



Universiteit
Leiden

The Netherlands

A Survey of the Sanskrit fragments Corresponding to the Chinese Samyuktāgama [Zōagonkyō sōtō bonbun danpen ichiran] (雜阿含經相當梵文斷片一覽).

Silk, J.A.

Citation

Silk, J. A. (2012). A Survey of the Sanskrit fragments Corresponding to the Chinese Samyuktāgama [Zōagonkyō sōtō bonbun danpen ichiran] (雜阿含經相當梵文斷片一覽). *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 55, 92-96. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/20505>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/20505>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Chung, Jin-il, *A Survey of the Sanskrit fragments Corresponding to the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama* [Zōagonkyō sōtō bonbun danpen ichiran] (雜阿含經相當梵文斷片一覽. Tōkyō: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房佛書林, 2008), 339 pp., ¥ 8000.00, ISBN 978 4 796 30183 1 / 4 796 30183 6.

It is well known that the Buddhist canonical collections long available to scholars in the form of the Pāli Nikāyas are likely to have had parallels in a number of other Indic forms, some of which have been preserved, although sometimes apparently piecemeal, in Chinese translations. Recent discoveries from Afghanistan and environs appear to have revealed a complete, or nearly complete, Sanskrit Dīrghāgama, which however remains so far unpublished.¹ A number of texts have been published over the years in Sanskrit (or something like it) based on materials discovered in Central Asia, but few of these fragments have yielded even complete texts, not to mention intact collections. While a certain amount of work has been done to coordinate the available Chinese Āgama translations with extant Pāli materials, a project yet to be systematically attempted is to coordinate these Chinese materials with extant Sanskrit fragments. It is not that scholars have necessarily considered the Pāli texts to be closer in any particular way to the Chinese (and in fact sheer geography would suggest the opposite), but rather that the Pāli materials are “complete” and conveniently available, while the Sanskrit sources are radically fragmentary, lie scattered in various publications, or were unidentified or unpublished.

Jin-il Chung has now performed the great service of continuing the process of collection of “*Sanskrit fragments Corresponding to the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama*.” This project involves not merely the sifting and sorting of a large number of often extremely fragmentary bits of text, but their careful analysis. For as Chung points out in his introduction, there is considerable uncertainty about the history of these diverse materials. One thing we do know is that we do not have the precise Indic sources of virtually any of the Chinese translations. That is to say, the Indic materials we now have may be determined to preserve parallel texts, or to, in Chung’s term, “correspond,”

¹) After I had written this I received from the author, Liu Zhen 刘震, his edition *Chanding yu kuxiu: Guanyu Fozhuan yuanchu fanben de faxian be yanjiu* 禅定与苦修—关于佛传原初梵本的发现和研究 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji 上海古籍, 2010). This is a Chinese version of his unpublished dissertation, “Versenkung und Askese: Eine neue Sanskrit-Quelle zur Buddha-Legende,” Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München, 2008, a study of Dīrghāgama 20, *Kāyabhāvanā-sūtra*.

but they are not to be considered the originals from which the Chinese was translated. Moreover, as Chung discusses as far as possible in his relatively short introduction, even the sectarian and/or local characteristics of the respective materials may differ.

Some work has been done on relevant problems, and Chung is fully conversant with virtually all the pertinent scholarship in a wide range of languages. What is more, the most recent directly relevant work is that of Andrew Glass, *Four Gāndhārī Saṃyuktāgama Sūtras* (Gandhāran Buddhist Texts 4; Seattle 2007), and Glass refers to Chung's work (as 'forthcoming') and Chung to Glass's (in both published form and as the PhD dissertation upon which the latter is based). This is only one example of the admirable cooperation which lies behind this project.

Chung states his goal as to "arrange the available Sanskrit material in an easily accessible format." That is to say, he aims to arrange the available Sanskrit material corresponding to the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama, the text preserved most conveniently in the Taishō edition as T. 99. In fact, Chung does not quite do this, at least in the manner which the expression might lead one to expect. What he does do is give references to the publications of this Sanskrit material, which each reader must then subsequently seek out for him- or herself. This presentation is in contrast to the approach of Fumio Enomoto in his *A Comprehensive Study of the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama: Indic Texts Corresponding to the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama as Found in the Sarvāstivāda-Mūlasarvāstivāda Literature*. Part 1: *Saṃgītanipāta (Kyoto, 1994). As this title makes clear, however, Enomoto limited his attention to the seventh and last section of the Āgama. What Chung has done is both more and less than what Enomoto did for a portion of the text. It is more not only in that it tackles the whole Saṃyuktāgama, but also in that it does not restrict attention to any specific range of literature, including even parallels in Tibetan, Tocharian and Uigur, for instance, as well as references to modern scholarship. It is less in that, for each text that he treated, Enomoto quoted both the Chinese text and the corresponding Sanskrit; when the latter is fragmentary, he indicated with bold type the corresponding Chinese portions, thus providing the beginnings of a rudimentary analysis. Even this is, of course, nothing more than a first step, since it simply presents the materials, without discussion or substantial analysis. How far it is possible to go with infinite patience and concentrating on a small core of material may be seen in the most impressive book of Glass, cited above, but the sheer length and detail of Glass's treatment of a small portion of text gives a good indication of how mammoth a job looms.

