

Intertextuality, Contradiction, and Confusion in the *Prasādanīya-sūtra*, *Sampasādanīya-sutta*, and 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*)

CHARLES DISIMONE

LUDWIG-MAXIMILIANS-UNIVERSITÄT MÜNCHEN

disimone@alumni.stanford.edu

ABSTRACT

The Sanskrit *Āgama* manuscript is a Sarvāstivāda/Mūlasarvāstivāda text containing a collection of ancient canonical Buddhist *sūtras*, composed in Sanskrit and written on birch bark folios. This collection had been lost for centuries and was rediscovered in the late twentieth century. In this paper, I examine key instances of intertextuality between a new edition of a *sūtra* from the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Āgama* — the Sanskrit *Prasādanīya-sūtra* — the Pali *Sampasādanīya-sutta*, and Chinese 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*) — the three corresponding versions of this text in the *āgama/nikāya* collections of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda, Theravāda, and Dharmaguptaka schools. Hence, contradictions among the texts that are not easily explainable will be shown, uncovering apparent confusion among the creators of these texts and hopefully shedding new light on our understanding of these texts.

KEYWORDS

Intertextuality, *Prasādanīya-sūtra*, *Sampasādanīya-sutta*, 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*), *Āgama*, *Dīgha-nikāya*, 長阿含經 (*Cháng āhán jīng*), (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda, Theravāda, Dharmaguptaka, death and rebirth, *pratīpad/paṭīpadā*, *prahāṇa/padhāna*

Introduction

For some time now, I have been working on a reconstruction and translation of the *Prasādanīya-sūtra*, which is one of the *sūtras* collected in the manuscript of the *Āgama* of the Sarvāstivāda/Mūlasarvāstivāda¹ tradition containing a collection of ancient, canonical Buddhist texts composed in Sanskrit with some

1. Hereafter (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda. Unfortunately, at present there is no satisfactory agreement among scholars as to what the distinctions are between these two terms. Cf. Hartmann 2014, 140 n. 5.

Prakrit and Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit elements, and written on birch bark folios in the Gilgit/Bamiyan Type II script, also known as Proto-Śāradā. This collection had been lost for centuries and was likely rediscovered somewhere within the border area of Afghanistan and Pakistan in the 1990's. It is rare among manuscripts found in the area in that it is exceptionally long, comprising forty-seven individual texts. One cannot specify with certainty the location of the find spot of the manuscript because it only came to the attention of scholars after it had appeared on the rare book market in London. While it is regrettable that the provenance remains unknown, it is believed to be another part of the cache of manuscripts found in the 1930s, at the Gilgit site in Pakistan, which was historically the area we refer to as Greater Gandhāra. Based on paleographical analysis and radiocarbon dating, the manuscript is thought to date from a period between the seventh and eighth centuries of the Common Era.² While this manuscript of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Dirghāgama* was likely written in the eighth century, the *Dirghāgama* text itself is much older and was likely composed centuries before. The recent finding of this manuscript is a boon to scholars as it allows a new window into the content of an important body of texts and additionally informs and develops our understanding of the extant, related corpuses: the Theravāda *Dīgha-nikāya* in Pali and the Dharmaguptaka *Dirghāgama*, 長阿含經 (*Cháng āhán jīng*)³ translated into Chinese. The new edition of the Sanskrit (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Prasādaniya-sūtra* that I have created⁴ allows us to see its corresponding versions in the *nikāya/āgama* collections of the Theravāda and Dharmaguptaka schools, the Pali *Sampasādaniya-sutta*⁵ and Chinese 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*)⁶ in a new light. In this paper, by examining several key instances of intertextuality between the Sanskrit *Prasādaniya-sūtra*, Pali *Sampasādaniya-sutta*, and Chinese 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*), contradictions among the texts that are not easily explainable will be shown, so as to uncover apparent confusion among the creators or redactors of these texts and ultimately provide new insights into, and complexities in, our understanding of all three of these texts.

Currently, over half of the *Dirghāgama* manuscript is split into four private collections, two in Japan and one each in Norway and the United States while the whereabouts of the rest of the manuscript remain a mystery, one that will hopefully be solved in time. The folios in all four private collections, while fragmentary in many places, have fortunately been subjected to high resolution scans, allowing scholars to study the texts independently of the location of the physical folios, which remain housed in the collections of their respective owners.

While I am fortunate to have very high quality photos of the manuscript at my disposal, the *Prasādaniya-sūtra* manuscript is damaged throughout, in some places quite heavily and the text itself is often problematic. As Hartmann notes:

2. Cf. Hartmann and Wille 2013, 137.
3. T I. Pinyin is used for all transliteration from Chinese.
4. This edition is available in my PhD dissertation from Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München submitted in 2016.
5. D III 99-116.
6. T I 76b24-79a28, translated by Buddhayaśas (佛陀耶舍) and Zhu Fonian (竺佛念) in 413 CE (see the preface for more information on the date of the translation, T I 1b1). For information on the circumstances of the translation see the catalogue, 出三藏記集 (*Chū sānzàng jì jí*), T LV 2145 11b1.

At first sight the manuscript looks very good, but it does not hold what it seems to promise. As soon as one starts reading the texts it becomes obvious that the textual transmission has already deteriorated to a degree that turns its perusal into quite a challenge for the modern academic reader.⁷

This has compounded the already philologically complicated process of creating the reconstruction in a way that is similar to piecing together a jigsaw puzzle. However, I have been successful in piecing together damaged sections of the manuscript and have been able to reconstruct the missing passages based on the many Sanskrit and Pali parallels to the text that I have compiled; whenever I have a textual parallel, I have been able to reconstruct the text with a reasonable degree of confidence. However, in the — fortunately — rare event where both the manuscript is damaged and there are no parallels extant, it is impossible to create a reconstruction and such portions of the text must remain lost until either the missing part of the manuscript is found or a similar parallel is discovered.

The *Prasādanīya-sūtra* is the sixteenth *sūtra* included in the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Dirghāgama*. Its subject matter concerns faith in the Buddha by enumerating topics he is foremost in teaching. It is preserved in Pali as the *Sampasādanīya-sutta*, the twenty-eighth *sutta* in the *Dīgha-nikāya* of the Theravāda tradition and the eighteenth *sūtra* in the Chinese translation of the *Dirghāgama*, 長阿含經 (*Cháng āhán jīng*) of the Dharmaguptaka tradition, titled 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*). While the three texts often mirror one another in content, following the same general structure, theme, and topics, there are numerous small and several major differences wherein the contents of the texts diverge. Additionally, the *Prasādanīya-sūtra* contains passages for which parallels can be found in these other sources: the *Khuddakapāṭha*, *Arthavinīscaya-sūtra*, *Śrāvabhūmi*, *Poṣadhavastu*, the *Saṅgīti-sutta*, *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, *Abhidharmadīpaṭīkā* (*Abhidharmadīpa* with *Vibhāṣāprabhāvṛtti*), *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, *Lalitavistara*, *Ṛṣṭapāla-sūtra*, *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*, *Daśabala-sūtra*, *Saṅghabhedavastu*, *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa-sūtra*, *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta*, *Mahānīdāna-sutta*, and naturally the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. The narrative structure is that of a dialogue between Śāriputra and the historic Buddha, Gautama, where Śāriputra expresses his faith in the Buddha that no other could match him in the understanding of *saṃbodhi* (perfect awakening), saying:

The opening and contents of the *sūtra*

Prasādanīya-sūtra, DĀ 16.1.2:⁸

(*evaṃ sati prasanno 'ha*)ṃ (*bha*)da(ṅta *bhagavato yan nābhūn, na bhavi*)[290r7](ṣ)-
ya(ti, *nāpy etarhi vidyate yad anyañ śramaṇo vā brāhmaṇo vā bhagavato 'ntikād bhūyo*
'*bhijñatarañ syād yaduta saṃbodhaya iti*)⁹

7. Hartmann 2014, 155.

8. With DĀ 16.1.2 and with all other references to the *Prasādanīya-sūtra* contained within, I use the numeration system I have created for the texts I have edited from the Sanskrit (Mūla-) Sarvāstivāda *Dirghāgama* manuscript. The first number (16) represents the number of the text in the ms., the second number is for the section in the text, and any following numeration (2 in this case) represents a subsection. So, 16.1.2 represents the second subsection of the first section in the *Prasādanīya-sūtra*.

9. All text and translation from the *Prasādanīya-sūtra* are from the edition and translation that I have produced as part of my dissertation.

This being so, I have faith, sir, in the Blessed One that there has not been any, will not be, nor does there now exist another ascetic or *brāhmaṇa* who could be more knowledgeable than the Blessed One in regard to perfect awakening.¹⁰

Gautama presses him to explain his position and Śāriputra does so at length, elaborating sixteen subjects that show the Blessed One's supremacy when he teaches them. This first section is nearly identical in the *Prasādanīya-sūtra*, *Sampasādanīya-sutta*, and 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*) but the texts quickly diverge and things begin to get complicated.

