

# JIABS

Journal of the International  
Association of Buddhist Studies



Volume 31 Number 1–2 2008 (2010)

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

JIABS is published twice yearly.

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

Address books for review to:

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

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

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

University of Lausanne  
CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

email: [iabs.treasurer@unil.ch](mailto:iabs.treasurer@unil.ch)

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

Fax: +41 21 692 29 35

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

Cover: Cristina Scherrer-Schaub

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

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

Print: Ferdinand Berger & Söhne

## EDITORIAL BOARD

KELLNER Birgit  
KRASSER Helmut  
Joint Editors

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

# JIABS

Journal of the International  
Association of Buddhist Studies

Volume 31 Number 1–2 2008 (2010)

## Obituaries

Jonathan A. SILK

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

## Articles

Diwakar ACHARYA

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

## Early Chinese Buddhist translations

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

Guest editor: Max Deeg

Max DEEG

*Introduction* . . . . . 79

Max DEEG

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

Hubert DURT

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

Toru FUNAYAMA

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

Andrew GLASS

*Guṇabhadra, Bāoyún, and the Saṃyuktāgama* . . . . . 185

Paul HARRISON

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

Elsa I. LEGITTIMO

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

Jan NATTIER

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

Jungnok PARK (†)

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

Jonathan A. SILK

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

Stefano ZACCHETTI

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

ZHU Qingzhi

*On some basic features of Buddhist Chinese* . . . . . 485

### Book review

Tsunehiko SUGIKI

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

•

*Notes on the contributors* . . . . . 543

## A new attribution of the authorship of T5 and T6 *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*

Jungnok Park (†)<sup>\*1</sup>

In my thesis submitted to the University of Oxford, I examine how Buddhist translators in China interpolated certain Chinese terms into the canonical body of Buddhist translations. There, my arguments mainly rest on textual attestation; for this attestation, the first step to be taken is to verify the traditional attributions of translatorship. In a chapter of this thesis, I illustrate how such a verification is performed, presenting a case study of T20 *Fo kaijie fanzhi aba jing* 佛開解梵志阿毘經 / *Ambāṣṭha-sūtra*, which has traditionally been attributed to Zhi Qian 支謙 (fl. 222–253).<sup>2</sup> In this paper, I adopt the same method for the attribution of the authorship of two *Parinirvāṇa-sūtra* translations, T5 *Fo bannihuan jing* 佛般泥洹經 and T6 *Bannihuan jing* 般泥洹經, to Zhi Qian.<sup>3</sup>

---

\* Jungnok Park's tragic passing away prevented the author's own final revision and proof reading of the paper; he could, for example, not add translations to some of the sources quoted as I asked him to do. In respect for Jungnok Park's authorship I only undertook some minor changes in style and added some Chinese characters [Max Deeg].

<sup>1</sup> I sincerely thank Prof. Paul Harrison and Prof. Jan Nattier for their kind comments on and corrections to my preliminary paper on this topic. I also thank Prof. Richard Gombrich and Mr. Lance Cousins, who supervised my research and drew my attention to the importance of T5 and T6.

<sup>2</sup> In this paper, all dates are C.E., unless designated as B.C.E.

<sup>3</sup> Since the thesis is planned to be published in book form, where the chapter in which I attest the translatorship of T20 will be omitted, and since, on the other hand, my unpublished thesis may be inaccessible to

Following the traditional attributions, the editors of the *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* (hereafter T) attribute T5 to Bo Fazuo 帛法祖 (fl. 290–306) and T6 to an anonym during the Eastern Jin (東晉: 317–419) dynasty. Some time ago Ui (1971) and recently Nattier (2003) argued that T6 is probably a translation by Zhi Qian. However, in the course of attesting the traditional attribution of T20 to Zhi Qian, I found that, while both T5 and T6 appear to be translations by Zhi Qian or a successor in his circle,<sup>4</sup> the translation of T5 can hardly be later than T6. Then, I undertook a critical reading of T5 and T6 in comparison with the Sanskrit and Pali recensions of the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* (hereafter MPS), as well as the corresponding Chinese translations, and found that T5 and T6 are rare materials from which we can extract information about how archaic Buddhist texts developed into the later, standardised sectarian texts. These two texts are valuable for the following reasons: firstly, they are complete translations of the MPS, which is one of the most voluminous texts of early Buddhist literature, containing much that is of doctrinal and literary interest; secondly, given the popularity of the *sūtra*, there are plenty of corresponding texts that demonstrate its chronological development; thirdly, and most importantly, these two texts clearly demonstrate the process of how the archaic Buddhism of T5 developed into T6, and then into later standardised Buddhism with a sectarian affiliation, because the original text of T6 is a revised version of T5, and T5 and T6 are probably affili-

---

the public, a certain degree of overlap with my previous work is unavoidable in this paper, in order to present my basic method in as complete a manner as possible.

<sup>4</sup> I use the expression “Zhi Qian’s translation circle” etc. in order to designate those whose translation works exhibit virtually identical lexical and stylistic features to those of Zhi Qian. For example, judging from the lexical and stylistic features, it is difficult to distinguish Kang Senghui’s 康僧會 translation work from that of Zhi Qian. Considering that there might have been other translators like Kang Senghui who were close in time and space to Zhi Qian, we should not attribute a translation to Zhi Qian merely because its composition style is virtually identical to his own.

ated to Sarvāstivāda in close connection to MPS(S) and T1451, the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivāda.

As the designated length of this article does not allow me to demonstrate all of the information that I found regarding T5 and T6, I restrict myself in this paper to arguing that T5 is probably one of the earliest translations by Zhi Qian, and that T6 is a retranslation based on a revised original, maybe by Zhi Qian himself at a later date, but, more probably, produced by one of his successors during the Wu (吳: 222–280) dynasty. The textual and doctrinal development of the MPS as reflected in T5 and T6 will be conveyed in a separate paper.

### 1. Previous research on Zhi Qian's work

Among modern scholars, Ui<sup>5</sup> was the first to argue that T6 is probably a translation by Zhi Qian. Nattier summarises his argument as follows: “Ui’s argument takes as its point of departure the testimony of the *Chu sanzang jiji* 出三藏記集 (see T2145, 55.6c15; a text by this title is also credited to Zhi Qian in his biography, 97c10–11). Ui then adduces a number of citations from a two-fascicle *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* 雙卷大般泥洹經 found in Sengyou’s 僧祐 (445–518) *Shijia pu* 釋迦譜 (T2040), showing that – of the seven extant and non-extant texts entitled ‘*Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*’ registered in Sengyou’s catalogue – this two-fascicle text can only correspond to the scripture attributed there to Zhi Qian. Finally, Ui demonstrates that the terminology used in these citations corresponds closely to what is found in the extant ‘anonymous’ text (i.e. T6) and not to the language of any other known version. On this basis, Ui concludes that T6 is in fact Zhi Qian’s translation.”<sup>6</sup>

Ui<sup>7</sup> presents a list of 22 extant translations by Zhi Qian among his 36 translations listed by Sengyou (僧祐: 445–518) in the *Chu sanzangji ji* (T2145.55.6c10–7a24, hereafter CSZJJ): T6, T54, T68, T76, T87, T169, T185, T198, T225, T281, T362, T474, T493, T532,

<sup>5</sup> Ui 1971: 519–523.

<sup>6</sup> Nattier 2004: 176, n. 34.

<sup>7</sup> Ui 1971 :530–532.

T556, T557, T559, T581, T632, T708, T735 and T790. In general, Ui follows the attributions by the cataloguers of T. Apart from T6, the other 21 texts among the 22 on Ui's list are identified as Zhi Qian's work by the T cataloguers. It remains unclear why he excludes from his list T1011, which is attributed to Zhi Qian both by Sengyou and the T cataloguers. In the case of T533, which is also attributed to Zhi Qian by the T cataloguers, this may have been excluded from his list because the title *Chamojie jing* 差摩竭經 in CSZJJ is different from the title *Pusa shengdi jing* 菩薩生地經 in T. However, major Buddhist catalogues have traditionally identified them as the same text with different titles. It also appears that Ui failed to include T210 in his list, since it is attributed by the T cataloguers not to Zhi Qian, but to Wei Qinan 維祇難 and others. However, as Nattier pointed out,<sup>8</sup> CSZJJ lists T210 as one of Zhi Qian's translations, and adds the information that Wei Qinan merely brought the text to China, while the actual translators were Zhu Jiangyan 竺將炎 and Zhi Qian (T2145.55.6c, 50a, 96a).

