

## A Comparison of the Chinese and Pāli *Samyukta/Samyuttas* on the Venerable Mahā-Maudgalyāyana (Mahā-Moggallāna)

MUN-KEAT CHOONG

University of New England  
New South Wales, Australia

mchoong@une.edu.au

---

This article first examines the textual structure of the *Maudgalyāyana Samyukta* (目犍連相應 *Muqianlian xiangying*) of the Chinese *Samyuktāgama* (Taishō vol. 2, no. 99) in conjunction with its Pāli parallel. Then it compares the main teachings contained in the two versions. It reveals similarities but also differences in both structure and content.

---

### Introduction

The *Maudgalyāyana Samyukta* (目犍連相應 *Muqianlian xiangying* ‘Connected with Maudgalyāyana’) of the Chinese *Samyuktāgama* (henceforth abbreviated SA; 雜阿含經 *Za ahan jing*, Taishō vol. 2, no. 99) corresponds to the *Moggallāna Samyutta* (no. 40 ‘Connected with Moggallāna’) and *Lakkhaṇa Samyutta* (no. 19 ‘Connected with Lakkhaṇa’) of the Pāli *Samyutta-nikāya* (abbreviated S). The *Lakkhaṇa Samyutta* is named after the monk Lakkhaṇa (勒叉那 *Lechana* in the Chinese version), but his role in the collection is simply to introduce the monk Maudgalyāyana (P. Moggallāna, 目犍連 *Muqianlian*). Thus, the Chinese *samyukta* (相應 *xiangying*) and its counterpart in these two Pāli *samyuttas* are collections of various discourses on the subject of the monk Mahā-Maudgalyāyana, ‘Maudgalyāyana the Great’ (P. Mahā-Moggallāna, 大目犍連 *Da-Muqianlian*),<sup>1</sup> the second of the Buddha’s most eminent monk-disciples after Śāriputra (P. Sāriputta) (cf. Choong 2016). At the time of the Buddha he was well-known for his skill in the exercise of supernormal or psychic power (Skt *rddhi*, P. *iddhi*).

---

1. In this article the Sanskrit name (Mahā-)Maudgalyāyana is used for both the Chinese and Pāli versions.

Keywords: Mahā-Moggallāna, Mahā-Maudgalyāyana, *Samyuktka*, *Moggallāna Samyutta*, *Lakkhaṇa Samyutta*, *Muqianlian Xiangying* 目犍連相應, *Dizi suoshuo song* 弟子所說誦, *Śrāvaka-bhāṣita*, *vyākaraṇa-aṅga*, *veyyākaraṇa-aṅga*

In this article the following issues will be addressed. Regarding the textual structure of the Chinese and Pāli collections, a general suggestion will be made on why the Chinese SA version is within the single *saṃyukta* on the monk Mahā-Maudgalyāyana, whereas the Pāli S version is in two separate *saṃyuttas* at two different locations for the same subject areas on the monk Mahā-Maudgalyāyana. Regarding the content, what are the differences between the two traditions?

In the following I first examine the textual structure of the two versions. Then I compare the main teachings contained in them, making use of new editions of SA: Yinshun's *Za ahan jing lun huibian* 雜阿含經論會編 [Combined Edition of *Sūtra* and *Śāstra* of the *Saṃyuktāgama*] (abbreviated CSA) and the Foguang *Tripiṭaka: Ahan zang: Za ahan jing* 佛光大藏經 阿含藏 雜阿含經 (abbreviated FSA).<sup>2</sup> This will reveal both similarities and differences in structure and content, thus advancing the study of early Buddhist teachings in this area.

### Textual structure

The *Maudgalyāyana Saṃyukta* (目犍連相應 *Muqianlian xiangying*) of the Chinese SA version was translated from now lost Indic-language originals. In the CSA edition the SA version bears the title *Muqianlian xiangying* supplied by the editor, Yinshun. In earlier editions of SA, *xiangying/saṃyukta* titles are lacking and the beginning and end of each *saṃyukta* have to be inferred from the *sūtra* contents. This Chinese *Maudgalyāyana Saṃyukta* is located in the Causal Condition Section (雜因誦 *Zayin song*) in the SA tradition.<sup>3</sup> The Pāli S counterparts of this Chinese *Maudgalyāyana Saṃyukta* are the *Moggallāna Saṃyutta* (no. 40) and the *Lakkhaṇa Saṃyutta* (no. 19). The *Moggallāna Saṃyutta* is located in the *Salāyatana Vagga* (Six Sense Spheres Section), and the *Lakkhaṇa Saṃyutta* is located in the *Nidāna Vagga* (Causal Condition Section). According to Yinshun, the Chinese *Maudgalyāyana Saṃyukta* and its Pāli counterparts pertain to the *vyākaraṇa-aṅga* (P. *veyyākaraṇa-aṅga*) portion of SA/S.<sup>4</sup>

2. These two new editions incorporate textual corrections, modern Chinese punctuation, comments, and up-to-date information on Pāli and other textual counterparts, including different Chinese versions of the text.
3. CSA i 46 (in 'Za ahan jing bulei zhi zhengbian 雜阿含經部類之整編 [Re-edition of the Grouped Structure of SA]') and iii 397; Yinshun 1971, 674. See also Choong 2000, 21, 244.
4. Choong 2000, 9–11, 21, 244, 248–250. *Vyākaraṇa* is one of the three *aṅgas* represented in the structure of SA/S: *sūtra* (P. *sutta*) 'discourse' (short, simple prose), *geya* (*geyya*) 'stanza' (verse mixed with prose), and *vyākaraṇa* (*veyyākaraṇa*) 'exposition'. These three *aṅgas* are the first three of nine types of early Buddhist text (*navāṅga*) classified according to their style and form. They are regarded by some scholars as historically the earliest ones to have appeared, in sequence, in the formation of the early Buddhist texts (cf. Nattier 2004). Also, only these first three *aṅgas* are mentioned in M 122 (*Mahāsuññatā-sutta*): III 115 and its Chinese counterpart, MA 191: T1, 739c. This suggests the possibility that only these three *aṅgas* existed in the period of Early (or pre-sectarian) Buddhism (cf. Mizuno 1988, 23; Nagasaki 2004, 51–2; Choong 2010, 55–63). Rupert Gethin on the H-Buddhism Discussion Network suggests that the PTS reading '*suttaṃ geyyaṃ veyyākaraṇassa hetu*' in M 122: III 115 should be corrected to '*suttaṃ geyyaṃ veyyākaraṇaṃ tassa hetu*', following the Ceylonese/Burmese version's reading: '*na kho Ānanda arahati sāvako sathhāraṃ anubandhituṃ yadidaṃ suttaṃ geyyaṃ veyyākaraṇaṃ tassa hetu*' ('It is not right, Ānanda, that a disciple should seek the Teacher's company for this reason, namely *sutta*, *geyya*, *veyyākaraṇa*'). This Pāli version's reading is clearly supported by the Chinese version in MA 191: T1, 739c: '佛言。阿難。不其正經。歌詠。記說故。信弟子隨世尊行奉事至命盡也。' ('The Buddha said:

In the Taishō *Tripitaka* the *vyākaraṇa* portion is marked off with the heading *Dizi suoshuo song* 弟子所說誦 (Skt *Śrāvaka-bhāṣita* ‘Section Spoken by *Śrāvakas*’).<sup>5</sup>

The Chinese *Maudgalyāyana Samyukta* comprises thirty-four discourses (SA 501–534), whereas its two Pāli counterparts consist of thirty-six discourses, of which fifteen are in *Moggallāna Samyutta* (S 40.1–15) and twenty-one are in *Lakkhaṇa Samyutta* (S 19.1–21). Thus, the two versions have almost the same number of discourses. The full set of Chinese-Pāli and Pāli-Chinese parallels is shown in Tables 1 and 2.

