

**Journal of Buddhist Studies, Vol. XII, 2014–2015**  
(Off-print)

**Discourse Merger in the *Ekottarika-āgama* (2)**  
**The Parallels to the *Kakacūpama-sutta* and the**  
***Alagaddūpama-sutta***

ANĀLAYO

Published by  
**Centre for Buddhist Studies, Sri Lanka &**  
**The Buddha-Dharma Centre of Hong Kong**



## Discourse Merger in the *Ekottarika-āgama* (2) The Parallels to the *Kakacūpama-sutta* and the *Alagaddūpama-sutta*

ANĀLAYO

### Introduction

In the present paper I study a peculiar feature of the *Ekottarika-āgama* preserved in Chinese translation, namely the occurrence of discourses in this collection that combine material which in other transmission lineages forms separate discourses, a phenomenon to which I refer as “discourse merger”.<sup>1</sup> My exploration begins with a survey of a range of instances of such apparent discourse merger in order to offer a general impression of this characteristic of the *Ekottarika-āgama* collection. Then I proceed to a case study based on translating the *Ekottarika-āgama* parallels to the *Kakacūpama-sutta* and the *Alagaddūpama-sutta*. In the final part of the article I take up a few more instances of discourse merger in the *Ekottarika-āgama* collection that confirm conclusions that suggest themselves from the case study.

### Cases of Apparent Discourse Merger in the *Ekottarika-āgama*

Discourse merger as a characteristic feature of the *Ekottarika-āgama* has already been examined by Lamotte in a study published nearly fifty years ago. In this study Lamotte comes to the conclusion that the *Ekottarika-āgama* collection contains an abundance of composite discourses artificially forged by putting side by side discourses or portions of discourses borrowed from other canonical texts.<sup>2</sup>

The discourse studied by Lamotte, found among the Tens, begins with an eulogy of Sāriputta by *devas*.<sup>3</sup> Then comes an episode in which a *yakkha* hits Sāriputta on the head while the latter is seated in diamond meditation.<sup>4</sup> Next follows another tale in which the monk Saṅjīva, a disciple of the former Buddha Kakusandha, has similarly attained diamond concentration and is mistaken for dead by passers-by who attempt to cremate him. He survives the cremation with body and robes intact. After relating this episode, the Buddha describes Sāriputta’s wisdom, followed by a set of stanzas in praise of Sāriputta.

Lamotte identifies distinct sources for each of these five parts of the discourse,<sup>5</sup> concluding that this case confirms the tendency evident in the *Ekottarika-āgama* of artificially forged discourses.

In addition to the case studied by Lamotte, an example of apparent discourse merger can be found in a discourse from the Threes of the *Ekottarika-āgama*, which combines elements that in the *Majjhima-nikāya* and the *Madhyama-āgama* are found in the *Cūḷagosiṅga-sutta* and the *Upakkilesa-sutta* as well as in their respective parallels.<sup>6</sup> This case is somewhat complex, as it also shows the type of doubling of textual passages that is common for early discourses in general, which in the present case is evident in the *Majjhima-nikāya* and *Madhyama-āgama* parallels to this *Ekottarika-āgama* discourse.

The *Cūḷagosiṅga-sutta* and the *Upakkilesa-sutta* as well as their two *Madhyama-āgama* parallels share a description of the Buddha not being recognized by the park keeper of a grove where the monk Anuruddha and his two companions live. They also share a detailed account of the harmonious cohabitation of these three monks.

A difference is that the *Upakkilesa-sutta* and its *Madhyama-āgama* parallel take place at Kosambī and their narrative introduction refers to a quarrel that had broken out among the monks at Kosambī.<sup>7</sup> In contrast, the *Cūḷagosiṅga-sutta* and its *Madhyama-āgama* parallel take place at Nādikā and their narrative introduction does not have any explicit relationship to the quarrel among the Kosambī monks.<sup>8</sup> The main body of the respective discourses also differs substantially, as in the *Upakkilesa-sutta* and its *Madhyama-āgama* parallel the Buddha gives detailed meditation instructions to help these three monks to surmount problems in their meditation practice.<sup>9</sup> In contrast, the *Cūḷagosiṅga-sutta* and its parallels report the range of attainments eventually reached by the same three monks.<sup>10</sup>

The actual discourses must be depicting two different occasions, since it is hardly possible for the same group of monks to receive meditation instructions on how they can overcome a series of obstacles to the very attainment of absorption and then, on the same occasion, be able to report their successful mastery of all four absorptions and the four immaterial attainments. A substantial period of time must be allowed to have elapsed between their reception of instructions on how to overcome obstructions to absorption attainment and their ability to declare their attainments. The *Ekottarika-āgama* discourse is situated at Kosambī and begins

by reporting the quarrel among the Kosambī monks,<sup>11</sup> similar to the *Upakkilesa-sutta* and its *Madhyama-āgama* parallel. Yet it introduces Anuruddha and his companions by describing their mastery of the four absorptions, thereby paralleling the *Cūlagosiṅga-sutta* and its *Madhyama-āgama* parallel.<sup>12</sup> Although the *Ekottarika-āgama* discourse does appear to have merged two originally different occasions, in this case the situation is rendered complex due to the doubling of the introductory narration in the *Cūlagosiṅga-sutta* and the *Upakkilesa-sutta*, as well as in their *Madhyama-āgama* parallels. Especially the detail of the Buddha not being recognized by the park keeper could hardly have occurred twice.<sup>13</sup> Such a doubling of textual passages is a recurrent occurrence in orally transmitted material and comparative study of the early discourses can bring to light several instances of this type in the Pāli discourses and the other *Āgamas*.

A simpler instance of the phenomenon of apparent discourse merger can be found among the Elevens of the *Ekottarika-āgama* collection. The discourse begins with an explanation of each of the links of dependent arising (*paṭicca samuppāda*),<sup>14</sup> similar to a discourse in the *Samyutta-nikāya*.<sup>15</sup> Next the *Ekottarika-āgama* discourse reports Ānanda's statement that dependent arising, even though deep, does not appear that deep to him.<sup>16</sup> Such a statement is found in the *Mahānidāna-sutta* and its parallels.<sup>17</sup> Whereas in the *Mahānidāna-sutta* and its parallels the Buddha counters Ānanda's presumption with a detailed exposition of dependent arising, in the *Ekottarika-āgama* discourse he counters it instead by relating the tale of an Asura king who taught his son that the ocean is deeper than the youngster had thought. The tale ends with the indication that the Asura king was a former life of the Buddha and the son a former life of Ānanda.<sup>18</sup>

Another example of apparent discourse merger occurs among the Sevens of the *Ekottarika-āgama*. The discourse offers a description of the destruction of the world by the successive appearance of seven suns, an event similarly depicted in a discourse among the Sevens of the *Aṅguttara-nikāya*, in parallels preserved in Sanskrit fragments, in a *Madhyama-āgama* discourse, in an individual translation preserved in Chinese, and in a discourse quotation in the *Abhidharmakośopāyikā-ṭīkā*, extant in Tibetan. The central topic taken up at the outset of these versions is impermanence,<sup>19</sup> which the description of the destruction of the world illustrates.

Later text like the *Lokapaññatti*, *Lokaprajñapti*, *Visuddhimagga*, and the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, which also take up the motif of the seven suns, tend to

focus increasingly on cosmological matters.<sup>20</sup> In line with this tendency, the *Ekottarika-āgama* discourse precedes the appearance of the seven suns with a general cosmological description.<sup>21</sup> After the episode of the seven suns, the *Ekottarika-āgama* versions continues with an account of the formation of the world,<sup>22</sup> which leads up to a description of the gradual decline of originally luminous beings similar to what can be found in the *Aggañña-sutta* and its parallels.<sup>23</sup> The resultant and rather long *Ekottarika-āgama* discourse gives the impression of being the outcome of a combination of originally unrelated textual pieces, placed together to satisfy an interest in cosmological descriptions.

Another example is a discourse among the Eights of the *Ekottarika-āgama*, which begins with the topic of the observance day (*uposatha*) and in this respect is similar to an exposition found in three consecutive discourses in the *Āṅguttara-nikāya* and their parallels.<sup>24</sup> In the *Ekottarika-āgama* discourse this topic then leads on to the theme of the appearance of the Buddha Maitreya in the future, to a past live of the Buddha as a princess, a tale found in the Pāli tradition as a *Jātaka* outside of the canonical *Jātaka* collection,<sup>25</sup> and to the meeting of the bodhisattva with the past Buddha Dīpaṃkara.

The meeting of the bodhisattva who was to become the Buddha Gotama with the former Buddha Dīpaṃkara recurs in a discourse among the Nines of the *Ekottarika-āgama*.<sup>26</sup> This discourse precedes its reference to this meeting by reporting how the Buddha gave Ānanda a teaching on the importance of friendship, *kalyāṇamittatā*, which has parallels in a discourse in the *Samyutta-nikāya*, Sanskrit fragments, two discourses in the *Samyukta-āgama*, and a parallel preserved in Tibetan translation.<sup>27</sup> Just as the discourse from the Eights of the *Ekottarika-āgama*, the present discourse from the Nines appears to be the result of a combination of originally unrelated textual pieces.