Discussing the renderings that are peculiar to Zhi Qian, Nattier includes 26 extant texts in the "provisional list of the authentic works of Zhi Qian": T6, T54, T68, T76, T87, T169, T185, T198, T210, T225, T281, T328, T361, T474, T493, T532, T533, T556, T557, T559, T581, T632, T708, T735, T790 and T1011.<sup>9</sup> To the 22 texts on Ui's list, she adds T210, T533 and T1011 for the reason mentioned above. She also adds T328, which is attributed to Bai Yan (白延: fl. 254–259) by the T cataloguers. Pending further study of this text, she points out that, while two translations with the same title, *Xulai jing* 須賴經, are mentioned in CSZJJ, Bai Yan's translation was not extant at the time of CSZJJ. Following the attribution by the T cataloguers, Ui attributes T362 *Amituo sanye sanfo salou fotan guodu rendao jing* 阿彌陀三耶三佛薩樓佛檀過度人道經 to Zhi Qian; however, agreeing with Harrison (1998), Nattier points out that the attribution of T361 *Wuliang qingjing pingdengjue jing* 無量清淨平等覺經 to Lokakṣema (支婁迦讖: fl. 178–189) and that

<sup>8</sup> Nattier 2003: 241, n. 119.

<sup>9</sup> Nattier 2003: 208–209, 241–242.

of T362 to Zhi Qian have been mistakenly transposed.<sup>10</sup> She adds four other texts (T20, T27, T507 and T511) to the list of “additional candidate texts.” In order to verify the authorship of T5 and T6, I will temporarily make use of Nattier’s list, including the “candidate texts,” except for T6, which is in question, and T328, whose new attribution by Nattier requires further research.

## 2. Verification of the authorship of T5 and T6

In order to pinpoint the translation date and place of T5 and T6, adopting the method of Zürcher (1991), I will proceed in four steps. First I internally compare the writing style, renderings and transliterations of T5 and T6 and argue that the former precedes the latter. Secondly, comparing these features of T5 and T6 with those of Zhi Qian, I argue that T5 and T6 are compatible with other works of Zhi Qian or of a successor in his circle. Thirdly, comparing those features of T5 and T6 with other possible translators’ work, I argue that it is unreasonable to attribute these texts to a translator whose translation work does not belong to Zhi Qian’s translation circle. Finally, examining more minute details of the writing style of T5 and T6, I conclude that T5 is probably one of the earliest translations of Zhi Qian, and that T6 is a later retranslation, possibly by Zhi Qian himself, but more probably by a successor in his circle.

### 2.1 *The precedence of T5 to T6*

As Nattier points out,<sup>11</sup> there is no doubt that either T5 or T6 is dependent on the other, or that one of these two is a retranslation of the other. As for “rettranslation,” we may categorise this into three types. The first would be a retranslation of the same original in order to correct mistranslations or revise awkward expressions; the second would be a retranslation based on a revised original within the same textual tradition; and the third would be a retranslation

---

<sup>10</sup> For this attribution, refer to Harrison 1998: 556–557; Nattier 2003: 242, n. 121; Ono 1936: spec. vol., 33–34; and Hirakawa 1968: 76, 89.

<sup>11</sup> Nattier 2003: 241, n. 118.

based on a new original which belongs to a different textual tradition. According to my examination of the textual development of T5 and T6 in comparison with the extant Pali and Sanskrit recensions as well as other corresponding Chinese translations of the MPS, the relationship between T5 and T6 seems to belong to the second type of retranslation.

A comparison between the writing style of T5 and T6 quickly reveals that T5 cannot be the result of a retranslation of T6. For example, T5.1.165b has:<sup>12</sup>

佛告諸比丘：“天下無常堅固。人愛樂生死，不求度世道者，皆為癡。父母皆當別離，有憂哭之念，人轉相恩愛貪慕悲哀，天下無生不死者。我本經說：‘生者皆當死，死者復生。轉相憂哭，無休息時。’須彌山尚崩壞，天上諸天亦死，作王者亦死，貧富貴賤下至畜生，無生不死者。莫怪佛却後三月當般泥洹！”

Whereas T6.1.181a has:

佛告諸比丘：“世間無常，無有牢固，皆當離散，無常在者。心識所行，但為自欺。恩愛合會，其誰得久。天地須彌，尚有崩壞，況于人物，而欲長存？生死憂苦，可厭已矣。佛後三月，當般泥洹。勿怪勿憂！”

In the above, the classical Chinese composition of T6 is in an elegant style, strictly following the rule of four syllables per phrase. In comparison, the composition of T5 appears to be relatively coarse and archaic. It appears absurd that anyone would have revised the composition of T6 into that of T5. An overall examination of the writing styles of T5 and T6 reveals that, while T6 generally follows the elegant style of classical *wenyan* 文言, i.e. a regular prosodic pattern of four or six syllables, that of T5 is comparatively archaic and coarse, so we should regard T6 as the result of the retranslation of T5.

The style of the verses (*gāthā*) confirms that T5 predates T6. When there is more than one translation of the same scripture, the later ones tend to contain more verses. T5 contains only 14 verses in a single location, whereas T6 has 48 verses in 17 locations. Furthermore, the form of the verses in T5 shows that it could not

<sup>12</sup> I leave these passages untranslated; what is in question is not their meaning but their prosodic style.

be a result of a retranslation of T6. The number of syllables in each line of the quatrains in T5.1.174a9–b7 show the following irregularities: 5/4/5/5, 5/5/5/5, 5/5/5/5, 5/5/5/5, 5/5/4/6, 4/6/5/5, 5/5/5/5, 5/5/5/5, 4/5/4/5, 4/5/5/5, 4/6/5/5, 5/4/4/6, 5/5/5/5, 4/6/5/6. On the contrary, all of the lines of the corresponding verses in T6 (1.189c–190a) regularly consist of five syllables. T5 corresponds to K653 (19.182a–204c) of the *Tripitaka Koreana* 高麗大藏經 (hereafter K) and Q670 (18.544a–58b) of the *Qisha dazangjing* 磧砂大藏經 (hereafter Q). T5 preserves the irregular verses, following K653 (19.202a21–b16); whereas, Q670 (18.556c13–57a1) presents regular verses of five syllables per line, which is passed on to the Yuan and Ming Tripitakas (see T5.1.174 notes 4–20). In order to understand this discrepancy in the transmission of the verses, we have to understand the history of woodblock Tripitakas in East Asia and the Buddhist method of presenting verses in Chinese prints.

The first woodblock Tripitaka, widely known as the *Kaibao dazangjing* 開寶大藏經, was engraved during 973–983 by order and with the support of Emperor Taizong 太宗, the founder of the Song dynasty.<sup>13</sup> Based on the *Kaibao dazangjing* and collecting more texts, the Khitans of the Liao dynasty (遼: 916–1125) produced their own blockprint-Tripitaka, probably before 1063, and the Koreans of the Goryeo (Koryŏ) dynasty produced their first one during 1011–1087. The Koreans edited their second edition during 1237–1251, which is the present K.<sup>14</sup> After the first engraving of the *Kaibao dazangjing*, which was burnt around 1120 during the invasion of the Tungut Jurchens, there were a series of private (sometimes produced with partial governmental support) blockprint-editions during the Northern (960–1126) and Southern Song dynasties (1127–1279); the private engraving of the present Q began during the reign of Emperor Lizong (1225–1264) of the Southern Song and was completed in 1349 under the Yuan dynasty. While the present T is based on K, the Tripitakas of China,

<sup>13</sup> For details of the *Kaibao dazangjing*, refer to Tong, 1991: 1–16.

<sup>14</sup> For details of the two Korean Tripitakas, refer to K: vol. 48: 1–17, and Buswell 2004: 129–138.

including the governmental Tripiṭakas of the Yuan, Ming and Qing dynasties, are based on the private engravings of the Song dynasty.

