

# 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

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

Jonathan A. Silk

*In respectful memory  
of Antonino Forte,  
scholar and friend*

## I. Theoretical considerations

It is probable that there have been questions about the authenticity of scriptures from the very earliest days of Chinese Buddhism, although our available evidence does not stretch back quite that far.<sup>1</sup> Modern scholars have also been intrigued by similar questions of origins, although sometimes for different, even perhaps quite opposite, motives. For the arbiters of orthodoxy in Buddhist China, one of the principal criteria for the authenticity of a scripture was its legitimate Indian (or “Western”) origin; a text was valid or genuine if it had been translated, rather than written or composed in China. What was crucial was that the text be authentic, and authenticity rested with the Buddha, in India.<sup>2</sup> For many modern scholars, in

---

<sup>1</sup> A summary of this paper was presented at the conference “Early Chinese Buddhist Translations” sponsored by the Austrian Academy of Sciences and held in Vienna April 18–21, 2007. I thank the organizer, Max Deeg, and the participants for their helpful comments and advice; in particular I acknowledge with appreciation my debt to Stefano Zacchetti. I am grateful to Nobumi Iyanaga, Kōsei Ishii and Paul Harrison for valuable comments.

<sup>2</sup> Of course, the case is much more complicated than this simple characterization suggests. For instance, even orthodox cataloguers were

particular those who focus on East Asian Buddhism, on the other hand, it has been the scriptures composed in China which are the true treasures, since these are felt to reveal a genuine *Chinese* religiosity, absent from, or at the very least less evident in, translations.<sup>3</sup> My concerns come from another direction. As a student of Indian Buddhism, I am interested in Buddhist scriptures in Chinese primarily from the perspective of the use to which they may be put in elucidating the Buddhism of India. The questions of greatest interest to me in this context revolve around how I may most legitimately and authentically make use of works in Chinese. To address such questions, we have to think about just what such works represent and reflect. Can we, in fact, use them to shed light on Indian concerns at all – and if so, how should we do this? Or do they reflect Chinese problematics to such an extent that their applicability to Indian questions is either effaced or so far hidden as to be beyond recall? Is it possible to balance these two extremes? On the other side is a concern for the Sinologist: how Chinese can a text be which, in part or as a whole, comes from, or is motivated or inspired by, a foreign creation? What might such an import or transplant have to say about domestic Chinese concerns? One thing is sure: whether establishing a viable standpoint either of the student of Indian Buddhism who would attempt to make use of Chinese evidence, or of the Sinologist who would refer to foreign-inspired works, considerable care and nuance is required.

The broad central question here, then, is: to what sorts of uses may we legitimately put Chinese versions of scriptures? Setting aside the Sinologist's concerns as best dealt with by genuine Sinologists, from the point of view of Indology, part of this question is easy – or at least, easier – to answer. If they are translations of Indian works, as may be verified through comparison with extant Indic texts, or through coordinated examination of independently produced Tibetan translations, for example, Chinese translations

---

able to accept that genuine revelation – which is to say, transmission of “Indian” Buddhist scripture – could be possible through dreams, visions and the like. See the very interesting discussions in Campamy 1991, 1993.

<sup>3</sup> A good survey is Buswell 1990; see too Kuo 2000.

may offer us an interpretation of, or viewpoint on, an Indic text – although, to be sure, the diverse problems that accompany the effort to make use of such translations are only now beginning to be explored seriously.<sup>4</sup> But how are we to proceed when we are unsure of the origins of a text? This question becomes especially acute when we take note of the recent, important ideas of Funayama Tōru, who has introduced in a particularly clear way the idea of a type (or types) of scriptural production which is (are) neither pure translation nor pure native creation. Funayama has eloquently brought to the fore the following observation: some works which claim for themselves, or have claimed on their behalf, Indian origins can be demonstrated to have been composed elsewhere.<sup>5</sup> But the use here of the word “composed” conceals a multitude of possible variations. The key (moving) point along the arc of possibility hangs on the extent to which the content of the text might have originated in an Indian, or perhaps better Indic, environment, reflecting Indic concerns, and the extent to which Chinese agendas, expectations and assumptions penetrate the work (simplifying, for the moment, the complication that the binary opposition of Indic and Chinese is also more than a little problematic). Setting aside works composed or compiled by Indians in China (or in the Sinitic sphere),<sup>6</sup> and concentrating on ‘scriptures’ more narrowly understood,<sup>7</sup> the types of works which result from what might, in some circumstances, be

---

<sup>4</sup> Some of the papers presented at the conference referred to in note 1 are good examples of recent work moving, in my opinion, in the right direction.

<sup>5</sup> See Funayama 2002, 2006.

<sup>6</sup> I am reminded in this context of the situation attendant on the later Indian Buddhist transmission to Tibet, in which we know that texts composed more or less ‘to order’ by Indian paṇḍits were accepted by Tibetans as genuine. A comparison of the two cases, removed as they are by centuries, should prove very interesting, the more so since the creation of a number of works within the Chinese cultural sphere also had the active cooperation or supervision of foreign authorities (on which see recently Funayama 2006).

<sup>7</sup> I leave out of consideration here śāstric compositions, usually classified in Chinese as *lùn* 論, which should perhaps be dealt with separately.

called ‘trans-creation’ range from abbreviated summaries or ‘best-of’ collections, as it were, to works ‘inspired by’ or ‘based on’ Indic sources, whether those sources themselves had attained some tangible form or not.

The former type of works, the ‘best-of’ collections, might be considered those the literal content of which can be traced to works having an Indic origin, although the arrangement of that content has been altered to some extent, usually by excision. Somewhere else along this continuum would lie a work like the “Sūtra of the Wise and the Fool” (*Xianyu jing* 賢愚經), clearly Indian to some extent, but not Indian *as such*. As for the class of works ‘inspired by,’ I have used the language of Hollywood here intentionally. For most of us are familiar with films which claim themselves to be ‘inspired by real events,’ or ‘based on a true story.’ I have come to think of some Chinese scriptures in this way, as located along a continuum, or even better, as distributed in a multi-dimensional space, rather than as divisible into one of two categories.<sup>8</sup> In this light, if we can no longer state the problem as one of deciding dichotomously between a work being either a translation or an apocryphon, what are we to do?

In fact, I already approached this general question some ten years ago, although I failed to articulate it within the same framework at that time. In studying the origins of the *Guan Wuliangshoufo jing* 觀無量壽佛經, the conclusion I came to – and it is not mine alone – is that while the text was compiled or brought together in China or Chinese-speaking Central Asia, it nevertheless contains genuine Indic elements which must have been derived directly from Indian traditions.<sup>9</sup> In particular, I argued that the frame story providing the setting for the meditative visions of the text was of thoroughly

---

<sup>8</sup> It may even be that, just as some philosophers speak of all language as metaphor, we should speak of all Chinese scriptures, by their very nature as translations or even simply as inspired by Indic mentalities, as in some fundamental sense Chinese. I leave this discussion for another occasion. For my thoughts on the ‘multi-dimensional space’ within which we might locate scriptures, see Silk 2002.

<sup>9</sup> See Silk 1997.



Indian origin. Simultaneously, it is perfectly evident that the text is not Indian as a whole. I did not myself extend my researches beyond the frame story, but based on the work of others dealing with the text *in extenso*, I accept that many elements cannot but have been composed originally in a Sinitic environment. So what is the text? Is it Indic, or Chinese, or something else? Is it a translation, or a trans-creation, or an apocryphon, or something else? These are particular questions about a specific work. But they are at the same time part of a much larger issue. One way – perhaps the only way – to work toward a generalizable answer to such questions of identity or origins, one – or indeed, the only – way to develop a method for evaluating and considering such cases, is to see what other types of examples one can find. One must try, that is, to plot the arc or distribution of such creations by careful examination of relevant works, one by one, leaving until later a more far-reaching evaluation of the range of evidence to be produced by such investigations. The present paper is intended, then, among other things, as a small contribution in this general direction.

## II. Sources

The *Jifayue sheku tuoluoni jing* 集法悦捨苦陀羅尼經, “The *Dhāraṇī-sūtra* on Collecting the Joy of the Teachings and Getting Rid of Suffering,” is extant only in a Chinese version, the date of which I will discuss in a moment.<sup>10</sup> Although it now appears in Chinese canons embedded within other texts, it was evidently transmitted in China as an independent text at one time.<sup>11</sup> Catalogues, begin-

---

<sup>10</sup> For helpful hints toward the resolution of some of the problems dealt with in this section, in particular regard to T.1332 and 1336, I am grateful to James Benn, James Robson, Robert Gimello, and especially Nobumi Iyanaga. I owe my initial acquaintance with the *Jifayue sheku tuoluoni jing* to Katō 1950: 39.

<sup>11</sup> The *Bussho Kaisetsu Daijiten* (Ono 1932–1935: 5.223a) refers to a manuscript of the text now in the Kyoto University Library (Kyōto daigaku fuzoku toshokan 京都大学附属図書館), registered as 藏 1/シ/6 (zō 1/shi/6). According to the kind information of Funayama Tōru, zō here points to the Zōkyōshoin 藏經書院, the collection of drafts and

ning with the *Zhongjing mulu* 衆經目錄 (I) of 594, cite it as a one *juan* work, here classified as belonging to the category of separate compilations of Mahāyāna scriptures, *dàshéng zhòngjīng biéshēng* 大乘衆經別生.<sup>12</sup> For the *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶紀 of 597, it is a Mahāyāna sūtra of an unknown translator, *dàshéng xiūduōluó shīyì* 大乘修多羅失譯,<sup>13</sup> while the *Zhongjing mulu* (II) of 602 calls it a separately compiled abbreviated extract of a Mahāyāna scripture, *dàshéng biéshēng chāo* 大乘別生抄.<sup>14</sup> The *Dazhou kanding zhongjing mulu* 大周刊定衆經目錄, compiled in 695, again refers to it as a Mahāyāna scripture by an anonymous translator *dàshéng shīyìjīng* 大乘失譯經.<sup>15</sup> As is well known, while the attribution to an anonymous translator is not, in and of itself, necessarily a sign that a work is not a “genuine translation,” in the sense of being based upon some foreign original, whatever this might mean, it can suggest the possibility of some origin outside the domain of officialdom. The classification of the text as a separate compilation or abbreviated abstract, *biéshēng chāo* 別生抄, however, is interesting. Almost all the works so classified are very short; the *Zhongjing mulu* (II) lists as *dàshéng biéshēng chāo* 大乘別生抄 fully 117 works in 137 *juan*,<sup>16</sup> indicating that virtually all of them are no longer than one *juan*. A number of these works, but by no means all, are *dhāraṇīs*. In fact, *biéshēng chāo*, or simply *chāojīng* 抄經, is an interestingly contested emic category, closely related to that of ‘apocryphal’ or ‘doubtful’ scriptures (*wěijīng* 偽經 or

---

manuscripts used for the compilation of the *Zokuzōkyō* 續藏經, including eventually unpublished texts. Hoping it might indeed be an independent manuscript of the sūtra, with the help of Funayama I obtained a copy. Unfortunately, I discovered that it is merely a transcript of the text as transmitted in the QDSJ (see below). For further information on the work’s transmission in Japan, see below.

<sup>12</sup> T.2146 (LV) 125c10 (*juan* 2).

<sup>13</sup> T.2034 (XLIX) 114a2 (*juan* 13).

<sup>14</sup> T.2147 (LV) 164b22 (*juan* 3); identical in T.2148 (LV) 199a28 (*juan* 3).

<sup>15</sup> T.2153 (LV) 437a24, b17 (*juan* 11).

<sup>16</sup> T.2147 (LV) 163c15–165a16 (*juan* 3).

*yíjīng* 疑經).<sup>17</sup> An extensive study of the works classed as *dàchéng biéshēng chāo* should help us move toward an understanding of the significance of this category, and in turn illuminate one traditional location of the *Jifayue sheku tuoluoni jing*.

While the *Jifayue sheku tuoluoni jing* (hereafter JSTJ) has not been, then, independently transmitted within the known Chinese canons, and appears to be unknown at Dunhuang 敦煌, at least as an independent work, it does exist embedded in other works, or in some versions of other works. In the Jin 金 and Second Koryō 高麗 canons, upon the latter of which the Taishō edition is based, the JSTJ appears within the *Guan xukongzang pusa jing* 觀虛空藏菩薩經 (“Sūtra on the Contemplation<sup>18</sup> of the Bodhisattva Ākāśagarbha” – hereafter, GXPJ), the *Qifo bapusa suoshuo datuoluoni shenzhou jing* 七佛八菩薩所說大陀羅尼神呪經 (“Spirit Spells Spoken by the Seven Buddhas and Eight Bodhisattvas” – hereafter, QDSJ), and the *Tuoluoni zaji* 陀羅尼雜集 (“*Dhāraṇī* Miscellany” – hereafter TZ).<sup>19</sup> In the Song period Qisha 磧砂 canon, on the other hand, it is found only in the third of these, the TZ. This is interesting because, as Stefano Zacchetti has clearly pointed out, the Jin and Koryō editions belong to a lineage separate from the Qisha, that of the Kaibao 開寶 canon.<sup>20</sup> Moreover, according to a note appended to the GXPJ in the Koryō edition, the *dhāraṇī* was also not found therein in the Qidan 契丹 or Liao 遼 edition, which is not now known to be extant.<sup>21</sup> The Qidan / Liao edition is closely

<sup>17</sup> See Tokuno 1990, and earlier Okabe 1971. As far as I know, the most thorough account of *chāojīng* so far is that in Ono 1932–1935, *bessatsu* 別冊, 300–369. The materials collected there should serve as the basis for any future study of this interesting category.

<sup>18</sup> Or perhaps “visualization”; I do not wish to enter here into the debates over the signification of the term *guan* in such titles.

<sup>19</sup> The translations of the last two titles I borrow from Strickmann 2002: 312, n. 39. See for QDSJ Strickmann 1996: 73–76, for the GXPJ Tsukinowa 1971: 112–119. On the TZ see Strickmann 1996: 76–78, and now Ochiai 2003, who notices our *dhāraṇī* on p. 73.

<sup>20</sup> Zacchetti 2005: 74–140, esp. the stemma on 133.

