

RESEARCH ARTICLE

What happened to the *Ekottarikāgama* 增壹阿含經 T125 after the death of Dao'an?

Michael Radich^{1,2}  and Jamie Norrish*

¹Institute for Advanced Studies on Asia, University of Tokyo, Bunkyo City, Tokyo, Japan and ²Heidelberg Centre for Transcultural Studies, Heidelberg University, Heidelberg, Germany

Corresponding author: Michael Radich; Email: michael.radich@hcts.uni-heidelberg.de

(Received 12 November 2023; revised 11 April 2024; accepted 11 June 2024)

Abstract

The only extant complete *Ekottarikāgama*, viz. *Zengyi ahan jing* 增壹阿含經 T125, has presented modern scholarship with significant challenges. This study departs from the assumption, demonstrated in prior work, that the extant collection is due to *Dharmanandin and Zhu Fonian (and not Saṅghadeva, as wrongly held by tradition and the Taishō). The study first systematically reviews and coordinates prior scholarship on a number of possible anomalous features of T125, such as possible Mahāyāna-ish elements, Sarvāstivādin elements, merged discourses, and material found only late in Pāli and other mainstream canonical parallels. We show that these anomalies are not evenly distributed, but cluster in certain patches of the collection. The second part of the study then presents new, internal (stylistic) evidence that shows that these anomalies tend to be correlated with evidence that associates some discourses in the collection with Zhu Fonian's style in original works, and with later texts. On this basis, we argue that the collection underwent modification after the death of Dao'an 道安 in 385, and suggest, more speculatively, that some of these modifications likely stemmed from the hand of Zhu Fonian.

Keywords: Āgamas; Chinese Buddhist translations; *Ekottarikāgama*; *Zengyi ahan jing*; Zhu Fonian

Introduction

In many respects, the Chinese *Ekottarikāgama* 增壹阿含經 T125 has defied the attempts of modern scholarship to understand it. As I will discuss in greater detail below, in catalogues and successive iterations of the canon, the ascription of the translatorship of the collection has oscillated between Saṅghadeva 僧伽提婆 (fl. 383–398) and Zhu Fonian 竺佛念 (fl. 382–413). Modern scholarly opinion has been divided on the same question. External evidence, in documents like prefaces, biographies, early catalogues, and early excerpts or citations, suggests that the collection had a complex early history, and multiple versions may have existed. The nature of the Indic *Vorlage(n)* is unclear, and unlike the other Chinese Āgama translations, modern scholarship has come to no consensus about the sectarian (*nikāya*) affiliation of the collection. Numerous features of the content of the collection strike us as anomalous, by comparison with other Mainstream Āgamas.

*The basic division of labour between authors was that Radich was responsible for Buddhology, philology, and write-up (so that Buddhological errors and bad prose are his responsibility alone), whereas the late Jamie Norrish wrote (and often ran) the code. This work is a true collaborative product, however, inasmuch as the conceptual design of the project emerged and developed in discussion. At the risk of dissonance, the pronoun “I” indicates thinking that is my responsibility alone (Radich), and “we” is used for joint aspects of the work. Needless to say, it is a matter for profound regret that Jamie Norrish did not live to see our work appear in print.

© The Author(s), 2025. Published by Cambridge University Press. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution and reproduction, provided the original article is properly cited.

In this study, I will principally aim to show that anomalous features of various types are unevenly distributed within T125, clustering in particular discourses and sections. I will argue that this distribution indicates that T125 is heterogeneous in nature. I will argue further that it is likely that some discourses or sections were modified substantively, probably in content as well as form and wording, sometime after the death of Dao'an 道安 in 385.

A second arm of my argument is more tentative and speculative. Various indications suggest that at least some of this probably later layer in the collection is due to Zhu Fonian. However, my evidence in support of this possibility is more circumstantial, and I present this second layer of my argument in the mode of a hypothesis, rather than a firm conclusion.

The study is divided into two main parts. First, I review anomalous features of T125 that have already been discussed in prior scholarship. Here, my contribution is to map the distribution of these features, to show that anomalies cluster. Second, I present new, internal (stylistic) evidence, discovered with computational tools,¹ which also suggests anomalies of different types, and show that this evidence, too, clusters. The paper is accompanied by a series of Appendices, presenting in tables the evidence supporting my arguments.

The many riddles of T125

Prior scholarship has already touched upon several respects in which the nature and textual history of T125 is complex and murky.² A first set of problems is adumbrated by a basic fact. As several scholars have noted, an unusually low proportion of T125 discourses is paralleled in the sister collection in Pāli, the *Āṅguttara-nikāya*, or even in other Āgamas and Vinayas more generally.² This raises tricky questions. Where did all the unparalleled material come from? Is it plausible to imagine an Indic Āgama collection with so little matching to other Āgamas and Nikāyas?

A different type of problem is presented by three discourses: EĀ 48.3 is duplicated more or less verbatim in T453, which is ascribed to *Dharmarakṣa 竺法護 (fl. ca. 266–308); EĀ 30.3 is likewise identical to T128b, ascribed to Zhi Qian 支謙 (ca. 193–252);² and EĀ 32.5 is virtually identical to T61, ascribed to Dharmarakṣa.⁵ Uncertainty about the ascription of these materials has sometimes prompted the suggestion that T125 may have absorbed originally extrinsic material over time.⁶

T125 has also proven to be a dark horse in terms of sectarian affiliation. Various theories on the sectarian affiliation of the collection have been proposed: usually Mahāsāṅghika (Akanuma, Mizuno, Takasaki, Waldschmidt,⁷ Bareau,⁸

¹I discovered this evidence using “TACL,” a software tool for the analysis of Chinese Buddhist texts that I have developed in collaboration with Jamie Norrish. For the TACL code, see <https://github.com/ajenhl/tacl>. For documentation, see <http://pythonhosted.org/tacl/>. For a GUI (graphic user interface) for the use of TACL, guides to use of the tool and associated methods, and research publications based on its application, see <https://dazangthings.nz/tacl-gui-one-stop-shop/>. Users should note that TACL has the capacity to discover phraseology documented in the Taishō apparatus, as well as the base text, which can conceal some instances of markers from searches in tools like CBReader; for an example, see n. 168.

²See also the overview in Anālayo 2013b, pp. 46–49.

⁵Kuan 2013b.

⁶Anālayo 2009, p. 824. Work in preparation has uncovered substantial evidence affirming the ascription of all three of these discourses to Zhu Fonian (and likewise, of course, their independently circulating doublets); see Chi *et al.* (in preparation).

⁷Waldschmidt 1980, pp. 136–37.

⁸See Bareau 1988, esp. 73–77. Bareau studies EĀ 24.5 (alongside 19.1) as a version of the Buddha’s biography. On the basis of his encyclopaedic knowledge of multiple versions of the same materials, he argues that especially the fourth and last part of 24.5 (as he divides the text), treating the Buddha’s post-awakening return to Kapilavastu, is most closely paralleled in the *Mahāvastu* (by comparison to versions of the same events in various Vinayas); on p. 77 Bareau conveniently summarises rare features shared by T125 and Mv. Bareau also makes the interesting observation that for the other three parts of the story, EĀ 24.5 is relatively brief in comparison to other versions. With his typical application of the comparative-genetic method, he treats this fact as evidence that in those parts of the story, EĀ 24.5 is close to the shape of a hypothetical early version. By contrast, in the fourth part, EĀ 24.5 and Mv are the most elaborated of all versions, and by Bareau’s

Schmithausen,⁹ Pāsādika,¹⁰ Kuan¹¹); less often Dharmaguptaka (Matsumoto Bunzaburō, Hiraoka).¹² Hiraoka has also pointed to a number of elements that show connections to Sarvāstivāda narrative traditions – in some cases, quite strong connections.¹³ These disagreements suggest that no clear determination is possible about the sectarian affiliation of T125 as a whole, and this is indeed the conclusion drawn by scholars such as Mizuno, Shizutani, Enomoto, Anālayo, and Hiraoka.¹⁴ I will return to this question later, when discussing Hiraoka’s evidence of possible Sarvāstivāda connections. To anticipate, however, the very assumption that a single, unitary affiliation exists to be discovered may be misleading and unhelpful.

As scholars have noted time and again, Dao’an writes in his Preface that the collection has 472 sutras – exactly matching the count in our extant text (if we include EĀ 1) – but only forty-one fascicles, against the fifty-one fascicles of the extant T125.¹⁵ This already suggests that material may have been added to the collection after it left Dao’an’s hands¹⁶ (though fascicle division can also be notoriously unstable in the course of transmission history).¹⁷

reckoning, therefore late. This may indicate that EĀ 24.5 is the product of some sort of splicing of originally different materials, in a manner analogous to “discourse merger” (see below).

⁹Schmithausen 1987, pp. 318–21 exhaustively compares versions of a standard list of concepts across a wide range of texts, and discovers unique matches between Prajñāpāramitā and four T125 discourses (EĀ 12.1, 29.7, 37.5, 46.4; he also notes some divergence between these passages and the Prajñāpāramitā parallels). On this basis, he reasons that EĀ and Prajñāpāramitā texts might have been common members of a “larger unit,” which he speculatively connects with “various Mahāsāṅghika groups.” Schmithausen is careful not to overgeneralise from his sample, but he says that at least on that basis, an affiliation to Dharmaguptaka or Sarvāstivāda appears less likely.

¹⁰Pāsādika 2010, pp. 88–90 argues that two passages in T125 show hints of “Mahāsāṅghika Buddhology,” “Mahāsāṅghika ontology,” and a “Mahāsāṅghika tenet.” I find his reasoning tendentious.

¹¹In several articles, Kuan has argued vigorously in favour of a Mahāsāṅghika affiliation for part or all of the collection, from various fresh points of view. Kuan 2012 argues for a possible Mahāsāṅghika affiliation of T125 on the basis of an unusual prevalence of place names related to Magadha (including Rājagṛha), and a possible historical concentration of Mahāsāṅghika in that region – though he notes that other factors suggest Mūlasarvāstivāda as an alternate explanation for the same evidence. Kuan 2013b argues that EĀ 32.5 shows Mahāsāṅghika-like elements in (a) refusing, in contrast to its parallels, to call 500 monks participating in the *pravāraṇā* ritual “arhats,” which he links to prohibitions in the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya against truthfully or falsely claiming arhatship for oneself or for others; and (b) giving a larger role than parallels to Ānanda, which he links to a possible Mahāsāṅghika predilection for Ānanda, as witnessed by the unique institution of a “festival of Ānanda” (*ānandamahā*) (57). He also adduces a reported Mahāsāṅghika tenet that “arhatship is not subject to regression”; see n. 100. Kuan’s other arguments in this article are too complex to summarise here. Kuan 2009 argues, on the basis of a complex analysis of subtleties in *anātman* doctrine as presented in EĀ 37.10, that *dis*-similarity from various Sthaviran sublineages increases the probability that T125 is Mahāsāṅghika, referring back to the reported primal split in the Saṅgha between Sthavira and (proto-)Mahāsāṅghika lineages. However, without positive evidence of actual similarities to known features of Mahāsāṅghika (which he does provide in other cases), such arguments risk confusing “non-Sthavira” features with features that are simply uncharacteristic of anything in India. So far as I noticed, Kuan nowhere directly engages with the possibility that the extant T125 sports features that it acquired in Central Asia or China.

¹²Where I do not give direct references, this list is based on surveys in prior scholarship. See Hiraoka 2007b, p. 212 w. n. 3; Anālayo 2009, pp. 822–23; Kuan 2012, p. 180.

¹³Hiraoka 2007b, 2008, 2013. I will return to Hiraoka’s evidence below.

¹⁴Enomoto 1984, pp. 102–3 (cf. English version, Enomoto 1986). Mizuno 1989, pp. 32–35; Anālayo 2009, pp. 822–23; Hiraoka 2007b, p. 212 w. n. 3. Although Enomoto’s article is periodically cited on the sectarian affiliation of EĀ, it actually contributes nothing fresh to the question – in contrast to his probing analysis of MĀ and SĀ. Shizutani 1973 argues that the collection combines elements originally due to various transmission lineages, and connects this with a hypothesis that it was transmitted by heterodox Sarvāstivādins from Mathura or Kashmir.

¹⁵為四十一卷 … 四百七十二經, T125 (II) 549a15, 26; CSZJJ T2145 (LV) 64b11, 22. See e.g. Anālayo 2013b, pp. 47–48; Palumbo 2013 (discussed in detail below).

¹⁶Anālayo 2013b, pp. 51–53 contemplates the possibility that revisers deliberately kept track of the overall number of sutras in the collection, in order not to create discrepancies with the known count, and therefore, that the overall growth of the collection could have resulted from shorter discourses being removed and substituted by longer ones. He also considers the possibility that room was made for additional material by merging discourses.

¹⁷See n. 73 for sensible cautions advanced by Palumbo about using text lengths measured in fascicles too naively in reconstructing textual history.

Nor is this the only potential anomaly here. Dao'an writes, further, that the reciter, Dharmanandi(n)(?) 曇摩難提¹⁸ (fl. 383–391), could remember the *uddānas*¹⁹ for the first twenty-six fascicles (of the forty-one he reports), but for the remaining fifteen fascicles, the *uddānas* were “omitted” 失 (i.e. had been forgotten by the reciter?).²⁰ But as Su has shown, the situation with the *uddānas* in our extant T125 is more complex, and does not entirely match with Dao'an's report. In fact, some chapters in the first part of the extant text are missing *uddānas*, and some chapters in the last part of the text have them.²¹ In addition, Su also studies cases in which the phraseology of the *uddānas* sometimes does not match the phraseology expressing the same meanings in the corresponding sutras; the sequence of sutras differs from the sequence of their keywords in the *uddānas*; a discourse indicated in an *uddāna* is missing from the collection; a discourse in the collection is not keyed in the *uddānas*; and the present *uddānas* point to discourses in two or more chapters.²² This reinforces the impression that the collection might have been revised, edited, reshuffled, or otherwise modified after its initial translation by Dao'an's group.

Another possible structural anomaly is suggested by a report in the *Fenbie gongde lun* 分別功德論 T1507 (a commentary on EĀ, on which more below). This commentary reports a tradition that EĀ originally had sections for every number up to a hundred (i.e. a section each for Twelves, Thirteens ... through to Ninety-Nines, Hundreds), but that most of this mass of text was forgotten through imbalances in the practice of the Saṅgha, until only ten sections were left. The extant T125, however, has eleven *vargas*, not ten.²³ Palumbo has related this tradition to apparent wrinkles in the *Zhuanji sanzang ji zazang zhuan* 撰集三藏及雜藏傳 T2026. This text presents a narrative of the compilation of the canon that gives pride of place to EĀ, and Palumbo has suggested that it was originally attached to a version of EĀ as a kind of preface or appendix.²⁴ Palumbo suggests further that the elements in T2026 relating to the Elevens may have been interpolated into an original text that only knew ten *vargas*.²⁵

The possibly anomalous status of the Elevens probably relates to further anomalies in the final fascicles of T125, which were pointed out by Mizuno.²⁶ According to T2026, the “Elevens” section is supposed to finish with a sutra on compassion 行慈,²⁷ which Mizuno identifies with EĀ 49.10. He points out further that of the twenty-nine sutras in Chs. 50–52, only three teach sets of eleven *dharma*s, as we should expect from their position; the others teach other sets, or have content that does not relate to

¹⁸Palumbo 2013, p. 5 n. 12 argues that this name should be reconstructed *Dharmananda.

¹⁹*Uddānas* are summary verses, like a cross between a table of contents, and a mnemonic key, against which to double-check the accuracy of recitation and transmission.

²⁰上部二十六卷全無遺忘，下部十五卷失其錄偈也，CSZJJ T2145 (LV) 64b12–13. As Palumbo 2013, pp. 275–76 points out, the juxtaposition with 遺忘 “forget” in the first part of this sentence makes it natural to read 失 as meaning that the *uddānas* had been forgotten. Palumbo himself argues that the “omission” was more global, and included not only the *uddānas*, but also parts of the sutras they were associated with. I do not follow Palumbo in this speculative reconstruction of events, which I think goes beyond what the evidence tells us; see p. 9.

²¹Su 2013, p. 210, Table 3; cf. also Palumbo 2013, p. 277 (discussed below). Because of the discrepancy between the fifty-one fascicles of the extant T125, and Dao'an's report of forty-one fascicles, it is difficult to correlate the structure he describes exactly with the extant collection, but if we divide approximately, the first two thirds (to about fasc. 34 in T125) should match Dao'an's longer first section, and the last third his shorter section. Of course, this calculation presumes that the proportions of the extant collection are roughly the same as in Dao'an's time, but if – as seems eminently possible – the later sections of the collection were expanded by later additions, Dao'an's first “26 fascicles” could have ended somewhere considerably short of fasc. 34. However, according to Su, in roughly the first two thirds of T125 (to fasc. 30 = Ch. 37), *uddānas* are missing for Chs. 1 (where we would not expect one in any case, since this chapter comprises a single text more like a preface), 12, 17, 18, 20, 27, 29, 30, 34, 35, 36, and 37; and in the remainder of the text, we do find *uddānas* for Chs. 39, 42, 43, 44, and 46.

²²See Su's own summary list (2013, pp. 204; and 205–10).

²³T1507 (XXV) 34a23–28.

²⁴Palumbo 2013, p. 114.

²⁵Palumbo 2013, pp. 117–18. This does not imply that the interpolation in question need have happened in China; it could have already been a feature of the Indic *Vorlage* of T2026.

²⁶Mizuno 1989, pp. 41–42.

²⁷十一處經/名放牛兒/慈經斷後/增一經終 ... 撰諸十一事經，以放牛兒十一事經為始，以行慈十一事經為終，T2026 (XLIX) 3b4–5, 4a20–21. (Note: slashes in quotes like these indicate stanza/line breaks in verse.)

numbered sets at all.²⁸ On this basis, Mizuno proposes that these chapters are a latter addition to the collection.

Mizuno also drew attention to cases in which citations in the *Jing lü yi xiang* 經律異相 T2121 (JLYX) do not match the extant T125, and the same problem was subsequently treated by scholars like Lin, Su, and Palumbo.²⁹ Most significantly, two discourses quoted from an EĀ cannot be found in the extant T125;³⁰ according to Palumbo's analysis, two other discourses match parallel independent sutras (speculatively identified by Mizuno as vestiges of an alternate translation of EĀ) better than T125.³¹ Other discourses differ to a degree that "cannot be explained as the result of imprecise quotation, abridgement or periphrasis, but must ensue from a different underlying text."³² Su gives sensible cautions about the extent to which citations in JLYX might not be verbatim, but still concludes, "The quotations in [JLYX] ... seem to have been extracted from a different *Ekottarikāgama*."³³ In a similar vein, scholars have also noted that T1507 – clearly a commentary composed in Chinese, to the Chinese translation of EĀ – in places cites EĀ with wording not exactly matched in the extant T125.³⁴ Several complex questions are raised by these observations, but they need not detain us here. For present purposes, the important point is that they may show that multiple versions of "the *Ekottarikāgama*" were once in circulation – and raise the question of how the extant T125 is related to other, partially lost or hypothetical versions, and where it sits relative to them in textual history.

The JLYX citations are also central to the arguments of Lin Jia'an.³⁵ Among prior studies, Lin comes closest to anticipating the theses of the present study. Lin argues that the extant T125 was produced by Zhu Fonian, working alone, around 410, as a revision of the original Dao'an/Chang'an translation. Lin argues that the JLYX citations stem from the old Dao'an/Chang'an translation, and that the size of the collection reported in old primary sources, expressed in number of fascicles, indicates that the present T125 is larger than the original translation. However, as I will discuss later in this paper (n. 211), despite the superficial similarity of Lin's arguments to my own, her evidence and reasoning is quite different (and in some respects, obscure or questionable).

The question of possible alternate versions of the collection is complicated still further by conflicted reports in the bibliographic tradition about who translated T125. Dao'an's preface to EĀ is unambiguous (but see again discussion after Palumbo below of finer complications introduced by other documents): the text was recited by Dharmanandin from Tokhara 兜佉勒;³⁶ Zhu Fonian was the translator 譯傳, and Tansong 曇嵩 (d.u.) was the amanuensis; the work was underway from summer 384 until spring 385. The translation was then revised by Dao'an and Fahe 法和 (d.u., c. early fourth to early fifth century); and Senglüe 僧略 (344–416) and Sengmao 僧茂 (d.u.) assisted in proof-reading.³⁷ However, Daoci 道慈 (fl. 391–401), writing in the early fifth century, reported that Saṅghadeva and Fahe had revised the EĀ of the Dao'an group.³⁸ Over time, this led to the emergence of claims that Saṅghadeva had also "translated" a version of the collection, and eventually, to the adoption of the mistaken ascription to Saṅghadeva as canonical (as it remains today).³⁹

²⁸See also Anālayo 2013b, p. 39 n. 110, citing the same observation by Yinshun in 1971.

²⁹Mizuno 1989, pp. 12–15; Lin 2009; Su 2013, pp. 213–24, referring to Su 2007; Palumbo 2013, pp. 134–44. Palumbo gives a convenient table of the differences, pp. 137–38.

³⁰Su 2013, p. 213; Palumbo 2013, p. 139.

³¹The matches in question are T119, and T215; Palumbo 2013, p. 139.

³²Palumbo 2013, p. 139; see also Su 2013, p. 213.

³³Su 2013, p. 219.

³⁴Mizuno 1989, p. 37.

³⁵Lin Jia'an 2009.

³⁶Palumbo 2013 argues at some length that Dharmanandin was most probably from Bactria, but that confusion about his origins was occasioned by the fact that he arrived in Chang'an with a party from Kashmir; 28–29.

³⁷CSZJJ T2145 (LV) 64a29–c2, esp. b6–14.

³⁸See n. 59.

³⁹The evidence of the catalogues has been surveyed multiple times by various scholars, and it would add little to our analysis here to rehearse it all again. For reviews, see e.g. Mizuno 1989, pp. 1–4; Matsumura 1989, pp. 361–67; Su 2013, pp. 198–99; Palumbo 2013, pp. 144–53. For an overview of some representative positions in modern scholarship on the

For present purposes, it is important to note that all this confusion about the ascription of T125 led to an influential false hypothesis about a supposedly lost or fragmented, “alternate” translation of EĀ by Zhu Fonian. Building upon these reports of two different translations, Mizuno championed a hypothesis that the “alternate” translation had not been entirely lost, but survived in scraps scattered through the canon as individual texts.⁴⁰ Further, and more problematically, because Mizuno adhered to the canonical ascription of T125 to Saṅghadeva, he supposed that this alternate EĀ was by Zhu Fonian and his collaborators. He also held that the same translators produced the group of texts he regarded as surviving vestiges of an alternate *Madhyamāgama*.⁴¹ It would go beyond the confines of my study here to consider the group of texts Mizuno points to fully (if indeed they constitute a coherent group at all). For our purposes, we need not broach these issues, since the Zhu Fonian translation of EĀ has been found – it is the canonical T125, which was under our noses all the time.⁴² Thus, the mistaken tradition that Saṅghadeva produced a “translation” of EĀ (rather than a mere revision), and the misascription of the extant T125 to Saṅghadeva, conjured up a ghost in the scholarly imagination haunting Zhu Fonian: the idea that his EĀ only partly survived, in the scattered shards identified by Mizuno. We risk confusion unless we firmly exorcise this ghost.

