

# JIABS

Journal of the International  
Association of Buddhist Studies



Volume 31 Number 1-2 2008 (2010)

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

JIABS is published twice yearly.

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

Address books for review to:

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

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

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

University of Lausanne  
CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

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

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

Fax: +41 21 692 29 35

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

Cover: Cristina Scherrer-Schaub

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

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

Print: Ferdinand Berger & Söhne

## EDITORIAL BOARD

KELLNER Birgit  
KRASSER Helmut  
Joint Editors

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

# JIABS

Journal of the International  
Association of Buddhist Studies

Volume 31 Number 1–2 2008 (2010)

## Obituaries

Jonathan A. SILK

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

## Articles

Diwakar ACHARYA

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

## Early Chinese Buddhist translations

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

Guest editor: Max Deeg

Max DEEG

*Introduction* . . . . . 79

Max DEEG

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

Hubert DURT

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

Toru FUNAYAMA

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

Andrew GLASS

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

Paul HARRISON

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

Elsa I. LEGITTIMO

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

Jan NATTIER

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

Jungnok PARK (†)

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

Jonathan A. SILK

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

Stefano ZACCHETTI

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

ZHU Qingzhi

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

### Book review

Tsunehiko SUGIKI

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

•

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

# A “new” early Chinese Buddhist commentary

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

Stefano Zacchetti

### 1. Introduction

The *Anban shouyi jing* 安般守意經 (*Canonical scripture on the ānāpānasmṛti*, i.e., “mindfulness of breathing in and out”), was arguably one of the most influential scriptures rendered into Chinese during the early period. This is shown, for instance, by the number of known commentaries devoted specifically to it, as well as by a handful of quotations from this text found in other early commentaries. Arthur Link’s seminal study (1976) documents a steady

\* This article is based on the paper presented at the International Symposium “Early Chinese Buddhist Translations” (Vienna 18–21 April, 2007). I should like to thank here Prof. Max Deeg (Cardiff University), the organizer of the symposium, and our host, Prof. Helmut Krasser, director of the Institute for the Cultural and Intellectual History of Asia (Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften). I should also like to acknowledge my debt towards Prof. Ochiai and Mr. Miyake of the Kongō-ji research group, who, through the good offices of Prof. Florin Deleanu, kindly sent to me the digitalised text of the Kongō-ji corpus, which proved essential for the preparation of the present paper. To Ven. Analayo I owe some precious information, especially on *vivaṭṭanā* in Pāli scholastic literature (see § 3 below). Last but certainly not least, I wish to express my deep gratitude to my friend Prof. Jonathan Silk, who kindly accepted to read a draft of this article and saved me from a number of blunders. Any errors remaining are mine alone.

interest in this scripture, which probably lasted until the beginning of the fifth century CE. This leads to the sure conclusion that the meditative practises expounded by the *Anban shouyi jing* played a crucial role in the development of early Chinese Buddhist thought.

We know, from a number of sources, some of which are rather early, that one scripture with this title had been translated during the Later Han dynasty, probably at some time in the mid-second century CE, by the famous Parthian translator An Shigao 安世高. This is attested, for instance, by the three surviving *Anban shouyi jing* prefaces translated and studied by Link (1976: 67–96), those by Kang Senghui 康僧會 († 280 CE),<sup>1</sup> Dao'an 道安 (312–385 CE),<sup>2</sup> and Xie Fu 謝敷 (fourth century).<sup>3</sup>

The various printed editions of the canon, from the Song *editio princeps*, the so-called *Kaibao zang* 開寶藏 (second half of the tenth century CE),<sup>4</sup> down to the modern standard edition, the *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* (Tokyo 1924–1932), contain a text named *Da anban shouyi jing* 大安般守意經 (T 602; hereafter T-ABSJY)

<sup>1</sup> CSZJJ p. 42c 29–43c 3; T 602 p. 163a 6–c 8.

<sup>2</sup> CSZJJ p. 43c 4–24.

<sup>3</sup> CSZJJ p. 43c 25–44b 28; on Xie Fu see Zürcher 1972: 136–137.

<sup>4</sup> This edition is nowadays almost entirely lost. It is, however, possible to retrieve some information on it from Weibo's 惟白 early twelfth century *Dazangjing gangmu zhiyao lu* 大藏經綱目指要錄 (*Shōwa hōbō sōmoku* 昭和法寶總目錄 no. 37, pp. 571–772), which summarily describes the content of all the scriptures then included in the canon. And, as demonstrated by Li and He (2003: 78–79), we know that Weibo based his work on a copy of the *Kaibao zang*. As is customary in this text, the entry on the *Da anban shouyi jing* 大安般守意經 (p. 708c) is a patchwork of words culled from the relevant scripture: Weibo quotes (and freely edits) a few words from Kang Senghui's preface and from the two rolls of the *jing* itself, which is clearly the same text transmitted in our present canon (T 602, or T-ABSJY). For example, this is how Weibo summarises the second roll of this scripture (I just quote the incipit): 佛說：出息入息，自覺自知，知長知短，知麤知細，知遲知疾。 Cf. the beginning of roll two of the T-ABSJY: 出息入息自覺，出息入息自知。當時為覺，以後為知。覺者，謂覺息長短；知者，謂知息生滅、麤細、遲疾也。(T 602 p. 168b 14–16).

ascribed to An Shigao. Although this traditional attribution has been generally accepted,<sup>5</sup> scholars recognised long ago that this T-ABSJY was a particular scripture, since it did not look like a “normal” translation.

To the best of my knowledge, the first author to make this point was the Korean monk Sugi 守其, the chief editor of the second national Koryŏ canon (the so-called *P'alman Taejanggyŏng* 八萬大藏經, thirteenth century CE). In his remarkable “Supplementary record of collation notes to the new carving of the great canon of the Koryŏ kingdom” (as Buswell 2004: 131 renders the title *Koryŏguk sinjo taejang kyŏjŏng pyŏllok* 高麗國新雕大藏校正別錄),<sup>6</sup> Sugi observed that in the *Da anban shouyi jing* transmitted in the canon the basic text was inextricably mingled with the glosses of an inter-linear commentary (經注不分). Unfortunately, Sugi’s masterpiece of textual scholarship is not included in the *Taishō*. But some of his notes appear also at the end of the relevant texts in the *P'alman Taejanggyŏng*, and in this way have been incorporated into the *Taishō* edition. This is also the case with the T-ABSJY. As we shall see, Sugi’s description of the T-ABSJY exerted a considerable (and ultimately distorting) influence on all subsequent research on this text, and for this reason it deserves to be quoted in full:<sup>7</sup>

此經按經首序及見經文，似是書者之錯，經注不分而連書者也。義當節而注之，然往往多有不可分處，故不敢擅節，以遺後賢焉。

Buswell (2004: 165) summarises this note as follows: “Based upon both information in the preface to this sūtra and an examination of the actual text itself, Sugi suspects that a copyist has incorrectly entered the interlinear notes to the scripture into the main body of the text, thereby producing many sections that are difficult to construe. As he cannot resolve the problems with the text based on his collation, he leaves them for later sages to solve.”

<sup>5</sup> See, for instance, Zürcher 1991: 297.

<sup>6</sup> K 1402, in *Koryŏ taejanggyŏng* 高麗大藏經, Seoul 1976, vol. 38, pp. 512–725.

<sup>7</sup> Sugi, *Koryŏguk sinjo taejang kyŏjŏng pyŏllok*, K. 1402 p. 647a; also in T 602 p. 173a 25–28.

It was on the basis of this assessment of the nature of T-ABSJY that Ui Hakuju, in his influential study of An Shigao's corpus, edited and translated this scripture trying to reconstruct its alleged original form, thus separating by conjecture the main text (經) from the commentary (註).<sup>8</sup>

Our knowledge of the *Anban shouyi jing* (and, indeed, of early Chinese Buddhist literature at large) changed dramatically in 1999, when a Japanese scholar, Kajiura Susumu, discovered two manuscripts (scroll A and B) with the same content at the Kongō-ji 金剛寺, a temple located in Osaka prefecture.<sup>9</sup> These manuscripts, presumably dating back to sometime between the eleventh and the thirteenth century CE, consist for the most part of previously practically unknown early Chinese Buddhist scriptures. Subsequent research on these scrolls established that the new texts they contain – three translations and one commentary lost in China at an early date<sup>10</sup> – can be ascribed, with a considerable degree of probability, to An Shigao and his circle. All these scriptures have been published in Ochiai 2004 (pp. 183–228).

One of these rediscovered scriptures bears the title *Anban shouyi jing* 安般守意經 (manuscript A, to which alone I refer throughout this article, cols. 61–275, in Ochiai 2004: 188–194), but is completely different from (and much shorter than) the canonical T-ABSJY. Particularly noteworthy is the fact that the Kongō-ji *Anban shouyi jing* (hereafter K-ABSJY) gives every appearance of being just a translated text,<sup>11</sup> with no traces of any interpolated commentary.

<sup>8</sup> Ui 1971: 235; note that Ui was unaware that this colophon is by Sugi.

<sup>9</sup> See Kajiura 2001.

<sup>10</sup> The content of the two Kongō-ji manuscripts can be summarized as follows (see Deleanu 2003: 64–65; Zacchetti 2003: 252–253): a. The Kang Senghui's preface to the *Anban shouyi jing*; b. three anonymous glosses to the *Anban shouyi jing*; c. *Foshuo shi'er men jing* 佛說十二門經; d. *Foshuo jie shi'er men jing* 佛說解十二門經; an anonymous commentary on the *Shi'er men jing*.

<sup>11</sup> See Deleanu 2003: 90. This has been questioned by Ven. Hung Hung-lung (Shi Guohui) in a recent publication (2008), but in my opinion



Since 1999, a number of articles devoted to the Kongō-ji texts have been published. As a result, some important points have been cleared up, particularly that of the authenticity of this rediscovered textual body. Indeed, there is considerable evidence corroborating its early dating and An Shigao’s authorship of the Kongō-ji texts.<sup>12</sup> Concerning the K-ABSJ, the most detailed and important study published to date is Deleanu 2003, to which the reader is referred for a general description of this scripture (see especially pp. 64–71).

Nevertheless, several problems remain unresolved: above all, the exact nature of the relationship between K-ABSJ and T-ABSJ. Although I cannot claim to have answered all the questions posed by the *Anban shouyi jing* literature, I gathered some evidence which, I believe, can enable us to see the entire matter in a clearer light.

## 2. The problem of the two *Anban [shouyi] jings*

The earliest surviving catalogue of Chinese Buddhist translations, that included in Sengyou’s *Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集 T 2145 (hereafter CSZJJ), lists (not consecutively) two scriptures with a similar title among An Shigao’s translations:

安般守意經一卷 安錄云：『小安般經』。(CSZJJ p. 5c 23).

大安般經一卷。(CSZJJ p. 6a 15).

In other words, Sengyou recorded an *Anban shouyi jing* as such, in one roll – which, as he noted, had been listed as *Smaller Anban jing* (小安般經) in Dao’an’s catalogue (安錄) – and a *Larger Anban jing* (大安般經), also in one roll.

It is generally agreed that the section of the CSZJJ containing the list of An Shigao’s translations is closely based on Dao’an’s lost catalogue, the *Zongli zhongjing mulu* 綜理眾經目錄. Thus Haya-shiya Tomojirō’s reconstruction of the latter does in fact list two *ānāpānasmṛti* scriptures (*Xiao anban jing* and *Da anban jing*).<sup>13</sup>

---

his arguments are not conclusive (see n. 122 below).

<sup>12</sup> On the authenticity of the K-ABSJ see Deleanu 2003: 75–81, and Zacchetti 2002.

<sup>13</sup> Hayashiya 1941: 390–391.

That Dao'an must have known the *Larger Anban [shouyi] jing* seems demonstrated by the very title “*Smaller Anban jing*” quoted by Sengyou from his catalogue, which otherwise would be difficult to account for. However, it remains open to question whether he recorded the *Larger Anban [shouyi] jing* as a translation by An Shigao.<sup>14</sup> There are, in fact, several pieces of evidence which, in my opinion, seem to contradict this hypothesis.

To begin with, it should be observed that Dao'an composed a commentary on just one *Anban shouyi jing*, as he himself informs us.<sup>15</sup> Likewise his preface only mentions one such scripture (see the discussion below). Moreover, Sengyou, in the entry of the CSZJJ devoted to the *Larger Anban [shouyi] jing*, does not quote any remark by Dao'an. This is a little unexpected, for, as we shall see below, we have evidence suggesting that by Dao'an's time this title already referred to a text which was similar to our present T-ABSJY, and it is hard to imagine that he might have recorded without comment a scripture of this sort, with its clear exegetical character so different from the style of other translations. All the more so because, from other notes quoted by Sengyou in the very same part of the CSZJJ we know that Dao'an was very keen to distinguish actual translations from exegetical texts composed by An Shigao.<sup>16</sup> It is also interesting that Sengyou himself, in the biographical section of the CSZJJ, – which, as shown by Antonello Palumbo (see n. 39 below), represents an earlier layer of this work – mentioned only one single *Anban shouyi jing* when he summarized An Shigao's activity as a translator.<sup>17</sup> No doubt, this record in itself might not carry much weight with regard to the problem we are discussing, yet it is noteworthy that in the same context Sengyou mentions the

<sup>14</sup> Cf. also Forte 1968: 178.

<sup>15</sup> 安般守意，多念之要藥也。為解一卷 今有。(CSZJJ roll 5, T 2145 p. 39c 18).

<sup>16</sup> CSZJJ p. 6b 5–6; see also Zacchetti 2004: 213.

<sup>17</sup> 於是宣釋眾經改胡為漢，出安般守意、陰持入經、大小十二門及百六十品等。(CSZJJ p. 95a 20–22; see also *Gao seng zhuan* 高僧傳 T 2059 p. 323b 6–7).

*Larger and Smaller shi'er men jing* 大小十二門, and we know now that these are in fact two distinct translations.<sup>18</sup>

I will not discuss here in detail the highly confusing records concerning these two *Anban shouyi jings* found in the other bibliographical catalogues composed after the CSZJJ. This subject has already been dealt with extensively by Forte (1968: 177–185) and Ochiai (2002: 32–33), and for further details the reader is referred to Appendix 1 below. The situation can be summarised as follows: after Sengyou's CSZJJ, the various Sui and Tang catalogues composed before Zhisheng's 智昇 *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄 T 2154 demonstrate an increasing degree of confusion. They record with slightly different titles two *Anban [shouyi] jings* (in either one or two rolls) ascribed to An Shigao, a larger and a smaller one, consisting – according to some sources – of thirty and twenty folios respectively. To make the situation more complex, in some catalogues the two scriptures bear the same title, while in others yet a third *Anban shouyi jing* is mentioned.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>18</sup> See Zacchetti 2003: 259–270, and cf. n. 48 below.

<sup>19</sup> See T 2034, T 2149, and T 2153. A possible explanation for these strange records can be found in roll 4 of the first *Zhongjing mulu* 眾經目錄, where an *Anban shouyi jing* in one roll (安般守意經一卷, T 2146 p. 139a 2) is recorded among the scriptures forged by Xiao Ziliang 蕭子良 (右自法句下八經, 並是蕭子良所造, 故附偽錄。T 2146 p. 139a 7–8; cf. Zürcher 1972: 439 n. 149). The imperial prince Xiao Ziliang of the Qi dynasty (460–494 CE), king of Jingling, was an enthusiastic supporter of Buddhism and a collector of canonical scriptures (see Tang 2000, vol. 1 pp. 345–348). The fact that an *Anban shouyi jing* was faked (if this record is indeed correct) is, in itself, very interesting, as it bears further witness to the importance of this scripture during the medieval period (see also Deleanu 1992: 55). The above record concerning this allegedly apocryphal *Anban shouyi jing* has parallels in the two subsequent catalogues called *Zhongjing mulu* (T 2147 p. 175a 5 and 13–15; T 2148 p. 212c 13 and 18–19). The two records – on An Shigao's third *Anban [shouyi jing]* on the one hand, and on Xiao Ziliang's forged *Anban shouyi jing* on the other – appear to be mutually exclusive, as no catalogue contains both. This suggests that these two could indeed have been the same text.

Zhisheng, in his renowned *Kaiyuan shijiao lu*, obviously tried to put some order in this mess (see below Appendix 1, entry no. 7). He made clear that in his time only one *Anban shouyi jing* was still in circulation in China: the *Larger Anban shouyi jing* usually edited in two rolls and consisting of 30 folios. This, as I will show below, is the same scripture which is still included in the canon as our T-ABSJY.

It is interesting to observe that Zhisheng was convinced that there had never been two *Anban shouyi jings*. He stated this in several passages of the *Kaiyuan lu* with his customary clarity, and in fact he extended his criticism of the double record – which in one passage he called “a serious error” – even to Sengyou. This is also the reason why he thought that even the alternative title mentioned by Dao’an – *Smaller Anban jing* – should in fact refer to the *Larger Anban shouyi jing* (see Appendix 1, entry no. 7, 1–3).

Yet there seems to be no doubt that in this case Zhisheng was wrong,<sup>20</sup> and that in earlier times there had actually been two different scriptures on *ānāpānasmr̥ti* circulating with a similar title, as is demonstrated by a number of other sources, earlier and more direct than the catalogues.

To begin with, Sengrui 僧叡, Kumārajīva’s eminent assistant, had already mentioned the two *ānāpānasmr̥ti* texts approximately one century before Sengyou’s record. In his preface devoted to some “*Dhyāna* scriptures” translated or compiled by Kumārajīva, he states that “formerly in this land there have been translated the *Xiuxing [daodi jing]*,<sup>21</sup> the *Larger* and *Smaller Shi’er men [jing]*,<sup>22</sup> the *Larger* and *Smaller Anban [jing]*.”<sup>23</sup> In fact, as we shall see below (§ 3), we have clear evidence that these old scriptures were still being read and used in Sengrui’s time.

<sup>20</sup> See also Hayashiya 1941: 406 n. 5 and Deleanu 1992: 56.

<sup>21</sup> I.e., the *Xiuxing dao di jing* 修行道地經 T 606 (*Yogācārabhūmi*) translated by Dharmarakṣa.

<sup>22</sup> See Zacchetti 2003.

<sup>23</sup> 此土先出修行、大小十二門、大小安般。(CSZJJ T 2145, p. 65a 20–21).

In the introductory paragraph I have mentioned the early prefaces to the *Anban shouyi jing*. What do they tell us about the problem of the two scriptures recorded by the catalogues? Kang Senghui and Dao’an’s prefaces do not contain any explicit reference to two *Anban shouyi jings*.