As for Indian verses, metres are measured by the number of syllables or by morae; in any case, the cadence decisive to the metre is determined by a particular pattern of heavy and light syllables. On the contrary, having no distinction between heavy and light syllables in classical Chinese, the Chinese had fixed forms of verse that were mainly determined by the number of syllables and the combination of rhyme, tone and antithesis. However, since it was impractical to follow all of these rules while translating the tens, hundreds or thousands of verses in a Buddhist scripture, Buddhist translators in China ignored all the other factors except the fixed number of syllables per line. From the “embryonic” translation period of An Shigao 安世高 (fl. 148–171) and Lokakṣema, they translated Indian verses into quatrains of lines of four, five, six or seven syllables. Besides, the Buddhist translators “visualised” the verses, as it were, by writing them in separate lines from the surrounding prose, forming rectangular horizontally running columns or blocks. Hence, while the Indians perceived verses by metrical reading, Chinese Buddhists could perceive them visually in the written text.

In archaic translations, however, we find that some verses are not translated into quatrains of the fixed number of syllables, although such cases are very rare. For example, both K745 and Q763, corresponding to T101 (the one-fascicle version of the *Samyuktāgama*) preserve the irregular translations of the verses. There, while K745 indicates the existence of verses, merely locating them on separate lines, Q763 visualises them by arranging them in the shape of two rectangular columns, using varying space widths. Visualisation is very important in identifying verses: for example, if K793 (19.907c18–21) and Q812 (19.192b29–c3), which correspond to T785 得道梯橙錫杖經, did not visualise the seven-line verses, the first line of which has one more syllable, there would be no way to detect that they were translations of verses: they do not comprise of eight lines, the number of syllables per line varies, and there is no combination of rhyme, tone or antithesis.

Considering the tradition of visualising verses in Chinese Buddhist prints, it appears virtually impossible for scribes or engravers to ruin the regular verses as beautifully presented at Q670.18.556c13–57a1, by adding or removing a syllable here and there: the varying space widths for the purpose of maintaining the rectangular columns must have been too irritating to their sight to be ignored. Moreover, the proofreaders must have caught such manifest misprints, unless the original text preserves such irregular verses. Therefore, we should conclude that, while K653 preserves the verses as archaic, as they were in its first translation, Q670 reflects a later, revised version. Therefore, I conclude that it is absurd to retranslate the verses of T6 into those of T5.

As for renderings, we also find T5 containing more archaic renderings than T6. For example, the archaic rendering of *piṇḍapātika* as *fenwei* 分衛 at T5.1.163a23 ff. is replaced by the later standard rendering of *qishi* 乞食 in T6.1.178b14 ff.; the rendering of *brāhmaṇa* as *shixin* 逝心 at T5.1.169b27 by *fanzhi* 梵志 at T6.1.185a10; and the rendering of *bhikṣu* as *chujin* 除饑 at T5.1.169c4 by *biqiu* 比丘 at T6.1.185a3. In particular, the renderings *jingxin* 淨心 (“mind of purification”), *sixin* 思心 (“the mind of thought”) and *zhixin* 智心 (“the mind of wisdom”) at T5.1.166a11 f. are rendered as *jiexin* 戒心: (“the mind of precepts”), *dingxin* 定心 (“the mind of concentration”) and *zhixin* 智心 (“the mind of wisdom”) at T6.1.182a4 f. The rendering *sixin* 思心 in T5 is especially odd and archaic, compared to the *dingxin* 定心 of T6.

In sum, a comparison between the writing style and renderings of T5 and those of T6 shows that the translation of T5 obviously precedes T6, considering that these two texts are in the relationship of retranslation in the second sense.

Ui’s (1971) arguments for attributing T6 to Zhi Qian may well be re-considered. I agree with his identification that T6 is the two-fascicle MPS that is quoted in Sengyou’s T2040 釋迦譜. However, his identification of T6 with Zhi Qian’s MPS in two fascicles is implausible. In his arguments, Ui makes use of the seven translations of Mahāyāna and “Hīnayāna” MPS listed in CSZJJ

(T2145.55.14a5–10); however, in this specific case, as he himself points out,<sup>15</sup> we cannot trust Sengyou's testimony with reference to Zhi Qian's MPS. In CSZJJ, Sengyou designates four of the seven translations as extant in his time: Zhi Qian's *Da bannihuan jing* 大般泥洹經 in 2 fascicles, Zhu Fahu's *Fangdeng nihuan jing* 方等泥洹經 in 2 fascicles,<sup>16</sup> and the two translations of the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa* by Dharmakṣema and Faxian.<sup>17</sup> The MPS quoted in T2040 cannot correspond to the translations of Zhu Fahu, Dharmakṣema or Faxian, which are Mahāyāna recensions. Furthermore, since Sengyou states that Zhi Qian's MPS is similar to that of Zhu Fahu<sup>18</sup> and that Zhi Qian's MPS is not from the *Dīrghāgama*, as Daoan claims,<sup>19</sup> the MPS quoted in T2040 cannot be Zhi Qian's, either. However, given the fact that the writing of T2040 began before the completion of T2145,<sup>20</sup> we reach the contradictory conclusion that the two-fascicle MPS that he documents in T2040 was not extant at the time when he wrote the respective passage in T2145.

As mentioned above, T6 corresponds to K654 and Q671. Following K654, T6 is entitled *Bannihuan jing* 般泥洹經, whereas Q671 is entitled *Fangdeng nihuan jing* 方等泥洹經, which is passed on the Yuan and Ming Tripiṭakas (see T6.1.176, n. 1). If what Sengyou designated as Zhu Fahu's *Fangdeng nihuan jing* 方等泥洹經 is in fact Q671 (=T6/K654) rather than T378 *Fangdeng bannihuan jing* 方等般泥洹經, the above problems can be solved entirely: the MPS quoted by Sengyou in T2040 is what he called

<sup>15</sup> Ui (1971): 519–520.

<sup>16</sup> Both Kawano 1986, and Suzuki 1995 identify T378 方等般泥洹經 as Zhu Fahu's *Fangdeng nihuan jing* 方等泥洹經.

<sup>17</sup> The three translations that were not extant at his time are Faxian's *Fangdeng nihuan jing* 方等泥洹經, Zhimeng's 智猛 (fl. 424) *Nihuan jing* 泥洹經 and Guṇabhadra's *Nihuan jing* 泥洹經. Faxian's translation is identified as T7 by the T cataloguers, and the latter two translations are no longer extant.

<sup>18</sup> 其支謙《大般泥洹》，與《方等泥洹》大同。(T2145.55.14a8–9).

<sup>19</sup> 大般泥洹經二卷 安公云：“出長阿含”。祐案今長阿含與此異。(T2145.55.6.c15).

<sup>20</sup> The contents of T2040 are quoted in CSZJJ (T2145.55.87b–88a)

Zhu Fahu's *Fangdeng nihuan jing* 方等泥洹經, which is the present T6 *Bannihuan jing* 般泥洹經 (=K654/Q671); whereas, what he called Zhi Qian's *Da bannihuan jing* 大般泥洹經 is T5 *Fo bannihuan jing* 佛般泥洹經 (=K653/Q670). In this case, we should interpret Sengyou's statement that Zhi Qian's MPS is not from the *Dīrghāgama*, contrary to Daoan's testimony, not in the sense that Zhi Qian's MPS is a Mahāyāna recension; it would rather mean that his translation is quite different in content from the text in T1, the *Dīrghāgama*, as I will illustrate in a separate paper. However, the crucial fact remains uncertain: to decide if what Sengyou called Zhu Fahu's *Fangdeng nihuan jing* 方等泥洹經 in CSZJJ is indeed T6/K654/Q671 will require further philological research.

## 2.2 *The compatibility of T5/T6 with the authorship of Zhi Qian's translation circle*

As the first generation of Chinese Buddhist translators, An Shigao 安世高 (fl. 148–171) and Lokakṣema laid the foundation for future Buddhist translation, such as the basic renderings, the system of transliteration and the structure of the translation teams. However, being full of unknown technical terms and exotic transliterations, written in a clumsy style, their translations are difficult to read, even when one is equipped with specific knowledge about Buddhism. Hence, in that embryonic period, when a basic knowledge of Buddhism was hardly to be expected of the readers, the pressing mission for the next generation was to produce translations that enabled the readers to understand the texts by themselves, even without any specific knowledge.

