

*Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* (2011, 24:35-70)  
Taipei: Chung-Hwa Institute of Buddhist Studies  
中華佛學學報第二十四期 頁35-70 (民國一百年), 臺北: 中華佛學研究所  
ISSN:1017-7132

## The Historical Relationship Between the Two Chinese *Samyuktāgama* Translations

Roderick S. Bucknell

Reader in Eastern Religions (retired) The University of Queensland

### Abstract

T 99 in the Taishō Chinese canon, titled *Za ahanjing* 雜阿含經 “*Samyuktāgama*,” is an almost complete translation, from a Sanskrit original, that is widely recognized as being of (Mūla)-Sarvāstivādin provenance. T 100, titled *Bieyi Za ahanjing* 別譯雜阿含經 “Other Translation of *Samyuktāgama*,” is a partial translation, probably also from Sanskrit, whose sectarian affiliation remains an issue for scholarly discussion. In this article certain features of these two texts are compared, with a view to clarifying their historical relationship. It is argued that the available evidence, particularly from relevant *uddānas*, supports the proposition advanced by Bingenheimer (2011) that the now lost Indic source-texts for these two Chinese translations were descended from a near common ancestor. Some characteristics of that common ancestor are then inferred.

### Keywords:

*Samyuktāgama*, *Āgama*, *Uddāna*, *Za ahanjing*, *Bieyi Za ahanjing*

## 《雜阿含經》和《別譯雜阿含經》的歷史關係

Roderick S. Bucknell

昆士蘭大學東方宗教學系退休教授

### 摘要

大正新修大藏經中的《雜阿含經》（經號99）是從梵文譯為漢文的一部幾乎完整的經典，通常被認為屬於說一切有部或根本說一切有部。《別譯雜阿含經》（經號100）是不完整譯文，很可能亦據梵文譯出；對其教派歸屬，學界尚有爭議。為了釐清這兩部經典的歷史關係，本人將二者的一些特點作比較考查而推論出該原型的一些特點，以考據所得—尤其是出自相關攝頌的證據—來支持馬德偉博士2011年提出的見解，也就是這兩部經典的梵文原是由同一原型所傳。

關鍵字：《雜阿含經》、阿含經、攝頌、《雜阿含經》、《別譯雜阿含經》

## Introduction

The Chinese Tripiṭaka contains Chinese translations of two sūtra collections that correspond broadly to the Pāli *Samyutta-nikāya*. In the Taishō edition these two translations are text no. 99, *Za ahanjing* 雜阿含經 (*Samyuktāgama*), and text no. 100, *Bieyi Za ahanjing* 別譯雜阿含經 (*Other Translation of Samyuktāgama*).<sup>1</sup>

T 99, *Za ahanjing* (henceforth abbreviated “ZA”), is widely considered to have been translated in the period 435-443 C.E. from a Sanskrit *Samyuktāgama* brought to China from Sri Lanka (Glass 2008; de Jong 1981, 108). T 100, *Bieyi Za ahanjing* (henceforth “BZA”)<sup>2</sup>, is an incomplete anonymous translation of a slightly different *Samyuktāgama* of uncertain provenance, which also appears likely to have been in Sanskrit (Mizuno 1970, 50-51). Scholars date this translation to some time within the period 385-431.<sup>3</sup> BZA corresponds to only one quarter of ZA; the reason for its incompleteness is unknown. ZA contains parallels for most of the sūtras in the Pāli *Samyutta-nikāya* (henceforth “SN”), and the reverse is true also.<sup>4</sup> BZA contains parallels for most of the sūtras in the *Sagātha-vagga* of SN and for some in other sections of SN.<sup>5</sup>

A succession of researchers have sought to identify the Buddhist school or schools to which ZA and BZA should be attributed. In the case of ZA this has yielded a fairly clear outcome. Mainly on the basis of verse sections that are shared in common with the *Udānavarga* in its various recensions, Enomoto (1980, 1984) presents a convincing case for attributing ZA to the

1 The title *Za ahanjing* is also applied to T 101, which, since it comprises only 27 sūtras, has little bearing on this study.

2 The abbreviations “ZA” and “BZA” for T 99 and T 100 respectively are as in Bingenheimer 2011 and earlier publications. Equivalent abbreviations found in recent literature are: “SA” and “ASA” (Choong 2007); “SĀ” and “SĀ<sup>2</sup>” (Anālayo and Bucknell 2006); “SĀc(1)” and “SĀc(2)” (Chung 2008); and “SA” and “SA2” (suttacentral.net).

3 The dating of the translation, due mainly to Mizuno (1970, 46-47), is discussed by Bingenheimer (2011, 3-6). The date range proposed indicates that BZA, despite its title (“Other translation ...”), is slightly earlier than ZA.

4 For a catalog of the known Pāli and other parallels of ZA sūtras, see Akanuma (1990, 26-119) and Foguang (1983, 4:1-72); <http://suttacentral.net/>; and, with emphasis on fragmentary Sanskrit parallels (Chung 2008). For the ZA and BZA parallels of SN, see Akanuma (1990, 172-266) and <http://suttacentral.net/>.

5 These other sections of SN include *saṃyuttas* whose Pāli titles are *Bhikkhu*, *Mahākassapa*, *Gāmaṇi*, *Mahānāma*, *Anamatagga*, and *Abyākata*. For the known Pāli and other parallels to the sūtras of BZA, see <http://buddhisticinformatics.ddbc.edu.tw/BZA/bzaComCatWeb.html>; Bingenheimer (2011, 247-302), Appendix 1; or <http://suttacentral.net/>. To facilitate comparison, I use the Pāli form for most sūtra and *saṃyutta* titles and for terms such as *saṃyutta* and *uddāna*. The numbering system used here for Pāli sūtras in SN vol. I is a slightly modified version of that in Feer’s 1884 edition, which has the merit of indicating the *saṃyuttas*. Page references to SN vol. I are also to Feer’s edition.

(Mūla)-Sarvāstivāda.<sup>6</sup> In the case of BZA, however, consensus has proved elusive. Arguments have been advanced favoring, in historical succession, the Kāśyapīya, the Mahīśāsaka or the Dharmaguptaka, and most recently the (Mūla)-Sarvāstivādin traditions.<sup>7</sup> While the latest research points to the (Mūla)-Sarvāstivāda, this proposition has not found universal acceptance.<sup>8</sup>

Within the above list, attribution of BZA to the (Mūla)-Sarvāstivāda is methodologically unique in that evidence for or against it can be sought by comparing BZA with ZA. If such comparison were to reveal that these two texts closely resemble each other in a number of significant respects, then that might amount to a case for assigning BZA to the same school as ZA. On this reasoning, if one accepts Enomoto's argument that ZA belongs to the (Mūla)-Sarvāstivāda, then one might conclude that BZA does also. Such is the principal approach adopted by Marcus Bingenheimer in the second chapter of his recent book on BZA (2011, 46-50). In comparing BZA with ZA, Bingenheimer considers the sequence of the sūtras in the two collections. He draws attention to far-reaching sequential agreement and, on the basis of this and other considerations, advances his key proposition: ZA and BZA are slightly divergent descendents from a near common ancestor within the (Mūla)-Sarvāstivāda.

In the present article I critically examine Bingenheimer's approach and conclusions. Provisionally adopting his method of comparing sūtra sequences, I note the effects of applying it to a wider and more diverse range of data within the *Samyuktāgama* corpus. The outcome is an endorsement of his proposition regarding a near common ancestor, and some suggestive insights into the nature of that long-lost ancestral collection.

## Restoration of the Scroll Sequence

As background for this interpretative enterprise, it is necessary to discuss issues relating to the sequence of the basic physical units on which the ZA and BZA texts are recorded, that is, their component scrolls (*juan* 卷, also often called "fascicles").<sup>9</sup>

6 I follow the now common practice of writing "(Mūla)-Sarvāstivāda" as shorthand for "Sarvāstivāda and/or Mūla-Sarvāstivāda," in recognition of the continuing uncertainty about how these two schools or sub-schools may be related.

7 For the Kāśyapīya: Hōdo (c.1770. See Mayeda 1985, 101); Akanuma (1939, 48-50); and Yinshun (1988, 98; 1983, 3-5). For the Mahīśāsaka or the Dharmaguptaka: Mizuno (1970). For the (Mūla)-Sarvāstivāda: Waldschmidt (1980, esp. 146ff); Enomoto (1980; 1984); and Hiraoka (2000). An overall summary and assessment is at Bingenheimer (2011, 23-50).

8 Evidence of this is the continuing appearance of articles that assume attribution of BZA to other schools.

9 The printed Taishō text, although presented in modern book format, retains a complete set of scroll headings both for ZA and for BZA. However, the scroll numbers shown there are

ZA consists of fifty scrolls; BZA has sixteen scrolls in the Taishō and related editions produced in Japan and Korea, but twenty scrolls in most editions produced in China.<sup>10</sup> It has long been recognized that, as regards the sequence of the scrolls, both texts are in disarray.<sup>11</sup> A further complication, when one is comparing the two texts with each other or with the Pāli SN, is that neither of the Chinese texts gives any direct indication of being divided into *samyuttas* (groups of “connected” sūtras). There are no *samyutta* headings and nothing corresponding to the lists of *samyutta* titles provided in SN.<sup>12</sup> This, combined with the disarrangement of the scroll sequence, means that the *samyutta*-based structure of ZA and BZA is not easily discerned. The Chinese sūtra numbers, which simply run from 1 to 1362 in ZA and from 1 to 364 in BZA, are a new addition supplied (presumably in the 1920s) by the Taishō editors. Convenient though they are, these sūtra numbers have the unfortunate effect of entrenching the confused sequence of the scrolls and the consequent obscuring of the *samyuttas*.

Researchers have, nevertheless, succeeded in identifying the major *samyuttas* within ZA and BZA and restoring the scroll sequence that would have prevailed in the newly translated texts.<sup>13</sup> The pioneer in this twofold task, Anesaki Masaharu (1908), was working some years before the publication of the relevant volume of the Taishō edition (vol. 2, 1924); consequently, his extensive comparative tables appear inconvenient to present-day scholars, for whom the Taishō is the standard reference. In the case of BZA the restored original scroll sequence that Anesaki proposed is beyond question. An easily read presentation of it, using the Taishō sūtra numbers, is offered in Table 1 (below).<sup>14</sup> In the case of ZA Anesaki’s proposed original scroll sequence has been progressively improved upon by later researchers, and the restoration task can now be considered essentially completed (Glass 2007, 39-42). In some recent editions of ZA this inferred original scroll sequence has been adopted and the sūtras have been re-numbered accordingly.<sup>15</sup> However, in the present article, the widely used Taishō sūtra numbers are retained, for obvious practical reasons. This accounts for some of the

seriously unreliable as indicators of the proper scroll sequence.

