Were the *Ekottarika-āgama* and the *Madhyama-āgama* Translated by the Same Person?

An Assessment on the Basis of Translation Style

Michael Radich
Victoria University of Wellington
&
Bhikkhu Anālayo
University of Hamburg

Abstract

On the basis of a large set of diverse markers of translation style, this paper argues that the *Ekottarika-āgama* (增一阿含經, T 125) was not translated by the same person or group as the *Madhyama-āgama* (中阿含經, T 26). We adduce evidence covering a wide range of phraseology, occurring very many times in each text. Overall, the *Ekottarika-āgama* and the *Madhyama-āgama* habitually and systematically differ from one another in the translation of many common names, terms, phrases and ideas. This leads to the conclusion that the received ascription of the *Ekottarika-āgama* to Saṅghadeva is incorrect.

Contents

I. Research Problem and Method

The Taishō canon ascribes the extant *Ekottarika-āgama* to Gautama Saṅghadeva (瞿曇僧伽提婆), but the Taishō apparatus also reports a conflicting tradition in the Song, Yuan and Ming editions of the canon, holding that the text was translated by Dharmanandin (曇摩難提).[1] At the same time, our earliest source on Zhu Fonian 竺佛念, the biography in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集 (T 2145), echoed in the *Gao seng zhuan* 高僧傳 (T 2059) reports that a translation of the *Ekottarika-āgama* was made by Zhu Fonian on the basis of a recitation by Dharmanandin in 384.[2] By contrast, the tradition that Saṅghadeva revised or retranslated the text seems not to be reported prior to Fei Changfang's 費長房 notoriously unreliable *Lidai san bao ji* 歷代三寶紀 (T 2034)[3]—although Palumbo has recently argued that Fei got this information from Baochang 寶唱 (ca. 466–after 517), who wrote in the early sixth century.[4]

Scholarly controversy over the attribution of this translation dates back almost to the inception of modern Buddhology.[5] Over recent

---

[1]   T 125 (hereafter EĀ) at T II 549b11; see also note 11 below.

[2]   T 2145 at T LV 111b18–19; T 125 at T II 549a10–14; see also note 17 below. The name of the reciter of the collection is reconstructed as Dharmananda in Palumbo 2013: 5 note 12.

[3]   Anālayo 2013: 46, Matsumura 1989: 362–365.

[4]   Palumbo 2013: 150–151.

[5]   As Demiéville 1954: 374 note 1 shows, the attribution to "Dharmanandin" (for our purposes, equivalent to the attribution to Zhu Fonian) was championed as far back as Nanjio's catalogue; Nanjio 1883: 133–134. Demiéville summarises subsequent opinions in support of the same attribution from such scholars as Lévi and Chavannes (in 1916), Sakaino (in 1927) and Ono Genmyō (in 1936). By contrast, Demiéville himself sides with the ascription to Saṅghadeva and shows that this ascription was also supported by such scholars as Matsumoto (in 1914), Hayashi (in 1928) and Hayashiya.

decades, scholars have increasingly expressed doubts about the at-
tribution of the *Ekottarika-āgama* to Saṅghadeva, suggesting that the
extant text is more likely to be by Zhu Fonian. Most of these scholars
have based this suggestion upon the observation that the terminology
and phraseology of the *Ekottarika-āgama* differs greatly from that of
the *Madhyama-āgama*, Saṅghadeva's most representative work.[6]

By contrast, Mizuno Kōgen, who studied both texts in detail, sup-
ported the traditional ascription of the *Ekottarika-āgama* to Saṅghadeva
by claiming that the canonical *Ekottarika-āgama* and *Madhyama-āgama*
were by the same hand.[7] The support of a scholar of Mizuno's stature
gives the ascription of the *Ekottarika-āgama* to Saṅghadeva great
weight, especially considering that he reiterated it three decades after
his original study, and also that his earlier study surveyed a wider
range of possible stylistic markers than any subsequent author.[8]

---

[6] Unebe 1968, Matsumura 1989: 364–367, Legittimo 2005: 3 [258] note
7, Legittimo 2006: 80–81 (cited in Nattier 2010: 233 note 8), Anālayo
2006: 145–146, Nattier 2007: 195–196 note 48, Legittimo 2010: 255–
256, Park 2012: 202–203 and Anālayo 2013: 46–47; cf. also Kamata
1990: 111–114, Lin 2009: 130–136 and Palumbo 2013: 79–80. However,
Lin's hypothesis is more complex, since he argues that Zhu Fonian
himself revised an original translation, working around the year 410. On
complications in Palumbo's hypothesis, see below.

[7] Mizuno 1956, Mizuno 1989: esp. 9–15.

[8] Previous studies have tended to rely on a fairly small number of stylistic
markers. For instance, Nattier 2007: 195–196 note 48 discusses about six
markers distinguishing the *Ekottarika-āgama* from the *Madhyama-āgama*;
even though it is usually referred to as the most detailed study to date of
Zhu Fonian's style, Unebe 1968 builds his argument on a single set of
terms (for the members of the eightfold path), which, moreover, are
weaker as criteria for the authorship of the *Ekottarika-āgama* than many
of the terms we examine below; Unebe 1971 (where Unebe's main aim,
however, was not to examine our present question) discusses five terms
or sets of terms; Lin 2009 uses approximately nine sets of markers (albeit
strong ones). Mizuno 1956: 88–89 ironically studies the largest number

Recently, Antonello Palumbo has revived and further complicated our doubts about the identity and nature of the extant *Ekottarika-āgama*.[9] Palumbo argues that a Chinese commentary on the *Ekottarika-āgama*, the *Fenbie gongde lun* 分別功德論 (T 1507), is clearly based upon the

