

References

- 1 *Ariyapariyesana sutta*, M I, 16 ff.
- 2 M I, 243. See also K.N.Upadhyaya, *Early Buddhism and the Bhagavadgītā*, Motilal Banarasidass, Delhi, 1971, reprint: 1983, pp. 95-96.
- 3 Alicia Matsunaga & Daigan Matsunaga, *Foundation of Japanese Buddhism*, Vol. II, Buddhist Books International, Los Angeles-Tokyo, 1988 (fourth printing), p.194.
- 4 Cf. Akira Hirakawa, *Indo-Bukkyō-shi (A History of Indian Buddhism)*, Vol. I, 1984 (fourth printing), Shunūsha, Tokyo, p.354.
- 5 D.T.Suzuki, *Zen and Japanese Culture*, Charles E. Tuttle Company, Tokyo, Japan, 1988, p.90.
- 6 *Ibid.*, p.4ā
- 7 Heinrich Dumoulin, S.J., *A History of Zen Buddhism*, Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2000 (1963), p.55.
- 8 See, *ibid.*, p. 67
- 9 D.T.Suzuki, *Zen and Japanese Culture*, Charles E. Tuttle Company, Tokyo, Japan, 1988, p.28.
- 10 *Op.cit.*
- 11 Junjirō Takakusu, *The Essentials of Buddhist Philosophy*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1978 [1947], p.173.

ZENG-YIA-HAN or Tseng-i A-han the "collection of texts increasing by one", is the title of the counterpart to the *Anguttara Nikāya* that has been preserved in Chinese translation as entry no. 125 in the Taishō edition (Nanjio no. 543). Judging from extant Sanskrit references, the corresponding Sanskrit term would be *Ekottarika Āgama*.¹

The *Ekottarika Āgama* found at Taishō no. 125 carries a preface by Dao-an, according to which the translation was undertaken during the years 384/385 of the common era by Zhu Fo-nian,² based on an original recited by the Tocharian Dharmanandin (*T. II, 549a14*),³ an original that appears to have been in a Prākṛit.⁴ There is some uncertainty in the records of translation activities about whether later on Gautama Saṅghadeva did a revision of this *Ekottarika Āgama* translation, or whether what is now found in the Taishō edition is a new translation made by him.

This is, in fact, what happened with the *Madhyama Āgama*, where an earlier *Madhyama Āgama* translation

by Zhu Fo-nian and Dharmanandin was replaced by a new *Madhyama Āgama* translation by Gautama Saṅghadeva. A close inspection of the two collections extant in the Chinese canon shows, however, that the translation vocabulary found in *Madhyama Āgama* rendered into Chinese by Gautama Saṅghadeva differs considerably from the terminology employed in *Ekottarika Āgama* discourses. These differences make it improbable that the two collections could stem from the same translator.⁵

Another uncertainty regarding this *Ekottarika Āgama* collection is the school that transmitted the original used for translation. Bareau refers to the introductory section of this collection in support of assigning it to the Mahāsāṃghika tradition, though unfortunately he does not offer further specifications.⁶ Thus a short survey of instances from this introductory section that seem relevant to the question of school affiliation may help to shed light on this issue.

After an expression of homage to the Buddha and his senior disciples, this introductory section gives a brief description of the first council. It reports that when Ānanda was asked to recite the discourses, he at first did not accept this invitation, apparently feeling that this role should better be taken by another monk (*T. II, 549b29*). This detail is also mentioned in the account of the first council in the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya (*T. XXII, 491b24*), while the other Vinayas do not mention any hesitation by Ānanda.⁷

The same account of the first council also mentions the presence of various gods and describes how, once Ānanda had concluded his recital of the discourses, the earth shook in approval and a rain of divine flowers set in (*T. II, 550c*). Similar elements can be found in the *Mahāvastu*, a work of the Lokottaravāda Mahāsāṃghika, which also reports the presence of gods, the shaking of the earth and a rain of heavenly flowers at the conclusion of the first council (*Mhv. I, 71*).

