

# JIABS

Journal of the International  
Association of Buddhist Studies



Volume 31 Number 1-2 2008 (2010)

The *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* (ISSN 0193-600XX) is the organ of the International Association of Buddhist Studies, Inc. As a peer-reviewed journal, it welcomes scholarly contributions pertaining to all facets of Buddhist Studies.

JIABS is published twice yearly.

Manuscripts should preferably be submitted as e-mail attachments to: [editors@iabsinfo.net](mailto:editors@iabsinfo.net) as one single file, complete with footnotes and references, in two different formats: in PDF-format, and in Rich-Text-Format (RTF) or Open-Document-Format (created e.g. by Open Office).

Address books for review to:

JIABS Editors, Institut für Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens, Prinz-Eugen-Strasse 8–10, A-1040 Wien, AUSTRIA

Address subscription orders and dues, changes of address, and business correspondence (including advertising orders) to:

Dr Jérôme Ducor, IABS Treasurer  
Dept of Oriental Languages and Cultures  
Anthropole

University of Lausanne  
CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

email: [iabs.treasurer@unil.ch](mailto:iabs.treasurer@unil.ch)

Web: <http://www.iabsinfo.net>

Fax: +41 21 692 29 35

Subscriptions to JIABS are USD 55 per year for individuals and USD 90 per year for libraries and other institutions. For informations on membership in IABS, see back cover.

Cover: Cristina Scherrer-Schaub

Font: “Gandhari Unicode” designed by Andrew Glass (<http://andrewglass.org/fonts.php>)

© Copyright 2010 by the International Association of Buddhist Studies, Inc.

Print: Ferdinand Berger & Söhne

## EDITORIAL BOARD

KELLNER Birgit  
KRASSER Helmut  
Joint Editors

BUSWELL Robert  
CHEN Jinhua  
COLLINS Steven  
COX Collet  
GÓMEZ Luis O.  
HARRISON Paul  
VON HINÜBER Oskar  
JACKSON Roger  
JAINI Padmanabh S.  
KATSURA Shōryū  
KUO Li-ying  
LOPEZ, Jr. Donald S.  
MACDONALD Alexander  
SCHERRER-SCHAUB Cristina  
SEYFORT RUEGG David  
SHARF Robert  
STEINKELLNER Ernst  
TILLEMANS Tom

# JIABS

Journal of the International  
Association of Buddhist Studies

Volume 31 Number 1–2 2008 (2010)

## Obituaries

Jonathan A. SILK

*In memoriam, Erik Zürcher (13 Sept. 1928 – 7 Feb. 2008)* . . . . . 3

## Articles

Diwakar ACHARYA

*Evidence for Mahāyāna Buddhism and Sukhāvātī cult in India in the middle period – Early fifth to late sixth century Nepalese inscriptions* . . . . . 23

## Early Chinese Buddhist translations

Contributions to the International Symposium “Early Chinese Buddhist Translations,” Vienna 18–21 April, 2007

Guest editor: Max Deeg

Max DEEG

*Introduction* . . . . . 79

Max DEEG

*Creating religious terminology – A comparative approach to early Chinese Buddhist translations* . . . . . 83

Hubert DURT

*Early Chinese Buddhist translations – Quotations from the early translations in anthologies of the sixth century* . . . . . 119

Toru FUNAYAMA

*The work of Paramārtha: An example of Sino-Indian cross-cultural exchange* . . . . . 141

Andrew GLASS

*Guṇabhadra, Bāoyún, and the Saṃyuktāgama* . . . . . 185

Paul HARRISON

*Experimental core samples of Chinese translations of two Buddhist Sūtras analysed in the light of recent Sanskrit manuscript discoveries* . . . . . 205

Elsa I. LEGITTIMO

*Reopening the Maitreya-files – Two almost identical early Maitreya sūtra translations in the Chinese Canon: Wrong attributions and text-historical entanglements* . . . . . 251

Jan NATTIER

*Who produced the Da mingdu jing 大明度經 (T225)? A reassessment of the evidence* . . . . . 295

Jungnok PARK (†)

*A new attribution of the authorship of T5 and T6 Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* . . . . . 339

Jonathan A. SILK

*The Jifayue sheku tuoluoni jing – Translation, non-translation, both or neither?* . . . . . 369

Stefano ZACCHETTI

*The nature of the Da anban shouyi jing 大安般守意經 T 602 reconsidered* . . . . . 421

ZHU Qingzhi

*On some basic features of Buddhist Chinese* . . . . . 485

### Book review

Tsunehiko SUGIKI

David B. Gray, *The Cakrasamvara Tantra (The Discourse of Śrī Heruka): A Study and Annotated Translation* . . . . . 505

•

*Notes on the contributors* . . . . . 543

## Reopening the Maitreya-files

Two almost identical early Maitreya *sūtra*  
translations in the Chinese Canon: Wrong  
attributions and text-historical entanglements\*

Elsa I. Legittimo

### Introduction

The future Buddha Maitreya has long exerted an intense fascination and attraction to ancient and modern Buddhist civilizations. His popularity is attested in Buddhist art, literature, faiths and practices. As a matter of fact the great number of ancient sources and translations dealing with Maitreya's future buddhahood are complemented by just as many modern publications written on the Maitreya myth, its versions, its possible origin, the extant Maitreya texts and their affiliations.<sup>1</sup> However, only little attention was so

---

\* My heartfelt thanks go to Max Deeg for having organized the Symposium on Early Chinese Buddhist Translations in Vienna, in April 2007, and for his unflinching support in proofreading this paper. I also express my gratitude to the Institute for the Cultural and Intellectual History of Asia of the Austrian Academy of Sciences and to its director Helmut Krasser for having hosted and managed this event.

<sup>1</sup> A selection of publications dealing with Maitreya's literature is given in the bibliography of the present paper. Regarding primary Maitreya text versions cf. the bibliography indicated for example by Baruch 1946, Deeg 1999, Demiéville 1920, and Lévi 1932. Moreover, Jan Nattier wrote a valuable appendix entitled "Major Canonical Texts Concerning Maitreya" that was unfortunately omitted from the publication (Nattier 1988). I am very grateful to her for giving me a copy of this unpublished appendix.

far paid to the linguistic features of one of the presumably oldest Maitreya *sūtra* translations extant in Chinese.

We have in the present Taishō canon several *sūtras* with titles, as well as content, referring to Maitreya.<sup>2</sup> Within the vast “Maitreya genre” five *sūtras* focus on Maitreya’s future buddhahood, its prerequisites and setting. The editors of the Taishō edition arranged these texts one after the other (no. 453–457) in volume fourteen. The first text is called the “Sūtra on Maitreya’s coming down to birth,” *Mile xiasheng jing* 彌勒下生經. The following two scriptures are both called: the “Sūtra on Maitreya’s coming down to birth and buddhahood,” *Mile xiasheng chengfo jing* 彌勒下生成佛經. These are followed by the “Sūtra on Maitreya’s great buddhahood,” *Mile dachengfo jing* 彌勒大成佛經, and the “Sūtra on the time of Maitreya’s arrival,” *Mile laishi jing* 彌勒來時經. Further Maitreya texts that mention Maitreya’s future buddhahood focus on other issues. This is the case with the chapter dedicated to Maitreya in the “Sūtra of the Wise and the Fool,” *Xianyu jing* 賢愚經,<sup>3</sup> the *Maitreyapariṣcchā*, *Mile pusa suo wen benyuan jing* 彌勒菩薩所問本願經,<sup>4</sup> and the “Sūtra on Maitreya’s Birth in the Tuṣita heaven,” *Guan Mile pusa shangsheng Doushuai-tian jing* 觀彌勒菩薩上生兜率天經).<sup>5</sup>

Of these eight texts no. 453 and no. 349 are attributed to Dharmarakṣa / Zhu Fahu 竺法護, one of the best known early translators of Buddhist texts into Chinese. He worked in China between 265 and 313 AD. Thus these two *sūtras* represent the supposedly oldest extant Maitreya *sūtra* translations. However, as indicated in the title of the present paper, we have in the Chinese Buddhist Canon two virtually identical texts on Maitreya’s future buddhahood. One of these is the “Sūtra on Maitreya’s coming down to birth” (no. 453) attributed to Dharmarakṣa. The other one is included without a specific name in scroll forty-four of the Chinese *Ekottarika-āgama*

<sup>2</sup> The full details are given in tabular form in Appendix I.

<sup>3</sup> T4, no. 202.

<sup>4</sup> T12, no. 349.

<sup>5</sup> T14, no. 452.

translation, the *Zengyi ahan jing* (增壹阿含經).<sup>6</sup> This text without any specific title is the third section of chapter forty-eight entitled the “Ten unwholesome [paths of the acts]” (*daśa-akuśala[-karma-patha]* / *shi bushan pin* 十不善品). The text has no Pāli equivalent in the Nikāyas. The extant *Ekottarika-āgama* translation is traditionally attributed to Gautama Saṃghadeva / Qutan Sengqietipo 瞿曇僧伽提婆 and is said to have been produced in the year 397 AD.

These twin scriptures were first noticed a century ago by Matsumoto Bunzaburō 松本文三郎.<sup>7</sup> The two texts are similar to such an extent that the possibility of two different translations can be ruled out. The setting and the content of the two *sūtras* are the same. Whereas most of the Maitreya *sūtras* begin with an account on Śāriputra / Shelifu 舍利弗, or at least have him as the Buddha’s interlocutor, the twin texts start like an *Āgama sūtra* with the famous formula: “Thus have I heard ...” The narration is located at Śrāvastī in the Jetavana Anāthapiṇḍikārāma / Shewei guo Qishu Jigudu yuan 舍衛國祇樹給孤獨園 and Ānanda / A’nan 阿難, the Buddha’s main interlocutor, inquires about the future Buddha Maitreya. The vocabulary of the two texts shows only minor variations and these are such that can be accounted for by copyist errors.

---

<sup>6</sup> T2, no. 125, 787c2–789c28. The *Ekottarika-āgama* is a collection that has 51 scrolls and contains 476 *sūtras* arranged in numerical order according to the sets of concepts or persons appearing in their subject matter. It is nominally equivalent to the Pāli *Aṅguttara-Nikāya* but partly differs in terms of substance and content. In 1984 Thich Huyên-Vi started a serial translation of the Chinese *Ekottarika-āgama*. The translated *sūtras* were published in 34 parts in the *Buddhist Studies Review*, from its very first issue onwards till vol. XXI, part 2. The translations appeared in sequence. The first six and half scrolls were published in French between 1984 and 1993 and the later five and half scrolls in English between 1993 and 2004. Huyên-Vi passed away in 2005. By then out of the total 51 scrolls of the *Ekottarika-āgama* the translation of the first twelve had been published. The English translations were made by Bhikkhu Pāsādika in collaboration with Sara Boin-Webb.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Matsumoto’s monograph on Maitreya’s pure land: *Miroku-jōdoron* (彌勒淨土論): Matsumoto 1911. His work was revised by N. Péri in the *Bulletin de l’École française d’Extrême-Orient*, cf. Péri 1911.

If the attribution to Dharmarakṣa was correct, we would easily have concluded that the *sūtra* in question was included into the Chinese *Ekottarika-āgama* version either by its translator or by a Chinese compiler shortly after the translation. This would explain why a *sūtra* that is generally not considered to belong to the oldest strata of Buddhist literature is nevertheless found in an *Āgama* collection.

But the attribution to Dharmarakṣa is not beyond doubt. On the contrary, all evidence points to someone else being the translator: the vocabulary, as we will see, is certainly the most convincing factor. Furthermore the old catalogues support hereto-related findings: the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* (開元釋教錄),<sup>8</sup> a catalogue from the Tang period, states that no. 453 was extracted from the *Ekottarika-āgama*, a fact that was already noticed by Matsumoto. In Appendix IV of the present paper, I will provide a brief summary of further relevant findings from the catalogues. Moreover, already in the thirteenth century, Sugi 守其, the Korean editor-in-chief of the *Koryō II canon* noted that the attribution to Dharmarakṣa was dubious. He added a postscript to no. 453 expressing his reservations regarding the attribution, arguing that the language is not characteristic of Dharmarakṣa's time. He also compared the different canons available to him. Since the present *Taishō* edition is based on the canon edited under Sugi's supervision, its Maitreya *sūtra* no. 453 (still) contains this note. Unfortunately Sugi's observations are not conclusive which might possibly be due to the fact that he had overlooked the Maitreya text in the *Ekottarika-āgama*.<sup>9</sup>

The translation of the twin Maitreya texts, in sum, appears to have been produced as part of the *Ekottarika-āgama*'s translation, and I will thus try to tackle this problem from different perspectives, starting with the *Ekottarika-āgama*'s translation issue.

---

<sup>8</sup> Cf. T55, no. 2154, 656a9–17. This catalogue was composed by Zhisheng 智昇 in the year 730 AD.

<sup>9</sup> Appendix III contains a translation of the postscript as well as an abstract of Robert E. Buswell's findings on Sugi's activities.