---

of markers of any of these authors (37 sets of markers), but only to arrive at an incorrect result (in footnotes to the Tables below, some examples where Mizuno cites some of our evidence, but overlooks its significance, are marked with an exclamation mark). Mizuno's errors may be methodologically instructive. He seems to have been partly misled, first, by external evidence that he read to suggest that the translations of the *Ekottarika-āgama* and the *Madhyama-āgama* which are now lost as integral texts, but witnessed in texts now scattered through the *Āgama* section of the Taishō and in citations in texts like the *Jing lü yi xiang* 經律異相 (T 2121), were the work of Dharmanandin (= Zhu Fonian). Next, as has been typical of studies of internal evidence to date, Mizuno also focuses on 'Buddhist'-looking language—predominantly transcriptions as well as opening and closing formulae. He thus overlooks a wider range of markers, like those that our computer-assisted methods here bring to our attention. Mizuno also compares only T 125, T 26 and the translations of the *Ekottarika-āgama* and the *Madhyama-āgama* lost as integral texts, not controlling his results by reference to other Zhu Fonian works. Even then, however, Mizuno's understanding of the evidence he tabulates is puzzling. Some of the 'markers' he lists have no diagnostic value, either because they are the same in T 26 and T 125, or even in all our texts; or because he lists no equivalent for T 26; or because usage is so mixed across all four texts as to establish no consistent pattern. Mizuno also missed some key evidence, e.g., 16 instances of 迦旃延 in T 125, three instances of 至真 in T 26, or instances of 惡趣 in both. When we set aside these various problematic markers, the most striking pattern left in the evidence that remains is a set of about twelve pairs of markers which consistently align T 125 *against* T 26 and the translations of the *Ekottarika-āgama* and the *Madhyama-āgama* lost as integral texts, alike. If anything, then, the overall conclusion suggested by this limited set of evidence is that T 26 is stylistically unique.

9   Palumbo 2013: 9–160 and 267–281.

received *Ekottarika-āgama* (T 125). Palumbo dates the *Fenbie gongde lun* itself to 385 and, for him, this means that the extant *Ekottarika-āgama* "must indeed [be] very close to the *Zengyi ahan jing* issued in … 385"—that is, to the work of Zhu Fonian and his collaborators.[10] At first sight, this might seem merely to add to the evidence that the extant *Ekottarika-āgama* is that of Zhu Fonian. At the same time, however, Palumbo mounts an intricate historical argument that as many as four versions of the *Ekottarika-āgama* once existed in China.[11] He also adduces a 'Preface to the *Madhyama-āgama*' by Shi Daoci 釋道慈 (fl. 391–401) to support the tradition that Saṅghadeva produced some version of the *Ekottarika-āgama*.[12] Palumbo argues further that there is evidence that the *Ekottarika-āgama* must in fact have undergone some kind of 'editorial revision' during the time that elapsed between

---

[10] Palumbo 2013: 261; cf. also 267–281; for a critical reply to some of Palumbo's suggestions cf. Anālayo 2015.

[11] Palumbo 2013: 36–49, esp. 94–96, 267–281; for Palumbo, the version commented upon by the *Fenbie gongde lun* was probably the third of these four versions.

[12] Palumbo 2013: 68–77. Daoci's 'Preface' is preserved at *Chu sanzang ji ji*, T 2145 at T LV 63c22–64a5. The 'Preface' does not mention the *Ekottarika-āgama* by name as a text that Saṅghadeva revised. Instead, it says, referring to a period during which Saṅghadeva was active in Luoyang, that the 'Abhidharma' (阿毘曇) and the 'Discourses' (廣說, identified by Palumbo with the *Vibhāṣā*) were produced anew and then that "subsequently, *these various scriptures and monastic codes were all* gradually translated [and] corrected [or: they were translated correctly]; only [a list of other texts] had yet to be produced anew", 自是之後，此諸經律漸皆譯正，唯『中阿鋡』、『僧伽羅叉』、『婆須蜜』、『從解脫緣』未更出耳 (T 2145 at T LV 64a3–5, our emphasis). Palumbo interprets the phrase "these various scriptures and monastic codes … all" to refer to a list of texts earlier in the 'Preface' that were produced by a team headed by Dao'an 道安 during an earlier period in Chang'an 長安. That list includes the *Ekottarika-āgama*, and this is the basis upon which Palumbo takes the preface to state that Saṅghadeva revised or "produced a new [version of]" the *Ekottarika-āgama*.

the version upon which the *Fenbie gongde lun* commented and the fixing of the extant version that has come down to us; and he wants to leave open the possibility that this revision might have been Saṅghadeva's work.[13] Palumbo also suggests that we may be able to discern contextual motives that led Saṅghadeva to change his terminology and style between his revision or translation of the *Ekottarika-āgama* and his work on the *Madhyama-āgama*,[14] and that this may account for the stylistic differences between the two texts as extant. For Palumbo, stylistic differences between the *Ekottarika-āgama* and the *Madhyama-āgama* therefore do not necessarily mean that the *Ekottarika-āgama* is in fact not Saṅghadeva's work, at least in part.[15]

Since external evidence thus associates two names most closely with the *Ekottarika-āgama*, namely, Saṅghadeva and Zhu Fonian, any attempt to argue that the text should be attributed to Zhu Fonian should examine two sets of evidence:

1. First, what evidence is there for or against the proposition that the *Ekottarika-āgama* was by the same translator as the *Madhyama-āgama*?

2. Second, what evidence is there for or against the proposition that the *Ekottarika-āgama* was translated by Zhu Fonian?

Before we enter into the details of our analysis of these questions, we must first stipulate several caveats, parameters and definitions.

First, any treatment of stylistic evidence for translatorship in such texts must ultimately keep in view the fact that these texts were of-

---

[13] Palumbo 2013: 279.

[14] Palumbo 2013: 78 argues that the *Madhyama-āgama* represents "the maturity of a translation idiom that [Saṅghadeva] had been building from scratch" over the course of a decade.

[15] Palumbo 2013: 82 writes cautiously: "None of the above clearly amounts to evidence suggesting that Saṅghadeva should positively be associated to T 125. It is, however, conceivable that at least portions of the received text, or perhaps its mere internal structure, might go back to the revision that this monk did carry out, probably at Luoyang in 390–391."

ten produced by groups. This is also true of the texts under study here. The colophon to the *Madhyama-āgama* reports that the translation was undertaken by Saṅghadeva, based on a text read out by Saṅgharakṣa (僧伽羅叉), with Daoci 道慈 acting as scribe, 筆受, assisted by Li Bao 李寶 and Kang Hua 康化.[16] Similarly, the colophon to the *Ekottarika-āgama* reports that the text was 'issued/produced', 出, by Dharmanandin and translated, 譯傳, by [Zhu] Fonian, with Tansong 曇嵩 acting as scribe.[17] In situations like this, our received texts could in principle bear the imprint of the style or verbal habits of more than one individual. In addition to the actual translator, the scribe, in particular, could have had a considerable impact on precise details of final wording.[18] Thus, in principle, it is possible that some distinctive features of the *Ekottarika-āgama* may be due to Tansong, as well as Zhu Fonian; and features of the *Madhyama-āgama* to Daoci, as well as Saṅgharakṣa.

