Structural Aspects of the *Majjhima-nikāya*

Bhikkhu Anālayo

Structural Aspects of the *Majjhima-nikāya*

Bhikkhu Anālayo, PhD, DLit
(Center for Buddhist Studies, University of Hamburg,
& Dharma Drum Buddhist College, Taiwan)

Abstract:

The present paper covers the following five topics: The function of the *Majjhima-nikāya* (I), its division into fifties (II), the chapters of the *Majjhima-nikāya* (III), the sequence of the discourses in its first chapter (IV) and the discourse titles in the *Majjhima-nikāya* (V).

Introduction

In the previous issue of the present journal, I studied oral features of the Pāli *Udāna* collection. Based on several features of the *Udāna* collection — such as the presence of concatenation between its verses, the sequence of its prose narrations, and differences between the prose that accompanies a particular verse in the Pāli version and in its Chinese counterpart — I came to the conclusion that a process of gradual growth has probably been responsible for the form in which the *Udāna* collection is now found in the Pāli canon.

In the following pages, I undertake a similar investigation of the *Majjhima-nikāya*. While the purpose at the forefront of my inquiry is to come to a better understanding of formal aspects of the *Majjhima-nikāya*, at the same time my investigation intends to see how far oral features of the *Udāna* collection, a work based on verses accompanied by a prose narration, recur or are similar to characteristics of a discourse collection where prose dominates and verses only occur on occasion,

almost never taking the central role they have in the *Udāna* collection.

As a basis for studying structural aspects of the *Majjhima-nikāya*, in the next section I at first briefly survey the overall function of this *Nikaya*, as a way of introducing the collection as a whole.

I) The Function of the *Majjhima-nikāya*

The *Majjhima-nikāya*, the "Middle [Length] Collection", takes its name from the intermediate length of nearly all of the discourses collected in this second of the four Pāli *Nikāyas*.[1] When compared to other *Nikāyas*, according to modern scholarship an overall emphasis can be discovered in the *Majjhima-nikāya* collection on providing instructions to disciples who fully devote themselves to the Buddhist path to liberation, catering in particular for ordained monastics.[2]

Thus Bailey (2003: 131) notes that *Majjhima-nikāya* discourses "convey a highly didactic Buddhism ... these are teachings extending far beyond the understanding or interest of all but the most highly sophisticated devotee". Franke (1915) draws attention to the frequent use of terminology related to $vi + \sqrt{ni}$ or $\sqrt{sikkh}$ in *Majjhima-nikāya* discourses, expressing an emphasis on discipline and training. Manné (1990: 79-81) explains that the purpose of the *Majjhima-nikāya* appears to be "the integration of new monks into the community and into the practice", as "all of the technicalities of the Teaching appear here in detail" and a number of "sermons on problems connected with the practice and its difficulty" can be found. Thus the *Majjhima-nikāya* provides a new monk or nun "with the fundamentals of the Teaching and the Practice". Marasinghe (2002: 565) observes that "the majority of the discourses of this collection are ... either directly addressed to the ordained disciples ... or are otherwise intended for them".

Information on the function of the Middle Length Collection from the perspective of the Sarvāstivāda tradition can be gathered from the

Vinayavibhāṣā, 薩婆多毘尼毘婆沙. According to the explanations given in this work, each of the four *Āgamas* has a distinct purpose. The characteristic of the *Madhyama* collection is that it offers "profound doctrines for intelligent people" and therefore is a collection of discourses that is "made use of by those who are learning".[3]

Another relevant source of information is an indication given in the Pāli commentarial tradition, according to which each of the four Pāli *Nikāyas* was handed down by the followers of one of the Buddha's chief disciples. The disciples responsible for memorizing the *Majjhima-nikāya* were the followers of Sāriputta.[4] Independent of the historical value one may be willing to accord to this presentation, it does show that the commentators felt that the *Majjhima-nikāya* had sufficient affinity with the character of Sāriputta to allow for such an association. Now, according to the early discourses, Sāriputta was responsible for training disciples in their progress towards the attainment of stream-entry.[5] Thus to relate him and his disciples to the *Majjhima-nikāya* would convey an emphasis on teachings for those who are under training for the attainment of liberating insight.

In sum, ancient sources and modern scholarship seem to converge on discerning a specific emphasis in the *Majjhima-nikāya* for training those disciples who are on a serious quest for a deeper understanding of the Dharma.

Conversely, studying and memorizing the *Majjhima-nikāya* might also lead to a specific perspective on the teaching as a whole. This can be seen in those passages in the Pāli commentaries that record differences of opinion between those who transmitted different *Nikāyas*.[6] Such differences of opinion seem to be an outcome of the specialisation of different groups of reciters or *bhāṇakas* on particular collections of discourses, a development that had its origin in the practical measure of dividing the labour of memorization.[7]

The commentarial tradition records that such specialisation went so far as to cause some *bhāṇakas* to identify with the particular collection that they were memorizing.[8] The distinctions that evolved in this way appear to have been well known among the laity as well, as a commentarial passage records that offerings might be made by lay followers with the specification that the gift should go to the reciters of the *Majjhima* collection etc.[9]

In sum, even though a distinct character may not have been the intention behind the original scheme of assembling the discourses to be transmitted in different *Nikāyas*, as a final product of oral transmission the *Majjhima-nikāya* can be seen to have a characteristic nature of its own, with a prominent emphasis on the training of monastics and seriously committed disciples.

II) The Division into Fifties

The *Majjhima-nikāya* assembles its discourses in three main subdivisions, three sets of "fifty". Though the contents of each of these "fifties" cannot be neatly set apart from each other, a closer investigation reveals a few differences among them.

In the first set of fifty a monk or a group of monks make up the audience in over seventy per cent of the discourses, and in the final fifty monk(s) are the audience in close to ninety per cent of the discourses (including one discourse spoken to nuns). In the middle fifty, however, only about twenty-five per cent of the discourses are addressed to a monk or a group of monks, even though one of the five subdivisions of the middle fifty is a "chapter on monks", *Bhikkhuvagga*, entirely spoken to monks.

In the first set of fifty, Sāriputta is the author of most of the discourses spoken by disciples, followed by Mahāmoggallāna, whereas Ānanda does not feature at all.[10] In the middle fifty, Ānanda is the most

prominent speaker of discourses spoken by disciples, followed by Sāriputta, whereas Mahāmoggallāana does not deliver a single discourse.[11] In the final fifty Sāriputta and Ānanda are the speakers of the same number of discourses, Mahāmoggallāna is again absent.[12] Thus the role played by chief disciples in the three fifties also differs.[13]

In the first set of fifty a monologue given by the Buddha to an unspecified number of monks, with the Jeta Grove as its location, is by far the most frequent type of setting.[14] This type of monologue is completely absent from the middle fifty, whose discourses almost entirely consist of dialogues.[15] In the final fifty the Jeta Grove monologue given by the Buddha to the monks recurs again with almost the same frequency as in the first set of fifty.[16] Thus a to some degree individual character of each of the three fifties appears to be reflected in their respective settings.

The middle fifty stands out for containing more verse material than the other two fifties.[17] The chapter headings of the middle fifty also set it apart from the other two fifties, as in the middle fifty each chapter is consistently named after the type of audience to which its discourses are spoken. Thus the middle fifty has a chapter on householders, a chapter on monks, a chapter on wanderers, a chapter on kings, and a chapter on Brahmins.[18] In contrast, the chapter headings in the first fifty and the final fifty vary and are at times taken from the discourse that stands at the beginning of the chapter,[19] and at other times reflect a particular theme treated in this chapter,[20] or else indicate the grouping principle applied in the chapter.[21]

The different character of the three fifties can also be seen by surveying the way some themes are treated in them. For purposes of illustration, by way of example I will briefly survey four such themes, namely: 1) the conduct of a monk, 2) the biography of the Buddha, 3) the practice of mindfulness and 4) the development of insight.

1) The first of these themes, the conduct of a monk, is taken up in several discourses in the first set of fifty. These describe how a monk can become a true heir of the *Dhamma*; how a monk should overcome blemishes or practise effacement; what makes a monk easy to admonish; under what conditions a monk should remain in a particular place; and what makes a monk a true recluse etc.[22] These discourses thus lay down the foundational aspects of proper conduct. The basic theme broached in this way recurs in the second and third sets of fifty from a more specific and *Vinaya*-related perspective. Three discourses among the middle fifty narrate the background to the regulation on eating only at the allowable time.[23] Two discourses among the final fifty lay down procedures to ensure communal harmony after the Buddha's demise.[24] Thus the theme of the conduct of a monk seems to progress from foundational to more specific treatments.

2) In the case of the life story of the Buddha, discourses in the first set of fifty offer autobiographical information on the Buddha's preawakening experiences as a bodhisattva.[25] The second set of fifty takes up the same theme from a broader temporal perspective by way of several *Jātakas*, descriptions of the bodhisattva's previous lives.[26] Here a progression towards a wider temporal perspective can be discerned.

