

Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal (2008, 21:23-54)

Taipei: Chung-Hwa Institute of Buddhist Studies

中華佛學學報第二十一期 頁 23-54 (民國九十七年)，臺北：中華佛學研究所

ISSN:1017-7132

The Two Versions of the *Other Translation of Saṃyuktāgama*

Roderick S. Bucknell

Reader in Eastern Religions (retired)

The University of Queensland

Abstract

The *Other Translation of Saṃyuktāgama* 別譯雜阿含經 exists in two versions. The version preserved as text no. 100 in the Taishō edition of the Chinese canon is divided into sixteen fascicles, a format carried over from the Korean edition on which the compilers of the Taishō mainly relied. The other version, found in most editions produced in China itself, is instead divided into twenty fascicles. These two versions contain almost the same collection of sūtras, but differ in their arrangement. As regards the grouping into *Saṃyuktas*, the twenty-fascicle version is in good order while the sixteen-fascicle version is in disarray. This article examines the proposition by Anesaki (1908) that the sixteen-fascicle version resulted from accidental disarrangement of a text that closely resembled the twenty-fascicle version, and seeks to identify how and when this could have come about.¹

Key words:

Saṃyuktāgama, *Āgama*, Chinese Canon, Korean Canon, Sugi

1 This article derives from a lecture I presented in June 2007 at the Dharma Drum Buddhist College in Taiwan. I wish to record my gratitude to the College for inviting me, and in particular to Marcus Bingenheimer, who provided valuable feedback and directed me to relevant literature.

《別譯雜阿含經》之兩個版本

Roderick S. Bucknell

昆士蘭大學東方宗教學系退休教授

提要

《別譯雜阿含經》有兩個版本，其中一個版本保留在大正新脩大藏經，經號100，共分為十六卷；其編排由大正新脩大藏經主要所依賴的高麗藏延續而來。而另一版本則分為二十卷，在中國歷代編纂的藏經中多半可見此版本。此兩個版本包含幾乎相同的經文，但其編排卻是不一樣的。在屬於相應部方面，二十卷的版本序列整齊，而十六卷的版本則雜亂無序。此篇論文檢視Anesaki認為此十六卷版本是從近似二十卷版本的文本因意外而造成無序的情形下產生的觀點，並探究確認此論點如何及何時產生。

關鍵字：《雜阿含經》、阿含經、漢文藏經、高麗藏、守其

Introduction

Text no. 100 in the Taishō edition of the Chinese canon bears the title *Bieyi za ahan jing* 別譯雜阿含經 (henceforth abbreviated as “BZA”), meaning *Other Translation of Samyuktāgama*.² The phrase, “Other Translation,” draws attention to the fact that the immediately preceding text, Taishō no. 99, is called simply “*Samyuktāgama*” *Za ahan jing* 雜阿含經 (henceforth “ZA”).³ Both ZA and BZA are translations, apparently from Sanskrit, of now lost *Samyuktāgama* texts corresponding broadly to the Pāli *Samyutta-nikāya*. ZA, comprising 1359 sūtras, is a complete translation of this *Āgama*; BZA, with just 364 sūtras (in the Taishō edition) and broadly corresponding to the last quarter of ZA, is incomplete.⁴ Whether the incompleteness of BZA is intentional or due to accidental loss remains unclear. In any case, the correspondence between BZA and the relevant portion of ZA is close enough to indicate that these two Chinese translations were based on very similar source texts. The sectarian affinities of BZA remain uncertain; current scholarly opinion is that it, as well as ZA, probably belongs to the Sarvāstivāda /Mūlasarvāstivāda (see Bingenheimer 2006, 22; Hiraoka 2000; Enomoto 1980 and 1984).

BZA, the incomplete *Other Translation of Samyuktāgama*, exists in two versions, found in different editions of the Chinese canon. The version preserved as Taishō no. 100 is divided into sixteen fascicles 卷.⁵ Its less well known counterpart in many other editions of the canon is instead divided into twenty fascicles. The twenty-fascicle version has all but eleven of the

2 The abbreviation “BZA” (also “ZA” for T 99) follows Bingenheimer (2006). Equivalent abbreviations found in recent literature are “SĀ” (for “2nd *Samyuktāgama*”; Anālayo and Bucknell 2006) and “ASA” (for “Additional *Samyuktāgama*”; Choong 2007).

3 However, the BZA translation is thought to have been the earlier of the two, the proposed dates being 385-431 for BZA (Mizuno 1970, 486), and 435-6 for ZA (Glass 2007, 28, 38-39). Exceptionally, in some editions (e.g., the 乾隆 Qianlong and 卅字 Manji editions), ZA and BZA are not adjacent, being separated by the *Dīrghāgama*. Confusingly, the next text again, T 101, is also called 雜阿含經 *Za ahan jing*. With only 27 sūtras, it appears to be a *Samyuktāgama* anthology; and being so brief, it has no relevance for the present study. Much of the information given in this article relating to ZA, BZA, and other texts, and to the various editions of the canon, was obtained from the CBETA website, at http://jinglu.cbeta.org/cgi-bin/jl_detail.pl?lang=sid=zruqo. Source references for information from this site will usually not be given in the remainder of the article.

4 While the ZA translation was presumably complete, the extant text is incomplete insofar as two of the original fifty fascicles have been lost. The stated numbers of sūtras are based on the numbering in the Taishō edition. Three of the 1362 sūtras in the extant ZA do not belong to it, hence the figure of 1359. For background information on BZA and an English translation of its first fascicle, see Bingenheimer (2006).

5 For the term *juan* 卷, the widely accepted “fascicle” is not entirely appropriate but is adopted here for convenience.

364 sūtras that make up T 100,⁶ but it differs considerably in how those sūtras are distributed within the text.

As regards the grouping of the sūtras into *Samyuktas* 相應, it has long been recognized that, while the twenty-fascicle version of BZA (henceforth “BZA/20”) is in good order, the sixteen-fascicle version (“BZA/16”) is in disarray. In his pioneering study, “The Four Buddhist *Āgamas* in Chinese,” Anesaki (1908) recognized that the arrangement of BZA/20 closely matches the arrangement of the corresponding portion of ZA, provided allowance is made for the demonstrable fact that some of the fascicles of ZA are out of sequence. On the basis of this evidence he inferred that BZA/20 comes close to preserving the original form of the “*Other Translation*.” Implied is that BZA/16 is a confused derivative of the same original text, a product of accidental disarrangement of that text’s components. While this interpretation seems likely to be correct, its details have hitherto remained unclear. The actual transpositions of textual material that are supposed to have resulted in the sixteen-fascicle version have not been identified, much less explained. To attempt to fill in these missing details is the purpose of the present article.

Methodologically, this study is of the same genre as the investigations by Anesaki and his successors into the above-mentioned issue of the fascicle sequence in ZA. It is also akin to the research by Hayashiya (1937) and Harrison (1997) into the confused sequence of T 150A (a partial *Ekottarikāgama* translation). Besides its immediate objective of teasing out the problems posed by BZA, this study aims at revealing some general principles involved in such cases of disarrangement of a sūtra collection.

To begin with, the two BZA versions will be put in historical perspective by considering their distribution among the various editions of the Chinese canon.⁷

Distribution of the Two Versions

BZA is not listed in the earliest of the extant Chinese catalogues, the *Chu san zang jiji* 出三藏記集 compiled by Sengyou 僧祐 (T 2145, 1a1, c. 520 C.E.). It does, however, appear in nine subsequent catalogues covering the period down to the late eighth century, and in every case it is described as consisting of twenty fascicles.⁸ While this information may not be entirely

6 The eleven missing sūtras are nos. 258-268 of T 100.

7 Much of the following information about the distribution of the two BZA versions was obtained from the CBETA website (see note 4, above). For more on the editions of the Chinese canon and their interrelationships, see *Foguang da cidian* (1988, 1001-1017).

8 T 2146, 130b20; T 2147, 154b28; T 2148, 186b21; T 2149, 298b24; T 2153, 431a10; T 2154, 691a29; T 2155, 737a27; T 2157, 815a04; T 2034, 116c07.

reliable, it is surely significant that not one of the catalogues from this early period mentions BZA in sixteen fascicles.

From the tenth century onward, following the development of printing technology, there exist, as sources, discrete printed editions of the Chinese canon. The first of them is the Kaibao zang 開寶藏 or Shu ben 蜀本, which was produced during the years 972-983 under the first and second emperors of the Northern Song dynasty, and later revised and expanded several times.⁹ The Kaibao edition, which became the basis for many subsequent editions of the canon, now survives only in fragments. Modern catalogues state that the BZA contained in it consisted of twenty fascicles.¹⁰ However, it is not clear on what basis this statement is made, and whether it refers to the original Kaibao edition of 983 or to one of its later revised versions.

Some seventy years after the original Kaibao came the Qidan edition 契丹藏, produced in the neighboring non-Han state of Qidan (Khitan) under the Liao dynasty. Little now remains of this edition, but from other sources (discussed below) it is known to have contained the twenty-fascicle version of BZA.

The next three printed editions, the Chongning 崇寧萬壽藏 (completed around 1140), Pilu 毘盧藏 (1151), and Yuanjue 思溪圓覺藏 (c. 1160), produced under the continuing Song dynasty, are progressively better preserved, and each of them is known to have also had BZA in its twenty-fascicle version.¹¹

Next in the historical sequence comes the Jin edition 趙城金藏, completed in 1173 under the Jurchen 女真 Jin dynasty, which had ousted the Qidan Liao dynasty. This is the earliest printed edition of the Chinese canon that has survived intact to the present day. The BZA text preserved in it is the sixteen-fascicle version. This is the first actually attested occurrence of BZA/16. It is also the last occurrence of this version in any edition produced in China until the twentieth century.