<sup>21</sup> See the note to the text edition, below. Although small portions of

related to the Fangshan stone canons 房山石經, whose copies of both the GXPJ and the QDSJ likewise do not contain the JSTJ (and TZ itself is apparently not represented in the Fangshan collection). Here we have, therefore, a rather clear set of lineages of printings of the Chinese canon, within some of which the JSTJ is attached to the GXPJ and QDSJ, while in others it is not; it seems to appear everywhere within the TZ. This distribution may have implications for the history of the JSTJ. At the same time, we also need to deal with the issue of the relations between the three homes of the JSTJ themselves.

Catalogues attribute the GXPJ to the translator \*Dharmamitra / Tanmomiduo 曇摩蜜多,<sup>22</sup> a foreign monk who came to China and died there in 442. Whether or not this attribution is to be accepted,<sup>23</sup> the dating of the text is nevertheless probably generally correct. But what is the extent of this work? As noted above, some versions of the GXPJ do not contain the JSTJ, which is, moreover, being rather awkwardly appended near the end of the text, from a structural point of view obviously an intrusion. The dating of the GXPJ to the mid-fifth century, then, even if solid, does not necessarily help us securely determine the date of the JSTJ itself, or help us trace its origins.

The QDSJ is cited by reference works as an anonymous work belonging to the period 317–420 (Eastern Jin 東晉). However, here again there are complications. Although there are a number of references to a one *juan* text with a similar title, what appears

---

the Qidan edition have been found, I do not know that our text is among them at this time.

<sup>22</sup> T.2151 (LV) 361b13–14 (*juan* 3); T.2153 (LV) 384b19–21: 宋元嘉年曇摩蜜多於揚州譯。出靜泰錄; T.2145 (LV) 12bc (*juan* 1) 12b28, c3–4 宋文帝時。罽賓禪師曇摩蜜多。以元嘉中於祇洹寺譯出。

<sup>23</sup> Tsukinowa 1971: 123 opines: “There is not one true example of something which could be termed a translation of Dharmamitra,” going on (pp. 123–124) to argue this on the basis of Dharmamitra’s biography. See the biography translated in Shih 1968: 140–143, and the consideration of Dharmamitra’s translations in Hayashiya 1945: 444–453. I have not investigated the matter, and therefore do not necessarily accept Tsukinowa’s opinion as fact.

to be this text more or less as we now know it is mentioned first several centuries later, in the *Datang neidian lu* 大唐內典錄 of 664, where it appears as an anonymous translation in four *juan*, 70 folios.<sup>24</sup> The *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄 of 730 lists a *Qifo suoshuo shenzhou jing* in 4 *juan*,<sup>25</sup> of which it says “The first *juan* calls it *Qifo shiyi pusashuo datuoluoni shenzhou jing*”<sup>26</sup> The same catalogue subsequently refers to a *Qifo suoshuo shenzhou jing* 七佛所說神呪經, likewise in four *juan*, going on as follows: “An anonymous translation of a Trepitaka of the Jin period,”<sup>27</sup> specifying in a note: “At present this is catalogued among works of the Eastern Jin (317–420).”<sup>28</sup> Moreover, it then offers a lengthy comment as follows:<sup>29</sup>

The preceding *Qifo suoshuo shenzhou jing* is registered in the Great Zhou Catalogue [= T.2153] as a retranslation. [This] states that [this *Qifo suoshuo shenzhou jing*] has the same original as the *Qifo shenzhou jing* in one *juan* translated during the Wu period [222–280] by the foreign *upāsaka* Zhi Qian.<sup>30</sup> [However,] at present, since this single *juan* version has been lost for quite some time, and the number of *juan* is also different [four as opposed to one], there are insufficient grounds for identifying the two (?). At present, relying on (the) old catalogue(s), I register it among unique texts [not as a retranslation].

<sup>24</sup> T.2149 (LV) 314c4 (*juan* 9): 七佛神呪經 四卷七十紙 失譯; also 287b18 (*juan* 6), 303c7 (*juan* 8). The *Dazhou kanding zhongjing mulu* 大周刊定衆經目錄 of 695 says the same, but listing 71 folios, T.2153 (LV) 465a3 (*juan* 13): 七佛神呪經一部四卷 七十一紙. Tokiwa 1938: 793 refers to Sengyou's *Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集 of 515 as recording this text (T.2145 [LV] 31b14 (*juan* 4): 七佛神呪一卷, with the note *jiélǚzhě yìběn* 結縷者異本. See below.

<sup>25</sup> 七佛所說神呪經四卷.

<sup>26</sup> T.2154 (LV) 510a8 (*juan* 3): 初卷云七佛十一菩薩說大陀羅尼神呪經.

<sup>27</sup> 晋代譯失三藏名.

<sup>28</sup> 七佛所說神呪經四卷.

<sup>29</sup> T.2154 (LV) 510a8 (*juan* 3): 初卷云七佛十一菩薩說大陀羅尼神呪經.

<sup>30</sup> Compare the following: T.2153 (LV) 400b21–24 (*juan* 5): 七佛神呪經一卷 結縷者異本一本或無經字。右吳代支謙譯。出長房錄。七佛神呪經一部四卷 七十一紙。以前二經同本別譯。

右此七佛神呪經，大周錄中編爲重譯。云與吳代外國優婆塞支謙所譯單卷七佛神呪經同本。今以此單卷經久闕，其本卷數復殊，不可懸配<sup>1</sup>。今依舊錄編單本內。

<sup>1</sup> v.l. 記

Indeed, as do other catalogues, the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* also lists a *Qifo shenzhou jing* in a single *juan* (with explicit appeal to Sengyou's *Chu sanzang ji ji* of 515), attributing it in a note to the translator Zhi Qian 支謙 of the Wu Yuezhi 吳月支.<sup>31</sup> On the other hand, the catalogue also reports the existence of a *Qifo ba pusa suo shuo shenzhou jing* 七佛八菩薩所說神呪經 in a single volume, of which it says that according to the Chen catalogue this is an abbreviation of the *Qifo jing*.<sup>32</sup>

It is hard to know what to conclude from this information. As Zhisheng 智昇 himself, the author of the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu*, concluded, there is virtually no chance that the QDSJ as we know it in four *juan* has anything to do with Zhi Qian or with such an early period. On the other hand, given its structure as a collection of *dhāraṇīs*, an expansion of a single volume text into a compendium of four volumes would have been easy to accomplish, at least from a mechanical point of view. Probably Zhisheng is right that the earlier text, while coincidentally sharing a name similar to that of our QDSJ, is otherwise unrelated. While we can probably, though not certainly, accept an attribution of the QDSJ in four *juan* to the fourth or fifth century, we have, once again, no assurance that it contained the JSTJ in that period.

The TZ is attributed to a slightly later period, 502–557. The basis for this appears to be once again the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu*, which says that the compiler is unknown, and that it is catalogued among works of the Liang 梁 (502–557).<sup>33</sup>

<sup>31</sup> T.2154 (LV) 633a20–21 (*juan* 14): 云與結縷者異本。或無經字。祐錄更有一本名與此同。吳月支優婆塞支謙譯。

<sup>32</sup> T.2154 (LV) 654b10 (*juan* 16): 陳錄云抄七佛經新編上。I have so far not been able to identify this Chen catalogue 陳錄。

<sup>33</sup> 未詳撰者。今附梁錄。This dating is stated as fact in the Hōbōgirin catalogue, for instance (Demiéville 1978), almost certainly on the authority of the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu*. Recently, however, some reasoning was

It then continues:<sup>34</sup>

This spell collection is listed in the Great Zhou catalogue [T. 2153] as an independent Mahāyāna sūtra,<sup>35</sup> and it also states the name of the translator to be lost, but this is not accurate. Examining the style of writing, [we learn that] this is a locally produced abbreviated compilation, and not an alternate translation of a Sanskrit original. We know this because works such as the *Qifo shenzhou jing* and the *Tuolinnibo jing* were translated having been brought from abroad.<sup>36</sup> The *Hu zhutongzi tuoluoni jing* was originally translated by Bodhiruci of the Wei. Moreover, the *Tuolinnibo jing* is the same work as the *Zuishengdeng wang jing*. Because such scriptures as these were all gathered together in this work, transmitted without a Sanskrit original, the work must be a local compilation. Because it is not yet known who compiled it, I mention it here (?).

右一呪集大周錄中爲大乘單本。復云失譯者，不然。尋檢其文乃是此方抄集而非梵本別翻。所以知者如七佛神呪經及陀鄰尼鉢經等並是人朝所翻。護諸童子陀羅尼經元魏菩提留支所譯。又陀隣尼鉢經共最勝燈王經二是同本。如此等經並皆集入故，非梵本所傳。必是此方撰集。未知的是何人所撰故，此述也。

Zhisheng's argument is that since TZ incorporates works known to have been otherwise translated, the compilation must be second-

---

offered by Ochiai 2003: 13, who wrote as follows: "Since the very similar *Tuoluoniji jing* was translated by Atikūta between the fourth and fifth years of the Yongzheng period (653–654), we can probably place TZ, which appears in the Liang catalogue, about a century earlier." 近似關係にあると指摘される『陀羅尼集經』が、阿地瞿多(Atikūta)によつて訳されたのが唐の永徽四年~五年(六五三~六五四)であるから、梁録に出目している『陀羅尼雜集』は、それより一世紀ほど以前にさかのぼることができるであろう。This reasoning, however, is far from firm, and the dating must remain unsure.

<sup>34</sup> T.2154 (LV) 624b4–7 (*juan* 13).

<sup>35</sup> T.2153 LV) 380a20 (*juan* 1): 陀羅尼集一部十卷 一百八十七紙一名雜呪經 (≈ 460b22 [*juan* 13]).

<sup>36</sup> The expression *rúcháo suǒ fàn* 入朝所翻 remains unclear to me. Chinese *rúcháo* 入朝 appears to indicate, basically, the arrival from abroad of ambassadors to have an audience with the emperor. This is the only instance of this term in Zhisheng's work.



ary and domestic. While Zhisheng's conclusion is certainly right, his reasoning is problematic, since one can well imagine Chinese translators doing what we know Tibetan translators did: in rendering compilations, these translators as a rule borrowed pre-existing translations, instead of translating the passages anew. If TZ were an Indian compilation, and its Chinese translators had access to and made use of earlier Chinese renderings of (some of) its contents, the result would be a Chinese rendering of a genuinely Indian text which, nevertheless, fulfilled Zhisheng's conditions for a local composition. For reasons to be detailed below, I believe that while his reasons are wrong, Zhisheng's conclusion is nevertheless correct, and TZ is a secondary and local Chinese compilation, some of the sources of which are very clear. However, even accepting the sixth century date for the collection, this does not help us with the date of JSTJ, since there is no assurance that the "original" TZ contained the JSTJ.

Now, one reason to maintain the secondary status of TZ is its large scale citation or incorporation of the QDSJ, of which the quotation of the JSTJ appears to be a part. TZ therefore seems to be entirely dependent upon the QDSJ.<sup>37</sup> But how could this be the case when the JSTJ does not appear within the QDSJ in the Qisha or Fangshan editions? Were the JSTJ in the TZ dependent on QDSJ, we would seem to be compelled to conclude that the JSTJ had once been part of QDSJ – whence it was borrowed into the TZ – but was subsequently removed from the QDSJ in the Qisha and Fangshan editions; the Kaibao tradition canons alone, in this scenario, preserved the original (or: a more original) format of the QDSJ containing JSTJ. TZ clearly post-dates the QDSJ, since it subsumes it; this would seem to rule out the TZ as the original canonical home of the JSTJ. Nevertheless, such collections clearly were able to grow over time, such that QDSJ could have "borrowed back" JSTJ from TZ – although why this would have happened only in the Kaibao lineage of the canon, and not in the Qisha and Fangshan

---

<sup>37</sup> TZ incorporates large portions of QDSJ, particularly, but not only, in the first four *juan*; for details of the correspondences see Ochiai 2003 (already noted in Strickmann 1996: 76).



canons, remains unexplained. As unclear and, frankly, confusing as all this is, the individual histories of the QDSJ and the GXPJ are more problematic still.

As extended units, both the QDSJ and the GXPJ were obviously heavily edited, if not outright compiled or composed, in China. Strickmann, for example, characterizes the QDSJ (as we have it) as an “obvious melange of prototantric elements and Chinese practices. Already,” he explains, “in passing from the bodhisattvas to the planetary spirits, we begin to notice, despite the Indian trappings, that we are truly under the skies of China.”<sup>38</sup> He does observe, however, that it is in the fourth and final chapter that Chinese elements begin to appear overtly; our *dhāraṇī*, on the other hand, occurs earlier, in the second chapter. Therefore, although the composite nature of the text is manifestly evident, it is at the same time certainly possible that the JSTJ is preserved in the QDSJ as a genuinely Indic element (I will explore below just what this expression might mean). The *dhāraṇī*'s status as somehow originally independent of the QDSJ – a collection of diverse materials – does seem evident. Therefore, identifying the composite nature of the text as a whole does not move us very far toward addressing the problem of the origin of the JSTJ itself. What, then, might we learn from the GXPJ?<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> Strickmann 1996: 73–74. See also Xiao 1994: 386–390 (I owe the latter reference to James Robson).

