早期佛典禪修公式在不同文本中所呈現之特質
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中文摘要

本文旨在探討佛教之禪修公式在早期佛典（以漢譯阿含經和巴利尼柯耶為主）的呈現情形。文中選取了兩個公式作為討論的例子，這兩者皆取自於早期佛教中可能是最長、最核心的一個修行道架構，此道架構又可以用巴利《沙門果經》(DN2)所記載者為代表。

第一個要說明的公式為「初禪公式」，第二個用來舉例者則為「根門守護公式」。在「初禪公式」中我們發現 DN2 之描述，特別是在公式之前序句 (introductory sentence) 部份，與其他版本有一些出入。在比對的過程中我們採用了多元化的對象，包括應用漢、巴、梵語版本的《沙門果經》或相關經，以及其他與《沙門果經》無關但也是在描寫同樣道架構的阿含經類。

在比對中，我們著重平看待各版本之間的差異和相同點，從分析這些異同點中我們提出幾點值得探討之處：為何 DN2
有其獨特的表達方式？其原因何在？這種異於它者的方式有甚麼根據和用意？為何各版本之間會產生異同？在排除了版本考勤學的原因之後這些異同點的特徵顯現了某些更深刻的意義，其中譬如對禪修公式的傳播和使用，乃至於早期佛典的集成與傳播的理解具有某些提示，弄清這些特質，對我們回顧和了解佛典之傳譯（如口傳文獻、傳譯師、教義公式化、佛典編制體例原則等等課題）也許會有不小的幫助。這些意義在本文的第二個例子中也有所補充和說明。

透過以上兩個例子，我們可以找出一些禪修公式的呈現方式的特質，筆者認為，若我們能夠以類似的方法去檢驗更多禪修公式的話，我們可以發現、累積到更多不同的特質，進而歸納出公式中一些重要的題例。本文結論所嘗試要表達的是：徹底的、多重的比對是必要和有用的。經過深度比對的結果，我們即可利用某些發現來檢討目前學界對佛典傳承史所提出的模式或假說。
Remarks on Buddhist meditation formulas occurring in various versions of early canonical texts. *

PhD candidate, Department of Theology and Religious Studies, University of Bristol, U.K. (Mr) KIN-TUNG YIT

Introduction

It is generally accepted that the early Buddhist canonical texts (i.e. Pali Nikāyas and Chinese Āgamas) were composed and transmitted orally during the early stages of their formation. It is also pointed out by scholars that one of the typical features of this literature is that it contains many formulaic expressions, or

* This paper was originally accepted for oral presentation in the Sixth Annual Buddhist Studies Graduate Student Conference (Harvard University, April 9-11, 2004).

formulas. These formulas, and some other fixed units of words, such as lists, are frequently seen in such literature. They were applied as important devices in expressing the key concepts of doctrine, and in composing the main body of the Buddhist texts. They were particularly of great value in their mnemonic function. This feature is very important to the studies of the transmission and formation of early Buddhist canonical texts - a complicated issue for modern scholarship. Although a few scholars have attempted to offer explanatory models to explain this issue, the overall picture still remains unclear. However, recent research in this field has begun to suggest that the investigation of formulas in Buddhist texts might have important implications for our understanding of the subject. The aim of this paper is to contribute to such an endeavour, and it constitutes a preliminary report on my examination of a special type of formula - the Buddhist meditation formulas - through various sources. In the following sections, I

---

3 A comprehensive study on the lists and their significance in Buddhist literature is done by R. Gethin, 1992.
4 The formulas and lists may well reflect the original and earliest form of the teaching or the words of the Buddha, as suggested by some scholars, though this speculation requires further extensive studies.
5 The models suggested by Cousins, 1983; Gombrich, 1990 and Allon, 1997; are of particular useful.
will explain how I examine the formulas, and how I attempt to elucidate some of their most significant implications.

First, I would like to provide a simple definition of what I regard as meditation formulas: they are formulas that are relevant to meditation practice. In the Buddhist sense, meditation practice can be designated, in general, as specific categories of profound practice, such as samatha meditation (calming meditation) and vipassana meditation (insight meditation). Alternatively, it can mean a specific kind of technical practice, such as satipatthana (mindfulness meditation). In my current usage, it is applied to an even broader range of Buddhist practice including sila (moral conduct), samadhi (concentration) and pañña (wisdom) or abhiññā (higher knowledge). In other words, meditation practice here refers to the whole of the so-called 'threelfold training'. The reason for embracing such a wide range of practice is that each of the trainings represents an essential stage of meditation practice, and all of them are equally important components of the complete Buddhist path to awakening. The present paper is concerned specifically with the range of meditation formulas found in one prominent path structure in the Pali Nikayas and Chinese Āgamas, since this constitutes a typical expression of most of the important Buddhist practices. This particular path structure, which embraces the threelfold training as a standard path to awakening, is found many times in early Buddhist texts. The most representative case is
to be found in the Silakkhandha-vagga of the Digha Nikāya (DN), particularly in the second sutta of the DN, the Sāmaññaphala-sutta (DN2), where it is presented in its complete version. More than twenty kinds of different formulas are seen in this path structure, and I will use two of them (the first jhāna formula and the indriya-

6 The full list of the formulas is listed as follows:

1. The arising of the Tathāgata (tathāgata uppajjati).
2. The obtaining of confidence in the Buddha's teaching (saddham paṭilabbhā).
3. The accomplishment of sila (silāsāsana).
4. The restraint of faculties (indriyāceti gattaṁvāra).
5. Mindfulness and Clear Comprehension (satisampajñāna).
6. Contentment (santuṣṭha).
7. Dwells solitarily (vivittum senāsanam bhajati).
8. The abandoning of five hindrances (pañcavāsana).
9. The gaining of first jhāna.
10. Second jhāna.
11. Third jhāna.
12. Fourth jhāna.
13. The inclination of mind to seeing and knowing (dhanakkassa).
14. The inclination of mind to mind-made body (manomaya).
15. Manifold supernatural power (iddhi).
17. The ability of knowing other's mind (cetopariyaṁ)āna).
18. The knowledge of recollecting past lives (pubbensāñcaussatiṁ)āna).
19. Seeing beings passing away and reborn (sattānām cutūpaṇī)āna).
20. The destruction of the cankers (āsavānaṁ khayaṁ)āna).
samvara or indriyesu guttadvāro formula) as my examples in the current paper.

In addition, I must explain how I define a 'formula'. A formula is generally one passage, or a set of fixed sentences that expresses a specific meditation practice. It is sometimes difficult to precisely define a formula, and scholars have not been entirely consistent either with regard to their exact length, or in setting limits to the group of phrases they contain. However, although the length of the formulas used in this essay do vary in these ways, with words, phrases, or even whole sentences, being added or left out in the different versions quoted, their status as formulas is relatively clear. Both the shortest 'bare formula' and its expanded versions will be treated as expressions of the same practice, and regarded equally as examples of the same formula. Indeed, the 'variations' in the formulas – the additional parts, and their wording - are themselves of primary interest in this investigation.