## The Chinese *Ekottarika-āgama* translation

The Chinese *Ekottarika-āgama* is preceded by an introduction written by Daoan 道安,<sup>10</sup> when the translation was completed in Chang'an 長安.<sup>11</sup> A discrepancy exists however between this introduction that states that the *Ekottarika-āgama* was expounded by Dharmānandin / Tanmonanti 曇摩難提 and translated into Chinese by Buddhasmṛti / Zhu Fonian 竺佛念 in 384 AD, and the note within the text itself, which appears directly beneath the title and states that it was translated by Gautama Saṃghadeva in 397 AD. On this issue the ancient Chinese catalogues contain contradictory information. And the thorough investigations undertaken so far in modern times, mostly by Japanese scholars, have not yet settled the question.<sup>12</sup>

A few years ago, however, a new era of terminological search options was inaugurated owing to the creation of the electronic database of the Chinese Canon (CBETA). This tool allows us to support linguistic and terminological observances with scientific data, and it can help to solve the translation problems related to the *Ekottarika-āgama*.

In fact, while searching hundreds of terms which Buddhasmṛti had employed in his translation of the Womb *sūtra*,<sup>13</sup> I repeatedly encountered these terms in his other translations, as well as in the *Ekottarika-āgama*. Certain wordings are only or nearly exclusively used by Buddhasmṛti, no matter whether these constitute technical terms or “normal vocabulary.” We even find in the *Ekottarika-āgama* expressions that were unmistakably created by him and not taken over by later translators. In the case of vocabulary forged by Dharmarakṣa, he is sometimes the last translator to have used certain terms, and such items can also be seen in the *Ekottarika-*

<sup>10</sup> Daoan lived between 312 and 385 AD.

<sup>11</sup> Chang'an is present day Xi'an 西安 in the Shanxi 陝西 province.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Mizuno 1956 and 1989, Warita 1973, and Enomoto 1984 and 1986.

<sup>13</sup> The *Pusa chutai jing* 菩薩處胎經 (T12, no. 384, 1015a–1058b), cf. Legittimo 2006b.

*āgama*. In previous works I put forth the hypothesis that either the extant Chinese *Ekottarika-āgama* is still the first translation by Buddhasmṛti (in this case the second one by Saṃghadeva was lost), or that the greatest part of it is Buddhasmṛti's translation, and that a veritable second translation by Saṃghadeva never took place. The collection instead might have simply been amended or enlarged by Saṃghadeva.<sup>14</sup>

The question whether the greatest part or even all of the Chinese *Ekottarika-āgama* could still be Buddhasmṛti's first translation from Dharmanandin's (most probably) oral exposition is of crucial significance for our understanding of this important but yet "unaffiliated" Āgama collection and for all subsequent research related to it. Regarding the affiliation of the Chinese *Ekottarika-āgama* scholars mostly agree that it was not translated from an Indian version belonging to the Sarvāstivādin or Mūlasarvāstivādin schools. Modern secondary literature generally proposes an affiliation to the Mahāsāṃghika school or in rare cases to the Dharmagupta school.<sup>15</sup> However, already in 1967 Étienne Lamotte rightly noted that there is no consistent proof for any of these assumptions,<sup>16</sup> and his assertion is still valid today, since no significant data has been generated in the last few decades.

Be that as it may, to ascertain the actual translator of the aforementioned extant Maitreya text is certainly an important step in the right direction and might help to clarify the origin of the Chinese *Ekottarika-āgama*.

---

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Legittimo 2005: Synopsis Part I, 3, and Legittimo 2006b: 80–81. Independently of my findings, Jan Nattier also noticed that the Chinese *Ekottarika-āgama* contains terminology typically found in Buddhasmṛti's translations (personal communication). Her inferences are based on investigations she carried out on the terminology found in the "Sūtra of the ten stages" (the *Shizhu duanjie jing* 十住斷結經, T 10, no. 309, 966a4–1047b13), also a translation by Buddhasmṛti.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. for example the overview published by Mayeda Egaku about Japanese research on the *Ekottarika-āgama*'s school affiliation: Mayeda 1985: 102–103.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Lamotte 1967: 106.

The Chinese *Ekottarika-āgama* collection remained unchanged since its translation at the end of the fourth century. The collection preserves a lot of material, about one third of its corpus, that could not yet be put in relation to other *Āgama*, *Nikāya* or para-canonical sources, and deserves investigation to enable conclusions about the early and middle phases of Indian and Central Asian Buddhism.<sup>17</sup>

### The vocabulary of the twin Maitreya *sūtras*

By means of careful investigation of the results obtained through electronic searches, a Chinese Buddhist translation might be successfully attributed to a particular translator on the basis of its vocabulary. I have extensively investigated all the vocabulary of the first section of the twin Maitreya texts<sup>18</sup> within the other translations of the Chinese Canon.<sup>19</sup> Basically every term or formulation appearing in the twin Maitreya texts as well as at least in one other translation was taken into account. Those formulations that appear over sixty times were left aside, as their connection with a particular translator or group of translators cannot be established. I have then categorized the texts in which the terms are found according to their translator, if known, or to the epoch of their translation. In a further step the texts are arranged in their chronological order, and set in relation to the Maitreya text.

These terminological investigations reveal that a great number of the linguistic features of the *Ekottarika-āgama* Maitreya text and the Maitreya *sūtra* no. 453 – both specific Buddhist termini as well as common language expressions – are not typical for

---

<sup>17</sup> The final results of my ongoing research project called “Comparative Studies on the Buddhist Canon: Analysis of the Chinese Translation of the *Ekottarika-āgama*, the *Zengyi ahan jing* 增壹阿含經” will be published in 2010. I thank the Swiss National Science Foundation for the financial support granted to this project.

<sup>18</sup> In the Taishō edition this corresponds for both versions to the first twenty-two lines of text, in the case of the Chinese *Ekottarika-āgama*: T2, no. 125, 787c2–22, and for the Maitreya *sūtra*: T14, no. 453, 421a6–27.

<sup>19</sup> The 1690 texts included in Taishō vols. 1–32.

Dharmarakṣa, or even for Saṃghadeva, but reflect a Chinese translation idiom mainly found in Buddhasmṛti's translations. 41.7% of all the occurrences in other texts of the searched terms can in fact be found in translations by Buddhasmṛti. While Dharmarakṣa's translations account for 0.9% of the occurrences, none of the terms are found in a translation attributed to Saṃghadeva. The details of this investigation are given in Appendix II.

This result constitutes a small piece of evidence and supports my longstanding hypothesis that the extant Chinese *Ekottarika-āgama* was translated by Buddhasmṛti.

### **Buddhasmṛti's connection to Dharmarakṣa and Kumārajīva**

It is certainly reasonable to say that Dharmarakṣa cannot have translated a scripture that contains as much vocabulary, which is incongruent to his own linguistic preferences and which overlaps with Buddhasmṛti's terminological habits. The few occurrences of the searched items in Dharmarakṣa's translations should be considered as terminological borrowings by Buddhasmṛti from Dharmarakṣa. Other translations by Buddhasmṛti actually show a higher number of borrowings from Dharmarakṣa than the investigated opening section of the Maitreya text. The low percentage is probably due to the fact that the beginning section has relatively few doctrinal terms that usually constitute the core of the borrowed vocabulary. It is no exaggeration to say that borrowings represent a significant aspect of the translation process and the translation history of the Chinese Canon. Dharmarakṣa who translated during the second half of the 3<sup>rd</sup> and the beginning of the 4<sup>th</sup> century AD has created many important terms and formulations and it was common practice for later translators to make use of his terminology until certain wordings were reformulated by Kumārajīva in the first decade of the 5<sup>th</sup> century.

Even the famous scholar-monk Daoan had a particular interest in Dharmarakṣa's translation corpus. And since manuscripts of Chinese Buddhist translations were hard to obtain in the middle of the fourth century, Daoan is credited with having learned numerous scriptures by heart. At a rather early stage of his career he started to

collect the extant Chinese translations of Buddhist texts and related data. In 374 Daoan composed the first catalogue of the Chinese Canon, the *Zongli zhongjing mulu* 綜理衆經目錄.<sup>20</sup> In 379 he arrived in Chang'an where he set up a translation team. Buddhasmṛti arrived at Chang'an at about the same time and started to work as a translator under Daoan's supervision. Buddhasmṛti seems to have had a predilection for terminology created by Dharmarakṣa. Many expressions in Buddhasmṛti's translations are discernable as vocabulary created by Dharmarakṣa. This tendency might be due to Daoan's educational influence. In any case Buddhasmṛti's literary style and vocabulary presuppose that he was well-acquainted with Dharmarakṣa's translations. It is safe to assume that Buddhasmṛti knew all the Dharmarakṣa translations available in Chang'an during the last quarter of the fourth century, and that he either had direct access to the texts or had learned them by heart. The use of Dharmarakṣa's terminology is therefore one of the characteristic features of Buddhasmṛti's translation corpus.

When Buddhasmṛti's vocabulary appears in Kumārajīva's translations, however, the circumstances are different and more difficult to comprehend. The fact that certain translations by Kumārajīva contain a great number of formulations and vocabulary that is mostly, but not exclusively, used by Buddhasmṛti deserves our fullest attention. Buddhasmṛti actually lived and worked in Chang'an at least between 378 and 413. This means that during Kumārajīva's whole stay in Chang'an, roughly the first decade of the fifth century,<sup>21</sup> Buddhasmṛti was also living there. It is significant that we have – with one exception – no record of Buddhasmṛti's translation activity during these ten years. The catalogues only men-

---

<sup>20</sup> It is generally assumed that he made additions to the catalogue until he passed away in 385. Although his catalogue was lost, most of its data is included in the still extant *Chu sanzang jiji* 出三藏記集, T55, no. 2145, composed in 515. The data borrowed from Daoan's catalogue are specified as coming from the *Anlu* 安錄, the "catalogue of (Dao)an."

<sup>21</sup> No matter which tradition regarding Kumārajīva's stay in Chang'an we assume as correct (arrival in 401 or 402, and death between 409 and 413), during the whole time Kumārajīva lived and worked Chang'an, Buddhasmṛti was also residing there.

tion him once as Kumārajīva's collaborator.<sup>22</sup> Yet despite this fact a certain number of other translations attributed to Kumārajīva display Buddhasmṛti's linguistic influences. On several occasions I have detected, for example, that the Chinese version of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa*, the *Da zhidu lun* 大智度論,<sup>23</sup> that has always and exclusively been attributed to Kumārajīva, bears in fact considerable traces of Buddhasmṛti's terminology.<sup>24</sup> It cannot be excluded that in the first decade of the 5<sup>th</sup> century, Buddhasmṛti worked "backstage" as one of Kumārajīva's translating assistants together with other scholar monks, translators and scribes. The fact that scriptures translated by others or with the help of others carry solely the master's name – in this case Kumārajīva's – is a common feature of Chinese Buddhist translation data.

---

<sup>22</sup> The only explicit mentioning of a collaboration between Kumārajīva and Buddhasmṛti concerns the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā* (*Mohe banruoboluomi jing* 摩訶般若波羅蜜經, T8, no. 223). The *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶紀 (T49, no. 2034, 77b-79a) says that this text was expounded by Kumārajīva (*Shi zhi fanwen* 什執梵文), translated by the Indian Buddhasmṛti (*Zhu Fonian chuan-yu* 竺佛念傳語) and written down by Ruizhao (*Ruizhao bi-shou* 叡肇筆受). Cf. Hureau 2006: 98, note 45.

<sup>23</sup> T25, no. 1509, 57c6–756c19. The full title is *Mohe banruo boluo-miduo jing shilun* 摩訶般若波羅蜜多經釋論.

<sup>24</sup> There is no reason why Kumārajīva should not have adopted vocabulary and termini used by Buddhasmṛti or by other preceding translators, but ordinary usage of preexisting vocabulary cannot explain why certain translations attributed to Kumārajīva contain a relatively significant proportion, i.e. a higher number of expressions characteristic of Buddhasmṛti. As the *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa* is a large scripture consisting of hundred scrolls that cover seven-hundred pages in the Taishō edition, it is no easy task to determine whether Buddhasmṛti influenced the translation on particular occasions, i.e. whether his traces are to be found only in certain chapters, whether he has "collaborated" throughout, or whether he even translated the whole text on behalf of Kumārajīva.

## The relatively early insertion of a Maitreya *sūtra* in an *Ekottarika-āgama*

The fact that the Chinese *Ekottarika-āgama* contains a Maitreya *sūtra* might come as a surprise. The same can be said about the discovery that the Maitreya *sūtra* in question was extracted from this *Āgama* to be circulated as an individual translation.

It would be interesting to trace the history of this extracted *sūtra* throughout the various canons. In this respect the postscript by Sugi represents the beginning of the scholarly investigation.<sup>25</sup> Also the Japanese manuscript transmissions still need to be investigated. So far I could only access the data on the extant twin Maitreya texts of the Amano Kongō-ji 天野金剛寺 and the Nanatsu-dera 七寺.<sup>26</sup> The canon of the Amano Kongō-ji has the Maitreya *sūtra* corresponding to no. 453 as an independent *sūtra*, but the canon of the Nanatsu-dera lacks this *sūtra*. It is further noteworthy that the version of the Kongō-ji does not mention any translator's name. In both canons the *Ekottarika-āgama* contains the Maitreya text.