Outside of China, however, BZA/16 is frequently attested. In Korea it is found in the second Korean edition of the Chinese canon 高麗大藏經 completed in 1251. Then, some six centuries later, it reappears in three modern editions produced in Japan: the Shukusatsu edition 縮刷 (1885), the Manji 卅字 (1905), and the Taishō 大正 (1924-1934). This is a consequence of the fact that each of these three was based principally on the second Korean edition.¹² A little later, back in China itself, BZA/16 also reappears in three modern editions: the Pinjia Vihāra edition 頻伽精舍 (1914), which is essentially a copy of the Shukusatsu from Japan; the Fojiao Dazangjing 佛教大藏經 (1983), which in turn relies heavily on the Pinjia edition; and the Zhonghua edition 中華 (Shanghai, 1984), which is a photographic reproduction of the old

9 On these revisions of the Kaibao edition see Zhanghui (2006, 227-8).

10 For example, Cai (1983) and the CBETA website.

11 See, for example, the partial table of contents of the *Āgama* section of the Yuanjue edition, reproduced at *Foguang da cidian* (1988, 1005).

12 Some older Japanese editions had BZA/20; e.g., the Ōbaku edition 黃蘗 (1681), which is said to have been directly copied from the Jiaxing edition 嘉興 (1606) brought from China.

Jin edition, supplemented with additional material from the second Korean edition. All of the other editions produced in China or Japan during the intervening centuries have BZA/20.

The above brief survey reveals a very uneven historical-geographical distribution for the two BZA versions. The pattern of distribution is consistent with the proposition that BZA/20 is the older version and BZA/16 is a later secondary derivative. In the transmission and spread of the presumably derivative BZA/16 a pivotal role is played by the second Korean edition. It is to the point, therefore, to consider how BZA/16 found its way into that edition. The following background information is condensed from accounts provided by Lancaster and Park (1979, xiv-xv) and Buswell (2004, 129-138).

In 991, shortly after the completion of the Kaibao edition, the reigning Song emperor sent a copy of this first Chinese printed canon as a gift to Korea's King Hyōnjong 顯宗. In 1010 Hyōnjong, following the example set by the first Song emperor, ordered that the Kaibao be edited and expanded and the resulting text carved on to wooden printing blocks. The outcome was the first printed edition produced in Korea, said to have been completed around 1087.

In 1234 the woodblocks of this first Korean edition were destroyed by fire during the Mongol invasion, but within four years work had begun on the production of a new set. On this occasion the editorial work that preceded the carving was done with particular thoroughness and care. The chief editor, a Korean scholar-monk named Sugi 守其, wrote a detailed account of the editorial decisions that were made. He included it in the new edition, under the title *Supplementary Record of the Editing for the New Carving of the Korean Canon* 高麗國新調大藏校正別錄.¹³ It is relevant here in providing information about BZA. Further such information can be found in fourteen notes that Sugi inserted throughout the newly edited BZA text itself. While Sugi's *Supplementary Record* is not reproduced in the Taishō edition, his notes to BZA do appear, in small type, through the text of T 100.

Sugi's *Supplementary Record* indicates that his editorial team compared and collated three xylograph editions of the Chinese canon, which he refers to as Song-ben 宋本, Guo-ben 國本, and Dan-ben 丹本. From the historical documents cited by Lancaster and other researchers, these three sources can be identified as follows. What Sugi calls "Song-ben" was the original Kaibao edition.¹⁴ Sugi's "Guo-ben" or "National edition" was the first Korean edition, an expanded and revised derivative of the original Kaibao; multiple copies of it had been made before the destruction of the printing blocks. And his "Dan-ben" was the Qidan edition, a copy of which had arrived in Korea shortly after its completion.

Most of the fourteen editorial notes preserved in T 100 relate directly to the division of the BZA text into fascicles.¹⁵ For example, the note that immediately follows the heading

13 No. 1402 in the Korean canon; also accessible in the Shukusatsu edition and its near derivatives. For background, see Lancaster and Park (1979), xiv-xvii and their note 35; for analysis, see Buswell (2004), and Zhanghui (2006, 163-284).

14 This is not the edition called Song 宋 in the Taishō footnotes; see Buswell (2004, 178).

15 The notes are at T 100, 411c21-28, 435a3, 443a9, 447b16, 453b25, 456b23, 458b16, 461c10, 468b19-24, 474a24, 476b2, 480a27-30, 485c2, 489b6.

“Fascicle no. 11” (T 100, 447b16) reads: 丹本第十九卷, “Equivalent to fascicle no. 19 of the Qidan edition.” Here Sugi is saying, in effect, that fascicle nineteen of the version of BZA contained in the Qidan edition is the same as fascicle eleven of the version of BZA adopted in the second Korean edition. The version in the second Korean edition is BZA/16. In terms of the Taishō numbering system, its fascicle eleven comprises the fifteen sūtras numbered 199 to 213; and comparison reveals that the corresponding fifteen sūtras in BZA/20 do make up its fascicle nineteen, as stated in the quoted editorial note. This note indicates, therefore, that the source referred to as Dan-ben had BZA/20, while the other two sources, whose version was adopted for the second Korean edition, had BZA/16. The same is indicated by each of the other notes that relate to the division of BZA into fascicles.¹⁶ It can be concluded, therefore, that the Qidan edition (Dan-ben) had the twenty-fascicle version of BZA, while the Kaibao and National editions had the sixteen-fascicle version.

This information helps to fill some of the gaps in our survey of the historical-geographical distribution of the two BZA versions. It can now be affirmed that BZA/16 existed already in the original Kaibao edition and in the National or first Korean edition. This conclusion conflicts with what is indicated in the modern catalogues cited above, according to which the Kaibao edition had BZA/20. A possible explanation is that these modern catalogues may be describing not the original Kaibao but rather one of its later revised editions, in which BZA/16 was perhaps replaced by BZA/20.

Further light is thrown on this issue by the first of Sugi’s notes to BZA.¹⁷ In this more extensive note Sugi states, in effect, that both the Kaibao and National editions lack the *Brahmā-samyukta* of BZA, and that he is filling this gap from the Qidan edition, which does have this *Samyukta*.¹⁸ Now, lack of the *Brahmā-samyukta* of BZA is also a feature of the Jin

16 A note follows the heading to each of the fascicles 9 to 16, and further notes are located within some fascicles. The note expected after the heading to fascicle 7 (equating it with Qidan fascicle 15) is missing. Fascicles 1-5 and 8 require no note since the corresponding Qidan fascicle would have had the same number. Though fascicle 9 seems to require no note for the same reason, it does have one. The case of fascicle 6 is covered by the first note, discussed below.

17 This note appears both in Sugi’s *Supplementary Record* (not included in T) and at the end of fascicle 5 of BZA/16. K 1402, 625a21-631c9; and K 651, 49c5-12 = T 100, 411c21-28. Cf. Zhanghui (2006, 191-192).

18 The note reads (in part): “The last five sūtras of this fascicle and the first five sūtras of fascicle 6 are all absent from the National and Song editions and present only in the Qidan edition. The first nine are sūtras on Brahmā’s questions; the tenth is the transposed *Subhadra-sūtra*. [...] In accordance with the Qidan edition [we] now add them separately to the two fascicles.” Where the *Supplementary Record* has 前九 “the first nine”, the replication within BZA/16 has the less coherent 第九 “the ninth.” The ten sūtras referred to are nos. 101-110 of T 100. Despite what the notes says, the Korean edition and its derivatives have six in fascicle 5 and four in fascicle 6. These ten sūtras demonstrably constitute the *Brahmā-samyukta*.

edition.¹⁹ But although the Jin (1173) predated the compiling of the second Korean edition (1236-1251), it was not among the editions available to Sugi's team as sources (Zhanghui 2006, 163). Consequently, this note by Sugi indirectly tells us that lack of the *Brahmā-saṃyukta* was a consistent characteristic of the BZA/16 that existed prior to Sugi's editorial work. This early link (between the sixteen-fascicle format and lack of the *Brahmā-saṃyukta*) supports the conclusion that the original Kaibao edition contained BZA/16. It thereby indicates that the disarrangement that produced BZA/16 had already occurred before the compiling of the Kaibao edition.

Within China BZA/16 was transmitted from the Kaibao edition to the Jin edition and no further. However, the exporting of a copy of the original Kaibao to Korea led to the preservation of BZA/16 there, and to its subsequent transmission to Japan and ultimately back to China. Regarding the earliest stages in these developments the details are not entirely clear.²⁰ What does seem clear, however, on the basis of the data cited, is that the disarrangement of textual material that produced BZA/16 had occurred already in the period before the first xylograph printed editions; the physical text that underwent the disarrangement would have been a manuscript copy, of which few are likely to have existed. With this as background, we turn now to the two versions themselves, with a view to clarifying the mechanism of the disarrangement that produced BZA/16.

Structure of the two BZA versions

Neither ZA nor BZA bears any direct indication that its component sūtras are grouped into *Saṃyuktas*. However, *Saṃyuktas* do become apparent once the sūtras are identified with their Pāli counterparts, most of which are to be found in *Saṃyutta-nikāya*. In his 1908 study of the

19 In the modern Zhonghua edition (Shanghai, 1988), which is basically an augmented photocopy of the Jin, the ten sūtras representing the missing *Brahmā-saṃyukta* have been supplied from the second Korean edition. However, while the first six of the ten sūtras have been correctly placed at the end of fascicle 5, the remaining four have been incorrectly placed at the end of fascicle 6 instead of at its beginning. Thus the two parts of *Brahmā-saṃyukta* have been separated, which demonstrates how easily a Chinese Buddhist text can become disarranged, even in modern times. The Taishō editors appear to have done something similar with T 150A; see Harrison (1997, 263-5).

