

Journal of Chinese Buddhist Studies (2017, 30: 1–31)
New Taipei: Chung-Hwa Institute of Buddhist Studies
中華佛學學報 第三十期 頁 1–31 (民國一百零六年) 新北：中華佛學研究所
ISSN: 2313-2000 e-ISSN: 2313-2019

On the *Ekottarikāgama* 增壹阿含經 T 125 as a Work of Zhu Fonian 竺佛念

Michael Radich

Senior Lecturer, Religious Studies, Victoria University of Wellington,
New Zealand

Abstract

On the basis of a large set of diverse stylistic markers, this paper argues that the *Ekottarikāgama* T 125 was translated by Zhu Fonian, and not by Saṃghadeva. The paper also considers implications of its findings for the broader corpus of texts ascribed to Zhu Fonian, and for methods in assessing ascriptions of Chinese Buddhist texts on the basis of internal evidence.

Keywords:

Ekottarikāgama, Zhu Fonian, Saṃghadeva, Chinese Buddhist translations, ascription

論《增壹阿含經》的譯者應是竺佛念

Michael Radich

紐西蘭威靈頓維多利亞大學宗教研究學院高級講師

摘要

基於數十種不同翻譯風格標誌的比較，本論文提議《增壹阿含經》的譯者應是竺佛念而非僧伽提婆。並就此結論進一步探討所涉及的兩個問題：一、歸屬於竺佛念的作品當中，哪些才確實是其翻譯的？二、依據文體風格來判定漢語佛教經典的譯者時，何為最恰當的方法？

關鍵詞：

增壹阿含經、竺佛念、僧伽提婆、漢語佛典譯本、歸屬

Introduction

The Chinese tradition contains mixed testimony about the translatorship of the *Ekottarikāgama*. It is likely that multiple versions once circulated, and the extant canonical text, the *Zengyi ahan jing* 增壹阿含經 T 125, is ascribed variously to *Dharmanandin 曇摩難提 and (Gautama) Saṃghadeva 瞿曇僧伽提婆 in the various versions of the text recorded in the apparatus to the Taishō Tripiṭaka.¹ Consequently, modern scholarship has long been riven over the question of whether it is correct to ascribe the extant text to Saṃghadeva or to Dharmanandin's team, in which the main work of translation would have been done by Zhu Fonian 竺佛念 (d.u.).² In a companion study to the present work,³ Ven. Anālayo Bhikkhu and I argued that there are too many stylistic differences between T 125 and Saṃghadeva's benchmark work, the *Madhyamāgama* 中阿含經 T 26, for the two to be due to the same hand. This argument was based upon a very wide range of stylistic markers of many types, including transcription terms, translation terms, formulae for the opening and closing of sūtras, formulae for various phases of practice and moments on the path, other Buddhist technical terms, proper names for persons and places common in Buddhist texts, and ordinary nouns for realia. Many of these markers, moreover, occurred many times in their respective texts, suggesting that they were reliable and frequent features of the respective authors' style. The internal evidence we adduced in that argument was already far more copious and varied than that adduced by any previous studies of the same problem.⁴

¹ T 125, 2: 549b11 and n. 11.

² For detailed references on these various dimensions of the problem, see Radich and Anālayo, "Were the *Ekottarika-āgama*."

³ Radich and Anālayo, "Were the *Ekottarika-āgama*."

⁴ Previous studies have relied on a fairly small number of stylistic markers. For instance, Nattier, "'One Vehicle'," 195–196 n. 48, discusses about six markers distinguishing the *Ekottarikāgama* from the *Madhyamāgama*; Unebe, "Jiku Butsunen" is usually referred to as the most detailed study to date of Zhu Fonian's style, but builds its argument on a single set of terms (for the members of the eightfold path), which, moreover, are weaker as criteria for the translatorship of the *Ekottarikāgama* than many of the terms we examine below; Unebe, "Tōshin" (the main aim of which is not to examine our present question) discusses five terms or sets of terms; Lin, "Xiancun" uses approximately nine sets of markers (albeit strong ones). Mizuno, "Kan'yaku...yakushutsu," 88–89, ironically studies the largest number of markers of any of these authors (36 markers), only to arrive at an incorrect result (see n. 38).

However, in that study, we contented ourselves with the negative conclusion that T 125 is highly unlikely to be by Saṃghadeva. The present study aims, as far as possible, to identify the most likely author of T 125, again by studying the terminology and phraseology of the text in much greater detail than has previously been attempted. I will adduce terminological and phraseological evidence even more copious than that adduced in the companion study, to argue that it is overwhelmingly probable that T 125 was translated by Zhu Fonian.

Preliminaries: Selection of the Benchmark Zhu Fonian Corpus

External evidence, as discussed above, presents us with two main candidates for translatorship (or authorship⁵) of the *Ekottarikāgama*: Zhu Fonian, and Saṃghadeva.⁶ In this study, I will therefore focus on stylistic markers capable of distinguishing between these two figures. That is to say, I will examine the *Ekottarikāgama* T 125 for markers characteristic of Zhu Fonian's idiom, in contrast with that of Saṃghadeva.

To render my treatment as robust as possible, I will take as my benchmark for Zhu Fonian's style a conservative pool of texts. The principal criteria in assembling this corpus are these: 1) the ascription to Zhu Fonian on the basis of external evidence should be unproblematic; and 2) the texts should be genuine translation texts. This leads me immediately to exclude a number of texts from my benchmark corpus:

⁵ By this equivocation, I mean to mark the possibility that some portions of the collection may have been added in China, and that Zhu Fonian could himself be responsible for some such additions. I will return to this problem below.

⁶ As always in studies of such corpora, "Zhu Fonian" should be regarded as a shorthand label of convenience for "(the) translation group(s) centering on Zhu Fonian," and similarly "Saṃghadeva" for "(the) translation group(s) centering on Saṃghadeva." It may ultimately be possible to distinguish between markers of the contributions of individual members of such translation groups to the collective style, but the present study makes no pretense of being so powerful. It is nonetheless important to think in terms of the group(s) centering on real translators such as Zhu Fonian, rather than groups centering on Indic reciters (or even figureheads) such as *Dharmanandin, because the latter focus can lead us on a wild goose chase in search of supposed "authorial signatures" that may not exist.

- the *Mohe banre chao jing* 摩訶般若鈔經 T 226, which is probably not due to Zhu Fonian;⁷
- the *Shi zhu duan jie jing* 十住斷結經 T 309,⁸ which Nattier has shown was composed in China, and is not a genuine translation;⁹
- the *Pusa chu tai jing* 菩薩處胎經 T 384, which may also be a Chinese composition;¹⁰

⁷ Kajiyoshi, *Genshi*, 68–76. On the basis of a complex discussion, Kajiyoshi concludes that the extant T 226 is most likely to be an alternate translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā* by Dharmarakṣa, which is noted variously in the catalogues as the “New *Daoxing jing*” 新道行經 and the “retranslation of the shorter version [of the *Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*]” 更出小品. For our present purposes, however, it suffices to note Kajiyoshi’s grounds for believing that the text has nothing to do with Zhu Fonian. Kajiyoshi notes that the *Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集 T 2145 preserves a preface by Dao’an 道安 (312/314–385?) to a text with a title very similar to our extant T 226: *Mohe boluore boluomi jing chao* 摩訶鉢羅若波羅蜜經抄; T 2145, 55: 52b8–52c26. However, the details of this notice show that it could not have referred to the present T 226. Rather, it describes a text which was a partial retranslation of the larger *Prajñāpāramitā*, which incorporated parts of the earlier translations by Mokṣala 無羅叉 (*Fang guang banre jing* 放光般若經 T 221) and Dharmarakṣa (*Guang zan jing* 光讚經 T 222). Moreover, the notice actually states that this translation was made by Fohu 佛護 (and Dharmamitra 曇摩婢, who “held the [foreign] text”), not by Zhu Fonian. Finally, Kajiyoshi also argues that Fohu (Fotuluocha 佛圖羅刹, *Buddharakṣa?) cannot be identified with Zhu Fonian, since a number of notices in the tradition clearly refer to these two figures in distinct capacities, e.g. as producing successive translations of the same text, or working together on a single translation (see T 2145, 55: 99a25–b5; 99b7–9; 73c3–8; 64c11–15). It seems clear, then, that the ascription of the extant T 226 to Zhu Fonian is based upon a double error: the conflation of Fohu with Zhu Fonian, and the conflation of the extant T 226 with a different, lost text that originally bore a title very similar to our extant T 226.