To start with the end, the *Prasādanīya-sūtra* ends with two *antaroddāna*s (summary verses) that act somewhat like a table of contents for the text. The second *uddāna* lists the names of the *sūtras* in this section of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Dirghāgama* but it is the first *uddāna* that concerns us presently. It is written in *anuṣṭubh* metre with a hypermetric first half-*pada*:¹¹

Prasādanīya-sūtra, DĀ 16.20.1, *Antaroddāna*:

saṃbodhikuśalāyatanaṃ pudgalā bhāṣyadarśanam
pratiprahāṇaṃ ṛddhiś ca nivāsādeśanena ca •
śāśvatam cānuśāstīś ca ga(rbhā)vakrānti pudgalā
(puruṣaśīlaviśuddhim ādhicai)[299v2]tasikena ca • || ||

This verse is a list of the topics discussed in the *Prasādanīya-sūtra* in the order they are presented in the text, which when unpacked from the confinement of metric form come out to this list:

1. *saṃbodhi* (DĀ 16.1 and DĀ 16.2 esp. but in every section) — Perfect awakening
2. *kuśala-dharma-prajñapti* (DĀ 16.3) — The classification of wholesome factors
3. *āyatana-prajñapti* (DĀ 16.4) — The classification of the sense spheres
4. *pudgala-prajñapti* (DĀ 16.5) — The classification of individuals
5. *bhāṣya-samudācāratā* (DĀ 16.6) — Conduct in speech
6. *darśana-samāpatti* (DĀ 16.7) — Attainments of discernment
7. *pratipad* (DĀ 16.8) — Practice
8. *prahāṇa* (DĀ 16.9) — Effort
9. *ṛddhi-viśaya-jñāna* (DĀ 16.10) — Knowledge of the range of supernormal power
10. *pūrva-nivāsānusmṛti-jñāna* (DĀ 16.11) — Knowledge of the recollection of former states of existence
11. *ādeśanā-vidhi* — (DĀ 16.12) — The method of reading minds
12. *śāśvata-vāditā* (DĀ 16.13) — The doctrines of eternalism

10. All translations except those from Pali sources (which already have excellent translations) are my own.

11. This metrical irregularity might be explained by the possibility that it was originally composed in Middle Indic or perhaps it's simply that an extra *aḥsara* had been added to the first line such as the *saṃ* in *saṃbodhi*.

13. *anusāsana-vidhi* (DĀ 16.14) — The method of instruction
14. *garbhāvakraṅti* (DĀ 16.15) — Descent into the womb
15. *puḍgala-vimukti-jñāna* (DĀ 16.16) — Knowledge of the liberation of persons
16. *puruṣa-śīla-viśuddhi-jñāna* (DĀ 16.17) — Knowledge of the purity of the moral conduct of persons
17. *ādhicaitasika* (DĀ 16.18) — Higher mental states

While there is no *antaroddāna* for the *Sampasādaniya-sutta*, at least not one included in any of the compiled editions, if one were to compile a list of topics discussed in that text one would find that it is similar in content (if not in order) to the list of topics in the *Prasādaniya-sūtra*:

1. *sambodhi* (D III 99,1) — parallels DĀ 16.1 and DĀ 16.2
2. *kusala-dhamma* (D III 102,10) — DĀ 16.3
3. *āyatana-paññati* (D III 102,23) — DĀ 16.4
4. *gabbhāvakkanti* (D III 103,3) — DĀ 16.15
5. *ādesana-vidhā* (D III 103,20) — DĀ 16.12
6. *dassana-samāpatti* (D III 104,15) — DĀ 16.7
7. *puggala-paññati* (D III 105,25) — DĀ 16.5
8. *padhāna* (D III 105,31) — DĀ 16.9 (but content matches DĀ 16.8)
9. *paṭipadā* (D III 106,6) — DĀ 16.8 (but content matches DĀ 16.9)
10. *bhassa-samācāra* (D III 106,20) — DĀ 16.6
11. *purisa-sīla-samācāra* (D III 106,26) — DĀ 16.17
12. *anusāsana-vidhā* (D III 107,7) — DĀ 16.14
13. *para-puggala-vimutti-ñāṇa* (D III 108,1) — DĀ 16.16
14. *sassata-vāda* (D III 108,20) — DĀ 16.13
15. *pubbe-nivāsānussati-ñāṇa* (D III 110,24) — DĀ 16.11
16. *cutūpapāta-ñāṇa* (D III 111,15) — No parallel with Sanskrit DĀ
17. *iddhi-vidhā* (D III 112,6) — DĀ 16.10
18. *abhicetasika* (D III 113,16) — DĀ 16.18

Finally, the list of topics as they appear in the 自歡喜經 (*Zi huānxǐ jīng*) along with the corresponding sections from the *Prasādaniya-sūtra* would be:

1. 等正覺 *děngzhèng jué* (T I 76c06) — DĀ 16.1 and DĀ 16.2
2. 制法 *zhìfǎ* (T I 76c28) — DĀ 16.3
3. 制諸入 *zhìzhūrù* (T I 77a04) — DĀ 16.4
4. 識入胎 *shìrùtāi* (T I 77a11) — DĀ 16.15
5. 道 *dào* (T I 77a18) — Content parallels DĀ 16.8
6. 滅 *miè* (T I 77a24) — Content parallels DĀ 16.9
7. 言清淨 *yánqīngjìng* (T I 77b05) — DĀ 16.6

8. 見定 *jiàndìng* (T I 77b11) — DĀ 16.7
9. 常法 *chángfǎ* (T I 77c03) — DĀ 16.13
10. 觀察 *guānchá* (T I 77c26) — DĀ 16.12
11. 教誡 *jiàojiè* (T I 78a11) — DĀ 16.14
12. 戒清淨 *jièqīngjìng* (T I 78a23) — DĀ 16.17
13. 解脫智 *jiětuō zhì* (T I 78b02) — DĀ 16.16
14. 宿命智 *sùmìng zhì* (T I 78b07) — DĀ 16.11
15. 天眼智 *tiānyǎn zhì* (T I 78b17) — No parallel with Sanskrit DĀ, content matches *cutūpapāta-ñāṇa* in Pali D but topic is different, namely the *divya-cakṣus* or divine eye.
16. 神足 *shénzú* (T I 78b27) — DĀ 16.10
17. 等覺 *děngjué*¹² (T I 78c13) — DĀ 16.18

From these lists you can see that the three texts run parallel to one another for the first several topics but they veer into their own orders after. Despite the differences in order, we find a general agreement between the three texts except for some noteworthy differences to which the rest of this paper will be devoted.

Death and rebirth sections

The section on *pudgala-prajñapti* in the *Prasādanīya-sūtra* (DĀ 16.15) and *puggala-paññati* in the *Sampasādanīya-sutta* (D III 105,25) — on the classification of individuals — is missing entirely in the 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*), and while the topics of the *Prasādanīya-sūtra* are all found in the *Sampasādanīya-sutta*, even if they are often only similar in the name of the topic being described, there is one topic from the *Sampasādanīya-sutta*, namely *cutūpapāta-ñāṇa* (knowledge of death and rebirth), a section described under the topic of 天眼智 (*tiānyǎn zhì*) — the *divya-cakṣus* or divine eye — in the 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*), that is not found anywhere in the *Prasādanīya-sūtra*, as summarized in Table 1, below.

	<i>Prasādanīya-sūtra</i>	<i>Sampasādanīya-sutta</i>	自歡喜經 (<i>Zì huānxǐ jīng</i>)
Section on classification of individuals	Included	Included	Not included
Section on knowledge of death and rebirth/the divine eye	Not included	Included	Included

Table 1.

Thus we see:

12. 等覺 (*děngjué*) is better translated as *sambodhi* than *ādhicitasika/abhicetasika*, the actual topic of this section (which refers to the joy one feels from having transcended thoughts related to sensual experience). It is possible that it is not explicitly stated in the Chinese although the description is included.