A special problem is presented by EĀ 50.4. In content, this discourse doubles up with a narrative also presented, with significant differences, in EĀ 1 (the story of Ma[k]hādeva). Anālayo has argued on the basis of translation terminology that EĀ 50.4 is by a different translator than the remainder of T125 (i.e. not by Zhu Fonian).⁴³ He therefore suggests that it was added wholesale to T125 at some point in its transmission history in China.⁴⁴ A follow-up study by Hung, using computational, statistical, quantitative methods, found strong evidence from a number of perspectives supporting Anālayo’s hypothesis that EĀ 50.4 is not by the same translator as the remainder of T125.⁴⁵

In a similar vein, Palumbo has argued that one of the building blocks in the construction of EĀ 48.2 was Chinese – an otherwise unknown translation of a *prātimokṣa*, possibly Sarvāstivādin,⁴⁶

question of this ascription, see Radich and Anālayo 2017, p. 212 n. 5. Su 2013, p. 199 w. n. 7 notes that Yinshun had already disputed the very existence of a so-called second “translation” in 1971.

⁴⁰Mizuno 1933/2010. The group of texts that Mizuno held to be vestiges of the “alternate” EĀ is T29, T39, T89, T106, T119, T122, T123, T127, T131, T133, T134, T136, T138, T139, T140, T149, T215, T216, T508, and T684. The identification of T215 and T216 as part of this group is due to Warita 1973.

⁴¹Mizuno’s parallel hypothesis about the alternate translation of MĀ was more successful (half so – he was apparently wrong that this group of texts were by Zhu Fonian); Mizuno 1969, Hung *et al.* 2010.

⁴²Previous studies by myself and Ven. Anālayo should suffice to show definitively that the extant T125 is indeed by Zhu Fonian (and Dharmmanandin, etc.), and not by Saṅghadeva; work in preparation will confirm the ascription to Zhu Fonian even more resoundingly. Radich and Anālayo 2017; Radich 2017; Chi *et al.* (in preparation).

⁴³Anālayo 2013b, pp. 25–35, 40–43. His phraseological evidence is as follows, for EĀ 1 and 50.4 respectively: 摩訶提婆 vs. 大天 for Mahādeva; 長壽 vs. 長生 for the name of the king; 以法治化 vs. 治以正法; 壽命 vs. 壽 (for lifespan); 童子身 vs. 太子身; 前長跪 vs. 右膝著地; a description of “going forth” reading 剃除鬚髮 ... 著三法衣 ... 學道 vs. 下鬚髮 ... 著法服 ... 入道; 典藏寶 vs. 主藏寶; 四等心 vs. 四梵行. In addition, he refers to wording in 50.4 that otherwise appears rarely or never in the remainder of T125, viz. 著法服 (never otherwise), 入道 (otherwise rare), 下鬚髮 (never otherwise), 食後起 (rare), 園中止 (never), 與大比丘僧 (never), 佛語阿難 (never), 阿難問佛 (never), 婆伽婆 (never), 佛說是已 (never).

⁴⁴Anālayo 2013b. Anālayo also notes that there are various differences in the narrative content of the two versions of the story (which would be odd in materials belonging to the same Indic collection); Anālayo 2013b, pp. 19–25 (with summary list 24). He argues further that the introduction of such widely deviating materials into the same collection is hardly likely in a context of oral transmission, and probably occurred in a context where the text was transmitted in writing; 24. Cf. Mizuno 1989, pp. 41–42.

⁴⁵Hung 2013. Hung also found substantial evidence against a second hypothesis advanced by Anālayo, that EĀ 50.4 was by the same translator as Mizuno’s scattered group of alternate *Madhyamāgama* discourses (cf. Mizuno 1969, Hung *et al.* 2010). Hung argues, rather, that the alternate MĀ discourses are by a third person or group, differing again from the persons responsible for the production of T125 and EĀ 50.4 respectively.

⁴⁶According to Palumbo 2013, pp. 125–26, Yabuki and Tsukamoto separately identified the text as a translation of sections of the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya. Palumbo himself argues for caution in regard to this identification, citing the precise form of the *prāyaścittikā/pātayantika/pāyattika* rule, and a clue pointing to a geographic origin outside northwest India.

represented by the Dunhuang manuscript Stein 797.⁴⁷ Palumbo is cautious about the conclusions we can draw from the parallel he points out, since he notes that it “does not necessarily imply a forgery” (viz. in EĀ 48.2) – the translator could have recognised a block of text in his Indic *Vorlage*, and used an existing translation known to him. But an alternate possibility is certainly that the Chinese represented by Stein 797 was in fact the only source for these materials in EĀ 48.2.⁴⁸

In another study, Anālayo has plausibly suggested that a passage has been corrupted in a manner that is best explicable if we posit that the change occurred in writing, and in Chinese.⁴⁹ He has also analysed cases where sudden shifts in protagonist, and other “continuity” problems, seem to betray the splicing together of originally separate materials.⁵⁰ Anālayo has also discussed an instance of a confusion between Jain and Buddhist doctrine, which he proposes would be unlikely to arise “in an Indian setting familiar with the contrast between the tenets” of the two groups.⁵¹ In sum, various clues point to the likelihood that parts of the extant T125 were modified in China, after the point of translation.

Thus, to sum up so far: remarkably few sutras in T125 are paralleled in other versions or languages. T125 has also been exceptionally resistant to efforts to identify the sectarian affiliation of its Indic *Vorlage*. These factors already make the collection an outlier. Nor can we be confident that we have received it as it was originally translated. The received T125 appears to have considerably more fascicles than the EĀ documented by Dao’an’s preface. Dao’an himself reports that the recitation of the *Vorlage* was attended by failures of memory for the *uddānas*, but the present state of T125 does not fit with Dao’an’s description of the resulting situation. The Elevens section, in particular, may have been a late interloper even in the Indic *Vorlage*;⁵² contains a large number of texts with no apparent relation to the numbering principle structuring the collection; and according to T2026, should not include Chs. 50–52. Later citations in JLYX, and a commentary on the Chinese translation, T1507, show varying degrees of mismatch with the extant T125. The bibliographic tradition eventually reported two separate Chinese “translations” of EĀ, and scholars down to the modern era have disputed which of these putative *Doppelgänger* survived. Indeed, a number of individual sutras still extant, scattered through the canon, may be leftover scraps of an alternate version. Further, at least one discourse (namely, EĀ 50.4) appears to have been translated by different hands than the remainder of T125, and the closest studies to date have suggested it may be a survival of such an alternate translation. One sutra overlaps verbatim with an early Sarvāstivāda *prātimokṣa* in Chinese, and Anālayo has suggested that another sutra contains an error that probably took place in writing, and in Chinese. These structural problems furnish ample reasons to suspect that T125 harbours anomalies in content.

Still further complications have been brought much more clearly into view by Palumbo’s brilliant, intricate and sensitive analysis of a wide range of evidence. Consequently, we can see that the textual history of the Chinese EĀ was even more complex than previously thought. For our purposes, Palumbo’s most important and convincing findings are that multiple versions of EĀ were produced

⁴⁷Palumbo 2013, pp. 126–27; cf. Anālayo 2014a, p. 1:22. According to earlier studies by Yabuki and Tsukamoto, *recto* and *verso* of Stein 797 correspond to the content of T1435 fasc. 27–28, and the *prātimokṣa* of T1436 – but in different translations. Stein 797 is dated by a colophon to 406.

⁴⁸An alternate possibility, it seems to me, is that EĀ 48.2 pre-existed the translation copied in Stein 797, and the translators of that document, by a reverse process to that hypothesised by Palumbo, recognised the verses from T125, and used that translation, rather than reinvent the wheel. See further discussion below, p. 24 ff.

⁴⁹Anālayo 2013a, pp. 23–31, analysing a derogatory reference to “*hīnayāna*” in EĀ 26.9. The essence of his hypothesis is that (a) a vocative 世尊 in one passage was misinterpreted as a nominative, and (b) a superfluous 如來 was added to a second passage on the basis of a perceived parallelism, to make the second passage chime with the first; 30–31. Anālayo notes that before him, Deeg 2006, p. 112 had already suggested that the passage is a “Chinese interpolation”; 31 n. 81.

⁵⁰E.g. Anālayo 2014a, pp. 17–20.

⁵¹Anālayo 2014–2015, p. 80.

⁵²It appears that the same was true of the Elevens in Pāli also; von Hinüber 1996, p. 40 (my thanks to Ven. Anālayo for this reference).

by the Dao'an group;⁵³ and that EĀ then experienced a turbulent transmission history down to the sixth century, probably circulating in multiple versions.

Palumbo has plausibly argued that in fact, no less than four distinct recensions of EĀ were most probably produced in rather quick succession at the end of the fourth century, three among the Dao'an translation group in the course of little more than a year, and one later revision:

- A first recension by the Dao'an group in 384, in 46 *juan*.⁵⁴ Palumbo identifies this recension with Mizuno's above-mentioned "alternate" translation of EĀ.⁵⁵
- A second recension, also by the Dao'an group, later in 384 (completed by February 385). Dao'an states that this version of the text was forty-one *juan* long, divided into two parts of twenty-six and fifteen *juan*, with and without *uddānas* respectively. It comprised 472 sutras.⁵⁶
- A third recension, produced in a period of forty days immediately after the second by the revision work of Dao'an and Fahe, with the assistance of Senglüe and Sengmao. The resulting text still comprised 472 sutras, but to the original forty-one *juan*, the revisers added an extra fascicle of summaries (now lost). This version should have been complete by March/April 385.⁵⁷
- A fourth recension, resulting from the revisions of Saṅghadeva and Fahe, which Palumbo argues was probably produced in Luoyang between 390 and early 391.⁵⁸

As already mentioned, copious internal evidence shows that the extant T125 is far more closely associated with Zhu Fonian than with Saṅghadeva (as represented by MĀ T26).⁵⁹ For our present purposes, we can therefore set aside Palumbo's fourth recension, i.e. the Saṅghadeva version, as of limited relevance for our investigation into T125. However, Palumbo's theories about the other three recensions, and their afterlives, must be addressed, since they bear closely on the question of various apparent anomalies in the extant T125 and their origins.⁶⁰

⁵³To anticipate for the sake of clarity, I will disagree with another of Palumbo's central claims: that the extant T125 is a product of the Dao'an group, which underwent no significant further change after Dao'an's death in 385. It is a central aim of the present study to dispute that claim.

⁵⁴Palumbo's source for the existence of this version is previously neglected information in Dao'an's preface to the "Sutra of Saṅgharakṣa" 僧伽羅剎經 T194: 十一月三十日乃了也。此年中出阿含六十卷、增一阿含四十六卷。伐鼓擊柝[柝SYM]之中而出斯百五卷, CSZJJ T2145 (LV) 71b20–22; Palumbo 2013, pp. 45–46, 54.

⁵⁵Palumbo's arguments for the identification of his "first recension" with Mizuno's alternate EĀ bear especially on the *Gopālaka-sūtra* 放生經 T123; he explicitly cautions that "we cannot be entirely sure whether all the 20 parallels located by Mizuno were indeed part of it." The identification is intricately bound up with Palumbo's arguments about the production of T2026, which Palumbo suggests was a kind of companion text for this recension, providing an origins narrative for the canon giving pride of place specifically to the version of EĀ represented by the "first recension"/alternate EĀ, and translated alongside it. See esp. Palumbo 2013, pp. 118–19, 143–44, 155.

⁵⁶Palumbo's source for this version is Dao'an's EĀ preface: 以秦建元二十年來詣長安...至來年春乃訖。為四十一卷, 分為上下部, 上部二十六卷, CSZJJ T2145 [LV] 64b8–12; Palumbo 2013, pp. 36–49, with full translation of the preface, 39–44.

⁵⁷Palumbo's source for this version is also Dao'an's EĀ preface: 余與法和共考正之, 僧略、僧茂助授漏失。四十日乃了...今為二阿含 [referring also to a version of MĀ – MR], 各為新錄一卷, CSZJJ T2145 (LV) 64b13–21.

⁵⁸Our principal source of information for this version is Daoci's preface to the *Madhyamāgama*. The preface itself begins with a statement that it relies upon a colophon 中阿鎔經記, T2145 (LV) 63c22. Daoci lists the texts produced by Dao'an's team, and then says that Saṅghadeva and Fahe "issued anew" 更出 the "Abhidharma" and the **Vibhāṣā* 廣說, and "rectified the translations" 譯正 of "all those sutras and Vinaya [texts]," excepting only the *Madhyamāgama* itself (which was to follow), T194, T1547 and the **Prātimokṣa* (即從提和更出阿毘曇及廣說也。自是之後, 此諸經律漸皆譯正。唯中阿鎔、僧伽羅叉、婆須蜜、從解脫緣未更出耳, CSZJJ T2145 [LV] 64a2–5). This statement clearly implies that the pair produced a new version of EĀ. See Palumbo 2013, pp. 66–82, esp. 70, 75–76.

⁵⁹See n. 43.

⁶⁰Some of the difficulties stemming from this reconstruction are confronted by Palumbo himself. He characterises the situation as "rather embarrassing": "Two somewhat different translations of the *Ekottarikāgama* were produced at Chang'an within Dao'an's team between 383 and 385"; Palumbo 2013, p. 260. He also considers an obvious difficulty – that "one and the same reciter [Dharmanadin] would produce apparently so different (*sic*) versions of the same collection"; 272–75.

In his preface to EĀ, Dao'an reports that in the course of recitation for the translation, some of the *uddānas* "went missing" 失 (seemingly meaning they were forgotten by the reciter). Palumbo's theories about the origins of the extant T125, including some of the anomalous elements we are discussing here, rest upon a speculative interpretation of this line. Palumbo opines that it is "none too credible" that Dharmanandin could have forgotten "the brief *uddānas*" for "well over one third of the entire collection," and yet not have forgotten "the much longer sutras."⁶¹ On the strength of this doubt, he speculates that Dao'an "is glossing over a far more embarrassing situation": that "Dharmananda may in fact have been unable to recite at least part of the sutras in the relevant *vargas*" as well.⁶² "Other members of the group – Zhu Fonian, Dao'an, the other foreign masters" are then supposed to have "step[ped] in on occasion to supply the missing portions. Versions of individual sutras that were known within the group might even have been chosen to replace those that Dharmananda had initially recited."⁶³ Palumbo thus speculates that the "large, 'composite sutras' [i.e. merger discourses – MR] that stand out in the received [T125]" were added between his hypothetical first and second or third recensions, as part of a strategy to redress the fallout from Dharmanandin's memory lapses.⁶⁴ He also conjectures further that the collection was reshuffled, still in the context of the Chang'an group, in order to sort the sutras into those for which *uddānas* were remembered, and those that were forgotten – in the process "decisively subvert[ing] the numerical progression of the series," that is to say, the very eponymous principle upon which an *Ekottarikāgama* is founded.⁶⁵

This intricate construct is not convincing. It piles speculation on speculation – guessing that the true extent of Dharmanandin's amnesia was greater than reported, and then imagining a particular solution to this problem. It also has the considerable disadvantage that it requires us to imagine that Dao'an and several "foreign masters," including Dharmanandin, would have intervened in *bud-dhavacana* to this extent.⁶⁶ To my mind, the anomalies in the extant T125 cannot be accounted for by Palumbo's hypotheses, and we are still in search of explanations.

As a counterpart to this theory about the creative interventions of Dao'an's Chang'an group in the text, Palumbo is also disinclined to believe that the content of EĀ was changed in any substantive manner after the production of the third recension in early 385 – which would mean that apart from sequence and arrangement,⁶⁷ the extant T125 represents that third recension.⁶⁸ A major plank of Palumbo's argument in this regard is the fact that T1507, which comments on EĀ, reflects

⁶¹This part of Palumbo's theory has been critiqued by Anālayo, who justly points to reasons that the *uddānas* could be the most easily forgotten portions of the text; Anālayo 2013b, pp. 23–30. Anālayo also objects (plausibly, in my view) to Palumbo's suggestion that differences in translation style between EĀ 50.4 and the rest of T125 could be the product of changes over time in the idiom of a single translator or team; and to Palumbo's theories about the "esoteric" nature of the Vinaya.

⁶²Palumbo 2013, pp. 275–77.

⁶³Palumbo 2013, p. 276. Palumbo does not give any indication where Chinese members of the group might have got this knowledge.

⁶⁴Palumbo 2013, pp. 273–74.

⁶⁵Palumbo 2013, p. 277. Palumbo's reasoning here is that it is implausible that Dharmanandin's "memory failures followed exactly the sequence of [EĀ]." It is indeed true, as Palumbo observes (279), that the *uddānas* in the extant T125 are not distributed in any manner reminiscent of the situation Dao'an describes; see also discussion of Su 2013 above, p. 4.

⁶⁶In evidence of his hypothesis, Palumbo adduces Zhu Fonian's remarks about his translation procedure from his preface to T2045; Palumbo 2013, pp. 283–84.

⁶⁷In principle, Palumbo is agnostic on this point. He writes, "How much of the text was changed ... *apart from its mere structural arrangement* ... cannot be conclusively established"; but also, that "what has been handed down to us is *in essence*, if certainly not in shape," the text produced before Dao'an's death; Palumbo 2013, p. 281 (my emphases). See also n. 68. Palumbo clearly shows that other evidence, to be discussed below, indicates considerable variation in the *structure* of the collection for some time to come: "At the beginning of the 6th c., the recensional order of the collection ... was in utter disarray"; Palumbo 2013, p. 156; for discussion of the evidence underlying this assertion, see esp. pp. 129–44.

⁶⁸For example, Palumbo writes that his "conjectures" "have the advantage of making sense of what we know without positing further ghosts down the textual history line," Palumbo 2013, p. 277; if we accept his theories, "we do not need to assume external agency [outside Dao'an's Chang'an group] or posthumous interference [after Dao'an's death] to account for" apparent anomalies in the extant T125, p. 275; see also n. 67.

a text very close to the extant T125. However, T1507 only comments on the first three and a half chapters of EĀ (less than three fascicles in T125, or about 5% of the whole). It cannot testify to anything in the extant T125 after Ch. 4.⁶⁹ Its evidence is thus not relevant for other portions of the extant T125 – including, especially, the portions in later parts of the text, which we see below are particularly problematic.

Moreover, for T1507 to serve as evidence that T125 had reached more or less its present contents by Dao'an's death, T1507 itself would also have to have assumed its present form by the same time. But to my mind, Palumbo does not clearly establish that T1507 could not have been modified after Dao'an's death.⁷⁰ The possibility therefore still remains open that T125 underwent significant changes – in content as well as organisation – after the death of Dao'an.

⁶⁹To obviate this difficulty, Palumbo cites a list of sutras from later parts of T125 to which he claims to be able to identify “references” in T1507; Palumbo 2013, p. 274 w. nn. 6–13. But his evidence here is particularly weak. The T125 discourses in question are EĀ 24.5, 29.6, 29.9, 30.3, 32.5, 36.5, 42.3, and 50.4. In almost all cases, these “references” are in fact to isolated *elements within* discourses, not to the discourse as a whole: for example, the supposed match for EĀ 24.5 is to “a distinctive formulation of the Four Noble Truths,” but though the exact string in question (苦諦、苦習諦、苦盡諦、苦出要諦) indeed occurs only in 24.5 and T1507, these same terms for the four truths also appear in at least EĀ 25.1 and 47.7; and in any case, this is only a single, non-specific line in a sutra over 8,000 characters long. In some cases, the general topic matches, but not the specifics: for example, the four kinds of *acintya* in EĀ 29.6 (which was also recognised by Mizuno 1989, pp. 34–35 as unusual) do not match in content with T1507 for **sattva, buddha*. In other cases, the specific wording differs, in a manner difficult to explain if T1507 was supposedly produced by the same group at the same time as EĀ: e.g. in the supposed “reference” to EĀ 29.9, 四部眾 vs. 四姓, 四恒水 vs. 四大河水, 剎帝利 vs. 剎帝; or in the supposed match for EĀ 36.5, 優鉢蓮華 vs. 優鉢華色; 補衣 vs. 縫衣裳. In other cases, the general story at issue matches, but not specifics: e.g. the contents of Subhūti's reflections in the supposed match for EĀ 36.5, or the story of Anāthapiṇḍada's daughter Sumaghadhā in 30.3. In another case, the context for Vaṅgisa's verses differs completely in EĀ 32.5 and T1507 – as Palumbo himself recognises elsewhere (p. 247). The “reference” to 50.4 is to a story which, as Palumbo himself discusses (p. 274 n. 13), is also presented in a different version in EĀ 1 (which is commented upon by T1507). Thus, there is no case, so far as I can see, where these supposed “references” necessarily refer precisely to the EĀ discourse in question. Palumbo further argues that it is “significant that in most cases such parallels correspond *in outline* to *portions of* long, hybrid texts within the extant [T125]” (my emphasis), and infers from this that “the textual and narrative material of the composite sutras ... was indeed available to the original translation team” (viz. of T1507) (p. 275). However, even if these supposed “references” to EĀ in T1507 were secure, they could only establish that the authors of T1507 knew versions of the sutras in question that contained the *elements in question*, and not the whole “long, hybrid texts” as they now appear in T125.

⁷⁰Palumbo's arguments on this score are complex. For our purposes, however, they may be boiled down to two separate points (which Palumbo conflates). (1) He mounts a strong case that T1507 was authored by a group that included Dao'an, on the basis of “mannerisms” and “hobbyhorses” shared by T1507 and Dao'an's writings: 大法 for “Abhidharma”; 身子 for Śāriputra; the *Analec*s allusion 未墜於地; and interest in Prajñāpāramitā and “fundamental non-existence” 本無; Palumbo 2013, pp. 249–51, 257. More generically, on the basis of rhyming verse and an allusion to Mao Heng's 毛亨 preface to the *Shi jing*, he argues for the presence, among the authors of T1507, of a “well-bred Chinese scholar,” who might also have been Dao'an; 247–48. (2) Palumbo also argues plausibly that Dharmanandin is most likely the person identified in T1507 as 其人, and the source for some information in T1507; pp. 189–90, 241, 256, 295–99. More circumstantially, he thinks he discerns the fingerprints of Zhu Fonian in three items of translation terminology: 石室 for Takṣaśilā, 真淨 for Śuddhodana, and 火鬘童子 for Jyotipāla *māṇava*; pp. 251–54. Thus, he believes that the authors of T1507 included Zhu Fonian and Dharmanandin as well.

Even if we accept that Dao'an probably had a hand in the production of parts of T1507, the key problem is that Palumbo nowhere demonstrates that Zhu Fonian and Dharmanandin could not have contributed their hallmark elements to T1507 after Dao'an's death. Palumbo is nonetheless obviously well aware that Zhu Fonian and Dharmanandin worked together at least until the production of T2045 in 391. In fact, he shows that a version of the story of Aśoka's “hell-prison” in T1507 corresponds “nearly verbatim” with a more developed version of the same material in T2045, but presents a convoluted argument that T2045 is not the source for T1507 here, because a second story from the Aśoka cycle found in T1507 is not found in T2045. Rather, he suggests that the source for the T1507 version was an oral tradition borne by Dharmanandin, and even speculates that a separate draft translation including this *avadāna* material was produced between 383 and 385; pp. 241–42. By contrast, we might equally, just as Palumbo says, “infer ... that someone who had Zhu Fonian and Dharmanandin's translation ... wrote the *Fenbie gongde lun* [or parts of it – MR] after 391” (p. 239). It is also possible that the memory of Dharmanandin could have been the source for both versions of the story, in T1507 and in T2045, without that implying that the T1507 version was the direct source for the T2045 version.