- 10 In ZA, scrolls 23 and 25 actually belong to another text, having apparently been inserted to fill gaps left by early loss of two ZA scrolls. For BZA the 16-scroll version of the Taishō edition is the one referred to throughout this article, except where otherwise stated.
- 11 In the case of BZA, while the 20-scroll version remained largely intact, the 16-scroll version suffered extensive disarrangement. Not only entire scrolls were transposed, as in ZA, but also detached portions of scrolls (see Bucknell 2008).
- 12 Both ZA and BZA have incomplete sets of *uddānas* listing sūtras but none for *samyuttas*.
- 13 This has been achieved by various means: comparing with the 20-scroll version of BZA; comparing, sūtra by sūtra, with the Pāli SN; and consulting the surviving *uddānas*, which list the sūtras like a table of contents.
- 14 Based on Bucknell (2008, 49-50, Table 4). The sign # indicates the presence of an *uddāna*; ø indicates the absence of an expected *uddāna*.
- 15 The editions in question are Yinshun’s combined edition of ZA and its commentary (1983), and the Foguang edition (1983). There is no comparable new edition of BZA.

discontinuities in the sequence of these numbers within ZA or within BZA, as they appear in the tables.<sup>16</sup>

Table 1: Restored Sūtra Sequence and *Samyutta* Structure of BZA

Sūtra range	Samyutta
1-11 #	Bhikkhu
12-22 #	“
23-32 #	Māra
33-42 #	Sakka
43-52 #	“
53-62 #	Kosala
63-73 #	“
74-83 #	Brāhmaṇa
84-91 ø	“
258-267 #	“
268, 92-100 #	“
101-110 ø	Brahmā
214-223 #	Bhikkhunī
224-230, 250-251 #	Vaṅgīsa
252-257 #	“
132-141 #	Devatā
142, 231-239 ø	“
240-249 #	“
161-169 ø	“
170-180 #	“
181-189 #	“
269-277 ø	“
278-287 #	“
288-297 #	“
298-307 #	Devaputta
308-317 #	“
318-329 #	Yakkha

<sup>16</sup> For example, near the end of the BZA sūtra sequence shown in Table 1, the jump from 160 to 330 is due to an inferred displacement of the *Anamatagga-samyutta* (330-350, first half of the present scroll 16) by a portion of the *Devatā-samyutta* (161-189, scroll 9).

351-359 #	Vana
360-364 ø	“
111-121 #	Kassapa
122-131 #	Gāmaṇi
143-151 #	*Assa
152-160 #	Mahānāma
330-340 #	Anamatagga
341-350 #	“
190-198 #	Abyākata
199-213 #	*Pabbajjita

## Evidence From the Sūtra Sequence

Bingenheimer (2011, 47) points out that, provided the above-mentioned disarrangement of the scroll sequence is allowed for, a comparative table showing the sūtras of BZA (identified by their Taishō numbers, 1 to 364) alongside their parallels in ZA reveals a remarkably regular correspondence.<sup>17</sup> With relatively few exceptions, the sūtra numbers of the ZA parallels are found to be in regular ascending numerical order, in step with the numbers of their BZA counterparts. This phenomenon is clearly seen in Table 2 (below) which lists, as a sample, the ZA and Pāli parallels to the first thirty-five sūtras of BZA. It covers the *Bhikkhu-*, *Māra-*, and (in part) *Sakka-samyuttas*.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>17</sup> See his table at <http://buddhistinformatics.ddbc.edu.tw/BZA/bzaComCatWeb.html>; or the table at [suttacentral.net](http://suttacentral.net) (from home page click Chinese > SA2 > green “Correspondences” button). For correspondences in the reverse direction (from ZA to BZA) listed in the restored scroll sequence, see Chung (2008, 259-270)

<sup>18</sup> The tables cited in the preceding note show BZA 6 as having its ZA parallel in ZA 275 rather than ZA 1066. This is because ZA 1066 consists of just one line of text directing the reader to the *Nanda-sutta*, which is found to be ZA 275. Evidently, ZA 1066 was a replica of ZA 275. Hence, it is appropriate that Table 2 shows ZA 1066 as the parallel to BZA 6. See Chung (2008, 261-262, 4n). In ZA and BZA *Bhikkhu-samyutta* is treated as belonging to *Sagātha-vagga*; see Bucknell (2007, 14-18).

Table 2: ZA and Pāli Parallels to BZA 1-35

<b>BZA</b>	<b>ZA</b>	<b>Pāli</b>
001	1062	SN 21.5
002	1063	SN 21.6
003	1064	SN 17.36, AN 4.68
004	1065	—
005	1067 §	SN 21.8
006	1066 §	AN 8.9
007	1068	SN 21.9
008	1069	SN 21.7, AN 4.48
009	1070	SN 21.4
010	1071	SN 21.10
011	1072	—
012	1073	AN 3.79
013	1074	—
014	1075	—
015	1076	—
016	1077	MN 86
017	1078	SN 1.20
018	1079	MN 23
019	1080	—
020	1081	AN 3.126
021	1082	—
022	1083	SN 2.9
023	1084	SN 4.9
024	1085	SN 4.10
025	1086	SN 4.15
026	1087	SN 4.07
027	1088	SN 4.11
028	1089	SN 4.06
029	1090	SN 4.13
030	1091	SN 4.23
031	1092	SN 4.25
032	1093	SN 4.2-3
033	1104 §	SN 11.11



034 1105 SN 11.13

035 1106 SN 11.12

The segment shown in Table 2 was not affected by the above-mentioned disarrangement of the scroll sequence, either in ZA or in BZA.<sup>19</sup> Consequently, one can readily see in it the sequential agreement to which Bingenheimer draws attention. Only two departures from regular correspondence are evident (marked with §). The first is the reversed sequence in the ZA parallels to BZA 5 and 6 (both of which feature the monk Nanda).<sup>20</sup> The second is the jump from ZA 1093 to ZA 1104, which occurs because the ten intervening ZA sūtras 1094-1103 (all in *Māra-samyutta*) do not have parallels in BZA. (They do have parallels in the Pāli.) Scanning down a complete table of BZA-to-ZA parallels, one finds such departures from strict sequential agreement scattered throughout the list. For the most part, however, the correspondence between the two sūtra sequences is remarkably regular.

Also apparent from Table 2 is that virtually no such regularity is found when the sūtras of BZA or of ZA are compared with their parallels in the Pāli *nikāyas*. The Pāli sūtra numbers themselves do largely reflect the grouping into *samyuttas*; for example, in Table 2 “SN 4.” correctly signals “*Māra-samyutta*” (*Māra* being the fourth *samyutta* in SN). Also, one does find cases like “BZA 23, 24 = SN 4.09, 4.10,” that is, cases where sūtras that are consecutive in BZA (and in ZA) have Pāli parallels that are also consecutive; but such cases are rare. Thus, the fairly close sequential agreement between BZA and ZA contrasts with a general lack of such agreement between BZA-ZA and SN.

Bingenheimer attaches considerable importance to these phenomena. Of the large-scale sequential agreement between BZA and ZA he says: “Agreement on this scale cannot be accidental” (Bingenheimer 2011, 47). He takes it as indicating that BZA and ZA represent closely related transmission lineages. More specifically, and taking account of Enomoto’s conclusion regarding ZA, he sees it as evidence that BZA and ZA are descended from a common (Mūla)-Sarvāstivādin ancestor – in other words, that they represent slightly divergent lines of development from what had earlier been a single *Samyuktāgama* transmission within the (Mūla)-Sarvāstivāda. As he points out, a natural concomitant of this interpretation is that the occasional sequential discrepancies between BZA and ZA are products of the period after the split into these two divergent lines of transmission.

Bingenheimer begins from the observation that comparison of the sūtra sequence in BZA and in ZA reveals far-reaching underlying agreement together with occasional cases of disagreement. He then takes the natural logical step: this pattern of similarity and difference must be a reflection of the stemmatic relationship of the two texts. The far-reaching sequential agreement is due to descent from a common (Mūla)-Sarvāstivādin ancestor; the occasional

<sup>19</sup> No effects of the disarrangement become apparent until BZA 49 = ZA 1222..

<sup>20</sup> The Taishō apparatus incorrectly shows the parallels of BZA 5 and 6 as ZA 1066 and 1067 respectively (T 99, 276, 3n, 4n; T 100, 374, 23n and 375, 5n). That is, the editors failed to notice this sequential discrepancy.

cases of disagreement are due to independent developments, in one or the other of the two lines, during the period after the split into sibling transmissions.

Now, it is inherently likely that not only BZA and ZA but also SN are all descended from a single remote common ancestor.<sup>21</sup> However, what Bingenheimer is pointing to is a very near (Mūla)-Sarvāstivādin common ancestor for just the Sanskrit source-texts of BZA and ZA. In positing this, he offers an answer to the much-debated question about BZA's sectarian affinity: like ZA, BZA too is (Mūla)-Sarvāstivādin.

How valid is this reasoning? A key feature of Bingenheimer's comparative analysis of BZA and ZA is its focus on the sequence of the sūtras within the collection. It is not immediately apparent that this is an appropriate way of assessing the degree of closeness of parallel sūtra collections. For example, one can well imagine that a skeptic, presented with Table 2, might raise objections such as the following:

The ten ZA sūtras numbered 1094 to 1103 are absent from Table 2 because they don't have parallels in BZA. But they do have parallels in the Pāli SN;<sup>22</sup> so, as regards this particular feature, there is a closer resemblance between ZA and SN than there is between ZA and BZA. That is, focusing on the sūtra *composition* of the three collections, rather than on the *sequence* of those sūtras, leads one to a different conclusion. And another point: the conclusion reached is influenced by the design of the table. Table 2 is based on the sequence in BZA (in the left-hand column) rather than on the sequence in ZA. But one could equally well set out the data so that the left-hand column contained the forty-five ZA sūtras and the middle column the thirty-five parallel BZA sūtras. With that alternative arrangement the lack of BZA parallels for ten of the ZA sūtras would show up as a conspicuous gap. This would make the sequential agreement much less impressive.

As these possible objections implicitly suggest, an adequate appraisal of Bingenheimer's interpretation would need to take due account of the varied types of evidence that might count against it. That would require, among other things, the compiling of data on the different types of sequential disagreement that do exist between BZA and ZA, and on their frequency, extent, and implications. Gathering such information will therefore be the next step in the present study. It will involve inspection of the entire table of parallels, from BZA 001 to BZA 364, with due attention also to correspondences (or lack thereof) in the reverse direction, that is, from ZA to BZA. This task is greatly facilitated by the *Concordances* table offered by Chung (2008, 259-270). Chung's table shows ZA-to-BZA parallels according to the restored ZA scroll sequence; and it highlights (with shading and other devices) all departures from

21 The various schools agree in attributing this common ancestor to the "First Council".

22 See Akanuma (1990, 98), where ZA 1094-1103 are the sūtras numbered 14-23; or see [suttacentral.net](http://suttacentral.net).

sequential agreement – apart from cases where a hiatus in the number series is simply an artifact of the restoration process.

Inspection of the data in this way reveals more than just the two types of sequential disagreement noted in Table 2. One can discern altogether six types, as follows.

**Type 1.** The simplest type of disagreement is the one seen above in the BZA sūtra sequence 5, 6 and its ZA counterpart 1067, 1066, in which the sūtras of the parallel pair are in the reverse sequence. Five instances of this are found:

BZA 5, 6	= ZA 1067, 1066
BZA 57, 58	= ZA 1231, 1230
BZA 98, 99	= ZA 1185, 1184 <sup>23</sup>
BZA 291, 292	= ZA 1294, 1293
BZA 326, 327	= ZA 1328, 1327

The arrangement of these parallel lists – in which the sūtras of each BZA pair are listed in normal numerical order (e.g., “5, 6” on the left) and the sūtras of each corresponding ZA pair appear in reversed numerical order (“1067, 1066” on the right) – is arbitrary. One could, for example, equally well write the first set thus: “ZA 1066, 1067 = BZA 6, 5.” Either way, it is as if one or the other of the parallel pairs had been reversed.