Sampasādāniya-sutta, D III 111,15–112,5: Section on *cutūpapāta-ñāṇa* (Knowledge of Death and Rebirth):

aparam pana bhante etad ānuttariyaṃ yathā bhagavā dhammaṃ deseti sattānaṃ cutūpapāta-ñāṇe. idha bhante ekacco samaṇo vā brāhmaṇo vā ātappam anvāya padhānam anvāya ... pe ... tathā-rūpaṃ ceto-samādhim phusati yathā samāhite citte dibbena cakkhunā visuddhena atikkanta-mānusakena satte passati cavamāne upapajjamāne hīne paṇite suvaṇṇe dubbaṇṇe sugate duggate yathā-kammūpage satte pajānāti: ime vata bhonto sattā kaya-duccaritena samannāgatā vacī-duccaritena samannāgatā mano-duccaritena samannāgatā ariyānaṃ upavādakā micchā-dīṭṭhikā micchādīṭṭhikammasamādānā, te kāyassa bhedā paraṃ marañā apāyaṃ duggatiṃ vinipātaṃ nirayaṃ upapannā. ime vā pana bhonto sattā kaya-sucaritena samannāgatā vacī-sucaritena samannāgatā manosucaritena samannāgatā ariyānaṃ anupavādakā sammādīṭṭhikā sammādīṭṭhi-kammasamādānā, te kāyassa bhedā [112] paraṃ marañā sugatiṃ saggaṃ lokaṃ upapannā ti. iti dibbena cakkhunā visuddhena atikkanta-mānusakena satte passati cavamāne upapajjamāne hīne paṇite suvaṇṇe dubbaṇṇe sugate duggate yathā-kammūpage satte pajānāti. etad ānuttariyaṃ bhante sattānaṃ cutūpapāta-ñāṇe.

Also unsurpassed is the Blessed Lord's way of teaching Dhamma in regard to knowledge of the death and rebirth of beings. Here, some ascetic or Brahmin ... attains to such concentration of mind that he sees with the divine eye, purified and surpassing that of humans, he sees beings passing away and arising: base and noble, well-favoured and ill-favoured, to happy and unhappy destinations as kamma directs them, and he knows: 'These beings, on account of misconduct of body, speech or thought, or disparaging the Noble Ones, have wrong view and will suffer the kammic fate of wrong view. At the breaking up of the body after death they are reborn in a lower world, a bad destination, a state of suffering, hell. But these beings, on account of good conduct of body, speech or thought, of praising the Noble Ones, have right view and will reap the kammic reward of right view. At the breaking up of the body after death they are reborn in a good destination, a heavenly world.' Thus with the divine eye, purified and surpassing that of humans, he sees beings passing away and rearing [base and noble, well-favoured and ill-favoured, to happy and unhappy destinations as kamma directs them].¹³ This is the unsurpassed teaching in regard to knowledge of the death and birth of beings. (LDB 423)

One might assume that this was merely an omission of the scribe and that it is safe to say that this topic should have also been included in the *Prasādāniya-sūtra*. It would indeed go along with the tone of the text, sitting well with such topics as *pūrva-nivāsānusrīti-jñāna* (knowledge of the recollection of one's former states of existence) in DĀ 16.11 and *garbhāvakraṅti* (descent into the womb) in DĀ 16.15. However, I do not believe this is the case as we have a clear idea of what the expected topics of this text are from the *antaroddāna*. This leaves us to consider the possibilities as to why this section does not appear in the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda tradition but does, albeit in subtly different ways, within the Theravāda and Dharmaguptaka traditions.

13. In quotations from Walshe's translation of the *Dīgha-nikāya*, the *Long Discourses of the Buddha* (LDB), passages in brackets are supplied from earlier passages filling in any ellipses where Walshe glossed over the text.

One possibility is that this section was added later to the *Sampasādaniya-sutta* and the 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*). It is worth mentioning that this section does not appear solely in the *Sampasādaniya-sutta* within Pali literature. In fact, this section on *cutūpapāta-nāna* appears nearly verbatim in the *Sāmaññaphala-sutta*:

Sāmaññaphala-sutta, D I 82,22–83,3:

so evam samāhite cite parisuddhe pariyodāte anaṅgane viḡatupakkilese madu-bhūte kammaniye ṡhite ānejjappatte sattānaṃ cutupapāta-nānāya cittaṃ abhiniharati abhininnāmeti. so dibbena cakkhunā visuddhena atikkanta-mānusakena satte passati cavamāne upapajjamāne hīne paṅīte suvaṅṅe dubbaṅṅe sugate duggate yathā-kammūpage satte pajānāti: ime vata bhonto sattā kaya-duccaritena samannāgatā vacī-duccaritena samannāgatā mano-duccaritena samannāgatā ariyānaṃ upavādakā micchā-diṡṡhikā micchādiṡṡhikammasamādānā, te kāyassa bhedaṃ paraṃ maraṇā apāyaṃ duggatiṃ vinipātaṃ nirayaṃ upapannā. ime vā pana bhonto sattā kaya-sucaritena samannāgatā vacī-sucaritena samannāgatā mano-sucaritena samannāgatā ariyānaṃ anupavādakā sammādiṡṡhikā sammā-diṡṡhi-kamma-samādānā, te kāyassa bhedaṃ paraṃ maraṇā sugatiṃ saggāṃ lokaṃ upapannā ti. iti dibbena cakkhunā visuddhena atikkanta-mānusakena [83] satte passati cavamāne upapajjamāne hīne paṅīte suvaṅṅe dubbaṅṅe sugate duggate yathā-kammūpage satte pajānāti.

And he, with mind concentrated, [purified and cleansed, unblemished, free from impurities, malleable, workable, established and having gained imperturbability,] applies and directs his mind to the knowledge of the passing-away and arising of beings. With the divine eye, purified and surpassing that of humans, he sees beings passing away and arising: base and noble, well-favoured and ill-favoured, to happy and unhappy destinations as kamma directs them, and he knows: ‘These beings, on account of misconduct of body, speech or thought, or disparaging the Noble Ones, have wrong view and will suffer the kammic fate of wrong view. At the breaking up of the body after death they are reborn in a lower world, a bad destination, a state of suffering, hell. But these beings, on account of good conduct of body, speech or thought, of praising the Noble Ones, have right view and will reap the kammic reward of right view. At the breaking up of the body after death they are reborn in a good destination, a heavenly world.’ Thus with the divine eye, [purified and surpassing that of humans,] he sees beings passing away and rearising [base and noble, well-favoured and ill-favoured, to happy and unhappy destinations as kamma directs them.] (LDB 107)

Perhaps, for whatever reason, someone at some point decided that this passage on knowledge of death and rebirth would work well in the *Sampasādaniya-sutta*. This is no more than a hypothesis and it is also possible that the passage in the *Sāmaññaphala-sutta* was taken from the *Sampasādaniya-sutta* or both texts reused the passage from some third source. If this passage was added to the *Sampasādaniya-sutta* from another source but did not make it into the *Prasādaniya-sūtra* of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Ārghāgama* as it is preserved in the Sanskrit manuscript, then it is possible that at some interim period this section was added before the Chinese translation was created because when we look for the passage corresponding to the one on *cutūpapāta-nāna* in the 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*), in the Dharmaguptaka *Ārghāgama*, the 長阿含經 (*Cháng āhán jīng*), we find, as seen

in the list above, that while the content of this section appears, the topic name is not *cutūpapāta-ñāna* but rather 天眼智 (*tiānyǎn zhì/divya-cakṣus, Skt/dibba-cakkhu, Pali*), the divine eye.

自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*), DĀ^c 18, T I 78b16–26: Section on 天眼智 (*tiānyǎn zhì*)
(The Divine Eye):

如來說法復有上者，謂天眼智。天眼智者，諸沙門、婆羅門種種方便，入定意三昧，隨三昧心，觀諸眾生，死者、生者，善色、惡色，善趣、惡趣，若好、若醜，隨其所行，盡見盡知。或有眾生，成就身惡行、口惡行、意惡行，誹謗賢聖，信邪倒見，身壞命終，墮三惡道。或有眾生，身行善、口言善、意念善，不謗賢聖，見正信行，身壞命終，生天人中，以天眼淨，觀諸眾生，如實知見。此法無上，智慧無餘，神通無餘，諸世間沙門、婆羅門無與如來等者，況欲出其上。

And in the *Tathāgata*'s way of teaching there is still something superior, namely the knowledge of the divine eye. What is the knowledge of the divine eye? Some ascetics or *brāhmaṇas* enter this *samādhi* of concentration via various means and engaging in this *samādhi* they behold all beings: dead, living, well-favored beings and ill-favored, those destined for positive or negative destinations as directed by their karma, and they know: 'Some beings conduct evil deeds by body, evil speech, and evil thought; they criticize the Noble Ones, have perverted beliefs and wrong views, and when their bodies collapse and their lives end they will fall into the three evil destinies. Some beings conduct good deeds by body, speak good speech, and think good thoughts; they do not criticize the Noble Ones, their views are correct, and they conduct their actions with faith. When their bodies collapse and their lives end they will be born among the divine beings or among men.' With the purified divine eye they behold all beings and know them as they truly are. This is the unsurpassed teaching; the wisdom without remainder, the supernatural power without remainder. Among all of the ascetics or *brāhmaṇas* of all worlds there is no one even equal to the *Tathāgata*, let alone surpassing him.

