

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

Who produced the *Da mingdu jing* 大百度經 (T225)?

A reassessment of the evidence*

Jan Nattier

The *Da mingdu jing* has long been considered one of the most solidly attributed texts in the corpus of Zhi Qian 支謙 (fl. 222–252 CE). Credited to Zhi Qian already in the earliest extant catalogue of Buddhist scriptures, the *Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集 compiled by the eminent scholar-monk Sengyou 僧祐 (completed c. 518 CE),¹ the *Da mingdu jing* has accordingly appeared on virtually every roster of Zhi Qian's works published in scholarly studies. Based on external evidence alone – that is, on the title of the text and its treatment in early scriptural catalogues – there would seem to be no reason to doubt its authenticity.

Several decades ago, however, an American scholar of Buddhism, Lewis R. Lancaster, published an article in which he argued that the *Da mingdu jing* is not actually Zhi Qian's work, but

* This paper was originally presented at a conference on “Early Chinese Buddhist Translations” held in Vienna on April 18–21, 2007. I would like to thank the conference organizer, Max Deeg, for his kind invitation to participate and our host, Helmut Krasser of the Austrian Academy of Sciences, for the sponsorship of this event. This paper has benefited from comments and suggestions made by a number of the conference participants, in particular Christoph Harbsmeier, Paul Harrison, and Stefano Zacchetti. Any errors that remain, of course, are my own.

¹ See T2145, 55.7a8. In the main entry the title is given as *Mingdu jing* 明度經; Sengyou also gives the alternate title *Da ming duwuji jing* 大百度無極經. Sengyou describes the text as consisting of four fascicles (四卷), though later catalogues give the alternatives of four or six.

was instead produced by the Han-period translator An Xuan 安玄 (Lancaster 1969). So far as I have been able to determine, this was the first article published in English devoted to any of the works of Zhi Qian (in Wade-Giles transcription, Chih Ch'ien), and this pioneering study has since been widely quoted.²

According to Lancaster, the “avoidance of transliteration” (that is, the preference for translation) that characterizes the *Da mingdu jing* is not at all typical of Zhi Qian’s other work (p. 248), but on the contrary, serves as evidence that this text is the work of someone else (p. 249). More specifically, Lancaster proposed that chapters 2–27 of the *Da mingdu jing* should be considered the work of An Xuan, while chapter 1 (which contains an interlinear commentary) is a revision of that text by another hand.³

Writing some fifteen years later, a Japanese scholar, KATSUZAKI Yūgen 勝崎裕彦, took precisely the opposite position.⁴ In an article published in 1985, Katsuzaki described the *Da mingdu jing* as “the most Zhi Qian-ish” (もつとも支謙的) of Zhi Qian’s translations (pp. 68, 91). For Katsuzaki – and indeed, for Japanese scholars in general – the preference for translation (Katsuzaki uses the term *giyaku* 義訳) rather than transcription (*onsha* 音写) is taken as one of the very hallmarks of Zhi Qian’s translation style.

Methodological issues (1): Lancaster’s approach

The fact that these two scholars could produce quite opposite arguments is a product, to a large extent, of their very different methodologies. To begin with the earlier of the two, in Lancaster’s pa-

² Lancaster’s argument is apparently accepted by Zürcher in his “A New Look at the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Texts” (Zürcher 1991, p. 294, notes 4 and 9). The paper is also cited (though not necessarily always with agreement) in numerous other studies.

³ For reasons that are not stated directly, Lancaster does not include chapters 28–30 (containing the story of Sadāprarudita and Dharmodgata) in his discussion of the vocabulary of the *Da mingdu jing*.

⁴ See Katsuzaki 1985. Katsuzaki does not refer to Lancaster’s article, and presumably it was not available to him.

per all fifty-three texts credited to Zhi Qian in the Taishō canon are accepted as genuine, and Lancaster refers to this entire body of material as a valid source of evidence concerning Zhi Qian's translation style (p. 247). A careful evaluation of the testimony provided by scriptural catalogues, however, shows that over half of these attributions were unknown to Sengyou and to his illustrious predecessor, Dao'an 道安, whose earlier catalogue (no longer extant as a separate work) was incorporated into the *Chu sanzang ji ji*. In many cases these "newly discovered" Zhi Qian translations were introduced for the first time in the *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶紀 compiled by Fei Changfang 費長房 (T2034, completed in 597 CE). As Fei is known to have introduced many false attributions into his catalogue, the degree of confidence that can be placed in such items is extremely low.⁵ Thus Lancaster's working list of Zhi Qian's translations was corrupted by the inclusion of dozens of texts that are certainly not his.⁶

Conversely, though Lancaster refers to having consulted all fifty-three of Zhi Qian's supposed works, virtually all of the terms which he says appear in the *Da mingdu jing* but not in any of Zhi Qian translations (p. 249) can in fact be found here and there in other texts, even when the list is narrowed to the two dozen or so that can be considered to be his genuine works.⁷ In the following chart the column on the left contains those terms which, according to Lancaster, appear in chapters 2 through 27 of the *Da mingdu jing* but not elsewhere in Zhi Qian's work. The column on the right

⁵ For an extensive critical discussion of Fei Changfang's catalogue see Tan 1991, pp. 3–246; a pioneering discussion in Japanese can be found in Hayashiya 1941, pp. 82–84 and 300–302. For brief overviews in English see Tokuno 1990, pp. 43–47 and Nattier 2008, pp. 14–15 and nn. 25 and 26.

⁶ It should be pointed out, however, that Lancaster has recently been an active participant in a project to update existing scriptural catalogues to reflect more reliable attributions, and that largely as a result of his efforts far better resources should be available online in the near future.

⁷ For a discussion of the translations that can reliably be attributed to Zhi Qian at the present state of our knowledge see Nattier 2008, pp. 121–148.

gives the Taishō text numbers of translations reliably attributed to Zhi Qian in which these terms also occur. Where the Chinese term in question is being used to translate a different Indian word than in the latter part of the *Da mingdu jing* (i.e., chapters 2–30 of the text; henceforth T225B), the text number is given in brackets together with the alternate Indic-language equivalent.

<u>Terms from ch. 2–27 of T225B</u>	<u>Other Zhi Qian texts where attested</u>
除饑(眾) for <i>bhikṣu</i>	T210 ⁸
定 (for <i>samādhi</i>)	T6, 76, 87, etc. ⁹
清信士 (for <i>upāsaka</i>)	T6, 76, 198, 361, 533, 581, 790
闍士 (var. 開士) (for <i>bo-dhisattva</i>)	T76, 493, 533

⁸ See T210, 4.567a24. The fact that this term is indeed being used as a translation of *bhikṣu* can be confirmed by consulting the parallels to this verse in the *Udānavarga* (XVII.8) and the *Maitreyāvadāna* (Vaidya 1959, p. 34, lines 14–15). Previous publications have treated this verse as being without any close parallel; see Mizuno (1981, p. 284), who suggests Udv XI.15 as a partial parallel, and Dhammajoti (1995, p. 184, n. 14) who follows Mizuno in offering the same suggestion.

⁹ The character 定 appears in virtually every text translated by Zhi Qian; in the texts listed above, it is certain that it is being used to represent *samādhi*. There may be many other cases as well, but a thorough examination of every occurrence of the character 定 lies beyond the range of this paper. For a representative passage in which the equivalent is certainly *samādhi* see T6, 1.181c27.

¹⁰ Lancaster treats this as part of a single long expression, viz., 無所著正真道最正覺, which he considers to be a translation of *anuttarasamyaksambodhi* (p. 249). In fact, however, the context – where the word 如來 “*tathāgata*” appears just before (8.482b21) – makes it clear that this group of characters consists of two distinct epithets of the Buddha: 無所著, used as a translation of *arhat*, and 正真道最正覺 corresponding to *samyaksambuddha* (consisting of 正真道, used by several early translators for *samyaksambodhi*, and 最正覺, presumably originally derived from **abhisambuddha*). On these epithets see Nattier 2003, pp. 217–219 and 222–223.

大士 (for <i>mahāsattva</i>)	T169, 474, 532 [T76, for <i>mahāpuruṣa</i>]
無所著 (for <i>arhat</i>) ¹⁰	T169, 532
正真道最正覺 (for <i>samyaksambuddha</i>)	[T361 and 474, for <i>samyaksambodhi</i> ; cf. also T281 and T1011] ¹¹
溝港 (for <i>śrotaṅpanna</i>)	T6, 87, 198, 474, 790

Lancaster's paper was written, of course, before the advent of the digital versions of the Chinese Buddhist canon (of which he himself was an early supporter), which now make it possible to search through large quantities of material at lightning speed. Moreover, the growing scholarly consensus on Zhi Qian's authorship of two of the texts given above – a non-Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* (T6) and a version of the *Larger Sukhāvātīvyūha* (T361) – was not yet in effect in the late 1960s.¹² Even if we take these factors into consideration, however, it is clear that Lancaster's statements concerning which terms are, or are not, found in Zhi Qian's work are contradicted by what we actually find in a number of genuine Zhi Qian texts.

In evaluating the claim that the *Da mingdu jing* is the work of An Xuan (or more properly, the work of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao, since the two men produced the *Fa jing jing* 法鏡經 together), it is important to note that no early catalogue attributes a *prajñāpāramitā* translation of any kind to An Xuan. Of course the silence of the catalogues does not, in itself, prove that such a translation did not exist. But in the absence of such bibliographic support it is all the more important to compare the vocabulary of the *Fa jing jing* (T322) thoroughly and systematically with that of the *Da mingdu jing*. Lancaster's article, however, does not include such a system-

¹¹ In all of these cases this expression is prefaced by the characters 無上-, and this combination is clearly intended as a translation of the term *anuttarasamyaksambodhi*. For slightly different phrasing cf. T281, 10.450c22–23 (現世得紹代無上正真之道為最正覺) and T1011, 19.680b22–23 (至於無上正真之道為最正覺).

¹² For the attribution of T6 to Zhi Qian see Nattier 2008, pp. 126–128 (with reference to an earlier analysis of the text in Ui 1971, pp. 517–523). On the authorship of T361 see Nattier 2008, p. 139 and the further references given there.

atic comparison, but focuses only on terms that are shared by the *Da mingdu jing* and the *Fa jing jing*. When we consider the vocabulary of the *Fa jing jing* as a whole, however, we find many terms and expressions used by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao that do not match those used in chapters 2–30 of the *Da mingdu jing* (T225B). (In cases where an expression appears only rarely in T225B, and where there is reason to think that its appearance is the result of editorial emendation rather than part of the original translation, the item is given in brackets with an explanatory note.) A few representative examples are the following:

<u>Sanskrit term</u>	<u>Equivalent in T322</u>	<u>Equivalent(s) in T225B</u>
<i>pratyekabuddha</i>	各佛	緣一覺
<i>sarvajña</i>	一切敏	一切知
<i>bhagavat</i>	眾祐	佛, ¹³ 天中天, [天尊, 世尊] ¹⁴
<i>kulaputra</i>	族姓男	善士, 高士
<i>punar aparaṃ</i>	又復	復次
<i>tat kasya hetoḥ</i>	所以者何	何以故, [所以者何] ¹⁵

¹³ The use of the transcription *fo* 佛 as a translation of *bhagavat* is discussed in Nattier 2006.

