

*A Guide to the Earliest Chinese
Buddhist Translations*

Texts from the Eastern Han 東漢 and Three Kingdoms 三國 Periods

Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica

Editor-in-Chief: Hiroshi KANNO

Volume 8

**A Guide to the Earliest Chinese
Buddhist Translations**

Texts from the Eastern Han 東漢 and Three Kingdoms 三國 Periods

Jan NATTIER

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo 2008

A Guide to the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations

Texts from the Eastern Han 東漢 and Three Kingdoms 三國 Periods

Jan NATTIER

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo 2008

Published by The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology (= IRIAB),
Soka University:

1-236 Tangi, Hachioji, Tokyo 192-8577, Japan

〒192-8577 東京都八王子市丹木町1-236

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所

Phone: (+ 81-42) 691-2695

Fax: (+ 81-42) 691-4814

E-mail: iriab@soka.ac.jp; URL: <http://iriab.soka.ac.jp/>

First Published 31, March, 2008

Printed in Japan by Meiwa Printing Co.Ltd., Tokyo, JAPAN

© Jan NATTIER

All rights reserved.

Apart from any fair dealing for the purpose of private study, research, criticism or review, no part of this book may be reproduced, translated or utilised in any form, either by print, photoprint, microform, multimedia or any other means, now known or hereafter invented, without written permission of the copyright holder and publishers. Enquiries should be made to the publishers.

ISBN 978-4-904234-00-6

Correspondence regarding all editorial matters, including manuscripts to be offered for publication, may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief of the Series "Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica" at The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University, Tokyo, JAPAN.

CONTENTS

Preface and Acknowledgements	v
------------------------------	---

PART I: INTRODUCTION

Early Chinese Translations: Problems and Prospects	3
The Scope of the Present Work: From the Beginnings to 280 CE	6
Translator Attributions: The Problem of Authenticity	9
External Evidence (1): The Testimony of Scriptural Catalogues	11
<i>Chu sanzang ji ji</i> 出三藏記集	11
<i>Gaoseng zhuan</i> 高僧傳	13
<i>Zhongjing mulu</i> 眾經目錄	13
<i>Lidai sanbao ji</i> 歷代三寶紀	14
Subsequent catalogues	15
External Evidence (2): Prefaces, Colophons, and Biographies	16
Internal Evidence: Vocabulary and Style	17
Aspects of the Translation Process (1): The So-called Translator	19
Aspects of the Translation Process (2): The So-called Text	20
Indian source-languages	21
Oral and written texts	22
The myth of the “original”	23
Intertextuality	24
Scripture as artifact	25
A Note on Names: First Names, Family Names, and Ethnikons	27
Objectives of this Study: A Brief User’s Guide	29
Limitations of this Study: Tasks for the Future	30

PART II: TRANSLATIONS PRODUCED DURING THE EASTERN HAN PERIOD (c. 147-220 CE)

Legendary beginnings	35
An Shigao 安世高	38
Biography	38
Contents of his corpus	41
Translation style	43
Authentic texts	44

Methodological preliminaries: external evidence	46
Āgama texts	49
<i>Dirghāgama</i>	49
<i>Madhyamāgama</i>	50
<i>Saṃyuktāgama</i>	50
<i>Ekottarikāgama</i>	52
A Mahāyāna Sūtra (?)	55
Treatises	59
An original composition	63
Newly discovered manuscripts	64
Other possible attributions	65
Problematic texts: further methodological reflections	68
Lost texts	71
Scholarly resources	72
Lokakṣema (Zhi Loujiachen) 支婁迦讖	73
Biography	73
Contents of his corpus	75
Translation style	75
Authentic texts	76
Methodological preliminaries (1): external evidence	77
Methodological preliminaries (2): internal evidence	79
Core texts	80
Second-tier texts	83
Third-tier texts	84
Problematic or revised texts	85
Newly proposed attributions	86
Lost texts	88
Scholarly resources	88
An Xuan 安玄 and Yan Fotiao 嚴佛調	89
Biography	89
Contents of their corpus	90
Translation style	91
Authentic texts	92
Methodological preliminaries: external and internal evidence	92
A Mahāyāna sūtra	93
Preface to a lost composition	93
Lost texts	93
Scholarly resources	94
Zhi Yao 支曜	94
Biography	94

Contents of his corpus	95
Translation style	95
Authentic texts	95
Methodological preliminaries (1): external evidence	96
Methodological preliminaries (2): internal evidence	98
A Mahāyāna sūtra (?)	100
Problematic texts: a methodological afterword	100
Lost texts	102
Scholarly resources	102
Kang Mengxiang 康孟詳	102
Biography	102
Contents of his corpus	103
Translation style	103
Authentic texts	104
Methodological preliminaries (1): external evidence	105
Methodological preliminaries (2): internal evidence	107
A biography of the Buddha	109
Problematic or revised texts	109
Scholarly resources	109
Other Han-period translations	109

PART III: TRANSLATIONS PRODUCED DURING THE THREE KINGDOMS PERIOD

1. THE WU 吳 KINGDOM (c. 220-280 CE)	113
Weiqinan 維祇難	113
Biography	113
Authentic texts	114
Zhi Qian 支謙	116
Biography	116
Contents of his corpus	117
Translation style	118
Authentic texts	121
Methodological preliminaries (1): external evidence	122
Methodological preliminaries (2): internal evidence	125
Āgama texts	126

<i>Dīrghāgama</i>	126
<i>Madhyamāgama</i>	128
Unidentified sūtras	130
An unidentified <i>jātaka</i> tale	133
Didactic verses	134
A Biography of the Buddha	135
Mahāyāna sūtras	136
Stylistic variations: sub-groups in Zhi Qian's corpus	146
Lost texts	149
Scholarly resources	148
Kang Senghui 康僧會	149
Biography	149
Contents of his corpus	150
Translation style	151
Authentic texts	152
Lost texts	154
Scholarly resources	154
2. THE WEI 魏 KINGDOM (c. 220-265 CE)	155
Bo Yan 白延	155
Kang Sengkai 康僧鎧 (*Saṃghavarman)	158
Other Wei-period translators	159
3. THE SHU 蜀 KINGDOM (c. 221-265 CE)	160
PART IV: CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS	
The Missing Majority: Texts by Unknown Translators	163
Establishing chronology through commentaries	164
Lineages of translation: tracing "rhetorical communities"	166
In Lieu of a Conclusion	168
Appendix I: Index of Translations by Taishō Text Numbers	169
Appendix II: Index of Sanskrit and Pāli Titles	173
Appendix III: Reference List of Han and Three Kingdoms Translations	175
Bibliography	179

Preface and Acknowledgements

This volume began its life in 2001, as a simple handout compiled for distribution to graduate students at Indiana University. It was intended to enable them to check quickly to determine whether or not, at the state of current scholarly opinion, a given text should be considered a genuine translation produced in the Eastern Han or Three Kingdoms period. Most of the students were not specialists in early Chinese Buddhism; they were focusing on Daoism, or Chinese poetry, or Indian Buddhism, but for these purposes they needed to know whether the translator attribution for a given scripture found in the widely used *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* edition of the canon should be trusted. From the outset, therefore, this brief guide was not intended primarily for specialists in Buddhist Studies, but rather for all those who could benefit from easy access, in a western language, to reasonably accurate and up-to-date information on which Buddhist translations could be assigned with confidence to the Han and Three Kingdoms periods.

There it might have stayed, as a skeletal outline with minimal discussion, were it not for an extremely fortunate set of circumstances that ultimately led to my move to Tokyo to join the staff of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology (IRIAB) at Soka University in January of 2006. The saga began when my husband, John R. McRae, received a Japan Foundation grant for a project to be carried out in calendar year 2004. Naturally this required coming to Japan, something that I had not envisioned when I myself applied for funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) and the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) for 2004-2005. We were suddenly faced with the challenge of choosing where to spend our time in Japan. Though many attractive possibilities presented themselves, the stellar assembly of scholars at Soka University—including Institute director Prof. Hiroshi Kanno, Prof. Akira Yuyama, Prof. Seishi Karashima, Prof. Stefano Zacchetti, and Dr. (now Prof.) Noriyuki Kudo—proved to be a compelling draw. With the help of Prof. Kanno, who endorsed our request to spend 2004 (and part of 2005, in my case) as Visiting Scholars at the Institute, we were able to move to the Soka University Guest House, where we spent an extremely enjoyable and productive period devoting ourselves full-time to our respective research projects.

The stimulating intellectual atmosphere at the Institute, with daily conversations with one or more of the above-mentioned colleagues on various topics of mutual interest, was a remarkable experience. When our colleague Stefano Zacchetti accepted a position in his home country and returned to Italy in 2005—to the great regret of us all—I was curious to hear who (presumably a young western scholar) would join the IRIAB team in his place. To my astonishment, I received a telephone call in March of 2005 asking whether I might consider being a candidate myself. There was no question at all about my response; I immediately said yes, and after many months during which the proper bureaucratic requirements were met in both the U.S. and Japan, my husband and I moved to Tokyo in 2006.

Many are the people to whom any merit in this monograph owes a debt of gratitude, first and foremost the colleagues at the Institute mentioned above. (Though Prof. Akira Yuyama has since retired, he is greatly missed, and his towering intellectual legacy has made us much of what we are; though Prof. Stefano Zacchetti is now teaching on the opposite side of the globe, his lively presence and great enthusiasm for exploring all aspects of early Chinese translations are still felt in our midst.) One of many reasons for my decision to move to Japan to join the staff of the IRIAB was the high value placed on philological study here, and I am deeply grateful to the Institute members for having accepted this relentlessly philological monograph for publication in the series *Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica*.

At an early stage the materials treated here were greatly enhanced by the opportunity to discuss them with students in a seminar at Tokyo University. I am grateful to all of the participants for their insights, and especially to Prof. Masahiro Shimoda, whose invitation to teach a course in his department offered me a precious opportunity to improve my knowledge of Chinese Buddhist translations as well as to get to know a remarkably talented group of students.

Four people must receive special acknowledgement here, for without them this volume would be far poorer, and indeed I suspect it would not have been finished at all. First and foremost is my colleague Seishi Karashima, with whom I have enjoyed countless hours of stimulating intellectual discussions of every conceivable aspect of the study of early Chinese Buddhist translations. He has challenged me to refine my methodology in many ways, and he

has supplied me with timely information on countless recent publications. Virtually every day (except in the final highly-pressured weeks of the completion of this monograph) we have been able to exchange ideas on topics of all sorts over our respective *bento* boxes at noon. His panoramic knowledge and superb intellectual talents continue to be an ongoing inspiration. It is no exaggeration to say—as I have told him on more than one occasion—that a major motive for my move to Japan was in order to have lunch with him.

My predecessor Stefano Zacchetti has continued to be an important conversation partner and friend from his new post in Italy, sharing his insights on a myriad of sinological and indological topics (now via Skype rather than over the coffee which he so generously served us in his office at the Institute day after day). But not only that, he read and carefully critiqued several sections of an earlier draft of this monograph, sharing his extensive knowledge of recent publications in a variety of languages as well as his own unpublished work. This study has benefited in countless ways from his insights and expertise.

My longtime friend Paul Harrison (now at Stanford University), whose own work on early Chinese translations has been a major source of inspiration for this study, offered detailed comments on the sections on An Shigao and Lokakṣema, contributing his always insightful corrections and suggestions at what turned out to be a very busy time in his own schedule. I am extremely grateful for his input, which has eliminated several errors and oversights and has greatly improved the present work.

Last—but most certainly not least—my husband John has done far more than any author could hope for in helping to make this monograph a reality. He has read and scrutinized every line of the text, offering countless suggestions—both grammatical and buddhological—for improvement. He has also taken care of a myriad of practical details (including some excellent stir-fried tofu dinners) for which the looming publication deadline left me no time. I have also relied on him for help, in everything from deciphering obscure lines in publications from the 1930s to speed-reading newly discovered journal articles at the eleventh hour, to compensate for my still inadequate Japanese. No one could hope for a more generous, affectionate, and supportive partner. Words fail when I try to express my appreciation.

Other colleagues and friends have contributed comments on various topics, or have responded to last-minute queries, which have likewise eliminated various gaffes and glitches here and there. Stephen R. Bokenkamp generously shared his inimitable sinological expertise in reading a particularly difficult colophon, helping me to tease out the meaning of various turns of phrase that had previously eluded me. Special mention goes also to Peter Skilling and Robert F. Campany, who both sent comments on the Introduction, and whose broad knowledge of things indological and sinological, respectively, continues to be an ongoing source of respect. Our dear friend Betsy Napper, who had the bad fortune to be visiting us precisely when work on the monograph went into overtime, pitched in to help straighten out a numbering disaster in the first version of the index, and bore my round-the-clock typing with remarkable good grace. I am also happy to acknowledge the kindness of my colleague Noriyuki Kudo, who encouraged me throughout the publication process and helped with some particularly difficult technical issues.

The research presented here has been supported by several generous sponsors, including the National Endowment for the Humanities and the American Council of Learned Societies in the U.S. and the Open Research Centre Project 2004-2008 (“Research Centre for Buddhist Philology”) at the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University, sponsored by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Science and Technology in Japan. Their support was essential to the completion and publication of this work, and I am happy to express my gratitude here.

Finally, it is my great pleasure to acknowledge the ongoing contributions of the Institute’s extremely competent administrator, Ms. Yoko Kusaba, whose ability to keep so many things on track at once is admired by us all, and our library staff members, Mr. Kenzo Kawasaki and Ms. Hisako Hayashi, whose bright personalities and helpful spirits are legendary. Without all of them, none of this would have been possible.

Despite the help of these many supporters, colleagues, and friends, there are surely many shortcomings that remain. It goes without saying that these are the responsibility of the author alone.

Part I

Introduction

Early Chinese Translations: Problems and Prospects

From the mid-second century through the latter part of the third century C.E., dozens (quite possibly hundreds) of Indian Buddhist scriptures were translated into Chinese for the first time. Many of these works have been lost, and others were subsequently subjected to revision. But those few texts produced during the Eastern Han and Three Kingdoms periods that have come down to us relatively intact constitute a precious resource for the study of Buddhist literature. On the one hand, they show us how Buddhist scriptures were first presented to Chinese audiences; on the other, they preserve the earliest available recensions of many Indian texts that are otherwise known only in much later Chinese or Tibetan translations or, in a few cases, in even later Pāli or Sanskrit manuscripts.¹ In sum, they offer a window into the Buddhist heritage of both India and China at a pivotal period in its history.

As translations, these sources provide us with evidence, first and foremost, concerning Buddhist developments in India. Though surviving texts translated during this period are few—in this volume fewer than seventy texts will be counted as works that can be dated with assurance to this period—they include both non-Mahāyāna and Mahāyāna sūtras as well as *jātaka* tales, didactic verses, biographies of the Buddha, abhidharma texts, and scriptures on meditation. (A notable exception is the Vinaya, which was not translated into Chinese until the fifth century CE.) Many of these pioneering works were re-translated into Chinese, and in some cases also into Tibetan, in subsequent centuries, and the availability of multiple versions of a given text enables us to chart the course of evolution of its Indian antecedents over time. Others have no later counterparts, and such “sole exemplars”—provided their status as translations, and not Chinese compositions, can be verified—provide our only means of access to Indian literary works that would otherwise have disappeared without a trace.

¹ Until recently most of the surviving Sanskrit manuscripts of Buddhist texts were those preserved in Nepal, which generally date from the tenth century CE or later. Manuscripts in Pāli, which have been transmitted in recent centuries mainly in the tropical climates of Sri Lanka and Southeast Asia, are even more recent, dating for the most part from as late as the nineteenth century CE. Earlier manuscripts have been found at Gilgit (in modern Pakistan) and at various sites in the Tarim Basin (modern Xinjiang, PRC), but even these date from around the sixth c. CE and thus are several centuries later than the earliest Chinese translations. Until quite recently, with the discovery in Afghanistan of several groups of manuscripts (most of them quite fragmentary) written in the Gāndhārī language and Kharoṣṭhī script, and dating in some cases from as early as the first century CE, hardly any Indic-language sources were known that are contemporary with the translations that will concern us here. (The Gāndhārī *Dharmapada*, already published by John Brough in 1962, is an important exception.) On these recent finds see for example Salomon 1999, Salomon 2000 and subsequent volumes in the same series (on the British Library fragments), Salomon 2003 and Glass 2006 (on manuscripts in the Senior collection), Braarvig 2000 and subsequent volumes in the series (on the Schøyen collection), and Strauch 2007 (on the Bajaur manuscripts). Though no exact parallel to any of the Chinese translations dealt with here has yet been found, these newly discovered texts offer valuable evidence, both physical and linguistic, concerning the nature of the source-texts on which at least some of the Chinese scriptures produced during the second and third centuries were probably based.

These translations also tell us, however, a great deal about the Chinese side of the equation. As we shall see, some translators working during this period (notably Zhi Qian 支謙 and Kang Senghui 康僧會) were quite comfortable with using indigenous Chinese religious terminology to express Buddhist ideas—including terms such as the *hun* 魂 and *po* 魄 spirits, Mt. Tai 太山 (occasionally printed 泰山) as a destination for the dead, and virtues such as humaneness (*ren* 仁) and ritually correct behavior (*yi* 儀)—while others (e.g., An Shigao 安世高 and Lokakṣema 支婁迦讖) scrupulously avoided them. Some (above all Zhi Qian) favored a four-character style for prose passages while translating Indian poetry into five-, seven-, or even six-character verse, while others (again we may point to An Shigao and Lokakṣema) eschewed the use of verse altogether, translating Indian poetry simply as prose. Some (the foremost example being Lokakṣema) favored transcribing the sounds, rather than translating the meaning, of virtually all names and Buddhist technical terms, a policy that yielded such now-familiar expressions as *boluomi* 波羅蜜 for *pāramitā* and *Xuputi* 須菩提 for Subhūti, but also unwieldy terms like *dasa'ajie* 怛薩阿竭 for *tathāgata* and *ohējusheluo* 漚和拘舍羅 for *upāyakaṣālya*. Others (above all, Lokakṣema's contemporaries An Xuan 安玄 and Yan Fotiao 嚴佛調) did just the opposite, translating not only Buddhist terms—e.g., *pāramitā* as *duwuji* 度無極 and *nirvāṇa* as *miedu* 滅度—but also proper names, resulting in such curious renditions as *Wenwu* 聞物 “Things Heard” for Śrāvastī and *Jingshou* 敬首 “Respect-Head” for Mañjuśrī. Yet the earliest extant translations, those produced by An Shigao, followed a “middle path” between these extremes, generally using transcriptions of personal and place names but translating most Buddhist technical terms. Thus while it is undeniably the case that certain directions of development in Chinese Buddhist translation techniques can be traced over time, an examination of this relatively small body of archaic scriptures makes it quite clear that several distinct translation styles were already in use simultaneously during the first century of Chinese translation activity.

The importance of early Chinese translations for the history of Buddhism is obvious, but their value for the study of language itself is also increasingly being recognized. Chinese transcriptions of Indian terms, for example, can help to clarify the second- and third-century pronunciations of the Chinese characters used to record them, while conversely these same transcriptions (and in many cases, especially when they are erroneous, Chinese translations as well) can point to the identity of the specific Prakrit dialect that served as the basis for a translated text. As the result of a number of recent studies comparing Chinese Buddhist scriptures with their extant Indic-language counterparts, it has become increasingly clear that it was generally not from classical Sanskrit but rather from a variety of Prakrit (i.e., vernacular) languages, including but not limited to Gāndhārī, that the first Chinese Buddhist translations were produced.

Not only Indian Prakrits, but also the vernacular speech of China, can be discerned in the language of some of these texts. Some translators (notably Kang Senghui) used a highly literary mode of expression, but others (of whom Lokakṣema is the most prominent

example) incorporated a wide range of colloquial expressions into their work. While these must be approached carefully—it would be too simplistic to assume, for example, that Lokakṣema’s work is a direct reflection of the spoken language of second-century Luoyang 洛陽, where he is known to have worked—these texts offer a rich range of data for investigation, particularly in passages containing informal dialogues. Translations by Lokakṣema and others thus constitute our earliest source for vernacular Chinese, which otherwise only began to appear in written form several centuries later, in Chan 禪 texts composed during the eighth c. CE and after.

Related to the question of literary vs. vernacular style are patterns in the usage of ordinary (i.e., non-Buddhist) terms, including such fundamental building-blocks as pronouns, particles (*xuzi* 虛字, “empty words”), and the verbs used to introduce quotations. The third-person pronoun *jue* 厥, for example, does not occur in any genuine Eastern Han translation, but it appears frequently in the work of the Wu 吳-period translators Zhi Qian and Kang Senghui. This might seem to suggest that such differences can be plotted chronologically and/or geographically with relative ease, but other examples show that this is often not the case. The second-person pronoun *ru* 汝, for example, is used freely by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao, but never by An Shigao (who had worked in the same city of Luoyang less than forty years before). Even more striking is the distribution of the first-person pronoun *wu* 吾, which appears numerous times in the sole work produced by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao, but never in the significantly larger corpus of their contemporary (and fellow Luoyang resident) Lokakṣema.

Even this small handful of examples makes it clear that it is impossible to generalize about “the” translation style of, for example, Luoyang in the Eastern Han period. What we see instead is a number of distinctive translation policies, resulting in strikingly different repertoires of vocabulary and style being used in the same place at virtually the same time. In a few cases we will be able to sort these differences along a chronological or geographical continuum, but in general it is more useful to think in terms of literary lineages—that is, of lines of transmission of translation policies which led to the formation of a number of distinct “rhetorical communities.” In some cases—for example, with the sharp contrast in style between Lokakṣema and the translation team of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao—we will find quite different rhetorical communities co-existing side by side. In others we will find that elements of translation vocabulary and style could be transmitted across long distances at great speed, as in the case of Zhi Qian, who produced most or all of his work in the Wu kingdom (then the extreme southeast of the Chinese cultural sphere), but whose vocabulary and style—including even the extremely rare medium of six-character verse—was adopted only a short time later by Dharmarakṣa (Zhu Fahu 竺法護), who came from the distant northwestern city of Dunhuang 敦煌 and worked primarily there and in Chang’an 長安. One fruitful approach to this body of material, therefore, will be to chart various patterns of shared vocabulary and style, which can help us in turn to chart the transmission of translated scriptures, sometimes across great distances in time and space.

In sum, it is clear that early Chinese Buddhist translations constitute a rich resource for scholars in a number of fields, including not only Buddhist Studies but also Indology (in particular, the study of Prakrit languages) and Sinology (including the study of phonology, grammar, and vernacular speech). But to make proper use of this valuable material we need to be able to locate our sources, at least in a general way, in space and time. And it is here that we encounter the problem which served as the initial catalyst for this study: the fact that a substantial percentage of the attributions of scriptures to second- and early third-century translators in the *Taishō Shinsbū Daizōkyō* (and other widely used editions of the canon) are incorrect. To state the problem in the starkest possible terms: in the case of any given text said to have been produced during the Han or Three Kingdoms period, the odds are greater than 50% that the attribution will be false. How these erroneous assignments entered the canonical record will be discussed below, but what is essential to recognize at the outset is the fact that traditional translator attributions cannot simply be accepted at face value. On the contrary, the first task in working on any text said to have been produced during this period is to evaluate the reliability of its attribution.

A major goal of this study, therefore, will be to consider the methodological issues involved in assessing traditional translator attributions and, by applying these methods, to identify the relatively small number of texts which can be attributed with confidence to this period. A second, and closely related, objective is to make available the findings set forth in the growing body of recent studies by specialists working on Buddhist texts translated during the second and third centuries CE. Taking these studies as its point of departure, the present work is intended as a brief guide to those texts which, at the present state of our knowledge, can be accepted as having been produced during this formative period.

The Scope of the Present Work: From the Beginnings to 280 CE

The question of what constitutes an “early” translation will of course elicit different responses from different scholars. An attempt to differentiate the terminology of “old” (舊) vs. “new” (新) scriptures had already been made by Sengyou 僧祐 in the early sixth century, albeit with only limited success.² Better known is the threefold typology of

² Sengyou’s categories draw the line at around the beginning of the fifth century, with Kumārajīva’s terminology treated as belonging to the language of “new” scriptures. Sengyou seems not to have recognized, however, the extent to which Kumārajīva adopted vocabulary introduced in the second century by Lokakṣema. Thus the transcription 辟支佛 for *pratyekabuddha*, found in Kumārajīva’s work but also standard in Lokakṣema’s corpus, is treated as belonging to the terminology of “new” scriptures, while the translation of the same word as 獨覺 “solely awakened,” which is unattested in any extant Han-period translation but appears in a number of later works, is given as an example of terminology found in “old” scriptures (see T2145, 55.5a16). Sengyou also treats terms found in sources contemporary with one another as if they belonged to different periods; for example, he classifies the translation of *bodhisattva* as 開士 “opener, revealer” as “old” and the transcription 菩薩 as “new” (5a15), despite the fact that they were used simultaneously (in scriptures translated by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao

“ancient” (古), “old” (舊) and “new” (新) translations widely used by East Asian scholars, where these three categories refer to texts translated prior to the fifth century CE (古), those produced in the fifth through early seventh centuries (舊) with the works of Kumārajīva and Paramārtha as representative examples, and those produced during the Sui 隋 and Tang 唐 periods (新), in particular by Xuanzang 玄奘 and his successors.³ A fourth period, that of translations produced during the Song 宋 (mid-tenth to late thirteenth centuries), is added by SAKAINO Kōyō 境野黄洋 in his influential history of Chinese Buddhism (1935).

Many other periodizations of Chinese Buddhist history have also been proposed, though not all of them take the history of translation of their focus.⁴ An exception is that of Erik Zürcher, who distinguishes between “primitive” (mid-second century to c. 220 CE) and “archaic” (c. 220-390 CE) translations. Adopting part of the older threefold system, Zürcher classifies translations produced by Kumārajīva, Paramārtha and others as “early” while retaining the term “new” for translations produced in the mid-seventh century CE and after.⁵

None of the chronological categories listed above, however, corresponds precisely to the period that will concern us here. Instead, this study will be devoted to a subset of the translations termed “old” (舊) by Sengyou and “ancient” (古) by Sakaino and others. That is, our focus will be on texts produced from the beginning of Chinese Buddhist translation activity (mid-second century CE) through the conquest of the Wu 吳 kingdom by the Western Jin 西晉 (280 CE). Thus this study will include all authentic Eastern Han translations, as well as the works of Zhi Qian 支謙 (fl. 220-252) and Kang Senghui 康僧會 (fl. 247-280 CE). It excludes, however, the works of Dharmarakṣa (Zhu Fahu 竺法護), who is traditionally classified as belonging to the Western Jin (265-309 CE).

To draw the line at this point is admittedly somewhat arbitrary, especially since Dharmarakṣa’s translation career appears to overlap with that of Kang Senghui. Yet there are good reasons, both scholarly and practical, to do so. To begin with the latter, the sheer size of Dharmarakṣa’s translation output—totalling well over six hundred *Taishō* pages by even the most conservative current estimates⁶—makes the responsible treatment of his corpus a daunting task. A few texts by Dharmarakṣa have recently received significant

and by Lokakṣema, respectively) during the late second century CE. Sengyou’s list is thus important not as an accurate reflection of the dates at which these various terms were coined, but rather for the information it provides about how these terms were perceived—i.e., as archaic or contemporary—at the beginning of the sixth century CE.

³ See Ono 1966, pp. 7-9.

⁴ For a convenient list of some of the periodization systems used by Japanese scholars see Kanaoka 1978, pp. 2-4.

⁵ Zürcher 1980, p. 97.

⁶ For a list of the works attributed to Dharmarakṣa in Sengyou’s *Chu sanzang jiji* see Boucher 1996, pp. 259-291.

scholarly attention,⁷ but most of his corpus has not yet been systematically studied. It would therefore be premature, I believe, to include Dharmarakṣa's translations in a survey of this type.

It is also appropriate, however, to raise the question of which—if any—of Dharmarakṣa's works should be included in a discussion of translations produced prior to 280 CE. Dharmarakṣa's career is generally thought to span a period from c. 265–309 CE,⁸ but there are some significant difficulties with this chronology. While it is based on the dates given in the catalogue section of the *Chu sanzang ji ji*—usually considered a very reliable source—it is far from clear that all of these dates came from Sengyou's own hand. One group of dates, in particular, appears in only one small and closely-related group of editions of the canon, and the dates in this group have an unusually high “failure rate,” i.e., mentioning a month in a given year, or a year in a given era, that did not exist according to the Chinese calendar.⁹ It is surely significant that virtually all of the pre-280 dates are included in this group of late additions to the list.

Turning to the surviving colophons or prefaces to translations that are generally considered to be the work of Dharmarakṣa, we find a similar pattern. Only one of these notices contains a date prior to 280 CE, and it has long been recognized as anomalous: not only does it refer to the translator by the transcribed Indian name Tanmoluocha 曇摩羅察 (rather than the usual Zhu Fahu 竺法護), it also describes him as an “Indian bodhisattva,” rather than—as in Sengyou's biography of Zhu Fahu and elsewhere in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*—as a Yuezhi 月支 from Dunhuang.¹⁰ (In this connection it is important to note that in his catalogue Sengyou treats this Indian Dharmarakṣa as a different person, giving him an

⁷ See in particular Seishi Karashima's glossary to Dharmarakṣa's translation of the *Lotus Sūtra* (Karashima 1998) as well as his earlier study of the vocabulary of the same text (Karashima 1992), and the study and translation of the first three chapters of Dharmarakṣa's *Larger Perfection of Wisdom Scripture* (*Guang zan jing* 光讚經, T222) by Stefano Zacchetti (Zacchetti 2005). A study and translation of Dharmarakṣa's version of the *Rāṣṭrapāla-paripṛcchā* by Daniel Boucher is also expected to appear in the near future (Boucher forthcoming).

⁸ See most recently Boucher 2007, especially pp. 22–30.

⁹ This pattern was recognized some time ago by KAWANO Satoshi 河野訓, who noted that a significant number of the dates given for Dharmarakṣa's translations in Sengyou's catalogue appear only in the so-called “Three Editions” (the Song, Yuan, and Ming versions of the canon), which belong to a single redactional lineage (Kawano 1989). This group, which includes a high percentage of occurrences of dates that did not exist according to the Chinese calendar, thus seems particularly untrustworthy; for some examples see Palumbo 2003 and Boucher 2007.

¹⁰ For his biography see T2145, 55.97c19ff., and cf. the colophons and other notices to his translations which are also preserved in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* (for example 55.49b15, 50c27, and 63b14, in all of which he is called a “bodhisattva from Dunhuang” and is given the *ethnikon* Zhi 支 rather than Zhu 竺; 56c17, where he is referred to as the “Dunhuang Yuezhi bodhisattva”; and 57c20–21, where he is called the “Dunhuang bodhisattva (關土) Zhu Fahu.”

entry separate from that of the Yuezhi translator Zhu Fahu.)¹¹ Finally, the date given in this notice for the completion of the translation—the thirtieth day of the twelfth month of the second year of the Taishi 太始 era (= 266 CE)—is non-existent, for as Antonello Palumbo has recently pointed out, the twelfth month of that year had only twenty-nine days.¹²

Aside from this one problematic notice—which may be an outright forgery, as Palumbo has suggested, but in any case is so anomalous that it is difficult to accept the information it contains as referring to the Yuezhi translator Zhu Fahu—the earliest of the surviving colophons and prefaces documenting Dharmarakṣa's translation activity is a notice dated to 284 CE, which describes his translation of the *Yogācārabhūmi* (*Xiuxing daodi jing* 修行道地經, T606) at Dunhuang. In sum, if we focus on the information contained in the remaining prefaces and colophons, and if we eliminate the dates found in the catalogue section that are of dubious reliability (and which probably do not go back to Sengyou himself), a quite different picture emerges, suggesting that Dharmarakṣa's translation career may have begun in Dunhuang (rather than in Luoyang) some two decades later than is generally thought, i.e., around the year 284 CE.

Be that as it may—and detailed future studies on this topic would be very welcome—Dharmarakṣa's work will be excluded from this study for the practical reason mentioned above. This will still leave us, as we shall see, with a rich assortment of texts translated in an array of literary styles that can reliably be dated to this period. Taken together, these translations total somewhat under three hundred pages in the printed *Taishō* edition of the canon—a substantial amount of material, yet still manageable in size.

Translator Attributions: The Problem of Authenticity

Perhaps inevitably, given the nature of our sources, this study will be organized around the names of particular individuals who are said to have played a key role in the initial period of the translation of Buddhist scriptures into Chinese. The question of the identity of the translator(s) of a given text is not merely a modern preoccupation; at least since the time of Daoan 道安, whose pioneering scriptural catalogue, the *Zongli zhongjing mulu* 綜理眾經目錄, was completed in 374 CE, attempts have been made to associate canonical scriptures with the names of particular translators. Daoan's catalogue is no longer extant, but Sengyou absorbed its contents into his own *Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集, completed c. 515 CE (thus perhaps inadvertently contributing to its disappearance as an independent work). The catalogue section of the *Chu sanzang ji ji* is structured around the names of scriptural translators, who are listed in chronological order together with the titles of the

¹¹ See T2145, 55.9c9-11.

¹² This and other anomalies in this colophon have been ably examined in Palumbo 2003, pp. 186-194.

texts they are considered to have produced.

Though Sengyou used the names of specific translators as his fundamental organizing principle, it is clear that in his time texts credited to specific individuals were far outnumbered by those whose translators' names were unknown. Both Daoan and Sengyou reserved a special section for these "anonymous" scriptures (失譯經), with 142 such works listed already in Daoan's catalogue (as reproduced in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*)¹³ and an astounding 1,306 texts added by Sengyou himself.¹⁴ This is in addition to the 92 works classified by Daoan as "Old Scriptures" (古異經),¹⁵ the 59 classified by him as "Liang Scriptures" (涼土異經), and the 24 listed as texts circulating "Between the Passes" (關中異經, an area largely coterminous with modern Shaanxi 陝西), all of which lack any reference to a translator's name.¹⁶

The use of the character 失 (meaning "lost") might seem to suggest that the identity of these translators had once been known but was lost in the course of transmission, but it is more likely that they were never recorded at all. These texts were, after all, considered to be *buddhavacana* and not the work of ordinary authors, and to affix one's own name to such scriptures might well have been considered inappropriate by some. Be that as it may, it is clear that it was quite usual, in the early centuries of Chinese Buddhist history, for scriptures to circulate without any mention of the translator's name.¹⁷ Thus one of the great challenges that confronted Daoan and his successors was to attempt to put this mass of material, much of it of unknown provenance, into something resembling chronological order.

Given the lack of documentation concerning the origins of a substantial number of translations produced during this period, it is evident that texts that can be assigned with confidence to particular individuals from the Eastern Han and Three Kingdoms periods represent only the tip of the iceberg—a small fraction even of those early translations that have survived, let alone of the much larger body of translated scriptures that must once have circulated in China. They are extremely important as benchmarks, however, for we can use them in turn as a basis for estimating the date of other purportedly early

¹³ 55.16c7-18c2. Sengyou divides these titles into two groups: ninety-two texts that were still available in his time, and an additional fifty that he considered to be lost.

¹⁴ 55.21b17-37b17; of the total of 1,306 titles, Sengyou reports that 846 were still in circulation, while 460 had been lost by his time.

¹⁵ It is possible that Daoan's original title for this category was 古典經; see below, p. 66, n. 146.

¹⁶ For these three categories see 55.15b13-16c6, 18c3-19b8, and 19b9-c7, respectively.

¹⁷ In his biography of Daoan, Sengyou makes it clear that this was considered a real problem by his illustrious predecessor: "From the Han to the Jin [periods], a fairly substantial number of scriptures arrived [in China], but the names of the people who transmitted [these] scriptures were not recorded. Later people tried to find out [who had brought them], but it is not possible to determine their dates" (55.108a18-20: 又自漢暨晉。經來稍多。而傳經之人名字弗記。後人追尋莫測年代)。

works via a comparative analysis of their vocabulary and style. Though the texts classified as “anonymous” are of course the work of unknown translators, this does not mean that we are unable to say anything at all about the time and the place where they were likely produced. In Part IV of this study we will return to this topic, providing some specific methodological guidelines on how the works of these nameless translators might be used.

In sum, in attempting to establish the identity of the translator of any purportedly early text, it is essential to make use of both of the types of evidence that are available to us: (1) external evidence, including above all the testimony of the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, which as the earliest extant scriptural catalogue is an essential starting point; and (2) internal evidence, that is, the vocabulary and style of the text in question. The discussion in the following sections is intended to indicate some of the basic issues involved in using these two types of data to establish reliable translator attributions.

External evidence (1): The Testimony of Scriptural Catalogues

As mentioned above, in evaluating the authenticity of the assignment of works to particular translators, it is essential that we consider both external evidence, i.e., what is said about these texts in other sources, and the internal evidence supplied by their own vocabulary and style. By far the most abundant external evidence is contained in Chinese catalogues of translated scriptures, and in this section we will briefly examine several of these, focusing on those that appear to be the most reliable, in addition to others that are frequently cited by scholars.

Chu sanzang ji ji 出三藏記集 (T2145). The evaluation of any attribution of a Chinese text to a translator who lived prior to the sixth century CE must begin—though it certainly does not end—with the evidence contained in the oldest extant catalogue of Buddhist translations, the *Chu sanzang ji ji* compiled by Sengyou (completed c. 515 CE). As noted above, Sengyou incorporated the earlier catalogue compiled by Daoan into his work, and these two scholar-monks share a well-deserved reputation for high scholarly standards. Since Daoan’s catalogue is no longer extant, we have no direct access to its contents, but through their citations in Sengyou’s work we can get a relatively clear picture of how he worked. Not only did he tabulate the titles of translated scriptures and their traditional attributions, but he read the texts himself, making his own decisions about the likely authorship of some previously unattributed works.¹⁸

By Sengyou’s time, however, the number of translated texts had escalated dramatically, and it would have been a daunting task indeed to examine the contents of them all. Thus it is perhaps not surprising that we find evidence here and there that Sengyou was concerned primarily with cataloguing the titles of texts, and in so doing sometimes treated translations with similar titles but radically different contents as variants

¹⁸ For one such instance—Daoan’s list of texts which, while circulating without attribution, appeared to him to “resemble” the works of Lokakṣema—see below, p. 77.

of a single work.¹⁹ Conversely, this *modus operandi* may also explain why Sengyou sometimes failed to recognize variant titles assigned to a single scripture as referring to the same text.²⁰

Though Sengyou clearly considered Daoan's work to be the fundamental source for early translations, he also had access to other pre-existing catalogues, whose status has been the subject of much scholarly debate.²¹ Indeed, one of the features of the *Chu sanzang ji ji* that lends it an aura of scholarly accuracy is the fact that Sengyou is careful to mention where he used Daoan's work, where he also consulted other sources, and where he compiled the entries in question himself.²²

In addition to the catalogue entries *per se*, the *Chu sanzang ji ji* also contains two other major sections that are relevant to the discussion here: a collection of prefaces and colophons, which preserves some of the earliest evidence for translator attributions, and a section containing biographies of many of the translators, which can provide precious additional details.

Sengyou's catalogue is not all of the same vintage, however. As others have observed, the biographical section of the *Chu sanzang ji ji* was apparently composed, for the most part, under the southern Qi 齊 (with the year 503 CE as a *terminus ante quem*), while the catalogue and the section containing prefaces and colophons were revised during the Tianjian 天監 era of the Liang 梁 dynasty (most probably in 515 CE).²³ Other

¹⁹ See for example his entry in the "multiple translations" section for the *Wuliangshou jing* 無量壽經, where translations representing both the *Larger* and *Smaller Sukhāvativyūha* are classified as versions of the same text (55.14a22-24), or his entry for the *Banniehuan jing* 般泥洹經, where translations of the non-Mahāyāna and Mahāyāna scriptures by this title (which have very little in common other than their setting in the Buddha's final days) are again treated as variant editions of the same text (55.14a5-10). On this issue cf. Okabe 1980, p. 5.

²⁰ A good example is Sengyou's treatment of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, which seems to appear under two different titles—both as the *Fangdengbu gupin weiyue shuo banruo jing* 方等部古品遺日說般若經 (the character 日 following 品 in the Taishō edition is probably to be eliminated; cf. T350, *Weiyue moni bao jing* 遺日摩尼寶經) and again as the *Baoji jing* 寶積經—on his list of Lokakṣema's translations.

²¹ For the translators belonging to the period with which we are concerned, the only additional sources cited by Sengyou are referred to as the *Bielu* 別錄 "Separate Catalogue" and *Jiulu* 舊錄 "Old Catalogue." Much ink has been spilled on the nature of these catalogues (among other things, whether each of these names refers to a specific work or to a category of texts) and the dates when they were composed, and thus far there is no universal scholarly consensus on these issues. The most cogent recent discussion known to me is by TAN Shibao 譚世保 (1991, pp. 33-52), who points out (among other things) that Fei Changfang appropriates and claims to be citing entries from these titles in ways that totally diverge from Sengyou's citations, and thus (to paraphrase Tan's conclusions) that Fei appears to be simply manipulating these titles for his own purposes rather than quoting directly from the same sources used by Sengyou.

²² See his note at 55.10a4-8, in addition to the references specifying his sources that accompany the entries to individual scriptures.

²³ Some of the best discussions can be found in Naitō 1958 and Palumbo 2003, p. 197 and n. 87.

smaller-scale inconsistencies, such as discrepancies in the number of works attributed to a given translator within the catalogue section itself, suggest that the *Chu sanzang ji ji* was also subjected to revision after Sengyou's time.²⁴ While this does not undermine the value of the work as a whole, it does serve as an important reminder that even the information contained in this foundational text cannot simply be accepted at face value.

Be that as it may, a close examination of Sengyou's work makes it clear that—whatever changes may have been introduced into the text either late in his own career or after his time—he was an exacting scholar who treated his sources with great care. The fact that the earliest extant catalogue of translated scriptures was produced by such a figure is a great advantage, and it means that our examination of the authenticity of translator attributions will begin, in every case, with the testimony given in his work.

Gaoseng zhuan 高僧傳 (T2059). While not of course a catalogue in the strict sense, this compendium of monastic biographies compiled by Huijiao 慧皎 (c. 530 CE) has long been relied upon for information on the careers of Buddhist translators. Indeed, the opening chapter of this work is devoted to the lives of translator-monks, which shows the importance Huijiao placed upon the contributions of these figures.

In general the *Gaoseng zhuan* follows the information contained in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* quite closely, often replicating Sengyou's biographies word for word. In other cases, however, Huijiao adds a wealth of new information, which is clearly drawn from another source. Much remains to be done in determining the nature of these additional sources; while some appear credible, others are probably not, and some material may even have been interpolated into the *Gaoseng zhuan* well after Huijiao's time.

Zhongjing mulu 眾經目錄 (T2146). The immediate successor to the catalogue section of Sengyou's *Chu sanzang ji ji* is the *Zhongjing mulu*, compiled by Fajing 法經 et al. in 594 CE. In contrast to Sengyou's work, where translated scriptures are arranged in chronological order, in the *Zhongjing mulu* they are grouped according to type. Thus the first section contains scriptures classified as “Mahāyāna sūtras” (大乘修多羅, 55.115aff.), while the second consists of “Hīnayāna sūtras” (小乘修多羅, 127cff.). There follows a section entitled “Mahāyāna Vinaya” (大乘毘尼, 138aff.), which is succeeded in turn by texts classified as belonging to the “Hīnayāna Vinaya” (小乘毘尼, 140aff.), and so on. Even within these categories there is no attempt to arrange translations in their historical sequence; thus a collection of *jātakas* attributed to Dharmarakṣa (生經, T154) is followed by a treatise on the *skandhas*, *dhātus*, and *āyatanas* by An Shigao (陰持入經, T603); this in turn is followed by part of a biography of the Buddha attributed to the early third-century translator Kang Mengxiang (中本起經, T196). But after naming texts by several other later translators, the list again reverts to the name of An Shigao, subsequently tacking back and forth between earlier and later figures. The compilers did, however, reserve a

²⁴ One glaring example is the inconsistency, within the catalogue section itself, in the number of texts attributed to Lokakṣema; on this see below, p. 76.

separate category within each section for texts whose translators' names were unknown.

Like the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, the *Zhongjing mulu* gives the impression of being the product of a careful and critical group of scholars. In those cases where Fajing and his colleagues refer to materials not found in Sengyou's catalogue, these additional notes deserve careful consideration.

Lidai sanbao ji 歷代三寶紀 (T2034). The next catalogue to be produced, compiled by Fei Changfang 費長房 in 597 CE (only three years after the catalogue produced by Fajing and his colleagues), presents a striking divergence from the works discussed above. Its most noteworthy feature is the radical amplification in the number of texts attributed to many early translators. Under Fei's brush An Shigao's corpus was increased from the thirty-four works attributed to him by Sengyou to 176 (T2034, 49.52b23), Zhi Qian's from thirty-six to 129 (58c14-15), and Dharmarakṣa's from sixty-four to 210 (64c14-15). Even figures to whom Sengyou credited no translations at all are now assigned an impressive number of texts; Nie Daozhen 聶道真, for example, who is known to Sengyou only as Dharmarakṣa's scribal assistant, is now credited with fifty-four translations of his own (66a22).

Fei's work has, at first glance, an aura of credibility, for he cites a wide range of catalogues to support the attributions he puts forth. A closer look, however, reveals that many of these supposed catalogues are otherwise unknown. And even on the surface, it seems highly improbable that, several centuries after the fact, he alone would suddenly have been able to discover hundreds of attributions that were unknown to previous cataloguers.²⁵

If we also bring internal evidence to bear on the problem—something that has rarely been done in previous studies—it becomes clear that, whatever their sources, the new attributions given in the *Lidai sanbao ji* are overwhelmingly false, for they frequently

²⁵ Doubt was cast on Fei's credibility long ago, when it was first pointed out that large numbers of texts listed as anonymous in earlier catalogues were suddenly attributed to specific individuals in Fei's work (see Hayashiya 1941, pp. 82-84 and 300-302, and cf. Tokuno 1990, especially pp. 43-47; for an extensive critical discussion of Fei's catalogue and its alleged sources see Tan 1991). Others, such as TOKIWA Daijō, have been more generous toward Fei, arguing that his references to catalogues lost before his time were not fictional, but were drawn from citations preserved in later catalogues (themselves since lost) that were still circulating in his time, notably that of Baochang (e.g., Tokiwa 1938, pp. 69-71). A mixed assessment of the situation has proposed by Antonello Palumbo, who has suggested that Fei unwittingly relied on certain catalogues that were forged (Palumbo 2003, p. 180, n. 31). One may still be permitted to remain suspicious, however, since so many of these catalogues never seem to have been seen by anyone but Fei himself. As Tokuno points out, given the fact that Fei had been closely involved with state-sponsored translation activities and may even have participated in the compilation of the *Zhongjing mulu*, "it is rather unrealistic to think that Fei possessed sources to which his fellow cataloguers lacked access, or that he never shared his findings with his colleagues" (1990, p. 45). Other features of Fei's catalogue that detract from its credibility are summarized succinctly by Tokuno as well (*op. cit.*, pp. 44-46). For an extensive critical discussion of the many problems with Fei's citations see Tan 1991, pp. 3-246.

credit works to early translators that contain terminological and stylistic features that came into use only long after their time.²⁶ Thus for the period with which we are concerned, any new attribution that first appears in Fei's catalogue should be considered false unless there is substantial evidence to support it.

Subsequent catalogues. In traditional Chinese scholarship it was standard practice to copy, with or without attribution, the work of one's eminent predecessors, and this is precisely what we find in catalogues produced after Sengyou's time. As noted above, Huijiao's *Gaoseng zhuan* often reproduces the biographical entries given in the *Chu sanzang jiji* word for word; likewise catalogues produced in the Sui period and after often replicate the entries given by Sengyou, Fajing, and others.

In light of this tradition it is particularly noteworthy that many catalogues composed after Fei Changfang's *Lidai sanbao ji* do not adopt his newly proposed attributions. On the contrary, subsequent cataloguers seem to have hesitated to accept his sweeping amplifications of Sengyou's work; instead, they continue to adhere rather closely to the attributions given by Fei's predecessors. Thus in the *Zhongjing mulu* 眾經目錄 (T2147) compiled by Yancong 彥琮 (var. - 憬) c. 610 CE, and in the identically titled *Zhongjing mulu* (T2148) compiled by Jingtai 靜泰 (c. 663 CE), Fei's new attributions have not yet made their mark.

It is in the *Da Tang neidian lu* 大唐內典錄 (T2149), compiled by Daoxuan 道宣 in 664 CE, that the impact of Fei's sweeping reassignments can first be seen. While Daoxuan did not accept all of Fei's new attributions, more than half of them are adopted here, resulting in significant changes in the picture of early Chinese translation history. Subsequent cataloguers again seem to have been reluctant, at least at first, to follow Daoxuan's lead in this regard; thus in the *Gujin yijing tuji* 古今譯經圖紀 (T2151) compiled by Jingmai 靖邁 at virtually the same time (664-665 CE), and in the *Da Zhou kanding zhongjing mulu* 大周刊定眾經目錄 (T2153) compiled by Mingquan 明佺 et al. in 695 CE, few if any of Fei's new attributions appear. In the widely respected *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄 (T2154) compiled by Zhisheng 智昇 in 730 CE, however, the majority of the new entries first adopted from Fei's catalogue by Daoxuan reappear. From this time on they became authoritative in Chinese Buddhist bibliographies, and on this basis they are reproduced in modern printings of the canon, including the widely used Taishō edition.

²⁶ Examples of self-evidently impossible attributions can easily be found among the works newly assigned to An Shigao by Fei Changfang. An Shigao is suddenly credited, for example, with texts filled with vocabulary that he does not use (e.g., 摩訶比丘僧 for *mahābhikṣusamgha*, the expression 仁者 as a form of direct address, and the phrase 八方上下 to refer to the ten directions, all of which occur in T621, 佛印三昧經), texts containing five-character verse (e.g., T525, 長者子懊惱三處經), whereas no verse passages of any kind appear in genuine An Shigao translations, and even texts that begin with the phrase *rusbi wo wen* 如是我聞, which did not come into use until the end of the fourth century CE (e.g., T553, 奈女祇域因緣經). Whatever Fei's sources may have been, it is easy to see that his results are fundamentally flawed.

It is through this lineage, in short, that hundreds of unreliable attributions have entered the mainstream of modern scholarly work, where they are regularly cited by scholars. On this shaky foundation many improbable theories concerning texts supposedly translated in the second and third centuries have been constructed. It is one of the main objectives of this study to provide information that will help to avoid such unfortunate outcomes in the future.

External evidence (2): Prefaces, Colophons, and Biographies

Scholarly accounts of the work of translators active in the period with which we are concerned frequently take the biographies collected in the *Gaoseng zhuan* as their starting point. This is, of course, a venerable and important work, but from the perspective of the chronological sequence of the available sources this is a rather odd place to begin. As noted above, Huijiao frequently copied the earlier biographical accounts compiled by Sengyou word-for-word. Where he did not, it should be assumed (pending confirmation from other sources) that he was working from later material, or that he composed these additional parts himself.²⁷

Even earlier than Sengyou's biographical collection, however, are many of the prefaces, colophons, and other miscellaneous notices to individual scriptures that contain important information concerning their translation. Indeed, it is evident that Sengyou drew upon these materials in compiling his biographies, for in many instances he repeats the information they contain, sometimes word-for-word. As Palumbo has observed, it makes far better sense to begin with these scriptural notices rather than with the biographies composed by Sengyou and Huijiao.²⁸ Indeed, a comparative analysis of these scriptural notices, on the one hand, and the biographies found in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* and the *Gaoseng zhuan*, on the other, makes it clear that the biographies sometimes paper over difficult passages, regularizing the wording and, in the process, sometimes altering the content of these earlier voices.²⁹ Indeed, if one reads the biographical accounts first, the

²⁷ A good example of such an addition is the biography of She Moteng 攝摩騰 (the supposed "Kāśyapa Mātāṅga," to whom the *Scripture in Forty-two Sections* is credited; see T2059, 49.322c15ff). No such biography is recorded by Sengyou, but the *Chu sanzang ji ji* does contain a preface—widely recognized to be a forgery—containing some of the wording found in Huijiao's account (T2145, 55.42c18ff). An important project—which, to the best of my knowledge has not yet been undertaken—would be a careful comparative and analytical study of the parts of Sengyou's work that were eliminated by Huijiao, and conversely, the portions that he added (whether on the basis of other sources available to him or as his own composition) to Sengyou's work. An important first step in this direction can be found in two articles by SATOMICHI NORIO 里道德雄 (1986a and b), where agreements and divergences between the *Chu sanzang ji ji* and the *Gaoseng zhuan* are tabulated. (I would like to thank Prof. FUNAYAMA Toru 船山徹 for bringing these articles to my attention.) There is still room, however, for an in-depth analysis of the types of materials added to (and subtracted from) Sengyou's work by Huijiao.

²⁸ Palumbo 2003, p. 186.

²⁹ A good example is the treatment by Sengyou (and subsequently by Huijiao) of the material contained in an early colophon to the *Banzhou sanmei jing* (T2145, 55.48c9-16), which appears in

problems in the scriptural notices can become harder to see.

Valuable as they are, these scriptural notices—ranging in style from elegant prefaces composed by authors such as Daoan to anonymous notes (記) recording a smattering of details concerning a given text—offer many problems of their own. Some of the texts appear to be corrupt; in at least one case Palumbo has suggested that we may have to do with an outright forgery.³⁰ Once again, in sum, we cannot simply take our sources at face value, but must first evaluate their legitimacy before constructing any hypotheses based on the information they contain.

Internal Evidence: Vocabulary and Style

It has long been recognized that Chinese Buddhist translations do not, as a whole, conform closely to the standards of classical Chinese style. Some of the differences, to be sure, are merely a matter of vocabulary, with transcribed Indian terms introducing a flavor quite different from that of native Chinese histories, philosophical essays, or poetry. Other differences, however, are of a more fundamental nature, involving matters of grammar, sentence structure, and a decidedly non-literary style. In recent years it has increasingly been recognized that many peculiar features of some (but not all) of the Buddhist translations produced during the Eastern Han and Three Kingdoms periods are due to their incorporation of elements of the vernacular speech of the time.³¹

Vernacular elements can be discerned in the work of a variety of translators, but in the period with which we are concerned the prime example of a translator who cast his work in a vernacular mode is Lokakṣema. Of the numerous examples of vernacular usages in Chinese Buddhist translations discussed in a classic study by Erik Zürcher (1977), the majority are drawn from Lokakṣema's works.

Other translators, however, produced scriptures formulated in a much more literary mode; a prime example, among translators active in the second and third centuries, is Kang Senghui.³² Here we find an elegant cadence based on four-character prosody, with wording more sophisticated than most of what we find in other translations of the time. In sum, Kang Senghui could be said to represent the other end of the vernacular-vs.-literary spectrum.

At first glance it would seem evident that texts framed in vernacular speech should be designed to reach the mass of ordinary citizens, while those framed in an elegant

an apparently simplified and regularized form in both Sengyou's biography section (96a1-6) and in Huijiao's *Gaoseng zhuan* (T2059, 324b21-25).

³⁰ Palumbo 2003, p. 191.

³¹ See for example Karashima 1996, Mizutani 1961, Morino 1983, Zhu 1992, and Zürcher 1977 and 1996. For an overview of the Buddhist contribution to Chinese vernacular literature see Mair 1994.

³² Other examples are Kang Mengxiang 康孟詳 and Zhi Yao 支曜, but (as discussed below) there are interesting problems in determining whether any of the received texts of the works attributed

GUIDE TO EARLY CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

classical style should be intended to reach an educated elite. In the case of Buddhist translations, however, matters are not so simple. For in the vernacular-oriented translations of Lokakṣema we also find extremely difficult multisyllabic transcriptions which would be anything but comprehensible to an ordinary Chinese reader (or listener) of the time. In Kang Senghui's elegant compendium of stories, the *Liudu ji jing*, on the other hand, we find relatively few transcribed terms; most of these are proper names, and they have generally been domesticated to conform with the standard maximum of three characters for a Chinese name (including both surname and given name). What we see, in other words, is an "exoticizing" tendency (retaining transcriptions of complicated foreign words) coexisting with a "vernacularizing" trend in one group of translations, while in another group we find an "indigenizing" tendency (translating most foreign words and abbreviating transcribed names to conform to Chinese standards) used in conjunction with elegant literary prose.

Such combinations only make sense if we imagine two quite different audiences to which early Chinese Buddhist translations were addressed: on the one hand, an audience of Chinese literati, who would have expected a fine classical style and would have found long foreign terms inelegant and coarse; and on the other, an audience of immigrants of various nationalities, able to use a modicum of spoken Chinese though lacking a Chinese literary education, but (given their cosmopolitan background) with a higher tolerance for foreign terms, even if the language on which the transcriptions were based—in virtually all cases an Indian Prakrit—was not their own.

Thus transcriptions (generally perceived by native Chinese speakers as "difficult words") coexisted with a style of writing that would have been considered "easy" (i.e., an early written version of vernacular Chinese), while "easy words" (Chinese translations of Buddhist technical terms and transcriptions domesticated to conform to Chinese standards) are generally found in texts cast in a sophisticated and elegant style. The fact that we do not find early translations that combine vernacular speech with domesticated vocabulary may well be evidence that one audience was not yet being drawn to Buddhism at this time: the masses of uneducated, and monolingual, Chinese.

Related to the issue of literary vs. vernacular style is the presence or absence of verses, for in the most vernacular scriptures (those of Lokakṣema and, to a lesser extent, those of An Shigao) there are no passages in verse at all, while in the more elegant literary productions of translators like Zhi Qian, Kang Senghui, and Kang Mengxiang, we encounter verses in a variety of styles. Four-character prosody, a mark of literary rather than vernacular usage, is also absent from the works of Lokakṣema and An Shigao, while translators whose style is more classical (including the three mentioned above) make ample use of it.

As to the terminology found in early Chinese Buddhist translations, most studies published to date have (quite reasonably) focused on Buddhist names and technical terms. But in an important new development in recent years scholars have begun to take note of

terminology that is not specifically Buddhist, including such features as pronouns, particles, and the structure of interrogative sentences.³³ Such studies are now beginning to make it possible to discern relationships among certain sub-groups of translations, which future studies may be able to associate with specific geographical and/or social milieux.³⁴

Aspects of the translation process (1): the so-called translator

The fact that traditional Buddhist scriptural catalogues attribute the majority of the titles they record to a single translator—figures such as Zhi Qian, Dharmarakṣa, Kumārajīva, and so on—creates a deceptive aura of simplicity. It might seem that we can assume, once we have compiled a list of scriptures that can be considered authentic works by these figures, that we will then have a relatively homogeneous group of texts produced by each individual. But just as the “great man” approach to historical writing has come under well-deserved fire in recent decades for obscuring a myriad of other contributing factors, so the habit of thinking of translations as produced by a handful of discrete individuals can obscure important aspects of the translation process. While it is undeniable that a few dedicated individual translators did make enormous contributions to the formation of the Chinese Buddhist canon, it is worth pausing to consider other parts of the picture as well.

First, it is clear that in some instances the person to whom a given scripture is credited in medieval catalogues is not the actual translator at all. I refer here not to the kinds of late and dubious attributions discussed above, but to another less insidious (but no less misleading) practice: the custom of giving primary weight to the identity of the foreigner who brought the scripture in question to China.³⁵ This was not merely a matter of an exotic flourish, for the problem of identifying and eliminating imposters (i.e., so-called “apocryphal scriptures” composed in China) required that, if at all possible, the fact that a given scripture was actually translated, and not composed in China, should be documented. (This appears to have been one of the factors, though by no means the only one, that motivated Fei Changfang in his wholesale introduction of hundreds of new translator assignments.)³⁶ If the identity of the foreigner who had brought the text to China was also known, this made the case for authenticity even stronger. What this means, for our purposes, is that in many cases a scripture is credited not to the actual translator, but to the foreign participant in the translation process, even if that person’s only role (albeit an important one) was to provide a written text and/or to recite the scripture aloud. In some

to them actually date from this period.

³³ Important contributions on these topics have been made by a number of scholars; for representative examples see Matsue 2005 and 2006.

³⁴ For a discussion of some ways of identifying such groupings see “Lineages of Translation: Tracing ‘Rhetorical Communities’ in Part IV below.

³⁵ For an apt summary of the situation see Forte 1984, p. 316.

cases we are fortunate to have early prefaces or other notices that record the specific tasks carried out by various participants. Had these records not survived, however, we would have falsely concluded that certain scriptures were translated by foreigners whose Chinese was actually far from adequate to the task.

Second, it is by now well established that the translation of Buddhist scriptures into Chinese was often—though by no means always—a group effort. As we shall see, there are some cases where certain translators appear to have worked alone, but in many other instances translations were produced by a committee composed of members with varying degrees of expertise at the Indian and Chinese ends of the linguistic spectrum. The shifting composition of such committees can surely account, in at least some subset of these cases, for the apparent terminological and stylistic variety in works listed in our sources as having been produced by the same translator.³⁷

A final factor immediately becomes evident if we recall the Buddhist notion of *anātman*—that is, the fact that positing a single unchanging entity known as “the translator” will fail to account even for a single individual’s adjustments in vocabulary and style over time. In the case of Zhi Qian, in particular, we will find that there is evidence for changes in his own stylistic preferences over the course of his long translation career.

Aspects of the translation process (2): the so-called text³⁸

As translations, the texts with which we are concerned are based on literary sources produced outside China, sources that were foreign to their East Asian recipients in a number of ways. They were foreign linguistically, of course, since they were composed in a non-Chinese language (or rather languages, as we will see below) whose Indo-European grammar and phonological repertoire were radically different from that of Chinese. They were also foreign religiously; countless studies (which I will not attempt to enumerate here) have examined the gap between Chinese and Indian understandings of everything from the nature of ultimate reality to the virtues to be cultivated in everyday life. But these incoming scriptures were also foreign in cultural terms; such elements as social hierarchy, customs concerning marriage and the family, and even the varieties of food and drink all differed from those known in China. Such areas of disjunction could be multiplied at great length, but I will confine myself to mentioning only one additional example: the vast difference in literary conventions. This is not merely a matter of language and style, but also of genre; there was no such thing as a “jātaka tale” in China before the arrival of Buddhism, for example, nor did the structure of Buddhist sūtras

³⁶ For an insightful reflection on Fei’s possible motives see Tokuno 1990, pp. 46–47.

³⁷ On this issue in the case of Dharmarakṣa see Boucher 1996, pp. 198–214; 1998, pp. 485–488; and 2006, pp. 30–32. As Zacchetti aptly puts it, “there have been in fact almost as many Dharmarakṣas as there have been texts translated under this name” (Zacchetti 2005, p. 13).

(beginning with the well-known phrase “thus have I heard” and frequently ending with the positive reaction of the audience) approximate any pre-existing Chinese literary form. The task of domesticating such alien artifacts—and indeed, of making numerous decisions as to the extent to which they *should* be domesticated—posed enormous challenges, to which the translators discussed below offered a wide variety of responses.

A full discussion of the nature of the circumstances that confronted this first cohort of translators, and the fortunes of their work after it left their hands, lies beyond the range of the present study. We may nonetheless pause here briefly, however, to consider a few of the factors that are necessary to placing early Chinese Buddhist translations—and the sometimes quite different versions of them that have come down to us today—in their proper context.

Indian source-languages. Several decades ago it was common to assume that Buddhist scriptures were translated into Chinese from Sanskrit originals. On this basis, Chinese transcriptions of Indian names and terms were often declared to be defective, and when Chinese scriptures were compared with their few surviving Sanskrit counterparts, the translators were often criticized for “abbreviating” their Indian texts as well. In sum, when a Sanskrit version of a given scripture was compared with its Chinese translation, the latter was often considered to fall well short of the mark.

This attitude did not originate with nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholars, for it can be seen already in the work of medieval Chinese scholars themselves. Lexicographers such as Huilin 慧琳 (737-820 CE) and Xuanying 玄應 (fl. 645-656 CE) frequently criticized early transcriptions for failing to provide a good match to the corresponding Sanskrit sounds,³⁹ while others, such as Daoan, faulted certain translators for abbreviating their Indian texts.⁴⁰ In short, the idea that some Chinese translations represented their source-texts quite imperfectly was widely circulated already in medieval China, as well as in more recent times in Asia and the West.

There are, of course, countless instances of clearly erroneous translations, and there are also cases where certain translators did condense the content of the Indian texts (though often, as we shall see, this was done not on the basis of the Indic-language text itself, but using an earlier translation already produced in China). But these facts should not be allowed to color our picture of the situation as a whole. First, it is vital to recognize that in the period with which we are concerned, classical Sanskrit had not yet become the dominant vehicle for Buddhist literary expression in India. On the contrary, Buddhist scriptures were circulating in a variety of local languages known as “Prakrits,” of which

³⁸ Some of the topics discussed in this section are treated more fully, and with additional references to secondary literature, in Nattier 2003a, especially pp. 10-16, 36-47, and 49-63.

³⁹ Countless examples can be found in the *Yiqiejing yin yi* 一切經音義 (T2128); a representative example is Huilin’s criticism of the transcription of Māra’s epithet *pāpīyān* as *boxun* 波旬 as mistaken (54.369a10ff.).

Gāndhārī is the best known (but by no means the only) example.⁴¹

What this means, for our purposes, is that the sources used by the translators discussed here were very different from those represented by most of those available in surviving Indic-language manuscripts today.⁴² Studies published to date indicate that Buddhist scriptures arriving in China in the early centuries of the Common Era were composed not just in one Indian dialect but in several, and the fact that most Prakrit languages had lost some of the phonological diversity of Sanskrit—that is, that sounds that were clearly distinguished in Sanskrit had become homophones in certain Prakrits—meant that the possibilities for ambiguity, or even outright misunderstanding, were rife.⁴³

In sum, the information available to us at present suggests that, barring strong evidence of another kind, we should assume that any text translated in the second or third century CE was *not* based on Sanskrit, but rather on one or another of the many Prakrit vernaculars. A close study of individual translations can often reveal clues as to the specific Prakrit languages of their source-texts, though here too caution is in order, for there are other factors that must be taken into consideration as well (see below under “Intertextuality”).

Oral and written texts. In a writing-oriented culture such as China, where the ability to express oneself in an elegant and literary style was considered one of the marks of a cultivated gentleman, one of the most foreign aspects of Indian Buddhist scriptures was their origin as oral texts. The fact that some Buddhist texts did come to be recorded in writing, and were transmitted in this form to China, should not obscure the fact that to write down a sacred text represented a monumental cultural shift in the Indian context, where the normal mode of transmission of such texts was oral, passed from teacher to

⁴⁰ See T2145, 55.52c13ff.

