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Preface and Acknowledgements

This volume began its life in 2001, as a simple handout compiled for distribution to graduate students at Indiana University. It was intended to enable them to check quickly to determine whether or not, at the state of current scholarly opinion, a given text should be considered a genuine translation produced in the Eastern Han or Three Kingdoms period. Most of the students were not specialists in early Chinese Buddhism; they were focusing on Daoism, or Chinese poetry, or Esoteric Buddhism, but for these purposes they needed to know whether the translator attribution for a given scripture found in the wildly varied Taishō Shinshō Daizōkyō edition of the canon should be trusted. From the outset, therefore, this brief guide was not intended primarily for specialists in Buddhist Studies, but rather for all those who could benefit from easy access, in a western language, to reasonably accurate and up-to-date information on which Buddhist translations could be assigned with confidence to the Han and Three Kingdoms periods.

There it might have stayed, as a skeletal outline with minimal discussion, were it not for an extremely fortunate set of circumstances that ultimately led to my move to Tokyo to join the staff of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology (IRiAB) at Soka University in January of 2006. The saga began when my husband, John R. McRae, received a Japan Foundation grant for a project to be carried out in calendar year 2004. Naturally this seemed coming to Japan, something that I had not envisioned when I myself applied for funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) and the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) for 2004-2005. We were suddenly faced with the challenge of choosing where to spend our time in Japan. Though many attractive possibilities presented themselves, the stellar assembly of scholars at Soka University—including Institute director Prof. Hiroshi Kanno, Prof. Akira Yuyama, Prof. Seishi Karasawa, Prof. Stefano Zaccetti, and Dr. (now Prof.) Noriyuki Kudo—proved to be a compelling draw. With the help of Prof. Kanno, who ensured our request to spend 2004 (and part of 2005, in my case) as Visiting Scholars at the Institute, we were able to move to the Soka University Guest House, where we spent an extremely enjoyable and productive period devoting ourselves full-time to our respective research projects.

The stimulating intellectual atmosphere at the Institute, with daily conversations with one or more of the above-mentioned colleagues on various topics of mutual interest, was a remarkable experience. When our colleague Stefano Zaccetti accepted a position in his home country and returned to Italy in 2005—to the great regret of us all—I was curious to hear who (presumably a young western scholar) would join the IRiAB team in his place. To my astonishment, I received a telephone call in March of 2005 asking whether I might consider being a candidate myself. There was no question at all about my response; I immediately said yes, and after many months during which the proper bureaucratic procedures were met in both the U.S. and Japan, my husband and I moved to Tokyo in 2006.

Many are the people to whom any merit in this monograph owes a debt of gratitude, first and foremost the colleagues at the Institute mentioned above. (Though Prof. Akira Yuyama has since retired, he is greatly missed, and his towering intellectual legacy has made much of what we are; though Prof. Stefano Zaccetti is now teaching on the opposite side of the globe, his lively presence and great enthusiasm for exploring all aspects of early Chinese translations are still felt in our midst.) One of many reasons for my decision to move to Japan to join the staff of the IRiAB was the high value placed on philological study here, and I am deeply grateful to the Institute members for having accepted this relentlessly philological monograph for publication in the series Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica.

At an early stage the materials treated here were greatly enhanced by the opportunity to discuss them with students in a seminar at Tokyo University. I am grateful to all of the participants for their insights, and especially to Prof. Masahiro Shimoda, whose invitation to teach a course in his department offered me a precious opportunity to improve my knowledge of Chinese Buddhist translations as well as to get to know a remarkably talented group of students.

Four people must receive special acknowledgment here, for without them this volume would not be far poorer, and indeed I suspect it would not have been finished at all. First and foremost is my colleague Seishi Karasawa, with whom I have enjoyed countless hours of stimulating intellectual discussions of every conceivable aspect of the study of early Chinese Buddhist translations. He has challenged me to refine my methodology in many ways, and he
has supplied me with timely information on countless recent publications. Visually every day (except in the final highly-pressured weeks of the completion of this monograph) we have been able to exchange ideas on topics of all sorts over our respective kesto boxes at noon. His panoramic knowledge and superb intellectual talents continue to be an ongoing inspiration. It is no exaggeration to say—as I have told him on more than one occasion—that a major启迪 for my move to Japan was in order to have lunch with him.

My predecessor Stefan Sacharoff has continued to be an important conversation partner and friend from his new post in Italy, sharing his insights on a myriad of sinological and indological topics (now via Skype rather than over the coffee which he so generously served us in his office at the Institute day after day). But not only that, he read and carefully criticized several sections of an earlier draft of this monograph, sharing his extensive knowledge of recent publications in a variety of languages as well as his own unpublished work. This study has benefited in countless ways from his insights and expertise.

My longtime friend Paul Terron (now at Stanford University), whose own work on early Chinese translations has been a major source of inspiration for this study, offered detailed comments on the sections on An Shigao and Lokakṣema, contributing his always insightful corrections and suggestions at what turned out to be a very busy time in his own schedule. I am extremely grateful for his input, which has eliminated several errors and oversights and has greatly improved the present work.

Last—but not certainly not least—my husband John has done far more than any author could hope for in helping to make this monograph a reality. He has read and scrutinized every line of the text, offering countless suggestions—both grammatical and bibliographical—for improvement. He has also taken care of a myriad of practical details (including some excellent stir-fried tofu dinners) for which the looming publication deadline left me too little time. I have also relied on him for help in everything from deciphering obscure lines in publications from the 1930s to speed-reading newly discovered journal articles at the eleventh hour, to compensate for my still inadequate Japanese. No one could hope for a more generous, affectionate, and supportive partner. Words fail when I try to express my appreciation.

Other colleagues and friends have contributed comments on various topics, or have responded to last-minute queries, which have likewise eliminated various gaffes and glitches here and there. Stephen R. Bokenkamp generously shared his inestimable sinological expertise in reading a particularly difficult colophon, helping me to tease out the meaning of various forms of phrase that had previously eluded me. Special mention goes also to Peter Nollling and Robert F. Campley, who both sent comments on the Introduction, and whose broad knowledge of things indological and sinological, respectively, continues to be an ongoing source of insight. Our dear friend Betty Napper, who has had the forbearance to be visiting us precisely when work on the monograph went into overdrive, pitched in to help straighten out a number of difficult issues in the first version of the index, and bore my round-the-clock typing with remarkable good grace. I am also happy to acknowledge the kindness of my colleague Nozoyuki Kudo, who encouraged me throughout the publication process and helped with some particularly difficult critical research.

The research presented here has been supported by several generous sponsors, including the National Endowment for the Humanities and the American Council of Learned Societies in the U.S. and the Open Research Centre Project 2004-2008 ("Research Council for Buddhist Pedology") at the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University, sponsored by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Science and Technology in Japan. Their support was essential to the completion and publication of this work, and I am happy to express my gratitude here.

Finally, it is my great pleasure to acknowledge the ongoing contributions of the Institute’s extremely competent administrator, Ms. Yuka Kusabu, whose ability to keep so many things on track at once is admired by us all, and our library staff members, Mr. Kenko Kawasaki and Ms. Kikako Hayashi, whose bright personalities and helpful spirits are legendary. Without all of them, none of this would have been possible.

Despite the help of these many supporters, colleagues, and friends, there are surely many shortcomings that remain. It goes without saying that none of these are the responsibility of the author alone.
Part I

Introduction
Early Chinese Translations: Problems and Prospects
From the mid-second century through the latter part of the third century C.E., dozens (quite possibly hundreds) of Indian Buddhist scriptures were translated into Chinese for the first time. Many of these works have been lost, and others were subsequently subjected to revision. But those few texts produced during the Eastern Han and Three Kingdoms periods that have come down to us relatively intact constitute a precious resource for the study of Buddhist literature. On the one hand, they show us how Buddhist scriptures were first presented to Chinese audiences; on the other, they preserve the earliest available recensions of many Indian texts that are otherwise known only in much later Chinese or Tibetan translations or, in a few cases, in even later Pali or Sanskrit manuscripts.1 In sum, they offer a window into the Buddhist heritage of both India and China at a pivotal period in its history.

As translations, these sources provide us with evidence, first and foremost, concerning Buddhist developments in India. Though surviving texts translated during this period are few—in this volume fewer than seventy texts will be counted as works that can be dated with assurance to this period—they include both non-Mahayana and Mahayana sūtras as well as jātaka tales, didactic verses, biographies of the Buddha, abhidharma texts, and scriptures on meditation. (A notable exception is the Viṣṇupada, which was not translated into Chinese until the fifth century C.E.) Many of these pioneering works were re-translated into Chinese, and in some cases also into Tibetan, in subsequent centuries, and the availability of multiple versions of a given text enables us to chart the course of evolution of its Indian antecedents over time. Others have no later counterparts, and such "sole exemplars"—providing their status as translations, and not Chinese compositions, can be verified—provide our only means of access to Indian literary works that would otherwise have disappeared without a trace.

1 Until recently most of the surviving Sanskrit manuscripts of Buddhist texts were those preserved in Nepal, which generally date from the tenth century C.E. or later. Manuscripts in Pāli, which have been transmitted in recent centuries mainly in the tropical climates of Sri Lanka and Southeast Asia, are even more recent, dating for the most part from as late as the twelfth or thirteenth century C.E. Earlier manuscripts have been found at Gilgit (in modern Pakistan) and at various sites in the Tarim basin (modern Xinjiang, PRC), but even these date from around the sixth century C.E. and thus are several centuries later than the earliest Chinese translations. Until quite recently, with the discovery in Afghanistan of several groups of manuscripts (most of them quite fragmentary) written in the Gandhāra language and Kharoṣṭhī script, dating in some cases from as early as the first century C.E., hardly any Indic-language sources were known that are contemporaneous with the translations that will concern us here. (The Graeco-Pakistanī, already published by John Brough in 1962, is an important exception.) On these three recent finds see for example Salomon 1999, Saloman 2000 and subsequent volumes in the same series (on the British Library fragments), Saloman 2003 and Glass 2006 (on manuscripts in the Senior collection), Brouagh 2000 and subsequent volumes in the series (on the Schøyen collection) and Strench 2007 (on the Biser manuscripts). Though no exact parallel to any of the Chinese translations dealt with here has yet been found, these newly discovered texts offer valuable evidence, both physical and linguistic, concerning the nature of the source-texts on which at least some of the Chinese scriptures produced during the second and third centuries were probably based.
These translations also tell us, however, a great deal about the Chinese side of the equation. As we shall see, some translators working during this period (notably Zhi Qian 支謙 and Kang Senghui 湯伯修) were quite comfortable with using indigenous Chinese religious terminology to express Buddhist ideas—including terms such as the "hun" 魂 and "po" 魄 spirits, Mt. Tai 太山 (occasionally printed "泰山") as a destination for the dead, and virtues such as humaneness (仁) and ritual correctness (義)—while others (e.g., An Shigao 安世高 and Lokakṣema 末利迦羅) scrupulously avoided them. Some (above all Zhi Qian) favored a four-character style for prose passages while translating Indian poetry into five-, seven-, or even six-character verse, while others (again we may point to An Shigao and Lokakṣema) eschewed the use of verse altogether, translating Indian poetry simply as prose. Some (the foremost example being Lokakṣema) favored transcribing the sounds, rather than translating the meaning, of virtually all names and Buddhist technical terms, a policy that yielded such now-familiar expressions as bolosmi 波路史米 for parāmitā and Xupai 萧普依 for Suhbhita, but also unwieldy terms like duawajie 迦迦毗耶 for tathāgata 真實陀迦 for aṣṭamaṣṭika 八建七卍 for nāgārjuna 瞿曇迦拘侶。 Others (above all, Lokakṣema's contemporaries An Xuan 安玄 and Yan Fotsao 謙佛圖) did just the opposite, translating not only Buddhist terms—e.g., parāmitā as duawaji 陀迦毗耶 and nirvāṇa as miudu 渾度—but also proper names, resulting in such curious renditions as Wenmou 韋夢khru "Things Heard" for Śrāvasti and fengshou 鳳首 "Respect-Head" for Matjuari. Yet the earliest extant translations, those produced by An Shigao, followed a "middle path" between these extremes, generally using transcriptions of personal and place names but translating most Buddhist technical terms. Thus while it is undeniable the case that certain directions of development in Chinese Buddhist translation techniques can be traced over time, an examination of this relatively small body of archaic scriptures makes it quite clear that several distinct translation styles were already in use simultaneously during the first century of Chinese translation activity.

The importance of early Chinese translations for the history of Buddhism is obvious, but their value for the study of language itself is also increasingly being recognized. Chinese transcriptions of Indian terms, for example, can help to clarify the second- and third-century pronunciations of the Chinese characters used to record them, while conversely these same transcriptions (and in many cases, especially when they are erroneous, Chinese translations as well) can point to the identity of the specific Prakrit dialect that served as the basis for a translated text. As the result of a number of recent studies comparing Chinese Buddhist scriptures with their extant Indic-language counterparts, it has become increasingly clear that it was generally not from classical Sanskrit but rather from a variety of Prakrit (i.e., vernacular) languages, including but not limited to Gāndhārī, that the first Chinese Buddhist translations were produced.

Not only Indian Prakrits, but also the vernacular speech of China, can be discerned in the language of some of these texts. Some translators (notably Kang Senghui) used a highly literary mode of expression, but others (of whom Lokakṣema is the most prominent
example) incorporated a wide range of colloquial expressions into their work. While these must be approached carefully—it would be too simplistic to assume, for example, that Lokakṣema’s work is a direct reflection of the spoken language of second-century Luoyang 洛陽, where he is known to have worked—these texts offer a rich range of data for investigation, particularly in passages containing informal dialogues. Translations by Lokakṣema and others thus constitute our earliest source for vernacular Chinese, which otherwise only began to appear in written form several centuries later, in Chan 藏 texts composed during the eighth c. CE and after.

Related to the question of literary vs. vernacular style are patterns in the usage of ordinary (i.e., non-Buddhist) terms, including such fundamental building-blocks as pronouns, particles (e.g., 也, “empty words”), and the verbs used to introduce quotations. The third-person pronoun 他, for example, does not occur in any genuine Eastern Han translation, but it appears frequently in the work of the Wu 吳-period translators Zhi Qian and Kang Senghui. This might seem to suggest that such differences can be plotted chronologically and/or geographically with relative ease, but other examples show that this is often not the case. The second-person pronoun 乃, for example, is used freely by An Xuan and Yan Foting, but never by An Shigao (who had worked in the same city of Luoyang less than forty years before). Even more striking is the distribution of the first-person pronoun 我, which appears numerous times in the sole work produced by An Xuan and Yan Foting, but never in the significantly larger corpus of their contemporary (and fellow Luoyang resident) Lokakṣema.

Even this small handful of examples makes it clear that it is impossible to generalize about the translation style of, for example, Luoyang in the Eastern Han period. What we see instead is a number of distinctive translation policies, resulting in strikingly different repertoires of vocabulary and style being used in the same place at virtually the same time. In a few cases we will be able to sort these differences along a chronological or geographical continuum, but in general it is more useful to think in terms of literary lineages—that is, of lines of transmission of translation policies which led to the formation of a number of distinct rhetorical communities. In some cases—for example, with the sharp contrast in style between Lokakṣema and the translation team of An Xuan and Yan Foting—we will find quite different rhetorical communities co-existing side by side. In others we will find that elements of translation vocabulary and style could be transmitted across long distances at great speed, as in the case of Zhi Qian, who produced most or all of his work in the Wu kingdom (then the extreme southeast of the Chinese cultural sphere), but whose vocabulary and style—including even the extremely rare medium of six-character verse—was adopted only a short time later by Dharmārāja (Zhu Fahu 朱法護), who came from the distant northwestern city of Dunhuang 敦煌 and worked primarily there in Chang’an 長安. One fruitful approach to this body of material, therefore, will be to chart various patterns of shared vocabulary and style, which can help us in turn to chart the transmission of translated scriptures, sometimes across great distances in time and space.
In sum, it is clear that early Chinese Buddhist translations constitute a rich resource for scholars in a number of fields, including not only Buddhist Studies but also Indoology (in particular, the study of Prakrit languages) and Sinology (including the study of phonology, grammar, and vernacular speech). But to make proper use of this valuable material we need to be able to locate our sources, at least in a general way, in space and time. And it is here that we encounter the problem which served as the initial catalyst for this study: the fact that a substantial percentage of the attributions of scriptures to second- and early third-century translators in the Taishō Shinshū Daizokyo (and other widely used editions of the canon) are incorrect. To state the problem in the starkest possible terms: in the case of any given text said to have been produced during the Han or Three Kingdoms period, the odds are greater than 50% that the attribution will be false. How these erroneous assignments entered the canonical record will be discussed below, but what is essential to recognize at the outset is the fact that traditional translator attributions cannot simply be accepted at face value. On the contrary, the first task in working on any text said to have been produced during this period is to evaluate the reliability of its attribution. A major goal of this study, therefore, will be to consider the methodological issues involved in assessing traditional translator attributions and, by applying these methods, to identify the relatively small number of texts which can be attributed with confidence to this period. A second, and closely related, objective is to make available the findings set forth in the growing body of recent studies by specialists working on Buddhist texts translated during the second and third centuries CE. Taking these studies as its point of departure, the present work is intended as a brief guide to those texts which, at the present state of our knowledge, can be accepted as having been produced during this formative period.

The Scope of the Present Work: From the Beginnings to 280 CE

The question of what constitutes an "early" translation will of course elicit different responses from different scholars. An attempt to differentiate the terminology of "old" (舊) vs. "new" (新) scriptures had already been made by Sengou 僧叡 in the early sixth century, albeit with only limited success. Better known is the threefold typology of

Sengou's categories draw the line at around the beginning of the fifth century, with Kumārajīva's terminology tending to belong to the language of "new" scriptures. Sengou seems not to have recognized, however, the extent to which Kumārajīva's adopted vocabulary introduced in the second century by Lokātāma. Thus the transcription 旧特不知道 for pratyeka-buddha, found in Kumārajīva's work but also standard in Lokātāma's corpus, is treated as belonging to the terminology of "new" scriptures, while the transcription of the same word as 無佛 "bodily awakened," which is unattested in any extant Han-period translations but appears in a number of later works, is given as an example of terminology found in "old" scriptures (see T2415, 55,5a16). Sengou also treats terms found in sources contemporary with one another as if they belonged to different periods; for example, he classifies the translation of budhisatva as 菩薩 "bodhisattva" as "old" and the transcription 平等 as "new" (5a15), despite the fact that they were used simultaneously (on scriptures translated by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao
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"ancient" (古典), "old" (古) and "new" (新) translations widely used by East Asian scholars, where these three categories refer to texts translated prior to the 5th century CE (古典), those produced in the fifth through early seventh centuries (古) with the works of Kumārajīva and Paramārtha as representative examples, and those produced during the Sui (618-618) and Tang (618-907) periods (新), in particular by Xuanzang 玄奘 and his successors.4 A fourth period, that of translations produced during the Song (960-1279) (mid-tenth to late thirteenth centuries), is added by Sakaino Kōgo 坂野光光 in his influential history of Chinese Buddhism (1935).

Many other periodizations of Chinese Buddhist history have also been proposed, though not all of them take the history of translation of Bāṣaṅka focus.5 An exception is that of Erik Zürcher, who distinguishes between "primitive" (mid-second century to c. 220 CE) and "archaic" (c. 220-395 CE) translations. Adapting part of the older threefold system, Zürcher classifies translations produced by Kumārajīva, Paramārtha and others as "early" while retaining the term "new" for translations produced in the mid-seventh century CE and after.6

None of the chronological categories listed above, however, corresponds precisely to the period that will concern us here. Instead, this study will be devoted to a subset of the translations termed "old" (古) by Sengyou and "ancient" (古典) by Sakaino and others. That is, our focus will be on texts produced from the beginning of Chinese Buddhist translation activity (mid-second century CE) through the conquest of the Wu 四王国 by the Western Jin 西晋 (280 CE). Thus this study will include all authentic Eastern Han translations, as well as the works of Zhi Qian 甄覩 (fl. 220-250) and Kang Senghui 堏僧會 (fl. 247-280 CE). It excludes, however, the works of Dharmarakṣa (Zhu Fahu 足法護), who is traditionally classified as belonging to the Western Jin (265-306 CE).

To draw the line at this point is admittedly somewhat arbitrary, especially since Dharmarakṣa’s translation career appears to overlap with that of Kang Senghui. Yet there are good reasons, both scholarly and practical, to do so. To begin with the latter, the sheer size of Dharmarakṣa’s translation output—totaling well over six hundred Taishō pages by even the most conservative current estimates—is such that the responsible treatment of his corpus is a daunting task. A few texts by Dharmarakṣa have recently received significant

and by Lokâniśvara, respectively during the late second century CE. Sengyou’s list is thus important not as an accurate reflection of the dates at which these various texts were coined, but rather for the information it provides about how these terms were perceived—i.e., as archaic or contemporary—at the beginning of the sixth century CE.

1 See Otou 1946, pp. 7-9.
3 For a convenient list of some of the periodization systems used by Japanese scholars see Kamisaka 1978, pp. 1-4.
4 For a list of the works attributed to Dharmarakṣa in Sengyou’s Chū saṃsaṅg jiiji see Borcher 1994, pp. 259-291.
scholarly attention, but most of his corpus has not yet been systematically studied. It would therefore be premature, I believe, to include Dhammaraksa's translations in a survey of this type.

It is also appropriate, however, to raise the question of which—if any—of Dhammaraksa's works should be included in a discussion of translations produced prior to 280 CE. Dhammaraksa's career is generally thought to span a period from c. 265-309 CE, but there are some significant difficulties with this chronology. While it is based on the dates given in the catalogue section of the Chah sanzang ji ji—usually considered a very reliable source—it is far from clear that all of these dates came from Sengsu's own hand. One group of dates, in particular, appears in only one small and closely-related group of editions of the canon, and the dates in this group have an unusually high "failure rate," i.e., mentioning a month in a given year, or a year in a given era, that did not exist according to the Chinese calendar. It is surely significant that virtually all of the pre-280 dates are included in this group of late additions to the list.

Turning to the surviving colophon-like prefaces to translations that are generally considered to be the work of Dhammaraksa, we find a similar pattern. Only one of those notices contains a date prior to 280 CE, and it has long been recognized as anomalous: not only does it refer to the translator by the transcribed Indian name Tannohouka, but also (rather than the usual Zhu Fahu 竺法護), it also describes him as an "Indian buddhista", rather than—as in Songyuan's biography of Zhu Fahu and elsewhere in the Chah sanzang ji ji—as a Yuezhi 魏至 from Dunhuang. In this connection it is important to note that in his catalogue Sengsu treats this Indian Dhammaraksa as a different person, giving him an

---

5 See in particular Seishi Karashima's glossary to Dhammaraksa's translation of the Leta Lian (Karashima, 1998) as well as his earlier study of the vocabulary of the same text (Karashima 1992, and the study and translation of the first three chapters of Dhammaraksa's Larger Perfection of Wisdom Scripture (Gong sha jing 壽士經, T232) by Stefano Zecchetti (Zecchetti 2003). A study and translation of Dhammaraksa's version of the Ratnapala-pakṣaṇā by Daniel Roubach is also expected to appear in the near future (Roubach forthcoming).

6 See most recently Roubach 2007, especially pp. 22-30.

7 This pattern was recognized some time ago by Kawanhiro Kjijō, who noted that a significant number of the dates given for Dhammaraksa's translations in Sengsu's catalogue appear only in the so-called "Three Editions" (the Song, Yuan, and Ming versions of the canon), which belong to a single redactional lineage (Kawanhiro 1990). The group, which includes a high percentage of occurrences of dates that did not exist according to the Chinese calendar, thus seems particularly unworthy, for some examples see Fumibato 2003 and Roubach 2007.

8 For his biography see T2145: 55.97 190L, and cf. the colophons and other notices to his translations which are also preserved in the Chah sanzang ji ji (for example 55.8615, 56c27, and 63b14, in all of which he is called a "buddhista from Dunhuang" and given the hōgen Zhu 竺, rather than Zhu 三, 56c17, where he is referred to as the "Dunhuang Yuetsi bodhisatva", and 57c28-21, where he is called the "Dunhuang bodhisatva (íì] Zhu Fahu)."
every separate from that of the Yuehki translator Zhu Fahu.\textsuperscript{11} Finally, the date given in this notice for the completion of the translation—the thirteenth day of the twelfth month of the second year of the 'Taishi 太始 era (c. 266 CE)—is non-existent, for as Antonello Palumbo has recently pointed out, the twelfth month of that year had only twenty-nine days.\textsuperscript{12}

Aside from this one problematic notice—which may be an outright forgery, as Palumbo has suggested, but in any case is so anomalous that it is difficult to accept the information it contains as referring to the Yuehki translator Zhu Fahu—the earliest of the surviving colophons and prefaces documenting Dharmaraksha's translation activity is a notice dated to 284 CE, which describes his translation of the Vajrasattvabhumi (Xingxing dandi jing 修行品地起, 'T600) at Dunhuang. In sum, if we focus on the information contained in the remaining prefaces and colophons, and if we eliminate the dates found in the catalogue section that are of dubious reliability (and which probably do not go back to Sengyou himself), quite different picture emerges, suggesting that Dharmaraksha’s translation career may have begun in Dunhuang (rather than in Luoyang) some two decades later than is generally thought, i.e., around the year 284 CE.

Be that as it may—and detailed future studies on this topic would be very welcome—Dharmaraksha’s work will be excluded from this study for the practical reason mentioned above. This will still leave us, as we shall see, with a rich assortment of texts translated as an array of literary styles that can reliably be dated to this period. Taken together, these translations total somewhat under three hundred pages in the printed Taishö edition of the canon—a substantial amount of material, yet still manageable in size.

Translators: The Problem of Authenticity

Perhaps inevitably, given the nature of our sources, this study will be organized around the names of particular individuals who are said to have played a key role in the initial period of the translation of Buddhist scriptures into Chinese. The question of the identity of the translator(s) of a given text is not merely a modern preoccupation; at least since the time of Daan 道安, whose pioneering scriptural catalogue, the Zongji zhongjing mulu 佛教經目錄, was completed in 374 CE, attempts have been made to associate canonical scriptures with the names of particular translators. Daan's catalogue is no longer extant, but Sengyou absorbed its contents into his own Chu anunng ji ji 出三藏記要, completed c. 515 CE (thus perhaps inadvertently contributing to its disappearance as an independent work). The catalogue section of the Chu anunng ji ji is structured around the names of scriptural translators, who are listed in chronological order together with the titles of the

\textsuperscript{11} See T2145, 55.9b9-11.

\textsuperscript{12} This and other anomalies in this colophon have been ably examined in Palumbo 2003, pp. 186-194.
texts they are considered to have produced.

Though Sengyu used the names of specific translators as his fundamental organizing principle, it is clear that his time texts credited to specific individuals were far outnumbered by those whose translators’ names were unknown. Both Daoan and Sengyu reserved a special section for these “anonymous” scriptures (无译经), with 142 such works listed already in Daoan’s catalogue (as reproduced in the Chu sanxiang ji ji)10 and as astounding 1,306 texts added by Sengyu himself.11 This is in addition to the 92 works classified by Daoan as “Old Scriptures” (古传经),12 the 59 classified by him as “Liang Scriptures” (梁土传经), and the 24 listed as texts circulating “Between the Passes” (驰中传经, an area largely coterminous with modern Shaanxi,陕西), all of which lack any reference to a translator’s name.13

The use of the character 失 (meaning “lost”) might seem to suggest that the identity of these translators had once been known but was lost in the course of transmission, but it is more likely that they were never recorded at all. These texts were, after all, considered to be buddhavacana and not the work of ordinary authors, and to affix one’s own name to such scriptures might well have been considered inappropriate by some. Be that as it may, it is clear that it was quite usual, in the early centuries of Chinese Buddhist history, for scriptures to circulate without any mention of the translator’s name.14 Thus one of the great challenges that confronted Daoan and his successors was to attempt to put this mass of material, much of it of unknown provenance, into something resembling chronological order.

Given the lack of documentation concerning the origins of a substantial number of translations produced during this period, it is evident that texts that can be assigned with confidence to particular individuals from the Eastern Han and Three Kingdoms periods represent only the tip of the iceberg—a small fraction even of those early translations that have survived, let alone of the much larger body of translated scriptures that must once have circulated in China. They are extremely important as benchmarks, however, for we can use them in turn as a basis for estimating the date of other purportedly early

10 55.1667-1862. Sengyu divides these titles into two groups, ninety-two texts that were still available in his time, and an additional fifty that he considered to be lost.
11 55.21657-37617. Of the total of 1,306 titles, Sengyu reports that 886 were still in circulation, while 460 had been lost by his time.
12 It’s possible that Daoan’s original title for this category was 古传经, see below, p. 66, n. 146.
13 For these three categories see 55.18163-1166, 1863-1968, and 1989-97, respectively.
14 In his biography of Daoan, Sengyu makes it clear that this was considered a real problem by his illustrious predecessor: “From the Han to the Jin period, a fairly substantial number of scriptures arrived in China, but the names of the people who transmitted [these] scriptures were not recorded. Later people tried to find out who had brought them, but it is not possible to determine their dates” (55.381-218-218; 又因传僧, 无译经多, 无译经之人名字未记, 使人传得莫得知年).
works via a comparative analysis of their vocabulary and style. Though the texts classified as "anonymous" are of course the work of unknown translators, this does not mean that we are unable to say anything at all about the time and the place where they were likely produced. In Part IV of this study we will return to this topic, providing some specific methodological guidelines on how the works of these nameless translators might be used.

In sum, in attempting to establish the identity of the translator of any purportedly early text, it is essential to make use of both of the types of evidence that are available to us: (1) external evidence, including above all the testimony of the Chu sansang ji ji, which as the earliest extant scriptural catalogue is an essential starting point; and (2) internal evidence, that is, the vocabulary and style of the text in question. The discussion in the following sections is intended to indicate some of the basic issues involved in using these two types of data to establish verifiable translator attributions.

External evidence (1): The Testimony of Scriptural Catalogues
As mentioned above, in evaluating the authenticity of the assignment of works to particular translators, it is essential that we consider both external evidence, i.e., what is said about these texts in other sources, and the internal evidence supplied by their own vocabulary and style. By far the most abundant external evidence is contained in Chinese catalogues of translated scriptures, and in this section we will briefly examine several of these, focusing on those that appear to be the most reliable, in addition to others that are frequently cited by scholars.

Chu sansang ji ji 出三藏記集 (T2145). The evaluation of any attribution of a Chinese text to a translator who lived prior to the sixth century CE must begin—though it certainly does not end—with the evidence contained in the oldest extant catalogue of Buddhist translations, the Chu sansang ji ji compiled by Sengyou (completed c. 515 CE). As noted above, Sengyou incorporated the earlier catalogue compiled by Daoan into his work, and these two scholar-monks share a well-deserved reputation for high scholarly standards. Since Daoan's catalogue is no longer extant, we have no direct access to its contents, but by their citations in Sengyou's work we can get a relatively clear picture of how he worked. Not only did he tabulate the titles of translated scriptures and their traditional attributions, but he read the texts himself, making his own decisions about the likely authorship of some previously unattributed works.10

By Sengyou's time, however, the number of translated texts had escalated dramatically, and it would have been a daunting task indeed to examine the contents of them all. Thus it is perhaps not surprising that we find evidence here and there that Sengyou was concerned primarily with cataloguing the titles of texts, and in so doing sometimes treated translations with similar titles but radically different content as variants.

10 For one such instance—Daoan's list of "texts which, while circulating without attribution, appeared to him to "resemble" the works of Lokaksema"—see below, p. 77.
of a single work. Conversely, this modus operandi may also explain why Sengyou sometimes failed to recognize variant titles assigned to a single scripture as referring to the same text.

Though Sengyou clearly considered Daoa's work to be the fundamental source for early translations, he also had access to other pre-existing catalogues, whose status has been the subject of much scholarly debate. Indeed, one of the features of the Chu sanzang ji ji that lends it an aura of scholarly probity in the fact that Sengyou is careful to mention where he used Daoa's work, where he also consulted other sources, and where he compiled the entries in question himself.

In addition to the catalogue entries per se, the Chu sanzang ji ji also contains two other major sections that are relevant to the discussion here: a collection of prefaces and colophons, which preserves some of the earliest evidence for translator attributions, and a section containing biographies of many of the translators, which can provide precious additional details.

Sengyou's catalogue is not all of the same vantage, however. As others have observed, the biographical section of the Chu sanzang ji ji was apparently composed, for the most part, under the southern Qi reign (with the year 503 CE as a terminus ante quem), while the catalogue and the section containing prefaces and colophons were revised during the Tianjian dynasty (most probably in 515 CE). Other
smaller-scale inconsistencies, such as discrepancies in the transfer of works attributed to a given translator within the catalogue section itself, suggest that the Chu sanzang ji ji was also subjected to revision after Sengyou's time.24 While this does not undermine the value of the work as a whole, it does serve as an important reminder that even the information contained in this foundational text cannot simply be accepted at face value.

Be that as it may, a close examination of Sengyou's work makes it clear that—whatever changes may have been introduced into the text either late in his own career or after his time—he was an exacting scholar who treated his source with great care. The fact that the earliest extant catalogue of translated scriptures was produced by such a figure is a great advantage, and it means that our examination of the authenticity of translator attributions will begin, in every case, with the testimony given in his work.

Gaoeng zhuoan 高僧傳 (T2059). While not of course a catalogue in the strict sense, this compendium of monastic biographies compiled by Huijiao 惠皎 (c. 530 CE) has long been relied upon for information on the careers of Buddhist translators. Indeed, the opening chapter of this work is devoted to the lives of translator-monks, which shows the importance Huijiao placed upon the contributions of these figures.

In general the Gaoeng zhuoan follows the information contained in the Chu sanzang ji ji quite closely, often replicating Sengyou's biographies word for word. In other cases, however, Huijiao adds a wealth of new information, which is clearly drawn from another source. Much remains to be done in determining the nature of these additional sources; while some appear credible, others are probably not, and some material may even have been interpolated into the Gaoeng zhuoan well after Huijiao's time.

Zhongjing mulu 中經目錄 (T2146). The immediate successor to the catalogue section of Sengyou's Chu sanzang ji ji is the Zhongjing mulu compiled by Faung 法輪 et al. in 594 CE. In contrast to Sengyou's work, where translated scriptures are arranged in chronological order, in the Zhongjing mulu they are grouped according to type. Thus the first sections contain scriptures classified as "Mahayana sutras" (大乘般若經, 5518aff.), while the second consists of "Hinayana sutras" (小乘般若經, 127aff.). There follow a section entitled "Mahayana Vinaya" (大乘毘尼, 119aff.), which is succeeded in turn by texts classified as belonging to the "Hinayana Vinaya" (小乘毘尼, 140aff.), and so on. Even within these categories there is no attempt to arrange translations in their historical sequence; thus a collection of jātakas attributed to Dharmarakṣa 㤭尸伐闍 (生経, T114) is followed by a treatise on the ikhandhā, dīghas, and ayatanas by An Shigao 安世高 (減竹入観, T603). In turn this is followed by part of a biography of the Buddha attributed to the early third-century translator Kang Mengqian 卡摩貴人 (中本起經, T196). But after passing texts by several other later translators, the list again reverts to the name of An Shigao, subsequently tacking back and forth between earlier and later figures. The compilers did, however, reserve a

---

24 One glaring example is the inconsistency within the catalogue section itself, in the number of texts attributed to Lokakṣema; on this see below, p. 76.
separate category within each section for texts whose translators' names were unknown.

Like the *Chu samzang ji ji*, the *Zhongying wula* gives the impression of being the product of a careful and critical group of scholars. In those cases where Fajing and his colleagues refer to materials not found in Senyoun's catalogue, these additional notes deserve careful consideration.

**Li Lai sanbao ji** 历代三宝记 (T2034). The next catalogue to be produced, compiled by Fei Changfang 韩昌公 in 597 CE (only three years after the catalogue produced by Fajing and his colleagues), presents a striking divergence from the works discussed above. Its most noteworthy feature is the radical amplification in the number of texts attributed to many early translators. Under Fei's brush An Shigao's corpus was increased from the thirty-four works attributed to him by Senyoun to 176 (T2034, 49.22b23), Zhi Qian's from thirty-six to 129 (58c14-15), and Dharmaraksha's from sixty-four to 210 (64c14-15). Even figures to whom Senyoun credited no translations at all are now assigned an impressive number of texts; Nie Daoshen 祈道深, for example, who is known to Senyoun only as Dharmaraksha's scribe, is now credited with fifty-four translations of his own (66a22).

Fei's work has, at first glance, an aura of credibility, for he cites a wide range of catalogues to support the attributions he puts forth. A closer look, however, reveals that many of these supposed catalogues are otherwise unknown. And even on the surface, it seems highly improbable that, several centuries after the fact, he alone would suddenly have been able to discover hundreds of attributions that were unknown to previous cataloguers. If we also bring into external evidence to bear on the problem—something that has rarely been done in previous studies—it becomes clear that, whatever their sources, the new attributions given in the *Li Lai sanbao ji* are overwhelmingly false, for they frequently

---

21 Double cast on Fei's credibility long ago, when it was first pointed out that large numbers of texts listed as anonymous in earlier catalogues were suddenly attributed to specific individuals in Fei's work (see Hayashiya 1941, pp. 82-84 and 308-102, and cf. Tokuno 1990, especially pp. 43-47; for an extensive critical discussion of Fei's catalogue and its alleged sources see Tan 1991). Others, such ‘Tokuno Daibo, have been more generous toward Fei, arguing that his references to catalogues lost before his time were not fictional, but were drawn from citations preserved in later catalogues (himself since lost) that were still circulating in his time, notably that of Baosheng (e.g., Tokuno 1998, pp. 67-71). A mixed assessment of the situation has proposed by Annemarie Palumbo, who has suggested that Fei unwittingly relied on certain catalogues that were forged (Palumbo 2001, p. 188, n. 31). One may still be permitted to remain suspicious, however, since so many of these catalogues never seem to have been seen by anyone but Fei himself. As Tokuno points out, given the fact that Fei had been closely involved with state-sponsored translation activities and may even have participated in the compilation of the *Zhongying wula*, it is rather unrealistic to think that Fei possessed sources to which his fellow-cataloguers lacked access, or that he never shared his findings with his colleagues (1990, p. 49). Other features of Fei's catalogue that detract from its credibility are summarized succinctly by Tokuno as well (op. cit., pp. 44-46). For an extensive critical discussion of the many problems with Fei's citations see Tan 1991, pp. 3-246.
credit works to early translators that contain terminological and stylistic features that came into use only long after their time. Thus for the period with which we are concerned, any new attribution that first appear in Fei's catalogue should be considered false unless there is substantial evidence to support it.

Subsequent catalogues. In traditional Chinese scholarship it was standard practice to copy, with or without attribution, the work of one's eminent predecessors, and this is precisely what we find in catalogues produced after Songyous time. As noted above, Huaijiao's Gaogong zhuan often reproduces the biographical entries given in the Chu sanzang ji for word for word, likewise catalogues produced in the Sui period and after often replicate the entries given by Songyou, Fajing, and others.

In light of this tradition it is particularly noteworthy that many catalogues composed after Fei Changfang's Lidai sanhao ji do not adopt his newly proposed attributions. On the contrary, subsequent catalogues seem to have hesitated to accept his sweeping amplifications of Songyou's work; instead, they continue to adhere rather closely to the attributions given by Fei's predecessors. Thus in the Zhongyang mula 宦經目錄 (T2147) compiled by Yancong 彭或 (var. - 懷) c. 610 CE, and in the identically titled Zhongyang mula (T2148) compiled by Jingtao 玄泰 (c. 663 CE), Fei's new attributions have not yet made their mark.

It is in the Da Tong yixian lu 大同新列傳 (T2149), compiled by Daowuan 道玄 in 664 CE, that the impact of Fei's sweeping reassignments can first be seen. While Daowuan did not accept all of Fei's new attributions, more than half of them are adopted here, resulting in significant changes in the picture of early Chinese translation history. Subsequent catalogues again seem to have been reluctant, at least at first, to follow Daowuan's lead in this regard; thus in the Gujin yijing tuj 近古經籍圖紀 (T2151) compiled by Jingmai 喜邁 at virtually the same time (664-665 CE), and in the Da Zhou hinding zhongyang mula 大周宗經宦經目錄 (T2153) compiled by Minguan 明遠 et al. in 695 CE, few if any of Fei's new attributions appear. In the widely respected Kaiyuan shipu lu 開元釋教錄 (T2154) compiled by Zhuheng 智昇 in 730 CE, however, the majority of the new entries first adopted from Fei's catalogue by Daowuan reappear. From this time on they became authoritative in Chinese Buddhist bibliographies, and on this basis they are reproduced in modern printings of the canon, including the wisely used Taisho edition.

---

Examples of self-evidently impossible attributions can easily be found among the works newly assigned to As Shigo by Fei Changfang. As Shigo is suddenly credited, for example, with texts filled with vocabulary that he does not use (e.g., 勝呂多 勝呂多) for mahābuddhayāngha, the expression 如 is a form of direct address, and the phrase 八方上下 to refer to the ten directions, all of which occur in Ts21, 佛說金光明, a text containing five-character verse (e.g., T325, 元景子佛說五處經三), whereas no verse passages of any kind appear in previous As Shigo translations, and even texts that begin with the phrase 見 in this 尊師說 法, which did not come into use until the end of the fourth century CE (e.g., T335, 尊師說 師說). Whatever Fei's sources may have been, it is easy to see that his results are fundamentally flawed.
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It is through this lineage, in short, that hundreds of uncredible attributes have entered the mainstream of modern scholarly work, where they are regularly cited by scholars. On this shaky foundation many improbable theories concerning texts supposedly transcribed in the second and third centuries have been constructed. It is one of the main objectives of this study to provide information that will help to avoid such unfortunate outcomes in the future.

External evidence (2): Prefaces, Colophons, and Biographer

Scholarly accounts of the work of translators active in the period with which we are concerned frequently take the biographies collected in the Gaoeng zhuan as their starting point. This is, of course, a venerable and important work, but from the perspective of the chronological sequence of the available sources this is a rather old place to begin. As noted above, Huijiao frequently copied the earlier biographical accounts compiled by Sengoua word-for-word. Where he did not, it should be assumed (pending confirmation from other sources) that he was working from later material, or that he composed these additional parts himself.27

Even earlier than Sengoua's biographical collection, however, are many of the prefaces, colophons and other miscellaneous notices to individual scriptures that contain important information concerning their translation. Indeed, it is evident that Sengoua drew upon these materials in compiling his biographies, for in many instances he repeats the information they contain, sometimes word-for-word. As Palumbo has observed, it makes far better sense to begin with these scriptural notices rather than with the biographies composed by Sengoua and Huijiao.28 Indeed, a comparative analysis of these scriptural notices, on the one hand, and the biographies found in the Chao suanng ji ji and the Gaoeng zhuan, on the other, makes it clear that the biographies sometimes paper over difficult passages, regularising the wording and, in the process, sometimes altering the content of these earlier voices.29 Indeed, if one reads the biographical accounts first, the

27 A good example of such an addition is the biography of the Moeng 567296 (the supposed "Kaiyua Mingsga", to whom the Sengoua in Puyou-xi Suonan is credited, see T3559, 49.2121515B). No such biography is recorded by Sengoua, but the Chu suanng ji ji does contain a preface—widely recognised to be a forgery—containing some of the wording found in Huijiao's account (T2145, 15.42188). An important project—which, to the best of my knowledge has not yet been undertaken—would be a careful comparative and analytical study of the parts of Sengoua's work that were eliminated by Huijiao, and conversely, the portions that he added perhaps on the basis of other sources available to him or as his own composition) to Sengoua's work. An important first step in this direction can be found in two articles by Sonoheigo Kinjo 535322 (1986a and b), where agreements and divergences between the Chu suanng ji ji and the Gaoeng zhuan are tabulated. I would like to thank Prof. Fuzang Tona for bringing these articles to my attention.

28 Palumbo 2003, p. 186.

29 A good example is the treatise by Sengoua (and subsequently by Huijiao) of the material contained in an early colophon to the Banjou nani 535441 (T2145, 15.42189-16), which appears in
problems in the scriptural notities can become harder to see.

Viewable as they are, these scriptural notities—ranging in style from elegant prolegoms composed by authors such as Daomin to anonymous notes (n) recording a smattering of details concerning a given text—offer many problems of their own. Some of the texts appear to be corrupt; in at least one case Pulambo has suggested that we may have to do with an outright forgery.19 Once again, in sum, we cannot simply take our sources at face value, but must first evaluate their legitimacy before constructing any hypotheses based on the information they contain.

Internal Evidence: Vocabulary and Style

It has long been recognized that Chinese Buddhist translations do not, as a whole, conform closely to the standards of classical Chinese style. Some of the differences, to be sure, are merely a matter of vocabulary, with transcribed Indian terms introducing a flavor quite different from that of native Chinese histories, philosophical essays, or poetry. Other differences, however, are of a more fundamental nature, involving matters of grammar, sentence structure, and a decidedly non-literary style. In recent years it has increasingly been recognized that many peculiar features of some (but not all) of the Buddhist translations produced during the Eastern Han and Three Kingdoms periods are due to their incorporation of elements of the vernacular speech of the time.20 Vernacular elements can be discerned in the work of a variety of translators, but in the period with which we are concerned the prime example of a translator who cast his work in a vernacular mode is Lokaksema. Of the numerous examples of vernacular usages is Chinese Buddhist translations discussed in a classic study by Erik Zürcher (1977), the majority are drawn from Lokaksema's works.

Other translators, however, produced scriptures formulated in a much more literary mode; a prime example, among translators active in the second and third centuries, is Kang Senghui.21 Here we find an elegant cadence based on four-character prosody, with wording more sophisticated than most of what we find in other translations of the time. In turn, Kang Senghui could be said to represent the other end of the vernacular-vs.-literary spectrum.

At first glance it would seem evident that texts framed in vernacular speech should be designed to reach the mass of ordinary citizens, while those framed in an elegant

an apparently simplified and regularized form in both Sengyu's biography section (964-6) end in Huili's Goomg zhuan (T205V, 32/621-25).

19 Pulambo 2003, p. 191.


21 Other examples are Kang Mengying (世尊彌) and Zhi Yao (至要), but (as discussed below) there are interesting problems in determining whether any of the received texts of the works attributed
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classical style should be intended to reach an educated elite. In the case of Buddhist translations, however, matters are not so simple. For in the vernacular-oriented translations of Lokaksema we also find extremely difficult multisyllabic transcriptions which would be anything but comprehensible to an ordinary Chinese reader (or listener) of the time. In Kang Senghui's elegant compendium of stories, the Lianda ji jing, on the other hand, we find relatively few transcribed terms; most of these are proper names, and they have generally been domesticated to conform with the standard maximum of three characters for a Chinese name (including both surname and given name). What we see, in other words, is an "exoticizing" tendency (retaining transcriptions of complicated foreign words) coexisting with a "vernacularizing" trend in one group of translations, while in another group we find an "indigenizing" tendency (translating most foreign words and abbreviating transcribed names to conform to Chinese standards) used in conjunction with elegant literary prose.

Such combinations only make sense if we imagine two quite different audiences to which early Chinese Buddhist translations were addressed: on the one hand, an audience of Chinese literati, who would have expected a fine classical style and would have found long foreign terms inelegant and coarse; and on the other, an audience of immigrants of various nationalities, able to use a modicum of spoken Chinese though lacking a Chinese literary education, but (given their cosmopolitan background) with a higher tolerance for foreign terms, even if the language on which the transcriptions were based—in virtually all cases an Indian Prakrit—was not their own.

Thus transcriptions (generally perceived by native Chinese speakers as "difficult words") coexisted with a style of writing that would have been considered "easy" (i.e., an early written version of vernacular Chinese), while "easy words" (Chinese translations of Buddhist technical terms and transcriptions domesticated to conform to Chinese standards) are generally found in texts cast in a sophisticated and elegant style. The fact that we do not find early translations that combine vernacular speech with domesticated vocabulary may well be evidence that one audience was not yet being drawn to Buddhism at this time: the masses of uneducated, and monolingual, Chinese.

Related to the issue of literary vs. vernacular style is the presence or absence of verses, for in the most vernacular scriptures (those of Lokaksema and, to a lesser extent, those of An Shigao) there are no passages in verse at all, while in the more elegant literary productions of translator like Zhi Qian, Kang Senghui, and Kang Mengzang, we encounter verses in a variety of styles. Four-character prosody, a mark of literary rather than vernacular usage, is also absent from the works of Lokaksema and An Shigao, while translators whose style is more classical (including the three mentioned above) make ample use of it.

As to the terminology found in early Chinese Buddhist translations, most studies published to date have (quite reasonably) focused on Buddhist names and technical terms. But in an important new development in recent years scholars have begun to take note of
terminology that is not specifically Buddhist, including such features as pronouns, particles, and the structure of interrogative sentences. Such studies are now beginning to make it possible to discern relationships among certain sub-groups of translations, which future studies may be able to associate with specific geographical and/or social milieus.

Aspects of the translation process (1): the so-called translator

The fact that traditional Buddhist scriptural catalogues attribute the majority of the titles they record to a single translator—figures such as Zhi Qian, Dharmarākṣa, Kumārajīva, and so on—creates a deceptive aura of simplicity. It might seem that we can assume, once we have compiled a list of scriptures that can be considered authentic works by these figures, that we will then have a relatively homogeneous group of texts produced by each individual. But just as the “great man” approach to historical writing has come under well-deserved fire in recent decades for obscuring a myriad of other contributing factors, so the habit of thinking of translations as produced by a handful of discrete individuals can obscure important aspects of the translation process. While it is undeniable that a few dedicated individual translators did make enormous contributions to the formation of the Chinese Buddhist canon, it is worth pausing to consider other parts of the picture as well.

First, it is clear that in some instances the person to whom a given scripture is credited in medieval catalogues is not the actual translator at all. I refer here not to the kinds of lat and dubious attributions discussed above, but to another less insidious (but no less misleading) practice: the custom of giving primary weight to the identity of the foreigner who brought the scripture is question to China. This was not merely a matter of an exotic flourish, for the problem of identifying and eliminating imposters (i.e., so-called “apocryphal scriptures” composed in China) required that, if at all possible, the fact that a given scripture was actually translated, and not composed in China, should be documented. This appears to have been one of the factors, though by no means the only one, that motivated Fei Changfang in his wholesale introduction of hundreds of new translator assignments. If the identity of the foreigner who had brought the text to China was also known, this made the case for authenticity even stronger. What this means, for our purposes, is that in many cases a scripture is credited not to the actual translator, but to the foreign participant in the translation process, even if that person’s only role (albeit an important one) was to provide a written text and/or to recite the scripture aloud. In some

to them actually date from this period.

13 Important contributions on these topics have been made by a number of scholars; for representative examples see Mane 2005 and 2006.

14 For a discussion of some ways of identifying such groupings see 15, images of Translation: ‘Tracing Rhizomatic Communities’ in Part V below.

15 For an apt summary of the situation see Fort 1984, p. 316. 
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As translations, the texts with which we are concerned are based on literary sources produced outside China, sources that were foreign to their East Asian recipients in a number of ways. They were foreign linguistically, of course, since they were composed in a non-Chinese language (or rather languages, as we will see below) whose Indo-European grammar and phonological repertoire were radically different from that of Chinese. They were also foreign religiously, countless studies (which I will not attempt to enumerate here) have examined the gap between Chinese and Indus understandings of everything from the nature of ultimate reality to the virtues to be cultivated in everyday life. But these incoming scriptures were also foreign in cultural terms: such elements as social hierarchy, customs concerning marriage and the family, and even the varieties of food and drink all differed from those known in China. Such areas of disjunction could be multiplied at great length, but I will confine myself to mentioning only one additional example: the vast difference in literary conventions. This is not merely a matter of language and style, but also of genre; there was no such thing as a "stakka tale" in China before the arrival of Buddhism, for example, nor did the structure of Buddhist sutas

---

24 For an insightful reflection on Te's possible motives see Tokuno 1990, pp. 46-47.

25 On this issue in the case of Dharmacakravyuha see Boucher 1996, pp. 198-214, 1998, pp. 487-488, and 2006, pp. 30.32. As Zucchetti aptly puts it, "there have been in fact almost as many Dharmacakravyuh as there have been texts translated under this name" (Zucchetti 2005, p. 13).
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(beginning with the well-known phrase "thus have I heard" and frequently ending with the positive reaction of the audience) approximate any pre-existing Chinese literary form. The task of domesticating such alien artifacts—and indeed of making numerous decisions as to the extent to which they should be domesticated—posed enormous challenges, to which the translators discussed below offered a wide variety of responses.

A full discussion of the nature of the circumstances that confronted this first cohort of translators, and the fortunes of their work after it left their hands, lies beyond the range of the present study. We may nonetheless pause here briefly, however, to consider a few of the factors that are necessary to placing early Chinese Buddhist translations—and the sometimes quite different versions of them that have come down to us today—in their proper context.

Indian source-languages. Several decades ago it was common to assume that Buddhist scriptures were translated into Chinese from Sanskrit originals. On this basis, Chinese transcriptions of Indian names and terms were often declared to be defective, and when Chinese scriptures were compared with their few surviving Sanskrit counterparts, the translators were often criticized for "abbreviating" their Indian texts as well. In sum, when a Sanskrit version of a given scripture was compared with its Chinese translation, the latter was often considered to fall well short of the mark.