⁸ In using this shorter title, which is the mode in which the text refers to itself internally, I follow Nattier, “Re-evaluating,” 231 and n. 2. In the Taishō, the text is given the more fulsome title *Zuishengwen pusa shi zhu chu gou duan jie jing* 最勝問菩薩十住除垢斷結經, which seems to date from Zhisheng 智昇 (writing in 730).

⁹ Nattier, “Re-evaluating.” Nattier shows that the Chinese sources of the text include at least *Mokṣala’s *Fang guang banre jing* 放光般若經 T 221; the *Chengju guangming dingyi jing* 成具光明定意經 T 630 ascribed to Zhi Yao 支曜, but itself probably composed in China (Nattier, “Re-evaluating,” 241–242 n. 26; Nattier, *Guide*, 96–102; some of the connections between T 309 and T 630 had already been partially studied before Nattier by Pu, “Notes”); and the **Akṣamayati-nirdeśa* 阿差末菩薩經 T 403 of Dharmarakṣa.

- the **Antarābhava-sutra* 中陰經 T 385, which may also be a Chinese composition;¹¹
- the *Da yun wuxiang jing juan dijiu* 大雲無想經卷第九 T 388, which I have shown is almost certainly not due to Zhu Fonian;¹² and
- the *Pusa yingluo benye jing* 菩薩瓔珞本業經 T 1485, which has long been regarded as an “apocryphon.”

We also exclude the *Jñānaprasthāna* 阿毘曇八犍度論 T 1543, since it is ascribed to Zhu Fonian and Saṃghadeva as a team, and as such, should in principle not help us distinguish between the styles of our two candidates.

Finally, I also exclude four other texts. These texts were possibly actually translated by Zhu Fonian, but the information the tradition gives us about their translation is conflicted, and all four bear the names of other “translators” in the Taishō canon:

- The *Zun Poxumi pusa suoji lun* 尊婆須蜜菩薩所集論 T 1549: In the Taishō, this text is credited to **Saṃghabhūti/Saṃghabhadrā*[?] 僧伽跋澄. However, Zhu Fonian’s role as a translator is affirmed by an anonymous preface preserved in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集 T 2145, which states that [Saṃgha]bhadrā/~bhūti?), [Dharma]nandin 難陀, and [Saṃgha]deva 掃/掃婆 merely “held [read] the Western text” 執胡本.¹³
- *Ayu wangxi huai mu yinyuan jing* 阿育王息壤目因緣經 T 2045: In the Taishō, this translation is ascribed to **Dharmanandin* 曇摩難提. However, the *Chu sanzang ji ji* preserves a preface by Zhu Fonian himself. Although the evidence is circumstantial, this preface seems to indicate that the actual work of translation was done by Zhu Fonian. Not only is it the only extant preface in Zhu Fonian’s name, but the preface also concludes with his reflections upon his

¹⁰ = *Pusa cong doushutian xiang shen mu tai shuo guangpu jing* 菩薩從兜術天降神母胎說廣普經. Legittimo, “Synoptic,” “Analysis;” Nattier, “Re-evaluating,” 234, 256.

¹¹ Nattier, “Re-evaluating,” 256. Nattier notes that several of the problematic works here (T 309, T 384, T 385) share with T 656 certain common features: they are “sole exemplars” (i.e. they have no attested parallels in any language); and they date to a later period in Zhu Fonian’s career, when the circumstances under which he was working had changed, and he seems to have been working alone; Nattier, “Re-evaluating,” 234–35, 256.

¹² Radich, “Problems.”

¹³ T 2145, 55: 71c8–72a8; repeated at T 1549, 28: 721a3–b4.

translation practice, which would be odd, if the preface were not attached to one of his translations.¹⁴ Elsewhere, the *Chu sanzang ji ji* simply ascribes this same text directly to Zhu Fonian, and states that when Dharmanandin “issued” 出 the text, Zhu Fonian served as interpreter 宣譯 as well as writing the preface.¹⁵

- The *Si ahanmu chao jie* 四阿鎗暮抄解 T 1505: In the Taishō, this text is ascribed to “Kumārabuddhi et al.” 鳩摩羅佛提等. However, an anonymous preface transmitted in *Chu sanzang ji ji* states that the role played by Kumārabuddhi was to “hold [read out] the Western text” 鳩摩羅佛提……執胡本, whereas the actual translation was by Zhu Fonian and Fohu 佛護 (*Buddharakṣa?).¹⁶
- The *Sengqieluo cha suoji jing* 僧伽羅刹所集經 T 194: In the Taishō, this text is ascribed to “Saṃghabhūti/Saṃghabhadrā[?] 僧伽跋澄 [“et al.” 等, Korean only]. However, an anonymous preface to the text preserved in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* states only that the text had been brought to Chang’an by Saṃghabhūti/Saṃghabhadrā(?) 僧伽跋澄. The preface does not directly identify his role in the translation process (on the pattern of other prefaces, it seems likely that he merely “held”, i.e. read, the “Western text” 胡本). On the other hand, the preface does explicitly state that Zhu Fonian translated, and Huisong 慧嵩 acted as amanuensis.¹⁷ Our information for this text is complicated further by the fact that we also have a conflicting postface, which holds that Saṃghabhūti/Saṃghabhadrā(?) 僧伽跋澄 recited the text, and the translation was done by *Vibhāṣā (sic) [and?] *Buddharakṣa 毘婆沙佛圖羅刹 (or could this mean something like “the Vaibhāṣika *Buddharakṣa?”).¹⁸

Excluding these texts¹⁹ yields the following conservative corpus as a benchmark. As I will show, this corpus certainly suffices as a reference point

¹⁴ T 2145, 55: 51b14–c16.

¹⁵ T 2145, 55: 10c4–6, 111b16–18.

¹⁶ T 2145, 55: 10b13–16 (repeated at T 1505, 25: 1a3–24; see also T 2145, 55: 64c3–23).

¹⁷ T 2145, 55: 71b2–23.

¹⁸ T 2145, 55: 71b24–c7; Kamata, *Chūgoku*, 107–108, argues that this postface is mistaken.

¹⁹ Sources also associate the following lost texts with Zhu Fonian:

1) The *Biqiuni da jie* 比丘尼大戒, for which a note preserved in *Chu sanzang ji ji* says Zhu Fonian “held [in his hands, i.e. read/recited] the Western [text]” 佛

to establish a very rich set of markers of Zhu Fonian’s regular style, as it contrasts with that of Saṃghadeva.²⁰

- *Dīrghāgama* T 1 (DĀ);
- *Udānavarga* 出曜經 T 212;²¹
- *Pusa yingluo jing* 菩薩瓔珞經 T 656;

念執胡。However, as Kamata suggests, this does not seem to indicate that Zhu Fonian was responsible for the actual translation of this text; CSZJJ T 2145: 81b21–24 (also 10a26–29), Kamata, *Chūgoku*, 97–98, 102.

2) The *Biqiu* [*shi song*] *da jie* 比丘[十誦]大戒: One note in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* says that Zhu Fonian translated this text; T 2145, 55: 10a23–25. However, according to Dao’an’s preface, Zhu Fonian’s role was only to write down (or copy?) the Indic (Sanskrit?) text 佛念寫其梵文, whereas the actual translation was done by Daoxian 道賢為譯; T 2145, 55: 80b5.

3) A *Madhyamāgama* 中阿鉢經, which appears in Sengyou’s 新集經律論錄 alongside the notice of Zhu Fonian’s *Ekottarikāgama*, with the information that the text was recited orally by Dharmanandin, and translated by Zhu Fonian 曇摩難提……口誦胡本、竺佛念譯出; T 2145, 55: 10b21–26. Mizuno “Kan’yaku…yakushutsu,” “Kan’yaku,” suggested that fragments of this collection were preserved in a range of individual texts extant in the present Taishō canon. However, Hung, Bingenheimer, and Wiles, “Quantitative,” problematizes the ascription of these texts to Zhu Fonian and his collaborators. They found that the group of 24 *Madhyamāgama* texts studied by Mizuno are indeed united by a common stylistic signature, but that “on the basis of the present research we are not able to prove that these 24 texts were translated, as Mizuno holds, by Dharmanandin and Zhu Fonian specifically,” 122.