In his study of discourse merger mentioned earlier, Lamotte also notes that the compilers responsible for such forging at times took some liberty with their sources by developing and transforming them in order to introduce Mahāyāna notions.<sup>28</sup> The occurrence of Mahāyāna-related material in such apparent discourse merger can also be seen in a discourse among the Nines and another discourse among the Elevens of the collection. The discourse found among the Nines relates an episode where Sakka finds his throne being occupied by a *yakkha*, an event similarly recorded in a discourse in the *Samyutta-nikāya* and its parallels.<sup>29</sup> Based on this tale, the Buddha then describes his practice of *mettā* for seven years and

its beneficial results, a description found in a range of other discourses, including another discourse in the same *Ekottarika-āgama*.<sup>30</sup> Next in the discourse under discussion Ānanda intervenes and queries what would happen if someone wished to go forth when no Buddha has arisen, in reply to which the Buddha affirms that even just going forth on one's own will enable one to reach the destruction of the influxes.<sup>31</sup> This then leads on to a discussion of the three *yānas* and to the Buddha's affirmation that these are taught by Buddhas of past, present, and future times.<sup>32</sup> The reference to the three *yānas* shows the influence of Mahāyāna thought in the *Ekottarika-āgama* collection in a form not attested in Pāli discourses or other Chinese *Āgamas*. Such influences form a recurrent trait of this collection elsewhere and are not confined to what appear to be cases of discourse merger.<sup>33</sup>

As already mentioned, another example of Mahāyāna-related material influencing a case of apparent discourse merger can be found among the Elevens of the *Ekottarika-āgama*. The discourse in question starts with an exposition of the fruitfulness of giving to the General Sīha, found similarly in the *Aṅguttara-nikāya* and its parallels, as well as in another discourse in the *Ekottarika-āgama*.<sup>34</sup> In the discourse under discussion the topic of giving leads on to an invitation for a meal, in relation to which *devas* inform the General Sīha of the level of awakening attained by the monastic recipients of the food offering, information in which he shows little interest. This part has parallels in a discourse in the *Aṅguttara-nikāya* and its *Madhyama-āgama* counterparts, where the one who is informed by the *devas* is rather the householder Ugga.<sup>35</sup> In the *Ekottarika-āgama* version the Buddha then lauds General Sīha for giving with the mind of a bodhisattva.<sup>36</sup>

The two cases from the Nines and Elevens just mentioned are also noteworthy in so far as they display another noteworthy feature, namely a doubling of parallels. Whereas it is less surprising to find the Buddha's description of his practice of *mettā* for seven years in two different *Ekottarika-āgama* discourses, the fact that the *Aṅguttara-nikāya* discourse to Sīha also has two *Ekottarika-āgama* parallels, and that these differ from each other, is remarkable.

A doubling of discourses as such is not an unusual feature and also found in the Pāli *Nikāyas*, but such occurrences usually involve the doubling of the same text. That is, the same discourse or part of a discourse has been allotted to more than one collection, presumably reflecting its popularity among reciters of different collections. What makes the *Ekottarika-āgama*

parallel to the discourse to Sīha and other such instances in the same collection noteworthy is that such doublings can involve substantially different versions of what in other transmission lineages is a single discourse.<sup>37</sup>

An instance of such doubling as part of an apparent discourse merger can be found in relation to a discourse among the Tens. The discourse begins with the Buddha's refusal to recite the code of discipline, because an impure monk is present in the assembly, an episode also recorded in a discourse in the *Aṅguttara-nikāya* and a range of parallels.<sup>38</sup> The *Ekottarika-āgama* discourse then continues with a description of the seven Buddhas of the past and their assemblies,<sup>39</sup> a piece that has a counterpart in the *Mahāpadāna-sutta* and its parallels,<sup>40</sup> among which one parallel is also found as a discourse in the same section of the *Ekottarika-āgama*.<sup>41</sup>

Another instance of doubling combined with apparent merger corresponds to what in the *Samyutta-nikāya* and in each of the two *Samyukta-āgamas* are single discourses in which the Buddha encourages Mahākassapa to give up his ascetic practices.<sup>42</sup> One version of this episode occurs among the Ones of the *Ekottarika-āgama*,<sup>43</sup> the other version is found among the Sevens of the same collection.<sup>44</sup> The parallel found among the Sevens continues from the basic episode common to the different versions with the need of Mahākassapa to remain until the coming of the next Buddha, clearly a case of expansion with later material.<sup>45</sup> The parallel among the Ones has the unique feature that here Mahākassapa proclaims that he would have become a Paccekabuddha, had he not met the Buddha.<sup>46</sup> The Paccekabuddha-motif is not found in any of the other versions, including the *Ekottarika-āgama* parallel found among the Sevens of the collection.

It is against the background of such instances of discourse merger in the *Ekottarika-āgama* collection that the case study to which I now turn is best evaluated.

### **The *Kakacūpama-sutta* and the *Alagaddūpama-sutta***

The main topic of the *Kakacūpama-sutta* and its *Madhyama-āgama* parallel is the need for patience. The two discourses begin by reporting that the monk Moliya Phagguṇa had been closely associating with the nuns, becoming angry if anyone should be critical of them, just as the nuns would get upset if anyone should find fault with Moliya Phagguṇa.<sup>47</sup> On being informed of this, the Buddha reminds Moliya Phagguṇa of the fact that he has gone forth and thus should not behave in this way, but should rather train in developing patience.



The Buddha then describes the proper attitude of former monks who followed his injunction to take only a single meal. Next he relates the tale of the housewife Vedehikā reputed for her patience who, on being tested by her maidservant Kālī, turns out to be rather impatient. The Buddha encourages the monks in his audience to remain patient in any situation, which he illustrates with various comparisons that lead up to the simile of the saw, according to which one should remain without hostility even if cruel bandits were to cut one to pieces.

In the case of the *Alagaddūpama-sutta* and its *Madhyama-āgama* parallel, the main theme is dogmatic adherence to views, contrasted to the realization of not-self. The two discourses begin with the monk Ariṭṭha's mistaken belief that sensual indulgence is not an obstacle for progress on the path to awakening.<sup>48</sup> Being reproached by other monks for this view, Ariṭṭha holds on to it firmly.<sup>49</sup> The Buddha clarifies Ariṭṭha's view to be a misunderstanding and to be in contrast to what he had taught.

This leads on to a warning that mere learning of various teachings in the form of the nine (or twelve) *anṅas*,<sup>50</sup> without examining their meaning, is comparable to grasping a snake in such a way that one will get bitten.<sup>51</sup> The teachings should be considered as comparable to a raft, which enables crossing over, instead of being something to hold on to for its own sake. In both versions the Buddha continues by examining six standpoints for views, followed by a penetrative exposition of not-self that leads up to the simile of people carrying away twigs from Jeta's Grove.

A discourse found among the Elevens of the *Ekottarika-āgama*, translated below, begins with Moliya Phagguna associating closely with the nuns, but then relates this to the issue of sexual intercourse and the simile of the snake.

### Translation of EĀ 50.8<sup>52</sup>

1. Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was staying at Sāvattihī in Jeta's Grove, Anāthapiṇḍika's Park.

2. At that time the monk Moliya Phagguna was going about together with the nuns, furthermore the nuns were in turn also fond of going about together with him. Their being together [was such] that there were people who made fun of the monk Moliya Phagguna.<sup>53</sup> The nuns thereupon became angry about this, they were upset and displeased. When people spoke bad about the nuns, then the monk Phagguna also got upset and displeased.

3. Then a group of many monks said to the monk Phagguna: “Why are you now [so] intimate with the nuns and the nuns in turn also associate with you [so much]?”<sup>54</sup>

Phagguna replied: “Now as I understand the teaching and discipline proclaimed by the Tathāgata,<sup>55</sup> for one who transgresses by having sexual intercourse, this does not suffice for being reckoned an offence.”<sup>56</sup> The group of many monks said in turn: “Stop, stop, monk,<sup>57</sup> do not say this! Do not slander the teachings proclaimed by the Tathāgata! Slandering the teachings proclaimed by the Tathāgata is not a small transgression. Moreover, the Blessed One has with innumerable means spoken about the defilement of sexual intercourse. That one who engages in sexual intercourse does not incur an offence is not at all reasonable. You should drop this evil view right away. By upholding it you will experience immeasurable *dukkha* for a long time.” Yet the monk Phagguna intentionally associated [with the nuns] and did not change his behaviour.<sup>58</sup>

4. Then the group of many monks approached the Blessed One, paid homage with their heads at his feet, and said to the Blessed One: “In the city of Sāvattihī there is one monk, called Phagguna, who associates together with the nuns, and the nuns moreover also keep associating with him, coming and going [to meet] the monk Phagguna. We have approached him to persuade him to change that behaviour, yet both [of them] thereupon do it still more frequently.<sup>59</sup> He does not relinquish his distorted view and does not act in accordance with the true Dharma.”<sup>60</sup>

5. At that time the Blessed One told one of the monks: “You approach that monk Phagguna and say: ‘The Tathāgata calls you.’” At that time the monk, having received the instruction from the Tathāgata, approached the monk Phagguna [saying]: “You should know that the Tathāgata is calling you.”

Hearing what that monk had said, the monk Phagguna approached the Blessed One, paid homage with his head [at the Buddha’s] feet, and sat to one side. At that time the Blessed One asked that monk: “Are you indeed intimate with the nuns?”<sup>61</sup> That monk replied: “It is like this, Blessed One!”

The Buddha said to the monk: “You are a monk, how can you associate [so much] together with the nuns? You are presently a clansman’s son

who has shaved off hair and beard, has put on the three monastic robes, and out of firm faith has gone forth to train in the path.”<sup>62</sup>  
The monk Phaggunā said to the Buddha. “Indeed, Blessed One, I am a clansman’s son who out of firm faith has gone forth to train in the path.”<sup>[813a]</sup>

The Buddha told the monk: “This is not for you the proper behaviour (*dharma*). Why do you associate [so much] together with the nuns?”  
The monk Phaggunā said to the Buddha: “I heard it being taught by the Tathāgata that for one who engages in sexual intercourse this does not suffice for being reckoned an offence or obstruction.”