Another relevant aspect of the introduction to the *Ekottarika Āgama* could be its suggestion that, in case the location of a discourse has been forgotten, it should simply be allocated to Śrāvastī (*T. II, 550b13*). A similar injunction to freely supply a location in case of loss of memory is also found in the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya (*T. XXII, 497a6*) and in the (Mūla)-sarvāstivāda Vinaya (*T. XXIV, 328c15 and 575b29*).⁸

Yet another relevant detail occurs in a brief account of the tale of King Ma(k)hādeva, found in the introduction to the *Ekottarika Āgama*. The tale itself is preceded by a reference to the three former Buddhas Kāśyapa, Krakucchanda and Kanakamuni (T. II, 551c10). While a reference to former Buddhas is absent from the other versions of the Mahādeva tale, such a reference can be found in the different versions of the tale of Ghaṭīkāra. Notably, of these different versions only the *Mahāvastu* account brings in these three former Buddhas (*Mhv.* I, 318), whereas the Pāli and *Madhyama Āgama* versions only mention a single former Buddha, Kāśyapa (*M.* II, 45 and *T.* I, 499a16).⁹

Hence the reference to three past Buddhas instead of one, the injunction to freely supply a location to a discourse when this has been forgotten, the manifestation of an earthquake and heavenly flowers at the conclusion of the first council, and Ānanda's initial hesitation to take on the role of reciting the discourses at the first council are elements in the introduction to the *Ekottarika Āgama* that would support associating it with the Mahāsāṃghika tradition.

A problem with such an identification, however, would be that the same introduction to the *Ekottarika Āgama* lists the four *Āgamas* in the sequence *Ekottarika, Madhyama, Dīrgha, Saṃyukta* (T. II, 549c28), whereas the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya adopts the sequence *Dīrgha, Madhyama, Saṃyukta, Ekottarika* (T. XXII, 491c16). Moreover, the introduction to the *Ekottarika Āgama* indicates that the *Kṣudrakapīṭaka* contains *Mahāyāna* scriptures (T. II, 550c10), whereas according to the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya the *Kṣudrakapīṭaka* assembles sayings by arhants and Pratyekabuddhas (T. XXII, 491c20). Besides, it remains uncertain to what degree the introductory section should be treated as an integral part of the *Ekottarika Āgama*, hence conclusions on the school affiliation of the introduction may not necessarily hold true for the whole *Āgama* collection.

In fact, a discourse in the *Ekottarika Āgama* lists altogether two-hundred-fifty *prātimokṣa* precepts (T. II, 787b10), whereas the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya contains a lesser number of rules.¹⁰ Moreover, discourses in the *Ekottarika Āgama* employ the twelve-fold listing of *aṅgas*, whereas the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya adopts the nine-fold listing (T. XXII, 227b25).¹¹

Regarding these objections, the argument based on the sequence of listing the four *Āgamas* loses some of its force since such consistency is also absent elsewhere. Thus the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya (T. XXII 968b15) lists discourses in a sequence that does not accord with the actual order found in the *Dīrgha Āgama* preserved in Chinese translation, even though this collection does seem to stem from the Dharmaguptaka tradition.¹² As far as the *Kṣudrakapīṭaka* is concerned, the compass and content of this collection appear to have been fluctuating to a great extent, something that holds true also for its counterpart in the Pāli tradition, the *Khuddaka Nikāya*.¹³

Regarding the count of *prātimokṣa* rules, some degree of lack of consistency can also be found elsewhere. Thus the *Saṃyukta Āgama*, generally held to be from the (Mūla-)sarvāstivāda tradition, speaks of "over two-hundred-fifty" rules (T. II, 210b14; 210c14; and 212c11), which exceeds the number of rules found in the Chinese translation of the (Mūla-)sarvāstivāda Vinaya.¹⁴ Pāli discourses just speak of "over one-hundred-and-fifty rules" (A. I, 230 and 231), a count that seems to reflect a stage in the promulgation of rules considerably earlier than the final count of precepts in the Theravāda Vinaya.¹⁵