20 The data indicate that the original Kaibao edition had BZA/16, but that one of the later revisions of the Kaibao entailed replacing this with BZA/20. To complete the picture one would need to know just when this substitution happened. It may seem anomalous that the Jin edition (1173), which has BZA/16, post-dates the Qidan, Chongning, Pilu, and Yuanjue editions, all of which have BZA/20; however, the Jin may have been based on a superseded earlier version of the Kaibao that still had BZA/16. Relevant data are at Zhanghui (2006, 227-229).

Chinese *Āgamas*, Anesaki presents the results of doing this with ZA and the two versions of BZA.

In the case of BZA/16, Anesaki found the text to be “in utter confusion” (1908, 70). In the case of BZA/20, however, comparison with the Pāli brought to light a clear and largely familiar structure. Applying the same procedure to ZA again revealed disorder, interpreted as indicating that thirteen of this text’s fifty fascicles had been accidentally transposed (as discussed below). However, restoring these transposed fascicles to their inferred original positions yielded a coherent arrangement of the *Samyuktas*; and those sections of the restored text whose content overlapped with BZA were found to match up well with the twenty-fascicle version – though with one large-scale difference, which will be discussed shortly.

The structure of BZA/20 is shown in Table 1, below. The twenty fascicles are indicated in the second column by the numbers in square brackets, “[1]” to “[20].” In the first column, headed “*Varga*,” appear five occurrences of the entry “1st.,” one for each of the fascicles [1] to [5]. The reference here is to the phrase 初誦 “First *varga*,” which appears in the heading to each of these five fascicles, thus: 初誦卷第一 “First *varga*, fascicle no. 1,” and so on down to 初誦卷第五 “First *varga*, fascicle no. 5.” Thereafter there is no reference to a *varga*; the remaining headings read simply 卷第六 “Fascicle no. 6” and so on.

The third column of Table 1 lists the sūtras contained in each of the twenty fascicles, identifying them by the numbers they bear in the Taishō edition. The listed sūtra numbers are in regular ascending sequence from 1 to 110, but thereafter are in seeming disorder. This situation reflects the fact that the sūtra sequence of BZA/20, shown in this table, differs from that of BZA/16, on which the Taishō numbering is based. Also to be noted is that the numbers 258-268 are missing from this table; that is, BZA/20 lacks counterparts for the eleven sūtras that are numbered 258-268 in BZA/16 (they are a portion of *Brāhmaṇa-samyukta*). The signs “#” and “ø” denote the presence or absence of an *uddāna* (summary verse) in the text, a feature that will be discussed later.

In the right-hand column of Table 1 are shown the *Samyuktas* that the listed sūtras represent, numbered in order of their appearance in the text.²¹ *Samyuktas* S-1 to S-11 in the upper part of the table, together with S-12 at the very bottom, correspond to the entire *Sagātha-vagga* of the Pāli *Samyutta-nikāya* (including *Bhikkhu-samyutta*; see Bucknell 2007, 12-18), though in a different sequence; hence the prefixed “S” (for “*Sagātha*”).

The remaining seven *Samyuktas*, B-1 to B-7, do not match up with any single one of the four remaining *vaggas* of the Pāli *Samyutta-nikāya*.²² However, they do match up with one of

21 Some Chinese researchers (e.g. Foguang Dazangjing, ZA, 1983, 4:11, table) combine *Deva*- and *Devaputta-samyuktas* under a single heading, 諸天 “All *Devas*”. The two categories recognized in the Pāli are readily discernable in both BZA and ZA, but they do appear to have been conflated in the relevant Chinese traditions.

22 Four of the seven have direct counterparts in the Pāli *Samyutta-nikāya*: *Mahākassapa-* and *Anamatagga-samyuttas* in *Nidāna-Vagga*; *Gāmaṇi-* and *Avyākata-samyuttas* in *Salāyatana-Vagga*. The others are unique to BZA (and ZA). Anesaki gives them Pāli names, whose Sanskrit

the seven *vargas* that are indicated by vestigial headings preserved in ZA and listed in full in the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya (T 1451, 407b21-28) and the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* (T 1579, 772c11-15). These seven *vargas* are the following:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. <i>Skandha-varga</i> | (Section on aggregates) |
| 2. <i>Ṣaḍāyatana-varga</i> | (Section on the six sense-bases) |
| 3. <i>Nidāna-varga</i> | (Section on causation) |
| 4. <i>Śrāvakahāṣita-varga</i> | (Section spoken by disciples) |
| 5. <i>Mārga-varga</i> | (Section on the path) |
| 6. <i>Buddhabhāṣita-varga</i> | (Section spoken by the Buddha) |
| 7. <i>Sagātha-varga</i> | (Section with verses) |

The one in question here is *Buddhabhāṣita-varga* (or *Tathāgatabhāṣita-varga*), the section spoken by the Buddha. Its first half is represented in *Samyuktas* B-1 to B-7 of BZA/20. The ZA sequence of the *vargas*, shown above, differs from that of BZA/20 in having *Buddhabhāṣita-varga* before *Sagātha-varga* rather than after it.²³

Apart from the anomalous location of *Vana-samyukta*, BZA/20 is completely orderly as regards the distribution of its *Samyuktas*. In this respect it contrasts with BZA/16, as will now be seen.

The structure of BZA/16 is set out in Table 2. Here the fascicle numbers, shown within round brackets in the second column, run from (1) to (16). The first column contains references to two *vargas*, represented as “1st.” and “2nd.” The phrase 初誦, “First *varga*,” appears in the headings for fascicles (1) to (5); the phrase 二誦, “Second *varga*,” comes immediately before sūtra no. 111, which is located part-way through fascicle (6), and it appears again in the heading for fascicle (7).

The sūtra numbers listed in the third column are in regular ascending order throughout, simply because BZA/16 is the version represented in the Taishō edition, from which the sūtra numbers are taken. In this case the *Samyuktas* (right-hand column) are in some disarray. Three of them are split, as signalled by the sign “~”: *Brāhmaṇa* and *Vaṅgīsa* are each split into two parts, and *Devatā* is in four parts.

Table 2 also reveals disorder in the grouping of the *Samyuktas* into *vargas*. The *Sagātha-varga* is, for the most part, in two blocks, one in the top third of the table (S-1 to S-6) and the other in the bottom third (S-7 to S-12). These two blocks are separated by *Buddhabhāṣita-varga*, which, however, is interspersed with two pieces of *Sagātha-varga* (both belonging to

equivalents would be: *Aśva*, *Mahānāma*, *Pravrājaka*.

23 This is the “one large-scale difference” mentioned above. Other variations in the *varga* sequence exist. The cited Vinaya list has *Buddhabhāṣita* before *Mārga* rather than after it; and *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* has *Buddhabhāṣita* and *Śrāvakahāṣita* together at the beginning, ahead of *Skandha*.

Devatā-samyukta). Furthermore, a piece of *Buddhabhāṣita* (namely, the entire *Anamatāgra-samyukta*) is anomalously located within the lower *Sagātha* block.

Here one can discern a link with the headings “First *varga*” and “Second *varga*,” which are clearly vestiges of a grouping of the sūtra material into two *vargas*. In both versions the beginning of First *varga* is at sūtra no. 1, thus coinciding with the beginning of *Sagātha-varga*. BZA/16 (Table 2) further indicates that the beginning of Second *varga* is at sūtra no. 111, that is, at the beginning of the block of *Samyuktas* that predominantly belong to *Buddhabhāṣita-varga*. In BZA/20 (Table 1) the “Second *varga*” label is lacking. However, if we experimentally copy this label from BZA/16 and paste it to the corresponding point in BZA/20 – that is, at sūtra no. 111 in Table 1 – the result is that the beginning of Second *varga* is identical with the beginning of *Buddhabhāṣita-varga*.

It is now apparent that the headings “First *varga*” and “Second *varga*” refer to *Sagātha-varga* and *Buddhabhāṣita-varga* respectively. In BZA/20 the significance of this labelling system is clearly evident, even despite the total loss of the “Second *varga*” label and the aberrant placement of *Vana-samyukta*. In BZA/16, however, the significance of the labels is heavily obscured, a further example of disorder in this version.

Comparison of Tables 1 and 3 shows that the two BZA versions agree completely from the beginning down to sūtra no. 100. As regards sūtra sequence, but not fascicle structure, they continue to agree as far as no. 110 – thanks to the above-noted fact that the Korean editors copied sūtras 101-110 (*Brahmā-samyukta*) from BZA/20 (Qidan edition) into the previously deficient BZA/16 (Kaibao and National editions). From sūtra 111 to the end the two versions are in considerable disagreement.

This broad pattern of correspondence between the two versions – complete agreement as far as sūtra no. 100, disagreement thereafter – indicates that the section from the beginning down to sūtra 100 has retained the form it had in the nearest common ancestor of the two versions, while the remainder has been more or less disarranged. In BZA/20 the obvious disarrangements are limited to misplacement of *Vana-samyukta* and loss of sūtras 258-268 from *Brāhmaṇa-samyukta*; in BZA/16 more drastic disruptions have occurred. This is the conclusion that Anesaki (1908) reached. In his ZA-BZA-Pāli correspondence table (Anesaki 1908, 77-138) he adopts, as the basis for comparison, a slightly modified version of BZA/20, in which *Vana-samyukta* has been moved up to follow immediately after *Yakṣa-samyukta* (1908, 131) and sūtras 258-268 have been reinstated between sūtras 91 and 92 of *Brāhmaṇa-samyukta* (1908, 121-122).²⁴ This modified version represents the inferred common ancestor of the two extant versions, BZA/20 and BZA/16.

