
A comparison of the Pāli and Chinese versions of the

Kassapa Saṃyutta, a collection of early Buddhist

*discourses on the Venerable Kāśyapa**

CHOONG MUN-KEAT

Abstract

This article first briefly examines the textual structure of the Kassapa Saṃyutta of the Pāli Saṃyutta-nikāya in conjunction with two other versions preserved in Chinese translation in a collection entitled 大迦葉相應 Dajiashe Xiangying (Skt. Mahākāśyapa Saṃyukta) in Taishō vol. 2, nos 99 and 100. Then it compares the main teachings contained in the three versions. It reveals similarities and differences in structure and doctrinal content, thus advancing the historical/critical study of early Buddhist doctrine in this area.

Introduction

The *Kassapa Saṃyutta* of the Pāli *Saṃyutta-nikāya* (abbreviated SN) is represented in Chinese by a collection entitled 大迦葉相應 *Dajiashe Xiangying* (Skt. *Mahākāśyapa Saṃyukta*) in two versions, one in the *Za Ahan Jing* 雜阿含經 (*Saṃyuktāgama*, abbreviated SA, Taishō vol. 2, no. 99), the other in the *Bieyi Za Ahan Jing* 別譯雜阿含經 (*Additional Translation of Saṃyuktāgama*, abbreviated ASA, Taishō vol. 2, no. 100). This *saṃyutta* in the Pāli version and its counterpart 相應 *xiangying* (*saṃyukta*) in the two Chinese versions are collections of various discourses on the subject of the Venerable Mahākāśyapa, ‘Kāśyapa the Great’ (P. Mahākassapa, 大迦葉 *Dajiashe*), one of the Buddha’s most eminent monk-disciples. He was well-known for his observance of ascetic practices during the Buddha’s lifetime and as chairman of the first *Saṅgha* council (*saṃgīti*) soon after the Buddha’s death.

In this article I first briefly examine the textual structure of the three versions. Then I compare the main teachings contained in them, making use of new editions of SA: Yin Shun’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 Za Ahan Jing* (abbreviated FSA).¹ This will reveal similarities and significant differences in structure and doctrinal content, thus advancing the study of early Buddhist teachings in this area.

*I am indebted to Rod Bucknell for his constructive comments and corrections on a draft of this article.

¹These 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.

I. Textual structure

The Pāli *Kassapa Saṃyutta* (no. 16) is located in the *Nidāna Vagga* (Causal Condition Section) of SN. The two corresponding Chinese versions in a collection entitled 大迦葉相應 *Dajiashe Xiangying* (*Mahākāśyapa Saṃyukta*, Connected with Kāśyapa the Great) contained in SA and ASA were translated from now lost Indic-language originals. In the CSA edition the SA version bears the title *Dajiashe Xiangying* supplied by the editor, Yin Shun. 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 SA version's *Dajiashe Xiangying* (i.e., counterpart of the Pāli *Kassapa Saṃyutta*) is located in the Path Section (道品誦 *Daopin Song*) in the SA tradition.² The corresponding ASA version's *Dajiashe Xiangying* is located in the sixth fascicle (卷 *juan*) of Taishō no. 100, where it is the first fascicle of the Second Section (二誦第一 *Er Song Di Yi*) of ASA.³ The *Kassapa Saṃyutta/Dajiashe Xiangying* pertains to the *vyākaraṇa-aṅga* (P. *veyyākaraṇa-aṅga*) portion of SA/SN, according to Yin Shun.⁴

The Pāli *Kassapa Saṃyutta* comprises thirteen discourses (SN 16.1–13), whereas its Chinese counterparts, both the SA and ASA versions, have eleven discourses (SA 1136–1144, 905–906; ASA 111–119, 120–121). The Pāli version has two more discourses than either of the two Chinese versions. The three versions thus contain almost the same number of discourses. The full set of Chinese–Pāli and Pāli–Chinese counterparts is shown in Tables 1 and 2.

As indicated in Table 1, two discourses (i.e., SA 905–906 = ASA 120–121) of the SA and ASA versions are out of order with regard to the structural arrangement. The rearrangement of the discourses indicated in Table 1 is according to the CSA version. As is indicated in the two tables, one discourse of the SN version (SN 16.5 = SA 1141 = ASA 116) does not match up with the structural sequence of the two Chinese versions. Also, two SN discourses (SN 16. 1–2) have no SA and ASA counterparts. Consequently, the SA and ASA versions are structurally closer to each other than to the SN version.⁵

²CSA i, p. 47 (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 vol. iii, p. 571; Yin Shun (1971), p. 674. See also Choong (2000), pp. 21, 246.

³Structurally the ASA version has two sections (初誦 and 二誦). Yin Shun (1971), p. 675; CSA iii, pp. 586–588. Cf. Mayeda (1964), pp. 653, 656; Bucknell (2008), pp. 46–47 (Table 1 and Table 2).

⁴Choong (2000), pp. 9–11, 17, 21–23, 243–251; (2010), pp. 55–60. *Vyākaraṇa* is one of the three *aṅgas* represented in the structure of SA/SN: *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 (*navanāga*) 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. Also, only these first three *aṅgas* are mentioned in MN 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, pp. 23, 45; Nagasaki 2004, pp. 51–2). Rupert Gethin on H-Buddhism Discussion Network suggests that the PTS reading “*suttaṃ geyyaṃ veyyākaraṇassa hetu*” in MN 122: III, 115 should be corrected to “*suttaṃ geyyaṃ veyyākaraṇaṃ tassa hetu*”, following the Ceylonese/Burmese version’s reading: “*na kho Ānanda arahatī sāvako saththāraṇaṃ 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: 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/Vyakarana.

⁵On Sanskrit fragments corresponding to the Chinese SA (T 99), see Chung (2008), pp. 190–191.

Table 1. Chinese-Pāli correspondences of the *Dajiashe Xiangying/Mahākāśyapa Saṃyukta* (= SN 16. *Kassapa Saṃyutta*)

SA (Chinese)	ASA (Chinese)	SN (Pāli)
1136	111	16.3
1137	112	16.4
1138	113	16.6
1139	114	16.7
1140	115	16.8
1141(cf. EA 12.5-6)	116	16.5
1142	117	16.9
1143	118	16.10
1144	119	16.11
905	120	16.12
906	121	16.13

Table 2. Pāli-Chinese correspondences of the *Kassapa Saṃyutta* (= *Dajiashe Xiangying*)

SN (Pāli)	SA (Chinese)	ASA (Chinese)
16.1	None	None
16.2	None	None
16.3	1136	111
16.4	1137	112
16.5	1141(cf. EA 12.5-6)	116
16.6	1138	113
16.7	1139	114
16.8	1140	115
16.9	1142	117
16.10	1143	118
16.11	1144	119
16.12	905	120
16.13	906	121

2. Disagreements on some teachings contained in the three versions

A few useful studies on Mahākāśyapa have been published.⁶ In the following I will discuss only the principal disagreements on certain teachings presented in the three versions of *Mahākāśyapa Saṃyukta* under six topics: (1) The Buddha asking Mahākāśyapa to give a *Dharma* talk, (2) *Dhuta* practice, (3) Mahākāśyapa's image of long beard-and-hair and sharing a seat with the Buddha (4) "Women are foolish": Ānanda's response to Mahākāśyapa, (5) After death, and (6) Five things that lead to the disappearance/non-disappearance of the true *Dharma*.

