Mūla-)Sar

<sup>82</sup> SĀ 568 at T II 150b20 and SN 41:6 at SN IV 294,8.

<sup>83</sup> T 1545 at T XXVII 780c25.

<sup>84</sup> MĀ 213 at T I 796a29, with a 聖 variant reading 鹿 for 鹿.

<sup>85</sup> MN 89 at MN II 121,21.

<sup>86</sup> Ps III 166: '*paradavuttā'ti parehi dinnavuttino*.

<sup>87</sup> Rhys Davids 1993: 420 s.v. *parada*; on the difficulties of this expression cf. also Horner 1975: 259 note 2.

vāstivāda *Vinaya* is also far from clear, as it reports that the monks "always feel fear, like deer in the forest".<sup>88</sup>

As a last example in my presentation I would like to take up the 214<sup>th</sup> discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 鞞訶提經. This discourse describes how a king inquired from Ānanda if the Buddha would undertake any bodily deed that could be censured by other Brahmins and recluses. In reply, Ānanda explained that the Buddha would not undertake a bodily deed that could be censured by "wise" Brahmins and recluses.

16) 「如來不行如是身行。謂是身行為沙門·梵志聰明智慧及餘世間所憎惡也」<sup>89</sup>

This specification is quite significant, since foolish people can blame even a saint. Thus, the point of this additional qualification seems to be that Ānanda wanted to distinguish between the righteous censure by "wise" recluse and Brahmins and unjustified criticism that was sometimes raised by contemporary recluses and Brahmins against the Buddha. The appropriateness of this qualification can be seen in the Chinese and Pāli versions of the present discourse, as both record that the king expressed his appreciation for Ānanda's reply, in fact according to the Pāli version he proclaimed that what he had not been able to accomplish with his question, Ānanda had accomplished with his reply, *yaṃ hi mayam ... nāsakkhimha pañhena paripūretum, taṃ ... āyasmata ānandena pañhassa veyyākaraṇena paripūritam*.<sup>90</sup>

On reading the PTS edition of this discourse, however, this sentence is a little puzzling, since according to its presentation the king already used the qualification "wise" in his question. A closer inspection of the different Pāli editions brings to light that though the Siamese edition agrees with the PTS edition,<sup>91</sup> the Burmese and the Ceylonese editions differ, in that according to them the king had not yet used the qualification "wise" in his question.<sup>92</sup> Thus, in this case the *Madhyama-āgama* version helps to show which of the Pāli editions carries the preferable reading.

By way of concluding my comparative notes on the *Madhyama-āgama*, I would like to suggest that these few selected examples show how much our study of the discourses can gain if the Chinese and Indic versions are placed side by side. Thus, just as according to de Jong (1968: 15) "no student of Buddhism, even if he is interested only in Indian Buddhism, can neglect the enormous corpus of Chinese

<sup>88</sup> T 1451 at T XXIV 237c29: 常懷兢懼如鹿依林.

<sup>89</sup> MĀ 214 at T I 798a13.

<sup>90</sup> M 88 at M II 114,7.

<sup>91</sup> The PTS edition at M II 113,33 and S<sup>o</sup>-M II 500 read *samaṇehi brāhmanehi viññūhi*.

<sup>92</sup> B<sup>e</sup>-M II 315 and C<sup>e</sup>-M II 542 only read *samaṇehi brāhmanehi*.

translations", I would like to propose that "no student of Chinese Buddhism can neglect the study of the Indic parallel versions", in order to minimize the risk of coming to conclusions that are based on transmission or translation errors.

Abbreviations:

(In the case of Chinese and Pāli sources, quotations are according to the Taishō and PTS editions by giving first the discourse by number and then its location by volume, page and line; in the case of Tibetan sources, quotations are to the location in the Derge and/or Peking editions).

AN	<i>Anguttara-nikāya</i>
B <sup>°</sup>	Burmese edition
C <sup>°</sup>	Ceylonese edition
DĀ	<i>Dirgha-āgama</i> (at T 1)
DĀ <sup>2</sup>	<i>Dirgha-āgama</i> (preserved in Sanskrit fragments)
D	Derge edition
DN	<i>Dīgha-nikāya</i>
EĀ	<i>Ekottarika-āgama</i> (at T 125)
MĀ	<i>Madhyama-āgama</i> (at T 26)
MN	<i>Majjhima-nikāya</i>
Ps	<i>Papañcasūdanī</i>
Q	Peking edition
SĀ	<i>Samyukta-āgama</i> (at T 99)
SĀ <sup>2</sup>	'other' <i>Samyukta-āgama</i> (at T 100)
SHT III	see Waldschmidt 1971
SHT IX	see Bechert 2004
S <sup>°</sup>	Siamese edition
SN	<i>Samyutta-nikāya</i>
SN <sup>2</sup>	<i>Sagāthavagga</i> of the <i>Samyutta-nikāya</i> , new PTS edition by Somaratne (1998)
T	Taishō
Vibh	<i>Vibhaṅga</i>
Vin	<i>Vinaya</i>