²⁴ See Anesaki’s “Tatiya-vagga” (1908, 121-122), where sūtras 19-29 (= T 100, sūtras 258-268) are between sūtras 18 and 30 (= T 100, sūtras 91 and 92). In his table the page numbers shown for BZA (his “B”) are from the Shukusatsu edition, which has BZA/16. However, the arrangement is that of the modified BZA/20, based on the reconstituted ZA. The jump from page 29 for his sūtra 18 to page 83 for his sūtra 19 reflects the jump from T 100, sūtra 91 to sūtra 258. Both of Anesaki’s reconstructions – the relocation of *Vana-samyukta* and the reinstatement of sūtras

The *Uddānas*

In Tables 1 and 3 the sign “#” indicates the presence of an *uddāna*, a summary verse listing the preceding set of about ten sūtras; the sign “ø” indicates the lack of an *uddāna* where one would be expected.²⁵

The *uddānas* of BZA share all the features of their counterparts in the Pāli nikāyas.²⁶ They mark the division of the text into “decades,” groups of sūtras, usually ten but sometimes rather more or fewer than ten, which often match up well with the grouping of those same sūtras into *Samyuktas*. For example, in fascicles 2 and 3 of both versions the decades consist of exactly ten sūtras each, but in fascicle 1 they consist of eleven each, because the *Bhikṣu-samyukta* has twenty-two sūtras. Functioning as partial tables of contents, the *uddānas* may be expected to throw light on the issues of sequence and arrangement being examined here.

The notion of missing *uddānas*, indicated by “ø”, is illustrated by the following example, based on the case of “84-91 ø” in Tables 1 and 3. An *uddāna* is found after sūtra no. 83, and then the next one is found after no. 100. Checking the content of each of these two *uddānas* against the sūtras preceding it reveals a gap. The *uddāna* after sūtra 83 lists sūtras 74-83, and the one after sūtra 100 lists sūtras 92-100. Thus, the intervening sūtras 84-91 are left unaccounted for; that is, the *uddāna* expected after sūtra 91 is missing. Six such cases of missing *uddānas* can be identified. A natural interpretation is that in each of these six cases a previously existing *uddāna* has been lost in the course of textual transmission. *Uddānas* would be naturally susceptible to such loss. Because they make no sense linguistically, they may have sometimes seemed, to poorly informed copyists, to be extraneous and better deleted from the text.

Once it is allowed that six *uddānas* have probably been lost, the distribution of the BZA *uddānas* is found to be largely regular, even in the disarranged BZA/16. There do, however, exist a few irregularities, which will now be considered.

As Table 2 shows, BZA/16 has an *uddāna* after sūtra no. 249 and another after no. 251, just two sūtras further down. Added to this anomaly is the fact that the second of the two cited *uddānas* lists nine sūtras, not just two. The other seven sūtras listed in this *uddāna* are found to be nos. 224-230. That is, the *uddāna* that follows sūtra no. 251 actually lists the sūtras

258-268 – are subsequently repeated in similar tables by Mayeda (1964, 654-656) and Yinshun (1988, 669-672).

25 The *uddānas* of T 100 are discussed in detail by Su (2008), a valuable resource for this study. ZA has *uddānas* only in its first five fascicles, now numbered 1, 10, 3, 2, 5.

26 In the Pāli canon a set of about ten suttas covered by an *uddāna* is termed a *vagga*. However, as noted by Bodhi (2000, 22), this term is used ambiguously in *Samyutta-nikāya*, where it refers also to a group of about ten *samyuttas* similarly covered by an *uddāna*. In what follows I retain the latter usage, limiting “*varga*” to a group of *Samyuktas* (*Sagātha-varga* and *Buddhabhāṣita-varga*), and adopting “decade” for a group of about ten sūtras covered by an *uddāna*.

numbered 224-230, 250, 251. Clarification of this situation can be found in BZA/20 (Table 1, fascicle [7]). There the nine sūtras listed in the *uddāna* that follows sūtra 251 are consecutive, being the first part of *Vaṅgīsa-samyukta*. That is to say, although this *Samyukta* is split in BZA/16, the relevant *uddāna* recognizes no split; although present in both versions of BZA, this *uddāna* actually represents the situation in BZA/20.

A second example of irregularity is provided by sūtra 142 in BZA/16. The preceding sūtras 132-141 are covered by one *uddāna* and the following sūtras 143-151 are covered by another; sūtra 142 is left unaccounted for (Table 2). Sūtras that are not listed in any *uddāna* are not uncommon in the two versions – hence the notion of missing *uddānas*. But this case is different in that 142 in BZA/16 is isolated, rather than being one of a decade of sūtras without *uddāna*. Here again an explanation for the anomaly can be found in BZA/20 (Table 1, fascicle [8]). There sūtra 142 is followed immediately by sūtras 231-239, which are also not listed in any *uddāna*. That is, the set of ten consecutive sūtras, 142, 231-239, constitutes a typical instance of a missing *uddāna*.

The two cases just discussed indicate that the *uddānas* were composed for BZA/20 – or for a text closely resembling it. Their imperfect fit with the structure of BZA/16 indicates that that version has resulted from disruption of the text at some time after the *uddānas* were composed.

Despite this, BZA/20 is not entirely free of such irregularities. One example can be found in the *uddāna* that follows sūtra 121. The sūtras listed in it are 111-121, which represent the total content of fascicles [13] and [14]. This situation is odd in two respects. First, this is the only case in BZA/20 where the decade of sūtras listed in an *uddāna* extends over more than one fascicle.²⁷ Second, as is pointed out by Yinshun (1988, 668-669), fascicles [13] and [14] are remarkable in being much smaller than any other fascicle of BZA/20. In terms of the physical space occupied by their component sūtras in the Taishō edition, fascicles [13] and [14] take up just three pages each, while the other eighteen fascicles range in size from six pages to nine pages. It is odd, therefore, that the decade of sūtras 111-121 should have been split between two fascicles, especially given that it constitutes a single *Samyukta* (the *Mahākāśyapa-samyukta*) and that its counterpart in BZA/16 is not split in this way.

The above observations amount to saying that it would be more natural if fascicles [13] and [14] were together as a single fascicle. This being the case, let us observe the effect of experimentally moving sūtras 111-117 out of fascicle [13] and uniting them with sūtras 118-121 in fascicle [14]. This gives fascicle [14] (*Mahākāśyapa-samyukta*) much the same size and structure as the nearby fascicles [12] (*Yakṣa-samyukta*) and [15] (*Grāmaṇī-samyukta*), but it results in an empty fascicle [13]. Now, the spot immediately after fascicle [12] is where *Vana-samyukta* properly belongs, as Anesaki recognized (1908, 74). This anomaly in the current

27 There is a partly similar case in BZA/16, namely the sharing of sūtras 101-110 (*Brahmā-samyukta*) between fascicles (5) and (6). Sugi transcribed these ten sūtras from the Qidan edition, which, being an instance of BZA/20, would have had them together in fascicle [6]. Sugi does not explain why he split this decade; cf. note 19, above.

location of *Vana-saṃyukta* can now be seen to correlate with the anomaly observed in fascicles [13] and [14]. Taken together, these two anomalies point to the following interpretation. Formerly, *Vana-saṃyukta* occupied fascicle [13], and the entire *Mahākāśyapa-saṃyukta* (sūtras 111-121) occupied fascicle [14]; that is, both the *Sagātha-* and *Buddhabhāṣita-vargas* were intact. Later, *Vana-saṃyukta* was mistakenly moved to the end of the collection, where it was re-labeled as fascicle [20]; and the resulting gap left between fascicles [12] and [14] was filled – perhaps consciously, perhaps unconsciously – by transferring part of the contents of fascicle [14] (namely, sūtras 111-118) upward to form a substitute fascicle [13].

The *uddānas* also help to clarify the only other anomaly in BZA/20, its lack of a block of eleven sūtras belonging to *Brāhmaṇa-saṃyukta*, namely nos. 258-268 (Table 2, fascicle (13)). This block of sūtras is problematic in BZA/16 also, in that it is located far from the remainder of *Brāhmaṇa-saṃyukta* (i.e., from sūtras 74-100 in fascicles (4) and (5)). Of the eleven sūtras the first ten, nos. 258-267, are listed in the *uddāna* following no. 267, which *uddāna* is naturally lacking in BZA/20. However, the eleventh sūtra, no. 268, called 旃陀 “*Caṇḍāla*,” is anomalously listed at the beginning of the *uddāna* that follows sūtra no. 100 (T 100, 409c29) and this *uddāna* does survive in BZA/20 (Table 1, fascicle [5]). The ten sūtras listed in it are nos. 268, 92-100. This tells us that sūtras 258-268 from *Brāhmaṇa-saṃyukta*, which are misplaced in BZA/16 and missing from BZA/20, properly belong between sūtras 91 and 92. That is to say, *Brāhmaṇa-saṃyukta* formerly had the following composition: 74-83 # ; 84-91 ø ; 258-267 # ; 268, 92-100 #.

The above examination of *uddānas* has clarified several of the discrepancies between the two versions of BZA; however, many more discrepancies remain to be accounted for. To deal with them we now turn to comparison with ZA, which is the principal technique employed by Anesaki (1908).

Comparison with ZA (T 99)

Anesaki presents his findings in an extensive table (1908, 71-138), which lists the sūtras of ZA together with their parallels, if any, in his proposed ancestral BZA. The comparison is complicated by the fact, mentioned earlier, that ZA is itself in disorder. Of the fifty fascicles that make up the present ZA, two (nos. 23 and 25) actually belong to an unrelated text (*Aśokāvadāna*), apparently having been used to fill gaps created when two of the original ZA fascicles were lost. In addition, thirteen fascicles (including one of the two supplied from *Aśokāvadāna*) have undergone a musical chairs type of rearrangement. The inferred original sequence of the fifty ZA fascicles, as initially proposed by Anesaki and refined by a succession of later researchers, is now widely accepted.²⁸ In this restored ZA sequence, the fascicles

28 In the Foguang Dazangjing (1983) the restored fascicle sequence of ZA is adopted and the sūtras are re-numbered accordingly. (BZA is not in the Foguang edition of the *Āgamas*, which

representing the two *vargas* that make up BZA are the following (ZA differs from BZA in locating *Sagātha-varga* after *Buddhabhāṣita-varga* rather than before it):

First half of *Buddhabhāṣita-varga*: *41, 32, 33, 34

Entire *Sagātha-varga*: 38, 39, 40, *46, 42, *4, 44, 45, *36, *22, 48, 49, 50.

