

i.e. that *feeling is made-by-oneself*, amounting to *the eternalist theory* (vadaṃ sassatam).

(4) It is not the case that “the one who acts and the one who experiences [the results] are different one from the other” (añño karoti añño paṭisamvediyati), or that “the feeling and the one who feels are different one from the other (aññā vedanā añño vediyati)” – i.e. that *feeling is made-by-another*, amounting to *the annihilationist theory* (vadaṃ ucchedam).

(5) The Tathāgata, avoiding both extremes (*the eternalist theory and the annihilationist theory*), teaches the Dharma by *the middle [way]* (majjhena);<sup>180</sup> that is, he teaches *arising by causal condition* in both the arising and ceasing modes.

(6) To have such understanding is *to know* (jānāti) and *to see* (passati) *feeling* (painful or pleasant).

Thus, SN and SA agree that the Buddha rejects both eternalism and annihilationism, teaching instead by *the middle way of arising by causal condition*.

Group B. Further teachings on the *middle way* are contained in SN 12. 35-36 and their counterpart SA 297, and in SA 293 (no SN counterpart).<sup>181</sup>

In SN 12. 35-36 and their counterpart SA 297 the Buddha says:<sup>182</sup>

In the view (diṭṭhi 見) that life (soul/self, jīva 命) and body (sarīra 身) are the same, there is no noble life (brahmacariyavāsa 梵行); and, bhiksus, in the view that life and body are different one from the other, there is no noble life.

The Tathāgata, avoiding these two extremes, teaches the Dharma by *the middle way of arising by causal condition* in both arising and ceasing modes. The quoted sentence is the Buddha’s response to the question “What is ageing-and-death, and whose is this ageing-and-death?” (katamaṃ jarāmaṇaṃ kassa ca panidaṃ jarāmaṇanti), or “Who ages-and-dies? To whom does this ageing-and-death belong?” (彼誰老死? 老死屬誰?).<sup>183</sup> The discourses in question then go backwards through the factors in the formula

180 The term “middle way”, majjhimā paṭipadā, does not actually appear in the sutta.

181 SN ii, pp. 60-64; T 2, pp. 84c-85a, 83c (CSA ii, pp. 36-37, 25-26). For Skt. versions of SA 293, 297, cf. Tripāṭhī, Sūtras 11, 15, pp. 137-140, 152-157.

182 SN ii, pp. 61, 63; T 2, p. 84c (CSA ii, pp. 36-37). Cf. Tripāṭhī, Sūtra 15, p. 154.

183 SN ii, pp. 60-61, 63; T 2, p. 84c (CSA ii, p. 36). Cf. Tripāṭhī, p. 153: tatra ko jarāmaṇaṃ kasya vā jarāmaṇam.

for arising by causal condition, as far as activities (saṅkhārā): “What are activities and whose are these activities?”<sup>184</sup>

This again is the teaching on *the middle way* of neither sameness nor difference, based on *arising by causal condition* in both arising and ceasing modes. It is similar to the above-noted teachings on *the middle way* of neither sameness nor difference with regard to self and feeling, and of neither eternalism nor annihilationism.

However, the sutras in question here (SN 12. 35-36 and SA 297) also display a significant difference. SA 297 has the Buddha say that the teaching of *the middle way* of *arising by causal condition* is to be called “the dharma-discourse on **great emptiness**” (大空法經).<sup>185</sup> SN 12. 35-36 lack this statement. Thus, only the SA version makes the connection between *the middle way* of *arising by causal condition* and the notion of *emptiness*.

That connection is also made in SA 293, which has no SN counterpart:<sup>186</sup>

I teach bhiksus this Dharma: **the noble** (賢聖),<sup>187</sup> **the supramundane** (出世),<sup>188</sup> **connected with emptiness** (空相應),<sup>189</sup> **according to the Dharma of arising by causal condition** (緣起隨順法).<sup>190</sup> That is to say: Because this exists, that exists; because this arises, that arises, namely: Conditioned by ignorance are activities ... Thus is the arising of the whole mass of suffering. [And similarly, in the ceasing mode, to] the ceasing of the whole mass of suffering.

