

JIABS

Journal of the International
Association of Buddhist Studies



Volume 29 Number 1 2006 (2008)

The *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* (ISSN 0193-600XX) is the organ of the International Association of Buddhist Studies, Inc. It welcomes scholarly contributions pertaining to all facets of Buddhist Studies. JIABS is published twice yearly, in the summer and winter.

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

Address books for review to:
JIABS Editors, Institut für Kultur - und Geistesgeschichte Asiens, Prinz-Eugen-Strasse 8-10, AT-1040 Wien, AUSTRIA

Address subscription orders and dues, changes of address, and business correspondence (including advertising orders) to:
Dr Jérôme Ducor, IABS Treasurer
Dept of Oriental Languages and Cultures
Anthropole
University of Lausanne
CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland
email: iabs.treasurer@unil.ch
Web: www.iabsinfo.net
Fax: +41 21 692 30 45

Subscriptions to JIABS are USD 40 per year for individuals and USD 70 per year for libraries and other institutions. For informations on membership in IABS, see back cover.

Cover: Cristina Scherrer-Schaub

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

© Copyright 2008 by the International Association of Buddhist Studies, Inc.

Print: Ferdinand Berger & Söhne GesmbH, A-3580 Horn

EDITORIAL BOARD

KELLNER Birgit
KRASSER Helmut
Joint Editors

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

JIABS

Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies

Volume 29 Number 1 2006 (2008)

Jikido TAKASAKI,

Between translation and interpretation – Cases in the Chinese Tripiṭaka – (Presidential address at the XIVth Conference of the International Association of Buddhist Studies, London, August 29 – September 3, 2005) 3

•

Ben BROSE

Crossing thousands of Li of waves: The return of China's lost Tiantai texts 21

William CHU

Syncretism reconsidered: The Four Eminent Monks and their syncretistic styles 43

Johan ELVERSKOG

The Mongolian Big Dipper Sūtra 87

Juhyung RHI

Fasting Buddhas, Lalitavistara, and Karuṇāpuṇḍarīka 125

Martin SEEGER

The Bhikkhunī-ordination controversy in Thailand 155

•

Notes on the contributors 185

BETWEEN TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION
– CASES IN THE CHINESE TRIPITAKA –

(Presidential address at the XIVth Conference of the International Association
of Buddhist Studies, London, August 29 – September 3, 2005)

JKIDO TAKASAKI, THE PRESIDENT

My colleagues, ladies and gentlemen,

It is a great honour and pleasure for me to deliver an address here in my capacity as the president of the IABS.

At the same time, however, I am afraid that my address is unworthy of the title given here, as I could not prepare sufficient materials in advance. I gave here the title “Between Translation and Interpretation” aiming to clarify the characteristics of the Chinese translations of Buddhist texts as far as known to me in the course of my research on them. My choice of this title was rather tentatively made. When requested from the IABS office to present this address, I was engaged in translating the *Bussho-ron* (*Fo-hsing-lun* 佛性論 **Buddhadhātu-śāstra*) into Japanese. (To this ‘Japanese translation,’ I will refer later.) As I had trouble understanding the text when its Sanskrit counterparts couldn’t be found, I felt it necessary to find rules for translating Indian texts into Chinese. In any case I immediately announced the address title in reply to the office without due consideration and preparation. So the materials I’m going to use are limited to the *Fo-hsing-lun* and some other texts translated by Paramārtha.

Before entering the main subject, I would like to refer to the two groups of scholars who are currently doing research on the Sanskrit and Indian Buddhist manuscripts newly discovered in Central Asia (Afghanistan) and in Tibet, respectively.

The first group consists of those scholars who are working on the Buddhist manuscripts in the so-called Schøyen Collection. The collection contains about 10,000 Buddhist manuscripts, mostly discov-

ered at the Bamiyan caves in Afghanistan. They were sent to London via Pakistan and appeared on the antiquities market in 1996. This information soon reached scholars at the IABS conference held in Leiden, after most of the manuscripts had been purchased by the wealthy Norwegian collector Mr. Martin Schøyen. Prof. Kazunobu Matsuda, together with Prof. Jens Braarvig, University of Oslo, asked for Mr. Schøyen's permission to do research on the collection's manuscripts, finally receiving his permission and starting the work in November 1997 with a project group of scholars including Prof. Matsuda, lead by Prof. Braarvig.

So far the group has published two large volumes as the result of their research, with the title: BUDDHIST MANUSCRIPTS IN THE SCHØYEN COLLECTION I (Oslo, 2000), & II (2002).

Prof. Matsuda has told me that the third volume will appear soon and that as the number of manuscripts studied so far is only ten percent of the collection, the group members will be able to enjoy the continued research for ten more years.

There is no need to explain the significance of the collection, which contains materials of the Sectarian Buddhism as well as Mahāyāna scripts. I greatly admire the efforts of the group and expect further fruitful research results for Buddhist studies internationally.