Kang Senghui – whose preface is in several respects a crucial source for the history of the *Anban shouyi jing* literature – simply states that An Shigao “conveyed through translation the arcane secrets of *ānāpāna*.”<sup>24</sup>

The *Anban shouyi jing* preface is generally considered an early work by Dao’an.<sup>25</sup> This is, more precisely, a preface to the commentary he devoted to the *ānāpānasmṛti* scripture. This preface is quite explicit in referring to only one *Anban shouyi jing* rendered into Chinese by An Shigao (“this scripture has been translated by him”).<sup>26</sup> In this document, Dao’an mentions also a commentary on this translation composed by Kang Senghui “at the beginning of the Wei [dynasty of the Three Kingdoms (220–265 AD)].”<sup>27</sup>

It is Xie Fu’s preface which contains the most significant evidence concerning the issue of the two *Anban shouyi jings*.<sup>28</sup> After having described An Shigao’s activities, Xie Fu ascribes to him the text he has commented upon, that is, the *Anban shouyi jing*.<sup>29</sup> Then he goes on to describe his efforts in understanding this scripture,

<sup>24</sup> 譯安般之祕奧 (CSZJJ T 2145 p. 43b 23); I have quoted Arthur Link’s translation of this passage (1976: 79).

<sup>25</sup> Ui 1956: 60 (see also pp. 79–83 for an annotated translation of Dao’an’s preface); Tang 2000, vol. 1 pp. 150–151; Zürcher 1972: 186; Fang 2004: 113.

<sup>26</sup> 此經其所譯也。(CSZJJ T 2145 p. 43c 20–21).

<sup>27</sup> 魏初康會為之注義。(CSZJJ T 2145 p. 43c 22). Note that the expression 注義, which is quite rare in the canon, might echo Kang Senghui’s preface to the *Anban shouyi jing* (陳慧注義, 余助斟酌, in CSZJJ T 2145 p. 43b 29–c1; cf. n. 116 below). On Kang Senghui’s commentary see Appendix 2 below.

<sup>28</sup> See also Ochiai 2002: 34.

<sup>29</sup> 其所譯出百餘萬言。...此安般典, 其文雖約, 義關眾經。(CSZJJ p. 44b 8–10; tr. Link 1976: 94–95).

stating, *inter alia*, that he had also consulted and “made extracts from scriptures such as the *Larger Anban* [*jing*] and the *Xiuxing* [*daodi jing*].”<sup>30</sup> This clearly demonstrates that, at least by Xie Fu’s time (fourth century), a *Larger Anban* [*shouyi*] *jing* was circulating as a text distinct and independent from the *Anban shouyi jing* translated by An Shigao.

These three prefaces are among the earliest sources we possess on the history of the *Anban shouyi jing* texts. From this viewpoint, Kang Senghui’s preface is, quite obviously, the most significant of the three. The only explicit quotation contained in this document shows that it must have been composed some time after 224 CE.<sup>31</sup> Elsewhere (Zacchetti forthcoming) I have argued that this preface is likely to date back to the first half of the third century – that is, presumably less than one hundred years after the *Anban shouyi jing* itself was translated. If we bracket for a moment the catalogue records, which ascribe both *ānāpānasmṛti* texts to An Shigao, the impression one receives from these early prefaces is that the *Larger Anban* [*shouyi*] *jing* came into existence *later* than the other scripture, at least after Kang Senghui’s time.

Be that as it may, in the light of all these sources, as pointed out by Ochiai (2002: 35) and Deleanu (2003: 87–89), the most logical hypothesis would be to take the T-ABSJY as the *Larger Anban* [*shouyi*] *jing* (also in view of the fact that it is with this title that it

---

<sup>30</sup> 并抄撮大安般、修行諸經 (CSZJJ p. 44b 23). On the *Xiuxing daodi jing*, see above n. 21.

<sup>31</sup> 經曰：『諸海十二事』(T 602 p. 163a 9 = T 2145 p. 43a 4); this is a verse from the *Fa ju jing* 法句經 (T 210 p. 574b 10) which was translated (we do not know precisely when), through a rather complex process, from an Indic original brought to China in 224 CE (see Mizuno 1981: 268–269, and Nattier 2008: 114–115). In my previous discussion of the dating of Kang Senghui’s *Anban shouyi jing* preface (in Zacchetti forthcoming) I did not mention this *Fa ju jing* quotation, as I could not identify it due to the variant reading found in the *Taishō* text (十三 instead of 十二 as in the Song, Yuan, and Ming editions), which, incidentally, is probably faulty, given that Kang Senghui’s text clearly requires that we read 十二 (he refers this verse to the twelve *āyatanas*). This quotation had likewise escaped Link (1976: 68 n. 28) and Nakajima (1997: 8 n. 4).

has been transmitted in the canon), and the K-ABSJY as the *Smaller Anban jing* (or, rather, the *Anban shouyi jing* tout court). However, both Ochiai and Deleanu remarked that a number of contradictions in the available sources make a definitive conclusion impossible.

I think that we nevertheless do possess enough evidence to reconstruct a large part of the history of the *Anban shouyi jing* literature and to corroborate the identification of the two *ānāpānasmṛti* scriptures mentioned by the catalogues. I will try to demonstrate this by re-examining some of the sources already studied with regard to this issue, and by introducing a few other which have not received the attention they deserve.

I will first discuss the *Da anban shouyi jing* 大安般守意經 or *Larger Anban shouyi jing*. The earliest testimonies concerning this text are essentially two: one is the already mentioned passage from Xie Fu’s fourth century *Anban shouyi jing* preface. The other is a quotation from a scripture named *Da anban* included in a short gloss found, in some editions,<sup>32</sup> at the end of the *Si di jing* 四諦經 T 32, another translation generally ascribed to An Shigao:

持宿命觀 大安般云：『信本因緣知從宿命有名直見』... (T 32, p. 816c 28).<sup>33</sup>

This quotation has been discussed in several studies devoted to the *Anban shouyi jing*,<sup>34</sup> and it has already been observed that it

<sup>32</sup> According to the *Taishō*’s apparatus this gloss is absent from the Song, Yuan and Ming editions. Incidentally, this is in fact an end note: it occurs after the *sūtra*’s closing formula (舍利曰說如是·比丘受行; T 32 p. 816c 27), and comments upon an expression (持宿命觀, “contemplation of the previous lives,” though 持 is unclear in this context) occurring in the *Si di jing* (T 32 p. 816c 2–3 and *passim* with variants). As such, this does not seem to be the remains of an interlinear commentary.

<sup>33</sup> I am unable to give a satisfactory translation of this passage; cf. Ui 1971: 233 (本因緣を信じて宿命より有るを知るを、是れを名づけて直見と為す) and 316; Du 1997: 154 (相信一切本於因緣，知道從宿命而有，此名為直見).

<sup>34</sup> Ui 971: 235 and 316; Aramaki 1975: 165; Ochiai 2002: 34–35; Deleanu 2003: 86–87 n. 54.

corresponds to a passage found in the T-ABSJY,<sup>35</sup> but not in the K-ABSJY. However there is another point we can take from this testimony, limited as it is, and one of considerable significance for the history of the *Anban shouyi jing* texts at that. Immediately after the *Da anban* quotation, on the very same line, another scripture is quoted within the same gloss:

... 義決云：『知前事如後事』是也。(T 32, p. 816c 28).<sup>36</sup>

Now, given the context where this quotation occurs, it is very probable that the name 義決 refers to the lost *Yi jue lü* 義決律,<sup>37</sup> a text ascribed to An Shigao in the CSZJJ:

義決律一卷 或云義決律法行經。安公云：『此上二經出長阿含』今闕 (CSZJJ p. 6a 7).<sup>38</sup>

The fact that Sengyou recorded the *Yi jue lü* as a text already missing at his time (今闕) represents an important clue: if this scripture was lost by the time he compiled his CSZJJ, this means that the gloss found in the *Si di jing* probably dates back to earlier than the end of the fifth century CE.<sup>39</sup> There is in fact some circumstantial evidence suggesting the end of the fourth century as a likely *terminus ante quem*,<sup>40</sup> and this corroborates the supposition that already

<sup>35</sup> 何等為直見？信本因緣，知從宿命有，是名為直見。(T 602, p. 172b 20–21).

<sup>36</sup> “The *Yi jue* states: ‘knowing previous events is like [knowing (?) later events;] this is exactly [what is meant by the expression 持宿命觀.]”

<sup>37</sup> See also Nattier 2008: 71 n. 15, and cf. Ui 1971: 316.

<sup>38</sup> “*Yi jue lü*, one roll (alternative title: *Yi jue lü faxing jing*. The Venerable [Dao]an states: ‘this and the preceding scripture [listed in the catalogue, viz. the *Pu fa yi jing* 普法義經 T 98] are taken from the *Dirghāgama*.’ Nowadays [this text] is lost.”

<sup>39</sup> As shown by Antonello Palumbo (2003: 197), Sengyou’s CSZJJ consists of different layers: “[t]he lives of the monks were apparently written for the most part under the southern Qi dynasty (479–502) until about 503, whereas the catalogue and the collection of bibliographical records were revised during the Tianjian 天監 era of the Liang dynasty, probably in 515.”

<sup>40</sup> The term 宿命, “past lives” (\**pūrvanivāsa*), occurring in the expres-



at a comparatively early date the title *Da anban [shouyi] jing* referred to a text presumably close to or identical with our canonical T-ABSJ.

Further evidence of this equivalence surfaces at a later time. Thus far, unfortunately, I have not been able to trace any Tang manuscript of the *Da anban shouyi jing*.<sup>41</sup> And yet we can get a fairly clear picture of this scripture at this crucial stage of development of the canon thanks to the entry devoted to it in Huilin’s 慧琳 *Yiqie jing yinyi* 一切經音義 T 2128 (p. 685a 4–21), completed in 807 CE.<sup>42</sup> Only a handful of words and expressions are recorded here by Huilin, it is true. But, as is customary with this lexicon, they are mostly peculiar and rare. And they are nearly all found (though with some variants) only in the T-ABSJ<sup>43</sup> and not in the

sion explained by the *Si di jing* gloss and attested also in other translations by An Shigao (e.g. see Zacchetti 2002b: 85), is frequent in the various *Āgama* and *Abhidharma* texts translated in Chang’an at the end of the fourth century under the supervision of Dao’an. This subject is also discussed in detail in several passages of the *Da zhidu lun* 大智度論 T 1509 translated by Kumārajīva at the beginning of the fifth century (e.g. see p. 98b 3–6; p. 240a 25–ff. etc.). It is hard to believe that a person having access to these highly influential works should have turned to two early scriptures in order to explain this term. All the more so, if we consider how quickly Kumārajīva’s influence in doctrinal matters spread even to South China (see for instance Zürcher 1972: 213–214).

<sup>41</sup> I have not been able to check whether the so-called *Shōgozō* 聖語藏, a collection of early Japanese (eighth century) and Chinese (Sui and Tang) manuscripts, contains any manuscript of the canonical *Da anban shouyi jing*. However, no reading from such a manuscript is quoted in the apparatus of T 602.

<sup>42</sup> See Yao Yongming 2003: 5.

<sup>43</sup> These are the words listed by Huilin in the entry relevant to the *Fo shuo Da anban shouyi jing* 佛說大安般守意經 (in two rolls) in the *Yiqie jing yin yi* T 2128, p. 685a 4–21 (I give in brackets the references to the corresponding passages in the T-ABSJ; the symbol ¶ marks peculiar variants given by Huilin which I could not reproduce): 羈瘦 (= T 602 p. 163c 15); 螻飛 (probably = 蝸飛, T 602 p. 163c 17); 蠕動 (probably = 蠕動 T 602 p. 163c 17–18); 軛觀 (= 軛, 觀, T 602 p. 164b 3, not forming a compound; 軛 is equivalent to 軛: see HDZ vol. 5 p. 3525a); 喘息 (= T 602

K-ABSJY. In other words, the thirty folio *Larger Anban [shouyi] jing* recorded by Tang catalogues was certainly (and not surprisingly) the same scripture which bears this title in our present canon. In fact, even the number of folios given in the catalogues is consistent with the present text of T 602.<sup>44</sup>

So much for the *Da anban shouyi jing*. We also have similar information concerning the other *ānāpānasmṛti* scripture mentioned by the catalogues, the *Anban shouyi jing* (or *Xiao anban jing* 小安般經, as, according to Sengyou, it was listed in Dao'an's catalogue), although we have perhaps fewer details than is the case with the *Da anban shouyi jing*.

Apart from the prefaces, already discussed above, we have, to begin with, a handful of quotations in two early commentaries (probably dating back to the first half of the third century CE) from an *Anban [shouyi jing]* which can be traced to our K-ABSJY.<sup>45</sup> That also the alternative title *Xiao anban [jing]* refers to the same text is confirmed by an interesting source which, to the best of my knowl-

---

p. 164c 26 and *passim*); 細滑 (= T 602 p. 165c 1 and *passim*); 十絆 (= T 602 p. 165b 17); 三輩 (= T 602 p. 164a 18); 𠄎 𠄎 (= 𠄎 𠄎, T 602 p. 166b 3; the variant of the first character discussed by Huilin also appears in some editions quoted in the *Taishō's* apparatus); 鑽火 (= T 602 p. 169b 5); 攘故 (= T 602 p. 170a 27); 黛眉 (= T 602 p. 171c 3–4). There is another expression quoted by Huilin as occurring in the *Da anban shouyi jing* which deserves a few words of comment. This is 痛𦉳 (T 2128 p. 685a 10–11) which, as made clear by Huilin's gloss, is simply a conjectural emendation to the current reading 痛痒 = *vedanā*, which he considered, wrongly, a mistake (經文從疒作痒, 是病也, 非經意也). There is no doubt, however, that 痛痒 (which is also attested in the K-ABSJY) is the correct reading (see Zacchetti 2003: 256 n. 19).

<sup>44</sup> During the Tang, the standard format of Buddhist manuscripts was 28 columns of 17 characters per folio. The T-ABSJY, on the other hand, is approximately made up by 29 registers consisting of an average of 29 columns × 17 characters (not counting Kang Senghui's preface), each *Taishō* register thus being slightly longer than one Tang manuscript folio.

<sup>45</sup> See Zacchetti 2002, and Deleanu 2003: 75–76; cf. also Appendix 2 below.

edge, has so far escaped the attention of scholars working on these scriptures.

Roll 10 of the CSZJJ contains a “Preface to the *Scripture on the thirty-seven categories* [viz. the *bodhipākṣika-dharmas*]” (三十七品經序, T 2145, p. 70b 16–c 12) by the *śramaṇa* Zhu Tanwulan 沙門竺曇無蘭 (\*Dharmaratna?).<sup>46</sup> This person presents us with something of a paradox: several documents ascribed to him have been preserved in the CSZJJ, and a certain number of translations have been transmitted under his name in the canon; and yet he is completely ignored by all the ancient biographical sources and, subsequently, by the main modern studies on Chinese Buddhism.<sup>47</sup> Incidentally, this shows the degree to which our perception of early Chinese Buddhism is conditioned by biographical sources (especially Huijiao’s *Gao seng zhuan* 高僧傳), and no doubt the activities of Tanwulan deserve a detailed study. As a matter of fact the documents transmitted under his name in the CSZJJ constitute an important source for studying late fourth century Buddhism and, what is of greater interest to us, for reconstructing the history of some early scriptures.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>46</sup> This reconstruction was proposed by Pelliot (1920: 345 n. 64). On the 三十七品經 see CSZJJ T 2145 p. 10b 17. For a translation of Tanwulan’s preface, see Nakajima 1997: 250–253.

<sup>47</sup> For instance, \*Dharmaratna is mentioned only in passing by both Tsukamoto (1985: 750) and Zürcher (1972: 55). For a list of translations ascribed to this person, one can consult Bagchi 1927: 322–334.

<sup>48</sup> For example, this preface by Tanwulan provides us with an important piece of evidence concerning the other scriptures contained in the same Kongō-ji manuscripts which have preserved the K-ASBSYJ, the three texts on the “twelve gates” 十二門 (see above n. 10). In my 2003 article devoted to this rediscovered textual corpus, I argued that the second text of this group, the *Foshuo jie shi'er men jing* 佛說解十二門經, was the “Smaller” *Shi'er men jing* 小十二門經 listed in the catalogues, and that it was originally followed by the same anonymous commentary on the “twelve gates” (SMJcomm) which is found after it in the Kongō-ji manuscripts (Zacchetti 2003: 260–261 and especially 283–285). This reconstruction is confirmed by Tanwulan’s preface, which states that “after the *Smaller shi'er men* [jing] there follow the three *vimokṣamukhas*” (小

The preface at issue, dated 396 CE, discusses, among other things, the treatment of the *bodhipākṣikas* in a number of early Chinese translations, including the *Smaller Anban [jing]*. Concerning the latter, Tanwulan writes:

小安般，三十七品後，則次止觀 (CSZJJ p. 70c 4).

“In the *Smaller Anban [jing]*, after the thirty-seven categories there follow tranquillity and insight.”

Although the thirty-seven *bodhipākṣikas* (三十七品) and the pair *śamatha / vipaśyanā* (止觀) are also discussed in the T-ABSJY, and in approximately the same sequence (cf. n. 110 below), this part of the T 602 text is extremely confused, while in the K-ABSJY *śamatha* and *vipaśyanā* are introduced immediately after the exposition of the Eightfold Path, which constitutes the last group of *bodhipākṣikas*.<sup>49</sup> Tanwulan’s testimony thus corroborates the hypothesis that the K-ABSJY is indeed the *Smaller Anban jing* recorded in the early catalogues. Note that even if Tanwulan’s preface were not genuine (which, pending a detailed study of this personage, at this stage cannot be ruled out), this would not substantially diminish its value for reconstructing the history of the *Anban shouyi jings*: it would still prove that at least by Sengyou’s time there was in circulation a *Smaller Anban jing* similar to our K-ABSJY.

In short, as far as our early sources are concerned (records in later catalogues are, as stated above, very confusing in this respect),

---

十二門後次三向; CSZJJ T 2145 p. 70c 5). This is exactly what we find in the Kongō-ji manuscripts, where immediately after the end of the *Foshuo jie shi'er men jing* (or *Smaller shi'er men jing*) the commentary begins expounding the three *vimokṣamukhas*, or 三向 (... 如是弟子歡喜受行。[end of the *Foshuo jie shi'er men jing*; beginning of the SMJcomm] 空爲第十三門，不願爲第十四門，泥洹爲第十五門是爲第四三門，所謂道門。已出十二門行向三。何等爲三向？一者向空，二者无思想，三者不願。etc.; Kongō-ji MS A, cols. 385–389 and ff.).

<sup>49</sup> MS A, columns 219ff. (in Ochiai 2004: 192; cf. also Deleanu 2003: 71): ... 如是{是}得道者八種道行事者，常作者，從行兩法，便滿具行。何等爲兩法？一者止，二者觀。 etc. (punctuation doubtful).

‘*Smaller Anban jing*’ became at a certain point<sup>50</sup> just an alternative title for *Anban shouyi jing* – exactly as is suggested by Sengyou’s record. An easy inference is that this alternative title was adopted in order to differentiate this from another scripture of similar title and content. Be that as it may, we have enough evidence suggesting that this [*Smaller*] *Anban [shouyi] jing* is nothing but our rediscovered K-ABSJY.