The asterisks highlight those fascicles whose transposition brought about the present disorder. For example, the present fascicle *46 properly belongs between fascicles 40 and 42, while the spot immediately after fascicle 45 belongs not to fascicle *46 but rather to fascicle *36.

The most direct evidence for these movements of fascicles within ZA comes from the distribution of the *Samyuktas* in the existing text. This can be illustrated by the case of *Vaṅgīsa-samyukta*, shown in Table 3. Sixteen sūtras of ZA can be identified as constituting *Vaṅgīsa-samyukta*; fourteen of them make up the second half of fascicle 45, while the remaining two are located at the beginning of fascicle *36. This suggests that fascicle *36 properly belongs immediately after fascicle 45.

Support for this proposition emerges when the relevant ZA sūtras are lined up with their parallels in BZA (Table 3). The ZA numbers for the last four sūtras of *Vaṅgīsa-samyukta* run 1220, 1221, 0993, 0994. Here there is a jump from sūtra 1221 located at the end of fascicle 45, to sūtra 0993 located at the beginning of fascicle *36; however, the numbers of the corresponding BZA sūtras run 254, 255, 256, 257, with no such discontinuity. The natural conclusion is that the ZA fascicle that now bears the number *36 formerly bore the number *46; this fascicle must have moved from its original position after fascicle 45 to a new position after fascicle 35, and consequently acquired the new number *36.

The converse principle also applies. For example, in BZA/20 the sequence of sūtra numbers within *Vaṅgīsa-samyukta* includes a segment that runs 229, 230, 250, 251, with a jump from 230 to 250 – as noted above in the relevant BZA *uddāna*. Yet the numbers of the corresponding ZA sūtras run, 1213, 1214, 1215, 1216, with no discontinuity; that is, BZA/20 matches up neatly with ZA while BZA/16 does not.²⁹

In these ways BZA/20 facilitates and confirms the reconstruction of the original ZA sequence; and the reconstructed ZA sequence demonstrates that BZA/20 comes close to

currently covers only the four complete *Āgamas*.) On the reconstruction and its evolution, see Glass (2007, 39-42).

29 Table 3 also shows that BZA 257, 132 = ZA 0994, 0995, which again conforms with BZA/20 rather than with BZA/16. The gap between BZA 253 and 254 suggests that a sūtra has been lost here. The *uddāna* confirms this: between the titles for 253 and 254 it lists an additional title, 龍脅 “Dragon flank” (T 100, 463c24), which clearly corresponds to the name 那伽山側 “Nāga mountain side” in ZA 1219 (T 99, 332b5-6). Cf. Choong (2007, 37), Table 1.

preserving the ancestral BZA arrangement.³⁰ Near-perfect correspondence within *Sagāthavarga* and *Buddhabhāṣita-varga* is achieved if one makes just the two adjustments to BZA/20 already identified: moving *Vana-samyukta* and reinstating sūtras 258-268 from *Brāhmaṇa-samyukta*.

The demonstrable fact that one quarter of the fascicles of ZA have undergone accidental disarrangement supports the proposition that some similar process underlies BZA/16. In the case of ZA the original arrangement was completely lost and researchers faced the task of reconstructing it; in the case of BZA, however, the ancestral form is largely preserved in BZA/20, and our task is to explain the process of disarrangement that produced the other version, BZA/16. For background to this latter task, we now look briefly at the principal features of the process of disarrangement underlying ZA.

It has first to be noted that the sūtra numbers in ZA—as also in BZA/16—are an innovation introduced by modern editors. In earlier times, with no sūtra numbers, the sequence of the fifty ZA fascicles was preserved only by the numbers on the fascicles themselves. That this function was not achieved in thirteen of the fifty ZA fascicles indicates that those fascicles had lost their numbers. The number of a fascicle is located at its beginning and, in the case of the folded scroll format 折本 and sewn booklet format 冊子本, often also at its end. Since these are the very parts of the fascicle that are most exposed to wear and tear, it is not surprising that loss of fascicle numbers should have been so common. Once several fascicles of a multi-fascicle text had lost their numbers, they would have been in danger of being accidentally interchanged. In the case of ZA it is evident that the unnumbered fascicles, after being accidentally transposed, were given new numbers in accordance with their new positions—a step that would have consolidated the new arrangement. Such changes would have been particularly likely to occur in multi-fascicle works during the period before large-scale printing (before the tenth century); with few copies of the *Āgama* texts in existence, there would have been little opportunity for cross-checking between different copies.

The process of transposition within ZA was such that each of the thirteen fascicles in question moved into the space vacated by another of the thirteen, while the remaining thirty-seven fascicles remained fixed. This is what I have called the “musical chairs” movement.³¹ The following is a shorthand representation of a few such movements, from the section of ZA that corresponds to BZA (listed above): *41 > *46 > *36. These are the present fascicle numbers. The meaning is: “The fascicle that was originally numbered 41 moved into the spot previously occupied by fascicle 46 and thus acquired the new number *46. The fascicle that was originally numbered 46 moved into the spot previously occupied by fascicle 36 and thus acquired the new number *36.” This concatenating movement is circular, coming back, after

30 There is no circularity of argument here because the points of discontinuity in the two texts usually do not coincide.

31 The comparison is not entirely appropriate, there being only an imperfect correspondence with what happens in the old game of musical chairs.

seven such transpositions, to fascicle *41, its arbitrarily chosen starting point. In the entire ZA one can discern three such circular patterns of movement, namely:

*41 > *46 > *36 > *47 > *22 > *[23] > *31 > *41

*4 > *2 > *10 > *43 > *4

*12 > *13 > *12

These facts established, attention can now turn to the task of discovering how BZA/16 could have developed.

Derivation of the Sixteen-fascicle Version of BZA

As noted above, the structure of BZA/16 is broadly characterized by having the second half of *Sagātha-varga* (S-7 to S-12) separated from the first half (S-1 to S-6), with *Buddhabhāṣita-varga* located between them. Let us examine this broad feature first, and then turn to more detailed features.

It is as if the *Sagātha-varga* of the ancestral BZA had been split in two and its second half moved down below *Buddhabhāṣita-varga*. In terms of the Taishō numbering, the split appears to be located after sūtra no. 110, at the end of *Brahmā-saṃyukta* (S-6). However, as noted earlier, the entire *Brahmā-saṃyukta* was missing in the Kaibao and National editions. This means that the defective version of BZA/16 preserved in those two editions lacked a substantial section of text at the very point where the split evidently occurred. It follows that the derivation of BZA/16 entailed not just a split in the manuscript after sūtra 110 but actual loss of the section that contained sūtras 101 to 110.

Given this clear evidence that the precursor to the present BZA/16 did become broken into two parts at the point in question, let us now examine the further proposition that the second of these two parts was moved away from the first and relocated after *Buddhabhāṣita-varga*. As already seen from the well-researched case of ZA, the existence of fascicle numbers did not necessarily prevent accidental transposition of fascicles within a Chinese *Āgama*; fascicle numbers were easily lost and re-assigned. However, the case of BZA/16 is significantly different. Whereas in ZA the transposed fascicles amount to about one quarter of the total (thirteen out of fifty) and are scattered throughout the text, in BZA/16 the purportedly transposed fascicles represent almost two thirds of the total (ten out of sixteen) and they are all located together in the lower part of the text (fascicles 7-16). Such a concentrated and large-scale loss of fascicle numbers seems unlikely.

Here it is relevant to look more closely at the BZA fascicle numbering system. As noted earlier, the heading to each fascicle includes not only the number of the fascicle 卷 but also, in several cases, the number of the *varga* 誦. The *varga* number series is incomplete, as can

be seen in Tables 1 and 3. The label 初誦 “First *varga*” is found on just the first five fascicles in both versions; the label 二誦 “Second *varga*” is found on the next two fascicles of BZA/16 only, being located part-way through fascicle (6) and again at the beginning of fascicle (7). We earlier drew the natural conclusion that these labels are vestiges of a formerly complete labeling system that recognized the grouping of the *Samyuktas* into *Sagātha-varga* (First *varga*) and *Buddhabhāṣita-varga* (Second *varga*).

Of interest here is the detailed format of these headings. It is slightly different in the two versions. In BZA/20 the headings read 初誦卷第一 “First *varga*, fascicle no. 1” and so on down to 初誦卷第五 “First *varga*, fascicle no. 5”; and subsequent headings read simply 卷第六 “Fascicle no. 6” and so on (T 100, 374, notes 2,4; 381, notes 6,9; etc.). In BZA/16 the format is a little more complicated. 卷第一 “Fascicle no. 1” in the first line of the fascicle is followed, in the third line, by 初誦第一 “First *varga* no. 1” (T 100, 374a3,5), and this pattern is maintained down to 卷第五 ... 初誦第五 “Fascicle no. 5 ... First *varga* no. 5” (T 100, 403a5,7). The next heading is 卷第六 “Fascicle no. 6” located at the beginning of fascicle (6), i.e. immediately before sūtra 107 (at T 100, 412a3), while 二誦第一 “Second *varga* no. 1” is located part-way through fascicle (6), immediately before sūtra 111 (at T 100, 414a17),³² and finally, 卷第七 ... 二誦第二 “Fascicle no. 7 ... Second *varga* no. 2” is located in the first and third lines of fascicle (7) (at T 100, 420a3,5). Subsequent fascicles have only the heading in the first line: 卷第八 “Fascicle no. 8” and so on, down to “Fascicle no. 16.”

