

JIABS

Journal of the International
Association of Buddhist Studies



Volume 31 Number 1–2 2008 (2010)

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

JIABS is published twice yearly.

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

Address books for review to:

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

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

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

University of Lausanne
CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland
email: iabs.treasurer@unil.ch

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

Fax: +41 21 692 29 35

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

Cover: Cristina Scherrer-Schaub

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

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

Print: Ferdinand Berger & Söhne

EDITORIAL BOARD

KELLNER Birgit
KRASSER Helmut
Joint Editors

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

JIABS

Journal of the International
Association of Buddhist Studies

Volume 31 Number 1–2 2008 (2010)

Obituaries

Jonathan A. SILK

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

Articles

Diwakar ACHARYA

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

Early Chinese Buddhist translations

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

Guest editor: Max Deeg

Max DEEG

Introduction 79

Max DEEG

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

Hubert DURT

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

Toru FUNAYAMA

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

Andrew GLASS

Guṇabhadra, Bāoyún, and the Saṃyuktāgama 185

Paul HARRISON

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

Elsa I. LEGITTIMO

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

Jan NATTIER

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

Jungnok PARK (†)

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

Jonathan A. SILK

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

Stefano ZACCHETTI

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

ZHU Qingzhi

On some basic features of Buddhist Chinese 485

Book review

Tsunehiko SUGIKI

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

•

Notes on the contributors 543

The work of Paramārtha

An example of Sino-Indian cross-cultural exchange*

Funayama Toru

This paper is a preliminary investigation of the life and work of Paramārtha (Ch. Zhendi 真諦; 499–569 CE), an Indian commentator active during the late Liang 梁 and early Chen 陳 periods of the Six Dynasties. Paramārtha is sometimes counted among the four great translators in the history of Chinese Buddhism. His oral commentaries on the texts he translated were written down by his disciples, which distinguishes him from other translators. These commentaries were often far more voluminous than the translations

* This is a revised version of Funayama 2005a. The paper, originally in Japanese, was translated by Mr. Benjamin Brose, subsequently reworked by the author. I am grateful for his patient work translating an article with intricate problems. I also want to thank Dr. Michael Radich, Prof. Jonathan A. Silk, Dr. Max Deeg and Mr. Ching Keng for their invaluable suggestions. Since I wrote the original Japanese article, I have organized a seminar called “Shintai sanzō to sono jidai” 真諦三藏とその時代 (“Paramārtha and His Times”), a five-year group study with the collaboration of multiple scholars in different fields of research. This seminar was begun in April 2005 and will end in March 2011, and is being held at the Kyōto daigaku jinbun kagaku kenkyūsho 京都大學人文科學研究所 (Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University). However, the result of this group research is not reflected in the present article. Any errors in this paper remain my own responsibility.

In this essay T refers to the *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經; Z refers to the *Dainippon zokuzōkyō* 大日本續藏經. For example, Z1.34.4, 351d refers to *Zokuzōkyō* first volume, case 34, book 4, folio 351, verso, lower register.

themselves. Unfortunately, almost all of Paramārtha's commentaries have now been lost. However, it is possible to gather some of them from the commentaries of Tang Dynasty scholar-monks such as the disciples of Xuanzang 玄奘 and Daoxuan 道宣.

These commentarial fragments, rather than Paramārtha's translations, are the primary concern of this paper.¹ I will not be focusing on aspects of Paramārtha's doctrinal or theoretical positions but rather on the basic circumstances under which he expressed those ideas.² In particular, I would like to consider the blend of Indian and Chinese cultures that is evident in the works of Indian scholar monks who immigrated to China. This blend is especially apparent in the works of Paramārtha. A better understanding of the specific features of Paramārtha's commentaries may further expand our understanding of his translations and as well as his thought.

The current knowledge of Paramārtha's translation activities was long ago enriched by Ui Hakuju's 宇井伯壽 detailed study entitled "Shintai sanzō den no kenkyū" 真諦三藏傳の研究.³ The present paper generally follows this article. However, as will be discussed below, some amendments and supplements can be made to Ui's study. Before examining the special characteristics of Paramārtha's work we should first consider some basic biographical facts.⁴

¹ Aspects of Paramārtha's translations have been addressed in Takasaki 1979 and Okada 2002.

² The characteristics of Paramārtha's thought and doctrinal studies have been discussed in a number of studies. Among the most important are the articles entitled "Jūhachi kūron no kenkyū" 十八空論の研究, "San mu shō ron no kenkyū" 三無性論の研究, "Kenjiki ron no kenkyū" 顯識論の研究, "Tenjiki ron no kenkyū" 轉識論の研究, and "Ketsujō ron no kenkyū" 決定藏論の研究 in Ui 1965: 131–497; Takasaki 1981; Katsumata 1961, vol. 2, chapter 3, section 2, "Shintai sanzō no shikisetsu" 真諦三藏の識説; and section 3, "Shintai sanzō no yakusho to Musō ron" 真諦三藏の譯書と無相論; and Iwata 2004.

³ Ui 1965: 1–130. Incidentally, nearly at the same time, Paul Demiéville published an important article for the study of Paramārtha, "Sur l'authenticité du Ta tch'eng k'i sin louen": Demiéville 1929.

⁴ Su 1978 and Yoshizu 2003 are two major comprehensive studies which concur with Ui Hakuju's "Shintai sanzō den no kenkyū."

Paramārtha's biography in the first fascicle of the *Further Biographies of Eminent Monks* (*Xu gaoseng zhuan* 續高僧傳) is well known, but earlier and later accounts are also relevant. The most important are those found in the following sources:

Huikai 慧愷 (Chen dynasty):⁵ Preface to the *Mahāyānasamgraha* (*She dasheng lun* 攝大乘論; T31, 112b–113b = 152c–153b).

Id.: Preface to the *Abhidharmakośa* (*Apidamo jushe shi lun* 阿毘達磨俱舍釋論; T29, 161ab).

Id.: Postface to the **Mahāyāna-Vijñāptimātratāsiddhi* (*Dasheng wei-shi lun houji* 大乘唯識論後記; T31, 73c).

Faqian 法虔: Postface to the *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā* (*Jingang bore boluomi jing* 金剛般若波羅蜜經; T8, 766bc).⁶

Fei Changfang 費長房 (Sui 隋 dynasty): *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶紀, fascicle 9 (T49, 87c–88b), and fascicle 11 (98c–99a).

Yancong 彥琮 (Sui dynasty): Preface to the *Hebu jingguangming jing* 合部金光明經 (T16, 359bc). *Lidai sanbao ji*, fascicle 12 (T49, 105c–106a).

⁵ Huikai (518–568), also known as Zhikai 智愷, was one of Paramārtha's eminent disciples. His biography is found in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, fascicle 1 (T50, 431b). He was often involved in the completion of Paramārtha's commentary in the role of *bishou* 筆受 “scribing” (literally “taking down with the brush”): a person who was ordered to transcribe oral instructions.

⁶ The author of this postface is not explicitly recorded, but judging from the contents I suspect that the author is Faqian 法虔. In the postface it states that in the *renwu* 壬午 year (562), ninth month, twenty-fifth day a translation in one fascicle with a commentary in ten fascicles was completed, and at that time, Faqian had made one hundred copies and had them circulated. The vow appended to the end of the text also reads: “So that all beings may, due to these true words, quickly reach *nirvāṇa* and always teach in accord with conditions.” Therefore, Faqian was probably also the author of the colophon. Cf. Ui 1965: 26–27. Other studies which also conclude that the author of the postface was Faqian include Yabuki 1933: 78; and Xu 2002: 172. In both studies the authors do not state why they concluded that Faqian was the author of the postface.

Author unknown: Preface to the *Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra* (*Jinguangming jing* 金光明經) in the Shōgozō canon 聖語藏.⁷

Author unknown: Preface to the *Sheng tianwang bore boluomi jing* 勝天王般若波羅蜜經 in the Shōgozō canon⁸ and the Fangshan shi jing 房山石經.⁹

Author unknown: Postscript to the *Guangyi famen jing* 廣義法門經 (T1, 922a).

According to his biographies in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* and other sources, Paramārtha first arrived in the Nanhai 南海 district of Guangzhou in the twelfth year of the Datong 大同 era (546), at the age of forty-eight. This being the case, the new information that he brought to China concerning Indian Buddhism dates from this year at the latest. However, Paramārtha had also stopped at Funan 扶南 before arriving in Guangzhou.¹⁰ Therefore, the Indian texts brought by Paramārtha probably originated some years earlier than 546.

With regard to his name, the eleventh fascicle of the *Lidai sanbao ji* states that “the Tripiṭaka Master¹¹ Boluomotuo 波羅末陀 of

⁷ See Ono 1929; Niryō gakujin 1930; and Niryō sei 1934. All three works are by the same author under different names. I have not yet been able to see the Shōgozō 聖語藏 preface. The above three articles contain photos and transcriptions of the preface, but these are incomplete and must be used with caution. With the exception of Su Gongwang’s recapitulation of Ui Hakuju’s work (Su 1978), subsequent research on Paramārtha and the *Jinguangming sūtra* has not touched on this important information. Especially valuable is the record of the expansion of the Shouliang chapter found in the “Daizō bunko koitsu zenpon mokuroku, 1.”

⁸ See Ono 1988.

⁹ For this see *Fangshang shi jing* (*Sui-Tang ke jing*) 房山石經(隋唐刻經) 2000, Vol. 2: 209. The same text is recorded in the *Zhonghua dazang jing* 中華大藏經 Vol. 8: 109, but note that it is copied by a contemporary person (an anonymous editor?) and contains some errors.

¹⁰ For a discussion of Paramārtha’s place within the history of Buddhism in Funan, see Shizutani 1942: esp. 24. According to Shizutani, during Paramārtha’s time the king of Funan, Rudravarman (Liutuobamo 留陀跋摩, ca. 514–550), favored Buddhism.

¹¹ “The Tripiṭaka Master” is called *tripiṭa* or *trepīṭaka* in (Buddhist Hybrid) Sanskrit. Forte 1990: 247f. n. 7.

Youchanni 優禪尼 (Skt. Ujjayinī; Pāli Ujjenī; Pkt. Ujenī) in Western India was known as Paramārtha during the Liang” (T49, 99a).¹² It is certain that Boluomotuo corresponds to the Sanskrit name of Paramārtha, or Paramattha in Pāli. Also, in Huikai’s Preface to the *Mahāyānasamgraha*, it says that “The Tripiṭaka Master was from a brahmin family in the kingdom of Youchanni. His *gotra*-name was Poluoduo 頗羅墮 (Bhāradvāja or Bharadvāja)¹³ and his personal name was Juluonata 拘羅那他 (Kulanātha), which is translated as ‘Qinyi’ 親依 in this land” (T31, 112c=52c).¹⁴

¹² Ujjayinī was the capital of the ancient country called Avantī (present Ujjain). Incidentally, in historical records dating from the time of Paramārtha, Youchanni/Ujjayinī was sometimes classified as western India (as in Paramārtha’s biography), and other times as central India (as in the biography of Yueposhouna 月婆首那 in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* T50, 430b as well as in the *Preface to the Shengtian bore jing* in the Shōgozō canon). Hence such designations were not always consistent.

¹³ I prefer the form Bhāradvāja which signifies ‘Bharadvāja’s descendant.’ But in Sanskrit texts, Bhāradvāja is sometimes written as Bharadvāja in the same sense. Demiéville (1929: 16) also indicates the form Bharadvāja. Ui (1965: 9) assumes the Sanskrit equivalent of Poluoduo 頗羅墮 to be “either Bhārata or Bharata,” but this is incorrect. A typical example of Poluoduo as the transcription of Bhāradvāja is Bintoulu Poluoduo 賓頭盧頗羅墮 (Piṇḍola-Bhāradvāja).

