

Two Sūtras in the Chinese *Samyuktāgama* without Direct Pāli Parallels — Some Remarks on how to identify ‘Later Additions’ to the Corpus

MARCUS BINGENHEIMER

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

marcus.bingenheimer@temple.edu

ABSTRACT

23 out of the 364 sūtras of the Shorter Chinese *Samyuktāgama* (BZA: Bieyi zaahan jing 別譯雜阿含經 T.100) and many more of the Longer Chinese *Samyuktāgama* (ZA: Zaahan jing 雜阿含經 T.99) have no known direct counterpart in Pāli, Sanskrit or Tibetan. These sūtras are especially suitable to introduce common problems regarding the relationship of early Indian sūtras and their Chinese translation. While usually the existence of an Indian parallel helps researchers to narrow down the range of likely forms of names and words, in the absence of Indian versions our understanding of translations and transcriptions becomes all the more conjectural. Āgama texts without a Pāli counterpart must also be suspected to be later additions to the collection and we have to deduce from form and content of the sūtra as well as its position in the collection, when, where and why the text came into being. The article introduces these problems as they appear in two BZA sūtras (153 and 184), both of which are translated below.

Keywords

Samyuktāgama, Chinese *Āgama*, *Nikāya*, dating methods, canonicity, riddle, *Jātaka*, lay arhants

INTRODUCTION

Scholarly consensus accepts that the Buddhist canon has developed over time since the death of the founder, for which a date around 400 BCE seems most likely.¹ Oral transmission seems to have been remarkably successful in commit-

1. The strongest arguments in favour of this date are summarized by Gombrich (2000).

ting a growing number of texts to collective memory, but textual changes could never be fully contained. Thus, from the very beginning of the tradition we find discussions of criteria for inclusion or exclusion of texts in the canon.² Since in an oral tradition every community ‘knows’ only what its current members have memorized, it must have been a common occurrence that a group was confronted with a *sūtra* they did not know, or a variant of a familiar text. The changes were amplified by the increasing geographic spread of Buddhism and the schisms into different schools, which led to variation in the *sūtra* and vinaya corpus.

For the layer of early *Āgama/Nikāya sūtra* literature the textual corpus available today can be divided, broadly speaking, into a northern and a southern tradition. The northern tradition is attested by the numerous Sanskrit fragments from Central Asia as well as the Chinese translations of *sūtra* collections and individual texts. The southern tradition is the, for our context, comparatively unified corpus of texts that is the Pāli canon, as it has been transmitted since Buddhaghosa. It is generally accepted that the Pāli canon was committed to writing in the first century BCE; the earliest Central Asian fragments of Buddhist texts also seem to be from this time.³ In general, the textual transmission in the southern tradition seems to have been more conservative and was closed earlier than that of the northern school.⁴ Therefore the various attempts to stratify early Buddhist *sūtra* literature were so far mostly based on the Pāli *Nikāyas*.⁵

In our quest to understand the earliest form of Buddhist doctrine, however, it is desirable to compare various versions from both traditions⁶ and in recent years more and more comparative studies of *Āgama* literature have been published.⁷ Generally speaking, and allowing for exceptions, it is reasonable to assume that the more witnesses of different stemma agree literally with each other, the older the text is likely to be.⁸ Texts that exist in both traditions must stem from the time

It is presented in detail in Bechert (1991, 1992, 1997) (see also Cousins’ review of Vols. 1–2 [1996]).

2. See the four *mahā-padesa* in DN II 123 and AN II 167 that are to ascertain whether a text is well-understood (*suggahita*) and indeed ‘the word of the Buddha’. As narrative this fact is encoded in the story of the monk Purāṇa who refuses to accept an ‘agreed’ version over his own (Vin II 290; von Hinüber 1989, 26).
3. Braavig & Liland (2010, XXVI).
4. For an overview of the discussion see Anālayo 2012b.
5. The most comprehensive attempt is by Pande (1995 [1957]), who amply cites previous research on the issue, but is now dated both in content and approach. Von Hinüber (1996, 25 f) mentions that methodologically coherent, comprehensive research on these matters is still scarce.
6. I believe the concise outline of different approaches Schmithausen has offered more than 20 years ago still holds (Ruegg & Schmithausen 1990: 1–3), and from the following it is obvious that I count myself among those who believe that relative statements about the age of texts and passages are possible in principle, and deserve to be made (Schmithausen’s third group). As Schmithausen points out, such layers can hardly ever be dated absolutely or ascribed to the Buddha himself without additional criteria.
7. Next to the monographs by Choong (2000), Anālayo (2011), and Bingenheimer (2011), the last fifteen years saw a growing number of articles in English and Chinese.
8. Schopen (1995[1985], 25–29) has famously argued that at times parallel agreement between versions can indicate that ‘levelling’ took place at some point and that textual differences can in fact signal older versions. Against that see Anālayo (2012b). My own position is that agreement of multiple witnesses is generally indicative of early strata, but that the possibility

before the division roughly around the turn of era.⁹ Some Āgama sūtras preserved in Chinese have no counterpart anywhere in the Pāli canon and must therefore in principle be suspected to be later additions that were created after the separation of the northern and southern tradition in the second to first century BCE. The same is true *vice versa* for Pāli sūtras for which there is no parallel anywhere in the northern tradition either as Sanskrit fragment or in Chinese translation.¹⁰

In the following, we will show how in two cases from the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama textual evidence strengthens the basic suspicion that these sūtras were added later to the canon of the Sarvāstivādins.

CASE 1: BZA 153 / ZA 928: MAHĀNĀMA ASKS HOW A LAY-MAN CAN OBTAIN THE FRUITS OF SPIRITUAL LIFE

BZA 153 on Mahānāma and its parallel in the Longer Chinese Saṃyuktāgama (T. 99) (ZA 928) do not seem to have a parallel in the Pāli. In both Chinese Saṃyukta collections, the sūtras of the cluster {BZA 153 / ZA 928} are wedged between two other discourses spoken to Mahānāma, which do have Pāli parallels; i.e. sūtra clusters {BZA 152 / ZA 927 / SN V 395} and {BZA 154 / ZA 929 / AN IV 220}. These two clusters are similar to each other both in structure and content. In both Mahānāma asks about what it means to be an *upāsaka* first in general terms, then with regard to distinct aspects of practice (faith, precepts, wisdom etc.).