That the Chinese translation does not list the topic of '*cutūpapāta-ñāna*' but *does* contain the content of this topic under the heading of 天眼智 (*tiānyǎn zhì*, the divine eye), which is but a part of the description in the Pali versions¹⁴ could mean a few things. Perhaps, if we follow the view that this section was added to the text later, it is possible that by the time this amended section reached the compilers of this Chinese translation the name of the topic itself was confused or lost if not purposefully changed and this is what we are left with. Another possibility, and perhaps the most likely, is that the section on *cutūpapāta-ñāna* was not a later addition to the *Sampasādanīya-sutta* and correspondingly neither was the section on 天眼智 (*tiānyǎn zhì*) in the 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*), but rather they represent a parallel textual development that is, for some unknown reason, not represented in the *Prasādanīya-sūtra* as it is preserved in the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Dirghāgama* manuscript. Indeed, there is evidence for this conclusion in that the concepts of *cutūpapāta-ñāna* and 天眼智 (*tiānyǎn zhì*) (*cyutyupapāda-jñāna* and

14. *Dibba-cakkhu* as seen above in the Pali translations.

divya-cakṣus in Sanskrit) are sometimes used interchangeably in texts.¹⁵ If we accept this possibility and conclude that this section was not a later addition to the *Sampasādaniya-sutta* and the 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*) then we are left with the question of why this section does not appear in the *Prasādaniya-sūtra*. As mentioned above, because this section is also missing from the *antaroddāna* I do not believe that it was mistakenly excluded from the *Prasādaniya-sūtra* and it seems to appear that in this case the textual tradition of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins diverged from those of the Theravādins and Dharmaguptikas by omitting a section on *cyutyupapāda-jñāna* or *divya-cakṣus*. This divergence within the traditions is further exacerbated by the fact of the inclusion of the section on *pudgala-prajñapti* in the *Prasādaniya-sūtra* and *puggala-paññati* in the *Sampasādaniya-sutta*. This suggests that while the Theravāda and Dharmaguptaka traditions appear to have developed in parallel regarding the concepts of *cutūpapāta-ñāna* and 天眼智 (*tiānyǎn zhì*) and the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins diverged, the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda and Theravāda traditions appear to have developed in parallel regarding the concepts of *pudgala-prajñapti* and *puggala-paññati* and the Dharmaguptikas appear to have diverged. While we must be cautious in our conclusions it would seem safe to hypothesize that the above divergences within the three traditions may stem from issues surrounding the shared and independent development of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda, Theravāda, and Dharmaguptaka textual traditions while keeping in mind that the *Prasādaniya-sūtra* preserved in the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Dirghāgama* manuscript is the only witness of this text available to us and we are thus unable to draw any completely solid conclusions regarding its content as it would have been generally accepted within the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda tradition.

Effort and practice sections

Continuing to another example of divergence among the three texts, from the lists of topics for the *Prasādaniya-sūtra*, *Sampasādaniya-sutta*, and 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*) we also see an incongruity between the sections on *prahāṇa/padhāna* (effort) and *pratipad/ṭṭipadā* (practice). The topic names and their actual content are switched in the Sanskrit and Pali so the section on *pratipad* in the *Prasādaniya-sūtra* parallels the content of the section on *padhāna* in the *Sampasādaniya-sutta* and the section on *prahāṇa* in the *Prasādaniya-sūtra* parallels the section on *ṭṭipadā* in the *Sampasādaniya-sutta*, and while the 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*) agrees with the *Prasādaniya-sūtra* regarding *pratipad*, it gives an apparently different topic-name for the section with content matching the section on *prahāṇa* in the *Prasādaniya-sūtra* and the section on *ṭṭipadā* in the *Sampasādaniya-sutta*. Given the confusion that can arise from keeping the topic-names and content from these three texts straight, the clearest way to proceed is to layout the similarities and contradictions as they appear based on the content of the various sections of these texts as opposed to the names of the topics being discussed:

15. Cf. discussions in the *Abhidharmakośa* (La Vallée Poussin 1923–1931, Tome V, 100) and *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra* (Lamotte 1976, Tome IV, 1809). Especially of note is La Vallée Poussin 1923–1931, Tome V, 100 note 1 where La Vallée Poussin remarks: ‘C’est la troisième *Abhijñā* dans le *Sūtra*. Elle porte deux noms: Hiuan-tsang la nomme *divyacakṣus*, Paramārtha, *cyutyupapādajñāna*. — *Mahāvvyutpatti*, *cyutyupapatti*, *Sūtrālaṅkāra*, *cyutopapāda*.’

Prasādānīya-sūtra, DĀ 16.8: Section on Pratipad (Practice):

(aparam api me bhadanta bhagava)ta{h} ā[293v5]nuttariyaṃ ya<dā me bhagavāṃ dharmāṃ deśayati yaduta pratipatsu <| ye kecic chramaṇā vā brāhmaṇā vā sataḥ pratipadah prajñāpayan(t)aḥ prajñāpa(yant)i (sarve) t(e sap)t(a) b(o)dhyamgāni <| k(a[293v6]tamā)ni sapta <| smrtisambo(dh)yaṃgaṃ dharmā<pravīcayavīryapṛitipraśr abdhisamādhyupekṣā-saṃbodhyaṃgam <| etad ānuttariyaṃ bhadanta bhagavato yaduta pratipatsu <| tad bhagavān aśeṣam abhi[293v7](jānāti | tat) t(e) aśeṣam abhijānata uttare 'bhijñeyaṃ nāsti yasyābhijñānād anyah śramaṇo vā brāhmaṇo vā bhagavato 'ntikād bhūyo 'bhijñatarā<| syād yaduta saṃbodhaye <|

For me, sir, there is another way in which the Blessed One is supreme when he teaches me doctrine, and that is regarding practices. Sir, there are some ascetics or brāhmaṇas who, when expounding actual practices, they all expound the seven limbs of awakening. What are these seven? They are: (1) the limb of awakening [consisting of] mindfulness, (2) the limbs of awakening [consisting of] discriminating comprehension of dharma, (3) vigor, (4) joy, (5) serenity, (6) meditative concentration, and (7) equanimity. Sir, this is the way in which the Blessed One is supreme, and that is regarding practices. The Blessed One knows this in its entirety. For you, knowing this in its entirety, there is nothing further to be known from the knowledge of which another ascetic or brāhmaṇa could be more knowledgeable than the Blessed One in regard to perfect awakening.

Sampasādānīya-sutta, D III 105,31–106,5: Section on Padhāna (Effort):

aparam pana bhante etad ānuttariyaṃ yathā bhagavā [106] dhammaṃ deseti padhānesu. satt' ime bhante bojjhaṅgā, sati-sambojjhaṅgo, dhamma-vīcaya-sambojjhaṅgo, vīriya-sambojjhaṅgo, pīti-sambojjhaṅgo, passaddhi-sambojjhaṅgo, samādhi-sambojjhaṅgo, upekkhā-sambojjhaṅgo. etad ānuttariyaṃ bhante padhānesu.

Also unsurpassed is Blessed Lord's way of teaching Dhamma in regard to the exertions. There are these seven factors of enlightenment: mindfulness, investigation of states, energy, delight, tranquility, concentration and equanimity. This is the unsurpassed teaching in regard to the exertions. (LDB 420).

自歡喜經 (Zì huānxǐ jīng), DĀ^c 18, T I 77a17–23: Section on 道 (dào) (The Path):

如來說法復有上者，所謂道也。所謂道者，諸沙門、婆羅門以種種方便，入定慧意三昧，隨三昧心修[1]¹⁶念覺意，依<無>欲¹⁷、依離、依滅盡、依出要[2]法；[3]精進、[4]喜、[5]捨、[6]定、[7]捨覺意，依<無>欲¹⁸、依離、依滅

16. All numeration in Chinese quotations is added for the reader's convenience.

17. Cf. MĀ 10, T I 432c16–18 (依無欲，依於滅盡，起至出要) and M I 11 (vivekanissitaṃ virāganissitaṃ nirodhanissitaṃ vossagga-pariṇāmiṃ).

18. Cf., as above in previous note, MĀ 10, T I 432c16–18 (依無欲，依於滅盡，起至出要) and M I 11 where the phrase vivekanissitaṃ virāganissitaṃ nirodhanissitaṃ vossagga-pariṇāmiṃ occurs both after the first and last limbs, neatly paralleling the passage presented in the 自歡喜經 (Zì huānxǐ jīng): katame ca bhikkhave āsavā bhāvanā pahātābā: idha bhikkhave bhikkhu paṭisaṅkhā yoniso sātisaṃbojjhaṅgaṃ bhāveti vivekanissitaṃ virāganissitaṃ nirodhanissitaṃ vossagga-pariṇāmiṃ, paṭisaṅkhā yoniso dhammavicayasambojjhaṅgaṃ bhāveti — pe — vīriyasambojjhaṅgaṃ bhāveti — pītisaṃbojjhaṅgaṃ bhāveti — passaddhisambojjhaṅgaṃ bhāveti — samādhisambojjhaṅgaṃ bhāveti — upekkhāsambojjhaṅgaṃ bhāveti vivekanissitaṃ virāganissitaṃ nirodhanissitaṃ vossagga-pariṇāmiṃ.