¹⁴ The expression “Heaven-honored One” (*tianzun* 天尊) occurs nine times in T225B, but these occurrences are clustered together on pp. 490b–492a (with all but two occurring on 490b–491b), a distribution that almost certainly points to the editorial emendation of this section (on this epithet see Nattier 2003, pp. 232–234). When the word *bhagavat* is not simply translated as *fo* 佛 “Buddha,” the translator of T225B overwhelmingly prefers the expression “god of gods” (*tian zhong tian* 天中天), which occurs ninety-three times. On the latter expression, which is especially frequent in the vocative use, see Iwamatsu 1985, Boucher 1996, pp. 210–214, and Nattier 2003, p. 234. The term “World-honored One” (*shizun* 世尊) occurs only once in T225B (at 488b7), and is surely the result of a copyist’s alteration.

¹⁵ There are only five occurrences of the expression *suoyizhe he* 所以

Even this brief selection makes it quickly evident that several key technical terms (as well as certain ordinary expressions) used in the *Fa jing jing* do not match those found in the *Da mingdu jing*.

Even more important than the differences in these individual lexical items, however, are fundamental differences in what we might call “translation policy.” First of all, one of the noticeable features of the *Fa jing jing* – which is, unfortunately, the sole work known to have been produced by the team of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao – is the relative consistency of its terminology; for example, the text contains only one term for *bhikṣu* (*chujin* 除饑), one term for *nirvāṇa* (*miedu* 滅度), and one name for Maitreya (*Cishi* 慈氏). The *Da mingdu jing*, by contrast, exhibits considerable variety in its terminology, using both *chujin* 除饑 and *biqiu* 比丘 for *bhikṣu*, *miedu* 滅度 and *niehuan* 泥洹 for *nirvāṇa*, and *Cishi* 慈氏 and *Mile* 彌勒 for Maitreya. Even in the case of the word *bhagavat*, which is rendered into Chinese in a variety of ways (including simply *fo* 佛 “Buddha”) and which has multiple equivalents in the latter part of the *Da mingdu jing* as shown in the chart above, the translators of the *Fa jing jing* appear to have made an effort to be consistent, using the term *zhongyou* 眾祐 “Mass of Blessings” wherever the corresponding Tibetan text indicates that the underlying term was a form of *bhagavat* “Blessed One.”

Most significant is the fact that throughout the *Fa jing jing* the translators consistently attempted to translate the meaning (rather than transcribing the sound) of *all* names and Buddhist technical terms, with the exception only of a few ancient words that had already come into widespread use before their time, i.e., the word *fo* 佛 (ONWC/EMC *but*) “Buddha,” the personal name *Anan* 阿難 “Ānanda,” and the *deva*-names *Shi* 釋 “Śakra” and *Fan* 梵

者何 in T225B, and these are clustered together in just one section of the text (8.482c–483b), thus again presumably revealing an editorial emendation of that passage. The expression *he yi gu* 何以故, by contrast, appears no fewer than ninety times, and is the standard formula in this text. Conversely, in T322 the usual form is 所以者何 (thirteen occurrences). 何以故 appears once in T322, but only as part of a more complex question (12.19c13, 何以故謂之為聖典? “Why are they called sacred texts?”).

“Brahmā.”¹⁶ Indeed, the *Fa jing jing* is such an extreme example of a “translation-only” policy that it is fair to say that its translators made every effort to avoid the use of transcriptions. The translator of the *Da mingdu jing*, however, does not follow suit. In T225B (as is also the case in T225A) we find a significant number of transcriptions, coexisting quite comfortably with a wide range of translated terms.¹⁷ Thus the *Da mingdu jing* does not conform (*pace* Lancaster) to the single most distinctive feature of the *Fa jing jing*: an almost total absence of transcription terms.

In sum, there is no solid evidence that the *Da mingdu jing* is the work of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao, while on the contrary several factors, both external and internal, militate against it:

- (1) The absence of any reference in early scriptural catalogues to the production of a *prajñāpāramitā* text of any kind (let alone of the *Da mingdu jing* in particular) by An Xuan (and/or Yan Fotiao);
- (2) The fact that chapters 2–30 of the *Da mingdu jing* (i.e., T225B) exhibit considerable variety in translation terminology,¹⁸ while the *Fa jing jing* generally employs a single Chinese equivalent for Buddhist names and terms; and
- (3) The fact that the *Da mingdu jing* (again, referring specifically to T225B) contains a significant number of transcriptions, while such terms are strenuously avoided (with the exception of a small handful of long-accepted names) in the *Fa jing jing*.

¹⁶ The word *seng* 僧, a transcription of *saṃgha*, occurs only once in the text (12.16b6), and it seems likely to be the result of a scribal emendation. Elsewhere the word is consistently translated as *zhòng* 眾 “assembly.”

¹⁷ There are far too many transcriptions in T225B to list them all here; for convenient access to this data see the extensive table compiled by Katsuzaki (1985, pp. 69–89). For his discussion of the issue of transcription itself see pp. 89–90.

¹⁸ In documenting this variety it will be important to exclude those variations that seem to have resulted from subsequent scribal emendation (cf. above, notes 14–16).

Even without considering the question of what – if anything – might be described as Zhi Qian’s “usual translation style” (a thorny issue to which we will return below), it is clear that there is no reason to assign the *Da mingdu jing* to An Xuan and Yan Fotiao.

Methodological issues (2): Katsuzaki’s approach

KATSUZAKI Yūgen employs a quite different method in analyzing the *Da mingdu jing*, taking as his point of departure descriptions of the work of Zhi Qian by scholars going back to the time of Sengyou. Drawing on the work of KAGAWA Takao 香川孝雄 (1984) and others, Katsuzaki proceeds on the basis of the assumption that the use of translations rather than transcriptions is a distinguishing feature of Zhi Qian’s work. Accordingly, he finds the *Da mingdu jing* – which does indeed abound in translated terms – to be the most typical of Zhi Qian’s style. On this basis, he recommends that the *Da mingdu jing* be used as a fundamental point of reference in studies of Zhi Qian’s work.

Katsuzaki’s description of Zhi Qian’s “typical style” is well grounded in traditional bibliographic sources, and as such it offers an accurate reflection of the views of Chinese Buddhist scholars from at least the sixth century CE onward. Conversely, however, the fact that his discussion reflects these traditional views means that it also shares in their shortcomings. In particular, neither the sources he quotes nor Katsuzaki himself take into account the troublesome fact that Zhi Qian’s corpus exhibits a high degree of inconsistency. Thus while some translations solidly attributed to him – e.g., the *Fanmoyu jing* 梵摩渝經 (T76) and the *Weimojie suoshuo jing* 維摩詰所說經 (T474) – do abound in translated terms and are composed in an elegant literary style, others – e.g., the *Yueming pusa jing* 月明菩薩經 (T169) and the *Huiyin sanmei jing* 慧印三昧經 (T632) – are less polished in style and contain a large number of transcribed terms. Thus if there is anything that could be described as a “characteristic feature” of Zhi Qian’s corpus, it is the very fact that *no* set of characteristics appears consistently throughout his work. On the contrary, texts that are solidly attributed to Zhi Qian from the time of Dao’an onwards exhibit a wide range of variation in both terminology and style.

To be fair, however, it should be pointed out that it was not Katsuzaki's objective in this article to establish the attribution of the *Da mingdu jing* to Zhi Qian; instead, his purpose was to provide a comparison of the terminology used in the *Da mingdu jing* with the corresponding terms found in Lokakṣema's 支婁迦讖 *Daoxing banruo jing* 道行般若經 (T224). And in so doing he has made an important contribution to the study of early Chinese translations, for his article contains a valuable table of Buddhist terms and proper names found in each chapter of the *Da mingdu jing*, with the corresponding terms in Lokakṣema's *Daoxing banruo jing* given for comparison (1985, 69–89).

A close look at this list, however, reveals another issue that requires our attention. Katsuzaki (again following traditional East Asian scholarly practice) treats the whole of the *Da mingdu jing* as a single text, drawing his examples from all of its chapters, from 1 through 30. But the sūtra as we have it consists of two quite dissimilar parts. Chapter 1 (henceforth T225A) differs in numerous respects from chapters 2–30 (T225B), including, but not limited to, vocabulary and style. Thus, as Lancaster rightly pointed out (p. 247), the first chapter is not of the same vintage as the others, and it should properly be dealt with separately.

A hybrid creation: Components of the *Da mingdu jing*

Even a cursory glance at the text of the *Da mingdu jing* contained in the present Taishō edition of the canon quickly reveals that the first part of this work, the “Practice” chapter (行品), is very different from the rest. Not only does it contain a translation of the first chapter of the sūtra itself, but it also includes an extensive inter-linear commentary which was clearly produced not in India but in China. The commentary explains various words and concepts found in the sūtra translation, quoting from a number of scriptures previously translated into Chinese.¹⁹ In some cases the explana-

¹⁹ The texts cited in the commentary to T225A are referred to there by the titles *Anban* 安般 (cited at 8.478c7; cf. T602, the *Da anban shouyi jing* 大安般守意經, but also the newly discovered manuscript discussed by Stefano Zacchetti in this issue), *Liaoben* 了本 (480a26; cf. T708, the

tions are prefaced by the words “The master says . . .” (師云), but neither the name of the master nor that of the author of the commentary is provided. Many of the texts cited here, however, are also cited in an early commentary on An Shigao’s *Yin chi ru jing* 陰持入經 (T1694), and the latter uses much of the same language, including the expression 師云. In a recent study Stefano Zacchetti has presented compelling evidence that the *Yin chi ru jing* commentary was the product of a community of Buddhists in the Wu 吳 kingdom that included the Chinese layman Chen Hui 陳慧 as well as the Sino-Sogdian monk Kang Senghui 康僧會 (Zacchetti forthcoming). Given the striking similarities between this text and the interlinear commentary to T225A, I believe it is highly likely that the latter was composed in the same milieu.

It is not only the presence of the commentary that distinguishes chapter 1 from the remainder of the text, however, for its vocabulary is different as well. There are a number of cases where the latter part of the text (T225B) uses vocabulary that does not occur in chapter 1 (T225A). The following are some representative examples: ^{20#}

<u>Sanskrit</u> ²⁰	<u>Chapter 1 (T225A)</u>	<u>Chapters 2–30 (T225B)</u>
<i>bodhisattva</i>	菩薩	闍士
<i>kulaputra</i>	族姓子	善士, 高士

Liaoben shengsi jing 了本生死經, but the material cited here does not have a parallel in that text), *Faju* 法句 (480b2; see T210, the *Faju jing* 法句經), *Dun zhen jing* 純真經 (480b3; see T624, the *Dun zhendouluo suowen rulai sanmei jing* 侏真陀羅所問如來三昧經), and *Huiyin jing* 慧印經 (480b4; see T632, the *Huiyin sanmei jing* 慧印三昧經). It is noteworthy that all of the above texts – though not always the same passages – are also cited in T1694, a commentary on An Shigao’s *Yinchiru jing* 陰持入經 (on which see Zacchetti forthcoming).