Shorter Chinese Saṃyuktāgama	Longer Chinese Saṃyuktāgama	Pāli
BZA 152	ZA 927	SN V 395
BZA 153	ZA 928	
BZA 154	ZA 929	AN IV 220

In addition, there are a number of other sūtras which feature Mahānāma. In the Pāli canon these are distributed in two different collections, the SN and the AN, while in the northern tradition, all sūtras on Mahānāma were collected in the Saṃyuktāgama. We will neglect the other three clusters on Mahānāma (BZA 155, 156, 157 and their parallels), noting only that they appear grouped together in the two Chinese versions of the (Mūla-)sarvāstivādin Saṃyuktāgama (ZA and BZA)¹¹, while in Pāli some are found in the SN others in the AN. Here a translation of BZA 153 (CBETA/T02.100.431b24–c11):

Thus have I heard, once, the Buddha was in Kapilavatthu at the Banyan Grove (*nigrodhārāma*). At that time the Shakya Mahānāma together with five hundred

that a unique witness preserves an older version cannot be ruled out. It is, however, the latter not the former that needs additional evidence, i. e. there should be some account of when and how the other versions came to be unified later or why the singular version can claim to be of greater age.

9. Neglecting the small number of texts that were translated from Pāli to Chinese such as the *Vimuttimaggā* / 解脫道論 (T.1648).
10. Related to this is the fact that there are apocryphal sūtras in the Theravāda tradition, i.e. although the Pāli canon of the Mahāvihāra found closure relatively early, sūtras kept being created and some survived in Mss form (von Hinüber (1996, § 436–437), Hallisey (1990)).
11. The (Mūla-)sarvāstivādin Saṃyuktāgama was transmitted in two versions, of which one was translated fully into Chinese as ZA, the other possibly only partially as BZA. For a summary of research on school attribution of the ZA and BZA see Bingenheimer (2011).

lay-followers (*upāsāka*) went to the Buddha, paid obeisance to the Buddha's feet, sat to one side and addressed the Buddha: 'World-honored One, those who, in accordance with the teachings of the Buddha regarding the lay-follower, wear white, fulfill the householder's responsibilities and have taken refuge in the triple gem, who call themselves lay-followers, how can they obtain the fruit of stream-entry (*sotāpanna-phalam*) ... up to [becoming a] non-returner (*anāgāmin*)?'

The Buddha said to the Shakya Mahānāma:

'They have to cut off the three fetters that are "belief in self-identity" (*sakkāya-ditṭhi*), "attachment to rites and rituals" (*silābbata-upādāna*), and the "web of doubt" (*vicikicchā*). Having cut off the three fetters one becomes a stream-enterer and will not again be reborn in the three evil realms. One obtains strong faith in the supreme way and after being reborn in the human or the heavenly realm [a maximum of] seven times one can end all suffering and enter Nirvana. This is how a lay-follower obtains stream-entry'.

Again [Mahānāma] asked: 'How does one become a once-returner (*sakadāgāmin*)?'

The Buddha said to Mahānāma: 'Someone having cut off the three fetters, further thins out sensual desire, anger and ignorance: he is called a once-returner'.

Again [Mahānāma] asked: 'How does one become a non-returner (*anāgāmin*)?'

The Buddha said to Mahānāma: 'Having cut off the three fetters and [then two more, cutting off all] the five lower fetters, he becomes a non-returner'.

When Mahānāma and the five hundred lay-followers heard this teaching, their minds were gladdened, and they said to the Buddha: 'World-honored One, wonderful indeed! May all lay-people obtain this advantage, they all should become lay-followers'. After Mahānāma and the lay-followers said this, they paid obeisance to the Buddha and left.

The monks having heard what the Buddha had said, were happy and remembered it well.¹²

Reasons for considering the *sūtra* a later addition to the canon

In the cluster {BZA 153 / ZA 928}, Mahānāma is accompanied by five hundred lay-followers. In both collections the *sūtra* is wedged between the clusters {BZA 152 / ZA 927 / SN V 395} and {BZA 154 / ZA 929 / AN IV 220}, in which Mahānāma appears before the Buddha alone. Although the exaggerated 'five hundred' is quite common in the early discourses, the hyperbole generally points to a later development. *Pañcasata* as a number in the narrative frame is a multiple of the Buddha's first audience: the *pañcavaggiyā bhikkhū*. It should be understood, and perhaps more aptly rendered, as 'many'.¹³ It is, however, rarely used in the BZA

12. 如是我聞：一時，佛在迦毘羅衛國尼拘陀林。時釋摩男與五百優婆塞往詣佛所，頂禮佛足，在一面坐，白佛言：「世尊！如佛所說優婆塞義，在家白衣具丈夫志，歸命三寶，自言我是優婆塞者，云何而得須陀洹果？乃至阿那含耶？」佛告釋摩男：「斷除三結，身見、戒取，及疑網等。斷三結已，成須陀洹，更不復受三塗之身，於無上道，生決定信，人天七返，盡諸苦際，入於涅槃，是名優婆塞得須陀洹。」又問：「云何而得斯陀含果？」佛告摩訶男：「斷三結已，薄婬怒癡，名斯陀含。」又問：「云何而得阿那含果？」佛告摩訶男：「若能斷三結及五下分，成阿那含。」時摩訶男及五百優婆塞聞此法已，心生歡喜，而白佛言：「世尊！甚為希有！諸在家者，獲此勝利，一切咸應作優婆塞。」時摩訶男及諸優婆塞作是語已，禮佛而退。諸比丘等聞佛所說，歡喜奉行。(Punctuation based on the CBETA/T. edition (Version 2011))

13. See the remarks and examples cited in Anālayo 2011, 417–418.

and even more rarely in the ZA, where it was occasionally used for beings (monks, lay-men, *devas*) as well as for things (chariots, palaces). Next to BZA 153 only BZA 97, 105, 227, 228, and 305 use ‘five hundred’ for describing a large audience, and BZA 153 is the only sūtra that mentions five hundred *upāsakas*. More significantly, its counterpart in the much larger ZA is also the only sūtra that mentions five hundred *upāsakas* who had come as retinue of the questioner. Therefore, although the number five-hundred appears in the early texts, this particular use of the hyperbole is unique for the BZA and the ZA.