I have sought to establish the identity of the *Smaller Anban jing* listed by Sengyou in his CSZJJ with the K-ABSJY, and of the *Larger Anban [shouyi] jing* with the T-ABSJY. Yet there remains at least one problem to be discussed.<sup>51</sup> As already mentioned above, some catalogues record the number of folios of two *Anban [shouyi] jings* (both, oddly enough, called “larger” 大):<sup>52</sup> thirty and twenty respectively. This, which on the surface looks like a rather solid piece of evidence, constitutes a problem vis-à-vis the two texts we have at present.<sup>53</sup> While the figure of thirty folios corresponds without problems to the T-ABSJY (see n. 44), the K-ABSJY only consists of eight folios. However, a closer look at these records shows that they are, in fact, not free of problems. The twenty-folio *Anban jing* is mentioned in just three catalogues. Now, while in the *Zhongjing mulu* T 2148 this scripture is recorded as “lost” (失本), Daoxuan in his *Da Tang neidian lu* T 2149 describes it as

---

<sup>50</sup> As we have seen, the earliest known source to adopt this title is Dao’an’s catalogue, as quoted in the CSZJJ. In fact, apart from those found in Tan Wulan and Sengrui’s prefaces, all the occurrences of this title in the canon are quotations of Dao’an’s statement. The name *Xiao anban jing* seems to have remained unknown to Kang Senghui and the authors of the early commentaries which quote the *Anban shouyi jing* (cf. also Appendix 2 below).

<sup>51</sup> Another seeming problem is that we find in an early commentary (the *Yin chi ru jing zhu* 陰持入經註 T 1694) one quotation from an *Anban [shouyi jing]* which does not match either K-ABSJY or T-ABSJY. However, as I will show in Appendix 2 below, I think that even this problem can be accounted for.

<sup>52</sup> Deleanu 2003: 84 n. 47.

<sup>53</sup> See Ochiai 2002: 35, and Deleanu 2003: 88–89.

a “text searched for” (? 訪本).<sup>54</sup> Only the late seventh century *Da Zhou kanding zhongjing mulu* – a catalogue not noted for its critical soundness<sup>55</sup> – lists the twenty-folio *Anban jing* without further comment. One can legitimately ask whether the compilers of these catalogues had actually seen this twenty-folio *Anban jing*. In short, it seems to me that the evidence concerning the number of folios of this shorter scripture is far from being as compelling as it might appear at first sight. But even if we take seriously these records, it would still be possible to formulate a hypothetical explanation. The whole Kongō-ji MS A, including, besides the K-ABSJ and the relevant preface by Kang Senghui, three texts concerning a group of twelve meditative stages (*shi'er men* 十二門) consists of 21 folios, while MS B contains 19 folios.<sup>56</sup> Thus it is possible to speculate that the alleged twenty-folio *Anban jing* was in fact a scroll similar to our two Kongō-ji manuscripts, containing in fact not just a text on *ānāpānasmṛti*, but what I would provisionally define as an anthology of An Shigao’s texts on meditation.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> What Daoxuan actually meant by *fangben* 訪本 is not entirely clear to me. I am not sure that Forte (1968: 180–181) is correct in interpreting this as meaning that the text, after having been lost, was later retrieved (“testo ritrovato”). In fact, in the catalogues this expression often refers to scriptures sought for but not found (訪本未獲; e.g. see *Kaiyuan lu* T 2154 p. 637a 25), but which were still existent in some manuscript canonical collections. This is perhaps how we should interpret also Daoxuan’s record on the twenty-folio *Anban jing*. Cf. also Ochiai 2002: 33.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. Tokuno 1990: 50–51. Another problem with this catalogue’s record of our texts is that the larger of the two scriptures is said to consist of forty-five folios (大安般守意經一部二卷 或一卷四十五紙; T 2153 p. 409a 8); this record, which is not attested in the Song, Yuan and Ming editions of the *Taishō*’s apparatus, is certainly wrong.

<sup>56</sup> See also remarks by Ochiai 2002: 35 and n. 20 p. 36.

<sup>57</sup> In this connection, it is interesting to observe that the Kongō-ji manuscript A bears an external label with the wrong title “*Foshuo da anban jing* – first roll” 佛說大安般經 卷上, presumably added by someone who – having noticed the familiar presence of Kang Senghui’s preface at the beginning of the collection – mistakenly took this scroll as the first part of T-ABSJ (see Kajiura 2001: 36; Deleanu 2003: 65). Perhaps

By way of conclusion of this section, a tentative sketch of the history of these two scriptures could then run as follows: initially there was only one single text on *ānāpānasmṛti*, a translation ascribed to An Shigao since the time of Kang Senghui whose original title was, in all likelihood, simply *Anban shouyi jing*. This is demonstrated by the early prefaces and by the quotations from this text found in Three Kingdoms commentaries. This early *Anban shouyi jing*, which at some point – we do not know precisely when – was lost in the main transmission line of the Chinese canon, is the recently rediscovered K-ABSJ. At a later stage, during the fourth century, we begin to find mention of a second, longer text called by a number of sources “Larger” *Anban shouyi jing*. At some point, perhaps beginning with Sengyou’s catalogue (as I have pointed out in § 2, Dao’an’s assessment of this scripture remains problematic), this text was ascribed to An Shigao as one of his translations. This process also entailed a change of title for the original *Anban shouyi jing*, which was now labelled (at least in some sources), by way of contrast with the second scripture, “Smaller” *Anban [shouyi] jing*. As we have seen, this potential source of confusion was, unfortunately, all too well exploited by Sui and Tang catalogues. By a quirk of fate, eventually only the second, possibly later scripture came to be preserved in the canon under An Shigao’s name as the T-ABSJ.

The study of catalogues and other external sources can only bring us this far. Now, in order to understand the nature of the T-ABSJ, its relationship to the K-ABSJ, its presumed dating and authorship, we have to turn to the texts themselves.

### 3. The relationship between T-ABSJ and K-ABSJ

Perhaps the most crucial problem posed by the discovery of the Kongō-ji manuscripts is the relationship between K-ABSJ and T-ABSJ. In fact, any hope of easily deciphering the latter (which

---

something similar happened also to the compilers of the three catalogues which mention the twenty-folio *Anban jing*, who, as I have suggested, perhaps could not consult directly the text in question and took it for a single scripture.

has always been a challenging text) with the help of the former vanished as soon as detailed comparative study of the two had begun.

This, I must say, came as a bit of a surprise. For, given that the K-ABSYJ seems a genuine translation by An Shigao, if the T-ABSYJ were indeed, as was generally believed after Sugi, a mixture of An Shigao's translation plus an *interlinear* commentary, having the translation as an independent text, it should have become possible to distinguish the basic text from the interpolated glosses without much difficulty. That this is not at all the case is a telling fact – indeed, it is a first-rate clue as to the nature of the T-ABSYJ.

In my short note on the *Anban shouyi jing* quotations found in early commentaries, I noted incidentally that one particular phrase of the T-ABSYJ looked very much like a gloss on one passage of the K-ABSYJ, which in turn was not found, in its entirety, in the former scripture (Zacchetti 2002: 158 n. 6). The obvious implication of this fact was that the T-ABSYJ as a whole might be an “exocentric” (so to speak) commentary to the rediscovered translation by An Shigao, and not to a text contained in the T-ABSYJ itself. However in that period I was pressed by other matters, and did not have time to pursue this line of research.

Later, during my researches into the origins of Chinese Buddhist exegetical literature, again and again I came across significant parallels between the T-ABSYJ and the few surviving commentaries dating back to the Han and Three Kingdoms periods. It soon became clear to me that this peculiar and obscure text was a crucial piece in the puzzle of early Chinese Buddhist exegetical literature, and this led to a reconsideration of the issues raised by the T-ABSYJ. In the following pages I will present the results of my analysis of this scripture, especially in comparison with the K-ABSYJ.

To begin with, there is not a single, homogenous pattern of correspondence between K-ABSYJ and T-ABSYJ. While the general structure of the two – that is, more precisely, the sequence of the topics introduced and discussed – is on the whole consistent (which is in itself a highly significant fact), in matter of details things are far more complex.



I will start my discussion from the very passage which caught my attention the first time I had a chance to study these two texts, and which is indeed the point where the relationship between them is easiest to see. This is the discussion of *huan* 還 (\**vivarta*, “turning”), the fifth of the six stages of the *ānāpānasmṛti* practise.<sup>58</sup> In view of the obscurity of this passage, both in K-ABSYJ and T-ABSYJ, before analysing these two scriptures it might be useful to discuss briefly some doctrinal aspects of this subject.

The T-ABSYJ, immediately before the passage we shall analyse below, gives the following definition of *vivarta*:

1. The fifth [aspect], turning and getting rid of fetters, means getting rid of the seven bodily evil deeds; the sixth aspect, purification and getting rid of fetters, consists in getting rid of the three mental evil deeds: this is named ‘turning.’ Turning means that the mind does not produce evil any more; <producing> evil constitutes not turning.<sup>59</sup>

My impression is that *vivarta* (Pāli *vivaṭṭanā*) is not discussed extensively in *Abhidharma* and exegetical literature concerning the *ānāpānasmṛti* practise. In the *Visuddhimagga*, which devotes a rather long and detailed discussion to *ānāpānasati* (chap. viii, §§ 145–244), *vivaṭṭanā* is listed among the eight stages<sup>60</sup> and glossed as *maggo*.<sup>61</sup>

<sup>58</sup> On these six aspects, see Deleanu 1992b: 52–57; Dhammajoti 2009; Dhammadipa 2009: 571–572.

<sup>59</sup> 第五還棄結者，謂棄身七惡；第六淨棄結者，為棄意三惡，是名為還。還者，為意不復起惡。<起>惡者是為不還也。(T 602 p. 167a 19–21). I conjecture <起> before 惡 also on the basis of the repetition of the phrase 還者，為意不復起惡 etc. found few columns below (T 602 p. 167a 23–24), where we indeed read 起惡者是為不還. One of these two occurrences of this passage is almost certainly due to a scribal error.

<sup>60</sup> The six stages found in K-ABSYJ, plus *phusanā* (third stage) and *paṭipassanā* (eighth and last stage).

<sup>61</sup> *Visuddhimagga* p. 230, chap. viii § 189 (see also p. 237 § 222). Elsewhere in the same section of the *Visuddhimagga* devoted to *ānāpānasati* it is the “knowledge of the way that is free from these imperfections” (Ñāṇamoli 1991: 279) which is defined as *maggo* (Pāli text p. 237 § 224: ... *upakkilesavimuttaṃ paṭipadāñāṇaṃ maggo ti vavatthapetvā* ...).

The Sarvāstivādin *Abhidharma* literature is perhaps more helpful to understand this stage in our two texts. Both the \**Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣā* and the *Abhidharmakośa* explain that *vivarta* involves a change of the object observed when practising the mindfulness of breathing.<sup>62</sup>

Whether this is what we have to read in the utterly obscure discussion of this subject found in the K-ABSJY (and, to be sure, in the T-ABSJY as well) remains open to question. Luckily enough, some help for deciphering our texts comes, quite unexpectedly, from another scripture which *de facto* provides us with a sort of commentary on An Shigao's translation. This is the *Zuochan sanmei jing* 坐禪三昧經 T 614, transmitted in the canon as a translation by Kumārajīva. In this text *vivarta* (*zhuanguan* 轉觀) is explained as follows:

2. Having abandoned fixation on the [bodily] accesses of the wind,<sup>63</sup>

The “imperfections” mentioned here are the “ten imperfections of insight” (as Ñānamoli renders the term *dasa vipassanupakkilesā*, on which see *Visuddhimagga* ch. XX §§ 105ff.), “which arise in the first stages of the contemplation of rise and fall” (*ibid.*). In this way Buddhaghosa establishes a connection between the mature stage of the “contemplation of rise and fall” (*udayabbayānupassanā*) and *vivaṭṭanā*. This is suggestive, as it can be further related to the treatment of *vivarta* – centered on the notion of impermanence and on the contemplation of rise and fall – found in both K-ASYJ and T-ABSJY.

<sup>62</sup> The \**Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣā* 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論 states that *vivarta* consists in turning from the contemplation of breathing to the production of the four *smṛtyupasthānas* (T 1545 p. 135a 23–25: 轉者, 轉此入出息觀, 起身念住, 展轉乃至起法念住). Some definitions of the functions performed by *vivarta* are listed on p. 135b 4–7 (see also Dhammajoti 2009: 642). According to the *Abhidharmakośa* (VI.12 p. 707, 14–15), *vivarta* involves a change and refinement of object, from wind to increasingly wholesome roots (*-uttarottareṣu kuśalamūleṣu*). On *vivarta* see also Deleanu 1992b: 53.

<sup>63</sup> 捨風門住. The expression *feng men* 風門, which is extremely rare in the canon, presumably refers, in this context, to the nostrils. Cf. also a preceding passage: 止法者, 數隨心極住意風門, 念入出息。(T 614 p. 275a 27–28).

one leaves [the preceding] rough method of contemplation.<sup>64</sup> [Then,] having so done, one realises that breathing is impermanent: this is called “contemplation by turning” (轉觀, \*vivarta). One contemplates the five obscure ones (五陰, *skandhas*) as impermanent, and is mindful of the fact that breathing in and breathing out arise and cease without being permanent. One perceives that the initial breath does not come from anywhere, and then observes that the successive breath likewise [vanishes] without a trace (?), [only] existing through the connection of causal factors, and [then] ceasing to exist when the causal factors are disconnected. [All] this is defined as “method of contemplation by turning.”<sup>65</sup>

In effect, this looks like a reasonable summary of the *vivarta* section in the K-ABSJY. The closeness in wording between this portion of the *Zuochan sanmei jing* and the corresponding passages in K-ABSJY and T-ABSJY is in some cases so striking, that it seems obvious that the author of the former had consulted the latter.<sup>66</sup>

This hypothesis fits well with the conclusions of research on the *Zuochan sanmei jing* recently presented by Toru Funayama (2006: 47–48). This and other similar scriptures produced by Kumārajīva’s circle are in fact not translations but, at least in part, compilations based on pre-existing materials (*ib. n. 38 p. 47*). It is then perfectly plausible that the compilers of the *Zuochan sanmei jing* made use, among other things, of An Shigao’s *Anban shouyi jing* which, as we have seen, had enjoyed such a popularity during the preceding periods. Even Sengrui’s reference to the *Larger* and *Smaller Anban* scriptures (see § 2 above) becomes more meaningful in the light of

---

<sup>64</sup> *Guanfa* 觀法, which is defined in the immediately preceding passage (T 614 p. 275b 5–7), is the translation of \**upalakṣaṇā* adopted in the *Zuochan sanmei jing*.

<sup>65</sup> 捨風門住，離塵觀法。離塵觀法，知息無常，此名轉觀。觀五陰無常，亦念入息、出息生滅無常。見初頭息無所從來，次觀後息亦無跡處，因緣合故有，因緣散故無，是名轉觀法。(Zuochan sanmei jing 坐禪三昧經 T 614 p. 275b 7–11).

<sup>66</sup> For example, consider the passage beginning with 見初頭息無所從來 (“One perceives that the initial breath does not come from anywhere etc.”), and cf. lemmata nos. 6 and 8 in the synoptic edition presented below.

the parallelism outlined above, especially in view of the particular relationship between this personage and the *Zuochan sanmei jing* (*ib.* p. 46). A systematic comparative study of the *ānāpānasmṛti* section in the *Zuochan sanmei jing* and the early texts devoted to this practise is no doubt worth attempting.<sup>67</sup>

Below I present synoptically the sections on *vivarta* in the K-ABSYJ and T-ABSYJ. Passages from the K-ABSYJ which appear quoted (with some variants) as lemmata in T-ABSYJ are numbered, printed in bold and underlined. My punctuation (and hence interpretation), especially of the difficult K-ABSYJ, remains highly tentative; variant readings are mentioned only when deemed necessary.

### 3. Section on *huan* 還 (*vivarta*)

K-ABSYJ (Kongō-ji MS  
A, cols. 109–120)

T-ABSYJ (T 602 p. 167a 19–b 26)

還爲何等？(1) 還五陰知見滅盡處。

入息出息色盛陰；

入息出息更痛痛盛陰；

入息出息念思想思想盛陰；

入息出息作行生死生死盛陰；

入息出息知識識盛陰。

如是(2) 受陰想已，如是受陰想，從生死便(3) 滅，受(4) 今有非前有，前有非今有。(5) 分別觀生死，(6) 見上頭无息所從來，作因有，不作盡无有。(7) 分別

(1a) 還五陰者，譬如買金得石，便棄捐地不用；人皆貪愛五陰，得苦痛，便不欲，是為還五陰也。

何等為便(1b) 見滅盡處？謂無所有，是為滅處。問：已無所有，何以故為處者？無所有處有四處：一者飛鳥以空中為處；二者羅漢以泥洹為處；三者道以無有為處；四者法在觀處也。出息入息

(2) 受五陰相者，謂意邪念，疾轉還正以生覺斷，為受五陰相。言受者，謂受不受相也。以受五陰相，知起何所滅何所。(3) 滅者，為受十二因緣。人從十二因緣生，亦從十二因緣死。不念者，為不念五陰也。知起何所滅何所，謂善惡因緣起便復滅；亦謂身亦謂氣生滅。

<sup>67</sup> When I was about to complete the present article, I came across Ven. Shi Guohui's interesting article on the textual formation of K-ABSYJ (2008). Although I do not find his general conclusions entirely convincing (see n. 122 below), he also noticed the parallelism between K-ABSYJ and *Zuochan sanmei jing*, providing a detailed comparative analysis of these two scriptures (2008: 127–129).

生死 (8)後觀无有迹處，作因有，已有便盡，不願向定成，度世已下<sup>68</sup>正道出世間地(9)未得道迹會不得中命盡要得道迹是天下地能得燒能得壞能得无有。得上說行者，不得中命盡惡墮道是名為還。

念便生，不念便死。意與身同等，是為斷生死道。在是生死間，一切惡事皆從意來也。(4)今不為前，前不為今者，謂前所念已滅，今念非前念。亦謂前世所作、今世所作各自得福。亦謂今所行善非前所行惡。亦謂今息非前息，前息非今息也。(5)為生死分別者，為意念生即生，念滅即滅，故言生死。當分別萬物及身過去未來福為索盡。何以故盡？以生便滅，滅便盡。已知盡，當盡力求也。(6)視上頭無所從來者，謂人無所從來，意起為人。亦謂人不自作來者，為有所從來；人自作自得，是為無所從來也。(7)生死當分別者，謂知分別五陰。亦謂知分別意生死，人意為常，知無有常，亦為分別也。(8)後視無處所者，為今現在\*視<sup>69</sup> 罪人在生死，會當得無有，脫於罪故，言後視無有處所。(9)未得道迹，不得中命盡，謂已得十五意不得中死。要當得十五意，便墮道，亦轉上至阿羅漢也。

The following is a very tentative translation of the T-ABSJY passage:

As to (1a) “turning to<sup>70</sup> the five obscuring factors” [in order to analyse them], it [may] be likened to [a person who, trying to] purchase gold, gets stones [instead], and then throws [these] down, without using them. All persons crave the five obscuring factors, and get suffering [in return]: then they [should] not desire [them any more]; this is “turning to the five obscuring factors.”