²⁰ Though the names and technical terms discussed here are given in Sanskrit for ease of recognition and convenience of reference, it is assumed throughout this discussion that Zhi Qian’s translations (and in fact most if not all of the Chinese translations produced from the second to fourth centuries CE) were based not on Sanskrit but on Prakrit originals.

<i>bhagavat</i>	佛, 世尊	佛, 天中天, [天尊, 世尊] ²¹
<i>bhikṣu</i>	比丘	除饑, 比丘
Pūrṇamaitrāyaṇī-putra	滿慈子	滿祝子

As is immediately evident from this chart, T225A uses terms for *bodhisattva* (*pusa* 菩薩), *kulaputra* (*zuxingzi* 族姓子), and *bhikṣu* (*biqiu* 比丘) that are widely attested in other early translations, while T225B uses a number of highly idiosyncratic translation terms, including “opener, revealer” (*kaishi* 闔士) for *bodhisattva*, “good sir” (*shanshi* 善士) or “exalted sir” (*gaoshi* 高士) for *kulaputra*, and “famine discarder” (*chujin* 除饑) for *bhikṣu*, some of which had already appeared in the work of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao. In certain cases a word used in T225A as the sole equivalent for a given Indic term is also found in T225B, but there it alternates there with other forms (for instance, in T225B both 除饑 and 比丘 are used for *bhikṣu*, while T225A uses 比丘 alone).

But it is not only in Buddhist terms and proper names that we can find differences between the two parts of the *Da mingdu jing*. If we examine the pronouns used in each part of the text, for example (following the lead of Matsue 2005), we find that T225A freely uses the word *wu* 吾 “I, me, my” for the first person pronoun (19 times in the non-commentarial part of chapter 1), while the word *wo* 我 is somewhat less common, occurring only 14 times in the same chapter. In the much-longer T225B, by contrast, the proportions are reversed, with 吾 occurring only 20 times versus 219 occurrences of 我. The second-person pronoun *qing* 卿 “you” occurs five times in T225B, but never in T225A, while conversely the pronoun *ru* 汝 occurs four times in T225A, but only three times in the whole of T225B.²² The demonstrative pronoun *ci* 此 “this” is used 44 times

²¹ The expressions 天尊 and 世尊 rarely appear in T225B and are probably the result of scribal emendation; see above, note 14.

²² T225B generally uses the word *ruo* 若 to express the second-person pronoun. In T225A, by contrast, all 38 occurrences of 若 appear to be in

in the non-commentarial portions of T225A (and another 41 times in the commentary), but only 28 times in the whole of T225B. In other words, the two parts of the text differ not only in their treatment of Buddhist names and terms, but in their choice of pronouns as well.

Other differences in ordinary (i.e., non-Buddhist) terminology can also be found. The oft-used question “Why is that?” (in Sanskrit, *tat kasya hetoh*) generally appears in the form *suoyizhe he* 所以者何 in T225A, while in T225B *he yi gu* 何以故 is almost always used. In introducing ordinary quoted speech – for example, statements made by Subhūti to Śāriputra or vice versa – T225A routinely uses the verb *yue* 曰, while in T225B the verb *yan* 言 is overwhelmingly preferred. To introduce a reply, T225A usually uses the verb *da* 答, while in T225B the standard form (with only a few exceptions)²³ is *dui* 對. When it is the Buddha who is speaking T225B often uses *yu* 語, but this verb never appears in T225A at all.²⁴

These pervasive differences make it quite clear that T225A and T225B were not produced by the same person, but were originally separate texts that were “pasted together” at some point, with the first chapter of the original T225B presumably being lost in the process. If additional chapters of T225A were ever completed – and this is not at all certain – they were presumably lost at the same time.

When did this amalgamation take place? That is, when did the *Da mingdu jing* as we have it – consisting of chapter 1 of T225A together with chapters 2–30 of T225B – come into being? It is not possible to answer this question with precision, but it is clear that it had already occurred by the time a version of the text came into the hands of the great lexicographer Xuanying 玄應 (fl. 645–656). If we examine his discussion of the vocabulary of a text called (*Da*)

the sense of “if,” a usage which of course also occurs in T225B.

²³ More than half of the occurrences of *da* 答 in T225B are clustered together in one brief section of the text (8.482b–483a), suggesting that the word has been introduced in the course of revision of this passage.

²⁴ In T225A *yu* 語 occurs only as a noun.

ming duwuji jing (大)明度無極經 in the *Yiqie jing yinyi* 一切經音義, we find that it begins with material now found in T225A, then proceeds to discuss material from T225B, in the same sequence in which these terms are found in the Taishō edition of T225 today.²⁵ Thus by the middle of the seventh century CE at the latest – and in all probability, long before that time – the hybrid *Da mingdu jing* was circulating as an integral text in China.

Based on the data presented above, we can already see that the way in which the question of the attribution of T225 is usually phrased – “Does the *Da mingdu jing* conform to the usual translation style of Zhi Qian?” – is flawed in at least two respects. First, there is no such thing as “the” *Da mingdu jing*; instead, the text consists of two parts (T225A and 225B) which were clearly produced at different times and under different circumstances. And second, as we shall see, there is tremendous variety in both vocabulary and style within Zhi Qian’s corpus, and thus there is no such thing as “the” usual translation style of Zhi Qian. Like a mathematical equation containing too many variables, the problem of the authorship of T225 cannot be solved when it is stated in the above terms. As an alternative, therefore, I would like to propose that we refine our approach by dealing with three aspects of the problem separately: first, an evaluation of the relationship of T225A and T225B (considered individually) to Lokakṣema’s T224; second, a comparison of the vocabulary and style of T225A and B to one another; and third, a comparison of the vocabulary and style of T225A and B (again considered separately) to other texts in the corpus of translations reliably attributed to Zhi Qian.

²⁵ See T2128, 54.364a24–c13. The text is called *Da ming duwuji jing* 大明度無極經 in the table of contents (T2128, 54.362c10) but only *Ming duwuji jing* 明度無極經 in the headings to the individual entries themselves (e.g., 明度無極經第一卷 at 364a24). Note that the version of the text used by Xuanying was in four *juan* 卷, a figure which corresponds to that given by Sengyou for Zhi Qian’s translation of the *Da mingdu jing*. The text also circulated in a version divided into six *juan* (明度經六卷[一名大明度無極經或四卷]); see Fajing’s *Zhongjing mulu*, T2146, 55.119b6), as is the case with the current Taishō edition of the text.

The *Da mingdu jing* 大明度經 (T225) and the *Daoxing banruo jing* 道行般若經 (T224)

Thus far we have considered only the two distinct segments of what today is known as the *Da mingdu jing*, i.e., chapter 1 (T225A) and chapters 2–30 (T225B), respectively. Our understanding of the history of both parts of the text can be greatly enhanced, however, by comparing them with the corresponding sections of the earliest extant Chinese translation of the text, Lokakṣema's *Daoxing banruo jing* (T224). It is commonly said that the *Da mingdu jing* is a revised version of Lokakṣema's translation, but as we shall see, this statement is true only if it is worded with great precision. A close comparison of these texts yields the following results.

(1) T225B is noticeably abbreviated with respect to T224. Even a cursory glance at these two texts shows that there is a noteworthy difference in their length. T224 – or rather, chapters 2–30 of that text, the portion which parallels T225B – occupies just over forty-nine pages in the Taishō edition (8.429a10–478b14), while T225B is only about half as long, totalling just twenty-six pages (482b6–508b13). While a certain amount of this difference in length can be explained by the replacement of long transcriptions of Indian terms with much shorter translation terms, it is due above all to the compression of Lokakṣema's often verbose and repetitive mode of expression. Compare, for example, the following renditions of a passage from Chapter 16 (corresponding to Chapter 18 of the Sanskrit text):

T224: 須菩提言：“佛說‘不可計’色、痛痒、思想、生死、識亦不可計？”佛語須菩提：“汝所問者，有何因使色、痛痒、思想、生死、識不可計、不可量。”(8.456c8–11)

T225B: 善業言：“佛說‘不可計’五陰亦然？”佛言：“若所問者，有所因使五陰可計量。”(8.496a23–25)

It is easy to see that in T224 the standard list of “form, feeling, conceptualizing, conditioning forces, and consciousness” is given in full as 色、痛痒、思想、生死、識, while in T225B it is abbreviated to simply “the five *skandhas*” (五陰).

But it is not only lists that are abbreviated, for T225B compresses other rhetorical elements as well. See for example the following passage from Chapter 2:

T224: 須菩提語釋提桓因言：“拘翼！是若干千萬天子樂者聽我當說。”須菩提持佛威神持佛力廣為諸天子說般若波羅蜜：“何所天子未行菩薩道，其未行者今皆當行。以得須陀洹道。不可復得菩薩道。” (8.429a18–23)

T225B: 善業曰：“諸天子樂聞者聽我說。因持佛力廣說智度。何天子未求闍士道者今皆當求。以得溝港道者不可復得闍士道{士}。” (8.48213–15)²⁶

Here the name of the person to whom Subhūti is speaking, the god Śakra (釋提桓因 in Lokakṣema’s rendition, including the epithet *devānām indra* “lord of the gods”), has been eliminated; likewise his epithet Kauśika, presumably used in the vocative in the underlying Indian text (拘翼 in T224), is also absent from T225B. A long reference in T224 to those gods (*devaputra*) who do not yet practice the bodhisattva path (何所天子未行菩薩道，其未行者) has been shortened in T225B as well (何天子未求闍士道者).

Sometimes several types of abbreviation are employed in a single passage, and in such cases the resulting difference in length can be even more extreme. A good example can be found in Chapter 3:

T224: 四天王白佛言：“我輩自共護是善男子善女人學般若波羅蜜者持者誦者。”梵摩三鉢天及梵天諸天人俱白佛言：“我輩自共護是善男子善女人學般若波羅蜜者、持者、誦者。”釋提桓因白佛言：“我自護是善男子、善女人學般若波羅蜜者、持者、誦者。” (8.431a25–431b2)

T225B: 四天王 釋 梵及諸天子等各白佛言：“我當護是學持誦者。” (8.483c10–11)

Here the statements made separately in T224 by the four *lokapālas* (四天王 in Lokakṣema’s translation), Brahmā Saṃpati and other gods of the Brahmāloka (梵摩三鉢天及梵天諸天人), and Śakra, Lord of the Gods (釋提桓因) are compressed in T225B into a single statement made by this entire group (四天王釋梵及諸天子等). The statement itself – in T224, “We will protect those good

²⁶ The character 士 enclosed in braces is presumably a scribal emendation, and should be removed.

men and good women who study the *prajñāpāramitā*, uphold it,²⁷ and recite it” (我自護是善男子、善女人學般若波羅蜜者、持者、誦者) – is also starkly abbreviated in T225B, which reads only “We will protect those who study, uphold, and recite [it]” (我當護是學持誦者). As a result, a passage that occupies eight lines in T224 takes up less than two full lines in T225B. This pattern obtains throughout T225B, and there is no need to belabor the point by citing additional examples here.²⁸ T225A, however – as we will see in the following sections – has a quite different relationship to T224.