**Type 2.** This differs from Type 1 in involving three sūtras rather than two:

BZA 48, 49, 50	= ZA 1120, 1222, 1119
BZA 173, 174, 175	= ZA 599, 600, 598
BZA 178, 179, 180	= ZA 1269, 1268, 1267

In the first of the three listed cases the relationship is partly obscured by the jump in the ZA number series from 1120 to 1222. This seeming discontinuity is a consequence of the restoration of the ZA scroll sequence. (See Chung 2008, 263, which shows that 1120 and 1222 are in fact consecutive in the restored ZA sūtra series.) The third case differs slightly from the other two; here it is as if ZA 1267 and 1269 had switched places.

**Type 3.** This type is represented by a unique case (located within *Devatā-samyutta*) where seventeen consecutive sūtras of BZA, namely 173-189, have ZA parallels (eighteen of them)

<sup>23</sup> With BZA 98 and 99 the Taishō editors have again overlooked the reversed correspondence. Consequently, at T 100, 408, 11n should be interchanged with 18n; similarly, 4n at T 99, 320 with 4n at T 99, 321.

whose numbers form an irregular series. This irregular series is marked with the sign § in Table 3 (below).<sup>24</sup> To provide context, it is shown together with the six sūtras that precede it and the two that follow it. This reveals that its irregularity consists, in part, in the sequential discontinuity at its beginning and end (a jump from 588 to 599 and another from 595 to 1270). Three portions of this irregular block are instances of simpler types of irregularity. “BZA 173, 174, 175 = ZA 599, 600, 598” is an instance of Type 2, as is also “BZA 178, 179, 180 = ZA 1269, 1268, 1267”; and “BZA 176, 177, — = ZA 601, 602, 603” is an instance of Type 4 (described below).

Table 3: The Seventeen/Eighteen Irregular Parallels.

BZA	ZA
167	0583
168	0584
169 神	0585 神
170	0586
171	0587
172	0588
173	0599 §
174	0600 §
175	0598 §
176	0601 §
177	0602 §
—	0603 §
178	1269 §
179	1268 §
180 #	1267 §
181	0596 §
182	0597 §
183	0589 §
184 神	0590 § 神
185 神	0591 § 神
186 神	0592 § 神
187	0593 §
188	0594 §
189 #	0595 §

<sup>24</sup> The notation 神 in Table 3 is explained later. Regarding the jump from 189 to 269, see Table 1.

269            1270  
270            1271

This large-scale departure from sequential agreement provides a particularly good example of the acknowledged arbitrariness of the mode of presentation. As far as can be known at this stage in the analysis, it would be just as valid to list the ZA sūtras in regular numerical order (588, 589, 590, ...) and their BZA parallels according to their correspondences with this (172, 183, 184, ...). This possible alternative arrangement of the data is the one adopted, with good reason, by Chung (2008, 267-268) in his ZA-to-BZA concordance.

**Type 4.** Here the disagreement consists in the lack of a ZA parallel to a BZA sūtra, or the converse of this: lack of a BZA parallel to a ZA sūtra. The following instances are found:

BZA 138, 139, 140 = ZA 1001, —, 1002  
BZA 298, 299, 300 = ZA 1300, —, 1301

BZA 148, —, 149 = ZA 922, 923, 924  
BZA 157, —, 158 = ZA 932, 933, 934  
BZA 176, 177, — = ZA 601, 602, 603  
BZA 253, —, 254 = ZA 1218, 1219, 1220  
BZA 270, —, 271 = ZA 1271, 1272, 1273

**Type 5.** Note has already been taken of the case in Table 2 where the block of ten ZA sūtras numbered 1094-1103 has no BZA counterpart. A second such case is to be found elsewhere: ZA 1344, which parallels the last sūtra of BZA (no. 364, in *Vana-samyutta*), is followed by a block of eighteen sūtras that has no BZA counterpart. We therefore have the following two instances:

BZA 32, —, 33 = ZA 1093, 1094-1103, 1104  
BZA 364, — . = ZA 1344, 1345-1362.

These differ from Type 4, in that what is missing here is not just a single parallel sūtra but a sizable parallel block of sūtras (in each case denoted by a dash).

**Type 6.** This type is represented in just one case:

ZA 1008 = BZA 234 + 235.

The first half of ZA 1008 corresponds to BZA 234, the second half to BZA 235. Here no sūtra is missing or out of place, yet there is an irregularity in the pattern of correspondence between ZA and BZA.

The six types of disagreement identified above fall naturally into three broad categories. In Types 1, 2, and 3 the disagreement or discrepancy resides purely in the *sequence* of the parallel sūtras; where these three types differ from one another is in the number of sūtras involved. In Types 4 and 5 the disagreement consists in the *absence* of one sūtra (Type 4) or of a block of sūtras (Type 5) from one side of the parallel relationship; the difference between these two types is again the number of sūtras involved. In Type 6 the disagreement is about whether there are two sūtras here or two parts of a single sūtra.

The above body of data on the different types of disagreement between ZA and BZA represents a basic resource for the evaluation of Bingenheimer's interpretation. It is clearly relevant to his proposition that such disagreements reflect divergent developments in the ZA line and/or the BZA line since their separation. An equally relevant resource for the evaluation is the *uddānas*, the mnemonic summarizing verses that list the sūtras like a table of contents. They will now be examined.

## Evidence From the *uddānas*

*Uddānas* are a familiar feature of the *nikāyas/āgamas* of the various traditions. Each *uddāna* lists, by key-words, the decade of sūtras that precedes it.<sup>25</sup> Of the extant Chinese *āgamas* only the *Madhyamāgama* (T 26) has a complete set of *uddānas*. While the Chinese *Dīrghāgama* (T 1) has no *uddānas*, the *Ekottarikāgama* (T 125) and the two *Samyuktāgamas* (ZA and BZA) have incomplete sets. It is self-evident that *uddānas* would have served the useful function of inhibiting loss or misplacement of sūtras, especially during the first few centuries of the Buddhist tradition in India, when the memorized texts had not yet been committed to writing. In the case of ZA and BZA the *uddānas*, as preserved in Chinese translation, can be expected to throw light on issues raised by the six types of disagreement identified above.

ZA contains fifteen *uddānas*, covering just the *Khandha-samyutta* and forming an unbroken series at the beginning of the collection. (They list the consecutive sūtras ZA 1-110 and 256-272.) It is natural to suspect that this may be just the beginning part of a set of *uddānas* that formerly listed the entire collection of Sanskrit sūtras now represented in ZA. Bingenheimer (2011, 16) suggests that Chinese monastics, with their traditional dependence on written texts

<sup>25</sup> Here I use "decade" to refer to the group of usually ten sūtras that is listed in an *uddāna*. This avoids the ambiguity of the Pāli term *vagga*, which denotes either a group of sūtras or a group of *samyuttas* similarly listed (see Bodhi 2000, 22 and Feer in SN I viii). Exceptionally, in the Chinese *Madhyamāgama* (T 26) each *uddāna* is located before, rather than after, the decade of sūtras it lists.

rather than on memorized oral transmission, may have been inclined to devalue *uddānas*. This could have led the ZA translation team to give up translating the Sanskrit *uddānas* early in the project. Regardless of whether this suggestion is entirely correct, there can be little doubt that the incompleteness of the ZA *uddāna* set is not due to natural accidental loss. Having such clear-cut boundaries, the set as we find it gives instead the strong impression of being *intentionally* incomplete.

BZA contains thirty-one *uddānas*, though there would have formerly been a total of thirty-seven to cover the entire surviving text.<sup>26</sup> The gaps occasioned by the absence of six expected *uddānas* are distributed irregularly.<sup>27</sup> This indicates that, unlike what one finds in ZA, the incompleteness of the BZA *uddāna* set is probably due to accidental loss in the course of the text's transmission. An *uddāna* appears as a linguistically meaningless appendage to an already complete sūtra (the last sūtra of a decade). As such, *uddānas* would have been vulnerable to omission by poorly informed copyists, whether Indian or Chinese.

The incomplete set of extant BZA *uddānas* now becomes our immediate focus of attention. Comparison confirms that, once the original scroll sequence has been restored, the BZA *uddānas* are largely accurate as a listing of the BZA sūtras. The studies of the BZA *uddānas* undertaken by Su (2008) and Chung (2008, 247-258) reveal only about eight discrepancies, in the form of omission or faulty sequence, in a total of 310 sūtras covered – that is, roughly 97 per cent accuracy.<sup>28</sup> Furthermore, thanks to the high degree of correspondence between the sūtra sequence of BZA and that of ZA, the BZA *uddānas* prove to be equally accurate as a listing of the sūtras in the section of ZA that corresponds to BZA, except over the range of sūtras marked with § in Table 3. It will be instructive, therefore, to see what light the *uddānas* may shed on the above-noted six types of disagreement between the two sūtra sequences.

A clear and straightforward example is the following instance of Type 4: “BZA 253, —, 254 = ZA 1218, 1219, 1220.” In this case (from *Vaṅgīsa-samyutta*) ZA sūtras 1218 and 1220

26 The 20-scroll version of BZA contains only 30 *uddānas* because it lacks sūtras BZA 258-268 (of *Brāhmaṇa-samyutta*), and with them the *uddāna* following BZA 267. For the locations of the surviving *uddānas* in the restored BZA see Table 1 (above). For more detail see Bucknell (2008, 46-48, Tables 1, 2, 4, 5). For the distribution of the *uddānas* of both ZA and BZA see Chung (2008, 259-270). For the texts of the Chinese *uddānas* themselves and references to relevant extant Sanskrit and Tibetan *uddānas* see Chung (2008, 247-258). For a detailed study of the *uddānas* of BZA based on the 16-scroll version, see Su (2008).

27 The irregularity is evident in Table 1. Of the 37 original *uddānas*, the ones now missing are the 9th, 12th, 17th, 19th, 22nd, and 29th (also the 10th in the 20-scroll version).

28 These figures are a little rough because of occasional doubts and/or disagreements between and within the two cited studies. The most noteworthy discrepancies between *uddānas* and sūtra text (other than those covered in the discussion of Types 1-6, below) are lack of key-words for five sūtras, namely: BZA 224 (Su 2008, 29; Chung 2008, 255, 53n), BZA 260 (Su 2008, 30; Chung 2008, 255, 45n), and BZA 333, 335, 336 (Su 2008, 31).

have parallels in the consecutive BZA 253 and 254 respectively, while the intervening ZA 1219 has no BZA parallel. As has been noted by several scholars, beginning with Yinshun (1983, 3:208 and 3:217, 3n), a resolution of this discrepancy is to be found in the relevant BZA *uddāna*.<sup>29</sup> Between the key-words for BZA sūtras 253 and 254 this *uddāna* has an extra key-word, for which there is no corresponding BZA sūtra; and this extra key-word matches up with the content of ZA 1219.<sup>30</sup> This shows that the Indic ancestor of BZA for which the *uddānas* were composed had an extra sūtra between BZA 253 and 254. Apparently, that sūtra became lost from the text at some later time, though its corresponding key-word was preserved in the *uddāna*. This situation tells us, therefore, that the existing Type 4 disagreement between ZA and BZA at this point reflects a secondary development within the BZA line of transmission; formerly the two sequences were in full agreement here. It also shows that the existence of *uddānas* did not necessarily prevent such transmission errors from occurring.