However, to date, scholars have had almost no success in distinguishing certainly between features of a text due to the scribe and those due to the translator,[19] and in many cases it may ultimately prove impossible to do so (principally because we have too few points of com-

---

[16] T I 809b26; cf. also Chen 2005: 612; T 2145 at T LV 64a13, and, for corresponding Uighur fragments, Kudara and Zieme 1990: 144–145. According to a Shōgozō (聖) variant, Kang Hua may also have been called Tang Hua 唐化.

[17] T 125 at T II 549a10–14; cf. note 2 above. On 出, see Chen 2005 and Boucher 2008 [2011], 93–94, with references to earlier discussions by Waley, Link, Robinson and Shih.

[18] On 筆受, cf. e.g., Fuchs 1930: 88, Chen 1960: 181, Shih 1968: 167, Boucher 1996 *passim*, but especially the portions on Nie Chengyuan 聶承遠, e.g., 142, 149, 155–156 and 159–164, Mei 1996 on T 186 and T 606, Zacchetti 2006: 166 note 41, Ishii 2012, Funayama 2013: 75, 92–94 and Tsui 2013.

[19] For endeavours in this direction, see the studies by Boucher, Mei and Ishii cited in note 18 above.

parison). For the purposes of the present study, then, 'Saṅghadeva' and 'Zhu Fonian' should be taken as terms of convenience, referring to translation groups that produced texts, or groups of texts, distinguishable in style from other texts or groups. To anticipate, we will show that it is possible to detect numerous clear and striking traits characteristic of 'Saṅghadeva' and 'Zhu Fonian', in this corporate sense. We should also note that in principle, final judgement about the style of either 'Zhu Fonian' or 'Saṅghadeva' (each taken as a group) must of course await full study of the complete corpus of each group.

In the present case, however, it is worthy of note that the final version of the *Madhyama-āgama,* in particular, arguably shows clear markers of an Indian hand, particularly in the fact that standard pericopes are rendered without introducing variations. In this, the *Madhyama-āgama* differs from the other *Āgama*s extant in Chinese translation, which show evidence of a Chinese hand introducing variations, in line with a tendency described by Zürcher (1991: 288) as follows: "[t]here is a strong tendency to avoid the monotonous effect of … verbatim repetition … by introducing a certain amount of diversification and irregularity", as a result of which "in the same translated scripture we often find various alternative forms and longer or shorter versions of the same cliché."

The fact that the *Madhyama-āgama* does not evince this tendency seen in the other *Āgama*s extant in Chinese makes it safe to conclude that Saṅghadeva must have played a decisive role in the translation process and that, at least in the present case, the Chinese scribe(s) probably did not exert any large influence on the wording of the final product of their group effort.

In relation to Saṅghadeva this is also significant in so far as, aside from the *Madhyama-āgama,* we have no certain and solid point of comparison. Only three other texts are ascribed to Saṅghadeva in the Taishō. One of these, of course, is the *Ekottarika-āgama* itself (in only some of the editions upon which the Taishō is based); but the attribution of the *Ekottarika-āgama* is precisely the topic at issue

here. A second text, the *Jñānaprasthāna* (阿毘曇八犍度論, T 1543), is ascribed to Saṅghadeva and Zhu Fonian working together. This means that in principle, T 1543 cannot be used to differentiate between the respective styles of each separately. In practice, however, as Radich will show in future work, T 1543 contains many markers characteristic of Zhu Fonian's other works; but on the other side, it shares very little with Saṅghadeva. This suggests that Zhu Fonian had a much greater hand than Saṅghadeva in producing the wording of the present text. This leaves only the *San fadu lun* 三法度論 (*Tridharmaka-śāstra* (?), T 1506).[20] This text, however, is notoriously difficult. It was reportedly produced in 391 as a retranslation because a first version, T 1505 (produced by Kumārabuddhi (鳩摩羅佛提) at Dao'an's urging in 382),[21] was regarded as unreliable. While careful comparison of T 1506 with T 26 is indeed an important task for future research, these facts suggest that it would be risky to take the text as a benchmark for a 'pure' Saṅghadeva style. This leaves us with only the *Madhyama-āgama* itself, so that for the purposes of the present study, 'Saṅghadeva' and '*Madhyama-āgama*' must be taken as axiomatically coterminous.

For Zhu Fonian, on the other hand, Radich will show in follow-up studies that features of the *Ekottarika-āgama* discussed below, and many further features, are also part of consistent patterns of usage spanning the whole Zhu Fonian corpus.[22]

In the present study, then, we will present a range of new internal evidence demonstrating far-reaching stylistic differences between the extant *Ekottarika-āgama* and the extant *Madhyama-āgama*. We will argue that these differences are too copious and fundamental for the two texts to be by the same person or group.

---

[20] Discussed at length, with partial translations, in Thích Thiên Châu 1999: 33–85; see also Priestly 1999.

[21] On T 1505, see also Hurvitz 1967.

[22] Radich, forthcoming a and forthcoming b.

II. Stylistic Analysis

Our argument, that it is highly improbable that the *Ekottarika-āgama* is by Saṅghadeva, is founded upon numerous instances in which one and the same meaning, or underlying Indic term or phrase, is translated differently in the *Madhyama-āgama* and in the *Ekottarika-āgama*. Examples are as follows (drawn from the Table below).

Differences between the two versions are apparent immediately upon the opening of a discourse, where the counterpart to "thus have I heard", *evaṃ me sutaṃ*,[23] reads 我聞如是 in the *Madhyama-āgama*, but 聞如是 only in the *Ekottarika-āgama*.[24] To some extent, this mirrors the situation at the close of a discourse, where the *Ekottarika-āgama* regularly introduces the standard concluding phrase 聞佛所說 歡喜奉行 with 爾時, whereas in the *Madhyama-āgama,* the same concluding phrase is not preceded by 爾時.[25]

Also noticeable are several more differences in the introductory part of a discourse. The standard phrase after *evaṃ me sutaṃ* indicates that "at one time the Blessed One dwelled" at such and such a place, *ekaṃ samayaṃ bhagavā … viharati*.[26] In the *Madhyama-āgama* this reads 一時佛遊, but in the *Ekottarika-āgama*, 一時佛在.[27] A monastic coming to meet the Buddha, wherever the Buddha has been staying, will express respect by putting the robe over one shoul-

---

[23] In what follows, we provide Pāli equivalents as a convenience to the reader only, on the understanding that the Pāli texts are the most accessible and regularly consulted Indic counterparts to the texts under examination. We intend to imply nothing thereby about the language of the Indic originals behind the Chinese translations themselves.