My examination of these formulas is based on an extensive textual and literal critical comparison, as well as doctrinal considerations. I attempt to investigate the same formula as they occur in many sources, including the Pali,

---

Sanskrit and Chinese versions. The comparisons are made on two different levels. First, the same formula can be examined in various versions of the same text or context; I refer here to the Sāmaññaphala-sutta, which is preserved in one Pali text (DN2), a Sanskrit (Saṅghabhedavastu or SBV) text, and at least two Chinese sources (Amozhoujing or DĀ20, Jīzhiguojìng or JZG), and the path structure this text reveals. Second, the various occurrences of the same path structure in different texts can be examined. For example, we may find it in the Majjhima Nikāya (MN), and its counterpart in the Madhyama Āgama (MĀ). Moreover, a similar formula, or sometimes the same formula, may also occur in contexts other than the path structure, thus providing a good opportunity for the comparison of different usages. In short, multiple methods of examination can be undertaken, including comparison between different collections of the canon (e.g. DN and MN, DĀ and MĀ), as well as inter-recensions (e.g. MN and MĀ) and inter-collections (MĀ and DN, MN and DĀ), and so on, and so forth. The implications of each method of comparison will be explained in the

---

1 The Tibetan versions have been left out simply because of the limited scope in this paper.
discussion, although I must emphasize that the extent of the comparisons made will necessarily be limited by the scope of the present work.

The following sections set out the details of the ways in which two formulas were examined and the results of the comparative studies through various sources.

**Example 1: the introductory sentence in the first jhāna formula**

The first example I would like to present is the first jhāna formula. It is commonly known to Buddhist scholars that in Buddhist meditation theory the attainment of the first jhāna is usually gained after the abandoning of the five hindrances, and this is particularly clear in the path structure mentioned before. For instance, in the Sāmaññaphala-sutta (DN2), the first jhāna formula is stated after the description of the abandonment of the five hindrances (DN 73, 20-74, 12):

$tass' imē pañca nīvarāne pahīne attani samanupassato pāmuśjam jāyati, pamuditassa piti jāyati, piti-mañassa kāyo passambhati, passaddha-kāyo sukham vedeti, sukhiṃ cittam samādhiyati.
(When he sees that these five hindrances have been abandoned within himself, gladness arises. When he is gladdened, rapture arises. When his mind is filled with rapture, his body becomes tranquil; tranquil in body, he experiences happiness; being happy, his mind becomes concentrated. )

so vivice’ eva kāme hi vividha akusalehi
dhammehi savitakkam savicāram vivekajam pīti-sukham
pathamajjhānāṁ upasampajja viharati.

(Quite secluded from sense pleasures, secluded from unwholesome states, he enters and dwells in the first jhāna, which is accompanied by applied and sustained thought and filled with the rapture and happiness born of seclusion.)

The above formula can be divided into two parts; the first is an introductory sentence, and the second is the core content which is considered to be the main body of the formula.

A Sanskrit parallel to the Sāmaññaphala-sutta (or Śrāmanyaphala-sūtra in Sanskrit) in the Saṅghabheda-vastu (SBV)

---

9 By quoting the passage from DN2, I am using Walshe (1987)’s English translation. The English translation of MN and SN are taken from Bhikkhu Bodhi’s works (1995, 2000). The English translation of AN is taken from Woodward and Hare (1932-1936) with some alteration.
of the Gilgit manuscript has recorded the formula in the following form (242, 20-243, 11):  

\[ \text{imāni paśca nīvaramāṇī cittopakleśakarāṇī prahāya prajñā daurbalyakarāṇī vighātapakṣāṇy antvāṇasamvartaniyāni, viviktam kāmaīr viviktaṁ pāpakair akusāladharmaś savitarkaṁ savicaram vivekajāṁ pritisukhaṁ prathamaṁ dhyāṇam upasampadya viharati.} \]

A Chinese parallel to DN2, the twentieth sūtra of the Dirgha Āgama (DĀ20), has the following statement of the formula (T01n1, 85b10):

自見未離諸障蓋心，覆蔽、聞見，慧眼不明。
彼即精勤，捨欲、惡不善法，與覺，觀俱，離生喜、樂，得入初禪。

(The seeing for himself that the hindrances have not been abandoned, which are the obstacles of the mind, concealed, darkness and not bright of the wisdom-eye, he practises earnestly, secluded from the senses pleasures, evil and unwholesome states, he enters and dwells in the first jhāna,

---

which is accompanied by applied and sustained thought and filled with the rapture and happiness born of seclusion.)

Another Chinese parallel, the *Jizhiguojing* 寂志果經 (IZG), which is an independent translation (not included in the existing Dirgha Āgama collection) of the *Sāmaññaphala-sutta* (or *Śrāmānyaphala-sūtra*), has preserved the following reading (T01n22, 274c08):

除五蓋、遠塵勞心力得智慧，而脫眾厄、刑獄、飢餓。已去受欲、眾不善法，有想、有行，寂而清淨，行第一禪。(Abandoning the five hindrances, away from the defilements, the mind is able to gain wisdom, he has rid himself of dangers, prisons and hunger, [etc.] Secluded from the sense pleasures and unwholesome states, he enters and dwells in the first *jhāna*, which is accompanied by applied and sustained thought, tranquil and purified.)

All the above four cases presumably reflect the same text, but it is seen that although the main body (i.e., the second sentence) of the formula remains the same, the introductory sentence in DN2 is different from the other versions. Whilst the Sanskrit and Chinese

11 The English translation from the Chinese Āgamas is my own translation.
sources preserve a shorter sentence, which describes the nature of the hindrances (i.e. the obscurations of the mind and wisdom, etc.), DN2 contains a longer sentence, which expresses the gradual arising of the happy mind, from gladness to concentration. It seems that two kinds of introductory sentences are recorded in the first jhāna formula in different texts. For the convenience of comparison, and by applying the first key word from the sentence, I tentatively called the first the pāmuṭja fixed sentence (as seen in DN2), and the second the nīvaraṇa fixed sentence (as seen in SBV, DĀ, JZG).

Furthermore, a second observation can be made: in the introductory sentence (i.e., the nīvaraṇa fixed sentence), the Sanskrit and Chinese versions differ slightly in terms of the wording, particularly in the description of the hindrances. Some have more adjectives qualifying the hindrances, whilst others have fewer. Their occurrences can be recalled as follows (the underlined phrases represent the variant reading):

SBV:
\[\text{imāni pañca-varāṇāni cittopakleśa-karāṇi prahāya prajñā-}\]
\[\text{daurbalya-karāṇi vighātapaksyāny anirvānasamvyanttiyāni.}\]

DĀ20:
自見末離諸陰蓋心、覆蔽、闇冥、慧眼不明。
IIZG:
除五蓋，遠塵勞心力得智慧。

MN and AN:
so ime pañca nīvarāṇe pahāya cetaso upakkilese paññāya
dubbalikarane

Why is DN2 different from the others? What is the
significance of this? And do the differences of wording in the
nīvarāṇa fixed sentence tell us anything in particular?

