

### Acknowledgements

I am indebted to Rod Bucknell, Giuliana Martini and Ken Su for comments on a draft of this paper.

### Notes

1. That oral transmission involves some degree of uncertainty is reflected in M 76 At M I 520,6, according to which what has been transmitted orally may be well remembered or not well remembered, it could be correct, but it could also be wrong, *sussutam* (S<sup>c</sup>: *susutam*) *pi hoti dussutam pi hoti, tathā pi hoti aññathā pi hoti*. A more detailed study of aspects of oral transmission in early Buddhism can be found in Analayo 2007, 2008; and 2009a, in which I survey oral characteristics of the Pāli discourses in general, offer a case study, and then turn to the working mechanism of memory that explains how changes could have happened. My explorations in this respect are based on the substantial contributions made by other scholars to this theme, such as by von Simson 1965; Cousins 1983; Coward 1986; Gombrich 1990; Collins 1992; von Hinüber 1994b; Allon 1997a and 1997b; and Wynne 2004.
2. In addition to these, a similar treatment can also be found in the \**Mahāprajñā-pāramitā-(upadeśa)-śāstra* (《大智度論》 on the title cf. Demiéville 1950/1973: 470 note 1), T 1509 at T XXV 74a2-b17, translated in Lamotte 1944/1981: 149-152. Chung 2008: 205 lists Skt. fragment MS 2380 50b+51a of the Schøyen collection as yet another parallel. For a listing of eleven qualities of a cowherd cf. also T 201.61 at T IV 317b21 and Lévi 1908: 140-144.
3. M 33 at M I 220, 1-224,29.
4. A 11.18 at A V 347,14-353,15, the title *Gopāla-sutta* is given to the discourse in B<sup>c</sup> and C<sup>c</sup>, and occurs in the *uddānas* in E<sup>c</sup> and S<sup>c</sup>.
5. SA 1249 at T II 342c11-343b6, I adopt the title suggested by Akanuma 1929/1990: 111.
6. EĀ 49.1 at T II 794a7-795a16.
7. T 123 at T II 546a16-547b4. The qualification 佛說, “spoken by the Buddha”, appears regularly in the titles of works in the Chinese canon, where in most cases it probably does not render an expression found in the original, but serves as a formula of authentication of the translated scripture.
8. Lü 1963: 242; Waldschmidt 1980: 136; Mayeda 1985: 99; Enomoto 1986: 23; Schmithausen 1987: 306; Choong 2000: 6 note 18; Hiraoka 2000; Harrison 2002: 1; Bucknell 2006: 685; and Glass 2010.

9. 《雜阿含經》 T 99, which at T II 1a5 mentions only Guṇabhadra as the translator; although a more detailed account can be found in the 《出三藏記集》 T 2145 at TLV 13a6. Forte 1984: 316 explains that every translation was “registered under the name of a single person, usually the actual guarantor of the text...This need to make one person responsible often meant that the actual contribution of other members of the team tended to be unacknowledged”. Since Guṇabhadra had only recently arrived in China, it seems improbable that he could already have had the language skills enabling him to translate the text himself.
10. De Jong 1981: 108.
11. For a more detailed discussion of the somewhat complex issue of the translators and school affiliation of the *Ekottarika-āgama* cf. Anālayo 2009b.
12. On Kumārājīva cf. e.g. Nanjio 1883/1989: 406f; Bagchi 1927: 178-200; Ch'en 1964: 81-83 and 367f; Shih 1968: 60-81; Tsukamoto 1979/1985: 254, 304f, 375, 450f, 851-854, 869-878; Weeraratne 1999; and McRae 2004.
13. For ease of comparison, I adopt the paragraph numbering used in the English translation of the *Mahāgopālaka-sutta* in Ñāṇamoli 1995/2005: 313-318. For the same reason, in my translation of SĀ 1249 I employ Pāli terminology (except for anglicized terms like 'Abhidharma'), without thereby intending to take a position on the original language of the *Samyukta-āgama*.
14. SĀ 1249 at T II 342c20: 不能除其害蟲, whereas the earlier listing in relation to the cowherd at T II 342c15 speaks just of 不去蟲.
15. SĀ 1249 at T II 342c21: 不知正路, 不知止處, where as the earlier listing in relation to the cowherd at T II 342c16 reads: 不知擇路, 不知擇處. The present and the above noted variation (note 14) reflect a penchant among Chinese translators to introduce some variation in their rendering of what in the Indic original were probably identical expressions. Zürcher 1991: 288 speaks of “a strong tendency to avoid the monotonous effect of ... verbatim repetition ... by introducing a certain amount of diversification and irregularity”, as a result of which “in the same translated scripture we often find various alternative forms and longer or shorter versions of the same cliché”.
16. These numbers are not found in the original, but are introduced by me to facilitate reference to the eleven qualities in the subsequent comparative study.
17. Abbreviations, here and below, are not my own, but are implicit in the original.
18. SĀ 1249 at T II 343a4: 亦復如是, there by indicating that the same treatment should be applied to each of the other senses.
19. SĀ 1249 at T II 343a7: 八正道, which thus does not employ the qualification “noble”. The same is also absent from a reference to the “four truths” in T 123 at T II 547a13: 四