This attitude did not originate with nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholars, for it can be seen already in the work of medieval Chinese scholars themselves. Lexicographers such as Huaini (737-820 CE) and Xuanying (818-885 CE) frequently criticized early transcriptions for failing to provide a good match to the corresponding Sanskrit sounds, while others, such as Daoan, faulted certain translators for abbreviating their Indian texts. In short, the idea that some Chinese translations represented their source-texts quite imperfectly was widely circulated already in medieval China, as well as in more recent times in Asia and the West.

There are, of course, countless instances of clearly erroneous translations, and there are also cases where certain translators did condense the content of the Indian texts (though often, as we shall see, this was done not on the basis of the Indic-language text itself, but using an earlier translation already produced in China). But these facts should not be allowed to color our picture of the situation as a whole. First, it is vital to recognize that in the period with which we are concerned, classical Sanskrit had not yet become the dominant vehicle for Buddhist literary expression in India. On the contrary, Buddhist scriptures were circulating in a variety of local languages known as "Prakrits," of which

---

38 Some of the topics discussed in this section are treated more fully, and with additional references to secondary literature, in Nair 2001a, especially pp. 10-16, 36-47, and 48-63.

39 Countless examples can be found in the Yijing yin yi 乙氏梵音義 (T1128); a representative example is Huaini's criticism of the transcription of Mira's epitaph pāpiśṭhān as bāmūn (94.59a10ff).
Gandhari is the best known (but by no means the only) example. The meaning, for purposes of the translators discussed here were very different from those represented by most of those available in surviving Indic-language manuscripts today. Studies published to date indicate that Buddhist scriptures arriving in China in the early centuries of the Common Era were composed not just in one Indian dialect but in several. The fact that most Prakrit languages had lost some of the phonological diversity of Sanskrit—that is, that sounds that were clearly distinguished in Sanskrit had become homophones in certain Prakrits—meant that the possibilities for ambiguity, or even outright misunderstanding, were rife.

In sum, the information available to us at present suggests that, barring strong evidence of another kind, we should assume that any text translated in the second or third century CE was not based on Sanskrit, but rather on one or another of the many Prakrit vernaculars. A close study of individual translations can often reveal clues as to the specific Prakrit languages of their source-texts, though here too caution is in order, for there are other factors that must be taken into consideration as well (see below under "Interpenetration").

Oral and written texts. In a writing-oriented culture such as China, where the ability to express oneself in an elegant and literary style was considered one of the marks of a cultivated gentleman, one of the most foreign aspects of Indian Buddhist scriptures was their origin as oral texts. The fact that some Buddhist texts did come to be recorded in writing, and were transmitted in this form to China, should not obscure the fact that to write down a sacred text represented a monumental cultural shift in the Indian context, where the normal mode of transmission of such texts was oral, passed from teacher to teacher.

An intermediate stage is seen in scriptures composed in what was labeled by the great Sanskritist Franklin Edgerton as "Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit" (BHS), which we might paraphrase as texts composed in incompletely Sanskritized Prakrit. Edgerton's original discussion (which has been the topic of some controversy; see for example Brough 1954) can be found in the introduction to his Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar (1953). For an updated treatment of the topic see von Hentig 1989. At various stages Chinese scriptures were translated from all three of these types of languages—Prakrit vernaculars, various types of BHS, and classical Sanskrit. There is still no evidence, as of this writing, that any Chinese Buddhist scriptures were translated from a text written in a Central Asian language; for a now somewhat dated discussion of the languages used for the transmission of Buddhist scriptures in Central Asia see Nuttall 1990.

The closest analogues are the Gandhari manuscripts in the Kharaqait script (dating from the first century CE and after) currently being studied by Richard Salomon and his team at the University of Washington. For references see above, n. 1.

---

60 See T2145, 15.52c13ff.

61 The term Prākrit (in Sanskrit, prakṛta) means "natural, unrefined," which in the context of languages refers to a vernacular language, in contrast to an elegant Sanskrit (samākṛta "composed") style. Though Sanskrit is generally said to be older than the various Prakrits (i.e. "Middle Indic") languages, it did not come into vogue as a medium for Buddhist textual composition until several centuries later. Thus the oldest Buddhist scriptures, both written and oral, were codified in various Prakrits, while the latest Buddhist scriptures were composed in classical Sanskrit.
disciple. The Buddhists were, apparently, the first religious group to make this move; what little information we have suggests that this happened for the first time toward the end of the first century BCE in Sri Lanka; in the far northwest (modern Pakistan and Afghanistan), evidence from new manuscript finds shows that this was already an established practice there by the first century CE.4 That these two regions—both on the fringes of the brahmanical culture of the Indian heartland—appear to have been the first to adopt this practice is probably significant, for to record sacred texts in writing would have been anathema to the Vedic tradition, not only because the power of the texts was considered to reside in their sound, but also because writing was considered unclean.

Many of the features of Indian Buddhist scriptures that would have seemed foreign to Chinese audiences stem from their background as oral texts, including the opening phrase “Thus have I heard” (which, rather than evoking the authority of a master-to-disciple lineage of transmission as in India, might well have sounded in Chinese rather like “The following is hearsay”), their seemingly gratuitous repetition of points already stated before, and the use of verse not as a freestanding literary device, but as a way to repeat material that had already been stated in prose. In sum, the Buddhist texts arriving in China from India were far from meeting Chinese literary expectations.

The myth of the “original.” By convention, the scriptures contained in the Buddhist Tripitaka (or at least, those in the Sutra and Vinaya sections, for there were differences of opinion in India concerning the Abhidharma portion of the canon) are said to be the word of the Buddha (bhuddhabhasita), engraved on the memories of his disciples and subsequently passed down orally from generation to generation. Even in the oldest extant canonical collection, however—that of the ordination lineage now known as the Theravāda, which preserved its scriptures in the Pali language—there are exceptions to this rule, with a number of discourses preached not by the Buddha, but by other members of his community. A look through the sūtras (Pali suttas) section of the canon also shows that many pieces of one “sūtra” (that is, what is labeled as one discrete discourse) re-appear in one or more others. Modern translators of these scriptures have sometimes chosen to eliminate these duplicates; thus one suddenly finds, near the beginning of S6 of Bhikkhu Bodhi’s translation of the Cūladakkabhikkhunī-sutta Sutta (“The Shorter Discourse on the Mass of Suffering,” sutta no. 14 in the Pali Majjhima-nikaya) the line “... as Sutta 13, §§7-15 . . .” (Bodhi 1995, p. 187). This elision of duplicated passages is not by any means his innovation, however, for the same practice appears in many volumes published decades earlier by the Pali Text Society, not only in their English translations but also in their editions of the Pali texts themselves. These editors and translators could, for that matter, appeal to a prototype in the Pali tradition itself, for often one finds the term poya,  

4 For some representative examples see Kasahima 1991 and Boucher 1998.

46 See Nettier 2003a, p. 59, n. 11.
meaning "to be completed according to the formula," in Pali texts. Such duplications point to a certain fluidity in the Buddhist recitation tradition in India, in which—unlike the Brahmanical tradition, where exact memorization and perfect pronunciation of the Vedic hymns were considered essential to ritual efficacy—the emphasis (to generalize very broadly) was on transmitting the meaning, and not the form, of the Buddha's words. This allowed, and even invited, the kind of linguistic variety discussed above, with scriptures being transmitted in a variety of local languages. But it also means that it is difficult to point to "the" original version of an Indian Buddhist text. If by "the original" we mean the discourse as pronounced by the Buddha, in the language of the region of Magadha in around the fifth century BCE, this original has been forever lost. What we have instead, when versions of these discourses have been preserved in writing, are a variety of snapshots (as it were) taken of the text, in one or more Buddhist languages, at various stages in the course of its development.

It is also important not to assume that such development was linear; on the contrary, the available evidence suggests a model more like that of a family tree, of which photographs of only a few members, belonging to different generations and to different branches of the family, have been preserved. What this implies for our topic here is that each text preserved in Chinese translation records an attempt to represent one such "photograph," but as a great literary and cultural remove and in a completely alien language.

Intertextuality. Thus far we have dealt with various factors that governed the creation and transmission of Buddhist scriptures in India, as well as their subsequent translation into Chinese. But there are still other factors that were operative in the Chinese cultural sphere alone. All of these have to do with the impact of originally separate texts upon one another, which we may describe as instances of "intertextuality."

Above we have noted that it is often possible to discern the language of the underlying Indian source-text by careful attention to the transcriptions (and in some cases, also the translations) found in a given Chinese translation. But an additional factor complicates this picture, for it was a common practice for Chinese translators to adopt terms that were already in circulation (whether translated or transcribed) to render expressions found in newly-arrived scriptures, regardless of the language in which the latter were cast. Thus the fact that we find the transcription Shālaśī for Śālaśī with its base form Shālaśī, first introduced by An Shigao—in a wide range of Chinese translations (including some produced during the period with which we are concerned) does not necessarily tell us anything at all about the language in which these texts were received in China. On the contrary, it simply suggests that translators were drawing upon a previously established lexicon in preparing their own renditions. When the same name appears in the rarely-used form Shālaśī, however—a form which appears to be based on Gândhārī, where

---

See Nierer 2003a, 58-59 and n. 11.
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the intervocalic *u* would be expected to change to *u* in some cases—we may infer that these texts are likely to have been based on Gāndhārī originals.\(^4\)

A larger-scale instance of intertextual relations occurs when it can be shown that one Chinese translation is directly dependent upon another. The case of Kumārajīva and his translation team consulting Dharmarāja's earlier translation of a version of the *Lauṣaṇa Sūtra* is well documented;\(^5\) likewise it can easily be shown that the same translation team, when preparing their own version of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, made ample use of Zhi Qian’s earlier translation of another recension of the same text.\(^6\)

Finally, yet another version of intertextual relations can be seen in cases where Chinese translators (or subsequent editors), confronted with a more expanded version of a given scripture, considered their existing edition to be defective and supplemented it with material drawn from another manuscript. Such is the case, for example, with Zhi Qian’s rendition of the *Dharmagupta* (where he added thirteen chapters drawn from another source to a text originally translated by the Indian monk Jiānyáng 白法) it is also the case with Kumārajīva’s *Lauṣaṇa Sūtra*, to which the section dealing with Dovādata (apparently missing from the Iśānian version on which he based his original translation) was added by editors at a later time.

**Scripture as artifact.** Finally, it is essential to bear in mind that a text is not merely its content; it is also an artifact, whether oral or written in form. Thus in order to fully understand the “life of the text” in both India and China, we must consider not only the way in which these translations were produced, but their status as objects once they had come into being. This is an essential step if we are to understand the shape of these documents as they have come down to us today.

To begin with oral texts, changes can take place as the result of a variety of events, including lapse of memory on the part of the reciter, or (conversely) his inadvertent recall of material that followed similar words in another memorized text.\(^7\) These changes can be deleterious, on the one hand, or interpolations on the other, both of them accidental rather than deliberate. Changes could also be introduced due to the incorporation (whether accidental or deliberate) of glosses produced in the course of the translation process, whether as the result of the translator’s deliberate attempt to enhance his audience’s understanding of a certain word or phrase,\(^8\) or due to the accidental recording of a

---


5. See for example T13 (1.233b27, 1.242a) and 241c18-19 and T32, 1.84bb21 and pāñcata, 1.84bb21 and pāñcata.

6. See for example the discussions in Ch’ien 1960, p. 190 and in de Jong 1968, p. 14. I would like to thank Stefano Zecchetti for supplying a copy of Ch’ien’s article, which was not easily available to me here, at the eleventh hour.

7. See Netzer 2008.

8. For some examples of expansion due to this process see Netzer 2003a, pp. 56-55.
translator's oral glosses by a scribe. In some cases we actually find glosses following a transcribed Indian name or term that define the transcribed word in Chinese, using the phrase han yue (in Chinese it is called ... ), information that was obviously not contained in the original Indian text.

Misunderstandings of another kind could result from different pronunciations of a word in different dialects; a classic example is given by John Brough in his study of the Gāndhāra Dharmagupta, which records a case in which a confusion between nāgāra "arising" and nākka "water" resulted in a catastrophic misunderstanding of the text. Finally, and much more far-reaching than any of the above deletions or alterations, are cases of the complete loss of a text, which can result if its sole living reciter should pass away without having transmitted it to any of his students.

The introduction of written scriptures introduced a whole new set of potential hazards. Scribal errors of various sorts then became possible, among them haplography (skipping from one line to an identical word or phrase in another) and visual confusion between similar letters. On the Indian side most such mistakes were generally fairly limited in scope, but once these scriptures had been translated into Chinese the possibilities for confusion increased exponentially. Especially in the case of transcriptions, whose source-terms in an Indic language would have been completely opaque to a scribe who knew only Chinese, there were countless possibilities for misunderstanding.

With written scriptures we also encounter a new set of threats to survival, including vulnerability to water and fire, the gradual effacement of letters through repeated use, and ultimately the decay and disappearance of any text that was not carefully preserved. Finally: as any librarian knows, the preservation and transmission of texts also involves their proper shelving and cataloguing. And in both India and China, the practice of recording Buddhist scriptures in loose-leaf format meant that the possibility for a disastrous reshuffling of pages was always present. As we shall see in the discussion below, there are a number of cases in texts produced during the period with which we are concerned in which the sequence of pages has become radically disordered, and others where unrelated scriptures have been mixed together with another text. As Paul Harrison has aptly observed, confronted with such texts in their current state one can easily visualize a hapless monk of some centuries ago dropping a bundle of scriptures in a monastic library,

---

1) Cf. the translation of the Leger Subhakarshana by Louis Giuseppe, where the name Aminda (together with the epithet ammata, "venerable") is translated as "the Buddhist's closest, and closest disciple, the revered Aminda" (Göschel 1996, p. 62). Such deliberate glosses cannot be called mistakes, but they indicate clearly what the translator thought his audience needed to know in order to understand and appreciate the foreign text.


3) Ironically, this happened even with the Chi jing yi ji itself, where Senyuan's list of "doubled scriptures" (23.51) has become intermixed with a list of Dunhu's commentaries (38c-40c, with
and then hastily trying to cover up the results of his mistake.\textsuperscript{14}

In sum, to understand the shape of Chinese Buddhist translations produced during the second and third centuries as they have come down to us today we must bear in mind a complex network of causes and conditions that have brought them to their present state. While this admittedly makes any discussion of these works more complicated, it also brings us somewhat closer to the real-life situations within which these scriptures were produced and transmitted in living Buddhist communities.

A Note on Names
During the period with which we are concerned it was standard for men—and we should note at the outset that not a single female translator is attested in the entire history of Chinese Buddhism—to have a surname (xing 姓) shared with other members of their family, as well as a personal or given name (ming 名). Occasionally the biographical sources also provide the zi 字 ("coming-of-age name"), and less commonly the ban 姓 (adult nickname), of certain individuals. Surnames almost always consisted of a single character, while given names might have either one or two. Only in the case of transcribed Indian names do we find longer given names, e.g., (Zha) Lou jachen (支)楼建腾, generally reconstructed as "Lokakṣema."\textsuperscript{15} Single-character given names were quite common in the Han and Three Kingdoms periods, partly as a legacy of the prohibition issued during the reign of Wang Mang 王莽 (8-23 CE), when it was forbidden to use disyllabic given names.\textsuperscript{16}

Given that so many of the early translators were non-Chinese, it is not surprising that many of the surnames recorded in our sources are actually ethnonyms—that is, terms that function as family names while also in-facting an individual's ethnic background. It is important to note that such ethnonyms were applied to anyone of foreign ancestry regardless of his actual place of birth. Thus An Shigao (who was born in Parthia, referred to as Amī 対伊 in Chinese sources) has the ethnicker: An 艾 ("Parthian") as his surname, while Zhi Qiao (who was born in China) has the ethniker Zhi 之, indicating that his ancestors belonged to the group known in Chinese sources as Yuechi 楯 (var. Yuezhi 楯氏). Likewise Kang Senghu, who was born in the territory of what is now northern Vietnam 阮 Sogdian parents who had migrated there from India, nevertheless carries the ethniker Kang 良 as an indicator of his ancestral ethnic heritage.

\textsuperscript{14} Duan’s commentaries discussed at 198(7-404:17).

\textsuperscript{15} Harrison 1997, p. 261.

\textsuperscript{16} Such unwieldy names were frequently abbreviated; thus Lokakṣema, for example, is often referred to simply as Zhi Chen 3:8.

\textsuperscript{17} According to Endymion Wilkinson, this prohibition lasted "more or less until the third century" (Wilkinson 2000, p. 100).
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In the case of ordained monks there is yet another layer of complication, for at some time prior to the mid-third century CE became common practice for a disciple to adopt the surname—which, in the case of a foreign monk, would be an ethnikon—of his master. (So far as I have been able to determine, there has not yet been any study of how widespread, in either time or space, this practice was.) Thus the translator Dharmaraksa (Zhu Fahu 祖法護) invariably referred to by the surname Zhu 祖 "Indian," indicating that he had studied with an Indian teacher, though his biography makes it clear that he was born in Dunhuang to a Yueshi family.17

The custom of using Shi 師 as a universal surname for monastics, introduced by Daoan in the late fourth century,18 was still unknown in the period with which we are concerned. Instead, each translator—whether lay or monastic—had a surname (which, if he was of non-Chinese ancestry or was the monastic disciple of a foreign master, would be an ethnikon) of his own. For this reason, in sources from the Han and Three Kingdoms periods all two-syllable names should be understood as including a surname. In transcribing such names in roman characters (i.e., in pinyin) both the surname and the given name should therefore be capitalized.19 Thus one writes An Xuan 安玄 (not "Anxuan"), Zhi Qian 支謙 (not "Zhiqian"), and so on, a rule that applies whether the figure in question is a layman or a monk.

Conversely, from Daoan’s time on, two-character monastic names—but not those of lay people—should be understood as consisting of a single given name, with the surname Shi assumed and thus not always explicitly mentioned. Such names are therefore written as one word, e.g., Huiyuan 會遠 (not "Hui Yuan") and Xuanzang 焉奘 (not "Xuan Zang").

17 The custom of adopting the ethnikons of one’s monastic master was not limited to those who were themselves of non-Chinese birth or ancestry. Zürcher cites the examples of Zhu Daocheng 竹道成 (d. 434) and his teacher Zhu Fana 竹法那 (d. 387), both of whom were ethnically Chinese (Zürcher 1959, pp. 241 and p. 425, n. 198). Citing a passage from the Gaowang zhuan (T2059, 50.354b16), Zürcher also suggests that Daoan himself may have borne the ethnikon Zhu before he introduced the practice of using Shi 師 as a surname for monastics (ib. 40).

18 This practice, introduced during the period 365–379 CE, quickly became widespread; according to Zürcher, Zhu Daocheng (cf. the previous note) was "one of the first Chinese monks with a religious surname of the old type mentioned in our sources." (Zürcher 1959, p. 281). For the traditional account of Daoan’s creation of this new system see the Chu sanzang ji (T2245, 35.190b26ff), the same account is repeated verbatim in the Gaowang zhuan (T2059, 50.354b70ff).

19 The use of capital letters is of course a western convention, but the introduction of the pinyin system to record Chinese is also a reflection of western writing practices. For a convenient summary of the officially sanctioned method of writing proper names in pinyin as set forth by the Xue Language Commission of the PRC see DeFrancis 1996, p. 83f, §1.3.28
Part I: Introduction

Objectives of this Study: A Brief User's Guide

The primary purpose of this volume is to make available, in an easily accessible form, the most current information as to which Chinese Buddhist translations can be assigned with confidence to the Han and Three Kingdoms periods. To facilitate this, three Appendices are included at the end of this volume: first, an index arranged according to Taishō text numbers for quick access to the discussions included here (Appendix 1); second, an index (arranged in alphabetical order) to Sanskrit and Pali scriptural titles (Appendix 2); and third, a short reference list of translations thought to belong to this period, arranged in chronological order according to the translators' names (Appendix 3).

If a reader wishes to know, for example, whether the "Baṣī saṃsaṣṭi prāṇaṃ pravīṣaṇaṃ jīvaṃ" (巴利三昧無明斷品 智水) is assigned to An Shigao in the Taishō canon and associated reference works, is really the work of this translator, she can turn to Appendix 1. If the Taishō text number is not there, this should be understood to mean that the scripture in question is not discussed in this volume, and thus that the attribution is not, at the present state of our knowledge, considered to be genuine. If the number is there—as in the present case—this means only that the text in question is discussed somewhere within this book; it does not imply that the traditional attribution to a Han or Three-Kingdoms translator is correct. To verify the status of the translation in question, the reader will therefore need to consult the discussions on the pages listed there.

Second, a reader who wishes to determine whether there is any Chinese translation of a particular Indian scripture (e.g., the Dharmagupta or the Vimalakirtiśrīdevī) dating from this period may consult the Sanskrit and Pali index (Appendix 2). If the title in question does not appear in the index, this should be understood to mean that no translation of it that can be dated to the period with which we are concerned has yet been identified. Although there is no index of Tibetan titles included here, readers working from Tibetan can use the valuable index to The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue (Lancaster and Park, 1979) to move from the Tibetan Dege (Tōhoku) and Peking (Čantai) catalogue numbers to those of the Tōhōhō edition via the Korean, which will in turn provide access to Appendix 1.

Finally, a reader wishing to gain a quick impression of how many texts are currently considered to be the work of a particular translator (e.g., An Shigao or Kang Senghui) can turn to Appendix 3, where the Taishō text numbers and titles of these translations are simply listed under each translator's name.

46 For a recent analysis of the vocabulary and style of this scripture (concluding that it is not in fact the work of An Shigao) see Fang and Gao 2007. Though their study is based exclusively on internal evidence, one could arrive at the same conclusion on the basis of externa evidence alone, for the "Baṣī saṃsaṣṭi prāṇaṃ pravīṣaṇaṃ jīvaṃ" is not attributed to An Shigao by Sengou, who classified it as an anonymous scripture (5331920.21). As is so often the case, this unsourced attribution first appears in the Lishu sanyo ji (495.1210 and 13.12-23).
One shortcoming of the present volume, from the point of view of at least some potential users, is that there is no index arranged according to the Chinese, Japanese, Korean, or Vietnamese pronunciation of the titles discussed here, nor is there a character index arranged by radicals. Admittedly these might be convenient for some, and the omission of such indices may be regrettable, but I have considered that it should be relatively easy for a reader interested in a particular translation to locate its Taishō text number, and from there to use the index provided in Appendix 1. Indeed, I suspect that the increasingly widespread use of computer searches of digital editions of the Chinese canon (pioneered by the CBETA group in Taiwan and now also available in the SAT edition produced in Japan), which produce results sorted according to Taishō text numbers, will eventually lead to a high degree of "number recognition" among scholars of coming generations.

A second purpose—and in the long range, perhaps an even more important one—is to make available a detailed discussion of the methodological tools by which the authenticity of individual translator attributions can be established. On this basis other scholars will be able to extend the analysis presented in this volume to evaluate the work of translators whose work falls outside the chronological range of this study or, for that matter, to re-evaluate the status of some of the works discussed here. I do not mean to imply, of course, that all of the methodological approaches presented here are new; many (though perhaps not all) were already being employed by scholars writing several decades ago. But because methodological issues are not always discussed explicitly in these studies, it seemed worthwhile to place the topic of methodology in the direct spotlight at various points in this work.

The sharp-eyed reader will notice immediately that I have not been consistent in using a single methodological approach to evaluating the attribution of all of the scriptures discussed here. This is deliberate, for in my view certain adjustments must be made according to the nature of the translator's modus operandi—e.g., whether he is thought to have worked alone or with others, whether he produced new translations or was involved in the polishing or the wholesale re-translation of existing scriptures, and so on. Rather than being discussed only in a single section, therefore, reflections on methodology are interspersed throughout this volume, with any particular factors that need to be considered in specific cases mentioned in connection with that translator and his works. Readers with a particular interest in methodological issues will thus have to skip around a bit to locate all of these sections, but it is my hope that the additional refinement which this procedure makes possible will make up for the inconvenience.

Limitations of this Study: Tasks for the Future

Because the focus of this study is on establishing a reliable chronology of early Chinese Buddhist translations, my first priority has been simply to determine whether or not they can be legitimately assigned to the Han or Three Kingdoms period. Knowing that these
works were circulating in China by the second or third century CE dates establish a terminus ante quem for their appearance in India, but many questions remain to be asked
about the relative dates of these scriptures, as well as about their relationship (or lack
thereof) to one another.

Second—and most obvious to many readers—is the fact that I have not attempted
to deal with the content (much less the doctrinal specifics) of the scriptures dealt with
here. This, too, is a matter for another venue; my concern has been simply to classify
them in a minimal way (ajjana text, Mahāyāna sūtra, and so on) in order to provide a basic
picture of the types of texts that were being translated into Chinese during this time. I
have also made no attempt to cite every publication dealing with each of these scriptures.
Instead, I have limited my citations to books and articles that bear directly on the topics
dealt with here: the date of translation of the texts, the identity of their translators, and
their language and style. Even so, I am sure that I have overlooked some valuable studies;
for this I beg the indulgence of the reader (and especially of the authors) for any papers
that I have failed to cite.

Third, because the central concern here is with translations, I have said relatively
little about Buddhist compositions produced in China during this period. By this I do not
mean primarily spurious texts (i.e., scriptures produced in China but with a claim to be
from India); in fact, the period with which we are concerned precedes the era of widespread
production of such texts as concerned figures like Faxian and Xuanzang. Rather,
there are texts of other types, produced during the second and third centuries CE, that
still await detailed study. As noted here and there in the following discussion, a number of
prefaces, colophons, and other scriptural notes, though often anonymous, are likely to
date from this period. Most of these texts with difficulties, and they deserve separate
and closely focused study in themselves. Most significant for understanding the formation
of Chinese Buddhism itself are the small number of commentaries that are thought to
date from this period. I have touched on these briefly below (see Part IV); their enormous
importance will surely reward detailed study in the future.

Finally, because this work is intended as an overview, it is of necessity a general
work, and many specific aspects of the vocabulary and style of the translations belonging to
this period could not be pursued here. Each of these scriptures is worthy of detailed study
in itself, and to date very few of the works discussed here have received such treatment.
In this difficult but vastly rewarding field, there is much that remains to be done.
Part II

Translations Produced During the Eastern Han Period
(c. 147-220 CE)
Legendary beginnings

Sengyou’s *Cha sanzang ji ji*, as we have seen, is the earliest extant catalogue of Chinese Buddhist translations, and the very first translation listed in this venerable work is entitled *The Scripture in Forty-zoo Sections* (*Sibi’er zhang jing* 四十二章經, 55.5c17). With a level of detail that is archaistic for the catalogue section of his work, Sengyou provides not just the names of the translators, but a depiction of the circumstances that led to the production of the text: Emperor Ming of the Han 翦蒙 (there referred to as Xiaoimg 翦蒙, r. 58-76 CE), after seeing a “golden man” in a dream, sent two envoys—Zhang Qian 張騫 and Qin Jing 秦景—to the Western Regions. Having arrived in the Yuezhi 率人諸国, they encountered a monk named Zhu Moteng 莫騰. After translating this text (presumably obtained from Zhu Moteng, though the passage does not say so explicitly) the two envoys returned to Lo-yang, where the text was duly placed in a repository of scriptures.1 If this account were true, it would be the foundation story not just of Buddhist translation activity in China, but of Chinese contact with Buddhism as such: as the result of an emperor’s auspicious dream, Chinese contacts with Buddhist countries to the West began, and the first scripture to be rendered into Chinese was translated under imperial patronage.2

A text by this title does in fact exist in transmitted versions of the canon (T784), where it is credited to Juyamoteng 楚王摩騰 (generally reconstructed in modern secondary sources as “Kāśyapa Maitāgata”) and Falan 法輪 (reconstructed as “Dharmaratna”). Scholars who have examined it closely, however, have agreed that the text as we have it does not go back to the Han (see Taig 1936). It might seem reasonable simply to conclude, therefore, that the received text is a revised version of the one originally translated at the initiative of Emperor Ming.

But the problems with this tradition are far more fundamental than the simple absence of a suitably ancient text. In a landmark study of the dream of Emperor Ming published in 1910, Heiri Maspero showed that this account is riddled with problems. First and foremost is a glaring anachronism: although an envoy named Zhang Qian was indeed sent from China to the Western Regions, this took place not in the first century CE but three centuries earlier, and the mission had nothing to do with Buddhism. On the contrary, its purpose was to enlist the aid of the Yuezhi in forming an alliance to counter the power of the Xiongnu 匈奴, a nomadic group who, after defeating the Yuezhi and driving many of them far to the west, was then harassing the northern borders of China.2

---

1 See T7145, 55.5c17-22. 四十二章經 (新唐書·列傳第三十二·儒林), 佛為 ABOVE 之僧, 翦蒙 翦蒙; 之僧周, 翦蒙 翦蒙, 翦蒙 翦蒙. 六月: 翦蒙 翦蒙, 翦蒙 翦蒙. The tradition here reported by Sengyou clearly indicates that the translation was made by Zhang Qian and Qin Jing, and not by the *travagga* Zhu Moteng cf. the further notice given in the *Cha sanzang ji ji* at 51.10b4-8.

2 The event in question took place in 138 BCE, with Zhang Qian returning to China in 125; for a convenient summary see Eberhard 1977, pp. 85-87.
Admittedly there are some sources (e.g., the Gaoyang zhuan) in which the ambassador is not called Zhang Qian, but rather Cai Yin 喬僧. But as Maspero has shown, the sources that read Zhang Qian are older, and the change of the name to Cai Yin merely appears as a belated attempt to cover up the obvious historical difficulties with placing the famous second century BCE ambassador Zhang Qian in the time of Emperor Ming. As to Senguy’s own account, Maspero demonstrates clearly that it is nothing more than an abbreviated version of the contents of an anonymous preface to the scripture (likewise preserved in the Chu xunzang ji ji), and indeed, that the preface is the ultimate source of all other accounts of the emperor’s dream and the ensuing mission. In light of Maspero’s analysis, the entire tale of the mission to the West, culminating in the translation of the Scripture in Forty-two Sections, is now widely viewed by scholars not only more than a web of fiction, and a poorly woven one at that.4

Turning back to the Chu xunzang ji ji itself, we can see that Senguy’s own stance with respect to this legend is far from straightforward. Though the Scripture in Forty-two Sections is the first text listed in his catalogue, he makes it clear in an accompanying note that his most reliable source—Daotan’s Zhangting muku—did not mention it. Instead, Senguy states that he had drawn his information on this text from the Jiulu 傳錄, a source whose precise date and authorship are uncertain but which appears to postdate Daotan’s work by more than a century.5

Moreover, somewhat later in his catalogue—following the entry for the translators Faju 斐姑 and Fali 声立, which occurs more than four pages below the entry for the Scripture in Forty-two Sections in the Taisho edition—Senguy provides an important scholarly note on its sources:

All of the scriptures that appear above, [those translated by] a total of seventeen people, from An Shigao down to Fali, are cited from [Daotan’s catalogue]. Of these, [for the entries concerning] a total of seven people, viz., Zhang Qian, Cai Jing, Zhu Shaofo, Weiqinan, Zhu Jiangyan, Bo Yan, and Bai Fuzu, I (he) have added new material collated from various other catalogues. From Yue Shido onwards, the entries have been newly compiled by myself.6

Several things are important about this note. First, it shows that the tradition known to

---

1 See T2059, 50.32e-24 and 321a9.
2 See Maspero 1910, pp. 126.
4 For a discussion of other problems with the account given see Maspero, pp. 128-129.
5 See Tien 1991, p. 36 (if one accepts that by Jiulu Senguy is referring to a single text).
6 See T2145, 55.10a4-8: 高陽志略，自安世經以下至漢立以上，凡十七家，並安公霍休撰。 其張誕、蔡信、竺錫幹、竺靜幹、竺錫之、竺賓、白延、帛詁，凡八人，皆出於晉鍾錫纂稿。入召南土變 以後，傳聞所纂纂。
Sengyou concerning the *Scripture in Forty-two Sections* (whatever his own assessment of its validity) attributed the work to Zhang Qian and Qin Jing, not to Zhu Mo teng (who is not mentioned in the list of translators at all). Second, Sengyou reiterates here that the story of Zhang Qian and Qin Jing was unknown to Daoan. Third, the wording of the above notice is somewhat awkward, which may indicate that the passage has been revised by the addition of these two names. As we have it, the text seems to suggest that Sengyou’s catalogue began with the works of An Shigao, and that the names of the other seven translators (吴支遁...凡七人, “Of these, a total of seven people, Zhang Qian...” and so on) should fall between An Shigao and Fati. In fact, however, the text attributed to Zhang Qian and Qin Jing provide those by An Shigao on Sengyou’s list. It may well be that this apparent dislocation is the result of a deliberately light revision on Sengyou’s part, inserting the new names but leaving the original structure of the passage intact, thus encoding a hint that the change had been made under duress.  

Other evidence corroborates the late incorporation of the *Scripture in Forty-two Sections* into the *Chuan samang ji ji*, for there is no account of any of the supposed participants in its production—Zhang Qian, Qin Jing, or Zhu Mo teng—in the biographical section of Sengyou’s work. But given the prominence of this text in the catalogue section, one would certainly expect at least a brief biography of its translator(s). But it is only later that such “biographies” first appear, and then in what Maepo’s work now allows us to see as a sanitized form.  

In any event, in light of studies by Maepo and others, there is certainly no longer any reason to accept the tradition of the translation of the *Scripture in Forty-two Sections* (or for that matter, of any other Buddhist text) during the first century of the Common Era. While a Buddhist presence had definitely been established in China by this time, the form that it seems to have taken at this point was centered on ritual practices (see Zürcher 1959, pp. 26-27) and artistic objects (see for example Ruan 1996), and not on scriptural texts. It would be nearly a century later before we encounter the first reliable accounts of the translation of Buddhist scriptures into Chinese.  

---

1 In retrospect one wonders if the unaccountably detailed information included with the catalogue entry—including the erroneous reference to Zhang Qian—may have been a subtle but deliberate attempt on Sengyou’s part to call attention to the dubiousness of this report. The account of Emperor Ming’s dream also occurs in the introductory section (55.538ff.), another portion of the *Chuan samang ji ji* that appears to have been revised after the completion of the biographical section. It seems likely that pressure to include the story was carried by the Liang Emperor Wu (386-464) himself, work in progress by Palumbo (mentioned in Palumbo 2003, n. 87) may shed substantial light on this issue.  

2 See the biographies of She Mo teng 释摩腾 (10.322c15ff.) and Zhu Mo teng 朱茂腾 (12b8ff.), respectively, to whom Hsüeh credits the *Scripture in Forty-two Sections* in the first two entries in the *Chuan samang ji ji*. Not only can we see that the anachronistic reference to Zhang Qian has been removed (replaced, as noted by Maepo, by the previously unknown Cai Yu), but even the reference to the Turkic country (with which Zhang Qian is fairly associated in Chinese historical sources) has disappeared, and both monks are said to be from India (12c2-3).  

3 See also Tang 1938, repr. 1943 (chapter 3) and Tokiwa 1938, pp. 51-54.
An Shigao 安世高

BIOGRAPHY

Having set aside the legendary account discussed above, we now come to the first translator who is actually known to us from the historical record. An Shigao, a native of Parthia (Ch. 灰) who came to Luoyang in the mid-second century CE. Concerning his life and translation activities we have an abundance of resources, including biographical accounts as well as prefaces and colophons in which he is mentioned. In these sources An Shigao is portrayed as a prince who renounced the throne in order to pursue the religious life and subsequently traveled to China. Having arrived early in the reign of Emperor Huan 恭帝 (r. 147-168 CE) he settled in Luoyang, where he spent more than twenty years translating Buddhist scriptures.

Other elements of his biography—notably the story that he left the capital during the time of Emperor Ling 灵帝 (r. 168-190 CE) to travel to the south, where he met his death as the result of a random encounter with a brawl in a marketplace—have been discarded by many modern scholars, along with the standard hagiographic references to An Shigao’s unusual talents and miraculous abilities. As Florin Dullea has pointed out, the earliest extant biography of An Shigao is that preserved in the Chu sanmeang pi ji 见三藏往還記 (T2145, 55.94e-521). The biography contained in Huijiao’s Gaoming zhuan 言明傳 (T2039, 50.32a28-32b4a) draws heavily on Sengsu’s earlier version (with certain additions and omissions), as indeed is usually the case (see Wright 1954 and Link 1957). Sengsu, in turn, had used a variety of earlier materials, notably Kang Senghui’s preface to the Ashāhāruṃ jīṃgaḥ, much of whose wording appears at the beginning of his account. No complete translation of Sengsu’s biography of An Shigao is available in any modern language, for Huijiao’s account sees the Italian translation in Forme 1968 and cf. the French translation in Shiš 1968 (pp. 4-9 plus his further remarks on pp. 9-11).

Limiting our sources to those dating from the time of Daon as or before, they are the following: Yan Fusi’s preface to the (no longer extant) Shumi diskhu shanping 仏說七賢品記 (T2145, 55.60b17-70b8), a preface to the Ji lu yinjing perhaps by Chen Hui (T1694, 53.9b9-21) and by Daon as to his own commentary on the same text (T2145, 55.44b29-45a3), a preface to the Ashāhāruṃ jīṃgaḥ by Kang Senghui (transmitted both in the Chu sanmeang pi ji 见三藏往還記 (T2145, 55.46c29-45a31) and with the received text of T602, 55.16a6-8), a preface to the Ashāhāruṃ jīṃgaḥ by Xin Fu 訾法 (T55.46c23-44b28), a preface to a commentary on the same text by Daon as (T2145, 55.8c3-4b0), and prefices by Daon as to the Shi’shī’er men yingjing (55.45b26-46a13), the Da shī’shī’er men yingjing (55.46a14-4b3), and his commentary on the Luoyān yì shēng jīng (55.45a14-4b2), and to Dharmakīrṇa’s translation of the Vajracchedikā (T2145, 55.6a7-8c8).

A number of secondary sources (notably Zinker 1959, p. 30) give a more specific date of 148 CE, drawing on Huijiao’s Gaoming zhuan, which places Daon as’s catalogue as stating that An Shigao began his translation career in the second year of Emperor Huan’s reign (T2039, 10.32a16-10). According to the Zinker’s study (1959, p. 31), who explicitly rejects the account of An Shigao’s
however, the fact that the account of his violent death is encrusted with orthodox doctrinal explanations interpreting this event in terms of karmic retribution does not negate the possibility that such a journey might actually have taken place. On the contrary, when this tale is analyzed from the perspective of the methodological "principle of embarrassment," it becomes obvious that to portray such an emissary figure as having met his doom at the hands of a common ruffian is hardly the sort of thing that a hagiographer would invent in order to embellish his account. The fact that An Shigao's biographers went to great lengths to frame this event in appropriate doctrinal terms—including the claim that An Shigao fully understood the karmic factors involved—only adds further weight to the likelihood that his death in southern China was not a fiction, but rather an inconvenient truth that was too well known to deny.

More sweeping than the mere elimination of hagiographical embellishments, or even the rejection of the account of An Shigao's journey to the south, is a reinterpretation of An Shigao's biography by Antonio Forte, who has contended that he was not a monk at all but rather a layman who was sent to the Chinese court by the Parthian government as a diplomatic hostage. An Shigao's lay status seems doubtful, however, in light of the fact that he is referred to as feihuang (飛黃)—a term used to translate the monastic title sānghydāya "preceptor" from an early date—in the earliest extant source referring to him, a preface composed in the late 2nd century CE by Yan Fottao  tenemos, a Chinese Buddhist monk who had been An Shigao's direct disciple. Subsequently Daosun described southern perspectives and accepts only the most skeletal version of An Shigao's life—that he abandoned the opportunities afforded by his royal connections in Parthia to travel to China, where he subsequently spent more than twenty years as a translator—as historical fact.

16 See Delamare 1995, pp. 6-7.
17 On the "principle of embarrassment" see Nattier 2003, pp. 63-66.
18 It should be admitted, however, that this story appears for the first time (in extant sources, at any rate) in the sixth century CE, so we should be cautious about giving it too much credence.
19 See Forte 1995, especially pp. 76-78. For a critical review of Forte's book which raises some significant methodological issues see Rong Xinjiang 1998, for a detailed critique of Forte's initial presentation of this interpretation (Forte 1992) see Delamare 1995, pp. 7-23.
20 The term sānghydāya occurs in two texts translated by Lokakṣema in contexts where the parallel Tibetan versions make it clear that the underlying term was sānghyāda. See T418, 13.099c1-2 where sānghydāya and sānghyāda correspond to deah yod and mehān pa in the Tibetans (see Harrison ed., 1978, §§93, p. 85, line 1 and cf. the English translation in Harrison 1990, p. 81, line 1) and T282, 10.451c15 (10.0.5.1) and 451c16 (10.0.5) and 452a1 (10.1.4.4) corresponding to Öehnli No. 76, vol. 25, 94.3.5 and 94.4.7.8 (deah yod and mehān pa, with the order reversed with respect to Lokakṣema's text). For the attribution of T282 to Lokakṣema see Nattier 2003c. On the term sānghyāda itself see Sasse 1997b. In all of these cases the term sānghydāya and sānghyāda clearly refer to specific types of monastic teachers.
21 Though the text itself has been lost, the preface is preserved in the Chā samantapāramitā (T2145, 55.69c19-70a9) on An Shigao see 69c25-26.
An Shigao as "a bodhisattva who had left the household" (捨家鬪士), while Sengyou referred to him as someone who had "left home to practice the Way" (出家修道). Chinese sources also regularly refer to him as a 龔人 (shamen 釋門) at least from the time of the Chu sanjia ji ji. It is true, as Forte notes, that one early source—Kang Senghuo's preface to the Akean "shengyi jing"—does not explicitly refer to An Shigao's monastic status. Given the unanimity on this score of all other early accounts, however, there seems to be no good reason to discard the traditional assumption that An Shigao was a monk.

As to the way in which An Shigao produced his translations, our sources give no explicit information. It has become customary among specialists to assume that all foreign masters were aided in their work by committees that included at least one native speaker of Chinese,23 but it may be significant that in An Shigao's case there is not a single mention of any translation assistants. On the contrary, his biography emphasizes the fact that, upon his arrival, he quickly became fluent in Chinese, conveying the impression that his own linguistic ability was sufficient to produce the translations that were described by Sengyou as "eloquent but not flowery, plain but not coarse" (時而不華，簡而不約). The style of his extant works (on which see below, pp. 43–44) is consonant with this scenario, for though their language can be described as "workmanlike" it does not betray any knowledge of Chinese literary conventions, nor do his translations allude to the classics or draw heavily on indigenous religious terms.24 Moreover, in the one case where we have an extant translation by an individual who was known to have been a member of

23 Dong's comments are contained in his preface to An Shigao's Akean shengyi jing, preserved in Sengyou's Chu sanjia ji ji (T2145, 55.48b and 44b19).
24 See the biography section of the Chu sanjia ji ji (T2145, 55.95a17).
25 E.g., at 55.65.
26 For a translation of the preface see Link 1976, pp. 67-68 (on An Shigao see especially pp. 78-79), and cf. Forte 1995, pp. 67-70.
27 See for example Ziechee 1979, p. 31, who seems to generalize from the case of Lokakṣema to conclude that all Han-period Buddhist translations were the product of group enterprises.
28 See the Chu sanjia ji ji, 55.95a25-26, and cf. Gaowang zhuan, 50.32a11b4, where the same wording is used. Sengyou is presumably alluding to the Lanya (65.1, 龐迦文傳, 舊雜文傳) in 50.32a11b4, where however 舊, and not 新, is contrasted with 新 "soberly" or "plainness".
29 The fact that An Shigao uses such expressions as da dao and zhi "monastic" in the sense of "strict non-action" to express the Indian idea of the experience of nirvāṇa suggests that the expressions da dao and zhi were so pervasive in the Chinese language and culture of the time (and by no means specifically Theravāda, as has sometimes been suggested) that it would have been difficult to express the idea of an ultimate, unconditioned reality to a Chinese-speaking audience without using them. Most other Chinese religious terms, by contrast—e.g., the hua "buddha" and pu hua "sacred spirits, Mt. Tai 彭祖 as a destination for the dead, and even the (especially Confucian) concept of xian li "humaneness"—are entirely absent from An Shigao's translations.
An Shigao’s circle—i.e., the Fa jing jing (T32), produced in the latter part of the second century CE by An Shigao’s student Tan Potiao emale together with the Parthian layman An Xuan 安玄—its translation style differs radically from that used by An Shigao himself. In such, we have no direct evidence of anyone assisting An Shigao in the translation process, and in the one case where we know of a specific individual who would have been able to do so, no trace of his own translation preferences can be found in the texts attributed to his master. It is possible, of course, that our sources simply neglected to record any information concerning An Shigao’s co-workers, but it is worth at least considering the possibility that, in contrast to many of his successors, An Shigao produced his translations on his own.

Be that as it may, An Shigao’s role in Chinese Buddhism was in every respect a foundational one: not only did he produce the earliest known translations of Buddhist scriptures, but his works covered a wide range of topics, conveying—if not a complete repertoire of early canonical literature—a rich anthology of Buddhist materials, made available to his Chinese audience, in their own language, for the first time. Though his translations appear archaic and awkward to modern readers, who are more accustomed to the fluid style of Kumārajīva and some of his successors, many of the individual terms (both translations and transliterations) that first appeared in An Shigao’s works—terms such as 佛 for Śākyamuni, 般 for the god Brahmā, 眼 for the eye, or 天 for heaven—were adopted by these subsequent translators and have continued to be used down to the present day. It is also clear, from the information preserved in the Guan shang ji ji and other medieval sources, that the scriptures An Shigao produced were avidly studied and commented upon by generations of Chinese Buddhist devotees. While some knowledge of Buddhism was circulating in China at least a century before his time—mainly in the form of images and certain cultic practices—it was An Shigao who played a pivotal role in introducing the Indian Buddhist literary heritage to China. It is fortunate indeed that so many works produced by this pioneering translator have survived.

**Contents of His Corpus**

Most of An Shigao’s extant translations deal with the basics of Buddhist teaching (e.g., the four noble truths, the eightfold path), meditation practices (e.g., mindfulness of breathing, the four satipāṭhayās, the four ḍhyānas and four āriyasaṃānāpatti), and various numerical lists. Though some of An Shigao’s translations are in the form of iṣṭam-style narrative texts, others are not śūraṃ but treatises. In addition to these, at least one (the Abhān kuśa)

---

79 On the style used by An Xuan and Tan Potiao, in which personal and place names (as well as Buddhist technical terms) are all translated rather than transliterated, see below, p. 91–92.

A notable exception is the Vinaya, of which no example can be found in An Shigao’s corpus. Whether there would have been a suitable audience (that is, an audience of ordained monastics, as the Vinaya is by tradition not to be revealed to the laypeople) at this early date, however, is uncertain.
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shi'er yinyuan jing 阿含口譯十二因緣經, T1508) appears to be not a translation at all, but a record of oral explanations delivered by An Shigao to his students (see below, p. 65).

A much-discussed feature of his corpus is the fact that it includes no texts that can be classified as "Mahāyāna"—none, that is, that encourage their readers to strive to attain Buddhahood rather than Arhatship. This does not mean, however, that the scriptures translated by An Shigao could not have been used by advocates of the Mahāyāna nor for that matter that he himself might not have been a practitioner of the bodhisattva path.34

Indeed, it is probably significant that the earliest sources—including the preface (cited above) by Yan Fotsio, who had worked with An Shigao and considered him his teacher—are unanimous in referring to him as a "bodhisattva."35 It is now widely recognized that there is no necessary conflict between an individual’s own bodhisattva aspirations and his or her membership in one of the Nikāyas (monastic ordination lineages, usually referred to as ‘schools’) that formed the institutional basis of Indian Buddhism.36 The fact that a number of An Shigao’s texts have been identified as belonging to the Sārāvatīśāṅkha school thus does not pose any obstacle to the possibility that he might have considered himself to be on the bodhisattva path.

It should also be noted, however, that among the works attributed to An Shigao by Daon are three whose titles suggest that they contained Mahāyāna-oriented materials. These are the Dansi fa xing jing 三藏發行經 "Scripture on Bringing Forth Bodhicitta" (cited in Sengyou’s catalog at 6a2), the Shibei yi jing 十四意經 "Scripture on Fourteen Thoughts" (for which Sengyou gives the alternate title of Duwu shibei yi jing 十四意經 "Scripture on the Fourteen Thoughts of the Bodhisattva," 6a2), and the Wushi jiaosi jing 五十校計經 "Scripture on the Fifty Evaluations" (for which Sengyou provides the alternative title of Mingshu wushi jiaosi jing 明五十八校計經 "Prajñāpāramitā Scripture on the Fifty Evaluations," 6a4). Of these the first two are no longer extant, but the Wushi jiaosi jing can still be found in the Taishō canon, where its presence has been masked by the fact that it has been absorbed into a completely unrelated text, the Mahakaranajjata (大

34 The scriptures of one or more Mahāyāna scriptures as the word of the Buddha, on the one hand, and the decision to pursue the bodhisattva path, on the other, appear to have been quite separate items in the early history of the Mahāyāna in India. In other words, it appears to have been entirely possible to strive for Buddhahood while appealing only to the authority of traditional (pre-Mahāyāna) canonical texts, or on the contrary, to accept the legitimacy of certain Mahāyāna scriptures while electing to strive for Arhatship oneself. For further analysis cf. Nettler 2003, p. 81, n. 15.

35 An Shigao is called a bodhisattva (菩提心) in the prefaces by Yan Fotsio and Kang Sengshi cited above (note 13), the first of which was composed by his own student. Daon continues this usage in the fourth century, using the term kaidi 幾意 (an alternative translation of "bodhisattva" introduced by An Xuan and Yan Fotsio) in reference to An Shigao in three prefaces preserved in the Chi sansang jji (55.448, 44c19, and 69b18). On this issue cf. Forte 1995, pp. 70-74 and Zschenti 2004a, p. 212, n. 80.

36 On this issue see for example Harrison 1991, Nettler 2003 (especially pp. 84-89), and Suzuki 1990 and 1997a.
And on the basis of its content it is clear that it does indeed contain a discussion of the bodhisattva path. As Uii pointed out many years ago, any claim that An Shigao had no connection with the Mahāyāna should certainly take such texts into account.14

Ignoring the possible significance of these texts, and without taking into account the fact that An Shigao himself is regularly referred to as a bodhisattva, many scholars have used the content of An Shigao's extant translations to infer that the Buddhism practiced in second-century Parthia was of the "Hīṃsāyāna" variety. There are some serious methodological problems, however, with this procedure.15 It is not at all certain, first of all, that the texts brought to China by any given individual were representative of the Buddhist scriptures that were circulating in his homeland; on the contrary, they may simply reflect the preferences of the translator himself. (The fact that the sole extant work by the near Parthian translator, An Xuan 安玄, is a Mahāyāna sūtra is probably an indication of precisely such differing personal preferences.) Second, if the translator had visited other regions where Buddhism was practiced prior to coming to China (as our sources indicate was the case with An Shigao), he might have well obtained some of these scriptures in one or more of these locales rather than in the country of his birth. Third, in some instances (though not in the case of An Shigao) the available sources specify that the translator had not brought the scriptures to China himself, but based his work on Indian manuscripts (or recited texts) brought by others. In short, it is always hazardous to assume—without corroboration from sources of another kind—that the output of any given translator provides an accurate reflection of the repertoire of Buddhist scripture that were known and accepted in his homeland. Thus while it is possible that An Shigao's translations reflected the Buddhist literature that was known and studied in Parthia during his lifetime,16 it is not possible to be sure that this was the case. At the very least, however, these translations provide us with solid evidence that the texts that served as their antecedents were in circulation, no later than the middle of the second century CE, somewhere in the Western Regions.

TRANSLATION STYLE

Zürcher has characterized the language of An Shigao's translations as "erratic, crude, full of vulgarisms, often chaotic to the point of unintelligibility."17 Several decades earlier he

14 See Uii 1971, p. 22. For reasons that are not clear to me Uii discusses only two of these three texts, excluding the Zaoe fa xing zing, whose title surely indicates that it contained a discussion of the bodhisattva path. Since Uii was not aware that a text corresponding to the Waoshu xianzi jing is still extant, he included only An's title, and not the content of the scripture that has been absorbed into T397, in his discussion. The Wuoshu xianzi jing will be discussed in detail below (see pp. 51-59).

15 For a discussion of error of these issues see Uii 1971, pp. 22-23.

16 For a reliable scholarly account of what is known about Parthian Buddhism see Uii 1999.

17 See Zürcher 1991, p. 283. In this he is echoing the opinion of Demièville, who had earlier
had described them as "no more than free paraphrases or extracts of the original texts" (Zürcher 1959, p. 34). It is now increasingly recognized, however, that the Indic texts from which the first Chinese translators were working may have differed substantially from those available to us today. At this stage of our knowledge, therefore, it seems better to reserve judgement on the accuracy of An Shigao's work pending the publication of detailed studies of individual works from his corpus, comparing these with extant parallels in Chinese or Tibetan translations as well as in Indic languages (where available).14

The style of An Shigao's translation idioms, by contrast, can be characterized with relative ease, and it remains quite consistent throughout his corpus. He routinely translates (rather than translating) proper names; technical terms, by contrast, are generally translated into Chinese, being transcribed only in a minority of cases. None of his authentic translations contain verses; as Zürcher has noted, portions of the text that were in verse in the Indic originals were rendered in prose by An Shigao, even when he introduces them with a Chinese phrase meaning "The following is said in ghitas" (songbua zhou jia

14 Zürcher describes An Shigao as making no concessions whatsoever to Chinese literary taste, and even suggests that he may have been unfamiliar with it (1991, p. 283).