Thematically too, there is a more natural progression between the questions in BZA 152 and BZA 154, whereas BZA 153 seems go off at a tangent by asking about the highest potential achievements of lay-people.

Possibly both clusters {BZA 152 etc.} and {BZA 154 etc.} were part of the original oral text base, perhaps as two versions of the same encounter. These two versions were probably preserved in the two different *bhāṇaka* traditions of the SN and the AN. In the northern tradition the Mahānāma sūtras from different *bhāṇaka* lines were gathered in the Saṃyuktāgama and brought in an approximate order starting with Mahānāma asking about the basic definition of *upāsaka* in the cluster {BZA 152 etc.} and moving on to the more specific questions {BZA 154 etc.}.¹⁴ At a later point the sūtra {BZA 153 / ZA 928} was inserted between the clusters {BZA 152 etc.} and {BZA 154 etc.}.

The sūtra describes the fruits lay-followers can hope to attain through their religious practice. It stops with the stage of the non-returner; arhantship is literally out of the question. Though the early sources do not seem to allow that lay-people can attain arhantship and continue their life as lay-people, this point seems to have been debated. Like the reversibility of the attainment of arhantship, the question of whether lay-practitioners may become and remain *arhants* is part of the general definition of what it means to be an *arhant*. The definition of arhantship was an important, but difficult undertaking, as for early Buddhism it involves a description of the ideal person, which runs into similar epistemological and logical problems as descriptions of Nirvana.

The early sources are unequivocal in allowing for lay-followers of both genders to attain the first three fruits and even, after a rebirth in a heavenly realm, Nirvana (e.g. MN I 492). Arhantship, on the other hand, the experience of Nirvana in this life and escape from further rebirth, was a different matter. The orthodox position is that although lay-followers can attain arhantship, they do so either shortly before entering the order or shortly before death.¹⁵ The logic of the monastic-lay divide in Buddhism prohibits the existence of healthy, long-lived ‘lay-arhants’. Contrary to Nirvana as the highest soteriological goal, arhantship was also a social status in the spiritual hierarchy of early Buddhism. This status was reserved for monastics, whose *raison d’être* implied some spiritual advantage over laypeople, and whose authority could have been challenged by a lay-arhant. According to Lamotte (1988 [1958]: 79), the Buddha himself did not want to com-

14. If these assumptions are correct, it follows that the Pāli tradition too has ‘doubled’ what were originally two single sūtras. See SN V 369 (*Paṭhama mahānāma*) and SN V 371 (*Dutiya mahānāma*), and AN V 328 (*Paṭhama mahānāma*) and AN V 332 (*Dutiya mahānāma*). With the latter the first version of the sūtra is only slightly expanded by the second (which, however, is not found in Chinese).

15. See Anālayo 2011, 373n176 and Mil.264–366.

mit himself on the issue, but the fact is, as Bhikkhu Bodhi has pointed out, that ‘in the Nikāyas there are no recorded cases of laypeople who attained arahantship and then continued to lead the lay life’.¹⁶

An echo of a debate about whether a lay-person (*gihī*) can be an *arhant* can be found in the *Katthāvatthu* (Kv IV.1, 267ff).¹⁷ The orthodox position, backed by canonical reference (MN I 483), is that a lay-follower must relinquish all ‘fetters of the lay-follower’ *gihisaññojanaṃ*, i.e. sex, children, non-monastic clothes, perfumes and other luxuries etc once he attains arhantship. The fact, however, that there have been detractors to this view proves that the position was debated, and at least some Buddhists believed or wanted to believe in the existence of lay-arhants. Perhaps the *sūtra* to Mahānāma cluster {BZA 153 / ZA 928} was created in context of one of these debates in northern India in order to clarify that the way of a lay-follower ends with the attainment of the fruit of non-returning. The text might have been added to the already existing *sūtras* spoken to Mahānāma that describe other characteristics of a lay-follower, to affirm the orthodox position that lay-followers can only rise to the level of non-returner.

The above issue, however, do not prove the lateness of {BZA 153 / ZA 928}; only the absence of a Pāli parallel, the unique use of the term ‘five hundred *upāsakas*’, and the position of the *sūtra* relative to its adjacent clusters hint at a composition after the (gradual) split into the northern and southern lines of textual transmission between the third and the first century BCE.

CASE 2: BZA 184 / ZA 590 A DEVA ASKS A RIDDLE

The traditional catalogs as well as the more recent databases that try to improve on them list no Pāli parallel for {BZA 184 / ZA 590}.¹⁸ The following is a translation of BZA 184 (CBETA/T02.100.439b29-440a1):

Thus have I heard, once, the Buddha was staying at Sāvattthī at the Jeta Grove in the Anāthapiṇḍika Park. At that time the Buddha addressed the monks: ‘Once upon a time in Kosala there were five hundred chariots, which their owners had driven into a dangerous wilderness with no grass or water. There were five hundred bandits quickly following the chariots planning to loot them. At that time there was a spirit (*devatā*) who lived in that wilderness who understood that the bandits wanted to loot [the caravan] and he thought: I will now go to these chariots and ask [their drivers a difficult question], if they can answer me I will save them, if they do not understand, “I will leave them [to their fate]”. Having thought thus he quickly went to the caravan. With his radiant body he illumi-

16. Bodhi (2012, 1772).

17. There is also a passage in the *Milindapañha* (242–244) that addresses the question what the advantage of going forth might be, if laypeople too can attain full enlightenment. Nāgasena gives a fairly vague description of the advantages of one ‘gone forth’ and seems to imply that monastics attain the final goal quicker: ‘one who has gone forth prospers quickly and without delay’ (Horner 1963, Vol.2, 51). The passage however does not directly address the question of arhantship. The list of laypeople (AN III, 450), which have attained ‘certainty about the Tathāgata, become seers of the deathless and live having realized the deathless’ (*Tathāgate niṭṭhaṃ gato amataddaso amataṃ sacchikatvā iriyati*) is not conclusive either.