¹⁴ The *Xu gaoseng zhuan* and later sources often wrongly use the form “Junaluotuo” 拘那羅陀. This version of the name comes from a metathesis of the sounds *la* (羅) and *na* (那). Huikai’s usage of Juluonata 拘羅那他 (he also uses *tuo* 陀) is certainly correct. Since Huikai was a direct disciple of Paramārtha and participated in his translation activities, his record is the most reliable. Huikai’s own biography, under the name of Zhikai 智愷, is attached to Fatai’s 法泰 biography in the first fascicle of the *Gaoseng zhuan* (T50, 431b). His family name was Cao 曹. The biography of Zhikai is followed by another biography, which states that a layman named Cao Pi 曹毘 wrote a lost biography of Paramārtha called *Sanzang lizhuan* 三藏歷傳 (also called “Cao Pi bieli” 曹毘別歷 [A Separate Biography of Paramārtha compiled by Cao Pi] which is mentioned in the biography of Paramārtha [T50, 430b]) on which the biography for Paramārtha Sanzang in the *Lidai sanbao ji* was based (T49, 88a; cf. 99a). The author is called a (lay) disciple who received bodhisattva

Regarding Paramārtha's school-affiliation, it has already been pointed out that he probably belonged to the Saṃmitīya (Zhengliang 正量) school.¹⁵ This assumption is based on the fact that Paramārtha translated the *Lü ershier mingliao lun* 律二十二明了論, the author of which was Buddhatrāta (Fotuoduoluo 佛陀多羅) of the Saṃmitīya school (T24, 665b).¹⁶ Moreover, it has also been noted that the terminology found in the *Mingliao lun*, such as *ren* 忍 (acceptance; Skt. *kṣānti*), *ming* 名 (name), *xiang* 相 (characteristic), and *shi diyi fa* 世第一法 (the highest worldly elements; Skt. *laukikāgradharma*) are also used in other branches of the Vātsīputrīya (Duzi 犢子) school to which the Saṃmitīya belonged.¹⁷ The terms *ren*, *ming*, *xiang* and *shi diyi fa* correspond to the Sarvāstivāda's *nuan* 煖 (the heated; Skt. *uṣma-* / *ūṣmagata*), *ding* 頂 (summit; Skt. *mūrdhan*), *ren* and *shi diyi fa* which are also called *shun jueze fen* 順決擇分 (aids to penetration; Skt. *nirvedhabhāgīya*). In Paramārtha's case, the usage of terms such as *ren*, *ming*, *xiang* and *shi diyi fa* was not limited to the *Mingliao lun* but also occurred in the *Bu zhi yi lun* 部執異論 and the *Xianshi lun* 顯識論.¹⁸

However, Paramārtha was not exclusively connected with the Saṃmitīya school. If we consider his theoretical views, the Sarvāstivāda and Yogācāra schools also played an important role. The well-known fact that throughout his life he devoted

precepts (*pusajie dizi* 菩薩戒弟子) under Paramārtha's supervision and listed as a son of Huikai's uncle. That is, Cao Pi and Huikai were paternal cousins.

¹⁵ In Paramārtha's case, the expression "Saṃmitīya" (<√*mā*) is preferable to "Saṃmatīya" (<√*man*) because in the *Bu zhi yi lun* 部執異論, the school is called "Zhengliang dizi bu" 正量弟子部 (T49, 20b13) and "Sanmeidiyu bu" 三眉底與部 (T49, 22c14).

¹⁶ Concerning Buddhatrāta, the colophon to this text further states that he was a saint who had attained the third stage (i.e., *anāgāmin*) of the Śrāvakayāna practice (T24, 672c).

¹⁷ See Ui 1965: 395; and Namikawa 2000, especially from page 189. See also Namikawa 1995.

¹⁸ Further, the definition of *araṇya* as translated below in Section 2 reveals that Paramārtha took the Saṃmitīya view as his own.

himself to the translation and explication of Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośa* (*bhāṣya*) and Asaṅga's *Mahāyānasamgraha* as well as Vasubandhu's commentary thereon should not be overlooked. These works demonstrate that Paramārtha was closely related to Vasubandhu and also possibly to other commentators of his era such as Dignāga (Chenna 陳那, ca. 480–540). Paramārtha translated two of Dignāga's works: the *Wuxiang si chen lun* 無相思塵論 in one fascicle (T1619, *Ālambanaparīkṣā*) and the *Jie juan lun* 解捲論, also in one fascicle (T1620, **Hastavālaprakaraṇa*).¹⁹ Although Dignāga's theoretical position can probably be said to be that of the syncretic faction of the Yogācāra and Sautrāntika schools, he also wrote an outline (i.e., the *Marmapradīpa*) to the *Abhidharmakośa* which makes it clear that he valued that text.

It is noteworthy that Dignāga had a close connection with the *Abhidharmakośa* of the Sarvāstivāda, although he was probably ordained by a master of the Vātsīputrīya school and did not belong to the Sarvāstivāda.²⁰ Dignāga's school-affiliation is instructive when reflecting on the same issues in Paramārtha's life. We should consider the possibility that in India during the fifth and sixth centuries several commentators belonged to schools other than the Sarvāstivāda school and nevertheless were skilled in the *Abhidharmakośa*. We can say that Dignāga and Paramārtha shared similar positions in that both of them made much of the *Abhidharmakośa* and Yogācāra thought as masters from schools other than Sarvāstivāda. The Saṃmitīya is generally considered to be one of the four branch schools stemming from the Vātsīputrīya.

¹⁹ For the *Hastavālaprakaraṇa* and the Tibetan translations, see Frauwallner 1959: 127–129, and 152–156; and Nagasawa 1978a and 1978b. The treatises Paramārtha brought to China include texts by Dignāga (ca. 480–540). Most probably it was thus Paramārtha who first introduced this most recent Indian literature to China. On the chronological relationship between Paramārtha and Dignāga see Hattori 1961: esp. 84–85.

²⁰ Obermiller 1932: 149. Chimpa/Chattopadhyaya 1990: 181. Frauwallner 1969: 390.

1. Paramārtha's compositions

This paper is primarily concerned with Paramārtha's original compositions. I would like to begin with the following information recorded in the seventh fascicle of the *Kaiyuan Shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄:

[In addition to the texts translated by Paramārtha] the *Changfang [lu]* 長房[錄], *Neidian [lu]* 內典[錄] and so on also refer to a list of [Paramārtha's] texts which begins with the *Zhenglun shiyi* 正論釋義, amounting to thirteen texts in 108 fascicles. [In the present catalogue] these treatises on *sūtras* as well as commentaries are not listed [among the list of translations] because they are Paramārtha's compositions, and not translations from Sanskrit.²¹

When we compare this passage's reference to "thirteen texts" with the information given in the *Lidai sanbao ji* (T49, 88a) and the *Datang neidian lu* 大唐內典錄 (T55, 273c), we can see that it probably refers to the following thirteen texts:

- (1) *Explication of the Authentic Treatises (Zhenglun shiyi 正論釋義)*, in five fascicles.
- (2) *On Buddha Nature (Foxing yi 佛性義)*, in three fascicles.
- (3) *On Meditation (Chanding yi 禪定義)*, in one fascicle.
- (4) *Commentary on the Abhidharmakośa[bhāṣya] (Jushe lun shu 俱舍論疏)*, in sixty fascicles (or fifty-three fascicles according to Huikai's Preface to the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*).
- (5) *Commentary on the Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā (Jingang bore shu 金剛般若疏)*, in eleven fascicles (ten fascicles of commentary and one of the *sūtra*).
- (6) *Commentary on [the Distinction between] the Eighteen Nikāyas (Shiba bu lun shu 十八部論疏)*, in ten fascicles.
- (7) *Commentary on the Saṃdhinirmocana-sūtra (Jiejie jing shu 解節經疏)*, in four fascicles.
- (8) *Commentary on the *Anuttarāśraya-sūtra (Wushangyi jing shu 無上依經疏)*, in four fascicles.

²¹ 又長房內典等錄，復有正論釋義等一十三部一百八卷，今以並是經論義疏，真諦所撰，非梵本翻，故刪不錄。(T55, 546c).

- (9) *Commentary on the *Tarkaśāstra (Rushi lun shu 如實論疏)*, in three fascicles.²²
- (10) *Commentary on the Catur[-ārya-]satya-sāstra (Si di lun shu 四諦論疏)*, in three fascicles.
- (11) *Commentary on the Refutation of the Ātmavāda [in the Abhidharma-kośa IX; viz., Po wo lun shu 破我論疏]*, in one fascicle.
- (12) *Commentary on the Theory of Sixteen Truths found in the Suixiang lun (Sui xiang lun zhong shiliu di shu 隨相論中十六諦疏)*, in one fascicle (extant as the *Sui xiang lun 隨相論*, T1641).
- (13) *The Opening Set Passages common to all Sūtras (Zhong jing tong xu 衆經通序)*, in two fascicles.

Most of these texts are no longer extant but a few details are known. First, fragments of the (4) *Jushe lun shu* exist in Puguang's 普光 *Jushe lun ji 俱舍論記*. That is to say, Puguang's text contains a number of Paramārtha's statements and it can be assumed that these were quoted from Paramārtha's original work. Similarly, (5) the *Jingang bore shu*, (6) *Shiba bu lun shu* (also known as the *Bu zhi [lun] shu 部執[論]疏* or the *Buzhi [lun] ji 部執[論]記*), and (7) the *Jiejie jing shu* are no longer extant, but can be partially reconstructed from the fragments cited in the works of Sui and Tang Dynasty commentators.²³ The high probability that (12) the *Suixiang lun zhong shiliu di shu* is the same as the *Suixiang lun* of the Taishō canon has already been established in a previous study.²⁴

It is likely that some other texts can also be attributed to Paramārtha. For example:

- (14) *Translation of Foreign Words (Fan waiguo yu 翻外國語)*, in seven fascicles (also known as *Za shi 雜事* or the *Jushe lun yinyuan shi 俱舍論因緣事*, T49, 88a). – This treatise is listed in the *Lidai sanbao ji* and the *Neidian lu* as the last one in the list of Paramārtha's works,

²² I tentatively follow Giuseppe Tucci's reconstruction of the title as "*Tarkaśāstra*" in Tucci 1929.

²³ An earlier important study of the *Bu zhi lun shu* is Demiéville 1931.

²⁴ Uī 1965: 96–97; Aohara 1993 and 2003. For a study which does not hold that the *Suixiang lun* contains Paramārtha's commentary, see Yoshizu 2003: 241. However, I am not fully convinced by Yoshizu's claim.

immediately following the above-mentioned (13) *Zhong jing tong xu*. We know from its name that it was probably not a translation but a composition by Paramārtha.

- (15) *Commentary on Lucid Explanations Concerning the Vinaya* (*Ming-liao lun shu* 明了論疏) or *Commentary on Twenty-two Lucid Explanations on the Vinaya* (*Lü ershier ming liao lun shu* 律二十二明了論疏), in five fascicles. – The translation of the *Lü ershier ming liao lun* has a postscript (T24, 673c) in which it is stated that the translation was completed in the second year of the Guangda 光大 era of the Chen (568), and that at the same time “a five fascicle commentary was made.” The same postscript further states that Huikai who belonged to Ayuwang Temple 阿育王寺 in Jiankang at that time was in charge of *bishou* 筆受 in the translation.²⁵ It is possible to recover a large portion of this commentary from the quotations found in later texts such as Dingbin’s 定賓 *Sifen lü shu shizong yi ji* 四分律疏飾宗義記 and Dajue’s 大覺 *Sifen lü chaopi* 四分律鈔批 (both of which were composed in the beginning of the eighth century).
- (16) *Commentary on the Mahāyānasamgraha* (*She dasheng lun yi shu* 攝大乘論義疏), in eight fascicles. – This text is known from Huikai’s Preface to the *Mahāyānasamgraha*. The lost fragments have been collected by Ui.²⁶
- (17) *Commentary on the Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra* (*Jinguangming [jing] shu* 金光明[經]疏), in thirteen fascicles. – There is a seven fascicle version of the *Jinguangming* translated by Paramārtha and also a thirteen fascicle commentary. A portion of the lost text can be reconstructed.
- (18) *Commentary on the Renwang bore jing* (*Renwang bore [jing] shu* 仁王般若[經]疏), in six fascicles. – Paramārtha’s lost *Renwang bore shu* can be reconstructed from the works of Jizang 吉藏, Zhiyi 智顛, and Yuance (Wonchuk) 圓測. It is clear that Paramārtha’s commentary was based on the *Renwang bore jing* translated by Kumārajīva. It is significant that the Indian monk Paramārtha would (perhaps at the request of a Chinese monk) write a commentary to an apocryphal text composed in China. There is a range of opinions regarding this point which will be discussed below.

²⁵ For *bishou* see n. 5 above.

²⁶ Ui 1935.

- (19) *Exposition on the Ninefold Cognition* (*Jiu shi lun yi ji* 九識論義記), in two fascicles, or alternatively, *Thesis on the Ninefold Cognition* (*Jiu shi zhang* 九識章), in three fascicles. – These texts contained Paramārtha’s advocacy of the ninefold consciousness as opposed to the more common eightfold consciousness of the Yogācāra school. Unfortunately, only a few fragments remain.²⁷
- (20) *Exposition on the Turning of the Dharma Wheel* (*Zhuan falun yi ji* 轉法輪義記), in one fascicle. Details unknown.
- (21) *Commentary on the Madhyāntavibhāga* (*Zhong bian [fenbie lun] shu* 中邊[分別論]疏). Three fascicles. Details unknown.
- (22) *Commentary on the Viṃśatikā* (*Dasheng weishi lun zhu ji* 大乘唯識論注記). Details unknown.
- (23) *Biography of [the Buddhist Master of the Law] Vasubandhu* (*Po-soupandou fashi zhuan* 婆藪槃豆法師傳 T2049), in one fascicle. – This is traditionally taken to be a translation, but an examination of its contents reveals elements which deviate from pure translation and suggest that it represents Paramārtha’s commentary or a mixture of commentary and translation.²⁸ This will be discussed further below.
- (24) *Xianshi lun* 顯識論, in one fascicle (T1618). – This text is also traditionally believed to have been translated by Paramārtha but its contents make it doubtful that it was a work of pure translation. The text has features of a commentary on the *Mahāyānasamgraha*. Therefore, there is a high probability that it is a record of one of Paramārtha’s lecture series on the *Mahāyānasamgraha*.
- (25) *Treatise on Buddha Nature* (*Foxing lun* 佛性論), in four fascicles. – As has already been pointed out in a previous study, the *Foxing lun* is closely related to the *Ratonagotravibhāga* (*Baoxing lun* 寶性論).²⁹ Although the contents of the two texts are partially the same, there are also a number of significant differences. For example, the *Foxing lun* has repeated expressions such as “The commentary sta-

²⁷ Recently, there has been some doubt regarding Paramārtha’s authorship of the text; see Yoshimura 2002 and 2003. It seems to me, however, that the authorship of this text is still an open question.

