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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 Saṅgharaks, another Kashmirian monk, and was transcribed by the monk Dào-ci, 道慈, with the assistance of Li-băo and Kāng-huà, 李寳 and 康化.\(^1\) The Indian original used for this translation appears to have been in a Prākrit,\(^2\) and with considerable probability stems from a Sarvāstivāda tradition.\(^3\)

The Madhyama-āgama collection contains altogether two-hundred-and-twenty-two discourse, 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.

---

1 T.I. 809b26: 請闕滿沙門僧伽羅叉令譯胡本, 請僧 伽提和譯胡為晉, 豫州沙門 道慈筆受, 興國 李寳, 康化 共書 (with a 聖 variant reading for the last as 唐化).
3 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. 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapters:</th>
<th>王相應品</th>
<th>梵志品</th>
<th>根本分別品</th>
<th>雙品</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourses:</td>
<td>MĀ 63 / MN 81</td>
<td>MĀ 150 / MN 96</td>
<td>MĀ 162 / MN 140</td>
<td>MĀ 182 / MN 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MĀ 67 / MN 83</td>
<td>MĀ 151 / MN 93</td>
<td>MĀ 163 / MN 137</td>
<td>MĀ 183 / MN 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MĀ 152 / MN 99</td>
<td>MĀ 164 / MN 138</td>
<td>MĀ 184 / MN 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MĀ 161 / MN 91</td>
<td>MĀ 165 / MN 133</td>
<td>MĀ 185 / MN 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

---

6 MĀ 107 and MĀ 108 are both parallels to MN 17.
7 In a similar vein, in regard to the Samyutta-nikāya and Samynkta-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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MĀ chapters</th>
<th>MN discourses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; chapter</td>
<td>- - - - - - - 24&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; chapter</td>
<td>- - - - - - - 61&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; chapter</td>
<td>- - - - - - - 101&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; chapter</td>
<td>123&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; 124&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; chapter</td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; chapter</td>
<td>- - - - - - - 81&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; 130&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; chapter</td>
<td>128&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 106&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 68&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 49&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 127&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 119&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; chapter</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; 15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; chapter</td>
<td>- 10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 20&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 19&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; chapter</td>
<td>17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; chapter</td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; chapter</td>
<td>- - 107&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 108&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 27&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; chapter</td>
<td>99&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 75&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; chapter</td>
<td>140&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 137&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 138&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 133&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; 134&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 132&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; 139&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 135&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 136&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; chapter</td>
<td>- 126&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 45&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 46&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; chapter</td>
<td>39&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 40&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 32&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; 31&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; 47&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 112&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; chapter</td>
<td>66&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 21&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; 65&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 70&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 104&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; - 125&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 129&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; chapter</td>
<td>54&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 26&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 64&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 77&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 79&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 80&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 44&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Another pattern of similarity can be found in relation to the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Dīgha-āgama* collection, preserved in Sanskrit fragments, as the number of parallels to *Majjhima-nikāya* discourses found in this *Dīgha-āgama* collection corresponds to the number of parallels to *Dīgha-nikāya* discourses found in the *Madhyama-āgama*, both being ten, as can be seen in figure 3 below. 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.

---

8 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 *Aṅguttara-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).

9 Of these ten *Dīgha-āgama* discourses, eight do not appear to have a parallel in any of the four Chinese Āgamas. Only DĀ 11 has an Āgama parallel, which is EĀ 31.1; while DĀ 12 has a parallel in an individual translation outside of the Āgamas, T 757.
To sum up, the patterns of similarity that can be discerned are:

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

\[
\text{MĀ} \Leftrightarrow \text{AN} \approx \text{MN} \Leftrightarrow \text{EĀ}
\]

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.

\[
\text{MĀ} \Leftrightarrow \text{DN} = \text{MN} \Leftrightarrow \text{DĀ}^2
\]

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 Ágamas stems from a common source.\(^{12}\)

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

---

\(^{10}\) The second part of this table has been adopted from Hartmann 2004: 126-127.

\(^{11}\) Hartmann 2000: 365 note 20 indicates that this identification still needs to be corroborated.