6. The Buddha said to the monk: “You foolish person. How is it that you state that the Tathāgata [proclaims] engaging in sexual intercourse not to be an offence? I have with innumerable means spoken of the defilement of sexual intercourse. Why do you now say this: ‘The Tathāgata proclaims that sexual intercourse is not an offence.’ You would do well to guard yourself against such a verbal transgression, so that you do not for a long time experience [*dukkha* in retribution for] that offence.”

7. The Buddha said: “You now just stop and wait until I have further asked the monks about this.”<sup>63</sup>

8. At that time the Blessed One said to the monks: “Have you heard me say to monks that sexual intercourse is not an offence?” The monks replied: “Blessed One, we have indeed not heard the Tathāgata say that sexual intercourse is not an offence. The reason is that the Tathāgata has with innumerable means spoken of the defilement of sexual intercourse.<sup>64</sup> If someone says that there is no offence in this, then this is not correct.”

9. The Buddha said to the monks: “It is well, it is well, monks, as you say, I have with innumerable means spoken of the defilement of sexual intercourse.”<sup>65</sup>

10. At that time the Blessed One spoke again to the monks:<sup>66</sup> “You should know, suppose a foolish person studies the practice of the teachings, namely the discourses (*sutta*), prose-and-verse (*geyya*), stanzas (*gāthā*), expositions (*veyyākaraṇa*), historical narratives (*nidāna*), quotes (*itivuttaka*), legends (*apadāna*), birth stories (*jātaka*), answers to questions (*vedalla*), marvels (*abbhutadhamma*),

explanations of meaning (*upadesa*), and inspired utterances (*udāna*).<sup>67</sup> Even though he recites those teachings, he does not understand their meaning. By not examining their meaning, he also does not follow the Dharma. What is appropriate for following the Dharma, that practice he never follows.

“The reason why he recites those teachings is that he wishes afterwards to debate together with people,<sup>68</sup> scheming for victory or defeat, and not for them to help himself. Having recited the teachings, he [still] transgresses their restrictions.<sup>69</sup>

“It is just as if there were a man who goes outside of a village wishing to hunt for a poisonous snake. As he sees a very large snake, on having reached it, he takes hold of it by the tail with his left hand.<sup>70</sup> Yet that snake turns around with the head and bites his hand. Because of this his life then comes to an end.

“It is just like that if a foolish person is careless, learning the teachings of the twelve divisions of the scriptures properly, yet without examining their meaning. The reason is that he thereby does not fathom the meaning of the true Dharma.

11. “Then suppose there is [instead] a son of a good family who takes care to guard himself against carelessly learning the teachings, the discourses, prose-and-verse, stanzas, expositions, historical narratives, quotes, legends, birth stories, answers to questions, marvels, explanations of meaning, and inspired utterances. Having recited these teachings, that person deeply understands their meaning. [813b] Due to understanding the teachings deep in meaning, he follows the instructions without misconduct.

“The reason why he recites the teachings is not because his mind [is concerned with] victory or defeat in debating with others. The reason why he learns to recite the teachings is his wish to collect them for himself, so that he can examine them. The reason why he recites the teachings is so that they bear fruit according to his aspiration.<sup>71</sup> Because of this he gradually approaches Nirvāṇa.

“This is just as if a man goes outside of his village wishing to hunt for a poisonous snake. Having seen a snake, holding iron pliers he first pinches its head and then catches it by the neck so that it cannot

move.<sup>72</sup> If that evil snake turns around its tail, wishing to harm the man, it will never reach him. Monks, the reason is that he has caught it by the neck.

“The son of a good family is also just like that. He learns to recite, reciting aloud and completely, and he examines its meaning. He follows the Dharma and never commits any misconduct. Because of this he gradually gets to approach Nirvāṇa. The reason is that he has taken hold of the true Dharma.

12. “Therefore, monks, those of you who understand my meaning should remember and respectfully receive it. Those of you who do not understand it should come and ask me further [about it]. The Tathāgata is right now present, regretting it later will be of no use.”<sup>73</sup>

At that time the Buddha told the monks:<sup>74</sup> “Suppose there is a monk in the great community who makes such a statement: ‘[As] I fully understand the precepts that have been proclaimed by the Tathāgata, for one who engages in sexual intercourse this does not suffice for being reckoned an obstructive offence.’ Those monks should tell that monk: ‘Stop, stop, do not say this! Do not slander the Tathāgata by saying these words. The Tathāgata never spoke these words.’

“If this monk changes in relation to what he has transgressed, then it is well. If he does not change that behaviour, you should admonish him again and a third time. If he should change, it is well. If he does not change, he has committed a *pācittiya*. If the monks hide this affair and do not expose it, all of them have committed a *pācittiya*. Thus, monks, I have established the precept.”

At that time the monks heard what the Buddha said, were delighted, and received it respectfully.

### Study of EĀ 50.8

Examining the above discourse from the viewpoint of internal coherence, it is noteworthy that, when the monks inform the Buddha of Phagguna’s excessive association with the nuns, they just indicate that “he does not relinquish his distorted view”, without any further specification of what kind of view underpins his way of behaviour.<sup>75</sup> Proper adjustment to the narrative context would have required that the monks first inform the Buddha of the content of Phagguna’s view. In fact when Phagguna meets the Buddha, the latter starts the discussion by inquiring about

his associating with the nuns. Had the Buddha known about Phaggunā's view, it would have been more natural for him to inquire about this rather grave misunderstanding and misrepresentation of his teaching.

This in itself minor point highlights a basic problem in the above *Ekottarika-āgama* discourse, namely the assumption that close association with the nuns results from the view that engaging in sex is unproblematic for a monk. The relationship between these two topics is far from self-evident. The *Kakacūpama-sutta* and its *Madhyama-āgama* parallel do report that the Buddha contrasted Phaggunā's excessive associating with nuns to the fact that he had gone forth from the household life and thus should leave behind the type of thoughts and attitudes of a householder.<sup>76</sup> This does not imply, however, that Phaggunā had necessarily sexual intentions. It just seems to reflect the fact that close association between males and females is inappropriate in a monastic setting. In fact if a monk holds the view that having sexual intercourse is not offence, one would rather expect that he associates frequently with laywomen, as his chances to engage in what he deems unproblematic would be much higher.

That the present discourse is indeed a patchwork of different textual pieces becomes evident in its last section, which reports the Buddha promulgating a rule against what in the *Ekottarika-āgama* is Phaggunā's clinging to his wrong view. The same wrong view was according to the *Alagaddūpama-sutta* rather upheld by Aritṭha, a name that has its counterpart in the *Madhyama-āgama* parallel in 阿梨吒, ālīzhā.<sup>77</sup> The same transcription can be found in the account of this episode in the Dharmaguptaka and Mahīśāsaka *Vinayas*, and the closely similar 阿利吒, ālīzhā, in the Mahāsāṅghika and Sarvāstivāda *Vinayas*.<sup>78</sup> The only variant in this respect occurs in the Chinese translation of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*,<sup>79</sup> yet in this case we fortunately have also access to a Sanskrit version, which indeed speaks of Ariṣṭa, and the Tibetan translation, which has the corresponding 'chi ltas.<sup>80</sup>

In sum, the six main *Vinayas* agree with the *Alagaddūpama-sutta* and its *Madhyama-āgama* parallel that the name of the monk who held on to the view that engaging in sensuality is not an offence was Aritṭha/Ariṣṭa. This in turn makes it safe to conclude that the fact that in the *Ekottarika-āgama* he is rather called 茂羅破群, màoluópòqún,<sup>81</sup> is the result of conflating the story of the monk who associates closely with nuns, Moliya Phaggunā, with the story of the monk Aritṭha.<sup>82</sup>

In relation to the present case of apparent merger of what in the *Majjhima-nikāya* are the *Kakacūpama-sutta* and the *Alagaddūpama-sutta*, it is noteworthy that another discourse, found among the Eights in the *Ekottarika-āgama*, also has extracts from both discourses. In what follows I translate the first part of this discourse.

### Translation of the First Part of EĀ 43.5<sup>83</sup>

Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was staying at Sāvattihī in Jeta's Grove, Anāthapiṇḍika's Park. At that time the Blessed One said to the monks: "I will now teach you the simile of the raft, <sup>[760a]</sup> pay proper attention with a collected mind."<sup>84</sup> The monks replied: "Indeed, Blessed One." [Thus] the monks received this instruction from the Buddha.

The Blessed One said: "Why is it called the 'simile of the raft'? If while travelling on a road you are caught by robbers, you should hold on to your mind and not give rise to evil sentiments. You should arouse a mental attitude of *mettā*, compassion, sympathetic joy, and equanimity, pervading all directions with it,<sup>85</sup> immeasurably, boundless, and incalculable.<sup>86</sup>

"You should keep your mind like the earth. Just as this earth receives what is pure and also receives what is impure, it receives excrement and urine, and all that is dirty and loathsome, yet the earth does not give rise to a discriminatory mental attitude, it does not say: 'This is beautiful, this is ugly.'<sup>87</sup> Now your practice should also be like this. Suppose you are being captured by robbers, do not give rise to evil thoughts or to a discriminatory mental attitude.

"As the earth, so water, fire, and wind also receive what is loathsome and receive as well what is beautiful; they all are without a discriminatory mental attitude. Arouse a mental attitude of *mettā*, compassion, sympathetic joy, and equanimity towards all living beings. The reason is that the practice of wholesome states could still be given up, let alone that one could be fond of evil states.<sup>88</sup>

"It is just as if there were a person who has encountered a fearful and difficult situation.<sup>89</sup> He wishes to get across that difficult situation and reach a place of safety. He runs around at will, searching for a safe place. He sees a large river that is very deep and wide. There is no

boat or bridge that could be used to cross over and reach the other shore. Whereas the place where he stands is very fearful and difficult, the other shore is not affected by it.