3) Regarding mindfulness practice, among the first set of fifty comprehensive instructions can be found in the *Satipaṭṭhāna-sutta*.[27] The final fifty takes up aspects of *satipaṭṭhāna* practice — mindfulness of breathing, mindfulness of the body, and the four noble truths — and dedicates a whole discourse to exploring each of these three aspects in additional detail.[28] This suggests a progression from foundational instructions on mindfulness to analyses of specific aspects of the same practice.

4) Prominent among the insight-related instructions in the first set of fifty are treatments of the senses and of perceptual experience

provided in the *Mūlapariyāya-sutta* and the *Madhupiṇḍika-sutta*.[29] The theme broached by these two discourses is taken up in more detail in a set of altogether ten discourses dedicated to the sense-spheres, found in the *Saḷāyatana-vagga*, the last chapter in the *Majjhima-nikāya*. This also suggests a progression from foundational instructions to more detailed analyses, here in relation to teachings on insight.

In sum, it seems that several discourses collected in the first set of fifty have a more foundational role, with discourses found in the middle fifty and the final fifty building on that.[30] This much appear to be also re-flected in the titles given to the three fifties, with the first of them being the *Mūlapaṇṇāsa*, "the Root Fifty", followed by the *Majjhimapaṇṇāsa*, "the Middle Fifty", and the *Uparipaṇṇāsa*, "the Top Fifty".

According to the *Visuddhimagga*, the three fifties were the three main units for memorization of the *Majjhima-nikāya* and were to be learnt by a prospective reciter one after the other in succession. That is, reciters would at first memorize the first fifty, and only when this was ac-complished would they turn to the middle fifty, and only when these had been successfully committed to memory would they learn the final fifty.[31] According to the commentary on the *Vinaya*, a monk who wants to become a reciter of the *Majjhima-nikāya* needs to memorize at least the first set of fifty.[32] From this it would follow that the first set of fifty is the minimum that needs to be learned, to which then the middle and the final fifty could be added. Though these descriptions are only found in the commentaries, they may well reflect ancient patterns among reciters.

Extrapolating from the indications given in the commentaries, the subdivision into three fifties could reflect differences in the memory skills of those who wish to become reciters of the *Majjhima-nikāya*. A reciter of less talent in memorization may only learn the first fifty, as sug-gested in the *Vinaya* commentary. In view of this it would only be natu-ral for the first set of fifty to collect together those discourses that treat

the most essential themes required for a monk's training and practice, in order to ensure that even those who learn just the first fifty will be provided with expositions on the most foundational matters.

A reciter with more abilities might then continue and learn also the second fifty. Having learned two fifties would enable him to take up preaching on a broader scale. This might be the underlying rationale for the five chapters assembled in the second fifty, which collect discourses spoken to householders, monks, wanderers, kings, and Brahmins. These five groups are the main audiences that a reciter would address when preaching, so that learning this second set of fifty would provide a selection of discourses related to each of these groups, as occasion demands.

A reciter who trains further and becomes a full-fledged *Majjhima-bhāṇaka*, in the sense of memorizing all of its discourses, would also have at his disposal the more detailed treatments on meditation practice and insight provided in the discourses collected under the third fifty. This would enable such a reciter to be not only a popular preacher, but also to act as a teacher for more advanced disciples and fellow monastics, guiding them in their practice.

Thus the division into three fifties could reflect the exigencies of oral transmission, where reciters of differing degree of ability are provided with a foundational set of discourses, with the option of adding more material for popular teaching through the second fifty and eventually more expositions for adepts in memorizing the *Majjhima-nikāya* by learning the final fifty.

III) The Chapters of the *Majjhima-nikāya*

The three fifties contain fifteen chapters, out of which fourteen chapters have ten discourses each, while one chapter — the *Vibhaṅga-vagga* — has twelve discourses. Due to this chapter with twelve discourses, the last of the three main subdivisions has fifty-two discourses, even though

its title is *Uparipaṇṇāsa*, "Top Fifty".[33)]

Perhaps the division heading of "fifty" should be understood mainly as an approximation, as in the *Khandha-saṃyutta* and in the *Saḷāyatana-saṃyutta* most "fifties" contain more than fifty discourses.[34)] Yet, the actual content of the "fifties" in these two *saṃyuttas* could be due to later expansion. In fact, in the *Jātaka* collection the division into fifties is also employed, and here the actual number of discourses contained in each "fifty" is indeed just fifty.[35)]

If at an earlier stage the final "fifty" of the *Majjhima-nikāya* contained just fifty discourses, built on the pattern of ten discourses per chapter, then the *Vibhaṅga-vagga* would originally have had only ten discourses, to which subsequently two discourses were added.

Now the *Vibhaṅga-vagga* contains four consecutive discourses concerned with the same topic, namely the verses on an auspicious night, *bhaddekaratta*.[36)] Horner (1959: 233 note 1) reasons that "this is the Vagga that has 12 Discourses. If it were thought desirable to reduce them to the normal 10, this Discourse [i.e. the *Bhaddekaratta-sutta*, MN 131], spoken by the Lord, would rank as one, and the next three, spoken by disciples, would have to be counted together as another single Discourse."

Her argument does not fully work, as only the *Ānandabhaddeka-ratta-sutta* (MN 132) and the *Mahākaccānabhaddekaratta-sutta* (MN 133) are spoken by disciples, whereas the exposition in the *Lomasakaṅgiyabhaddekaratta-sutta* (MN 134) is spoken by the Buddha, so that authorship alone would not suffice for considering these three to be versions of a single original.

Following the lead provided by Horner, however, it is noteworthy that the first discourse among these four, the *Bhaddekaratta-sutta* (MN 131),[37] records exactly the same exposition as found in the *Lomasakaṅ-*

giyabhaddekaratta-sutta (MN 134),[38)] namely an exposition given by the Buddha on the implications of the verses on an auspicious night from the perspective of the five aggregates. Hence it could be that during the course of oral transmission the introductory part of the *Lomasakaṅgiyabhaddekaratta-sutta* was lost among some reciters and only the exposition itself was remembered, which then became the *Bhaddekaratta-sutta*.[39)]

On this hypothesis, perhaps the *Bhaddekaratta-sutta* was added to the *Vibhaṅga-vagga* after this chapter had already been formed in accordance with the ten discourses per chapter pattern, thereby causing an increase of the number of discourses in this chapter.

Another suggestion regarding this chapter has been made by Rhys Davids (1902: 475), who comments that the *Dakkhiṇāvibhaṅga-sutta* (MN 142), which records how the Buddha refused a gift made to him by his foster mother and then gave an exposition on the merits of offerings to different recipients,[40)] "seems to belong, in its subject-matter, to the Vinaya" and thus as a *Majjhima-nikāya* discourse was "probably interpolated". Closer inspection brings to light that while all the other discourses in the *Vibhaṅga-vagga* follow the same pattern of beginning with a summary statement, followed by offering a detailed exposition of this statement, this pattern is not evident in the *Dakkhiṇāvibhaṅga-sutta*. This would support the hypothesis that the *Dakkhiṇāvibhaṅga-sutta* did not originally form part of the group of ten discourses that were assembled under the heading of "analyses of a summary", but was later added to the chapter on analyses as it has the term "analysis" in its title. The *Bhaddekaratta-sutta* and the *Dakkhiṇāvibhaṅga-sutta* are respectively the first and the last discourse in the *Vibhaṅga-vagga*, as can be seen in the survey below, two positions that would be the most probable places for a later addition to the group.

Distribution of Discourses in the Final Fifty:

	101	102	103	104	105	106	107	108	109	110	
	111	112	113	114	115	116	117	118	119	120	
	121	122	123	124	125	126	127	128	129	130	
131	132	133	134	135	136	137	138	139	140	141	142
	143	144	145	146	147	148	149	150	151	152	

The hypothesis that these two discourses (MN 131 and MN 142) could have been added later to the *Vibhaṅga-vagga* does not intend to thereby assess the authenticity of their content, since in principle it could well be that relatively early material was shifted to a different position within a discourse collection at a later time. In the end, whatever may be the final word on when the *Bhaddekaratta-sutta* and the *Dakkhiṇāvibhaṅga-sutta* became part of the *Vibhaṅga-vagga*, it does seem likely that this particular chapter has been subsequently expanded from an original count of ten discourses.[41]

That the arrangement of the discourses in the *Majjhima-nikāya* is the product of a gradual development would also follow from a statement made in the commentaries, according to which the *Bakkula-sutta* was only included in the *Majjhima-nikāya* at the so-called second council or communal recitation.[42] Thus even the Chapter on Emptiness, *Suññata-vagga*, in which the *Bakkula-sutta* is now found, could not have been a product of the recitation that according to the traditional account was carried out at the first council or communal recitation.