⁴¹ The term Prakrit (in Sanskrit, *prakṛta*) means “natural, unrefined,” which in the context of languages refers to a vernacular language, in contrast to an elegant Sanskrit (*saṃskṛta* “composed”) style. Though Sanskrit is generally said to be older than the various Prakrit (= “Middle Indic”) languages, it did not come into vogue as a medium for Buddhist textual composition until several centuries later. Thus the oldest Buddhist scriptures, both written and oral, were codified in various Prakrits, while the latest Buddhist scriptures were composed in classical Sanskrit.

An intermediate stage is seen in scriptures composed in what was labeled by the great Sanskritist Franklin Edgerton as “Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit” (BHS), which we might paraphrase as texts composed in incompletely Sanskritized Prakrit. Edgerton’s original discussion (which has been the topic of some controversy; see for example Brough 1954) can be found in the introduction to his *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar* (1953). For an updated treatment of the topic see von Hinüber 1989. At various stages Chinese scriptures were translated from all three of these types of languages—Prakrit vernaculars, various types of BHS, and classical Sanskrit. There is still no evidence, as of this writing, that any Chinese Buddhist scripture was translated from a text written in a Central Asian language; for a by now somewhat dated discussion of the languages used for the transmission of Buddhist scriptures in Central Asia see Nattier 1990.

⁴² The closest analogues are the Gāndhārī manuscripts in the Kharoṣṭhī script (dating from the first century CE and after) currently being studied by Richard Salomon and his team at the University of Washington. For references cf. above, n. 1.

disciple. The Buddhists were, apparently, the first religious group to make this move; what little information we have suggests that this happened for the first time toward the end of the first century BCE in Sri Lanka; in the far northwest (modern Pakistan and Afghanistan), evidence from new manuscript finds shows that this was already an established practice there by the first century CE.⁴³ That these two regions—both on the fringes of the brahmanical culture of the Indian heartland—appear to have been the first to adopt this practice is probably significant, for to record sacred texts in writing would have been anathema to the Vedic tradition, not only because the power of the texts was considered to reside in their sound, but also because writing was considered unclean.⁴⁵

Many of the features of Indian Buddhist scriptures that would have seemed foreign to Chinese audiences stem from their background as oral texts, including the opening phrase “Thus have I heard” (which, rather than evoking the authority of a master-to-disciple lineage of transmission as in India, might well have sounded in Chinese rather like “The following is hearsay”), their seemingly gratuitous repetition of points already stated before, and the use of verse not as a freestanding literary device, but as a way to repeat material that had already been stated in prose. In sum, the Buddhist texts arriving in China from India were far from meeting Chinese literary expectations.

The myth of the “original.” By convention, the scriptures contained in the Buddhist Tripiṭaka (or at the least, those in the Sūtra and Vinaya sections, for there were differences of opinion in India concerning the Abhidharma portion of the canon) are said to be the word of the Buddha (*buddhavacana*), engraved on the memories of his disciples and subsequently passed down orally from generation to generation. Even in the oldest extant canonical collection, however—that of the ordination lineage now known as the Theravāda, which preserved its scriptures in the Pāli language—there are exceptions to this rule, with a number of discourses preached not by the Buddha, but by other members of his community. A look through the sūtra (Pāli *sutta*) section of the canon also shows that many pieces of one “sūtra” (that is, what is labeled as one discrete discourse) re-appear in one or more others. Modern translators of these scriptures have sometimes chosen to eliminate these duplications; thus one suddenly finds, near the beginning of §6 of Bhikkhu Bodhi’s translation of the *Cūḷadukkhakkhandha Sutta* (“The Shorter Discourse on the Mass of Suffering,” sutta no. 14 in the Pāli *Majjhima-nikāya*) the line “. . . as Sutta 13, §§7-15 . . .” (Bodhi 1995, p. 187). This elision of duplicated passages is not by any means his innovation, however, for the same practice appears in many volumes published decades earlier by the Pali Text Society, not only in their English translations but also in their editions of the Pāli texts themselves. These editors and translators could, for that matter, appeal to a prototype in the Pāli tradition itself, for one often finds the term *peyyāla*,

⁴³ For some representative examples see Karashima 1993 and Boucher 1998.

⁴⁴ See Nattier 2003a, p. 59, n. 11.

meaning “[to be completed according to the] formula,” in Pāli texts.⁴⁶

Such duplications point to a certain fluidity in the Buddhist recitation tradition in India, in which—unlike the brahmanical tradition, where exact memorization and perfect pronunciation of the Vedic hymns were considered essential to ritual efficacy—the emphasis (to generalize very broadly) was on transmitting the meaning, and not the form, of the Buddha’s words. This allowed, and even invited, the kind of linguistic variety discussed above, with scriptures being transmitted in a variety of local languages. But it also means that it is difficult to point to “the” original version of an Indian Buddhist text. If by “the original” we mean the discourse as pronounced by the Buddha, in the language of the region of Magadha in around the fifth century BCE, this original has been forever lost. What we have instead, when versions of these discourses have been preserved in writing, are a variety of snapshots (as it were) taken of the text, in one or more Buddhist languages, at various stages in the course of its development.

It is also important not to assume that such development was linear; on the contrary, the available evidence suggests a model more like that of a family tree, of which photographs of only a few members, belonging to different generations and to different branches of the family, have been preserved. What this implies for our topic here is that each text preserved in Chinese translation records an attempt to represent one such “photograph,” but at a great literary and cultural remove and in a completely alien language.

Intertextuality. Thus far we have dealt with various factors that governed the creation and transmission of Buddhist scriptures in India, as well as their subsequent translation into Chinese. But there are still other factors that were operative in the Chinese cultural sphere alone. All of these have to do with the impact of originally separate texts upon one another, which we may describe as instances of “intertextuality.”

Above we have noted that it is often possible to discern the language of the underlying Indian source-text by careful attention to the transcriptions (and in some cases, also the translations) found in a given Chinese translation. But an additional factor complicates this picture, for it was a common practice for Chinese translators to adopt terms that were already in circulation (whether translated or transcribed) to render expressions found in newly-arrived scriptures, regardless of the language in which the latter were cast. Thus the fact that we find the transcription *Shelifu* 舍利弗 for Śāriputra—first introduced by An Shigao—in a wide range of Chinese translations (including some produced during the period with which we are concerned) does not necessarily tell us anything at all about the language in which these texts were received in China. On the contrary, it simply suggests that translators were drawing upon a previously established lexicon in preparing their own renditions. When the same name appears in the rarely-used form *Sheliyue* 舍利曰, however—a form which appears to be based on Gāndhāri, where

⁴⁶ See Nattier 2003a, 58-59 and n. 11.

the intervocalic *pu* would be expected to change to *vu* in some cases—we may infer that these texts are likely to have been based on Gāndhārī originals.⁴⁷

A larger-scale instance of intertextual relations occurs when it can be shown that one Chinese translation is directly dependent upon another. The case of Kumārajīva and his translation team consulting Dharmarakṣa's earlier translation of a version of the *Lotus Sūtra* is well documented;⁴⁸ likewise it can easily be shown that the same translation team, when preparing their own version of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, made ample use of Zhi Qian's earlier translation of another recension of the same text.⁴⁹

Finally, yet another version of intertextual relations can be seen in cases where Chinese translators (or subsequent editors), confronted with a more expanded version of a given scripture, considered their existing edition to be defective and supplemented it with material drawn from another manuscript. Such is the case, for example, with Zhi Qian's rendition of the *Dharmapada* (where he added thirteen chapters drawn from another source to a text originally translated by the Indian monk Jiangyan 將炎); it is also the case with Kumārajīva's *Lotus Sūtra*, to which the section dealing with Devadatta (apparently missing from the Indian version on which he based his original translation) was added by editors at a later time.

Scripture as artifact. Finally, it is essential to bear in mind that a text is not merely its content; it is also an artifact, whether oral or written in form. Thus in order to fully understand the "life of the text" in both India and China, we must consider not only the way in which these translations were produced, but their status as objects once they had come into being. This is an essential step if we are to understand the shape of these documents as they have come down to us today.

To begin with oral texts, changes can take place as the result of a variety of events, including lapse of memory on the part of the reciter, or (conversely) his inadvertent recall of material that followed similar words in another memorized text.⁵⁰ These can result in deletions, on the one hand, or interpolations on the other, both of them accidental rather than deliberate. Changes could also be introduced due to the incorporation (whether accidental or deliberate) of glosses produced in the course of the translation process, whether as the result of the translator's deliberate attempt to enhance his audience's understanding of a certain word or phrase,⁵¹ or due to the accidental recording of a

⁴⁶ On the etymology and uses of the term see Norman 1997, pp. 87-88.

⁴⁷ See for example T13 (1.233b27, c1[2x] and 241c18-19) and T32, 1.814b21 and *passim*.

⁴⁸ See for example the discussions in Ch'en 1960, p. 180 and in de Jong 1968, p. 14. I would like to thank Stefano Zacchetti for supplying a copy of Ch'en's article, which was not easily available to me here, at the eleventh hour.

⁴⁹ See Nattier 2000.

⁵⁰ For some examples of expansion due to this process see Nattier 2003a, pp. 54-55.

translator's oral glosses by a scribe. In some cases we actually find glosses following a transcribed Indian name or term that define the transcribed word in Chinese, using the phrase *han yan* 漢言 ("in Chinese it is called ..."), information that was obviously not contained in the original Indian text.

Misunderstandings of another kind could result from different pronunciations of a word in different dialects; a classic example is given by John Brough in his study of the Gāndhārī *Dharmapada*, which records a case in which a confusion between *udaya* "arising" and *udaka* "water" resulted in a catastrophic misunderstanding of the text.⁵² Finally, and much more far-reaching than any of the above deletions or alterations, are cases of the complete loss of a text, which can result if its sole living reciter should pass away without having transmitted it to any of his students.

The introduction of written scriptures introduced a whole new set of potential hazards. Scribal errors of various sorts then became possible, among them haplography (skipping from one line to an identical word or phrase in another) and visual confusion between similar letters. On the Indian side most such mistakes were generally fairly limited in scope, but once these scriptures had been translated into Chinese the possibilities for confusion increased exponentially. Especially in the case of transcriptions, whose source-terms in an Indic language would have been completely opaque to a scribe who knew only Chinese, there were countless possibilities for misunderstanding.

With written scriptures we also encounter a new set of threats to survival, including vulnerability to water and fire, the gradual effacement of letters through repeated use, and ultimately the decay and disappearance of any text that was not carefully preserved. Finally, as any librarian knows, the preservation and transmission of texts also involves their proper shelving and cataloguing. And in both India and China, the practice of recording Buddhist scriptures in loose-leaf format meant that the possibility for a disastrous reshuffling of pages was always present. As we shall see in the discussion below, there are a number of cases in texts produced during the period with which we are concerned in which the sequence of pages has become radically disordered, and others where unrelated scriptures have been mixed together with another text.⁵³ As Paul Harrison has aptly observed, confronted with such texts in their current state one can easily visualize a hapless monk of some centuries ago dropping a bundle of scriptures in a monastic library,

⁵¹ Cf. the translation of the *Larger Sukhāvatīvyūha* by Luis Gómez, where the name *Ānanda* (together with the epithet *ayusmat*, "venerable") is translated as "[the Buddha's] cousin, and closest disciple, the reverend Ānanda" (Gómez 1996, p. 62). Such deliberate glosses cannot be called mistakes, but they indicate clearly what the translator thought his audience needed to know in order to understand and appreciate the foreign text.

⁵² See Brough 1962, pp. 45-48.

⁵³ Ironically, this happened even with the *Chu sanzang ji ji* itself, where Sengyou's list of "doubtful scriptures" (疑經) has become intermixed with a list of Daoan's commentaries (38c-40c, with

and then hastily trying to cover up the results of his mistake.⁵⁴

In sum, to understand the shape of Chinese Buddhist translations produced during the second and third centuries as they have come down to us today we must bear in mind a complex network of causes and conditions that have brought them to their present state. While this admittedly makes any discussion of these works more complicated, it also brings us somewhat closer to the real-life situations within which these scriptures were produced and transmitted in living Buddhist communities.

A Note on Names

During the period with which we are concerned it was standard for men—and we should note at the outset that not a single female translator is attested in the entire history of Chinese Buddhism—to have a surname (*xing* 姓) shared with other members of their family, as well as a personal or given name (*ming* 名). Occasionally the biographical sources also provide the *zi* 字 (“coming-of-age name”), and less commonly the *hao* 號 (adult nickname), of certain individuals. Surnames almost always consisted of a single character, while given names might have either one or two. Only in the case of transcribed Indian names do we find longer given names, e.g., (Zhi) Loujiachen (支婁迦讖, generally reconstructed as “Lokakṣema.”⁵⁵ Single-character given names were quite common in the Han and Three Kingdoms periods, partly as a legacy of the prohibition issued during the reign of Wang Mang 王莽 (9–23 CE), when it was forbidden to use disyllabic given names.⁵⁶

Given that so many of the early translators were non-Chinese, it is not surprising that many of the surnames recorded in our sources are actually ethnicons—that is, terms that function as family names while also indicating an individual’s ethnic background. It is important to note that such ethnicons were applied to anyone of foreign ancestry regardless of his actual place of birth. Thus An Shigao (who was born in Parthia, referred to as Anxi 安息 in Chinese sources) has the ethnicon *An* 安 “Parthian” as his surname, while Zhi Qian (who was born in China) has the ethnicon *Zhi* 支, indicating that his ancestors belonged to the group known in Chinese sources as Yuezhi 月支 (var. Yuezhi 月氏). Likewise Kang Senghui, who was born in the territory of what is now northern Vietnam to Sogdian parents who had migrated there from India, nonetheless carries the ethnicon *Kang* 康 “Sogdian” as an indicator of his ancestral ethnic heritage.

Daoan’s commentaries discussed at 39b17–40b17).

⁵⁴ Harrison 1997, p. 263.

⁵⁵ Such unwieldy names were frequently abbreviated; thus Lokakṣema, for example, is often referred to simply as Zhi Chen 支讖.

⁵⁶ According to Endymion Wilkinson, this prohibition lasted “more or less until the third century” (Wilkinson 2000, p. 100).

In the case of ordained monks there is yet another layer of complication, for at some time prior to the mid-third century CE it became common practice for a disciple to adopt the surname—which, in the case of a foreign monk, would be an ethnicon—of his master. (So far as I have been able to determine, there has not yet been any study of how widespread, in either time or space, this practice was.) Thus the translator Dharmarakṣa (Zhu Fahu 竺法護) is usually referred to by the surname *Zhu* 竺 “Indian,” indicating that he had studied with an Indian teacher, though his biography makes it clear that he was born in Dunhuang to a Yuezhi family.⁵⁷

The custom of using *Shi* 釋 “Śākya” as a universal surname for monastics, introduced by Daoan in the late fourth century,⁵⁸ was still unknown in the period with which we are concerned. Instead, each translator—whether lay or monastic—had a surname (which, if he was of non-Chinese ancestry or was the monastic disciple of a foreign master, would be an ethnicon) of his own. For this reason, in sources from the Han and Three Kingdoms periods all two-syllable names should be understood as including a surname. In transcribing such names in roman characters (i.e., in *pinyin*) both the surname and the given name should therefore be capitalized.⁵⁹ Thus one writes An Xuan 安玄 (not “Anxuan”), Zhi Qian 支謙 (not “Zhiqian”), and so on, a rule that applies whether the figure in question is a layman or a monk.

Conversely, from Daoan’s time on, two-character monastic names—but not those of lay people—should be understood as consisting of a single given name, with the surname *Shi* assumed and thus not always explicitly mentioned. Such names are therefore written as one word, e.g., Huiyuan 慧遠 (not “Hui Yuan”) and Xuanzang 玄奘 (not “Xuan Zang”).

⁵⁷ The custom of adopting the ethnicon of one’s monastic teacher was not limited to those who were themselves of non-Chinese birth or ancestry. Zürcher cites the examples of Zhu Daosheng 竺道生 (d. 434) and his teacher Zhu Fatai 竺法太 (d. 387), both of whom were ethnically Chinese (Zürcher 1959, pp. 281 and p. 425, n. 198). Citing a passage from the *Gaoseng zhuan* (T2059, 50.354a16), Zürcher also suggests that Daoan himself may have borne the ethnicon *Zhu* before he introduced the practice of using *Shi* 釋 as a surname for monastics (*loc. cit.*).

⁵⁸ This practice, introduced during the period 365–379 CE, quickly became widespread; according to Zürcher, Zhu Daosheng (cf. the previous note) was “one of the last Chinese monks with a religious surname of the old type mentioned in our sources” (Zürcher 1959, p. 281). For the traditional account of Daoan’s creation of this new system see the *Chu sanzang jiji* (T2145, 55.108b29ff); the same account is repeated verbatim in the *Gaoseng zhuan* (T2059, 50.354b29ff).

⁵⁹ The use of capital letters is of course a western convention, but the introduction of the *pinyin* system to record Chinese is also a reflection of western writing practices. For a convenient summary of the officially sanctioned method of writing proper names in *pinyin* as set forth by the State Language Commission of the PRC see DeFrancis 1996, p. 838, §1.3.

Objectives of this Study: A Brief User's Guide

The primary purpose of this volume is to make available, in an easily accessible form, the most current information as to which Chinese Buddhist translations can be assigned with confidence to the Han and Three Kingdoms periods. To facilitate this, three Appendices are included at the end of this volume: first, an index arranged according to Taishō text numbers for quick access to the discussions included here (Appendix 1); second, an index (arranged in alphabetical order) to Sanskrit and Pāli scriptural titles (Appendix 2); and third, a short reference list of translations thought to belong to this period, arranged in chronological order according to the translators' names (Appendix 3). If a reader wishes to know, for example, whether the *Baoji sanmei wenshushili pusa wen fashen jing* 寶積三昧文殊師利菩薩問法身經 (T356), which is assigned to An Shigao in the Taishō canon and associated reference works, is really the work of this translator, she can turn to Appendix 1. If the Taishō text number is not there, this should be understood to mean that the scripture in question is not discussed in this volume, and thus that the attribution is not, at the present state of our knowledge, considered to be genuine. If the number *is* there—as in the present case—this means only that the text in question is discussed somewhere within this book; it does not imply that the traditional attribution to a Han or Three-Kingdoms translator is correct.⁶⁰ To verify the status of the translation in question, the reader will therefore need to consult the discussion on the pages listed there.

Second, a reader who wishes to determine whether there is any Chinese translation of a particular Indian scripture (e.g., the *Dhammapada* or the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*) dating from this period may consult the Sanskrit and Pāli index (Appendix 2). If the title in question does not appear in the index, this should be understood to mean that no translation of it that can be dated to the period with which we are concerned has yet been identified. Although there is no index of Tibetan titles included here, readers working from Tibetan can use the valuable index to *The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue* (Lancaster and Park, 1979) to move from the Tibetan Derge (Tōhoku) and Peking (Ōtani) catalogue numbers to those of the Taishō edition via the Korean, which will in turn provide access to Appendix 1.

Finally, a reader wishing to gain a quick impression of how many texts are currently considered to be the work of a particular translator (e.g., An Shigao or Kang Senghui) can turn to Appendix 3, where the Taishō text numbers and titles of these translations are simply listed under each translator's name.

⁶⁰ For a recent analysis of the vocabulary and style of this scripture (concluding that it is not in fact the work of An Shigao) see Fang and Gao 2007. Though their study is based exclusively on internal evidence, one could arrive at the same conclusion on the basis of external evidence alone, for the *Baoji sanmei wenshushili pusa wen fashen jing* is not attributed to An Shigao by Sengyou, who classified it as an anonymous scripture (55.30b20–21). As is so often the case, this untenable attribution first appears in the *Lidai sanbao ji* (49.52b10 and 23–24).

One shortcoming of the present volume, from the point of view of at least some potential users, is that there is no index arranged according to the Chinese, Japanese, Korean, or Vietnamese pronunciation of the titles discussed here, nor is there a character index arranged by radicals. Admittedly these might be convenient for some, and the omission of such indices may be regrettable, but I have considered that it should be relatively easy for a reader interested in a particular translation to locate its Taishō text number, and from there to use the index provided in Appendix 1. Indeed, I suspect that the increasingly widespread use of computer searches of digital editions of the Chinese canon (pioneered by the CBETA group in Taiwan and now also available in the SAT edition produced in Japan), which produce results sorted according to Taishō text numbers, will eventually lead to a high degree of “number recognition” among scholars of coming generations.

A second purpose—and in the long range, perhaps an even more important one—is to make available a detailed discussion of the methodological tools by which the authenticity of individual translator attributions can be established. On this basis other scholars will be able to extend the analysis presented in this volume to evaluate the work of translators whose work falls outside the chronological range of this study or, for that matter, to re-evaluate the status of some of the works discussed here. I do not mean to imply, of course, that all of the methodological approaches presented here are new; many (though perhaps not all) were already being employed by scholars writing several decades ago. But because methodological issues are not always discussed explicitly in these studies, it seemed worthwhile to place the topic of methodology in the direct spotlight at various points in this work.

The sharp-eyed reader will notice immediately that I have not been consistent in using a single methodological approach to evaluating the attribution of all of the scriptures discussed here. This is deliberate, for in my view certain adjustments must be made according to the nature of the translator’s *modus operandi*—e.g., whether he is thought to have worked alone or with others, whether he produced new translations or was involved in the polishing or the wholesale re-translation of existing scriptures, and so on. Rather than being discussed only in a single section, therefore, reflections on methodology are dispersed throughout this volume, with any particular factors that need to be considered in specific cases mentioned in connection with that translator and his works. Readers with a particular interest in methodological issues will thus have to skip around a bit to locate all of these sections, but it is my hope that the additional refinement which this procedure makes possible will make up for the inconvenience.

Limitations of this Study: Tasks for the Future

Because the focus of this study is on establishing a reliable chronology of early Chinese Buddhist translations, my first priority has been simply to determine whether or not they can be legitimately assigned to the Han or Three Kingdoms period. Knowing that these

works were circulating in China by the second or third century CE does establish a *terminus ante quem* for their appearance in India, but many questions remain to be asked about the relative dates of these scriptures, as well as about their relationship (or lack thereof) to one another.

Second—and most obvious to many readers—is the fact that I have not attempted to deal with the content (much less the doctrinal specifics) of the scriptures dealt with here. This, too, is a matter for another venue; my concern has been simply to classify them in a minimal way (*āgama* text, Mahāyāna sūtra, and so on) in order to provide a basic picture of the types of texts that were being translated into Chinese during this time. I have also made no attempt to cite every publication dealing with each of these scriptures. Instead, I have limited my citations to books and articles that bear directly on the topics dealt with here: the date of translation of the texts, the identity of their translators, and their language and style. Even so, I am sure that I have overlooked some valuable studies; for this I beg the indulgence of the reader (and especially of the authors) for any papers that I have failed to cite.

Third, because the central concern here is with translations, I have said relatively little about Buddhist compositions produced in China during this period. By this I do not mean primarily apocryphal texts (i.e., scriptures produced in China but with a claim to be from India); in fact, the period with which we are concerned precedes the era of widespread production of such texts which so concerned figures like Daoan and Sengyou. Rather, there are texts of other types, produced during the second and third centuries CE, that still await detailed study. As noted here and there in the following discussion, a number of prefaces, colophons, and other scriptural notes, though often anonymous, are likely to date from this period. Most of these teem with difficulties, and they deserve a separate and closely focused study in themselves. Most significant for understanding the formation of Chinese Buddhism itself are the small number of commentaries that are thought to date from this period. I have touched on these briefly below (see Part IV), their enormous importance will surely reward detailed studies in the future.

Finally, because this work is intended as an overview, it is of necessity a general work, and many specific aspects of the vocabulary and style of the translations belonging to this period could not be pursued here. Each of these scriptures is worthy of detailed study in itself, and to date very few of the works discussed here have received such treatment. In this difficult but vastly rewarding field, there is much that remains to be done.

Part II

Translations Produced During the Eastern Han Period (c. 147-220 CE)

Legendary beginnings

Sengyou's *Chu sanzang ji ji*, as we have seen, is the earliest extant catalogue of Chinese Buddhist translations, and the very first translation listed in this venerable work is entitled *The Scripture in Forty-two Sections* (*Sishi'er zhang jing* 四十二章經, 55.5c17). With a level of detail that is uncharacteristic for the catalogue section of his work, Sengyou provides not just the names of the translators, but a description of the circumstances that led to the production of the text: Emperor Ming of the Han (here referred to as Xiaoming 孝明, r. 58-76 CE), after seeing a “golden man” in a dream, sent two envoys—Zhang Qian 張騫 and Qin Jing 秦景—to the Western Regions. Having arrived in the Yuezhi 月支 country, they encountered a monk named Zhu Moteng 竺摩騰. After translating this text (presumably obtained from Zhu Moteng, though the passage does not say so explicitly) the two envoys returned to Luoyang, where it was duly placed in a repository of scriptures.¹ If this account were true, it would be the foundation story not just of Buddhist translation activity in China, but of Chinese contact with Buddhism as such: as the result of an emperor's auspicious dream, Chinese contacts with Buddhist countries to the West began, and the first scripture to be rendered into Chinese was translated under imperial patronage.

A text by this title does in fact exist in transmitted versions of the canon (T784), where it is credited to Jiayemoteng 迦葉摩騰 (generally reconstructed in modern secondary sources as “Kāśyapa Mātanga”) and Falan 法蘭 (reconstructed as “Dharmaratna”). Scholars who have examined it closely, however, have agreed that the text as we have it does not go back to the Han (see Tang 1936). It might seem reasonable simply to conclude, therefore, that the received text is a revised version of the one originally translated at the initiative of Emperor Ming.

But the problems with this tradition are far more fundamental than the simple absence of a suitably ancient text. In a landmark study of the dream of Emperor Ming published in 1910, Henri Maspéro showed that this account is riddled with problems. First and foremost is a glaring anachronism: although an envoy named Zhang Qian was indeed sent from China to the Western Regions, this took place not in the first century CE but three centuries earlier, and the mission had nothing to do with Buddhism. On the contrary, its purpose was to enlist the aid of the Yuezhi in forming an alliance to counter the power of the Xiongnu 匈奴, a nomadic group who, after defeating the Yuezhi and driving many of them far to the west, was then harassing the northern borders of China.²

¹ See T2145, 55.5c17-22: 四十二章經一卷(舊錄云:孝明皇帝四十二章。安法師所撰錄闕此經)。右一部,凡一卷,漢孝明帝夢見金人。詔遣使者張騫羽林中郎將秦景到西域。始於月支國遇沙門竺摩騰。譯寫此經,還洛陽。藏在蘭臺石室第十四間中。其經今傳於世。 The tradition here reported by Sengyou clearly indicates that the translation was made by Zhang Qian and Qin Jing, and not by the *śramaṇa* Zhu Moteng; cf. the further notice given in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* at 55.10a4-8.

² The event in question took place in 138 BCE, with Zhang Qian returning to China in 125; for a convenient summary see Eberhard 1977, pp. 85-87.

Admittedly there are some sources (e.g., the *Gaoseng zhuan*) in which the ambassador is not called Zhang Qian, but rather Cai Yin 蔡愔.³ But as Maspéro has shown, the sources that read Zhang Qian are older, and the change of the name to Cai Yin merely appears as a belated attempt to cover up the obvious historical difficulties with placing the famous second century BCE ambassador Zhang Qian in the time of Emperor Ming.⁴ As to Sengyou's own account, Maspéro demonstrates clearly that it is nothing more than an abbreviated version of the contents of an anonymous preface to the scripture (likewise preserved in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*),⁵ and indeed, that the preface is the ultimate source of all other accounts of the emperor's dream and the ensuing mission. In light of Maspéro's analysis, the entire tale of the mission to the West, culminating in the translation of the *Scripture in Forty-two Sections*, is now widely viewed by scholars nothing more than a web of fiction, and a poorly woven one at that.⁶

Turning back to the *Chu sanzang ji ji* itself, we can see that Sengyou's own stance with respect to this legend is far from straightforward. Though the *Scripture in Forty-two Sections* is the first text listed in his catalogue, he makes it clear in an accompanying note that his most reliable source—Daoan's *Zhongjing mulu*—did not mention it. Instead, Sengyou states that he had drawn his information on this text from the *Jiulu* 舊錄, a source whose precise date and authorship are uncertain but which appears to postdate Daoan's work by more than a century.⁷

Moreover, somewhat later in his catalogue—following the entry for the translators Faju 法炬 and Fali 法立, which occurs more than four pages below the entry for the *Scripture in Forty-two Sections* in the Taishō edition—Sengyou provides an important scholarly note on his sources:

All of the scriptures that appear above, [those translated by] a total of seventeen people, from An Shigao down to Fali, are cited from [Dao]an's catalogue. Of these, [for the entries concerning] a total of seven people, viz., Zhang Qian, Qin Jing, Zhu Shuofo, Weiqinan, Zhu Jiangyan, Bo Yan, and Bai Fazu, I (祐) have added new material collated from various other catalogues. From Yue Shidu onwards, the entries have been newly compiled by myself.⁸

Several things are important about this note. First, it shows that the tradition known to

³ See T2059, 50.322c24 and 323a9.

⁴ See Maspéro 1910, pp. 126.

⁵ See T2145, 55.42c18-28.

⁶ For a discussion of other problems with the account given in the preface see Maspéro, pp. 128-129.

⁷ See Tan 1991, p. 36 (if one accepts that by *Jiulu* Sengyou is referring to a single text).

⁸ See T2145, 55.10a4-8: 總前出經，自安世高以下至法立以上，凡十七家，並安公錄所載。其張騫、秦景、竺朔佛、維祇難、竺將炎、白延、帛法祖，凡七人，是祐校眾錄新獲所附。入自衛士度以後，皆祐所新撰。

Sengyou concerning the *Scripture in Forty-two Sections* (whatever his own assessment of its validity) attributed the work to Zhang Qian and Qin Jing, not to Zhu Moteng (who is not mentioned in the above list of translators at all). Second, Sengyou reiterates here that the story of Zhang Qian and Qin Jing was unknown to Daoan. Third, the wording of the above notice is somewhat awkward, which may indicate that the passage has been revised by the addition of these two names. As we have it, the text seems to suggest that Sengyou's catalogue began with the works of An Shigao, and that the names of the other seven translators (其張騫 . . . 凡七人, "Of these, a total of seven people, Zhang Qian, . . ." and so on) should fall between An Shigao and Fali. In fact, however, the text attributed to Zhang Qian and Qin Jing *precedes* those by An Shigao on Sengyou's list. It may well be that this apparent disjunction is the result of a deliberately light revision on Sengyou's part, inserting the new names but leaving the original structure of the passage intact, thus encoding a hint that the change had been made under duress.⁹

Other evidence corroborates the late incursion of the *Scripture in Forty-two Sections* into the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, for there is no account of any of the supposed participants in its production—Zhang Qian, Qin Jing, or Zhu Moteng—in the biographical section of Sengyou's work. But given the prominence of this text in the catalogue section, one would certainly expect at least a brief biography of its translator(s). But it is only later that such "biographies" first appear, and then in what Maspéro's work now allows us to see as a sanitized form.¹⁰

In any event, in light of studies by Maspéro and others,¹¹ there is certainly no longer any reason to accept the tradition of the translation of the *Scripture in Forty-two Sections* (or for that matter, of any other Buddhist text) during the first century of the Common Era. While a Buddhist presence had definitely been established in China by this time, the form that it seems to have taken at this point was centered on ritual practices (see Zürcher 1959, pp. 26-27) and artistic objects (see for example Ruan 1996), and not on scriptural texts. It would be nearly a century later before we encounter the first reliable accounts of the translation of Buddhist scriptures into Chinese.

⁹ In retrospect one wonders if the uncustomarily detailed information included with the catalogue entry—including the anomalous reference to Zhang Qian—may have been a subtle but deliberate attempt on Sengyou's part to call attention to the dubiousness of this report. The account of Emperor Ming's dream also occurs in the introductory section (55.5b18ff.), another portion of the *Chu sanzang ji ji* that appears to have been revised after the completion of the biographical section. It seems likely that pressure to include the story was exerted by the Liang Emperor Wu 梁武帝 himself; work in progress by Palumbo (mentioned in Palumbo 2003, n. 87) may shed substantial light on this issue.

¹⁰ See the biographies of She Moteng 攝摩騰 (50.322c15ff.) and Zhu Falan 竺法蘭 (323a8ff.), respectively, to whom Huijiao credits the *Scripture in Forty-Two Sections* in the first two entries in the *Gaoseng zhuan*. Not only can we see that the anachronistic reference to Zhang Qian has been removed (replaced, as noted by Maspéro, by the previously unknown Cai Yin), but even the reference to the Yuezhi country (with which Zhang Qian is firmly associated in Chinese historical sources) has disappeared, and both monks are said to be from India (天竺).

¹¹ See also Tang 1938, repr. 1983 (chapter 3) and Tokiwa 1938, pp. 51-54.

An Shigao 安世高

BIOGRAPHY

Having set aside the legendary account discussed above, we now come to the first translator who is actually known to us from the historical record: An Shigao, a native of Parthia (Ch. *Anxi* 安息) who came to Luoyang in the mid-second century CE. Concerning his life and translation activities we have an abundance of resources, including biographical accounts¹² as well as prefaces and colophons in which he is mentioned.¹³ In these sources An Shigao is portrayed as a prince who renounced the throne in order to pursue the religious life and subsequently traveled to China. Having arrived early in the reign of Emperor Huan 桓帝 (r. 147-168 CE)¹⁴ he settled in Luoyang, where he spent more than twenty years translating Buddhist scriptures.

Other elements of his biography—notably the story that he left the capital during the time of Emperor Ling 靈帝 (r. 168-190 CE) to travel to the south, where he met his death as the result of a random encounter with a brawl in a marketplace—have been discarded by many modern scholars, along with the standard hagiographic references to An Shigao's unusual talents and miraculous abilities.¹⁵ As Florin Deleanu has pointed out,

¹² The earliest extant biography of An Shigao is that preserved in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*; see T2145, 55.95a6-c21. The biography contained in Huijiao's *Gaoseng zhuan* (T2059, 50.323a24-324a6) draws heavily on Sengyou's earlier version (with certain additions and omissions), as indeed is usually the case (see Wright 1954 and Link 1957). Sengyou, in turn, had used a variety of earlier materials, notably Kang Senghui's preface to the *Anban shouyi jing*, much of whose wording appears at the beginning of his account. No complete translation of Sengyou's biography of An Shigao is available in any western language; for Huijiao's account see the Italian translation in Forte 1968 and cf. the French translation in Shih 1968 (pp. 4-9 plus his further remarks on pp. 9-12).

¹³ Limiting our sources to those dating from the time of Daoan or before, they are the following: Yan Fotiao's preface to the (no longer extant) *Shami shihui zhangjü* 沙彌十慧章句 (T2145, 55.69c19-70a8), preface to the *Yin chi ru jing* perhaps by Chen Hui (T1694, 33.9b9-25) and by Daoan to his own commentary on the same text (T2145, 55.44b29-45a13), a preface to the *Anban shouyi jing* by Kang Senghui (transmitted both in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* at 55.42c29-43c3 and with the received text of T602, 15.163a6-c8), a preface to the *Anban shouyi jing* by Xie Fu 謝敷 (55.43c25-44b28), a preface to a commentary on the same text by Daoan (T2145, 55.43c4-24), and prefaces by Daoan to the *Shi'er men jing* (55.45b26-46a13), the *Da shi'er men jing* (55.46a14-b18), and his commentary on the *Renben yu sheng jing* (55.45a14-b2), and to Dharmarakṣa's translation of the *Yogācārabhūmi* (T2145, 55.69a27-c18).

¹⁴ A number of secondary sources (notably Zürcher 1959, p. 30) give a more specific date of 148 CE, drawing on Huijiao's *Gaoseng zhuan*, which quotes Daoan's catalogue as stating that An Shigao began his translation career in the second year of Emperor Huan's reign (T2059, 50.324a9-10: 安世高以漢桓帝建和二年至靈帝建寧中二十餘年譯出三十餘部經). No such date appears in Sengyou's *Chu sanzang ji ji*, however (which is of course based heavily on Daoan's work), and thus it seems prudent to be somewhat cautious in this regard.

¹⁵ See for example Zürcher 1959, p. 33, who explicitly rejects the account of An Shigao's

however, the fact that the account of his violent death is encrusted with orthodox doctrinal explanations interpreting this event in terms of karmic retribution does not negate the possibility that such a journey might actually have taken place.¹⁶ On the contrary, when this tale is analyzed from the perspective of the methodological “principle of embarrassment,” it becomes obvious that to portray such an eminent figure as having met his doom at the hands of a common ruffian is hardly the sort of thing that a hagiographer would invent in order to embellish his account.¹⁷ The fact that An Shigao’s biographers went to great lengths to frame this event in appropriate doctrinal terms—including the claim that An Shigao fully understood the karmic factors involved—only adds further weight to the likelihood that his death in southern China was not a fiction, but rather an inconvenient truth that was too well known to deny.¹⁸

More sweeping than the mere elimination of hagiographical embellishments, or even the rejection of the account of An Shigao’s journey to the south, is a reinterpretation of An Shigao’s biography by Antonino Forte, who has contended that he was not a monk at all but rather a layman who was sent to the Chinese court by the Parthian government as a diplomatic hostage.¹⁹ An Shigao’s lay status seems doubtful, however, in light of the fact that he is referred to as *heshang* 和上—a term used to translate the monastic title *upādhyāya* “preceptor” from an early date²⁰—in the earliest extant source referring to him, a preface composed in the late 2nd century CE by Yan Fotiao 嚴佛調, a Chinese Buddhist monk who had been An Shigao’s direct disciple.²¹ Subsequently Daoan described

southern peregrinations and accepts only the most skeletal version of An Shigao’s life—that he abandoned the opportunities afforded by his royal connections in Parthia to travel to China, where he subsequently spent more than twenty years as a translator—as historical fact.

¹⁶ See Deleanu 1993, pp. 6-7.

¹⁷ On the “principle of embarrassment” see Nattier 2003, pp. 65-66.

¹⁸ It should be admitted, however, that this story appears for the first time (in extant sources, at any rate) in the sixth century CE, so we should be cautious about giving it too much credence.

¹⁹ See Forte 1995, especially pp. 74-78. For a critical review of Forte’s book which raises some significant methodological issues see RONG Xinjiang 1998; for a detailed critique of Forte’s initial presentation of this interpretation (Forte 1992) see Deleanu 1993, pp. 7-23.

²⁰ The term 和上 occurs in two texts translated by Lokakṣema in contexts where the parallel Tibetan versions make it clear that the underlying term was *upādhyāya*. See T418, 13.909c1-2 where 和上和 善師 correspond to *slob dpon* and *mkhan po* in the Tibetan (see Harrison ed., 1978, §9D, p. 85, line 1 and cf. the English translation in Harrison 1990, p. 81, line 5) and T282, 10.451c15 (師、和上) and 451c28 (和上) and 452a1 (師), corresponding to Ōtani No. 761, vol. 25, 94.3.5 and 94.4.7-8 (*slob dpon* and *mkhan po*, with the order reversed with respect to Lokakṣema’s text). For the attribution of T282 to Lokakṣema see Nattier 2005a. On the term *upādhyāya* itself see Sasaki 1997b. In all of these cases the terms 和上和 (善)師 clearly refer to specific types of monastic teachers.

²¹ Though the text itself has been lost, the preface is preserved in the *Chu sanzang jiji* (T2145, 55.69c19-70a8); on An Shigao see 69c25-26.

GUIDE TO EARLY CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

An Shigao as “a bodhisattva who had left the household” (捨家開士),²² while Sengyou referred to him as someone who had “left home to practice the Way” (出家修道).²³ Chinese sources also regularly refer to him as a *śramaṇa* (*shamen* 沙門) at least from the time of the *Chu sanzang ji ji*.²⁴ It is true, as Forte notes, that one early source—Kang Senghui’s preface to the *Anban shouyi jing*—does not explicitly refer to An Shigao’s monastic status.²⁵ Given the unanimity on this score of all other early accounts, however, there seems to be no good reason to discard the traditional assumption that An Shigao was a monk.

As to the way in which An Shigao produced his translations, our sources give no explicit information. It has become customary among specialists to assume that all foreign masters were aided in their work by committees that included at least one native speaker of Chinese,²⁶ but it may be significant that in An Shigao’s case there is not a single mention of any translation assistants. On the contrary, his biography emphasizes the fact that, upon his arrival, he quickly became fluent in Chinese, conveying the impression that his own linguistic ability was sufficient to produce the translations that were described by Sengyou as “eloquent but not flowery, plain but not coarse” (辯而不華，質而不野).²⁷ The style of his extant works (on which see below, pp. 43–44) is consonant with this scenario, for though their language can be described as “workmanlike” it does not betray any knowledge of Chinese literary conventions, nor do his translations allude to the classics or draw heavily on indigenous religious terms.²⁸ Moreover, in the one case where we have an extant translation by an individual who was known to have been a member of

²² Daoan’s comments are contained in his preface to An Shigao’s *Anban shouyi jing*, preserved in Sengyou’s *Chu sanzang jiji* (T2145, 55.44b3 and 44b19).

²³ See the biography section of the *Chu sanzang ji ji* (T2145, 55.95a17).

²⁴ E.g., at 55.6b5.

²⁵ For a translation of the preface see Link 1976, pp. 67–80 (on An Shigao see especially pp. 78–79), and cf. Forte 1995, pp. 67–70.

²⁶ See for example Zürcher 1959, p. 31, who seems to generalize from the case of Lokakṣema to conclude that all Han-period Buddhist translations were the product of group enterprises.

²⁷ See the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, 55.95a25–26, and cf. *Gaoseng zhuan*, 50.323b11, where the same wording is used. Sengyou is presumably alluding to the *Lunyu* 論語 (VI.18, 質勝文則野，文勝質則史), where however 文, and not 華, is contrasted with 質 “solidity” or “plainness”).

²⁸ The fact that An Shigao uses such expressions as *de dao* 得道 “attain the Dao” and *zhi wuwei* 致無為 “attain non-action” to express the Indian idea of the experience of *nirvāṇa* suggests that the expressions *dao* and *wuwei* were so pervasive in the Chinese language and culture of the time (and by no means specifically “Daoist,” as has sometimes been suggested) that it would have been difficult to express the idea of an ultimate, unconditioned reality to a Chinese-speaking audience without using them. Most other Chinese religious terms, by contrast—e.g., the *hun* 魂 and *po* 魄 spirits, Mt. Tai 泰山 as a destination for the dead, and even the (especially Confucian) virtue of *ren* 仁 “humaneness”—are entirely absent from An Shigao’s translations.

An Shigao's circle—i.e., the *Fa jing jing* 法鏡經 (T322), produced in the latter part of the second century CE by An Shigao's student Yan Fotiao 嚴佛調 together with the Parthian layman An Xuan 安玄—its translation style differs radically from that used by An Shigao himself.²⁹ In sum, we have no direct evidence of anyone assisting An Shigao in the translation process, and in the one case where we know of a specific individual who would have been able to do so, no trace of his own translation preferences can be found in the texts attributed to his master. It is possible, of course, that our sources simply neglected to record any information concerning An Shigao's co-workers, but it is worth at least considering the possibility that, in contrast to many of his successors, An Shigao produced his translations on his own.

Be that as it may, An Shigao's role in Chinese Buddhism was in every respect a foundational one: not only did he produce the earliest known translations of Buddhist scriptures, but his works covered a wide range of topics, conveying—if not a complete repertoire of early canonical literature³⁰—a rich anthology of Buddhist materials, made available to his Chinese audience, in their own language, for the first time. Though his translations appear archaic and awkward to modern readers, who are more accustomed to the fluid style of Kumārajīva and some of his successors, many of the individual terms (both transcriptions and translations) that first appeared in An Shigao's works—terms such as *se* 色 for *rūpa*, *fan* 梵 for the god Brahmā, *Anan* 阿難 for Ānanda, or *tian* 天 for *deva* (as well as “heaven”)—were adopted by these subsequent translators and have continued to be used down to the present day. It is also clear, from the information preserved in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* and other medieval sources, that the scriptures An Shigao produced were avidly studied and commented upon by generations of Chinese Buddhist devotees. While some knowledge of Buddhism was circulating in China at least a century before his time—mainly in the form of images and certain cultic practices—it was An Shigao who played a pivotal role in introducing the Indian Buddhist literary heritage to China. It is fortunate indeed that so many works produced by this pioneering translator have survived.

CONTENTS OF HIS CORPUS

Most of An Shigao's extant translations deal with the basics of Buddhist teaching (e.g., the four noble truths, the eightfold path), meditation practices (e.g., mindfulness of breathing, the four *smṛtyupasthānas*, the four *dhyānas* and four *ārūpyasamāpattis*), and various numerical lists. Though some of An Shigao's translations are in the form of *āgama*-style narrative texts, others are not sūtras but treatises. In addition to these, at least one (the *Ahan koujie*

²⁹ On the style used by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao, in which personal and place names (as well as Buddhist technical terms) are all translated rather than transcribed, see below, p. 91-92.

³⁰ A notable exception is the Vinaya, of which no example can be found in An Shigao's corpus. Whether there would have been a suitable audience (that is, an audience of ordained monastics, as the Vinaya is by tradition not to be revealed to the laity) at this early date, however, is uncertain.

shi'er yinyuan jing 阿含口解十二因緣經, T1508) appears to be not a translation at all, but a record of oral explanations delivered by An Shigao to his students (see below, p. 63).

A much-discussed feature of his corpus is the fact that it includes no texts that can be classified as “Mahāyāna”—none, that is, that encourage their readers to strive to attain Buddhahood rather than Arhatship. This does not mean, however, that the scriptures translated by An Shigao could not have been used by advocates of the Mahāyāna, nor for that matter that he himself might not have been a practitioner of the bodhisattva path.³¹ Indeed, it is probably significant that the earliest sources—including the preface (cited above) by Yan Fotiao, who had worked with An Shigao and considered him his teacher—are unanimous in referring to him as a “bodhisattva.”³² It is now widely recognized that there is no necessary conflict between an individual’s own bodhisattva aspirations and his or her membership in one of the Nikāyas (monastic ordination lineages, usually referred to as “schools”) that formed the institutional basis of Indian Buddhism.³³ The fact that a number of An Shigao’s texts have been identified as belonging to the Sarvāstivāda school thus does not pose any obstacle to the possibility that he might have considered himself to be on the bodhisattva path.

It should also be noted, however, that among the works attributed to An Shigao by Daoan are three whose titles suggest that they contained Mahāyāna-oriented materials. These are the *Daoyi fa xing jing* 道意發行經 “Scripture on Bringing Forth Bodhicitta” (cited in Sengyou’s catalogue at 6a2), the *Shisi yi jing* 十四意經 “Scripture on Fourteen Thoughts” (for which Sengyou gives the alternate title of *Pusa shisi yi jing* 菩薩十四意經 “Scripture on the Fourteen Thoughts of the Bodhisattva,” 6a23), and the *Wushi jiaoji jing* 五十校計經 “Scripture on the Fifty Evaluations” (for which Sengyou provides the alternative title of *Mingdu wushi jiaoji jing* 明度五十校計經 “Prajñāpāramitā Scripture on the Fifty Evaluations,” 6a14). Of these the first two are no longer extant, but the *Wushi jiaoji jing* can still be found in the Taishō canon, where its presence has been masked by the fact that it has been absorbed into a completely unrelated text, the *Mahāsaṃnipāta* (大

³¹ The acceptance of one or more Mahāyāna scriptures as the word of the Buddha, on the one hand, and the decision to pursue the bodhisattva path, on the other, appear to have been quite separable items in the early history of the Mahāyāna in India. In other words, it appears to have been entirely possible to strive for Buddhahood while appealing only to the authority of traditional (pre-Mahāyāna) canonical texts, or on the contrary, to accept the legitimacy of certain Mahāyāna scriptures while electing to strive for Arhatship oneself. For further details cf. Nattier 2003, p. 81, n. 15.

³² An Shigao is called a bodhisattva (*pusa* 菩薩) in the prefaces by Yan Fotiao and Kang Senghui cited above (note 13), the first of which was composed by his own student. Daoan continues this usage in the fourth century, using the term *kaishi* 開士 (an alternative translation of “bodhisattva” introduced by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao) in reference to An Shigao in three prefaces preserved in the *Chu sanzang jiji* (55.44b3, 44c19, and 69b18). On this issue cf. Forte 1995, pp. 70-74 and Zacchetti 2004a, p. 212, n. 80.

³³ On this issue see for example Harrison 1995, Nattier 2003 (especially pp. 84-89), and Sasaki 1995 and 1997a.

集經, T397). And on the basis of its content it is clear that it does indeed contain a discussion of the bodhisattva path. As Ui pointed out many years ago, any claim that An Shigao had no connection with the Mahāyāna should certainly take such titles into account.³⁴

Ignoring the possible significance of these texts, and without taking into account the fact that An Shigao himself is regularly referred to as a bodhisattva, many scholars have used the content of An Shigao's extant translations to infer that the Buddhism practiced in second-century Parthia was of the "Hīnayāna" variety. There are some serious methodological problems, however, with this procedure.³⁵ It is not at all certain, first of all, that the texts brought to China by any given individual were representative of the Buddhist scriptures that were circulating in his homeland; on the contrary, they may simply reflect the preferences of the translator himself. (The fact that the sole extant work by the next Parthian translator, An Xuan 安玄, is a Mahāyāna sūtra is probably an indication of precisely such differing personal preferences.) Second, if the translator had visited other regions where Buddhism was practiced prior to coming to China (as our sources indicate was the case with An Shigao), he might have well obtained some of these scriptures in one or more of these locales rather than in the country of his birth. Third, in some instances (though not in the case of An Shigao) the available sources specify that the translator had not brought the scriptures to China himself, but based his work on Indian manuscripts (or recited texts) brought by others.

In short, it is always hazardous to assume—without corroboration from sources of another kind—that the output of any given translator provides an accurate reflection of the repertoire of Buddhist scriptures that were known and accepted in his homeland. Thus while it is possible that An Shigao's translations reflected the Buddhist literature that was known and studied in Parthia during his lifetime,³⁶ it is not possible to be sure that this was the case. At the very least, however, these translations provide us with solid evidence that the texts that served as their antecedents were in circulation, no later than the middle of the second century CE, somewhere in the Western Regions.

TRANSLATION STYLE

Zürcher has characterized the language of An Shigao's translations as "erratic, crude, full of vulgarisms, often chaotic to the point of unintelligibility."³⁷ Several decades earlier he

³⁴ See Ui 1971, p. 22. For reasons that are not clear to me Ui discusses only two of these three texts, excluding the *Daoyi fa xing jing*, whose title surely indicates that it contained a discussion of the bodhisattva path. Since Ui was not aware that a text corresponding to the *Wushi jiaoji jing* is still extant, he included only its title, and not the content of the scripture that has been absorbed into T397, in his discussion. The *Wushi jiaoji jing* will be discussed in detail below (see pp. 55-59).

³⁵ For a discussion of some of these issues see Ui 1971, pp. 22-23.

³⁶ For a reliable scholarly account of what is known about Parthian Buddhism see Utz 1999.

³⁷ See Zürcher 1991, p. 283. In this he is echoing the opinion of Demiéville, who had earlier

had described them as “no more than free paraphrases or extracts of the original texts” (Zürcher 1959, p. 34). It is now increasingly recognized, however, that the Indic texts from which the first Chinese translators were working may have differed substantially from those available to us today. At this stage of our knowledge, therefore, it seems better to reserve judgement on the accuracy of An Shigao’s work pending the publication of detailed studies of individual works from his corpus, comparing these with extant parallels in Chinese or Tibetan translations as well as in Indic languages (where available).³⁸

The style of An Shigao’s translation idiom, by contrast, can be characterized with relative ease, and it remains quite consistent throughout his corpus. He routinely transcribes (rather than translating) proper names; technical terms, by contrast, are generally translated into Chinese, being transcribed only in a minority of cases. None of his authentic translations contain verses; as Zürcher has noted, portions of the text that were in verse in the Indic originals were rendered in prose by An Shigao, even when he introduces them with a Chinese phrase meaning “The following is said in *gāthās*” (*conghou shuo jue* 從後說絕). Zürcher describes An Shigao as making no concessions whatsoever to Chinese literary taste, and even suggests that he may have been unfamiliar with it (1991, p. 283).

Sengyou, by contrast, held An Shigao’s work in the highest esteem, ranking him as one of the three greatest translators in early Chinese Buddhist history,³⁹ and the impact of his translations on subsequent generations of Chinese Buddhists is undeniable. It would be difficult to find any later translator who did not adopt at least some of his vocabulary, and the commentaries on his work composed by some of the distinguished figures of subsequent centuries (including Kang Senghui and Daoan) testify to the high regard in which his translations were held. In sum, however inelegant and even non-native his Chinese renditions may have been, they clearly served their basic purpose: to communicate some of the basic categories of Indian Buddhism to Chinese audiences in a language that they could understand.

AUTHENTIC TEXTS⁴⁰

In the *Chu sanzang ji ji* Sengyou summarizes his tabulation of the works of An Shigao with the following comment:

said of An Shigao’s *Yogācārabhūmi* (T607) that “le style est gauche et chaotique au point d’être souvent presque inintelligible” (Demiéville 1954, p. 343).

³⁸ A good example of such a study is Vetter and Harrison 1998.

³⁹ See his biography of An Xuan, which contains the following observation: 安侯、都尉、佛調三人傳譯號為難繼 “the translations of the Marquis An [Shigao], the Commander-in-chief of the Cavalry (i.e., An Xuan), and [Yan] Fotiao are said to be difficult to equal” (or, in more colloquial English, “a hard act to follow” (T2145, 55.96a17–18).

⁴⁰ I owe many of the bibliographical references in this and the following section to my colleague Stefano Zacchetti, whose assistance in charting the rapidly changing landscape of An Shigao studies I am happy to acknowledge here. For further details on An Shigao’s corpus see Zacchetti forthcoming (b).

The above thirty-four works,⁴¹ comprising forty fascicles (*juan* 卷) in all, were translated by the *sramana* An Shigao from the country of Parthia (*Anxi* 安息) during the time of Emperor Huan 桓帝 [r. 147-168 CE] of the Han [dynasty].⁴²

The entries themselves were drawn, according to Sengyou's own testimony, from Daoan's catalogue.⁴³ Sengyou had not seen all of the texts himself, however, for he reported that six of them had been lost by his time.⁴⁴

Already at the outset, however, we encounter a small problem, for the catalogue as we have it actually lists thirty-five texts totalling forty-one fascicles, a discrepancy which suggests that one of these titles was added to the list after it left Sengyou's hand. One of the one-fascicle texts, in other words, was apparently not on Sengyou's original list.

There is no easy way to determine which of the thirty-five items has been added, though it has often been observed that some of the titles may be duplicate names for a single text (e.g., the *Apitan wu fa jing* 阿毘曇五法經 and the *Wu fa jing* 五法經, or the *Ahan koujie shi'er yinyuan jing* 阿含口解十二因緣經 and the *Shi'er yinyuan jing* 十二因緣經).⁴⁵ If the extra item added to the list was simply such a variant name, then no substantive damage would have been done by the addition. This discrepancy serves as a reminder, however, that even our most reliable source—the *Chu sanzang ji ji*—cannot simply be accepted at face value.

Using Sengyou's list as their point of departure, two of the leading specialists in the field, U_i Hakuju (1971, published posthumously) and Erik Zürcher (1991) each compiled lists of the works they considered to be genuine translations by An Shigao. In the overwhelming majority of cases the assessments put forth by these two scholars are in agreement, with both of them accepting the following texts (arranged here in the sequence of their Taishō numbers) as An Shigao's work:

- T13: *Chang ahan shi bao fa jing* 長阿含十報法經
- T14: *Renben yusheng jing* 人本欲生經
- T31: *Yiqie liu sheshou yin jing* 一切流攝守因經
- T32: *Si di jing* 四諦經
- T36: *Benxiang yizhi jing* 本相猗致經

⁴¹ The catalogue as we have it actually gives thirty-five titles, a discrepancy which suggests that one of the titles was added to the list after it left Sengyou's hand.

⁴² T2145, 55.6b4-5: 右三十四部，凡四十卷，漢桓帝時安息國沙門安世高所譯出。

⁴³ So stated by Sengyou at 55.10a4-5.

⁴⁴ In at least one case a work described as "lost" by Sengyou is still in existence, though its presence has been masked (at least since the early sixth century CE) by the fact that it was amalgamated with another text by a different name. See the discussion of the *Za jing sishisi bian* 雜經四十四篇 (which comprises most of T150A, entitled *Qi chu san guan jing* 七處三觀經) below, pp. 52-53.

⁴⁵ See for example U_i 1971, p. 21, and Tsukamoto 1985, p. 89.

GUIDE TO EARLY CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

- T48: *Shifa feifa jing* 是法非法經
 T57: *Lou fenbu jing* 漏分布經
 T98: *Pufa yi jing* 普法義經
 T112: *Ba zhengdao jing* 八正道經
 T150a: *Qi chu san guan jing* 七處三觀經
 T150b: *Jiu heng jing* 九橫經
 T602: *Anban shouyi jing* 安般守意經
 T603: *Yin chi ru jing* 陰持入經
 T605: *Chanxing faxiang jing* 禪行法想經
 T607: *Daodi jing* 道地經
 T792: *Fa shou chen jing* 法受塵經

In addition to these, Zürcher (but not Ui) considers the following text to be genuine:⁴⁶

- T1508: *Ahan koujie shi'er yinyuan jing* 阿含口解十二因緣經

Conversely, Ui (but not Zürcher) credits An Shigao with the following three titles:

- T105: *Wu yin piyu jing* 五陰譬喻經
 T109: *Zhuan falun jing* 轉法輪經
 T1557: *Apitan wu fa xing jing* 阿毘曇五法行經

The above list of “consensus texts,” as well as the four works (T105, 109, 1508 and 1557) nominated by one or the other of these two scholars, will be the starting point of our discussion here. In an attempt to refine their findings still further, we will use both of the methodological approaches outlined in the Introduction (above, pp. 11-19), viz., using external evidence (above all, the information contained in Sengyou's *Chu sanzang ji ji*) as well as internal evidence (i.e., the vocabulary and style of the texts themselves) to assess the authenticity of these works.

Methodological preliminaries: external evidence

In addition to the simple fact that a given title is (or is not) registered under An Shigao's name in Sengyou's catalogue,⁴⁷ there are three other types of external evidence that can be used in determining the validity of the attribution to An Shigao of a given text. First, a small number of these texts have extant prefaces or colophons which explicitly attribute them to An Shigao. In the order of their Taishō numbers, and considering only those texts that have extant notices dating from the time of Daoan or before, the following texts belong to this category:

- T14: *Renben yu sheng jing* 人本欲生經⁴⁸

⁴⁶ Ui apparently considered the text to be lost (1971, p. 22).

⁴⁷ That is, among the texts listed in the catalogue portion of the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, where An Shigao's works appear on pp. 5c23-6b3, with the summary statement quoted above given at 6b4-6.

⁴⁸ Preface by Daoan to his commentary on the text (55.45a14-b2).

PART II: THE EASTERN HAN PERIOD

T602: *Anban shouyi jing* 安般守意經⁴⁹

T603: *Yin chi ru jing* 陰持入經⁵⁰

T607: *Dao di jing* 道地經⁵¹

-- *Da shi'er men jing* 大十二門經⁵²

-- *Xiao shi'er men jing* 小十二門經⁵³

Another small subset of the titles attributed to An Shigao by Sengyou consists of those works singled out for special mention in his biography of the translator.⁵⁴ Again in the order of their Taishō numbers (where applicable), they are the following:

T602: *Anban shouyi jing* 安般守意經⁵⁵

T603: *Yin chi ru jing* 陰持入經

T607: *Dao di jing* 道地經

-- *Da shi'er men jing* 大十二門經

-- *Xiao shi'er men jing* 小十二門經

-- *Bai liushi pin jing* 百六十品經

There is considerable overlap between this group and the texts mentioned in An Shigao's biography, but this is hardly surprising since prefaces and colophons were among the sources used by Sengyou in compiling the biographical section of his catalogue.⁵⁶

The fact that these texts are treated in An Shigao's biography as his most prominent works suggests that their attribution to him was well established and thus should be given additional weight.

The scriptures in these two categories, then, have a special claim to authenticity as genuine translations by An Shigao. It is worth noting that the majority of them are treatises rather than sūtras, a fact which points to the significant impact of such works on subsequent generations of Buddhist thinkers in China.

⁴⁹ Prefaces by Kang Senghui (55.42c29-43c3) and Daoan (43c4-24). But see below, p. 60, on the likely identity of the text referred to here.

⁵⁰ Preface perhaps by Chen Hui to a commentary on the *Yin chi ru jing* (T1694; see 33.9b9-25) and by Daoan (55.44b29-45a13) to his own commentary on the text.

⁵¹ Preface to the later translation of the complete text by Dharmarakṣa (T606) by Daoan (69a27-c18), but including a discussion of An Shigao's earlier work.

⁵² Preface by Daoan (55.46a14-b18).

⁵³ Preface by Daoan (55.45b26-46a13).

⁵⁴ See T2145, 55.95a21-24: 出安般守意陰持入經大小十二門及百六十品等。初外國三藏眾護撰述經要為二十七章。世高乃剖析護所集七章，譯為漢文。即道地經也。

⁵⁵ The problems with identifying the received text (T602) with Sengyou's references to the *Anban shouyi jing* will be discussed below (p. 60).

⁵⁶ Sengyou's biography of An Shigao, for example (T2145, 55.95a7ff.), begins with material that also appears in Kang Senghui's preface to the *Anban shouyi jing* (see 55.43b16ff.).

Conversely, a third group of texts is treated in Sengyou's catalogue as being of somewhat ambiguous status. In the case of four texts listed under An Shigao's name, Sengyou quotes Daoan as stating simply that they "resemble" An Shigao's work (似世高撰也).⁵⁷ At first glance this would seem to indicate that Daoan was unsure as to whether they had been produced by An Shigao or by someone else, but the use of the character *zhuan* 撰 makes this interpretation problematic. As Zacchetti has observed, in Daoan's usage this term "always refers to the work of compilation, or even abridgement, which produced the original texts, not to their later translation."⁵⁸ This would seem to imply, therefore, that Daoan considered these to be likely to have been composed, rather than simply translated, by An Shigao.⁵⁹ They are the following:

T32: *Si di jing* 四諦經

T1508: *Ahan koujie* 阿含口解

-- *Shisi yi jing* 十四意經

-- *Apitan jiushiba jie jing* 阿毘曇九十八結經

Of these the last two are apparently not extant, but texts with titles corresponding to the first two can be found in the transmitted canon (as indicated by the Taishō text numbers given above). And the *Ahan koujie*—both in its title, which refers to "oral explanations" (口解), and in its content—does indeed seem likely to be a composition by An Shigao rather than a translation of an Indian text, as Zacchetti has recently documented in detail (Zacchetti 2004a).

But the fact that Daoan included the *Si di jing* in this category as well is puzzling. Not only does the text conform quite closely in vocabulary and style to other solidly attributed An Shigao texts, it also has every appearance of being a translation, from the standard opening formula "Thus have [I] heard" (聞如是) through the formulaic ending stating that when this teaching had been pronounced the members of the audience accepted it and put it into practice (說如是 . . . 受行). There are, however, two brief commentarial remarks at the end of the text,⁶⁰ and Zacchetti has made the cogent suggestion that this exegetical portion might once have been larger than in the present text, thus leading Daoan to raise the question of whether it might have been a composition by An Shigao rather than simply a translation.⁶¹ In the form in which we have it, however, the *Si di jing* (with the sole exception of these stray commentarial notes) is surely a translation of an Indic-language sūtra.

* * *

⁵⁷ See T2145, 55.6b6.

⁵⁸ Zacchetti 2004, p. 213; emphasis in the original.

⁵⁹ See Zacchetti 2004, p. 213.

⁶⁰ See T32, 1.816c28. On these glosses and their sources see below, p. 71, n. 157.

⁶¹ Zacchetti 2004, p. 213, n. 88.

The following discussion, which deals with all of the works attributed to An Shigao that can be found in modern editions of the Chinese Buddhist canon, is divided for convenience into three categories: *āgama* texts (i.e., non-Mahāyāna sūtras), Mahāyāna scriptures, and treatises. Those in the first category are further sorted according to their parallels in other *āgama* collections⁶² and, where available, Daoan's remarks concerning their classification. As is well known, different recitation lineages catalogued their sacred texts in different ways; thus a sūtra that was transmitted as part of a *Madhyamāgama* (Pāli *Majjhimanikāya*) in one monastic community might appear in the *Samyuktāgama* (Pāli *Samyuttanikāya*) of another. Thus while I believe that the following method of sorting An Shigao's works can be useful as an expedient organizing principle, the reader should bear in mind that it is intended as nothing more than that.

In this section only texts that can be identified with titles attributed to An Shigao by Daoan will be considered. Additional works that have been nominated for consideration on other grounds will dealt with below ("Other possible attributions," pp. 65-68).

Āgama texts

Dirghāgama. Of the texts that can be attributed with a reasonable degree of confidence to An Shigao we may begin with two which have counterparts in the both the Chinese *Dirghāgama* and the Pāli *Dīghanikāya*:

T13: *Zhang ahan shi bao fa jing* 長阿含十報法經 (*Daśottarasūtra*)⁶³

T14: *Ren ben yu sheng jing* 人本欲生經 (*Mahānidānasūtra*)⁶⁴

Another sūtra, though classified by the Taishō editors in the section of texts with parallels in the Chinese *Samyuktāgama*, does not appear to have a parallel in that or any other Chinese *āgama* collection, nor has a Pāli counterpart yet been identified. As the text has been assigned to the *Dirghāgama* of the Sarvāstivādins by Uwe Hartmann,⁶⁵ we may provisionally include it here:

T98: *Pu fa yi jing* 普法義經 (*Arthavistarasūtra*)⁶⁶

⁶² This includes the Chinese *āgama* translations as well as the Pāli *nikāyas*, in addition to the small number of surviving Sanskrit manuscripts of *āgama* texts and, where available, parallels in the Tibetan canon (though the Tibetans did not translate the four Āgamas as discrete collections).

⁶³ Cf. DN 34 in Pāli and T1(10) in Chinese. An Shigao's text has been translated into modern Japanese in Ui 1971, pp. 245-275; see also de Jong 1966. The Japanese translation of the Chinese *Dirghāgama* version by KARASHIMA Seishi 辛嶋静志 (2000) contains extensive notes on the vocabulary of An Shigao's version as well. On the Sanskrit version of the sūtra found at Turfan see Mittal 1957 and Schlinghoff 1962.

⁶⁴ Cf. DN 15 in Pāli and T1(13) in Chinese. A version of the sūtra is included in the Chinese *Madhyamāgama* (T26[97]); there is also a separate translation of the sūtra (T52). For a modern Japanese translation of An Shigao's version see Ui 1971, pp. 36-113; a small portion has been translated into English by Erik Zürcher (see the appendix to Vetter 1994, pp. 159-160).