\(^{12}\) While Bechert 1991: 9 believes that "the compilations available to us hardly go back to any 'Ur-Ágamas', 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 bhāvakas ('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, 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 Sanghadeva 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 14th 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" 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。或自為。或為他。不善與苦果受於苦報」
「彼身業不淨。或自為。或為他。善與樂果受於樂報」

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)

---

13 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).
14 Lévi 1896: 480 renders 淨 in the present context as "pur".
15 MĀ 14 at T I 436c11.
16 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 शुद्ध, शुद्धि, परिशुद्धि, विशुद्धि, परिशोधयाति, शुभा, व्यवदान, प्रसांना, विमल also lists कल्प, "proper", and कल्प, "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 羅雲經 a "permissible" (淨) bodily deed should be confessed, while a "not permissible" (不浄) bodily deed leads to the arising of joy. 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 羅雲經 of the Madhyama-āgama has a parallel in the Ambalaṭṭhikārāhu-lovāda-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. The same is also the case for another parallel to the 羅雲經 found in the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivada Vinayavibhaṅga, preserved in Chinese and Tibetan. A sūtra quotation from the present discourse in the Vyākhyāyukti-ṭīkā, preserved in Tibetan, 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, 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-

---

17 MĀ 14 at T I 436c27.
18 MN 61 at MN I 415,29: akusalam idam kāyakammaṃ dukkhudrayam dukkhavipākam.
19 T 1442 at T XXIII 761a11: 是不善事，是苦惡業，能於未來感苦異熟。D 'dal ba cha 217a56 or Q je 201a6: bdag dang gzhain la gnod par 'gyur ba mi dge ba (D: 'bri) sdag bsngal 'byung ba rnam par smin pa sdag bsngal ba.
20 Q sens tsam i 71a5: gnod pa dang idan pa mi dge ba sdag bsngal 'byung ba dang.
21 T 1579 at T XXX 405b8: दत्तधिकम ... अत्मानो व परास्य व अकृतसारम. or Shukla 1973: 55,16: vyābhādhikam ... ātmano vā parasya vā akusalam.
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 194th discourse of the *Madhyama-āgama,* and Karashima (1992: 263) notes the occurrence of this type of error in Dharmarākṣa'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 25th discourse, the *水喻經.* This discourse refers to a forest dweller, *araññaka/* *aranyaka,* in a way that seems to be quite unique in the *Madhyama-āgama* collection, namely as, *阿繾若,* instead of the more usual rendering of the same as "no thing," 無事. This variation from the usual *Madhyama-āgama* translation vocabulary is interesting in so far as the transcription 阿繾若 occurs with considerable frequency in the *Ekottarika-āgama.* 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 Sa/ndotaboveghadeva, or whether it is an actual retranslation undertaken by him, a retranslation that then replaced Dharmanandī's earlier translation.

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 Sañghadeva would have based such a

---

22 This recommendation refers to the *Lāghulovāda,* "spoken by the Blessed One, the Buddha, concerning falsehood", *musā vāda/* *adhigichya bhagavatā budhena bhāsite,* cf. Hultzsch 1925: 173.

23 Cf. below quote number 13 (MĀ 194).

24 MĀ 25 at T I 454a19.

25 Noted by Minh Chau 1991: 327 as the standard *Madhyama-āgama* rendering for *araññā.*

26 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.

27 The *出三藏記集,* T 2145 at T LV 71b29; the *畳經目錄,* T 2146 at T LV 127c29; the *大周刊定畳經目錄,* 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 Dharmanandī; while according to the *歷代三寶紀,* T 2034 at T XLIX 70c5, Gautama Sañghadeva 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, and there is no indication that Gautama Sanghadeva 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 Sanghadeva's Madhyama-āgama translation.

The next example I would like to take up appears to be a simple translation error, found in the 26th discourse in the Madhyama-āgama, the 善知識經. 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", 話.

2) 「當學知坐取善坐也。不逼長老坐。為小比丘語」

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 paṭibhāsati/pratibhāhate. This suggests the possibility of a translation error, which could have happened due to mistaking paṭibhāhati/pratibāhate, "to keep off", for paṭibhāsatī/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」

In this case, too, a translation error appears to have happened. According to the
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Pāli parallel, the Dhānañjāni-sutta, when Sāriputta arrived this Brahmin was at his cowshed getting his cows milked, gāvo goṭṭhe dohāpeti. The idea of "inflicting pain", 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 goṭṭhe, "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 Prākrit 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 Prākrit.