²⁸ Takakusu 1904: 293 n. 110, Takakusu 1905: 38, and Frauwallner 1951: 17–18.

²⁹ Tsukinōwa 1971 and Hattori 1955.

tes ...” (*shi yue* 釋曰) and “The record (i.e., commentary) states ...” (*ji yue* 記曰) in various contexts. According to Sakamoto Yukio 坂本幸男, these are Paramārtha’s commentaries.³⁰

- (26) *Notes on the Seven Items* (*Qi shi ji* 七事記). – This text is not mentioned in the records of works attributed to Paramārtha but it is cited in Yuance’s commentary on the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*. The “seven items” refers to the standard seven words stated at the beginning of Buddhist *sūtras*, namely “thus” – “I” – “have heard” – “at one time” – “the Buddha, World-honored one” – “was staying at such-and-such place” – “together with great *bhikṣus*.” It seems that the *Qi shi ji* gave a detailed explanation of these opening lines.³¹

Thus we can list at least twenty-six works of Paramārtha. It is likely that there are some more texts which have yet to be identified as Paramārtha’s compositions.³²

2. Characteristics of Paramārtha’s commentarial method

Paramārtha was one of India’s eminent scholar-monks and many of his compositions naturally reflect an orthodox translation style.

³⁰ In the *Foxing lun*, “The commentary states” (*shi yue* 釋曰) and “The record (i.e., commentary) states” (記曰 *ji yue*) appear seventeen times. See Sakamoto 1935: 264–267. For further discussions of this issue see also Takasaki 2005: 61–63.

³¹ Judging from the quotations, this text appears to be closely related to the *Jingang bore shu*. It is possible that this was simply another name for the beginning section of the *Jingang bore shu*. At the same time, from various citations of the name *Qi shi ji*, it could be that the original first portion of the *Jingang bore shu* was later circulated independently as an extended commentary on the beginning section of *sūtras*. On the *Qi shi ji*, see Ui 1965: 85; and Funayama 2002: 28 n. 41.

³² The *Zhonglun shu* 中論疏 (*Commentary on the Madhyamakaśāstra*) referred to in the *Lidai sanbaoji* 11 (T49, 99a) might have been the work of Paramārtha. Generally speaking it can be assumed that in the list of Paramārtha’s works the word *shu* 疏 for a commentatorial work (in contrast to the word *shi* 釋) suggests that it is not a translation. I owe this suggestion to Dr. Ōtake Susumu in personal communication. See also Imazu 1925: esp. 79. I am indebted also to Dr. Ōtake for this reference.

However, Paramārtha also had his own unique style, compared to other commentators. In what follows, I would like to point out some examples of Paramārtha's commentarial method.

Revealing the multiple meanings within a single phrase

One of the identifiable characteristics of Paramārtha's commentarial style is his frequent listing and explanation of the various meanings present within a single phrase. For example:

In Paramārtha's commentary it says: The term *araṇya* (*alianruo* 阿練若) has three meanings. The first [meaning] is 'a place far from noise (*raṇa*).' That is to say, a place where the sounds of large cities do not reach. The second [meaning] is 'a place far from deforested areas.' That is to say, a place where people do not go to collect firewood. And the third [meaning] is 'a place far from conflict (*raṇa*).' By 'a place of conflict' is meant a place where defilements disrupt good actions; those who live in such places will fall prey to defilements. For this reason, an *araṇya* is called 'a place far from conflict.' Places that are from one *krośa* up to a hundred or a thousand *yojanas* away [from noise, deforested areas, or conflict] can be called an *araṇya*. According to the Sarvāstivāda school's interpretation, one *krośa* is five-hundred *dhanu* (*gong* 弓).³³ According to the Sammitīya's interpretation, on the other hand, one *krośa* is equal to one thousand *dhanu*. Since one *dhanu* is equal to eight *chi* 尺, altogether it is a place eight-hundred *zhang* 丈³⁴ distant. Based on the measurements of this land [i.e., China], it would be a little over four *li*³⁵ [from areas of disturbance].³⁶

³³ This idea is defined in the *Abhidharmakośa* III 87cd and the *Bhāṣya* thereon.

³⁴ 1 *zhang* = 10 *chi*; therefore, 800 *zhang* is 8,000 *chi* = 1,000 *dhanu* = 1 *krośa*.

³⁵ More accurately, it is 4.444... *li*.

³⁶ The text runs as follows: 真諦《釋》云，阿練若者，自有三義。一者離聲處，謂國邑音聲所不至故。二者離斫伐處，謂採薪所不至故。三者離鬪諍處，謂一切煩惱總能動亂善法，名為鬪諍。若住此處，能伏煩惱，故名離鬪諍也。從一拘盧舍外，外去乃至百千由旬，皆名阿練若處。若薩婆多部解，一拘盧舍五百弓。依正量部解，一拘盧舍凡一千弓也。一弓八尺，凡八百丈地。若准此間，應成四里少許。(Yuance's *Jie shenmi jing shu*, third fascicle, Z.1.1.34.4, 351b)

Here Paramārtha analyzes the Sanskrit term *araṇya* (P. *arañña*), a quiet, forested place of practice, as *a-raṇa*.³⁷ ‘A’ is a negative prefix and ‘*raṇa*’ is defined in the three ways given above. This demonstrates Paramārtha’s commentarial style of revealing the multiple meanings inherent within a single word. There are also other examples. According to Paramārtha, “sons of the Buddha” has five meanings,³⁸ “at that time” has eleven meanings,³⁹ “spiritual powers” has three meanings,⁴⁰ and “great” also has three meanings.⁴¹ Paramārtha frequently employed formulas for listing explanations: “such and such has ~ meanings,” “such and such has ~ types,” or “such and such itself has ~ meanings.” This is not to say that this technique was unique to Paramārtha. Rather, it was a general characteristic widely employed by Indian commentators, but it is nonetheless strongly represented especially in Paramārtha’s work.

It is noteworthy that Paramārtha’s conversion from Indian to Chinese metrology was based on the view of the Saṃmitīya school, and not of the Sarvāstivāda. This would be possible only if his main standpoint was the Saṃmitīya.

Furthermore, in the passage cited above, Paramārtha points out the diverging interpretations of the length of one *krośa* within the Sarvāstivāda school and the Saṃmitīya school. At the end of some passages, when comparing Indian and Chinese meanings, Paramārtha frequently uses the term “here [in China]” or “in this place” (*cijian* 此間) to explain the equivalent Chinese measures.

³⁷ For *a-raṇa* see Edgerton 1953: 64, “*a-raṇa*,” q.v., where it is explained that *raṇa* can signify *kleśa* (defilement).

³⁸ Paramārtha’s commentary is quoted in the first fascicle of Yuance’s *Jie shenmi jing shu* 解深密經疏, (Z1.34.4, 317c; cf. 324a). It may also have been quoted from Paramārtha’s *Jiejie jing shu*. Furthermore, an analogous commentary which is not listed as the original work of Paramārtha, but rather as one of his translations can be found in the *She dasheng lun yi* 攝大乘論釋 (Vasubandhu), eighth fascicle (T31, 306b).

³⁹ Yuance’s *Jie shenmi jing shu*, third fascicle (Z1.34.4, 349a).

⁴⁰ Ibid., second fascicle (Z1.34.4, 334a).

⁴¹ Ibid., first fascicle (Z1.34.4, 317a); Jizang’s 吉藏 *Fahua yishu* 法華義疏, first fascicle (T34, 457c).

Among the Indian monks who came to China, this way of explication was unique to those who were skilled in the different views of various schools, and Paramārtha was a typical example of such monks.

Interpretation of the meanings of proper nouns

Another unique characteristic of Paramārtha's work is his explanation of proper nouns. Two passages exemplify this approach. The first discusses the origin of the name Mahākāśyapa:

In the *Shiba bu lun shu* 十八部論疏⁴² it says: Correctly speaking, for Jiashe 迦葉 we should say Jiashebo 迦葉波 (*Kāśapa / Kāsapa?; P. Kassapa; Skt. Kāśyapa). Here [in China], *jiashe* means 'light' (*kāśa*) and *bo* means 'to drink' (*√pā*). Taken together, they mean 'drinker of light.' 'Drinker [of Light]' is a surname. There was an ancient ascetic (**r̥ṣi*) called 'Drinker of Light.' He had a luminous body and was able to drink various types of light and make them invisible. The present Jiashe belongs to a clan of this light drinking ascetic and therefore has the surname 'Drinker of Light.' His name was derived from his surname and so he was called 'Drinker of Light.'⁴³

This explanation is the same as Paramārtha's free translation of the Kāśyapīya (Jiashewei 迦葉維) school as Yinguang bu 飲光部 (literally "drinking light school"), but in the above passage his explanation is more detailed.

A second example is found in an explanation of the origin of the name "Mulian" 目連:

The Tripiṭaka Master Paramārtha said: Correctly speaking, for [Mulian] we should say Wuqi Luo 勿伽羅 (*Mudgala?; cf. P. Moggallāna, Skt. Maudgalyāyana). Here [in China], *wuqie* is called

⁴² Also known as the *Buzhi lun shu* 部執論疏.

⁴³ The text runs as follows: 《十八部論疏》云，具足應言迦葉波。迦葉，此云光。波，此云飲。合而言之，故云飲光。飲〔光〕是其姓。上古仙人名為飲光。以此仙人，身有光明，能飲諸光，令不復現。今此迦葉，是飲光仙人種，即以飲光為姓，從姓立名，稱飲光也。（Jizang's *Fahua yi shu*, first fascicle, T34, 459b).

‘western bean’ (*hudou* 胡豆), which is a green-colored bean⁴⁴ and *luo* means ‘to receive’ (\sqrt{la}) here. Taken together, they have the meaning of ‘receiving western beans.’ Probably this surname comes from an ancient ascetic ($*\gamma\dot{s}i$) called Wujialuo who only ate these beans and no other food. Therefore, he was named ‘Receiver of Western Beans.’ [Mulian] belongs to his clan and hence he has this name.⁴⁵

These explanations of people’s names are not generally found among the explications of other Indian commentators, but they do exist in the form of fragments of Paramārtha’s works which are still preserved in the Buddhist canon. This suggests that this style of explanation was unique to Paramārtha. It is quite possible that Paramārtha’s explanation here is based on his knowledge of the *nirvacana* tradition.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ *Maudga* > *mudga* (Pāli *mugga*). These green colored beans probably correspond to modern “mung” beans.

⁴⁵ The text runs as follows: 真諦三藏云，應言勿伽羅。勿伽者，此言胡豆，即綠色豆。羅，此云受。合而為言，應言受胡豆。蓋是其姓，上古有仙人名勿伽羅，不食一切物，唯食此豆，故名受胡豆。其是仙人種，故以為名也。(Jizang’s *Fahua yishu*, first fascicle, T34, 459c). Cf. Kuiji’s *Amituo jing shu* 阿彌陀經疏：故真諦云，應名勿伽羅。此云愛(受)胡豆。愛(受)胡豆即菉豆也。上古有仙人唯食此豆，是彼仙種，因姓為名 (T37, 315c). Furthermore, in the original text of the same commentary “愛” is erroneously given for “受.” Also, Paramārtha’s interpretation of ‘Mulian’ is found in the sixth fascicle of the *Sanlun xuanyi jianyou ji* 三論玄義檢幽集 by Chūgan Chōzen 中觀澄禪 (T70, 465bc). It is clear from the context that the passage is quoted from the ‘*Chaopi*’ 抄批, namely the *Sifen lü chaopi* 四分律鈔批 by commentator Dajue 大覺 (fl. ca. the beginning of the eighth century) in the Tang. However, the passage is not found in the extant version of the *Sifen lü chaopi*. Therefore it is highly probable that the extant version is different from the *Chaopi* consulted by Dajue.

⁴⁶ See, for example, the explanations of “*kaśyāpa*,” q.v. in Deeg 1995: 328 (also 425), “*aranya*,” q.v. in *ibid.*: 362 (also 422) and “*kacchapa*,” q.v. (cf. *kāśyapa*) in Kahrs 1998: 142. Note, however, that these explanations are not the same as Paramārtha’s.