The principal question remains why a text of Maitreya's future buddhahood was incorporated into an *Ekottarika-āgama* before or during the fourth century AD. Texts related to this Maitreya *sūtra* exist in various Indian languages as well as in translation,<sup>27</sup> thus we have several Sanskrit manuscripts of a scripture called *Maitreya-*

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Appendix III.

<sup>26</sup> The photocopies of this and the other Maitreya *sūtras* included in the Kongō-ji Canon were kindly made available to me by Prof. Ochiai Toshinori, Tokyo, of the Japanese manuscript project FRONTIER, which aims to catalogue and photograph the ancient manuscript of the Nara and Heian periods kept in manuscript collections of Japanese temples (Gakujutsu Furontia “Nara-Heian koshakyō kenkyū shoten no keisei” Purojekuto 学術フロンティア「奈良平安古写経研究拠点の形成」プロジェクト), Tokyo.

<sup>27</sup> Maitreya-texts are extant in a great variety of ancient languages: Pāli, (“Hybrid”) Sanskrit, Tibetan, Iranian, Tocharian, Uyghur, Turkish, and of course Chinese. Cf. footnote no. 1.

vyākaraṇa.<sup>28</sup> In Pāli, the *Anāgatavaṃsa* is a similar text. In the Theravāda tradition it is classified as para-canonical and exists in various versions.<sup>29</sup> The Maitreya *sūtra* recited by Dharmanandin in Chang'an in 385 as part of his *Ekottarika-āgama* transmission predates the known Sanskrit and Pāli versions. The same can, of course, be said of the Maitreya *sūtra* no. 349, the *Maitreyapari-prcchā* / *Mile pusa suo wen benyuan jing* 彌勒菩薩所問本願經, translated by Dharmarakṣa between 265 and 313 AD.

Whereas in China the several Maitreya *sūtras* are included in the Chinese Canon and are therefore considered canonical, and the one under discussion is even included in an Āgama, the Sanskrit and Pāli Maitreya *sūtra* versions might never have been part of a canon.<sup>30</sup> In the absence of other complete Indian canons besides the Pāli Canon, the canonical or para-canonical status of the Indian versions might just as well be undeterminable.

A large number of sections of the Chinese *Ekottarika-āgama* still remain unattested in other traditions. This is not only the case with the Maitreya text. The fact that the Indian or Central Asian *Ekottarika-āgama* known to Dharmanandin includes material excluded from the Pāli Nikāyas, should not belie the archaism of the collection. Before 385 this Āgama was most probably transmitted orally, which allowed for the inclusion of material pertinent to its holders. Although more recent entries could easily be set

---

<sup>28</sup> The latest discovery regarding the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* is a manuscript fragment contained in the Schøyen Collection. Its transliteration is given together with a concise overview of all the previous critically edited manuscript versions by Jens-Uwe Hartmann 2006: 7–9.

<sup>29</sup> For a brief note on the *Anāgatavaṃsa* cf. von Hinüber 2000: 98, §200. The author notes that texts concerning Metteyya/Maitreya seem to have been more popular in Buddhist schools other than Theravāda. This is certainly true, but the *Anāgatavaṃsa* and its commentaries have nonetheless been handed down in the Buddhist traditions of Sri Lanka and South East Asia up to the present day in various versions. On the basis of Jacqueline Filliozat's cataloguing efforts of South-east Asian manuscript collections it appears that a considerable number of *Anāgatavaṃsa* commentaries are still extant: cf. Filliozat 1993.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Hartmann 2006: 7.



within the numerical context of an oral *Ekottarika-āgama*, neither the Maitreya *sūtra*, nor any of the other *sūtras* of the *Ekottarika-āgama* that also mention Maitreya, can demonstrate that the collection is a younger compilation. Rather, these *sūtras* signify that Maitreya gained popularity at an early stage of Buddhist development, a proposition further attested by Maitreya's portrayal at the very early stages of Buddhist art from Mathura and Gandhara.<sup>31</sup>

### A note on Maitreya in the Chinese Āgamas

Except for the Maitreya text under discussion, Maitreya appears another thirty-four times in the remaining Chinese *Ekottarika-āgama*. These other occurrences are found in eleven of the total fifty-one scrolls of the collection. What we see in the *Ekottarika-āgama* is that Maitreya is mentioned in the introduction as well as in twelve different *sūtras*. With this much data at our disposal an investigation on Maitreya's role in the *Ekottarika-āgama* is without doubt a meaningful undertaking.<sup>32</sup>

When searching for Maitreya in the other Chinese Āgamas it is easy to detect the far greater number of occurrences within the *Ekottarika-āgama*. In the *Dīrgha-āgama*<sup>33</sup> Maitreya is only mentioned once and this instance corresponds to Maitreya's occurrence in the Pāli *Cakkavatti-sihanāda-sutta*.<sup>34</sup> In the *Madhyama-āgama* he appears throughout the later part of a section called the "Sūtra expounding the origin," *Shuo ben jing* 說本經, that could so far

<sup>31</sup> Cf. the chapter "Sieben Buddhas und Maitreya" in Zin 2003, p. 457–470, in particular footnote 62 and 63, p. 464. The oldest Maitreya portrayals date from the first half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD.

<sup>32</sup> An evaluation of each of these *sūtras* can yield results that may help to understand the overall circumstances of how "Maitreya found his way" into the *Ekottarika-āgama*. Such an investigation is planned as part of my presently ongoing *Ekottarika-āgama* project, for which see footnote no. 17.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. the *Chang ahan jing* 長阿含經 (T1, no. 1, expounded by Buddha-yaśas and translated by Buddhasmṛti between 412 and 413).

<sup>34</sup> *Dīghanikāya* XXVI, PTS edition, vol. 3, section 25–26, p. 76.

not be traced in the Pāli Canon.<sup>35</sup> Further, the two extant translations of the *Samyukta-āgama*<sup>36</sup> do not mention Maitreya. Among the extant Chinese Āgamas the *Ekottarika-āgama* thus stands out as the one which is most fond of Maitreya. It goes without saying, however, that the Āgamas now extant in Chinese are of different school affiliations, and that “the responsibility” for any particularities found in the Chinese *Ekottarika-āgama* could lie with the denominational transmission of this particular collection prior to its translation.

---

<sup>35</sup> Cf. the *Zhong a han jing* 中阿含經 (T1, no. 26, scroll 13, 510b–511c). The extant version is said to be a translation by Saṃghadeva from the very end of the fourth century on the basis of a manuscript belonging to the Sarvāstivāda school. The collection, however, had been translated by Buddhasmṛti thirteen years earlier on the basis of Dharmanandin’s (apparently oral) exposition. Saṃghadeva arrived in Chang’an immediately before this first translation was undertaken. Due to political troubles, the first translation had to be finished in a hurry and under difficult conditions. In later years, when Saṃghadeva was able to read Chinese, he is said to have realized how bad the translation was and that it contained many inaccuracies. He was then able to retranslate it on the basis of the aforementioned manuscript. It would have been an extreme coincidence had both sources, the (probably) oral transmission line on which the first translation was based and the Sarvāstivāda manuscript that generated the second translation, been identical. Saṃghadeva thus might have reused those parts of the older translation that were not found in the newly obtained manuscript. Only a thorough investigation of the vocabulary and the linguistic features can reveal whether the *sūtra* in question, the *Shuoben jing* 說本經, might still be part of the older translation or whether it was indeed translated by Saṃghadeva. Anālayo (forthcoming) has investigated the extant Chinese translation of the *Madhyama-āgama* and discovered certain irregularities (personal communication) that might support this hypothesis.

<sup>36</sup> The *Za ahan jing* 雜阿含經 (T2, no. 99, translated by Guṇabhadra / Qiunabatuoluo 求那跋陀羅 in the middle of the fifth century), and the *Bieyi za ahan jing* 別譯雜阿含經 (T2, no. 100, an anonymous translation from the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century).

## A Maitreya passage in a Chinese *Dharmapada*

The opening section of the Chinese *Dharmapada* (or *Udānavarga*) called *Chuyao jing* 出曜經<sup>37</sup> strikes as an extraordinary way to start such a verse compendium. The collection, in fact, begins with a condensed Maitreya *sūtra* said to have been expounded by the Buddha while he was staying in Vārāṇasī.<sup>38</sup> Surprisingly (or not) this translation from the end of the fourth century was also made by Buddhasmṛti. It provides a further trace of a Maitreya *sūtra*, or rather an extract of it, contained in an older collection.

Whereas the rest of Buddhasmṛti's *Dharmapada* version is composed in a style that alternates between long explanatory prose sections and one or two *gāthās*, its beginning section takes the literary form of a "normal" short Nikāya or Āgama *sūtra*. After the passage on the future Buddha Maitreya, the text continues with a short passage on a *sūtra* called "the six *indriyas* of the *kāmadhātu*" (*you jing ming yue: Liugeng ledao* 有經名曰六更樂道).<sup>39</sup> In the next

<sup>37</sup> T4, no. 212, 609c–776a.

<sup>38</sup> I am referring here to the very first part of chapter one called "Impermanence" (*Wuchangpin diyi zhiyi* 無常品第一之一) (609c).

<sup>39</sup> T4, no. 212, 610a11. This might be a reference to a *sūtra* that exists in two versions in the Taishō Canon: the *Modeng nü jing* 摩登女經 (T14, no. 551, tr. attributed to An Shigao 安世高) and the *Modeng nü jiexing zhong liushi jing* 摩登女解形中六事經 (T14, no. 552, an anonymous translation from around 317–420). The attribution to An Shigao is doubtful, and the text is not mentioned in Stefano Zacchetti's recently published list of ascertained translations of An Shigao (cf. Zacchetti 2007). We do not know from when this translation is and whether it precedes or postdates the other. No. 551 has 1273 characters (incl. dots), and no. 552 has 1235. The divergences between the two translations are so minimal, that the two texts cannot be said to represent two different translations of the same original. It remains uncertain which text was written first and taken as a basis for the other. The texts contain a short exposition on the six *indriyas* ("sense-organs") and their defiled nature as part of the Buddha's attempt to turn away the attention of a young woman from Ānanda's beautiful appearance. The girl had fallen in love with Ānanda, but was strongly "discouraged" from focusing on those sense-organs for which she loved Ānanda (his eyes, his mouth, etc.).

passage, probably the proper beginning of an earlier version of this *Dharmapada* the Buddha is said to dwell in Vaiśālī. The Maitreya passage and the section on the “six *indriyas*” seem to be interpolations. It is yet unclear when these were added to the collection, and whether there might be further unusual coincidences between Buddhasmṛti’s *Dharmapada* and *Ekottarika-āgama* translations.

### Final remarks

When considering content-related resemblances among scriptures that were translated by the same translator, there are a few final points that I wish to bring up. A natural (and frequent) conclusion is to claim that such similarities are due to their being products of the same translator. Notwithstanding this, we should not exclude the possibility that similarities can also be due to – yet unknown – common school affiliation. The Chinese canon contains hundreds of texts of which we do not know the Indic school affiliation. In many of these cases we have no corresponding Indic source text. A certain number of these Chinese translations could be interrelated in regards to their place of origin, despite their generic difference. Intertextuality in Chinese texts translated by the same person or the same group of persons in one particular Chinese locality might indicate that the texts were brought from one particular place through the same route to the same destination, i.e. in this case to Chang’an. Texts of different genres translated by the same person that share certain contextual motives and/or doctrinal views might have belonged to the same – yet unidentified – school or the same Buddhist community and might have even been transmitted from the same canon. Thus, it is not excluded that the community which possessed the *Ekottarika-āgama* now extant in Chinese also had the *Dharmapada*, now no. 212 in the Chinese canon, and that there could be further scriptures in the Chinese canon that once belonged to the same Buddhist school. Although at the moment it is too early to propose or try to prove precise intertextual relations, the question may be raised with reason.

The cultural, religious and social Chinese environment is often assumed to have had a strong influence on the translation process of Buddhist texts and on their contents as well. It is well known

that Daoan, who acted as the key figure in the dissemination of Buddhism in China in the second half of the fourth century, was a fervent believer and worshipper of Maitreya.<sup>40</sup> Buddhasmṛti might have shared the same predilection. On the other hand, Daoan is the uncontested pioneer of the establishment of Buddhist canonical orthodoxy in China and the first who fought against apocrypha in a systematic way.<sup>41</sup> Towards the end of the fourth century Maitreya worship had got a foothold in China since not long ago, and it can be presumed that at that time belief in Maitreya was more widespread in Central Asia, than in China.<sup>42</sup> Also the numerous scriptures treating Maitreya's future buddhahood that were brought to China from abroad before (or shortly after) the year 400 were probably more popular in their place of origin than in China. Thus, even though a canonical Indian or Central Asian Maitreya *sūtra* was never found, the canonical, or "āgamic," status of the Chinese Maitreya *sūtra* discussed in this paper does not necessarily reflect a Chinese peculiarity.

---

<sup>40</sup> The *Gao seng zhuan* 高僧傳 (T50, no. 2059, 353b26–28, composed by Huijiao, 497–554) tells us that Daoan held special repentance sessions during *poṣadha* days and that this practice was later carried out in every temple in China. On this occasion he and his disciples would gather in front of their Maitreya statue and express their wish to be reborn in the Tuṣita heaven near Maitreya.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. note no. 20.