- 諦, cf. below note 27; for a study of other occurrences of this type and of their significance cf. Anālayo 2006.
20. SĀ 1249 at T II 343a21: 乃至, counterpart to *pe* in Pāli discourses.
  21. SĀ 1249 at T II 343a29: 如上清淨分說, 乃至.
  22. M 33 at M I 223,31: “from time to time, having approached those monks who are learned, who are versed in the tradition, who are bearers of the Dharma, bearers of the discipline and bearers of the summaries, he interrogates and asks questions of them”, *ye te bhikkhū* (S’ adds: *therā*) *bahussutā aḡatāgamā dhammadharā vinayadharā mātikādhārā te kālena kālaṃ upasaṅkamtivā paripucchati paripaṅhuti*, with a similarly worded counterpart in A 11.18 at AN V 352,9. The variation in the Siamese edition, which additionally mentions *therā*, neatly illustrates the type of error that can happen during transmission. This additional reference, which is not found in the same edition’s description of the negative case where someone does not approach learned monks, is quite probably influenced by the fact that the eleventh quality speaks of *ye te bhikkhū therā rattuṅṅū*. During oral transmission or in the course of the later copying of the text, this reference has quite probably been the source for the addition of *therā* of *ye te bhikkhū bahussutā*.
  23. SĀ 1249 at T II 343a11: 修多羅, 毘尼, 阿毘曇.
  24. Cf. e.g. Przyłuski 1926: 334-335; Horner 1941: 292; Migot 1952: 524-530; Warder 1961; Frauwallner 1971: 116-117; Jaini 1977: 45; Muck 1980: 15-16; Bronkhorst 1985: 305; Gómez 1987/2005: 1270; Gethin 1992: 158-162; von Hinüber 1994c: 120f; Cox 1995: 8; Buswell 1996: 84-89; Watanabe 1983/1996: 42-45; Hirakawa 1993/1998: 140-142; Norman 1997: 51; and Ronkin 2005: 27-30.
  25. EĀ 49.1 at T II 794c29 lists 契經, 祇夜, 授決, 偈, 因緣, 本末, 方等, 譬喻, 生經, 說, 廣普, 未曾有法, corresponding to the discourses (*sūtra*), stanzas (*geya*), expositions (*vyākaraṇa*), verses (*gāthā*), historical narratives (*nidāna*), sayings (*itivṛttaka*), extensive treatments (*vaṅpūlyā*), legends (*avudāna*), birth stories (*jātaka*), treatises, (*upadeśa*), inspired utterances (*udāna*) and marvels (*adbhūtaadharmā*). My correlation is based on the indications given in Nattier 2004: 194.
  26. Found e.g. in M 22 at M I 133,24, where the parallel version MA 200 at T I 764a14 and EĀ 50.8 at T II 813a16 also have listings of twelve *aṅgas*. Lamotte 1956: 263 note 2 explains that the twelve-fold presentation prevails in the Chinese *Āgamas*, in the Chinese *Vinayas* (except for the *Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya*), in the main treatises of the Sarvāstivāda, Sautrāntika, Vaibhāṣika, and Yogācāra schools, and in most Mahāyāna *sūtras*. On the *aṅgas* in the Pāli discourses cf. esp. Jayawickrama 1959, Kalupahana 1965, and von Hinüber 1994a.
  27. T 123 at T II 547a12: “How does a monk know the ford? [Here] a monk knows the four