4) *Huan wang jing* 幻網經, mentioned in the anonymous postface to T 194 preserved in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, T 2145, 55: 71c1–2.

²⁰ Su, “Terms” has examined instances in three texts of this core Zhu Fonian corpus (*Dīrghāgama*, T 212 and T 1428) in which the same Indic term is translated more than one way. As Su’s examples show, the terminology and style of this corpus is not entirely uniform or stable. However, the evidence surveyed below shows amply that even if variety exists, there is also sufficient regularity across these texts to identify reliable markers of Zhu Fonian’s translatorship/authorship—some of them exclusive (see Table 7).

²¹ Note, however, that Hiraoka, “*Shutsu yō kyō*,” has argued that the prose portions of the *Udānavarga* T 212 contain narrative material aligning with multiple Mainstream transmission traditions, and the text is therefore unlikely to have been composed in its present form in an Indic context. Rather, he suggests that it was probably expanded and modified at the point of translation into Chinese. Hiraoka also mentions, following Watanabe Kazuko 田辺和子, that T 212 borrows a number of stories from the *Faju piyu jing* 法句譬喻經 T 211, which Mizuno 水野 and Enomoto 榎本 have argued was itself composed in China; Hiraoka 843, 844 n. 7.

- the *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya* 四分律 T 1428; and
- the *Binaiye* 鼻奈耶 T 1464.

Our only solid reference point for the style of Saṃghadeva is the *Madhyamāgama* T 26, and I will therefore take that text as our benchmark for his style.

Examination of Stylistic Markers

The *Ekottarikāgama* shares a large amount of phraseology and terminology with the Zhu Fonian texts in this benchmark corpus, while those same markers are never found in the *Madhyamāgama*.

Not only are phrases matching our criteria copious in this Zhu Fonian reference corpus, but they are also of various types, and this fact, in itself, makes the likelihood stronger that we are seeing a global difference between two authorial styles. It will therefore be convenient to list the evidence by type.

First, we find various proper names—the names of common persons, places, gods etc.—shared by the *Ekottarikāgama* and the Zhu Fonian reference corpus, but never found in the *Madhyamāgama*.

Conventions for all Tables

- ♦ None of the terms listed ever appears in the *Madhyamāgama*.
- ♦ Counts are approximate.²²
- ♦ Items already discussed in Radich and Anālayo, “Were the *Ekottarika-āgama*,” are listed in [square brackets].
- ♦ **Bold** indicates especially strong markers. Markers for which counts are **bold** (middle column) appear over 100 times in the *Ekottarikāgama*. Markers for which benchmark corpus texts are **bold** (rightmost column) appear in all five benchmark texts (as well as the *Ekottarikāgama*).
- ♦ Indic equivalents and/or English translations for Chinese terms and phrases are given only to aid readers in assessing the type of language at issue. They

²² All counts based upon electronic searching, as these are, should be regarded as provisional, since the digitization process may be subject to error; since most such searches (e.g. with the CB Reader) do not take into account textual variants, even as witnessed in the Taishō apparatus; and because the Taishō editing process, including the apparatus, was itself subject to error.

do not represent a claim that the Chinese in every instance in the texts corresponds to exactly the Indic term or meaning given.

Table 1: Names of persons etc. found in the *Ekottarikāgama* and the Zhu Fonian corpus, but never in the *Madhyamāgama* (see above for conventions)

term	instances in <i>Ekottarikāgama</i>	other Zhu Fonian texts
[舍利弗] Śāriputra	411x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
釋提桓因 Śakrodevānām Indra	150x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
[祇樹] Jetavana	132x	DĀ, T 212, T 1428, T 1464 (copious)
[羅閱城] Rājagṛha	108x	DĀ, T 212, T 1428, T 1464
[阿闍世] Ajātaśatru	91x	DĀ, T 212, T 1428, T 1464
釋迦文 Śākyamuni	63x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428
毘舍離 Vaiśālī	48x	DĀ, T 212, T 1428
耆闍崛山 Gr̥dhakūṭa	23x	DĀ, T 212, T 1428, T 1464
[閻浮提] Jambudvīpa	19x	DĀ, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
優波離 Upāli	16x	T 1428 (copious), T 1464

Next, we also find transcription terms with the same pattern of distribution.

Table 2: Transcription terms found in the *Ekottarikāgama* and the Zhu Fonian corpus, but never in the *Madhyamāgama* (see above for conventions)

term	instances in <i>Ekottarikāgama</i>	other Zhu Fonian texts
沙門婆羅門 <i>śramanabrāhmaṇa</i>	112x	DĀ, T 212, T 1428, T 1464
由旬 <i>yojana</i>	78x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
[阿須倫] <i>asura</i>	74x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1464

泥洹 ²³ <i>nirvāna</i>	17x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1464
三耶三佛 <i>saṃyaksambuddha</i>	13x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1464
阿僧祇 <i>asaṃkhyeya</i>	9x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428

The same pattern of distribution marks numerous Buddhist terms which are translated into Chinese (or translated in part), rather than transcribed.

Table 3: Buddhist technical terms found in the *Ekottarikāgama* and the Zhu Fonian corpus, but never in the *Madhyamāgama* (see above for conventions)

term	instances in <i>Ekottarikāgama</i>	other Zhu Fonian texts
[如來至真等正覺] “Tathāgata, Arhat, Saṃyaksambuddha”	74x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428
[(色、聲、香、味……) 細滑] * <i>sparśa</i> , * <i>spraṣṭavya</i>	54x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
眾生類 “classes of sentient beings”	51x	DĀ, T 212, T 656
[三惡趣] * <i>durgati</i> [<i>traya</i>]	48x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428
[六入] <i>ṣaḍāyatana</i>	45x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1464
神力 “supernatural power”	44x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
三法衣 “three monastic robes”	38x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1464
戒律 “precepts and monastic rule”	37x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428
眾僧 “the Saṃgha”	36x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
契經 <i>sūtra</i>	31x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428
盡道 “...cessation, and the path” ²⁴	27x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464

²³ See Palumbo, *Early Chinese Commentary*, 123 and n. 62, 91 n. 186, 216.

²⁴ *Nirodha* and *mārga*, viz., the third and fourth noble truths.

[不用處] <i>ākimcanyāyatana</i>	26x	DĀ, T 212, T 1428
苦諦 <i>duḥkhasatya</i>	20x	DĀ, T 212, T 1428, T 1464
他化自在天 ²⁵ <i>paranirmitavaśavartin</i>	20x	DĀ, T 1428
光音天 <i>ābhāsvara</i>	20x	DĀ, T 212
空三昧 “emptiness <i>samādhi</i> ”	18x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428
盡諦 <i>nirodhasatya</i>	18x	DĀ, T 212, T 1428
無數方便 “countless expedients”	17x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
習諦 <i>samudayasatya</i>	15x	DĀ, T 1428
眾生心 “minds of sentient beings”	12x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428
[苦出要諦] <i>mārgasatya</i>	10x	DĀ
[猗覺意] <i>praśrabdhi- sambodhyaṅga</i>	8x	DĀ, T 656, T 1428
法語 <i>dharmakathā</i>	6x	DĀ, T 1428, T 1464

²⁵ Cf. also 化自在天, which has a similar distribution. Jan Nattier points out that the combination of two supposed heavens named 化自在天 + 他化自在天 is apparently an error distinctive of Zhu Fonian; 他化自在天 for *paranirmitavaśavartin* makes sense, but 化自在天 appears to name a heaven that does not exist in Indian Buddhism (**nirmitavaśavartin*); Nattier (personal communication). 化自在天 (without 他) first appears in Dharmarakṣa for *paranirmitavaśavartin*. In those contexts it is clearly distinct from **nirmāṇarati*, which appears next to it in lists and is translated 無橋樂天 or 無橋樂 (presumably by an etymologization from *māna* “pride” = 橋); e.g. T 186, 3: 489c13–16. 化自在天 (without 他) is otherwise very restricted in distribution (thereby incidentally forming part of a widespread pattern in which Zhu Fonian’s idiom shows unusually heavy debts to Dharmarakṣa). However, in lists in Zhu Fonian texts, 化自在天 appears alongside 他化自在天, and any other more usual or comprehensible equivalent for *nirmāṇarati* is missing (cf. Nattier, “Re-evaluating,” 252). This could mean that the name 化自在天 has somehow been reinterpreted as *nirmāṇarati* (as an anonymous JCBR reviewer suggests), but if so, the logic by which this equivalence is arrived at is opaque to me.