The second group of scholars I wish to refer to here is affiliated to the Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism at Taisho University, Tokyo. They have conducted research for more than a decade on the Buddhist manuscripts preserved by several organizations in the People's Republic of China, the first result of their work having been published in 1994 as the "Facsimile Edition of the *Śrāvaka-bhūmi* Sanskrit Palm-leaf Manuscript."

In the ensuing years, the group, lead by Prof. Y. Matsunami, further approached the Chinese government, including the Administrative Department of the Potala Palace, requesting permission to allow them access to the Buddhist Sanskrit manuscripts kept there. They finally received permission in 1997. After two years of research in other palaces in Lhasa, they were allowed to enter the Potala Palace,

which is said to hold about one hundred bundles of manuscripts of Buddhist Sanskrit scriptures.

On July 30, 1999, Prof. Hisao Takahashi, a member of the group, came across a manuscript on which he found the title *Jñānālokā-
laṃkāra*. As it intrigued him, he took a closer look at the bundle and found that it contained complete versions of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* (VKN) and the *Jñānālokālaṃkāra* (JAA), both very important Mahāyāna scriptures. He told his colleagues that his finding was made purely by chance, but Prof. Matsunami called it ‘serendipity’, using the word coined by Horace Walpole.

They decided to work first on these two scriptures, completing the transliteration of the texts into Roman script and preparing the following volumes:

VIMALAKĪRTINIRDEŚA, Transliterated Sanskrit Text Collated with Tibetan and Chinese Translations

JÑĀNĀLOKĀLAṂKĀRA, Transliterated Sanskrit Text Collated with Tibetan and Chinese Translations and with an Introduction to VKN and JAA

Both were edited by the group mentioned above and published together as a set by the Taisho University Press, Tokyo, in 2004.

The significance of this finding is somehow different, I think, from the Buddhist manuscripts from the Bamiyan caves. In the case of the Bamiyan manuscripts, they were excavated from the ruins of Buddhist temples where monks once lived and perhaps recited and wrote scriptures. That is to say, the excavated manuscripts are simply the scriptures that were used there on a daily basis. By contrast, in the Tibetan case, the manuscripts found by the Taishō group had been stored in a temple as sacred treasures, probably worshiped daily, but not recited at all. Rather they were kept in secret, no one being allowed to see them. (Their existence had been revealed to foreigners who had visited Lhasa earlier, such as Rev. E. Kawaguchi, but the Dalai Lama never gave permission for them to be seen. Remember that this time permission was given by an administrative authority, not by the Dalai Lama!)

But why were these manuscripts stored secretly? They are no doubt the scriptures (*sūtras*, *vinayas*, and *śāstras*) that were used as

the source texts for the Tibetan translations. After the translations were completed, the Sanskrit manuscripts became of no use and were kept in a storehouse. In their place, the scriptures that had been translated into Tibetan must have been used to recite, read and interpret the Buddhist doctrines. We can expect many more manuscripts to be 'found' in Tibetan monasteries, considering great numbers of scriptures contained in the Tibetan Tripiṭaka!

How, then, was the case in China, where another big collection of Buddhist scriptures exists, namely the Chinese Tripiṭaka, the Buddhist Tripiṭaka in Chinese translation. So far we haven't heard that Sanskrit manuscripts have been found anywhere in China. This may be another problem to be dealt with in relation to our main subject.

The Dharma should be taught in a vernacular language

Asking disciples to propagate his *dhamma*, the Buddha told them: may it be that the *dhamma* be taught in the vernacular language of the respective land.

Following this principle, disciples scattered all over India to teach the *dhamma*. One of these groups settled perhaps in the Magadha area, later collecting their *dhamma* as taught in the Magadhyan vernacular, Pāli or the Holy Words, and still later (?) writing it down. Thus was the genesis of the Pāli Tipiṭaka. And once its authority was established, this Tipiṭaka remained basically unchanged, spreading all over India along with the order, which regarded this Tipiṭaka as sacred. Finally, it spread via Sri Lanka or Siṃhala outside of India, reaching the Southeast Asian countries of Thailand, Cambodia, Burma and others, where it is still used today. Here it should be noted that in these countries the Pāli Tipiṭaka is used untranslated, being only transcribed into the respective script.

Other groups moved towards north-western India, e.g., the Gandhāra area, establishing orders there and compiling their sacred texts in Gandhārī. However, they later changed their principles and changed their sacred language to Sanskrit, retaining certain vernacular elements peculiar to Buddhism. We now call this Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit. It was used by the orders of the Sectarial Buddhism and also by a new group who called themselves Mahāyāna.

The groups in north-western India also spread their power outside of India, but the transmitted scriptures remained the same since the areas being reached could be termed a part of the Indian cultural sphere, where Indian languages, primarily Sanskrit, were commonly used or at least culturally understood. Bamiyan is located within this area. The common language of Buddhist texts gradually changed to Sanskrit, in accordance with the so-called Sanskritization of Indian society after the unification of India by the Gupta Dynasty.