盡、依出要。此法最上，智慧無餘，神通無餘，諸世間沙門、婆羅門無能與如來等者，況欲出其上。

And in the *Tathāgata*'s way of teaching there is still something superior, namely the path. What is the path? Some ascetics or *brāhmaṇas* enter this *samādhi* of discriminating concentration and engaging in this *samādhi*, they practice (1) recollection, which is supported by seclusion, dispassion, elimination, and matures in relinquishing; (2) *dharma*; (3) vigor; (4) joy; (5) serenity; (6) meditative concentration; and (7) equanimity, which is supported by seclusion, dispassion, elimination, and matures in relinquishing. This is the unsurpassed teaching [regarding the path]; the wisdom without remainder, the supernatural power without remainder. Among all of the ascetics or *brāhmaṇas* of all worlds there is no one even equal to the *Tathāgata* let alone surpassing him.

These sections in all three texts describe the seven *bodhyaṅga/bojhaṅga/七覺意 (qī juéyì)*¹⁹ (limbs of awakening). The *Prasādanīya-sūtra* and 自歡喜經 (*Zi huānxǐ jīng*) respectively refer to them as *pratipad* and 道 (*dào*), a standard translation of *pratipad/pañipadā* (practice), but they are never described as such in other texts as far as I have been able to discover. However, they are not described as *padhāna* (effort), as the *Sampasādanīya-sutta* reads, either. In fact, Rhys Davids, Walshe, and Gethin have all noted how unusual it is that the *bojhaṅgas* are here used to describe the *padhānas*.²⁰ When we look at the next set of corresponding sections between the three texts, we see further incongruities:

Prasādanīya-sūtra, DĀ 16.9: Section on *Prahāṇa* (Effort):

aparam api <me> bhadanta bha[293v8]gavata ānuttaryaṃ yadā me bhagavāṃ dharmāṃ deśa(ya)ti yaduta prahāṇeṣu ḷ catvārimāni bhadanta prahāṇāni <ḷ katamāni catvāri <ḷ astiḥṃḥ> prahāṇaṃ duḥkhaṃ dhandhābhijñāṃ, asti prahāṇaṃ duḥkhaṃ kṣiprābhijñā[294r1](m, asti prahāṇaṃ sukhaṃ dhamdābhijñāṃ asti prahāṇaṃ sukhaṃ kṣiprābhijñāṃ) na bahujanyaṃ prthubhūtaṃ na yāvad <ḷ devamanuṣyebhyaḥ (samyaksuprakāśitaṃ) <ḷ tatra, bhadanta, ya(d) i(da)ṃ (pra)hāṇaṃ duḥkhaṃ dhandhābhijñāṃ [294r2] (dhandhatvāt tadduḥkha)tvād dhīnam ākhyātaṃ <ḷ tatra yad idaṃ prahāṇaṃ duḥkhaṃ kṣiprābhijñāṃ tadduḥkhatvād dhīnam ākhyātaṃ <ḷ tatra yad idaṃ prahāṇaṃ {duḥkha} <sukhaṃ} dhandhābhijñāṃ dhandhatvā<d} dhī(nam ākhy) ātaṃ <ḷ tatra yad idaṃ prahā[294r3](ṇaṃ su)kh(aṃ) kṣ(i)prābhijñāṃ na bahujanyaṃ prthubhūtaṃ na yāvad devamanuṣyebhyaḥ samyaksuprakāśitaṃ, tad abahujanyatvād aprthubhūtvād <d} na yāvad <d} devamanuṣye(bhya)ḥ samyak(su)prakāśita[294r4]tvād dhīnam ākhyātaṃ <ḷ bhagavato, bhadanta, prahāṇaṃ sukhaṃ kṣiprābhijñāṃ bahujanyaṃ prthubhūtaṃ yāvad <d} devamanuṣyebhyaḥ samyaksuprakāśita(m) <ḷ e(tad ānuttaryaṃ bhadanta bhagavato yaduta) [294r5] prahāṇeṣu ḷ tad bhagavān{ṇ} aśeṣaṃ (abh)i(jānāti)

The *pe* after *dhammavicayasambojhaṅgaṃ bhāveti* and before *viriyasambojhaṅgaṃ bhāveti* may also suggest that this phrase of *vivekanissitaṃ virāganissitaṃ nirodhanissitaṃ vossaggaparīṇāmiṃ* (or, 依無欲, 依於滅盡, 起至出要在 Chinese) was meant to appear after each *aṅga* (limb) acting as a refrain of sorts.

19. 七覺意 (*qī juéyì*), the seven aspects of awakening as opposed to limbs, is how the term is described in the 自歡喜經 (*Zi huānxǐ jīng*), cf. T I 76c28). This is a standard way of understanding 覺意 (*juéyì*), cf. Vetter 2012, 281 and Zacchetti 2002, 81.
20. Rhys Davids and Rhys Davids 1921, 101 note 3, LDB 420 note 875 (on p. 607), and Gethin 2001, 146–147.

⟨ḅ⟩ *tat te aśeṣam abhijānata uttare 'bhi(j)ñ(e)yaṃ nāsti yasyābhijñānād anyah śra(maṇo vā brāhmaṇo vā bhagavato 'ntikād bhūyo 'bhi)[294r6]jñātara⟨ḥ⟩ syād yaduta sambodhaye ⟨ḅ⟩*

For me, sir, there is another way in which the Blessed One is supreme when he teaches me doctrine, and that is regarding efforts. Sir, there are four efforts. What are these four? When effort is painful and understanding comes slowly; when effort is painful and understanding comes quickly; when effort is pleasurable and understanding comes slowly, and when effort is pleasurable and understanding comes quickly, which does not pertain to many people and is not widespread nor due to which is it well and properly explained to gods and men. Under these circumstances, sir, this painful effort with slow understanding is said to be inferior due to the painfulness and slowness of it. Under these circumstances, this painful effort with quick understanding is said to be inferior due to the painfulness of it. Under these circumstances, this pleasurable effort with slow understanding is said to be inferior due to slowness. Under these circumstances, this pleasurable effort with quick understanding, which does not pertain to many people and is not widespread nor due to which is it well and properly explained to gods and men, is said to be inferior due to the fact that it is does not pertain to many people and is not widespread as well as to the fact that it is not well and properly explained to gods and men. Because of the Blessed One, sir, there is pleasurable effort and quick understanding, which pertains to many people and is widespread and due to which is well and properly explained to gods and men. Sir, this is the way in which the Blessed One is supreme, and that is regarding efforts. The Blessed One knows this in its entirety. For you, knowing this in its entirety, there is nothing further to be known from the knowledge of which another ascetic or *brāhmaṇa* could be more knowledgeable than the Blessed One in regard to perfect awakening.

Sampasādanīya-sutta, D III 106,6–19: Section on *Paṭipadā* (Practice/Modes of Progress):²¹

aparam pana bhante etad ānuttariyaṃ yathā bhagavā dhammaṃ deseti paṭipadāsu. catasso imā bhante paṭipadā, dukkhā paṭipadā dandhābhiññā, dukkhā paṭipadā khippābhiññā, sukhā paṭipadā dandhābhiññā, sukhā paṭipadā khippābhiññā. tatra bhante yāyaṃ paṭipadā dukkhā dandhābhiññā, ayaṃ bhante paṭipadā ubhayaṃ' eva hīnā akkhāyati dukkhattā ca dandhattā ca. tatra bhante yāyaṃ paṭipadā dukkhā khippābhiññā, ayaṃ bhante paṭipadā dukkhattā hīnā akkhāyati. tatra bhante yāyaṃ paṭipadā sukhā dandhābhiññā, ayaṃ bhante paṭipadā dandhattā hīnā akkhāyati. tatra bhante yāyaṃ paṭipadā sukhā khippābhiññā, ayaṃ bhante paṭipadā ubhayaṃ' eva paṇīta akkhāyati sukhattā ca khippattā ca. etad ānuttariyaṃ bhante paṭipadāsu.