[24] Mizuno 1956: 88(!), Nattier 2007: 195 note 48, Lin 2009: 130 and Palumbo 2013: 79.

[25] Lin 2009: 130.

[26] For a study of the opening phrase in general cf. Anālayo 2014: 41–45.

[27] Mizuno 1956: 88(!) and Lin 2009: 130.

der, *ekaṃsaṃ uttarāsaṅgaṃ karoti*. The *Madhyama-āgama* renders this 偏袒著衣, whereas the *Ekottarika-āgama* uses 偏露右肩 or 著衣正服.[28] With or without such expressions of respect, a visitor will usually sit down at one side, *ekamantaṃ nisīdati*. The *Madhyama-āgama* expresses this 坐一面, whereas the *Ekottarika-āgama* reads 在一面坐.

At times a visitor will inquire whether the Buddha or someone else dwells at ease, *phāsuvihāra*. The *Madhyama-āgama* expresses this in the form 起居輕便, in contrast to 身體輕便 in the *Ekottarika-āgama*. Just as in all his activities, the ultimate purpose for which the Buddha gives teachings to a visitor is "for the welfare of many … of *deva*s and human beings", *bahuno janassa atthāya hitāya ... devamanussānaṃ*.[29] The *Madhyama-āgama* regularly employs the expression 為天為人求義及饒益 to convey this, whereas in the *Ekottarika-āgama* we find 多所饒益天人 or the even shorter 多饒益人. A significant purpose of such teachings is to arouse the delight of the listeners, perhaps corresponding to *pāmojja*. Such delight is often referred to in the midst of a discourse, where the *Madhyama-āgama* reads 勸發渴仰, vs. expressions like 勸令歡喜, 勸發令喜, 勸樂令喜 or 勸發令喜 in the *Ekottarika-āgama*.

Ideally, such a teaching will inspire someone to go forth from the

---

[28] A related difference occurs in relation to paying respect at the Buddha's feet, *bhagavato pāde sirasā vandati*. In the *Madhyama-āgama* this is translated 稽首佛足, whereas in the *Ekottarika-āgama* the phrase is 頭面禮足. However, the difference between the two collections in this case is not entirely clear-cut, as 頭面禮足 does appear twice in the *Madhyama-āgama*. The same phrase is very copious in other core Zhu Fonian works T 212, T 1428 and T 1464.

[29] Another audience could be recluses and brahmins, *samaṇa* and *brāhmaṇa*, which in the *Madhyama-āgama* are 沙門梵志 (448x) but in the *Ekottarika-āgama* 沙門婆羅門 (112x). 沙門婆羅門 never occurs in the *Madhyama-āgama*, but the term 沙門梵志 does feature twice in the *Ekottarika-āgama*, both times in verse.

household out of faith, *saddhā agārasmā pabbajati*, for which the *Madhyama-āgama* uses 至信捨家, whereas the *Ekottarika-āgama* uses 以信堅固出家. One who has gone forth is expected to devote time to dwelling in seclusion, *viveka*, which in the *Madhyama-āgama* reads 在遠離獨住 vs. 在閑靜 in the *Ekottarika-āgama.*

A central purpose of dwelling in seclusion is of course that one purifies the mind, *cittaṃ parisodheti*, where the *Madhyama-āgama* uses 淨除其心 vs. expressions like 淨其意 or 以清淨之心 in the *Ekottarika-āgama.* Purifying the mind takes place by overcoming a host of defilements, one of which is covetousness, *abhijjhā*. This is rendered 增伺 in the *Madhyama-āgama*, whereas the *Ekottarika-āgama* uses 貪樂 and at times apparently also 想著 (although this particular pair of characters can also convey other meanings).

For cultivating the *brahmavihāra*s, the mind should be free from aversion and free from ill will, *avera* and *avyāpajjha*. The *Madhyama-āgama* describes such a mental condition with the phrase 無怨無恚, but the *Ekottarika-āgama* uses 心無恚怒. The actual cultivation of a *brahmavihāra* then takes place by way of a radiation in all directions, *sabbāvantaṃ lokaṃ ... pharitvā viharati*, which reads 遍滿一切世間 成就遊 in the *Madhyama-āgama*, whereas on the relatively fewer occasions such a radiation is found in the *Ekottarika-āgama,* we find expressions like 一切亦一切一切世間, 上下悉滿其中, 一切中一切, 遍 滿其中 and 盡於世間.

The meditative progress of insight in turn requires understanding phenomena as they really are. When such an expression occurs in the past tense, corresponding to *yathābhūtaṃ pajānanto*, then the *Madhyama-āgama* employs the phrase 知如真已. An occurrence of this phrase in the past tense is rare in the *Ekottarika-āgama*, but in one instance it appears in the form 已知如真. As with all other examples discussed here, these phrasings are mutually exclusive, that is, the positioning of 已 at the end of 知如真 is only found in the *Madhyama-āgama*, whereas 已 at the beginning of the expression 知 如真 occurs only in the *Ekottarika-āgama*.

The final goal for the sake of which one goes forth is regularly described by saying, 'birth is extinguished', *khīṇā jāti*. In such contexts the *Madhyama-āgama* renders this as 生已盡, but the *Ekottarika-āgama* renders it as 生死已盡.[30] Having extinguished the prospect of birth implies that one will not experience future existence, *nāparaṃ itthathāya*, which is 不更受有 in the *Madhyama-āgama* but 更不復受有 in the *Ekottarika-āgama*.[31]

Another difference concerns the seven treasures of a wheel-turning king. One of these is a general with magical abilities, whom the *Madhyama-āgama* calls 主兵臣寶, whereas the *Ekottarika-āgama* uses 典兵寶.[32] Also in the realm of the fabulous, the *asura*s are represented by 阿修羅 in the *Madhyama-āgama*,[33] but 阿須倫 in the *Ekottarika-āgama*.[34]

A number of further differences can be found in doctrinal terms. In the *Madhyama-āgama* and the *Ekottarika-āgama* respectively, the six senses-spheres, *saḷāyatana*, are 六處 vs. 六入;[35] bodily contact as one of the five sense-door experiences, *phassa*, is 觸 vs. 細滑;[36] and feeling as one of the five aggregates, *vedanā*, is 覺 vs. 痛.[37] Again,

---

[30] Lin 2009: 131 and 133.

[31] Lin 2009: 131 and 133.