(2) T225A is not abbreviated with respect to T224. It is not as straightforward to compare the length of T225A with that of T224, for as noted above, T225A includes an interlinear commentary. Thus it is only by subtracting the space occupied by this commentary that a genuine comparison with T224 can be obtained. If we do so, however, the result differs dramatically from what we saw in the case of T225B. A typical example, drawn from a passage at the beginning of the *sūtra*, is the following:

T224: 佛在羅閱祇，耆闍崛山中。摩訶比丘僧不可計，諸弟子，舍利弗、須菩提等，摩訶薩菩薩無央數，彌勒菩薩、文殊師利菩薩等。月十五日說戒時。(8.425c6–9)

T225A: 聞如是。一時佛遊於王舍國，其雞山，與大比丘眾不可計。弟子善業第一。及大眾菩薩無央數。敬首為上首。是時十五齋日月滿。(8.478b23–25)

Subsequent passages display a similar ratio, for example the following:

T224: 何以故？佛所說法，法中所學皆有證。皆隨法。展轉相教。展轉相成。法中終不共諍。何以故？時而說法，莫不喜樂者自恣。善男子、善女人而學。(8.425c14–17)

T225A: 所以者何？從佛說法，故有法學賢者子、賢者女得法意以為證。其為證者所說、所誨、所言，一切如法無諍。所以者何？如來說法為斯樂者。族姓子傳相教如經意無所諍。(8.478c1–8, with commentarial material removed)

²⁷ I.e., who bear it in mind.

²⁸ For one other comparison, drawn from the story of the bodhisattva Sadāprarudita toward the end of the *sūtra*, see Zürcher 1991, p. 281.

In a few cases, T225A is even slightly longer than the corresponding passage in T224. For example:

T224: 作是說般若波羅蜜，菩薩聞是心不懈怠，不恐、不怯、不難、不畏，菩薩當念作是學。當念作是住。當念作是學。入中心不當念是菩薩。何以故？有心無心。(8.425c22–26)

T225A: 若如是說，菩薩意志不移、不捨、不驚、不怛、不以恐受、不疲、不息、不惡難此微妙明度，與之相應而以發行，則是可調隨教者也。又菩薩大士行明度無極當學受此。如受此者不當念是：“我知道意。”所以者何？是意非意。淨意光明。(8.478c14–21)

In sum, the translator of T225A does not show any signs of having attempted to condense the wording of his Indian source-text.

(3) T225B follows the non-technical wording of T224 very closely. While the difference in overall length between T225B and the parallel portion of T224 is quite striking, in other respects what is noteworthy is the degree of similarity between the two texts. If we set aside for the moment the question of Buddhist names and terms, restricting our inquiry to the ordinary (non-technical) vocabulary used in the two texts, we find that the author of T225B drew heavily from the wording of T224 even as he abbreviated its prose style and replaced many of Lokakṣema's transcriptions of Buddhist names and terms with Chinese translations. We have already seen several examples of this phenomenon in the passages cited above. A particularly vivid instance, however, can be found in Chapter 16 (corresponding to the beginning of Chapter 19 in the Sanskrit):

T224: 須菩提白佛言：“菩薩持初頭意近阿耨多羅三耶三菩，若持後頭意近之？”佛言：“初頭意後來意。是兩意無有對。”須菩提：“後來意初頭意無有對。何等功德出生長大？”佛言：“譬如然燈炷。用初出明然炷？用後來明然炷？”須菩提言：“非初頭明然炷，亦不離初頭明然炷，亦非後明然炷，亦不離後明然炷。”佛問須菩提：“云何？如是，不？”須菩提言：“如是，天中天！”佛言：“菩薩不用初意得阿耨多羅三耶三菩，亦不離初意得，亦不用後意得，亦不離後意得也。”(8.457a15–25)

T225B: 善業問言：“闍士以初意近無上正真道耶？以後來意近乎？斯兩意無對。何等功德出生長大之者？”佛言：“譬如燈炷然。用初出明燒炷乎？後來明耶？”善業言：“非初明亦不離初明。非後明亦不離後

明。”佛言：“如是不用初意得無上正真道亦不離初意。非後意 亦不離後意得。” (8.496b16–22)

In terms of Buddhist technical terminology and general rhetorical style, these two passages are as different as they could possibly be. The word *anuttarasamyaksambodhi* is transcribed as *anouduo-luosanyesanpu* 阿耨多羅三耶三菩 in T224, while it is translated as *wushang zheng zhen dao* 無上正真道 in T225B. *Subhūti* appears as *Xuputi* 須菩提 in T224, but as *Shanye* 善業 in T225B, and the key term *bodhisattva* is given as *pusa* 菩薩 in T224 but as *kaishi* 闍士 in T225B. In addition to these differences in Buddhist terms, it is also clear that T225B is substantially shorter, eliminating repetitions and condensing the rhetorical style of T224, as we have already seen in the other examples given above.

Yet in other respects the two texts exhibit striking parallels. In the above passages I have underlined some of the instances in which the two contain identical terminology (though T224 sometimes supplements them with additional words). Such a thoroughgoing resemblance in non-technical or “ordinary” vocabulary – especially when viewed in light of the dramatic differences in rhetorical style and in Buddhist names and terms – cannot be accidental. On the contrary, given that this phenomenon is attested throughout chapters 2–30 of the *Da mingdu jing*, it seems clear that T225B is not an independent translation, but rather a revision of T224. The author of T225B thus maintained a great deal of the non-technical terminology found in Lokakṣema’s translation even as he radically altered its proclivity for the transcription of Buddhist names and technical terms and its repetitive and verbose style.

The same cannot be said, however, about T225A. Here we have a far smaller body of material to deal with, since T225A consists of only a single chapter of the text. Based on a comparison of this material with the corresponding portion of T224, however, we can immediately see that the relationship between these two texts is very different than that between T224 and T225B.

(4) T225A does not adopt the terminology of T224. In sharp contrast to the case of T225B, the wording used in T225A does not show signs of reliance on Lokakṣema’s text. The opening *nidāna*

found in these two translations has already been introduced above; here, instead of noting what the two texts have in common, I have underlined instances where – if T225A were dependent upon T224 – the two texts might be expected to agree, but they do not:

T224: 佛在羅閱祇，耆闍崛山中。摩訶比丘僧不可計，諸弟子，舍利弗、須菩提等，摩訶薩菩薩無央數，彌勒菩薩、文殊師利菩薩等。月十五日說戒時。(8.425c6–9)

T225A: 聞如是。一時佛遊於王舍國，其雞山，與大比丘眾不可計。弟子善業第一。及大眾菩薩無央數。敬首為上首。是時十五齋日 月滿。(8.478b23–25)

First of all, in T224, as is typical of Lokakṣema's genuine translations, there is no equivalent of the famous formula beginning with "Thus have I heard" (*evaṃ mayā śrutam*). T225A, however, does not follow suit, but uses the standard pre-Kumārajīva form "Thus it was heard [by me]," *wen rushi* 聞如是, followed by *yishi* 一時 "at one time."²⁹ The terminology used to indicate the Buddha's location likewise does not match, being expressed with "was staying at ..." (*zai* 在 ... *zhong* 中) in T224 but with "was traveling about in ..." (*you yu* 遊於) in T225A. Another noteworthy difference is in the treatment of what was surely the word *pramukha*, a term which means "at the head" in the sense of either "foremost" or simply "and so on." While T224 takes it in the latter sense, using *deng* 等 (here meaning "et cetera") in both cases, T225A has "number one" (*di yi* 第一) in the first instance and "foremost" (*shang shou* 上首) in the second. The terms used to refer to the time at which the discourse took place are also different: according to T224, the sūtra was preached on the fifteenth day of the month, "at the time when the precepts were pronounced" (*shuo jie shi* 說戒時). T225A, by contrast, uses the term "abstinence day" (*zhai ri* 齋日), adding also that "the moon was full" (*yue man* 月滿). Such cases can be found throughout T225A, and as we will see in section (6) below, many of the differences involve not only the wording but the content of the text as well.

²⁹ For a discussion of this and other treatments of the opening formula in early Chinese Buddhist translations see Nattier forthcoming.

There are, to be sure, some vocabulary items that do match: for example, the expressions “incalculable” (*bu keji* 不可計) and “innumerable” (*wuyangshu* 無央數) are the same in both texts. This is, however, only to be expected if the two translators were working from similar originals and there was no obvious alternative available in Chinese. Compared with the close resemblance we have seen above between T224 and T225B, the degree of difference between T224 and T225A is striking.

(5) T225B follows T224 very closely in content. In the examples given in sections (1) and (3) above, we have seen that, even as T225B condenses the text of T224 by eliminating repetitions and summarizing well-known lists (e.g., by referring to “the five skandhas” rather than naming the five items individually), it does so without altering its overall content. The pattern illustrated by the examples already given above can be seen by comparing virtually any section of T225B with its parallel in T224, and it is not necessary to adduce additional illustrations here. There are, to be sure, occasional discrepancies between the two; these can probably best be explained by postulating that the author of T225B also made use of an Indic-language manuscript that differed slightly from Lokakṣema’s source-text.³⁰ The overall pattern, however, is one of extremely close correspondence to T224.

(6) T225A often diverges from T224 in content. We have already seen that, unlike T225B, T225A differs from T224 not only in its rendition of many Buddhist names and terms, but also in its ordinary (i.e., non-technical) vocabulary. But it diverges from T224 in more substantive ways as well. In the opening lines of the sūtra, cited in section (4) above, T224 singles out two disciples (Subhūti and Śāriputra) and two bodhisattvas (Maitreya and Mañjuśrī) for special mention. T225A, by contrast, mentions only one character in each category (Subhūti and Mañjuśrī, respectively). Several other differences in the content of this passage have also been not-

³⁰ For examples of such slight divergences see the lists of non-human beings on pp. 329ff. below.

ed above. These are matters of substance, not simply variations in mode of expression. Thus it seems reasonable to assume that these discrepancies reflect differences in the source-texts that served as the basis for T224 and T225A.

Though T225A consists only of a single chapter, numerous other divergences between its content and that of T224 can also be found. Indeed, some passages are so different that – were it not for their location in the sequence of the narrative – it would be difficult to determine that they are parallel to one another.³¹ In sum, despite the fact that it is comparable to T224 in length, T225A does not exhibit a close relationship to T224 in any other respect.

* * *

The examples given above demonstrate clearly that T225B is not an independent translation, but instead is a revision of Lokakṣema's *Daoxing jing* (T224). Though the author of T225B shortened the text dramatically by eliminating much of the repetitive prose of the Indian original, and though he replaced most of Lokakṣema's cumbersome transcriptions with Chinese translations of Buddhist names and terms, he also carried over a great deal of the non-technical vocabulary found in Lokakṣema's text while, in most cases, reproducing the overall content of T224 (albeit in condensed style). Thus, despite the radical differences between T224 and T225B in Buddhist terminology and in literary style, the direct dependence of T225B on T224 can clearly be discerned.