Another aspect relevant to the present discussion is the relationship between the chapter topics in the *Majjhima-nikāya* and the distribution of discourses into chapters. Here it is noteworthy that, even though the fourth and fifth chapters — the *Mahāyamaka-vagga* and the *Cūḷayamaka-vagga* — are devoted to "pairs", the final part of the fifth chapter no longer contains pairs, as illustrated below.

Mahāyamaka-vagga:

MN 31 & MN 32 *Cūḷa- & Mahāgosiṅga-sutta*

MN 33 & MN 34 *Mahā- & Cūḷagopālaka-sutta*

MN 35 & MN 36 *Cūḷa- & Mahāsaccaka-sutta*

MN 37 & MN 38 *Cūḷa- & Mahātaṇhāsaṅkhaya-sutta*

MN 39 & MN 40 *Mahā- & Cūḷa-assapura-sutta*

Cūḷayamaka-vagga:

MN 41 & MN 42 *Sāleyyaka- & Verañjaka-sutta* [43]

MN 43 & MN 44 *Mahā- & Cūḷavedalla-sutta*

MN 45 & MN 46 *Cūḷa- & Mahādhammasamādāna-sutta*

MN 47 *Vīmaṃsaka-sutta*

MN 48 *Kosambiya-sutta*

MN 49 *Brahmanimantanikasutta*

MN 50 *Māratajjanīya-sutta*

Yet, among the remaining discourses in the *Majjhima-nikāya* another ten pairs can be found, so that there would have been enough material to fill this chapter with pairs and make its content agree with its title. Other pairs in the *Majjhima-nikāya* are:

MN 11 & 1 MN 2 *Cūḷa- & Mahāsīhanāda-sutta*

MN 13 & MN 14 *Mahā- & Cūḷadukkhakkhandha-sutta*

MN 27 & MN 28 *Cūḷa- & Mahāhatthipadopama-sutta*

MN 29 & MN 30 *Mahā- & Cūḷasāropama-sutta*

MN 62 & MN 147 *Mahā- & Cūḷarāhulovāda-sutta*

MN 63 & MN 64 *Cūḷa- & Mahāmaluṅkya-sutta*

MN 77 & MN 79 *Mahā- & Cūḷasakuludāyi-sutta*

MN 109 & MN 110 *Mahā- & Cūḷapuṇṇama-sutta*

MN 121 & MN 122 *Cūḷa- & Mahāsuññata-sutta*

MN 135 & MN 136 *Cūḷa- & Mahākammavibhaṅga-sutta*

As becomes readily apparent from the above survey, the smaller and greater versions of a pair of discourses do not occur in a fixed sequence.[44] Out of seventeen pairs, nine pairs have the *cūḷa*-version first, while the other eight pairs list first the respective *mahā*-version. Thus neither the allocation of pairs to chapters, nor the position of the members of each pairs, seems to be the result of a clearly devised and then consistently executed act of organizing the material.

A similar pattern can be observed in regard to the distribution of discourses into chapters according to theme. Thus the sixth chapter on householders (*Gahapati-vagga*) contains a discourse spoken to wanderers, the *Kukkuravatika-sutta* (MN 57), which does not seem to bear any relation to householders. The same discourse could have found a better placing in the chapter on wanderers (*Paribbājaka-vagga*), which at present contains a discourse spoken to a householder who had earlier met a wanderer, the *Samaṇamaṇḍikā-sutta* (MN 78). Here a simple exchange of the two discourses would have done better justice to the respective chapter headings, as illustrated below.

Kukkuravatika-sutta	⇔	*Samaṇamaṇḍika-sutta*
(spoken to wanderers)		(spoken to a householder)
now in: *Gahapati-vagga*		now in: *Paribbājaka-vagga*

The same sixth chapter on householders (*Gahapati-vagga*) also contains a discourse spoken to a prince, the *Abhayarājakumāra-sutta* (MN 58). This discourse could have found a more suitable placing in the chapter on kings (*Rāja-vagga*), which already has another discourse addressed to a prince, the Bodhirājakumara-sutta (MN 85). The chapter on kings also has a discourse whose main protagonist is a householder, the *Ghaṭīkāra-sutta* (MN 81). Hence in this case, too, an exchange of the two discourses, by placing the *Abhayarājakumāra-sutta* in the chapter on kings and the *Ghaṭīkara-sutta* in the chapter on householders, would have better suited the respective chapter headings, as illustrated below.

Abhayarājakumāra-sutta	⇔	*Ghaṭīkāra-sutta*
(spoken to a prince)		(spoken to a householder)
now in: *Gahapati-vagga*		now in: *Rāja-vagga*

Even the allocation of discourses to the *Majjhima-nikāya* does not seem to invariably follow a strict principle. Some discourses, such as the *Mahāsīhanāda-sutta* and the *Mahāsakuludāyi-sutta*, are rather long and could well have found a suitable placing in the *Dīgha-nikāya*;[45] while the discourses collected in the final chapter of the *Majjhima-nikāya* are quite brief and, as they all deal with the sense-spheres, almost look like an extract from the *Saḷāyatana-vagga* of the *Saṃyutta-nikāya*.[46]

The examples given so far convey the impression that the arrangement of discourses in the *Majjhima-nikāya* was the outcome of a gradual process during which organizational principles that may have existed at some point were not always adhered to. The impression of a gradual process is reinforced when one turns to compare the Pāli collection with its counterpart in the *Madhyama-āgama*, preserved in Chinese translation (中阿含經).[47] The *Madhyama-āgama* has eighteen chapters, each of which contains a minimum of ten discourses, though a few chapters have considerably more.

Comparing the chapter division of the two collections, it turns out that the *Madhyama-āgama* and the *Majjhima-nikāya* have only four chapters in common: on pairs, on kings, on Brahmins, and on analyses (*vibhaṅga*). These chapters occur, moreover, at different places in the two collections.[48] The contents of these four chapters also differ considerably in the respective collections. Thus whereas nine Pāli discourses from the Chapter on Analyses have a parallel in their Chinese equivalent chapter, only four Pāli discourses from the Greater Chapter on Pairs and from the Chapter on Brahmins are found in the corresponding Chinese chapter, and the Chapters on Kings in the *Majjhima-nikāya* and the *Madhyama-āgama* have just two discourses in common, as illustrated below.

Chapters on Analyses:

(*Vibhaṅga-vagga* 14th / 根本分別品 13th)

MN 132 / MĀ 167

MN 133 / MĀ 165

MN 134 / MĀ 166

MN 135 / MĀ 170

MN 136 / MĀ 171

MN 137 / MĀ 163

MN 138 / MĀ 164

MN 139 / MĀ 169

MN 140 / MĀ 162

Chapters on Pairs:

(*Mahāyamaka-vagga* 4th / 雙品 15th)

MN 31 / MĀ 185

MN 32 / MĀ 184

MN 39 / MĀ 182

MN 40 / MĀ 183

Chapters on Brahmins:

(*Brāhmaṇa-vagga* 10th / 梵志品 12th)

MN 91 / MĀ 161

MN 93 / MĀ 151

MN 96 / MĀ 150

MN 99 / MĀ 152

Chapters on Kings:

(Rāja-vagga 9th / 王相應品 6th)

MN 81 / MĀ 63

MN 83 / MĀ 67

As can be seen from the above survey, the parallel discourses also oc-cur in different sequences in the respective chapters. In fact, the dis-courses in the *Majjhima-nikāya* and the *Madhyama-āgama* in general are

arranged in rather different ways. These differences support the impression that the present location of the discourses is the outcome of a process specific to each of the two collections and thus would have taken place at some point during their respective transmission.[49]

IV) The Sequence of the Discourses in the First Chapter

Another aspect of relevance to the structure of the *Majjhima-nikāya* is the way the discourses follow each other. Closer inspection brings to light an underlying pattern where a preceding discourse has some aspects in common with the next discourse. Such linking or "concatenation" can take various forms.[50] While in the *Udāna* collection cases of concatenation between verses involve the repetition of key terms, in the present prose context the same principle manifests in an at times less straightforward manner.