<sup>42</sup> Colossal Maitreya statues, for example the one seen by Faxian and Baoyun around the year 400 in modern Dardistan further support this hypothesis. Cf. Deeg: 2005, 111–115.

## Appendix I

The Chinese *sūtra* translations on Maitreya's future buddhahood

In the table the translators' attributions are given as indicated in the Taishō edition.

No.	Title	Attributed translator and date	※ <sup>43</sup>	Beginning narration of the scripture
453 (T14)	“Sūtra on Maitreya's coming down to birth” <i>Mile xia sheng jing</i> 彌勒下生經 (also called <i>Mile chengfo jing</i> 彌勒成佛經)	Dharma-rakṣa (Zhu Fahu 竺法護) – end of the 3 <sup>rd</sup> , beginning of the 4 <sup>th</sup> century	3506	The scripture starts like an Āgama <i>sūtra</i> with the famous formula: “Thus have I heard ...” The narration is located at Śrāvastī in the Jetavana Anāthapiṇḍikārāma. Ānanda inquires about Maitreya, the future Buddha.
454 (T14)	“Sūtra on Maitreya's coming down to birth and buddhahood” <i>Mile xia sheng cheng fo jing</i> 彌勒下生成佛經 (also called <i>Guan Mi shou-jue jing</i> 觀彌受決經 and <i>Mile danglai chengfo jing</i> 彌勒當來成佛經)	Kumārajīva (Jiunoluoshi 鳩摩羅什) – first decade of the 5 <sup>th</sup> century	3301	The text starts with a praise directed towards Śāriputra: He is great and wise, is able to follow the Buddha, and turn the wheel of the <i>dharma</i> . He is a great leader in matters of the Buddhist teachings, and it is due to his kindness towards all the living beings and for their sake that he addresses and questions the Buddha. His questions immediately refer to the future arrival of the Buddha Maitreya.
455 (T14)	“Sūtra on Maitreya's coming down to birth	Yi Jing (義淨) – first decade of	2258	The <i>sūtra</i> begins like this: “Thus have I heard ...” It is set on the Gṛdhrakūṭa

<sup>43</sup> Number of characters including dots.

	and buddha-hood” <i>Mile xia sheng cheng fo jing</i> 彌勒下生成佛經	the 8 <sup>th</sup> century		near Rājagṛha. After a brief introduction to the setting, Śāriputra is introduced as the foremost among the leaders of the dharma. He then speaks to the Buddha in verses and immediately addresses the subject of the future Buddha. <sup>44</sup>
456 (T14)	“Sūtra on Maitreya’s great buddhahood” <i>Mile da cheng fo jing</i> 彌勒大成佛經 (also called <i>Mile chengfo jing</i> 彌勒成佛經)	Kumārajīva – first decade of the 5 <sup>th</sup> century	8383	At the beginning we find the formula “Thus have I heard ...” The Buddha is staying in Magadha on a mountain, the place where all the Buddhas of the past have subdued Māra. <sup>45</sup> Śāriputra is among those spending the summer retreat together with the Buddha on top of the mountain. <sup>46</sup> In this version the prolegomenon is longer than in the others. Śāriputra requests the Buddha to talk about the future Buddha Maitreya.
457	“Sūtra on the time of Maitreya’s arrival”	Anonymous (317–420)	1238	Without any indication on the location the text starts by saying that Śāriputra is the Buddha’s foremost

<sup>44</sup> Although this *sūtra* has the transcription for Maitreya (*Mile* 彌勒) in its title, the scripture itself does not contain this transcription for Maitreya but only the translation *Cishi* 慈氏.

<sup>45</sup> Māra is the lord of the world of desire *kāmadhātu*, the highest of the six heavens. To conquer Māra (*xiang Mo* 降魔) means to subdue passions and desires.

<sup>46</sup> The mountain name is spelled *Bosha-shan* 波沙山. The text of the Taishō edition adds within brackets the translation of the Indian name and says: “This is the ‘Mountain of the solitary end’” (*Gujue-shan ye* 孤絕山也). I thank Max Deeg for the suggestion that the Chinese transcriptions *Bosha* 波沙 and *Boshana* 波沙那 might refer to the Indraśāila mountain.

	<i>Mile lai shi jing</i> 彌勒來時經			disciple and that due to his mercy he reflects on those who dwell under heaven. He approaches, pays respect and questions the Buddha on Maitreya.
202 (T4)	The chapter called Pāvāri (?) (Bopoli 波婆離) of the “Sūtra of the Wise and the Fool” ( <i>Xianyu jing</i> 賢愚經). <sup>47</sup>	Huijue (慧覺), middle 5 <sup>th</sup> century	7146	The chapter has a “classical” <i>sūtra</i> beginning: “Thus have I heard. Once the Buddha was staying on the Ḡḍhrakūṭa at Rājagḡha. He was accompanied by 1250 disciples.” At that time the king of Bārāṇasī was Brahma-datta. To him a golden-coloured son is born endowed with the thirty-two major and all the minor signs of a great being. The newborn clearly bears the insignia of Maitreya and thus his parents are extremely happy. The story then develops in an unusual way. Towards the end of the chapter the Buddha intervenes and states that this is a past story and then tells the future story about Maitreya. This last part resembles the other Maitreya- <i>sūtras</i> , but seems to be a shorter version.

<sup>47</sup> The *sūtra* has thirteen scrolls. The chapter concerning Maitreya’s future buddhahood is contained in scroll number twelve. According to Demiéville 1920: 163, the title Bopoli 波婆離 is a transcription of Pravārī. It might also transcribe the name Pāvāri. Elsewhere in no. 202, Maitreya only appears once in each of the following scrolls: one, four, and thirteen.



349 (T12)	“Sūtra on Maitreya’s inquiry,” <i>Maitreyapari-prcchā</i> , <i>Mile pu sa suo wen ben yuan jing</i> 彌勒菩薩所問本願經 (also called <i>Mile pusa ben-yuan jing</i> 彌勒菩薩本願經, <i>Mile wen ben-yuan jing</i> 彌勒問本願經 and <i>Mile benyuan jing</i> 彌勒本願經)	Dharmarakṣa <sup>48</sup> – end 3 <sup>rd</sup> , beginning 4 <sup>th</sup> century	3865	The text begins with “Thus have I heard. Once the Buddha travelled to the country of the Vṛjīs.” <sup>49</sup> Although the <i>sūtra</i> discusses Maitreya’s future buddhahood, this theme is by no means the only main topic of the scripture. The <i>sūtra</i> acknowledges both: the bodhisattva Maitreya, the disciple of the Buddha, as well as the future Buddha Maitreya. The <i>sūtra</i> is mostly devoted to highlighting the (present) Buddha’s qualities and merits. The first interlocutor to the Buddha is the bodhisattva Maitreya himself, the second but not less important one is Ānanda.
452 (T14)	“Sūtra on Maitreya’s Birth in the Tuṣita heaven,” <i>Guan mile pusa shangsheng doushuai-tian jing</i> 觀彌勒菩薩上生兜率天經 (also called <i>Mile shangsheng jing</i> 彌勒上生經)	Juqu Jingsheng (沮渠京聲), middle of the 5 <sup>th</sup> century	3940	The <i>sūtra</i> begins like no. 453 with the standard formula on the Buddha being in the Jetavana park in Śrāvastī, but then the text continues with the Buddha’s miraculous golden light emissions. This is followed by the enumeration of the Buddha’s worthy disciples, such as Śāriputra, and the number of their retinues. In this text also the Buddha speaks

<sup>48</sup> The *Chu sanzang jiji* supports the attribution to Dharmarakṣa, cf. T55, no. 2145, 8b10.

<sup>49</sup> *Pi* 披 in *Piqi guo* 披祇國 is either an alternative or a mistaken character for *ba* 拔 as found in *Baqi guo* 拔祇國, the country of the Vṛjīs.

				to Ānanda. The scripture discusses Maitreya's future buddhahood, but differs from the other sūtras as it rather focuses on the marvellous performances and qualities of a Buddha. Moreover this sūtra also belongs to the "genre" of scriptures that know "both Maitreyas": the bodhisattva, disciple of the Buddha, listening to the present discourse and the future Buddha of the same name.
--	--	--	--	---

## Appendix II

### The vocabulary of the twin Maitreya texts

The aim of the second appendix is to show the details of the investigation on the vocabulary of the first section of the text. A total of nineteen terms or formulations comply with the above-mentioned prerequisites, i.e. they appear at least once in another translation and not more than sixty times in total. The items appear:

- 11 times in translations preceding Buddhasmṛti and out of these, two are found in translations by Dharmarakṣa,
- 9 times in texts with yet unclear chronological order in relation to Buddhasmṛti's translations, i.e. in texts that were translated either before, during or shortly after Buddhasmṛti's working period (378–413),
- 94 times in Buddhasmṛti's translation corpus,
- 14 times in Kumārajīva's translation corpus, and
- 74 times in translations postdating Buddhasmṛti.

None of the terms are found in a translation attributed to Saṃghadeva. Excluding the Maitreya text the terms are contained another 23 times in various passages of the Chinese *Ekottarika-āgama*.

Since the purpose of the investigation is to ascertain the translator of the twin Maitreya *sūtra*, and as there are good chances that he is the translator of the other parts of the *Ekottarika-āgama*, these 23 occurrences in the *Ekottarika-āgama* have not been counted for any one particular translator.

In total the nineteen terms occur 263 times within the translations of the Chinese Canon. Considering that the Maitreya *sūtra* was duplicated we can count 244 distinct textual occurrences, and 225 occurrences without the Maitreya *sūtra*. As noted at the beginning of the paper, this means that Buddhasmṛti's translations account for 41.7% and Dharmarakṣa's translations for only 0.9% of the 225 occurrences.

The searched terms are underlined and the results explained in the footnotes. The characters differing in the two Maitreya texts are underlined with dots, and the readings of the Japanese Kongō-ji manuscript are given in bold characters when coinciding with one or the other version. In case the manuscript contains a third variant reading this is put into squared brackets within the text version of the *Ekottarika-āgama*. The characters in brackets refer to the foregoing characters. A question mark indicates that the manuscript has an unreadable character, and a minus sign that the foregoing character is missing in the manuscript.

<p>Chinese <i>Ekottarika-āgama</i>, <i>Zengyi ahan jing</i> 增壹阿含經<sup>50</sup> (T2, no. 125, 787c2 – 789c28, EA no. 414) section 3 (三)</p>	<p>The “Sūtra on Maitreya’s Descend and Birth,” <i>Mile xiasheng jing</i> 彌勒 下生經<sup>51</sup> (T14, no. 453, 421a5 – 423b13)</p>
<p>聞如是、一時、佛在舍衛國祇樹給孤 獨園、與大比丘衆五百人俱。</p>	<p>聞如是、一時佛、在舍衛國祇樹給孤 獨園、與大比丘衆五百人俱。</p>
<p>爾時阿難偏露右肩右膝著地白<b>世尊</b>。 <sup>53</sup>言：如來玄鑒<sup>54</sup>、無事不察<sup>55</sup>、 當來過去現在三世皆悉明了。 <b>諸</b>過去諸佛姓名字名號<sup>56</sup>。弟子菩薩 翼從多少<sup>57</sup>皆悉知之、一劫百劫、 若無數劫、悉觀察知。亦復知： 國王大臣人民姓字、<b>斯</b>能分別。 如今現在國界若干。亦復明了、 將來久遠彌勒出現、至真等正覺 欲聞其變。弟子翼從<sup>58</sup>、佛境豐樂、</p>	<p>爾時阿難偏露右肩右膝著地白<b>佛</b>。 言：如來玄鑒、無事不察、 當來過去現在三世皆悉明了。 過去諸佛姓名字名號。弟子菩薩 翼從多少 皆悉知之、一劫百劫、 若無數劫、<b>皆</b>悉觀察。亦復如是： 國王大臣人民姓字、<b>則</b>能分別。 如今現在國界若干。亦復明了、 將來久遠彌勒出現、至真等正覺。 欲聞其變。弟子翼從、佛境豐樂、</p>

<sup>50</sup> Scroll 44, chapter 48. Translation attributed to Gautama Samghadeva (Dongjin Jibin sanzang Qutansengqietipo yi 東晉闍賓三藏瞿曇僧伽提婆譯).

<sup>51</sup> Translation attributed to Dharmarakṣa (*Xijin Yuezhi sanzang Zhu Fahu yi* 西晉月氏三藏竺法護譯).

<sup>52</sup> T2, no. 140, 862c17 (the *Anabindhua qizi jing* 阿那邠邸化七子經, tr. attributed to An Shigao 安世高, second half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century); T13, no. 397, 212b22 (the *Samnipātasūtra*, the *Da fangdeng daji jing* 大方等大集經, section 12 – the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* – tr. by Zhiyan 智嚴 and Baoyun 寶雲 in the early-middle 5<sup>th</sup> century); 44 times in T22, no. 1428, (the *Sifen lü* 四分律, tr. by Buddhasmṛti), <total of 48 appearances>.