Finally, the twelve-fold listing of *aṅgas* may well have developed out of the earlier nine-fold listing. Thus it could be that the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya brought by the pilgrim Fa-xian from Pāṭaliputra has preserved an earlier stage of this listing, whereas the *Ekottarika Āgama* collection that the Tocharian Dharmanandin had memorized could reflect a later stage of development.¹⁶

In sum, then, though the introduction to the *Ekottarika Āgama* furnishes some arguments in favour of attributing this collection to the Mahāsāṃghika school, an attribution that in fact seems to be the one most commonly proposed in scholarly circles,¹⁷ there are a number of counter-indications. As neither the arguments in favour of a Mahāsāṃghika affiliation nor the counter-indications seem conclusive, the school affiliation of the *Ekottarika Āgama* is probably best considered as still to be determined.

What can safely be said about the *Ekottarika Āgama*, however, is that it contains a fair number of Mahāyāna ideas. Thus one *Ekottarika Āgama* discourse reports how Maitreya inquires from the

Buddha about the six perfections (*T. II*, 645b1). Two discourses present cultivating the bodhicitta in those who have not yet cultivated it as something that necessarily accompanies the appearance of a Tathāgata (*T. II*, 699a7 and *T. II*, 703b18). Other discourses reflect the three *yāna* conception, distinguishing between the path of an arhant, the path of a Pratyekabuddha and the path of a Samyaksambuddha (e.g. *T. II*, 751a18 or *T. II*, 757a14).¹⁸ In a particularly telling passage, the Buddha discloses four of his qualities which "the Hīnayānists cannot understand" (*T. II*, 640a5).¹⁹

Other discourses in the *Ekottarika Āgama* show the degree to which this collection has incorporated various legends and tales, some of which have their counterparts in later texts of the Pāli tradition. One such tale describes how the nun Utpalavarṇā transformed herself into a wheel-turning king in order to be the first to receive the Buddha on his return from a sojourn in the heaven of the Thirty-three (*T. II*, 707c8). The commentary to the *Dhammapada* contains a simpler version of this story, not related to the Buddha's descent from the heaven of the Thirty-three. According to the *Dhammapada* commentary, Uppalavarṇā only suggested to the Buddha that she could perform such a miracle, which the Buddha, however, did not sanction (*DhpA.* III, 211). Another *Ekottarika Āgama* story with a counterpart in Pāli commentarial literature is the tale of the massacre of the Śākyaans and the destruction of their capital by the successor of King Pasenadi (*T. II*, 692a15 and *DhpA.* I, 359 or *Jā.* IV, 152). The remarkable passing away of Mahāprajāpati Gautamī is also recorded in a discourse in the *Ekottarika Āgama* (*T. II*, 822a10), an account that has a Pāli counterpart in the *Apadāna* (*Ap.* 540).

Another *Ekottarika Āgama* discourse records the former Buddha Dīpaṃkara's prediction of Śākyamuni's future attainment of Buddhahood (*T. II*, 758b26), a story which in the Pāli tradition has its counterpart in the *Buddhavaṃsa* (*Buv.* 9). The same *Ekottarika Āgama* discourse even traces the former existences of Śākyamuni Buddha further into the past, reporting that at the time when Dīpaṃkara received his prediction, the future Śākyamuni Buddha was a princess (*T. II*, 758c4). This tale has a parallel in an apocryphal *Jātaka* collection in Pāli.²⁰

Yet another *Ekottarika Āgama* discourse reports that, during the lifetime of Śākyamuni Buddha, a statue

was made in his likeness at the request of a contemporary king (*T. II*, 706a12).²¹ Since archaeological findings demonstrate that the early stages of Buddhist art were restricted to symbolic representations of the Buddha and the idea of depicting the Buddha in sculpture or painting arose only at a later time, this passage must be considerably later than the Mauryan period.