Due to limitations of space, in the context of the present study I will take up only the first chapter of ten discourses in the *Majjhima-nikāya*, in order to show by way of example how this mode of interrelation between neighbouring discourses can operate.[51]

1) *Mūlapariyāya-sutta* (MN 1) & *Sabbāsava-sutta* (MN 2)
The two discourses begin their respective treatment by examining the case of the untaught worldling, which they describe with the same standard passage.[52] Both discourses proceed from this to the liberated monk who has gone beyond the influxes and fetters, a similarity in pattern that provides a close interrelation between them.[53]

2) *Sabbāsava-sutta* (MN 2) & *Dhammadāyāda-sutta* (MN 3)
The *Sabbāsava-sutta* instructs how to eradicate the influxes. The theme of eradication recurs right away at the beginning of the *Dhammadāyāda-sutta*, which criticizes monks who do not eradicate what their teacher told them to eradicate.[54]

3) *Dhammadāyāda-sutta* (MN 3) & *Bhayabherava-sutta* (MN 4)

An aspect of proper conduct highlighted in the *Dhammadāyāda-sutta* is the need to dwell in seclusion.[55] The topic of seclusion forms the central theme of the *Bhayabherava-sutta*, which expounds the difficulties of living in seclusion. The interrelation between the two discourses is further strengthened by the circumstance that in the *Dhammadāyāda-sutta* the monks who practise seclusion function as a shining example,[56] just as in the *Bhayabherava-sutta* the Buddha's practice of seclusion functions as a shining example for his disciples.[57]

4) *Bhayabherava-sutta* (MN 4) & *Anaṅgana-sutta* (MN 5)

The *Bhayabherava-sutta* describes the obstructive effect of various evil mental qualities, a theme continued in the *Anaṅgana-sutta*, which examines various evil mental qualities of a monk. The relationship between the two discourses is further strengthened by the fact that several evil qualities mentioned in the *Bhayabherava-sutta* recur in the same terms in the description of evil monks given at the conclusion of the *Anaṅgana-sutta*.[58]

5) *Anaṅgana-sutta* (MN 5) & *Ākaṅkheyya-sutta* (MN 6)

The *Anaṅgana-sutta* examines unworthy wishes of a monk and highlights the importance of making an effort to overcome them. The next discourse, the *Ākaṅkheyya-sutta*, takes up the same theme from the complementary perspective of the worthy wishes of a monk, explaining how effort should be directed in order for such wishes to come to fulfilment. The two treatments even have a partial overlap, as both take up the case of a monk who wishes to obtain food and clothing etc.[59]

6) *Ākaṅkheyya-sutta* (MN 6) & *Vatthūpama-sutta* (MN 7)

The *Ākaṅkheyya-sutta* proceeds from going beyond unwholesome states of mind, via the attainment of stream-entry, to the attainment of full awakening. The next discourse, the *Vatthūpama-sutta*, takes up the same topics, as it first treats a series of unwholesome mental states, then refers to the attainment of stream-entry, and finally culminates in the

attainment of the destruction of the influxes.

7) *Vatthūpama-sutta* (MN 7) & *Sallekha-sutta* (MN 8)

The *Vatthūpama-sutta* and the *Sallekha-sutta* base their respective expositions on what needs to be overcome in order to progress on the path. The relationship between these two discourses is so close in this respect that they both list the same mental defilements.[60]

8) *Sallekha-sutta* (MN 8) & *Sammādiṭṭhi-sutta* (MN 9)

The *Sallekha-sutta* takes up the transcendence of views,[61] a theme the next discourse, the *Sammādiṭṭhi-sutta*, develops from its complementary perspective by exploring various aspects of right view. This theme is already adumbrated in the *Sallekha-sutta*'s reference to right view as the way to overcome wrong view.[62]

9) *Sammādiṭṭhi-sutta* (MN 9) & *Satipaṭṭhāna-sutta* (MN 10)

The *Sammādiṭṭhi-sutta*'s treatment revolves around various aspects that are to be "known", *pajānāti*, in order to accomplish right view. The need to "know" is a central theme of the next discourse, the *Satipaṭṭhāna-sutta*, where the same activity is mentioned again and again in the descriptions of the four *satipaṭṭhānas*. Both discourses thus share in common a treatment of how one factor of the noble eightfold path can be developed with the help of various aspects that are to be "known".[63]

These ways of interrelation show the degree to which the order of the discourses in this chapter is suited to the requirements of oral transmission, where discourses that have some aspect or other in common follow each other, thereby facilitating the reciter's task to recite them in the proper sequence, without accidental omission.

V) The Titles of Discourses

The titles of *Majjhima-nikāya* discourses show considerable variations in different Pāli editions, as can be seen in the survey below, which lists

discourses with their PTS title contrasted to the titles found in some Asian editions (only noting cases with major differences):[64]

MN 7: *Vatthūpama-sutta* — Bᵉ: *Vattha-sutta*

MN 26: *Ariyapariyesana-sutta* — Bᵉ & Sᵉ: *Pāsarāsi-sutta*

MN 53: *Sekha-sutta* — Sᵉ: *Sekhapaṭipadā-sutta*;

MN 56: *Upāli-sutta* — Sᵉ: *Upālivāda-sutta*;

MN 61: *Ambalaṭṭhikārāhulovāda-sutta* — Sᵉ: *Cūḷarāhulovāda-sutta*;

MN 63: *Cūḷamāluṅkya-sutta* — Sᵉ: *Cūḷamāluṅkyovāda-sutta*;

MN 71: *Tevijjavacchagotta-sutta* — Bᵉ: *Tevijjavaccha-sutta*, —
        Sᵉ: *Cūḷavacchagotta-sutta*;

MN 72: *Aggivacchagotta-sutta* — Bᵉ: *Aggivaccha-sutta*;

MN 73: *Mahāvacchagotta-sutta* — Bᵉ: *Mahāvaccha-sutta*;

MN 124: *Bakkula-sutta* — Sᵉ: *Bakkulattheracchariyabbhūta-sutta*;

MN 149: *Mahāsaḷāyatanika-sutta* — Sᵉ: *Saḷāyatanavibhaṅga-sutta*.

The considerable degree of variations that can in this way be observed gives the impression as if the titles of discourses were not fully fixed at an early stage of the process of transmission.[65] This impression receives further support from a closer look at a case where the different editions agree on the title: the *Mahāsīhanāda-sutta* (MN 11). This discourse closes by reporting the Buddha's recommendation that his exposition should be remembered under the title of being a "hair-raising instruction".[66] The title "hair-raising" recurs also in a *Jātaka* tale that parallels the beginning part of the *Mahāsīhanāda-sutta* and in references to this discourse in the Pāli commentaries and works like the *Milindapañha* or the *Cariyāpiṭaka*.[67] These occurrences suggest that the Pāli version of the present discourse was known for quite some time under this title. A parallel to the *Mahāsīhanāda-sutta* found in the *Dīrgha-āgama* preserved in Sanskrit fragments appears to have had the title "hair-raising" discourse as well, a title also found in a reference to this discourse in the *Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa*.[68] A parallel preserved as an individual Chinese translation has the related title "Discourse that Raises the Bodily Hairs out of Joy".[69] Judging from this range of references, it seems as if the

title *Mahāsīhanāda-sutta* came into use only at a relatively late point in the transmission of the Pāli discourse, confirming the impression gained from the variations found between Pāli editions regarding discourse titles.

Such variations do not seem to be a specific feature of the *Majjhima-nikāya* alone. The *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya* refers to several discourses that are to be found in the *Madhyama-āgama* collection.[70] Each of these references corresponds to the location of the equivalent discourse in the Chinese *Madhyama-āgama*.[71] Though these locations accord with the indications given in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, all five Chinese discourses have titles that differ from the titles mentioned in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*.[72] That the indications given in the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya* on the location of discourses should agree with the Sarvāstivāda *Madhyama-āgama* collection but disagree in regard to the respective titles of these discourses further confirms the impression that the titles of discourses were not yet fixed during the early stages of the process of transmission. Perhaps several titles were even for some time used concurrently, until eventually one title came to be decided on. In fact, the early discourses themselves report how on occasion the Buddha would give a range of titles for a single discourse, as is for example the case with the *Bahudhātuka-sutta* (MN 115),[73] descriptions that may have set a precedent for title variations.

Conclusion

In sum, several of the above surveyed characteristics of the *Majjhima-nikāya* appear to reflect the influence and exigencies of oral transmission. Thus the division into three fifties builds up from an emphasis on foundational material towards more detailed and analytical presentations, a tripartite structure that would be eminently suited to the requirements of having a collection of discourses that can be memorized by reciters of varying degrees of capacity. The topics of chapters are not consistently used to assemble discourses in the *Majjhima-nikāya*, and a

glance at the parallel *Madhyama-āgama* suggests the allocation of discourse to have been to a large extent school-specific. Nevertheless, the location of discourses in the *Majjhima-nikāya* appears to involve some connection between adjacent discourses that would facilitate remembering them in proper sequence.

Hence, though the *Majjhima-nikāya* differs in structure, content and type from the *Udāna*, similar processes can be seen at work in both cases. Both collections seem to be the outcome of a gradual process of evolution during oral transmission, which in various ways has left its imprint on their final shape. These two cases probably exemplify processes at work in the formation of the early discourses in general. To the question of what this implies in terms of the historical value of the Pāli discourses I intend to turn in the next issue of the present journal.

Abbreviations

AN	*Aṅguttara-nikāya*
B[e]	Burmese edition
C[e]	Ceylonese edition
Cp	*Cariyāpiṭaka*
EA	*Ekottarika-āgama*
E[e]	PTS edition
It-a	*Itivuttaka-aṭṭhakathā*
Jā	*Jātaka*
MĀ	*Madhyama-āgama*
Mil	*Milindapañha*
MN	*Majjhima-nikāya*
Ps	*Papañcasūdanī*
Q	Peking edition
S[e]	Siamese edition
SHT	Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden
Sp	*Samantapāsādikā*
Sv	*Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*
T	Taishō edition

Vin   *Vinaya*

Vism   *Visuddhimagga*

References

Adikaram, E.W. 1946/1994: *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon, or 'State of Buddhism in Ceylon as Revealed by the Pāli Commentaries of the 5ᵗʰ Century A.D.*', Sri Lanka, Dehiwela: Buddhist Cultural Centre.