<sup>53</sup> It is a little but remarkable difference between the two versions that Ānanda addresses the Buddha with *bhagavat* (*shizun* 世尊) in the *Ekottarika-āgama*, and *Buddha* (*fo* 佛) in no. 453.

<sup>54</sup> T4, no. 212, 650b17 (the *Dharmapada*, the *Chuyao jing* 出曜經, tr. by Buddhasmṛti), <total of 3 appearances>.

<sup>55</sup> Chin. *Ekottarika-āgama* (EA), T2, no. 125, 661c14; T2, no. 128a, 839b25 (*Xumoti nü jing* 須摩提女經, tr. by Zhi Qian 支謙 and others in the first half of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century); T4, no. 212, 717c3, <total of 5 appearances>.

<sup>56</sup> EA, 790a22; T10, no. 309, 1001b17 (the “Sūtra on the Ten Stages,” the *Shizhu duanjie jing* 十住斷結經, tr. by Buddhasmṛti); T16, no. 656, 34b2 (the *Pusa yingluo jing* 菩薩瓔珞經, tr. by Buddhasmṛti), <total of 5 appearances>.

<sup>57</sup> EA, 708b28 and 708b 29; T4, no. 212, 683c23, 684a18 and 746c16; T10, no. 309, 1027c14, <total of 8 appearances>.

<sup>58</sup> EA, 758b12 ; T4, no. 212, 677b13 and 689b27; T10, no. 309, 1012b17; T16, no. 656, 77b16, <total of 7 appearances>.

經幾時 <sup>59</sup> 。	為經幾時。
佛告阿難：汝還就座、聽我所說。 彌勒出現、 <u>國土豐樂</u> <sup>60</sup> 、弟子多少。	佛告阿難：汝還就 <u>坐</u> 、聽我所說。 彌勒出現、 <u>國土豐樂</u> 、弟子多少。

<sup>59</sup> EA, 710b4, 786c4, 787b20 and 787c10; two different translations of the *Karuṇāpūṇḍarikāsūtra* – T3, no. 157, 169a22, 185b10, 215a8 and 216b7 (the *Beihua jing* 悲華經, tr. by Dharmakṣema / Tanwuchen 曇無讖 between 414 and 421, and T3, no. 158, 235b26 (the *Dacheng bei fentuoli jing* 大乘悲分陀利經, anonymous translation, 350–431); T4, no. 200, 255c4 (the *Zhuanji bai yuan jing, juan disi* 撰集百緣經卷第四, tr. by Zhi Qian 支謙 in the first half of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century); T6, no. 220, 803a7 and 851c21 (the *Da banruo boluomiduo jing* 大般若波羅蜜多經, tr. by Xuanzang 玄奘 in the middle of the 7<sup>th</sup> century); T12, no. 360, 270a6 (the *Wuliang shou jing* 無量壽經, tr. by Saṃghavarman / Kang Sengkai 康僧鎧, in the middle of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century); T13, no. 397, 111a9 (the *Samnipātasūtra*, the *Da fangdeng daji jing* 大方等大集經, section 8, tr. by Dharmakṣema, 414–421); T27, no. 1545, 360c23 (the *Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣā / Apidamo da piposha lun* 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論, tr. by Xuanzang); T28, no. 1546, 267a16 and 336b16 (the *Apitan piposha lun* 阿毘曇毘婆沙論, tr. by Buddhavarman / Futuobamo 浮陀跋摩 and Daotai 道泰 between 427 and 439); T29, no. 1558, 74a3 (the *Abhidharmakośaśāstra / Apidamo jushe lun* 阿毘達磨俱舍論, tr. by Xuanzang); T29, no. 1562, 550b11 (the *Apidamo shunzhenli lun* 阿毘達磨順正理論, tr. by Xuanzang); T29, no. 1563, 867a21 (the *Apidamo zang xianzong lun* 阿毘達磨藏顯宗論, tr. by Xuanzang); T31, no. 1598, 411b3 (the *She dasheng lunshi* 攝大乘論釋, tr. by Xuanzang), <total of 23 appearances>.

<sup>60</sup> T1, no. 1, 101c2 (the Chinese *Dirghāgama, Chang ahan jing* 長阿含經 tr. by Buddhasmṛti); T1, no. 7, 220c28 (the *Māhāparinirvāṇa sūtra*, the *Da banniepan jing* 大般涅槃經, tr. by Faxian 法顯 between 414 and 420); EA, 787c12; T3, no. 156, 128b20 (the *Da fangbian fo baoen jing* 大方便佛報恩經, anonymous translation of the 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> century); T3, no. 159, 292c14, 294a12 and 330c15 (the *Dasheng bensheng xindi guan jing* 大乘本生心地觀經, tr. by Prajña / Banruo 般若, end of the 8<sup>th</sup> or beginning of the 9<sup>th</sup> century); T3, no. 163, 391a10 (the *Miaose wang yinyuan jing* 妙色王因緣經, tr. by Yijing 義淨 between 700 and 712); T4, no. 200, 217b17; T5, no. 220, 995c1; T9, no. 278, 500a2 and 512c20 (the [*Buddha*] *avatamsakasūtra*, the *Da fanguang fo huayan jing* 大方廣佛華嚴經, tr. by Buddhahadra / Fotuobatuoluo 佛陀跋陀羅 between 408 and 429); T12, no. 339, 100a3 (the *Dewugou nü jing* 得無垢女經, tr. by Gautama Prajñārucci / Qutan Banruoliuzhi 瞿曇般若流支 in the first half of the 6<sup>th</sup> century); T14, no. 482, 663c21 (the *Chi shi jing* 持世經, tr. by Kumārajīva in the first decade of the 5<sup>th</sup> century); T15, no. 614, 274b3 (the *Zuochan sanmei jing* 坐禪三昧經, tr. by Kumārajīva); T16, no. 665, 432b5 (the *Jinguangming zuisheng wang jing* 金光明最勝王經, tr. by Yijing); T17, no. 721, 160b10 (the *Zhengfa nianchu jing* 正法念處經, tr. by tr. by Gautama Prajñārucci); T22, no. 1425, 386c17 (the *Mohesengqi lü* 摩訶僧祇律, tr. by Buddhahadra); T23, no. 1442, 869b3 and 873c5 (the *Genben shuo yiqieyoubu pinaiye* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶, tr. by Yijing); T24, no. 1448, 68b19 (the *Genben shuo yiqieyoubu pinaiye yao shi* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶藥事,

善思念之、執在心懷 <sup>61</sup> 。是時、 <u>阿難從佛受教</u> <sup>62</sup> 、即還就 <u>座</u> 。	善思念之、執在心懷。是時、 <u>阿難從佛受教</u> 、即還就 <u>坐</u> 。
爾時、世尊告阿難曰：將來久遠於此國界。當有城郭名曰 <u>鷄[雞]頭</u> <sup>63</sup> 。 <u>東西十二由旬</u> <sup>64</sup> 、 <u>南北七由旬</u> <sup>65</sup> 、 <u>土地豐熟</u> <sup>66</sup> 、人民熾盛、街巷成行。爾時。城中有龍王名曰 <u>水光</u> <sup>67</sup> 。	爾時、世尊告阿難曰：將來久遠於此國界。當有城郭名曰 <u>翅頭</u> 。 <u>東西十二由旬</u> 、 <u>南北七由旬</u> 、 <u>土地豐熟</u> 、人民熾盛、街巷成行。爾時城中有龍王名曰 <u>水光</u> 。

tr. by Yiing); T25, no. 1509, 536c7, 540c14 and 736a1 (the *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa*, the *Da zhidu lun* 大智度論, tr. by Kumārajīva / Jiumoluoshi 鳩摩羅什); T32, no. 1646, 352c2 (the *Chengshi lun* 成實論, tr. by Kumārajīva), <total of 27 appearances>.

<sup>61</sup> EA, 708c11; T3, no. 155, 115a15 (the *Pusa benxing jing* 菩薩本行經, anonymous translation 317–420); T9, no. 263, 128c25 (the *Lotus*, the *Zhengfa hua jing* 正法華經, tr. by Dharmarakṣa in 286); T14, no. 432, 77c10 (the *Shi jixiang jing* 十吉祥經, anonym. translation 350–431), <total of 6 appearances>.

<sup>62</sup> EA, 767b7 and 769a3; T2, no. 149, 874b15 (*A'nan tongxue jing* 阿難同學經, tr. by An Shigao 安世高 in the second half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century); T4, no. 194, 143b10 (the *Sengqieluo cha suo ji jing* 僧伽羅刹所集經 tr. by Buddhasmṛti); T17, no. 814, 782b29 (the *Xiangyi jing* 象腋經, tr. by Dharmamitra / Tanmomiduo 曇摩蜜多 between 424 and 442), <total of 7 appearances>.

<sup>63</sup> The town name found in the EA (Jitou 鷄頭) appears also in other translations by Buddhasmṛti as well as in a few texts by other translators, but none by Dharmarakṣa. The town name found in no. 453 (Chitou 翅頭) is elsewhere only found in the two Maitreya *sūtra* translations by Kumārajīva: no. 454 (the *Mile xiasheng chengfo jing* 彌勒下生成佛經) and no. 456 (the *Mile da chengfo jing* 彌勒大成佛經). These town names have not been taken into account for the final count.

<sup>64</sup> T1, no. 1, 120a1; EA, 609b27; T3, no. 190, 659c27 and 664a16 (the *Fo benxing ji jing* 佛本行集經, tr. by Jñānagupta / Shenajueduo 闍那崛多在 the second half of the 6<sup>th</sup> century); T11, no. 310, 430a9 and 465a14 (the *Ratnakūta*, *Da baoji jing* 大寶積經, section 16, tr. by Narendrayaśas / Naliantiyeshe 那連提耶舍 in the second half of the 6<sup>th</sup> century); T11, no. 320, 974a17 (the *Pitāputrasamāgama*, *Fuzi heji jing* 父子合集經, tr. by Richeng 日稱 in the 11<sup>th</sup> century); T22, no. 1428, 782b1 and 910c27, <total of 11 appearances>.

<sup>65</sup> The three occurrences coincide with three appearances of the preceding expression: T11, no. 310, 465a14, T22, no. 1428, 782b1 and 910c27, <total of 5 appearances>.

<sup>66</sup> EA, 609b28 and 731b29; T4, no. 194, 121b27 and 135c21; T10, no. 309, 1030b6; T22, no. 1428, 782b2, <total of 8 appearances>.

<sup>67</sup> T13, no. 402, 553a26 (the *Baoxing tuoluoni jing* 寶星陀羅尼經, tr. by Prabhāmitra / Boluopomiduoluo 波羅頗蜜多羅 in the first half of the 7<sup>th</sup> century), <total of 3 appearances>.

夜雨澤香 <sup>68</sup> 。晝則清和。	夜雨香澤。晝則清和。
是時、鷄[雞]頭城中有羅刹鬼名曰葉華。所行順法、不違正教。伺[不客?]人民寢寐之後。除去穢惡 <sup>69</sup> 諸不淨者。又以香汁 <sup>70</sup> 而灑其地 <sup>71</sup> 、極為香淨。	是時、翅頭城中有羅刹鬼名曰葉華。所行順法、不違正教。每向人民寢寐之後。除去穢惡諸不淨者。常以香汁而灑其地、極為香淨。
阿難當知：爾時、閻浮地、東西南北、十萬由旬。諸山河石壁 <sup>72</sup>	阿難當知：爾時、閻浮地、東西南北、千萬由旬。諸山河石壁

<sup>68</sup> An inversion of two characters has occurred in one of the texts.

<sup>69</sup> EA, 688b25, 688b28, 827c6 and 827c8 ; T4, no. 194, 116b21; T10, no. 309, 970a4 and 970b4; T20, no. 1134A, 576c10 (the *Jin'gang shouming tuoluoni jingfa* 金剛壽命陀羅尼經法, tr. by Amoghavajra / Bukong 不空 in the 8<sup>th</sup> century); T27, no. 1545, 29c29 (the *Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣā*, the *Apidamo da piposha lun* 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論, tr. by Xuanzang); T28, no. 1546, 21a17 (the *Apitan piposha lun* 阿毘曇毘婆沙論, tr. by Buddhavarman / Futuobamo 浮陀跋摩, 424–453), <total of 12 appearances>.

<sup>70</sup> EA, 623b12 ; T15, no. 627, 416b14 (the *Ajātaśatrukaukṛtyavinodana / Wenshushili puyue sanmei jing* 文殊師利普超三昧經, tr. by Dharmarakṣa); T18, no. 898, 776b23 (the *Pinaīye jing* 毘奈耶經, an anonymous translation 618–805); T18, no. 901, 839a2 (the *Tuoluoni jijing* 陀羅尼集經, tr. by Adiquduo 阿地瞿多 in 653–654); T20, no. 1180, 779b23 (the *Liuzi shenzhou jing* 六字神咒經, tr. by Bodhiruci / Putiliuzhi 菩提流志 in the first half of the 6<sup>th</sup> century); T20, no. 1184, 785 (the *Bazi wenshu gui* 八字文殊軌, tr. by Bodhirsi / Putixian 菩提仙 in 847); T21, no. 1331, 497b17 (the *Guanding jing* 灌頂經, tr. by Śrīmitra / Bo Shilimiduoluo 帛尸梨蜜多羅, in the first half of the 4<sup>th</sup> century); T22, no. 1428, 783c20, <total of 10 appearances>.