Thus the Chinese translation of the *Ekottarika Āgama* appears to have remained open to later elements to a remarkable degree. How far these later elements were already part of the Indic original of the *Ekottarika Āgama*, however, remains open to question. Notably, the *Ekottarika Āgama* has a version of the legend of arhants who, instead of passing away, remain as protectors of the Dharma (*T. II*, 787c2). A nearly identical version of this legend, except for a few variants, can be found elsewhere in the Taishō edition (*T. XIV*, 421a6), attributed to Dharmarakṣa, whose translation activities took place considerably earlier than Dharmanandin's translation of the *Ekottarika Āgama*. Another similar case is a tale of the daughter of Anāthapiṇḍika, who married into a household without faith in the Buddha. The *Ekottarika Āgama* presents this tale in the same way as found in a translation attributed to Zhi Qian (*T. II*, 660a1 and *T. II*, 837c12), a translator active over a century before Dharmanandin.²² Though the identification of the translators of these two texts paralleling parts of the *Ekottarika Āgama* needs further corroboration, nevertheless, these two cases give the impression as if some material could have been incorporated in the *Ekottarika Āgama* translation that was not part of its Indic original. This would explain the rather heterogeneous nature of the *Ekottarika Āgama* collection and clarify why it contains late elements not found in the other *Āgamas* or in the Pāli *Nikāyas*.

Lamotte draws attention to another characteristic feature of the *Ekottarika Āgama*, where at times a single text combines material that appears to stem from originally different discourses.²³ An example for this pattern is an *Ekottarika Āgama* discourse that reports how a monk publicly refused to obey the Buddha's instruction to eat a single meal per day (*T. II*, 800c2), thereby paralleling the *Bhaddāli Sutta* and its *Madhyama Āgama* counterpart (*M. I*, 437 and *T. I*, 746b27). The same *Ekottarika Āgama* discourse continues, however, by describing how the sight of another monk who went begging during a stormy night

caused fear to a woman (*T. II*, 800c8), an event described in the *Laṭukikopama Sutta* and its *Madhyama Āgama* parallel (*M. I*, 448 and *T. I*, 741b9). After relating this event, the *Ekottarika Āgama* discourse returns to events related to the monk who refused to eat only a single meal per day, thereby again paralleling the *Bhaddāli Sutta* and its *Madhyama Āgama* counterpart. That the present case is indeed a conflation of two originally separate events can be seen in a sentence which begins by addressing an exhortation to develop contentment to the monk unwilling to eat a single meal, but ends by telling the monk who went begging on a stormy night to train himself in this way (*T. II*, 801c5).

On the other hand, however, the *Ekottarika Āgama* also preserves several discourses that appear to be very early, at times even offering what might be closer to the original than their Pāli counterpart. An example could be the *Ekottarika Āgama* parallel to the *Mahāgosiṅga Sutta*. The Pāli version presents the ability to reply to questions about *Abhidhamma* without faltering as a characteristic quality of Mahāmoggallāna (*M. I*, 214). Yet, other Pāli discourses regularly associate Mahāmoggallāna with the ability to exercise supernormal powers (e.g. *A. I*, 23). The *Ekottarika Āgama* parallel to the *Mahāgosiṅga Sutta* indeed reckons the exercise of supernormal powers to be characteristic of Mahāmoggallāna/Mahāmaudgalyāyana (*T. II*, 711a18). The same is also the case with a *Madhyama Āgama* parallel to this discourse, which moreover associates the ability to discuss *Abhidhamma* with another disciple, Mahākaccāna/Mahākātyāyana (*T. I*, 727b23). As Mahākaccāna is not mentioned at all in the *Mahāgosiṅga Sutta*, it seems as if during the course of oral transmission the Pāli version lost a reference to his presence, and what was originally his statement ended up in the mouth of Mahāmoggallāna. Thus, in this case it seems highly probable that the *Ekottarika Āgama* version, together with the *Madhyama Āgama* version, preserves a more original reading than their Pāli counterpart.²⁴

In sum, then, the *Ekottarika Āgama* preserved in Chinese translation is a text with rather complex features, combining some material that could be relatively early with other texts that clearly reflect later developments. Thus it is no wonder that the *Ekottarika Āgama* differs from its Pāli counterpart to a considerable degree, exceeding the degree of difference

that can be found between other *Āgamas* and their Pāli Nikāya counterparts. Though the *Ekottarika Āgama* adopts the same structural principle of collecting discourses in a numerically ascending order from Ones to Elevens, more than half of its discourses have no counterpart in the *Aṅuttara Nikāya*. While the degree to which the *Ekottarika Āgama* has remained open to later additions during the course of its transmission makes it a less reliable witness for early Buddhism, at the same time this collection is a particularly rich source of information on the development of Buddhist thought and narrative literature, in particular in relation to the early stages of development of Mahāyāna thought.