“Then that person ponders and reflects: ‘Now this river is very deep and also wide, and there is nothing to be used to cross over.’<sup>90</sup> Now I could gather wood and grass, bind it together as a raft and try to cross over. Having relied on this raft I can get from this shore to the other shore.’ Then that person gathers wood and grass, binds it together as a raft, and tries to cross over.’<sup>91</sup> Relying on this raft he gets from this shore to the other shore.’<sup>92</sup>

“Having crossed over to that shore he further reflects: ‘This raft has been of much benefit to me, using this raft I gained relief from distress and from being in a fearful position, I got to reach a place that is not affected by it. Now I will not let go of this raft, but keep it for my own use afterwards.’

“How is it, monks, in the place which that person has reached, will he afterwards be able to make use of the raft himself, or will he not be able to do so?” The monks replied: “He will not, Blessed One. That person has now already obtained the fruition of his aspirations. After that, of what further use is the raft for him?”

The Buddha said to the monks: “Even so, one should let go of wholesome dharmas, let alone what is contrary to the Dharma.”<sup>93</sup>

### Study of the First Part of EĀ 43.5

The above discourse begins by announcing the simile of the raft, which in the *Alagaddūpama-sutta* and its parallels illustrates the appropriate attitude towards the teachings, in continuity with the simile of the snake. After this announcement, however, the *Ekottarika-āgama* discourse moves into the subject matter of the *Kakacūpama-sutta* and its parallels by describing the need for equanimity when being caught by robbers. This is the topic of the simile of the saw in the *Kakacūpama-sutta* and its parallels.

Next the above *Ekottarika-āgama* discourse continues by illustrating an attitude of patience with the example of the elements, which in the *Majjhima-nikāya* are instead found in the *Mahārāhulovāda-sutta*. This case is particularly interesting, since the *Mahārāhulovāda-sutta* has a parallel among the Twos of the *Ekottarika-āgama*, yet this discourse



does not have the instruction on developing patience by following the example of the elements.<sup>94</sup>

Eventually the *Ekottarika-āgama* discourse translated above does come round to deliver the simile of the raft. The remainder of the discourse, which I have not translated, continues with a description of the Buddha's pre-awakening experience, including an account how he confronted Māra when being on the seat of awakening.<sup>95</sup>

That this discourse is the result of patchwork is fairly evident from the narrative disruption between the Buddha's announcement that he will teach the simile of the raft and its actual delivery, making it safe to assume that other material has been interpolated between the announcement and the simile itself.

The narrative discontinuity is not only evident in the fact that the announcement of the simile leads on to unrelated material, it can also be seen in the transition from this material to the actual simile. After having mentioned the arousing of the *brahmavihāras* towards all beings, the discourse continues with the statement "the reason is that the practice of wholesome states could still be given up, let alone that one could be fond of evil states." This seems to be a corrupted version of the conclusion drawn at the end of the simile of the raft that "one should let go of wholesome dharmas, let alone what is contrary to the Dharma", which is similarly found in the *Alagaddūpama-sutta* and its parallels.<sup>96</sup> Whereas at this juncture the statement makes sense, the in itself already somewhat puzzling formulation found earlier has no self-evident relationship to the previously mentioned *brahmavihāra* practice, even though it is introduced with the connecting phrase "the reason is that". Thus it seems safe to conclude that this discourse is the result of combining textual pieces of different origins.

In this way, textual pieces stemming from the *Kakacūpama-sutta* and the *Alagaddūpama-sutta*, as well as their parallels, have become building blocks for this discourse among the Eights of the *Ekottarika-āgama* as well as for the discourse translated above in full from the Elevens of the same collection. Besides illustrating such merger, the present case also shows to some extent the feature of doubling of discourse parallels, in so far as two discourses in the *Ekottarika-āgama* are each partial parallels to a single discourse in the *Majjhima-nikāya*. Another noteworthy feature is that the remainder of the second *Ekottarika-āgama* discourse shows the

integration of later material, such as Māra challenging the bodhisattva on the seat of awakening, which in the Pāli canon can only be found in the commentarial literature.<sup>97</sup> As discussed in the first part of the present article, both the doubling of discourses and the integration of late material are recurrent features of discourse merger in this collection.

### More Cases of Discourse Merger

Another noteworthy feature of the present case is that it involves two discourses that in the *Majjhima-nikāya* follow each other immediately (MN 21 and MN 22). The same holds for another case of discourse merger found among the Elevens of the *Ekottarika-āgama*. Although this discourse is for the most part a parallel to the *Sela-sutta* in the *Majjhima-nikāya* (also found in the *Sutta-nipāta*), it incorporates several textual pieces that appear to stem from the *Assalāyana-sutta* and its parallels.<sup>98</sup> This discourse (EĀ 49.6) thus combines material from what in the *Majjhima-nikāya* are two adjacent discourses (MN 92 and MN 93), just as the discourse that directly follows it in the *Ekottarika-āgama* (EĀ 49.7) combines material from what in the *Majjhima-nikāya* are two adjacent discourses (MN 65 and MN 66), this being the case I already translated and studied in a previous paper on discourse merger.<sup>99</sup> In this case the type of narrative inconsistency that emerges through closer study suggests that the merger did not happen during oral transmission, but would have taken place in some way in the written medium.<sup>100</sup>

The sequence of these two pairs in the *Majjhima-nikāya*, MN 65 and MN 66 as well as MN 92 and MN 93, is determined by thematic continuity. This leaves open the possibility that a similar sequence could have been observed in a different discourse collection that has versions of these discourses. Although certainly not decisive in itself, this does give the impression as if these cases of merger might have been produced by combining anyway adjacent discourses. The same possibility holds for the main case studied in this article, where two *Ekottarika-āgama* discourses combine material from what in the *Majjhima-nikāya* are two adjacent discourses, the *Kakacūpama-sutta* and the *Alagaddūpama-sutta* (MN 21 and MN 22).

Narrative inconsistency of the type found in the present case study can also be identified in another instance of discourse merger, found among the Sevens of the *Ekottarika-āgama*. The discourse begins with Pasenadi expressing his opinion that some ascetics who have just passed by must be arahants, whereupon the Buddha points out that only through close

acquaintance can one know if someone is indeed an arahant.<sup>101</sup> Records of this episode in the *Samyutta-nikāya* and the two *Samyukta-āgamas* continue by indicating that these were actually sham ascetics employed by Pasenadi as spies,<sup>102</sup> giving the impression that the king perhaps tried to test out if the Buddha was able to recognize that they were not genuine arahants.

The *Ekottarika-āgama* discourse has no such indication about the true nature of these ascetics, instead of which it continues somewhat abruptly with the tale of the seer Asita's visit to some Brahmins seers who try to curse him.<sup>103</sup> This tale is also found in the *Assalāyana-sutta* and its parallels,<sup>104</sup> which I mentioned above in relation to the previous case of discourse merger, where it forms part of a debate between the Buddha and his visitor on the Brahminical claim to superiority among the four classes (*vaṇṇa*) of Indian society. This is clearly the original location of the Asita tale, as once the Brahmin seers find out that their curses are ineffective, Asita gives them a teaching on the lack of foundation of their belief that Brahmins are superior to others.

In contrast, the *Ekottarika-āgama* version continues after this episode with the topic of what makes one an arahant, even though the tale of Asita does not bear any relation to this theme. In this way, the *Ekottarika-āgama* discourse gives the impression that a discourse originally concerned with the theme of the ability to recognize if someone is an arahant has been expanded through interpolation of another story taken from a version of the *Assalāyana-sutta*. In its present form, the Asita tale in the *Ekottarika-āgama* no longer illustrates mistaken Brahminical presumptions, but rather centers on mistaken notions of what leads to kingship or rebirth in heaven, which does not fit the narrative context particularly well.<sup>105</sup>

Another example of an apparent discourse merger that results in narrative inconsistency can also be found among the Sevens of the *Ekottarika-āgama*. This discourse combines what in the Pāli tradition are two separate discourses given to the lay disciple Mahānāma. The first part of the *Ekottarika-āgama* discourse parallels the report given in a discourse in the *Samyutta-nikāya*.<sup>106</sup> In this discourse the Buddha assures Mahānāma that he would not meet an evil rebirth even if he were to pass away suddenly. The Buddha compares this to breaking a pot full of oil that had been placed in the water, whereupon the oil will rise to the water's surface. After a brief reference to the Buddha's pre-awakening ascetic practices, the second part of the *Ekottarika-āgama* discourse continues

similar to a discourse in the *Majjhima-nikāya* and its parallels.<sup>107</sup> In this *Majjhima-nikāya* discourse the Buddha informs Mahānāma of a meeting he had with Jain ascetics during which he expressed his criticism of their belief that self-mortification is the path to freedom, getting them to admit that he experienced more pleasure than even the king. The *Ekottarika-āgama* discourse continues with a simile contrasting a large amount of water to a single drop to illustrate the mass of *dukkha* left behind by a noble disciple in contrast to the small amount of *dukkha* still remaining, which has a counterpart in yet another discourse in the *Samyutta-nikāya* and its *Samyukta-āgama* parallel.<sup>108</sup>

That this *Ekottarika-āgama* discourse is indeed a patchwork of originally separate texts suggests itself from an inconsistency in a formal aspect of the Buddha's narration of his past encounter with the Jains. This narration is throughout worded in the first person singular, with the Buddha indicating "then I said to the Nigaṇṭhas".<sup>109</sup> Yet, in the midst of their discussion he instead introduces his next reply by stating "the Blessed One said".<sup>110</sup>

Another inconsistency occurs when the Buddha leads over from the description of his pre-awakening six-year ascetic practices to his encounter with the Jains by stating that "at that time I moreover went to ...", making it clear that this encounter should be placed during this period of six years.<sup>111</sup> This renders the ensuing comparison between the Buddha's and the king's happiness meaningless, since during the time of his asceticism the Buddha-to-be could not have claimed to live in greater happiness than the king.