⁶Malalasekera (1937), pp. 576–483; Akanuma (1967), pp. 369–372; Nyanaponika and Hecker (2003), pp. 107–136; Mori and Motozawa (2004); Iwai (2004).

(I) The Buddha asking Mahākāśyapa to give a *Dharma* talk (SA 1138 = ASA 113 = SN 16.6)

The three versions (SA 1138⁷ = ASA 113⁸ = SN 16.6⁹) report in common how the Buddha advises Mahākāśyapa to give a *Dharma* talk to certain *bhikṣus* (monks), because the Buddha himself should also do so. However, Mahākāśyapa declines the Buddha's advice. This is because Mahākāśyapa considers that those *bhikṣus* are difficult to teach and do not accept instruction. He then gives an example: Bhaṇḍa (a pupil of Ānanda) and Abhiñjika¹⁰ argue with each other over which of them can know more and better about the *Dharma*. Having heard of this quarrel from Mahākāśyapa, the Buddha then asks a certain *bhikṣu* to call those two *bhikṣus* to come and see him. The two *bhikṣus* then come to meet the Buddha. During their conversation with the Buddha, they gradually come to understand that the main purpose of learning the *Dharma* is not for that kind of quarrelling. They make a confession and ask for forgiveness of their mistakes. In this story shared by the three versions three issues need to be addressed, namely the following.

(I) In the SA version, after Mahākāśyapa tells the Buddha about the quarrel of the two *bhikṣus* in order to decline the Buddha's advice to give a *Dharma* talk to the *bhikṣus*, this is recorded:

At that time, the Venerable Ānanda was standing behind the Buddha, fanning the Buddha with a fan. He addressed the Venerable Mahākāśyapa: "Please stop [such judgment]. Be patient. The young *bhikṣus* have little wisdom, have poor wisdom". The Venerable Mahākāśyapa [then] responded to the Venerable Ānanda: "You should keep quiet. Do not make me question you in the *Saṅgha* (Assembly)". Then the Venerable Ānanda remained silent.¹¹

The corresponding ASA version has this:

At that time, Ānanda was waiting upon the Blessed One, fanning the Buddha with a fan. Then Ānanda said to Kāśyapa: "Stop, stop [such judgment]. Listen to my confession. Such *bhikṣus*, newly entered into the *Buddha-Dharma*, are ignorant, lacking wisdom, lacking full understanding [of the *Dharma*]. Then the Venerable Kāśyapa said to Ānanda: "You should stop [talking], Ānanda; you should not utter such biased words in the *Saṅgha*."¹²

The Pāli counterpart does not record such a conversation between Ānanda and Mahākāśyapa. Also, the above-mentioned comments in the two Chinese versions aimed directly at Ānanda by Mahākāśyapa in the presence of the Buddha are not entirely the same. Nevertheless, the two Chinese versions here reveal that Ānanda, in dealing with Mahākāśyapa, is not in a superior position, and that the two seem to have some personal disagreement within the *Saṅgha*.

⁷T2, p. 300b–c; CSA iii, pp. 573–574; FSA 3, pp. 1294–1298.

⁸T2, p. 415a–b.

⁹PTS II, pp. 203–205. Cf. Rhys Davids (1922), pp. 137–139; Bodhi (2000), pp. 667–669.

¹⁰He is a pupil of Anuruddha in SN 16.6, but a pupil of Mahāmaudgalyāyana in SA 1138 and ASA 113.

¹¹“時。尊者阿難住於佛後。以扇扇佛。語尊者摩訶迦葉言。且止。尊者摩訶迦葉。且忍。尊者迦葉。此年少比丘少智・惡智。尊者摩訶迦葉語尊者阿難言。汝且默然。莫令我於僧中間汝事。時。尊者阿難即默然住。” (T2, p. 300b; CSA iii, p. 573; FSA 3, p. 1295)

¹²“爾時阿難。侍於世尊。以扇扇佛。爾時阿難。語迦葉言。止止尊者。聽我懺悔。如此比丘。新入佛法。愚無智慧。未有所解。尊者迦葉。語阿難言。爾止阿難。汝莫僧中作偏黨語。” (T2, p. 415a).

(II) The SA version reports the Buddha as asking the two *bhikkhus* about their quarrel thus:

“Are you two treating the teachings, namely *Sūtra*, *Geyā*, *Vyākaraṇa*, *Gāthā*, *Udāna*, *Nidāna*, *Avadāna*, *Itiyuktaka*/*Itivṛttaka*, *Jātaka*, *Vāipulya*, *Adbhuta-dharma*, and *Upadeśa*¹³ that are spoken by me, just for arguing with each other regarding who can know more and better?” The two monks then replied to the Buddha: “No, we are not doing that, Venerable Sir”.¹⁴

The corresponding ASA version records thus:

“When you comprehend the teachings, namely *Sūtra*, *Geyā*, *Vyākaraṇa*, *Gāthā*¹⁵, *Udāna*, *Nidāna*, *Itiyuktaka*, *Jātaka*¹⁶, *Vāipulya*¹⁷, *Adbhuta-dharma*,¹⁸ *Upadeśa*, and *Avadāna*,¹⁹ that is, the twelve collections spoken by me, do you read them thoroughly and usefully for the purpose of arguing who knows more and better?” The two *bhikkhus* then replied to the Buddha: “No. The twelve collections do not have such a teaching indeed, Venerable Sir”.²⁰

The teachings of the Buddha in these two Chinese texts refer to the twelve *aṅgas*. Their Pāli counterpart does not mention this; it only refers to *Dharma* or to *Dharma-Vinaya* (PTS II, p. 205). This list of the twelve *aṅgas* in the two Chinese versions likely belongs to a later addition/development of the texts.