⁶⁵ See Hartmann 1989 and 1992.

⁶⁶ No Chinese counterpart has been identified in any of the *āgama* collections, but see the

Madhyamāgama. The following texts have counterparts in the Chinese *Madhyamāgama* and/or the Pāli *Majjhimanikāya* (with several of them also having counterparts in the Chinese *Ekottarikāgama*, though not in the Pāli *Āṅguttaranikāya*):

T31: *Yiqie liu she shou yin jing* 一切流攝守因經 (*Sarvāsravasūtra*)⁶⁷

T32: *Si di jing* 四諦經 (*Satyavibhaṅgasūtra*)⁶⁸

T36: *Benxiang yizhi jing* 本相猗致經⁶⁹

T48: *Shifa feifa jing* 是法非法經⁷⁰

T57: *Liu fenbu jing* 漏分布經 (*Nirvedhika-sūtra*)⁷¹

Saṃyuktāgama. Sengyou's list of An Shigao's translations includes a note by Daoan describing three of these sūtras as being from the *Saṃyuktāgama*.⁷² One of the three now appears as an independent scripture in the Taishō canon:

T112: *Ba zheng dao jing* 八正道經 (**Mithyātva-sūtra*)⁷³

Parallels in the Chinese *Saṃyuktāgama* and the Pāli *Saṃyuttanikāya* have been adduced by AKANUMA Chizen 赤沼智善,⁷⁴ but as Zacchetti has observed, these supposed counterparts (especially the Pāli) do not resemble An Shigao's translation very closely (2007c, p. 8).

Two additional scriptures classified as *Saṃyuktāgama* sūtras by Daoan, however, can no longer be found in the canon as separate texts, for due to an extremely anomalous set of circumstances they have come to be conflated with an anthology of *Ekottarikāgama*

separate translation by Paramārtha (T97). There is also a Tibetan version entitled *Don rgyas-pa zhes-bya-ba'i chos-kyi rnam-grangs* (Stog Palace 177, Derge 318, Peking 984). Sanskrit fragments of the text were found at Turfan; on these and their relationship to An Shigao's work see Hartmann 1996 and Yamabe 1997, pp. 162-169. For a Japanese translation of An Shigao's version see Ui 1971, pp. 276-295.

⁶⁷ Cf. MN 2 in Pāli and T26(10) in Chinese; there is another version of the text in the Chinese *Ekottarikāgama* (T125[40.6]). The only modern study known to me is the translation in Ui 1971, pp. 327-334.

⁶⁸ Cf. MN 141 (*Satyavibhaṅgasutta*) in Pāli and T26(31) in Chinese. This text, too, has a parallel in the Chinese *Ekottarikāgama* (T125[27.1]). See Ui 1971, pp. 306-317.

⁶⁹ Cf. T26(51) in the Chinese *Madhyamāgama* as well as another separate translation (T37); there appears to be no corresponding text in the Pāli canon. For a Japanese translation see Ui 1971, pp. 318-321.

⁷⁰ Cf. T26(85) in Chinese; no parallel has been identified in Pāli. See Ui 1971, pp. 322-326.

⁷¹ See T26(111) in the Chinese *Madhyamāgama*. The Pāli parallel is contained not in the *Majjhimanikāya* but in the *Āṅguttara* (AN VI.63); see the *Nibbedhika-sutta* (A.iii.410-417). For a Japanese translation see Ui 1971, pp. 296-305.

⁷² See T2145, 55.6a10-12. One of the three, the *Qi chu san guan jing*, also appears in Sengyou's listing of "condensed" or "extracted" scriptures (*chao jing* 抄經), where it is again said to be from the *Saṃyuktāgama* (異出抄雜阿含, 55.30b2).

⁷³ For a Japanese translation see Ui 1971, pp. 340-343.

⁷⁴ See Akanuma 1929, p. 236, where the *Ba zheng dao jing* is associated with the Pāli *Micchattasutta* (SN V, pp. 17-18) and with T99(784) in the Chinese *Saṃyuktāgama*.

texts also translated by An Shigao (now classified as T150A in the Taishō canon). The details of how this came about have been thoroughly documented by Paul Harrison (1997a), and will be summarized in the section on *Ekottarikāgama* texts immediately below. Here we may simply list the titles of these two additional scriptures, both of which appear in more than one place:

T150A(1) and (3) [sic]: *Qi chu san guan jing* 七處三觀經⁷⁵

T150A(31) and T150B [sic]: *Jiu heng jing* 九橫經⁷⁶

Of these, the *Qi chu san guan jing* also appears as the final sūtra in the *Za ahan jing* 雜阿含經, an archaic anthology of *Saṃyuktāgama* texts (see T101[27]).⁷⁷ To the best of my knowledge it has not previously been noted that a piece of the same text appears yet again, in some but not all editions of the canon, at the end of the *Si yuan jing* 四願經 “Scripture on the Four Wishes” (T735), a completely unrelated scripture translated by Zhi Qian.⁷⁸

Finally, two other texts with parallels in the Chinese *Saṃyuktāgama*, both with titles corresponding to works credited to An Shigao in Sengyou’s catalogue, are accepted as authentic by Ui but rejected by Zürcher on the basis of internal evidence:

T105: 五陰譬喻經 *Wu yin piyu jing*⁷⁹

T109: 轉法輪經 *Zhuan falun jing*⁸⁰

In his discussion of these two translations Zürcher states only that, in general terms, the *Wu yin piyu jing* contains “style and terminology [that] are definitely not those of An Shigao and his team,” while the *Zhuan falun jing* “contains stylistic features and *wenyan* admixtures that do not normally appear in An Shigao’s translations” (1991, p. 300). But it is possible to be considerably more specific. The *Wu yin piyu jing* contains a number of lexical features that do not appear in any of An Shigao’s core texts, including (to name only a few) the use of the phrase 遊於 to specify the place where the scripture was preached, the phrase 告比丘言 to introduce the Buddha’s speech to the monks, and the phrase 所以者何 to translate the formulaic question *tat kasya hetoh* “Why is that?” Moreover, the majority of the text is in four-character prosody, a style which is not at all

⁷⁵ Cf. T99(42) in the Chinese *Saṃyuktāgama*.

⁷⁶ See Ui 1971, pp. 377-379, Yamabe 1997, pp. 169-176, and the partial translation in Maspero 1967, p. 193.

⁷⁷ The fact that many of the sūtras contained in this anthology resemble the vocabulary and style of An Shigao’s translations has led some scholars to conclude that this collection might be his work as well; on this issue see below, “Other possible attributions.”

⁷⁸ See T735, 17.537b16-c27. This stray fragment—which begins not only in the middle of a sentence, but in the middle of a phrase!—corresponds to the material found in T150A from the character *shi* 是 (of *rushi* 如是!) at 2.876c12 through the end of the sūtra (= T101, 2.499a21-b29).

⁷⁹ See Ui 1971, pp. 349-352.

⁸⁰ See Zacchetti 1997 and Ui 1971, pp. 335-339.

characteristic of An Shigao's work. Most telling, however, is the fact that it contains twenty-eight lines of five-character verse (introduced by the phrase 佛說偈言 "The Buddha spoke [the following] in *gāthās*"), a feature that never occurs in any genuine An Shigao translation. Thus, despite the generally archaic appearance of the text, it seems quite certain that it is not the work of An Shigao.

The *Zhuan falun jing* contains no suspicious verses, but it contains other features that are unknown in any genuine An Shigao translation, including the use of the first-person pronoun *wu* 吾, the double-negative expression 莫不 "[there were] none who did not ...," the subordinating particle 之, and the epithets 最正覺 (apparently for *samyaksambuddha*) and 眾祐 (apparently for *bhagavat*). Here we also find the use of the temporal particle 已 "after [having done] ..." in the closing formula of the sūtra (佛說是已皆大歡喜), which again diverges from the language used in An Shigao's core texts. In short, the vocabulary of the *Zhuan falun jing* departs from An Shigao's normal style in far too many ways for this to be considered his work.

We may follow Zürcher, therefore, in excluding these two short sūtras from the list of genuine An Shigao translations. Whether Zürcher is correct in assigning them to the Han period, however, is somewhat less than certain. At least in the case of the *Zhuan falun jing*, certain unusual vocabulary items seem otherwise unknown prior to the time of Zhi Qian (fl. 220-252), who may have been the one to coin them.⁸¹ Further work will be required, therefore, before we can determine more precisely to what period, and to which rhetorical communities, these two translations should be assigned.

Ekottarikāgama. Daoan also credits to An Shigao an anthology of texts from an *Ekottarikāgama*, entitled *Za jing sishisi bian* 雜經四十四篇 "Sūtra Miscellany in Forty-Four Sections."⁸² That collection was long thought to have been lost, as reported already by Sengyou in his entry for this title.⁸³ In a study published in 1937, however, HAYASHIYA Tomojirō 林屋友次郎 demonstrated that this collection still survives today, comprising most of the content of the following text:

T150A: *Qi chu san guan jing* 七處三觀經 (**Saptasthāna-sūtra*)⁸⁴

⁸¹ See for example the heaven-names 不驕樂天 "heaven of delight without arrogance" (*sic*, for the *Nirmāṇarati* heaven) and 化應聲天 "heaven of the transformation of responsive sounds" (*sic*, for the *Paranirmitavaśavartin* heaven) which are widely used in Zhi Qian's work but not attested in any scripture that is certain to date from before his time.

⁸² His comments are preserved in Sengyou's *Chu sanzang jiji*; see T2145, 55.6a13.

⁸³ T2145, 55.6a13: 雜經四十四篇二卷(安公云:出增一阿鎗既不標名未詳何經。今闕)。

⁸⁴ See Ui 1971, pp. 353-376. For an important study of this text (building on the earlier study in Hayashiya 1937), including a reconstruction of the original sequence of its contents, see Harrison 1997. The text has been edited and translated by Vetter and Harrison (1998); sūtra no. 12 (according to Harrison's numbering; see 1997, p. 269) has been edited and translated by Harrison (in Dietz 2000, pp. 30-31).

This state of affairs, however, is the result of a series of mishaps in textual transmission. At an early date—prior to the time of Sengyou's *Chu sanzang ji ji*, at any rate—An Shigao's anthology of *Ekottarikāgama* texts had been conflated with two of his *Samyuktāgama* translations, viz., the *Qi chu san guan jing* 七處三觀經 and the *Jiu heng jing* 九橫經. As the *Qi chu san guan jing* was placed at the head of the text, its title came to be used to refer to the entire collection, thus effectively masking the presence of the *Za jing sishisi bian*. (An additional intruder into An Shigao's *Ekottarikāgama* anthology, a scripture entitled *Ji gu jing* 積骨經 [T150A(30)], does not seem to have been known to Daoan and is treated by Sengyou as an anonymous translation.)⁸⁵

Though Hayashiya was able to locate the missing *Za jing sishisi bian* within the *Qi chu san guan jing*, the problem of reconstructing its original structure still remained largely unsolved. The situation was extremely complicated, for not only had three unrelated scriptures been added to An Shigao's *Ekottarika* anthology, at a certain point some of the pages of this amalgamated collection were rearranged in the wrong order. Other pages were lost and, when they were replaced from another source, were inserted at the wrong point. As a result, as Harrison puts it, the version of the text found in the Taishō canon today is “a complete and utter jumble” (1997a, p. 264). Building on Hayashiya's initial attempt to rearrange the text, however, Harrison has been able to sort out the confusion in admirable fashion.⁸⁶ A complete list of Pāli, Chinese, Sanskrit and Tibetan parallels to each of the forty-four sūtras belonging to the original *Ekottarikāgama* anthology is given by Harrison as well (pp. 268-275), so I will not recapitulate them here.

In addition to the forty-four texts contained in this recovered anthology, two other very short sūtras, accepted by both Ui and Zürcher as the work of An Shigao, have recently been identified by Harrison as corresponding, at least in part, to materials found in the Pāli *Āṅguttara-nikāya*:⁸⁷

T605: *Chan xing faxiang jing* 禪行法想經⁸⁸

T792: *Fa shou chen jing* 法受塵經⁸⁹

On external grounds alone—that is, based on the fact that these titles are credited to An Shigao by Daoan—there is no reason to doubt this attribution, so at first glance it would seem that we should add these texts to the roster of An Shigao's *Ekottarikāgama*

⁸⁵ See 55.28b21.

⁸⁶ See Harrison 1997, p. 262ff. and cf. Hayashiya 1937, pp. 30-50.

⁸⁷ Harrison 1997a, p. 277.

⁸⁸ See Ui 1971, pp. 346-348; identified by Harrison (1997, p. 277) as corresponding to AN I.20 *Jhāna* (A.i.38-43, especially 41-42; *Gradual Sayings* I, 34-39); Harrison also notes parallel phraseology in AN I.6 (A.I.10-11; *Gradual Sayings* I, 8-9).

⁸⁹ See Ui 1971, pp. 344-345; identified by Harrison (1997, p. 277) as corresponding to AN I.1 *Rūpādi* (A.I.1-2; *Gradual Sayings* I.1-2), with an additional parallel in the Chinese *Ekottarikāgama* (T125, section 9.7-8; 1.563a13-b10).

translations.⁹⁰

Internal evidence, however, tells a quite different story. As Hu Chirui 胡敕瑞 has recently shown,⁹¹ the *Fa shou chen jing* has a number of anomalous features that contrast sharply with the usual style of An Shigao's translations. Of these the most dramatic is the use of the first-person pronoun *wu* 吾, which never occurs in any other text by An Shigao (all of which use *wo* 我 exclusively for this purpose).⁹² Hu cites several other aberrant features as well,⁹³ the cumulative effect of which is to show that the language of the *Fa shou chen jing* differs strikingly from that of the other works credited by Sengyou to An Shigao.

The *Fa shou chen jing* is not completely isolated, however, for the other text listed immediately above—the *Chan xing faxiang jing* (T605)—shares a number of its highly unusual expressions. Though the latter text does not include the pronoun *wu* 吾,⁹⁴ it does use the highly atypical opening phrase 一時佛遊於 . . . “Once the Buddha was sojourning at . . .” (in place of An Shigao's usual wording 一時佛在 . . . “Once the Buddha was staying at . . .”),⁹⁵ as well as (in one case) the character 之 used as a subordinating particle.⁹⁶ The two texts also share the closing expression 佛說是已 “When the Buddha had taught this,” which is not found in any other translation by An Shigao.⁹⁷ Most striking of all, however, is the shared use—in these two texts alone, among translations commonly attributed to An

⁹⁰ For the catalogue entries in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* see 55.6b2 and 6a22, respectively.

⁹¹ Hu 2005, p. 272, §2.2. I would like to thank Stefano Zacchetti for sending me a copy of this article, which had not yet reached our library at the time of this writing.

⁹² The pronoun *wu* 吾 does occur in T109, another text attributed to An Shigao by Sengyou but which exhibits a number of other anomalous features suggesting that the text as we have it is surely not his work.

⁹³ Additional anomalous features cited by Hu are the use of the expression [佛]遊於 “[the Buddha was] sojourning at” (in place of An Shigao's usual [佛]在 “[the Buddha was] staying at”), the use of 是以 “therefore” (in place of An Shigao's normal 用是故), the use of the subordinating/genitive particle 之 (extremely rare, though not altogether unattested, in An Shigao's corpus), and the use of the expression 女子 “woman,” which is completely absent not only from the other texts attributed to An Shigao but from virtually all other translations produced during the Eastern Han and Three Kingdoms periods.

⁹⁴ T605 does not contain the pronoun 我 either, however; presumably its Indic-language original simply did not include any equivalent of the word “I.”

⁹⁵ The character 遊—with or without the preposition 於—never occurs elsewhere in An Shigao's corpus (the postscript to T603, where this character appears twice [15.180b12 and c3], is by a different hand).

⁹⁶ See T605, 15.181c4-5: 若以彈指間念此諸想之事。

⁹⁷ An Shigao's normal closing statement is 佛說如是 “[When] the Buddha had taught thus” (e.g., in T14, 36, 57, and 112, as well as in numerous sūtras in the anthologies T101 and T150A); in two cases he writes simply 佛說是 “[When] the Buddha had taught this” (T31 and 48). In no case, however, does the temporal particle 已 occur in this context.

Shigao by specialists—of the very rare formulation 比丘受教從佛而聽 “the monks accepted the teaching and listened to the Buddha” which occurs near the beginning of both sūtras, just after the Buddha has called the monks to attention.⁹⁸ Not only is this wording absent from An Shigao’s work,⁹⁹ but it is also unattested in the work of virtually all translators from the Eastern Han, Three Kingdoms, and Western Jin periods. In short, this extremely rare usage strongly suggests that T792 and T605, while clearly archaic, are not the work of An Shigao. Conversely, however, they are certainly related to one another, and further work on the place of these two texts within the corpus of early Chinese translations will surely be able to clarify the situation further. In particular, two other texts that could fruitfully be compared with these works are the *Shi zhi jing* 七知經 (T27), listed as anonymous by Daoan,¹⁰⁰ and the *Chan xing sanshiqi pin jing* 禪行三十七品經 (T604) which, as Zacchetti has noted, shares a great many peculiar features with T605, and which must be directly related to it in some way.¹⁰¹

A Mahāyāna sūtra (?)

As noted above, Sengyou (based on the earlier work of Daoan) attributes to An Shigao at least three scriptures whose titles suggest that they were Mahāyānist in content. Two of

⁹⁸ See T605, 15.181b21 and T792, 17.737a1. The rarity of this wording is true not only of the eight characters taken together, but also of each of the four-character phrases used here; aside from these two supposed An Shigao translations, the phrase 比丘受教 only occurs, among texts that can be dated with some confidence to the first decade of the fourth century CE or before, in the *Shi zhi jing* 七知[var. 智經] (T27, 1.810a7), a text which is ascribed to Zhi Qian in later catalogues but listed as anonymous by Daoan (T2145, 55.19a1), and in the sole translation ascribed to Kang Mengxiang by Sengyou (T196, 中本起經; see 4.152a23). Its rarity becomes especially obvious when we note that it does not appear in the substantial bodies of work produced by Lokakṣema and Zhi Qian, nor even (with one possible but problematic exception) in the corpus of Dharmarakṣa (see T337, 12.89b15).

The second phrase, 從佛而聽, is even less common, being completely absent from all pre-fourth century translations, with (again) the sole exception of T27 (*loc. cit.*). Indeed, in the entirety of the CBETA edition of the canon (App1 edition), this expression occurs in this context *only* in T27, T605 and T792. (The other four occurrences—T278, copied in T279; and T681, copied in T682—are in a completely different context, and they occur in five-character verse passages with another word [法 or 受] following the verb 聽.) The phrase 從佛而聽 is, in short, a very distinctive usage, which strongly suggests that T605, T729 and T27 are related in some way.

⁹⁹ The use of the formula 佛告[諸]比丘 “The Buddha addressed the monks,” i.e., called them to attention (with no direct quotation following), is—unlike the other features being discussed here—quite typical of An Shigao’s work. Most commonly, An Shigao writes some version of the following: 佛告比丘。比丘應唯然。“The Buddha addressed the monks, and the monks replied (應) “Yes, [sir],” where 唯然 is presumably a translation of *evam* “thus, just so” in the sense of an expression of agreement or willingness to listen.

¹⁰⁰ See T2145, 55.19a1, where the title is given as 七智經 (var. 七知經). The attribution of the text to Zhi Qian, which appears in modern printed editions of the canon, stems from Fei Changfang’s notoriously unreliable *Lidai sanbao ji* (T2034, 49.57c20) and need not be taken seriously.

¹⁰¹ Zacchetti 2007c, pp. 15-17.

these—the *Daoyi faxing jing* 道意發行經 “Scripture on Bringing Forth Bodhicitta” and the *Shisi yi jing* 十四意經 “Scripture on Fourteen Thoughts” (for which Sengyou gives the alternate title of *Pusa shisi yi jing* 菩薩十四意經 “Scripture on the Fourteen Thoughts of the Bodhisattva”)—have long been lost, and to the best of my knowledge they are not cited in any extant work.¹⁰² The third, however—entitled *Wushi jiaoji jing* 五十校計經 “Scripture on the Fifty Evaluations,” for which Sengyou provides the alternative title of *Mingdu wushi jiaoji jing* 明度五十校計經, “Prajñāpāramitā Scripture on the Fifty Evaluations”—does have a counterpart in the extant Chinese Buddhist canon. As in the case of An Shigao’s *Ekottarikāgama* anthology discussed above, its presence has been hidden by the fact that it has been absorbed into an entirely unrelated collection of scriptures, in this case the *Dafangdeng da ji jing* 大方等大集經 (*Mahāsammipāta-sūtra*), where it appears as chapter 13, entitled “The Bodhisattvas of the Ten Directions”:

T397(13) *Shi fang pusa pin* 十方菩薩品¹⁰³

The content of the text clearly corresponds to the title given by Sengyou, for within the sūtra are discussed fifty “evaluations” (五十校計) to be practiced by bodhisattvas. The text is, in other words, clearly Mahāyāna in content, and if the attribution to An Shigao is authentic this would mean that he translated at least one Mahāyāna scripture.

Neither Ui nor Zürcher, however, included this scripture on their respective lists of authentic An Shigao translations. Zürcher does not give any reason for its exclusion; Ui, on the other hand, discusses only the title of the text,¹⁰⁴ considering the translation

¹⁰² Fei Changfang’s statement that the *Daoyi fa xing jing* is “from the Dīrghāgama” (出長阿含, T2034, 49.50b4) is—like many other such remarks that appear for the first time in his catalogue—quite implausible, and there is no reason to take it seriously.

¹⁰³ T397, 13.394b8-407a16. The most substantial discussion of this scripture in any western language is that given in Deleanu 1993, pp. 43-44, n. 100; in Japanese see the detailed analysis by Shizutani (1974, pp. 233-237). The latter takes the text to be the work of An Shigao but (employing what seems to be circular reasoning) finds it problematic that it appears to be a Mahāyāna sūtra, arguing that since An Shigao translated only “Hīnayāna” scriptures, this too should be viewed as a “Hīnayāna” text (*sic*; see p. 234: 世高は小乗経典を訳しただけであるから、本経も小乗経典とみるべきであろう). As a way around the problem, Shizutani proposes that the sūtra is actually a critique of Mahāyāna bodhisattvas, composed from the perspective of the Hīnayāna sect to which An Shigao belonged (p. 236: 本経は彼の所属した小乗部派の立場からの、大乘菩薩の立場二対する批判書と解すべきであろう).

It is true that the sūtra is critical of those bodhisattvas who fall short in their practice, but this need not suggest that it is in any sense a criticism by a non-Mahāyānist; on the contrary, Mahāyāna sūtras abound in such critiques. To mention only a single example, the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā* criticizes bodhisattvas for failures of a variety of sorts, e.g., wrongly and arrogantly believing themselves to be incapable of retrogression (*avaivartika*; e.g., xxi.385-391), failing to practice *upāya* and thus falling accidentally into Arhatship (xvi.310), and even rejecting the authority of the *Prajñāpāramitā* itself (e.g., viii.178ff., xi.234ff.) As Shizutani also observes, though the sūtra does criticize bodhisattvas, it does not fundamentally reject as non-Buddhist their desire to attain Buddhahood and to help beings (p. 236); in fact, it accepts the bodhisattva path as a part of Buddhism, i.e., as one of the three vehicles (p. 237).

¹⁰⁴ See above, p. 43, n. 34.

itself to have been lost by Daoan's time (1971, pp. 22, 450). This appears to be a slip of the pen, however, for as Deleanu has rightly observed, the *Chu sanzang ji ji* does not report the text as lost, and there is no evidence that Daoan and Sengyou were unable to consult it (1993, p. 44, n. 100). Indeed, the "Bodhisattvas of the Ten Directions" chapter of the *Mahāsaṃnipāta-sūtra* (T397[13]) has long been associated with the *Wushi jiaoji jing* in standard reference works,¹⁰⁵ and in the Song, Yuan, and Ming editions of the canon An Shigao's name is attached to this section. In sum, the external evidence linking the content of this chapter with the *Wushi jiaoji jing* assigned to An Shigao by Daoan is sufficiently strong that it should be given a place in any analysis of possible works by this translator.

Internal evidence, however, tells a quite different story. While the language of the sūtra is clearly archaic, and its terminology (like that of other early translations) includes many items that were coined by An Shigao, there are also a substantial number of elements that are quite alien to his normal style. It might seem reasonable to begin with the Buddhist names and terms found in the text, but since its content is quite different from the other works in his corpus—i.e., *āgama* texts and non-Mahāyāna treatises—the fact that expressions such as 無數劫 "innumerable kalpas," 釋迦文佛 "Śākyamuni Buddha," or for that matter 菩薩 "bodhisattva," do not appear elsewhere in An Shigao's work probably reflects only the fact that the corresponding terms were absent from his Indic-language sources.

If we focus on ordinary (i.e., non-Buddhist) terminology, by contrast, a clear pattern quickly appears. Most telling are the following grammatical forms:

- the pronoun *ru* 汝, which occurs twenty-seven times in T397(13), is not found in any other translation solidly attributed to An Shigao;
- the plural particle *cao* -曹, which occurs no fewer than fifty-two times here, but is also unknown in any genuine An Shigao translation;¹⁰⁶ and
- enclosure formations ("circumfixes") in which the name of the person addressed is enclosed by two verbs of speaking, such as *wen* 問 . . . *yan* 言 "asked," *gao* 告 . . . *yan* 言 "told," and *bao* 報 . . . *yan* 言 "replied," occur numerous times here but never elsewhere in An Shigao's work¹⁰⁷

With so many features which are foreign to An Shigao's normal style, it is clear that this cannot be his work.

¹⁰⁵ See Mochizuki, vol. 4, p. 3422b-c and the *Busho kaisetsu daijiten*, vol. 5, p. 206. As noted by Deleanu (1993, p. 44, n. 100), both sources trace the erroneous inclusion of this text in the *Mahāsaṃnipāta-sūtra* to the Sui 隋 period; more specifically, it is thought to have been placed there by Sengjiu 僧就 (see the *Busho kaisetsu daijiten*, vol. 7, p. 478 and Mochizuki, vol. 4, pp. 3422c).

¹⁰⁶ The sole occurrence in An Shigao's *Ekottarikāgama* anthology is in T150A(30), the *Ji gu jing* 積骨經, which is one of the "intruders" introduced into that text from another source (see above, p. 53).

¹⁰⁷ The expression 報言 does occur in An Shigao's corpus, but never with the name of the person spoken to being placed between the two verbs.

But if it is not by An Shigao, can we say anything at all about when, and by whom, this text was produced? In the case of the *Chan xing faxiang jing* and the *Fa shou chen jing* discussed above, both of which appear to fall outside the range of An Shigao's style, we were able to identify a very small number of other texts that share some of their distinctive expressions.¹⁰⁸ And this is also the case with the *Wushi jiaoji jing*. The divergent items listed immediately above are far too common in works produced by early translators other than An Shigao to be used efficiently as primary tracers. Instead, we may look briefly at some of the formulaic expressions that appear in T397(13). Looking first at the closing formula, we can see that the description of the audience's reaction is expressed as follows: "All of them were extremely joyful. They performed salutations to the Buddha, pressing their faces to the Buddha's feet. Accepting [the teachings] and [undertaking to] practice them, they departed" 皆大歡喜。前為佛作禮，頭面著佛足。受行而去。(13.407a15-16). This wording does not occur elsewhere in An Shigao's work, but virtually all of its components—[皆]大歡喜，[前]為佛作禮，頭面著佛足，and 而去—occur regularly in precisely this same context in translations attributed to Lokakṣema.¹⁰⁹ The opening of the text, too, is reminiscent of Lokakṣema's style, for it begins without any representation of the famous phrase "Thus have I heard ..." (*evam mayā śrutam*), but simply states where the discourse took place.

A detailed discussion of the many terms found in T397(13) that also occur in works credited to Lokakṣema lies beyond the range of this study, but we may note first of all that—with one exception—all of the above grammatical forms singled out above as alien to An Shigao's usage (the pronoun 汝, the plural suffix -曹, and the enclosure formations consisting of various verbs of speech + -言) can be found in great abundance in Lokakṣema's corpus.¹¹⁰

Yet it is possible to be still more specific. As already observed several decades ago by Shizutani, the beginning of the sūtra resembles that of Lokakṣema's *Dousha jing* 兜沙

¹⁰⁸ See above, pp. 54-55.

¹⁰⁹ See for example the *Daoxing banruo jing* 道行般若經 (T224), where the reaction of a group of gods to the Buddha's Subhūti's discourse is portrayed as follows: 皆前以頭面著佛足，繞三匝而去。(8.451b8-9), and the final conclusion of the sūtra reads 皆大歡欣。為佛作禮而去 (478b12-13). An even closer match is offered by Lokakṣema's *Banzhou sanmei jing* 般舟三昧經 (T418), which closes with the following: 皆大歡喜。前為佛作禮而去 (13.919c3-4). Interestingly, the one element that does not appear in his formulaic usage, 受行 "accepted [the teachings and] put them into practice," is one that is standard here in An Shigao's work, but when encased within this longer series of statements it seems out of place.

¹¹⁰ The exception is the combination of 告 . . . 言, which does not appear in any of Lokakṣema's core texts (a category to be discussed below). It does appear, however, in an archaic translation of the *Akṣobhyavyūha* (T313, *Achu foguo jing* 阿閼佛國經), which Daoan considered to be similar to Lokakṣema's work in style.

經 (T280).¹¹¹ For Shizutani, what was noteworthy about these passages was their content, which he considered to be unexpected in a “Hīnayāna” sūtra. But from our perspective it is the terminology itself that is worthy of note. T397(13) begins by placing the Buddha at Rājagṛha, at the “place of Dharma purity” (法清淨處), on a spontaneously-manifested lion-seat (自然師子座), covered by a canopy (交絡帳; 13.394b9-10). Though T280 opens at Magadha rather than at Rājagṛha, the description of the locale (法清淨處) is the same, and once again the Buddha is seated on a spontaneously-appearing lion-seat (自然師子座; 10.445a6-8). Though the characters 交絡帳 do not appear in the opening passage of T280, they can be found eleven times in other parts of sūtra (with the middle character written as 路 rather than 絡), always directly following the expression 自然師子座.¹¹² There is yet another occurrence of these two phrases (this time with the middle character of 交絡帳 written 露) in the *Zhu pusa qiu fo benye jing* 諸菩薩求佛本業經 (T282), which can now be seen as another piece of the same translation which, as discussed below, was separated from T280 in the course of transmission in China.¹¹³

The extent of this shared wording (some of it quite rare) is so striking that it is difficult to imagine that it could be the result of coincidence, and it strongly suggests that there is some relationship between the two.¹¹⁴ In sum, these two texts—while substantially different in content—seem to be drawing on a common lexicon.

While it is far too early to draw any firm conclusions from these similarities, it is clear that a detailed comparative study of the *Wushi jiaoji jing* and the works credited to Lokakṣema, especially the *Dousha jing*, could well be rewarding. Pending such a study, we may put forth the hypothesis that the *Wushi jiaoji jing* was produced in a community whose members considered themselves to be disciples (or descendants of disciples) of An Shigao, but who also had access to translations produced by Lokakṣema’s community, in particular the *Dousha jing*. While this scenario must of course remain speculative at this early stage, what we can say with confidence is that the *Wushi jiaoji jing* is not the work of An Shigao himself.

Treatises

Thus far we have dealt only with the sūtra translations credited to An Shigao by Daoan, but an important component of his corpus consists of texts that are not sūtras, but scholastic treatises. Indeed, as noted above, virtually all of the translations singled out for attention

¹¹¹ Shizutani 1974, p. 234.

¹¹² T280, 10.445a8; 445b19, 23, and 27; and 445c9, 13, 17, 21, and 25.

¹¹³ See T282, 10.454a18-19: 諸菩薩等悉各於一一七寶蓮華師子座交露帳中坐. On the relationship of this text to T280 see below, pp. 87-88.

¹¹⁴ While spontaneously-appearing lion seats can be found in other places, the expression “the place of Dharma purity” 法清淨處 occurs only once outside these texts (see T1442, 23.688c27).

in Sengyou's biography of An Shigao are works of the latter type. Of these one of the most solidly attributions, mentioned in An Shigao's biography as well as in prefaces by such illustrious figures as Kang Senghui and Daoan himself, is the *Anban shouyi jing* 安般守意經 "Scripture on Guarding the Mind [through Mindfulness of] Inhalation and Exhalation." A text by this name in fact appears in the Taishō edition of the canon:

T602: *Da anban shouyi jing* 大安般守意經

It has long been recognized, however, that this is not simply a translation of an Indian text, but includes commentarial material added in China. Which parts are commentary and which might belong to an original translated text, however, are not clearly marked within the scripture itself, and until recently a significant amount of scholarly attention was focused on the problem of how to distinguish them.¹¹⁵

The recent discovery of a manuscript containing a significantly different work by this name at the Kongōji 金剛時 temple in Japan, however, has cast the problem in an entirely new light.¹¹⁶ A comparison of the language of the Kongōji manuscript with that of the received text of the *Da anban shouyi jing* (T602) makes it quite clear that it is the manuscript, and not the received text (or even a part of the received text), that most closely reflects An Shigao's usual vocabulary and style.¹¹⁷ Moreover, the discovery of the Kongōji manuscript has also provided a new perspective on the nature of T602 itself. After a careful analysis of both works, Zacchetti has concluded that T602 is not a translation at all (that is, it does not consist of a translation plus interpolated commentarial notes), but that it is simply a commentary on another text, viz., a version of the *Anban shouyi jing* like that represented in the Kongōji manuscript.¹¹⁸ The relationship of T602 to An Shigao's community—that is, whether it should be viewed as the work of one of his immediate disciples, or of someone from a later generation, or (what seems far less likely) as the work of An Shigao himself—still awaits a detailed investigation.

The discovery of the Kongōji manuscript entails in turn a radical shift in the assessment of the canonical T602, which has long been considered to be one of the benchmarks of An Shigao's language and style.¹¹⁹ While the external evidence supporting this assessment could hardly be stronger—since a work entitled *Anban shouyi jing* is not only the very first work credited to An Shigao in Sengyou's catalogue, but is also documented in two early prefaces (by Kang Senghui and Daoan) and is also expressly mentioned in his

¹¹⁵ For two attempts to separate the scriptural portions of the text from the commentary see Aramaki 1971 and Ui 1971, pp. 201-244. A punctuated critical edition of the text is included in Du 1997.

¹¹⁶ On the Kongōji manuscripts see below, "Newly discovered manuscripts."

¹¹⁷ See Zacchetti 2002b.

¹¹⁸ Zacchetti 2007b and 2007c, p. 13.

¹¹⁹ See for example Demiéville 1954, p. 343, n. 3 and p. 353, n. 1, and Zürcher 1991, p. 279 (cited in Zacchetti 2007c, n. 40).

biography in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*—the case of the Kongōji manuscript serves as a reminder of the importance of giving equal weight to internal evidence as well. The fact that the received text of T602 contains terminology that is not usual for An Shigao (even in sections of the text that were thought to be parts of a translation rather than the commentary) has long been known, but it is only since the Kongōji manuscript came to light that the full significance of this fact has become apparent. In short, while T602 must now be removed from the list of An Shigao's translations, it should be replaced by the text from Kongōji discussed below (p. 64).

The *Anban shouyi jing* was not the only text translated by An Shigao that was the recipient of an early commentary. Another such text (likewise a treatise rather than a sūtra) is the “Scripture on the *Skandhas*, *Dhātus*, and *Āyatanas*”:

T603: *Yin chi ru jing* 陰持入經¹²⁰

In this case it is fairly straightforward to distinguish the translation from its Chinese commentary, for in the Taishō edition of the canon the translated scripture (T603) has been printed separately from the commentary (T1694, which bears exactly the same title, though it is sometimes referred to in modern secondary studies as the *Yin chi ru jing zhu* 陰持入經注), though it should be noted that this is the result of a modern editing procedure.¹²¹ The commentary itself is thought to date from the middle of the third century CE; it will be discussed separately below (p. 152).

The identity of the base text, however—that is, whether it should be considered a translation or an original composition produced in China, perhaps by An Shigao himself—has long been debated. In a ground-breaking study, however, Zacchetti has identified an Indic counterpart to the *Yin chi ru jing* in a part of Chapter 6 of the Pāli *Peṭakopadesa*, thus providing convincing proof that it is indeed a translation of an Indian text.¹²² Internal evidence, in this case, strongly supports the assessment of the received text of T603 as An Shigao's work, and thus it can retain its central place among his authentic translations.

The text as it has come down to us, however, is not complete, for as Sengyou writes in the section of his catalogue devoted to commentaries written by Daoan (whose notes to the *Yin chi ru jing* have unfortunately not survived), “The *Yin chi ru [jing]* is the surviving portion of a translation by [An] Shigao.”¹²³ This does not seem to refer to the fact that it corresponds to only a portion of the *Peṭakopadesa*, however; as Zacchetti has shown, there is strong evidence that Chapter 6 of this work originally circulated

¹²⁰ In the Taishō edition of the text the first character in the title is printed 除 [*sic*]. See Ui 1971, pp. 114–200 and Yamabe 1997.

¹²¹ See Zacchetti 2002b, p. 95, where earlier precedents for the procedure of separating this text from its commentary (and preface) as also discussed.

¹²² See Zacchetti 2002a.

¹²³ T2145, 55.39c19: 陰持入者世高所出殘經也.

GUIDE TO EARLY CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

independently, and An Shigao's translation was probably based on such a separate work.¹²⁴ Instead, it seems to be drawing attention to the fact that T603 ends abruptly, without finishing the topic under discussion. It is possible that An Shigao simply was not able to finish his translation, but it seems more likely that at some point (prior to the time of Sengyou, at any rate) the end of the text was lost in the course of transmission.¹²⁵

Another treatise for which there is strong external evidence supporting the attribution to An Shigao has long been recognized as corresponding to part of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, a text composed by the Sarvāstivādin master Saṃgharakṣa:

T607: *Dao di jing* 道地經¹²⁶

Comparison with the *Xiuxing daodi jing* 修行道地經 (T606), a later (and considerably longer) translation of Saṃgharakṣa's treatise by Dharmarakṣa, quickly reveals that An Shigao's version consists of material corresponding to chapters 1-5, 22, and 24 of the twenty-seven chapters contained in Dharmarakṣa's work.¹²⁷ An Shigao's translation, in other words, does not appear to represent the entire text, but only an abridgement of a substantially larger work.

In this case scholarly debate has focused not on whether or not the *Dao di jing* was produced by An Shigao—for there is widespread agreement that it is his—but on where and by whom the abridgement was made. The *Chu sanzang jiji* gives conflicting information on this score. In the list of An Shigao's translations given in the catalogue section, Sengyou quotes Daoan as saying that the abridgement had been produced outside China.¹²⁸ In his introduction to the section on "abbreviated" scriptures (*chao jing* 抄經), however, Sengyou describes it as having been abridged by An Shigao himself.¹²⁹ One can well imagine that An Shigao, faced with the huge task of making Buddhist canonical literature comprehensible to his Chinese audience, thought it useful to devote his limited time and resources to producing the essentials of a number of different texts, and indeed several of his translations consist of selections from a larger collection of sūtras (e.g., the *Ekottarikāgama* anthology contained within T150A) or an excerpt from a larger individual scripture (e.g.,

¹²⁴ Zacchetti 2002a, pp. 90-91.

¹²⁵ Zacchetti 2002a, p. 88.

¹²⁶ See the classic study by Demiéville (1954, especially pp. 343-347), as well as Ui 1971, pp. 411-436, Deleanu 1997, and Yamabe 1997.

¹²⁷ See Demiéville 1954, p. 343.

¹²⁸ See 55.6c28: 安公[云]: 大道地經者修行經抄也。外國所抄。"Lord [Dao] An [says], "The *Da dao ji jing* is abridged version of the *Xiuxing [daodi jing]*. It was abridged abroad [i.e., not in China]."

¹²⁹ See 55.37c1-2: 昔安世高抄出修行為大道地經。"In former times An Shigao abridged and translated the *Xiuxing [daodi jing]* as the *Da dao ji jing*." (If this was intended to say that he translated a condensed version of the text, one would rather expect the word order to be different: 出抄修行.) Cf. T2059, 323b9etc. and Demiéville p. 344, n. 1.

T603, which corresponds to only one part of the *Peṭakopadesa*). Based on this circumstantial evidence, and taking note of the fact that the type of abbreviation that we see in the *Dao di jing*—i.e., the selection of only certain key chapters from a longer treatise—does not seem to be well attested in Indian Buddhist literature, it seems reasonable to infer that the condensation of the text was probably done by An Shigao himself.

The final extant treatise listed by Daoan as a translation by An Shigao is an abhidharma text, which can now be found in the Taishō canon under the following title:

T1557: *Apitan wu fa xing jing* 阿毘曇五法行經¹³⁰

Though accepted as authentic by Ui, it is not included on Zürcher's list of genuine Han-period translations for reasons that are not altogether clear. The vocabulary and style of the text appear to be quite congruent with that of An Shigao's other works, however, so it is included here pending further study.

An original composition

Included on Zürcher's list of An Shigao's works (1991, p. 298) but not in the study published by Ui (1971) is a text whose title can be translated as "Oral Explanation of the *Āgamas*: Scripture on the Twelfefold Causal Links":

T1508: *Ahan koujie shi'er yinyuan jing* 阿含口解十二因緣經¹³¹

The editors of the Taishō canon assigned this text to the slightly later Parthian translator An Xuan and his Chinese co-worker Yan Fotiao, but this attribution is obviously unfounded,¹³² for Daoan explicitly credits the text to An Shigao.¹³³ As mentioned above, however, he does not simply list it without comment, but notes that it "appears to have been composed by An Shigao" (似世高撰也).¹³⁴ Indeed, as suggested by both the title and the content of the text, we surely have to do not with a translation of an Indian original, but a text produced in China designed to suit the needs of audiences there.¹³⁵

The language of the text is, on the whole, congruent with the usage found in An

¹³⁰ See Ui 1971, pp. 380-410; for other Chinese parallels see Cox 1995, p. 75, n. 11.

¹³¹ See Zacchetti 2004a.

¹³² Like so many other problematic attributions, the assignment of T1508 to An Xuan can be traced to the *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶紀 compiled by Fei Changfang 費長房 (T2034, 49.34a7 and 53b27). For a detailed discussion of the treatment of T1508 in this and other Chinese catalogues see Zacchetti 2004a, p. 214 and notes 89-93.

¹³³ It might also be added that the vocabulary and style of the text does not resemble at all that of the sole extant work reliably attributed to these two translators, the *Fa jing jing* 法鏡經 (T322), on which see below, pp. 91-92.

¹³⁴ See T2145, 55.6b6; cf. above, p. 48.

¹³⁵ On the attribution of T1508 to An Shigao, see the detailed discussion in Zacchetti 2004a, especially pp. 212-219, with references to earlier work especially by Hayashiya (1945, pp. 389-396) and Forte (1968, pp. 190-194).

Shigao's core translations. The very circumstances of its production, however—presumably as an oral discourse delivered by An Shigao and recorded in writing by others—suggest that it may be slightly removed from An Shigao's other works, over which the translator may have had greater control.

On the one hand, this implies that—unlike the other texts discussed above—this scripture cannot provide us with a direct reflection of the Buddhist literature that was circulating in India. On the other hand, it provides valuable evidence concerning how one Buddhist missionary from Parthia chose to present the Dharma to his Chinese audience, in his own words, in second-century Luoyang.

Newly discovered manuscripts

The field of An Shigao studies is currently being revolutionized by the recent re-discovery at Kongōji 金剛寺, a temple located in Ōsaka Prefecture, of several texts that appear to be ascribable to An Shigao. In 1999 KAJIURA Susumu 梶浦晋 discovered two scrolls in the Kongōji collection containing previously unknown texts related to An Shigao's translations. Kajiura conveyed this news to OCHIAI Toshinori 落合俊典, who had been conducting research on a manuscript collection found at another Japanese Buddhist temple, and published a preliminary report on his finding (Kajiura 2001). Subsequently Ochiai established a research group devoted to the study of these manuscripts, which is still continuing at present.¹³⁶

The first of the texts identified in the Kongōji collection bears the same title as a quite different work contained in the Taishō canon (T602):

K-ABSJY¹³⁷ *Anban shouyi jing* 安般守意經¹³⁸

Though it is clearly related to T602, a close analysis of its vocabulary and style shows that it is the Kongōji manuscript, and not the received text found in the Taishō canon, that most closely resembles An Shigao's core translations. Viewed in light of the Kongōji version, in fact, it has now become clear that T602 is not a translation, or even a translation with interlinear commentary, of an Indian text, but rather a commentary based on a scripture resembling K-ABSJY.¹³⁹

Two other texts included in the Kongōji manuscript have titles that correspond to

¹³⁶ For the texts themselves see Ochiai 2004, pp. 183–227, where facsimiles of the two scrolls together with a transcription of scroll A (with the variants found in scroll B, which is another copy of the same material, included in the apparatus) have been published. A number of studies by members of this research group have been published thus far; in addition to the materials collected in Ochiai 2004 these include Deleanu 2003, Ochiai 2001 and 2002, and Zacchetti 2002b, 2003, 2004b and c, and 2007b.

¹³⁷ In the following discussion I have adopted the abbreviations used in Zacchetti 2003 with minor modifications.

¹³⁸ See Kajiura 2001, Deleanu 2003, and Zacchetti 2004b.

¹³⁹ See Zacchetti 2007b.

works credited to An Shigao by Sengyou, but which had long thought to be lost:

K-SMJ *Fo shuo Shi'er men jing* 佛說十二門經¹⁴⁰

K-JSMJ *Fo shuo jie shi'er men jing* 佛說解十二門經¹⁴¹

According to the *Chu sanzang ji ji* An Shigao translated two versions of a text with this title, viz., the *Larger Scripture on the Twelve Gates* (大十二門經) and the *Smaller Scripture on the Twelve Gates* (小十二門經).¹⁴² It now appears that these titles indeed correspond to the K-SMJ and the K-JSMJ, respectively.¹⁴³

In addition to the above three texts, which almost certainly represent the oldest extant versions of the titles ascribed to An Shigao by Daoan (and subsequently by Sengyou), the Kongōji manuscript contains a commentary which has no counterpart in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*:

K-SMJ(comm) Anonymous commentary to the *Shi'er men jing*¹⁴⁴

This substantial text (totalling nearly two hundred lines) ends with a variant title, viz., the *Dhyāna Scripture on the Twelve Gates* (十二門禪經). Though it is clearly related to the translations contained in the Kongōji manuscript (especially K-SMJ, according to Zacchetti's findings), it appears to be a Chinese composition rather than a translation of an Indian text (Zacchetti 2003, p. 295).

The discovery of three new works that can be credited to An Shigao, together with an early Chinese commentary on one of them, means that the available corpus of An Shigao's work has now been significantly expanded. Future detailed studies of the vocabulary and style of the Kongōji manuscripts in comparison with the received texts of other texts by An Shigao promise to make a substantial contribution to our understanding of this formative period of Chinese Buddhist translation history.

Other possible attributions

In his study of An Shigao's *Ekottarikāgama* anthology Hayashiya (1937) pointed out that two sūtras contained in that text in its present form (as T150A[1]1 and [3] and T150A[30] and T150B, respectively) also appear in the *Za ahan jing* 雜阿含經, an archaic anthology of texts from the *Saṃyuktāgama*. One of these, the ubiquitous *Qi chu san guan jing* 七處三觀經, appears as the last scripture in this collection (no. 27); the other, the very brief *Ji gu jing* 積骨經—a text which, we should note, was not mentioned in Daoan's catalogue and is treated as anonymous by Sengyou¹⁴⁵—appears (like most of the sūtras in this

¹⁴⁰ See Kajiura 2001, Zacchetti 2003 and 2004b. An English translation is given in Zacchetti 2004c.

¹⁴¹ See Zacchetti 2003.

¹⁴² T2145, 55.5c26–27.

¹⁴³ For a detailed discussion of this issue see Zacchetti 2003, pp. 261–270 (especially p. 266).

¹⁴⁴ See Zacchetti 2003.

¹⁴⁵ See above, p. 53 and n. 85.

collection) without a separate title, as *sūtra* no. 11.

No translation that can be associated with either the title or the contents of the *Za ahan jing* is credited to An Shigao by Daoan; on the contrary, as Harrison has pointed out (2002, p. 3), twenty-four of the twenty-seven texts now contained within T101 appear elsewhere in Daoan's catalogue, in a group of anonymous scriptures categorized as *Gu yi jing* 古異經 "Ancient Variant [Translations of] Scriptures" (var. *Gu dian jing* 古典經).¹⁴⁶ The only items found in T101 that are not listed there are the *Qi chu san guan jing* (*sūtra* no. 27), which as we have seen is treated as the work of An Shigao by Daoan, and *sūtras* 9 and 10, whose titles appear elsewhere in Sengyou's catalogue and whose style appears to be of a different vintage.¹⁴⁷ Despite the lack of external evidence (that is, of support in the oldest catalogues) for considering the *Za ahan jing* as the work of An Shigao, Hayashiya viewed the appearance of two *sūtras* (the *Qi chu san guan jing* and the *Ji gu jing*) in both T150A and T101 as suggestive of a relationship between the two anthologies. Combining this with internal evidence, drawn from his own study of the terminology used in T101 and in translations solidly attributed to An Shigao, Hayashiya felt that he had sufficient grounds to propose that T101 was also an authentic translation by An Shigao (1937, pp. 27-37).

¹⁴⁶ As Harrison points out (2002, p. 29, n. 9) the character *yi* 異 seems a bit odd, as it ought to imply that other translations of these same texts were in circulation (which does not seem to be the case). Noting that the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄 (T2154) reads simply *Gu dian jing* 古典經, Harrison offers the reasonable suggestion that the 古異經 is the result of a visual confusion between similar characters (*loc. cit.*). In fact the term 古典經 is even older, for it appears several times in the *Da Zhou kanding zhongjing mulu* 大周刊定眾經目錄 (T2153, completed in 695 CE), where this terminology is consistently said to be cited from Sengyou (e.g., 55.401b22, 413b25 and 28, 413c1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11; cf. 414a6ff., where Daoan's list itself is discussed). The context is the same in the *Kaiyuan lu*, where the expression 古典經 appears no fewer than 84 times, usually with an adjacent note stating that Daoan's category is being cited on the basis of Sengyou's catalogue. In fact, there is one occurrence of the form 古典經 in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* itself, at the end of the list of the ninety-two scriptures assigned to this category by Daoan (55.16c6; cf. the beginning of the same section, where the title of Daoan's category is instead given as 古異經, 55.15b13). In short, there is every reason to agree with Harrison's supposition that the original name for this category in Daoan's catalogue did not refer to "variant" (異) scriptures, but simply to scriptures described as "ancient texts" (*Gu dian jing* 古典經).

¹⁴⁷ As Harrison has shown, T101(9), which (like most of the works in this collection) has no individual title, also appears in exactly the same form as T612, the *Shen guan jing* 身觀經, where it is credited in the Taishō canon to Dharmarakṣa (Zhu Fahu 竺法護). This attribution was unknown to Sengyou, however, who includes this title only in his list of abbreviated or excerpted scriptures (*chao jing* 抄經; see T2145, 55.28a22). The attribution to Dharmarakṣa appears to have first been made by Fei Changfang (see T2034, 49.64a20), where it is among the 210 texts (!) assigned to this translator (64c14ff.), many of them on dubious grounds. As to T101(10), which likewise has no title of its own, Harrison has shown that its content (an allegory concerning a man who had four wives) allows it to be identified with the *Si fu yu jing* 四婦喻經, a scripture listed by Sengyou as among the sixty-four translations by Dharmarakṣa that had been lost by his time (T2145, 55.9a15). The same title also appears elsewhere in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* (55.34c4, listed as a citation drawn from the *Jiu lu*), where however it is included on Sengyou's list of anonymous scriptures which had been lost by his time (see 55.37b13ff.).

Building on the earlier study by Hayashiya, Harrison (2002) produced a much more comprehensive study of the *Za Ahan jing*, including a synopsis of the content of each sūtra and a list of their parallels in Pāli and Chinese (no Tibetan counterparts to these sūtras have yet been identified). After a careful examination of the style of the *Za Ahan jing*, as well as the treatment of its component sūtras by Daoan, Harrison cautiously concludes that the text could be included in An Shigao's corpus "provisionally, as a translation which *may* have been made by him (on the understanding always that [sūtras] Nos. 9 & 10 are set to one side" (2002, p. 4; emphasis added). In sum, Harrison's conclusion is that most of the following text is likely (but not certain) to be the work of An Shigao:

T101: *Za ahan jing* 雜阿含經 (*Samyuktāgama*)

Since Harrison's article includes a detailed discussion of the individual sūtras in this collection and the relevant parallel texts (2002, pp. 5-19), so I will not repeat this information here, but will merely add a few additional comments directed toward possible future studies of this topic.

First, as Harrison points out, "it gives one pause for thought that the great pioneer of Chinese Buddhist bibliography, Shi Dao'an 釋道安 (314-385), did not ascribe this anthology to An Shigao, even tentatively" (2002, p. 2). This is all the more true, I would add, in light of the fact that Daoan greatly valued An Shigao's works, as shown by the fact that he composed prefaces and commentaries to a number of them, and thus we may assume that he would certainly have made every effort to document all authentic translations by this towering figure. Furthermore, as Harrison notes, in other cases (notably that of Lokakṣema, to be discussed below) Daoan was quite capable of making tentative attributions on the basis of style. That he did not do so here may well be an indication that he knew these sūtras were *not* An Shigao's work, despite their stylistic similarity to his translations. They were clearly archaic, however, and thus he placed them in the category of "old scriptures" (古典經) produced by unknown translators.

Second, Harrison is surely correct in setting aside sūtras 9 and 10, which in terms of both vocabulary and style seem to be of another vintage.¹⁴⁸ Yet there are "contaminants" in other sections of T101 as well. One of the most jarring is the presence of the second-person pronoun *qing* 卿, which never occurs in any solidly attributed An Shigao translation, but appears eleven times in sūtra 10 (though not in sūtra 9). It also appears, however, six times elsewhere in the text—twice in sūtra no. 1 and four times in sūtra no. 2. Other expressions which, while seemingly straightforward and even formulaic, do not seem to occur elsewhere in An Shigao's corpus also appear here and there in T101, e.g., 多比丘俱 "together with many monks" (in sūtra 1), 大福 "great merit" (in sūtra 2), 說是

¹⁴⁸ My own computer searches of translation vocabulary, drawing primarily on the works of Zhi Qian, have turned up dozens of cases in which expressions used by translators who lived a century or more after An Shigao's time appear in sūtras 9 and/or 10 but not in the rest of T101, thus confirming Harrison's conclusion—based on external as well as internal evidence—that they are from a different source.

絕 “spoke these *gāthās*” (in sūtra 5; cf. An Shigao’s usual 從後說絕 “then spoke [in] *gāthās*”). None of these—with the possible exception of the extremely unexpected pronoun *qing* 卿—offers conclusive evidence that any given section of T101 is not the work of An Shigao. The cumulative effect of these divergences from his usual wording, however, suggests that there may be alien elements in this collection in addition to those found in sūtras 9 and 10.

On the other hand, the language and style is clearly archaic, and it certainly appears to be related to An Shigao’s usage. Thus we may provisionally include T101 (excepting sūtras 9 and 10, together with any other parts that may subsequently be shown to be incompatible with An Shigao’s usual style) as an “adjunct text”—that is, one that is (though not produced by the great translator himself) highly likely to be associated with his lineage.

Problematic texts: further methodological reflections

In the above discussion we have treated as authentic only those texts attributed to An Shigao by Daoan and reproduced as such in the earliest extant catalogue, Sengyou’s *Chu sanzang ji ji*. Other attributions, most of which were first introduced more than four centuries after An Shigao’s time by Fei Changfang, who padded his catalogue with literally hundreds of “newly discovered” attributions, are notoriously unreliable. As noted above, these new assignments—based on sources which sound credible, but which were strangely unavailable to any other cataloguers before or during his time—can usually be shown, on the basis of internal evidence, to be implausible. Thus of the fifty-four texts credited to An Shigao in the current Taishō edition of the canon (counting T150A and B separately), only thirteen have been accepted as genuine here (plus T1508, wrongly credited to An Xuan and Yan Fotiao by the Taishō editors, again following an attribution introduced by Fei Changfang).

Even among those titles credited to An Shigao by Daoan, however, we have found several which diverge sharply from the usage found in his “core texts”—that is, those texts for which we have the most support in external sources, such as early prefaces and colophons. The following five titles, therefore, must be classified as problematic attributions on internal grounds:

- T105: *Wu yin piyu jing* 五陰譬喻經
- T109: *Zhuan falun jing* 轉法輪經
- T397(13) *Shi fang pusa pin* 十方菩薩品 (var. *Wushi jiaoji jing* 五十校計經)
- T605: *Chanxing faxiang jing* 禪行法想經
- T792: *Fa shou chen jing* 法受塵經

What remains to be explained, therefore, is the gap between Daoan’s acceptance of these as the work of An Shigao versus their divergence from the language and style found in the vast majority of his works.

A number of options for interpretation would seem to present themselves. First,

An Shigao might have made certain adjustments in his choices of terminology over the course of his long translation career. Such an explanation works best when confronting relatively minor variations in Buddhist terms; it is easy to find examples of scholars writing in English, for example, who referred to the second element of the eightfold path (*samyaksamkalpa*) as “right understanding” in their early publications but as “right resolve” in subsequent years, or who shifted from “enlightenment” as a translation of the Buddha’s experience of *nirvāṇa* to “awakening” in later works. Such inconsistencies are only natural in the work of any given individual, and thus it is not necessarily a cause for alarm when we find An Shigao rendering “right action” (*samyak-karmānta*, as the fourth element of the eightfold path) as 直治 “upright regulation” in the *Yin chi ru jing*,¹⁴⁹ as 直法 “upright method” in his version of the *Daśottara-sūtra*,¹⁵⁰ and 直行 “upright action” in several other works.¹⁵¹

The hypothesis of changes in personal preference, however, is far less adequate to explain dramatic differences in such basic grammatical features as pronouns (e.g., *wu* 吾 or *ru* 汝, which never appear in An Shigao’s core texts), plural particles (e.g., *cao* 曹, which is likewise foreign to An Shigao’s work), or the use of enclosure formations (such as *bai* 白 . . . *yan* 言) to introduce quoted speech. Such cases seem very unlikely to be the result of the shifting usage of a given individual; on the contrary, they seem to indicate that these divergent texts were produced in significantly different linguistic and/or literary environments.

It is also important to recall that these problematic texts do not all differ from An Shigao’s standard style in the same way. That is, while T605 and T792 resemble one another quite closely, T397(13) exhibits a different terminological pattern, and T105 and T109 each contain stylistic features that are not shared either with one another or with any other text on this list. In sum, while the overwhelming majority of titles assigned to An Shigao by Daoan are relatively consistent in style, these five problematic texts differ both from his core works and (with the exception of the pair of T605 and T792) from one another.

Two other possible scenarios—both of which are known to have affected the works of certain other translators—should also be considered briefly here. First is the effect of the shifting composition of translation committees, a factor that is considered to have played a major role in, for example, the texts produced by Dharmarakṣa.¹⁵² As noted

¹⁴⁹ T603, 15.174b9 and 12.

¹⁵⁰ T13, 1.236c10, 237a24 and b1. The reading as 直法, however, may be merely a scribal error for 直治.

¹⁵¹ T31, 1.816a15 and *passim*; T57, 1.852a13 and *passim*; and T98, 1.924c17, where it occurs in a list of ten rather than eight items.

¹⁵² On this issue see above, p. 20, n. 37.

GUIDE TO EARLY CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

above, however, there is not a single mention of An Shigao having employed any assistants, and thus to attribute these variations to the participants in such a group would require postulating a situation for which our sources give no concrete support. An additional argument against this explanation is the very diversity of these five problematic works, for we would have to postulate several shifts of translation personnel, to account for the variety in their styles. Four of the five problematic texts, however, are extremely short, with T605 and T792 occupying barely one register (that is, one third of a page) in the Taishō edition of the canon, while T105 and T109 occupy approximately two registers apiece. Thus it seems quite unlikely that the production of such brief texts would require the repeated recruitment of new personnel. In sum, there is no evidence to support the idea that these differences in style are due to the input of translation assistants, and given both the variety and the brevity of these non-conforming texts, this scenario seems rather remote.

A second scenario would be that these texts were in fact translated by An Shigao, but that they were later revised by other users. Such revision is well documented in the case of certain other translators, notably Lokakṣema, for whom several examples will be considered below. For such revision to take place, however, implies that the text in question was actively used. On the contrary, however, these five scriptures appear to be some of the least influential of the works attributed to An Shigao. Not one of them has an extant preface or colophon, not one is mentioned in An Shigao's biography or was the subject of a commentary, and (so far as I have been able to determine) there are no citations from any of them in other Chinese works. The theory of subsequent revision would also require us to postulate a complicated scenario in which these texts were reworked by at least four different individuals (or groups) in order to account for the differences in their vocabulary and style. Given all of these problems, it is clear that this explanation, too, is quite unlikely. The most reasonable conclusion, in sum, is that these five scriptures were not translated by An Shigao, but by a number of other translators whose names are unknown.

If this is the case, then how are we to account for the fact that Daoan attributed them—mistakenly, as it now appears—to An Shigao? Given Daoan's generally scrupulous approach to his material, it seems highly unlikely that he added them carelessly or arbitrarily to his list of An Shigao's works. Instead, the most probable explanation is the obvious one: that they had already come to be classified as the work of An Shigao by Daoan's time. Thus what remains to be explained is how these five relatively obscure scriptures came to be associated with this famous translator's name.

Any explanation of this situation must remain tentative, but it seems most likely to this writer that the fact that these translations—which seem certain to have been produced by other hands—were nonetheless credited to An Shigao at an early date may be simply the result of the tremendous esteem in which An Shigao was held by his disciples. That is, the level of respect for this pioneering translator may have been powerful enough for

subsequent translators in his immediate lineage to have neglected to record their own names, allowing the texts to circulate simply as the products of “An Shigao’s school.”

The most plausible scenario, in sum, is that these texts were produced by a variety of individuals who considered themselves to be members of An Shigao’s lineage, but whose stylistic preferences and linguistic backgrounds (including, in some cases, an education in literary Chinese) differed sharply from his own. Thus while it is probable that these translations date from the latter part of the Eastern Han period, it is safest to assume simply that they postdate the lifetime of An Shigao by an uncertain number of years.

LOST TEXTS

Nearly a dozen titles credited to An Shigao in Sengyou’s catalogue have not yet been identified with any extant work, and may therefore be presumed, at the present state of our knowledge, to be lost. Some of these were registered as lost already in Sengyou’s time; where this is the case, I have provided the reference in the notes below. In the order in which they appear in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* (55.5c25–6b3), these lost works are the following:

Bai liushi pin jing 百六十品經 (“Scripture in 160 Chapters”) ¹⁵³

Daoyi fa xing jing 道意發行經 (“The Practice of Generating Bodhicitta”) ¹⁵⁴

Qi fa jing 七法經 [var. *Apitan qi fa xing* 阿毘曇七法行經] (“[Abhidharma] Scripture on the Seven Dharma[-Practices]”) ¹⁵⁵

Wu fa jing 五法經 “Scripture on the Five Dharmas” ¹⁵⁶

Yi jue lü 義決律 [var. *Yi jue lü fa xing jing* 義決律法行經] (“Scripture on [Dharma-Conduct in accordance with] the Definitive Vinaya”) ¹⁵⁷

Shiwei jing 思惟經 [var. *Shiwei lüeyao fa* 思惟略要法] (“Scripture on [the Essential Method of] Meditation”) ¹⁵⁸

¹⁵³ Sengyou cites the *Jiu lu* 舊錄 as saying that this was an *Ekottarikāgama* anthology in 160 chapters.

¹⁵⁴ The Song, Yuan and Ming editions add a note stating that “this scripture is now lost” (今闕此經; see 55.6, note 1).

¹⁵⁵ Registered as lost by Sengyou (6a3).

¹⁵⁶ Not listed as lost by Sengyou (6a4), and thus presumably to be distinguished from the *Apitan wufa jing* that occurs two lines before (6a2).

¹⁵⁷ From the *Dirghāgama* according to Daoan (55.6a7). Though the text as such is lost, a tantalizingly brief quotation from it appears at the end of another text by An Shigao, the *Si di jing* (T32). Commenting on the expression 持宿命觀, the gloss reads as follows: 義決云: “知前事如後事是也” (T32, 1.816c28). The other gloss on the same term is drawn from the *Da anban jing*: 大安般云: “信本因緣。知從宿命有名直見” (loc. cit.). Interestingly, this corresponds to a passage in the canonical *Anban shouyi jing* (T602, 15.172b21).

¹⁵⁸ The longer variant title surely postdates An Shigao, for the expression *lüeyao* 略要 “essentials, main points” is not attested in any Buddhist text dating from the Han or Three Dynasties period. The

GUIDE TO EARLY CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

Shi'er yinyuan jing 十二因緣經 (“Scripture on the Twelve *Nidānas*”) ¹⁵⁹

Shisi yi jing 十四意經 [var. *Pusa shisi yi jing* 菩薩十四意經], (“Scripture on the Fourteen Thoughts [of the Bodhisattva]”) ¹⁶⁰

Apitan jiushiba jie jing 阿毘曇九十八結經 (“Abhidharma [Treatise on] the Ninety-Eight Bonds”) ¹⁶¹

Nanti jialuoyue jing 難提迦羅越經 (“Sūtra [spoken to] Nanda the Gr̥hapati”) ¹⁶²

SCHOLARLY RESOURCES

While some individual terms found in An Shigao's translations are discussed in the sources cited above, there has not yet been a systematic study of his vocabulary. An essential starting point is U1 Hakuju's glossary (1971, pp. 455-467); for some of the transcription terms found in An Shigao's corpus, together with reconstructions of their Han-period pronunciations, see Coblin 1983 (pp. 241-242). A major international cooperative project to carry out a systematic study of all of the non-Mahāyāna texts datable to the Eastern Han (most of which can be ascribed to An Shigao), coordinated by KARASHIMA Seishi 辛嶋静志 and FANG Yixin 方一新, is currently in the planning stage. When completed, the resulting glossary is expected to include terminology drawn from all of the texts listed above.

variant title is, in fact, the same as that of a scripture credited to Kumārajīva (T617, *Shiwei lüeyao jing* 思惟略要法) whose status has been the topic of some debate.

¹⁵⁹ This text should be considered lost only if it is not (as suggested in U1 1971, p. 21) simply a variant title for the *Ahan koujie shi'er yinyuan jing* 阿含口解十二因緣經 (T1508).