Sengyou, by contrast, held An Shigao's work in the highest esteem, ranking him as one of the three greatest translators in early Chinese Buddhist history,15 and the impact of his translations on subsequent generations of Chinese Buddhists is undeniable. It would be difficult to find any later translator who did not adopt at least some of his vocabulary, and the commentaries on his work composed by some of the distinguished figures of subsequent centuries (including Kang Senghai and Daoan) testify to the high regard in which his translations were held. In sum, however inelegant and even non-natural his Chinese renditions may have been, they clearly served their basic purpose: to communicate some of the basic categories of Indian Buddhism to Chinese audiences in a language that they could understand.

AUTHENTIC TEXTS16

In the Cha sanxang ji ji Sengyou summarizes his tabulation of the works of An Shigao with the following comment:

said of An Shigao's Fajang-abhism (T607) that "le style est gauche et chaotique au point d'être souvent presque inintelligible" (Denoeux 1914, p. 343).

14 A good example of such a study is Vemur and Harrison 1998.

15 See his biography of An Xuan, which contains the following observation: 安般婆(阿含婆). 翻‘三藏與譯人馬鳴’’s, the translations of the Mingli An (athigh), the Commander-in-chief of the Cavalry (i.e., An Xuan), and [Yao] Fotiao are said to be difficult to equal (or, in more colloquial English, “a hard act to follow” (T2145, 55.96a17-18).

16 I owe many of the bibliographical references in this and the following section to my colleagues Stefano Zichetti, whose assistance in charting the rapidly changing landscape of An Shigao studies I am happy to acknowledge here. For further details on An Shigao's corpus see Zichetti forthcoming (b).
The above thirty-four works, comprising forty facsimiles (juan 简) in all, were translated by the Genshu An Shiguo from the country of Parthia (Pehu 玉) during the time of Emperor Huan 桓帝 [r. 147-168 CE] of the Han 帝朝 dynasty.\(^{42}\)

The entries themselves were drawn, according to Sengyou’s own testimony, from Daoan’s catalogue.\(^{15}\) Sengyou had not seen all of the texts himself, however, for he reported that six of them had been lost by his time.\(^{44}\)

Already at the outset, however, we encounter a small problem, for the catalogue as we have it actually lists thirty-five texts totalling forty-one facsimiles, a discrepancy which suggests that one of these titles was added to the list after it left Sengyou’s hand. One of the one-facsimile texts, in other words, was apparently not on Sengyou’s original list.

There is no easy way to determine which of the thirty-five items has been added, though it has often been observed that some of the titles may be duplicate names for a single text (e.g., the }

\[\text{Apitan xu fa jing} 阿提延五法經} and the }

\[\text{Wu fa jing} 五法經} or the }

\[\text{Bian kongjie shi ye yinyuan jing} 彼含口解十二因緣經} and the }

\[\text{Shi ye yinyuan jing} 十二因緣經}.

\(^{45}\) If the extra item added to the list was simply such a variant name, then no substantive damage would have been done by the addition. This discrepancy serves as a reminder, however, that even our most reliable source—the Chuan sanzang ji ji—cannot simply be accepted at face value.

Using Sengyou’s list as their point of departure, two of the leading specialists in the field, Us Hakuji (1971, published posthumously) and Erik Zürcher (1991) each compiled lists of the work they considered to be genuine translations by An Shiguo. In the overwhelming majority of cases the assessments put forth by these two scholars are in agreement, with both of them accepting the following texts (arranged here in the sequence of their Taiji nianben) as An Shiguo’s work:

T11: }

\[\text{Chang ahan shi fa jing} 引阿合十簡法經} \(\text{原阿合十簡法經}\)

T14: }

\[\text{Remben wencheng jing} 人本齋成型經} \(\text{人本齋成型經}\)

T31: }

\[\text{Yue ke sheshou ye jing} 月缺七 совершенный法經} \(\text{一切缺遷守法經}\)

T32: }

\[\text{Si di jing} 四地經} \(\text{四地經}\)

T36: }

\[\text{Bousi jing yi jing} 本相指致經} \(\text{本相指致經}\)

\(^{41}\) The catalogue that we have actually gives thirty-five titles, a discrepancy which suggests that one of the titles was added to the list after it left Sengyou’s hand.

\(^{42}\) T1145, 55.6b-4: 筆三十四部・凡四十一本・訥州僧慧業齋抄門標首善道多生．

\(^{43}\) So stated by Sengyou at 55.10a-5j.

\(^{44}\) In at least one case a work described as “lost” by Sengyou is still in existence, though its presence has been masked at least since the early sixth century CE by the fact that it was amalgamated with another text by a different name. See the discussion of the }

\[\text{Za jing shenzi jing} 泽精申子經} (which comprises more or T130A, entitled Qian shi ye yinyuan jing 十因緣經) below, pp. 12-53.

\(^{45}\) See for example Us 1971, p. 21, and Tsunamoto 1985, p. 89.
T48: Shifu feifa jing 赤法非法经
T37: Lou fenbu jing �峒分布经
T98: Paifa yi jing 赤法异经
T112: Be chengdaos jing 八正道经
T109a: Qi shu wu guan jing 七疏五观经
T109b: Jiu huang jing 九横经
T602: Anban shousi jing 安那香识经
T603: Yin chih ru jing 隐持入经
T605: Chansing fasang jing 行方便想经
T607: Dandi jing 凡地经
T792: Fu shou chen jing 佛受藏经

In addition to these, Zürcher but not Uji considers the following text to be genuine: 46

T1508: Aban bujue shi'en yinwen jing 所含口解十二因缘经

Conversely, Uji but not Zürcher credits An Shigao with the following three titles:
T105: Wu yin piaoy jing 无因飘移经
T109: Zhuan foulan jing 转法轮经
T1557: Apitan we fa xing jing 诃陀般若法行经

The above list of "consensus texts," as well as the four works (T105, 109, 1508 and 1557) nominated by one or the other of these two scholars, will be the starting point of our discussion here. In an attempt to refine their findings still further, we will use both of the methodological approaches outlined in the Introduction (above, pp. 11-19), viz., using external evidence (above all, the informatic contained in Sengyou’s Chu sanzang ji [H] as well as internal evidence (i.e., the vocabulary and style of the texts themselves) to assess the authenticity of these works.

Methodological preliminaries: external evidence

In addition to the simple fact that a given title is (or is not) registered under An Shigao’s name in Sengyou’s catalogue, 47 there are three other types of external evidence that can be used in determining the validity of the attribution to An Shigao of a given text. First, a small number of these texts have extant prefixes or colophons which explicitly attribute them to An Shigao. In the order of their Taishō numbers, and considering only those texts that have extant notices dating from the time of Daosu or before, the following texts belong to this category:

T14: Rokben ya cheng jing 人本欲生经

46 Uji apparently considered the text to be lost (1971, p. 22).
47 That is, among the texts listed in the catalogue portion of the Chu sanzang ji ji, where An Shigao's works appear on pp. 5c13-603, with the cumulative statement quoted above given at 6b4-6.
48 Preface by Daosu to his commentary on the text (55.4s1b-4b2).
Another small subset of the titles attributed to An Shigao by Sengyou consists of those works singled out for special mention in his biography of the translator. Again in the order of their Taishō numbers (where applicable), they are the following:

T602: *Aohan shouji jing* 唐啟善經

T603: *Yin chi ra jing* 隐持入經

T607: *Dao di jing* 道地經

-- *Da shi'er men jing* 大十二門經

-- *Xiao shi'er men jing* 小十二門經

There is considerable overlap between this group and the texts mentioned in An Shigao's biography, but this is hardly surprising since prefaces and colophons were among the sources used by Sengyou in compiling the biographical section of his catalogue. The fact that these texts are treated in An Shigao's biography as his most prominent works suggests that their attribution to him was well established and thus should be given additional weight.

The scriptures in these two categories, then, have a special claim to authenticity as genuine translations by An Shigao. It is worth noting that the majority of them are treatises rather than sūtras, a fact which points to the significant impact of such works on subsequent generations of Buddhist thinkers in China.

---

69 Prefaces by Kang Senghui (55.43c20-43c3) and Daoxin (4c3-4b). But see below, p. 40, on the likely identity of the text referred to here.

70 Preface perhaps by Chen Hui to a commentary on the *Yin chi ra jing* (T1694; see 33.9b9-25) and by Daoxin (55.44a29-45a15) to his own commentary on the text.

71 Preface to the latter translation of the complete text by Dharma-rakṣa (T605) by Daoxin (69a7c-18b), but including a discussion of An Shigao's earlier work.

72 Preface by Daoxin (55.4a14-4b18).

73 Preface by Daoxin (55.4b16c-4a13).

74 See T2145, 55.9a21b-24: "世紀安康善法師述入經大十二門及百六品等。初外傳三藏經傳異事經序為二十七章，世宗乃為所傳義第七章，譯为護文，印成地經位。"

75 The problems with identifying the received text (T602) with Sengyou's references to the *Aohan shouji jing* will be discussed below (p. 60).

76 Sengyou's biography of An Shigao, for example (T2145, 55.9a47b), begins with material that also appears in Kang Senghui's preface to the *Aohan shouji jing* (see 55.43b10ff.).
Conversely, a third group of texts is treated in Sengyou’s catalogue as being of somewhat ambiguous status. In the case of four texts listed under An Shigao’s name, Sengyou quotes Daoan as stating simply that they “semble” An Shigao’s work (似梵高所述). At first glance this would seem to indicate that Daoan was unsure as to whether they had been produced by An Shigao or by someone else, but the use of the character zhan ( Vladimir) makes this interpretation problematic. As Zacchetti has observed, in Daoan’s usage this term “always refers to the work of compilation, or even abridgement, which produced the original texts, not to their later translation.” This would seem to imply, therefore, that Daoan considered these to be likely to have been composed, rather than simply translated, by An Shigao. They are the following:

T32: Si di jiè 阿難經
T1506: Ahan kuai 阿鸞口解
-- Shui yì jiè 舍思義解
-- Apian jiashua jiè jiè 阿班駒九十八解

Of these the last two are apparently not extant, but texts with titles corresponding to the first two can be found in the transmitted canon (as indicated by the Taishō text numbers given above). And the Ahan kuai—both in its title, which refers to “oral explanations” (口解), and in its content—does indeed seem likely to be a composition by An Shigao rather than a translation of an Indian text, as Zacchetti has recently documented in detail (Zacchetti 2004a).

But the fact that Daoan included the Si di jiè in this category as well is puzzling. Not only does the text conform quite closely in vocabulary and style to others solidly attributed An Shigao texts, it also has every appearance of being a translation, from the standard opening formula “Thus have I heard” (聞如是, 悉乃), ending with the formula reminiscent of the way this text was transmitted that when this teaching had been pronounced the members of the audience accepted it and put it into practice (說如是, 悉乃). There are, however, two brief commentarial remarks at the end of the text, and Zacchetti has made the cogent suggestion that this exegetical portion might once have been larger than in the present text, thus leading Daoan to raise the question of whether it might have been a composition by An Shigao rather than a simple translation. In the form in which we have it, however, the Si di jiè (with the sole exception of these stray commentarial notes) is surely a translation of an Indian-language sūtra.

* * *

85 See T2145, 55.866.
86 Zacchetti 2004, p. 213; emphasis in the original.
87 See Zacchetti 2004, p. 213.
88 See T32, 1.816c28. On these glosses and their sources see below, p. 71, n. 157.
The following discussion, which deals with all of the works attributed to An Shigao that can be found in modern editions of the Chinese Buddhist canon, is divided for convenience into three categories: āgama texts (i.e., non-Mahāyāna sūtras), Mahāyāna scriptures, and treatises. Those in the first category are further sorted according to their parallels in other āgama collections6 and, where available, Daosōn’s remarks concerning their classification. As is well known, different recitation lineages catalogued their sacred texts in different ways; thus a sūtra that was transmitted as part of a Madhyamāgama (Pali Mahāmāgyāna) in one monastic community might appear in the Sanyogikāgama (Pali Sanyogikasūtra) of another. Thus while I believe that the following method of sorting An Shigao’s works can be useful as an expedient organizing principle, the reader should bear in mind that it is intended at nothing more than that.

In this section only texts that can be identified with titles attributed to An Shigao by Daosōn will be considered. Additional works that have been nominated for consideration on other grounds will be dealt with below ("Other possible attributions," pp. 65-68).

Āgama texts

Dirghāgama. Of the texts that can be attributed with a reasonable degree of confidence to An Shigao we may begin with two which have counterparts in both the Chinese Dirghāgama and the Pali Divvānukāya:

T13: Zhang ahun Xi hao fa jing [Ch. Alhun Shi (Paśupatataroṣṭra)]

T14: Ren hui yi sheng jing [Mahanidānasūtra]7

Another sūtra, though classified by the Taishō editors in the section of texts with parallels in the Chinese Sanyogikagama, does not appear to have a parallel in that or any other Chinese āgama collection, nor has a Pali counterpart yet been identified. As the text has been assigned to the Dirghāgama of the Sarvastivadins by Uwe Hartmann,8 we may provisionally include it here:

T98: Pu fa yi jing [Ārthavatīrśtrāyay]

---

6 This includes the Chinese āgama translations as well as the Pali nikāyas, in addition to the small number of surviving Sanskrit manuscripts of āgama texts and, where available, parallels in the Tibetan canon (though the Tibetan did not translate the four āgamas of this section).


8 Cf. DN 15 in Pali and T3(13) in Chinese. A version of the sūtra is included in the Chinese Madhyamāgama (T26[1?]); there is also a separate translation of the sūtra (T32). For a modern Japanese translation of An Shigao’s version see U. 1971, pp. 314-315; a small portion has been translated into English by Erk Zürcher (see the appendix to Zucker 1994, pp. 159-160).


10 No Chinese counterpart has been identified in any of the āgama collections, but see the
**Madjayamāgama.** The following texts have counterparts in the Chinese Madhyamāgaṇa and/or the Pāli Mahāpiṇḍaṇa (with several of them also having counterparts in the Chinese Ekottarikāgaṇa, though not in the Pāli Aṅguttarānīkāya):

- **T31:** *Yupi la cha hwa ym jing* — 一切善法有盡 (Sarvātāravassinīra)*
- **T32:** *Si di jing* — 一切法 (Sarvātāravassinīra)*
- **T36:** *Benxiang yi de jing* — 本相寂滅 (Nirvāṇadīka-sītra)*
- **T48:** *Shi jia fei jing* — 異法非法 (Nirvāṇadīka-sītra)*
- **T57:** *Liu fen hui jing* — 梵分布匿 (Nirvāṇadīka-sītra)*

**Samiyuktāgaṇa.** Sengyō's list of An Shigao's translations includes a note by Dao'an describing three of these sūtras as being from the Samiyuktāgaṇa. One of the three now appears as an independent scripture in the 'Taishō' canon:

- **T112:** *Ba zheg da jing* — 八正道經 (Miyakō-sūtra)*

Parallels in the Chinese Samiyuktāgaṇa and the Pāli Samiyuttānīkāya have been adduced by Akasagatos Chien. As Czuchczy has observed, these supposed counterparts (especially the Pāli) do not resemble An Shigao's translation very closely (2007c, p. 8).

Two additional scriptures classified as Samiyuktāgaṇa sūtras by Dao'an, however, can no longer be found in the canon as separate texts, for due to an extremely anomalous set of circumstances they have come to be conflated with an anthology of Ekottarikāgaṇa.
texts also translated by An Shigao (now classified as T150A is the Taishō canon). The details of how this came about have been thoroughly documented by Paul Harrison (1997a), and will be summarized in the section on Ekottavākāya texts immediately below. Here we may simply list the titles of these two additional scriptures, both of which appear in more than one place:

T150A(1) and (3) [S]: *Qi chu san yuan jing* 七處三願經

T150A(31) and T150B [S]: *Jin brng jing* 九輪經

Of these, the *Qi chu san yuan jing* also appears as the final sūtra in the *Zhao abian jing* 藩阿含經, an at-chaic anthology of Sānyāsākāya texts (see T101[27]).

77 To the best of my knowledge it has not previously been noted that a piece of the same text appears yet again, in some but not all editions of the canon, at the end of the *Si yuan jing* 四願經, “Scripture on the Four Wishes” (T735). A completely unrelated scripture translated by Zhi Qian.

Finally, two other texts with parallels in the Chinese *Sānyāsākāya*, both with titles corresponding to works credited to An Shigao in Sengyou's catalogue, are accepted as authentic by Li but rejected by Zürcher on the basis of internal evidence:

T205: 五輪婆沙經 *Wu lün puṣa jing*?

T109: 佛教論經 *Zhi fen lun jing*?

In his discussion of these two translations Zürcher states only that, in general terms, the *Wu lün puṣa jing* contains “style and terminology that are definitely not those of An Shigao and his team,” while the *Zhi fen lun jing* contains stylistic features and terms that do not normally appear in An Shigao’s translations” (1991, p. 300). But it is possible to be considerably more specific. The *Wu lün puṣa jing* contains a number of lexical features that do not appear in any of An Shigao’s core texts, including (to name only a few) the use of the phrase 謂之 to specify the place where the scripture was preached, the phrase 誉比丘善 to introduce the Buddha’s speech to the monks, and the phrase 所以者何 to translate the formulaic question *tat kāra khot* “Why is that?” Moreover, the majority of the text is in four-character prosody, a style which is not at all

77 Cfr. T99(42) in the Chinese *Sānyāsākāya*.
79 The fact that many of the sūtras contained in this anthology resemble the vocabulary and style of An Shigao’s translations has led some scholars to conclude that this collection might be his work as well, on this issue see below, “Other possible attributions.”

80 See T715, 17.537h16–27. This stray fragment—which begins not only in the middle of a sentence, but in the middle of a phrase—corresponds to the material found in T150B from the character 之 (of mahu 之) at 2.876a12 through the end of the sūtra (= T151, 2.499a21–b29).

81 See UC 1971, pp. 349–352.
characteristic of An Shigao's work. Most telling, however, is the fact that it contains twenty-eight lines of five-character verse (introduced by the phrase 極微細言 "The Buddha spoke the following in pārabhīs"), a feature that never occurs in any genuine An Shigao translation. Thus, despite the generally archaic appearance of the text, it seems quite certain that it is not the work of An Shigao.

The Zhuan falun jing contains no miraculous verses, but it contains other features that are unknown in any genuine An Shigao translation, including the use of the first-person pronoun 我, the double-negative expression 莫不 "there were none who did not ...,", the subordinating particle 之 and the epithets 美正果 (apparently for samyakāmbuddha) and 翁略 (apparently for bhagavat). Here we also find the use of the temporal particle 已 "after [having done] ..." in the closing formula of the stūra (佛頂蓋已皆大歡喜), which again diverges from the language used in An Shigao's core texts. In short, the vocabulary of the Zhuan falun jing departs from An Shigao's normal style is far too many ways for this to be considered his work.

We may follow Zürcher, therefore, in excluding these two short stūras from the list of genuine An Shigao translations. Whether Zürcher is correct in assigning them to the Han period, however, is somewhat less than certain. At least in the case of the Zhuan falun jing, certain unusual vocabulary items seem otherwise unknown prior to the time of Zhi Qian (fl. 220–252), who may have been the one to coin them.44 Further work will be required, therefore, before we can determine more precisely to what period, and to which rhetorical communities, these two translations should be assigned.

Ekottarikagama. Ussan also credits to An Shigao an anthology of texts from an Ekottarikagama, entitled Za jing zhi bian 集法四十五篇 "Sutra Miscellany in Forty-Four Sections."45 That collection was long thought to have been lost, as reported already by Sengyū in his entry for this title.46 In a study published in 1917, however, Hovun's Tomojarō 林宗次郎 demonstrated that this collection still survives today, comprising most of the content of the following text:

T150A. Qi chu an guan jing 七處三十二略 ("Saptatattvāvalaśūtra")47

44 See for example the heaven-names 下極樂天 "heaven of delight without arrogance" (sic, for the Nīmarūca heaven) and 六極樂天 "heaven of the transformation of responsive sounds" (sic, for the Paramītratvaśūtra heaven) which are widely used in Zhi Qian's work but not noted in any scripture that is certain to date from before his time.
45 His comments are preserved in Sengyū's Chu umsong jīpi; see T2145, 55.6a13.
46 T2145, 55.6a13: 雄諦四十五篇二般在公雲：出柳一利即不移名未詳所住。今更 榮其。 See U1 1971, pp. 351–376. For an important study of this text (building on the earlier study in Hayakawa 1977), including a reconstruction of the original sequence of its contents, see Harrison 1997. The text has been edited and translated by Vetter and Harrison (1990), stūra no. 12 (according to Harrison's numbering; see 1997, p. 260) has been echoed and translated by Harrison (in Dietz 2000, pp. 30–31).
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This state of affairs, however, is the result of a series of mishaps in textual transmission. At an early date—prior to the time of Sengyu’s *Chu sanmang ji ji*, at any rate—An Shigao’s anthology of *Ekottarika* texts had been conflated with two of his *Samyukta* translations, *etc.*. The *Qi chu san guan jing* 七處三觀經 and the *Jiu beng jing* 九帳經. As the *Qi chu san guan jing* was placed at the head of the text, its title came to be used to refer to the entire collection, thus effectively masking the presence of the *Jia jing* 九帳記. (An additional intrusion into An Shigao’s *Ekottarika* anthology, a scripture entitled *Ji gu jing* 師吉經 [T150A30], does not seem to have been known to Daoan and is treated by Sengyu as an anonymous translation.)

Though Hayashiya was able to locate the missing *Jia jing* 九帳記 within the *Qi chu san guan jing*, the problem of reconstructing its original structure still remained largely unsolved. The situation was extremely complicated, for not only had three unrelated scriptures been added to An Shigao’s *Ekottarika* anthology, at a certain point some of the pages of this amalgamated collection were rearranged in the wrong order. Other pages were lost and, where they were replaced from another source, were inserted at the wrong point. As a result, as Harrison puts it, the version of the text found in the Taishö canon today is “a complete and utter jumble” (1977a, p. 264). Building on Hayashiya’s initial attempt to rearrange the text, however, Harrison has been able to sort out the confusion in admirable fashion. A complete list of Pali, Chinese, Sanskrit, and Tibetan parallels to each of the forty-four sutras belonging to the original *Ekottarika* anthology is given by Harrison as well (pp. 268-275), so I will not recapitulate them here.

In addition to the forty-four texts contained in this recovered anthology, two other very short sutras, accepted by both U1 and Zürcher as the work of An Shigao, have recently been identified by Harrison as corresponding, at least in part, to materials found in the Pali *Anguttara-nikāya*. 3

1965. *Chun xing sanmang jing* 春行三作った 경

1979a. *Fa shou chu jing* 法受諸記

On external grounds alone—that is, based on the fact that these titles are credited to an An Shigao by Daosun—there is no reason to doubt this attribution, so at first glance it would seem that we should add these texts to the roster of An Shigao’s *Ekottarika*  

---

3 See 55.28b-21.


5 Harrison 1997a, p. 277.

6 See U1 1971, pp. 346-348; identified by Harrison (1997, p. 277) as corresponding to AN L29 *Jnana* (A.1.18-43, especially A.4-43); *Gradual Sayings* 1.14-19; Harrison also notes parallel phrasing in AN L6 (A.1.10-11; *Gradual Sayings* 1.8-9).

7 See U1 1971, pp. 344-345; identified by Harrison (1997, p. 277) as corresponding to AN L1 *Karma* (A.1.1-2); *Gradual Sayings* L1-2, with an additional parallel in the Chinese *Ekottarika* (T125, section 9.7-8; J.50a1.1-b10).
translations. Internal evidence, however, tells a quite different story. As Hu Chinshu has recently shown, the Fa shou chen jing has a number of anomalous features that contrast sharply with the usual style of An Shigao's translations. Of these the most drastic is the use of the first-person pronoun 余, which never occurs in any other text by An Shigao (ak of which use 余 exclusively for this purpose). Hu cites several other aberrant features as well, the cumulative effect of which is to show that the language of the Fa shou chen jing differs strikingly from that of the other works credited by Sengou to An Shigao.

The Fa shou chen jing is not completely isolated, however, for the other text listed immediately above—the Cha sheng faxing jing (T605)—shares a number of its highly unusual expressions. Though the latter text does not include the pronoun 余, it does use the highly atypical opening phrase 余時作佛云云. "Once the Buddha was sojourning at . . ." (in place of An Shigao's usual wording 余時作佛云云. "Once the Buddha was staying at . . .") as well as in (one case) the character 之 used as a substituting particle. The two texts also share the closing expression 余時作佛云云. "When the Buddha had taught this," which is not found in any other translation by An Shigao. Most striking of all, however, is the shared use—in these two texts alone, among translations commonly attributed to An Shigao.
Shigao by specialists—the very rare formulation 比丘受教如虔恭聽 "the monks accepted the teaching and listened to the Buddha" which occurs near the beginning of both stanzas, last after the Buddha has called the monks to attention.¹⁰ Not only is this wording absent from An Shigao’s work,¹¹ but it is also unattested in the work of virtually all translators from the Eastern Han, Three Kingdoms, and Western Jin periods. In short, this extremely rare usage strongly suggests that T792 and T605, while clearly archaic, are not the work of An Shigao. Conversely, however, they are certainly related to one another, and further work on the place of these two texts within the corpus of early Chinese translations will surely be able to clarify the situation further. In particular, two other texts that could fruitfully be compared with these works are the Shi zhi jing 七智經 (T27), listed as anonymous by Daoan,¹² and the Chan xing suanyi jing 行三十七品經 (T604) which, as Zacchetti has noted, shares a great many peculiar features with T605, and which must be directly related to it in some way.¹³

A Mahāyāna stūra (?)

As noted above, Sengyou (based on the earlier work of Daoan) attributes to An Shigao at least three scriptures whose titles suggest that they were Mahāyānist in content. Two of

¹⁰ See T605, 5.181b21 and T792, 17.37a1. The rarity of this wording is true not only of the eight characters taken together, but also of each of the four-character phrases used here; aside from these two supposed An Shigao translations, the phrase 比丘受教 only occurs, among texts that can be dated with some confidence to the first decade of the fourth century CE or before, in the Shi zhi jing 七智經 (T27, 1.80a7), a text which is ascribed to Zhi Qian in later catalogues but listed as anonymous by Daoan (T2145, 55.19a2), and in the sole translation ascribed to Kang Menguang by Sengyou (T196, 11.31c3). This rarity becomes especially obvious when we note that it does not appear in the substantial body of work produced by Lokottama and Zhi Qian, nor even (with one possible but problematic exception) in the corpus of Dharmakūsa (see T337, 12.89b13).

The second phrase, 比丘虔恭聽, is even less common, being completely absent from all pre-fourth-century translations, with (again) the sole exception of T727 (loc. cit.). Indeed, in the entirety of the CBETA edition of the canon (Ap1 edition), this expression occurs in this context only in T27, T605 and T792. (The other four occurrences—T278, copied in T279, and T841, copied in T602—are in a completely different context, and they occur in five-character verse passages with another word (如 or 亦) following the verb 聆.) The phrase 比丘虔恭聽, in short, a very distinctive usage, which strongly suggests that T605, T792 and T727 are related in some way.

¹¹ The use of the formula 比丘受教 is rare. "The Buddha addressed the monks," i.e., called them to attention (with no direct quotation following), is — unlike other features being discussed here—quite typical of An Shigao’s work. Most commonly, An Shigao uses some version of the following: 比丘受教 "The Buddha addressed the monks, and the monks replied (of the) "Yes, [Sir]," where 聆 is presumably a translation of cram "thus, just so" in the sense of an expression of agreement or willingness to listen.

¹² See T2145, 55.19a1, where the title is given as 七智經 (var. 七智経). The attribution of the text to Zhi Qian, which appears in modern printed editions of the canon, stems from Fei Changfang’s notoriously unreliable Lüshi suanyi jing (T2094, 49.57c24) and need not be taken seriously.

¹³ Zacchetti 2007c, pp. 15-17.
these—the Dayu faying jing 中意發行經 “Scripture onBringing Forth Bodhichitta” and the Shi yu jing 十四雲頂 “Scripture on Fourteen Thoughts” (for which Sengyou gives the alternate title of Pusa shi yu jing 菩薩十四雲頂 “Scripture on The Fourteen Thoughts of the Bodhisattva”)—have long been lost, and to the best of my knowledge they are not cited in any extant work.183 The third, however—entitled Wado jiaji jing 五十四結集經 “Scripture on the Fifty Evaluations,” for which Sengyou provides the alternative title of Misadu wuji jiaji jing 明度五十結集經 “Prajñāpāramitā Scripture on the Fifty Evaluations”—does have a counterpart in the extant Chinese Buddhist canon. As in the case of An Shigao’s Ekottarāgama anthology discussed above, its presence has been hidden by the fact that it has been absorbed into an entirely unrelated collection of scriptures, in this case the Daedongyong da ji jing 大方等大集経 (Mahāsāṃghika-sūtra), where it appears as chapter 13, entitled “The Bodhisattvas of the Ten Directions”:

T297(13) Shi fang pusa pin 十方菩薩品184

The content of the text cleanly corresponds to the title given by Sengyou, for within the sutra are discussed fifty “evaluations” (五十結集) to be practiced by bodhisattvas. The text is, in other words, clearly Mahāyāna in content, and if the attribution to An Shigao is authentic this would mean that it was translated at least one Mahāyāna scripture.

Neither Us nor Zürcher, however, included this scripture on their respective lists of authentic An Shigao translations. Zürcher does not give any reason for its exclusion; Us, on the other hand discuses only the title of the text,185 considering the translation

183 Fei Chengfeng’s statement that the Dayu fe xing jing is “from the Dhāraṇīpāramitā” (出槃経初, T2014, 49.5064) is—like many other such remarks that appear for the first time in his catalogue—quite implausible, and there is no reason to take it seriously.

184 T297, J13948-407a. The most substantial discussion of this scripture is in a Japanese work, Deleau () p. 43-44, n. 100; in Japanese see the detailed analysis by Shiromai (T1974, pp. 211-213). The latter takes the text to be the work of An Shigao, but (employing what seems to be a circular reasoning) finds it problematic that it appears to be a Mahāyāna sutra, arguing that since An Shigao translated only “Himayama” scripture, this too should be viewed as a “Himayama” text (see p. 214). It is not a Mahāyāna scripture, to say the least. As a way around the problem, Shiromai proposes that the sutra is actually a criticism of Mahāyāna bodhisattvas, composed from the perspective of the Himayama sect to which An Shigao belonged (p. 236). This is how it is proposed to be translated (pp. 236-237). It is not a Mahāyāna scripture, to say the least.

It is true that the sutra is critical of these bodhisattvas who fall short in their practice, but this need not suggest that it is in any sense a criticism by a non-Mahāyānist; on the contrary, Mahāyāna sutras abound in such critiques. To mention only a single example, the Anandaśīkā prajñāpāramitāśāstra criticizes bodhisattvas for failures of a variety of sorts, e.g., wrongly and arrogantly believing themselves to be incapable of non-aggression (śrāvastivādins, e.g., xii., 385-391), failing to practice upāya and thus accidentally into Arhatship (p. 310), and even rejecting the authority of the Prajñāpāramitā itself (e.g., vii., 1786; vi., 2348). As Shiromai also observes, though the sutra does criticize bodhisattvas, it does not fundamentally reject as non-Buddhists their desire to attain Buddhahood and to help beings (p. 236); in fact, it accepts the bodhisattva path as a way of Buddhism, i.e., as one of the three vehicles (p. 237).

185 See above, p. 43, n. 14.
Itself to have been lost by Daoan’s time (1971, pp. 22, 450). This appears to be a slip of the pen, however, for as Deleau has rightly observed, the Chenjang ji p does not report the text as lost, and he notes that it was lost. In the case of Sengyu, they were unable to consult it (1993, p. 44, n. 100). Indeed, the “Bodhisattvas of the Ten Directions” chapter of the Mahā bodhisattva-asutra (T197(13)) has been lost and associated with the Wukh javaj jing in standard references,194 and in the Song, Yuan, and Ming editions of the canon An Shigao’s name is attached to this section. In sum, the external evidence linking the content of this chapter with the Wukh javaj jing assigned to An Shigao is sufficiently strong that it should be given a place in any analyzes of possible works by this translator.

Internal evidence, however, tells a quite different story. While the language of the sûtra is clearly archaic, and its terminology (like that of other early translations) includes many items that were coined by An Shigao, there are also a substantial number of elements that are quite alien to his normal style. It might seem reasonable to begin with the Buddhist names and terms found in the text, but since no context is quite different from the other works in his corpus—i.e.,âyana texts and non-Mahayana treatises—the fact that expressions such as 无量的 “innumerable kalpas,” 佛障本作 “Sakyamuni Buddha,” or for that matter 佛教 “bodhisattva,” do not appear elsewhere in An Shigao’s work probably reflects only the fact that the corresponding terms were absent from his Indic-language sources.

If we focus on ordinary (i.e., non-Buddhist) terminology, by contrast, a clear pattern quickly appears. Most telling are the following grammatical forms:

• the pronoun we 乃, which occurs twenty-seven times in T197(13), is not found in any other translation; it is attributed to An Shigao;

• the plural particle 皆 -皆, which occurs no fewer than fifty-two times here, but is also known in any genuine An Shigao translation;195 and

• enclosure formations (“circumfixes”) in which the same of the person addressed is enclosed by two verbs of speaking, such as we 问 问 “asked,” gan 传 传 “told,” and han 韩... 韩 “told,” occur numerous times here but nowhere elsewhere in An Shigao’s work.196

With so many features which are foreign to An Shigao’s normal style, it is clear that this cannot be his work.

194 See Mochizuki, vol. 4, p. 342(b)-c and the Banho kairon daishin, vol. 5, p. 206. As noted by Deleau (1993, p. 44, n. 100), both sources trace the erroneous inclusion of this text in the Mahā bodhisattva-asutra to the Sui period; more specifically, it is thought to have been placed there by Songzi 詼资 (see the Banho kairon daishin, vol. 7, p. 478 and Mochizuki, vol. 4, p. 342(c)).

195 The sole occurrence in An Shigao’s Ekeitarikayaana anthology is in T159A(40), the ji gu jing 前者经, which is one of the “intruders” introduced into that text from another source (see above, p. 55).

196 The expression 衛言 does occur in An Shigao’s corpus, but never with the name of the person spoken to being placed between the two verbs.
But if it is not by An Shigao, can we say anything at all about when, and by whom, this text was produced? In the case of the *Chen xing faxiang jing* and the *Fa shou chen jing* discussed above, both of which appear to fall outside the range of An Shigao’s style, we were able to identify a very small number of other texts that share some of their distinctive expressions. 108 And this is also the case with the *Wushi jian jing*. The divergent items listed immediately above are far too common in works produced by early translators other than An Shigao to be used efficiently as primary tracers. Instead, we may look briefly at some of the formulaic expressions that appear in T397(13). Looking first at the closing formula, we can see that the description of the audience’s reaction is expressed as follows: “All of them were extremely joyous. They performed salutations to the Buddha, pressing their faces to the Buddha’s feet. Accepting [the teachings] and undertaking to practice them, they departed.” 109 Although we may note first of all that—with one exception—all of the above grammatical forms singled out above as alien to An Shigao’s usage (the pronoun 师, the plural suffix -等, and the enclosure formations consisting of various verbs of speech + 师) can be found in great abundance in Lokaksema’s corpus. 110 Yet it is possible to be still more specific. As already observed several decades ago by Shizutani, the beginning of the stria resembles that of Lokaksema’s *Dharmakīrti jing* 演沙

108 See above, pp. 54-55.
109 For example the *Daming hanyus jing* 僧伽耶法印 (T224), where the reaction of a group of gods to the Buddha’s Subhismita’s discourse is portrayed as follows: 僧伽耶法印僧伽耶·僧伽耶法印 (64518-9), and the final conclusion of the stria reads 僧伽耶·佛师语. (64518-9), and the final conclusion of the stria reads 僧伽耶·佛师语. (64518-9). An even closer match is offered by Lokaksema’s *Bancho sanmei jing* 布阿求喃経 (T318), which closes with the following: 僧伽耶·佛师语. (13919-3-4). Interestingly, the one element that does not appear in his formulaic usage, 佛师 accepted [the teachings] and put them into practice,” is one that is standard here in An Shigao’s work, but when encased within this longer series of statements it seems out of place.

110 The exception is the combination of 今 in ... 今, which does not appear in any of Lokaksema’s core texts (a category to be discussed below). It does appear, however, in an archaic translation of the *Akshobhyaśīla* (T313, Ch6 jishu jing 顯講維法經), which Danon considered to be similar to Lokaksema’s work in style.
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For Shisatsu, what was noteworthy about these passages was their content, which he considered to be unexpected in a “Hinayan” sūtra. But from our perspective it is the terminology itself that is worthy of note. T395t13 begins by placing the Buddha at Rājagaha, at the “place of Dharma purity” (法清淨處), on a spontaneously manifested lion-seat (自然獅子座), covered by a canopy (袈裟; 13.394b9-10). Though T280 omits at Magadha rather than at Rājagaha, the description of the locale (法清浄處) is the same, and once again the Buddha is seated on a spontaneously-appearing lion-seat (自然獅子座; 10.445a6-8). Though the characters 交接横 do not appear in the opening passage of T280, they can be found eleven times in other parts of sūtra (with the middle character written as 貫 rather than 交), always directly following the expression 自然獅子座. There is yet another occurrence of these two phrases (this time with the middle character of 交接横 written 交接) in the Zhu jiuza qia fei kongye jing 諸善護戒持本業經 (T282), which can now be seen as another piece of the same translation which, as discussed below, was separated from T280 in the course of transmission in China.

The extent of this shared wording (some of it quite rare) is so striking that it is difficult to imagine that it could be the result of coincidence, and it strongly suggests that there is some relationship between the two. In sum, these two texts—while substantially different in content—seem to be drawing on a common lection.

While it is far too early to draw any firm conclusions from these similarities, it is clear that a detailed comparative study of the Wushi jianji jing and the works credited to Lokakṣema, especially the Doudou jing, could well be rewarding. Pending such a study, we may put forth the hypothesis that the Wushi jianji jing was produced in a community whose members considered themselves to be disciple (or descendants of disciples) of An Shigao, but who also had access to translations produced by Lokakṣema’s community, in particular the Doudou jing. While this scenario must of course remain speculative at this early stage, what we can say with confidence is that the Wushi jianji jing is not the work of An Shigao himself.

Treatises

Thus far we have dealt only with the sūtra translations credited to An Shigao by Daoan, but an important component of his corpus consists of texts that are not sūtras, but scholastic treatises. Indeed, as noted above, virtually all of the translations singled out for attention

111 Shittōsenj 1974, p. 234.

112 T280, 10.445a8; 445b19, 23, and 27; and 445c9, 13, 17, 21, and 25.

113 See T282, 10.454a16-19. 諸善護戒持本業經中所。On the relationship of this text to T280 see below, pp. 87-88.

114 While spontaneously-apparating lion seats can be found in other places, the expression “the place of Dharma purity” (法清浄處) occurs only once outside these texts (see T1442, 23.688b27).
in Sengyou's biography of An Shigao are works of the latter type. Of these one of the most solidly attributed, mentioned in An Shigao's biography as well as in prefaces by such illustrious figures as Kang Senghui and Daoan himself, is the *Akan shouyi jing* 安般守坐經 "Scripture on Guarding the Mind [through Mindfulness] of Inhalation and Exhalation." A text by this name in fact appears in the Taisho edition of the canon: *T602:* *Da anhan shouyi jing* 大安般守坐經

It has long been recognized, however, that this is not simply a translation of an Indian text, but includes commentarial material added in China. Which parts are commentary and which might belong to an original translated text, however, are not clearly marked within the scripture itself, and until recently a significant amount of scholarly attention was focused on the problem of how to distinguish them.\(^\text{115}\)

The recent discovery of a manuscript containing a significantly different work by this name at the Kongoji 金剛寺 temple in Japan, however, has cast the problem in an entirely new light.\(^\text{116}\) A comparison of the language of the Kongoji manuscript with that of the received text of the *Da anhan shouyi jing* (T602) makes it quite clear that it is the manuscript, and not the received text (or even a part of the received text), that most closely reflects An Shigao's usual vocabulary and style.\(^\text{117}\) Moreover, the discovery of the Kongoji manuscript has also provided a new perspective on the nature of T602 itself. After a careful analysis of both works, Zacchetti has concluded that T602 is not a translation at all (that is, it does not consist of a translation plus interpolated commentarial notes), but that it is simply a commentary on another text, *viz.*, a version of the *Ahan shouyi jing* like that represented in the Kongoji manuscript.\(^\text{118}\) The relationship of T602 to An Shigao's community—that is, whether it should be viewed as the work of one of his immediate disciples, or of someone from a later generation, or (what seems far less likely) as the work of An Shigao himself—still awaits a detailed investigation.

The discovery of the Kongoji manuscript entails in turn a radical shift in the assessment of the canonical T602, which has long been considered to be one of the benchmarks of An Shigao's language and style.\(^\text{119}\) While the external evidence supporting this assessment could hardly be stronger—since a work entitled *Ahan shouyi jing* is not only the very first work credited to An Shigao in Sengyou's catalogue, but is also documented in two early prefaces (by Kang Senghui and Daoan) and is also expressly mentioned in his

\(^{115}\) For two attempts to separate the scriptural portion of the text from the commentary see Aramaki 1971 and Uji 1971, pp. 201-244. A punctuated critical edition of the text is included in Du 1997.

\(^{116}\) On the Kongoji manuscripts see below, "Newly discovered manuscripts."

\(^{117}\) See Zacchetti 2002b.

\(^{118}\) Zacchetti 2007b and 2007c, p. 13.
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biography in the "Chu mingzuo ji ji"—the case of the Kongjì manuscript serves as a reminder of the importance of giving equal weight to internal evidence as well. The fact that the received text of T602 contains terminology that is not usual for An Shigao (even in sections of the text that were thought to be parts of a translation rather than the commentary) has long been known, but it is only since the Kongjì manuscript came to light that the full significance of this fact has become apparent. In short, while T602 must now be removed from the list of An Shigao’s translations, it should be replaced by the text from Kongjì discussed below (p. 64).

The "Jian chu niu jing" was not the only text translated by An Shigao that was the recipient of an early commentary. Another such text (likewise a treatise rather than a sutra) is the "Scripture on the Skandhas, Dhyānas, and Ayatanas".

T603: "Yin chi ru jing" 隨時入經

In this case it is fairly straightforward to distinguish the translation from its Chinese commentary, for in the Taishō edition of the canon the translated scripture (T603) has been printed separately from the commentary (T1694), which bears exactly the same title, though it is sometimes referred to in modern scholarly studies as the "Yin chi ru jing chu" 隨時入經注, though it should be noted that this is the result of a modern editing procedure. The commentary itself is thought to date from the middle of the third century CE; it will be discussed separately below (p. 152).

The identity of the base text, however—that is, whether it should be considered a translation or an original composition produced in China, perhaps by An Shigao himself—has long been debated. In a ground-breaking study, however, Zachetti has identified an Indic counterpart to the "Yin chi ru jing" in a part of Chapter 6 of the Pali Petakopadesa, thus providing convincing proof that it is indeed a translation of an Indian text. Internal evidence, in this case, strongly supports the assessment of the received text of T603 as An Shigao’s work, and thus it can retain its central place among his authentic translations.

The text as it has come down to us, however, is not complete, for as Songyuan writes in the section of his catalogue devoted to commentaries written by Daoan (whose notes to the "Yin chi ru jing" have unfortunately not survived), “The "Yin chi ru jing" is the surviving portion of a translation by [An] Shigao.” This does not seem to refer to the fact that it corresponds to only a portion of the Petakopadesa, however, for Zachetti has shown, there is strong evidence that Chapter 6 of this work originally circulated

---


113 See Zachetti 2002a, p. 95, where earlier precedents for the procedure of separating this text from its commentary (andpreface) are also discussed.

114 See Zachetti 2002a.

115 T2145, 55.39x19. 附弃入者世治所出詹姆斯.
Independently, and An Shigao's translation was probably based on such a separate work. Instead, it seems to be drawing attention to the fact that T603 ends abruptly, without finishing the topic under discussion. It is possible that An Shigao simply was not able to finish his translation, but it seems more likely that at some point (prior to the time of Sengyou, at any rate) the end of the text was lost in the course of transmission.

Another translation for which there is strong external evidence supporting the attribution to An Shigao has long been recognized as corresponding to part of the Yogācārabhūmi, a text composed by the Sārśeṣvādīn master Saṃgharakṣa:

T607: *Dān di jīng* 繼地經

Comparison with the *Xuánzì xuědì jīng* 行進地經 (T506), a later (and considerably longer) translation of Saṃgharakṣa's treatise by Dharmarakṣa, quickly reveals that An Shigao's version consists of material corresponding to chapters 1-5, 22, and 24 of the twenty-seven chapters contained in Dharmarakṣa's work. An Shigao's translation, in other words, does not appear to represent the entire text, but only an abridgement of a substantially larger work.

In this case scholarly debate has focused not on whether or not the *Dān di jīng* was produced by An Shigao—for there is widespread agreement that it is his—but on where and by whom the abridgement was made. The *Chú sūnming ji ji* given conflicting information on this score. In the list of An Shigao's translations given in the catalogue section, Sengyou quotes Daoan as saying that the abridgement had been produced outside China. In his introduction to the section on "abbreviated" scriptures (*chōn jīng* 倜經), however, Sengyou describes it as having been abridged by An Shigao himself. One can well imagine that An Shigao, faced with the huge task of making Buddhist canonical literature comprehensible to his Chinese audience, thought it useful to devote his limited time and resources to producing the essentials of a number of different texts, and indeed several of his translations consist of selections from a larger collection of sūtras (e.g., the *Ekottarikāgama* anthology contained within T150A) or an excerpt from a larger individual scripture (e.g.,

---

125 Zacchetti 2002b, p. 88.
127 See Demiéville 1954 p. 343.
128 See 55.6628: “An [Shigao] and his followers copied a foreign sūtra. This sūtra was translated by Dharmarakṣa and is known as the *Dān dào jī jīng*.”
129 See 55.37c1-2: “In former times An Shigao abridged and translated the *Xuánzí xuědì jīng* as the *Dān dào jī jīng.*” (If this was intended to say that he translated a condensed version of the text, one would rather expect the word order to be different: *Dào shì zhēn*.) Cfr. T2095, 323h/voca and Demiéville p. 344, n. 1.
The final extant treatise listed by Daoan as a translation by An Shigao is an abhidharma text, which can now be found in the Taishō canon under the following title: T1557. *Apitan sau fa sying jing* 阿毘達磨法相經

Though accepted as authentic by Ul, it is not included on Zürcher’s list of genuine Han-period translations for reasons that are not altogether clear. The vocabulary and style of the text appear to be quite congruent with that of An Shigao’s other works, however; so it is included here pending further study.

An original composition

Included on Zürcher’s list of An Shigao’s works (1991, p. 298) but not in the study published by Ul (1971) is a text whose title can be translated as “Oral Explanation of the Agamas: Scripture on the ‘inseparable Causal Links’”

T1508: *Aham kaya te’ir yinjuan jing* 阿含口解十二因緣經

The editors of the Taishō canon assigned this text to the slightly later Pālian translator An Xuan and his Chinese co-worker Yan Fojiao, but this attribution is obviously unfounded,158 for Daoan explicitly credits the text to An Shigao.159 As mentioned above, however, he does not do so simply yet it without comment, but notes that it “appears to have been composed by An Shigao” (安世高撰).160 Indeed, as suggested by both the title and the content of the text, we surely have to do not with a translation of an Indian original, but a text produced in China designed to suit the needs of audiences there.161

The language of the text is, on the whole, congruent with the usage found in An

158 See Ul 1971, pp. 380-410; for other Chinese parallels see Cao 1995, p. 75, n. 11.

159 See Zucchetti 2004a.

160 Like so many other problematic attributions, the assignment of T1508 to An Xuan can be traced to the *Liân jü yun huá* 聲聞法華 compiled by Fei Changfeng 費常風 (T2014, 49.54a7 and 53b27). For a detailed discussion of the treatment of T1508 in this and other Chinese catalogues see Zucchetti 2004a, p. 214 and notes 80-89.

161 It might also be added that the vocabulary and style of the text does not resemble at all that of the sole extant work reliably attributed to these two translators: the *Fa jing jing* 江氏經 (T1322), on which see below, pp. 91-92.

162 See T2145, 55.45b6; cf. above, p. 48.

163 On the attribution of T1508 to An Shigao, see the detailed discussion in Zucchetti 2004a, especially pp. 212-219, with references to earlier work especially by Hayabya (1945, pp. 389-390) and Forte (1968, pp. 190-195).
Shigao’s core translations. The very circumstances of its production, however—presumably as an oral discourse delivered by An Shigao and recorded in writing by others—suggest that it may be slightly removed from An Shigao’s other works, over which the translator may have had greater control.

On the one hand, this implies that—unlike the other texts discussed above—this scripture cannot provide us with a direct reflection of the Buddhist literature that was circulating in India. On the other hand, it provides valuable evidence concerning how one Buddhist missionary from Parthia chose to present the Dharma to his Chinese audience, in his own words, in second-century Luoyang.

**Nestly discovered manuscripts**

The field of An Shigao studies is currently being revolutionized by the recent re-discovery at Kongjūi Temple, a temple located in Osaka Prefecture, of several texts that appear to be attributable to An Shigao. In 1999 KajuraSusumu discovered two scrolls in the Kongjūi collection containing previously unknown texts related to An Shigao’s translations. Kajura conveyed this news to Ochiai Toshinori, who had been conducting research on a manuscript collection found at another Japanese Buddhist temple, and published a preliminary report on his findings (Kajura 2001). Subsequently Ochiai established a research group devoted to the study of these manuscripts, which is still continuing at present.

The first of the tests identified in the Kongjūi collection bears the same title as a quite different work contained in the Taishō canon (T602):

K-ABSYY

Though it is clearly related to T602, a close analysis of its vocabulary and style shows that it is the Kongjūi manuscript, and not the received text found in the Taishō canon, that most closely resembles An Shigao’s core translations. Viewed in light of the Kongjūi version, in fact, it has now become clear that T602 is not a translation, or even a translation with interlinear commentary, of an Indian text, but rather a commentary based on a scripture resembling K-ABSYY.

Two other texts included in the Kongjūi manuscript have titles that correspond to

---

157 For the texts themselves see Ochiai 2004, pp. 183-227, where facsimiles of the two scrolls together with a transcription of scroll A (with the variants found in scroll B, which is another copy of the same material, included in the apparatus) have been published. A number of studies by members of this research group have been published thus far, in addition to the materials collected in Ochiai 2004 these include Deleanu 2003; Ochiai 2001 and 2002, and Zacchetti 2002b, 2003, 2009a and c, and 2007b.

158 In the following discussion I have adopted the abbreviations used in Zacchetti 2003 with minor modifications.


160 See Zacchetti 2007b.
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works credited to An Shigao by Sengyou, but which had long thought to be lost:

K-SMJ  *Fo shuo Shī’er men jīng* 非說十二門經

K-JSMJ  *Fo shuo Jī’er men jīng* 非說爾十二門經

According to the *Chu sanmang jì jì* An Shigao translated two versions of a text with this title, *viz.,* the *Larger Scripture on the Twelve Gates* (*大十二門經*) and the *Smaller Scripture on the Twelve Gates* (*小十二門經*). It now appears that these titles indeed correspond to the K-SMJ and the K-JSMJ, respectively.

In addition to the above three texts, which almost certainly represent the oldest extant versions of the texts ascribed to An Shigao by Daoan (and subsequently by Sengyou), the Kongōji manuscript contains a commentary which has no counterpart in the *Chu sanmang jì jì*.

K-SMJ(Comm.)  Anonymous commentary to the *Shī’er men jīng* 146

This substantial text (toalising nearly two hundred lines) ends with a variant title, *viz.**, the *Dīhyāka Scripture on the Twelve Gates* (*十二門陣經*). Though it is clearly related to the translations contained in the Kongōji manuscript (especially K-SMJ, according to Zacchetti’s findings), it appears to be a Chinese composition rather than a translation of an Indian text (Zacchetti 2003, p. 295).

The discovery of these new works that can be credited to An Shigao, together with an early Chinese commentary on one of them, means that the available corpus of An Shigao’s work has now been significantly expanded. Future detailed studies of the vocabulary and style of the Kongōji manuscripts in comparison with the received texts of other texts by An Shigao promise to make a substantial contribution to our understanding of this formative period of Chinese Buddhist translation history.

