《中阿含》比較研究摘要

原著： Analayo 無著法師
蘇錦坤　譯

目　　次

作者簡介

一、摘要

本文依據現存對應經典的比對，來探討《中阿含》的一些特性，在討論漢譯《中阿含》的結構之後，接著檢視所選引《中阿含》經文，來說明將《中阿含》的漢譯及巴利(有時也包括梵文和藏文)對應經典比對閱讀的重要性，以確認某些字句的涵義，因此而避免來自傳誦的訛誤與輾轉繕寫的錯謬。

二、《中阿含》結構與相似性

依據釋道慈的〈後出中阿含經記〉，《中阿含經》於西元 398 年在罽賓比丘瞿曇僧伽提婆的領導下再譯，由罽賓比丘僧伽羅叉誦胡本，豫州沙門道慈筆受，李寶、康化共書[1]。[2]《中阿含》的原稿語言依現代學者的研究推論為(古印度) 俗語

Prākrit[3],[4] 而且有相當高的可能是來自說一切有部。[5]

漢譯《中阿含》共有 222 經，分為十八品，一般而言，每一品至少有 10 經，也有如〈大品〉的經數多達 25 經。與此對應的巴利《中部尼柯耶》則有 152 經，分為十五品，〈分別品〉為 12 經，其餘十四品為 10 經。因此，即使有一些例外，原來的結集原則可能是每品有十經，這也是大部分佛教文獻結集的原則[6]。

關於《中阿含》與《中部尼柯耶》的品名，兩者有四個品名稱相同：on

kings (9)， 六. 王相應品；on Brahmins (10)，十二. 梵志品；on expositions (14)，

十三. 根本分別品；on pairs (4 & 5)，十五. 雙品。這四品在兩者不但位置不同，所

---

1 附註中如有中括號 [ ]，中括號內之數目字為原註編號，如 [5] 為原註 5，附註中如果沒有中括號，則表示此註為譯者所增加的附註。

2 [1]《後出中阿含經序》(大正 1，809b23～28)，「康化」《聖》本作「唐化」。

3 Prakrit，為相對於 Sanskrit (古典梵語)，經典中翻譯 Sanskrit 為雅語，所以有學者翻譯 Prakrit 為(古印度)俗語。

4 [2] 關於《中阿含》原稿的語言，參考 Bapat (1969：5)，Enomoto (1986：20)，von Hineuber (1982：250)。

5 [3] 關於《中阿含》原稿所屬的部派，參考 Mayeda (1985：98)，Minh Chau (1991：27)。Enomoto (1984：198)解釋說：「現存的漢譯《中阿含》可能代表這個(中阿含)結集最早的三個版本之一，第二個版本有部分被保存在一些中亞梵文殘卷中，第三個版本可以在後來的論著所引的經文見到。」

6 印順導師《原始佛教聖典之集成》p.706：「『品』，本為隨類集經，10 經結一偈頌以便持誦。這十經的一頌，就稱之為品，是極一般的情形；如事實上略有多少，也只增減一、二而已。《中部》是這樣的，而《中阿含經》一八品中，10 經為一品的共一一品，11 經的有二品，這都近於常態；或有 14、15、16 經為一品的，更有 20 經、25 經為一品，顯然是大大的增編了！」。

包含的經典內容也不盡相同，例如《中部尼柯耶》的〈Rāja-vagga 王品〉與《中阿含》的〈王相應品〉有兩經相同；《中部尼柯耶》的〈Brāhmaṇa-vagga 婆羅門品〉與《中阿含》的〈梵志品〉有四經相同；《中部尼柯耶》的〈Mahāyamaka-vagga 雙大品〉與《中阿含》的〈雙品〉有四經相同；《中部尼柯耶》的〈Vibhaṅga-vagga 分別品〉與《中阿含》的〈根本分別品〉有九經相同[7]，如＜表一＞。

＜表一＞四品中的對應經典

品名	王相應品	梵志品	根本分別品	雙品
對應經典	MĀ 63/MN 81 MĀ 67/MN 83	MĀ 150/MN 96 MĀ 151/MN 93 MĀ 152/MN 99 MĀ 161/MN 91	MĀ 162/MN 140 MĀ 163/MN 137 MĀ 164/MN 138 MĀ 165/MN 133 MĀ 166/MN 134 MĀ 167/MN 132 MĀ 169/MN 139 MĀ 170/MN 135 MĀ 171/MN 136	MĀ 182/MN 39 MĀ 183/MN 40 MĀ 184/MN 32 MĀ 185/MN 31

在我的研究進展過程，發現有機會對赤沼智善《漢巴四部四阿含互照錄》(1990/1929)的《中阿含》與《中部尼柯耶》的對應經典部分作個更正，我在《中阿含 28、86、106、168 經》與赤沼智善《互照錄》不同。赤沼智善《互照錄》(1990：171) 將《中阿含・28 經》列為《中部尼柯耶・143 經》的對應經典，但是《中阿含・28 經》與《相應部尼柯耶 55：26 經(SN V 380)》同樣是舍利弗對給孤獨長者說法，

---

[7] [4]《中阿含經》第六品〈王相應品〉對應的爲《中部尼柯耶》第九品〈Rāja-vagga 王品〉，第十二品〈梵志品〉對應的爲《中部尼柯耶》第十品〈Brāhma□a-vagga 婆羅門品〉，第十三品〈根本分別品〉對應的爲《中部尼柯耶》第十四品〈Vibnavga-vagga 分別品〉，第十五品〈雙品〉對應的爲《中部尼柯耶》〈Mahāyamaka-vagga 雙品〉。也可參考印順導師《原始佛教聖典之集成》（1983：704）。

而最後給孤獨長者康復了。至於《中部尼柯耶・143 經》，最後給孤獨長者去世了，而且他聽到的教導也不同。因此《中阿含・28 經》應該被認定為《相應部尼柯耶 55：26 經》的對應經典。赤沼智善《互照錄》(1990：171) 將《中阿含・86 經》列為《中部尼柯耶・148 經》的對應經典，在《中阿含・86 經》，阿難問佛陀如何教導年少比丘，佛陀的回答是五蘊、六入處、十二緣起、四念處、四正勤、四神足與包含其他議題的一大範圍的說法。相對地，《中部尼柯耶・148 經》則根本未提到阿難，所教導的也只是六入處，如此，兩者差異這麼大，它們不能被當成對應經典。赤沼智善《互照錄》(1990：169) 將《中阿含・168 經》列為《中部尼柯耶・120 經》的對應經典，但是進一步檢視發現這兩部經彼此並不相同，《中部尼柯耶・120 經》描述

「願 mental aspiration (意行)」如何導致不同的來生，《中阿含・168 經》則描述不

同的禪定導致來生到不同的天界；如此這兩部經就較不可能來自同一個來源，而被認為是「對應經典」，雖然彼此有類似的主題，但是卻來自不同的情況。同樣地，赤沼智善《互照錄》(1990：163) 將《中阿含・106 經》與單譯經《樂想經》列為《中部尼柯耶・1 經》的對應經典，但是進一步檢視發現《中部尼柯耶・1 經》討論世俗凡夫、有學、阿羅漢與如來，《中阿含・106 經》與《樂想經》則描述兩種不同的沙門、婆羅門與如來，而且不僅所描述的地點與《中部尼柯耶・1 經》不同，也未論及涅槃，更未談及比丘聽法之後「不受其教」。 相對地，《增一阿含・44.6 經》完全與上述各差異點不同而符合《中部尼柯耶・1 經》的細節。所以在一般意義下，《中阿含・106 經》與單譯經《樂想經》似乎不適合列為《中部尼柯耶・1 經》的對應經典。所以我的結論是《中阿含・28 經》與《中阿含・86 經》肯定不是《中部尼柯耶》的對應經典，《中阿含・106 經》與《中阿含・168 經》我強烈懷疑是否該列為《中部尼柯耶》的對應經典。此外，在赤沼智善《互照錄》所列的對應經典之外，《中阿含・29 經》為《中部尼柯耶・9 經》的對應經典[8]，《中阿含・208 經》列為《中部尼柯耶・79 經》的對應經典。

　　如此，依據我的判斷，《中部尼柯耶》有 95 部經在《中阿含》有對應經典，因為《中部尼柯耶・17 經》在《中阿含》有兩部對應經典[9]，所以，《中阿含》有 96 部經在《中部尼柯耶》有對應經典。兩者對應經典的次序安排有很大的差異，在＜表二＞，依照《中阿含》的次序將《中部尼柯耶》的對應經典列表，＜表二＞清晰地顯示其間的差異。

＜表二＞《中阿含》與《巴利尼柯耶》的經號次序

---

[8] [5] 印順導師《原始佛教聖典之集成》p.709。

[9] [6] 《中部尼柯耶・ 17 經》在《中阿含》有 107 經、108 經為對應經典。

(A: 第一直行，中文數目字一到十接著阿拉伯數字 11 到 18，代表《中阿含》的第一品到第十八品。

B: 第一橫列，中括號內的數字，如 [1]， [2]…[16]， [17] 代表此品的第一經、第二經、…第十六經、第十七經；第二橫列的「第十二品」經號爲 [18]、[19]、 [20]。

C. 各格的阿拉伯數字爲中部尼柯耶經號，如第十八橫列、第九直行的數字爲 63，代表《中阿含》第十八品第九經爲《中部尼柯耶》第 63 經。格內如爲「xxx」代表此品到此結束，如第七橫列、第十六直行爲「xxx」代表此品有 15 經，如格內爲空格，代表此經在《中部尼柯耶》無對應經典。)

	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[8]	[9]	[10]	[11]	[12]	[13]	[14]	[15]	[16]	[17]
一									24	2	xxx						
二				61					101		xxx						
三						69	97		9	28	141	xxx					
四	123		124								xxx						
五																	xxx
六						81	130			83					xxx		
七	128			106		68	49	127		119				113		xxx	
八	5	3	15		8		7				xxx						
九		10	13	14	20	19	11		6		xxx						
十	17	17							18		xxx						
11															50	82	56
11									xxx								
12			107	108	27				96	93	99	75					
12			91	xxx													
13	140	137	138	133	134	132		139	135	136	xxx						
14		126	45	46			25	78	142	115	xxx						
15	39	40	32	31	47	112		117	121	122	xxx						
16	66	21	65	70	104		125	129	22	38	xxx						
17		54	26	64	16	77	79	80	44	43	xxx						
18	90	89	88		87	52				63		xxx					

即使快速掃瞄一次＜表二＞，也能看出《中阿含》與《中部尼柯耶》的經文次序有不同的安排。這樣的差異給我們一個印象，這些次序的安排顯然是與各自的口誦傳承有關，雖然，＜表一＞所顯示的相似性可能意味它們來自一個共同的起源[10]。

---

[10] [7]在相同的部派血脈下，(適用於《雜阿含》與《相應部尼柯耶》的現象，也適用於《中阿含》與《中部尼柯耶》，)Andrew Glass 安德魯格拉斯在他的博士論文《*Connected Discourses in Gandhāra: A Study, Edition, and Translation of Four Saṃyuktāgama-Type Sūtras from the Senior Collection*》(2006：6)作了如此的結論：「遵循共有的經典次序似乎是相當古老以前的事，從現存經典所看到的經文內容與經典次序的重大差異，顯示他們遵循各自不同的發展。」Norman 諾門(1992：40)在〈The Value of the Pāli Tradition〉文中解釋說：「各個部派保留相同的『品』或『相應』名稱，一般而言卻保留不同的經典與次序。」

　　相同的結構也可在『《增支部》(增一阿含)的結集』與『《中部》(中阿含)的結集』的跨部派的關係發現，《中阿含》在《增支部尼柯耶》的對應經典比率，幾乎和《中部尼柯耶》在《增一阿含》的對應經典比率一樣[11]。

　　　　另一個相同結構的例子也可在(根本)說一切有部的《長阿含》梵文殘卷發現，《長部尼柯耶》在《中阿含》發現的對應經典，幾乎和梵文《長阿含》在《中部尼柯耶》發現的對應經典的數量一樣，都是十部經，參考＜表三＞[12]。

　　　　＜表三＞[13]

《長部尼柯耶 》	《中阿含》		梵文《長阿含》	《中部尼柯耶》
DN 15	MĀ 97		DĀ² 7	MN 60[14]
DN 17	MĀ 68		DĀ² 10	MN 105
DN 21	MĀ 134		DĀ² 11	MN 4
DN 22	MĀ 98		DĀ² 12	MN 12
DN 23	MĀ 71		DĀ² 17	MN 102
DN 25	MĀ 104		DĀ² 19	MN 95
DN 26	MĀ 70		DĀ² 20	MN 36
DN 27	MĀ 154		DĀ² 21	MN 85
DN 30	MĀ 59		DĀ² 22	MN 100
DN 31	MĀ 135		DĀ² 43	MN 55

　　雖然這兩組經典在＜表三＞平行並列，仔細檢視＜表三＞所列的兩組對應經典，他們的次序並未顯示任何規則，這兩組彼此也沒有任何對應關係。

　　　　總之，上述相似性的格式可被確認的為：

---

[11] [8]在 Akanuma 赤沼智善《漢巴四部四阿含互照錄 The Comparative Catalogue of Chinese Agamas & Pali Nikayas》(1929，1990：7〜25)，考察了對應經典而作此建議：「大約 37% 的《中阿含》經典在《增支部尼柯耶》有對應經典」，而依我個人(無著法師)的估算，大約 35% 的《中部尼柯耶》經典在《增一阿含》有對應經典或參考經典(partial parallel)。

[12] [9]在這十部梵文《長阿含》中，有八部在漢譯四阿含找不到對應經典，只有梵文《長阿含‧11 經》有《增一阿含‧31.1 經》為對應經典，梵文《長阿含‧12 經》有大正藏《經集部》單譯經的《佛說身毛喜豎經》為對應經典。

[13] [10]在＜表三＞的右半部，梵文《長阿含》與《中部尼柯耶》的對應經典取自 Hartmann 〈Contents and Structure of the Dīrghāgama of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins〉(2004：126〜127)。

[14] [11] Hartmann 〈Zu einer Neuen Handschrift des Dīrghāgama,〉(2000：365)的「註 20」，註明這需要進一步核對。

1) 《中阿含》在《增支部尼柯耶》的對應經典比率，幾乎和《中部尼柯耶》在《增一阿含》的對應經典比率一樣。

$$MĀ \Leftrightarrow AN \approx MN \Leftrightarrow EĀ$$

2) 《長部尼柯耶》在《中阿含》發現的對應經典，幾乎和梵文《長阿含》在《中部尼柯耶》發現的對應經典的數量一樣。

$$MĀ \Leftrightarrow DN = MN \Leftrightarrow DĀ^2$$

雖然這樣的相似性不能完全排除僅是出於巧合，此種相似的程度已足夠令人驚奇，除了認爲《四部尼柯耶》與《四阿含》來自相同的起源以外，無法遇見這樣的相似性[15]。

當個別的《中阿含》與《中部尼柯耶》經典作比對時，會得到推測兩者的主幹源自共同點的突出印象。巴利經文或許在佛陀涅槃後傳誦四世紀[16]，由錫蘭比丘書寫下來[17]，在此之後又經過另一個四百年的傳誦書寫才翻譯成漢文經典，漢譯四阿含翻譯自不同佛教部派的誦讀傳承，兩者即使在一些細節也有令人驚奇的相似性。不過，如同口誦傳承的資料所會發生的一樣，兩者也無可避免地出現相當數量的差異與變化。

另一個從《中阿含》比較研究得到的驚人印象是翻譯品質相當地高，雖然《中阿含》的翻譯仍然只算是中國佛教翻譯的早期階段，讀了《中阿含》之後會得到強烈的印象，僧伽提婆與他的翻譯團隊不僅了解他們的工作，也盡全力把《中阿含》

---

[15] [12]貝赫特 Bechert 在〈Methodological considerations concerning the language of the earliest Buddhist tradition 關於早期佛教傳統使用的語言的方法學上的考量〉(1991：9)文中相信：「目前我們所能見到的結集文獻無法帶我們追溯到任何『阿含原型』，但是它們能追溯到使用經典組織原則之下的個別編輯結果」，這意味著現存文獻之間跨部派的相同性「引向一個無誤的假設：應當已經有一個整個文獻的原型存在」。諾曼 Norman (1989：33) 建議：「在最早期佛教搜集教法時構成的基礎」形成這四個基本的(經典)組群，「這可能是『bhā□akas 唄(口*匿)者制度』的起源，他們負責佛陀教法中不同經典組群的傳誦。」葡拉薩 Prasad (1985：137) 對各部派的經典有不同的次序作此評論：「經典次序安排的準則是清楚的，它是聽其自然地允許多個準則。隨著時間的演變，經典的位置就隨著不同的部派而改變。」

[16] [13] 關於佛陀入滅的年份，貝赫特 Bechert (1995) 建議在西元前 400 年，加上前後二十年的誤差值。

[17] 關於佛陀入滅的年份，印順導師依南北傳「五師相傳」的舊說，《佛教史地考論》 p.194 ：「佛滅百十六年，阿育王自立；百二十年，育王行灌頂禮，這不但『持之有故，言之成理』，可說各方面都能吻合；與錫蘭傳的所以不同，也說出他的不同來源。如考定佛元，在現階段，這是唯一可用的傳說。如育王灌頂於西元前 271，即自立於 275，即可推得佛滅年，即佛後元年──為西元前 390 年。」