Allon, Mark 2001: *Three Gāndhārī Ekottarikāgama-Type Sūtras, British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 12 and 14*, Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Anālayo 2008: The Chinese Madhyama-āgama and the Pāli Majjhima-nikāya - In the Footsteps of Thich Minh Chau", *Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies*, vol. 9 pp. 1-21.

Anālayo 2009a: "The Buddha's Truly Praiseworthy Qualities - According to the Mahāsakuludāyi-sutta and its Chinese Parallel", *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, vol. 30 pp. 137-160.

Anālayo 2009b: "The Development of the Pāli Udāna Collection", *Bukkyō Kenkyū*, vol. 37 pp. 39-72.

Anesaki, Masaharu 1934: "Some Problems of the Textual History of the Buddhist Scriptures", in *Katam Karaniyaṃ: Lectures, Essays and Studies*, M. Anesaki (ed.), Tokyo: Herald Press, pp. 273-288.

Baba, Norihisa 2005: "On the Order of the Compilation of the Abhidhammapiṭaka and the Khuddakanikāya", *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū*, vol. 53 no. 2 pp. 994-991.

Bailey, Greg et al. 2003: *The Sociology of Early Buddhism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bluck, Robert 2002: "The Path of the Householder: Buddhist Lay Disciples in the Pāli Canon", *Buddhist Studies Review*, vol. 19 no. 1 pp. 1- 18.

Bodhi, Bhikkhu 2000: *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha, A New Translation of the Saṃyutta Nikāya*, Boston: Wisdom Publication.

Chalmers, Robert 1926: *Further Dialogues of the Buddha, Translated from the Pali of the Majjhima Nikāya*, London: Oxford University Press, vol.1.

Charpentier, Jarl 1910: "Zur Geschichte des Cariyāpiṭaka", *Wiener Zeitschrift Für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vol. 24 pp. 351-415.

de Jong, J. W. 1979: "Les Sūtrapiṭaka des Sarvāstivādin et des Mūḷasarvāstivādin", in *Buddhist Studies, (by J. W. de Jong)*, G. Schopen (ed.), Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, pp. 229-236.

Dutt, Nalinaksha 1978: *Buddhist Sects in India*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Dutt, Nalinaksha 1984: *Gilgit Manuscripts, Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinayavastu, vol. III part 1*, Delhi: Sri Satguru, vol. 1.

Endo, Toshiichi 2003a: "Selective Tendency in the Buddhist Textual Tradition?", *Journal of the Centre for Buddhist Studies, Sri Lanka*, vol. 1 pp. 55-72.

Endo, Toshiichi 2003b: "Views Attributed to Different Bhāṇakā (Reciters) in the Pāli Commentaries", *Bukkyō Kenkyū*, vol. 31 pp. 1-42.

Enomoto, Fumio 1986: "On the Formation of the Original Texts of the Chinese Āgamas", *Buddhist Studies Review*, vol. 3 no. 1 pp. 19-30.

Feer, Léon 1875: "Études Bouddhiques, Les Jātakas", *Journal Asiatique*, ser. 7 vol. 5 pp. 357-434 and ser. 7 vol. 6 pp. 243-306.

Franke, R. Otto 1914a: "Die Zusammenhänge der Majjhimanikāya-Suttas", *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. 68 pp. 473-530.

Franke, R. Otto 1914b: "Majjhimanikāya und Suttanipāta", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vol. 28 pp. 261-276.

Franke, R. Otto 1915: "Der einheitliche Grundgedanke des Majjhimanikāya: Die Erziehung gemäß der Lehre (dhamma-vinaya)", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vol. 29 pp. 134-171.

Goonesekera, Lakshmi R. 1967: "Aṭṭhakathā", in *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, G.P. Malalasekera (ed.), Sri Lanka: Department of Buddhist Affairs, vol. 2 no. 2 pp. 335-352.

Goonesekera, Lakshmi R. 1968: "Bhāṇaka", in *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, G.P. Malalasekera (ed.), Sri Lanka: Department of Buddhist Affairs, vol. 2 no. 4 pp. 688-690.

Hartmann, Jens-Uwe 1991: *Untersuchungen zum Dīrghāgama der Sarvāstivādins*, unpublished habilitation thesis, Göttingen: Georg-August-

Universität.

Harvey, Peter 1990: *An Introduction to Buddhism, Teachings, history and practices*, Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.

Horner, I.B. 1953/1980: "Mahā- and Cūḷa-vaggas and Suttas in the Majjhima-Nikāya", in *Indianisme et Bouddhisme, Mélanges offerts à Mgr. Etienne Lamotte*, Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut Orientaliste, pp. 191-196.

Horner, I.B. 1959/vol. 3, 1967/vol. 1: *The Collection of the Middle Length Sayings (Majjhima-Nikāya)*, London: Pali Text Society.

Jones, John Garrett 1979: *Tales and Teachings of the Buddha, The Jātaka Stories in relation to the Pāli Canon*, London: Allen & Unwin.

Lévi, Sylvain 1932: *Mahākarmavibhaṅga (La Grande Classification des Actes) et Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa (Discussion sur le Mahā Karmavibhaṅga)*, Paris: Ernest Leroux.

Lü, Cheng 1963: "Āgama", in *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, G.P. Malalasekera (ed.), Sri Lanka: Department of Buddhist Affairs, vol. 1 no. 2 pp. 241-244.

Lüders, Heinrich 1941/1966: *Bhārhut und die Buddhistische Literatur*, Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint Ltd.

Manné, Joy 1990: "Categories of Sutta in the Pāli Nikāyas and their Implications for our Appreciation of the Buddhist Teaching and Literature", *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, vol. 15 pp. 30-87.

Marasinghe, M.M.J. 2002: "Majjhimanikāya", in *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, W.G. Weeraratne (ed.), Sri Lanka: Department of Buddhist Affairs, vol. 6 no. 4 pp. 564-577.

Mayeda [= Maeda], Egaku 1985: "Japanese Studies on the Schools of the Chinese Āgamas", in *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*, H. Bechert (ed.), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, vol. 1 pp. 94-103.

McTighe, Leslie Clifford 1988: *Mentoring in the 'Majjhima Nikāya': A study of the canonical Buddha's instruction of the laity*, PhD thesis, Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University.

Minayeff, I.P. et al. 1983: *Buddhist Texts from Kashgar and Nepal,* Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.

Minh Chau, Thich 1991: *The Chinese Madhyama Āgama and the Pāli Majjhima Nikāya*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Mori, Sodō 1990: "The Origin and History of the Bhāṇaka Tradition", in *Ānanda: Papers on Buddhism and Indology, A Felicitation Volume Presented to Ānanda Weihena Palliya Guruge on his Sixtieth Birthday*, Y. Karunadasa (ed.), Colombo: Felicitation Volume Editorial Committee, pp. 123-129.

Nakamura, Hajime 1980/1999: *Indian Buddhism, A Survey with Bibliographical Notes*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Ñāṇamoli 1995/2005: *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha, A Translation of the Majjhima Nikāya*, Bhikkhu Bodhi (ed.), Boston: Wisdom.

Neumann, Karl Eugen 1896/1995: *Die Reden des Buddha, Mittlere Sammlung, Aus dem Pāli-Kanon Übersetzt*, Herrnschrot: Beyerlein & Steinschulte.

Norman, K.R. 1983: *Pāli Literature, Including the Canonical Literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of all the Hīnayāna Schools of Buddhism*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Norman, K. R. 1984/1992: "The Value of the Pāli Tradition", in *Collected Papers*, K.R. Norman (ed.), Oxford: Pāli Text Society, vol. 3 pp. 33-44.

Renou, L. 1957: "Les Divisions dans les Textes Sanscrites", *Indo-Iranian Journal*, vol. 1 pp. 1-32.

Rhys Davids, C.A.F. 1902: Review [of *Majjhima-Nikāya* PTS ed. vol. II and III], *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, pp. 472-483.

Samuels, Jeffrey 1999: "Views of Householders and Lay Disciples in the Sutta Piṭaka: A Reconsideration of the Lay/Monastic Opposition", *Religion*, vol. 29 pp. 231-241.

Schumann, W. Hans 1982/1999: *Der historische Buddha, Leben und Lehre des Gotama*, München: Diederichs.

Shiraishi, Ryokai 1996: *Asceticism in Buddhism and Brahmanism, A comparative study*, Tring: Institute of Buddhist Studies.

Skilling, Peter 1997: *Mahāsūtras: Great Discourses of the Buddha*, Oxford: Pali Text Society, vol. 2.