<sup>71</sup> T8, no. 228, 675b23 and 675b24 (the *Fomu chusheng san fazang banruo boluomiduo jing* 佛母出生三法藏般若波羅蜜多經, tr. by Shi Hu 施護, at the end of the 10<sup>th</sup> or the beginning of the 11<sup>th</sup> century), <total of 4 appearances>.

<sup>72</sup> T1, no. 1, 101c11; EA, 616a14 and 799a28; T4, no. 212, 386a18, 635a13, and 734c3; T10, no. 300, 907a5 (the *Da fanguang fo huayan jing busiyi fo jingjie fen* 大方廣佛華嚴經不思議佛境界分, tr. by Devaprajña / Tiyunbanruo 提雲般若 at the end of the 7<sup>th</sup> century); T10, no. 301, 910b19 (the *Da fanguang rulai busiyi jingjie jing* 大方廣如來不思議境界經, tr. by Śikṣānanda / Shichanantuo 實叉難陀 between the end of the 7<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 8<sup>th</sup> century); T10, no. 309, 1015c12, 1015c27, 1016a10, 1016a14, 1016a25, 1016b9, 1023b17 and 1040c27; T11, no. 310, 449c7, (the *Ratnakūta*, the *Da baoji jing* 大寶積經, section 17, tr. by Kumārajīva in the first decade of the 5<sup>th</sup> century, section 23, 503a20, 505b4, and 508a15, tr. by Ūrdhvaśūnya (?) / Yueposhouna 月婆首那 in the 6<sup>th</sup> century); T12, no. 374, 377b11 (the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra / Da banniepan jing* 大般涅槃經, tr. by Dharmakṣema, 414–421); T12, no. 384, 1024b1, 1036c27, 1040c29, 1041a1, 1050b25, 1053c14 and 1054a3 (the “Womb sūtra,” the *Pusa chutai jing* 菩薩處

皆自消滅<sup>73</sup>。四大海水各據一方。

皆自消滅。四大海水各滅一萬。

胎經, tr. by Buddhasmṛti); T13, no. 397, 112c8 (section 8, tr. by Dharmakṣema); T16, no. 613, 245a4, 253b11, 253c25, 267a24 and 267a27 (the *Chan miyaofa jing* 禪祕要法經, tr. by Kumārajīva); T16, no. 617, 299c4 (the *Siwei lüeyaofa* 思惟略要法, tr. by Kumāraj.); T16, no. 619, 327c3 (the *Wumen chan jingyao yongfa* 五門禪經要用法, tr. by Dharmamitra); T16, no. 643, 692b14 (the *Guanfo sanmeihai jing* 觀佛三昧海經, tr. by Buddhahhadra); T16, no. 656, 19b29, 93c25 and 120a16; T16, no. 671, 533c26 (the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*, the *Rulengqie jing* 楞伽經, tr. by Bodhiruci); T16, no. 672, 599c25 (the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*, the *Dasheng rulengqie jing* 大乘楞伽經, tr. by Śikṣānanda); T17, no. 823, 853 (the *Yiqie fa gaowang jing* 一切法高王經, tr. by Gautama Prajñāruci); T19, no. 997, 526c25 (the *Shouhu guojie zhu tuoluoni jing* 守護國界主陀羅尼經, tr. by Prajña and Muniśrī / Mounishili 牟尼室利 between the end of the 8<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 9<sup>th</sup> century); T20, no. 1060, 109a14 (the *Qianshou qianyan ai dabeixin jing* 千手千眼礙大悲心經, tr. by Qiefandamo 伽梵達摩); T20, no. 1072A, 169b18 and 169c29 (the *Matou niansong yigui fa pin* 馬頭念誦儀軌法品, tr. by Amoghavajra); T21, no. 1230, 162a3 (the *Dalun jin'gang zongchi tuoluoni jing* 大輪金剛總持陀羅尼經, anonymous translation 618–847); T21, no. 1332, 536c14, 537c18 and 539a23 (the *Qifo suo shuo shenzhou jing* 七佛所說神咒經, anonymous translation 317–420); T25, no. 1509, 105b; and T28, no. 1547, 519c21 (the *Bingposha lun* 鞞婆沙論, tr. by Saṃghabhadra / Sengqiebadeng 僧伽跋澄 in 383), <total of 55 appearances>.

<sup>73</sup> T7, no. 220, 780a27 and 876b28); two translations of the [*Adhy*]ardhaśatikā: T8, no. 240, 776b7 and 778a22 (the *Shixiang banruoboluomi jing* 實相般若波羅蜜經, tr. by Bodhiruci), and T8, no. 241, 779a6 (the *Jin'gangding yujia liqu banruo jing* 金剛頂瑜伽理趣般若經, tr. by Vajrabodhi / Jin'gangzhi 金剛智 in the twenties or thirties of the 8<sup>th</sup> century); T12, no. 385, 1064b10 (the *Antarābhavasūtra*, the *Zhongyin jing* 中陰經, tr. by Buddhasmṛti); T19, no. 946, 179a2 and 179b22 (the *Da foding guangju tuoluoni jing* 大佛頂廣聚陀羅尼經, anonymous tr. 618–805); T19, no. 1007, 664a1 (the *Mouli mantuoluo zhou jing* 牟梨曼陀羅咒經, anonymous tr. from the first half of the 6<sup>th</sup> century); T20, no. 1080, 189c5 (the *Ruyilun tuoluoni jing* 如意輪陀羅尼經, tr. by Bodhiruci); T20, no. 1083, 202a2 and 202a6 (the *Guanshiyin pusa ruyi moni tuoluoni jing* 觀世音菩薩如意摩尼陀羅尼經, tr. by Ratnacinta / Baosiwei 寶思惟, between the end of the 7<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 8<sup>th</sup> century); T21, no. 1335, 575c17 (the *Da jiyi shenzhou jing* 大吉義神咒經, tr. between 453 and 462 by Tanyao 曇曜); T32, no. 1670 (B), 709b1 (the *Naxian biqiu jing* 那先比丘經, anonymous tr. 317–420), <total of 16 appearances>.



### Appendix III

#### Annotated translation of the postscript<sup>74</sup>

Thanks to Robert E. Buswell's thorough study on the editorial process of the Koryŏ II Tripiṭaka, the seemingly anonymous postscript that follows the Maitreya *sūtra* no. 453 can clearly be attributed to Sugi 守其, the Korean editor-in-chief of the Koryŏ II canon.<sup>75</sup> "Completed in 1251 after sixteen years of labour by thousands of scholars and craftsmen, the entire set (of the Koryŏ II canon) consisted of some 1,514 texts in 6,815 fascicles, carved on 81,258 individual blocks. All texts appearing in previous editions of the canon were included, making it the most comprehensive collection of East Asian Buddhist literature assembled up to that time."<sup>76</sup> Sugi strongly suspected that the Maitreya *sūtra* in question was wrongly attributed to Dharmarakṣa, but since he did not have enough evidence for a different attribution, he left the attribution intact, but added a scholarly postscript to the text.

---

<sup>74</sup> Cf. T14, no. 453, 423b14–423c1. I thank Jan Nattier, International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism (IRIAB), Tokyo, for going through a preliminary version of this translation with me, for her valuable suggestions, and for introducing Robert E. Buswell's research to me. I am also very grateful to Christoph Anderl, Institutt for kulturstudier og orientalske språk (IKOS), (the Department of Culture Studies and Oriental Languages), Oslo University, for revising one of my last versions of the postscript's translation, and I wish to thank those who commented on the translation when I presented it in Vienna in April 2007 at the Symposium on Early Chinese Buddhist Translations.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. Robert E. Buswell 2004: introduction and 156–157, for the postscript in question. I quote from the introduction: "Sugi's work appears in cases *chun*, *i*, and *mil* of the xylographs of the Koryŏ canon. It has been reprinted in *Koryŏ taejanggyŏng*, vol. 38 (1976), p. 512–725; it appears as K. 1402 in the reprint. The text was also included in the Pinqie edition of the canon (Shanghai: Pinqie Qingshe, 1909–14), case *jieh*, nos. 9–10; vols. 397–98."

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Buswell (2004), introduction. Parenthesis added by the author of the present paper.

按開元錄有譯無本。中有法護譯彌勒成佛經一名彌勒當來下生經者。

乍觀此經。即彼失本而還得之。其實非也。

何則羅什譯彌勒成佛經目下注云。與下生經異本與法護譯彌勒成佛經同本。兩譯一闕。則彼失本經非此下生經。六譯三失之一者明矣。

又按孤山智圓重校金剛般若後序云。古德分經皆用紙數者。一紙有二十五行一行十七字。

I checked [the section on items] for which there is a [known] translator but no [extant] work in the *Kaiyuan* catalogue.<sup>77</sup> In [this section] there is the “Sūtra on Maitreya’s buddhahood” translated by Dharmarakṣa, also called the “Sūtra on Maitreya’s future coming down to birth.”

At a first glance this *sūtra* is just that lost work and we [may think we] have regained it. But in reality this is not so (i.e. this assumption is incorrect).

Why is that so? [Because in the *Kaiyuan* catalogue] the note after the title of the “Sūtra on Maitreya’s buddhahood” translated by Kumārajīva says: “[This text] is a different text from the “Sūtra on the coming down to birth” but it is the same text as the “Sūtra on Maitreya’s buddhahood” translated by Dharmarakṣa. There are two translations and one is missing.” So that lost text is not this (i.e. the present one) “Sūtra on the coming down to birth.” It is evident that [this text] is one of the three lost translations among the six translations.

Moreover, according to Gushan Zhiyuan’s<sup>78</sup> reedition (i.e. collation) of the *Vajraprajñā* (金剛般若)<sup>79</sup> the following is stated in the postscript: “When the ancient virtuous ones were distinguishing *sūtras* they used [the method of] counting the pages.<sup>80</sup> One page consists of twenty-five lines containing seventeen Chinese characters each.”

<sup>77</sup> The *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄, T55, no. 2154.

<sup>78</sup> Gushan Zhiyuan 孤山智圓 is a Chinese master (967–1022). I could not find that special notice which Sugi attributes to him, but the information he is said to have reported regarding the ancient manuscripts seems correct and is evidenced by existing manuscripts. The number of lines might vary slightly and the last page might just contain a few lines. Besides other methods, the ancient Chinese way to check the size of the extant texts for verifying whether the title and lengths of a text fit its description found in the catalogues is indeed an appropriate approach.

<sup>79</sup> He must be referring to one of the versions of the *Vajracchedikā*, the *Jin’gang jing* 金剛經, in its shortened Chinese title as found in T7, no. 220(9) and T8, no. 235–239.

今檢失本彌勒經目下注云。一十七紙則計有七千二百二十二字。此經只有三千一百七十六字。則尚未其半。豈是彼經歟。

則丹藏無此經為得。然此經文頗似漢晉經注。又有漢云之言。還恐此是三失本中第一本。錄云今附西晉者耳。

If we critically compare [this information with] the note [found] under the title of the lost Maitreya *sūtra* that says: “seventeen pages,” then [we can] estimate [that this text] consisted of seven thousand two hundred and twenty two characters. This (i.e. the present) *sūtra* only has three thousand one hundred and seventy six characters. Since this is less than half that size, how could it possibly be that *sūtra*?

Although the Khitan Canon (Danzang 丹藏) does not have this *sūtra*, the style of this scripture rather resembles that of the *sūtras* and commentaries of the Han 漢 and Jin 晉 dynasties. In addition, it contains words spoken (i.e. used) during the Han dynasty.<sup>81</sup> I also suspect that this is the first (anonymous) translation (lit. text) among the three lost translations (lit. texts) [of the Maitreya *sūtra* that was translated six times]. [In support of my assumption] the [*Kaiyuan*] catalogue states [about this translation]: “Now it is attributed to the Western Jin period.”<sup>82</sup>

<sup>80</sup> I.e. they counted the paper sheets, which when glued together constituted a scroll (or several scrolls). Particularly in the case of scriptures that have variant versions, various translations, and that are known under different titles – especially when it comes to shorter texts – only the number of pages might help to differentiate similar texts. Cf. note 78.

<sup>81</sup> As noted by Ch. Anderl the formulation *han yun zhi yan* 漢云之言 is indeed particular. Within the Chinese Canon *yun zhi yan* 云之言 is not found a second time. And *han yun* 漢云 is mostly used in the catalogues for indicating the Chinese meaning of a foreign name or term that has been transcribed into Chinese phonetically. It is a typical feature of Buddhasmṛti's translations that they contain older vocabulary. Sugi has correctly noticed this feature regarding this text although he did not link the translation to Buddhasmṛti.

<sup>82</sup> The *Kaiyuan* catalogue has the following entry: “The *Mile danglai sheng jing* 彌勒當來生經, one scroll: the *Chu sanzang jiji* (i.e. the catalogue by Sengyou) says that [this text] was [already] in Daoan's catalogue, included in [the section containing] the texts for which the translators were unknown (lit. lost). Now it is recorded as the first translation of the Western Jin period (265–317),” cf. T55, no. 2154, 629c28.