Ultimately, such studies should be carried out for the whole Āgama, indeed for the whole literature, but this is a task which may take centuries.

Chung makes many important points in his introduction. Many of these concern the difficulties of recognizing parallels and correspondences, and determining whether such corresponding passages actually should be understood to belong to a collection similar to the Saṃyuktāgama. As he argues on p. 10, such fragmentary parallels may even belong to materials older than the Saṃyuktāgama collection as such. What is more, not only do there exist in Chinese not one “Saṃyuktāgama” but two, so to speak, T. 99 *Za Ahan jing*, and T. 100, *Beiyi Za Ahan jing* (= Nipātas VI and VII of the Saṃyuktāgama) (or three, if one counts T. 101 as well), though the original structure of both of these collections has become corrupted. The results of research by a number of scholars has resulted in the hypotheses of the Chinese scholar-monk Yinshun regarding the original ordering of the collection gaining wide acceptance. The putatively corrected order, found on Chung’s Table 3 on p. 23, is followed in the body of his book (cp. Glass 2007: 40, Table 5). Therefore, any reader who wishes to locate possible Sanskrit correspondences to a given sūtra must first consult the table in order to determine where in the book he must look, since the ordering does not begin at 1 and continue in strict order to 1362, but rather takes into account the hypothesized reordering. It is too complicated to rehearse here the rationale behind this reordering, but in brief, the suggestion is that this now represents the original order of the collection in Chinese. This emphatically does not mean that this represents *the* order of the Saṃyuktāgama. It is clear from a variety of evidence that different versions may have had somewhat different orderings.

The relation between the Vinaya and Abhidharma corpora and the Saṃyuktāgama is also discussed. Chung says, for instance, pp. 12–13, that while “there is no indication that the complete Āgama was already known to the Sarvāstivāda vinayadharas,” “the Mūlasarvāstivāda vinayadharas knew the Saṃyuktāgama in its fully developed form.” Chung is also careful of the grounds upon which he makes his arguments, implicitly arguing (p. 18) against some earlier theories which sought sectarian identity in linguistic forms. For Chung, “it would appear that differences in diction between versions reflect regional features or different stages in the transmission within the Sarvāstivāda tradition, but not necessarily the characteristics of a different school.”

The core of the book, pp. 41–245, contains the sūtra-by-sūtra listing of correspondences (omitting mention of those sūtras for which no correspon-

dence can be identified). Many of the entries constitute mini-bibliographies of the respective texts, such that the material gathered here must serve as the starting point for any further work on this collection. The comprehensive listing is followed by a “Table of Uddānas” (pp. 247–258), with extensive annotation, “Concordances to the Parallels of the Za-ahanjing” with the Bei-yi Za Ahan jing (pp. 2589–270), that is to say, Nipātas VI and VII of T. 99 with T. 100, a concordance with Pāli texts (pp. 271–277) and, following the references, an Appendix of “Some Sūtras of the Za-ahanjing and their Sanskrit Counterparts of Unknown Affiliation” (pp. 309–339), wherein we find editions of Sūtras 9, 10 and 84, 15, 16, 31, 50, 57, and finally sūtra 351. These appendices are arranged much in the manner of Enomoto’s book, mentioned above, with Chinese and Sanskrit side-by-side, although here accompanied also by extensive annotation.

A very few minor errors caught my eye: On p. 12n18, the form Darva Mallaputra does not exist; in Pāli one should write Dabba Mallaputta; the Sanskrit form, as Chung notices further in the same note, is Dravya Mallaputra. The error may be traced to Akanuma’s *Indo Bukkyō Kōyu Meishi Jiten* (Kyoto, 1931: 140a). On p. 26n89, Chung credits Richard Gombrich with the idea that Pāli *sutta* may correspond to Sanskrit *sūkta*, rather than *sūtra*. This idea is not originally Gombrich’s, and moreover, according to Oskar von Hinüber (“Die neun āngas,” *WZKS* 38 [1994] 132, reprinted in his *Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden, 2009: 170), it is to be rejected. On p. 29n99, the page reference to Vetter 2000 must be to pp. 99–294, not 99–309.

Jin-il Chung’s work doubtless represents a magnificent contribution to our familiarity with the Saṃyuktāgama, and corresponding Indic sources. Nevertheless, and without intending in the very least to question this achievement, one must ask whether printing the “Survey” as a book (not to mention a book published in Japan and difficult to obtain abroad) was the best choice. It seems to me that a much more useful course would have been to present precisely these same materials as an online database. (The beginnings of such already exist: <http://buddhisticinformatics.ddbc.edu.tw/BZA/>; <http://buddhisticinformatics.ddbc.edu.tw/BZA/bzaComCatWeb.html>.) This would provide a number of advantages: In the first place, the listings could be easily updated, as more parallels are identified. Secondly, an online database would allow editions, such as those provided in the Appendices, to be gradually added for all entries. The same holds true for secondary references, translations and so on. In fact, the flexibility of an online database seems perfect for the presentation of precisely this sort of

information. It is therefore to be hoped that, notwithstanding the existence of this book in its old-fashioned form, its contents might soon be put online in a more accessible and revisable format.

Jonathan A. Silk
Leiden University