

## Masquerading as Translation: Examples of Chinese Lectures by Indian Scholar-Monks in the Six Dynasties Period

Some years ago I wrote an article in Japanese, the title of which in English is “Mediating ‘Chinese Translation’ and ‘Chinese Composition’: Regarding Some Features Special to Chinese Buddhist Texts.”<sup>1</sup> There, I attempted to describe the characteristics of Chinese Buddhist translation and to suggest also that when we maintain a distinction between Chinese translation (*yi* 譯) and Chinese composition (*zhuan* 撰述) as mutually exclusive categories,<sup>2</sup> namely that the Chinese translation of an Indic text is a genuine translation without any influence from the Chinese side, then we are apt to confront a situation where the dichotomy can no longer stand. To put it simply, there might be a third type of literature which falls between a Chinese translation and a Chinese composition or compilation. More specifically, the article was intended to raise three questions. First, in which cases were there omissions of original passages and additions of new passages to the translated text? Second, in which cases were there passages from another work that were brought into the translation in its eventual form under a new title? And last, is there any conclusive evidence for the

I WOULD like to express my special thanks to Prof. Victor H. Mair, Prof. Daniel Boucher and Prof. Tansen Sen, who kindly invited me to “Mairfest” in December, 2003, and to all the participants who provided questions and comments on my talk at the conference. My gratitude also goes to colleagues and friends who expressed interest in earlier versions of this article and suggested improvements on many points: Prof. Enomoto Fumio, Prof. Kogachi Ryūichi and Dr. Monica Esposito, to mention only a few. It goes without saying, however, that all the mistakes in this paper remain my own responsibility.

<sup>1</sup> Funayama Tōru 船山徹, “‘Kan’yaku’ to ‘Chūgoku senjutsu’ no aida: Kanbun Butten ni tokuyūna keitai wo megutte” 漢譯と中國撰述の間, 漢文佛典に特有な形態をめぐって, in *Bukkyō shigaku kenkyū* 佛教史學研究 45.1 (2002), pp. 1–28. After the publication of the above article, a remarkable article on the exegetical tradition in the later Han period was published: Stephano Zacchetti, “Teaching Buddhism in Han China: A Study of the *Ahan koujie shi’er yinyuan jing* T no. 1508 Attributed to An Shigao,” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 7 (2004), pp. 197–224.

<sup>2</sup> In the Buddhist catalogues such as the *Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集, the notion of “translation” mainly in the written form is indicated by such words as *yi* 譯, *chu* 出, *yichu* 譯出, and

existence of lectures delivered to a Chinese audience by Indian monks, but which were later transmitted as translations as if the original texts had existed in India?

In the present article, I wish to continue to examine this problem, mainly on the basis of the third question.<sup>3</sup> In this context, however, it goes without saying that we are in possession of a plethora of Chinese texts in the form of lectures on a certain *sūtra*. Thus, rather than focusing on such lectures in general, I would like to shift the focus to lectures that were transmitted as translations for some reason. At least five examples of such scriptures from the Six Dynasties period can be pointed out.

The reason why lectures by Indian monks were confused with translations will be found in the mode of translation at that time. As pointed out in previous studies,<sup>4</sup> the translation of Buddhist texts was usually performed not by a translator alone but by a group of translators, each member playing a certain role such as reciting the text, dictation, and combining words in sequences appropriate to the Chinese language. And from a historical point of view, there were two types of translation groups. One was the type where not only the translation itself but the exegesis for the audience was conducted in the process of translation.<sup>5</sup> The other was a translation team organized only for the purpose of producing translations in a quick and efficient manner, without giving lectures to others. While collaborative translations during the Sui-Tang were mostly made by the latter type with no audience present, the earlier translations by the end of the Six Dynasties period were most probably of the former type, with a large audience attending. Sometimes those present were witness to the translation process, being able to compare the current translation with a previous version, and questions and answers were exchanged between the translation group and the audience.<sup>6</sup> Under such conditions, very often discussions to

---

*fan* 翻, whereas the concept of “oral translation” or “interpretation/interpreter” is expressed by such words as (*kou*) *yi* (口)譯, *chuanyi* 傳譯, (*kou*) *xuan* (口)宣, *xuanyi* 宣譯, *duyu* 度語, and *chuanyu* 傳語.

<sup>3</sup> This paper is based on section four of my above-mentioned article. There are no changes in the basic points of my analysis, but the contents are considerably revised and enlarged here.

<sup>4</sup> Tso Sze-bong 曹仕邦, *Zhongguo Fojiao yijing shi lunji* 中國佛教譯經史論集 (Taipei: Dongchu chubanshe, 1990), pp. 10–30, 100–7. Wang Wenyan 王文顏, *Fodian hanyi zhi yanjiu* 佛典漢譯之研究 (Taipei: Tianhua chubanshiye gongsi, 1984), pp. 129–60. Kimura Senshō 木村宣彰, “Rajū to Genjō” 羅什と玄奘, *Shirizu higashi Ajia Bukkyō, dainikan, Bukkyō no tōzen* シリーズ東アジア佛教, 第2巻 佛教の東漸 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1997), pp. 250–53.