Palumbo also presents a range of evidence suggesting that “the” EĀ – possibly at times circulating in at least two different versions – had a somewhat volatile history for a time after its first production. This evidence mitigates against his theory that T125 was more or less closed in 385. Fascicle numbers given for words in EĀ glossed by the *Fan Fanyu* 翻梵語 T2130 suggest that the compiler was referring to a collection with a different order and smaller format.⁷¹ As already mentioned, Palumbo also considers at length the above-mentioned problem of citations in JLYX, which are also incompatible with the received T125, as studied before him by Mizuno and Lin Jia’an; these citations also seem to reflect a collection with a different structure and order than T125.⁷² Palumbo further points out that in CSZJJ, Sengyou lists a version of EĀ in thirty-three *juan*;⁷³ a long discussion in the *Da Zhou kanding zhongjing mulu* 大周刊定眾經目錄, which is presented (Palumbo believes plausibly) as a citation from Baochang’s 寶唱 (fl. ca. 502–516) catalogue (roughly contemporaneous with Sengyou), confirms the one-time existence of this thirty-three fascicle version, and further specifies that it was produced on an imperial commission 明定.⁷⁴ The same *Da Zhou kanding zhongjing mulu* entry, having discussed two versions of EĀ, ascribed to Saṅghadeva and to Dharmānandin and Zhu Fonian respectively, further states explicitly that both are extant; as Palumbo points out, this is valuable evidence that two different versions were known at the same time at some point in history.⁷⁵ Against this backdrop of these numerous reports about various orderings and fascicle divisions of the collection, Palumbo’s summary of the treatment of the collection, as cited in later works and listed in the catalogues, shows that the first evidence of a collection with fifty-one fascicles (or fifty), as the received T125, dates only to the Sui.⁷⁶

As already mentioned above, Palumbo himself aims to restrict the implications of this evidence to the structure and order of the collection, and contends that the content of T125 was more or less fixed by the time Dao’an died in 385. However, the chaotic state of EĀ traditions in the fifth to sixth centuries, which we glimpse here, also leaves ample room for the extant T125 to incorporate products of interventions into content also, effected later than the death of Dao’an.

In sum, Palumbo has shown that even at its birth in Chang’an in 384–385, the Chinese EĀ already had a singularly chequered beginning, and so far as we can discern through the haze of our evidence, at least down to the late sixth century, volatility prevailed. However, even Palumbo’s imaginative and magisterial orchestration of a rich body of evidence, much of it external to the text, does not establish that all the anomalies in the received T125 were the products of Dao’an’s group, and in place by 385. Indeed, the various puzzles besetting the text, as surveyed above, are still only a part of a broader picture, in which anomalies multiply all the more. To that picture we now turn.

⁷¹Palumbo 2013, pp. 129–31.

⁷²Palumbo 2013, pp. 134–44.

⁷³增一阿鎔經三十三卷(秦建元二十年夏出[+至SYM], 二十一年春訖定, 三十三卷, 或分為二[三SYM]十四分[卷SYM]), CSZJJ T2145 (LV) 10b21–23; Palumbo 2013, p. 145. It is important to note that even a format apparently so different from Dao’an’s forty-one or forty-six fascicles, or the extant fifty-one fascicles, need not for that reason alone have differed in content. See Palumbo’s cogent discussion of this point, pp. 155–56; the striking example of twenty- and thirty-fascicle formats for the same text cited at p. 155 n. 121; and the even more germane observation about S.380, bearing EĀ 39.2, p. 158 n. 126. See also Mizuno 1981, pp. 360–62, showing that multiple versions of Ud (now T212) in twenty fascicles circulated, but did not differ in content from the present version (now thirty fascicles). We should therefore certainly not leap from differences in the number of fascicles reported to the conclusion, for example, that our extant fifty-one-*juan* text is necessarily longer than those reported in Dao’an’s preface.

⁷⁴右寶唱錄云, 明定 ... 為三十三卷, T2153 (LV) 422a19–26; Palumbo 2013, pp. 147–50.

⁷⁵... 今二本俱存, T2153 (LV) 422a29; Palumbo 2013, p. 151. For various reasons, Palumbo takes this sentence as still comprising part of the quote from Baochang, though he acknowledges that it is difficult to tell where the quote ends; pp. 148–50. This is a complex issue, which we cannot and need not solve here; whether it was under the Liang or the Tang, the key point for our purposes is that one witness claims to have knowledge of two contemporaneous different versions of EĀ.

⁷⁶In Fajing’s 法經 (fl. 594) T2146 and its successors; Palumbo 2013, p. 145.

Nine classes of possible anomaly in T125

When we read T125, it can seem that anomalous features of various types catch the eye at nearly every turn. In the following, I will give an overview of nine different classes of evidence that indicate possible anomalies. I will first synthesise results from prior research.⁷⁷ To date, treatments of five different types of evidence have been scattered over a fairly wide number of disparate, more focused studies.⁷⁸ Few attempts have been made to give an overview,⁷⁹ and no scholar has tried systematically to coordinate the evidence with individual T125 discourses. I will present such a survey. This exercise is already illuminating, since it reveals that the evidence clusters in particular parts of the collection. Following that, I will introduce four classes of internal (phraseological-stylistic) evidence, which likewise serve as possible indicators of anomalies. Finally, I will consider all these types of evidence in concert, and ask whether patterns in their distribution give us clues about the nature of some individual discourses, and the provenance, nature, and shape of the extant collection as a whole.

Mahāyāna features

Previous scholarship has noted that a number of T125 discourses include features usually associated, in varying degrees, with the Mahāyāna.⁸⁰

For the purposes of this analysis, I will treat the following elements as possibly (proto-)Mahāyāna (note that some discourses contain more than one of these elements, and therefore appear more than once in this list):⁸¹

- “vehicles” (*yāna*, 乘) discourse,⁸² including references to the “Mahāyāna” 大乘 in so many words (1, once referring to 方等大乘; 19.8),⁸³ to “*hīnayāna*” (26.9),⁸⁴ three vehicles (**triyāna*

⁷⁷Ven. Anālayo has done more than any other single scholar to advance our understanding of EĀ. My debts to his work will be clear from the numerous references below.

⁷⁸Mizuno 1989, pp. 19–32 also treats the presentation of extended *jātaka/avadāna* tales as a feature atypical for Nikāyas/Āgamas. I believe he has a point, though this is probably a matter of degree, not kind – of course, the Pāli and other Mainstream canons also include some material of the same type, such as the *Mahāsudarāna-sūtra* (D17, in other versions merged with the *Mahāparinirvāṇa*), the *Ghaṭikāra-sutta* MN 81, or the *Makhādeva-sutta* MN 83 (paralleled in EĀ 1 and 50.4). However, Mizuno does not give an exhaustive list, and it would go beyond my capacity to try and compile one for the purpose of this present study; future studies might try to coordinate this feature with the other classes of evidence surveyed here.

⁷⁹Perhaps the most concise overview, now naturally a little out of date, is Anālayo 2009.

⁸⁰Mizuno 1989, pp. 15–18; Anālayo 2009, pp. 823–24, 2013a; Kuan 2013a. Some of Kuan’s arguments are predicated on accepting the arguments of Lin 2009 that Zhu Fonian himself revised EĀ, and citations in JLYX are from the first version produced under Dao’an; I do not regard these arguments as conclusive (see n. 211), though the conclusion they come to may still be correct. See also Pāsādika 2010, pp. 87–91, though I find his arguments unconvincing. My identification of such elements largely synthesises prior scholarship, especially Anālayo. However, I have refrained from following some suggestions, and myself added some other elements, or other further instances of individual elements.

⁸¹Anālayo 2013a, pp. 6–12 rightly aims to distinguish between such elements, and others which may simply be later, such as the idea of making Buddha-images (EĀ 36.5), which has been treated by some scholars as evidence of “Mahāyāna” colouring in T125. See Mizuno 1989, pp. 16–17, and especially Kuan 2013a, pp. 150–63; Anālayo’s refutation of these arguments is convincing (however, for this same discourse, see also n. 123). Palumbo has also problematised the idea of simple identification of “Mahāyāna” elements in T125 by referring to a “Mahāyānist undertide” in the **Mahāvibhāṣā* “which so far has largely eluded scholarly attention”; Palumbo 2013, p. 317, referring to Radich 2010, and Martini 2013, p. 55. Arguing against Hirakawa, Shizutani 1973 goes to some lengths to deny that various elements necessarily represent a full-fledged Mahāyāna; he thinks they bespeak, rather, a preparatory phase for or bridge to the Mahāyāna. Such cautions are well taken. I here hedge my bets by hinting at the cagey, borderline notion of “proto-Mahāyāna,” because I do not want to get bogged down in insoluble issues of definition. The key point is not to adjudge fuzzy definitional boundaries, but to track elements that are *probably* unusual in the context of a Mainstream Āgama.

⁸²Anālayo 2013a, pp. 13–14 w. n. 31, 33; Table, 33.

⁸³Anālayo 2013a, p. 21 w. n. 58. Anālayo points out that one instance of 大乘 also occurs at DĀ 1 T1 (I) 12c28 (also translated by Zhu Fonian); p. 32 n. 84.

⁸⁴Hayashi 1933/2010, p. 7; Anālayo 2013a, pp. 12–13, 23–31.

- 三乘) (1, 3.3, 12.6, 24.6, 26.9, 32.1, 43.2, 45.5, 48.3, 48.5),⁸⁵ the itemised set of **śrāvaka*(*yāna*),⁸⁶ **pratyekabuddha*(-*yāna*),⁸⁷ and **buddha*(-*yāna*) (聲聞, 緣覺/辟支, 佛乘, etc.) (1, 23.1,⁸⁸ 24.6,⁸⁹ 28.5, possibly 32.5,⁹⁰ 43.2, 45.5,⁹¹ 47.3, 48.5);
- Maitreya as a bodhisattva (20.6, 27.5, 42.6, 48.3);⁹²
 - (possibly) the “concentration like adamant” (*vajropamasamādhi*), associated with magical powers, and appearing as part of longer lists of *samādhi* names (4.9, 42.4, 48.6);⁹³
 - the bodhisattva path as a viable or desirable goal for adherents other than Śākyamuni⁹⁴ (1, 10.5, 20.3, 20.7, 20.10, 24.5, 27.5, 35.2, 36.5, 38.7⁹⁵), including the ideal of achieving buddhahood and the thirty-two marks (10.3⁹⁶), or the ambition of “becoming a Buddha like Śākyamuni” (1⁹⁷);
 - the Buddha preaching bodhisattva practices 菩薩行 to others⁹⁸ (20.3, 48.5, 52.6⁹⁹);
 - (possibly) the notion of (a “ground” that is) **avaivartika* 不退轉(地)¹⁰⁰ (26.9,¹⁰¹ 42.8,¹⁰² 43.2¹⁰³);

⁸⁵Anālayo 2013a, p. 14 w. n. 32.

⁸⁶Mention of *śrāvakas* in the context of this set must be distinguished from other mentions, which do not necessarily imply Mahāyāna; e.g. when the Buddha names a person as “foremost among my **śrāvakas*” for this or that quality, or the characterisation of certain disciples as **mahāśrāvaka*.

⁸⁷I exclude from consideration other mentions of *pratyekabuddhas* that do not necessarily have Mahāyāna colouring, such as a brief *jātaka* with a *pratyekabuddha* protagonist, EĀ 24.4 T125 (II) 613a3–13; or an odd passage in which Kāśyapa declares that if the Buddha had not achieved *anuttarasamyaksambodhi*, Kāśyapa himself would have become a *pratyekabuddha*; EĀ 12.6 T125 (II) 570b5–8.

⁸⁸T125 (II) 609b18–20.

⁸⁹所謂高廣之床, 金、銀、象牙之床, 或角床、佛座、辟支佛座、阿羅漢座、諸尊師座, T125 (II) 625c4–5.

⁹⁰Verses declare that the *dharmas* of Buddhas of the past and future are the same as those of Śākyamuni, and superior to those achieved by **pratyekabuddhas* or **śrāvakas*; T125 (II) 676c12–21.

⁹¹彼人為在何部? 聲聞部、辟支 [+佛 SYMSh]部, 為[+是SYM]佛部耶, T125 (II) 773b8–9.

⁹²Anālayo 2013a, p. 6; but cf. the caveat at p. 17 n. 43.

⁹³Lamotte 1967 argues that *vajropamasamādhi* (EĀ 48.6) is a Mahāyāna-like element, and Kuan 2013a, pp. 140–49 pursues the argument in more detail; Anālayo 2013a, pp. 6–12 aims to refute this notion by citing similar ideas in Mainstream discourses. However, I still believe that a conjunction of elements pointed out by Kuan do suggest a possible connection with Mahāyāna: specifically, that a *samādhi*, so-termed, is portrayed as having magical power; and that this *samādhi* appears as part of a longer list of *samādhi* names; Kuan 146, referring to Skilton 2002. I have thus considered this element worth tracking in as a possible hint of Mahāyāna-like materials.

⁹⁴Cf. Table, Anālayo 2013a, p. 33.

⁹⁵此山過去久遠, 亦同此名, 更無異名。所以然者, 此仙人山, 恒有神通菩薩、得道羅漢、諸仙人所居之處, T125 (II) 723a16–19; cf. also 723b25–26.

⁹⁶T125 (II) 564b16–17, Anālayo 2013a, p. 15 w. n. 35.

⁹⁷T125 (II) 552b10, Anālayo 2013a, p. 21 w. n. 57.

⁹⁸Cf. Table, Anālayo 2013a, p. 33.

⁹⁹In both EĀ 48.5 and 52.6, the Buddha explains, and advocates, the spirit in which a bodhisattva gives; T125 (II) 792c16–24, 826b25–29.

¹⁰⁰The Mahāyāna concept of *avaivartika* must be distinguished from the use of the same wording, 不退轉, in Mainstream contexts, for “*dharmas* [that ensure] non-decline,” etc., e.g. 七不退轉法 in EĀ 40.2, T125 (II) 738b18–c12. Mizuno 1989, p. 35 has a different page number, but is transparently referring to this passage; as he shows, the rubric at issue is the set of seven qualities taught by the Buddha to make the Saṅgha impregnable to threats, by analogy to the seven strengths that made the state of Vajji indomitable; cf. DĀ 1 T1 (I) 11b23–12a6, Pāli *aparihānīyesu dhammesu*, D 2:79. However, this list may be evidentially significant for us in a different sense. Mizuno 1989 argues that the list is anomalous against all other known versions. Kuan 2013b, p. 52 cites the *Samayabhedoparacanacakra* 部執異論 for a claim that it was a Mahāsāṅghika tenet that “arhatship is not subject to regression,” and on these grounds, regards the EĀ 32.5 instance of this concept as evidence of a Mahāsāṅghika sectarian affiliation, rather than Mahāyāna. Palumbo 2013, p. 299 cites T1507, which explicitly associates a doctrine of four types of “lapse” (退轉, *parihāṇi*) to which nine classes of *arhats* are subject. I am grateful to Ven. Anālayo for advice that clarified my understanding of this category (personal communication, October 2023).

¹⁰¹立無量眾生在三乘行, 有在不退轉地住者, T125 (II) 639c25–26; Anālayo 2013a, p. 12 n. 27.

¹⁰²立不退轉之[-SYM]地, T125 (II) 755b14.

¹⁰³意不退轉, T125 (II) 757c7, c15.

- the notion of **bodhicitta* (1, 10.5, 35.2, 52.6);¹⁰⁴
- mention of the six perfections in application to persons other than Śākyamuni or past Buddhas (1, 27.5);¹⁰⁵
- the concept of **mahākaruṇā*, especially if it is recommended as a practice for persons other than the Buddha(s) (38.1, ¹⁰⁶ 49.4);
- the concept of *ekajātipratibaddha* 一生補處 (20.10, 42.3);¹⁰⁷
- the notion of “Buddha lands” 佛土,¹⁰⁸ including simultaneous remote lands in the present, and the idea of teleporting between them (26.9, 37.2, ¹⁰⁹ 38.7) – to which we should add other notions connected with an expanded cosmology,¹¹⁰ such as the **trisāhasramahāsāhasralokadhātu*¹¹¹ (三千大千世界, 三千大千剎土) (18.5, 24.3, 24.5, 36.5, 37.2, 37.3, 41.1, 42.3, 43.2, 48.3), or “other *buddhakṣetras*” 他方剎土 (41.1);
- the names of other little-known Buddhas:¹¹² 奇光如來 (37.2), 寶藏如來 (43.2), 師子應如來, 柔順佛, 光焰佛, 無垢佛 (48.4);
- elements in EĀ 1 redolent of the “cult of the text”;¹¹³
- the term *bodhisattva-mahāsattva* 菩薩摩訶薩 (20.7, 27.5);¹¹⁴
- **anuttarasamyaksambodhi* (無上正真之道, 無上正真等正覺) as a generalised goal (rather than a special property of Śākyamuni and past and future Buddhas) (20.7, ¹¹⁵ 26.5, 39.3, possibly 49.2¹¹⁶);
- the “four fundamentals of the Dharma” 四法本(末), 四事之教, 四法之本 (26.8, 26.9, 31.4, 42.3);¹¹⁷
- the presence of multiple bodhisattvas in the same scene (1, 10.8, 38.7, 48.3¹¹⁸);

¹⁰⁴Anālayo 2013a, pp. 15–16.

¹⁰⁵Anālayo 2013a, pp. 17–18.

¹⁰⁶Anālayo 2013a, p. 16 n. 38.

¹⁰⁷Anālayo 2013a, pp. 16–17.

¹⁰⁸Hayashi 1933/2010, p. 7.

¹⁰⁹Anālayo 2013a, p. 18.

¹¹⁰Mizuno also treats as a Mahāyāna-like feature the use of hyperbolically large numbers, but I have not included it in my list here; Mizuno 1989, p. 18.

¹¹¹Ven. Anālayo points out (personal communication, October 2023) that this concept is found once in the Pāli canon, at AN 3.80. Clearly, then, it is not an absolute Mahāyāna monopoly. However, I differ from Anālayo in my view of the evidential significance of this item in the present context. Even if this notion is not exclusive to the Mahāyāna, it is associated far more strongly with Mahāyāna contexts, and it is therefore worth noting as a sign of *possible* or *probable* (quasi-)Mahāyāna colouring. Cf. nn. 81, 123.

¹¹²Mizuno 1989, p. 16.

¹¹³Hayashi 1933/2010, p. 6; Mizuno 1989, p. 17; Anālayo 2013a, pp. 21–22, 31–32; Palumbo 2013, p. 222, referring to admonitions to memorise, recite, and disseminate the text, and promises of benefits that will accrue from doing so. The phrase “cult of the text” is my own. I have in mind a modification and expansion of the notion more famous as the “cult of the book”; cf. Schopen 1975; Drewes 2007; Radich 2019a/2020, pp. 545, 555; Radich 2021, pp. 88, 89.

¹¹⁴As discussed by Enomoto 1984, p. 101, SĀ 1177 also features the *bodhisattva-mahāsattva*, T99 (II) 317a25–26. This element is therefore not utterly unique to T125, among the Āgamas.

¹¹⁵The Buddha explains that the past Buddhas achieved *anuttarasamyaksambodhi* by cultivating two viewpoints (contemplations, perspectives), and urges *bhikṣus* to cultivate the same viewpoints; T125 (II) 600b9–15.

¹¹⁶In a peculiar and obscure passage, talk of the possibility of a practitioner(?) achieving **anuttarasamyaksambodhi* in the future under the tutelage(?) of Kāśyapa (the *śrāvaka* famed for his practice of the *dhutagaṇas*): 若供養過去諸聲聞, 後身方當乃得受報。設供養迦葉者, 現身便受其報。設我不成無上等正覺, 後當由迦葉成等正覺, T125 (II) 795b13–16.

¹¹⁷This is an interesting case. The rubric has no obvious Mahāyāna content, but Kuan argues that T125 is “the only non-Mahāyāna text that has this formula.” See Kuan 2013a, pp. 170–82, esp. p. 176, and the list of instances in Mahāyāna texts, p. 175 n. 103.

¹¹⁸諸過去諸佛姓字、名號、弟子、菩薩翼從多少, T125 (II) 787c5–6; at issue is the question of the number of bodhisattvas and *śrāvakas* among the following of the Buddhas of the past, which implies that some of those Buddhas had multiple bodhisattvas.

- the concept of *vajrakāya* 金剛之身 (3.1, 26.9, 42.3),¹¹⁹ and the idea that the Buddha in his *dharmakāya* has an extremely long lifespan, that the *dharmakāya* endures when the fleshly body passes away, etc. (1, 48.2¹²⁰),¹²¹
- descriptions of the Buddha issuing prophecies (**vyākaraṇa*, 蒞/別, 記) explicitly so named, specifically for buddhahood (24.5, 35.2, 36.5);¹²²
- Subhūti (of Prajñāpāramitā fame) expressing a doctrine redolent of “emptiness” (*śūnyatā*) (36.5).¹²³

The following forty-five discourses are presently known to feature one or more of the above-listed Mahāyāna elements:¹²⁴

EĀ 1, 3.1, 3.3, 4.9, 10.3, 10.5, 10.8, 12.6, 18.5, 19.8, 20.3, 20.6, 20.7, 20.10, 23.1, 24.3, 24.5, 24.6, 26.5, 26.9, 27.5, 28.5, 32.5, 35.2, 36.5, 37.2, 37.3, 38.1, 38.7, 39.3, 41.1, 42.3, 42.4, 42.6, 42.8, 43.2, 45.5, 47.3, 48.2, 48.3, 48.4, 48.5, 48.6, 49.4, 52.6.

Of course, it is not easy to judge the exact degree in which some of these elements really indicate “Mahāyāna,” nor what we should make of them even if they are such.

However, Nattier plausibly suggests that Zhu Fonian’s “track record,” as a compiler of original sutras with Mahāyāna colouring, makes him a plausible candidate to have introduced at least some of the peculiarities we observe in the text – which naturally includes such Mahāyāna colouring.¹²⁵ On the other hand, Anālayo has also pointed out that the introduction of Mahāyāna elements to the collection might have equally naturally occurred in Central Asia, i.e. the source culture of the reciter, Dharmanandin.¹²⁶ Palumbo points to a number of ways that the flirtation with apparently Mahāyāna tropes and notions might be a more general feature of other texts associated with EĀ, including other apparently Sarvāstivāda texts, and other texts produced by the Dao’an group.¹²⁷

¹¹⁹如來體者金剛所成, T125 (II) 554a23; 如來金剛之身, 不久亦當取般涅槃, 640b23–24; 如來身者金剛之數, 意欲碎此身如芥子許, 751a11–12; Hayashi 1933/2010, pp. 6–7; Radich 2012, pp. 264–66.