These questions become even more compelling when we look
at further occurrences. In the Pali accounts, the path structure,
which is the same as DN2, is also seen in the MN(e.g. MN27) and
AN(e.g. A II 208). They read the first jhāna formula in the
following way (e.g. M I 179, A II 208):

so ime pañca nīvarāṇe pahāya cetaso upakkilese paññāya
dubbalikaranero vīvico' eva kāmehi vīvīccha akusalehi
dhanamhi savitakkaṃ savicāraṃ vivekajam pātisukham
pathamajjhānam upasampajja viharati.

A Chinese parallel to the MN27, the MĀ146, agrees with the
above reading (T01n26, 657c21):
It is somehow surprising that the introductory sentence in the MN and AN does not follow DN2, but rather makes use of a form that is similar to the non-DN2 versions. In other words, MN and AN both apply the nivaraṇa fixed sentence rather than the pāmuṇja fixed sentence as the introductory sentence to the first jhāna formula. It is of interest to ask why both MN and AN do not follow DN2, especially when they too are coming from the Pali tradition? And why is the expression in MN and AN so close to SBV, DĀ and IZG?

Many more examples throughout the Nikāyas and Āgamas can be enumerated, but these are sufficient for our discussion. On the basis of the aforementioned accounts, several points can be made:

1. There are variations between the same texts in various versions.
2. The variations are also seen between different collections in the same tradition, i.e., DN and MN.
3. Variant readings occur between different recensions: the Pali, Sanskrit and Chinese sources.

4. The main content of the formula remains the same in each version.

How are we to interpret all of these points?

One simple and usual way to explain them is that these texts were preserved by different Buddhist schools in different periods of time. For instance, the Pali source is believed to belong to the Theravāda tradition, SBV has a Sarvāstivāda origin, DĀ may be a product of the Dharmaguptaka, while the affiliation of IZG is uncertain. The variations are probably a result of changes occurring within each school, or simply speaking, each school has its own version of the text. Again, a simple reason for explaining the second point is that the difference between MN and DN versions may come from the bhānakas system. However, this general view, though plausible and useful, is not very satisfactory, since it does not tell us much about the real causes for the variations.

Another interpretation is that the variations originated perhaps from the fallibility of the redactor(s), the transmitter(s), the scribe(s) or even the translator(s) of the texts, and that the changes are made either intentionally or unintentionally. However, when we examine the above variations in detail, they do not seem to
involve 'corruptions' or 'errors' from the perspective of textual criticism. Furthermore, as we do not have definite evidence of an original root text from which all these versions and all the variations were later made, we need a methodology involving a complex study based on textual criticism, before we can obtain direct evidence that the redactor(s), etc., are to 'blame'. However, since surviving manuscripts of early texts and textual criticism are relatively rare, and no complete collections of manuscripts representing each tradition have so far been assembled, relatively little can be done through textual criticism to account for the variations.

Nevertheless, it is still possible to find significant clues in the existing published or printed versions of the Nikāyas and Āgamas. I will try to demonstrate a simple application of this in the following discussion.

From the above evidence, it appears that the arrangement of the introductory sentence in DN2 is unique, since other versions, including MN and AN, follow another seemingly more common

---

12 The common possibilities for the corruptions suggested by the textual criticism (though mainly based on manuscripts traditions) are: handwriting, changes in spelling and pronunciation, omissions, addition, transposition, context, the influence of Christian thought (or religious thought in general), deliberate activity of the scribe, etc., (Cf. Reynolds and Wilson, 1991, pp. 222-233) and they do not seem to apply to the variations seen in Buddhist texts, at least in explicit way.
type of introductory sentence. Is the usage in DN2 a deliberate interpolation? Or is DN2 correct in adding the pāmuṇja fixed sentence to the formula? In order to investigate these questions, I searched for the occurrence of the pāmuṇja fixed sentence (if at all possible a full list of occurrences) throughout the four Nikāyas and Āgamas, to see whether it is valid to put this fixed sentence in the place reserved for the beginning of the first jhāna formula.

I found that the main part of the pāmuṇja fixed sentence consists of the set phrase: pāmuṇjam jāyati, pāmuṇjaśca pīti jāyati, pīti-mānaṁ kāyo pahissambhāti, pāsaṁddhikāyo sukham vedeti, sukhis cittaṁ samādhiyati. This set phrase is seen in many places, and I will call it the pāmuṇja set phrase. It appears in various contexts, and their occurrences will be summarised in the list below. Note that in the list I use the arrow ‘→’ to refer to the sequence of the relevant phrases or themes that occur before or after the pāmuṇja set phrase, thus indicating the main points of the context in order.

1. Pañca-vimuttīyanāṁ (D III 241-3, A III 21-3, T1, 51c; T1, 230c-231b)

Five practices (receiving teaching, etc.) → so tasmiṁ dhamme attha-patisamvedi ca hoti dhammapatisamvedi ca tassa attha-patisamvedino dhammapatisamvedino pāmojjam jāyati → the pāmuṇja set phrase
2. Nava-dhammā (D III 288, S II 31-2, A V 1-7, A V 311-7, T1, 485a-487c; T1, 572b-c; T1, 563c-564a)
yoniso-manasikaro to pāmōjjaṃ jāyati \(\rightarrow\) the pāmūjja set

phrase \(\Rightarrow\) samahitena cittena yathā-rūpam pajānāti passati,
yathā-bhūtan jānām passam nibbindatī, nibbindam virajjati,
virāgā vimuccati.

3. The recollection of the Buddha, etc. (M I 37-8, S V 398, A III 285; V 329, 333-4, T2, 574a-c)
sō: buddhe ... dhamme ... saṅghe ... avaccappasādena
samannāgato ’mhi ’ti labhati atthavedam, labhati
dhammavedam, labhati dhammupasamhitam pāmūjja \(\rightarrow\) the
pāmūjja set phrase \(\Rightarrow\)(one of the below cases)

(1)MN: Brahma-vihāra \(\rightarrow\) liberation

(2)SN: samāhite citte dhammā pātubhavanti, dhammānam
pātubhāva appamādavihāri teva saṅkhām gacchati

(3)AN: ariyasaṅvako visamagatāya pajāya samappatto
viharati, saryāpajjāya pajāya avyāpajjho viharati,
dhammasotassamāpanno buddhānussatim bhāvetti

4. Satta-bojjhanga (M III 85-6; S V 66-9; 332; 339)
satisambojjhanga \(\rightarrow\) dhammavicayasambojjhanga \(\rightarrow\)
viriyasambojjhāngo, āraddhaviriyassa uppajjati pitī nirāmisā
\(\Rightarrow\) pītisambojjhango, pitimanaṃ kāyo pi passambhati cītīm
pi passambhati → passaddhisam-bojjhanga, passaddhakāyassa
sukhaṃ hoti sukhiṃ cittaṃ samādhiyati →
samādhisambojjhango, so tathā samāhitam cittaṃ sañdhukāṃ
ajjhupakkhitā hoti → upikhasambojjhanga.