18. Anesaki (1908), Akanuma (1929 [1990]), Suttacentral (<http://www.suttacentral.net/>), The Bieyi Zaahanjing Project (<http://buddhistinformatics.ddbc.edu.tw/BZA/>).

nated the five hundred chariots with bright light and put this question in verse to the merchants:

Who is called asleep by someone who is awake? Who is called awake by someone who is asleep?

Whoever can discern the meaning of this [riddle], should know to answer me now.

At that time among the merchants there was a lay-follower (*upāsaka*) who had deep faith in the three jewels and taken refuge in the Buddha, the Dharma and the Saṅgha. His resolve with regard to the Buddha, the Dharma and the Saṅgha was without doubt. Also regarding the four truths his mind harbored no doubts. He had already seen the truth and attained the first fruit [of stream-entry]. Rising in the morning he would sit upright, concentrate his mind in front of him, and with a loud voice recite the sūtras, verses from the *Dhammapada*,¹⁹ the *Pārāyana*, and various other texts. This lay-follower answered with a verse:

I am called asleep by someone who is awake. And I am called awake by someone who is asleep.

I have completely understood this matter, therefore I do answer thus.

At that time the spirit asked with a verse:

Why do you say: 'I am called asleep by someone who is awake.

And I am called awake by someone who is asleep'?

Why do you answer me thus?

The lay-follower answered with a verse:

An Arhant, who has cut off desire, hatred, ignorance,
has ended all taints, he who is awakened, might call me asleep.

But someone, who does not know the arising of suffering and the way to end it,
by him, who is asleep, I might be called awake. Thus, spirit, you should know.

Again the spirit spoke a verse:

Indeed one might be called asleep by those who are awake[ned].

You have answered me well. I have not met a Dharma brother (*dharma-bhrātṛ*)?

for a long time, seeing one now I am greatly pleased.

Because of you, your companions will return unharmed today'.

When the Buddha had finished, the monks having heard what the Buddha had said, were happy and remembered it well.²⁰

19. Verses that are collected today in the Pāli *Dhammapada*, or the Chinese *Fajū jīng* 法句經 (T. 210).

20. 如是我聞：一時，佛在舍衛國祇樹給孤獨園。爾時，佛告諸比丘：於往昔時，俱薩羅國有五百乘車，而以為伴，行到曠野險難之處，無有水草。有五百賊尋逐其車，規欲擄掠。時有天神，住曠野中，知賊欲劫，而作是念：我今當往詣彼車所，我當問之，彼若能答，當為救護。設有不通，我當放捨。思惟是已，尋即來到行客車前，身光遍照，五百乘車盡皆大明，即便以偈問商估言：誰於寤者名為睡？誰於睡者名為寤？誰能解達如斯義，宜知是時應答我。時商估中，有優婆塞，於三寶所深得淨信，歸佛法僧，於佛法僧得了決定，無有狐疑。又於四諦，亦無疑心。已得見諦，獲於初果。晨朝早起，正身端坐，繫念在前，高聲誦經，誦法句偈，及波羅緣，種種經偈。彼優婆塞說偈答言：我於寤者名為睡，我於睡者名為寤，我知斯事悉明了，是故今者以偈答。爾時，天神以偈問言：汝今云何作是言：我於寤者名為睡，我於睡者名為寤？云

Literary content and a newly discovered Pāli parallel

The content presented here is obviously ‘late’ in the sense that it presupposes Buddhism. The subject of the caravan of wandering merchants is typical for *jātaka* literature and so is the riddle.²¹ Indeed, there is a hitherto unnoticed Pāli parallel for this story and the riddle around which it is built. The *Jāgara Jātaka* (Fausbøll 1883 [1963], 403–405; Cowell No. 414) contains the same riddle embedded in a slightly different version of the narrative frame. Here, the unnamed lay-follower stays awake at night to protect the caravan from thieves, without, however, meeting a *devatā*. On his return the Buddha tells him a *jātaka*, where he, the Buddha himself, in a previous incarnation solved the riddle of a *devatā* (specifically, a tree-spirit (*rukkha-devatā*)), while practising austerities at night.

The riddle in Pāli runs: *Ko ‘dha jāgarataṃ sutto, ko ‘dha suttesu jāgaro // ko mam’etaṃ vijānāti, ko taṃ paṭibhaṇāti me ti* – ‘Who is it that is awake among those who sleep and sleeps among those who are awake? Who understands me, who can answer me?’²² The answer given by the Bodhisattva is: *Ahaṃ jāgarataṃ sutto, ahaṃ suttesu jāgaro // ahaṃ etaṃ vijānāmi, ahaṃ paṭibhaṇāmi me ti* – ‘I am awake among those who sleep and asleep among those who are awake. I understand [your riddle], I answer you’. This corresponds almost literally to what we find in the ZA: 誰於覺睡眠 誰復睡眠覺 // 誰有解此義 誰能為我說 and 我於覺睡眠 我於睡眠覺 // 我解知此義 能為人記說.

Both in the Pāli and in the ZA the syntax of the riddle is terse. The BZA, by inserting the ‘to be called Y by X’ (於X名為Y), reduces the gnomic under-determinedness of the stanza. Interestingly, this more explicit reading of the riddle stanza is attested in the Pāli commentary: *Tattha kathaṃ jāgarataṃ sutto ti kathaṃ tvaṃ jāgarataṃ sattānaṃ antare sutto nama [a]hosi*. (Fausbøll 1883 [1963], 404). What exists as a gloss in the Pāli *Jātaka* commentary was realized in the north in the *sūtra* text.