In his description to Mahānāma, in the *Ekottarika-āgama* version the Buddha three times states that one cannot reach happiness through happiness: first when introducing his encounter with the Jains, then when discussing with them, and the third time on drawing out the implications of his superior happiness compared to the king.<sup>112</sup> Yet this statement made three times is precisely the belief upheld by the Jains, which the comparison between the king's and the Buddha's happiness is meant to counter. The *Majjhima-nikāya* discourse and its *Madhyama-āgama* parallel in fact attribute such a statement to the Jains.<sup>113</sup> For further confirmation the Jain *Sūyagada* can be consulted, which takes exactly this position.<sup>114</sup> One would not expect such a confusion in the attribution of a key statement of the discourse to the Buddha instead of to his opponents to occur in an Indian setting familiar with the contrast between the tenets upheld by the Buddhists and by the Jains respectively.

## Conclusion

The above surveyed cases clearly bear out the correctness of Lamotte's assessment of the *Ekottarika-āgama* as having an abundance of composite discourses artificially forged by putting side by side discourses or portions of discourses borrowed from other canonical texts.<sup>115</sup> At times closer inspection suggests that such merger of discourses would have happened in the written medium and thus presumably in China, given that the Indic original reached China by oral transmission.<sup>116</sup> This does not hold for all the cases of merger surveyed in this paper, however, some of which might equally well have occurred already earlier during oral transmission. What remains certain, however, is that these merger cases conflate what earlier were distinct textual pieces.

## Abbreviations

AN	<i>Aṅguttara-nikāya</i>
D	Derge edition
DĀ	<i>Dīrgha-āgama</i> (T 1)
Dhp-a	<i>Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā</i>
DN	<i>Dīgha-nikāya</i>
EĀ	<i>Ekottarika-āgama</i> (T 125)
It	<i>Itivuttaka</i>
Jā	<i>Jātaka</i>
MĀ	<i>Madhyama-āgama</i> (T 26)
MN	<i>Majjhima-nikāya</i>
Q	<i>Qian-long</i> (Peking) edition
SĀ	<i>Samyukta-āgama</i> (T 99)
SĀ <sup>2</sup>	<i>Samyukta-āgama</i> (T 100)
SHT	Sanskrihandschriften aus den Turfanfunden
Sn	<i>Sutta-nipāta</i>
SN	<i>Samyutta-nikāya</i>
T	Taishō edition
Ud	<i>Udāna</i>
Vin	<i>Vinaya</i>

## References

- Anālayo 2008: “Reflections on Comparative Āgama Studies”, *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal*, 21: 3–21.
- Anālayo 2010: “The Influence of Commentarial Exegesis on the Transmission of Āgama Literature”, in *Translating Buddhist Chinese, Problems and Prospects*, 1–20, K. Meisig (ed.), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Anālayo 2011a: *A Comparative Study of the Majjhima-nikāya*, Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation.
- Anālayo 2011b: “The Conversion of the Brahmin Sela in the Ekottarika-āgama”, *Thai International Journal of Buddhist Studies*, 2: 37–56.
- Anālayo 2011c: “The Tale of King Ma(k)hādeva in the Ekottarika-āgama and the Cakravartin Motif”, *Journal of the Centre for Buddhist Studies, Sri Lanka*, 9: 43–77.
- Anālayo 2012: “The Tale of King Nimi in the Ekottarika-āgama”, *Journal of the Centre for Buddhist Studies, Sri Lanka*, 10: 69–94.
- Anālayo 2013a: “Mahāyāna in the Ekottarika-āgama”, *Singaporean Journal of Buddhist Studies*, 1: 5–43.
- Anālayo 2013b: “Two Versions of the Mahādeva Tale in the Ekottarika-āgama, A Study in the Development of Taishō No. 125”, in *Research on the Ekottarika-āgama (Taishō 125)*, Dhammadinnā (ed.), 1–70, Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation.
- Anālayo 2014: “Discourse Merger in the Ekottarika-āgama (1), The Parallel to the Bhaddāli-sutta and the Latukikopama-sutta, Together with Notes on the Chinese Translation of the Collection”, *Singaporean Journal of Buddhist Studies*, 2: 5–35.
- Anālayo 2015a: “The Buddha’s Past Life as a Princess in the Ekottarika-āgama”, *Journal of Buddhist Ethics*, 22: 95–137.
- Anālayo 2015b: “Pratyekabuddhas in the Ekottarika-āgama”, *Journal of the Oxford Centre for Buddhist Studies*, 8: 10–27.
- Anālayo 2016: “Āgama and Aṅga in the Early Buddhist Oral Tradition” (forthcoming)
- Banerjee, Anukul Chandra 1977: *Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts in Sanskrit, Prātimokṣa Sūtra and Bhikṣukarmavākya*, Calcutta: World Press.
- Bechert, Heinz and K. Wille 1989: *Sanskrihandschriften aus den Turfanfunden, Teil 6*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Bollée, Willem B. 1988 (vol. 2): *Studien zum Sūyagada, Textteile, Nijjutti, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes 1993/2000: *The Two Traditions of Meditation in Ancient India*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Dhammajoti, Bhikkhu K.L. 2015: “Prajñā-vimukta, ubhayatobhāga-vimukta and vimokṣāvaraṇa, The Sarvāstivāda Perspective”, in *Buddhist Meditative Praxis, Traditional Teachings & Modern Applications*, K.L. Dhammajoti (ed.), 25–49, Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong, Centre of Buddhist Studies.
- Dietz, Siglinde 2007: “The Saptasūryodayasūtra”, in *Indica et Tibetica 65, Festschrift für Michael Hahn zum 65. Geburtstag von Freunden und Schülern überreicht*, K. Konrad and J. U. Hartmann (ed.), 93–112, Wien: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien.

- Dutt, Nalinaksha 1984: *Gilgit Manuscripts, Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinayavastu, vol. III part 3*, Delhi: Sri Satguru.
- Fukita, Takamichi 2003: *The Mahāvādānasūtra: A New Edition Based on Manuscripts Discovered in Northern Turkestan*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Gombrich, Richard F. 1996: *How Buddhism Began, The Conditioned Genesis of the Early Teachings*, London: Athlone.
- Hirakawa, Akira 1997: *Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Dictionary*, Tokyo: Reiyukai.
- Jacobi, Herman 1895/1996 (vol. 2): *Jaina Sūtras, Translated from Prakrit*, Delhi: Low Price Publications.
- Kuan, Tse-fu 2013: “Legends and Transcendence: Sectarian Affiliations of the Ekottarika Āgama in Chinese Translation”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 133.4: 607–634.
- Lamotte, Étienne 1944/1981 (vol. 1): *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra)*, Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut Orientaliste.
- Lamotte, Étienne 1967: “Un sūtra composite de l’Ekottarāgama”, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 30: 105–116 (an English translation can be found in the *Buddhist Studies Review*, 1995: 27–46).
- Legittimo, Elsa 2014: “The First Āgama Transmission to China”, in *Buddhism Across Asia: Networks of Material, Intellectual and Cultural Exchange*, T. Sen (ed.), 65–83, Singapore: Institute of South-East Asian Studies.
- Mayeda [=Maeda], Egaku 1985: “Japanese Studies on the Schools of the Chinese Agamas”, in *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur, Erster Teil*, H. Bechert (ed.), 94–103, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Nagashima, Jundo 2009: “The Sanskrit Fragments Or. 15009/51–90 in the Hoernle Collection”, in *Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia, The British Library Sanskrit Fragments, Volume II*, S. Karashima and K. Wille (ed.), 128–159, Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- Ñāṇamoli, Bhikkhu 1995/2005: *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha, A Translation of the Majjhima Nikāya*, Bhikkhu Bodhi (ed.), Boston: Wisdom.
- Nattier, Jan 2004: “The Twelve Divisions of Scriptures (十二部經) in the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations”, *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University*, 7: 167–196.
- Pachow, W. 1955: *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa, on the Basis of its Chinese, Tibetan, Sanskrit and Pali Versions*, Santiniketan: Sino-Indian Cultural Society.
- Palumbo, Antonello 2013: *An Early Chinese Commentary on the Ekottarika-āgama, The Fenbie gongde lun 分別功德論 and the History of the Translation of the Zengyi ahan jing 增一阿含經*, Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation.
- Pauly, Bernard 1959: “Fragments Sanskrits de Haute Asie (Mission Pelliot)”, *Journal Asiatique*, 247: 203–249.
- Pruitt, William and K.R. Norman 2001: *The Pātimokkha*, Oxford: Pali Text Society.