... Profound (甚深)<sup>191</sup> is this, namely **arising by causal condition**. Even more profound, more difficult to see is this, namely the renunciation of all attachment, the extinction of craving, absence of desire, cessation, **nirvana** (一切取離、愛盡、無欲、寂滅、涅

184 SN ii, pp. 62, 64; T 2, p. 84c (CSA ii, p. 37). Cf. Tripāṭhī, p. 154.

185 T 2, p. 84c (CSA ii, p. 36). Cf. Tripāṭhī, pp. 153, 157: mahāśūnyatānāma dharmaparyāyah.

186 T 2, p. 83c (CSA ii, pp. 25-26). Cf. Tripāṭhī, Sūtra 11, pp. 138-139.

187 Skt. āryāyām (p. 138).

188 Skt. lokottarāyām.

189 Skt. śūnyatāpratisamyukta; not in the corresponding Tripāṭhī, Sūtra 11, p. 138.

190 Skt. pratītyasamutpādānulomatā; not in Sūtra 11, but found in Tripāṭhī, Sūtra 14, p. 149, which corresponds to SA 296: T 2, p. 84b-c (CSA ii, pp. 34-35) = SN 12. 20: SN ii, pp. 25-27.

191 Skt. gambhīram (p. 139).

槃).<sup>192</sup> These two dharmas are namely **the compounded and the uncompounded** (有爲、無爲).<sup>193</sup>

The compounded is **arising, persisting, changing, passing away** (若生、若住、若異、若滅).<sup>194</sup> The uncompounded is **not arising, not persisting, not changing, not passing away** (不生、不住、不異、不滅).<sup>195</sup>

This discourse is mainly saying that the Dharma taught by the Buddha is profound, supramundane (i.e. dealing with nirvana), connected with emptiness, and based on the teaching of *arising by causal condition*. This text refers to these two profound dharmas, *arising by causal condition* and the way to *nirvana*, as *the compounded* and *the uncompounded* respectively.

Further on the subject of *arising by causal condition* as profound, at SN 12. 60 Ānanda says he finds that teaching easy to understand, but the Buddha responds that it is indeed *profound* (gambhīra).<sup>196</sup> Thus, this idea that the dharma of *arising by causal condition* is profound (甚深) is recorded both in SA 293 (above) and in SN 12. 60, neither of which has a counterpart in the other tradition.

To conclude, SN and SA agree that the teaching of *arising by causal condition* is *profound* and connected with the notion of the *middle way*. This *middle way* is also called *right view*, understood through the practice of insight, i.e. fully seeing (knowing) both the arising and the ceasing modes of *arising by causal condition*, and fully seeing conditioned phenomena as not-self or empty of self. *The middle way (right view)* in both versions is variously shown as avoiding the two extremes: fully seeing neither existence (arising) nor non-existence (ceasing) of the world and suffering, neither sameness nor difference of soul/self and body, neither sameness nor difference of self and feeling, or neither eternalism nor annihilationism with regard to self and feeling.

At the same time, some statements in SA are not shared with SN, namely: (1) the reference to the teaching on *the middle way of arising by causal condition* as “the dharma-discourse on **great emptiness** (大空法經)”, and (2) the reference to both the middle way of arising by causal condition and

192 Skt. sarvopadhīpratīniḥsargas tṛṣṇākṣayo virāgo nirodho nirvāṇam.

193 Skt. saṃskṛtañ cāsaṃskṛtañ ca.

194 Skt. saṃskṛtasyotpādo 'pi prajñāyate vyayo 'pi sthityanyathātvam api.

195 Skt. asaṃskṛtasya naivotpādaḥ prajñāyate na vyayo na sthityanyathātvam.

196 SN ii, p. 92.