BZA 184/ZA 590 and *Jātaka* 414 are examples for how the early Buddhist community incorporated narrative motifs (a bandit raid on caravans, the riddle posed by a tree spirit) into their textual tradition. In this case, the narrative material became a *sūtra* in the northern tradition, while it was incorporated into the *Jātaka* collection in the Pāli tradition. There, as part of the *Khuddaka Nikāya*, it was still within the *Sutta-piṭaka*, but clearly marked as a different genre. The example shows again that the northern *Samyuktāgama* collections were closed later than the Pāli SN or AN. The inclusion of the gloss that simplifies the syntax of the riddle in the BZA is another indication that the BZA indeed underwent further independent changes after it split off the ZA.²³

何如此而答我？優婆塞以偈答言：斷除貪欲瞋恚癡，諸漏已盡阿羅漢，彼稱為寤我名睡。不知苦習及滅道，我於彼睡名為寤，天神汝今應當知。天神復說偈問言：善哉於寤名為睡，汝能善解答我問。久來不見法兄弟，今得相見大歡悅。今爾眾伴為汝故，一切安隱得歸還。佛說是已，諸比丘聞佛所說，歡喜奉行。(Punctuation based on the CBETA/T. edition (Version 2011))

21. E.g. *Jātaka* Story Nos 214, 514, 522, 546.

22. Neglecting the strange *jāgarataṃ*, the *suttesu* seems to imply ‘among’. Cowell translates: ‘Who is it that wakes when others sleep and sleeps while others wake? Who is it can read my riddle, who to this will answer make?’

23. Su (2010) has found similar evidence. In BZA 140 and BZA 311, the BZA includes the solution in the riddle verse. For further evidence that the BZA was closed later than the ZA see Bingenheimer 2011, 45–50.

By itself, appearance of material in a Chinese or Sanskrit version of a *sūtra* that is part of the commentary in the Pāli canon should be considered a sign of lateness. Even if the early (Singalese) commentarial literature was largely overwritten by Buddhaghosa, we do know that the Buddhist tradition in ancient Sri Lanka had a strong sense of the *mūla/aṭṭhakatā* division from its beginning in the third century BCE.²⁴ As the work of Endo has shown, the Sinhala commentaries found closure already in the first century BCE and new material was collected elsewhere (in the so-called *Mahā-aṭṭhakathā*).²⁵ Commentarial Āgama literature, or rather the awareness of a separate commentarial tradition next to the ‘canon’, was much less developed in the northern tradition around the turn of the era. It is highly unlikely that what was considered part of a *sūtra* in the first century BCE was moved into a Pāli commentary. In the geographically more widely spread northern tradition, on the other hand, commentarial matter could easily be ‘promoted’ to *mūla* status.

There are two more textual phenomena in this *sūtra* that are indicators for a later redaction and which can sometimes be used to establish a relative chronological order of texts: The use of a ‘late’ term and a reference to another text.

Dating a single term in comparative perspective

At times it is possible to trace textual changes by investigating single terms.²⁶ *Fa xiongdi* 法兄弟 ‘Dharma-brother’ is a comparatively unproblematic concept in a Chinese context, where lineage is conceived of via the metaphor of kinship ties. The teacher stands in for the father, his fellow students under the same teacher are addressed as ‘uncles’, and one’s own fellow students as ‘brothers’. In this sense the two characters 法兄 are frequently used for ‘Dharma-brother(s)’ in later Chinese Buddhist texts, especially of the Chan school.

Looking for the original of the three character compound 法兄弟 in an Indian-Chinese Buddhist text, a form of Skt *dharma-bhrātṛ* is the obvious candidate. It is difficult, however, to find examples for its use. In Buddhist lexicography, Ogiwara (1978 [1988]: sub voc. *dharma-bhrātṛ*) was the first to attest the equivalent *fa di* 法弟 for *dharma-bhrātṛ* in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* chapter of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, traditionally attributed to Asaṅga (third to fourth century CE; parts have been written earlier).²⁷ The term *dharma-bhrāta* appears also in Gopadatta’s *Jātakamāla* (*Bhavalubdhaka* Verse 93), which was probably written after 450,²⁸ and in the even later tantric text *Ārya Mahāmāyūrī-vidyārājñī*. The earliest Chinese version of the latter text, the *Fomu dakongque mingwang jing* 佛母大孔雀明王經 (early 8th century) duly has *faxiongdi* 法兄弟 (CBETA/T.19.982.427b).

24. For the Sinhalese commentaries before Buddhaghosa see Adikaram (1946, 10–23) and Endo (2013, 15–121). During the period of oral transmission the distinction between *sūtra* and commentary were less clear cut (Anālayo 2010), and there is textual evidence that the ‘Sinhala Rendition of the Indian Original Commentaries’ added new material between the third and the first century BCE (Endo 2013, 15–32).

25. Endo (2013, 31–32).

26. See e.g. von Hinüber (1989: 30 ff).

27. His edition has *dharma-bhrātṛ*: Wogihara (1930–1936, 153).

28. Hahn (1992, 28). For the text see Hahn’s electronic version at the Göttingen Register of Electronic Texts in Indian Languages (GRETIL) (online at: <http://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil.htm> [Accessed Jan. 2013]).

I was unable to find a Pāli equivalent such as **dhamma-bhātu*²⁹ in the dictionaries, indices and full-text-databases available to me and it seems that the kinship metaphor was generally not used widely, certainly not in the early Pāli texts, where fellow students in the Dharma were referred to as ‘friend’ *mitta*, ‘companion’ *sahāya*, or ‘dear to the heart’ *suhada* etc.

The Chinese 法兄弟 appears in the Chinese versions of the *Buddhacarita* (unfortunately in Canto 28, for which the Sanskrit is lost) and in a Mūlasarvāstivādin *vinaya* text.³⁰ Though in both cases the Sanskrit cannot be ascertained, a form of *dharma-bhrāṭṛ* is likely.