¹²⁰我釋迦文佛壽命極長。所以然者, 肉身雖取滅度, 法身存在, etc., T125 (II) 787b23–29.

¹²¹Hayashi 1933/2010, p. 7; Mizuno 1989, pp. 22–23. Passages in EĀ 37.3, 37.5, and 45.4 also speak of *dharmakāya* in a slightly different sense, where the question of Mahāyāna colouring is more ambiguous – the “*dharmakāya* with five members” is equated with the *asaikṣaskandhas/anāsravaskandhas*, T125 (II) 711b29–c2, 712b23–c3. On this conception of *dharmakāya*, see Radich 2010, pp. 138–42.

¹²²I exclude reference to Śākyamuni receiving his own prophecy of buddhahood under Dipaṃkara, e.g. EĀ 20.3, T125 (II) 599a19–24; or the even earlier prediction received by Dipaṃkara, in which Śākyamuni-to-be (at the time a princess) received a prediction of a prediction, EĀ 42.3, T125 (II) 757c8–758a3. Further, Hiraoka notes that *vyākaraṇa* of various broader types are common in Sarvāstivāda narrative literature; Hiraoka 2013, p. 76. For this reason, I have not treated instances of *vyākaraṇa* in EĀ 11.10, 38.11, and 49.9 as probably related to the Mahāyāna. I also naturally exclude interesting translations of *vyākaraṇa* as a genre of text, in nine- or twelvefold lists of the *aṅgas* comprising the canon, as if it too means “prophecies”: EĀ 25.10 T125 (II) 635a17–20; 29.5 657a2–4; 39.1 728c3–5; 49.1 794b14–16, c29–795a1; 50.8 813a16–17, 28–29.

¹²³Mizuno 1989, p. 17. See further p. 29. I am grateful to Ven. Anālayo for reminding me (personal communication) that Subhūti is also associated with emptiness in MĀ 169, T26 (I) 703c10–11. Strictly speaking, then, this element cannot be regarded as a Mahāyāna monopoly. Nonetheless, once more, I think it is legitimate to see a much stronger association with the Mahāyāna (cf. nn. 81, 111).

¹²⁴As pointed out by Nattier 2012 and Anālayo 2013a, pp. 32–33, a listing like this shows that Mahāyāna elements are not evenly distributed throughout the collection. See further below.

¹²⁵Nattier 2012; echoed by Anālayo 2013b, pp. 49–51; see also Nattier 2010, pp. 256–57. Nattier is referring to Zhu Fonian’s composition of T309 (for which see Nattier 2010), and problems with the content of T212 (citing Hiraoka 2007a). We can now supplement this picture with reference to T656 (Lin and He [Radich] 2020, Lin and Radich 2021); more circumstantially, we should probably assume that similar processes lie behind the production of T384 and T385.

¹²⁶Anālayo 2013a, p. 32 n. 83. Anālayo also suggests that lore memorised by Dharmanandin might be one source for EĀ 1. He bases this hypothesis on the perception that EĀ 1 bears some generic resemblances to the account found at the beginning of the Pāli commentary on DN about the composition of the text and the canon.

¹²⁷Dao’an’s preface to T1549 reports that its compiler, Vasumitra, was a bodhisattva to be reborn in Tuṣita; Palumbo 2013, pp. 33–35.

We must also consider the possibility that Mahāyāna elements, and/or discourses containing them, could have been added to our extant T125 by someone other than Zhu Fonian, at other points in the history of the text.

“Merged” discourses

Following the lead of a study of EĀ 48.6 by Lamotte,¹²⁸ Anālayo has also studied a number of instances in T125 of a phenomenon he calls “discourse merger.” Material paralleled in two or more different texts in other collections or branches of the tradition – often, material elsewhere found in different collections or genres of text – has here been combined to form a single discourse. In some cases, Anālayo’s analysis shows that the merging of sources has been imperfectly achieved, and scars remain from the surgery involved, such as abrupt changes of protagonist, or choppy progression in the narrative. Anālayo also shows cases in which merged discourses are paralleled in *suttas* immediately succeeding one another in MN; and a case in which two different merged T125 discourses combine material paralleled in the same pair of separate MN/MĀ *suttas*.

At least the nineteen discourses mentioned in Table 1 are probable products of such mergers.¹²⁹

Strikingly, the vast majority of known instances of such “merged” discourses are concentrated in the last ten chapters of T125.

Citing some of the evidence discussed above, showing that parts of T125 may betray modification in China and in Chinese, Anālayo argues that two cases of discourse merger must have occurred in China, and several other cases are most likely to have taken place in a written medium (and therefore, most likely in China, given that the originals reached China by oral transmission).¹³⁰

Discourses with late or post-canonical Pāli parallels

T125 also contains a number of discourses including material that in the Pāli tradition only appears in post-canonical or commentarial sources (Table 2).¹³¹

Material of this type has usually been taken as a sign that the Indic *Vorlage* of T125 remained open relatively late, and some of its individual sutras may therefore also be late.

A principal aim of the present study is to assess the likelihood that changes were made to T125 after the death of Dao’an. In this light, a methodological caution is called for. We have no simple way of judging when or where elements like those in Table 2 might have been added to the collection, and must keep clearly in view the possibility that they entered the collection during the development of the Indic *Vorlage*.¹³² We can appreciate the need for such caution by reference to work by Baba, who has studied a series of doctrinal elements found in Northern Āgamas, including T125, which only appear in post-canonical works in Pāli (e.g. paracanonical works, commentaries):¹³³ for example, a number of instances of taking refuge in the Buddha alone with the transcribed formula **namo buddhāya* 南無佛. This element appears in EĀ 48.3 and 49.9 (twice). However, Baba shows that **namo buddhāya* also occurs in SĀ, a number of Chinese Vinayas (including Zhu Fonian’s T1428), and the *Divyāvadāna*. Thus, this element is no monopoly of T125 alone.¹³⁴ Other examples of

¹²⁸Lamotte 1967.

¹²⁹This list is mostly confined to what I could derive from former scholarship, and unlikely to be complete; cf. Anālayo 2014–2015, p. 85 n. 6; see also Anālayo 2009, pp. 824–25.

¹³⁰Anālayo 2014a, p. 1:22.

¹³¹See Anālayo 2009, p. 824; 2010. It is important to note that many of these traditions also appear elsewhere (e.g. in a range of other textual traditions, in art, etc.). My intention with the present formulation is only to indicate that in research on this problem to date, the main point of comparison has been the Pāli tradition, and that in that set of parallels, the materials in question appear to be later than the canon.

¹³²I intend these remarks as a general methodological caution for the specific purposes of this study only. I do not have in mind any studies that have argued that material of this sort in T125 must have been added in China, and indeed, I am aware of no such studies.

¹³³Baba 2008 [2020], pp. 196–203.

¹³⁴T125 (II) 789c6, 804a20; Baba 2008 [2020], p. 246 n. 141.

Table 1. 'Merged' discourses in EĀ.

EĀ discourse	Parallel(s)
24.8	MN/MĀ <i>Cūḷosīṅga-sutta</i> ; <i>Upakkilesa-sutta</i> , etc. ¹
31.8	<i>Mahāsīhanāda-sutta</i> MN 12; <i>Mahāsaccaka-sutta</i> MN 36 ²
40.1	AN/MĀ, etc.; DN etc. ³
40.9	SN/SĀ; MN, etc. ⁴
41.1	Three sets of parallels: SN; MN/MĀ, etc.; SN/SĀ, etc. ⁵
41.5	SN/SĀ; elsewhere in T125 ⁶
43.2	AN; the extra-canonical Pāli <i>Paññāsa-jātaka</i> ⁷
43.5	Two different sutras of MN/MĀ ⁸
44.10	Another T125 discourse; SN/SĀ ⁹
45.1	<i>Dhammapada</i> commentary; <i>Jātakas</i> ¹⁰
45.4	MN/MĀ; SN/SĀ ¹¹
45.5	SN, etc.; AN/elsewhere in T125 ¹²
48.2	AN; DN, etc. ¹³
48.6	Up to five different sets of parallel sources ¹⁴
49.5	SN; DN, etc. ¹⁵
49.6	Two different MN/MĀ sutras ¹⁶
49.7	Two different MN/MĀ sutras ¹⁷
50.8	Two different MN/MĀ sutras ¹⁸
52.6	AN/T125 itself; AN/MĀ ¹⁹

¹Mizuno (1989), pp. 20–21; Anālayo (2014–2015), pp. 64–65.

²I have added this discourse merger to the list I derived from Anālayo.

³Anālayo (2014–2015), pp. 65–66.

⁴Anālayo (2014–2015), pp. 78–79.

⁵Anālayo (2014–2015), pp. 79–80.

⁶Anālayo (2014–2015), p. 68.

⁷Anālayo (2014–2015), 66; and Anālayo (2015a), with further references.

⁸Anālayo (2014–2015), pp. 75–78. Anālayo notes that different portions of the same MN/MĀ parallel sutras are merged in EĀ 50.8; 75.

⁹Anālayo (2014–2015), p. 66.

¹⁰Anālayo (2014–2015), p. 85 n. 6.

¹¹Anālayo (2014–2015), p. 85. n. 5.

¹²Anālayo (2014–2015), pp. 66–67.

¹³Mizuno (1989), pp. 21–23; Anālayo (2014–2015), p. 68.

¹⁴Lamotte (1967); Anālayo (2014–2015), pp. 63–64.

¹⁵Anālayo (2014–2015), p. 65; in *buddhakṣetrapariśodhana: a festschrift for paul harrison*, edited by c. disimone and n. witkowski, 29–40. marburg: indica et tibetica verlag.

¹⁶Like 50.8 and 49.7, 49.6 merges material from two sutras that appear in immediate succession in MN; Anālayo (2014–2015), p. 78.

¹⁷Like 50.8 and 49.6, 49.7 merges material from two sutras that appear in immediate succession in MN; Anālayo (2014–2015), p. 78.

¹⁸Anālayo (2014a 1); Anālayo (2014–2015), pp. 68–74. Anālayo notes that a final passage in the text is not matched in either of the MN/MĀ parallels, and suggests it is likely to be from a Vinaya source; 73 w. n. 74. He also notes that different portions of the same MN/MĀ parallel sutras are merged in EĀ 43.5; 75. Like 49.6 and 49.7, 50.8 also merges material from two sutras that appear in immediate succession in MN; 78.

¹⁹Anālayo (2014–2015), p. 67.

such elements include the **Nagara-sūtra* explanation of the *pratīyasamutpāda*, or mention of “emptiness in the ultimate sense” (**paramārthaśūnyatā*), or the addition of “emptiness” (*śūnyatā*) to the older set of *anitya*, *duḥkha*, and *anātman* (the “three characteristics” of all *dharmas*). However, Baba’s examples again are drawn from several Āgamas, not only T125. Baba also points out that such elements in the Chinese Āgama translations are matched in multiple Sanskrit manuscripts,

Table 2. EĀ discourses with late/post-canonical Pāli parallels.

EĀ discourse, content	Parallel source(s)
23.1, past lives of Bhaddā Kaccāna	<i>Aṅguttara-nikāya</i> commentary ¹
28.1, story of a niggard	<i>Dhammapada</i> commentary ²
28.4, the Buddha tests the fortune-telling powers of a “Brahmin” as they examine a skull	<i>Theragāthā</i> commentary ³
34.2, massacre of the Śākyaans	<i>Dhammapada</i> commentary ⁴
36.5, transformation of the nun Utpalavarṇā into a <i>cakravartin</i>	<i>Dhammapada</i> commentary ⁵
38.11, plague of Vaiśālī	<i>Dhammapada</i> commentary ⁶
43.2, Dīpaṃkara’s prediction that the future Śākyamuni will attain buddhahood	<i>Buddhavaṃsa</i> ⁷
43.2, Śākyamuni-to-be was a princess	<i>Paññāsa-jātaka</i> ⁸
44.7, the Buddha cares personally for a sick monk	<i>Dhammapada</i> commentary ⁹
45.1, escape from the island of the <i>rākṣaṣīs</i>	<i>Jātaka</i> commentary ¹⁰
45.7, attempt to trap the Buddha and his monks in a pit of burning coals	<i>Dhammapada</i> commentary ¹¹
49.5, foolhardy son of the king of the <i>asuras</i> bathes where the sea is too deep	<i>Dīgha-nikāya</i> commentary ¹²
52.1, <i>parinirvāṇa</i> of Mahāprajāpatī Guatamī	<i>Apadāna</i> ¹³
52.2, past lives of Bhaddā Kapilānī	<i>Apadāna</i> , <i>Therīgāthā</i> commentary, <i>Aṅguttara-nikāya</i> commentary ¹⁴
52.9, ten ominous dreams of King Prasenajit	<i>Jātaka</i> commentary ¹⁵

¹Anālayo (2014b), pp. 119–20 w. n. 33.²Kuan (2012), p. 190.³Kuan (2012), p. 190.⁴Anālayo (2010), p. 7.⁵Cf. Bareau (1997), p. 25; Anālayo (2016), pp. 306–7 n. 20.⁶Matsuda (2001), pp. 2–3.⁷Anālayo (2010), pp. 7.⁸Anālayo (2010), pp. 7; Anālayo (2015a).⁹Kuan (2012), p. 195.¹⁰Hiraoka (2013), pp. 83–84 w. n. 24.¹¹Kuan (2012), p. 195, Anālayo (2014a), p. 17 n. 25 and p. 20 n. 27.¹²in *buddhakṣetrapariśodhana: a festschrift for paul harrison*, edited by c. disimone and n. witkowski, 29–40. marburg: indica et tibetica verlag.¹³Mizuno (1989); Anālayo (2015b).¹⁴Anālayo (2014b), p. 120 w. n. 34.¹⁵Kuan (2012), p. 186, Pāsādika (2007).

and so cannot be an addition of the translators (or compilers) of the Chinese texts.¹³⁵ For our present purposes, the main lesson of Baba’s examples is that we cannot conclude that everything in T125 that looks unusual, against the benchmark of the Pāli tradition in particular, necessarily entered the text at the point of translation into Chinese, or subsequent further development of the collection.

Discourses without parallels (“sole exemplars”), and with

Another key item of information that we must track for each discourse is whether or not the discourse is paralleled in other texts, collections, or languages.

In the first instance, the main significance of such evidence (especially where the parallels are in languages other than Chinese, and no earlier Chinese parallels exist) is that parallels indicate that a

¹³⁵Baba 2008 [2020], p. 203.

discourse (or the paralleled part of a discourse) cannot have been invented from whole cloth in China. In addition, if we suspect that a discourse might not originate from the Indic *Vorlage* of the first translation of the collection as a whole, the existence of parallels (unless they can be shown to be derived from T125 itself) forces us to ask where the compiler of the discourse in question could have got their information about the content of the discourse.¹³⁶

Conversely, when a discourse is unparallelled (a “sole exemplar”), the chance that it is an addition or independent invention is somewhat greater, though the lack of a parallel is no guarantee that a sutra is anomalous, and we also cannot be sure when or where it might have been added to the collection.

In Appendix 5, I have therefore listed parallels where I am aware of them.¹³⁷ However, we should note that various closer studies of individual discourses regularly reveal parallels, sometimes quite numerous, not included in such listings. We should also note that supposed “parallels” listed in various sources correspond in varying degrees to their T125 counterparts, and sometimes only match a part of a longer, complex T125 discourse (see once more “merged discourses” above).

Possible Sarvāstivāda elements

As mentioned above, Hiraoka has pointed to a number of elements in T125 that show connections to Sarvāstivāda narrative traditions – in some cases, quite strong connections.¹³⁸

To be clear, a connection between Sarvāstivāda and T125 does not necessarily count as anomalous. The main thing that might make it appear anomalous is the fact that, as reviewed above, the hypothesis of a Mahāsāṅghika affiliation for the Indic *Vorlage* of EĀ has tended to dominate the uncertain scholarly treatment of the problem of the sectarian affiliation of the collection. The strong association of Sarvāstivāda and Abhidharma in the modern scholarly imagination might also lead us to perceive a certain possible tension between (quasi-)Mahāyāna features of the collection, and any Sarvāstivāda colouring we can find. Neither of these considerations is certain of interpretation. Nonetheless, the possibility that Sarvāstivāda elements might be heterogeneous with some other features of the collection means, to my mind, that it is worth tracking the distribution of those elements, in case they correlate with other phenomena.

To anticipate somewhat, Sarvāstivāda content may also be worth tracking for other reasons. First, in what we might call his “middle period,” Zhu Fonian first collaborated with Dharmanandin, around

¹³⁶Anālayo 2018, p. 126 remarks that it is not simple to determine the significance of a discourse having no known parallels. He considers the possibility that such evidence might show in some cases that unparallelled discourses are late, or a product of reworking in China (referring to his earlier study of EĀ 50.4), but he is also careful to point out, through the example of the *Jivaka-sutta*, that it is also clearly possible for such materials to be early.

¹³⁷The main sources I consulted for this exercise were Akanuma 1958/1929; Anālayo 2011, pp. 2:1038–55; Kuan 2012 (following Akanuma 1929); and other scholarship as noted in Appendix 5. I also consulted suttacentral.net, though the listings there are clearly incomplete. I have not aimed to give all known parallels in Appendix 5, since for my purposes, the main question is simply whether or not such parallels exist. My listings should therefore not be treated as a substitute for the more systematic studies that are my sources.

¹³⁸Hiraoka 2007b, 2008, 2013 (the English publication largely repeats the same findings as the earlier two-part Japanese study; I here give page references to English only). Note that Hiraoka also points to other features that are possibly closer to lineages like Mahāsāṅghika or Dharmaguptaka than to Sarvāstivāda, or features that have no obvious resemblances to any other traditions; Hiraoka 2013, pp. 88–102.

The possible Sarvāstivāda connections in T125 observed by Hiraoka revolve largely around narrative material, and may therefore be related to the prevalence of *jātaka/avadāna* material discussed by Mizuno 1989. Note that in 391, Dharmanandin (the reciter of EĀ for the original translation) was the source for the translation of the “*Dharmavivardhanāvadāna* as T2045; CSZJJ T2145 (LV) 51c9–14, Palumbo 2013, pp. 89, 241. This text is paralleled in the Aśoka cycle in the *Divyāvadāna* (versions of other parts of which also show up in T1507; Palumbo 234–46). As their work together in 391 shows, Dharmanandin was a long-time collaborator with Zhu Fonian, and his familiarity with this text strongly suggests him as a plausible source for other (Mūla)Sarvāstivāda narrative material.

Hiraoka himself uses these materials to propose that a Sarvāstivāda affiliation should be more seriously considered for T125 (or its Indic *Vorlage*). As I remark elsewhere in the present study, I suspect that a clear sectarian affiliation for T125 as a whole might elude us. See Anālayo 2016, pp. 212–14 for sensible cautions against the use of Hiraoka’s evidence to evaluate the sectarian affiliation of T125 as a whole, and for a summary of impressions deriving from comparative Āgama studies that mitigate against a close association of the collection as a whole with Sarvāstivāda.

391, on the production of the **Dharmavivardhana-sūtra* T2045, which has close associations with the *Divyāvādāna* – a collection which, in turn, has close associations with Sarvāstivāda. Zhu Fonian then also collaborated with **Saṅghabhūti* 僧伽跋澄/僧伽跋澄 (fl. 381–399?) on the production of the *Udānavarga* T212 in 397–399 – and T212 also has Sarvāstivāda associations.¹³⁹ Further, Dharmanandin himself was also the reciter of the initial Chinese translation of the *Madhyamāgama*, which has also been identified as Sarvāstivāda. In conjunction with his work on T2045, this suggests that Dharmanandin had Sarvāstivāda training or affiliations. Saṅghabhūti also had Sarvāstivāda associations – he brought the **Vibhāṣā* to China, and is credited with its earliest translation (鞞婆沙論 T1547). We will consider below the hypothesis that Zhu Fonian could be responsible for some of the heterogeneous content in T125. His ongoing association with Dharmanandin, his association with Saṅghabhūti, and his translation of these two Sarvāstivāda texts all indicate that he could have been a vector for the introduction of Sarvāstivāda elements into EĀ.

Finally, and again to anticipate, I will also discuss below internal stylistic evidence that some EĀ discourses might have been composed after the production of the Chinese Sarvāstivāda Vinaya T1435, and in knowledge of its content. This factor, too, suggests that Sarvāstivāda content could be worth tracking.

Hiraoka organises his Sarvāstivāda evidence into three categories, depending upon his degree of confidence that it shows a genuine and exclusive relation between Sarvāstivāda and T125. My impression of the evidential value of some points differs somewhat from Hiraoka's own. In my view, the strongest items of evidence that he adduces are these: details in the description of the Buddha's miraculous smile in connection with the issue of a *vyākaraṇa* (EĀ 43.2);¹⁴⁰ details of the Buddha's prediction of eventual attainment of *pratyekabuddha* status for Devadatta (EĀ 49.9);¹⁴¹ details in a story about an offering of 2,500 parasols (EĀ 38.11)¹⁴²; details of a past life story of Dharmaruci in the context of the *Dīpaṃkara* story (EĀ 20.3);¹⁴³ details of the *jātaka* relating the escape of a caravan-leader from the island of the *rākṣasīs* (EĀ 45.1);¹⁴⁴ and a tradition holding the period of human gestation to be *eight or nine months* (EĀ 31.10, 33.2, 34.1, 38.6, 38.11, 51.3).¹⁴⁵ With the exceptions of EĀ 31.10 and 34.1, all the discourses in this list feature a concentration of anomalous features in other categories (see further below).

In earlier work, I myself have also pointed to possible Sarvāstivāda connections in details of the treatment of the story of Ajātaśatru (EĀ 43.7).¹⁴⁶ Kuan notes that Sarvāstivāda sutras also seem to share the predilection he detects in T125 for settings in Magadha.¹⁴⁷ Palumbo suggests Sarvāstivāda connections for the idea that the four great rivers issue from Lake Anavatapta (EĀ 29.9, 48.5), which is also found in the **Mahāvibhāṣā*; and a parallel to one discourse (EĀ 29.3), which is cited and discussed in all three *Vibhāṣās*.¹⁴⁸ Palumbo has also proposed a number of circumstantial reasons that a Sarvāstivāda connection, no less than a Mahāsāṅghika one, might be compatible

¹³⁹A tradition widely documented in Sarvāstivāda sources holds that the collection was compiled by **Dharmatrāta*; T1547 (XXVIII) 416b17–20, T1546 (XXVIII) 1c21–25, T1545 (XXVII) 1b16–20, Pradhan 1967, p. 3, T1558 (XXIX) 1b26–27, etc.; see also Mizuno 1981, p. 369. This tradition is also cited in the Preface to T212, and so was quite likely known to Zhu Fonian; T212 (IV) 609b27.

¹⁴⁰Hiraoka 2013, pp. 76–77; Palumbo 2013, p. 303.

¹⁴¹Hiraoka 2013, pp. 77–78.

¹⁴²Hiraoka 2013, pp. 79–81.

¹⁴³Hiraoka 2013, pp. 82–83 w. n. 20.

¹⁴⁴Hiraoka 2013, pp. 83–84 w. n. 24.

¹⁴⁵Hiraoka 2013, p. 87.