In this respect, Zhi Qian's work is conspicuous: his translations were probably far more readable by Chinese intellectuals than the works of his predecessors. Furthermore, his classical Chinese composition reflects a sense of literary style; although to be located in the middle of the archaic translation period, many of his works are

as polished as the works of the following old translation period.<sup>21</sup> The composition of T5 and T6 demonstrates this characteristic of Zhi Qian's work: the relatively polished classical Chinese in T5 and T6 does not hamper readers from understanding its meaning because of awkward sentence structures, exotic writing style, etc., as much as in the works of his predecessors. However, such improved linguistic standard as refined composition, appropriate renderings and an adequate proper choice between Chinese names and transliterations were still insufficient to produce a readable translation per se, since the very content to be conveyed by the linguistic rendering was extremely exotic to the Chinese at that time. To solve this problem, Zhi Qian utilised or interpolated Chinese concepts in his translations, sometimes to the extent that it distorted the original content of the Indian texts. For example, in T76 *\*Brahmāyusūtra* 梵摩渝經, when Brahmāyus seeks refuge in the Buddha, Zhi Qian introduces the five precepts in the following Chinese style:

I want to be a Buddhist follower. Maintaining benevolence, I will not kill living beings; being content, I will not commit theft; being chaste, I will not have inappropriate sexual relationships; being faithful, I will not lie; being pious to parents, I will not drink intoxicants.<sup>22</sup>

Here, above all, the justification of sobriety in terms of filial piety must be a Chinese interpolation; such a justification is not found within the context of Indian Buddhism. Zhi Qian's interpolations in his translation work, on the one hand, helped the Chinese readers to understand exotic Buddhist ideas in the familiar terms of Chinese thought, and, on the other hand, transformed bizarre Indian values, so that Buddhism became compatible with the pre-

---

<sup>21</sup> I follow Ono's distinction of three periods in the history of Chinese Buddhist translation: that of archaic translation (before 375), that of old translation (376–617) and that of new translation (after 618): Ono, 1936: spec. vol., 7–9.

<sup>22</sup> 願為清信士，守仁不殺，知足不盜，貞潔不婬，執信不欺，盡孝不醉。(T76.1.886a.) In the Pali *Brahmāyu-sutta* (M.II.145) and the Chinese *Fanma jing* of the *Madhyamāgama* (T26.1.689b), corresponding to T76, only the threefold taking of refuge is mentioned, without reference to the five precepts.

established Chinese moral principles, particularly filial piety and loyalty.<sup>23</sup>

T5 and T6 show a similar tendency towards interpolations reflecting Chinese thought and values. For example, while the Sanskrit *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* (hereafter MPS(S)) and the Pali *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* (hereafter MPS(P))<sup>24</sup> mention the Vṛjji people's refusal to have sexual relationships by force as one of the seven reasons why the republic of Vṛjji is invulnerable to the attack of other countries,<sup>25</sup> T5 and T6 introduce this virtue as follows:

Have you heard that the Vṛjji people are cultivated and polite, that there is distinction between the sexes, and that the elder and the younger people [look after and] serve one another?<sup>26</sup>

Indeed, the “distinction between the sexes” 男女有別, a famous Confucian slogan, implies far more than merely not having sexual relationships by force. Among educated people, i.e. the expected readers of T5 and T6, men and women (if we accept the tradition literally, when over seven years old) were not supposed to be in the same space, much less mingling together, unless they were parents

<sup>23</sup> Not to mention leaving one's own family by entering monkhood, for which the Confucians have blamed Buddhism throughout Chinese history, even the Indian Buddhist idea of donation was accused of ruining the value of the Chinese family system. The *Mouzi lihuo lun* 牟子理惑論 (T2102.52.1a–7a) discusses this topic.

<sup>24</sup> In this paper, references to MPS(S) include MPS\_ST.I and MPS\_ST.II., and references to MPS(P) include the *Mahāsudassana-sutta* (D.II.169–99)

<sup>25</sup> MPS(P) (D.II.74): *kin ti te Ānanda sutaṃ: Vajjī yā tā kulitthiyo kulakumāriyo tā na okkassa pasayha vāsentī? ti.* Mostly reconstructed from the Tibetan \**Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya-kṣudraka-vastu*, MPS(S) (§ 1.26) has: (*kiṃ nu tvayānanda śrutam yās tā vṛjīnāṃ vṛjiprajāpatyo vṛjikumārikāś ca piṭṛrakṣitā mātṛrakṣitā bhrātṛrakṣitā bhaginīrakṣitāḥ śvaśurarakṣitā śvaśrurakṣitā jñātīrakṣitā gotrarakṣitāḥ saparidaṇḍāḥ sasvāmikāḥ kan*)yāḥ *paraparigṛ(hītā antaśo mālāguṇaparikṣitā api tadrūpāsu) na sa*(*hasā cāritram āpadyante*).

<sup>26</sup> 汝聞：越祇，禮化謹敬，男女有別，長幼相事不？ (T5.1.160c); 汝聞：越祇，禮化謹敬，男女有別，長幼相事？ (T6.1.176b)

and children or husband and wife. The translation in question is an interpolation, in that it conveys extra meanings that are absent from the original context. In this way, with regard to the tendency towards Chinese interpolations, T5 and T6 are in accordance with the translation work of Zhi Qian.<sup>27</sup>

A comparison between the renderings in T5/T6 and those of Zhi Qian quickly reveals that T5 and T6 are indeed compatible with Zhi Qian's authorship. For example, the renderings of the four achievements of Buddhist practitioners, i.e. *śrota-āpanna*, *sakṛdāgāmin*, *anāgamin* and *arhat*, are respectively translated as *gougang* 溝港 ("stream"), *pinlai* 頻來 ("visiting in repetition"), *buhuan* 不還 ("not returning") and *yingzhen* 應真 ("truly worthy"), found both at T5.1.164a and T6.1.179c. For four out of the five aggregates reconstructed from the list of twelvefold dependent origination, both T5.1.163b and T6.1.178c use *se* 色, *tong* 痛, *xing* 行 and *shi* 識 respectively for *rūpa*, *vedanā*, *saṃskāra* and *vijñāna*. For the seven treasures of the wheel-turning king, i.e. *cakraratna*, *hastiratna*, *aśvaratna*, *maṇiratna*, *strīratna*, *gṛhapatiratna* and *pariṇāyakarātna*, T5.1.170a has *huangjinfeilun* 黃金飛輪, *shenlibaixiang* 神力白象, *ganseshenma* 紺色神馬, *mingyuezhu* 明月珠, *tianyunuqi* 天玉女妻, *zhubaoshengchen* 主寶聖臣 and *dianbingshengchen* 典兵聖臣, and T6.1.185c has *jinlunbao* 金輪寶, *baixiangbao* 白象寶, *ganmabao* 紺馬寶, *yunubao* 玉女寶, *shenzhubao* 神珠寶, *lijibao* 理家寶 and *xianjiangbao* 賢將寶. These peculiar renderings of T5 and T6 are in accordance with the renderings in Zhi Qian's other works.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>27</sup> For a relevant example unique to T5, we find an interpretation of equanimity (*upekṣā*), one of the four immeasurable states of mind, saying "... [The king] contemplated the great practice of filial piety in order to liberate [those who were his] parents during [past] incalculable eons. [Thus, he] observed his five body organs and the nine body opening [filled] with discharges": ... 思大孝行，欲度無數劫之親，自惟五藏九孔惡露。 (T5.1.171a)

<sup>28</sup> Between T5 and T6, only the latter contains the renderings of the ten epithets of the Buddha (1.187b) and the twelve divisions of scriptures (188a). For the peculiarity of these two sets of renderings by Zhi Qian, see Nattier 2003 and 2004.

In sum, based on the writing style, the interpolations reflecting Chinese thought and the peculiar renderings of T5 and T6, we hardly find evidence to reject the attribution of either text to Zhi Qian's translation circle.