Also unsurpassed in [sic]²² the Blessed Lord's way of teaching Dhamma in regard to the modes of progress, which are four: painful progress with slow comprehension, painful progress with quick comprehension, pleasant progress with slow comprehension, pleasant progress with quick comprehension. In the case of painful progress with slow comprehension, progress is considered poor on account of both painfulness and slowness. In the case of painful progress with quick comprehen-

21. Note that Walshe translates *paṭipadā* in the LDB as *modes of progress* while I prefer *practice*.

22. Read *is*.

sion, progress is considered poor on account of painfulness. In the case of pleasant progress with slow comprehension, progress is considered poor on account of slowness. In the case of pleasant progress with quick comprehension, progress is considered excellent on account of both pleasantness and quick comprehension. This is the unsurpassed teaching in regard to modes of progress. (LDB 420–421)

自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*), DĀ^c 18, T 1 77a23–77b5: Section on 滅 (*miè*) (Elimination):

如來說法復有上者，所謂為滅。滅者，謂[1]苦滅遲得，二俱卑陋；[2] 苦滅速得，唯苦卑陋；[3] 樂滅遲得，唯遲卑陋；[4] 樂滅速得，然不廣普，以不廣普，故名卑陋。如今如來樂滅速得，而復廣普，乃至天人見神變化。

舍利弗白佛言：世尊所說微妙第一，下至女人，亦能受持，盡有漏成無漏，心解脫、慧解脫，於現法中自身作證：生死已盡，梵行已立，所作已辦，不受後有，是為如來說無上滅。此法無上，智慧無餘，神通無餘，諸世間沙門、婆羅門無能與如來等者，況欲出其上。

And in the *Tathāgata*'s way of teaching there is still something superior, namely elimination. Regarding elimination there is: (1) painful elimination with slow attainment, both are lowly and inferior; (2) painful elimination with fast attainment, the painful elimination is lowly and inferior; (3) pleasurable elimination with slow attainment, only the slow attainment is lowly and inferior; (4) pleasurable elimination with fast attainment, which even so is not well-known and because it is not well-known is still considered lowly and inferior. However, there is the present pleasurable elimination with fast attainment of the *Tathāgata* that is well-known [and thus, not inferior] in so far as divine beings and humans see the supernatural transformation [of the *Tathāgata*].

Śāriputra addressed the Buddha, the World-honored One. 'That which has been explained is subtle and most marvelous; even women are also able to uphold [this teaching]. They exhaust their contaminations and attain the state of being without contaminations. Their minds are liberated, liberated through this wisdom. They experience awakening themselves in the present world. Having exhausted birth and death, having lived the holy life, and having accomplished that which is to be done, they do not undergo subsequent rebirth. This is the unsurpassed elimination taught by the *Tathāgata*.' This is the unsurpassed teaching; the wisdom without remainder, the supernatural power without remainder. Among all of the ascetics or *brāhmaṇas* of all worlds there is no one even equal to the *Tathāgata*, let alone surpassing him.

Table 2 summarizes the above:

	Topic name in <i>Prasādanīya-sūtra</i>	Topic name in <i>Sampasādanīya-</i> <i>sutta</i>	Topic name in 自歡喜經 (<i>Zì huānxǐ jīng</i>)
painful/pleasant progress & slow/quick comprehension	<i>Prahāṇa</i> (Effort)	<i>Paṭipadā</i> (prac- tice)	滅 (<i>Miè</i>) (Elimination):
<i>bodhyaṅgas</i> / <i>bojjhaṅgas</i>	<i>Pratipad</i> (practice)	<i>Padhāna</i> (Effort)	道 (<i>Dào</i>) (The Path)

Table 2

Here we see that the section on *prahāṇa* in the *Prasādaniya-sūtra*, with the exception of its topic name, corresponds well with the section on *paṭipadā* in the *Sampasādaniya-sutta*. The Chinese of the 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*) also shares similar content in its description but interestingly adds Śāriputra speaking with the Buddha to make a point of how this teaching is suitable ‘even’ for women. This is something not seen anywhere in the other two texts.

At first glance it appears that the topic name given in the 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*) does not match with the topic name of *prahāṇa* as is given in the *Prasādaniya-sūtra*, with the 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*) peculiarly using the term 滅 (*miè*). The character 滅 (*miè*) is most commonly used as the Chinese translation for *nirodha* (cessation), which would be an unusual term to be described here, while for *prahāṇa* we would generally expect some term like 努力 (*nǔlì*). The issue is further complicated by the fact that 滅 (*miè*) is also used as a translation of the term *nirodha* in the 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*) itself, as we have seen in the section on 道 (*dào*) above.²³ However, in addition to being a translation of *nirodha*, 滅 (*miè*) also seems to have been used as an interpretation of *prahāṇa*, which more broadly has the meaning of abandonment, renunciation, or elimination and became used in the sense of effort from its relation to the BHS word *pradhāna* and Pali *padhāna*.²⁴ Karashima suspects that this interpretation of 滅 (*miè*) has its origins in the area of Gandhāra and expresses doubt that the translators understood the doctrinal idea regarding the term, noting that Xuanzang uses 滅 (*miè*) in this way in his translation of the 大毘婆沙論 (*Dàpípośhālùn*)²⁵ as does An Shigao in his translation of the 十報法經 (*Shíbàofǎ jīng*).²⁶

When first confronted by these deviations in the texts, one might be compelled to suspect that the schema presented in the *Prasādaniya-sūtra* with *pratipad* (practice) representing the *bodhyaṅgas* and *prahāṇa* (effort) described as being painful, pleasurable, etc. is the most accurate reading and that the structure of these sections in the *Sampasādaniya-sutta* is perhaps the result of some editorial mix up somewhere over the centuries. Such suspicions are certainly bolstered when one sees that the text of the 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*) agrees with the *Prasādaniya-sūtra* in the sections on 道 (*dào*) and *pratipad* and could be bolstered even further if the suspicious topic of 滅 (*miè*) can be safely equated with *prahāṇa*. However, it becomes clear that such suspicions are unfounded when one looks to other sources. No other text I have found follows the schema set in the *Prasādaniya-sūtra* and 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*). I have, however, been able to find several passages in other texts²⁷ that agree with the reading of the *Sampasādaniya-sutta*

23. 依無欲、依離、依滅盡、依出要, which as has been pointed out in notes 18 and 19, parallels MĀ 10, T I 432c16–18 (依無欲、依於滅盡, 起至出要) in Chinese and M I 11 (*vivekanissitaṃ virāganissitaṃ nirodhanissitaṃ vossagga-pariṇāmiṃ*) in Pali.

24. For the usage of 滅 (*miè*) as a translation of *prahāṇa/pradhāna/padhāna* cf. Seishi Karashima's notes to the Japanese translation of the DĀ^c in Okayama, et al. 1997, 313 note 134 and 271–272 note 107 and Okayama, et al. 2000, 205 note 188 and 226 note 35. Also, s.v. *prahāṇa* and *pradhāna* in SWTF and *pradhāna* in BHSD where Edgerton notes ‘the older Chin. rendering has effort, the later abandonment, as if (Skt.) *prahāṇa*; Tib. also the latter.’

25. In the 大毘婆沙論 (*Dàpípośhālùn*), 滅 (*miè*) can be found at T XXVII 725a–c.

26. Okayama, et al. 1997, 271–272 note 107 and Okayama et al. 2000, 226 note 35. In the 十報法經 (*Shíbàofǎ jīng*), 滅 (*miè*) can be found at T I 234b.

27. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (Abhidh-k-bh(P) 382), *Śrāvabhūmi* (Śrāv-bh II 34: (II)-A-II-2a-(5)),

and specifically use the term *pratipad*²⁸ (practice) to describe these four, various types of progress.

It would be dangerous and much too simplistic to say that the *Sampasādaniya-sutta* is correct and the *Prasādaniya-sūtra* and 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*) are wrong. Perhaps the scribes may have inadvertently switched the topic names and content descriptions in these two sections or perhaps there is some other reason for the confusion in the *Prasādaniya-sūtra* and 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*), but even if the *Sampasādaniya-sutta* appears to have the most accurate or acceptable understanding of the content of *pratipad/paṭipadā*, it remains just as problematic as the other two texts regarding the usage of *prahāṇa/padhāna*. Indeed, because the *Prasādaniya-sūtra* and 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*) both share similarly unlikely readings and because of the irregular use of the term *padhāna* to describe *bodhyaṅga/bojjhaṅga* in the *Sampasādaniya-sutta*, the notion that all of these discrepancies between the texts could simply be dismissed as multiple instances of scribal error seems rather implausible.