<sup>39</sup> Modern treatments of GXPJ generally do not take account of the JSTJ. It is, however, briefly noted in De Visser 1931: 33, who says the following: “Here begins a new part of the sūtra entitled ‘Sūtra on the *dhāraṇī*'s [sic] for collecting the joy of the Law throwing away sufferings’ (*shūhōetsu shaku daranikyō*).” He then gives, in a new paragraph and without explanation, the following: “Namaḥ Buddhāya! Namaḥ Dharmāya! Nāmaḥ Saṅghāya! Namaḥ Viśvadhacāya (?)! Namaḥ Āgakhacāya (?)! Namaḥ Mahāsattva Bhagali (?).” It is curious that he then continues: “The remaining text is evidently a repetition of the contents of the *Ākāśagarbhasūtra* ... given above.” He appears here to ignore the narrative, which is clearly the most characteristic element of our short text. This narrative is summarized by Kamibayashi Ryūjō 神林隆淨 in Ono 1932–1935: 4.340d–341a, in his discussion of the QDSJ. Likewise, Kuo Li-Ying 1994: 137–138 summarizes the story. In saying that the GXPJ is

There are some indications that, at least in the later tradition, the JSTJ was closely identified with the GXPJ. The JSTJ consists, as we will see, of its *dhāraṇī* and an explanatory story. The narrative is quoted, or perhaps better paraphrased or abbreviated, in several works of East Asian authors. In the *Dasheng fayuan yilin zhang* 大乘法苑義林章 of Kuiji 窺基 (632–682),<sup>40</sup> which appears to preserve the earliest such reference to the story, the passage is attributed to the *Daji jing* 大集經, that is to say, to the Mahāsaṃnipāta collection of scriptures. Now, the GXPJ itself is not formally considered to belong to that collection.<sup>41</sup> But, at least in the *Dazhou kanding zhongjing mulu* 大周刊定衆經目錄 scripture catalogue compiled in 695,<sup>42</sup> which is to say, only a few years after the death of Kuiji in 682, the translation is listed along with other texts which do belong to the Mahāsaṃnipāta formally speaking. Evidently the same association reflected in this catalogue lies behind Kuiji's attribution of his citation to this collection, suggesting that for him the passage belongs to, or with, the GXPJ. On the other hand, very soon after Kuiji, the Korean scholar Ūijōk 義寂 cited the text in his *Posal kyebon-so* 菩薩戒本疏,<sup>43</sup> without reference to any collection and calling it by a shortened name, *Jifayue jing* 集法悅經, suggesting that the connection with the Mahāsaṃnipāta collection was not necessarily always asserted. Later still, and perhaps in light of the same tradition as that followed by Kuiji, the Khitan-Liao monk Feizhuo 非濁 (d. 1063) in his *Sanbao ganying yaolüelu* 三寶感應要略錄 explicitly sources his citation as “from the *Jifayue sheku tuoluoni jing*, a separate transmission of a work found within the Mahāsaṃnipāta.”<sup>44</sup> Further association comes from the context

---

the only place in which the JSTJ is found, however, she overlooks its two other sources.

<sup>40</sup> T.1861 (XLV) 307a15–22 (*juan* 3); see below. More correctly his name should be given as merely Ji.

<sup>41</sup> See the brief discussion of the “supplementary” Mahāsaṃnipāta texts in Braarvig 1993: xxx–xxxii.

<sup>42</sup> .2153 (LV) 384b19 (*juan* 2).

<sup>43</sup> T.1814 (XL) 657a6–20 (*juan* 1).

<sup>44</sup> T.2084 (LI) 839c6 (*juan zhong*): 出集法悅捨苦陀羅尼經。此是大集

in which the JSTJ is found in the QDSJ. In the QDSJ found in the Koryō edition, the JSTJ is preceded by a small character note which reads:<sup>45</sup> “In the Song edition, there are found here twelve lines of the *Xukongzang pusa dhāraṇī*. We checked it, and it is what is given above in *juan* one, leaf twenty-two,<sup>46</sup> so here we omit it.” This again suggests some association between the JSTJ and the GXPJ in the minds of the compilers of this recension of the QDSJ, and / or the editors of the Koryō canon.

There is a final possible reason for some association between the QDSJ and GXPJ. The *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* has an entry on the *Xukongzang pusa wen fo jing* 虛空藏菩薩問佛經 in one *juan*, concerning which it then says:<sup>47</sup> “This is also called the *Xukongzang pusa wen Qifo tuoluoni jing*, and again the *Qifo shenzhou jing* ….” Here the names of the QDSJ and the GXPJ seems to be almost fused, and it is possible, then, that for a reader who had been unable to compare the actual texts, some confusion may have arisen due to the alternate names by which the two works, QDSJ and GXPJ, were known.

Despite the preponderance of often contradictory or just unclear evidence, the simple confluence of certain, albeit not entirely independent, pieces of information, including the presence of the JSTJ in the GXPJ, QDSJ and TZ in one canonical lineage, seems to suggest that JSTJ was established already in the fifth century in China. The only really firm date we have to work with, however, is significantly later, the first catalogue reference in the *Zhongjing mulu* (I) of 594, in which the text is recorded independently, and not as forming a part of any of the three texts within which it is now to be found. If this independent version were an extract from an earlier

---

經中別流也。

<sup>45</sup> K.433 (XIII) 1084a18: 宋本此中有虛空藏菩薩真言十二行檢之，卽上第一卷二十二幅所出。今此中除之； see the same at T.1332 (XXI) 541b17 (*juan* 1).

<sup>46</sup> In the reprint edition this is found at 1081a12ff.

<sup>47</sup> T.2154 (LV) 539a16 (*juan* 6): 亦云虛空藏菩薩問七佛陀羅尼呪經，亦云七佛神呪經 … See also 600c14 (*juan* 12), 708c22 (*juan* 19 – alternate version).

version transmitted only within another work, however, while 594 would necessarily remain our *terminus ante quem*, the true date of origin could be significantly earlier. Even setting aside the problem of its date, there remain significant unexplained questions. How could it be that the JSTJ is transmitted only in some recensions of the QDSJ if, as certainly seems to be the case, TZ borrowed the former from the latter? Or is TZ the original home of the JSTJ? There is some philological evidence for this in the readings of the text themselves; although such a judgement must be to some extent subjective, TZ appears to preserve a more readable text of the JSTJ than do either QDSJ or GXPJ. This might suggest that the JSTJ was borrowed, albeit imperfectly, from TZ by GXPJ and QDSJ – but once again, the chronological problems this entails are not trivial.

For the moment we must be content, it seems, to catalogue the substantial problems with the history of the text, and then move on.

### III. The text: Edited and translated

Before we proceed further, let us see what the JSTJ itself looks like.<sup>48</sup> I edit it here as it appears in the sources presently available to me.<sup>49</sup>

*Guan xukongzang pusa jing*, T.409 (XIII) 679c29–680b23.

Korean 64 (VII) 824c16–825c6

Jin – *not reproduced* –

Qisha – *not included in this version* –

Fangshan – *not included in this version* –

*Qifo ba pusa suo shuo datuoluoni shenzhou jing*, T.1332 (XXI) 544b5–c26 (*juan* 2).

Korean 433 (XIII) 1084a18–1085a11 (*juan* 2)

Jin 466 (XXIII) 893b7–894a22 (*juan* 2, leaves 4–6)

Qisha – *not included in this version* –

---

<sup>48</sup> My understanding of the text owes much to the kindness of Christoph Harbsmeier, although he is, needless to say, not responsible for my misunderstandings (or punctuation!); thanks also to Stefano Zacchetti for excellent advice.

<sup>49</sup> I cite the Taishō locations for reference; my edition relies directly on (reproductions of) the blockprint sources.

Fangshan – not included in this version –

*Tuoluoni zaji*, T. 1336 (XXI) 631a4–b27 (*juan* 9).

Korean 1051 (XXX) 1282c5–1283b22 (*juan* 9)

Jin 1142 (LIII) 462c4–463b21 (*juan* 9, leaves 11–13)

Qisha 1072 (fasc. 445) 76a19–77a11 (*juan* 9)

Fangshan – text not included in published collection –

集法悅捨苦陀<sup>50</sup>羅尼經<sup>51</sup>

南無佛陀耶<sup>52</sup> 南無達摩耶 南無僧伽耶 南無毘首陀遮耶 南無阿伽竭  
浮遮耶 南無摩訶<sup>53</sup>薩婆婆<sup>54</sup>伽利耶 多擲姪<sup>55</sup>哆<sup>56</sup> 林弥利 婆簸<sup>57</sup>婆弥  
留遮呵<sup>58</sup> 檀摩陀 那闍那唏希<sup>59</sup>知泚<sup>60</sup>利<sup>61</sup> 婆居<sup>62</sup>婆遮耶 那耶波羅婆

<sup>50</sup> Some write 陀 – not further noted.

<sup>51</sup> K 433 adds in small type 此呪丹本中無, “This dharaṇī is not contained in the [Qi]dan edition,” meaning it was not found in what is also known as the Liao canon 遼藏. In the notes, I use the following: ZH = *Zhonghua Dazangjing* 中華大藏經 (Beijing 1984–1988); Sixi 思溪, Puning 普寧, Ming 明.

<sup>52</sup> K 433, J 466 地, J 1142, K 1051 地, Q 1072 蛇, and so below for all instances of 耶. With the exception of the first five or six words, and the last one, only the first three of which I understand, I have no confidence in the correctness of the word divisions within the *dhāraṇī*.

<sup>53</sup> J 466, K 433, Q 1072 呵

<sup>54</sup> J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072 omit 婆.

<sup>55</sup> J 466, K 433 small type 輕 for 姪; J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072 omit 姪.

<sup>56</sup> K 64 adds small type 彦賀反; J 466, K 433 add small type 彦賀

<sup>57</sup> J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072 簸

<sup>58</sup> K 1051 陀, J 1142, Q 1072 陀

<sup>59</sup> K 433 small type 希 for 希; J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072 omit 希

<sup>60</sup> K 64 adds 底; J 466, K 433 泚 for 泚 followed by small type 泚

<sup>61</sup> K 64 omits 利

<sup>62</sup> J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072 居

摩呵<sup>63</sup>唏知底<sup>64</sup>利 殃<sup>65</sup>求 知利默求知利 比婆薩婆耶那 比<sup>66</sup>林婆闍呵  
陁舍耶<sup>67</sup>輸 薩婆娑羅 三蔓<sup>68</sup>鉢泆<sup>69</sup> 波波 波<sup>70</sup>利 摩訶 阿那 莎呵。

爾時，佛告諸大眾言。吾本無數劫中處於凡夫時，字遮他陁。在加  
倫<sup>71</sup>邏<sup>72</sup>國作於商客販賣治業虛。妄無實造諸惡行不可稱計。姪荒無  
道不可具說。是時，愚癡害父愛母。經<sup>73</sup>由<sup>74</sup>數年<sup>75</sup>，舉國人民一皆知  
之稱聲唱言。是遮他陁害父愛母今經<sup>76</sup>數年。吾時思念與六畜無異更  
無人事。時於加倫<sup>77</sup>邏<sup>78</sup>國<sup>79</sup>夜<sup>80</sup>跳城奔走趣於深澤。

時此國王名毘闍<sup>81</sup>。告令國中人民，此遮他陁姪荒<sup>82</sup>無道致爲此事。

<sup>63</sup> J 466, K 433 small type 摩呵 for 摩呵; J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072 訶 for 呵

<sup>64</sup> K 64 泆; J 466, K 433 泆 for 底 followed by small type 泆; J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072 泆 for 底

<sup>65</sup> J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072 央 for 殃

<sup>66</sup> J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072 毘 for 比

<sup>67</sup> J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072 地 for 耶; writing 馳 may have led to confusion

<sup>68</sup> K 64 adds small type 無律反; J 466, K 433 add small type 無律; J 1142, K 1051 幕, Q 1072 慕 for 蔓; Taishō's note to T. 1336 indicates that Sixi, Puning and Ming read 慕.

<sup>69</sup> J 466, K 433 泆

<sup>70</sup> J 466, K 433 omits 波

<sup>71</sup> J 466, K 433 偷 for 倫

<sup>72</sup> J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072 羅

<sup>73</sup> K 1051 逕 for 經;

<sup>74</sup> Following J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072; others omit 由

<sup>75</sup> Following J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072; others add 中

<sup>76</sup> Following J 1142, Q 1072 (K 1051 今逕); others 經今

<sup>77</sup> J 466, K 433 偷 for 倫

<sup>78</sup> J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072 羅

<sup>79</sup> Taishō's note to T. 409, ZH indicate 國 is missing in Sixi.

<sup>80</sup> Following J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072; others omit 夜

<sup>81</sup> J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072 add 羅

<sup>82</sup> J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072 曠 for 荒

其有能得此人者當重賜寶物。時此國人各各受<sup>83</sup>募<sup>84</sup>欲捕吾身。是時<sup>85</sup>，驚怖即出國作沙門在於他國。修行十善坐禪學道晝夜泣淚經<sup>86</sup>三十七年。以五逆罪障故，心不得<sup>87</sup>定憂悲叵處。以三十七年中在於山窟，常舉聲泣<sup>88</sup>苦哉，苦哉。當以何心去此苦也。悲歎<sup>89</sup>下窟乞食時，道中地得一大鉢。中有一匣<sup>90</sup>經。更無餘經，唯有集法悅捨苦陁羅尼。

說過去恒河沙諸佛<sup>91</sup>泥洹時，常在毘悅羅國，說此陁羅尼，付諸大菩薩。後有人得聞此陁羅尼者。此人過去世時修持五戒十善，當今<sup>92</sup>得聞。有人雖聞而不在心不修習<sup>93</sup>者是名無緣。此陁羅尼能除<sup>94</sup>去百億劫生死五逆大罪。若有人受持讀誦者，終不墮於三塗，地獄·餓鬼·畜生。何以故。過去諸佛以欲泥洹時專<sup>95</sup>當說之，尊重歎仰稱其功德不可計量，付諸菩薩。後有衆生得聞此陁羅尼者，修習著<sup>96</sup>心，福報難計，猶如須彌寶海。凡夫不能得<sup>97</sup>量。若有人作諸惡行，竊聞此陁羅尼名，不及修習一用在懷墮於地獄<sup>98</sup>。一切地獄中蒙此人恩，苦痛不行。有人能行現身精勤修習得者，睹見百千萬佛剎土得福無量不

<sup>83</sup> J 466, K 433 愛 for 受

<sup>84</sup> J 466, K 433 (and according to Taishō's note and ZH Sixi also): others 慕 for 募; therefore J 466, K 433 have the common word àimù 愛慕.

