the Dharmaguptaka school (another sub-school of the Vibhajyavāda) we have a Chinese translation of Dīrghāgama (DA), corresponding to the Pāli DN; and for the Mahāsaṃghika we have a Chinese translation of Ekottarāgama (EA), roughly corresponding to the Pāli AN. There are, therefore, four Chinese Āgamas (SA, MA, DA, EA) corresponding to the four principal Pāli Nikāyas (SN, MN, DN, AN), but representing three different schools. Besides these, there is in Chinese an "Additional Translation of the Saṃyuktāgama" (別譯雜阿含經 Bieyi Za-ahan-jing). This is a translation of part of SA (mainly the Geya-aṅga portion), and may belong to the Kāśyapīya school (another sub-school of the Vibhajyavāda; see above figure).[19] Finally, there are Chinese versions of many individual sutras from all four Āgamas.

The present study deals with SN and SA, one of the four extant Nikāyas/Āgamas. SN is preserved intact in Pāli, whereas SA was translated into Chinese from a now lost Sanskrit text by a monk named Guṇabhadra between 435-445 AD.[20] These two texts belong to two major schools, the Tāmraśāṭīya (SN) and the Sarvāstivāda (SA), that developed within the Sthavira branch in the period before the emergence of Mahāyāna Buddhism. Structurally, they are characterised by a grouping of their contents according to topics, such as "The Five Aggregates", "Causal Condition", "The Noble Eightfold Path" – a feature that enhances their value as a source of information on matters of doctrine. This study does not examine the entire SN and SA, but rather focuses on their Sūtra-aṅga portion. That portion is of particular value as a source on early Buddhist teachings, for reasons that will now be briefly discussed.

2. Historical importance of SN/SA and of its Sūtra-aṅga portion

The historical importance of SN/SA has been demonstrated by the Chinese scholar-monk Yin Shun (印順) in two books, 原始佛教聖典之集成 [*The Formation of Early Buddhist Texts*] (1971),[21] and 雜阿含經論會編 [*Combined Edition of Sūtra and Śāstra of Saṃyuktāgama*] (1983).[22]

---

19 Yin Shun, *Formation*, pp. 98, 668-672. MAYEDA, pp. 652, 662.

20 Yin Shun, "雜阿含經部類之整編" Za-ahan-jing Bulei zhi Zhengbian ["Re-edition of the Grouped Structure of SA"], in 雜阿含經論會編 Za-ahan Jing-Lun Huibian [*Combined Edition of Sūtra and Śāstra of Saṃyuktāgama*] (1983; Zhengwen Chubanshe, Taipei, 1991), vol. i, p. 1; *Formation*, p. 96. Cf. Bunyiu NANJIO, *A Catalogue of the Buddhist Tripitaka* (1883, Oxford; reprinted Lokesh Chandra, Delhi, 1980), p. 135; MAYEDA, pp. 648-649; NAKAMURA, *Indian Buddhism*, p. 37.

21 For publication details, see note 3, above.

22 3 vols. See note 20, above.

In these two works (here abbreviated *Formation* and CSA), Yin Shun presents the results of his extensive research on the historical process of formation of the Vinaya-piṭaka and Sūtra-piṭaka during the period of Early Buddhism. He takes account of Japanese scholars' work on this topic, in particular HIRAKAWA Akira's 律藏の研究 (English title: *A Study of the Vinaya-piṭaka*, 1960),[23] and MAYEDA Egaku's 原始佛教聖典の成立史研究 (English title: *A History of the Formation of Original Buddhist Texts*, 1964).[24] However, he criticises some of their conclusions and presents his own findings. Both *Formation* and CSA have had considerable influence in Chinese scholarly circles. They are taken account of in the new edition of the Chinese SA in the *Foguang Tripiṭaka*, published in 1983 (abbreviated FSA).[25] Vol. 1 of FSA contains a statement that the editors were guided by Yin Shun's research; and vol. 4 reprints from CSA an article by Yin Shun entitled "雜阿含經部類之整編" ["Re-edition of the Grouped Structure of SA"] (abbreviated RESA).[26] Most importantly, the Foguang Tripiṭaka adopts the order of the fascicles (juan 卷) of SA as reconstructed by Yin Shun (discussed below). Both Yin Shun's CSA and the FSA were reviewed favourably by MIZUNO Kōgen (1988).[27] A brief introduction to the relevant research findings will now be provided as background on the structure of SA (also of SN), and in order to locate the present study within the context of previous work.

(1) The extant Chinese SA is in disorder with regard to the arrangement of its fifty fascicles (also, two of the original fifty fascicles have been lost). This obscures its under-lying structural organisation. As is pointed out by MIZUNO, the suggestion that the extant Chinese SA is in disorder, together with an attempt to rearrange the text, was first made by M. ANESAKI in an

---

23 *Ritsuzō no Kenkyū* (Sankibō Busshorin, Tokyo).