[32] Lin 2009: 130 and 133. 典藏寶 is almost completely unique to Zhu Fonian (T 309, T 384, T 656); it also appears in T 202. Notably, the *Dīrgha-āgama* also has a list of the seven treasures that does not feature 典兵寶: 何謂七寶？一、金輪寶，二、白象寶，三、紺馬寶，四、神珠寶，五、玉女寶，六、居士寶，七、主兵寶 (T 1 at T I 21c11–13).

[33] Palumbo 2013: 80.

[34] In the case of Sakka, the ruler of the *deva*s, the *Madhyama-āgama* uses 天帝釋 (24x), whereas the *Ekottarika-āgama* often uses 釋提桓因 (150x), but on several occasions also employs 天帝釋 (14x). The more frequently used *Ekottarika-āgama* rendering, 釋提桓因, does not occur at all in the *Madhyama-āgama*.

[35] Nattier 2007: 196 note 48; cf. also Nattier 2010: 238 note 22.

[36] Cf. Unebe 1971: 294–295.

[37] Notably, the *Ekottarika-āgama*, T 125 at T II 707b15, explains 痛者名覺,

right intention, *sammā saṅkappa*, is 正志 vs. 正治;[38] the four *satipaṭṭhāna*s are 四念處 vs. 四意止;[39] the awakening factor of tranquillity, *passaddhi-sambojjhaṅga,* is 息覺支 vs. 猗覺意;[40] and the divine abode of equanimity, *upek(k)hā,* is 捨 vs. 護.[41]

The two collections also differ in their rendition of the eightfold noble path, *ariyo aṭṭhaṅgiko maggo*, which is 八支聖道 vs. (賢)聖八品道;[42] the corresponding noble truth of the path leading to the cessation of *dukkha*, *dukkhanirodhagāminī paṭipadā āriyasaccaṃ*, is 苦滅道聖諦 vs. 苦出要諦;[43] the final result so obtained, i.e., the realization of arahantship, *arahattaṃ pāpuṇati/sacchikaroti*, is 得阿羅訶 vs. either 得阿羅漢 or 成阿羅漢.[44] Not only the realization of arahantship, but also the term *arahaṃ* as part of the phrase *tathāgato arahaṃ sammāsambuddho* differs: the *Madhyama-āgama* reads 無所著,

thus showing awareness of the other term and the identity in meaning of both. This is an interesting case also because the equivalent term in *Dīrgha-āgama* listings of the five aggregates is rather 受. Cf. Unebe 1971: 291–292.

[38] Anālayo 2006: 147 note 8.

[39] Notably the expression 意止 does occur in the *Madhyama-āgama*, but only for the three *satipaṭṭhāna*s, T I 693c23.

[40] Unebe 1971: 297–298, Lin 2009: 131 and 133–134.

[41] Unebe 1971: 288–289. To these instances the third and fourth immaterial spheres could be added, where 無所有處 in the *Madhyama-āgama* corresponds to 不用處 in the *Ekottarika-āgama*, with just a single reference to 無所有處 in T 125 at T II 779c4 (explained to be equivalent to 不用處). Again, 非有想非無想處 in the *Madhyama-āgama* corresponds to 有想無想處 in the *Ekottarika-āgama*, a rendering that appears twice in the *Madhyama-āgama*, T 26 at T I 543a24 and 609c15.

[42] Palumbo 2013: 80.

[43] Cf. Unebe 1971: 285–286.

[44] Even with the final goal of *nibbāna,* different renderings can be found. Both collections frequently use 涅槃, but the *Ekottarika-āgama* also employs 泥洹 (16x), which is never found in the *Madhyama-āgama*; see Palumbo 2013: 123 and 216 note 62.

the *Ekottarika-āgama* 至真.[45] According to tradition it takes a long time to become a *sammāsambuddha*—uncountable eons. To convey the notion of *asaṅkheyya* + *kappa*, the *Madhyama-āgama* employs 無量 + 劫, the *Ekottarika-āgama* instead 阿僧祇劫.

Shifting from the supramundane to the ordinary, the term for village, *gāma,* is 村邑 vs. 村落;[46] the proper name of the district of Magadha is 摩竭陀 vs. 摩竭(國);[47] and Jambudīpa is 閻浮洲 vs. 閻浮提.[48] The Gijjhakūṭa is 鷲巖山 vs. 耆闍崛山; and Vesāli 鞞舍離 vs. 毗舍離.[49] The names of Buddhist monasteries differ: the Gosiṅgasāla-vanadāya is 牛角娑羅林 vs. 牛師子園;[50] the Veḷuvana Kalandaka-nivāpa is 竹林迦蘭哆園 vs. 迦蘭陀竹園;[51] and the famous Jetavana is 勝林 vs. 祇樹 or 祇洹林.[52] Evidently variations in the rendering of

---

[45] Two appearances of 如來無所著等正覺 can be found in the *Ekottarika-āgama*. Both occurrences are in EĀ 50.4, a discourse that clearly appears to be a later addition to the collection and which also in many other respects varies from the translation terminology used elsewhere in the *Ekottarika-āgama*; cf. Anālayo 2013.

[46] A difference in the proper name of a town can be found in the *Madhyama-āgama*'s use of 王舍城 for Rājagaha, instead of which the *Ekottarika-āgama* regularly employs 羅閱城. However, 王舍城 occurs once in the *Ekottarika-āgama*, T 125 at T II 575b2; cf. Mizuno 1956: 89(!).

[47] Mizuno 1956: 89.

[48] Palumbo 2013: 79.

[49] The standard measurement for distances between villages and towns, etc., is the *yojana*, which in the *Madhyama-āgama* is 由延 (40x), but never 由旬. The *Ekottarika-āgama* frequently renders it as 由旬 (78x), but also has 由延 a few times (7x). Palumbo 2013: 79 notes that the *Madhyama-āgama* equivalent 由延 also appears in other works by Zhu Fonian (T 212, T 309, T 656, T 1428, T 1464).

[50] This is in fact from the *Ekottarika-āgama* parallel to the very *Madhyama-āgama* discourse that contains this place name: MĀ 184 = EĀ 37.3 (= MN 32); cf. Anālayo 2011: 209–216, esp. 209 note 32.

[51] Cf. Mizuno 1956: 89(!).