從印度語系的語言譯好。如此，《中阿含》當然也是一個好例子來支持 Landcaster

蘭卡斯特(1979：224)的敘述：「在漢譯經典中我們有極端珍貴的證據來源，...有某

種程度的確認，翻譯團隊了解他們要翻譯的內容，也以毅力和準確來完成翻譯。」

所以，如同狄鍾 de Jong 的文章〈佛陀的語言在中國〉(1968：15) 的敘述：「沒有

任何佛教學生能忽視如此龐大的中文翻譯資料，即使是他只對印度佛教有興趣。」

　　即使如此，翻譯失誤仍然無可避免地發生，在本文以下章節，將舉例描述那些

經文像是失誤，那些像是中文譯本的失誤，那些像是巴利對應經典的失誤。

三、《中阿含・14 經・羅云經》，淨而且不善

　　我舉的第一個例子是《中阿含・14 經・羅云經》，這部經記載了佛陀對羅云的

教導。此教導的部分字句說「應遠離身的『淨』行[18]」，同時也是不善與導致苦

報；至於身的「不淨行」，則是善與導致樂報。

(1)《中阿含・14 經》：「彼身業淨，或自為、或為他，不善與苦果受於苦報」[19]
「彼身業不淨，或自為、或為他，善與樂果受於樂報」[20]

　　這段經文令人詫異，因為身業同時為善與不淨似乎是互相牴觸，釋明珠 Minh

Chau (1991：34 & 132) 建議此處經文的「淨」字解釋為戒律所「允許」但是有不

善的後果，相對的如「身業不淨」為戒律所「不允許」但是有善的後果。接著他作

結論說，這樣的教導容許對戒律作比較自由的解釋。釋明珠意圖將「淨」字假設有

和一般意義「清淨」不同的解釋來讓此段經文合理化；這樣的解釋得到 平川彰

Arika Hirakawa 所編的《中文梵文字典》(1997：728) 的支持，他在 śuddha,

śuddhi, pariśuddhi, viśuddhi, pariśodhayati, śubha, vyavadāna, prassanna,

vimala 之外也列了 kalpika「合適的」和 kalpa 「合適的、實在的、可行的、可能

---

[18] [14] 列維 Lévi (1896：480) 將此處的「淨」解釋為 "Pur"。

[19] [15] 《中阿含・14 經》(大正 1，436c11)。

[20] [16] 《中阿含・14 經》(大正 1，436c14)。

的」為「淨」的等義字。不過，釋明珠的詮釋有一個問題，依據《羅云經》的教導，如果過去已作了身「淨」業，應向善知識發露表白；至於身不淨業，則可晝夜歡喜，住正念正智[21]。如果依上述將「淨」字解釋為「可允許的、合適的」，則這段敘述沒有意義，因為「合適的」行為就不需要向善知識發露表白。事實上，為利益他人而違犯戒律，這是比較晚期的佛教思想，在早期經典尚未發現這樣的敘述。

《中阿含‧14 經‧羅云經》在《中部尼柯耶》有一對應經典《中部‧61 經‧

教誡羅睺羅經 Ambalaṭṭhikārāhula-lovāda sutta》，在巴利對應經文中並未設想有

身業同時是淨與不善，而僅是單純地敘說如此不善身行將會導致惡報[22]。類似的經

文也出現在漢譯與藏譯的《根本說一切有部毘奈耶》[23]、一部保存在藏文的《 Vyā

khyāyukti-tīkā》所引的一段經文[24]與一段在＜聲聞地＞轉寫的經文，都與巴利經文

和《根本說一切有部毘奈耶》一致，而是指此段教導為「避免有害與不善的身行」
[25]，並未設想這樣的行為可能被認為是淨行。

事實上，如果對羅睺羅的教誡是如此前後矛盾的話，阿育王就不會明確地將此經列為建議誦讀的經文之一[26]。如果一部經典告誡人民去作被禁止的事，只要他們認為這是善的，國王極可能就不會建議這樣的經典。因為這部經可能是由於直接而實用的倫理教導而被選入建議名單。如此看來，似乎《中阿含經》的部分經典有訛誤

的困擾，這樣的訛誤可能因為誤解原文的「連音 Sandhi 」而造成：例如，原文有一

個否定字首 "-a" 而譯文誤譯為沒有；或者反過來，原文沒有一個否定字首 "-a" 而譯

---

[21] [17]《中阿含‧ 14 經》(大正 1，436c23～437a5)。

[22] [18]《中部‧61 經》(M I 415, 29) akusalaj idaj kayakammaj dukkhudrayaj dukkhavipakaj。

[23] [19]《根本說一切有部毘奈耶》：「是不善事是苦惡業。能於未來感苦異熟」(大正 23，761a11～
12)；D *'dul ba cha* (217a56) or (Q *je* 201a6)： *bdag dang gzhan la gnod par 'gyur ba mi dge ba* (D： *ba'i*)
sdug bsngal 'byung ba rnam par smin pa sdug bsngal ba。

[24] [20] Q *sems tsam i* 71a5： *gnod pa dang ldan pa mi dge ba sdug bsngal 'byung ba dang*。

[25] [21]《瑜伽師地論》：「自損及以損他是不善」(大正 30，405b5)或者參考 Shukla (1973： 55，16)
vyabhadhikaj…atmano va parasya va akusalaj。

[26] [22] 阿育王法敕銘刻(Asoka's Edict) 列入《羅云經》的可能原因，請參考 *Lāghulovāda*, "spoken by
the Blessed One, the Buddha, concerning falsehood", *musā vāda☐ adhigichya bhagavatā budhena bhāsite*,
cf. Hultzsch (1925：173)。

文誤譯爲有。相同的例子也發生在《中阿含・194 經》[27]，辛島靜志 Seisi Karashima (1992：263)在《漢譯〈正法華經〉經文研究 *The Textual Study of the Chinese Versions of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*》指出同樣的錯誤也發生在 竺法護翻譯的《正法華經》。

四、《中阿含・25 經・水喻經》，阿練若

下一個例子來自《中阿含・25 經・水喻經》有關一個術語的翻譯，此經將

「araññaká aaraṇvaka 住在森林者」譯爲「阿練若」[28]，而不是《中阿含》慣用的譯

語「無事」[29]，這樣的差異相當有意思，因爲「阿練若」爲《增一阿含》的常用譯

法[30]。這個細節可能與《中阿含》、《增一阿含》的翻譯有關，現存的《增一阿

含》到底是僅僅經瞿曇僧伽提婆訂正，或是由他再譯而取代了原先達摩難提的譯

本，這個《增一阿含》的翻譯者議題並不是十分清晰肯定[31]。這個問題主要是這兩部

經所用的翻譯術語一般來說有很大的差異，因此很難說他們是同一個人的翻譯。

---

[27] [23] 參考本文的引文第 18 章《中阿含 ・194 經》。

[28] [24]《中阿含 25 經》「阿練若比丘」(大正，454a19)。

[29] [25] 釋明珠《中文中阿含與巴利中部尼柯耶的比較研究》(1991：327)評論道「無事」是《中阿含》對 arabba 的標準譯語。

[30] [26] 此字《增一阿含》共有十二經譯爲「阿練若」而無一處譯爲「無事」：《12.5 經》「其有歎譽阿練若者」(大正 2，569c14～15)；《12.6 經》「住阿練若」(大正 2，570a25)；《13.1 經》「作阿練若行」(大正 2，571b2)；《25.6 經》「行阿練若」(大正 2，633b16)；《37.3 經》「阿練若行」(大正 2，711a8)；《38.6 經》「作阿練若」(大正 2，721a1)；《39.10 經》「行阿練若」(大正 2，734a8)；《49.2 經》「所謂阿練若」(大正 2，795a26)。

[31] [27]《出三藏記集》：「曇摩難提口誦增一阿含并幻網經，使佛念為譯人」(大正 55，71b29～c2)；《眾經目錄》：「《增一阿含經》50 卷(前秦・建元年・沙門曇摩難提譯)」(大正 55，127c29)；《大周刊定眾經目錄》：「《增一阿含經》一部 50 卷(內典云，或 51 卷，初譯，長房入藏錄云四十二經九百三十九紙)右前秦・建元二十年・曇摩難提長安譯，出長房錄。」(大正 55，422b4～7)；《開元釋教錄》：「《增壹阿鋡經》50 卷(第一譯建元二十年，甲申夏出至來春訖，為 40 卷，佛念傳譯，曇嵩筆受，見安公經序。僧叡、僧祐、寶唱錄並載祐云 33 及 24 卷，恐誤。)」(大正 55，511b14～15)，以上均稱《增一阿含》爲達摩難提譯。至於《歷代三寶紀》：「《增一阿含經》50 卷(隆安元年正月出是第二譯，與難提本小異，竺道祖筆受。或四十二、或三十三無定。見道祖及寶唱錄)。」(大正 49，70c5～6)「罽賓國・三藏法師瞿曇僧伽提婆…重出中、《增阿含》等。」(大正 49，70c11～17)；也參考無著法師(2006)； Bagchi (1927：159，337)； Enomoto (1986：19)；Lamotte (1967：105)； Lü (1963：242)； Mayeda (1985：102)；Waldschmidt (1980：169，note 168)；印順導師《原始佛教聖典之集成》：「《歷代三寶記》所說，僧伽提婆於隆安元年（西元三九七）正月，再譯《增壹阿含經》，是值得懷疑的！依據當時的記錄，僧伽提婆《增壹阿含經》的改正，在洛陽而不是江南。從來只此一部——曇摩難提所（譯）出，僧伽提婆重

如果瞿曇僧伽提婆重新翻譯《增一阿含》的話，他所根據的經文來源也不是很清楚。因爲他是根據書寫爲文字的「胡本」來翻譯《中阿含》，而達摩難提的《增一阿含》譯本則是依據自己的記憶「闇誦」[32]。對於瞿曇僧伽提婆的《增一阿含》翻譯是否來自記憶背誦，或是他拿到了達摩難提背誦的《增一阿含》的文本而依此翻譯，也沒有明確的敘述。

然而，《中阿含》出現的「阿練若」譯語指出現存的《中阿含》與《增一阿含》似乎有某種關係。事實上，我們知道達摩難提也在早先翻譯了《中阿含》，雖然後來這個譯本似乎佚失了。目前這個議題仍然有一種可能性，如同呂澂所建議的(1963：242)，在現存僧伽提婆再譯《中阿含》仍然保留一些達摩難提翻譯的《中阿含》經文。

五、《中阿含‧26 經‧瞿尼師經》，為小比丘訶

接下來的例子是發生於《中阿含‧26 經‧瞿尼師經》的一個誤譯的例子，在描述比丘對於座位的適當行爲時，經文教導說不該侵占長老比丘的座位，而且年輕比丘不該受「訶」。

(2)《中阿含‧26 經》：「當學知坐取善坐也，不逼長老坐，為小比丘訶。」[33]

當取用座位時不能妨礙長老，這當然是合理的，但是爲何要譴責年輕比丘就難以理解。依據《中部尼柯耶》的對應經典《中部‧69 經，Gulissāni sutta》，相對應的經文是「不要將年輕比丘趕離座位 *nave ca bhikkhū na āsanena paṭibāhissāmi.* 」[34] 這可能是《中阿含》的譯者誤把「驅離 *paṭibāhati/pratibādhate*」理解成「譴責 *paṭibhāsati/pratibhāṣate*」。

治改定。」(1962：93)。

[32] [28]《出三藏記集》：「《增一阿鋡經》33 卷。《中阿鋡經》59 卷。右二部，凡 92 卷，晉孝武時，兜佉勒國沙門曇摩難提，以符堅時入長安，難提口誦胡本，竺佛念譯出。」(大正 55，10, b21～26)。

[33] [29]《中阿含‧26 經》(大正 1，455c6～8)。

[34] [30]《中部‧69 經》(MN I 469,18)。

六、《中阿含‧27 經‧梵志陀然經》，苦治居民

《中阿含‧27 經‧梵志陀然經》描述舍利弗拜訪一位婆羅門，依據《中阿含》，舍利弗到達時，這位婆羅門正離開家到泉水邊讓他的人民承受痛苦。

(3)《中阿含 ‧27 經》：「梵志陀然從其家出。至泉水邊苦治居民。」[35]

在此，經文中似乎有誤譯，此經的巴利對應經典是《中部‧ 97 經 *Dhānañjāni-sutta*》，對應經文則是此婆羅門正在牛舍擠牛奶 *gāvo goṭṭhe dohāpeti*。[36]

造成翻譯為「苦治」的原因可能是將字根「√*duh* 擠牛奶」誤當作「√*dru*, "傷害」，至於翻譯成「居民」的原因則較難解釋，雖然，可能因「受傷害」的字就假設有人受傷害，或者將牛棚(牛舍) *goṭṭhá*/*goṣṭha* 誤譯為 *gottá*/*gotra* 親族，或者「居民」純粹只是翻譯者加進去的字。

將字根「√*duh* 擠牛奶」誤當作「√*dru*, "傷害」比較容易在 Prākrit(古印度)俗語發生，和巴利語一樣，這兩個字型較難區分出後者有一個『r』的音，在梵文(雅語)中，這樣的失誤比較不可能發生。因此，這一個誤譯支持《中阿含》所翻譯的原文可能是 Prākrit 古印度俗語的假設。

以上所舉的例子已經顯示研讀早期經典時，對讀現有的漢巴不同版本的經文的重要性。這樣的對照閱讀當然是互利的，也就是說，不僅從巴利對應經典可以幫忙解讀《中阿含》，而且同樣地，從漢譯對應經典可以幫忙解讀巴利經文[37]。因為，不僅翻譯時會導致誤譯，在口誦傳承時也可能因為記憶差錯而造成失誤，《中阿含 ‧63 經，鞞婆陵耆經》可能有這樣的一個例子。

---

[35] [31]《中阿含 ‧27 經》(大正 1，456c9～10)。

[36] [32]《中部‧97 經》(MN II 186,2)，(B^e-MN II 396 and S^e-MN II 624 read *dūhāpeti*)。

[37] [33] 這些例子可以參考無著法師〈藉助四阿含解讀巴利經典〉(2005)。

七、《中阿含・63 經・鞞婆陵耆經》，稱長老

此經描述過去佛迦葉派遣他的弟子到一位施主家化緣草來覆蓋屋頂，當弟子到達施主家時，他剛好外出，只有盲眼的父母在家。《中阿含》敘述說施主的盲眼雙親問是誰到來，弟子回答並且解釋自己是比丘。

(4)《中阿含・63 經》：「父母…聞已。問曰：『誰…耶？』比丘答曰：『長老，我等是…比丘。』」[38]

巴利對應經典《中部・81 經，Ghatikara sutta》，諸比丘回答施主的雙親「姊妹 bhagini」[39]，在《中阿含》則是回答「長老」相當於 *āyasmant/āyuśmant*，通常是對比丘的尊稱，但是也適用於稱呼長者。在古印度的特殊社會中，妻子的地位如同是僕人般的附屬品[40]，正常情況之下比丘對夫妻說話時不可能只稱呼妻子，因此很清楚地，《中阿含》的敘述應該是比較合適的經文。

八、《中阿含・78 經・梵天請佛經》，*juti* 榮耀

有時候漢譯與巴利經典在同一部經互相更正，我們可以在《中部・49 經，Brahmanimantaṇika sutta》與《中阿含・78 經・梵天請佛經》看到這樣的例子。此經敘述佛陀遇到自負的梵天，梵天自認為常住永存。為了斥責梵天的邪見，佛陀指出他知道梵天從何處來、往何處去，因此梵天現在的狀態離長住永存尚遠。

(5)《中阿含・78 經》：「梵天，我知汝所從來處、所往至處。」[41]

---

[38] [34]《中阿含・63 經》(大正 1，502b24〜27)。

[39] [35]《中部・81 經》(MN II 53，25)。

[40] [36] Von Hinüber (1993：102) 指出在 Vin IV 21，3, 當婆婆稱呼她的媳婦時用 *je,* 通常是用來稱呼女奴隸的(如《中部・21 經》(MN I 125，18)) ，這樣的稱呼反映了媳婦在夫家的社會地位低微。Horner (1990：1) 解釋說：「在古印度一個出嫁的女人的「生活完全忙碌於對先生及公婆的侍候，她在家中只有極少的權限，而且完全沒有社交活動。」

[41] [37]《中阿含・78 經》(大正 1，548a8)。

14

不過，《中部‧49 經》裡，佛陀告訴梵天知道他的去處與「榮耀」，*te ahaṃ,*

Brahme, gatiñca pajānāmi jutiñca pajānāmi[42]。經文此處出現「榮耀 *juti*」這個字令

人困惑，因爲佛陀完全了知梵天，因此也了知梵天的所有榮耀，在質疑梵天的常見

時去提他的榮耀並不實際，如《中阿含‧78 經》，佛陀指出梵天的所從來、所去

處，已足以破斥梵天自以爲常的見解。至於提及對梵天榮耀的了解，在經文中並不

貼切。

《中阿含》版本的讀法得到 PTS 版本與 Sinhalese 古錫蘭語版本的支持，在這

兩個版本均讀爲「死亡 *cuti*」而不是「榮耀 *juti*」[43]。就經文而言，「死亡 *cuti*」顯得

是較合適的讀法，也與《中阿含》版本吻合。如此《中阿含》的對應經文協助我們

決定不同版本的巴利經文中那一版本比較合適。

九、經名的差異

早期經典在不同版本之間的對應經典顯示相當多的差異是「經名」。同一部經

不僅在不同部派的傳誦有不同的經名，甚至在巴利文獻裡不同的版本的經名也有相

當程度的差異；以《中部尼柯耶》爲例，有十多部經在不同的巴利版本有實質上不

同的經名[44]。就如此的變化而言，有時《中阿含》比《中部尼柯耶》的對應經典有

更合適的經名就不足爲奇。我們可以在《中阿含‧101 經‧增上心經》[45]看到這樣

的例子，它的對應經典《中部尼柯耶‧20 經》經名爲「尋行止息

---

[42]　[38]《中部‧49 經》(MN I 328，25)。

[43]　[39]　PTS 版本(MN I 557) 與 Cᵉ-MN I 768 note 5；參考 Horner (1967： 391 註 5) ，他認爲 *juti* 應該是 *cuti*。