<sup>68</sup> 下: Kongō-ji MS<sup>B</sup> = 不.

<sup>69</sup> T 602 reads 不見, which does not seem to make sense; I tentatively correct this reading to *shi* 視 on the basis of the preceding lemma.

<sup>70</sup> My translation is tentative: one cannot rule out that here *huan* 還 is to be interpreted as “turning away from,” as is perhaps suggested by the T-ABSJY commentary.

What is it (1b) “**then one sees [their] point/place (處) of cessation**”?

It means that [when] there is nothing, this is the point/place of cessation. Question: given that there is nothing, how is it that it constitutes a place (處)? [Answer:] there are four [instances of] place consisting in the inexistence of place: the first is a flying bird which has empty space as its place; the second is the *arhat* who has *nirvāṇa* as his place;<sup>71</sup> the third is the Way (= *\*bodhi*?), which has inexistence (?) as its place; the fourth are (?) the *dharmas* which rest on the basis (處) [provided by] analysis.

As to (2) “**apprehending the characteristics<sup>72</sup> of the five obscure ones (skandha) when breathing out and in,**”<sup>73</sup> it means that when the mind thinks perversely, one [should] quickly turn to what is correct, in order to produce awareness [and] elimination<sup>74</sup> [of the negative mental states; this] is “apprehending the characteristics of the five obscure ones.” When [the *Anban shouyi jing*] says “**apprehending,**” it means [both] apprehending [and] not apprehending the characteristics [of the *skandhas*].<sup>75</sup> Because one apprehends the characteristics of the

<sup>71</sup> Cf. *Milindapañha* PTS ed. pp. 320–321: *Yathā ... ākāso ... vihagagamo nirāvarano ananto, evam eva kho ... nibbānaṃ ... ariyagamaṇaṃ nirāvaraṇaṃ anantaṃ.*

<sup>72</sup> Instead of the lemma’s *xiang* 相, K-ABSJY reads *xiang* 想; as is well known, these characters are often confused; in this case, 相 is probably the correct reading.

<sup>73</sup> On the correspondence between this passage of the T-ABSJY (出息入息) and its counterpart in the K-ABSJY, see the discussion below.

<sup>74</sup> This is a very tentative translation of 以生覺、斷. Alternatively, one could read *jueduan* 覺斷 together, as a single disyllabic word. This term is attested, in a context similar to the present one (on breathing and *ānāpānasmṛti*), in Buddhavarman’s translation of the *\*Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣā* (阿毘曇毘婆沙論 T 1546); e.g.: 覺斷入出息者, 觀察斷過去煩惱也。(T 1546 p. 107a 9–10). The corresponding term in Xuanzang’s translation of the *Mahāvibhāṣā* is *suiguanduan* 隨觀斷 (see T 1545 p. 136b 30 and ff.).

<sup>75</sup> My interpretation of this passage (謂受不受相也) is tentative. Given that this passage focuses on the impermanence of the *skandhas*, this might refer to the fact that one perceives them without clinging to them; cf. Ui 1971: 214; Du 1997: 70 (此處所言「受」, 就是受「不受相」).

five obscure ones, one knows what is produced and what ceases.<sup>76</sup> (3) “**Ceases**” [in the *Anban shouyi jing*] means being subject to the twelve causal links (*pratīyasamutpāda*). Human beings are born on the basis of the twelve causal links, and [likewise] perish on the basis of the twelve causal links.

Not thinking means not thinking of the five obscure ones. “One knows what is produced and what ceases” [in the passage above] means that positive and negative causal factors arise and then cease again. It also means that both body and ether are born and cease. When one thinks [of a certain thing (?)] it is born, when one does not think [of it], it then perishes; thought and body are alike, this is cutting off the path of birth and death. Within this [process of] birth and death, all negative states come from thought.

As to (4) “**the present is not the past, the past is not the present,**” it means that what has been previously thought has already ceased, and [hence] the present thought is not the previous thought. It also means that both what has been done in the past and what has been done in the present each receive their own [different] retribution. It also means that the good deeds performed at present are not the bad deeds performed in the past. It also means that the present breath is not the former breath, the former breath is not the present breath.

As to (5) “**making an examination of birth and death,**”<sup>77</sup> it means that if the mind thinks of birth, then [a certain state] is born, if one thinks of cessation, then [a certain state] ceases, therefore [here the *Anban shouyi jing*] mentions “birth and death.” [The practitioner] should examine<sup>78</sup> how the past and future retributions pertaining to the myriad of things as well as to oneself come to a complete<sup>79</sup> end. Why do they come to end? Because as soon as they arise, they cease,

<sup>76</sup> Cf. the following passage, also from the T-ABSJY: 知出何所滅何所者，譬如念石出石；入木，石便滅。五陰亦爾；出色入痛痒，出痛痒入思想，出思想入生死，出生死入識。(T 602 p. 168b 20–23).

<sup>77</sup> Cf. Ui 1971: 215. Note that the passage corresponding, in the K-ABSJY, to this lemma has a different reading: 分別觀生死, which is somewhat clearer from a syntactical point of view.

<sup>78</sup> *Fenbie* 分別; cf. 如有分別, “examining [things] how they [really] are” (*Yin chi ru jing* 陰持入經 T 603 p. 176a 15), corresponding to *yathābhūtaṃ vicayo* in the *Peṭakopadesa* (PTS ed. p. 122, 20–21).

<sup>79</sup> On this use of *suo* 索 see Hu 2002: 177–178.

[and so] ceasing they come to end. Having understood this [principle, viz. that they all] come to end, one should seek it with all one's energy.

(6) As to “**observing that one<sup>80</sup> does not come from anywhere in the past,**”<sup>81</sup> it means that persons do not come from anywhere, the arising of thought constitutes persons. It also means that if a person did not come [into being] through his own actions he would then come from somewhere; the fact that persons do [in fact] themselves obtain [the reward] of their own actions is [the meaning of] ‘not coming from anywhere.’

(7) “**Birth and death ought to be examined**” means knowing how to examine the five obscure ones. It also means knowing how to examine the [process of] birth and death of the mind. People consider it as being permanent;<sup>82</sup> if one understands that it is [in fact] impermanent, [this] too is examining.<sup>83</sup>

(8) “**Afterwards one observes that there is no place**” means that [although] in the present time one observes that sinners are in the [cycle of] birth-and-death, because they will eventually<sup>84</sup> attain inexistence

<sup>80</sup> K-ABSJY has 見上頭无息所從來 (probably to be corrected as \*見上頭息无所從來), and this reading appears confirmed by the parallel in the *Zuochan sanmei jing* T 614 (see above passage no. 2 with n. 65–66: 見初頭息無所從來). However, it seems clear that the commentary on this passage in the T-ABSJY is actually based on the lemma it quotes, without 息.

<sup>81</sup> Concerning this obscure expression, 無所從來, it might be interesting to note that in the *Chang ahan shi bao fa jing* 長阿含十報法經 (*Daśottarasūtra*) T 13 translated by An Shigao, *pūrvanivāsānusr̥ti* is rendered as 知本從來 (T 13 p. 236b 5). This possible parallelism becomes even more significant if we consider that elsewhere the T-ABSJY itself seems to be quoting the entire list of the six *ābhijñās* exactly from the same *Chang ahan shi bao fa jing* (cf. n. 127 below), with the minor variant 知本所從來 (T 602 p. 173a 22) for *pūrvanivāsānusr̥ti*.

<sup>82</sup> Unlike Ui (1971: 215) and Du (1997: 73), here I tentatively take *yiwei* 意為 together in the sense of “to consider etc.” (= 意謂); for a possible parallel cf. *Qi chu san guan jing* 七處三觀經 T 150A p. 876c 25: 非常, 人意為常.

<sup>83</sup> My punctuation and translation of this obscure passage partly follow Ui 1971: 215 and Du 1997: 73–74.

<sup>84</sup> Both Ui (1971: 215) and Du 1997: 75) follow in this point the punctuation proposed by the *Taishō*, separating *hui* 會 and *dang* 當. However,



and free themselves from [their] sins,<sup>85</sup> [the *Anban shouyi jing*] states that “**Afterwards one observes that there is no place.**”

(9) “**When one has not yet attained [the status of the] Path-seeking One,<sup>86</sup> one cannot perish in the middle of one’s life**” means that if one has already achieved the fifteen thoughts,<sup>87</sup> one cannot die within [that status]; one should<sup>88</sup> achieve the fifteen thoughts, then one would reach the path<sup>89</sup> and progress up to the [status of] Arhat.<sup>90</sup>

I will not address here the question of how much sense my translation of the above passage makes, especially from a doctrinal point

---

*huidang* 會當 (“certainly, in the end etc.”) is a common disyllabic word in medieval Chinese (e.g. see Dong and Cai 1994: 253–254; Ōta 1988: 73; Zacchetti 2005: 271 n. 238). As to my reading of 會當得無有 as a separate phrase, cf. also 能得無有 in the K-ABSJY.

<sup>85</sup> Provided that my interpretation is correct (which is far from certain!), this passage sounds problematic (but also intriguing) from a doctrinal point of view.

<sup>86</sup> On 道迹 / 道跡 as an early translation of *srotaāpanna* see Zacchetti 2002b: 86 n. 64.

<sup>87</sup> As observed by Du Jiwen (1997: 76 n. 11; cf. also Ui 1971: 241), 十五意 must refer to the fifteen moments (*pañcadaśa kṣaṇāḥ*) of the *darśamārga* (see, for example, *Abhidharmakośa* VI.28 p. 730, 5).

<sup>88</sup> On *yaodang* 要當 see Dong and Cai 1994: 575ff.

<sup>89</sup> The expression 便墮道 is likely to refer to the achievement of the status of *srotaāpanna*. In two passages of the *Yin chi ru jing* T 603 we find the expression 墮道迹 used in the sense of “becoming *srotaāpanna*”; see, for example, T 603 p. 178a 19: 道弟子便墮道迹, which corresponds to *ariyasāvako hoti sotāpanno* in the *Peṭakopadesa* (PTS ed. p. 130, 26–27; cf. Zacchetti 2007: 403, § 3.2.1.a); see also T 603 p. 179a 24 = *Peṭakopadesa* p. 133, 14. In the light of these parallels, instead of the text found in T 602 (便墮道, 亦轉上至阿羅漢也), one could perhaps read 便墮道\*迹, 轉上至etc., emending 亦 to 迹.

<sup>90</sup> After this in the T-ABSJY there follows another passage which is clearly part of the same gloss on 不得中命盡, but has so far defied all my attempts to translate it (cf. Ui 1971: 215 and Du 1997: 73): 中得道 [宋、元、明 eds. +迹] 亦不得中命盡, 為息、意、身凡三事, 謂善惡意要當得道迹亦復中壞。息死復生, 善意起復滅, 身亦不得中死也。(T 602 p. 167b 26–29).

of view, nor will I discuss whether in this case the ABSYJ provides a good explanation of the K-ABSYJ text.<sup>91</sup> One thing, however, seems clear: the T-ABSYJ passage edited above in the right-hand column is a commentary on the K-ABSYJ passage quoted on the left. The overall consistency in the sequence of topics and especially the presence of lemmata in T-ABSYJ (often followed by the particle *zhe* 者) do not leave room for any doubts.<sup>92</sup>

And yet this is no doubt a particular kind of commentary: it does not explain each phrase or term of the basic text. In other words: it is not at all so closely bound to it, but it contains some free digressions, especially the rather long one at the beginning of the section on *vivarta* (passage no. 1 above) from 第五還棄結者是為助意也.<sup>93</sup>

Now, if we take a closer look at the lemmata quoted from the K-ABSYJ into the T-ABSYJ passage presented above, we will notice that while several of them are indeed literal quotations, others diverge from the K-ABSYJ parallels in some more or less significant details (generally one or two words), such as nos. 4 (今不為前·前不為今者) and 5 (為生死分別者), corresponding to 今有非前有·前有非今有 and 分別觀生死 respectively in K-ABSYJ, which rather look like free quotations. Of course, the long, independent textual transmission of these two scriptures may well have played

---

<sup>91</sup> Note that in the passage translated above I have rendered the lemmata on the basis of their explanations found in T-ABSYJ (as far as I could understand them), but I am far from being sure that these represent a correct interpretation of the K-ABSYJ text.

<sup>92</sup> Some instances of parallelism between K-ABSYJ and T-ABSYJ, including four occurring in the section on *vivarta*, have been pointed out as “parallel passages and similar sentences” also by Deleanu (2003: 81–82; see also n. 35 p. 82), who concludes that “such similar passages are ... very few.” However, as I will show, these are not isolated or casual parallels, but part of a more general and coherent pattern which is present (though perhaps less perspicuously) also in other sections of the two scriptures.

<sup>93</sup> Incidentally, this passage has a significant parallel in the *Ahan koujie shi'er men jing* T 1508 ascribable to An Shigao (see Zacchetti 2004: 215–216).

a role in producing such discrepancies, but occasionally we can perceive in the profile of quotations a conscious editorial technique at work.

In this respect, the gloss on lemma no. 2 in the T-ABSYJ (出息入息受五陰相) is particular interesting: it is in part (受 ... 陰相) a direct quotation (with the common variant 相 for 想) of its K-ABSYJ counterpart (受陰想), while the rest (出息入息) summarises the immediately preceding enumeration of the five *skandhas* associated with breathing in and out (入息出息色盛陰; 入息出息更痛痛盛陰 etc.).

But the long passage on *vivarta* presents other intriguing features. Let us consider, for instance, the two passages I have underscored in the T-ABSYJ passage. The first occurrence of the string 知起何所滅何所 is part of the gloss on lemma no. 2 (受者); but then the second occurrence (知起何所滅何所·調善惡因緣起便復滅 etc.), must be a sub-commentary on this very gloss. And this is not the only instance of this sort of sub-commentary found in the T-ABSYJ (see, for instance, example no. 5 below).

The passage I have marked with dotted characters (不念者 etc.) represents yet another typology of gloss not infrequent in the T-ABSYJ: it gives every appearance of being a gloss on a lemma which, however, is not found, in this context, either in K- or in T-ABSYJ. The presence of this and other similar passages remains one of the mysteries of the T-ABSYJ.

This rather clear text / commentary pattern can be seen mainly in the section devoted in both scriptures to the crucial six aspects, or stages, being endowed with which, according to the *Abhidharmaśāstra*, the *ānāpānasmṛti* is perfected.<sup>94</sup> We can also observe, in this connection, that these six aspects played a crucial role in An Shigao’s teaching on mindfulness of breathing.<sup>95</sup>

I will list here two other passages (preceding and following the section on *vivarta* quoted above as no. 3) which show, to varying degrees, the kind of parallelism pointed out above. For the sake of

<sup>94</sup> Ed. Shastri p. 706: *ṣaṭkāraṇayuktā caiṣā paripūrṇā bhavati*.

<sup>95</sup> See Zacchetti 2003: 287–288 and 2004: 215–217.

concision, I omit from the passages I quote the parts which do not have a direct bearing to our discussion.

#### 4. Section on 止 (\**sthāpanā*)

K-ABSYJ (Kongō-ji MS A, cols. 78–80)

止爲何等？(1) 入息至竟遍止鼻頭莫隨 (2) 出息至竟著鼻頭莫隨 是爲止。何用是止？但欲從是止念。

T-ABSYJ (T 602 p. 166c 22–167a 2)

(1) 入息至盡鼻頭止，謂惡不復入，至鼻頭止。(2) 出息至盡著鼻頭，謂意不復離身行向惡故著鼻頭，亦謂息初入時，便一念向不復轉。息出入亦不復覺，是爲止也。止者，如出息入息覺知前意出，不覺後意出。覺前意爲意相觀，便察出入息見敗，便受相畏生死便却意，便隨道意相也。

(1–2) 莫為相隨者<sup>96</sup>，但念著鼻頭，五陰因緣不復念，罪斷意滅，亦不喘息，是爲止也。莫為相隨者，謂莫復意念出入，隨五陰因緣，不復喘息也。

#### 5. Section on 觀 (\**upalakṣaṇā*)

K-ABSYJ (Kongō-ji MS A, cols. 82–88)

觀爲何等？入息出息分別(1) 俱相觀 受意念法想。入息出息爲色陰；

T-ABSYJ (T 602 p. 167a 3–18)

第四觀者，觀息敗時與觀身體異息。見因緣生，無因緣滅也。心意受相者<sup>97</sup>，謂意

<sup>96</sup> The text corresponding, in this section of the K-ABSYJ, to the commentary's 莫為相隨 is simply *mo sui* 莫隨, but the expression *xiang sui* 相隨 is attested elsewhere in the K-ABSYJ (see MS A col. 104).

<sup>97</sup> The string 心意受相 in the T-ABSYJ might perhaps be related (with the usual variation 相 / 想) to the reading 受意念法想 found in the K-ABSYJ (see also Shi Guohui 2008b: 6).

入息出息更痛爲受痛陰；  
 入息出息覺爲成思想陰；  
 入息出息覺爲受行陰；  
 入息出息覺從念是爲識盛陰。  
 如是受陰想已，如是受陰想分別俱  
 想觀，新新生滅，相離(2) **无有故**  
 (3) **觀入息異出息異**，入息因痛異，  
 出息因痛異， etc.

欲有所得，心計因緣會當復  
 滅，便斷所欲不復向，是為  
 心意受相也。以識因緣為

(1) **俱相觀**者，謂識知五陰因  
 緣。

出息亦觀，入息亦  
 觀。觀者，謂觀五  
 陰，是為俱觀。亦應意意相  
 觀，為兩因緣，在內斷惡念  
 道也。

(3) **觀出息異入息異者**，謂  
 出息為生死陰，入息為思想  
 陰。有時出息為痛痒陰，  
 入息為識陰，隨因緣起便受  
 陰。意所向無有常，用是故  
 為異。道人當分別知是。亦  
 謂出息滅，入息生；入息  
 滅，出息生也。(2) **無有故**  
**者**，謂人意及萬物，意起已  
 滅，物生復死，是為無有故  
 也。非出息是入息，非入息  
 是出息；非，謂出息時意不  
 念入息，入息時意不念出  
 息。所念異故言非也。中信<sup>98</sup>  
 ，謂入道中見道因緣信道，  
 是為中信也。

However, in other parts of the T-ABSJY, the relationship with the K-ABSJY is of a very different kind.