5. **Individual account**

**M I 283:** abandoning of covetousness, etc. → purified and
liberated from evil states → **the pānūjja set phrase**
Brahma-vihāra → āsavānaṃ khaya

**S IV 78:** dwells with restraint over six faculties → **the pānūjja set phrase**
samāhite citte dhammā pātubhavanti,
dhammānām pātubhāvā appamādavihāri tveva
saṅkhaṃ gacchati

**S IV 351:** good conduct → **Brahma-vihāra** reflecting: yañca
kāyassa bhedā param maraṇā sugatim saṅgaṃ lokam
upapajjissāmi → **the pānūjja set phrase**

**S V 156:** bare formula of satipaṭṭhāna → inspiring sign → **the pānūjja set phrase** reflecting on withdrawing: so iti
paṭissamikkhati: yassa khvāhaṃ atthāya cittaṃ
panidahim. so me attī sa bhinnipphanno. handa dāni
patisamharatī. so patisamharati ceva na ca vitakketi
na ca vicārati, avitakkombhi avicāro ajhattam satimā
sukhamasmi ti pajānāti.

A I 243: harmonious company → beget much merit → dwell in
Brahma-vihāra (brahman bhikkhave vihāram tasmin
samaye bhikkhū viharanti) → yadidam muditāya
cetovimuttiyā pamuditissa piṭi jāyati, pitimanassa kayo
passambhati, passaddhakāyo sukham vediyati, sakhino
cittām samādhiyati

D I 196: abandoning acquired self → defiling mental states
disappear → purified states grow strong → diṭthe va
dhamme sayam abhiṃśa sacchikatvā upasampajjā
viharissati → pāmujaṃ c'eva bhavissati piṭi ca
passadhi ca sati ca sampajaṇṇaḥ ca, sukho ca vihāro

I do not intend to go further in explaining the details or minor
differences in each occurrence of each category as listed above,
but to sum up the main concern. The pāmuja set phrase is found
in five categories of contexts, but none of them follows the
Silakkhandhavagga by placing it in the intermediate location
between the abandoning of hindrances and the attainment of the
first jhāna. Therefore it seems that in terms of ‘form’ the above
occurrences do not support DN2's usage. However, a noticeable point is apparent, that some of the above accounts have revealed a relationship between the pādumja set phrase and the samādhi practice. Although this relationship is unclear in the first category of the accounts, the following connection is clear from some examples (S IV 78, V 398) in the third and fifth categories: the pādumja set phrase → samāhite cittte dhammā pātubhavanti. The second and fourth categories also make it clear that the pādumja set phrase is a series of states leading up to samādhi. Additionally, in some cases the set phrase is preceded by sila practice, followed by wisdom practice (e.g., yathābhūtānaṇadassana) and concludes with the result of liberation. As a consequence, the structure of sila, samādhi, paññā and vimutti is clearly indicated, and there is no doubt that pādumja set phrase signifies the samādhi practice. From this point of view, the expression of the pādumja set phrase → samāhite cittte dhammā pātubhavanti accords quite well with DN2's usage on the sequence of the abandonment of five hindrances → the pādumja fixed sentence → first jhāna. In other words, the pādumja set phrase denotes a stage leading to jhāna, and is thus equivalent to the nivaraṇa fixed sentence. For this reason DN's usage does not seem to be an accident, because the arrangement of the pādumja fixed sentence seems to be as valid as the nivaraṇa fixed sentence. If this is so, it would lead us to think of how the formula was formed. First, the main body of the
formula remains the same, but another fixed sentence was applied
(pāṇujja fixed sentence) to replace the more common fixed
sentence (niśvarana fixed sentence) on a possibly valid doctrinal
basis. There is no contradiction involved in exchanging these two
sentences, which may have been intended to make a specific
point, although the simple use of a preferred similar sentence is
the more likely explanation. Second, the expression of DN2
implies that the meditation formula is not an entirely fixed and
unchanged entity. The formula is a composition of different
smaller units, each of which I refer to as a fixed sentence or set
phrase. Relevant fixed sentences or set phrases are put together to
constitute a formula. This information is probably not new to
scholarship, but the formation of a formula in terms of smaller
building blocks may reveal some message regarding how the oral
tradition worked. Before we move on from here, let us briefly look

\[\text{11} \text{ We may have some other doctrinal reasons to support this. In a private}
\text{communication, Mr Lance Cousins has kindly offered me a solution that pāṇujja}
\text{pericope could be seen as an upacārasamādhi (in contrast to the jñānas which are}
apunāsamādhi). This is very profound but unfortunately I haven’t had success to
\text{find direct evidence to prove this. In another occasion, Dr Rupert Gethin pointed}
\text{out to me that DN2 has an emphasis on the progression of happiness in its context,}
\text{and the pāṇujja fixed sentence is a case in point to the arrangement. His}
\text{comment is also a very good point for interpretation, though further clarification}
\text{is needed.}\]
at another point regarding the variation of the *nivaraṇa* fixed sentence as referred to earlier.

The expression of the *nivaraṇa* fixed sentence is basically about the hindrances that are described as the corruptions of the mind and the weakeners of wisdom. It is found that different wording of the *nivaraṇa* fixed sentence occurs in the SBV, DA, JZG and MN. At first sight, the differences seem to be trivial and unimportant. For instance, SBV differs from MN and AN only by the addition of two extra adjectives to the hindrances: tending to vexation and leading away from *nirvāṇa* (*vighā tepakṣyaṇy anirvānasamvarṇatiyāṇī*). And DA20 has some adjective words about the obstruction and darkness of the hindrances (*蓋*、覆蔽、闇冥、慧眼不明) that are not seen in other versions. However, when we compare these differences to the occurrences of the *nivaraṇa* fixed sentence in other places in the Nikāyas and Āgamas, some interesting points do arise. This is especially true when we look at the chapter of 'connected discourses on the factors of enlightenment' (*bojhangasamyutta*) in the Samyutta Nikāya (SN, S V 63-140), where the description of the five hindrances, or occurrences of the *nivaraṇa* fixed sentence, are collectively brought together and displayed in different *suttas*. This is also the case in the Chinese Samyukta Āgama (SĀ), throughout which there is a scattering of occurrences. I do not intend to demonstrate each occurrence in detail here, but will summarise briefly. In this
particular chapter, we have recognised at least five main types of expression for the *nīvaraṇa* fixed sentence, each of which differs in the way in which it depicts the hindrances. Examples will be listed as set out below, and the Chinese parallels will also be listed as indicated by the equation symbol ‘=’. It should be noted that the wording of the Chinese text corresponding to SN is not always directly comparable to the Pali accounts, though to a large extent they do agree with each other quite well.