¹⁶⁰ Registered as lost by Sengyou (6a23).

¹⁶¹ Listed as lost by Sengyou (6b1).

¹⁶² Registered as lost by Sengyou (6b3).

Lokakṣema (Zhi Loujiachen 支婁迦讖)

BIOGRAPHY

Sengyou's biography of Lokakṣema is considerably shorter than that of An Shigao, providing only a few basic details concerning his life and work.¹⁶³ He is described as a native of the country of the Yuezhi (月支, var. 月氏), which most scholars identify with the realm of the Kushans, who then controlled northwest India and adjoining regions.¹⁶⁴ He apparently came to China as an ordained monk,¹⁶⁵ arriving in Luoyang toward the end of the reign of Emperor Huan 桓帝 (r. 147-168 CE). His translation career, according to the same source, took place in the time of the following ruler, Emperor Ling 靈帝, and during the period from 178-189 CE he is said to have produced Chinese versions of a number of Mahāyāna scriptures.¹⁶⁶ Subsequently, with the disturbances that heralded the eventual fall of the Han, conditions in Luoyang deteriorated rapidly, and Lokakṣema disappears from the historical record. As Sengyou poignantly remarks, "Where his life later ended, however, is not known."¹⁶⁷

Though this translator is regularly referred to in Western-language sources as "Lokakṣema"—and I will continue to follow that convention here—the equivalence of his Chinese name with this reconstructed Sanskrit form is not certain, and from time to time other possibilities, e.g., *Lokakṣama, have been suggested. There are differences of opinion on how to transcribe his Chinese name as well. The character 讖 can be read as either chèn or chàn in the modern Beijing dialect, and without any other occurrences of this character as a transcription term in texts that are certain to be from the period with

¹⁶³ Sengyou's entry on Lokakṣema may be found at 55.95c22-96a7; for a partial English translation see Tsukamoto 1985, vol. 1, p. 98. For his biography in the *Gaoseng zhuan* (which generally follows Sengyou's account word-for-word) see 50.324b13-25; a French translation is given in Shih 1968, pp. 13-15.

¹⁶⁴ This is not, however, the only possible interpretation. The realm of the Kushans corresponds (albeit roughly) to what is referred to in Chinese sources as the country of the Great Yuezhi (大月支), who fled far to the West after being defeated by the Xiongnu in the early 2nd century BCE. Another group of Yuezhi, however, migrated only as far as the southeastern Tarim Basin, where they were referred to in Chinese sources as the Little Yuezhi (小月支). Lokakṣema's biography does not specify which of these territories he was from, thus leaving open both possibilities.

¹⁶⁵ Sengyou refers to him as a *śramaṇa* (*shamen* 沙門) at 55.6b26; elsewhere, in a preface to the *Banzhou sanmei jing* by an unspecified author, he is called a bodhisattva (55.48c12).

¹⁶⁶ See T2145, 55.95c25-26. The statement found here, according to which Lokakṣema carried out his translation work during the Guanghe 光和 (178-184) and Zhongping 中平 (184-189) periods, does not match the account found in the catalogue section of Sengyou's work, according to which he produced translations during the time of Emperor Huan 桓帝 (r. 147-168 CE) as well as Emperor Ling 靈帝 (r. 168-190) (55.6b25-26). For a translation of the latter passage see below, p. 76.

¹⁶⁷ T2145, 55.96a1.

which we are concerned it is difficult to determine which reading is to be preferred. I have adopted the reading *chen* for the final syllable of the name here on the grounds that this reading better represents the component *-kṣema*, which in turn has been chosen because it seems to be better attested in Buddhist sources as an element of proper names than any of the other possible candidates.

What is most surprising, however, is the fact that the name Zhi Loujiachen 支婁迦讖 does not actually appear in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* at all. Instead, Sengyou refers to this figure simply as Zhi Chen 支讖 in both the biography and the catalogue sections of his work, and it is this same two-character form that also appears in all of the prefaces and colophons collected there.¹⁶⁸ If we assemble the available sources in chronological order, it becomes clear that the “complete” four-character form Zhi Loujiachen does not appear in any source prior to the *Gaoseng zhuan*.¹⁶⁹ This raises interesting questions, which unfortunately cannot be pursued here, as to what the sources of Huijiao’s information might have been. For convenience I will retain the easily recognizable form “Lokakṣema,” but this might need to be altered in the future if subsequent studies should determine that Zhi Loujiachen was not the original form of his name.

Just as the content of An Shigao’s translations is sometimes wrongly used to infer the nature of the Buddhism practiced in his Parthian homeland, so the content of Lokakṣema’s translations is sometimes marshalled as evidence that the Mahāyāna enjoyed special favor in the Kushan realm. This is methodologically problematic, however, for a number of reasons.¹⁷⁰ First, even if Lokakṣema did come from Kushan territory—which is probable but not entirely certain—there is no evidence that Buddhism was the predominant religion in that region; indeed, there is considerable evidence that it was not.¹⁷¹ There is also no reason to assume that “the Mahāyāna”—whatever that may have meant at the time—held exclusive sway even in those circles, be they large or small, that

¹⁶⁸ See 55.47b24, 47c6-7, 48c12, 49a15 and 18, and 52c12-13.

¹⁶⁹ For Huijiao’s treatment of the name Zhi Chen 支讖 as an abbreviation of Zhi Loujiachen 支婁迦讖 see T2059, 50.324b13. If the longer form is indeed genuine, the abbreviated rendition is presumably due at least in part to the prohibition against given names of more than one character issued during the reign of Wang Mang 王莽 (r. 9-23 CE). Needless to say, it was easy to confuse this shortened form with the similar-looking name of Zhi Qian 支謙. As we shall see, this may have occasionally contributed to confusion as to which of these two figures translated a given text.

¹⁷⁰ Cf. above, p. 43, for a general discussion of the problems with attempting to reconstruct the nature of Buddhist thought and practice in any given place on the basis of the corpus of a particular translator.

¹⁷¹ The justly famous Buddha image found on the coinage of King Kanishka is in fact a distinct minority among the dozens of other deities who are also represented, most of them of Greek or Iranian origin (see Rosenfield 1967 and more recently the studies collected in Brancaccio and Behrendt 2006, especially the paper by Ellen Raven and the introductory notes by Rosenfield, pp. 11-17). The idea that Kanishka was a convert to Buddhism—or even more specifically, a patron of Mahāyāna Buddhism, as is often asserted—has no support in historical sources, and is best viewed as a pious legend.

avored the Buddhist religion.

It should also be noted that Lokakṣema is described as translating two of his most famous works—the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā* (*Daoxing banruo jing* 道行般若經, T224) and the *Śūraṅgamasamādhi-sūtra* (*Shoulengyan jing* 首楞嚴經, no longer extant)—not from texts he had brought with him to China, but from manuscripts supplied by the Indian monk Zhu Shuofu 竺朔佛 (var. Zhu Foshuo 竺佛朔).¹⁷² In such circumstances it would be extremely hazardous to infer from the content of Lokakṣema's translations any information on what forms of Buddhism might have been popular in his homeland. What is quite clear on the basis of his surviving works, however, is his own interest in Mahāyāna sūtras, for all of the translations solidly attributed to him are scriptures of this kind.

CONTENTS OF HIS CORPUS

In many respects Lokakṣema's corpus represents the polar opposite of that of An Shigao. No *āgama* texts or treatises of any kind are included either in his surviving work or in the record of translations lost by Sengyou's time; instead, all of the works credited to him are Mahāyāna sūtras. Again in contrast to An Shigao, many of whose translations are extremely short, Lokakṣema produced several quite lengthy texts, with the longest (T224, his version of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā*) totalling no fewer than ten fascicles.

TRANSLATION STYLE

Like all other translators in Chinese Buddhist history, Lokakṣema adopted many terms previously introduced by An Shigao. When no existing equivalent was available, however—as was the case with many Mahāyāna terms that did not occur in scriptures translated by An Shigao—new renditions were coined, of necessity, by Lokakṣema himself. A tabulation of these new forms quickly demonstrates that, in contrast to An Shigao (who generally translated Buddhist technical terms into Chinese but transcribed the sound of proper names), Lokakṣema overwhelmingly favored the use of transcription for words of both types. Making little or no effort to domesticate the terminology of his Indian source-texts, Lokakṣema produced such cumbersome multisyllabic expressions as *oubejusheluo* 漚和拘舍羅 for *upāyakaśaśya* and *anouduluosan'yesanpu* 阿耨多羅三耶三菩 [sic] for *anuttarasamyaksambodhi*. He also chose to adhere extremely closely to the style of the Indic prose (including its penchant for repetitive statements), resulting in many cases in extraordinarily long Chinese sentences. In only one significant respect does he clearly (and apparently deliberately) diverge from the content of his originals, typically omitting altogether the famous opening phrase “Thus have I heard.”¹⁷³

¹⁷² See the *Chu sanzang jiji*, 55.96a1ff. and cf. Zürcher 1959, p. 35.

¹⁷³ This opening phrase is absent from T224, T418 (in some but not all editions), T350, T362, T458, and T807. It is included (in the standard pre-Kumārajīva form *wen rushi* 聞如是) in T313, some editions of T418, T624 and T626. This pattern correlates at least in part with doubts already expressed by scholars on other grounds concerning the authenticity, or subsequent revision, of some of these texts

GUIDE TO EARLY CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

Like An Shigao, Lokakṣema renders Indian verse passages into Chinese prose, doing so even in the case of the *Neizang bai bao jing* 內藏百寶經 (T807), whose Indic-language source-text was probably entirely in verse.¹⁷⁴ One of his translations, the *Banzhou sanmei jing* 般舟三昧經 (T418), appears at first to be an exception, for it contains passages in five-, six-, and seven-syllable verse. As Harrison has shown, however, this text has been subjected to substantial revision after Lokakṣema's time, and all of the verse portions can be shown to be from this later stratum (Harrison 1990, pp. 236-249).

Despite their undeniably pedantic style and often unwieldy vocabulary, Lokakṣema's translations also include a significant number of vernacular elements (discussed in detail in Zürcher 1977; cf. also Zürcher 1996). Much still remains to be done in determining the extent to which these might reflect, as Zürcher suggests (1977 and 1991, p. 282), the actual speech of the population of Luoyang at the time.

AUTHENTIC TEXTS

In the catalogue section of the *Chu sanzang ji ji* Sengyou summarizes the contents of Lokakṣema's translation corpus as follows:

The above thirteen [var: fourteen] works, comprising twenty-seven fascicles in all, were translated by Zhi Chen 支讖, a *śramāṇa* from the Yuezhi 月支 country, during the time of Emperor Huan 桓帝 [r. 147-168 CE] and Emperor Ling 靈帝 [r. 168-190] of the Han [dynasty].¹⁷⁵

Here again we have a discrepancy in the numbering, for though most editions of the canon read “thirteen,” fourteen titles are actually listed here.¹⁷⁶ Once again, therefore, it appears that the *Chu sanzang ji ji* has been altered after it left Sengyou's hand.

Taking Sengyou's testimony as their starting point, Erik Zürcher (1991) and Paul Harrison (1987, 1993) have each compiled lists of texts they consider to be genuine works by Lokakṣema. Of the twelve texts attributed to Lokakṣema by the Taishō editors, eight are accepted as genuine by Zürcher:

- T224: *Daoxing banruo jing* 道行般若經
- T280: *Dousha jing* 兜沙經
- T313: *Achu foguo jing* 阿閼佛國經
- T350: *Weiyue moni bao jing* 遺曰[←曰]摩尼寶經

(see below, “Authentic Texts”).

¹⁷⁴ See Harrison 1993, p. 159.

¹⁷⁵ T2145, 55.6b25-27: 右十三部，凡二十七卷，漢桓帝靈帝時月支國沙門支讖所譯出。

¹⁷⁶ In place of the number 十三 “thirteen” the so-called Three Editions (the Song, Yuan, and Ming) read 十四 “fourteen”; see note 22 to the Taishō edition (vol. 55, p. 6). It is highly unlikely that the character 四 could be a mere scribal error for 三; instead, it seems probable that this emendation was introduced deliberately in order to eliminate the discrepancy that had resulted from the interpolation of an additional title. On the identity of this extra text see below, pp. 77-78.

- T418: *Banzhou sanmei jing* 般舟三昧經
 T458: *Wenshushili wen pusa shu jing* 文殊師利問菩薩署經
 T626: *Azheshi wang jing* 阿闍世王經
 T807: *Neizang bai bao jing* 內藏百寶經

Harrison agrees in accepting most of these as authentic, but expresses reservations concerning the *Achu foguo jing* (1993, p. 166) and points out that portions of the *Banzhou sanmei jing* are the product of revision and do not date from Lokakṣema's own time, as will be discussed in detail below.¹⁷⁷

Conversely, one text rejected by Zürcher is considered by Harrison (1993, p. 141) to be Lokakṣema's work:

- T624: *Dun zhendouluo suowen rulai sanmei jing* 侖真陀羅所問如來三昧經

The above "consensus texts," plus those works accepted as genuine by Harrison but not by Zürcher or *vice versa*, will be the starting point for our discussion here. Once again we will use both external and internal evidence to further assess the authenticity of these translations.

Methodological preliminaries (1): external evidence

As always, it is essential to begin with a close reading of the information found in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* before turning to evidence of other kinds. And in Lokakṣema's case a remark appended by Sengyou to the list of his works in the catalogue section suggests that we should be cautious in accepting some of the above attributions. Though Sengyou does catalogue all of the above texts (plus others which are no longer extant) under Lokakṣema's name, his postscript to this section reveals that not all of these attributions are equally secure:

As to these, concerning the nine scriptures from the "Old Version" (*Gu pin* 古品) to the "Hundred Chapters of the Inner Treasury" (*Neizang bai pin* 內藏百品), Lord An [i.e., Daoan] says, "They resemble Lokakṣema's translations (似支讖出也)."¹⁷⁸

In other words, though these nine texts are classified by Sengyou as Lokakṣema's work, it is clear that Daoan did not have any documentary evidence concerning their origins, but was merely grouping them with the works of Lokakṣema on the basis of their language and style.

In this passage too we encounter a numerical problem, for the list of scriptures from the *Gu pin* to the *Neizang bai pin* given in the received text of the canon contains ten titles, not nine. In this case, however, it is quite easy to determine which sūtra has been added to the list, for one of them—the *Guangming sanmei jing* 光明三昧經—is said

¹⁷⁷ See Harrison 1993, pp. 146-147 and 1990, pp. 224-249.

¹⁷⁸ T2145, 55.6b26-27: 其古品以下至內藏百品凡九經，安公云：“似支讖出也。”

to have been absent from Daoan's list.¹⁷⁹ Assuming that this is correct (and there is no evidence elsewhere in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* that Daoan knew of such a title), the *Guangming sanmei jing* could not possibly be one of the texts that Daoan described as looking like Lokakṣema's work, for it was not included in his catalogue at all.¹⁸⁰

The solid attribution by Daoan of only three texts (one of them now lost) to Lokakṣema conforms to what we find in the biographical section of the *Chu sanzang ji ji*:

Toward the end of the time of Emperor Huan 桓帝 of the Han [dynasty] he came to Luoyang, and during the Guanghe 光和 (178-184) and Zhongping 中平 (184-189) periods of [the reign of] Emperor Ling 靈帝 he translated foreign texts (胡文),¹⁸¹ producing three scriptures: the *Banruo daoxing pin* 般若道行品 [sic], the *Shoulengyan* 首楞嚴, and the *Banzhou sanmei* 般舟三昧.¹⁸²

As is usually the case, the account found in the *Gaoseng zhuan* follows suit.¹⁸³

As with An Shigao's translations, it seems likely that the items singled out for attention in Lokakṣema's biography are those for which prefaces or colophons documenting his authorship were available to Sengyou. Surviving notices to the above three texts have in fact been preserved in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, although they teem with difficulties and, in at least one case, it is not entirely certain that the translation referred to is actually that of Lokakṣema.¹⁸⁴

One additional source, however—a preface to a combined edition of the *Shoulengyan jing*, which is generally (but perhaps mistakenly) attributed to the composer of the synoptic edition itself, Zhi Mindu 支愍度 (fl. fourth century CE)¹⁸⁵—attributes two other translations

¹⁷⁹ See T2145, 55.6b15: 光明三昧經一卷(出別錄。安錄無)。

¹⁸⁰ It is possible that this entry is the result of a confusion between the names Zhi Chen 支謙 and Zhi Yao 支曜, for at least by the late fourth century CE the latter was considered to have translated a text entitled *Chengju guangming dingyi jing* 成具光明定意經 (T630).

¹⁸¹ Though the term *hu* 胡 may be used in some cases to differentiate texts written in the Kharoṣṭhī script from those written in Brāhmī (*fan* 梵; see Boucher 2000), there is no reason to think that it has that specific sense here.

¹⁸² See T2145, 55.95c24-27: 漢桓帝末遊于洛陽。以靈帝光和中平之間傳譯胡文，出般若道行品首楞嚴般舟三昧等三經。

¹⁸³ See T2059, 50.324b15-18.

¹⁸⁴ For notices to the *Shoulengyan jing* that mention Lokakṣema see T2145.55.49a16-b17 (attributed traditionally, but perhaps wrongly, to Zhi Mindu 支愍度) and 48c18-49a15 (anonymous but probably to be dated, on internal grounds, to the mid-fourth century); on the *Banzhou sanmei jing* see 55.48c9-16 (anonymous); and on the *Daoxing jing* see 55.47a12-c3 (by Daoan) and 47c4-9 (by an anonymous author), both of which appear to be devoted to an abbreviated version of the text translated by Zhu Shuofu with the assistance of Lokakṣema.

¹⁸⁵ See the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, 55.49a16-b17.

PART II: THE EASTERN HAN PERIOD

to Lokakṣema: the *Azheshi wang jing* 阿闍世王經 (here written 阿闍貰) and the *Dun zhendouluo suowen rulai sanmei jing* 佉真陀羅所問如來三昧經 (here abbreviated as 屯真). If the assignment to Zhi Mindu is genuine, this would show that a tradition assigning these two additional titles to Lokakṣema was circulating no later than the fourth century CE.

Lokakṣema's version of the *Shoulengyan jing* has not survived, but it would seem that we should treat the two remaining translations discussed above—the *Daoxing banruo jing* (T224) and the *Banzhou sanmei jing* (T418)—as comprising his “core texts,” with which all other translations purported to be his work should be compared. Matters are not quite so simple, however, for as we shall see, the transmitted text of the *Banzhou sanmei jing* has been significantly revised, and certain sections of the text as we have it clearly did not come from Lokakṣema's own hand.

In the discussion that follows, therefore, we will consider each scripture attributed to Lokakṣema individually, examining both the external evidence concerning the time and place of its production and the internal evidence offered by its vocabulary and style. Because detailed information on parallels to these texts in Chinese, Tibetan, and (where available) in Sanskrit have been given in Harrison 1993, I will not recapitulate this information here, but will confine myself to mentioning only new findings that have appeared since that time.

Methodological preliminaries (2): internal evidence

Most previous studies of Lokakṣema's translations have focused on the evidence contained in scriptural catalogues, and—somewhat surprisingly—have generally ignored Daoan's remark that most of the texts subsequently assigned to this translator by Sengyou merely “resembled” Lokakṣema's work. Studies based on internal evidence—i.e., involving a critical analysis of the similarities and differences in the vocabulary and style used in the various texts belonging to this group—have been rare. Harrison's discussion of the translation terminology used in Lokakṣema's version of the *Pratyutpanna-buddha-sammukhāvasthita-samādhi-sūtra* is an important exception to this tendency;¹⁸⁶ more recently, a similar methodological approach has been applied to the *Azheshi wang jing* 阿闍世王經 (T626) and the *Dun zhendouluo suowen rulai sanmei jing* 佉真陀羅所問如來三昧經 (T624) by MIYAZAKI Tenshō 宮崎展昌 (2007a and b).

If we combine the external evidence outlined above with an analysis of terminological and stylistic features of all of the scriptures attributed to Lokakṣema by Sengyou, we will find that these works can be stratified into a number of layers, based on their proximity to his two surviving “core texts,” the *Daoxing banruo jing* and (the unrevised portions of) the *Banzhou sanmei jing*. The following discussion is arranged according to this approach.

¹⁸⁶ See Harrison 1990, pp. 236–249, where the disadvantages of overvaluing external sources are explicitly discussed (p. 222).

Core texts

Of all of the extant scriptures assigned to Lokakṣema by Sengyou, by far the most trustworthy, on the basis of external evidence, are the *Daoxing banruo jing* and the *Banzhou sanmei jing*. Of these the first appears to have come down to us relatively unscathed, and thus may be considered the single most reliable indicator of Lokakṣema's vocabulary and style:

T224: *Daoxing banruo jing* 道行般若經 (*Aṣṭasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā*)

Lokakṣema's version of the text was revised in subsequent years not once but twice: first by Zhi Qian, who produced a significantly shorter and more elegant version, and second a much more lightly polished version, produced by a translator whose identity has been the topic of debate.¹⁸⁷ The existence of these two early revisions suggests that Lokakṣema's pioneering translation was considered both valuable and problematic, leading others to attempt to produce more comprehensible versions.

Even Lokakṣema's original translation, however (that is, the text that in its present state appears as T224), has not been transmitted without alteration, for we can find instances here and there of a phenomenon that I would like to refer to as "clustering," in which terminology that is atypical of a given text nonetheless appears there, but clustered together in a certain limited portion of the text.¹⁸⁸ In sum, while the *Daoxing banruo jing* can, in general, be considered as one of Lokakṣema's benchmark works, it will be important in future studies to give careful attention to those portions of the text that exhibit anomalous features and which appear to have been revised after his time.

¹⁸⁷ In the Taishō edition of the canon this translation—alternatively titled the *Chang'an pin* 長安品 or "Chang'an version," a label which is confirmed by the fact that the vocabulary cited from the *Chang'an pin* in Huilin's 慧琳 *Yiqie jing yin yi* 一切經音義 (T2128) does indeed occur here, and only here, among extant *Prajñāpāramitā* scriptures—is attributed to Tanmopi 曇摩婢 (Dharmapriya) and Zhu Fonian 佛念譯. HIRAKAWA Akira 平川彰, however, considered it to be the work of Dharmarakṣa (1963, p. 84, n. 150). The latter seems unlikely, given what we now know of Dharmarakṣa's language and style. What is certain, however, is that this is not an independent translation but a very lightly revised version (made, however, with respect to a somewhat different Indian recension) of Lokakṣema's original text.

¹⁸⁸ See for example the treatment of the word *śrāvaka* in the *Daoxing jing*. This term is routinely translated by Lokakṣema using the "substitution term" *aluohan* 阿羅漢 (see Harrison 1987, p. 81, and on the phenomenon of substitution terms see Nattier 2006b). In two places in the text, however, clusters of occurrences of *shengwen* 聲聞 "voice-hearer," a translation which comes into wide use only in the late third century CE, can be found (i.e., only at 8.438a-440a and 447a-448b in a text which encompasses pp. 425a-478b). This expression, which does not occur in any translation ascribed to the Han period (the sole occurrence in T184 at 3.465a16 is not a compound and is not being used in this sense) with the exception of one second-tier Lokakṣema text (T458) and two third-tier translations (T624 and T626), nor for that matter in any authentic Three Kingdoms text (the sole occurrence in T6, 1.187a2 is not a compound), with the exception of a similarly clustered occurrence in Zhi Qian's *Larger Sukhāvativyūha* (T361, 12.288c17-18). The portion of the text containing the *Sadāprarudita* story (chapters 28-29 in Lokakṣema's version) also contains some exceptional vocabulary (e.g., *xianzhe* 賢者 for *kulaputra*, usually translated as 善男子 in Lokakṣema's work) whose significance remains to be investigated.

The other surviving text which is strongly supported by external evidence as the work of Lokakṣema is his rendition of an early recension of the *Pratyutpanna-buddha-sammukhāvasthita-samādhi-sūtra*:

T418: *Banzhou sanmei jing* 般舟三昧經¹⁸⁹

In this case, however, the situation is far more complicated. The terminology and style of the prose portions of this text are indeed quite congruent with the usage of the *Daoxing banruo jing*. As noted above, however, T418 also contains numerous passages in verse (including five-, six-, and seven-character styles), and these verse portions of the text include terminology that diverges significantly both from that of the *Daoxing jing* and from the prose portions of the *Banzhou sanmei jing* itself. A few representative examples of terms found in the verse (but not the prose) of T418 are the following:¹⁹⁰

	<u>T224</u>	<u>T418 (prose)</u>	<u>T418 (verse)</u>
upāsaka	優婆塞	優婆塞	清信女
preta	薜荔	薜荔	餓鬼
niraya	泥犁	---	地獄
mahāsattva	摩訶薩	摩訶薩	大士
upāyakaūśalya	漚和拘舍羅	---	善權方便

It is easy to see that these are all translations, in contrast to the transcriptions that serve as the standard terms in the *Daoxing jing* and (in cases where they occur in the prose in T418) in the *Banzhou sanmei jing*. Thus we are dealing here not just with additional new vocabulary items, but with terminology of different (and quite consistent) type. This makes it a virtual certainty that the verse portions are the work of someone other than the translator who produced the prose sections of the text.

A close look at the transmitted versions of the text reveals clear evidence that an older version of the scripture has indeed been subsequently revised. As SAKURABE Hajime 桜部建 has observed, evidence for the existence of two different versions of the *Banzhou sanmei jing* can be seen in the Taishō canon itself, where differences between the Korean version (K), which served as the base text for the Taishō edition, and the version contained in the “Three Editions” of the Song, Yuan, and Ming (SYM) can be clearly seen in the variant readings recorded in the notes (Sakurabe 1975). And these are not mere matters

¹⁸⁹ This scripture has been the topic of a superb study by Paul Harrison, including a critical edition of the Tibetan text (1978) and a study and annotated translation of the Tibetan version (1990). The latter, however, also includes a detailed analysis of the Chinese versions of the scripture, including that of Lokakṣema (pp. 207-272) as well as an edition and translation of a Sanskrit fragment of the text (273-302). Last but hardly least, Harrison has also translated T418 into English (1998a), unfortunately with only minimal annotation, as required by the series in which it appeared. Other studies of specific aspects of the text will be mentioned in the notes below.

¹⁹⁰ Most of these examples are taken from Harrison 1990, pp. 236-249.

of a different word here and there, but substantial divergences in the version transmitted in SYM from that of the text recorded in K.

The detailed analysis given by Harrison (1990, pp. 221-235 and 248-249) shows that the text found in K is itself a hybrid creation. The first part of the sūtra (chapters 1-3 and the first half of chapter 4, i.e., through 13.907c7 in the Taishō edition) appears in an unrevised version in K,¹⁹¹ thus differing in many respects from the revised version in SYM. The latter part of K, however (the second half of chapter 4, from 907c8 onward, and all of chapters 5-16) is essentially identical to the revised version found in SYM. Thus it is evident that in the Korean edition an older (unrevised) version of the first part of the sūtra came to be combined at a certain point with a newer (revised) version of the remainder of the text.

Most striking is the fact that in chapter 3 and the first half of chapter 4 the *gāthās* are rendered in prose in K, while in SYM they are translated as verse. The opening lines of the sūtra differ as well, for where SYM contains a detailed *nidāna* beginning with “Thus have [I] heard” (聞如是) and including a long list of epithets of the arhats in the audience,¹⁹² the version found in K is significantly shorter, lacking both of these elements and beginning with the simple statement that “The Buddha was at Rājagṛha” (佛在羅閱, 13.902c27). The latter, however, is standard for Lokakṣema, and indeed the *Daoxing jing* begins in exactly the same way (8.425c6).

Many questions remain about the manner in which the revised version was produced, and Harrison offers several possible scenarios (*op. cit.*, pp. 232-233). He also raises the question of when, and by whom, these revisions—largely restricted to adding a more detailed introductory *nidāna* and replacing an earlier prose translation of the *gāthā* sections with verse—were made. Though the pursuit of this question was not a part of his agenda in this study, he suggests two likely candidates for future investigation: Dharmarakṣa, who is also credited by Daoan with having produced a version of the *Banzhou sanmei jing*,¹⁹³ and Zhi Qian, who is known for having revised other works by Lokakṣema (*op. cit.*, p. 249).¹⁹⁴ It is possible, in fact, that the text was revised more than once, for the non-Lokakṣema vocabulary is concentrated not just in the verse portions—all of which, we may assume, were added after Lokakṣema’s time—but in those composed in seven-character form. If

¹⁹¹ An exception is the brief verse passage at 906a8-11 (found in K as well as SYM), which has no parallel in the Tibetan and is explained by Harrison as the result of a separate incident of textual conflation (1990, 233-235). On this passage see also Sakurabe 1981.

¹⁹² See T418, 13.602, n. 4.

¹⁹³ T2145, 55.8a1 and 14b20.

¹⁹⁴ An important discussion of Zhi Qian’s revision of an existing text is found in the notice to Zhi Mindu’s edition of the *Shoulengyan jing* (T2145, 55.49a16ff.) as well as a preface describing the preparation of the final version of the *Dharmapada*, which is thought to be his own composition (55.49c20).

this is the case, it might be that this points to an earlier revision (incorporating verses in five- and six-character format), followed by a later one in which seven-character verses were added as well.¹⁹⁵

Both of these possibilities should be investigated thoroughly in the future, but at present we can observe that there is one text in Zhi Qian's corpus of translations—the *Huiyin sanmei jing* 慧印三昧經 (T632)—that resembles T418 in a significant number of ways. First, it exhibits the same pattern of differentiation between prose and verse that we find in the *Banzhou sanmei jing*; that is, the prose portions are heavily laden with transcription terms, while the verse sections also contain translation terms, such as *rulai* 如來 for *tathāgata* and *duwuji* 度無極 for *pāramitā*, that do not appear in the prose. It thus appears that T418 and T632 have been subjected to very similar processes of revision. Second, while most of the transcriptions in both T418 and T632 are identical with those used in Lokakṣema's other core text, the *Daoxing jing* (T224), a few are not, and several of these unusual forms—e.g., *Shelifuluo* 舍利弗羅 (rather than simply *Shelifu* 舍利弗) for *Śāriputra* and *Moyixuan* 摩夷亓 (461a26) for “Maheśvara”—appear in both T418 and T632, but not in any other text in either Lokakṣema's or Zhi Qian's corpus.

In sum, there is good reason to infer that these two texts are related in some way. While the most likely candidate for the revisor of the *Banzhou sanmei jing* would therefore appear to be Zhi Qian, the possibility that Dharmarakṣa was responsible (or even that he contributed an additional layer of revisions after Zhi Qian's initial changes had been incorporated) is still worth investigating. A close comparative study of the *Banzhou sanmei jing* and the *Huiyin sanmei jing* will surely be rewarding.

Second-tier texts

From this point on we will be discussing translations that were not ascribed directly to Lokakṣema by Daoan, but only aligned with his work on the basis of their vocabulary and style. As we shall see, some of these offer a closer match than others. As a provisional approach, therefore, I will begin by assigning the translations that bear the closest resemblance to Lokakṣema's core texts to a group called “second tier” texts. Those that bear a more distant relationship will be classified as belonging to a “third tier,” while those that differ most dramatically from Lokakṣema's normal usage will be referred to as “problematic” or “revised” texts.

In determining which texts should be assigned to the second tier we may recall, first of all, Lokakṣema's standard practice of omitting the standard opening formula “Thus have I heard at one time.” In fact, the translations that most closely resemble those of Lokakṣema in terms of their vocabulary and style (including a lack of four-character

¹⁹⁵ If this were the case, it might be that the reference to the “correction and completion” (校定悉具足) of the text in 208 CE, found in a notice preserved in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* (T2145, 55. 48c13-14), refers to the first but not the final revision of the text.

prosody and the translation of verse passages, where these are present, into prose) also lack this opening *nidāna*. Without examining the terminology of each text in detail—which would cause this study to swell to impossible proportions—I will simply list these texts here, agreeing with Daoan that they do, in general terms, “resemble” Lokakṣema’s work (似支識出也):

T280: *Dousha jing* 兜沙經 (part of the *Proto-Avataṃsaka*)¹⁹⁶

T350: *Weiyue moni bao jing* 遺曰[<-日]摩尼寶經 (*Kāśyapaparivarta*)¹⁹⁷

T458: *Wenshushili wen pusa shu jing* 文殊師利問菩薩署經 (“Mañjuśrī’s Inquiry Concerning the Bodhisattva Career”)

T807: *Neizang bai bao jing* 內藏百寶經 (“The Hundred Jewels of the Inner Treasury”)¹⁹⁸

All of these exhibit occasional anomalies in vocabulary that are not found in Lokakṣema’s core texts. Yet they still resemble his language and style in overall terms. It thus seems reasonable to conclude, following Daoan’s lead, that they are—if not his own translations—at least the products of members of his school.

Three other texts (or rather, texts catalogued under three separate Taishō numbers in the transmitted canon as T282, T283, and T362) probably also belong in this category, and will be discussed in detail below. Though not found on Daoan’s list of Lokakṣema’s works, there are good reasons to believe that they too are products of his school, and thus that they should be included within the “second-tier” category.

Third-tier texts

Still more distant from Lokakṣema’s general style, and exhibiting a much higher ratio of translations to transcriptions than in the second-tier group, are the following two works:

¹⁹⁶ For this designation see Nattier 2005a, which also contains a synoptic edition showing the parallels between this translation and Zhi Qian’s *Pusa benye jing* (T281). Other parts of this text appear to have been separated (and subsequently catalogued separately) in the course of transmission in China; for these see below, pp. 87–88.

¹⁹⁷ There is a vast literature on this scripture; for abundant bibliographic references to research on the Sanskrit version see Vorobyeva-Desyatovskaya, Karashima, and Kudo 2002, where the most up-to-date edition of the Sanskrit text can be found. Still especially valuable for the study of Lokakṣema’s version are the synoptic edition of T350 together with its Sanskrit, Tibetan, and other Chinese parallels by Alexander von Staël-Holstein (1926) and the German translation of T350 by Friedrich Weller (1968/69).

¹⁹⁸ Though I have categorized this text as a Mahāyāna scripture here, Harrison has shown that it is actually a Mahāyānized version of a text transmitted among various Mahāsāṃghika groups, including the Pūrvaśailas and the Lokottaravādins; some of its verses are cited in the *Mahāvastu* produced by the latter. For further details see Harrison 1982. An English translation of this text has recently appeared (Xing 2006); I would like to thank Paul Harrison for calling my attention to this article.

T624: *Dun zhendouluo suowen rulai sanmei jing* 侖真陀羅所問如來三昧經
(*Druma-kinnara-rāja-paripṛcchā-sūtra*)¹⁹⁹

T626: *Azheshi wang jing* 阿闍世王經 (*Ajātaśatru-kauṛṭya-vinodanā-sūtra*)²⁰⁰

Not surprisingly, both of these translations also begin with the standard pre-Kumārajīva opening formula, *wen rushi* 聞如是 “Thus have [I] heard....”

Despite the fact that the notice attributed to Zhi Mindu supports the acceptance of these texts to Lokakṣema, they contain certain features which are sufficiently anomalous to place them in a separate category. A recent study by Miyazaki (2007b) suggest that these two translations are closely related to one another, with T624 approximating Lokakṣema’s usual vocabulary somewhat more closely than does T626.

PROBLEMATIC OR REVISED TEXTS

As we have seen, most of the translations traditionally ascribed to Lokakṣema are only tentatively attributed to him by Daoan. Of the translations in this group, the most distant from the language and style of Lokakṣema’s “core texts” is the following scripture, which (like the two texts belonging to the third-tier category) begins with “Thus have [I] heard”:

T313: *Achu foguo jing* 阿閼佛國經 (*Akṣobhya-vyūha*)²⁰¹

This scripture contains no verses, but neither do the later Chinese and Tibetan translations; thus this indicates merely that the Indian source-text was entirely in prose. As to its vocabulary, however, the *Achu foguo jing* abounds in non-Lokakṣema translation terms to a greater extent than any of the other titles reviewed above. This vocabulary is used consistently throughout the text; while virtually all of the texts discussed above contain the transcription *dasa’ajie* 怛薩阿竭 for *tathāgata*, for example, and the third-tier texts (T624 and T626) use the translation *ruilai* 如來 as well,²⁰² in the *Achu jing* only *ruilai* occurs.

¹⁹⁹ No translation of this text into a western language has yet been published, but for a critical edition of the corresponding Tibetan version see Harrison 1992. An analysis of the transcriptions found in the mantra contained in the text is given in Harrison and Coblin 1999. For a discussion of some of the Buddhist technical terms used in the text see Miyazaki 2007b.

²⁰⁰ For a richly annotated Japanese translation of this text see Murakami 1994. A discussion of the vocabulary of the text in comparison with other works credited to Lokakṣema can be found in Miyazaki 2007a and b. Several Sanskrit fragments have recently been identified; see Harrison and Hartmann 1998, 2000, and 2002.

²⁰¹ For a critical edition of the Tibetan text, together with its parallels in Chinese, see Satō 2002. A partial French translation of the Tibetan version can be found in Dantinne 1983. For preliminary information on the recent find of a Gāndhārī manuscript containing a related (but not identical) scripture dealing with Akṣobhya see Strauch 2007.

²⁰² There is also one occurrence in T458 (14.440b20). The two occurrences of *ruilai* in T224 (8.450b3 and 453b23) both occur in close proximity to the transcription *dasa’ajie* and in conjunction with the term *benwu* 本無 (Lokakṣema’s standard equivalent for *tathatā*), and are probably best viewed as

Likewise it employs *zheng jue* 正覺 as its sole equivalent for *samyaksambuddha*, eschewing Lokakṣema's normal transcription *san'yesanfo* 三耶三佛. Even the ubiquitous transcription *biqiuseng* 比丘僧 for *bhikṣusaṃgha* does not appear in the *Achu jing*, which uses the transcription-cum-translation *biqiu zhong* 比丘眾 instead. In short, of all of the scriptures associated with Lokakṣema's name by Daoan, the *Achu jing* is the most distant from the usage found in the *Daoxing jing*. Thus if there was indeed a translation of this scripture produced by Lokakṣema, the text as we have it has surely been thoroughly revised.

At the other end of the spectrum, however, it is not difficult to identify the translation in the group discussed above that is closest to the *Achu jing* in terminology: it is the verse portion (but not the prose) of the *Banzhou sanmei jing*. Indeed two of the terms mentioned above (正覺 and 比丘眾) occur only, among scriptures credited by Sengyou to Lokakṣema, in the *Achu jing* and the verse portions of the *Banzhou sanmei jing*; the same is true of the translation terms *zhong sheng* 眾生 (for *sarvasattva*) and *shizun* 世尊 (for *bhagavat*). In light of these and many other similarities not cited here, it seems highly likely that the *Achu jing* and the revised verse sections of the *Banzhou sanmei jing* are members of the same textual lineage, and may even have been produced in the same place and time.

In sum, though the unrevised prose portions of the *Banzhou sanmei jing* may remain on the list of Lokakṣema's "core translations," the verses belong instead with the *Achu foguojing*. Thus we may include this text in the category of "problematic or revised" works as well:

T418 (verses): *Banzhou sanmei jing* 般舟三昧經

In future studies it may well be profitable to examine the verse portion of this work not as a part of the group of Lokakṣema's translations, but rather in comparison with those scriptures that appear to be its own closest relatives (or, to use the terminology proposed in Part IV below, its own "rhetorical community"), above all the *Achu jing* (T313) and the verse portion of the *Huiyin sanmei jing* (T632).

NEWLY PROPOSED ATTRIBUTIONS

Recently Harrison has also proposed, on stylistic grounds, that the version of the larger *Sukhāvativyūha* traditionally attributed to Zhi Qian (T362) may in fact be the work of Lokakṣema.²⁰³ More specifically, Harrison has suggested that the text as we have it is a slightly revised version of an original translation by Lokakṣema or a member of his school, while the version of this sūtra attributed by the Taishō editors to Lokakṣema (T361)—an attribution that has been widely questioned by scholars—is actually the work of Zhi Qian. (For a discussion of this text see the section on Zhi Qian below.) What seems to have

etymological explanations (as suggested in Harrison 1990, p. 243) rather than translations *per se*. Neither *rulai* nor *dasa'ajie* occurs in T350 or T807.

²⁰³ See Harrison 1998b, pp. 556–557 and notes 16–18; 1999; and Harrison et al., 2002.

happened, in other words, is that the attributions of the two texts were switched at an early date.²⁰⁴ Harrison's theory has substantial merit and is gaining broad acceptance, and we may therefore add to the list of the extant products of Lokakṣema's school the following text, with the understanding that it has undergone a certain degree of emendation since the time of its original translation:²⁰⁵

T362: *Amituo san'yesanfo saloufotan guodu ren dao jing* 阿彌陀三耶三佛
薩樓佛檀過度人道經²⁰⁶

Future studies comparing the terminology and style of this text to other scriptures discussed in this section could make an important contribution to our understanding of its relationship to other texts produced by Lokakṣema or members of his school. At present, it seems that T362 fits best with the group labeled "second-tier texts" above, but further clarification of its standing would be welcome.

Finally, two other small texts, corresponding to portions of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* and traditionally credited to the Western Jin 西晉 figures Nie Daozhen 聶道真 and Zhu Fahu 竺法護 (Dharmarakṣa), respectively, also appear to be the work of Lokakṣema. Both of them begin abruptly, which suggests that they are fragments of a larger work rather than complete sūtras in themselves. Moreover, T282 begins precisely at the point where Lokakṣema's T280 ends, and T283 again begins from the endpoint of T282. Taken together, these three texts—T280, T282, and T283—correspond to the whole of a translation subsequently produced by Zhi Qian, the *Pusa benye jing* 菩薩本業經 (T281), which points to the possibility that they originally comprised another complete version of this text. Finally, the terminology employed in T282 and T283 is not only typical of Lokakṣema's usage but in some cases is virtually unique to his work. In sum, it appears that T280, T282 and T283 originally comprised a single translation by Lokakṣema or a member of his community which at some point were separated into three different pieces, with the first piece retaining the original title and the other two becoming what I have referred to elsewhere as "orphaned texts" (*gu jing* 孤經), which were subsequently catalogued separately.²⁰⁷ Accordingly, we may now add the following two items to the list of Lokakṣema's extant works:

²⁰⁴ How this could have happened becomes clearer when we recall that Lokakṣema is usually referred to not by his full transcribed name but by the abbreviated form Zhi Chen 支謙, whose similarity to the name of Zhi Qian 支謙 is evident.

²⁰⁵ In particular, Harrison specifies that the portion of the text dealing with the "Five Evils" (五惡), which is widely recognized as a Chinese interpolation, is the product of a different hand.

²⁰⁶ A Japanese study and translation now appearing in a series of articles by KARASHIMA Seishi (1999b ff.), is an essential resource, as is the synoptic edition published in Kagawa 1984.

²⁰⁷ See Nattier 2005a. The popularity of the translations of this text by both Lokakṣema (or a member of his school) and Zhi Qian can be gauged by the fact that both versions were actively appropriated by the composers of apocryphal texts, both Buddhist and Daoist; for a list of such borrowings see the appendix to Nattier 2007c.

GUIDE TO EARLY CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

T282: *Zhu pusa qiu fo benye jing* 諸菩薩求佛本業經

T283: *Pusa shizhu xingdao pin* 菩薩十住行道品

These texts, too, appear best to be identified with the other translations assigned here to the “second-tier” group. Once again, future comparative studies of these texts will surely be able to clarify the picture further.

LOST TEXTS

Of the translations catalogued under Lokakṣema’s name in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, the following items appear to be lost:

Shoulengyan jing 首楞嚴經 (a version of the *Śūraṅgama-samādhi-sūtra*, already lost in Sengyou’s time)

Guangming sanmei jing 光明三昧經 (“Sūtra on the Samādhi of Luminosity”) ²⁰⁸

Hu banniehuan jing 胡般泥洹經 (“The Hu Parinirvāṇa Sūtra”) ²⁰⁹

Bo ben jing 字本經 (“The Original *Puṣya Sūtra”) ²¹⁰

The disappearance of these scriptures does not seem to have been recent, for of all of them were reported as lost by Sengyou in his own time. Assuming that the *Fangdengbu gupin weiwei* 方等部古品 ²¹¹ 遺曰[<-日]說般若經 (also reported as lost by Sengyou) is simply another name for the *Kāśyapaparivarta* (T350, *Weiyue moni bao jing* 遺曰[<-日]摩尼寶經, which is elsewhere referred to in Sengyou’s catalogue by the title *Baoji jing* 寶積經), we may infer that this text actually was—and still is—in circulation under another name.

SCHOLARLY RESOURCES

Because of his reputation as a pioneer in the transmission of Mahāyāna Buddhism to China, Lokakṣema has received substantial scholarly attention in Japan. As a result, an

²⁰⁸ This title was not associated with Lokakṣema’s name in Daoan’s catalogue, but was cited by Sengyou from the *Bie lu* (55.6b15). It seems likely that, as noted above, this assignment is the result of confusion between this title and the similar title credited to Zhi Yao (the *Chengju guangming dingyi jing* 成具光明定意經, T630).

²⁰⁹ What the content of this “foreign” (*hu*) *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* was is unclear; as its length is given as consisting of just a single fascicle, it is unlikely to have been a counterpart of the archaic *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtras* preserved as T5 and T6, both of which are two fascicles in length. While this may simply have been a shorter account of the Buddha’s final days, it is interesting to speculate on whether it might have been a scripture dealing not with the *parinirvāṇa* of the Buddha himself, but with that of his foster-mother, Mahāprajāpatī (for which cf. T144 and T145) or perhaps even another of the Buddha’s disciples.

²¹⁰ Though no specifics concerning this text are given by Sengyou (other than the fact that the translation was two fascicles in length), it seems highly likely that this was the antecedent of the “abbreviated Puṣya sūtra” (*Bo chao jing* 字抄經) in one fascicle attributed to Zhi Qian (cf. the discussion of T790 below, pp. 132–133).

²¹¹ The character 日 found here in the transmitted text of Sengyou’s catalogue is probably to be removed.

unexpectedly high percentage of his often obscure translation terms can be found in standard dictionaries (including Nakamura 1981, Mochizuki 1932-36, and especially Hirakawa 1997, where many suggested Sanskrit equivalents can be found).

For the Sanskrit or Prakrit equivalents of some of the transcriptions found in Lokakṣema's corpus, together with reconstructions of their Han-period pronunciations, see Coblin 1983, pp. 242-253. A valuable discussion of Lokakṣema's translation style and a list of some of his characteristic technical terms, with special reference to the *Banzhou sanmei jing* and the *Daoxing jing*, is given in Harrison 1990, pp. 236-249. See also the very useful comparative table of the vocabulary of Lokakṣema's *Daoxing jing* in comparison with that of the *Da mingdu jing* (T225, ascribed to Zhi Qian) in Katsuzaki 1985. Studies of the terminology of the *Dun zhendouluo suowen rulai sanmei jing* (T624) and the *Azheshi wang jing* (T626) can be found in Miyazaki 2007a and b.

For the *Da Amituo jing* (T362), now widely recognized as a product of Lokakṣema's community, the ongoing series of publications by Karashima (1999b ff.) is an essential resource. A glossary of Lokakṣema's *Daoxing jing*, currently in preparation by the same author, is expected to be a major contribution to our understanding of Lokakṣema's translation idiom.

An Xuan 安玄 and Yan Fotiao 嚴佛調 (var. Yan Foutiao 嚴浮調)

BIOGRAPHY

An Xuan, of Parthian origin like An Shigao, came to Luoyang as a merchant toward the latter part of the reign of Emperor Ling (r. 168-190). For some unspecified act of merit he was awarded the honorific title "Commander-in-chief of the Cavalry" (騎都尉). He appears to have been a dedicated lay Buddhist prior to his arrival in China; referring to him as an *upāsaka* (優婆塞), Sengyou praises his adherence to the precepts as well as his knowledge of the Buddhist scriptures. As he gradually gained facility in Chinese he became interested in propagating the scriptures, and he is described as engaging in discussions with the community of monks. He remained a layman all his life, producing his sole surviving translation in cooperation with the *śramaṇa* Yan Fotiao, a native of Linhuai 臨淮 (Anhui 安徽) who had been a devotee of Buddhism from an early age and is thought by some to have been the first Chinese to become an ordained monk.

Although An Xuan, as a layman, would not be expected to appear in the *Gaoseng zhuan*, his eminence was such that Huijiao apparently felt constrained to include him, solving the problem by appending his biography to the section dealing with Lokakṣema.²¹²

²¹² T2059, 324b25-c7. For an English translation of most of the biography see Tsukamoto 1985, vol. 1, pp. 496-497, n. 15; for a French translation see Shih 1968, p. 16 (also cited in Tsukamoto, *op. cit.*, p. 497, note k).

GUIDE TO EARLY CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

In the earlier account given in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, by contrast, An Xuan is accorded a section of his own.²¹³

Yan Fotiao receives even briefer notice. In the biographical section of the *Chu sanzang ji ji* he is mentioned only within the account of the life of An Xuan, which refers to him as a *śramaṇa* and mentions his native place of Linhuai (55.96a14-16); the *Gaoseng zhuan*, which follows Sengyou's description of both men almost word for word, simply follows suit (50.324c2-4). In addition, however, we have one short but precious document composed by Yan Fotiao himself, a preface to the "Ten Wisdoms of the Novice" (see below under "Authentic texts"). Yan Fotiao is referred to by the title of *ācārya* (阿祇梨) in the heading to this preface, which has been preserved in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* (55.69c20).

Though the details concerning their lives are few, Sengyou is quite specific about the method by which they worked, reporting that An Xuan "orally translated the Indic-language text" (口譯梵文) while Yan Fotiao wrote it down (筆受). Thus while we are accustomed to thinking of translation teams as consisting of a foreign monk together with his lay assistants, here we have the opposite case: a foreign *upāsaka* whose knew both spoken Chinese and the language of the source-text (presumably a Prakrit vernacular) well enough to produce an oral Chinese translation of the scripture, assisted by a Chinese monk whose literary education was sufficient to enable him to record it in suitable prose.

Sengyou is unstinting in his praise of the quality of their work, stating that in their translation "the principle is captured and the sound is correct, fully [conveying] the scripture's subtle purport" (理得，音正，盡經微旨), adding that their skill became legendary in subsequent generations (郢匠之義見述後代).²¹⁴ He also explicitly links them with An Shigao, praising the three of them as translators whose work was "difficult to follow" (為難繼), i.e., which reached a standard difficult for others to emulate. In retrospect, it is striking that Lokakṣema's name is missing from this list.

CONTENTS OF THEIR CORPUS

The sole translation produced by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao, according to the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, is a Mahāyāna sūtra, the *Ugraparipṛcchā-sūtra*. Sengyou also reports that Yan Fotiao was the author of a text dealing with the practice of the novice monk (*śramaṇera*), entitled

²¹³ See T2145, 55.96a8-28; an English translation of most of the biography is given in Tsukamoto 1985, vol. 1, pp. 95-96. Since Huijiao was clearly dependent on Sengyou's earlier work, frequently (as here) citing it word for word (see Link 1957), the fact that Sengyou accords a significant place to An Xuan is likely to have affected Huijiao's treatment of him.

²¹⁴ 55.96a15-16. Since An Xuan and Yan Fotiao do not use transcriptions of Indian terms (with the sole exception of the long-established loan-word *fó* 佛 for "Buddha"), Shih's translation of the characters 音正 as "les transcriptions phonétiques [étaient] correctes" (1968, p. 16) is improbable; presumably Sengyou was referring here to the overall "sound" of the text, i.e., the mellifluous character of its wording.

Shami shi hui 沙彌十慧 “Ten Wisdoms of the Novice Monk (*śramaṇera*).”²¹⁵ The text itself has not survived, and no citations from it have yet been identified, but the fact that Yan Fotiao is credited with the production of such a work confirms what is implicit in Sengyou’s reference to him as a *śramaṇa*, i.e., that he was also involved in, and concerned with, the specifics of the monastic life. For the preface to the text (preserved in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*) see “Authentic texts” below.

TRANSLATION STYLE

The most striking feature of the work of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao is their translation policy, which differs strikingly from those of both of their predecessors, An Shigao and Lokakṣema. Whereas An Shigao had followed a “middle path,” employing transcription to represent proper names but translation for most Buddhist terms, and Lokakṣema overwhelmingly preferred to use transcription for words of both types, An Xuan and Yan Fotiao attempted to translate—rather than to transcribe—all proper names, as well as Buddhist terms, into Chinese. Thus in place of the well-established term *Shewei* 舍衛, used to transcribe a presumably Prakrit form of the city-name “Śrāvastī” by both An Shigao and Lokakṣema, An Xuan and Yan Fotiao introduced the unexpected translation *Wenwu* 聞物, apparently interpreting the word as etymologically derived from *śrāv-* (< *śru* “hear”) + *vastu* “thing, object.”²¹⁶ Other similarly novel translation choices include *chujin* 除饑 “one who gets rid of hunger” for *bhikṣu*, *gefo* 各佛 “individual Buddha” for *pratyekabuddha*, and *jingshou* 敬首 “respect-head” for the bodhisattva Mañjuśrī. Many of these terms were subsequently borrowed by other translators, notably Zhi Qian and Dharmarakṣa.

In terms of literary style the work of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao is more classical than that of either of their predecessors, with few evident vernacularisms and, as Zürcher has observed (1991, p. 283) some admixture of typical *wenyan* elements. There are occasional passages in four-character prosody, though non-metric prose predominates. There are no passages in verse, but since there is no evidence that the Indic text of the *Ugra* itself contained any verses this should not necessarily be construed as a feature of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao’s translation style itself.²¹⁷

Despite the fact that no Indic-language version of the *Ugraparipṛcchā* has been preserved,²¹⁸ a comparison with the two other Chinese translations, as well as a much later

²¹⁵ See below, “Lost texts.”

²¹⁶ A similar policy was followed by the Tibetans in the eighth century, when they translated the same name as *Mnyan yod*, “hearing” + “existence,” deriving the name from “hearing” (*śrāv-*) plus “exists” (*asti*).

²¹⁷ See Nattier 2003a, p. 39.

²¹⁸ A number of citations from the text, however, are contained in Śāntideva’s *Śikṣāsamuccaya*;

translation into Tibetan,²¹⁹ allows us to be reasonably sure about what the content of the underlying source-text would have been. And in light of this evidence, it is clear that—despite occasional lapses—the overall level of accuracy of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao’s translation is remarkably high.

AUTHENTIC TEXTS

In the catalogue section of the *Chu sanzang ji ji* Sengyou summarizes the work of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao as follows:

The above two works, comprising two fascicles in all, were translated (譯出) during the time of Emperor Ling by the *śramaṇa* Yan Fotiao together with Commander-in-chief An Xuan.²²⁰ [Of these] the *Ten Wisdoms* is a composition (撰) by [Yan] Fotiao.²²¹

Though the first part of Sengyou’s notice would seem to indicate that both works were translations, his comment concerning the *Ten Wisdoms* makes it clear that he considered it to be an original composition by Yan Fotiao and not a translation of an Indian text.

The latter work has not survived, but the first text credited to these translators, the *Fa jing jing* “Dharma-Mirror Sūtra,” is still extant. Both Both Harrison (1987) and Zürcher (1991) agree in accepting it as the work of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao:

T322: *Fa jing jing* 法鏡經

As in the case of Lokakṣema, we will take the opinion of these two specialists as our starting point.

Methodological preliminaries: external and internal evidence

In the case of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao our task is made easy by the fact that their sole extant work is abundantly documented in the historical record. It is clear that Sengyou had drawn his catalogue listing for the *Fa jing jing* directly from Daoan, for he cites the latter as describing the text as belonging to the *Vaipulya* section of the canon.²²² Thus the catalogue entry itself is of the highest possible level of reliability. A preface by Kang Senghui 康僧會 (fl. 247-280), likewise preserved in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, also credits the text to An Xuan and Yan Fotiao.²²³ Not surprisingly, the *Fa jing jing* is also mentioned by name in Sengyou’s biography of these two translators (55.96a14). The unanimity of the

see Mochizuki 1988, pp. 247-310.

²¹⁹ For a discussion of these other versions of the *Ugraparipṛcchā* see Nattier 2003, pp. 16-18.

²²⁰ See 55.6c5-6: 右二部。凡二卷。漢靈帝時。沙門嚴佛調都尉安玄共譯出。

²²¹ 55.6c6: 十慧是佛調所撰。

²²² On the term *vaipulya*, often used as a synonym for “Mahāyāna,” see Skilling 2001 and 2004.

²²³ See 55.46b19-c11. For an English translation of portions of the preface see Tsukamoto 1985, vol. 1, p. 96 and p. 498, n. 16.

testimony in these sources, in sum, makes it quite certain that the *Fa jing jing* is indeed the work of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao.

As to internal evidence, the style of the *Fa jing jing*—in which virtually every name and Buddhist technical term is translated rather than transcribed—is quite unique, and there is no comparable text produced by any other translator. It would therefore be difficult to contend that the *Fa jing jing* as we have it was produced by someone else. Though Sengyou also credits a text entitled *Fa jing jing* to Zhi Qian (55.7a19), treating it as another translation of the same sūtra (15a10), no other extant text by Zhi Qian follows this extreme policy of translation-only. Thus we may conclude that, if Zhi Qian did indeed translate a version of the *Fa jing jing*, it has long been lost, and the one that has survived is its Han-period ancestor.

A Mahāyāna sūtra

It is straightforward, in sum, to accept An Xuan and Yan Fotiao's translation of the *Ugrapariprcchā* as their authentic work:

T322: *Fa jing jing* 法鏡經 (*Ugrapariprcchā-sūtra*)²²⁴

Preface to a lost composition

Only one translation by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao has come down to us, but a preface thought to be the work of the latter has been preserved in the *Chu sanzang jijī*. Accordingly, we may also include the preface itself as a genuine Han-period composition:

T2145. *Shami shi hui zhangju xu* 沙彌十慧章句序²²⁵

The title as given in the preface (which is longer than the simple *Shi hui* or *Shami shi hui* given in the catalogue section) suggests that Yan Fotiao's entire composition may have been in verse.

LOST TEXTS

As noted above, the text to which Yan Fotiao wrote his preface has not survived, and (barring new discoveries in the future) it must be considered lost:

--- *Shami shi hui* 沙彌十慧 (var. *Shami shi hui zhangju xu* 沙彌十慧章句)

“Verses on the Ten Wisdoms of the Novice”

The meaning of the title is not entirely straightforward. Zürcher suggests that it may

²²⁴ No study devoted specifically to An Xuan and Yan Fotiao's translation of this scripture has yet been published, but readers can consult with profit the Japanese translation of the Tibetan version in Sakurabe 1974 as well as the study of the text in light of citations in the *Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā* and the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* given in Mochizuki 1988. An English translation and analysis of the text, based on the Tibetan version but with reference to the Chinese translations (including that of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao) as well, can be found in Natier 2003a.

²²⁵ See T2145, 55.69c19-70a8. In the catalogue portion of the text Sengyou describes the “Ten Wisdoms” as a scripture consisting of selections compiled by Yan Fotiao (十慧是佛調所撰, 6c6).

GUIDE TO EARLY CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

refer to the ten types of cleverness (*xia* 黠) mentioned in the *Anban shouyi jing* (viz., the six aspects of breathing meditation together with the Four Noble Truths).²²⁶ As an alternative, however, he suggests that it may refer simply to the ten precepts to be observed by the novice monk (*loc. cit.*). Yan Fotiao's preface, as Zürcher notes, says nothing specific about the meaning of the title; Kang Senghui's commentary on the text would surely have clarified matters, but of this work only a few tantalizing words have survived.²²⁷

SCHOLARLY RESOURCES

No glossary or study of the vocabulary of these translators has yet been published,²²⁸ and many of their technical terms are not registered in standard dictionaries. For translation terms later adopted by Dharmarakṣa in his *Lotus Sūtra* one may also consult Karashima's *Glossary* (1998). Some terms are discussed in the notes and in Appendices 2 and 3 of my study of the *Ugraparipṛcchā* (Nattier 2003). Occasional terms, with suggested Sanskrit equivalents, can be found in Hirakawa's *Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Dictionary* (1997). A glossary of the *Fajing jing* is currently being compiled (Nattier, in preparation).

Zhi Yao 支曜

BIOGRAPHY

No biographical details concerning Zhi Yao's life are recorded in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* or the *Gaoseng zhuan*. Sengyou dedicates to him only a single sentence at the end of his account of Lokakṣema, stating merely that "at that time there was also Zhi Yao, who translated the *Chengju guangming jing*" (時又有支曜譯出成具光明經, 55.96a7). Huijiao adds that he was a *śramaṇa* and credits him with at least one additional translation, but provides no further personal details (T2059, 50.324c7-9).²²⁹ The only specific chronological information given in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* is in the catalogue section (6c1-2), where his

²²⁶ Zürcher 1959, p. 331, n. 88 (referring to the received text of T602). A different list of ten *xia* (which also includes the Four Noble Truths as four of its elements) is given in an abhidharma text translated by An Shigao; see T1557, 1000c9-12: 一為法點。二為比點。三為知人心點。四為巧點。五為苦點。六為習點。七為滅點。八為道點。九為盡點。十為無為點。The meanings of the individual items are discussed in the following lines (1000c12-1001a9).

²²⁷ A single quotation from Kang Senghui's commentary is preserved in the *Fayuan zhulin* 法苑珠林 (T2122, 53.1000a1-2) by Daoshi 道世 and in the *Zhujing yaoji* 諸經要集 (T2123, 54.179b16-17) by the same author. The citation (which is identical in both works) reads as follows: 康僧會法鏡經云: "凡夫貪染六塵。猶餓夫貪飯不知厭足今聖人斷貪除六情飢饉故。號出家尼。為除饉也。"

²²⁸ The annotated translation of the sūtra included in an unpublished dissertation by Nancy Schuster (1976) is unfortunately not reliable.

²²⁹ See T2059, 50.324c7-9. For a discussion of the texts attributed to Zhi Yao see below, "Authentic Texts."

PART II: THE EASTERN HAN PERIOD

sole translation is dated to the reign of Emperor Ling (168-190 CE). Nothing is said about his ethnicity or place of origin, though the ethnonym *zhi* 支 suggests that he was of Yuezhi ancestry. If he was indeed a monk, however, we should be cautious about jumping to this conclusion, for prior to the late fourth century CE it was customary, in at least some circles, for a disciple to adopt the *ethnikon* of his master.²³⁰

CONTENTS OF HIS CORPUS

The sole text currently accepted by most scholars as an authentic translation by Zhi Yao is classified as a Mahāyāna sūtra; no other Chinese, Tibetan, or Sanskrit version has been identified. It is possible, however, that even this single attribution is not reliable, and indeed that this text is not a translation of an Indian scripture at all; for details see below under “Authentic texts.”

TRANSLATION STYLE

Like An Xuan and Yan Fotiao, Zhi Yao—if indeed he was responsible for the creation of this text—introduced some strikingly new technical terms, all of them translations rather than transcriptions. But unlike An Xuan and Yan Fotiao’s newly minted terminology, this distinctive vocabulary does not seem to have been adopted by any subsequent translator. Expressions like *chu’e* 除惡 for “monk” (*bhikṣu*), *qi’e zhong* 棄惡眾 for “community of nuns” (*bhikṣuṇī-saṃgha*), *wenshi* 文士 (evidently for “layman,” *upāsaka*), and *wushang duzun pingdeng zhi yi* 無上獨尊平等覺意 (apparently for “the thought of supreme perfect awakening,” *anuttarasamyaksambodhicitta*) remained unique to this text, with no visible progeny in later translations.²³¹ Whether or not it is an authentic second-century translation of an Indic text, therefore, T630 clearly represents a terminological dead end in Chinese Buddhist literature.

Its style, by contrast, is quite mainstream—mainstream, that is, by the standards of classical (non-Buddhist) Chinese literature. As Zürcher points out, 60% of the text is in four-character prosody, and examples of pure Chinese-style parallelism abound (1991, p. 284); one passage, he remarks, “reads like a Chinese essay” (p. 295, n. 15). In addition, the text contains several passages in unrhymed five-syllable verse (p. 284). In sum, he writes, “The language is more classical than that of any other Han Buddhist text” (*loc. cit.*).

AUTHENTIC TEXTS

Sengyou’s catalogue listing, like his biographical note, credits Zhi Yao with just one translation. Following the title *Chengju guangming jing* 成具光明經 (for which 成具光明

²³⁰ See above, “A Note on Names.”

²³¹ The only exceptions are in texts quoting (with or without acknowledgement) from the *Chengju guangming jing* itself. On the significance of these citations see below, pp. 97-98.

三昧經 and 成具光明定意經 are given as variants), Sengyou writes:

The above text, comprising one fascicle in all, was translated by Zhi Yao during the time of Emperor Ling [r. 168-190].²³²

Accordingly, of the four texts attributed to Zhi Yao in the Taishō canon Harrison (1987) and Zürcher (1991) accept only the following one as genuine:

T630: *Chengju guangming dingyi jing* 成具光明定意經

As before, we will take the consensus of these two authorities as our starting point.

Methodological preliminaries (1): external evidence

Sengyou's account of the production by Zhi Yao of a sūtra entitled *Chengju guangming jing* (with the above-mentioned variant names) seems entirely consistent, with full agreement between the information given in the catalogue and the biographical section of his text. No other work is credited in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* to Zhi Yao, and thus it would seem that this title alone should be viewed as a fully reliable attribution.

Yet once again other evidence complicates the picture. First of all, as noted above, the terminology used in the *Chengju guangming jing* appears to have no visible successors.²³³ If it were actually a genuine Han-period translation, this would be the first text we have encountered whose terminology was widely ignored by subsequent translators. Even the most unexpected renditions introduced by the pioneers of Chinese Buddhist translations—such as *zhi fangbian* 直方便 for *samyagvyāyāma* “right effort” in the works of An Shigao, *ouhejusheluo* 漚和拘舍羅 for *upāyakaśālya* “tactical skill” in the works of Lokakṣema, *kaishi* 闍士 (var. 開士) for “bodhisattva” in the work of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao, or *Qiuluzi* 秋露子 for “Śāriputra” (from a Prakrit version of the alternate form *Śāradvatīputra*) in the works of Zhi Qian and Kang Senghui²³⁴—enjoyed at least a brief “half-life” in the texts of subsequent translators. That the vocabulary of the *Chengju guangming jing* did not exhibit the same pattern suggests that this sūtra may have followed a quite different literary trajectory.

In contrast to its apparent lack of influence during the late Han and Three Kingdoms periods, however, the *Chengju guangming jing* clearly attracted attention during the late fourth century, for as Zürcher points out, this text was “one of the first sūtras which [Daoan] as a *śramaṇera* had to memorize.”²³⁵ The earliest text to quote this scripture by

²³² 55.6c2.