Two further instances of Type 4 yield similar results, namely “BZA 148, —, 149 = ZA 922, 923, 924” and “BZA 157, —, 158 = ZA 932, 933, 934.”<sup>31</sup> In each of these the BZA *uddāna* is found to include an extra key-word that fits the unmatched ZA sūtra, thereby indicating the former presence of a BZA sūtra where there is now a gap.

In another instance of Type 4, “BZA 270, —, 271 = ZA 1271, 1272, 1273,” there is no corresponding *uddāna*. This is one of the six cases where an expected *uddāna* happens to be missing from BZA. It is noteworthy, however, that the block of sūtras that the missing *uddāna* would have listed comprises only nine extant BZA sūtras (BZA 269-277), rather than the standard ten and, furthermore, that the ZA counterpart block does have ten (ZA 1270-1279). This makes it likely that BZA formerly had the full complement of ten sūtras here, and that those ten were listed in the now missing *uddāna*. That is, there probably did formerly exist a BZA parallel to ZA 1272.

In another case (the missing parallel for ZA 603) there does exist an *uddāna*, but it includes no unmatched key-word that might fill the gap. And in the remaining two cases (lack of ZA parallels for BZA 139 and 299) the gap to be filled is not in BZA but in ZA, for which no corresponding *uddāna* is available.

29 This case is noted by Choong (2007, 37, Table 1), and discussed by Su (2008, 29); Chung (2008, 266, 11n); and Bingenheimer (2011, 17-18 and 30n).

30 The *uddāna* follows BZA 257 at T 100, 463c24-26. The relevant key-word is *long xie* 龍脅 “Dragon flank” (T 100, 463c24), which corresponds to *naqie shance* 那伽山側 “Nāga mountainside,” a place-name mentioned in ZA 1219 (T 99, 332b05-06 & 11). The Pāli parallel, SN 8.8, instead has “Nāga” as an epithet of the Buddha (SN I 192).

31 Both originally noted by Su (2008, 27) and further discussed by Bingenheimer (2011, 17-18, 30n); also Chung (2008, 260, 1n and 2n). The key-words are *tiaosheng* 調乘 “taming, training” (T 100, 431b03) corresponding to *tiaofu* 調伏 etc., *idem.* in ZA 923 (T 99, 234b28); and *shi'er* 十二 “twelve” (T 100, 434c24) corresponding to *shi'er* 十二 in ZA 933 (T99, 238c23).



This review of Type 4 discrepancies in light of the *uddānas* has revealed that the agreement in sūtra sequence between ZA and BZA is, underlyingly, even greater than is apparent from direct comparison of the two parallel lists of sūtras. Three of the discrepancies noted earlier are demonstrably due to faulty transmission within the BZA line: three BZA sūtras were lost along the way. It cannot be known whether they were lost from a Sanskrit forerunner of BZA or from the Chinese BZA after the translation. In any case, the confirmation of these three cases of sūtra loss provides support for the twin propositions advanced by Bingenheimer: that BZA and ZA derive ultimately from one and the same text (the claimed (Mūla)-Sarvāstivādin common ancestor); and that the present discrepancies between BZA and ZA are due to independent unilateral developments since the two lines of transmission parted company. Also noteworthy is a curious property possessed by the three BZA *uddānas* successfully consulted in this examination of Type 4 disagreements: each of them represents the present ZA sūtra sequence more accurately than it does the present BZA sūtra sequence.

Similar examination of Type 1 and Type 2 disagreements yields less clear-cut outcomes. For the first listed instance of Type 1, “BZA 5, 6 = ZA 1067, 1066” the *uddāna* has, instead of two consecutive key-words, the entry *er nantuo* 二難陀 “two [on] Nanda.” This fails to provide the needed information on the sequence of the two sūtras in question. On the other hand, it is informative in suggesting that the sequence of these two sūtras was not considered important enough to deserve stating explicitly, which in turn helps to explain how the observed disagreement could come about. The same situation is found in the third instance, “BZA 98, 99 = ZA 1185, 1184”; the *uddāna* has *er suntuo* 二孫陀 “two [on] Sunda[rika Bhāradhvāja].” In the remaining three listed instances the *uddāna* does distinguish between the two sūtras, thereby indicating their sequence in the *uddāna*; and in each case the *uddāna* sequence agrees with the BZA sūtra sequence.

For Type 2 (discrepant sequence in a group of three sūtras) the *uddāna* confirms the BZA sequence in two of the three listed instances. In the remaining instance, “BZA 173, 174, 175 = ZA 599, 600, 598,” the *uddāna* has 173, 175, 174, which disagrees with both sūtra sequences and is therefore hard to interpret.

*Uddānas* are also available for the segment of text involved in Type 3, the unique instance of large-scale sequential discrepancy shown in Table 3. There is an *uddāna* listing the sūtras BZA 170-180 and another listing BZA 181-189. In the first of these there is a discrepancy; for as noted already under Type 2, the sūtras numbered BZA 173, 174, 175 are represented in the *uddāna* in the sequence 173, 175, 174. In the second case the sequence of the BZA sūtras is identical with that of the *uddāna*. In sharp contrast to this fairly close agreement on the BZA side, the ZA sūtra sequence in the same segment (ZA 589-603 & 1267-1269) does not match up at all with that of the BZA *uddānas* – as can be seen at a glance in Table 3.

The fairly close correspondence seen in this segment (BZA 173-189) between the BZA *uddānas* and the BZA sūtra sequence is consistent with what one finds throughout BZA (cf. the statistics cited above regarding the accuracy of the BZA *uddānas*). Equally close

correspondence was also noted earlier between the BZA *uddānas* and the greater part of the ZA sūtra sequence. Throughout most of the large portion of ZA that corresponds to BZA the agreement is so close that it appears almost as if the BZA *uddāna* set were meant to serve not only for BZA but also for ZA. Against this background, the block of eighteen ZA sūtras marked with the sign § in Table 3 is exceptional: here there is a poor match between the BZA *uddānas* and the ZA sūtras.<sup>32</sup>

This situation points to the following as a possible interpretation. When the *uddānas* were composed they were equally applicable to BZA and ZA; that is, the BZA and ZA sequences matched up completely and the BZA *uddāna* set fitted both of them. Later, however, accidental disarrangement of the sequence in the block of eighteen ZA sūtras highlighted in Table 3 yielded the present sequential disagreement in this part of ZA. The movements of sūtra material implied in this postulated disarrangement are shown in Table 4.<sup>33</sup>

32 In Table 3, the two *uddānas* in question are those following BZA 180 and 189. The *uddāna* following BZA 189 comprises 9 key-words that correspond to the 9 ZA sūtras 589-597; however, there is a sequential mismatch between key-words and sūtras, with ZA 596 & 597 seemingly out of place. For the *uddāna* following BZA 180, there is a different kind of sequential mismatch between the 4th to 11th *uddāna* keywords and the 4th to 11th sūtras (ZA 598-603 & 1267-1269). In addition to this disagreement between each *uddāna* and its corresponding decade of sūtras, the sequence of the two entire ZA decades relative to each other is the reverse of the sequence of their BZA counterparts.

33 In Table 4 the 1st and 2nd columns (BZA and ZA-1) are as in Table 3. The added 3rd column (ZA-2) shows the ZA sūtras in their present sequence. The arrows show the movements of ZA sūtra material that would have yielded this present arrangement. Basically, two blocks of ZA sūtras have switched places, and two small-scale Type 2 disarrangements have also occurred.

Table 4: Source of the Seventeen/Eighteen Irregular Parallels.

<i>BZA</i>	<i>ZA-1</i>	<i>ZA-2</i>	
171	0587	0587	
172	0588	0588	
173	0599	0589	
174	0600		0590
175	0598		0591
176	0601		0592
177	0602		0593
—	0603		0594
178	1269		0595
179	1268		0596
180	1267		0597
181	0596		0598
182	0597	0599	
183	0589	0600	
184	0590	0601	
185	0591	0602	
186	0592	0603	
187	0593	1267	
188	0594	1268	
189	0595	1269	
269	1270	1270	
270	1271	1271	

There is, however, a possible alternative interpretation that needs to be considered: perhaps the postulated disarrangement of the sūtra sequence occurred in BZA rather than in ZA. This alternative links to a point raised earlier: Table 3 could have been drawn up with the ZA sūtras in regular numerical sequence on the left, and their BZA parallels consequently in a more or less confused sequence on the right. There is a good reason why one should reject this alternative possible arrangement for Table 3, and with it the alternative interpretation just canvassed. Throughout the two texts, except in this particular section, the BZA *uddānas* consistently agree not only with the BZA sūtra sequence but also with the ZA sūtra sequence.

In this section alone they disagree markedly with the ZA sequence, and this finding clearly points to the ZA sequence as being the one that underwent disarrangement.

Given the likelihood that there formerly existed a full set of *uddānas* in the ZA line of transmission, it is to the point to ask why they did not prevent this disarrangement from occurring. We have already seen, in the discussion of Type 4 discrepancies, that the existence of BZA *uddānas* did not necessarily prevent the loss of isolated sūtras from BZA or its Sanskrit forerunner. In the present case, however, the large scale of the disarrangement suggests rather that the two relevant *uddānas* may have been missing at the time in question. Perhaps piecemeal loss of *uddānas* had already set in within the ZA line, just as evidently happened in its BZA counterpart.

The large cluster of sequential discrepancies shown in Table 3 is a serious exception to the far-reaching sequential agreement between ZA and BZA that Bingenheimer emphasizes. However, it has now been shown, on the basis of evidence from the BZA *uddānas* and through the simplicity of the mechanism depicted in Table 4, that this exception is likely to reflect a relatively small-scale transmission error.

For the remaining two types of disagreement, Types 5 and 6, relevant *uddānas* do not exist, so one must resort to other approaches. Let us consider first the simpler Type 6, in which a single ZA sūtra corresponds to two consecutive BZA sūtras. In this case, the expected BZA *uddāna* happens to be one of the six that were apparently lost in transmission. However, interpretation is facilitated by the existence of Pāli parallels. The correspondences are as shown:

ZA 1008a	= ZA 234	= SN 1.74
ZA 1008b	= ZA 235	= SN 1.70

Here I have the suffixed “a” and “b” to distinguish the first and second halves respectively of ZA 1008. The question is: Did a formerly unitary BZA sūtra split into two separate sūtras, BZA 234 and BZA 235; or did two formerly separate ZA sūtras unite to become a single sūtra, ZA 1008? The fact that the two BZA sūtras correspond to two discrete SN sūtras points to the second possibility. The BZA transmission has preserved the ancestral situation, in which there were two separate sūtras here. In the ZA transmission two formerly separate consecutive sūtras have been joined head to tail.<sup>34</sup>

Finally, let us consider Type 5, in which a sizable block of sūtras in ZA has no counterpart in BZA. Two instances of this have been identified, for neither of which a relevant *uddāna* is available.