### 2.3 *The incompatibility of T5/T6 with the work of other translators*

As mentioned above, T5 and T6 are complete translations of the longest *sūtra* from the early period of Buddhist literature. A comparison of several of the peculiar renderings in T5 and T6 reveals that T5 and T6 may be attributed to Zhi Qian, but at least were probably not translated outside Zhi Qian's translation circle. For example, as Nattier pointed out,<sup>29</sup> we find in T5.1.167a and T6.1.182b the list of 28 Buddhist heavens that are unique to Zhi Qian's translation circle; among Zhi Qian's other works, we often find the same lists, with trivial differences, in T198.4.185b, T225.8.485a, 487a and T281.10.447ab. As another example of such parallels, the collocation of the renderings *yintai* 姪態 ("lustful state (of mind)"), *nutai* 怒態 ("angry state (of mind)"), and *chitai* 癡態 ("ignorant state (of mind)") is only found in T5 (1.163b ff.), T6 (1.177a) and furthermore in Zhi Qian's T54 (1.848b ff.) in the huge amount of translations of canonical texts in the Chinese Tripiṭaka.

These few renderings that are particular to Zhi Qian's translation work strongly support the view that T5 and T6 are probably works by Zhi Qian's translation circle. However, this is not yet sufficient to attribute these two texts to Zhi Qian's translation circle. To make this more certain, we may as well verify that the lexical and stylistic features of T5 and T6 are incompatible with the authorship of any other translator outside of Zhi Qian's translation circle. In order to achieve this certainty, I adopt the following approach:

- 1) I restrict the examination of the compatibility of T5 and T6 with other translators' works to the period of archaic translations (–375). The renderings used in T5 and T6 imply that

<sup>29</sup> Nattier 2003: 241, n. 118

these texts were hardly translated during the period of old or new translations.

- 2) I do not consider the first two translators in China of whom we know, i.e. An Shigao and Lokakṣema, as possible authors of T5 and T6. The writing style and renderings of T5 and T6 are distinct from these translators' work. However, T5 contains some archaic renderings that are common to Later Han translations (until 219); therefore, I also consider other Later Han translators than the mentioned first two as candidate authors for T5.
- 3) I consider only those texts that are attributed to specific translators by the CSZJJ. This restriction is imposed in order to prevent any incorrect conclusions being drawn from renderings or composition styles that later cataloguers may have arbitrarily added.<sup>30</sup> I therefore am only concerned with the extant texts cited in the CSZJJ.

Other candidate translators who may fulfill the above conditions are: An Xuan 安玄 (c. 181) and Yan Fodiao 嚴佛調; Zhi Yao 支曜 (c. 185); Kang Mengxiang 康孟詳 (fl. 194–199); Kang Senghui 康僧會 (?–280); Bai Yan 白延 (fl. 254–259); Zhu Fahu 竺法護 (fl. 266–308); Nie Chengyuan 聶承遠; Wuchaluo 無叉羅 (fl. 291) and Zhu Shulan 竺叔蘭; Faju 法炬 (fl. 308) and Fali 法立. From An Xuan to Kang Mengxiang, I will examine whether these are compatible with an authorship of T5 alone, and, for the remaining translators, if they are possible candidates for both T5 and T6.

### An Xuan 安玄 and Yan Fodiao 嚴佛調

CSZJJ (T2145.55.6c3–4) attributes the *Fajing jing* 法鏡經 and the *Shihui* 十慧 to An Xuan and Yan Fodiao, among which the former is identified with T322 by the T cataloguers and the latter is not ex-

<sup>30</sup> For the arbitrary attributions of translatorship according to Fei Changfang's 費長房 catalogue T2034 *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶紀 (hereafter LDSBJ) from 597, see Tokuno, 1992 [1990]: 33–35.

tant. As Zürcher<sup>31</sup> pointed out, the most conspicuous characteristic of their translation is that “virtually all proper names and technical terms have been translated.” Due to this characteristic, they are excluded from the list of possible authors of T5. For example, while T322 has only the semantic rendering of *chujin* 除讎 (11 times) for *bhikṣu*, T5 has both the semantic rendering *chujin* (3 times) and the transliteration *biqiu* 比丘 (239 times), (while T6 has only the transliteration *biqiu* (91 times)). The frequent occurrence of transliterations in T5 leaves little possibility that An Xuan or others are the translators of T5.

### Zhi Yao 支曜

CSZJJ (T2145.55.6c1–2) attributes the *Chengju guangming jing* 成具光明經 to Zhi Yao, and this text is identified with T630 by the T cataloguers. The classical Chinese composition style of T630 is as refined as that of T6, and appears superior to T5, transliterations are rare. For example, while T5 uses the transliteration *pusa* 菩薩 for *bodhisattva*, T630 uses *mingshi* 明士, which never occurs in T5 or in Zhi Qian’s other works. This clearly weakens the possibility that Zhi Yao is the author of T5. We hardly find a reason to attribute T5 to Zhi Yao, given the close similarity between T5 and other works attributed to Zhi Qian’s translation circle.

### Kang Mengxiang 康孟詳

CSZJJ (T2145.55.6c7–9) attributes the *Zhong benqi jing* 中本起經 to Kang Mengxiang, a text which is identified with T196. Again, the classical Chinese composition style of Kang Mengxiang in T196 is compatible with the authorship of T5. However, one conspicuous characteristic of T196 is that we seldom find semantic renderings of proper names. This, again, weakens the possibility of his being the author of T5, where we often find semantic renderings of proper names. Furthermore, some transliterations of T196 fail to coincide with those of T5: T5 transliterates Magadha and Vṛji respectively as *mojie* 摩竭 and *yuezhi* 越祇, whereas T196 uses *mojieti* 摩竭提

<sup>31</sup> Zürcher 1991: 283.

and *baqi* 拔耆. In addition, we find a discrepancy between the renderings in T5 and T196. For example, while T5 usually translates *brāhmaṇa* as *shixin* 逝心, T196 always translates it as *fanzhi* 梵志. To sum up, it also seems to be unrealistic to attribute T5 to Kang Mengxiang, while at the same time ignoring its greater similarity with the works of Zhi Qian and Kang Senghui.

### Kang Senghui (康僧會: ?–280)

CSZJJ attributes the *\*Ṣaṭpāramitāsamāsa-sūtra*, *Liudu ji jing* 六度集經 and the *Wupin* 吳品 to Kang Senghui; the former is identified with T152 by the T cataloguers and the latter is not extant. As for the style of composition, the prose of T152 is as elegant as T6, and appears superior to T5; both T152 and T6 follow the regular style of classical *wenyan* 文言 more than T5. The forms of the verses in T152 are also similar to those found in T6, being quatrains of four, five, six or seven syllables; T152 has no quatrain and instead containing a mixed number of syllables as found in T5.

T152 also shows the same tendency to use terms which reflect Chinese values as found in T5 and T6: all three texts are full of basic Confucian terms, such as *ren* 仁 (“benevolence”), *yi* 義 (“righteousness”), *xiao* 孝 (“filial piety”), etc. In addition, the three texts are interpolated with the Chinese term *hunshen* 魂神 (“spirit”) which denotes a permanent agent that goes through *saṃsāra* (T5.1.162a15, T6.1.177a26 ff.; T152.3.35c6, 48c26). Besides, in T152, we also find the Chinese style justification of the five precepts, which is very similar to the aforementioned statement in T76 *\*Brahmāyuh-sūtra* (1.886a):

Firstly, maintaining benevolence, I will not kill living beings but do them a favour. Secondly, being humble, I will not commit theft but abandon my things to aid people. Thirdly, being chaste, I will not have inappropriate sexual relationships but keep to celibacy. Fourthly, being truthful, I will not tell a lie but speak sincerely. Fifthly, being filially pious, I will not get drunk but behave faultlessly.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>32</sup> 一者，慈仁不殺，恩及群生；二者，清讓不盜，捐己濟眾；三者，貞潔不婬，不犯諸欲；四者，誠信不欺，言無華飾；五者，奉孝不醉，行無沾污。(T152.3.52a).