BZA/16, therefore, incorporates two separate numbering systems. Alongside a simple numbering of the sixteen fascicles from (1) to (16) there exists another system in which the numbering of the fascicles begins from “no. 1” in First *varga* and then begins again from “no. 1” in Second *varga*. The latter, *varga*-based system is likely to be historically the earlier, since it is now very incomplete, a feature suggestive of long disuse. The simple (1)-to-(16) numbering system, being intact and fully functional, is likely to be an innovation that superseded the old system.

Despite the incompleteness of the corresponding data from BZA/20, it is clear that this *varga*-based system will have existed in the common ancestor from which BZA/20 and BZA/16 diverged. In presenting this common ancestor, Anesaki (1908) does not discuss the issue of fascicle numbering; however, the evidence cited above indicates that in the ancestral version the numbering of the fascicles would have followed the old system: it began from “no. 1” in each of the two *vargas*. The subsequent abandoning of this system in favor of the one that operates in the two existing BZA versions was no doubt linked to the very evident large-scale loss of the “First *varga*” and “Second *varga*” labels. That the new system manifests in two different varieties would have been a natural consequence of the development of the text

32 This separation of the two headings for fascicle 6 is an artefact of Sugi’s insertion of sūtras 107-110 (the latter part of *Brahmā-samyukta*) at this point. More natural would have been to insert them one line further down, thereby keeping the two headings together. In the original Jin edition, which lacks *Brahmā-samyukta*, the two headings are together before sūtra 111 (see table at Zhanghui 2006, 191).

itself into two different versions following the accidental rearrangement of its contents. Our immediate task is to see what these findings about the numbering of the fascicles may tell us about the large-scale rearrangement witnessed in BZA/16.

The starting point is the inferred nearest common ancestor of the two extant BZA versions. This is shown in Table 4. The structure is as originally proposed by Anesaki and confirmed in the analysis of BZA/20 (Table 1) presented earlier in this paper.³³

To this structure we now add the old *varga*-based system for numbering the fascicles. For the *varga* labels, the more complete of the two existing versions, that preserved in BZA/16, is shown in Table 4. Probably a *varga* label appeared on every fascicle in the original BZA. However, what Table 4 purports to show is not the *original* BZA (the text as it was shortly after the Chinese translation was completed); rather, it is the *nearest common ancestor* of the two extant versions, an early but already defective descendant of that original. Regarding the fascicle numbers, those for First *varga*, shown in Table 4 as running from 1 to 13, are identical with their counterparts in the new system, that is [1] to [13]; those in Second *varga*, however, run from 1 to 6.³⁴

As to the physical form of this common ancestor, it is likely that the nineteen handwritten fascicles were self-contained units (for example, individual folded scrolls), whose proper sequence was preserved only by their *varga* and fascicle numbers. With a *varga*-based numbering system and many of the *varga* numbers missing, conditions were right for disarrangement to occur.

In the process of disarrangement whereby the common ancestor developed into BZA/16, the loss of *Brahmā-samyukta* clearly would have been a crucial trigger-point. Its immediate effect was to reduce fascicle 6 of *Sagātha-varga* to half its former size. The surviving half-fascicle, containing just *Bhikṣuṇī-samyukta*, now lacked the initial heading “No. 6,” though this number was probably preserved on its last page.

In the resulting defective BZA manuscript the fascicles now fell naturally into three groups, groups that would have remained clearly evident to its users even if the fascicle sequence were accidentally disrupted. One of these three groups comprised fascicles numbered from 1 to 5, each of which was also labeled “First *varga*.” A second group comprised fascicles numbered 1 to 6, of which the first two were also labeled “Second *varga*.” And a third group comprised fascicles numbered 7 to 13, plus the half-fascicle 6, none of which had a *varga* number. For the custodians of the damaged and incompletely labeled manuscript this third group evidently posed a problem: did it belong with the first group or with the second? In

33 To reiterate, the reconstruction of the common ancestor involves reversing the changes that yielded BZA/20; that is: reuniting the two halves of *Mahākāśyapa-samyukta* in fascicle [14]; returning *Vana-samyukta* to fascicle [13]; and restoring the missing sūtras 258-268 of *Brāhmaṇa-samyukta* in fascicle [5].

34 The inferred fascicle numbers of the common ancestor are here written without enclosing brackets; e.g., “6” as opposed to “[6]” or “(6).” The sūtra numbers shown in Table 4, being unique to the modern Taishō edition, are included only to identify the content.

fact it belonged with the first, but it is evident that they mistakenly took it as belonging with the second, thereby inadvertently transferring the latter half of *Sagātha-varga* to the end of *Buddhabhāṣita-varga*.

This mistake is understandable. To begin with, the fact that the third group resembled the first group in having gāthās (verses) would not have been visually apparent because, unlike later printed editions, early manuscripts usually did not set verse apart from prose; the lines of written characters simply ran on uninterrupted, without even gaps between sentences. Again, the half-fascicle 6 of the third group would have looked like a continuation of the clearly identified fascicle 6 of the second group. Uniting the third group with the second would yield an unbroken series of fascicle headings, from “No. 1” to “No. 13.” This superficially desirable outcome would not be achieved if the third group were united with the first, since the series would then lack the heading, “No. 6”. At a deeper level, however, the outcome was unsatisfactory. What was actually the second half of First *varga* was now presented as the second half of Second *varga*.

Having discussed the largest and most obvious transposition witnessed in BZA/16, let us turn now to the smaller ones.

Conspicuous among the discrepancies in BZA/16 (Table 2) is the fragmentation of *Devatā-saṃyukta* into four pieces. Comparison with BZA/20 and ZA indicates that one of these four pieces, comprising sūtras 269-297, has remained in its original location, adjacent to *Devaputra-saṃyukta* in *Sagātha-varga*, while the other three pieces, comprising sūtras 132-142, 213-249, and 161-189, have been moved.

One of the three transposed *Devatā* pieces, comprising sūtras 161-189 and labeled as fascicle (9) in BZA/16, is now located within *Buddhabhāṣita-varga*; it is in a spot (between B-4 and B-6) that properly belongs to *Anamatāgra-saṃyukta* (B-5) (Table 2). *Anamatāgra-saṃyukta*, in its turn, is currently located within the lower half of *Sagātha-varga* near the end of the text; clearly, it too has moved. That is, the *Devatā* piece in question (sūtras 161-189) has moved into the gap created by the departure of *Anamatāgra-saṃyukta*, as shown in Table 5. This double transposition of textual material partly resembles the musical chairs movement identified in ZA, whereby one block of text moves into the gap created by the movement of another block.

Another of the three transposed *Devatā* pieces, sūtras 231-249, moved up a short distance to insert itself between sūtras 230 and 250 of *Vaṅgīsa*, thereby splitting that *Saṃyukta* in two. And the third piece, sūtras 132-142, moved in between *Grāmaṇī-* and *Aśva-saṃyuktas*. In neither of these last two cases did the arriving block take the place of a departing block. Something resembling the musical chairs movement did, nevertheless, occur, in that the departure of the three formerly contiguous *Devatā* pieces was partly compensated for by the arrival of the above-mentioned block of eleven sūtras (258-268) from *Brāhmaṇa-saṃyukta*.

Within the developing BZA/16, therefore, a total of five pieces of text changed position, over and above the large-scale movement of the second half of *Sagātha-varga* already discussed. This is portrayed in Table 5. The sūtra layout shown there supposes that the large-scale

transposition has already occurred: the second half of *Sagātha-varga* (S-7 to S-12) is shown in its new position below *Buddhabhāṣita-varga* (B-1 to B-7). The five pieces involved in the small-scale movements are shown (boxed) in the positions they occupied before moving, and their transpositions are indicated by the arrows. The likely relative chronology of these different movements is difficult to discern. Table 5 is, therefore, a non-diachronic representation.³⁵

The old *varga*-based system of fascicle numbers, while making possible the large-scale transposition discussed earlier, ought to have impeded small-scale transpositions of the sort just discussed. One must ask, then, why it failed to prevent the movement of the five pieces of text in question. For two of the five pieces, namely the block of eleven sūtras from *Brāhmaṇa-samyukta* (nos. 258-268) and the second of the three pieces from *Devatā-samyukta* (231-249), the answer is simple. In these two cases the piece that moved was neither an entire fascicle nor located at the beginning of a fascicle, so is likely to have borne no fascicle number. Since, in addition, each of these two unnumbered pieces attached itself, after the transposition, to the end of an existing fascicle and merged with it, its movement was in no way constrained by fascicle numbers. The remaining three transposed pieces were either entire fascicles (161-189 and 330-350) or the beginning of a fascicle (132-142), so ought to have had fascicle numbers (9, 4, and 8 respectively in the old system; see Table 4). For these three cases the precedent provided by ZA suggests that the fascicle numbers may have simply become lost, thereby rendering the pieces of text liable to be accidentally moved.

These large- and small-scale transpositions were accompanied by some minor movements in the fascicle boundaries, which reduced the number of fascicles from nineteen to sixteen.³⁶ It was probably at this juncture that the new set of fascicle numbers, running from (1) to (16), was introduced. This would have served to inhibit any further changes and thus consolidate the new arrangement.

In contrast to the complexity of BZA/16, the derivation of BZA/20 from the ancestral form involved just the three changes already identified. The loss of the block of eleven sūtras 258-268 from *Brāhmaṇa-samyukta* will have happened very early, as no trace of its former presence remains in the existing system of fascicle numbers. On the other hand, the transfer of *Vana-samyukta* from the end of *Sagātha-varga* to the end of *Buddhabhāṣita-varga* and the consequent adjustment involving *Mahākāśyapa-samyukta* probably happened *after* the introduction of the new numbering system; otherwise there would have been no perceived need to compensate for

35 Some tentative suggestions are possible regarding the transposition of sūtras 258-268. This event in BZA/16 seems likely related to the loss of the same block of sūtras in BZA/20. Perhaps this block had become detached within an early BZA manuscript before the divergence into two versions. In the BZA/20 trajectory it became lost, while in BZA/16 it was re-attached to the manuscript but at the wrong place. In that case the movement of this block within BZA/16 may be the only small-scale transposition to have preceded the large-scale transposition.