¹⁴⁶Radich 2011, pp. 164–66. I would now moderate my overly bold suggestions there, evoking MacQueen, about the way we might interpret possible Mahāyāna connections with T125. Cf. also criticisms of my evaluation from a different point of view in Wu 2012, pp. 195–96.

¹⁴⁷Kuan 2012, pp. 197–201.

¹⁴⁸Palumbo 2013, pp. 300–2. The *Vibhāṣā* mentions that the canonical status of this sutra was denied by the *Dārṣṭāntikas* (increasing the tightness of its connection with the *Vaibhāṣikas* in particular).

with the Mahāyāna colouring that we observe in some T125 discourses.¹⁴⁹ Palumbo further discusses at length narrative traditions in T1507 and T2026 that appear to connect the *Vorlage(n)* of one or more Chinese EĀ(s) with the Sarvāstivāda.¹⁵⁰ However, we also should note a tradition, communicated in T1507, that the Sarvāstivādin had an EĀ in ten *vargas*, rather than eleven. This tradition has sometimes been taken to rule out a Sarvāstivādin affiliation for the present T125 as a whole, since it goes up to the Elevens.¹⁵¹

Hiraoka has advanced the stimulating suggestion that T125 may in fact be “a patchwork” from the perspective of sectarian affiliation.¹⁵² Such an approach might indeed offer a way out from the apparent impasse of scholarship on the question of sectarian affiliation. If the collection indeed combines materials from more than one different transmission lineage, trying to determine “the” affiliation of the collection as a whole may be asking the wrong question. Nonetheless, I have judged that it may also be worth tracking possible Sarvāstivāda-like materials, and I have therefore included this evidence as a separate category in Appendix 5.

Phraseology regular in Dharmarakṣa, but never in Zhu Fonian outside T125

Thus far, I have been surveying evidence of types already discussed in prior scholarship. In the sections to follow, I turn to newly discovered internal, phraseological evidence of several types, which also suggests that T125 discourses containing it may be anomalous in some way.

I was initially spurred to undertake the work leading to this study by the observation, in the course of other work,¹⁵³ that T125 discourses sometimes feature words or turns of phrase, otherwise rare, that are not found in Zhu Fonian’s corpus outside T125, but *do* recur in several works by Dharmarakṣa. It was natural to ask whether such phraseology indicated something about the nature of the discourses in

¹⁴⁹Ideas in the *Vibhāṣās* about Buddha bodies, the Three Vehicles, and focus on Śākyamuni’s own bodhisattva career, Palumbo 2013, pp. 317–18; a tradition that Vasumitra, the reputed compiler of T1549, was a bodhisattva, Palumbo 33–35, 318. To these suggestions, we might add the obvious facts that MPPU T1509 attests powerfully to the existence of a contemporaneous source culture in which Sarvāstivāda ideas were intermingling with Mahāyāna in interesting ways. Similarly, Harivarman’s **Satyasiddhi* T1646, a work nearly as central as MPPU to Kumārajīva’s project and legacy, appears to reflect a similar interaction between Mahāyāna-like tendencies and some sort of Abhidharma more broadly (if not necessarily Sarvāstivāda/Vaibhāṣika). Hiraoka 2011 has argued that the *Xin ming jing* 心明經 T569 shows some light proto-Mahāyāna colouring, but at the same time, other features and parallels may show that the text was closely connected to Sarvāstivāda (I am grateful to Baba Norihisa for pointing me to Hiraoka’s study in this connection).

¹⁵⁰This evidence, and Palumbo’s arguments about it, are quite complex. Palumbo suggests that we might need to distinguish between multiple distinct versions of EĀ within the broader Sarvāstivāda context, so that the reported version of EĀ that only went up to the Tens might not have been the only “Sarvāstivāda” version. However, his argument here is rendered problematic by a hypothesis, following Mori Sodō, that the “foreign master(s)” mentioned at T1507 (XXV) 31b19 are *bahirdeśakas*; see pp. 174, 284, 314–15, 319–20. This hypothesis is undermined by the fact that it rests in significant part on a misreading of the phrase 外國法師徒相傳, T1507 34a28, to refer to the same group. This reading has been cogently criticised by Gao 2014; echoed by Kuan 2017, pp. 446–47.

The same tradition is also distinguished by a possibly fabulous idea that EĀ originally had one hundred series of numbered *dharma* rubrics. Palumbo mentions that this idea also appears in the Mahāsaṅghika Vinaya, p. 306; but brushes aside this complication for his attempted refutation of Mahāsaṅghika associations for T125 as a whole with the suggestion that it “may represent either the memory of a very early, common lore or, more probably ... recent exposure to Sarvāstivāda influences.”

¹⁵¹See esp. Palumbo 2013, pp. 297–98. Palumbo himself argues at length against this assumption, pp. 297–317; but in part on the basis of his problematic theory of a connection to the *bahirdeśakas* (see n. 150). On the tradition at issue, see also Palumbo pp. 98, 115–18 (hints that T2026 was adjusted to make room for the Elevens later), 144, 259, 273, 284, 295–98 (w. translation of the relevant passage in T1507), 305–6 (the same tradition reported in the *Vibhāṣā*). However, many of the points made by Palumbo in these discussions bear more directly on T1507 or T2026, rather than EĀ itself, or especially the extant T125.

¹⁵²“The extant *Ekottarikāgama* may have been formed based on Sarvāstivāda traditions with a patchwork of traditions of other affiliation”; Hiraoka 2013, p. 102. Hiraoka’s wording here might imply that Sarvāstivāda materials form the centre of gravity or substrate of T125 as a whole. If this is his intended meaning, I believe greater caution is in order.

¹⁵³The work in question is a monograph (Radich, in preparation), now in its advanced stages, applying my TACL software and related methods to the critical study of translation style and ascriptions in the Dharmarakṣa corpus.

which it featured, and whether discourses featuring such phraseology were still otherwise stylistically representative of the Zhu Fonian idiom.

We search for evidence with which we can address these questions by a simple method. We first search for markers that distinguish Zhu Fonian against Dharmarakṣa. Here, we naturally bracket out T125 itself from the Zhu Fonian corpus, since it is the target under investigation. We then look for the subset of the evidence so found that also occurs in T125.¹⁵⁴ We also test for the contrary hypothesis: we reverse the procedure, and see whether we can discover, conversely, markers that distinguish Dharmarakṣa specifically from Zhu Fonian. We then see whether there is any difference in the distribution of each type of marker across the various T125 discourses.

To anticipate, it is vital to note immediately that these tests discovered much more phraseology associating T125 with Zhu Fonian, than with Dharmarakṣa. Thus, the first result of this set of tests was to affirm the basic ascription of all discourses to Zhu Fonian. I discuss this aspect of the results in more detail below (p. 26 ff.).

Nonetheless, the tests also discovered a substantial body of phraseology in T125 suggesting close connections to Dharmarakṣa/the W. Jin. In Appendix 2, I list 337 items of phraseology shared by T125 and multiple Dharmarakṣa texts, but never otherwise found in Zhu Fonian. It is striking that it was possible to find so much evidence of this type. Apparently, parts of T125 sport features that are more strongly “Dharmarakṣa-like,” or “W. Jin-like,” than they are typical for Zhu Fonian. At the same time, as I have just mentioned, we cannot doubt the basic ascription of all of T125 to Zhu Fonian, including discourses with a concentration of this Dharmarakṣa-like diction. I will return to the discussion of this pattern later, after examining some other classes of anomalous-looking phraseology in T125.

Phraseology typical of Zhu Fonian’s original works (the “Mahāyāna quartet”), but not his translations

Zhu Fonian’s corpus includes four Mahāyāna sutras: the *Shi zhu duan jie jing* 十住斷結經 T309, the *Pusa chu tai jing* 菩薩處胎經 T384, the *Zhongyin jing* 中陰經 T385, and the *Pusa yingluo jing* 菩薩瓔珞經 T656. Nattier showed that T309 is in fact a Chinese composition, not a translation – but that the ascription is correct, that is to say, it is indeed by Zhu Fonian.¹⁵⁵ In a follow-up study, Lin Qian and I showed that the same is true of T656, and suggested more circumstantially that it is probably also true of T384 and T385.¹⁵⁶ At the present state of research, then, the best-grounded hypothesis is that all four of these texts are original Zhu Fonian compositions. I will refer to these texts as the “Mahāyāna quartet.”

In Appendix 3, I list 222 items of phraseology that are found in these four texts and in T125, but not in “real translations” by Zhu Fonian.¹⁵⁷ We might consider various reasons that these items would appear in the “Mahāyāna quartet,” and not in Zhu Fonian’s other works, and consequently, for the presence of the same items in T125.

Some items have a clearly discernible link to Mahāyāna content, e.g. 一生補處 (#O004), 三世諸佛 (#O008), 佛國 (#O043). By contrast to the “Mahāyāna quartet,” none of the genuine translations in

¹⁵⁴In TAFL terms (see n. 1), these tests are: (1) an asymmetrical difference test of ZFn (minus T125) against Dhr, keeping only the n-grams unique to the ZFn side of the comparison; (2) an intersect test of ZFn (minus T125) against T125; and (3) a “supplied intersect” finding the material shared by the results of these first two tests.

¹⁵⁵Nattier 2010.

¹⁵⁶Lin and Radich 2020, 2021.

¹⁵⁷The corpus I treated as genuine translations by Zhu Fonian comprises DĀ T1, T194, T1428, T1464, T1505, T1543, T1549, and T2045. This list includes several ascriptions that buck the received tradition represented by the Taishō. Justification of these revised ascriptions is a complex matter, for which see Chi *et al.* (in preparation). Ud T212 is a complex case, because it probably includes elements added in China and in Chinese; Hiraoka 2007a. For this reason, I bracket T212 out of both corpora in this test, and indeed, we see in Appendix 3 that it includes a quantity of phraseology otherwise characteristic of the “Mahāyāna quartet”; see also n. 189. Because T125 is the text under investigation, I naturally also bracket it out of both corpora.

Zhu Fonian's corpus have any discernible connections to the Mahāyāna, and such phraseology may therefore distinguish the "Mahāyāna quartet" because of the differing content that typifies those texts. The presence of the same items in T125 might then overlap considerably with the presence of various types of (tendentially) Mahāyāna colouring, already discussed above. However, this consideration certainly cannot explain all the items on our list.

Alternatively, we have substantial primary external evidence showing that when working on real translations, Zhu Fonian worked in teams.¹⁵⁸ By contrast, interestingly enough, for the "Mahāyāna quartet," we have very little evidence in the primary documents of our external evidence. We consequently do not know much about the circumstances under which these texts were produced, nor even their dates (though we have a relatively clear idea about the dates of almost all other texts in Zhu Fonian's corpus). Given the different nature of the work, however, we can surmise that Zhu Fonian most likely worked alone on the "Mahāyāna quartet."

Now, it is logical to expect that when he was working in groups, Zhu Fonian's wording was subject to various types of "control" or modulation. The wording he originally suggested in his (presumably oral) translation of the Indic text might have been modified through discussion, for instance; or other members of the group might have subsequently edited or polished the text in various ways (as we know was the case for the original translation of EĀ itself in the Dao'an group¹⁵⁹). Indeed, when working in a group, Zhu Fonian himself might have made a conscious effort to conform to certain decisions of group policy in choice of translation terminology, at least as concerned such salient aspects of the text as technical terms, proper names, and formulae. By contrast, when he was working alone, we might expect that Zhu Fonian was able to relax back into his own voice, so to speak. This dynamic might explain some differences between "his" idiom when he was really translating, and his style in original compositions. The presence of the same traits in T125 discourses, in turn, might hint that they, too, are more of the nature of original compositions.

Alternatively again, if Zhu Fonian did have a collaborator (or collaborators) when working on his original compositions, some differences in phraseology might reflect the habitual usages of those unknown collaborators.

Whatever the reasons might be, Appendix 3 shows clearly that a number of fine differences can be observed between recurring features of Zhu Fonian's distinctive "original composition" idiom, and the idiom characteristic of his real translations.¹⁶⁰ It is noteworthy that so many of these turns of phrase should be shared by discourses in T125. This suggests that there may be places in T125 itself where we also catch snatches of Zhu Fonian's "composition" voice. For that reason, it seems worthwhile tracking this evidence, too, as part of our larger treatment of possible anomalies in T125, and seeing whether it clusters in particular parts of the collection.

Phraseology typical of later Zhu Fonian translations

As shown by Palumbo's close analysis of the primary documents, so far as we can tell from our external evidence, work on any version of EĀ that we might associate with Zhu Fonian's name – meaning, in this case, the work of Dao'an's Chang'an group – should have come to an end with the death of Dao'an in 385.

In Zhu Fonian's corpus, more broadly, we are fortunate, in that – with the exception of the "Mahāyāna quartet," as just discussed – we have unusually solid external evidence, in primary documents, for the dates of translation of most of his other works.¹⁶¹ This gives us the opportunity to detect differences between two widely separated phases in Zhu Fonian's translation career: first, the very

¹⁵⁸For discussion of this evidence, see *Chi et al. (in preparation)*.

¹⁵⁹CSZJJ T2145 (LV) 64b8–12; Palumbo 2013, pp. 39–44.

¹⁶⁰Readers should note that Appendix 3 does not represent anything like an exhaustive treatment of this problem, since it is restricted to phraseology that also occurs in T125. A fuller treatment would consider differences between Zhu Fonian's translations and compositions in their own right, without reference to the separate problems represented by T125.

¹⁶¹A detailed discussion of the evidence for these dates will be presented in *Chi et al. (in preparation)*.

earliest phase of his work, when he collaborated with Dao'an's group in Chang'an; and second, the very tail end of his career (once more, we bracket out T125, since we want our test to be agnostic about its status).¹⁶²

- T1505 (382 CE), T1464 (383), T1543 (383), T194 (384), T1549 (384);
- T1428 (410–412), DĀ T1 (413).

Appendix 4 presents 149 items of wording shared by T125 with the two large, late translations (DĀ and T1428), but never found in the earliest translations. As can be seen from scrutiny of that Appendix, many of these items also appear in texts known to have been produced in the middle period of Zhu Fonian's career, after Chang'an, but before the very latest texts: T2045 (translated in 391), T212 (399), and the "Mahāyāna quartet" (dates unknown). The point I wish to make with this phraseology, then, is not that it necessarily means that texts featuring it are as late as T1428 and DĀ, but that such diction is *atypical* for the Chang'an period.

According to the picture of the production of Zhu Fonian's EĀ, reconstructed in such fine detail by Palumbo on the basis of external evidence, then, such phraseology should not feature in T125, because Palumbo holds that the text was in essence complete in content (if not arrangement) by Dao'an's death. In some cases (especially that of some Vinaya terms, like 針筒#L139), we can be confident that the phrasing in question simply did not exist in the 380s. Even if some of these usages did already exist at that time, our test demonstrates that they were not (otherwise?, i.e. outside T125) used by Zhu Fonian (or his group) in that early period. This suggests that discourses in which this sort of phraseology concentrates may have been altered or even added to the collection later than the original production of the first version of the collection, i.e. after 385. Such discourses should therefore be targeted for further investigation.

Phraseology first appearing after the year 398

Finally, we turn to one more type of phraseological evidence that indicates possible anomalies in T125. The application of TACL allows us to discover about eighty items of phraseology that never appear in any reliably ascribed and dated text¹⁶³ before the *Madhyamāgama* (trans. 398) or the time of Kumārajīva (who arrived in China around 402).¹⁶⁴

¹⁶²I bracket out two other texts. The dating of Ud T212 is potentially problematic. Our most reliable date for its production derives from the preface transmitted at the start of T212 (not collected in CSZJJ), and falls in 399; Palumbo 2013, pp. 63–64, n. 130; on this document, see also Felbur 2018, pp. 39–40 w. n. 38. However, Greene has argued suggestively that T212 may date to after the arrival of Buddhahadra in China in 406–408; Greene 2012, p. 27, n. 50. It is therefore safer to exclude it, and suspend judgement. Among the translation texts, that leaves only T2045. If we also bracket out T2045, translated in 391, the remaining group of "early" texts has the advantage of being tightly bunched in a period of only a couple of years, and the exact period in which T125 was ostensibly also produced; and also, of restricting that corpus to texts produced by roughly the same group. I therefore judged that little is lost for our test by bracketing out T2045 as well; indeed, the test might possibly be the stronger for it. I have naturally bracketed out from this test the "Mahāyāna quartet," since we have virtually no information about when those texts were produced. However, as can be seen from an examination of the evidence gathered in Appendix 4, in a number of cases, wording characteristic of the later translations also appears in the "quartet."

¹⁶³As a basic methodological principle, I determine such matters with reference to ascriptions for which the earliest and most reliable external evidence is clear, and which are well-accepted and uncontroversial in the best modern scholarship. Documenting the rationales for selection of texts in all benchmark corpora before and around the time of Zhu Fonian is a massive task in its own right, and space prevents me discussing that question fully here. I undertake this task in Radich (in preparation). In footnotes below, I draw the reader's attention to some cases in which individual markers occur in isolated instances in texts of uncertain ascription sometimes associated with the pre-Zhu Fonian period, such as T23, T211, T544, and T730.

¹⁶⁴I have excluded items that I could find in non-translation writings before 398, e.g. the writings of Dao'an. I thank Antonello Palumbo for pointing out oversights in an earlier draft on this score.

~中有比丘尼, 一切智人, 三昧力故, 不種善根, 乞食, 食已..., 五受陰, 人不應與~, 今云何言, 今當更~, 付囑, 何因緣故, 何況餘人,¹⁶⁵ 作妄語, 作房舍, 偈中, 先生,¹⁶⁶ 共和合,¹⁶⁷ 再三教, 冷病, 到佛所頭面禮足, 受其語, 唾器, 因緣、果報, 因緣譬喻, 好守護, 婆羅門、居士 (also #L062), 實定, 實爾世尊, 小因緣, 居士婦, 巷中, 弟子應~, 從何處來, 必應, 惡不善法有覺有觀, 應作是言, 打捷椎/捷稚/捷推/捷搥, 拘尸城, 按摩, 提婆達多,¹⁶⁸ 放牛人, 斷食, 是故應~, 更無異~, 最上最妙/最妙最上, 未犯, 正位,¹⁶⁹ 比丘住處, 比丘少欲知足, 汝等實~, 生悔心, 生、老、病、死、憂、悲、苦、惱, 異論, (為, etc.) 病人說法, 看病人, 瞻波,¹⁷⁰ 破魔, 神力故, ...者善, 若不~, 聲聞乘、辟支佛乘、佛乘, 菩薩摩訶薩成就~, 見餘比丘尼, 語居士, 語餘比丘, 諸佛神力, 諸寶物, 諸比丘不應~, 講堂門, 財施法施, 貧賤人,¹⁷¹ 迴向,¹⁷² 遊行到~, 邊地人, 針筒/針筩, 間錯, 阿那律、難提、金毘羅,¹⁷³ 飢儉,¹⁷⁴ 首陀羅, 默然受已。

On the received chronology, the presence of such phraseology in T125 is anachronistic. Generally speaking, then, all this phraseology suggests that contrary to Palumbo's hypothesis about its history, our extant T125 incorporates modifications to the content of the texts dating from after the time of Dao'an.

Some items on this list are very strongly associated with the Kumārajīva corpus as a whole, e.g. 偈中 (T1509, T1521, T1564, T1646). Curiously, other items are concentrated in MPPU/DZDL T1509, e.g. 今云何言, 今當更~, 何況餘人, 因緣、果報。

A considerable number of the items listed here are concentrated in the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya translated by Kumārajīva's group, 十誦律 T1435 (and in some cases, other Vinayas following): e.g. ~中有比丘尼, 人不應與~, 作房舍, 共和合, 作妄語, 再三教, 好守護, 打捷椎/捷稚/捷推/捷搥. In fact, even items without obvious Vinaya connotations can reveal such a connection on closer examination. For example, ...乞食, 食已... ("begged for food, and having eaten it...") features in a distinctive Vinaya rendering of a formula describing a monastic rising at dawn to go on the almsround; 共和合 ("mutual harmony") almost always features in contexts speaking of (and urging) concord in the Saṅgha; 唾器 "spittoon" appears to have been coined because of the need to translate regulations about such utensils (were they exotic at the time?);¹⁷⁵ and even 實爾世尊 ("Indeed it is so, O Bhagavat") is heavily concentrated in Vinaya texts.

This pattern hints that some T125 discourses are distinguished by interest in topics, narratives, and tropes more at home in Vinaya contexts. Admittedly, even in Dao'an's time, EĀ is already reported to have had a distinctly Vinaya colouring.¹⁷⁶ Nonetheless, the use of *this specific phraseology* suggests that someone who contributed to those EĀ discourses, in their present form, was working after the

¹⁶⁵Twice in T730; see n. 173.

¹⁶⁶Also at T23 (I) 303b25–26. However, I regard the date and ascription of T23 (traditionally ascribed to Faju and Fali, W. Jin) as an outstanding research problem. See also nn. 167, 170.

¹⁶⁷Also at T23 (I) 290a7–8; see nn. 166, 170.

¹⁶⁸E.g. 爾時, 提婆達兜 [=多SYM] 以失神足... T125(43.4) (II) 759b1–2. This usage is concealed from searching in tools like CBReader by the v.l. TACL has the capacity to take into account the documentation of alternate witnesses in the Taishō apparatus.

¹⁶⁹Also found at T544 (XIV) 840a4. Greene 2016, pp. 42–43 has argued that some version of this text must have existed before the time of Dao'an. See also n. 171.

¹⁷⁰Also appears at T23 (I) 308a23; see nn. 166, 167.

¹⁷¹Also found at T544 (XIV) 838b8; see n. 169.

¹⁷²Appears once at T638 (XV) 540a20 (W. Jin), but with v.l.: 堅進[+不轉SYMP]迴向[-SYM]者[-P], so most likely a false hit.

¹⁷³Also appears once in the *Chu chu jing* 處處經 T730 (XVII) 526b4, which Greene 2016, pp. 16–17 has argued dates to "no later than the early 300s." I am grateful to Antonello Palumbo for reminding me of Greene's study in this connection.

¹⁷⁴In T211, ascribed to Faju and Fali. I regard the ascription and date of T211, like that of T23, as an outstanding research problem; cf. n. 166.

¹⁷⁵The single instance in T125, however, is a metaphorical use to describe the disgusting impurity of the human mouth: 口是唾器, 出不淨之物, T125(39.8) (II) 724b1.

¹⁷⁶For example, Dao'an says: 其中往往有律語, 外國不通與沙彌、白衣共視也, CSZJJ T2145 (LV) 64b23–24.

production of T1435 in 405–406.¹⁷⁷ In light of the fact that T1435 is a Sarvāstivāda Vinaya, this evidence may also cast fresh light on the apparent Sarvāstivāda connections of some narrative material in T125 (discussed above, p. 19 ff.), and also, on the verbatim match with the possibly Sarvāstivādin *prātimokṣa* of Stein 797 studied by Palumbo (see p. 7). This aspect of T125 certainly merits further investigation.