In addition to the *Ekottarika Āgama* found as Taishō no. 125, parts of another *Ekottarika Āgama* collection were translated into Chinese by An Shi-gao during the second century of the common era, a translation now found in the Taishō edition as entry no. 150A (covering one fascicle). Besides the material found in the Chinese canon, Sanskrit fragments discovered in Gilgit have brought to light parts of the Ones and Twos of an *Ekottarika Āgama*. This collection, which could be of (Mūla-)sarvāstivāda provenance,²⁵ shows closer similarities to the *Aṅuttara Nikāya* than the *Ekottarika Āgama* preserved in Chinese (*T. no. 125*). A number of *Ekottarika Āgama* fragments have also been preserved among the fragment findings from Central Asia,²⁶ and a commentary by Śamathadeva on the *Abhidharmakośa* contains some *Ekottarika Āgama* extracts in Tibetan.²⁷

See also ĀGAMA

Anālayo

References

- 1 Allon: *Three Gāndhārī Ekottarikāgama Type Sūtras*, Seattle 2001: 11 lists occurrences in the (Mūla-)sarvāstivāda Vinaya (*GM. I*, 45,19), the *Divyāvadāna* (*Divy.* 329,2+6), the *Mahāvīyutpatti* (*Mhvut* § 1421 p. 109), and the *Karmavibhāṅgopadeśa* (*Kvbh.* 153,11; 157,9 and 167,2). The alternative expression *Ekottara Āgama*, in contrast, appears not to be attested (SHT VI 1386 aA1 has preserved *ekotta(r)[i]*, so that in this case the reading remains uncertain).