(III) The sequence of the twelve *aṅgas* in the two Chinese versions is also not the same, as the following table shows:

SA 1138	ASA 113
<i>Sūtra</i>	<i>Sūtra</i>
<i>Geyā</i>	<i>Geyā</i>
<i>Vyākaraṇa</i>	<i>Vyākaraṇa</i>
<i>Gāthā</i>	<i>Gāthā</i>
<i>Udāna</i>	<i>Udāna</i>
<i>Nidāna</i>	<i>Nidāna</i>
<i>Avadāna</i>	<i>Itiyuktaka</i>
<i>Itiyuktaka</i>	<i>Jātaka</i>
<i>Jātaka</i>	<i>Vāipulya</i>
<i>Vāipulya</i>	<i>Adbhuta-dharma</i>
<i>Adbhuta-dharma</i>	<i>Upadeśa</i>
<i>Upadeśa</i>	<i>Avadāna</i>

¹³*Sūtra* = 修多羅 P. *Sutta*, Discourse; short, simple prose; *Geyā* = 祇夜 *Geyya*, Stanza: verse mixed with prose); *Vyākaraṇa* = 受記 *Veyyākaraṇa*, Exposition; *Gāthā* = 伽陀 Verse; *Udāna* = 優陀那 Solemn Utterance; *Nidāna* = 尼陀那 Causal Conditions; *Avadāna* = 阿波陀那 *Apadāna*, Simile; *Itiyuktaka*/*Itivṛttaka* = 伊帝目多伽 *Itivuttaka*, So Said; *Jātaka* = 闍多伽 Birth Stories; *Vāipulya* = 毘富羅 *Vedalla*, Analysis; *Adbhuta-dharma* = 阿浮多達摩 *Abbhuta-dhamma*, Extraordinary Things; and *Upadeśa* = 優波提舍 Instruction.

¹⁴“汝等持我所說修多羅·祇夜·受記·伽陀·優陀那·尼陀那·阿波陀那·伊帝目多伽·闍多伽·毘富羅·阿浮多達摩·優波提舍等法。而共諍論。各言。汝來試共論議。誰多誰勝耶。二比丘白佛。不也。世尊。” (T2, p. 300c; CSA iii, p. 574; FSA 3, p. 1296).

¹⁵說偈. That is 伽陀 (*Gāthā*) in SA 1138.

¹⁶本生 = 闍多伽 (*Jātaka*) in the SA version.

¹⁷毘佛略 = 毘富羅 (Skt. *Vāipulya*, P. *Vedalla*) in the SA version.

¹⁸未曾有 = 阿浮多達摩 (Skt. *Adbhuta-dharma*, P. *Abbhuta-dhamma*) in the SA version.

¹⁹本事 = 阿波陀那 (= 本起 Skt. *Avadāna*, P. *Apadāna*) in SA version (SA 1138). Note that the term 本事 shown in this ASA 112 text is usually used in other Chinese Buddhist texts to refer to *Itiyuktaka*/*Itivṛttaka* (P. *Itivuttaka*). Cf. Mayeda (1964), pp. 348–376; Yin Shun (1971), pp. 495, note 7, 547–556.

²⁰“汝若解我所說修多羅·祇夜·授記·說偈·優他那·尼他那·伊帝目多伽·本生·毘佛略·未曾有·優波提舍·本事是十二部。汝若讀誦。令通利者。是等經中。為有勝負以不。時二比丘白佛言。世尊。是十二部。實無是說。” (T2, p. 415a-b)

In ASA 113 *Avadāna* is at the bottom of the list, whereas in SA 1138 it is located in seventh place, after *Nidāna*. This suggests that the two versions preserve different listings of the *aṅgas*. Thus, they probably do not belong to the same school.²¹

To summarise, three issues have been addressed here:

- (I) The two Chinese versions portray Mahākāśyapa, in the presence of the Buddha, as being in a superior position to Ānanda regarding the quarrel between the two *bhikṣus*, and they seem to have some personal issues within the *Śaṅgha*.
- (II) The two Chinese texts refer to the teachings of the Buddha in terms of the twelve *aṅgas*, whereas their Pāli counterpart refers to it as the *Dharma* or *Dharma-vinaya*. The list of twelve *aṅgas* in the two Chinese versions is likely to be a later addition/development of the texts.
- (III) Also, the sequence of the twelve *aṅgas* differs in the two Chinese versions. This suggests that these two versions belong to two different traditions.

(2) *Dhuta* practice

(SA 1141 = ASA 116 = SN 16.5; cf. EA 12.5-6)

SA 1141²² and ASA 116²³ mention the following three practices: forest dwelling, wearing rag-robcs, and eating almsfood. These are regarded as *dhuta*, ‘ascetic practices’. They are found in the Pāli counterpart, SN 16.5.²⁴ This section will discuss this situation in the three versions.

SN 16.5 reports the Buddha as, on one occasion, advising Mahākāśyapa that, being now old, he should wear robes offered by householders, accept meals given on invitation, and dwell close to him (the Buddha). But Mahākāśyapa declines the Buddha’s advice, and states that he has long cultivated and praised the following nine practices:

Being a forest dweller (*āraṇṇako*), an almsfood eater (*piṇḍapātiko*), a rag-robe wearer (*paṃsukūliko*), a triple-robe user (*tecīvariko*), a person who is of few wishes (*appiccho*), contented (*santuṭṭho*), secluded (*pavivitto*), aloof from society (*asaṃsaṭṭho*), and energetic (*āraddhaviṛiyo*).

Mahākāśyapa also says that he has cultivated and praised the above-mentioned nine practices in recognition of two benefits, namely: for his own present happiness and for later generations who may follow his example, leading to their welfare and happiness.

Having heard what Mahākāśyapa has said, the Buddha then expresses agreement with him, and says the practices are certainly for the good, welfare, and happiness of both *devas* and humans, out of compassion for the world. In the Pāli version, however, the Buddha names not all nine practices but just three practices (PTS II, p. 203):

Therefore, Kassapa, you wear hempen rag-robcs (*paṃsukūlikāni*) that are cast off, walk for alms (*piṇḍapātāya*), and dwell in the forest (*araṇṇe*).

²¹Cf. Yin Shun (1971), pp. 495–496, note 7.

²²T2, p. 301c; CSA iii, pp. 577–578; FSA 3, pp. 1303–1304.

²³T2, p. 416b–c.

²⁴PTS II, pp. 202–203. Cf. Rhys Davids (1922), pp. 136–137; Bodhi (2000), pp. 666–667.

On the other hand, the two Chinese counterparts (SA 1141 and ASA 116) do not record entirely the same contents as the Pāli version (SN 16.5), and the two Chinese versions themselves are not entirely the same either, as the following shows.

(a) Both SA 1141 and ASA 116 do not mention all of the nine practices indicated in SN 16.5. They instead mention only three practices: forest dwelling (阿練若 *alianruo*), wearing rag-robes (糞掃衣 *fensaoyi*) and eating almsfood (乞食 *qishi*).²⁵

The three practices in the Pāli version are included in the nine practices mentioned by Mahākāśyapa. However, the Pāli version presents the three practices as a group found only in the Buddha's final response to Mahākāśyapa, who points out the importance of the nine practices to the Buddha.

(b) The three practices in the two Chinese versions (nine in the Pāli version) have the two benefits stated by Mahākāśyapa in response to the Buddha's advice and question. The contents of the two benefits in the two Chinese versions are in principle similar to the Pāli version, although the wording differs among the three versions. Nevertheless, the main issue is that the Buddha's responses to the two benefits presented by Mahākāśyapa are clearly not the same in the three versions, as follows.

