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Brahmā’s Invitation: the Ariyapariyesanā-sutta in the Light of its Madhyama-āgama Parallel*

Anālayo

The present article begins by surveying the role of the ancient Indian god Brahmā in the early Buddhist discourses as exemplifying a tendency referred to in academic research as “inclusivism”. A prominent instance of this tendency can be found in the Ariyapariyesanā-sutta of the Pāli canon, which reports that Brahmā intervened to persuade the recently awakened Buddha to teach. This episode is absent from a Madhyama-āgama parallel to the Ariyapariyesanā-sutta, of which I provide a partial translation. The translation is followed by a brief evaluation of this difference between the two parallel records of the events surrounding the Buddha’s awakening.

Brahmā in Early Buddhism

The way the denizens of the ancient Indian pantheon appear in early Buddhist texts exemplifies a mode of thought that scholars have called “inclusivism”. The term inclusivism refers to a tendency to include, although in a subordinate position and at times with significant modifications, central elements of other religious traditions within the framework of one’s own.

The role of the ancient Indian god Brahmā in early Buddhist texts is a good example of the way this strategy of inclusivism operates. Two main trends can be discerned. Several passages mock the claim that Brahmā is an all-knowing and

---

* I am indebted to Rod Bucknell, Christian Luczanits, Shi Kongmu, Giuliana Martini, Jan Nattier, Ken Su and Monika Zin for comments and suggestions on a draft of the present paper. It goes without saying that I am solely responsible for whatever errors still remain.

†Cf. the articles collected in Oberhammer 1983 (esp. the paper by Hacker), as well as Mertens 2004, Kibling 2005 and Ruegg 2008: 97–99.

eternal creator god, while in other discourses a Brahmā by the name of Sahampati acts as a guardian of Buddhism.²

An instance of the tendency to satirize Brahmā, or more precisely to satirize Brahmās, as in Buddhist texts we meet with several manifestations of this god, can be found in the Brahmajāla-sutta and its parallels preserved in Chinese and Tibetan translation as well as in Sanskrit fragments. The discourse professes to explain, tongue-in-cheek, how the idea of a creator god came into being.³

Behind the explanation proffered in the *Brahmajāla-sutta* and its parallels stands the ancient Indian cosmological conception of the world system going through cycles of dissolution and evolution. Once a period of dissolution is over, the celestial Brahmā realm reappears and a particular living being, in accordance with its merits, is reborn into this realm. This living being at some point feels lonely and develops a wish for company. In the course of time, other living beings are also reborn in this Brahmā world, in accordance with their merits. The living being arisen first in the Brahmā world now reasons that its wish for company must have been what caused those other living beings to appear in the Brahmā world. This misconception then leads to the first living being’s claim to be the creator of the others, a claim the other beings accept as fact and truth.

In this way, the *Brahmajāla-sutta* and its parallels parody a creation myth similar to what is found in the *Brhadāranyaka Upaniṣad*.⁴ As this example shows, early Buddhism does not flatly deny the existence of a creator god, but instead

---

²Bailey 1983: 14 explains that “Brahmā is treated in two distinct ways; either he is bitterly attacked, or he is portrayed as a zealous devotee of the Buddha”; cf. also Anālayo 2003. In what follows, I take into account only instances found in more than one textual tradition, thus passages preserved only in the Pāli canon are left aside.

³The relevant passage can be found in DĀ 21 at T I 90b21, T 21 at T I 266b15, Weller 1934: 22, 29 (§60), and in discourse quotations in T 1548 at T XXVIII 657a19 and D 4094 ju 145a1 or Q 5595 tu 166b4; cf. also Gombrich 1996: 81 and Collins 2011: 32f; for a comparative study and a translation of DĀ 21 cf. Anālayo 2009a.

⁴This has been pointed out by Gombrich 1990: 13 and Norman 1991/1993: 272. The criticism of such indications made by Bronkhorst 2007: 207–218 relies on his assigning some of the early discourses to a relatively late period, based on a reference to MN 93 at MN II 149,4 to Yona, which to him (p. 209) “suggests that the passage which contains this reference was composed after – perhaps long after – the conquest of Alexander the Great”. I am under the impression that this need not be the case. Already Bühler 1895/1963: 27 note 1 points out that, given that an Indian contingent formed part of the invasion of Greece by Xerxes (480 bc), once these Indians had returned home it would be only natural for Indian texts to reflect knowledge of the Ionians (i.e., the reference is not to Bactrian Greeks), cf. in more detail Anālayo 2009b and for a survey of similar indications made by other scholars Anālayo 2011a: 552 note 116.
purports to explain how this notion arose, namely as the outcome of a deluded
Brahmā’s belief that beings arose in his realm in compliance with its wish for com-
pany. With a good dose of humour, the psychologically intriguing point is made
by presenting the notion of a creator god as an inventive response to loneliness.

Another discourse features a direct confrontation between a Brahmā and the
Buddha, culminating in a contest. In this contest, each of the two tries to manifest
his respective power in a celestial version of “hide and seek”; that is, each attempts
to vanish from the other’s sight. While Brahmā fails to go beyond the Buddha’s
range of vision, the Buddha completely disappears from the sight of Brahmā and
the heavenly assembly.\(^{5}\)

By depicting the Buddha’s ability to trump Brahmā in regard to invisibility, the
discourse not only asserts the superiority of the Buddha, but also appears to be
punning on what may have been a common aspiration among Brahmins, namely
the wish to gain a personal vision of Brahmā.\(^{6}\)

The superior power of the Buddha comes up again in relation to another
Brahmā, who believes himself to be of such might that nobody else can reach
his realm. His complacent belief is thoroughly shattered when the Buddha and
several of his disciples manifest themselves seated in the air above this Brahmā.\(^{7}\)

Needless to say, the position and height of seats in ancient Indian customs express
the hierarchical positioning of those seated.\(^{8}\) Hence the image of Brahmā unex-
pectedly finding the Buddha and some monks seated above him would not have
failed to have its comic effect on the audience, while at the same time summing
up the message of the discourse in a succinct image easily remembered in an oral
society.