For the further propagation of Buddhism beyond the Indian cultural sphere, however, the scriptures had to be translated into the languages of respective areas. This corresponded well to the principle laid down by the Buddha. There may be cases of their translation into languages of Western countries in the ancient period, but as far as we know, the only important case in ancient days (apart from the later Tibetan translation) was the advance of Buddhism into the Chinese cultural sphere. This was accompanied by the translation of the scriptures into Chinese, beginning in the first century A.D., five hundred years after Buddha's Mahāparinirvāṇa.

Now I should return to today's main theme, the problems of the Chinese translation.

Characteristics of the Chinese letters or characters

First of all, we must recognize that the Chinese language is an isolating language, that is to say, it has no inflections as in the Indo-European languages nor does it have postpositions as in Tibetan and Japanese. Moreover, Chinese characters are usually classified as ideograms or ideographs, resulting in each character having a meaning independent of its pronunciation. In other words, a change of pronunciation does not affect its meaning. These characteristics caused various problems in the translation of Buddhist texts.

Translation of the Buddhist concepts and idioms

To begin with, I will offer the term *triratna*, i.e., Buddha, Dharma, and Saṅgha, as an example (see Table no. 1).

The term ‘*buddha*’ was quite a new concept for the Chinese. They provisionally accepted it with transliterations, such as *futo* (*fu-t’u* 浮圖) *butsuda* (*fo-t’o* 佛陀) or *butsu* (*fo* 佛), finally settling on the latter, *butsu* (*fo* 佛), for *buddha*, just as the Sanskrit word *buddha* is commonly used in modern Western languages. The Chinese grasped the term’s meaning quite well and translated it with *kakusha* (*chueh-che* or *chiao-che* 覺者), “the awakened one.” Interesting is the Chinese character they selected. The character *butsu* (*fo*) consists of two parts, *nin* (*jen*), a sign for a human being, and *pu* (*fu*), a sign of negation (弗). The original meaning was a human being whose appearance or features are vague or unclear. It was applied to the Buddha, probably because he is a human being, but, at the same time in a common sense, is not. The wit and originality of the Chinese as shown here is particularly appealing.

The term *butsu* (*fo*) came to be well adapted in the Chinese context, and is widely used not only for denoting the Buddha himself, but also as an adjective for things and concepts concerning Buddhism, just like the Western term ‘Buddhist’ (e.g., *bukkyō* (*fo-chiao*, 佛教) for ‘Buddhist teaching’ (**buddha-sāsana*, *dharma*).

The second term, ‘*dharma*,’ was translated with *ho* (*fa* 法), except when used as a part of proper names, e.g., Bodhidharma (菩提達磨). The Chinese gave the Sanskrit word *dharma* an exactly identified meaning, namely “a principle rule to be followed.” Once established, they applied the same term *ho* (*fa*) to various other cases, in spite of the difference of meaning (e.g., *buppo*, *fu-fa* 佛法 for *buddha-dharma*, “Buddha’s teaching”; *shohomuga*, *chu-fa-wu-wo* 諸法無我 for “all phenomena are without a self”). This introduced another problem for understanding Buddhism in its Chinese translation.

The third term, ‘*saṅgha*,’ was first transliterated, like *buddha*, by two characters, *so* (*seng* 僧) and *ga* (*chia* 伽), both newly created characters for transliterating Sanskrit words. The term’s meaning was interpreted as a group of people (*shu*, *chung* 衆) assembled with the purpose of attending the Buddha’s teaching, but in the end the Chinese settled on another way of transliterating *saṅgha*, namely by abridging it to the first character *so* (*seng* 僧). Although it started as a collective noun, soon it came to mean the individual monks who

belong to the *saṅgha*, except when indicating the third part of the *triratna*.

Next I will refer to some idiomatic expressions or stock phrases used in the Buddhist scriptures. As one example, let me examine the beginning portion of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* (see Table no. 2).

*evam mayā śrutam / ekasmin samaye bhagavān Rājagṛhe viharati sma
Gṛdhrakūṭe parvate mahatā bhikṣusaṅghena sārddham dvādaśabhir bhikṣu-
śataih sarvaiḥ –* (Saddharmapuṇḍarīka)

如是我聞。一時佛住王舍城耆闍崛山中。與大比丘眾萬二千人俱。皆是阿
羅漢。 (羅什訳『妙法華』)

For the first sentence, Kumārajīva shows the commonly accepted formulation, which follows the Sanskrit wording (*ju shih* for *evam*, *wo* for *mayā*, and *wen* for *śrutam*), while Dharmapāla omits the term for *mayā*. This omission is said to be true to the Buddhist doctrine of *anātman*, no-self. However, if a word denoting the first person were put at the beginning, Dharmapāla's translation would show the natural style of a Chinese sentence. It is said that Kumārajīva finally fixed the present wording.

As for the second long sentence, both translations are quite literal, showing a correct meaning in accordance with the original.