²³³ This is somewhat surprising in light of Zürcher's remark that this text was “one of the first sūtras which Tao-an as a *śramaṇera* had to memorize” (Zürcher 1959, p. 378, n. 73; see Daoan's biography in the *Chu sanzang jiji*, T2145, 55.108a8 and its counterpart in the *Gaoseng zhuan*, T2059, 50.351c12). In fact Daoan's own writings show no trace of the vocabulary found in this text, nor does he ever cite it in any of his works.

²³⁴ For this expression see Karashima and Nattier 2005.

²³⁵ Zürcher 1959, p. 378, n. 73; see Daoan's biography in the *Chu sanzang jiji*, T2145, 55.108a8

PART II: THE EASTERN HAN PERIOD

name, so far as I have been able to determine, is the *Fengfa yao* 奉法要 composed by Xi Chao 郗超, which dates from approximately the same period (c. 377 CE).²³⁶ A few decades later the text was again quoted in the *Zhao lun* 肇論, composed by Sengzhao 僧肇 (374-414 CE).²³⁷ Afterwards it virtually disappears from view, with its occasional citation in canonical sources occurring only in texts that are dependent on Sengzhao's work.²³⁸ Based on this data, therefore, we might be justified in concluding that the sūtra enjoyed a brief flurry of interest in the late fourth and early fifth centuries, while being generally ignored both before and after this time.

This information is substantially confirmed, but also dramatically amplified, by a new study by NISHIWAKI Tsuneki 西脇常記 of a fragment of a commentary on the *Chengju guangming jing* found at Turfan.²³⁹ Based on the fact that the commentary seems to be drawing on material found in the version of the Larger *Prajñāpāramitā* translated by Mokṣala in 291 CE (T221, the *Fangguang banruo jing* 放光般若經), Nishiwaki argues that it must have been produced after this translation but before the appearance of Kumārajīva's *Mohe banruo boluomi jing* 摩訶般若波羅蜜經 (T223), which quickly superseded Mokṣala's work and would be expected to be quoted in works produced in the fifth century or later.²⁴⁰ On paleographic grounds, as well as on the basis of the fibers in the paper itself, Nishiwaki estimates that the manuscript fragment dates from the first half of the fourth century CE.²⁴¹

One other quite unexpected finding further underscores the salience of this scripture in the late fourth century CE, for in one of the scriptures considered to be a translation by Zhu Fonian 竺佛念 (fl. 365 - c. early 400s CE), the *Zuisheng wen pusa shizhu chugou duanjie jing* 最勝問菩薩十住除垢斷結經 (T309), at least two passages from the *Chengju guangming jing* have been incorporated without attribution. The degree of correspondence

and its counterpart in the *Gaoseng zhuan*, T2059, 50.351c12.

²³⁶ See T2102, 52.87c25ff. and 88a12ff.

²³⁷ T1858, 151b15ff. and 154c19ff.

²³⁸ See the seventh-century Chan commentary *Zhao lun shu* 肇論疏 (T1859, 45.169a13ff., 174a24ff., and 181c6ff.) and its sub-commentary, the *Zhao lun xin shu* 肇論新疏 (T1860, 45.206a4ff., 212b4ff., and 220c4ff., 240c3ff.).

²³⁹ Nishiwaki 2007, pp. 46-60.

²⁴⁰ Nishiwaki 2007, pp. 51-52. Nishiwaki suggests that the commentary was most likely produced even earlier, i.e., prior to the time when Daoan drew attention to Dharmarakṣa's translation of the same text, the *Guangzan jing* 光讚經 (T222), in 376 CE (*op. cit.*, p. 56).

²⁴¹ The situation is rather complicated, for the manuscript has been repaired, and the repaired portion (which includes a section of the apocryphal *Tiwei jing* 提謂經, which was composed in 460 CE, on the reverse side) is assigned by Nishiwaki to the latter part of the sixth century. Based on the other evidence cited above, I suspect that the date of the early portion of the fragment is slightly later, i.e., that it was copied in the mid- to late fourth century CE.

makes it clear that Zhu Fonian has plagiarized (while in some cases reworking) a substantial number of lines from this scripture. On the one hand, this serves as additional evidence that the *Chengju guangming jing* was being actively used toward the end of the fifth century CE. On the other hand, however, it raises grave doubts about the status of the *Shizhu duan jie jing* as a translation of an Indian scripture.²⁴²

Methodological preliminaries (2): internal evidence

The idea that a text produced during the Han period, after apparently remaining invisible for nearly two centuries, would suddenly began to attract attention in the mid- to late fourth century CE is rather puzzling, but this does not present an insurmountable problem in itself. It is entirely possible for a translated scripture to lie unused on a monastery shelf, gathering dust over the centuries until someone—for reasons that are rarely documented in our sources—suddenly takes an interest in it. Thus the fact that the *Chengju guangming jing* appears to have been completely ignored by other translators, as well as by commentators and the authors of treatises, until sometime in the fourth century CE need not pose a serious obstacle to accepting the text as a Han-period translation of an Indian text.

Internal evidence, however, raises some serious questions about its provenance, for the sūtra contains a number of elements that are quite unexpected in an Indian Buddhist scripture. One of the most striking is its explanation of the practice of *dhyāna* (here translated as *yixin* 一心 “single mind”), which begins as follows:

What is extensive single-mindedness (廣一心)? By filially serving one’s father and mother he unifies his mind; by respecting his teachers he unifies his mind.²⁴³

It is difficult to imagine that such an exegesis of the word *dhyāna*—focusing not on meditative practices but on worldly social relations—could have been penned by an Indian author.

The passage continues with other items that are less unexpected, giving a superficial impression of a translated Indian text:

By cutting off desire and distancing himself from the worldly, he unifies his mind. By entering into the thirty-seven sections (*pin* 品),²⁴⁴ he unifies his mind. . . . By counting the breath and entering into *chan* 禪 [i.e., *dhyāna*], abandoning the six [kinds of sense-objects?] and actualizing purity,

²⁴² A preliminary report on the parallels between the two texts was given in Nattier 2006c. A published version is expected to appear in the *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University*, vol. XII (March 2009).

²⁴³ T630, 15.453b6-7: 何謂廣一心? 孝事父母則一其心。尊敬師友而一其心。 One could also read “unifies *their* minds,” but some of the subsequent statements in this section appear to make better sense if they are taken as referring to the practitioner unifying his own mind.

²⁴⁴ The expression 三十七品經 (var. -經法) was introduced by An Shigao as an equivalent for the thirty-seven *bodhipakṣa-dharmas*; see T112, 2.505b9 and 10, T603, 15.173c24 and 26, and *passim*).

he unifies his mind. Being able to practice these things oneself and then teaching them to others—this is called “extensive single-mindedness.”²⁴⁵

But while some of these sentiments would be quite at home in an Indian scripture, the basic structure of the passage, in which *dhyāna* is translated as *yixin* 一心,²⁴⁶ which is then broken down into its component parts of *yi* 一 (used as a verb) and *xin* 心 (used as a noun), only works in Chinese. It would be impossible, in other words, to come up with the above explanations by analyzing the word *dhyāna* (or *jhāna*) in Sanskrit or Prakrit.

Viewed in light of this passage, we can now see that the *Chengju guangming jing* contains other unexpected elements as well. At the beginning of the sūtra, for example, the Buddha instructs Ānanda to summon four groups: bodhisattvas (*mingshi* 明士), the *bhikṣusamgha* (*chu'e zhong* 除惡眾), arhats (*wu zhao* 無著), and stream-enterers (*lü ji* 履跡). But such a grouping is unattested, to the best of my knowledge, in any Indian Buddhist text. Equally unusual is the list of those who actually appear in response to Ānanda's invitation: the above-mentioned *bhikṣusamgha*, arhats, and stream-enterers, followed by the *bhikṣuṇīsamgha* (*xiannü qi'e zhong* 賢女棄惡眾), bodhisattvas (*mingshi* 明士), and finally the “literati who practice the precepts while living at home” (*wenshi jujia xiu jie zhe* 文士居家修戒者, = *upāsakas*?). This strange assortment of audience members is difficult to map onto any list of audience members normally found in Mahāyāna sūtras; instead, it gives the impression that the author was manipulating a variety of categories found in other translated Buddhist texts, but without any clear sense of their Indian antecedents.

The opening *nidāna* contains several other anomalous features as well, the first being the statement that the Buddha straightened his robe (整服) before speaking to Ānanda. References to “straightening one's robe” (more commonly written 整衣服) are legion in Buddhist scriptures, but something appears to have gone wrong here, for to arrange one's garment before speaking to another person is, according to Indian codes of conduct, a gesture of respect. Thus it is the person of inferior status (e.g., a disciple or a visitor) and not the superior (the Buddha himself) who is portrayed in sūtra literature as making this gesture before initiating a conversation. The Buddha does, to be sure, occasionally straighten his own robe as well, but this is virtually always part of a standard trope describing his preparations to go into town for alms (“straightened his robe, took up his bowl,” etc.).²⁴⁷ In short, the statement that the Buddha took care to arrange his robe before speaking to Ānanda seems to violate Indian norms of social interaction, and again it

²⁴⁵ T630, 15.453b7-8, 11-13: 斷愛遠俗而一其心。入三十七品而一其心。... 數息入禪捨六就淨而一其心。身自能行復教他人。此謂廣一心也。

²⁴⁶ The term *yixin* 一心 as a translation for *dhyāna* was apparently introduced by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao (see T322, 12.21b1), though it also appears in this sense in a number of outlying (problematic or revised) texts attributed to Lokakṣema.

²⁴⁷ The one exception I have been able to find in scriptures translated during the Three Kingdoms period or before is in Zhi Qian's *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*, but here the Buddha has just emerged from bathing in the river (see T6, 1.184a29).

points to the possibility of haphazard borrowing of language found in other sūtras without an understanding of the Indian cultural background.

The fact that the Buddha instructs Ānanda to summon the above-mentioned groups early in the morning is also unexpected, for this is the time of day when members of the monastic community would normally go into town for alms. Given that members of the Buddhist *saṃgha* were not allowed to eat after noon, if the Buddha were to call a meeting at such an early hour at least some of those in attendance would miss their sole meal of the day!²⁴⁸

The introduction to the sūtra continues to alternate between the strange and the familiar, as when the most exalted among the various beings who come from other world-systems to join the audience sit on seats that spontaneously appear in the sky, while the less-developed participants—“those with fleshly bodies who have not yet developed the four bases of paranormal power (*rddhipadas*, 四神足)”—sit on couches (榻) instead. While for advanced bodhisattvas to hover in the sky is a common trope in Mahāyāna sūtras, the idea that lower-ranking members of the audience would be seated on couches in the Buddha’s presence seems extremely odd.

The various anomalies described above, in sum, point to the possibility that the *Chengju guangming jing* is not a translation of an Indian text at all, but an apocryphal scripture produced in China. Indeed, it may well be that the reason this text “reads like a Chinese essay,” as Zürcher puts it, is that it *is* a Chinese essay, an indigenous composition combining bits and pieces of Buddhist lore with ideas and terminology from other sources. While this suggestion is only provisional, additional research is clearly needed before this text can be included with confidence in a discussion of Han-period translations.

A Mahāyāna sūtra (?)

As noted above, the attribution of the *Chengju guangming jing* to the Han-period translator Zhi Yao is problematic. It is included here with the understanding that further work is needed to determine both its date and whether it is actually a genuine translation:

T630: *Chengju guangming dingyi jing* 成具光明定意經

Problematic texts: a methodological afterword

In light of the various anomalies discussed above, it may now be worth considering the bizarre vocabulary found in “Zhi Yao’s” text from another angle. If we consider the possibility that the text might be an apocryphon, we can then look for antecedents of his vocabulary in other Buddhist scriptures. And when we do so, it becomes apparent that a number of its unusual terms might be viewed as adaptations of, or plays on, terminology introduced by earlier translators. The term *chu’e* 除惡, apparently intended to mean

²⁴⁸ Śāriputra’s fears concerning precisely such a situation are among the items parodied in the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*; see chapter 10 of Kumārajīva’s version (T475).

“monk,” bears a certain resemblance to the word *chujin* 除饑 “one who gets rid of hunger” used for *bhikṣu* by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao. The word *qi’e* 棄惡 for “nun,” in turn, might now be seen as a secondary derivative of *chu’e* 除惡. The term *lǚ zhi* 履跡 might be seen as a modification of An Shigao’s *dao zhi* 道跡 “tracks of the Way” for *śrotaāpanna* “stream-enterer,” an expression also used in the same sense in (for example) a number of translations by Zhi Qian. *Mingshi* 明士 “bodhisattva” seems to echo both *kaishi* 闍士 (var. 開士) “opener, revealer,” used for “bodhisattva” by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao, and *mingzhe* 明哲 “wise one,” used for *pandita* by the same translators. Even the long-mysterious presence of the name *Guanyin* 觀音—a rendition that otherwise appears for the first time in the fifth century, as an abbreviation of the translation *Guanshiyin* 觀世音 introduced by Kumārajīva—might at last find an explanation, not as the antecedent of Kumārajīva’s later usage but as an unrelated variation on An Xuan and Yan Fotiao’s *Kuiyin* 闕音.²⁴⁹

The *Fa jing jing* 法經經, a text which was still being avidly used (and, as we have seen, receiving high praise) in Daoan’s time, thus may have been a particularly rich source of inspiration for the author of the *Chengju guangming jing*. But there are other possibilities as well. A number of non-technical expressions used in T630 are otherwise seen for the first time only in texts produced in the late third or early fourth century CE, which suggests that its composer may have been able to make refer to translations dating from this period as well. A few suggestive similarities in vocabulary and content suggest that particularly good candidates for future investigation may be Mokṣala’s *Larger Prajñāpāramitā* (*Fangguang banruo jing* 放光般若經, T291), Zhi Qian’s *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* (*Weimojie suoshuo jing* 維摩詰所說經, T474), and a number of the translations produced by Dharmarakṣa.

Finally, we may briefly consider the status of the supposed Han-period translator Zhi Yao himself. With so little information concerning this figure it is difficult to determine whether he actually existed at all. But if he did, it is possible that a scripture entitled *Chengju guangming jing*. was indeed produced during the Han period but was lost, with its title alone being appropriated by the composer of the text as we have it. But this is only a theoretical possibility. Given the evidence discussed above concerning citations from, and a fragment of a commentary on, the sūtra—all of which correspond to the text as we have it—it seems probable that the *Chengju guangming jing* catalogued by Daoan, and which he

²⁴⁹ Kumārajīva’s own translation of the name of Avalokiteśvara (at that time still in a Middle Indic form such as Avalokitasvara or Avalokasvara) as *Guanshiyin* is clearly based both on his Indic-language source and on the earlier translation coined by Dharmarakṣa, *Guangshiyin* 光世音 (based on an understanding of the name as **Ābhā-loka-svara* “light-world-sound”). The character *shi* 世 “world” in Kumārajīva’s version is clearly redundant, indicating not that he had a variant Indic-language original (which would have had to read something like **Avalokita-loka-svara* in order to yield his Chinese translation), but rather the broad acceptance at the time of Dharmarakṣa’s earlier form. For further details on these and other names of Avalokiteśvara in early Chinese sources see Karashima 1999a and Nattier 2007d.

GUIDE TO EARLY CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

recited as a young monk, was the text that appears in the canon as T630 today. If the text is indeed apocryphal, the composer did his work well, for it does not seem to have aroused Daoan's suspicions.

LOST TEXTS

The *Gaoseng zhuan* credits Zhi Yao with other translations as well, only one of which—the *Xiao benqi [jing]* 小本起[經], presumably a biography of the Buddha—is named.²⁵⁰ No such work by Zhi Yao is mentioned by Sengyou, however, and it is unclear whether the attribution is correct. In any event, no text by this title can be found in modern editions of the canon, so if such a work was circulating in Huijiao's time, it may now be registered here as lost.

--- *Xiao benqi jing* 小本起經 (?)

SCHOLARLY RESOURCES

I am not aware of any studies devoted to the vocabulary and style of the *Chengju guangming jing* aside from the few comments made in Zürcher 1991, and hardly any of its unusual terms appear in standard dictionaries. Indian equivalents and explanations of many of its terms are suggested in the annotations to the Japanese *yomikudashi* version published by IZUMI Hōkei 泉芳環 (2000). Virtually everything about this unusual text still remains to be investigated.

Kang Mengxiang 康孟詳

BIOGRAPHY

The last of the Han-period translators registered in Sengyou's catalogue is Kang Mengxiang, and once again little about him is known. He was apparently born in China of Sogdian parentage, though his precise ethnicity is contested by some.²⁵¹ The biographical note given in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, appended to the note on Yan Fotiao (which in turn is an appendix to the biography of An Xuan), is extremely brief, noting only that Kang Mengxiang's forebears were from Kangju 康居 and crediting him with the translation of a text entitled *Zhong benqi [jing]* 中本起[經] "Middle-[length] Scripture on Former Events."²⁵² In the catalogue section Sengyou specifies that this translation was carried out

²⁵⁰ See T2059, 50.324c9: 囉譯成具定意小本起等。

²⁵¹ At issue is the location of his ancestral place of Kangju, which some Central Asianists insist should be identified not with Sogdiana but with an area farther to the East in the territory of Ferghana. For a discussion of the relations of Sogdiana with East Asia see Naymark 2001, especially pp. 65–66.

²⁵² On the term *benqi* 本起 (lit. "former arising") see Kanno 2001.

PART II: THE EASTERN HAN PERIOD

during the Jian'an 建安 period of the reign of Emperor Xian 獻帝 (r. 190-220 CE).²⁵³ Neither passage makes any mention of his working with any foreign monks or other assistants, nor does Sengyou give any information concerning his degree of facility in foreign languages. He does include, however, a highly complimentary assessment of Kang Mengxiang's work by Daoan, who praises its literary elegance.²⁵⁴ The *Gaoseng zhuan* adds no further biographical detail, though (as discussed below under "Authentic texts") it describes Kang Mengxiang as working with an Indian associate and credits him with the translation of one additional text.²⁵⁵

CONTENTS OF HIS CORPUS

The only extant works generally attributed to Kang Mengxiang by specialists are two collections of tales of the Buddha's former and final lives, which are treated as separate texts in the Taishō edition of the canon. Though these are not generally classified as Mahāyāna scriptures, they contain certain elements—such as references to the ten *bhūmis* (T184, 3.463a25) and the six *pāramitās* (T184, 463a22; T196, 4.147c13, etc.)—that suggest they were composed (or at least transmitted) in communities that were familiar with certain Mahāyāna ideas. As we shall see, it seems likely that at least one of these texts has undergone revision by a later hand. This does not, however, alter the basic profile of Kang Mengxiang's work, which is limited to the genre of biographies of the Buddha.

TRANSLATION STYLE

Zürcher describes Kang Mengxiang's work in glowing terms as representing the peak of Han Buddhist translations. "From a literary point of view," he writes, they are "the most sophisticated products of Han Buddhism" (1991, p. 284).²⁵⁶ Among the stylistic features to which he draws particular attention are the frequent use of *wenyan* elements, abundant Chinese-style parallelism, a very regular prosodic pattern, and the skilled use of unrhymed verse of varying lengths (*loc. cit.*). Indeed, if we bracket the translation attributed to Zhi Yao—whose status as a Han-period translation, as discussed above, is uncertain at best—Kang Mengxiang appears to have been the first to use versified passages of any kind in Chinese Buddhist translations.²⁵⁷ All of the verses in T196 are in five-character format; T184,

²⁵³ For Sengyou's biographical note on Kang Mengxiang see T2145, 55.96a20-22; for his catalogue entry see 6c7-9.

²⁵⁴ T2145, 55.96a21-22: 安公稱：“孟詳出經突突流便。足騰玄趣。”

²⁵⁵ For Huijiao's treatment of Kang Mengxiang see T2059, 50.324c7-14.

²⁵⁶ Zürcher may also have been influenced by the opinion of Daoan (cited above, n. 254); the same wording is found in the *Gaoseng zhuan*, 50.324c13-14.

²⁵⁷ Lokakṣema's *Banzhou sanmei jing* (T418) would be an exception if the verses in this anomalous text were produced by Lokakṣema himself, but there is solid evidence that they were added after his

however, contains a greater variety of styles, including one passage in seven-character format (which is quite common in Buddhist translations dating from the mid-third century and after) and another in a highly unusual nine-character meter.²⁵⁸ The passage in seven-character verse seems likely, however, to be the result of revision at a later date, and it would be safer not to assume that this style was already in use during the Han period.

AUTHENTIC TEXTS

The catalogue section of the *Chu sanzang ji ji* lists just one translation by Kang Mengxiang: the *Zhong benqi jing* 中本起經, for which the variant title *Taizi zhong benqi jing* 太子中本起經 is also given. Sengyou concludes this entry with the following comment:

The above text, [comprising] two fascicles in all, was translated by Kang Mengxiang during the Jian'an 建安 period [196-220 CE] of Emperor Xian 獻帝 of the Han [dynasty].²⁵⁹

In all of the cases discussed above Zürcher has applied quite stringent criteria for determining translator attributions, accepting only those texts registered in *Chu sanzang ji ji* and, of these, rejecting any that are labeled by Sengyou as having been drawn from a source other than Daoan. In this case, however, he accepts an additional work not credited to Kang Mengxiang by Sengyou, the *Xiuxing benqi jing* 修行本起經, as being a genuine attribution as well. Thus of the four texts attributed to this translator in the Taishō canon, Zürcher (1991)—like most other scholars—accepts the following two titles as authentic:

T184: *Xiuxing benqi jing* 修行本起經

T196: *Zhong benqi jing* 中本起經

Zürcher offers several reasons in support of this assessment. First of all, though they now appear as separate texts, T184 and T196 comprise a continuous narrative (Zürcher 1991, p. 290); indeed, the last paragraph of T184 is repeated *verbatim* at the beginning of T196 (p. 296, n. 20). Moreover, another biography of the Buddha, the *Taizi ruiying benqi jing* 太子瑞應本起經 (T185), which is solidly attributed to Zhi Qian (early 3rd century CE), contains a revised version of the contents of both T184 and T196, from which Zürcher apparently infers that Zhi Qian knew of the two as comprising a single text (*loc. cit.*). Zürcher also gives weight to the fact that T184 contains glosses introduced by the words *Han yan* 漢言 “In the Han language,” which he argues should indicate a date prior to 220 CE. Finally, he points to the fact that the *Xiuxing benqi jing* is credited to Kang Mengxiang in the *Gaoseng zhuan* (*loc. cit.*). In sum, although the *Xiuxing benqi jin* is not credited to Kang Mengxiang by Sengyou (much less by Daoan), in Zürcher’s view “the authenticity of the text as a late Han translation is beyond all doubt” (*loc. cit.*).

time—perhaps even by Zhi Qian or one of his associates.

²⁵⁸ Seven-character verse occurs at 3.471a-b; the passage in nine-character verse is at 3.468c-469a.

²⁵⁹ T2145, 55.6c8-9: 右一部，凡二卷，漢獻帝建安中康孟詳譯出。

As we shall see, however, both external and internal evidence complicate this picture. Whatever the original relationship between these two scriptures might have been—and it is not at all impossible that a single translation corresponding to the content of both might have been produced by Kang Mengxiang—in the form in which we have them it is clear that these two texts have had quite separate histories.

Methodological preliminaries (1): external evidence

As we have seen, Sengyou's catalogue attributes only a single translation to Kang Mengxiang, whose title, the *Zhong benqi jing*, corresponds to that of T196.²⁶⁰ This same text is also the sole translation assigned to him in Sengyou's brief biographical notice. No colophon or preface devoted to this scripture has survived, but the agreement between these two sections of the *Chu sanzang ji ji* suggests that we can be fairly confident that this text—and this text alone—was considered by Daoan to be Kang Mengxiang's work.

Daoan also know of a scripture entitled *Xiuxing benqi jing*, but in his catalogue (as reproduced by Sengyou) it is registered in a completely different place. Instead of being credited to Kang Mengxiang—or indeed, to any other known translator—it appears as the first entry in the portion of his catalogue devoted to scriptures whose translators' names were unknown (55.16c18).

In the *Gaoseng zhuan*, however—as Zürcher has pointed out—Kang Mengxiang is also credited with the translation of the *Xiuxing benqi jing*, a title corresponding to that of T184.²⁶¹ This divergence from Sengyou's account is unexpected, for Huijiao usually follows Sengyou quite closely, often reproducing his descriptions word-for-word. And the divergence is quite substantial, for Huijiao provides a significant amount of detail, portraying Kang Mengxiang as collaborating (on both the *Zhong benqi jing* and the *Xiuxing benqi jing*) with an associate named Zhu Dali 竺大力, using texts that had been brought from Kapilavastu by a *śramana* named Tanguo 曇果 (< *Dharmaphala?). Neither of these two additional figures seems to have been known to Daoan; their names do not appear, at any rate, anywhere in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*.

Zürcher's suggests that Huijiao must have drawn this information from an early colophon (1991, p. 296, n. 20), which seems quite reasonable at first glance. But a review of the treatment of the *Xiuxing benqi jing* in subsequent catalogues presents an extraordinarily complicated picture. For despite the prominence of the *Gaoseng zhuan*, subsequent bibliographers do not follow suit. Instead, with just one exception, in catalogues produced prior to the *Da Tang neidian lu* 大唐內典錄 (T2149, compiled by Daoxuan 道宣 in 664 CE) Kang Mengxiang is not mentioned in this regard, and this scripture is credited to Tanguo and Zhu Dali alone. That exception is the problematic *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶記

²⁶⁰ See 55.6c7-9 and 96a20-21. A variant title 太子中本起經 is given as well (6c7).

²⁶¹ See T2059, 50.324c10-11.

(T2034), which reports that the *Xiuxing benqi jing* was translated by Zhu Dali and Kang Mengxiang, based on a manuscript brought from Kapilavastu by Kang Mengxiang (*sic!*) and Tanguo.²⁶² The waters are muddied still further by the fact that in a number of catalogues the title *Xiuxing benqi jing* is said to be an alternate name for the *Xiao benqi jing* 小本起經, a scripture which is treated as anonymous by Sengyou,²⁶³ but beginning with the *Zhongjing mulu* 眾經目錄 compiled by Fajing 法經 et al. (594 CE) is credited to the elusive Zhi Yao.²⁶⁴

Ordinarily it might be reasonable to assume that subsequent catalogues drew their assignments of the *Xiuxing benqi jing* to Kang Mengxiang from Huijiao's account. But the pattern of these attributions suggests that we should be cautious in this regard. For Daoxuan's *Da Tang neidian lu* is known to have been the portal through which many of Fei Changfang's arbitrary (and overwhelmingly false) new attributions entered the mainstream of Chinese Buddhist bibliography. The fact that a number of catalogues published after Huijiao's time, but prior to Daoxuan's work, fail to follow him in assigning the *Xiuxing benqi jing* to Kang Mengxiang points to the possibility that our initial impression that Fei Changfang drew this information from the *Gaoseng zhuan* might be false. On the contrary, there is a real possibility that this attribution was interpolated into Huijiao's work from the *Lidai sanbao ji*.²⁶⁵ Although this suggestion must remain speculative pending further research, what is beyond doubt is that the attribution of the *Xiuxing benqi jing* postdates both Daoan and Sengyou.

Returning now to Daoan's entry for this title, we find that he does not merely register it as anonymous, but provides specific information concerning its provenance: "[This text] recently appeared in the South; it is actually an amplification (益) of the *Xiao*

²⁶² T2034, 49.54b13-16.

²⁶³ T2145, 55.32a28.

²⁶⁴ T2146, 55.128a12.

²⁶⁵ Interestingly, Fei Changfang cites the *Gaoseng zhuan* in one of his entries concerning the *Xiuxing benqi jing* (T2034, 49.34a14), which he does very rarely (only seven times in all, by my count, in the whole of his catalogue). But it may be significant that virtually all of these citations are used to bolster extremely shaky attributions. The first one, for example, quotes the following statement concerning An Shigao: 高僧傳云：安世高從建初二年至靈帝建寧中。凡二十餘載。合譯法句等經一百七十四部一百八十八卷 (49.33a23). But the *Gaoseng zhuan* says no such thing; rather than attributing one hundred seventy-four texts to An Shigao, it states merely that he translated "more than thirty works" (T2059, 49.324a10 譯出三十餘部經). Likewise Fei quotes the *Gaoseng zhuan* as crediting an "Old *Vimalakīrti*" as well as five other works to Yan Fotiao: 高僧傳云：古維摩詰等六部經合十卷。並臨淮嚴佛調於洛陽出之 (49.34a9), but again, no such statement can be found in Huijiao's work. Similarly, Fei claims that the *Gaoseng zhuan* ascribes the *Xingqi benxing jing* 興起本行經 and four other works, totaling eight fascicles in all, to Kang Mengxiang: 高僧傳云：興起本行經等五部合八卷。並康孟詳出。But this claim is also patently false, for no text by this title is mentioned in Huijiao's work. In sum, rather than supporting his claims, Fei's citations from the *Gaoseng zhuan*—all of which appear to contain false information—should raise a red flag in the minds of researchers.

benqi [jing] 小本起[經].²⁶⁶ Thus Daoan considered the *Xiuxing benqi jing* to be an expanded version of an earlier biography of the Buddha. For his part, Sengyou had listed it as one of the anonymous translations that were no longer available in his time.²⁶⁷ In fact, it may well be that the reason Sengyou was unable to locate a copy of the *Xiao benqi jing* was that it had already been absorbed into the new-and-improved version that was by then circulating under the title *Xiuxing benqi jing*.

Methodological preliminaries (2): internal evidence

The fact that T185 is solidly attributed to Zhi Qian, while T184 is assigned in certain medieval catalogues to Kang Mengxiang (though far from unanimously, as shown above), has led many scholars to draw the obvious conclusion that Zhi Qian must have made use of T184, i.e., the *Xiuxing benqi jing*, in the preparation of his own *Taizi ruiying benqi jing* (T185). And indeed, a quick comparison of the two texts shows that there are numerous passages in which T184 and T185 match word for word. The same is true of T185 and the first part of T196, and thus it might seem obvious that Zhi Qian's work is a revision of both of these texts, which accordingly must date from prior to his time.

As KAWANO Satoshi 河野訓 has shown (1991), however, the situation is not quite so simple, for there are also many passages in T184 that are more extensive, and more elegant (including portions in verse where T185 is entirely in prose), than what we find in the corresponding passages of Zhi Qian's text. In still other cases, entire segments of T184 have no counterpart in T185 at all.

This is not at all what we are accustomed to seeing in other cases where it is clear that Zhi Qian revised translations by others. On the contrary, the typical pattern—as seen, for example, in his revision of Lokakṣema's *Daoxing jing* 道行經 (T224) as the *Damingdu jing* 大明度經 (T225)—is that Zhi Qian adheres quite closely to both the content and much of the wording of the older version, while “upgrading” some of its Buddhist terminology and recasting it in a more polished and elegant style. There is no known case in which Zhi Qian replaces verse passages of an older version with prose; on the contrary, the use of a wide variety of metric forms is one of the hallmarks of Zhi Qian's style. Indeed, the presence of verses is one of the features that differentiates his revised version of the *Larger Sukhāvativyūha* (T361, the *Pingdengjue jing* 平等覺經) from the more archaic version that is now widely considered to be the product of Lokakṣema's school (T362, the *Da amituo jing* 大阿彌陀經).

In sum, while the *Taizi ruiying benqi jing* and the *Zhong benqi jing* clearly share a great deal of common material, it is impossible to explain the content and style of the former as the result of a revision by Zhi Qian of the *Zhong benqi jing* as we know it today.

²⁶⁶ See 55.16c18: 安公言：“南方近出。直益小本起耳。”

²⁶⁷ T2145, 55.32a28.

Thus we are left in the confusing situation of having two Buddha-biographies that are obviously related to one another, but the nature of that relationship is not at all clear.

A way out of this dilemma has been proposed by Kawano, who is one of the few scholars working on this topic who has paid close attention to Daoan's remarks concerning the provenance of the *Xiuxing benqi jing*. Based on a detailed comparative analysis of the content of T184 and T185, Kawano proposes an eminently reasonable hypothesis: that the received text of the *Xiuxing benqi jing* (i.e., T184) is precisely what Daoan said it was: a revised and expanded version of an older *Xiao benqi jing*. More specifically, bearing in mind Daoan's remark that the text had "appeared recently" (近出), Kawano proposes that the present text of the *Xiuxing benqi jing* is a revision of an Eastern Jin 東晉 (317-420) version of the *Xiao benqi jing* (Kawano 1991, p. 165). The *Taizi ruiying benqi jing*—whose status as a genuine Wu-period product Kawano finds no reason to question—thus cannot have drawn on the *Xiuxing benqi jing* as we have it, for Zhi Qian's version is actually older than the latter text. Instead, in addition to material now found in the first portion of Kang Mengxiang's *Zhong benqi jing*, Zhi Qian appears to have drawn on an older (now lost) *Xiao benqi jing*.²⁶⁸

Even a brief glance at the vocabulary used in T184 and T196 confirms Kawano's contention that these two texts as we have them cannot be products of the same hand. While both of them contain verses, the formula generally used to introduce them in T184 is 說偈(言), which occurs fifteen times in T184 but never in T196; in the latter, by contrast, the standard formula is (而)作頌曰, which occurs sixteen times here but only once in T184. The verb 曰 "say" occurs no fewer than 126 times in T196, while its appearances have been reduced to only twenty-four in the whole of T184. The translation of *bhagavat* as *zhongyou* 眾祐 "mass of blessings" occurs six times in T196, but never in T184; conversely, the translation of Śākyamuni as *nengren* 能仁 "capable of humaneness" occurs five times in T184, but never in T196. Finally, the distinctive renditions of *dharma* as *jingfa* 經法 and *daofa* 道法, which are characteristic features of T196 (occurring six and four times, respectively), are never found—with the exception of one occurrence of *daofa* in the context of the ten epithets of the Buddha, where it was surely a "frozen form" (i.e., a fixed formulaic expression)—in the whole of T184.

Thus while it may be that Zürcher is correct in viewing T184 and T196 as ultimately stemming from a single narrative tradition, it now seems quite clear that these two scriptures are products of different milieux. While the *Zhong benqi jing* can still be accepted as a translation produced by Kang Mengxiang, the present text of the *Xiuxing benqi jing* appears to be the product of a different time and place. If Kawano's reasoning is correct, it may be significantly younger, produced a century or more after his time.

²⁶⁸ This is in addition to the material found in the first part of T196, which also has parallels in Zhi Qian's T185. The latter part of T196 has no parallel in T185; in fact, it appears that the text breaks off abruptly.

A Biography of the Buddha

In light of the recent studies discussed above, the one text that can confidently be attributed to Kang Mengxiang at present is the following:

T196: *Zhong benqi jing* 中本起經

Even here, however, there is a distinct possibility that the text may have been revised after Kang Mengxiang's time. Ongoing research on this and other early biographies of the Buddha will surely be able to further clarify the situation in the future.

PROBLEMATIC OR REVISED TEXTS

As discussed above, the other text commonly attributed to Kang Mengxiang now appears to be of a significantly later date:

T184 *Xiuxing benqi jing* 修行本起經

Accordingly, it should now be removed from the list of genuine Han-period translations, though it will remain an integral part of any study of the evolution of the biography of the Buddha in China.

SCHOLARLY RESOURCES

No systematic study has yet been made of the vocabulary of the *Zhong benqi jing*. For the Sanskrit or Prakrit equivalents of some of the transcriptions found in both T196 and T184, together with reconstructions of their Han-period pronunciations, see Coblin 1983, pp. 253-256. A complete Dutch translation of T184 and T196 (treated as portions of a single text) has been published by Zürcher (1978).

For the *Xiuxing benqi jing* an essential resource is now the detailed study in Kawano 2007; see also Kawano 1991 for a discussion of his initial proposal concerning the relationship of T184 to T185.

Other Han-period translations

Finally, a text that is generally attributed to Zhi Qian has recently been re-examined, and in light of this new analysis it is clear that the language of the text is not that of Zhi Qian. In this case, however, the likelihood is that the scripture is older, rather than, younger, than traditional catalogues suggest, and indeed that it is a Han-period translation:

T708: *Liaoben shengsi jing* 了本生死經

As Zacchetti has pointed out, though the attribution of this text to Zhi Qian appears already in Sengyou's catalogue (T2145, 55.7a15), there is good reason to doubt its reliability. Both in the biographical section of Sengyou's catalogue and in the preface to the text composed by Daoan, Zhi Qian is referred to not as the translator of the *Liao ben shengsi jing* but as the author of a commentary on it (see T2145, 55.97c13 and 45b20-22, respectively). Indeed, Daoan explicitly refers to the scripture itself as having arrived in China at the end

GUIDE TO EARLY CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

of the Han period (55.45b20). It should also be noted that a “separately translated” text by the same title and of the same length (one fascicle) is included in Daoan’s list of “anonymous scriptures” (55.18b4); thus Daoan seems to have been familiar with two different translations of this text.

In sum, the evidence preserved in these sources, in combination with the obviously archaic language of the text, would seem to indicate that the scripture now preserved as T708 was already in circulation prior to the time of Zhi Qian. It seems very probable that it was produced toward the end of the Han period, and in future studies it may be examined with profit in comparison with other works of this date.²⁶⁹

²⁶⁹ For a detailed discussion of these and other issues concerning this text see Zacchetti 2004a, pp. 210-212.

Part III

Translations Produced During the Three Kingdoms Period

1. THE WU 吳 KINGDOM (c. 220-280 CE)

Weiqinan 維祇難

BIOGRAPHY

The Indian monk Weiqinan, whose name is generally (but surely wrongly) reconstructed as “Vighna,”¹ is often considered to be the first translator active in the Wu kingdom. His name is not mentioned in the biographical section of the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, and Sengyou includes Weiqinan among those translators for whom he had supplemented the information provided in Daoan’s catalogue with additional material from other sources (55.10a4-8). In the catalogue section, however, Sengyou provides a bit of detail, reporting that Weiqinan

¹ The correspondence between the name *Weiqinan* and its supposed Indian antecedent *Vighna* “obstacle” is problematic at best. The initial character wéi 維 (EMC wī, ONWC *iui) is widely used as a transcription for Indic *vi* or *ve*, but the use of the final character nán 難 (EMC nan, ONWC non) to transcribe an Indic-language *na* would be completely unexpected. On the contrary, other characters (notably *na* 那) were regularly used for this purpose, while *nan* 難 frequently appears as the counterpart of *-nan(da)* (e.g., *anan* 阿難 < *Ānanda*). The character qí 祇 (EMC gji/gjiš, ONWC *gie), also pronounced zhī (EMC tciā/tci, ONWC *tse), has a wide range of Indian counterparts, including *ji* (in *yuezhi* 越祇 < Pkt. *Vajji; cf. Skt. *Vṛjī*), *je(ta)* (in *zhihuan* 祇洹 < *Jetavana*, as well as *zhi* 祇 for the name “Jeta” alone), *khye(ya)* (in *asengqi* 阿僧祇 < *asamkhyeya*), and *gr(ha)* or *gi(ha)* (in *luoyueqi* 羅閱祇, presumably from a Prakrit form of *Rājagṛha*). It would be completely unexpected, however, for qí 祇 (or for that matter, any Chinese character) to be used solely to represent a consonant—e.g., *gh*—which is non-syllabic, that is, which is not followed by a vowel. In short, to derive the Indian name “Vighna” from *Weiqinan* would be extremely difficult. Bearing in mind that in many second- and third-century transcriptions abbreviation is not the exception but the rule, with entire syllables sometimes being omitted in the process (as in many of the examples given above), a more plausible equivalent might be something like **Vijitananda* (with 祇 for *jī[ta]*, for which cf. above for the use of the same character as a transcription of *je[ta]*). If this is correct the name should then be read *Weizhinan* rather than *Weiqinan*; since this is only a provisional suggestion, however, I have retained the traditional reading for the time being.

The interpretation of *Weiqinan* as a transcription of “Vighna” appears to be based on Fei Changfang’s *Lidai sanbao ji*, where the name *Weiqinan* is said to mean *zhang’ai* 障礙 “obstacle” (T2034, 49.57a5-6). The equation of this transcribed name with Sanskrit *vighna* (which does indeed mean “obstacle”) goes back at least to the work of Sylvain Lévi, who presented this equivalence without comment in his study of the *Faju jing* (Lévi 1912, 205); subsequently it has appeared in standard reference works (e.g., Mochizuki 1932-36, vol. 1, p. 108b, s.v. *Iginan*) and is widely repeated in secondary sources. But the phonological problems discussed above, as well as the rather inauspicious sound of the name, raise serious questions about the validity of this equivalence. Far more likely, in my view, is a scenario in which a Chinese bibliographer pronounced the name *Weiqinan* for a native informant (i.e., an immigrant from India) and asked him what it might mean. Not wanting to disappoint his host—and, of course, having no knowledge whatsoever of Chinese historical phonology—such an informant might well have come up with the postulated “Vighna.” For another possible case of such an after-the-fact etymology see the discussion of the name Tanmojialuo 曇摩迦羅 (var. Tangejialuo 曇柯迦羅), reconstructed (again wrongly, I suspect) as “Dharmakāla,” below (p. 159, n. 135).

had arrived in the Wu kingdom in the third year of the Huangwu 黃武 period (= 224 CE), bringing with him a manuscript of the *Dharmapada* (6c10-13).

The *Gaoseng zhuan*, by contrast, provides a long and detailed account of Weiqinan's background and early life,² thus diverging significantly from the standard pattern in which the *Gaoseng zhuan* follows the *Chu sanzang ji ji* very closely. From this it is clear that Huijiao was working from another source. Though its reliability should be subject to normal standards of scrutiny, it has a ring of truth, for (interspersed with the usual adulatory hagiographic details) he offers the unexpected statements that Weiqinan came from a family of fire-worshippers³ and that he himself was converted to Buddhism as the result of an encounter with a monk who was engaged in the study both of the "Hīnayāna" (*xiaosheng* 小乘) and of Buddhist spells (or "arcane arts," *daoshu* 道術). Such an account seems unlikely to have been manufactured in China, and thus initially at least—pending confirmation from another source—it deserves to be considered seriously.

AUTHENTIC TEXTS

Even a quick look at Sengyou's catalogue entry, however, reveals that he does not actually credit Weiqinan with any translations at all. Following the initial entry for the *Faju jing* 法句經 (*Dharmapada*) in his catalogue section,⁴ Sengyou provides the following details:

As to the above text, consisting of two fascicles in all, during the time of Emperor Wen 文帝 of the Wei, in the third year of the Huangwu 黃武 period [= 224 CE] of the Wu king Sun Quan 孫權 [r. 222-252], the Indian *śramaṇa* Weiqinan brought the foreign text (胡本). [In] Wuchang 武昌 Jiangyan 將炎 and Zhi Qian translated it.⁵

In other words, while Weiqinan is credited with having brought the manuscript from India, it is not he but two others—Jiangyan and Zhi Qian—who are said to have produced the actual translation.

A comparison of this information with the contents of a preface to the *Faju jing* found in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* is instructive. Though the preface is anonymous, it has

² See T2059, 50.326b14-28.

³ Huijiao's wording 世奉異道以火祠為正, "For generations [his] family had accepted a non-Buddhist religion, holding the worship of fire to be the correct [way]" (50.326b14-15). Zürcher interprets this to mean that Weiqinan "came from a Brahmin family" (1959, p. 47), but none of the common words for *brāhmaṇa* are used here, and in the period with which we are concerned the possibility that his family participated in an Iranian tradition of fire-worship such as that espoused by the Kushans should not be excluded.

⁴ There is a second entry for the same title under Zhi Qian's name; see below, p. 134.

⁵ T2145, 55.6c11-13: 右一部，凡二卷，魏文帝時天竺沙門維祇難以吳主孫權黃武三年齎胡本。武昌竺將炎共支謙譯出。

been considered by a number of eminent scholars to be the work of Zhi Qian,⁶ and there seems to be no good reason to doubt this interpretation. The portion of the preface concerning Weiqinan reads as follows:

First of all, Weiqinan left India and arrived in Wuchang in the third year of the Huangwu era [= 224 CE]. From him I received a five-hundred verse version of this [scripture]. [I] requested his travel-companion,⁷ Jiangyan 將炎, to translate it.

The author then reports that Jiangyan, while quite competent at handling the Indic-language text, was not yet good at Chinese, and so the result was lacking in elegance (其辭不雅).⁸ The preface also makes it clear that its author did not leave the text as he found it, for the he refers explicitly to making inquiries of Zhu Jiangyan on points that were unclear, and—on a larger scale—adding to the text thirteen additional chapters that were obtained from another source. The *Fajū jing* is thus a composite product, including materials brought by Weiqinan and translated in preliminary fashion by Zhu Jiangyan, together with a significant amount of material supplied (presumably by Zhi Qian) from another source.

Thus although a translation of this text (T210, *Faju jing* 法句經) is attributed to “Weiqinan and others” in the Taishō canon, this is based on information given in later catalogues and does not square with the account given in the *Chu sanzang jī ji*.⁹ According to Sengyou, the actual translation work was done by Weiqinan’s fellow Indian monk Zhu Jiangyan 竺將炎, who produced a rough Chinese-language version which was polished and set down in writing by Zhi Qian.¹⁰ In sum, though Weiqinan performed the vital role of bringing the manuscript to Wuchang, there is no basis for crediting him with the translation itself, and Zhu Jiangyan’s rough translation has not survived as an independent text. Accordingly, this translation will be discussed below in the section on Zhi Qian.

⁶ See for example Mizuno 1953, p. 15; Maeda 1964, p. 700; and Tokiwa 1938, pp. 358 and 555. For an English translation of the preface see Willemen 1973, pp. 210–213.

⁷ The term that I have rendered as “travel companion” (同道) could also be translated “co-religionist,” but the choice does not affect the overall sense of the passage.

⁸ T2145, 55.50a11–13: 將炎雖善天竺語。未備曉漢。其所傳言或得胡語。或以義出音。近於質直。僕初嫌其辭不雅。

⁹ The translation is first credited to “Weiqinan and others” in Fajing’s *Zhongjing mulu*, compiled in 594 CE (T2146, 55.144b16); Weiqinan alone is listed as the translator in Yancong’s seventh-century *Zhongjing mulu* (T2147, 55.180b7) and in some subsequent catalogues (e.g., T2148, 55.218a1).

¹⁰ For Sengyou’s account see T2145, 55.6c10–13 (in the catalogue section) and 96a22–27 (in the biographies section).

Zhi Qian 支謙**BIOGRAPHY**

With Zhi Qian we return to a situation comparable to that of An Shigao, in which Sengyou provides copious biographical detail.¹¹ The account of his life in the *Gaoseng zhuan*, by contrast, is considerably shorter, with a number of omissions and occasional differences in content.¹² Other valuable information is provided by several prefaces to other scriptures which refer to Zhi Qian's life and work. It is noteworthy that the sole preface devoted specifically to a translation produced (or rather, in this case, finalized) by Zhi Qian is thought to be the work of the translator himself.¹³

According to the *Chu sanzang ji ji* Zhi Qian was born in north China, the grandson (or perhaps, according to another source, the son) of an immigrant from the country of the Greater Yuezhi.¹⁴ He is also portrayed as a "grand-disciple" of Lokakṣema, having studied with the latter's student Zhi Liang 支亮 in Luoyang. Sengyou describes him as a precocious youth who excelled in the study of languages, mastering "foreign writings" (胡書) as well as Chinese. Toward the end of the Han, as chaos spread throughout the north, Zhi Qian migrated with several dozens of his countrymen to the southern Wu kingdom, settling first at Wuchang 武昌 and subsequently (after 229 CE) in Jianye 建業, where the ruler Sun Quan 孫權 was so impressed with his abilities that he appointed him tutor to the crown prince.

Though it seems that Zhi Qian had already begun translating Buddhist texts while in Luoyang, the bulk of his translation activity was carried out in the south. Late in life he retired to the mountains, taking the five precepts and practicing as an *upāsaka* in a

¹¹ For Sengyou's account see T2145, 55.97b13-c18. Portions of the biography are translated into English in Tsukamoto 1985, pp. 145-146 and p. 578, notes 7 and 8.

¹² In the *Gaoseng zhuan*—where, strictly speaking, a layman would not be expected to appear—Zhi Qian's biography is inserted within the section on Kang Senghui (T2059, 50.325a18-b4). For a French translation of Huijiao's account see Shih 1968, pp. 21-23. Significant divergences from Sengyou's account will be noted below.

¹³ See the preface by Zhi Mindu 支敏度 to his own combined edition of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* (*He Weimojie jing xu* 合維摩詰經序, 55.58b21-c10), the notice (also attributed to Zhi Mindu) to a combined edition of the *Śūramgama-samādhi-sūtra* (*He Shoulengyan jing ji* 合首楞嚴經記, 55.49a16-b9), and the preface by Daoan to the *Liaoben shengsi jing* 了本生死經 (55.45b3-25). The preface to the *Faju jing* (法句經序, 55.49c20-50a28), listed as anonymous by Sengyou, is now considered to have been composed by Zhi Qian (cf. above, pp. 114-115 and n. 6).

¹⁴ The notice attributed to Zhi Mindu, however (which will be discussed in detail below), states that it was Zhi Qian's father, rather than his grandfather, who immigrated to China (55.49a22), while Huijiao portrays Zhi Qian as having been an immigrant himself (50.325a19). The latter scenario is hardly likely, given the high level of competence in literary Chinese that is evident in Zhi Qian's translations.

monastic environment. When he died at the age of sixty (in 252 CE or shortly after),¹⁵ the current Wu ruler, Sun Liang 孫亮, is said to have written a letter to the monastic community mourning his death.

CONTENTS OF HIS CORPUS

While An Shigao is known for his translations of *āgama* texts and scholastic (non-Mahāyāna) treatises, and Lokakṣema seems to have specialized exclusively in Mahāyāna scriptures, Zhi Qian's corpus is unconstrained by these categories, including both Mahāyāna and non-Mahāyāna sūtras as well as didactic verses (texts corresponding to the *Dhammapada* and the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, with additional material not found in the Pāli versions), *jātaka* and *avadāna*-style texts, and a biography of the Buddha. At least one writer has credited him with translating a tantric text as well, but this is based on a misclassification of the work in question.¹⁶ It has also been claimed that Zhi Qian produced a synoptic edition of three versions of a *dhāraṇī* text, but this too is mistaken, the result of the misattribution to Zhi Qian of a notice written long after his time.¹⁷

¹⁵ There are differences of opinion concerning the date of certain events in Zhi Qian's life; for details and further references see Palumbo 2003, pp. 204-205, n. 108.

¹⁶ Zhi Qian's translation of the *Wuliangmen weimichi jing* 無量門微密持經 (T1011) is described as a tantric text of the *kriyā yoga* category by Anthony Tribe (in Williams and Tribe 2000, p. 271, n. 5), but this assertion reflects an anachronistic frame of reference drawn from later Indian and Tibetan sources, and moreover it seems to have been made without actually consulting the content of the text itself. The work in question is actually a quite standard Mahāyāna sūtra, whose classification in the esoteric (i.e., tantric) texts section of the Taishō canon appears to be based solely on the presence of the word 密 "esoteric" (and perhaps also the word 持, which here refers to *dhāraṇī*) in its title. (In the Tibetan canon, by contrast, its counterpart is included in the sūtra section; see Peking/Ötani nos. 539 and 808.) Tribe's treatment of this text as a *kriyā yoga* tantra appears to be based on a list published earlier by Stephen Hodge (1994), who however more prudently treats this text not as a tantra per se, but as a "sūtra with tantric elements" (p. 74).

¹⁷ See T2145, 55.51c17-52a10. There is a long tradition of assigning this notice, and by extension the synoptic edition to which it refers, to Zhi Qian; see for example Tang 1938, p. 132 [= Tang 1983, p. 161]; Zürcher 1959, p. 352, n. 81; Lamotte 1998, p. 88, and Nakajima 1997, p. 82 and p. 83, n. 1. A close look at the content of the notice, however, quickly reveals that this attribution is impossible. It is true that, in the notice as we have it, the author is listed as Zhi Gongming 支恭明, which is one of several names applied to Zhi Qian. But the fact that the notice refers not only to Zhi Qian's own translation of this scripture (T1011, *Wuliangmen weimichi jing* 無量門微密持經) but also to two other translations produced well after his time—the *Chusheng wuliangmen chi jing* 出生無量門持經 (T1012) translated by Buddhahadra (359-429 CE) and the *Anantuonimuqia-nihelituolinni jing* 阿難陀目佉尼呵[←阿]離陀鄰尼經 (T1015) translated by Buddhāśānta (fl. 525-539 CE), or more probably its similarly-titled predecessor (T1013) translated by Guṇabhadra (394-468)—makes it clear that this is a much later work. (Tang makes a heroic effort to align these titles with some lost anonymous scriptures listed in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, but it is far more straightforward to simply correlate them with the titles of these extant texts.) The notice also quotes from a note by a certain Tanfei 曇斐, who—if he is the same person who is referred to in the *Gaoseng zhuan* (50.382c5ff.)—died in 518 CE. Tang's suggestion that the text as we have it is corrupt may well be correct; my own suspicion, however, is that what we have here are some

In addition to Zhi Qian's translation work—much of which, as discussed below, appears to have consisted of revisions of previously existing Chinese texts—Sengyou credits him with having composed linked verses in praise of the bodhisattva comprising three “Indian songs” (*fanbai* 梵唄).¹⁸ According to Sengyou, Zhi Qian had drawn the material for these songs (or perhaps better, “hymns”) from the *Wuliangshou jing* 無量壽經 (i.e., the *Larger Sukhāvatīvyūha*)¹⁹ and the *Zhong benqi jing* 中本起經 (presumably the ancestor of T184), two texts which, as discussed below, were subsequently revised by Zhi Qian himself as T361 and T185, respectively. Unfortunately none of these hymns appear to be extant, but the Chinese canon contains one poem (in five-character verse) devoted to the praise of Amitābha and his world which reflects vocabulary otherwise found only in Zhi Qian's version of the *Larger Sukhāvatīvyūha* (T361).²⁰ It may well be that this anonymous text was composed by an author who was familiar not just with Zhi Qian's translation of this scripture, but with his earlier *fanbai* as well.²¹

TRANSLATION STYLE

Zhi Qian is unique among the translators dealt with here in that a substantial number of his works are not original translations but revisions—produced with or without reference to an actual Indic-language text—of the work of others.²² Partly for this reason, and partly also due to personal preference, Zhi Qian's work is characterized by a tremendous

preliminary notes made by Sengyou himself which somehow found their way into the transmitted text of the *Chu sanzang ji ji* in unfinished form.

¹⁸ See T2145, 55.97c12-13: 製讚讀菩薩連句梵唄三契。

¹⁹ It is interesting that Sengyou uses the title *Wuliangshou jing* 無量壽經 here, since in his catalogue this name first appears as the title of a translation by Dharmarakṣa (7c6) produced several decades after Zhi Qian's time. It may well be that at an early date this title was already interchangeable with *Amituo jing* 阿彌陀經, the title credited by Sengyou to Zhi Qian (55.6c25).

²⁰ See T373, *Hou chu Amitufo jie* 後出阿彌陀佛偈. The title of the work (including the characters *hou chu* 後出 “issued later”) points to the existence of an earlier text of the same type, which may well have been one of those credited by Sengyou to Zhi Qian. For a recent study of this text, focusing on the rhyme pattern in its verses (which are cast in five-character form), see Saitō 2005.

²¹ Among all the texts preserved in the Taishō canon, the (erroneous) translation *Shiraowang* 世饒王 “World-Abundance-King” for *Lokeśvararāja* is attested only in Zhi Qian's *Pingdengjue jing* (T361) and in the *Hou chu Amitufo jie* (T373), thus making it clear that there must be some relationship between them. Another very distinctive term found in Zhi Qian's *Pingdengjue jing*, however—the translation of the name of the Buddha Amitābha as *Wuliangqingjing* 無量清淨 “Limitless Purity”—does not find a match in the *Hou chu Amitufo jie*, for here the two epithets are separated, with the Buddha himself bearing the name *Wuliang*, while his land is named *Qingjing*. Thus it seems unlikely that the hymn could have been composed by Zhi Qian himself (see Nattier 2007a, pp. 384-385).

²² Zhi Qian's activity as a revisor of the works of others is discussed in a notice preserved in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* which is generally credited to Zhi Mindu (T2145, 55.49a16-b9); on some possible problems with this attribution see below, p. 123, n. 34.

variety in vocabulary; his corpus contains, for example, at least eight different translations and transcriptions of the word “arhat.”²³ Some of this diversity can be explained by Zhi Qian’s retention in his revised translations of terms used in the earlier versions of these texts, but even within a single scripture (or a single section of a given scripture) we often find multiple Chinese renditions of a single Indic term. Thus it seems likely that this terminological multiplicity was not simply a side-effect of the revision process, but also reflects a predilection for variety on the part of Zhi Qian himself.

As discussed below, some of the scriptures solidly attributed to Zhi Qian in early sources bear a striking resemblance to the style of his teacher’s teacher, Lokakṣema; assuming that these attributions are correct, it is possible that these date from an early period in his career. Most of his translations, however, exhibit notable departures from Lokakṣema’s work. One characteristic feature of what might be characterized as Zhi Qian’s “mature style” is a strong preference for four-character prosody—indeed, this could be deemed his default mode—supplemented by the liberal use of verse. It was long thought that all verses found in Buddhist translations were unrhymed, but in a series of important studies Saitō Takanobu 齊藤隆信 has recently demonstrated convincingly that this is not the case with Zhi Qian. Though many examples of unrhymed verse can indeed be found in his corpus, in other cases it is clear that Zhi Qian was not only employing the use of meter, but of patterns of rhyme as well.²⁴

The majority of the verse passages in Zhi Qian’s corpus are pentasyllabic, though he also makes extensive use of an unusual six-character style which appears for the first time (in translations which can be dated with confidence) in his work.²⁵ Several tantalizing

²³ In addition to the well known term 阿羅漢 Zhi Qian also employs the expressions 阿羅訶, 羅漢, 無所著, 無著, 應儀, 應真, 真人, and 至真 (see Nattier 2003b, pp. 212–219). A ninth equivalent, 應供 (which appears only once), is probably the result of a scribal emendation (*op. cit.*, p. 216).

²⁴ See for example Saitō 2000, 2001, and 2004.

²⁵ Six-syllable verse is quite uncommon in Buddhist translations; it is also very rare, for that matter, in Chinese literature in general in the period with which we are concerned, so much so that it is not even mentioned in many surveys of Chinese poetic forms. See for example the illuminating discussion by MATSUURA Tomohisa 松浦友久, which deals only with four-, five-, and seven-character verse (Matsuura 1996). There are numerous examples in the translations of Zhi Qian (T6, T169, T198, T210, T361, T532, and T632), however. Verses in six-character meter can also be found in Lokakṣema’s *Banzhou sanmei jing* (T418), but these passages—which belong to the revised portions of the text—point not to the use of such verse by Lokakṣema himself, but rather to a revision of the text, perhaps even by Zhi Qian or a member of his circle. (Two other versions of the same scripture, T417 and T419, also contain six-syllable verse; it would be useful to study these in comparison with the six-syllable passages found in T418.) The only other text known to have been produced during this period that contains a passage in this style is Kang Senghui’s *Liudu ji jing* 六度集經 (T152, 3.51a–b), but this portion of the text can be shown to be borrowed from Zhi Qian (see below, p. 150). Thus in the first half of the third century CE the presence of six-character verse is a virtual fingerprint of Zhi Qian’s work.

Only about two dozen other scriptures—out of a total of 847—in the first seventeen volumes of the Taishō canon (i.e., those containing translated *āgama* texts, *jātakas* and *avadānas*, and Mahāyāna

references in later sources suggest a possible connection between these six-character verses and the genre of “Indian-[style] songs” (*fanbai* 梵唄) mentioned above, a form of verse with which Zhi Qian is the first to be credited.²⁶ Only two of his translations (the *Taizi ruiying benqi jing*, T185, and the *Weimojie jing*, T474) contain verses in the seven-character meter that was to become widely popular in subsequent centuries.

The vocabulary of Zhi Qian’s corpus includes a significant number of transcriptions, especially (but by no means exclusively) in his most “Lokakṣema-like” works, as discussed below. Virtually all of these terms, however, appear to have been introduced by his predecessors. In general (at least in his “post-Lokakṣema period”) Zhi Qian appears to have preferred to use Chinese translations for most names as well as for Buddhist technical terms. These terms, too, were sometimes adopted from previous translations—of which he seems to have drawn preferentially from the *Fajing jing* by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao (T322) and the biography of the Buddha by Kang Mengxiang (T196 and the antecedent of T184)—but in other cases they may have been coined by Zhi Qian himself. A substantial number of these new renditions, however, appear to be based on an erroneous understanding of the underlying Indic name or term, which calls into question Sengyou’s high estimate of Zhi Qian’s linguistic abilities.²⁷

sūtras) contain six-syllable verse; of those not translated by Zhi Qian, the majority are by Dharmarakṣa, and none are certain to date from prior to Zhi Qian’s time. Thus it appears that it may have been Zhi Qian who first used this metric form in Chinese Buddhist translations, and that this is one of many respects in which Dharmarakṣa subsequently imitated his style.

²⁶ Sengyou does not tell us how many syllables per line Zhi Qian’s “Indian songs” contained, but a slightly later passage in the *Gaoseng zhuan* explicitly links the genre of *fanbai* with a six-syllable style. Huijiao relates the story of a monk named Zhi Tanyue 支曇曜, who was famous for scriptural recitation and who had been summoned to the capital of the Eastern Jin 東晉 from the territory of Wu in the early 370s CE. After a dream in which a god instructed him in “vocal arts” 聲法, he awoke and he composed an “Indian song” in six-syllable style (六言梵唄 see T2059, 50.413c5-12). While this account does not allow us to conclude that the term *fanbai* referred exclusively to hexasyllabic poetry, it does tell us that for Huijiao, at least, six-syllable verse could be included within this category. One other reference, found in the catalogue section of the *Chu sanzang jiji*, again connects the six-syllable style with Indian verse. In a list of verses drawn from various sources Sengyou refers to a text entitled *Yaolian menggan fanyin liuyan baiji* 藥練夢感梵音六言唄記 (92b5). Though the term *fanbai* does not occur here, once again it is clear that a six-character verse style is being connected with “Indian sounds.”

It still remains to be determined whether any correlation can be established between the six-syllable style used in texts produced by Zhi Qian and others and any particular form of Indian meter. If the verses in the *fanbai* style composed by Zhi Qian and others were indeed inspired by Indian metric compositions, we may have here a still earlier instance of the sort of “stimulus diffusion” in poetic technique that has been so masterfully chronicled for the late fifth century CE and after by Victor Mair and Tsu-lin Mei (1991).

²⁷ Among the hundreds of examples are such renditions as 寶首 “Jewel Head” for *Ratnaśrī* “Jewel Glory,” 不老 “not growing old” for *akṣara* “letter, syllable,” and 等 “uniform” for *apramāṇa* “unlimited.” In all such cases we must also consider the possibilities that (1) Zhi Qian adopted the rendition in question from an earlier translation that has not survived, and/or (2) his rendition reflects an interpretation that was already circulating in India. In the latter case, some of what appear from our

There is a considerable degree of overlap between the vocabulary and style employed in much of Zhi Qian's corpus and in that of Kang Senghui, a confluence so great that it seems appropriate to speak of a "Wu scriptural idiom." For further details see the section on Kang Senghui's translation style (below, pp. 150-152).

AUTHENTIC TEXTS

Beginning as before with the testimony provided in Sengyou's catalogue, we find the following summation at the end of his list of Zhi Qian's translations:

The above thirty-six works, comprising forty-eight fascicles in all, were translated by Zhi Qian during the time of Emperor Wen 文帝 of the Wei, from the beginning of the Huangwu 黃武 period [= 222-229 CE] of the Wu king Sun Quan 孫權 through the middle of the Jianxing 建興 period [253 CE] of Sun Liang 孫亮.²⁸

Matching these titles with those that appear in the transmitted canon, scholars have generally agreed in accepting twenty-three of the fifty-two translations credited to Zhi Qian by the Taishō editors as being genuine examples of his work. These are listed below, with the Taishō text numbers of those that will be shown to be problematic enclosed in brackets:

- T54: *Shi Monan ben sizi jing* 釋摩男本四子經
- T68: *Laizhaheluo jing* 賴吒和羅經
- T76: *Fanmoyu jing* 梵摩渝經
- T87: *Zhai jing* 齋經
- T169: *Yueming pusa jing* 月明菩薩經
- T185: *Taizi ruiying benqi jing* 太子瑞應本起經
- T198: *Yizu jing* 義足經
- [T225]: *Da mingdu jing* 大明度經
- T281: *Pusa benye jing* 菩薩本業經
- [T362]: *Amituo sanyesanfo saloufotan guoduren daoing* 阿彌陀三耶三佛薩樓佛檀過度人道經
- T474: *Weimojie jing* 維摩詰經
- T493: *Anan sishi jing* 阿難四事經
- T532: *Sihemo jing* 私呵末[<-昧]經 (var. *Pusa daoshu jing* 菩薩道樹經)
- T533: *Chamojie jing* 差摩竭經 (var. *Pusa shengdi jing* 菩薩生地經)
- T556: *Qinu jing* 七女經
- T557: *Longshi nü jing* 龍施女經

vantage point to be simply errors based on false etymologies may actually reflect creative exegesis—for which certain Prakrit languages, with their numerous homophones and near-homophones, offered particularly rich opportunities—by Dharma-preachers in India.

²⁸ T2145, 55.7a23-24: 右三十六部，四十八卷，魏文帝時支謙以吳主孫權黃武初至孫亮建興中所譯出。

GUIDE TO EARLY CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

- [T559]: *Lao nüren jing* 老女人經
 T581: *Bashi jing* 八師經
 T632: *Huiyin sanmei jing* 慧印三昧經
 [T708]: *Liaoben shengsi jing* 了本生死經
 [T735]: *Siyuan jing* 四願經
 T790: *Bo jing chao* 孝經抄
 T1011: *Wuliangmen weimi chi jing* 無量門微密持經²⁹

In addition to the above titles, two other translations credited to Zhi Qian by Sengyou, but not registered as such in transmitted versions of the canon, have also been accepted as the work of Zhi Qian by specialists. The first is a version of the (non-Mahāyāna) *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*, listed as an anonymous scripture registered in an Eastern Jin catalogue by the Taishō editors but identified by U_I Hakuju with the *Da banniehuan jing* assigned to Zhi Qian by Sengyou:

- T6: *Banniehuan jing* 般泥洹經

The second is a version of the *Dharmapada*, based on a rough translation initially produced by the Indian monk Zhu Jiangyan.³⁰ Though the Taishō editors, following later Chinese catalogues, assign this work to Weiqinan, there is now a general consensus (whose basis will be discussed below) that the text as we have it should be credited to Zhi Qian:

- T210: *Faju jing* 法句經

Once again this approach—which is based solely on the evidence provided by Sengyou's catalogue—will be the starting point, and not the end-point, of the discussion here.