Another episode describes how the Great Brahmā encounters a Buddhist
monk who requests an answer to the ageless question about what transcends the

\(^{5}\) MN 49 at MN I 330, 7 and MĀ 78 at T I 548c10; on this discourse cf. also Gombrich 2001, for

\(^{6}\) This would be reflected in an episode in DN 29 at DN II 237,3, DĀ 3 at T I 32a28 and the
Mahāvastu, Senart 1897: 209, 13, which reports how a Brahmin steward, because of his dexterous
way of carrying out his duties, is believed to have personally seen Brahmā, which then inspires him
to retire into seclusion and practise so as to indeed have such direct communion with Brahmā; cf.
also Sanskrit fragment 5305V in Schlingloff 1961: 37. Another parallel, T 8 at T I 210c19, differs in
not reporting the belief that he had already seen Brahmā.

\(^{7}\) SN 6.5 at SN I 144,17 and its parallels SĀ 1 196 at T II 324c22 and SĀ² 109 at T II 412c22. In SN
6.5 the Buddha and the monks even emanate fire.

\(^{8}\) Nichols 2009: 54 comments, on the present instance, that in the Pāli version “the Buddha,
significantly, appears directly above the Brahmā, giving a spatial demonstration of his superiority".
world, formulated in terms of where the four elements of earth, water, fire and wind cease without remainder. The monk had already proceeded through different celestial realms recognized in the ancient Indian cosmology, seeking a reply to his question. His inquiry remained unanswered, as the denizens of each heavenly realm directed him onwards to the next higher realm for a reply to his query.

When he finally reaches the presence of the Great Brahmā, the answer he receives is that the Great Brahmā is supreme in the whole world. The monk is not satisfied with this self-affirming declaration and insists on being instead given a proper reply to his question. When the Great Brahmā realizes that he is not able to get around this inquisitive monk by simply insisting on his own superiority, the Great Brahmā takes the monk aside and confides that he does not know the answer to the monk’s query. Yet the Great Brahmā cannot admit this in public, as this would be upsetting to the other gods, who believe that Great Brahmā knows everything.

This amusing description of the Great Brahmā being forced to admit his own ignorance in private culminates with the Great Brahmā telling the monk that, to find an answer to his question, he should return to where he came from and ask the Buddha. In other words, with the help of an entertaining tale the audience is told that, in order to get a proper reply to their quest for going beyond the world, viz. Nirvāṇa, they should turn to the Buddha.

These four tales vividly illustrate the tendency in early Buddhist discourse to mock the notion of Brahmā as an all-knowing creator god of supreme might. In addition to this satirical strand, however, the early Buddhist discourses also feature a Brahmā in the role of a protector of Buddhism. In the Pāli discourses, this Brahmā bears the name of Sahampati, although the parallel versions often do not give his name.

Several discourses report how this Brahmā approves the Buddha’s decision to honour nobody else, instead according the place of honour to the Dharma that

---

9DN 11 at DN I 221,3, Sanskrit fragment 388v7 in Zhou 2008: 7, DĀ 24 at T I 102b18 (translated in Meisig 1995: 194) and D 4094 ju 64a2 or Q 5595 tu 71a4; cf. also SHT X 3805 and 3926 in Wille 2008: 181f and 221f. Kibinger 2005: 40 takes up the present instance as an example for Buddhist inclusivism towards Vedic religion, where “belief in the Vedic gods continues, but not without some new qualifications that position them much lower within the Buddhist system”.

10 According to McGovern 2011, such criticism raised against Brahmā as a creator god appears to have in turn had repercussions on this very notion in the Brahminical tradition.

11 SN 6.2 at SN I 139,7 or AN 4.21 at AN II 20, 14 and their parallels SĀ 1188 at T II 321c27, SĀ 101 at T II 410a13 and D 4094 nyu 85a3 or Q 5595 thu 131a3; cf. also T 212 at T IV 718c1.
he has discovered. In this way, Brahmā explicitly endorses the notion that the Buddha is supreme in the world, a message similar to that conveyed in the tales examined above. Instead of a deluded Brahmā whose defeat and discomfiture convey this message, here we encounter a properly domesticated Brahmā who knows his place ... in the Buddhist thought world, that is.

This Brahmā also voices his support of Buddhism in poetic form on another occasion by extolling the life of a seriously practising Buddhist monk. Another instance shows this Brahmā taking a close interest in the welfare of the Buddhist order by intervening in order to reconcile the Buddha with a group of unruly monks. At the time of the Buddha’s passing away, this Brahmā is again present and pronounces a stanza suitable for the occasion.

The support given to the Buddhist cause by this Brahmā becomes particularly prominent in the autobiographical account of the Buddha’s awakening, recorded in the Ariyapariyesanā-sutta. According to this discourse, having just gained awakening, the Buddha was hesitant to teach others what he had discovered. On becoming aware of the Buddha’s disinclination to teach, Brahmā Sahampati appeared before the Buddha and requested him to teach, proclaiming that there would be those who would understand.