**Other possible attributions**

In his study of An Shigao’s *Ekottarāgama* anthology Hayashiya (1917) pointed out that two sūtras contained in that text are in present form in T150A11 and 3 and T150A30 and T150B, respectively) also appear in the *Zu shen jīng* 陣列分別, an archaic anthology of texts from the *Sūnatākāvṛtta*. One of these, the ubiquitous *Qi chū san guan jīng* 七處 三觀經, appears as the last sūtra in this collection (no. 27); the other, the very brief *Jī gū jīng* 金骨經—a text which, we should note, was not mentioned in Daoan’s catalogue and is treated as anonymous by Sengyou—appears (like most of the sūtras in this

\[\text{146 See Kajuma 2001, Zacchetti 2003 and 2004a. An English translation is given in Zacchetti 2004c.} \]

\[\text{143 See Zacchetti 2003.} \]

\[\text{144 T42/45, 55.6:26-27.} \]

\[\text{145 For a detailed discussion of this issue see Zacchetti 2003, pp. 261-270 (especially p. 36).} \]

\[\text{146 See Zacchetti 2006.} \]

\[\text{147 See above, p. 51 and u. 85.} \]
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collection) without a separate title, as stitra no. 11.

No translation that can be associated with either the title or the contents of the Za shan jing is credited to An Shigao by Daoan; on the contrary, in Harrison has pointed out (2002, p. 3), twenty-four of the twenty-seventh texts now contained in T101 appear elsewhere in Daoan's catalogue, in a group of anonymous scriptures categorized as Gu yi jing 古異經 “Ancient Variant [Translations of Scriptures]” (var. Gu dan jing 古典經).

The only items found in T101 that are not listed there are the Qi chu san guan jing (stitra no. 27), which as we have seen is treated as the work of An Shigao by Daoan, and stitras 9 and 16 whose titles appear elsewhere in Sengyou's catalogue and whose style appears to be of a different vintage. Despite the lack of external evidence (that is, of support in the older catalogues) for considering the Za shan jing as the work of An Shigao, Hayashiya viewed the appearance of two stitras (the Qi chu san guan jing and the Ji gu jing) as both T150A and T101 as suggestive of a relationship between the two anthologies. Combining this with internal evidence, drawn from his own study of the terminology used in T101 and in translations solidly attributed to An Shigao, Hayashiya felt that he had sufficient grounds to propose that T101 was also an authentic translation by An Shigao (1957, pp. 27-37).

182 As Harrison points out (2002, p. 29, n. 9) the character 之 seems a bit odd, as it ought to imply that other translations of these same texts were in circulation (which does not seem to be the case). Noting that the Kayaan atithia is (T2154) credits simply Gu dan jing 古典經, Harrison offers the reasonable suggestion that the 古典經 is the title of a visual confusion between similar characters (Ie. cit.). In fact the term 古典經 even older, for it appears several times in the Da Zhen kanding 兆承堂 collections (T711-3, completed in 695 CE), where this terminology is consistently said to be cited from Sengyou, e.g., 55.40b22, 43b35c2 and 28, 41c3, 1, 3, 7, 9 and 11; cf. 41a466ff., where Daoan's list itself is discussed. The context is the same in the Kayaan, in which the expression 古典經 appears no fewer than 80 times, usually with an adjacent note stating that Daoan's category is being cited out the basis of Sengyou's catalogue. In fact, there is one occurrence of the form 古典經 in the Chu sanming Ji ji itself, at the end of the list of the ninety-two scriptures assigned to this category by T501 (55.166c, cf. the beginning of the same section, where the title of Daoan's category is instead given as 古典经, 55.153b1). In short, there is every reason to agree with Harrison's supposition that the original name for this category in Daoan's catalogue did not refer to “variants” (or) scriptures, but simply to scriptures described as “ancient texts” (Gu dan jing 古典經).

187 As Harrison has shown, T101 (11), which (like most of the works in this collection) has no individual title, also appears in exactly the same form in T6, 6 the Shen guan jing 善國經, where it is credited in the T6's canon to Dharmakirti (Zhu Fahn 竺法蘭). This attribution was unknown to Sengyou, however, who includes this title only in his list of abbreviated or excerpted scriptures (Shu jing 詩經) (see T2145, 55.28a22). The attribution to Dharmakirti appears to have first been made by Fei Changfang (see T2034, 49.64a20), where it is among the 210 texts (t) assigned to this translator (46c4ff.), many of them on devotional grounds. As to T101(10), which likewise has no title of its own, Harrison has shown that its content (an allegory concerning a man who had four wives) allows it to be identified with the Si jia yi jing 四家易經, a scripture listed by Sengyou as among the sixty-four translations by Dharmaraksa that had been lost by his time (T2145, 55.9a15). The same title also appears elsewhere in the Chu sanming Ji ji (55.34c6, listed as a citation drawn from the Jia jia), where however it is included on Sengyou's list of anonymous scripture which had been lost by his time (see 55.37b18ff.).
Building on the earlier study by Hayashiya, Harrison (2002) produced a much more comprehensive study of the *Za abhan jing*, including a synopsis of the content of each sūtra and a list of their parallels in Pāli and Chinese (no Tibetans counterparts to these sūtras have yet been identified). After a careful examination of the style of the *Za abhan jing*, as well as the treatment of its component sūtras by Daon, Harrison cautiously concludes that the text could be included in An Shigao’s corpus “provisionally, as a translation which may have been made by him (on the understanding always that [sūtras] Nos. 9 & 10 are set to one side” (2002, p. 4, emphasis added). In sum, Harrison’s conclusion is that most of the following text is likely (but not certain) to be the work of An Shigao.

T101: *Za abhan jing* 海阿含經 (Sanjuktsesama)

Since Harrison’s article includes a detailed discussion of the individual sūtras in this collection and the relevant parallel texts (2002, pp. 5-19), so I will not repeat this information here, but will merely add a few additional comments directed toward possible further studies of this topic.

First, as Harrison points out, “it gives one pause for thought that the great pioneer of Chinese Buddhist bibliography, Shi Dao’an 書道安 (314-385), did not ascribe this anthology to An Shigao, even tentatively” (2002, p. 2). This is all the more true, I would add, in light of the fact that Daon greatly valued An Shigao’s works, as shown by the fact that he composed prefaces and commentaries to a number of them, and thus we may assume that he would certainly have made every effort to document all authentic translations by this towering figure. Furthermore, as Harrison notes, in other cases (notably that of Lokakṣema, to be discussed below) Daon was quite capable of making tentative attributions on the basis of style. That he did not do so here may well be an indication that he knew these sūtras were not An Shigao’s work, despite their stylistic similarity to his translations. They were clearly archaic, however, and thus he placed them in the category of “old scriptures” (古典經) produced by unknown translators.

Second, Harrison is surely correct in setting aside sūtras 9 and 10, which in terms of both vocabulary and style seem to be of another vintage. Ye there are “contaminants” in other sections of T101 as well. One of the most jarring is the presence of the second-person pronoun *pi* (他), which never occurs in any similarly attributed An Shigao translation, but appears eleven times in sūtra 10 (though not in sūtra 9). It also appears, however, six times elsewhere in the text—twice in sūtra no. 1 and four times in sūtra no. 2. Other expressions which, while seemingly straightforward and even formalistic, do not seem to occur elsewhere in An Shigao’s corpus also appear here and there in T101, e.g., 多比丘僧 “together with many monks” (in sūtra 1). 大發 "great merit" (in sūtra 2). This is

184 My own computer searches of translation vocabulary, drawing primarily on the works of Zhi Qian, have turned up dozens of cases in which expressions used by translators who lived a century or more after An Shigao’s time appear in sūtras 9 and/or 10 but not in the rest of T101, thus confirming Harrison’s conclusion—based on external as well as internal evidence—that they are from a different source.
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Problematic texts: further methodological reflection

In the above discussion we have treated as authentic only those texts attributed to An Shigao by Daoan and reproduced as such in the earliest extant catalogue, Sengyuan's Chu sanfang ji ji. Other attributions, most of which were first introduced more than four centuries after An Shigao's time by Fei Changfang, who padded his catalogue with literally hundreds of "newly discovered" attributions, are notoriously unreliable. As noted above, these new assignments—based on sources which sound credible, but which were strangely unavailable to any other cataloguers before or during his time—can usually be shown, on the basis of internal evidence, to be implausible. Thus of the fifty-four texts credited to An Shigao in the current Taisho edition of the canon (counting T150A and B separately), only thirteen have been accepted as genuine here (plus T150B, wrongly credited to An Xuan and Yan Feitao by the Taisho editors, again following an attribution introduced by Fei Changfang).

Even among those titles credited to An Shigao by Daoan, however, we have found several which diverge sharply from the usage found in his "core texts"—that is, those texts for which we have the most support in external sources, such as early prefaces and colophons. The following five titles, therefore, must be classified as problematic attributions on internal grounds:

T105: Wu yin ping jing 五隸音辨經
T109: Zhanan falan jing 轉法輪經
T397(13) Shi jing xuan pin 十方善護品 (var. Wu shi jiao yi jing 五十戒経)
T605: Chanxing fa xiang jing 偈行法想經
T792: Fa shou chen jing 法受義經

What remains to be explained, therefore, is the gap between Daoan's acceptance of these as the work of An Shigao versus their divergence from the language and style found in the vast majority of his works.

A number of options for interpretation would seem to present themselves. First,
An Shigao might have made certain adjustments in his choices of terminology over the course of his long translation career. Such an explanation works best when confronting relatively minor variations in Buddhist terms; it is easy to find examples of scholars writing in English, for example, who referred to the second element of the right disposition (samyakakāmalaya) as "right understanding" in their early publications but as "right resolve" in subsequent years, or who shifted from "enlightenment" as a translation of the Buddha's experience of nirvana to "awakening" in later works. Such inconsistencies are only natural in the work of any given individual, and thus it is not necessarily a cause for alarm when we find An Shigao rendering "right action" (samyak-karmaṇa), as the fourth element of the eightfold path as 定解 "upright regulation" in the Pi  "right action" in several other works.110

The hypothesis of changes in personal preference, however, is far less adequate to explain dramatic differences in such basic grammatical features as pronouns (e.g.,  or  which never appear in An Shigao's core texts), plural particles (e.g., , which is likewise foreign to An Shigao's work), or the use of enclose formations (such as  . ... ) to introduce quoted quoted speech. Such cases seem very unlikely to be the result of the shifting usage of a given individual; on the contrary, they seem to indicate that these divergent texts were produced in significantly different linguistic and/or literary environments.

It is also important to recall that these problematic texts do not all differ from An Shigao's standard style in the same way. That is, while T605 and T792 resemble one another quite closely, T397 (13) exhibits a different terminological pattern, and T605 and T609 each contain stylistic features that are not shared either with one another or with any other text on this list. In sum, while the overwhelming majority of titles assigned to An Shigao by Daesan are relatively consistent in style, these five problematic texts differ both from his core works and (with the exception of the pair of T605 and T792) from one another.

Two other possible scenarios—both of which are known to have affected the works of certain other translators—should also be considered briefly here. First is the effect of the shifting composition of translation committees, a factor that is considered to have played a major role in, for example, the texts produced by Dharmakirti.111 As noted

110 T603, 51764/9 and 21.
111 T31, 1.216c6-10, 237c24 and at. The reading as 4548, however, may be merely a trivial error for 5448.
112 T31, 1.815a15 and passim, T57, 1.852a13 and passim; and T76, 1.924b17, where it occurs in a list of ten rather than eight items.

[On this issue see above, p. 20, v. 37.]
above, however, there is not a single mention of An Shigao having employed any assistants, and thus to attribute these variations to the participants in such a group would require positing a situation for which our sources give no concrete support. An additional argument against this explanation is the very diversity of these five problematic works, for we would have to postulate several shifts of translation personnel, to account for the variety in their styles. Four of the five problematic texts, however, are extremely short, with T605 and T792 occupying barely one register (that is, one third of a page) in the Taishō edition of the canon, while T105 and T109 occupy approximately two registers apiece. Thus it seems quite unlikely that the production of such brief texts would require the repeated recruitment of new personnel. In sum, there is no evidence to support the idea that these differences in style are due to the input of translation assistants, and given both the variety and the brevity of these non-conforming texts, this scenario seems rather remote.

A second scenario would be that these texts were in fact translated by An Shigao, but that they were later revised by other users. Such revision is well documented in the case of certain other translators, notably Lokakṣema, for whom several examples will be considered below. For such revision to take place, however, implies that the text in question was actively used. On the contrary, however, these five scriptures appear to be some of the least influential of the works attributed to An Shigao. Not one of them has an extensive preface or colophon, not one is mentioned in An Shigao’s biography or was the subject of a commentary, and (so far as I have been able to determine) there are no citations from any of them in other Chinese works. The theory of subsequent revision would also require us to postulate a complicated scenario in which these texts were reworked by at least four different individuals (or groups) in order to account for the differences in their vocabulary and style. Given all of these problems, it is clear that this explanation, too, is quite unlikely. The most reasonable conclusion, in sum, is that these five scriptures were not translated by An Shigao, but by a number of other translators whose names are unknown.

If this is the case, then how are we to account for the fact that Daøan attributed them—mistakenly, as it now appears—to An Shigao? Given Daøan’s generally scrupulous approach to his material, it seems highly unlikely that he added them carelessly or arbitrarily to his list of An Shigao’s works. Instead, the most probable explanation is the obvious one: that they had already come to be classified as the work of An Shigao by Daøan’s time. Thus what remains to be explained is how these five relatively obscure scriptures came to be associated with this famous translator’s name.

Any explanation of this situation must remain tentative, but it seems most likely to this writer that the fact that these translations—which seem certain to have been produced by other hands—were nonetheless credited to An Shigao at an early date may be simply the result of the tremendous esteem in which An Shigao was held by his disciples. That is, the level of respect for this pioneering translator may have been powerful enough for
subsequent translators in his immediate lineage to have neglected to record their own
names, allowing the texts to circulate simply as the products of "An Shigao's school."

The most plausible scenario, in sum, is that these texts were produced by a variety
of individuals who considered themselves to be members of An Shigao's lineage, but
whose stylistic preferences and linguistic backgrounds (including, in some cases, an eduction
in literary Chinese) differed sharply from his own. Thus while it is probable that these
translations date from the latter part of the Eastern Han period, it is safest to assume
simply that they pertain to the lifetime of An Shigao by an uncertain number of years.

Lost texts
Nearly a dozen titles credited to An Shigao in Sengou's catalogue have not yet been
identified with any extant work, and may therefore be presumed, at the present state
of our knowledge, to be lost. Some of these were registered as lost already in Sengou's
time; where this is the case, I have provided the reference in the notes below. In the
order in which they appear in the Chu sanxang ji ji (35. 5c25-563), these lost works are
the following:

1. Bai luoke pin jing 百六十品經 ("Scripture in 160 Chapters") 143
2. Qian fa xing jing 欽敬發行經 ("The Practice of Generating Benevolence") 154
3. Qi li jing 七法經 [var. Aaptan qi fa xing 伽呬頴七法行経] ("Abhidharma Scripture
   on the Seven Dharma-Practices")
4. Wu fa jing 五法經 ("Scripture on the Five Dharmas") 156
5. Yi jie li 寶決律 [var. Yi jue li fa xing jing 聖決律行經] ("Scripture on [Dharma-
   Conduct in accordance with the Definitive Vinaya"])
   Method of Meditation"])

143 Sengou cites the Jiu bao 藥寶 as saying that this was an Ekottarikavya anthology in 160
   chapters.

144 The Song, Yuan and Ming editions add a note saying that "this scripture is now lost" (今闕本)
   (see 55. 6, note 1).

145 Registered as lost by Sengou (63a).

146 Not listed as loc by Sengou (63a), and thus presumably to be distinguished from the Aaptan
   xiao fa jing that occurs two lines before (662).

147 From the Dredhikavya according to Daoan (55. 67). Though the text is such as is lost, a
   tantalizingly brief quotation from it appears at the end of another text by An Shigao, the Si de jing (T32).
   Commenting on the expression 修習諸法, the gloss reads as follows: 聖寂云： "誦經法事 Various texts"
   (T32. 1.916c28). The other gloss on the same term is drawn from the Da ekan jing: 大般鳴論云： "於三
   因時，佛示涅槃有若言正" (loc. cit.). Interestingly, this corresponds to a passage in the canonical.
   Akan shuou jing (T602. 1.1263b1).

148 The longer version of the title surely postdates An Shigao, for the expression Anaana 眞聖 "essentials,
   main points" is not attested in any Buddhist text dating from the Han or Three Dynasties period. The
SHIGAO TRANSLATIONS

Shi'er yinynuan jing 十二因緣經 ("Scripture on the Twelve Nuidans")119
Shiye yi jing 十四要經 (var. Pusa shiye yi jing 哲學十四要經), ("Scripture on the Fourteen Thoughts of the Bodhisattvas")120
Apatan jiochaka jing 淨見法九十八法經 ("Abhiharmo [Treatise on] the Ninety-Eight Bonds")121
Nanti jawuwaye jing 佛提迦離遊經 ("Sutra [spoken to] Nanda the Gṛhapaci")122

SCHOLARLY RESOURCES

While some individual terms found in An Shigao's translations are discussed in the sources cited above, there has not yet been a systematic study of his vocabulary. An essential starting point is Ut Hakuju's glossary (1971, pp. 455-467); for some of the transcription terms found in An Shigao's corpus, together with reconstructions of their Han-period pronunciations, see Coblin 1983 (pp. 241, 242). A major international cooperative project to carry out a systematic study of all of his non-Mahāyāna texts datable to the Eastern Han (most of which can be ascribed to An Shigao), coordinated by KASHIMA Seishi 平尾静志 and FANG Yixin 方一新, is currently in the planning stage. When completed, the resulting glossary is expected to include terminology drawn from all of the texts listed above.

---

119 This text should be considered lost only if it is not (as suggested in Ut 1971, p. 21) simply a variant title for the Abhan kaijue shi'er yinynuan jing 阿含小乘十二因緣經 (T3508).
120 Registered as lost by Sengyou (6623).
121 Listed as lost by Sengyou (6821).
122 Registered as lost by Sengyou (6863).
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Lokaksema (Zhi Lousiachen 支婆迦闍)

BIOGRAPHY

Sengyou's biography of Lokaksema is considerably shorter than that of An Shigao, providing only a few basic details concerning his life and work. He is described as a native of the country of the Yuechi (月支), which most scholars identify with the realm of the Kushana, who then controlled northwest India and adjoining regions. He apparently came to China as an ordained monk, arriving in Luoyang toward the end of the reign of Emperor Huan (r. 147-168 CE). His translation career, according to the same source, took place in the time of the following ruler, Emperor Ling 順帝, and during the period from 178-189 CE he is said to have produced Chinese versions of a number of Mahāyāna scriptures. Subsequently, with the disturbances that heralded the eventual fall of the Han, conditions in Luoyang deteriorated rapidly, and Lokaksema disappears from the historical record. As Sengyou poignantly remarks, "Where his life later ended, however, is not known."

Though this translator is regularly referred to in Western-language sources as "Lokaksema"—and I will continue to follow that convention here—the equivalence of his Chinese name with this reconstructed Sanskrit form is not certain, and from time to time other possibilities, e.g., "Mo-kalasama, have been suggested. There are differences of opinion on how to transcribe his Chinese name as well. The character 聲 can be read as either chin or chia in the modern Beijing dialect, and without any other occurrences of this character as a transcription term in texts that are certain to be from the period with

---

163 Sengyou's entry on Lokaksema may be found at 51.95c22-96a7; for a partial English translation see Tsukamoto 1985, vol. 1, p. 96. For his biography is the Guang zhuan (which generally follows Sengyou's accounts word-for-word) see 50.32b13-25; a French translation is given in Shih 1968, pp. 13-21.

164 This is not, however, the only possible interpretation. The realm of the Kushana corresponds (what is referred to in Chinese sources as the country of the Great Yuechi (大月支), who fled far to the West after being defeated by the Xiongnu in the early 2nd century BCE. Another group of Yuechi, however, migrated only as far as the southeastern Twin Basin, where they were referred to in Chinese sources as the Little Yuechi (小月支). Lokaksema's biography does not specify which of these territories he was from, thus leaving open both possibilities.

165 Sengyou refers to him as a houyin (gāmín) 55.6b26; elsewhere, in a preface to the houyin (gāmín) by an unspecified author, he is called a bodhisattva (53.4b12).

166 See T2145, 55.95c25-26. The standard found here, according to which Lokaksema carried out his translation work during the Guangzheng 五年 (110-118) and Zhongjiao 十七 (184-189) periods, does not match the account found in the catalogue section of Sengyou's work, according to which he produced translations during the time of Emperor Huan (r. 147-168 CE) as well as Emperor Ling (r. 168-189). For a translation of the latter passage see below, p. 76.

167 T2145, 55.96a7.
which we are concerned it is difficult to determine which reading is to be preferred. I have adopted the reading *chen* for the final syllable of the name here on the grounds that this reading better represents the component *ṣīma*, which in turn has been chosen because it seems to be better attested in Buddhist sources as an element of proper names than any of the other possible candidates.

What is most surprising, however, is the fact that the name Zhi Loujiachen 註理 誠 in fact does not actually appear in the *Chu wenzang jì jì* at all. Instead, Sengyou refers to this figure simply as Zhi Chen 謹 in both the biography and the catalogue sections of his work, and it is this same two-character form that also appears in all of the prefaces and colophons collected there.108 If we assemble the available sources in chronological order, it becomes clear that the "complete" four-character form Zhi Loujiachen does not appear in any source prior to the *Gaotong zhuan*.109 This raises interesting questions, which unfortunately cannot be pursued here, as to what the sources of Huijiao's information might have been. For convenience I will retain the easily recognizable form "Lokakaśāma," but this might need to be altered in the future if subsequent studies should determine that Zhi Loujiachen was not the original form of his name.

Just as the content of An Shigao's translations is sometimes wrongly used to infer the nature of the Buddhism practiced in his Parthian homeland, so the content of Lokakaśāma's translations is sometimes marshalled as evidence that the Mahāyāna enjoyed special favor in the Kushan realm. This is methodologically problematic, however, for a number of reasons.110 First, even if Lokakaśāma did come from Kushan territory—which is probable but not entirely certain—there is no evidence that Buddhism was the predominant religion in that region; indeed, there is considerable evidence that it was not.111 There is also no reason to assume that "the Mahāyāna"—whatever that may have meant at the time—held exclusive sway even in those circles, be they large or small, that

---

108 See 55.47b24, 47c6-7, 48c12, 49a15 and 18, and 52c12-13.

109 For Huijiao's treatment of the name Zhi Chen 謹 as an abbreviation of Zhi Loujiachen 註理 誠 see T2059, 59.22b.13. If the shorter form is indeed genuine, the abbreviated rendition is presumably due at least in part to the prohibition against given names of more than one character issued during the reign of Wang Mang 昭帝始的九-3 CE). Needless to say, it was easy to confuse this shortened form with the similar-looking name of Zhi Qian 註賢. As we shall see, this may have occasionally contributed to confusion as to which of these two figures translated a given text.

110 Cf. above, p. 43, for a general discussion of the problems with attempting to reconstruct the nature of Buddhist thought and practice in any given place on the basis of the corpus of a particular translator.

111 The most famous Buddha image found on the coinage of King Kanishka is in fact a distinct minority among the dozens of other deities who are also represented, most of them of Greek or Iranian origin (see Rosenfield 1967 and more recently the studies collected in Brunacci and Behrends 2006, especially the paper by Ellen Krenn and the introductory notes by Rosenfield, pp. 11-17). The idea that Kanishka was a convert to Buddhism—or even more specifically, a patron of Mahāyāna Buddhism, as is often asserted—has no support in historical sources, and is best viewed as a pious legend.
favored the Buddhist religion.

It should also be noted that Lokaksema is described as translating two of his most famous works—the *Aṣṭasāhasrika Prāṇīpāmaṇī* (Dassing bhammajing 超行勝呪經, T224) and the *Śāṅgoyuṇaṃsaśāstra* (Shenlengyasong 俱作論疏, T219)—not from texts he had brought with him to China, but from manuscripts supplied by the Indian monk Zhu Shaofu 竺佛所 (var. Zhu Foshuo 竺佛所). In such circumstances it would be extremely hazardous to infer from the content of Lokaksema’s translations any information on what form(s) of Buddhism might have been popular in his homeland. What is quite clear on the basis of his surviving works, however, is his own interest in Mahāyāna sūtras, for all of the translations so clearly attributed to him are scriptures of this kind.

**CONTENTS OF HIS CORPUS**

In many respects Lokaksema’s corpus represents the polar opposite of that of An Shigao. No *ajāta* texts or treatises of any kind were included either in his surviving works or in the record of translations lost by Sengyou’s time; instead, all of the works credited to him are Mahāyāna sūtras. Again in contrast to An Shigao, many of whose translations are extremely short, Lokaksema produced several quite lengthy texts, with the longest (T224, his version of the *Aṣṭasāhasrika Prāṇīpāmaṇī*) totalling no fewer than ten fascicules.

**TRANSLATION STYLE**

Like all other translators in Chinese Buddhist history, Lokaksema adopted many terms previously introduced by An Shigao. When no existing equivalent was available, however—as was the case with many Mahāyāna terms that did not occur in scriptures translated by An Shigao—new renditions were coined, of necessity, by Lokaksema himself. A tabulation of these new forms quickly demonstrates that, in contrast to An Shigao (who generally translated Buddhist technical terms into Chinese that resembled the sounds of proper names), Lokaksema overwhelmingly favored the use of transcription for words of both types. Making little or no effort to domesticate the terminology of his Indian source-texts, Lokaksema produced such cumbersome multisyllabic expressions as *upoṭṭhapajñāna* 頂髻阿精那 for *upaṭṭha* and *pajñāna* 阿精那 for *prasādoṣa* 道所大過等. He also chose to adhere extremely closely to the style of the Indic prose (including his penchant for repetitive statements), resulting in many cases in extraordinarily long Chinese sentences. In one only significant respect does he clearly (and apparently deliberately) diverge from the content of his originals, typically omitting altogether the famous opening phrase “Thus have I heard.”

---

13) See the Chu anzuang jiji, 55.96#1ff and cf. Zürcher 1959, p. 35.
14) This opening phrase is absent from T324, T418 (in some but not all editions), T358, T362, T458, and T807. It is included (in the standard pre-Koṣaṇājīva form but not 所宣) in T313, some editions of T418, T424 and T626. This pattern correlates at least in part with dates already expressed by scholars on other grounds concerning the authenticity, or subsequent revisions, of some of these texts.
Like An Shigao, Lokakṣema renders Indian verse passages into Chinese prose, doing so even in the case of the Neizang hai buu jing 内藏百寶經 (T807), whose Indic-language source-text was probably entirely in verse.\(^{174}\) One of his translations, the Hauzhou sanmei jing 懲舟三昧經 (T418), appears at first to be an exception, for it contains passages in five-, six-, and seven-syllable verse. As Harrison has shown, however, this text has been subjected to substantial revision after Lokakṣema’s time, and all of the verse portions can be shown to be from this later stratum (Harrison 1990, pp. 236-249).

Despite their undeniably pedantic style and often unwieldy vocabulary, Lokakṣema’s translations also include a significant number of vernacular elements (discussed in detail in Zürcher 1977; cf. also Zürcher 1996). Much still remains to be done in determining the extent to which these might reflect, as Zürcher suggests (1977 and 1991, p. 242), the actual speech of the population of Luoyang at the time.

**AUTHENTIC TEXTS**

In the catalogue section of the Chu sanzang ji ji Sengyou summarises the contents of Lokakṣema’s translation corpus as follows:

> The above thirteen [var: fourteen] works, comprising twenty-seven fascicles in all, were translated by Zhi Chen 知陳, a framan from the Yuezhī 月支 country, during the time of Emperor Huan 晉桓 [r. 147-168 CE] and Emperor Ling 晉靈 [r. 168-190] of the Han [dynasty].\(^{175}\)

Here again we have a discrepancy in the numbering, for though most editions of the canon read “thirteen,” fourteen titles are actually listed here.\(^{176}\) Once again, therefore, it appears that the Chu sanzang ji ji has been altered after it left Sengyou’s hand.

Taking Sengyou’s testimony as their starting point, Erik Zürcher (1991) and Paul Harrison (1987, 1993) have each compiled lists of texts they consider to be genuine works by Lokakṣema. Of the twelve texts attributed to Lokakṣema by the Taishō editors, eight are accepted as genuine by Zürcher:

- **T224**: Daaxing henuo jing 動行般若經
- **T260**: Daolu jing 多路經
- **T313**: Achu feguo jing 阿耨頂果經
- **T350**: Weiyue meniu hao jing 為月門內好經

\(^{174}\) See Harrison 1991, p. 159.

\(^{175}\) T2145, 55.a.25-27: 右十三部，凡二十七卷，譯經會蘭華和尚支陳支陳譯出。

\(^{176}\) In place of the number 十三, "thirteen" the so-called Three Editions (the Song, Yuan, and Ming) read 十四 “fourteen”; see note 22 to the Taishō edition (vol. 55, p. 6). It is highly unlikely that the character 四 could be a mere scribal error for 十三 instead, it seems probable that this attention was introduced deliberately in order to eliminate the discrepancy that had resulted from the interpolation of an additional title. On the identity of this extra text we below, pp. 77-78.
Harrison agrees in accepting most of these as authentic, but expresses reservations concerning the *Ahu fuyun jing* (1993, p. 166) and points out that portions of the *Banchou sanmei jing* are the product of revision and do not date from Lokaksema’s own time, as will be discussed in detail below.17

Conversely, one text rejected by Zürcher is considered by Harrison (1993, p. 141) to be Lokaksema’s work:

T624: *Dan zhenduodi sanmei jing* 但真地所撰如来三昧經
The above “conclusive texts,” plus those words accepted as genuine by Harrison but not by Zürcher or vice versa, will be the starting point for our discussion here. Once again we will use both external and internal evidence to further assess the authenticity of these translations.

**Methodological preliminaries (I): external evidence**

As always, it is essential to begin with a close reading of the information found in the *Chu sanzeang j’ie* before turning to evidence of other kinds. And in Lokaksema’s case no remark appended by Sengyou to the list of his works in the catalogue section suggests that we should be cautious in accepting some of the above attributions. Though Sengyou does catalogue all of the above texts (plus others which are no longer extant) under Lokaksema’s name, his postscript to this section reveals that not all of these attributions are equally secure:

As to these, concerning the nine scriptures from the “Old Version” (*Gu pin* 古品) to the “Hundred Chapters of the Inner Treasury” (*Nizang hai pin* 外藏百卷), Lord An (i.e., Daoan) says, “They resemble Lokaksema’s translations (似支藏出).”18

In other words, though these nine texts are classified by Sengyou as Lokaksema’s work, it is clear that Daoan did not have any documentary evidence concerning their origins, but was merely grouping them with the works of Lokaksema on the basis of their language and style.

In this passage too we encounter a numerical problem, for the list of scriptures from the *Gu pin* to the *Nizang hai pin* given in the received text of the canon contains ten titles, not nine. In this case, however, it is quite easy to determine which stra has been added to the list, for one of them—the *Guangming sanmei jing* 光明三昧經—is said

---

17 See Harrison, 1993, pp. 146-147 and 790, pp. 224-249.
18 T2145, 55.5b26-27. 其古品以下至内藏百卷凡九经。安公云：‘似外藏出也.’
to have been absent from Daoan’s list.179 Assuming that this is correct (and there is no evidence elsewhere in the Chu sanzang ji ji that Daoan knew of such a title), the Guangming samma jing could not possibly be one of the texts that Daoan described as looking like Lokakṣema’s work, for it was not included in his catalogue at all.180

The solid attribution by Daoan of only three texts (one of them now lost) to Lokakṣema conforms to what we find in the biographical section of the Chu sanzang ji ji. Toward the end of the time of Emperor Huan 惠帝 (reign 178-184 AD) he came to Luoyang, and during the Guanghe 光和 (184-189 AD) period of the reign of Emperor Ling 懷帝 he translated foreign texts (新文),181 producing three scriptures: the Sanmao daxue jing 三摩大會經, the Shouguan 勇觀, and the Banzao samma 貝敷三昧.182 As is usually the case, the account found in the Guangming chapian follows suit.183

As with An Shigao’s translations, it seems likely that the items singled out for attention in Lokakṣema’s biography are those for which prefaces or colophons documenting his authorship were available to Sengṣū. Surviving notices to the above three texts have in fact been preserved in the Chu sanzang ji ji, although they seem with difficulties and, at least in one case, it is not entirely certain that the translation referred to is actually that of Lokakṣema.184

One additional source, however—a preface to a combined edition of the Shouguan jing, which is generally (but perhaps mistakenly) attributed to the composer of the synoptic edition itself, Zhi Mindu 支摩度 (II. fourth century CE)185—attributes two other translations

---

179 See T2145, 55.6015: 光明三昧經（卷出序錄）（安巖譯）

180 It is possible that this entry is the result of a confusion between the names Zhi Chen 支謙 and Zhi Yao 支業, for at least by the late fourth century CE the latter was considered to have translated a text entitled Chengxi guangming dingyi jing (成息光明定義經) (T630).

181 Though the term jin can be used in some cases to designate texts written in the Kharoshī script from those written in Brahmi (see 82), see Boucher 2000), it is not to reason to think that it has that specific sense here.

182 See T2145, 55.9524-27: 選加末曬諸大絕—以眾善根而成佛謂謂文。出毘尼戒行品

183 See T2099, 50.1244a-18.

184 See T2145, 55.9526-27: 漢加末曬諸大絕—以眾善根而成佛謂謂文。出毘尼戒行品

185 See T2145, 55.4916-18: 聞此諸大絕學。
to Lokaksema: the *Ashoke wang jing* 阿耨大王經 (here written 阿耨經) and the *Dun zhenduluo suwuen rulai sammi jing* 佛頂陀羅所聞如來三昧經 (here abbreviated as 堅陀). If the assignment to Zhi Mindu is genuine, this would show that a tradition assigning these two additional titles to Lokaksema was circulating no later than the fourth century CE.

Lokaksema’s version of the *Shoubengyan jing* 有本經 has not survived, but it would seem that we should treat the two remaining translations discussed above—the *Daeung kunwoo jing* (T224) and the *Rancho sammi jing* (T418)—as comprising his "core texts," with which all other translations purported to be his work should be compared. Matters are not quite so simple, however, for as we shall see, the transmitted text of the *Rancho sammi jing* has been significantly revised, and certain sections of the text as we have it clearly did not come from Lokaksema’s own hand.

In the discussion that follows, therefore, we will consider each scripture attributed to Lokaksema individually, examining both the external evidence concerning the time and place of its production and the internal evidence offered by its vocabulary and style. Because detailed information on parallels to these texts in Chinese, Tibetan, and (where available) in Sanskrit have been given in Harrison 1993, I will not recapitulate this information here, but will confine myself to mentioning only new findings that have appeared since that time.

**Methodological preliminaries (2): internal evidence**

Most previous studies of Lokaksema’s translations have focused on the evidence contained in scriptural catalogues, and—somewhat surprisingly—have generally ignored Deon’s remark that most of the texts subsequently assigned to this translator by Sengyou merely “resembled” Lokaksema’s work. Studies based on internal evidence—i.e., involving a critical analysis of the similarities and differences in the vocabulary and style used in the various texts belonging to this group—have been rare. Harrison’s discussion of the translation terminology used in Lokaksema’s version of the *Prajnaparamita-buddha-samadhisthita-samadhi-sutra* is an important exception to this tendency;106 more recently, a similar methodological approach has been applied to the *Ashoke wang jing* 阿耨大王經 (T620) and the *Dun zhenduluo suwuen rulai sammi jing* 佛頂陀羅所聞如來三昧經 (T624) by Mizuki Tendō 宮崎騰昌 (2007a and b).

If we combine the external evidence outlined above with an analysis of terminological and stylistic features of all of the scriptures attributed to Lokaksema by Sengyou, we will find that these works can be stratified into a number of layers, based on their proximity to his two surviving “core texts,” the *Daeung kunwoo jing* and (the unreviewed portions of) the *Rancho sammi jing*. The following discussion is arranged according to this approach.

---

106 See Harrison 1990, pp. 218-249, where the disadvantages of overvaluing external sources are explicitly discussed (p. 222).
Core texts
Of all of the extant scriptures assigned to Lokaksema by Sengyou, by far the most trustworthy, on the basis of external evidence, are the Daoshang baoren jing and the Ranzhou sanmei jing. Of these the first appears to have come down to us relatively unscathed, and thus may be considered the single most reliable indicator of Lokaksema’s vocabulary and style.

T224: Daoshang baoren jing 道尚寶訓經 (Aṣṭamaññiputra prajñāpāramitā) Lokaksema’s version of the text was revised in subsequent years not once but twice: first by Zhi Qian, who produced a significantly shorter and more elegant version, and second a much more lightly polished version, produced by a translator whose identity has been the topic of debate. The existence of these two early revisions suggests that Lokaksema’s pioneering translation was considered both valuable and problematic, leading others to attempt to produce more comprehensible versions.

Even Lokaksema’s original translation, however (that is, the text that in its present appearance appears as T224), has not been transmitted without alteration, for we can find instances here and there of a phenomenon that I would like to refer to as “clustering,” in which terminology that is atypical of a given text nonetheless appears there, but clustered together in a certain limited portion of the text. In sum, while the Daoshang baoren jing can, in general, be considered as one of Lokaksema’s benchmark works, it will be important in future studies to give careful attention to those portions of the text that exhibit anomalous features and which appear to have been revised after his time.

187 In the Taitō edition of the canon this translation—alternatively titled the Chang’an pin 建安 points or “Chang’an version,” a label which is confirmed by the fact that the vocabulary cited from the Chang’an pin in Hinton’s 赫思義 (T2128) does indeed occur here, and only here, among extant Prajñāpāramitā scriptures attributed to Xuanwu 善賢佛 (Dhammaprīya) and Zhu Rui 朱叔如, Haksuksa Moksa 釋悉訥摩訶巍, however, considered it to be the work of Dhammaraksa (1964, p. 84, n. 150). The latter seems unlikely, given what we now know of Dhammaraksa’s language and style. What is certain, however, is that this is not an independent translation but a very lightly revised version (made, however, with a somewhat different Indian recession) of Lokaksema’s original text.

188 See for example the treatment of the word hrdaya in the Daoshang jing. This term is routinely translated by Lokaksema using the substitution term “adhoc 仮的 (see Hinton 1967, p. 81, and on the phenomenon of substitution terms see Nettier 1990b). In two places in the text, however, always of occurrences of itenag 一切 (voiced “voice-hearer,” a translation which comes into wide use only in the late third century CE, can be found (i.e., only at 8.454a-460a and 476a-489b in a text which encompasses pp. 475a-478b). In his expression, which does not occur in any translation ascribed to the Han period (the sole occurrence in T184 at 1.465al6 is not a compound and is not being used in this sense) with the exception of one second-century Lokaksema text (T438) and two third-century translations (T524 and T525), nor for that matter in any authentic Three Kingdoms text (the sole occurrence in T5, 1.18762 is not a compound), with the exception of a similarly clustered occurrence to Zhi Qian’s Larger Sikkhandasatipātra (T561, 12.800c17-18). The portion of the text containing the Stiddhamatāvibhāga story (Chapters 28-29 in Lokaksema’s version) also contains some exceptional vocabulary (e.g., vāsa 貞女 for balapara, usually translated as 善命女 in Lokaksema’s work) whose significance remains to be investigated.
The other surviving text which is strongly supported by external evidence as the work of Lokakṣema is his rendition of an early recension of the *Prayaṇapāna-buddha-samādhiyajñāna-samādhi-vīra*:

**T418: Banzhou samuṣṭi jing 柏舟三昧经**

In this case, however, the situation is far more complicated. The terminology and style of the prose portions of this text are indeed quite congruent with the usage of the *Dārśana bharata jing*. As noted above, however, T418 also contains numerous passages in verse (including five-, six-, and seven-character styles), and these verse portions of the text include terminology that diverges significantly both from that of the *Dārśana jing* and from the prose portions of the *Banzhou samuṣṭi jing* itself. A few representative examples of verse found in the prose (but not the prose) of T418 are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T24</th>
<th>T418 (prose)</th>
<th>T418 (verse)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>upisala</td>
<td>悦婆婆</td>
<td>悦婆婆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preta</td>
<td>設加</td>
<td>設加</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niyaya</td>
<td>涅槃</td>
<td>涅槃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mahajattra</td>
<td>摩訶闍</td>
<td>摩訶闍</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upāyakauśalya</td>
<td>雜和拘舍羅</td>
<td>雜和拘舍羅</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is easy to see that these are all translations, in contrast to the transcriptions that serve as the standard terms in the *Dārśana jing* and (in cases where they occur in the prose in T418) in the *Banzhou samuṣṭi jing*. Thus we are dealing here not just with additional new vocabulary items, but with terminology of different (and quite consistent) type. This makes it a virtual certainty that the verse portions are the work of someone other than the translator who produced the prose sections of the text.

A close look at the transcribed versions of the text reveals clear evidence that an older version of the scripture has indeed been subsequently revised. As Suzuki Hajime 柚木浩明 has observed, evidence for the existence of two different versions of the *Banzhou samuṣṭi jing* can be seen in the Taishō canon itself, where differences between the Korean version (K), which served as the base text for the Taishō edition, and the version contained in the "Three Editions" of the Song, Yuan, and Ming (SYM) can be clearly seen in the variant readings recorded in the notes (Sukurabe 1975). And these are not mere matters...

---

**Note:** This scripture has been the topic of a superb study by Paul Harrison, including a critical edition of the Tibetan text (1998) and a study and annotated translation of the Tibetan version (1990). The latter, however, also includes a detailed analysis of the Chinese versions of the scripture, including that of Lokakṣema (pp. 207-272) as well as an edition and translation of a Swatki fragment of the text (273-282). Last but hardly least, Harrison has also translated T418 into English (1986a), unfortunately with only minimal annotation, as required by the series in which it appeared. Other studies of specific aspects of the text will be mentioned in the notes below.

**Footnote:** Most of these examples are taken from Harrison 1998, pp. 236-249.
of a different word here and there, but substantial divergences in the version transmitted in SYM from that of the text recorded in K.

The detailed analysis given by Harrison (1990, pp. 221-235 and 248-249) shows that the text found in K is itself a hybrid creation. The first part of the stūra (chapters 1-3 and the first half of chapter 4, i.e., through 13.907c7 in the Taishō edition) appears in an unrevised version in K,139 thus differing in many respects from the revised version in SYM. The latter part of K, however (the second half of chapter 4, from 907c8 onward, and all of chapters 5-16) is essentially identical to the revised version found in SYM. Thus it is evident that in the Korean edition an older ( unrevised) version of the first part of the stūra came to be combined at a certain point with a newer (revised) version of the remainder of the text.

Most striking is the fact that in chapter 3 and the first half of chapter 4 the gāthās are rendered in prose in K, while in SYM they are translated as verse. The opening lines of the stūra differ as well, for where SYM contains a detailed mānasā beginning with ""Thus have I heard"" (avyākhyāta), and including a long list of epithets of the arhats in the audience,140 the version found in K is significantly shorter, lacking both of these elements and beginning with the simple statement that ""The Buddha was at Rājagha"" (साधु राजग्रहस्ते, 13.902c27). The latter, however, is standard for Lokakṣema, and indeed the Dāsāvāna jīrṇa begins in exactly the same way (8.425c6).

Many questions remain about the manner in which the revised version was produced, and Harrison offers several possible scenarios (op. cit., pp. 232-233). He also raises the question of when, and by whom, these revisions—largely restricted to adding a more detailed introductory mānasā and replacing an earlier prose translation of the gāthā sections with verse—were made. Though the pursuit of this question was not a part of his agenda in this study, he suggests two likely candidates for future investigation: Dharmarakṣa, who is also credited by Daoan with having produced a version of the samādhi samānih jīrṇa141 and Zhi Qian, who is known for having revised other works by Lokakṣema (op. cit., p. 249).142 It is possible, in fact, that the text was revised more than once, for the non-Lokakṣema vocabulary is concentrated not just in the verse portions—all of which, we may assume, were added after Lokakṣema's time—but in those composed in seven-character form. If

139 An exception is the brief verse passage at 906a8-11 (found in K as well as SYM), which has no parallel in the Tibetan and is explained by Harrison as the result of a separate incident of textual conflation (1990, 233-235). On this passage see also Suzuki (1981).
140 See T418, 13.602, n. 4.
141 T2145, 55.8a14 and 14b20.
142 An important discussion of Zhi Qian's revision of an existing text is found in the note to Zhi Minzho's edition of the Shudanamen jīrṇa (T2145, 55.49a16ff) as well as a preface describing the preparation of the final version of the Dharmapāla, which is thought to be his own composition (55.49b20).
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this is the case, it might be that this point to an earlier revision (incorporating verses in five- and six-character format), followed by a later one in which seven-character verses were added as well.195

Both of these possibilities should be investigated thoroughly in the future, but at present we can observe that there is one text in Zhi Qian's corpus of translations—the Huaiyin sanmei jing 始於三味經 (Ts32)—that resembles T418 in a significant number of ways. First, it exhibits the same pattern of differentiation between prose and verse that we find in the Banzhao sanmei jing; that is, the prose portions are heavily laden with transcription terms, while the verse sections also contain translation terms, such as rāhule 置於 for tathāgata and dānqi 恭敬 for pāraśuḥ, that do not appear in the prose. It thus appears that T418 and T632 have been subjected to very similar processes of revision.

Second, while most of the transcriptions in both T418 and T632 are identical with those used in Lokakṣema's other core text, the Daśaṅga jing (T224), a few are not, and several of these unusual forms—e.g., sthānabhisamā 其所相應 (rather than simply sthānā 其所相) for Ājīvika 慬毗迦 and Māvakara 嬰母迦 (461a26) for "Maleśvara"—appear in both T418 and T632, but not in any other text in either Lokakṣema's or Zhi Qian's corpus.

In sum, there is good reason to infer that these two texts are related in some way. While the most likely candidate for the reviser of the Banzhao sanmei jing would therefore appear to be Zhi Qian, the possibility that Dharmarakṣa was responsible (or even that he contributed an additional layer of revisions after Zhi Qian's initial changes had been incorporated) is still worth investigating. A close comparative study of the Banzhao sanmei jing and the Huaiyin sanmei jing will surely be rewarding.

Second-tier texts

From this point on we will be discussing translations that were not ascribed directly to Lokakṣema by Daśaṅga, but only signed with his work on the basis of their vocabulary and style. As we shall see, some of these offer a closer match than others. As a provisional approach, therefore, we will begin by assigning the translations that bear the closest resemblance to Lokakṣema's core texts to a group called "second-tier" texts. Those that bear a more distant relationship will be classified as belonging to a "third-tier," while those that differ most dramatically from Lokakṣema's normal usage will be referred to as "problematic" or "revived" texts.

In determining which texts should be assigned to the second tier we may recall, first of all, Lokakṣema's standard practice of omitting the standard opening formula "Thus have I heard at one time." In fact, the translations that most closely resembles those of Lokakṣema is terms of their vocabulary and style (including a lack of four-character

195 If this were the case, it might be that the reference to the "correction and completion" 謂定 權益的 of the text in 208 CE, found in a notice preserved in the Chu sanxang ji ji (T2145, 55. 48c13-16), refers to the first but not the final revision of the text.
prosody and the translation of verse passages, where these are present, into prose) also
lock this opening middle. Without examining the terminology of each text in detail—which
would cause this study to swell to impossible proportions—I will simply list these texts
here, agreeing with Daoan that they do, in general terms, "resemble" Lokaksema’s work
(弘文論出弘)

T280: Daoshu jing 定沙經 “part of the Proto-Avatamsaka”
T350: Weiyun mumi hou jing 應行虱母後經 (the Kāśyapa-aparicīra)
T458: Wenbuchu wen pasu shu jing 文殊師利問菩薩經 ("Mahāyāna Inquiry
Concerning the Bodhisattva Career")

T807: Neizang hai benjing 內藏石賢經 ("The Hundred Jewels of the Inner
Treasury")

All of these exhibit occasional anomalies in vocabulary that are not found in Lokaksema’s
core texts. Yet they still resemble his language and style in overall terms. It thus seems
reasonable to conclude, following Daoan’s lead, that they are—if not his own translations—at
least the products of members of his school.

Three other texts (or rather, texts catalogued under three separate Taishō numbers
in the transmitted canon as T282, T283, and T362) probably also belong in this category,
and will be discussed in detail below. Though not found on Daoan’s list of Lokaksema’s
works, there are good reasons to believe that they too are products of his school, and thus
that they should be included within the "second-tier" category.

Third-tier texts

Still more distant from Lokaksema’s general style, and exhibiting a much higher ratio of
translations to transcription than in the second-tier group, are the following two works:

---

For this designation see Nadies 2001a, which also contains a synoptic edition showing the
parallel between this translation and Zhu Qin’s Pau-hwens jing (T281). Other parts of this text appear
to have been separated (and subsequently catalogued separately) in the course of transmission in China;
for these see below, pp. 87-88.

There is a vast literature on this scripture; for abundant bibliographic references to research
on the Sanskrit version see Vorobyova-Demyanovskaya, Kerenshina, and Kudo 2002, where the most
up-to-date edition of the Sanskrit text can be found. Still especially valuable for the study of Lokaksema’s
version are the synoptic edition of T310 together with its Sanskrit, Tibetan, and other Chinese parallels
by Alexander von Stell-Holtein (1926) and the German translation of T310 by Friedrich Weller
(1968/69).

Though I have categorized this text as a Mahāyāna scripture here, Harrison has shown that
it is actually a Mahādyutikā version of a text transmitted among various Mahādyutikā groups, including
the Pārvatikās and the Lokamārāvalikās; some of its verses are cited in the Mahāvastu produced by the
latter. For further details see Harrison 1982. An English translation of this text has recently appeared
(Xing 2006). I would like to thank Paul Harrison for calling my attention to this article.
T624: *Dum zhendulun danzen rualui uanma jing* (Dum zhendulun danzen rualui uanma jing)\textsuperscript{198}

T626: *Achobh utang jing* (Achobh utang jing)\textsuperscript{201}

Not surprisingly, both of these translations also begin with the standard pre-Kumārajīva opening formula, *u+juii+* (Latin *omnis*), the term for which is ujanma (BPPB X 2008: 138).

Despite the fact that the notice attributed to Zhu Mindu supports the acceptance of these texts to Lokakṣema, they contain certain features which are sufficiently anomalous to place them in a separate category. A recent study by Miyazaki (2007b) suggests that these two translations are closely related to one another, with T624 approximating Lokakṣema's usual vocabulary somewhat more closely than does T626.

**Problematic or Revised Texts**

As we have seen, most of the translations traditionally ascribed to Lokakṣema are only tentatively attributed to him by Daoan. Of the translations in this group, the most distant from the language and style of Lokakṣema's "core texts" is the following scripture, which (like the two texts belonging to the third-tier category) begins with "Thus have [I] heard":

**T315:** *Acha fagau jing* (Acha fagau jing)\textsuperscript{202}

This scripture contains no verses, but neither do the later Chinese and Tibetan translations; thus this indicates merely that the Indian source-text was entirely in prose. As to its vocabulary, however, the *acha fagau jing* abounds in non-Lokakṣema translation terms to a greater extent than any of the other titles reviewed above. This vocabulary is used consistently throughout the text; while virtually all of the texts discussed above contain the transcription *datajii* (datajii) for *sattihigata*, for example, and the third-tier texts (T624 and T626) use the translation *ralui* (ralui) as well,\textsuperscript{203} in the *acha jing* only *ralui* occurs.

---

\textsuperscript{198} No translation of this text into a western language has yet been published, but for a critical edition of the corresponding Tibetan version see Harrison 1992. An analysis of the transcriptions found in the *uanma* contained in the text is given in Harrison and Colburn 1999. For a discussion of some of the Buddhist technical terms used in the text see Miyazaki 2007b.

\textsuperscript{201} For a richly annotated Japanese translation of this text see Murakami 1994. A discussion of the vocabulary of the text in comparison with other works credited to Lokakṣema can be found in Miyazaki 2007a and b. Several Sanskrit fragments have recently been identified; see Harrison and Harman 1998, 2000, and 2002.

\textsuperscript{202} For a critical edition of the Tibetan text, together with its parallels in Chinese, see Sant 2002. A partial French translation of the Tibetan version can be found in Dantinne 1983. For preliminary information on the recent find of a Gandharā manuscript containing a related (but not identical) scripture dealing with Akobhā see Strach 2007.

\textsuperscript{203} There is also one occurrence in T458 (T458b30). The two occurrences of *ralui* in T224 (T224b3 and T224b43) both occur in close proximity to the transcription *datajii* and in conjunction with the term *zanab* (Lokakṣema's standard equivalent *fuu tanab*), and are probably best viewed as
Likewise it employs zheng jue 正覺 as its sole equivalent for sannyaok Ou hindubha, eschewing Lokakṣema's normal transcription san-ye-safi 三耶三佛. Even the ubiquitous translation bhiṣajīngha 毘丘僧 for bhikkhuśamgha does not appear in in the Aṣṭu jing, which use the translation ces-translation bhiṣaj zheng 毘丘僧 instead. In short, of all the scriptures associated with Lokakṣema's name by Daoan, the Aṣṭu jing is the most distant from the usage found in the Dhauing jing. Thus if there was indeed a translation of this scripture produced by Lokakṣema, the text as we have it has surely been thoroughly revised.