The point of the sentence is found in the phrase '*yo dai-bi-ku-shu gu (yu ta-pi-ch'iu chung chu,*' 與大比丘眾俱) in Dharmapāla's translation, which is equivalent to the Sanskrit '*mahatā bhikṣusaṅghena sārddham.*' (The character *chu* 俱 is, together with the character *yu* 與 functioning in the instrumental case, equivalent to the Sanskrit *sārddham* in the sense of 'together with' or 'accompanied by.')

In the Sanskrit original, following the phrase mentioned above are terms that explain the number and qualifications of the monks who are part of the *saṅgha*. These terms are all in the instrumental case ending. Dharmapāla's translation follows the meaning of the terms faithfully, but does not show the case. Thus it would be possible to read this portion as a separate sentence, with *bi ku sen ni hyaku (pi-ch'iu tsien er po* 比丘千二百) as the subject, although an inconspicuous one.

Kumārajīva, however, through his own ingenuity, rearranges the first group of terms explaining the number of *bhikṣus* (which he carelessly miscounts) within the phrase. Ending the sentence after the phrase, he starts a new sentence explaining the qualifications of the *bhikṣu* with the heading *kai ze* (*chieh shih*, 皆是) ‘all of them are’ (*’i-ts’i* 一切 in Dharmapāla’s tr.). This expression was quite comfortable and understandable for the Chinese, and after Kumārajīva, this stock phrase became established by Buddhist translators.

Additional interpretation and insertion of commentary words – Cases in Paramārtha’s translation

When any language tries to accept a foreign language in translation, it may need certain explanations in addition to the direct, literal translation. In Chinese Buddhist translations, too, we observe many cases of explanations that were provided especially for Chinese readers. Particular to Paramārtha’s translation are his insertions of sentences explaining his own doctrinal interpretation as well as quotations from other texts to support this interpretation.

Triṣṭakācārya Paramārtha, Chen-ti (Shindai 眞諦) in Chinese translation, was a Yogācāra-vijñānavādin active in the fifth to sixth century AD who contributed to the transmission of many texts of the Yogācāra school, including the *Mahāyānasaṅgraha* of Asaṅga and others.

In his translation of Vasubandhu’s (Shih-chin/Seshin 世親) commentary on the *Mahāyānasaṅgraha*, it is well known that at some places he added interpretations that are not found in other translations such as that of Hsüan tsang. I myself have established that these inserted sentences are basically identical with sentences found in the *Ratnagotravibhāga*, an important basic text for understanding the Tathāgatagarbha doctrine. I thus realized that Paramārtha was a Tathāgatagarbhavādin who wished to combine the Tathāgatagarbhavāda with the Vijñānavāda. I will quote here one or two examples of his interpretation.

1. About ‘*anādikāliko dhātuḥ*’ (see Table no. 3)

This famous verse of the so-called *Abhidharma-Mahāyāna-Sūtra*, of which the Sanskrit original is attested in the *Ratnagoṭravibhāga* (RGV) and Sthiramati’s commentary on the *Vijñaptimātratā-Trimśikā*, is quoted in the *Mahāyānasaṅgraha* (MS) as the proof for the existence of *ālaya-vijñāna*, which is the basis for objects to be known (*ouchi-eji/ying chih i chih* 應知依止). It is indicated here in terms of ‘*anādikāliko dhātuḥ*’ (the basis without beginning). While the RGV quotes it as the proof for the ‘*tathāgatagarbha*’ serving as the basis, Paramārtha adopted the interpretation of the MS, developing his unique doctrine of the *ādhānavijñāna*.

Now the first question is how to read the sentence *kai i-ge wi-sho* (*chieh i-chieh wei-hsing* 界以解爲性). This sentence, stating that A *i* B *wei* C, is to be read: A with B constitutes its C, i.e., A’s C is B. Thus C, the nature (*hsing*) of A, ‘*dhātu*’ (*kai, chieh* 界), is B, ‘*ge*’ (*chieh* 解) (understanding, interpretation). Thus traditionally this nature was called ‘understanding nature’ (*ge-sho/chieh-hsing* 解性), but its actual meaning is quite uncertain. According to other translations of equivalent passages as well as in Paramārtha’s second interpretation, the term ‘*dhātu*’ is explained as ‘*hetu*’ (cause) (see Table no. 3,1). I wish to suggest the following manner to read the sentence in question: “‘*dhātu*’ should be understood as nature (*svabhāva* (*hsing/sho* 性) (the nature of the Buddha, as well as of *sarvasattvas*).” (It is equivalent to the first meaning, ‘*t’i-lui*’ (體類), of the five meanings next listed by Paramārtha.)

Another point that I wish to mention here is his clear and literal translation appearing in the quotation of a passage from the *Śrīmālā-sūtra* (no. 3 in Table no. 3). The quotation is used as proof for the phrase ‘*sarvadharmasamāśrayaḥ*.’ In comparison to the RGV translation, one sees that Paramārtha’s translation is far more understandable and doctrinally correct (especially noteworthy is the translation of the term ‘*amuktajñā*’ or ‘*amuktajñāna*’ as an adjective of *asaṃskṛta-dharma*; a comparison with the translation of the *Śrīmālā-sūtra* is also worthwhile).