宋藏還得而編入之  
為得之矣。而二錄  
並無下生經是法護  
譯者。今云法護譯  
者何耶。

伏俟賢哲

To the [editors of the] Song canon it was also available and having obtained it they included it. But both catalogues (the *Chu sanzang jiji* and the *Kaiyuan lu*) did not list the “Sūtra on the coming down to birth” as being translated by Dharmarakṣa. How can it be then that it is nowadays regarded as a translation by Dharmarakṣa?

I will submit this to the wise ones.<sup>83</sup>

## Appendix IV

### An overview of further relevant findings from the catalogues

The overview is focused on our main Maitreya *sūtra* no. 453 called *Mile xiasheng jing* 彌勒下生經. In regard to this title, however, it is important to keep in mind that it might also refer to the *sūtras* no. 454 and 455. For the sake of correctly presenting the data of the catalogues, I will primarily use the Chinese names. The data presented in this appendix is drawn from the *Chu sanzang jiji* 出三藏記集 (T55, no. 2145) composed in 515 by Sengyou (僧祐), the oldest extant critical catalogue, and the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄 (T55, no. 2154) composed in 730 by Zhisheng 智昇. Before making this choice, I have also searched other Chinese secondary sources of the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> century, and verified whether they contain important supplementary data. An investigation on Maitreya *sūtra* related information, for example in the *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶紀 (T49, no. 2034) composed by Fei Changfang 費長房 in 597, did not yield relevant findings. This and later sources have hence been excluded.

The author of the *Chu sanzang jiji* mentions the *Mile xiasheng jing* 彌勒下生經 twice. First, he includes it together with a further Maitreya *sūtra*, the *Mile chengfo jing* 彌勒成佛經, in a list of thirty-five translations attributed to Kumārajīva.<sup>84</sup> Note that the title of

<sup>83</sup> Which means: This matter awaits the judgement of future scholars.

<sup>84</sup> For the mention of the text cf. T55, no. 2145, 11a5–6, for the expla-

the other Maitreya text probably refers to no. 456. Later the *Chusanzang jiji* mentions the *Mile xiasheng jing* 彌勒下生經 as a different (anonymous) translation in a section on newly gathered extant scriptures of which the translators' names have been lost.<sup>85</sup> Among the scriptures that were extant and of which the translators' names were lost it also lists a *sūtra* called *Mile shoujue jing* 彌勒受決經.<sup>86</sup>

The author of the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* at first mentions the *sūtra* in question while referring to another one. The listed text is actually the *Mile laishi jing* 彌勒來時經 and it is said to be the third translation of the scripture called *Mile xiasheng jing* 彌勒下生經, translated by Kumārajīva as well as by others.<sup>87</sup> The *Mile laishi jing* 彌勒來時經 is mentioned in the list of the extant translations of which the translators are unknown.<sup>88</sup> Further on in the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* the *Mile xiasheng jing* 彌勒下生經 also appears in the list of translations attributed to Kumārajīva.<sup>89</sup> The catalogue says:

The *Mile chengfo jing* 彌勒成佛經 in one scroll is the second translation of the same *Mile chengfo jing* 彌勒成佛經 text that had been translated by Dharmarakṣa. It was translated [by Kumārajīva] in the fourth year of (the era) Hongshi 弘始 (402).

The *Mile xiasheng jing* 彌勒下生經 in one scroll is also called the *sūtra* on “Maitreya receiving the *vyākaraṇa*” (*Mile shoujue jing* 彌勒受決經). The text starts with the great Śāriputra's inquiry. It is the same text as the *Mile laishi jing* 彌勒來時經. It is the fourth translation. It is further called *Mile chengfo* 彌勒成佛 as well as “(Maitreya's) Future Descent and Buddhahood” (*Dangxia chengfo* 當下成佛).<sup>90</sup>

---

nations on the text cf. 11a26–29, and for the introductory explanations to this section of the catalogue cf. 21b17–21c9.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. T55, no. 2145, 22b29 for the text's listing and 21b17–21c9 for the introduction to the list.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. T55, no. 2145, 32c8 for the text, 37b13–16 for explanations on the listed texts, and (like above) 21b17–21c9 for the introduction to the list.

<sup>87</sup> Cf. T55, no. 2154, 509c24.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. T55, no. 2154, 503a1 for the title of the list and 510b11–16 for the final comments on the listed scriptures.

<sup>89</sup> Cf. T55, no. 2154, 513c–515.3 for the comments on Kumārajīva.

<sup>90</sup> Cf. T55, no. 2154, 512c11–12.

Further, the *Mile xiasheng jing* 彌勒下生經 is also said to have been translated by Yueposhouna 月婆首那 in 554. His translation is said to be the fifth translation of the *sūtra*, and is identified with the text translated by Kumārajīva. Yueposhouna is said to have translated eleven scriptures in the middle of the sixth century, all listed with their titles. Out of these eleven texts six were extant when the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* was composed and five were lost. Yueposhouna's Maitreya *sūtra* is listed among those works that were already lost. This is what we learn from the catalogue.<sup>91</sup>

This translation might have disappeared as an individual text, but it is in my opinion not lost, as in the *Ratnakūṭa* we have a *sūtra* translated by Yueposhouna that is probably the Maitreya version Zhisheng, the author of the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu*, believed to be lost.<sup>92</sup> By no means is it the same *sūtra* that Kumārajīva translated. Although it is also a Maitreya *sūtra*, it is, compared to the other extant texts, a generously extended Mahāyāna version. The *sūtra* is known as the *Maitreyamahāsimhanāda*. With over 20000 characters in total, it fills two scrolls of the *Ratnakūṭa* and is probably the longest available Maitreya *sūtra*. In scroll one it contains, among other narrations, long discussions between the Buddha and Maitreya, and in scroll two it includes some of the core events also narrated in the canonical Maitreya versions: the great *cakravartin* king, the increased lifespan, the arrival of the future Buddha and so forth.

---

<sup>91</sup> Cf. T55, no. 2154, 538b10 for the mentioning of the text and 538a22–27 and 538b15–16 for the comments.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. the *Da baoji jing* 大寶積經 (T11, no. 310, scrolls 88 and 89, section 23 (*Mohejiaye hui* 摩訶迦葉會), 501b–514b). The *Ratnakūṭa* was compiled by Bodhiruci on the basis of already extant as well as new translations at the end of the 7<sup>th</sup> or the beginning of the 8<sup>th</sup> century, and at least two decades before the composition of the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu*. For some reason Bodhiruci did not keep or use a Maitreya-title when he inserted the *sūtra* into the great *Ratnakūṭa* collection. Zhisheng's failure to trace this version in the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* is understandable. As the *sūtra* had been known as a Maitreya *sūtra* in China, how could he have identified it without its name?

As the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* is an extremely well structured and meticulous catalogue, the same text appears under several headings. We find the *Mile xiasheng jing* 彌勒下生經 also in the section that lists the *sūtra* translations of which the translators are known, the texts extant, that belong to the ‘bodhisattva *tripiṭaka* catalogue’ and that are Mahāyāna scriptures translated more than once.<sup>93</sup> In the list below, the texts II), III), and IV) are identified as different translations of the same text. Moreover, the catalogue explains that the text was translated six times in total, that these three are the only existing versions, and that all the others are lost.<sup>94</sup>

- I) The *Mile chengfo jing* 彌勒成佛經 translated by Kumārajīva is said to be a different *sūtra* from the three following ones. Further, it is also said to be the second of two translations, the *first* translation being lost.
- II) The *Mile laishi jing* 彌勒來時經 is said to be a translation by an anonymous translator, and the *third* translation of the *sūtra* in question.
- III) The *Mile xiasheng jing* 彌勒下生經 is said to have also been called the *sūtra* on “Maitreya receiving the prophecy (*vyākaraṇa*)” (*Mile shoujue jing* 彌勒受決經). Its exposition starts with Śāriputra. The translation is attributed to Kumārajīva, and it is said to be the fourth translation of the *Mile xiasheng jing*.
- IV) The *Mile xiasheng chengfo jing* 彌勒下生成佛經 translated by Yijing 義淨 is said to be the sixth translation.

The *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* further lists those Mahāyāna *sūtras* that have been translated more than once of which the translators are known but the texts lost.<sup>95</sup> Under this section we find the seventeen pages long *Mile chengfo jing* 彌勒成佛經, also called *Mile danglai xiasheng jing* 彌勒當來下生經, which was translated by Dharmarakṣa. This text is mentioned as the first (lost) translation of a Maitreya-text that was translated a total of two times.

The catalogue further lists the lost translations of another Maitreya-text: (I) the first anonymous translation called *Mile danglai*

<sup>93</sup> Cf. T55, no. 2154, 595a8.

<sup>94</sup> Cf. T55, no. 2154, 595b15–29.

<sup>95</sup> Cf. T55, no. 2154, 626a5.

*sheng jing* 彌勒當來生經, (II) the second anonymous translation called *Mile zuofo shishi jing* 彌勒作佛時事經, and (III) the fifth translation by Paramārtha / Zhendi 真諦 called *Mile xiasheng jing* 彌勒下生經. These three translations are said to be the three lost translations of the *sūtra* that was translated a total of six times.<sup>96</sup>

Of great interest is the section of the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* that lists those texts that were extracted from larger *sūtras* or collections.<sup>97</sup> The section has been divided into several subgroups. Under the subcategory of texts belonging to the small vehicle, i.e. Āgama and Āgama-related texts,<sup>98</sup> we find the following information:

The *sūtra* called *Mile xiasheng jing* 彌勒下生經 was extracted from scroll number forty-four. In this *sūtra* the Buddha is said to dwell in Śrāvastī (Shewei guo 舍衛國) and is asked by Ānanda to hold an exposition. The text contains seven pages. It was extracted from the Chinese *Ekottarika-āgama* (*Zengyi ahan* 增一阿含).<sup>99</sup>

Finally, one of the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu*'s most valuable sections is the 'Catalogue of what is contained in the Canon,' the *Ruzang lu* (入藏錄) as it represents the detailed table of contents of the Buddhist Canon of its time. Also in the *Ruzang lu*, data has been repeated as certain sections were re-entered in full length from elsewhere. The opening section of scroll nineteen deals with the *sūtras*, *vinaya* texts, and commentaries attributed to the great vehicle (*dasheng jinglü* 大乘經律論).<sup>100</sup> In scroll twenty, its second part, the scriptures belonging to the small vehicle (*xiaosheng ruzang lu xia* 小乘入藏錄下) are listed.<sup>101</sup> However within scroll twenty after the small vehicle section has ended we find once more the information given in scroll nineteen.<sup>102</sup> As shown below in the translation of the

<sup>96</sup> Cf. T55, no. 2154, 629c25–630a4.

<sup>97</sup> Cf. T55, no. 2154, 651a16 for the heading of the section.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. T55, no. 2154, 655a8 for the heading of the subsection.

<sup>99</sup> Variant writing for the *Zengyi ahan jing* 增壹阿含經, cf. T55, no. 2154, 656a9–17.

<sup>100</sup> Cf. T55, no. 2154, 680a27–b11.

<sup>101</sup> Cf. T55, no. 2154, 691a11–22.

<sup>102</sup> Cf. T55, no. 2154, 700c24–701a8.



relevant passages of the two scrolls, scroll twenty contains supplementary details on the translators.

Scroll nineteen<sup>103</sup>

The *Mile chengfo jing* 彌勒成佛經 in one scroll has seventeen pages.

The *Mile laishi jing* 彌勒來時經 in one scroll has three pages.

The *Mile xiasheng jing* 彌勒下生經 in one scroll is also called *Mile shoujue jing* 彌勒授<sup>105</sup>決經, as well as *Mile chengfo jing* 彌勒成佛經 and *Dangxia chengfo* 當下成佛 and *Xiasheng chengfo* 下生成佛. It begins with Śāriputra. It has seven pages.

The *Mile xiasheng chengfo jing* 彌勒下生成佛經 in one scroll is a translation by Yijing 義淨. It has five pages.

Scroll twenty<sup>104</sup>

The *Mile chengfo jing* 彌勒成佛經 in one scroll has seventeen pages and was translated by Kumārajīva.

The *Mile laishi jing* 彌勒來時經 in one scroll has three pages and is an anonymous translation.

The *Mile xiasheng jing* 彌勒下生經 in one scroll is also called *Mile shoujue jing* 彌勒受決經, as well as *Mile chengfo jing* 彌勒成佛經, and *Dangxia chengfo* 當下成佛, and *Sheng chengfo* 生成佛. It begins with Śāriputra. It has seven pages. It is a translation by Kumārajīva.

The *Mile xiasheng chengfo jing* 彌勒下生成佛經 in one scroll has five pages. It is a translation by Yijing 義淨.