The absence of this term in the early Pāli sources, combined with the late date of the few Sanskrit witnesses — the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, Gopadatta, and the *Mahāmāyūrī-vidyārājñī* — suggests that the term was used only relatively late (post first century CE?) and never gained much currency. If *dharma-bhrāṭṛ* was indeed the original of 法兄弟 in the BZA,³¹ it is another indication that BZA 184 is a later addition to the (Mūla)sarvāstivādin corpus.

References to other texts

Early references to titles of other texts are often significant for textual studies. They provide help with the relative dating of a text, and sometimes reveal important facts about the development of the canon as a whole. The most interesting passage in BZA 184 in this regard are the two titles, neither of which is mentioned in the ZA or the Pāli parallel.

In the BZA the *upāsaka* recites ‘verses from the *Dhammapada*/*Dharmapada*, the *Pārāyana* and various others’, while in the ZA the *upāsaka* meditates on the twelve-fold chain of interdependent arising (*pratītya-samutpāda*). The Pāli *Jātaka* mentions neither recitation nor meditation.

Faju 法句 is a common, literal translation of *Dharmapada* and unproblematic. *Boluoyuan* 波羅緣, on the other hand, is a unique transcription of the title of the text known as *Pārāyana*, the final part of the *Suttanipāta* (Sn).³² The ‘Chinese editions’ collated in the Taishō have 波羅經 for this passage, which on first sight seems more familiar, but is a *lectio facilior*, which turns the lesser known 波羅緣 (*Pārāyana*) into 波羅經, an abbreviation of (*Prajñā*)*pāramitā sūtra*.³³

29. Pāli *anuja* (‘following-born’ = younger brother) is an unlikely candidate for 法兄弟.

30. At T.4.0192.53c02 and T.4.193.114a15. The *Genbenshuoyiqieyoubu nituona mudejia* 根本說一切有部尼陀那目得迦 T.24.1452.421c09.

31. The parallel in ZA 590 has 諸兄弟. The plural makes no sense here, and is probably an early scribal error that changed 法 to a (cursive) 諸. The Pāli *Jātaka*’s parallel does not contain this sentence at all. The *devatā* compliments the Bodhisattva on his solution, but does not say he has waited for a ‘Dharma brother’ or ‘fellow student’.

32. Perhaps **prāyana* as elsewhere in the BZA 波羅 has been used to transcribe *prā-* (e.g. 波羅提木叉 for *prātimokṣa*).

33. Though there is no doubt that 波羅經 is a mistake here, the redactors of the Chinese text might claim ameliorating circumstances: the BZA does indeed include a reference to a *Pāramitā Sūtra*. It appears in BZA 258 as *boluomidu jing* 波羅蜜闍經. (CBETA, T02, no. 100, 464, b12). It is not clear if this surprising anachronism was part of the Indian version of the BZA used by the translators, or should be understood as a gloss that entered the text at the stage of the oral translation.

The last two *vaggas* of the Sn, the *Aṭṭhaka vagga* and the *Pārāyana vagga*, are widely considered as belonging to the earliest stratum of the Buddhist canon.³⁴ They are both cited several times in *sūtra* and *vinaya* texts of both the northern and the southern tradition, and as Lévi remarks ‘nous sommes en droit de classer l’Arthavarga parmi les monuments les plus anciens de la littérature bouddhique’ and ‘le Pārāyana est une des collections les plus authentiquement établies’.³⁵ It is mentioned in ZA 1164 (no BZA parallel) where monks debate the ‘questions of Tissa Metteyya in the Pārāyana’ 波羅延低舍彌德勒所問.³⁶ In another passage in {ZA 1321/BZA 320} Anuruddha is said to have recited the Pārāyana (ZA: 波羅延那, BZA: 波羅延大德之偈) and other early texts from the Sn in the morning.³⁷ This latter passage is interesting, as it points to the use of the Sn verses in morning recitations. It is virtually certain that parts of the Sn as well as verses from the *Udāna*, the *Khuddakapāṭha* and the *Paritta* have been used in morning recitations,³⁸ and the passages from the Chinese *Saṃyuktāgamas* confirm this. This strengthens the assumption that von Hinüber (1996, 50) has carefully put forward: ‘[the] Sn may be considered, if one wants to speculate, some kind of earlier ritual handbook’.

With regard to content, too it, is not surprising that BZA 184 mentions the *Pārāyana vagga*. Riddle-like questions play a central role in the *Pārāyana vagga* and it is easy to see how someone who recited these exchanges every morning could resolve the riddle of the *devatā*. The reference to the *Pārāyana* does of course not indicate in itself that the BZA 184 is a later addition to the canon, as the text is mentioned relatively often in the *sūtra* and *vinaya* literature of both the northern and southern tradition. However, the question arises: considering that it does not appear in the ZA, should the reference in the BZA be regarded as a later addition relative to the ZA, or has the ZA removed the reference and replaced it with the meditation on *pratītya-samutpāda*? Evidence from other passages suggests that the BZA underwent a period of independent development after it forked off from the ZA, which found closure earlier.³⁹ This course of events is also in accord with what we have observed above about the simplification of the riddle-verse and

34. See the magistral article by Lévi (1915). Also Norman (1983, 63 ff), Norman (1992, xxvii ff), von Hinüber (1996, 49). For a discussion of the contents see Vetter (1990, 38–42).

35. Lévi (1915, 417, 419). Most famously the verses of the Sn are referenced in an Aśoka inscription (Bairāt Edict). For an overview of parallels see Jayawickrame (1976, 137–150) and Norman (1980; and 1992, xxxiv). The most comprehensive listing of parallels to the Sn *gāthās* and *suttantas* in Pāli, Sanskrit and Chinese to date is Mizuno (1992), the reference in BZA 184 escaped him, however, probably because of the unique transliteration for *Pārāyana*.