無數劫事 “* <i>asamkhyeyakalpa</i> things (<i>sic?</i>)”	6x	DĀ, T 212, T 656
上人法 * <i>uttaro manuṣyadharmāḥ</i>	5x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
戒盜(結) ²⁶ “attachment to precepts”	5x	DĀ, T 212
斷結 “cut off the fetters”	4x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428
合掌 “joined palms” = <i>añjali</i>	3x	DĀ, T 212, T 1428 (copious), T 1464
受具足戒 “receive full precepts”	2x	T 1428 (copious)

In addition, we also find common nouns, verbs, and adjectives matching the same pattern (though in classical Chinese, the boundaries between these parts of speech can in some cases be fuzzy).

Table 4: Common nouns, verbs and adjectives found in the *Ekottarikāgama* and the Zhu Fonian corpus, but never in the *Madhyamāgama* (see above for conventions)

Where the boundary between technical terms and ordinary nouns is fuzzy, the term is listed here, rather than in Table 3.

term	instances in <i>Ekottarikāgama</i>	other Zhu Fonian texts
出現 ²⁷ “appear”	174x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428
~之類 “...and suchlike”	125x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
亂想 “deluded notions”	98x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428
利養 “benefit”	80x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428

²⁶ This term refers to the second of three types of “fetters” (*saṃyojana*), namely, rigid attachment to the letter of precepts. It is quite restricted in its distribution in the canon as a whole. In texts supposedly before Zhu Fonian, it appears only in T 1557 (7x), ascribed to An Shigao. It never appears in Kumārajīva. Among other texts contemporary to Zhu Fonian, it appears in T 1506 (4x), T 1547 (47x), and T 1550 (9x). Outside our “reference” corpus, it also appears in other texts ascribed to Zhu Fonian: T 309 (1x), T 1543 (86x), T 1549(8x).

²⁷ Cf. also 出現於世, *Ekottarikāgama* (96), DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428—also, naturally, never in the *Madhyamāgama*.

醫藥 “medicine”	81x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
閑靜 ²⁸ “secluded and quiet”	80x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428
鬼神 “spirit(s)”	63x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428
大患 “calamity”	58x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428
狐疑 ²⁹ “suspicion”	53x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
本末 “beginning and end, primary and ancillary”	41x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
愚惑 “foolishness”	39x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428
[村落] “village”	38x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
恩愛 “benevolence, favour”	38x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428
清旦 “morning”	37x	DĀ, T 212, T 1428, T 1464
言教 “teachings”	26x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428
縱廣 “length and breadth”	24x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
承受 “receive”	24x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
流轉 “flow”	22x	DĀ, T 212, T 656
變化 “transformation”	17x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
恚怒 “anger”	10x	DĀ, T 212, T 656
天宮 “heavenly palace”	11x	DĀ, T 212, T 1428, T 1464
專念 “steadily mindful”	6x	DĀ, T 212, T 1428
過去現在 “past and present”	2x	DĀ, T 212, T 656
石蜜 “refined cane sugar”	2x	DĀ, T 212, T 1428 (copious), T 1464

We also find numerous formulaic phrases, regular collocations, and recurring combinations of ordinary words distributed in the same manner.

²⁸ The more specific phrase 閑靜之處 appears in *Ekottarikāgama* (52x) and T 212 (5x).

²⁹ Often in phrases like 無有狐疑, 無復狐疑.

Table 5: Recurring phrases found in the *Ekottarikāgama* and the Zhu Fonian corpus, but never in the *Madhyamāgama* (see above for conventions)

term	instances in <i>Ekottarikāgama</i>	other Zhu Fonian texts
[一時佛在] “At one time, the Buddha was at...”	440x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428
所以然者 “because/the reason being that...”	284x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
白佛言 “said to the Buddha”	240x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
[在一面坐] “sat to one side”	174x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
對曰：「如是……」 “replied, ‘Indeed...’”	112x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428
比丘對曰 “the monk replied”	104x	DĀ, T 212
不能自勝 ³⁰ “could not control himself”	89x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
如實知之 “know it as it really is”	83x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428
爾時阿難 “at that time, Ananda”	77x	DĀ, T 212, T 1428, T 1464
取滅度 “‘took’ extinction”	76x	DĀ, T 212, T 656
得法眼淨 “attained purity of the Dharma eye”	62x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
以此因緣 “for this reason”	58x	DĀ, T 212, T 1428, T 1464
在虛空 ³¹ “in the air”	54x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428
如汝所言 “as you say”	54x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
[生死已盡梵行已立] “birth and death are exhausted, and <i>brahmacārya</i> is complete”	52x	DĀ, T 212

³⁰ Cf. also 踊躍不能自勝, which accounts for many (but not all) of these instances of 不能自勝, and has a similar distribution.

³¹ Cf. also 在虛空中.

取命 “end his life”	45x	DĀ, T 212
懷恐怖 “felt terror”	42x	DĀ, T 212, T 1428
入地獄 ³² “entered into a hell”	42x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
[成阿羅漢] “become an arhat”	41x	DĀ, T 212, T 1428
由此因緣 “for this reason”	39x	DĀ, T 212, T 1428, T 1464
[得阿羅漢] “attain arhatship”	34x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
從 X 禪起 “arises from X meditation...”	19x	T 1428, T 1464
就座 ³³ “took a seat”	18x	DĀ, T 1428 (copious), T 1464
往白 “go and tell”	12x	DĀ, T 212, T 1428, T 1464
現在前 “appeared before [him...]”	10x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428
復有 X 法 ³⁴ “in addition, there are X dharmas”	6x	DĀ, T 656, T 1428
[偏露右肩] “bared the right shoulder”	5x	DĀ, T 1428 (copious)
於異時 “at another time”	4x	T 1428 (copious)
受持諷誦 “receive and preserve [the text] and recite it...”	3x	T 656 (copious)
心所念法 “the dharma of which one thinks”	3x	DĀ, T 212, T 656
知他人心 “knows the minds of other people”	2x	DĀ, T 212, T 656
人間遊行 “travelling among humankind”	2x	DĀ, T 1428 (107x)
~寶成就 ³⁵ “...treasure [is] complete”	2x	DĀ, T 656
處母胎 “was in [his] mother’s womb”	1x	DĀ, T 212, T 656

³² Cf. Lin, “Xiancun,” 135–36.

³³ Cf. also 就座而坐, which has a similar distribution.

³⁴ “X” represents a number, e.g. 復有二法.

³⁵ Various, in reference to the *saptaratna*, or one or another thereof.

We even find conjunctions, adverbs, and verbs of speech and thought matching the same pattern.

Table 6: Conjunctions, adverbs, and verbs of speech and thought found in the *Ekottarikāgama* and the Zhu Fonian corpus, but never in the *Madhyamāgama* (see above for conventions)

term	instances in <i>Ekottarikāgama</i>	other Zhu Fonian texts
更不 “never again”	130x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
生此念 “had this thought...”	87x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
報言 “reply”	83x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
靡不 “not un-” (double negative)	44x	DĀ, T 212, T 656
稱言 “call”	11x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428
[最初] “first”	9x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428
問言 “ask”	8x	DĀ, T 1428
念言 “think”	6x	DĀ, T 212, T 656, T 1428, T 1464
自言 “say to oneself”	3x	DĀ, T 212, T 1428 (copious), T 1464

In sum, Tables 1–6 show that the *Ekottarikāgama* contains a very large number of markers that are common to the texts most reliably ascribed to Zhu Fonian, none of which ever appear in the *Madhyamāgama*. Some of these markers (counts shown in **bold** in the tables, central column) appear over 100 times in the *Ekottarikāgama*, and thus constitute very strong evidence that the markers concerned are regular, recurring habits of the translator, and therefore, more likely to be significant for the identification of translatorship based upon style. Similarly, other markers (text names/numbers shown in **bold** in the tables, rightmost column) appear in all five of our benchmark texts, which are most reliably ascribable to Zhu Fonian (as well as in the *Ekottarikāgama*). These markers are thus overwhelmingly likely to constitute reliable, regular features of Zhu Fonian’s idiom, especially as distinguished from that of Saṃghadeva. In addition, these markers cover a wide range of types of language—the names of many of the most central persons and places in the Buddhist tradition; technical Buddhist terms, in both transcription and translation; recurring formulaic phrases, collocations and stereotyped phrases;

and “nuts and bolts” functional parts of speech like conjunctions, verbs of speech and thought, and adverbs.