- Sander, Lore and E. Waldschmidt 1980: *Sanskriithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden, Teil IV*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Senart, Émile 1882 (vol. 1): *Le Mahāvastu, texte sanscrit publié pour la première fois et accompagné d'introductions et d'un commentaire*, Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Silverlock, Blair Alan 2015: *An Edition and Study of the Gosiga-sutra, The Cow-Horn Discourse (Senior Collection Scroll no. 12): An Account of the Harmonious Anarudha Monks*, PhD thesis, University of Sydney.
- Skilling, Peter 2000: “Vasubandhu and the Vyākhyāyukti Literature”, *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 23.2: 297–350.
- Tatia, N. 1975: *Prātimokṣasūtram of the Lokottaravādimahāsāṅghika School*, Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Tripāthī, Chandrabhal 1995: *Ekottarāgama-Fragmente der Gilgit-Handschrift*, Reinbek: Verlag für Orientalistische Fachpublikationen.
- Vetter, Tilmann 1994: “Zwei schwierige Stellen im Mahānidānasutta, Zur Qualität der Überlieferung im Pāli-Kanon”, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens und Archiv für Indische Philosophie*, 38: 137–160.
- von Gabain, Annemarie 1954: *Türkische Turfan-Texte VIII*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- von Hinüber, Oskar 1997: “Old Age and Old Monks in Pāli Buddhism”, in *Aging, Asian Concepts and Experiences Past and Present*, 65–78, Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- von Simson, Georg 2000 (vol. 2): *Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst 1956 (vol. 2): *Das Mahāvādānasūtra, ein kanonischer Text über die sieben letzten Buddhas, Sanskrit, verglichen mit dem Pāli nebst einer Analyse der in Chinesischer Übersetzung überlieferten Parallelversion, auf Grund von Turfan-Handschriften herausgegeben*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst 1959: “Chinesische archäologische Forschungen in Sin-Kiang (Chinesisch Turkestan)”, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, 54.5/6: 229–242.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst 1970: “Fragment of a Buddhist Sanskrit Text on Cosmogony”, in *Añjali, Papers on Indology and Buddhism, A Felicitation Volume Presented to Oliver Hector de Alwis Wijesekera on his Sixtieth Birthday*, J. Tilakasiri (ed.), 40–45, Colombo: University of Ceylon.
- Wille, Klaus 2009: “The Sanskrit Fragments Or. 15004 in the Hoernle Collection”, in *Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia, The British Library Sanskrit Fragments, Volume II*, S. Karashima and K. Wille (ed.), 73–104, Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University.
- Yamagiwa, Nobuyuki 2001: *Das Pāṇḍulohitakavastu, Über die verschiedenen Verfahrensweisen der Bestrafung in der buddhistischen Gemeinde, Neuauflage der Sanskrit-Handschrift aus Gilgit, tibetischer Text und deutsche Übersetzung*, Marbug: Indica et Tibetica.



## Notes

- \* I am indebted to bhikkhunī Dhammadinnā, Michael Radich, and Mike Running for commenting on a draft of this paper.
- 1 In Anālayo 2008: 10f I briefly drew attention to this pattern, which I studied in more detail in relation to EĀ 49.7 in Anālayo 2014.
  - 2 Lamotte 1967: 106: “une ... particularité de l'*Ekottara* sur laquelle je voudrais attirer l'attention est l'abondance des Sūtra composites, artificiellement forgés en mettant bout à bout des Sūtra ou des portions de Sūtra empruntés à d'autres textes canoniques.”
  - 3 EĀ 48.6 at T II 793a9.
  - 4 On this expression cf. Anālayo 2011a: 301f note 180.
  - 5 Regarding the parallels to one of these episodes, involving Sañjīva, it is noteworthy that the discourse counterparts in MN 50 at MN I 333,17, MĀ 131 at T I 620c17, T 66 at T I 864c14, and T 67 at T I 867a27 (the episode is also found in D 4094 *ju* 75b4 or Q 5595 *tu* 85a8 and parts of it are preserved in Sanskrit fragment SHT IV 412 folio 8V, Sander and Waldschmidt 1980: 26f) also report another episode to have taken place at the time of the Buddha Kakusandha (involving mischief done by Māra), and this episode has a counterpart in another discourse in the *Ekottarika-āgama*, EĀ 45.4 at T II 772b9 (the preceding part of EĀ 45.4 at T II 772a26 reports Māra preventing the Buddha Gotama from receiving alms; for a similar tale cf. SN 4.18 at SN I 114,6 and SĀ 1095 at T II 288a13).
  - 6 In what follows my survey of apparent instances of discourse merger is not intended to be comprehensive, but merely aims at providing examples by way of illustration. I also focus only on instances that involve an apparent merger of material found among the early discourses. Thus I do not take up cases like, e.g., EĀ 45.1 at T II 769b15, which combines the story of Māgandīya trying to offer his daughter to the Buddha (for a Pāli counterpart cf. Dh-p-a III 193,1) with a version of the *Valāhassa-jātaka* (cf. Jā 196 at Jā II 127,23). In relation to the Māgandīya tale I would nevertheless like to note an entertaining element in EĀ 45.1 at T II 769c6 where, after the Buddha has refused to accept Māgandīya's daughter, an old monk urges the Buddha to accept, adding that otherwise he was ready to accept the girl for himself. Needless to say, the Buddha sternly rebukes him for this suggestion. On old monks in Pāli texts cf. also von Hinüber 1997: 72–74.
  - 7 MN 128 at MN III 152,24 and its parallel MĀ 72 at T I 532c10.
  - 8 MN 31 at MN I 205,15 and its parallel MĀ 185 at T I 729b29.
  - 9 MN 128 at MN III 157,28 and its parallel MĀ 72 at T I 536c18; cf. also SHT VI 1384, Bechert and Wille 1989: 109, D 4094 *ju* 276a3 or Q 5595 *thu* 20a5, and an Uighur fragment, von Gabain 1954: 27f.
  - 10 MN 31 at MN I 207,30, MĀ 185 at T I 730a29, and Senior Kharoṣṭhī fragment 12, Silverlock 2015.
  - 11 EĀ 24.8 at T II 626b11.
  - 12 EĀ 24.8 at T II 629a24.
  - 13 For a more detailed discussion cf. Anālayo 2011a: 203ff.
  - 14 EĀ 49.5 at T II 797b15.
  - 15 SN 12.2 at SN II 2,12.
  - 16 EĀ 49.5 at T II 797c22.
  - 17 DN 15 at DN II 55,8, DĀ 13 at T I 60b6, T 14 at T I 242a2, and MĀ 97 at T I 578b14; T 52 at T I 844b18 differs in so far as Ānanda rather affirms the profundity of dependent arising, which according to Vetter 1994: 142 would be the result of a later change.
  - 18 EĀ 49.5 at T II 798a12.
  - 19 AN 7.62 at AN IV 100,5, Dietz 2007: 105f (recurrent references to impermanence in a Schøyen fragment), MĀ 8 at T I 428c9, T 30 at T I 811c24, and Dietz 2007: 95,3 (the introductory passage on impermanence in the Tibetan discourse quotation).
  - 20 Dietz 2007: 93 notes that the descriptions of the appearance of the seven suns in the *Lokapaññatti*, *Lokaprajñapti*, *Visuddhimagga*, and the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* “are marked by the omission of the refrain ... ‘all compounded things are impermanent etc.’”, thereby

- exemplifying how such cosmological interests can result in a loss of focus on the main teaching about impermanence.
- 21 EĀ 40.1 at T II 735c15 begins with the monks discussing that even Mount Meru is bound to be destroyed, which the Buddha then takes as the starting point for giving a detailed description of Mount Meru and other mountains.
- 22 EĀ 40.1 at T II 737a5.
- 23 DN 27 at DN III 84,26, Waldschmidt 1970 (Sanskrit fragments), DĀ 5 at T I 37b28, T 10 at T I 218b14, MĀ 154 at T I 674b16, and a discourse quotation in D 4094 *ju* 192b1 or Q 5595 *tu* 219b4; cf. also the *Mahāvastu*, Senart 1882: 338,13.
- 24 In AN 8.41 at AN IV 248,20 and AN 8.42 at AN IV 251,6 the Buddha addresses the monks on the topic of the observance day; in AN 8.43 at AN IV 255,17 he instead addresses Visākhā. The parallels MĀ 202 at T I 770a20, T 87 at T I 911a2, and T 88 at T I 912a24 correspond in this respect to AN 8.43, whereas T 89 at T I 913a21 and the discourse under discussion, EĀ 43.2 at T II 756c17 (which also differs in so far as it does not compare the observing of the eightfold *uposatha* to the conduct of *arahants*), are addressed to monks and thus closer in this respect to AN 8.41 and AN 8.42.
- 25 EĀ 43.2 at T II 757a26; for a translation and comparative study of this past life of the Buddha as a princess cf. Anālayo 2015a.
- 26 EĀ 44.10 at T II 768c20.
- 27 SN 45.2 at SN V 2,15 and its parallels in a Sanskrit fragment, SHT I 533 folio 106 R3ff, Bechert and Wille 1989: 215f, as well as in SĀ 726 at T II 195b18, SĀ 768 at T II 200c6, and D 300 *sha* 305a1 or Q 966 *lu* 334b4; corresponding to EĀ 44.10 at T II 768c9.
- 28 Lamotte 1967: 116 concludes that EĀ 48.6 “est un exemple typique de ces Sūtra composites artificiellement forgés par les diascévastes de l’*Ekottarāgama* en mettant bout à bout d’autres Sūtra ou fragments de Sūtra. Mais ces compilateurs prennent quelques libertés avec leur sources, les développent et, au besoin, les transforment pour introduire des convictions qui leur sont chères et généralement inspirées du Mahāyāna.”
- 29 SN 11.22 at SN I 237,16 and parallels in a Sanskrit fragment, Waldschmidt 1959: 241, SĀ 1107 at T II 291a28, and SĀ<sup>2</sup> 36 at T II 385a7; corresponding to EĀ 45.5 at T II 772c16.
- 30 AN 7.58 at AN IV 894 and It 1.22 at It 15,5, with parallels in Sanskrit fragments, Tripāṭhī 1995: 168ff, SHT IV 412.32, Sander and Waldschmidt 1980: 64ff, MĀ 61 at T I 496b5, MĀ 138 at T I 645c21, and EĀ 10.7 at T II 565b28; corresponding to EĀ 45.5 at T II 773a1.
- 31 EĀ 45.5 at T II 773a20.
- 32 EĀ 45.5 at T II 773a25: 過去將來三世諸佛，盡當說三乘之法。
- 33 Pace Legittimo 2014: 70, who comments on the consideration of the *Ekottarika-āgama* as “the most Mahayanised Āgama among the extant Āgamas. This last point has been repeated over the last decades in Buddhist scholarship ‘like a mantra’. Nonetheless ... the mere emphasis in the *Ekottarikāgama* on certain topics that gained an increased importance in the early phases of Mahāyāna does not suffice to categorize these issues as Mahayanic. Many of these topics are also discussed – although with less emphasis – in the other extant parallel versions of the early sūtras.” In Anālayo 2013a I have shown that the *Ekottarika-āgama* not only refers to the three vehicles and the conduct of a lay bodhisattva, but also mentions the *ekajātipratibaddha* bodhisattva; it records an exposition on the six *pāramitās* given to the bodhisattva Maitreya as well as a visit paid by a monk to another Buddha in a different Buddhafield who then teleports monks from that Buddhafield so that they can receive teachings from the Buddha of this Buddhafield; and it even uses the term *hīnayāna*. These are clearly elements not found in other Āgamas or their Pāli *Nikāya* counterparts. Thus the characterization of the *Ekottarika-āgama* as having distinct Mahāyāna elements that set it apart from other extant collections of early discourse is a correct assessment and not merely something repeated by scholars, comparable to a mantra.
- 34 AN 5.34 at AN III 39,6, with parallels in a Sanskrit fragment, Pauly 1959: 242ff, and in EĀ 32.10 at T II 680c24; corresponding to EĀ 52.6 at T II 826a4.
- 35 AN 8.22 at AN IV 215,7 and MĀ 38 at T I 481a12.
- 36 EĀ 52.6 at T II 826b25: 斯名菩薩之心，平等惠施，若菩薩布施之時。