The scene of Brahmā standing with his hands in the traditional gesture of respect to one side of the Buddha sitting in meditation became a favourite topic of ancient Indian art, exemplifying the central theme that underlies this episode: the superiority of the Buddha to Brahmā and thereby of the Buddha’s teaching to Brahminical beliefs. The motif is already current during the aniconic period,
when the presence of the Buddha appears to have been indicated only symbolically. One specimen from Gandhāra shows only the empty seat of awakening under a tree, flanked on both sides by the gods Brahmā and Indra, who, with their hands in the traditional gesture of respect, appear to be inviting the Buddha to teach (see Figure 1).

Figure 1: Courtesy Trustees of the British Museum

teaching could not be more blatant”, cf. also Gombrich 1996: 21. Nichols 2009: 52 adds that “the motif of Brahmā pleading for the presence of the dhamma in the world shows the supposed creator’s helplessness” to bring about the same without the Buddha.


The sculpture is at present in the British Museum, London.
The tendency to depict the Buddha being worshipped by Brahmā as well as Indra is pervasive in sculptures, including reliquaries. In some cases it remains uncertain if a particular image is intended to portray the request to teach, or whether it may be just a scene of worship in general.

In another specimen from Gandhāra, however, the Buddha is clearly shown in a reflective pose, supporting his head with his right arm, which in turn is supported by his raised knee. Although this posture is frequently used for bodhisattva images, the monkish dress in combination with the uṣṇīṣa make it clear that the central figure is the Buddha. The seat and the tree in the background suggest the seat of awakening and on each side of the Buddha, at a little distance, stand Brahmā and Indra, who share with the Buddha the feature of being haloed. Between Indra and the Buddha, a little to the back, we also find Vajrapāṇi.

The proposed identification of this image as depicting “the pensive Buddha who is being requested to teach the Dharma” appears at first glance not entirely straightforward. The Buddha is surrounded by five monks, while Brahmā and Indra – supposedly major figures in the present scene – stand at some distance from him. On the Buddha’s right two monks are turned towards him with their hands held in the gesture of worship. On his left another three monks are standing, of whom the one closest to the Buddha may also be in the same respectful gesture, while the next one turns back towards his companion, as if he were hesitating or in doubt, needing to be urged on by the fifth in the group.

20 Several representations in Gandhāran art are collected in Kurita 1988: 77–79 and 125–136; cf. also Foucher 1905: 421–427. A study of the role of Indra in Buddhist texts as another instance of inclusivism can be found in Anālayo 2011b.
21 A well-known example is the Kanisṭha reliquary; cf., e.g., van Lohuizen-de Leeuw 1949: 98–101, the description in Dobbins 1971: 25 and the photograph in Huntington 2001: 134.
24 In Gandhāran art Vajrapāṇi and Indra are distinct from each other, cf. Foucher 1905: 564, Senart 1906: 122, Vogel 1909: 525, Konow 1930, Coomaraswamy 1971: 31, Santoro 1979: 301; cf. also Lamotte 1966. In the Pāli commentarial tradition, however, these two are identical, cf., e.g., Sv I 264,12.
25 The relief, which is now found in the Swat Museum, Saidu Sharif, Pakistan, has been identified in Luczanits 2008: 226 catalogue number 165 as “der nachdenkliche Buddha wird gebeten, den Dharma zu lehren”.

ANĀLAYO – BRAHMĀ’S INVITATION

18
The fact that the monks are five in number, together with the impression that not all of them are filled with the same degree of confidence, suggests that the scene may represent the Buddha’s encounter with what were to become his first five monk disciples, an episode narrated in the latter part of the Ariyapariyesanā-sutta and its Madhyama-āgama parallel. The two versions agree that although the five monks had decided not to show respect to the Buddha, as they thought he had given up his striving for liberation, when he actually approached they did receive him with respect.

Given that in Indian and Central Asian art successive events are at times represented in a single image,\(^\text{26}\) the present piece could be combining the request to teach by Brahmā and Indra with a pictorial reference to his being received by those who were the first to benefit from the Buddha’s acceptance of this request.

---

\(^{26}\) Cf., e.g., Schlingloff 1981.
Coming back to the textual sources, records of the present episode in the early discourses and in several biographies preserved in Chinese translation mention only an intervention by Brahmā alone, without referring to Indra. The same is true of several Vinaya accounts. According to the Mahāvastu, however, Brahmā came together with Indra. The same is also stated in the Jātaka Nidānakathā. This gives the impression that for Brahmā to be accompanied by Indra could be a subsequent stage in the evolution of this motif, which in turn influenced representations in art.

In view of the widespread occurrence of this episode in art and literature, it comes as a surprise that the only known complete discourse parallel to the Ariyapariyesanā-sutta does not mention Brahmā at all. This parallel is found in a Madhyama-āgama collection preserved in Chinese translation, which according to modern scholarship can be assigned to the Sarvāstivāda tradition. In what follows, I translate the first part of the Madhyama-āgama discourse.