The sheer quantity of such markers found in the *Ekottarikāgama*—thousands in total—is also powerful evidence that it is vastly more probable that Zhu Fonian translated the text, than that Saṃghadeva did. Readers should also note that even the copious evidence of the above tables is merely a sampling of such markers, rather than an attempt to list them exhaustively. As observant readers may have noted, in a somewhat artificial attempt to render more manageable the sheer quantity of evidence, while at the same time ensuring that all markers listed were relevant not just to Zhu Fonian but to his *āgama* idiom, the tables above were largely restricted to terms that also appear in the *Dīrghāgama*. If this artificial restriction were removed, even more markers of this type could certainly be found in quantity.

Finally, we can also find even stronger internal evidence that Zhu Fonian was probably the translator of our extant *Ekottarikāgama*. Table 7 lists terms and phrases that appear in the *Ekottarikāgama*, but are otherwise *only* ever found in (other) texts by Zhu Fonian—that is, never in any other translation texts in the entire Taishō Tripiṭaka; this means, naturally, that such terms are also never found in the *Madhyamāgama*.

Table 7: Terms and phrases in the *Ekottarikāgama* unique to the Zhu Fonian corpus

Note that some of the terms listed also appear in Zhu Fonian works outside the reference corpus (i.e. T 309, T 384).

term/phrase	<i>Ekottarikāgama</i>	elsewhere
云何為[X]法？所謂…… “What are the X dharmas? Namely…”	35x	T 212 (2x), T 309 (2x), T 656 (1x)
在閑靜之處 “in a secluded and quiet spot”	35x	T 212 (3x)
長生太子 “Prince Long Life” ³⁶	34x	T 212 (8x)

³⁶ Cf. 長壽王經：王有太子，名曰長生，T 161, 3: 386a8; 六度集經：太子名長生，T 152, 3: 5a20–21. All instances in the *Ekottarikāgama* are found in 24.8 = MN 31, MN 128. The Indic name underlying this Chinese is uncertain. In the Theravada Vinaya, the name is Dīghāvu; for further details, see Anālayo, *Comparative Study*, 2: 732 n. 230.

羅閱城 ³⁷ 迦蘭陀竹園 ³⁸ 所 “in the city of Rājagṛha, in the Karaṇḍa-Venuvana”	33x	T 212 (4x), T 1464 (2x)
諸比丘從佛受教 “The monks received a teaching from the Buddha”	27x	T 1428 (1x)
更不(復)受胎如實知之 ³⁹ “will never [again] take up [residence in] a womb, and knows it as it is”	22x	T 212 (3x)
爾時世尊便說斯偈 “At that time, the World-Honoured One then spoke this <i>gāthā</i> ”	19x	T 212 (5x), T 309, T 656
身壞命終生善處天上 ⁴⁰ “[when] the body is destroyed and life comes to an end, is reborn in a good destiny or a heaven”	19x	T 212 (3x)
罪人報曰 “the culprit replied...”	13x	DĀ (1x), T 212 (8x)
拔祇國 Vajjī	12x	DĀ (1x)
(著/服)三法衣，出家(學/修)道 ⁴¹ “[don] the three monastic robes, and leave the home [to practice] the path”	12x	DĀ (5x), T 212 (1x)
有漏成無漏心解脫智慧解脫 [e.g. discard...] “the defiled and perfect the undefiled mind, liberation of mind, liberation through wisdom”	12x	DĀ (3x), T 212 (1x)
X 知 Y 心中所念，即…… “X knew what Y was thinking, and then...”	10x	DĀ (1x), T 212 (2x), T 309 (2x), T 1428 (4x)

³⁷ Sometimes also 王舍城 (T 212, T 1464); once 羅閱祇 T 212.

³⁸ Mizuno, “Kan’yaku...yakushutsu,” 89 (see n. 4).

³⁹ Lin, “Xiancun,” 131, 133.

⁴⁰ Lin, “Xiancun,” 131, 133, 135.

⁴¹ The specific variant 著三法衣，出家學道 is found only in the *Ekottarikāgama* and T 212. 服三法衣，出家修道 is found only in the *Dīrghāgama* (also 服三法衣，出家為道，服三法衣，出家求道).

The (copiously attested) *Madhyamāgama* version of this formula is rather 著袈裟衣[，至信、]捨家、無家、學道.

以天眼(觀)清淨無瑕穢 “[sees] with the heavenly eye, [which is] pure and without taint or blemish”	6x	T 212 (19x)
即於座上諸塵垢盡得法眼淨 “then, right where he sat, eliminated all dirt and impurity, and attained purity of the Dharma eye”	6x	T 212 (1x), T 309 (1x), T 1428 (18x)
眾生類亦復如是 “the same is also the case with classes of sentient beings”	5x	T 212 (19x), T 384 (1x)
說法已即從(座/坐)起 “having taught the Dharma, he rose immediately from his seat”	5x	DĀ (1x), T 1428 (2x), T 1464 (3x)
(諸)天、世人、魔、若魔天(及)(人 /沙門) ⁴² “god[s], men of the world, <i>māras</i> , <i>māra</i> -like deities [and humans/ <i>śramaṇas</i>]”	5x	DĀ (9x), T 309 (1x), T 1428 (1x)
無常為變易法 ⁴³ “...impermanent, constituting a mutable dharma”	4x	DĀ (12x), T 212(1x)
至(var. 往, 即往)世尊所……頭面 禮足, 在一面坐, 以此因緣具白 世尊 “went to the World-Honoured One...did obeisance at his feet, sat to one side, and related these events to the World-Honoured One”	3x	T 1428 (174x)
自相謂言: ⁴⁴ 此沙門…… “said to one another, ‘This <i>śramaṇa</i> ...’”	2x	T 1428 (3x), T 1464 (32x)
當語彼比丘 “...should say to that monk”	2x	DĀ (3x), T 1428 (12x)
於現法中自身作證 “to bear direct witness oneself in the here and now”	1x	DĀ (13x), T 1428 (1x)

⁴² 魔、若魔天 alone is in some senses an even stronger marker, with few exceptions outside of the Zhu Fonian corpus: *Dīrghāgama* (13x), *Ekottarikāgama* (17x), T 212 (2x), T 226 (1x), T 309 (8x), T 384 (1x), T 656 (1x), T 1428 (7x), with scattered instances in T 223, T 224, T 227, T 650, T 657, T 816, and T 1509.

⁴³ Even 為變易法 is unique to Zhu Fonian, and it is also found in T 1464 (1x).

⁴⁴ 自相謂言 is also a strong Zhu Fonian marker, though not unique to him; it never appears in the *Madhyamāgama*.

盡形壽不殺、不盜、不姪、不欺、不飲酒 “to the end of his life not kill, not steal, not engage in sexual misconduct, not cheat, and not booze”	1x	DĀ (14x)
或有眾生、若干種身、若干種想 “Or there might be a sentient being with a certain type of body and a certain type of mind”	1x	DĀ (5x)

Conclusions

The above analyses should demonstrate that in our extant *Ekottarikāgama*, markers characteristic of Zhu Fonian are extremely numerous. None of the above terms appear in the *Madhyamāgama*. In combination with the external evidence, the internal evidence surveyed above provides extremely strong support for Zhu Fonian’s translatorship (or perhaps partial authorship) of the text.

The evidence presented in this paper is only one half of a more complex case against the ascription of T 125 to Saṃghadeva, and in favour of ascription to Zhu Fonian. In our companion study to the present paper, Ven. Anālayo Bhikkhu and I showed that in numerous cases, the same underlying meaning in the Indic source text is systematically translated differently into Chinese in the *Ekottarikāgama* and the *Madhyamāgama*.⁴⁵ In the present study, I have shown that conversely, there exists in the *Ekottarikāgama* an overwhelming number of terms and phrases, together used a total of thousands of times, which are characteristic of the other works most reliably ascribed to Zhu Fonian, but never appear in the *Madhyamāgama*. Furthermore, these characteristic Zhu Fonian markers cover a wide range of types of phraseology, including proper names; transcription terms; technical Buddhist terms; common nouns, verbs and adjectives; and more functional parts of speech like conjunctions, adverbs and verbs of speech (Tables 1–6 above). In addition, it is possible to discover a number of very strong markers—usually longer phrases, like narrative formulae and recurring characteristic combinations of words—which are found in the *Ekottarikāgama*, and are otherwise unique to the Zhu Fonian corpus (Table 7).