References:

- Akanuma, Chizen 1990 (1929): *The Comparative Catalogue of Chinese Āgamas & Pāli Nikāyas*, Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.
- Anālayo 2005: "Some Pāli Discourses in the Light of Their Chinese Parallels", in *Buddhist Studies Review*, vol. 22 no.1 pp. 1-14, and vol. 22 no. 2 pp. 93-105.
- Anālayo 2006: "The Ekottarika-āgama Parallel to the Saccavibhaṅga-sutta", in *Buddhist Studies Review*, vol. 23 no. 2.
- Anālayo 2007: "Who said it? Authorship Disagreements between Pāli and Chinese Discourses", in *Indica et Tibetica 65, Festschrift für Michael Hahn zum 65. Geburtstag von Freunden und Schülern überreicht*, J. U. Hartmann et al. (ed.), Wien, pp. 1-14.
- Bagchi, Prabodh Chandra 1927: *Le Canon Bouddhique en Chine*, Paris: Geuthner, vol. 1.
- Bapat, P.V. 1969: "Chinese Madhyamāgama and the Language of its Basic Text", in *Dr. Satkari Mookerji Felicitation Volume*, B.P. Sinha (ed.), Varanasi: Chowkhamba Publications, pp. 1-6.
- Bechert, Heinz 1991: "Methodological considerations concerning the language of the earliest Buddhist tradition", in *Buddhist Studies Review* vol. 8 pp. 3-19.
- Bechert, Heinz (ed.) 1995: *When did the Buddha live?*, Delhi: Sri Satguru.

- Bechert, Heinz (ed.) 2004: *Sanskrihandschriften aus den Turfanfunden. Teil 9: Die Katalognummern 2000-3199* (beschrieben von Klaus Wille), Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Choong, Mun-keat 1999: *The Notion of Emptiness in Early Buddhism*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- de Jong, J.W. 1968: *Buddha's Word in China, 28th George Ernest Morrison Lecture*, Canberra: Australian National University.
- Enomoto, Fumio 1984: "The Formation and Development of the Sarvāstivāda Scriptures", in *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Congress of Human Sciences in Asia and North Africa*, T. Yamamoto (ed.), Tokyo: Tōhō Gakkai, pp. 197-198.
- Enomoto, Fumio 1986: "On the Formation of the Original Texts of the Chinese Āgamas", in *Buddhist Studies Review*, vol. 3 pp. 19-30.
- Glass, Andrew 2006: *Connected Discourses in Gandhāra: A Study, Edition, and Translation of Four Saṃyuktāgama-Type Sūtras from the Senior Collection*, PhD dissertation, University of Washington, published at <http://www.andrewglass.org/phd.php> (accessed on 04-08-2006).
- Gnoli, Raniero 1978: *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu*, vol. 2, (Serie Orientale Roma, vol. 49), Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- Griffith, Paul J. 1991 (1986): *On Being Mindless: Buddhist Meditation and the Mind-Body Problem*, Illinois, La Salle: Open Court.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe 2000: "Zu einer Neuen Handschrift des Dīrgha Āgama," in *Vividharatnakarandaka: Festgabe für Adelheid Mette*, Chojnacki et al (ed.), Swisttal-Odendorf, pp. 359-367.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe 2004: "Contents and Structure of the Dīrghāgama of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins" in *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism*, Tokyo: Soka University, vol. 7 pp. 119-137.
- Hirakawa, Akira 1978: *Index to the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, Tokyo: Daizo Shuppan Kabushikikaisha, vol. 3.
- Hirakawa, Akira 1997: *Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Dictionary*, Tokyo: Reiyukai.
- Horner, I.B. 1967: *The Collection of the Middle Length Sayings*, London: Pali Text Society, vol. 1.
- Horner, I.B. 1975: *The Book of the Discipline*, London: Pali Text Society, vol. 5.
- Horner, I.B. 1990 (1930): *Women under Primitive Buddhism*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Hultzsch, E. 1925: *Inscriptions of Asoka*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Karashima, Seishi 1992: *The Textual Study of the Chinese Versions of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*, Tokyo: Sankibo Press.
- Kudo, Noriyuki 2004: *The Karmavibhaṅga*, Tokyo: Soka University.
- Lamotte, Étienne 1967: "Un Sūtra Composite del'Ekottarāgama", in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Oxford, vol. 30 pp. 105-116.
- Lancaster, Lewis R. 1979: "Buddhist Literature: Its Canons, Scribes, and Editors" in *The Critical Study of Sacred Texts*, W.D. O'Flaherty (ed.), Berkeley, pp. 215-229.
- Lévi, Sylvain 1896: "Notes sur des Inscriptions de Piyadassi - Le Lāghulovāda de l'Edit de Bhabra", in *Journal Asiatique* ser. 9 vol. 8 pp. 475-485.
- Lü, Cheng 1963: "Āgama", in *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, Ceylon, vol. 1 pp. 241-244.
- Mayeda, Egaku 1985: "Japanese Studies on the Schools of the Chinese Āgamas", in *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*, H. Bechert (ed.), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, vol. 1 pp. 94-103.
- Mette, Adelheid 1995: "The Synchronism of the Buddha and the Jina Mahāvīra and the Problem of Chronology in Early Jainism", in *When did the Buddha Live?*, H. Bechert (ed.), Delhi: Sri Satguru, pp. 179-183.
- Minh Chau, Thich 1991: *The Chinese Madhyama Āgama and the Pāli Majjhima Nikāya*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Mittal, Kusum 1957: *Dogmatische Begriffsreihen im Älteren Buddhismus I; Fragmente des Daśottarasūtra; (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden)*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, vol. 4.