According to Paramārtha’s translation, the meaning of this passage can be understood as follows:

As is said in the scripture:

O Lord, this nature of consciousness (*shiki-kai* 識界) is the basis (*niśraya* 依), the support (*ādihāra* 持), and the standing place (*pratiṣṭhā* 建立) for those qualities of Buddha (*dharma* 佛功德) that are always connected with (it) (*sambaddha* 相應), inseparable from (it) (*avinirbhāga* 不相離), not rejected wisdom (*amuktajñāna/amuktajña* 不捨智), of the *asaṃskṛta* character and greater in number than the grains of sand in the Gaṅgā. O Lord, also for those *dharmas* of the *saṃskṛta* character which are not connected, separated, or rejected wisdom is it the basis, the support, and the standing place. Thus the verse says, ‘support of all the *dharmas*.’

(The Chinese translation is problematic in that it doesn’t show the case relations. ‘For’ is emended above. To do this, we must base ourselves on the Sanskrit.)

2. What is the Buddha nature (*buddha-dhātu*)?

In connection with Paramārtha’s deep knowledge of the RGV, I will refer next to the *Fo-hsing-lun* (*Bussho-ron*) (FHL), another work that he translated.

The text is an explanation of the *buddha-dhātu*, otherwise called *tathāgatagarbha*. It consists of four parts, but the main section, the *Nidāna-parivarta* or Introduction, the third portion of the third part, which discusses the nature (*svabhāva*) of the *tathāgatagarbha*, and the entire fourth part, on the ten characteristics of the *tathāgatagarbha*, are all based on the RGV. The introduction is equivalent to the RGV’s *deśanā-prayojana-parivarta*, the section on the purpose of the teaching, and the RGV’s verse 1,27 and its commentary are used to explain the nature of the *tathāgatagarbha* in terms of *dharmakāya*, *tathatā*, and *tathāgatadhātu*. The fourth part, on the characteristics of the *tathāgatagarbha*, is based entirely on the first chapter of the RGV into which passages from other chapters of the RGV have been inserted. The only differences are occasional references to the Vi-jñānavāda (esp. of *āśrāyaparivṛtti*, the change of the basis). The purpose of the FHL’s composition may have been to insert these references after a rearrangement of the RGV.

Now I will consider a few passages that show signs of being commentary by the translator and some sentences that were inserted to explain certain technical terms for the Chinese readers (see Table no. 4).

1. The first example is in a passage in the first chapter of the fourth part, which teaches the nature of *tathāgatagarbha*. The introductory phrase ‘*shaku-yetsu (shih-yueh 釋曰)*’ marks the beginning of a commentary passage, but there is no sign showing how long the passage continues. From the context, I have judged it to be a maximum of six lines (796c, 9-14). Whether the character ‘*ko (ku 故)*’ belongs to the commentary is uncertain. It is possible that it should be considered part of the original source, indicating the ablative case ending of a Sanskrit word in the original. It is also possible to regard the whole paragraph, including the quotation from the *Anūnatvāpūrṇatvanirdeśa*, as being a commentary. If this were the case, the passage would show a closer affinity to the passage I discuss below. In any case, the commentator, probably Paramārtha himself, was well versed in the RGV.

2. The second example shows a sample of a definition of a term. The term in question, ‘*nyun-katsu (jun-hua 潤滑)*,’ is the translation of the single Sanskrit word *snigdha*, meaning wet or moist. But the definition explains the two characters individually. Cases of a single concept being translated with two characters of similar meaning are often observed. One reason is that the Chinese are fond of constructing words with two characters, so that the phrases and sentences are rhythmical. In any case, according to the interpolated definition, ‘*jun*’ denotes the meaning of commitment or penetration, while ‘*hua*’ means averting fault and asking for virtue.

3. The third example is again a definition of a technical term. The term ‘*nyonyo (juju 如如)*’ is Paramārtha’s unique translation of the Sanskrit word *tathatā*, which is usually translated as ‘*shin-nyo (chen-ju 眞如)*.’ The latter translation is also used by Paramārtha. The definition explains that worldly ‘suchness’ or truth (*su-ju 俗如*) is nothing but true ‘suchness’ (*chen-ju 眞如*) and vice versa, because the

two kinds of ‘suchness’ are not different. If this definition were really written by him, it would be very important. But the content is doubtful. The parallel use of the characters ‘*chen* (眞)’ and ‘*su* (俗)’ reminds us of the *paramārtha-satya* and the *saṃvṛti-satya*, and their *advayatā* may be all right. But to apply them to each character is rather nonsensical.