- 2 However, Dao-an's introduction speaks of only forty-one fascicles (T. II, 549a15), whereas the extant translation consists of fifty-one fascicles.
- 3 T. stands for the Taishō edition.
- 4 Waldschmidt: "Central Asian Sūtra Fragments and their Relation to the Chinese Āgamas", *The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition*, Göttingen: 1980: 137.
- 5 Nattier: "'One Vehicle' 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*, 2007: 196 note 48 explains that "the differences between the two texts are too great to be explained simply by positing that the translator changed his mind over the course of time, or even that the differences are due to the input of different translation committees". For arguments in favour of attributing T. 125 to Saṅghadeva cf. Demiéville: "La Yogācārabhūmi de Saṅgharakṣa", *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient*, 44.2, 1954: 374.
- 6 Bareau: *Les Sectes Bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule*, Paris 1955: 55 and 57.
- 7 Cf. the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya, T. XXII, 968b13; the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya, T. XXII, 191a17; the (Mūla-)sarvāstivāda Vinaya, T. XXIV, 406a28; the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya, T. XXIII, 448b12; and the Theravāda Vinaya, Vin. II, 287,13.
- 8 For the corresponding passage in the Tibetan (Mūla-)sarvāstivāda Vinaya and a discussion cf. Schopen: "If you can't Remember, How to Make it up, Some Monastic Rules for Redacting Canonical Texts", *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*, Honolulu 2004: 395-407.
- 9 Another parallel in the *Saṅghabhedavastu* of the (Mūla-)sarvāstivāda Vinaya does not mention any former Buddha, cf. Gnoli: *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu*, 2, Roma 1978: 22.
- 10 Pachow: *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, Santiniketan 1955: 11, counts 218 rules, cf. also T. XXII, 555b15 (which gives a count of each category of precepts, except for the *śaikṣa* rules).
- 11 This has been pointed out by Hirakawa: "The Rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism", *The Memoirs of the Toyo Bunko*, Tokyo 1963: 63-64, who in other publications has also noted the problems regarding the *Kṣudrakapīṭaka* and the *prātimokṣa*.
- 12 Bareau: "L'Origine du Dīrgha-āgama Traduit en Chinois par Buddhayaśas", *Essays Offered to G.H. Luce*, Ascona 1966: 50.
- 13 Lamotte: "Problèmes Concernant les Textes Canoniques 'Mineurs'", *Journal Asiatique* 1956: 253.
- 14 Pachow: *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, Santiniketan 1955: 11, counts 248 rules in the Chinese translation (cf. also T. XXIV, 507b19, which gives a count of each category of precepts, except for the *śaikṣa* rules), but then indicates that the Tibetan translation has 258 rules, with ten additional *śaikṣa* rules.
- 15 The commentary AA. II, 346 explains that 150 was the number of rules that had been proclaimed by the time of this discourse. The final count covers 220 actual precepts and 7 *adhikaraṇasamatha-dhammas*.
- 16 In fact, the listings of the twelve *aṅgas* in the *Ekottarika Āgama* are not uniform and display variations in sequence, cf. T. II, 635a11; T. II, 657a2; T. II, 728c3; T. II, 794b15; T. II, 813a16.
- 17 Mayeda [=Maeda]: "Japanese Studies on the Schools of the Chinese Āgamas", *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*, 1, Göttingen 1985: 102-103, reports that several Japanese scholars favour the Mahāsāṃghika hypothesis, while others have suggested a Dharmaguptaka or a Sarvāstivāda affiliation. The research by Schmithausen: "Beiträge zur Schulzugehörigkeit und Textgeschichte kanonischer und postkanonischer buddhistischer Materialien", *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna Literatur*, 2, Göttingen 1987: 321, however, makes it less probable that the *Ekottarika-āgama* could stem from a Dharmaguptaka or Sarvāstivāda school. On the improbability of a Sarvāstivāda or (Mūla-)sarvāstivāda affiliation of the *Ekottarika Āgama* cf. also Harrison: "The Ekottarikāgama Translations of An Shigao", *Buddhavidyāsudhākarāḥ: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert*, Swisstal-Odendorf 1997: 280.
- 18 Examples noted by Harrison: op.cit.: 280; and by Bareau: "La Fin de la Vie du Buddha selon l'Ekottara-āgama", *Hinduismus und Buddhismus*, Freiburg 1987: 34.
- 19 Noted by Deeg: "Unwirkliche Gegner, Chinesische Polemik gegen den Hīnayāna-Buddhismus", *Jaina-Itihāsa-Ratna, Festschrift für Gustav Roth zum 90. Geburtstag*, Marburg 2006:

112. Other passages that show such influence have been noted in the serialized translation of the first sections of the *Ekottarika Āgama* by Huyen-Vi and Pāsādika, published in *Buddhist Studies Review*, cf. 1998: 65 note 4, 69 note 15, 206 note 3, and 208 note 8; 2001: 224 note 17; 2002: 49 note 4-5 and 188 note 22.
- 20 Jaini: "Paḍīpadānājātaka: Gautama's Last Female Incarnation", *Collected Papers on Buddhist Studies*, Delhi 2001: 369; cf. also Gombrich: "The Significance of Former Buddhas in the Theravādin Tradition", *Buddhist Studies in Honour of Walpola Rahula*, London 1980: 70, on a version of the same tale in a later Sinhalese prose work, the *Saddharmālaṅkāraya*.
- 21 Lamotte: *History of Indian Buddhism*, Louvain-La-Neuve 1988: 635, notes that similar tales of the establishment of a replica of the Buddha, though with different kings as their respective protagonists, are found in the (Mūla-)sarvāstivāda Vinaya (T. XXIII, 782b19 and T. XXIV 434b20) and in the *Dīvyāvadāna* (Dīvy. 547).
- 22 These two cases have been noticed by Lévi and Chavannes: "Les Seize Arhat Protecteurs de la Loi", *Journal Asiatique*, 1916: 191 and 263.
- 23 Lamotte: "Un Sūtra Composite del'Ekottarāgama", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 30, 1967: 105-116 (Engl. trsl. in *Buddhist Studies Review*, 1995: 27-46).
- 24 For a more detailed discussion of these and other instances cf. Anālayo: "Some Pāli Discourses in the Light of Their Chinese Parallels", *Buddhist Studies Review*, 22.1-2, 2005: 1-14 and 93-105.
- 25 Tripāthī: *Ekottarāgama-Fragmente der Gilgit Handschrift*, Reinbek 1995: 28 and 34.
- 26 SHT I 620R (A. V, 342); SHT II 163c; SHT II 163dR (A. IV, 244); SHT III 820; SHT III 952; SHT III 974; SHT III 975; SHT III 977; SHT III 990; SHT III 994; SHT III 1000; SHT V 1031; SHT V 1103; SHT V 1108; SHT V 1112; SHT V 1171R (A. II, 45); SHT VI 1326 (212); SHT VI 1341; SHT V 1343; SHT VI 1395; SHT VIII 1957; SHT IX 2071; SHT IX 2772. Note: SHT stands for *Sanskrihandchriften aus den Turfanfunden*, Waldschmidt et al. ed., Wiesbaden 1965-2004; references are to volume of the series and number of the fragment. The above listing covers also fragments that parallel *Aṅguttara Nikāya* discourses where it is uncertain if these fragments were part of an *Ekottarika* collection, but does not take into account fragment parallels to *Aṅguttara Nikāya* discourses that have a counterpart in the *Madhyama Āgama* or *Saṃyukta Āgama*. In cases where a fragment has been identified after the original publication in the SHT series, for ease of reference the location of the Pāli parallel in the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* has been added in brackets.
- 27 These can be located with the help of Honjō: *A Table of Āgama Citations in the Abhidharmakośa and the Abhidharmakośopāyikā*, Kyoto 1984. *Ekottarika Āgama* quotations in the *Abhidharmakośa* itself have been listed by Pāsādika: *Kanonische Zitate im Abhidharmakośabhāṣya des Vasubandhu*, Göttingen 1989: 135.

ZHONG A-HAN or Chung A-han "collection of texts of medium length", is the title of the *Madhyama Āgama* preserved in Chinese translation as entry no. 26 in the Taishō edition (Nanjio no. 542).¹ This discourse collection, which is a counterpart to the *Majjhima Nikāya* preserved in the Pāli canon, was translated by the Kashmiri Gautama Saṅghadeva during the years 397-398 of the present era, based on a written original read out by Saṅgharakṣa, another Kashmiri monk (T. I, 809b26).² The original manuscript used for the translation stemmed with high probability from a Sarvāstivāda tradition and appears to have been in a Prākṛit.³ Saṅghadeva's translation was carried out in the presence of a group of forty scholar monks, with Dao-ci acting as the scribe and Li-bao and Kang-hua as assistants. A previous *Madhyama Āgama* translation undertaken by Zhu Fo-nian and Dharmanandin is no longer extant and was thus apparently replaced by the version rendered into Chinese by Saṅghadeva.

The *Madhyama Āgama* collection translated by Saṅghadeva contains altogether two-hundred-and-twenty-two discourses, which are distributed over eighteen chapters that make up sixty fascicles in the Chinese canon. In contrast, the *Majjhima Nikāya* has one-hundred-and-fifty-two discourses in fifteen chapters. In both collections, the count of ten discourses per chapter is the most common case, though a few chapters in the *Madhyama Āgama* have considerably more discourses. Of the total number of discourses in the *Majjhima Nikāya*, close to a hundred *suttas* have counterparts in the *Madhyama Āgama*.⁴

ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF BUDDHISM

Founder Editor-in Chief

G. P. MALALASEKERA, M. A., Ph. D., D. Litt., Professor Emeritus

Editor-in Chief

W. G. WEERARATNE, M. A., Ph. D.

VOLUME VIII

FASCICLE 3 : Vācā – Z hong a-han



2009