truths,” 云何比丘知渡水處？比丘知四諦。

28. The image of the cowherd is of course a familiar one in Indian thought. On its relation to the *Kṛṣṇa* legend cf. e.g. Vaudeville 1975.
29. The same is reflected in a simile in M 8 at M I 45,3 and its parallel MA 91 at T I 574b3, according to which someone who is drowning or sinking in the mud will be unable to pull out another who is in the same predicament. Similarly, one who has not yet fully disciplined himself or herself will not be able to discipline others. As Nānaponika 1964/1988: 29 points out, this image sounds a warning against premature attempts to set oneself up as a guide for others.
30. M 33 at M I 220,15: *abhubbo imasmim dhammavinaye vuddhim virūhimi vepullam āpajjitum* (S: *vuddhim*), cf. also A I 1.18 at A V 347,26.
31. As Freiburger 2000: 41 comments, this presentation implies that neglecting to teach others hinders one's own progress, “wer es versäumt, andere zu unterweisen ... wird dadurch in seinem Fortschritt gehindert”. For a case study of the contribution that teaching others can offer to one's own progress towards awakening cf. Anālayo 2010.
32. SĀ 1249 at T II 343a21; EA 49.1 at T II 794b21; and T 123 at T II 546c3; cf. also T 1509 at T XXV 74b13.
33. M 33 at M I 222,9 and A 11.18 at A V 350,13. Unlike the present case, in several other instances Chinese parallel versions give more emphasis to the divine abodes than their Pāli counterparts, cf. Minh Chau 1991: 30f.
34. A 7.64 at A IV 116,22+23: *gāreyyho* and *pasamso*. It is noteworthy that the Chinese parallels to this discourse treat the case of one who acts only for his or her own benefit with softer criticism, as MĀ 1 at T I 422a6 and T 27 at T I 810b22 merely indicate that those who also benefit others are superior and more excellent than those who only benefit themselves (a third parallel, EĀ 39.1 at T II 728b-729b, does not treat this case at all). A study of the Chinese parallels to this discourse can be found in Schmithausen 2004.
35. Dhṛp 368. A counterpart in the Gāndhāri *Dharmapada*, verse 70 in Brough 1962/2001: 128, reads *metra-vihara yo bhikhu, prasana budha-sāsane, padiviju pada suda, sagharavośamu suha*. A version of this verse in the Patna *Dharmapada*, verse 59 in Cone 1989: 119, reads *mettāvihāri bhikkhu, prasanno buddhuśāsane, putivijhi padaṃ santam, samkha-ropasamam sukham* (Roth 1980: 102 reads *mettrā-vihāri* and *samkhā-ropasamam*). In the *Udāna(-varga)* (on the title of this work cf. Bernhard 1968 and the discussion in Willemsen 1978: xxvf and Dhammajoti 1995: 39), verse 32.21 in Bernhard 1965: 437, the corresponding verse reads *maitravihāri yo bhikṣu, prasanno*

*buddhaśāsane, adhigacchet padam sântam, saṃskāropasamam sukham*; with its Tibetan counterpart in verse 32.22 in Beckh 1911: 134, reading *dge slong gang zhig byams gnas shing, sangs rgyas bstan la rab dad des* (Zongtse 1990: 386 reads *de*), 'du byed nyer zhi zhi pa yi, zhi ba'i go 'phang thob par 'gyur (where the third and fourth sections of the verse thus come in the opposite order); and Chinese counterparts in T 210 at T IV 572a11 and T 212 at T IV 764c27: 比丘為慈, 愛敬佛教, 深入止觀, 滅行乃安, cf. also the similarly formulated T 213 at T IV 796b18: 慈為慈慈, 愛敬於佛教, 深入妙止觀, 滅穢行乃安, (where in each case the third part of the verse speaks instead of "deeply entering into tranquillity and insight"). Yet another version of this verse can be found in the *Mahāvastu*, Senart 1897: 421,18, reading: *maitrāvihāri yo bhikṣuḥ, prasanno buddhaśāsane, adhigacchati padam sântam, usecanam ca mocanam* (which thus shows a variation in regard to the fourth section by referring to the "delightful release"; cf. also *Udāna(-varga)* verse 32.20 in Bernhard 1965: 437, which agrees with *Udāna(-varga)* verse 32.21 in respect to the first three parts, but in the fourth part reads *usecanakadarśanam*). The formulation of Dhṛ 368 and its Indic parallels would not imply, pace Wiltshire 1990: 269 and Maithrimurthi 1999: 69, that loving kindness on its own leads to the final goal. The verse only highlights the important supportive function that loving kindness can offer for progress towards this liberation, where the constraints of a verse quartet do not allow mentioning all the other requirements for reaching awakening. An indispensable requirement is in fact mentioned at least in the Chinese versions, namely the development of insight.