[44]　[40]　這些是《中部‧7 經》*Vatthūpama-sutta*，Bᵉ 的經名爲 *Vattha-sutta*；《中部‧26 經》*Ariyapari-yesana-sutta*，Bᵉ 與 Sᵉ 的經名爲 *Pāsarāsi-sutta*；《中部‧53 經》*Sekha-sutta*，Sᵉ 的經名爲 *Sekhapa□ipadā-sutta*；《中部‧56 經》*Upāli-sutta*，Sᵉ 的經名爲 *Upālivāda-sutta*；《中部‧61 經》*Ambala□□hikārāhulovāda-sutta*，Sᵉ 的經名爲 *Cū□arāhulovāda-sutta*；《中部‧63 經》*Cū□amālu□-kya-sutta*，Sᵉ 的經名爲 *Cū□amālu□kyovāda-sutta*；《中部‧71 經》*Tevijjavacchagotta-sutta*，Bᵉ 的經名爲 *Tevijjavaccha-sutta* ，Sᵉ 的經名爲 *Cū□avacchagotta-sutta*；《中部‧72 經》*Aggivacchagotta-sutta*，Bᵉ 的經名爲 *Aggivaccha-sutta*；《中部‧73 經》*Mahāvacchagotta-sutta*，Bᵉ 的經名爲 *Mahāvaccha-sutta*；《中部‧124 經》*Bakkula-sutta*，Sᵉ 的經名爲 *Bakkulattheracchariyabbhūta-sutta*；《中部‧149 經》*Mahāsa□āyatanika-sutta*，Sᵉ 的經名爲 *Sa□āyatanavibha□ga-sutta*。

[45]　[41]《中阿含 101 經》(大正 1，588a3)。

vitakkasaṅkhārasaṇṭhāna」[46]，只是經中克服不善念的五種方法之一，至於所有五種方法都是用來修習 *adhicitta* 增上心[47]。如此，以作為全經所處理的議題的經名而言，《中阿含》比《中部尼柯耶》的對應經典更合適。

十、事件或教導的順序

另一個在不同版本之間的差異是經文中教導或相關事件的次序，《中阿含‧102 經‧念經》有這樣的例子，經文敘述佛陀在成等正覺之前，如何處理升起的不善念，每當不善念升起時，立刻迅速驅除它，因為他看見不善念隱含的危險。《中阿含‧102 經》將此比喻成牧牛人阻止牛進入田中，因為他知道只要未能阻止牛入田中，他就會遭遇麻煩[48]。依據《中阿含》，解說完這個方法之後，佛陀轉到心念的一般特性，解說只要心念時常如此著意，就會導致傾向在這樣的心念中。[49]

不過，在對應經典《中部‧19 經，*Dvedhāvitakka-sutta*》所呈現的議題順序是不一樣的，首先是驅除不善念，其次是「心念時常如此著意」，最後才是牧牛人的譬喻[50]。《中阿含‧102 經》的順序較直接了當，因為牧牛人的譬喻是要解說對不良後果的恐懼，而不是解說「常興起的念會導致心念的傾向，就會傾向導致在這樣的心念中」，因此這個譬喻在「驅除不善念」的解說之後是最合適的。

十一、《中阿含‧145 經‧瞿默目犍連經》，受佛擁護

《中阿含‧145 經‧瞿默目犍連經》紀錄阿難的一句話，他說他樂住於此竹園，因為受到世尊的保護，可是，經文起先就說「佛般涅槃後不久」，因此不知道阿難指的保護的含意是什麼。

(6)《中阿含‧145 經》：「一時，佛般涅槃後不久」[51]

「我樂住竹林加蘭哆園中，所以者何？以世尊擁護故。」[52]

---

[46] [42] 採用自 Ñā□amoli《中部尼柯耶英譯》(2005：212)。

[47] [43] 《中部‧20 經》(MN I 119：3)提及此五種方法時的經文為 *adhicittaṃ anuyuttena ... bhikkhunā*。

[48] [44]《中阿含‧102 經》「牧牛兒放牛野澤。牛入他田，牧牛兒即執杖往遮。所以者何？牧牛兒知因此故，必當有罵、有打、有縛、有過失也。」（大正 1，589a28～b2）。

[49] [45] 《中阿含經》「隨所思、隨所念，心便樂中。」(大正 1，589b5～6)。

[50] [46] 《中部‧19 經》(MN I 115，29)。

[51] [47] 《中阿含‧145 經》(大正 1， 653c22)。

依據巴利經文，阿難稱竹園爲有助益的，因爲竹園受到阿闍世王大臣雨勢的保護[53]。巴利註釋書解釋說，雨勢對此竹園特別照顧，因爲，有預言稱雨勢來生將會在此園出生爲猴子，如此預期的來生也紀錄在〈*Karmavibhaṅga* 業分別〉[54]。如此，《中阿含・145 經》所說的受到世尊保護，可能是出於傳誦錯誤或誤譯，而在此經文所說的保護只是一位大臣對此竹園的世俗的保護。

十二、《中阿含・162 經・分別六界經》，三受五受

接下來的例子是《中阿含・162 經・分別六界經》，經中列了五種受，樂受、苦受、喜受、憂受、捨受，但是最後又總結爲三受。

(7)《中阿含・162 經》：「樂覺…苦覺…喜覺…憂覺…捨覺…此三覺。」[55]

不過，《中部・140 經，*Dhātuvibhaṅga sutta*》在對應的經文只列了三種受：

sukha 樂受， *dukhha* 苦受與 *adukkhamasukha* 不苦不樂受[56]。《中部・140 經》的讀法已經在《中阿含・162 經》得到確認，因爲經文中說「此三覺」，所以五受的解說顯得是晚出的解說而取代了原先的三受，檢視其他同部異譯的經文可以得到進一步的確認，如單譯經中，支謙譯的《佛說頞沙王五願經》也只是談到三受[57]。這個例子到此爲止顯示了有趣的現象，經文紀錄了早期邁向更繁多的細節分析的傾向，一種最終發展爲多種「阿毘達摩」的傾向。

---

[52] [48]《中阿含・145 經》(大正 1，655b13～15)。

[53] [49]《中部・108 經》(MN III 13，20)。

[54] [50] Ps IV 73 與 Kudo (2004： 72，5 & 73，4)。

[55] [51]《中阿含・162 經》(大正 1，691b5～c5)。

[56] [52]《中部・140 經》(MN III 242，11)。

[57] [53]《佛說頞沙王五願經》：「目所貪愛得之因快樂…從苦致苦能知爲苦。…因得不苦不樂自知遠離諸苦」(大正 14，780b29～c3)。

十三、《中阿含‧163 經‧分別六處經》，三十六刀

《中阿含‧163 經‧分別六處經》談及一個特殊的議題，當經文檢視了六喜、六憂、六捨，各組分別談及與六根有關的依著欲和無欲。這樣的三十六種解說在《中阿含‧163 經》統稱爲令人困惑的名稱「三十六刀」。

(8)《中阿含‧163 經》：「三十六刀…有六喜依著，有六喜依無欲，有六憂依著，有六憂依無欲，有六捨依著，有六捨依無欲。」[58]

巴利經典《中部‧137 經， *Saḷāyatanavibhaṅga sutta* 》在對應的經文的字句是「三十六有情跡、有情句 *chattiṃsa sattapad* 」[59]，這樣的比對顯示譯者可能將「有情 *sattásattva* 」誤解爲「刀 *satthásastra* 」[60]，或者可能是抄寫者誤將「句」字抄成「刀」字。在《*Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* 阿毗達磨俱舍論》此詞則讀爲「*ṣaṭtriṃśac chāstṛpadāni*， 老師(解說)的三十六種狀況」，此處的梵文是「*śāstṛ /satthar* 老師」[61] 而不是巴利經典的「*sattásattva* 有情」，這樣的解讀與玄奘的翻譯「三十六師句」[62] 吻合；至於真諦的翻譯爲「三十六寂靜足」[63]，可能是譯自「*śāntapadāni*」，意

---

[58] [54] 《中阿含‧163 經》(大正 1，692c16～20)。

[59] [55] 《中部‧137 經》(MN III 217，8)。

[60] [56] 僧伽跋澄翻譯的《鞞婆沙論》：「應說三十六，如三十六刀。」(大正 28，435c28～29) ，「刀」字《正倉院聖語藏本》作「勾」字。

[61] [57] 在 Pradhan 的《*Abhidharmakośabhā□ya* 3：36》(1967：150，8)， Pruden (1988：437) 解釋爲「三十六個老師解說的要點」。

[62] [58] 《阿毘達磨俱舍論》：「又即喜等為三十六師句」(大正 29，54b12)，也參考 Hirakawa (1978：97) 將藏文對應字詞「*ston pa'i bka'*」解說爲「老師的宣示」，以及《阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論》：「世尊說為三十六師句」(大正 27，718a25)。

[63] [59] 《阿毘達磨俱舍釋論》：「復次喜等成三十六寂靜足」(大正 29，211b12～13)。

18

思爲「寂靜的狀況」或「(導向)寂靜的道路」，此處是「*śāntapadāni* 寂止」而不是

巴利經典的「*sattásattva* 有情」。

如上所述，「三十六刀」看起來是個傳譯的失誤。

十四、《中阿含・171 經・分別大業經》，句子不完整

《中阿含・171 經・分別大業經》在討論業報後，世尊作了如此的宣示，告訴
阿難說如果有人聽聞此「分別大業經」，會對如來更加增上心靖得到喜樂。

**(9)《中阿含・171 經》：「阿難，若汝從世尊聞分別大業經者，於如來倍復增上心靖
得喜。」**[64]

對照巴利《中部・136 經，*Mahākammavibhaṅga sutta*》，此段經文似乎保存

得不完整，因爲經文只說：「阿難，如果你從如來處聽聞對業的詳細解釋 *sace*

tumhe, Ānanda, suṇeyyātha tathāgatassa mahākammavibhaṅgaṃ vibha-

jantassā'ti」，「ti」在此表示句子就結束了[65]。這樣讀起來會讓人覺得句子不完整，

因爲前面有一個假設語句的不變化詞「*sace* 假若」，可是這句子在「假若阿難聽聞

了有關業的詳細解釋」後，沒有說明結果會是如何。

這部經《中阿含》提供了較完整的說明，借助於此我們可以把《中部・136

經》的句子還原成「*sace tumhe, Ānanda, suṇeyyātha tathāgatassa mahā-*

---

[64] [60]《中阿含・171 經》(大正 1，707a19～21)，此處依宋元明藏作「聞」字，大正藏爲「問」字。

[65] [61]《中部・136 經》(MN III 209,12)，在《增支部・6:62 經》(AN III 404,5) 對類似的宣示有同樣
的句型：「*sace tumhe, Ānanda, su□eyyātha tathāgatassa purisindriyañā□āni vibhajantassā'ti*」，同樣
地在《中阿含・112 經》也有完整的句子：「若汝從如來聞大人根智分別者，必得上信如來而懷歡
喜。」(大正 1，601a15～16)，另一單譯經《阿耨風經》的對應經文與《中阿含・174 經》更爲類
似：「汝阿難，當從如來聽，分別大人根相當增上，於如來有信樂意歡喜生。」(大正 1，854b7～
9)。

kammavibhaṅgaṃ vibhajantassa, tatra vo, Ānanda, tathāgate cittaṃ bhiyyosomat-

tāya pasīdeyya pāmojjaṃ labheyya」。

十五、《中阿含・174 經・受法經》，非種

　　接著是《中阿含・174 經・受法經》的例子，依漢譯經文來澄清巴利經文的句意。此經敘述沉溺於感官欲樂的危險有如沙羅樹逐漸被蔓藤爬滿(而枯死)，這個譬喻的巴利版敘述起初當蔓藤的種子落在沙羅樹旁時，住在沙羅樹的樹神十分憂慮，他的朋友安慰他說種子會被一些動物吃掉、帶走、或者此種子可能成為「非種

abījaṃ vā pan' assa」[66]，「非種」的意思並不清楚，在《中阿含》可以幫忙解釋這個意涵，漢譯《中阿含・174 經》的相當字句是「敗壞不成種子」。

(10)《中阿含・174 經》：「或敗壞不成種子。」[67]

十六、《中阿含・190 經・小空經》，無想心定

　　在《中阿含・190 經・小空經》中，世尊解說一系列的禪修經驗以導入殊勝的空觀，在此過程中經文提及「無想心定」，並說此修習為基於「知」此禪定的本質。[68]

(11)《中阿含・190 經》：「當數念一無想心定。彼如是知，…然有不空，唯一無想心定。」[69]

---

[66] [62]《中部・45 經》 (MN I 306，12)。

[67] [63]《中阿含・174 經》(大正 1，711c21)。

[68] 無著法師解釋此「無想心定」的本質(the nature of this attainment) 為「無量識處想空，無所有處想空，但是有一不空，無想心定不空」。

[69] [64]《中阿含・190 經》(大正 1，737c2～4)。

　　不過，此段經文在 巴利與藏譯的對應經典爲「無相心定 *animittaṃ*

cetosamādhiṃ」[70]，或是「無相界 *mtshan ma med pa dbyings*」[71]，這樣的解讀比較

適合本經文。

　　「無想」這兩字有時不恰當地出現在一些經文裡，這似乎是一再發生的議題。

如《中阿含‧211 經‧大拘絺羅經》「有二因二緣生無想定」，「unconcious

concentration 無想定」[72] 在 巴利與藏譯的對應經文爲「signless concentration 無相定」

[73]，這個例子得到《大乘成業論 *Karmasiddhi-prakaraṇa*》引用同一經典的支持，此

處翻譯的也是作「無相」[74]。

在其他漢譯經典中，可以發現相當數量的經文顯示「相」與「想」字常混淆在一起

[75]，所以正確的「相」字或「想」字必須基於經文去建立。「相」字和「想」字很容

---

[70] [65]《中部‧121 經》 (MN III 107，29)。

[71] [66] Skilling (1994：172，5)。

[72] [67]《中部‧136 經》(MN III 209，12) ，《中阿含‧211 經》：「尊者大拘絺羅答曰：『有二因二
緣生無想定。云何為二？一者不念一切[1]想。二者念無想界。是謂二因二緣生無想定。」(大正
1，792b12～15)可注意的是[1]《聖本》「想」字作「相」字。

[73] [68]《中部‧43 經》(MN I 296，32) 。

[74] [69]《大乘成業論》：「如《摩訶俱瑟祉羅契經》中依滅盡定作如是問：『幾因幾緣為依能入無相
界定？』答言：『具壽，二因二緣為依能入無相界定。謂不思惟一切相，及正思惟無相界。」(大正
31，784b16～20) 《中阿含‧211 經》經名爲《大拘絺羅經》正是引文所指之《摩訶俱瑟祉羅契
經》。

[75] [70] Choong (1999：116，note 220) 指出《雜阿含‧272 經》：「住無相三昧」(大正 2，72a26～
27) ，在巴利《相應部尼柯耶》對應經文「無相」爲 *animitta* (《相應部‧22:80 經》 (SN III 93，
23) ，但是《明藏本》作「無想」。相反的例子是《中阿含‧146 經》「然不受想」(大正 1，657c3
～4)作爲描述「守護諸根」的一部份，在巴利《中部‧27 經》對應經文「想」字爲 *nimitta* (《中
部‧27 經》 (MN I 180，27)) ，但是《正倉院聖語藏本》(《聖》本)作「相」字。另外一個相關的
例子是《中阿含‧187 經》「然不受相。…。然不受相。」(大正 1，733c19～22)兩個「相」字《明
藏本》都作「想」字，《宋藏本》與《元藏本》只在第一個「相」作「想」字。同樣地，《中阿
含‧169 經》「無義相應」(大正 1，701c1) ，《大德寺本》「相」字作「想」字，如此則則意味著
「相應」譯自(～ *sa□* + √*yuj*) 或 (*sa□* + √*bandh*) 而失去意義。《中阿含‧34 經》：「因此起貢高
者，都無是相。…都無是相。」(大正 1，475b8～16)，在同一經中卻作「想」字，「以此起貢高
者，都無是想。」(大正 1，475b2) ，似乎是「相」字和「想」字混淆的例子。另一個例子是《十支
居士八城人經》：「度一切色相，至有想無想處正受住。」(大正 1，916c8)，《宋》、《元》、
《明》藏本的『想』字似乎比較適合經文。另外的例子是《增壹阿含 ‧24.8 經》，在談及第四無色
定時作「有想無相處」(大正 2， 629b1) ，《聖》本作「有想無想處」，後面的經文也確認《聖》
本的讀法爲正確，如「有想無想處。…有想無想處…有想無想處。」(大正 2，629b3～25)；另一例

易在翻譯中發生混淆，不僅是因為兩者在書寫時非常相似，只差一個「心」的部首，而且在早期的中古漢語的發音也十分近似，直到現代中文也是如此[76]。由於「無相」與「無想」兩者有相關的意義[77]，因此，兩字誤用的錯誤在後來的字辭的校對也難被查核出來。印順導師在《空之探究》建議：「無想定是無相心定的異譯」[78]，上述的發現與此見解吻合。

十七、《中阿含‧192 經‧加樓烏陀夷經》，雨夜乞食

在《中阿含‧192 經‧加樓烏陀夷經》中，有一個協助解讀巴利經文的例子，漢巴經文提到有一比丘於雨夜乞食，有一婦女在閃電光中突然見到正在乞食的比丘，以為見鬼而恐怖驚嚇。依據巴利《中部‧66 經》，這位受到驚嚇的婦女此時說了一句難解的話：「 *bhikkhussa ātu māri, bhikkhussa mātu māri* 比丘的父母已死」[79]在巴利經文中，此句話不是清晰易解。