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. 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 63rd discourse in the Madhyama-āgama, the 裡婆陵者經. 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...聞曰。誰...耶。比丘答曰。長老。我等是...比丘。」

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. According to the Madhyama-āgama version, however, they instead used the address 長老, corresponding to āyasmanī āyuśmanī, 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

32 MN 97 at MN II 186.2 (B²-MN II 396 and S²-MN II 624 read ḍūhāpeti).
33 A survey of examples for this potential of the Chinese Āgamas can be found in Anālayo 2005.
34 MĀ 63 at T I 502b24.
35 MN 81 at MN II 53,25.
a servant, 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 78th discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the *梵天請佛經*, and its parallel in the *Brahmanimantanika-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」

In the *Brahmanimantanika-sutta*, however, the Buddha told Brahmā that he knew Brahmā’s destiny and "splendour", *te aham, Brahme, gatiṣca pajānami jutīṣca pajānami*. The occurrence of *jūti*, "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". 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
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. 40

In view of such variations, it is not surprising that at times the title of a *Mahāyama-āgama* discourse appears to be preferable to the title of its *Majjhima-nikāya* parallel. Such a case can be found in the 101st discourse in the *Mahāyama-āgama*, the 增上心經. 41 Its counterpart is the *Vitakkasāṃghāsa-sutta* in the *Majjhima-nikāya*. Now *vitakkasāṃghāsa*, "stilling the thought-formation", 42 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. 43 Thus in as much as a title for the whole discourse is concerned, the *Mahāyama-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 102nd discourse of the *Mahāyama-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 *Mahāyama-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. 44 After explaining this method, according to the *Mahāyama-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. 45

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

40 These are the *Vatthūpama-sutta*, MN 7, where B⁰ has the title *Vattha-sutta*; the *Ariyapariyesana-sutta*, MN 26, where B⁰ and S⁰ have the title *Pāsarāsi-sutta*; the *Sekha-sutta*, MN 53, where S⁰ has the title *Sekhapātapa-sutta*; the *Upālī-sutta*, MN 56, where S⁰ has the title *Upālīvāda-sutta*; the *Ambalattikārāhulovāda-sutta*, MN 61, where S⁰ has the title *Cūramāhulovāda-sutta*; the *Cūramālunkya-sutta*, MN 63, where S⁰ has the title *Cūramālunkiyovāda-sutta*; the *Tevijjavacchagotta-sutta*, MN 71, where B⁰ has the title *Tevijjavacchagotta-sutta* and S⁰ the title *Cūlavacchagotta-sutta*; the *Akkāvagottasutta*, MN 72, where B⁰ has the title *Aggivaccha-sutta*; the *Mahāvagottasutta*, MN 73, where B⁰ has the title *Mahāvagottasutta*; the *Bakkula-sutta*, MN 124, where S⁰ has the title *Bakkulathera-ccharyavabhabhūta-sutta*; and the *Mahāsāvatānāsika-sutta*, MN 149, where S⁰ has the title *Sālavatānāvibhanga-sutta*.
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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. 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 145th discourse of the _Madhyama-āgama_, the _羅駝日犍連經_, 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) 「佛滅後槃王久。」
「我樂住竹林加闍泅園中。所以者何。以世尊護護故。」

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. 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_. 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 162nd 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.
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Its Pāli parallel, the Dhātuvibhaṅga-sutta, however, lists only three types of feelings in the corresponding passage, *sukha*, *dukhha* and *adukkhasukha*. 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-qīān, 支謙, which also refers only to three feelings. 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 163rd discourse *Pratimśa sattapadā*. This suggests that the expression "thirty-six positions of beings", *chatti/sattapadā*, could be due to mistaking *satta/sattva*, "being", for *sattha/śāstra*, "knife", or could perhaps be a copyist's mistake, confusing *kāla* with *kāla*. The corresponding expression in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* reads *ṣatīrīṣaḥ chāstapadāni*, "thirty-six positions [set forth] by the teacher", which thus has *satīrīṣaḥ sāstrāḥ*, "teacher", instead of *sattavā*, "being". This expression recurs in Xuán-zāng's (玄奘) translation as "三十六師句", while Paramārtha's
translation speaks of 三十六寂静足,\textsuperscript{59} which suggests ~ śāntapadāni, "peaceful positions", or perhaps "paths of tranquility".