SA 1141 records the Buddha as responding to Mahākāśyapa thus:

The Buddha told Kāśyapa: "Good, good, Kāśyapa. You have been for a long time [practising so] for the good, welfare, and happiness of sentient beings, out of compassion for the world, for the welfare and happiness of *devas* and humans".²⁶

The Buddha told Kāśyapa: "If someone condemns the *dhuta* practice, then he condemns me. If someone praises the *dhuta* practice, then he praises me. Why? This is because I have long praised the *dhuta* practice. Therefore, Kāśyapa, one should praise the person who practises forest dwelling, wearing rag-robes, and eating almsfood".²⁷

The corresponding ASA 116 says this:

The Buddha praised Kāśyapa: "Good, good. If practising so, you have been a long time for the good, welfare and happiness of the multitude, out of compassion for the world."²⁸

If some *śramaṇa* or brahmin (*brāhmaṇa*) condemns the *dhuta* practice, he condemns me. If someone praises the good of the *dhuta* practice, he praises me. Why? This is because I have used countless ways under different conditions to praise the good of establishing the *dhuta* practice as the best of all practices. From now on you should practise *dhuta*, and praise the one who is able to practise *dhuta*.²⁹

Thus, the SA version indicates that the practices are for the benefit of both *devas* and humans, which is similar to the SN version, whereas the ASA version does not mention *devas* (天

²⁵ The ASA version places wearing rag-robes (納衣/糞掃衣) before forest dwelling and eating almsfood, an order that differs slightly from the SA version.

²⁶ "佛告迦葉。善哉。善哉。迦葉。汝則長夜多所饒益。安樂眾生。哀愍世間。安樂天人。"

²⁷ "佛告迦葉。若有毀咎頭陀法者。則毀於我。若有稱歎頭陀法者。則稱歎我。所以者何。頭陀法者。我所長夜稱譽讚歎。是故。迦葉。阿練若者。當稱歎阿練若。糞掃衣。乞食者。當稱歎糞掃衣。乞食法。"

²⁸ "佛讚迦葉。善哉善哉。汝若如是。於長夜中。憐愍世間。利益弘多。為作救濟。義利安樂。"

²⁹ "若有沙門及婆羅門。毀頭陀者。是等即為毀咎於我。若有讚嘆頭陀功德。是等即為讚嘆於我。所以者何。我以種種因緣無數方便。讚嘆頭陀所得功德。安立頭陀。讚嘆頭陀。諸行中勝。汝從今日已後。常應自行阿練若行。讚嘆能行阿練若行者。"

tian). Also, both the SA and ASA versions mention the term *dhuta* ‘an ascetic practice’, which is not found in the SN version. According to the SA and ASA versions, the term *dhuta* refers to the three practices: forest dwelling, wearing rag-robes, and eating almsfood.³⁰

To sum up, the nine practices presented as a group of practices by Mahākāśyapa in the Pāli version are not shared in common with the two Chinese versions. Only the three practices (forest dwelling, wearing rag-robes, and eating alms-food) as a group are shared in common in the three versions. Both the SA and SN versions say the three practices are for the benefit of both *devas* and humans, whereas the ASA version does not include the *devas*. Finally, the SN version does not use the term *dhuta* for the nine and three practices; only the two Chinese versions use the term *dhuta* for the three practices. It is likely that the three practices regarded as *dhuta* mentioned only in the SA and ASA versions represent the earlier content of the notion of *dhuta* in Early Buddhism.³¹

(3) Mahākāśyapa’s image of long beard-and-hair and sharing a seat with the Buddha (SA 1142 = ASA 117 = SN 16.9)

SA 1142³² = ASA 117³³ = SN 16.9³⁴ report in common how the Buddha on one occasion explains to the *bhikṣus* what great attainments Mahākāśyapa has achieved in terms of his *dhyāna* (P. *jhāna*) and supernormal knowledge (P. *abhiññā*), abilities similar to those of the Buddha himself. However, two issues need to be addressed here regarding the three versions. Only the two Chinese versions record that Mahākāśyapa has the image of long beard-and-hair, and was invited by the Buddha to share a seat with him, as the following shows.

SA 1142 and ASA 117 record in common that one day Mahākāśyapa, having kept long (長 *zhang*) beard-and-hair (鬚髮 *xufā*) and worn dirty rag-robes (弊衲衣 *binayi*/衣被弊壞 *yibei bihuai*), comes to visit the Buddha. At that time, there arise in the minds (心 *xin*) of some *bhikṣus*, thoughts of disrespect (念 *nian*) regarding Mahākāśyapa’s appearance, thus:

SA 1142: Who is this *bhikṣu* who wears dirty rags? He comes here without proper appearance [referring to his long beard-and-hair] and without proper clothing [referring to his wearing dirty rags].³⁵

³⁰The term *dhuta* is also mentioned in another Chinese counterpart, EA 12.6: T 2, p. 570a-b; but it refers to more than the three practices (p. 570b).

³¹According to the Pāli tradition, *dhuta* ‘an ascetic practice’ consists of thirteen items (*dhuta-aṅgas*), but twelve items in the northern Buddhist tradition. The thirteen *dhuta-aṅgas* are (Nyanatiloka/Nyanaponika, p. 59; cf. PED, p. 342): 1. *pamsukūlika* (wearing patched-up robes), 2. *teṭṭvarika* (wearing only three robes), 3. *piṇḍapātika* (going for alms), 4. *sapadānika* (not omitting any house whilst going for alms), 5. *ekāsānika* (eating at one sitting), 6. *pattapiṇḍika* (eating only from the alms-bowl), 7. *khalupacchābhattika* (refusing all further food), 8. *ārañṇika* (living in the forest), 9. *rukḍhamūlika* (living under a tree), 10. *abbhokāsika* (living in the open air), 11. *susānika* (living in a cemetery), 12. *yathāsanthatika* (being satisfied with whatever dwelling), 13. *nesajjika* (sleeping in the sitting position, never lying down). The twelve items of *dhuta* in the northern Buddhist tradition lack either the above-mentioned no. 12. *Yathāsanthatika* (cf. Foguang Dacidian, p. 6362; FSA 3, p. 1301, note 3) or no. 4. *sapadānika* (cf. Nakamura’s *Bukkyōgo Daijiten*, p. 803). See also Hayashima (1964), pp. 52–105.

³²T2, p. 302a-b; CSA iii, pp. 578–579; FSA 3, pp. 1304–1306.

³³T2, pp. 416c–417a.

³⁴PTS II, pp. 210–214. Cf. Rhys Davids (1922), pp. 141–145; Bodhi (2000), pp. 671–674.

³⁵“此何等比丘。衣服麤陋。無有儀容而來。衣服佯佯而來。”

ASA117: This venerable one does not know what is the proper manner of being a monk. He wears dirty rags. Also, his beard-and-hair are long. His manner is improper.³⁶

Knowing what the *bhikkhus* have been thinking about Mahākāśyapa's appearance, the Buddha then invites Mahākāśyapa to come and sit next to him (i.e., to share "half a seat", 半座 *banzuo*, with the Buddha).³⁷ However, Mahākāśyapa says to the Buddha: "I am your disciple and you are my teacher", and sits down to one side. Then the Buddha, before the other *bhikkhus*, explains how great are the achievements of Mahākāśyapa in terms of *dhyāna* and supernormal knowledge, attainments similar to those of the Buddha himself.