In many Sanskrit, Pali, and Chinese Buddhist texts there are indeed four *prahāṇas/padhānas* elucidated but they do not share the description we see laid out in the *Prasādaniya-sūtra*, which is in actuality the accepted description of the four *pratipads/paṭipadās*, as described in the *Sampasādaniya-sutta*. The accepted usage of the four *prahāṇas/padhānas* is not that described in the *Prasādaniya-sūtra* and *Sampasādaniya-sutta* but is an alternate model of the four *samma-ppadhānas/samyak-prahāṇas* that are commonly outlined in several²⁹ texts.³⁰ Here is a succinct statement of this alternate model of them as found in the *Saṅgīti-sutta*:

Saṅgīti-sutta, D III 225,27–28 (cf. A II 16–17):

cattāri padhānāni. saṃvara-padhānaṃ, pahāna-padhānaṃ, bhāvanā-padhānaṃ, anurakkhaṇā-padhānaṃ.

Four efforts: The effort of (a) restraint (*saṃvara-padhānaṃ*), (b) abandoning (*pahāna-padhānaṃ*), (c) development (*bhāvanā-padhānaṃ*), (d) preservation (*anurakkhaṇā-padhānaṃ*). (LDB 490)

It appears that there is confusion in both the *Prasādaniya-sūtra* and *Sampasādaniya-sutta* over the concept of *prahāṇa/padhāna* where it seems to have been confused with the *bodhyaṅgas/bojjhaṅgas*. Perhaps this was an innovation by the unknown author or authors of these texts or perhaps it was just a simple mistake that ended up becoming orthodoxy. In either case, it establishes support for the view that although these two texts, along with the 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*), broadly share

Abhidharmasamuccaya (Abhidh-sam 75), *Arthavinīscaya-sūtra* (Arthav(V) 317–318), and *Abhidharmadīpaṭīkā* (Abhidh-d 355–356).

28. These texts are all in Sanskrit and thus only the Sanskrit term is used here.

29. D II 312; D III 221; M I 301; M II 26–28, M II 129; M III 251; S V 9, S V 196, S V 198, S V 244–248, S V 268–269; A I 153; A II 15, A II 74, A II 256; A III 12; A IV 462–463; DhS 234; Vibh 105, Vibh 208–215, Vibh 216, Vibh 235; Peṭ 71, Peṭ 98, Peṭ 128, Peṭ 183, Peṭ 185; Nett 18, Nett 123; and Mil 371. Cf. Gethin 2001, 69 and 355.

30. It is important to reiterate that the description of *prahāṇas/padhānas* discussed here is not the same as the description of the four *sammappadhānas/samyakprahāṇas* that often appear in *Nikāya*, *Abhidhamma*, and even Sanskrit sources but rather an alternate schema (cf. Gethin 2001, 73–74 and s.v. *padhāna* in PTSD).

a common authorship as Buddhist *sūtra/sutta* literature they were each reused and refined by different traditions.

Concluding remarks

The emergence of the Sanskrit (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Dīrghāgama* manuscript and with it this new witness of the *Prasādaniya-sūtra* allows us to see the *Sampasādaniya-sutta* and 自歡喜經 (*Zi huānxǐ jīng*) in a new light; although the issues uncovered by this light often cast new and perhaps greater shadows of confusion around these related texts. In this paper we have seen multiple instances of intertextuality between the *Prasādaniya-sūtra*, *Sampasādaniya-sutta* and 自歡喜經 (*Zi huānxǐ jīng*). While the three texts on the whole tend to agree with one another, based on the passages quoted above it is clear that when looked over in detail many deviations among the texts emerge, creating contradictions among the readings of the corresponding passages of the three texts. The meaning of these deviations is not clear. We cannot say the readings of any of these texts are more or less 'correct' or closer to some hypothetical 'original' text than the others, and can only be sure that they are different. It seems likely that there was some confusion among the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda, Theravāda, and Dharmaguptaka Buddhist traditions regarding the content of these texts.

While we can only speculate what was behind the apparent confusion among the various redactors of these texts in the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda, Theravāda, and Dharmaguptaka traditions, if we look at the structure of these three texts an interesting fact emerges, that it is relatively unique. As noted in the beginning of this article, the narrative structure of the *Prasādaniya-sūtra*, along with the *Sampasādaniya-sutta* and 自歡喜經 (*Zi huānxǐ jīng*), revolves around Gautama questioning Śāriputra's statements about the nature of a buddha. The object of such a narrative structure is that by Śāriputra and Gautama engaging in a friendly debate, the reader or listener can then learn just what exactly separates the teaching ability of a buddha from some other sage. There are several *suttas* in the *Dīgha-nikāya* and *Majjhima-nikāya* that take the structure of a debate.³¹ However, the *Sampasādaniya-sutta* is the only *sutta* in either the *Dīgha-nikāya* or the *Majjhima-nikāya* in which a debate is recorded between the Buddha and a monk, which in this case is Śāriputta.³² In the *Sampasādaniya-sutta*, just as in the other two texts, we see that it is the Buddha who in a sense admits defeat and accepts the superlative claims of Śāriputta as representing his doctrine, expressing that this sermon should be repeated to dispel the doubts of any who question Buddhist teachings. Is this odd narrative structure a clue into the reason for the apparent confusion among the redactors of the texts? It is impossible to say but, given the relatively unique narrative structure, perhaps these texts were always met with a certain degree of ambivalence, which we see reflected in the divergences in the content of the topics and their descriptions in the different texts.

31. Following Manné's criteria of a debate there are eighteen debates in the *Dīgha-nikāya*: D 1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; 10; 11; 12; 13; 23; 24; 25; 28; and 31 and twenty-nine in the *Majjhima-nikāya*: M 7; 14; 27; 30; 35; 36; 56; 58; 60; 72; 74; 75; 76; 79; 80; 84; 90; 91; 92; 93; 94; 95; 96; 99; 100; 102; 107; and 124 (Manné 1990, 75).

32. Manné 1990, 61.

Regardless of any hypothetical ambivalence surrounding the structure of the three texts among their redactors, we can see from the deviations in content that there was some ambivalence over the theme of how a buddha is supreme among teachers between the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda, Theravāda, and Dharmaguptaka traditions. This should not be surprising considering the occasionally disparate views taken by these three traditions over Buddhist doctrine. However, instead of closing the case here with a verdict of doctrinal differences explaining any confusion among the texts, I would posit that it is also — perhaps more — likely that these differences owe their origins not to any real philosophical disagreement between the traditions over doctrine but rather to the redactors and translators weaving their own particular understanding of the positions of their tradition if not their own views into the text when faced with a passage that was, for whatever reason, difficult for them to understand and thereby inadvertently sowing the seeds of later disagreement between traditions. Thus we find original statements unique to each text that now create further confusion for modern scholars with access to the three texts and the ability to view them side-by-side and in the context of the sum of collected Buddhist literature conveniently available, increasingly often digitally, in the present times.

I will conclude with the caveat that it is inherently dangerous to draw any firm conclusions made from comparisons between the *Prasādanīya-sūtra*, the *Sampasādanīya-sutta*, and the 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*). While all three texts are ‘canonical’ in that they would be considered *buddhavacana* within the schools that composed them, they are separated by practical, geographical, and temporal differences that must be considered. The edition of the *Prasādanīya-sūtra* discussed here, as a part of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Dirghāgama* manuscript found in Gilgit, was possibly a product of *sūtra* copying for merit and was perhaps not considered greatly worthwhile as a work of literature at the time of its production as the recension of the manuscript extant today is probably dated from a period after the *Dirghāgama* as a work had faded from the zeitgeist of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins and was likely used more for ritual purposes or possibly for the sake of completeness in their library.³³ The *Sampasādanīya-sutta* may or may not have been in a similar situation at certain points in history but we must remember that it is the product of an ostensibly refined and closed Theravāda canon. The text we read today is the result of a centuries-long project in Sri Lanka by the Mahāvihāra monastic order in order to attain hegemony over its rivals³⁴ and similar considerations are true of the 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*). Even if all three texts eventually served more ritual than literary functions in the traditions of their creation, the histories of the *Sampasādanīya-sutta* and 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*) are distinct from that of the *Prasādanīya-sūtra* due to the fact that they have been consistently available to readers throughout the centuries, and especially to scholars in the last hundred years, while the *Prasādanīya-sūtra* has been completely unavailable for centuries.

Geographically, it’s impossible to precisely delineate their historical ranges of influence but it can cautiously be said that the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins held influence in the north of South Asia and into Central Asia and the Theravādins in the

33. Cf. Hartmann 2014, 156–157.

34. Cf. Collins 1990, 89–126.

south and Dharmaguptikas in the northwest of South Asia and in East Asia. We can't say how great the interplay of ideas was between them and thus have no real idea in the case of the texts we've looked at here if it was the *Prasādaniya-sūtra* influencing the *Sampasādaniya-sutta* or the opposite and while it appears clear that the 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*) owes more to the *Prasādaniya-sūtra* than to the *Sampasādaniya-sutta* we cannot be exactly sure where and how it fits in this triad.