依據註釋書，此文的含意是：如果此比丘的父母還在世，他就不用在晚上出來找食物[80]。這樣的解釋似乎不適合此段經文，因為在古印度一般慣例，佛教出家與外道出家都是乞食為生，因此在古印度應該不會有婦女認為出家人應依父母飲食，而非乞食。

子為《梵摩渝經》：「以空不願無想之定」(大正 1，884b17～18)，《宋》、《元》、《明》藏本的『無相之定』為較合適。但是，如《般泥洹經》：「以受不念眾想之定。」(大正 1，180a15)，在 Waldschmidt (1950：18) 的梵文殘卷 (S 360 folio 171 V4) 和 Waldschmidt (1951：195，1) 的藏譯版相對經文卻是「不念一切相」(梵文 *sarvanimi(ttānām amanasikārād*) 和藏文 *mtshan ma thams cad yid la mi bya bar*)。「不念一切相 *sabbanimittānam amanasikārā*」也出現在 《長部尼柯耶‧16 經》(DN II 100，16)，經中不是很明確地敘說世尊用以克服他的病痛。 相對應地在《根本說一切有部毘奈耶雜事》有類似的說法：「應以無相三昧觀察自身令苦停息」(大正 24，387a22)。

[76] [71] 參考 Pulleyblank (1991：337 and 338) 或 Unger (1989：89)。

[77] 印順導師《空之探究》p.30：「無想（無相心）定與非想非非想處定、無想定、滅盡定，有著複雜的關係。」

[78] [72]印順導師《空之探究》p.61～62 ：「《中部》與此經相當的，是《有明大經》，無想定是無相心定的異譯。所說的無相，有二方面：一是不作意一切相的無相，一是超越一切相的無相界──涅槃。」

[79] [73]《中部‧66 經》(MN I 449，1): (Be-MN II 112 讀作 *mārī*) 。 Trenckner (1993：567) 評論說：「此句經文的意涵無可置疑的是這個婦女說了一句俚語。」 Ñā□amoli 在《中部尼柯耶英譯》(2005：552) 譯為「父母已死的比丘」，菩提比丘在同一書中的註解 672 解釋說：「這段經文似乎是非常口語化的巴利語。」

[80] [74] Ps III 165。

《中阿含・192 經》可以協助解讀此句巴利經文，《中阿含・192 經》的對應經文為此婦女受到驚嚇十分憤怒，而詛咒此比丘的父母早死、宗族斷絕。

(12)《中阿含・192 經》：「令此沙門父母早死，令此沙門種族絕滅。」[81]

如此，《中阿含・192 經》澄清了有關這個比丘父母死亡的文句，其實是來自這個驚嚇而憤怒的婦女的詛咒，比巴利註釋書的解說更合適。

十八、《中阿含・194 經・跋陀和利經》，不瞋恚憎嫉

另一個與比丘行為有關的例子是《中阿含經・194 經・跋陀和利經》，經中談到有比丘因不當行為而見疑時的反應。依據經文，有一類比丘會發怒，而說他將依照僧團的願望行事；另一類比丘則不會發怒，也不說他將依照僧團的願望行事。

(13)《中阿含・194 經》：「瞋恚憎嫉，發怒廣惡…作如是說，我今當作令眾歡喜而可意」[82]
「不瞋恚憎嫉。發怒廣惡…不如是說，我今當作令眾歡喜而可意」[83]

巴利經文的敘說與此不同，發怒的那一類比丘不說他將依照僧團的願望行事；不發怒的另一類比丘則說他將依照僧團的願望行事[84]。事實上這樣也較符合一人的預料。所以這個例子也是和第二章的引文第一例一樣，是誤解「連音 *sandhi*」而混淆了肯定句與否定句。

十九、《中阿含・211 經・大拘絺羅經》，身行止息

接下來的例子是《中阿含・211 經・大拘絺羅經》，經文解釋當入滅盡定時，先滅身行，次滅口行，最後滅意行。要了解這個解說，需要知道在此經之前的經典已說明身行代表出入息，口行代表尋與伺，意行代表想與受。

---

[81] [75]《中阿含・192 經》(大正 1，741b16～17)。

[82] [76]《中阿含・ 194 經》(大正 1，748b28～c1)。

[83] [77]《中阿含・194 經》(大正 1，748c12～14)。

[84] [78]《中部・65 經》(MN I 442，31 及 MN I 443，10)。

(14)《中阿含・211 經》：「比丘入滅盡定時，先滅身行，次滅口行，後滅意行。」
[85]

不過，依據《中部・44 經・有明小經 *Cūḷavedalla-sutta*》先滅的是口行(尋與伺)，其次是身行(入息與出息)，最後是意行(想與受) [86]。

雖然出滅盡定時顯然應該是依照相反的次序，兩者描述的次序也不同。在巴利經文口行最後升起，在《中阿含》最後升起的是身行。關於身口意三行止息的次序，似乎，當依序由四禪入滅盡定時，尋與伺(口行)止息而進入二禪，出入息(身行)則只有在進入四禪時止息[87]。[88] 這個次序與《中部・44 經・有明小經 *Cūḷavedalla-sutta*》敘述的相同，也得到《雜阿含》與其《相應部尼柯耶》的對應經典的支持，依據此兩部經，入滅盡定時尋與伺的口行先止息[89]。此外，《阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論》也與《中部・44 經》相同[90]。如此，《中阿含》的此段經文可能比較不合適，我們可以容易地設想到這樣的傳譯訛誤是怎麼在口誦傳承中發生的，早期經典反覆重複著典型的「身口意」次序很容易影響傳誦者的記憶，傳誦者在背誦經文時很可能誦出他們習慣的次序，而未能察覺在此經文正確的順序是「口身意」。

二十、《中阿含・213 經・法莊嚴經》，護他妻食如鹿

《中阿含・213 經・法莊嚴經》描述「佛教比丘無爲無求，盡形壽修行梵行」之後，接著說「護他妻食如鹿」。

(15)《中阿含・213 經》：「無為無求，護他妻食如鹿，自盡形壽修行梵行。」[91]

---

[85] [79]《中阿含・211 經》(大正 1，792a8～10)，在無著法師《中部尼柯耶比較研究》(2007) 也提及在漢巴對應經典中主角扮演不同的角色。

[86] [80]《中部・44 經》 (MN I 320，4) ，關於出「滅盡定」次第的解釋，檢驗這些解釋遭遇的困難以及各佛教部派如何嘗試去解決此問題，參考 Griffith (1991)。

[87] [81]《長部・33 經》(DN III 270，18)與《增支部・10：20 經》(AN V 31，25)提及四禪時身行止息，而依據《相應部・36：11 經》 (SN IV 217，18) 四禪時所有呼吸止息。

[88] 《雜阿含・474 經》：「初禪正受時，言語止息。二禪正受時，覺觀止息。三禪正受時，喜心止息。四禪正受時，出入息止息。」(大正 2，121b10～12)。

[89] [82] 《雜阿含經》：「入滅正受者先滅口行，次身行，次意」(大正 2，150b20～21) 及《相應部・41：6 經》 (SN IV 294，8)。

[90] [83]《阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論》：「入滅定時先滅語行，次身行，後意行」(大正 27，780c25～26)。

[91] [84]《中阿含 213 經》(大正 1，796b2～4)《聖》本讀「鹿」字爲「麄」字。

24

如經文所顯現的，確實難以了解。依據《中部‧89 經》的對應經文為「依賴他人(布施為生)、心(自由)如鹿 *paradavutta migabhūtena cetasā*」[92]，如此則建議《中阿含》版本可能把「*parada*」誤為「*paradāra* 他人的妻子」，把「*vutta*」誤為「*vṛta,* 阻止、檢查以阻止、抑制」，或者繕寫者誤把「獲」抄寫成「護」。即使翻譯者誤解「*paradavutta*」， 也許透過註釋書他們仍然知道此句含有與「依賴他人」有關的意思，因此嘗試以「他人妻子的食物」來帶出這個意思。我們可以理解翻譯者所遭遇的困境，因為「*paradavutta*」的含意相當晦澀，而且註釋書將此解釋為「依賴他人」[93]，巴利聖典協會(PTS)的《巴英字典》解釋此字為「因已準備而欣喜」，然後又解說此字意指「敏捷的、勤奮積極的、機敏警覺的」[94]。另一段在《根本說一切有部毘奈耶雜事》得對應經文「常懷兢懼如鹿依林」也是完全不清楚[95]。

二十一、《中阿含‧214 經‧韗訶提經》，智慧沙門

我要舉的最後一個例子是《中阿含‧214 經‧韗訶提經》，經文敘述波斯匿王問阿難是否佛陀會有遭受其他沙門、婆羅門譴責的身行，阿難回答，佛陀不會有遭受「智慧」沙門、婆羅門譴責的身行。

(16)《中阿含‧214 經》：「如來不行如是身行，謂是身行為沙門、梵志聰明智慧及餘世間所憎惡也」[96]

---

[92] [85]《中部‧89 經》 (MN II 121，21)。

[93] [86] Ps III 166: *'paradavuttā'ti parehi dinnavuttino*。

[94] [87] Rhys Davids (1993：420 s.v. *parada*) ，有關此字解釋上的困難，參考 Horner (1975：259) note 2。

[95] [88]《根本說一切有部毘奈耶雜事》：「常懷兢懼如鹿依林」(大正 24，237c29～238a1)。

[96] [89]《中阿含‧214 經》(大正 1，796b2～4)。

此處「智慧」沙門、婆羅門的特性很重要，因爲愚蠢的人也會責罵聖人。如此，阿難似乎要區別「智慧沙門、婆羅門的合理譴責」與「世俗沙門、婆羅門有時對佛陀不如理的批評」。漢巴經文都可讀到「智慧」這個特性十分合適，所以兩者均記載波斯匿王對阿難回答的激賞。事實上，在巴利經文波斯匿王宣稱「在他問題所無法完成的，阿難在回答中完成了。 *yaṃ hi mayaṃ … nāsakkhimha pañhena paripūretuṃ, taṃ … āyasmatā Ānandena pañhassa veyyākaraṇena paripūrita*」[97]。

　　不過，在閱讀這部經文的 PTS 版本時，這句子有一點令人困惑，因爲發問時波斯匿王已經用了「智慧」沙門、婆羅門了，(因此沒有理由激賞阿難以「智慧」沙門、婆羅門回答。) 進一步檢視不同巴利版本，發現雖然暹羅版與 PTS 版相同[98]，但是緬甸版與錫蘭版在波斯匿王問話時並未用「智慧」發問[99]。如此，《中阿含・213 經・法莊嚴經》也提供一個參考去判斷那一巴利版本的讀法教合適。

二十二、結語

　　作爲《中阿含比較研究摘要》的結語，我建議依以上所列舉的例子，足以顯示將漢巴經典並列對讀，我們的研究可以從中獲益良多。如此，就如狄鍾 de Jong (1968:15) 的敘述：「沒有任何佛教學生能忽視如此龐大的中文翻譯資料，即使是他只對印度佛教有興趣。」我想增加一句：「沒有任何研究中國佛教的學生能忽視印度語系的對應經典」，以避免基於口誦傳承訛誤或翻譯錯謬的經典作結論的風險。

縮寫：

(中文經典引文依照《大正藏》編號，巴利經典引文依照《PTS》版本編號，第一個數目字表示經號，然後依卷數，頁次及行次標示。如爲藏文經典，引文則依 Derge 版與/或北京版標示。).

AN　　*Aṅguttara-nikāya*

B^e　　Burmese edition

---

[97] [90] 《中部・88 經》 (MN II 114，7)。

[98] [91] PTS-M II 113，33 與 S^e-M II 500 讀爲「 *sama☐ehi brāhmanehi viññūhi*」。

[99] [92] B^e-M II 315 與 C^e-M II 542 僅讀爲「*samaṇehi brāhmanehi*」。

C^e	Ceylonese edition
DĀ	*Dīrgha-āgama* (at T 1)
DĀ²	*Dīrgha-āgama* (preserved in Sanskrit fragments)
D	Derge edition
DN	*Dīgha-nikāya*
EĀ	*Ekottarika-āgama* (at T 125)
MĀ	*Madhyama-āgama* (at T 26)
MN	*Majjhima-nikāya*
Ps	*Papañcasūdanī*
Q	Peking edition
SĀ	*Saṃyukta-āgama* (at T 99)
SĀ²	'other' *Saṃyukta-āgama* (at T 100)
SHT III	see Waldschmidt 1971
SHT IX	see Bechert 2004
S^e	Siamese edition
SN	*Saṃyutta-nikāya*
SN²	*Sagāthavagga* of the *Saṃyutta-nikāya*, new PTS edition by Somaratne (1998)
Spk-pṭ	*Sāratthappakāsinī-purāṇaṭīkā* (subcommentary on S)
T	Taishō
Vibh	*Vibhaṅga*
Vin	*Vinaya*

【原著參考書目】

Akanuma, Chizen 1990 (1929): *The Comparative Catalogue of Chinese Āgamas & Pāli Nikāyas*, Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.

Anālayo 2005: "Some Pāli Discourses in the Light of Their Chinese Parallels", in *Buddhist Studies Review*, vol. 22 no.1 pp. 1-14, and vol. 22 no. 2 pp. 93-105.

Anālayo 2006: "The Ekottarika-āgama Parallel to the Saccavibhaṅga-sutta", in *Buddhist Studies Review*, vol. 23 no. 2.

Anālayo 2007: "Who said it? Authorship Disagreements between Pāli and Chinese Discourses", in *Indica et Tibetica 65, Festschrift für Michael Hahn zum 65. Geburtstag von Freunden und Schülern überreicht*, J. U. Hartmann et al. (ed.), Wien, pp. 1-14.

Bagchi, Prabodh Chandra 1927: *Le Canon Bouddhique en Chine*, Paris: Geuthner, vol. 1.

Bapat, P.V. 1948: "The Śrāma□yaphala-Sūtra and its different versions in Buddhist Literature", in *Indian Culture*, vol. 15 pp. 107-114.

Bapat, P.V. 1969: "Chinese Madhyamāgama and the Language of its Basic Text", in *Dr. Satkari Mookerji Felicitation Volume*, B.P. Sinha (ed.), Varanasi: Chowkhamba Publications, pp. 1-6.

Bechert, Heinz 1991: "Methodological considerations concerning the language of the earliest Buddhist tradition", in *Buddhist Studies Review* vol. 8 pp. 3-19.

Bechert, Heinz (ed.) 1995: *When did the Buddha live?*, Delhi: Sri Satguru.

Bechert, Heinz (ed.) 2004: *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden. Teil 9: Die Katalognummern 2000-3199* (beschrieben von Klaus Wille), Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

Choong, Mun-keat 1999: *The Notion of Emptiness in Early Buddhism*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

de Jong, J.W. 1968: *Buddha's Word in China, 28th George Ernest Morrison Lecture*, Canberra: Australian National University.

Enomoto, Fumio 1984: "The Formation and Development of the Sarvāstivāda Scriptures", in *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Congress of Human Sciences in Asia and North Africa*, T.Yamamoto (ed.), Tokyo: Tōhō Gakkai, pp. 197-198.

Enomoto, Fumio 1986: "On the Formation of the Original Texts of the Chinese Āgamas", in *Buddhist Studies Review*, vol. 3 pp. 19-30.

Feer, Léon 1888: " Études Bouddhiques. Nā□aputta et le Niga□□has", in *Journal Asiatique*, ser. 8 vol. 12 pp. 209-252.

Glass, Andrew 2006: *Connected Discourses in Gandhāra: A Study, Edition, and Translation of Four Sa□yuktāgama-Type Sūtras from the Senior Collection*, PhD dissertation, University of Washington, published at http://www.andrewglass.org/phd.php (accessed on 04-08-2006).

Gnoli, Raniero 1978: *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Sa□ghabhedavastu*, vol. 2, (*Serie Orientale Roma, vol. 49*), Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.

Griffith, Paul J. 1991 (1986): *On Being Mindless: Buddhist Meditation and the Mind-Body Problem*, Illinois, La Salle: Open Court.

Hartmann, Jens-Uwe 2000: "Zu einer Neuen Handschrift des Dīrghāgama," in *Vividharatnakarandaka: Festgabe für Adelheid Mette*, Chojnacki et al (ed.), Swisttal-Odendorf, pp. 359-367.

Hartmann, Jens-Uwe 2004: "Contents and Structure of the Dīrghāgama of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins" in *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology*, Tokyo: Soka University, vol. 7 pp. 119-137.

Hirakawa, Akira 1978: *Index to the Abhidharmakośabhā□ya*, Tokyo: Daizo Shuppan Kabushikikaisha, vol. 3.

Hirakawa, Akira 1997: *Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Dictionary*, Tokyo: Reiyukai.

Horner, I.B. 1967: *The Collection of the Middle Length Sayings*, London: Pali Text Society, vol. 1.

Horner, I.B. 1975: *The Book of the Discipline*, London: Pali Text Society, vol. 5.

Horner, I.B. 1990 (1930): *Women under Primitive Buddhism*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Hultzsch, E. 1925: *Inscriptions of Asoka*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Karashima, Seishi 1992: *The Textual Study of the Chinese Versions of the Saddharmapu□□arīkasūtra*, Tokyo: Sankibo Press.

Kudo, Noriyuki 2004: *The Karmavibha□ga*, Tokyo: Soka University.

Lamotte, Étienne 1967: "Un Sūtra Composite del'Ekottarāgama", in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Oxford, vol. 30 pp. 105-116.

Lancaster, Lewis R. 1979: "Buddhist Literature: Its Canons, Scribes, and Editors" in *The Critical Study of Sacred Texts*, W.D. O'Flaherty (ed.), Berkeley, pp. 215-229.

Lévi, Sylvain 1896: "Notes sur des Inscriptions de Piyadassi - Le Lāghulovāda de l'Edit de Bhabra", in *Journal Asiatique* ser. 9 vol. 8 pp. 475-485.

Lü, Cheng 1963: "Āgama", in *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, Ceylon, vol. 1 pp. 241-244.