Comparing India and China

Paramārtha was an Indian who had gone to China, and some of his comments comparing India and China have been preserved. The following statement about seasons is one example:

Dharma Master Paramārtha declared that there are three seasons, as follows: The four hot months [in India] span from the sixteenth day of the first month to the fifteenth day of the fifth month in this land [i.e., China]. The four rainy months span from the sixteenth day of the fifth month to the fifteenth day of the ninth month. The four cold months span from the sixteenth day of the ninth month to the fifteenth day of the first month. From the ninth day of the later half of the second month of the rainy season the nights gradually grow longer. In this place, this [begins on] the ninth day of the seventh month. From the ninth day of the later half of the fourth month of the cold season the nights gradually become shorter. In this place, this [begins on] the ninth day of the first month.⁴⁷

Descriptions of the seasonal divisions of the year in other texts such as the *Datang Xiyu ji* differ from those given by Paramārtha.⁴⁸ However, the passage cited above provides a concrete description of the months and days which mark the three seasonal divisions of the year in China (referred to above as “this place”).

In the “Yiyi” 一異 chapter of the *Jiejie jing*, i.e., *Samdhanirmocana-sūtra*, there is a reference to a musical instrument *pina* 毘拏.

⁴⁷ The text runs as follows: 又真諦法師立三際云，從此間正月十六日，至五月十五日，為熱際四月。從五月十六日，至九月十五日，為雨際四月。從九月十六日，至正月十五日，為寒際四月。雨際第二月後半第九日夜漸增，當此間七月九日。寒際第四月後半第九日夜漸減，當此間正月九日。(Puguang’s 普光 *Jushe lun ji* 俱舍論記, eleventh fascicle, T41, 188a).

⁴⁸ For an introduction to the six yearly divisions, see the seventh fascicle of the *Sapoduo pini piposha* 薩婆多毘尼毘婆沙 (**Sarvāstivādinayavibhāṣā* T23, 547c; translator unknown). For reference to the theory of three divisions, see the second fascicle of Daoshi’s 道世 *Pini taoyao* 毘尼討要 (Z1.70.2, 134b).

It is a translation of Skt. *vīṇā*.⁴⁹ Paramārtha explains the word in the following way:

In Paramārtha's note it says: A *pina* is a musical instrument. It approximately resembles the *piba* 毘巴 here.⁵⁰

Historically speaking, the creation of the Chinese *piba* (or *pipa*) was partially influenced by the Western Regions. This sort of information is rarely found in other Buddhist texts.

Comparing the theories of various schools

We have already seen how Paramārtha's commentaries include elucidations of the various meanings inherent in individual phrases. In a similar way, Paramārtha sometimes explained a given point from the perspective of different schools. His comment on the robe colors of Indian monks is one example. A monk's robes in India, called *kaṣāya* or *kāṣāya* 'deteriorated clothes,' had to be neither new nor of a pure color. Paramārtha described how monks' robes were altered to meet this requirement. The following is the Sui master Jizang's 吉藏 statement:

Tripitaka Master Paramārtha said: "The *kaṣāya* of foreign lands [i.e., India] are of blood-red color (crimson). Although [the robes] of the five schools⁵¹ are different, they are all red." Question: It is often said that robes are of three deteriorated colors. Why do you say that they are all red? Answer: It is usually explained that new robes are first stained blue, then they are soaked in mud, and next they are soaked in the sap of the Mulan (magnolia) tree. Therefore they can be called either blue, mud[-colored], or Mulan[-colored]. Tripitaka Master [Paramārtha] said: "This method is not used in the Middle Kingdom

⁴⁹ The word *pina* is found in T16, 713b25–26. Its Tibetan equivalent is *pi bang*. For the Tibetan translation of the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* see Lamotte 1935: 46, chap. 3, 6, ll. 4–7.

⁵⁰ The text runs as follows: 真諦《記》云，毘拏者是音樂器。此間毘巴，大略相似。(Yuanze's *Jie shenmi jing shu*, fascicle two, interlinear note, Z1.34.4, 347b).

⁵¹ For the notion of "the five schools" (*wubu* 五部), see Funayama 2007: esp. 86–89.

[i.e., India]. The three types of deterioration means that [monks' robes should] be stained by using one of three colors. They are stained blue if blue dye is available in the place. If no blue is available there, then the robes are stained with mud. If mud is not available there, one can grind iron to make a liquid [so that the robes] are stained. If one of these colors can be obtained it is sufficient. The colors will, however, vary according to differences of time and place. Because there is concern that *bhikṣus* will have doubts and regrets, it is said that one [of these] colors should be used. Although the doctrines of the eighteen schools are different, the color of their robes is the same. Therefore the *Great (Nirvāṇa) Sūtra* says: '[Those who] see my disciples wearing crimson robes say that [the robes] are [the color of] blood.'⁵² But since the method of staining is not the same, there are differences among the various schools. [For example], the Sarvāstivāda school stains the visible areas [of their robes]; the Sthaviravāda (Theravāda) school stains the seams [of their robes]; and the Sammitīya school stains the four corners [of their robes].'⁵³

Different versions of the above explanation can be found in the lost fragments preserved in the fourteenth fascicle of the *Xuan ying yin yi* 玄應音義 (also known as *Hui lin yin yi* 慧琳音義, fascicle fifty-nine; T54, 699a), and Daoxuan's *Jiemo shu* (in *Sifen lu jiemo shu ji yuan ji* 四分律羯磨疏濟緣記, fascicle eighteen; Z1.64.5, 459b) and elsewhere. These fragments are similar in that they all preserve Paramārtha's explanations to a Chinese audience regarding the color of monks' robes in India. According to Paramārtha, although

⁵² Cf. T12, 457b; 699b. Although the reference to the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* is included in Paramārtha's statement, we cannot exclude the possibility that it was Jizang's addition.

⁵³ The text runs as follows: 真諦三藏云, 赤血色衣, 外國袈裟, 雖復五部不同, 同皆赤色. 問. 常云三種壞色. 云何言竝赤色. 答. 常解云, 新衣前取青染, 次則入泥, 次樹汁度之, 名為木蘭, 故云若青若泥若木蘭. 三藏云. 預是中國人, 都無此法. 言三種壞色者, 三色之中, 隨用一色, 以點印之. 若有青處, 則用青點. 若無有青處, 用泥為點. 無泥處, 可磨鐵汁點之, 竝但應取一色便足, 但為時處各異, 一色不恒, 恐諸比丘生於疑悔, 故言於三種隨取一色. 十八部義雖異, 衣色是一. 故《大經》云, 見我弟子著赤色衣, 謂呼是血. 但點不同故, 有諸部為異. 若薩婆多部, 點顯現處. 上座部則節節皆點. 若正量部, 但點四角也. (Jizang's *Jingang bore jing yi shu*, second fascicle, T33, 97bc).

the staining methods of various schools were different, their robes were all considered to be red.⁵⁴

The next section discusses the positions of different schools regarding the number of teachings, 80,000 or 84,000.

Master Paramārtha said: Question: What does it mean to say that among the eight thousand teachings there is a single position regarding things such as the five *skandhas*? According to the Sthaviravāda (Theravāda) school, there are 84,000 teachings, while according to the Sammitīya school, there are only 80,000. Answer: In terms of the six types of *dharmas*, all teachings interpret the meaning in the same way. ...⁵⁵

We should be careful to note that the style here is roughly the same as a few other of Paramārtha's works which have been handed down as "translations." For example, in the *Xianshi lun*, the following commentary comparing schools is given:

[Regarding the *ālayavijñāna* of the Yogācāra school,] among the teachings of the Lesser Vehicle, the Sammitīya school calls it **avipranāśa* [*wushi* "without expiry"], using the analogy of a 'written contract.' ... The Mahāsāṃghika school calls it *sheshi* 攝識⁵⁶ The Sarvāstivāda school calls it **samanvāgataprāpti*⁵⁷ and the Sthaviravāda (Theravāda) school calls it **bhavāṅgavijñāna*. ...⁵⁸

Furthermore, a discussion of various schools can also be seen in the *Sui xiang lun*.⁵⁹

⁵⁴ On staining, see Hirakawa 1994: 606–616; and Satō 1963: 683–690.

⁵⁵ The text runs as follows: 真諦師云，問。此五蘊等八萬法門得一味義，其相云何。若依上坐(座)部，則有八萬四千法門。今依正量部，但有八萬。答。約六種法相，顯一味義。... (Yuance's *Jie shenmi jing shu*, third fascicle, Z1.34.4, 352c)

⁵⁶ The Skt. equivalent is unknown.

⁵⁷ The original Sanskrit term is not clear; it could also be *samanvāgatā prāptih*.

⁵⁸ The text runs as follows: 若小乘義，正量部名為無失，譬如券約。... 摩訶僧耆柯部名為攝識。... 薩婆多部名同隨得。... 他毘梨部名有分識。... (T31, 880c–881a).

⁵⁹ Cf. 若是薩婆多義，有同隨得繫之戒善，生雖謝同隨得繫，其住在過

Use of Chinese rather than Indian generic names in examples

In Indian Buddhist texts, there are cases where it is necessary in the course of an argument to provide a proof by means of an example that distinguishes between two different people. In such instances, we frequently see the use of the names ‘Devadatta’ and ‘Yajñadatta,’ just as in English, we might use generic names like ‘John’ and ‘Tom.’ Paramārtha also uses this rhetorical device. For example, in the *Po wo* 破我 chapter of the *Abhidharmakośa*, an illustration is used to distinguish between the minds of two people, referring to the minds of Devadatta (*devadatta-cetas*) and Yajñadatta (*yajñadatta-cetas*), which Paramārtha translated directly as “Tianyu’s 天與 (i.e., Devadatta’s) mind and Ciyu’s 祠與 (i.e., Yajñadatta’s) mind” (T29, 308b10). However, in other, similar cases we find examples in which Paramārtha used the Chinese names Zhang 張 and Wang 王, rather than Indian names. An example is found in the sixth fascicle of Dingbin’s *Sifenlu shi zong yi ji* where the *Ming liao [lun] shu* is quoted: “The three families of Zhang, Wang, and Li 李 each in turn provided food for *bhikṣus*” (Z.1.66.2, 173ab). Other examples are not restricted to Paramārtha’s compositions, but also appear in his translations. For instance, this usage is also seen in the first fascicle of the *Foxing lun*:

... First, the distinction between self and others is established with reference to [mental] continuums of different bodies. For example, when two people face each other, there are the concepts of self and other just as when Zhang faces Wang, Zhang is self and Wang is other; when Wang faces Zhang, Wang is self and Zhang is other. This logic also applies in the case of [non-human] objects. ...⁶⁰

The same sort of example is also found in the fourth fascicle of the *Si di lun*:

去，繫果在未來。若正量部戒善，生此善行，與無失法俱生，其不說有業能業，體生即謝滅，無失法不滅，攝業果令不失。（T32, 161c–162a）

⁶⁰ The text runs as follows: ... 前約異體相續，立自他義，如兩物相望，故互為自他，以張望王，張即為自，王即為他。以王望張，王自張他。義亦如是。... (T31, 789c; see also 792c24).

You ask: [Inasmuch as] all conditioned things are momentary without abiding, how can memory be possible? Why? Because it is incoherent to suppose that one person sees, and a different person remembers. Answer: If the cognizer changes, then memory would be impossible, just as if Zhang saw and Wang remembered. If the continuum of cognition changes, then in that case, too, memory would be impossible, just as one cannot remember a horse when what one saw was a cow. If cognition is unitary, then memory is still impossible, since no subsequent state of cognition could come into existence. That which is different from these three cases is called memory.⁶¹

It seems that the reference to Zhang and Wang was provided by Paramārtha or a member of his translation group in view of those in his Chinese audience who would not be familiar with Indian names such as Devadatta and Yajñadatta.

Commenting on sūtras composed in China

That Paramārtha and his translation group were conscious of their Chinese audience is also revealed in other ways. For example, we know that he made commentaries for *sūtras* composed in China. These *sūtras* include the *Renwang bore jing* 仁王般若經 (*Scripture of Benevolent Kings*) which was transmitted as one of Kumārajīva's translations. Since the Chinese provenance of this text has already been discussed by Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信亨, Ōno Hōdō 大野法道, and other scholars, there is no need to re-examine it here.⁶² It is certain that Paramārtha composed a commentary on this apocryphal *sūtra* in which he advocated some of his own views.

As mentioned in the first section of this paper, according to the list of *sūtras* recorded in the eleventh fascicle of the *Lidai sanbao*

⁶¹ The text runs as follows: 汝問。諸有為法，剎那不住，念云何成。何以故。他見他憶無此義故者。答。若知者異，念則不成。如張見王憶。若智相續異，念亦不成。如見牛不憶馬等。若智一，念亦不成。無後智故。反*此三義，則名為念。(T32, 397b) * The Song, Yuan, and Ming editions of the Canon read *fan* 反 while the Korean edition reads *ji* 及。

⁶² For a discussion of past research on the *Renwang bore jing* as an apocryphon, as well as my own thoughts on the matter, see Funayama 1996.

ji (T49, 99a2; a10), Paramārtha translated the *Renwang bore jing* in one fascicle and composed a commentary, the *Renwang bore shu*, in six fascicles. Other citations found in the works of Jizang, Zhiyi, and Yuance, confirm that Paramārtha's own commentary on the *sūtra* (which is sometimes called *Benji* 本記 "[Paramārtha's] original/root record (i.e., commentary)" in later references) did exist. However, the existence of Paramārtha's translation of the *sūtra* was denied by scholars such as Mochizuki and Ōno who maintained the *Renwang jing* was produced in China. There is an interesting fact which supports their view: In many, if not all cases, the words from the *sūtra* contained in Paramārtha's *Renwang bore shu* as quoted by Yuance are exactly the same as the apocryphal text said to have been translated by Kumārajīva, the *Renwang bore boluomi jing* 仁王般若波羅蜜經 (T245). As I indicated in a previous paper,⁶³ a close examination of the relationship between the apocryphal *Renwang jing* and the fragmentary quotations of Paramārtha's "Original Note" (*Renwang bore shu*)⁶⁴ reveals the following three points: (1) Paramārtha never translated the *Renwang jing*; (2) Paramārtha certainly composed some kind of commentary to the *Renwang jing*; and (3) Paramārtha based himself on the apocryphal text of Chinese origin, whose translation was traditionally attributed to Kumārajīva.