In this story both Mahākāśyapa having an image of keeping long beard-and-hair and being invited by the Buddha to share a seat with him are not found in the Pāli counterpart, SN 16.9.

Also, the major issue here is the appearance of Mahākāśyapa with long beard-and-hair described in the two Chinese versions. This physical appearance of Mahākāśyapa is not allowed in the *Bhikkhu Saṅgha*. It is likely that the presentation of this image of Mahākāśyapa in the two Chinese texts reflects the traditional Chinese Mahāyāna image of the *Aluohan* (阿羅漢 = *Arhant*) superimposed by the translators.

(4) "Women are foolish": Ānanda's response to Mahākāśyapa (SA 1143 = ASA 118 = SN 16.10; cf. SA 1144 = ASA 119 = SN 16.11)

SA 1143³⁸ = ASA 118³⁹ = SN 16.10⁴⁰ report in common how Ānanda and Mahākāśyapa go together to the quarters of *bhikkhuniīs* (Buddhist nuns), where Mahākāśyapa gives a *Dharma* talk to them. However, after the talk, a certain *bhikkhuniī*⁴¹ expresses displeasure, asking how Mahākāśyapa can give a *Dharma* talk in the presence of Ānanda. She describes this action as just like a needle-peddler wanting to sell a needle to a needle-maker. Overhearing this statement by the displeased *bhikkhuniī*, Mahākāśyapa asks Ānanda: "Am I the needle-peddler and you the needle-maker?"

According to the Pāli version, Ānanda replies thus:

Be indulgent, Venerable Kassapa! Women are foolish (*Khamatha bhante Kassapa. Bālo mātugāmo*).

According to the SA counterpart, Ānanda replies:

Please stop [saying that]! Be patient, because this foolish old woman is of little wisdom, through being not well cultivated. (且止。當忍。此愚癡老嫗。智慧薄少。不曾修習故。)

And according to the ASA version, his reply is this:

³⁶“彼尊者。不知出家所有威儀。衣色變穢。鬚髮亦長。威儀不具。”

³⁷Cf. Iwai Shogo, 'The Tradition of 'Sharing Half a Seat' 「半座を分かつ」伝承について', *Memoirs of the Chuo Academic Research Institute*, Monograph Series no. 9, article 9 (Tokyo, 2004), <http://www.sakya-muni.jp/monograph/09/9/>

³⁸T2, p. 302b-c; CSA iii, pp. 579-580; FSA 3, pp. 1307-1310.

³⁹T2, p. 417a-c.

⁴⁰PTS II, pp. 214-217. Cf. Rhys Davids (1922), pp. 145-146; Bodhi (2000), pp. 674-676.

⁴¹SN: Thullatissā; SA and ASA: 偷羅難陀 Thullanandā.

Stop, stop [saying that], Venerable sir! [She] is [like] a little child (櫻 *ying*), foolish, of little wisdom; there is no need to blame [her]. [I] hope, Venerable sir, that you will accept her (其 *qi*) confession. (止止尊者。櫻愚少智。不足具責。唯願大德。聽其懺悔。)

Thus, the Pāli version has Ānanda responding to Mahākāśyapa with “women are foolish,” while the two Chinese versions have him describing just the woman in question as foolish.

A rather different situation is found in the next set of sutra parallels in the *saṃyukta*: SA 1144 = ASA 119 = SN 16.11. As before, the two Chinese versions have Ānanda saying:

SA 1144: Please stop [saying that], Venerable Mahākāśyapa! Be patient, Venerable Mahākāśyapa! This (此) foolish old woman has no wisdom in her nature. (且止。尊者摩訶迦葉。忍之。尊者摩訶迦葉。此愚癡老嫗無自性智。)

ASA 119: This (此) *bhikṣuṇī* has naive understanding, just like a little child. I hope, Venerable sir, that you will accept her (其) confession. (此比丘尼。稚小兒智。猶如櫻孩。唯願大德。聽其懺悔。)

However, the Pāli parallel, SN 16.11, contains no counterpart for this wording.

According to these two Chinese texts (SA 1144 and ASA 119), the main reason for Ānanda's response to Mahākāśyapa is the latter's report that he has overheard a *bhikṣuṇī*⁴² maliciously expressing displeasure when Mahākāśyapa, who had formerly been a heterodox practitioner (外道 *waidao*, *aññatitthiyapubbo*), calls Ānanda a boy (童子 *tongzi*/小兒 *xiao'er*, *kumāraka*).

To sum up, in the two sets, SA 1143 = ASA 118 = SN 16.10 and SA 1144 = ASA 119 = SN 16.11, only the Pāli SN 16.10 has Ānanda make the generalising statement “women are foolish”; the Chinese versions (SA 1143 = ASA 118 and SA 1144 = ASA 119) have him clearly refer only to the particular woman in question as foolish. It is possible that the translators of the Chinese versions deliberately added the word “this” (此/其), feeling that the original meaning might offend Chinese women at the time (4th–5th century CE).⁴³

(5) After death

(SA 905 = ASA 120 = SN 16.12)

SA 905⁴⁴ and ASA 120⁴⁵ both report how certain heretical teachers⁴⁶ come and ask Śāriputra about the four questions: After death does the *Tathāgata* exist, not exist, both exist and not exist, or neither exist nor not exist? Śāriputra tells them each of these four questions has not been declared by the Buddha. Those heretical teachers are unhappy and dissatisfied

⁴²SA 1144: 低舍, ASA 119: 帝舍難陀, SN 16.11: Thullanandā.

⁴³Cf. Bodhi (2000), p. 802, note 289: “*Khamatha bhante Kassapa bālo mātugāmo*. I have translated this sentence with complete fidelity to the text, aware that some readers might find the rendering provocative. One consultant told me, “You’ve just lost half your readership”, and suggested *bālo mātugāmo* as “she is a foolish woman.” To my mind, this would distort the meaning of the Pāli in subservience to current views of gender. I do not see how the sentence could be construed in any other way than I have rendered it. I leave it to the reader to decide whether Ānanda himself could actually have made such a statement or whether it was put into his mouth by the compilers of the canon”.

⁴⁴T2, p. 226a-b; CSA iii, pp. 583–585; FSA 3, pp. 1317–1319.

⁴⁵T2, pp. 419a-b.

⁴⁶Six in total mentioned in the ASA version: 外道六師.

with his replies and leave. Śāriputra then comes to tell Mahākāśyapa about this event, and asks him why these questions have not been declared by the Buddha. Mahākāśyapa then explains the reason to him. By contrast, the Pāli version, SN 16.12,⁴⁷ does not mention the heretical teachers, but reports only Śāriputra (P. Śāriputta) coming to ask Mahākāśyapa the four questions about the existence of a *Tathāgata* after death. Mahākāśyapa tells Śāriputra that these questions have not been declared by the Buddha, and explains to him why. Mahākāśyapa's explanations to Śāriputra, as recorded in the three versions, are not entirely the same. The following discusses these issues.