<sup>85</sup> ZH says Sixi omits 時

<sup>86</sup> J 466 逕 for 經

<sup>87</sup> Following J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072; others omit 得

<sup>88</sup> J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072 add 哭

<sup>89</sup> J 1142, K 1051 嘆 for 歎, but Q 1072 歎

<sup>90</sup> J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072 函 for 匣

<sup>91</sup> J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072 add 臨

<sup>92</sup> Following Q 1072 (Taishō T. 1336, ZH note that Sixi, Puning and Ming and several others share this reading); all other texts read 令 for 今

<sup>93</sup> Following J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072; others 集

<sup>94</sup> Q 1072 adds 過; Taishō T. 1336, ZH note the same for Sixi, Puning and Ming

<sup>95</sup> Following J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072; others 會

<sup>96</sup> Taishō note to T. 1336, ZH note that Sixi reads 耆 for 著

<sup>97</sup> Taishō's note to T. 409, ZH indicate 得 missing in Sixi

<sup>98</sup> J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072 add 中

可具說。唯有諸佛與諸菩薩乃能究盡。聲聞二乘人者不能得知。何以故。此陁羅尼非一佛二佛所說。過去恒河沙諸佛所說。

是時，吾得此經<sup>99</sup>即不乞食歡喜向窟。到於窟中，燒香禮拜。悲淚讚仰，於窟中修習讀誦經<sup>100</sup>。一年始得。以罪業障故，不能得入心懷。是時，吾即以秋月夜洗浴修<sup>101</sup>行，經<sup>102</sup>一七日。如童子初學憤憤者不少。便更行於七日。亦如是憤憤無異。心中愁惱，不知云何意中。思惟<sup>103</sup>此陁羅尼字書<sup>104</sup>，經<sup>105</sup>於數反，心中忽定。時吾<sup>106</sup>欣悅。如人地得百千斤金人無知者，內欣不止。吾時亦然。修行數年，飛行無導<sup>107</sup>，睹見十方三世諸佛。後有行者如法行之。

[*Dhāraṇī*]

At that time the Buddha spoke to the members of the great assembly, saying: “When, during infinite aeons, I was still at the stage of being an ordinary person (*\*prthagjana*), my name was Zhetatuo.<sup>108</sup> Living in the land of Jiatouluo I engaged in sales and peddling. I was dishonest, lied, and did all manner of evil deeds, which are impossible to recount. My sexual perversity and my immorality are impossible to fully detail. At that time, stupidly insensitive, I killed my father and made love to my mother.<sup>109</sup> Over a number of years the people of the

<sup>99</sup> J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072 add 已

<sup>100</sup> J 466 逕 for 經

<sup>101</sup> Taishō's note to T. 409 here says that 兄 is missing in Sixi, which makes no sense to me.

<sup>102</sup> J 466 逕 for 經; ZH says Sixi omits 經

<sup>103</sup> Following J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072; others 沾思 (J 466, K 433 恬思)

<sup>104</sup> Following J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072; others omit 書. See the note to the translation here.

<sup>105</sup> J 466 逕 for 經

<sup>106</sup> Following J 1142, K 1051, Q 1072; others 我時

<sup>107</sup> K 433, K 1051, Q 1072 礙

<sup>108</sup> Kamibayashi in Ono 1932–1935: 4.340d suggests “Cathadha?” which I cannot understand.

<sup>109</sup> The rhetorical device here is interesting; with the phrase 愚癡害父愛母 the text references the so-called three poisons, *moha*, *dveṣa* and *rāga*, delusion, hatred and lust.



entire country all came to know of this, and loudly proclaimed: ‘Now it’s been a number of years since this Zhetatuo killed his father and made love to his mother.’ At that time I pondered [the fact that I] was no different from the beasts; [what I did] wasn’t the act of a human being. Then at night I jumped over the city wall at Jiatouluo, fled and hastened toward a deep marsh.

“At that time the king of that country was called \*Vija. He issued a proclamation to the people in his state: ‘This fellow, Zhetatuo, has committed acts of sexual perversity, and his immorality extends to committing this offense. Whoever can lay hands on this person will be handsomely rewarded.’ Then each and every person in this country responded to this appeal and was eager to get hold of me. Much alarmed, I left the state, and became a *śramaṇa* in another country. I cultivated the ten good [precepts], practiced seated meditation, and studied the Way. I wept day and night for thirty-seven years. Because of the obstacle of having committed the five sins of immediate retribution,<sup>110</sup> my mind was never at rest, and I could not find peace. For thirty-seven years I lived in a cave in the mountains, always crying out ‘Oh, how painful it is! Oh, how painful it is! With what mental [technique?] should I get rid of this pain?’ When, sobbing with grief, I went down from the cave to beg for alms, on the road I found a large bowl. Within it there was a *sūtra* box, but only one *sūtra* inside: the ‘*Dhāraṇī* on Collecting the Joy of the Teachings and Getting Rid of Suffering.’

“It is said that in the past Buddhas as many as the sands of the [Ganges] river, at the time of their *nirvāṇa*, always lived in the land of Piyueluo, preaching this *dhāraṇī*, bestowing it upon the great bodhisattvas. Later there was someone who was able to hear this *dhāraṇī*. This person in a past age practiced upholding the five restrictions and the ten good actions, and now he did hear it. If there is someone who, although he hears it, still does not take it seriously and does not practice, such a person is called one without a karmic link.<sup>111</sup> This *dhāraṇī* can

---

<sup>110</sup> These five – murder of a father, mother, arhat, drawing the blood of a buddha, and causing a schism in the monastic community – are the most serious crimes catalogued in Buddhist literature; see Silk 2007.

<sup>111</sup> The sense of *wúyúán* 無緣 seems to be that if, despite being presented with the opportunity to profit from the text, one still fails to do so, this is due to the burden of past karma and the absence of a necessary karmic conditioning from previous lives.

remove the great transgression produced by the five sins of immediate retribution committed through hundreds of thousands of aeons of rebirth. If there is a person who upholds, reads and recites it, he will never fall into the three unfavorable realms, hells, hungry ghosts or animals. Why? The Buddhas of the past, when they were about to enter *nirvāṇa*, devoted themselves to preaching it. They venerated and praised its merits as incalculable, and bestowed it upon bodhisattvas. Later, if there will be beings who have the opportunity to hear this *dhāraṇī*, practice [it] and take it seriously, their positive rewards will be difficult to calculate, like an ocean of gems [as great as Mount] Sumeru. Ordinary people will not be able to reckon it. If there is someone who performs all sorts of evil acts, [but] surreptitiously hears the name of this *dhāraṇī*, even without practicing [it], as soon as he holds it in mind he might fall into hell. [Then] all people in hell would benefit from this person's beneficial influence, and their sufferings would not be active (?).<sup>112</sup> If there is someone who can practice this and in the present body energetically cultivating obtain [the *dhāraṇī*], he will see hundreds of billions of buddha fields, and the merit he acquires will be limitless and inexpressible. Only buddhas and bodhisattvas are able to fully exhaust it. Auditors and those belonging to the second vehicle (of the Lone Buddhas) cannot understand. Why? This *dhāraṇī* was not preached by [only] one buddha or two buddhas, but by the buddhas of the past as many as the sands of the Ganges.

“At that time, I picked up this scripture and without begging for food immediately returned to the cave joyously. Once inside the cave, I burned incense and offered worship.<sup>113</sup> Piteously weeping and venerating, I practiced the recitation of the scripture inside the cave. After one year, I was first able [to understand it], but because of the obstacle of my sinful actions, I was not able to get it to enter my mind. At that time, on an autumn moon-lit night I washed and practiced for a whole seven days. Like a beginning student worried quite a lot, I practiced again for seven days. I was still as unsettled as before. I was disturbed

---

<sup>112</sup> These two sentences are difficult, and I am not confident I have understood them well.

<sup>113</sup> The expression *shāoxiāng lǐbài* 燒香禮拜 is attested in Buddhist works of the early fifth century (T.397 [XIII] 136c4 [juan 19]; T. 643 [XV] 696a1 [juan 10]), and in secular works at least as early as the *Weishu* 魏書 of 551–554 (see Morohashi 1955–1960: 7.524b [19420.18]). Is this significant for the dating of JSTJ?

in my mind, and I did not know what to think. Contemplating the written form of this *dhāraṇī*, after many perturbations,<sup>114</sup> my mind was suddenly settled. Then I was delighted. Like a person who finds a hundred thousand gold *jīn* on the ground, that others did not know were there, inside I was endlessly joyous. I then was also like that man. Practicing for many years, I became able to fly without obstacle and see the buddhas of the three worlds in the ten directions. Later there will be practitioners who follow this practice.”

Although some obscurities remain, the general sense of the text and the trajectory of its narrative are quite clear. What are we to make of this text? Let us begin with the *dhāraṇī* itself. This presents, for the time being at least, insuperable difficulties. While the restitutions of the first few words are obvious enough, the remainder is indecipherable in terms of its (putative) Indic original. All we can be certain about is the following: *Nāmo buddhāya, nāmo dharmāya, nāmo saṃghāya*, and then the final *svāhā!* Even word boundaries are far from clear, and while the printed editions do separate the characters spatially into units, their separations are not consistent, suggesting, as we would expect, that the respective editors likewise had little idea what shape the *dhāraṇī* should take. Is it, in fact, a genuine *dhāraṇī* in – that is, transcribed from – some Indic language? There is simply no way to know with the information available at present.

As with the *dhāraṇī* itself, the proper names in the story which follows – in modern Chinese pronunciation Zhetatuo, Jiatouluo and Piyueluo – in their turn also defy reconstruction. The name Pishe (if it is not to be read Pisheluo, with the variant recorded in TZ) appears to reflect \*Vija, which might suggest itself as a name for a king, although even this is far from sure. So the transcriptions – if that is indeed what they are – offer little help to us, since they could simply represent either badly transmitted forms or irregular tran-

---

<sup>114</sup> Or “after repeating it many times”? But this does not necessarily fit with the idea that it was the written form of the text which was contemplated. It is very difficult both to establish and understand the text here. Few clear parallels are to be found in other texts, and for the time being both the correct reading and interpretations must remain elusive. I thank Iyanaga Nobumi and Ishii Kōsei for their advice.

scriptions, or mere pseudo-Indic inventions. At present there is no way to further refine our appreciation of their original(s). To focus back on our central question, then, neither the *dhāraṇī* itself nor the transcriptions in the story nudge us one way or another toward any particular point on the arc spanning the gulf between translation and local composition.

The narrative core of the work does, nevertheless, lead us in a particular direction, or rather, provides a solid point of reference. For, unlike the case with the *dhāraṇī*, in the story we are able to identify a clearly Indian precedent, and moreover one not known to have been otherwise transmitted to China before the time of Xuanzang in the mid-seventh century, long after catalogues assure us the JSTJ was already circulating in China.

The basic story of our text, a Jātaka of the Buddha, has him as a dishonest peddler, who kills his father and has sex with his mother. He escapes, fleeing the wrath of his fellows, ending up in another land, where he becomes a *śramaṇa*. He lives in a cave for thirty-seven years, in despair. During this time – and this is crucial – he habitually cries out “Oh, how painful it is! Oh, how painful it is!” The story goes on, but this is the portion of central relevance for us here. For it is to this that we can compare Indic versions of the story of the notorious Mahādeva, the putative instigator of the fundamental schism between the Sthaviras and Mahāsāṃghikas, the putative cause of the dissolution of the Buddha’s previously unified monastic community.

#### IV. A parallel

The core version of the story of Mahādeva is that found in the \**Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā*, which is now known only in Chinese translation (*Apidamo Dapiposha lun* 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論). This story is also relatively widely known in a variety of, generally quite abbreviated, forms in Indian Buddhist literature. The various ways in which the story is cast, however, do not elsewhere in known

Indian texts involve the integration of an exclamation of pain, as does the *Vibhāṣā*, whose account reads as follows:<sup>115</sup>

Long ago there was a merchant in the kingdom of Mathurā. He married while still a youth and soon his wife gave birth to a baby boy. The child, who had a pleasing appearance, was given the name Mahādeva.

Before long, the merchant went on a long journey to another country taking with him rich treasure. Engaging in commercial ventures as he wended his way, a long time passed without his return. The son, meanwhile, had grown up and defiled his mother. Later on, he heard that his father was returning and he became fearful at heart. Together with his mother, he contrived a plan whereby he murdered his father. Thus did he commit his first sin of immediate retribution.

This deed of his gradually came to light, whereupon, taking his mother, he fled to the city of Pāṭaliputra, where they secluded themselves. Later, he encountered a monk-*arhat* from his native land who had received the support of his family. Again, fearing that his crime would be exposed, he devised a plan whereby he murdered the monk. Thus did he commit his second sin of immediate retribution.

[Mahādeva] became despondent. Later when he saw that his mother was having sexual relations with another, he said to her in raging anger: “Because of this affair, I have committed two serious crimes. Drifting about in an alien land, I am forlorn and ill-at-ease. Now you have abandoned me and fallen in love with another man. How could anyone endure such harlotry as this?” With this excuse he also murdered his mother. He had committed his third sin of immediate retribution.

Inasmuch as he had not entirely cut off the strength of his roots of goodness, [Mahādeva] grew deeply and morosely regretful. Whenever he tried to sleep, he became ill-at-ease. He considered by what means his serious crimes might be eradicated. Later, he heard that the Śākyaputra *śramaṇas* [Buddhist monks] were in possession of a method for eradicating crimes. So he went to the Kukkuṭārāma monastery. Outside its gate he saw a monk engaged in slow walking practice. The monk was reciting a hymn:

<sup>115</sup> The basic translation is that of Mair 1986: 20–25, which I have modified. The full account is in T.1545 (XXVII) 510c24–512a19 (*juan* 99), with the portion quoted here found at 510c24–511b28.

If someone has committed a serious crime,  
 He can eradicate it by cultivating goodness;  
 He could then illuminate the world,  
 Like the moon coming out from behind a screen of clouds.

When [Mahādeva] heard this, he jumped for joy. He knew that, by taking refuge in the Buddha's teachings his crimes could certainly be eradicated. Therefore he went to visit the monk. Earnestly and persistently, [Mahādeva] entreated the monk to ordain him. When the monk saw how persistent [Mahādeva's] entreaties were, he ordained him without making an investigation or asking any questions. He allowed him to retain the name Mahādeva and offered him admonitions and instructions.

Now Mahādeva was quite brilliant and so, not long after he had renounced the world he was able to recite the text and grasp the significance of the Tripiṭaka. His words were clear and precise and he was skillful at conversion. In the city of Pāṭaliputra, there were none who did not turn to Mahādeva in reverence. The king heard of this and repeatedly invited him into the inner precincts of the palace. There he would respectfully make offerings to Mahādeva and entreat him to lecture on the teachings.

Later, [Mahādeva] left [the capital] and went to dwell in a monastery where, because of impure thoughts, he had wet dreams. Now, he had previously declared himself an *arhat*, but when he ordered a disciple to wash his soiled robes, the disciples spoke to him saying: "An arhat is one in whom all the outflows have been exhausted (\**kṣīṇāsraṇā*). How then, Master, is it possible that you still have such a thing?"

