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Guṇabhadra, Bǎoyún, and the Saṃyuktāgama

Andrew Glass

Introduction

The only complete version of the Saṃyuktāgama available in Chinese is the Zá ánh jìng 雜阿含經 in 50 rolls (juàn 卷, T 2 no. 99). The main facts regarding this translation are not in dispute, namely, that the Indian monk Guṇabhadra / Qiúnà bátuóluó 求那跋陀羅 (394–468) recited the text for the Chinese monk Shì Bǎoyún 釋寶雲 (376–449) to translate during the period 435 to 443 in Nánjīng 南京, then Jiànkāng 建康, the Capital of the new established Líu‐Sòng 劉宋 Dynasty (420–479). This version of the Saṃyuktāgama is considered to be a Sarvāstivāda recension based on similarities between the translation and surviving Sanskrit fragments of this sūtra collection and quotations and commentaries in other extant sources (Mayeda 1985–7). Other details regarding this translation are less clear. One problem is the specific location of the translation activity, whether it was done at Qíhuán 庇洹寺 temple or at Wàguān 瓦官寺 temple. The available sources differ on this point. A second, and more interesting problem, is the source used for

---

1 I would like to thank the organizers and participants of the symposium on Early Chinese Buddhist Translations held at the Institut für Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. I am particularly grateful to Zhangcan Cheng, Max Deeg, Toru Funayama, Zequn Ma, and Stefano Zacchetti for their assistance with this paper.

2 One problem with this translation that has been largely solved is the disorder in the sequence of the rolls. For a summary of the scholarship on this see Glass 2007a: 39–42.
the translation of this text. Did Guṇabhadra read out the text from
the manuscript which Fāxiān 法顯 obtained in Sri Lanka around
410/411 or did he use another manuscript, or did he recite it from
memory? Inconsistencies in the accounts of the extant catalogues
have caused confusion over this point and fertilized academic de-
bate for the past eighty years.

In this paper, I offer an explanation that attempts to reconcile
the differences between the sources regarding which temple hosted
the translation work. I also consider the problem of the translation
source, and hope to convince the reader that in the absence of con-
crete evidence which could put an end to the debate, the weight of
circumstantial evidence falls heavily in favour of the source be-
ing Fāxiān’s manuscript. I will also show that the main arguments
that have been used to dismiss Fāxiān’s manuscript from being the
source do not stand up to scrutiny.

The location of the translation of the Saṃyuktāgama

Prabodh Chandra Bagchi was the first scholar to identify the
discrepancy in the location of the translation work. He quoted
two opposing reports concerning Gunabhadra’s translation of the
Saṃyuktāgama but did not pursue the problem. These reports state:

In the 12th year of Yuánjiā (= 435) he [Gunabhadra] reached Guǎngzhōu …
at first he lived at Qíhuán temple … At Qíhuán temple he gathered
many scholar monks and translated the Zá āhán jǐng.4

Zá āhán jǐng, 50 rolls: translated at Wǎguān temple.5

The source for the first account is the Chū sānzàng jìjí 出三藏記集
which was compiled by Sēngyòu 僧祐 (445–518) in about 515. This
source is widely regarded as the most reliable extant catalogue of
the early translations. It would, therefore, be easy to dismiss this
problem since the source of the contradicting report is the Lidài

3 Bagchi 1927: 382.
4 元嘉十二年至廣州。...初住祇洹寺。...於祇洹寺集義學諸僧。譯出雜
阿含經。CSJ 105c6–14.
5 雜阿含經五十卷於瓦官寺譯。LSJ 91a24; DNL 258c12.
sān'bào ji 歷代三寶紀, a catalogue prepared by Fèi Zhāngfāng 費長房 in 597, and which is held in rather less esteem by modern scholars. However, there is some additional support for the facts given in Fèi’s report:

Gunabhadra arrived in Jiànkāng in the 12th year of Yuánjīā (435) and was ordered by the emperor to live at Qīhuán temple; until the 20th year of Yuánjīā (443) he worked on translations at Wǎguān temple in Jiànkāng.6

This account comes from the Gǔjīn yìjīng tújì 古今譯經圖紀, compiled by Shì Jìngmài 釋靖邁 in 664–665. Qīhuán temple and Wǎguān temple were both located in the Sānjǐng 三井 district of Jiànkāng, and were probably at most about two kilometres distant from each other.7 For Gunabhadra, a man in his early forties who had travelled from India to China by way of Sri Lanka, this must have been within easy commuting distance. Therefore, the details in this account are at least plausible.

The source of the translation of the Samyuktāgama

The source of Gunabhadra’s translation of the Samyuktāgama is not specified in the account given in the Chū sānzàng jìjí (see above). This omission has led to considerable debate; since, if Fǎxiǎn’s manuscript of this text had been used, some modern scholars feel that Sēngyōu would have mentioned it.8 On the other hand, if Gunabhadra had provided the source, or recited it from memory, this might equally have been mentioned.

6 以宋文帝元嘉十二年來至楊都，帝深重之，勅住祇洹寺。至宋元嘉二十年歲次癸未，於楊都瓦官寺譯。GYT 362b4–6.
7 Today there is a new temple next to the site of the old Wǎguān temple, which burned down at the beginning of the Ming dynasty (佛學大詞典, s.v. 瓦官寺, accessed from the China Buddhism website http://www.cnbuddhism.com/cidian/ShowArticle.asp?ArticleID=42478, 31 October 2007). The exact location of Qīhuán temple is not known, but was in the same district (Lú 2002: 251).
It has long been known, however, that the Lìdài sānbāo jì specifies that the source of the Samyuktāgama translation was Fāxiān’s manuscript:

Zā āhān jīng, 50 rolls: translated at Wāguān temple. Fāxiān brought it back. Seen in Dàohui’s Sòngqì catalog.\(^9\)

It does not seem possible that this could refer to another translation of the Zā āhān jīng in fifty rolls, as such a translation would have had to have passed otherwise undetected into obscurity; and further, the fact that Guṇabhadra worked on the same text very close by (as mentioned previously) must preclude such a hypothesis.

The crux of this debate therefore, amounts to whom to believe; does the Chū sănzāng jījī’s silence imply Fāxiān’s manuscript was not the source, or does the Lìdài sānbāo jì actually contain some facts not reported by the earlier source? Perhaps more important than these two reports is the subtext of the debate: how could a copy of a Sarvāstivādin Samyuktāgama have been made in Sri Lanka at the beginning of the fifth century? I suspect this problem has determined the shape of much of the debate more than the matter of whom to believe.\(^10\)

Several new arguments have been put forward in order to advance the view that Gunabhadra provided the source. Most of these try to read between the lines of the sources cited above with the aim of detecting new evidence. Those who accept Fāxiān’s manuscript as the source have largely been content to accept the Lìdài sānbāo jì and have not gone into further detail. In order to move the debate forward we must consider other details that relate to the

---

\(^9\) 雜阿含經五十卷於瓦官寺譯。法顯齎來。見道慧宋齊錄。LSJ 91a24; DNL 258c12.

\(^10\) Scholars who reject the LSJ version, and therefore claim the source to be other than Fāxiān’s manuscript include Yìnshùn (1983: 1, 3), Mizuno (1988: 8), Enomoto (2002: 37), and Nagasaki and Kaji (2004: 46). Those who accept that the LSJ may be correct include de Jong (1981: 108), Tsukamoto (1985: 439), and Tseng (2000: xxviii–xxx). Akanuma (1939: 51 n. 8) and Demiéville (1953: 418) were aware of the issue but did not commit to either side.
problem. In this respect, I would like to pursue two questions: was there an opportunity and motive to use Fāxiān’s manuscript? And conversely, was there an opportunity and motive for Guṇabhadra to have provided the source?

**Fāxiān’s manuscript**

To discover if there was a motive and opportunity for Fāxiān’s manuscript to have been used we must consider the people involved, and their histories. As is well known, the person identified as the translator (yì 譯) is often not whom we would regard as the translator in the usual modern sense of the term. This is true in the case of Guṇabhadra’s Zā āhán jīng, as we learn from Sēngyòu:

The Indian Mahāyāna Master Guṇabhadra … recited the texts. The monk Shì Bǎoyún 釋寶雲 (376–449) and the disciples Pútí 菩提 (Bodhi) and Fǎyǒng 法勇 (Dharmodgata) interpreted them. According to the same source Guṇabhadra had not long been in China when he began work on this text, so we can easily accept that Bǎoyún, Bodhi, and Dharmavīra were responsible for the actual work of translation. The most important of these interpreters is Bǎoyún, whose biography is recorded in the Chū sānzáng jījī (113a5–b2). This biography also appears in the Gāosēng zhuàn 高僧傳 (339c18–340a14) by Huìjiǎo 慧皎 (519) with minor differences.

---

11 Nagasaki and Kaji did investigate the relationship between the translation team that worked on the Zā āhán jīng and Fāxiān, and identified the connections, but they did not assert their findings in their final conclusion (2004: 38–45).

12 天竺摩訶乘法師求那跋陀羅…宣出諸經。沙門釋寶雲及弟子菩提法勇傳譯 (CSJ 13a6–8). Sanghavarman is said to have had an “eminent disciple” called Bodhi (神足弟子菩提), who may be identified with Bǎoyún’s assistant on this translation. This fact is recorded in the fragmentary citations of a lost work of Sēngyòu, Sàpōduō shīzǐ zhúān 薩婆多師資傳 (Fūnayama 2000: 349; forthcoming).

13 One difference worth noting is that Huìjiǎo seems to have known that Bǎoyún died at the age of 74 (七十有四, GSZ 340a13) whereas Sēngyòu...
That fact that Bǎoyún was the primary translator of Gunabhadra’s Zá āhán jíng is central to this investigation, because Bǎoyún travelled with Fǎxián through Central Asia, as far as Puruṣapura (modern Peshawar). Details of their journey are provided both in the Gāosēng Fǎxián zhuàn 高僧法顯傳 (T 51 no. 2085) and in Bǎoyún’s biography. Unfortunately Bǎoyún’s own account of his travels has not survived. An outline of their journey based on these sources follows:

Bǎoyún was probably born in 37614 in Liángzhōu 潛州15 (present-day western Gānsū, to the north west of Lánzhōu). This means he would have been about 24 when he met Fǎxián in Zhāngyè 張掖 (a city in Liángzhōu) in 400.16 Fǎxián would have been some years older – perhaps as little as one year or as much as 15 or so, but almost certainly Fǎxián was not 63 at the time (i.e., the age traditionally ascribed to him).17

Fǎxián tells us that he and his four companions met Bǎoyún and four of his friends in Zhāngyè. The ten of them had in mind to travel to the West, and so they spent a happy summer together anticipating their journey.18 Of this journey, Bǎoyún’s biography tells was not so exact, giving his age as “70 something” (七十餘, CSJ 113b1) – unless he made this up!

14 Calculated from his age at his death in 449, provided in GSZ 以元嘉二十六年於山寺。春秋七十有四 (340a13).
15 CSJ 潛州人也 (113a06); GSZ 潛州人 (339c18).
16 GFZ 857a10–12. This date is based on Legge, who determined the year of Fǎxián’s departure based on the GFZ, and the biography of Fǎxián in the GSZ (Legge 1886: 9; also Deeg 2005: 23–4). In Bǎoyún’s biography the date is given as 晉隆安之初 (GSZ 339c22) which refers to the beginning of the period 397–402.
17 Fǎxián’s dates are uncertain and problematic. Traditional dates for him are 337–422, but this means he would have been 63 when he crossed the desert to Khotan and the Karakoram to Skardu, which seems quite unlikely. Legge suggested he may have been 25 when he went to India (Legge 1886: 3); Deeg suggests he may have been a little older, perhaps thirty or forty (Deeg 2005: 29).
us simply that they “walked across the Taklamakan and climbed over snowy mountains, [they] struggled with sufferings and dangers without thinking it difficult, and reached Khotan.”

We get rather more detail from Fāxiān, according to whom ten of them went as a group as far as Dūnhuáng, whereupon Fāxiān and his friends went on ahead via Shànshàn to Yānyí, also known as Šorčuq, where they rested for two months. During this time they were rejoined by Bāoyùn and his companions. From there, seven of the travellers, including Fāxiān and Bāoyùn set out for Khotan across the Taklamakan Desert. The journey took one month and five days, concerning which Fāxiān tells us: “The sufferings they endured were unparalleled in human experience.” The distance from Yānyí to Khotan is about 600 miles (1,000 km). To have walked that distance in just over a month would mean they must have been walking about 18 miles (30 km) per day.

After more than three months in Khotan Fāxiān, Bāoyùn and two other companions continued on their journey, crossing the Karakoram mountains to reach Skardu, where they met up with Huījīng and two others who had gone on ahead from Khotan. The seven travelled together as far as Udyāna (Wūcháng), where Huījīng and his two companions went on ahead again. After spending the summer in Udyāna, Fāxiān, Bāoyùn and two others continued South visiting Suhata (Sūhēduō), Gandhāvatī (Jiāntuówèi), Takṣaśilā (Zhúchāshǐluó), and finally Puruṣapura (Fúlóushā). It was perhaps the autumn of 401 by the time they arrived.

The purpose of this summary is to point out that Bāoyùn travelled with Fāxiān for about one year through extremely dangerous and testing terrain. After their two groups reunited in Yānyí,
Fāxiān and Bāoyún stayed together while their other companions came and went. To have undertaken such a testing journey together would surely have made them either close friends or bitter enemies. The fact that they subsequently worked together in China, suggests it was the former.

Fāxiān’s biography tells us that Bāoyún and Sēngjīng returned to China while Fāxiān went alone to Haḍḍa to see the skull-bone relic. Bāoyún’s biography tells us that while in India, he studied the local language before returning to China.

[Bāoyún, while in the foreign lands, studied the foreign books extensively. He became thoroughly accomplished (貫練) in all the sounds, scripts, and exegesis of the countries of India. Afterwards he went back to Cháng’ān.]

We do not know exactly how long Bāoyún stayed in Gandhāra, but it must have been long enough to give him a good start in Sanskrit. That he returned to Cháng’ān is also interesting since he was not from there. Perhaps this was Fāxiān’s suggestion, maybe they planned to meet there, or maybe it was just the obvious place to go for a monk interested in translation at that time.

While in Cháng’ān Bāoyún met and worked with Buddhhabhadra. When Buddhhabhadra was expelled from Cháng’ān by Kumārajīva’s followers, Bāoyún and his friend Huìguān 慧觀 went with him. First they travelled to Mount Lú 盧山 and then, toward the end of 412, they continued on to Jiànkāng and took up residence

---

23 雲在外域，遍學胡書。天竺諸國音字詁訓，悉皆貫練。後還長安。（CSJ 113a13–4); Tsukamoto 1985: 439. The Chá sānzàng jì reads hūshū 胡書, where the Gāosēng zhuǎn has fānshū 梵書. It is tempting to follow Dan Boucher’s suggestion regarding hūshū 胡書 (Boucher 2000), and understand that Bāoyún studied Kharoṣṭhī, however, Bāoyún was in Gandhāra about 100 years after Kharoṣṭhī fell out of use in that area (Salomon forthcoming; Glass 2007b: 72), so this most likely refers to Sanskrit or Hybrid Sanskrit books written in Brāhmī.

24 CSJ 113a15; GSZ 339c27. Buddhhabhadra had travelled from Kashmir to Cháng’ān with Zhiyán, who was one of Bāoyún’s companions on the journey to Turfan. Zhiyán and two others left the main group there and later reached Kashmir.
at Dàochāng temple 道場寺.25 At about the same time, Fāxiān returned to China, and having heard of the problems in Cháng’ān, went directly to Jiànkāng. There, Fāxiān and Bāoyún were reunited, ten years and almost 3,000 miles from where they had parted ways. Fāxiān also took up residence at Dàochāng temple and together with Buddhabhadra, Bāoyún and Huìguān, they produced numerous translations. The working relationships are documented in the catalogues, for example, “Il [Fāxiān] demanda au maître de Dhyāna du pays étranger Buddhabhadra, de traduire et de publier, dans le Tao-tch’ang sseu, le Mo ho seng k’i liu 摩訶僧祇眾律;”26 and “The Dhyāna master Buddhabhadra held the foreign book [Mahāparinirvāṇasastra], Bāoyún translated.”27

Further support for the connection between Bāoyún and Fāxiān during this period can also be found in the texts themselves. Max Deeg has recently reported that Günabhadra’s translation of the Samyuktāgama contains some terms which follow Fāxiān’s transliterations; he gives as an example Pāli ghositā gahapati > qūshīluó zhǎngzhē São 師羅長者.28 The first occurrence of this name and title comes in Fāxiān’s translation of the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvānasūtra. The same transliteration appears fifteen times in the Zā āhán jīng.29 The reason for this connection must be Bāoyún who, as men-

---

26 Shih 1968: 114.
27 禪師佛大跋陀・手執胡本・寶雲傳譯 - CSJ 60b10. The Lídài sānbāoji 了十八善本 ji has a slightly different report of the translation of this text: “an old catalogue says Buddhabhadra recited this text, and Bāoyún held the brush” 剃錄云・覺賢出・寶雲筆受 - LSJ 71b7.
29 E.g., T 2 no. 99, e.g., p. 117c24. This phrase also occurs in three other works of this period: Dharmakṣema’s version of the Mahāparinirvānasūtra (T no. 374) in 421; Buddhajīva’s translation of the Mahāsāka Vinaya (T no. 1421); and Huīyān 慧嚴, Huīguān 慧觀, and Xiè Língyùn’s 謝靈運 re-edition of Dharmakṣema and Fāxiān’s versions of the Mahāparinirvānasūtra (T no. 375), prepared in Jiānkāng (Nánjīng) and dated broadly to the Yuánjiā era (424–52). It is interesting to note that Huīguān had served as scribe for Günabhadra’s Zā āhán jīng, while his friend Huīyān had done the same for Buddhajīva’s Mahāsāka Vinaya,
tioned above, was involved in the production of Fāxiàn's translation of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* and also translated Guṇabhadra's recitation of the Saṃyuktāgama into Chinese.

Since Fāxiàn wrote the Gāosēng Fāxiàn zhuàn while living at Dàochāng temple, we may assume that his manuscript of the Saṃyuktāgama had not been lost on his journey from Sri Lanka to Jiānkāng, as he would probably have mentioned such an important detail. The fact that Bāoyūn and Fāxiàn lived and worked at the same temple from 413 to about 422 shows that Bāoyūn would, in all likelihood, have had access to Fāxiàn’s manuscript of the Saṃyuktāgama. Therefore, we can deduce that Guṇabhadra’s translation team, which included Bāoyūn, would have had the opportunity to make use of Fāxiàn’s manuscript.

The next thing I wish to show is that there was a concerted effort to translate those manuscripts which Fāxiàn had brought back with him. This effort began soon after Fāxiàn’s return and extended into the period following his retirement from translation work. It seems to have continued as long as his colleagues, especially Bāoyūn, were active.

According to his own account, Fāxiàn obtained the following manuscripts during his journey to the West.

In Pāṭaliputra (GFZ 864b19–28; CSJ 112a20–1):
- The Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya / Mōhē sēngqī zhòng lǜ 摩訶僧祇眾律 (T 22 no. 1425)
- The Sarvāstivāda Vinaya / Sàpóduō zhòng lǜ 薩婆多眾律
- The *Saṃyuktābhidharma / Zá āpítán xīn 雜阿毘曇心
- A sūtra, Yán jīng 经
- The first chapter of the *Vaipulyaparinirvāṇasūtra* / Fāngdēng bānhūduān jīng 方等般泥洹經
- The Mahāsāṅghika Abhidharma / Mōhē sēngqī āpítán 摩訶僧祇阿毘曇

and that the two collaborated in the re-edition of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*.

In Campā (GFZ 864c8):
- Unspecified sūtras

In Sri Lanka (GFZ 865c24–5; CSJ 112a26):
- The Mahiśāsaka Vinaya / Mihāśāsī lū 摩訶僧祇律 (T 22 no. 1421)
- The Dirghāgama / Cháng āhān jīng 長阿含經
- The Saṃyuktāgama / Záhán jīng 雜阿含經
- The *Kśudrakapiṭaka31 / Zázàng jīng 雜藏經 (T 17 no. 745)

In 416, Fǎxiǎn and Buddhabhadra translated the manuscript of the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya / Mōhēsēngqī lū 摩訶僧祇律 (T 22 no. 1425). In 417 they began work on the Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra / Dà bānnīyuàn jīng 大般泥洹經 (T 12 no. 376). Fǎxiǎn tells us he obtained the first chapter of this text in Pāṭaliputra, but this translation may or may not be connected with that manuscript. We learn from Sēngyòu and the Gāosēng zhuàn33 that Fǎxiǎn had Buddhabhadra read out (譯出) this text. They also translated the *Kśudraka-pitaka (T 17 no. 745); the Yán jīng 綖經; and the *Saṃyuktābhīdharma-hṛdaya 雜阿毘曇心,34 the last two of which had been lost by the time of the Kāiyuán shìjiào lù 開元釋教錄 (730) and probably much earlier.35

The first of Fǎxiǎn’s manuscripts to be translated after Fǎxiǎn’s “retirement”36 was the Mahiśāsaka Vinaya translated between 423 and 434 by Buddhajīva and Zhú Dàoshēng 竺道生 at Lóngguāng 更求得彌沙塞律藏本。得長阿含雜阿含。復得一部雜藏。(T 51 no. 2085 p. 865c24–5). See also Tsukamoto 1985: 436–7, and Deeg 2005: 572.

31 KSL 505b27; Lancaster 1979, K 889; Deeg 2005: 561 n. 2455.
32 GFZ 864b27; CSJ 60b2–10; Bagchi 1927: 348.
33 CSJ 112b20; Another part of Sēngyòu’s work has the comment “Yán jīng (Sanskrit, not translated)” 綖經 (梵文未譯出) (CSJ 12a3); however, at least one, and possibly two more texts from this section of the CSJ are similarly labelled but are known to have been translated.
The fate of the remaining manuscripts is not spelled out in the catalogues. We do know, however, that Bāoyün worked on a translation of the *Samyuktābhidharmahṛdaya* in 433 or 434 with Saṅghavarman. The same Saṅghavarman is credited with the translation of the *Sarvāstivādanaṃṭākā / Sāpōduōbù pǐnǐ môdēlēqiē* 薩婆多部毘尼摩得勒伽 (T 23 no. 1441) done in the following year, 435. Saṅghavarman’s connection with Bāoyün provides the opportunity to have had access to Fāxiān’s Sarvāstivāda Vinaya manuscript (薩婆多眾律). The fact that Fāxiān tells us his manuscript was 7,000 verses long, and Saṅghavarman’s translation is also 7,000 verses long, adds weight to this idea that the latter may be a translation of the former.

Therefore, if we ignore the unspecified *sūtra* obtained from Campā, only three of Fāxiān’s manuscripts were left untranslated when Guṇabhadra arrived in 435: the Mahāsāṅghika Abhidharma, the Dirghāgama, and the Samyuktāgama. The case of the Dirghāgama is easily explained as this text was translated from another source by Buddhayaśas and Zhū Fóniàn 竺佛念 in Cháng’ān around the time of Fāxiān’s return. Even though this translation was done in another city, knowledge of that translation would have spread to Jiānkāng as there was frequent contact between the translation centres.

The case of the Mahāsāṅghika Abhidharma is different, as no other version was available, and this text cannot be connected with any translation done since. We must conclude in this case that

---


38 The circumstances of the translation of this text are confused, and it is uncertain whether this was a new translation of the same text that Fāxiān obtained in Pāṭaliputra (i.e., the Zā’āpítán xǐn), and which was translated by Fāxiān and Buddhahadra, probably in association with Bāoyün; or whether this was a separate text entirely. The details of this situation are described in Dessein 1999: lxxvi–lxxxii.

39 On the length of Fāxiān’s manuscript see GFZ 864b23–4 = Deeg 2005: 561; CSJ 21a18. For the length of T 23 no. 1441 see Kamata 1998: 389.

it was not translated but it is impossible to guess exactly why this was so.

When Gunabhadra arrived in Jiānkāng, the Samyuktāgama would have been the most important work in the collection of Fāxiān’s manuscripts that had not yet been translated. As shown above, Bāoyùn would have had access to this manuscript, and further, he may well have had an interest in seeing this manuscript translated out of a sense of loyalty to his former travelling companion and colleague. It is easy to imagine that Bāoyùn could have persuaded Gunabhadra, a man eighteen years his junior, to recite the Samyuktāgama for him to translate when the latter had only just arrived from India.

**Gunabhadra’s source**

According to the biography given by Sēngyòu, Gunabhadra was born into a Brahman family in North Central India (中天竺 = Madhyadeśa). He is said to have converted to Buddhism after encountering the *Saṃyuktābhidharmahṛdaya* (阿毘曇雜心), then, not satisfied with mainstream Buddhism (小乘), he went on to study under a Mahāyāna master. Like Fāxiān and others before him, he went to Sri Lanka, and onward by boat to China. After arriving in Guāngzhōu 廣州 the monks Huìyán and Huìguān (an associate of Fāxiān and Bāoyùn) were ordered to go to meet him and take him to Qīhuán temple 祇洹寺. The first text he is said to have worked on after arriving in Jiānkāng is the Samyuktāgama.

His biography does say that he had mastered the Tripiṭaka (博通三藏, CSJ 105b23), but this does not mean that he was capable of reciting the entire canon from memory. Certainly memorization is a well known feature of Indian learning, and such learning might well have been part of his training, but we do not know if this included memorizing the Samyuktāgama. As mentioned above, Sēngyòu reports that Gunabhadra was interested in the *Saṃyuktābhidharmahṛdaya* and the Mahāyāna, and he is known to have

---

41 CSJ 105b17–106b21 and GSZ 344a5–345a23.
worked on translations of several important Mahāyāna texts.\(^{42}\) If he had memorized the whole of the Saṃyuktāgama in particular – a text almost equal in length to all of his other translations combined – this might well have been mentioned. Therefore, while it is perhaps conceivable that Gunābhadrā could have provided the source of the Zā āhān jīng from memory, there is reasonable doubt that this was so.

We also learn from Gunābhadrā’s biography that he was familiar with writing and using written texts, for example “the Mahāyāna master tested [Gunābhadrā], ordering him to take out [a text] from the sūtra box”\(^{43}\) (i.e., a box containing written texts); “then [Gunābhadrā] read out the commentaries.”\(^{44}\) Therefore, he could have brought a manuscript of the Saṃyuktāgama himself. But such a position seems doubtful. In Fāxiān’s case, he went to India with a plan to gather manuscripts. He must have known at the time he left China that there was no complete translation of the Saṃyuktāgama in Chinese, therefore we can see a clear reason for him to have obtained a copy of this text during his journey, and his own travel account and other biographies make it clear that he did obtain a manuscript of this very text. The same is not true for Gunābhadrā. Gunābhadrā would not have known the Saṃyuktāgama was needed in China and he not did he have an obvious interest in this text. Furthermore, his biography does not mention that he brought any manuscripts with him. Therefore, it is unlikely that he would have brought a manuscript of the Saṃyuktāgama himself.

As seen above, we know that Gunābhadrā was literate, therefore, he would have been able to read Fāxiān’s manuscript of the Saṃyuktāgama and explain the details for Bāoyūn to translate. Even if Gunābhadrā had been a specialist in this text, it is also quite likely that he would have made use of Fāxiān’s manuscript; just as Buddhajīva, a Mahīśāsaka monk and specialist in the Vinaya, did when

\(^{42}\) These include, among others, the Śrīmālā(devi)simhanādasūtra (T 12 no. 353), the Lāṅkāvatārasūtra (T 16 no. 670), and the Sandhinirmocanasūtra (T 16 no. 678).

\(^{43}\) 大乘師試令探取經匣．CSJ 105b25.

\(^{44}\) 於是誦詮講義 CSJ 105b27.
he was asked by the monks of Jiànkāng to translate the Mahiśāsaka Vinaya manuscript that Fāxiān had brought back from Sri Lanka.45

**Arguments against Fāxiān’s manuscript**

The primary argument against Fāxiān’s manuscript providing the source for the translation of the Zā āhán jīng has been that it is not explicitly identified as such in the Chū sānzàng jiǔ. The problem with this argument is that the Chū sānzàng jiǔ does not specify a different source either. We must accept that, for whatever reason, Sēngyōu did not have this information. Therefore, his silence regarding the source should not be taken to support either side of this argument.

In an earlier portion of the same catalogue, Sēngyōu records a list of Fāxiān’s manuscripts specifying that some of them, including the Zā āhán jīng were not translated.46 However the Mahiśāsaka Vinaya is similarly recorded and is known to have been translated, and so is the Yán jīng.47 Since the details given concerning these two texts are inconsistent with reports later in the very same catalogue, the information given for the Zā āhán jīng is not reliable.

As suggested earlier, one of the main perceived problems seems to have been the fact that Fāxiān obtained his manuscript of the Šānyuktāgama in Sri Lanka. Since the translation of the Zā āhán jīng is widely regarded as belonging to the (Mūla)sarvāstivāda tradition, some scholars have been uncomfortable with identifying this with Fāxiān’s manuscript since Sri Lanka is a long way from the homeland of that school.48 However, prior to the 12th century Theravāda Buddhism did not enjoy a monopoly position in Sri Lanka. Bechert has argued that the Jetavanārāma Sanskrit Inscription and other evidence suggest the presence of other schools (nikāya). He tentatively identifies these schools as the Mūlasarvāstivadins, the

---

45 GSZ 339a3–13; Shih 1968: 118–9.
46 “Zā āhán jīng (Sanskrit, not translated)” 雜阿鋡經(梵文未譯) CSJ 12a5.
47 彌沙塞律(梵文未譯) CSJ 12a6, see also n. 35 above.
48 See for example Yinshūn 1983: 3; Nagasaki and Kaji: 46.
Mahāsāṅghikas, the Sāṃmitīyas and the Sthaviras (Theravādins).\footnote{Bechert 1998: 3; see also Bechert 2005: 48–9.}
This conclusion is supported by the fact that Fāxiàn brought back a copy of the Mahāśāsaka Vinaya from Śrī Lanka. Therefore it is also quite possible that he obtained a Sarvāstivāda manuscript of the Sāmyuktāgama there.

Mizuno has argued that because an audience of many monks was invited to hear Guṇabhadra’s reading of the text,\footnote{CSJ 105c13; see above n. 4.} this indicates a new version of the text was being used rather than one that had been available for twenty years – as Fāxiàn’s manuscript had been by that time.\footnote{Mizuno 1988: 8.} However, the fact that the manuscript had been in Jiànkāng for twenty years is no reason to suppose that its translation was any less important – after all, since the manuscript was in Sanskrit, the contents would not have been accessible to the many monks who were invited to listen to it.

**Conclusion**

The above survey of the circumstances surrounding the translation of the Zā āhān jīng has shown that while there are problems connecting the translation done by Guṇabhadra to the manuscript brought back by Fāxiàn, there is ample circumstantial evidence to support this claim. Furthermore, the alternate hypothesis, that Guṇabhadra himself provided the manuscript, either in manuscript or oral form, is more problematic with the current evidence.

**Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSJ</td>
<td>Chū sānzàng jìjí 出三藏記集 (T 55 no. 2145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNL</td>
<td>Dàtáng nèidiǎn lù 大唐內典錄 (T 55 no. 2149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFZ</td>
<td>Gāosēng fǎxiǎn zhuàn 高僧法顯傳 (T 51 no. 2085)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GYT</td>
<td>Gǔjīn yìjīng tújī 古今譯經圖紀 (T 55 no. 2151)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSZ</td>
<td>Gāosēng zhuàn 高僧傳 (T 50 no. 2059)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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