According to SN 16.12, Mahākāśyapa explains the matter to Śāriputra thus (PTS II, p. 223):

Why, friend, has the Blessed One (the Buddha) not declared this (*avyākataṃ*) (i.e., each of the four questions about the existence of the *Tathāgata* after death)?

Because it is unbeneficial, does not belong to the fundamentals of the noble life (*brahmacāriya*), does not lead to disenchantment (*nibbidāya*), to fading away of desire (*virāgāya*), to ceasing (*nirodhāya*), to peace (*upasamāya*), to direct knowledge (*abhiññāya*), to enlightenment (*sambodhāya*), to *Nirvāṇa* (*nibbānāya*). Therefore, the Blessed One has not declared this.

And what, friend, has the Blessed One declared?

The Blessed One, friend, has declared: This is suffering, this is the origin of suffering, this is the cessation of suffering, and this is the way leading to the cessation of suffering.

And why, friend, has the Blessed One declared this?

Because this is beneficial, belongs to the fundamentals of the noble life, leads to disenchantment, to fading away of desire, to ceasing, to peace, to direct knowledge, to enlightenment, to *Nirvāṇa*. Therefore, the Blessed One has declared this.

Thus, this Pāli version presents merely a practical reason for not declaring each of the questions about the existence of the *Tathāgata* after death.

According to the two Chinese versions, Mahākāśyapa explains to Śāriputra thus:

SA 905

The venerable Mahākāśyapa told Śāriputra: If one says that after death the *Tathāgata* exists, this is material form. If one says that after death the *Tathāgata* does not exist, this is material form. If one says that after death the *Tathāgata* both exists and does not exist, this is material form. If one says that after death the *Tathāgata* neither exists nor does not exist, this is material form.⁴⁸

ASA 120

The venerable Mahākāśyapa told Śāriputra, one would rather say after physical death the *Tathāgata* exists,... and so forth to... neither exists nor does not exist.⁴⁹

⁴⁷PTS II, pp. 222–223. Cf. Rhys Davids (1922), pp. 150–151; Bodhi (2000), pp. 679–680.

⁴⁸“尊者摩訶迦葉語舍利弗言。若說如來後有生死者。是則為色。若說如來無後生死。是則為色。若說如來有後生死・無後生死。是則為色。若說如來非有後・非無後生死。是則為色。”

⁴⁹“尊者迦葉。語舍利弗言。如來寧可說色滅已。生於後有。乃至非生非不生。”

The *Tathāgata* is the one whose material form has ceased, whose mind is well liberated. To say that after death [the *Tathāgata*] exists is not correct. To say that after death [the *Tathāgata*] does not exist, both exists and does not exist, [or] neither exists nor does not exist, is also not correct. The *Tathāgata* is one whose material form has ceased, whose mind is well liberated. It is profound, deep in meaning, immeasurable, cessation, *nirvāṇa*.⁵⁰

Śāriputra, if one says that after death the *Tathāgata* exists, this is feeling, perception, activities, consciousness; is movement, anxiety, illusory, the compounded, [and] craving. The same also applies to “it neither exists nor does not exist,” and so on.⁵²

The *Tathāgata* is the one whose craving has ceased, whose mind is well liberated. Thus, to say that [the *Tathāgata*] exists is not correct; both exists and does not exist, [or] neither exists nor does not exist, is also not correct. The *Tathāgata* is one whose craving has ceased, whose mind is well liberated. It is profound, deep in meaning, immeasurability, cessation, *nirvāṇa*.⁵⁴

Śāriputra, because of the above-mentioned causes and conditions, the World-Honoured One will not declare the following questions if asked: “After death does the *Tathāgata* exist, not exist, both exist and not exist, or neither exist nor not exist?”⁵⁶

The World-Honoured One, who has ceased in material form, is liberated by right wisdom. So [the *Tathāgata*] does not have [the issue] that after death [the *Tathāgata*] exists, does not exist, both exists and does not exist, [or] neither exists nor does not exist. For this reason, these [questions] are not declared. Such a meaning is profound, deep, immeasurable, and so on to cessation.⁵¹

Feeling, perception, and so forth to consciousness, regarding [the question whether] after death [the *Tathāgata*] exists, and so on to neither exists nor does not exist, are also the same [as the above-mentioned]. It is about movement, egotistical, wavering, the compounded, karmic action, [and] craving. This craving contains [the attachment to] both existence and non-existence, or existence, or non-existence, or neither existence nor non-existence.⁵³

The *Tathāgata* is the one whose craving has ceased, whose mind is well liberated. Because of craving having ceased, the *Tathāgata* does not have existence, non-existence, both existence and non-existence, [or] neither existence nor non-existence. Its meaning is profound, deep without limitation, immeasurability, and so forth to cessation.⁵⁵

Venerable Śāriputra, you should know that because of the above-mentioned causes and conditions, the *Tathāgata* will not declare the following questions: After death does [the *Tathāgata*] exist, not exist, both exist and not exist, or neither exist nor not exist?⁵⁷

⁵⁰“如來者。色已盡。心善解脫。言有後生死者。此則不然。無後生死・有後無後・非有後非無後生死。此亦不然。如來者。色已盡。心善解脫。甚深廣大。無量無數。寂滅涅槃。”

⁵¹“世尊於彼色所盡處。正智解脫。然都無有死此生彼。死此不生彼。亦生亦不生。非生非不生。是故不答。如斯之義。甚深廣大。無量無邊。無有算數。乃至盡滅。”

⁵²“舍利弗。若說如來有後生死者。是則為受・為想・為行・為識・為動・為慮・為虛誑・為有為・為愛。乃至非有非無後有亦如是說。”

⁵³“受想乃至識。死此生彼。乃至非生非不生。亦復如是。此是動轉。此是憍慢。此是放逸。此是有為造作之業。此是愛結。此愛生彼愛不生彼。愛亦生彼。亦不生彼愛。非生彼非不生彼。”

⁵⁴“如來者。愛已盡。心善解脫。是故說後有者不然。後無・後有無・後非有非無者不然。如來者。愛已盡。心善解脫。甚深廣大。無量無數。寂滅涅槃。”

⁵⁵“如來愛盡得善解脫。愛盡生彼有亦無也。不生彼有亦無也。生彼不生彼亦無也。非不有生彼。非不無生彼亦無也。此義甚深。廣大無邊。無有算數。至於盡滅。”

⁵⁶“舍利弗。如是因・如是緣。故有問世尊。如來若有・若無・若有無・若非有非無後生死。不可記說。”

⁵⁷“大德舍利弗當知。以是因緣故。如來於問中。而不正答。死此生彼。此死不生彼。亦生彼亦不生彼。非生非不生。”

Accordingly, regarding the questions whether after death the *Tathāgata* exists, does not exist, both exists and does not exist, or neither exists nor does not exist, the two Chinese versions provide identical analytic-psychological explanations on the issues, although having a few differences in wording. Their explanations are essentially that the *Tathāgata* is one whose craving has ceased, whose mind is well liberated from attachment to existence and non-existence of the five aggregates (material form, feeling, perception, activities, and consciousness); therefore the four questions are not to be declared by the Buddha. Also, the meaning of the four non-declarations is regarded as profound, deep, immeasurable, and related to the uncompounded *nirvāṇa*, the cessation of suffering. On the other hand, the Pāli version focuses more on the practical value for the cessation of suffering or the attainment of enlightenment, without giving any explanation of the questions regarding what happens after death.