36 For example, in the common ancestor *Anamatāgra*- and *Vana-samyuktas* were two separate fascicles, some distance apart (Table 4); then, after *Anamatāgra*'s transfer to the position next to *Vana* (Table 5), they merged as a single larger fascicle (Table 2).

the disappearance of fascicle 13. The new system – with fascicle numbers running from [1] to [19] – followed closely the pattern of the old one. The only change consisted in increasing by thirteen each of the six fascicle numbers in *Buddhabhāṣita varga*: “1” became “[14]” and so on. Whether the introduction of a new numbering system happened independently in the two versions of BZA, or was due to mutual influence is difficult to judge.

Conclusion

The above analysis has offered an explanation for the existing differences between BZA/20 and BZA/16. The lack of hard data from the period of the inferred common ancestor – for example, relevant manuscript remains – means that the explanation is to some extent hypothetical. Nevertheless, the analysis has gone some way toward revealing how the two versions of BZA developed.

Regarding the processes of rearrangement, it has been found that the case of BZA differs significantly from that of ZA. In ZA the units that move are always entire individual fascicles and consequently are of nearly uniform size. In BZA the units that move range in size from a block of eight entire fascicles down to parts of fascicles containing little more than a single decade of sūtras.³⁷ Again, in ZA the transposition of fascicles always follows the musical chairs principle: the movement of a fascicle into a certain spot is accompanied by the movement of another fascicle out of that same spot, while the adjacent fascicles remain undisturbed. In BZA this kind of movement is rare among the small-scale transpositions;³⁸ more often the movement of a piece of text into a certain spot is achieved by pushing in between two previously adjacent pieces of text, sometimes thereby splitting an existing fascicle.³⁹

At the the same time, the development of BZA does share one important feature in common with that of ZA. In both cases the movement of pieces of text takes no account of the grouping of the sūtras into *Samyuktas* and the grouping of the *Samyuktas* into *vargas*. (Even in the generally well-preserved BZA/20, *Vana-samyukta* moved from one *varga* to the other.) The principles underlying the *Samyuktāgama* structure appear to have been lost sight of. Had the custodians of these texts been more conscious of the grouping into *Samyuktas*, the accidental disarrangements undergone by BZA and ZA might have been avoided.

In the case of BZA, one custodian of the texts seems particularly at fault on this score, namely Sugi, the chief editor of the second Korean edition. Obligated to choose between the two

37 In T 150A even more irregular fragmentation preceded the transpositions, with a break sometimes occurring within a sūtra. See Harrison (1997, 262-3).

38 The only true example is the movement of 161-189 into the spot vacated by 330-350 in BZA/16.

39 In BZA/16, the insertion of 330-50 between 329 and 351 (i.e., between two fascicles); or of 231-249 between 230 and 250 (thereby splitting a fascicle and a decade).

BZA versions, Sugi for some reason preferred the confused BZA/16 over the orderly BZA/20.⁴⁰ As is convincingly demonstrated by Buswell (2004) with many cogent examples from Sugi's *Supplementary Record*, the Korean chief editor was a highly competent practitioner of the art of textual criticism. Overall, his editorial decisions were based on thoroughly sound principles. Yet in the case of BZA Sugi clearly made the wrong choice, opting for the version preserved in the Kaibao and National editions rather than that in the Qidan.⁴¹ One can only assume that this otherwise highly competent Tripiṭaka master failed to see the order in BZA/20 and the disorder in BZA/16. Like many before him, he appears to have been barely conscious of the underlying grouping into *Samyuktas*. Sugi's notes on BZA indicate that he compared both versions with ZA (which he calls 大本雜阿含 "the big edition of *Samyuktāgama*"; T 100, 411c24-25). Yet such comparison failed to alert him to the confused arrangement of BZA/16, perhaps because ZA was equally confused.

While Sugi's decision ensured the continuing dominance of BZA/16 in Korea, back in Song China BZA/20 soon gained the ascendancy. Whether in a revision of the Kaibao edition or perhaps in the editing for its early successors, BZA/20 ousted BZA/16. It remained the only accepted version until BZA/16 returned to China from Japan in the early twentieth century.

The current pre-eminence of the Taishō edition ensures that BZA/16 is by far the better known and more accessible of the two versions. Yet the text-critical considerations highlighted in the present study amount to a good case for reinstating BZA/20 as the received text – or, even better, resurrecting the inferred ancestral version of this important sūtra collection.⁴²

40 In each version a section of text was lacking: sūtras 258-268 in BZA/20, sūtras 101-110 in BZA/16. Therefore, degree of completeness was not an issue in choosing between the two versions.

41 This choice is the more puzzling in light of Buswell's finding (2004, 141-143) that Sugi generally considered the Qidan edition by far the most reliable of his three sources.

42 Just as this article was going to press, I was advised of a significant difference between the Jin and second Korean editions. Though otherwise identical with BZA/16 prior to the reinstatement of *Brahmā-samyukta*, the version in the Jin edition locates the block of sūtras 132-142 between sūtras 257 and 258, in fascicle (13) rather than in fascicle (8). (See Table 2 and Zhonghua edition, BZA, fascicles (8) and (13).) That is, this block, which is the beginning portion of *Devatā-samyukta*, comes immediately after *Vaṅgīsa-samyukta*, as in BZA/20 (Table 1). In terms of Table 5, the first of the three boxed portions of *Devatā-samyukta* is not transposed. Sūtras 258-268 from *Brāhmaṇa-samyukta* have moved in below it, i.e. into the space formerly occupied by the second and third portions (231-249, 161-189). This indicates that the transposition of sūtras 132-142 was historically the last of those shown in Table 5. It also raises questions about the identity of the source text used for the Jin edition. I am grateful to Ken Su, who made this last-minute discovery and kindly passed it on to me.

Table 1: *Samyuktas* and *sūtras* of twenty-fascicle version

<i>Varga</i>	Fascicle	<i>Sūtras</i>	<i>Samyukta</i>
1st.	[1]	1-11 # 12-22 #	S-1. <i>Bhikṣu</i> "
1st.	[2]	23-32 # 33-42 #	S-2. <i>Māra</i> S-3. <i>Śakra</i>
1st.	[3]	43-52 # 53-62 #	" S-4. <i>Kosala</i>
1st.	[4]	63-73 # 74-83 #	" S-5. <i>Brāhmaṇa</i>
1st.	[5]	84-91 ø 92-100 #	" "
	[6]	101-110 ø 214-223 #	S-6. <i>Brahmā</i> S-7. <i>Bhikṣuṇī</i>
	[7]	224-230, 250-251 # 252-257 #	S-8. <i>Vaṅgīsa</i> "
	[8]	132-141 # 142, 231-239 ø 240-249 #	S-9. <i>Devatā</i> " "
	[9]	161-169 ø 170-180 # 181-189 #	" " "
	[10]	269-277 ø 278-287 #	" "
	[11]	288-297 # 298-307 # 308-317 #	" S-10. <i>Devaputra</i> "
	[12]	318-329 #	S-11. <i>Yakṣa</i>
	[13]	111-117~	B-1. <i>Mahākāśyapa</i>
	[14]	~118-121 #	"
	[15]	122-131 #	B-2. <i>Grāmaṇī</i>
	[16]	143-151 # 152-160 #	B-3. <i>Aśva</i> B-4. <i>Mahānāma</i>
	[17]	330-340 # 341-350 #	B-5. <i>Anamatāgra</i> "
	[18]	190-198 #	B-6. <i>Avyākṛta</i>
	[19]	199-213 #	B-7. <i>Pravrājaka</i>
	[20]	351-359 # 360-364 ø	S-12. <i>Vana</i> "

Table 2: *Samyuktas* and *sūtras* of sixteen-fascicle version

<i>Varga</i>	Fascicle	<i>Sūtras</i>	<i>Samyukta</i>
1st.	(1)	1-11 # 12-22 #	S-1. <i>Bhikṣu</i> "
1st.	(2)	23-32 # 33-42 #	S-2. <i>Māra</i> S-3. <i>Śakra</i>
1st.	(3)	43-52 # 53-62 #	" S-4. <i>Kosala</i>
1st.	(4)	63-73 # 74-83 #	" S-5. <i>Brāhmaṇa~</i>
1st.	(5)	84-91 ø 92-100 # 101-106~	" " S-6. <i>Brahmā</i>
	(6)	~107-110 ø 111-121#	" B-1. <i>Mahākāśyapa</i>
2nd.	(7)	122-131 #	B-2. <i>Grāmaṇī</i>
2nd.	(8)	132-141 #, 142 143-151 # 152-160 #	S-9. <i>Devatā~</i> B-3. <i>Aśva</i> B-4. <i>Mahānāma</i>
	(9)	161-169 ø 170-180 # 181-189 #	S-9. <i>~Devatā~</i> " "
	(10)	190-198 #	B-6. <i>Avyākṛta</i>
	(11)	199-213 #	B-7. <i>Pravrājaka</i>
	(12)	214-223 # 224-230~ 231-239 ø 240-249 #	S-7. <i>Bhikṣuṇī</i> S-8. <i>Vaṅgīsa~</i> S-9. <i>~Devatā~</i> "
	(13)	~250-251 # 252-257 # 258-267 # 268	S-8. <i>~Vaṅgīsa</i> " S-5. <i>~Brāhmaṇa</i> "
	(14)	269-277 ø 278-287 # 288-297 #	S-9. <i>~Devatā</i> " "
	(15)	298-307 # 308-317 # 318-329 #	S-10. <i>Devaputra</i> " S-11. <i>Yakṣa</i>
	(16)	330-340 # 341-350 #	B-5. <i>Anamatāgra</i> "

351-359 # S-12. *Vana*
 360-364 ø "

Table 3: Sample Comparison of ZA and BZA.