⁴⁵ Radich and Anālayo, “Were the *Ekottarika-āgama*.”

The evidence discussed in this paper alone comprises a total of 137 markers, occurring between them more than 6,200 times in the *Ekottarikāgama*, and approximately 15,520 times further in the core Zhu Fonian corpus of DĀ, T212, T656, T1428, and T1464.⁴⁶ To reiterate, none of these markers occur even once in the *Madhyamāgama*. By contrast, using the same methods, I have only been able to find in the *Ekottarikāgama* around two dozen markers possibly more characteristic of Saṃghadeva's style, as defined by his benchmark text, the *Madhyamāgama*, occurring between them less than 100 times in the *Ekottarikāgama*.⁴⁷ Numerical calculations based upon the

⁴⁶ Counts are necessarily approximate for a combination of reasons: variant readings in various witnesses to the texts; difficulties accounting for patterns featuring non-contiguous strings with some of the search methods employed; and so on.

⁴⁷ Using the same techniques used to find my other evidence, I was able only to find a few markers occurring in both the *Ekottarikāgama* and the *Madhyamāgama*, but never elsewhere in the Zhu Fonian corpus (the pattern we would expect if the *Ekottarikāgama* were by Saṃghadeva). For example: 於意云何 (MĀ 154x/EĀ 1x); 大拘絺羅 (MĀ 89x/EĀ 1x); 及比丘眾 (MĀ 82x/EĀ 7x); 問曰瞿曇 (MĀ 73x/EĀ 2x); 如是尊者 (MĀ 67x/EĀ 4x); 婆私吒 (MĀ 57x/EĀ 1x); 受夏坐 (MĀ 57x/EĀ 3x); 優多羅 (MĀ 54x/EĀ 26x); 得正見 (MĀ 52x/EĀ 1x); 浮彌 (MĀ 50x/EĀ 1x); 如是比丘觀……身 (MĀ 44x/EĀ 6x); 四方四維 (MĀ 43x/EĀ 1x); 而作是語 (MĀ 41x/EĀ 12x); 飲食床榻 (MĀ 40x/EĀ 1x); 諸梵行者 (MĀ 40x/EĀ 9x); 作惡業 (MĀ 36x/EĀ 1x); 頭那 (MĀ 35x/EĀ 1x); 無有猶豫 (MĀ 34x/EĀ 1x); 自歸於佛 (MĀ 30x/EĀ 3x); 尼拘類樹 (MĀ 27x/EĀ 2x); 本所得 (MĀ 27x/EĀ 1x); 四增上心 (MĀ 22x/EĀ 1x); 最上最妙 (MĀ 22x/EĀ 1x); 無有病痛 (MĀ 22x/EĀ 1x); 誹謗聖人 (MĀ 21x/EĀ 3x); 父母[...]妻子奴婢 (MĀ 21x/EĀ 2x).

I do not claim that this list is exhaustive, but it does contain all the markers that I could find, matching the search conditions, that are most copious in the *Ekottarikāgama*. The list features only 26 markers, which between them occur only 93 times in the *Ekottarikāgama*; the five most frequent markers alone (及比丘眾, 優多羅, 如是比丘觀……身, 而作是語, 諸梵行者) occur between them a total of 60 times, leaving only 33 instances in total of the remaining 21 markers. This is not a pattern characteristic of a translation style. In fact, as we see above, for some reason, most of these markers occur dozens of times in the *Madhyamāgama*, but only once or twice in the *Ekottarikāgama*. Moreover, it is also noticeable that some discourses feature more than one of these markers, and at least some discourses featuring such markers appear anomalous within the *Ekottarikāgama* for other reasons as well (e.g. they feature apparently Mahāyāna elements, or they are “merged” discourses). The problems raised by such discourses, and the presence within them of small quantities of markers anomalous to the Zhu Fonian corpus, are complex, so much so that I cannot even

qualitative methods used here will always be at best suggestive, but these orders of magnitude strongly suggest that the Zhu Fonian markers identified here and in the companion study are vastly more numerous in the *Ekottarikāgama* than markers characteristic of Saṃghadeva. At the very least, this should mean that the burden of proof should now lie with any scholar who wishes to argue, despite the evidence presented here, that the *Ekottarikāgama* was in fact translated by Saṃghadeva.

In conclusion, the overall pattern of evidence suggests overwhelmingly that our extant *Ekottarikāgama* is the work of Zhu Fonian.

Directions for Future Research

The primary focus of this paper has been to investigate the translatorship of the *Ekottarikāgama* only. Since external evidence presents us with two main candidates, Zhu Fonian and Saṃghadeva, as possible translators of this text, the appropriate method was to proceed primarily by comparing the Zhu Fonian corpus with only one point of comparison, namely, the *Madhyamāgama*, which is our main point of reference for Saṃghadeva's style.

A full and rigorous study of problems of attribution in Zhu Fonian's entire corpus would require the identification of markers which distinguish Zhu Fonian's work from a much larger set of points of comparison—ideally, at least all translation works prior to his time for which ascription is secure, and all secure ascriptions among his contemporaries. I intend to undertake such a study of the full corpus in the near future.

However, even though it is restricted to markers that distinguish Zhu Fonian's style from that of Saṃghadeva, the present study, in combination with the earlier paper by Ven. Anālayo and myself, is still the most thorough study to date of the distinguishing features of the style of Zhu Fonian. It is worth noting, therefore, that the present study has already suggested in passing that some texts much more regularly feature characteristic Zhu Fonian markers than others. These passing observations provide us with a set of hypotheses that we can further evaluate in future investigations.

substantiate here my claim that such broader patterns exist, let alone treat them satisfactorily. I hope to address this problem in future work. For the present, I can only suggest that the occurrence of such anomalous markers in small quantities in the *Ekottarikāgama* is not a problem unique to apparent Saṃghadeva markers, nor does it seem to me sufficient reason to doubt the significance of the overwhelmingly more copious evidence studied above for the question of translatorship.

Very few of the Zhu Fonian markers studied here appear in T 226, T 1485, and T 388. This observation provides further circumstantial support for suggestions in prior scholarship that these works are probably not by Zhu Fonian (and that T 226 and T 1485 are therefore incorrectly ascribed in the present Taishō canon).

By contrast, relatively many of our markers appear in T 309, circumstantially supporting Nattier's conclusion that although it was composed in China, the text is nonetheless by Zhu Fonian.⁴⁸ The same is true of T 384 and T 385, which, as we saw above, scholars have also suggested may have been composed in China.

The *Jñānaprasthāna* 阿毘曇八韃度論 T 1543 is ascribed in the present Taishō canon to Zhu Fonian and Saṃghadeva working together. However, the markers identified in this study do not seem to indicate that both figures had an equal hand in producing the wording of our received text. The text features very few distinctive markers of Saṃghadeva's style, as represented by the *Madhyamāgama*. By contrast, it does feature several dozen of our Zhu Fonian markers—none of which ever appear in the *Madhyamāgama*. Provisionally, then, it appears likely that Zhu Fonian had a much greater hand in producing the wording of our present *Jñānaprasthāna* than Saṃghadeva.

However, as already mentioned, the evidence presented in this paper (with the exception of the small number of “strong” markers presented in Table 7) is primarily of use in distinguishing Zhu Fonian's works from the works of Saṃghadeva, and therefore, is at best of only provisional value in distinguishing Zhu Fonian from other translators (or authors). Full corroboration of these hypotheses, therefore, must await future work.

Finally, I must also mention that the findings of the present paper cannot pretend to exhaustively resolve all problems of translatorship/authorship and style within the *Ekottarikāgama* itself.

We have seen above that overwhelming evidence shows that the style of the *Ekottarikāgama* is to be associated far more closely with Zhu Fonian than Saṃghadeva. Moreover, in future work on the Zhu Fonian corpus in general, I will present still more evidence of very strong (i.e. often, for all practical intents and purposes, exclusive) Zhu Fonian markers, which are also found in great quantity in the *Ekottarikāgama*, supporting this ascription even further.