At the other end of the spectrum, however, it is not difficult to identify the translation in the group discussed above that is closest to the Aṣṭu jing in terminology: it is the verse portion (but not the prose) of the Bambou sammei jing. Indeed two of the terms mentioned above (正覚 and 毘丘僧) occur only, among scriptures credited by Sengyou to Lokakṣema, in the Aṣṭu jing and the verse portions of the Bambou sammei jing; the same is true of the translation terms zheng zheng 正正 (for sarva-svattra) and shihou 狄譚 (for bhagavat). In light of these and many other similarities not cited here, it seems highly likely that the Aṣṭu jing and the revised verse sections of the Bambou sammei jing are members of the same textual lineage, and may even have been produced in the same place and time.

In sum, though the unrevised prose portions of the Bambou sammei jing may remain on the list of Lokakṣema's "core translations," the verses belong instead with the Aṣṭu jing. Thus we may include this text in the category of "problematic or revised" works as well.

T41B (verse): Bambou sammei jing 仏在法華形

In future studies it may well be profitable to examine the verse portion of this work not as a part of the group of Lokakṣema's translations, but rather in comparison with those scriptures that appear to be its own closest relatives (or, to use the terminology proposed in Part IV below, its own "theoretical community"), above all the Aṣṭu jing (T313) and the verse portion of the Huiyin sammei jing (T632).

NEWLY PROPOSED ATTRIBUTIONS

Recently Harrison has also proposed, on stylistic grounds, that the version of the larger Sākyamuni-śāstra traditionally attributed to Zhi Qian (T362) may in fact be the work of Lokakṣema.30 More specifically, Harrison has suggested that the text as we have it is a slightly revised version of an original translation by Lokakṣema or a member of his school, while the version of this sūtra attributed by the Taishō editors to Lokakṣema (T361)—an attribution that has been widely questioned by scholars—is actually the work of Zhi Qian.

(For a discussion of this text see the section on Zhi Qian below.) What seems to have

30 See Harrison 1998b, pp. 556-557 and notes 16-18; 1999; and Harrison et al., 2002.
happened, in other words, is that the attributions of the two texts were switched at an early date. Harrison's theory has substantial merit and is gaining broad acceptance, and we may therefore add to the list of the extant products of Lokakṣema's school the following text, with the understanding that it has undergone a certain degree of emendation since the time of its original translation.

T362: Aṃitra sanyāsaṃha sālūparantam gauda ren daśa jing 與阿毘三迦三佛 報優部學僧人道昆

Future studies comparing the terminology and style of this text to other scriptures discussed in this section could make an important contribution to our understanding of its relationship to other texts produced by Lokakṣema or members of his school. At present, it seems that T362 fits best with the group labeled "second-tier texts" above, but further clarification of its standing would be welcome.

Finally, two other small texts, corresponding to portions of the Buddhavatamsaka and traditionally credited to the Western Jin 西晋 figures Nie Daozhen 南詣信 and Zhu Fahu 竺法護 (Dharmaraka), respectively, also appear to be the work of Lokakṣema. Both of them begin abruptly, which suggests that they are fragments of a larger work rather than complete sūtras in themselves. Moreover, T282 begins precisely at the points where Lokakṣema's T280 ends, and T283 again begins at the endpoint of T282. Taken together, these three texts—T280, T282, and T283—correspond to the whole of a translation subsequently produced by Zhi Qian, the Pusa bennye jing 僧僧行經 (T281), which points to the possibility that they originally comprised another complete version of this text. Finally, the terminology employed in T282 and T283 is not only typical of Lokakṣema's usage but in some cases is virtually unique to his work. In sum, it appears that T280, T282 and T283 originally comprised a single translation by Lokakṣema or a member of his community which at some points were separated into three different pieces, with the first piece retaining the original title and the other two becoming what I have referred to elsewhere as "orphaned texts" (gu jing 京藏), which were subsequently catalogued separately. Accordingly, we may now add the following two items to the list of Lokakṣema's extant works:

---

20 How this could have happened becomes clearer when we recall that Lokakṣema is usually referred to not by his full transliterated name but by the abbreviated form Zhi Qian 造贊, whose similarity to the name of Zhi Qian 造贊 is evident.

21 In particular, Harrison specifies that the portion of the text dealing with the "Five Evil" (wù yīhuà 五習) is widely recognized as a Chinese interpolation, which is the product of a different hand.

22 A Japanese study and translation now appearing in a series of articles by Kakaihama Seishi (1996-6), is an essential resource, as is the synoptic edition published in Kagawa 1984.

23 See Naizer 2005a. The popularity of the translations of this text by both Lokakṣema (or a member of his school) and Zhi Qian can be gauged by the fact that both versions were actively appropriated by the composers of apocryphal texts, both Buddhist and Daoist; for a list of such borrowings see the appendix to Naizer 2007c.
GUIDE TO EARLY CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

T282: Zhu pu sa qin ji breny jing 諸菩薩筌佛彌經
T286: Pi-tsa chhi-chu sing-lao ten 疏釋十住行品

These texts, too, appear best to be identified with the other translations assigned here to the "second-tier" group. Once again, further comparative studies of these texts will surely be able to clarify the picture further.

LOST TEXTS

Of the translations catalogued under Lokaksema's name in the Ch'iu so-mang ji ji, the following items appear to be lost:

Shaulengya jing 達勒尼経 (a version of the Sāriputtā-maṇḍalī-sīla, already lost in Sengyou's time)
Guangming samsi jing 光明三昧經 ("Sutta on the Samādhi of Luminosity")
Hu hsa-nsian jing 會散顯經 ("The Hu Parinirvāṇa Sūtra")
Bu-si jing 布施經 ("The Original "Puya Sūtra")

The disappearance of these scriptures does not seem to have been recent, for of all of them were reported as lost by Sengyou in his own time. Assuming that the Fanyingjia quan wenmen 方譯部全品 "Complete Texts of the Early Day" (also reported as lost by Sengyou) is simply another name for the Kānaparivarta (T139), Wu hsin mao lu jing 五心毛輪經 (also found under Lokaksema, which is elsewhere referred to in Sengyou's catalogue by the title Bu-reu jing 寶如經), we may infer that this text actually was—and still is—in circulation under another name.

SCHOLARLY RESOURCES

Because of his reputation as a pioneer in the transmission of Mahāyāna Buddhism to China, Lokaksema has received substantial scholarly attention in Japan. As a result, an

208 This title was not associated with Lokaksema's name in Dacon's catalogue, but was cited by Sengou from the We h h (33.617). It seems likely that, as noted above, this assignment is the result of confusion between this text and the similar title credited to Zhu Yao (the Changjia guangming sūtra jing 成業光明定經, T630).

209 What the content of this "foreign" (pa) Mahāparinirvāṇa-sīla was is unclear, as its length is given as consisting of just a single fascicle, it is unlikely to have been a counterpart of the archaic Mahāparinirvāṇa-sīla preserved as T5 and T6, both of which are two fascicles in length. While this may simply have been a shorter account of the Buddha's final days, it is interesting to speculate on whether it might have been a scripture dealing not with the parinirvāṇa of the Buddha himself, but with that of his father—another, Mahāprajñā (for which cf. T144 and T145) or perhaps even another of the Buddha's disciples.

210 Though no specifics concerning this text can be found here in the transmitted text of Sengou you (other than the fact that the translation was two fascicles in length), it seems highly likely that this was the antecedent of the "immortalized Puyi sūtra" (Bh do chao jing 無造經) in one fascicle, attributed to Zhu Qian (cf. the discussion of T796 below, pp. 112-113).

211 The clearing up of the translation of Sengou you's catalogue is probably to be removed.
unexpectedly high percentage of his often obscure translation terms can be found in
standard dictionaries (including Nakamura 1981, Mochizuki 1932-36, and especially
Hirakawa 1997, where many suggested Sanskrit equivalents can be found).

For the Sanskrit or Prakrit equivalents of some of the transcriptions found in
Lokakṣema’s corpus, together with reconstructions of their Han-period pronunciations,
see Cobb 1983, pp. 242-253. A valuable discussion of Lokakṣema’s translation style and a
list of some of his characteristic technical terms, with special reference to the Bauhous
samset jing and the Daosheng jing, is given in Harrison 1990, pp. 236-249. See also the
very useful comparative table of the various forms of Lokakṣema’s Daosheng jing in comparison
with that of the Da mingju jing (T225, at some to Zhi Qian) in Kanze 1985. Studies of the
terminology of the Dan zhendaulan suwen ruai samset jing (T242) and the Ashebi
wang jing (T260) can be found in Miyazaki 2007 a and b.

For the Da Amituo jing (T362), now widely recognized as a product of Lokakṣema’s
community, the ongoing series of publications by Karashima (1999b ff.) is an essential
resource. A glossary of Lokakṣema’s Daosheng jing, currently in preparation by the same
author, is expected to be a major contribution to our understanding of Lokakṣema’s translation
idiom.

An Xuan 安玄 and Yan Fotiao 嚴佛照 (var. Yan Fotiao 嚴浮照)

BIOGRAPHY

An Xuan, of Parthian origin like An Shigao, came to Luoyang as a merchant toward the
latter part of the reign of Emperor Ling (r. 168-189). For some unspecified service of merit
he was awarded the honorific title “Commander-in-chief of the Cavalry” (馬都護). He
appears to have been a dedicated lay Buddhist, prior to his arrival in China, referring to
him as an upāsaka (upāsaka). Sengyou praises his adherence to the precepts as well as his
knowledge of the Buddhist scriptures. As he gradually gained facility in Chinese he
became interested in propagating the scriptures, and he is described as engaging in
discussions with members of the community of monks. He remained a layman all his life, producing his sole
surviving translation in cooperation with the Āryama Yan Fotiao, a native of Linyuan (嶽
(Anhai 岳州) who had been a devotee of Buddhism from an early age and is thought by
some to have been the first Chinese to become an ordained monk.

Although An Xuan, as a layman, would not be expected to appear in the Gaoseng
zhuan, his eminence was such that Huijiao apparently felt constrained to include him,
solving the problem by appending his biography to the section dealing with Lokakṣema.22

22 T2659, 324023-87. For an English translation of most of the biography see Tsukamoto 1981,
vol. 1, pp. 496-497, n. 15; for a French translation see Stuh 1968, p. 16 (also cited in Tsukamoto, op. cit.,
p. 497, note k).
In the earlier account given in the *Chuan san sang ji ji*, by contrast, An Xuan is accorded a section of his own. \(^{211}\)

Yan Fotio receives even briefer notice. In the biographical section of the *Chuan san sang ji ji* he is mentioned only within the account of the life of An Xuan, which refers to him as a *vramana* and mentions his native place of Lintao (55.96a14–16); the *Gaoneng chuan*, which follows Sengyou's description of both men almost word for word, simply follows suit (50.32c2–4). In addition, however, we have one short but precious document composed by Yan Fotio himself, a preface to the "Ten Wisdoms of the Novice" (see below under 'Authentic texts'). Yan Fotio is referred to by the title of *daitya* (大师) in the heading to this preface, which has been preserved in the *Chuan san sang ji ji* (55.69c20).

Though the details concerning their lives are few, Sengyou is quite specific about the method by which they worked, reporting that An Xuan "orally translated the Indic-language text" (口译梵文) while Yan Fotio wrote it down (笔录). Thus while we are accustomed to thinking of translation teams as consisting of a foreign monk together with his lay assistants, here we have the opposite case: a foreign apadaka whose name was known both to spoken Chinese and the language of the source-text (presumably a Prakrit vernacular) well enough to produce an oral Chinese translation of the scripture, assisted by a Chinese monk whose literary education was sufficient to enable him to record it in suitable prose.

Sengyou is unimpressed in his praise of the quality of their work, stating that in their translation "the principle is captured and the sound is correct, fully [conveying] the scripture's subtle purport" (理正、言正、密契微旨), adding that their skill became legendary in subsequent generations (是所以後世後代).\(^{212}\) He also explicitly links them with An Shigao, praising the three of them as translators whose work was "difficult to follow" (难继述), i.e., which reached a standard difficult for others to emulate. In retrospect, it is striking that Lokakṣema's name is missing from this list.

**Contents of Their Corpus**

The sole translation produced by An Xuan and Yan Fotio, according to the *Chuan san sang ji ji*, is a Mahāvīra st事業, the *Ugrapariprajña-sūtra*. Sengyou also reports that Yan Fotio was the author of a text dealing with the practice of the novice monk (*vramanera*), entitled

\(^{211}\) See T2145, 55.96a28-28, an English translation of most of the biography is given in Tsukamoto 1985, vol. 1, pp. 95–96. Since Huijio was clearly dependent on Sengyou's earlier work, frequently (as here) citing it word for word (see Link 1975), the fact that Sengyou accords a significant place to An Xuan is likely to have affected Huijio's treatment of him.

\(^{212}\) 55.96a13–16. Since An Xuan and Yan Fotio do not use transcriptions of Indian terms (with the sole exception of the long-established loan-word *sit* (坐 for "Buddha"), Shin's translation of the characters 坐正 as "the transcriptions phonetically [transliterate] corrects" (1986, p. 16) is improbable; presumably Sengyou was referring here to the overall "sound" of the text, i.e., the mellifluous character of its wording.
Shanshi shi bai 沙界十倍 "Ten Wisdoms of the Novice Monk (trumane).") 111 The text itself has not survived, and no citations from it have yet been identified, but the fact that Yan Fotiao is credited with the production of such a work confirms what is implicit in Sengyun's reference to him as a trumane, i.e., that he was also involved in, and concerned with, the specifics of the monastic life. For the preface to the text (preserved in the Chu sanxiang ji) see "Authentic text" below.

**Translation Style**

The most striking feature of the work of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao is their translation policy, which differs strikingly from those of both of their predecessors, An Shigao and Lokaksema. Wherever An Shigao had followed a "middle path," employing transcription to represent proper names but translation for most Buddhist terms, and Lokaksema overwhelmingly preferred to use transcription for words of both types, An Xuan and Yan Fotiao attempted to translate—rather than to transcribe—all proper names, as well as Buddhist terms, into Chinese. Thus in place of the well-established term Shetrā 同嗣, used to transcribe a presumably Prakrit form of the city-name "Śrāvasti" by both An Shigao and Lokaksema, An Xuan and Yan Fotiao introduced the unexpected translation "Wēnťuān 雲聞", apparently interpreting the word as etymologically derived from śrāta- (< śravā "hear") + -ṭuā "thing, object." 112 Other similarly novel translation choices include djñān "one who gets rid of hunger" for bhājas, gṛñṇa 吃 "individual Buddha" for prayākeča-buddha, and jñāninga 智谷 "respect-head" for the bodhisattva Manjūśrī. Many of these terms were subsequently borrowed by other translators, notably Zhi Qian and Dharmarakṣa.

In terms of literary style, the work of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao is more classical than that of either of their predecessors, with few evident vernacularisms in, as Zürker has observed (1991, p. 283) some mixture of typical awraś elements. There are occasional passages in four-character prosody, though non-metric prose predominates. There are no passages in verse, but since there is no evidence that the Indic text of the Ugrāvesa itself contained any verses this should not necessarily be construed as a feature of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao's translation style itself. 113

Despite the fact that no Indic-language version of the Ugrāvesa had been preserved, 114 a comparison with the two other Chinese translations, as well as a much later

---

111 See below, "Lost texts."

112 A similar policy was followed by the Tibetans in the eighth century, when they translated the same name as Miyamayu, "bearing," a "residence," deriving the name from "building" (hrisrā-) plus "village" (virtha.

113 See Natier 2001a, p. 19.

114 A number of citations from the text, however, are contained in Śāntideva's Śāramāṇapāca.
translation into Tibetan,\textsuperscript{219} allows us to be reasonably sure about what the content of the underlying source text would have been. And in light of this evidence, it is clear that—despite occasional lapses—the overall level of accuracy of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao’s translation is remarkably high.

\subsection*{Authentic Texts}

In the catalogue section of the \textit{Chu sanxang ji ji} Sengyou summarizes the work of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao as follows:

\begin{quote}
The above two works, comprising two fascicles in all, were translated (翻譯) during the time of Emperor Ling by the commander-in-chief An Xuan.\textsuperscript{220} Of these the Ten Wisdoms is a composition (集) by [Yan] Fotiao.\textsuperscript{221}
\end{quote}

Though the first part of Sengyou’s notice would seem to indicate that both works were translations, his comment concerning the \textit{Ten Wisdoms} makes it clear that he considered it to be an original composition by Yan Fotiao and not a translation of an Indian text.

The latter work has not survived, but the first text credited to these translators, the \textit{Fa jing jing} “Dharma-Mirror Sutra,” is still extant. Both Bon Harrison (1987) and Zürcher (1991) agree in accepting it as the work of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao:

\begin{quote}
TJ22: \textit{Fa jing jing} 读鏡經
\end{quote}

As in the case of Lokakṣema, we will take the opinion of these two specialists as our starting point.

\subsection*{Methodological preliminaries: external and internal evidence}

In the case of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao our task is made easy by the fact that their sole extant work is abundantly documented in the historical record. It is clear that Sengyou had drawn his catalogue listing for the \textit{Fa jing jing} directly from Daxao, for he cites the latter as describing the text as belonging to the \textit{Vajapada} section of the canon.\textsuperscript{222} Thus the catalogue entry itself is of the highest possible level of reliability. A preface by Kang Senghai 陳僧海 (d. 247–280), likewise preserved in the \textit{Chu sanxang ji ji}, also credits the text to An Xuan and Yan Fotiao.\textsuperscript{223} Not surprisingly, the \textit{Fa jing jing} is also mentioned by name in Sengyou’s biography of these two translators (55.96a14). The unanimity of the

\begin{flushright}
see Mochizuki 1988, pp. 247-310.
\end{flushright}

\textsuperscript{219} For a discussion of these other versions of the \textit{Upanisadagrabhī} see Noséier 2003, pp. 1-18.

\textsuperscript{220} See 55.6c5-6. 二部 - 凡二卷 - 道書寺 - 沙門繩頭羅陀安玄共譯出。

\textsuperscript{221} 55.6c6- - 順基師譯所出。

\textsuperscript{222} On the term \textit{vaiśūya}, often used as a synonym for “Mahāyāna,” see Shilling 2003 and 2004.

\textsuperscript{223} See 55.60b19-c11. For an English translation of portions of the preface see Tsukamoto 1985, vol. 1, p. 96 and p. 498, n. 16.
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testimony in these sources, in sum, makes it quite certain that the Fa jing jing is indeed the work of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao.

As to internal evidence, the style of the Fa jing jing—in which virtually every name and Buddhist technical term is translated rather than transcribed—is quite unique, and there is no comparable text produced by any other translator. It would therefore be difficult to contend that the Fa jing jing as we have it was produced by someone else. Though Sengyou also credits a text entitled Fa jing jing to Zhi Qian (55.7a19), treating it as another translation of the same sītra (15a10), no other extant text by Zhi Qian follows this extreme policy of translation-only. Thus we may conclude that, if Zhi Qian did indeed translate a version of the Fa jing jing, it has long been lost, and the one that has survived is the Han-period ancestor.

A Mahāyāna sūtra
It is straightforward, in sum, to accept An Xuan and Yan Fotiao’s translation of the Ugraparipṛṣchā as their authentic work:

T322. Fa jing jing 于楼兰 (Ugraparipṛṣchā-sūtra)134

Preface to a lost composition
Only one translation by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao has come down to us, but a preface thought to be the work of the latter has been preserved in the Chu sanzang jijì. Accordingly, we may also include the preface itself as a genuine Han-period composition:

T2145. Shami shi hui zhuang jiu xu (沙彌十善業序)135

The title as given in the preface (which is longer than the simple Shi hui or Shami shi hui given in the catalogue section) suggests that Yan Fotiao’s entire composition may have been in verse.

Lost texts
As noted above, the text to which Yan Fotiao wrote his preface has not survived, and (barring new discoveries in the future) it must be considered lost:

--- Shami shi hui 沙彌十善 (var. Shami shi hui zhuang jiu xu 沙彌十善業序) "Verses on the Ten Wisdoms of the Novice" The meaning of the title is not entirely straightforward. Zarcher suggests that it may

134 No study devoted specifically to An Xuan and Yan Fotiao’s translation of this scripture has yet been published, but readers can consult with profit the Japanese translation of the Tibetan version in Sakurada 1974 as well as the study of the text in light of citations in the Daibutsuchozobō and the Shōkaihozobō given in Matsumoto 1988. An English translation and analysis of the text, based on the Tibetan version but with reference to the Chinese translations (including that of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao) as well, can be found in Nierst 2003a.

135 See T2145, 55.0a19–70a8. In the catalogue portion of the text Sengyou describes the “Ten Wisdoms” as a scripture consisting of selections compiled by Yan Fotiao (沙彌是彌所集, 65b).
refer to the ten types of cleverness (sia 賢) mentioned in the <i>Akan shousheng jing</i> (viz., the six aspects of breathing meditation together with the Four Noble Truths).224 As an alternative, however, he suggests that it may refer simply to the ten precepts to be observed by the novice monk (loc. cit.). Yan Foting’s preface, as Zürcher notes, says nothing specific about the meaning of the title; Kang Sendng’s commentary on the text would surely have clarified matters, but of this work only a few tantalizing words have survived.225

**Scholarly Resources**

No glossary or study of the vocabulary of these translators has yet been published,226 and many of their technical terms are not registered in standard dictionaries. For translation terms later adopted by Dharmaraksas in his <i>Lotus Sutra</i> one may also consult Karashima’s <i>Glossary</i> (1998). Some terms are discussed in the notes and in Appendices 2 and 3 of my study of the <i>Ugraprajñaprabhā</i> (Nattier 2003). Occasional terms, with suggested Sanskrit equivalents, can be found in Hiyakawa’s <i>Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Dictionary</i> (1997). A glossary of the <i>Fajing jing</i> is currently being compiled (Nattier, in preparation).

Zhi Yao 夔昭

**Biography**

No biographical details concerning Zhi Yao’s life are recorded in the <i>Chu sanjang ji ji</i> or the <i>Gasong zhuai</i>. Sengyou dedicates him to only a single sentence at the end of his account of Lokaksa, stating merely that “at that time there was also Zhi Yao, who translated the <i>Chengji guangming jing</i>” (時又有支曜譯出成員光明殿, 55.96a7). Huijiao adds that he was a <i>trāmanda</i> and credits him with at least one additional translation, but provides no further personal details (T2059, 50.32b6-7).227 The only specific chronological information given in the <i>Chu sanjang ji ji</i> is in its catalogue section (6c1-2), where his...
sole translation is dated to the reign of Emperor Ling (166-190 CE). Nothing is said about his ethnicity or place of origin, though the etymology "zi" suggests that he was of Yueh ancestry. If he was indeed a monk, however, we should be cautious about jumping to this conclusion, for prior to the late fourth century CE it was customary, in at least some circles, for a disciple to adopt the etymology of his master.216

**CONTENTS OF HIS CORPUS**

The sole text currently accepted by most scholars as an authentic translation by Zhi Yao is classified as a Mahāyāna sutra; no other Chinese, Tibetan, or Sanskrit version has been identified. It is possible, however, that even this single attribution is not reliable, and indeed that this extant is not a translation of an Indian scripture at all; for details see below under "Authentic texts."

**TRANSLATION STYLE**

Like An Xuan and Yan Fotiao, Zhi Yao—if indeed he was responsible for the creation of this text—introduced some strikingly new technical terms, all of them translations rather than transcriptions. But unlike An Xuan and Yan Fotiao’s newly minted terminology, this distinctive vocabulary does not seem to have been adopted by any subsequent translator. Expressions like chu 菩萨 for “monk” (bhikṣu, qī ‘zhòng 菩萨 for “community of nuns” (bhikṣuni-samgha), wühēn 证士 (evidently for “layman,” upāsaka), and wubăng 作士 (apparently for “the thought of supreme perfect awakening,” anuttaramajja-samādhicitta) remained unique to this text, with no visible progeny in later translations.217 Whether or not it is an authentic second-century translation of an Indic text, therefore, T630 clearly represents a terminological dead end in Chinese Buddhist literature.

In style, by contrast, is quite mainstream—mainstream, that is, by the standards of classical Mahāyāna-Buddhist) Chinese literature. As Zürcher points out, 60% of the text is in four-character prosody, and examples of pure Chinese-style parallelism abound (1991, p. 284); one passage, he remarks, "reads like a Chinese essay" (p. 295, n. 15). In addition, the text contains several passages in unrhymed five-syllable verse (p. 284). In sum, he writes, "The language is more classical than that of any other Han Buddhist text” (loc. cit.).

**AUTHENTIC TEXTS**

Sengouy's catalogue listing, like his biographical note, credits Zhi Yao with just one translation. Following the title Cheung yangming jing 成具光明影 (for which 成具光明影)

---

216 See above, “A Note on Names.”

217 The only exceptions are in texts quoting (with or without acknowledgement) from the Cheung yangming jing itself. On the significance of these citations see below, pp. 87-88.
GUIDE TO EARLY CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

Sengyoe writes:
The above text, comprising one fascicle in all, was translated by Zhi Yao during the reign of Emperor Ling (c. 166-190). Accordingly, of the four texts attributed to Zhi Yao in the Taishō cannon Harrison (1987) and Zürcher (1993) accept only the following one as genuine:

T630: *Chengji guanyming dingzi jing* (Concerning the Children of the Family Temple).

As before, we will take the consensus of these two authorities as our starting point.

**Methodological preliminaries (1): external evidence**

Sengyoe’s account of the production of Zhi Yao of a sūtra entitled *Chengji guanyming jing* (with the above-mentioned variant names) seems entirely consistent, with full agreement between the information given in the catalogue and the biographical section of his text. No other work is credited in the *Chu sanzang ji* to Zhi Yao, and thus it would seem that this title alone should be viewed as a fully reliable attribution.

Yet once again other evidence complicates the picture. First of all, as noted above, the terminology used in the *Chengji guanyming jing* appears to have no visible successor. If it were actually a genuine Han-period translation, this would be the first text we have encountered whose terminology was widely ignored by subsequent translators. Even the most unexpected renditions introduced by the pioneers of Chinese Buddhist translations—such as *chi shengbu* (True dharmas) for *samayacarita* “right effort” in the works of An Shigao, *abhidharma* (knowledge of the perfect) for *upayakausalya* “tactical skill” in the works of Lokakṣema, *klāśa* (war) for *bodhisattva* in the work of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao, or *kuśa* (tuft of grass) for *Śrīpaṭṭa* (from a Prakrit version of the alternate form *Śrīpaṭṭa* in the works of Zhi Qian and Kang Senghu)—enjoyed at least a brief “half-life” in the texts of subsequent translators. That the vocabulary of the *Chengji guanyming jing* did not exhibit the same pattern suggests that this sūtra may have followed a quite different literary trajectory.

In contrast to its apparent lack of influence during the late Han and Three Kingdoms periods, however, the *Chengji guanyming jing* clearly attracted attention during the late fourth century, for as Zürcher points out, this text was “one of the first sūtras which *Dōshin* as a *butsa* had to memorize.”

The earliest text to quote this scripture by *Dōshin*. In the *Chu sanzang ji*, T2145, 15.10a8

---

203 §5.62.

204 This is somewhat surprising in light of Zürcher’s remark that this text was “one of the first sūtras which *Dōshin* had to memorize” (Zürcher 1959, p. 378, n. 73; see Dōshin’s biography in the *Chu sanzang ji*, T2145, 15.10a8 and its counterpart in the *Gosōg abun*, T2059, 50.531a12). In fact Dōshin’s own writings show no trace of the vocabulary found in this text; nor does he ever cite it in any of his works.

205 For this expression see Katsushina and Natterer 2005.

206 Zürcher 1959, p. 378, n. 73; see Dōshin’s biography in the *Chu sanzang ji*, T2145, 15.10a8
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name, so far as I have been able to determine, is the *Fenglei* 奉 lei, which dates from approximately the same period (c. 377 CE). A few decades later the text was again quoted in the *Zhou han* 周漢, compiled by Senghao 僧浩 (744–414 CE). Afterwards it virtually disappears from view, with its occasional citation in canonical sources occurring only in texts that are dependent on Senghao’s work. Based on this data, therefore, we might be justified in concluding that the sutra enjoyed a brief flurry of interest in the late fourth and early fifth centuries, while being generally ignored both before and after this time.

This information is substantially confirmed, but also dramatically amplified, by a new study by Nishiwaki 二氏筆記 of a fragment of a commentary on the *Chengju guangming jing* found at Turfan. Based on the fact that the commentary seems to be drawing on material found in the version of the *Larger Prājñāpāramitā* translated by Mokula in 291 CE (T221, the *Fangguang huanru jing* 放光般若經), Nishiwaki argues that it must have been produced after this translation but before the appearance of Kumārajīva’s *Mahā bhūmijodo jīva jing* 摩訶般若波羅蜜經 (T229), which quickly superseded Mokula’s work and would be expected to be quoted in works produced in the fifth century or later. On palaeographic grounds, as well as on the basis of the fibers in the paper itself, Nishiwaki estimates that the manuscript fragment dates from the first half of the fourth century CE.

One other quite unexpected finding further underscores the salience of this scripture in the late fourth century CE, for in one of the scriptures considered to be a translation by Zhu Fonian 周佛念 (fl. 365–c. early 400s CE), the *Zisheng wu pasu shizhu daqin* chuang luoxie jing 侍隨問菩薩十住品斷絶經 (T309), at least two passages from the *Chengju guangming jing* have been incorporated without attribution. The degree of correspondence

---

and its counterpart in the *Gaojì chuan*, T2019, 50.351c12.

---

186 See T180, 387a12ff. and 88a12ff.

187 T180, 151b1ff. and 14a19ff.

188 See the seventh-century Chn commentary *Zhao ren xun chu* 道人訓 (T1859,45.109a1HE, 174a2HE, and 181c1fE) and its sub-commentary, the *Zhao ren xun chu* 道人訓 (T2090, 45.206a4ff., 212b4ff., and 225c4ff., 240c1ff).


190 Nishiwaki 二氏筆記, 2007, pp. 51–52. Nishiwaki suggests that the commentary was most likely produced even earlier, i.e., prior to the time when Daonan drew attention to Dharmaraksa’s translation of the same text, the *Guangguang jing* 光輝經 (T222), in 376 CE (ibid., p. 56).

191 The situation is rather complicated, for the manuscript has been repaired, and the repaired portion (which in-takes a section of the apocryphal *Tibei jing* 西域經, which was composed in 469 CE, on the reverse side) is assigned by Nishiwaki to the latter part of the sixth century. Based on the other evidence cited above, I suspect that the date of the early portion of the fragment is slightly later, i.e., that it was copied in the mid- to late fourth century CE.
makes it clear that Zhu Fonian has plagiarized (while in some cases reworking) a substantial number of lines from this scripture. On the one hand, this serves as additional evidence that the Chongzuo guangming jing was being actively used toward the end of the fifth century CE. On the other hand, however, it raises grave doubts about the status of the Shizhu duan jie jing as a translation of an Indian scripture.

Methodological preliminaries (2): internal evidence

The idea that a text produced during the Han period, after apparently remaining invisible for nearly two centuries, would suddenly begin to attract attention in the mid-to late fourth century CE is rather puzzling, but this does not present an insurmountable problem in itself. It is entirely possible for a translated scripture to lie unused on a monastery shelf, gathering dust over the centuries until someone—for reasons that are rarely documented in our sources—suddenly takes an interest in it. Thus the fact that the Chongzuo guangming jing appears to have been completely ignored by other translators, as well as by commentators and the authors of treatises, until sometime in the fourth century CE need not pose a serious obstacle to accepting the text as a Han-period translation of an Indian text.

Internal evidence, however, raises some serious questions about its provenance, for the sutra contains a number of elements that are quite unexpected in an Indian Buddhist scripture. One of the most striking is its explanation of the practice of dhyāna (here translated as jìyì—i.e., "single mind"), which begins as follows:

What is extensive single-mindedness (第—単心)? By filially serving one’s father and mother he unifies his mind; oy respecting his teachers he unifies his mind.273 It is difficult to imagine that such an exegesis of the word dhyāna—focusing on meditative practices but on worldly social relations—could have been penned by an Indian author.

The passage continues with other items that are less unexpected, giving a superficial impression of a translated Indian text:

By cutting off desire and distancing himself from the worldly, he unifies his mind. By entering into the thirty-seven sections (in 𤶥),274 he unifies his mind. . . . By counting the breath and entering into chañ (i.e., dhyāna), abandoning the six kinds of sense-objects and actualizing purity.

273 A preliminary report on the parallels between the two texts was given in Nattier 2006a. A published version is expected to appear in the Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhist Studies at Soka University, vol. XII (March 2009).
274 T60, 15.451b6-7. 他謂單一心？非事裡則其心。是事裡友於其心。 One could also read "unifies their minds," but some of the subsequent statements in this section appear to make better sense if they are taken as occurring to the practitioner unifying his own mind.
275 The expression 三十七菩提心 (三十七菩提心) was introduced by An Siuqin as an equivalent for the thirty-seven bodhisattva-aitkaras; see T112, 2.509a9 and 10, T601, 15.173a24 and 26, and passim.)
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he unifies his mind. Being able to practice these things oneself and then teaching to others—this is called "extensive single-mindedness."\(^{245}\)

But while some of these sentiments would be quite at home in an Indian scripture, the basic structure of the passage, in which *dhyāna* is translated as *śītām* — "heart"\(^{246}\) which is then broken down into its component parts of *śī* — (used as a verb) and *tām* — (used as a noun), only works in Chinese. It would be impossible, in other words, to come up with the above explanations by analyzing the word *dhyāna* (or *jhāna*) in Sanskrit or Pāli.

Viewed in light of this passage, we can now see that the *Cheng Ching yuanying jing* contains other unexpected elements as well. At the beginning of the sūtra, for example, the Buddha instructs Ānanda to summon four groups: bodhissattvas (*mīngshī* 明士), the *bhikkhu-samgha* (*chén* 釋門), arhats (*sū* 習者), and stream-enterers (*mì* 彼等). But such a grouping is unattested, to the best of my knowledge, in any Indian Buddhist text. Equally unusual is the list of those who actually appear in response to Ānanda's invitation: in the aforementioned *bhikkhu-samgha*, arhats, and stream-enterers, followed by the *bhikkhu-samgha* (*ciān* 侶 in Chinese), bodhissattvas (*mīngshī* 明士), and finally the "literati who practice the precepts while living at home" (*wēn* 修 *zì* 等). This strange assortment of audience members is difficult to map onto any list of audience members normally found in Mahāyāna texts; instead, it gives us an impression that the author was transplanting a variety of categories found in other translated Buddhist texts, but without any clear sense of their Indian antecedents.

The opening *niāna* contains several other anomalous features as well, the first being the statement that the Buddha straightened his robe (robe) before speaking to Ānanda. References to "straightening one's robe" (more commonly written 襟衣式) are legion in Buddhist scriptures, but something seems to have gone wrong here, for to arrange one's garment before speaking to another person is, according to Indian concepts of conduct, a gesture of respect. Thus it is the person of inferior status (e.g., a disciple or a visitor) and not the superior (the Buddha himself) who is portrayed in śītra literature as making this gesture before initiating a conversation. The Buddha does, to be sure, occasionally straighten his own robe as well, but this is virtually always part of a standard trope describing his preparations to go into town for abhit ("straightened his robe, took up his bowl," etc.).\(^{247}\)

In short, the statement that the Buddha took care to arrange his robe before speaking to Ānanda seems to violate Indian norms of social interaction, and again it

---

245 TD30, 15.4510-4.8, 11-13: 頃聚屬皆盡一心心入三十七法道心心...雪息入雜染六根

246 The term *śītām* as a translation for *dhyāna* was apparently introduced by An Naosh and Yan Fung (see TD32, 22-218b), though it also appears in this sense in a number of ordinary (problematic or revised) texts attributed to Lokakhema.

247 The exception 1 exception has been able to find scriptures translated during the Three Kingdoms period or before is in Zhu Qian's *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*, but here the Buddha has just emerged from bathing in the river (see T6, 1.184a47).
points to the possibility of haphazard borrowing of language found in other sūtras without an understanding of the Indian cultural background.

The fact that the Buddha instructs Ananda to summon the above-mentioned groups early in the morning is also unexpected, for this is the time of day when members of the monastic community would normally go into town for alms. Given that members of the Buddhist saṅgha were not allowed to eat after noon, if the Buddha were to call a meeting at such an early hour at least some of those in attendance would miss their sole meal of the day! 236

The introduction to the sūtra continues to alternate between the strange and the familiar, as when the most exalted among the various beings who come from other world-systems to join the audience is on seats that spontaneously appear in the sky, while the less-developed participants—"those with fleshly bodies who have not yet developed the four bases of paranormal power (cāḍhīpadas, 非神通)—sit on couches (fā)" instead. While for advanced bodhisattvas to hover in the sky is a common trope in Mahāyāna sūtras, the idea that lower-ranking members of the audience would be seated on couches in the Buddha's presence seems extremely odd.

The various anomalies described above, in sum, point to the possibility that the Chenu guangming jing is not a translation of an Indian text at all, but an apocryphal scripture produced in China. Indeed, it may well be that the reason this text "reads like a Chinese essay," as Zurcher puts it, is that it is a Chinese essay, an indigenous composition combining bits and pieces of Buddhist lore with ideas and terminology from other sources. While this suggestion is only provisional, additional research is clearly needed before this text can be included with confidence in a discussion of Han-period translations.

A Mahāyāna sūtra (?)

As noted above, the attribution of the Chenu guangming jing to the Han-period translator Zhi Yao is problematic. It is included here with the understanding that further work is needed to determine both its date and whether it is actually a genuine translation.

T630. Chenu guangming dingzi jing (妙見光明定道經)

Problematic texts: a methodological afterword

In light of the various anomalies discussed above, it may now be worth considering the bizarre vocabulary found in "Zhi Yao's" text from another angle. If we consider the possibility that the text might be an apocryphon, we can then look for antecedents of his vocabulary in other Buddhist scriptures. And when we do so, it becomes apparent that a number of its unusual terms might be viewed as adaptations of, or plays on, terminology introduced by earlier translators. The term shù 順, apparently intended to mean

236 Śūraṇgūpa's fears concerning precisely such a situation are among the items parodied in the Vinavadīnīmāndūra; see chapter 10 of Kumārajīva's version (T475).
"monk," bears some resemblance to the word chijn 聰 from "one who gets rid of hunger" used for bhikṣu by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao. The word gér 者 for "one," in turn, might now be seen as a secondary derivative of cha's 彼岸. The term lā zhe 聳者 might be seen as a modification of An Shigao's dachī 達識 "tracks of the Way" for rūpaṃpatiṇa "stream-enterer," an expression also used in the same sense in (for example) a number of translations by Zhi Qian. Mingshi 明士 "bodhiśattva" seems to echo both katti 門士 (var. 門士) "opener, revealer," used for "bodhiśattva" by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao, and mingzhe 明哲 "wise one," used for puṇya by the same translators. Even the long-mysterious presence of the name Guanyin 觀音—a rendition that otherwise appears for the first time in the fifth century, as an abbreviation of the translation Gaumihya 觀自在 introduced by Kumārajīva—might at last find an explanation, not as the antecedent of Kunstraivva's later usage but as an unrelated variation on An Xuan and Yan Fotiao's Kṣitigarbha 金剛薩.119

The Fa jing jing 詩經, a text which was still being avidly used (and, as we have seen, receiving high praise) in Dasan's time, thus may have been a particularly rich source of inspiration for the author of the Chengiu guanyin jing. But there are other possibilities as well. A number of non-technical expressions used in T630 are otherwise seen for the first time only in texts produced in the late third or early fourth century CE, which suggests that its composer may have been able to make refer to translations dating from this period as well. A few suggestive similarities in vocabulary and content suggest that particularly good candidates for future investigation may be Mokula's Larger Prajñāpāramitā (Fangguang kuanmu jing 放光明般若論, T291), Zhi Qian's Vimalakīrti-sūtra (Wieimokie suibou jing 惠輪記所說經, T474), and a number of the translations produced by Dharmarāja.

Finally, we may briefly consider the status of the supposed Han-period translator Zhi Yao himself. With so little information concerning this figure it is difficult to determine whether he actually existed at all. But if he did, it is possible that a scripture entitled Chengiu guanyin jing was indeed produced during the 2 Han period but was lost, with its title alone being appropriated by the composer of the text as we have it. But this is only a theoretical possibility. Given the evidence discussed above concerning citations from, and a fragment of a commentary on, the sūtra—all of which correspond to the text as we have it—it seems probable that the Chengiu guanyin jing cataloged by Dasan, and which he

119 Kumārajīva's own translation of the name of Avalokiteśvara (at that time still in a Middle Indic form such as Avalokitasuva or Avalokiteśvara) in Gaumihya is clearly based both on his Indic-language sources and on the earlier translation coined by Dharmarāja, Gaumihya 金剛悉 (based on an understanding of the name as "bhiṣṭa-bha-raṁ "light-body-sound"). The character sūtra ["sutra" in Kumārajīva's version is clearly redundant, indicating that he had a variant Indic-language original (which would have had to read something like "bhikṣa-bha-raṁ in order to yield his Chinese translation), but rather the broad acceptance at the time of Dharmarāja's earlier form. For further details on these and other names of Avalokiteśvara in early Chinese sources see Kasaoka 1999a and N. Pastori 2007a.
recited as a young monk, was the text that appears in the canon as T630 today. If the text is indeed apocryphal, the composer did his work well, for it does not seem to have aroused Daoan’s suspicions.

**Lost Texts**

The Gāṇarāja chāna credits Zhi Yao with other translations as well, only one of which—the Xiao běng [ingly 小本起經, presumably a biography of the Buddha—is named.\(^{110}\) No such work by Zhi Yao is mentioned by Sengyou, however, and it is unclear whether the attribution is correct. In any event, no text by this title can be found in modern editions of the canon, so if such a work was circulating in Jiǔjiāo’s time, it may now be registered here as lost.

---

**SCHOLARLY RESOURCES**

I am not aware of any studies devoted to the vocabulary and style of the Chengiu guangming jing aside from the few comments made in Zonche 1991, and hardly any of its unusual terms appear in standard dictionaries. Indian equivalents and explanations of many of its terms are suggested in the annotations to the Japanese yomukudashi version published by Izumi Hōkei 東平居 (2000). Virtually everything about this unusual text still remains to be investigated.

**Kang Mengxiang 康孟祥**

**Biography**

The last of the Han-period translators registered in Sengyou’s catalogue is Kang Mengxiang, and once again little about him is known. He was apparently born in China of Sogdian parentage, though his precise ethnicity is contested by some.\(^{220}\) The biographical note given in the Chu sanzang ji ji, appended to the note on Yan Fotiao (which in turn is an appendix to the biography of An Xuan), is extremely brief, noting only that Kang Mengxiang’s forebears were from Kangjin 康珍 and attributing to him the translation of a text entitled Zhong běng [ingly 中本起經 “Middle-length Scripture on Former Events.”\(^{221}\) In the catalogue section Sengyou specifies that this translation was carried out

---

220 See T2979, 10.324v-9; 裏譯成其言小本起經.

221 At issue is the location of his ancestral place of Kangjin, which some Central Asians insist should be identified not with Sogdiana but with an area further to the East in the territory of Fergana. For a discussion of the relations of Sogdiana with East Asia see Nymark 2001, especially pp. 65-66.

during the Jian'an 晉安 period of the reign of Emperor Xian 晉惠帝 (r. 190-220 CE). Neither passage makes any mention of his working with any foreign monks or other assistants, nor does Sengyou give any information concerning his degree of facility in foreign languages. He does include, however, a highly complimentary assessment of Kang Mengziang's work by Daoan, who praises its literary elegance. The Gaueng zhuan adds no further biographical detail, though (as discussed below under "Authentic texts") it describes Kang Mengziang as working with an Indian associate and credits him with the translation of one additional text.

Contents of his corpus

The only extant works generally attributed to Kang Mengziang by specialists are two collections of tales of the Buddha's former and final lives, which are treated as separate texts in the Taishō edition of the canons. Though these are not generally classified as Mahāyāna scriptures, they contain certain elements—such as references to the ten bhūmīs (T184 3.463a23) and the six pāramitās (T184, 403a22; T196, 4.147c13, etc.)—that suggest they were composed (or at least transmitted) in communities that were familiar with certain Mahāyāna ideas. As we shall see, it seems likely that at least one of these texts has undergone revision by a later hand. This does not, however, alter the basic profile of Kang Mengziang's work, which is limited to the genre of biographies of the Buddha.

Translation style

Zürcher describes Kang Mengziang's work in glowing terms as representing the peak of Han Buddhist translations. "From a literary point of view," he writes, they are "the most sophisticated products of Han Buddhism" (1991, p. 284). Among the stylistic features to which he draws particular attention are the frequent use of anayān elements, abundant Chinese-style parallelisms, very regular prosodic pattern, and the skilled use of unrhymed verse of varying lengths (ibid. cit.). Indeed, if we bracket the translation attributed to Zhi Yao—which status as a Han-period translation, as discussed above, is uncertain at best—Kang Mengziang appears to have been the first to use versified passages of any kind in Chinese Buddhist translations. All of the verses in T196 are in five-character format; T184...

---

121 For Sengyou's biographical note on Kang Mengziang see T2145, 5.96a20-22; for his catalogue entry see 6.7-9.
122 T2145, 5.96a21-22: 安公云：‘或云出興安國郡’ 足雞立矣。'
123 For Haijiao's treatment of Kang Mengziang see T2059, 50.32a7-14.
124 Zürcher may also have been influenced by the opinion of Daoan (cited above, n. 254); the same wording is found in the Gaueng zhuan, 50.32a6-13.
125 Lokakṣema's Rasabja samājī jing (T148) would be an exception if the verses in this anomalous text were produced by Lokakṣema himself, but there is solid evidence that they were added after his...
however, contains a greater variety of styles, including one passage in seven-character format (which is quite common in Buddhist translations dating from the mid-third century and after) and another in a highly unusual nine-character meter.\(^{29}\) The passage in seven-character verse seems likely, however, to be the result of revision at a later date, and it would be safer not to assume that this style was already in use during the Han period.

**AUTHENTIC TEXTS**

The catalogue section of the *Chu shuo* xi ji lists just one translation by Kang Mengxiang: the *Zhong hou ji* 中本校勘, for which the variant title *T'ai Tzu zhong hou ji* 太子中候記 is also given. Sengyou concludes this entry with the following comment:

The above text, [comparing] two fascicles in a, was translated by Kang Mengxiang during the Jia'an 疆安 period [196-220 CE] of Emperor Xian 殷帝 of the Han 漢 [dynasty].\(^{19}\)

In a of the cases discussed above Zürcher has applied quite stringent criteria for determining translator attributions, accepting only those texts registered in *Chu shuo* xi ji and, of these, rejecting any that are labeled by Sengyou as having been drawn from a source other than Daoan. In this case, however, he accepts an additional work not credited to Kang Mengxiang by Sengyou, the *Xiuang hou ji* 修行中候記, as being a genuine attribution as well. Thus of the four texts attributed to this translator in the Taishō canon, Zürcher (1991)—like most other scholars—accepts the following two titles as authentic:

- T194: *Xiuang hou ji* 修行中候記
- T196: *Zhong hou ji* 中本校勘

Zürcher offers several reasons in support of this assessment. First of all, though they *now* appear as separate texts, T184 and T196 comprise a continuous narrative (Zürcher 1991, p. 290); indeed, the last paragraph of T184 is repeated verbatim at the beginning of T194 (p. 296, b, 20). Moreover, another biography of the Buddha, the *Tai Tzu ruiyou hou ji* 太子瑞應中候記 (T185), which is solidly attributed to Zhi Qian (early 3rd century CE), contains a revised version of the contents of both T184 and T196, from which Zürcher apparently infers that Zhi Qian knew of the two as composing a single text (*loc. cit.*). Zürcher also gives weight to the fact that T184 contains glosses introduced by the words *Han yu* 漢云 "In the Han language," which he argues should indicate a date prior to 220 CE. Finally, he points to the fact that the *Xiuang hou ji* is credited to Kang Mengxiang in the *Ganweng zuan* (lo. *cit.*). In sum, although the *Xiuang hou ji* is not credited to Kang Mengxiang by Sengyou (much less by Daoan), in Zürcher’s view “the authenticity of the text as a late Han translation is beyond all doubt” (*loc. cit.*).

---

29 Seven-character verse occurs at 3.47a-b, the passage in nine-character verse is at 3.46b-c-469a.

20 T2145, 55.6c8-9. 石一民、凡亮、張鷗編譯中唐敦煌寫卷.
As we shall see, however, both external and internal evidence complicate this picture. Whatever the original relationship between these two scriptures might have been—and it is not at all impossible that a single translation corresponding to the content of both might have been produced by Kang Mengziang—in the form in which we have them it is clear that these two texts have had quite separate histories.

Methodological preliminaries (1): external evidence

As we have seen, Sengyou’s catalogue attributes only a single translation to Kang Mengziang, whose title, the Zhong benzi jing, corresponds to that of TI96.240 This same text is also the sole translation assigned to him in Sengyou’s brief biographical notice. No colophon or preface devoted to this scripture has survived, but the agreement between these two sections of the Chu sansang ji ji suggests that we can be fairly confident that this text—and this text alone—was considered by Daoan to be Kang Mengziang’s work.

Daoan also knew of a scripture entitled Xiangzi benzi jing, but in his catalogue (as reproduced by Sengyou) it is registered in a completely different place. Instead of being credited to Kang Mengziang—or indeed, to any other known translation—it appears as the first entry in the portion of his catalogue devoted to scriptures whose translators’ names were unknown (55.16c18).

In the Gaotong zhuan, however—as Zürcher has pointed out—Kang Mengziang is also credited with the translation of the Xiangzi benzi jing, a title corresponding to that of TI84.241 This divergence from Sengyou’s account is unexpected, for Huijiao usually follows Sengyou quite closely, often reproducing his descriptions word-for-word. And the divergence is quite substantial, for Huijiao provides a significant amount of detail, portraying Kang Mengziang as collaborating (on both the Zhong benzi jing and the Xiangzi benzi jing) with an associate named Zhu Dali 児大刀, using texts that had been brought from Kapilavastu by a bhikṣu named Tangnu 唐努 (c. Dharmapala). Neither of these two additional figures seems to have been known to Daoan; their names do not appear, at any rate, anywhere in the Chu sansang ji ji.

Zürcher’s suggests that Huijiao must have drawn this information from an early colophon (1951, p. 296, n. 20), which seems quite reasonable at first glance. But a review of the treatment of the Xiangzi benzi jing in subsequent catalogues presents an extraordinarily complicated picture. For despite the prominence of the Gaotong zhuan, subsequent bibliographers do not follow suit. Instead, with just one exception, in subsequent catalogues produced prior to the Da Tang meishu lu 大唐書經錄 (T2149, compiled by Daoxuan 道宣 in 664 CE) Kang Mengziang is not mentioned in this regard, and this scripture is credited to Tangnu and Zhu Dali alone. That exception is the problematic Lidai sanhao ji 歷代三寶紀

240 See 55.6c7-9 and 96a30-21. A variant title 太子中本經 is given as well (6c7).
241 See T2059, 50.32r10-11.
(T204), which reports that the Xiaoxing benji jing was translated by Zhu Dali and Kang Mengxiang, based on a manuscript brought from Kapilavastu by Kang Mengxiang (in2) and Tanguo.262 The waters are muddled still further by the fact that in a number of catalogues the title Xiaoxing benji jing is said to be an alternate name for the Xiao benji jing 小本記經, a scripture which is treated as anonymous by Sengyou,263 but beginning with the Zongming jing wu ching ju lu compiled by Fajing 逢經 et al. (594 CE) is credited to the elusive Zhi Yao.264

Ordinarily it might be reasonable to assume that subsequent catalogues drew their assignments of the Xiaoxing benji jing to Kang Mengxiang from Huijiao’s account. But the bare facts of these attributions suggest that we should be cautious in this regard. For Daoyuan’s Da Tang widiona lu is known to have been the portal through which many of Fei Changfang’s (Directly and overwhelmingly false) new attributions entered the mainstream of Chinese Buddhist bibliography. The fact that a number of catalogues published after Huijiao’s time, but prior to Daoyuan’s work, fail to follow him in assigning the Xiaoxing benji jing to Kang Mengxiang points to the possibility that our initial impression that Fei Changfang drew this information from the Gaoseng zhuan might be false. On the contrary, there is a real possibility that this attribution was interpolated into Huijiao’s work from the Liqai sanxue ji.265 Although this suggestion must remain speculative pending further research, what is beyond doubt is that the attribution of the Xiaoxing benji jing postdates both Daoyuan and Sengyou.

Returning now to Daoyuan’s entry for this title, we find that he does not merely register it as anonymous, but provides specific information concerning its provenance: "[This text] recently appeared in the South; it is actually an amplification (或) of the Xiao

---

262 T2014, 49.54a13-16.
263 T2145, 55.32a28.
264 T2146, 55.12b41.
265 Interestingly, Fei Changfang cites the Gaoseng zhuan as one of his entries concerning the Xiaoxing benji jing (T2014, 49.54a4), which he does very rarely (only seven times in all, by my count, in the whole of his catalogue). But it may be significant that virtually all of these citations are used to bolster extremely shaky attributions. The first one, for example, quotes the following statements concerning An Shigao: 高僧傳云：安息國僧伽於二安房國客居。凡二十餘載，盡講真言經一百七十部及一百八十六卷 (49.32a23). But the Gaoseng zhuan says no such thing; rather than attributing one hundred seventy-four years to An Shigao, it states merely that he translated more than thirty works (T2009, 49.12a120b ten thirty-three works). Likewise Fei quotes the Gaoseng zhuan as crediting An "Old Faithfulman" as well as five other works to Yan Fotuo. 高僧傳云：古僧傳是等六部合十卷。法師等譯號於中流七之 (49.34a7), trot again, no such statement can be found in Huijiao’s work. Similarly, Fei cites China that the Gaoseng zhuan attributes the Yangting benji jing 尋經本記經 and four other works, totaling eighty fascicules in all, to Kang Mengxiang. 高僧傳云：懷威本記經等五部合八卷。法師等計訖。 But this claim is also patently false, for no text by this title is mentioned in Huijiao’s work. In sum, rather than supporting his claim, Fei’s citations from the Gaoseng zhuan—all of which appear to contain false information—should raise red flag in the minds of researchers.