Methodological preliminaries (1): external evidence

As we have seen, Sengyou's catalogue is internally consistent in crediting thirty-six translations to Zhi Qian. The biographical section of the same work, however, gives a different figure, assigning him only twenty-seven works, which conforms to suggestions made elsewhere that the catalogue section was expanded after the biographical section was composed.³¹ Four translations are mentioned by name in Zhi Qian's biography, suggesting that Sengyou considered them to be his most noteworthy works:³²

- T6: *Dabanniehuan [jing]* 大般泥洹[經]
 T185: *[Taizi] ruiying benqi [jing]* [太子]瑞應本起[經]
 T210: *Faju [jing]* 法句[經]
 T474: *Weimojie [jing]* 維摩詰[經]

Huijiao reproduces the above discussion almost word-for-word, but with one notable exception: in the *Gaoseng zhuan* Zhi Qian is credited not with twenty-seven translations,

²⁹ Var. 成道降魔得一切智經.

³⁰ T2145, 55.6c20; cf. Zürcher 1959, p. 48.

³¹ See Palumbo 2003, p. 197.

³² 55.97c10-11. As is usual in the biographies section, Sengyou gives these individual titles in abbreviated form.

but with forty-nine.³³

In addition to the scriptures singled out for attention in the biographical section of the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, a few others are attributed to Zhi Qian in prefaces or other notices preserved in the same work. One of the best known of these is Zhi Mindu's 支愍度 preface to his own combined edition of the *Vimalakīrti*, where he writes that he used the translation produced by Zhi Qian (here called Zhi Gongming 支恭明, abbreviated 明) as his base text, while collating it with two other versions (55.58c2ff.). Zhi Qian's (lost) translation of the *Sūraṅgama-samādhi-sūtra* is mentioned in another notice, also traditionally (but perhaps wrongly) ascribed to Zhi Mindu,³⁴ which contains an important discussion comparing the very different translation styles preferred by Lokakṣema and Zhi Qian (here called Zhi Yue 支越, styled Gongming 恭明, with his name abbreviated as 越). The same notice also contains an explicit mention of Zhi Qian's revision of scriptures produced by others (55.49a25ff.). Yet another preface, to Zhi Qian's revised version of the *Dharmapada*, is thought to have been composed by Zhi Qian himself. Thus in other early sources—that is, in the various scriptural notices collected by Sengyou—we find additional corroborating support for Zhi Qian's production of the following works:

T210: *Faju jing* 法句經

--- *Shoulengyan jing* 首楞嚴經

T474: *Weimojie jing* 維摩詰經

It is worth noting that the subset of Zhi Qian's corpus singled out in the above sources includes texts belonging to a wide range of genres: two Mahāyāna sūtras (the *Sūraṅgama* and the *Vimalakīrti*), one non-Mahāyāna sūtra (the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*), a biography of the Buddha (the *Taizi ruiying benqi jing*), and a collection of didactic verses corresponding

³³ T2059, 50.325a29-b4.

³⁴ Though the attribution of this notice to Zhi Mindu is widely accepted, it contains a number of peculiar features which could perhaps benefit from further consideration. First, although Zhi Mindu's name is indeed given immediately below the title of the notice, it is not followed by any of the usual verbs (作 or in some cases 撰) used by Sengyou to indicate authorship. Second, the heading also mentions a commentary by Xie Fu 謝敷, which seems out of place if this were indeed a note by Zhi Mindu to his own synoptic edition. Third, whereas Zhi Mindu's (well-documented and uncontroversial) preface to his own combined edition of the *Vimalakīrti* uses the name Zhi Gongming 支恭明 (abbreviated as just "Ming" at 58c4) for the person who is presumably Zhi Qian, the *Sūraṅgama* notice refers to him as Zhi Yue 支越 (with the *zi*, to be sure, of Gongming 恭明), abbreviating his name not as "Ming" but as "Yue" (e.g., at 49a24), which never occurs in the *Vimalakīrti* document. Finally, two times—in reference to Lokakṣema and to Zhi Qian's father [*sic*; his grandfather according to the biography in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*—the *Sūraṅgama* notice refers to people coming to Zhongguo 中國. This is not of course an odd term in itself, but it is interesting that it never occurs anywhere else in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, with the exception of passages authored by Sengyou himself; instead, all other prefaces and colophons refer to people coming to specific places (Luoyang, Chang'an, etc.). Given the great importance of the information contained in this notice—not only about Zhi Qian's work in revising earlier translations, but also concerning the attribution of T624 and T626 to Lokakṣema—it would be extremely useful if the authorship of this notice, and thus its date, could be established with somewhat greater confidence.

to the *Dharmapada* (the *Faju jing*).

Conversely, Sengyou notes that several of the translations assigned by him to Zhi Qian were absent from Daoan's catalogue. Grouped together at the end of his section on Zhi Qian, all of these are said to be drawn from another source (55.7a17-22):

- T68: *Laizhabeluo jing* 賴吒和羅經
 T557: *Longshi nü jing* 龍施女經
 --- *Shoulengyan jing* 首楞嚴經
 --- *Fajing jing* 法鏡經³⁵
 --- *Luzi jing* 鹿子經
 --- *Shi'ermen dafangdeng jing* 十二門大方等經

Following the procedure outlined above, we should consider the absence of these titles from Daoan's catalogue to indicate that their attribution to Zhi Qian is somewhat less secure and should be evaluated with particular care. In this regard it is surprising (and it may well be significant) that a translation by Zhi Qian of the *Shoulengyan jing*, which finds strong support in another external source, viz. the notice to Zhi Mindu's combined edition, was apparently unknown to Daoan. In any event, Sengyou was evidently making his judgement on the basis of the title alone, for he states that the translation itself was already lost in his time (55.7a17).

In using external sources to establish a list of genuine translations by Zhi Qian we also encounter another peculiar problem: the occasional confusion between his name and that of Lokakṣema. As we have already seen, Lokakṣema's name was generally abbreviated as Zhi Chen 支讖 in our earliest sources, and the potential for confusion between this and the similar-looking Zhi Qian 支謙 is evident. That this is not merely a theoretical possibility can quickly be confirmed by comparing Zhi Qian's biography in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* with that found in the *Gaoseng zhuan*. As noted above, in many passages Huijiao simply copies Sengyou's account word for word. But in one such passage—where Zhi Qian's heritage as the student of a disciple of Lokakṣema is being described—the received text of the *Gaoseng zhuan* states (correctly) that during the time of the Han emperors Huan and Ling, Zhi Chen 支讖 (i.e., Lokakṣema) translated scriptures.³⁶ The corresponding passage in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, however, reads “Zhi Qian 支謙.”³⁷ As we shall see, it appears that in at least one case—that of the *Larger Sūkhāvativyūha*—confusion between these nearly identical names—which could so easily be miscopied by a scribe—led to the treatment in later catalogues of a translation actually produced by Lokakṣema as Zhi

³⁵ The title of this scripture corresponds to that of a translation of the *Ugraparipṛcchā-sūtra* which is solidly attributed to An Xuan and Yan Fotiao (T322, *Fajing jing*). It is uncertain whether the rather generic title “Dharma-Mirror Scripture” was being used in Sengyou's source to refer to a version of the same scripture, but it is quite certain that T322 is not Zhi Qian's work.

³⁶ 50.325a19-20: 初漢桓靈之世有支讖譯出眾經。

³⁷ 55.97b23-24: 初桓靈世支謙譯出法典。

Qian's work instead, resulting in a cascade of subsequent confusions concerning the authorship of other translations of the text.

Methodological preliminaries (2): internal evidence

In the case of translators such as An Shigao and Lokakṣema, it is a fairly straightforward matter to establish a "core group" of the texts most reliably attributed to them with whose vocabulary and style other works said to be theirs could then be compared. The situation is entirely different, however, with Zhi Qian, for when we consult the scriptures credited to him by Sengyou, we encounter a veritable cacophony of voices. Some texts reliably attributed to him resemble the work of Lokakṣema, abounding in transcriptions and long (and often convoluted) sentences. Others are far closer to the work of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao, adopting some of their distinctive vocabulary and strongly (though never exclusively) preferring translation to transcription. Some appear to reflect elements of vernacular speech, while others employ a more elegant and literary style. Still others fall somewhere in between, exhibiting various combinations of the above features. In short, it seems impossible to characterize Zhi Qian's corpus as a whole in any general way. Indeed, it might be fair to say if there is any feature which can be said to be most characteristic of his work, it is this very inconsistency itself.³⁸

In the case of many other translators it would be natural to ascribe these differences to the shifting composition of the translator's committee of assistants. But in Zhi Qian's case we have no evidence that he ever participated in such an arrangement. On the contrary, the sole source that tells us anything specific about how he worked—and it is exceedingly valuable information, for it appears to come from the brush of Zhi Qian himself—is the preface to the *Faju jing* 法句經 (T210). Here the author portrays himself as taking a completed but rough translation produced by someone else, asking the translator for clarification on various points (for in this case the initial translator, the Indian monk Jiangyan 將炎, was still alive), and then finalizing the work himself, supplementing the existing text with "missing" chapters procured from another source (cf. above, p. 115). In sum, Zhi Qian does not describe himself as working *with* others, but rather as polishing and completing an already existing work. It is such a procedure, as we shall see, that appears to have shaped many of his other translations as well.

Such a *modus operandi* can explain, at least in part, why Zhi Qian's works appear to be wildly inconsistent in language and style. But a closer look shows that other factors should be considered as well. In a number of cases (discussed in detail below) he appears to have revised works originally translated by Lokakṣema or a member of his school, yet not all of these revisions had the same stylistic result. Some adhere fairly closely to what must have been Lokakṣema's original wording; others, however, diverge sharply from his language

³⁸ For a selection of examples of the variation in usage found in Zhi Qian's corpus with special attention to the "ten epithets of the Buddha" see Nattier 2003b.

and style. It would appear, therefore, that we must also postulate another contributing factor: changes in Zhi Qian's own approach to translation over his long and productive career.

Though precise dates are elusive, it appears that Zhi Qian began his translation work toward the end of the Han, perhaps in the second decade of the third century CE, when he was still living in Luoyang, the place of his birth. Most of his translations, however (including the *Faju jing* referred to above), appear to have been produced after his flight to the kingdom of Wu. For our purposes, this implies that we must consider not only a chronological factor—i.e., the translator's right to change his mind over the course of time—but also a geographical one, resulting from Zhi Qian's move to a new and quite different cultural and literary milieu.

Whatever the relative impact of these factors, it is clear that Zhi Qian's corpus includes translations that vary widely in both terminology and literary style. Ordinarily this would provide strong grounds for doubting the attribution of all of these translations to a single individual, but given what we know of Zhi Qian's biography and, above all, of his way of working, I believe that it is legitimate to include them here.

This being the case, however, it is not possible to arrange Zhi Qian's work in terms of "core texts" vs. other dissimilar translations. In coming years it may become possible to say more about the evolution of his translation style over time, but for the moment I will begin by simply arranging these translations, as in the case of An Shigao above, according to genre. At the end of this section I will return to the question of how best to understand the exceptionally great diversity within the corpus of texts that appear to be legitimately attributed to Zhi Qian.

Āgama texts

Dīrghāgama. Zhi Qian's corpus contains only one text that corresponds to a sūtra found in the Chinese *Dīrghāgama* (as well as in the Pāli *Dīghanikāya*), but it is a quite substantial one: a version of the non-Mahāyāna account of the Buddha's final days corresponding to the Pāli *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* (DN 16):

T6: *Banniehuan jing* 般泥洹經³⁹

As noted above, a *Da banniehuan jing* 大般泥洹經 is one of the works credited to Zhi Qian not only in Sengyou's catalogue, but also in the biographical section of the *Chu sanzang ji ji*. No such text is attributed to him in the Taishō canon, but Uṇ Hakuju suggested long

³⁹ Other parallels in Chinese are T1(2), T5, and T7; for the first part of the text cf. also T26(142). A convenient summary of the content of these various Chinese translations, as well as the version preserved in Pāli, can be found in Bareau 1963-71. For fragments of a Sanskrit version of the text see Waldschmidt 1955 and Alsdorf 1955. Arguments have been made for the attribution of T5, rather than T6, to Zhi Qian in Iwamatsu 1976 and more recently in Park forthcoming. There is much to recommend this attribution as well, but as I will attempt to show in the following discussion there are a number of factors that point to T6 as the more likely candidate.

ago that T6—now listed as the work of an unknown translator of the Eastern Jin 東晉 dynasty (317-420 CE)—is the version by Zhi Qian to which Sengyou refers (Ui 1971, pp. 517-523).⁴⁰ Ui's very detailed argument is quite convincing in itself, but we can now point to two additional features that strongly support the attribution of T6 to Zhi Qian: first, that it includes a list of names of the Buddhist heavens in forms that are almost entirely unattested outside his translations,⁴¹ and second, that T6 contains a long passage in rhymed six-character verse (1.184c1-18). One other feature may be the most telling of all, for here we find the well-known expression *shen bu mie* 神不滅 “the spirit is not destroyed,” over which so much ink would subsequently be spilled in Chinese treatises. Among texts that can be dated to the period with which we are concerned, this phrase appears only in the works of Zhi Qian.⁴²

An intriguing set of problems is posed by the existence of another Chinese *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* (T5) which shares a substantial amount of unusual vocabulary with T6, and which appears to have been based on a similar (though not identical) Indian original. The language of T6 is much more elegant in style than that of T5; thus it seems unlikely, from a literary perspective, that T5 could be a revision of T6.⁴³ On the other hand, T5 contains a considerable amount of material that has no parallel in T6, which raises questions about whether T6 as we have it could really be a revision of T5 in its present form. A third possibility is that both T5 and T6 might both be descendants (i.e.,

⁴⁰ Ui's argument takes as its point of departure the testimony of the *Chu sanzang jiji*, which attributes a “Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra” (*Da banniehuan jing* 大般泥洹經) in two fascicles to Zhi Qian (see T2145, 55.6c15; a text by this title is also credited to Zhi Qian in his biography, 97c10-11). Ui then adduces a number of citations from a two-fascicle *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* (雙卷大般泥洹經) found in Sengyou's *Shijia pu* 釋迦譜 (T2040), showing that—of the seven extant and non-extant texts entitled “(Mahā)parinirvāṇa Sūtra” registered in Sengyou's catalogue—this two-fascicle text can only correspond to the scripture attributed there to Zhi Qian. Finally, Ui demonstrates that the terminology used in these citations corresponds closely to what is found in the extant “anonymous” text (i.e., T6) and not to the language of any other known version. On this basis, Ui concludes that T6 is in fact Zhi Qian's translation.

⁴¹ The two exceptions are T1485 (a Chinese apocryphon which borrows heavily from Zhi Qian's T281) and T5 (another *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*, which shares a substantial amount of unusual vocabulary with T6 and is surely related to it in some way).

⁴² In addition to its occurrence here (T6, 1.188c26), the phrase also appears in Zhi Qian's biography of the Buddha (T185, 3.475a2) and in a little-known sūtra entitled “Ānanda's Four Matters” (*Anan sishi jing* 阿難四事經, T493, 14.757a17). The phrase does not appear in other Chinese versions of T6 or T185; T493 has no known parallel. Whether it was Zhi Qian who coined this expression—or rather, who first used it in a Buddhist context—depends on the date of two archaic translations of unknown authorship in which this saying can also be found: T730 (17.527b21) and T751A (17.573b25) and B (574b6). The rarity of this expression is indicated by the fact that it is also absent from the voluminous corpus of Dharmarakṣa, with the exception of his biography of the Buddha which draws part of its material, including this passage, from the work of Zhi Qian (T186, 3.503b2).

⁴³ On this point I am inclined to agree with the assessment given in Park forthcoming.

revisions) of a common, but now lost, original. In any case, it is clear that the two texts are connected in some way, and further work on their relationship will be very welcome.⁴⁴

Though the relationship of T6 to T5 is difficult to characterize, the style of T6 can be described with relative ease. Most personal and place names, as well as Buddhist technical terms, are translated rather than transcribed. Verse passages abound, generally in five-character format but also (in one instance) in Zhi Qian's trademark six-character style, while the translator's "default mode" is four-character prose.⁴⁵ In sum, the style of the text is quite the opposite of the translations of Lokakṣema, suggesting that it was directed toward an audience with low tolerance for transcriptions of strange foreign words but with an appreciation for Chinese literary conventions.

Madhyamāgama. Three texts with parallels in the Chinese *Madhyamāgama* and in the Pāli *Majjhimanikāya* are credited to Zhi Qian by Sengyou. The first of these corresponds to the text known in Pāli as the *Cuḷadukkhakkhandhasutta* (MN14), a portion of which (§§6-14) coincides, in turn, with part of *The Greater Discourse on the Mass of Suffering* (*Mahādukkhakkhandha-sutta*, MN 13, §§7-15). The title found in the current Taishō edition of the canon is the following:

T54: *Shi Monan ben sizi jing* 釋摩男本四子經 [sic]⁴⁶

The characters *Shi Monan* 釋摩男 clearly correspond to the abbreviated transcription of the name of the main character, "Mahānāma the Śākyan," but what the characters *ben sizi jing* 本四子 "original four sons" (?) are doing here is not at all clear. The title assigned to Zhi Qian by Sengyou was much shorter, reading simply *Shi Monan jing* 釋摩男經, a text for which he reports that Daoan classified it as belonging to the *Madhyamāgama*.⁴⁷ The character *ben* 本 "original" was added to the title first, perhaps in order to indicate that this was the earliest of several translations of the text.⁴⁸ The title given in the Taishō edition

⁴⁴ T5 is closely related, in turn, to the *Fomu banniehuan jing* 佛母般泥洹經 (T145), a scripture recounting the final *nirvāṇa* of the Buddha's foster mother, Mahāprajāpatī (see Karashima and Nattier 2005, pp. 363-364). It seems likely that both translations were produced in the Wu kingdom in the third century CE, but further research is needed to clarify their date and provenance.

⁴⁵ There also cases where lines in four-character format are labeled as "gāthās" (here translated as *song* 頌; see for example 1.190b9 and 14).

⁴⁶ In addition to the Pāli version, parallel Chinese texts can be found in T26(100) and T55; no Tibetan version has yet been identified. Similarities in some unusual vocabulary indicate that the translator of T26(100) made use of Zhi Qian's version.

⁴⁷ See T2145, 55.7a6: 釋摩男經一卷(安錄云出中阿含).

⁴⁸ See T2145, 55.27a24 (included in the section containing Sengyou's own list of anonymous scriptures); the same title is given in T2146, 55.129c10. For a possible example of the use of the character 本 to indicate an earlier version of a text cf. the entry for the *Bo ben jing* 孛本經 (perhaps to be interpreted as "The Original *Bo Sūtra*"?) attributed to Lokakṣema by Sengyou, presumably in contrast to the revised *Bo chao jing* 孛抄經 (T790) ascribed to Zhi Qian; for the latter see the discussion of T790 below.

is apparently a recent development; at any rate, it does not appear in any of the medieval catalogues produced through the eighth century CE.

In contrast to the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* translation discussed above, Zhi Qian's version of the *Mahānāma-sūtra* is cast in a quite different style. Not only the name of the title character, but also many other names and technical terms, are given in transcription rather than transcription. The text does not conform to the four-character prosodic style favored in many other texts by Zhi Qian. The fact that it lacks any verse passages, however, is not in itself telling, for the same is true of the corresponding Pāli text.

A second *Madhyamāgama* text credited to Zhi Qian by Sengyou, corresponding to the Pāli *Raṭṭhapālasutta* (MN82), rests on a less stable foundation, for according to Sengyou such a text was not attributed to Zhi Qian by Daoan. On the contrary, Sengyou says he drew his information from another catalogue (別錄所載, 55.7a22):

T68: *Laizhabeluo jing* 賴吒和羅經⁴⁹

Like T54, T68 exhibits a random prosodic pattern, with no instances of verse (but once again, there are none in the corresponding Pāli text), and again we see a strong inclination for transcription rather than translation. The unusual wording at the beginning of the text, which states that the Buddha was with “five hundred *śramaṇas*” (與五百沙門俱)—not five hundred *bhikṣus* (五百比丘)—is quite rare, and a comparative study of other texts that use the “substitution term” 沙門 *shamen* in this context may well be able to highlight a relationship of this text with other early translations.⁵⁰

A third translation corresponds to another text found in the Pāli *Majjhimanikāya*, the *Brahmāyusutta* (MN91):

T76: *Fanmoyu jing* 梵摩渝經⁵¹

Unlike the two texts discussed just above, T76 exhibits an interestingly hybrid character: on the one hand it is composed without benefit of regular four-character prosody, but it includes one passage in five-character verse (1.885a-b). Though (like T54 and T68) it contains a substantial number of transcriptions, it also contains a significant number of translation terms adopted from An Xuan and Yan Fotiao. Finally, this is one of several scriptures in Zhi Qian's corpus that contain terms of clearly Chinese origin, for instance in its glossing of the five Buddhist precepts using traditional Chinese virtues and its reference to the *hun* spirit (*hunling* 魂靈) as the entity that transmigrates. Indeed, it could well be described as the most Confucian of Zhi Qian's translations, not only mentioning

⁴⁹ In addition to the Pāli version cf. the Chinese parallels in T26(132) and T69; no Tibetan translation has yet been identified. The story is also retold in a Chinese treatise of uncertain date (T1507, 25.42b17-c20) and an anthology compiled in the sixth century (T2121, 53.95b7-17).

⁵⁰ I have discussed the phenomenon of such “substitution terms”—i.e., the use of the transcription of one Indian term (e.g., *śramaṇa*) to translate another (e.g., *bhikṣu*)—in Nattier 2006b.

⁵¹ For a parallel in the Chinese *Madhyamāgama* cf. T26(161), which however is based on a significantly different (not merely longer) recension, also differing noticeably from the Pāli.

such general virtues as *ren* 仁 “humaneness” (886a9) and *xiao* 孝 “filiality” (886a10), but even using terms like *yasheng* 亞聖 “minor sage” (normally used to refer to Mencius, in contrast to Confucius; see 883b23) and *ru* 儒 “(Confucian) scholar” (883b27 and *passim*).

A fourth translation solidly attributed to Zhi Qian also has parallels in the Chinese *Madhyamāgama*, though in Pāli (where the scripture has no separate title but is sometimes referred to as the *Visākhā-sutta*) the closest match is found in the *Aṅguttaranikāya* instead:

T87: *Zhai jing* 齋經 “Abstinence Day Sūtra”⁵²

Of the texts in this group this is another of the most sinified, with a strong four-character pattern throughout most of the text and a pronounced inclination for translation rather than transcription. Those terms (virtually all of them proper names) that are transcribed are highly domesticated, generally reduced to just one or two characters in length. Like T76, T87 also includes a substantial amount of indigenous Chinese religious vocabulary, notably in its use of terms for the “spirit” (*jingshen* 精神 or *hunshen* 魂神) that is reborn.⁵³

Unidentified sūtras. Zhi Qian’s corpus also includes two *āgama*-like scriptures for which no parallels in any other collection have been identified. Both of them have been catalogued by the Taishō editors as Mahāyāna sūtras (included in vols. 14 and 17, respectively), but because their content contains nothing that (in my view) is specific to a Mahāyāna tradition it seems best to deal with them here.

We may begin with a scripture which, though as yet unidentified, has every appearance of being a standard Indian *āgama* text:

T581: *Bashi jing* 八師經 “Sūtra Concerning the Eight Teachers”

In this relatively short text (just over one page in the Taishō edition) the Buddha replies to an inquiry concerning the identity of his religious teacher by describing how he had learned to adhere to the proper path by observing eight “teachers,” *viz.*, the five precepts (*pañcaśīla*), old age, sickness, and death.

No parallel in any language (including Chinese) has yet been identified. The entire sūtra is quoted, however, in two anthologies of scriptures compiled by Daoshi, which are of considerable value for establishing a critical edition of the text.⁵⁴ It is also quoted in a Chinese apocryphon, the *Zhaoming pusa jing* 照明菩薩經, as recently discussed by LIN Min 林敏 (2005).

The style of the text is reminiscent of that of the *Fanmoyu jing* (T76) and (to a

⁵² Wrongly identified as corresponding to AN VIII.43 in Lancaster and Park 1979 (see under K714, which in turn is identified with Zhi Qian’s K721); this text does indeed deal with the same topic, but the closest Pāli parallel is actually with AN iii.70 (I.205-215), exceeding the degree of correspondence with AN VIII.41, 42 and 43. The closest parallel in the Chinese to Zhi Qian’s version is T26(202); cf. also T88 and T89. Zhi Qian’s version of the text is also retold in abbreviated form in T2122 (53.935a27-c2).

⁵³ See 1.911c12 and 912a5 (*jingshen*) and 912a7 (*hunshen*).

⁵⁴ See T2122, 53.818a1-819a9 and T2123, 54.127a-c.

slightly lesser extent) the *Zhai jing* (T87), with its abundance of indigenous Chinese religious terminology, again including references to the *hun* 魂 and *po* 魄 spirits. As in T76, the five lay precepts are glossed with such Chinese virtues as *ren* 仁, *xiao* 孝, and so on; in fact, the correlations between Indian and Chinese terms are exactly the same in these two scriptures. The text exhibits a strong inclination for the use of four-character prosody; most technical terms are translated, while proper names are generally transcribed.

The final text in this category presents a much more complicated situation, for it is not an integral text at all, but rather the result of conflation of three separate sources:

T735: *Siyuan jing* 四願經 “The Scripture on the Four Wishes”⁵⁵

The first part of the scripture—a complete, if very short, text in itself—does indeed deal with the “four wishes” mentioned in the title (for physical pleasures, wealth and property, family and friends, and guarding the mind); there is also a standard formulaic ending (諸弟子聞經歡喜，為佛作禮), making it clear that we are dealing with a complete sūtra that occupies less than one page in the Taishō edition (17.536b18-537a16).

Following this, however, there begins a completely unrelated scripture dealing with the vicissitudes of death and rebirth in *samsāra* and exhorting its audience to uphold the five precepts, composed (unlike what we may now call “T735A”) in regular four-character prosody. This text (“T735B”) is even shorter, occupying just under one register in the Taishō edition (17.537a17-b16), and again it closes with a formulaic ending (弟子聞經歡喜前受教). Finally, as discussed above, there is yet another scripture represented here, which we may now call “T735C.” But this one is present only in fragmentary form, for at 537b16 there begins (in the middle of a sentence!) a portion of a text corresponding to the *Qi chu san guan jing* 七處三觀經 discussed above.⁵⁶

The title *Siyuan jing* should, therefore, refer only to T735A. This scripture and T735B, however, share some important features, above all (once again) the heavy use of indigenous Chinese religious terms such as Mt. Tai (太山) as a destination for the dead and various terms for the transmigrating spirit.⁵⁷ Moreover, though the apparatus to the Taishō edition indicates that T735B and C are joined to T735A only in the “Three Editions” (Song, Yuan, and Ming), a fragment of the text found at Dunhuang includes material from both T735A and B (see Inokuchi 1980, p. 71-72). Thus whatever the original identity of T735B may have been, there seems to have been a long tradition in

⁵⁵ The term *yuan* 願 is generally used in Zhi Qian’s translations in the ordinary sense of “wish” rather than in the technical sense of “vow”; the latter concept (expressed using a variety of Indic terms) is most commonly translated as *shi* 誓 in his work. An important exception is the *Pingdengjue jing* (T361), where however the character *yuan* is being taken over from the earlier *Da Amituo jing* (T362) produced in Lokakṣema’s school.

⁵⁶ See above, pp. 50–51; parallel occurrences of the scripture can be found in T150A(1) and (3) and T101(27).

⁵⁷ See 17.537a21: 精神魂魄.

some circles of cataloguing it following Zhi Qian's T735A. It is entirely possible that T735B, too, is a translation by Zhi Qian, though further work is needed to determine its identity and its parallels, if any, in other sources.

One further text in the category of unidentified non-Mahāyāna sūtras attributed to Zhi Qian by Sengyou is sufficiently different in kind from those discussed above that I have deliberately placed it last (disregarding the sequence of Taishō text numbers). It is another very brief scripture, only one Taishō page in length, entitled:

T493: *Anan sishi jing* 阿難四事經 “The Scripture on the Four Matters
[preached to] Ānanda”

The text is set just prior to the Buddha's final extinction, and it consists of a reply to Ānanda's question concerning what people should rely on after the Buddha's death in order to attain merit (福) and liberation (度) after the Buddha is gone. This theme is not at all uncommon, nor is the statement that, though the Buddha himself will pass away, his Dharma will remain. But what is noteworthy about this text is its pervasive emphasis on social service. That is, the Buddha tells Ānanda that by giving to the poor—including birds and beasts, and even insects—one will obtain the same merit as if he were serving the Buddha himself. Rulers and wealthy people are advised to use the grain in their storehouses to help those in need, and there are repeated references to “noxious *qi*” 毒氣 that causes illness to spread.⁵⁸ It may well be worth considering the possibility that part of this material might have been composed in China. Neither Daoan nor Sengyou expressed any skepticism, however, concerning the authenticity of the text, so for the time being we may include it here.

As to its style, the text is set for the most part in four-character prose; there is no verse of any kind. With the exception of the place name at the beginning (and, of course, the long-standing transcription of “Ānanda” as *Anan* 阿難), virtually all Buddhist terms are translated rather than transcribed. Not surprisingly, in light of what we have seen above, this is yet another of the texts in which we find mention of the *hun* 魂 (the word *po* 魄 does not occur here) as the transmigrating spirit.⁵⁹ This is also one of the three translations in Zhi Qian's corpus to incorporate the phrase *shen bu mie* 神不滅.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ 14.757b1, 7, and 16. The same expression also occurs in another translation by Zhi Qian (T581, 14.965c4) and once in Kang Senghui's *Liudu ji jing* (T152, 3.18c11), but not in any other text translated during or before this period.

⁵⁹ See 14.757a14, 17, 27, and b4-5.

⁶⁰ 14.757a17: 魂神不滅，復更求身。 On this phrase cf. above, p. 127.

An unidentified *jātaka* tale

Zhi Qian's corpus also contains an extended *jātaka* tale for which no parallel in any language has yet been identified:

T790: *Bo jing chao* 孝經抄

The main figure in the scripture is named *Bo* 孝, a character which elsewhere is used as a transcription of the name *Puṣya. If this is its referent here, the title would then be “The Condensed Version (抄) of the *Puṣya Sūtra*.” It is clear that Sengyou considered this scripture to be an abridgement of an earlier work, for he cites it at the very beginning of his section on *Chao jing* 抄經 “Abridged scriptures,” together with the *Daodi jing* 道地經 (T607) by An Shigao discussed above. It is noteworthy that these two texts are singled out as paradigmatic examples of “good” abridgements—that is, cases where their authors are simply making traditional scriptural materials available in a shorter and more accessible form, rather than twisting their meaning for their own ends.

As we have seen, a title including the same transcription character—the *Bo ben jing* 孝本經, perhaps now to be understood as “The Original *Puṣya Sūtra*”—is also ascribed to Lokakṣema. If the ascription is correct—and the text in question is no longer extant, so we cannot consult it directly—this would imply that Zhi Qian's *Bo jing chao* is yet another example of his revision of a text previously translated by Lokakṣema.

The unusually large number of variant readings given in the apparatus to the Taishō edition (the vast majority of them drawn from the Imperial Palace edition, on which see Zacchetti 2005, p. 111) suggests that the text was actively used, and even points to the possibility that the surviving versions may represent more than one recension of the text (something that still remains to be investigated). Its popularity is also underscored by the fact that, like several other translations by Zhi Qian, it is cited in a medieval anthology.⁶¹ Though no evidence has yet been brought forth concerning the impact (or even the existence) of this scripture in other regions, its positive reception in China can be considered as established beyond any doubt.

The scripture begins with an account of the construction of the Jetavana, but its character as a *jātaka* tale is made clear by its reversion to a “story of the past” to explain events of the present, and its concluding identification of past figures with characters living during the Buddha's time. An intriguing feature of the text is that it quotes from something referred to simply as a *jing* 經 “sūtra” or “scripture”; these passages are in four-character format (something found occasionally in other parts of the text), and they are printed as verse in the Taishō edition. It may well be, however, that these are not (as they initially seem to be) quotations from another scripture, but simply the verse sections commonly found in *jātaka* tales. There are no other verses in the scripture, and the proper names are transcribed.

⁶¹ Cited in T2122 (twice): 53.591c24, 8b8b7ff.

Didactic verses

Two texts attributed to Zhi Qian by Sengyou correspond to scriptures catalogued in the Pāli canon as part of the *Khuddakanikāya*, though since not all Buddhist recitation lineages in India had such a division in their canons, we cannot be sure how these would have been classified by those who transmitted them to China. The first of these corresponds to the verses found in the Pāli *Aṭṭhakavagga* (Skt. *Arthavargīya*), together with substantial additional commentarial material:

T198: *Yizu jing* 義足經⁶²

The most distinctive stylistic feature of this text is that the vast majority of it is set in six-character verse; there is also five-character verse, as well as some four-character passages labeled as *gāthās* (偈). The prose sections, by contrast, are not metric, and the text contains many transcribed place names, though other Buddhist terms are generally translated. One passage (4.178a19-c14) has an exact parallel in Kang Senghui's *Liudu ji jing* (T152, 3.50c1-51b6). Since the story in question contains six-character verse, which is ubiquitous in T198 but otherwise unknown in T152, it seems virtually certain that Kang Senghui borrowed the passage from Zhi Qian, and not vice versa.

A second text corresponds to the Pāli *Dhammapada* (Skt. *Udānavarga*), which is likewise assigned in the Pāli canon to the *Khuddakanikāya*:

T210: *Faju jing* 法句經⁶³

As noted above, the text is credited in the Taishō canon to “Weiqinan et al,” but substantial external evidence (notably the discussion in Sengyou's biography of Zhi Qian, as well as the preface thought to have been composed by Zhi Qian himself) points to Zhi Qian as responsible for putting the text in its final form. Like T198 virtually the whole of the text is cast in a regular metric style, but here the verses are almost all in five-character or four-character form. Only one relatively short passage is composed in six-character verse (4.573b6-15).

Word-for-word parallels to the *Xiuxing benqi jing* 修行本起經 (T184) can be found in at least two passages in the *Faju jing*.⁶⁴ This suggests that the author of the latter—which

⁶² There are no parallels in the Chinese. For fragments of the Sanskrit text see Hoernle 1916. For bibliography on the Pāli version see von Hinüber 1996 and Norman 1983. I have not yet had a chance to examine Bapat 1951.

⁶³ In addition to the Pāli (for bibliographic references see von Hinüber 1996 and Norman 1983), parallels in Chinese can be found in T211, 212, and 213. The foundational studies of Lévi (1912) and Mizuno (1953) are still of great value; ongoing studies of T212 by HIRAOKA Satoshi (most recently in Hiraoka 2007) are yielding important results. Japanese translations of T210 (Hikita 2000) and T211 (Tanabe 2000 and Kamitsuka et al., 2001) have recently appeared; for a valuable brief review of these three publications on these texts see Yuyama 2003. An English translation of T211 can be found in Willemen 1999.

⁶⁴ See T184, 3.467a18-21, = T210, 4.574a12-15, and T184, 3.467a22-23, = T210, 4.559b6-7. The latter passage is also cited in the commentary to An Shigao's *Yinchiru jing* (T1694, 33.14c32-3), where the citation reads simply 偈曰 “A *gāthā* says.”

seems likely to be a Jin-period revision of an originally Han-period text, as Kawano has suggested (see above, p. 108)—used Zhi Qian’s *Faju jing* as one of his sources. It would be well worth examining other parts of T184 in detail to see if there are additional passages that appear to be citations from this or other works by Zhi Qian.

A Biography of the Buddha

Another of the texts singled out for special mention in Sengyou’s biography of Zhi Qian is his biography of the Buddha:

T185: *Taizi ruiying benqi jing* 太子瑞應本起經⁶⁵

As discussed above in the section on Kang Mengxiang, this text has a very close relationship to the *Xiuxing benqi jing* 修行本起經 (T184) as well as to the first part of the *Zhong benqi jing* 中本起經 (T196), with many passages agreeing word-for-word. The relationship among these texts is extraordinarily complicated, however, and it is not possible to derive any one of them in a straightforward manner from any of the others. What is clear that all three of these biographies were actively used, and that all of them (including the version originally produced by Zhi Qian) were updated more than once. The text as we have it still bears Zhi Qian’s fingerprints, however, one of which is the use of the phrase *shen bu mie* 神不滅 “the spirit is not destroyed.”⁶⁶

It is also frequently stated that Zhi Qian’s T185 borrowed material from another archaic biography of the Buddha, the *Yichu pusa benqi jing* 異出菩薩本起經 (T188).⁶⁷ This seems less certain, however. While it is certainly true that some of the events dealt with in T185 have parallels in T188, the wording is quite dissimilar, and in my view a direct relationship between these two texts has yet to be demonstrated. It seems more likely that Zhi Qian drew this additional material from another source, whether an Indian text (oral or written) or another now-lost Chinese translation.

In style the *Taizi ruiying benqi jing* tends heavily toward a four-character prosodic pattern, with numerous passages in five-character verse. Only once (at 3.477b-c) does it use the seven-character form that was to become so popular in subsequent centuries.⁶⁸

⁶⁵ A Japanese translation is now available in Hirai 2002. For a valuable study of this text in comparison with the versions by Kang Mengxiang (T184) and Dharmarakṣa (T186) see Kawano 2007.

⁶⁶ Cf. above, p. 127.

⁶⁷ So according to Zürcher 1980, p. 111, n. 51. The association between T185 and T188 is also discussed in Matsuda 1988, but because she accepted the authenticity of the Taishō editors’ attribution of T188 to the Western Jin translator Nie Daozhen 聶道真, Matsuda was forced to postulate a lost antecedent of this text as the source of the material found in both T185 and T188 (p. 486). This is a classic case of why it is necessary to first verify translator attributions in Sengyou’s catalogue, however, for the attribution to Nie Daozhen (known to Sengyou only as the scribal assistant of Dharmarakṣa) is patently false, first stemming from the *Lidai sanbao ji* (T2034, 49.66a20). In the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, by contrast, the *Yichu pusa benqi jing* is listed as anonymous (T2145, 55.22c20).

⁶⁸ Because the seven-character format is so rare in Zhi Qian’s work (appearing only here and in

Mahāyāna sūtras

Zhi Qian's corpus includes a significant number of Mahāyāna sūtras, several of which are substantial in size. Many are early versions of well-known scriptures, some of which even survive in Sanskrit form. Others are much more obscure and, in some cases, extant only in the translations produced by Zhi Qian. As with the non-Mahāyāna texts discussed above, Zhi Qian's Mahāyāna translations exhibit a wide range of vocabulary and style, ranging from transcription-laden works in prose to elegant literary texts punctuated by verse. In the following discussion I will begin with well known scriptures that have parallels in other languages, followed by a group of lesser known but nonetheless identifiable texts (all of them, perhaps not coincidentally, very short). Finally I will deal with those that seem to be without parallels in any language, and for which Zhi Qian's versions are therefore the sole exemplars.

Prajñāpāramitā. Of all of the Mahāyāna scriptures attributed to Zhi Qian one of the best known, and seemingly least controversial, is a version of the smaller *Prajñāpāramitā* (known in surviving Sanskrit manuscripts as the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*):

T225: *Da mingdu jing* 大明度經⁶⁹

The actual situation, however, is extraordinarily complicated, for the text as it has come down to us consists of two parts: chapter one ("T225A"), which includes not only the sūtra itself but also an interlinear commentary, and chapters two through thirty ("T225B"), which include the sūtra alone and are the product of a different hand. Both the vocabulary and the style demonstrate that these are the work of two different writers. T225B is composed in elegant four-character prosody, while T225A is written in an irregular prosodic style. T225B overwhelmingly favors translation, even for proper names, and adopts many of the terms coined by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao, including *kaishi* 闍士 for *bodhisattva*, *chujin* 除瞋 for *bhikṣu* (though the transcription-term *biqiu* 比丘 also appears) and *yingyi*

two places in his version of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* (T474, on which see below), it may be worth considering the possibility that these passages are the result of later interpolation, but this issue cannot be pursued here.

⁶⁹ There is an enormous literature on this text and related *Prajñāpāramitā* scriptures, most of which is not relevant to the problem at hand, so I will not attempt to review it here. An overview of other versions of this scripture in Sanskrit, Chinese, and Tibetan is given in Conze 1978. The only article known to me in a western language on T225 (A and/or B) is Lancaster 1969; the hypothesis put forth there, however—that T225(B) should be viewed as the work of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao rather than of Zhi Qian—can now be shown to be implausible (Nattier forthcoming).

In Japanese, important contributions have been made by KATSUZAKI Yūgen 勝崎裕彦; see in particular the valuable comparative table of the Buddhist terminology used in T225 and Lokakṣema's T224 in Katsuzaki 1985. Useful information on particular terms can also be found in the series of articles published by ASAYAMA Yukihiro 朝山幸彦 (1983ff.).

A glossary of Lokakṣema's T224, now in preparation by KARASHIMA Seishi, contains cross-references to the corresponding terms in T225, and when completed it will be an immensely valuable tool for future studies.

應儀 for *arhat*. T225A, on the other hand, uses *pusa* 菩薩 for *bodhisattva* and *biqiu* 比丘 for *bhikṣu* (in this recension of chapter one there is no counterpart of the word *arhat*).

Non-Buddhist terminology, too, makes it clear that these two parts are the product of different hands: in T225A the pronoun *wu* 吾 appears more often than *wo* 我 (19 vs. 14 times), while in T225B the opposite is the case (20 vs. 219 times); likewise the verb *yue* 曰 is used far more often than *yan* 言 in T225A (73 vs. 43 occurrences, with many of the latter in the interlinear commentary), while the reverse is true in T225B (146 vs. 503). Even the formulaic question *tat kasya hetoh* “why is that?” is rendered differently in the two portions, with *suoyizhe he* 所以者何 used almost exclusively in T225A, while T225B prefers the expression *heyigu* 何以故.

The two parts also have very different relationships to the earlier *Daoxing jing* 道行經 by Lokakṣema. T225B is clearly a revision of T224, carrying over much of its wording even as the text is abbreviated and many transcriptions replaced with translations. T225A, on the other hand, exhibits no direct connection to Lokakṣema’s work. In sum, T225 as we have it is not a single text, but a hybrid work in which two different translations of the scripture (one of them with an interlinear commentary) have been “pasted together.”

The fact that both T225A and B share certain unusual renderings of proper names, however—including the very rare translation *Qiuluzi* 秋露子 for *Śāriputra* (or rather, for *Śāradvatīputra*; see Karashima and Nattier 2005) and *Shanye* 善業 for *Subhūti*, a rendition which appears to be unknown outside this text—makes it clear that the translator of one of these portions of the text was making use of the other.

Both T225A or T225B show certain similarities with other translations produced by Zhi Qian, and it is not immediately obvious which part of this hybrid texts should be viewed as his. As I have shown elsewhere, however, T225A contains a number examples of wording that is not otherwise found in Zhi Qian’s corpus, while on the contrary T225B contains a number of terms that are used exclusively, or nearly so, by Zhi Qian (Nattier forthcoming). Moreover, Zhi Qian is known to have played an active role in revising existing translations by Lokakṣema. On balance, therefore, it seems reasonable to conclude that it T225B that is the work of Zhi Qian, while T225A was produced by another hand. The latter has no obvious similarity to the work of any other translator, and for the moment it seems best simply to regard it as an anonymous translation. The interlinear commentary, however, shares numerous similarities with the commentary to the *Yinshiru jing* 陰持入經 (T1694), not only in its language but in the repertoire of texts that it cites. In a forthcoming study Stefano Zacchetti has suggested that the “Master Chen” 陳氏 who is said to have annotated T1694 is probably its author, with the comments attributed to the “Teacher” belonging to Kang Senghui.

Buddhāvataṃsaka.⁷⁰ Zhi Qian’s corpus also includes a translation of a text

⁷⁰ The rationale for using this title rather than the more common “Avataṃsaka-sūtra” is discussed in Sakurabe 1969; an important new study on this topic can now be found in Ōtake 2007.

corresponding to portions of the mammoth *Huayan jing* 華嚴經 subsequently translated by Buddhahadra (as T278) and Śikṣānanda (as T279):

T281: *Pusa benye jing* 菩薩本業經⁷¹

In this case, too, Zhi Qian has retranslated a text previously produced by Lokakṣema, the *Dousha jing* 兜沙經 (T280). Indeed, with the aid of Zhi Qian's work, it has been possible to reunite the latter with two other pieces of the text that were separated and subsequently catalogued separately, as discussed above (pp. 87–88). The relationship between Zhi Qian's version of the text and that of Lokakṣema is not nearly as close, however, as in the case of the *Damingdu jing* (T225B) and the *Daoxing jing* (T224); indeed, it is clear that Zhi Qian was using a different Indian recension of the text, and his translation has only occasional similarities in wording to that of Lokakṣema, as can immediately be seen by consulting the synoptic edition given in Nattier 2005.

The *Pusa benye jing* exhibits Zhi Qian's characteristic preference for translation over transcription, with a noteworthy pattern of reducing proper names to fit a regular syllabic pattern of three characters (for the names of Buddhas) or two characters (for bodhisattvas and buddha-fields).⁷² A long segment of the text has been typeset as verse in the printed Taishō edition (see 10.447b25–449b24), but it appears that the scripture does not actually contain any verse passages at all; instead, this is simply another example of Zhi Qian's well-established preference for four-character prosody. A comparison with the corresponding Tibetan translation, in any event, shows no signs of a regular metric pattern, which makes it virtually certain that the Indian source-text was actually in prose.

Proof of the popularity of Zhi Qian's translation can be seen in the extent to which it was plagiarized by the composers of indigenous scriptures: substantial material from the *Pusa benye jing* was incorporated word-for-word into the apocryphal *Pusa yingluo benye jing* 菩薩瓔珞本業經 (T1485), and extensive borrowings have been identified in the Daoist *Lingbao* 靈寶 scriptures as well.⁷³ In sum, this was a widely influential work, known in both Buddhist and Daoist circles. The impact of Zhi Qian's translation can also be seen in the later versions of the *Avatamsaka* by Buddhahadra and Śikṣānanda, which often

⁷¹ There is a huge literature on various aspects of the *Huayan jing*, but the earlier translations by Lokakṣema and Zhi Qian have received relatively little scholarly attention. Important exceptions include Kobayashi 1958, Mano 1992, and above all Sakamoto 1933; see also Kimura 1984 for an overview of various scholarly positions on the relationship of these early translations to the larger *Buddhāvataṃsaka*. For a chart of the relationship between T281 and its parallels in other Chinese translations see Nattier 2005, p. 329 and Nattier 2007c, pp. 133–134; a synoptic edition of T281 and its parallels in T280, T282, and T283 is also given in Nattier 2005.

⁷² See 10.446c17–447a6.

⁷³ For a list of such borrowings in both Buddhist and Daoist scriptures see Appendix 2 in Nattier 2007c.

reflect Zhi Qian's wording and style.⁷⁴

Larger Sukhāvātīyūha. In Part II I have discussed Paul Harrison's proposal that the version of the *Sukhāvātīyūha* traditionally attributed to Zhi Qian (T362, the *Amituo sanyesanfo saloufotan guoduren daojing* 阿彌陀三耶三佛薩樓佛檀過度人道經) should instead be attributed to Lokakṣema or a member of his school (see above, pp. 86-87). In light of this very persuasive suggestion, it is now possible to see that the version traditionally assigned to Lokakṣema (an attribution which has been widely questioned by scholars) may now be considered to be a revision by Zhi Qian of this older work:

T361: *Wuliang qingjing pingdengjue jing* 無量清淨平等覺經⁷⁵

A major study of T361 and T362 now in progress by Paul Harrison (from which preliminary results were presented in Harrison 1999) promises to cast considerable light on this matter. In the meantime, we may simply note that T361 is what we might call a "close revision" of T362, carrying over much of its vocabulary, as Zhi Qian's *Da mingdu jing* (T225B) does with respect to Lokakṣema's *Daoxing jing* (T224). While this means that some of the transcriptions found in T362 (especially proper names) are adopted here, many other terms that are transcribed in T362 are translated into Chinese in T361. T361 differs from T362, however, in that it contains passages in verse, with one section in five-character meter (280b-c); a longer passage is in Zhi Qian's trademark six-character style (288a-289a). Aside from these, however, the prosodic pattern is fairly random, with only occasional passages conforming to the style of four-character prose.⁷⁶

Vimalakīrtinirdeśa. Another of the translations by Zhi Qian that has strong support in external sources is his version of the *Vimalakīrti*:

T474: *Weimojie jing* 維摩詰經⁷⁷

⁷⁴ For example, Buddhahadra (and subsequently Śikṣānanda) adopted the translations of the names of several of the bodhisattvas of the ten directions from Zhi Qian's T281, even when they were erroneous (e.g., 覺首 for *Buddhaśrī, 德首 for *Guṇaśrī, 目首 for *Netraśrī, etc.). These two translators also followed much of Zhi Qian's wording in Chapter 7 (淨行品; Chapter 11 in Śikṣānanda), including the famous refrain 當願眾生 "one should wish that all beings [attain various results]."

⁷⁵ An essential resource for the study of this text is the synoptic edition published in Kagawa 1984. Following the work of FUJITA Kōtatsu 藤田宏達 (1970; in English see Fujita 1996), most scholars have until recently assigned this translation to Bo Yan. In light of our current understanding of Zhi Qian's translation style, however, it is now evident that Zhi Qian is a far better candidate (as discussed below).

⁷⁶ The sole exception to this characterization is the long section on the "Five Evils," which abounds in four-character prose; as previously noted, however, this is considered to be a Chinese interpolation and not part of the translated text.

⁷⁷ There is a veritable flood of studies of this influential scripture (most of them based on Kumārajīva's Chinese translation); limitations of time preclude providing details on them here. The study of this scripture has entered a new era with the publication of a recently discovered Sanskrit version of the text, made available in an extremely useful synoptic edition (including Zhi Qian's version as well as the other Chinese and Tibetan translations) by the Taishō University Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature (2004).

According to Sengyou, Zhi Qian's was the first translation of this widely influential text; it is listed as "lost," however, in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* (55.6c14), a fact which has led to speculation that the extant version mentioned above might actually be that of Dharmarakṣa.⁷⁸ Given the fact that Dharmarakṣa borrowed extensively from Zhi Qian's terminology, even adopting elements of his style (e.g., the use of six-character verse), it is often difficult to differentiate the work of these two translators without an extensive terminological analysis. Such an analysis has not yet been carried out with respect to T474, but two factors point in the direction of Zhi Qian's authorship rather than that of Dharmarakṣa. First, the text contains glosses in *Hanyan* 漢言, whereas Dharmarakṣa regularly uses the name of the dynasty during which he lived, providing glosses in *Jinyan* 晉言 (an expression which occurs in no fewer than eleven of his translations).⁷⁹ Second, the name of the bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara (or rather, of an earlier Prakrit form of that name) provides "fingerprints" of the presence of these two translators: whereas Dharmarakṣa never uses any translation of this name other than his own signature rendition of *Guangshiyin* 光世音, this translation never appears in the works of Zhi Qian (nor for that matter is it ever used, so far as I have been able to determine, anywhere outside the corpus of Dharmarakṣa). Zhi Qian's preferred translation, on the other hand—and the only one ever found in his work, aside from a transcription copied in a revision of an earlier text⁸⁰—is *Kuiyin* 闕音, a form borrowed from An Xuan and Yan Fotiao. And again this is a translation of extremely limited usage, appearing (aside from An Xuan and Yan Fotiao's *Fajing jing*, T322) only in Zhi Qian's work.⁸¹ Thus just as the name *Guangshiyin* offers a guarantee of Dharmarakṣa's presence, so the appearance of the name *Kuiyin* points to the presence either of An Xuan

⁷⁸ See for example SHI Guopu 釋果樸 1998, who presents an interesting (but in my view ultimately unpersuasive) argument that T474 cannot be the work of Zhi Qian. Her analysis is based on a fragment of a commentary on the text discovered at Dunhuang (Pelliot 3006); she first infers that the commentary must be the work of Daoan (though this seems less than sure), and in turn reasons that, because Daoan was critical of Zhi Qian's translation style, he would not have written a commentary on a text produced by Zhi Qian. For mentions of Dharmarakṣa's translation of this scripture (which, unlike Zhi Qian's version, is not listed as lost) see the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, 55.9c12.

⁷⁹ T337 (阿闍王女阿術達菩薩經), where several glosses in *Hanyan* appear, is an interesting and problematic exception; it is probably not the work of Dharmarakṣa. Zhi Qian does not usually provide glosses—at least, in what appears to be his later work he simply eliminates the transcribed term in favor of a translation—but several glosses in *Hanyan* do appear in a scripture that appears to be one of his earliest translations (T169, 月明菩薩經).

⁸⁰ The form *Elouxuan* 盧樓亘 appears only in his revised version (T361) of Lokakṣema's *Da Amituo jing* (T362), and is clearly borrowed from the latter.

⁸¹ The only occurrences I have been able to locate in the Chinese canon are in T322 by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao (12.15b7), T1011 by Zhi Qian (19.680b13), and T474 (14.519b16), the *Vimalakīrti* itself.

and Yan Fotiao (which is not relevant in this case) or of Zhi Qian.⁸²

Both the vocabulary of the text—which offers numerous other instances of vocabulary pioneered by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao in addition to the name *Kuiyin*—and its style are congruent with other authentic works by Zhi Qian. The text exhibits a strong four-character prosodic pattern, with some passages in five- and seven-character verse. While future in-depth studies of the terminology and style of the text will be most welcome, at present there seems to be no reason to doubt that the text is the work of Zhi Qian.

Tathāgata-jñāna-mudrā-samādhi. A stark contrast with the vocabulary and style of Zhi Qian's *Vimalakīrti* is offered by this text, which as discussed above is the most Lokakṣema-like work in Zhi Qian's corpus:

T632: *Huiyin sanmei jing* 慧印三昧經

The prose portions of the text abound in transcribed terms, but—as in the case of the *Banzhou sanmei jing* (T418) discussed above—the verses contain some translated terms that are not found in the prose. In fact T632 and T418 share some distinctive vocabulary, and it seems likely that they were produced in the same milieu.⁸³ Though Sengyou does not attribute a text whose title can be associated with the *Huiyin sanmei jing* to Lokakṣema, a good working hypothesis would be that this is a revised version produced by Zhi Qian of an earlier product of Lokakṣema's school.

What makes it clear that this is Zhi Qian's work is not only the solidity of Sengyou's attribution, but also a feature internal to the text. In addition to passages in five-character verse (15.462a-c and 464c-465b), as well as sections with four-character passages labeled as *gāthās* (偈; see 463c-464c, 466a-c, 467a-b, and 467c-468a), we also find two verse passages in Zhi Qian's signature six-character form (462c-463a and 464c).

Anantamukhanirbhāra-dhāraṇī. The final text in this category has sometimes been classified as a tantra, due apparently to the fact that it contains a translation of the word *dhāraṇī* (持) in its title (see note 15 above); in the Taishō edition of the canon it is catalogued in the “esoteric” (密教) scriptures section. The text is classified in the Tibetan canon as a Mahāyāna sūtra, however, and not a tantra, and on the basis of its content I can see no reason not to do the same here. The work in question is the following:

T1011: *Wuliangmen weimi chi jing* 無量門微密持經 (var. 成道降魔得一切智經)⁸⁴

A distinctive (and rather unexpected) feature of the text is that Zhi Qian has translated (rather than described) not only most names and Buddhist technical terms, but even the

⁸² On these and other names for Avalokiteśvara in Chinese translations see Karashima 1999 and Nattier 2007d.

⁸³ See above, pp. 83.

⁸⁴ An essential resource is the fine study by INAGAKI Hisao, which deals Zhi Qian's version as well as other Chinese and Tibetan translations of this scripture (Inagaki 1987).

dhāraṇī itself!⁸⁵ (It seems worth raising the question as to whether he actually understood what a *dhāraṇī* is.)

Again we find an alternation of prose and verse (in this case only in the five-character style); four-character prosody comes and goes throughout the text. The vocabulary includes dozens of examples of expressions that are quite at home in the works of Zhi Qian, including the list of translations of bodhisattva names near the beginning of the text (one of which is *Kuīyīn* 闍音, as discussed above).

Minor Mahāyāna sūtras. Included in this category are a number of short Mahāyāna scriptures that have no close parallels elsewhere, but which can be identified at least to a certain degree with other translations preserved in Chinese and/or Tibetan. To this group belongs one of the most Lokakṣema-like works in Zhi Qian's corpus, which (though classified in the Taishō canon in the *jātaka* and *avadāna* section) deals with the pursuit of the bodhisattva path and is best described as a Mahāyāna scripture:

T169: *Yueming pusa jing* 月明菩薩經 **Candraprabhabodhisattva-sūtra*

No exact parallel to the scripture has yet been identified, though it has certain similarities to the *Jñānavatī* chapter of the *Samādhirāja* (ch. 34; cf. Durt 1998).⁸⁶

Most of this short text (occupying only a single page in the Taishō edition) exhibits a random prosodic pattern, but there is one short passage in six-character verse (411c). The scripture abounds in transcriptions, but some of these are glossed with translations in *hanyan* 漢言.⁸⁷

A second sūtra in this category has two alternate titles, with one of these based on the name of the main character Kṣemaṅkara, and thus may be given the title of *Kṣemaṅkara-sūtra*:

T533: *Chamojie jing* 差摩竭經 (var. *Pusa shengdi jing* 菩薩生地經)

The meaning of the alternate title ("The Bodhisattva's Birth-Ground"?) is less clear, for the expression *shengdi* 生地 does not occur anywhere in the scripture except as the name of the text. No Sanskrit or Chinese version of the sūtra has yet been identified, but a somewhat different recension of the sūtra exists in Tibetan, entitled *Bde byed kyi zhus pa* and carrying an accompanying transcription that indicates a Sanskrit title of *Kṣemaṅkara-paripṛcchā-sūtra*.⁸⁸

This text is as short as T169 (only one page in length) but quite different in style: many lines are in four-character prose, and although the name of the Kṣemaṅkara and a

⁸⁵ See 19.680c5-11 and cf. the very useful synoptic table in Inagaki 1987, pp. 310-352.

⁸⁶ The story is retold in two medieval Chinese anthologies; see T2121 (53.163b19-c5) and T2122 (53.776b14-25).

⁸⁷ The only other text by Zhi Qian in which such glosses are found is the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* (T474).

⁸⁸ For the Tibetan version (based on a quite different recension) see Stog Palace no. 308.

few other proper names are transcribed, virtually all of the Buddhist terminology is translated, and once again these are terms that are well attested elsewhere in Zhi Qian's work.⁸⁹ Nearly one-third of the text is in five-character verse, but there is a brief section in six-character form at the end.

Somewhat longer (totalling just under two pages in the Taishō edition) is the following scripture, which again has no exact parallel:

T556: *Qinü jing* 七女經

The text has interesting similarities to the *Saptakumārīka-avadāna* ascribed to Gopadatta,⁹⁰ for in both versions seven sisters (in Zhi Qian's text, the seven daughters of a *brāhmaṇa* named *Mahāmitra) visit a cemetery in order to practice meditation. Though the version translated by Zhi Qian may have its roots in the *avadāna* genre, however, in this recension the story has clearly been Mahāyānized, with the seven young women in the embedded story of a previous era receiving a prediction from the Buddha Kāśyapa of their own future buddhahood (14.909a11ff.).⁹¹ Interestingly, Sengyou quotes Daoan as saying that the text is from the Abhidharma,⁹² which is rather unexpected; one wonders whether there might have been some confusion between "abhidharma" and "avadāna" in the Chinese perception of information provided by a nameless Indian informant.

As to its style, the text contains neither verse nor any discernible four-character pattern, and almost all names and terms are transcribed. The imprint of indigenous Chinese religious ideas, however, can be clearly seen, for once again we find a mention of the *hun* 魂 and *po* 魄 spirits (908b25).

Shortest of all is the following text (occupying only two registers in the Taishō edition), whose title might be reconstructed as the *Nāgadattā-sūtra*:

T557: *Longshinü jing* 龍施女經

Here again there is no clear parallel, though the Taishō editors associate the text with the significantly different (though similarly titled) text that follows, the *Longshi pusa benqi jing* 龍施菩薩本起經 (T558) attributed to Dharmarakṣa. In a recent study Saitō (2003) has argued that T558, rather than T557, should be considered the work of Zhi Qian. His argument, based both on the testimony of scriptural catalogues and on the pattern of rhyme in the verse sections of the text, is well crafted, and it seems quite persuasive as far as it goes. But the vocabulary used in the text tells a different story. Despite its

⁸⁹ Of particular interest is the text's treatment of the name of Amitābha; for a detailed discussion see Nattier 2007a, 365-367.

⁹⁰ See Dargyay 1978 for an edition and German translation of the Tibetan Tanjur version and an overview of other versions of the story. The Sanskrit text is given in the Appendix to Hahn 1992 (pp. 58-72).

⁹¹ Despite this content, the scripture is classified as a "Hinayāna" sūtra (小乘修多羅) by Fajing (T2146, 55.128b16; see the section heading at 127c25).

⁹² T2145, 55.7a4: 安公云：出阿毘曇。

brevity—occupying less than two full pages—T558 is virtually saturated with vocabulary that occurs numerous times in other translations by Dharmarakṣa, but never in texts by Zhi Qian. This is true of both the prose and the verse sections, so it seems that the attribution of T557, rather than T558, to Zhi Qian should be retained.⁹³ It should be noted, however, that this is one of two extant scriptures attributed to Zhi Qian by Sengyou for which he reports that the scripture was not known to Daoan.⁹⁴

Though no other translation resembles T557 closely enough to be described as another version of the same scripture, comparable themes can be found in other scriptures. Most notably, as Stephen Bokenkamp has observed, the *Longshinü jing* echoes material found in a story in Kang Senghui's *Liudu ji jing* (T152, story #73).⁹⁵ It is also one of several translations by Zhi Qian that were copied (with adaptations) in the Daoist Lingbao 靈寶 scriptures.⁹⁶

The style of the text is not particularly distinctive; there is no discernible four-character pattern, and of the few names and technical terms it contains, some are transcribed but others translated into Chinese. None of its terminology, however, is foreign to Zhi Qian's usage, so we may allow it to remain on the list of his authentic works.

Another title assigned to Zhi Qian by Sengyou, the *Laonuren jing* 老女人經 (whose Sanskrit name has been reconstructed on the basis of the Tibetan as **Mahālalikā-pariprcchā-sūtra*),⁹⁷ appears to correspond to the text now contained in the Taishō edition as T559. Another text with a similar title, the *Laomu jing* 老母經 (T561), is treated as anonymous but dated to the Liu-Song 劉宋 period (420–479 CE) in the Taishō canon.

As it happens, however, it is the vocabulary found in T561, and not in T559, that most closely reflects Zhi Qian's usage. Even the titles themselves point in this direction, for while Zhi Qian never uses the expression 老女人, the term 老母 does appear in his work. Elsewhere I have given a detailed discussion of the terminology found in these two scriptures, so I will simply report the conclusion of that study here: T561 is a revision of the older translation found in T559, and it is the revised text, and not the older one, that should be viewed as the work of Zhi Qian.⁹⁸

T561: *Laomu jing* 老母經

⁹³ Time constraints do not allow for an adequate discussion of the topic here, but a few representative examples of quite ordinary-looking terms that are never used by Zhi Qian but occur multiple times in Dharmarakṣa's corpus are 不計吾我, 過去世時, 報其恩, and 等侶 in the prose section and 等平, 發菩提心, 變為男子, and 無上心 in the verse.

⁹⁴ T2145, 55.7a18: 龍施女經一卷(別錄所載, 安錄無).

⁹⁵ Stephen R. Bokenkamp: personal communication, 1998.

⁹⁶ Bokenkamp 1983, pp. 474–475.

⁹⁷ See Peking (Ötani) no. 838, *Bṛhas-mos zhus-pa*.

⁹⁸ See Nattier 2007b.

As in the case of the *Qinü jing* 七女經 (T556) discussed above, T559 is classified by Daoan as being from the Abhidharma; since T561 is simply a lightly revised version of T559, this description should apply to it as well. Again like T556, the story is of the *avadāna* type, explaining on the basis of events in a previous life why it is that the title character is so wise, on the one hand, but so poor on the other. This raises the question, once again, of a possible confusion between the terms *abhidharma* and *avadāna* in the course of transmission of information concerning this text.

The translation is entirely in prose, with no regular metric pattern. As discussed in my article on the attribution of this text, the vocabulary of T561 is quite congruent with Zhi Qian's usage (Nattier 2007b).

A sole exemplar. Finally we come to a Mahāyāna scripture for which no counterpart of any kind has yet been identified in any language. Occupying over four Taishō pages, it is a quite substantial text whose title can be reconstructed as the *Simhamati-sūtra*:

T532: *Sihemo jing* 私呵末[<-昧]經 (var. *Pusa daoshu jing* 菩薩道樹經)

Though the name of the title character is given throughout the printed Taishō edition as *Sihemei* 私呵昧, Sengyou's catalogue entry reads 私呵末(經) (< *Simhamati), which seems certain to be the original form; both *Sihemei jing* 私呵昧經 and *Pusa daoshu jing* 菩薩道樹經 are given there as variant titles (T2145, 55.6c23). Though no Chinese, Tibetan, or Indic-language parallel has yet been identified, there is a long citation from the text in Daoshi's *Fayuan zhulin* 法苑珠林, where the title has undergone yet another change, now appearing as the *Sihesanmei jing* 私呵三昧經 (!).⁹⁹

The scripture deals with the practices of the bodhisattva, and it is built around categories of six, a structure that is reflected in the style, for the text abounds in six-character verse. Some passages are in four-character prosody, but no other style of verse is to be found. The text also contains abundant examples of the distinctive translation terminology introduced in An Xuan and Yan Fotiao's *Fajing jing* 法鏡經 (T322), including such expressions as *shixin* 逝心 "expelling mind" for *brāhmaṇa*, *yingyi* 應儀 "worthy of rites" for *arhat*, and *gefo* 各佛 "individual Buddha" for *pratyekabuddha*.

Whatever the fortunes of other this scripture outside China may have been, it is clear that it garnered considerable attention here, for Kang Senghui wrote both a commentary and a preface to the text.¹⁰⁰ Daoxuan's *Guang hongmingji* 廣弘明集 also records a brief "song of praise" (*can* 讚) based on the scripture.¹⁰¹

⁹⁹ See T2122, 53.894c21-23; the same passage is repeated in the *Zhujing yaoji* 諸經要集 (T2123, 54.97a7-9), also composed by Daoshi.

