

"Radich" Taishō corpus for use with TACL

For use in conjunction with [TACL](#) and the [TACL GUI](#), [Michael Radich](#) has developed a modified version of the Taishō corpus, as digitised by [CBETA](#). That corpus is available for download [here](#), at [Zenodo](#) (DOI 10.5281/zenodo.6798304). We have also made a full TACL database based on this corpus available for download [here](#), once again at Zenodo (DOI 10.5281/zenodo.6795218).

The first modification effected here is we have removed from the texts prefaces, "postfaces", colophons and other similar paratextual elements, to leave as much as possible only the material presented in tradition as "the text" proper. This point holds especially for the "translation" texts (meaning simply texts presented in the canon as translations, not texts regarded by modern scholarship as authentic translations: mainly T1-T1692, and a few texts scattered in a couple of other places). The material thus stripped out is still available in separate units, which we have not included in this corpus, but are happy to provide on request.

The application of this principle to non-translation texts creates a few anomalies. Readers should **NOTE** especially that the removal of paratextual elements creates a peculiar situation for two texts: the *Guan Mile pusa shan Doushuai tian jing ti xu* 觀彌勒菩薩上兜率天經題序 T1772, and the *Da Qin Jingjiao liuxing Zhongguo beisong bing xu* 大秦景教流行中國碑頌并序 T2144. As their titles suggest, these works comprise material that is treated by the creators of the CBETA XML as *all* "paratext". T1772 is entirely a "preface" 序, and T2144 is mostly a preface, with an inscription that CBETA also treats as a kind of paratextual element. When we apply the above policy of removing such a paratextual elements from the "Radich" corpus, the result is that for these two texts, no content remains. Users who wish to include those two texts (or parts thereof) in their analyses are advised to obtain TACL-ready copies of the texts from the TACL "T-X corpus" ([here](#)).

The modifications to this corpus also address a problem created by the treatment of certain bodies of text as single units by the Taishō editors (often based upon decisions much older in textual history), which means that multiple distinguishable units of text travel under the same Taishō number. This means in turn that CBETA treated the same "texts" as single units in their XML. A simple example of the resulting problem may be seen in the *Ratnakūṭa* 大寶積經 T310. This collection lumps together forty-nine separable texts, by a range of different translators, produced at widely varying dates. For the purposes of many types of textual analysis based on internal evidence, we may need to treat these forty-nine component texts as individual units. In the "Radich" modified corpus, then, we have divided texts into their smaller constituent units, in order to make such analysis possible.

This subdivision of the texts does not preclude treatment of the textual units presented in the Taishō as single units, for the purposes of other analyses. This can be simply achieved by giving all the constituent texts the same "label" (in TACL parlance) in a TACL "catalogue", as explained in the [TACL User's Guide](#) and the [TACL GUI User's Manual](#).

For users who wish to treat such a Taishō "work" as a single unit, the "Radich" corpus also includes a version of the work with the suffix "-whole" in the filename (e.g. T0026-whole). Users should **NOTE** that because we have the corpus of both split versions of such works or collections, and the single CBETA work as a unit, there is a risk of redundancy in TACL analyses using this corpus. The corpus must therefore be used with appropriate care. TACL catalogues including such texts should ordinarily only include EITHER the split version of any such work or collection (or part/s thereof), OR the single unit representing the whole work/collection. In this connection, readers are reminded that a work can be omitted from an analysis based on a TACL catalogue by either of two measures: either the work can be deleted from the catalogue entirely, or the work can be left in the catalogue, but not given a "label" (see the TACL or TACL GUI user's guide for details).

Readers should also note that the decision to split a text in the corpus in this manner does not represent a judgement that the evidence or modern scholarship suggesting the split is certainly correct. Rather, we treat these splits as hypotheses, to be further tested. But such testing is only possible, in TACL, if we have the option of treating constituent components of the texts distinctly.

Below, I present a list of all texts that have been subjected to such modifications, and give brief explanations of the rationale in each case. Texts are listed in Taishō order. Often, explanations will be given in the highly abbreviated form of reference to entries in Radich's [CBC@ database](#), where traditional sources and evidence and modern scholarship bearing on questions of attribution are summarised. (Readers are reminded that CBC@ is intended only as a finding aid for the evidence and scholarship it indexes, and not as a *substitute* for direct reference to that evidence and scholarship in each case. That is to say, *caveat lector*; and if you want to build an argument on any of the evidence or modern scholarship referenced at CBC@, please consult the original and critically check our characterisations.)

In some simple cases, we take it that no further explanation is necessary for the modifications of a "text" or collection (see e.g. T26).

The present form of this so-called "Radich" corpus is in part based upon the happenstance of the research purposes to which the corpus has been applied to date. It is thus somewhat haphazard and inconsistent in its coverage (in part because the work of setting up such "splits" can be substantial, and has not seemed worth undertaking until a case is found for which it would actually be required). Thus, for example, we have thus far split only one of the three (sometimes partial) Chinese *Samyuktāgamas* (T101). If TACL users observe further cases where we have not split or modified texts, but modern scholarship gives good reason to believe that such a modification could be a useful improvement to the corpus or it could be useful for a particular piece of research, they are asked to [contact us](#).