Generally speaking, it stands to reason that most of these items are entirely atypical of the Zhu Fonian corpus. My test targeted items that never appear before the year 398, and that period includes most of the firmly datable works in the Zhu Fonian corpus. All items in those texts were therefore excluded by the test conditions. However, we should note that some of the phraseology here appears in Zhu Fonian's latest translations, DĀ T1 and T1428 (which were produced after Kumārajīva's time, around 410–413), e.g. 五受陰, 今當更~ (T1); ... 乞食, 食已..., 今云何言, 今當更~ (T1428).

Incidentally, some of these items also appear in Zhu Fonian's "Mahāyāna quartet." Examples are 放牛人, 飢儉, 菩薩摩訶薩成就~ (T309, T384); 神力故 (T309, T384, T385); 打捷椎/捷稚/捷推/捷捷 (T384); 先生, 破魔 (T384, T385); and 生、老、病、死、憂、悲、苦、惱 (T656). This may hint that the texts in the "quartet" indeed post-date Kumārajīva's arrival, as Nattier suggested.¹⁷⁸

To anticipate the discussion below, these items are by no means evenly distributed in T125. Almost none appear in the first twenty fascicles of the collection (with the notable exception of the "Preface," EĀ 1). Thereafter, they appear in almost every chapter of the collection, with some increase in frequency in the last ten fascicles or so.¹⁷⁹

Confirming the ascription of all T125 discourses to Zhu Fonian

With all the evidence of anomalies in prior scholarship surveyed above, it is natural to ask whether T125 might include some discourses that have nothing to do with Zhu Fonian (at least, I found myself asking that question). However, as I will now demonstrate, the basic ascription of all T125 discourses to Zhu Fonian, including even those sporting numerous anomalies, can hardly be called into question.

Phraseology shared by T125 and Zhu Fonian, but not Dharmarakṣa

As mentioned above, prior work led me to discover some diction in T125 that is more characteristic of Dharmarakṣa than of Zhu Fonian. Spurred by that discovery, as already described above (p. 21), I undertook a set of tests in which I set Dharmarakṣa and Zhu Fonian "head to head" – that is to say, I looked explicitly for phraseology associating T125 with Dharmarakṣa and not with Zhu Fonian, and vice versa.

These tests easily discovered a substantial body of evidence clearly corroborating the basic ascription of all discourses in EĀ to Zhu Fonian, against Dharmarakṣa. Over 600 items of phraseology are listed in Appendix 1. Each occurs (a) in T125; and (b) multiple times in at least one other Zhu Fonian text (usually more than one text – often quite a number); but (c) never in Dharmarakṣa (with a very few select exceptions).¹⁸⁰ This evidence comprises a wide range of parts of speech and turns of phrase, many very typical for Buddhist texts. Between them, these markers comprise a rich and convincing signature of translation style. In all discourses in T125, such phraseology far outweighs phraseology

¹⁷⁷I emphasise that I do not mean here that Vinaya phraseology or content *tout court* was unknown before 405–406; my argument hinges on the *specific wording* used to articulate these concepts, as it is found in T1435.

¹⁷⁸Nattier 2010, p. 254 (and *passim*).

¹⁷⁹These items occur in the following eighty-three discourses (sometimes more than one item in a single discourse): 1, 3.9, 11.7, 11.8, 12.1, 12.8, 13.3, 13.5, 21.3, 23.1, 23.4, 23.6, 24.2, 24.5, 24.8, 25.6, 25.10, 26.5, 26.7, 26.9, 27.2, 27.3, 27.5, 28.1, 28.4, 28.6, 29.6, 31.2, 31.8, 32.9, 33.1, 33.2, 33.4, 34.2, 34.5, 35.3, 35.7, 35.9, 36.5, 37.7, 38.6, 38.7, 38.9, 38.10, 38.11, 39.1, 39.8, 40.5, 41.1, 41.4, 41.5, 42.3, 42.5, 43.4, 43.7, 44.7, 45.1, 45.2, 45.5, 45.7, 46.6, 46.7, 46.8, 47.4, 47.5, 47.6, 47.8, 48.4, 48.5, 48.6, 49.1, 49.6, 49.7, 50.4, 50.5, 50.8, 50.10, 51.3, 52.1, 52.2, 52.6, 52.7, and 52.9.

¹⁸⁰In a very few cases, I have included interesting items that occur a single time only in Dharmarakṣa. On the methodological problem represented by such "sole exceptions," see Radich (in preparation).

associated with Dharmarakṣa against Zhu Fonian.¹⁸¹ Thus, even discourses with unusually “Dharmarakṣa-like” diction are genuine products of Zhu Fonian, or a group that he belonged to.

The basic ascription of all T125 discourses to Zhu Fonian can also be corroborated by an even larger body of more rigorously discovered evidence. However, presentation of that evidence in full is a complex matter, and must be left to a future study.¹⁸²

Rare phraseology shared with Zhu Fonian’s “Preface” to the *Dharmavivardhana-sūtra

An additional class of evidence associates some discourses in T125 even more tightly with Zhu Fonian as an individual – not just with the corporate entities that produced the translations we associate with his name.

Zhu Fonian potentially represents an exceptionally rich object of study, because he is one of the rare cases in which we have both translations, and works from his own brush.¹⁸³ In fact, in his case, we have original works in two quite different genres. As already discussed, we have the “quartet” of Mahāyāna sutras, which are demonstrably his own original compositions (T309, T656), or probably so (T384, T385). In addition, however, *Chu sanzang ji ji* has transmitted a “Preface to the Sutra of the Tale of How Prince *Dharmavivardhana Lost His Eyes” 王子法益壞目因緣經序, i.e. the preface to Zhu Fonian’s translation of the *Dharmavivardhana-sūtra T2045.¹⁸⁴ This preface bears a byline ascribing it to Zhu Fonian, and we will see immediately below that this ascription is borne out by copious internal evidence.

We would ordinarily assume, by default, that a preface of this type was authored by a single figure, unassisted. Zhu Fonian’s preface thus gives us an exceptional opportunity to sample his individual voice. In addition, the preface is not constrained by the dynamics of translation, where word choice is influenced by the effort to reflect a *Vorlage* with many characteristics alien to the writer’s native idiom. The genre of the preface certainly has equally ornate and artificial constraints of its own, but within those limits, the preface also gives us an opportunity to see how Zhu Fonian words himself when he is not stretching to meet an Indic text halfway.

Using TACL, we can discover the following rare phrasing shared by Zhu Fonian’s Preface, and his translation works, including T125 discourses:

受困 (also T212); ~之累 (also T212, T309); ~之深(~) (also T212, T309); 神寺 (also T212); 玄鑿 (also T212, T309, T384, T656); 難計 (also T212, T656); (設有)毫釐/毫釐 (also T212, T309, T384, T656); 著翅~¹⁸⁵ (also T385); 有所由 (also T212, T309); 出斯 (also T212, T309);¹⁸⁶ 天竺 (also T212, T1464, T1505, T1543);¹⁸⁷ 在王宮 (also T212); 將來之~ (also T212); 殃譽 (also T212); 耳目 (also T656); 來變 (not 如來變) (also T212); 萌兆 (also T212, T309, T656); 不朽 (also T212, T384, T656, T1464, T1549, T2045 body); ~貌殊特 (also T212, T1428); 萬民 (also DĀ T1, T212, T2045 body); 登位 (also DĀ T1, T309, T384, T1428); 師宗 (also T384, T656, T2045 body); 喪目 (also T1549); 引入 (also T309, T384, T1464).

For reasons of space, I have refrained from showing the full distribution of these items in canonical translations; interested readers can easily check for themselves using the usual digital search tools. It should be emphasised, however, that especially if we restrict our view to the period before Sengyou, all of these items

¹⁸¹For reasons of space, I refrain from presenting distribution and counts of all the items in Appendix 1.

¹⁸²Chi *et al.* (in preparation).

¹⁸³Cf. Radich 2019b, p. 132 n. 12 – where I unfortunately overlooked Zhu Fonian and his “Preface” to T2045.

¹⁸⁴CSZJJ T2145 (LV) 51b14–c16; also carried in the Taishō at the head of the text itself, T2045 (L) 172a17–b19.

¹⁸⁵著翅惡狸, EĀ 19.8; 為著翅之暴狸, T2045 Preface; 著翅虫, T385. Also in Vinaya T1425, T1435.

¹⁸⁶Also in the preface to T194.

¹⁸⁷I have not listed instances in another preface, to T1428; nor those in interlinear notes in T1543 and T1549. Searches for 天竺 in CBETA are hampered by the fact that it appears in so many bylines, which are extrinsic to the translation texts that interest us here.

are rare in translations outside the Zhu Fonian corpus. In particular, 玄鑿 is a “smoking gun,” never found in any translator before Sengyou except for Zhu Fonian. Another item, 毫釐/毫釐, is apparently a real favourite, occurring more than fifty times in eight Zhu Fonian translations.

One clear implication of this test is that there can be no doubt (if there ever was any) that the Preface to T2045 is genuinely by Zhu Fonian. It is remarkable how many such items can be found, given the brevity of the Preface (492 characters). This short text is like a dense showcase of characteristic Zhu Fonian turns of phrase.

Outside the Zhu Fonian corpus, some rare items in the Preface appear most frequently in the Dharmarakṣa corpus, e.g. ~之深, ~之室, 神寺, 不寤, 難計, 殃豐, 將來之~, 罪福之~.¹⁸⁸ This fact further affirms the proximity of Zhu Fonian’s idiom to that of Dharmarakṣa. Indeed, one item, 殃豐, is a “smoking gun” for Zhu Fonian, if we only exclude Dharmarakṣa (and vice versa); another, ~之室, is likewise a “smoking gun” for the two combined in the period before Sengyou; and 神寺 is also nearly exclusive to these two translators. Because these same items also appear in the T2045 Preface, they serve as particularly strong evidence that Zhu Fonian’s idiom, even when he was not translating, was indeed particularly close to Dharmarakṣa.

It is striking to note how many of these items are found in Zhu Fonian’s original “Mahāyāna quartet,” and especially, in T212.¹⁸⁹ This finding dovetails with the evidence in Appendix 3, and may reinforce the suggestion that when he was not translating, Zhu Fonian gravitated towards a slightly different idiom. Once more, the presence of items characteristic of that sub-idiom in some T125 discourses may be a sign that those discourses were (in part?) produced by processes more analogous to those operative for the “Mahāyāna quartet,” or for this preface, than for Zhu Fonian’s “true translations.”

Synthesis and analysis: the uneven distribution of these types of evidence in T125

To recapitulate: a number of features suggest that T125 is the most peculiar Āgama. An unusually large number of its sutras are unparalleled; near-verbatim *Doppelgänger* of three discourses float free in other parts of the Taishō; the question of the “sectarian affiliation” of T125 has thus far defeated scholarship; the size of the present collection, and the distribution of the *uddānas*, does not appear to match Dao’an’s account at the moment of production; initial production of the collection was hampered by some forgetfulness on the part of the reciter; the Elevens may have been a late afterthought on the part of the Indic tradition behind the collection; also in the Elevens, the evidence of T2026 suggests that the collection should end at Ch. 49, so that the last three chapters (50–52) may be a late addition; and tradition and modern scholarship have struggled to determine who translated our received text. The collection also has a complex and chequered history. EĀ 50.4 doubles up with narrative material in EĀ 1, and appears to be by a different hand; verses in EĀ 48.2 match a Sarvāstivādin *prātimokṣa* preserved in a Dunhuang manuscript; and one passage may show signs of an error committed in writing, in Chinese. As Palumbo has shown, moreover, the Dao’an group probably produced three

¹⁸⁸This list anticipates the wider net cast in n. 189 immediately below, and includes some of those items.

¹⁸⁹In fact, in doing this work, I also found a number of other items of rare diction, which do not appear in T125, but which are shared by the T2045 Preface and other Zhu Fonian works – and again, a striking number are in T212: 縱情, 受對, 群徒, 逝後 (“after [I/the] Tathāgata is gone/has departed,” referring to the *parinirvāṇa*), ~之室, 不寤, 入百鍊之/入百鍊之, 曠遠, 明矣, 罪福之~, 聖人降~, 斯緣. This may indicate some especially close relation between T212 and T2045. One hypothesis that immediately springs to mind is that these texts belong to the same phase of Zhu Fonian’s translation career (these are the only two texts with reported dates in the 390s, 391, and 398–399 respectively; CSZJJ T2145 [LV] 51c9–11, T212 [IV] 609c1–10). This factor could also be tied up with collaborators.

As already mentioned, the nature of T212 is a complex problem in its own right. I have also stumbled across the following items which, within Zhu Fonian’s corpus, appear in T212 and T125 only (with a couple of rare exceptions for some items): 阿鼻地獄, 可敬可貴, 如斯之~, 如桃華, 不得久停, 欲不淨想, 無猶豫, ~之人亦復如是, 外寇, 梵志行, 死徑, 無有出期, 持戒之人, 彼國界, 契經、律、阿毘曇, 如此之~, 奔趣, 不復殺生, 無為之處, 著鎧持仗, ~之本末, 普會講堂, 生死之海, 免濟, 姦宄, 受福無窮, 誦千章, 饒財多寶, 此眾生類, 世八業. This may indicate that there are especially close relations between T212 and certain T125 discourses. I have not investigated this problem systematically, but it should be an agenda for future research.

recensions of the text in quick succession, and the collection appears to have then circulated in various arrangements, and possibly two different contemporaneous versions, down to the sixth century.

We then surveyed five types of evidence which might indicate possible anomalies in individual sutras in T125, by comparison with what is usually more typical for Mainstream Āgama collections. These elements have already been studied in prior scholarship: (proto- or quasi-) Mahāyāna-like elements; “merged” discourses, combining material found in two or more separate sutras in other transmission traditions; discourses which are only paralleled in late (post-canonical or commentarial) materials in other transmission lineages (especially Pāli); and material with probable Sarvāstivāda associations, which *may* be anomalous, against the backdrop of common judgements that the collection as a whole was most probably not basically Sarvāstivāda. A further indication of possible room for anomalies, though only a weak and circumstantial one, is the absence of known parallels for an individual sutra (i.e. sutras that are “sole exemplars”); conversely, sutras that do have known parallels are thereby less likely to be simple inventions out of whole cloth in China.

In addition, we surveyed four classes of phraseological evidence which likewise indicate possible anomalies in T125: wording typical of Dharmarakṣa (or the W. Jin), but not of Zhu Fonian; wording typical of Zhu Fonian’s original composition sutras, but not his true, unadulterated translations; wording typical of Zhu Fonian’s later translations, rather than the earliest ones produced in the Chang’an years under Dao’an; and wording that first appears after the year 398, in MĀ or Kumārajīva.

What, then, does all this evidence show us when we consider it in concert? Appendix 5 is the heart of the analysis upon which my argument here is built. It organises the evidence in all the various classes we have discussed, as it features in individual discourses in T125. Perusal of Appendix 5 shows that the evidence in all classes is very unevenly distributed, and the distribution of various anomalies is correlated. In short, certain discourses and sections in T125 are hotspots for anomalies of multiple types.

In this section, I will walk the reader through the most important aspects of this evidence, to highlight several patterns that emerge. On that basis, I will advance two arguments. First, portions of T125 must have been altered after the initial translation of the collection by Dao’an’s group in 384–385 – probably after the year 400. Second, and more speculatively, we should hypothesise that these alterations were introduced to the collection, at least in part, by Zhu Fonian himself.

I will begin with the clearest cases. As can be seen in Appendix 5, a small number of individual discourses leap out particularly, because they display densely concentrated evidence of possible anomalies: discourses like EĀ 20.3, 23.1, 24.5, 24.6, 24.8, 26.9, 27.5, 28.1, 30.3, 31.1, 31.8, 32.5, 33.2, 34.2, 34.5, 36.5, 37.2, 37.3, 38.6, 38.11, 42.3, 43.2, 43.7, 44.7, 48.2, 48.3, 48.5, 49.6, 49.9, 51.3, 51.8, 52.1, and 52.2. (Noticeably, apart from EĀ 1, we find no such discourses in the first nineteen chapters; see further below.) For the sake of argument, I will focus first on these discourses, which I will provisionally refer to as the “weirdest thirty-three.” Anomalies are so heavily concentrated in these discourses that something is undeniably afoot.

Let us take EĀ 36.5 as a first example.¹⁹⁰ This discourse tells the story of the Buddha returning from the Heaven of the Thirty-Three, where he has spent the rains retreat preaching to his mother, Māyā. He descends on the central staircase of three that have miraculously appeared for the occasion. On the flanking staircases, Indra and Brahmā wait upon him sedulously, with the royal yak-tail fan and parasol. During his absence, King Udayana has had the first ever Buddha image made. Upon the return of the Buddha in the flesh, a throng rushes to see him – note the overtones of what we might call “Buddhist *darśan*.”¹⁹¹ Subhūti, however, decides not to join the *darśan*-seekers. He reflects that the Buddha cannot truly be seen in the faculties of his fleshly body, because “all *dharma*s are empty and tranquil” 一切諸法皆悉空寂. There are obvious echoes here of the famous *Vakkali-sutta* trope, “He who sees the *dharma*, sees the Buddha.”¹⁹² Subhūti further reflects, in verse, “Anyone

¹⁹⁰Bureau 1997; Mizuno 1989, p. 17.

¹⁹¹Radich 2015, p. 138 w. n. 360, with further references. This theme is obviously tied up with the narrative situation of the discourse, which tells the story of the making of the first Buddha *image* for King Udayana.

¹⁹²See e.g. Radich 2007, §3.2.3, 362–370.

who wants to pay obeisance to the Buddha ... should contemplate empty *dharmas*” 若欲禮佛者...當觀於空法。He reiterates to himself that all *dharmas* are empty and tranquil 諸法皆悉空寂, and decides to take refuge in “the collectivity of true *dharma(s)*” 我今歸命真法之聚。Then he goes back calmly to mending his robe.¹⁹³ Subhūti’s attitude is contrasted with that of the nun Utpalavarṇā, an enthusiastic Buddha-viewer, who transforms into a *cakravartin* to win prime position in the crowd.

We need not quibble about the exact extent to which Subhūti, emptiness, or the Buddha image count as “Mahāyāna.” The content of EĀ 36.5 is already remarkable. The evidence collected in the entry for EĀ 36.5 in Appendix 5 shows that the discourse also has an unusual concentration of other remarkable features. It sports elements elsewhere found only in commentarial or post-canonical texts: the story of the nun Utpalavarṇā becoming a *cakravartin*, and the “miracle at Saṃkaśya” (of the Buddha’s descent). In these traditions, the discourse merges material found elsewhere in separate texts. It features a number of Mahāyāna-leaning notions: the *bodhisattva* path as a generalised goal, reference to the **trisāhasramahāsāhasralokadhātu*, and the Buddha giving *vyākaraṇa* to others, as well as the figure of Subhūti and his reflections on “emptiness.”

In phraseological terms, meanwhile, EĀ 36.5 also features unusually large quantities of Dharmarakṣa-like diction, wording characteristic of Zhu Fonian’s original compositions, and phrasing typical for Zhu Fonian’s later translations; and it even features one item heavily characteristic of Kumārajīva’s Prajñāpāramitā texts (爾時釋提桓因白佛言, in T223, T227, MPPU/DZDL T1509 – though this item also appears in *Mokṣala’s T221). Thus, the indications of content and style converge. A discourse featuring several outlier traits, which have already sounded alarm bells for prior scholars, also has a heavy concentration of stylistic features atypical for the regular Zhu Fonian corpus, the period of the original translation of EĀ, the genre of Āgama translations, and T125 more generally.

As a second example, we might refer more briefly to EĀ 48.3 (doubled in T453). This text treats narratives surrounding the coming of the future Buddha Maitreya. It places in the mouth of “our” Buddha, Śākyamuni, traditions concerning Maitreya himself, and his relations with Kāśyapa, against the backdrop of a Land-of-Cockayne-like depiction of the future world in which these events transpire. For our analysis, it is significant that this discourse features concepts redolent of the Mahāyāna: **triyāna* 三乘, Maitreya as a bodhisattva, the **trisāhasramahāsāhasralokadhātu*, and the appearance of multiple bodhisattvas in the same scene. In addition, however, it features ten items of diction associated with Dharmarakṣa rather than Zhu Fonian, five items usually found only in original compositions in the Zhu Fonian corpus, and five items otherwise only found in later translations in the Zhu Fonian corpus. Once more, then, apparent anomalies in content are associated with an unusual concentration of anomalies in phraseology. EĀ 48.3 also features the above-mentioned “smoking gun” for Zhu Fonian, which appears in his Preface to T2045: 玄鑿; and one other item of rare diction also found in the Preface: 神寺. These features mean that at least parts of the text are probably closely associated with Zhu Fonian as an individual, not just with the groups he translated in.

A third example is significant for a different reason. Kuan has shown that an episode in EĀ 37.2, in which Mahāmaudgalyāyana journeys to a remote Buddha-field, is probably based upon a similar episode in Dharmarakṣa’s **Tathāgataḡuhyaka-sūtra* 密迹金剛力士會 T310(3).¹⁹⁴ On the basis of comparison with citations of a similar EĀ discourse in JLYX, Kuan argues further that EĀ 37.2 was the product of revision to an earlier version of EĀ produced in Chang’an by the Dao’an group, and that Maudgalyāyana’s cosmic voyage was added as part of that revision.¹⁹⁵ On the basis of two

¹⁹³T125 (II) 707c11–708a2.

¹⁹⁴Kuan 2019. The passage in question is at T310(3) (XI) 56c10–57b18, echoed at EĀ 37.2 T125 (II) 709c25–710a23 (in my view, the parallel extends slightly further than Kuan traces it, in two additional simple elements: Maudgalyāyana recites verses from the distance of his remote Buddha-world, and his voice is heard by Śākyamuni’s audience; they ask Śākyamuni about the voice in this cosmic broadcast, and he explains).

¹⁹⁵In addition to Mahāmaudgalyāyana’s cosmic voyage, Kuan argues that a sermon on the six *dhātus* (which rationalises the inclusion of EĀ 37.2 in the Sixes) was probably also added as part of these revisions.

phraseological clues,¹⁹⁶ and reference to aspects of Zhu Fonian's career and known practices (as also discussed elsewhere in the present paper), Kuan argues that Zhu Fonian was most likely the author of these revisions. This discovery is potentially quite significant.¹⁹⁷ If T310(3) was indeed the source of this passage in EĀ 37.2,¹⁹⁸ it would represent the first time, to my knowledge, that a specific earlier Chinese source has been found for material in T125 (excepting EĀ 1). For our purposes, then, it is potentially significant that EĀ 37.2 is, again, one of the “weirdest thirty-three.” As we see in Appendix 5, it features Mahāyāna-ish elements like “Buddha lands” 佛土, rare names of other Buddhas, and the **trisāhasramahāsahasralokadhātu*; it is (as a whole) unparalleled; and it features an unusual concentration of diction more typical of Dharmarakṣa than Zhu Fonian, of Zhu Fonian's original works rather than his translations, and of his later works rather than his early work under Dao'an. Finally, it is also suggestive that it features one word, 難計, which is otherwise rare, but found in Zhu Fonian's Preface to T2045.¹⁹⁹

If we zoom out from these examples, and consider the “weirdest thirty-three” as a group, we note that quite a number of these discourses feature possible Mahāyāna-like material (fifteen discourses, or about half: EĀ 20.3, 23.1, 24.5, 24.6, 26.9, 27.5, 32.5, 36.5, 37.2, 37.3, 42.3, 43.2, 48.2, 48.3, 48.5). A number also feature elements with possible Sarvāstivāda connections (seven discourses: 20.3, 33.2, 38.6, 38.11, 43.7, 49.9, 51.3). It is fairly common for these discourses to feature content found in post-canonical materials in Pāli (six discourses: 34.2, 36.5, 38.11, 43.2, 44.7, 52.1). “Discourse merger” is also quite common (eight discourses: 24.8, 31.8, 36.5, 38.6?, 42.3, 43.2, 48.2, 49.6).