- 37 A doubling that does not involve discourse merger can also be observed, e.g., in the case of the two *Ekottarika-āgama* versions of the tale of the former king Ma(k)hādeva, EĀ 1 at T II 551b26 and EĀ 50.4 at T II 806c21, which I have studied in Anālayo 2011c, 2012, and 2013b. One of the two *Ekottarika-āgama* parallels shows such distinctively different Chinese translation terminology as to make it safe to conclude that it could not stem from the translator(s) responsible for the other *Ekottarika-āgama* parallel as well as for most of what is now the remainder of the *Ekottarika-āgama* extant in the Taishō edition as entry 125.
- 38 AN 8.20 at AN IV 204,28, MĀ 37 at T I 478b18, MĀ 122 at T I 610c27, T 33 at T I 817a12, T 34 at T I 818a13, T 35 at T I 819a7, T 64 at T I 862b11, an event also recorded in the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya*, T 1421 at T XXII 180c26, the Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, T 1435 at T XXIII 239b9, the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, Dutt 1984: 107,2 (abbreviated reference), and the Theravāda *Vinaya*, Vin II 236,9; corresponding to EĀ 48.2 at T II 786a28.
- 39 EĀ 48.2 at T II 786c4; Kuan 2013: 629, based on his survey of EĀ 48.2 and its parallels, comments that possibly Zhu Fonian, “borrowed the legend of the seven Buddhas ... and inserted it into EĀ 48.2.”
- 40 DN 14 at DN II 2,15, Sanskrit fragments, Waldschmidt 1956: 68ff and Fukita 2003: 36ff (cf. also Wille 2009: 80), DĀ 1 at T I 1c19, T 2 at T I 150a18, T 4 at T I 159b12; cf. also T 212 at T IV 683c24.
- 41 EĀ 48.4 at T II 790a28.
- 42 SN 16.5 at SN II 202,6, SĀ 1141 at T II 301c7, and SĀ<sup>2</sup> 116 at T II 416b8.
- 43 EĀ 12.6 at T II 570a23.
- 44 EĀ 41.5 at T II 746a21; cf. also Anālayo 2013a: 13 notes 29 and 30.
- 45 The relationship between Mahākassapa and the coming of Maitreya recurs in another discourse, EĀ 48.3 at T II 787c2 (= T 453 at T XIV 421a6; cf. also Anālayo 2015b: 21 note 48), which also exhibits distinct features of lateness.
- 46 For a translation and study cf. Anālayo 2015b.
- 47 MN 21 at MN I 122,11 and its parallel MĀ 193 at T I 744a7. SN 12.32 at SN II 50,19 and its parallel MĀ 23 at T I 451a6 (cf. also a Sanskrit fragment, Nagashima 2009: 138) report that Moliya Phagguna eventually disrobed, which Sāriputta then takes as an indication that he did not find satisfaction in the Buddha’s teaching.
- 48 MN 22 at MN I 130,2 and its parallel MĀ 200 at T I 763b3.
- 49 His firmly holding on to his view forms part of the introductory narration to a *pātayantika/pācittiya* regulation against such dogmatic attitudes in the Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya*, T 1428 at T XXII 682a9, the Mahāsāṅghika *Vinaya*, T 1425 at T XXII 367a3, the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya*, T 1421 at T XXII 56c12, the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, T 1442 at T XXIII 840b21, with its Sanskrit and Tibetan counterparts in Yamagiwa 2001: 86,7 and 87,8, the Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, T 1435 at T XXIII 106a3, and the Theravāda *Vinaya*, Vin IV 133,32. Vin II 27,26 reports that Ariṭṭha eventually disrobed.
- 50 On the *āngas* cf. Anālayo 2016.
- 51 Gombrich 1996: 23 explains that “the simile rests on the fact that ‘misunderstood’ in Pali, *duggahīta*, literally means ‘badly grasped’. A man who hunts a water snake and when he finds it grasps it by the coils or tail gets bitten and may even die, because he has grasped it badly.” Similarly in the case of those like Ariṭṭha “the advantages they derive from their learning are being able to criticise others and to quote; but they do not get what should be the real benefit of such learning. Because they have misunderstood the teaching, it only does them harm.”
- 52 The translated text is EĀ 50.8 at T II 812c2 to 813b22. In my translation and discussion I adopt Pāli for proper names and doctrinal terms in order to facilitate comparison with the parallels in the *Majjhima-nikāya*. I have divided the discourse into sections and numbered these for ease of comparison with the English translation of MN 21 and MN 22 in Ñāṇamoli 1995/2005; the numbering and the divisions are not found in the Chinese original.
- 53 MN 21 and MĀ 193 do not mention that people were making fun of Moliya Phagguna.
- 54 This inquiry has no counterpart in either MN 21 and MĀ 193 or MN 22 and MĀ 200. In

- MN 21 at MN I 122,21 and MĀ 193 at T I 744a11 a single monk or a group monks report to the Buddha that Moliya Phagguna associates excessively with the nuns, whereupon the Buddha calls him to his presence. In MN 22 at MN I 130,7 and MĀ 200 at T I 763b5 monks hear about Ariṭṭha's mistaken view and confront him on this matter, without any reference to nuns or his behaviour.
- 55 Adopting the variant 戒 instead of 誡.
- 56 MN 22 at MN I 130,6 just speaks of engaging in things that are obstructive, *antarāyikā dhammā*, MĀ 200 at T I 763b4 of “engaging in sensuality”, 行欲. Here EĀ 50.8 at T II 812c10 is more outspoken with its reference to 犯婬, which in the Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya*, which shares with the *Ekottarika-āgama* the being attributed to the same translator Zhú Fóniàn (竺佛念), occurs in several contexts related to the *pārājika* of engaging in sexual intercourse; cf., e.g., T 1428 at T XXII 809a21, 815b21, or 959a8.
- 57 The term “monk”, 比丘, is unusual as a direct form of address used between monks, as it is only the Buddha who is regularly shown to address a monk or a group of monks in this way. The standard form of address among monks in other early discourses could be either the simple “you”, 汝, used in the present discourse in the preceding exchange, or else “venerable friend”, 賢者 or 尊者. One would not expect the usage of the term “monk” to occur in the way it does in the present context in a text transmitted in an Indian setting familiar with the way monks usually address each other.
- 58 According to MĀ 200 at T I 763b14, for three times the monks unsuccessfully tried to get Ariṭṭha to give up his view.
- 59 In MN 22 at MN I 131,31 and MĀ 200 at T I 763b28 the monks only report their inability to get him to give up his view, but do not refer to any type of conduct based on the view.
- 60 The reference to relinquishing his distorted view at this juncture in EĀ 50.8 is unexpected, since the monks have so far not mentioned any view in their report to the Buddha.
- 61 In MN 22 at MN I 132,9 and MĀ 200 at T I 763c5 the Buddha instead inquires after Ariṭṭha's view.
- 62 The reminder of having left the household life has a counterpart in MN 21 at MN I 123,19 and its parallel MĀ 193 at T I 744a28. As in the present context in EĀ 50.8, this provides a contrast to Moliya Phagguna's excessively close association with the nuns.
- 63 An injunction to stop is not found in MN 22 or MĀ 200. Before asking the monks about their understanding of his teaching regarding sensuality, in MN 22 at MN I 132,25 the Buddha asks if they think Ariṭṭha has even a glimmering of this teaching and discipline, which they deny, whereupon Ariṭṭha sits in silent dismay and the Buddha declares that he will be known for his evil view. Ariṭṭha's sitting in silent dismay also occurs in MĀ 200 at T I 764a7, where this happens after the Buddha has inquired about the understanding of the other monks and come to the conclusion that Ariṭṭha has misrepresented him and committed a serious offence.
- 64 In MN 22 at MN I 133,7 and MĀ 200 at T I 763c16 the monks at this juncture mention several similes which the Buddha had delivered to illustrate the disadvantages of sensual pleasures; cf. the survey in Anālayo 2011a: 148f note 17 and table 3.2. Whereas in MĀ 200 this is the first time these similes come up, in MN 22 the monks have already mentioned them when trying to convince Ariṭṭha of his wrong view, and the Buddha has also listed them when rebuking Ariṭṭha. MN 22 and MĀ 200 agree that the Buddha repeats the set of similes in his reply to the monks, after they have proclaimed the similes in front of him.
- 65 According to MN 22 at MN I 133,20, the Buddha at this juncture categorically declares that it is impossible to engage in sensual pleasures without having sensual desires.
- 66 In MĀ 200 at T I 764a10 the Buddha first encourages the monks to inquire from him, or from other monks, if they do not fully understand his teachings, before describing the predicament of a foolish person who learns the various teachings in the form of the twelve *aṅgas* without understanding their meaning.
- 67 My translation is based on the identification of the counterparts to the twelve *aṅgas* in the present passage by Nattier 2004: 194 and on what I assume to be the probable significance of these *aṅgas*; cf. in more detail Anālayo 2016. In line with my general policy I add the Pāli counterparts in brackets so as to facilitate comparison. The order of the twelve *aṅgas*