Some structural features of the above-mentioned collections relating to *Maudgalyāyana* are discussed below.

1. Two SA discourses (SA 501, 503) have their S counterparts in the *Bhikkhu Samyutta* (21.1, 3). Sixteen SA discourses (SA 504–506, 511–512, 514, 519, 521, 526–529, 531–534) do not have known S counterparts. Fifteen S discourses (S 19.3, 7, 9; S 40.1, 3–8, 11–15) have no known SA equivalents. The two versions contain almost the same number of corresponding discourses.
2. This corpus of SA and S versions covers three subject areas: (a) SA 501–503 and S 40.1–9 relate to meditation states and supernormal power; (b) SA 504–507 and S 40.10–15 relate to *devas* (gods) and their connection with the Three Refuges (Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha) and the precepts/morality (*śīla*); and (c) the final group SA 508–534 and S 19.1–21 relates to various kinds of *preta* (P. *petā* ‘departed spirits’).

Thus, the Chinese SA version is organised into these three subject areas in sequence within the single *saṃyukta* on the monk Mahā-Maudgalyāyana.<sup>6</sup> The Pāli S version, however, is in two separate groups (*saṃyuttas*) at two different locations (S 19 in *Nidāna Vagga* and S 40 in *Salāyatana Vagga*) for the same three subject areas on the monk Mahā-Maudgalyāyana.

How a group of discourses/*suttas* is structured need not be an indication of the age of the discourses, and one structure could contain relatively earlier and later discourses; however, one may raise this question: which version on the subject of this monk is likely to be the historically earlier one? It could be suggested that, in the ancestral version of SA, these *Vyākaraṇa-aṅga* discourses were attached to, or subordinated to, the relevant *Sūtra-aṅga* sections, and that later editors decided to group them into one discrete *Śrāvaka-bhāṣita* section.<sup>7</sup> Or it could be that the observed structural discrepancies simply reflect differences in how the two schools

“Ānanda, it is not for this reason, namely *sūtra*, *geya*, *vyākaraṇa*, that a disciple follows the World-Honoured One with respect until the end of life”). See the discussions on H-Buddhism posted on 21–23, 31 October 2011 under this subject: Disagreement in Renderings of Sutra/Geya/Vyākaraṇa.

5. T2, 126a. Hosoda 1989, 542; Choong 2000, 17, nn. 5, 7; Chung 2008, 139. Cf. Mukai 1985, 13, nn. 29, 30.
6. On Sanskrit fragments corresponding to the Chinese SA, which are not covered in this study, see Chung 2008, 141–2.
7. Cf. Choong 2000, 23, n. 22. I agree with Yinshun about the three-*aṅga* structure of SA and the reconstruction of the sequence of SA. His findings on the structure and content of SA are logical. Cf. Mizuno 1988, 45; Nagasaki 2004, 51–2, 60; Choong 2010, 55–60.

Table 1. Chinese–Pāli correspondences of the *Maudgalyāyana Saṃyukta*/*Muqianlian xiangying* (= S 40. *Moggallāna Saṃyutta* and 19. *Lakkhaṇa Saṃyutta*)

<i>Maudgalyāyana Saṃyukta (Chinese SA)</i>	<i>Pāli S</i>
501	40.2; 21.1 ( <i>Bhikkhu Saṃyutta</i> )
502	40.9
503	21.3
504	None
505 (cf. EA 19.3)	None (cf. M 37)
506 (cf. EA 36.5)	None
507	40.10 (sections 1 and 2); cf. 40.11–15
508	19.1
509	19.2
510	19.4
511	None
512	None
513	19.8
514	None
515	19.6
516	19.5
517	19.16
518	19.10
519	None (cf. 19.3 <sup>1</sup> )
520	19.14
521	None
522	19.11
523	19.13
524	19.15
525	19.12
526	None
527	None
528	None
529	None
530	19.17–21 <sup>2</sup>
531	None
532	None
533	None
534	None

1. CSA iii 413, n. 12; FSA 2, 844, n. 3.
2. CSA iii 418, nn. 20–23.

Table 2. Pāli–Chinese correspondences of 19. *Lakkhaṇa Samyutta* and 40. *Moggallāna Samyutta* (= *Maudgalyāyana Samyukta/Muqianlian xiangying*)

Pāli S	<i>Maudgalyāyana Samyukta (Chinese SA)</i>
19.1	508
19.2	509
19.3	None (cf. 519)
19.4	510
19.5	516
19.6	515
19.7	None
19.8	513
19.9	None
19.10	518
19.11	522
19.12	525
19.13	523
19.14	520
19.15	524
19.16	517
19.17–21	530
40.1	None
40.2 (cf. 21. <i>Bhikkhu Samyutta</i> 1)	501
40.3–8	None
40.9	502
40.10	507
40.11–15	None (cf. SA 507 = S 40.10)

(*Vibhajjavāda/Vibhajjavāda* and *Sarvāstivāda/Sabbatthivāda*)<sup>8</sup> developed after separating from their common origin (i.e. the *Sthavira* tradition).

### Disagreements on some contents contained in the two versions

A few useful studies on *Mahā-Maudgalyāyana* have been published.<sup>9</sup> In the following I discuss only the principal disagreements on certain contents (mainly the details of the stories) presented in the two versions of the *Maudgalyāyana* collection under four topics: (1) guidance by means of supernatural power; (2) instruc-

8. The SA version belongs to the *Sarvāstivāda* school. I consider that the *Sarvāstivāda* is not a different school from the *Mūla-Sarvāstivāda* (Nakasaki 2004, 16–17, 30–48; cf. Choong 2000, 6, n. 18; Schmithausen 1987, 306).

9. E.g. Malalasekera 1937, 541–547; ‘Mahā Moggallāna Thera’; Akanuma 1967, 375–380; Nyanaponika and Hecker 2003, 69–105.

tion regarding ‘devoted to vigour’ by means of divine sight and divine hearing; (3) *devas*, the Three Refuges, and the precepts; and finally (4) various karmic causes of the suffering of tormented ghosts. All of the Chinese SA texts translated here have never been translated before.<sup>10</sup>

### **Guidance by means of supernormal power (SA 501–2 = S 40.1–9)**

The discourses S 40.1–9<sup>11</sup> record the Buddha as giving guidance to Mahā-Maudgalyāyana on each of the nine concentrative meditations by means of supernormal or psychic power (*iddhiyā*). The Chinese counterparts, SA 501–2,<sup>12</sup> have similar accounts, but with some differences, as will now be discussed.