The first of these two large-scale discrepancies is located within *Māra-saṃyutta*. In ZA this *saṃyutta* comprises twenty sūtras, ZA 1084-1103, and every one of them has a parallel in the

<sup>34</sup> ZA and BZA differ from SN in including, with every single sūtra, a full narrative frame, beginning with “Thus have I heard...”. ZA 1008 has only one occurrence of this frame, so has the appearance of being one sūtra rather than two.

*Māra-samyutta* of the Pāli SN.<sup>35</sup> The *Māra-samyutta* of BZA is only half as large, with just ten sūtras, BZA 23-32. These ten correspond one-to-one with ZA 1084-1093, the first ten sūtras of the ZA *samyutta*. For the remaining ten, ZA 1094-1103, there are no BZA parallels.

In this respect ZA resembles SN more closely than it resembles BZA, a point noted early in this article as potentially challenging to Bingenheimer's proposition for a near common ancestor for ZA-BZA. That proposition does, however, accommodate this finding. The absence of the ten sūtras from BZA can reasonably be interpreted as due to accidental loss, and thereby identified as another of the various unilateral developments that occurred after the two lines of transmission separated. Since the material lost would have been a complete decade of sūtras, the *uddāna* expected after its last sūtra would have been lost with it, leaving no trace. That ten sūtras were lost from BZA rather than added to ZA is, in any case, strongly indicated by the existence of Pāli parallels for the extra ten ZA sūtras.

On the data available, it is hard to suggest at what period this loss might have occurred, in particular whether it occurred in the Sanskrit forerunner of BZA or in the Chinese BZA text after the translation. The latter possibility claims attention because of two well-documented cases of similar loss of material from BZA within China. Both of these cases date from some time after the differentiation of BZA into a twenty-scroll version and a sixteen-scroll version. That differentiation must have already occurred before 983 C.E., when the sixteen-scroll version is first attested (indirectly) in the Kaibao edition of the Chinese canon (Bucknell 2008, 26-30, esp. 29).

The first of the two cases is evidenced in the fact that the twenty-scroll version of BZA lacks eleven of the sūtras listed in Table 1, namely BZA 258-268 (within *Brāhmaṇa-samyutta*). That is to say, this block of eleven sūtras is present in the sixteen-scroll version but absent from the twenty-scroll version. Anesaki recognized that this block would have been present in the common ancestor of these two versions, at the location shown in Table 1.<sup>36</sup> This situation closely resembles the absence of the block of ten Māra sūtras from BZA as against its presence in ZA.<sup>37</sup>

35 Of the 25 sūtras in the Pāli *Māra-samyutta* nos. 8, 19, and 24 are not represented in the ZA counterpart, while 2 and 3 are represented in a single sūtra (ZA 1093), and 4 and 5 in another (ZA 1096); hence the total of 20 sūtras for ZA.

36 The composition of the *samyutta* thus becomes 74-83#; 84-91ø; 258-267#; 268, 92-100#. This is indicated by the final *uddāna*, which lists sūtras 268 & 92-100 (Su 2008, 26, para. 9). Cf. note 26 (above).

37 The loss of the 11 sūtras on *brāhmaṇas* could have occurred in the Chinese BZA at some time between its translation (c. 385-431 C.E.) and the completion (in 983) of the Kaibao edition of the Chinese canon (see following note). The implied loss of the ten sūtras on Māra could have occurred early in the Chinese transmission, or already in the Sanskrit source at some time after the split from the ZA line.

The second case is based on an editorial note found, in the Taishō edition, inserted into the text of the *Brahmā-saṃyutta* of BZA.<sup>38</sup> In this note the thirteenth-century editor says, in effect, that the *Brahmā-saṃyutta* is missing from the sixteen-scroll version of BZA, which is his primary source for the new BZA edition that he is compiling; and he explains that he has filled the gap by copying the missing *saṃyutta* from the twenty-scroll version. The Chinese *Brahmā-saṃyutta* comprises ten sūtras and, according to the cited note, this block of ten sūtras was missing from the sixteen-scroll version until it was reinstated there through this editorial intervention.

Given these two well-documented cases of a block of sūtras becoming lost from BZA, it is clearly reasonable to infer that BZA's lack of a counterpart for a decade of sūtras in the *ZA Māra-saṃyutta* is similarly due to accidental loss. However this loss occurred, it is covered by Bingenheimer's notion of divergent development within the two lines of transmission represented in ZA and BZA.

The other large-scale discrepancy listed under Type 5 relates to *Vana-saṃyutta*. The BZA version of this *saṃyutta* comprises fourteen sūtras; the ZA version comprises parallels for those fourteen, in the same sequence, followed by a further eighteen sūtras (numbered 1345-1362). The fourteen shared sūtras have parallels in the Pāli SN, though in a different sequence; and according to recent research, they also have parallels in a version of the *Vana-saṃyutta*, in a different sequence again, identified in one of the first-century Gāndhārī manuscripts (Glass 2007, 44, Table 6, line 2). That is to say, BZA, SN, and the Gāndhārī manuscript all have a *Vana-saṃyutta* of fourteen sūtras, while ZA has a version with the same fourteen sūtras followed by a further eighteen. None of these eighteen extra ZA sūtras has a known parallel in the Pāli SN or anywhere else.

Whereas the *Māra-saṃyutta* case considered above points to loss of sūtra material from BZA, this *Vana-saṃyutta* case instead suggests addition of new sūtra material to ZA.<sup>39</sup> As regards implications for Bingenheimer's proposition, evaluation of this case is facilitated by the dubious credentials of the eighteen extra sūtras in ZA. Being clearly a secondary addition unique to ZA, this group of eighteen sūtras is covered by the notion that the ZA and BZA lines underwent divergent development after the split.

All of the six points of disagreement identified earlier have now been examined, often with the aid of relevant *uddānas*. The findings have demonstrated, in various ways, that departures from total agreement between ZA and BZA can be adequately accounted for as due to divergent developments since the split into two independent trajectories. Taken together, the explanations purport to describe how certain characteristics of the common ancestor changed

38 This note is by Sugi (守其), chief compiler of the 2nd Korean edition of the Chinese canon (completed 1251 C.E.), which would later be the principal basis for the Taishō edition (1924-). It is reproduced at T100, 411c21-28 – but for 第九 “the ninth” substitute the more coherent 前九 “the first nine,” as at K 651, 49c05-12. Details at Bucknell (2008, 26-30), esp. notes 17, 18 on p. 29.

39 The 18 extra sūtras come at the end of the entire ZA collection, the natural place for late additions.

differentially as the two derivative branches developed. These characteristics and the changes they underwent can be summed up as follows:

- a ) In the common ancestor, *Māra-samyutta* comprised twenty sūtras as preserved in ZA; in the BZA line the second of these two decades was lost.
- b ) The ancestral *Vana-samyutta* comprised just the fourteen sūtras that are represented in BZA (and in the Pāli and Gāndhārī versions); the extra eighteen sūtras found in ZA represent a later addition.
- c ) Within the *Devatā-samyutta* of the common ancestor the seventeen sūtras represented in BZA 173-189 were in the sequence that is preserved in that BZA segment and in the two relevant *uddānas*; in the ZA line this sequence became disarranged.
- d ) In one case two consecutive sūtras became joined together in the ZA line, while in the BZA line they remained separate as in the common ancestor (Type 6).
- e ) In three cases the common ancestor included a sūtra that is preserved in ZA (and listed in the BZA *uddānas*), though missing from the BZA sūtra text (Type 4).
- f ) In a few similar cases, where ZA and BZA disagree on the presence or absence of a single sūtra (Type 4), the likely situation in the common ancestor is unclear. Also unclear are several cases (Types 1 and 2) where ZA and BZA disagree on the sequence of two or three consecutive sūtras.

All of the cases just reviewed and summarized fit well with Bingenheimer's proposition that the BZA and ZA sequences progressively diverged, as changes occurred in one or the other of these two separate lines of development. This established, the discussion can now focus on his more fundamental claim that the two texts were formerly one text: the proposed common (Mūla)-Sarvāstivādin ancestor. The main basis for this claim is the remarkably close, though not perfect, correspondence between ZA and BZA as regards the sūtras they comprise and the sequence of those sūtras. In the next section I further examine this correspondence and its significance, particularly in light of certain peculiarities of the sequence itself.

## The Significance of Sequential Agreement

The far-reaching agreement between the sūtra sequence in BZA and the corresponding portion of ZA is, as Bingenheimer rightly points out, unlikely to be accidental. Whereas there are obvious constraints on the choice of sūtras that can make up any particular *samyutta*, there are, generally speaking, no constraints on the sequence in which those sūtras may be arranged within the *samyutta*. Since the sequence is largely arbitrary, the number of possible sequences, even within a small *samyutta* of just ten sūtras, is enormous.<sup>40</sup> The likelihood of identical sūtra

<sup>40</sup> The number of different sequences in which ten sūtras could be strung together as a *samyutta* is  $10! = 3,628,800$ .

sequences occurring by chance, even within a small segment, is correspondingly low. There are, therefore, good grounds for attaching significance to large-scale sequential correspondence as an indicator of close sectarian affinity.

While it is hardly necessary to argue further in support of this interpretative principle, it will be instructive to examine further examples of its application to ZA and BZA. I will do this by highlighting some additional instances of shared sequential features found within one of the *saṃyuttas*, namely *Devatā-saṃyutta*, “Connected with divine beings.” This *saṃyutta* lends itself well to the purpose. It is relatively large, with eighty-nine sūtras in ZA and eighty-eight in BZA, and it includes sūtras dealing with divine beings other than the *devatās* from which it derives its title, namely: *devaputtas* “sons of gods,” *tiannü* 天女 “female gods,” and *tianshen* 天神.<sup>41</sup> In terms of these categories, its sūtra composition is as shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Sūtra composition of *Devatā-saṃyutta* of BZA and ZA.

Class of divine being	BZA	ZA
<i>devatā</i> “gods, deities”	74	74
<i>devaputta</i> “sons of gods”	5	5
<i>tiannü</i> 天女 “female gods”	5	6
<i>tianshen</i> 天神 ?	4	4
TOTAL	88	89

The distribution of these different types of divine being within the *saṃyutta* will now be examined. This will entail recognizing, where relevant, the sources of the various types of disagreement between ZA and BZA discussed under Types 1-6. Earlier in this study it was necessary to allow for the inferred disarrangement of the ZA and BZA scroll sequences when undertaking the initial comparison of the two sūtra sequences. It is now similarly necessary to allow for the inferred unilateral changes within the two parallel lines of transmission (Types 1-6) when attempting to press back toward the common ancestor.

Only some of the previously noted changes are actually relevant to this examination of *Devatā-saṃyutta*. In particular, the loss of parallels for several individual sūtras (Type 4) will be acknowledged by, in effect, imagining the missing parallels to have been restored, thus filling the gaps in the surviving sūtra sequence. (For example, recognizing the likely loss of a BZA parallel for ZA 1272 raises the number of BZA sūtras about female gods from five to six; see Table 5.) On the other hand, the confused sequence of eighteen consecutive ZA sūtras (Type 3) happens to have no bearing on the issues under scrutiny here, so will be passed

<sup>41</sup> The title *Devatā-saṃyutta* is that of the Pāli counterpart *saṃyutta*, reflecting the relevant keyword in an *uddāna* that lists the *saṃyuttas* of the Pāli *Sagātha-vagga* (at SN I 240.22-23).



over without comment. For ease of presentation, the different classes of divine beings will be discussed in the reverse of the order shown in Table 5.