Skilling, Peter 2009: "Redaction, recitation, and writing, Transmission of

the Buddha's teaching in India in the early period", in *Buddhist Manuscript Cultures, Knowledge, ritual, and art*, S.C. Berkwitz et al. (ed.), London: Routledge, pp. 53-75.

Somaratne, G.A. 2006: "Saṃyutta Nikāya", in *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, W.G. Weeraratne (ed.), Sri Lanka: Department of Buddhist Affairs, vol. 7 no. 4 pp. 687-690.

Somaratne, G.A. 2009: "White-clothed Celibate Arahants in Early Buddhism", in *Buddhist and Pāli Studies in Honour of the Venerable Professor Kakkapalliye Anuruddha*, K.L. Dhammajoti et al. (ed.), Hong Kong: Centre of Buddhist Studies, University of Hong Kong, pp. 151-167.

von Hinüber, Oskar 1996/1997: *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*, Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.

von Hinüber, Oskar 1998: *Entstehung und Aufbau der Jātaka-Sammlung, Studien zur Literatur des Theravāda-Buddhismus I*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

von Hinüber, Oskar 1999: *Das Pātimokhasutta der Theravādin, Seine Gestalt und seine Entstehungsgeschichte, Studien zur Literatur des Theravāda-Buddhismus II*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

Waldschmidt, Ernst et al. 1971: *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, vol. 3.

Waldschmidt, Ernst 1980: "Central Asian Sūtra Fragments and their Relation to the Chinese Āgamas", in *The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition*, H. Bechert (ed.), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 136-174.

Notes:

*   I am indebted to Rod Bucknell and Giuliana Martini for commenting on a earlier version of this paper. It goes without saying that I remain solely responsible for any errors. The present paper is based on research undertaken as part of my habilitation through a "Comparative Study of the *Majjhima-nikāya*", completed at the University of Marburg, which I hope to get ready for publication in the near future.

1) Sv I 23,8: "What is the middle collection? The discourses of middle length,

collected in fifteen chapters, beginning with the 'discourse on the root instruc-
tion', one-hundred-and-fifty-two discourses", *katamo majjhima-nikāyo? majjhi-
mappamāṇāni pañcadasavaggasaṅgahāni mūlapariyāyasuttādīni diyaḍḍhasataṃ
dve ca suttāni*. Horner 1967: x interprets this definition to imply that "mid-
dle" could also refer to the number of discourses found in the present collec-
tion. However, the preceding "long collection", *Dīgha-nikāya*, counts only
thirty-four discourses, so that on this interpretation the "long" collection
should rather be called the "short" collection, as it has the least number of dis-
courses. Moreover, the other two *Nikāyas* receive their name from the type
of discourses they contain, this being either discourses collected according to
topic (*saṃyutta*) or according to numerical principles (*aṅguttara*), titles not re-
lated to the number of discourses the collections contain. Thus the qualifica-
tion "middle" can safely be assumed to refer to a characteristic of the
discourses contained in the *Majjhima-nikāya*, namely their "middle" length.

2) Though in the thought world of the early discourses the ordained monastic ex-
emplifies such serious practice of the path, at the same time the path is also in-
tended for and made use of by laity. Several scholars have pointed out that
a strict division between monastics intent on liberation and laity concerned
solely with accumulating merits leading to a heavenly rebirth is not an accu-
rate reflection of early Buddhist thought, cf. e.g. Bluck 2002 or Samuels
1999. Nevertheless, the assumption by Bluck 2002: 10 (relying on Harvey
1990: 218 and Schuman 1982/1999: 217) and Samuels 1999: 238 that AN
6.119-120 at AN III 450-451 proves the existence of lay arahants (the same as-
sumption recurs in Somaratne 2009: 153) does not seem to be correct, as
these discourses only indicate that several householders had reached some
level of awakening, not necessarily the highest; in fact AN 6.44 at AN III
348,3+5 reports that two householders mentioned in the listing in AN 6.120
passed away as once-returners, making it quite clear that they were not lay
arahants. The position of early Buddhist thought in this respect seems to be
that, though a lay person can reach the highest level of awakening, the ensu-
ing transformation of personality is such that he or she will not continue to
live the lay life, but go forth (unless death should be too imminent to allow
for this). An example would be the report in several *Vinayas* that the house-
holder Yasa attained full awakening and after that went forth, cf. e.g. the

Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya*, T 1421 at T XXII 105b28, the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, T 1450 at T XXIV 129b8, or the Theravāda *Vinaya*, Vin I 17,3. According to the Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya*, T 1428 at T XXII 789c6, however, he went forth after having attained streamentry and became an arahant when already being a monk, T 1428 at T XXII 790a1.

3) T 1440 at T XXII 503c28 explains: 為利根众生說諸深義, 名中阿含, 是學問者所習; which Nakamura 1980/1999: 32 translates as: "For intelligent persons profound doctrines were set forth. They were compiled in the *Madhyamakāgama*. This is what scholars (lit. 'those who learn') esteem".

4) Sv I 15,5: *majjhima-nikāyaṃ saṅgāyitvā dhammasenāpati-sāriputtattherassa nissitake paṭicchāpesuṃ: 'imaṃ tumhe pariharathā'ti.*

5) MN 141 at MN III 248,25, MĀ 31 at T I 467b17, EĀ 27.1 at T II 643b11, and T 32 at T I 814b26.

6) Cf. e.g. Sv I 15,27, which records disagreements between the *Dīghabhāṇakas* and the *Majjhimabhāṇakas* on the very structure of the canon, namely on the nature of the *Khuddaka* collection. On this particular issue cf. also Baba 2005: 993. A survey of various disagreements between *bhāṇakas* of the four *Nikāyas* can be found in Adikaram 1946/1994: 27-32 and Endo 2003b: 13-35; cf. also Goonesekera 1967: 342 note 98.

7) Goonesekera 1968: 689 explains that in the "course of time the bhāṇakas of the different divisions of the Canon seem to have developed into distinct schools of opinion". Mori 1990: 127 notes that "the Bhāṇakas who were originally responsible for the memorization and transmission of particular Nikāyas or scriptures became gradually the exponents of views and opinions concerning the interpretation of the teaching embodied in them"; cf. also Dutt 1978: 42.

8) According to Ps II 9,18, some monks were prone to developing a worldly type of affection towards the *Nikāya* they were memorizing, conceiving of it as e.g. "our Middle-long collection", *'amhakaṃ majjhimanikāyo 'ti mamāyanti, evaṃ ... gehasitaṃ pemaṃ sandhāya vadanti*; cf. also Adikaram 1946/1994: 32.

9) Sp VI 1254,6: *majjhimabhāṇakādayo detha*; cf. also Endo 2003a: 67 who, based on a study of instances that reflect a preference given in the *Vinaya* commentary to the *Majjhima* collection, concludes that "the *Vinaya-aṭṭhakathā* ... appears to have favored the textual tradition of the *Majjhima-*

aṭṭhakathā", a finding that would be in line with the suggested emphasis in the *Majjhima* on training monastics, thereby creating a natural affinity to the *Vinaya* and its reciters.

10) MN 3, MN 5, MN 9, MN 28 and MN 43 are spoken by Sāriputta, whereas MN 15 and MN 50 are spoken by Mahāmoggallāna. My survey only takes into account discourses that are attributed as a whole to a particular monk, not discourses where a monk plays a secondary role by making a shorter remark or asking a question etc. The dividing line is not always clear, thus perhaps MN 37 could be added to the above list, as Mahāmoggallāna's role in this discourse seems rather central.

11) MN 52, MN 53, MN 76 and MN 88 are spoken by Ānanda, whereas MN 69 and MN 97 are spoken by Sāriputta.

12) MN 108, MN 123 and MN 132 are spoken by Ānanda, whereas MN 114, MN 141 and MN 143 are spoken by Sāriputta (I treat MN 144 as a discourse spoken by Channa).

13) On the role of the Buddha as a teacher of laity in the *Majjhima-nikāya* cf. McTighe 1988 (whose conception of 'laity', however, includes *paribbājakas*).

14) MN 2, MN 6, MN 11, MN 16, MN 17, MN 19, MN 20, MN 25, MN 33, MN 45, MN 46, MN 47 and MN 49.

15) The only monologue in the middle fifty is MN 69, given by Sāriputta at the Bamboo Grove.

16) MN 102, MN 111, MN 112, MN 113, MN 117, MN 120, MN 130, MN 131, MN 137, MN 139, MN 148 and MN 149. For a survey of the locations associated with MN discourses cf. also Shiraishi 1996: 150-155.