36. CBETA, T02, no. 99, 310, b21–26. Quoting Sn verses 1041–1042. The ZA contains three other mentions of the *Pārāyana*: CBETA, T02, no. 99, p. 95, b10–14 (cites Sn verse 1038); CBETA, T02n0099_p0255c10–13 (cites Sn verse 1048).

37. CBETA, T02, no. 99, 362, c8–12 and CBETA, T02, no. 100, 480, c20–23. The fact that the BZA transliterates *Pārāyana* once as 波羅延 and elsewhere as 波羅緣 is not surprising, given the generally low consistency of transliterations in the BZA. For more on the occasions for reciting *sūtras* mentioned in the canon, see Anālayo 2007.

38. Another example of merchants on a journey reciting these texts is found in the *Pūrṇāvadāna* (Tatelman 2005, 140). Lévi (1915, 418) translates this as ‘Les marchands avec qui Pūrṇa s’est embarqué ‘récitent tout au long, avec l’intonation, au moment de l’aube, l’Udāna, le Pārāyana, les Satyadrśaḥ, les Sthaviragāthāḥ, les Śailagāthāḥ, les Munigāthāḥ, les Arthavargiya sūtra’.

39. Bingenheimer (2011: 48–49).

the use of *dharma-bhrātṛ*, both of which imply that the Indian original of the BZA is later than that of the ZA.

Though each hint on its own cannot be considered definite proof, all differences discussed so far point to the following scenario: after the split into northern and southern versions of the *Samyukta* collection, the story around the riddle of the *devatā*, that originated in northern India, was incorporated in the northern *Sūtra-piṭaka* as {BZA 184 / ZA 590}, while in the more conservative southern tradition it was included in the *Jātaka* collection. Originally the same text, certain differences between ZA 590 and BZA 184 were introduced later. In BZA 184 the riddle was made more explicit by inserting what in the Pāli commentary is ‘... *antare ... nama ahoṣi*’. The remark of the *devatā* that he had waited for a *dharma-bhrātṛ* seems to have been added after the BZA split from the ZA. Moreover the meditation on *pratītya-samutpāda* was changed into a morning recitation that included the *Pārāyana*, a practice that was perhaps deemed more appropriate for an *upāsaka*.

CONCLUSION

The discussion of two Chinese *Samyuktāgama sūtra* clusters without known Pāli parallel has shown the following: (1) Our knowledge of existing parallels is incomplete, the bulk of the data on parallels was collected by Akanuma (1929), who, however, did not include all *Jātaka* texts. Researchers should consider searching for corresponding versions even where available catalogs do not list a parallel. (2) A close analysis of the two Chinese *Āgama sūtra* clusters suggest that they are almost certainly ‘later additions’ to the canon. In doing so we have used certain questions that can be considered generic for a discussion of ‘lateness’: What can be said of the relative position of the *sūtras* in their respective *Āgama* collections? What other parallels are available and do they offer a clue as to their creation? Can a single term indicate ‘lateness’? Are references to other texts an integral part of the *sūtra* or could they have been added later?

Through questions like these it is possible to make discrete, clearly circumscribed statements regarding the relative order of how early *sūtra* material developed in the canon. One day these statements will need to be synthesized on a larger scale and laid out in a more comprehensive view.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Venerable Anālayo for commenting on a draft version of this paper.

ABBREVIATIONS

AN	<i>Āṅguttara Nikāya</i>
BZA	<i>Biēyī za ahan jīng</i> 別譯雜阿含經 (T.100)
CBETA	<i>Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association</i> 中華電子佛典協會
CBETA/T.	CBETA edition of the Taishō canon CD-Version 2011
DN	<i>Dīgha Nikāya</i>
Mil.	<i>Milindapañha</i>
MN	<i>Majjhima Nikāya</i>
SN	<i>Samyutta Nikāya</i>
Sn	<i>Sutta-nipāta</i>
Vin	<i>Vinaya</i>
ZA	<i>Za ahan jīng</i> 雜阿含經 (T.99)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adikaram, Edward W. 1946. *Early Buddhist History in Ceylon*. [Reprinted by Dehiwala, Buddhist Cultural Center, 1994.]
- Akanuma, Chizen 赤沼智善. 1929. *Kanpa shibu shiagon goshōroku* 漢巴四部四阿含互照錄 — *The Comparative Catalogue of Chinese Āgamas and Pāli Nikāyas*. Nagoya: Hajinkaku shobō 破塵閣書房, 1929. [Reprinted by Sankinbō Busshorin, 1958. Sri Satguru Publications, 1990 (Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica no. 74).]
- Anālayo Bhikkhu. 2007. 'Oral Dimensions of Pali Discourses: Pericopes, other Mnemonic Techniques and the Oral Performance Context'. *Canadian Journal of Buddhist Studies* 3: 5–33.
- . 2010. 'The Influence of Commentarial Exegesis on the Transmission of Āgama Literature'. In *Translating Buddhist Chinese, Problems and Prospects*, (East Asia Intercultural Studies 3), edited by K. Meisig, 1–20. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 2011. *A Comparative Study of the Majjhima-nikāya*. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation. (Dharma Drum Buddhist College Research Series).
- . 2012a. 'Teaching the Abhidharma in the Heaven of the Thirty-three, The Buddha and his Mother'. *Journal of the Oxford Centre for Buddhist Studies* 2: 9–35.
- . 2012b. 'The Historical Value of the Pāli Discourses'. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 55: 223–253. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/001972412X620187>
- Anesaki, Masaharu 姉崎正治. 1908. *The Four Buddhist Āgamas in Chinese — A Concordance of their Parts and of the Corresponding Counterparts in the Pāli Nikāyas*. Yokohama: Kelly & Walsh (The Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan).
- Bechert, Heinz. Ed. 1991, 1992, 1997. *The Dating of the Historical Buddha. Die Datierung des Historischen Buddha*. 3 Vols. (Symposium zur Buddhismusforschung, IV, 1–3). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Bodhi Bhikkhu. 2012. *The Numerical Discourses of the Buddha — A Translation of the Aṅguttara Nikāya*. Boston, MA: Wisdom Publications.
- Braavig, Jens and Fredrik Liland. 2010. *Traces of Gandhāran Buddhism – An Exhibition of Ancient Buddhist Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection*. Oslo: Hermes.
- Bingenheimer, Marcus. 2011. *Studies in Āgama Literature — With special reference to the Shorter Chinese Saṃyuktāgama*. Taipei: Xinwenfeng. (Online at: http://mbingenheimer.net/publications/bingenheimer_StudiesInAgamaLit_2011.pdf)
- Choong, Mun-keat. 2000. *The Fundamental Teachings of Early Buddhism: A comparative study based on the Sūtrāṅga portion of the Pāli Saṃyutta-Nikāya and the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. (Beiträge zur Indologie 32)
- Cousins, Lance S. 1996. 'The Dating of the Historical Buddha: A Review Article'. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Third Series*, 6 (1): 57–63. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1356186300014760>
- Cowell, Edward Byles. Ed. 1895–1907. *The Jātaka or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births*. 6 Vols. Cambridge University Press. [Various Indian reprints].
- Endo, Toshiichi. 2013. *Studies in Pāli Commentarial Literature — Sources, Controversies and Insights*. Hongkong: Centre of Buddhist Studies, University of Hong Kong.
- Fausbøll, Viggo. 1883 [1963]. *The Jātaka together with its Commentary — being Tales of the Anterior Births of Gotama Buddha*. 4 Vols. London: Lusac (Pali Text Society).
- Gombrich, Richard. 2000. 'Discovering the Buddha's date'. In *Buddhism for the New Millennium*, edited by Lakshman S. Perera, 9–25. London: World Buddhist Foundation.
- Levi, Sylvain. 1915. 'Sur la Recitation Primitive des Textes Bouddhiques'. *Journal Asiatique*, ser. 11. 5: 401–447.