For the Chinese term *tianshen* 天神 it is not clear what the corresponding Indic term may have been; perhaps it was simply *deva*.<sup>42</sup> Of the four *tianshen* sūtras in the ZA-BZA *Devatā-samyutta* two have Pāli parallels, both of them in *samyuttas* other than *Devatā*. In neither case does the Pāli sūtra throw light on the meaning of the Chinese term.<sup>43</sup>

The locations of the four *tianshen* sūtras are marked (with 神) in Table 3, which displays a segment of the *samyutta*. Three of the four (ZA 590-592 = BZA 184-186) are together as a block; the fourth (ZA 585 = BZA 169) is located some distance further up the list – sixteen places up in the case of ZA, fifteen in the case of BZA. As the table shows, this positional difference (16 versus 15) correlates with the lack of a BZA parallel for ZA 603 (noted earlier under Type 4). This recognized, it can be said that the ZA and BZA versions exhibit the same discontinuous distribution of the *tianshen* sūtras.<sup>44</sup> This shared feature demands explanation. The most adequate explanation, surely, is the one that follows automatically from Bingenheimer’s interpretation: the shared discontinuous pattern of distribution was inherited from the common ZA-BZA ancestor. (Why the four sūtras should have had that unexpected distribution in the common ancestor is a separate issue that lies beyond the scope of this study.)

Next to be considered are the *tiannü* 天女, “female gods” or perhaps “daughters of gods.” Of the six or five sūtras on female gods in the ZA-BZA *Devatā-samyutta* two have parallels in the corresponding SN *samyutta*; they are the consecutive sūtras on Pajjunna’s daughters, Kokanadā and Cūḷa-Kokanadā (BZA 271 = ZA 1273 = SN 1.40 and BZA 272 = ZA 1274 = SN 1.39). This indicates that inclusion of sūtras on female gods within *Devatā-samyutta* is a feature that goes back to the more remote common ancestor of the Pāli and (Mūla)-Sarvāstivādin branches of the stemma. Of the six/five ZA/BZA sūtras on female gods, five/four (ZA 1270-1274 / BZA 269-272) are together as a block, while the remaining one (ZA 1284 = BZA 282) is located ten places further down the list (ZA 1284 = BZA 282). That is, the sūtras about female gods have a discontinuous distribution similar to that of the sūtras about *tianshen*. The implications for the theory of a common ancestor are also similar in the two cases.

The *devaputta* or “sons of gods” category is a little more complex. The most straightforward of the five instances of it is the pair ZA 583 = BZA 167, for which the Pāli parallel is SN 2.9,

42 The Chinese word *tianshen* 天神 combines two near-synonyms each of which can, by itself, mean “god.” The use of this term in both the ZA and BZA versions of the *samyutta* shows that it translated some specific Indic term distinct from *devatā*.

43 In one case the Pāli parallel speaks of a *yakkha*, a “demon” (BZA 186 = ZA 592 = SN 10.8); in the other it speaks of a *devaputta*, a “son of gods” (BZA 169 = ZA 585 = SN 2.18).

44 This would remain true even if one were to reorganize Table 3 to match Chung’s table of concordances (2008, 267), i.e. if one were to list the ZA sūtras marked with § (rather than their BZA parallels) in regular numerical order. In that situation the isolated *tianshen* sūtra (ZA 585 = BZA 169) would be located five places above the block of three (ZA 590-592).

*Candimā-sutta*.<sup>45</sup> Within the Pāli *Sagātha-vagga*, SN 2.9 is located in *Devaputta-saṃyutta*, the section “Connected with sons of gods.” This location is appropriate since Candimā (the Moon) is referred to in the sūtra itself as a *devaputta*, a “son of gods.”<sup>46</sup> However, the Chinese parallel sūtras, ZA 583 and BZA 167, despite featuring the same *devaputta* Candimā (*Yue tianzi* 月天子), are located in *Devatā-saṃyutta*, “Connected with gods.”<sup>47</sup> In this location each of these parallel Chinese sūtras about the *devaputta* Candimā is conspicuously out of place, being preceded and followed by a long series of sūtras on *devatās*.<sup>48</sup> It appears possible that ZA 583 and its parallel BZA 167 were somehow accidentally moved into *Devatā-saṃyutta* from their natural location in *Devaputta-saṃyutta*. But, whether or not this is how these two parallel sūtras came to be so illogically placed within the sūtra series, there remains the remarkable fact that *both* of them have this illogical placement.<sup>49</sup> This is hard to explain satisfactorily other than by supposing that the illogical placement existed already in the near common ancestor. The same applies for the four other *devaputta* sūtras in *Devatā-saṃyutta*, for which details are given in the next paragraph.

As to their distribution within the *saṃyutta*, three of the five *devaputta* sūtras are together as a block, namely ZA 593 = BZA 187 on Sudatta = Anāthapiṇḍika, ZA 594 = BZA 188 on Hatthaka, and ZA 595 = BZA 189 on Nandipāla; the other two are widely separated from that block and from each other: ZA 999 = BZA 136 on Serī and ZA 583 = BZA 167 on Candimā.<sup>50</sup> And when allowance is made for irregularities caused by two instances of Type

45 ZA 583 at T 99, 155a07; BZA 167 at T 100, 436a05; SN 2.9 at SN I 50; cf. Enomoto 1994, 3; and Waldschmidt 1970: 181-183.

46 Or “young deva” in Bodhi’s translation (2000: 75, para. 2; 139-163).

47 *Saṃyuttas* are not demarcated in ZA and BZA; I am referring here to the *Devatā-* and *Devaputta-saṃyuttas* as identified by researchers. On the *devaputta/devatā* distinction, the Pāli commentary says *devaputtas* are named and *devatās* unnamed (Spk I 104; Rhys Davids 1950, 65, 1n; Bodhi 2000, 384-385, 141n). This rule applies also in BZA and ZA. In BZA the terms are *tian* 天 for *devatā* and *tianzi* 天子 for *devaputta*. In ZA both are called *tianzi* 天子; the ZA translators evidently ignored the distinction. Yet the rule prevails: named *tianzi* are in *Devaputta-saṃyutta* and unnamed *tian/tianzi* in *Devatā-saṃyutta* – with just 5 exceptions, one of which is Candimā. The uniform use of *tianzi* in ZA, plus the presence of a few *tianshen*, *tiannü*, and *devaputtas* among the *devatās*, may explain why the Yinshun and Foguang editions of ZA combine the two into one *saṃyutta*, dubbed *Zhu tian xiangying* 諸天相應 “Connected with all gods” (Yinshun 1983, 1:48-49; 3:219-325).

48 The sūtras on *tianshen* and *tiannü* appear similarly out of place; but then, these two classes differ from *devaputtas* in having no *saṃyutta* dedicated to them.

49 Also remarkable, but no longer surprising, is that these two parallel sūtras are identically placed within the *saṃyutta*: ZA 583 = BZA 167 are two places above the isolated pair of *tianshen* sūtras, ZA 585 = BZA 169; see Table 3.

50 Of these 5 sūtras, the first 4 are complicated in BZA by shifts between the *tian* (*devatā*) and *tianzi* (*devaputta*) categories. The sūtras on Sudatta = Anāthapiṇḍika, Hatthika, and Serī refer

4 disagreement and one of Type 6, the block of three sūtras and the two isolated sūtras are at exactly corresponding locations in the sūtra sequence of ZA and BZA. This is, therefore, another variant on the pattern of distribution seen already in the *tianshen* and female god categories; and it has the same implications for the notion of a common ancestor.

All of the remaining seventy-four sūtras in the *Devatā-samyutta* are indeed about *devatās*.<sup>51</sup> They stand out from the non-*devatā* sūtras in that, with just one exception (ZA 1289 = BZA 287), every one of them closes with the same stereotyped stanza, in which the *devatā* praises the Buddha's attainment of final nirvana.<sup>52</sup>

The *Devatā-samyutta*, therefore, comprises seventy-four sūtras on *devatās*, and fifteen/fourteen sūtras on the three other kinds of divine being. Of the fifteen/fourteen sūtras on non-*devatās*, four are scattered throughout the *samyutta*, while the other eleven/ten are in three blocks: a block of three *devaputtas*, a block of five/four female gods, and a block of four *tianshen*. These three blocks happen to be contiguous, following each other in the order just mentioned and thus making up a single larger block of eleven/ten sūtras, namely ZA 590-595 & 1270-1274 = BZA 184-189 & 269-272. Consequently, the basic collection of seventy-four sūtras on *devatās* is split into six segments by the presence of one tripartite block and four isolated sūtras on three kinds of minor divine being.

Altogether, this amounts to a complex and rather illogical pattern of distribution for the different types of divine being that figure in the *Devatā-samyutta*. Yet, when allowance is made for the discontinuities occasioned by the cases of sequential disagreement already recognized, this entire complex pattern of distribution is identical in the ZA and BZA versions of the *samyutta*. As before, there is only one satisfactory way of explaining the observed facts: the complex and irregular distributional pattern shared by ZA and BZA developed once only, in a near common ancestor of the two texts.

Having now adequately exploited the method of comparing sūtra sequences, let us return briefly to that other fruitful investigative tool, study of the *uddānas*.

---

to the protagonist as a *tian* until his name is disclosed but thereafter as a *tianzi*. The BZA sūtra on Nandipāla calls him a *tian* throughout despite mentioning his name early; and it has two Pāli parallels: SN 2.24 in *Devaputta-samyutta*, which names him, and SN 1.50 in *Devatā-samyutta*, which does not. Two Pāli parallels similarly exist for Sudatta = Anāthapiṇḍika: SN 2.20 with name, and SN 1.48 without name.

51 Of these 74 sūtras 73 are paired between ZA and BZA. The remaining one ZA sūtra and one BZA sūtra are accounted for thus: ZA 603 lacks a BZA parallel; and BZA 234 and 235 together have a single ZA parallel (ZA 1008).

52 The one exception is in any case unusual in speaking of not just one *devatā* but eight. The stereotyped closing stanza first appears in ZA 995 = BZA 132 (at T 99, 261a09-10 and T 100, 426a21-22). In Pāli it appears, with slightly different wording, just once: SN 1.1 at SN vol. I, page 1. A Sanskrit version is at Enomoto (1994, 12).

## *Uddānas* and the Common Ancestor

The *uddānas* of BZA have been found to be, for the most part, equally accurate as a table of contents to the relevant portion of ZA. They have thereby not only provided further evidence for descent from a near common ancestor; they have also offered clues to the composition of that ancestor. *Uddānas* reflect the composition and arrangement of a text as it was at the time of their compilation. It is to the point, therefore, to consider at what stage in its historical development the Indic source-text of BZA is likely to have acquired its set of *uddānas*. Clues to this can be found in the scope and distribution of the *uddānas* within the extant Chinese text.