Mahādeva spoke to him, saying: "I was afflicted by Devaputramāra. You should not think this strange. Now, the outflows may broadly be classified into two categories: one due to defilements (\**kleśa*) and the other due to impurities. The *arhat* has no outflows due to defilements, but he is yet unable to avoid those due to impurities. Why? Although the defilements of arhats are extinguished, how can they be without urine, feces, tears, spittle, and the like? Now, the Devaputramāras always hate the Buddha's teachings. Whenever they see someone who is cultivating goodness, they invariably attempt to ruin him. Even an arhat is afflicted by them, and therefore I had an outflow. They caused it. You should not be skeptical about this." This is termed "the origin of the first false view."

Again, ... second false view. ... third false view. ... fourth false view.

Mahādeva had, indeed, committed a host of crimes. However, since he had not destroyed his roots of good, during the middle of the night he would reflect upon the seriousness of his crimes and upon where he would eventually undergo bitter sufferings. Beset by worry and fright, he would often cry out, “Oh, how painful it is!” His disciples who were dwelling nearby were startled when they heard this and, in the early morning, came to ask him whether he were out of sorts.

Mahādeva replied, “I am feeling very much at ease.”

“But why,” asked his disciples, “did you cry out last night, ‘Oh, how painful it is!’?”

He proceeded to inform them: “I was proclaiming the noble path (\**āryamārga*). You should not think this strange. In speaking of the noble path, if one is not utterly sincere in the anguish with which he heralds it, it will never become manifest at that moment when one’s life reaches its end. Therefore, last night I cried out several times, ‘Oh, how painful it is!’”

This is termed the “origins of the fifth false view.” ...

In the translation above I have underlined the crucial phrases linking the story in the JSTJ with that in the *Vibhāṣā*. Despite this similarity, within a Chinese context we cannot see the source of the former in the latter. It is important to establish this, since otherwise one might well see the JSTJ as a purely native production. However, the *Vibhāṣā* which contains this story was not to be translated into Chinese by Xuanzang 玄奘 until 659, at the very least sixty-five years after the JSTJ – counting from the 594 *terminus ante quem* for the JSTJ in the *Zhongjing mulu* – and the translation may postdate the JSTJ by as much as two centuries, if a mid-fifth century date for the latter were to be accepted. It is also very difficult to imagine that the story could have been borrowed by the JSTJ from the earlier translation of the *Vibhāṣā* produced by Buddhavarman / Futuobamo 浮陀跋摩 in the first half of the fifth century, the last forty of whose one hundred *juan* were destroyed in a fire, it is said. There are two reasons for this difficulty. In the first place, the remaining sixty *juan* of the earlier translation correspond to the first 111 *juan* of Xuanzang’s version, and the story of Mahādeva appears in Xuanzang’s *juan* 99, well within the scope of the overlapping portion. Moreover, even in the unlikely event that the Buddhavarman translation originally did contain an account of

Mahādeva as an Oedipal criminal, in order to accept that version as the basis for the story in the JSTJ one would have to assume not only that the name of the protagonist was changed, which is a trivial matter, but that a calumnious story associated with one of the villains of Indian Buddhist history was subsequently intentionally applied to the Buddha himself, albeit in a past life. This, I believe, is hardly credible. If, then, it is most unlikely, if not impossible, that the JSTJ found its inspiration in the *Vibhāṣā* in Chinese, because the story almost certainly did not appear in Buddhavarman's version and because Xuanzang's version clearly postdates the JSTJ, what of the Indian sources of the *Vibhāṣā*? I have argued, in a recent book, that the *Vibhāṣā*'s narrative account of the schismatic Mahādeva is directly related to the story of Dharmaruci as preserved in the *Divyāvadāna*,<sup>116</sup> itself unknown in China, and no other likely sources are now known to be extant. What is important, moreover, is that reference to the utterance of the phrase "Oh, how painful it is!" is absent from the story in the *Divyāvadāna*. Although in the *Vibhāṣā* this ejaculation plays a part in the recitation of the fifth of the heretical Five Theses, and is related to the protagonist's failure to overcome his defilements, in the JSTJ the motivation is much more direct – despair over his sinful state. The existence of the JSTJ appears to provide evidence either for a different Indian transmission of the basic story, probably unrelated to the episode of Mahādeva, or for positing an otherwise unknown Indic tradition upon which Xuanzang's *Vibhāṣā* translation was based, or to which it is related. However, there is some additional evidence that a structurally similar version of the story circulated, perhaps even in India, in which the story element of the verbal expression of despair played a part, although the evidence for this tradition comes very much later, and from far away.

---

<sup>116</sup> See Silk 2008a. This also provides, inter alia, additional detail on other Indian versions of the same basic story, and some related, but brief, Chinese references. It is interesting, although almost certainly nothing other than dumb chance, that the Chinese *fāyuè* 法悦 which forms part of the title of the *Jifayue sheku tuoluoni jing*, could represent Dharmaruci, as Paul Harrison pointed out to me.



Thirteenth century Tibetan presentations of the story of Mahādeva contain reference to this episode. A good example for our purposes is the *rGya bod kyi chos 'byung rgyas pa* (“Extensive History of Buddhism in India and Tibet”) of the rNying ma pa author mKhas pa lde'u:<sup>117</sup>

Then, 110 years after the passing of the Teacher, there was a Venerable Mahādeva who was born in a merchant family. While his father was gone on trade, he slept with his mother. When his father returned, having deliberated with his mother, he killed his father. Concerned about their bad reputation, they fled to another country. There was an *arhat*-monk whom they had earlier patronized. When they met him there, out of concern that he might have spread their bad reputation, through a stratagem they offered him an invitation and killed him by giving him poison. Then after the mother slept with another, [Mahādeva] became jealous, and killed his mother as well. Thus did he commit three of the sins of immediate retribution. Still, his outlook was not inverted.

Having removed the impediments to his serious religious practice, going to another country he then requested initiation in the monastic communities, and this being given he was fully ordained [as a monk]. Since his intelligence and drive were great, he applied himself to religion, and thus he grew full of wisdom, such that the king of the land and all of the people honored him greatly.

He then became lustful, and pridefully he lied, saying: “I have obtained the fruit of arhatship.” His merit increased, and the king offered him an invitation [to attend him]. There [at court] he became enamored of the king’s consort. Since [she] saw him ejaculate, [she] asked: “If one is a saint, one has cut off the defilements, and thus does not produce semen, yet how is it that you produce semen?”

“I am tormented by Māra. Even though I have become an arhat (*\*āśaikṣa*), Devaputramāra places obstacles in the way of my goodness.” Because his disciples were given to idle chatter, he said to several of them: “You have obtained the status of Stream Winner, or Arhat, Lone buddha or Renunciant.”

<sup>117</sup> Chab spel tshe brtan phun tshogs 1987: 98.20ff. See also, for example, Sa skya Paṇḍita’s *sDom pa gsum gyi rab tu dbye ba* in Rhoton 2002: 325–326, trans. 172–174.

Since he said that, his retinue asked: “We don’t know anything at all, so how are we able to obtain these great fruits?”

[He replied] “Sure you have obtained them!” and said many such things.

On another occasion, having repented since he had lied in giving inverted teachings to his disciples, at night he was afflicted, and called out “Alas, alack, the great suffering!”

The assembly heard this, and said “What is the trouble?”

“There is no trouble at all.”

“Then why did you say ‘alas, alack’ they asked.

He said: “I was thinking of the Noble Path. If one does not call out, it will not be clear to one.” ...

Now, it is possible that thirteenth century Tibetan authors may have based themselves on, or been influenced by, traditions from the east, from China, as much as upon Indian legends.<sup>118</sup> Therefore, even setting aside their late date, these stories do not necessarily constitute evidence for the Indian origins of this Oedipal tale in this configuration. In this light, the remarkable parallelism between the narrative in the JSTJ and that in the *Vibhāṣā* must be due either to the reliance of the former on some version of the *Vibhāṣā* (or, in turn, its source(s)) circulating in India or Central Asia, or to a parallel transmission of this story which, nevertheless, was less closely aligned with the Dharmaruci story traditions than with that associating the same basic story with Mahādeva’s fifth “thesis,” that concerning the arhat’s nocturnal exclamation of pain.

## V. Thinking about classification

What the presence in the JSTJ of the story of Mahādeva, under the guise of the mysterious Zhetatuo, tells us about the origins of the scripture appears to be the following: although it is possible that the story was known in China before the translation of the *Vibhāṣā* by Xuanzang, in a form that was either not written or subsequently became entirely lost, such that now we can find traces of

---

<sup>118</sup> See Silk 2008b for a consideration of the Tibetan materials relevant to the legend of Mahādeva.

it nowhere other than in the JSTJ, there can be little question but that the narrative core of the JSTJ more or less directly reflects a genuine Indian tradition. And this is so no matter where the text as a whole was ultimately compiled or created. I will return to this point in a moment.

We should consider here a number of related concerns. First is just how the JSTJ is to be classified, in terms of genre. It calls itself, or is called by the sources which now preserve it, and many – but not all – works which refer to it, a *jing*, generally indicating in Buddhist technical usage, a *sūtra*. Yet, it lacks the formal structural features which characterize a *sūtra*, the stock opening and closing, above all, something which is, probably not incidentally, characteristic of the class of separate compilations or abbreviated abstracts, *biéshēng chāo*, mentioned above. It is possible that single *juan* independent versions do or did have these formal opening and closing formulas, which were removed when the content – the *dhāraṇī* and narrative – were embedded in other contexts, the works within which we now find the JSTJ.<sup>119</sup> At the same time, as we will see below, at least one later scholar, the thirteenth century Japanese monk Gyōnen, explicitly raises the point that this *dhāraṇī* is not a *sūtra*. The core of the work is, in fact, a *Jātaka*-style narrative, the central point of which is a basically typical self-promotion of the text itself. (It is worth pointing out that there is nothing tantric about the text at all, which is not surprising since there is nothing inherently tantric about *dhāraṇīs*.) The point of the story comprising the text – the story the text tells – is the efficacy of the text itself – or the *dhāraṇī* alone – to extinguish sin. It argues for this efficacy, interestingly, in two ways. First is the conventional approach of simply promising to eradicate evil karma for one who upholds, reads and recites the text itself. In addition, however, it also argues in a more philosophical, or at least sophisticated, manner, offering the removal of obstacles to meditative development, leading to peace of mind and magical

<sup>119</sup> In fact, such transformations were noticed traditionally. For instance, Huiyuan 慧遠 of the Jingyingsi 淨影寺 noted how the opening of Kumārajīva's translation of the *Daśabhūmika* was modified when it was placed in the larger Avataṃsaka collection; see *Weimo yiji* 維摩義記 T.1776 (XXXVIII) 425b24–26 (*juan* 1), cited by Funayama 2007: 3.

attainments, the ability to fly and to see all buddhas throughout the universe. It also, once again typically, grounds the authority of the text in the ‘historical fact’ that it was preached by buddhas of the past; it is from these buddhas that our buddha, Śākyamuni, the narrator of the account, was able to receive the text during a distant previous life when he was an Oedipal criminal. The *dhāraṇī* benefited him, and thus he preaches it – or we had better say, less technically, relates it – to us, to anyone whom it might likewise benefit.

I do not think that the fact that the text as we have it is not structurally a *sūtra* had any implications for the authority with which it might have been vested, such that, for instance, its failure to contain a prefatory “Thus I have heard” gave license to Chinese compilers to treat it with less reverence than they might have treated scriptures that looked ‘more canonical.’ Comparison with similar works allows us to think about questions like this, and we do have a number of such works, the presentation of which does not follow the canonically enshrined format of a *sūtra*. Perhaps the most famous of these is the so-called “Platform *Sūtra*” (short form, *Tan jing* 壇經), but this is not the only example. Therefore, it does not seem likely that the mere structural form of the JSTJ necessarily had, in this respect at least, any direct impact on its reception. A more interesting question may be how Indian this work is, not from the perspective of traditional Chinese receptions of the text, but from a modern historical viewpoint.

Now, the question of the status of works containing both Indic and local elements is not a new one, either to modern or traditional scholarship. Seventy years ago Alexander von Staël-Holstein discussed the status of the so-called Larger *Śūraṅgama-sūtra* (*Dafoding rulai miyin xiuzheng liaoyi zhupusa wanxing shoulengyan jing* 大佛頂如來密因修證了義諸菩薩萬行首楞嚴經). In his study he noticed the introduction provided this scripture by the Qianlong 乾隆 emperor in 1770 (or much more likely, in his name).<sup>120</sup> The emperor argued (or assumed?) that since the \**Sugatoṣṇīṣa-dhāraṇī* found within the *sūtra* entirely agrees with an Indian text,

<sup>120</sup> Staël-Holstein 1936. I was reminded of this article by a remark in Kapstein 2007.

the sūtra is manifestly authoritative (*de'i nang gi bde gshegs gtsug tor gyi gzungs rgya gar gyi dpe dang shin tu 'grig pas || mdo 'di tshad ma yin par mngon*). The question was cast as one of genuine, Indian scripture or Chinese forgery. In considering the arguments of a Chinese scholar published in 1934,<sup>121</sup> however, Staël-Holstein showed himself more tolerant of ambiguity. Rejecting the idea that the inclusion of a *dhāraṇī* with questionable transliterations calls into question the status of a work *in toto*, he wrote: “Neither can the Emperor’s view be accepted in its entirety (the *dhāraṇī* proves the authenticity of the larger *Śūraṅgama* as a whole), but we must admit that the *Śūraṅgama* (or *Sugatoṣṇīṣa*) *dhāraṇī* makes the thesis of the ultra-sceptics (the larger *Śūraṅgama* is a Chinese forgery from beginning to end) equally untenable.” Although Staël-Holstein evidently did not explicitly reject the dichotomy between authenticity and forgery entirely, he nevertheless seems to have traveled quite some distance down the path I am now exploring.

To conclude our investigation so far, then, despite the considerable circumstantial evidence, beginning with sūtra catalogues which are unable to provide any details about the translation of the work, and including the irregular mode of its transmission apparently centrally, although not exclusively, as an intrusion within other works, suggestive of an ‘apocryphal’ origin, we must conclude that the work nevertheless is, at least in part, genuinely and authentically Indian, even if we would question whether it should be called a “sūtra” as such (although Chinese tradition does so regard it). So how shall we classify it? Is it a translation, then? There are some indications casting doubt on the supposition that it is a strict translation of an Indian work, in the sense of preserving the formal features of an Indic original, or of representing a “literal” translation as such. In other words, there are reasons to doubt that there ever existed a text in India (or the Indic world?) having the contents, and in the shape, of the JSTJ as we now know it. This would seem to rule out calling it a translation as such.