Let us consider the initial part in both scriptures. Here the T-ABSJY is largely independent from the K-ABSJY: whereas the latter simply lists some key terms of the *ānāpānasmṛti* practise, providing each of them with short definitions, the former devotes to the same topics a vast profusion of glosses. The K-ABSJY begins

<sup>98</sup> The expression being commented here (*zhong xin* 中信) has, as far as I can see, no corresponding term in the K-ABSJY (cf. Deleanu 2003: 89 with n. 61).

with a short discussion of the very word *ānāpānasmṛti*,<sup>99</sup> which is reflected, in the T-ABSJY, by a long and detailed exposition (T 602 p. 163c 20–164a 24),<sup>100</sup> introducing some of those terminological combinations which are so typical of An Shigao’s tradition.<sup>101</sup> Then the K-ABSJY introduces the “six matters” (*liu shi* 六事) of *ānāpānasmṛti*, briefly defining their basic functions (Kongō-ji MS A, cols. 64–71); corresponding to this, we find in the T-ABSJY a long series of glosses on these six stages as a group (T 602 p. 164a 24–b 26). Then the first of the six stages, “counting” (*shu* 數, \**gaṇanā*), is singled out from the list, and discussed in a long and exceedingly detailed passage which, as such, is completely independent from the K-ABSJY, adding much materials not found in the latter text (T 602 p. 164b 27–165a 3). This portion of the T-ABSJY is followed by a section on the so-called “sixteen excellent [practises]” (*shiliu sheng* 十六勝) relevant to *ānāpānasmṛti* (T 602 p. 165a 4–19),<sup>102</sup> of which there is no trace in the K-ABSJY, after which we find a long section containing remarks (at times in the form of questions and answers)<sup>103</sup> on the preceding portions and on the practise of “counting” in general (T 602 p. 165a 19–166b 16). Thus the whole initial portion of the T-ABSJY (T 602 p. 163c 20–166b 16) can be interpreted as a long, free commentary to just ten columns of the K-ABSJY.

<sup>99</sup> 何等爲安？何等爲般？何等爲安般守意？入息爲安；出息爲般；隨是法意是名爲安般守意。(Kongō-ji MS A cols. 62–63).

<sup>100</sup> I quote here just the beginning of this passage: 安爲身，般爲息，守意爲道。守者，爲禁亦謂不犯戒。禁者，亦爲護。護者，遍護一切無所犯。意者，息；意亦爲道也。(T 602 p. 163c 20–22).

<sup>101</sup> See Zacchetti 2002: 82 n. 47 and 2004: 219–221. This portion of the T-ABSJY includes, *inter alia*, a group of terms which is not mentioned in the K-ABSJY, viz. the “ten [kinds of] wisdom” 十黠 (see Deleanu 2003: 83 with n. 43).

<sup>102</sup> On this subject, see Deleanu 2003: 92 and 1992b: 49–52; Dhammajoti 2008; Dhammadipa 2009: 568–570.

<sup>103</sup> It is to be noted that the form question and answer (問/報), which occurs 35 times (quite a high number of times for such a text) is entirely absent from the first pages of the T-ABSJY, while it is used with increasing frequency especially in the second roll of this scripture.

What conclusions can we draw from the preceding comparative analysis of the two scriptures? The first, main point we can make is that even in those portions which are more clearly commenting upon the K-ABSJY (e.g. passages nos. 3–5 quoted above), the T-ABSJY is *not an interlinear commentary* – that is: it is not a commentary whose glosses are *inserted into the complete basic text*. Indeed, several features of the various passages examined before seemingly rule out the traditional interpretation of the T-ABSJY, such as the very form in which are edited those passages which find close parallels in the K-ABSJY. Not only are the lemmata neither complete nor always precise (with frequent variations in lexicon and word order), while an interlinear commentary (*zhu* 注) normally consists of the *complete* basic text, *into which* the glosses are inserted.<sup>104</sup> But the use of the form “... *zhe, wei* ...” (... 者, 謂 ...) shows that these “parallels” are in fact occasional – though not infrequent – quotations of passages from the translated basic scripture *into* an exegetical text, not the other way round, as would be expected in a normal interlinear commentary. In this respect, one can compare the T-ABSJY with the *Yin chi ru jing zhu* 陰持入經註 T 1694, just to mention an example which is particularly telling, given that this interlinear commentary was probably composed (though on the basis of entirely different criteria) at around the same time and by the same editorial team to which we owe also the T-ABSJY.<sup>105</sup>

Incidentally, this is the reason why Ui Hakuju’s reconstruction of what he believed was the original aspect of the T-ABSJY (in Ui 1971) is not valid: not just because he may have occasionally failed to draw correctly the line between main text and commentary,<sup>106</sup> but for a more substantial reason: he worked on the basis of a wrong assumption, namely that there was a *jing* 經 and an interpolated *zhu*

<sup>104</sup> See Kanno 2003: 302–303.

<sup>105</sup> See Zacchetti forthcoming.

<sup>106</sup> Of course, it is easy now, having the K-ABSJY at our disposal, to criticize Ui Hakuju for the shortcomings we find in his work on the T-ABSJY, which remains an important achievement. On Ui’s way of subdividing this text see also Deleanu’s remarks (2003: 86 n. 55).

注 to be separated.<sup>107</sup> In doing this he was no doubt misled by the great Sugi's remark on this scripture (經注不分). In other words, in all probability the present state of T-ABSYJ is not the result of an alteration of its original aspect: this is just a typologically very peculiar, perhaps unique,<sup>108</sup> exegetical text. And, in its own peculiar way, it is (mainly, at least) a commentary precisely on the K-ABSYJ.

Florin Deleanu (2003: 70–71) has shown that the K-ABSYJ can be subdivided into five main sections:

1. Definition of *ānāpānasmṛti*.
2. Exposition of the six practises (counting etc.).
3. Exposition of the 37 factors conducive to awakening (*bodhipākṣikā dharmāḥ*).
4. Exposition of some doctrinal categories related to cultivation: *śamatha* and *vipaśyanā*, realisation of the Four Truths etc.
5. The Four Fruits (*sakṛdāgāmin*, *anāgāmin* etc.).

If we leave aside the details (as well as the digressions and repetitions so common in the T-ABSYJ, which, as I have shown, can be accounted for), and just focus on the main points, we can see how the content of first four main sections of the K-ABSYJ is found also in the T-ABSYJ,<sup>109</sup> and in essentially the same sequence, in spite of the fact that its final part is rather confusing and contains many repetitions:<sup>110</sup>

<sup>107</sup> Cf. also Shi Guohui 2008b.

<sup>108</sup> Cf. Kanno's presentation of early Chinese Buddhist commentaries (2003: 303–307).

<sup>109</sup> For a convenient synopsis of T-ABSYJ see Deleanu 2003: 71–75.

<sup>110</sup> The last section in which the two scriptures display the kind of complex relationship basic text / commentary described in the preceding pages is that on *śamatha* and *vipaśyanā* and the realisation of the Four Truths (K-ABSYJ cols. 219–225 ≅ T-ABSYJ T 602 p. 168c 17–169a 7; cf. Deleanu 2003: 81 with n. 34). I quote here the two texts, highlighting the corresponding passages (my punctuation is tentative):

#### K-ABSYJ

何等爲兩法？一者止，二者觀。止亦觀雙俱行。行，便行知受解四諦：一識



1. Definition of *ānāpānasmṛti* (T-ABSJYJ T 602 p. 163c 20–164a 24).
2. Exposition of the six practises (T 602 p. 164a 24–167c 1).
3. Exposition of the 37 factors conducive to awakening (T 602 p. 167c 2–168c 16).
4. *Śamatha* and *vipaśyanā*, realisation of the Four Truths (T 602 p. 168c 17–169a 7).

Only the last main subject introduced by the K-ABSJYJ (Four Fruits) is entirely absent from the T-ABSJYJ.

There is one feature of the T-ABSJYJ which apparently goes against its interpretation as a commentary: unlike the K-ABSJYJ, which begins directly with the definition of *ānāpānasmṛti*, the text transmitted in the canon seems to be provided, at the very beginning, with a setting – or rather, alternative settings – (“The Buddha was in the land of Sakya/Śakya, in the land of Vajjī/Vṛjī – someone says in the land of Icchānaṅgala”).<sup>111</sup> However, if we take a closer look at this initial portion of the T-ABSJYJ, we will easily find that

苦，二舍習，三盡自證，四行道滿。譬如日出作四事：一壞冥，二為現明，三為見色萬物，四成熟萬物；止觀亦如是正雙行，便知受解四諦：一識苦，二舍習，三盡自證，四諦行滿也。

#### T-ABSJYJ

道人行道未得觀，當校計得觀。在所觀，意不復轉，為得觀止惡一法，為坐禪觀二法。有時觀身，有時觀意，有時觀喘息，有時觀有，有時觀無，在所因緣當分別觀也。止惡一法，觀二法，惡已盡。止觀者為觀道。惡未盡，不見道；惡已盡，乃得觀[v.l. 見]道也。止惡一法為知惡。一切能制不著意為止，亦為得息相隨止。得息相隨止，是為止惡一法。惡已止，便得觀故為觀二法。為得四諦為行淨。當復作淨者，識苦棄習知盡行道。如日出時。淨轉出十二門故。經言：從道得脫也[cf. n. 127 below]。去冥見明如日出時。譬如日出，多所見為棄諸冥。冥為苦。何以知為苦？多所望礙故知為苦。何等為棄習？謂不作事。何等為盡證？謂無所有。道者明識苦斷習盡證念道。識從苦生，不得苦亦無有識，是為苦也。盡證者，謂知人盡當老病死。證者，知萬物皆當滅，是為盡證也。譬如日出作四事：一壞冥，謂慧能壞礙；二見明，謂礙除獨慧在；三見色萬物，為見身諸所有惡露；四成熟萬物，設無日月，萬物不熟；人無有慧，礙意亦不熟也。

<sup>111</sup> For the reconstructions of the Indic names underlying 越祇國, 舍羈瘦國, and 遮匿迦羅國, I follow Aramaki 1971: 139.

this probably does not constitute a *nidāna*, but just a short notice on the Buddha's practise of the *ānāpānasmṛti*.<sup>112</sup> There is one aspect of this initial passage of T-ABSJY which can substantiate this hypothesis: it contains an expression (蜻飛蠕動之類; "species [of animals] that flit and wriggle")<sup>113</sup> which is a stock formula used for designing living beings in general, and well attested (with some variants) in translations by Lokakṣema, Zhi Qian, Kang Senghui, and Dharmarakṣa,<sup>114</sup> just to mention a few important names, but (apart from this very occurrence in the T-ABSJY) absent from An Shigao's corpus.

Above I have shown that, in *some* sections, the T-ABSJY is – at times very clearly so – a commentary to some *specific* passages of the K-ABSJY, but also that this pattern is not followed consistently. This, at first sight, is one of the most puzzling features of this scripture. If the T-ABSJY is a commentary to the K-ABSJY, as is clearly suggested by some of its parts, how is it possible that in many other places, even where it discusses topics related to the *ānāpānasmṛti* practise in an extremely detailed way, no mention is made of significant terms or subjects introduced by the K-ABSJY

---

<sup>112</sup> 佛在越祇國舍羈瘦國，亦說一名遮匿迦羅國。時佛坐行安般守意九十日。佛復獨坐九十日者，思惟校計欲度脫十方人及蜻飛蠕動之類。復言：『我行安般守意九十日者，安般守意得自在慈念意』。(T 602, p. 163, c15–19). On this passage see Deleanu 2003: 89 and n. 63 pp. 90–91, who also tentatively takes this passage as a “later interpolation” (*id.* n. 60). I think that this interpretation is certainly correct, in the sense that this is simply part of the commentary, and is not to be seen as an original translation by An Shigao.

<sup>113</sup> I have adopted, with minor modifications, Paul Harrison's rendition of this formula (1990: 246).

<sup>114</sup> Concerning the presence of this formula (often used to render *sarvasattva-*) in Lokakṣema's corpus, see Harrison 1990: 246. An occurrence is found in chapter 29 of the *Da mingdu jing* 大明度經 (T 225 p. 506b 27), i.e. in a portion of this scripture which, according to Jan Nattier (2008: 137), can be reasonably ascribed to Zhi Qian. For Kang Senghui see *Liu du ji jing* 六度集經 T 152 p. 3b 20, 15a 11, 19a 3–4 and *passim* (see also Deleanu 1992: 53); for Dharmarakṣa, see for example his translation of the Larger *Prajñāpāramitā* (*Guang zan jing* 光讚經 T 222 p. 162b 20).

in the corresponding sections? Is it possible to put forward a reasonable working hypothesis which could enable us to explain, at least to a certain extent, the strange inconsistencies of this text? I think that the answer can be positive, and that the key to many of these problems is to be found in Kang Senghui’s preface to the *Anban shouyi jing*, which (intriguingly enough) is found in the canon before the T-ABSJY, and in the Kongō-ji MS before the K-ABSJY.

Erik Zürcher suggested that the glosses supposedly interpolated into the T-ABSJY “basically represent the exegesis transmitted to K’ang Seng-hui by the three laymen from the school of An Shih-kao, as stated by K’ang in his preface to this scripture.”<sup>115</sup> In fact what Kang Senghui seems to be telling us in his preface is that he assisted a certain Chen Hui 陳慧 (a follower of An Shigao’s school) in composing a commentary to An Shigao’s *Anban shouyi jing*, a commentary based on An Shigao’s own interpretation of this scripture.<sup>116</sup>

But what sort of explanations by An Shigao had Chen Hui and Kang Senghui at their disposal? As I have tried to demonstrate elsewhere,<sup>117</sup> we have now a fairly clear idea of the sort of exegetical materials produced by An Shigao’s circle during the Han. We possess two typologically similar texts – in my opinion the records of

---

<sup>115</sup> Zürcher 1978: 119. Of course, one cannot completely rule out the possibility that the T-ABSJY may contain also glosses composed by other authors and added to the text at a later stage, as maintained by some scholars (on this issue see Deleanu 1992: 52–55 and cf. *id.* 2003: 85 n. 52).

<sup>116</sup> “Chen Hui annotated these doctrines and I aided in consultation and revision. If it was not from the master, it was not transmitted [by me] since I dared not [add anything] on my own initiative” 陳慧注義，余助斟酌。非師不[*v.l.* 所]傳，不敢自由也。(T 602 p. 163c 5–6; T 2145 p. 43b 29-c 1; tr. Link 1976: 80). On the crucial problem of the identity of the “master” referred to by Kang Senghui in this passage, Arthur Link (1976: 64) convincingly argued: “Since K’ang Seng-hui was an ordained monk, and those who transmitted the *An-pan shou-yi* exegesis to him were Chinese laymen, it is very unlikely that he would refer to any one of them as ‘master.’ It therefore seems certain that the ‘master’ here designates only one person, An Shih-kao.”

<sup>117</sup> Zacchetti 2004: 219–221.

“oral explanations” (*koujie* 口解) – the *Ahan koujie shi'er yinyuan jing* 阿含口解十二因緣經 (hereafter AHKJ) T 1508, and the commentary on the *Shi'er men jing* 十二門經 (hereafter SMJcomm) preserved in the same Kongō-ji manuscripts as the K-ABSJY. In my opinion, both of these texts can be ascribed, on the basis of various facts, to An Shigao and his followers.<sup>118</sup>

Now, what if Chen Hui and Kang Senghui had used a similar text – a hypothetical \**Anban koujie* 安般口解, i.e., a lecture on the *Anban shouyi jing* not strictly bound to the basic text and full of digressions on more or less closely related topics, such as the AHKJ and the SMJcomm – by An Shigao? I think that this is more than a guess. When I compared the SMJcomm and the AHKJ with the T-ABSJY, I discovered several specific and significant correspondences in matter of typology, doctrinal content, and peculiar terminology shared by these three texts.<sup>119</sup>

We have, in fact, even some direct evidence supporting that hypothesis. As I tried to demonstrate elsewhere, the “Master” who authored the three glosses on the *ānāpānasamṛti* found at the end of the K-ABSJY<sup>120</sup> is probably no other than An Shigao himself. And one of these three glosses occurs, very significantly, also in the T-ABSJY.<sup>121</sup> These glosses, then, by a rare chance might have

<sup>118</sup> This is practically certain for the AHKJ T 1508 (see Zacchetti 2004: 212–215). The case of the SMJcomm – which is nowhere mentioned in the old catalogues – is certainly more complex, but its connection with An Shigao’s tradition is strongly suggested by several bits of evidence (see Zacchetti 2003: 285–295 and 2004b); cf. however Nattier 2008: 65.

<sup>119</sup> See Zacchetti 2004: 215–219 and 2004b.

<sup>120</sup> This short exegetical appendix to K-ABSJY (see n. 10 above; cf. Deleanu 2003: 70–71 with n. 20; Zacchetti 2003: 287–289) reads as follows: 師云：『數息為一禪，相隨為二禪，止為三禪，觀為四禪』。師云：『數息為四意止，相隨為四意斷，止為四神足，觀為五根、五力，還為七覺意，淨為八道行』。師云：『數息為須陀洹，相隨為斯陀含，止為阿那含，觀為阿羅漢』。(MS A, cols. 276–282).

<sup>121</sup> 數息為四意止，相隨為四意斷，止為四神足念，觀為五根、五力，還為七覺意，淨為八行也。(T 602 p. 164b 18–19); cf. the second Master’s gloss found at the end of K-ABSJY, as quoted in the preceding note. The first of these three glosses, on the other hand, is quoted from the SMJcomm

preserved a direct remnant of the “explanations” of An Shigao used to compile the T-ABSJY.

And yet in several respects the T-ABSJY remains considerably different from the other two early exegetical texts ascribable to An Shigao’s circle.<sup>122</sup> The SMJcomm, too refers a couple of times to its

---

(see Zacchetti 2003: 287–289).

<sup>122</sup> In recent years, Ven. Shi Guohui (Hung Hung-lung) has been publishing a steady stream of studies focused on both K-ABSJY and T-ABSJY (some signed with his lay name, and some with his religious name; for convenience, I have followed the author’s usage, and recorded these studies separately in my bibliography). His works relevant to this subject known to me are: Hung 2006, 2008, and 2009; Shi Guohui 2008 and 2008b. The last two are the longest of this group of articles, and I could access them only when the present study was approaching completion. I will try now to summarise Hung’s conclusions about the nature of these scriptures and their mutual relationship as I could understand them.

First of all, he notices several parallelisms between K-ABSJY and the chapter on *ānāpānasmṛti* (數息品) of Saṅgharakaṣa’s *Yogācārabhūmi* translated by Dharmarakaṣa (*Xiuxing daodi jing* 修行道地經 T 606 p. 213a 21ff.), and concludes that “the text [viz. K-ABSJY] was written by An Shigao, but is not entirely a direct translation from an original source ...”; rather, it is a concoction of different sources, particularly the Indic original of the above mentioned *Yogācārabhūmi* chapter (Hung 2008: 143–144; see also Shi Guohui 2008: 131–138 and 140–141; Hung 2006: 116 refers to Aramaki 1971: 140–141 as the ultimate source of this idea). I must say that I found none of the parallels between K-ABSJY and other sources pointed out by the author in support of his thesis particularly clear or convincing. That there should be parallelism between different scriptures in their treatment of fundamental Buddhist tenets such as, for example, the thirty-seven *bodhipāṅśikas* (see Hung 2008: 137–142) is hardly surprising given the highly formulaic nature of the passages at issue, and per se certainly does not imply any direct connection. Moreover, both structure and style of K-ABSJY seem rather coherent, and I see no compelling reason to doubt that this text is not the translation of a single original. In fact the style of this scripture is clearly that of a very direct translation, and indeed several passages betray the tendency to stick to the syntax of the Indic original which is typical of An Shigao’s translation technique (see Zacchetti 2007: 398–400; see also

basic text (the *Shi'er men jing* 十二門經),<sup>123</sup> but not nearly as often as the T-ABSYJ. The fact that literal (or almost literal) parallels to the K-ABSYJ found in the T ABSYJ are, as already remarked, generally concluded by the particle *zhe* 者 is also telling: these are traces of a conscious editing on the part of the people who compiled this commentary – viz., most likely, Chen Hui and Kang Senghui.