As a rule an *uddāna* covers ten sūtras, but occasionally it covers nine or eleven or, rarely, a number even further from the standard ten.<sup>53</sup> In BZA this is most clearly seen near the beginning of the collection.<sup>54</sup> There the third to sixth *uddānas* cover ten sūtras each; however, the first and second *uddānas* cover eleven sūtras each, and so too does the seventh (see Table 1). A reason for these departures from the standard ten sūtras per *uddāna* is readily found. The *Bhikkhu-saṃyutta*, to which the first two *uddānas* refer, comprises twenty-two sūtras. It is apparent, therefore, that having the first two *uddānas* cover eleven sūtras each was a means of fitting the *uddānas* to the *saṃyutta*. After *Bhikkhu-saṃyutta* the next two *saṃyuttas* are *Māra* with ten sūtras (covered by one *uddāna*) and *Sakka* with twenty sūtras (two *uddānas*). The next again is *Kosala-saṃyutta* with twenty-one sūtras; of its two *uddānas* the first lists ten sūtras and the second lists eleven. The principle seen in these first few *saṃyuttas* is in evidence throughout BZA. It is clear, then, that the *uddānas* of this version were designed to match up with the *saṃyuttas*.

For the fifteen *uddānas* of ZA, evidence of such a link with the *saṃyutta* structure is not available because the sūtras they list constitute just one large *saṃyutta* (*Khandha-saṃyutta*). In the Pāli SN, however, a correspondence similar to that noted in BZA is apparent. That is, the correspondence seen in BZA is not unusual. What makes it noteworthy is that, although BZA can be shown to have a *saṃyutta*-based structure, this structure is not signaled explicitly in the text. In the absence of *saṃyutta* headings, the *saṃyutta*-based structure of BZA (and of ZA as well) had to be inferred (by scholars in modern times) by examining the contents of the component sūtras and then seeking correlations with the *saṃyuttas* of SN. Yet this long-lost underlying structure of BZA is found to be clearly reflected in the surviving *uddānas*.

On the basis of this finding one can conclude that those who composed the BZA *uddānas* were well aware of the grouping of the sūtras into *saṃyuttas* and considered it important. This indicates that the BZA *uddānas* date from an early

53 Of the 31 surviving BZA *uddānas*, 17 cover ten sūtras each. Rare extreme cases are the *uddāna* following BZA 213 (T 100, 453b19-21), which lists fifteen sūtras, and that following BZA 257 (T100, 463c23-26), which lists seven.

54 The first 91 sūtras of BZA escaped the disarrangement of the scroll sequence. Having preserved the original arrangement, they reveal clearly the underlying structure.

period when the grouping into *saṃyuttas* had not yet been lost sight of.

A further historical clue can be found in an odd feature of one particular *uddāna* reference in BZA, that for sūtra no. 17.<sup>55</sup> This sūtra unmistakably parallels the Pāli *Samiddhi-sutta*, SN 1.20, which describes how the monk Samiddhi, having just emerged from bathing in a hot spring, is approached by a *devatā* and urged to consult the Buddha regarding a doctrinal question. For some reason the BZA sūtra does not mention the monk's name, but in all other details it corresponds closely with the Pāli *Samiddhi-sutta*. It is therefore clear that the unnamed monk in BZA 17 is indeed Samiddhi.

Now, in the relevant *uddāna* of SN, the key-word used for referencing sūtra 1.20 is, unsurprisingly, *Samiddhi*. In the relevant BZA *uddāna*, the key-word used for referencing sūtra 17 is 散倒吒 *Sandaozha*. As is noted by Su (2008, 33) and further discussed by Bingenheimer (2011, 18), if this Chinese key-word is meant to be a phonetic transcription of the Indic name *Samiddhi*, then there is a discrepancy here: one would expect the second syllable of the transcription to be not *dao* but *mi*.<sup>56</sup> One might, therefore, consider the possibility that some scribe made an error when copying this *uddāna*.<sup>57</sup> Ultimately, however, it is immaterial whether there has been a scribal error here. Regardless of whether the name in the *uddāna* was meant to be *Sandaozha* or *Sanmizha*, it is clearly likely to have been understood as the name of the monk spoken of in the sūtra. That name would have been appropriate as the key-word for BZA 17, for the same reason that *Samiddhi* is appropriate as the key-word for the Pāli parallel, SN 1.20.

Yet there remains an incongruity here. As mentioned above, the monk in BZA 17, who is clearly identical with the monk Samiddhi in the Pāli parallel, is not actually named in the Chinese sūtra; furthermore, he is also not named in the closely similar parallel, ZA 1078. Bingenheimer (2011, 18) comments that the absence of the monk's name from the BZA sūtra text suffices to explain why the supposedly faulty transmission of the name in the *uddāna* was not subsequently noticed and rectified. He adds, however, that what really needs explaining is how and why those who composed the BZA *uddānas* came to use the monk's name as the key-word for this sūtra (BZA 17), if that name was not present in the sūtra itself.

55 BZA 17 is at T 100, 379a23-c02; the corresponding *uddāna* is at T 100, 381a17-19. SN 1.20 is at SN I 8; the *uddāna* is at SN I 12.

56 For Chinese transcriptions of *Samiddhi* see Akanuma 1994, 565b-576a. Support for the inference that the unnamed monk in BZA 17 is Samiddhi can be found in MN 133 = MA 165. The opening paragraphs of this parallel pair (at MN III 192 = T 26, 696b28-c07) are identical with those of SN 1.20 in every detail: not only MN 133 names the monk as *Samiddhi*; MA 165 does also, using the transcription 三彌提 *Sanmiti*.

57 BZA contains frequent inconsistencies and errors in transcription of Indic terms and proper names, in both sūtras and *uddānas* (see Bingenheimer 2011, 19); e.g., the name *Somā* appears as 蘇摩 *Sumo* in BZA 215 (T 100, 453c27) but as 素彌 *Sumi* in the corresponding *uddāna* (T 100, 456b21; see Chung 2008, 255, 47n).

A possible explanation that immediately suggests itself is that the name *was* present in the sūtra (the Sanskrit antecedent of BZA 17) at the time the *uddāna* was composed but later was accidentally lost from the sūtra, though preserved in the *uddāna*. Why, then, is the name also absent from the ZA parallel (ZA 1078)? It can hardly be that the monk's name, which was accidentally lost from one sūtra in the BZA line of transmission (i.e., the Sanskrit antecedent of BZA 17), also happened to be accidentally lost from the parallel sūtra in the ZA line of transmission (i.e., the Sanskrit antecedent of ZA 1078). It is not hard to suggest a viable explanation: the loss of the monk's name occurred at a time when the two parallel Sanskrit sūtras represented in ZA 1078 and BZA 17, were still a single sūtra – that is, at a time before the (Mūla)-Sarvāstivādin transmission of the *Samyuktāgama* split into the divergent ZA and BZA trajectories. In other words, the loss of the monk's name occurred in the common ancestor of the present parallel sūtras. This amounts to saying that the *uddānas* preserved in BZA were composed for that common ancestor.

The implied relative chronology is as follows:

- In the Sanskrit common ancestor of ZA-BZA the sūtra in question contained the monk's name, *Samiddhi*.
- *Uddānas* were composed for that common ancestor, in which the sūtra about Samiddhi was represented by the key-word, *Samiddhi*.
- This name became lost from the sūtra but was preserved in the *uddāna*.
- The transmission split into the two lines that would ultimately yield ZA and BZA.
- In the ZA line the relevant *uddāna* (along with most others) became lost or was intentionally deleted; in the BZA line, however, it has survived, though with some uncertainty about the transcription of the monk's name.

The case of the *Samiddhi-sutta* has led to a further conclusion: the set of *uddānas* that is partly preserved in BZA was created for the common Indic ancestor of ZA and BZA. This provides further details in the emerging picture of that common ancestor. It can now be affirmed that the ZA-BZA common ancestor was explicitly structured into *saṃyuttas*, and that it had a set, presumably complete, of *uddānas* listing its component sūtras according to that *saṃyutta* structure.

## Subsequent Developments

Let us look now in the opposite historical direction and consider how the Sanskrit texts witnessed in ZA and BZA may have evolved subsequently. Here it becomes appropriate to glance briefly at two further textual sources beyond the Pāli *nikāyas* and the Chinese *āgama* translations. These two sources are: (1) the many Sanskrit manuscript fragments, mainly from Central Asia, that have been identified as probably belonging to a *saṃyuktāgama*; and (2) the

sūtra quotations, similarly identified, preserved in the Tibetan translation of Śamathadeva's *Abhidharmakośopāyikā*.<sup>58</sup>

Use of such materials in the present context is beset by some serious methodological difficulties. To illustrate, let us briefly consider one of the Sanskrit manuscripts listed by Chung (2008, 98-113, "NidSa"; cf. p. 286). This is a sizable text comprising a series of twenty-five sūtras in Sanskrit, which was identified by Ernst Waldschmidt (1957) as belonging to the *Nidāna-samyukta* of a *samyuktāgama*. Along with related fragments, it was subsequently edited by Chandrabhāl Tripāṭhī (1962). As Waldschmidt demonstrates, these twenty-five sūtras match up fairly well with the first twenty-five sūtras of the ZA *Nidāna-samyutta* (ZA 283-303, 343-346).<sup>59</sup> Unlike the ZA text, however, the manuscript version includes two *uddānas*, one after the eleventh sūtra and another after the twenty-first.<sup>60</sup>

How might this manuscript text relate, historically, to ZA and/or BZA? The clues seem ambivalent. The sūtra sequence matches that of ZA; the presence of *uddānas* is reminiscent of BZA. Here it has to be borne in mind that such a Sanskrit text could well be historically later than the two Chinese translations; also that the incompleteness of the ZA *uddāna* set may be due to intentional omission by the Chinese translators, and that the incompleteness of the BZA text may be due to accidental loss of the first three quarters of either the Sanskrit source-text or the Chinese translation. Given such uncertainties, all one can say of this *Nidāna-samyukta* manuscript is that it could represent either the ZA line or the BZA line – or perhaps neither of them.

Looking more widely, let us now consider Chung's "Table of *Uddānas*" (Chung 2008, 247-258, esp. notes 14-32). It shows that, in addition to the fifteen Chinese *uddānas* of ZA and the thirty-one of BZA, some seventeen *uddānas* are to be found among the *Samyuktāgama* sūtra materials preserved in Sanskrit manuscript fragments and Tibetan translated quotations.<sup>61</sup> This

58 Materials of both types are catalogued in Chung (2008, 247-258, esp. 14-32n). Putative Sanskrit parallels (from diverse sources) to sūtras of the *Sagātha-vagga* (*Samgīta-nipāta*) of ZA are set out in Enomoto (1994). On *Abhidharmakośopāyikā*, see Honjō (1984). Linguistic limitations have prevented me from making use of the Tibetan quotations.

59 I have followed Waldschmidt in skimming over one detail: two of the expected 25 Sanskrit sūtras are missing, namely the presumed parallels for ZA 285 and 286 (= SN 12.53 and 52), on the lamp simile and the bonfire simile respectively. No doubt these were lost through damage to the manuscript.