4. To conclude, I will consider two cases where the *Fo-hsing-lun* (FHL) utilizes verses from the RGV (see Table no. 5). The *Fo-hsing-lun* is mainly written in prose, and its verses are mostly quotations whose sources are clearly mentioned in most cases. Among the verses I found two cases that are similar to verses in the RGV. In the first case the verse is said to be from the *Ge-setsu-kyo* (*Chieh-chieh-ching* 解節經), and in the second case there is no mention of the source.

a. The first case is a commentary verse in the RGV preceding the passage on the unchangeable character of the *tathāgatagarbha* or *tathāgatadhātu*, the verse being a summary (*piṇḍārtha*) of the following explanation. The position of the verse in the FHL parallels this exactly. While the title of the Sūtra said to be the source is the same as that of the basic Sūtra of the Vijñānavāda (*Sandhinirmocana*), neither this verse nor the name of the attending Bodhisattva (*Kai-chi*, *Hai-chih* 海智 can be identified with Sāgaramati) can be found there.

b. The second case is also parallel in the two texts. Both passages refer to the four kinds of people who cannot understand the real nature of the *tathāgatagarbha*, this nature being shown in the verses. The verses in the RGV are based on the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*, as shown in the quotation that follows. In contrast, the FHL summarises the content of the verses in prose, probably by consulting the RGV as well as the quotation from the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*. In this doctrine, the concept *tathāgatagarbha* or *tathāgatadhātu* is always identified with the *tathatā*. Here, its nature is defined as being empty (*śūnya*) of pollutions and non-empty (*aśūnya*) of Buddhas’ qualities, as shown in the first example of the *Mahāyānasaṅgraha*.

Here too, the Chinese of Paramārtha's translation is far more comprehensible than the translation of the RGV. But why is the source not mentioned in the FHL? Was it a direct borrowing of the original text, or was it perhaps the work of the translator? We cannot deny the possibility of the latter. It is even not impossible to imagine that Paramārtha himself was the real author or composer of the FHL and that it had no original source from which it was translated.

Conclusion

The Chinese Tripiṭaka, i.e., the Buddhist scriptures translated into Chinese, together with commentaries on them and independent texts written by the Chinese, spread gradually all over the Chinese cultural sphere of East Asia, including Korea, Japan and Vietnam, lands where Chinese characters and its writing system were officially used. Until today, there has been no attempt in these areas to translate the Chinese Tripiṭaka into the vernacular languages. Rather the attempt was made to write articles and books in Chinese. The situation has not yet changed.

For example, in Japan Buddhism was first introduced via Korea early in the sixth century AD and then directly from China during the Sui and the T'ang Dynasties. After the invention of Japanese letters based upon Chinese characters in the early ninth century, the Japanese started to interpret Chinese texts using Japanese, inventing a way of reading and writing sentences that combines Japanese letters with Chinese characters. (Japanese letters or syllabary are called 'ka-na' (假名) 'provisional letters,' in contrast to Chinese characters, which are 'ma-na' (真名), 'original, true letters.')

This method is applied when reading Chinese texts as well. It is a unique way of translating, called *yomikudashi* in Japanese. It is practised even today.

And even today the Japanese write their Japanese sentences with a mixture of Chinese characters and Japanese *kana* syllabaries. Chinese characters are sometimes read with the Chinese pronunciation (but in a Japanese manner) (*on* 音), and sometimes according to their meaning with the Japanese pronunciation (*kun* 訓). It is quite easy to catch the meaning of Chinese ideograms.

Now my lecture has returned to the subject that introduced it. Please let me close my lecture here. Thank you for your attention.

Tables

Table No. 1: *triratna* (ratna-traya) 三寶

Buddha	佛	(人+弗、弗=不)	<佛陀、浮圖。	覺者
Dharma	法			
Saṅgha	僧	<僧伽	(衆)	

Table No. 2: Stock phrases at the beginning of sūtras (example from the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*)

evaṃ mayā śrutam | ekasmin samaye bhagavān Rajagr̥the viharati sma, Ḡḍhra-kuṭe parvate mahatā bhikṣusaṃghena sārđhaṃ dvādaśabhir bhikṣuśataiḥ, sarvair arhadbhiḥ kṣīnāsraṃvair niḥkleśair vaśībhūtaiḥ suvimuktacittaiḥ suvimuktaprajñair ajñāneyair mahānāgaiḥ, kṛtakṛtyaiḥ kṛtakaraṇīyair apahṛtabhārair anuprāptasvakārthaiḥ parikṣīṇabhavasamyojanaiḥ samyag-ājñā-suvimuktacittaiḥ sarvacetovaśītāparamapāramitāprāptair abhijñānābhijñātair mahāśrāvakaiḥ //

(tr. by Kumārajīva)

如是我聞。一時佛住王舍城耆闍崛山中。與大比丘衆萬二千人俱。皆是阿羅漢。諸漏已盡。無復煩惱。逮得己利盡諸有結。心得自在。

(tr. by Dharmapāla)