The fact that the author of T225B made deliberate changes in the terminology and style of T224, however, means that these two texts can be used together to highlight the distinctive features of each. In particular, a systematic study of which elements the author of T225B did and did not change in the process of revising T224 may cast additional light on which portions of Lokakṣema's text sounded too colloquial to be acceptable to an author seeking to recast the text in more elegant and more literary Chinese.³²

³¹ See for example T224, 8.426b24–26 vs. T225A, 8.479b26–29, and T224, 8.426c21–25 vs. T225A, 8.480a7–10.

³² On vernacular elements in Lokakṣema's translations see Zürcher

T225A, on the other hand, manifests no direct connection to T224, and as such it is valuable in a different way. As an independent translation (of which unfortunately only a single chapter survives) it can serve as a witness to an Indic-language text closely related to, but slightly different from, that used by Lokakṣema. Here a worthy project would be a systematic comparison of T225A not only with the first chapter of Lokakṣema's T224, but with the corresponding section of the second translation of the text produced by Xuanzang 玄奘, preserved in his *Da banruo boluomituo jing* 大般若波羅蜜多經 (T220[5]). The latter, which to my knowledge has received almost no scholarly attention to date, is the only one of the post-Zhi Qian Chinese translations of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* that may turn out to belong to the same recensional family, broadly conceived, as T225A and T224.³³

Intertextuality: The relationship between T225A and T225B

This is not the end of the story, however, for before we can determine which part – if either – of T225 might be the work of Zhi Qian, we must first deal with the relationship between the two parts of the *Da mingdu jing* itself. Above we have seen that the terms used in T225A and T225B – not only specifically Buddhist expressions, but also ordinary non-technical words – exhibit differences that are too great to allow the hypothesis that the same person could have been responsible for both parts. In certain cases, it is true, the two parts use identical Buddhist terms:

1977 and 1996.

³³ Xuanzang knew of two different Indian versions of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā*, which he evidently considered different enough to warrant separate translations. Of these T220(4) is the more developed version, while T220(5) appears to be based on an older recension. In particular, the similarity of its opening *nidāna*, which mentions the presence of Subhūti and Śāriputra as well as Maitreya and Mañjuśrī in the audience (7.865c7–11) is similar enough to that found in T224 and (to a lesser extent) T225A to suggest that these three texts may belong to the same branch of the textual family tree.

<u>Sanskrit</u>	<u>T225A and B</u>
<i>śrāvaka</i>	弟子
<i>pratyekabuddha</i>	緣一覺
<i>mahāsattva</i>	大士
<i>tathāgata</i>	如來
<i>prajñāpāramitā</i>	明度無極 ³⁴
<i>avaivartika / avinivartanīya</i>	不退轉

Such matches as these are hardly decisive, however, for these same terms also occur in many other Buddhist texts, including (but not limited to) works translated by Zhi Qian. Thus the presence of such widely used Buddhist terminology in both T225A and T225B cannot tell us very much.

There are, however, a few shared terms which are extremely rare, and whose occurrence in both T225A and B is of great significance. Especially noteworthy are the following proper names:

Śāriputra	秋露子
Subhūti	善業
Gṛdhrakūṭa	雞山

Of these *Qiuluzi* 秋露子 (var. 鷺鷥子) for Śāriputra appears only in five other texts,³⁵ while *Shanye* 善業 as a translation of “Subhūti” does not appear – to the best of my knowledge – anywhere else in the Chinese canon. Occurrences of *Jishan* 雞山 (or its variant *Yaoshan* 鷓山) are likewise extremely rare.³⁶ The fact that both

³⁴ T225B also uses the term 智度(無極) in a few cases, but these are clustered in just two places in the text (four occurrences on 482b, two on 485b), and thus it seems virtually certain that they are the result of textual emendation.

³⁵ For a discussion of these occurrences (which are found, aside from their appearance in T225A and B, only in T145, 152, 500, 507, and 769, in addition to texts citing or commenting upon these works) see Karashima and Nattier 2005, pp. 362–365.

³⁶ The term appears in what was probably its original form, *Jishan* 雞山 “Chicken Mountain,” in T16 (尸迦羅越六方禮經, 1.250c14), T101 (雜阿含經, 2.496b14), T150A (七處三觀經, 2.880b11), and T507 (未生冤經, 14.774b26), in addition to the occurrences in T225A and B. (There are also a few occurrences in commentarial sources quoting from the texts

T225A and T225B contain these highly unusual names thus seems to require one of two scenarios: either the translator of T225B had access to a copy of T225A (whether a complete or an incomplete version of the text we do not know), or the translator of T225A had access to a copy of T225B. The only other alternative would seem to be that both translators had access to an unknown third source – a “catalyst text,” as it were – which contained this vocabulary and from which both of them could have borrowed. No such text is extant, however, and surviving lexicographic sources do not provide any evidence for the existence of such a work. The most prudent course, therefore, would be to assume that there was direct contact between T225A and T225B. If this was in fact the case, it would imply that one of these two translators invented the name *Shanye* – and perhaps the name *Qiuluzi* as well – while the other, in the course of producing his own version of the text, simply adopted these terms.

All three of these unusual names are used exclusively – that is, without any alternative translation or transcription – in both parts of T225, and it would seem at first glance that there is no viable way to determine the direction of their transmission. Yet a few clues may be available nonetheless. First, they are translations of terms that already had well-established transcriptions in Chinese by the time of Lokakṣema (late second c. CE), viz., *Shelifu* 舍利弗 for Śāriputra (already attested in the works of An Shigao,

just listed.) In the more elegant-sounding form Yaoshan 鷲山 “Hawk Mountain” it occurs in T5 (佛般泥洹經, 1.160b8, c26 and 28), T6 (般泥洹經, 1.176a5 and 13, b16), T152 (六度集經, 3.1a7), T511 (14.779a9 and c8), both with the variant reading Jishan 雞山), T528 (菩薩逝經, 14.803a11), and T536 (申日兒本經, 14.819b29). The latter form is discussed in one treatise (T1766, 涅槃玄義發源機要, 38.18b28) in connection with its use in T5, and it is registered in the *Yiqie jing yin yi* (T2128, 54.672c11) in the section dealing with vocabulary used in T511. With the exception of T528 and 536 (both of which are listed as anonymous in Sengyō’s catalogue and, pending a detailed study, must be regarded as of uncertain date) and the treatises which quote from the above works, all of the texts in which these two renditions of Ḡḍhrakūṭa occur appear to have been produced in the second or third century CE.

Xuputi 須菩提 for *Subhūti*, and *Qishejue* 耆闍崛 for *Ḡḍhrakūṭa*. Thus they represent a deliberate attempt to find an alternative for these transcribed forms. Another feature that these terms have in common is that, etymologically speaking, they are clearly erroneous. *Qiuluzi* appears to be based on an interpretation of the alternative name *Śāradvatīputra* as consisting of *śarada* “autumn” plus a Prakrit form of either *pathi* “road, path” or *dadhi* “yoghurt, fermented milk.”³⁷ As to *Shanye* for *Subhūti*, the first character (*shan* 善 “good,” for *su-* “good, well”) is unproblematic, but the use of *ye* 業 “work, business” to translate *-bhūti* “existence, well-being, prosperity” is not at all expected. Likewise the translation of *Ḡḍhrakūṭa* as *Jishan* 雞山 “Chicken Mountain” is puzzling, reflecting perhaps a confusion between Prakrit forms of *Ḡḍhrakūṭa* and *kukkūṭa* “cock.”

We may begin, therefore, by formulating the question in this way: In which part of the *Da mingdu jing* as we have it – T225A or T225B – would such creative but mistaken translations appear to be more at home? That is, can we find, in either part of this hybrid text, other translations that appear to be of a similar type?

It is immediately evident that both parts of T225 contains a rich array of translation terms that may be relevant to our inquiry. But an essential principle in understanding the *modus operandi* of any Chinese Buddhist translator is that we must first distinguish between those terms that appear to have been newly introduced in the text in question and those that were already present in earlier translated texts. That is, to understand how a particular translator worked, we must distinguish between terms that he himself seems to have invented and those that were already in circulation and which he could have simply borrowed from another source. In the case of the *Da mingdu jing* this means that, before saying anything at all about the terminology used in either section, we must first compile a list of those terms found in T225A and T225B that had previously appeared in other Chinese texts.

When we do so, it becomes immediately apparent that both parts of T225 are drawing on a substantial reservoir of pre-existing

³⁷ See Karashima and Nattier 2005.

Buddhist vocabulary. The terminology used in T225A has antecedents in a variety of sources, among them the works of An Shigao (who uses *Wangshe* 王舍 for Rājagṛha, *xianzhe* 賢者 for *āyusmat*, and *biqiu* 比丘 for *bhikṣu*), Lokakṣema (whose translations are the earliest extant works to use *pusa* 菩薩 for *bodhisattva*, though the term was surely in circulation orally well before), and Kang Mengxiang (*shizun* 世尊 for *bhagavat*, *zuxingzi* 族姓子 for *kulaputra*). It also employs numerous terms introduced by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao (e.g., *Jingshou* 敬首 for Mañjuśrī, *duwuji* 度無極 for *pāramitā*, *shanze* 山澤 for *araṇya*, and *wushang zheng zhen* [zhi] 無上正真[之]道 for *anuttarasamyaksambodhi*). T225A gives the impression, in sum, of having been produced by a translator familiar with a wide range of translations produced through the early third century CE, and of having drawn his terminology from a number of these sources without discrimination.

T225B, by contrast, shows a particular preference for the terminology of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao, adopting even two of their most idiosyncratic renderings (*kaishi* 闍士 for *bodhisattva* and *chujin* 除饑 for *bhikṣu*) as well as a host of more ordinary terms (including *yingyi* 應儀 for *arhat*, *Cishi* 慈氏 for Maitreya, and so on). In this regard Lancaster was correct in calling attention to the large number of terms used in T225B that have counterparts in T322. But while it is not possible (as we have seen) to say that T225B was produced by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao themselves, the fact that the creator of T225B drew heavily from their work is undeniable. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that T225B was produced by an author who was under the spell of the terminology and style of the *Fajing jing*.

What this implies for the topic of discussion here is that it is the author of T225B, and not that of T225A, who would have been most likely to follow An Xuan and Yan Fotiao in their practice of translating (rather than transcribing) proper names, thus jettisoning the well-established forms *Shelifu* 舍利弗 “Śāriputra,” *Xuputi* 須菩提 “Subhūti,” and *Qishejue* 耆闍崛 “Gṛdhrakūṭa” and replacing them with the imaginative neologisms *Qiuluzi* 秋露子, *Shanye* 善業, and *Jishan* 雞山.