We also find that the renderings of T152 are compatible with both T5 and T6. The writer of T152 renders the correspondent Pali *cakkavatti dhammiko dhammarājā* as *feixinghuangdi* 飛行皇帝 (3.1c ff.) as T5 (1.169b3 ff.), instead of T6's *zhuanlun (sheng)wang* 轉輪(聖)王 (1.185a7 ff.); *sotāpanna* and *sakadāgāmin* as *gougang* 溝港 and *pinlai* 頻來 (3.2b ff.) as in T5 (1.163b4 ff.) and T6 (1.178b25 ff.). The five aggregates are given as *se* 色, *tong* 痛, *xiang* 想, *xing* 行 and *shi* 識 (3.43b), as we can reconstruct four of them from the list of twelvefold dependent origination (T5.1.163b, T6.1.178c). For the renderings of the seven treasures, T152 presents three slightly differing lists (3.21c, 48c, 52a); they are, however, similar to those of T5.1.170a and T6.1.185c.

In sum, an examination of the writing style and the use of renderings in T152 reveals that the authorship of T5 and T6 is compatible with that of T152. Furthermore, we hardly find any substantial difference in the writing style and the use of semantic renderings or transliterations between T152 and Zhi Qian's translations; only historical records, such as CSJZZ, inform us that this is Kang's translation rather than Zhi Qian's.

### Bai Yan 白延 (fl. 254–259)

The T cataloguers attribute T328 *Xulai jing* 須賴經 to Bai Yan, which is also one of the three translations attributed to him by CSZJJ (T4215.55.7b). His brief biography in CSZJJ indicates that he was not a creative but a revising translator (T2145.55.96a) [specify?]; his *Xulai jing* may also be a retranslation of Zhi Qian's previous work, probably in the first category of the three kinds of retranslation. However, as mentioned above, Nattier rejects the traditional attribution of T328 to Bai Yan and attributes it to Zhi Qian instead. Indeed, the renderings of T328 are in accordance with Zhi Qian's other works. However, in terms of writing style, we find a few factors that weaken Nattier's attribution.

Most of all, in T328, we cannot detect interpolations reflecting Chinese values, which are so conspicuous in T5 / T6 and Zhi Qian's other works. We cannot find a single occurrence of *yi* 義 (“righteousness”) or *xiao* 孝 (“filial piety”) in T328. In the case of *ren* 仁

(“benevolence”), it is used only as a rendering of *karuṇā* in place of *bei* 悲, or as an honorific, meaning “gentleman.” On the contrary, advocating the concept of impermanence in accord with the Indian Buddhist context, the translator directly attacks the Daoist value of fostering life, deriding the Daoist express *zibaobusi* 自保不死 (“[aiming at] the art of self-protection and immortality”), and also directly attacks the Confucian concept of filial piety, using the expression 無毛髮之愛念 (“I do not hold hair and bodily hair dear”).<sup>33</sup> This attitude towards Confucianism and Daoism is odd in a translation work of Zhi Qian’s. It appears more reasonable to regard T328 as Bai Yan’s retranslation of the original by Zhi Qian.

Judging from its renderings, the writer of T328 is compatible with the authorship of T5 and T6. Many renderings peculiar to Zhi Qian are found in T5/T6 and T328. However, the reflected attitude towards Chinese values which is indirectly expressed in T5 and T6 seems to rather question his translatorship of T328. The probability that the translator of T328 also wrote T5 and T6 is far lower than the probability of Zhi Qian and Kang Senghui having translated it. Hence I omit his name from the list of possible candidates for the authorship of T5 and T6.

### Zhu Fahu 竺法護 (239?–316?)<sup>34</sup>

CSZJJ attributes 154 texts to Zhu Fahu 竺法護. Among the extant texts in T, 95 translations are attributed to him. Having researched

<sup>33</sup> To understand what the quoted passage means to the Chinese, consider the following attack by a hypothetical Confucian in the *Mouzi lihuo lun*: “The *Xiao jing* (孝經: *Scripture on Filial Piety*) announces, ‘Any part of the body, even the hair and the skin, should not be damaged, since it is given by the parents.’ And, at his final moments, Zengzi 曾子 [summoned his sons and] said, ‘Uncover my hands, uncover my feet. [Is there any part damaged?]

Now, Buddhist monks shave their heads. How could they violate the saints’ words and not commit themselves to the duty of filial piety?’ 孝經言: “身體髮膚, 受之父母, 不敢毀傷。” 曾子臨沒: “啟予手, 啟予足。” 今沙門剃頭, 何其違聖人之語, 不合孝子之道也? (T2102.52.2c)

<sup>34</sup> Zhu Fahu’s biography in CSZJJ (T2145.55.97c–98b) records that he died on the road while trying to escape a revolt, because of which

the prologues, colophons and Buddhist catalogues, Suzuki (1995) declared 40 texts to be definite translations by Zhu Fahu, and classified them into five types according to their similarities in terms of renderings and transliterations. In order to inspect whether Zhu Fahu could be a possible candidate for the translatorship of T5 or T6, I restrict my examination to the 40 texts researched by Suzuki. Her list and classification of the definite translations of Zhu Fahu are as follows: Type A (T222, T588, T636), Type A' (T186, T263, T266, T285, T291, T292, T310 (fascicles 8–14), T310 (fascicles 117–118), T345, T398, T403, T460, T461, T565, T606, T627, T817), Type B (T585), Type B' (T338) and Type C (T103, T170, T182ab, T199, T283, T315ab, T317, T342, T349, T378, T399, T425, T435, T459, T481, T589, T598, T737).

Among the five types, we find that Zhu Fahu copies many renderings of Zhi Qian in works of Types A', B, B' and C. However, we find that some renderings in T5/T6 fail to accord with any of the forty texts by Zhu Fahu given above. As for the four achievements of the Buddhist practitioners, neither of the renderings *gougang* 溝港 for Pali *sotāpanna*, or *pinlai* 頻來 for *sakadāgāmin* of T5 and T6 appear in Zhu Fahu's works.<sup>35</sup> There are several occurrences of *yingzhen* 應真 (T263, T266, T398, T403 and T481) for *arhat*; however these occur independently, never in the sequence of the four achievements. For these four achievements, Zhu Fahu uses the transliterations *xutuohuan* 須陀洹, *situohan* 斯陀含, *anahan* 阿那含 and *aluohan* 阿羅漢 (T222.8.150b, T460.14.449c, T481.14629b and

---

Emperor Hui 惠帝 moved his residence to Chang'an 長安. Since this happened in 304 and since he is said to have been 78 when he died (according to the Chinese calculation), he may have been born in 227. However, listing Zhu Fahu's translations, Sengyou himself annotates that Zhu Fahu had been engaged in translation from the era Taishi 太始 (265–274) to the second year of the era Yongjia 永嘉 (308) (T2145.55.9bc). The colophon to T588 *Xuzhen tianzi jing* 須真天子經 (T2145.55.48b) records that the text was translated in 266; and the colophon to T186 *Puyao jing* 普曜經 (*ibid.*) records that it was translated by Zhu Fahu in 308. Therefore, the record of his death year in his biography appears to be incorrect.

<sup>35</sup> *Pinlai* appears once, at T425.14.43c. However, there it is not a technical rendering for *sakadāgāmin*.

T588.15.107a), or the renderings *daoji* 道跡 (or 道迹), *wanglai* 往來, *buhuan* 不還 and *wuzhu* 無著 (T263.9.118a, T266.9.206a–210c, T342.12.146b ff., T345.12.164c, T398.13.419c ff., T403.13.592c ff., T585.15.9b and 598.15.143c). Besides, while both T5 and T6 use *lijia* 理家 to render *grhapati*, none of the forty texts of Zhu Fahu uses *lijia*; Zhu Fahu normally uses *changzhe* 長者 for this. This apparent inconsistency between the renderings of T5 and T6 and those of Zhu Fahu reveals that Zhu Fahu could not be the writer of T5 or T6.