This so-called 'translation' by Kumārajīva, which formed the basis of Paramārtha's commentary, also reveals Paramārtha's

⁶³ Funayama 2006: 53–54. A close examination of Yuance's quotations of the *benji* clearly reveals that Paramārtha's text was a commentary on a text that had already existed as Kumārajīva's translation, inasmuch as we presume that Yuance's quotations are correct and trustworthy. It is certain that he sometimes did not quote the passages of other texts verbatim, but I assume that his quotations of the *benji* are largely trustworthy. At least it is evident that he knew Paramārtha's commentary on the *Renwang jing* and that what is called "Paramārtha's translation of the *Renwang jing*" did not exist in Yuance's times (see T33, 361c).

⁶⁴ The fact that Paramārtha's *Original Note* quoted by Yuance is the same as Paramārtha's *Renwang bore shu* is discussed in Ui 1965: 53. For a summary of Paramārtha's lost text cited in Yuance's *Renwang jing shu* see Kimura 1982.

system of *panjiao* 判教 (critical systematization of the Buddha's teachings). Although I am not able to give a complete account of Paramārtha's system of *panjiao* here, a few brief points can be introduced. First, there is a section of Paramārtha's commentary contained in the eighteenth fascicle of Puguang's 普光 *Jushe lun ji* 俱舍論記 which reads: "Furthermore, Paramārtha said: 1265 years have now passed since the Buddha's *nirvāṇa*" (T41, 282a).⁶⁵ This reveals Paramārtha's historical perspective as a Buddhist and, at the same time, it shows that Paramārtha assumed the development of the Buddha's teachings even within the Buddha's forty-five year teaching career. This citation was probably drawn from Paramārtha's lost texts, the *Jiejie jing shu* and the *Bu zhi lun ji*. From these two texts we see that in the *Jiejie jing* (also known as the *Jie shen mi jing*) there were three types of teachings, or turnings of the wheel of the *dharma*. It seems, however, that Paramārtha advocated a *panjiao*, which, while analogous to this, also differed somewhat in form. He developed this *panjiao* in his commentary to the *Renwang jing*. That is to say, the forty-five years of the Tathāgata's preaching career can be divided into three "wheels of teaching" (*fa lun* 法輪): *zhuanfalun* 轉法輪 ("turning the *dharma*-wheel"), *zhaofalun* 照法輪 ("illuminating the *dharma*-wheel"), and *chifalun* 持法輪 ("upholding the *dharma*-wheel"). This can be seen in the following passage:

Paramārtha said: The Tathāgata preached three types of *dharma*-wheel during his forty-five years in this world. These were the *zhuanfalun*, *zhaofalun*, and *chifalun*. Among these three *dharma*-wheels there are the revealed and the secret. The secret [teachings] are found among all three turnings of the *dharma*-wheels, from the night he attained emancipation to the night he entered *nirvāṇa*. The revealed [teachings were given] during the first seven years after he had attained emancipation. In the thirty-one years after the first seven, he turned the *zhuanfalun*.⁶⁶ During the seven years after the thirty-eighth

⁶⁵ Frauwallner 1951: 7–8.

⁶⁶ The expression *zhuan zhuanfalun* 轉轉法輪 would be unusual in Indic language, because the first *zhuan* is certainly a verb, whereas the compound *zhuanfalun*, which includes the second *zhuan*, should be a noun as the object of the first *zhuan*.

year, he turned the *chifalun*. [Thus we know that] after he turned the dharma-wheel he preached the *Wisdom Sūtras* up to the twenty-ninth year, that is [one year] before the thirtieth year, and only when it came to the eighth day of the first month of the thirtieth year, he preached the *Renwang*. Therefore, [the *sūtra*] states, “The eighth day of the [first] month of the [first] year [after the twenty-nine years].” Namely, he preached this *sūtra* in the thirty-seventh year after he attained emancipation and he was seventy-two years old.⁶⁷

In the history of Chinese Buddhism, there are two traditions regarding the chronology of Śākyamuni’s teaching. In the first, Śākyamuni left home at nineteen, attained the way at thirty, preached for forty-nine years, and died at the age of seventy-nine. In the second, he left home at twenty-nine, attained the way at thirty-five, preached for forty-five years, and died at the age of eighty.⁶⁸ The passage

⁶⁷ The text runs as follows: 真諦云, 如來在世四十五年, 說三法輪。謂轉·照·持。然此三輪, 有顯有密。密則從得道夜, 至涅槃夜, 俱轉三法輪。顯則初成道七年, 但轉轉法輪。七年後三十一年中, 轉照法輪。三十八年後七年中, 轉持法輪。從轉轉法輪來, 有三十年前至二十九年已說餘般若, 今至三十月初月八日, 方說《仁王》。故言“初年月八日”, 此則成佛道三十七年說此經, 乃年七十二歲也云云。(Spoken by Zhiyi, recorded by Guanding, *Renwanghu guo bore jing shu* 仁王護國般若經疏, second fascicle, T33, 263b). Note that the same content is also given in a different quote in the following way: 有云。真諦三藏意, 如來在世四十五年, 說三乘(for種?)法輪。一轉轉法輪, 說小乘故。然轉有顯密。密則始從得道夜, 至涅槃夜, 但具轉三法輪。顯即從初成道七年, 但轉轉法輪。次七年後三十一年中, 兼轉·照法輪。從三十八年後, 於七年中, 轉種(for持?)法輪。從初照至于轉治(for 持?)來, 合有三十一年。前二十九年已說餘般若, 今至三十月初月八日, 方說《仁王般若》, 故云“初年月八日”。故今《本記》云, 言“初年月八日”者, 即正月八日。如來成道七年說《般若》。案此經文, 已二十九年, 至此時, 應是成道後三十六年。此《本記》意, 義如上記。(Yuance’s *Renwang jing shu*, end of the first fascicle, T33, 376bc. Cf. also Jizang’s *Renwang bore jing shu*, first fascicle, T33, 321a).

⁶⁸ The belief that the Buddha preached for forty-nine years is found in Bai Fazu 白法祖 (Western Jin), trans., *Fo bannihuan jing* 佛般泥洹經, last fascicle (T71, 171bc, 172a); (translator unknown), *Bannihuan jing*, last fascicle (T1, 187a); Daoan 道安 (Former Qin / Eastern Jin), *Binaiyexu* 鼻奈耶序; Kumārajīva (Later Qin), trans., *Chan miyaofa jing* 禪秘要法經, middle fascicle (T15, 256a); Xiao Zilang 蕭子良 (Southern Qi),

quoted above in which Paramārtha speaks of the Tathāgata's "forty-five years in this world" conforms to the latter tradition. The same point is explained in the *Renwang bore jing*, where it says: 爾時十號三明大滅諦金剛智釋迦牟尼佛,初年月八日,方坐十地。(T8, 825b). The expression "*chu nian yue ba ri*" (初年月八日 "on the eighth day of the month [sic!] of the first year") does not seem to occur in other *sūtras* and is one of the unique characteristics of the *Renwang jing*. Therefore, the above passage can be interpreted as Paramārtha's development of an original classificatory system for *sūtras* for the purpose of explaining the *Renwang bore jing*. Incidentally, the *locus classicus* for the meaning of the three types of *dharma* wheel (*zhuan*, *zhao*, and *chi*) is not the *Renwang bore jing* or the *Jie shen mi jing*, but rather a passage in Paramārtha's translation of the chapter called *Ye zhang mie pin* 業障滅品 of the *Jin guangming (diwang) jing* 金光明(帝王)經.⁶⁹

One thing that is made clear from the above passage is that our previous assumption that, since he was Indian, Paramārtha would not comment on apocryphal texts is incorrect. Moreover,

Jingzhuzi 淨住子 (T52, 318c), and so forth. On the belief that the Buddha preached for forty-five years, see *Dasheng beifen tuoli jing* 大乘悲分陀利經 (translator unknown), sixth fascicle (T3, 276b); Tanwuchen 曇無讖 (Beiliang), trans., *Bei hua jing* 悲華經, eighth fascicle (T3, 219c); Saṃghabhadra 僧伽跋陀羅 (Sengjia Batuoluo, Southern Qi), trans., *Shan jian lü biposha* 善見律毘婆沙, first fascicle (T24, 675b); Bodhiruci 菩提流支 (Northern Wei), *Jingang xian lun* 金剛仙論, third fascicle (T25, 818b), and so forth.

⁶⁹ I.e., 歸命頂禮一切諸佛世尊, 現在十方世界, 已得阿耨多羅三藐三菩提者, 轉法輪, 照法輪, 持法輪, 雨大法雨, 擊大法鼓, 吹大法螺, 出微妙聲, 豎大法幢, 秉大法炬 (translation omitted). This passage is contained in the second fascicle of the *Jin guangming jing* (T16, 368b). On the *Jin guangming jing* as the basis for Paramārtha's theory, see the first fascicle of Chengguan's 澄觀 *Da fanguang huayan jing shu*: 真諦三藏依《金光明》立轉·照·持三輪之教, 亦大同此, 而時節小異。謂, 七年前說四諦, 名轉法輪。七年後說《般若》, 具轉·照二輪, 以空照有故。三十年後具轉·照·持, 以雙照空有持前二故 (T35, 508c; translation omitted). Incidentally, in Yijing's translation it reads: 轉妙法輪, 持·照法輪 (T16, 414a). In this translation, the three categories of turning, illuminating, and upholding are not clear.

as has already been established by Mochizuki, it would be a mistake to conclude on the basis of Paramārtha's commentary that the *Renwang bore jing* is an authentic *sūtra*. In other words, we cannot deny the possibility that Paramārtha made commentaries even on *sūtras* which he knew to be apocryphal (such as the *Renwang jing*). Having been trained in the orthodox Indian method of *sūtra* commentary this should have been unacceptable to him. Why then would Paramārtha do this? The reasons for this cannot be discussed in detail here, but, for one thing, Paramārtha was invited to preach to a Chinese audience so it is possible that he made use of *sūtras* that were already established and well-known in China in order to spread the Buddhist teachings.

*Approval of the characteristic doctrines of Chinese Buddhism –
The use of the theory of san shixin*

In his commentaries on Buddhist *sūtras*, Paramārtha was conscious of the technical terminology currently used in China, and made use of terms such as *shixin* 十信 (“ten faiths”), *shijie* 十解 (“ten comprehensions”), *shixing* 十行 (“ten practices”) and *shihuxiang* 十廻向 (“ten dedications”) when referring to the grounds of bodhisattva practice. *Shijie*, *shixing* and *shihuxiang* are called *san shixin* 三十心 which means “three sets of ten minds.” As has already been demonstrated, these terms related to the theory of bodhisattva practice were unique to Chinese Buddhist doctrine, and are not found in Indian texts. It has also already been pointed out that Paramārtha used the term *shijie* to refer to the traditional “ten abodes” (*shizhu* 十住).⁷⁰

⁷⁰ Mizuno 1984. Further, the following examples offer evidence of Paramārtha's use of terminology coined in China: 1. 真諦三藏《九識章》云，問。《大本》(i.e., 涅槃經)云“緣覺十千劫到” (cf. T12, 491c), 到何位，是何宗。答。此是寂宗意，除三界或(惑)，廻心學大乘，入十信，信法如如。准知真諦亦說十信為所到處(Yuance's *Jie shenmi jing shu*, fourth fascicle, Z1.34.4, 391bc; translation omitted). 2. 依《本記》云，出二乘也。大乘有二。一十信至十解，是不定。猶退為二乘。二十行至十地，是定。故言“行獨大乘” (Yuance's *Renwang jing shu*, fascicle “shang ben” 卷上本, T33,369a; translation omitted). 3. 一《本記》云，十信為習種性。十解為性

3. Interpolated elements within the translated text

Another issue regarding terms unique to the Chinese theory of stages mentioned at the end of the last section is the fact that Paramārtha used technical terms such as *shixin*, *shijie*, *shixing* and *shihuixiang* in both his commentaries and in what have been identified as his translations. This is one of the reasons why it is problematic to take some of Paramārtha's works as pure translations of Indic texts. As many previous studies have already shown, there is a passage in the third fascicle of Paramārtha's translation of the *She dasheng lun shi* which reads:

Bodhisattvas are of two kinds: (1) one who abides at a worldly stage; and (2) one who abides at a holy stage. The stages from the initial arousing of the mind (of enlightenment) to the Ten Faiths are all worldly stages. The stages of the Ten Comprehensions or higher all belong to the holy stages.⁷¹

There is also an explanation given in the fourth fascicle of the same text:

Bodhisattvas are of two kinds: namely, worldlings and saints. Those who are in the stages up to the Ten Faiths are worldlings, and those who are in the stages of the Ten Comprehensions or higher are saints.⁷²

From these passages we can see that some of Paramārtha's theory clearly diverged from the Indian terminology and doctrine of practice and was derived instead from Chinese Buddhist doctrines.