Macqueen, Graeme 1988: *A Study of the Śrāma□yaphala-Sūtra*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

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

Meisig, Konrad 1987: *Das Śrāma□yaphala-Sūtra: Synoptische Übersetzung und Glossar der Chinesischen Fassungen Verglichen mit dem Sanskrit und Pāli*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Mette, Adelheid 1995: "The Synchronism of the Buddha and the Jina Mahāvīra and the Problem of Chronology in Early Jainism", in *When did the Buddha Live?*, H. Bechert (ed.), Delhi: Sri Satguru, pp. 179-183.

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

Mittal, Kusum 1957: *Dogmatische Begriffsreihen im Älteren Buddhismus I; Fragmente des Daśottarasūtra*; (*Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden*), Berlin: Akademie Verlag, vol. 4.

Monier-Williams, M. 1999 (1899): *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Ñā□amoli, Bhikkhu 2005 (1995): *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha*, Boston: Wisdom.

Norman, K.R. 1989: "The Pāli language and scriptures", in *The Buddhist Heritage*, Skorupski (ed.), pp. 29-53.

Norman, K. R. 1992: "The Value of the Pāli Tradition", in *Collected Papers*, Norman, Oxford: PTS, vol. 3 pp. 33-44.

Pradhan, P. 1967: *Abhidharmakośabhā□ya*, (*Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 8*), Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.

Prasad, Chandra Shekhar 1985: "Some Reflections on the Relation between the Āgamas and the Nikāyas", in *Proceedings and Papers of the Second Conference of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, Nalanda pp. 131-140.

Pruden, Leo M. 1988b: *Abhidharmakośabhā□yam*, Berkeley: Asian Humanity Press, vol. 2.

Pulleyblank, Edwin G. 1991: *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese and Early Mandarin*, Vancouver: UBC Press.

Rhys Davids, T.W. 1993 (1921-25): *Pāli-English Dictionary*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Shukla, Karunesha 1973: *Śrāvakabhūmi of Ācārya Asa□ga*, Patna: Jayaswal Research Institute.

Skilling, Peter 1994: *Mahāsūtras: Great Discourses of the Buddha*, Oxford: PTS, vol. 1.

Trenckner, V. 1993 (1888): *The Majjhima Nikāya*, Oxford: PTS.

Unger, Ulrich 1989: *Glossar des Klassischen Chinesisch*, Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.

von Hinüber, Oskar 1982: "Upāli's Verses in the Majjhimanikāya and the Madhyamāgama", in *Indological and Buddhist Studies*, Canberra, pp. 243-251.

von Hinüber, Oskar 1993: "From Colloquial to Standard Language. The Oral Phase in the Development of Pāli", in *Premier Colloque Étienne Lamotte*, Louvain-la-Neuve, pp. 101-113.

Wagle, Narenda 1985: "The Gods in Early Buddhism in Relation to Human Society" in *New Paths in Buddhist Research*, A.K. Warder (ed.), Durham, pp. 57-80.

Waldschmidt, Ernst 1950/vol. 1, 1951/vol. 2: *Das Mahāparinirvā□asūtra*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Waldschmidt, Ernst 1956: *Das Mahāvadānasutra, ein Kanonischer Text über die sieben letzten Buddhas,* Berlin: Akademie Verlag, vol. 2.

Waldschmidt, Ernst (ed.) 1971: *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden. Teil 3: Katalognummern 802-1014* (unter Mitarbeit von Walter Clawitter und Lore Sander-Holzmann), Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

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

Yìn-shùn 1983 (1962): 《原始佛教聖典之集成》 [The Compilation of the Early Buddhist Canon], Taipei: 正聞出版社.

Yìn-shùn 1986 (1985): 《空之探究》 [Exploration of Emptiness], Taipei: 正聞出版社.

譯者參考書目

中華電子佛典協會 CBETA，(2006)，＜大正新脩大藏經＞，CD，台北市，中華電子佛典協會 CBETA。

佛光山宗務委員會，(1983)，＜阿含藏＞，＜佛光大藏經＞，台北市，佛光出版社。

印順文教基金會，(2006)，＜印順法師佛學著作集＞，CD，新竹市，福嚴精舍。

作者簡介

本文作者 Ven. Anālayo無著法師出家於上座部佛教，西元2000年於錫蘭Peradeniya 培羅迪釀大學修得巴利與佛教研究博士學位，博士論文結集爲《四念處---趨向解脫的直捷道路》一書，由英國Windhorse風馬出版社與錫蘭BPS佛教出版社於 2003年出版。此外，無著比丘爲《佛教百科全書》的撰稿人之一，並且在其他學術刊物發表文章。目前正在從事的主要專案爲《A Comparative Study of Majjhima Nikāya 中部尼柯耶比對研究》，這是德國Marburg University馬堡大學與北美印順導師文教基金會的合作專案。由澳洲教授 Rod Bucknell 與無著法師合作的 《Correspondence Table for Parallels to the Discourses of the Majjhima Nikāya: Toward a Revision of Akanuma's Comparative Catalogue，中部尼柯耶相應經典對照表：邁向赤沼智善漢巴四部互照錄的修訂版》也已完成。另外，如要查詢對應經典，可以在網站上查詢無著法師參與的 http://www.suttacentral.net/。無著法師也參與中文佛教辭典計畫，可以在網站上看到近況，http://www.buddhism-dict.net/creditśanalayo-list.html。無著法師同時也參與中華佛學研究所的「中阿含英譯計畫」，相關現況請參考 **http://sw.chibs.edu.tw/~mb/t26/index.html**。

Comparative Notes on the Madhyama-āgama

Anālayo 2006

Abstract:

The present paper offers a survey of some features of the *Madhyama-āgama*, based on a comparison with its extant parallels. After taking up matters related to the structure of the *Madhyama-āgama* collection, selected passages from *Madhyama-āgama* discourses will be examined in order to show the importance of placing the different versions of a discourse, preserved in Chinese and Pāli (and at times also in Sanskrit or Tibetan) side by side, in order to ascertain the implications of certain passages and to avoid being misled by transmission or translation errors.

According to the information that has come down to us, the *Madhyama-āgama* collection was translated towards the end of the fourth century into Chinese under the leadership of the Kashmirian monk Gautama Saṅghadeva. The translation was based on a written Indic original read aloud by Saṅgharakṣa, another Kashmirian monk, and was transcribed by the monk Dào-cí, 道慈, with the assistance of Lǐ-bǎo and Kāng-huà, 李寶 and 康化.[100] The Indian original used for this translation appears to have been in a Prākrit,[101] and with considerable probability stems from a Sarvāstivāda tradition.[102]

The *Madhyama-āgama* collection contains altogether two-hundred-and-twenty-two discourse, which are assigned to eighteen chapters. Each of these chapters contains a minimum of ten discourses, though a few chapters have considerably more. Its Pāli counterpart, the *Majjhima-nikāya*, contains one-hundred-fifty-two discourses in fifteen chapters, arranged into fourteen chapters with ten discourses each and one chapter with twelve discourses. Hence, in spite of some variations the principle of ten discourses per chapter could be an original characteristic of both collections, a grouping principle that is in fact recurrent in Buddhist literature.

---

[100] T I 809b26: 請罽賓沙門僧伽羅叉令誦胡本, 請僧 伽提和轉胡爲晉, 豫州沙門 道慈筆受, 吳國 李寶, 康化 共書 (with a 聖 variant reading for the last as 唐化).

[101] On the language of the *Madhyama-āgama* manuscript cf. Bapat 1969: 5; Enomoto 1986: 20 and von Hinüber 1982: 250.

[102] On the school affiliation of the *Madhyama-āgama* cf. Mayeda 1985: 98 and Minh Chau 1991: 27. Enomoto 1984: 198 explains that the *Madhyama-āgama* translated into Chinese probably represents the earliest of three versions of this collection, the second of the three being the version preserved in some of the Central Asian Sanskrit fragments and the third version being what is found in *sūtra* quotations in later works.

Regarding the chapter division in the two collections, four chapters in the *Madhyama-āgama* and the *Majjhima-nikāya* share the same headings and also have several discourses in common. These are the chapters on kings, on Brahmins, on expositions (*vibhaṅga*), and on pairs; chapters that occur, however, at different places in the two collections.[103] Two Chinese discourse from the chapter on kings; four Chinese discourses from the chapter on Brahmins and from the chapter on pairs; and nine Chinese discourses from the chapter on expositions have a parallel in their Pāli equivalent chapter.

Figure 1:

Discourse parallels in similarly entitled *Madhyama-āgama* and *Majjhima-nikāya* chapters

Chapters:	王相應品	梵志品	根本分別品	雙品
Discourses:	MĀ 63 / MN 81 MĀ 67 / MN 83	MĀ 150 / MN 96 MĀ 151 / MN 93 MĀ 152 / MN 99 MĀ 161 / MN 91	MĀ 162 / MN 140 MĀ 163 / MN 137 MĀ 164 / MN 138 MĀ 165 / MN 133 MĀ 166 / MN 134 MĀ 167 / MN 132 MĀ 169 / MN 139 MĀ 170 / MN 135 MĀ 171 / MN 136	MĀ 182 / MN 39 MĀ 183 / MN 40 MĀ 184 / MN 32 MĀ 185 / MN 31

During the progress of my research, it has been possible to update the identification of parallels between *Madhyama-āgama* and *Majjhima-nikāya* discourses noted in Akanuma 1990. I differ from Akanuma in regard to MĀ 28; MĀ 86; MĀ 106 and MĀ 168. Akanuma 1990: 171 lists MĀ 28 as a parallel to MN 143. But MĀ 28 agrees with SN 55.26 at SN V 380 as regards Sāriputta's instructions to Anāthapiṇḍika, and in having Anāthapiṇḍika recover, while in MN 143 he passes away and the instructions he receives are also different. Hence, MĀ 28 is better reckoned a parallel to SN 55.26. Akanuma 1990: 171 lists MĀ 86 as a parallel to MN 148. In MĀ 86, Ānanda asks the Buddha how to instruct a group of young

---

[103] The 6th chapter in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the chapter on sayings "connected with kings" (王相應品), has a counterpart in the 9th chapter in the *Majjhima-nikāya*, the *Rāja-vagga*. The 12th chapter in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the chapter on "Brahmins" (梵志品), has its counterpart in the *Brāhmaṇa-vagga*, the 10th chapter in the *Majjhima-nikāya*. The 13th chapter in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the chapter on "expositions" (根本分別品) has its counterpart in the *Vibhaṅga-vagga*, the 14th chapter in the *Majjhima-nikāya*. The 15th chapter in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the chapter on "pairs" (雙品), has a counterpart in the *Mahāyamaka-vagga*, the 4th chapter in the *Majjhima-nikāya*. Cf. also Yìn-shùn 1983: 707.

monks. The Buddha responds by discussing the five aggregates, the six senses, dependent origination, the four establishings of mindfulness, the four right efforts, the four ways to power and a whole range of other topics. In contrast, in MN 148 Ānanda does not occur at all and the topic of the discourse are only the six senses. Thus, MĀ 86 and MN 148 differ to such a degree that they cannot be reckoned parallels. Akanuma 1990: 169 lists MĀ 168 as a parallel to MN 120. Yet, closer examination shows that the two discourses differ considerably from each other, as MN 120 describes how a mental aspiration can lead to various rebirths, while MĀ 168 describes how jhāna practice leads to the Brahmā worlds. This makes it improbable that the two discourses stem from the same original and can be reckoned as proper 'parallels', as in spite of similarity of topic they seem to go back to different occasions. The same applies also to MĀ 106 (and T 56), which Akanuma 1990: 163 lists as parallels to MN 1. Closer inspection shows that whereas MN 1 discusses worldling, disciple in higher training, *arahant*, and *tathāgata*, MĀ 106 and T 56 discuss two types of recluses/Brahmins and the Buddha. They name a different location for the discourse and differ from MN 1 in not discussing *Nibbāna*, and in not concluding with the monks failing to delight in the exposition. In contrast, EĀ 44.6 agrees with MN 1 on the above points. Therefore, MĀ 106 and T 56 also do no seem to qualify for being parallels in the proper sense. Thus, I would conclude MĀ 28 and MĀ 86 are definitely not parallels to *Majjhima-nikāya* discourses; and in the case of MĀ 106 and MĀ 168 I have strong doubts if these should be reckoned as 'parallels'. In addition to the parallels recognized by Akanuma, MĀ 29 is a parallel to MN 9,[104] and MĀ 208 is a parallel to MN 79.

Thus, according to my reckoning ninety-five *Majjhima-nikāya* discourses have counterparts in the *Madhyama-āgama*, which, as two *Madhyama-āgama* discourses are counterparts to a single *Majjhima-nikāya* discourse,[105] count up to ninety-six discourses. These parallels are arranged in the two collections in rather different ways. This difference in arrangement can best be illustrated by placing the *Majjhima-nikāya* discourses in the order their parallels occupy in the *Madhyama-āgama*, as done in figure 2. Even a cursory glance at figure 2 shows the extent to which the arrangement of discourses differs in the two collections. These differences support the impression that the location of the discourses was the outcome of a process specific to each of the two collections, though the similarities exhibited in figure 1 could be the remnants of a common starting-point.[106]

---

[104] See Yin-shun 1983: 709.

[105] MĀ 107 and MĀ 108 are both parallels to MN 17.

[106] In a similar vein, in regard to the *Saṃyutta-nikāya* and *Saṃyukta-āgama* collections Glass 2006: 6 comes to the conclusion that while the "shared principle of arrangement is likely to be very old, important differences between the content and arrangement of the extant versions show that they followed separate

Figure 2:

Majjhima-nikāya discourses arranged in the sequence of their *Madhyama-āgama* parallels

MĀ chapters: MN discourses:

1st chapter	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24th	2nd					
2nd chapter	-	-	-	61st	-	-	-	-	101st	-					
3rd chapter	-	-	-	-	-	69th	97th	-	9th	28th	141st				
4th chapter	123rd	-	124th	-	-	-	-	-	-	-					
5th chapter	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6th chapter	-	-	-	-	81st	130th	-	-	83rd	-	-	-	-	113th	
7th chapter	128th	-	-	106th	-	68th	49th	127th	-	119th	-	-	-	113th	-
8th chapter	5th	3rd	15th	-	8th	-	7th	-	-	-					
9th chapter	-	10th	13th	14th	20th	19th	11th	-	6th	-					
10th chapter	17th	17th	-	-	-	-	-	-	18th	-					
11th chapter	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
11th chapter	-	50th	82nd	56th	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
12th chapter	-	-	107th	108th	27th	-	-	-	96th	93rd					
12th chapter	99th	75th	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	91st					
13th chapter	140th	137th	138th	133rd	134th	132nd	-	139th	135th	136th					
14th chapter	-	126th	45th	46th	-	-	25th	78th	142nd	115th					
15th chapter	39th	40th	32nd	31st	47th	112th	-	117th	121st	122nd					
16th chapter	66th	21st	65th	70th	104th	-	125th	129th	22nd	38th					
17th chapter	-	54th	26th	64th	16th	77th	79th	80th	44th	43rd					
18th chapter	90th	89th	88th	-	87th	52nd	-	-	-	63rd	-				

A structural similarity can be found in the cross-tradition relationship between the middle collections and the numerical collections. The percentage of *Aṅguttara-nikāya* parallels to *Madhyama-āgama* discourses is almost the same as the percentage of *Ekottarika-āgama* parallels to *Majjhima-nikāya* discourses.[107]

Another pattern of similarity can be found in relation to the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Dīrgha-āgama* collection, preserved in Sanskrit fragments, as the number of parallels to *Majjhima-nikāya* discourses found in this *Dīrgha-āgama* collection corresponds to the number of parallels to *Dīgha-nikāya* discourses found in the *Madhyama-āgama*, both being ten, as can be seen in figure 3 below.[108] In spite of this parallelism, a closer look at figure 3 shows that the actual order in which these parallels occur in both cases does not seem to follow a specific pattern, nor do these two sets of ten parallels appear to be related to each other.

---

developments". Norman 1992: 40 explains that "the sects ... had the same names for the groups of texts, but were not ... in general agreement about their contents, or the order of the contents".

[107] A survey of the parallels noted by Akanuma 1990: 7-25 suggests that about 37% of the discourses in the *Madhyama-āgama* collection have a parallel in the *Aṅguttara-nikāya*; while about 35% of the dis courses found in the *Majjhima-nikāya* have a partial or full parallel in the *Ekottarika-āgama* (the second figure is based on my own research into *Majjhima-nikāya* parallels).

[108] Of these ten *Dīrgha-āgama* discourses, eight do not appear to have a parallel in any of the four Chinese *Āgamas*. Only DĀ² 11 has an *Āgama* parallel, which is EĀ 31.1; while DĀ² 12 has a parallel in an individual translation outside of the *Āgamas*, T 757.

Figure 3: [109]

Parallels to DN discourses found in MĀ and parallels to DĀ^2 discourses found in MN

To sum up, the

Dīgha-nikāya	Madhyama-āgama
DN 15	MĀ 97
DN 17	MĀ 68
DN 21	MĀ 134
DN 22	MĀ 98
DN 23	MĀ 71
DN 25	MĀ 104
DN 26	MĀ 70
DN 27	MĀ 154
DN 30	MĀ 59
DN 31	MĀ 135

Skt. Dīrgha-āgama	Majjhima-nikāya
DĀ^2 7	MN 60[110]
DĀ^2 10	MN 105
DĀ^2 11	MN 4
DĀ^2 12	MN 12
DĀ^2 17	MN 102
DĀ^2 19	MN 95
DĀ^2 20	MN 36
DĀ^2 21	MN 85
DĀ^2 22	MN 100
DĀ^2 43	MN 55

patterns of similarity that can be discerned are:

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

$$MĀ \Leftrightarrow AN \approx MN \Leftrightarrow EĀ$$

2) The number of Madhyama-āgama parallels in the Dīgha-nikāya is the same as the number of Majjhima-nikāya parallels in the Sanskrit Dīrgha-āgama collection.

$$MĀ \Leftrightarrow DN = MN \Leftrightarrow DĀ^2$$

While it cannot be excluded that such similarities are a product of chance, they are striking enough and one would not expect to come across such similarities unless the basic four-fold division into four *Nikāyas* or *Āgamas* stems from a common source.[111]

The supposition that the *Madhyama-āgama* and the *Majjhima-nikāya* stem from a common starting point is also a prominent impression to be gained when individual discourses in these two collections are compared to each other. It is quite amazing to find that the version of a discourse recited and written down perhaps four centuries after the

---

[109] The second part of this table has been adopted from Hartmann 2004: 126-127.