---

<sup>121</sup> Li Yishao 李翊灼, “Foxue weishu bianlue” 佛學偽書辯略, in *Guoli zhongyang daxue wenyi congkan* 國立中央大學藝文叢刊 1/2: 7–46 [not seen].

Is it, then, a non-translation? The presence in the work of a narrative the Indic origins of which can be decisively proved, and which appears on the basis of presently available evidence to have been otherwise unavailable in China in the period to which the creation of the JSTJ belongs, strongly suggests that the JSTJ transmits genuinely Indian materials (directly, and not on the basis of some previous Sinitic tradition), even if their presentation may differ from the form(s) in which those materials were transmitted within the Indian world. (This, incidentally, leaves aside the whole issue of the linguistic form of the *dhāraṇī* itself, concerning which, at this point, as confessed above, I can conclude nothing.) In the absence of other evidence, it does certainly seem, then, that the JSTJ cannot be termed a non-translation in its entirety.

Is the text, then, both a translation and a non-translation? Is it, in other words, meaningful to say that the JSTJ is, simultaneously, both a translation and a non-translation, containing both genuine Indic and non-Indic elements? Or does the least bit of non-Indic content, like a crumb of bread on a Passover plate, spread contagion through the whole? What do we say of a work that was put together somewhere out of imported parts – is a Toyota assembled in Nebraska a Japanese or an American car? I am reminded here of what the author Paul Theroux said when asked by an interviewer – who seemed keen on the genre as a type of history – what he would call a work of historical narrative in which conversations to which the author did not have access are nevertheless recreated. Theroux replied: “I call it fiction.” This is one kind of answer, of the ‘one drop pollutes the pot’ kind, but it need not be ours. Taken to its logical extreme, this approach suggests that the mere act of translation definitively separates a work from its source, since any localization at all fundamentally cannot but alter a work in uncontrollable ways. This very real philosophical issue operates on a more basic level than the comparatively gross one I engage here, and is a problem for another day.

Finally, should we settle for saying that such works are neither translation nor non-translation, that, after all, the dichotomy itself is misleadingly, or even impossibly, posed? Is the most fruitful approach at this point to decide that we may have been asking the

wrong question, trying to fit a square peg in a round hole? What would it do to our appreciation of such scriptures were we to set aside the binary opposition between translation and non-translation altogether? Could this help us to see something we have previously been unable to visualize about the process of inculturation of Buddhism in China, about the creation of authority and the locus – or loci – of creativity, the nexus of which is centered precisely in this moment of intercultural scripture production?

Despite my playful evocation of the tetralemma, then, in the end these four possibilities may each, in their own ways, be equally true. And this very fact, I believe, has the potential to tell us an enormous amount about scripture production in Chinese Buddhism, and about the process of the creation of Chinese Buddhism as a whole. I will return to this basic point in the conclusion below.

## VI. The legacy of the *Jifayue sheku tuoluoni jing*

When I began this research, which grew out of my work on Mahādeva, I had no notion that I was doing more than following up a minor detail in an otherwise itself already sufficiently complicated quilt of stories and historical accounts. But as sometimes happens when one begins to tug absent-mindedly on a loose thread, unexpected things emerged; I discovered that this little *dhāraṇī* may have been more popular than I had supposed. We noticed above that it was known to a few Chinese authors. Aside from catalogue entries, the earliest such reference I know is that of Kuiji 窺基 (632–682), in his *Dasheng fayuan yilin zhang* 大乘法苑義林章, in which we find the following:<sup>122</sup>

It says in the *Mahāsāṃnipātasūtra*: The Buddha said: Infinite aeons ago I was still in the stage of being an ordinary person, named Zhetatuo. Living in the land of Jiatouluo, I engaged in sales and peddling, but was dishonest and lied, and did all sorts of evil deeds. It's impossible to fully detail them. At that time, stupidly insensitive, I killed my father and made love to my mother. Everyone in the land knew of this, and considered me not different from the six kinds of

<sup>122</sup> T.1861 (XLV) 307a15–22 (*juan* 3).

beasts. The king of the land desired me to be killed. Fearful, I left and set out for other regions. I became a *śramaṇa* [and practiced?] for thirty-seven years. Because of the obstacle of the five sins of immediate retribution, my mind could not find peace. Later, in order to beg for alms I took a large bowl. Within the bowl there was this *dhāraṇī* called ‘Collecting the Joy of the Teachings and Getting Rid of Suffering and Trouble.’ For a year I recited it without ceasing. Then I was able to attain meditative concentration.

大集經中。佛言。我本無數劫中處在凡夫。字遮他陀。在加倫羅國作賈客販賣，虛妄無實，造諸惡行。不可具說。是時，愚癡害父姪母。舉國知之與六畜無別。國王欲殺。吾怖往投異方，作沙門三十七年。以五逆罪障，心不得定。後因乞食，拾得一鉢。鉢中有此陀羅尼名集法呪捨苦難。經一年餘，誦持不絕。方得禪定。

<sup>1</sup> Read 悅

Here we have a relatively brief synopsis of the core narrative. At almost the same time, the Korean scholar Ūijök 義寂 cited the text in his *Posal kyebon-so* 菩薩戒本疏 at greater length, as follows:<sup>123</sup>

Therefore, the *Jifayue jing* says: Zhetatuo committed the five sins of immediate retribution, and was made to suffer by the king. At that time he was astonished and fearful, and became a *śramaṇa*. Living in another country, he practiced the ten good [precepts], did seated meditation and studied the Way. He wept night and day for thirty [sic!] years. Because of the obstacle of the five sins of immediate retribution, his mind could not find peace. In a mountain cave, he was always crying out “Oh, how painful it is! Oh, how painful it is! With what mental [technique?] can I get rid of this pain?” At one time, he was about to go out begging for alms. Sobbing with grief, he went down from the cave, toward a village. At that time he found a large bowl on the road. Within the bowl he saw there was the ‘*Dhāraṇī* on Collecting the Joy of the Teachings and Getting Rid of Suffering.’ Taking this scripture, without begging for alms he immediately returned to the cave joyously. He burned incense and offered worship, and piteously weeping and venerating it, he practiced the recitation of this scripture within the cave. After a year had passed, he was first able to extin-

<sup>123</sup> T.1814 (XL) 657a6–20 (*juan* 1). The text is also referred to slightly later in the commentary of Taehyōn 太賢, *Pōmmanggyōng kojōkki* 梵網經古迹記 T.1815 (XL) 716b10 (*juan* xia).



guish his transgressions. But because of the obstacle of his karma, he was not able to get it to enter his mind. At that time, he [ritually] washed and practiced for seven days. Like a beginning student, he worried and was not the least bit at ease. Practicing for seven days, his worry was unchanged. Mentally suffering, he did not know what to think. Therefore he contemplated the written form of the *dhāraṇī*, and after many perturbations, his mind was suddenly settled. Then he was delighted. Like a person who finds a hundred thousand gold *jīn* on the ground, that others did not know were there, inside he was endlessly joyous. Practicing for many years, he was able to fly without obstacle and see the buddhas of the three worlds in the ten directions.

故集法悅經云。遮他陀犯五逆罪爲王所掉。是時，驚怖即作沙門。在於他國，修行十善坐禪學道。晝夜泣淚，經三十年。以五逆罪障故，心不得定。於山窟中常舉聲哭苦哉。苦哉。當以何心去此苦也。彼於一時將欲乞食，悲歎下窟出詣村。時道中得一大鉢。鉢中見有集法悅捨苦陀羅尼。得此經已，即不乞食歡欣還窟。燒香禮拜，悲淚歎仰。窟中修習讀誦是經。經一年已，始得滅罪。以業障故，不能得入心。是時，即洗浴修行經七日。如童子初學慎不小使。行於七日如是慎無異。心中愁惱不知云何意。故思此陀羅尼字書。經於數反，心中忽定。時自欣悅。如人地得百千斤金人無知者，內悅不止。修行數年，飛行無礙，覩見十方三世諸佛。

Some centuries later, the Khitan-Liao monk Feizhuo 非濁 (d. 1063) in his *Sanbao ganying yaoliüelu* 三寶感應要略錄 quoted or closely paraphrased as follows.<sup>124</sup>

Infinite aeons long ago when Śākyamuni was an ordinary person he was named Zheta [sic!]. Living in the land of Jiatouluo, he engaged in sales and peddling, but was dishonest and lied, and did all sorts of evil deeds, killing his father and making love to his mother. After many years, all the people of the land all came to know of it, and they loudly proclaimed: 'Zheta killed his father and made love to his mother.' When [he] thought about it, [he considered himself] no different from the beasts. Then at night he lept over the city walls, and fled and hastened toward a deep marsh.

The king of the land, Pisheluo, announced to the people of the country: 'This fellow has committed sexual perversities and immoral acts. Whoever can lay hands on him will be handsomely rewarded.' Then

<sup>124</sup> T.2084 (LI) 839c7–23 (*juan zhong*).

each and every person in the country eagerly desired to get hold of him. He left the country, and became a *śramaṇa*. In another country he practiced seated meditation and studied the Way. He wept day and night for thirty-seven years. Because of the obstacle of having committed the five sins of immediate retribution, his mind [was never at rest].<sup>125</sup> For thirty-seven years he lived in a cave in the mountains, raising his voice and crying out in distress. Sobbing with grief, he went down from the cave to beg for alms, and then, on the road, found a large bowl. Within it there was a *sūtra* box, but only one *sūtra* inside, the ‘*Mahāsammipāta Dhāraṇī Sūtra* on Collecting the Joy of the Teachings and Getting Rid of Suffering.’ This scripture can remove the great transgression produced by the five sins of immediate retribution committed through hundreds of millions of aeons of rebirth. If there is a person who upholds, reads and recites it, he will never fall into the three unfavorable realms. Why? Because it was preached by the buddhas of the past when they attained *nirvāṇa*.

At that time, having obtained this scripture, he did not go begging for alms, but immediately returned to the cave joyously. He burned incense and offered worship, and piteously weeping and venerating it, he practiced the recitation of this scripture within the cave. After a year had passed, he was first able to [extinguish his transgressions].<sup>126</sup> But because of the obstacle of his karma, he was not able to make it enter his mind. After passionately practicing for years, he was able to fly without obstacle and see the buddhas of the ten directions.

釋迦昔無數劫中。在凡夫時名遮他。在加倫羅國作於商客販賣活。虛妄無實，造諸惡行。害父愛母。逕由數年，舉國人民一皆知之。稱聲唱言。遮他陀害父愛母。爾時思念，與畜無異。時夜跳城，奔走趣於深澤。

國王毘闍羅告國人民。此又姪癡無道。其有能得者，當重賜寶物。國人各各受募欲捕其身。即出國作沙門。在於他國坐禪學道。晝夜泣淚，逕三十七年。以五逆障故，心不得[*text missing?*] 三十七年在於山窟，舉聲泣哭。悲歎下窟乞食。時道中地得一大鉢。中有一函經，更無餘經。唯有大集法悅捨陀羅尼經。此經能除百億劫生死五逆大罪。若有受持讀誦者，終不墮三途。何以故。過恒河沙諸佛所說故。

<sup>125</sup> Perhaps five or six characters appear to have dropped from the text here.

<sup>126</sup> Again, some text is evidently missing here.

是時，得此經已，即不乞食，歡喜向窟中。燒香禮拜，悲淚讚仰。於窟中修習讀誦。經一年始得[*text missing?*]。以罪業障故，不能入心。懷更數年修行，飛行無礙，見十方諸佛。

As is evident, Chinese, Khitan and Korean authors all noticed the work, or to be more cautious, all referred to its story. The same was true further east as well. The ninth-century Japanese Tendai scholar Annen 安然 notes the JSTJ in his catalogue *Shoajari shingon mikkyō burui sōroku* 諸阿闍梨真言密教部類總錄 as an example of a text which contains methods to ward off disease *jobyōhō* 除病法, apparently considered as an independent text since its extent is mentioned as one *juan*.<sup>127</sup> But this reference does not necessarily indicate any first-hand familiarity with the text, the more so since the JSTJ does not claim for itself any particular efficacy with respect to disease. Annen does not stop with this reference, however, and other evidence makes it quite clear that he did know the JSTJ, directly or indirectly. In another of his works, the *Futsū jubo-satsukai kōshaku* 普通授菩薩戒廣釋 of 882, he refers to the text as follows:<sup>128</sup>

Therefore the *Jifayue jing* says: Zheta [sic!], having committed five crimes and being made to suffer by the king, was fearful and became a *śramaṇa*. Living in another country, he practiced for thirty [sic!] years. Going out begging, on the road he obtained a large bowl, within which was the ‘*Dhāraṇī* on Collecting the Joy of the Teachings and Getting Rid of Suffering.’ He recited it for one year, and from the first

<sup>127</sup> T.2176 (LV) 1122a25, b3 (*kan jō*): 佛說集法悅捨苦陀羅尼經一卷。A note indicates that the text was not available in the library of the Bonshakuji 梵釋寺, but is listed in its catalogue, 梵釋闕本, 今有錄中載之。Annen’s work is in principle a compilation of the catalogues of works brought to Japan by eight Buddhist monks who visited China and collected esoteric scriptures, but also contains additional materials. See Misaki 1968.

<sup>128</sup> T.2381 (LXXIV) 759b2–7 (*juan sheng*). See also 773b6–7: 集法悅云。誦陀羅尼滅五逆飛行十方。此經既滅五逆。則知亦滅七逆。This text is discussed by Groner 1990, who refers to this quotation on p. 272, and 287 n. 65. See also Groner 1987. For the context of the debate over whether commission of a sin of immediate retribution disqualifies one from receiving the bodhisattva precepts, see Kubota 1984.

was able to extinguish his transgressions. For seven days he contemplated the letters of the *dhāraṇī*, and his mind was suddenly settled. As if finding a thousand gold pieces, he was able to fly and see the buddhas of the three worlds.