種性。十行為道種性。十迴向已上即屬見道。經說信等為其性故。又下經云。十信十止十堅心。故知十信為習種性(Yuance's *Renwang jing shu*, fascicle *zhong ben* 卷中本 T33,386c; translation omitted). These passages are enough to clarify Paramārtha's use of technical terms such as *shixin* and *shihuixiang* in his explanations of the theory of practice. I have already discussed this issue in Funayama 2002: esp. 22; and Funayama 2003: esp. 126.

⁷¹ 菩薩有二種，一在凡位，二在聖位。從初發心，訖十信以還，並是凡位。從十解以上，悉屬聖位。(T31,174c)

⁷² 菩薩有二種。謂凡夫·聖人。十信以還是凡夫，十解以上是聖人。(T31,177c)

Briefly stated, in the history of Chinese Buddhism from the Six Dynasties through the Sui and Tang, the standard theory for the stages of the bodhisattva path contained the following fifty-two stages after *chu faxin* 初發心 (generation of *bodhicitta*):

- ten elementary stages called ten faiths (*shixin* 十信) [stages 1–10]
- ten abodes (*shizhu* 十住; called *shijie* 十解 in Paramārtha’s texts) [stages 11–20]
- ten practices (*shixing* 十行) [stages 21–30]
- ten dedications (*shihuixiang* 十迴向) [stages 31–40]
- ten grounds (or ten stages, *shidi* 十地) [stages 41–50]
- final two grounds (*hou erdi* 後二地) [stages 51–52]⁷³

The stages from *chu faxin* to the end of the *shixin* were known as the “stages of outer (*bāhya*) worldlings (*prthagjana*).” Next, what is called *san shixin* “three sets of ten minds” were known as the “stages of inner worldlings” and the *chudi* 初地 (“first ground” of the ten holy grounds) and up were regarded as the “stages of saints.” In contrast with this system, we know from the two passages cited above that Paramārtha’s theory held that the stages from *chu faxin* to the end of the *shixin* were known as the “stages of worldlings” (*fan wei* 凡位 or *fanfu wei* 凡夫位) and the stages from the beginning of ten abodes on were known as the “stages of saints” (or holy stages; *sheng wei* 聖位 or *shengren wei* 聖人位). This way of establishing the boundary between worldlings and saints (or holy beings) was a significant divergence from contemporary Chinese doctrines. From the perspective of his Chinese audience, this way of explaining the theory of the bodhisattva path had the value of being easy to understand. On the other hand, it is problematic that the texts which are transmitted as “Paramārtha’s translations” contain those non-translational elements. Which part of the translation was literal and which part was added by Paramārtha or his translation group? These issues have not yet been completely resolved.

⁷³ For this point, see also Funayama 2005b: 388–392.

Translating one Sanskrit word with two Chinese characters and giving different explanations for each

Closely related to the preceding discussion is the fact that Paramārtha often used two Chinese characters to translate a single Indic word and provided different explanations for each of those characters. Of course, the use of two similar Chinese characters to express the meaning of a single Indic word is not unusual, but to give different explanations for those two characters is quite rare. A straightforward example, already discussed by Nagao Gadjin, is the way in which the word “*huanxi*” 歡喜 (joy/joyous) is explained by its components “*huan*” and “*xi*.”⁷⁴ *Huanxi* is a simple word which corresponds to the original adjective *pramudita-* (to be delighted, to be happy), namely the first stage of the earliest ten stages of the bodhisattva path, also known as the “joyous ground” (*pramuditā bhūmiḥ*). In the eighth fascicle of Paramārtha’s translation of Vasubandhu’s commentary on the *Mahāyānaśāstra*, it is explained in the following way:

To abandon affection for oneself is called *huan*, and to produce affection for others is called *xi*.⁷⁵

This explanation is completely based on the Chinese language and is not possible in Sanskrit. From his investigation of the context in which the word occurred, Nagao points out that this is not just limited to the explanation of the word *huanxi* but can be extended throughout the entire section in question and that those elements cannot be taken as translations. Furthermore, Nagao also indicates that in addition to *huanxi* in Paramārtha’s translation of Vasubandhu’s commentary on the *Mahāyānaśāstra*, there is also the example of the differentiation of the characters *yi* and *yong* in the compound *yi-yong* 意用 (*āśaya*).

Moreover, in the ninth fascicle of the same text, the phrase *xin-yao* 信樂意 (*adhyāśaya*) is separated into *xin*, *yao*, and *yi*. The explanation given for the difference between *xin* and *yao* is as follows:

⁷⁴ Nagao 1987: 60.

⁷⁵ 捨自愛名歡，生他愛名喜. (T31, 206a).

Because the mind is settled and without doubt about the orthodox teachings of the six *pāramitās*, it is called *xin* (faith). And because one wishes to practice in accord with the object towards which one holds faith, it is called *yao* (desire).⁷⁶

Xinyaoyi corresponds to the Sanskrit term *adhyāśaya*. The same Sanskrit word is translated as *shenxin* 深心 by Buddhaśānta and Gupta, and as *zengshang yiyao* 增上意樂 by Xuanzang. Therefore, it seems that Paramārtha's distinction between *xin* and *yao* does not make sense in Sanskrit.

The explanation of the term *runhua* 潤滑 in second fascicle of the *Foxing lun* is yet another example. There, *runhua* is divided into *run* 潤 and *hua* 滑 as two separate notions.⁷⁷ The corresponding portion of the section of the Sanskrit text of the *Ratnagoṭravibhāga* leads us to believe that the original Sanskrit for *runhua* was the single word *snigdha* “moist / lubricating” and that distinguishing between *run* and *hua* does not make sense in the context of Indic languages.

Again, as has already been discussed in a previous study, in the *Sui xiang lun* 隨相論, the term *aiyu* 愛欲 (*chanda*) used in the *Abhidharmakośa* is analyzed in terms of *ai* and *yu*.⁷⁸

⁷⁶ 於六度正教中，心決無疑，故名為信。如所信法，求欲修行，故名為樂。(T31, 213b).

⁷⁷ In the passage which gives a detailed explanation of this term, *run* and *hua* are distinguished: 潤滑者，潤以顯其能攝義，滑者顯其背失向德義 (T31, 797a12–13). The term originated as an explanation of the phrase “*san runhua xing zhe*” 三潤滑性者 (T31, 796c17–18) and originally appeared in the following passage: 別相有三種。何者為三。一者如意功德性，二者無異性，三者潤滑性 (T31, 796b5–6). Fortunately, these three terms were translated in the thirty-first verse of the original Sanskrit text of the *Baoxing lun* 寶性論* and its prose commentary as *ruyi gongdexing* 如意功德性, *wuyixing* 無異性, and *runhuaxing* 潤滑性 and correspond to the Sanskrit words *prabhāva*, *ananyathābhāva*, *snigdha* (or *snigdhabhāva*). In spite of the fact that the passage following “*san runhuaxingzhe*” (T31, 796c17–18) does not exactly correspond to the *Baoxing lun*, we can safely infer that the term *runhua* is equivalent to Skt. *snigdha*. *For this passage see Takasaki 1989: 47–48.

⁷⁸ Namely, 我及愛是見道所破，欲是修道所破 (T32, 165c4–5; transla-

We have seen examples of how, in texts such as the *She dasheng lun shi* and the *Foxing lun*, one Sanskrit word was translated using two semantically similar Chinese characters which were interpreted as having different meanings. With regard to these examples, previous research has generally held that they resulted from the scribal errors of Paramārtha's disciples, since an Indian scholar-monk such as Paramārtha was not expected to give such explanations.⁷⁹ It has been concluded, therefore, that those aspects of Paramārtha's translations which are inexplicable or inconvenient are attributable to his disciples' misunderstandings, but I doubt that such explanations are correct. As shown above, Paramārtha's commentary on the apocryphal *Renwang bore jing* and the Chinese Buddhist doctrinal terminology used to discuss the beginning stages of practice (ten faiths, ten practices, and ten dedications of mind) cannot be explained in terms of disciples' errors. Setting aside the question of whether or not Paramārtha fully endorsed this approach, we can say that using elements unique to China in commentaries was in some form approved by him or by the consensus of his *sūtra* translation group.

Pure translation should contain small-print interlinear notes

In Paramārtha's "translations" we sometimes observe that those words which should have been written as small interlinear notes if the text was a pure translation are included in the body of the text.

tion omitted). For this see Aohara 2003: 845.

⁷⁹ Nagao Gadjin writes: "It is difficult to believe that this sort of Chinese commentary could have come from Paramārtha. Therefore it was probably the commentary of his disciples which was mixed in with [the original translation]." (Nagao 1987: 60.) Furthermore, when proposing the theory that there existed two different Vasubandhus who were later mistakenly identified as a single person, Frauwallner also noted the possibility that Paramārtha correctly understood the difference between the two persons but that his disciples wrongly confused them as a single person and therefore compiled the *Posoupandou fashi zhuan* 婆藪槃豆法師傳 which took Vasubandhu as a single person. See Frauwallner 1951: 18.

There are a number of such passages. A typical example is found in the following passage of the *Xianshi lun* 顯識論:

Third, *yong shi* 用識 is of six types such as [cognition] in the realm of the eye; these are the six cognitions. The *Dalun* calls them *zhengshou shi* 正受識.⁸⁰

In Chinese Buddhism, the *Dalun* frequently refers to the *Da zhidu lun*, but this is not the case; here *Dalun* refers to the *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*. It is easily surmised from the general context that the *Xianshi lun* is a kind of commentary on a certain section of the *Mahāyānasamgraha*. It should be noted that *yong shi* and *zhengshou shi* both derive from the same Sanskrit word *aupabhogikam vijñānam* (or *upabhogavijñānam*).⁸¹ In other words, although the different translations of *yong shi* and *zheng shoushi* are meaningful in Chinese, they create a tautology in Indic languages and are meaningless in the given context. Therefore, the underlined words of the above passage probably did not exist in the original Indic text.

⁸⁰ 第三用識者，六種眼識界等，即是六識。《大論》名為正受識 (T31, 879a).

⁸¹ The translation of *yong shi* is found in a stanza in the first fascicle of Paramārtha's translation of the *Madhyāntavibhāga* 中邊分別論 (T31, 451c28) and in the prose commentary thereon (452a1–2). The corresponding Sanskrit for the term in the verse (1, 9b) is *aupabhogikam (vijñānam)*; in the verse commentary it is *upabhoga(-vijñānam)*. Furthermore, a stanza of the *Zhongbian fenbie lun* is quoted in the *Mahāyānasamgraha*, where the same term is translated as *shou shi* 受識 (T31, 115c19). This *shou shi* corresponds to what was translated in the preceding prose commentary as *shouyong shi* 受用識 (T31, 118c18). In short, in comparing Paramārtha's translations of the *Zhongbian fenbie lun* and the *She dasheng lun*, he translates the same Sanskrit word alternately as *yong shi*, *shou shi*, and *shouyong shi*. Moreover, in the first fascicle of Paramārtha's translation of the *She dasheng lun* there is the term *zhengshou shi* 正受識. This corresponds to what Xuanzang translated as *bi neng shou shi* 彼能受識 and probably refers to the Sanskrit *upabhoga*. On this point see Nagao 1987: 275–277. Taking all this into account, it is evident that there is no essential difference between *yong shi* and *zhengyong shi*. Using both of them forms a tautology in Sanskrit.