聞如是。一時佛遊王舍城靈鷲山。與大比丘衆俱。比丘千二百。一切無著。諸漏已盡無復欲塵。已得自在逮得己利。生死已索衆結即斷。一切由已獲度無極。已脫於慧心解得度。

Table No. 3: A Comparative table of Paramārtha's translation of the *Mahāyānasaṅgraha* on the verse of the *Abhidharmamahāyānasūtra*, 'anādikāliko dhātuḥ' and the commentary on it, and a parallel passage in the *Ratnagoṭravibhāga*

(P) 156c–157a

此界無始時 一切法依止

(RGV) pp. 72. 13–73. 8

anādikāliko dhātuḥ sarvadharmasam-āśrayaḥ |

若有諸道有 及有得涅槃

tasmin sati gatiḥ sarvā nirvāṇādhigamo 'pi ca //

积曰

1. [界] 以解爲 性。此界有五義。一體類義 ... 二因義 ... 三生義 ... 四真實義 ... 五藏義。

2. (after 1) *dhātur iti / yad āha / yo 'yam bhagavaṃs, tathāgatagarbho lokottaragarbhaḥ prakṛtipariśuddhagarbha iti /*

2. 約此界。佛世尊說。

1. *tatra katham anādikālikaḥ*

「比丘、衆生初際不可了達。無明爲蓋、貪愛所縛、或流或接、有時泥黎耶、... 有時天道。比丘、汝等如此長時受苦、增益貪愛恒受血滴」

yat tathāgatagarbham evādhikṛtya bhagavatā pūrvakoṭir na prajñāyaya

由此證故、知「無始時」。

iti deśitaṃ prajñaptam /

3. 如經言。「世尊、此識界、是依、是持、是處。恒相應及不相離不捨智、無爲、恒伽沙等數諸佛功德。世尊、非相應、相離、捨智、有爲諸法、是依、是持、是處」故、言「一切法依止」。

3. *sarvadharmasamāśraya iti / yad āha / tasmād, bhagavaṃs, tathāgatagarbho niśraya ādhāraḥ pratiṣṭhā saṃbaddhānām avinirbhāgānām amuktajñānām asaṃskṛtānām dharmānām / asambaddhānām api, bhagavan, vinirbhāga(dharmānām) muktajñānām saṃskṛtānām dharmānām, niśraya ādhāraḥ pratiṣṭhā tathāgatagarbha iti /*

4. 如經言。「世尊、若如來藏有、由不了故、可言、生死是有」故言「若有、諸道有」。

4. *tasmin sati gatiḥ sarveti / yad āha / sati, bhagavaṃs, tathāgatagarbhe, saṃsara iti parikalpitam asya vacanam iti*

5. 如經言。「世尊、若如來藏非有、於苦無厭惡、於涅槃無欲、樂、願」故言「及有得涅槃」。

5. *nirvāṇādhigamo 'pi ceti / yad āha / tathāgatagarbhas cet, bhagavan, na syāt, na syād dukkhe 'pi nirvāṇecchā prārthanā pranidhir veti vistaraḥ //*

(Pao-hsing-lun, p. 839a-b) 『寶性論』 PHL

此五種喻能作三種佛法身因。以是義故、說如來性因。此以何義。此中明性義以爲因義。以是義故、經中偈言。

無始世來性 作諸法依止 依性有諸道 及證涅槃果

此偈明何義。2. 「無始世界性者、如經說」言。

諸佛如來、依如來藏、說諸衆生無始本際不可得知」故。

1. 所言「性」者、如聖者勝鬘經言。

「世尊、如來說、如來藏者、是法界藏。出世間法身藏。出世間上上藏。自性清淨法身藏。自性清淨如來藏」故。

3. 「作諸法依止」者。如聖者勝鬘經言。

「世尊、是故如來藏、是依、是持、是住持 是建立。世尊、不離、不離智、不斷、不脫、不異、無爲、不思議佛法。世尊、亦有斷、脫、異、外、離、離智、有爲法。亦依、亦持、亦住持、亦建立、依如來藏」故。

4. 「依性有諸道」者、如聖者勝鬘經言。

「世尊、生死者依如來藏。世尊、有如來藏故、說生死。是名善說」故。

5. 「及證涅槃果」者、如聖者勝鬘經言。

「世尊、依如來藏故、有生死。依如來藏故、證涅槃。世尊、若無如來藏者、不得厭苦、樂求涅槃。不欲涅槃、不願涅槃」故。

此明何義。明如來藏究竟如來法身不差別。眞如體相畢竟定佛性體。於一切時、一切衆生身中皆無餘盡、應知。

Table No. 4: A comparative table of the *Fo-hsing-lun* (FHL) and the *Ratnagotravibhāga* (RGV/PHL)