Different readings of the *nīvaraṇa* fixed sentence in the SN and SĀ:

1. S V 95 ( &A III 63):

   *ime kho bhikkhave pañca āvaranā nīvaraṇā cetaso*
   *upakkilesā paññāya dubbalikaranā*

   =《雜含》SĀ707 (T2, 189c):

   世尊告諸比丘：有五障，五蓋，煩惱於心、能養智慧、
   障闇之分、非明、非正覺、不轉趣涅槃。

2. S V 96-7:

   *ime kho bhikkhave pañca āvaranā nīvaraṇā cetaso*
   *ājñhāriḥ paññāya dubbalikaranā*

   =《雜含》SĀ708 (T2, 190a):
何等為五？謂貪欲蓋，漸漸增長，睡眠、掉悔、疑蓋，漸漸增長。以增長故，令善心覆覆、墜溝。

3. S V 97:
pañcime bhikkhave nivaranā andhakaraṇā acakkhukaṇā
aññānakaraṇā paññānirodhikā vighātapaṭkhiyā
anibbānasamvattanikā

= 《雜含》SĀ706 (T2, 189c):
諸比丘！有五法，能為黑闇，能為無明，能為無智，能獲智慧、非明、非等覺，不轉貪涅槃。

4. S V 108:
pañca nivarane pahāya cetaso upakkilese paññāya
dubbali karaṇe sattabojjhange yathābhūtam bhāvethāti.

= 《雜含》SĀ713 (T2, 191a) (This is the closest case to SBV):
斷五蓋，覆心、慧力贏，為障礙分，不轉貪涅槃
(=vighātapaṭkṣyānāni nivānasamvartaniyām)；住四念處，修七覺意。

5. S V 115-7:
etha tumhe bhikkhave pañcanivarane pahāya cetaso
upakkilese pahāya dubbalikaraṇe mettāsahagatena cetasā
ekam disam pharitvā viharatha

=《雜含》SĀ743 (T2, 197b):
[不]斷五蓋，惱心、慧力羸、煩障分、不善業等，盡
攝其心，住四念處；心與慧俱，無怒、無嗔，亦無瞋
恚，廣大、無量，善修，充滿四方、四維上下，一切世
間。

The above different expressions accord well with the
differences seen in the SBV, MN&AN, DĀ20 and JZG. The
expression in SBV is almost the same as SĀ713, and the
equivalent terms of vighātapaksyāṇy anirvānasaṃvartaniyāni can
be found in S V 97 (vighātapakkhiyā anibbānasaṃvattaniyā)\textsuperscript{14}
Furthermore, MN&AN’s expression is similar to S V 95, 96-7 and

\textsuperscript{14} It is worth noting that the Pali correspondent (S V 108) to the SĀ713 does not
have the terms vighātapakkhiyā anibbānasaṃvattani. These terms occur in
another text (S V 97). The Chinese correspondent (SA706) to the text in S V 97
has a slightly different wording in comparison to the Pali account as well. This is
perhaps another notion in showing that the changeable and compatible wording
can be exchanged between texts. Moreover, in identifying the corresponding
relationship between SN and SĀ I follow Akamnua’s catalogue (1929). The
identification is usually indicated by the parallel context between two texts.
108, and DĀ20’s phrases of ‘obstructions, darkness, etc.’ can also be found in many places under such terms: āvarana (obstructions =障), andhakaraṇa (making blind =能為黑闇), ajjāhūthā (high over =能為障), aññānakaraṇa (making ignorance =能為無智), etc. This observable fact offers us an excellent example for explaining the differences in the above texts. Since many types of the nīvaraṇa fixed sentence with minor variation were recorded in the SN and SĀ, it is difficult to tell which of them is the earliest or original reading, but they are more likely to have existed more or less at the time when the canon was composed.\(^{15}\) Simply speaking, it seems to me that the canon has collected most, if not all, of the possible expressions for the nīvaraṇa fixed sentence together, each of them being applied in a particular text or context,\(^{16}\) and some repeatedly used in other texts. When we turn to the case of the non-DN2 Sāmaññaphala-sutta texts, the variation seen in different sources is not really a ‘variant reading’, because each type of reading is already seen in the canon. It seems as if the redactor of each version of the text has either picked one particular option

---

\(^{15}\) I do not claim that there was no time sequence for the occurrence of each expression, but I would argue that the sequence is relatively insignificant, because it is not seem to be the time difference of centuries, or before and after the Buddha’s time.

\(^{16}\) Perhaps some of these texts represent the original reference for a particular type of expression.
from the many available to apply in its use in his own text, or made a slight change according to his memory. In either case, he would have been clearly aware that the adding or exchanging of some descriptive words did not affect the meaning of the sentence, even if it did perhaps indicate a slight failure to memorise the exact wording of a particular expression, or it was due to a little confusion. If my speculation is reasonable, it reveals a feature of the formation of the fixed sentence as well as formula in Buddhist texts, which indicates a fixed structure and meaning, but permits a dynamic alteration in wording within a range of options. This is to be expected in an oral tradition, particularly sometimes when precise word-for-word memorisation is difficult to be achieved. However, under the principle of memorising major points, the preservation and transmission of the correct meaning will still be maintained.

The next example, which echoes the aforementioned aspects of the formation of the formula, will tell us more about the principle applied in the oral tradition.
Example 2: The *indriya-samvara* or *indriyesu guttadvāro* formula

The second example I would like to present is a formula called the *indriya-samvara* or *indriyesu guttadvāro* formula, which concerns the restraint of the sense faculties when one is encountering the relevant sense objects (e.g., seeing a form with the eye).

Again, I will list the occurrences of the formula in each version of the *Sāmaññaphala-sutta* in the first place, followed by the other texts. The formula is read in each of the four texts (DN2, SBV, DĀ21 and JZG) as follows:

1. DN2 (*Dīgha Nikāya*, D I 70):

   (1) *kathān ca mahā-rāja bhikkhu indriyesu guttadvāro hoti?*
   (2) *idha mahā-rāja bhikkhu caṇkhunā rūpam divisvā na nimittaggāhi hoti nānuvyañjanaggāhi. yatvādhikaraṇam enaṃ caṇkhundriyam asaṃvutam viharantam abhijjhā- dumanassā pāpakā akusalā dhammā anvāsavayyum tassa saṃvarāya patipajjati, rakkhati caṇkhundriyam, caṇkhundriye saṃvaram āpajjati, sotena saddaṃ sutvā ... pe ... ghānena gandham ghāyitvā ... pe ... jivhāya rasam sāyitvā ... pe ... kāyena phoṭṭhabbaṃ phusitvā ... pe ...*
manasā dhammam viññāya na nimittaggahī hoti
nānuvyayanānāgghahī. yatvādhi karaṇanam enaṃ manindriyam
asamvutam viharantam abhiji-domanassā pāpakā akusalā
dhammā anvāssaveyyum tassa samvarāya paṭipajjati,
rakkhati manindriyam, manindriye samvaram āpajjati.
(3) so iminā ariyena indriyasamvareṇa samannāgato
ajjhattam avyāseka-sukham paṭisaṃvedetī. evam kho mahā-
rāja bhikkhu indriyesu gutta-dvāro hoti.

英譯：
(1) And how, great king, does the bhikkhu guard the doors of
his sense faculties?
(2) Herein, great king, having seen a form with the eye, the
bhikkhu does not grasp at the sign or the details. Since, if he
were to dwell without restraint over the faculty of the eye, evil
unwholesome states such as covetousness and grief might
assail him, he practises restraint, guards the faculty of the eye,
and achieves restraint over the faculty of the eye. Having heard
a sound with the ear ... an odour with the nose ... having tasted
a flavour with the tongue ... having touched a tangible object
with the body ... having recognised a mind-object with the
mind, the bhikkhu does not grasp at the sign or the details.
Since, if he were to dwell without restraint over the faculty of
the mind, evil unwholesome states such as covetousness and
grief might assail him, he practises restraint, guards the
faculty of the mind, and achieves restraint over the faculty of the mind.