As is well-known, the *Biography of the Buddhist Master of the Law Vasubandhu* has also been identified as one of Paramārtha's translations. However, unless it is assumed that there are elements added to the translation, passages like the following cannot be properly understood:

In this land there was a Brahman, who was the state master, with the surname Kauśika. He had three sons who were all named Vasubandhu. Vasu is translated as 'heaven' (*tian*). Bandhu is translated as 'family' (*qin*). In India, there is such a custom in naming children. Although they have the same name, they are each given another [different] name so that they can be distinguished. The third child named Vasubandhu became a monk of the Sarvāstivāda school and attained the fruit of arhatship. He was also named Bilinchibasuo 比隣持跋娑 (Virīncivatsa?). Bilinchi was his mother's name and Basuo (*vatsa*) means 'son' or 'child.' People also use the name Basuo to refer to the offspring of cattle. But in this place [i.e., China] the offspring of cattle are called *du* 犢.⁸²

In this passage, an explanation of the name Vasubandhu is given. It is evident that the name Vasubandhu (Tianqin 天親, Shiqin 世親) was not the name he received when he was ordained as a monk (i.e., what is called "dharma name") but rather his original birth name conferred on him by his parents.⁸³ It is possible to assume

⁸² 此土有國師婆羅門姓憍尸迦。有三子同名婆藪槃豆。婆藪譯為天，槃豆譯為親。天竺立兒名有此體。雖同一名，復立別名，以顯之。第三子婆藪槃豆，於薩婆多部出家，得阿羅漢果。別名比隣持跋娑⁽¹⁾。比隣持是其母名。跋娑⁽²⁾譯為子，亦曰兒。此名通人畜，如牛子亦名跋娑⁽²⁾，但此土呼牛子為犢⁽³⁾。(T50, 188b). (1) *Suo* 娑 - (1) The original text gives *po* 婆 but, given the context, it should be read *suo* 娑. (2) *Basha* 跋娑 - The Korean edition has *fupo* 紱婆; The Song, Yuan, and Ming editions all have *bapo* 跋婆, but it should read *basha* in accord with its meaning. (3) In the Taishō canon (as well as the Shukuzō 縮藏) this section is punctuated as "... 為犢長子。婆藪槃豆是菩薩根性人。" However, it should read "... 為犢。長子婆藪槃豆是菩薩根性人。"

⁸³ Likewise, according to the first fascicle of Shentai's 神泰 commentary on the *Abhidharmakośa* (*Jushe lunshu* 俱舍論疏, first fascicle, Z1.83.3, 277cd), the "Vasu" of Vasubandhu means Vasudeva and his parents were given the child because they worshipped at *Posou tian miao* 婆藪天廟 (that is, Vasudeva shrine).

that the underlined words were supplemented when the text was translated into Chinese.

The next passage is also from the *Biography of Dharma Master Vasubandhu*:

Within five hundred years after the Buddha's *nirvāṇa*, there was an *arhat* named Jiazhanyanzi 迦旃延子 (Kātyāyanīputra). His name was derived from his mother's surname, which was Jiazhanyan. He first became a monk of the Sarvāstivāda school. He was Indian and later went to the kingdom of Jibin 罽賓國.⁸⁴ Jibin is in the northwest of India. In collaboration with the five hundred *arhats* and the five hundred bodhisattvas, he compiled the Sarvāstivāda school's Abhidharma text, the *Ba jialanta* 八伽蘭他 (**Aṣṭaśāstrā*). Here it is known as the *Ba jian* 八犍度. ...⁸⁵

It is hard to believe that the underlined words are translations from the original Indic text. Although the above-cited passages are traditionally regarded as translations, it is noteworthy that the phrases “this place” (*citu* 此土) and “here” (*cijian* 此間) which refer to China are used in the above two passages. The *Ba jian* signifies the *Apitan ba jian lun* 阿毘曇八犍度論 (T1543) translated by Saṃghavarman and Zhu Fonian. It is a version of the *Jñānaprasthāna*, the text later translated by Xuanzang as the *Fazhi lun* 發智論.

The possibility that the *Biography of Dharma Master Vasubandhu* is not a pure translation, and that it contains elements of Paramārtha's oral commentaries was first pointed out by Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎, and I concur with his conclusion. However, I would like to correct an error Takakusu made regarding the following passage:

⁸⁴ Jibin 罽賓 signifies the northwest region which includes Gandhāra and Kashmir.

⁸⁵ 佛滅度後五百年中，有阿羅漢名迦旃延子。母姓迦旃延，從母為名。先於薩婆多部出家。本是天竺人，後往罽賓國。罽賓在天竺之西北。與五百阿羅漢及五百菩薩，共撰集薩婆多部阿毘達磨，製為《八伽蘭他》，即此間云《八犍度》。... (T50, 189a). * “Jian” 犍, following the Song, Yuan, and Ming editions. The Korean edition has “qian” 乾.

Up to this part, the text records the [three] brothers of Vasubandhu and so forth. Hereafter, it records that Sanzang Sheli 三藏闍梨⁸⁶ went east from the imperial palace of Taicheng 臺城 [and later] arrived at Guangzhou where he again translated all the Mahāyāna treatises. It also records the affairs which occurred after his death so that these things would be passed on to later generations.⁸⁷

In this passage, Takakusu's translation of Taicheng as "the capital of Tai-chou," that is to say, the capital city of Tai prefecture (present Zhejiang province) is incorrect.⁸⁸ Moreover, Takakusu also mistakenly disregards the distinction between the characters *tai* 臺 (Taicheng 臺城) and *tai* 台 (Taizhou 台州).⁸⁹

Furthermore, the identity of the author of this passage is quite problematic. I would suggest that this postscript was not a later addition but was present from the beginning. One reason for this is the unique expression used to refer to Paramārtha, "Sanzang Sheli." First, at the end of the *Niepan jing benyou jinwu ji lun* 涅槃經本有今無偈論, translated by Paramārtha, it notes that it was "Sanzang Sheli's oral exposition" 三藏闍梨解旨 (T26, 282c). This passage reveals that it was Paramārtha's own oral commentary transcribed as an appendix to the translation. And second, at the end of Paramārtha's translation of the *Guangyi famen jing* 廣義法門經, there is a passage which reads:

This *sūtra* issued from a chapter of the *Middle Āgama* [*Madhyamāgama*]. Paramārtha Sanzang Sheli was requested to translate it on the tenth day of the eleventh month of the fourth year (563) of the

⁸⁶ *Sanzang* is "the Tripiṭaka Master" and *sheli* (for *asheli* 阿闍梨) signifies "master" or "mentor"; that is, Paramārtha.

⁸⁷ 前來訖此, 記天親等兄弟。此後記三藏闍梨從臺城出入東至廣州, 重譯大乘諸論并遷化後事, 傳於後代。(T50, 191a).

⁸⁸ Takakusu 1904: 293

⁸⁹ Takakusu's error is not explicitly mentioned by Frauwallner 1951: 18, but his translation shows the referent for the place name Taicheng as "the city of Tai (Nanjing)." *Taicheng* should rather be understood as indicating the inner city of Jiankang, namely the imperial palace where the emperor resided. This was correctly indicated in Demiéville 1931: 18. For a classic study on Taicheng, see Zhu 1936: 108–116.

Tianjia era of the Chen, *guiwei* year, at the Zhizhi Temple 制旨寺 in Guangzhou.⁹⁰

Considering these two examples, it is possible that Paramārtha was reverentially called *Sanzang Sheli* by his direct disciples.

In any event, if the above-mentioned affairs of Paramārtha after his arrival in China were recounted in the now lost second half of the present *Biography of Dharma Master Vasubandhu*, it goes without saying that such records cannot be called translation in the strict sense.

Conclusion

This essay has examined some of the unique aspects of Paramārtha's compositions (or rather, his oral teachings as recorded by his disciples) through quoted fragments. These fragments provide clear evidence of the proactive techniques utilized by Paramārtha when commenting on *sūtras*, which include: revealing the multiple meanings within a single phrase; interpreting the meanings of proper nouns; comparing India and China; comparing the theories of various Indian schools; the use of Chinese rather than Indian names; and commenting even on apocryphal *sūtras*. Further, we have discussed elements within his "translations" such as his method of translating one Sanskrit word with two Chinese characters and giving different explanations for each, and the presence within the body of the text of passages which, if the texts were translations in the strict sense, should have been given as small-print interlinear notes.

Generally speaking, this essay has shown that one of the primary characteristics of Paramārtha's compositions was his consciousness of the culture of his Chinese disciples and audience. In this we see a concrete example of the intersection of Indian and Chinese cultures. Paramārtha actively made use of elements unique to Chinese culture. This may have been one of his unique traits or it may have been a common pattern among Indian scholar-monks of

⁹⁰ 此經出中阿含一品。陳天嘉四年歲次癸未十一月十日，於廣州制旨寺，請真諦三藏闍梨為譯。(T1, 922a).

that period.⁹¹ The latter possibility is also suggested in sections of the *Da zhidu lun* 大智度論.⁹² Either way, it is a tangible example of the Buddhist monk Paramārtha's "preaching the *dharma* in accord with circumstances" and his practice of "skillful means."

⁹¹ For confirmation of the Northern Wei monk Bodhiruci's 菩提流支 use of Chinese doctrine and *sūtra* exegesis, see Ōtake 2001: 65–68. Moreover, Yuance's *Jie shenmi jingshu*, *Renwang jingshu*, as well as other Tang commentaries, quote the teachings of the Indian monk called *Chang'er sanzang* 長耳三藏 (i.e., "the Tripiṭaka Master 'Long Ears'"). Some of those passages state that *Chang'er Sanzang* explained compounds such as *rushi* 如是 (*evam*) of the phrase *rushi wo wen* 如是我聞 by dividing it into *ru* 如 and *shi* 是 as two separate notions. The identity of *Chang'er Sanzang* is uncertain, but in the second fascicle of Zhanran's *Weimo jing lueshu* 維摩經略疏 (T38, 583b5) there is mention of a "Shang tongshi" 尚統師, that is to say Fashang 法上 (495–580 cf. "Gaoqi Shang tongshi" 高齊尚統師 T85, 514b4–5), who once spoke with with *Chang'er Sanzang*. Therefore, it may be the case that *Chang'er Sanzang* was the monk from the Northern Qi who worked as a *zhao xuantong* 昭玄統 (governmental monk-administrator; for this see also the *Lidai sanbao ji*, fascicle 12 in T49, 102c20–21), that is Narendrayaśas 那連提耶舍 (490–589) who was explicitly characterized by his long ears (see T50, 433a17–20; T55, 365b11–13). For Narendrayaśas as one of ten members of the *xuantong* under Fashang, see Yamazaki 1942: 521 and 545–556. 唐·栖復《法華玄贊要集》卷七: 言長耳等者, 梵云那連提黎耶舍, 隨(read隋)言尊, 北印度烏長人也。(Z1. 53, 4, 326c). Further, according to Yamaguchi Hiroe, an eighteenth century Japanese Tendai monk Shutoku Honjun 守篤本純, also identifies *Chang'er sanzang* with Narendrayaśas; for this, see Yamaguchi 2004: 116f.

⁹² I.e., 讚歎者, 美其功德為讚, 讚之不足, 又稱揚之故言歎。 (T25, 277a). Lamotte translates the passage as follows: "Tsan-t'an 讚歎 (*varnana* « louange »). – Louer leurs qualités, c'est *tsan*; les vanter sans cesse et les exalter, c'est *t'an*." And on this runs his brief comment: "Ces explications sémantiques sont évidemment des gloses chinoises à l'usage des Chinois." For this see Lamotte 1976: 1934.

Bibliography

- Aohara Norisato 青原令知 1993: “Tokue no Zuisō ron” 德慧の『隨相論』, *Indogaku bukkuyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 41/2, pp. 978(185)–974(189).
- 2003. “Tokue Zuisō ron no jittai gyōsō kaishaku” 德慧『隨相論』の集諦行相解釋, *Indogaku bukkuyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 51/2, pp. 847(186)–842(191).
- Chimpa, Lama and Chattopadhyaya, Alaka (tr.), Chattopadhyaya, Debiprasad (ed.), 1990: *Tāranātha’s History of Buddhism in India*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass (originally Simla, 1970).
- Deeg, Max, 1995: *Die altindische Etymologie nach dem Verständnis Yāska’s und seiner Vorgänger: eine Untersuchung über ihre Praktiken, ihre literarische Verbreitung und ihr Verhältnis zur dichterischen Gestaltung und Sprachmagie*, Dettelbach: J. H. Röll.
- Demiéville, Paul, 1929: “Sur l’authenticité du Ta tch’eng k’i sin louen,” *Bulletin de la Maison Franco-Japonaise* II, 2, Tokyo, pp. 1–79 (reprint: Paul Demiéville, *Choix d’études bouddhiques (1929 – 1970)*. Leiden: E. J. Brill 1973, pp. 1–79).
- 1931: “L’origine des sectes bouddhiques d’après Paramārtha,” *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 1, 1931, pp. 15–64 (reprint, Paul Demiéville, *Choix d’études bouddhiques (1929 – 1970)*, Leiden: E. J. Brill 1973, pp. 80–130).
- Edgerton, Franklin, 1953: *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, Vol. II, New Haven: Yale University Press (Reprint Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass 1970).
- Fangshang shi jing (Sui-Tang ke jing)* 房山石經(隋唐刻經), 30 Vols, Beijing: Huaxia chubanshe 2000.
- Forte, Antonino, 1990: “The Relativity of the Concept of Orthodoxy in Chinese Buddhism: Chih-sheng’s Indictment of Shih-li and the Proscription of the *Dharma Mirror Sutra*,” In: Robert E. Buswell, Jr. (ed.), *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, pp. 239–249.
- Frauwallner, Erich, 1951: *On the Date of the Buddhist Master of the Law Vasubandhu*, Roma: IsMEO.
- 1959: “Dignāga, sein Werk und seine Entwicklung,” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens*, 3, pp. 83–164.
- 1969: *Die Philosophie des Buddhismus*, 3. durchgesehene Auflage, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