If this is the case, it would imply that the author of T225A had access to a copy of T225B, and that he adopted the renditions of the names used in the latter in some cases, but not all. A good illustration of this scenario is the treatment of the name of a figure who plays only a minor role in this sūtra, but who appears (fortunately for our purposes) in both T225A and B. His name, which appears in Sanskrit texts as Pūrṇamaitrāyaṇīputra, is translated in T225A as *Mancizi* 滿慈子, which can easily be identified with the Sanskrit, with *man* 滿 “full” serving as a translation of *pūrṇa* (*id.*), while *maitrāyaṇī* has been interpreted as a derivative of *maitrī* “loving-kindness” (hence its translation as *ci* 慈 “kind, loving”). The version of the name found in T225B, by contrast – where it is given as *Manzhuzi* 滿祝子 “son of fulfilled wishes” – is unexpected. It is surely the case that, as KARASHIMA Seishi has suggested, the translator of T225B did not see a form of the name resembling the Sanskrit *Pūrṇamaitrāyaṇīputra* (which would have allowed its association with *maitrī*), but rather something closer to the Pāli *Puṇṇamantāniputta*.³⁸ It is less certain, however, that his contention that the translator interpreted the middle segment of this name as if it were the a form of the word *mantra* (cf. Pāli *manta*) is correct. If this were the case, the translator of T225B would surely have used the easily available equivalent *zhou* 咒 “spell,” a term that actually appears several times in the same text as a translation both of *vidyā* (in the sense of “magical formula”) and of *dhāraṇī*.³⁹

³⁸ See Karashima 1992, p. 277

³⁹ For *zhou* 咒 in T225B see 8.484a2–b15, where it occurs five times as a translation of *vidyā*, and 8.506b1 and 507b25, where the corresponding Sanskrit text has *dhāraṇī*. One additional occurrence of *zhou* is at 495b24, where it occurs in a list of practices to be avoided by the bodhisattva (若符咒藥不行之). The corresponding Sanskrit text contains a longer list of items including *mantras*, recitation (*jāpa*), herbs (*auśadhi*), spells (*vidyā*), and medicine (*bhaiṣajya*), making it difficult to align precisely with the text of T225B. It seems likely, however, that the character *zhou* is being used here, as before, to translate a form of *vidyā*, while *fu* 符 corresponds to *mantra*, and *yao* to *auśadhi* or *bhaiṣajya*. The corresponding passage in Lokakṣema’s text (8.455c2) also has three items, *viz.*, 符, 祝 (previously used several times as the equivalent of *vidyā*) and 行藥.

It is true that both *dhāraṇī* and *vidyā* are translated by Lokakṣema in T224 as *zhu* 祝 (sometimes with the addition of another character),⁴⁰ but it is noteworthy that the author of T225B never follows suit, but consistently changes this reading to *zhou* 咒. Thus it seems virtually certain that, if he had perceived a form of the word “mantra” in Pūrṇa’s name, he would have used the character *zhou* here as well. As to *zhu* 祝 itself, its most basic meaning is “(good) wishes,” especially wishes directed toward another, hence the additional connotations of “blessing” or “benediction.” If, as is often the case in Indian manuscripts, the letter *-n-* was represented simply by a dot (i.e., an *anusvāra*), it would be a simple matter for the translator to overlook it and to interpret a Prakrit form **manta* as if it were *mata*, meaning “thought, intention, wish.”⁴¹

Be that as it may, what we have here is a case in which the forms of the name found in T225A and B are parallel in their overall structure, but differ in their renditions of the middle character. If the translator of T225A had access to a copy of T225B, but was also working from an Indian manuscript in a different dialect – one closer to Sanskrit, in which an echo of the word *maitrī* could be discerned in this name – it would have been easy for him to adopt the name found in T225B while “correcting” 祝 to 慈 in light of his own Indic-language source.

⁴⁰ The character *zhu* 祝 occurs in T224 at 8.431c18(2x), 19, and 21, and at 433b20(2x), 21, 22(2x), 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 28, where the corresponding Sanskrit text indicates an underlying form of *vidyā*; it also occurs at 474c26, 475b29, 475c1, and 477a7, where the Sanskrit text points to a form of *dhāraṇī*. The sole occurrence of *zhu* in a negative sense – that is, as part of a list of practices to be avoided by the bodhisattva – is found at 455c2, where it seems likely to be another example of the use of the character as a translation of *vidyā* (see the previous note). Two other occurrences of *zhu* (at 471a9 and 12) are in the transcription of a proper name, and are not relevant to the discussion here.

⁴¹ Here we may compare the rendition of Pūrṇa’s name as *Manyuanzi* 滿願子 “Son of Wishes-Fulfilled” which appears in the works of a number of other translators, including Dharmarakṣa and Zhu Fonian. (Note that the term *yuan*, which eventually came to be used as a technical term for “vow,” generally means simply “wish” or “desire” in early translations.)

The picture that emerges from the above considerations, in sum, is that the author of T225A produced a retranslation of the text, relying heavily on a (different) Indic-language original but also consulting the lost first chapter of T225B. In the process he took over a few translation terms found in T225B, including the renditions found there of the names of Śāriputra, Subhūti, and Gṛdhrakūṭa. In many other respects, however, the translator of T225A showed his independence, jettisoning some of the peculiar vocabulary borrowed by the author of T225B from An Xuan and who wrote Yan Fotiao and reverting to the use of alternatives already well established before his time.

Zhi Qian and the *Da mingdu jing*: Re-framing the question

At this point we must finally return to the question posed in the title of this paper: Who produced the *Da mingdu jing*? As we have seen, the text consists of two quite distinct parts, and so we must ask the question separately concerning each one. Since this hybrid text has long been attributed to Zhi Qian – not just in modern editions of the canon, such as the *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō*, but at least since Xuanying encountered it in the seventh century CE – it seems reasonable to begin our inquiry by asking which of the two parts of the *Da mingdu jing*, if either, can legitimately be counted as his work.

A major challenge, however, immediately confronts us in attempting to answer this question, for Zhi Qian's translations are extremely varied in both vocabulary and style. Some manifest a four-character prosodic pattern, while others are composed in non-metric form. A few (including T169 and 632 and, to a lesser extent, T361) abound in the long transcriptions introduced by Lokakṣema, while another group (T76, 474, and 532) features the distinctive translation terminology introduced by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao. Most contain a mixture of vocabulary of both kinds, but even here we find distinctive subgroups of other kinds. If we examine the patterns in Zhi Qian's treatment of the word *arhat*, for example, we find a mutually exclusive distribution of the terms *aluohan* 阿羅漢 and *luohan* 羅漢 in his works; we also find that some texts belonging to the *luohan* 羅漢 group also use vocabulary belonging to the

zhenren 真人 group, while those belonging to the *aluohan* 阿羅漢 group do not.⁴²

Some of this variety is surely due to the evolution of Zhi Qian's own stylistic preferences during his thirty-year translation career. Recalling that as a young man he was a student of one of Lokakṣema's disciples in Luoyang, but that most (possibly all) of his translations were produced after his move to the Wu kingdom in the South, it is possible that the texts in the "Lokakṣema-like" group are his earliest productions, and that in subsequent years he abandoned that mode of translation in favor of a more literary and elegant style. But another factor was surely at work as well. It is well known that Zhi Qian revised the work of many other translators, and in so doing, he carried over various elements of their terminology and style. The fact that the texts he revised were themselves composed in a wide range of styles could thus have contributed to the diversity that we see in his work. In addition, however, we must take into consideration his own evident preference for variety, for Zhi Qian's terminology does not only vary from one text to another, but even within individual translated texts.⁴³

Given both the substantial size of Zhi Qian's translation corpus and the wide-ranging variety in his terminology, it is perhaps not surprising that – with the exception of proper names of people and places who happen not to appear elsewhere in Zhi Qian's corpus, virtually all of the Buddhist names and terms used in T225A and B can be found somewhere in the corpus of Zhi Qian.⁴⁴ They are

⁴² Nattier 2003, p. 235, and cf. the following note.

⁴³ See for example the translation of *brāhmaṇa* both as *shixin* 逝心 and as *fanzhi* 梵志 in T76, T198, and T210, or the rendition of *arhat* both as *yingyi* 應儀 and as *yingzhen* 應真 in T76, and in no fewer than three different forms – as *yingzhen* 應真, *zhenren* 真人, and *zhizhen* 至真 – in T6, T87, and T474.

⁴⁴ The one item that I have been unable to locate elsewhere is *shan-shi* 善士 (used in T225B as a translation of *kulaputra*). It seems likely, however, that this term was coined specifically as a modification of Lokakṣema's *shan nanzi* 善男子 (replacing 男子 with 士), and thus was tied to this specific context alone.

also used, however, in texts produced by many other translators, above all those of Dharmarakṣa (Zhu Fahu 竺法護), who borrowed extensively from Zhi Qian's vocabulary and style. If we begin with Buddhist names and terms, in other words – as has been standard in virtually all studies of translator attributions produced to date – we will find that either T225A or T225B could be described as “looking like” the work of Zhi Qian.

What I would propose to do at this point, therefore, is to approach the problem from a different angle, examining a broad sample of ordinary expressions as well as a few unusual Buddhistic terms, to see whether they do, or do not, appear in Zhi Qian's translation corpus.

T225A. We may begin with T225A, listing a sampling of items that appear here but never in any text that is solidly attributed to Zhi Qian. In cases where it is only a part of the usage that is unusual, the part which does *not* occur in Zhi Qian's work is underlined>. Where there is an obvious variant in punctuation or wording that could be expected, I have searched for these alternatives as well (they are given in brackets). Where such variations actually occur in the text of T225A, they are given without being enclosed in brackets. (I have excluded material from the interlinear commentary, which is clearly of a different vintage and will be discussed briefly below.)

Expressions found in T225A, but not in Zhi Qian's corpus

王舍國其雞山 [王舍國。其雞山]⁴⁵

何等是 ...

何所為 ...

得佛坐 [得佛座, 得佛之坐, 得佛之座]

受拜 [授拜]

凡愚

兩際

愚數

直言

⁴⁵ What is unusual here is the use of the character *qi* 其 to introduce the second piece of geographical information.

六根
 昇於大乘, 昇大乘⁴⁶
 帶甲
 虛閑
 都一切
 費耗
 自然識 [自然之識]
 樂不起法
 上辯
 法之要 [法要]

The fact that so many ordinary expressions found in T225A – as well as a few specifically Buddhist formulations, such as “ascend the Great Vehicle” (*sheng yu dasheng* 昇於大乘), “receive a prophecy (*vyākaraṇa*)” (*shou bai* 受拜), “six roots” (*liu gen* 六根, for the six *indriyas* or sense organs) – do not appear anywhere in Zhi Qian’s quite extensive corpus makes it quite certain that T225A cannot be the work of Zhi Qian. The fact that T225A also contains some Buddhist terms that *do* occur in Zhi Qian’s translations need not deter us from drawing this conclusion, since these are terms that can also be found in a wide range of texts by other translators. In sum, at this point in our inquiry we can confidently remove T225A from the list of possible translations by Zhi Qian.

T225B. What, then, of the remaining part of the *Da mingdu jing*, i.e., T225B? Here we have quite the opposite situation from what we saw in T225A, for it is difficult to find any terminology in T225B that is alien to Zhi Qian’s work. There are, of course, a number of cases where such expressions can be found, but virtually all of them fall into one or the other of the following categories: (1) terms that were borrowed directly from T224, or (2) terms whose absence from other translations by Zhi Qian can be explained by their content. The second of these categories includes the names of people and places who happen not to occur in other texts translated by Zhi Qian (e.g., Śreṇika, Pūrṇamaitrāyaṇīputra, Dharmodgata, and

⁴⁶ The character *sheng* 昇 does appear in Zhi Qian’s corpus, but never in conjunction with *dasheng* 大乘 or any other translation of *mahāyāna*.