[110] Hartmann 2000: 365 note 20 indicates that this identification still needs to be corroborated.

[111] While Bechert 1991: 9 believes that "the compilations available to us hardly go back to any 'Ur-Āgamas', but originated as the result of local applications of the same principles of organisation", suggesting that the similarities among the extant collections then "lead to the erroneous assumption that there might have been an original form of the corpus as a whole"; Norman 1989: 33 suggests that "probably ... from the earliest period of Buddhism the collection of sermons was made on the basis" of these four basic groups, which "was probably the beginning of the system of *bhāṇakas* (`reciters'), who shared out the recitation of the various sections of the Buddha's teaching among themselves". Prasad 1985: 137 comments on the arrangement of discourses in the canons of various schools that "the criteria for such distribution were clear but the discourses are by nature such that they satisfy more than a single criteria. In [the] course of time the position of those discourses ... changed in different schools".

Buddha's passing away by Sri Lankan monks can be so closely similar,[112] even in small circumstantial details, to a discourse handed down by a different Buddhist school and translated another four centuries later into Chinese. At times, such similarities even involve sharing the same mistakes. Yet, at the same time there are undeniably quite a number of differences and variations, as is only to be expected of orally transmitted material.

Another striking impression that can be gained from a comparative study of the *Madhyama-āgama* is the relatively high quality of its translation. Though this translation still falls into the early phase of translation activity in China, on reading this collection one gets the strong impression that the team around Saṅghadeva knew what they were doing and endeavoured to render the Indic text at their disposal to the best of their abilities. Thus, the *Madhyama-āgama* collection is certainly a good instance to corroborate the statement made Lancaster (1979: 224) that "in the Chinese canon we have an invaluable source of evidence ... with some assurance that those translators knew their craft and practiced it with vigour and accuracy". Thus, as de Jong (1968: 15) points out, "no student of Buddhism, even if he is interested only in Indian Buddhism, can neglect the enormous corpus of Chinese translations".

Nevertheless, translation errors inevitably occurred, and a description of what appear to be such errors, together with what may be transmission errors that affected either the Chinese version or its Pāli parallel, will be the theme of the remainder of my presentation.

The first example I would like to take up stems from the 羅云經, the 14th discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama*. This discourse records an instruction given by the Buddha to his son. As part of this instruction, the Buddha tells his son that he should refrain from a bodily action that is "pure" [113] and at the same time unwholesome and results in affliction; whereas a bodily action that is "not pure" but at the same time is wholesome and does not result in suffering can be undertaken.

1)「彼身業淨。或自爲。或爲他。不善與苦果受於苦報」[114]
　「彼身業不淨。或自爲。或爲他。善與樂果受於樂報」[115]

This presentation is surprising, since to qualify an action as wholesome and at the same

---

[112] Regarding the date of the Buddha's passing away, the research collected in Bechert 1995 suggests a reasonable date to be approximately 400 B.C. (allowing a latitude of +/- twenty years).

[113] Lévi 1896: 480 renders 淨 in the present context as "pur".

[114] MĀ 14 at T I 436c11.

[115] MĀ 14 at T I 436c14.

time as impure seems contradictory. Minh Chau (1991: 34 and 132) suggests that the character 淨 in this context could refer to actions that are "permissible" according to the monastic code of discipline but have unwholesome results, as opposed to actions that are not permissible but that have wholesome results. He then concludes that this instruction allows a more liberal attitude towards the interpretation of monastic regulations. Minh Chau's reasonable attempt to make sense out of this passage by assuming that 淨 may have a meaning different from its more usual meaning of "purity" receives support from the Chinese-Sanskrit dictionary compiled by Hirakawa (1997: 728), who in addition to *śuddha, śuddhi, pariśuddhi, viśuddhi, pariśodhayati, śubha, vyavadāna, prasanna, vimala* also lists *kalpika*, "proper", and *kalpa*, "proper, practicable, feasible, possible", as equivalents for 淨. A problem with Minh Chau's interpretation, however, is that according to the instruction for a past bodily action in the 羅云經 a "permissible" (淨) bodily deed should be confessed, while a "not permissible" (不淨) bodily deed leads to the arising of joy.[116] This statement makes no sense, since for a "permissible" bodily deed there would be no need for confession. In fact, the idea to give precedence to other's welfare over the requirements of moral conduct belongs to a later phase of Buddhist thought and does not yet seem to be found in the early discourses.

The 羅云經 of the *Madhyama-āgama* has a parallel in the *Ambala☐☐hikārāhulovāda-sutta* of the *Majjhima-nikāya*. The corresponding passage in the Pāli version reads differently, since it does not envisage that a bodily action could be pure and unwholesome at the same time, but simply classifies such an unwholesome bodily deed as a deed that results in affliction.[117] The same is also the case for another parallel to the 羅云經 found in the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivada *Vinayavibha☐ga*, preserved in Chinese and Tibetan.[118] A *sūtra* quotation from the present discourse in the *Vyākhyāyukti-☐īkā*, preserved in Tibetan,[119] and a paraphrase of the present passage in the *Śrāvakabhūmi*, agree with the Pāli discourse and the *Vinayavibha☐ga* version that the present instructions are to refrain from a bodily deed that is harmful and unwholesome,[120] without envisaging that such a deed could be reckoned as pure.

In fact, if the instruction to Rāhula had offered such an ambivalent instruction, one would

---

[116] MĀ 14 at T I 436c27.

[117] MN 61 at MN I 415,29: *akusala☐ ida☐ kāyakamma☐ dukkhudraya☐ dukkhavipāka☐*.

[118] T 1442 at T XXIII 761a11: 是不善事, 是苦惡業, 能於未來感苦異熟. D *'dul ba cha* 217a56 or Q *je* 201a6: *bdag dang gzhan la gnod par 'gyur ba mi dge ba* (D: *ba'i) sdug bsngal 'byung ba rnam par smin pa sdug bsngal ba*.

[119] Q *sems tsam i* 71a5: *gnod pa dang ldan pa mi dge ba sdug bsngal 'byung ba dang*.

[120] T 1579 at T XXX 405b5: 自損及以損他是不善, or Shukla 1973: 55,16: *vyābhādhika☐ ... ātmano vā parasya vā akuśala☐*.

not expect it to feature among King Aśoka's explicit recommendations, a choice that might well be due to the straightforward and practical ethical instruction given in this discourse.[121] A king would quite probably not recommend a discourse that enjoins doing what is not permitted because one believes it to be wholesome. Thus, it seems that this part of the *Madhyama-āgama* version might have suffered from a translation error. Such an error could have occurred due to misinterpreting a *sandhi* in the Indic original to imply that a particular word has, or else does not have, the negative prefix *a-*. A similar error can be found in the 194th discourse of the *Madhyama-āgama*,[122] and Karashima (1992: 263) notes the occurrence of this type of error in Dharmarak□a's translation of the *Saddharmapu□□arīka-sūtra*, confirming that such mistakes did take place.

The next example is related to the translation terminology employed in the *Madhyama-āgama*, taken from the 25th discourse, the 水喻經. This discourse refers to a forest dweller, *araññaka/ara□yaka*, in a way that seems to be quite unique in the *Madhyama-āgama* collection, namely as, 阿練若,[123] instead of the more usual rendering of the same as "no thing", 無事.[124] This variation from the usual *Madhyama-āgama* translation vocabulary is interesting in so far as the transcription 阿練若 occurs with considerable frequency in the *Ekottarika-āgama*.[125] This detail thus could be of relevance to the relationship between the translations of these two discourse collections. The identity of the translator of the *Ekottarika-āgama* is not an unequivocal matter, since it is not entirely clear if the translation now extant in Chinese has only been revised by Gautama Sa□ghadeva, or whether it is an actual retranslation undertaken by him, a retranslation that then replaced Dharmanandī's earlier translation.[126]

A problem with this suggestion is that in general the translation terminology in these two collections differs considerably, and that to such an extent that makes it difficult to assume how the two collections could have been translated under the same person.

---

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

[122] Cf. below quote number 13 (MĀ 194).

[123] MĀ 25 at T I 454a19.

[124] Noted by Minh Chau 1991: 327 as the standard *Madhyama-āgama* rendering for *arañña*.

[125] Cf. e.g. EĀ 12.5 at T II 569c14; EĀ 12.6 at T II 570a25; EĀ 13.1 at T II 571b2; EĀ 25.6 at T II 633b16; EĀ 37.3at T II 711a8; EĀ 38.6 at T II 721a1; EĀ 39.10 at T II 734a9; EĀ 49.2 at T II 795a26.

[126] The 出三藏記集, T 2145 at T LV 71b29; the 眾經目錄, T 2146 at T LV 127c29; the 大周刊定眾經目錄, T 2153 at T LV 422b6; and the 開元釋教錄, T 2154 at T LV 511b15, attribute the *Ekottarika-āgama* translation to Dharmanandī; while according to the 歷代三寶紀, T 2034 at T XLIX 70c5, Gautama Sa□ghadeva retranslated the *Ekottarika-āgama*; cf. also Anālayo 2006; Bagchi 1927: 159 and 337; Enomoto 1986: 19; Lamotte 1967: 105; Lü 1963: 242; Mayeda 1985: 102; Waldschmidt 1980: 169 note 168; and Yin-shun 1983: 93.

It is also not clear on what Gautama Saṅghadeva would have based such a retranslation, since whereas in the case of the *Madhyama-āgama* his translation was based on a written original, Dharmanandī translated the *Ekottarika-āgama* based on an original he had memorized,[127] and there is no indication that Gautama Saṅghadeva had also memorized this collection or had otherwise access to an original corresponding to what Dharmanandī had committed to memory.

Nevertheless, the occurrence of the term 阿練若 in the *Madhyama-āgama* points to some form of relationship between the translation of these two collections, in fact we know that Dharmanandī had earlier also translated a *Madhyama-āgama* into Chinese, though it seems that this translation was subsequently lost. The present finding thus leaves open the possibility, suggested by Lü (1963: 242), that some of the renderings employed by Dharmanandī in his earlier *Madhyama-āgama* translation were re-employed in Saṅghadeva's *Madhyama-āgama* translation.

The next example I would like to take up appears to be a simple translation error, found in the 26ᵗʰ discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 瞿尼師經. In a description of proper behaviour for monks in regard to seats, this discourse instructs that one should not encroach on elder monks and younger monks should not be "scolded", 訶.

2) 「當學知坐取善坐也。不逼長老坐。爲小比丘訶」[128]

That when taking a seat one should not incommode elder monks is certainly reasonable, but why there should be any scolding of younger monks is less easy to understand. According to the Pāli parallel, the *Gulissāni-sutta*, the instruction in the present case it to not "keep off" young monks from their seats, *nave ca bhikkhū na āsanena paṭibāhissāmi*.[129] This suggests the possibility of a translation error, which could have happened due to mistaking *paṭibāhati/pratibādhate*, "to keep off", for *paṭibhāsati/pratibhāṣate*, "to retaliate".

The next discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 梵志陀然經, describes a visit paid by Sāriputta to a Brahmin. According to the *Madhyama-āgama* discourse, when Sāriputta arrived he found that this Brahmin was outside of his house by the side of a spring and was

---

[127] T 2145 at T LV 10b25.
[128] MĀ 26 at T I 455c6.
[129] MN 69 at MN I 469,18.

"inflicting pain on the resident people".

3)「梵志陀然從其家出。至泉水邊苦治居民」[130]

In this case, too, a translation error appears to have happened. According to the Pāli parallel, the *Dhānañjāni-sutta*, when Sāriputta arrived this Brahmin was at his cowshed getting his cows milked, *gāvo go□□he dohāpeti*.[131] The idea of "inflicting pain", 苦治, could to be due to a mistaking of √*duh*, "to milk", for √*dru*, "to harm" or "to hurt". The occurrence of "resident people", 居民, is less easily explainable, though perhaps the idea that someone is being harmed or hurt might have led to a misinterpretation of *go□□ha/go□□ha*, "cow-pen", for *gotta/gotra*, "clan". Alternatively, the reference to the "resident people" could be a gloss introduced by the translator.

A mistaking of √*duh* for √*dru* could occur more easily in a Prākrit in which, like in Pāli, the two forms are not distinguishable by the occurrence of an *r* in the latter, whereas such a mistaking would seem less probable in Sanskrit. Thus, this translation error would support the assumption that the original used for translating the *Madhyama-āgama* was in a Prākrit.

These few examples already show the importance of studying the early discourses in conjunction, in the sense of reading the different versions available alongside each other. This is certainly the case in both ways, that is, not only does a reading of a *Madhyama-āgama* discourse benefit from examining its Pāli parallel, but similarly a reading of a Pāli discourse benefits from an examination of its Chinese counterpart.[132] This is because errors are not only to due translation, but can also be the outcome of lapses of memory during oral transmission. An example for this potential can be found in the 63rd discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 鞞婆陵耆經. This discourse describes a situation where the former Buddha Kassapa sent some of his monks to the house of one of his supporters in order to procure grass for thatching his roof. When the monks arrive, the supporter himself was out and only his blind parents were at home. The *Madhyama-āgama* version reports that the blind parents asked who had come, and the monks replied by explaining who they are.

4)「父母 ... 聞已。問曰。誰 ... 耶。比丘答曰。長老。我等是 ... 比丘」[133]

---

[130] MĀ 27 at T I 456c9.
[131] MN 97 at MN II 186,2 (B[e]-MN II 396 and S[e]-MN II 624 read *dūhāpeti*).
[132] A survey of examples for this potential of the Chinese *Āgamas* can be found in Anālayo 2005.
[133] Mâ 63 at T I 502b24.

The Pāli version of this exchange differs in so far as it reports that the monks addressed the blind parents with the word "sister", *bhagini*.[134] According to the *Madhyama-āgama* version, however, they instead used the address 長老, corresponding to *āyas-mant/āyuśmant*, a respectful form of address regularly used to refer to monks, but also appropriate towards elders in general. In a patriarchal society like ancient India, where the wife played a subordinate role comparable to a servant,[135] one would not expect that monks who speak to a couple would only address the woman, so that the form of address given in the *Madhyama-āgama* is clearly the preferable reading.

My next example is from the 78th discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 梵天請佛經, and its parallel in the *Brahmanimantaṇika-sutta*. This discourse describes an encounter between the Buddha and a conceited Brahmā, who mistakenly thought himself to be eternal. In order to dispel this deluded assumption of Brahmā, the Buddha pointed out that he knew where Brahmā had come from and where Brahmā was going to, thereby showing that Brahmā's present existence was far from being eternal.

5)「梵天。我知汝所從來處‧所往至處」[136]

In the *Brahmanimantaṇika-sutta*, however, the Buddha told Brahmā that he knew Brahmā's destiny and "splendour", *te ahaṃ, Brahme, gatiñca pajānāmi jutiñca pajānāmi*.[137] The occurrence of *juti*, "splendour", is puzzling, since though the Buddha would know all about Brahmā, and therewith also all that is to be known about Brahmā's splendour, to display such knowledge would not be as effective a challenge to Brahmā's belief in being eternal as the *Madhyama-āgama* version's proposal that the Buddha knew where Brahmā was going to. Knowledge of where Brahmā was going to would indeed undermine Brahmā's belief in being eternal, whereas knowledge of Brahmā's splendour would not seem to be so pertinent to the point at stake in the present context.

The *Madhyama-āgama* version receives support from a variant reading found in the PTS and the Sinhalese edition, which reads *cuti*, "passing away".[138] In view of the context this

---

[134] MN 81 at MN II 53,25.

[135] Von Hinüber 1993: 102 draws attention to Vin IV 21,3, where a mother-in-law addresses her daughter-in-law with *je*, an address elsewhere used to address a female slave, cf. e.g. MN 21 at MN I 125,18. This form of address reflects the low social position of a daughter-in-law in the household of her in-laws. Horner 1990: 1 explains that in ancient India a married women's "life was spent in complete subservience to her husband and his parents. She was allowed little authority at home and no part in public activities."

[136] MĀ 78 at T I 548a8.

[137] MN 49 at MN I 328,25.

[138] PTS edition at MN I 557 and Cᵉ-MN I 768 note 5; cf. also Horner 1967: 391 note 5, who comments that

appears to be the preferable reading. In this way, the *Madhyama-āgama* version helps us to decide in favour of a reading found only as a variant in the Pāli editions.

An aspect of the early discourses that shows considerable variations between different versions of the same discourse is the title. This is not only the case for versions from different reciter traditions, since even between Pāli editions of the same discourse a considerable degree of variation can be found in regard to titles. In the *Majjhima-nikāya* collection, for example, more than ten discourses have a substantially different title in another Pāli edition.[139]

In view of such variations, it is not surprising that at times the title of a *Madhyama-āgama* discourse appears to be preferable to the title of its *Majjhima-nikāya* parallel. Such a case can be found in the 101st discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 增上心經.[140] Its counterpart is the *Vitakkasa☐☐hāna-sutta* in the *Majjhima-nikāya*. Now *vitakkasankhārasa☐☐hāna*, "stilling the thought-formation",[141] is only one of the five methods described in this discourse for overcoming unwholesome thoughts, whereas all five methods are for the purpose of developing the "higher mind", *adhicitta*, 增上心.[142] Thus in as much as a title for the whole discourse is concerned, the *Madhyama-āgama* version's title seems to fit better than its Pāli counterpart.