17) The number of discourses in which verses are found is distributed in an ascending manner over the three fifties, with six discourses in the first fifty that contain verse (MN 7, MN 12, MN 26, MN 34, MN 49 and MN 50); eight discourses in the middle fifty (MN 53, MN 56, MN 75, MN 82, MN 86, MN 91, MN 92 and MN 98); and nine discourses in the final fifty (MN 116, MN 128, MN 130, MN 131, MN 132, MN 133, MN 134, MN 142 and MN 143). Yet, the verse sections in the middle fifty are rather long, so that in terms of overall percentage the middle fifty has about 53% of the verse material found in the *Majjhima-nikāya* as a whole, while the first fifty has about 14% and the final fifty about 33%.

18) These are the *Gahapati-vagga* (6th chapter), the *Bhikkhu-vagga* (7th), the *Paribbājaka-vagga* (8th), the *Rāja-vagga* (9th) and the *Brāhmaṇa-vagga* (10th).

19) The *Mūlapariyāya-vagga* (1st chapter), the *Sīhanāda-vagga* (2nd), the *Devadaha-vagga* (11th), the *Anupada-vagga* (12th) and the *Suññata-vagga* (13th) appear to take their title from the first discourse found in each chapter. Von Hinüber 1998: 108 notes that the same principle is also found frequently in the *Jātaka* collection, where *vaggas* tend to be titled after the first tale that occurs in them.

20) The *Saḷāyatana-vagga* (15th chapter) appears to take its title from the theme treated in the discourses collected under this heading.

21) A grouping principle appears to be responsible for the title of the *Opamma-vagga* (3rd chapter), *Mahāyamaka-vagga* (4th), *Cūḷayamaka-vagga* (5th) and the *Vibhaṅga-vagga* (14th). Regarding the 3rd chapter, I follow Chalmers 1926: x and Neumann 1896/1995: 143 in adopting the chapter title found in the B^e, C^e and S^e editions, while E^e reads *Tatiya-vagga*. As Norman 1983: 45 comments, "since six of the ten *suttas* have the word *upama* in their title", it would indeed be "appropriate to call it Opammavagga"; cf. also Horner 1967: x.

22) MN 3, MN 5, MN 8, MN 15, MN 17, MN 39 and MN 40.

23) MN 65, MN 66 and MN 70.

24) MN 103 and MN 104, a theme that recurs also in MN 108.

25) MN 12, MN 26 and MN 36.

26) MN 81 and MN 83.

27) MN 10.

28) MN 118, MN 119 and MN 141.

29) MN 1 and MN 18.

30) Neumann 1896/1995: xxxvii aptly compares the *Mūlapaṇṇāsa* to the foundation, the *Majjhimapaṇṇāsa* to the pillars, and the *Uparipaṇṇā*sa to the dome of the edifice of the *Majjhima-nikāya*.

31) Vism 95,23 describes that a prospective reciter of the *Majjhima-nikāya* needs to first memorize the first fifty, then the middle fifty, and then the final fifty, *mūlapaṇṇāsaṃ sajjhāyantassa majjhimapaṇṇāsako āgacchati, taṃ sajjhāyantassa uparipaṇṇāsako*.

32) Sp IV 789,14: *sace majjhimabhāṇako hoti, mūlapaṇṇāsako uggahetabbo*, which

forms part of the medium amount of memorization to be undertaken by a monk who would act as a preacher. Less is required for just being considered a "learned" monk, but a monk who wishes to teach the nuns should know all three *piṭakas* together with their commentaries.

33) A similar departure from a standard count of ten can also be found in the case of the *pācittiya* regulations where the penultimate chapter (*Sahadhammikavagga*) also counts twelve, resulting in an overall count of ninety-two rules in nine chapters, cf. Vin IV 157,8.

34) The first and the third "fifty" of the *Khandha-saṃyutta* contain more than fifty discourses, just as the first, second and fourth "fifties" in the *Salāyatana-saṃyutta* (the third "fifty" has fifty discourses in E^e, but more than fifty in other editions). Bodhi 2000: 22 comments that in the *Saṃyutta-nikāya* the expression fifty "is only an approximation, since the sets usually contain slightly more than fifty suttas". Somaratne 2006: 689 concludes that in the *Saṃyutta-nikāya* "the word *paṇṇāsaka* is used as a round number".

35) A division into three fifties in the *Ekanipā*ta of the *Jātaka* collection (cf. Jā I 261; Jā I 410 and Jā I 511) groups exactly one-hundred-and-fifty tales into three groups of fifties; cf. also von Hinüber 1998: 109.

36) Regarding *bhaddekaratta*, Bodhi in Ñāṇamoli 1995/2005: 1342 note 1210 explains that "*ratta* and *ratti* could be taken to represent respectively either Skt *ratra* and *ratri* (= night) or Skt *rakta* and *rakti* (= attachment)". Sanskrit fragment versions of this expression can be found in SHT III 816 V3 in Waldschmidt 1971: 32, which reads: *bhadragarātrīya* (cf. also R2), and in fragment 3 b3 in Minayeff 1983: 243, which reads: *bhadrakarātriyaḥ*. A Tibetan version in Q (979) *mdo sna tshogs*, *shu* 171a7 similarly speaks of an "auspicious night", *mtshan mo bzang po* (found similarly in the other extant Tibetan versions). Thus the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions support the first of the two alternatives mentioned above, hence my rendering as "auspicious night".

37) MN 131 at MN III 187.

38) MN 134 at MN III 199, with parallels in MA 166 at T I 698c-699c and T 77 at T I 886a-887a.

39) That the *Bhaddekaratta-sutta* could be the outcome of a transmission mistake within the Pāli tradition is supported by the circumstance that it is the only one out of the four Pāli discourses that does not have a Chinese counterpart,

though such absence in itself is not conclusive, cf. Anālayo 2008: 7-9.

40）MN 142 at MN III 253-257.

41）Renou 1957: 2 and 29 notes that groups of ten form a principle grouping in Vedic texts, which was also frequently used by the Buddhists and the Jains. This makes it probable that the chapters of the *Majjhima-nikāya* were originally based on assembling groups of ten discourses.

42）Ps IV 197,2 comments on the *Bakkula-sutta* that "this discourse was included at the second council", *idaṃ pana suttaṃ dutiyasaṅgahe saṅgahītaṃ*.

43）The *Sāleyyaka-sutta* and the *Verañjaka-sutta* are so similar in content that they can also be reckoned as a pair, but the final four discourses do not constitute "pairs".

44）On the distinction between *mahā* and *cūḷa* cf. Horner 1953/1980.

45）MN 12 and MN 77. In the latter case, the length of MN 77 may be the result of an expansion during oral transmission, cf. in more detail Anālayo 2009a.

46）These are discourses MN 143 to MN 152, all of which have parallels in the *Saṃyukta-āgama* (MN 143 is the only case where this involves only a partial parallel, SĀ 593), with the counterparts for MN 145 to 152 (SĀ 200, SĀ 236, SĀ 276, SĀ 280, SĀ 282, SĀ 304, SĀ 305, SĀ 311) being located in the section on the six sense-spheres, 六入處, of the *Saṃyukta-āgama*.

47）T 26 at T I 421a-809a, translated by Gautama Saṅghadeva during the period 397-398 of the present era, a collection generally held to belong to the Sarvāstivāda tradition, cf. Enomoto 1986: 21, Lü 1963: 242, Mayeda 1985: 98, Minh Chau 1991: 27 and Waldschmidt 1980: 136.

48）Anesaki 1934: 284 notes that "the methods of division into chapters and the order of successive dialogues are quite different" in the two collections.

49）Norman 1984/1992: 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".

50）Von Hinüber 1999: 20 (cf. also von Hinüber 1996/1997: 12) notes as an example for concatenation the sequence of *pācittiya* rules of the *pātimokkha*, where rule 4 refers to teaching recitation to someone who has not been fully ordained, *anupasampannaṃ*; rule 5 takes up the issue of lying down in the presence of someone who has not been fully ordained, *anupasampannena* … *sahaseyyaṃ kapeyya*; rule 6 then turns to lying down in the presence of a

woman, *mātugāmena sahaseyyaṃ kappeyya*; rule 7 then treats of teaching the Dhamma to women, *mātugāmassa ... dhammaṃ deseyya*; so that in each case a particular expression found in the earlier rule is taken up in the subsequent rule, namely *anupasampanna, sahaseyyā* and *mātugāma* respectively. On concatenation between discourses cf. also Allon 2001: 18-22, on concatenation in the *Udāna* collection cf. Anālayo 2009b.

51) My survey takes its inspiration from the treatment given to the interrelation between *Majjhima-nikāya* discourses by Franke 1914a, who examines the remaining discourses up to MN 76 (on MN 92 and MN 98 cf. Franke 1914b).