To make work with this "Radich" corpus easier, we have made available [here](#) a "boilerplate" blank catalogue (without TACL "labels").

Dirghāgama T1

Split into individual *sūtras*.

We also give special treatment to T1(30), based on Anālayo (2014):

<https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/4648/>

Mahāparinirvāna-sūtra 般泥洹經 T6

The two fascicles of the work have been separated, based on Zhisheng's statement that he sought out and rediscovered a two-fascicle version of the work: T2154 (LV) 530a3-5, as studied by Iwamatsu (1976):

<https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/828/>

Madhyamāgama T26

Split into individual *sūtras*.

Samyuktāgama T101

Split into individual *sūtras*.

**Ekottarikāgama T125*

Split into individual *sūtras*.

**Ekottarikāgama T150A*

Split into individual *sūtras*.

Liu du ji (jing) 六度集(經) T152

Split into individual tales/*sūtras*.

Sheng jing 生經 T154

Split into individual tales/sūtras.

Lalitavistara T186

Split into the following sets of material:

- verses
- material overlapping with T185
- chapters 25-28
- remainder

See:

<https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/1552/>

especially Okano (1987, 1990); Saitō (2013); Matsuda (1988).

Lalitavistara T187

We separate out a possible interpolation pointed out by Okano (1990).

<https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/1558/>

Kalpanāmanditikā T201, "Sūtra of the Wise and the Foolish" T202, Za baozang jing 雜寶藏經 T203, Za piyu jing 雜譬喻經 T204, Za piyu jing 雜譬喻經 T205, Jiu za piyu jing 舊雜譬喻經 T206, Za piyu jing 雜譬喻經 T207, Zhongjing zhuan za piyu 眾經撰雜譬喻 T208, Bai yu jing 百喻經 T209

Split into individual tales/sūtras.

*Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra 大般若波羅蜜多經 T222

Split into individual sūtras.

"Larger" Prajñāpāramitā T222

We separate out a possibly anomalous portion of Chapter 3 pointed out by Sasaki (1972):

<https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/211/>

Aṣṭasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā T225A/B

We separate the first fascicle (Nattier's T225A) from the rest of the text (Nattier's T225B), and separate the first fascicle into layers, corresponding to the root text and an interleaved commentary. Thus:

- T225A root text
- T225A interlinear commentary
- T226B

See:

<https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/175/>

Saddharmapundarīka T262

We separate out the Devadatta chapter, which was translated and inserted later:

<https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/400/>

Saddharmapundarīka T263

We separate out Chapters 8 and 10 (Suguro 1993):

<https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/398/>

Buddhāvataṃsaka T278

We separate out portions corresponding to earlier translations of the same material, which may have borrowed from those earlier materials.

Ratnakūṭa T310

Split into individual *sūtras*.

*Surāta-sūtra 須賴菩薩經 T328

Verse and prose are treated separately (this decision was made in the service of a hypothesis as yet untreated in published work).

Sukhāvativyūha T360, T361, T362

In all three versions of the *Sukhāvativyūha* T360, T361, and T362, we separate out the so-called "Five Evils" section. See especially Nōnin (2011):

<https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/4375/>

In addition, in T360 only, we separate out the unparalleled §§5-22 (see Gómez 1996):

<https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/1308/>

Mahāparinirvāna-(mahā)sūtra T374

We treat separately (1) portions of the text paralleled in T376, Tibetan, and Sanskrit, and (2) portions unique to T374 (fascicles 11-40).

**Mahāsamnipāta* T397

Split into individual *sūtras*.

Pratyutpannabuddhasammukhāvasthitasamādhi-sūtra T418

We treat separately portions of the text revised as unrevised and revised by Harrison; and, within the revised portions, prose and verse. Thus:

- unrevised
- revised prose
- revised verse

See:

<https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/2195/>

esp. Harrison (1990), Nattier (2008).

Saṅgharaksita Yogācārabhūmi T606

We treat separately portions of the text (roughly) paralleled in the earlier translation of An Shigao, and the last three chapters, which have Mahāyāna colouring.

<https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/2098/>

Suvarṇabhāṣottama-sūtra T664

This is the synoptic version of the *Suvarṇabhāṣottama* put together by Baogui under the Sui. It comprises chapters ascribed to a number of different translators. We have therefore separated the text into chapters.

Si yuan jing 四願經 T735

Split into three parts, as per Nattier (2008):

<https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/274/>

"Consecration Sūtra" 灌頂經 T1331

This collection actually comprises twelve different *sūtras*. We have split it into these twelve texts.

Liu men tuoluoni jing lun fu guangshi 六門陀羅尼經論附廣釋 T1361

Split into root text and commentary.

Pusa jie yaoyi jing 菩薩戒要義經 T1503

See Ōno (1954):

<https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/1656/>

Prajñāpradīpa T1566

Split by fascicle, because of a report that the amanuensis for each fascicle was different. See Funayama (2013):

<https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/1766/>

*Tattvasiddhi/Satyasiddhi T1646

Split into individual chapters.

Hong ming ji 弘明集 T2102

Split into component texts.

Chu sanzang ji ji 出三藏記集 T2145

Split into component texts.