Translation

The Discourse at Ramma[ka]’s [Hermitage]

\[\text{MN 26 at MN I 168,18 (repeated in MN 85 at MN II 93,26 and SN 6.1 at SN I 137,12), Catuspariṣat-sūtra fragment, Waldschmidt 1957: 112,14 ($8.9), and EĀ 19.1 at T II 593b3 (translated in Bareau 1988: 78); cf. also, e.g., T 185 at T III 486b2, T 189 at T III 643a3, T 190 at T III 806a13 and T 191 at T III 953a1.}\]

\[\text{Cf. the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya, T 1428 at T XXII 786c24; the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya, T 1421 at T XXII 103c23; the (Mūla)-Sarvāstivāda Vinaya, Gnoli 1977: 129,6 (cf. also T 1450 at T XXIV 126b2 and the Tibetan parallel, Waldschmidt 1957: 113,14 ($8.7)); and the Theravāda Vinaya, Vin I 5,21.}\]

\[\text{Senart 1897: 315,1. In the Lalitavistara, Brahmā is rather accompanied by his retinue, Lefmann 1902: 394,8 (cf. also T 186 at T III 528b4 and T 187 at T III 603b5).}\]

\[\text{Jā T 81,10. Stanzas with which Indra (Sakka) and then Brahmā invite the Buddha to teach can be found in SN 11.17 at SN I 233,32, a discourse which, however, gives Jetās Grove as the location.}\]


\[\text{The translated part of MĀ 204 begins at T I 775c7 and ends at T I 777b11. Translations of this part of MĀ 204, taken section by section, can be found in Bareau 1963: 14f, 24f, 28, 72 and 145 and in Minh Chau 1991: 153–156 and 245–248.}\]

\[\text{The Pāli editions differ on the title. While E\textsuperscript{e} and C\textsuperscript{e} have the title Ariyapariyesanā-sutta, the “Discourse on the Noble Search”, B\textsuperscript{e} and S\textsuperscript{e} give the title as Pāsarāsi-sutta, the ”Discourse on the Heap of Snares”, referring to a simile that describes a deer caught in snares, found in the latter part of the discourse.}\]
1. Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was dwelling at Sāvatthī, in the Eastern Garden, the Mansion of Migāra’s Mother.

3. At that time, in the afternoon the Blessed One emerged from sitting in seclusion, came down from the top of the mansion and said to the venerable Ānanda: “I shall now go together with you to the river Aciravatī to bathe”. The venerable Ānanda replied: “Yes, certainly”.

The venerable Ānanda took hold of a door-opener and went to all the huts. He told all the monks he saw: “Venerable ones, you could all gather at the house of the Brahmin Ramma[ka].” On hearing this the monks gathered at the house of the Brahmin Ramma[ka].

The Blessed One, followed by the venerable Ānanda, went to the Aciravatī river. He took off his robes, placed them on the bank and entered the water to bathe. Having bathed, he came out again, wiped his body [dry] and put on his robes.

At that time the venerable Ānanda was standing behind the Blessed One, holding a fan and fanning the Buddha. Then the venerable Ānanda, with his hands joined [in respect] towards the Buddha, said: “Blessed One, the house of the Brahmin Ramma[ka] is very pleasant and orderly, it is highly delightful. May the Blessed One approach the house of the Brahmin Ramma[ka], out of compassion.” The Blessed One accepted [the suggestion of] the venerable Ānanda by remaining silent.

---

34 In order to facilitate comparison with the translation of MN 26 by Ānālayo 2011: 170–189.

35 MN 26 at MN I 160,17 provides a more detailed introductory narration, corresponding to §2 and the first part of §3 in Ānālayo 2011: 170–189. According to its report, in the morning the Buddha had gone begging alms and some monks had approached Ānanda expressing their wish to receive a discourse from the Buddha, whereupon Ānanda told them to go to Rammaka’s hermitage. Sanskrit fragment parallels to the present episode are SHT V 1332a in Sander 1985: 227, SHT VI 1493 in Bechert 1989: 161f, and SHT X 3917 in Wille 2008: 217.

36 The episode of Ānanda informing the other monks is not found in MN 26.

37 According to MN 26 at MN I 161,9, he stood clothed in one robe waiting for his limbs to dry on their own.
4. Then the Blessed One, followed by the venerable Ānanda, went to the house of the Brahmin Ramma[ka]. At that time, a group of many monks were seated together in the house of the Brahmin Ramma[ka] discussing the Dharma. The Buddha stood outside the door, waiting for the monks to finish their discussion of the Dharma. The group of many monks, having completed their investigation and discussion of the Dharma, remained silent. On [coming] to know this, the Blessed One coughed and knocked on the door. Hearing him, the monks swiftly came and opened the door.

The Blessed One entered the house of the Brahmin Ramma[ka] and sat on a seat that had been prepared in front of the group of monks. He asked them: “What have you just been discussing, monks? For what matter are you sitting together here?”

Then the monks replied: “Blessed One, we have just been discussing the Dharma, it is for a matter of Dharma that we have been sitting together here.”

The Buddha commended them: “It is well, it is well, monks, sitting together you should engage in [either of] two things: the first is to discuss the Dharma, the second is to remain silent. Why? I shall also teach you the Dharma, listen carefully and pay proper attention!” The monks replied: “Yes, of course, we shall listen to receive the instruction.”

5. The Buddha said: “There are two types of search, the first is called a noble search, the second is called an ignoble search. What is an ignoble search? Someone, being actually subject to disease, searches after what is subject to disease, being actually subject to old age ... subject to death ... subject to worry and sadness ... being actually subject to defilement, searches after what is subject to defilement.

8. What is, being actually subject to disease, searching after what is subject to disease? What is subject to disease? Sons and brothers are subject to disease,

---

38 In MN 26 at MN I 161,26 the second part of the Buddha’s inquiry is about the nature of their discussion that had been interrupted, vippakata. This appears to be an application of a stock phrase without consideration of the context, since the preceding section, in agreement with MĀ 204, indicates that their discussion had not been interrupted, as the Buddha had politely waited for it to finish before making his presence known.