(3) Endowed with this noble restraint of the sense faculties, he experiences within himself an unblemished happiness. In this way, great king, the bhikkhu guards the doors of the sense faculties.

2. SBV (Sanghabhedavastu, 230, 11-16):

(1) sa indriyair guptadvāro bhavati; nipakasmṛtir
guptasmyānānasah sahavasthāvaccārakah;
(2) sa caksuṣo rūpāṇi ṛṣṭvā na nimmagṛhī bhavati;
nānuvyājanagrāhī; yato’dhikaraṇam eva cakṣurindriyena
asamvarasamvr̥tasya viharatah abhidhyādaurmanasye loke
pāpakā akūṣalā dharmāś cittam anusravanti; teṣām
samvarāya pratipadyate; rakṣati cakṣurindriyam;
cakṣurindriyena samvaram āpadyate; śrotṛndriyena śabdān,
ghrāṇendriyena gandhān, jihvāyā rasān, kāyena spratavyānī,
mansā dharmān vijñāya na nimmagṛhī bhavati;
nānuvyājanagrāhī; yato’dhikaraṇam eva manaindriyena
asamvarasamvr̥tasya viharatah abhidhyādaurmanasye loke
pāpakā akūṣalā dharmāś cittam anusravanti; teṣām
samvarāya pratipadyate; rakṣati manaindriyam;
manaindriyena samvaram āpadyate

(3) missing
3. **DĀ20 (Dirgha Ágama, T1n1, 84c15-20):**

(1) **missing**

(2) 目雖見色而不取相，眼不為色之所拘繫，堅固寂然，
無所貪著，亦無憂患；不漏諸惡，堅持戒品，善護眼
根。耳、鼻、舌、身、意亦復如是。善御六觸，護持調
伏，令得安隱。

(Having seen a form with his eye, [he] does not grasp at the
sign; [his] eye is not attached to the form. (He) is firm and
calm, without covetousness and with no grief, evil states might
not flow into [his mind]. Endowed with moral practice
(*silasampanna), he guards the eye faculty properly, and thus
for the ear, nose, tongue, body and mind. He controls the six
contacts (*phassa), through restraint and taming he seeks to
gain tranquillity.)

(3) 猶如平地駕四馬車，善調御者，執鞭挾控，使不失轡。

比丘如是，御六根馬，安隱無失。

(Just as a skilful charioteer, while driving a four-horse chariot
on level ground, holds the reins and holds the whip to get the
chariot under control; so too a bhikkhu guard the horse of the
six sense faculties in safety without mistake.)
4. JZG (寂志果經, T1n22, 274b8-13):

(1) 根門寂定，心在安跡，諸根不亂，守護其心，故使無想在道。

(Tranquil the sense doors (*indriyadvāra-upaśamā), the mind is in a peaceful state. The sense faculties are undisturbed (*aviksīpta-indriyā). [He ] protects the mind(*raksītasmṛti) and tends to make it with the way without thought / consciousness. (i.e., he does not have any thought attached to the sense objects.)

(2) 目見好色，不想求以為好。斷滅所受，奉行善本，其心內住，遠離內色，守護眼根。如是耳聲鼻香舌味身更，不以想求，亦無所著，除諸不可，棄諸愚癡，斷不善法。其意內住，故使不亂，令心根定。

(Having seen a pleasing form with the eye, he does not think upon it as pleasing. He cuts off what was being felt/received and practices good conduct; his mind dwells internally (*ajjhatam cittam santhitam) and away from internal form; he guards the eye faculty. And thus [in the same way for] the [hearing of ] sound with ear, odour with the nose, flavour with the tongue, tangible objects with the body. He is not intent upon nor is he attached to [the sense objects]. He dispels the
unpleasant and ignorance. Cutting off the unwholesome states, his mind becomes steadied internally. He tends to be unconfused in order to settle down the mind faculty.

(3) 其比丘奉是賢聖戒，第一知足，其心寂定，禮節恆定。

(The Bhikkhu is endowed with the āriya-sīla, the contentment, and the tranquillity of the mind with the restraint of the sense faculties.)

The formula can be divided into three parts: (1) the introductory sentence, (2) the main body, and (3) the closing sentence. We can see that differences occurs in each part. The variations in the first two parts are of particular importance. The main points can be summed up as follows. First, in part (1), DN2 has a short sentence, which is a simple way of introducing the formula, whereas SBV presents an introduction with a sentence possessing further meaning, which is not seen in DN. DĀ does not have the first part, but starts from the second. JZG has a sentence, which is closer to SBV with even more additional words (see underlined phrases), and it is worth noting here, as will be illustrated later, that these words are another type of important expression to the same practice. Second, in part (2), the formulations in DN2, DĀ and SBV agree with each other quite well, while JZG's expression is interesting, as it seems to state an explanation that is not entirely identical with the expression in the
other three texts. For instance, its wording tends to highlight ‘the non-attachment to the delighted forms, cutting off what was being felt/received,’ rather than ‘not grasping at the sign or the details.’ In other words, there is a slight shift in the meaning. Finally, in the expression of part (3), DN2 has added an expression of the experience of the unblemished happiness in the practice; SBV does not have a closing sentence; JZG has a plain sentence, which is merely a repetition of the title of the formula and other practices; and it is interesting to see that DĀ20 has a simile attached to the main formula.

How are we to explain these variations, and what is their significance? Before we attempt to offer an explanation, let us look at some more examples in other texts.

The indriya-samvara formula also appears in MN and AN, in the accounts of the path structure. Its expression in MN and AN basically agrees with DN2. However, a Chinese parallel to MN27, the MĀ146, states the formula as follows (T1n26, 657c3-9):

(1) 守護諸根，常念開塞，念欲明達，守護念心而得成就，恒起正知。

---

17 Cf. MN27 (M I 180-1), A II 208, etc.

18 This title reflects indriya-samvara rather than indriyesu g txtadvıro.
(He guards the sense faculties, thinks of closing [them] constantly and tends to be luminous in mind. He achieves restraint over the mind and clear comprehension arises [in him] all the time.)

(2) 若眼見色，然不受想，亦不味色，謂念誹故... (the same as DN2)

(3) missing.

MĀ146 clearly has a fixed sentence in part (1) of the formula, which makes it different from DNs and MNs, but it agrees with SBV and JZG. The wording of this fixed sentence is worthy of discussion. The expression of the latter phrases (He achieves restraint ... all the time) is close to SBV and JZG, and the former phrase ‘thinks of closing [the senses] constantly and tends to be luminous in mind’ is neither seen in Pali nor Sanskrit versions. The idea of ‘closing’ is of particular interest, as it bears some similarity to JZG’s expression of ‘cutting off what was perceived’. This is clearly a variation between recensions (MN and MĀ). If we bring together all the other differences, we also see that there

19 味色, lit. ‘characterize the form’. Chinese seems to translate a term from vyañjyati rather than anuvyāñjana, because 味 is usually a translation for vyañjana.

20 誹誹, lit. ‘dispute’. Chinese seems to take up the third meaning of adhikarana, see PED 27.
are variation between collections, such as MN and DN in part (3), and MA and DA in part (1); and that there is a similarity (or ‘correspondence’) between MA and SBV, JZG in part (1).