As in the case of most Buddhist scriptures that existed or exist in several translations, although the catalogues say that various translations were made of the same Maitreya *sūtra* (*Mile xiasheng jing* 彌勒下生經), in reality all “true” translations were made on the basis of different manuscripts, and thus represent at least slightly differing versions. *Sūtras* with similar names often, but not necessarily, belong to the same genre and expound similar content matter. Nevertheless, when comparing such texts, there are two main distinctions to be taken into account: translations of essentially different *sūtras*, and translations of various versions of a certain *sūtra*. It goes without saying that this distinction is not in

<sup>103</sup> Cf. T55, no. 2154, 684a5–9.

<sup>104</sup> Cf. T55, no. 2154, 705c12–16.

<sup>105</sup> The character *shou* 授 might be a mistake for *shou* 受. The Taishō edition has no footnote regarding this anomaly.

every case an easy one. Even in the case of several translations that are said to have been made of the same *sūtra*, the variations found between these translations are not simply due to different translation methods, but are mostly based on divergences found in the source texts. Thus, even if this is written in the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu*, we should not take for granted that six translations of exactly the same Maitreya *sūtra* were ever made, but rather consider that the author of the catalogue, in this case Zhisheng, considered certain translations to represent the same text. This kind of classification needs to be understood in relation to other, more divergent translations that clearly do not derive from the same text. Contents and length, i.e. the number of pages, of Chinese translations are formal indicators for grouping translations as having been made from the same *sūtra*.

If we return to the still extant five Maitreya *sūtras*, the *Mile chengfo jing* 勒大成佛經, now no. 456 attributed to Kumārajīva is by far the longest (8383 characters) of the five Maitreya *sūtras* in question. Since it is not mentioned in the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* under this name, the present title should be regarded as a later invention. The text corresponds to the *sūtra* that has seventeen pages. In ancient times it was most frequently called *Mile chengfo jing* 彌勒成佛經, and sometimes it was also called *Mile danglai xiasheng jing* 彌勒當來下生經. Kumārajīva's translation is said to have replaced Dharmarakṣa's first translation. Whether both translations ever existed at the same time, or whether Dharmarakṣa's translation was lost before the new translation was produced, is not clear. It cannot, of course, be verified how similar these two versions actually were. The catalogues agree however in saying that this *sūtra* was "only" translated twice, that Dharmarakṣa's translation did not survive and that this *sūtra* is different from the other Maitreya *sūtras*.

Moreover, although the title *Mile xiasheng chengfo jing* 彌勒下生成佛經 is used for two Maitreya *sūtras* in the present Taishō edition (no. 454 and 455), the *Chu sanzang jiji* never refers to this title. In fact, when a *sūtra* was translated several times, its title could change considerably. The *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* uses this title only to refer to the *sūtra* translated by Yijing. Besides the abovementioned entries, the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* lists it under Yijing's translations

and says that it has one scroll, that it is the sixth translation of the text called *Mile xia jing* 彌勒下經, which was also translated by Kumārajīva, and that Yijing's translation was completed in the year 701 (*Dazu yuannian* 大足元年).<sup>106</sup> The extant Taishō no. 455 has 2258 characters and coincides well with the five pages it is said to have filled.

Next, the *Mile laishi jing* 彌勒來時經 does not appear in the *Chu sanzang jiji* under its present title either. But the catalogue lists a *sūtra* called *Mile shoujue jing* 彌勒受決經 among those scriptures that were extant but their translators' names lost.<sup>107</sup> The *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* notes that the *Mile laishi jing* 彌勒來時經 is an extant anonymous translation, the third translation of a group of similar *sūtras*, and that it is the smallest one among those that survived. This text can be identified as no. 457 in the Taishō edition.

We further have in the Taishō edition the *Mile xiasheng chengfo jing* 彌勒下生成佛經 (no. 454), a title which, as stated above, is not mentioned in the *Chu sanzang jiji*. This *sūtra* is thought to belong to the same group as Yijing's translation (no. 455). The author of the *Chu sanzang jiji* however mentions two Maitreya *sūtras* attributed to Kumārajīva: the *Mile chengfo jing* 彌勒成佛經 and the *Mile xiasheng jing* 彌勒下生經. The first one could already be identified as no. 456, and the second one is no. 454.

The *sūtra* no. 454 is a translation of the Maitreya *sūtra* which the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* tells us was translated a total of six times. Three translations were and are still extant and can be identified: the third is the anonymous translation no. 457, the fourth is Kumārajīva's no. 454, and the sixth is Yijing's no. 455. The three lost translations (the first, second and fifth among the total of six) might have been: an anonymous translation of a *sūtra* called *Mile danglai sheng jing* 彌勒當來生經, an anonymous translation called *Mile zuofo shishi jing* 彌勒作佛時事經, and Paramārtha's translation of a *sūtra* entitled *Mile xiasheng jing* 彌勒下生經. To this, we should add that Yueposhouna is also said to have produced the fifth trans-

<sup>106</sup> Cf. T55, no. 2154, 567b1–2 for the text and 568b4–569b4 for the passage on Yijing.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. T55, no. 2145, 32c8 and 21b17–21c9.

lation, and that this was believed to have been lost, although it is still extant within the *Ratnakūṭa*.

In sum, the *Mile xiasheng jing* 彌勒下生經 (no. 453), the *sūtra* wrongly attributed to Dharmarakṣa, is in fact only mentioned in the catalogues as a text extracted from the *Ekottarika-āgama*, and the Maitreya text translated by Dharmarakṣa was lost already at the time of the earliest catalogues, and belonged to the other Maitreya *sūtra* that was translated six times.

## Bibliography

- Abegg, Emil. 1928. *Der Messiasglaube in Indien und Iran*. Berlin / Leipzig: De Gruyter.
- Akanuma, Chizen 赤沼智善. 1929. *The Comparative Catalogue of Chinese Āgamas & Pāli Nikāyas*. Nagoya: Hajinkaku-Shobō 破塵閣書房.
- Anālayo (T.P. Steffens). forthcoming. *A Comparative Study of the Majjhima-kāya*. Habilitationsschrift des Fachbereiches Fremdsprachliche Philologien der Philipps-Universität Marburg 2006.
- Baruch, Willy. 1946. "Maitreya d'après les sources de Sérinde." *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 1946: 67–92.
- Buswell, Robert E. 2004. "Sugi's Collation Notes to the Koryō Buddhist Canon and Their Significance for Buddhist Textual Criticism." *The Journal of Korean Studies* 9/4: 129–184.
- Deeg, Max. 1999. "Das Ende des Dharma und die Ankunft des Maitreya. Endzeit- und Neue-Zeit-Vorstellungen im Buddhismus mit einem Exkurs zur Kāśyapa-Legende." *Zeitschrift für Religionswissenschaft* 7: 145–169.
- 2005. *Das Gaoseng-Faxian-Zhuan als religionsgeschichtliche Quelle*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Demiéville, Paul. 1920. "Compte-rendu de Leumann 1919." *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* XX: 158–170.
- 1954. "Maitreya l'inspirateur." *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* XLIV: 376–387.
- 1954. "Le paradis de Maitreya." *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* XLIV: 387–395.
- Emmerick, Ronald E. 1968. *The Book of Zambasta*, London: Oxford University Press.

- Enomoto, Fumio 榎本文雄. 1984. “Setsuissaiubu-kei Āgama tenkai – Chūagon to Zōagon wo megutte” 説一切有部系アーガマ展開 – 『中阿含』と『雑阿含』をめぐって [The development of the Āgamas in the Sarvāstivāda lineage – An approach to the *Madhyama-āgama* and the *Samyukta-āgama*]. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* XXXII/2: 51–54.
- . 1984. “Agonkyōten no Seiritsu” 阿含經典の成立 [The formation of the Āgama scriptures]. *Tōyōgakujuksukenkyū* 東洋学術研究 [Journal of Oriental Studies] 23/1: 93–108.
- . 1986. “On the Formation of the Original Texts of the Chinese Āgamas.” *Buddhist Studies Review* 3/1: 19–30.
- Filliozat, Jacqueline. 1993. “The commentaries to the Anāgatavaṃsa in the Pāli manuscripts of the Paris collections.” *Journal of the Pali Text Society* XIX: 43–63.
- Filliozat, Jean. 1950. “Maitreya, l’invaincu.” *Journal Asiatique* 238: 145–149.
- Hardacre Helen; Sponberg, Alan (eds.). 1988. *Maitreya, the Future Buddha* (Proceedings of the Princeton Conference on Maitreya Studies, May 1983). Cambridge / New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jaini, Padmanabh S. “Stages in the Boddhisattva Career of the Tathāgata Maitreya.” Hardacre, Sponberg 1988: 54–90.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe. 2006. „Maitreyavyākaraṇa“. Jens Braarvig, Paul Harrison, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Kazunobu Matsuda, Lore Sandere (eds.). *Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. III. Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection. Oslo: Hermes Publishing: 7–9.
- Hinüber, Oskar von. 2000. *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. Berlin / New York: De Gruyter.
- Hureau, Sylvie. 2006. “Preaching and translating on poṣadha days: Kumārajīva’s role in adapting an Indian ceremony to China.” *Journal of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies* X: 87–118.
- Lamotte, Étienne. 1967. “Un Sūtra Composite de l’*Ekottarika-āgama*.” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 30: 105–116.
- Legittimo, Elsa I. 2005. “Synoptic Presentation of the *Pusa chu tai jing* - Part I (chapters 1–14).” *Sengokuyama Journal of Buddhist Studies* 仙石山論集 II: 1–111.
- . 2006a. “Synoptic Presentation of the *Pusa chu tai jing* - Part II (chapters 15–38).” *Sengokuyama Journal of Buddhist Studies* 仙石山論集 III: 1–175.
- . 2006b. *Analysis of the Pu sa chu tai jing* 菩薩處胎經 (T12, no. 384). Tokyo 2006, [unpublished doctoral thesis, International College for

- Postgraduate Studies (ICABS); a publication including a full translation is planned in the series *Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques* of the Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises, Bruxelles 2010].
- Leumann, Ernst. 1919. *Maitreya-samiti, das Zukunftsideal der Buddhisten – Die nordarische Schilderung in Text und Übersetzung*. Strassburg.
- Lévi, Sylvain. 1925. “Le sūtra du sage et du fou dans la littérature de l’Asie Centrale.” *Journal Asiatique* 207: 305–332.
- 1932. “Maitreya le consolateur.” Leroux, Ernest (ed.). *Études d’Orientalisme publiées par le musée Guimet à la mémoire de Raymonde Linossier*, vol. II. Paris: 355–402.
- Majumdar, Ramesh Chandra. 1959. “Ārya-Maitreya-vyākaraṇa.” Dutt, N. (ed.). *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. IV. Calcutta: 185–214.
- Matsumoto, Bunzaburō 松本文三郎. 1911. *Miroku-jōdo-ron* 彌勒淨土論 [A Monograph on Maitreya’s Pure Land]. Tokyo: Heibonsha 平凡社.
- Mayeda, Egaku. 1985. “Japanese Studies on the Schools of the Chinese Āgamas.” Heinz Bechert (ed.). *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*, Erster Teil. Göttingen: 94–103.
- Meddagama, Udaya; Holt, John Clifford. 1993. *Anāgatavaṃsa Deśanā – The Sermon of the Chronicle-To-Be*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Minayeff, Ivan P. 1886. “Anāgata-vaṃsa.” *Journal of the Pali Text Society* II: 33–53.
- Mizuno, Kōgen 水野弘元. 1956. “Kanyaku Chūagon to Zōichiagon to no yakushutsu ni tsuite” 漢訳中阿含と増一阿含との訳出について [On the Chinese Translations of the *Madhyama-āgama* and the *Ekottarika-āgama*]. *Proceedings of The Okurayama Oriental Research Institute*, vol. II. Yokohama: 41–90.
- 1989. “Kanyaku no Chūagongyō to Zōichiagongyō” 漢訳の中阿含経と増一阿含経 [The Chinese Versions of the *Madhyama-āgama* and the *Ekottarika-āgama*]. *Bukkyō Kenkyū / Kokusai Bukkyōto Kyōkai* 18 仏教研究 / 国際仏教徒協会: 1–42.
- Nattier, Jan, 1988. “The Meanings of the Maitreya Myth: A Typological Analysis.” *Hardacre, Sponberg* 1988: 23–47.
- Péri, Noël. 1911. [Untitled book review of Matsumoto’s *Miroku-jōdo-ron*] (under heading: Bibliographie – Japon). *Bulletin de l’École française d’Extrême-Orient* XI: 439–458.
- Warita, Takeo 割田剛雄. 1973. “Dommanandai-yaku Zōichiagongyō no genzaikyō ni tsuite” 曇摩難提訳「増一阿含経」の現在経について [On the Extant Sūtra of the *Ekottarika-āgama* Translated by Dharmanandin]. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* XXI, 2: 148–149.

- Zacchetti, Stefano. 2007. "The Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations: A Preliminary Attempt to Define the Corpus of An Shigao's Translations and Review the State of Art in the Relevant Research." *Language Identity and Language Change in Collision and Dialog Between Civilizations (II)*. Forum: The Harmony of Civilizations and Prosperity for All – Diversity in the Development of Human Civilization. Beijing: 1–17 [unpublished conference paper].
- Zin, Monika. 2003. *Ajanta – Handbuch der Malereien / Handbook of the Paintings 2: Devotionale und ornamentale Malereien*, Vols.1–2, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.