故集法悅經云。遮他之犯五逆罪，爲王所悼怖作沙門。在於他國，修行三十年。乞食，道中得大鉢。中有集法悅捨苦陀羅尼。讀誦一年。始得滅罪。七日思惟陀羅尼字。心中忽定。如得千金。飛行覩見三世諸佛。

The use of the form Zheta instead of Zhetatuo and the length of practice designated as thirty rather than thirty-seven years suggest Annen may have known the JSTJ indirectly. What remains mysterious, however, is what his sources might have been. Üjök's commentary speaks of thirty years, but has the protagonist's name as Zhetatuo, while Feizhuo, who does use the form Zheta, belongs to a period two centuries *after* Annen. This suggests that there existed intermediate sources, either now lost or as yet undiscovered, which provided the bases upon which some authors in China, Korea and Japan retold the story of the JSTJ. However, the often nearly literal recounting of the stories rules out an oral source, and makes it certain that all these authors drew the story from a written account directly related to that we now know.

A later Japanese work of the monk Gyōnen 凝然 (1240–1321) also cites the JSTJ, in this case clearly following on the tradition of the above-noted Korean commentaries on the Brahma's Net Precepts based on the *Fangwang jing* 梵網經. What is particularly interesting about Gyōnen's citation in his *Bonmō kaihonsho nichijushō* 梵網戒本疏日珠鈔, dating to 1318, is that he cites the narrative twice.<sup>129</sup> First, he attributes his abbreviated citation to the *Jifayue jing* and, interestingly, this version, like that of Annen, uses the name Zheta and mentions a time period of thirty years. On the other hand, since it contains considerably more detail, it cannot be based on Annen's version (or not on it alone). Gyōnen's first recounting is as follows:

<sup>129</sup> The passage as a whole is T. 2247 (LXII) 239a8–b3 (*juan* 46).

Therefore the *Jifayue jing* says: Zheta having committed five sins of immediate retribution was made to suffer by the king. At that time, surprised and fearful he immediately became a *śramaṇa*. Living in another country, he practiced the ten good [precepts], did seated meditation and studied the Way. Day and night he wept for thirty years. Because of the obstacle of the five sins of immediate retribution, his mind was not settled. In a mountain cave, he always raised his voice and cried out “Oh, how painful it is! With what mental [technique] can I get rid of this pain?” At one time, he was about to go out begging for alms. When, sobbing with grief, he went down from the cave toward a village, he found a large bowl on the road. Within the bowl he saw there was the ‘*Dhāraṇī* on Collecting the Joy of the Teachings and Getting Rid of Suffering.’ Taking this scripture, without begging for alms he immediately returned to the cave joyously. He burned incense and offered worship, and piteously weeping and adoring its merits, he practiced the recitation of this scripture within the cave. After a year had passed, he was first able to extinguish his transgressions. But because of the obstacle of his karma, he was not able to make it enter his mind. At that time, he straightaway washed and practiced for seven days. Like a beginning student, he was worried and not the least bit at ease. Practicing for seven days, his worry was unchanged. Mentally suffering, he did not know what to think. Therefore, he contemplated the written form of the *dhāraṇī*, and after many perturbations, his mind was suddenly settled. Then he was delighted. Like a person who finds a hundred thousand gold *jīn* on the ground, that others did not know were there, inside he was endlessly joyous. Practicing for many years, he was able to fly without obstacle and see the buddhas of the three worlds in the ten directions.

故集法悅經云。遮他之犯五逆罪，爲王所掉。是時，驚怖即作沙門。在於他國，修行十善坐禪學道。晝夜泣淚經三十年。以五逆罪障故，心不得定。於山窟中，常舉聲哭。苦哉。當以何心去此苦也。彼於一時，將欲乞食，悲歎下窟出詣村時，道中得一大鉢。鉢中見有集法悅捨苦陀羅尼。得此經已，即不乞食，歎欣還窟。燒香禮拜，悲淚歎欣。窟中修習讀誦是經。經一年已，始得滅罪。以業障故，不能得入心。是時即洗浴，修行經七日。如童子初學慎不小便。行於七日，如是憤憤無異。心中愁惱不知云何意故。思此陀羅尼字書，經於數反，心中忽定。時自欣悅。如人地得百千斤金，人無知者，內悅不止。修行數年，飛行無礙，覩見十方三世諸佛。

After a brief comment, Gyōnen continues, however:

The *Guan xukongzang pusa jing* explains the matter of this extermination of transgression. *Jifayue* is the name of the *dhāraṇī*, not the original name of the scripture. Although the matter of extinguishing transgression is explained in that scripture, it does not speak of receiving the precepts. Therefore, Ūijök did not permit confession of the sins of immediate retribution through taking the precepts. This *Guan xukongzang jing* is contained in the *Mahāsamnipāta-sūtra*.

He then continues as follows:

The Tathāgata Śākyamuni, long ago during uncountable aeons ago when he was still in the stage of being an ordinary being, was called Zhehuata [sic!]. Living in the land Jialunluo [read: Jiutuoluo] he was a peddler and salesman. He performed all sorts of evil deeds, even as severe as the sins of immediate retribution. The king heard of this and reproved him. Frightened and fearful, he left the country and immediately became a *śramaṇa*. He practiced the ten good [precepts], did seated meditation and studied the Way. Reciting the *dhāraṇī* he extinguished his transgression and attained meditative concentration. When he had diligently practiced, the sins of immediate retribution were extinguished.

觀虛空藏菩薩經說此滅罪事。集法悅者是陀羅尼名，非經本名。雖彼經中說滅罪事，不言受戒。故寂法師不許逆罪懺滅受戒。此虛空藏經在大集經中。

釋迦如來昔本無數劫中處凡夫時，字遮化他。在加論<sup>1</sup>邏國商客販賣。造諸惡行乃至逆罪。王聞責罰。驚怖出國即作沙門。修習十善坐禪學道，誦陀羅尼滅罪得定。既懃修習逆罪消滅。

<sup>1</sup> Read 倫 for 論

This passage demonstrates that for Gyōnen, in the early fourteenth century, the JSTJ was known and regarded as authoritative. Or it may be better to put it slightly differently. Gyōnen makes an explicit differentiation between the *Jifayue sheku tuoluoni* and its source in the GXPJ by saying: “The *Guan xukongzang pusa jing* explains the matter of this extermination of transgression. *Jifayue* is the name of the *dhāraṇī*, not the original name of the scripture.” Therefore, he is explicitly not recognizing the *Jifayue sheku tuoluoni* as a *sūtra*, but restricting the reference to the *dhāraṇī*. Especially in this light, what is interesting about Gyōnen’s use of the text, and the earlier notice of Annen as well, of which Gyōnen was surely aware, as

with earlier Chinese and Korean authors, is that the *dhāraṇī* in question is not itself quoted. Apparently the narrative describing the efficacy of the *dhāraṇī* is enough, at least in the contexts in which the story is invoked, which are polemical and not ritual. This might suggest that the *dhāraṇī* was somehow subordinated to its explanatory narrative, at least in such contexts.

Even if this might have been true for the medieval authors quoted above, however, it is manifestly not the case in Edo Japan. That the *dhāraṇī per se*, in the sense of the transcribed ‘spell,’ was not forgotten (or was later rediscovered) is proved by two interesting Edo period sources.

The Saitama Prefectural Museum (Saitama Kenritsu Hakubutsukan 埼玉県立博物館)<sup>130</sup> possesses a single one-sided woodblock of the *Jifayue sheku tuoluoni*, of uncertain date, said to have come from the Kandōin 甘堂院, a Rinzai temple in Kuki 久喜 city in Saitama Prefecture.<sup>131</sup> This block contains the Chinese text of the *dhāraṇī*, with interlinear reading in a mixture of *hiragana* and *katakana*, and a postface in Japanese, signed by Motomura Chikō 本村智廣 of Kuki, Bushū 武州 (= Musashi, the old kuni comprising present day Saitama-ken). The Chinese text of the *dhāraṇī* reads as follows (I preserve the line breaks):<sup>132</sup>

佛說集法悅捨苦陀羅尼  
 南無佛陀蛇南無達磨蛇南無僧伽蛇  
 南無毘首陀遮蛇南無阿伽竭<sup>1</sup>遮蛇  
 南無摩訶薩婆伽利蛇多擲哆姪<sup>2</sup>彌利  
 婆 毘婆彌留遮陀檀摩陀那闍那啼知

<sup>130</sup> Now Saitama Prefectural Museum of History and Folklore, Saitama Kenritsu Rekishi to Minzoku no Hakubutsukan 埼玉県立歴史と民俗の博物館.

<sup>131</sup> The following is based on the research reported in Hariya 1984. This is one of four blocks presented to the museum in 1981; no information is offered about the other three blocks.

<sup>132</sup> The reading is Hariya’s since, despite my efforts at digital manipulation, I was not able to massage the scan of the published photograph I received from my friend Funayama Tōru to a point where I could reliably read it.



沘利婆 𑖀婆遮蛇那蛇婆羅薩摩訶  
 唏知沘利央求知利默求知利比婆薩  
 婆蛇那毘姪<sup>2</sup>婆闍呵陀舍地輸薩婆娑  
 羅三慕鉢沘波波波利摩訶阿那莎呵

<sup>1</sup> Misreading or miswriting 淨 <sup>2</sup> Or 姪?

The following postface reads:<sup>133</sup>

It says in the canon: This *dhāraṇī* is the secret essential expression of the buddhas. If someone were to once ..., then the five sins of immediate retribution committed over hundreds of thousands of aeons will disappear. Moreover, if one were to place it in his pocket,<sup>134</sup> even if he were to enter hell, thanks to the merits of the spell, the sufferings of all the sinners would cease. In every generation the buddhas, at the time of their entry into *nirvāṇa*, entrust [this *dhāraṇī*] to the bodhisattvas and teach it to living beings. Lord Śākyamuni was pleased to copy it out with his own hand for his father King Śuddhodhana, and placed it in his coffin. All the more reason for living beings of the future to place the spell in their pockets and at the death of a loved one to place it in the coffin. However evil the individual is, there is not the slightest doubt that he will be free of the evil destinies and reborn in the Pure Land. Therefore, intending to spread the benefit [of this *dhāraṇī*] broadly, I am having it printed [from this very block].

大蔵にいはいく。この陀羅尼は諸佛秘密の要文なり。もし人ひとたび  
 □□ぬる時は百億ごうの五逆罪を除くとなり。又、懐中へ入れたれば、  
 たどひ地獄に入るとも神呪の徳によって一切罪人の苦しみを止むとな  
 り。代々の諸佛御入滅の節は必ず諸菩薩へ御付嘱有りて衆生に授け  
 たまふとあり。釈迦世尊は御父浄飯大王の為に御手づから書写遊ば  
 し御棺の中に納めたまふ。まして未来の衆生この神呪を懐中するか又  
 は不幸の節棺中に納める時は、いかなる罪惡の人たりとも惡道をいで  
 て浄土に生まることいささか疑なしとなり。よつて廣く利やくを思ふ  
 て印刷する者なり。

<sup>133</sup> As with the Chinese text, I offer the transcription given by Hariya, although it is somewhat normalized, rewritten in modern forms of characters, and so on. It appears to me that all *kanji* in the original are provided with interlinear *kana* reading (*rubi*), although these are for the most part illegible to me on the photograph.

<sup>134</sup> The sense here appears to be: carry it on his person.



武州久喜本村智廣印刷

It is quite likely that the same piety which lies behind the sponsorship of the woodblock and its printing also informed the creation of a second Edo artifact from Saitama, a hexagonal stone pillar dated 1788.<sup>135</sup> The pillar serves as a grave marker for the Arai 新井 and Wogihara 荻原 families at the Seiryūzan Kōtokuin 青龍山廣徳院, a Sōtō temple in Hirota, Kawasato-mura 川里村広田 (from 2001 Kawasato-machi 町, Kōnosu 鴻巣 city, geographically quite close to Kuki).<sup>136</sup> The six sides of the pillar contain the following text (the division is that on the pillar; each paragraph represents a face):

雪峯銀盛居士  
利山妙月大姉

佛說集法悅捨苦陀羅尼曰  
南無佛陀蛇南無達磨蛇南  
無僧伽蛇南無毘首陀遮蛇

南無阿伽竭浮遮蛇南無摩  
訶薩婆伽利蛇多擲哆姪彌  
利婆 彌留遮陀檀麼陀那

利天明八年戊申八月初四日  
雪

闍那唏知泚利婆 彌婆遮蛇  
那蛇婆羅薩摩訶唏知泚利  
婁求知利默求知利薩婆薩

婆蛇那毘姪<sup>1</sup>婆闍呵陀舍地  
輸薩婆羅三慕鉢泚婆利摩  
訶阿那薩婆莎呵

<sup>1</sup> Or 姪?

Several things are evident here. First, the grave marker (or should we call it a *dhāraṇī* pillar?) does not reproduce the text of the

<sup>135</sup> The year is given both by reign title and year and by stem and branch, followed by the month and day: 天明八年戊申八月初四日.

<sup>136</sup> The original situation of the pillar, however, is not clear, according to Hariya 1984: 132.

woodblock, despite the close chronological as well as geographical relation between the two. Although on internal evidence both seem to have their respective origins in the version of the *dhāraṇī* transmitted in the TZ – note the readings 南無摩訶薩婆伽利蛇, 留遮陀, 泐利, 陀舍地輸 and use of 罽 – neither corresponds exactly to any version I have seen so far. This makes sense, since even if the Japanese carvers directly used a canonical text, it would have most likely been one produced, either by printing or hand-copying, within Japan. There must have been, then, intermediate copies, or a transmission of the *dhāraṇī* independent of the canons so far recorded as circulating in Japan. The existence of the text early on in Japan is, in fact, attested in a census of Nara 奈良 period manuscripts, which lists a copy of the JSTJ written in 743 (Temyō 天平 15).<sup>137</sup> The subsequent fate of the text in Japan has not, as far as I know, been investigated, but it is likely that it continued to be copied in later centuries. In addition, it seems likely that the patron of the Edo period grave marker was somehow aware of the tradition which gave rise to the contemporaneous woodblock print. He may even have been explicitly aware of the funereal function suggested in the postface, with this awareness motivating the choice of inscription,<sup>138</sup> especially since the narrative accompanying the *dhāraṇī* proper in JSTJ provides little explicit motivation for any such association, although it does mention the utility of the *dhāraṇī* in hell. It would almost certainly be going too far to suggest upon this basis that we can assume the patron to have believed the deceased to have committed a sin of immediate retribution – archetypically, the murder of a parent – although this is not absolutely impossible.<sup>139</sup> Further speculation about the popularity and influ-

<sup>137</sup> Ishida 1930: 91 (of part 2) lists as §1759 a reference to a manuscript recorded in the *Dainippon Komonjo* 大日本古文書 8.167.