If we carry on and look at more occurrences in other texts that apply the indriya-samvara or indriyesu gatadvāro formula in contexts other than the path-structure, the picture becomes even more complicated. I shall skip the details of these complications in this paper, and return to the questions raised earlier.

\[21\] For example, in MN33, the Mahāgāpālaka-sutta (M I 223), a description of about eleven qualities (ekādasa-dhamma) is seen. These qualities are referring to a simile of a cowherd who possesses eleven factors. The fourth factor is ‘he dresses wounds’ (vaman paticchedā hota) and the indriya-samvara formula is applied to this factor. There are three Chinese parallels, SĀ1249, EĀ40-1 and one independent translation, the Foshuo fangqiu jing (佛說放牛經), all of them have the same context as MN33. However, the wording of indriya-samvara formula differs in each text, as shown below:

**Chinese parallel 1.** SĀ1249 (T2, 343a2-4) reads:

云何不覆壞？謂眼見色，隨取形相，不守貪根。世間貪憂，忘不善法，心隨生漏，不能防護。耳、鼻、舌、身、意根亦復如是，是名不覆其壞。

**Chinese parallel 2.** EĀ40-1 (T2, 546b11-14) reads:

云何應護而不可護？比丘！見色起想，聞聲愛著，思惟形相，不知為惡，不護眼根。耳、鼻、舌、身、心，盡欲外愛，而不能護。如是，比丘！應護而不可護。

And the Foshuo fangqiu jing (佛說放牛經, T2n123, 547a) reads:
From the occurrences discussed so far it can be seen that the main body of the formula remains the same in most cases (except in the case of JZG, where there are some differences), the changes happen merely in the introductory part and closing parts. Next, it seems that parts (1) and (3) can be separated from the main body of the formula, partly because each of them is missing in some cases; yet in the case of SBV, JZG and MĀ, the expression of part (1) is strongly attached to the main body, which makes the main formula look larger. In fact, the sentence of part (1) in SBV, JZG and MĀ can be seen as a fixed sentence, which I called the nipakasmti fixed sentence. The absence of this sentence in DN2, as well as in MN&AN, does not mean that it is totally absent in the Pali source. One such account is found in the AN (A III 138):

indriyesa guttadvārā viharatha ārakkhasato nipakasato sārakkhitamānasā satārakkhena cetasā samannāgata ti.

(Live with the sense-doors guarded, being mindfulness of watching over, be wise in mindfulness, with the way of the
mind well watched over, possessed of a mind that is mindful on watch.

It is interesting to note that in the above account a sentence similar to the nīpākaṃśtī fixed sentence is also used to refer to the practice of the restraint of the sense faculties.

It appears that this sentence is frequently used by many Chinese and Sanskrit sources. Since it is incorporated into the indriya-saṃvara or indriyesa guțtadvāro formula, and cannot be separated from the main body of the formula, its omission by the DN2, MN&AN is worth noting. It may well be the case that the transmitters of DN, etc. have regarded the expression of part (2) as sufficient, and hence chose to omit the sentence, or that they

---

22 For example, the indriya-saṃvara formula in the Śrāvakabhūmi (ŚrBh 9.13ff.) reads:

(1) indriyasamvaraḥ katamah, sa tam eva śīlasamvaram niśśritya āraṃśitaṃśtvit bhavati nīpākaṃśtvit

smṛtyāraṃśitaṃśtasah samāvasthāvocarakaḥ.

(2) Similar to SBV

And the indriya-saṃvara formula in the Mahāvastu (Mvu III 52.3-15) reads:

(1) taṃmāt ita kāṣyap evaṃ śīkaśitaṃ, kiṃ tv aham saṃsa indriyesa guptadvāro vihartiṃśtvit āraṃśitaṃ niśśritya niśśrityaṃśtvit samāvasthāvocarakaḥ ādānavadāvāviti niśśrityaḥ prajñā araktena cetasa samanvığataḥ.

(2) Similar to SBV.
simply preferred the shorter of the two options. In addition to this, a similar situation is found in part (3), where the attachment of a simile occurs in DĀ, but is missing in DN2, MN&AN. This simile, though is not expressed by DN2, etc., again, is not absent in the Pali canon. At S IV 176, a passage is employed to explain three kinds of practice: ‘one who guards the doors of the sense faculties, is moderate in eating and intent on wakefulness’ (indriyesu guttañcito, bhojanā mātattā, jāgariyam anuyutto). The first practice is represented by the indriya-samvara formula (the same as part (2) of the DN2 expression), and a simile is added to the formula, which has exactly the same content as seen in DĀ20.23

---

23 S IV 176:

seyyathāpi bhikkhave subhūniyaṃ cātunamahāpathe ājāññaratho yutto asa odihasatapado tam evaṃ daṅkho yoggācariyo assadammassarutthi abhirūdhvā vamena haṭṭhena rasmiyo gahetu dakkhiṇena haṭṭhena patodam, gahetu yenickenaham yadeccham samāraśi paṇcuppāraśi paṇc evam evaṃ kho bhikkhave bhikkhu imesam channam indriyānam arakkhāya sikkhati. sanyāmīya sikkhati damāya sikkhati upassāmāya sikkhati. evam kho bhikkhave bhikkhu indriyesu gubbiñcito hoti.

(Suppose, bhikkhus, a chariot harnessed to thoroughbreds was standing ready on even ground at a cross road, with a goad on hand. Then a skilful trainer, a charioteer of horses to be tamed, would mount it and taking the reins in his left hand and the goad in his right, would drive away and return by any route he wants, whenever he wants. So too, a bhikkhu trains in protecting these six sense faculties, trains in controlling them, trains in taming them, trains in
With regard to part (2), the case of JZG is worth explaining. Its key idea for the formula stating ‘Having seen a pleasing form with the eye, he does not intent upon it as pleasing’, is not expressed by other versions. Again, it is found that a similar expression is not totally absent in the Pali source. At S IV 120, a formula is applied to explain the practice of ‘guarding the doors’ (guttadvāra, presumably the guarding of the doors of the sense faculties), and the formula reads just like a description of the concept of ‘does not intent upon delighted nor unpleasant form’. Its key sentence, cakkhāna rūpam disvā piyarūpe rūpe ndhīmuccati, apiyarupe rūpe na vyāpajjati, supports JZG’s expression very well. This example provides more evidence that the expression of JZG that does not occur in DN2, etc., was not pacifying them. It is thus in this way, bhikkhu, that a bhikkhu guards the doors of the sense faculties.)

\[24\]

kittāvatā nu kho bho kaecāna guttadvāro hoti. idha brāhmaṇa bhikkhu cakkhāna rūpam disvā piyarūpe rūpe ndhīmuccati, apiyarupe rūpe na vyāpajjati upatthāya satiyā ca viharati appamāṇacetaso. taṇ ca cetovimuttim paññāvimmuttim yathābhīhantam pajānati, yathāssa te uppannā pāpakā akusala dhammā apurusasā nirujjhanti, sotena saññām sutvā ... ghānena gasdhām ghāyilvā ... jīvāya rasam ālayivā ... kāyena pūtthabham phusīvā ... manā dhammam viññāya pivarimpe dhamme ndhīmuccati. apiyarupe na vyāpajjati upatthāya satiyā ca viharati appamāṇacetaso taṇ ca cetovimuttim paññāvimmuttim yathābhīhantam pajānati yathāssa te uppannā pāpakā akusala dhammā apurusasā nirujjhanti.
necessarily unknown to Pali tradition, and hence not unique to non-Pali sources. Moreover, it may suggest that perhaps an exchange is happening in JZG in part (2) of the formula, in the sense that the transmitter of this text has chosen an alternative expression as his preference. In other words, at least two options were known to him, but he just happened to select the one that was different from other versions. The reason for the preference is not known, but it is not important since the main idea of the formula remains the same whichever option is used.