Another aspect of the early discourses that shows considerable variations between different versions is the sequence in which otherwise similar aspects or teachings are presented. A case in point is the 102nd discourse of the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 念經, which describes how the Buddha, during the time before his awakening, handled the arising of unwholesome thoughts. This discourse describes that whenever an unwholesome thought arose, the future Buddha would quickly dispel such thoughts, as he was aware of the danger inherent in them. The *Madhyama-āgama* discourse compares this to a cowherd who would stop the cows

---

juti "seems to be faulty for *cuti*".

[139] These are the *Vatthūpama-sutta,* MN 7, where B^e has the title *Vattha-sutta*; the *Ariyapariyesana-sutta,* MN 26, where B^e and S^e have the title *Pāsarāsi-sutta*; the *Sekha-sutta*, MN 53, where S^e has the title *Sekhapa☐ipadā-sutta*; the *Upāli-sutta*, MN 56, where S^e has the title *Upālivāda-sutta*; the *Ambala☐☐hikā-rāhulovāda-sutta*, MN 61, where S^e has the title *Cū☐arāhulovāda-sutta*; the *Cū☐amālu☐kya-sutta*, MN 63, where S^e has the title *Cū☐amālu☐kyovāda-sutta*; the *Tevijjavacchagotta-sutta*, MN 71, where B^e has the title *Tevijjavaccha-sutta* and S^e the title *Cū☐avacchagotta-sutta*; the *Aggivacchagotta-sutta*, MN 72, where B^e has the title *Aggivaccha-sutta*; the *Mahāvacchagotta-sutta*, MN 73, where B^e has the title *Mahāvaccha-sutta*; the *Bakkula-sutta*, MN 124, where S^e has the title *Bakkulattheracchariyabbhūta-sutta*; and the *Mahā-sa☐āyatanika-sutta*, MN 149, where S^e has the title *Sa☐āyatanavibha☐ga-sutta*.

[140] MĀ 101 at T I 588a3.

[141] Adopting the rendering used in Ñā☐amoli 2005: 212.

[142] MN 20 at MN 119,3 introduces the five methods with *adhicittam anuyuttena ... bhikkhunā*.

from straying into the ripe crop, as he knows that he will incur trouble if he does not prevent them from eating the crop.[143] After explaining this method, according to the *Madhyama-āgama* discourse the Buddha turned to the general nature of the mind, explaining that whatever one frequently thinks about will eventually lead to a corresponding inclination of the mind.[144]

Its Pāli counterpart, the *Dvedhāvitakka-sutta*, however, presents these topics in a different sequence, as it first takes up the dispelling of unwholesome thought, then describes how the mind follows the course set by whatever one frequently thinks about, and only after that comes out with the simile of the cowherd.[145] Here the *Madhyama-āgama* discourse present a more straightforward sequence, since the purpose of the cowherd's simile is to illustrate fear of unwanted consequences, not to illustrate that frequent thoughts lead to a mental inclination. Thus, the simile of the cowherd finds its best placing right after the exposition of unwholesome thoughts, as an illustration of this exposition.

My next example is from the 145th discourse of the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 瞿默目揵連經, records a remark by Ānanda, in which he pointed out that the delighted in living in the Bamboo Grove because of the protection given by the Blessed One. Since according to the same discourse the Buddha had already passed away by the time Ānanda made this remark, one might wonder what the implications of this protection could be.

6)「佛般涅槃後不久」[146]
　　「我樂住竹林加蘭哆園中。所以者何。以世尊擁護故」[147]

According to the Pāli version, however, Ānanda remarked that the conducive conditions in the Bamboo Grove were due to the protection given by Vassakāra, a minister of King Ajātasattu.[148] The Pāli commentary then explains that Vassakāra gave particular care to the Bamboo Grove, as according to a prediction he was going to be reborn in his next life as a monkey in this grove, a rebirth prospective also referred to in the *Karmavibhaṅga*.[149] Thus, in this case it seems as if the reference in the *Madhyama-āgama* version to the protection given by the Blessed One, who had already passed away, may just be a simple transmission

---

[143] MĀ 102 at T I 589a25.
[144] MĀ 102 at T I 589b5.
[145] MN 19 at MN I 115,29.
[146] MĀ 145 at T I 653c22.
[147] MĀ 145 at T I 655b14.
[148] MN 108 at MN III 13,20.
[149] Ps IV 73 and Kudo 2004: 72,5 and 73,4.

or translation error, and the protection spoken of in the present context appears to intend merely the mundane type of protection a minister might give to a park.

Another passage of interest to the present topic can be found in the 162nd discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 分別六界經, lists and examines five types of feeling tones that can be experienced, which are happiness, pain, mental pleasure, mental displeasure and equanimity, but then summarizes these as three types of feelings.

7) 「樂覺 ... 苦覺 ... 喜覺 ... 憂覺 ... 捨覺 ... 此三覺」[150]

Its Pāli parallel, the *Dhātuvibhaṅga-sutta*, however, lists only three types of feelings in the corresponding passage, *sukha*, *dukhha* and *adukkhamasukha*.[151] In the present case this reading is confirmed by the *Madhyama-āgama* discourse itself, as in its summary of the present exposition it speaks of three types of feelings, so that the five-fold presentation appears to be a later expansion of what originally was only a treatment of three types of feelings. Further confirmation can be gleaned from another version of the same discourse, preserved as an individual translation by Zhī-qīan, 支謙, which also refers only to three feelings.[152] The present instance is interesting in so far as it documents the beginning stages in the development of a tendency towards ever more detailed analysis, a tendency that eventually led to the rise of the different *Abhidharmas*.

The next discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama* collection, the 163rd discourse entitled 分別 六處經, takes up a related topic, as it examines the six types of pleasure, of displeasure and of equanimity, presenting each set of six as either related to sensuality or else not related to sensuality. The resultant thirty-six fold presentation receives the rather puzzling heading of being "thirty-six knives".

8) 「三十六刀 ... 有六喜依著。有六喜依無欲。有六憂依著。有六憂依無欲。有六捨 依著。有六捨依無欲」[153]

The corresponding Pāli passage, however, speaks of "thirty-six positions of beings",

---

[150] MĀ 162 at T I 691b5-c5.
[151] M 140 at M III 242,11.
[152] T 511 at T XIV 780b29.
[153] MĀ 163 at T I 692c16.

chatti□sa sattapadā.[154] This suggests that the expression "thirty-six knives", 三十六刀, could be due to mistaking *satta/sattva*, "being", for *sattha/śastra*, "knife", or could perhaps be a copyist's mistake, confusing 句 with 刀.[155] The corresponding expression in the *Abhidharmakośabhā□ya* reads *□a□tri□śac chāst□padāni*, "thirty-six positions [set forth] by the teacher",[156] which thus has *satthar/śāst□*; "teacher", instead of *satta/sattva*, "being". This expression recurs in Xuán-zàng's（玄奘）translation as 三十六師句;[157] while Paramārtha's translation speaks of 三十六寂靜足,[158] which suggests ~ *śāntapadāni*, "peaceful positions", or perhaps "paths of tranquillity".

The next example is from the 171st discourse of the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 分別大業經, which begins a treatment of karma with an announcement by the Buddha, in which he told Ānanda that if he (and the other monks) would hear this great exposition on karma, they would develop increasing mental tranquillity and happiness in regard to the *Tathāgata*.

9)「阿難。若汝從世尊聞分別大業經者, 於如來倍復增上心靖得喜」[159]

In the Pāli counterpart, this sentence does not seem to have been preserved in full, as the passage just reads "if you, Ānanda, would hear the detailed great exposition on karma by the *Tathāgata*", *'sace tumhe, Ānanda, su□eyyātha tathāgatassa mahākammavibha□ga□ vibhajantassā'ti*, at which point the sentence ends.[160] The way this sentence reads one has the impression that it could have been truncated, since even though it begins with the hypothetical indeclinable "if", *sace*, it ends without explaining what will happen "if" the monks and Ānanda hear the detailed great exposition on karma.

Here the *Madyhama-āgama* version offers a more complete version of the Buddha's statement, and with its help the Pāli sentence could be restored to something like: *sace*

---

[154] MN 137 at MN III 217,8.
[155] The same expression recurs in Sa□ghabhūti's *Vibhā□ā* translation in T 1547 at T XXVIII 435c29: 三十六刀, with 勾 as a 聖 variant for 刀.
[156] Abhidh-k 3:36 in Pradhan 1967: 150,8, rendered by Pruden 1988: 437 as "thirty-six points of the Master".
[157] T 1558 at T XXIX 54b12, cf. also Hirakawa 1978: 97, who gives the Tibetan equivalent as *ston pa'i bka'*, the "teacher's pronouncement(s)". The *Mahāvibhā□ā* in T 1545 at T XXVII 718a25 also speaks of 三十六師句.
[158] T 1559 at T XXIX 211b13.
[159] MĀ 171 at T I 707a19: (adopting the 宋, 元, and 明 variant reading 聞 for 問)
[160] MN 136 at MN III 209,12. The same pattern recurs again in regard to a similar proclamation made by the Buddha according to AN 6:62 at AN III 404,5: *'sace tumhe, Ānanda, su□eyyātha tathāgatassa purisindriya-ñā□āni vibhajantassā'ti*, where again the *Madhyama-āgama* counterpart in MĀ 112 at T I 601a15 completes the sentence in a way closely resembling MĀ 171: 若汝從如來聞大人根智分別者, 必得上信如來而 懷歡喜, a reading which in this case is, moreover, found similarly in another parallel, the individual translation T 58 at T I 854b7: 汝阿難, 當從如來聽, 分別大人根相當增上, 於如來有信樂意歡喜生.

tumhe, Ānanda, su□eyyātha tathāgatassa mahākammavibha□ga□ vibhajantassa, tatra vo, Ānanda, tathāgate citta□ bhiyyosomattāya pasīdeyya pāmojja□ labheyya.

Another example where the Chinese translation is of help to clarify a Pāli passage can be found in the 174th discourse of the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 受法經. This discourse illustrates the danger of indulgence in sensual pleasures with the example of a *sāla* tree that is gradually overgrown by a creeper. The Pāli version of this simile describes that when at first the seed of this creeper falls down in the vicinity of the *sāla* tree, the worries of the *deva* that lives in the tree will be appeased by his friends who tell the *deva* that the seed will probably be eaten by some animal, or carried away, or else the seed of such a creeper might become a "no-seed", *abīja□ vā pan' assa*.[161] The last of these possibilities is not entirely clear, since one might wonder what the implications could be of a seed becoming a "no-seed". Here the *Madhyama-āgama* parallel helps to clarify the implication of this imagery, as it describes how this seed might "rot and not be a seed [any more]".

10) 「或敗壞不成種子」[162]

The next example stems from the 190th discourse of the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 小空經, which treats a series of meditative experiences that lead to the realization of emptiness in its ultimate and supreme sense. In the context of this series of meditative experiences, this discourse speaks of an "unconscious concentration of the mind", but then continues to describe a form of practice that is based on "knowing" the nature of this attainment.

11) 「當數念一無想心定。彼如是知 ... 然有不空。唯一無想心定」[163]

Its Pāli and Tibetan parallels, however, speak instead of a "signless concentration of the mind", *animitta□ cetosamādhi□*,[164] or of the signless element, *mtshan ma med pa dbyings*,[165] a reading that would fit the context much better.

The appearance of a reference to "unconscious", 無想, in a context where this meaning does not fit too well seems to be a recurrent issue, since several similar cases can be found.

---

[161] MN 45 at MN I 306,12.
[162] MĀ 174 at T I 711c11.
[163] MĀ 190 at T I 737c3.
[164] MN 121 at MN III 107,29.
[165] Skilling 1994: 172,5.

One such case is the 大拘絺羅經, which refers to an "unconscious concentration",[166] while its Pāli parallel speaks of "signless concentration" instead.[167] In this case, the Pāli version's reading is supported by a quotation from the same discourse in the *Karmasiddhi-prakaraṇa*, which indeed speaks of "signless" concentration.[168]

Quite a number of similar occurrences can be found in other Chinese discourse translations,[169] which indicate that the two characters 相 and 想 were prone to being confused with each other, so that the correct reading needs to be established in each case based on the context. A confusion of 相 and 想 could easily happen during translation, as the two characters are not only fairly similar in writing, differing only on the presence or absence of the heart radical, but also had a rather similar pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, as they do still today.[170] Due to the related meaning of the two terms, such an error would then easily escape being noticed during a later checking of the translation. Thus, this finding corroborates the suggestion made by Master Yìn-shùn (1986: 61), who based on his extensive readings in the Chinese Tripiṭaka, comes to the conclusion that the "unconscious concentration of the mind" should simply be treated as an alternative rendering for the

---

[166] MĀ 211 at T I 792b12: 無想定. Notably, subsequent occurrences of this expression in MĀ 211 have a 聖 variant reading as 無相定.

[167] MN 43 at MN I 296,32.

[168] T 1609 at T XXXI 784b18: 入無相界定.

[169] Choong 1999: 116 note 220 draws attention to another instance found in SĀ 272 at T II 72a26, where a counterpart to *animitta* in SN 22:80 at SN III 93,23 reads 無相, "signless", but has a variant reading as 無想, "unconscious". The reverse case occurs in MĀ 146 at T I 657c4 as part of a description of sense-restraint, which in the Pāli version MN 27 at MN I 180,27 speaks of the "sign", *nimitta*, but in the Chinese reads 想, "perception", with the variant reading 相, "sign". A complementary case is MĀ 187 at T I 733c19+22, which uses the character 相, "sign", to describe the practice of sense-restraint, but then notes 想, "perception", as a variant reading for the same context. Again in MĀ 169 at T I 701c1 the expression "not connected with benefit", 無義相應, has 想 as a variant for 相, on adopting which the expression 相應 as a rendering of ~ *saṃ* + √*yuj,* or *saṃ* + √*bandh* would lose its sense. MĀ 34 at T I 475b8+16 refers to the absence of pride with the expression 貢高者, 都無是相, while the same discourse MĀ 34 at T I 475b2 refers to the same absence of pride with the expression 貢高者, 都無是想, yet another instance where the characters 相 and 想 appear to have been confused with each other. Another instance is T 92 at T I 916c8, where the character 相, "sign", occurs in a description of overcoming all perceptions of form in order to reach the immaterial attainments, with the better fitting 想, "perception", as a variant reading. Again, EĀ 24.8 at T II 629b1 refers to the fourth immaterial attainment as 有想 無相, with the better fitting 有想無想, as a variant reading, a reading confirmed in EĀ 24.8 at T II 629b3+22+24. Another example occurs in a description of a meditation practice undertaken regularly by the Buddha in T 76 at T I 884b17, according to which he practised "unconscious" concentration, 無想 之定, with the better fitting "signless concentration", 無相之定, as a variant reading. Yet another example can be found in T 6 at T I 180a16, which speaks of the *samādhi* used by the Buddha to overcome an illness as 不念眾想之定, "concentration of not giving attention to numerous perceptions", while the corresponding Sanskrit fragment S 360 folio 171 V4 in Waldschmidt 1950: 18 and the Tibetan version in Waldschmidt 1951: 195,1 speak instead of "not giving attention to any signs", *sarvanimi(ttānām amana-sikārād)* and *mtshan ma thams cad yid la mi bya bar*. The idea to not give attention to "signs", *sabbanimit-tānam amanasikārā*, occurs also in the corresponding Pāli passage in DN 16 at DN II 100,16, though not explicitly as the means used by the Buddha to overcome his illness. The (Mūla-)sarvāstivāda *Vinaya* similarly speaks of the "signless concentration" at this point, T 1451 at T XXIV 387a22: 無相三昧.

[170] Cf. Pulleyblank 1991: 337 and 338 or Unger 1989: 89.

signless concentration of the mind.[171]

An instance where the *Madhyama-āgama* version helps to better understand a Pāli passage can be found in the 192nd discourse, the 加樓烏陀夷經. The Chinese and Pāli versions of this discourse describe a situation where a monk goes begging during a stormy night. During a flash of lightning, a woman suddenly sees this monk searching for alms and is thoroughly terrified, believing him to be an evil spirit. According to the Pāli, the frightened woman makes a rather cryptic remark, exclaiming that the mother and father of this monk have died, *bhikkhussa ātu māri, bhikkhussa mātu māri*.[172] As it stands in the Pāli version, this remark is not easily intelligible.

According to the commentary, the intended meaning is that if the monk's parents were still alive, he would not need to go in search for food during the night.[173] This commentarial explanation does not seem to fit the situation too well, as it was a general custom for monks and recluses in ancient India to subsist on begging food as part of their way of life. Thus, the idea that they should be fed by their parents instead of begging their food would not be the type of reasoning to be expected of a woman in ancient India.

The solution to this cryptic passage can be found in the *Madhyama-āgama* version, where the reference to the monk's parents comes as part of a set of curses spoken by the frightened woman, in which she expressed her anger by wishing that his mother and father may pass away, and that his whole clan may meet with destruction

12)「令此沙門父母早死。令此沙門種族絕滅」[174]

In this way the *Madhyama-āgama* discourse clarifies that the reference to the death of the monk's parents was part of a curse spoken by the frightened woman, a presentation that seems to fit the context better than the explanation offered in the Pāli commentary.

Continuing with another example related to the conduct of monks, the 194th discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 跋陀和利經, describes the behaviour of a monk who is investigated for some misdeed. According to its description, one type of monk displays

---

[171] 無想定是無相心定的異譯.
[172] MN 66 at MN I 449,1: (B^e-MN II 112 reads *mārī*). Trenckner 1993: 567 comments that "the text no doubt purports to make the woman speak a sort of patois". Ñā□amoli 2005: 552 renders this passage as "a bhikkhu whose ma's died and whose pa's died", with Bodhi in ibid. p. 1270 note 672 explaining that "the utterance ... appears to be a very colloquial Pali".
[173] Ps III 165.
[174] MĀ 192 at T I 741b16.

anger and then says that he wants to act in accordance with the wishes of the *saṅgha,* while another type of monk does not display anger and does not say that he wants to act in accordance with the wishes of the *saṅgha*.

13) 「瞋恚憎嫉。發怒廣惡 ... 作如是說。我今當作令眾歡喜而可意」[175]
　　「不瞋恚憎嫉。發怒廣惡 ... 不如是說。我今當作令眾歡喜而可意」[176]

　　The Pāli version has these in a different manner, as according to its presentation the monk who displays anger is the one who is also unwilling to act in accordance with the wishes of the *saṅgha*, and the one who does not display anger is the one who says that he is willing to act in accordance with the wishes of the *saṅgha*.[177] This is in fact what one would expect, so that the present instance could be another instance, similar to the first example given above, where a misunderstanding of a *sandhi* may have led to a confusion between the positive and the negative versions of a statement.

　　My next example comes from the 211st discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 大拘絺羅經, which explains that when someone enters the attainment of cessation, first the bodily formations cease, then the verbal formation, and then the mental formation. To understand this proposition it needs to be kept in mind that in the early discourses the bodily formation stands for breathing in and out, the verbal formation for initial and sustained mental application, and the mental formation for perception and feeling.

14) 「比丘入滅盡定時。先滅身行。次滅口行。後滅意行」[178]

　　According to the parallel, the *Cūḷavedalla-sutta* of the *Majjhima-nikāya*, however, first the verbal formation ceases (initial and sustained mental application), followed by the bodily formation (breathing in and out), and finally the mental formation ceases (perception and feeling).[179]

　　In relation to the emergence from cessation, the same difference recurs, though obviously

---

[175] MĀ 194 at T I 748b28.
[176] MĀ 194 at T I 748c18.
[177] MN 65 at MN I 442,31 and MN I 443,10.
[178] MĀ 211 at T I 792a8, on the different roles taken by its protagonists in the Chinese and Pāli versions cf. Anālayo 2007.
[179] MN 44 at MN I 302,4. For an examination of the difficulties involved in explaining emergence from the attainment of cessation and how different Buddhist schools attempted to tackle this problem cf. Griffith 1991.

in the reverse order. According to the Pāli version the verbal formation is the last to arise, while according to the Chinese presentation the bodily formation arises last.

In relation to the sequence in which the three formations ceases, it seems that when proceeding through the *jhānas* in order to attain cessation, the verbal formation of initial and sustained mental application will be left behind on attaining the second *jhāna*, while the bodily formation of in- and out-breathing will only cease with the attainment of the fourth *jhāna*.[180] This would correspond to the sequence proposed in the Pāli version of the *Cū□a-vedalla-sutta*. This sequence receives further support from a discourse in the *Sa□yukta-āgama* and its Pāli parallel. According to these two discourses, on attaining cessation the first formation to cease is indeed the verbal formation of initial and sustained mental application.[181] Besides, the *Mahāvibhā□ā* also agrees with the sequence proposed in the Pāli version of the *Cū□avedalla-sutta*.[182] Thus this part of the *Madhyama-āgama* discourse appears to offer the less probable reading. It could easily be imagined how the present reading in the *Madhyama-āgama* version could have come into being due to an error during oral transmission. The standard triad body-speech-mind, which is such a recurrent feature in the early discourses, could easily have influenced the memory of the reciters and caused them to recite the passage in the standard sequence to which they were used to, instead of adopting the unusual sequence verbal-bodily-mental, even though in the present context this sequence would be the correct presentation.

The 213th discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 法莊嚴經, describes that the Buddhist monks were independent and free from wishes and would life the holy life for as long as their body would last, a description in which the same discourse also explains that the monks would "protect food from others' wives, like deer".

15)「無爲無求。護他妻食如鹿。自盡形壽修行梵行」[183]

As it stands, this description is difficult to understand. According to the Pāli version, however, the monks are "dependent on others with a mind like deer", *paradavutta migabhūtena cetasā*.[184] This suggests that the *Madhyama-āgama* version's reference to

---

[180] DN 33 at DN III 270,18 and AN 10:20 at AN V 31,25 speak of the tranquillisation of the bodily formation with the fourth *jhāna*, at which point according to SN 36:11 at SN IV 217,8 all breathing ceases.

[181] SĀ 568 at T II 150b20 and SN 41:6 at SN IV 294,8.

[182] T 1545 at T XXVII 780c25.

[183] MĀ 213 at T I 796a29, with a 聖 variant reading 麂 for 鹿.

[184] MN 89 at MN II 121,21.

"others' wives" may be due to a mistaking of *parada* for *paradāra*, "the wife of another", while the idea of "protection" could be due to mistaking *vutta* for *v□ta*, "stopped", "checked", "held back", or else 護 could be a scribe's error for 獲, "to get". Even though the translator(s) appear(s) to have misunderstood the expression *paradavutta*, perhaps through knowledge of some commentarial explanation he/they knew that the idea of "depending on others" was involved, an idea he?they may then have attempted to bring out with the imagery of "food from others' wives". The difficulties of the translator(s) are understandable, as the expression *paradavutta* is difficult and while the commentaries explain it to mean "dependent on others",[185] the PTS dictionary renders it literally as "fond of being prepared" and then explains it to mean "apt, active, alert".[186] A version of this passage in the *K□u-drakavastu* of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya* is also far from clear, as it reports that the monks "always feel fear, like deer in the forest".[187]

As a last example in my presentation I would like to take up the 214th discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama*, the 鞞訶提經. This discourse describes how a king inquired from Ānanda if the Buddha would undertake any bodily deed that could be censured by other Brahmins and recluses. In reply, Ānanda explained that the Buddha would not undertake a bodily deed that could be censured by "wise" Brahmins and recluses.

16)「如來不行如是身行。謂是身行爲沙門‧梵志聰明智慧及餘世間所憎惡也」[188]

This specification is quite significant, since foolish people can blame even a saint. Thus, the point of this additional qualification seems to be that Ānanda wanted to distinguish between the righteous censure by "wise" recluse and Brahmins and unjustified criticism that was sometimes raised by contemporary recluses and Brahmins against the Buddha. The appropriateness of this qualification can be seen in the Chinese and Pāli versions of the present discourse, as both record that the king expressed his appreciation for Ānanda's reply, in fact according to the Pāli version he proclaimed that what he had not been able to ac-complish with his question, Ānanda had accomplished with his reply, *ya□ hi maya□ ... nāsakkhimha pañhena paripūretu□, ta□ ... āyasmatā Ānandena pañhassa veyyākara□ena paripūrita□*.[189]

---

[185] Ps III 166: *'paradavuttā'ti parehi dinnavuttino*.

[186] Rhys Davids 1993: 420 s.v. *parada*; on the difficulties of this expression cf. also Horner 1975: 259 note 2.

[187] T 1451 at T XXIV 237c29: 常懷兢懼如鹿依林.

[188] MĀ 214 at T I 798a13.

[189] M 88 at M II 114,7.

On reading the PTS edition of this discourse, however, this sentence is a little puzzling, since according to its presentation the king already used the qualification "wise" in his question. A closer inspection of the different Pāli editions brings to light that though the Siamese edition agrees with the PTS edition,[190] the Burmese and the Ceylonese editions differ, in that according to them the king had not yet used the qualification "wise" in his question.[191] Thus, in this case the *Madhyama-āgama* version helps to show which of the Pāli editions carries the preferable reading.

By way of concluding my comparative notes on the *Madhyama-āgama*, I would like to suggest that these few selected examples show how much our study of the discourses can gain if the Chinese and Indic versions are placed side by side. Thus, just as according to de Jong (1968: 15) "no student of Buddhism, even if he is interested only in Indian Buddhism, can neglect the enormous corpus of Chinese translations", I would like to propose that "no student of Chinese Buddhism can neglect the study of the Indic parallel versions", in order to minimize the risk of coming to conclusions that are based on transmission or translation errors.

Abbreviations:

(In the case of Chinese and Pāli sources, quotations are according to the Taishō and PTS editions by giving first the discourse by number and then its location by volume, page and line; in the case of Tibetan sources, quotations are to the location in the Derge and/or Peking editions).

AN	*Aṅguttara-nikāya*
B^e	Burmese edition
C^e	Ceylonese edition
DĀ	*Dirgha-āgama* (at T 1)
DĀ^2	*Dirgha-āgama* (preserved in Sanskrit fragments)
D	Derge edition
DN	*Dīgha-nikāya*
EĀ	*Ekottarika-āgama* (at T 125)
MĀ	*Madhyama-āgama* (at T 26)
MN	*Majjhima-nikāya*

---

[190] The PTS edition at M II 113,33 and S^e-M II 500 read *samaṇehi brāhmanehi viññūhi*.
[191] B^e-M II 315 and C^e-M II 542 only read *samaṇehi brāhmanehi*.

Ps	*Papañcasūdanī*
Q	Peking edition
SĀ	*Saṃyukta-āgama* (at T 99)
SĀ²	'other' *Saṃyukta-āgama* (at T 100)
SHT III	see Waldschmidt 1971
SHT IX	see Bechert 2004
Sᵉ	Siamese edition
SN	*Saṃyutta-nikāya*
SN²	*Sagāthavagga* of the *Saṃyutta-nikāya*, new PTS edition by Somaratne (1998)
T	Taishō
Vibh	*Vibhaṃga*
Vin	*Vinaya*

References:

Akanuma, Chizen 1990 (1929): *The Comparative Catalogue of Chinese Āgamas & Pāli Nikāyas*, Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.

Anālayo 2005: "Some Pāli Discourses in the Light of Their Chinese Parallels", in *Buddhist Studies Review*, vol. 22 no.1 pp. 1-14, and vol. 22 no. 2 pp. 93-105.

Anālayo 2006: "The Ekottarika-āgama Parallel to the Saccavibhaṃga-sutta", in *Buddhist Studies Review*, vol. 23 no. 2.

Anālayo 2007: "Who said it? Authorship Disagreements between Pāli and Chinese Discourses", in *Indica et Tibetica 65, Festschrift für Michael Hahn zum 65. Geburtstag von Freunden und Schülern überreicht*, J. U. Hartmann et al. (ed.), Wien, pp. 1-14.

Bagchi, Prabodh Chandra 1927: *Le Canon Bouddhique en Chine*, Paris: Geuthner, vol. 1.

Bapat, P.V. 1969: "Chinese Madhyamāgama and the Language of its Basic Text", in *Dr. Satkari Mookerji Felicitation Volume*, B.P. Sinha (ed.), Varanasi: Chowkhamba Publications, pp. 1-6.

Bechert, Heinz 1991: "Methodological considerations concerning the language of the earliest Buddhist tradition", in *Buddhist Studies Review* vol. 8 pp. 3-19.

Bechert, Heinz (ed.) 1995: *When did the Buddha live?*, Delhi: Sri Satguru.

Bechert, Heinz (ed.) 2004: *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden. Teil 9: Die Katalognummern 2000-3199* (beschrieben von Klaus Wille), Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

Choong, Mun-keat 1999: *The Notion of Emptiness in Early Buddhism*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

de Jong, J.W. 1968: *Buddha's Word in China, 28th George Ernest Morrison Lecture*, Canberra: Australian National University.

Enomoto, Fumio 1984: "The Formation and Development of the Sarvāstivāda Scriptures", in *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Congress of Human Sciences in Asia and North Africa*, T. Yamamoto (ed.), Tokyo: Tōhō Gakkai, pp. 197-198.

Enomoto, Fumio 1986: "On the Formation of the Original Texts of the Chinese Āgamas", in *Buddhist Studies Review*, vol. 3 pp. 19-30.

Glass, Andrew 2006: *Connected Discourses in Gandhāra: A Study, Edition, and Translation of Four Sa☐yuktāgama-Type Sūtras from the Senior Collection*, PhD dissertation, University of Washington, published at http://www.andrewglass.org/phd.php (accessed on 04-08-2006).

Gnoli, Raniero 1978: *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Sa☐ghabhedavastu*, vol. 2, (*Serie Orientale Roma, vol. 49*), Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.

Griffith, Paul J. 1991 (1986): *On Being Mindless: Buddhist Meditation and the Mind-Body Problem*, Illinois, La Salle: Open Court.

Hartmann, Jens-Uwe 2000: "Zu einer Neuen Handschrift des Dīrgh☐gama," in *Vividharatnakarandaka: Festgabe für Adelheid Mette*, Chojnacki et al (ed.), Swisttal-Odendorf, pp. 359-367.

Hartmann, Jens-Uwe 2004: "Contents and Structure of the Dīrghāgama of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins" in *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology*, Tokyo: Soka University, vol. 7 pp. 119-137.

Hirakawa, Akira 1978: *Index to the Abhidharmakośabhā☐ya*, Tokyo: Daizo Shuppan Kabushikikaisha, vol. 3.

Hirakawa, Akira 1997: *Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Dictionary*, Tokyo: Reiyukai.

Horner, I.B. 1967: *The Collection of the Middle Length Sayings*, London: Pali Text Society, vol. 1.

Horner, I.B. 1975: *The Book of the Discipline*, London: Pali Text Society, vol. 5.

Horner, I.B. 1990 (1930): *Women under Primitive Buddhism*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Hultzsch, E. 1925: *Inscriptions of Asoka*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Karashima, Seishi 1992: *The Textual Study of the Chinese Versions of the Saddharmapu☐☐arīkasūtra*, Tokyo: Sankibo Press.

Kudo, Noriyuki 2004: *The Karmavibha☐ga*, Tokyo: Soka University.

Lamotte, Étienne 1967: "Un Sūtra Composite del'Ekottarāgama", in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Oxford, vol. 30 pp. 105-116.

Lancaster, Lewis R. 1979: "Buddhist Literature: Its Canons, Scribes, and Editors" in *The Critical Study of Sacred Texts*, W.D. O'Flaherty (ed.), Berkeley, pp. 215-229.

Lévi, Sylvain 1896: "Notes sur des Inscriptions de Piyadassi - Le Lāghulovāda de l'Edit de Bhabra", in *Journal Asiatique* ser. 9 vol. 8 pp. 475-485.

Lü, Cheng 1963: "Āgama", in *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, Ceylon, vol. 1 pp. 241-244.

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

94-103.

Mette, Adelheid 1995: "The Synchronism of the Buddha and the Jina Mahāvīra and the Problem of Chronology in Early Jainism", in *When did the Buddha Live?*, H. Bechert (ed.), Delhi: Sri Satguru, pp. 179-183.

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

Mittal, Kusum 1957: *Dogmatische Begriffsreihen im Älteren Buddhismus I; Fragmente des Daśottarasūtra; (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden)*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, vol. 4.

Ñā□amoli, Bhikkhu 2005 (1995): *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha*, Boston: Wisdom.

Norman, K.R. 1989: "The Pāli language and scriptures", in *The Buddhist Heritage*, Skorupski (ed.), pp. 29-53.

Norman, K. R. 1992: "The Value of the Pāli Tradition", in *Collected Papers*, Norman, Oxford: PTS, vol. 3 pp. 33-44.

Pradhan, P. 1967: *Abhidharmakośabhā□ya*, (*Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 8*), Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.

Prasad, Chandra Shekhar 1985: "Some Reflections on the Relation between the Āgamas and the Nikāyas", in *Proceedings and Papers of the Second Conference of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, Nalanda pp. 131-140.

Pruden, Leo M. 1988b: *Abhidharmakośabhā□yam*, Berkeley: Asian Humanity Press, vol. 2.

Pulleyblank, Edwin G. 1991: *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese and Early Mandarin*, Vancouver: UBC Press.

Rhys Davids, T.W. 1993 (1921-25): *Pāli-English Dictionary*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Shukla, Karunesha 1973: *Śrāvakabhūmi of Ācārya Asa□ga*, Patna: Jayaswal Research Institute.

Skilling, Peter 1994: *Mahāsūtras: Great Discourses of the Buddha*, Oxford: PTS, vol. 1.

Trenckner, V. 1993 (1888): *The Majjhima Nikāya*, Oxford: PTS.

Unger, Ulrich 1989: *Glossar des Klassischen Chinesisch*, Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.

von Hinüber, Oskar 1982: "Upāli's Verses in the Majjhimanikāya and the Madhyamāgama", in *Indological and Buddhist Studies*, Canberra, pp. 243-251.

von Hinüber, Oskar 1993: "From Colloquial to Standard Language. The Oral Phase in the Development of Pāli", in *Premier Colloque Étienne Lamotte*, Louvain-la-Neuve, pp. 101-113.

Wagle, Narenda 1985: "The Gods in Early Buddhism in Relation to Human Society" in *New Paths in Buddhist Research*, A.K. Warder (ed.), Durham, pp. 57-80.

Waldschmidt, Ernst 1950/vol. 1, 1951/vol. 2: *Das Mahāparinirvā□asūtra*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Waldschmidt, Ernst 1956: *Das Mahāvadānasutra, ein Kanonischer Text über die sieben letzten Buddhas*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, vol. 2.

Waldschmidt, Ernst (ed.) 1971: *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden. Teil 3: Katalognummern 802-*

1014 (unter Mitarbeit von Walter Clawitter und Lore Sander-Holzmann), Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

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

Yìn-shùn 1983 (1962): 原始佛教聖典之集成 [The Compilation of the Early Buddhist Canon], Taipei: 正聞出版社.

Yìn-shùn 1986 (1985): 空之探究 [Exploration of Emptiness], Taipei: 正聞出版社.