At the same time, however, the *Ekottarikāgama* is clearly a complex, even polyvocal, text. To begin with, Anālayo has already presented considerable

⁴⁸ Nattier, “Re-evaluating.”

evidence (including summaries of prior scholarship) showing that it contains material which is unusual, by comparison with other *Nikāya/Āgama* collections: discourses which are “mixed”, “merged” or in Lamotte’s terms, “composite”⁴⁹ (that is to say, single discourses which comprise material that is found in more than one discourse in other *Nikāya/Āgama* collections);⁵⁰ discourses featuring possible Mahāyāna influence;⁵¹ discourses which double, with telling differences, discourses found elsewhere within the same *Ekottarikāgama*;⁵² and discourses containing material which seems late in other transmission traditions (for example, only being found in commentarial literature in Pāli).⁵³ Of course, many of these features of the text could have been produced during its history outside China, prior to translation.⁵⁴ At the same time, such features also require us to keep an open mind about possible complexities in the Chinese text proper, as distinct from complexities deriving from the underlying Indic “original(s).”⁵⁵

In this light, it may be significant that in the process of preparing the present study, it was possible to observe in passing some marginal features of the *Ekottarikāgama* that do not appear to fit with the overall pattern of stylistic evidence surveyed above.

For example, *Ekottarikāgama* 43.2 (which Anālayo has identified as containing “late” material only paralleled in Pāli commentaries, and showing possible Mahāyāna influence⁵⁶) contains the phrase, “From [his = the Buddha’s] mouth, five-coloured light issued forth, and shone throughout a billion world-systems 口出五色光明，遍照三千大千世界。”⁵⁷ The sequence 光明遍照三千大千世界, which appears at the end of this phrase, is otherwise unknown in any Zhu Fonian text, and indeed, in any text prior to Zhu Fonian;

⁴⁹ Lamotte, “Sūtra composite.”

⁵⁰ See e.g. Anālayo, “Reflections,” 9–10; Anālayo, “Two Versions,” 52 n. 145; Anālayo, “Discourse Merger.”

⁵¹ See e.g. Anālayo, “Mahāyāna;” Anālayo, “Two Versions,” 16–17.

⁵² See e.g. Anālayo, “Influence,” 7 n. 45; Anālayo, “Two Versions.”

⁵³ See e.g. Anālayo, “Influence,” 2, 7; Anālayo, “Buddha’s Past Life,” esp. 105–106.

⁵⁴ Note, however, that Anālayo, “Two Versions” (see esp. 25–43, 49–50, 56) has argued on stylistic grounds that at least *Ekottarikāgama* 50.4 is probably by a different hand than the remainder of the *Ekottarikāgama*, and was probably added to the collection in China.

⁵⁵ Cf. Anālayo, “Influence,” 7–8 and n. 45.

⁵⁶ Anālayo, “Mahāyāna,” 14 n. 32.

⁵⁷ T 125, 2: 758b14–15.

but it appears a number of times in texts soon after 400, including seven instances in Kumārajīva's **Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa* 大智度論 T 1509, and other instances in **Dharmakṣema* (T 157, T 397), the “Sūtra of the Wise Man and the Fool” 賢愚經 T 202, and in Faxian's *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra* 大般泥洹經 T 376. Of course, it is possible that these other texts got this locution, directly or indirectly, from the sole *Ekottarikāgama* instance as their ultimate source, but it is also possible that such evidence might betray revision of the text, or interpolation into it, later than the initial translation by the team including Zhu Fonian in 383.

Problematic for different reasons is the archaic transcription 多薩阿竭、阿羅呵、三耶三佛 for “Tathāgata, Arhat, Saṃyaksambuddha,” which appears in *Ekottarikāgama* 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 8.5, 8.6, 8.7, 8.8, 8.10, 12.3, and 42.3.⁵⁸ This transcription otherwise looks characteristic of **Lokakṣema* (with a single variant);⁵⁹ outside these *Ekottarikāgama* discourses, however, the precise form seen here only ever occurs in Zhu Fonian's T 384 (which is suspected of being an original composition), and in the *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya* 十誦律 T 1435 ascribed to **Punyatara* 弗若多羅 and Kumārajīva.

As a final brief example, *Ekottarikāgama* 27.5 somewhat famously features Maitreya, and has been identified as a locus of possible Mahāyāna influence.⁶⁰ Among several stylistically anomalous features exhibited by this discourse, we find (four times) the transcription 波羅蜜 for *pāramitā*, which dates back to **Lokakṣema*. In texts supposedly by Zhu Fonian, this transcription otherwise only appears in T 226, T 388, and T 1485—i.e. texts which, as we have seen, are almost certainly *not* by Zhu Fonian; and twice in T 384. (It also, incidentally, never appears in the *Madhyamāgama*.)

It must be emphasized that marginal examples like these cannot undermine the central conclusions of this study. In light of the evidence presented in the body of this paper, our conclusion must still be that at its core, the *Ekottarikāgama* is overwhelmingly more characteristic of Zhu Fonian than the supposed translator whose name it bears in the present Taishō Tripiṭaka, Saṃghadeva. At the same time, such anomalies also show that there is still more to the text than we have been able to fully study here, and such features of the text are an important topic for future research.

⁵⁸ I am grateful to Ven. Anālayo for first drawing my attention to the occurrence of these terms in the text. Cf. 如來至真等正覺 for the same set of epithets, listed in Table 3 above.

⁵⁹ In **Lokakṣema*, 怛薩阿竭、阿羅呵、三耶三佛.

⁶⁰ Anālayo, “Mahāyāna,” 17 and n. 42, citing Harrison, “*Ekottarikāgama*.”

Postscript on Method

Analysis of texts for the purposes of this paper and the companion study was greatly facilitated by the use of TACL (“Text Analysis for Corpus Linguistics”), a suite of computer tools I am currently developing in collaboration with Jamie Norrish.⁶¹ However, it should be emphasized that the probative significance of all the evidence cited in this paper does not depend upon the operation of the software. Rather, the evidence can be assessed by the reader (and has been assessed by the author) using the same methods and criteria used in research based upon ordinary digital searches for individually selected terms using CBETA, such as are now common in the field.

Much might be said about the differences that tools like TACL might make to the consideration of our research questions. Detailed consideration of that question will have to await another occasion. However, it is worth briefly discussing one obvious feature of the evidence presented in this paper—its quantity.

As this paper has indirectly demonstrated, tools like TACL allow us to identify, relatively easily and rapidly, large numbers of terms and phrases that can serve as decisive evidence in questions of attribution, and other aspects of the compositional processes that produced our texts. By comparison, traditional studies, undertaken without the aid of such tools, have tended to argue such questions on the basis of much smaller pools of stylistic markers and other evidence.

The discovery of such large quantities of relevant evidence by means of such tools opens up the possibility of a new kind of approach to such questions. We might call this a “mass qualitative” approach. Unlike more traditional studies, it can gather and handle large quantities of evidence, and in this sense, it deals with evidence or data in “mass.” It is to be hoped that part of the strength of an argument built upon this method is the way that it thus

⁶¹ As applied to the analysis of Chinese Buddhist texts, TACL allows a conceptually simple comparison of the n -grams (strings of length n characters, where n is defined by the user), in two or more texts or corpora of any size, up to and including the entire canon, in either of two ways: 1) What n -grams are found only in A, and not in B (or vice versa)? 2) What n -grams are found in both A and B? The tool generates full lists of n -grams matching these criteria, which the researcher can then examine in context, in conjunction with digital searches via the CBETA CReader (CBETA 2011). The code repository for TACL may be found at: <https://github.com/ajenhl/tacl/>. For other early results of TACL-assisted research, see Radich, “On the Sources,” “Problems,” “Tibetan Evidence.”

shows a large amount of evidence all pointing to the same conclusion. At the same time, however, this method is not properly quantitative, in that I have made only very rudimentary attempts, in the present paper, to quantify the evidence from which I argued, and I also have not analysed the evidence using statistical methods. Rather, the approach is still “qualitative”—it has taken each term or phrase as a distinct point of evidence in its own right; presented each piece of evidence individually; and thereby allowed readers to assess each in isolation, admitting the possibility that various pieces of evidence could be of varying quality and strength.