In other words, we can speculate that perhaps the T-ABSYJ was not produced as a “normal” commentary, working mainly on the basis of the scripture to be commented on, but, rather, its compilers tried to put some already existing exegetical material on the *ānāpānasmṛti* and related practises – presumably fluid and rather unsystematic as the other old “oral explanations” – into a more solid frame, matching it, whenever deemed possible or necessary, with the basic text, that is, An Shigao’s translation of the *ānāpānasmṛti* scripture, and adding some parts from their own hand. After all this hypothesis would fit Kang Senghui’s description of his collaboration with Chen Hui.

---

Deleanu 2003: 79–81). Concerning the relationship between K-ABSYJ and T-ABSYJ, Hung 2006: 118 concluded that “[w]e find that T-ASYJ is an oral interpretation [口解] just like ... T 1508, whereas K-ASYJ is a simplified literal rendering.” This hypothesis, I believe, partly goes in the right direction, even if, as I have argued in the present article, I do not think that T-ABSYJ can be considered, *sic et simpliciter*, the direct transcription of an “oral explanation.” However, more recently Hung has proposed a more complex (and, in my opinion, more cumbersome and even less convincing) picture. I quote here his conclusions from the English abstract of Shi Guohui 2008b (p. 64; cf. also *id.* pp. 2, 4, 57–58), leaving the reader to judge the soundness of these arguments: “... we can infer that *Anban Shouyi Jing* has been interpreted a number of times in its history, and between the original version of *Foshou* [*sic*] *Da Anban Shouyi Jing* that has not yet been ‘paraphrased’ (with paraphrases added) by Chen Hui [*sic*], and the newly discovered version of *Anban Shouyi Jing*, an ‘intermediate version’ of *Anban Shouyi Jing* should be identified. This ‘intermediate version’ of *Anban Shouyi Jing* can be identified in the form of the newly discovered *Anban Shouyi Jing*. It is also very likely that the contents of this version also include the ‘plain and explicit’ interpretations by An Shigao himself.”

<sup>123</sup> See Zacchetti 2003: 279–280.

If this is correct, many apparently incoherent features of the T-ABSYJ become understandable. For example, it is conceivable that the “editors” (Chen Hui and Kang Senghui) did not always quote the basic text: for example, we can imagine, when the hypothetical “oral explanations” they were editing had an excursus which did not correspond very well to the original *Anban shouyi jing*. In an exegetical text of this kind, which does not follow its basic scripture as closely as an interlinear commentary, it is not surprising that we should find that some topics introduced by the basic text are not mentioned at all, while other topics, not present in the basic text (like the “sixteen excellent [practises]” *shiliu sheng* 十六勝 and the “ten [kinds] of wisdom” *shi xia* 十點), could occur in the commentary. Or, again, that there should be differences in matter of terminology between basic text and commentary.<sup>124</sup> On the contrary, all these features are reminiscent of the SMJcomm, in which some topics of the basic text are dealt with in a very detailed way (e.g. the pair *vitarka / vicāra*),<sup>125</sup> while others are not referred to at all – not to mention the frequent digressions typical not only of this commentary, but of the AHKJ as well. It is also probable that Chen Hui and Kang Senghui may occasionally have taken a more active role in editing their materials, although it is generally hard to detect their intervention and to determine their procedures in any specific way.<sup>126</sup> There is, however, some evidence suggesting that the authors of the commentary made use of other scriptures translated by An Shigao.<sup>127</sup>

<sup>124</sup> Cf. Deleanu 2003: 82–83.

<sup>125</sup> See Zacchetti 2003: 280.

<sup>126</sup> A possible exception is the introductory section of T-ABSYJ discussed above, which seems to betray the presence of Kang Senghui’s hand, as already pointed out by Deleanu (1992: 53).

<sup>127</sup> Unlike the *Yin chi ru jing* commentary (T 1694), no *sūtra* title is mentioned in the T-ABSYJ – a feature also shared by both AHKJ and SMJcomm (see Zacchetti 2003: 290 and 295; 2004: 220). However, there are three occurrences of the formula *jing yan* 經言 (presumably: “a scripture says”): T 602 p. 168c 26–27; p. 169c 7 (要經言), and p.170a 12. The first one is the most interesting: 如日出時，淨轉出十二門故。經言：從道得脫也; not only does this passage contain a reference to the “twelve

The complex, multilayered nature of the T-ABSJY is also revealed by the fact that it contains glosses which comment upon other passages occurring in the T-ABSJY itself which are, in turn, comments upon the K-ABSJY (e.g. in the crucial section on *vivarta*, see example no. 3 above). That is, some portions of the T-ABSJY consist not just of a commentary to the basic text, but also of a sub-commentary. A possible explanation of these passages is that in these cases the “basic commentary” could represent the original exegesis by An Shigao, while the sub-commentary would then reflect the work of Chen Hui and Kang Senghui.

All this is, needless to say, merely hypothetical. But the fact that the T-ABSJY is not, entirely and directly, An Shigao’s work is also demonstrated by some aspects of its language – especially non-terminological lexical usages and grammatical features<sup>128</sup> (which

---

gates” expounded by the homonymous scriptures (see Zacchetti 2003: 270 n. 83), but the phrase introduced by 經言 (從道得脫也) has a partial parallel in An Shigao’s translation of the *Yogācārabhūmi*: 從澁道得脫出 (*Dao di jing* 道地經 T 607 p. 233b 23; cf. T 606 p. 186a 19–21). It ought to be noted, however, that not only do these two phrases diverge in some details, but even the contexts where they occur in the two scriptures are completely different, so we cannot be absolutely sure that here the T-ABSJY is indeed quoting the *Dao di jing*. The clearest instance of quotation (albeit a rather free one) into the T-ABSJY occurs at its very end, where the six *ābhijñās* are enumerated: ... 六通智：一為神足，二為徹聽，三為知他人意，四為知本所從來，五為知往生何所，六為知索漏盡，是為六也。(T 602 p. 173a 20–23). The renditions of this list correspond closely to those found in An Shigao’s translation of the *Daśottarasūtra*, the *Chang ahan shi bao fa jing*: 六知：一神足、二徹聽、三知人意、四知本從來、五知往生何所、六知結盡。(T 13 p. 236b 4–6). Some of these correspondences are specific enough to grant, in my opinion, that the two scriptures are indeed directly connected. This is particularly true of item no. 4 in both lists, *zhi wang sheng hesuo* 知往生何所 (probably a translation of *cyutyupapādanajñāna* = *divyacakṣus*: see Lamotte 1976: 1809 and ff.), which is not attested elsewhere. It is impossible to determine to which layer of the T-ABSJY these quotations or references belong – i.e., whether they were part of the original materials composed within An Shigao’s circle, or were added later by Chen Hui and Kang Senghui.

<sup>128</sup> For example, we find six occurrences of particle *zhi* 之, which is



I consider among the best internal criteria for establishing the authorship of an early translation) – which appear foreign to the rest of the Parthian translator’s corpus. From this point of view, a better understanding of the nature of the T-ABSJY should prevent us from uncritically using this text as a source for the linguistic study of Han translations. So far this scripture has been generally accepted as a genuine translation by An Shigao,<sup>129</sup> and data gathered from the T-ABSJY have been seen as reflecting the language of Later Han translations.<sup>130</sup> But given that this commentary, even if it incorporates a substantial amount of Han materials, was in all likelihood assembled during the Three Kingdom period in a different part of China (which is also potentially significant), the T-ABSJY should be handled with the greatest caution (or not handled at all!) when studying the language of Later Han Buddhist translations.

In conclusion, this new interpretation of the T-ABSJY greatly enriches our knowledge of early Chinese Buddhist exegetical lit-

---

otherwise extremely rare in the texts that can be safely ascribed to An Shigao (see Hu 2005: p. 272 § 2.2, with the relevant notes and Zacchetti 2007: 403). Far more significant and apparent is the use of the final particle *ye* 也. In the texts transmitted in the canon which I consider genuine works of An Shigao (T 13, 14, 31, 32, 36, 48, 57, 98, 112, 150 A–B, 603, 607, 1508; on the rationale for this list see Zacchetti forthcoming b), there are only three occurrences of 也, and in two cases 也 occurs only as a variant, while in the K-ABSJY 也 occurs six times. In contrast to this, in the T-ABSJY there are 268 occurrences of 也, a figure significant enough to set this text apart from the rest of An Shigao’s corpus. The high frequency of this particle in the T-ABSJY is interesting, also because it is probably to be ascribed to its exegetical nature and to the editorial process through which this scripture was produced. One can also mention *hesuo* 何所 (“What? Which? Etc.” etc., used as object in the postverbal position; see Yu 1993: 146) which occurs nine times in the T-ABSJY, but is otherwise unattested in An Shigao’s corpus with this meaning (cf. T 13 p. 236b 5: 知往生何所, discussed in the preceding note, where *hesuo* means “where, in which place”).

<sup>129</sup> In fact Zürcher (1991: 279) indicates T 602 as one of the main touchstones for evaluating the authenticity of other texts ascribed to An Shigao.

<sup>130</sup> See for instance Coblin 1983: 241–242 and Hu Chirui 2002: 346.

erature. It provides us with an essentially *new* text (that is: a new way of looking at the old text) of what was *the* major commentary in the Han-Wu Kingdom doctrinal tradition related to An Shigao's teaching. There is little doubt that the scriptures discussed in the present article pose many questions that remain to be answered. Nevertheless, the discovery of the Kongō-ji manuscripts is one of those rare, felicitous cases when the discovery of a new thing also entails the reinterpretation (and hence the rediscovery) of an old thing which we could not properly understand.

## Appendix 1

### The *Anban shouyi jings* in the catalogues

I have quoted in the main body of the article the entries concerning the two *Anban [shouyi] jings* found in Sengyou's CSZJJ. Here are the records relevant to our subject from the catalogues compiled after the CSZJJ, arranged in chronological order up to Zhisheng's *Kaiyuan lu*:

1. *Zhongjing mulu* 眾經目錄 T 2146,<sup>131</sup> roll 3 (“Canonical collection of Lesser Vehicle *sūtras*” 小乘修多羅藏): “*Larger Anban shouyi jing* in one roll translated by An Shigao of the Later Han dynasty; *Anban shouyi jing* in one roll translated by An Shigao etc..”<sup>132</sup>

2. *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶紀 T 2034:<sup>133</sup>

1. Roll 4 (within the list of An Shigao's translations): “*Anban shouyi jing* in two rolls or in one roll. Dao'an says: ‘*Smaller Anban*,’ see Zhu Shixing's *Catalogue of Han [translations]*;<sup>134</sup> same [record] in

<sup>131</sup> Completed in 594 CE by Fajing 法經 and others.

<sup>132</sup> 大安般經一卷 後漢世安世高譯; 安般守意經一卷 後漢世安世高譯 (T 2146 p. 128a 15–16).

<sup>133</sup> Completed in 597 CE by Fei Zhangfang 費長房 (Tokuno 1990: 43–47; for a detailed study of this work, see Tan Shibao 1991: 3–246).

<sup>134</sup> Tan Shibao (1991: 94–103) offers a very detailed discussion of this

the catalogues by Sengyou and Li Kuo<sup>135</sup> ... *Larger Anban jing* in one roll or two rolls; Dao'an commented on it; see Sengyou's catalogue. It is also called *Da anban ji jing*.<sup>136</sup>

2. Roll 14 (Catalogue of the Lesser Vehicle *sūtras* by a known translator 小乘修多羅有譯錄): “*Larger Anban jing* in two rolls; ... *Larger Anban jing* in one roll; *Anban shouyi jing* in one roll.”<sup>137</sup>

3. *Zhongjing mulu* 眾經目錄 T 2147,<sup>138</sup> roll 1 (Single texts [i.e., translations] of Lesser Vehicle *sūtras* 小乘經單本): “*Larger Anban jing* in one or two rolls; *Anban shouyi jing* in one or two rolls.”<sup>139</sup>

catalogue. Not only does Tan provide additional evidence in support of the opinion, shared by several other scholars, that the *Han lu* 漢錄 was a late fabrication, but he also argues that it was in fact authored by Fei Zhangfang himself (see *id.* p. 99ff.).

<sup>135</sup> On Li Kuo's 李廓 catalogue, composed around 532–533 CE at the end of the Northern Wei dynasty, see Hayashiya 1941: 67–68; cf. Tan 1991: 186–190, who calls the reliability of Fei Zhangfan's quotations from this catalogue into question.

<sup>136</sup> 安般守意經二卷 或一卷。道安云：『小安般』。見朱士行漢錄，及僧祐、李廓錄同。... 大安般經一卷 或二卷。道安注解。見祐錄。或云大安般集經。(T 2034 p. 50b 6 and 20). The alternative title *Da anban ji jing* 大安般集經 is only mentioned by Fei Zhangfang, but the first *Zhongjing mulu* 眾經目錄 records a text with a similar title in roll 6, among the extracts of Lesser Vehicle *sūtras* (小乘抄集): 大安般經集二卷 後漢世安世高譯 (T 2146 p. 144b 20); cf. also Forte 1968: 179–180.

<sup>137</sup> 大安般經二卷; ... 大安般經一卷; 安般守意經一卷。(T 2034 p. 116a 4 and 22–23); cf. Forte 1968: 180–181. On the three scriptures mentioned here by Fei Zhangfang, see n. 19 above.

<sup>138</sup> Completed in 602 by Yancong 彥棕 and others; on the strict criteria adopted by the authors of this catalogue, see Tokuno 1990: 47–48.

<sup>139</sup> 大安般經一卷或二卷; 安般守意經一卷或二卷 (T 2147 p. 154a 26–27).

#### 4. *Da Tang neidian lu* 大唐內典錄 T 2149:<sup>140</sup>

1. Roll 1 (Catalogue of Buddhist scriptures translated during the Later Han 後漢傳譯佛經錄): “*Larger Anban shouyi jing* in two rolls; Dao’an says: ‘*Smaller Anban*,’ see the catalogues by [Zhu] Shixing, Sengyou and Li Kuo; *Larger Anban jing* in one roll commented by Dao’an, see Sengyou’s catalogue. ... *Anban jing*” (all these three texts are ascribed to An Shigao).<sup>141</sup>
2. Roll 7 (Catalogue of Lesser Vehicle *sūtras*, both single translations and retranslations, by known and unknown translators 小乘經單重翻本并譯有無錄): “*Larger Anban shouyi jing* in two rolls or one roll, thirty folios, translated by An Shigao of the Later Han. ... *Larger Anban jing* in two rolls or one roll, twenty folios, text searched for,<sup>142</sup> translated by An Shigao etc.”<sup>143</sup>
3. Cf. also T 2149 p. 308a 15 and 24; p. 322c 19 and 23.

5. *Zhongjing mulu* 眾經目錄 T 2148,<sup>144</sup> roll 1 (Single texts of Lesser Vehicle *sūtras* 小乘經單本): “*Larger Anban jing* in one roll (also called [*Anban*] *shouyi [jing]*), alternatively in two rolls, thirty folios), translated by An Shigao of the Later Han. ... *Larger Anban jing* in one roll (or two rolls, twenty folios; lost), translated by An Shigao etc.”<sup>145</sup>

#### 6. *Da Zhou kanding zhongjing mulu* 大周刊定眾經目錄 T 2153:<sup>146</sup>

1. Roll 7 (Single translations of Lesser Vehicle *sūtras* 小乘單譯經): “*Anban jing* in one roll. The preceding [scripture] was translated by

<sup>140</sup> Completed by Daoxuan 道宣 in 664.

<sup>141</sup> 大安般守意經二卷 道安云：『小安般』見土行、僧祐、李廓錄；大安般經一卷 道安注見僧祐錄 ... 安般經 (T 2149 p. 221b 3–4 and p. 222b 2).

<sup>142</sup> On the expression 訪本, see n. 54 above.

<sup>143</sup> 大安般守意經二卷或一卷三十紙 後漢世安世高譯。大安般經二卷或一卷二十紙訪本 (T 2149 p. 298c 22–23 and 26).

<sup>144</sup> Completed in 665 CE by Jingtai 靜泰.

<sup>145</sup> 大安般經一卷 一名守意。或二卷，三十紙 後漢世安世高譯。... 大安般經一卷 或二卷，二十紙。失本 後漢世安世高譯。(T 2148 p. 186c 10 and 13).

<sup>146</sup> Completed in 695 CE by Mingquan 明佺 et al.

An Shigao of the Later Han, [record] taken from [Fei] Zhangfang’s catalogue [viz. T 2034]. ... *Larger Anban shouyi jing*, one work in two rolls (or one roll, forty-five folios).<sup>147</sup> The preceding [scripture] was translated by An Shigao of the Later Han, [record] taken from [Fei] Zhangfang’s catalogue. *Larger Anban jing*, one work in two rolls or one roll, twenty folios. The preceding [scripture] was translated by An Shigao etc., [record] taken from the [*Da Tang*] *neidian lu*.<sup>148</sup>

2. Roll 14 (Canonical collection of Lesser Vehicle *sūtras* 小乘修多羅藏).<sup>149</sup> “*Larger Anban shouyi jing*, one work in two rolls (or one roll). *Larger Anban jing*, one work in one roll.”<sup>150</sup>

### 7. *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄 T 2154:<sup>151</sup>

1. Roll 1 (list of An Shigao’s translations included in the “General catalogue of the various canonical scriptures” 總括群經錄): “*Larger Anban shouyi jing* in two rolls or in one roll; in some cases [the title is given] without the characters *shouyi*, in others it is simply called *Anban*. Venerable [Dao]’an said: ‘*Smaller Anban*,’ and commented upon it; [Seng]you’s catalogue records another distinct *Larger Anban* in one roll, [while Fei Zhang]fang’s catalogue records yet an-

<sup>147</sup> On this record see above n. 55.

<sup>148</sup> 安般經一卷。右後漢代安世高譯，出長房錄。... 大安般守意經一部二卷 或一卷四十五紙 [四十五紙: not in【宋】【元】【明】]。右後漢代安世高譯，出長房錄。大安般經一部二卷 或一卷二十紙。右後漢代安世高譯，出內典錄。(T 2153 p. 408b 25–26; p. 409a 8–11). The second part of this record, relevant to the *Da anban shouyi jing* and the *Da anban jing*, has in fact been transmitted in two different recensions. In what the *Taishō* apparatus calls “the three [editions],” viz. the Song Sixi edition, the Yuan Puning edition, and the Ming Jingshan edition, the part from 大安般守意經 to 出內典錄 reads as follows: 安般經一卷。右後漢代安世高譯，出長房錄。... 大安般經一卷。【宋】+ 二十紙] 大安般守意經一部二卷 或一卷。右後漢代安世高譯，出內典錄。

<sup>149</sup> According to Forte (1968: 183) this is part of the descriptive catalogue of the actual canon existing in 695 CE.