52) MN 1 at MN I 1,9 = MN 2 at MN I 7,17: *assutavā puthujjano ariyānaṃ adassāvī ariyadhammassa akovido ariyadhamme avinīto sappurisānaṃ adassāvī sappurisadhammassa akovido sappurisadhamme avinīto.*

53) MN 1 at MN I 5,10: *bhikkhu ... khīṇāsavo ... parikkhīṇabhavasaṃyojano*, and MN 2 at MN I 12,5: *bhikkhu sabbāsavasaṃvarasaṃvuto ... vāvattayi saṃyojanaṃ* (Bᵉ and Sᵉ: *vivattayi*). Another link between the two discourses could be that MN 1 at MN I 6,13 describes the penetrative vision of the *Tatāgata* that goes beyond a worldling's conceivings by proclaiming *sabbaso taṇhānaṃ khayā ... anuttaraṃ sammāsambodhiṃ abhisambuddho*, thereby broaching the theme of the proper vision of phenomena that comes about with full awakening, a theme taken up at the beginning of MN 2 at MN I 7,4 in terms of the need to develop knowledge and vision for being able to reach full awakening, *jānato ... passato āsavanaṃ khayaṃ vadāmi*. To develop such knowledge and vision, MN 2 recommends *yoniso manasikāra*, the very opposite of the worldling's conceivings mentioned in MN 1.

54) MN 2 at MN I 7,10 presents seven modes how the influxes should be eradicated, *āsavā pahātabbā*. MN 3 at MN I 14,14 reads: *yesañca dhammānaṃ Satthā pahānam āha, te ca dhamme nappajahanti*. MN 3 at MN I 15,25 then develops the idea of eradication by describing that the noble eightfold path leads to the eradication of various mental defilements, *lobhassa ca pahānāya dosassa ca pahānāya atthi majjhima paṭipadā ... ayam eva ariyo aṭṭhaṅgiko maggo*. By referring to the noble eightfold path, MN 3 continues the theme of the path to the eradication of *dukkha* mentioned in MN 2 at MN I 9,19: *ayaṃ dukkhanirodhagāminī paṭipadā*, where this path is also related to eradication, as it occurs in the exposition of influxes to be eradicated through vision,

āsavā dassanā pahātabbā.

55) MN 3 at MN I 14,2 contrasts disciples that do not follow their teacher's example and do not practise seclusion, *satthu pavivittassa viharato, sāvakā vivekaṃ nānusikkhanti*, to disciples that follow their teacher's example, *sāvakā vivekam anusikkhanti*.

56) MN 3 at MN I 15,4 *paviveke pubbaṅgamā*.

57) MN 4 at MN I 16,22: *Gotamo pubbaṅgamo*. The two discourses also have in common that they mention the Buddha's compassion, MN 3 at MN I 12,15: *atthi me tumhesu anukampā*, and MN 4 at MN I 23,35: *pacchimañca janataṃ anukampamāno*.

58) MN 4 at MN I 19,30 = MN 5 at MN I 32,13: *kusītā hīnaviriyā* (Bᵉ: *hīnavīriyā*); MN 4 at MN I 20,10 = MN 5 at MN I 32,13: *asamāhita vibbhanta-citta*; MN 4 at MN I 20,19 = MN 5 at MN I 32,14: *duppaññā eḷamūgā* (Cᵉ and Sᵉ: *elamūgā*).

59) MN 5 at MN I 29,35: *lābhī assaṃ paṇītānaṃ cīvarānaṃ ... piṇḍapātānaṃ ... senāsanānaṃ ... gilānapaccayabhesajjaparikkhārānaṃ*; and MN 6 at MN I 33,12: *lābhī assaṃ cīvarapiṇḍapātasenāsanagilānapaccayabhesajjaparikkhārānaṃ* (in both instances Bᵉ: *gilānappaccaya*ᵒ).

60) MN 7 at MN I 36,29 lists *kodha, upanāha, makkha, paḷāsa, issā, macchariya, māyā, sāṭheyya*, and *atimāna*, mental defilements that recur in the listing in MN 8 at MN I 42,35.

61) MN 8 at MN I 40,15: *yā imā ... anekavihitā diṭṭhiyo loke uppajjanti*, followed by querying how these views can be left behind.

62) MN 8 at MN I 42,18: *pare micchādiṭṭhī bhavissanti, mayam ettha sammādiṭṭhī bhavissāmā* (Sᵉ: *micchādiṭṭhikā* and *sammādiṭṭhikā*).

63) Each of the two discourses has well over a hundred occurrences of the term *pajānāti*.

64) On title variations in the case of *Jātaka* tales cf. Feer 1875: 367-377, Jones 1979: 12, Lüders 1941/1966: 136-137 and von Hinüber 1998: 7-16.

65) Skilling 2009: 64 explains that "there was no standardization of titles", noting that, though this gives the impressions "that the titles were devised later", it also needs to be take into account that "many titles are shared by Mahāvihāra and Sarvāstivāda collections", showing that these drew on an already existing common heritage.

66) MN 12 at MN I 83,25: *Lomahaṃsanapariyāya*. The title *Lomahaṃsa* occurs

also in the summary verse (*uddāna*) of B^e and S^e, even though these editions use *Mahāsīhanāda* as the title.

67) This is the *Lomahaṃsa-jātaka* at Jā I 389,14. In Mil 396,2, Nāgasena quotes part of the *Mahāsīhanāda-sutta*, to which he refers as the *Lomahaṃsana-pariyāya*. Sv I 179,3 and It-a I 109,1 refer to MN 12 as the *Lomahaṃsa(na)-sutta*. The *Cariyāpiṭaka*, Cp 35,16 entitles a set of verses (verses 359-362) concerned with the bodhisattva's ascetic practices as *Mahālomahaṃsacariyaṃ*, the "great hair raising conduct", cf. also Charpentier 1910: 400-403.

68) *Ro(maharṣaṇa)-sūtra*, reconstructed title (from an *uddāna* preserved in a Hoernle fragment) in Hartmann 1991: 237, who notes that the same title recurs in a reference to the present discourse in the *Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa* in Lévi 1932: 158,11: *Romaharṣaṇīya sūtra*.

69) T 757 at T XVII 591c11: 身毛喜豎經.

70) The *Bhaiṣajyavastu* in Dutt 1984: 93,10 refers to the *Māndhātṛ-sūtra* found in the *Rājasaṃyuktanipāta*; p. 98,15 to the *Velāma-sūtra* in the *Brāhmaṇa-nipāta*; p. 111,20 to the *Mahādeva-sūtra* and p. 112,19 to the *Nimi-sūtra* in the *Rājasaṃyuktanipāta*; and p. 217,12 to the *Nandīpāla-sūtra* in the *Rājasaṃyuktanikāya* (Skilling 1997: 282 note 65 suggests that in the last case "*nikāya* could be a wrong reading for *nipāta*"); for counterparts in the Chinese translation of this Vinaya cf. de Jong 1979: 400.

71) Waldschmidt 1980: 142-144 identifies the following counterparts: the *Māndhātṛ-sūtra* corresponds to MĀ 60 at T I 494b-496a; the *Velāma-sūtra* corresponds to MĀ 155 at T I 677a-678a; the *Mahādeva-sūtra* and the *Nimi-sūtra* correspond to MĀ 67 at T I 511c-515b; and the *Nandīpāla-sūtra* corresponds to MĀ 63 at T I 499a-503a. MĀ 60, MĀ 63, and MĀ 67 are indeed found in the "chapter related to kings", 王相應品, and MĀ 155 occurs in the "chapter on Brahmins", 梵志品.

72) The counterpart to the *Māndhātṛ-sūtra*, MĀ 60 at T I 494b9, has the title 四洲經, "Discourse on Four Continents". The counterpart to the *Velāma-sūtra*, MĀ 155 at T I 677a8, has the title 須達經 and is thus entitled after its protagonist Sudatta (i.e. Anāthapiṇḍika). The counterpart to the *Mahādeva-sūtra* and the *Nimi-sūtra*, MĀ 67 at T I 511c21, takes Mahādeva's mango-grove — the location where the discourse takes place — as its title, 大天㮈林經. The counterpart to the *Nandīpāla-sūtra*, MĀ 63 at T I 499a9, also takes the discourse's

location as its title, 續婆陵耆經. Notably, Śamathadeva's commentary on the *Abhidharmakośa* gives the title of MĀ 67 just as *lha chen po*, cf. Q (5595) *mngon pa'i bstan bcos*, *tu* 86a8, thereby agreeing with the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya* (and the *Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa* in Lévi 1932: 161,14). In the case of MĀ 63, however, Śamathadeva's commentary uses the name of the location as the discourse's title, thereby agreeing with the Sarvāstivāda *Madhyama-āgama* collection against the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, cf. Q (5595) *mngon pa'i bstan bcos, tu* 279a7 and Skilling 1997: 279-285.

73) MN 115 at MN III 67,30 concludes with the Buddha listing several titles, as is the case for the parallel versions MA 181 at T I 724c1; T 776 at T XVII 713c27; Q (963) *mdo sna tshogs, lu* 330a8; for a *sūtra* quotation in the *Dharmaskandha*, T 1537 at T XXVI 502c17, and for another *sūtra* quotation in Śamathadeva's commentary on the *Abhidharmakośa*, Q (5595) *mngon pa'i bstan bcos, tu* 36b5.