- Funayama Toru 船山徹 1996: “Gikyō *Bonmō kyō* seiritsu no shomondai” 疑經『梵網經』成立の諸問題, *Bukkyō shigaku kenkyū* 仏教史学研究 39/1, pp. 54–78.
- 2002: “‘Kan’yaku’ to ‘Chūgoku senjutsu’ no aida – kanbun Butten ni tokuyū na keitai o megutte” 「漢譯」と「中國撰述」の間 – 漢文佛典に特有な形態をめぐって, *Bukkyō shigaku kenkyū* 佛教史學研究 45/1, pp. 1–28.
- 2003: “Ryūju, Mujaku, Seshin no tōtatsushita kai ni kansuru shodenshō” 龍樹, 無著, 世親の到達した階位に関する諸傳承, *Tōhōgaku* 東方學 105, pp. 134–121.
- 2005a: “Shintai sanzō no chosaku no tokuchō: Chūin bunka kōshō no rei to shite” 真諦三藏の著作の特徴 – 中印文化交渉の例として, *Kansai daigaku, Tōzai gakujutsu kenkyūsho kiyō* 關西大學東西學術研究所紀要 38, pp. 97–122
- 2005b: “Seijakan no ni keitō – Rikuchō Zui Tō bukkyōshi chōkan no isshiron” 聖者觀の二系統 – 六朝隋唐佛教史鳥瞰の一試論, in: Mugitani Kunio 麥谷邦夫 (ed.), *Sangyō kōshō ronsō* 三教交渉論叢, Kyoto: Kyōto daigaku jinbun kagaku kenkyūsho, pp. 373–408.
- 2006: “Masquerading as Translation: Examples of Chinese Lectures by Indian Scholar-Monks in the Six Dynasties Period,” *Asia Major, Third Series*, Vol. XIX, Pts. 1–2, pp. 39–55.
- 2007: “Kyōten no gisaku to henshū: Yuigyō zanmai kyō to Sharihotsu mon kyō,” 經典の偽作と編輯 – 『遺教三昧經』と『舍利弗問經』, in: Kyōto daigaku Jinbun kagaku kenkyūsho (ed.), *Chūgoku shūkyō bunken kenkyū* 中國宗教文獻研究, Kyoto: Rinsen shoten, pp. 83–107.
- Hattori Masaaki 服部正明 1955: “*Busshō ron no ichi kōsatsu*” 『佛性論』の一考察, *Bukkyō shigaku* 佛教史學 4/3&4, pp. 160–174.
- 1961: “Dignāga oyobi sono shūhen no nendai” ディグナーガ及びその周邊の年代, in: *Tsukamoto hakase shōjū kinen bukkyō shigaku ronshū* 塚本博士頌壽記念佛教史學論集, Kyoto: Tsukamoto hakase shōjū kinen kai, pp. 79–96.
- Hirakawa Akira 平川彰 1994: *Hirakawa Akira chosaku shū, dai 16 kan ni-hyakugojikkai no kenkyū III* 平川彰『平川彰著作集第 16 卷 二百五十戒の研究 III, Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- Imazu Kōgaku 今津洪嶽 1925: “Ragōrabadara no chūron chū ni tsuite” 羅睺羅跋陀羅の中論註に就て, *Gendai Bukkyō* 現代佛教, 2–16, pp. 72–84.
- Iwata Taijō 岩田諦靜 2004: *Shintai no yuishikisetsu no kenkyū* 真諦の唯識説の研究, Tokyo: Sankibō busshorin.

- Kahrs, Eivind, 1998: *Indian Semantic Analysis: The 'Nirvacana' Tradition*, Cambridge: University of Cambridge (Oriental Publications 55).
- Katsumata Shunkyō 勝又俊教 1961: *Bukkyō ni okeru shinshikiki setsu no kenkyū* 佛教における心識説の研究, Tokyo: Sankibō busshorin.
- Kimura Kunikazu 木村邦和 1982: “Saimyōji Enjiki ni okeru Shintai sanzō shoden no gakusetsu ni taisuru hyōka, 2” 西明寺圓測における真諦三藏所傳の學説に對する評價(二), *Kenkyū kiyō (Nagaoka tanki daigaku)* 研究紀要(長岡短期大學) 6, pp. 82–67.
- Lamotte, Étienne, 1935: *Samḍhinirmocana sūtra: l'explication des mystères*, Louvain: Bureaux du recueil, Bibliothèque de l'Université.
- 1976: *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñā-pāramitāsāstra), Tome IV*, Louvain: Institut Orientaliste.
- Mizuno Kōgen 水野弘元 1984: “Gojūnii tō no bosatsu kaii setsu” 五十二位等の菩薩階位説, *Bukkyōgaku* 佛教學 18, pp. 1–28.
- Nagao Gadjin 長尾雅人 1987: *Shō daijō ron – wayaku to chūkai (ge)* 攝大乘論 – 和譯と注解(下), Tokyo: Kōdansha.
- Nagasawa Jitsudō 長沢實導 1978: *Yugagyō shisō to mikkyō no kenkyū* 瑜伽行思想と密教の研究, Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha.
- 1978a: “Kan'yaku nihon taishō Chibetto yaku *Shuryō ron chū wayaku*” 漢譯二本對照チベット譯『手量論註』和譯, in: Nagasawa 1978, pp. 291–301.
- 1978b. “*Musō shijin ron no keitaironteki kentō*” 『無想思塵論』の形態論的検討, in: Nagasawa 1978, pp. 301–307.
- Namikawa Takayoshi 並川孝儀 1995: “Shōryōbu no shi zenkon i setsu” 正量部の四善根位説. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 44/1, pp. 399(96)–393(102).
- 2000: “Chibetto yaku *Ui mui kecchaku no Shōryōbu setsu to Ritsu nijūni myōryō ron*” 「チベット譯『有為無為決擇』の正量部説と『律二十二明了論』, in: *Katō Junshō hakase kanreki kinen ronshū, Abidaruma bukkyō to Indo shisō* 加藤純章博士還暦記念論集, アビダルマ佛教とインド思想, Tokyo: Shunjūsha, pp. 181–194.
- Niryō gakujin 二楞學人 1930: “*Hōbō renpeki, 1*” 法寶連璧(一). *Gendai bukkyō* 現代佛教 3, January, special edition, pp. 175–179.
- Niryō sei 二楞生 1934: “*Daizō bunko koitsu zenpon mokuroku, 1*” 大藏文庫古逸善本目錄(一). *Pitaka* ピタカ 5, pp. 15–46.
- Obermiller, E., 1932: *History of Buddhism (Chos-ḥbyung) by Bu-ston. II. Part. The History of Buddhism in India and Tibet*, Heidelberg: O. Harrassowitz.

- Okada Yukihiro 岡田行弘 2002: “Kan’yaku butten kenkyū josetsu – Shintai yaku *Hōgyō ōshō ron o megutte*” 漢譯佛典研究序説 – 真諦譯『寶行王正論』をめぐって, in: *Kimura Kiyotaka hakase kanreki kinen ronshū, higashiajia bukkyō – sono seiritsu to tenkai* 木村清孝博士還暦記念論集, 東アジア佛教 – その成立と展開, Tokyo: Shunjūsha, pp. 47–63.
- Ono Genmyō 小野玄妙 1929: “Ryō Shintai yaku *Konkōmyō kyō jobun*” 梁真諦譯金光明經序文, *Butten kenkyū* 佛典研究 1/2, p. 5.
- Ono Katsutoshi 小野勝年 1988: “Shōgozō no *Shōtennō hannya haramitsu kyō no kyōjo ni tsuite*” 聖護(sic!)藏の「勝天王般若波羅蜜經」の經序について, *Nanto bukkyō* 南都佛教 9, pp. 48–67.
- Ōtake Susumu 大竹晋 2001: “*Kongōsen ron no seiritsu mondai*” 『金剛仙論』の成立問題, *Bukkyō shigaku kenkyū* 仏教史学研究 44/1, pp. 49–70.
- Sakamoto Yukio 坂本幸男 1935: “*Busshō ron kaidai*” 佛性論解題, *Kokuyaku issai kyō, yugabu, jūichi* 國譯一切經瑜伽部十一, Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, pp. 255–268.
- Satō Mitsuo 佐藤密雄 1963: *Genshi bukkyō kyōdan no kenkyū* 原始佛教教團の研究, Tokyo: Sankibō busshorin.
- Shizutani Masao 靜谷正雄 1942: “Funan bukkyō kō” 扶南佛教考, *Shina bukkyō shigaku* 支那佛教史學 6/2, pp. 12–37.
- Su Gongwang 蘇公望 1978: “Zhendi sanzang yishu kao” 真諦三藏譯述考, in: Zhang Mantao 張曼濤 et al. (eds.), *Fodian fanyi shi lun* 佛典翻譯史論 (Xiandai Fojiao xueshu congkan 現代佛教學術叢刊 38), Taipei: Dasheng wenhua chubanshe 1978, pp. 67–108 (first published in *Weimiao sheng* 微妙聲 2, pt. 2–6, 1937, and again as *Zhendi sanzang nianpu, fu yishu kao* 真諦三藏年譜・附譯述考, Beijing: Beijing foxue shuju chuban 1940).
- Takakusu, Junjirō, 1904: “The Life of Vasu-bandhu by Paramārtha (A.D. 499–569),” *T’oung pao*, Série II, Vol. V, pp. 269–296.
- 1905: “Study of Paramartha’s Life of Vasu-bandhu; and the Date of Vasu-bandhu,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1905, pp. 33–53.
- Takasaki Jikidō 高崎直道 1979: “Shintai sanzō no yakukyō” 真諦三藏の譯經, in: *Mori Mikisaburō hakase shōju kinen: Tōyōgaku ronshū* 森三樹三郎博士頌壽記念 東洋學論集, Kyoto: Hōyū shoten, pp. 1109–1125.
- 1981: “Shintai sanzō no shisō” 真諦三藏の思想, in: *Daijō bukkyō kara mikkyō e: Katsumata Shunkyō hakase koki kinen ronshū* 大乘佛教から密教へ – 勝又俊教博士古稀記念論集, Tokyo: Shunjūsha, pp. 701–716.
- 1989: *Hōshō ron* 寶性論, Tokyo: Kōdansha.

- 2005: “Busshō ron kaidai” 佛性論解題, in: Takasaki Jikidō and Kashiwagi Hiroo 柏木弘雄, *Busshō ron. Daijō kishin ron (kyū shin ni yaku)* 佛性論大乘起信論 (舊新二譯), Tokyo: Daizō shuppan, pp. 15–64.
- Tsukinowa Kenryū 月輪賢隆 1971: “Kugyō ichijō hōshō ron ni tsuite” 究竟一乘寶性論に就て, in: *Butten no hihanteki kenkyū* 佛典の批判的研究, Kyoto: Hyakkaen, pp. 364–381 (first published in *Nippon bukkyō gakkai nenpō* 日本佛教學會年報 7, 1934).
- Tucci, Giuseppe, 1929: *Pre-Dinnāga Buddhist Texts on Logic from Chinese Sources*, Gaekwad Oriental Series 49, Baroda.
- Ui Hakuju 宇井伯壽 1935: “Shō daijō ron giso no dampen” 攝大乘論義疏の斷片, in: Ui Hakuju. *Shō daijō ron kenkyū* 攝大乘論研究, Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, pp. 117–130.
- 1965: *Indo tetsugaku kenkyū, dairoku* 印度哲學研究第六, Tokyo: Iwanami shoten (first published in Tokyo: Kōshisha shobō, 1930).
- Xu Ming 許明 (ed.) 2002: *Zhongguo Fojiao jinglun xu ba ji ji*, 1 中國佛教經論序跋記集(一), Shanghai: Shanghai cishu chubanshe.
- Yabuki Keiki 矢吹慶輝 1933: *Meisa yoin kaisetsu* 鳴沙余韻解說, Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.
- Yamaguchi Hiroe 山口弘江 2004: “Yuima gyō bunso shoin no Fushū kyō ni tsuite” 『維摩經文疏』所引の「普集經」について, *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 53/1, pp. 116–123.
- Yamazaki Hiroshi 山崎宏 1942: *Shina chūsei bukkyō no tenkai* 支那中世佛教の展開, Tokyo: Shimizu shoin.
- Yoshimura Makoto 吉村誠 2002: “Shōron gakuha no shinshiki setsu ni tsuite” 攝論學派の心識說について, *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 51/1, pp. 61–65.
- 2003: “Shōron gakuha no shinshiki setsu ni tsuite” 攝論學派の心識說について, *Komazawa daigaku Bukkyōgakubu ronshū* 駒澤大學佛教學部論集 34, pp. 223–242.
- Yoshizu Yoshihide 吉津宜英 2003: “Shintai sanzō yakushutsu kyō ritsu ron kenkyū shi” 真諦三藏譯出經律論研究誌, *Komazawa daigaku bukkyōgakubu kenkyū kiyō* 駒澤大學佛教學部研究紀要 61, pp. 225–285.
- Zhu Xie 朱楔 1936: *Jinling guji tukao* 金陵古蹟圖考, Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan.