

# 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](mailto: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](mailto: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

# Guṇabhadra, Bǎoyún, and the Saṃyuktāgama<sup>1</sup>

Andrew Glass

## Introduction

The only complete version of the Saṃyuktāgama available in Chinese is the *Zá āhán jīng* 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 / Qiúnàbátuólúó 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 ne established Liú-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.<sup>2</sup> One problem is the specific location of the translation activity, whether it was done at Qíhuán temple 祇洹寺 or at Wǎguān temple 瓦官寺. The available sources differ on this point. A second, and more interesting problem, is the source used for

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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 Fǎxiǎn 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 debate 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 concrete evidence which could put an end to the debate, the weight of circumstantial evidence falls heavily in favour of the source being Fǎxiǎn's manuscript. I will also show that the main arguments that have been used to dismiss Fǎxiǎn'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.<sup>3</sup> He quoted two opposing reports concerning Guṇabhadra's translation of the Saṃyuktāgama but did not pursue the problem. These reports state:

In the 12<sup>th</sup> year of Yuánjiā (= 435) he [Guṇabhadra] reached Guǎngzhōu ... at first he lived at Qíhuán temple ... At Qíhuán temple he gathered many scholar monks and translated the Zā āhán jīng.<sup>4</sup>

Zā āhán jīng, 50 rolls: translated at Wǎguān temple.<sup>5</sup>

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 Lìdài

<sup>3</sup> Bagchi 1927: 382.

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> 雜阿含經五十卷於瓦官寺譯。LSJ 91a24; DNL 258c12.

sānbǎo jì 歷代三寶紀, a catalogue prepared by Fèi Zhǎngfáng 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:

Guṇabhadra arrived in Jiànkāng in the 12<sup>th</sup> year of Yuánjiā (435) and was ordered by the emperor to live at Qíhuán temple; until the 20<sup>th</sup> year of Yuánjiā (443) he worked on translations at Wǎguān temple in Jiànkāng.<sup>6</sup>

This account comes from the Gǔjīn yìjīng tújì 古今譯經圖紀, compiled by Shì Jìngmài 釋靖邁 in 664–665. Qíhuán 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.<sup>7</sup> For Guṇabhadra, 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 Saṃyuktāgama

The source of Guṇabhadra's translation of the Saṃyuktāgama is not specified in the account given in the Chū sānzàng jìjì (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 Sēngyòu would have mentioned it.<sup>8</sup> On the other hand, if Guṇabhadra had provided the source, or recited it from memory, this might equally have been mentioned.

<sup>6</sup> 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.

<sup>7</sup> 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 (佛学大词典, 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 Qíhuán temple is not known, but was in the same district (Lú 2002: 251).

<sup>8</sup> Mizuno (1988: 8), Enomoto (2002: 37), and Nagasaki and Kaji (2004: 46).

It has long been known, however, that the *Lidài sānbǎo jì* specifies that the source of the *Samyuktāgama* translation was Fǎxiǎn's manuscript:

Zá āhán jīng, 50 rolls: translated at Wǎguān temple. Fǎxiǎn brought it back. Seen in Dàohuì's Sòngqí catalog.<sup>9</sup>

It does not seem possible that this could refer to another translation of the *Zá āhán 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 sānzàng jìjī*'s silence imply Fǎxiǎn's manuscript was not the source, or does the *Lidài sānbǎo 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.<sup>10</sup>

Several new arguments have been put forward in order to advance the view that Guṇabhadra 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 Fǎxiǎn's manuscript as the source have largely been content to accept the *Lidài sānbǎo jì* and have not gone into further detail. In order to move the debate forward we must consider other details that relate to the

<sup>9</sup> 雜阿含經五十卷於瓦官寺譯。法顯齋來。見道慧宋齊錄。LSJ 91a24; DNL 258c12.

<sup>10</sup> Scholars who reject the LSJ version, and therefore claim the source to be other than Fǎxiǎn's manuscript include Yinshùn (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.<sup>11</sup> In this respect, I would like to pursue two questions: was there an opportunity and motive to use Fǎxiǎn's manuscript? And conversely, was there an opportunity and motive for Guṇabhadra to have provided the source?

### Fǎxiǎn's manuscript

To discover if there was a motive and opportunity for Fǎxiǎn'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 *Zá 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.<sup>12</sup>

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 sānzàng jìjǐ* (113a5–b2). This biography also appears in the *Gāosēng zhuān* 高僧傳 (339c18–340a14) by Huijiǎo 慧皎 (519) with minor differences.<sup>13</sup>

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

<sup>12</sup> 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). Saṅghavarman 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, *Sàpódūo shīzī zhuàn* 薩婆多師資傳 (Funayama 2000: 349; forthcoming).

<sup>13</sup> One difference worth noting is that Huijiǎo 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 Guṇabhadra's *Zá āhán jīng* is central to this investigation, because Bǎoyún travelled with Fǎxiǎn through Central Asia, as far as Puruṣapura (modern Peshawar). Details of their journey are provided both in the *Gāosēng Fǎxiǎn 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 376<sup>14</sup> in Liángzhōu 涼州<sup>15</sup> (present-day western Gānsù, to the north west of Lánzhōu). This means he would have been about 24 when he met Fǎxiǎn in Zhāngyè 張掖 (a city in Liángzhōu) in 400.<sup>16</sup> Fǎxiǎn would have been some years older – perhaps as little as one year or as much as 15 or so, but almost certainly Fǎxiǎn was not 63 at the time (i.e., the age traditionally ascribed to him).<sup>17</sup>

Fǎxiǎn 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.<sup>18</sup> 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!

<sup>14</sup> Calculated from his age at his death in 449, provided in GSZ 以元嘉二十六年終於山寺。春秋七十有四。(340a13).

<sup>15</sup> CSJ 涼州人也 (113a06); GSZ 涼州人 (339c18).

<sup>16</sup> GFZ 857a10–12. This date is based on Legge, who determined the year of Fǎxiǎn's departure based on the GFZ, and the biography of Fǎxiǎn 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.

<sup>17</sup> Fǎxiǎn'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).

<sup>18</sup> GFZ 857a10–12; Legge 1886: 11; Deeg 2005: 496–7.

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.”<sup>19</sup>

We get rather more detail from Fǎxiǎn, according to whom ten of them went as a group as far as Dūnhuáng 敦煌, whereupon Fǎxiǎn and his friends went on ahead via Shànshàn 鄯善 to Yānyí 焉夷, also known as Šorčuq, where they rested for two months. During this time they were rejoined by Bǎoyún and his companions.<sup>20</sup> From there, seven of the travellers, including Fǎxiǎn and Bǎoyún set out for Khotan across the Taklamakan Desert. The journey took one month and five days, concerning which Fǎxiǎn tells us: “The sufferings they endured were unparalleled in human experience.”<sup>21</sup> 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 Fǎxiǎn, Bǎoyún and two other companions continued on their journey, crossing the Karakoram mountains to reach Skardu, where they met up with Huìjǐng and two others who had gone on ahead from Khotan. The seven travelled together as far as Udyāna (Wūcháng 烏菴), where Huìjǐng and his two companions went on ahead again. After spending the summer in Udyāna, Fǎxiǎn, Bǎoyún and two others continued South visiting Suhata? (Sùhēduō 宿呵多), Gandhāvati (Jiāntuówèi 犍陀衛), Takṣaśilā (Zhúchàshīluó 竺剎尸羅), and finally Puruṣapura (Fúlóushā 弗樓沙).<sup>22</sup> It was perhaps the autumn of 401 by the time they arrived.

The purpose of this summary is to point out that Bǎoyún travelled with Fǎxiǎn for about one year through extremely dangerous and testing terrain. After their two groups reunited in Yānyí,

<sup>19</sup> 涉履流沙登踰雪嶺。勤苦艱危不以為難。遂歷于闐 (CSJ 113a11–12; GSZ 339c23–4).

<sup>20</sup> GFZ 857a12–28; Legge 1886: 11–5; Deeg 2005: 497–500.

<sup>21</sup> 所經之苦人理莫比 GFZ 857b3; Legge 1886: 16; Deeg 2005: 500.

<sup>22</sup> GFZ 857b1–858b12; Legge 1886: 16–33; Deeg 2005: 501–12.

Fǎxiǎn and Bǎoyún 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.

Fǎxiǎn's biography tells us that Bǎoyún and Sēngjǐng returned to China while Fǎxiǎn went alone to Haḍḍa to see the skull-bone relic. Bǎoyún's biography tells us that while in India, he studied the local language before returning to China.

[Bǎo]yún, 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.<sup>23</sup>

We do not know exactly how long Bǎoyún 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 Fǎxiǎn'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 Bǎoyún met and worked with Buddhābhadrā.<sup>24</sup> When Buddhābhadrā was expelled from Cháng'ān by Kumārajīva's followers, Bǎoyún and his friend Huìguān 慧觀 went with him. First they travelled to Mount Lú 廬山 and then, toward the end of 412, they continued on to Jiànkāng and took up residence

<sup>23</sup> 雲在外域，遍學胡書。天竺諸國音字詰訓，悉皆貫練。後還長安。(CSJ 113a13–4); Tsukamoto 1985: 439. The Chū sānzàng jìjī reads *húshū* 胡書, where the Gāosēng zhuān has *fànshū* 梵書. It is tempting to follow Dan Boucher's suggestion regarding *húshū* 胡書 (Boucher 2000), and understand that Bǎoyún studied Kharoṣṭhī, however, Bǎoyún 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.

<sup>24</sup> CSJ 113a15; GSZ 339c27. Buddhābhadrā had travelled from Kashmir to Cháng'ān with Zhìyán, who was one of Bǎoyún's companions on the journey to Turfan. Zhìyán and two others left the main group there and later reached Kashmir.

at Dào chǎng temple 道場寺.<sup>25</sup> At about the same time, Fǎxiǎn returned to China, and having heard of the problems in Cháng'ān, went directly to Jiànkāng. There, Fǎxiǎn and Bǎoyún were reunited, ten years and almost 3,000 miles from where they had parted ways. Fǎxiǎn also took up residence at Dào chǎng temple and together with Buddhahadra, Bǎoyún and Huìguān, they produced numerous translations. The working relationships are documented in the catalogues, for example, “Il [Fǎxiǎn] demanda au maître de Dhyāna du pays étranger Buddhahadra, de traduire et de publier, dans le Tao-tch'ang sseu, le Mo ho seng k'i liu 摩訶僧祇眾律;”<sup>26</sup> and “The Dhyāna master Buddhahadra held the foreign book [*Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*], Bǎoyún translated.”<sup>27</sup>

Further support for the connection between Bǎoyún and Fǎxiǎn during this period can also be found in the texts themselves. Max Deeg has recently reported that Guṇabhadra's translation of the Saṃyuktāgama contains some terms which follow Fǎxiǎn's transliterations; he gives as an example Pāli *ghosito gahapati* > *qúshīluó zhǎngzhě* 瞿師羅長者.<sup>28</sup> The first occurrence of this name and title comes in Fǎxiǎn's translation of the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*. The same transliteration appears fifteen times in the *Zá āhán jīng*.<sup>29</sup> The reason for this connection must be Bǎoyún who, as men-

<sup>25</sup> Tsukamoto 1985: 453, 884.

<sup>26</sup> Shih 1968: 114.

<sup>27</sup> 禪師佛大跋陀。手執胡本。寶雲傳譯。CSJ 60b10. The *Lìdài sānbǎo jì* has a slightly different report of the translation of this text: “an old catalogue says Buddhahadra recited this text, and Bǎoyún held the brush” 舊錄云。覺賢出。寶雲筆受。LSJ 71b7.

<sup>28</sup> Deeg 2005: 485–6.

<sup>29</sup> 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 *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* (T no. 374) in 421; Buddhajīva's translation of the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya (T no. 1421); and Huìyán 慧嚴, Huìguān 慧觀, and Xiè Língyùn's 謝靈運 re-edition of Dharmakṣema and Fǎxiǎn's versions of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* (T no. 375), prepared in Jiànkāng (Nánjīng) and dated broadly to the Yuánjiā era (424–52). It is interesting to note that Huìguān had served as scribe for Guṇabhadra's *Zá āhán jīng*, while his friend Huìyán had done the same for Buddhajīva's Mahīśāsaka Vinaya,

tioned above, was involved in the production of Fǎxiǎn's translation of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* and also translated Guṇabhadra's recitation of the Saṃyuktāgama into Chinese.

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

The next thing I wish to show is that there was a concerted effort to translate those manuscripts which Fǎxiǎn had brought back with him. This effort began soon after Fǎxiǎn's return and extended into the period following his retirement from translation work.<sup>30</sup> It seems to have continued as long as his colleagues, especially Bǎoyún, were active.

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

In Pāṭaliputra (GFZ 864b19–28; CSJ 112a20–1):

- The Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya / Móhē sēngqí zhòng lǜ 摩訶僧祇眾律 (T 22 no. 1425)
- The Sarvāstivāda Vinaya / Sàpódūo zhòng lǜ 薩婆多眾律
- The \*Saṃyuktābhīdharmahṛdaya / Zá āpítán xīn 雜阿毘曇心
- A sūtra, Yán jīng 經
- The first chapter of the Vaipulyaparinirvāṇasūtra / Fāngděng bānníhuán jīng 方等般泥洹經
- The Mahāsāṅghika Abhidharma / Móhē sēngqí āpítán 摩訶僧祇阿毘曇

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

<sup>30</sup> See Deeg 2005: 27–8.

In Campā (GFZ 864c8):

- Unspecified *sūtras*

In Sri Lanka (GFZ 865c24–5; CSJ 112a26):

- The Mahīśāsaka Vinaya / Míshāsāi lǜ 彌沙塞律 (T 22 no. 1421)
- The Dīrghāgama / Cháng āhán jīng 長阿含經
- The Saṃyuktāgama / Zá āhán jīng 雜阿含經
- The \*Kṣudrakapiṭaka<sup>31</sup> / Zázàng jīng 雜藏經 (T 17 no. 745)

In 416, Fǎxiǎn and Buddhabhadra translated the manuscript of the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya / Móhēsēngqí lǜ 摩訶僧祇律 (T 22 no. 1425).<sup>32</sup> In 417 they began work on the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* / *Dà bānníyuán 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 zhuàn*<sup>33</sup> that Fǎxiǎn had Buddhabhadra read out (譯出) this text. They also translated the \*Kṣudraka-piṭaka (T 17 no. 745); the *Yán jīng* 纏經; and the \**Saṃyuktābhidharma-hṛdaya* 雜阿毘曇心,<sup>34</sup> 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.<sup>35</sup>

The first of Fǎxiǎn’s manuscripts to be translated after Fǎxiǎn’s “retirement”<sup>36</sup> was the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya translated between 423 and 434 by Buddhajīva and Zhú Dào shēng 竺道生 at Lóngguāng

<sup>31</sup> 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.

<sup>32</sup> KSL 505b27; Lancaster 1979, K 889; Deeg 2005: 561 n. 2455.

<sup>33</sup> GFZ 864b27; CSJ 60b2–10; Bagchi 1927: 348.

<sup>34</sup> CSJ 112b20; Another part of Sēngyòu’s work has the comment “Yán jīng (Sanskrit, not translated)” 纏經 (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.

<sup>35</sup> Bagchi 1927: 348. According to Pelliot “cette traduction était déjà perdue vers l’an 500” 1930: 272.

<sup>36</sup> See Deeg 2005: 27–8.

temple 龍光寺 in Jiànkāng.<sup>37</sup> The fate of the remaining manuscripts is not spelled out in the catalogues. We do know, however, that Bǎoyún worked on a translation of the *Samyuktābhīdharmahṛdaya* in 433 or 434 with Saṅghavarman.<sup>38</sup> The same Saṅghavarman is credited with the translation of the *Sarvāstivādivinayamāṭṛkā* / Sàpódūobù pínì módelèqié 薩婆多部毘尼摩得勒伽 (T 23 no. 1441) done in the following year, 435. Saṅghavarman's connection with Bǎoyún provides the opportunity to have had access to Fǎxiǎn's Sarvāstivāda Vinaya manuscript (薩婆多眾律). The fact that Fǎxiǎn 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.<sup>39</sup>

Therefore, if we ignore the unspecified *sūtra* obtained from Campā, only three of Fǎxiǎn's manuscripts were left untranslated when Guṇabhadra arrived in 435: the Mahāsāṅghika Abhidharma, the Dīrghāgama, and the Samyuktāgama. The case of the Dīrghāgama is easily explained as this text was translated from another source by Buddhayaśas and Zhú Fóniàn 竺佛念 in Cháng'ān around the time of Fǎxiǎn's return. Even though this translation was done in another city, knowledge of that translation would have spread to Jiànkāng as there was frequent contact between the translation centres.<sup>40</sup> 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

---

<sup>37</sup> CSJ 12b3; GSZ 339a6–8; Lancaster 1979, K 895; Bagchi 1927: 364; Kamata 1998: 383.

<sup>38</sup> 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 Fǎxiǎn obtained in Pāṭaliputra (i.e., the Zǎ'āpítán xīn), and which was translated by Fǎxiǎn and Buddhābhadra, probably in association with Bǎoyún; or whether this was a separate text entirely. The details of this situation are described in Dessein 1999: lxxvii–lxxxii.

<sup>39</sup> On the length of Fǎxiǎn's manuscript see GFZ 864b23–4 = Deeg 2005: 561; CSJ 21a18. For the length of T 23 no. 1441 see Kamata 1998: 389.

<sup>40</sup> See Tsukamoto 1985: 440.



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

When Guṇabhadra arrived in Jiànkāng, the Saṃyuktāgama would have been the most important work in the collection of Fǎxiǎn's manuscripts that had not yet been translated. As shown above, Bǎoyún 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 Bǎoyún could have persuaded Guṇabhadra, a man eighteen years his junior, to recite the Saṃyuktāgama for him to translate when the latter had only just arrived from India.

### Guṇabhadra's source

According to the biography given by Sēngyòu,<sup>41</sup> Guṇabhadra 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 \**Saṃyuktābhīdharmahr̥daya* (阿毘曇雜心), then, not satisfied with mainstream Buddhism (小乘), he went on to study under a Mahāyāna master. Like Fǎxiǎn and others before him, he went to Sri Lanka, and onward by boat to China. After arriving in Guǎngzhōu 廣州 the monks Huìyán and Huìguān (an associate of Fǎxiǎn and Bǎoyún) were ordered to go to meet him and take him to Qíhuán temple 祇洹寺. The first text he is said to have worked on after arriving in Jiànkāng is the Saṃyuktāgama.

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 Saṃyuktāgama. As mentioned above, Sēngyòu reports that Guṇabhadra was interested in the *Saṃyuktābhīdharmahr̥daya* and the Mahāyāna, and he is known to have

<sup>41</sup> CSJ 105b17–106b21 and GSZ 344a5–345a23.

worked on translations of several important Mahāyāna texts.<sup>42</sup> 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 Guṇabhadra could have provided the source of the *Zá āhán jīng* from memory, there is reasonable doubt that this was so.

We also learn from Guṇabhadra's biography that he was familiar with writing and using written texts, for example “the Mahāyāna master tested [Guṇabhadra], ordering him to take out [a text] from the *sūtra box*”<sup>43</sup> (i.e., a box containing written texts); “then [Guṇabhadra] *read out* the commentaries.”<sup>44</sup> Therefore, he could have brought a manuscript of the Saṃyuktāgama himself. But such a position seems doubtful. In Fǎxiǎn'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 Guṇabhadra. Guṇabhadra 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 Guṇabhadra was literate, therefore, he would have been able to read Fǎxiǎn's manuscript of the Saṃyuktāgama and explain the details for Bǎoyún to translate. Even if Guṇabhadra had been a specialist in this text, it is also quite likely that he would have made use of Fǎxiǎn's manuscript; just as Budhajāiva, a Mahīśāsaka monk and specialist in the Vinaya, did when

---

<sup>42</sup> These include, among others, the *Śrīmālā(devī)siṃhanādasūtra* (T 12 no. 353), the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* (T 16 no. 670), and the *Sandhinirmocanasūtra* (T 16 no. 678).

<sup>43</sup> 大乘師試令採取經匣。CSJ 105b25.

<sup>44</sup> 於是讀誦講義 CSJ 105b27.

he was asked by the monks of Jiànkāng to translate the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya manuscript that Fǎxiǎn had brought back from Sri Lanka.<sup>45</sup>

### Arguments against Fǎxiǎn's manuscript

The primary argument against Fǎxiǎn's manuscript providing the source for the translation of the *Zá āhán jīng* has been that it is not explicitly identified as such in the *Chū sānzàng jǐjī*. The problem with this argument is that the *Chū sānzàng jǐjī* does not specify a different source either. We must accept that, for whatever reason, Sēngyòu 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, Sēngyòu records a list of Fǎxiǎn's manuscripts specifying that some of them, including the *Zá āhán jīng* were not translated.<sup>46</sup> However the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya is similarly recorded and is known to have been translated, and so is the *Yán jīng*.<sup>47</sup> Since the details given concerning these two texts are inconsistent with reports later in the very same catalogue, the information given for the *Zá āhán jīng* is not reliable.

As suggested earlier, one of the main perceived problems seems to have been the fact that Fǎxiǎn obtained his manuscript of the Saṃyuktāgama in Sri Lanka. Since the translation of the *Zá āhán jīng* is widely regarded as belonging to the (Mūla)sarvāstivāda tradition, some scholars have been uncomfortable with identifying this with Fǎxiǎn's manuscript since Sri Lanka is a long way from the homeland of that school.<sup>48</sup> However, prior to the 12<sup>th</sup> 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

<sup>45</sup> GSZ 339a3–13; Shih 1968: 118–9.

<sup>46</sup> “*Zá āhán jīng* (Sanskrit, not translated)” 雜阿含經(梵文未譯) CSJ 12a5.

<sup>47</sup> 彌沙塞律(梵文未譯) CSJ 12a6, see also n. 35 above.

<sup>48</sup> See for example Yinshùn 1983: 3; Nagasaki and Kaji: 46.

Mahāsāṅghikas, the Sāṃmitīyas and the Sthavīras (Theravādins).<sup>49</sup> This conclusion is supported by the fact that Fǎxiǎn brought back a copy of the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya from Sri Lanka. Therefore it is also quite possible that he obtained a Sarvāstivāda manuscript of the Saṃyuktāgama there.

Mizuno has argued that because an audience of many monks was invited to hear Guṇabhadra's reading of the text,<sup>50</sup> this indicates a new version of the text was being used rather than one that had been available for twenty years – as Fǎxiǎn's manuscript had been by that time.<sup>51</sup> 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 *Zá āhán jīng* has shown that while there are problems connecting the translation done by Guṇabhadra to the manuscript brought back by Fǎxiǎn, 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

CSJ	Chū sānzàng jǐjí 出三藏記集 (T 55 no. 2145)
DNL	Dàtáng nèidiǎn lù 大唐內典錄 (T 55 no. 2149)
GFZ	Gāosēng fǎxiǎn zhuàn 高僧法顯傳 (T 51 no. 2085)
GYT	Gǔjīn yìjīng tújì 古今譯經圖紀 (T 55 no. 2151)
GSZ	Gāosēng zhuàn 高僧傳 (T 50 no. 2059)

<sup>49</sup> Bechert 1998: 3; see also Bechert 2005: 48–9.

<sup>50</sup> CSJ 105c13; see above n. 4.

<sup>51</sup> Mizuno 1988: 8.

KSL Kāiyuán shìjiào lù 開元釋教錄 (T 55 no. 2154)

LSJ Lidài sānbǎo jì 歷代三寶紀 (T 49 no. 2034)

## References

- Akanuma Chizen 赤沼智善. 1939. *Bukkyō kyōten-shi ron* 佛教經典史論. Nagoya: Sanbōshoin.
- Bagchi, Pramod Chandra. 1927. *Le canon bouddhique en Chine: les traducteurs et les traductions*. Sino-Indica; publications de l'Université de Calcutta, tome I<sup>er</sup>. Paris: Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Berchert, Heinz. 1998. "Remarks on Buddhist Sanskrit literature in Sri Lanka from the 9th century until the end of the Daṃbadeṇiya period." In Paul Harrison and Gregory Schopen, eds., *Sūryacandrāya: Essays in Honour of Akira Yuyama on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. Indica et Tibetica: Monographien zu den Sprachen und Literaturen des indotibetischen Kulturraumes, vol. 35: 1–8. Swistal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- . 2005. *Eine regionale hochsprachliche Tradition in Südasien: Sanskrit-Literatur bei den buddhistischen Singhalesen*. Veröffentlichungen zu den Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens, Heft 37. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Boucher, Daniel. 2000. "On *hu* and *fan* again: the transmission of barbarian manuscripts to China." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 23: 7–28.
- . 2006. "Dharmarakṣa and the Transmission of Buddhism to China." *Asia Major* 19: 13–37.
- Deeg, Max. 2005. *Das Gaoseng-Faxian-Zhuan als religionsgeschichtliche Quelle: der älteste Bericht eines chinesischen buddhistischen Pilgermönchs über seine Reise nach Indien mit Übersetzung des Textes*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Demiéville, Paul. 1953. "Le bouddhisme: les sources chinoises." In Renou and Filliozat, eds., *L'Inde classique: manuel des études indiennes*. Vol. 2: 398–463. Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Enomoto Fumio 榎本文雄. 2002. "'Zōagongyō' no yakushutsu to genten no yurai" 『雜阿含經』の訳出と原典の由来 (On the translation of the Saṃyuktāgama into Chinese and its Indic origin). In *Bukkyō bunka no kichō to tenkai: Ishigami Zen'ō Kyōju koki kinen ronbunshū* 石上善應教授古稀記念論文集: 仏教文の基調と展開抜刷 (Basis and Evolution of Buddhist Culture: Essays in Honour of Professor Zen'ō Ishigami on his Seventieth Birthday): 31–41. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.
- Funayama Tōru 船山徹. 2000. "Ryō no Sōyū sen Satsubatashi shiden to Tōdai bukkyō" 梁の僧祐撰『薩婆多師資傳』と唐代佛教 (Tang Bud-

- dhism and the Sapoduo shizi zhuan compiled by Sēngyòu of the Liang Dynasty). In Yoshikawa Tadao 吉川忠夫, ed., *Tōdai no shūkyō 唐代の宗教*: 325–354. Kyoto: Hōyū shoten.
- Forthcoming. “Guṇavarman and Some of the Earliest Examples of Ordination Platforms (*jietan*) in China.” In James Benn, Jinhua Chen, and James Robson, eds., *Images, Relics and Legends: Formation and Transformation of Buddhist Sacred Sites*.
- Glass, Andrew. 2007a. *Four Gāndhārī Saṃyuktāgama Sūtras: Senior Kharoṣṭhī Fragment 5*. Gandhāran Buddhist Texts 4. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- 2007b. “The Chronology of the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions: A reassessment in light of recent discoveries.” *Gandhāran Studies* 1: 61–76.
- de Jong, J. W. 1981. “Fa-hsien and Buddhist texts in Ceylon.” *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 9: 105–116.
- Kamata Shigeo 鎌田茂雄. 1998. *Daizōkyō zenkaisetsu daijiten 大藏經全解説大事典*. Tokyo: Yūzankaku Shuppan.
- Lancaster, Lewis. 1979. *The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Legge, James. 1886. *A record of Buddhistic kingdoms being an account by the Chinese monk of his travels in India and Ceylon (A.D. 399–414) in search of the Buddhist books of discipline*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lú Hǎimíng. 2002. *Liù cháo dū chéng 六朝都城*. Nanjing: Nánjīng Chūbǎnshè.
- Mayeda Egaku. 1985–7. “Japanese studies on the schools of the Chinese āgamas.” In Heinz Bechert, ed., *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse, dritte Folge, Nr. 149 & Nr. 154 / Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, III: 94–103. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Mizuno Kōgen 水野弘元. 1988. “‘Zōagonyō’ no kenkyū to shuppan” 『雜阿含經』の研究と出版 (Research and Publication of the Chinese Version of the *Saṃyuttanikāya*). *Bukkyō kenkyū 佛教研究 (Buddhist Studies)* 17: 1–45.
- Nagasaki Hōjun 長崎法潤 and Kaji Yōichi 加治洋一. 2004. *Zōagonyō 雜阿含經I*. Shin kokuyaku daizōkyō 新国訳大藏經: Agonbu 阿含部4. Tokyo: Daizōshuppan.
- Pelliot, P. 1930. “Les stances d’introduction de l’Abhidharmahrdayaśāstra de Dharmatrāta.” *Journal asiatique* 217: 267–73.
- Salomon Richard. Forthcoming. “Whatever happened to Kharoṣṭhī? The Fate of a Forgotten Indian Script.” In John Baines, John Bennett and

- Stephen Houston, eds., *The Disappearance of Writing Systems*. London: Equinox Publishing.
- Shih, Robert. 1968. *Biographies des moines éminents de Houei-Kiao: Kao seng tchoua*. Bibliothèque du Muséon 54. Louvain: Institut orientaliste, Bibliothèque de l'Université.
- Tseng, H. Vinita. 2000. *The Nidānavagga of Sāratthappakāsini*. PhD diss., Faculty of Oriental Studies, Oxford University.
- Tsukamoto Zenryū 塚本善隆. 1985. Leon Hurvitz, tr., *A History of Early Chinese Buddhism: from its Introduction to the Death of Hui-yüan*. Tokyo and New York: Kodansha International Ltd.
- Yinshùn 印順. 1983. *Zá āhán jīng lùn huìbiān* 雜阿含經論會編 3 vols. Taipei: Zhèngwén Chūbǎnshè.