---
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Methodological preliminaries (2): internal evidence

The fact that T185 is solidly attributed to Zhi Qian, while T184 is assigned in certain medieval catalogues to Kang Mengxiang (though far from unanimously, as shown above), has led many scholars to draw the obvious conclusion that Zhi Qian must have made use of T184, i.e., the Xiaoxing benqi jing, in the preparation of his own Taiji ruixing benqi jing (T185). And indeed, a quick comparison of the two texts shows that there are numerous passages in which T184 and T185 match word for word. The same is true of T185 and the first part of T196, and thus it might seem obvious that Zhi Qian’s work is a revision of both of these texts, which accordingly must date from prior to his time.

As KOBAYA Satoshi 间野佑士 has shown (1991), however, the situation is not quite so simple, for there are also many passages in T184 that are more extensive, and more elegant (including portions in verse where T185 is entirely in prose), than what we find in the corresponding passages of Zhi Qian’s text. In still other cases, entire segments of T184 have no counterpart in T185 at all.

This is not at all what we are accustomed to seeing in other cases where it is clear that Zhi Qian revised translations by others. On the contrary, the typical pattern—as seen, for example, in his revision of Lokaksema’s Dausung jing 勝進經 (T224) as the Da mingda jing 大明大經 (T225)—is that Zhi Qian adheres quite closely to both the content and much of the wording of the older version, while “upgrading” some of its Buddhist terminology and recasting it in a more polished and elegant style. There is no known case in which Zhi Qian replaces passages of an older version with prose; on the contrary, the use of a wide variety of metric forms is one of the hallmarks of Zhi Qian’s style. Indeed, the presence of verses is one of the features that differentiates his revised version of the Larger Sukhāvativatā (T361, the Pingdengjue jing 平等覺経) from the more archaic version that is now widely considered to be the product of Lokaksema’s school (T362, the Da amituo jing 大阿彌陀經).

In sum, while the Taiji ruixing benqi jing and the Zhong benqi jing clearly share a great deal of common material, it is impossible to explain the content and style of the former as the result of a revision by Zhi Qian of the Zhong benqi jing as we know it today.

See 55.16c18: 安公云云，“欲万长出，直复小本起耳。”

20 T2185, 55.31h28.
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Thus we are left in the confusing situation of having two Buddha-biographies that are obviously related to one another, but the nature of that relationship is not at all clear.

A way out of this dilemma has been proposed by Kawano, who is one of the few scholars working on this topic who has paid close attention to Daoan's remarks concerning the provenience of the Xianxing henqi jing. Based on a detailed comparative analysis of the content of T184 and T185, Kawano probes an eminently reasonable hypothesis: that the received text of the Xianxing henqi jing (i.e., T184) is precisely what Daoan said it was: a revised and expanded version of an older Xia henqi jing. More specifically, bearing in mind Daoan's remark that the text had "appeared recently" (近出), Kawano proposes that the present text of the Xianxing henqi jing is a revision of an Eastern Jin period (317-420) version of the Xia henqi jing (Kawano 1991, p. 165). The Tachiu rogyi buo jing—whose status as a genuine Wu-period product Kawano finds no reason to question—thus cannot have drawn on the Xianxing henqi jing as we have it, for Zhi Qian's version is actually older than the latter text. Instead, in addition to material now found in the first portion of Kang Mengxiang's Zhong henqi jing, Zhi Qian appears to have drawn on an older (now lost) Xia henqi jing.149

Even a brief glance at the vocabulary used in T184 and T196 confirms Kawano's contention that these two texts as we have them cannot be products of the same hand. While both of them contain verses, the formula generally used to introduce them in T184 is 憑外言, which occurs fifteen times in T184 but never in T196; in the latter, by contrast, the standard formula is (他)他作應, which occurs sixteen times here but only once in T184. The verb “是”say” occurs no fewer than 126 times in T184, while its appearances have been reduced to only twenty-six in the whole of T184. The translation of bhagavat as zhangyu 指喻 “mass of blessings” occurs six times in T196, but never in T184; conversely, the translation of Skylanami as ngegus 布德 “capable of benefiting” occurs five times in T184, but never in T196. Finally, the distinctive renderings of dharmas as jingfa 見法 and dasfa 达法, which are characteristic features of T196 (occurring six and four times, respectively), are never found—with the exception of one occurrence of dasfa in the context of the ten epithets of the Buddha, where it was surely a "frozen form" (i.e., a fixed formulaic expression)—in the whole of T184.

Thus while it may be that Zucher is correct in viewing T184 and T196 as ultimately stemming from a single narrative tradition, it now seems quite clear that these two scriptures are products of different milieus. While the Zhong henqi jing can still be accepted as a translation produced by Kang Mengxiang, the present text of the Xianxing henqi jing appears to be the product of a different time and place. If Kawano's reasoning is correct, it may be significantly younger, produced a century or more after his time.

149 This is in addition to the material found in the first part of T196, which also has parallels in Zhi Qian's T185. The latter part of T196 has no parallel in T184; in fact, it appears that the text breaks off sharply.
A Biography of the Buddha

In light of the recent studies discussed above, the one text that can confidently be ascribed to Kang Mengxiang at present is the following:

T196: Zhang menqi jing

Here, however, there is a distinct possibility that the text may have been revised after Kang Mengxiang’s time. Ongoing research on this and other early biographies of the Buddha will surely be able to further clarify the situation in the future.

PROBLEMATIC OR REVISED TEXTS

As discussed above, the other text commonly attributed to Kang Mengxiang now appears to be of a significantly later date:

T184: Xiqing menqi jing

Accordingly, it should now be removed from the list of genuine Han-period translations, though it will remain an integral part of any study of the evolution of the biography of the Buddha in China.

SCHOLARLY RESOURCES

No systematic study has yet been made of the vocabulary of the Zhang menqi jing. For the Sanskrit or Prakrit equivalents of some of the transcriptions found in both T196 and T184, together with reconstructions of their Han-period pronunciations, see Coblin 1983, pp. 253–256. A complete Dutch translation of T184 and T196 (treated as portions of a single text) has been published by Zächcher (1978).

For the Xiqing menqi jing an essential resource is now the detailed study in Kawano 2007; see also Kawano 1991 for a discussion of his initial proposal concerning the relationship of T184 to T185.

Other Han-period translations

Finally, a text that is generally attributed to Zhi Qian has recently been re-examined, and in light of this new analysis it is clear that the language of the text is not that of Zhi Qian. In this case, however, the likelihood is that the scripture is older, rather than younger, than traditional catalogues suggest, and indeed that it is a Han-period translation:

T708: Lianshen shengpi jing

As Zucchetti has pointed out, though the attribution of this text to Zhi Qian appears already in Songyao’s catalogue (T2145, 55.7a15), there is good reason to doubt its reliability. Both in the biographical section of Songyao’s catalogue and in the preface to the text composed by Daoan, Zhi Qian is referred to not as the translator of the Lianshen shengpi jing but as the author of a commentary on it (see T2145, 55.97c13 and 45b20–22, respectively). Indeed, Daoan explicitly refers to the scripture itself as having arrived in China at the end
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of the Han period (55.45b20). It should also be noted that a "separately translated" text by
the same title and of the same length (see fascicle) is included in Daoan's list of "anonymous
scriptures" (55.18b4); thus Daoan seems to have been familiar with two different translations
of this text.

In sum, the evidence preserved in these sources, in combination with the obviously
archaic language of the text, would seem to indicate that the scripture now preserved as
T708 was already in circulation, prior to the time of Zhi Qian. It seems very probable that
it was produced toward the end of the Han period, and in future studies it may be
examined with profit in comparison with other works of this date.209

209 For a detailed discussion of these and other issues concerning this text see Zucchetti 2004a,
pp. 210-212.
Part III

Translations Produced During the Three Kingdoms Period
1. THE WU 烏 KINGDOM (c. 210–280 CE)

Wei晋 with

BIography

The Indian monk Wei晋an, whose name is generally (but surely wrongly) reconstructed as "Vijka,"
1 is often considered to be the first translator active in the Wu kingdom. His
name is not mentioned in the biographical section of the Cha qingzang ji ji, and Sengyu
includes Wei晋an among those translators for whom he had supplemented the information
provided in Daonai catalogue with additional material from other sources (55.10+5). In
the catalogue section, however, Sengyu provides a bit of detail, reporting that Wei晋an

1 The correspondence between the name Wei晋an and its supposed Indian antecedent "Vijka
"obstacle" is problematic at best. The initial character 貓 (EMC 麥, ONWC "mi") is widely used as a
transcription for Indic mi or si, but the use of the final character 男 (EMC nan, ONWC "nom") to
transcribe an Indic-language na would be completely unsupportable. On the contrary, other characters
(namely na (EMC, ONWC) were regularly used for this purpose, while 貓 is frequently appears as the counterpart of
$san$ (EMC, ONWC) e.g., 贍 (EMC nan, ONWC "nom"), also pronounced 貍 (EMC nan, ONWC "nom") has a wide range of Indic counterparts, including $ji$ (in
peaceful 聖) e.g., 貍 (on average 聖, in 聖) (on average 聖, in 聖), and 贍 (on average 聖, in 聖), presumably from a Prakrit form of $rajya$.
It would be completely unsupportable, however, for 貍 (or for that matter, any Chinese character) to be used solely to represent a *non-syllabic* e.g., which is
non-syllabic, that is, which is not followed by a vowel. In short, to derive the Indian name "Vijka"
from Wei晋an would be extremely difficult. Bearing in mind that in many second- and third-century
transcriptions abbreviation is not the exception but the rule, with entire syllables sometimes being
omitted in the process (as in many of the examples given above), a more plausible equivalent might be
something like *Vijka* (with 輔, 輔, and 輔, of above for the use of the same character as a
transcription of $Vijka$). If this is correct the name should be read Wei晋an rather than Wei晋an;
since this is only a provisional suggestion, however, I have retained the traditional reading for the time
being.

The interpretation of Wei晋an as a transcription of "Vijka" appears to be based on Fei
Changqing's Liaozheng jishu ji, where the name Wei晋an is said to mean 聖 zhang'ei 男 "obstacle" (73034,
49.57x+5). The equation of this transliterated name with Sanskrit vijka (which does indeed mean
"obstacle") goes back at least to the work of Sylvain Levi, who presented this equivalence without
comment in his study of the Faja jing (Levi 1932, 203); subsequently it has appeared in standard
reference works (e.g., Mochizuki 1932-36, vol. 1, p. 108b, s.v. fitmno) and is widely repeated in
secondary sources. But the phonological problems discussed above, as well as the rather inauspicious
sound of the name, raise serious questions about the validity of this equivalence. For more likely, in my
view, is a scenario in which a Chinese bibliographer pronounced the name Wei晋an for a native
informant (i.e., an immigrant from India) and asked him what it might mean. Not wishing to disappoint
his host—and, of course, having no knowledge whatsoever of Chinese historical phonology—such an
informant might well have come up with the personified "Vijka." For another possible case of such an
after-the-fact etymology see the discussion of the name Tsanmojišu 蘭摩窟什 (var. Tsanomjišu 蘭摩窟什), reconstructed (again wrongly, I suspect) as "Dharanikala," below (p. 199, n. 135).
had arrived in the Wu kingdom in the third year of the Huangwu (黄戃) period (= 224 CE), bringing with him a manuscript of the Dharmapada (経10-13).

The Gaoseng zhidao, by contrast, provides a long and detailed account of Wei Qinian's background and early life, thus diverging significantly from the standard pattern in which the Gaoseng zhidao follows the Chu sanzang ji ji very closely. From this it is clear that Huijie was working from another source. Though its reliability should be subject to normal standards of scrutiny, it has a ring of truth, for (interpersed with the usual adulatory biographic details) he offers the unexpected statements that Wei Qinian came from a family of fire-worshippers' and that he himself was converted to Buddhism as the result of an encounter with a monk who was engaged in the study both of the "Hinayana" (小乘教) and of Buddhist spells (or "arcane arts," daoju 道術). Such an account seems unlikely to have been manufactured in China, and thus initially at least—pending confirmation from another source—it deserves to be considered seriously.

AUTHENTIC TEXTS

Even a quick look at Sengou's catalogue entry, however, reveals that he does not actually credit Wei Qinian with any translations at all. Following the initial entry for the Fajing 法印 (Dharmapada) in his catalogue section, Sengou provides the following details:

As to the above text, consisting of two fascicules in all, during the time of Emperor Wen 文宣 of the Wei, in the third year of the Huangwu (黄戃) period [= 224 CE] of the Wu king Sun Quan 孫權 [r. 222-252], the Indian triumans Wei Qinian brought the foreign text (刊本). [In] Wuchang 武昌 Jiangyan 譯災 and Zhi Qian 資千 translated it.1

In other words, while Wei Qinian is credited with having brought the manuscript from India, it is not he but two others—Jiangyan and Zhi Qian—who are said to have produced the actual translation.

A comparison of this information with the contents of a preface to the Fajing 心经 found in the Chu sanzang ji ji is instructive. Though the preface is anonymous, it has

1 See T2603, 30.326b14-28.

Huijie's wording is 世尊佛言, which means, "For generations [his] family had accepted a non-Buddhist religion, holding the worship of fire to be the correct way." Zürcher interprets this to mean that Wei Qinian "came from a Brahmin family" (1979, p. 47), but note of the common words for brahmana are used here, and in the period with which we are concerned the possibility that his family participated in an Indian tradition of fire-worship such as that espoused by the Kothanes should not be excluded.

2 T2145, 55.ac11-13: "有一部，凡二卷，魏文宣時梵竺沙門僧基譯以褥基業寄武三卷屬結歸。"
been considered by a number of eminent scholars to be the work of Zhi Qian, and there seems to be no good reason to doubt this interpretation. The portion of the preface concerning Weiqian reads as follows:

First of all, Weiqian left India and arrived in Wuchang in the third year of the Huangwu era [= 224 CE]. From him I received a five-hundred verse version of this [scripture]. [I] requested his travel-companion, Jiangyan 蒋炎, to translate it.

The author then reports that Jiangyan, while quite competent at handling the Indic-language text, was not yet good at Chinese, and so the result was lacking in elegance (其譯可稱), The preface also makes it clear that its author did not leave the text as he found it, for the he rewrote explicitly to make inquiries of Zhu Jiangyan on points that were unclear, and—on a larger scale—adding to the text thirteen additional chapters that were obtained from another source. The Fajing king is thus a composite product, including materials brought by Weiqian and translated in preliminary fashion by Zhu Jiangyan, together with a significant amount of material supplied (presumably by Zhi Qian) from another source.

Thus although a translation of this text (T210, Fajing 神咒) is attributed to “Weiqian and others” in the Tainhö canon, this is based on information given in later catalogues and does not square with the account given in the Chu sanzangji 吳。According to Sengou, the actual translation work was done by Weiqian’s fellow Indian monk Zhu Jiangyan 趙顔炎, who produced a rough Chinese-language version which was polished and set down in writing by Zhi Qian. In sum, though Weiqian performed the vital role of bringing the manuscript to Wuchang, there is no basis for crediting him with the translation itself, and Zhu Jiangyan’s rough translation has not survived as an independent text. Accordingly, this translation will be discussed below in the section on Zhi Qian.

---


7 The term that I have rendered as “travel companion” (同遊) could also be translated “co-religionist,” but the choice does not affect the overall sense of the passage.

8 T2145. 55.50a11-13: 萬氏善譯梵字, 未據義訓, 其所傳言或得於人, 或以義出者, 近於詭遇; 威約譯其餘十數。

9 The translation is first credited to “Weiqian and others” in Fajing’s Zhongqing ming list, compiled in 594 CE (T2146, 55.148b16); Weiqian alone is listed as the translator in Yangzong’s seventh-century Zhongqing ming (T2147, 55.180b7) and in some subsequent catalogues (e.g., T2148 55.218a).

10 For Sengou’s account see T2145, 55.6c10-13 (in the catalogue section) and 96b22-27 (in the biographies section).
Zhi Qian

**Biography**

With Zhi Qian we return to a situation comparable to that of An Shigyo, in which Sengyou provides copious biographical detail.10 The account of his life is the Gaeseng zhaan, by contrast, is considerably shorter, with a number of omissions and occasional differences in content.11 Other valuable information is provided by several prefaces to other scriptures which refer to Zhi Qian’s life and work. It is noteworthy that the sole preface devoted specifically to a translation produced (or rather, in this case, finalized) by Zhi Qian is thought to be the work of the translator himself.12

According to the Chu smaeng jji Zhi Qian was born in north China, the grandson (or perhaps, according to another source, the son) of an immigrant from the country of the Greater Yueh.13 He is also portrayed as a “grand-disciple” of Lokakshema, having studied with the latter’s student Zhi Liang in Luoyang. Sengyou describes him as a precocious youth who excelled in the study of languages, mastering “foreign writings” (外国字) as well as Chinese. Toward the end of the Han, as chaos spread throughout the north, Zhi Qian migrated with several dozens of his countrymen to the southern Wu kingdom, settling first at Wuchang and subsequently after 229 CE in Jianye 建業, where the ruler Sun Quan 當權 was so impressed with his abilities that he appointed him tutor to the crown prince.

Though it seems that Zhi Qian had already begun translating Buddhist texts while in Luoyang, the bulk of his translation activity was carried out in the south. Late in life he retired to the mountains, taking the five precepts and practicing as an upadaka in a

---

10 For Sengyou’s account see T2145, 55.973c-1c8. Portions of the biography are translated into English in *Takakusu*, pp. 145-146 and p. 370, notes 7 and 8.

11 In the Gaeseng zhaan—where, strictly speaking, a layman would not be expected to appear—Zhi Qian’s biography is inserted within the section on Kung Shengbu (879-889). For a French translation of Hsüan’s account see Shih 1966, pp. 21-23. Significant divergences from Sengyou’s account will be noted below.

12 See the preface by Zhi Minbu 竹敏符 to his own combined edition of the Vinsiritheva-grahatas (Hsiao Wen-hsiu sheng jien 蕭德賢修統). 55.5b21. For another example of the same book, see T2145, 55.971a6-7, and the preface by Hsiao to the Lingshan hongxi jing 佛說華嚴經 (55.45d-1c5). The preface to the Fuji jing 妙法蓮華經, 55.9c26-9c28, listed as anonymous by Sengyou, is now considered to have been composed by Zhi Qian (cf. above, pp. 114-115 and n. 6).

13 The note attributed to Zhi Minbu, however (which will be discussed in detail below), states that it was Zhi Qian’s father, rather than his grandfather, who immigrated to China (55.49a22), while Hsüan portrays Zhi Qian as having been an immigrant himself (58.32c-1c9). The latter scenario is hardly likely, given the high level of competence in literary Chinese that is evident in Zhi Qian’s translations.
monastic environment. When he died at the age of sixty (in 252 CE or shortly after), the current Wu ruler, Sun Liang 宋武, is said to have written a letter to the monastic community mourning his death.

**CONTENTS OF HIS CORPUS**

While An Shigao is known for his translations of *ajama* texts and scholastic (non-Mahāyāna) treatises, and Lokakṣema seems to have specialized exclusively in Mahāyāna scriptures, Zhi Qian’s corpus is unconstrained by these categories, including both Mahāyāna and non-Mahāyāna sūtras as well as didactic verses (texts corresponding to the Dharmapadda and the *Aṣṭasahasrika*, with additional material not found in the Pāli versions), *jātaka* and *avatāra*-style texts, and a biography of the Buddha. At least one writer has credited him with translating a tantric text as well, but this is based on a misclassification of the work in question. It has also been claimed that Zhi Qian produced a synoptic edition of three versions of an *ādhavata* text, but this too is mistaken, the result of the misattribution to Zhi Qian of a notice written long after his time.

13 There are differences of opinion concerning the date of certain events in Zhi Qian’s life; for details and further references see Palombo 2003, pp. 204-205, n. 108.

14 Zhi Qian’s translation of the *Vid羚Elyamogos vijnāna jīva* 婀梨摩訶衍經 (T1011) is described as a tantric text of the *ādiṣṭhata* category by Anthony B. (in Williams and Trich 2000, p. 271, n. 5), but this assertion reflects anachronistic frame of reference drawn from later Indian and Tibetan sources, and moreover it seems to have been made without actually consulting the content of the text itself. The work in question is actually a quite standard Mahāyāna sūtra, whose classification in the esoteric (i.e., tantric) sūtra section of the *Tanjō kanon* appears to be based solely on the presence of the word “esoteric” (and perhaps also the word “jīva”), which here refers to *jīva* (soul) in its title. (In the Tibetan canon, by contrast, its counterpart is included in the sutra section; see Peking/Osaka nos. 589 and 808.) Trich’s treatment of this text as a *ādiṣṭhata* tantra appears to be based on a list published earlier by Stephen Hodge (1994), who however must surely treat this text not as a tantra per se, but as a “sutra with tantric elements” (p. 74).

15 See T2145, 55.55c17-52a10. There is a long tradition of assigning this notice, and by extension the synoptic edition to which it refers, to Zhi Qian; see for example Tang 1998, p. 132 [= Tang 1981, p. 161]; Zürcher 1959, p. 352, n. 81; Lamotte 1998, p. 88, and Nakamura 1975, p. 82 and p. 83, n. 1. A close look at the context of the notice, however, quickly reveals that this attribution is impossible. It is true that, in the notice as we have it, the author is listed as Zhi Gongming 之共明, which is one of several names applied to Zhi Qian. But the fact that the notice refers not only to Zhi Qian’s own translation of this scripture (T1011, *Vid羚Elyamogos vijnāna jīva* 婀梨摩訶衍經) but also to two other translations produced well after his time—the *Chuangpeng vid羚Elyamogos chī jīng* 出生蓮華開經 (T1012) translated by Bodhidharma (599-629 CE) and the *Anamūnemāṇi-svāhā-pratīti jīvadhatu* (T1061) translated by Bodhidharma (fl. 525-539 CE), or even probably its similarly-titled predecessor (T1013) translated by Gunadhara (594-666)—makes it clear that this is a much later work. (Tang makes a heroic effort to align these titles with some lost anonymous sūtraes listed in the *Chu zangji ji ji*, but it is far more straightforward to simply correlate them with the *yulya* of these extant texts.) The notice also quotes from a note by a certain Tengli in which, if he is the same person who is referred to in the *Gongming zhuan* (50.34c5-58) —died in 518 CE. Tang’s suggestion that the text as we have it is corrupt may well be correct; my own suspicion, however, is that what we have here are some
In addition to Zhi Qian’s translation work—which of which, as discussed below, appear to have consisted of revisions of previously existing Chinese texts—Sengyou credits him with having composed linked verses in praise of the bodhisattva comprising three “Indian songs” (fǎnbū 梵詠). According to Sengyou, Zhi Qian had drawn the material for these songs (or perhaps better, “lyrics”) from the Waidangshou jìng 無量壽 願 (i.e., the Larger Sukhāvatīvyūha) and the Zhong kongjīng 中經記 (presumably the ancestor of T184), two texts which, as discussed below, were subsequently revised by Zhi Qian himself as T61 and T185, respectively. Unfortunately none of these hymns appear to be extant, but the Chinese canon contains one poem (in five-character verse) devoted to the praise of Amāśā and his world which reflects vocabulary otherwise found only in Zhi Qian’s version of the Larger Sukhāvatīvyūha (T361). It may well be that this anonymous text was composed by an author who was familiar not just with Zhi Qian’s translation of this scripture, but with his earlier fǎnbū as well.21

TRANSLATION STYLE

Zhi Qian is unique among the translators dealt with here in that a substantial number of his works are not original translations but revisions—produced with or without reference to an actual Indic-language text—of the work of others.22 Paradoxically this treason, and partly also due to personal preference, Zhi Qian’s work is characterized by a tremendous preliminary notes made by Sengyou himself which somehow found their way into the transmitted text of the Chu sanmōng jì ji in unplaced form.


21 It is interesting that Sengyou uses the title Waidangshou jìng 無量壽 願 here, since in his catalogue this name first appears as the title of a translation by Dhammarakṣa (744) produced several decades after Zhi Qian’s time. It may well be that at an early date this title was slowly interchangeable with amāśā jìng 具足功德, the title credited by Sengyou to Zhi Qian (T33.66c25).

22 See T373, Hua chu jìmōng ji jì 混出事略標記記. The title of the work (including the characters Hua chu 混出 “mixed later”) points to the existence of an earlier text of the same type, which may well have been one of those credited by Sengyou to Zhi Qian. For a recent study of this type, focusing on the rhyme pattern in its verses (which are cast in five-character form), see Saito 2005.

23 Among all the texts preserved in the Taishō canon, the (terrestrial) translation Shōwa shū 住世華 the “World-Abundance-King” of Lokottaravāsala is attested only in Zhi Qian’s Pingtongjīng jìng (T641) and in the Hua chu jìmōng ji jì (T373), thus making it clear that there must be some relationship between them. Another very distinctive term found in Zhi Qian’s Pingtongjīng jìng, however—the translation of the name of the Buddha Subhūti as Waidangshoujīng 無量壽願 in Sengyou’s “Larger Purification”22—does not find a match in the Hua chu jìmōng ji jì, for here the two characters are separated with the Buddha himself bearing the name Waidang, while his head is named Qīngjīng. Thus it seems unlikely that the hymns could have been composed by Zhi Qian himself (see Nanzō 2007a, pp. 384-385).

24 Zhi Qian’s activity as a reviewer of the works of others is discussed in a notice preserved in the Chu sanmōng jì ji which is generally credited to Zhi Mozu (T2145, 55.49a14-bf); on some possible problems with this attribution see below, p. 123, n. 34.
variety in vocabulary; his corpus contains, for example, at least eight different translations and transcriptions of the word "altar." This some of this diversity can be explained by Zhi Qian's retention in his revised translations of terms used in the earlier versions of these texts, but even within a single scripture (or a single section of a given scripture) we often find multiple Chinese renditions of a single Indic term. Thus it seems likely that this terminological multiplicity was not simply a side-effect of the revision process, but also reflects a predilection for variety on the part of Zhi Qian himself.

As discussed below, some of the scriptures solidly attributed to Zhi Qian in early sources bear a striking resemblance to the style of his teacher's teacher, Lokašāma, Assuming that these attributions are correct, it is possible that these date from an early period in his career. Most of his translations, however, exhibit notable departures from Lokašāma's work. One characteristic feature of what might be characterized as Zhi Qian's "mature style" is a strong preference for four-character prose—indeed, this could be deemed his default mode—supplemented by the liberal use of verse. It was long thought that all verses found in Buddhist translations were unrhymed, but in a series of important studies Sato Takahiro 佐藤隆雄 has recently demonstrated convincingly that this is not the case with Zhi Qian. Though many examples of unrhymed verse can indeed be found in his corpus, in other cases it is clear that Zhi Qian was not only employing the use of meter, but of patterns of rhyme as well. The majority of the verse passages in Zhi Qian's corpus are pentasyllabic, though he also makes extensive use of an unusual six-character style which appears for the first time (in translations which can be dated with confidence) in his work. Several tantalizing
references in later sources suggest a possible connection between these six-character verses and the genre of "Indian-style" songs (fanhai 花海) mentioned above, a form of verse with which Zhi Qian is the first to be credited.26 Only two of his translations (the Tai Tsai mayng ling jing, T185, and the Weimeng jing, T1474) contain verses in the seven-character meter that was to become widely popular in subsequent centuries.

The vocabulary of Zhi Qian's corpus includes a significant number of transcriptions, especially (but by no means exclusively) in his most "Lokaksema-like" works, as discussed below. Virtually all of these terms, however, appear to have been introduced by his predecessors. In general (at least in his "post-Lokaksema period") Zhi Qian appears to have preferred to use Chinese translations for most names as well as for Buddhist technical terms. These terms, too, were sometimes adopted from previous translations—of which he seems to have drawn preferentially from the Fajing jing by Xu Xuan and Yan Fuzao (T1322) and the biography of the Buddha by Kang Mengzang (T196) and the antecedent of T1845—but in other cases they may have been coined by Zhi Qian himself. A substantial number of these new renderings, however, appear to be based on an erroneous understanding of the underlying Indic name or term, which calls into question Sengyo's high estimate of Zhi Qian's linguistic abilities.27

26 Sengyo does not tell us how many syllables per line Zhi Qian's "Indian songs" contained, but a slightly later passage in the Gaogong chuan explicitly links the genre of fanhai with a six-syllable style. Huimin維翻 the story of a monk named Zhi Tanmion三勿, who was born for ascetical recreation and who had been summoned to the capital of the Eastern Jin 宋 from the territory of Wu in the early 4th CE. After a dream in which a god instructed him in "vocal arts" he wrote and he composed an "Indian song" in six-syllable style (六言梵咒) see T2059, 50.41bc-12). While this account does not allow us to conclude that the term fanhai referred exclusively to hexasyllabic poetry, it does suggest that for Huimin, at least, six-syllable verse could be included within this category. One other reference, found in the catalogues of the Chu sanjang jiji, again connects the six-syllable style with Indian verse. In a list of verses drawn from various sources Sengyo refers to a text entitled Yaole nenang sanjia fuyuan haiyuan (野草等光三伽梵緣海源). Though the term fanhai does not occur here, once again it is clear that a six-character verse style is being connected with "Indian sounds."

It still remains to be determined whether any correlation can be established between the six-syllable style used in texts produced by Zhi Qian and others and any particular form of Indian meter. If the verses in the fanhai style composed by Zhi Qian and others were indeed inspired by Indian metrical compositions, we may have here a still earlier instance of aon 伴 “aimless diffusion” in poetic technique that has been so masterfully chronicled for the late fifth century CE and after by Victor Mair and Yau-lin Mei (1991).

27 Among the hundreds of examples are such renderings as zhihao "Jewel Head" for Ramāyāṇa "Jewel Glory." 不是 "not growing old" for abhaya "lifter, syllable," and and "unlimited." In all such cases we must also consider the possibilities that (1) Zhi Qian adopted the rendition in question from an earlier translation that has not survived, and/or (2) his rendering reflects an interpretation that was already circulating in India. In the latter case, some of what appear from our
There is a considerable degree of overlap between the vocabulary and style employed in much of Zhi Qian’s corpus and in that of Kang Senghui, a coincidence so great that it seems appropriate to speak of a “Wu scriptural idiom.” For further details see the section on Kang Senghui’s translation style (below, pp. 150-152).

AUTHENTIC TEXTS

Beginning as before with the testimony provided in Sengyou’s catalogue, we find the following summation at the end of his list of Zhi Qian’s translations:

The above thirty-six works, comprising forty-eight fascicles in all, were translated by Zhi Qian during the time of Emperor Wen of the Wei, from the beginning of the Huangwu period (222-229 CE) of the Wu warlord Sun Qian through the middle of the Jianning period (253 CE) of Sun Liang.”

Matching these titles with those that appear in the transmitted canon, scholars have generally agreed in accepting twenty-three of the fifty-two translations credited to Zhi Qian by the Taishō editors as being genuine examples of his work. These are listed below, with the Taishō text numbers of those that will be shown to be problematic enclosed in brackets:

T54: Shi Moman ben sii jing 释摩男本四子经
T68: Latchabahuo jing 當化佛經
T76: Fanmenya jing 梵摩難經
T87: Zhai jing 貫經
T169: Yueming pao jing 月明寶經
T185: Tuizi ruizying bengi jing 般若智慧經
T198: Tizao jing 義足經
T242: Da minglu jing 大明度經
T281: Puuo bongi jing 薬本經
[T362]: Animtuo santesanb fo shenjutu jing 與佛陀之首佛讃経
T474: Weimeji jing 常悔経
T493: Amin shi jing 阿難四事経
T533: Sihmon jing 帝承経 (var. Pao dazouhj jing 帝高經)
T533: Cszemo ji jing 采藥經 (var. Pao shuod jing 般若說経)
T556: Qiao jing 七女経
T557: Langbi sui jing 琅毗女経

vantage point to be simply errors based on false etymologies may actually reflect creative exegetes—for which certain Praekrit languages, with their numerous homophones and near-homophones, offered particularly rich opportunities—by Dharma-preachers in India. 76 T2545, 55.72a3-24: 阿含三千部，四十八卷。識文者特立論此義主至讚善法師卷今未見中
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[T559]: Lao nairen jing 老女人經
T581: Basho jing 八齋經
T632: Huaiyn sansui jing 懷印三林經
[T708]: Liulian shengshi jing 了本生死經
[T775]: Siyuang jing 四獨經
T790: Bo jing chu 佛經抄
T1011: Wujiangmen weimi chi jing 無量門微密持經

In addition to the above titles, two other translations credited to Zhi Qian by Sengyou, but not registered as such in transmitted versions of the canon, have also been accepted as the work of Zhi Qian by specialists. The first is a version of the (usc-Mahayana) Mahaparinirvana-sutra, listed as an anonymous scripture registered in an Eastern Jin catalogue by the Taisho editors but identified by Ut Hakuju with the Da banniehuan jing assigned to Zhi Qian by Sengyou:

T6: Banniehuan jing 檀泥洹經

The second is a version of the Dharmapada, based on a rough translation initially produced by the Indian monk Zhu Jiaqian.

Though the Taisho editors, following later Chinese catalogues, assign this work to Weiqian, there is now a general consensus (whose basis will be discussed below) that the text as we have it should be credited to Zhi Qian:

T210: Fajing 法經

Once again this approach—which is based solely on the evidence provided by Sengyou’s catalogue—will be the starting point, and not the end-point, of the discussion here.

Methodological preliminaries (1): external evidence

As we have seen, Sengyou’s catalogue is internally consistent in crediting thirty-six translations to Zhi Qian. The biographical section of the same work, however, gives a different figure, assigning him only twenty-seven works, which conforms to suggestions made elsewhere that the catalogue section was expanded after the biographical section was composed. Four translations are mentioned by name in Zhi Qian’s biography, suggesting that Sengyou considered them to be his most noteworthy works:

T6: Da banniehuan jing 大般泥洹經
T185: Taiizi ruying kenglai jing [大子如鏡本來經]
T210: Fajing 法經
T474: Waimoying jing [歪摩誦經]

Houjiao reproduces the above discussion almost word-for-word, but with one notable exception: in the Guong zhuan Zhi Qian is credited not with twenty-seven translations, but with thirty-six.

29 Var. 成道時獲得一切智眼。
31 See Palumbo 2003, p. 197.
32 55.97(c10-11). As is usual if the biographies section, Sengyou gives these individual titles in ahimsastand form.
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but with forty-nine. 11

In addition to the scriptures singled out for attention in the biographical section of the Chu saang jii ji, a few others are attributed to Zhi Qian in prefaces or other notices preserved in the same work. One of the best known of these is Zhi Mindu’s șu-șê-șê preface to his own combined edition of the Vimalakîrîti, where he writes that he used the translation produced by Zhi Qian (here called Zhi Gongming șu-șê-șê, abbreviated șê-șê) as his base text, while collating it with two other versions (55.38c23ff). Zhi Qian’s (lost) translation of the Sâramagama-svâmitâ-sutra is mentioned in another notice, also traditionally (but perhaps wrongly) ascribed to Zhi Mindu,12 which contains an important discussion comparing the very different translation styles preferred by Lokaksemaka and Zhi Qian (here called Zhi Yuei 良惠, styled Gongming 良明, with his name abbreviated as șê). The same notice also contains an explicit mention of Zhi Qian’s revision of scriptures produced by others (55.49a25ff). Yet another preface, to Zhi Qian’s revised version of the Dharmapada, is thought to have been composed by Zhi Qian himself. Thus it is other early sources—that is, in the various scriptural notices collected by Sengyou—we find additional corroborating support for Zhi Qian’s production of the following works:

T210: Fajîn jîng 仏記觀
* Shihduangyuan jîng 聖德圓經

T474: Wensîng jîng 梵聲經

It is worth noting that the subset of Zhi Qian’s corpus singled out in the above sources includes texts belonging to a wide range of genres: two Mahāyāna sūtras (the Sâramagama and the Vimalakîrîti), one non-Mahāyāna sūtra (the Mahâparinirvâna-sûtra), a biography of the Buddha (the Taizî ruîying buâei jîng), and a collection of didactic verses corresponding

---

10 T2659, 10.325a29-l4.

11 Though the attribution of this notice to Zhi Mindu is widely accepted, it contains a number of peculiar features which could perhaps benefit from further consideration. First, although Zhi Mindu’s name is indeed given immediately below the title of the notice, it is followed by any of the usual verbs (if so in some cases it) used by Sengyou to indicate authorship. Second, the heading also mentions a commentary by Xie Fu 隱福, which seems out of place if this were indeed a note by Zhi Mindu to his own synoptic edition. Third, whereas Zhi Mindu’s well-documented and uncontroversial preface to his own combined edition of the Vimalakîrîti uses the name Zhi Gongming 丈光明 (abbreviated as just “Ming” at 58c4) for the person who is presumably Zhi Qian, the Sâramagama notice refers to him as Zhi Yuei 志惠 (with the șê, to be sure, of Gongming 良明), abbreviating his name not as “Ming” but as “Yuei” (e.g., at 49a24f), which never occurs in the Vimalakîrîti document. Finally, two times—in reference to Lokaksemaka and to Zhi Qian’s father (as his grandfather according to the biography in the Chu saang jii ji)—the Sâramagama notice refers to people coming to “Zhanggou 丁河.” This is not of course an odd term in itself, but it is interesting that it never occurs anywhere else in the Chu saang jii ji, with the exception of passages authored by Sengyou himself; instead, all other prefaces and colophons refer to people coming to specific places (Lunyang, Chongyan, etc.). Given the great importance of the information contained in this notice—not only about Zhi Qian’s work in revising earlier translations, but also concerning the attribution of T624 and T626 to Lokaksemaka—it would be extremely useful if the authorship of this notice, and thus its date, could be established with somewhat greater confidence.
to the Dharma-pada (the Fajing). Conversely, Sengyou notes that several of the translations assigned by him to Zhi Qian were absent from Daoan’s catalogue. Grouped together at the end of his section on Zhi Qian, all of these are said to be drawn from another source (53.7a17-22):

- T6: Lanzhabelonn Jing 羅呪和羅經
- T537: Longhsi yi jing 龍豎女經
- Shoulingyan jing 寶鏡嚴經
- Fajing jing 法鏡經
- Luciz jing 鹿子經
- Shi’ermen dangfengjing 十二門大方等經

Following the procedure outlined above, we should consider the absence of these titles from Daoan’s catalogue to indicate that their attribution to Zhi Qian is somewhat less secure and should be evaluated with particular care. In this regard it is surprising (and it may well be significant) that a translation by Zhi Qian of the Shoulingyan jing, which finds strong support in another external source, e.g., the notice to Zhi Mindu’s combined edition, was apparently unknown to Daoan. In any event, Sengyou was evidently making his judgement on the basis of the title alone, for he states that the translation itself was already lost in his time (53.7a17).

In using external sources to establish a list of genuine translations by Zhi Qian we also encounter another peculiar problem: the occasional confusion between his name and that of Lokaksema. As we have already seen, Lokaksema’s name was generally abbreviated as Zhi Chen 丈尊 in our earliest sources, and the potential for confusion between this and the similar-looking Zhi Qian 丈尊 is evident. That this is not merely a theoretical possibility can quickly be confirmed by comparing Zhi Qian’s biography in the Chu samzang ji ji with that found in the Gasson shun. As noted above, in many passages Huijiao simply copies Sengyou’s account word for word. But in one such passage—where Zhi Qian’s heritage as the student of a disciple of Lokaksema is being described—the received text of the Gasson shun states (correctly) that during the time of the Han emperors Han and Liu, Zhi Chen 丈尊 (i.e., Lokaksema) translated scriptures.48 The corresponding passage in the Chu samzang ji ji, however, reads “Zhi Qian 丈尊.”49 As we shall see, it appears that in at least one case—that of the Large Sahajatattvyasā—confusion between these nearly identical names—which could so easily be misinterpreted by a scribe—led to the treatment in later catalogues of a translation actually produced by Lokaksema as Zhi

---

47 The title of this scripture corresponds to that of a translation of the Ugrapraprthibhavaka which is solely attributed to An Xuan and Yan Feitao (T332, Fajing jing). It is uncertain whether the rather generic title “Dharma-Mirror Scripture” was being used in Sengyou’s source to refer to a version of the same scripture, but it is quite certain that T332 is not Zhi Qian’s work.

48 50.32a19-20: 高ucid(rowsつくせas boosting出雕版.

49 55.9b21-24: 丈尊呪法等經雕刻出雕版.
Qian's work instead, resulting in a cascade of subsequent confusions concerning the authorship of other translations of the text.

Methodological preliminaries (2): internal evidence

In the case of translators such as An Shigao and Lokakśema, it is a fairly straightforward matter to establish a "core group" of the texts most reliably attributed to them with whose vocabulary and style other works said to be theirs could then be compared. The situation is entirely different, however, with Zhi Qian, for when we consult the scriptures credited to him by Sengyu, we encounter a veritable cacophony of voices. Some texts reliably attributed to him resemble the work of Lokakśema, abounding in transcriptions and long (and often convoluted) sentences. Others are far closer to the work of An Xuan and Yan Fotiao, adopting some of their distinctive vocabulary and strongly (though never exclusively) preferring translation to transcription. Some appear to reflect elements of vernacular speech, while others employ a more elegant and literary style. Still others fall somewhere in between, exhibiting various combinations of the above features. In short, it seems impossible to characterize Zhi Qian's corpus as a whole in any general way. Indeed, it might be fair to say if there is any feature which can be said to be most characteristic of his work, it is this very inconsistency itself.14

In the case of many other translators it would be natural to ascribe these differences to the shifting composition of the translator's committee of assistants. But in Zhi Qian's case we have no evidence that he ever participated in such an arrangement. On the contrary, the sole source that tells us anything specific about how he worked—and it is exceedingly valuable information, for it appears to come from the brush of Zhi Qian himself—is the preface to the Fǎjì jìng 法師紀 (T210). Here the author portrays himself as taking a completed but rough translation produced by someone else, asking the translator for clarification on various points (for in this case the initial translator, the Indian monk Jiānyǎn 僧贊, was still alive), and then finalizing the work himself, supplementing the existing text with "missing" chapters procured from another source (cf. above, p. 115). In sum, Zhi Qian does not describe himself as working with others, but rather as polishing and completing an already existing work. It is such a procedure, as we shall see, that appears to have shaped many of his other translations as well.

Such a modus operandi can explain, at least in part, why Zhi Qian's works appear to be wildly inconsistent in language and style. But a closer look shows that other factors should be considered as well. In a number of cases (discussed in detail below) he appears to have revised works originally translated by Lokakśema or a member of his school, yet not all of these revisions had the same stylistic result. Some adhere fairly closely to what must have been Lokakśema's original wording; others, however, diverge sharply from his language

---

14 For a selection of examples of the revision in usage found in Zhi Qian's corpus with special attention to the "ten epithets of the Buddha" see Namier 2003b.
and style. It would appear, therefore, that we must also postulate another contributing factor: changes in Zhi Qian's own approach to translation over his long and productive career.

Though precise dates are elusive, it appears that Zhi Qian began his translation work toward the end of the Han, perhaps in the second decade of the third century CE, when he was still living in Luoyang, the place of his birth. Most of his translations, however (including the Fajing referred to above), appear to have been produced after his flight to the kingdom of Wu. For our purposes, this implies that we must consider not only a chronological factor—i.e., the translator's right to change his mind over the course of time—but also a geographical one, resulting from Zhi Qian's move to a new and quite different cultural and literary milieu.

Whatever the relative impact of these factors, it is clear that Zhi Qian's corpus includes translations that vary widely in both terminology and literary style. Ordinarily this would provide strong grounds for doubting the attribution of all of these translations to a single individual, but given what we know of Zhi Qian's biography and, above all, of his way of working, I believe that it is legitimate to include them here.

This being the case, however, it is not possible to arrange Zhi Qian's work in terms of "core texts" vs. other dissimilar translations. In coming years it may become possible to say more about the evolution of his translation style over time, but for the moment I will begin by simply arranging these translations, as in the case of An Shigao above, according to genre. At the end of this section I will return to the question of how best to understand the exceptionally great diversity within the corpus of texts that appear to be legitimately attributed to Zhi Qian.

Ágama texts

_DIRGHĀYU MA. Zhi Qian's corpus consists only one text that corresponds to a sūtra found in the Chinese _Dirghāyuma_ (as well as in the Pāli _Dighanikāya_), but it is a quite substantial one: a version of the non-Mahāyāna account of the Buddha's final days corresponding to the Pāli _Mahāparinibbāna-ratā_ (DN 16):

TF: _Bamnichuan jing_ 保藏法經

As noted above, a _Da bamnichuan jing_ 大藏法經 is one of the works credited to Zhi Qian not only in Sengsuō's catalogue, but also in the biographical section of the _Chu sanzang ji_. No such text is attributed to him in the _Tōshō_ canon, but Ui Hakujū suggested long

---

Other parallels in Chinese are T12, T5, and T7; for the first part of the text cf. also T36(42). A convenient summary of the content of these various Chinese translations, as well as the version preserved in Pāli, can be found in Beecroft 1963-71. For fragments of a Sanskrit version of the text see Waldschmidt 1955 and Alsdorf 1955. Arguments have been made for the attribution of TS, rather than T6, to Zhi Qian in Iwamoto 1976 and more recently in Park forthcoming. There is much to recommend this attribution as well, but as I will attempt to show in the following discussion there are a number of factors that point to T6 as the more likely candidate.
age that T6—now listed as the work of an unknown translator of the Eastern Jīe 㝛命 dynasty (317-420 CE)—is the version by Zhu Qian to which Senggou refers (U 1971, pp. 517-523). Uii’s very detailed argument is quite convincing in itself, but we can now point to two additional features that strongly support the attribution of T6 to Zhu Qian: first, that it includes a list of names of the Buddhist heavens in forms that are almost entirely unattested outside his translations; and second, that T6 contains a long passage in rhymed six-character verse (1.184c1-1.18). One other feature may be the most telling of all, for here we find the well-known expression shen bu mie 神不灭 “the spirit is not destroyed,” over which so much ink would subsequently be spilled in Chinese treatises. Among texts that can be dated to the period with which we are concerned, this phrase appears only in the works of Zhu Qian.

An intriguing set of problems is posed by the existence of another Chinese Mahāparinirvāṇa-stūpa (T5) which shares a substantial amount of unusual vocabulary with T6, and which appears to have been based on a similar (though not identical) Indian original. The language of T6 is much more elegant in style than that of T5; thus it seems unlikely, from a literary perspective, that T5 could be a revision of T6.43 On the other hand, T5 contains a considerable amount of material that has no parallel in T6, which raises questions about whether T6 as we have it could really be a revision of T5 in its present form. A third possibility is that both T5 and T6 might both be descendants (i.e.,

42 Uii’s argument takes as its point of departure the testimony of the Cha samang ji, which attributes “Mahāparinirvāṇa-stūpa” (Da huanqin zheng 大煥金正经) in two fascicles to Zhu Qian (see T2145, 55.6c1-6; a text by this title is also credited to Zhu Qian in his biography, 97c10-11). Uii then adds a number of citations from a two-fascicle Mahāparinirvāṇa-stūpa (禅類金正经) found in Senggou’s Shiji pu 神漸録 (T2460), showing that—at least seven extant and non-extant texts entitled “Mahāparinirvāṇa-stūpa” registered in Senggou’s catalogue—this two-fascicle text can only correspond to the scripture attributed there to Zhu Qian. Finally, Uii demonstrates that the terminology used in these scriptures corresponds closely to what is found in the extant “anonymous” text (i.e., T6) and not to the language of any other version. On this basis, Uii concludes that T6 is in fact Zhu Qian’s translation.

43 The two exceptions are T1485 (a Chinese transcription which borrows heavily from Zhu Qian’s T281) and T5 (another Mahāparinirvāṇa-stūpa, which shares a substantial amount of unusual vocabulary with T6 and is merely related to it in some way). In addition to its occurrence here T6, 1.18c26), the phrase also appears in Zhu Qian’s biography of the Buddha (T185, 3.47a2) and in a little-known sūtra entitled “Ananya’s Four Manners” (Ananya si ji 善見四相論, T99, 14.72a17). The phrase does not appear in other Chinese versions of T6 or T185; T93 has no known parallel. Whether it was Zhu Qian who coined this expression—or rather, who first used it as a Buddhist context—depends on the date of two scholia translations of unknown authorship in which this saying can also be found: T370 (17.52b21) and T831A (17.57b23), and B (57b2c6). The rarity of this expression is indicated by the fact that it is also absent from the voluminous corpus of Dhammarāja, with the exception of his biography of the Buddha which draws part of its material, including this passage, from the work of Zhu Qian (T196, 5.30b3).

44 On this point I am inclined to agree with the assessment given in Park forthcoming.
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revisions) of a common, but now lost, original. In any case, it is clear that the two texts are connected in some way, and further work on their relationship will be very welcome.44

Though the relationship of T6 to T3 is difficult to characterize, the style of T6 can be described with relative ease. Most personal and place names, as well as Buddhist technical terms, are translated rather than transcribed. Verse passages abound, generally in five-character format but also (in one instance) in Zhi Qian's trademark six-character style, while the translator's "default mode" is four-character prose.45 In sum, the style of the text is quite the opposite of the translations of Lokaksema, suggesting that it was directed toward an audience with low tolerance for transcriptions of strange foreign words but with an appreciation for Chinese literary conventions.

Madhyamāgama. Three texts with parallels in the Chinese Madhyamāgama and in the Pāli Mahāmaṇḍalaśāstra are credited to Zhi Qian by Sengyou. The first of these corresponds to the text known in Pāli as the Culasūkakahabhāndhaśāstra (MN 6), a portion of which (§§6-14) coincides, in turn, with part of The Greater Discourse on the Mass of Suffering (Mahābhūkṣhakhandha-sūtra, MN 13, §§7-15). The title found in the current Taishō edition of the canon is the following:

T54: Shi Manan len sti jing 釋摩男本四子經 [jie]

The characters Shi Manan 釋摩男 clearly correspond to the abbreviated transcription of the name of the main character, "Mahānāma the Sākyan," but what the characters len sti jing 本四子 "original four sons" (?) are doing here is not at all clear. The title assigned to Zhi Qian by Sengyou was much shorter, reading simply Shi Manan jing 釋摩男經, a text for which he reports that Daoan classified it as belonging to the Madhyamāgama.46 The character len 子 "original" was added to the title first, perhaps in order to indicate that this was the earliest of several translations of the text.47 The title given in the Taishō edition

---

44 T6 is closely related, in turn, to the Fumu kunnicchān jing 禦母歡倪賚經 (T145), a scripture recounting the final service of the Buddha's foster mother, Mahājñāpīti (see Karashima and Natter 2001, pp. 563-564). It seems likely that both translations were produced in the Wu kingdom in the third century CE, but further research is needed to clarify their date and provenance.

45 There are also cases where lines in four-character form are labeled as "gōshūs" (here transcribed as gōshū; see for example T1408 and 14).

46 In addition to the Pāli version, parallel Chinese texts can be found in T26(100) and T55; no Tibetan version has yet been identified. Similarities in some unusual vocabulary indicate that the translator of T26(100) made use of Zhi Qian's version.

47 See T2145, 55.7a6: " 與摩男一自變抄云出中阿含." (1)

48 See T2145, 55.27a24 (included in the section containing Sengyou's own list of anonymous scriptures); the same title is given in T2146, 55.129c10. For a possible example of the use of the character 子 to indicate an earlier version of a text cf. the entry for the Be len jing 材本經 (perhaps to be interpreted as "The Original Be Store") attributed to Lokaksema by Sengyou, presumably in contrast to the revised Be shao jing 平抄經 (T790) ascribed to Zhi Qian, for the latter see the discussion of T790 below.
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is apparently a recent development; at any rate, it does not appear in any of the medieval catalogues pre-dated through the eighth century CE.

In contrast to the Mahāparinirvāṇa-nītrī translation discussed above, Zhi Qian’s version of the Mahāvīra-nītrī is cast in a quite different style. Not only the name of the title character, but also many other names and technical terms, are given in transcription rather than transcription. The text does not conform to the four-character prosodical style favored in many other texts by Zhi Qian. The fact that it lacks any verse passages, however, is not in itself telling, for the same is true of the corresponding Pāli text.