Sadāprarudita, as well as the city of Gandhavatī); it also includes terms related to topics which are not treated elsewhere, e.g., 代歡喜德福 (for *puṇya-anumodanā* “rejoicing in [another’s] merit”), 篋函 (a certain type of box in which a jewel is placed), or 幻師 (for “magician,” a term taken over from T224).

But it is not only general conformity with Zhi Qian’s work that we find here; in fact, T225B contains several extremely unusual terms that are virtually unique to the translations of Zhi Qian. In the following sections, therefore, I will focus on some extremely rare Buddhist terms which occur in T225B, but not in T225A, and which can help to clarify the identity of the translator of this portion of the text.

(a) The best of bipeds: Śākyamuni in T225B

Above we have encountered several epithets of the Buddha that are used in T225B, among them *tianzhongtian* 天中天 (used as a translation of *bhagavat*), *wusuo-zhuo* 無所著 (for *arhat*), *zhengzhen dao zui zheng jue* 正真道最正覺 (for *samyaksambuddha*), and of course *fo* 佛 (for *buddha*, as well as for *bhagavat*). Of these, only the ubiquitous *fo* also occurs in T225A as an epithet of the Buddha.⁴⁷

As we have seen, all of these expressions – though most of them are quite unusual – can be encountered in the translation corpus of Zhi Qian. The most peculiar term used in T225B, however, is not an epithet but a proper name: the term *Nengru* 能儒 “Capable of Being Scholarly” as a translation of *Śākyamuni*. The name occurs in T225B in a passage in which the past Buddha Dīpaṃkara confers a prediction on the future Buddha Śākyamuni. The passage in question reads as follows: 錠光佛授[←受]我決言：“若後當為人中持悉逮佛智，作佛名能儒，如來、無所著、正真道最正覺、三界最尊” (8.483b29–c2). The term *Nengru* is quite unexpected as a translation of “Śākyamuni,”⁴⁸ though the similar term *Nengren*

⁴⁷ There is one occurrence of *wusuo-zhuo* 無所著 in T225A, but there it means simply “unattached,” and is not being used as a translation of *arhat* as an epithet of the Buddha (see 8.480c15–17: 秋露子曰問：“何故菩薩大士亦彼悉知而意不著？”善業曰：“以無意故於彼悉知而無所著”).

⁴⁸ The use of the term *ru* 儒 is especially peculiar in light of the fact

能仁 (“Capable of Humaneness”) occurs in a number of texts.⁴⁹ The name *Nengru*, by contrast, is much rarer, occurring in only two other places in the Chinese Buddhist canon (aside from discussions of the term in lexicographic works and quotations of it in Chinese treatises): in Zhi Qian’s *Pusa benye jing* 菩薩本業經 (T281), in a list of highly sinified epithets of the Buddha,⁵⁰ and in Zhi Qian’s biography of the Buddha (*Taizi ruiying benqi jing* 太子瑞應本起經, T185), in a gloss explaining that 能 means “Śākya” and 儒 means “muni.”⁵¹ The only other occurrence of this name in a supposedly translated text is in Baoyun’s *寶雲 Fo benxing jing* 佛本行經 (T193), which draws on a wide range of early translations and here appears to be retelling Zhi Qian’s version of the story of the future Śākyamuni’s prediction (4.93b1). In sum, the name *Nengru* is attested only in texts translated by Zhi Qian or in other works quoting directly from them.⁵²

(b) Non-human beings: *gandharvas*, *mahoragas* and their ilk

Gods (*devas*), *nāgas*, and *asuras* appear with great frequency in early Chinese translations, but other members of the list of the so-called “eight kinds of beings” (八部) appear only rarely.⁵³

that it means not only “scholarly” in a general sense, but also (in certain contexts) “Confucian.”

⁴⁹ The earliest occurrences of the term *Nengren* are in Kang Mengxiang’s (revised) biography of the Buddha (T184), Zhi Qian’s *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* (T474), and Kang Senghui’s collection of jātika tales (T152). There are also well over a hundred occurrences in the translations of Dharmarakṣa.

⁵⁰ 或有名佛為大聖人。或有名佛為大沙門。或號眾祐。或號神人。或稱勇智。或稱世尊。或謂能儒。或謂昇仙。或呼天師。(10.447a14–17).

⁵¹ 汝當作佛。名釋迦文(天竺語釋迦為能文為儒義名能儒)(3.473a23).

⁵² In addition to Baoyun’s apparent citation, the name appears only in treatises composed in China in which earlier translations are quoted or the term itself is discussed (e.g., T1763, a commentary on the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* [T374], which quotes the gloss in Zhi Qian’s T185).

⁵³ The expression 八部 itself does not occur in the work of any translator of Zhi Qian’s time or before

Fortunately, however, extended lists of various categories of living beings occur in two different places in T225B, which allows us to examine their terminology in detail. The first one is the following:

十方無數佛國諸天人、鬼、龍、質諒神、執樂神、胸臆行神、似人形神 (485a7–8)

“All the gods (天人), *yakṣas* (鬼), *nāgas* (龍), *asuras* (質諒神), *gandharvas* (執樂神), *mahoragas* (胸臆行神), and *kiṃnaras* (似人形神) of the innumerable buddha-lands of the ten directions”

Characteristically, the parallel passage in Lokakṣema’s T224 is almost exactly twice as long:

十方無央數佛國諸天人、諸龍、阿須倫、諸閼叉鬼神、諸迦樓羅鬼神、諸甄陀羅鬼神、諸乾陀羅鬼神、諸摩睺勒鬼神、諸人諸非人 (8.434c28–435a2)

“All the gods (天人), *nāgas* (龍), *asuras* (阿須倫), *yakṣa*-spirits (閼叉鬼神), *garuḍa*-spirits (迦樓羅鬼神), *kiṃnara*-spirits (甄陀羅鬼神), *gandharva*-spirits (乾陀羅鬼神), *mahoraga*-spirits (摩睺勒鬼神), and human and non-human beings of the innumerable buddha-lands of the ten directions”

A glance at the terminology used in these two versions also shows clearly how the author of T225B worked: in every case where Lokakṣema’s version used a transcribed term – even such a familiar one as *axulun* 阿須倫 for *asura*⁵⁴ – he has opted for a translated term instead.

Another such list appears in a later section of T225B:

入於日、月、星宿、質諒神、龍鬼王、執樂神、似人形神、脅臆行神、蛇軀神，亦入禽獸、餓鬼、地獄、蝸飛蠕動、蚊行喘息。(506b25–27)

“He enters into [the realm of] the sun, moon, stars, *asuras* (質諒神), *nāga* kings (龍鬼王) [or *nāga*- and *yakṣa*-kings?], *gandharvas* (執樂神), *kiṃnaras* (似人形神), *mahoragas* (脅臆行神), and snake-bodied spirits (蛇軀神); he also enters into [the realm] of the birds and beasts

⁵⁴ The transcription *axuluo* 阿須羅 does not appear in translations produced during Zhi Qian’s time or before; instead, the final syllable is regularly written *-lun* 倫 (var. 輪). I suspect that the latter forms reflect a spoken Iranian plural form that ended in *-t*, but this remains to be documented.

(禽獸, for the animal realm), hungry ghosts (餓鬼), hell-[beings] (地獄) – [in short, into the realms of all] things that flit and wriggle, [all] things that crawl and breathe (蜻飛蠕動、蚘行喘息).”⁵⁵

Cf. T224, which again is twice as long and uses a substantial number of transcribed terms:

亦入於日、月，亦入於星宿，亦入於阿須倫，亦入於龍，亦入於鬼神，亦入於捷陀羅，亦入於迦留勒，亦入於甄陀羅，亦入於摩睺勒，亦入於羅刹，亦入於鳩壇，亦入於薜荔，亦入於禽獸，亦入於泥犁，亦入於蜻飛，亦入於蠕動，亦入於蚘行，亦入於喘息。(8.475b16–21)

Lokakṣema’s text generally offers a close match to the passage just cited, though it contains two items – *rākṣasas* (羅刹) and *kumbhāṇḍas* (鳩壇) – that have no equivalent in T225B. Once again the author of T225B has both abbreviated the text and replaced these foreign-sounding transcriptions with translations.

Though the two lists found in T225B are quite different from one another, they share four extremely rare terms: *zhiliang shen* 質諒神 “spirits whose nature is indulgent” (?) for *asura*, *zhiyue shen* 執樂神 “spirits who carry musical instruments” for *gandharva*,⁵⁶ *si renxing shen* 似人形神 “spirits that take human form” for *kiṃnara*, and *xiongyixing shen* 胸臆行神 “breast-going spirit” for *mahoraga* (written *xieyixing shen* 脅臆行神 “flank-going spirit” in the second passage). Making use of the wonderful search capabilities made possible using the CBETA edition of the canon, we can eas-

⁵⁵ Here Zhi Qian uses a pre-existing expression for “all living beings” (*sarvasattva*), viz., 蜻飛蠕動, which appears widely in Lokakṣema’s corpus as well as in the specific parallel passage here (I have borrowed the felicitous English translation “all things that flit and wriggle” from Paul Harrison). The expression 蚘行喘息 “things that crawl and breathe,” by contrast, is not used as a compound by Lokakṣema; in his corpus these elements appear only here (i.e., in T224), where they appear as two separate components (蚘行 and 喘息).

⁵⁶ I am grateful to Paul Harrison for his assistance in interpreting this expression, in particular for pointing out that the character 樂 should be read as *yue* “music” or “musical instrument” here rather than *le* “pleasure, delight,” reflecting the identity of the *gandharvas* as celestial musicians.

ily determine that these four translation equivalents occur together only in one other text in the entire Chinese Buddhist canon: the *Siṃhamati-sūtra* (T532, *Sihemo jing* 私呵末經)⁵⁷ translated by Zhi Qian.⁵⁸

This text, like the *Da mingdu jing*, contains a long list of human and non-human beings, in which all of the members of the list are rendered in translation rather than transcription:

一者如來滅訖後舍利得供養。諸天、龍、鬼神、質諒神、執樂神、金鳥神、似人形神、胸臆行神、人、非人，皆來供養舍利，為作禮無有極。(T532, 14.812a25–28)

First, after the Tathāgata's extinction, his relics will be worshipped. The various gods (天), *nāgas* (龍), *yakṣas* (鬼神), *asuras* (質諒神), *gandharvas* (執樂神), *garuḍas* (金鳥神), *kiṃnaras* (似人形神), *mahoragas* (胸臆行神), human and non-human beings (人非人) will all come to make offerings to the relics; they will pay homage to them without limit.

Once again there are notable differences in content and sequence between this list and those found in T225B, which we can assume reflect differences in their underlying Indic-language originals. Yet the similarity in terminology is striking. There can surely be no doubt that these two texts are the product of the same milieu.