In the S version the nine concentrative meditations are spoken of one by one in turn, each in a single discourse: the four *dhyānas* (P. *jhāna*) in S 40.1–4; the four formless realms (*āyatana*) in S 40.5–8; and the signless mind-concentration ‘*animitto cetosamādhī*’ in S 40.9. For example, the first *dhyāna* is dealt with in S 40.1. Each discourse reports that as Mahā-Maudgalyāyana meditates in seclusion (in Jeta’s Grove, Anāthapiṇḍada (P. Anāthapiṇḍika)’s Park), he asks himself what a particular state of concentrative meditation (*jhāna*) is, then correctly states what it is, then enters it, but not in a stable and sustained way.<sup>13</sup> He then receives guidance from the Buddha by means of supernormal power (i.e. encouragement on what he is trying to do, and guidance on how to sustain the relevant state). This guidance is received not by the Buddha physically coming to give Mahā-Maudgalyāyana instruction, but mentally while Mahā-Maudgalyāyana is in seclusion. In other words, Mahā-Maudgalyāyana hears the voice as guidance from the Buddha who physically is a great distance away.

However, the corresponding Chinese SA version mentions only two states of concentrative meditation separately in two consecutive discourses: the second *dhyāna* in SA 501 (counterpart of S 40.2 and 21.1) and the signless mind-attainment ‘無相心正受 *wuxiang xin-zhengshou*’<sup>14</sup> in SA 502 (counterpart of S 40.9).

Also, the SA discourses record that Mahā-Maudgalyāyana (at Vulture Peak mountain near Rājagṛha<sup>15</sup>) receives guidance ‘three times’ by means of supernormal power from the Buddha, who is in Kalandaka’s bamboo-grove near Rājagṛha<sup>16</sup> but appears before Mahā-Maudgalyāyana. These two SA discourses (SA 501–2) record Mahā-Maudgalyāyana as saying this:

10. Cf. <http://agamaresearch.ddbc.edu.tw/sa%E1%B9%83yukta-agama-3>  
<http://buddhistinformatics.chibs.edu.tw/BZA/bzaComCatWebOrig.html>  
[http://mbingenheimer.net/publications/bingenheimer\\_StudiesInAgamaLit\\_2011.pdf](http://mbingenheimer.net/publications/bingenheimer_StudiesInAgamaLit_2011.pdf)  
<https://suttacentral.net/>  
 Anālayo 2015; Bingenheimer 2011.

11. IV, 262–269. Cf. Woodward 1927, 179–185; Bodhi 2000, 1302–1308.

12. T 2, 132a–c; CSA iii 397–398; FSA 2, 816–820.

13. E.g. ‘*katamaṃ nu kho pathamaṃ jhānanti*’ (‘now what is the first *jhāna*?’) (IV, 263).

14. 正受 *zhengshou*, Skt P. *samāpatti*.

15. ‘王舍城耆闍崛山中’ (the Gṛdhrakūṭa mountain at Rājagṛha).

16. ‘王舍城迦蘭陀竹園’ (Kalandaka’s *veļuvana* at Rājagṛha).

By means of supernormal power the World-Honoured One came to where I was three times and gave me three teachings. He established me in the condition/state<sup>17</sup> of the great person<sup>18</sup> [regarding the practice of concentrative meditation].<sup>19</sup>

Moreover, regarding the Buddha's meditation guidance, these two SA discourses include the following expression by Mahā-Maudgalyāyana:

SA 501:

As is rightly taught, the Buddha's sons<sup>20</sup> are born from the Buddha's mouth and born by metamorphosis/transformation from the Dharma, obtaining a share in the Buddha-dharma [as inheritance]; this applies precisely to me. Why is that? Because I am the Buddha's son born from the Buddha's mouth and born by metamorphosis from the Dharma, obtaining a share in the Buddha-dharma [as inheritance].<sup>21</sup> With [only] a little effort<sup>22</sup> I have attained the meditations/trances (禪 *chan, dhyāna*), the liberations (解脫 *jietuo, vimokṣa*), the concentrative meditations/absorptions (三昧 *sanmei, samādhi*) and the attainments (正受 *zhengshou, samāpatti*). Just as the eldest [son and] crown prince of a wheel-turning monarch,<sup>23</sup> even when not yet anointed as king, has already attained the king's law,<sup>24</sup> and without expending any effort, is able to obtain the five sensual pleasures.<sup>25</sup> So I too am like that. As the Buddha's son, I have attained, without any effort, the meditations, the liberations, the concentrative meditations and the attainments.<sup>26</sup>

SA 502 says much the same, though with a slightly different word order:

As is rightly taught of the Buddha's sons, then this applies precisely to me, being born from the Buddha's mouth and born by metamorphosis from the Dharma, obtaining a share in the Buddha-dharma [as inheritance]. Why is that? ... I have attained the meditations, the liberations, the concentrative meditations and the attainments.<sup>27</sup>

Thus, whereas the S version describes the nine concentrative meditations separately and has Mahā-Maudgalyāyana receiving the Buddha's guidance on them one

17. 處 = *sthānena*?

18. 大人 = *mahāpuruṣa*?

19. '世尊以神通力三至我所。三教授我。以大人處建立於我。'. Note: In the Taishō edition SA 501, the term 第三禪 in 132a29 should be corrected to: 第二禪, according to the context of the discourse (See also FSA 2, 817, n. 8). T 2, 132a-c; CSA iii 397-398; FSA 2, 816-820.

20. 佛子, P. *buddhaputta, buddhaputtā* 'the son (s) of the Buddha'.

21. Cf. *Dīgha-nikāya* III.84.

22. The translation of 方便 as 'effort' is based on the translation of the eight limbs of the path elsewhere in T 99 as 正見、正志、正語、正業、正命、正方便、正念、正定 (e.g. at 10a17-18), which shows it should correspond to (*samyak*-)vyāyāma.

23. 轉輪聖王, Skt *cakravartī rājan*, P. *rājā cakkavattin*. A wheel-turning monarch shares with the Buddha the 32 marks 'of a great person'.

24. Or the king's lawful power.

25. 五欲功德, P. *pañca kāmaḡuṇā*.

26. '若正說佛子從佛口生。從法化生。得佛法分者。則我身是也。所以者何。我是佛子。從佛口生。從法化生。得佛法分。以少方便。得禪·解脫·三昧·正受。譬如轉輪聖王長太子。雖未灌頂。已得王法。不勤方便。能得五欲功德。我亦如是。為佛之子。不勤方便。得禪·解脫·三昧·正受。' T 2, 132b; CSA iii 397; FSA 2, 818.

27. '若正說佛子者。則我身是。從佛口生。從法化生。得佛法分。所以者何。... 得禪·解脫·三昧·正受。' T 2, 132b-c; CSA iii 398; FSA 2, 819.

by one through supernormal power, the SA version mentions individually only two kinds of concentrative meditation and has Mahā-Maudgalyāyana receiving the Buddha's guidance on them three times in the one day through supernormal power. These two kinds of meditation in the SA version are the second *dhyāna* and the signless mind-attainment. Here, only the details of the stories differ, but not their doctrinal implications.

***Instruction regarding 'devoted to vigour' by means of divine sight and divine hearing (SA 503 = S 21.3)***

The Chinese SA 503<sup>28</sup> and its counterpart S 21.3<sup>29</sup> record, in very similar terms, an exchange between Mahā-Maudgalyāyana and Śāriputra, both of whom are staying in the Bamboo Grove near Rājagrha. In response to a question by Śāriputra, Mahā-Maudgalyāyana says that he has not been dwelling in an attainment of cessation (寂滅正受 *jimie zhengshou*), a peaceful abode (*santena vihārena*), but rather in a coarse attainment (麤正受 *cu zhengshou*), a gross abode (*olārikaena vihārena*), in which he has had an exchange with the Buddha (who is dwelling in Jetavana, Anāthapiṇḍada's park at Śrāvastī). This reported exchange consisted in Mahā-Maudgalyāyana asking what is meant by 'devoted to vigour/energy' (慳懃精進 *yingqin jingjin*, *āraddhaviṛiya*) and the Buddha then responding to the question. This exchange had taken place by means of divine sight (天眼 *tianyan*, *dibba-cakkhu*) and divine hearing (天耳 *tian'er*, *dibba-sota*). Two issues in the two versions need to be pointed out here.

1. In S 21.3 Mahā-Maudgalyāyana replies to the following question by Śāriputra:

Friend Maudgalyāyana, your faculties are bright, and your complexion is pure and clear. Has the Venerable Mahā-Maudgalyāyana spent the day in a peaceful abode?<sup>30</sup>

This expression, 'your faculties are bright, and your complexion is pure and clear' (*vipassannāṇi kho te ... indriyāni parisuddho mukhavaṇṇo pariyodāto*), is clearly about Mahā-Maudgalyāyana's complexion. What his complexion<sup>31</sup> has to do with his meditative state (*santena vihārena* 'peaceful abode') is not clearly stated in the text. No such expression is present in the Chinese version.<sup>32</sup> Thus, the antiquity of this detail of the Pāli version is in question.

28. T 2, 132c–133a; CSA iii 398–400; FSA 2, 820–822.

29. II 275–277. Cf. Rhys Davids 1922, 186–187; Bodhi 2000, 714–716.

30. '*Vipassannāṇi kho te āvuso Moggallāna indriyāni, parisuddho mukhavaṇṇo pariyodāto, santena nunāyasmā Mahā-Moggallāno ajja vihārena vihāstī*' (275).

31. A reviewer's comment: 'It is surely not about his "complexion", i.e. the physical state of his skin, but about the fact that his face looks relaxed and he looks alert. I think this kind of expression is relatively common in Pāli Suttas.'

32. Cf. a similar expression found in S 28.1–9: III 235–238 (no Chinese counterparts), in which however, the expression is Ananda's question to Śāriputta: 'Friend Śāriputta, your faculties are bright, and your complexion is pure and clear. In which abode (state, *vihārena*) has the Venerable Śāriputta spent the day?' ('*Vipassannāṇi kho te āvuso Śāriputta indriyāni, parisuddho mukhavaṇṇo pariyodāto, katamenāyasmā Śāriputto ajja vihārena vihāstī*') (235). This text has no Chinese equivalent (Choong 2016, 49, n. 54). Cf. also M 151: III 293–297 and its Chinese counterpart SA 236: T2, 57b (CSA i 280–281), in which the expression is the Buddha's question (M 151) to Śāriputta. The words of the Buddha's question '*vipassannāṇi kho te ... indriyāni parisuddho mukhavaṇṇo pariyodāto*' in M 151 are lacking in the Chinese counterpart (Choong 1999, 11, n. 41).



2. Regarding the phrase ‘devoted to vigour’ explained by the Buddha to Mahā-Maudgalyāyana, the Chinese SA version differs greatly from the Pāli S version as follows. The Buddha says:

SA 503: Maudgalyāyana, a monk (*bhikṣu*) during the day, by walking to and fro and sitting, purifies his mind by means of un-hindering mental states. In the first watch of the night by sitting and walking to and fro he purifies his mind by means of un-hindering mental states. In the middle watch of the night he goes out of his room, washes his feet, [and then] returning to his room, lies down on his right side, placing one foot on the other, clearly setting up mindfulness on things [at this present moment], rightly mindful and rightly aware, fixing his mind intently on the thought of rising. In the last watch of the night, gradually having awoken [from sleep and] having risen, by sitting and walking to and fro, he purifies his mind by means of un-hindering mental states. Maudgalyāyana, this is called a monk devoted to vigour.<sup>33</sup>

S 21.3: Here, Maudgalyāyana, a monk devoted to vigour dwells [practising] thus: Verily let [only] skin, sinews, and bones remain, and let flesh and blood dry up in my body, but there will be no halting of effort until I have attained what can be attained by a man’s strength, by a man’s vigour, by a man’s progress. It is in this way, Maudgalyāyana, that one becomes devoted to vigour.<sup>34</sup>

Thus, regarding ‘devoted to vigour’, the S version seems to be taking it in the general sense of endeavor, whereas the SA version specifies more practical and specific features of endeavor, such as what a monk should do during the day, in the first watch of the night, in the middle watch of the night, and in the last watch of the night.<sup>35</sup> Again, there is not a real doctrinal difference here, but simply a more general or specific application of a teaching.

### ***Devas, the Refuges, and the precepts (SA 507 = S 40.10)***

SA 507<sup>36</sup> and its counterpart S 40.10<sup>37</sup> are about *devas* (gods, 天子 *tianzi* or 天 *tian*)<sup>38</sup> and their connection with the practice of faith in the Refuges and of the precepts/morality (*śīla*, 戒 *jie*). The *devas* in the two versions (cf. also SA 504–506 and S 40.11–15) refer mainly to ‘Śakra, ruler of the gods’ (P. *Sakka devānaṃ inda*, 釋提桓因 *Shi Tihuan Yin*/天帝釋 *Tiandi Shi*) and other *devas* in the heaven of the Thirty-three gods (Skt. *Trāyastriṃśāḥ*, P. *Tāvatiṃsā devā*, 三十三天 *Sanshisian Tian*).<sup>39</sup> The contents

33. ‘目捷連。若此比丘晝則經行·若坐。以不障礙法自淨其心。初夜若坐·經行。以不障礙法自淨其心。於中夜時。出房外洗足。還入房。右脇而臥。足足相累。係念明相。正念正知。作起思惟。於後夜時。徐覺徐起。若坐亦經行。以不障礙法自淨其心。目捷連。是名比丘懇勩精進。’ T 2, 132c–133a; CSA iii 399; FSA 2, 821.

34. II 276: ‘*Idha Moggallāna bhikkhu āradhāviriyo viharati. kāmam taco ca nahāru ca aṭṭhi ca avasusatu. sarīre upasussatu maṃsalohitam. Yam tam purisathāmena purisaviriyena purisaparakkamena pattabbam. na tam apāpunitvā viriyassa saṅghānam bhavissatīti. Evaṃ kho Moggallāna āradhāviriyo hotīti*’ Cf. Rhys Davids 1922, 187; Bodhi 2000, 715.

35. However, a similar teaching is found in S 35.120, 198: iv, 103–105, 175–177, but it is called ‘devoted to wakefulness’ (*jāgariyam anuyutto*). Cf. Choong 2000, 98–99.

36. T 2, 134c–135a; CSA iii 405; FSA 2, 832.

37. IV, 269–280. Cf. Woodward 1927, 185–189; Bodhi 2000, 1308–1312.

38. Regarding 天子, 天 (*devaputras, devatās*), cf. also Choong 2011.

39. On ‘Śakra, ruler of the gods’ in the Pāli and Chinese versions of the *Sakka Samyutta*, cf. also Choong 2012.

of the two versions, SA 507 and S 40.10, are not entirely the same, as the following points out.

SA 507 is a very short discourse. For the Pāli S 40.10 there already exist translations in English. For the purpose of comparison I now provide the following full translation of the Chinese text:

Thus have I heard.

Once the Buddha was staying in Kalandaka's bamboo grove at Rājagrha. Then forty *devas* came to the place of the Venerable Mahā-Maudgalyāyana. Having paid homage to him, they stepped back and sat down at one side.<sup>40</sup>

At that time, the Venerable Mahā-Maudgalyāyana said to the *devas*: 'Good, *devas*, you have attained imperishable confidence/faith (不壞淨 *buhuaijing*, Skt *avetya-prasāda*, P. *avecca-pasāda*) in the Buddha, in the Dharma, are possessed of imperishable confidence in the Saṅgha.'<sup>41</sup>

Then, the forty *devas* rose from their seats, arranged their robes, bared their right shoulders, placed their palms together, and said to the Venerable Mahā-Maudgalyāyana: 'We have attained imperishable confidence in the Buddha, imperishable confidence in the Dharma, in the Saṅgha; [we are] possessed of the noble precepts; therefore, we have been reborn in a heaven.' A certain *deva* said that he had gained imperishable confidence in the Buddha; one said that he had gained imperishable confidence in the Dharma; one said that he had gained imperishable confidence in the Saṅgha; one said that he realized the noble precepts; and therefore, on the breakup of the body, at the end of life, they would be able to be reborn in (a) heaven.<sup>42</sup>

At that time, the forty *devas*, in the presence of the Venerable Mahā-Maudgalyāyana, individually predicted that they would attain the fruit of Stream-entry (須陀洹 *Xutuohuan*, Skt. *Srotāpatti*, P. *Sotāpatti*). The *devas* then disappeared. Just like these forty *devas*, another eight hundred *devas*, [and then] ten thousand *devas* also spoke so.<sup>43</sup>

Thus, the main point in this discourse, SA 507, is that the reason why the *devas*, at the breaking up of the body, after death, are reborn in a heaven world, is that they either possess one of these four qualities (i.e. imperishable confidence in the Buddha, in the Dharma, in the Saṅgha, and the noble precepts), or they possess all of them.

As stated above, the Pāli counterpart of SA 507 is S 40.10. This discourse and the succeeding discourses, S 40.11–15, have identical contents, except for the names of the *deva* in each of the discourses. The *devas*' names in S 40.10–15 are: Sakka in S 40.10; and Candana, Suyāma, Santusita, Sunimmita, and Vasavatti in S 40.11–15

40. '一時。佛住王舍城迦蘭陀竹園。時。有四十天子來詣尊者大目犍連所。稽首作禮。退坐一面。'

41. '時。尊者大目犍連語諸天子言。善哉。諸天子。於佛不壞淨成就。法·僧不壞淨成就。'Regarding *pasāda*, the verbal form of this word is *paśidati*, which means not only "to have faith", but also "to be clear and calm; to become of peaceful heart; to be purified, reconciled or pleased". So, *pasāda* appears to signify "calmed faith" (not fanatical or blind faith): (Choong 2000, 235).

42. '時。四十天子從座起。整衣服。偏袒右肩。合掌白尊者大目犍連。我得於佛不壞淨。於法·僧不壞淨。聖戒成就。故生天上。有一天言。得於佛不壞淨。有言得法不壞淨。有言得僧不壞淨。有言聖戒成就。身壞命終。得生天上。'

43. '時。四十天子於尊者大目犍連前。各自記說得須陀洹果。即沒不現。如四十天子。如是四百·八百·十千天子亦如是說。'

respectively. Only S 40.10 has the full content; in the remaining discourses (40.11–15) it is largely elided. In effect, then, there is just one discourse here containing the actual content.

Also, S 40.10 is a very long discourse, divided into four sections. Only the contents of the first two sections generally match up with the Chinese counterpart, SA 507. Comparison of the two versions, S 40.10 and SA 507, reveals the following differences:

- The numbers of *devas* listed in SA 507 are forty, eight hundred, and ten thousand (a total of 10,840 *devas*), whereas in S 40.10 the numbers are five hundred, six hundred, seven hundred, eight hundred, and eighty thousand *devas* (a total of 82,600 *devas*). The number of *devas* in the S version is far more than that in the SA version.
- The term *saraṇa* ‘refuge’ is clearly expressed in the S version (in sections 1 and 3). The *devas* are going for refuge to the Buddha, the Dhamma, and the Saṅgha. This term *saraṇa* and associated expressions are not found in the SA version.
- As stated above, S 40.10 is divided into four sections, of which only the first two have generally corresponding sections in the counterpart SA 507. The contents of the last two unpaired sections of S 40.10 are as follows (in summary):

Because of the going for refuge to one of the three gems (Buddha, Dhamma, Saṅgha), or going for refuge to all three gems, or the possession (*samannāgamaṇi*) of one of the four qualities (i.e. definite confidence ‘*aveccapāsādena*’ in the Buddha, in the Dharma, in the Saṅgha, and adherence to the noble precepts), or the possession of all four qualities, some *devas* are, at the breaking up of the body, after death, not only reborn in a good destination, the heaven world (*sugatiṃ saggam lokam*), but also surpass other *devas* in ten respects: in their heavenly life span (*dibbena āyunā*), heavenly beauty (*dibbena vaṇṇena*), heavenly happiness (*dibbena sukheṇa*), heavenly fame (*dibbena yasena*), heavenly supremacy (*dibbena adhipateyyena*), heavenly forms (*dibbehi rūpehi*), heavenly sounds (*dibbehi saddehi*), heavenly odours (*dibbehi gandhehi*), heavenly flavours (*dibbehi rasehi*) and heavenly tactile objects (*dibbehi phoṭṭhabbehi*).

It is seen, then, that the Pāli S version has extra information about the good results of faith in the Three Refuges and practice of the precepts, results that are not mentioned in the Chinese SA version. The reason why those *devas* have such additional good results owing to their faith and practice is *only* stated in the S version, which says that compared to other *devas* in their realm, they have greater beauty etc. due to their great faith and/or precept-keeping. Thus, the antiquity of this piece of teaching about faith, together with the story in the Pāli version is in question.

Nevertheless, the Chinese version does focus on faith (confidence 淨 *jing*, *prasāda*) in the Three Refuges, and also talks about the practice of the precepts. The distinctive feature of the Pāli version is that it speaks of taking refuge in the

three gems. The two texts also differ in the range and detail of the results or rewards they describe. Thus, the two texts do have in common firm faith and the precepts.

**Various karmic causes of the suffering of tormented ghosts**  
(SA 508–534 = S 19.1–21)

SA 508–534<sup>44</sup> and S 19.1–21<sup>45</sup> are equivalent collections.<sup>46</sup> As stated above, the Pāli discourses S 19.1–21 make up the collection called *Lakkhaṇa Saṃyutta*. The collection is named after the monk Lakkhaṇa, but his role in its *suttas* is to introduce Mahā-Maudgalyāyana, similar to the SA parallels. Both sets, S 19.1–21 and SA 508–534, describe various forms of tormented ghost (P. *peta*,<sup>47</sup> Skt *preta*), and the karmic causes for the arising of the suffering experienced by them.

For example, SA 508 reports that, as instructed by Mahā-Maudgalyāyana, the monk Lechana 勒叉那 (i.e. Lakkhaṇa), while in the presence of the Buddha, asks Mahā-Maudgalyāyana why he smiled at a certain location. Mahā-Maudgalyāyana then describes having previously seen a tormented ghost at that place:

While on the road I saw, moving through the air, a being whose body looked like a multi-storey building/tower (樓閣 *louge*), wailing and lamenting in distress and pain.<sup>48</sup>

The Pāli counterpart of this, S 19.1, reports a similar story regarding the smile displayed by Mahā-Maudgalyāyana in a certain place. However, in this version the ghost moving through the air is described as having the form of a skeleton (*aṭṭhika-saṅkhalika*):

Just now, friend, as I was descending from Mount Vulture’s Peak, I saw a skeleton moving through the air. Vultures, crows, and falcons kept following it, pecking at its ribs, stabbing it, tearing it apart as it uttered cries of pain.<sup>49</sup>

The Buddha then, in both versions, confirms Mahā-Maudgalyāyana’s vision, and explains the karmic cause that brings such suffering and pain to the ghost: that being was formerly a cattle butcher in this same Rājagṛha. As a result of that *karma*, he has been tormented for countless years in hell (*niraye*, 地獄 *diyu*). By the remaining effect of that *karma* (*tass’ eva kammaṣṣa vipākāvasesena*, 餘罪 *yuzui*), he has taken his present form of individuality.

Each discourse in the two versions reports, on the same pattern, how Mahā-Maudgalyāyana describes a tormented ghost, which he has seen with supernormal

44. T 2, 135a–139a; CSA iii 406–420; FSA 2, 832–856.

45. II 254–262. Cf. Rhys Davids 1922, 169–174; Bodhi 2000, 700–705.

46. For the Chinese-Pāli and Pāli-Chinese discourse correspondences, see tables 1 and 2 above.

47. Rhys Davids 1922, 170 n. 5, 171 n. 1. Note: The term for ‘ghost’ is not found in the two versions (S 19.1–21 and SA 508–534). To use ‘ghost’ here is for indicating that the class of beings in question is a ghost-like non-human being.

48. ‘我路中見一眾生。身如樓閣。啼哭號呼。憂悲苦痛。乘虛而行。’ T 2, 135a; CSA iii 407; FSA 2, 834.

49. II 255: ‘*Idhāham āvuso Gijjhakuṭṭā pabbatā orohanto addasaṃ aṭṭhikasāṅkhalikaṃ vehāsaṃ gacchataṃ. tam enaṃ gijjhā pi kākā pi kulalā pi anupatitvā anupatitvā phāṣūlantarikāhi vitacchenti vibhajenti, sā sudam aṭṭassaraṃ karoti*’

vision, and then the Buddha verifies that vision, and clarifies the karmic cause that has resulted in such suffering and pain for the ghost, and previously dwelling in hell for countless years.

Not all tormented ghosts and their karmic causes are identically described in the two versions, as the following examples show.

1. SA 508 = S 19.1: These parallel versions of the discourse presented above agree as regards their main content. They do, however, differ in one detail: the ghost's body is described as resembling a multi-storey building in SA 508, but a skeleton in S 19.1. This difference in appearance may be due to confusion of the words for 'multi-storey building' and 'skeleton'.<sup>50</sup>

2. SA 523 = S 19.13: SA 523 reports Mahā-Maudgalyāyana as describing a tormented ghost thus:

While on the road I saw a large being whose whole body was suppurating and torn, stinking, filthy and unclean, moving through the air. Crows, vultures, falcons, hawks, wild animals, and hungry dogs were following it, eating at it while it wailed and lamented. I thought: 'This being has such a body and experiences such suffering. It is indeed painful.'<sup>51</sup>

Then in the discourse the Buddha explains the karmic cause of the suffering of the ghost:

In the past this being was a woman in Vārāṇasī selling sex for a living (i.e. a prostitute). At that time, there was a monk ordained under the Buddha Kāśyapa. That woman invited the monk [to her place] with impure intentions. The monk did not know her intentions and sincerely accepted her invitation. The woman was angry, and sprinkled/splattered dirty water over the body of the monk. As a result of that offence, she has already undergone countless torments in hell. [Because of] the remnant of that offence [left over after her time in] hell, she has now acquired such a body, and continues to experience these sufferings.<sup>52</sup>

In the S version, however, the ghost is described as having the form of a flayed woman (*nicchaviṃ ithiṃ*) moving through the air:

Just now, friend, ... I saw a flayed woman moving through the air. Vultures, crows, and falcons kept following it, pecking at her ribs, tearing her apart while she it uttered cries of pain.<sup>53</sup>

50. It is likely that the Chinese word 樓閣 *louge* 'multi-storey building/tower' in SA 508 was confused with 髑髏 *louge* 'skeleton'. Cf. also SA 509 (= S 19.2), which also mentions birds and animals pecking at a skeleton-like being.

51. '我於路中見一大身眾生。舉體膿壞。臭穢不淨。乘虛而行。烏·鷄·鵬·鷲·野干·餓狗隨逐獲食。啼哭號呼。我念眾生得如是身。受如是苦。一何痛哉。' T 2, 137b; CSA iii 414-415; FSA 2, 847.

52. '此眾生者。過去世時。於此波羅奈城為女人賣色自活。時。有比丘於迦葉佛所出家。彼女人以不清淨心請彼比丘。比丘直心受請。不解其意。女人瞋恚。以不淨水灑比丘身。緣斯罪故。已地獄中受無量苦。地獄餘罪。今得此身。續受斯苦。' T 2, 137b-c; CSA iii 415; FSA 2, 847-848.

53. II 259: 'Idhāham āvuso ... addasaṃ nicchaviṃ ithiṃ vehāsaṃ gacchataṃ. tam enaṃ gijjhā pi dhaṅkā pi kulalā pi anupatitvā anupatitvā vitacchenti vibhajenti, sāsudam aṭṭassaraṃ karoti'

The Buddha then explains the karmic cause: that woman was an adulteress (*aticārini*), also in Rājagṛha. What then follows is a pattern similar to the rest of both the S and SA discourses. As a result of that *karma*, she has been tormented for countless years in hell. And by the remaining effect of that *karma* she has acquired such a body.

Thus, two main differences are found in these two versions of the discourse: in the description of the tormented ghost and in the karmic cause of this. In particular, being a prostitute in the SA version was not simply identified as the bad *karma*, but trying to seduce a monk, and then angrily throwing dirty water on him, whereas being an adulteress in the S version was so considered. Being a prostitute and being an adulteress are obviously two different situations associated with two different mentalities, although they both concern women and aspects of their sexual behaviour. Accordingly, these stories are two versions of the similar story.

3. SA 512 (no S parallel): The description of a tormented ghost presented in this discourse reads: ‘The whole body was without skin, just like a piece of meat, moving through the air’; so, it is like the above flayed woman in the S version’s story. The karmic cause of the suffering of the tormented ghost is: ‘She induced abortion by herself.’<sup>54</sup>

Here the main issue is abortion. This is considered in the SA discourse as a bad *karma*; there is no S version.

4. SA 514 (no S parallel): The description of a tormented ghost reads: ‘Hairs grew all over its body. These hairs were burning, hurting its body. The pain was extreme, penetrating to the bone and marrow.’ The karmic cause of the tormented ghost is: ‘That being liked fighting, using swords to hurt others.’<sup>55</sup>

The main message is that war-like mentality and using weapons to hurt others are bad *karmas*.

5. SA 519; cf. S 19.3: In SA 519, the description of a tormented ghost reads: ‘Its body was entangled in a snare of copper and iron. Fire constantly blazing fiercely and burnt its body. The pain in its body was extreme, penetrating to the bone and marrow, as it moved through the air.’ The karmic cause of the tormented ghost is: ‘That being had been a fisherman.’<sup>56</sup>

This discourse also adds: ‘Just like fishermen, so also are bird-catchers [and] rabbit-hunters.’<sup>57</sup>

In S 19.3, the description of the tormented ghost reads: Its body was ‘a lump of meat (*mamsapiṇḍam*) (cf. above SA 512, and S version’s flayed woman passage). Vultures, crows, and falcons kept following it, pecking at its ribs, stabbing it, tearing it apart while it uttered cries of pain.’ The karmic cause of the tormented ghost is: ‘The being had been a bird-catcher (*sākuṇiko*).’ (S II 256)

54. ‘舉體無皮。形如肉段。乘虛而行。... 自墮其胎。’ T 2, 136a–b; CSA iii 410; FSA 2, 839–840.

55. ‘舉身生毛。毛利如刀。其毛火然。還割其體。痛徹骨髓。... 好樂戰爭。刀劍傷人。’ T 2, 136b; CSA iii 411; FSA 2, 840–841.

56. ‘以銅鐵羅網自纏其身。火常熾然。還燒其體。痛徹骨髓。乘虛而行。... 為捕魚師。’ T 2, 137a; CSA iii 413; FSA 2, 844.

57. ‘如捕魚師。捕鳥。網兔亦復如是。’ T 2, 137a; CSA iii 413; FSA 2, 844.

The main message here is that being a fisherman shown in the Chinese version (SA 519) is regarded as bad *karma*, the cause of the suffering of the tormented ghost. This is not found in the Pāli S version. The reason for this is not known.

To sum up, this section gives examples of various tormented ghosts and their karmic causes shown in the two versions. There are some differences between the two versions regarding tormented ghosts. Some tormented ghosts and their karmic causes are found only in the Chinese SA version, and some are found only in the Pāli S version. Overall, they are likely to be related to folk ghost stories connected with the concept of *karma*.

Regarding the description of the tormented ghosts, there may have been some confusion of the different versions of the account, and perhaps there is also some confusion about which S discourse corresponds to which SA discourse. In cases of difference it is not possible to conclude which version of the ghost's depiction is the earlier one.

### Conclusion

We have seen that the related texts we have been discussing are arranged differently in S and SA. It could be that both the Pāli and the Chinese collections are all artificial and/or late compilations. It is possible that the discourses were at first attached to, or subordinated to, the relevant sections (*vaggas/songs* 誦), and that the gathering of them into *samyuttas/samyuktas* grouped in a single section was a later development. It is likely that the extant two versions on the subject of the Venerable Mahā-Maudgalyāyana reflect the changes, rearrangements, and expansions of textual compilation in how the two schools (the Vibhajyavāda and Sarvāstivāda) developed after splitting from their common origin (the Sthavira tradition).

As regards its treatment of the S and SA versions, this study has shown the following areas in which further attention are particularly needed.

This structure (the Chinese *Maudgalyāyana Samyukta* and its Pāli counterpart in two collections, *Moggallāna Samyutta* and *Lakkhaṇa Samyutta*) bears certain resemblances to the structure of the Chinese *Śāriputra Samyukta* (舍利弗相應 *Shelifu xiangying*) of SA in relation to its Pāli parallels.<sup>58</sup>

1. The Chinese *Śāriputra Samyukta* (which, as with the Pāli S 28 *samyutta*, bears the monk's name) includes two single discourses corresponding to ones in S 38 and 39 *Samyuttas*.<sup>59</sup> Most of the S parallels to the SA discourses are in a different *samyutta* located some distance away (here, the *Lakkhaṇa Samyutta*).

58. Cf. Choong 2000, 21, 244, 249–250; 2016, 28–32.

59. S 38 *Jambukhādaka Samyutta* (16 discourses) and S 39 *Sāmaṇḍaka Samyutta* (16 discourses) = SA 490 and 491 (note: two 'discourses', not two 'samyuktas' in the Chinese SA). S 28 *Śāriputta Samyutta* has 10 discourses (only S 28.10 = SA 500). Cf. Choong 2000, 21, 244, 249–250; 2016, 28–32.

2. In both the *Sāriputta* and *Moggallāna Saṃyuttas* the Pāli version has the series of nine concentrative attainments as *suttas* 1–9: S 28. 1–9 (*Sāriputta Saṃyutta*) and S 40. 1–9 (*Moggallāna Saṃyutta*).
3. It is noteworthy that the *Moggallāna Saṃyutta* is *saṃyutta* no. 40, while the preceding *saṃyuttas* numbered 38 and 39 are the ones that correspond to the *Sāriputta Saṃyutta*.
4. Therefore, it appears that in many ways the *Moggallāna Saṃyutta* mimics the *Sāriputta Saṃyutta* — an interesting phenomenon, given the close association of these two famous monks.<sup>60</sup>

As for the contents, this comparative study of these Chinese and Pāli collections has focused on some disagreements between the two versions. It has focused on four major topics: guidance by means of supernormal power; instruction regarding ‘devoted to vigour’ by means of divine sight and divine hearing; *devas*, the Three Refuges, and the precepts; and finally various karmic causes of the suffering of tormented ghosts. Overall, there is little by way of doctrinal differences in these texts, but interesting variations on shared themes.

### Acknowledgements

I am indebted to Roderick S. Bucknell for his constructive comments, suggestions and corrections on a draft of this article. I am grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments and corrections. I am also thankful to Peter Harvey for his useful remarks and amendments.