Now, as mentioned above, it is in principle possible that discourses could have acquired such potential anomalies in content prior to translation into Chinese. It is also possible that some anomalies in content found their way into the collection at the time of its original translation under Dao'an in Chang'an in 384–385. However, we see clearly in this sample that anomalous features of content are strongly associated with unusual concentrations of phraseological anomalies. Some of the phraseological anomalies, moreover, strongly suggest that at least some layer in these discourses is later than the original EĀ produced in 384–385, and possibly later than the arrival on the scene of some Kumārajīva texts. Twenty of these discourses (about two thirds) feature phrasing associated with the period after the year 398 (23.1, 24.5, 24.8, 26.9, 27.5, 28.1, 31.8, 33.2, 34.2, 34.5, 38.6, 38.11, 42.3, 43.7, 44.7, 48.5, 49.6, 51.3, 52.1, 52.2).²⁰⁰ All thirty-three discourses feature some diction characteristic of later Zhu Fonian, in contrast to his earliest translations produced under Dao'an – often in

¹⁹⁶鉢盂, 凡常.

¹⁹⁷Kuan was apparently anticipated in his discovery by an anonymous editors' note in the Foguang edition of T125, which led him to T310(3); Foguang dazangjing bianxiu weiyuanhui 1983–1988, p. 3:1109 n. 3; Kuan 40 n. 23. Akanuma also knew the same parallel; Akanuma 1958/1929, p. 142.

¹⁹⁸I am convinced that resemblances between the two episodes are indeed too close to be coincidental, so that one must be the source of the other. Most particularly: the remote Buddha-world and its Buddha have similar (but not identical) names; the beings there are immense; Maudgalyāyana appears to them like a tiny “worm” 虫/蟲 in monk's garb; he walks on the rim of one of their giant bowls; he performs wonders to cow their scorn 輕慢; he projects his voice, reciting verses, back to the Sāhā world. I am also convinced that Kuan's comparison with JLYX has probably uncovered evidence of the introduction of this passage into EĀ 37.2 via a revision of an earlier Chinese EĀ. My only hesitation in accepting Kuan's argument lies in the fact that he does not show, and I cannot discover independently, any rare or unique *wording or diction* shared by the two passages. All the shared wording that I can discover, in the order in which the passage proceeds, is this: 不現 河沙 如來、至真、等正覺 此虫/蟲 釋迦文 弟子神足第一 輕慢. All of this wording is generic enough in the respective idioms of both Dharmarakṣa and Zhu Fonian, so that I suspect they could plausibly have arrived at it independently, while translating similar passages in source texts. In principle, then, I am not sure we can rule out the alternate hypothesis that the resemblance between the two passages stems from an Indic *Vorlage* of T125 (at some remove) borrowing from an Indic version of the *Tathāgataguhyaka*, or vice versa. The passage might then have already existed in some other part of an earlier Chinese recension of EĀ, and been introduced to EĀ 37.2 as part of possible reshuffling and recombination of elements in the collection, which might conceivably also have been an aspect of the work of revision. On the contrary, the elimination of closer resemblances in wording might equally have been a feature of the way the reviser worked. The absence of rare verbatim measures therefore does not prove that T310(3) *cannot* have been the source for EĀ 37.2.

¹⁹⁹In translated scriptures, 難計 is vastly more common in Dharmarakṣa and Zhu Fonian than elsewhere, and almost unknown in any other texts of firm ascription. See also Radich (in preparation), Table 1, #A1864.

²⁰⁰Once more, I found such diction in eighty-three discourses overall (about a sixth of all T125 discourses); see n.179.

notable quantities. These phraseological anomalies can best be explained by two hypotheses: first, that parts of T125 were altered or added later than the initial translation, probably after the year 400; and second, more circumstantially, that Zhu Fonian may have had a hand in such changes. In this light, it is certainly suggestive that possible anomalies in content also cluster in the same discourses. At least some anomalies in content may be coeval with anomalies in phraseology.

How far, then, does this pattern reach? For the sake of argument, I began by focusing on the “weirdest thirty-three” – a restricted subset of discourses in which the clustering of anomalies is particularly clear. Notoriously, however, absence of evidence is not evidence of absence. Other discourses might also have undergone similar reworking, without sporting the evidence that signals the problem in the same degree. These thirty-three discourses might be merely the tip of an iceberg. Appendix 5 thus presents us with a “slippery slope” problem – how much evidence do we need before we declare that a discourse is clearly anomalous?

I would certainly not want to make too much of this potential “evidence” for all discourses in which it appears. I initially set the threshold for inclusion of a discourse in Appendix 5 at two or more items, in order to capture as much of the picture as possible. However, this threshold really is rather low. For example, with a few exceptions, very few discourses in the first twenty chapters (excepting EĀ 1) feature more than four items of my phraseological evidence (exceptions are 8.1, 10.8, 11.7, 11.8, 11.10, 12.1, 13.3, 13.5, 13.7, 16.1, 17.1, 18.4, 18.7, 19.1, 19.3, 19.11, and 20.3); and almost none feature post-398 diction (but see 3.9, 11.7, 11.8, 12.1, 13.3). We also see that the first nineteen chapters include no discourses with anomalies at the levels seen in the “weirdest thirty-three” (in order of appearance, the first discourse in the collection on my list is 20.3). Generally speaking, then, the first twenty chapters or so of T125 appear to be largely free of unusual concentrations of our potential evidence. Perhaps this indicates that a certain low-level presence of “possible anomalies” in at least some discourses is explicable by chance, or other dynamics, and we should only get suspicious when that concentration is exceeded.²⁰¹

In fact, if we zoom out to the level of T125 as a whole, we see that 208 discourses (a little under half) feature either no evidence in the various classes listed in Appendix 5, or only one such item.²⁰² To save space, I have excluded such untouched discourses from Appendix 5 entirely. It is instructive to list those discourses. Large stretches of T125 appear unscathed by the pattern we are tracing, in particular towards the beginning of the collection:²⁰³

- 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10
- 3.2, 3.4, 3.6, 3.10
- 4.3, 4.4, 4.7
- 5.2, 5.4 (defective decade, five discourses)
- 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4 (defective decade, four discourses)
- 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 8.5, 8.7, 8.9, 8.10
- 9.3, 9.4, 9.5, 9.6, 9.8, 9.9, 9.10
- 10.1, 10.2, 10.4, 10.7, 10.9, 10.10
- 11.1, 11.2, 11.3, 11.4, 11.5, 11.6, 11.9
- 12.2, 12.4, 12.5, 12.7, 12.8, 12.9, 12.10
- 13.2 (defective decade, seven discourses)
- 14.1, 14.2, 14.3, 14.4, 14.5, 14.6, 14.7, 14.8, 14.10
- 15.1, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 15.5, 15.6, 15.7, 15.8, 15.9, 15.10
- 16.2, 16.3, 16.5, 16.6, 16.7, 16.8, 16.10

²⁰¹By that standard, we should note that quite a number of discourses from later parts of the collection in our listings would also count as innocuous (20.2, 20.6, 20.7, 20.8, 20.10, 20.12, 20.13, 21.5, 23.5, 23.6, 24.1, etc.).

²⁰²I estimate that a single item of evidence could just as well be a product of chance, and certainly should not be treated as evidentially significant. This is not to say that I consider two or more items a certain indication of anything fishy; see below.

²⁰³In Chs. 1, 7, 30, 45, and 48, every discourse features potential evidence over the two-item threshold. Those chapters therefore do not appear in this list.

17.2, 17.3, 17.5, 17.6, 17.8 (supernumerary decade, eleven discourses)
 18.1, 18.6, 18.8, 18.9, 18.10
 19.4, 19.5, 19.7, 19.9 (supernumerary decade, eleven discourses)
 20.1, 20.4, 20.5, 20.9, 20.11 (supernumerary decade, thirteen discourses)
 21.1, 21.2, 21.4, 21.6, 21.7, 21.8, 21.10
 22.1, 22.2, 22.3, 22.4, 22.5, 22.6, 22.7, 22.8, 22.9, 22.10
 23.7, 23.8, 23.9, 23.10
 24.7, 24.10
 25.1, 25.2, 25.3, 25.4, 25.5, 25.8, 25.9, 25.10
 26.1, 26.2, 26.3, 26.4, 26.8
 27.4, 27.6, 27.7, 27.8, 27.9
 28.2, 28.3 (defective decade, seven discourses)
 29.2, 29.4, 29.8, 29.10
 31.3, 31.10, 31.11 (supernumerary decade, eleven discourses)
 32.1, 32.2, 32.8, 32.11 (supernumerary decade, twelve discourses)
 33.3, 33.5, 33.6, 33.7, 33.8, 33.9
 34.4, 34.6, 34.7, 34.8, 34.9
 35.1, 35.3, 35.4, 35.6, 35.8
 36.1, 36.2, 36.3 (defective decade, five discourses)
 37.4
 38.2, 38.3 (supernumerary decade, twelve discourses)
 39.4, 39.5, 39.6, 39.7
 40.3, 40.8
 41.2 (defective decade, five discourses)
 42.9
 43.8
 44.1, 44.2, 44.4, 44.5, 44.8 (supernumerary decade, eleven discourses)
 46.1, 46.2, 46.5, 46.9
 47.2, 47.9
 49.2, 49.10
 50.2, 50.7
 51.1, 51.2
 52.3, 52.4, 52.5 (defective decade, nine discourses)

Large parts of T125 thus appear to be untouched by any phenomenon (or phenomena) our markers might indicate. Indeed, by the standard of the above list, some whole decades are completely clear of possible anomalies (e.g. Chs. 2, 15, 22). Moreover, through about the first half of the collection, most texts in many decades are largely unaffected.

Conversely, other stretches of T125 are hotspots. For example, in Chs. 45 (a defective decade with seven discourses) and 48 (also defective, six discourses), every discourse is at or over our threshold, and most discourses sport considerably more than two of our markers.

As I already mentioned, relatively little of our evidence occurs in the first thirty-odd chapters. Of course, there are exceptions. The highly anomalous “Preface” EÅ 1 is (unsurprisingly) riddled with evidence of all types, and must be treated separately. Another exception to the overall pattern is Ch. 13, where all discourses but one (of seven) are over the two-item threshold. Further, even in these portions of the collection, some individual discourses also have a particularly heavy dose of our evidence. On the whole, however, discourses in this first long part of the text, to Ch. 30 or so, rarely have more than a few items of possible evidence in total.

From about Ch. 30, by contrast, the density of our evidence increases, and discourses free of it taper off. The increase comes at first in patches. Then, most strikingly, in the last portion of the collection, beginning around Ch. 36, our evidence becomes more consistently thick on the ground. Thus, if our

evidence indicates that someone tampered with T125, a first hypothesis might be that they did not lavish their attention evenly over the collection as a whole. Rather, it looks as if they concentrated their efforts in Ch. 1, and portions of the text after Ch. 20, perhaps working unevenly on particular stretches even within that range; and a particular focus was about the last third of the collection.

In sum, it seems likely that the pattern of problems we are tracing extends somewhat further than the “weirdest thirty-three” discourses, in which it is most strikingly evident. At the same time, it is difficult to know how much evidence suffices to show that an individual discourse is problematic, and we cannot assume that all later alterations or additions to the collection will have left visible traces. Closer investigation of individual discourses may allow us to make further progress with such questions (and our findings highlight the requirement for such work). Meanwhile, however, despite these difficulties, an overall imbalance in the distribution of the anomalies seems rather clear, and indicates that later interventions were more frequent in approximately the second half of the collection, than in the first.

In attempting to interpret this evidence, we should keep several factors in mind.

First, to reiterate, there can be little doubt that all discourses in T125 – even the “weirdest thirty-three,” for all their anomalies – are strongly associated with Zhu Fonian in some fashion. As discussed above (p. 26), all discourses in T125 strongly evince distinctive signs of the Zhu Fonian translation idiom. Many also feature items among the set of rare wordings I identified in Zhu Fonian’s T2045 preface – in fact, even in the “weirdest thirty-three,” an unusually high proportion of discourses feature such diction (sixteen discourses of thirty-three, or about half: 23.1, 24.6, 24.8, 31.8, 33.2, 34.2, 36.5, 37.2, 38.6, 38.11, 42.3, 43.7, 48.3, 51.3, 51.8, 52.2). Of course, this evidence is not unequivocal. Zhu Fonian was also the main translator of EĀ in 384–385, and as I have already mentioned, ample stylistic evidence demonstrates that T125 as a whole is most closely associated with his style and no other. We might imagine, then, that evidence of Zhu Fonian’s stylistic fingerprint belongs entirely to the initial stratum of the texts, produced in the Dao’an group in 384–385; by contrast, evidence of later diction, anachronistic against the work of the Dao’an group, could be due to the later intervention of another hand.

However, this hypothetical possibility is rendered rather unlikely by the fact that characteristic Zhu Fonian phraseology is found through all parts of T125, and further, that this phraseology is consistent not only with Zhu Fonian’s translations, but also (perhaps all the more) with his probably original Mahāyāna sutras. Moreover, my evidence includes stylistic traits in several classes associated specifically with Zhu Fonian, but with parts of his corpus outside the context in which EĀ was originally translated, and outside its genre – his original works, his later works, and the T2045 preface – and these traits, too, concentrate particularly in anomalous discourses. It remains most likely, then, that on the whole, anomalous phraseological traits, too, stem from Zhu Fonian.

Next, the discourses in our restricted sample of the “weirdest thirty-three” discourses, for example, do include some “sole exemplars” – texts without known parallels. However, it is perhaps more important to note that for most of them, parallels are in fact known. Taking our “weirdest thirty-three” again as an example, in that group, twenty-seven texts are paralleled (more than four fifths): 23.1, 24.5, 24.6, 24.8, 26.9, 28.1, 30.3, 31.1, 31.8, 32.5, 34.2, 34.5, 36.5, 37.2, 37.3, 38.6, 38.11, 42.3, 43.2, 43.7, 44.7, 48.2, 49.6, 49.9, 51.8, 52.1, and 52.2. Thus, only six texts in this group are “sole exemplars.” This holds true more broadly of discourses featuring anomalous evidence – no particular correlation can be seen between concentrations of possible anomalies and “sole exemplar” discourses. Thus, it cannot be the case that all anomalous discourses were invented out of whole cloth in China. Any hypothesis we form about the origin of discrepancies in T125 must include a way of accounting for knowledge of the source materials indicated by the parallels (possibly in earlier Chinese versions of EĀ itself, which may have been reworked in some manner to produce extant discourses sporting anomalies).

Additionally, we should recognise that even if, hypothetically speaking, all our different classes of possible evidence do in fact indicate the presence of anomalies in the text, those anomalies may not necessarily all have been introduced to the text at the same stage, or by the same processes or actors. This holds especially for anomalies at the level of content. Merged discourses, for instance, or elements

paralleled in Pāli post-canonical and commentarial sources, or possible Sarvāstivāda elements – or at least some such elements – might have been introduced to a *Vorlage* in India or Central Asia.²⁰⁴ Some anomalies in content may also have been introduced at the time of initial translation under Dao'an in Chang'an. In fact, for the “Preface” chapter (EĀ 1), some oddities must at least have pre-existed the commentary, T1507, which comments extensively on that chapter.²⁰⁵ Finally, we also cannot exclude *a priori* the possibility that the collection was modified in China, after its initial production by the Dao'an group, by two or more persons or groups at different times, so that phraseological evidence apparently indicating a layer (or layers) heterogeneous with the expected style of the Chang'an group and period might not all point to the same interventions.

Even admitting these complications, however, we can draw some cautious inferences from the evidence of Appendix 5.

Evidence of possible anomalies is very unevenly distributed in T125. This already suggests that the collection, in its present form, must be a blend of material heterogeneous in nature, content, and provenance. A considerable portion of this unevenly distributed evidence of possible anomalies is phraseological in nature, suggesting that some considerable portion of this heterogeneity does not only inhere at the level of an Indic *Vorlage*, but is also at least in part a reflection of vicissitudes undergone by the text in its post-translation, Chinese guise. These various types of evidence, unevenly distributed as they are, roughly correlate – where we find anomalies of content, we are more likely also to find anomalies of phraseology, and vice versa. This suggests that at least some of the anomalous features of content were introduced in association with the same processes that gave rise to the discrepancies in style. Further, some of the anomalous phraseology is associated with a period later than the initial production of EĀ by the Dao'an group in Chang'an in 384–385, and some, more specifically, with a period after the year 398. This suggests revision or modification later than the initial translation process – that is, after the production of all three Chang'an recensions revealed by Palumbo's research. Some later revision of this sort would have the additional advantage of possibly accounting for the apparent discrepancy in the present size of T125, the mystery of the extra chapters among the Elevens (Chs. 50–52), and potentially, some of the recensional chaos that prevailed down to the sixth century.

Therefore, we have strong reason to believe that some discourses in T125 underwent significant modifications or interventions after 385. Further, it is likely that those interventions went beyond the rearrangements in structure and order envisioned by Palumbo for the post-Dao'an life of the text. The interventions are reflected rather globally in the phraseology of some discourses; and the uneven distribution of that phraseology, and its correlation with anomalies in content, strongly suggests that at least some anomalies in content, too, in some discourses, are products of those post-385 interventions.

Next, I turn to the more speculative second arm of my argument. Even if all apparent anomalies in T125 may not have the same origin, it is natural to favour economical hypotheses. In this light, we should recall several salient facts. Zhu Fonian was already closely associated with EĀ through his participation in the original translation project. He is known to have produced at least two substantial sutras of his own (T309, T656), and possibly two more (T384, T385); he may also have added some layers of narrative material to his translation of the *Udānavarga* T212.²⁰⁶ He thus had a demonstrated “track record” of interest in producing new scripture, and the capacity to do so. Zhu Fonian also had a long-time association with Dharmanandin, the original reciter of EĀ (they worked together at least until the translation of T2045 in 391). Through Dharmanandin, he had a possible source of

²⁰⁴I am grateful to Yamabe Nobuyoshi for encouraging me to emphasise the possible place of Central Asia in such developments (personal communication).

²⁰⁵I am grateful to Antonello Palumbo for correcting my neglect of this key point in an earlier draft of this work (personal communication). As discussed above, Palumbo himself holds that T1507 was produced before the death of Dao'an, which would imply that EĀ 1 also had its present form before that time; I myself am less sure that T1507 necessarily attained its present form so early (see n. 70).

²⁰⁶It is tempting to suggest that Zhu Fonian was by vocation an author of *buddhavacana*, who worked as a translator in his day job.

information about genuine Indic textual traditions, including Sarvāstivāda traditions, of the type that might be reflected by the evidence of parallels.²⁰⁷ (However, we should not forget that Zhu Fonian himself is also supposed to have travelled widely when young,²⁰⁸ and may thus have had his own body of such knowledge.) Finally, Zhu Fonian was from Liangzhou,²⁰⁹ and it is therefore plausible to assume that he was formed in a culture of Buddhist textual learning steeped in the texts of the W. Jin and their associated scriptural idiom. In this light, it is also little wonder that generally speaking, his own idiom is demonstrably close to that of Dharmarakṣa, and it is plausible that when freed from the constraints of collaboration and the guardrails of an exact *Vorlage*, his diction might have drifted even further in that direction.²¹⁰ In sum, Zhu Fonian provides us with a point of convergence where many of the apparently anomalous features in T125 could have been produced. Consequently, we should consider the hypothesis that Zhu Fonian himself revised the collection in some manner, probably after the year 398, and even after the translation of the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya around 405–406.²¹¹

For the present, I advance this hypothesis as just that – a hypothesis. We might hope that future work will discover finer clues to the exact period of later interventions into T125, and for or against the contention that the author of those interventions was Zhu Fonian. It is also possible, however, that the exact timing and agent of such interventions will forever lie outside the reach of clearer proofs.

In closing, I must also underline the point that in my view, the evidence treated here allows us only limited insight into the exact nature of the interventions that T125 later underwent. Some things can be inferred, but others remain unclear. As noted above, many of the most anomalous discourses, including the “weirdest thirty-three,” include elements paralleled in other scriptural sources. That means that later interventions most likely did not invent whole discourses out of thin air; it is more likely that they represented some sort of reworking (rearrangement, rewriting, expansion, etc.) of existing material. On the other hand, I have already stated that some anomalies could have been introduced before translation, into the *Vorlage*; or at the time of initial translation under Dao’an in 384–385; as well as after translation, in the later interventions for which I here argue. This possibility

²⁰⁷This does not necessarily mean that we should envisage a scenario in which Dharmanandin worked with Zhu Fonian on alterations to EĀ, or knew about such work. Zhu Fonian could have learned various narratives from him in a first step, and applied that knowledge subsequently.

²⁰⁸少好遊方，備貫風俗，家世西河，洞曉方語，華、戎[梵YM]音義莫不兼解，CSZJJ T2145 (LV) 111b10–11.

²⁰⁹CSZJJ T2145 (LV) 111b8.

²¹⁰As I will show in Radich (*in preparation*), a generic “Dharmarakṣa signal” of phraseology is also stronger in Zhu Fonian’s original Mahāyāna sutras (T309, T384, T385, and T656) than in almost any of his other works, which gives further circumstantial support to this hypothesis. However, the waters are also muddied somewhat for T309 and T656 by the fact that these texts take Dharmarakṣa texts as their direct sources. On these four texts as original compositions rather than translations (the case for T384 and T385 is somewhat weaker than for T309 and T656), see Nattier 2010; Lin and He [Radich] 2020; Lin and Radich 2021.

²¹¹On the surface, this hypothesis might appear to resemble the conclusions reached by Lin Jia’an 2009. As already discussed above, Lin argues that the extant T125 is the result of revision of an original Dao’an/Chang’an translation, produced by Zhu Fonian, working alone, around 410. However, the evidential grounds for my argument differ fundamentally. We have seen that EĀ citations in JLYX differ significantly from T125. Lin argues that these citations were taken from a first Chang’an translation of EĀ. This portion of her argument is based upon problematic assumptions about the significance of fascicle numbers in primary documents and old citations, as discussed by Palumbo 2013, pp. 140–41 (see once more n. 73). Assuming this identity, Lin then argues that T125 represents a revision and expansion of the first translation. She considers three candidates as possible authors of this revision (i.e. T125). She rejects Dharmanandin, in the belief (surely mistaken) that Dharmanandin left China soon after the initial Āgama translations were complete (p. 125; she seems unaware that Dharmanandin worked on the translation of T2045 in 391). She rightly rejects Saṅghadeva, on the basis of the evidence in the catalogues (where she overlooks Daoci’s preface) and translation style. She then convincingly demonstrates that T125 evinces traits uniquely associated with Zhu Fonian, based on renderings of five formulae (pp. 126–32). Finally, she compares a single passage in both T125 and a parallel cited in JLYX, and argues that the T125 version alone likewise includes a stylistic trait unique to Zhu Fonian. This only demonstrates, however, that (some layer of) T125 is indeed by Zhu Fonian. The identification of the “JLYX EĀ” with the first Chang’an translation is not secure. Further, Lin’s date of 410 for Zhu Fonian’s supposed revisions comes out of the blue (pp. 137–41) – I could not discover any evidence or arguments by which she supports it.

makes it difficult for us to discern exactly which anomalies in content might be products of later intervention.