24 See note 6, above. MAYEDA deals only with the Sūtra piṭaka.

25 佛光大藏經 Foguang Dazangjing [*Foguang Tripiṭaka*]: 阿含藏, 雜阿含經 Ahan Zang, Za-ahan-jing [*Āgama piṭaka, Saṃyuktāgama*], 4 vols., edited by Foguang Dazangjing Bianxiu Weiyuanhui [Editorial Commission of Foguang Tripiṭaka] and published by Foguang Publisher (Kao-hsiung, 1983).

26 CSA vol. i, pp. 1-74. FSA i, pp. 9-12, and p. 1 at the beginning of the text; iv, pp. 2373-2444. CSA was published in March 1983, and FSA was published in August 1983. The two appeared in Taipei and Kao-hsiung at almost the same time.

27 "雜阿含經の研究と出版" Zōagonkyō no Kenkyū to Shuppan ["Studies and Publications on Saṃyuktāgama"], *Bukkyō Kenkyū*, 17 (1988), pp. 1-45; Chinese Translation by WU Laoze in 雜阿含經之研究 Za-ahan-jing zhi Yanjiu [*Study of Saṃyuktāgama*] (Yuan Heng Si Miao Lin, Kao-hsiung, 1988), pp. 1-103. MIZUNO's review mentions previous relevant work by Japanese Buddhist scholars, but particularly praises Yin Shun's work on the formation of SA and his rearrangement of its fascicles.

article published in 1908.[28] Further investigation of SA was presented by LÜ Cheng (呂澂) in an article in 1924.[29] LÜ is the first to note that, according to *Yogācāra-bhūmi-śāstra* (瑜伽師地論), the SA was the foundation of the four Āgamas; and he suggests that the structure of the *Sūtra-mātṛkā* (契經 摩呾理迦/本母), essentially a commentary on portion of SA, contained in the Vastu-saṃgrahaṇī (攝事分) of the *Yogācāra-bhūmi-śāstra*,[30] reflected the order of the divisions of SA. In his *Formation* and CSA, Yin Shun presents further extensive research on that topic. He demonstrates in detail that, according to the Vastu-saṃgrahaṇī, SA consists of three components representing the categories (aṅgas) termed Sūtra, Geya, and Vyākaraṇa.[31] These are the first three in a set of nine or twelve such categories or genres into which the contents of the Sūtra-piṭaka were traditionally classified. They are:

1. Sūtra (P. Sutta): short, simple prose
2. Geya (Geyya): verse mixed with prose
3. Vyākaraṇa (Veyyākaraṇa): exposition[32]

Yin Shun points out that only these three aṅgas out of the nine or twelve are mentioned in MA 191 and its Pāli counterpart, MN 122 (Mahāsuññatā-

---

28 MIZUNO, pp. 3-4 (see note 27, above); M. ANESAKI, "The Four Buddhist Āgamas in Chinese: A concordance of their parts and of the corresponding counterparts in the Pāli Nikāyas", *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, XXXV (1908), pp. 68-138.

29 "雜阿含經刊定記" ["The Revision of SA"], originally published in 內學 *Nei Xue* 1 (Nanjing, 1924), pp. 104-125; reprinted in *Foguang Tripiṭaka: Āgama piṭaka*, "Appendix 2" (1988), pp. 659-679. Cf. also 雜阿含經論 [*Sūtra and śāstra of SA*], 40 fascicles, 1937-1938 (Xinwenfeng, Taipei, repr. 1992).

30 T 30, No. 1579, pp. 772c-868b. *Yogācāra-bhūmi-śāstra* was translated from Skt. by Xuan Zang (玄奘) (596-664 AD). The author is named as Maitreya or Maitreya-nātha, known as Maitreya Bodhisattva (c. 270-350 AD), but is also considered to be Asaṅga (c. 310-390 AD). NAKAMURA, *Indian Buddhism*, pp. 256, 264.

31 Cf. also Akira MUKAI, "The Vastusaṃgrahaṇī of the Yogācārabhūmi and the Saṃyuktāgama", *Hokkaidō Daigaku Bungakubu Kiyō*, 32/2 (1985), pp. 1-41. For comment on this article, see MIZUNO, p. 45.

32 The Pāli tradition recognises nine aṅgas or "classifications of teaching" (nava-aṅga [-buddha]-vacana or -satthu-sāsana). The remaining six are: 4. Gāthā ("Verse"), 5. Udāna ("Solemn Utterance"), 6. Ityuktaka/Itivṛttaka (Itivuttaka, "So Said"), 7. Jātaka ("Birth Stories"), 8. Vaipulya (Vedalla, "Analysis"), and 9. Adbhuta-dharma (Abbhuta-dhamma, "Extraordinary Things"). Other schools add three more: 10. Nidāna ("Causal Conditions"), 11. Avadāna ("Simile"), and 12. Upadeśa ("Instruction"), making "twelve classifications of the teaching" (Skt. dvādaśa-aṅga-dharma [or -buddha] -[pra]vacana). MAYEDA, pp. 188, 209-210, 216; Yin Shun, *Formation*, pp. 476, 494-497.