This “mass qualitative” approach makes for an argument that is very strong, by the standards of more traditional studies and methods. At the same time, however, such an approach also raises a challenging methodological issue. In the consideration of any given problem of attribution, how much evidence is enough? And how can we know how much is enough? Ultimately, these are empirical questions that will require quantitative, even statistical answers.⁶²

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my thanks to Jan Nattier and the Ven. Anālayo Bhikkhu for advice and ideas. Work on this paper was conducted during a research stay at the Numata Center for Buddhist Studies at the University of Hamburg, during which time I was supported by a Fellowship for Experienced Researchers from the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. I am most grateful to the Foundation, and to my host at Hamburg, Michael Zimmermann, for their support. I also thank two anonymous reviewers for JCBS, whose careful comments helped me improve this work.

⁶² The development of reliable procedures to select raw data for measurement by statistical methods strikes me as a complex methodological problem in its own right. The attempt to incorporate such methods would take the present study far beyond its current limits, and also lies beyond my present expertise.

References

- DĀ *Dīrghāgama* 長阿含經 T 1
- M Ming [edition of the Chinese canon, as indicated in the critical apparatus to T]
- S Song [edition of the Chinese canon, as indicated in the critical apparatus to T]
- T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經, as accessed via CBETA (2011)
- Y Yuan [edition of the Chinese canon, as indicated in the critical apparatus to T]
- Anālayo, Bhikkhu. “The Buddha’s Past Life as a Princess in the *Ekottarika-āgama*.” *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 22 (2015): 95–137.
- _____. *A Comparative Study of the Majjhima-nikāya*. Dharma Drum Buddhist College Research Series 3. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing, 2011.
- _____. “Discourse Merger in the *Ekottarika-āgama* (1), The Parallel to the *Bhaddāli-sutta* and the *Laṭukikopama-sutta*, Together with Notes on the Chinese Translation of the Collection.” *Singaporean Journal of Buddhist Studies* 2 (2014): 5–35.
- _____. “The Influence of Commentarial Exegesis on the Transmission of Āgama Literature.” In *Translating Buddhist Chinese: Problems and Prospects*, edited by Konrad Meisig, 1–20. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010.
- _____. “Mahāyāna in the *Ekottarika-āgama*.” *Singaporean Journal of Buddhist Studies* 1 (2013): 5–43.
- _____. “Reflections on Comparative Āgama Studies.” *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* 21 (2008): 3–22.
- _____. “Two Versions of the Mahādeva Tale in the *Ekottarika-āgama*, A Study in the Development of Taishō No. 125.” In *Research on the Ekottarika-āgama* (Taishō 125), edited by Dhammadinnā Bhikkhunī, 1–70. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation, 2013.
- CBETA (Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association). *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經, edited by Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡邊海旭. Tokyo: Taishō shinshū daizōkyō kankōkai/Daizō shuppan, 1924–1932; CBReader v. 3.10, 2011.
- Harrison, Paul. “The *Ekottarikāgama* Translations of An Shigao.” In *Bauddhavidyāsudhākarah: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of his 65th birthday*, edited by J.U. Hartmann et al., 261–84, Swisstal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica, 1997.

- Hiraoka Satoshi 平岡聡. “*Shutsu yō kyō no seiritsu ni kansuru mondai* 『出曜經』の成立に関する問題.” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 55, no. 2 (2007): 848–42[L].
- Hung, Jen-Jou, Marcus Bingenheimer and Simon Wiles. “Quantitative Evidence for a Hypothesis Regarding the Attribution of Early Buddhist Translations.” *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 25, no. 1 (2010): 119–34.
- Kajiyoshi Kōun 梶芳光運. *Genshi hannya kyō no kenkyū, sono ichi: Daijō Bukkyō no seiritsushiteki kenkyū* 原始般若經の研究 その一：大乘仏教の成立史的研究. Tokyo: Sankibō busshorin, 1944/1980.
- Kamata Shigeo 鎌田茂雄. *Chūgoku Bukkyō shi: Nanbokuchō no Bukkyō (ge)* 中国仏教史：南北朝の佛教（下）. Tokyo: Tōkyō daigaku shuppankai, 1990.
- Lamotte, Étienne. “Un *sūtra* composite de l’*Ekottarāgama*.” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 30 (1967): 105–16 (English translation in *Buddhist Studies Review*, 1995: 27–46).
- Legittimo, Elsa. “Analysis of the *Pusa chu tai jing* 菩薩處胎經 (T12, no. 384).” PhD dissertation, International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies, Tokyo, 2006 [not seen].
- . “Synoptic Presentation of the *Pusa chu tai jing* (PCJ) 菩薩處胎經, the *Bodhisattva Womb Sūtra* Part 1 (chapters 1–14).” *Sengokuyama Journal of Buddhist Studies* 2 (2005): 1–111.
- Lin Jia’an 林家安. “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, 2009.
- Mizuno Kōgen 水野弘元. “Kan’yaku *Chū agon kyō* to *Zōichi agon kyō* 漢訳『中阿含經』と『增一阿含經』.” *Bukkyō kenkyū* 仏教研究 18 (1989): 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, 509–79. Taipei: Fagu wenhua, 2003.
- . “Kan’yaku *Chū agon* to *Zōichi agon* to no yakushutsu ni tsuite 漢訳『中阿含』と『增一阿含』との譯出について.” *Ōkurayama gakuin kiyō* 大倉山学院紀要 2 (1956): 41–90[L].
- Nattier, Jan. *A Guide to the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations: Texts from the Eastern Han 東漢 and Three Kingdoms 三國 Periods*. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University, 2008.
- . “‘One Vehicle’ (一乘) in the Chinese Āgamas: New Light on an Old Problem in Pāli.” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 10 (2007): 181–200.

- _____. “Re-evaluating Zhu Fonian’s *Shizhu duanjie jing* (T 309): Translation or Forgery?” *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University* 13 (2010): 256.
- Palumbo, Antonello: *An Early Chinese Commentary on the Ekottarika-āgama: The Fenbie gongde lun 分別功德論 and the History of the Translation of the Zengyi ahan jing 增壹阿含經*. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation, 2013.
- Pu, Chengzhong. “Notes on the *Chengju guangming jing*, ‘Sūtra of Achieving the Bright Light Concentration.’” *Buddhist Studies Review* 25, no. 1 (2008): 27–53.
- Radich, Michael. “On the Sources, Style and Authorship of Chapters of the Synoptic *Suvarṇaprabhāsottama-sūtra* T664 Ascribed to Paramārtha (Part 1).” *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism* 17 (2014): 207–44.
- _____. “Problems of Attribution, Style, and Dating Relating to the *Great Cloud Sūtras* in the Chinese Buddhist Canon (T 387, T 388/S.6916).” In *Buddhist Transformations and Interactions: Papers in Honor of Antonino Forte*, edited by Victor Mair, Tansen Sen, and Chen Jinhua, 235–289. Amherst, NY: Cambria Press, 2017.
- _____. “Tibetan Evidence for the Sources of Chapters of the Synoptic *Suvarṇaprabhāsottama-sūtra* T664 Ascribed to Paramārtha.” *Buddhist Studies Review* 32, no. 2 (2015): 245–270.
- Radich, Michael and Bhikkhu Anālayo. “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 *Research on the Madhyama-āgama*, edited by Dhammadinnā, 209–237. Dharma Drum Institute of Liberal Arts Research Series 5. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation, 2017.
- Su, Ken 蘇錦坤. “Terms, Verses and Events Differently Translated by Zhu Fonian 竺佛念: A Comparative Study Based on Parallel Passages in the *Chang Ahan Jing* (長阿含經, Taishō 1), *Chuyao Jing* (出曜經, Taishō 212) and *Sifeng [sic] Lu [sic]* (四分律, Taishō 1428).” Paper presented at “The Chinese Translation of the *Dīrgha-āgama* 長阿含經國際研討會,” October 18, 2013, Dharma Drum Buddhist College. Accessed May 31, 2014. <https://www.academia.edu/7157920/>.
- Unebe Toshihide 畷部俊英. “Jiku Butsunen no kenkyū: Kan’yaku *Zōichi agon kyō no yakushutsu o megutte* 竺仏念の研究：漢訳『增壹阿含經』の訳出をめぐって.” *Nagoya daigaku bungaku bu kenkyū ronshū* 名古屋大学文学部研究論集 51 (1970): 3–38.
- _____. “Tōshin no yakkyōsha Sōgyadaiba no kenkyū 東晉の訳経者僧伽提婆の研究.” *Dōhō daigaku ronsō* 同朋大学論叢 24–25 (1971): 262–80.