	ZA		BZA
<i>Samyukta</i>		sūtra	sūtra
<i>Bhikṣuṇī</i>	45	1198	214
		1199	215
		1200	216
		1201	217
		1202	218
		1203	219
		1204	220
		1205	221
		1206	222
		1207	223
<i>Vaṅḡsa</i>		1208	224
		1209	225
		1210	226
		1211	227
		1212	228
		1213	229
		1214	230
		1215	250
		1216	251
		1217	252
		1218	253
		1219	
		1220	254
		1221	255
	*36	0993	256
		0994	257
<i>Devatā</i>		0995	132
		0996	133
		0997	134
		0998	135
		0999	136
		1000	137

Table 4: Inferred Nearest Common Ancestor,
With Old Fascicle Numbers

<i>Varga</i>	Fascicle <i>Old</i>	Sūtras <i>New</i>	<i>Samyukta</i>
1st.	1	[1]	1-11 # S-1. <i>Bhikṣu</i> 12-22 # "
1st.	2	[2]	23-32 # S-2. <i>Māra</i> 33-42 # S-3. <i>Śakra</i>
1st.	3	[3]	43-52 # " 53-62 # S-4. <i>Kosala</i>
1st.	4	[4]	63-73 # " 74-83 # S-5. <i>Brāhmaṇa</i>
1st.	5	[5]	84-91 ø " 258-267 # " 268, 92-100 # "
	6	[6]	101-110 ø S-6. <i>Brahmā</i> 214-223 # S-7. <i>Bhikṣuṇī</i>
	7	[7]	224-230, 250-251 # S-8. <i>Vaṅgīsa</i> 252-257 # "
	8	[8]	132-141 # S-9. <i>Devatā</i> 142, 231-239 ø " 240-249 # "
	9	[9]	161-169 ø " 170-180 # " 181-189 # "
	10	[10]	269-277 ø " 278-287 # "
	11	[11]	288-297 # " 298-307 # S-10. <i>Devaputra</i> 308-317 # "
	12	[12]	318-329 # S-11. <i>Yakṣa</i>
	13	[13]	351-359 # S-12. <i>Vana</i> 360-364 ø "
2nd.	1	[14]	111-121 # B-1. <i>Mahākāśyapa</i>
2nd.	2	[15]	122-131 # B-2. <i>Grāmaṇī</i>
	3	[16]	143-151 # B-3. <i>Aśva</i> 152-160 # B-4. <i>Mahānāma</i>

4	[17]	330-340 # B-5. <i>Anamatāgra</i>
		341-350 # "
5	[18]	190-198 # B-6. <i>Avyākṛta</i>
6	[19]	199-213 # B-7. <i>Pravrājaka</i>

Table 5: Inferred Transpositions Witnessed in BZA/16

1-11 #	S-1. <i>Bhikṣu</i>	
12-22 #		"
23-32 #	S-2. <i>Māra</i>	
33-42 #	S-3. <i>Śakra</i>	
43-52 #		"
53-62 #	S-4. <i>Kosala</i>	
63-73 #		"
74-83 #	S-5. <i>Brāhmaṇa</i>	
84-91 ø		"
258-267 #		
268~		
~92-100 #		"
[101- 110 ø	S-6. <i>Brahmā</i>]	
111-121 #	B-1. <i>Kāśyapa</i>	
122-131 #	B-2. <i>Grāmaṇī</i>	
143-151 #	B-3. <i>Aśva</i>	
152-160 #	B-4. <i>Mahānāma</i>	
330-340 #		
341-350 #		
B-5. <i>Anamatāgra</i>		
"		
190-198 #	B-6. <i>Avyākṛta</i>	
199-213 #	B-7. <i>Pravrājaka</i>	
214-223 #	S-7. <i>Bhikṣuṇī</i>	
224-230~	S-8. <i>Vaṅgīsa</i>	
~250-251 #		"
252-257 #		"
132-141 #		
142~		
S-9. <i>Devatā</i>		
"		

The diagram consists of several boxes and arrows. On the left, a vertical line has arrows pointing to the right towards the boxes for sections 258-267, 330-340, and 132-141. On the right, a vertical line has arrows pointing to the left towards the boxes for sections 258-267, 330-340, and 132-141. This indicates a relationship or transposition between these sections and the main body of text.

~231-239 ø		"
240-249 #		"
161-169 ø		"
170-180 #		"
181-189 #		"
269-277 ø		"
278-287 #		"
288-297 #		"
298-307 #	S-10. <i>Devaputra</i>	"
308-317 #		"
318-329 #	S-11. <i>Yakṣa</i>	"
351-359 #	S-12. <i>Vana</i>	"
360-364 ø		"

Abbreviations and Sigla

BZA	<i>Bieyi za ahan jing</i> 別譯雜阿含經
BZA/16	Sixteen-fascicle version of BZA
BZA/20	Twenty-fascicle version of BZA
K	Second Korean Edition of the Canon 高麗大藏經
T	Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō 大正新修大藏經
ZA	<i>Za ahan jing</i> 雜阿含經
#	Indicates the presence of an <i>uddāna</i> (summary verse)
∅	Indicates the absence of an expected <i>uddāna</i>
~	Indicates a break within a decade or a <i>Samyukta</i>

References

- Anesaki, Masaharu. 1908. The Four Buddhist *Āgamas* in Chinese. *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan* 35(3):1-149.
- 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* 4:215-43.
- Bingenheimer, Marcus. 2006. The Shorter Chinese *Samyukta Āgama*—Preliminary Findings and Translation of Fascicle 1 of the *Bieyi Za Ahan Jing* 別譯雜阿含經 (T 100). *Buddhist Studies Review* 23(1):21-60.
- Bodhi, Bhikkhu. 2000. *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha: A New Translation of the Samyutta Nikāya*. Boston: Wisdom.
- Bucknell, Roderick S. 2007. The Structure of the *Sagātha-vagga* of the *Samyutta-nikāya*. *Buddhist Studies Review* 24(1):7-34.
- Buswell, Robert E. 2004. Sugi's *Collation Notes* to the Koryō Buddhist Canon and Their Significance for Buddhist Textual Criticism. *The Journal of Korean Studies* 9(1/Fall):129-84.
- Cai Yunchen 蔡運辰. 1983. *Ershiwu zhong zangjing mulu duizhao kaoshi* 二十五種藏經目錄對照考釋 [Comparative tables of twenty-five different editions of the Chinese Buddhist Canon]. Taipei: Xinwenfeng.
- Choong Mun-keat. 2007. A Comparison of the Pāli and Chinese Versions of the *Vaṅgīsa-thera Samyutta*, a Collection of Early Buddhist Discourses on the Venerable *Vaṅgīsa*. *Buddhist Studies Review* 24(1):35-45.
- Enomoto Fumio 榎本文雄. 1980. Udānavarga shohon to Zō-agon-gyō, Betsuyaku Zō-agon-gyō, Chū-agon-guō 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 *Samyuktāgama*, its Alternative Translation, and the *Madhyamakāgama* are to be Ascribed). *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* インド學佛教學研究 28(2):55-7.
- Enomoto Fumio 榎本文雄. 1984. Agon kyōten no seiritsu 阿含經典の成立 [The Formation of the Original Text of the Chinese *Āgamas*. *Journal of Oriental Studies* 東洋學術研究 23(1):93-108.
- Foguang Da Cidian* 佛光大辭典 [Great Foguang Dictionary] 1988. Ed. *Foguang da cidian* bianxiu weiyuanhui. Kaohsiung: Foguang Chubanshe.
- Foguang Dazangjing: *Ahan zang: Za ahan jing* 佛光大藏經: 阿含藏: 雜阿含經 [Foguang Tripiṭaka: *Āgama: Samyuktāgama*], 1983. Ed. Foguang Dazangjing Bianxiu Weiyuanhui. Kaohsiung: Foguang Chubanshe.
- Glass, Andrew. 2007. *Four Gāndhārī Samyuktāgama Sūtras: Senior Kharoṣṭhī Fragment 5*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.

- Harrison, Paul. 1997. The *Ekottarikāgama* Translations of An Shigao. *Bauddhavidyā-sudhākarah: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, (= Indica et Tibetica 30) Ed. P. Kieffer-Pülz and J.-U. Hartmann. 261-84. Swisttal-Odendorf.
- Hayashiya Tomojirō 林屋友次郎. 1937. An Seikō yaku no Zō-agon to Zōichi-agon 安世高譯の雜阿含と增一阿含 [As to *Samyuktāgamasūtra* and *Ekottarāgamasūtra* translated by An Shi-kaō]. *Bukkyō Kenkyū* 佛教研究 1(2):11-50.
- Hiraoka Satoshi. 2000. The Sectarian Affiliation of Two Chinese *Samyuktāgamas*. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* インド學佛教學研究 49(1):506-500 = (1)-(7).
- Lancaster, Lewis R. and Sung-Bae Park, eds. 1979. *The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 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* in Chinese]. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* インド學佛教學研究 18(2) (= no. 36):41-51.
- Shi Zhanghui 釋章慧. 2006. “*Shenri jing*” yanjiu 《申日經》研究 [A Study of the *Shenri Jing*] (= *Zhonghua Fojiao Yanjiusuo Luncong* 44). Taipei: Fagu Wenhua.
- Su, Ken 蘇錦坤. 2008. *Bieyi Za Ahan Jing 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]. *Satyabhisamaya* 正觀, no. 45 (June): forthcoming.
- Yinshun 印順. 1988. *Yuanshi Fojiao shengdian zhi jicheng* 原始佛教聖典之集成 [The compilation of the scriptures of Early Buddhism] (2nd ed.). Taipei: Zhengwen.
- Zhanghui. 2006. See Shi Zhanghui. 2006.