The attribution of the *Sihemo jing* to Zhi Qian, as it happens, is one of the most solid in his entire repertoire: not only is the text credited to him by Sengyou (drawing, in turn, on the catalogue of Dao'an), but it contains a substantial number of lines in six-character verse, a style that does not appear in the work of any other

⁵⁷ Var. 私呵味經 *Sihemei jing*; also called 菩薩道樹經 according to Sengyou, 55.6c23.

⁵⁸ Some of the individual terms can be found in other places; of these *zhiliang* 質諒 (not always with the added character *shen* 神) is probably the most common, appearing in a number of translations by Dharmarakṣa as well as in other later texts. Interestingly, in the *Fahua yishu* 法華義疏 (T1721), the term 質諒 is explained as corresponding not to *asura*, but to *sura*, a back-formation of the word *asura* formed by taking the initial *a-* as a negative prefix; see 37.465b29ff. I would like to thank FUNAYAMA Tōru for bringing this passage to my attention.

translator of Zhi Qian's time or before. The *sūtra* is also mentioned in Sengyou's biography of Kang Senghui as one of the three texts on which Kang Senghui is known to have written a commentary, which establishes the date of the text as prior to Kang Senghui's time.⁵⁹ According to the *Zhongjing mulu* 眾經目錄 compiled by Fajing 法經 et al. (T2146), Kang Senghui also composed a preface to the text, which unfortunately has not been preserved.⁶⁰

An examination of the vocabulary of the *Sihemo jing* shows that, among the texts reliably attributed to Zhi Qian, it is one of those that most closely resemble the style of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao. With only a few exceptions, all Buddhist terms are translated rather than transcribed, and a number of terms found in the *Fajing jing* are also attested here. If we assume (as I believe we should, in the absence of any countervailing evidence) that this is indeed the work of Zhi Qian, it might be classified as one of the translations he produced during the period in which he was entranced by the *Fajing jing*. Just as an art historian might have difficulty in ascertaining that the paintings produced during Picasso's "Blue Period" were the work of the same artist who produced his "Rose Period" or "Cubist Period" works, just so we may now consider T532 – and, I would suggest, T76, T474, and T225B as well – as belonging to Zhi Qian's "An Xuan Period." Even though they differ in many respects from the texts produced at other times during his career, they also have many elements in common, and may be considered to belong to a single sub-category of Zhi Qian's texts.

The remaining piece: T225A

What, then, can we say of the remaining piece of the current *Da mingdu jing*, i.e., T225A? As we have seen, the disjunction between parts A and B of the received text of T225 is too great to conceive of them having been produced by the same individual. If this is the case, though, who might be the author of T225A?

⁵⁹ See T2145, 55.97a15: 又注安般守意法鏡道樹三經.

⁶⁰ See T2146, 55.147a9.

One strong candidate for the authorship of T225A would be Kang Senghui, for according to Sengyou's catalogue he was the translator of a text called the "Wu pin" (吳品).⁶¹ This text is considered by Zürcher and others to be a version of the smaller *Prajñāpāramitā*; could it be, then, that T225A is a remnant of Kang Senghui's translation of this text?

Once again, because T225A is so short, it is possible to conduct a fairly thorough comparison of its vocabulary with that of Kang Senghui's work. The following is a representative list of expressions found in T225A that are unknown in the sole authentic translation by Kang Senghui (T152):

Expressions found in T225A, but not in Kang Senghui's work:

遊於	直言
王舍國其雞山 [王舍國·其雞山] ⁶²	六根
佛請	惡友
菩薩大士	善友
聖恩	白佛
賢者子	句義
族姓子	質直
意志	四衢道
受此	大悲意
當以知此	虛閑
匡政	費耗
信解	都一切
何等是	興衰
何所為	自然識
得佛坐	道人法
受拜	上辯
凡愚	以默
兩際	

⁶¹ See T2145, 7a26. Sengyou describes the text as consisting of five *juan* and says that, in his time, it was lost (闕).

⁶² As noted above, what is unusual here is the use of the character *qi* 其 to introduce the second piece of geographical information.

Indeed, a search not just of early Buddhist translators, but of the *Taishō Daizōkyō* as a whole, shows that T225A is unique in many respects. The unusual terms it employs, which in many cases are not found in any other Chinese Buddhist translation, point to the likelihood that it was the work of a translator who produced little or nothing else. At this stage, therefore, it appears to be most reasonable to state simply that T225A is the work of an anonymous translator, and that it cannot be associated with any other work still extant today.

Matters are quite different, however, with the interlinear commentary to T225A, which exhibits numerous similarities to the *Yin chi ru jing zhu* (T1694). The two commentaries quote from many of the same texts – that is, they share a common “canon” (see above, n. 19) – and they use similar language, including the repeated statement “the teacher says” (師云). According to a recent study by Stefano Zacchetti, the “Master Chen” 陳氏 who is said to have annotated T1694 (presumably to be identified with the Chinese layman Chen Hui) is probably its primary author, with the comments attributed to the “Teacher” belonging to Kang Senghui (Zacchetti forthcoming). Given the very strong resemblance between T1694 and the interlinear commentary to T225A, I would suggest that the latter is a product of this same Wu-kingdom community.

Conclusions

In light of the evidence presented above, it is clear that T225A cannot be the work either of Zhi Qian or of Kang Senghui. Conversely, it seems quite certain that T225B (which shares a number of very rare terms with other works in Zhi Qian’s corpus) should be considered one of Zhi Qian’s genuine translations. As to the interlinear commentary to T225A, it seems very likely that it is the product of the community headed by Kang Senghui.

We have also seen that T225B is a revision of Lokakṣema’s T224, produced with at least a cursory reference to a different Indian manuscript. The authorship of T225A, however, remains unclear. Because of the large number of terms that are unattested in any other early Chinese translation, it seems quite possible that

this is the only work ever produced by the translator in question. For the time being, therefore, it seems most prudent to regard it simply as an “anonymous” text.

Bibliography

- Cowell, E.B., and R.A. Neill, eds., 1886. *The Divyāvadāna, a collection of early Buddhist legends, now first edited from the Nepalese Sanskrit mss. in Cambridge and Paris*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dhammajoti, Bhikkhu Kuala Lumpur, 1995. *The Chinese Version of Dharma-pada, Translated with introduction and annotations*. Kelaniya, Sri Lanka: Postgraduate Institute of Pali and Buddhist Studies, University of Kelaniya.
- HAYASHIYA Tomojirō 林屋友次郎, 1941. *Kyōroku kenkyū 経録研究*. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.
- IWAMATSU Asao 岩松浅夫, 1985. “‘Tenchūten’ kō” 「天中天」考 [An Examination of the Epithet ‘Devātideva’]. *Tōhō 東方*, 1, pp. 201–219.
- KAGAWA Takao 香川孝雄, 1984. *Muryōjukyō no shohon taishō kenkyū 無量寿経の諸本対照研究* [A Comparative Study of the Texts of the Larger *Sukhāvativyūha-sūtra*]. Kyoto: Nagata Bunshodo.
- KARASHIMA Seishi 辛嶋静志, 1992. *The Textual Study of the Chinese Versions of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra in the Light of the Sanskrit and Tibetan Versions*. Tokyo: Sankibo.
- _____ and Jan Nattier, 2005. “*Qiuluzi* 秋露子: An Early Chinese Name for Śāriputra.” *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the Academic Year 2004* [ARIRIAB], vol. 8, pp. 361–376.
- KATSUZAKI Yūgen 勝崎裕彦, 1985. “Shiken no yakugo no kenkyū – Daimyōdōkyō no yakugo bunseki” 支謙の訳語の研究(一) – 『大度度経』の訳語分析 – . *Taishō daigaku sōgō bukkyō kenkyūjo nenpō* 大正大学総合仏教学研究年報, no. 7, pp. 67–93.
- Lancaster, Lewis R., 1969. “The Chinese Translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñā-pāramitā-sūtra* attributed to Chih Ch’ien 支謙.” *Monumenta Serica, Journal of Oriental Studies*, vol. 28, pp. 246–257.
- MATSUE Takashi 松江崇, 2005. “Jōko kango ni okeru ninshō daishi no ‘kakkutsusetsu’ o megutte 上古漢語における人称代詞の‘格屈折’をめぐって.” *Tōtetsu* 『饗饗』13.
- MIZUNO Kōgen 水野弘元, 1981. *Hokkukyō no kenkyū 法句経の研究* [A Study of the Dharmapadas]. Tokyo: Shunjusha.
- Nattier, Jan, 2003. “The Ten Epithets of the Buddha in the Translations of Zhi Qian 支謙.” *Annual Report of The International Research Institute*

for *Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2002* [ARIRIAB], vol. 6, pp. 207–250.

_____, 2006. “Masquerading as Transcription: Substitution Terms in Chinese Buddhist Translations.” [Unpublished; read at the] International Symposium on Aspects of the Language of Chinese Buddhist Translations, International Research Center for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University, Tokyo, Japan, November 2006.

_____, 2008. *A Guide to the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations: Texts from the Eastern Han 東漢 and Three Kingdoms 三國 Periods*. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica, X. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.

_____, forthcoming. “Now You Hear It, Now You Don’t: The Phrase ‘Thus Have I Heard’ in Early Chinese Buddhist Translations.” In Tansen Sen, ed., *Buddhism across Asia: Networks of Material, Intellectual and Cultural Exchange*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

TAN Shibao 譚世保, 1991. *Han Tang Foshi tanzhen* 漢唐佛史探真. Guangdong: Zhongshan daxue chubanshe 中山大學出版社.

TOKUNO, Kyoko, 1990. “The Evaluation of Indigenous Scriptures in Chinese Buddhist Bibliographical Catalogues.” In Robert E. Buswell, Jr., ed., *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press), pp. 31–74.

UI Hakuju 宇井伯壽, 1971. *Yakukyōshi kenkyū* 訳経史研究. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.

Vaidya, P. L., ed., 1959. *Divyāvadāna*. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning.

Zacchetti, Stefano, forthcoming. “Some Remarks on the Authorship and Chronology of the *Yin chi ru jing zhu* 陰持入經注 T1694: The Second Phase in the Development of Chinese Buddhist Exegetical Literature.” In Mauro Maggi and Silvio Vita (eds.), *Buddhist Asia 2. Papers from the Second Conference of Buddhist Studies Held in Naples in June 2004* (Università di Napoli “L’Orientale.” Centro di Studi sul Buddhismo), Italian School of East Asian Studies, Kyoto.

Zürcher, Erik, 1977. “Late Han Vernacular Elements in the Earliest Buddhist Translations.” *Journal of the Chinese Languages Teachers Association*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 177–203.

_____, 1991. “A New Look at the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Texts.” In Koichi Shinohara and Gregory Schopen, eds., *From Benares to Beijing: Essays on Buddhism and Chinese Religion in Honour of Prof. Jan Yün-hua* (Oakville, Ontario: Mosaic Press), pp. 277–304.

_____, 1996. “Vernacular Elements in Early Buddhist Texts: An Attempt to Define the Optimal Source Materials.” *Sino-Platonic Papers*, no. 71, pp. 1–31.