Lastly, we could add one example to show that extra words occurring in JZG and MĀ146 are not without their roots in other Buddhist texts. For instance, JZG and MĀ146 commonly express the concept of ‘no thought attached to [the sense objects]’ (JZG: 救使無想在道) or ‘thinking of closing [senses] constantly’ (MĀ146: 常念閉塞), and although it is not seen in the standard expression of the indriya-samvara formula, it is found as an important interpretation for the practice of the restraint of the sense faculties in many important Buddhist texts.²⁵

²⁵ Cf. EĀ21-6 (Ekottara Āgama, T2, 603e22-27), EĀ 49-8(T2, 802a3-7):

(1) 云何比丘諸根寂静？
(What is the tranquility of sense faculties (*indriya-upāsāma)?)

(2) 於是，比丘若無見色，不起想念，無有憶念，於眼根而得清淨，因
    於眼根得解脫，住賢善根，若耳聞聲，鼻嗅香，舌知味，身知細滑，
意知法，不起著者，無有識念，於意根而得清淨，因彼求於解脫，
但護意根。
(Herein, a bhikkhu, seeing a form with the eye, he has not arisen a
thought attached to it, without consciousness upon it he gains purification
over the eye faculty. Because he is looking for liberation, he guards his
eye faculty all the time. (and the same for other sense faculties)

Furthermore, with regard to No 6: MA’s reading of ‘thinking of closing
[senses] constantly’ (常念閉塞), see:
The *Visuddhimagga* 21:

    tassa samvarāya paṭipajjati tassa cakkhundriyassa satikavātena
    pidghanathāya paṭipajjati. (…he enters upon the way of closing that eye
    faculty by the door-panel of mindfulness)

And the *Saundarananda* XIV 1:

    atha smṛtyakavātena pidhāyendriya-sanyāmam bhajane bhava mātrajjho
dhyānāyānamāmayā ca.

    (Restraining of the senses by closing [them] with the door-panel of
    mindfulness …)

Also, with regard to JZG’s reading of ‘tends to make it with the way of
thoughtless’ (致使無想在道) see MN138 (M III 225-6):

cakkhuṁ rūpam divasā na rūpanimittānusāri viññāpaṁ hoti na
rūpanimittassādudgāthitam na rūpanimittassādasaṁyojana-saṁyuttam,
bhājana viññāpaṁ avikkhittam avisaṭṭha ti vuccati. sotena sakkam
sāravā ...

(Having seen a form with the eye, if his consciousness does not follow after
the sign of form, is not tied and shackled by gratification in the sign of form,
is not fettered by the fetter of gratification in the sign of form, then his
consciousness is called ‘not distracted and scattered externally’ …)
From the analysis of the three parts of the *indriya-samvara* formula in various texts, we found a common point that the missing or additional sentence is not totally absent or added in a particular recension of canon, as they can be found in one place or another in every version of the canon.

**Conclusion**

This comparative study of parallel versions of two particular Buddhist meditation formulas in a group of texts belonging to different schools, and preserved in three different languages, reveals a number of interesting points between the parallel to the same texts or context, the collections of the canon (e.g., DN and MN; DĀ and MĀ), as well as variations between different recensions of the canon (e.g., Nikāyas and Āgamās).

Although a fuller understanding of the formation of meditation formulas from the comparison is waiting for further investigation, two important findings are obtained in this study: the variation and the similarity of the formulas in various versions of texts. First, the variation could occur anywhere, even within texts from the same tradition. The difference between DN and MN being a fine example here. Second, the variation is usually found in the secondary parts of the formulas, such as the introductory and closing parts, which are by their nature smaller units such as fixed
sentences and set phrases, the formulation of the main body remains the same. However, the wording of the main body of the formula sometimes undergoes slight changes, and the changes in the wording is sufficiently limited to suggest that it is neither arbitrary nor due to mistakes by the scribes. To put it another way, some extra words are seen in the formula in a particular version of a text in one tradition, but not in others. However, the missing words, or more precisely, the other ways of expression, can also be found in almost every tradition. In other words, the differences are not really 'variant readings', but look more like an alternative of several options, and the changing over of each option does not affect the main point of the formula. This phenomenon is of particular interest, because it may reflect some process of the oral transmission, or a kind of natural way of how the memorization works. Most importantly, the meaning of the formula has never been lost or altered. This in turn indicates that the overall structure of the formula is very similar in every version of its expression. In addition to this, the tendency to maintain the correct meaning, or even the exact wording, is frequently seen, suggesting that the precise wording really does matter. This concern further reveals that how much effort was made by every Buddhist tradition to preserve the literature in an accurate way. This was probably due to the traditional serious attitude of preserving the 'Buddha’s words'.
Furthermore, this study has indicated that awareness of the Chinese and Sanskrit sources has played a crucial role in understanding the changes that have occurred in the formulas. Without examining the occurrences in these sources, we would not know that certain wordings were preferred by some traditions in the expression of the formulas. For example, we would not know that the combination of a particular fixed sentence and the bare formula was common outside the Pali tradition.

Finally, the present study is about a specific type of literary style in Buddhist literature (the meditation formulas in a sequential path-structure). The characteristics of this style provide a good foundation for us to begin to understand how some Buddhist texts were composed and transmitted, and even suggest a useful methodology for further research in the field. This would allow us to test the models proposed within recent scholarship on the composition and transmission of Buddhist oral literature. For example, I do not see much evidence from the meditation formulas that supports the features proposed by Lance Cousins, when he says that there is ‘a strong improvisatory element’ in early Buddhist texts.\(^\text{26}\) On the contrary, the content of the formulas are

\(^{26}\) Cousins, 1983, p. 9.
quite tidy. They do not perform, or display the features of frequent variation that we might expect had they been improvised in the way that is sometimes to be seen within the narrative portion of these Buddhist texts. Moreover, Gombrich's proposal of a rigid, perhaps word-for-word, or verbatim model, is not entirely applicable to the Buddhist formulas, because it cannot fully explain the 'changes', which do occur. However, further consideration of these matters is beyond the scope of the present paper.

\[27\] Gombrich, 1990b, p. 24. He mentions that the early Buddhist texts were 'deliberate compositions which were then committed to memory, and later systematically transmitted to pupils.' And he suggests that such a feat of preservation has the Brahmans as the example, who had been preserving the Vedic literature word-for-word in an oral way for centuries.
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