[52] Mizuno 1956: 89(!), Anālayo 2006: 146 note 7 and Nattier 2007: 195–196 note 48.

place names occur not only in relation to less well-known places, where one might imagine that a translator no longer has clearly in mind the translation used on an earlier occasion. Such would not be possible with places like Jeta's Grove, which is by far the most often mentioned location for a discourse.[53]

The same holds for the way other proper names are translated in the two collections. Here, the *Madhyama-āgama* renders the expressions Nigantha and Niganthaputta as 尼揵 and 尼揵親子 respectively, whereas the *Ekottarika-āgama* uses a single term that differs from both, 尼揵子. For the qualification of the Buddha as the Sakyamuni we find 釋牟尼 vs. 釋迦文. In addition, the two collections differ on such proper names as that of king Ajātasatthu, 未生怨 vs. 阿闍世; or of monks, such as Bhaddāli, 跋陀和利 vs. 跋提婆羅; or Moliyaphagguna, 牟利破群 vs. 茂羅破群.[54] Such differences also occur for well-known monks such as Anuruddha, 阿那律陀 vs. 阿那律, and Sāriputta, 舍梨子 vs. 舍利弗.[55] As with locations, here too it seems fairly probable that a translator would remember the way the names of these eminent monks had been translated on earlier occasions, so that variations in rendering them could only be conscious, or else, as in the present case, most likely indicate that the two works are by different translators.

---

[53] On the somewhat mechanical assigning of locations cf. Schopen 1997/2004 and Anālayo 2011: 887 note 138.

[54] Another example is Upāli, which in the *Madhyama-āgama* is 優婆離 (128x), but in the *Ekottarika-āgama* 優波離 (16x). However, two occurrences of 優婆離 can be found in the *Ekottarika-āgama*: in one case it is the name of a layman and thus not of the monk Upāli; in the other case, a variant reading matches the 'standard' *Ekottarika-āgama* translation 優波離.

[55] Mizuno 1956: 89(!), Anālayo 2006: 146 note 7, Palumbo 2013: 79. However, note that in MĀ 211 the Taishō critical apparatus shows that the variant 舍利弗 for 舍黎子 consistently appears in SYM.

In sum, the differences in translation terminology between the two versions are substantial, ranging from circumstantial phrases, via standard expressions and doctrinal terms, to proper names. It does not seem conceivable that the same translator could have changed his translation terminology to such an extent that one person could be responsible for rendering both collections into Chinese. The present survey thus confirms the finding of Hung and Anālayo that the translations of the *Madhyama-āgama* (T 26) and of the *Ekottarika-āgama* (T 125) must be the work of different translators.[56]

To summarize these findings, the Table below gives a survey of the differences in translation idiom between the *Madhyama-āgama* and the *Ekottarika-āgama*. The Table also presents the number of times each term or phrase occurs in the respective text. These counts allow us to see that the terms and phrases in question are not only fundamental to Buddhist discourse in almost all its categories, but also, in many cases, occur very many times in the text, showing that they were extremely frequent and consistent habits of the translators of each text.

---

[56] Hung and Anālayo 2017 in this volume.

Table. Differing Terms for the Same Meaning
in the *Madhyama-āgama* and the *Ekottarika-āgama*

All terms listed for the *Madhyama-āgama* never occur in the *Ekottarika-āgama* and vice versa. Numbers in brackets indicate number of instances (e.g., 73x = 'occurs 73 times'). Counts are approximate, as always for work relying upon the CBETA CB-Reader.

Madhyama-āgama	*Ekottarika-āgama*
我聞如是 (223x)	聞如是 (454x)
聞佛所說歡喜奉行 (211x)	爾時 ... 聞佛所說歡喜奉 (425x)
一時佛遊 (217x)	一時佛在 (440x)
偏袒著衣 (54x)	偏露右肩 (5x) 著衣正服 (1x)
坐一面 (163x)	在一面坐 (174x)
起居輕便 (43x)	身體輕便 (5x)
為天為人求義及饒益 (26x)	多所饒益天人 (2x), 多饒益人 (4x)
勸發渴仰 (138x)	勸令歡喜 (5x),勸發令喜(1x), 勸樂令喜 (1x), 勸發令喜 (1x)
至信捨家 (184x)	以信堅固出家 (23x)
在遠離獨住 (74x)	在閑靜 (51x)
淨除其心 (148x)	淨其意 7x, 以清淨之心 (2x)
增伺 (59x)	貪樂 8x; cf. also 想著 (34x)
生已盡梵行已立 (110x)	生死已盡梵行已立 (52x)
無怨無恚 (111x)	心無恚怒 (4x)
遍滿一切世間成就遊 (86x)	一切亦一切一切世間,上下悉滿其中,一切中一切,遍滿其中,盡於世間
知如真已 (59x)	已知如真 (1x)
不更受有 (112x)	更不復受有 (27x)
主兵臣寶 (25x)	典兵寶
阿修羅 (54x)	阿須倫 (74x)

Madhyama-āgama	*Ekottarika-āgama*
六處 (91x)	六入 (45x)
觸 (31x)	細滑
覺 (36x)	痛 (30x)
正志 (26x)	正治 (15x)
四念處 (61x)	四意止 (9x)
息覺支 (1x)[57]	猗覺意 (8x)
捨 (28x)	護 (27x)
八支聖道 (61x)	(賢)聖八品道 (28x)[58]
苦滅道聖諦 (7x)	苦出要諦 (10x)
得阿羅訶 (14x)	得阿羅漢 (34x), 成阿羅漢 (41x)
如來無所著等正覺 (210x)	如來至真等正覺 (74)
無量＋劫 (6x)	阿僧祇劫 (8x)
村邑 (81x)	村落 (38x)
摩竭陀 (63x)	摩竭(國) (25x)
閻浮洲 (80x)	閻浮提 (19x)
鷲巖山 (8x)	耆闍崛山 (23x)
鞞舍離 (33x)	毘舍離 (48x)
牛角娑羅林 (57x)	牛師子園 (14)
竹林迦蘭哆園 (13x)	迦蘭陀竹園 (35x)
勝林 (131x)	祇樹 (378x), 祇洹林 (1x)
尼捷 (155x)/尼捷親子 (59x)	尼捷子 (20x)
釋牟尼(1x)	釋迦文 (63x)
未生怨 (9x)	阿闍世 (91x)

---

[57] The term occurs often as part of an abbreviated enumeration, where instead of 息覺支 one just finds 息.

[58] Also T 212 and T 384. This seems to be a very specific Zhu Fonian marker (rarely found outside the Zhu Fonian corpus).