A second Mahābodhisattva text credited to Zhi Qian by Sengyou, corresponding to the Pali Ratnapalaśāstra (MN22), rests on a less stable foundation, for according to Sengyou such a text was not attributed to Zhi Qian by Dunan. On the contrary, Sengyou says he drew his information from another catalogue (别译所载, 55.7a22):

T68: Letzachi’nduo jing 良吒尼難經

Like T54, T68 exhibits a random prosodic pattern, with no instances of verse (but once again, there are none in the corresponding Pāli text), and again we see a strong inclination for transcription rather than translation. The unusual wording at the beginning of the text, which states that the Buddha was with “five hundred śramaṇas” (五百沙門) —not five hundred śrāvikas (五百衆)—is quite rare, and a comparative study of other texts that use the “substitution term” sāmaṇa in this context may well be able to highlight a relationship of this text with other early translations.39

A third translation corresponds to another text found in the Pāli Mahīśasikāya, the Buddhabhūtas (MN91):

T76: Fomán jing 梵摩難經

Unlike the two texts discussed just above, T76 exhibits an interestingly hybrid character: on the one hand it is composed without benefit of regular four-character prosody, but it includes one passage in five-character verse (1.885a-b). Though (like T54 and T68) it contains a substantial number of transcriptions, it also contains a significant number of translation terms adopted from An Xuan and Yan Fotiao. Finally, Āśa is one of several scriptures in Zhi Qian’s corpus that contain terms of clearly Chinese origin, for instance in its glossing of the five Buddhist precepts using traditional Chinese virtues and its reference to the ban spirit (ban shen 廝神) as the entity that transmigrates. Indeed, it could well be described as the most Confucian of Zhi Qian’s translations, not only retaining

39 In addition to the Pāli version cf. the Chinese parallels in T26(132) and T69, no Tibetan translation has yet been identified. The story is also retold in a Chinese treatise of uncertain date (T1507, 15.42b7-15.42c20) and an anthology compiled in the sixteenth century (T2121, 51.96b7-17).
30 I have discussed the phenomenon of such “substitution terms”—i.e., the use of the transcription of an Indian term (e.g., śramaṇa) to translate another (e.g., bhikṣu)—in Nierier 2006a.
31 For a parallel in the Chinese Mahāvīra-nītrī cf. T26(141), which however is based on a significantly different (not merely longer) recension also differing noticeably from the Pāli.

129
such general virtues as ren ("humaneness") (886a9) and xiao ("filiality") (886a10), but even using terms like yusheng ("true sapling") (886b1-2) and ren ("Confucian scholar") (886b27 and passim).

A fourth translation solidly attributed to Zhi Qian also has parallels in the Chinese Mahāyānagama, though in Pali (where the scripture has no separate title but is sometimes referred to as the Visukha-sutta) the closest match is found in the Aṅguttara-nikāya instead: T87: Zhai jing 芝経 "Abstinence Day Sutta".*

Of the texts in this group this is another of the most simplified, with a strong four-character pattern throughout most of the text and a pronounced inclination for translation rather than transcription. Those terms (virtually all of them proper names) that are transcribed are highly domesticated, generally reduced to just one or two characters in length. Like T76, T87 also includes a substantial amount of indigenous Chinese religious vocabulary, notably in its use of terms for the "spirit" (jīngdào 聖道 or hūnshēng 禪師) that is reborn.**

Unidentified sūtras. Zhi Qian's corpus also includes two āgama-like scriptures for which no parallels in any other collection have been identified. Both of them have been catalogued by the Taishō editors as Mahāyāna sūtras (included in vols. 14 and 17, respectively), but because their content contains nothing that (in my view) is specific to a Mahāyana tradition it seems best to deal with them here.

We may begin with a scripture which, though as yet unidentified, has every appearance of being a standard Indian āgama text:

TS81: Bashi jing 八師經 "Sūtra Concerning the Eight Teachers"

In this relatively short text (just over one page in the Taishō edition) the Buddha replies to an inquiry concerning the identity of his religious teacher by describing how he had learned to adhere to the proper path by observing eight "teachers," viz., the five precepts (pañcabhiyā), old age, sickness, and death.

No parallel in any language (including Chinese) has yet been identified. The entire sūtra is quoted, however, in two anthologies of scriptures compiled by Daoshu, which are of considerable value for establishing a critical edition of the text.*** It is also quoted in a Chinese apocryphon, the Zhuang ming pusa jing 足跡菩薩經, as recently discussed by LIN Min 林敏 (2005).

The style of the text is reminiscent of that of the Fannyou jing (T76) and (to a

---

*Wrongly identified as corresponding to AN VII.43 in Lancaster and Park 1979 (see under K71), this text does indeed deal with the same topic, but the closest Pali parallel is usually with AN III.70 (L20b-213), exceeding the degree of correspondence with AN VII.41, 42 and 43. The closest parallel in the Chinese to Zhi Qian's version is T26(202); cf. also T88 and T89: Zhi Qian's version of the text is also retold in abbreviated form in T2122 (53.956a7-c).

**See 1.911c12 and 912a5 (jīngdào) and 912a7 (hūnshēng).

***See T2122, 53.816a1-819a9 and T2123, 54.127c-.
slightly lesser extent) the Zhuang jing (T78), with its abundance of indigenous Chinese religious terminology, again including references to the hou 豪 and pe 俳 spirits. As in T76, the five lay precepts are glossed with each Chinese virtue as ren 仁, xiao 孝, and so on; in fact, the correlations between Indian and Chinese terms are exactly the same in these two scriptures. The text exhibits a strong inclination for the use of four-character proverbs; most technical terms are translated, while proper names are generally transcribed.

The final text in this category presents a much more complicated situation, for its text is not an integral text at all, but rather the result of confusion of three separate sources: T735: Siyuan jing 四源經 "The Scripture on the Four Wishes".

The first part of the scripture—a complete, if very short, text in itself—does indeed deal with the "four wishes" mentioned in the title (for, physical pleasures, wealth and property, family and friends, and guarding the mind); there is also a standard formulaic ending (諸 弟子聞此教言，為佛作標)，making it clear that we are dealing with a complete sutra that occupies less than one page in the Taisho edition (17.536b18-537a16).

Following this, however, there begins a completely unrelated scripture dealing with the vicissitudes of death and rebirth in samāra and exhorting its audience to uphold the five precepts, composed (unlike what we may now call "T735A") in regular four-character prose-ly. This text ("T735B") is even shorter, occupying just one column in the Taisho edition (17.537a17-537b16), and again it closes with a formulaic ending (諸子聞此教言，為佛作標) (373a18). Finally, as discussed above, there is yet another scripture represented here, which we may now call "T735C." But this one is present only in fragmentary form, for at 537b16 there begins (in the middle of a sentence!) a portion of a text corresponding to the Qi che suon guan jing 七處三根經 discussed above.38

The title Siyuan jing should, therefore, refer only to T735A. This scripture and T735B, however, share some important features; above all (once again) the heavy use of indigenous Chinese religious terms such as Mt. Tai (太山) as a destination for the dead and various terms for the transcending spirit.39 Moreover, though the apparatus to the Taisho edition indicates that T735B and C are joined to T735A only in the "Three Editions" (Song, Yuan, and Ming), a fragment of the text found at Daihonzan includes material from both T735A and B (see Inokuchi 1980, p. 71-72). This whatever the original identity of T735B may have been, there seems to have been a long tradition in

---

38 The terms yuán 無 is generally used in Zhi Qian's translations in the ordinary sense of "wide" rather than in the technical sense of "view"; the latter concept (expressed using a variety of Indic terms) most commonly translated as chi 之 in his work. An important exception is the Pundarīka jing (T36), where however the character yuán is being taken over from the earlier Da Amitya jing (T62) produced in Lokakṣema's school.

39 See above, pp. 50-51; parallel occurrences of the scripture can be found in T18A1(1) and (3) and T1007(7).

131
some circles of cataloguing it following Zhi Qian’s T’735A. It is entirely possible that T’735B, too, is a translation by Zhi Qian, though further work is needed to determine its identity and its parallels, if any, in other sources.

One further text in the category of unidentified non-Mahāyāna sūtras attributed to Zhi Qian by Sengyou is sufficiently different in kind from those discussed above that I have deliberately placed it last (disregarding the sequence of Taishō text numbers). It is another very brief scripture, only one Taishō page in length, entitled:

T’493: *Ānun tshö jing* 阿耨四事經 “The Scripture on the Four Matters [preached to] Ānanda”

The text is set just prior to the Buddha’s final extinction, and it consists of a reply to Ānanda’s question concerning what people should rely on after the Buddha’s death in order to attain merit (福田) and liberation (果) after the Buddha is gone. This theme is not at all uncommon, nor is the statement that, though the Buddha himself will pass away, his Dharma will remain. But what is noteworthy about this text is its pervasive emphasis on social service. That is, the Buddha tells Ānanda that by giving to the poor—including birds and beasts, and even insects—one will obtain the same merit as if he were serving the Buddha himself. Rulers and wealthy people are advised to use the grain in their storehouses to help those in need, and there are repeated references to “noxious qi” 毒氣 that causes illness to spread.48 It may well be worth considering the possibility that part of this material might have been composed in China. Neither Daon nor Sengyou expressed any skepticism, however, concerning the authenticity of the text, so for the time being we may include it here.

As to its style, the text is set for the most part in four-character prose; there is no verse of any kind. With the exception of the place name at the beginning (and, of course, the long-standing transcription of “Ānanda” as *Ānun* 阿耨), virtually all Buddhist terms are translated rather than transcribed. Not surprisingly, in light of what we have seen above, this is yet another of the texts in which we find mention of the *hua* 陀 (the word *pu* 陀 does not occur here) as the transmigrating spirit.49 This is also one of the three translations in Zhi Qian’s corpus to incorporate the phrase *shen bu mei* 神不美.49

---

48 14.757b1, 7, and 16. The same expression also occurs in another translation by Zhi Qian (T581, 14.965c4) and once in Kang Senghui’s *Linda ji jing* (T152, 3.18c11), but not in any other text translated during or before this period.

49 See 14.757a14, 17, 27, and b4-5.

49 14.757a17: (或神不美。) On this phrase cf. above, p. 127.
An unidentified *jataka* tale

Zhi Qian's corpus also contains an extended *jataka* tale for which no parallel in any language has yet been identified:

T'90: *Bu jing chao* 卜驚抄

The main figure in the scripture is named *Bu*, a character which elsewhere is used as a transcription of the name "Puṣya." If this is its referent here, the title would then be "The Condensed Version (抄) of the *Puṣya Sūtra*." It is clear that Sengyou considered this scripture to be an abridgment of an earlier work, for he cites it at the very beginning of his section on *Chao jing* 長經 "Abridged scriptures," together with the *Da di jing* 大帝經 (*T*607) by An Shigao discussed above. It is noteworthy that these two texts are singled out as paradigmatic examples of "good" abridgements—that is, cases where their authors are simply making traditional scriptural materials available in a shorter and more accessible form, rather than twisting their meaning for their own ends.

As we have seen, a title including the same transcription character—the *Bu jing* Bu 長經, perhaps now to be understood as "The Original *Puṣya Sūtra*"—is also ascribed to Lokakṣema. If the ascription is correct—and the text in question is no longer extant, so we cannot consult it directly—this would imply that Zhi Qian's *Bu jing chao* is yet another example of his revision of a text previously translated by Lokakṣema.

The unusually large number of variant readings given in the apparatus to the *Taisō* edition (the vast majority of them drawn from the Imperial Palace edition, on which see Zaccetti 2005, p. 113) suggests that the text was actively used, and even points to the possibility that the surviving versions may represent more than one recension of the text (something that still remains to be investigated). Its popularity is also underscored by the fact that, like several other translations by Zhi Qian, it is cited in a *medieval* anthology.¹⁴ Though no evidence has yet been brought forth concerning the impact (or even the existence) of this scripture in other regions, its positive reception in China can be considered as established beyond any doubts.

The scripture begins with an account of the construction of the Jetavana, but its character as a *jataka* tale is made clear by its reverse to a "story of the past" to explain events of the present, and its concluding identification of past figures with characters living during the Buddha's time. An intriguing feature of the text is that it quotes from something referred to simply as a *jing* 經 "scripture"; these passages are in four-character format (something found occasionally in other parts of the text), and they are printed in verse in the *Taisō* edition. It may well be, however, that these are not (as they initially seem to be) quotations from another scripture, but simply the verse sections commonly found in *jataka* tales. There are no other verses in the scripture, and the proper names are transcribed.

¹⁴ Cited in *T*2122 (twice): 53.994c34, 60b87ff.
Didactic verses

Two texts attributed to Zhi Qian by Sengyou correspond to scripture passages catalogued in the Pali canon as part of the Khuddakanikaya, though since not all Buddhist recitation lineages in India had such a division in their canons, we cannot be sure how these would have been classified by those who transmitted them to China. The first of these corresponds to the verses found in the Pali Aṣṭhakaṃkha (Skt. Arthasaṃgraha), together with substantial additional commentarial material: T198: Yaśa jīva (義足尼) The most distinctive stylistic feature of this text is that the vast majority of it is set in six-character verse; there is also five-character verse, as well as some four-character passages labeled as gāthās (偈). The prose sections, by contrast, are not metric, and the text contains many transcended place names, though other Buddhist terms are generally translated. One passage 5.173a19-c14) has an exact parallel in Kang Senghai's Ludi ji jing (T152, 3.50c1-51b6). Since the story in question contains six-character verse, which is ubiquitous in T198 but otherwise unknown in T152, it seems virtually certain that Kang Senghai borrowed the passage from Zhi Qian, and not vice versa.

A second text corresponds to the Pali Dharmapada (Skt. Uddâna), which is likewise assigned to the Pali canon to the Khuddakanikaya: T210: Fàjī jīng (法句经) As noted above, the text is credited in the Tānḥō canon to "Weiqiu et al.," but substantial external evidence (notably the discussion in Sengyou's biography of Zhi Qian, as well as the preface thought to have been composed by Zhi Qian himself) points to Zhi Qian as responsible for putting the text in its final form. Like T198 virtually the whole of the text is cast in a regular metric style, but here the verses are almost all in five-character or four-character form. Only one relatively short passage is composed in six-character verse (4.573b15-16). Word-for-word parallels to the Xiàoxíng fènji jīng (修行本起經) (T184) can be found in at least two passages in the Fàjī jīng. This suggests that the author of the latter—which

---

64 There are no parallels in the Chinese. For fragments of the Sanskrit text see Horner 1916. For bibliography on the Pali version see von Hüthner 1996 and Norman 1983. I have not yet had a chance to examine Bopu 1951.

65 In addition to the Pali (for bibliographic references see von Hüthner 1996 and Norman 1983), parallels in Chinese can be found in T211, 212, and 213. The foundational studies of Lien (1912) and Minuma (1913) are still of great value; ongoing studies of T212 by Hiroaka Sanosh (most recently in Hiroaka 2007) are yielding important results. Japanese translations of T210 (Hikita 2006) and T211 (Tsunami 2000 and Kazumori et al., 2001) have recently appeared; for a valuable brief review of these three publications on these texts see Yamaoka 2003. An English translation of T2.1 can be found in Wilhelm 1999.

66 See T286, 3.467a18-21, = T210, 4.574b12-15, and T384, 3.467a22-23, = T210, 4.559b6-7. The latter passage is also cited in the commentary to An Shigao's 4 Timeh jing (T1694, 3.15c32-3), where the citation reads simply 黑目 "A gāthā ayā."
seems likely to be a Jin-period revision of an originally Han-period text, as Kawano has suggested (see above, p. 100)—used Zhi Qian’s Tujia jing as one of his sources. It would be well worth examining other parts of T184 in detail to see if there are additional passages that appear to be citations from this or other works by Zhi Qian.

A Biography of the Buddha

Another of the texts singled out for special mention in Sengyou’s biography of Zhi Qian is his biography of the Buddha:

T185: Taitsu ruying benqi jing 太上如經本紀经

As discussed above in the section on Kang Mengzeng, this text has a very close relationship to the Xiaozao benqi jing 修行本紀经 (T184) as well as to the first part of the Zhongben jing 中本經 (T196), with many passages agreeing word-for-word. The relationship among these texts is extraordinarily complicated, however, and it is not possible to derive any one of them in a straightforward manner from any of the others. What is clear is that all three of these biographies were actively used, and that all of them (including the version originally produced by Zhi Qian) were updated more than once. The text as we have it still bears Zhi Qian’s fingerprints, however, one of which is the use of the phrase zhe bu mian "the spirit is not destroyed." 65

It is also frequently stated that Zhi Qian’s T185 borrowed material from another archaic biography of the Buddha, the Ticha puja benqi jing 寺出菩提本紀經 (T188). 66

This seems less certain, however. While it is certainly true that some of the events dealt with in T185 have parallels in T188, the wording is quite dissimilar, and in my view a direct relationship between these two texts yet to be demonstrated. It seems more likely that Zhi Qian drew this additional material from another source, whether an Indian text (oral or written) or another now-lost Chinese translation.

In style the Taitsu ruying benqi jing reads heavily toward a four-character prosodic pattern, with numerous passages in five-character verse. Only once (at 3.477c-c) does it use the seven-character form that was to become so popular in subsequent centuries. 67

65 A Japanese translation is now available in Hirii 2002. For a valuable study of this text in comparison with the versions by Kang Mengzeng (T184) and Dharmarakṣa (T186) see Kawano 2007.

66 Cf. above, p. 127.

67 So according to Zürcher 1980, p. 111, n. 51. The association between T185 and T188 is also discussed in Marwil 1988, but because she accepted the authenticity of the Taishi editor’s attribution of T188 to the Western Jin translator Nie Daozheng (尉道真), Matsumura was forced to posituate a lost antecedent of this text as the source of the material found in both T185 and T188 (p. 48b). This is a classic case of why it is necessary to first verify translator attributions in Sengyou’s catalogue, however, for the attribution to Nie Daozheng (known to Sengyou only as the scribal assistant of Dharmarakṣa) is patently false, first stemming from the Laiyi sanben ji (T204, 46.66c-26). In the Cha sanben ji ji, by contrast, the Ticha puja benqi jing is listed as anonymous (T2145, 55.22c-2b).

68 Because the seven-character format is so rare in Zhi Qian’s work (appearing only here and in
two places in his version of the Vimalakirtinirdeśa (T494, on which see below), it may be worth considering the possibility that these passages are the result of late interpolation, but this issue cannot be pursued here.

There is an enormous literature on this text and related Prajñāpāramitā scriptures, most of which is not relevant to the problem at hand, so I will not attempt to review it here. An overview of other versions of this scripture in Sanskrit, Chinese, and Tibetan is given in Cizao 1978. The only article known to me in a western language on T225 (A and/or B) is Lancaster 1869; the hypothesis put forth there however—that T225(B) should be viewed as the work of Xu Xian and Yan Fotiao rather than of Zhi Qian—can now be shown to be implausible (Narita forthcoming).

In Japanese, important contributions have been made by Katsuhisa Yuge 書道弘 (Tsuta); see in particular the valuable comparative table of the Buddhist terminology used in T224 and Lokakṣema’s T224 in Katsuzaki 1985. Useful information on particular terms can also be found in the series of articles published by Akahori Yukihiko 阿原幸彦 (1981ff).

A glossary of Lokakṣema’s T224, now prepared by Katsuhisa Yuge 書道弘, contains cross-references to the corresponding terms in T225, and when complete it will be an immensely valuable tool for future studies.
likely for arhat. T225A, on the other hand, uses yuza 喜者 for bodhisattva and hisip 比丘 for bhikkhu (in this recension of chapter one there is no counterpart of the word arhat).

Non-Buddhist terminology, too, makes it clear that these two parts are the product of different hands: in T225A the pronoun se 也 appears more often than se 色 (19 vs. 14 times), while in T225B the opposite is the case (20 vs. 219 times); likewise the verb yuza 日 is used far more often than yuza 日 in T225A (73 vs. 43 occurrences, with many of the latter in the interlinear commentary), while the reverse is true in T225B (146 vs. 503). Even the formulaic question tat kaya hetub "why is that?" is rendered differently in the two portions, with samayika he 所應若何 used almost exclusively in T225A, while T225B prefers the expression hōkyō 何故哉.

The two parts also have very different relationships to the earlier Dancing jing 無行經 by Lokakṣema. T225B is clearly a revision of T224, carrying over much of its wording even as the text is abbreviated and many translations replaced with translations. T225A, on the other hand, exhibits no direct connection to Lokakṣema’s work. In sum, T225 as we have it is not a single text, but a hybrid work in which two different translations of the scripture (one of them with an interlinear commentary) have been “pasted together.”

The fact that both T225A and B share certain unusual renderings of proper names, however—including the very rare translation Quakai 祈恵子 for Sariputra (or rather, for Sarvātathāpratapa; see Karashina and Nattier 2005) and Shanye 相應 for Subhāti, a rendition which appears to be unknown outside this text—makes it clear that the translator of one of these portions of the text was making use of the other.

Both T225A or T225B show certain similarities with other translations produced by Zhi Qian, and it is not immediately obvious which part of this hybrid texts should be viewed as his. As I have shown elsewhere, however, T225A contains a number of examples of wording that is not otherwise found in Zhi Qian’s corpus, while on the contrary T225B contains a number of terms that are used exclusively, or nearly so, by Zhi Qian (Nattier forthcoming). Moreover, Zhi Qian is known to have played an active role in revising existing translations by Lokakṣema. On balance, therefore, it seems reasonable to conclude that it T225B is that of the work of Zhi Qian, while T225A was produced by another hand. The latter has no obvious similarity to the work of any other translator, and for the moment it seems best simply to regard it as an anonymous translation. The interlinear commentary, however, shares numerous similarities with the commentary to the Tathāgatāvibhūjā (T1694), not only in its language but in the repertoire of texts that it cites. In a forthcoming study Stefano Zicchetti has suggested that the “Master Chen” 楚氏 who is said to have annotated T1694 is probably its author, with the commoners attributed to the “Teacher” belonging to Kang Senghai.

Buddhāvatānātmasaka. Zhi Qian’s corpus also includes a translation of a text

---

3 The rationale for using this title rather than the more common “Avatārakā-sūtra” is discussed in Sakaides 1969, an important new study on this topic can now be found in Osaka 2007.
corresponding to portions of the mammoth *Huayan jing* subsequently translated by Buddhahadra (as T278) and Siksainanda (as T279):

T281: *Pusa benye jing* 吾達本業經

In this case, too, Zhi Qian has retranslated a text previously produced by Lokaksema, the *Daoshu jing* 道書經 (T280). Indeed, with the aid of Zhi Qian’s work, it has been possible to reissue the latter with two other pieces of the text that were separated and subsequently catalogued separately, as discussed above (pp. 87-88). The relationship between Zhi Qian’s version of the text and that of Lokaksema is not nearly as close, however, as in the case of the *Daominglu jing* (T225B) and the *Daosuing jing* (T224); indeed, it is clear that Zhi Qian was using a different Indian recension of the text, and his translation has only occasional similarities in wording to that of Lokaksema, as can immediately be seen by consulting the synopsis edition given in Natter 2003.

The *Pusa benye jing* exhibits Zhi Qian’s characteristic preference for translation over transcription, with a noteworthy pattern of reducing proper names to fit a regular syllabic pattern of three characters (for the names of Buddhas) or two characters (for bodhisattvas and buddha-fields). A long segment of the text has been typeset as verse in the printed Taisho edition (see 10.447b25-448b24), but it appears that the scripture does not actually contain any verse passages at all; instead, this is simply another example of Zhi Qian’s well-established preference for four-character prose. A comparison with the corresponding Tibetan translation, in any event, shows no signs of a regular metric pattern, which makes it virtually certain that the Indian source-text was actually in prose.

Proof of the popularity of Zhi Qian’s translation can be seen in the extent to which it was plagiarized by the composers of indigenous scriptures: substantial material from the *Pusa benye jing* was incorporated word-for-word into the apocryphal *Pusa yongluo benye jing* 吾達藥燄本業經 (T1485), and extensive borrowings have been identified in the *Daosih Lingbao 道氏靈寶 scripture* as well. In sum, this was a widely influential work, known in both Buddhist and Daoist circles. The impact of Zhi Qian’s translation can also be seen in the later versions of the *Avinorinjaka* by Buddhahadra and Siksainanda, which often

---

7) There is a huge literature on various aspects of the *Huayan jing*, but the earlier translations by Lokaksema and Zhi Qian have received relatively little scholarly attention. Important exceptions include Kobayashi 1958, Mats 1992, and above all Sakamoto 1993; see also Kimura 1984 for an overview of various scholarly positions on the relationship of these early translations to the later *Buddhakavatmaka*. For a chart of the relationship between T281 and its parallels in other Chinese translations see Natter 2003, p. 319 and Natter 2007c, pp. 133-134; a synopsis edition of T281 and its parallels is T280, T282, and T283 is also given in Natter 2005.

8) See 10.446c17-447a6.

9) For a list of such borrowings in both Buddhist and Daoist scriptures see Appendix 2 in Natter 2007c.
reflect Zhi Qian's wording and style.4

Larger Sukhāvatīvyūha. In Part II I have discussed Paul Harrison's proposal that the version of the Sukhāvatīvyūha traditionally attributed to Zhi Qian (T342, the 467thannasūtra subhasta gaudara dharma) should instead be attributed to Lokakṣema or a member of his school (see above, pp. 86-87). In light of this very persuasive suggestion, it is now possible to see that the version traditionally assigned to Lokakṣema (an attribution which has been widely questioned by scholars) may now be considered to be a revision by Zhi Qian of this older work:

T361: Wulun guangjing zengduoyu jing

A major study of T361 and T362 now in progress by Paul Harrison (from which preliminary results were presented in Harrison 1999) promises to cast considerable light on this matter. In the meantime, we may simply note that T361 is what we might call a "close revision" of T362, carrying over much of its vocabulary, as Zhi Qian's Da minzao jing (T215B) does with respect to Lokakṣema's Laxan jing (T224). While this means that some of the transcriptions found in T362 (especially proper names) are adopted here, many other terms that are transcribed in T362 are translated into Chinese in T361. T361 differs from T362, however, in that it contains passages in verse, with one section in five-character meter (280–c); a longer passage is in Zhi Qian's trademark six-character style (288a–289a).

Vimalakīrti-nirādāja. Another of the translations by Zhi Qian that has strong support in external sources is his version of the Vimalakīrti:

T474: Weimojue jing 随機妙經

For example, Buddhadhara (and subsequently Sīkśānanda) adopted the translations of the names of several of the bodhisattvas of the ten directions from Zhi Qian's T341, even when they were erroneous (e.g., 賛 for "Buddhasri" in the case of Gossari, 諸 for "Narāśī", etc.). These two translators also followed much of Zhi Qian's wording in Chapter 7 (行品, Chapter 11 in Śīkṣānanda), including the famous refutation 豊富變生 "one should wish that all beings [adjust various results]."

An essential resource for the study of this text is the synoptic edition published in Kajawa 1984. Following the work of Fujita Kōtoku 『同福記』(1976 in English see Fujita 1996), most scholars have until recently assigned this translation to Bo Yans. In light of our current understanding of Zhi Qian's translation style, however, it is now evident that Zhi Qian is a far better candidate (as discussed below).

The sole exception to this characterization is the long section on the "Five Evil" which abounds in four-character prose; in previously noted, however, this is considered to be a Chinese interpolation and not part of the translated text.

There is a veritable flood of studies of this influential scripture (most of them based on Kumāryāja's Chinese translation), limitations of time preclude providing details on them here. The study of this scripture has entered a new era with the publication of a recently discovered Sanskrit version of the text, made available in an extremely useful synoptic edition (including Zhi Qian's version as well as the other Chinese and Tibetan translations) by the Taishō University Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature (2000).
GUIDE TO EARLY CHINESE TRANSLATIONS

According to Sengyou, Zhi Qian's was the first translation of this widely influential text; it is listed at "lost," however, in the Chu sanzang jji ji (55.6c14), a fact which has led to speculation that the extant version mentioned above might actually be that of Dharmarakṣa.78

Given the fact that Dharmarakṣa borrowed extensively from Zhi Qian's terminology, even adopting elements of his style (e.g., the use of six-character verse), it is often difficult to differentiate the work of these two translators without an extensive terminological analysis. Such an analysis has not yet been carried out with respect to T474, but two factors point in the direction of Zhi Qian's authorship rather than that of Dharmarakṣa.

First, the text contains glosses in Han yuean 資嚴, whereas Dharmarakṣa regularly uses the name of the dynasty during which he lived, providing glosses in Jingyuan 景元 (an expression which occurs in no fewer than eleven of his translations).79 Second, the name of the bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara (or rather, of an earlier Prakrit form of that name) provides "fingerprints" of the presence of these two translators; whereas Dharmarakṣa never uses any translation of this name other than his own signature rendition of Guangbiyin 光世音, this translation never appears in the works of Zhi Qian (nor for that matter is it ever used, so far as I have been able to determine, anywhere outside the corpus of Dharmarakṣa).

Zhi Qian's preferred translation, on the other hand—and the only one ever found in his work, aside from a transcription copied in a revision of an earlier text—is Kaiyuan 慶元, a form borrowed from An Xuan and Yan Fotiso. And again this is a translation of extremely limited usage, appearing (aside from An Xuan and Yan Fotiso's Fajing jing, T322) only in Zhi Qian's work.80 Thus just as the name Guangbiyin offers a guarantee of Dharmarakṣa's presence, so the appearance of the name Kaiyuan points to the presence either of An Xuan.

78 See for example Sze Giopu 翟君瑀 1998, who presents an interesting (but in my view ultimately unpersuasive) argument that T474 cannot be the work of Zhi Qian. Her analysis is based on a fragment of a commentary on the text discovered at Dunhuang (Pelliot 5090), which she infers that the commentary must be the work of Daosan (though this seems less than sure), and in turn reasons that, because Daosan was critical of Zhi Qian's translation style, he would not have written a commentary on a text produced by Zhi Qian. For mentions of Dharmarakṣa's translation of this scripture which, unlike Zhi Qian's version, is not listed as lost see the Chu sanzang jji ji, 55.6c12.

79 T317 (阿難上女阿難上女), where several glosses in Han yuean appear, is an interesting and problematic exception; it is probably not the work of Dharmarakṣa. Zhi Qian does not usually provide glosses—at least, in what appears to be his later work he simply eliminates the transcribed items in favor of a translation—but several glosses in Han yuean do appear in a scripture that appears to be one of his earliest translations (T169, 月照等流).

80 The form Ekhasan 慶元 appears only in his revised version (T361) of Lokakṣema's Da Amritajing (T342), and is clearly borrowed from the latter.

The only occurrences I have been able to locate in the Chinese canon are in T332 by An Xuan and Yan Fotiso (12.1137), T1011 by Zhi Qian (39.6808.13), and T474 (48.5190.16), the Vimalakirti itself.
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and Yan Fomiao (which is not relevant in this case) or of Zhi Qian.\footnote{On these and other names for Avalokitesvara in Chinese translations see: Karleinha 1999 and Nemer 2007a.} Both the vocabulary of the text—which offers numerous other instances of vocabulary pioneered by An Xuan and Yan Fomiao in addition to the name Kanṣa—and its style are congruent with other authentic works by Zhi Qian. The text exhibits a strong four-character prosodic pattern, with some passages in five- and seven-character verse. While future in-depth studies of the terminology and style of the text will be most welcome, at present there seems to be no reason to doubt that the text is the work of Zhi Qian.

Tādhāgata-jñāna-mādrā-samālaḥ. A stark contrast with the vocabulary and style of Zhi Qian’s Viṣṇulakṣṇa is offered by this text, which as discussed above is the most Lokāyata-like work in Zhi Qian’s corpus.

T632: Hūyin sammi jing 與印三味經

The prose portions of the text abound in transcribed terms, but—as in the case of the Raṇḍau sammi jing (T418) discussed above—the verses contain some translated terms that are not found in the prose. In fact T632 and T418 share some distinctive vocabulary, and it seems likely that they were produced in the same milieu.\footnote{See above, pp. 81.} Though Sengyou does not attribute a text whose title can be associated with the Hūyin sammi jing to Lokāyata, a good working hypothesis would be that this is a revised version produced by Zhi Qian of an earlier product of Lokāyata’s school.

What makes it clear that this is Zhi Qian’s work is not only the solidity of Sengyou’s attribution, but also its feature internal to the text. In addition to passages in five-character verse (15.46a–c and 46c–46d), as well as sections with four-character passages labeled as gāthās (§9; see 45c–46c, 46a–c, 46a–b, and 46c–46a), we also find two verse passages in Zhi Qian’s signature six-character form (46c–46a and 46c).

Anastamukhamātrā-sūtra-sūcakā. The final text in this category has sometimes been classified as a tantra, due apparently to the fact that it contains a translation of the work abhāva (§1) in its title (see note 15 above); in the Tāskā edition of the canon it is catalogued in the “esoteric” (śrāvaṇa) scriptures section. The text is classified in the Tibetan canon as a Mahāyāna stūpa, however, and not a tantra, and on the basis of its content I can see no reason not to do the same here. The work in question is the following:

TI011: Wulōnseng niu wéimi dì jīng 無漏門微密持經 (par. 成道留魔得一切智經)\footnote{An essential resource is the fine study by INAGAKI Hisao, which dealt Zhi Qian’s version as well as other Chinese and T’iwatan translations of this scripture (Inagaki 1987).}

A distinctive (and rather unexpected) feature of the text is that Zhi Qian has translated (rather than described) not only most names and Buddhist technical terms, but even the
dhārayati itself.\textsuperscript{86} (It seems worth raising the question as to whether he actually understood what a dhārayati is.)

Again we find an alternation of prose and verse (in this case only in the five-character style), four-character proseody comes and goes throughout the text. The vocabulary includes dozens of examples of expressions that are quite at home in the works of Zhi Qian, including the list of translations of bodhisattva names near the beginning of the text (one of which is Kāśyapa, as discussed above).

Minor Mahāyāna sūtras. Included in this category are a number of short Mahāyāna scriptures that have no close parallels elsewhere, but which can be identified at least to a certain degree with other translations preserved in Chinese and/or Tibetan.

To this group belongs one of the most Lokākāsa-like works in Zhi Qian’s corpus, which (though classified in the Taihō canon in the jūdaka and avadāna section) deals with the pursuit of the bodhisattva path and is best described as a Mahāyāna scripture: T169: Yueming puja jing 月明菩薩經 Candraprabhahodisattva-sūtra

No exact parallel to the scripture has yet been identified, though it has certain similarities to the Jātaka chapter of the Sūtrākasāra (ch. 34; cf. Durt 1998).\textsuperscript{87}

Most of this short text (occupying only a single page in the Taihō edition) exhibits a random prosodic pattern, but there is one short passage in six-character verse (411c). The scripture abounds in transcriptions, but some of these are glossed with translations in hanyan 漢言.\textsuperscript{88}

A second sūtra in this category has two alternate titles, with one of these based on the name of the main character Kṣemākara, and thus may be given the title of Kṣemākara-sūtra.

T533: Chamaijie jing 嵐摩伽経 (var. Puja shengdi jing 吾像生地経)

The meaning of the alternate title ("The Bodhisattva’s Birth-Ground?") is less clear, for the expression shengdi 生地 does not occur anywhere in the scripture except as the name of the text. No Sanskrit or Chinese version of the sūtra has yet been identified, but a somewhat different recension of the sūtra exists in Tibetan, entitled Bele byed kyi sbyos pa and carrying an accompanying transcription that indicates a Sanskrit title of Kṣemākara-paripṛcchā-sūtra.\textsuperscript{89}

This text is as short as T169 (only one page in length) but quite different in style: many lines are in four-character prose, and although the name of the Kṣemākara and a

\textsuperscript{86} See 19.688c5-11 and cf. the very useful synoptic table in Inagaki 1987, pp. 310-312.

\textsuperscript{87} The story is retold in two medieval Chinese anthologies; see T2121 (53.165b19-c5) and T2122 (53.770b4-25).

\textsuperscript{88} The only other text by Zhi Qian in which such glosses are found is the Vimalakīrtinītādī (T474).

\textsuperscript{89} For the Tibetan version (based on a quite different recension) see Sing Palace no. 308.
few other proper names are transcribed, virtually all of the Buddhist terminology is transliterated, and once again these are terms that are well attested elsewhere in Zhi Qian's works. Nearly one-third of the text is in five-character verse, but there is a brief section in six-character form at the end.

Somewhat longer (totaling just under two pages in the Taishö edition) is the following scripture, which again has no exact parallel:

T556: Qini jing 七女经
The text has interesting similarities to the Saptakumārīka-avadāna ascribed to Gopālakara, for in both versions seven sisters (in Zhi Qian's text, the seven daughters of a bhūmaṇa named Mahānārāma) visit a cemetery in order to practice meditation. Though the version translated by Zhi Qian may have its roots in the avadāna genre, however, in this recension the story has clearly been Makāyanīzed, with the seven young women in the embedded story of a previous era receiving a prediction from the Buddha Kasyapa of their own future buddhahood (14.909a11ff.). Interestingly, Songyue quotes Daoan as saying that the text is from the Abhidharma, which is rather unexpected; one wonders whether there might have been some confusion between "abhidharma" and "avadāna" is the Chinese perception of information provided by a nameless Indian informant.

As to its style, the text contains neither verse nor any discernible five-character pattern, but I suppose all names and terms are transcribed. The imprint of indigenous Chinese religious ideas, however, can be clearly seen, for once again we find a mention of the ban 檀 and the spirit (908a25).

Shortest of all is the following text (occupying only two registers in the Taishö edition), whose title might be reconstructed as the Nāgaratva-sūtra:

T557: Longshen jing 龙胜经
Here again there is no clear parallel, though the Taishö editors associate the text with the significantly different (though similarly titled) text that follows, the Longshen puza benji jing 龙胜普住本经 (T558) attributed to Dharmaraksa. In a recent study Saitō (2003) has argued that T558, rather than T557, should be considered the work of Zhi Qian. His argument, based both on the testimony of scriptural catalogues and on the pattern of rhyme in the verse sections of the text, is well crafted, and it seems quite persuasive as far as it goes. But the vocabulary used in the text tells a different story. Despite its

---

80 Of particular interest is the text's treatment of the name of Asamihā, for a detailed discussion see Nuttter 2007a, 86-307.
81 See Dergun 1978 for an edition and German translation of the Tibetan Tanjur version and an overview of other versions of the story. The Sanskrit text is given in the Appendix to Hahn 1992 (pp. 58-72).
82 Despite this context, the scripture is classified as a "Hinayāna" sūtra (小乘今日般) by Fajing (T2064, 55.120b14; see the section heading at 17c25).
83 T2145, 55.7a4: 造密教。
brevity—occupying less than two full pages—T538 is virtually saturated with vocabulary that occurs numerous times in other translations by Dharmaraksa, but never in texts by Zhi Qian. This is true of both the prose and the verse sections, so it seems that the attribution of T357, rather than T538, to Zhi Qian should be retained.41 It should be noted, however, that this is one of two extant scriptures attributed to Zhi Qian by Sengyou for which he reports that the scripture was not known to Daoan.42

Though no other translation resembles T357 closely enough to be described as another version of the same scripture, comparable themes can be found in other scriptures. Most notably, as Stephen Bokenkamp has observed, the Longshenhui jing echoes material found in a story in Kang Senghui’s Liuda ji jing (T152, story #73).43 It is also one of several translations by Zhi Qian that were copied (with adaptations) in the Daoist Lingbao 密藏 scriptures.44

The style of the text is not particularly distinctive; there is no discernible four-character pattern, and of the few names and technical terms it contains, some are transcribed but others translated into Chinese. None of its terminology, however, is foreign to Zhi Qian’s usage, so we may allow it to remain on its list of his authentic works.

Another title assigned to Zhi Qian by Sengyou, the Laomuren jing 老人經 (whose Sanskrit name has been reconstructed on the basis of the Tibetan as “Mahālalikā-paraśūktā-sūtra,”)45 appears to correspond to the text now contained in the Taishō edition as T359. Another text with a similar title, the Laomu jing 老母經 (T561), is treated as anonymous but dated to the Liu Song 劉宋 period (420–479 CE) in the Taishō canon.

As it happens, however, it is the vocabulary found in T561, and not in T538, that most closely reflects Zhi Qian’s usage. Even the titles themselves point in this direction, for while Zhi Qian never uses the expression 老女人, the term 老母 does appear in his work. Elsewhere I have given a detailed discussion of the terminology found in these two scriptures, so I will simply report the conclusion of that study here: T561 is a revision of the older translation found in T539, and it is the revised text, and not the older one, that should be viewed as the work of Zhi Qian.46

T561: Laomu jing 老母經

41 Time constraints do not allow for an adequate discussion of the topic here, but a few representative examples of quite ordinary-looking terms that are never used by Zhi Qian but occur multiple times in Dharmaraksa’s corpus are 講計音, 敬去時, 嗅其鬼, 和 尊信 in the prose section and 信行, 靜為行, 和 無上心 in the verse.

42 T2145, 55a10: 老母經一卷文錄較散. 無跡無


45 See Peking (Owari) no. 818, args mas zhab-pa.

46 See Nattier 2007b.
As in the case of the Qian jing in the T559 discussed above, T559 is classified by Daoan as being from the Abhidharma, since T561 is simply a lightly revised version of T559, this description should apply to it as well. Again like T556, the story is of the avadana type, explaining on the basis of events in a previous life why it is that the title character is so wise, on the one hand, but so poor on the other. This raises the question, once again, of a possible confusion between the terms abhidharma and avadana in the course of transmission of information concerning this text.

The translation is entirely in prose, with no regular metric pattern. As discussed in my article on the attribution of this text, the vocabulary of T561 is quite congruent with Zhi Qian's usage (Naver 2007b).

A sole exemplum. Finally we come to a Mahayana scripture for which no counterpart of my kind has yet been identified in any language. Occupying over four Taisho pages, it is a quite substantial text whose title can be reconstructed as the Simhanāta-sūtra:

T532: Simhanāta jing

Though the name of the title character is given throughout the printed Taisho edition as Simhanāta, Sengyō's catalogue entry reads Simhanāta (< Śīluccanāta), which seems certain to be the original form; both Simhānāta and Pusa daubō jing 平魔頌佛經 are given there as variant titles (T214F, 15.6c23). Though no Chinese, Tibetan, or Indic-language parallel has yet been identified, there is a long citation from the text in Daśabhiṣaṇa Fāyuan zháidūn 法眼珠林, where the title has undergone yet another change, now appearing as the Simhanāte jing 三頭三味經 (1-99).

The scripture deals with the practices of the bodhisattva, and it is built around categories of six, a structure that is reflected in the style, for the text abounds in six-character verse. Some passages are in four-character prose, but no other style of verse is to be found. The text also contains abundant examples of the distinctive translation terminology introduced in Xin Yuan and Yan Fochi's Fajing jing 法鏡經 (T332), including such expressions as dxiai “expelling mind” for bhāvanā, yingx zǒng “worthy of rite” for arka, and gēf 名符 “individual Buddha” for pratýabhidha.

Whatever the fortunes of other scripture outside China may have been, it is clear that it garnered considerable attention here, for Kang Senghui wrote both a commentary and a preface to the text.104 Daoxuan's Guangbīngjīng 善弘明記 also records a brief “song of praise” (kan 頌) based on the scripture.105

104 See T212, 53.89c21-23; the same passage is repeated in the Zhashīng yuē 法使釋 (T212, 54.97c7-9), also composed by Daoxuan.

105 See Sengyō's biography of Kang Senghui (5.97a15), which mentions a commentary to the Daṇḍha jing as well as Kang Senghui's composition of prefaces; Fujina's Zōngshīng mōda (T214E) specifies that one of the latter was a preface to the Daṇḍha jing (51.147a6). Neither of these writings, unfortunately, has survived.

106 See the Daṇḍha jing can 平魔頌佛 in T2103, 52.359b18-21. The fact that the poem echoes
Stylistic variations: sub-groups in Zhi Qian’s corpus

As we have had occasion to observe numerous times above, a distinctive feature of Zhi Qian’s corpus is precisely the variety in his terminology and style. Translations that have a strong claim to authenticity on external grounds include some that are quite “Lokaksema-like” in appearance, featuring an abundance of transcribed terms, long and often convoluted sentences, and a general absence of literary or vernacular features. Others could be described as more “An Xuan-like,” with virtually all names and texts translated into Chinese, using many expressions borrowed from An Xuan and Yan Foutao’s Faping jing. Some are composed in a crisp four-character style, while others exhibit an irregular metric pattern. Some contain five- or six-character verse (or more rarely, verses in a seven-character format); many of these are unrhymed, but in some cases (as Saito has shown) there are rhymed verses as well. One might be forgiven for thinking of the story of the blind men and the elephant: depending on whether one feels the ear, or the tail, or the side (that is, depending on which text by Zhi Qian one consults), a completely different picture will emerge.102

How, then, can we make sense of this great inconsistency on Zhi Qian’s part? We have already noted that the important contributing factor was surely the fact that he was active in revising translations produced by others. As a result, his works contain some vocabulary carried over from previous translations, even when we see him modifying other elements of those same texts. We have also noted that while he began his career as a member of the community founded by Lokaksema in the north, at the fall of the Han he migrated to the southern Wu kingdom, where his literary talents seem to have been greatly appreciated and he was brought in to court circles as a tutor to the ruler’s son. It seems likely that his exposure to this new cultural environment may also have been a factor in introducing changes to his translation style.

If all of the variations in vocabulary and style found in Zhi Qian’s corpus were due to traces of previously existing texts that he revised, we might well conclude that these are entirely random (or better, case-specific), and that no chronological or geographical pattern can be discerned. This may well be so, but it is nonetheless worth raising the possibility that, by paying attention to certain specific elements found in his translations, we might be able to identify at least a general direction of development.

A good place to start would be with the feature that appears to be most unique to Zhi Qian during this period: the use of six-character verse. A review of the translations reliably attributed to Zhi Qian that do, and do not, contain this form of verse reveals an interesting picture: with but one exception, none of his most An Xuan-like translations

the stele’s location at the Bamboo Grove (竹林) in Rizheng (壬辰), as well as giving the name of the stele character (abbreviated, more sensu, as R-309) makes it quite certain that k is this stele that it means.

102 Cf. the remarks by Zucchetti on the case of Dharmakirti: “there have been in fact almost as many dharmakirti as there have been texts translated under this name” (Zucchetti 2005, p. 13).
(that is, those that contain the smallest number of transcriptions and borrow heavily from the vocabulary of the Fo jing jing) contain six-character verse. On the contrary, this verse form appears in both of the more "Lokaksesa-like" of his translations (T169 and T332), as well as in several texts that might be described as "intermediate" in style (exhibiting a mixture of transcription and translation but not containing any of the most distinctive terms used by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao).101 The sole text in the "An Xuan-like" category that contains six-character verse—and it contains a substantial amount of it—and no other kind—in T332, the Sinhabami-nīrāva. Thus with this sole exception, we might say that the use of An Xuan-like vocabulary is a strong counter-indicator for the presence of six-character verse.

T332 has, however, a feature that is almost certainly related to its anomalous status in this regard: the entire text is built around lists of six items each. It seems quite likely, therefore, that it was the context of the text (or rather, its structure consisting of six-item units) that elicited the use of six-character verse in this case.

Returning to the overall pattern in the use of this style of verse, we might propose the following as a working hypothesis to be pursued in future studies. As a Buddhist disciple belonging to Lokaksesa's school in Luoyang, Zhi Qian began his career by approximating Lokaksesa's transcription-oriented approach. He differed from it only in adding verse passages where the Indic source-text was itself in verse, as we can see from his version of the Bhagavata Purana (T62). It was in this period that he began to use six-character verse, a form that appears to have been in vogue in Luoyang (but not in the south) at the time. Early revisions by Zhi Qian of works from Lokaksesa's school (including T361 and T780), as well as translations that appear to have been made without reference to a pre-existing Chinese version (e.g., T169, T198, and T337), also include six-character verse where there were verse passages in the Indian original. Where the original was entirely in prose, Zhi Qian follows suit, but the style (tending toward transcription rather than translation) remains the same (e.g., T54, T68, T556, and T537). Subsequently we see Zhi Qian moving toward greater incorporation of translated terminology, but not yet adopting the distinctive vocabulary introduced by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao; representative examples of this transitional type would include T6 and T185. Finally we see Zhi Qian becoming entranced with the terminology introduced in An Xuan and Yan Fotiao's Fo jing jing (T32), and producing a series of works strongly influenced by this text (T7A, T87, T223B, T281, T474, T493, T332, T381, and T1011). It is in the latter group that we find such features as the avoidance of transcription and preference for translation, the heavy use of four-character proseody, and the ample use of indigenous Chinese religious terms. It is also in this group that we find the total absence of six-character verse, with the exception of one single text (the Sinhabami-nīrāva, T332), which as we

101 Texts of this type which include six-character verse are T6, T198, T210, T361, and T333.
have seen has an internal structural element that may well have elicited this style.

Given what we know about Zhi Qian's situation in the Wu kingdom, it is tempting to attempt to align the above data with his move from Luoyang to the south. That is, it seems reasonable to put forth the hypothesis that after his migration to the Wu kingdom he began to produce texts that were more literary and elegant in style, borrowing heavily from the *Faqing jing* (whose popularity in the Wu kingdom is well attested) and making increasing use of indigenous Chinese religious terms, a feature that is also evident in the work of his fellow Wu-kingdom resident, Kang Senghui.

Much remains to be done in attempting to periodize the translations of Zhi Qian, and this brief sketch is intended only as an indicator of how future studies might approach this question. It will be a great advantage if we can at last move beyond the image of the "blind men and the elephant" to discern a pattern in the kaleidoscopic variety of his work.

**LOST TEXTS**

The following titles attributed to Zhi Qian by Sengyou have not been identified with any extant text and may be presumed, at the present state of our knowledge, to be lost:

--- *Xiao shenhua jing* 小照花經
--- *Youdasuowu jing* 作多羅經
--- *Huangyjng* 輪送經 (var. *Xia shifang lihou guan wen* 序方糧徑護文)
--- *Xianchudun jing* 銳苦德經
--- *Fo congcheng muzing samshi ji* 佛從上所行三十智
--- *Wenming ershi jie* 智明二十階
--- *Fajing jing* 佛鏡經
--- *Lanci jing* 樂子經
--- *Shi'er men da fangdeng jing* 小二門大方等經
--- *Shuangyuan jing* 雙源願經
--- *Xiaqi jing* 順契經

Of these the *Shuangyuan jing* (cited from the *Bolu 別錄*, not from *Daon* may be the result of confusion between Zhi Qian's name at that of Lokakeema (Zhi Chen 業滿). On the *Xiaqi jing* 順契經 (T328), the extant version of which is probably not Zhi Qian's work, see below, p. 157. Finally, the attribution of the *Lianzhen shengzi jing* 联賢生子經 (T798) to Zhi Qian it apparently an error made by Sengyou himself (see above, p. 109), so I have not included it here.

**SCHOLARLY RESOURCES**

Relatively few studies have been devoted to the translations of Zhi Qian thus far, and it seems fair to say that our understanding of the works of this translator is still at a rather primitive stage. Works that can be consulted with profit for an understanding of his vocabulary include those by Katsuzaki (1985 and others), Satô 1994, and Asayama (1983 and others). I have dealt with some aspects of Zhi Qian's terminology in previous studies (Natier 2003b, 2004, 2006a, and 2007a and b).
Kang Senghui 永僧会

BIOGRAPHY

As in the case of Zhi Qian, we have fairly detailed information on the life of Kang Senghui, some of it from his own hand.104 According to his biography in the Chu sanzang ji (closely followed by the Guang zhuan), he was born in Jiaozhi 简州 in the far south of the Wu kingdom (near present-day Hanoi), the son of a Sogdian merchant who had immigrated from India, where his ancestors had lived for generations.105 While still in his teens Kang Senghui lost both of his parents, and soon afterwards he became a monk. Before long, however, his first teachers died as well. In the tenth year of the Chawu 赤乌 era (≈ 247 CE) he moved to the Wu capital of Jianye, where his monastic garb and strange foreign appearance seem to have aroused official suspicion. His biography portrays him as receiving sternly friendly and threatening treatment from the ruling powers, and it describes him as employing a range of techniques—from lecturing the ruler on karma and rebirth to causing a miraculous relic of the Buddha to appear—to gain official permission to propagate the Buddhist teachings. After a long life in which he was alternately engaged in producing translations and commentaries and negotiating with the Wu authorities, Kang Senghui is said to have died in the first year of the Taikang 太康 era (≈ 280 CE), the same year in which the Wu kingdom was finally conquered by the Western Jin 西晋.

The dates given in the Kang Senghui's biography are significantly different from those given in Sengyou's catalogue section, where his translation activity is assigned to the period from 226-240 CE (according to the chronology of the Wu), or from 222-238 (according to Wu reign periods).106 If either of these ranges is correct, his translation career would have overlapping substantially with that of Zhi Qian; indeed, one might expect that they should have met, with both of them living in the Wu capital and interacting with the courts at the same time. None of the available sources, however, makes any mention of such a meeting, though it is clear that there was contact of another kind, for

104 For the earliest biographical treatments see Sengyou's Chu sanzang ji (T2145), 55.9a29-97a17 and Huwán's Guang zhuan (T2059), 50.32b13-18 and 32.58a3-32b13. French translations of the latter, including the intervening material concerning Zhi Qian, can be found in Chevannes 1909 and Shih 1968, pp. 20-31. Even these versions are (in the words of Erich Ziebere) "obscured by legend," which makes the value of Kang Senghui's own autobiographical remarks all the greater. These are contained in his preface to the Akha shangi jing (preserved in the Chu sanzang ji, 55.42b29-33a1; for Kang Senghui's comments on his own life see ≈1b24-24a1). For other early works composed by Kang Senghui see below, p. 157.