39 According to MN 26 at MN I 161,27, the monks had been speaking about the Blessed One. This would provide a smoother transition to the Buddha’s subsequent delivery of an autobiographical account of his awakening, thereby continuing with a topic already broached by the monks.

40 Here and below, the abbreviations are found in the original.

41 MN 26 at MN I 161,36 also mentions being subject to birth (= §6 in Naṇamoli 1995/2005: 254). Another difference is in the sequence, as MN 26 turns to being subject to disease (§8) only after mentioning the topic of being subject to old age (§7). Yet another difference is that MN 26
elephants, horses, cattle, sheep, male and female slaves, wealth, treasures, rice and cereals are subject to disease and destruction. Living beings, stained and touched by greed and attachment, intoxicated with pride, take hold of and enter amidst these, without seeing the danger and without seeing an escape, grasping at them and engaging with them.

7. - 11. What is being subject to old age ... subject to death ... subject to worry and sadness ... subject to defilement? Sons and brothers are subject to defilement, elephants, horses, cattle, sheep, male and female slaves, wealth, treasures, rice and cereals are subject to defilement and destruction. Living beings, stained and touched by greed and attachment, intoxicated with pride, take hold of and enter amidst these, without seeing the danger and without seeing an escape, grasping at them and engaging with them.

That such a person, wanting and searching for the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from disease, should attain the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from disease – that is not possible. [That such a person, wanting and] searching for the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from old age ... free from death ... free from worry and sadness ... free from defilement, should attain the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from old age ... free from death ... free from worry and sadness ... free from defilement – that is not possible. This is reckoned an ignoble search.

12. What is a noble search? Someone reflects: ‘I am actually subject to disease myself and I naively search for what is subject to disease, I am actually subject to old age... subject to death ... subject to worry and sadness ... subject to defilement myself and I naively search for what is subject to defilement. I would now rather search for the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from disease, search for the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from old age ... free from death ... free from worry and sadness ... free from defilement!’

gives a full treatment of each topic, while MĀ 204 abbreviates. The items mentioned to illustrate each case also differ slightly, thus MN 26 at MN I 162,4 mentions wife and son instead of brother and son, etc. The main themes are the same, however, except that MN 26 does not refer to rice and cereals at all.

42MN 26 does not take up the topic of not seeing the danger and the escape, although such a reference can be found regularly in other contexts, e.g., MN 99 at MN II 203,16: anādīnavadassāvī anissaranapañño, differing from the formulation in MĀ 204 in as much as, in regard to the escape, the Pāli phrase speaks of lacking wisdom.

43Adopting the variant 求 instead of 法.
That such a person, searching for the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from disease, should attain the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from disease – that is certainly possible. [That such a person], searching for the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from old age ... free from death ... free from worry and sadness ... free from defilement, should attain the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from old age ... free from death ... free from worry and sadness ... free from defilement – that is certainly possible.

13. Formerly, when I had not yet awakened to supreme, right and complete awakening, I thought like this: ‘I am actually subject to disease myself and I naively search for what is subject to disease, I am actually subject to old age ... subject to death ... subject to worry and sadness ... subject to defilement myself and I naively search for what is subject to defilement. What if I now rather search for the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from disease, search for the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from old age ... free from death ... free from worry and sadness ... free from defilement’?

14. At that time I was a young lad, with clear [skin] and dark hair, in the prime of youth, twenty-nine years of age, roaming around well adorned and enjoying myself to the utmost. At that time I shaved off my hair and beard, while my father and mother were crying and my relatives were displeased. I donned dyed robes and out of faith went forth to leave the household life and train in the path, maintaining purity of livelihood in body, maintaining purity of livelihood in speech and in mind.
15. Having accomplished this aggregate of morality, aspiring and searching for the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from disease ... free from old age ... free from death ... free from worry and sadness ... the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from defilement, I approached Āḷāra Kālāma and asked him: “Āḷāra, I wish to practise the holy life in your Dharma, will you permit it?” Āḷāra replied to me: “Venerable one, I certainly permit it. You may practise as you wish to practise.”

I asked again: “Āḷāra, this Dharma of yours, did you know it yourself, understand it yourself, realize it yourself?” Āḷāra replied to me: “Venerable one, completely transcending the sphere of [boundless] consciousness I have attained dwelling in the sphere of nothingness. Therefore I myself have known this Dharma of mine, understood it myself, realized it myself.”

I thought again: ‘Not only Āḷāra has such faith, I too have such faith, not only Āḷāra has such energy, I too have such energy, not only Āḷāra has such wisdom, I too have such wisdom, [whereby] Āḷāra has known this teaching himself, understood it himself, realized it himself.’ Because I wished to realize this Dharma, I thereupon went to stay alone and in seclusion, in an empty, quiet and tranquil place, with a mind free from indolence I practised energetically.

Having stayed alone and in seclusion, in an empty, quiet and tranquil place, with a mind free from indolence practising energetically, not long after I realized that Dharma.

Having realized that Dharma, I again approached Āḷāra Kālāma and asked him: “Āḷāra, is this the Dharma you have known yourself, understood yourself, realized yourself, namely, by completely transcending the sphere of boundless consciousness to attain dwelling in the sphere of nothingness?” Āḷāra Kālāma replied

---

make its way into the present context. Von Hinüber 1996/1997: 31 explains that “pieces of texts known by heart may intrude into almost any context once there is a corresponding key word.”