- Ñānamoli, Bhikkhu 2005 (1995): *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha*, Boston: Wisdom.
- Norman, K.R. 1989: "The Pāli language and scriptures", in *The Buddhist Heritage*, Skorupski (ed.), pp. 29-53.
- Norman, K. R. 1992: "The Value of the Pāli Tradition", in *Collected Papers*, Norman, Oxford: PTS, vol. 3 pp. 33-44.
- Pradhan, P. 1967: *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, (*Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 8*), Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Prasad, Chandra Shekhar 1985: "Some Reflections on the Relation between the Āgamas and the Nikāyas", in *Proceedings and Papers of the Second Conference of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, Nalanda pp. 131-140.
- Pruden, Leo M. 1988b: *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam*, Berkeley: Asian Humanity Press, vol. 2.
- Pulleyblank, Edwin G. 1991: *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese and Early Mandarin*, Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Rhys Davids, T.W. 1993 (1921-25): *Pāli-English Dictionary*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Shukla, Karunesh 1973: *Śrāvakabhūmi of Ācārya Asaṅga*, Patna: Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Skilling, Peter 1994: *Mahāsūtras: Great Discourses of the Buddha*, Oxford: PTS, vol. 1.
- Trenckner, V. 1993 (1888): *The Majjhima Nikāya*, Oxford: PTS.
- Unger, Ulrich 1989: *Glossar des Klassischen Chinesisch*, Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.
- von Hinüber, Oskar 1982: "Upāli's Verses in the Majjhimanikāya and the Madhyamāgama", in *Indological and Buddhist Studies*, Canberra, pp. 243-251.
- von Hinüber, Oskar 1993: "From Colloquial to Standard Language. The Oral Phase in the Development of Pāli", in *Premier Colloque Étienne Lamotte*, Louvain-la-Neuve, pp. 101-113.
- Wagle, Narendra 1985: "The Gods in Early Buddhism in Relation to Human Society" in *New Paths in Buddhist Research*, A.K. Warder (ed.), Durham, pp. 57-80.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst 1950/vol. 1, 1951/vol. 2: *Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst 1956: *Das Mahāvadānasūtra, ein Kanonischer Text über die sieben letzten Buddhas*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, vol. 2.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst (ed.) 1971: *Sanskrihandschriften aus den Turfanfunden. Teil 3: Katalognummern 802-1014* (unter Mitarbeit von Walter Clawitter und Lore Sander-Holzmann), Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst 1980: "Central Asian Sūtra Fragments and their Relation to the Chinese Āgamas", in H. Bechert (ed.) *The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 136-174.
- Yin-shùn 1983 (1962): 原始佛教聖典之集成 [The Compilation of the Early Buddhist Canon], Taipei: 正聞出版社.
- Yin-shùn 1986 (1985): 空之探究 [Exploration of Emptiness], Taipei: 正聞出版社.