<sup>150</sup> 安般守意經一部二卷 或一卷。大安般經一卷。(T 2153 p. 467a 29–b1).

<sup>151</sup> Completed by Zhisheng 智昇 in 730 CE.

other *Anban* in one roll: they are all repetitions. See the catalogues by [Zhu] Shixing, Sengyou and Li Kuo.”<sup>152</sup>

2. Roll 13 (list of Single translations of Lesser Vehicle *sūtras* 小乘經單譯): “*Larger Anban shouyi jing* in two rolls also called simply *Larger Anban jing*. [Dao’]an said: ‘*Smaller Anban*.’ Alternatively in one roll. Translated by the Anxi Tripitaka [master] of the Later Han An Shigao. Catalogues such as the *Da Zhou* [*kanding zhongjing mulu*] etc. record an additional *Larger Anban jing* in one roll, stating that it was also translated by An Shigao. Checking its text, [one can see that] this is nothing but the first roll of the *Anban shouyi jing*. Their wording being completely identical, I will not record [it] again.”<sup>153</sup>
3. Roll. 17 (list of Newly identified *sūtras* with the same text under different titles 新括出名異文同經): “*Larger Anban jing* in one roll or in two rolls. The [*Da Tang*] *neidian lu* states that it is in two rolls, [while Fei Zhang]fang’s catalogue states that it is in one roll. The text of the above scripture is completely identical to the *Larger Anban shouyi jing*, [only] the length of the title is different. That in the various catalogues there have been maintained [the distinction between] these two texts is a serious error indeed.”<sup>154</sup>
4. Roll 20 (list of Single translations of Lesser Vehicle *sūtras* 小乘經單譯, being part of the crucial “Catalogue of [scriptures] included in the canon” 入藏錄, section 小乘入藏錄): “*Larger Anban shouyi jing* in two rolls also called simply *Larger Anban jing*, or without the word *Da*. The Venerable [Dao’]an said: ‘*Smaller Anban*.’ Alternatively in one roll. Thirty folios.”<sup>155</sup>

<sup>152</sup> 大安般守意經二卷 或一卷,或無守意字,或直云安般。安公云:『小安般』,兼注解。祐錄別載大安般一卷,房錄更載安般一卷,並重也。見土行、僧祐、李廓三錄。(T 2154 p. 480a 3–4).

<sup>153</sup> 大安般守意經二卷 亦直云大安般經。安公云:『小安般』。或一卷。後漢安息三藏安世高譯 又[so【宋】【元】【明】]; T 2154: 右大周等錄更有大安般經一卷,亦云安世高譯。勘其文句,即是安般守意經上卷。文既全同,故不重載。(T 2154 p. 616b 24–26).

<sup>154</sup> 大安般經一卷 或二卷。內典錄云二卷;長房錄云一卷。右一經與大安般守意經文句全同,名廣略異。群錄之中存其二本者,誤之甚也。(T 2154 p. 664b 19–21).

<sup>155</sup> 大安般守意經二卷 亦直云大安般經,或無大字。安公云:『小安般經』。或一卷。三十紙。(T 2154 p. 693b 12–13).

5. Cf. also roll 10 (T 2154 p. 578b 18) roll 18 (抄安般守意經一卷, p. 679b 25); roll. 20 (p. 698b 15).

## Appendix 2

### On the *Anban jie* 安般解 quoted in the *Yin chi ru jing* commentary

The so-called *Yin chi ru jing zhu* 陰持入經註 T 1694 (hereafter YCRJZ), an interlinear commentary datable to the first half of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century CE<sup>156</sup> on the *Yin chi ru jing* T 603 translated by An Shigao, contains four quotations from a text called *Anban jie* 安般解, or “Explanation of the [*Canonical scripture on the*] *ānāpāna-[smṛti]*.”<sup>157</sup> This *Anban jie*, evidently a commentary on the *Anban shouyi jing*, is only known through the following quotations:

1. 安般解曰：『息從內出，息中具有四大，而心在中，謂之內身也。息由外來，四大亦爾。禪家以息為身，繫意在息，無令身想矣。』(T 1694 p. 11b 22–25).
2. 安般解曰：『頻來在欲 \*界<sup>158</sup> 中，已捨四廣倒，無餘疑結也。』(T 1694 p. 22a 23–24).
3. 安般解曰：『轉戒本願，當以戒求道，反求天上榮樂也，是謂轉戒矣。本願求道而違道就耶。不還之行<sup>159</sup> 無復有之，故曰盡也。』(T 1694 p. 22b 22–25).

<sup>156</sup> See Zacchetti forthcoming.

<sup>157</sup> Cf. Aramaki 1975: 165; Deleanu 1992: 51–52 and 2003: 88 n. 58.

<sup>158</sup> T 1694: 果. Cf. K-ABSJ MS A cols. 263–264: 四顛倒在欲界中已盡舍 (on this passage, see the discussion below).

<sup>159</sup> In An Shigao’s *Yin chi ru jing* we find the form 𨳗 used, apparently as a mere graphical variant, instead of *xing* 行 (not recorded with this meaning in HDZ vol. 2 p. 826a). That this variant is original, or at least very old, is demonstrated by a gloss found in the commentary (𨳗, 行也。T 1694 p. 9c 22). Given that the interlinear commentary was originally transmitted together with the basic text (see Zacchetti forthcoming and 2002: 94–96), this variant occurs often also in the glosses, as is the case with this quotation from the *Anban jie*. For the sake of convenience, I have used here the current form.

4. 安般解曰：『精進在行，首尾相屬，邪念不得入其中間，謂之不漏』。  
(T 1694 p. 22c 29–23a 1).

Probably also the following, in spite of its heading, is to be regarded as a quotation from the *Anban jie*, and not from the *Anban [shouyi jing]*:<sup>160</sup>

5. 安般曰：『念因有分，念盡無有。斯空、不願、無想定，向泥洹門也』。(T 1694 p. 11c 21–22).

The style of this passage is consistent with the other four quotations: note, for instance, the occurrence of *wenyan* elements such as *si* 斯 and the noun predicate marked by *ye* 也. Also the string 空、不願、無想[v.l. 相]定 is noteworthy: this particular formulation of the three *vimokṣamukhas* is very rare in the canon (especially due to the form *bu yuan* 不願), occurring only in approximately a dozen texts, for the most part – which is noteworthy – dating back to the Three Kingdoms period.<sup>161</sup> In view of the hypothetical authorship of the *Anban jie* (see below), this corroborates that this quotation comes from the same commentary as the preceding four, and that *Anban yue* 安般曰 (“The *Anban [shouyi jing]* states”) should be taken as a mere scribal error for *Anban jie yue* 安般解曰 (“The *Anban jie* states”). As I will show below, there is yet another, stronger argument in support of this interpretation.

What can we learn from these few quotations? First of all, the *Anban jie* was written in a reasonably accurate form of literary Chinese, and was very different, in this respect, from the T-ABSJY.

<sup>160</sup> Cf. Ochiai 2002: 35; Deleanu 2003: 89. The YCRJZ contains two other passages introduced by the formula 安般曰, which have parallels in the K-ABSJY and therefore are to be seen as quotations from An Shigao’s *Anban shouyi jing* (see Zacchetti 2002).

<sup>161</sup> In this connection, it is interesting to observe that three of these few occurrences are to be found in the anonymous commentary to the first roll of the *Da mingdu jing* 大明了經 (T 225 pp. 478c 3, 478c 11, and 479a 7–8; on this commentary see Nattier 2008: 136–137), and one in Kang Senghui’s *Liu du ji jing* 六度集經 (T 152, p. 47, c17–18). The latter (空不願無想之定), with the final *dīng* 定 (\**samādhi*), comes particularly close to the *Anban jie* occurrence of this formula.



More important, it is possible to demonstrate beyond doubt that it too was a commentary on our K-ABSJY.

As a part of its exposition of the *anāgāmi-phala* (“fruit of the Non-returner,” *anahan fu* 阿那含福),<sup>162</sup> the K-ABSJY lists the five fetters which are to be removed in order to attain this status:

6. 阿那含名爲不還世間。阿那含福爲何等？五下結已盡。何等爲五？貪欲、瞋恚、見身、轉戒本願、爲疑，是五爲<sup>163</sup>。(K-ABSJY, MS A, cols. 258–261).<sup>164</sup>

Let us now consider the third *Anban jie* quotation:

轉戒本願，當以戒求道，反求天上榮樂也，是謂轉戒矣！本願求道而違道就耶。不還之行無復有之，故曰盡也。<sup>165</sup>

The occurrence in both the K-ABSJY and the *Anban jie* quotation of the term *zhuan jie benyuan* 轉戒本願, a translation correspond-

<sup>162</sup> For the equivalence 福 = *phala* in this context, see *Yin chi ru jing* 陰持入經 T 603 p. 178a 7–12 and cf. *Peṭakopadesa* (PTS edition) p. 130, 10–17.

<sup>163</sup> Probably to be read as 是爲五.

<sup>164</sup> “Anāgāmin means not returning to [this] world.” What is the *anāgāmi-phala*? It is [the fact that] the five fetters (*\*samyojana*) [which bind to] lower states (*\*avarabhāgīya*) have disappeared (五下結已盡). Which five? *\*Kāmacchanda* (貪欲), *\*vyāpāda* (瞋恚), *\*satkāyadr̥ṣṭi* (見身), *\*śīlavrataparāmarśa* (轉戒本願), *\*vicikitsā* (疑), these are the five [fetters]” (cf. *Abhidharmakośa* V.43 p. 660, 1–3).

<sup>165</sup> “As to ‘turning away from discipline and the original vow’ (? 轉戒本願 = *\*śīlavrataparāmarśa*): one should seek the Way through discipline; if on the contrary one seeks the splendid enjoyments of the heavens, this is called ‘turning away from discipline.’ [It is indeed a case of] having originally vowed to seek the Way, and instead departing from the Way going after what is evil. The practise of the Non-returner does not have these [perversions] any more, therefore [the *Anban shouyi jing*] says that [this and the other fetters] have disappeared.” Here I have rendered *zhuan jie benyuan* 轉戒本願 on the basis of the interpretation provided by the author of the *Anban jie*, which is perhaps very far from the original meaning of An Shigao’s obscure rendition (cf. the next note). Note that *ye* 耶 is used in this passage (違道就耶) with the meaning of *xie* 邪 (“evil”): cf. Wang Li 2000: 980a.

ing to Sanskrit *śīlavrataparāmarśa* (“attachment to discipline and practises”) not attested elsewhere in the canon, is the strongest piece of evidence connecting the two texts, but it is not the only one. Here the *Anban jie* is quoted by the YCRJZ within a gloss commenting upon a passage of the *Yin chi ru jing* which introduces two categories termed, in the Pāli parallel, *sīlassa sīlabbataparāmāso* and *suddhassa sīlabbataparāmāso*.<sup>166</sup> The fact that this passage does not contain the word *jin* 盡 demonstrates that even 故曰盡也 (“therefore it says that [this and the other fetters] have disappeared”) is part of the *Anban jie* quotation, and hence refers, in all likelihood, to 五下結已盡 (“the five fetters [which bind to] lower states have disappeared”) in the K-ABSJY.

In fact for all the *Anban jie* glosses quoted by the YCRJZ we can detect more or less clear parallels in the K-ABSJY.

The first quotation (no. 1 above) might be a commentary on a passage of the K-ABSJY describing the practise of the four *smṛtyupasthānas* associated with the *ānāpānasmṛti*,<sup>167</sup> and resulting in the attainment of the three *vimokṣamukhas*:

7. 內外身身觀止<sup>168</sup>，若入息出息壞時覺，是時見即空定向活無為度世行。內外身身相觀止，若入息出息行清淨，是時見正可是不願定向活無為渡世行。內外身身相觀行止，若入息出息所更痛不受想，從出滅止意，便却生死，是不想定向活無為度世行是名為身觀止。(K-ABSJY, MS A, cols. 128–134).

Cf. the first part of the *Anban jie* quotation:

息從內出。息中具有四大，而心在中，謂之內身也。息由外來，四大亦爾。<sup>169</sup>

<sup>166</sup> 彼持行戒轉摸質為二輩：一為渴愛墮，二為不解避。(Yin chi ru jing T 603 p. 179a 3–4); this corresponds (not without problems!) to *Peṭakopadesa* p. 132, 16–17 (PTS edition): *sīlabbataparāmāso dvidhā: sīlassa vā suddhassa vā*. An Shigao’s translations of all the terms occurring in this passage are at best problematic. I interpret his rendition of *sīlabbataparāmāsa* as follows: 持行戒(=*sīla*-)轉(=*vata*, directly rendered as  $\sqrt{vṛt}$ )摸質(=*parāmāsa*; cf. Zacchetti 2002b: 86 n. 70).

<sup>167</sup> Cf. Gethin 2001: 56–57.

<sup>168</sup> For a parallel of this formulation, see Zacchetti 2007: 398.

<sup>169</sup> “Breathing comes out from within. In it are contained the four

The second quotation listed above presents us with a problem: while it deals with the *sakṛdāgāmin*,<sup>170</sup> it has a very clear (and partly verbatim) parallel in the discussion devoted by the K-ABSJY to the next stage, that of *anāgāmin*:

8. 阿那含福爲五。何等爲五？多少不復生欲；從所因緣瞋恚起相逢，不復瞋恚；四顛倒在欲界中已\*舍盡知；<sup>171</sup>爲五下縛結已舍盡知，爲意向猶寂然，意樂寂然，意隨寂然，是爲五。(K-ABSJY, MS A, cols. 262–266).

Cf. the *Anban jie* quotation:

頻來在欲\*界中，已捨四廣倒，無餘疑結也。<sup>172</sup>

Apparently the author of the *Anban jie* interpreted the abandonment of the four distortions as taking place during the previous stage.

The fourth quotation seems to provide a definition of *bu lou* 不漏, and this expression occurs in the definition of each of the four forms of special knowledge (*catasrah pratisamvidah*) found in the K-ABSJY (MS A, cols. 229–242).

Even the quotation introduced by *Anban yue* 安般曰 (“The *Anban* [*shouyi jing*] states,” no. 5 above) can be matched to a passage in the K-ABSJY (see no. 7 quoted above), a fact which further corroborates that this is indeed a gloss from the *Anban jie*, as already argued above. As we have seen, not only does the K-ABSJY

---

*mahābhūtas* and the mind is located therein: this is called ‘internal.’ Breathing comes from without, and the same happens with the four *mahābhūtas*.”

<sup>170</sup> *Pinlai* 頻來 is an early translation of *sakṛdāgāmin*, “once-returner,” whose earliest occurrence is in the *Fa jing jing* 法鏡經 T 322 translated during the Han by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao (see T 322 p. 16a 7).

<sup>171</sup> \*舍盡知: K-ABSJY 盡舍知; but the expression 舍盡知 (probably: “abandons and thoroughly knows”) occurs four times in this section of the K-ABSJY (see MS A cols. 264–265, 270, and 271).

<sup>172</sup> “The *sakṛdāgāmin*, having already abandoned the four distortions while staying in the desire realm (*kāmadhātu*), has no fetter of doubt (疑 = \**vicikitsā*) remaining.”

introduce the three *vimokṣamukhas*, but it does so employing the same (rare) terminology we find in the text quoted by the YCRJZ.<sup>173</sup>

It is noteworthy that, if my comparative analysis is correct, apart from quotation no. 1, all these *Anban jie* glosses would deal with topics introduced in the final part of the K-ABSJY which, as observed above (§ 3), has no parallel in the T-ABSJY. This shows that, unlike the latter, the *Anban jie* was probably a commentary on the entire K-ABSJY.<sup>174</sup>

The last issue we have to discuss concerning the *Anban jie* is that of its date and authorship. Erik Zürcher (1972: 54) suggested that the author of this commentary might be Kang Senghui. As already mentioned above (§ 2 with n. 27), we know that this personage composed a commentary to the ABSJY.<sup>175</sup> We know also that Kang Senghui was involved in the composition of the YCRJZ (see Zacchetti forthcoming), and this *Anban jie* was evidently composed within the same circle which produced also the YCRJZ within which it is quoted. The two texts share a few terms and expressions which are rare or unattested elsewhere in the canon, occurring in passages of the YCRJZ which have no direct relationship with the *Anban jie*.<sup>176</sup>

<sup>173</sup> See K-ABSJY, MS A cols. 129ff.: 空定 ... 不願定 ... 不想定; cf. 斯空、不願、無想定 in the *Anban [jie]* gloss quoted by the YCRJZ.

<sup>174</sup> There is, however, also an alternative, if highly speculative, explanation of this fact. Perhaps this *Anban jie* only covered the subjects which were not dealt with in the other commentary based on An Shigao's "oral explanation." Given that, as I will show below, both commentaries were probably composed within the same circle, one cannot completely rule out this possibility. However, the fact that no passage commenting upon the initial portion of the K-ABSJY (specifically devoted to the *ānāpānasmṛti* practise and its six stages) is quoted in the YCRJZ may well stem from the simple fact that the YCRJ does not deal with the *ānāpānasmṛti*.

<sup>175</sup> See CSZJJ T 2145 p. 97a 15–16; *Zhongjing mulu* T 2146 p. 147a 22 (cf. Forte 1968: 179).

<sup>176</sup> These are: 廣倒 = \**viparyāsa* (see *Anban jie* quotation no. 2, and cf. YCRJZ T 1694 p. 16a 6, p. 16c 8); 當以戒求道 (*Anban jie* quotation no. 3, cf. YCRJZ T 1694 p. 13b 3); 首尾相屬 (*Anban jie* quotation no. 4, cf.

The style and, as far as this is significant, the vocabulary<sup>177</sup> of the *Anban jie* quotations are consistent with those of Kang Senghui. In fact, it is possible to substantiate the hypothesis that this personage is the author of this commentary by adducing a more specific instance of parallelism. A short passage occurring in the first quotation from the *Anban jie* (禪家以息為身，繫意在息)<sup>178</sup> is echoed<sup>179</sup> in Kang Senghui’s preface to the *Anban shouyi jing* (是以行寂繫意著息).<sup>180</sup> Actually, the two texts are even closer, if we accept the variant reading *xingjia* 行家 found in the Kongō-ji MSS (both A and B)<sup>181</sup> for the *xing ji* 行寂 of the *Taishō* (both in T 602 and in the CSZJJ): cf. the very rare *chanjia* 禪家 in the *Anban jie* gloss.

The compound *xingjia* 行家, “practitioner,” seems quite rare, although I have not systematically checked all occurrences of these two characters in the canon. It is, however, very frequent (with the variant for *xing* 行 discussed in n. 159 above) in the YCRJZ, where it is definitely a key technical term.<sup>182</sup> What is more important for

---

YCRJZ T 1694 p. 16a 17).