### Nie Chengyuan 聶承遠

Nie Chengyuan is a Buddhist layman who participated as a scribe (*bishou* 筆受) in Zhu Fahu's translation teams for T222, *Guangzan jing* 光讚經, T263, *Zhengfahua jing* 正法華經, T285, *Jianbei yi-qie zhide jing* 漸備一切智德經, T398, *Daai jing* 大哀經, T585, *Chixin fantian suo wen jing* 持心梵天所問經, T588, *Xuzhen tianzi jing* 須真天子經 and the lost translation of the *Śūramgama-sūtra*, *Shoulengyan jing* 首楞嚴經. CSZJJ attributes the *Chaoriming jing* 超日明經 to him and notes that it is a revised translation, probably of the first category of the three types, of Zhu Fahu's original version. T638 is identified with Nie's *Chaoriming jing* by the standard catalogues of the T.

T638 copies the renderings of Zhu Fahu: for example, for the renderings of the four achievements of the practitioners, it follows Zhu Fahu's renderings: *daoji* 道跡, *wanglai* 往來, *buhuan* 不還 and *wuzhu* 無著 (15.535a, 536b). As for the rendering of *grhapati*, he also uses *changzhe* 長者 instead of *lijia* 理家. Therefore, given that he is the writer of T638, Nie Chengyuan should be excluded from the list of possible writers of T5 and T6.

### Wuchaluo 無叉羅 and Zhu Shulan 竺叔蘭

The Chinese monk and first documented traveller to the Western Regions Zhu Shixing 朱士行 left China around 260, received the *Fanguang jing* 放光經 (*Pañcaviṃśati-sāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*) in Khotan and sent it back to China. It arrived in Louyang 洛陽 in 282 and was translated in the Suinansi 水南寺 in 291. The Khotanese monk, Wuchaluo 無叉羅, recited the original text

(*zhi huben* 執胡本), and Zhu Shulan 竺叔蘭, a Chinese layman of Indian origin, translated / interpreted it (*kouchuan* 口傳). The text was revised again by Zhu Shulan and Zhu Faji 竺法寂 in 303–304. Considering the typical procedure of Chinese Buddhist translation, we may regard Zhu Shulan as the substantial translator of the text. T221 *Fanguang banruo jing* 放光般若經 is identified by the T cataloguers as the *Fanguang jing* attributed to Zhu Shixing and others in CSZJJ.

An examination of the renderings in T221 quickly reveals that Zhu Shulan and others from his circle are no candidates for the translatorship of T5 and T6. Instead of the *gougang* 溝港, *pinlai* 頻來, *buhuan* 不還 and *yingzhen* 應真 of T5 and T6, T221 uses the transliterations *xutuohuan* 須陀洹, *situohan* 斯陀含, *anahan* 阿那含 and *aluohan* 阿羅漢 for the names of the four achievements of practitioners. Furthermore, T221 is full of transliterations, which do not appear in T5 or T6, as for example, *aweisanfo* 阿惟三佛: *abhisambuddha*, *anouduoluosanyesanpu* 阿耨多羅三耶三菩: *anuttarasamyaksambodhi*, *boluomi* 波羅蜜: *pāramitā*, and *ouhejusheluo* 漚瑟拘舍羅: *upāyakauśalya* are not in accordance with the respective vocabulary of T5 or T6. Due to the inconsistency of renderings between T5 / T6 and T221, I exclude Zhu Shulan and his circle from the list of possible candidates for the translatorship of T5 or T6.

### Faju (法炬: fl. 308) and Fali 法立

The colophon to T186, *Puyao jing* 普曜經, states that Faju was one of the scribes (*bishou* 筆受) in Zhu Fahu's translation team in 308 (T2145.55.48bc). CSZJJ attributes four texts, i.e. the *Loutan jing* 樓炭經, the *Faju benmo jing* 法句本末經, the *Futian jing* 福田經, and the *Da fangdeng rulaizang jing* 大方等如來藏經, to Faju,<sup>36</sup> and notes that Fali 法立 is the co-translator of the second and the third of these. The first three are identified as T23 大樓炭經, T211 法句譬喻經 and T683 諸德福田經 by the T cataloguers.

<sup>36</sup> It is striking that the number of Faju's translations increases to 132 in LDSBJ.

As for the writing style, I could find no decisive difference between T5 / T6 and Faju's three extant translations. The prose and verse styles of Faju's translations are similar to those of T6 and superior to those of T5. As for the terminology reflecting Chinese values, we find the Chinese-style emphasis on filial piety intermittently throughout T23 and T211. However, we find some conspicuous differences between the renderings of T5/T6 and those in Faju's works. Instead of the Chinese renderings of *gougang* 溝港, *pinlai* 頻來, *buhuan* 不還 and *yingzhen* 應真 for the four achievements of practitioners in T5 and T6, Faju's works have the transliterations *xutuohuan* 須陀洹 (T211.4.575c ff.), *situohan* 斯陀含 (T211.4.581a) and *aluohan* 阿羅漢 (T23.1.290b ff., T211.4 ff.). Also, for the rendering of *grhapati*, all three texts of Faju use *changzhe* 長者 instead of *lijia*.

The writing style of Faju's works is in accordance with T5 and T6, but there are several differences between the renderings of Faju's works and those of T5 and T6. As a result, compared to Zhi Qian and Kang Senghui, it is not very likely that Faju is the writer of T5 and T6.

Thus, a comparison of the writing style and renderings reveals that it is unreasonable to attribute T5 or T6 to anyone else except Zhi Qian or one of his successors in his translation circle.

### 3. The translation date and place of T5 and T6

About the end of the Han emperor Xian's 獻帝 reign (190–219), there was nationwide upheaval, and Zhi Qian moved (probably from Henan 河南 province)<sup>37</sup> to the territory of Wu 吳 (222–280) in southern China. Sun Quan (孫權: 182–252), the lord of Wu, invited him to the capital, Jianye 建業, and supported his translation work. Early records (T2145.55.49a28, T2059.50.325b1) reveal that Zhi Qian was engaged in Buddhist translation from 222 during

<sup>37</sup> Daoan's prologue to the *Liaobenshengsi jing* 了本生死經 designates Zhi Qian as Henan Zhi Gongming 河南支恭明 (T2145.5545b21). Henan is the province in which Luoyang, the capital of the Han dynasty, was located.

the Jianxing 建興 era (252–53). Kang Senghui was born in Jiaozhi 交趾 (now in northern Vietnam), Wu 吳. He became a monk at the age of ten, after losing his parents, and moved to Jianye 建業 in 247. With the support of the Wu dynasty, he produced several translations and commentaries, dying in 280 (T2145.55.96b–97a). The Wu dynasty was overthrown in 280 by the Jin 晉 dynasty (265–419), which resulted in the reunification of China. After the collapse of the Wu dynasty, the centre for Buddhist translation activities moved to Chang'an 長安 and Louyang 洛陽, the two major cities in northern China. Considering these historical factors and the above examined philological information, we should locate the translation of T5 and T6 in southern China around Jianye 建業, during the Wu dynasty.

From the internal evidence of T5 and T6, we can trace more detailed translation dates: while T5 is probably one of the earliest translations by Zhi Qian, T6 is a work by a successor in his circle rather than by Zhi Qian himself, and I will bring further evidence for this conclusion.

First of all, the archaic form of the verses in T5 indicates that we should locate the translation of T5 prior to that of the *Dharmapada* translation T210, *Faju jing* 法句經, which is composed entirely in verse. T210 was translated by Zhi Qian and Zhu Jiangyan 竺將炎 around 224, having been revised and enlarged shortly thereafter.<sup>38</sup> As mentioned above, the number of syllables in each line of the verses varies in T5.1.174ab. On the contrary, T210 has only regular quatrains of four, five or six syllables; a quatrain never occurs with a mixed number of syllables. It is improbable that Zhi Qian produced such a clumsy composition, after having composed a large number of quatrains in regular form. Therefore, the composition of T5 should be located prior to the translation of T210, i.e. around 224. Considering that Zhi Qian started his translation in c. 222, this explains why we find more archaic renderings in T5 than in T6.

---

<sup>38</sup> For the translation date of T210, see T2145.55.50a2–28, in particular lines 9–10. It tells that the original text arrived at Wuchang 武昌 in 224.