46MN 26 at MN I 164,2 indicates that the bodhisattva at first learned the theoretical aspects of Āḷāra’s Dharma.

47Dutt 1940: 639 explains that the reference to faith in the present context stands for “confidence in his abilities to develop the powers necessary to achieve his object.”

48MN 26 at MN I 164,16 lists all of the five faculties of faith, energy, mindfulness, concentration and wisdom. The same is also the case for the corresponding section in the Sanskrit fragment 331v1–2 in Liu 2010: 106. Since mindfulness and concentration are required to reach deeper levels of concentration, the Pāli and Sanskrit listings of mental qualities offer a more complete presentation.

49MN 26 does not mention that the bodhisattva went to practise energetically in seclusion. Sanskrit fragment 331v3 in Liu 2010: 106 agrees in this respect with MĀ 204.
to me: “Venerable one, this is [indeed] the Dharma that I have known myself, understood myself, realized myself, namely, by completely transcending the sphere of [boundless] consciousness to attain dwelling in the sphere of nothingness.”

Āḷāra Kālāma further said to me: “Venerable one, just as I realized this Dharma, so too have you; just as you realized this Dharma, so too have I. Venerable one, come and share the leadership of this group.” Thus Āḷāra Kālāma, the teacher, placed me on an equal level, thereby giving me supreme respect, supreme support and [expressing] his supreme delight.

I thought again:[776c] “This Dharma does not lead to knowledge, does not lead to awakening, does not lead to Nirvāṇa. I would rather leave this Dharma and continue searching for the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from disease ... free from old age ... free from death ... free from worry and sadness ... the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from defilement.”

16. I promptly left this Dharma and continued searching for the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from disease ... free from old age ... free from death ... free from worry and sadness ... the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from defilement. I approached Uddaka Rāmaputta and asked him: “Uddaka, I wish to train in your Dharma, will you permit it?” Uddaka Rāmaputta replied to me: “Venerable one, I certainly permit it. You may train as you wish to train.”

I asked again: “Uddaka, what Dharma did your father, Rāma, know himself, understand himself, realize himself?” Uddaka Rāmaputta replied to me: “Venerable one, completely transcending the sphere of nothingness he attained dwelling in the sphere of neither-perception-nor-non-perception. Venerable one, what my father Rāma knew himself, understood himself, realized himself, is this Dharma.”

I thought again: ‘Not only Rāma had such faith, I too have such faith, not only Rāma had such energy, I too have such energy, not only Rāma had such wisdom, I too have such wisdom, [whereby] Rāma knew this Dharma himself, understood it himself, realized it himself. Why should I not get to know this Dharma myself, understand it myself, realize it myself?’ Because I wished to realize this Dharma, I thereon went to stay alone and in seclusion, in an empty, quiet and tranquil place, with a mind free from indolence I practised energetically. Having stayed alone and in seclusion, in an empty, quiet and tranquil place, with a mind free from indolence practising energetically, not long afterwards I realized that Dharma.

---

50 According to MN 26 at MN 164,32, at this point the bodhisattva explicitly indicates that he has attained the same. Sanskrit fragment 331v6 in Liu 2010: 106 agrees in this respect with MN 26.

51 Adopting the variant reading 父羅摩 instead of 羅摩子.
Having realized that Dharma, I again approached Uddaka Rāmaputta and asked him: “Uddaka, is this the Dharma your father Rāma knew himself, understood himself, realized himself, namely, by completely transcending the sphere of nothingness to attain dwelling in the sphere of neither-perception-nor-non-perception?” Uddaka Rāmaputta replied to me: “Venerable one, this is [indeed] the Dharma that my father Rāma knew himself, understood himself, realized himself, namely, by completely transcending the sphere of nothingness to attain dwelling in the sphere of neither-perception-nor-non-perception.”

Uddaka Rāmaputta further said to me: “Venerable one, just as my father Rāma realized this Dharma, so too have you; just as you realized this Dharma, so too did my father. Venerable one, come and share the leadership of this group.”

Thus Uddaka Rāmaputta, the teacher, made me also a teacher, thereby giving me supreme respect, supreme support and [expressing] his supreme delight.

I thought again: “This Dharma does not lead to knowledge, [777a] does not lead to awakening, does not lead to Nirvāṇa. I would rather leave this teaching and continue searching for the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from disease ... free from old age ... free from death ... free from worry and sadness ... the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from defilement.”

17. I promptly left this Dharma and continued to search for the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from disease ... free from old age ... free from death ... free from worry and sadness ... the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from defilement, I went to a Brahmin village called Sena near Uruvelā, south of Elephant Peak Mountain. In that area I reached a delightful lush mountain forest by the river Nerañjarā, which was clean and full to its banks.