¹⁰⁰ See Sengyou's biography of Kang Senghui (55.97a15), which mentions a commentary to the *Daoshu jing* as well as Kang Senghui's composition of prefaces; Fajing's *Zhongjing mulu* (T2146) specifies that one of the latter was a preface to the *Daoshu jing* (55.147a9). Neither of these writings, unfortunately, has survived.

¹⁰¹ See the *Daoshu jing can* 道樹經讚 in T2103, 52.359b18-21. The fact that this poem echoes

Stylistic variations: sub-groups in Zhi Qian's corpus

As we have had occasion to observe numerous times above, a distinctive feature of Zhi Qian's corpus is precisely the variety in his terminology and style. Translations that have a strong claim to authenticity on external grounds include some that are quite "Lokakṣema-like" in appearance, featuring an abundance of transcribed terms, long and often convoluted sentences, and a general absence of literary or *wenyan* features. Others could be described as more "An Xuan-like," with virtually all names and terms translated into Chinese, using many expressions borrowed from An Xuan and Yan Fotiao's *Fajing jing*. Some are composed in a crisp four-character style, while others exhibit an irregular metric pattern. Some contain five- or six-character verse (or more rarely, verses in a seven-character form); many of these are unrhymed, but in some cases (as Saitō has shown) there are rhymed verses as well. One might be forgiven for thinking of the story of the blind men and the elephant: depending on whether one feels the ear, or the tail, or the side (that is, depending on which text by Zhi Qian one consults), a completely different picture will emerge.¹⁰²

How, then, can we make sense of this great inconsistency on Zhi Qian's part? We have already noted that one important contributing factor was surely the fact that he was active in revising translations produced by others. As a result, his works contain some vocabulary carried over from previous translations, even when we see him modifying other elements of those same texts. We have also noted that while he began his career as a member of the community founded by Lokakṣema in the north, at the fall of the Han he migrated to the southern Wu kingdom, where his literary talents seem to have been greatly appreciated and he was brought in to court circles as a tutor to the ruler's son. It seems likely that his exposure to this new cultural environment may also have been a factor in introducing changes to his translation style.

If all of the variations in vocabulary and style found in Zhi Qian's corpus were due to traces of previously existing texts that he revised, we might well conclude that these are entirely random (or better, case-specific), and that no chronological or geographical pattern can be discerned. This may well be so, but it is nonetheless worth raising the possibility that, by paying attention to certain specific elements found in his translations, we might be able to identify at least a general direction of development.

A good place to start would be with the feature that appears to be most unique to Zhi Qian during this period: the use of six-character verse. A review of the translations reliably attributed to Zhi Qian that do, and do not, contain this form of verse reveals an interesting picture: with just one exception, none of his most An Xuan-like translations

the sūtra's location at the Bamboo Grove (竹園) in Rājagṛha (王舍國), as well as giving the name of the title character (abbreviated, *metri causa*, as 私呵) makes it quite certain that it is this sūtra that is meant.

¹⁰² Cf. the remarks by Zacchetti on the case of Dharmarakṣa: "There have been in fact almost as many Dharmarakṣas as there have been texts translated under this name" (Zacchetti 2005, p. 13).

(that is, those that contain the smallest number of transcriptions and borrow heavily from the vocabulary of the *Fajing jing*) contain six-character verse. On the contrary, this verse form appears in both of the most “Lokakṣema-like” of his translations (T169 and T632), as well as in several texts that might be described as “intermediate” in style (exhibiting a mixture of transcription and translation but not containing any of the most distinctive terms used by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao).¹⁰³ The sole text in the “An Xuan-like” category that contains six-character verse—and it contains a substantial amount of it, and no other kind—is T532, the *Simhamati-sūtra*. Thus with this sole exception, we might say that the use of An Xuan-like vocabulary is a strong counter-indicator for the presence of six-character verse.

T532 has, however, a feature that is almost certainly related to its anomalous status in this regard: the entire text is built around lists of six items each. It seems quite likely, therefore, that it was the content of the text (or rather, its structure consisting of six-item units) that elicited the use of six-character verse in this case.

Returning to the overall pattern in the use of this style of verse, we might propose the following as a working hypothesis to be pursued in future studies. As a Buddhist disciple belonging to Lokakṣema’s school in Luoyang, Zhi Qian began his career by approximating Lokakṣema’s transcription-oriented approach. He differed from it only in adding verse passages where the Indic source-text was itself in verse, as we can see from his version of the *Huiyin sanmei jing* 慧印三昧經 (T632). It was in this period that he began to use six-character verse, a form that appears to have been in vogue in Luoyang (but not in the south) at the time. Early revisions by Zhi Qian of works from Lokakṣema’s school (including T361 and T790), as well as translations that appear to have been made without reference to a pre-existing Chinese version (e.g., T169, T198, and T533), also include six-character verse where there were verse passages in the Indian original. Where the original was entirely in prose, Zhi Qian follows suit, but the style (tending toward transcription rather than translation) remains the same (e.g., T54, T68, T556, and T557). Subsequently we see Zhi Qian moving toward greater incorporation of translated terminology, but not yet adopting the distinctive vocabulary introduced by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao; representative examples of this transitional type would include T6 and T185. Finally we see Zhi Qian becoming entranced with the terminology introduced in An Xuan and Yan Fotiao’s *Fajing jing* (T322), and producing a series of works strongly influenced by this text (T76, T87, T225B, T281, T474, T493, T532, T581, and T1011). It is in the latter group that we find such features as the avoidance of transcription and preference for translation, the heavy use of four-character prosody, and the ample use of indigenous Chinese religious terms. It is also in this group that we find the total absence of six-character verse, with the exception of one single text (the *Simhamati-sūtra*, T532), which as we

¹⁰³ Texts of this type which include six-character verse are T6, T198, T210, T361, and T533.

have seen has an internal structural element that may well have elicited this style.

Given what we know about Zhi Qian's situation in the Wu kingdom, it is tempting to attempt to align the above data with his move from Luoyang to the south. That is, it seems reasonable to put forth the hypothesis that after his migration to the Wu kingdom he began to produce texts that were more literary and elegant in style, borrowing heavily from the *Fajing jing* (whose popularity in the Wu kingdom is well attested) and making increasing use of indigenous Chinese religious terms, a feature that is also evident in the work of his fellow Wu-kingdom resident, Kang Senghui.

Much remains to be done in attempting to periodize the translations of Zhi Qian, and this brief sketch is intended only as an indicator of how future studies might approach this question. It will be a great advantage if we can at last move beyond the image of the "blind men and the elephant" to discern a pattern in the kaleidoscopic variety of his work.

LOST TEXTS

The following titles attributed to Zhi Qian by Sengyou have not been identified with any extant text and may be presumed, at the present state of our knowledge, to be lost:

- *Xiao Achacuomo jing* 小阿差末經
- *Youduoluo mu jing* 優多羅母經
- *Huiguo jing* 悔過經 (var. *Xu shifang lihui guo wen* 序十方禮悔過文)
- *Xianzhe de jing* 賢者德經
- *Fo congshang suoxing sanshi ji* 佛從上所行三十偈
- *Weiming ershi jie* 惟明二十偈
- *Fajing jing* 法鏡經
- *Luzi jing* 鹿子經
- *Shi'er men da fangdeng jing* 十二門大方等經
- *Shoulengyan jing* 首楞嚴經
- *Xulai jing* 須賴經

Of these the *Shoulengyan jing* (cited from the *Bieku* 別錄, not from Daoan) may be the result of confusion between Zhi Qian's name and that of Lokakṣema (Zhi Chen 支識). On the *Xulai jing* 須賴經 (T328), the extant version of which is probably not Zhi Qian's work, see below, p. 157. Finally, the attribution of the *Liaoben shengsi jing* 了本生死經 (T708) to Zhi Qian is apparently an error made by Sengyou himself (see above, p. 109), so I have not included it here.

SCHOLARLY RESOURCES

Relatively few studies have been devoted to the translations of Zhi Qian thus far, and it seems fair to say that our understanding of the works of this translator is still at a rather primitive stage. Works that can be consulted with profit for an understanding of his vocabulary include those by Katsuzaki (1985 and others), Satō 1994, and Asayama (1983 and others). I have dealt with some aspects of Zhi Qian's terminology in previous studies (Nattier 2003b, 2004, 2006a, and 2007a and b).

Kang Senghui 康僧會**BIOGRAPHY**

As in the case of Zhi Qian, we have fairly detailed information on the life of Kang Senghui, some of it from his own hand.¹⁰⁴ According to his biography in the *Chu sanzang jiji* (closely followed by the *Gaoseng zhuan*), he was born in Jiaozi 交趾 in the far south of the Wu kingdom (near present-day Hanoi), the son of a Sogdian merchant who had immigrated from India, where his ancestors had lived for generations.¹⁰⁵ While still in his teens Kang Senghui lost both of his parents, and soon afterwards he became a monk. Before long, however, his first teachers died as well. In the tenth year of the Chiwu 赤烏 era (= 247 CE) he moved to the Wu capital of Jianye, where his monastic garb and strange foreign appearance seem to have aroused official suspicion. His biography portrays him as receiving alternately friendly and threatening treatment from the ruling powers, and it describes him as employing a range of techniques—from lecturing the ruler on karma and rebirth to causing a miraculous relic of the Buddha to appear—to gain official permission to propagate the Buddhist teachings. After a long life in which he was alternately engaged in producing translations and commentaries and negotiating with the Wu authorities, Kang Senghui is said to have died in the first year of the Taikang 太康 era [= 280 CE], the same year in which the Wu kingdom was finally conquered by the Western Jin 西晉.

The dates given in the Kang Senghui's biography are significantly different from those given in Sengyou's catalogue section, where his translation activity is assigned to the period from 226-240 CE (according to the chronology of the Wei), or from 222-258 (according to Wu reign periods).¹⁰⁶ If either of these ranges is correct, his translation career would have overlapped substantially with that of Zhi Qian; indeed, one might expect that they should have met, with both of them living in the Wu capital and interacting with the court at the same time. None of the available sources, however, makes any mention of such a meeting, though it is clear that there was contact of another kind, for

¹⁰⁴ For the earliest biographical treatments see Sengyou's *Chu sanzang jiji* (T2145), 55.96a29-97a17 and Huijiao's *Gaoseng zhuan* (T2059), 50.325a13-18 and 325b4-326b13. French translations of the latter, including the intervening material concerning Zhi Qian, can be found in Chavannes 1909 and Shih 1968, pp. 20-31. Even these accounts are (in the words of Erik Zürcher) "obscured by legend," which makes the value of Kang Senghui's own autobiographical remarks all the greater. These are contained in his preface to the *Anban shouyi jing* (preserved in the *Chu sanzang jiji*, 55.42c29-43c3; for Kang Senghui's comments on his own life see 43b24-43c3). For other extant works composed by Kang Senghui see below, p. 153.

¹⁰⁵ As in the case of Kang Mengxiang (see above, p. 102, n. 251), the statement that Kang Senghui's ancestors were from Kangju 康居 causes some scholars to assign them to a territory near, but not in, Sogdiana.

¹⁰⁶ For the passage in question see below under "Authentic Texts."

Kang Senghui's biography states that he wrote a commentary on one of Zhi Qian's translations,¹⁰⁷ and he cites a passage from another in his own *Liudu ji jing* (see below under "Translation Style"). Thus, however one adjudicates the apparent contradictions between the chronological data given in the catalogue and biography sections of the *Chusanzang jiji*, it makes sense to consider Kang Senghui as a slightly later contemporary of Zhi Qian.

It is noteworthy that in his own writing Kang Senghui portrays himself as having derived great benefit from the presence of three laymen—Han Lin 韓林, Pi Ye 皮業, and Chen Hui 陳慧, whom he refers to as “three worthies” 三賢者—who had migrated to the Wu kingdom after the fall of the Han, bringing with them teachings derived from the school of An Shigao. It was Chen Hui, he reports, who provided the annotations to the *Anban shouyi jing*, which Kang Senghui helped to revise and record.¹⁰⁸

CONTENTS OF HIS CORPUS

Kang Senghui's sole extant translation is a collection of *jātaka* tales organized according to the system of six perfections of the bodhisattva (*pāramitās*, here translated using the term *duwuji* 度無極 introduced by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao). Though the collection is not a “Mahāyāna” text in the sense of recommending the practice of the bodhisattva path to practitioners in general—like other traditional *jātaka* collections, its objective is to relate the greatness of the figure who was to become the Buddha Śākyamuni, not to encourage others to do the same—the fact that it employs this framework suggests that this collection may have been transmitted in a Mahāyāna-oriented milieu. The appearance of the bodhisattva Mañjuśrī in one of the stories in the collection is also a noteworthy feature.¹⁰⁹ Like Kang Mengxiang's work, however, his translations are probably best described as belonging to a transitional category, containing traditional stories of the Buddha's previous lives arranged within a format reflecting certain Mahāyāna assumptions.

In addition to his translation work Kang Senghui was also actively involved in the production of scriptural commentary, and here too it is clear that he devoted his energies to explicating both Mahāyāna and non-Mahāyāna texts. These works included two commentaries on Mahāyāna sūtras (the *Fajing jing*, T322 and the *Daoshu jing*, T532) and another on a text focusing on traditional meditation practice (the *Anban shouyi jing*; presumably a version resembling that found in K-ABSYJ). Though the first two have not survived, it is possible that the latter is still embedded within the transmitted text of the

¹⁰⁷ T2145, 55.97a15; for the parallel passage in the *Gaoseng zhuan* see T2059, 50.326a23. The sūtra in question is T532 (私呵昧經) for which Sengyou's catalogue gives the alternate title of 菩薩道樹經 (55.6c23).

¹⁰⁸ See Kang Senghui's preface to the *Anban shouyi jing* (T2145, 55.43b27ff.).

¹⁰⁹ See story #13, 3.7a26, b22, c16 and 19.

Anban shouyin jing (T602).¹¹⁰

TRANSLATION STYLE

Of all the Han and Wu-kingdom translators, Kang Senghui's translation style is among the most literary in form. Another notable feature is the degree to which it conforms to that of Zhi Qian. The two translators share a wide range of vocabulary, some of it used rarely or not at all in other texts. Both clearly prefer translation to transcription, and they employ four-character prosody with regularity as well as translating occasional passages into unrhymed verse. Like Zhi Qian, Kang Senghui generally uses the standard five-character format. There is one passage in which he seems to employ the rare six-character style, but this is in fact a quotation (identified by name) from Zhi Qian's *Yizu jing* 義足經 (T198).¹¹¹

A particularly striking aspect of Kang Senghui's translation style—and one which is even more prominent, in percentage terms, in his work than in that of Zhi Qian—is the liberal use of ideas and terminology drawn from indigenous Chinese religion, ranging from references to entering Mt. Tai 太山¹¹² after death to discussions of the fate of the *hunling* 魂靈 spirit(s) to the use of expressions with explicit resonances in Confucian and Daoist texts.¹¹³ Against this background it is not surprising to find Kang Senghui portrayed

¹¹⁰ See Zürcher 1959, p. 54.

¹¹¹ See T198, 4.178b27-c13, copied in T152, 51a19-b6. In fact the whole story in which this verse passage occurs is drawn from the same text by Zhi Qian.

In T152 five-character verse appears at 3.20a, 27c, and 34c; a passage of six-character verse occurs at 51a-b. T206 contains only a single passage of five-character verse (4.510c). As discussed above (pp. 17-18 and notes 48 and 49), six-syllable verse appears to have been introduced into Chinese translation literature by Zhi Qian; it is rarely used by other translators, with the exception of Dharmarakṣa who in a number of respects can be shown to have drawn upon the "Wu scriptural idiom" of Zhi Qian and Kang Senghui discussed immediately below.

¹¹² The alternate form 泰山 does not appear in the received text of Kang Senghui's work.

¹¹³ A quick comparison with the works of Lokakṣema—who is commonly thought to have been overly influenced by Chinese (especially Daoist) concepts—is instructive. In Lokakṣema's core texts the term *taishan* 泰山 never appears; it occurs only once in a third-tier text (T626, 15.390a22). In Kang Senghui's work, by contrast, the term appears (in the form *taishan* 太山) thirty-eight times. The term *hunling* 魂靈 occurs fifteen times in Kang Senghui's work, but not at all in Lokakṣema; likewise the intriguing term *feixing huangdi* 飛行皇帝 (used as a translation of *cakravartin*) appears thirteen times in Kang Senghui's work but is never employed in Lokakṣema's texts. The expression *wuwei* 無為 (used by some early translators to render *asaṃskṛta* "unconditioned" as well as *nirvāṇa*) appears only a handful of times in Lokakṣema's corpus, while it occurs eight times in Kang Senghui's much shorter (and much less philosophically-oriented) *Liudu ji jing*. Even the innocuous (though certainly Confucian-inspired) term *ren* 仁 hardly ever occurs in Lokakṣema's work, being almost entirely restricted to the expression 仁者 (used as a form of direct address) and the related use of 仁 alone as a *de facto* pronoun. It occurs in Kang Senghui's work, by contrast, no fewer than 130 times.

in his biography in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* as responding to questions from the Wu ruler Sun Hao 孫皓 in terms drawn exclusively from traditional Chinese—i.e., non-Buddhist—sources.¹¹⁴

Despite the fact that Zhi Qian's biography is inserted, in the *Gaoseng zhuan*, in the midst of the account of Kang Senghui's life, there is no evidence that the two ever met in person, for Zhi Qian had already withdrawn to the mountains when Kang Senghui arrived in Jianye in 247 CE. The substantial overlap in their translation vocabulary, however, makes it virtually certain that Kang Senghui consulted translations produced or revised by Zhi Qian. Indeed, one of the texts for which he is said to have written a commentary—titled the *Daoshu jing* 道樹經 in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*—was one of Zhi Qian's translations.¹¹⁵

Whether the similarity between their translations is due specifically to borrowing by Kang Senghui from the works of Zhi Qian, or whether both men were participants in a broader rhetorical community for which no explicit evidence has survived, the confluence of style between the works of these two translators is so great that it seems appropriate to speak of a “Wu scriptural idiom.” This idiom drew preferentially, in turn, on the vocabulary and style of earlier translations by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao (T322) and by Kang Mengxiang (T184 and T196). In subsequent decades this idiom would be appropriated by Dharmarakṣa, whose translations—though produced far from the territory of Wu, in Dunhuang and the northern Chinese capitals of Luoyang and Chang'an—bear the strong imprint of the vocabulary and style favored by these two southern translators.

AUTHENTIC TEXTS

The account of Kang Senghui's work in the catalogue section of the *Chu sanzang ji ji* is quite brief, for he is credited there with only two works, a text in five fascicles and ten chapters entitled the *Wu pin* 吳品 “Wu version,” described by Sengyou as lost, and another scripture in nine fascicles entitled the *Liudu ji jing* 六度集經 “Compendium on the Six Perfections” (T2145, 55.7a25-26). Sengyou summarizes his entry as follows:

The above two texts, comprising fourteen fascicles in all, were translated by the Indian śramaṇa Kang Senghui at the time of emperor Ming 明帝 of the Wei 魏, during the time of the Wu rulers (主) Sun Quan 孫權 [r. 222-252] and Sun Liang 孫亮 [r. 252-258].¹¹⁶

Of the two extant texts attributed to Kang Senghui by the Taishō editors, only one

¹¹⁴ T2145, 55.96c11-16. The same wording is repeated in the *Gaoseng zhuan* (T2059, 50.325c19-28).

¹¹⁵ T2145, 55.97a15; for the parallel passage in the *Gaoseng zhuan* see T2059, 50.326a23. The sūtra in question is T532 (私呵昧經) for which Sengyou's catalogue gives the alternate title of 菩薩道樹經 (55.6c23).

¹¹⁶ T2145, 55.7a27-7b1: 右二部。凡十四卷。魏明帝時。天竺沙門康僧會。以吳主孫權孫亮世所譯出。

corresponds to a title credited to him by Sengyou. The language of the text is very much in line with Kang Senghui's own writings (discussed below), and there is no reason to dispute its authenticity:

T152: *Liudu ji jing* 六度集經

As with the Buddha-biographies attributed to Zhi Qian (T185) and to Kang Mengxiang (T184 and T196), questions have been raised about whether Kang Senghui's *jātaka* collection is really a translation, or whether it might be a compendium assembled in China.¹¹⁷ Further study of the contents of this important text will surely be rewarding; in particular, a comparative analysis of individual stories in the collection with their analogues in other scriptures may cast much light on the situation.

Sengyou also credits Kang Senghui with a second translation, a text referred to as the 吳品, or the "Wu version" (55.7a26)—but of what? Zürcher speculates (presumably on the grounds of the character 品, which is often used to distinguish various versions of the *Prajñāpāramitā* sūtras) that this may have been a local recension of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā*, and this is certainly a possibility.¹¹⁸ Whatever the content of this mysterious text might have been, Sengyou was unable to examine it, for it had already been lost in his time.

In addition to his translated work, several short pieces authored by Kang Senghui himself have been preserved:

Preface to An Shigao's *Anban shouyi jing* (55.42c29-43c3)¹¹⁹

Preface to his own (lost) commentary on An Xuan and Yan Fotiao's *Fajing jing* (55.46619-c11 and 12.15a5-26)

Introductions to sections 1 through 5 of his own *Liudu ji jing* (3.1a14-20

[*dāna*], 16c9-14 [*śīla*], 24a19-b4 [*kṣānti*], 32a10-19 [*vīrya*], 3.39a15-41a20 [*dhyaṇa*])¹²⁰

¹¹⁷ This possibility was raised already by Chavannes in his translation of the collection (1910, p. 1, n. 1).

¹¹⁸ Zürcher 1959, p. 53. The fact that a version of the text by Kang Senghui's contemporary Zhi Qian (大明度經, T225) was already in circulation and was immensely popular in this region might be viewed as evidence against this identification. Note however that the *Gaoseng zhuan* credits Kang Senghui with the production of a text referred to only as 小品 (50.326a21), a name which was often used as an abbreviated title of the shorter *Prajñāpāramitā* sūtra. In Kang Senghui's biography in the *Chu sanzang jiji* a text (presumably the same one) titled 道品 is mentioned, which evokes the short title of Lokakṣema's translation of the *Aṣṭa* (T224, 道行經). Future work on the identity of this mysterious "Wu pin" should be carried out in tandem with a thoroughgoing analysis of the vocabulary and style of the *Da mingdu jing*; given the noticeable difference between the terminology used in chapter 1 (which contains an interlinear commentary which Kang Senghui may well have been involved in producing) and the remainder of the text, it may be worth considering whether Kang Senghui's "Wu pin" can be identified with some subset of the currently extant *Da mingdu jing*.

¹¹⁹ For an annotated English translation see Link 1976, pp. 67-80.

¹²⁰ Chavannes (1910) provides French translations of three of these: the introductions to the

Zürcher has also suggested that the commentary interspersed within the text of the *Anban shouyi jing* (T602) includes explanations by Kang Senghui and his contemporary Chen Hui, with whom he is said to have written a commentary to that text, as well as glosses added later by Daoan (Zürcher 1959, p. 53). An explication of An Shigao's 陰持入經 (T1694; the scripture itself was extracted from the commentary in the modern period and included in the Taishō canon separately as T603) may also incorporate comments by Kang Senghui (Zürcher 1959, p. 54). It may even be that some of the remarks attributed to an unnamed "master" in the interlinear commentary to the first chapter of Zhi Qian's 大明度經 (T225) are the words of Kang Senghui as well (Zürcher, *loc. cit.*).

A puzzle is presented, at least initially, by the long list of translations attributed to Kang Senghui in the biographical section of the *Chu sanzang ji ji* (55.97a13-14, followed by the *Gaoseng zhuan* at 50.326a20-21), which does not agree at all with the much shorter list of only two works given by Sengyou in his catalogue section (55.7a25-26). A solution, however, is easily found, for all four of the additional titles given here also occur as the names of stories belonging to the *prajñā* section of the *Liudu ji jing* (nos. 88-91, 3.49b24-52b1).

LOST TEXTS

In addition to the *Wu pin* mentioned above, Kang Senghui is also known to have produced at least two commentaries, one on the *Fajing jing* (T322) translated by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao (to which his preface has been preserved) and another to Zhi Qian's *Daoshu jing*.

- *Wu pin* 吳品 (a *prajñāpāramitā* text?)
- *Fajing jing zhu* 法鏡經注
- *Daoshu jing zhu* 道樹經注

Though all of these are thought to be lost, a few tantalizing lines of Kang Senghui's *Fajing jing* commentary are quoted in a sixth-century anthology, the *Fayuan zhulin* 法苑珠林 by Daoshi 道世.¹²¹

SCHOLARLY RESOURCES

The single most valuable resource for the study of Kang Senghui's work is the annotated French translation of virtually all of T152 by Édouard Chavannes (1910, pp. 5-346); a translation of T206 is also included there (pp. 347-428). Another very useful source is Link 1976, which contains annotated translations of Kang Senghui's preface to the *Anban*

dāna section (pp. 1-2), the *śīla* section (p. 97), and the *vīrya* section (pp. 213-214). An English translation of the introduction to the *dhyāna* section, with extensive annotation, is given in Link 1976, pp. 103-124. (Note that for some reason the *dhyāna* introduction is labeled in the Taishō edition as stories 74, 75 and 76; these are not actual stories, however, but Kang Senghui's own introductory remarks.) Kang Senghui's introduction to the sixth section, on *prajñā*, has not survived; his introduction to the *kṣānti* section has yet to be translated into any western language.

¹²¹ See T2122, 1000a1-2: 康僧會法鏡經云：凡夫貪染六塵。猶餓夫貪飯不知厭足。今聖人斷貪除六情飢饉。故號出家尼為除饉也。

shouyi jing (pp. 67-80) and his introduction to the *dhyāna* section of the *Liudu ji jing* (pp. 103-124). Ongoing work by Stefano Zacchetti is casting considerable light on the works of Kang Senghui; see in particular his study on the *Yinchiru jing zhu* (Zacchetti forthcoming). For a study of certain aspects of the *Liudu ji jing*, including in particular the portrayal of women in the text, see also Shi 2007.

2. THE WEI 魏 KINGDOM (c. 220-265 CE)

In comparison to the wealth of translations produced during the Latter Han and, after its fall, in the Wu Kingdom to the south, hardly any Buddhist scriptures seem to have been translated under the Wei, and of those that may have been produced there almost none have survived. No doubt the troubled times, characterized by ongoing military campaigns and internal power struggles, inhibited the translation of new scriptural texts, as well as creating poor conditions for the preservation of those that were actually produced. Be that as it may, it is telling that Sengyou—who used Wei dynasty reign-periods to assign dates even to translators like Zhi Qian and Kang Senghui, who produced their translations in the south—was able to mention only a single translator, Bo Yan, who lived and worked under the Wei.¹²²

Bo Yan 白延

BIOGRAPHY

Bo Yan receives a brief mention in the *Chu sanzang jiji* at the end of the biographical entry on An Xuan (55.96a27-28) and another short listing in the catalogue section (55.7b2-6), but virtually all of the information given in both places is negative. Sengyou reports that Bo Yan's place of origin is unknown, that all three of the works credited to him have been lost, and that Bo Yan's name was not registered in Daoan's catalogue, a fact which casts some doubt on the validity of these attributions (which Sengyou says he drew from another source). All three of Bo Yan's supposed translations, moreover, are described in the biographical section as retranslations of already existing works, and two of the three titles are also assigned by Sengyou to Zhi Qian.¹²³ According to Lamotte, the surname Bo 白 (which he considers to be simply a variant of the character 帛, though in Sengyou's

¹²² Unless I have misunderstood something, Zürcher's statement that Daoan and Sengyou "do not list any names of translators or works translated during this [Wei] period" (Zürcher 1959, p. 55) is incorrect.

¹²³ The *Chu sanzang jiji* credits Zhi Qian with translating the *Xulai jing* 須賴經 (still extant in Sengyou's time) and the *Shoulengyan jing* 首楞嚴經 (which is listed as "lost"). The third title credited to Bo Yan, the *Chu zai huan jing* 除災患經, has no parallel in the list of works attributed by Sengyou to Zhi Qian.

catalogue section the two appear to be clearly distinguished)¹²⁴ implies that he was a member of the Kuchean royal family (1965, p. 80). This is indeed the case with another figure by the same name who lived a century later (as discussed immediately below). Not all monks with this surname, however, had any connection to Kucha; the scholar-monk Bo Yuan 帛遠 (styled Fazū 法祖), for example, was the son of a Confucian scholar from Henan 河南, and there is no reason to think that he was not ethnically Chinese.¹²⁵

Virtually the only positive details given in the *Chu sanzang jiji* are the dates of Bo Yan's translation work, but even these are contradictory. In the biography section he is said to have been active toward the end of the Zhengshi 正始 era (240-249), but Sengyou's catalogue entry for Bo Yan places him in the time of Lord Gaogui 高貴公 (254-260).¹²⁶

It is difficult to reconcile the information provided by Sengyou with the account given in the *Gaoseng zhuan* concerning Bo Yan 帛延, even if this name is simply a variant reading of 白延. The dates given for this figure are approximately the same (though Huijiao uses yet a third chronological frame of reference, placing him in the middle of the Ganlu 甘露 era, i.e., from 256-260 CE). Now, however, he is credited six scriptures rather than three, and the only one that is named—the *Wuliang qingjing pingdengjue jing* 無量清淨平等覺經 (T361), whose authorship has long been a topic of debate—does not correspond to any of the titles included on Sengyou's list.

The waters are muddied still further by the fact that the *Chu sanzang jiji* also contains an anonymous preface to a translation of a sūtra by the same title,¹²⁷ where the text is credited to the Yuezhi *upāsaka* Zhi Shilun 支施崙, who “held the foreign text in his hand” (手執胡本) and “issued” it (出), presumably to be understood here as “recited” the Indian text, and the Kuchean prince Bo Yan (歸慈王世子帛延), who is described as the actual translator (譯者). All of this took place with the active participation of the Prefect of Liangzhou, Zhang Tianxi 張天錫, who at the end of the preface is said to have “chosen the terminology” (屬辭, presumably meaning that he made certain editorial decisions) himself. To add to the confusion, at the beginning of the preface he is said to have “issued” the text (出), using precisely the same wording applied to the *upāsaka* Zhi Shilun, but presumably the verb is to be taken here in a more general causal sense, implying that he “had the text translated” under his sponsorship and supervision.

¹²⁴ See Sengyou's list of translators for whom he had drawn his information from sources other than Daoan, where Bo Yan 白延 and Bai Fazū 帛法祖 are listed one after the other (55.10a6).

¹²⁵ See his biography in the *Chu sanzang jiji*, 55.107a26ff.

¹²⁶ Even on this point there is some difference of opinion. While most sources (including the catalogue section of the *Chu sanzang jiji*, 55.7b2-6) place him in the 250s CE, Sengyou places him slightly earlier, during the decade of the 240s, in the biographical section of the same account (55.96a27-28).

¹²⁷ T2145, 55.49b18-29. A French translation is given in Lamotte 1965; for the corresponding English version see Lamotte 1998, p. 91. A Japanese translation can be found in Nakajima 1997, pp. 60-61.

PART III: THE THREE KINGDOMS PERIOD

The date given in the preface, which corresponds to 373 CE, places these events more than a century after the time of the Wei-period Bo Yan. Yet there is a curious echo in this account, for not only is this Eastern Jin-period Bo Yan said to have translated the same *Surāta-sūtra* as did his Wei-period predecessor, but another of the texts said to have been “issued” (出) in Liangzhou by the same Yuezhi reciter, the *upāsaka* Zhi Shilun, is the *Śūrangama-samādhi-sūtra*, which is also among the texts credited to the earlier Bo Yan by Sengyou.

AUTHENTIC TEXTS

In the catalogue section of the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, as mentioned above, Sengyou credits Bo Yan with three translations, all of which are listed as lost. More specifically, Bo Yan is said to have translated the *Śūrangama-samādhi-sūtra* (*Shoulengyan jing* 首楞嚴經), the *Surāta-sūtra* (*Xulai jing* 須賴經), and a third text entitled “Scripture on Averting Disasters” (*Chu zaihuan jing* 除災患經). Sengyou concludes with the following note:

The above three works, comprising four fascicles in all, were translated by Po Yan during the time of Lord Gaogui of the Wei. They are cited from the *Bie lu*; previously his name was not in Lord [Dao]an’s catalogue.¹²⁸

It appears that the *Shoulengyan jing* and the *Chu zaihuan jing* have indeed been lost, but a translation of the *Xulai jing* (T328) is credited to Bo Yan by the editors of the Taishō canon.

A scripture by this title, however, is attributed by Sengyou both to Zhi Qian and to Bo Yan (e.g., at 55.14a15-18). Thus according to the methodology outlined above, we should compare the vocabulary and style of the extant text with other works by both translators before deciding whether the attribution found in the received tradition (i.e., in the Taishō canon) is correct. With no other translations that are certain to be by Bo Yan available to offer a basis for comparison, however, we are limited to the internal evidence provided by the other works of Zhi Qian. As noted above, while the style of the text offers no dramatic divergences from that of other translations by Zhi Qian, over the past several years it has repeatedly failed to appear in searches for Zhi Qian’s most distinctive terms. Thus at present it seems most likely that the text as we have it is indeed the work of Bo Yan. It is therefore included here pending further study:

T328: *Xulai jing* 須賴經

SCHOLARLY RESOURCES

Most studies published to date that mention the work of Bo Yan are devoted to his supposed translation of the *Pingdengjue jing* (T361), which at the current state of our knowledge appears to have been produced by Zhi Qian instead (see above, p. 139). To

¹²⁸ T2145, 7b5-6: 右三部，凡四卷，魏高貴公時白延所譯出。別錄所載。安公錄(先無其名)

date the most detailed examination of the sole translation that may in fact be Bo Yan's work, the *Xulai jing*, is the discussion by Hayashiya (1945, pp. 83-114), who however relies on later catalogues and credits T328 to Dharmarakṣa.¹²⁹ Eight of the entries concerning Bo Yan found in traditional scriptural catalogues, from the *Chu sanzang ji ji* to the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu*, are translated into French in Lamotte 1965, pp. 79-80; cf. the English version in Lamotte 1998, pp. 72-73.

Kang Sengkai 康僧鎧 (Saṃghavarman)

BIOGRAPHY

As noted above, Bo Yan is the only Wei-period translator listed in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, where Kang Sengkai's name is not even mentioned. The latter figure first appears in the *Gaoseng zhuan* (50.325a6-8) and in Fajing's *Zhongjing mulu* (55.119a24). The absence of any reference to translations by Kang Sengkai in Sengyou's work means that these attributions are automatically suspect, but because two of Kang Sengkai's supposed works have been widely influential in East Asia we will briefly consider the evidence for and against their authenticity here.

Three texts are credited to Kang Sengkai by the Taishō editors: a version of the *Ugrapariprocchā-sūtra* (*Yujie zhangzhe hui* 郁伽長者會, T310[19]), a version of the larger *Sukhāvativyūha-sūtra* (*Wuliangshou jing* 無量壽經, T360), and a vinaya text (*Tanwude lübu zajiemo* 曇無德律部雜羯磨, T1432). As we have seen, none of these attributions appear in Sengyou's catalogue (much less in that of Daoan). Fajing's catalogue (T2146) attributes only the first of these three scriptures to Kang Sengkai, and subsequent catalogues follow him in this practice at first.¹³⁰ A version of the *Sukhāvativyūha* is assigned to him for the first time in Fei Changfang's *Lidai sanbao ji* (597 CE);¹³¹ references to a vinaya text translated by Kang Sengkai are later still.¹³²

¹²⁹ Hayashiya's analysis is based on the fact that both Zhi Qian's and Bo Yan's versions of the text are registered as lost in later catalogues. The attribution of a translation of the *Xulai jing* to Dharmarakṣa, however, was unknown to either Daoan or Sengyou. Thus it seems most prudent to infer that the similarities between the terminology found in T328 and in some of Dharmarakṣa's extant translations simply reflect the latter's adoption of terms that were already in use by other third-century translators (including Zhi Qian). As is well known, some scriptures that were registered as lost by Sengyou were actually still in circulation elsewhere; thus it should not be assumed that no translation that currently appears in the Chinese canon could be correlated with one listed in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* as lost.

¹³⁰ See T2147 (55.158b27) and T2148 (55.191b13).

¹³¹ T2034, 49.56b23-24.

¹³² The earliest reference that I have been able to locate is in the eighth-century *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* (T2154, 55.619b7-8). The *Gaoseng zhuan* credits Kang Sengkai with the translation of four scriptures, but only the *Ugra* is mentioned by name (譯出郁伽長者等四部經, 50.325a6-8).

Whatever the testimony of the catalogues, internal evidence alone is sufficient to demonstrate that none of these texts is the work of Kang Sengkai. The language of the *Ugraparipṛcchā* and the *Sukhāvatīvyūha* is clearly not that of the third century; both texts begin, for example, with the expression 如是我聞, which came into use only at the end of the fourth century.¹³³ References to Kang Sengkai's supposed translation of a vinaya text are so late that they hardly require internal evidence to support their dubiousness, but an examination of the language of this text would no doubt yield a similar result.¹³⁴

In sum, despite the frequent mention of his name in studies of East Asian Buddhism, not a single text can reliably be credited to Kang Sengkai. While there may well have been such a monk living in north China during the Wei period, his name simply became a peg on which to hang the attribution of texts which are obviously of much later vintage.

AUTHENTIC TRANSLATIONS

None.

Other Wei-period translators

Two other Wei-period translators—whose names can be reconstructed as Dharmendra (曇帝, var. 曇無帝) and Dharmakara¹³⁵ (曇柯迦羅, var. 曇摩迦羅), respectively—are mentioned in the *Gaoseng zhuan* and later sources,¹³⁶ but none of the works attributed to them have survived. If the report of their translations given in the *Gaoseng zhuan* is

¹³³ Earlier texts use the form 聞如是, avoiding the use of the first-person pronoun. Zürcher has suggested that the shift to the four-character phrase was made for metric reasons (1991, p. 288), but the three-character formula occurs widely in texts that employ the pattern of four-character prosody. My own suspicion is that the shift to the four-character formula was simply the result of the concern for faithfulness to the Indian original finally winning out over the reluctance to portray the transmitter of the text as so blatantly (and impolitely) referring to himself.

¹³⁴ I am not well versed enough in the history of Chinese vinaya terminology to make such an evaluation. An examination of this issue by a vinaya specialist would be most welcome.

¹³⁵ This name is usually reconstructed as *Dharmakāla, but this is surely incorrect. As Zürcher pointed out long ago, the form of the name found in the earliest sources, where the second character is written *ge* 柯 rather than *mo* 摩 as in later catalogues, is unexpected (Zürcher 1959, p. 55). In my view this is probably the result of an old copying error for an original 阿, a character frequently used to mark an internal long *ā*, e.g. in Lokakṣema's typical rendering of the word *tathāgata* as *dasa'ajie* 怛薩阿竭. Unlike *Dharmakāla (which would mean "Dharma-Black" or "Dharma-Time"), the use of *Dharmakara* ("Dharma-Treasury") as a Buddhist name is well established, occurring (among other places) in the larger *Sukhāvatīvyūha* as the name of the bodhisattva who would eventually become the Buddha Amitābha.

¹³⁶ Huijiao gives an extended account of the activities of this figure, including an often-cited passage relating his criticism of the low level of monastic practice in Luoyang (T2059, 50.324c15-325a6). The Parthian monk Dharmendra receives a much briefer notice (50.325a8-9). An additional translator, An Faxian 安法賢 (Dharmabhadra?) begins to be assigned to the Wei period even later, starting with the *Lidai sanbao ji* (T2034, 49.56c27-57a2).

GUIDE TO EARLY CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

reliable, however—and much depends on the status of a source called the *Weishi lu* 魏世錄 said to have been compiled by Shi Daoliu 釋道流 and completed by Zhu Daozu 竺道祖 around 419 CE¹³⁷—it is noteworthy that both of these figures are credited with producing translations of a type of literature that is completely unattested among the extant works listed above: the list of monastic rules, or *prātimokṣa*, of which Dharmendra is said to have translated the Dharmaguptaka version and Dharmākara that of the Mahāsaṃghikas. In any event their works have not come down to us, for the versions of these texts preserved in the Taishō canon are the work of later translators.¹³⁸

3. THE SHU 蜀 KINGDOM (c. 221-265 CE)

Given the substantial number of texts produced in the Wu kingdom, and the much smaller but still significant number of texts rumored to have been produced under the Wei (according to later sources, at any rate), it is striking that none of the scriptural catalogues mention a single Buddhist translation produced in the southwestern realm of Shu. While noting this absence ONO Genmyō 小野玄妙 cautions against assuming that there were none; as a possible example, he points to the existence of a “Shu *Śūraṅgamasamādhi-sūtra*” (*Shu Shoulengyan jing* 蜀首楞嚴經).¹³⁹ Ono concedes, however, that this could refer either to a text produced during the period of the Shu kingdom or simply to one produced in the territory of Shu, whatever the actual date of the translation. Presumably it could also refer to a recension of a text which—whatever its time and place of composition—had become particularly popular in the Shu region. Thus such references, intriguing as they are, cannot demonstrate that any Buddhist texts were translated in Shu during the Three Kingdoms period. The resounding silence of the catalogues strongly suggests that, whatever the importance of this region as a center of textual production and transmission in later Buddhist history, during the Three Kingdoms period its day had not yet come.

¹³⁷ On this catalogue and three other lost works which recorded the titles of texts circulating in the Wu kingdom, in the Jin 晉 dynasty, and in Gansu, respectively, see Zürcher 1959, p. 338, n. 164 and Pelliot 1923, p. 102 and n. 3. Zürcher points out that Huijiao does not actually cite the *Weishi lu*, but since all the later catalogues do he infers that this may be where the information found in the *Gaoseng zhuan* was obtained.

¹³⁸ For the Mahāsaṃghika *prātimokṣa* see T1426 (attributed to Buddhahadra); for the Dharmaguptaka version see for example T1429 (attributed to Buddhayaśas).

¹³⁹ Ono 1936, p. 43a. Ono does not provide a reference, but presumably he is referring to a text by this title cited by Sengyou (T2145, 55.32b2) and later catalogues. This is not the only such text; another “Shu sūtra” is also registered by Sengyou (55.32a9), bearing the title *Shu Puyao jing* 蜀普耀經. In both cases Sengyou notes that the citations are not from Daoan but from another catalogue (the *Jiulu* 舊錄), while the texts themselves are described as “appearing to have come” from Shu (似蜀土所出).

Part IV

Conclusions

THE MISSING MAJORITY: TEXTS BY UNKNOWN TRANSLATORS

In the preceding sections I have attempted to review of all of the extant Chinese Buddhist scriptures that can be reliably assigned to translators who lived and worked during the Han and Three Kingdoms periods. In general I have included only those texts attributed to translators of these eras by Sengyou (or better still, by Daoan), though I have made occasional exceptions when there is overwhelming evidence of another kind.

But in so doing I have dealt with only a fraction of the translations produced during this period. Many have been lost, of course, but that is not the problem I refer to here. Rather, as noted in the Introduction, it is the fact that during the second and third centuries CE Buddhist scriptures circulating without any mention of the name of the translator were not the exception but the rule. Most scriptures, in other words, were “anonymous translations,” with no preface or colophon to indicate their date or provenance.

The extent to which this was the case is masked, in modern editions of the canon, by the intervention of Fei Changfang, whose sweeping assignment to known translators of scriptures classified by Daoan and Sengyou as anonymous has obscured the identity of the vast majority of these texts. Fortunately, however, two long lists of such anonymous scriptures (失譯經) have been preserved in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, one compiled by Daoan (pp. 55.16c7-18c2) and the other by Sengyou himself (21c10-37b17). Thus it is possible to simply ignore the attributions given in modern printings of the canon and work directly from the lists of anonymous works given by Daoan and Sengyou. Because of the fluidity of titles, though, it is not always a simple matter to collate the names given by Daoan and Sengyou with those found in modern editions of the canon, but even so it is possible to identify dozens of such surviving anonymous texts.

Because Daoan’s catalogue preceded that of Sengyou by more than a century, texts on Daoan’s list of anonymous scriptures have a higher probability than those added by Sengyou of dating from the period with which we are concerned. Some, of course, may be as late as the fourth century CE, but many others are likely to be products of the Han and Three Kingdoms periods. Thus there are many dozens of texts that could—if properly identified—contribute additional information to our knowledge of the form and content of scriptures that were being translated into Chinese at this time.

Not surprisingly, these anonymous scriptures have generally been neglected by scholars,¹ for since they cannot be placed precisely in time or space it is difficult to know

¹ A notable exception is Hayashiya’s extended discussion of this topic, which is an essential starting point for any study of these works (Hayashiya 1941, pp. 452-968). An article by Zürcher (1995) raises a number of interesting points and includes plot summaries of several of these sūtras, but overall it seems to obscure rather than to illuminate the topic by declaring that, of the 142 scriptures listed by Daoan as anonymous, only “a pitiful residue of 17 texts” can still be found in the Taishō canon (p. 163). In fact, as Hayashiya has shown, dozens of others are still extant as well. Zürcher’s exclusion of these

how to use the data they contain. There are, however, at least two ways in which we can attempt to place them somewhat more precisely: first, by identifying citations from these scriptures in early Chinese compositions that can be dated with some precision; and second, by identifying certain sub-groups of texts that share distinctive patterns of usage, i.e., that belong to what I will refer to here as distinct “rhetorical communities.”

Limitations both of space and especially of time (with a looming deadline for the submission of this monograph) preclude an extensive discussion of these topics, so I will simply sketch the outlines of these possibilities here. The texts mentioned below should thus not be construed as representing a comprehensive list, in any sense, of anonymous texts that can be viewed as dating from the second or third century; instead, they constitute only a few representative examples of what such an approach can allow us to find.

Establishing chronology through commentaries

A well-known practice in the field of Indian Buddhism, where finding a citation in an external source of known provenance is often the only way of gaining any concrete information concerning the date of composition of (for example) a given Mahāyāna sūtra, is to make use of commentaries for this purpose. The same thing can be done, however, with early Chinese translations. In cases where a treatise or commentary composed in China can be dated with some degree of assurance, it is then possible in turn to determine that the scriptures cited in that text must have been in circulation prior to its time.

An excellent example of such a text is the interlinear commentary on the *Yinchiu jing* 陰持入經 (T603), a scripture translated by An Shigao as discussed above. The commentary itself (T1694, with the same title as the base-text) is anonymous, but evidence contained in its preface, as well as certain distinctive usages within the text itself, make a third-century date extremely probable.² In addition to its discussion of the *Yinchiu jing* itself, the commentary cites brief passages from more than a dozen scriptures, most of which are cited by name. The majority of these are well-known Eastern Han or Wu-kingdom translations, and none were produced later than the middle of the third century CE.³

additional titles is puzzling; on internal criteria, it would appear that he has removed from the list of extant “anonymous” scriptures all those that have received translator attributions (most of them by Fei Changfang) in subsequent centuries.

² So suggested in Zürcher 1959, p. 54; an extended study is given in Zacchetti (forthcoming).

³ T1694 cites three translations by An Shigao (T13, 602, and 607, in addition of course to T603 which serves as the primary basis of the commentary), six by Zhi Qian (T210, 225, 474, 532, 561, 632), one by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao (T322) and one which is listed as anonymous by Daoan, but is associated with Lokakṣema in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* (T624). Four citations from a commentary on the *Anban shouyi jing* (安般解, cited at 33.11b22, 22a23, 22b22, and 22c29) show promising similarities to material in the newly discovered Kongōji manuscripts (see above, pp. 64–65). Two credited simply to “a sūtra” (15b24 and 22b12) and one credited to “a *gāthā*” (14c9) have not yet been identified.

In two instances, however, the *Yinchiru jing* commentary cites scriptures for which Sengyou's *Chu sanzang jī jī* does not provide a translator's name.⁴ Judging from the context, it would seem highly likely that these, too, are of a similar vintage. The first, cited in the *Yinchiru jing* commentary by the title *Feijiasha jing* 沸迦沙經 "The Pukkusāti Sūtra," corresponds to a text included by Daoan on his list of anonymous scriptures.⁵ In the Taishō edition of the canon this text appears under the following name:

T511: *Pingsha wang wuyuan jing* 萍沙王五願經 "The Sūtra on the Five Wishes of King Bimbisāra"⁶

Though the titles are different, this is unquestionably the same work, for the passage cited in T1694 (33.15a21) does indeed occur in T511 (14.780c21).

The other scripture cited in T1694 for which Sengyou does not provide a translator's name is the *Zhongxin jing* 中心經, a title which does not occur as such in the *Chu sanzang jī jī* but is elsewhere given as a variant of *Zhongxin zhengxing jing* 中心正行經.⁷ With the latter title in mind, we can now see that Sengyou does list a work entitled *Ahan zhengxing jing* 阿含正行經 in his section on "excerpted" or "abbreviated" texts (抄經).⁸ Though no

⁴ A third scripture cited there is the *Liaoben shengsi jing* 了本生死經 (T708), a scripture attributed (mistakenly, it seems) to Zhi Qian by Sengyou, but actually an anonymous Han-period translation (see above, pp. 109-110).

⁵ Cited in the *Chu sanzang jī jī* as 沸迦沙王經, with the variant title 萍沙王五願經 (55.17c27). These are not, as it might initially appear, variant writings of the name of the same figure, but the names of two different kings (萍比沙, var. 萍沙 < Bimbisāra and 沸迦沙, var. 沸迦沙 < Pukkusāti) who appear in the text. The content of the sūtra is in fact a variant of the story of these two kings told by Buddhaghosa in his commentary on the *Dhātuvibhaṅga-sutta* of the *Majjhimanikāya* (MA v.33-63). In light of this relationship it is particularly interesting that Sengyou quotes Daoan as saying that this sūtra is from the *Madhyamāgama*. For Daoan's full list of 142 titles whose translators' names have been lost see 55.16c7-18c2.

⁶ Daoan notes that the sūtra is from the *Madhyamāgama* (55.17c27), and indeed the later Chinese translation of that collection contains a translation based on a different recension of the same text (T26[162], *Fenbie liujie jing* 分別六界經). There is also a corresponding sūtra in the Pāli (MN 140, *Dhātuvibhaṅga-sutta*). The version translated as T511, however, contains additional material not found in either of these counterparts, including Pukkusāti's identity as the former king of Takṣaśīla, his friendship with King Bimbisāra, and above all the Buddha's foreknowledge of Pukkusāti's impending death and his decision to travel to the potter's workshop to preach to Pukkusāti on his last night in this world. For an analogue to this portion of the text we must turn a commentary on the scripture by Buddhaghosa (MA v.33-63). The fact that this material is found in T511, which (whatever its precise date) clearly precedes Buddhaghosa by (fl. fifth century CE) by at least two centuries demonstrates that the commentaries composed by the famous scholar-monk incorporated traditions that were already circulating well before his time. It also demonstrates that material classified as a commentary in one tradition (e.g., that represented by Buddhaghosa) could be incorporated into a sūtra itself in another textual lineage.

⁷ See for example the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu*, T2154, 55.503c8.

⁸ Cited at 55.29b23. For an excellent discussion of the *chaojing* 抄經 category of scriptures see Tokuno 1990, especially pp. 39-40 and 42-43.

scripture titled *Zhongxin jing* appears in the Taishō edition of the canon, a work by this alternate title is found there:

T151: *Ahan zhengxing jing* 阿含正行經 “*Āgama* Scripture on Correct Conduct”
Despite the multiple permutations of the title, there is no question that this is the same text, for all three of the citations from the *Zhongxin jing* given in T1694 (at 33.13c4, 14c16, and 16a24–25) correspond to material found in T151 (at 2.883c14, 883c15 [with some difference in wording], and 883c5, respectively).⁹

In sum, though these scriptures are treated as anonymous in our oldest source, on the basis of their citations in the *Yinchiru jing* commentary it is possible to determine their approximate date, if not their precise provenance. As a result, we can add them to the small number of scriptures that can be attributed with confidence to the second or early third century CE. The careful investigation of other early commentaries and treatises will surely enable us to expand our knowledge of scriptures produced during this period.

Lineages of translation: Tracing “rhetorical communities”

In the discussion above we have observed on numerous occasions that second- and third-century translators borrowed pre-existing vocabulary. It would be difficult—and probably impossible—to find a single translated scripture where the vocabulary pioneered by An Shigao has not made its mark.¹⁰ Other expressions introduced by Lokakṣema, on the one hand, or by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao on the other, have also been passed down from generation to generation, though here we can see the lines of transmission separating into distinct streams, with some translators preferring the transcription terms favored by Lokakṣema, while others adopted the translations coined by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao. The fact that in Zhi Qian’s work we see these streams coming together, in all probability as the result of his own distinctive life history (beginning as a member of Lokakṣema’s school in Luoyang and ending in the Wu kingdom, where the translations of An Shigao and of An Xuan were highly valued), should not obscure the fact that these translation traditions came from distinct sources and did not always interact in this way. In these distinct patterns of usage we can discern what might be thought of as different translation “schools”: that is, we can identify different terminological and stylistic preferences that were characteristic of the distinct Buddhist groups that composed and transmitted them.

⁹ Zürcher (1959, p. 55) identifies the text referred to as 中心經 in T1694 as corresponding to T743 (忠心經). This is indeed another version—that is, a later translation of a different recension—of the same text (though it was not recognized as such by the Taishō editors). The material quoted in T1694, however, corresponds more closely to the content of T151. This eliminates the chronological problem raised by Zürcher (*loc. cit.*), who felt compelled to assign an earlier date to T743 based on its apparent citation in T1694.

¹⁰ There is always the possibility, of course, that some of the terms that appear for the first time in written sources produced by An Shigao were already current as oral expressions.

PART IV: CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Widely shared patterns of usage, such as *se* 色 for *rūpa*, or *pusa* 菩薩 for *bodhisattva*, of *fantian* 梵天 for the *brahmā* heaven—many of which, as noted above, go back to An Shigao—can tell us little about the contours of these communities. Other terms, however, were far more limited in circulation, and these can serve as “tracers,” revealing specific sub-groups of texts with shared patterns of usage.

A good example is what might be called the “Qiuluzi group,” the very small number of scriptures that use the name *Qiuluzi* 秋露子 (var. 鷺鷥子) as a translation of a variant form of the name Śāriputra, i.e., *Śāradvatīputra*, as discussed in an earlier study by Seishi Karashima and myself (Karashima and Nattier, 2005). This is such an unusual translation that it is virtually impossible to imagine that it could have been independently coined more than once; instead, it seems most reasonable to see its presence in these few texts—for it appears in only six translated scriptures in the entire Taishō canon—as an indication of borrowing. But as it turns out, these texts share other common features as well; to mention only a few, all six texts make ample use of the first-person pronoun *wu* 吾, the verb *yue* 曰, and the final-particle *ye* 也. These features may not seem particularly distinctive until we recall that they are entirely absent from the works of An Shigao. *Wu* 吾 is also absent from the core texts of Lokakṣema, and—while frequent in the two “third-tier” texts (T624 and T626) that form a distinctive sub-group in other respects—is almost entirely absent from the second-tier texts associated with his community as well.

Numerous other possibilities for identifying distinct textual groupings can quickly be identified as well. Some are based on vocabulary; for example, one could identify sub-groups which, like the “Qiuluzi group,” share certain very rare expressions, e.g., *Wenwu* 聞物 “Things Heard” for Śrāvastī, or *Jishan* 雞山 “Chicken Mountain” (var. *Yaoshan* 鵠山 “Hawk Mountain”) for *Gṛdhrakūṭa*. It would be extremely hazardous to jump to the conclusion that all such works are by the same translator, but their rarity does suggest that the texts in which we find them are related in some way.

Groupings can also be identified on the basis of form; scriptures in which verses are translated as prose, for example—a feature standard in Lokakṣema’s genuine works—could fruitfully be compared with one another, as could scriptures that contain the unusual style of six-character verse. One could also assemble a list of those scriptures that lack a proper *nidāna*, beginning simply with *Fo zai* 佛在 . . . “The Buddha was at . . .,” as in Lokakṣema’s work. Such shared “translation traditions” hint at the actual transmission of conventions for the production of Buddhist scriptures over time and space, sometimes over far greater distances than one would expect.

A rhetorical community, in sum, need not be an actual community whose members live and work in close proximity. It can also be a “virtual” community, with Dharmarakṣa (for example) being in a certain sense a member of the lineage of Zhi Qian by virtue of the terminological and stylistic features that he borrows, or Kumārajīva as a “dual inheritor” of much of the terminology of Lokakṣema, coupled with the literary flair of the “mature style” of Zhi Qian. The degrees of such affiliation, of course, can vary widely—a translator

GUIDE TO EARLY CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

can borrow a single term, or an entire repertoire of vocabulary as well as style—from another source. Yet all of these are worth documenting if we are to construct a richer history of Chinese Buddhist translation activity.

IN LIEU OF A CONCLUSION

The only conclusion that one can possibly offer to a work of this type is the recognition that it has only scratched the surface. Most of the scriptures discussed above have received little scholarly attention to date; even those that have will continue to reward further study. And with each new finding our picture of the contours of early Chinese translation activity will become more nuanced than before.

For those who are not specialists in Buddhism, much less in the history of Buddhist translations, my hope is that this brief guide will clarify some of the issues involved, prevent wasted efforts due to using false translator attributions, and ultimately allow such scholars to spend more time on their own specialties and less time on the intricacies of Chinese scriptural bibliography. For those who are specialists in Buddhism, it is my hope that this study may stimulate additional interest in scriptures that can be dated to the second and third centuries CE, especially those that have received little attention to date. And finally, for those few hardy souls who share my passion for attempting to wrest the meaning from these often elusive texts, I hope for continued progress in making new discoveries. If this small monograph soon becomes outdated as a result, that is only as it should be.

APPENDIX 1

Index to Translations by Taishō Text Numbers

T1(2)	126n39	T101(27)	51, 131n56, 65
T1(10)	49n63	T105	46, 51 , 68, 69, 69, 70
T1(13)	49n64	T109	46, 51 , 54n92, 68, 70
T5	88n209, 126n39, 127, 127n41, 128, 128n44	T112	46, 50 , 54n97, 99n244
T6	80n188, 88n209, 99n247, 119n25, 122, 126-128 , 147, 147n103	T125(9)	53n89
T7	126n39	T125(40.6)	50n67
T13	25n47, 45, 49 , 69n150, 164n3	T125(27.1)	50n68
T14	45, 46, 49 , 54n97	T144	88n209
T26(10)	50n67	T145	88n209, 128n44
T26(31)	50n68	T150A	45n44, 46, 51n78, 52-53 , 54n97, 64, 68, 69
T26(51)	50n69	T150A(1)	51 , 65, 131n56
T26(85)	50n70	T150A(3)	51 , 131n56
T26(97)	49n64	T150A(30)	53, 57n106, 65
T26(100)	128n46	T150A(31)	51
T26(111)	50n71	T150B	46, 51 , 65, 69
T26(132)	129n49	T151	166
T26(142)	126n39	T152	119n25, 132n58, 134, 144, 151n111, 153, 154
T26(161)	129n51	T154	14, 16
T26(162)	165n6	T169	119n25, 121, 140n79, 142, 147
T26(202)	130n52	T184	80n188, 103, 104-109 , 118, 120, 134, 134n64, 135, 135n65, 152, 153
T27	55 , 55n98, 55n100	T185	104, 107, 108, 108n268, 109, 118, 120, 121, 122, 127n42, 135 , 147, 153
T31	45, 50 , 54n97, 69n151	T186	127n42, 135n65
T32	25n47, 45, 48, 48n60, 50 , 71n157	T188	135, 135n67
T36	45, 50 , 54n97	T196	14, 55n98, 103, 104-109 , 120, 135, 152, 153
T37	50n69	T198	119n23, 121, 134 , 147, 147n103, 151, 151n111
T48	47, 50 , 54n97	T206	151n111, 154
T52	49n64	T210	113-115 , 119n23, 122, 123, 125, 134-135 , 147n103
T54	121, 128-129 , 147	T211	134n63
T55	128n46	T212	134n63
T57	46, 50 , 54n97, 69n151	T213	134n63
T68	121, 124, 129 , 147	T221	97
T69	129n49	T222	8n7, 97n240
T76	121, 129-130 , 131, 147	T223	99
T87	121, 130 , 131, 147	T224	58n109, 75, 75n173, 76, 78, 80 , 81, 83, 85, 85n202, 107, 136n69, 137, 138, 139, 153n118
T88	130n52	T225	89, 107, 121, 136, 136-137 , 138, 139, 147, 153n118, 154, 164n3
T89	130n52		
T97	50n66		
T98	46, 49 , 69n151		
T99(42)	51n75		
T99(784)	50n74		
T101	51n78, 54n97, 66, 67-68 , 67n148, 68, 69		
T101(9)	66, 66n147, 67n148		
T101(10)	66, 66n147, 67n148		
101(11)	65-66		

GUIDE TO EARLY CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

T278	55n98, 138		99n244, 154, 164, 164n3
T279	55n98, 138	T604	56
T280	58-59, 76, 84 , 87, 138, 138n71	T605	46, 53-55 , 68, 69, 70
T281	84n196, 87, 121, 127n41, 137-139 , 147	T606	9, 47n51, 62
T282	39n20, 59, 59n113, 84, 87-88 , 138n71	T607	44n37, 46, 47, 62-63 , 133, 164n3
T283	84, 87-88 , 138n71	T612	66n147
T291	101	T617	72n158
T309	97	T621	15n26
T310(19)	158	T624	75n173, 77, 79, 80n188, 81, 85, 89, 123n34, 164n3, 167
T313	58n110, 75n173, 76, 85-86	T626	75n173, 77, 79, 80n188, 81, 85, 89, 123n34, 151n113, 167
T322	42, 63n133, 92-93 , 99n246, 120, 124n35, 140, 140n81, 145, 147, 150, 152, 154	T630	78n180, 88n208, 95-101, 104, 151
T328	148, 157 , 158, 158n129	T632	83, 86, 88, 119n25, 122, 141, 147, 164n3
T337	55n98, 140n79	T681	55n98
T350	12n20, 75n173, 76, 84 , 84n197, 86, 86n202, 88	T682	55n98
T356	29	T708	109-110 , 112, 122, 148, 165n4
T360	158	T727	57
T361	80n188, 86, 88, 107, 118, 119n25, 139, 140n80, 147, 147n103, 156, 157, 118n21, 131n55, 147n103, 156, 157	T730	127n42
T362	75n173, 84, 86-87 , 89, 107, 121, 131n55, 139, 140n80	T735	51, 51n78, 122, 131-132
T373	118n20, 118n21	T743	166n9
T397	43, 43n34, 56n103	T751A	127n42
T397(13)	56-59 , 68, 69	T784	35
T417	119n25	T790	88n210, 122, 128n48, 133 , 147
T418	39n20, 58n109, 75n173, 77, 79, 81-83 , 86, 103n257, 119n25, 141	T792	46, 53-55 , 68, 69, 70
T419	119n25	T807	75n173, 76, 77, 84 , 86n202
T458	75n173, 77, 80n188, 84 , 85n202, 86	T1011	117n16, 117n17, 122, 140n81, 141-142 , 147
T474	101, 120, 121, 122, 123, 136n68, 139-141 , 142n87, 147	T1012	117n17
T475	100n248	T1013	117n17
T493	121, 127n42, 132 , 147	T1015	117n17
T511	165	T1426	160n138
T525	15n26	T1432	158
T532	119n25, 121, 145 , 147, 150, 150n107, 152n115, 164n3	T1442	59n114
T533	121, 142-143 , 147, 147n103	T1485	127n41, 138
T553	15n26	T1507	129n49
T556	121, 143 , 145, 147	T1508	42, 46, 48, 63-64 , 69, 72n159
T557	121, 124, 143-144 , 147	T1557	46, 63 , 94n226
T558	143-144	T1694	38n13, 47n50, 61, 134n64, 137, 154, 164-166
T559	122, 144-145	T1858	97n237
T561	144-145 , 164n3	T1859	97n238
T581	122, 130-131 , 132n58, 147	T1860	97n238
T602	38n13, 46, 47, 60-61, 64, 71n157, 94n226, 151, 154, 164n3	T2034	14-15 , 29n60, 55n100, 56n102, 63n132, 66n147, 106n262, 106n265, 108, 113n1, 135n67, 158n131, 159n136
T603	14, 46, 47, 61-62 , 64, 69n149,	T2040	127n40
		T2059	13 , 16n27, 17n29, 28n57, 28n58, 36n3, 38n12, 38n13, 38n14, 62n129, 74n169, 78n183, 89n212, 94, 94n229, 96n233, 102n250, 103n255, 105n261, 106n265, 114n2, 116n12, 120n26, 123n33,

APPENDIX I: INDEX BY TAISHŌ TEXT NUMBERS

	149n104, 150n107, 152n114, 152n115, 159n136
T2102	97n236
T2103	145n101
T2121	129n49, 142n86
T2122	94n227, 130n52, 130n54, 133n61, 142n86, 145n99, 154n121
T2123	94n227, 130n54, 145n99
T2128	21n39, 80n187
T2145	9-10, 11-13 , and <i>passim</i>
T2146	13-14 , 106n264, 115n9, 128n48, 143n91, 145n100, 158, 160n138
T2147	15, 115n9, 158n130
T2148	15, 115n9, 158n130
T2149	15, 105, 160n138
T2151	15
T2153	15, 66n146
T2154	15, 66n146, 158n132, 165n7

APPENDIX 2

Index of Sanskrit and Pāli Titles

For convenience of use by those who are not Indologists, the texts given below are listed in order of the Roman alphabet (not in Sanskrit syllabic order).