As for T6, an internal comparison of the renderings in Zhi Qian's work reveals the probability that T6 is not a retranslation by Zhi Qian himself, since some of the renderings in T6 are not in accordance with his other work. For example, instead of *buwangyan* 不妄言 (“not uttering lies”), *qiyu* 綺語 (“frivolous words”), *liangshe* 兩舌 (“double tongue”), and *ekou* 惡口 (“harsh words”) in T5 (1.162b), T6 (1.177b) renders respectively as *bugichan* 不欺讒 (“flattering”), *ningshi* 佞飾 (“false embellishment”), and *ema* 惡罵 (“reviling”). While the four renderings of T5 are found intermittently in Zhi Qian's other works, the three renderings of T6 fail to feature at all.

In addition, a comparison of the attitudes towards Chinese interpolations between T5 and T6 suggests that the writer of T6, i.e. the retranslator of T5, is not Zhi Qian himself. As mentioned above, the frequent use of terms reflecting Chinese values is one of the important characteristics of Zhi Qian's work. Such interpolations, particularly the emphasis on filial piety, are conspicuous in the translation of T5: as the Chinese expanded the concept of filial piety to the concept of loyalty, so that it came to function as a political ideology, the author of T5 utilises filial piety as a religious ideology. With reference to these expressions of filial piety, the writer of T6 leaves them in a few cases but removes them in the majority of cases:

**Table 1: Interpolations of expressions / passages related to filial piety in T5 and T6**

Only in T5	Both in T5 and T6	Only in T6
1.164a19–20, 164b7, 169b19, 169b25, 169c1, 169c20, 170a9, 170c24, 171a5, 171a16, 172a6, 172a09, 172a14, 172b19, 172b24, 172b29, 173a11, 173b23.	T5.1.160c15–16 ≐ T6.1.176b5–6, 175b8 ≐ 191a22.	1.176b22.

Given that we can find expressions of filial piety throughout Zhi Qian's other works, the tendency of T6 to remove such expressions from T5 reveals that the author of T6 is probably not Zhi Qian.

Surveying the use of the relatively older and later renderings in T5, T152 (by Kang Senghui), and T6, we can obtain meaningful

information that narrows down the possible period during which T6 was translated. Comparing the peculiar renderings of the older and later couplets, we find the following examples:

**Table 2: Use of archaic renderings in T5, T152 and T6**

	<i>piṇḍapātika</i>		<i>brāhmaṇa</i>		<i>Samādhi</i>		<i>bhikṣu</i>		<i>rājan cakravartin</i>	
	分衛	乞食	逝心	梵志	思心	定心	除饑	比丘	飛行皇帝	轉輪 (聖)王
T5	7	0	29	2	12	0	3	239	13	1
T152	5	1	13	125	0	1	14	112	13	0
T6	0	2	0	18	0	2	0	91	0	9

In the above table, the terms in the left-hand column for each couplet pre-date the ones in the right column. As expected, T5 represents the oldest stratum using archaic renderings most frequently. Then, although being a work of a generation after Zhi Qian, T152 shows that it still preserves a considerable number of archaic renderings. On the contrary, T6 replaces all of the archaic renderings with later “standardized” ones. This implies that T6 is possibly more recent than Kang Senghui’s T152. Hence, we should regard T6 as one of the latest works in Zhi Qian’s translation circle, i.e. possibly a work from about 280.

## Conclusion

From the above examination, I draw the following conclusions:

- 1) An examination of the renderings in T5 and T6 reveals that both texts are translations by Zhi Qian or by one of his successors from his translation circle.
- 2) The archaic writing style, particularly the style of the verses, and the renderings that are unique to Zhi Qian indicate that T5 is probably the work of Zhi Qian and that it may be one of his earliest translations. T5 appears to have been composed earlier than T210, which was translated around 224.
- 3) The tendency of T6 to remove the interpolated expressions

of filial piety in T5 and replace the archaic renderings of T5 with later standard renderings indicate that the writer of T6 is probably not Zhi Qian himself, but a successor who produced the work possibly around 280.

## Bibliography

### 1. Primary sources

- [D] *Dīgha-nikāya*: Rhys Davids, T. W.; Carpenter; J. Estlin (eds.). 1890. *Dīgha Nikāya*, 3 vols. London: Pali Text Society.
- [K] *Tripitaka Koreana*: Dongguk University (ed.). 1957. *Goryeo Daejanggyeong* 高麗大藏經, 48 vols., Seoul: Dongguk University.
- [MPS] *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*:
- [MPS(P)] *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* (D.II.72–168) and *Mahāśudassana-sutta* (D.II.169–99)
- [MPS(S)]: Waldschmidt, Ernst (ed.). 1950–51. *Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- [MPS(ST.I)]: Waldschmidt, Ernst (ed.). 1961. “Der Buddha preist die Verehrungswürdigkeit seiner Reliquien: Sondertext I des Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra.” *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen: Philologisch-Historische Klasse*. Göttingen: Van den Hoeck & Rupprecht: 375–385.
- [MPS\_ST.II]: Waldschmidt, Ernst (ed.). 1948. “Wunderkräfte des Buddha: eine Episode im Sanskrittext des Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra.” *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen: Philologisch-Historische Klasse*. Göttingen: Van den Hoeck & Rupprecht: 48–91.
- [T] *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō*: Takakusu, Junjiro; Watanabe, Kaikyoku (eds.). 1924: *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經, 85 vols. Tokyo: Taishō shinshū daizōkyō kankōkai 大正新脩大藏經刊行會.
- [Q] *Qisha dazangjing*: Yanshengyuan dazangjing ju 延聖院大藏經局 (ed.). 1987. *Songban qisha dazangjing* 宋版磧砂大藏經. 40 vols. Taibei: Xinwenfeng chuban gongsi 新文豐出版公司.

2. *Secondary sources:*

- Buswell, Robert E. 2004. "Sugi's Collation Notes to the Koryō Buddhist Canon and Their Significance for Buddhist Textual Criticism." *Journal of Korean Studies*, 9, 1: 129–184.
- Harrison, Paul. 1998. "Women in the Pure Land: Some Reflections on the Textual Sources." *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 26, 6: 553–572.
- Hirakawa, Akira 平川彰. 1968. *Shoki daijō bukkyō no kenkyū* 初期大乘仏教の研究. Tokyo: Shunjusha 春秋社.
- Kawano, Satoshi 河野訓. 1986. "Jiku Hōgo no yakukyō ni tsuite" 竺法護の訳経について. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 印度学仏教学研究 35, 1: 72–74.
- 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 Buddhism at Soka University* 創価大学国際仏教学高等研究所年普 6: 207–250.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004. "The Twelve Divisions of Scriptures (十二部經) in the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations." *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University* 創価大学国際仏教学高等研究所年普 7: 167–196.
- Ono, Genmyō 小野玄妙; Maruyama, Takao 丸山孝雄. 1936–1978: *Bussho kaisetsu daijiten* 佛書解説大辭典. Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha 大東出版社.
- Suzuki, Hiromi 鈴木裕美. 1995. "Koyaku kyōten ni okeru yakugo ni tsuite: Jiku Hōgo yakushutsu kyōten wo chūshin toshite" 古訳經典における訳語について: 竺法護訳出經典を中心として. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 印度學佛教學研究, 43, 2: 198–200.
- Tokuno, Kyoko. 1992. "The Evaluation of Indigenous Scriptures in Chinese Buddhist Bibliographical Catalogues." Buswell, Robert E. (ed.). *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*, ed. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications (Original publication: University of Hawai'i Press. 1990): 31–74.
- Tong, Wei 童玮, 1991. *Beisong "Kaibao dazangjing" diaoyin kaoshi ji mulu huanyuan* 北宋《开宝大藏经》雕印考释及目录还原. Beijing: Shumu wenxian chubanshe 书目文献出版社.
- Ui, Hakuju 宇井伯壽. 1971. *Yakukyōshi kenkyū* 訳経史研究. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店.
- Zürcher, E. 1991. "A New Look at the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Texts." Shinohara, Koichi; Schopen, Gregory (eds.). *From Benares to Beijing: Essays on Buddhism and Chinese Religion in Honour of Prof. Jan Yün-Hua*. Oakville: Mosaic Press: 277–324.