Madhyama-āgama	Ekottarika-āgama
跋陀和利 (80x)	跋提婆羅 (8x)
牟利破群(25x)	茂羅破群 (13x)
阿那律陀 (377x)	阿那律 (115x)
舍梨子 (631x)	舍利弗 (411x)

Conclusion

The evidence of the Table shows that the style of the extant *Madhyama-āgama* and *Ekottarika-āgama* differs greatly for many names, terms and phrases that occur copiously in both texts—in some cases, hundreds of times. The evidence includes a range of phraseology: proper names, like the names of the Buddha's contemporaries and place names; formulaic phrases, like those associated with *sūtra* openings and those associated with stereotyped moments in the monastic career or the soteriological path; technical terms for important and common Buddhist categories; and so on. Moreover, many of the terms in question occur an immense number of times in their respective texts, showing that they are recurring and reliable habits of the texts' translators. This copious evidence makes it safe to conclude that the *Madhyama-āgama* and the *Ekottarika-āgama* are not by the same translator, which means it is highly unlikely that the *Ekottarika-āgama* is by Saṅghadeva.

This naturally leads to the following question: who, then, is the most likely author of the *Ekottarika-āgama*? In a separate paper, Radich will present similarly plentiful evidence that the actual translator of the *Ekottarika-āgama* is Zhu Fonian.[59]

---

[59] Radich, forthcoming b.

Postscript on Method

Analysis of texts for the purposes of this paper was greatly facilitated by the use of TACL ('Text Analysis for Corpus Linguistics'), a suite of computer tools currently being developed by Jamie Norrish in collaboration with Michael Radich.[60] However, it should be emphasized that the probative significance of all the evidence cited in this paper does not depend upon the operation of this software. Rather, the evidence can be assessed by the reader (and has been assessed by the authors) using the same methods and criteria used in research based upon ordinary digital searches for individually selected terms using CBETA, such as are now common in the field.

---

[60] As applied to the analysis of Chinese Buddhist texts, TACL allows a conceptually simple comparison of the n-grams (strings of length *n* characters, where *n* is defined by the user), in two or more texts or corpora of any size, up to and including the entire canon, in either of two ways: 1) What n-grams are found only in A and not in B (or vice versa)? 2) What n-grams are found in both A and B? The tool generates full lists of n-grams matching these criteria, which the researcher can then examine in context, in conjunction with digital searches via the CBETA CBReader. The code repository for TACL may be found at: https://github.com/ajenhl/tacl/. For other early results of TACL-assisted research, see Radich 2014 and forthcoming a.

Abbreviations

DĀ   *Dīrgha-āgama* (T 1)
EĀ   *Ekottarika-āgama* (T 125)
M   Ming edition (as indicated in the critical apparatus to T)
MĀ   *Madhyama-āgama* (T 26)
S   Song edition (as indicated in the critical apparatus to T)
T   Taishō edition (as accessed via CBETA 2011)
Y   Yuan edition (as indicated in the critical apparatus to T)

References

Anālayo, Bhikkhu 2006: "The Ekottarika-āgama Parallel to the Sacca-vibhaṅgasutta and the Four (Noble) Truths", *Buddhist Studies Review*, 23.2: 145–153.

——— 2011: *A Comparative Study of the Majjhima-nikāya*, Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation.

——— 2013: "Two Versions of the Mahādeva Tale in the Ekottarika-āgama: A Study in the Development of Taishō no. 125", in Dhammadinnā (ed.), *Research on the Ekottarika-āgama (Taishō 125)*, Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation, 1–70.

——— 2014: "The Brahmajāla and the Early Buddhist Oral Tradition", *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University*, 17: 41–59.

——— 2015: "Discourse Merger in the Ekottarika-āgama (1): The Parallel to the Bhaddāli-sutta and the Latukikopama-sutta, Together with Notes on the Chinese Translation of the Collection", *Singaporean Journal of Buddhist Studies*, 2: 5–35 (= id. 2016: *Ekottarika-āgama Studies*, Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation, 87–111).

Boucher, Daniel 1996: *Buddhist Translation Procedures in Third-Century China, A Study of Dharmarakṣa and his Translation Idiom*, PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

——— 2008 [2011]: *Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna, A Study and Translation of the Rāṣṭrapāla-paripṛcchā-sūtra*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass/Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

CBETA [Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association] 2011: Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡邊海旭 (ed.), *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經, Tokyo: Taishō shinshū daizōkyō kankōkai / Daizō shuppan, 1924–1932; CBReader v. 3.10.

Chen, Jinhua 2005: "Some Aspects of the Buddhist Translation Procedure in Early Medieval China: With Special References to a Longstanding Misreading of a Keyword in the Earliest Extant Buddhist Catalogue in East Asia", *Journal asiatique*, 293.2: 603–662.

Ch'en, Kenneth 1960: "Some Problems in the Translation of the Chinese Buddhist Canon", *Qinghua xuebao* 清華學報 [*Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies*] n.s. 2, no. 1: 178-186.

Demiéville, Paul 1954: "La Yogācārabhūmi de Saṅgharakṣa", *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient*, 44.2: 339–436.

Fuchs, Walter 1930: "Zur technischen Organisation der Übersetzungen buddhistischer Schriften ins chinesische", *Asia Major*, 6: 84–103.

Funayama, Tōru 船山徹 2013: *Butten wa dō Kan'yaku sareta no ka, sūtora ga kyōten ni naru toki* 仏典はどう漢訳されたのか スートラが経典になるとき, Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.

Hung, Jen-jou and Bhikkhu Anālayo 2017: "A Quantitative Textual Analysis of the Translation Idiom of the Madhyama-āgama and the Ekottarika-āgama", in Dhammadinnā (ed.), *Research on the Madhyama-āgama*, Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation, 177–196.

Hurvitz, Leon 1967: "The Road to Buddhist Salvation as Described by Vasubhadra", *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 87.4: 434–486.

Ishii, Kōsei 石井公成 2012: "Shintai kan'yo bunken no yōgo to gohō: NGSM ni yoru hikaku bunseki 真諦關與文獻の用語と語法—NGSM による比較分析 [The Vocabulary and Syntax of Paramārthan Texts: A Comparative Analysis Using NGSM]", in Funayama Tōru 船山徹(ed.), *Shintai sanzō kenkyū ronshū* 真諦三藏研究論集 [*Studies of the Works and Influence of Paramārtha*], Kyoto: Kyōto daigaku jinbun kagaku kenkyūjo / Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University, 87–120.