- in EĀ 50.8 differs not only from the more commonly found sequence in other textual collections, but also from other listings of the twelve *aṅgas* in the same *Ekottarika-āgama*, as can conveniently be seen in the survey in Nattier 2004: 193f.
- 68 The problem of learning the teachings just for the sake of debating is also mentioned in MN 22 at MN I 133,28, but not in MĀ 200.
- 69 The problem of transgressing the restrictions is not taken up in MN 22 or MĀ 200.
- 70 Adopting the variant 捫 instead of 扞.
- 71 Adopting the variant 其 instead of 有.
- 72 Adopting the variant 鉗 instead of 鑷.
- 73 A similar injunction is found in MN 22 at MN I 134,26, but not in MĀ 200.
- 74 The remainder of EĀ 50.8 does not have a counterpart in MN 22 or MĀ 200, but seems to stem rather from a *Vinaya* context. As mentioned above in note 49, Ariṭṭha's obstinate holding on to his wrong view leads to a *pātayantika/pācittiya* regulation in the different *prātimokṣas/pātimokkhas*, according to which a monk who misrepresents the teachings should be reprimanded for three times. If he still does not relinquish his view, he has fallen into an offence; cf. Dharmaguptaka rule 68, T 1429 at T XXII 1019c14, Kāśyapīya rule 55, T 1460 at T XXIV 663a9, Mahāsāṅghika rule 45, Tatia 1975: 23,16, Mahīśāsaka rule 48, T 1422 at T XXII 197c13, Mūlasarvāstivāda rule 55, Banerjee 1977: 38,3, Sarvāstivāda rule 55, von Simson 2000: 219,1, and Theravāda rule 68, Pruitt and Norman 2001: 70,1; as well as the comparative survey in Pachow 1955: 150.
- 75 Cf. above note 60.
- 76 Cf. above note 62.
- 77 MĀ 200 at T I 763b3.
- 78 The Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya*, T 1428 at T XXII 682a10, the Mahāsāṅghika *Vinaya*, T 1425 at T XXII 367a3, the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya*, T 1421 at T XXII 56c12, and the Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, T 1435 at T XXIII 106a3. The Theravāda *Vinaya* agrees with MN 22 in speaking of Ariṭṭha, Vin IV 133,33.
- 79 T 1442 at T XXIII 840b22: 無相, a standard rendering of *animitta*.
- 80 Yamagiwa 2001: 86,8 and 87,9.
- 81 EĀ 50.8 at T II 812c3.
- 82 The school affiliation of the *Ekottarika-āgama* is a matter of continued discussion, but different suggestions have been offering arguments in support of a Mahāsāṅghika affiliation, or else a Dharmaguptaka or a Sarvāstivāda affiliation; cf. the survey in Mayeda 1985:102f. In the case of each of these three suggested school affiliations, the presentation in EĀ 50.8 would disagree with the respective *Vinaya*.
- 83 The translated section is taken from EĀ 43.5 at T II 759c29 to 760a26.
- 84 The simile of the raft is found in MN 22 at MN I 134,30 and its parallel MĀ 200 at T I 764b19, as well as in a discourse quotation in D 4094 *nyu* 74b6 or Q *thu* 119b7 and in T 1509 at T XXV 63c7, translated in Lamotte 1944/1981: 64.
- 85 Adopting a variant that adds 慈悲喜, in keeping with the formulation found later in EĀ 43.5 at T II 760a11.
- 86 The need to maintain mental balance and practice either just *mettā* or else all four *brahmavihāras* is the topic of the simile of the saw in MN 21 at MN I 129,15 and its parallel MĀ 193 at T I 746a12. Whereas MN 21 only speaks of practising *mettā*, MĀ 193 mentions all four *brahmavihāras*. References to this simile in MĀ 30 at T I 465a9 and SĀ 497 at T II 130a23 speak only of *mettā*, a reference in MN 28 at MN II 186,11 does not mention any of the *brahmavihāras*.
- 87 An injunction to develop a mental attitude comparable to the earth and the other elements, which do not react when filth is thrown at them, can be found in MN 62 at MN I 423,18, where this instruction is addressed by the Buddha to his son Rāhula and, after also mentioning space, leads on to the cultivation of the four *brahmavihāras*. Notably, instructions on the elements are absent from the *Ekottarika-āgama* parallel to MN 62, EĀ 17.1 at T II 582a13.
- 88 My translation follows the indication in Hirakawa 1997: 951 that 翫習 can render *priyatā*.
- 89 Adopting a variant that adds 猶 to 如.

- 90 Adopting two variants that add 今 and 無由得渡。  
 91 Adopting the variant 求 instead of 而, in accordance with the previous description.  
 92 Adopting two variants that add 依此棧已 and 得, in keeping with the previous description.  
 93 A similar injunction concludes the simile of the raft in MN 22 at MN I 135,24 and its parallel MĀ 200 at T I 764c13, as well as in D 4094 *nyu* 75a6 or Q *thu* 120a7 and T 1509 at T XXV 63c8.  
 94 Cf. above note 87. This leaves open the possibility that such instructions were originally also found in the *Ekottarika-āgama* parallel to MN 62, EĀ 17.1, and were later displaced to become part of EĀ 43.5.  
 95 EĀ 43.5 at T II 760b7.  
 96 Cf. above note 93.  
 97 Jā I 72.1. For a survey of other instances of incorporation of later elements in the *Ekottarika-āgama* cf. Anālayo 2010: 7.  
 98 Cf. Anālayo 2011a: 546 note 89 and for a translation and study of the part of EĀ 49.6 that corresponds to the *Sela-sutta*, MN 92 and Sn 3.7, Anālayo 2011b.  
 99 EĀ 49.7 at T II 800b27 to 801c13; cf. in more detail Anālayo 2014.  
 100 The same holds for a polemic reference to the *hīnayāna*, which also shows traces of having come into being in a written medium; cf. Anālayo 2013a: 30f.  
 101 EĀ 40.9 at T II 742b3 to 742b21.  
 102 SN 3.11 at SN I 798 (cf. also Ud 6.2 at Ud 66,5), SĀ 1148 at T II 306a9, and SĀ<sup>2</sup> 71 at T II 399b11; cf. also T 212 at T IV 748c5.  
 103 EĀ 40.9 at T II 742b21 to 742c22.  
 104 MN 93 at MN II 154,29, MĀ 151 at T I 665b26, T 71 at T I 878a2; this part of the discourse is also preserved in a discourse quotation in D 4094 *ju* 110a4 or Q 5595 *tu* 126a3, and in the as yet unpublished Schøyen fragments 2380/37 and 2380/44.  
 105 I already drew attention to this in Anālayo 2011a: 555 note 133.  
 106 SN 55.21 at SN V 369,1; corresponding to EĀ 41.1 at T II 744a2 to 744a21.  
 107 MN 14 at MN I 92,26 and its parallels MĀ 100 at T I 587b13, T 54 at T I 849a12, and T 55 at T I 850c1 (for a reference in *Vyākhyāyukti* literature cf. Skilling 2000: 342); corresponding to EĀ 41.1 at T II 744a27 to 744b21.  
 108 SN 56.57 at SN V 463,1 and SĀ 440 at T II 113c14.  
 109 The discussion begins in EĀ 41.1 at T II 744b1 with 我爾時往至彼所, 語尼捷子, and then continues with the Buddha introducing his replies at T II 744b6, 744b11, and 744b13 with 我爾時復語尼捷子曰。  
 110 EĀ 41.1 at T II 744b17: 世尊告曰。  
 111 EĀ 41.1 at T II 744a27: 我爾時復遊在仙人窟中。  
 112 EĀ 41.1 at T II 744a26, 744b9, and 744b20: 不可從樂至樂。  
 113 MN 14 at MN I 93,36 and MĀ 100 at T I 587b28.  
 114 *Sūyagada* 1.3.4.6, Bollée 1988: 19,11, criticizes the assumption that happiness can be gained through happiness; cf. also Jacobi 1895/1996: 269 note 4. The correspondence of this criticism to the present passage in MN 14 has already been noted by Bronkhorst 1993/2000: 27 note 4.  
 115 Dhammajoti 2015: 27f, having noted the profusion of Mahāyāna ideas in the *Ekottarika-āgama*, comes to a conclusion that similarly suggests itself from the cases of merger, in that “it is therefore risky to put too much weight on the content or form of a given *sūtra* in this collection in arguing for it being the ‘original form’ of a canonical discourse, on the basis of its often briefer description or absence of a particular list.”  
 116 T II 549a11; Palumbo 2013: 77 sums up that “the *Ekottarika-āgama*, however, was the memory treasure of Dharmananda, and there is no evidence that its Indic original was ever put down in writing.”