sutta),[33] and he suggests that they were historically the earliest ones to appear; the Sūtra-aṅga was the earliest of the three. Yin Shun sees the gradual formation of SA (and also its counterpart SN) as corresponding to these three aṅgas formed in sequence. Accepting the Vastu-saṃgrahaṇī's statement, he suggests that the SA/SN (i.e. the synthesis of the three aṅgas) came into existence first, and that subsequent expansion of it yielded the other Āgamas/Nikāyas in the sequence MA/MN, DA/DN, EA/AN; and he concludes that the gradual formation of the nine aṅgas happened in parallel with development of the four Āgamas/Nikāyas, of which SA/SN was the foundation.[34]

(2) The claim that SA consists of Sūtra, Geya, and Vyākaraṇa portions is mainly based on the Vastu-saṃgrahanī. The Pāli canon does not record such a tradition for SN. However, SA and SN are different versions (traditions) of the same collection, and comparison of the organisation of these two versions shows that they share a very similar structure. In both SN and SA the numerous discourses are grouped according to their subject matter into saṃyuktas (P. saṃyutta, Chinese xiangying 相應) (literally, "connected with"). The saṃyuktas are grouped in turn into vargas (P. vagga, Ch. song 誦 or pin 品) ("sections"). Superimposed on this structure is, in the case of SA, a categorisation according to the three aṅgas (details are given in Chapter 1). While no such categorisation is applied in the SN tradition, it is likely to have existed.[35]

(3) As mentioned above, the Sūtra-mātṛkā in the Vastu-saṃgrahanī of the *Yogācāra-bhūmi-śāstra* was shown by LÜ Cheng to be based on the SA. In fact it is based only on a portion of SA, namely the Sūtra-aṅga portion. The Sūtra-aṅga portion of SA comprises the greater part of four of its vargas, those titled "Aggregates", "Sense spheres", "Causal condition", and "Path". This portion is considered by Yin Shun to be the earliest in the historical

---

33 CSA i, "Preface", pp. 1-2. T 2, p. 739a; MN iii, p. 115.

34 *Formation*, pp. 630-631, 788-791 (cf. pp. 507, 622-625, 695-696); CSA i, "RESA", pp. 34, 39. According to Yin Shun, by expansion of the three aṅgas (compiled in SA/SN) new categories or classifications (aṅgas) then came to exist: aṅgas 6. Ityuktaka, 7. Jātaka, 8. Vaipulya, and 9. Adbhuta-dharma were compiled in MA, DA, and EA; aṅga 4. Gāthā corresponds to certain texts of *Sutta-nipāta*, and 5. Udāna is *Dhammapada*, both compiled in the Khuddaka-nikāya rather than being made part of the four basic Āgamas/Nikāyas (*Formation*, pp. 623-624, 808, 861). For the arguments by contemporary Buddhist scholars in regard to whether the nine (or twelve) aṅgas came to exist before the four Āgamas/Nikāyas or vice versa, see MAYEDA, pp. 486-488; *Formation*, pp. 5-6, 476-481; HIRAKAWA, pp. 74-75.

35 *Formation*, pp. 684-702; CSA i, "RESA", pp. 53-57.

formation of SA, and to contain the most fundamental teachings of the Buddha. In order to clarify the relationship between the Sūtra-mātṛkā of *Yogācāra-bhūmi* and the discourses of the extant Chinese SA, Yin Shun compiled his three-volume CSA. Vols. 1 and 2 cover the Sūtra-aṅga portion; vol. 3 covers the Geya and Vyākaraṇa portions.

(4) Yin Shun's textual research on the formation of early Buddhist texts suggests the following:

(a) SA/SN is an early compilation, whose structure had its origin in the first council; it therefore "represents" the situation with regard to the compilation of the Buddhist teachings shortly after the death of the Buddha.[36]

(b) Although the extant SA and SN are sectarian texts, one can seek an understanding of early Buddhist teachings by studying them comparatively.[37]

The above brief summary may suffice to give some idea of how Yin Shun's investigations into the early process of formation of the Buddhist Āgamas/Nikāyas point to the historical importance of SA/SN. Yin Shun's conclusions add to the significance of the present study of SA/SN. This study does not cover the entire SA/SN; it deals only with its Sūtra-aṅga portion focusing particularly on the main teachings contained in that portion. It makes use of Yin Shun's work, particularly that represented in vols. 1 and 2 of CSA. However, whereas Yin Shun is mainly concerned with structure, the present study focuses on content.

3. Aim and significance of the research

The doctrinal topics – the five aggregates, etc. – which define the saṃyuktas of SA/SN, are familiar subjects in Buddhist studies. However, a systematic comparison of how those doctrinal topics are dealt with in the Pāli SN and the Chinese SA has not been attempted hitherto. The present study is such a systematic comparison. Its purpose is to clarify the similarities and

---

36 *Formation*, pp. 629-630, 690, 732; CSA i, "Preface", p. 1. Yin Shun maintains that MA/MN, DA/DN, and EA/AN originated at the second council, one hundred years after the death of the Buddha, and thus represent the Buddhism of the period just before that council (*Formation*, p. 732).

37 CSA i, "RESA", p. 60.