- Hahn, Michael. 1992. *Haribhaṭṭa and Gopadatta — Two Authors in the Succession of Āryaśūra On the Rediscovery of Parts of their Jātakamālās*. 2nd Edition Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies. (Studia Philologica Buddhica — Occasional Paper Series 1).
- Hallisay, Charles. 1990. 'Tuṇḍilovāda — An alledgedly non-canonical sutta'. *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* 15: 155–195.
- Horner, Isaline B. Trans. 1963, 1964. *Milinda's Questions*. 2 vols. London: Luzac. (Pali Text Society).
- Hinüber, Oskar von. 1989. *Der Beginn der Schrift und frühe Schriftlichkeit in Indien*. Mainz: F. Steiner (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. Vol. 11).
- . 1996. *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Hwang, Soonil. 2002. *Metaphor and Literalism — A Study of doctrinal development of nirvana in the Pali Nikāya and subsequent tradition compared with the Chinese Āgama and its traditional interpretation*. PhD thesis, Oxford. [Later published as: *Metaphor and Literalism in Buddhism: The Doctrinal History of Nirvana*. Routledge, 2006].
- Jayawickrama, N.A. 1976. 'A Critical Analysis of the Sutta-nipāta'. *Pāli Buddhist Review* 1–3: 136–163. [Second in a series of eight articles published in the *Pāli Buddhist Review* between 1976 and 1978.]
- Lamotte, Étienne. 1988 [1958]. *History of Indian Buddhism — from the Origins to the Śāka Era*. Translated by Sara Webb-Boin. Louvain: Institut Orientaliste Louvain-la-Neuve (Peeters Press).
- Mizuno, Kōgen 水野弘元. 1992. 'Sutta nipāta no ge ya kyō no taiōhyō スッタニパータの偈や經の対応表'. *Bukkyō kenkyū 仏教研究* 21: 1–56.
- Norman, Kenneth Roy. 1980. 'Four Etymologies from the Sabhiya-Sutta'. Orig. in: *Buddhist Studies in Honour of Walpola Rahula*, edited by Somaratna Balasooriya et al, 173–184. London: Gordon Fraser. = Kenneth R. Norman, *Collected Papers II*, Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1991, 59–70.
- . 1983. *Pāli Literature - including the canonical literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of all Hīnayāna schools of Buddhism*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 1992. *The Group of Discourses (Sutta-Nipāta)*. Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- Ogiwara Unrai 荻原雲來 [= Wogihara, Unrai]. 1978 [1988]. *Bonwa daijiten 梵和大辭典* [Large Sanskrit-Japanese Dictionary]. 2 Vol. Edition 1978 [Reprint: Taipei: Xinwenfeng 新文豐, 1988].
- Pande, Govind Chandra. 1995 [1957]. *Studies in the Origins of Buddhism*. Allahabad 1957 [4. Revised Edition Delhi: Motilal, 1995].
- Ruegg, David S., and Lambert Schmithausen. 1990. *Earliest Buddhism and Madhyamaka*. Leiden: Brill.
- Schopen, Gregory. 1995 [1985]. 'Two Problems in the History of Indian Buddhism, The Layman/Monk Distinction and the Doctrines of the Transference of Merit'. In his *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1995, 23–56 (First published in *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 10 (1985), 9–47).
- Su, Jinkun 蘇錦坤. 2010. "Za ahan jing", 'Bieyi za ahan jing' yu 'Xiangying bu nikaye' de yitong 《雜阿含經》、《別譯雜阿含經》與《相應部尼柯耶》的異同'. Unpublished manuscript.
- Tatelman, Joel. 2005. *The Heavenly Exploits — Buddhist Biographies from the Dīvyāvadāna*. Vol. 1. Bury St Edmunds: New York University Press.
- Vetter, Tilmann. 1990. 'Some remarks on older parts of the Suttanipāta'. In *Earliest Buddhism and Madhyamaka*, edited by David S. Ruegg and Lambert Schmithausen, 36–56. Leiden: Brill.
- Wogihara, Unrai 荻原雲來 [= Ogiwara, Unrai] (Ed.). 1930–1936. *Bodhisattvabhūmi*. Tokyo.