(6) The five things that lead to the disappearance/non-disappearance of the true Dharma (SA 906 = ASA 121 = SN 16.13)

SA 906⁵⁸ = ASA 121⁵⁹ = SN 16.13⁶⁰ specify five factors that lead to the non-disappearance (or disappearance) of the true *Dharma*. The five specified in the SA and ASA versions are similar, but slightly different from those in the SN version. The following discusses this teaching in connection with the notion of deterioration (*hāyana*, 濁 *zhuo*).

According to the SN version, the five things for which monks (*bhikkhū*), nuns (*bhikkhunī*), male lay followers (*upāsakā*), and female lay followers (*upāsikā*) dwell with respect are: 1. the teacher (*satthar*), 2. the teaching (*Dhamma*), 3. the assembly (*sangha*), 4. the training (*sikkhā*), and 5. concentration (*samādhi*). The SA version refers to monks dwelling with respect and support (供養 *gongyang*) for: 1. the Buddha/teacher, 2. the teaching, 3. the training, 4. the instructions, and 5. the followers of the holy life who are praised by the Buddha. The ASA version is similar to the SA version, but does not explicitly refer to only the monks dwelling with respect and support towards the five factors.

One issue at the beginning of these three texts needs to be addressed. The SA and ASA versions mention the notion of five deteriorations (濁), which are not found in the Pāli counterpart, SN 16.13.

The five deteriorations, according to the SA version, are deterioration of lifespan (命濁 *mingzhuo*), deterioration of afflictions (煩惱濁 *fannaozhuo*), deterioration of *kalpa* (劫濁 *jiezhuo*), deterioration of living beings (眾生濁 *zhongshengzhuo*), and deterioration of view (見濁 *jianzhuo*). The ASA version differs slightly from the above as regards sequence, placing deterioration of living beings before deterioration of *kalpa*.⁶¹ The Buddha in the SA and ASA texts tells Mahākāśyapa that because of these deteriorations, more precepts are made (制戒 *zhijie*) by the Buddha; however, because the precepts are well pursued by fewer monks, the true *Dharma* (正法 *zhengfa*) disappears and a counterfeit of the true *Dharma*

⁵⁸ T2, pp. 226b–227a; CSA iii, pp. 585–586; FSA 3, pp. 1319–1322.

⁵⁹ T2, pp. 419b–c.

⁶⁰ PTS II, pp. 223–225. Cf. Rhys Davids (1922), pp. 151–152; Bodhi (2000), pp. 680–681.

⁶¹ “命濁, 結使濁, 眾生濁, 劫濁, 見濁。”

(像法 *xiangfa*) appears. The meaning of the five deteriorations is not explained in these two Chinese texts.⁶²

In these five deteriorations only one item, deterioration of living beings, is mentioned in the Pāli counterpart, SN 16.13. There the Buddha instructs Mahākāśyapa thus:

It happens thus, Kāśyapa. When living beings (*sattesu*) are deteriorating (*hāyamānesu*) and the true *Dharma* (*saddhamma*) is disappearing, there are then more precepts (*sikkhāpadāni* ‘training rules’), and few monks are established in knowledge (*aññāya*). Kāśyapa, there is no disappearing of the true *Dharma* unless a counterfeit of the true *Dharma* (*saddhammapaṭirūpakam*) arises in the world. But when a counterfeit of the true *Dharma* arises in the world, then there is a disappearing of the true *Dharma*.⁶³

The meaning of ‘living beings are deteriorating’ in this Pāli version is also not explained. The corresponding two Chinese versions, as stated above, give only the names of the five deteriorations without any details. Consequently, questions arise regarding the antiquity of the components of the doctrine of deterioration (*hāyamāna* 濁) in all three versions.

Conclusion

The Pāli *Kassapa Saṃyutta* has two more discourses (SN 16.1–2) than the two Chinese versions. Only these two Pāli discourses lack Chinese counterparts. Structurally the two Chinese versions are much closer to each other than to the SN version.

As for the contents, this comparative study of the three different versions has focused on some principal disagreements presented in them. The comparison has revealed the following main points:

- (1) Both the SA and ASA versions record a conversation indicating that Mahākāśyapa is in a superior position to Ānanda as regards the two *bhikṣus*’ quarrel in the presence of the Buddha. Their Pāli counterpart does not have such a conversation. These two Chinese versions may indicate that Mahākāśyapa and Ānanda had some personal disagreements within the *Saṅgha*.
- (2) Both the SA and ASA texts refer to the teaching of the Buddha in terms of the twelve *aṅgas*, whereas their Pāli counterpart refers to it as *Dharma* or *Dharma-vinaya*. The list of twelve *aṅgas* in the two Chinese versions is likely to be a relatively late addition or development of the text.

Also, the sequence of the twelve *aṅgas* differs in the two Chinese versions. This suggests that the two do not belong to the same tradition.

- (3) The following nine practices as a group of trainings for Buddhist monks mentioned by Mahākāśyapa in the Pāli version are not shared in common with the two Chinese versions:

Being a forest dweller, an almsfood eater, a rag-robe wearer, a triple-robe user, a person who is of few wishes, contented, secluded, aloof from society, and energetic.

⁶²The detailed explanations of the five, 五濁 *pañca kaṣāyāḥ*, in Mahāyāna texts are provided in *Foguang Dacidian*, vol. 2, pp. 1201–1203.

⁶³SN vol. II, p. 224. Cf. Rhys Davids (1922), p. 152; Bodhi (2000), p. 681.

- (4) Only the three practices that form a group of trainings, i.e., forest dwelling, wearing rag-robles, and eating almsfood, which are mentioned by the Buddha himself in the three versions are shared in common.

Also, the SA and SN versions say that these three practices are for the benefit of both *devas* and humans, whereas the ASA version does not mention *devas*.

- (5) The Pāli version does not use the term *dhuta* for the nine and three practices. Only the two Chinese versions use the term *dhuta* for the three practices. It is likely that the three practices regarded as *dhuta* mentioned only in the SA and ASA versions are an early stage in the development of the contents of *dhuta* in early Buddhism.
- (6) Mahākāśyapa's image of keeping long beard-and-hair and his being invited by the Buddha to share a seat with the Buddha, are both present in the Chinese versions but not in the Pāli version.