1. An example of the basic textual construction

(FHL)	(RGV)
(796a-c)	
佛性論辯相分第四中自體相品第一復次、佛性一切種相有十義、應知。言十相者。一自體相。二因相。...十無差別相。一自體相者、有二種。一者別相。二者通相。別相有三種。何者爲三。一者如意功德性。二者無(別)異性。三者潤滑性。所言如意功德相者。謂如來藏有五種。...	<i>daśavidhārtha</i> : v.29. (p.26) <i>svabhāva, hetu, etc.</i> (1) <i>svabhāva</i> : v.30ab, 31. <i>svalakṣaṇa: prabhāva, ananyathābhāva, snigdhabhāva, ... cintāmaṇi-nabhovāri-viśuddhaḡaṇasādharmya.</i>
(796c)	
二無別異性者、凡夫・聖人及諸佛無分別心性過失・功德・究竟清淨處、平等遍滿。譬如虛空。又如土・銀・金器。此三雖異、而其性等、皆是空。空處不別故、名	<i>ananyathābhāva: pṛthagjanārya-sambuddhatathatāvya-tirekataḡ / (v.45ab) (6) vṛtti</i> <i>taddoṣaḡaṇaniṣṡhāsu vyāpi sāmānyalakṣaṇam / (v.50ab) (8)</i>

無別異性。

釋曰。言「過失」者、謂凡夫。「功德」者、即有學聖人。「究竟清淨」者、即諸佛。此三處雖殊、而其性不異。此即以土喻凡夫。銀喻學者。金喻諸佛。雖復三器有異、而其空性一種故。

又是有清淨遍滿等三義、有者顯無爲義。清淨顯無染義。遍滿顯無礙義故。

佛告舍利弗。*

衆生界不異法身。法身不異衆生界。由此義故。無二無別。唯有名字。

如是佛性。於三位中、平等遍滿。由淨不淨品無變異故、故說如虛空性。

(806b) 遍滿品第八

譬如土銀金等器中虛空遍滿平等無差別、如來法界遍滿三位中亦復如是。是故、從位次第、說此遍滿。如無上依經說。

阿難、是如來界、於三位中、一切處等、悉無圭礙。本來寂靜。譬如虛空、一切色種不能覆、不能塞。若土銀金器、虛空處等、悉無圭礙。

是名遍滿。

sarvatraga

mṛdu-jata-suvaruṇabhājana
(p. 41, 14)

(of *ākāśa*, exact source unknown, textual position unfixed)

*Q. from the *Anūnatvāpūrṇatva-nirdeśa*

tasmāc chāriputra nānyaḥ sattva-dhātur nānyo dharmakāyaḥ / ... advayam etad arthena / vyañjana-mātrabhedha iti / (p. 41, 15–17) (cf. p. 41, 18–19)

PHL 832b for RGV, (8) *sarvatraga*

過功德畢竟 遍至及同相
下中勝衆生 如虛空中色
此偈明何義。...

猶如虛空、在瓦銀金三種器中、平等無異無差別、一切時有。以是義故、經中說有三時次第。如不增不減經言*

舍利弗、不離衆生界有法身。不離法身有衆生界。衆生界即法身。法身即衆生界。舍利弗、此二法者義一名異故。

2 & 3. Examples of interpolated explanations of technical terms

2. FHL 797a, 11.12–15

「潤滑」者、「潤」以顯其能攝義。「滑」者顯其背失向德義。譬如水界、亦有二能。一則能攝散物。(二)唯滑不澁故。由潤故、能攝。由滑故、不澁。故以潤者爲因、以滑者爲果。故曰現因果義。

for Skt
snigdha(tā)

3. FHL 805c, 11.23–24

「如如」者、俗如即眞如。眞如即俗如。眞俗二如、
無別異故。 for Skt
tatha(tā)

Table No. 5: A Comparative table of RGV verses in FHL and PHL

a. RGV, v. I,51: *ayaṃ ca teṣāṃ piṇḍārtho veditavyaḥ /
doṣāgantukatāyogād guṇaprakṛtiyogataḥ /
yathā pūrvaṃ tathā paścād avikāritvadharmatā // 51*

FHL 806c

言無前後際變異者、如佛爲海智菩薩說。
解節經偈言。

客塵相應故 有自性德故
如前後亦爾 是無變異相

PHL 832b

此等諸偈、略說要義、應知。
偈言。

諸過客塵來 性功德相應
眞法體不變 如本後亦爾

b. RGV, v. I, 154–5:

*tatra katamaḥ sa tathāgatagarbhaśūnyatārthanaya ucyate /
nāpaneyam ataḥ kiṃcid upaneyam na kiṃcana /
draṣṭavyaṃ bhūtato bhūtaṃ bhūtadarśī vimucyate // 154
śūnya āgantukair dhātuḥ savinirbhāgalakṣaṇaiḥ /
aśūnyo 'nuttarair dharmair avinirbhāgalakṣaṇaiḥ // 155*

FHL 812b

如來藏者、道理何相。如偈說言。

無一法可損 無一法可增
應見實如實 見實得解脫
由客塵故空 與法界相離
無上法不空 與法界相隨

PHL 840a

以何等法、是如來藏。偈言。

不空如來藏 謂無上佛法
不相捨離相 不增減一法
如來無爲身 自性本來淨
客塵虛妄染 本來自性空