On seeing it, I thought: “This place that I have reached is a delightful lush mountain forest by the river Nerañjarā, which is clean and full to its banks. If a son of a good family wishes to train, he can train here. So I shall train, I would now rather train in this place.’ I promptly took some grass and approached the tree of awakening. Having reached it, I spread out [the grass] as a sitting mat beneath [the tree] and sat down cross-legged with the determination not to break

52 According to MN 26 at MN I 166,26, however, Uddaka offered the sole leadership of his group to the bodhisattva. Sanskrit fragment 33218 in Liu 2010: 107 agrees in this respect with MĀ 204. In view of the fact that the bodhisattva had attained what Uddaka had not attained himself, the reading in MN 26 fits the context better. Because of the repetitive nature of the account of the two teachers, it could easily have happened that the reading appropriate for the first instance was accidentally applied to the second instance, taking place at a time before the Sanskrit fragment version and MĀ 204 were transmitted separately.
my sitting until the influxes had been eradicated. I [indeed] did not break my sitting until the influxes had been eradicated.53

18. Searching for the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from disease, I attained the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from disease. Searching for the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from old age ... free from death ... free from worry and sadness ... free from defilement, I attained the supreme peace of Nirvāṇa, which is free from old age ... free from death ... free from worry and sadness ... free from defilement. Knowledge arose, vision arose and I was concentrated on the requisites of awakening.54 I knew as it truly is that birth has been eradicated, the holy life has been established, what had to be done has been done and there will be no more experiencing of existence.55

22. Having just awakened to the supreme, right and complete awakening, I thought: “To whom should I first teach the Dharma?” I further thought: “Should I now first teach the Dharma to Āḷāra Kālāma?” At that time there was a heavenly being up in the sky that told me: “Great sage, may you know that Āḷāra Kālāma passed away seven days ago.” I also came to know for myself that Āḷāra Kālāma had passed away seven days ago. I thought again: “It is a great loss for Āḷāra Kālāma that he did not get to hear this Dharma. If he had heard it, he would have quickly understood the Dharma in accordance with the Dharma.”

23. Having just awakened to supreme, right and complete awakening, I thought: “To whom should I first teach the Dharma?” I further thought: “Should I now first teach the Dharma to Uuddaka Rāmaputta?” At that time there was again a heavenly being up in the sky that told me: “Great sage, may you know that Uuddaka Rāmaputta passed away fourteen days ago.”56 [777b] I also came to know for myself that Uuddaka Rāmaputta had passed away fourteen days ago. I thought again: “It is a great loss for Uuddaka Rāmaputta that he did not get to hear this Dharma. If he had heard it, he would have quickly understood the Dharma in accordance with the Dharma.”

53 MN 26 does not report the preparation of the seat or the determination not to get up until the influxes are destroyed.

54 A reference to the bodhipakkhiyā dhammā is not found in MN 26.

55 At this point, MN 26 at MN I 167,30 to MN I 169,30 continues with the Buddha’s reflection that his Dharma is difficult to understand, followed by reporting Brahmā’s intervention. Thus two full pages of the F5 edition, corresponding to §§19–21 in Nāṇamoli 1995/2005: 260–262, are without any counterpart in MĀ 204.

56 According to MN 26 at MN I 170,15, Uuddaka had passed away just the night before.
24. Having just awakened to supreme, right and complete awakening, I thought: “To whom should I first teach the Dharma?” I further thought: “The five monks of former times, who supported me in my efforts, have been of much benefit. When I practised asceticism, those five monks served me. Should I now first teach the Dharma to the five monks?” I further thought: “Where are the five monks of former times now?” With the purified divine eye that transcends [the vision] of human beings I saw that the five monks were in the Deer Park at the Dwelling-place of Seers near Benares. After staying under the tree of awakening according [to my wishes], I gathered my robes, took my bowl and approached Benares, the city of Kāsi.

Comparison

Placing the above translated part of the Discourse at Ramma[ka]'s [Hermitage] and the corresponding part of the Ariyapariyesanā-sutta side by side reveals a number of small variations. By far the most prominent difference, however, is the complete absence of Brahmā in the Madhyama-āgama version.

In the Ariyapariyesanā-sutta, the episode with Brahmā’s intervention begins with the Buddha reflecting on the profundity of his realization, in particular the difficulty of understanding the principle of dependent arising and the nature of Nirvāṇa for those who are steeped in worldliness and defilements. Anticipating that others would not understand him, the Buddha considers that this would be troublesome and decides not to teach the Dharma.

Brahmā Sahampati becomes aware of this reflection in the Buddha’s mind and realizes that the world will be lost, as the Buddha is disinclined to teach. Quickly appearing in front of the Buddha, with hands together in respect, Brahmā Sahampati requests the Buddha to teach, arguing that some will understand. Following Brahmā’s request, out of compassion the Buddha surveys the world with his divine eye and realizes that some beings are indeed capable of understanding, whereupon he decides to teach. Realizing that the mission has been successful, Brahmā Sahampati pays homage and disappears.

57MĀ 204 at T I 777b9: 仙人住, while MN 26 at MN I 170,30 speaks of the Isipatana; on the term cf. Caillat 1968.
58MĀ 204 continues with the Buddha meeting Upaka on the way to Benares, etc.
59There are more substantial differences between the remaining parts of MN 26 and MĀ 204, which I did not translate in order to stay within the prescribed size for an article in this journal.
In principle, the difference between the two parallel versions regarding the episode of Brahmā’s intervention can be explained in two ways:

1) The episode has been lost in the Madhyama-āgama Discourse at Ramma[ka]'s [Hermitage], either through accidental loss or because those responsible for its transmission or translation have purposely omitted it.

2) The narration of Brahmā’s entreaty is an element added later to the Ariyapariyesanā-sutta.

Regarding the first possibility, the Madhyama-āgama discourse translated above does not give the impression that a loss of text has occurred, as the narration runs smoothly without any uneven transition. Moreover, the remainder of the Chinese discourse makes as much sense as its Pāli parallel; that is, there appears to be no need for Brahmā to intervene in order for subsequent events to be coherent.