Also, regarding the appearance of Mahākāśyapa – long beard-and-hair – this is not allowed in the *Bhikṣu Saṅgha*. This physical appearance of Mahākāśyapa is likely to reflect the Chinese Mahāyāna traditional image of an *Aluohan* (阿羅漢 = *Arhant*) that has been superimposed by the translators.

- (7) The Pāli text SN 16.10 has the statement “women are foolish” made by Ānanda to Mahākāśyapa, whereas the two Chinese versions, SA 1143–4 and ASA 118–9, refer to only the particular *bhikṣuṇī* in question as being foolish.

It is possible that the translators of the two Chinese versions deliberately portrayed the event in this way by adding the word “this” (此/其), in order to avoid offending Chinese women of that period.

- (8) Regarding the four questions – After death does the *Tathāgata* exist, not exist, both exist and not exist, or neither exist nor not exist? – the Pāli version provides no answers, but shifts the focus to questions that are of value for the cessation of suffering or the attainment of enlightenment. In contrast, the two Chinese versions offer equivalent analytic-psychological explanations on the questions about after death, although containing some different expressions.
- (9) The two Chinese versions mention the five deteriorations without giving any details, whereas the Pāli version only mentions one of the five deteriorations (namely, deterioration of living beings) without any explanation. The notion of deteriorations is certainly not clearly presented in either the Pāli version or the two Chinese versions. Thus, the antiquity of the components of the deteriorations doctrine is questionable.

Overall, this study has revealed some substantial disagreements among the three versions in major teachings on the subject of the renowned monk, the Venerable Mahākāśyapa.
<mchoong@une.edu.au>

Abbreviations

- ASA *Bieyi Za Ahan Jing* [*Additional Translation of Saṃyuktāgama*] (T 2, no. 100)
 CSA *Yin Shun's Za Ahan Jing Lun Huibian* [*Combined Edition of Sūtra and Śāstra of the Saṃyuktāgama*] (3 vols, 1983)
 EA *Ekottarikāgama* (T 2, no. 125)

- FSA *Foguang Tripiṭaka Za Ahan Jing (Saṃyuktāgama)* (4 vols, 1983)
 PED *Pali-English Dictionary* (edited by RHYS DAVIDS and STEDE)
 PTS Pali Text Society
 SA *Saṃyuktāgama* (T 2, no. 99)
 SN *Saṃyutta-nikāya* (PTS edition)
 T Taishō Chinese *Tripiṭaka* (The standard edition for most scholarly purposes)

Bibliography

- Akanuma, Chizen, *Indo Bukkyō Koyū Meishi Jiten* [A Dictionary of Buddhist Proper Names] (Kyoto, 1967, reprinted 1986).
 Bodhi, Bhikkhu, *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha: A New Translation of the Saṃyutta Nikāya* (Boston, MA, 2000).
 Bucknell, Roderick S, *Pali-Chinese Sutra Correspondences* (unpublished draft) (Brisbane, 2004).
 Bucknell, Roderick S, 'The Two Versions of the Other Translation of *Saṃyuktāgama*', *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal*, vol. 21 (2008), pp. 23–54.
 CBETA Chinese Electronic Tripitaka Version 2007 (Taipei, 2007).
 Choong, Mun-keat, *The Fundamental Teachings of Early Buddhism: A comparative study based on the Sūtrāṅga portion of the Pāli Saṃyutta-Nikāya and the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama* (=Beiträge zur Indologie 32) (Wiesbaden, 2000).
 Choong, Mun-keat, 'Problems and Prospects of the Chinese *Saṃyuktāgama*: Its structure and content', *Translating Buddhist Chinese: Problems and Prospects* (= Series: East Asia Intercultural Studies – Interkulturelle Ostasienstudien 3; edited by Konrad Meisig) (Wiesbaden, 2010), pp. 53–64.
 Chung, Jin-il, *A Survey of the Sanskrit Fragments Corresponding to the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama* (Tokyo, 2008).
 佛光大辭典 *Foguang Dacidian* [Foguang Great Dictionary], 8 vols. (Kao-hsiung, 1988).
 Hayashima, Kyōshō, 初期仏教と社会生活 *Shoki Bukkyō to Shakai Seikatsu* [Early Buddhism and Social Life] (Tokyo, 1964).
 Iwai, Shogo, 'The Tradition of 'Sharing Half a Seat' 「半座を分かつ」伝承について', *Memoirs of the Chuo Academic Research Institute*, Monograph Series no. 9, article 9 (Tokyo, 2004), <http://www.sakya-muni.jp/monograph/09/9/>.
 Malalasekera, G. P., *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*, 2 vols. (New Delhi, 1937, reprinted 1983).
 Mayeda, Egaku, 原始佛教聖典の成立史研究 *Genshi Bukkyō seiten no seiritsushi kenkyū*; (*A History of the Formation of Early Buddhist Texts*) (Tokyo, 1964).
 Mizuno, Kogen, '雑阿含経の研究 と出版 'Zōagonkyō no Kenkyū to Shuppan [Studies and Publications on *Saṃyuktāgama*], *Bukkyō Kenkyū*, no. 17 (1988), pp. 1–45.
 Mori, Shoji and Motozawa, Tsunao, 'Biographical Study of Mahākassapa 摩訶迦葉 (Mahākassapa) の研究', *Memoirs of the Chuo Academic Research Institute*, Monograph Series no. 9, article 8 (Tokyo, 2004), <http://www.sakya-muni.jp/monograph/09/8/>.
 Nagasaki, Hōjun, '雑阿含経解題' Zōagonkyō Kaidai [Explanatory notes of the Chinese *Saṃyuktāgama* (Taishō 99)], 雑阿含経 I, 新国訳大蔵経, 阿含部 4 Zōagonkyō 1, *Shinkokuyakudai-zōkyō Agonbu* 4 [The New Japanese Translation of the Chinese *Saṃyuktāgama* (Taishō 99) vol. 1, *Āgamas* no. 4] (Tokyo, 2004), pp. 5–63.
 Nakamura, Hajime, 佛教語大辞典 *Bukkyōgo Daijiten* [Great Dictionary of Buddhist Terms] (Tokyo, 1981, reprinted 1987).

- Nyanaponika, Thera and Hecker, Hellmuth, *Great Disciples of the Buddha: Their Lives, Their Works, Their Legacy* (Boston, 2003).
- Nyanatiloka/Nyanaponika, *Buddhist Dictionary: Manual of Buddhist Terms and Doctrines* (Kandy, 1952, 4th revised edition 1980, reprinted 1997).
- Rhys Davids, C. A. F., *The Book of the Kindred Sayings* (SN II) (London, 1922).
- Yin Shun, 原始佛教聖典之集成 *Yuanshi Fojiao Shengdian zhi Jicheng* [The Formation of Early Buddhist Texts] (Taipei, 1971).

CHOONG MUN-KEAT

University of New England, Armidale, Australia