Pāli titles

- Aṅguttaranikāya (*see also* Ekottarikāgama): 50, 53
 Aṭṭhakavagga (*see also* Arthavargīya): 117, 134
 Brahmāyusutta: 129
 Cūḷadukkhakkhandhasutta: 23, 128
 Dasottarasutta: *see* Daśottarasūtra
 Dhammapada (*see also* Dharmapada): 29, 117, 134
 Dhātuviḥhaṅgasutta: 165n5 and 6
 Dīghanikāya: 41, 126
 Jātaka: 133, 150
 Khuddakanikāya: 134
 Mahādukkhakkhandhasutta: 128
 Mahānidānasutta: *see* Mahānidānasūtra
 Mahāparinibbānasutta (*see also* Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra): 126
 Majjhimanikāya (*see also* Madhyamāgama): 23, 49, 50, 128, 165n5
 Micchattasutta: 50n74
 Nibbedhikasutta: 50n71
 Peṭakopadea: 61, 63
 Raṭṭhapālasutta: 129
 Sabbāsavasutta: 50
 Sacchaviḥhaṅgasutta: 50n68
 Saṃyuttanikāya (*see also* Saṃyuktāgama): 49,
 Visākhāsutta: 130

Sanskrit titles

- Ajātaśatrukaukṛtyavinodanāsūtra: 85
 Akṣobhyavyūha: 85
 Anantamukhanirhāradhārānī: 117nn16 and 17, 252-142
 Arthavargīya (*see also* Aṭṭhakavagga): 134
 Arthavistarasūtra: 49
 Aṣṭasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā: 56n103, 75, 80, 136
 Avatamsaka: *see* Buddhāvataṃsaka
 Buddhāvataṃsaka: 84, 87, 137-139

GUIDE TO EARLY CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

- *Candraprabhabodhisattvasūtra: 142
 Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā: 93n224
 Daśottarasūtra: 49, 69
 Dharmapada (*see also* Dhammapada): 3n1; 26, 82n194, 114
 Dīrghāgama: 49, 56n102, 71n157, 126-128
 Drumakinnararājaparipṛcchāsūtra: 85
 Ekottarikāgama (*see also* Aṅguttaranikāya): 50, 62, 71n153
 Jātaka: 133, 150
 Kāśyapaparivarta: 12n20, 84, 88
 *Kṣemaṅkarasūtra: 142-143
 Madhyamāgama: 49, 50, 128-130, 165n6
 *Mahālalikāparipṛcchāsūtra: 144-145
 Mahānāmasūtra: 129
 Mahānidānasūtra: 49
 Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra: 88n209, 99n247, 123, 127, 129
 Mahāsaṃnipāta: 42-43, 56, 57, 57n105
 Mahāvastu: 84n198
 Mithyātvasūtra: 50
 *Nāgadattāsūtra: 143-144
 Nirvedhikasūtra: 50
 Prajñāpāramitā: 56n103 (Smaller), 8n7 (Larger), 56n103 (general), 97 (Larger)
 Prātimokṣa: 160
 Pratyutpannabuddhasaṃmukhāvasthitasamādhisūtra: 79, 81
 Rāṣṭrapāla-paripṛcchā: 8n7
 Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra: 8n7
 Samādhirājasūtra: 142
 Saṃyuktāgama (*see also* Saṃyuttanikāya): 49, 51, 65-68
 Saptakumārikāvadāna: 143
 Saptasthānasūtra: 52-53
 Sarvāsravasūtra: 50
 Satyavibhaṅgasūtra: 50
 Śikṣāsamuccaya: 93n224
 *Sīmhamatisūtra: 145, 147
 Sukhāvatīvyaḥ (Larger): 12n19, 26n51, 80n188, 86-87, 107, 118, 139, 158, 159
 Sukhāvatīvyaḥ (Smaller): 12n19
 Śūraṅgamasamādhisūtra: 75, 88, 116, 123, 123n34, 157, 160
 Surātasūtra: 157
 Tathāgatajñānamudrāsamādhī: 141
 Udānavarga: 134
 Ugraparipṛcchāsūtra: 90, 92, 92n219, 93, 94, 124n35, 158, 159
 Vimalakīrtinirdeśa: 29, 100n248, 101, 123, 123n34, 139-141
 Vinaya: 158
 Yogācārabhūmi: 9, 38n13, 44n37, 62

APPENDIX 3

Reference List of Han and Three Kingdoms Translations

This section is intended to provide a convenient overview and quick reference guide to those texts that are currently considered to be authentic translations produced during the Han and Three Kingdoms periods. Other texts which seem unlikely to be the work of these translators themselves, but are closely related to his authentic works and appear to be associated with his community, are also included but are categorized separately.

In some cases texts have become jumbled in the course of transmission; thus there is not always a one-to-one correspondence between a text found in the Taishō canon today and the text originally produced by the translator in question. For example, only part of T150A, the *Qi chu san guan jing* 七處三觀經, corresponds to An Shigao's original translation of the *Za jing sishisi bian* 雜經四十四篇; the remainder consists of other materials.

As Zhi Qian is known for having revised the translations of others (in particular, those of Lokakṣema), as well as re-translating other works that were already in circulation, those that are revisions will be marked (R) below.

Readers are encouraged to consult the relevant discussions above, using Appendix 1 to locate these via their Taishō text numbers, for further details.

An Shigao 安世高

1. Core texts

- T13: *Zhang ahan shi bao fa jing* 長阿含十報法經
- T14: *Ren ben yu sheng jing* 人本欲生經
- T31: *Yiqie liu she shou yin jing* 一切流攝守因經
- T32: *Si di jing* 四諦經
- T36: *Benxiang yizhi jing* 本相猗致經
- T48: *Shifa feifa jing* 是法非法經
- T57: *Liu fenbu jing* 漏分布經
- T98: *Pu fa yi jing* 普法義經
- T112: *Ba zheng dao jing* 八正道經
- T150A [part]: *Za jing sishisi bian* 雜經四十四篇 [now embedded within the *Qi chu san guan jing* 七處三觀經]
- T150A(1) and (3), T735C [sic]: *Qi chu san guan jing* 七處三觀經
- T150A(31) and T150B [sic]: *Jiu heng jing* 九橫經
- T603: *Yin chi ru jing* 陰持入經
- T607: *Dao di jing* 道地經
- T1508: *Ahan koujie shi'er yinyuan jing* 阿含口解十二因緣經

T1557: *Apitan wu fa xing jing* 阿毘曇五法行經

NOTE: See also the discussion of newly discovered manuscripts (not included in the Taishō and other transmitted editions of the canon) on pp. 64-65 above.

2. Second-tier texts (probably produced by members of An Shigao's school)

T101: *Za ahan jing* 雜阿含經 (excluding sūtras 9 and 10; see p. 67ff. for details)

3. Associated texts (possibly produced by members of An Shigao's school)

T105: *Wu yin piyu jing* 五陰譬喻經

T109: *Zhuan falun jing* 轉法輪經

T397(13) *Shi fang pusa pin* 十方菩薩品 (var. *Wushi jiaoji jing* 五十校計經)

T605: *Chanxing faxiang jing* 禪行法想經

T792: *Fa shou chen jing* 法受塵經

Lokakṣema 支婁迦讖

1. Core texts

T224: *Daoxing banruo jing* 道行般若經

T418: *Banzhou sanmei jing* 般舟三昧經 [unrevised prose portions only]

2. Second-tier texts (closely related texts, probably from Lokakṣema's school)

T280: *Dousha jing* 兜沙經

T282: *Zhu pusa qiu fo benye jing* 諸菩薩求佛本業經

T283: *Pusa shizhu xingdao pin* 菩薩十住行道品

T350: *Weiyue moni bao jing* 遺曰[<-日]摩尼寶經

T362: *Amituo san'yesanfo saloufotan guodu ren dao jing* 阿彌陀三耶三佛薩樓佛檀過度人道 [with the exception of the "Five Evils" 五惡 section]

T458: *Wenshushili wen pusa shu jing* 文殊師利問菩薩署經

T807: *Neizang bai bao jing* 內藏百寶經

3. Third-tier texts (more distantly related texts, perhaps from his school)

T624: *Dun zhendouluo suowen rulai sanmei jing* 鈍真陀羅所問如來三昧經

T626: *Azheshi wang jing* 阿閼世王經

4. Problematic or revised texts

T313 *Achu foguo jing* 阿閼佛國經

T418: *Banzhou sanmei jing* 般舟三昧經 [verse portions and revised prose]

APPENDIX III: REFERENCE LIST

An Xuan 安玄 and **Yan Fotiao** 嚴佛調

T322: *Fa jing jing* 法鏡經

Zhi Yao 支曜

1. **Core texts**

None [see below]

2. **Problematic texts** (status uncertain; may date from considerably after the Han)

T630: *Chengju guangming dingyi jing* 成具光明定意經

Kang Mengxiang 康孟詳

1. **Core texts** (possibly with some later emendation)

T196: *Zhong benqi jing* 中本起經

2. **Problematic or revised texts**

T184: *Xiuxing benqi jing* 修行本起經

Zhi Qian 支謙

1. **Core texts**

T6: *Banniehuan jing* 般泥洹經 (R)

T54: *Shi Monan ben sizi jing* 釋摩男本四子經

T68: *Laizhabeluo jing* 賴吒和羅經

T76: *Fanmoyu jing* 梵摩渝經

T87: *Zhai jing* 齋經

T169: *Yueming pusa jing* 月明菩薩經

T185: *Taizi ruiying benqi jing* 太子瑞應本起經 (R)

T198: *Yizu jing* 義足經

T210: *Faju jing* 法句經 (R)

T225B: *Da mingdu jing* 大明度經 (chapters 2-30) (R)

T281: *Pusa benye jing* 菩薩本業經 (R)

T361: *Wuliang qingjing pingdengjue jing* 無量清淨平等覺經 (R)

T474: *Weimojie jing* 維摩詰經

T493: *Anan sishi jing* 阿難四事經

T532: *Sihemo jing* 私呵末[<-昧]經 (variant title: *Pusa daodi jing* 菩薩道樹經)

GUIDE TO EARLY CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

- T533: *Chamojie jing* 差摩竭經 (variant title: *Pusa shengdi jing* 菩薩生地經)
- T556: *Qinu jing* 七女經
- T557: *Longshi nü jing* 龍施女經
- T561: *Lao mu jing* 老母經 (R)
- T581: *Bashi jing* 八師經
- T632: *Huiyin sanmei jing* 慧印三昧經 (R)
- T735A: *Siyuan jing* 四願經
- T790: *Bo jing chao* 孝經抄 (R)
- T1011: *Wuliangmen weimi chi jing* 無量門微密持經

2. Texts of uncertain status

- T735B: --- (no separate title; attached to T735A)
- T328: *Xulai jing* 須賴經

Kang Senghui 康僧會

1. Core texts

- T152: *Liudu ji jing* 六度集經

2. Associated texts (texts with which Kang Senghui is likely to have been involved)

- T225A: *Da mingdu jing* 大明度經 (interlinear commentary portion)
- T602: *Anban shouyi jing zhu* 安般守意經注
- T1694: *Yinchiru jing zhu* 陰持入經注

Bo Yan 白延

1. Core texts

None.

2. Texts of uncertain status

- T328: *Xulai jing* 須賴經

Anonymous Translations

For some examples of texts of uncertain authorship which appear to have been produced during the Han and Three Kingdoms periods see above, pp. 109-110 and 165-166.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AKANUMA Chizen 赤沼智善, 1929. *Kanpa shibu shiagon goshōroku* 漢巴四部四阿含互照錄 (*The Comparative Catalogue of Chinese Āgamas and Pāli Nikāyas*). Nagoya: Hajinkaku shobō. Reprinted by Sankibō Busshorin, 1958; Sri Satguru Publications, 1990 (= Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica no. 74).
- ARAMAKI Noritoshi 荒牧典俊, 1971. "Indo Bukkyō kara chūgoku bukkyō e—Anban shui kyō to Kō Sōe - Dōan - Sha Fu jo nado— インド仏教から中国仏教へ—安般守意經と康僧会・道安・謝敷序など—." *Bukkyō shigaku* 仏教史学, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 1-45.
- ASAYAMA Yukihiro 朝山幸彦, 1983. "Shiken no 'yakushutsu no shikata' to denreki 支謙の「訳出の仕方」と伝歴 [The Connection between Zhi Qian's Translation Method and his own Life Experience]." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究, 83 (42, no. 1), pp. 236-242.
- , 1987. "Shiken to Rō-Sō shisō 支謙と老莊思想 [Zhi Qian and Lao-Zhuang thought]." *Indotetsugaku bukkyōgaku / Hokkaido Indotetsugaku bukkyōgakukai* 印度哲学仏教学 / 北海道印度哲学仏教学会 2, pp. 221-230.
- , 1992. "Shiken-yaku butten-gun ni okeru Chūgokuteki hen'yō no imi to kadai 支謙訳大乘経典と大阿彌陀經—その空の考え方をめぐって [Mahāyāna Sūtras Translated into Chinese by Zhi Qian and the *Da Amituo jing*]." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究, 81 (41, no. 1), pp. 51-56.
- , 2000. "Shiken-yaku butten-gun ni okeru Chūgokuteki hen'yō no imi to kadai 支謙訳仏典群における中国の変容の意味と課題 [Sinicization in the Scriptures Translated by Zhi Qian]." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究, 96 (48, no. 2), pp. 64-70.
- Bapat, P. V., 1951. *Arthapada sūtra: spoken by the Buddha, translated by the Upāsaka Che-Kien under the Wu dynasty (222-280 A.D.)*. Santiniketan: Visva-Bharati.
- Bareau, André, 1963-71. *Recherches sur la biographie du Buddha dans les Sūtrapitaka et les Vinayapitaka anciens*. 3 vols. Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Bokenkamp, Stephen R., 1983. "Sources of the *Ling-pao* Scriptures." In Michel Strickmann, ed., *Tantric and Taoist Studies in Honour of R. A. Stein, Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques*, no. 21 (Brussels: Institute Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises), vol. 2, pp. 434-486.
- , 1990. "Stages of Transcendence: The *Bhūmi* Concept in Taoist Scripture." In Robert E. Buswell, Jr., ed., *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press), pp. 119-147.
- Boucher, Daniel J., 1996. "Buddhist Translation Procedures in Third-Century China: A Study of Dharmarakṣa and His Translation Idiom." Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania.
- , 1998. "Gāndhārī and the Early Chinese Buddhist Translations Reconsidered: The Case of the *Saddharma-puṇḍarikasūtra*." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 118, no. 4, pp. 471-506.
- , 2000. "On *Hu* and *Fan* Again: The Transmission of 'Barbarian' Manuscripts to China." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 7-8.

GUIDE TO EARLY CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

- _____, 2006. "Dharmarakṣa and the Transmission of Buddhism to China." *Asia Major*, Third Series, vol. 19, parts 1-2, pp. 13-37.
- Braarvig, Jens, ed., 2000. *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection*, I: *Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. I. Oslo: Hermes Publishing.
- _____, 2002. *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection III, Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. II. Oslo: Hermes Publishing.
- _____, 2006. *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection: Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. III. Oslo: Hermes Publishing.
- Brancaccio, Pia, and Kurt Behrendt, eds., 2006. *Gandhāran Buddhism: Archaeology, Art, Texts*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Brough, John, ed., 1954. "The Language of the Buddhist Sanskrit Texts." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 351-375.
- _____, 1962. *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Chavannes, Édouard, 1909. "Seng-houei." *T'oung-pao*, vol. 10, pp. 199-212.
- _____, 1910. *Cinq cents contes et apologues extraits du Tripiṭaka chinois et traduits en français*. Vol. 1. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
- Ch'en, Kenneth, 1960. "Some Problems in the Translation of the Chinese Buddhist Canon." *Tsing-Hua Journal of Chinese Studies*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 178-188.
- Coblin, W., South, 1983. *A Handbook of Eastern Han Sound Glosses*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.
- Conze, Edward, 1978. *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature*. 2nd ed., rev. and enl. Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica, Series Maior, I. Tokyo: The Reiyukai.
- Cox, Collett, 1995. *Disputed Dharmas: Early Buddhist Theories on Existence, An Annotated Translation of the Section on Factors Dissociated from Thought from Saṅghabhadra's Nyāyānusāra*, Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series XI, Tokyo, The Reiyukai.
- Dantinne, Jean, trans., 1983. *La splendeur de l'Inébranlable (Akṣobhya-vyūha)*. Tome I (Chapitres I-III): *Les auditeurs (śrāvaka)*. Louvain-la-neuve: Institut Orientaliste.
- Dargyay, Lobsang, 1978. *Die Legende von den sieben Prinzessinnen*. Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Vienna.
- DeFrancis, John, 1996. *ABC Chinese-English Dictionary*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- DELEANU Florin デレアヌ フロリン, 1993. "An Shigao 安世高 and the History of the *Anban shouyi jing* 安般守意經." In *Ronsō: Ajia bunka to shisō* 論叢 アジア文化と思想 [*Asian Culture and Thought*], no. 2, pp. 1-47.
- _____, 1997. "A Preliminary Study on An Shigao's 安世高 Translation of the *Yogācārabhūmi* 道地經." In *Journal of the Department of Liberal Arts, Kansai Medical University*, vol. 17, pp. 33-52.
- _____, 2003. "The Newly Found Text of the *An ban shou yi jing* Translated by An Shigao." *Journal of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies*, vol. 6, pp. 170-133 [sic].
- Demiéville, Paul, 1954. "Le Yogācārabhūmi de Saṅgharakṣa." *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 339-436.
- Dietz, Siglinde, 2002. "Fragments of the *Andhasūtra, of the Sūtra on the Three Moral Defects of Devadatta, and of the Kavikumāravadāna." In Jens Braarvig (general ed.), *Manuscripts in*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- the Schøyen Collection III, Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. 2 (Oslo: Hermes Publishing), pp. 25-36.
- DU Jiwen 杜繼文, trans., 1997. *Anban shouyi jing* 安般守意經. Zhongguo Fojiao jingdian baozang jingxuan baihua ban 中國佛教經典寶藏精選白話版, no. 116. Taipei: Foguang wenhua shiye youxian gongsi.
- Durt, Hubert, 1998. "Two interpretations of human-flesh offering: Misdeed or supreme sacrifice." *Journal of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies* (Tokyo), pp. 57-83 [horizontal section], = pp. 236-210 [sic].
- Eberhard, Wolfram, 1977. *A History of China*. Fourth revised edition. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Edgerton, Franklin. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. Vol. 1: Grammar. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.
- FANG Yixin 方一新 and Gao Lieguo 高列過, 2007. "Tì An Shigao yì Fò shuò Bàoji sānměi wénshùshìlì púsa wén fashēn jīng kaobian" 題安世高譯《佛說寶積三昧文殊師利菩薩問法身經》考辨 [A Consideration of the *Fò shuò Bàoji sānměi wénshùshìlì púsa wén fashēn jīng* Attributed to An Shigao]. *Hanyushi yanjiu* 漢語史研究, no. 10, pp. 543-563.
- Forte, Antonino, 1968. "An Shih-kao: biografia e note critiche." *Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli*, vol. 28, pp. 151-194.
- , 1984. "The Activities in China of the Tantric Master Manicintana (Pao-ssu-wei 寶思惟: ?-721 A.D.) from Kashmir and of his Northern Indian Collaborators." *East and West*, n.s. 34: 301-345.
- , 1992. "An Shigao 安世高 and His Descendants." *Bukkyō shigaku kenkyū* 仏教史学研究, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 1-35.
- , 1995. *The Hostage An Shigao and His Offspring*. Italian School of East Asian Studies Occasional Papers 6 (Kyoto).
- FUNAYAMA Tōru 船山徹, 2000. "Ryō no Sōyū-sen Sappata shiji-den to Tōdai bukkyō 梁の僧祐撰『薩婆多師資伝』と唐代仏教 [The Biographies of the Masters and Disciples of the Sarvāstivāda by Sengyou of the Liang and Tang-dynasty Buddhism]." *Tōdai no shūkyō* 唐代の宗教 *Kyōto Daigaku Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyūjo kenkyū hōkoku* 京都大学人文科学研究所研究報告. Kyōto: Hōyū shoten.
- Glass, Andrew, 2006. "Connected Discourses in Gandhāra: A Study, Edition, and Translation of Four Saṃyuktāgama-Type Sūtras from the Senior Collection." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington.
- Gómez, Luis O., 1996. *Land of Bliss: The Paradise of the Buddha of Measureless Light*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Hahn, Michael, 1992. *Haribhatta and Gopadatta*. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- HARADA Hiromichi 原田弘道, 2000. *Hokku kyō* 『法句經』 [Dharmapada]. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan 大蔵出版.
- Harrison, Paul M., 1978. *The Tibetan Text of the Pratyutpanna-Buddha-Saṃmukhāvasthita-Samādhi-Sūtra*. Tokyo: The Reiyukai Library.
- , 1982. "Sanskrit Fragments of a Lokottaravādin Tradition." In L. A. Hercus et al., *Indological and Buddhist Studies: Volume in Honour of Professor J. W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday* (Canberra: Faculty of Asian Studies), pp. 211-234.

- _____, 1987. "Who Gets to Ride in the Great Vehicle? Self-Image and Identity Among the Followers of the Early Mahāyāna." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 67-89.
- _____, 1990. *The Samādhi of Direct Encounter with the Buddhas of the Present*. Tokyo: The International Institute of Buddhist Studies.
- _____, 1992. *Druma-kinnara-rāja-paripṛchā-sūtra: A Critical Edition of the Tibetan Text*. Studia Philologica Buddhica Monograph Series, VII. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- _____, 1993. "The Earliest Chinese Translations of Mahāyāna Buddhist Sūtras: Some Notes on the Works of Lokakṣema." *Buddhist Studies Review*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 135-177.
- _____, 1995. "Searching for the Origins of the Mahāyāna: What Are We Looking For?" *Eastern Buddhist*, n.s., vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 48-69.
- _____, 1997a. "The *Ekottarikāgama* Translations of An Shigao." In Petra Kieffer-Pülz and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, eds., *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday (Indica et Tibetica, vol. 30)*, pp. 261-284.
- _____, 1997b. "Women in the Pure Land: Some Reflections on the Textual Sources." Paper presented at the Chung-Hwa Institute conference on Pure Land Buddhism, Taipei, Taiwan.
- _____, 1998a. *The Pratyutpanna Samādhi Sutra translated by Lokakṣema*. BDK English Tripiṭaka 25-II, pp. 1-116. Berkeley, California: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research.
- _____, 1998b. "Women in the Pure Land: Some Reflections on the Textual Sources." *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 26, pp. 553-572.
- _____, 1999. "On the Authorship of the Oldest Chinese Translation of the *Larger Sukhāvati-vyūha-sūtra*." Unpublished conference paper presented at the International Association of Buddhist Studies meeting, Lausanne, Switzerland.
- _____, 2002. "Another Addition to the An Shigao Corpus? Preliminary Notes on the Early Chinese *Samyuktāgama* Translation." In Sakurabe Ronshu Committee, ed., *Studies in Honour of Dr. Sakurabe Hajime on the Occasion of His Seventy-seventh Birthday* (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten), pp. 1-32 [horizontal section].
- Harrison, Paul, and W. South Coblin, 1999. "The Oldest Buddhist Incantation in Chinese? A Preliminary Study of the Chinese Transcriptions of the Mantra in the *Druma-kinnara-rāja-paripṛchā-sūtra*." In John R. McRae and Jan Nattier, eds., *Collection of Essays 1993 [sic], Buddhism Across Boundaries: Chinese Buddhism and the Western Regions* (Taipei: Foguang Cultural Enterprise Co., Inc.), pp. 137-186.
- Harrison, Paul, and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, 1998. "A Sanskrit Fragment of the *Ajātaśatru-kauṛṭya-vinodanā-sūtra*." In Paul Harrison and Gregory Schopen, eds., *Sūryacandrāya: Essays in Honour of Akira Yuyama On the Occasion of His 65th Birthday, Indica et Tibetica 35* (Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag), pp. 67-86.
- _____, 2000. "Ajātaśatrukauṛṭyavinodanāsūtra." In Jens Braarvig, ed., *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection I: Buddhist Manuscripts*. Volume I (Oslo: Hermes Publishing), pp. 167-216, plus "Addendum: Two Additional Fragments of the Ajātaśatrukauṛṭya-vinodanāsūtra," pp. 301-302.

- _____, 2002. "Another Fragment of the Ajātaśatrukaukṛtyavinodanāsūtra." In Jens Braarvig, ed., *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection III: Buddhist Manuscripts*. Volume II (Oslo: Hermes Publishing), pp. 45-49.
- Harrison, Paul, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, and Kazunobu Matsuda, 2002. "Larger Sukhāvativyūha." In Jens Braarvig, ed., *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection, III: Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. 2 (Oslo: Hermes Publishing), pp. 179-214.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe, 1996. "An Shigao's Translation of the Arthavistarasūtra." Unpublished paper presented at the workshop "The Works of An Shigao," Leiden, 19-20 December.
- HAYASHIYA Tomojirō 林屋友次郎, 1937. "An Seikō yaku no Zō-agon to Zōichi-agon" 安世高訳の雜阿含と増一阿含 [The *Saṃyuktāgama* and the *Ekottarāgama* as Translated by An Shigao]. *Bukkyō kenkyū* 仏教研究 I, 2, pp. 11-50.
- _____, 1941. *Kyōroku kenkyū* 經錄研究. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.
- _____, 1945. *Iyaku kyōrui no kenkyū* 異訳經類の研究. Tōyō Bunko ronsō 東洋文庫論叢, no. 30. Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko kankō 東洋文庫刊行.
- von Hinüber, Oskar, 1989. "Origin and Varieties of Buddhist Sanskrit." In Collette Caillat, ed., *Dialectes dans les littératures Indo-aryennes* (Paris: Collège de France), pp. 341-367.
- _____, 1996. *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hoernle, A. F. Rudolf, 1916. *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan*. London: Oxford University Press.
- HIKITA Hiromichi 引田弘道, trans., 2000. *Hokkukyō* 法句經 [Dharmapada]. Shin kokuyaku daizōkyō, Indo-senjutsu, Hon'en-bu 4 新国訳大蔵經・インド撰述部・本縁部 4. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan.
- Hirai Yūkei 平井有慶, 2002. "Taishi zuiō hongī kyō 太子瑞應本起經." In Hirai Yūkei and Ōminami Ryūshō 大南竜昇, *Taishi zuiō hongī kyō - Busshogyō san* 『太子瑞應本起經一仏所行讃』. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan 大蔵出版.
- HIRAOKA Satoshi 平岡聡, 2007. "Shutsuyōkyō no seiritsu ni kansuru mondai 『出曜經』の成立に関する問題 [Issues concerning the formation of the *Chuyao jing*]." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 55, no. 2, pp. 181-187 (horizontal section).
- HIRAKAWA Akira, ed., 1963. "The Rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism and Its Relationship to the Worship of Stūpas." Translated from the Japanese by Taitetsu Unno. *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Tōyō Bunko*, 22, pp. 57-106.
- _____, 1997. *Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Dictionary* Tokyo: The Reiyukai.
- Hodge, Stephen, 1994. "Considerations on the Dating and Geographical Origins of the *Mahāvairocanaṅghisambodhi-sūtra*." *The Buddhist Forum*, vol. 3, pp. 57-83.
- HU Chirui 胡敕瑞, 2005. "Zhonggu hanyu yuliao jianbie shuyao" 中古漢語語料鑒別述 要. *Hanyu shi xuebao* 漢語史學報, no. 5, pp. 270-279.
- Inagaki, Hisao, 1987. *The Anantamukhanirhāra-dhāraṇī Sūtra and Jñānagarbha's Commentary: A Study and the Tibetan Text*. Kyoto: Nagata bunshōdō.
- INOKUCHI Taijun 井ノ口泰淳, 1980. 西域出土仏典の研究 [A Study on the Buddhist Texts Unearthed at Central Asia, Based upon Chinese Buddhist Texts in the "Archaeological Albums of the Ōtani Collection" (*Saiiki Kōko zufu*, vol. II)]. Kyoto: Ryūkoku University.
- IWAMATSU Asao 岩松浅夫, 1976. "Nehan kyō shōhon no honyakusha—涅槃經小本の翻訳者 [The translator of the "short text" of the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra*]." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度

GUIDE TO EARLY CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

- 学仏教学研究 49 (25, no. 1), pp. 244-247.
- _____, 1985. " 'Tenchūten' kō" 「天中天」考 [An Examination of the Epithet 'Devātideva']. *Tōbō* 東方, 1, pp. 201-219.
- IZUMI Hōkei 泉芳環 2000. "Jōgu kōmyō jōi kyō 成具光明定意經." In Sasaki Takanori 佐々木孝憲, Izumi Hōkei, and Tajima Tokuon 田島徳音, trans. *Kokuyaku issaikyō (Indo senjutsu bu kyōshūbu* 12) 国訳一切經 (印度撰述部 經集部 12) (単行本). Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha.
- de Jong, J. W., 1966. "The Daśottarasūtra." In *Kanakura Hakushi koki kinen: Indogaku bukkuyōgaku ronshū* 金倉博士古希記念：印度学仏教学論集 (Tokyo), pp. 3-25. Reprinted in G. Schopen, ed., *Buddhist Studies by J. W. de Jong* (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1979), pp. 251-273.
- _____, 1968. "Buddha's Word in China." 28th George Ernest Morrison Lecture, Canberra. Reprinted in Gregory Schopen, ed., *Buddhist Studies by J. W. de Jong* (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press), pp. 77-101.
- KAGAWA Takao 香川孝雄, 1984. *Muryōjūkyō no shohon taishō kenkyū* 無量寿經の諸本対照研究 [A Comparative Study of the Texts of the Larger Sukhāvatīvyūha-sūtra]. Kyoto: Nagata Bunshodo.
- KAJIURA Susumu 梶浦晋, 2001. "Kongōji issaikyō to shinshutsu An Seikō yaku butten" 金剛時一切經と新出安世高訳仏典. *Bukkyōgaku seminā* 仏教学セミナー, no. 73, pp. 25-44.
- KAMITSUKA Yoshiko 神塚淑子, Kanno Hiroshi 菅野博史, Sueki Fumihiko 末本文美士, Matsumura Takumi 松村巧, trans.; Enomoto Fumio 榎本文雄 and Hikita Hiromichi 引田弘道, comm., 2001. *Hokku hiyu kyō* 法句譬喻經 [Sūtra on the Parables of Dharma]. 2 vol.; Tokyo: Daizō shuppan.
- KANAOKA Shōkō 金岡照光, 1978. *Bukkyō kanbun no yomikata* 仏教漢文の読み方. Tokyo: Shunjusha.
- KANNO Ryūshō 菅野龍清, 2001. "Ryōdai butten rufu jōkyō no ichi-kōsatsu — *Hongi kyō* rui o chūshin to shite — [An examination of the circumstances of distribution of Buddhist scriptures during the Liang — centering on Jātaka texts —]." *Bukkyō shisō Bukkyō shironshū: Taga Ryūgen Hakushi koki kinen ronshū* 仏教思想仏教史論集：田賀龍彦博士古稀記念論集. Ed. by Taga Ryūgen Hakushi Koki Kinen Ronbunshū Kankōkai 田賀龍彦博士古稀記念論文集刊行会. Tokyo: Sankibō busshorin.
- KARASHIMA Seishi 辛嶋静志, 1992. *The Textual Study of the Chinese Versions of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra in the Light of the Sanskrit and Tibetan Versions*. Tokyo: Sankibo.
- _____, 1996. "On Vernacularisms and Transcriptions in Early Chinese Buddhist Scriptures." *Sino-Platonic Papers*, no. 71, pp. 32-42.
- _____, 1998. *A Glossary of Dharmarakṣa's Translation of the Lotus Sutra*. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica, I. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- _____, 1999a. "Hokekyō no bunkengakuteki kenkyū (2): Kannon 'Avalokita-svara' no gogi kaishaku" 法華經の文献的研究 (2): 観音 'Avalokitasvara' の語義解釈. In *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology*, vol. 2, pp. 39-66.
- _____, 1999b. "Dai Amidakyō yakuchū (1)" 「大阿彌陀經」訳注 (一). *Bukkyō daigaku sōgō kenkyūjō kiyō* 仏教大学総合研究所紀要, no. 6, pp. 135-150.
- _____, trans., 2000. "Jūjōkyō 十上經." In *Gendai yakugo 'Agon kyōten' — Jōagongyō* 現代

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 訳語 『阿含經典』—長阿含經, vol. 3 (Tokyo: Hirakawa Shuppansha), pp. 37-74 (translation) and 157-215 (notes).
- _____, and Jan Nattier, 2005. "Qiuluzi 秋露子, An Early Chinese Name for Śāriputra." *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2004 [ARIRIAB]*, vol. 8, pp. 361-376.
- KATSUZAKI Yūgen 勝崎裕彦, 1985. "Shiken no yakugo no kenkyū — *Daimyōdōkyō* no yakugo bunseki" 支謙の訳語の研究 (一) — 『大明度經』の訳語分析 —. *Taishō daigaku sōgō bukkyō kenkyūjo nenpō* 大正大学総合仏教学研究年報, no. 7, pp. 67-93.
- _____, 1987. "Shiken no yakugo no kenkyū — onshago o megutte" 支謙の訳語について—音写語をめぐって— [On Zhi Qian's translation terminology—concerning transcriptions—]. *Bukkyō bunka kenkyū* 仏教文化研究 32, pp. 179-194.
- _____, 2000. "Shōhonkei hannyakō 'Tennō hon' no kaishaku 「小品系般若經<天王品>の解釈」 [On the Second Chapter 'Śakra-parivarta' in the Smaller Mahāprajñāpāramitā Sūtras]." *Taishō daigaku kenkyū kiyō* 大正大学研究紀要, vol. 85, pp. 1-28.
- KAWANO Satoshi 河野訓, 1989. "Jikuhōgo no kyōten yakushutsu nentō saikō" 竺法護の經典訳出年等再考. *Bukkyō bunka* 仏教文化 vol. 22, pp. 50-54.
- _____, 1991. "Shoki Chūgoku Bukkyō no butsuden o meguru shomondai—*Shugyō hongikyō* ni kanren shite— 初期中国仏教の仏伝をめぐる諸問題—「修行本起經」に関連して— [Problems in the Early Chinese Biographies of the Buddha—Related to the *Xiuxing benqi jing*—]. *Tōyō Bunka Kenkyūjo kiyō* 東洋文化研究所紀要 113:127-176(L).
- _____, 2006. *Shoki kanyaku butten no kenkyū: Jiku Hōgo o chūshin to shite* 初期漢訳仏典の研究: 竺法護を中心として [A study of early Chinese Buddhist translations: Centering on Zhu Fahu]. Ise: Kōgakkan Daigaku Shuppanbu.
- _____, 2007. *Kanyaku butsuden kenkyū* 漢訳仏伝研究: 竺法護を中心として [A study of Chinese Buddha Biographies]. Ise: Kōgakkan Daigaku Shuppanbu.
- KIMURA Kiyotaka 木村清孝, 1984. "Kegon kyōten no seiritsu" 華嚴經典の成立. *Tōyō gakujutsu kenkyū* 東洋学術研究 23:212-231.
- KOBAYASHI Jitsugen 小林實玄, 1958. "Bosatsu hongō kyō no ito—Kegon dai kyō no hensan ni kanshite" 菩薩本業經の意図—華嚴大經の編纂に關して—. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 168-169.
- Lamotte, Étienne, 1965. *La concentration de la marche héroïque (Śūraṅgamasamādhisūtra)*. Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques, vol. XIII. Bruxelles: Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises.
- _____, 1998. *Śūraṅgamasamādhisūtra: The Concentration of Heroic Progress*. Translated from the French by Sara Boin-Webb. London: Curzon Press.
- Lancaster, Lewis R., 1969. "The Chinese Translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñā-pāramitā-sūtra* attributed to Chih Ch'ien 支謙." *Monumenta Serica, Journal of Oriental Studies*, vol. 28, pp. 246-257.
- _____, and Sung-bae Park, eds., 1979. *The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lévi, Sylvain, 1912. "L'*Apramāda-varga*: Étude sur les recensions des *Dharmapadas*." *Journal Asiatique*, dixième série, tome XX, pp. 203-294.
- LIN Min 林敏, 2005. "Shōmyō bosatsu kyō to Hasshikyō ni tsuite 『照明菩薩經』と『八師經』に

- ついて.” *Indogaku bukkuyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 699-701.
- Link, Arthur E., 1957. “Remarks on Shih Seng-yu’s *Ch’u San-tsang chi-chi* as a Source for Hui-chiao’s *Kao-seng chuan* as Evidenced in Two Versions of the Biography of Tao-an.” *Oriens* 10, pp. 292-295.
- , 1976. “Evidence for Doctrinal Continuity of Han Buddhism from the Second through the Fourth Centuries: The Prefaces to An Shih-kao’s *Grand Sūtra on Mindfulness of the Respiration* and K’ang Seng-hui’s Introduction to ‘The Perfection of Dhyaṇa’.” In James B. Parsons, ed., *Papers in Honor of Professor Woodbridge Bingham: A Festschrift for his Seventy-fifth Birthday* (San Francisco: Chinese Materials Center), pp. 55-126.
- MAEDA Egaku 前田慧學, 1964. *Genshi bukkuyō seiten no seiritsushi kenkyū* 原始仏教聖典の成立史研究. Tokyo: Sankibō busshōrin.
- Mair, Victor H., 1994. “Buddhism and the Rise of the Written Vernacular in East Asia: The Making of National Languages.” *Journal of Asian Studies*, vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 707-751.
- , and Tsu-lin Mei, 1991. “The Sanskrit Origins of Recent Style Prosody.” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 375-470.
- MANO Ryūkai 真野龍海, 1992. “Kegon kyō no kyōdai ni tsuite (1)” 華嚴經の経題について (1). *Indogaku bukkuyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 411-403 [sic].
- Maspéro, Henri, 1910. “Le songe et l’ambassade de l’empereur Ming: Étude critique des sources.” *Bulletin de l’École Française d’Extrême-Orient*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 95-130.
- , 1967. *Mélanges posthumes sur les religions et l’histoire de la Chine*, II: *Le Taoïsme*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Matsuda, Yūko, 1988. “Chinese Versions of the Buddha’s Biography.” *Indogaku bukkuyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 489-480 [sic].
- MATSUE Takashi 松江崇, 2005. “Jōko kango ni okeru ninshō daishi no ‘kakkutsusetsu’ o megutte 上古漢語における人称代詞の‘格屈折’をめぐる.” *Tōtetsu* 『饗宴』 13.
- , forthcoming. “Shanggu zhongqi chanmu-xi yiwen daici xitong-zhong jufa fenfu de hufu xianxiang 上古中期禪母系疑問代詞系統中句法分佈的互補現象.” *漢語史學報* 6.
- MATSUURA Tomohisa 松浦友久 1996. “Rhythm in Chinese Classical Poetry: With a Focus on ‘Beat Rhythm’ and ‘Silent Syllables’ (Rhythm Vacuums).” *Acta Asiatica (Bulletin of the Institute of Eastern Culture)*, vol. 70 (Tokyo: The Tōhō Gakkai), pp. 20-36.
- Mittal, Kusum, 1957. *Dogmatische Begriffsreihen im Älteren Buddhismus I. Fragmente des Daśottarasūtra aus zentralasiatischen Sanskrit-handschriften*. Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden, IV. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- MIYAZAKI Tenshō 宮崎展昌, 2007a. “Ajaseōkyō (T626) no kanyaku ni tsuite” 『阿闍世王經』 (T626) の漢訳について. *Indotetsugaku bukkuyōgaku kenkyū* 印度哲学仏教学研究 no. 14, pp. 57-71.
- , 2007b. “Tonshindarashomonnyōraisammaikyō no kanyaku ni tsuite” 『純真陀羅所問如來三昧經』 の漢訳について. *Bukkyō bunka kenkyū ronshū* 仏教文化研究論集, no. 11, pp. 18-39.
- MIZUNO Kōgen 水野弘元, 1953. “Udāna to Hokku ウダーナと法句.” In *Komazawa daigaku gakuhō* 駒沢大学学報, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 3-24.
- MIZUTANI Shinjō 水谷真成, 1961. “Kan’yaku butten ni okeru tokui naru taigū-hyōgen ni

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- tsuite—Yakkyō-goi reishaku no ichi—” 漢譯佛典における特異なる待遇表現について—
譯經語彙零釋之一。 In *Tsukamoto Hakushi shōju kinen bukkō shigaku ronshū* 塚本博士__寿
記念仏教史学論集 [Essays on the History of Buddhism Presented to Professor Zenryū
Tsukamoto on his Retirement from the Research Institute for Humanistic Studies] (Kyoto),
pp. 746-759.
- MOCHIZUKI Ryōkō 望月良晃, 1988. "Daijō bosatsu no shūkyō seikatsu—'Ikuka chōja kyō' no
kōsatsu" 大乘菩薩の宗教性格—郁伽長者經の考察。 In his *Daijō nehangyō no kenkyū—
kyōdanshiteki kōsatsu* (Tokyo: Shunjūsha), pp. 221-350.
- MOCHIZUKI Shinkō 望月信亨, 1932-36. *Mochizuki Bukkyō daijiten* 佛教大辭典. 10 vols. Tokyo:
Seiten kankō kyōkai.
- MORINO Shigeo 森野繁夫, 1983. "Rikuchō yakkyō no gohō to goi" 六朝訳經の語法と語彙。
Tōyō gaku jutsu kenkyū 東洋学術研究, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 66-81.
- MURAKAMI Shinkan 村上真完 and OIKAWA Shinkai 及川真介, trans., 1994. *Ajase-ō kyō - Monjushiri
mon kyō: hoka* 阿闍世王經/校註・文殊師利問經: 他. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan.
- NAITŌ Tatsuo 内藤龍雄, 1958. "Shutsu sanzō ki shū no senshū nenji ni tsuite" 出三藏紀集年次
について。 *Indogaku bukkōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 162-163.
- NAKAJIMA Ryūzō 中島龍蔵, 1997. *Shutsu sanzō kishū jōkan yakuchū* 出三藏記集序卷訳注 [Annotated
Translation of the Prefaces Fascicle of the *Chu sanzang ji ji*]. Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten.
- Nanjio, Bunyiu (= NANJŌ Bun'yū 南條文雄), 1883. *A Catalogue of the Chinese Translation of the
Buddhist Tripitaka*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Nattier, Jan, 1990. "Church Language and Vernacular Language in Central Asian Buddhism."
Numen, vol. 37, pp. 195-219.
- _____, 2000. "The Teaching of Vimalakīrti (*Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*): A Review of Four English
Translations." *Buddhist Literature*, vol. 2, pp. 234-258.
- _____, 2003a. *A Few Good Men: The Bodhisattva Path according to The Inquiry of Ugra
(Ugraparipṛcchā-sūtra)*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- _____, 2003b. "The Ten Epithets of the Buddha in the Translations of Zhi Qian 支謙."
*Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University
for the Academic Year 2002 [ARIRLAB]*, vol. 6, pp. 207-250.
- _____, 2004. "The Twelve Divisions of Scriptures (十二部經) in the Earliest Chinese
Buddhist Translations." *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced
Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2003 [ARIRLAB]*, vol. 7, pp. 167-196.
- _____, 2005. "The Proto-History of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*: The *Pusa benye jing* 菩薩本
業經 and the *Dousha jing* 兜沙經." *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for
Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2004 [ARIRLAB]*, vol. 8, pp.
323-360.
- _____, 2006a. "The Names of Amitābha/Amitāyus in Early Chinese Buddhist Translations
(1)." *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka
University for the Academic Year 2005 [ARIRLAB]*, vol. 9, pp. 183-199 (Tokyo, 2006).
- _____, 2006b. "Masquerading as Transcription: Substitution Terms in Chinese Buddhist
Translations." Paper presented at the International Symposium on Aspects of the Language
of Chinese Buddhist Translations, International Research Center for Advanced Buddhology,
Soka University, Tokyo, Japan, November 2006.

- _____, 2006c. "Re-evaluating the Translations of Zhu Fonian 竺佛念: A Preliminary Report." American Oriental Society, Western Branch, Victoria, B.C., Canada, October 2006.
- _____, 2007a. "The Names of Amitābha/Amitāyus in Early Chinese Buddhist Translations (2)." *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2006* [ARIRLAB], vol. 10, pp. 359-394.
- _____, 2007b. "Brief Communication: A reassessment of the dates and translator attributions of the *Laonüren jing* 老女人經 (T559) and the *Laomu jing* 老母經 (T561)." *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2006* [ARIRLAB], vol. 10, pp. 529-532.
- _____, 2007c. "Indian Antecedents of Huayan Thought: New Light from Chinese Sources." In Imre Hamar, ed., *Reflecting Mirrors: Perspectives on Huayan Buddhism*, Asiatische Forschungen 151 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag), pp. 109-138.
- _____, 2007d. "Avalokiteśvara in Early Chinese Buddhist Translations: A Preliminary Survey." In William Magee and Yi-hsun Huang, eds., *Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara and Modern Society: Proceedings of the Fifth Chung-Hwa International Conference on Buddhism* (Taipei: The Chung-Hwa Institute), pp. 181-212.
- _____, forthcoming. "Who Wrote the *Damingdu jing* 大明度經 (T225)? A Reassessment of the Evidence." Forthcoming in *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*.
- _____, in preparation. *A Glossary of the Fajing jing* 法鏡經 (T322).
- Naymark, Alexandr, 2001. "Sogdiana, Its Christians and Byzantium: A Study of Artistic and Cultural Connections in Late Antiquity and Early Middle Ages." Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University.
- NISHIWAKI Tsuneki 西脇常記, 2007. *Isutanbūru Daigaku Toshokan shozō Torufan shutsudo kango danpen kenkyū* イスタンブール大学図書館所蔵トルファン出土漢語断片研究 [A study of the Chinese fragments from Turfan held by the Istanbul University Library]. Kyoto: Dōshisha Daigaku.
- Norman, K. R., 1980. "The Dialects in Which the Buddha Preached." In Heinz Bechert, ed., *The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition/Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung*, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Dritte Folge, No. 117, pp. 61-77.
- _____, 1983. *Pāli Literature, Including the Canonical Literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of All the Hīnayāna Schools of Buddhism*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- _____, 1997. *A Philological Approach to Buddhism*. The Bukkyō Dendō Kyōkai Lectures 1994. The Buddhist Forum, vol. 5. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- OCHIAI Toshinori 落合後典, 2001. "Yomigaetta Chūgoku bukkō no 'genten': Kongō-ji de hakken sareta An Seikō-yaku *jūni mon kyō* よみがえった中国仏教の〈原典〉—金剛寺で発見された安世高訳『十二問経』 [A reborn "original text" of Chinese Buddhism: The *Twelve Questions Sūtra* translated by An Shigao discovered at Kongō-ji]. *Daihōrin* 大法輪 (March 2001): 132-135.
- _____, 2002. "*Dai anpan kyō* to *Shō anpan kyō* 『大安般経』と『小安般経』 [On the

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Da-anpan-jing* and *Xiao-anpan-jing*.” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 101 (51, no. 1): 31-36.
- , ed., 2004. *Kongoji issaikyō no kisoteki kenkyū to shinsbutsu butten no kenkyū* 金剛寺一切經の基礎的研究と新出仏典の研究. Heisei 12 nendo ~ heisei 15 nendo kagaku kenkyū hihojokin kiban kenkyū (A) • (1) kenkyū seika hōkokusho (kadai bangō 12301001) 平成 12 年度～平成 15 年度科学研究費補助金基盤研究 (A) • (1) 研究成果報告書 (課題番号 12301001),
- ONO Genmyō 小野玄妙, 1933-1936. *Busscho kaisetsu daijiten* 仏書解説大辞典. 12 vols. Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha.
- , 1936. *Busscho kaisetsu daijiten* 仏書解説大辞典. *Bekkan* 別巻 [Supplementary volume]: *Bukkyō kyōten sōron* 仏教經典總論 [A General Study of Buddhist Canonical Literature]. Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha.
- ŌTAKE Susumu, 2007. “On the Origin and Early Development of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*.” In Imre Hamar, ed., *Reflecting Mirrors: Perspectives on Huayan Buddhism*, Asiatische Forschungen 151 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag), pp. 87-107.
- Palumbo, Antonello, 2003. “Dharmarakṣa and Kaṇṭhaka: White Horse Monasteries in Early Medieval China.” In Giovanni Verardi and Silvio Vita, eds., *Buddhist Asia 1: Papers from the First Conference of Buddhist Studies Held in Naples in May 2001* (Università degli Studi di Napoli “L’Orientale”: Centro di Studi sul Buddhismo, 2001), pp. 186-199.
- Park, Jungnok, forthcoming. “A New Attribution of the Authorship of T5 and T6 Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra.” Forthcoming in the *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*.
- Pelliot, Paul, 1923. “La théorie des quatre fils du ciel.” *T’oung Pao*, deuxième série, tome 22, pp. 97-123.
- RONG Xinjiang 荣新江, 1998. “Fu Andun «Zhizi An Shigao ji qi houyi» 富安敦《质子安世高及其后裔》” [review of Antonino Forte’s *The Hostage An Shigao and His Offspring*]. In *Dongxi jiaoliu luntan* 《东西交流论谭》 (1998). Reprinted in RONG Xinjiang, *Zhongguo Zhongguo wailai wenming* 中古中国外来文明 (Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 2001), pp. 427-440.
- Rosenfield, John R., 1967. *Dynastic Arts of the Kushans*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- RUAN Rongchun [GEN Eishun] 阮荣春, 1996. *Bukkyō denrai no michi—Nanpō ruto* 佛教伝来の道—南方ルート [The Route of Transmission of Buddhism—The Southern route]. Kyoto: Yūkonsha.
- SAITO Takanobu 齊藤隆信, 2000. “Shiken to Kumaraju yaku butten ni okeru ge no shiritsu 支謙と鳩摩羅什譯佛典における偈の詩律 [A Study of rhymed *gāthās* translated by Zhi Qian and Kumārajīva].” *Bukkyō shigaku kenkyū* 仏教史学研究, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 70-91.
- , 2001. “Kango butten ni okeru ge no kenkyū 漢語仏典における偈の研究 [A Study of *gāthās* in the Chinese Buddhist Canon].” *Kagawa Takao Hakushi koki kinen ronbunshū: Bukkyōgaku Jōdogaku kenkyū* 香川孝雄古希記念論文集：仏教学浄土学研究, pp. 33-50.
- , 2003. “Kango butten ni okeru ge no kenkyū: Jiku Hōgo yaku Ryūse bosatsu hongī kyō no shiritsu ni tsuite 漢語仏典における偈の研究—竺法護訳『龍施菩薩本起經』の詩律をめぐって [A Study of *gāthās* in the Chinese Buddhist Canon: On the meter in the *Longshi nū pusa benqi jing* translated by Dharmarakṣa].” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学

- 仏教学研究 52, no. 1, pp. 215-219.
- _____, 2004. "Tonkō-bon *Shichinyo kan kyō* to sono ge 敦煌本『七女観経』とその偈 [The Dunhuang text *Seven Women Contemplation Scripture* and its Verses]." *Takahashi Hirotosugu sensei koki kinen ronbunshū: Jōdogaku Bukkyōgaku ronsō* 高橋広次先生古希記念論文集：浄土学仏教学論叢, pp. 461-478.
- _____, 2005. "Kōshutsu Amida-butsu ge ni tsuite 『後出阿弥陀仏偈』について [On the *Houchu Amitufo jie*]." *Jōdoshūgaku kenkyū* 浄土宗学研究 32 (2005): pp. 50-51.
- SAKAINO Kōyō 境野黄洋, 1935. *Shina Bukkyō seishi* 支那仏教精史 [A Spiritual History of Chinese Buddhism]. Reprinted Tokyo: Sankibō busshorin 山喜房仏書林, 1972.
- SAKAMOTO Yukio 坂本幸男, 1933. "Bosatsu hongō kyō to Kegon kyō to no kōshō ni kansuru ichi kōsatsu" 菩薩本業經と華嚴經との交渉に關する一考察. In *Tokwa Hakushi Kanreki kinen bukkyō ronsō* 常盤博士還暦記念仏教論叢 (Tokyo: Kōbundō shobō 弘文堂), pp. 135-149.
- SAKURABE Hajime 桜部建, 1969. "Kegon to iu go ni tsuite" 華嚴と言う語について, *Ōtani gakubō* 大谷学報 181(49-1):26-31.
- _____, trans., 1974. "Ikuka chōja shomongyō" 郁伽長者諸問經. In *Daijō butten* 大乘仏典, vol. 9, *Hōshakubu kyōten* 宝積部經典 (Tokyo: Chūō kōronsha), pp. 231-335.
- _____, 1975. "Hanjuzanmaikyō kanken" 般舟三昧經管見. *Hashimoto Hakushi taikan kinen Bukkyō kenkyū ronshū* 橋本博士退官記念佛教研究論集 (Osaka), pp. 173-180.
- _____, 1981. "Yuishin shisō o motta Hanjuzanmaikyō no issetsu ni tsuite" 唯心思想を盛った般舟三昧經の一節について. *Ōtani gakubō* 大谷学報, vol. 61, no. 3, pp. 1-7.
- Salomon, Richard, 1999. *Ancient Buddhist Scrolls from Gandhāra: The British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments*. Seattle: University of Washington Press/British Library, 1999.
- _____, 2003. "The Senior Manuscripts: Another Collection of Gandharan Buddhist Scrolls." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 123, pp. 73-92.
- SASAKI Shizuka 佐々木閑, 1995. "Daijō bukkyō zaike kigen setsu no mondaiten [Problematic issues in the theory of the lay origins of the Mahāyāna]" 大乘仏教在家起源説の問題点. *Hanazono daigaku bungakubu kenkyū kiyō* 花園大学文学部研究紀要, no. 27, pp. 29-62.
- _____, 1997a. "A Study on the Origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism." A revised English version of Sasaki 1995. *The Eastern Buddhist*, n.s., vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 79-113.
- _____, 1997b. "Oshō to ajari" 和尚と阿闍梨. *Hanazono daigaku bungakubu kenkyū kiyō* 花園大学文学部研究紀要, no. 29, pp. 1-43.
- SATŌ Naomi 佐藤直実, 2002. *Zō-Kan yaku Ashuku bukkoku kyō kenkyū* 藏漢訳『阿閼佉国経』研究 [A Study of the Tibetan and Chinese Translations of the *Akṣobhyavyūha-sūtra*]. Ph.D. dissertation, Kyōto University.
- SATŌ Yoshihiro 佐藤義博, 1994. "Shiken-yaku kyōten no tokuchō ni tsuite—toku ni genshi bukkyō seiten o chūshin ni— 支謙訳經典の特徴について一特に原始仏教聖典を中心に—[On Characteristics of the Chinese Buddhist Canons Translated by Zhi Qian.]" *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 198-202.
- SATOMICHI Norio 里道德雄, 1986a. "Shaku Hōshō-den no kisoteki kenkyū 釈宝唱伝の基礎的研究 [A preliminary study of the biography of Shi Baochang]." *Ōkurayama ronshū* 大倉山論集 (March 1986): pp. 409-441.

- _____, 1986b. "Nanchō sōden no kenkyū (ichi) 南朝三僧伝の研究 (一) [A study of three monastic biographies of the southern dynasties (1)]." *Tōyōgaku kenkyū* 東洋楽研究 (March 1986): pp. 61-102.
- Schlinghoff, Dieter, 1962. *Dogmatische Begriffsreihen im Älteren Buddhismus Ia. Dasottarasūtra IX-X. Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden, IVa*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Schuster, Nancy J., 1976. "The *Ugraparipṛcchā*, the *Mahāratnakūṭasūtra* and Early Mahāyāna Buddhism." 2 vols. Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto.
- SHI Chikai 釋持愷 [= SHYU Ching-mei 徐清梅], 2007. "A Few Good Women: A Study of the *Liu du ji jing* (A Scripture on the Collection of the Six Perfections) from Literary, Artistic, and Thematic Perspectives." Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University.
- SHI Guopu 釋果樸, 1998. *Dunhuang xiejuan P3006, Zhi Qian ben Weimojie jing zhujie kao* 敦煌寫卷P3006支謙本維摩詰經注解考 [An annotation on the Dunhuang Version of P3006 attributed to Zhi Qian]. Taipei: Fagu Culture Press.
- SHIZUTANI Masao 静谷正雄, 1974. *Shoki daijō bukkō no seiritsu katei* 初期大乘仏教の成立過程. Kyoto: Hyakkaen.
- SHYU Ching-mei [= SHI Chikai], 2000. "Zhi Qian's Translation Style: A Study of the Formative Period of Chinese Buddhist Literature." M.A. thesis, Department of Religion, University of Hawai'i.
- Skilling, Peter, 2001. "Relations between Śrāvaka and Vaitulya Sūtra Literature." Unpublished paper presented at the Conference on Early Mahāyāna sponsored by the Buddhist Studies Program, Stanford University, Asilomar, California, May 2001.
- _____, 2004. "Mahāyāna and Bodhisattva: An essay towards historical understanding." In Dans Pakorn Limpunusorn and Chalermpon Iampakdee (eds.), *Phothisatava barami kap sangkhom thai nai sahatsawat mai* [Bodhisattvaparami and Thai Society in the New Millennium]: *Proceedings of a seminar in celebration of the fourth birth cycle of Her Royal Highness Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn held at Thammasat University, 21 January 2546 (2003)* (Bangkok: Thammasat University Press), pp. 139-156.
- Strauch, Ingo, 2007. "The Bajaur Collection: A New Collection of Kharoṣṭhī Manuscripts — A Preliminary Catalogue and Survey —." Online version 1.0, August 2007.
- von Staël-Holstein, Alexander, 1926. *The Kāśyapaparivarta: A Mahāyānasūtra of the Ratnakūṭa Class*. Shanghai: Commercial Press.
- Taishō University, Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature, 2004. *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa: Transliterated Sanskrit Text Collated with Tibetan and Chinese Translations*. Taishō University: Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism.
- TAN Shibao 譚世保, 1991. *Han-Tang fojiao-shi* 汉唐佛教史 [History of Buddhism from Han to Tang]. Guangdong: Zhongshan Daxue chubanshe.
- TANABE Kazuko 田辺和子, trans., 2000. *Hokku hiyu kyō* 法句譬喻經 [Sūtra on the Parables of Dharma]. Shin kokuyaku daizōkyō, Indo-senjutsu, Hon'en-bu 5 新国訳大蔵経・インド撰述部・本縁部 5. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan.
- TANG Yongtong 湯用彤, 1936. "The Editions of the Ssu-shi-erh-chang-jing." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, vol. 1, pp. 147-155.
- _____, 1938. *Han Wei liang jin nanbei chao Fojiao shi* 漢魏兩晉南北朝佛教史 Reprint 1983: Beijing, Zhonghua shuju.

GUIDE TO EARLY CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

- TOKIWA Daijō 常盤大定, 1938. *Gokan yori Sōsei ni itaru yakkyō sōroku* 後漢より宋齊に至る訳経総録. Reprint. Tokyo: Kokusho kankōkai, 1973.
- Tokuno, Kyoko, 1990. "The Evaluation of Indigenous Scriptures in Chinese Buddhist Bibliographical Catalogues." In Robert E. Buswell, Jr., ed., *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press), pp. 31-74.
- TSUKAMOTO Zenryū, 1985. *A History of Early Chinese Buddhism From Its Introduction to the Death of Hui-yüan*. Translated by Leon Hurvitz. Vol. 1. Tokyo: Kodansha International.
- UI Hakuju 宇井伯壽, 1956. *Shaku Dōan kenkyū* 釋道安研究 [A Study of Shi Daoan]. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店.
- , 1971. *Yakukyōshi kenkyū* 訳経史研究. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.
- Utz, David A., 1999. "Arśak, Parthian Buddhists, and 'Iranian' Buddhism." In John R. McRae and Jan Nattier, eds., *Buddhism Across Boundaries: Chinese Buddhism and the Western Regions*, = *Collection of Essays 1993* [sic] (Taipei: Fo Guang Shan Foundation for Buddhist & Culture Education), pp. 421-447.
- Vetter, Tillman, 1994. "Zwei schwierige Stellen im Mahānidānasutta." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasasiens*, Band XXXVIII, pp. 137-160.
- Vetter, Tillman, and Paul Harrison, 1998. "An Shigao's Chinese Translation of the *Saptasthānasūtra*." In Paul Harrison and Gregory Schopen, eds., *Sūryacandrāya: Essays in Honour of Akira Yuyama on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, Indica et Tibetica, 35 (Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag), pp. 197-216.
- Vetter, Tillman, and Stefano Zacchetti, 2004. "On *Jingfa* 經法 in Early Chinese Buddhist Translations." *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2003*, vol. VII [March 2004], pp. 159-166.
- Vorobyeva-Desyatovskaya, M. I., with Seishi KARASHIMA and Noriyuki KUDO, 2002. *The Kāśyapaparivarta: Romanized Text and Facsimiles*. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- Weller, Friedrich, 1968/69. "Kāśyapaparivarta nach der Han-Fassung verdeutscht. In *Buddhist Yearly* (Halle/Saale), pp.; 57-221; reprinted in Wilhelm Rau, ed., *Kleine Schriften / Friedrich Weller* (Stuttgart: Steiner-Verlag-Wiesbaden-GmbH, 1987), vol. 2, pp. 1136-1304.
- Willemen, Charles, 1973. "The Prefaces to the Chinese *Dharmapadas Fa-chü ching* and *Ch'u-yao ching*." *T'oung pao*, vol. 59, pp. 203-219.
- , 1999. *The Scriptural Text: Verses of the Doctrine, with Parables*. = BDK English Tripiṭaka, 10-II. Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research.
- Williams, Paul, and Anthony Tribe, 2000. *Buddhist Thought: A Complete Introduction to the Indian Tradition*. London: Routledge.
- Wright, Arthur, 1954. "Biography and Hagiography: Hui-chiao's *Lives of Eminent Monks*." *Silver Jubilee Volume of the Zinbun-Kagaku-Kenkyūso* (Kyoto: Kyoto University), pp. 383-432.
- Xing, Guang, 2006. "The *Lokānuvartana-sūtra* 佛說內藏百寶經 Taishō No. 807 (T17, 751b12-753c23) Translated into Chinese by Lokakṣema." *Journal of the Centre for Buddhist Studies Sri Lanka*, vol. 4, pp. 312-330.
- YAMABE Nobuyoshi 山部能宜, 1997. "An Shigao as a Precursor of the Yogācāra Tradition: A Preliminary Study." In *Watanabe Takao Kyōju kanreki kinen ronshū: Bukkyō shisō bunkashi*

- ronsō 渡邊隆生教授還暦記念仏教思想文化史論叢 [Buddhist Thought and History of Buddhist Culture: A Collection of Papers in Honor of Professor Watanabe Takao on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday] (Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō), pp. 153-194.
- YUYAMA Akira 湯山明, 2003. "Introducing Three Recent Japanese Publications on the Dharmapada Literature in Chinese." *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2002* [ARIRLAB], vol. 6, p. 340.
- Zacchetti, Stefano, 1997. "Un problema di critica testuale ne *Foshuo zhuan falun jing* (T109) attribuito ad An Shigao." *Annali di Ca' Foscari, Rivista della Facoltà di Lingue e Letterature Straniere dell'Università di Venezia*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 381-395.
- _____, 2002a. "An early Chinese translation corresponding to Chapter 6 of the *Petakopadesa*. An Shigao's *Yin chi ru jing* T 603 and its Indian original: a preliminary survey." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, vol. 65, no. 1, pp. 74-98.
- _____, 2002b. "Brief Communication: On the Authenticity of the Kongōji manuscript of An Shigao's *Anban Shouyi jing* 安般守意經." *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2001*, vol. 5, pp. 157-158.
- _____, 2003. "The Rediscovery of Three Early Buddhist Scriptures on Meditation: A Preliminary Analysis of the *Fo shuo shi'er men jing*, the *Fo shuo jie shi'er men jing* Translated by An Shigao and Their Commentary Preserved in the Newly Found Kongō-ji Manuscript." *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2002*, vol. 6 [March 2003], pp. 251-299.
- _____, 2004a. "Teaching Buddhism in Han China: A Study of the *Ahan koujie shi'er yinyuan jing* T 1508 Attributed to An Shigao." *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2003*, vol. VII, pp. 197-224.
- _____, 2004b. "An Shigao's Texts Preserved in the Newly Discovered Kongō-ji Manuscript and Their Significance for the Study of Early Chinese Buddhism." *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 898-895 [sic].
- _____, 2004c. "The Scripture on the Twelve Gates Preached by the Buddha (Kongō-ji Ms A 金剛寺本—甲本, ll. 283-364)." In OCHIAI Toshinori 落合後典, ed., *Kongoji isai kyō no kisoteki kenkyū to shinshutsu batten no kenkyū* 金剛寺一切經の基礎的研究と新出仏典の研究. Heisei 12 nendo ~ heisei 15 nendo kagaku kenkyū hihojokin kiban kenkyū (A) • (1) kenkyū seika hōkokusho (kadai bangō 12301001) 平成12年度～平成15年度科学研究費補助金基盤研究 (A) • (1) 研究成果報告書 (課題番号 12301001), pp. 238-231.
- _____, 2005. *In Praise of the Light: A Critical Synoptic Edition with an Annotated Translation of Chapters 1-3 of Dharmarakṣa's Guang zan jing* 光讚經, *Being the Earliest Chinese Translation of the Larger Prajñāpāramitā*. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica VIII. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- _____, 2007a. "Inventing a New Idiom: Some Aspects of the Language of the *Yin chi ru jing* 陰持入經 T 603 Translated by An Shigao." *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2006* [ARIRLAB], vol. 10, pp. 395-416.
- _____, 2007b. "Translation or Commentary? On the Nature of the *Da Anban Shouyi*

GUIDE TO EARLY CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

- jing* (大安般守意經) T 602." Unpublished paper presented at the Symposium on Early Chinese Buddhist Translations (Institute for the Cultural and Intellectual History of Asia at the Austrian Academy of Sciences), Vienna, April 18-21, 2007.
- _____, 2007c. "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." Unpublished paper presented at the Beijing Forum, November 2-5, 2007.
- _____, forthcoming. "Some Remarks on the Authorship and Chronology of the *Yin chi ru jing zhu* 陰持入經注 T1694: The Second Phase in the Development of Chinese Buddhist Exegetical Literature." In Mauro Maggi and Silvio Vita (eds.), *Buddhist Asia 2. Papers from the Second Conference of Buddhist Studies Held in Naples in June 2004* (Università di Napoli "L'Orientale". Centro di Studi sul Buddhismo), Italian School of East Asian Studies, Kyoto.
- ZHU Qingzhi 朱慶之, 1992. *Fodian yu zhonggubanyu cihui yanjiu* 佛典與中古漢語詞彙研究. Taipei: Wenjin chubanshe.
- Zürcher, Erik, 1959. *The Buddhist Conquest of China*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- _____, 1977. "Late Han Vernacular Elements in the Earliest Buddhist Translations." *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 177-203.
- _____, trans., 1978. *Het leven van de Boeddha Xiuxing Benqijing & Zhong Benqijing Vertaald uit de vroegste Chinese overlevering*. Amsterdam: Meulenhoff.
- _____, 1980. "Buddhist Influence on Early Taoism." *T'oung Pao*, vol. 66, nos. 1-3, pp. 84-147.
- _____, 1991. "A New Look at the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Texts." In Koichi Shinohara and Gregory Schopen, eds., *From Benares to Beijing: Essays on Buddhism and Chinese Religion* (Oakville: Mosaic Press), pp. 277-304.
- _____, 1995. "Obscure Texts on Favorite Topics: Dao'an's *Anonymous Scriptures*." In Helwig Schmidt-Glintzer, ed., *Das andere China: Festschrift für Wolfgang Bauer zum 65. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- _____, 1996. "Vernacular Elements in Early Buddhist Texts: An Attempt to Define the Optimal Source Materials." *Sino-Platonic Papers*, no. 71, pp. 1-31.