### Abbreviations

CSA	<i>Za ahan jing lun huibian</i> 雜阿含經論會編 [Combined Edition of <i>Sūtra and Śāstra of the Saṃyuktāgama</i> ]. 3 vols. Ed. Yinshun 印順. Taipei: Zhengwen, 1983. Chubanshe
EA	<i>Ekottarikāgama</i> 增一阿含經 (T 2, no. 125)
FSA	<i>Foguang dazangjing ahan zang: Za ahan jing</i> 佛光大藏經阿含藏：雜阿含經 [Foguang Tripiṭaka <i>Saṃyukta-āgama</i> ]. 4 vols. Ed. Foguang Dazangjing Bianxiu Weiyuanhui 佛光大藏經編修委員會. Dashu, Gaoxiong: Foguangshan Zongwu Weiyuanhui, 1983.
MA	<i>Madhyamāgama</i> 中阿含經 (T 1, no. 26)
M	<i>Majjhima-nikāya</i>
PTS	Pali Text Society
SA	<i>Saṃyuktāgama</i> 雜阿含經 (T 2, no. 99)

60. Cf. Choong 2016, 28–32. The Pāli *Sāriputta Saṃyutta* essentially split into two *saṃyuttas*, i.e. S 28 and 38 (including no. 39), and S 28.1–9 have the appearance of a single *sutta*, for the same subject areas on the monk *Sāriputta*. Similarly, the Pāli *Moggallāna Saṃyutta* is in two separate *saṃyuttas* at two different locations, i.e. S 19 in *Nidāna Vagga* and S 40 in *Salāyatana Vagga*, for the same subject areas on the monk *Mahā-Moggallāna*.



- S *Samyutta-nikāya*
- T Taishō Chinese *Tripitaka* (The standard edition for most scholarly purposes) *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經. 100 vols. Ed. Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaikyoku 渡辺海旭. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924–34.

M and S references are to PTS editions.

## Bibliography

- Anālayo Bhikkhu. 2015. *Samyukta-āgama Studies*. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation.  
See also: <http://agamaresearch.ddbc.edu.tw/sa%E1%B9%83yukta-agama-3>
- Akanuma, Chizen. 1967. *Indo bukkyō koyū meishi jiten* [A Dictionary of Buddhist Proper Names]. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, repr. 1986.
- Bingenheimer, Marcus. 2011. *Studies in Āgama Literature, with Special Reference to the Shorter Chinese Samyuktāgama*. Taipei: Shin Wen Feng Print Co. See also: <http://buddhistinformatics.chibs.edu.tw/BZA/bzaComCatWebOrig.html> and [http://mbingenheimer.net/publications/bingenheimer\\_StudiesInAgamaLit\\_2011.pdf](http://mbingenheimer.net/publications/bingenheimer_StudiesInAgamaLit_2011.pdf)
- Bodhi, Bhikkhu. 2000. *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha: A New Translation of the Samyutta Nikāya*. Boston, MA: Wisdom Publications.
- Bucknell, Roderick S. 2015. (unpublished 3<sup>rd</sup> draft). *Sūtra Parallels: Tables of parallel Buddhist discourses in Pali, Chinese, Tibetan, etc. Parts 1 and 2*. Brisbane. <https://suttacentral.net/CBETA> Chinese Electronic Tripitaka Version 2007. Taipei: Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association.
- Choong, Mun-keat. 1999 [1995]. *The Notion of Emptiness in Early Buddhism*. 2nd ed. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- . 2000. *The Fundamental Teachings of Early Buddhism: A comparative study based on the Sūtrāṅga portion of the Pāli Samyutta-Nikāya and the Chinese Samyuktāgama*. Beiträge zur Indologie 32. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- . 2010. 'Problems and Prospects of the Chinese Samyuktāgama: Its structure and content', *Translating Buddhist Chinese: Problems and Prospects*, edited by Konrad Meisig, 53–64. East Asia Intercultural Studies - Interkulturelle Ostasienstudien 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- . 2011. 'A comparison of the Pāli and Chinese versions of the *Devatā Samyutta* and *Devaputta Samyutta*, collections of early Buddhist discourses on *devatas* "gods" and *devaputras* "sons of gods".' *Journal of the Oxford Centre for Buddhist Studies* 1: 60–88.
- . 2012. 'A comparison of the Pāli and Chinese versions of the *Sakka Samyutta*, a collection of early Buddhist discourses on "Śakra, ruler of the gods".' *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 22(3–4): 561–574.
- . 2016. 'A comparison of the Chinese and Pāli versions of the *Śāriputra Samyukta*, a collection of early Buddhist discourses on the Venerable Śāriputra'. *Journal of the Oxford Centre for Buddhist Studies* 10: 27–52.
- Chung, Jin-il. 2008. *A Survey of the Sanskrit Fragments Corresponding to the Chinese Samyuktāgama*. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.
- Hosoda, Noriaki. 1989. 'Torufan shōrai mokuhansatsu bonbun zatsu-agonkyō dankan' トルファン将来木版刷梵文雜阿含經斷簡 [Fragmentary wood-block manuscripts of the Sanskrit *Samyuktāgama* from Turfan]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 37 (2): 540–546.

- Mizuno, Kogen 水野弘元. 1988. 'Zōagonkyō no kenkyū to shuppan' 雜阿含經の研究と出版 [Studies and Publications on *Samyuktāgama*]. *Bukkyō Kenkyū* 17: 1–45.
- Mukai, Akira 向井亮. 1985. 'Yugashichiron shashibun to zōagonkyō' 瑜伽師地論攝事分と雜阿含經 (The *Vastusaṅgrahaṇī* of the *Yogācārabhūmi* and the *Samyuktāgama*), *Hokkaidō Daigaku Bungakubu Kiyō* 32(2): 1–41.
- Nagasaki, Hōjun 長崎法潤. 2004. 'Zōagonkyō kaidai' 雜阿含經解題 [Explanatory notes of the Chinese SA (Taishō 99)], *Zōagonkyō 1, Shinkokuyakudaizōkyō agonbu 4* 雜阿含經 I, 新国訳大藏經, 阿含部 4 [The New Japanese Translation of the Chinese SA (Taishō 99) vol. 1, *Āgamas* no. 4], 5–63. Tokyo: Daizōshuppan.
- Nattier, Jan. 2004. 'The Twelve Divisions of Scriptures (十二部經) in the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations'. *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 7: 167–196.
- Malalasekera, G. P. 1983 [1937]. *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*, 2 vols. New Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corporation.
- Nyanaponika Thera and Hecker, Hellmuth. 2003. *Great Disciples of the Buddha: Their Lives, Their Works, Their Legacy*. Boston, MA: Wisdom Publications.
- Rhys Davids, C.A.F. 1922. *The Book of the Kindred Sayings* (S II). London: PTS.
- Schmithausen, Lambert. 1987. 'Beiträge zur Schulzugehörigkeit und Textgeschichte kanonischer und postkanonischer Materialien', *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hinayāna-Literatur*, 2. Teil, *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse*, 3. Folge, Nr. 154, Göttingen, 304–406.
- Woodward, F. L. 1927. *The Book of the Kindred Sayings* (S IV). London: PTS.
- Yinshun. 1971. *Yuanshi fojiao shengdian zhi jicheng* 原始佛教聖典之集成 [The Formation of Early Buddhist Texts]. Taipei: Zhengwen Chubanshe.