105 As in the case of Kang Mengxiang (see above, p. 102, n. 251), the statement that Kang Senghui's ancestors were from Karit' 可立, causes some scholars to assign them to a territory near but not in, Sogdiana.

For the passage in question see below under "Authentic Texts."
Kang Senghui’s biography states that he wrote a commentary on one of Zhi Qian’s translations,107 and he cites a passage from another in his own Liu dan ji jing (see section under “Translation Style”). Thus, however one adjudicates the apparent contradictions between the chronological data given in the catalogue and biography sections of the Chu sanzang ji ji, it makes sense to consider Kang Senghui as a slightly later contemporary of Zhi Qian.

It is noteworthy that in his own writing Kang Senghui portrays himself as having derived great benefit from the presence of three laymen—Han Lin, Pi Ye, and Chen Hui—who had migrated to the Wu kingdom after the fall of the Han, bringing with them teachings derived from the school of An Shigao. It was Chen Hui, he reports, who provided the annotations to the Anhun shouyi jing, which Kang Senghui helped to revise and record.108

CONTENTS OF HIS CORPUS

Kang Senghui’s sole extant translation is a collection of jātaka tales—organized according to the system of six perfections of the bodhisattva (paramitas, here translated using the term devasi introduced by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao). Though the collection is not a “Mahāyāna” text in the sense of recommending the practice of the bodhisattva vows to practitioners in general—like other traditional jātaka collections, its objective is to relate the great deeds of the ārya who was to become the Buddha Śakyamuni, not to encourage others to do the same—the fact that it employs this framework suggests that this collection may have been transmitted in a Mahāyāna-oriented milieu. The appearance of the bodhisattva Maitreya in one of the stories in the collection is also a noteworthy feature.109

Like Kang Meteoyang’s work, however, his translations are probably best described as belonging to a transitional category, containing traditional stories of the Buddha’s previous lives arranged within a format reflecting certain Mahāyāna assumptions.

In addition to his translation work, Kang Senghui was also actively involved in the production of scriptural commentary, and here too it is clear that he devoted his energy to explicating both Mahāyāna and non-Mahāyāna texts. These works included two commentaries on Mahāyāna sutras (the Fēijīng jīng, T.322 and the Daqiu jīng, T.332) and another on a text focusing on traditional meditation practice (the Anhun shouyi jīng; presumably a version resembling that found in K-ABS). Though the first two have not survived, it is possible that the latter is still embedded within the transmitted text of the

107 T2145, 55.97a15: for the parallel passage in the Guangong shuansheng see T2059, 50.31a23. The sutra in question is T532 (not T526) for which Sengsuo’s catalogue gives the alternate title of 吳譞譟菩薩
108 See Kang Senghui’s preface to the Anhun shouyi jing (T2145, 55.41b27f).
109 See entry #13, 3.7a26, b22, c16 and 19.
As can be seen, Kang Senghui's translation style is among the most literary in form. Another notable feature is the degree to which it conforms to that of Zhi Qian. The two translators share a wide range of vocabulary, some of it used rarely or not at all in other texts. Both clearly prefer translation to transcription, and they employ four-character proverbs with regularity as well as translating occasional passages into unrhymed verse. Like Zhi Qian, Kang Senghui generally uses the standard five-character format. There is one passage in which he seems to employ the rare six-character style, but this is in fact a quotation (identified by name) from Zhi Qian's *T'ai jing* (T198).

A particularly striking aspect of Kang Senghui's translation style—and one which is even more prominent, in percentage terms, in his work than in that of Zhi Qian—is the liberal use of ideas and terminology drawn from indigenous Chinese religion, ranging from references to entering Ms. Tai 太山 after death to discussions of the fate of the *human* 人的精神 (T198). Against this background it is not surprising to find Kang Senghui portrayed

---

118 See Zürcher 1959, p. 54.
119 See T198, 4.178627-213, copied in T152, 51a19-56. In fact the whole story in which this verse passage occurs is drawn from the same text by Zhi Qian.

In T152 five-character verse appears at 3.20a, 27c, and 34c; a passage of six-character verse occurs at 53a-b. T266 contains only a single passage of five-character verse (4.51b). As discussed above (pp. 17-18 and notes 48 and 49), six-character verse appears to have been introduced into Chinese translation literature by Zhi Qian; it is rarely used by other translators, with the exception of Dhammsara who in a number of respects can be shown to have drawn upon the "Wu scriptural idiom" of Zhi Qian and Kang Senghui discussed immediately below.

The alternate form 緣 does not appear in the received text of Kang Senghui's work.

A quick comparison with the works of Lokaksetra—who is commonly thought to have been overly influenced by Chinese (especially Daoist) concepts—is instructive. In Lokaksetra's core texts the term 緣 緣 never appears; it occurs only once in a third-tier text (T626, 15.190a22). In Kang Senghui's work, by contrast, the term appears (in the form 緣緣 緣緣) thirty-eight times. The term 緣 緣 occurs fifteen times in Kang Senghui's work, but not at all in Lokaksetra; likewise the intriguing term 緣 緣 appears thirteen times in Kang Senghui's work but is never employed in Lokaksetra's texts. The expression 緣 緣 (used by some early translators to render 梵天, unconditioned) as well as 緣 緣 appears only a handful of times in Lokaksetra's corpus, while in Kang Senghui's much shorter (and much less philosophically-oriented) *Laiyin jing*. Even the innocuous (though certainly Confucian-inspired) term 緣 緣 hardly ever occurs in Lokaksetra's work, being almost entirely restricted to the expression 緣 緣 (used as a form of direct address) and the related use of (i.e., alone as a de facto pronoun. It occurs in Kang Senghui's work, by contrast, no fewer than 130 times.)
in his biography in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* as responding to questions from the Wu ruler Sun Hao 孫浩 in terms drawn exclusively from traditional Chinese—i.e., non-Buddhist—sources.\(^{114}\)

Despite the fact that Zhi Qian’s biography is inserted, in the *Gaoweng zhuan*, in the midst of the account of Kang Senghui’s life, there is no evidence that the two ever met in person, for Zhi Qian had already withdrawn to the mountains when Kang Senghui arrived in Jianyue in 247 CE. The substantial overlap in their translation vocabulary, however, makes it virtually certain that Kang Senghui consulted translations produced or revised by Zhi Qian. Indeed, one of the texts for which he is said to have written a commentary—titled the *Dawen jing* 大文經 in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*—was one of Zhi Qian’s translations.\(^{117}\)

Whether the similarity between their translations is due specifically to borrowing by Kang Senghui from the works of Zhi Qian, or whether both men were participants in a broader rhetorical community for which no explicit evidence has survived, the confluence of style between the works of these two translators is so great that it seems appropriate to speak of a "Wu scriptural idiom." This idiom drew preferentially, in turn, on the vocabulary and style of earlier translations by Xu Xuan and Yan Froao (T322) and by Kong Mengxiang (T184 and T196). In subsequent decades this idiom would be appropriated by Dharmaśāla, whose translations—though produced far from the territory of Wu, in Dunhuang and the northern Chinese capitals of Luoyang and Chang’an—bear the strong imprint of the vocabulary and style favored by these two southern translators.

**AUTHENTIC TEXTS**

The account of Kang Senghui’s work in the catalogue section of the *Chu sanzang ji ji* is quite brief, for he is credited there with only two works, a *text* in five fascicles and ten chapters entitled the *Wu pin* 吳譜 "Wu version," described by Sengyou as lost, and another scripture in nine fascicles entitled the *Liaoh jijings* 六旻集註 "Compendium on the Six Perfections" (T2145, 55.7a25-26). Sengyou summarizes his entry as follows:

The above two works, comprising fourteen fascicles in all, were translated by the Indian śramaṇa Kang Senghui at the time of emperor Ming 明 明 of the Wei 魏, during the time of the Wu rulers 吳 Sun Quan 孫權 (r. 222-252) and Sun Liang 孫亮 (r. 253-258).\(^{118}\)

Of the two extant texts attributed to Kang Senghui by the Taisō editors, only one

---

114 T2145, 55.96c11-16. The same wording is repeated in the *Gaowang zhuan* (T2099, 50.32c19-28).

115 T2145, 55.97a15; for the parallel passage in the *Gaoweng zhuan* see T2099, 50.32d12. The sūtra in question is T352 (E453), for which Sengyou’s catalogue gives the alternate title of *Buddhāprajñā* 般若波羅蜜 (*55.6c23*).

116 T2145, 55.7a27-7b1: 右二弟 - 亀四 十 - 崇嚴 - 得生 - 勝 - 以 - 勝 - 勝 - 勝 - 小 - 勝 - 勝 - 勝 - 勝 - 
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corresponds to a title credited to him by Sengyou. The language of the text is very much in line with Kang Senghui's own writings (discussed below), and there is no reason to dispute its authenticity:

T152: **Lindu ji jing** 麗僊集經

As with the Buddha-biographies attributed to Zhi Qian (T185) and to Kang Mengxiang (T194 and T196), questions have been raised about whether Kang Senghui's *jōshū* collection is really a translation, or whether it might be a compendium assembled in China. Further study of the contents of this important text will surely be rewarding; in particular, a comparative analysis of individual stories in the collection with their analogues in other scriptures may cast much light on the situation.

Sengyou also credits Kang Senghui with a second translation, a text referred to as the or the "Wu version" (55.7a26)—but of what? Zürcher speculates (presumably on the grounds of the character 悟, which is often used to distinguish various versions of the *Prabhāpatīrūpa* sutras) that this may have been a local recension of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prabhāpatīrūpa*, and this is certainly a possibility. Whatever the content of this mysterious text might have been, Sengyou was unable to examine it, for it had already been lost in time.

In addition to his translated work, several short pieces authored by Kang Senghui himself have been preserved: Preface to An Shigao's *Aohan zhongjing* (55.42c9-43c3) Preface to his own (lost) commentary on An Xuan and Yan Foji's *Fajing jing* (55.46b19-21 and 12.15a5-26) Introductions to sections 1 through 5 of his own *Lindu ji jing* (3.1a14-20 [āṇāna], 16c9-14 [āṇāna], 2a19-24 [āṇāna], 3a10-19 [āṇāna], 3.39a15-41a20 [āṇāna]).

---

118 This possibility was raised already by Chavannes in his translation of the collection (1910, p. 1, n. 1).

119 Zürcher 1959, p. 53. The fact that a version of the text by Kang Senghui's contemporary Zhi Qian (六月集, T225) was already in circulation and was immensely popular in this region might be viewed as evidence against this identification. Note, however, that the *Sanbang zhuan* credits Kang Senghui with the production of a text referred to only as *Sākā* (50.32a21), a name which was often used as an abbreviation of the shorter *Prabhāpatīrūpa* sūtras. In Kang Senghui's biography in the *Chao sanbang zhuan* a text (presumably the same one) titled *Sākā* is mentioned, which evokes the short title of Lokakṣema's translation of the *Aṣṭa* (T224). Future work on the identity of this mysterious "Wu jīn" should be carried out in tandem with a thoroughgoing analysis of the vocabulary and style of the *Da minguo jīng*; given the non-negligible difference between the terminology used in chapter 1 (which contains an interlinear commentary which Kang Senghui may well have been involved in producing) and the remainder of the text, it may be worth considering whether Kang Senghui's "Wu jīn" can be identified with some subset of the currently extant *Da minguo jīng*.

118 For an annotated English translation see Link 1976, pp. 67-80.

119 Chavannes (1910) provides French translations of three of these: the introductions to the
Zürcher has also suggested that the commentary interspersed within the text of the *Anhun shuqi jing* (T602) includes explanations by Kang Senghui and his contemporary Chen Hui, with whom he is said to have written a commentary to that text, as well as glosses added later by Daoan (Zürcher 1959, p. 53). An explanation of An Shigao's *Videh pitaka* (T1694), the scripture itself was extracted from the commentary in the modern period and included in the *Taidi* canon separately as T603) may also incorporate contributions by Kang Senghui (Zürcher 1959, p. 54). It may even be that some of the remarks attributed to an unnamed "master" in the interlinear commentary to the first chapter of Zhi Qian's *Da ming lu* (T225) are the words of Kang Senghui as well (Zürcher, loc. cit.).

A puzzle is presented, at least initially, by the long list of translations attributed to Kang Senghui in the biographical section of the *Chu sanzang ji ji* (55.97a13-14, followed by the *Gaowen zhuan* at 30.32a20-21), which does not agree at all with the much shorter list of only two words given by Sengyou in his catalogue section (55.7a25-26). A solution, however, is easily found, for all four of the additional titles given here also occur as the names of stories belonging to the *prajñā* section of the *Loushu jing* (nos. 88-91, 3.49b24-52b1).

**LOST TEXTS**

In addition to the *Ws pin* mentioned above, Kang Senghui is also known to have produced at least two commentaries, one on the *Fajing jing* (T323) translated by An Xuan and Yan Fotiao (to which his preface has been preserved) and another to Zhi Qian's *Daoshu jing*.

---

*Ws pin* (a *prajñāpāramitā* text?)

---

*Fajing jing* (Fu 高唐 禪注)

---

*Daoshu jing* (Du 道舒 禪注)

Though all of these are thought to be lost, a few tantalizing lines of Kang Senghui's *Fajing jing* commentary are quoted in a sixth-century anthology, the *Fayuan zhuan* (translated by Daozhi) 212.

**SCHOLARLY RESOURCES**

The single most valuable resource for the study of Kang Senghui's work is the annotated French translation of virtually all of *T152* by Édouard Chavannes (1916, pp. 5-146); a translation of *T236* is also included there (pp. 347-428). Another very useful source is Link 1976, which contains annotated translations of Kang Senghui's preface to the *Anhun*.

---

212 See T2122, 1000a1-2. 莊仲常法藏注云：凡大食漢六底，猶騰大食漢不知番足。今華入蕃，番番底當於番足。
Bo Yan 白延

**BIOGRAPHY**

Bo Yan receives a brief mention in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* at the end of the biographical entry on An Xuan (55.96a27-38) and another short listing in the catalogue section (55.76b-6), but virtually all of the information given in both places is negative. Sengyou reports that Bo Yan’s place of origin is unknown, that all three of the works credited to him have been lost, and that Bo Yan’s name was not registered in Daoan’s catalogue, a fact which casts some doubt on the validity of these attributions (which Sengyou says he drew from another source). All three of Bo Yan’s supposed translations, moreover, are described in the biographical section as retellings of already existing works, and two of the three titles are also assigned to Sengyou to Zhi Qian.125 According to Lamotte, the surname Bo 管 (which he considers to be simply a variant of the character 管, though in Sengyou’s

122 Unless I have misunderstood something, Zürcher’s statement that Daoan and Sengyou "do not list any names of translators or works translated during this [Wei] period" (Zürcher 1959, p. 35) is incorrect.

123 The *Chu sanzang ji ji* credits Zhi Qian with translating the Xinai jing 信夷经 (still extant in Sengou’s text) and the Shouningzang jing 祭神藏经 (which is listed as “lost”). The third title credited to Bo Fan, the *Chu zai buan jing* 管白變經, has no parallel in the list of works attributed by Sengyou to Zhi Qian.
catalogue section the two appear to be clearly distinguished) implies that he was a member of the Kuchean royal family (1985, p. 80). This is indeed the case with another figure by the same name who lived a century later (as discussed immediately below). Not all monks with this surname, however, had any connection to Kucha; the scholar-monk Bo Yaan 布延, for example, was the son of a Confucian scholar from Hexian 郭熙, and there is no reason to think that he was not ethnically Chinese.152

Virtually the only positive details given in the Chu sanzung ji ji are the dates of Bo Yan's translation work, but even these are contradictory. In the biography section he is said to have been active toward the end of the Zhenghe 正和 era (280-249), but Sengyou's catalogue entry for Bo Yan places him in the time of Lord Guogui 郭貴公 (254-260).153

It is difficult to reconcile the information provided by Sengyou with the account given in the Gaojia zhuan concerning Bo Yan 布延, even if this name is simply a variant reading of 布延. The dates given for this figure are approximately the same (though Huijiao uses yet a third chronological frame of reference, placing him in the middle of the Ganlu 梁后 era, i.e., from 250-260 CE). Now, however, he is credited six scriptures rather than three, and the only one that is named—the Weiyou shaoguo ziyongzong jujing 無畏涅槃平等覺經 (Ti161), whose authorship has long been a topic of debate—does not correspond to any of the titles included on Sengyou's list.

The waters are muddied still further by the fact that the Chu sanzung ji ji also contains an anonymous preface to a translation of a sutra by the same title,154 where the text is credited to the Yuehi apstaka Zhi Shilun 正等論, who "held the foreign text in his hand" (手持外經) and "issued" it (出), presumably to be understood here as "excited" the Indian text, and the Kuchean prince Bo Yan (布延王延子布延), who is described as the actual translator (譯主). All of this took place with the active participation of the Prefect of Liaozhou, Zhang Tianqi 張天奇, who at the end of the preface is said to have "chosen the terminology" (應別, presumably meaning that he made certain editorial decisions) himself. To add to the confusion, at the beginning of the preface he is said to have "issued" the text (出), using precisely the same wording applied to the apstaka Zhi Shilun, but presumably the verb is to be taken here in a more general causal sense, implying that he "had the text translated" under his sponsorship and supervision.

152 See Sengyou's list of translators for whom he had drawn his information from sources other than Danuan, where Bo Yan 布延 and Bai Fuzi 白法子 are listed one after the other (55.10a6).

153 See his biography in the Chu sanzung ji ji, 55.107a5ff.

154 Even on this point there is some difference of opinion. While most sources (including the catalogue section of the Chu sanzung ji ji, 55.7b2-6) place him in the 250 CE, Sengyou places him slightly earlier, during the decade of the 240s, in the biographical section of the same account (55.106a27-28).

The date given in the preface, which corresponds to 373 CE, places these events more than a century after the time of the Wei-period Bo Yan. Yet there is a curious echo in this account, for not only is this Eastern Jin-period Bo Yan said to have translated the same Sūtra-sūtra as did his Wei-period predecessor, but another of the texts said to have been "issued" (出) in Liuzhou by the same Yuezhi reciter, the ādiśakya Zhi Shilun, is the Sāramārga-sūtra-sūtra, which is also among the texts credited to the earlier Bo Yan by Sengyou.

AUTHENTIC TEXTS

In the catalogue section of the Chú sanyang ji ji, as mentioned above, Sengyou credits Bo Yan with three translations, all of which are listed as lost. More specifically, Bo Yan is said to have translated the Sāramārga-sūtra-sūtra (Shoudengyu jing 舍緣蕅經), the Sārimbha-sūtra (Xialai jing 順賴經), and a third text entitled "Scripture on Averting Distressers" (Chu zaihuan jing 趨災患經). Sengyou concedes with the following note:

The above three works, comprising four fascicles in all, were translated by Bo Yan during the time of Lord Gaogui of the Wei. They are cited from the Bie lei previously his name was not in Lord Duqian's catalogue. It appears that the Shoudengyu jing and the Chu zaihuan jing have indeed been lost, but a translation of the Xialai jing (T328) is credited to Bo Yan by the editors of the Taishō canon.

A scripture by this title, however, is attributed by Sengyou both to Zhi Qian and to Bo Yan (e.g., at 55.14a15-18). Thus according to the methodology outlined above, we should compare the vocabulary and style of the extant text with other works by both translators before deciding whether the attribution found in the received tradition (i.e., in the Taishō canon) is correct. With no other translations that are certain to be by Bo Yan available to offer a basis for comparison, however, we are limited to the internal evidence provided by the other works of Zhi Qian. As noted above, while the style of the text offers no dramatic differences from that of other translations by Zhi Qian, over the past several years it has repeatedly failed to appear in searches for Zhi Qian's most distinctive terms. Thus at present it seems most likely that the text as we have it is indeed the work of Bo Yan. It is, therefore, included here pending further study.

T328: Xialai jing 順賴經

SCOLARLY RESOURCES

Most studies published to date that mention the work of Bo Yan are devoted to his supposed translation of the Pingdeqiu jing (T361), which at the current state of our knowledge appears to have been produced by Zhi Qian instead (see above, p. 139). To

128 T2145, 7b6-6: 左三思，凡四卷，魏鄭覺時為廷所譯出，述維所載，安公漸(先無其本)。“
Kang Sengkai 吳敏鈞 (Sanghavarmman)

BIography

As noted above, Bo Yan is the only Wei-period translator listed in the Chu sançaŋg ji ji, where Kang Sengkai’s name is not even mentioned. The latter figure first appears in the Gaosen zhuan (50.325a-8) and in Fajing’s Zhongjing mala (55.119z24). The absence of any reference to translations by Kang Sengkai in Sengyu’s work means that these attributions are automatically suspect, but because two of Kang Sengkai’s supposed works have been widely influential in East Asia we will briefly consider the evidence for and against their authenticity here.

Three texts are credited to Kang Sengkai by the Tashō editors: a version of the Ugraparipüçö-nītra (Yajje zangbye bai 無模漸喜基, T30[19]), a version of the larger Sukhāvatīvyūha-sūtra (Wulangshou jing 無忘疏侯經, T340), and a vinaya text (Tamvo de lābu sajīme 穿無佛部著難記, T1432). As we have seen, none of these attributions appear in Sengyu’s catalogue (much less in that of Daoan). Fajing’s catalogue (T2146) attributes only the first of these three scriptures to Kang Sengkai, and subsequent catalogues follow him in this practice at first.108 A version of the Sukhāvatīvyūha is assigned to him for the first time in Fei Changfang’s Lidak samta ji (597 CE);109 references to a vinaya text translated by Kang Sengkai are later still.110

108 Hayashiya’s analysis is based on the fact that both Zhi Qian’s and Bo Yan’s versions of the text are registered as lost in later catalogues. The attribution of a translation of the Xulai jing to Dharmaraksa, however, was unknown to either Daoan or Sengyu. Thus it seems most prudent to infer that the similarities between the terminology found in T328 and in some of Dharmaraksa’s extant translations simply reflect the latter’s adoption of terms that were already in wèi by other third-century translators (including Zhi Qian). As is well known, some scriptures that were registered as lost by Sengyu were actually still in circulation elsewhere; thus it should not be assumed that no translation that currently appears in the Chinese canon could be correlated with one listed in the Chu sançaŋg ji ji as lost.

109 See T2147 (55.158b27) and T2148 (55.159b13).

110 T2034, 49.56h23-24.

110 The earliest reference that I have been able to locate is in the eighth-century Kiyamā shāhā (T2154, 55.619b7-8). The Gaosen zhuan credits Kang Sengkai with the translation of four scriptures, but only the Ugrā is mentioned by name (識出模漸基誓難所難記, 50.325a6-8).
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PART III: THE THREE KINGDOMS PERIOD

Whatever the testimony of the catalogues, internal evidence alone is sufficient to demonstrate that none of these texts is the work of Kang Sengkai. The language of the Upaguptaviprakha and the Sukhāvativrātya is clearly that of the third century; both texts begin, for example, with the expression 如是我聞, which came into use only at the end of the fourth century. References to Kang Sengkai’s supposed translation of a vinaya text are so late that they hardly require internal evidence to support their dubiousness, but an examination of the language of this text would no doubt yield a similar result.

In sum, despite the frequent mention of his name in studies of East Asian Buddhism, not a single text can reliably be credited to Kang Sengkai. While there may well have been such a monk living in north China during the Wei period, his name simply became a peg on which to hang the attribution of texts which are obviously of much later vintage.

AUTHENTIC TRANSLATION

None.

Other Wei-period translators

Two other Wei-period translators—whose names can be reconstructed as Dharmendra (德弟, var. 德弟) and Dharmikara (德弟迦那, var. 德弟迦那), respectively—are mentioned in the Gaosung zhuans and later sources, but none of the works attributed to them have survived. If the report of their translations given in the Gaosung zhuans is

135 Earlier texts use the form 唯如是, avoiding the use of the first-person pronoun. Zürcher has suggested that the shift to the four-character phrase was made for metric reasons (1991, p. 288), but the three-character formula occurs widely in texts that employ the pattern of four-character prose. My own suspicion is that the shift to the four-character formula was simply the result of the concern for dharmadāna to the Indian original finally winning out over the reluctance to portray the transmitter of the text as too blantly (and unpolitely) referring to himself.

136 "I am not well versed enough in the history of Chinese vinaya terminology to make such an evaluation. An extinguishment of this issue by a vinaya-specialist would be most welcome."
reliable, however—and much depends on the status of a source called the Wenbi lu 萬巻録 said to have been compiled by Shi Daolu 石道流 and completed by Zhu Daoyu 朱道如 around 419 CE—it is noteworthy that both of these figures are credited with producing translations of a type of literature that is completely unattested among the extant works listed above: the list of monastic rules, or pratimoksa, of which Dharmendra is said to have translated the Dharmaguptaka version and Dharmakara that of the Mahasanghidakas. In any event their works have not come down to us, for the versions of these texts preserved in the Tripitaka canon are the work of later translators.118

3. THE SHU 蜀 KINGDOM (c. 221-265 CE)

Given the substantial number of texts produced in the Wu kingdom, and the much smaller but still significant number of texts rumored to have been produced under the Wei (according to later sources, at any rate), it is striking that none of the scriptural catalogues mention a single Buddhist translation produced in the southwestern realm of Shu. While noting this absence ONO Genndō 小野次郎 cautions against assuming that there were none; as a possible example, he points to the existence of a “Shu Shāmantaramrajasa-nirāra” (Shu Shāmantara jing 蜀四言論経),119 ONO conceding, however, that this could refer either to a text produced during the period of the Shu kingdom or simply to one produced in the territory of Shu, whatever the actual date of the translation. Presumably it could also refer to a recension of a text which—whatever its time and place of composition—had become particularly popular in the Shu region. Thus such references, intriguing as they are, cannot demonstrate that any Buddhist texts were translated in Shu during the Three Kingdoms period. The resounding silence of the catalogues strongly suggests that, whatever the importance of this region as a center of textual production and transmission in later Buddhist history, during the Three Kingdoms period its day had not yet come.

117 On this catalogue and three other lost works which recorded the titles of texts circulating in the Wu kingdom, in the Jin W dynasty, and in Ganzu, respectively; see Zirkel 1989, p. 318, n. 164 and Pelliot 1921, p. 102 and n. 3. Zirkel points out that Fujiiro does not actually cite the Wenbi lu, but since all the other catalogues do he infers that this may be where the information found in the Ganzu shuonan was obtained.

118 For the Mahāsanghikha pratimoksa see T149 (attributed to Buddhaghosa); for the Dharmaguptaka version see for example T1497 (attributed to Buddhayaśa).

119 One 1936, p. 411. ONO does not provide a reference, but presumably he is referring to a text by this title cited by Sengyou (T1445, 55.32b2) and later catalogues. “This is not the only such text: another “Shu sūtra” is also registered by Sengyou (55.32a2), bearing the title Shu Pusa jing 蜀菩薩經. In both cases Sengyou notes that the citations are not from Daowu but from another catalogue (the Jiafu 賈福), while the texts themselves are described as "appearing to have come" from Shu (邱巻所出).
Part IV

Conclusions
THE MISSING MAJORITY: TEXTS BY UNKNOWN TRANSLATORS

In the preceding sections I have attempted to review all of the extant Chinese Buddhist scriptures that can be reliably assigned to translators who lived and worked during the Han and Three Kingdoms periods. In general I have included only those texts attributed to translators of these eras by Sengou (or better still, by Daoan), though I have made occasional exceptions when there is overwhelming evidence of another kind.

But in so doing I have dealt with only a fraction of the translations produced during this period. Many have been lost, of course, but that is not the problem I refer to here. Rather, as noted in the Introduction, it is the fact that during the second and third centuries CE Buddhist scriptures circulating without any mention of the name of the translator were not the exception but the rule. Most scriptures, in other words, were "anonymous translations," with no preface or colophon to indicate their date or provenance.

The extent to which this was the case is masked, in modern editions of the canon, by the intervention of Fei Changfang, whose sweeping assignment to known translators of scriptures classified by Daoan and Sengou as anonymous has obscured the identity of the vast majority of these texts. Fortunately, however, two long lists of such anonymous scriptures (未譯部) have been preserved in the Cha samzang ji, one compiled by Daoan (pp. 55.16c7-1862) and the other by Sengou himself (21c10-75b17). Thus it is possible to simply ignore the attributions given in modern printings of the canon and work directly from the lists of anonymous works given by Daoan and Sengou. Because of the Bailey of titles, though, it is not always a simple matter to collate the names given by Daoan and Sengou with those found in modern editions of the canon, but even so it is possible to identify dozens of such surviving anonymous texts.

Because Daoan's catalogues preceded that of Sengou by more than a century, texts on Daoan's list of anonymous scriptures have a higher probability than those added by Sengou of dating from the period with which we are concerned. Some, of course, may be as late as the fourth century CE, but many others are likely to be products of the Han and Three Kingdoms periods. Thus there are many dozens of texts that could—if properly identified—contribute additional information to our knowledge of the form and content of scriptures that were being translated into Chinese at this time.

Not surprisingly, these anonymous scriptures have generally been neglected by scholars, for since they cannot be placed precisely in time or space it is difficult to know

---

1 A notable exception is Hayashiya's extended discussion of this topic, which is an essential starting point for any study of these works (Hayashiya 1941, pp. 452-608). An article by Zürcher (1997) raises a number of interesting points and includes plot summaries of several of these texts, but overall it seems to obscure rather than to illuminate the topic by declaring that, of the 142 scriptures listed by Daoan as anonymous, only "а residual of 17 texts" can still be found in the Taisho canon (p. 161). In fact, as Hayashiya has shown, dozens of others are still extant as well. Zürcher's exclusion of these
how to use the data they contain. There are, however, at least two ways in which we can attempt to place them somewhat more precisely: first, by identifying citations from these scriptures in early Chinese compositions that can be dated with some precision; and second, by identifying certain sub-groups of texts that share distinctive patterns of usage, i.e., that belong to what I will refer to here as distinct "rhetorical communities." Limitations both of space and especially of time (with a looming deadline for the submission of this monograph) preclude an extensive discussion of these topics, so I will simply sketch the outlines of these possibilities here. The texts mentioned below should thus not be construed as representing a comprehensive list, in any sense, of anonymous texts that can be viewed as dating from the second or third century; instead, they constitute only a few representative examples of what such an approach can allow us to find.

Establishing chronology through commentaries

A well-known practice in the field of Indian Buddhism, where finding a citation in an external source of known provenance is often the only way of gaining any concrete information concerning the date of composition of (for example) a given Mahāyāna sūtra, is to make use of commentaries for this purpose. The same thing can be done, however, with early Chinese translations. In cases where a treatise or commentary composed in China can be dated with some degree of accuracy, it is then possible in turn to determine that the scriptures cited in that text must have been in circulation prior to its time.

An excellent example of such a text is the interlinear commentary on the Vinītāra jing 菩提樹經 (T603), a scripture translated by An Shigao as discussed above. The commentary itself (T1694, with the same title as the base-text) is anonymous, but evidence contained in its preface, as well as certain distinctive usages within the text itself, make a third-century date extremely probable. In addition to its discussion of the Vinītāra jing itself, the commentary cites brief passages from more than a dozen scriptures, most of which are cited by name. The majority of these are well-known Eastern Han or Wǔ-königdom translations, and none were produced later than the middle of the third century CE.

additional titles are pencilled: on internal criteria, it would appear that he has removed from the list of extant "anonymous" scriptures all those that have received translator attributions (most of them by Fei Changlong) in subsequent centuries.

1 So suggested in Zürcher 1959, p. 34; an extended study is given in Zacchetti (forthcoming).
2 T1694 cites three translations by An Shigao (T11, 662, and 607, in addition of course to T603 which serves as the primary basis of the commentary), sin by Zhi Qian (T210, 225, 474, 512, 561, 652), one by An Xuan and Yan Foxian (T212) and one which is listed as anonymous by Dunan, but is associated with Lelukṣeka in the Chu samyang ji ji (T624). Four citations from a commentary on the Atthār akṣo jing 阿含阿毘訶經 (556/86), cited as 33,11622, 22423, 22622, and 22229) show promising similarities to material in the newly discovered Korean manuscripts (see above, pp. 64-65). Two credited simply to a "stirnp" (13b24 and 22b12) and one credited to "a gahā" (14c9) have not yet been identified.
In two instances, however, the *Yinchuan jing* commentary cites scriptures for which Sengyou’s *Cha sanzang ji ji* does not provide a translator’s name.4 Judging from the context, it would seem highly likely that these two, too, are of a similar vintage. The first, cited in the *Yinchuan jing* commentary by the title *Fojiasha jing* 佛業沙經*The Pukkuśita Siṣṭa,* corresponds to a text included by Daon in his list of anonymous scriptures.5 In the Taishō edition of the canon this text appears under the following name:

T311:  *Pingsha zang sanyan jing*  普沙上五翻經*The Siṣṭa on the Five Wishes of King Ribhuṣāsita.*6

Though the titles are different, this is unquestionably the same work, for the passage cited in T1694 (53.54:1) does indeed occur in T311 (14:790c:21).

The other scripture cited in T1694 for which Sengyou does not provide a translator’s name is the *Zhoengxin jing* 中心經, a title which does not occur as such in the *Cha sanzang ji ji* but is elsewhere given as a variant of *Zhengxin zhengxing jing* 心中正行經.7 With the latter title in mind, we can now see that Sengyou does list a work entitled *Ahn zhengxing jing* 何含正行經 in his section on “excepted” or “abbreviated” texts (抄本的).8 Though no

4 A third scripture cited there is the *Lindeon shengzai jing* 了本生大業* (T708), a scripture attributed (mistakenly, it seems) to Zhi Qian by Sengyou, but actually an anonymous Hinayana translation (see above, pp. 109-110).

5 Cited in the *Cha sanzang ji ji* 佛業沙經* (T311) as *Shandili jing* 甚劣利經. (55.17c:27). These are too as it might initially appear, variant writings of the name of the same figure, but the names of two different kings (under the, var. 甚劣沙王 and 遠劣沙王, var. 遠劣沙王 and 他劣沙王) who appear in the text. The continuities of the siṣṭa is in fact a variant of the story of these two kings told by Budhaghoṣa in his commentary on the *Dharmasattra-nāτa of the Mahāmāyūrasa* (MA v.33:6). In light of this relationship it is particularly interesting that Sengyou quotes Daon as saying that this siṣṭa is from the *Mahāyamāyūrasa*. For Daon’s full list of 142 titles whose translators’ names have been lost see 55.18:7-18:2.

6 Daon notes that the siṣṭa is from the *Mahāyamāyūrasa* (55.17c:27), and indeed the later Chinese translation of that collection contains a translation based on a different rendering of the same text (T260:632, *Foche jiaosai jing* 阿含正行絃*). There is also a corresponding siṣṭa in the Pali (MN 140, *Dhānakūṭa-nāτa*). The version translated as T511, however, contains additional material not found in either of these counterparts, including Pukkuśita’s identity as the former king of Takṣaṭika, his friendship with King Ribhuṣāsita, and above all the Buddha’s direct knowledge of Pukkuśita’s impending death and his decision to travel to the potter’s workshop to preach to Pukkuśita on his last night in this world. For an analog to this portion of the text we must turn to a commentary on the scripture by Budhaghoṣa (MA v.33:6). The fact that this material is found in T511, which (whatever its precise date) clearly precedes Budhaghoṣa by (at least five centuries) at least ten centuries demonstrates that the commentaries composed by the famous scholar-monk incorporated traditions that were already circulating well before his time. It also demonstrates that material classified as a commentary in one tradition (e.g., that represented by Budhaghoṣa) could be incorporated into a siṣṭa (itself in another textual lineage).

7 See for example the *Kaiyuan shijian fo* T2154, 55.503:8.

8 Cited at 55.280c2. For an excellent discussion of the *chaos*  令 category of scriptures see Tokuno 1990, especially pp. 39-40 and 42-43.
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scripture titled Zhongxin jing appears in the Taiho edition of the canon, a work by this alternate title is found there:

T151: Aban zhongxing jing 啓正行經 ＂Agama Scripture on Correct Conduct" 

Despite the multiple permutations of the title, there is no question that this is the same text, for all three of the citations from the Zhongxin jing given in T1694 (at 33:13c4, 16a10, and 16a24e-25) correspond to material found in T151 (at 2.88s10c14, 88s3c15 [with some difference in wording], and 88s3c5, respectively)." 

In sum, though these scriptures are treated as anonymous in our oldest source, on the basis of their citations in the Yinchau jing commentary it is possible to determine their approximate date, if not their precise provenance. As a result, we can add them to the small number of scriptures that can be attributed with confidence to the second or early third century CE. The careful investigation of other early commentaries and treatises will surely enable us to expand our knowledge of scriptures produced during this period.

Lineages of translation: Tracing "rhetorical communities"

In the discussion above we have observed on numerous occasions that second- and third-century translators borrowed pre-existing vocabulary. It would be difficult—and probably impossible—to find a single translated scripture where the vocabulary pioneered by An Shigao has not made its mark.12 Other expressions introduced by Lokaksesa, on the one hand, or by An Xuan and Yan Fotsio on the other, have also been passed down from generation to generation, though here we can see the lines of transmission separating into distinct streams, with some translators preferring the transcription terms favored by Lokaksesa, while others adopted the translations coined by An Xuan and Yan Fotsio. The fact that in Zhi Qian's work we see these streams coming together, in all probability as the result of his own distinctive literary approach (beginning as a member of Lokaksesa's school in Luoyang and ending in the Wu kingdom, where the translations of An Shigao and of An Xuan were highly valued), should not obscure the fact that these translation traditions came from distinct sources and did not always interact in this way. In these distinct patterns of usage we can discern what might be thought of as different translational "schools": that is, we can identify different terminological and stylistic preferences that were characteristic of the distinct Buddhist groups that composed and transmitted them.

12 Zircher (1959, p. 55) identifies the text referred to as 中心经 in T1694 as corresponding to T741 警心法門. This is indeed another version—that is, a later translation of a different recension—of the same text (though it was not recognized as such by the Taiho editors). The material quoted in T1694, however, corresponds more closely to the content of T151. This eliminates the chronological problem raised by Zircher (loc. cit.), who felt compelled to assign an earlier date to T749 based on its apparent citation in T1694.

13 There is always the possibility, of course, that some of the terms that appear for the first time in written sources produced by An Shigao were already current in oral expressions.
Widely shared patterns of usage, such as se for rite, or pae for budhivara, of san in the brata for the brata heaven—many of which, as noted above, go back to An Shigao—can tell us little about the contours of these communities. Other terms, however, were far more limited in circulation, and these can serve as tracers, revealing specific sub-groups of texts with shared patterns of usage.

A good example is what might be called the "Quiluzi group," the very small number of scriptures that use the name Quiluzi 秋露子 (var. 春露子) as a translation of a variant form of the name Srivatsa, i.e., Śrāvatsatāptra, as discussed in an earlier study by Seishi Karashima and myself (Karashima and Nattier, 2007). This is such an unusual translation that it is virtually impossible to imagine that it could have been independently coined more than once; instead, it seems most reasonable to see its presence in these few texts—as it appears in only six translated scriptures in the entire Taishō canon—as an indication of borrowing. But as it turns out these texts share other common features as well; to mention only a few, all six texts make ample use of the first-person pronoun tu 吾, the verb pae 目, and the final-particle yu 具. These features may not seem particularly distinctive until we recall that they are entirely absent from the works of An Shigao. Wǔ 是 is also absent from the core texts of Lokakṣema, and—while frequent in the two "third-tier" texts (T624 and T726) that form a distinctive sub-group in other respects—is almost entirely absent from the second-tier texts associated with his community as well.

Numerous other possibilities for identifying distinct textual groupings can quickly be identified as well. Some are based on vocabulary; for example, one could identify sub-groups which, like the "Quiluzi group," share certain very rare expressions, e.g., Wēn ū "Things Head" for Śrīvatsa, or Fēih mia "Hawk Mountain" (var. Yānhūn 岩山 "Hawk Mountain") for Āryaśīva. It would be extremely hazardous to jump to the conclusion that all such works are by the same translator, but their rarity does suggest that the texts in which we find them are related in some way.

Groupings can also be identified on the basis of form; scriptures in which verses are translated as prose, for example—a feature standard in Lokakṣema's genuine works—could fruitfully be compared with one another, as could scriptures that contain the unusual style of six-character verse. One could also assemble a list of those scriptures that lack a proper sūtra, beginning simply with Fēi zài 費在 . . . . "The Buddha was s . . . . " as in Lokakṣema's work. Such shared "translation traditions" hint at the actual transmission of conventions for the production of Buddhist scriptures over time and space, sometimes over far greater distances than one would expect.

A rhetorical community, in sum, need not be an actual community whose members live and work in close proximity. It can also be a "virtual" community, with Dharmarakṣa (for example) being in a certain sense a member of the lineage of Zhi Qian by virtue of the terminological and stylistic features that he borrows, or Kumārajīva as a "dual inheritor" of much of the terminology of Lokakṣema, coupled with the literary flair of the "mature style" of Zhi Qian. The degrees of such affiliation, of course, can vary widely—a translator
can borrow a single term, or an entire repertoire of vocabulary as well as style—from another source. Yet all of these are worth documenting if we are to construct a richer history of Chinese Buddhist translation activity.

IN LIEU OF A CONCLUSION

The only conclusion that one can possibly offer to a work of this type is the recognition that it has only scratched the surface. Most of the scriptures discussed above have received little scholarly attention to date; even those that have will continue to reward further study. And with each new finding our picture of the contours of early Chinese translation activity will become more nuanced than before.

For those who are not specialists in Buddhism, much less in the history of Buddhist translations, my hope is that this brief guide will clarify some of the issues involved, prevent wasted efforts due to using false translator attributions, and ultimately allow such scholars to spend more time on their own specialties and less time on the intricacies of Chinese scriptural bibliography. For those who are specialists in Buddhism, it is my hope that this study may stimulate additional interest in scriptures that can be dated to the second and third centuries CE, especially those that have received little attention to date. And finally, for those few hardy souls who share my passion for attempting to wrest the meaning from these often elusive texts, I hope for continued progress in making new discoveries. If this small monograph soon becomes outdated as a result, that is only as it should be.
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T2132 54c227, 130a52, 130m54, 133b61, 142a68, 145a99, 154a121
T2123 54c227, 130a54, 145a99
T2128 218a39, 406e7
T2145 9,10, 11, 13, 26 prepone
T2146 13-14, 106a264, 113a36, 128a48, 148n91, 145a100, 158, 160a138
T2147 45, 115d9, 130a130
T2148 45, 115d9, 130a130
T2149 15, 105, 106a138
T2151 15
T2153 15, 66o146
T2154 15, 66o146, 158a132, 165n7
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APPENDIX 2

Index of Sanskrit and Pāli Titles

For convenience of use by those who are not Indologists, the texts given below are listed in order of the Roman alphabet (not in Sanskrit syllabic order).

Pāli titles

Aṅgottaramaṇīya (see also Ekottarikāgama): 50, 53
Arihakavagga (see also Arihavargiya): 117, 134
Brhamāsutta: 129
Cāṇḍakaṅkākkhandhasutta: 23, 128
Dassottaravasutta: see Dassottaravutta
Dhammapada (see also Dhammapada): 29, 117, 134
Dīnaṁvīhariṁvīhasutta: 165n5 and 6
Dīghaṁkiyā: 41, 126
Jātaka: 133, 150
Khuddamakāṇīya: 134
Mahāpokkhaṁkhandhasutta: 128
Mahāsūtaṁnaṇasutta: see Mahāsūtaṁnaṇaśastra
Mahāsūtaṁnaṇasutta (see also Mahāpokkhaṁkhandhasutta): 126
Mahāsūtaṁnaṇasutta (see also Mahāpokkhaṁkhandhasutta): 22, 49, 50, 128, 165n5
Medhānavasutta: 90n74
Nibbuddabhasutta: 50n71
Petaṇapadea: 61, 63
Kātapaḷasutta: 129
Sānghasānasutta: 50n68
Sattvottamakāṇīya (see also Sattvottamaśastra): 49, 130

Sanskrit titles

Āṣaṭaśatruksaṇyārasvinrānasūtra: 85
Atriḥiyaśaya: 85
Anantaśakranānirādhaḥśruti: 317n16 and 17, 232-142
Arihavanavāya (see also Arihakavagga): 134
Arihavargiya (see also Arihakavagga): 49
Aṣṭasahasrikā Prajñaparamitā: 56n103, 75, 80, 136
Atantavasaka: see Buddhāvatattvasaka
Buddhāvatattvasaka: 84, 87, 137-139
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*Candrasphahabodhiśīlaṃvāsāra: 142
Dasiśvūnakvīhiśabha: 93n224
Dāvānābarasvāta: 49, 69
Dharmapada (see also Dhammapada): 3n1, 26, 82n194, 114
Dirghāgama: 49, 56n102, 71n157, 126-128
Drumakīṇaśarjaparipṛcchāśāstra: 85
Ekottarāgama (see also Aṣṭuttarānīkāya): 50, 62, 71n153
Jñātaka: 133, 150
Kāḷyāṇapariprasthāna: 12n20, 84, 88
*Ksemankarasūtra: 142-143
Madhyāyāgama: 49, 50, 128-130, 165n6
*Mahālalī śaṅkaraśāstra: 144-145
Mahānāmasūtra: 129
Mahāsūtранābha: 49
Mahāpārisīvaśāstra: 88n209, 99n247, 123, 127, 129
Mahāsūtrānta: 42-43, 56, 57, 57n105
Mahāvastu: 84n198
Māhiśāvatāra: 50
*Nāgārjunāśāstra: 141-144
Nīlakantaśāstra: 50
Prajñāpāramitāśāstra: 56n103 (Smaller), 8n7 (Larger), 56n103 (general), 97 (Larger)
Pratītisāstra: 160
Pratītyasamutpādanaśāstra: 79, 81
Rāṭtrapāla-paripṛcchā: 8n7
Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-śūtra: 8n7
Samādhiśāstra: 142
Sak'yeyāgama (or aśaṃsamanikāya): 49, 51, 65-68
Saptakāfaśāstra: 143
Saptavastuśāstra: 52-53
Sarvāvatāra: 50
Sarvāyatanāṅgaśāstra: 50
Śūkṣmaśāstra: 93n224
*Sūnandāśāstra: 145, 147
Sukhāvatīvyūha(Larger): 12n19, 26n51, 80n188, 86-87, 107, 118, 139, 158, 159
Sukhāvatīvyūha(Smaller): 12n19
Śūraśāstra: 75, 88, 116, 123, 123n34, 157, 160
Surināśāstra: 157
Tathāgataprajñāpanākrśasamādhi: 141
Uddānahavāka: 134
Ugraparipṛcchāśāstra: 90, 92, 92n219, 93, 94, 124n35, 158, 159
Vimalakīrtinirdeśa: 29, 108n248, 101, 123, 123n34, 139-141
Vinaya: 158
Yogicīcākhyānottara: 9, 38n13, 44n37, 62
APPENDIX 3

Reference List of Han and Three Kingdoms Translations

This section is intended to provide a convenient overview and quick reference guide to those texts that are currently considered to be authentic translations produced during the Han and Three Kingdoms periods. Other texts which seem unlikely to be the work of these translators themselves, but are closely related to his authentic works and appear to be associated with his community, are also included but are categorized separately.

In some cases texts have become jumbled in the course of transmission; thus there is not always a one-to-one correspondence between a text found in the Taishō canon today and the text originally produced by the translator in question. For example, only part of T150A, the Qi chu san guan jing 七處三觀經, corresponds to An Shigao’s original translation of the Za jing shibei bian 隨緣四十種; the remainder consists of other materials.

As Zhi Qian is known for having revised the translations of others (in particular, those of Lokakṣema), as well as re-translating other works that were already in circulation, those that are revisions will be marked (R) below.

Readers are encouraged to consult the relevant discussions above, using Appendix 1 to locate these via their Taishō text numbers, for further details.

An Shigao 安世高

1. Core texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text No.</th>
<th>Full Title and Short Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T13</td>
<td>Zheng an shi hao fa jing 周阿含十寳法經</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T14</td>
<td>Ren ren yi sheng jing 人本欲生經</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T31</td>
<td>Yuyi liu she hou yin jing 一切流屬守因經</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T32</td>
<td>Si di jing 四禪經</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T36</td>
<td>Benxiang yizhi jing 本相指致經</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T48</td>
<td>Shi jia fei jing 師家非法經</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T57</td>
<td>Liu fenhu jing 禮分候經</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T96</td>
<td>Pu fa yi jing 佛法義經</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T112</td>
<td>Ba sheng dou jing 八正道經</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T150A</td>
<td>[part]: Za jing shibei bian 隨緣四十種 [now embedded within Qi chu san guan jing 七處三觀經]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T150A (1) and (3), T150C [sic]: Qi chu san guan jing 七處三觀經</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T150A (2) and T150B [sic]: Jin beng jing 九帳經</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T603</td>
<td>Yin chi ru jing 涕智入經</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T607</td>
<td>Dao di jing 道地經</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T150B: Ahan kuajie shi‘er jinyuan jing 阿含口解十二因緣經</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Second-tier texts (probably produced by members of An Shigao's school)
   T01: Za aban jing 嶽阿含經 (excluding stanzas 9 and 10; see p. 67ff for details)

3. Associated texts (possibly produced by members of An Shigao's school)
   T05: Wu ya pusa jing 五蘆菩提経
   T109: Zhen an famen jing 聖安梵門經
   T397(13): Shi jing yao yao jin 十方菩薩品 (var. Wushi jiazi jing 五土袈裟経)
   T605: Chansing faliang jing 乘法良経
   T792: Fa shou chen jing 法受僧経

Lokakṣema 羅睺羅迦

1. Core texts

   T24: Dansing banruo jing 道行般若経
   T418: Banzhuo samui jing 銀策三昧経 [unrevised prose portions only]

2. Second-tier texts (closely related texts, probably from Lokakṣema's school)

   T280: Dousha jing 定沙経
   T282: Zhou pusa qin fo kenei jing 超諸菩薩勤佛因経
   T283: Pusa zhihua zhihao guan 無著十住護經
   T350: Weyue mei hui jing 僧伽[壹]會経
   T342: Antuo san yeans fo san guada ren dan jing 阿耨三耶三佛 聖護般涅槃人品 [with the exception of the "Five Evils" 五惡 section]
   T458: Wenzubashi wen pua du jing 文殊普利間菩薩経
   T807: Neizang hai hao jing 内藏海経

3. Third-tier texts (more distantly related texts, perhaps from his school)

   T624: Dui zhennlaluo suwun moli samwei jing 随義陀離所聞如來三味経
   T626: Ashushi waang jing 阿闍世王経

4. Problematic or revised texts

   T313: Acha fegga jing 阿迦佛迦経
   T418: Banzshou samwei jing 瓣舟三味経 [verse portions and revised prose]
An Xuan 安玄 and Yan Fotiao 袁佛調

T322: Fā jīng jìng 法講經

Zhi Yao 支耀

1. Core texts

None [see below]

2. Problematic texts (status uncertain; may date from considerably after the Han)

T630: Chengyu guanyunming dingyi jing 觀云光明定意經

Kang Mencxiano 康彌詳

1. Core texts (possibly with some later emendation)

T190: Zhong henji jing 中本起經

2. Problematic or revised texts

T183: Xiuxing henji jing 修行本起經

Zhi Qian 支謙

1. Core texts

T6: Baowu he bu jing 法咒河掘經 (R)
T54: Shi Mo hao fen zhi jing 赛摩好分之經（複寫本四字經）
T68: Laohe hou lu jing 老河后緒經
T76: Fanmou jing 般摩誦經
T87: Zha jing 坐經
T169: Yuanming pao jing 原明保聞經
T185: Taizi rui jing kwei jing 太子瑞堅本起經 (R)
T196: Yun jing 舊見經
T210: Faka jing 法刻經 (R)
T225R: Da mingdu jing 大明度經 (chapters 2-30) (R)
T281: Pusa benshui jing 菩薩本水經 (R)
T361: Wuxiang qingjing jingqielu yongjing 無量清淨平等覺經 (R)
T474: Wumiaojing 萬妙經
T495: Anan zhui jing 阿難護經（瑞傳本）
T532: Sihong jing 悟弘經 [c.–d.?] (variant title: Pusa daodi jing 菩薩道地經)
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T533: Chamu bing 佛教经 (variant title: Pusa shengtai jing 布薩生地經)
T556: Qiu jing 七女經
T557: Longbo na jing 龙池女经
T561: Lao mu jing 稷母經 (R)
T581: Baiji jing 八部經
T652: Huayin sannu jing 鸠摩三味經 (R)
T735A: Siyuan jing 四願經
T790: Bu jing chao 子经抄 (R)
T1011: Wulangmen wenshi jing 無量門往倉持經

2. Texts of uncertain status

T735B: --- (no separate title, attached to T735A)
T7328: Xulai jing 许烈經

Kang Senghui 康僧會

1. Core texts

T152: Liushu ji jing 六度集經

2. Associated texts (texts with which Kang Senghui is likely to have been involved)

T225A: Da mingtiu jing 大明度经 (interlinear commentary portion)
T602: Anban sannu jing zhu 安般三味經注
T1694: Yimin jing zhu 楚敏經注

Bo Yan 白延

1. Core texts

None.

2. Texts of uncertain status

T328: Xulai jing 许烈經

Anonymous Translations

For some examples of texts of uncertain authorship which appear to have been produced during the Han and Three Kingdoms periods see above, pp. 109-110 and 165-166.
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