Proposing a conscious omission of this episode from the Madhyama-āgama version would require identifying some good reason for removing it. This can in fact be found. With subsequent developments in Buddhist traditions, the notion became prevalent that the Buddha had prepared himself during numerous past lives for his task as a teacher who would lead others to awakening. This notion makes it rather surprising that, once he has accomplished all that is required for carrying out this mission, he should need prompting by another in order to start teaching at all. Without this episode, the Buddha’s autobiographical account is more easily reconciled with the traditional belief in his prolonged preparation for becoming a teacher.

Regarding the second of the two above-mentioned possibilities, however, it seems equally possible that the Brahmā episode is a later addition. The general
tendency during oral transmission is in fact more often to add and expand than consciously to remove passages. Given that the Madhyama-āgama account reads smoothly without Brahmā’s intervention, it could well be that an early version of the Buddha’s autobiographical account did not mention Brahmā at all.

The same pattern recurs in relation to the former Buddha Vipassī: the Mahā-padāna-sutta and its Dirgha-āgama parallel – the latter probably stemming from the Dharmaguptaka tradition – report an intervention by Brahmā which is absent from a partial parallel preserved in Chinese and from a Sanskrit fragment version. The partial Chinese version shows several substantial differences when compared with the Sanskrit fragments of the Mahāvadāna-sūtra, making it fairly certain that the two stem from different lines of transmission.

sufficiently different to allow for different but complementary perspectives on the implications of awakening.


63 DN 14 at DN II 36.21 and DĀ 1 at T I 8b22.

64 T 3 at T I 156c14 and Waldschmidt 1956: 148 note 2.

65 Just to mention a few major differences: On the prince’s first outing from the palace, according to T 3 at T I 154b13 he encounters a sick person, in the Sanskrit fragment version, Waldschmidt 1956: 118, 11, he instead first comes across someone afflicted by old age and only meets a sick person on the second outing. When his father comes to know what has happened, in T 3 at T I 154c5 he reflects that by staying at home the prince will become a wheel-turning king, but by going forth he will become a Buddha, whereas in the Sanskrit fragment version, Waldschmidt 1956: 120,25, the father worries whether the prediction that the prince will go forth will come true, without any reference to his becoming a wheel-turning king or a Buddha. On the fourth outing, having seen someone who has gone forth in T 3 at T I 155c3 the prince returns to the palace and there develops the aspiration to go forth, whereas in the Sanskrit fragment version, Waldschmidt 1956: 129,1, he approaches the renunciate, converses with him and then decides on the spot to go forth as well. The Sanskrit fragments, Waldschmidt 1956: 131,2, report that a reflection on the nature of the Dharma motivates the people to follow the prince’s example and go forth, whereas in T 3 at T I 155c17 they are motivated by his having relinquished his high position. According to the Sanskrit fragment version, Waldschmidt 1956: 132,6, the bodhisattva Vipaśyin decides that he had better live alone and therefore dismisses the people who have followed him and gone forth, telling them to come back once he has reached awakening. Next he obtains grass and approaches the seat of awakening with the intention not to break his sitting until the destruction of the influxes has been achieved. None of these episodes is recorded in T 3. In T 3 at T I 156a14 the bodhisattva Vipaśyin’s investigation of dependent arising covers all twelve links, including formations and ignorance, whereas in the Sanskrit fragment version, Waldschmidt 1956: 137,7, his investigation instead leads up to the reciprocal conditioning of consciousness and name-and-form. In T 3 at T I 156b20 Vipaśyin’s awakening is preceded by his contemplation of the rise and fall of the five aggregates, whereas the Sanskrit fragment version, Waldschmidt 1956: 146,1, also mentions his contemplation of the rise
Once the absence of the Brahmā episode recurs in what appear to be separate lines of transmission, it becomes probable that this episode is indeed a later addition. If such an addition took place, it must have happened at a time when the Madhyama-āgama parallel to the Ariyapariyesanā-sutta as well as the Sanskrit fragment version of the Mahāvadāna-sūtra and the partial Chinese parallel were already being transmitted independently from the ancestor of the Theravāda and Dharmaguptaka versions of these discourses. The powerful effect of this episode would then have been responsible for the widespread occurrence of Brahmā’s intervention in texts like the Mahāvastu or the Jātaka Nidānakathā, etc., and in iconographic representations.

While the tendency for Brahmā to be ‘included’ in early Buddhist discourses appears to be so well attested that it can safely be assumed to be early, the most prominent example of Brahmā’s role as a promoter of Buddhism – his requesting the Buddha to teach and thereby enabling the coming into existence of the whole Buddhist tradition – may be a later addition to the autobiographical account of the Buddha’s awakening.

and fall of the links of dependent arising. Such substantial differences make it safe to assume that the two versions derive from separate transmission lineages.
Abbreviations

AN  Aṅguttara-nikāya
Be  Burmese edition
Ce  Ceylonese edition
D  Derge edition
DĀ  Dirgha-āgama (T 1)
DN  Dīgha-nikāya
EĀ  Ekottarika-āgama (T 125)
Ee  PTS edition
Jā  Jātaka
MĀ  Madhyama-āgama (T 26)
MN  Majjhima-nikāya
Q  Qian-long (Peking) edition
Se  Siamese edition
SĀ  Sa .myukta-āgama (T 99)
SĀ²  Sa .myukta-āgama (T 100)
SHT  Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden
SN  Sa .myutta-nikāya
Sv  Sumaṅgalavilāsinī
T  Taishō edition (CBETA)
Ud  Udāna
Vin  Vinayapiṭaka
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