60 These *uddānas* are transcribed at Waldschmidt (1957, 374); Tripāṭhī (1962, 37 (folio 9R) and 48 (folio 15V)); and Chung (2008, 250, 22-23n). The key-words, together with their ZA and SN parallels, are listed at Tripāṭhī (1962, 7-8). For the Sanskrit parallel to ZA 286, which is missing from the manuscript, no key-word is found in the *uddāna*. Instead of the expected "lamp, bonfire" we find "two on lamps." But two sūtras on lamps are not found in the manuscript either. It seems, then, that this *uddāna* was amended as material was progressively lost from the sūtra text.

61 Two of these 17 are from the *Nidāna-samyutta* manuscript discussed above. "17" is a rough figure because of the fragmentary condition of some of the *uddānas*.

fact fits well with the proposition, advanced earlier, that the ZA-BZA common ancestor would have had a full set of *uddānas*. Taken together, these considerations indicate that a complete, or nearly complete, set of *uddānas* is likely to have been a feature of the Sanskrit antecedents of both ZA and BZA up to the time when they were translated into Chinese. It would follow that the fifteen *uddānas* of ZA and the thirty-one of BZA are two surviving vestiges of that single ancestral set.<sup>62</sup>

## Conclusions and Some Further Questions

I have argued in support of Bingenheimer's proposition that the Indic source-texts represented in the Chinese *Za ahanjing* (ZA, T 99) and *Bieyi Za ahanjing* (BZA, T 100) were descended from a single common (Mūla)-Sarvāstivādin ancestor. His already substantial case is now strengthened by reasoning based mainly on certain features of the *uddānas*. I have argued that the available evidence not only supports a ZA-BZA common ancestor, but also gives some indication of its composition. The overall outcome is a strong endorsement of Bingenheimer's coherent and basically simple picture of the relationship between ZA and BZA. This provides support for the already well-founded view that both ZA and BZA belong to the (Mūla)-Sarvāstivāda. It also fits well with the contention, presented in Chapter 2 of Bingenheimer's book (2011, 23ff), that earlier attempts to attribute BZA to other schools are unconvincing.

A secondary outcome derives from the data on sequential disagreements between ZA and BZA (Types 1 to 6), initially used in arriving at the common ancestor. This body of data can now be seen as summarizing the changes that occurred unilaterally in the divergent lines of transmission during the period between the split into two traditions (at an unknown date) and the translation into Chinese (around the fifth century C.E.). It thereby provides insight into the kinds of changes that could occur in a large sūtra collection within a presumably fairly short space of time.

The arguments and conclusions presented here raise further questions, particularly the following two. How, why, and when did the ancestral *Samyuktāgama* of the (Mūla)-Sarvāstivādins split into two lines of transmission? And how, if at all, might this split relate to the sectarian division that yielded the branches called Sarvāstivāda and Mūla-Sarvāstivāda? For now these questions must be left as a challenge for future researchers.<sup>63</sup>

62 The 1st and 2nd ZA *uddānas* (at T 99, 1c20-21 and 3a04-05) refer to sūtras 1-7 and 8-14 respectively. This departure from the principle of ten sūtras per *uddāna*, so evident in BZA, may seem to count against the suggestion that the *uddānas* of ZA and of BZA belong to a single set. However, the seeming discrepancy is an artifact of the Taishō sūtra numbering system for ZA. What the editors labeled as sūtra no. 1 is treated in the 1st *uddāna* as four consecutive sūtras. On this basis the 1st *uddāna* does refer to ten sūtras. Much the same is true of the 2nd *uddāna*.

63 I am gratefully indebted to Bhikkhu Anālayo, Ken Su, and an anonymous reviewer for constructive comments on an early draft of this article. I am also grateful to Marcus Bingenheimer for giving me a preview of his then forthcoming book, and for having invited me in 2007 to give a seminar



## Abbreviations and Sigla

BZA	<i>Bieyi Za ahanjing</i> 別譯雜阿含經 (T 100)
Foguang	<i>Foguang Dazangjing. Ahan zang. Za ahanjing</i> 佛光大藏經·阿含藏·雜阿含經
K	Second Korean edition of the Chinese Tripitaka 高麗大藏經
SN	<i>Samyutta-nikāya</i> , PTS edition (5 vols.), Léon Feer ed. 1884-1898.
Spk	<i>Sāratthappakāsinī</i> ( <i>Samyutta-nikāya</i> commentary), PTS edition.
T	Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō 大正新修大藏經
ZA	<i>Za ahanjing</i> 雜阿含經 (T 99)
神	天神 <i>tianshen</i> , a class of divine beings
=	links parallel (corresponding) sūtras
—	missing or unattested sūtra(s)
#	indicates the presence of an <i>uddāna</i>
∅	indicates the absence of an expected <i>uddāna</i>
§	signals a departure from regular sequential correspondence

---

at Dharma Drum Buddhist College, Taiwan, thereby re-awakening my long-standing interest in the *Bieyi Za ahanjing*. Finally, I acknowledge the great help received from using the CBETA Chinese Electronic Tripitaka. Postscript: Belatedly I realize that Type 6 disagreement occurs not just once, as stated, but seven times.

## References

- Akanuma, Chizen 赤沼智善. 1981. *Bukkyō keiten shi ron* 佛教經典史論 (*A Historical Discussion of the Buddhist Scriptures*). Tokyo: Hōzōkan.
- Akanuma, Chizen 赤沼智善. 1990. *The Comparative Catalogue of Chinese Āgamas and Pāli Nikāyas*. Delhi: Sri Satguru.
- Akanuma, Chizen 赤沼智善. 1994 [1931]. *A Dictionary of Buddhist Proper Names, Indo Bukkyō Koyū Meishi Jiten*. Delhi: Sri Satguru.
- Anālayo and Roderick S. Bucknell. 2006. Correspondence Table for Parallels to the Discourses of Majjhima Nikāya: Toward a Revision of Akanuma's Comparative Catalogue. *Journal of the Centre for Buddhist Studies* 4:215-243.
- Anesaki, Masaharu. 1908. The Four Buddhist Āgamas in Chinese. *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan* 35(3):1-149.
- Bingenheimer, Marcus. 2011. *Studies in Āgama Literature – With Special Reference to the Shorter Chinese Saṃyuktāgama*. Taipei: Xinwenfeng.
- Bodhi, Bhikkhu, trans.. 2000. *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha: A New Translation of the Saṃyutta Nikāya*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Bucknell, Roderick S. 2007. The Structure of the Sagātha-Vagga of the Saṃyutta-Nikāya. *Buddhist Studies Review* 24(1):7-34.
- Bucknell, Roderick S. 2008. The Two Versions of the Other Translation of Saṃyuktāgama. *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* 21:23-54.
- Choong, Mun-keat. 2007. A Comparison of the Pāli and Chinese Versions of the Vaṅgīsa-thera Saṃyutta, a Collection of Early Buddhist Discourses on the Venerable Vaṅgīsa. *Buddhist Studies Review* 24(1):35-45.
- Chung, Jin-il. 2008. *A Survey of the Sanskrit Fragments Corresponding to the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama*. Tokyo: Sankibō.
- de Jong, J. W. 1981. Fa-Hsien and Buddhist Texts in Ceylon. *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* 9:105-116.
- Enomoto, Fumio 榎本文雄. 1980. Udānavarga Shohon to Zō Agongyō, Betsuyaku Zō Agongyō, Chū Agongyō no Buhakizoku. Udānavarga 諸本と雜阿含經別譯雜阿含經中阿含經の部派歸屬 (On the Recensions of the Udānavarga and the School to Which Saṃyuktāgama, its Alternative Translation, and the Madhyamakāgama are to be Ascribed). *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 28(2):55-57.
- Enomoto, Fumio. 榎本文雄. 1984. Agon Kyōten no Seiritsu 阿含經典の成立 (The Formation of the Chinese Āgamas). *Tōyōgaku jutsu Kenkyū* 東洋學術研究 23(1):93-108.

- Enomoto, Fumio. 1994. *A Comprehensive Study of the Chinese Samyuktāgama: Indic Texts Corresponding to the Chinese Samyuktāgama as Found in the Sarvāstivāda-Mūlasarvāstivāda Literature*. Kyoto: Kacho Junior College.
- Foguang Dazangjing Bianxiu Weiyuanhui 佛光大藏經編修委員會. 1983. *Foguang Dazangjing. Ahan Zang. Za Ahanjing (Foguang Tripiṭaka: Āgama: Samyuktāgama, 4 vols.)*. Kaohsiung: Foguang.
- Glass, Andrew. 2007. *Four Gāndhārī Samyuktāgama Sūtras: Senior Kharoṣṭhī Fragment 5 (Gāndhāran Buddhist Texts, vol. 4)*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.
- Glass, Andrew. 2008. Guṇabhadra, Baoyun, and the Samyuktāgama. *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 31(1-2):185-203.
- Hiraoka, Satoshi. 2000. The Sectarian Affiliation of Two Chinese Samyuktāgamas. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 49(1):506-500
- Honjō, Yoshifumi 本庄良文. 1984. *Kusharon Shoe Agon Zenpyō* 俱舍論所依阿含全表 (*A Table of the Āgama Citations in the Abhidharmakośa and the Abhidharmakośopāyikā*). Kyoto: Honjō Yoshifumi.
- Mayeda, Egaku 前田惠學. 1985. Japanese Studies on the Schools of the Chinese Āgamas. *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*. Ed. Heinz Bechert. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 94-103.
- Mizuno, Kōgen 水野弘元. 1970. Betsuyaku Zōagongyō ni tsuite 別譯雜阿含經について (On the “Other Translation of Samyuktāgama”). *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 18(2):41-51.
- Rhys Davids, C.A.F., trans. 1917. *The Book of the Kindred Sayings*. Vol. I. London: Pāli Text Society.
- Su, Ken 蘇錦坤. 2008. Bieyi Za ahan Hing Shesong de Tedian 《別譯雜阿含經》攝頌的特點 (Some Characteristics of the *Uddānas* of Bieyi Za ahan Jing, T 100). *Zhengguan zazhi* 45:5-80.
- Tripāṭhi, Chandrabhāl. 1962. *Fünfundzwanzig Sūtras des Nidānasamyukta (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden VIII)*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst. 1957. Identifizierung Einer Handschrift des Nidānasamyukta aus den Turfanfunden. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 107:372-401. Reprint, 1967. *Ernst Waldschmidt, Von Ceylon bis Turfan, Schriften zur Geschichte, Literatur, Religion und Kunst des indischen Kulturraumes. Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag am 15. Juli 1967*. Ed. Heinz Bechert. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 288-317.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst. 1970. Buddha Frees the Disc of the Moon (Candrasūtra). *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 33:179-183. Reprint, 1989. *Ernst Waldschmidt, Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*. Eds. Heinz Bechert and Petra Kieffer-Pülz. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner. 296-301.

- Waldschmidt, Ernst. 1980. Central Asian Sūtra Fragments and their Relation to the Chinese Āgamas. *Die Sprache der Altesten Buddhistischen Überlieferung (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung 2)*. Ed. Heinz Bechert; Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, 117). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 136-174.
- Yinshun. 1983. *Za Ahan Jinglun Hui Bian (Samyuktāgama: Combined Edition of Sūtra and Commentary)* 3 vols. Taipei: Zhengwen.
- Yinshun. 1988. *Yuanshi Fojiao Shengdian zhi Jicheng (The Compilation of the Scriptures of Early Buddhism)*. Taipei: Zhengwen.