The next example is from the 171\textsuperscript{st} discourse of the Madhyama-āgama, the 分别大業經, 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」\textsuperscript{60}

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 mahākammavibhaṅgam vibhajantassā'ī, at which point the sentence ends.\textsuperscript{61} 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 Madyhama-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 mahākammavibhaṅgam vibhajantassā, tatra vo, Ānanda, tathāgate citīṁ bhīvyosomattāya pasīdeyya pāmojja labheyya.

Another example where the Chinese translation is of help to clarify a Pāli passage can be found in the 174\textsuperscript{th} 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
"no-seed", abhiṣam vā pan' assa. 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」

The next example stems from the 190th 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—無想心定。彼如是知...然有不空。唯一無想心定」

Its Pāli and Tibetan parallels, however, speak instead of a "signless concentration of the mind", anumitta cetosamādhī, or of the signless element, mtshan ma med pa dbyings, 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 大拘絣羅經, which refers to an "unconscious concentration", while its Pāli parallel speaks of "signless concentration" instead. In this case, the Pāli version's reading is supported by a quotation from the same discourse in the Karmasiddhi-prākaraṇa, which indeed speaks of "signless" concentration.

Quite a number of similar occurrences can be found in other Chinese discourse translations, which indicate that the two characters 相 and 想 were prone to...
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. 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-shun (1986: 61), who based on his extensive readings in the Chinese Tripitaka, 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.

An instance where the Madhyama-āgama version helps to better understand a Pāli passage can be found in the 192nd discourse, the 加樓鳥陀夷経. 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
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72 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 mārī, bhikkhussa mātu mārī*.

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. 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」

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 194th 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。發怒廣懲 ... 作如是說。我今當作令眾歡喜而可意」

The Pāli version has these in a different manner, as according to its presentation...
the monk who displays anger is the one who is also unwilling to act in accordance with the wishes of the sangha, 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 sangha. 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 211st discourse in the Madhyama-āgama, the 大拘絃羅經, 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」

According to the parallel, the Cūlavedalla-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).

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. This would correspond to the sequence proposed in the Pāli version of the Cūlavedalla-sutta. This sequence receives further support from a discourse in the Saṃyukta-āgama and its Pāli parallel. According to these two discourses, on attaining cessation the first forma-
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tion to cease is indeed the verbal formation of initial and sustained mental application. Besides, the Mahāvibhāṣā also agrees with the sequence proposed in the Pāli version of the Cūṇapadāsa-sutta. 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 213th discourse in the Madhyama-āgama, 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) 「無為無求。護他妻食如鹿。自盡形壽修行梵行」

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", paradāvutta migabhūtena cetasā. 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 vrta, "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 paradāvutta, 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 paradāvutta is difficult and while the commentaries explain it to mean "dependent on others", the PTS dictionary renders it literally as "fond of being prepared" and then explains it to mean "apt, active, alert". A version of this passage in the Kṣudrakavastu of the (Mūla-)Sar
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vāstivāda *Vinaya* is also far from clear, as it reports that the monks "always feel fear, like deer in the forest". 88

As a last example in my presentation I would like to take up the 214th discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 輔訶提經. 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」 89

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 ... āyasmatā Ānandena pañhassa veyyākaraṇena paripūritam*. 90

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, 91 the Burmese and the Ceylonese editions differ, in that according to them the king had not yet used the qualification "wise" in his question. 92 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

---

88 T 1451 at T XXIV 237c29: 常懷兢懼如鹿依林.
89 MĀ 214 at T I 798a13.
90 M 88 at M II 114,7.
91 The PTS edition at M II 113,33 and S%-M II 500 read *samaṇehi brāhmaṇehi viññūhi*.
92 B%-M II 315 and C%-M II 542 only read *samaṇehi brāhmaṇehi*. 
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  Anguttara-nikāya
B  Burmese edition
C  Ceylonese edition
DĀ  Dirgha-āgama (at T 1)
DĀ  Dirgha-āgama (preserved in Sanskrit fragments)
D  Derge edition
DN  Dīgha-nikāya
EĀ  Ekottarika-āgama (at T 125)
MĀ  Madhyama-āgama (at T 26)
MN  Majjhima-nikāya
Ps  Papancaśūdanī
Q  Peking edition
SĀ  Samyuktā-āgama (at T 99)
SĀ  'other' Samyuktā-āgama (at T 100)
SHT III see Waldschmidt 1971
SHT IX see Bechert 2004
S  Siamese edition
SN  Samyutta-nikāya
T  Taishō
Vibh Vibhanga
Vin Vinaya
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