Kamata, Shigeo 鎌田茂雄 1990: *Chūgoku Bukkyō shi, Nanbokuchō no Bukkyō (ge)* 中国仏教史南北朝の佛教(下), Tokyo: Tōkyō daigaku shuppankai.

Kudara, Kōgi and Peter Zieme 1990: "Uigurische Āgama-Fragmente (2)", *Altorientalische Forschungen*, 17: 130–145.

Legittimo, Elsa 2005: "Synoptic Presentation of the Pusa chu tai jing (PCJ) 菩薩處胎經, the Bodhisattva Womb Sūtra Part 1 (Chapters 1–14)", *Sengokuyama Journal of Buddhist Studies*, 2: 1–111 [260–150].

——— 2006: *Analysis of the Pusa chutai jing* 菩薩處胎經 *(T12, No. 384)*, PhD dissertation, International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies, Tokyo [not seen].

——— 2010: "Reopening the Maitreya-files – Two Almost Identical Early Maitreya Sūtra Translations in the Chinese Canon: Wrong Attributions and Text-historical Entanglements", *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 31.1/2: 251–294.

Lin, Jia'an 林家安 2009: *Xiancun Han yi Zengyi ahan jing zhi yizhe kao* 現存漢譯增一阿含經之譯者考, MA thesis, Yuan Kuang Institute of Buddhist Studies 圓光佛學研究所 (Taiwan).

Matsumura, Hisashi 1989: "One Sūtra of the Ekottarikāgama on Triśaraṇagamana and Pañcaśīla", *Archiv Orientální*, 57: 359–371.

Mei, Naiwen 梅廼文 1996: "Zhu Fahu de fanyi chutan 竺法護的翻譯初探", *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* 中華佛學學報, 9: 49–64.

Mizuno, Kōgen 水野弘元 1956: "Kan'yaku Chū agon to Zōichi agon to no yakushutsu ni tsuite 漢譯『中阿含』と『增一阿含』との譯出について", *Ōkurayama gakuin kiyō* 大倉山学院紀要, 2: 41–90 [L].

——— 1989: "Kan'yaku no Chū agon kyō to Zōichi agon kyō 漢訳の『中阿含経』と『增一阿含経』", *Bukkyō kenkyū* 仏教研究 18: 1–42 [L]; Chinese translation: "Hanyi de Zhong ahan jing yu Zengyi ahan jing 漢譯《中阿含經》與《增一阿含經》", in Shuiye Hongyuan [= Mizuno Kōgen], *Fojiao wenxian yanjiu, Shuiye Hongyuan zhuzuo xuanji* (1) 佛教文獻研究—水野弘元著作選集(一), Xu Yangzhu 許洋主 (tr.), Taipei: Fagu wenhua, 2003, 509–579.

Nanjio, Bunyiu 1883: *A Catalogue of the Chinese Translation of the Buddhist Tripitaka, the Sacred Canon of the Buddhists in China and Japan, Compiled by Order of the Secretary of State for India*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Nattier, Jan 2007: "'One Vehicle' (一乘) in the Chinese Āgamas: New Light on an Old Problem in Pāli", *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University*, 10: 181–200.

——— 2010: "Re-evaluating Zhu Fonian's Shizhu duanjie jing (T309): Translation or Forgery?", *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University*, 13: 213–256.

Palumbo, Antonello 2013: *An Early Chinese Commentary on the Ekottarika-āgama, The Fenbie gongde lun* 分別功德論 *and the History of the Translation of the Zengyi ahan jing* 增壹阿含經, Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation.

Park, Jungnok 2012: *How Buddhism Acquired a Soul on the Way to China*, Sheffield: Equinox Publishing.

Priestly, Leonard C.D.C. 1999: *Pudgalavāda Buddhism, The Reality of the Indeterminate Self* (South Asian Studies Papers, 12), Toronto: University of Toronto Center for South Asian Studies.

Radich, Michael 2014: "On the Sources, Style and Authorship of Chapters of the Synoptic Suvarṇaprabhāsottama-sūtra T664 Ascribed to Paramārtha (Part 1)", *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology*, 17: 207–244.

——— forthcoming a: "Problems of Attribution, Style, and Dating Relating to the 'Great Cloud Sūtras' in the Chinese Buddhist Canon (T 387, T 388/S.6916)", in Victor Mair, Tansen Sen and Chen Jinhua (ed.), *Buddhist Transformations and Interactions, Papers in Honor of Antonino Forte.*

——— forthcoming b: "On the Ekottarika-āgama 增壹阿含經 T125 as a Work of Zhu Fonian 竺佛念", *Journal of Chinese Buddhist Studies.*

Schopen, Gregory 1997/2004: "If You Can't Remember, How to Make It Up: Some Monastic Rules for Redacting Canonical Texts", in *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters, Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India,* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press*, 395–407.

Shih, Robert 1968: *Biographies des Moines Éminents (Kao Seng Tchouan) de Houei-Kiao, traduites et annotées*, Louvain: Institut Orientaliste.

Thích Thiên Châu, Bhikshu 1999: *The Literature of the Personalists of Early Buddhism*, Sara Boin-Webb (tr.), Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Tsui, Chunghui 2013: "Silk Road and Early Buddhist Scribal Culture in China (3-5 C)", *Singaporean Journal of Buddhist Studies*, 1: 63–107.

Unebe, Toshihide 畝部俊英 1968: "Jiku Butsunen no kenkyū: Kan'yaku Zōichi agon kyō no yakushutsu wo megutte 竺仏念

の研究 漢訳『増壱阿含経』の訳出をめぐって", *Nagoya daigaku bungaku bu kenkyū ronshū* 名古屋大学文学部研究論集, 51: 3−38.

——— 畝部俊英 1971: "Tōshin no yakkyōsha Sōgyadaiba no kenkyū 東晉の訳経者僧伽提婆の研究", *Dōhō daigaku ronsō* 同朋大学論叢, 24/25: 226−280.

Zacchetti, Stefano 2006: "Alcune osservazioni sul canone buddhista cinese nella fase della transmissione manoscritta", in Giuliano Boccali and Maurizio Scarpari (ed.), *Scritture e codici nelle culture dell'Asia: Giappone, Cina, Tibet, India; Prospettive di studio*, Venezia: Cafoscarina, 161−182.

Zürcher, Erik 1991: "A New Look at the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Texts", in Koichi Shinohara and Gregory Schopen (ed.), *From Benares to Beijing, Essays on Buddhism and Chinese Religion in Honour of Prof. Jan Yün-Hua*, Oakville: Mosaic Press, 277−304.