In this connection, it is important to recall once more that the evidence I treat is so unevenly distributed in T125. For that reason, whatever their nature may have been, later interventions did not affect the whole collection evenly. Most probably, they did not touch many discourses in the collection at all. Thus, the later interventions certainly did not produce an entirely new work, and should not be imagined in the key of categories like “retranslation.” Consequently, even if T125 does, as I contend, include substantial material dating from after 385, at the same time, it must still be heavily based upon the work of the translation group in Chang’an before Dao’an’s death. My argument presents a picture of the extant T125 as a complex, mixed, or layered textual artefact – not as a post-Dao’an work, root and branch.

With these caveats, my central conclusion, that T125 was modified in some manner probably impinging upon content after the initial translation of EĀ in 384–385, implies some consequences for our treatment of the collection in scholarly analysis. The collection sports an impressive array of anomalies, and the anomalies cluster in some sutras more than others. Some of this evidence points to alteration of the collection in China at a point later than the initial translation. These facts suffice to urge considerable caution in using the collection as evidence for anything in early or Mainstream Buddhism, especially in India – even more so, in using sutras in the later parts of the collection; and even more so again, sutras with a high concentration of the anomalous features we have surveyed. These same facts also suggest that the quest for “the” sectarian affiliation of T125, as we have received it, may be doomed, and that the quest to identify a sectarian affiliation for a hypothetical Indic *Vorlage* may first need to confront the difficult task of disentangling the *Vorlage* from subsequent accretions.

Abbreviations

AN	<i>Āṅguttara-nikāya</i>
ARIRIAB	Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University
BSR	Buddhist Studies Review
Chn	Chinese
CSZJJ	<i>Chu sanzang ji ji</i> 出三藏記集 T2145
DĀ	<i>Dīrghāgama</i> 長阿含經 T1
Dhr	*Dharmarakṣa 竺法護
Divy	<i>Divyāvadāna</i>
DN	<i>Dīgha-nikāya</i>
DZDL	see MPPU
EĀ	<i>Ekottarikāgama</i> (to be distinguished from T125)
IBK	<i>Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū</i> 印度學佛教學研究
Ja	<i>Jātaka</i>
JIABS	Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies
JLYX	<i>Jing lü yi xiang</i> 經律異相 T2121
MĀ	<i>Madhyamāgama</i> 中阿含經 T26
MN	<i>Majjhima-nikāya</i>
MPPU/DZDL	* <i>Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa</i> 大智度論 T1509
MSV	<i>Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya</i>
Mv	<i>Mahāvastu</i>
SĀ	<i>Samyuktāgama</i> (usu. 雜阿含經 T99; where noted, 別譯雜阿含經 T100)
Skt	Sanskrit
SN	<i>Samyutta-nikāya</i>
T	<i>Taishō shinshū daizōkyō</i> 大正新脩大藏經
Th	<i>Theragāthā</i>

Tib	Tibetan
Ud	<i>Udānavarga</i> 出曜經 T212
ZFn	Zhu Fonian 竺佛念

Supplementary material. The supplementary material for this article can be found at <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479591424000366>.

Acknowledgements. I (Radich) here record my gratitude for helpful feedback on earlier drafts of this work to Venerable Anālayo, Norihisa Baba, Sharon Chi, Rafal Felbur, Ikuma Hiromitsu, Sangyop Lee, Antonello Palumbo, Yamabe Nobuyoshi, and an anonymous reviewer for the *International Journal of Asian Studies*. This research was conducted during a one-year stay as Visiting Professor at the Institute for Advanced Studies on Asia at Tokyo University, and I thank the Institute for their generous support.

References

- Akanuma C.** (1958 [1929]). *The Comparative Catalogue of Chinese Āgamas and Pāli Nikāyas*. Tokyo: Hajinkaku-Shobō.
- Anālayo.** (2009). *Zeng-yi A-han*. In Weeraratne W.G. (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, 8.3. Sri Lanka: Department of Buddhist Affairs, pp. 822–827.
- Anālayo.** (2010). The influence of commentarial exegesis on the transmission of Āgama literature. In Meisig K. (ed.), *Translating Buddhist Chinese: Problems and Prospects*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, pp. 1–20.
- Anālayo.** (2011). *A Comparative Study of the Majjhima-nikāya*. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation.
- Anālayo.** (2013a). Mahāyāna in the *Ekottarika-āgama*. *Singaporean Journal of Buddhist Studies* 1, 5–43.
- Anālayo.** (2013b). 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, pp. 1–70.
- Anālayo.** (2014a). 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.
- Anālayo.** (2014b). Karma and female birth. *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 21, 109–153.
- Anālayo.** (2014–2015). Discourse merger in the *Ekottarika-āgama* (2): the parallels to the *Kakacūpama-sutta* and the *Alagaddūpama-sutta*. *Journal of Buddhist Studies* 12, 63–90.
- Anālayo.** (2015a). The Buddha’s past life as a princess in the *Ekottarika-āgama*. *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 22, 95–137.
- Anālayo.** (2015b). Miracle-working nuns in the *Ekottarika-āgama*. *The Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies* 16, 1–27.
- Anālayo.** (2016). *Ekottarika-Āgama Studies*. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation.
- Anālayo.** (2018). An *Ekottarika-āgama* discourse without parallels: from perception of impermanence to the pure land. *BSR* 35(1–2), 125–134.
- Baba N.** 馬場紀寿. (2008 [2020]). *Jōzabu Bukkyō no shisō keisei: Buddha kara Buddaōsa e* 上座部仏教の思想形成 ブッダからブッダゴーサへ. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- Baba N.** (2024). The making of Chinese *Ekottarikāgama* discourse 49.5. In *Buddhakṣetrapariśodhana: A Festschrift for Paul Harrison*, edited by C. DiSimone and N. Witkowski, 29–40. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- Bareau A.** (1988). Les débuts de la prédication du Buddha selon l’*Ekottara-Āgama*. *Bulletin de l’École française d’Extrême-Orient* 77, 69–96.
- Bareau A.** (1997). Le prodige accompli par le Buddha à Saṃkaśya selon l’*Ekottara-āgama*. In Lienhard S. and Piovano I. (eds), *Lex et Litterae: Studies in Honour of Professor Oscar Botto*. Torino: Edizione dell’Orso, pp. 17–30.
- Boucher D.** (1996). *Buddhist Translation Procedures in Third-Century China: A Study of Dharmarakṣa and his Translation Idiom*. PhD dissertation. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania
- Chi S., Lin Q. and Radich M.** *How the Mainstream Canon Came to China: A Computer-Assisted Study of Style and Attribution in the Corpus of Zhu Fonian* (provisional title). In preparation.
- Deeg M.** (2006). Unwirkliche Gegner: chinesische Polemik gegen den Hinayāna-Buddhismus. In Huesken U., Kieffer-Pülz K., and Peters A. et al. (eds), *Jaina-Itihāsa-Ratna, Festschrift für Gustav Roth zum 90. Geburtstag*. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica, pp. 103–125.

³Hayashi 1933/2010, pp. 7–8 counts 156 of the sutras in T125 (out of 471) with matches in AN, and 176 sutras for which he cannot find parallels anywhere. Anālayo 2009, p. 825 writes, “more than half of [T125] discourses have no counterpart in the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*.” Cf. also Legittimo 2009, p. 92 n. 4; Anālayo 2013b, pp. 51–52 n. 143, citing Akanuma.

⁴Lévi 1916, pp. 191, 263; Sakaino 1935, pp. 427–28; Hayashiya 1945, pp. 141–215; Iwamoto 1979, pp. 97, 133; Boucher 1996, pp. 279–80, referring to Matsumoto Bunzaburō; Legittimo 2010, pp. 257, 272.

- Drewes D. (2007). Revisiting the phrase 'sa prthivipradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet' and the Mahāyāna cult of the book. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 50, 101–143.
- Enomoto F. 榎本文雄. (1984). "Agon kyōten no seiritsu" 阿含經典の成立. *Tōyō gakujutsu kenkyū* 東洋學術研究 23(1), 93–108(R).
- Enomoto F. (1986). On the formation of the original texts of the Chinese Āgamas. *BSR* 3(1), 19–30.
- Felbur R.J. (2018). Anxiety of Emptiness: Self and Scripture in Early Medieval Chinese Buddhism, with a Focus on Sengru 僧叡. PhD dissertation. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University.
- Foguang dazangjing bianxiu weiyuanhui 佛光大藏經編修委員會. (1983–1988). *Foguang dazangjing, Ahan zang, Zengyi ahan jing* 佛光大藏經 阿含藏 增壹阿含經. 4 vols. Kaohsiung: Foguangshan zongwu weiyuanhui.
- Gao M. 高明道 [Friedrich Grohmann]. (2014). "Kai juan you yi: yi er suibi" 開卷有疑 一二隨筆. *Foguang* 法光 303, 2–3.
- Greene E.M. (2012). Meditation, Repentance and Visionary Experience in Early Medieval Chinese Buddhism. PhD dissertation. Berkeley, CA: U. C. Berkeley.
- Greene E.M. (2016). A reassessment of the early history of Chinese Buddhist vegetarianism. *Asia Major* 29(1), 1–43.
- Hayashi G. 林五邦. (1933/2010). "Kaidai" 解題. In *Kokuyaku issaikyō Indo senjutsu bu: Agonbu hachi* 國譯一切經印度撰述部 阿含部八. Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, pp. 1–16.
- Hayashiya T. 林屋友次郎. (1945). *Iyaku kyōrui no kenkyū* 異譯經類の研究. Tokyo: Tōyō bunko.
- Hiraoka S. 平岡聡. (2007a). "Shutsu yō kyō no seiritsu ni kansuru mondai" 『出曜經』の成立に関する問題. *IBK* 55(2), 848–842[L].
- Hiraoka S. 平岡聡. (2007b). "Zōitsu agon kyō no seiritsu kaimei ni mukete (1)" 『増一阿含經』の成立解明に向けて(1). *IBK* 56(1), 212–219.
- Hiraoka S. 平岡聡. (2008). "Zōitsu agon kyō no seiritsu kaimei ni mukete (2)" 『増一阿含經』の成立解明に向けて(2). *IBK* 57(1), 254–261.
- Hiraoka S. 平岡聡. (2011). "Bussetsu shin myō kyō no seiritsu: setsuissaiubu no daijō kyōten to iu kanōsei" 佛說心明經の成立 説一切有部の大乘經典という可能性. *IBK* 60(1), 131/428–139/420.
- Hiraoka S. (2013). The school affiliation of the *Ekottarika-āgama*. In Dhammadinnā (ed.), *Research on the Ekottarika-āgama (Taishō 125)*. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation, pp. 71–105.
- von Hinüber O. (1996). *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. Indian Philology and South Asian Studies 2. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hung J.-J. (2013). The second version of the Mahādeva tale in the *Ekottarika-āgama*: quantitative text analysis and translatorship attribution. In Dhammadinnā (ed.), *Research on the Ekottarika-āgama (Taishō 125)*. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation, pp. 107–132.
- Hung J.-J., Bingenheimer M. and Wiles S. (2010). Quantitative evidence for a hypothesis regarding the attribution of early Buddhist translations. *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 25(1), 119–134.
- Iwamoto Y. 岩本裕. (1979). *Sumāgadā avadāna kenkyū* スマーカダ・アウ・アタ・ーナ研究. Tokyo: Keimeii.
- Karashima S. 辛島静志. (1992). *The Textual Study of the Chinese Version of the Saddharmapundarikasutra in the Light of the Sanskrit and Tibetan Versions*. Bibliotheca Indologica et Buddhologica 3. Tokyo: Sankibo Press.
- Karashima S. 辛島静志. (1998). *A Glossary of Dharmaraka's Version of the Lotus Sūtra* 正法華經詞典. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica I. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism – Soka University.
- Kuan T.-f. (2009). Rethinking non-self: a new perspective from the *Ekottarika-āgama*. *BSR* 26(2), 155–175.
- Kuan T.-f. (2012). A geographical perspective on sectarian affiliations of the *Ekottarika Āgama* in Chinese translation (T 125). *Journal of Chinese Buddhist Studies* 2, 179–208.
- Kuan T.-f. (2013a). Mahāyāna elements and Mahāsāṃghika traces in the *Ekottarika-āgama*. In Dhammadinnā (ed.), *Research in the Ekottarika-āgama (Taishō 125)*. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation, pp. 133–194.
- Kuan T.-f. (2013b). Legends and transcendence: sectarian affiliations of the *Ekottarika Āgama* in Chinese translation. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 133(4), 607–634.
- Kuan T.-f. (2017). Review of Palumbo (2013). *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 137(2), 444–448.
- Kuan T.-f. (2019). Moggallāna's journey to another Buddha-field: how a Mahāyāna narrative crept into the *Ekottarika Āgama* (T 125). *Religions of South Asia* 13(1), 24–50.
- Lamotte É. (1967). Un *sūtra* composite de l'*Ekottarāgama*. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 30, 105–116. English translation: "A Composite *Sūtra* from the *Ekottarāgama*." Translated by Sara Boin-Webb. *BSR* 12, no. 1 (1995): 27–46.
- Legittimo E. (2009). The case of Bakkula according to the Chinese *Ekottarikāgama*. *The Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies* 10, 91–103.
- Legittimo E. (2010). Reopening the Maitreya-files – two almost identical early Maitreya Sutra translations in the Chinese canon: wrong attributions and text-historical entanglements. *JIAS* 31(1/2), 251–294.
- Lévi S. (1916). Les seize Arhat protecteurs de la Loi. *Journal Asiatique*, Series II 8, 5–50, 189–304.
- Lin J. 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, Taiwan: Yuan-Kuang Institute of Buddhist Studies 圓光佛學研究所.

- Lin Q.** 林乾 and **He S.** 何书群 [Michael Radich]. (2020). “Zhu Fonian suo ‘yi’ dasheng jingdian de jisuanji fuzhu wenben fenxi yanjiu” 竺佛念所译大乘经典的计算机辅助文本分析研究. *Shijie zongjiao wenhua* 世界宗教文化 6, 16–22.
- Lin Q. and Radich M.** (2021). A computer-assisted analysis of Zhu Fonian’s original Mahāyāna Sūtras. *BSR* 38(2), 145–168.
- Martini G.** (2013). Bodhisattva texts, ideologies and rituals in Khotan in the fifth and sixth centuries. In De Chiara M., Maggi M. and Martini G. (eds), *Buddhism among the Iranian Peoples of Central Asia*. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, pp. 13–69.
- Matsuda Y.** (2001). *Sūtra* 38.11 from the Chinese *Ekottarāgama*: the plague in Vaiśālī. *Kyūshū Ryūkoku tanki daigaku kiyō* 九州龍谷短期大学紀要 47, 1–29.
- Matsumura H.** (1989). One *Sūtra* of the *Ekottarikāgama* on *Trīṣaraṇagamana* and *Pañcaśīla*. *Archiv Orientalní* 57, 359–371.
- Melzer G. and Hartmann J.-U.** (2023). Anāthapiṇḍada and his seven sons: a short *sūtra* from the Gilgit finds. In Noriyuki Kudo (ed.), *Śāntamatiḥ, Manuscripts for Life: Essays in Memory of Seishi Karashima*. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica 15. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University, pp. 247–262.
- Mizuno K.** 水野弘元. (1933/2010). “*Zōitsu agon kyō kaidai* (hoi) 增一阿含經解題 (補遺). In *Kokuyaku issaikyō Indo sensjutsu bu: Agonbu hachi* 國譯一切經印度撰述部 阿含部八. Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, pp. 415–429.
- Mizuno K.** 水野弘元. (1969). “*Chū agon kyō kaidai*” 中阿含經解題. *Kokuyaku issaikyō* 國訳一切經, Agon bu 阿含部 6. *Revised Edition Agon bu* 6, 403–411.
- Mizuno K.** 水野弘元. (1981). “*Shutsu yō kyō no kenkyū*” 出曜經の研究. In Mizuno K., *Hokkukyō no kenkyū* 法句經の研究. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, pp. 359–476.
- Mizuno K.** 水野弘元. (1989). “Kan’yaku *Chū agon kyō* to *Zōitsu agon kyō*” 漢訳『中阿含經』と『增一阿含經』. *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), translated by Xu Yangzhu 許洋主, 509–579. Taipei: Fagu wenhua, 2003.
- Nattier J.** (2003). The ten epithets of the Buddha in the translations of Zhi Qian 支謙. *ARIRIAB* 6, 207–250.
- Nattier J.** (2010). Re-evaluating Zhu Fonian’s *Shizhu duanjie jing* (T309): translation or forgery? *ARIRIAB* 13, 256.
- Nattier J.** (2012). “Reconsidering the Chinese *Ekottarika-āgama*: Questions of Content and School Affiliation in Light of the Translator’s Track Record.” Unpublished paper, workshop entitled “The Chinese Translation of the *Ekottarika-āgama*: Research Perspectives & Collaboration.” 20th April 2012, Dharma Drum Buddhist College, Taiwan.
- Palumbo A.** (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* 增一阿含經. Dharma Drum Buddhist College Research Series 7. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation.
- Pāsādika.** (2007). The *Ekottarāgama* parallel to *Jātaka* 77. In Klaus K. and Hartmann J.-U. (eds), *Indica et Tibetica: Festschrift für Michael Hahn, zum 65. Geburtstag von Freunden und Schülern überreicht*. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 66. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien, pp. 395–403.
- Pāsādika.** (2010). Gleanings from the Chinese *Ekottarāgama* regarding school affiliation and other topics. In Meisig K. (ed.), *Translating Buddhist Chinese: Problems and Prospects*. East Asia Intercultural Studies/Interkulturelle Ostasienstudien 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, pp. 87–96.
- Pradhan P.** (ed.) (1967). *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya of Vasubandhu*. Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Radich M.** (2007). *The Somatics of Liberation: Ideas about Embodiment in Buddhism from Its Origins to the Fifth Century C.E.* PhD dissertation. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations.
- Radich M.** (2010). Embodiments of the Buddha in Sarvāstivāda doctrine: with special reference to the **Mahāvibhāṣā*. *ARIRIAB* 13, 121–172.
- Radich M.** (2011). *How Ajātaśatru was Reformed: The Domestication of “Ajase” and Stories in Buddhist History*. Studia Philologica Buddhica Monograph Series XXVII. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- Radich M.** (2012). Immortal Buddhas and their indestructible embodiments: the advent of the concept of *vajrakāya*. *JIAS* 34, 227–290.
- Radich M.** (2015). *The Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra and the Emergence of Tathāgatagarbha Doctrine*. Hamburg Buddhist Studies 5. Hamburg: Hamburg University Press.
- Radich M.** (2017). On the *Ekottarikāgama* 增壹阿含經 T 125 as a work of Zhu Fonian 竺佛念. *Journal of Chinese Buddhist Studies* 30, 1–31.
- Radich M.** (2019a [2020]). Reading the writing on the wall: ‘Sengchou’s’ cave at Xiaonanhai, early Chinese Buddhist meditation, and unique portions of **Dharmakṣema’s Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra*. *JIAS* 42, 515–632.
- Radich M.** (2019b). Kumārajīva’s ‘Voice’? In Mittler B., Gentz J., Gentz N. and Yeh C.V. (eds), *China and the World – The World and China: A Transcultural Perspective*. Deutsche Ostasienstudien 37. Gossenberg: Ostasien Verlag, pp. 131–145.
- Radich M.**=He Shuqun 何書群. (2021). “The **Suvarṇabhāṣottama-sūtra*”=“Wofoyuan ben *Jin guangming jing*” 卧佛院本《金光明經》. In Sassmann M. and Hua S. 孫華 (eds), *Buddhist Stone Sutras in China. Sichuan Province, Volume 5: Wofoyuan Section E–F*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag/Hangzhou: China Academy of Art Press, pp. 42–63, 64–91.

- Radich M.** (2025). *Telling Words: Dharmakṣa, Computers, and Phraseology as Evidence for Ascription*. Hamburg Buddhist Studies. Bochum/Freiburg: projekt verlag.
- Radich M. and Anālayo B.** (2017). Were the *Ekottarika-āgama* 增壹阿含經 T 125 and the *Madhyama-āgama* 中阿含經 T 26 translated by the same person? An assessment on the basis of translation style. In Dhammadinnā (ed.), *Research on the Madhyama-āgama*. Dharma Drum Institute of Liberal Arts Research Series 5. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation, pp. 209–237.
- Sakaino K.** 境野黄洋. (1935). *Shina Bukkyō seishi* 支那佛教精史. Tokyo: Sakaino Kōyō hakase ikō kankōkai.
- Schmithausen L.** (1987). Beiträge zur Schulgehörigkeit und Textgeschichte kanonischer und postkanonischer buddhistischer Materialien. In Heinz Bechert (ed.), *Zur Schulgehörigkeit von Werken in der Hinayāna-Literatur*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 304–406.
- Schopen G.** (1975). The phrase ‘*sa pṛthivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet*’ in the *Vajracchedikā*: notes on the cult of the book in the Mahāyāna. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 27, 147–181.
- Shizutani M.** 静谷正雄. (1973). “Kan’yaku Zōitsu agon kyō no shozoku buha” 漢訳『増一阿含經』の所属部派. *IBK* 43(1), 54–59.
- Skilton A (2002). State or statement? Samādhi in some early Mahāyāna Sūtras. *The Eastern Buddhist* 34, 51–93.
- Su J.** 蘇錦坤=Ken Su. (2007). “Baochang Jing lü yi xiang suoyin zhi Ahan jing: shilun Shuiye Hongyuan jiaoshou de ‘Zengyi ahan jing jieshuo’” 寶唱《經律異相》所引之阿含經—試論水野弘元教授的〈增一阿含經解說〉. *Fuyan Foxue yanjiu* 福嚴佛學研究 2, 91–160.
- Su K.** (2013). The *Uddānas* and structural aspects of the *Ekottarika-āgama*. In Dhammadinnā (ed.), *Research on the Ekottarika-āgama (Taishō 125)*. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation, pp. 195–233.
- Waldschmidt E.** (1980). Central Asian *Sūtra* fragments and their relation to the Chinese *Āgamas*. In Heinz Bechert (ed.), *Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung/The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition*. Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 136–174.
- Warita T.** 割田剛雄. (1973). “Dommanandai yaku Zōitsu agon kyō no genzon kyō ni tsuite” 曇摩難提訳「増一阿含經」の現存経について. *IBK* 42(2), 148–149.
- Wu J.** (2012). *From Perdition to Awakening: A Study of Legends of the Salvation of the Patricide Ajātaśatru in Indian Buddhism*. PhD dissertation Cardiff: Cardiff University.