<sup>177</sup> Note, in particular, *pinlai* 頻來 (= *sakṛdāgāmin*, in *Anban jie* quotation no. 2) and *rongle* 榮樂 (“splendid and full of pleasures,” in quotation no. 3), both not particularly common in the canon. These two words are attested together – apart from the YCRJZ – only in Kang Senghui’s *Liu du ji jing* T 152 (e.g. see p. 2b 22–23 and passim for *pinglai* 頻來; p. 8c 6 and passim for *rongle* 榮樂). See also n. 161 above on 空·不願·無想定.

<sup>178</sup> “The *dhyāna*-practitioner considers breathing as the body, and [therefore] applies his thought to breathing.”

<sup>179</sup> The only difference between the two key passages I have underscored is the use of *zai* 在 in one, and of *zhuo* 著 in the other. However in this context 在 and 著 (on which see Li Weiqi 2004: 405–414) can be considered substantially equivalent in meaning (cf. Zhang Cheng 2000).

<sup>180</sup> CSZJJ T 2145 p. 43a 13–14 = T 602 p. 163a 18–19. Arthur Link (1976: 72) translates: “For this reason in the practise of calming (*śamatha*) one fixes thought fast to the respiration.”

<sup>181</sup> Kongō-ji MS A col. 14 (Ochiai 2004: 186 with n. 20); see also *id.* p. 207 for the facsimiles of the two manuscripts.

<sup>182</sup> For example, it occurs also in the same gloss which contains the first *Anban jie* quotation (YCRJZ T 1694 p. 11b 21–22): 行家照然止意著道 ...

our discussion, however, is that this term occurs once also in Kang Senghui's *Liu du ji jing* 六度集經,<sup>183</sup> a fact which in turn corroborates that *xingjia* 行家 could well be the correct reading even in Kang's preface, as attested by the Kongō-ji MSS.

In conclusion, Kang Senghui is the most likely candidate for authorship of the *Anban jie*. If this hypothesis is correct, then we are probably facing the following scenario: Kang Senghui cooperated with Chen Hui in editing a commentary on the *Anban shouyi jing* translated by An Shigao (i.e., our K-ABSJ) based upon some materials reflecting An Shigao's own teaching on this subject. This is the present T-ABSJ, which, as we have seen, is unquestionably related, in doctrinal terms, to other exegetical texts ascribable to An Shigao's circle (AHKJ and SMJcomm), but differs in some points of style and language from other An Shigao's know works, thus betraying the hand of later editors. Apart from this co-authored exegetical work, Kang Senghui, probably during the first half of the third century, independently composed, in his typical, more refined style, another typologically different commentary to the same K-ABSJ, which is the *Anban jie* quoted in the YCRJZ.

## Bibliography

### *Primary sources and abbreviations*

*Abhidharmakośa*: Swami Dwarikadas Shastri (ed.), *Abhidharmakośa & Bhāṣya of Ācārya Vasubandhu with Sphuṭārthā Commentary of Ācārya Yaśomitra*, 2 vols, Bauddha Bharati, Varanasi 1998 (first ed. 1970).

AHKJ: *Ahan koujie shi'er yinyuan jing* 阿含口解十二因緣經 T 1508.

(“the practitioner fixes with clarity his thought on the Way ...”).

<sup>183</sup> 行家雖遠十情慾怨 ... (T 152 p. 39a 27); instead of *xingjia* 行家, the Song, Yuan, and Ming editions read *xingji* 行寂. Arthur Link adopts this reading, translating this passage as “The practitioner of *śamatha*, though he has put a distance between himself and the ten enemies of the ten desires ...” (1976: 107 with n. 191). However, in the light of the YCRJZ's usage of this term, I think that in this case Link is probably wrong, and that *xingjia* 行家 is the correct reading.

CSZJJ: Sengyou 僧祐, *Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集 T 2145.

HDZ: *Hanyu da zidian* 漢語大字典, 8 vols., Chengdu 1986–1990.

K-ABSJY: Kongō-ji text of the *Anban shouyi jing* 安般守意經.

SMJcomm: Commentary on the *Shi'er men jing* 十二門經, Kongō-ji 金剛寺 manuscript.

T-ABSJY: *Foshuo Da anban shouyi jing* 佛說大安般守意經 T 602.

*Visuddhimagga*: Warren, Henry Clarke (ed.; revised by Dharmananda Kosambi), *The Visuddhimagga of Buddhaghosācariya*, Harvard Oriental Series 41, Cambridge Mass., 1950.

### Literature

Aramaki, Noritoshi 荒牧典俊 1971, “Indo Bukkyō kara Chūgoku Bukkyō e: Anpan shui kyō to Kō Sōe, Dōan, Sha Fu jo nado” インド仏教から中国仏教へ—安般守意經と康僧会・道安・謝敷序など, *Bukkyō shigaku* 仏教私学 vol. 15 no. 2 (1971), pp. 121–165.

Bagchi, Prabodh Chandra 1927, *Le canon bouddhique en Chine. Les traducteurs et les traductions*, tome 1, Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, Paris.

Buswell, Robert E. 2004, “Sugi’s Collation Notes to the Koryō Buddhist Canon and Their Significance for Buddhist Textual Criticism,” *Journal of Korean Studies*, n. 9, 2004, pp. 129–184.

Coblin, W. South 1983, *A Handbook of Eastern Han Sound Glosses*, The Chinese University Press, Hong Kong.

Deleanu, Florin 1992, “An Seikō yaku *Anpan shui kyō* genkō-bon no seiritsu ni tsuite” 安世高譯『安般守意經』現行本の成立について, in: *Tōyō no shisō to shūkyō* 東洋の思想と宗教, 9 (1992), pp. 48–63.

Deleanu, Florin 1992b, “Mindfulness of Breathing in the *Dhyāna Sūtras*,” *Transactions of the International Conference of Orientalists in Japan*, n. XXXVII, 1992, The Institute of Eastern Culture (Tōhō Gakkai), pp. 42–57.

Deleanu, Florin 2003, The Newly Found Text of the *An ban shou yi jing* Translated by An Shigao,” *Journal of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies*, vol. 6, March 2003, pp. 63–100.

Dhammadipa, Bhikkhu 2009: “Two Divisions of *Ānāpānasati/smṛti* in their Chronological Development,” in K.L. Dhammajoti et al. (eds.), *Buddhist and Pali Studies in Honour of the Venerable Professor Kakkapalliye Anuruddha*, Centre of Buddhist Studies, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong 2009, pp. 567–582.

- Dhammajoti, Bhikkhu K.L. 2008, “The Sixteen-mode Mindfulness of Breathing,” *Journal of the Centre for Buddhist Studies*, vol. 6, 2008, pp. 251–288.
- Dhammajoti, Bhikkhu K.L. 2009: “The Doctrine of the Six-stage Mindfulness of Breathing,” in K.L. Dhammajoti et al. (eds.), *Buddhist and Pali Studies in Honour of the Venerable Professor Kakkapalliye Anuruddha*, Centre of Buddhist Studies, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong 2009, pp. 639–650.
- Dong Zhiqiao 董志翹 and Cai Jinghao 蔡镜浩 1994, *Zhongguo xuci yufa lishi* 中古虚词语法例释, Jilin jiaoyu chubanshe, Changchun.
- Du, Jiwen 杜繼文 1997 (tr.), *Anban shouyi jing* 安般守意經, *Zhongguo Fo jiao jingdian baozang jingxuan baihua ban* 中國佛教經典寶藏精選白話版 no. 116, Foguang wenhua shiye youxian gongsi, Taibei.
- Fang, Guangchang 方广锜 2004, *Dao'an pingzhuan* 道安评传, Kunlun chubanshe, Beijing.
- Forte, Antonino 1968, “An Shih-kaio: biografia e note critiche,” *Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli*, 28 (1968), pp. 151–194.
- Funayama, Tōru 2006, “Masquerading as Translations: Examples of Chinese Lectures by Indian Scholar-monks in the Six Dynasties Period,” *Asia Major*, Third Series, vol. XIX, parts 1–2, 2006, pp. 39–55.
- Gethin, R. M. L. 2001 (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), *The Buddhist Path to Awakening*, Oneworld, Oxford.
- Harrison, Paul 1990, *The Samādhi of Direct Encounter with the Buddhas of the Present: An annotated English Translation of the Pratyutpanna-Buddha-Saṃmukhāvasthita-Samādhi-Sūtra with Several Appendices relating to the History of the Text*, Studia Philologica Buddhica (Monograph Series V), The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, Tokyo.
- Hayashiya, Tomojirō 林屋友次郎 1941, *Kyōroku kenkyū* 經錄研究, vol. 1, Iwanami shoten, Tokyo.
- Hu, Chirui 胡敕瑞 2002, “*Lun heng*” *yu Donghan fodian ciyu bijiao yanjiu* 《論衡》與東漢佛典詞語比較研究, Bashu shushe, Chengdu.
- Hu, Chirui 胡敕瑞 2005, “Zhongguo hanyu yuliao jianbie shuyao” 中古漢語語料鑒別述要, *Hanyu shi xuebao* 漢語史學報, no. 5, 2005, pp. 270–279.
- Hung, Hung-lung 洪鴻榮 (Hong Hongrong = Shi Guohui 釋果暉) 2006, “The Newly Found Kongō-ji Manuscript An-Ban Shou-Yi Jing and T 602 Fo-Shuo Da An-Ban Shou-Yi Jing – An Analysis of T 602 to Distinguish the Original Scripture from its Commentary,” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究, vol. 54, 3 (2006), pp. 1226–1231.
- Hung, Hung-lung 洪鴻榮 (Hong Hongrong = Shi Guohui 釋果暉) 2008, “Does the Newly Discovered *An Ban Shou Yi Jing* Originate from an



- Indian-language-Text or Not?,” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究, vol. 56, 3 (2008), pp. 1173–1180.
- Hung, Hung-lung 洪鴻榮 (Hong Hongrong = Shi Guohui 釋果暉) 2009, “The Newly-discovered *An Ban Shou Yi Jing* and *Yinchiru Jing* T 603,” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究, vol. 57, 3 (2009), pp. 1278–1284.
- Kanno, Hiroshi 2003, “Chinese Buddhist Sutra Commentaries of the Early Period,” *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2002*, n. 6, pp. 301–320.
- Kajiura, Susumu 梶浦晋 2001, “Kongōji issaikyō to shinshutsu An Seikō yaku butten” 金剛寺一切經と新出安世高訳仏典, *Bukkyōgaku seminā* 佛教学セミナー n. 73, May 2001, pp. 25–43.
- Lamotte, Étienne 1976, *Le traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāsāstra)*, Tome IV, Louvain.
- Li Fuhua 李富华, He Mei 何梅 2003, *Hanwen Fojiang dazangjing yanjiu* 汉文佛教大藏经研究, Zongjiao wenhua chubanshe, Beijing.
- Li, Weiqi 李维琦 2004, *Fojing ciyu huishi* 佛经词语汇释, Hunan shifan daxue chubanshe, Changsha.
- Link, Arthur E. 1976, “Evidence for Doctrinal Continuity of Han Buddhism from the Second through the Fourth Centuries. The Prefaces of An Shih-kaō’s *Grand Sūtra on Mindfulness of the Respiration* and K’ang Seng-hui’s Introduction to the ‘Perfection of Dhyāna,’” in: James B. Parsons (ed.), *Papers in Honor of Professor Woodbridge Bingham. A Festschrift for his Seventy-fifth Birthday*, Chinese Materials Center, San Francisco, 1976, pp. 55–126.
- Mizuno, Kōgen 水野弘元 1981, *Hokkugyō no kenkyū* 法句經の研究, Shunjū-sha, Tokyo, 1981..
- Nakajima, Ryūzō 中嶋隆藏 1997 (ed.), *Shutsu sanzō kishū – jōkan yakuchū* 出三藏記集—序卷訳注, Heirakuji Shoten, Kyoto.
- Ñānamoli, Bhikkhu (tr.) 1991, *The Path of Purification (Visuddhimagga)*, Buddhist Publication Society, Kandy (1<sup>st</sup> ed. Colombo 1956).
- Nattier, Jan 2008, *A Guide to the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations: Texts from the Eastern Han 東漢 and Three Kingdoms 三國 Periods*, The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology – Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica X), Tokyo.
- Ochiai, Toshinori 落合俊典 2002, “*Dai anban kyō* to *Shō anban kyō*” 『大安般經』と『小安般經』, *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究, vol. 51, 1 (2002), pp. 31–36.

- Ochiai, Toshinori 落合俊典 2004 (ed.), *Kongōji issayikyō no kisoteki kenkyū to shinshutsu butten no kenkyū* 金剛寺一切經の基礎的研究と新出仏典の研究, Research Report, Tokyo.
- Ōta, Tatsuo 大田辰夫 1988, *Chūgokugo shi tsūkō* 中国語史通考, Hakuteisha, Tokyo.
- Palumbo, Antonello 2003, “Dharmarakṣa and Kaṅthaka: White Horse Monasteries in Early Medieval China,” in: Giovanni Verardi and Silvio Vita (eds.), *Buddhist Asia 1. Papers from the First Conference of Buddhist Studies Held in Naples in May 2001*, (Università di Napoli “L’Orientale.” Centro di Studi sul Buddhismo), Italian School of East Asian Studies, Kyoto 2003, pp. 167–216.
- Pelliot, Paul 1920, “Meou-tseu ou les doutes levés: Traduit et annoté,” *T’oung Pao* vol. XIX, 1920, pp. 255–433.
- Shi, Guohui 釋果暉 (= Hung, Hung-lung) 2008, “The Textual Formation of the Newly Discovered *Anban shouyi jing*,” *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* 中華佛學學報, no. 21, 2008, pp. 123–143.
- Shi, Guohui 釋果暉 (= Hung, Hung-lung) 2008b, “*Bussetsu Dai anban shui kyō ni okeru ‘honbun’ to ‘chū’ no kaimei*” 『佛說大安般守意經』における「本文」と「註」の解明, *Dharma Drum Journal of Buddhist Studies*, no. 3, 2008, pp. 1–65.
- Tan, Shibao 譚世保 1991, *Han Tang Fo shi tan zhen* 汉唐佛史探真, Zhongshan daxue chubanshe, Guangzhou.
- Tang, Yongtong 汤用彤 2000, *Tang Yongtong quanji* 汤用彤全集, 7 vols., Hebei renmin chubanshe, Shijiazhuang.
- Tokuno, Kyoko 1990, “The Evaluation of Indigenous Scriptures in Chinese Buddhist Bibliographical Catalogues,” in: Buswell, Robert E. (ed.), *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*, University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu 1990, pp. 31–74.
- Tsukamoto, Zenryū 1985, *A History of Early Chinese Buddhism. From its Introduction to the Death of Hui-yüan* (Translated by Leon Hurvitz), 2 vols., Kodansha International LTD, Tokyo.
- Ui, Hakuju 宇井伯壽 1956 (2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1979), *Shaku Dōan kenkyū* 釋道安研究, Iwanami Shoten, Tokyo.
- Ui, Hakuju 宇井伯壽 1971, *Yakuyōshi kenkyū* 訳経史研究, Iwanami Shoten, Tokyo.
- Wang, Li 王力 2000, *Wang Li gu hanyu zidian* 王力古漢語字典, Zhonghua shuju, Beijing.
- Yao, Yongming 姚永铭 2003, *Huilin «Yiqie jing yinyi» yanjiu* 慧琳《一切经音义》研究, Jiangsu guji chubanshe, Nanjing.
- Yu, Liming 俞理明 1993, *Fojing wenxian yuyan* 佛经文献语言, Bashu shushe, Chengdu.

- Zacchetti, Stefano 2002, “Brief Communication: On the Authenticity of the Kongōji Manuscript of An Shigao’s *Anban Shouyi jing* 安般守意經,” *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2001*, n. 5, 2002, pp. 157–158.
- Zacchetti, Stefano 2002b, “An Early Chinese Translation corresponding to Chapter 6 of the *Peṭakopadesa* – An Shigao’s *Yin chi ru jing* T 603 and its Indian Original: A Preliminary Survey,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, vol. 65 (1), 2002, pp. 74–98.
- Zacchetti, Stefano 2003, “The Rediscovery of Three Early Buddhist Scriptures on Meditation: A Preliminary Analysis of the *Fo shuo shi’er men jing*, the *Fo shuo jie shi’er men jing* Translated by An Shigao and Their Commentary Preserved in the Newly Found Kongō-ji Manuscript,” *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2002*, n. 6, 2003, pp. 251–299.
- Zacchetti, Stefano 2004, “Teaching Buddhism in Han China: A Study of the *Ahan koujie shi’er yinyuan jing* T 1508 Attributed to An Shigao,” *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2003*, n. 7, 2004, pp. 197–224.
- Zacchetti, Stefano 2004b, “An Shigao’s Texts Preserved in the Newly Discovered Kongō-ji Manuscript and Their Significance for the Study of Early Chinese Buddhism,” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 vol. 52, 2 (2004), pp. 57–60.
- 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*, The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology – Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica VIII), Tokyo.
- Zacchetti, Stefano 2007, “Inventing a New Idiom: Some Aspects of the Language of the *Yin chi ru jing* 陰持入經 T 603 Translated by An Shigao,” *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2006* n. 10, 2007, pp. 395–416.
- Zacchetti, Stefano (forthcoming), “Some remarks on the Authorship and Chronology of the *Yin chi ru jing zhu* T 1694: The Second Phase in the Development of Chinese Buddhist Exegetical Literature,” forthcoming in Giacomella Orofino and Silvio Vita (eds.), *Buddhist Asia 2. Papers from the Second Conference of Buddhist Studies Held in Naples in June 2004*, (Università di Napoli “L’Orientale.” Centro di Studi sul Buddhismo), Italian School of East Asian Studies, Kyoto 2009.

- Zacchetti, Stefano (forthcoming b), “Defining An Shigao’s 安世高 Translation Corpus: The State of the Art in Relevant Research,” forthcoming in *Historical and Philological Studies of China’s Western Regions* (西域历史语言研究集刊), No. 3, 2009.
- Zhang, Cheng 張頴 2000, “Wei Jin Nanbeichao shiqi ‘zhuo’ zi de yongfa” 魏晉南北朝時期「著」字的用法, *Zhongwen xuekan* 中文學刊, no. 2, 2000, pp. 121–138.
- Zürcher, Erik 1972 (1<sup>st</sup> ed. 1959), *The Buddhist Conquest of China*, E. J. Brill, Leiden.
- Zürcher, Erik 1978 (review of some works published in *Mélanges de sinologie offerts à Monsieur Paul Demiéville II*, Bibliothèque de l’Institut des Hautes Etudes Chinoises, vol. XX, Paris 1974), *T’oung Pao* LXIV, 1978, pp. 114–124.
- Zürcher, Erik 1991, “A new look at the earliest Chinese Buddhist texts,” in: Koichi Shinohara and Gregory Schopen (eds.), *From Benares to Beijing, essays on Buddhism and Chinese Religion in honor of Prof. Jan Yün-hua*, Mosaic, Oakville, Ontario, 1991, pp. 277–300