Beyond the nebulous geography of their composition, the *Prasādaniya-sūtra*, *Sampasādaniya-sutta*, and 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*) are even more strongly separated by time. The versions of the *Sampasādaniya-sutta* and 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*) cited in this paper have been passed down through the centuries under the watchful eyes of countless monks and more recently by secular scholars. They have doubtlessly undergone many changes and iterations in this interval and over this period many witnesses have been preserved. Whether these changes affecting the various iterations of the *Sampasādaniya-sutta* and 自歡喜經 (*Zì huānxǐ jīng*) were great or small, they have an impact on our present understanding. The *Prasādaniya-sūtra* on the other hand, has only one extant witness that has heretofore been frozen in time by virtue of its being sequestered in some lost corner of Central Asia and has thus been safe from the scrutiny and accompanying interpretations made by both monks and scholars until quite recently.

Acknowledgements

My thanks to both Jens-Uwe Hartmann and Paul Harrison for providing excellent feedback and suggestions after reading earlier drafts of this paper, and to Jin kyoungh Choi and Eric Greene for their keen insights on several points and kindly offering their time and effort to look over my Chinese translations. Additionally I am grateful to Seishi Karashima for enlightening me on the nuances of the term 滅 (*miè*) in Chinese translations of Buddhist *sūtra* literature and generously providing me with various resource materials. Finally, I cannot neglect to thank Elisa Freschi, Jowita Kramer, Cathy Cantwell, and Peter Harvey for their skilled editing. Naturally, any mistakes are my own. The research conducted for this article was supported by the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD).

Editorial conventions

()	restoration of damaged or illegible <i>aṣaras</i>
< >	addition by editor
{ }	deletion by editor
<u>Underline</u>	amendment of individual <i>aṣara</i> by text editor
•	dot like punctuation in ms.
	<i>daṇḍa</i>
	double <i>daṇḍa</i>
h	<i>Jihvāmūliya</i>

Abbreviations³⁵

A	<i>Aṅguttara-nikāya</i> , edited by Richard Morris and E. Hardy, <i>The Aṅguttara-Nikāya</i> . London 1885–1900 (PTS).
Abhidh-d	<i>Abhidharmadīpa</i> , edited by P.S. Jaini, <i>Abhidharmadīpa with Vibhāṣāprabhāvṛtti</i> . Patna 1959 (TSWS 4).
Abhidh-k-bh(P)	Vasubandhu, <i>Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam</i> , edited by P. Pradhan, <i>Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu</i> . (rev. 2nd ed.) K.P. Jayaswal Research Center, Patna 1975 (TSWS 8).
Abhidh-sam	Asaṅga, <i>Abhidharmasamuccaya</i> , edited by P. Pradhan, <i>Abhidharmasamuccaya: Critically ed. and studied by Prahlad Pradhan</i> . Santiniketan 1950 (VBS 12).
Arthav(V)	<i>Arthavinīcaya-sūtra</i> , edited by P.L. Vaidya in, <i>Mahāyāna-Sūtra-Saṃgraha Part I</i> . Darbhanga 1961 (BST 17).
BHS	Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit
BHSD	Edgerton, Franklin, <i>Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary</i> . (repr.) Delhi 1972.
BST	Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, Darbhanga.
D	<i>Dīgha-nikāya</i> , edited by T. W. Rhys Davids and J. Estlin Carpenter, <i>The Dīgha Nikāya</i> . (repr. with corrections) Lancaster 2006 (1890–1911) (PTS).
DĀ	Sanskrit (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda <i>Dīrghāgama</i>
DĀ ^c	Chinese Dharmaguptaka <i>Dīrghāgama</i> , 長阿含經 (<i>Cháng āhán jīng</i>), T I
Dhs	<i>Dhammasaṅgaṇi</i> , edited by E. Muller, <i>The Dhammasaṅgaṇi</i> . London 1885 (PTS).
LDB	<i>The Long Discourses of the Buddha</i> (<i>Dīgha-nikāya</i> Translation), Maurice Walshe, <i>The Long Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Dīgha Nikāya</i> . (repr.) Boston, MA: Wisdom Publications 1995.
M	<i>Majjhima-nikāya</i> , edited by V. Trenckner, R. Chalmers, <i>The Majjhima-Nikāya</i> . (repr.) Oxford 1993 (1888–1899) (PTS).
MĀ	<i>Madhyamāgama</i>
Mil	<i>Milindapañha</i> , edited by V. Trenckner, <i>The Milindapañho being Dialogues between king Milinda and the Buddhist sage Nāgasena</i> . London 1962 (PTS).
Ms.	Manuscript
Nett	<i>Nettipakaraṇa</i> , edited by E. Hardy, <i>The Netti-Pakaraṇa, with Extracts from Dhammapāla's Commentary</i> . London 1902 (PTS).
Peṭ	<i>Peṭakopadesa</i> , edited by A. Barua, <i>The Peṭakopadesa</i> . London 1949 (PTS).
PTS	Pali Text Society

35. The abbreviations of non-Pali sources are generally based off those found in Bechert, 1990.

PTSD	<i>Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary</i> , T. W. Rhys Davids and William Stede. London 1921–1925 (PTS).
S	<i>Samyuttanikāya</i> , edited by L. Feer, London 1884–1898 (PTS).
Skt.	Sanskrit
Śrāv-bh II	<i>Śrāvabhūmi</i> , trans., edited by Śrāvabhūmi Study Group (The Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism, Taisho University)/大正大学総合佛教研究所声聞地研究会, Śrāvabhūmi, The Second Chapter with Asamāhitā bhūmiḥ, Śrūtamayī bhūmiḥ, Cintamayī bhūmiḥ, Revised Sanskrit Text and Japanese Translation/瑜伽論声聞地. 第二瑜伽処. 付, 非三摩晒多地. 聞所成地. 思所成地: サンスクリット語 テキスト と 和訳. Tokyo 2007.
SWTF	<i>Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus des Turfan-Funden</i> . Begun by Ernst Waldschmidt, edited by Heinz Bechert, von Georg von Simson, Michael Schmidt, and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Volumes 1–27, Göttingen 1973ff.
T	<i>Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō</i> or <i>Taishō Issaikyō</i> , 100 vols, edited by J. Takakusu and K. Watanabe, Tōkyō 1924ff.
TSWS	Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series, Patna.
VBS	Vishva-Bharati Studies, Santiniketan.
Vibh	<i>Vibhaṅga</i> , edited by C. A. F. Rhys Davids, <i>The Vibhaṅga being the Second Book of the Abhidhamma Piṭaka</i> . London 1904 (PTS).

Bibliography

- Bechert, Heinz. 1990. *Abkürzungsverzeichnis zur buddhistischen Literatur in Indien und Südostasien*. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Collins, Steven. 1990. 'On the very idea of the Pali Canon'. *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 15: 89–126.
- Gethin, R. M. L. 2001. *The Buddhist Path to Awakening*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oneworld Publications.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe. 2014. 'The *Āgama* of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin: What was the purpose of this collection?'. In *Research on the Āgama*, edited by Dhammadinnā, 135–166. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe and Klaus Wille. 2013. 'The manuscript of the *Āgama* and the private collection in Virginia'. In *From Birch Bark to Digital Data: Recent Advances in Buddhist Manuscript Research*, edited by Paul Harrison and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, 137–156. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Lamotte, Étienne. 1976. *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna: (Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra): Tome IV: Chapitres XLII (suite) - XLVIII*. Louvain: Institut Orientaliste.
- de La Vallée Poussin, Louis. 1923–1931. *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*. Paris: Paul Geuthner.
- 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* 15: 29–87.

- Okayama, Hajime, Yoshiko Kamitsuka, Seishi Karashima, Hiroshi Kanno, Fumihiko Sueki, Hiromichi Hikita, and Takumi Matsumura. 1997. 現代語訳「阿含経典」：長阿含経. 第2卷/*Gendaigoyaku agon kyōten: Jōagongyō. Dai 2 kan.* Tōkyō: Hirakawa Shuppansha.
- . 2000. 現代語訳「阿含経典」：長阿含経. 第3卷/*Gendaigoyaku agon kyōten: Jōagongyō. Dai 3 kan.* Tōkyō: Hirakawa Shuppansha.
- Rhys Davids, T. W. and C. A. F. Rhys Davids. 1965 [1921]. *Dialogues of the Buddha Part III Translated from the Pali of the Dīgha Nikāya.* Reprint. London: Pali Text Society.
- Vetter, Tilmann. 2012. *A Lexicographical Study of An Shigao's and his Circle's Chinese Translations of Buddhist texts.* Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies.
- Zacchetti, Stefano. 2002. 'An early Chinese translation corresponding to chapter 6 of the *Peṭakopadesa*. An Shigao's *Yin chi ru jing* T 603 and its Indian original: A preliminary survey'. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 65(1): 74–98. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0041977X02000046>