<sup>138</sup> I owe this suggestion to William Bodiford; something similar is probably implied by Hariya's comments on p. 136.

<sup>139</sup> It is conceivable that a search through Edo period legal records might still reveal some facts of interest. However, Mr. David Eason, a graduate student at UCLA, was generous enough to check through the *Saitama-ken shi* 埼玉県史 but, as he writes, he “was unable to turn up anything relating to this particular case. This rules out finding a lead in

ence of the JSTJ, as a unit or as a spell alone, in Japan must await further evidence.

## VII. Conclusions

All of the above leaves us, then, with a *dhāraṇī* – a magical spell – capable of erasing the karmic guilt of the worst sins imaginable in Buddhist thought, the five sins of immediate retribution. The *dhāraṇī*'s efficacy is attested by the Jātaka account appended to the *dhāraṇī* itself, although it was usual for the latter to be cited independently of the former. There is evidence from Japan, on the other hand, that the *dhāraṇī* itself did circulate, sometimes along with a vernacular paraphrase or “executive summary,” as we see from the woodblock studied above, and the *dhāraṇī* appears alone as well, as on the Saitama grave marker. I have not so far been able to trace the *dhāraṇī* in Indian or Tibetan sources, and if it is truly unknown this absence might be taken by some modern scholars as a sort of warning sign. However, for later Chinese, Korean and Japanese authors there could hardly have arisen doubts about the authenticity of works well accepted into the received canons, even if embedded within other works. Therefore, it is unlikely that the authenticity of the JSTJ or its *dhāraṇī* would have been questioned much, if at all, in the period after the canonicity of the text was firmly established in and by the sūtra catalogues in the sixth century. Moreover, even independent transmissions of a one *juan* JSTJ would have been unlikely to foster suspicion, since just such a work is recorded even in early scripture catalogues without any explicit indications of doubt, while in Japan Annen's catalogue likewise records the work without comment. This, then, may be one of the first lessons to take away from such studies. In the long run, by the fate it has ordained for a given scripture the tradition itself tells us how the work was judged. Therefore, questions such as how to classify a work or class of works, or even Chinese translations as a whole, are in many respects *our* questions. This does not, of course, render them illegitimate. However, it does mean that in thinking

---

any printed sources relating to the village in which these families [Arai and Wogihara] were active.”

about them, the farther we distance and liberate these questions from emic notions such as “genuine” and “apocryphal,” the better. Indigenous classifications will serve as data for our considerations, but traditional categories do not map well onto our own; traditional questions and our questions are quite different, and therefore traditional answers cannot substitute for the answers we for our part are obliged to produce.

It might be argued that we may not have advanced much toward a practical and useful answer, or set of answers, to the question of how those interested in Indian Buddhism should approach texts in Chinese, the authenticity of which is somehow suspect. And it is true that our narrow investigations have not generated a check-list or set of criteria through which we might judge the authenticity (which is to say, “Indianness”) of works in Chinese, and evaluate their utility for any study of Indian Buddhism. But we could hardly have expected to produce such a mechanical result. The present investigations have, I believe, nevertheless made it clear that through close studies of texts such as the JSTJ we can begin to make progress in this regard. As a first step the erasure from our tool-kit of the dichotomy of “genuine” and “apocryphal” is a necessary prerequisite. These labels reflect polemical positions entirely foreign to our scholarly projects, and are generated by criteria thoroughly different from those which inform our efforts. Second, we *are* moved forward by the evidence demonstrating that we are not justified in neglecting the utility for studies of Indian Buddhism of a work in Chinese simply because it does not fit the expected parameters of translations. In a number of respects the JSTJ does not fulfill our expectations of what a translation from an Indic work should look like. I have argued that it nevertheless does allow us to state with confidence that some version of the story we know otherwise as the tale of Mahādeva, including the episode of the protagonist’s night-time cries of psychic pain, must have circulated within the Indian world in some fashion unconnected to the schism narrative within which the *Vibhāṣā* presents its account. This does more than confirm something that we otherwise knew about Indian Buddhism, proceeding to provide new evidence available only from this source. It may well be that comparatively few such works in Chinese can be shown to provide comparably reliable and unique

information about Indian matters. But until we carry out extensive investigations of this still almost entirely unexplored literature, we will remain ignorant of what treasures may lie unnoticed in the Chinese canons.

In conclusion, while it is premature to propose any sort of guidelines for the student of Indian Buddhism who wishes to make use of works in Chinese other than those obviously and verifiably translated from an Indic original, it would likewise be a mistake to dismiss the utility or value of such works. The existence of texts like the JSTJ demonstrates the potential to discover in such materials new and important sources for studies not only of the inculturation of Buddhism in China but for the Buddhism of the Indian world as well.

## Literature

- Braarvig, Jens. 1993. *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*. Volume I: *Edition of extant manuscripts with an index*. Volume II: *The Tradition of Imperishability in Buddhist Thought*. Oslo: Solum Forlag.
- Buswell, Robert E., Jr. 1990. "Introduction: Prolegomenon to the Study of Buddhist Apocryphal Scriptures." In Robert E. Buswell, Jr., ed., *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press: 1–30.
- Campany, Robert Ford. 1991. "Notes on the Devotional Uses and Symbolic Functions of Sutra Texts as Depicted in Early Chinese Buddhist Miracle Tales and Hagiographies." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 14/1: 28–72.
- . 1993. "Buddhist Revelation and Taoist Translation in Early Medieval China." *Taoist Resources* 4/1: 1–29.
- Chab spel tshé brtan phun tshogs. 1987. *mKhas pa lde'us mdzad pa'i rGya bod kyi chos 'byung rgyas pa* (Lhasa: Bod ljong mi dmangs dpe skrun khang).
- Demiéville, Paul. 1978. *Répertoire du Canon Bouddhique Sino-Japonais. Édition de Taishō (Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō)*. Fascicule Annexe du Hōbōgirin. 2nd edition. Paris: Libraire d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve / Tokyo: Maison Franco-Japonaise.
- De Visser, M[arinus] W[illem]. 1931. *The Bodhisattva Ākāśagarbha (Kokūzō) in China and Japan*. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Afdeling Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks,

Deel 30/1. Amsterdam: Uitgave van de Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam.

Funayama Tōru 船山徹. 2002. “‘Kan’yaku’ to ‘Chūgoku senjutsu’ no aida: Kanbun Butten ni tokuyū na keitai o megutte” 「漢訳」と「中国撰述」の間 – 漢文仏典に特有な形態をめぐって [Mediating ‘Chinese Translation’ and ‘Chinese Composition’: Regarding some figures special to Chinese Buddhist literature]. *Bukkyō Shigaku Kenkyū* 仏教史学研究 45/1: 1–28.

———. 2006. “Masquerading as Translation: Examples of Chinese Lectures by Indian Scholar-Monks in the Six Dynasties Period.” *Asia Major* 19/1–2: 39–55.

———. 2007. “‘Nyoze gamon’ ka ‘nyoze gamon ichiji’ ka – Rokuchō Zuitō ‘nyoze gamon’ kaishakushi kanken” 「如是我聞」か「如是我聞一時」か – 六朝隋唐「如是我聞」解釋史管見 [‘Thus I have heard’ or ‘Thus I have heard at one time’: Six Dynasties, Sui and Tang interpretations]. Unpublished.

Groner, Paul. 1987. “Annen, Tankei, Henjō, and Monastic Discipline in the Tendai School: The Background of the *Futsū jubosatsukai kōshaku*.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 14/2–3: 129–159.

———. 1990. The Fan-wang ching and Monastic Discipline in Japanese Tendai: A Study of Annen’s *Futsū jubosatsukai kōshaku*.” In Robert E. Buswell, Jr., ed., *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press: 251–290.

Hariya Kōichi 針谷浩一. 1984. “Chōsa nōto *Bussetsu Shūhōetsu Shaku Darani* ni kakawaru futatsu no shiryō ni tsuite” 調査ノート「佛説集法悦捨苦陀羅尼」に関わるふたつの資料について [Two materials concerning the *Jifayue sheku tuoluoni*]. *Saitama Kenritsu Hakubutsukan Kiyō* 埼玉県立博物館紀要 11: 131–137.

Hayashiya Tomojirō 林屋友次郎. 1945. *Iyaku Kyōrui no Kenkyū* 異譯經類の研究. Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko 東洋文庫.

Ishida Mosaku 石田茂作. 1930. *Shakyō yori mitaru Narachō Bukkyō no Kenkyū* 寫經より見たる奈良朝佛教の研究. Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko 東洋文庫 (Tōyō Bunko Ronsō 東洋文庫論叢 11).

Kapstein, Matthew T. 2007. “The Tibetan *Yulanpen Jing*.” In Matthew T. Kapstein and Brandon Dotson, eds. *Contributions to the Cultural History of Early Tibet*. Leiden: Brill: 219–246.

Kubota Tetsumasa 窪田哲正. 1984. “Enkai ni okeru shichigyaku jukai no mondai: Shōshin, Enrin, Eisai no setusu o megutte” 円戒における七逆受戒の問題 – 証真・円琳・栄西の説をめぐって [On the problem of the *shichigyaku-jukai* in Precepts for Immediate and Perfect Enlightenment

- (*enkai*). *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 32/2: 192–195 (750–753).
- Kuo, Li-ying. 1994. *Confession et contrition dans le bouddhisme chinois du Ve au Xe siècle*. Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient (Publications de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient, Monographies 170).
- . 2000. “Sur les apocryphes bouddhiques chinois.” *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 87/2: 677–705.
- Katō Seishin 加藤精神. 1950. “Hakushuji Daiten no kenkyū” 舶主兒大天の研究 [A study of ship captain's son Mahādeva]. *Ishii Kyōju Kanreki Kinen Bukkyō Ronkō* 石井教授還暦起念 佛教論攷. *Jōdogaku* 浄土學 22/23: 32–43 (Tokyo: Taishō Daigaku Jōdogaku Kenkyūkai 大正大學浄土學研究會).
- Mair, Victor. 1986. “An Asian Story of the Oedipus Type.” *Asian Folklore Studies* 45/1: 19–32.
- Misaki Ryōshū 三崎良周. 1968. “Annen no Shoajari shingon mikkyō burui sōroku ni tsuite” 安然の諸阿闍梨眞言密教部類總録について [On “A Catalogue of the Shingon Esoteric Buddhist Canons brought into Japan” by Annen]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究: 98–105 (572–579).
- Morohashi Tetsuji 諸橋轍次. 1955–1960. *Dai Kanwa Jiten* 大漢和辭典. Tokyo: Daishūkan shoten 大修館書店.
- Ochiai Toshinori 落合俊典. 2003. “Darani zasshu shoshū no kyōten ni tsuite” 『陀羅尼雜集』所収の經典について [On some sūtras of the *Tuoluoni zaji*]. *Journal of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies / Kokusai Bukkyō Daigakuin Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō* 国際仏教大学院大学研究紀要 6: 59–85.
- Okabe Kazuo 岡部和雄. 1971. “Sōyū no gigikyōkan to shōkyōkan” 僧祐の疑偽經觀と抄經觀 [Sengyou's View of Pseudo-sūtra]. *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyōgakubu Ronshū* 駒沢大学佛教学部論集 2: 63–74.
- Ono Genmyō 小野玄妙. 1932–1935. *Bussho Kaisetsu Daijiten* 佛書解説大辭典 (Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha 大東出版社).
- Rhoton, Jared Douglas. 2002. *A Clear Differentiation of the Three Codes: Essential Distinctions among the Individual Liberation, Great Vehicle, and Tantric Systems. The sDom gsum rab dbye and Six Letters*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Shih, Robert. 1968. *Biographies des Moines Eminents (Kao Seng Tchouan) de Houei-kiao*. Louvain: Institut Orientaliste (Bibliothèque du Muséon 54).

- Silk, Jonathan A. 1997. "The Composition of the *Guan Wuliangshoufo-jing*: Some Buddhist and Jaina Parallels to its Narrative Frame." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 25/2: 181–256.
- 2002. "What, If Anything, is Mahāyāna Buddhism? Problems of Definitions and Classifications." *Numen* 49/4: 355–405.
- 2007. "Good and Evil in Indian Buddhism: The Five Sins of Immediate Retribution." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 35: 253–286.
- 2008a. *Riven By Lust: Incest and Schism in Indian Buddhist Legend and Historiography*. University of Hawaii Press.
- 2008b. "The Indian Buddhist Mahādeva in Tibetan Sources." *Indo Tetsugaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* インド哲学仏教学研究 15: 27–55.
- Staël-Holstein, Baron Alexander von. 1936. "The Emperor Ch'ien-Lung and the Larger *Śūraṅgamasūtra*." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 1: 136–46 + plates.
- Strickmann, Michel. 1996. *Mantras et mandarins: Le bouddhisme tantrique en Chine*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- 2002. *Chinese Magical Medicine*. Edited by Bernard Faure. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Tokiwa Daijō 常盤大定. 1938. *Gokan yori Sōsei ni itaru Yakkyō Sōroku* 後漢より宋齊に至る訳経総録. Reprint: Kokusho Kankōkai 国書刊行会, 1973.
- 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: 31–74.
- Tsukinowa Kenryū 月輪賢隆. 1971. "Butten no shūshi" 仏典の終始 [Buddhist texts from beginning to end]. Reprinted in *Butten no Hihanteki Kenkyū* 仏典の批判的研究. Kyoto: Hyakkaen 百華苑, 1981): 5–173.
- Xiao Dengfu 蕭登福. 1994. *Daojiao Shuyi yu Mijiao Dianji* 道教術儀與密教典籍. Taipei: Xinwen feng 新文豐.
- Zacchetti, Stefano. 2005. *In Praise of the Light: A Critical Synoptic Edition with an Annotated Translation of Chapters 1–3 of Dharmarakṣa's Guang zan jing 光讚經, Being the Earliest Chinese Translation of the Larger Prajñāpāramitā*. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica VIII).