<sup>5</sup> Erik Zürcher, *The Buddhist Conquest of China* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959, 1972), p. 31.

<sup>6</sup> Ōchō Enichi 横超慧日 and Suwa Gijun 諏訪義純, *Rajū* 羅什 (1982; Tokyo: Daizō shupan, 1991), p. 226; Kimura, “Rajū to Genjō,” pp. 250–51.

adjust the translation for proper understanding proceeded simultaneously. Therefore we should take into account the possibility that the results of exegesis were sometimes intentionally interpolated, or that additional remarks in the process of translation accidentally came to be mixed into the translation.

VIMALĀKṢA (ca. 338–414)

We begin with the case of Vimalākṣa 卑摩羅叉 (*Beimoluocha*). According to his biography in fascicle 2 of *Gaoseng zhuan* 高僧傳, Vimalākṣa, who had once been Kumārajīva's *vinaya* master at Kucha, traveled to Chang'an 長安 and met Kumārajīva again. Later he journeyed to Shouchun 壽春,<sup>7</sup> where he compiled the final version of *Shisong lü* 十誦律. And after this, the biography testifies that he moved to Jiangling 江陵, where he gave a lecture on *Shisong lü* shortly before his death. The entry runs as follows:

Meanwhile, [Vimalākṣa] went south to Jiangling. On the occasion of a summer retreat (*xiazu* 夏坐) at Xin Monastery, he gave a lecture on *Shisong lü*. As he had become fluent in Chinese, he was good at communicating with the audience. [Thanks to him], the subtle essence of inactivity (*wuzuo* 無作 \**akriyā*)<sup>8</sup> was clearly understood by the people at that time. People who [wanted to] analyze the words of texts and pursue ultimate principle gathered like trees in a forest. People who [wished to] clarify each article [of the precepts] and know what is prohibited [in the precepts] were also abundant in number. It was due to Vimalākṣa's ability that the monastic code of behavior became widespread. Huiguan of Daochang Temple 道場慧觀 profoundly integrated Vimalākṣa's true intention in his lecture, and recorded the master's prescription on the internal (namely, Buddhist) prohibition of light and heavy [sins] 內禁輕重, was compiled [by Huiguan] in two fascicles. Then it was sent to the capital (Jiankang), where the monks and the nuns learned it and vied with each other in transcribing it. Hearing this,

<sup>7</sup> Shouchun was south of the Huai River; its significance is discussed by Tsukamoto Zenryū 塚本善隆, "Suikeichū no Jushun Dōkōji ni tsuite" 水經注の壽春導公寺について, in *Tsukamoto Zenryū chosaku shū, dai san kan, Chūgoku chūsei Bukkyōshi ronkō* 塚本善隆著作集第三卷中國中世佛教史論攷 (Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, 1960; rpt. 1975), pp. 51–66.

<sup>8</sup> For the term *wuzuo* 無作 (inactivity, *akriyā*), a synonym of *wubiao* 無表 (*avijñapti-karman*), as the essence of the precepts (*jieti* 戒體), see Katō Junshō 加藤純章, "Muhyō to musa" 無表と無作, in *Ejima Yasunori hakase tsuitōronshū, Kū to jitsuzai* 江島惠教博士追悼論集, 空と實在 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 2001), pp. 5–24. For further examples of *wuzuo* (as *jieti*) in the context of precepts, see e.g. *T* no. 1763, vol. 37, p. 429B6 (僧宗曰, 若談戒體, 即是無作) and 580B7–20 (esp. B8: 僧亮曰, 無作是戒體).

the people at that time coined a proverb: “Vima[lākṣa]’s unsophisticated words, on being skillfully recorded by Huiguan, made the people of the capital transcribe the text, which caused the price of paper to run up like gemstones.” The text is still popular as a norm for younger generations.<sup>9</sup>

Immediately after this, Vimalākṣa returned to Shouchun and passed away at the age of seventy-seven. Although the exact year of the lecture is not mentioned in the above account, Huiguan’s movements, when compared with the descriptions in Buddhahadra’s biographies, reveal that Vimalākṣa read the lecture in Jiangling during one summer between the years 412–415.<sup>10</sup> Further, Vimalākṣa’s lecture, mentioned as the “Internal (that is, Buddhist) Prohibition of Light and Heavy (Sins)” is not extant as it is, but in all probability later became a text called *Wubai wenshi (jing)* 五百問事(經) ([*Scripture of Five Hundred Questions*]). A text bearing that name is not found in the modern editions of the Chinese Buddhist Canon. Fortunately, however, it is preserved in the old Japanese manuscripts of the *issaikyō* (“complete scriptures”) collections such as *Nanatsudera issaikyō* 七寺一切經,<sup>11</sup> *Matsuosha issaikyō* 松尾社一切經,<sup>12</sup> and *Natori shingūji issaikyō* 名取新宮寺一切經.<sup>13</sup>

A close comparison of *Wubai wenshi (jing)* with other scriptures reveals that it has a counterpart in *Taishō Tripitaka* (it is numbered 1483, *Mulian wen jielüzhong wubai qingzhongshi (jing)* 目連問戒律中五百輕重事(經) ([*Scripture of Maudgalyāyana’s Questions about Five Hundred Light and Heavy Sins in the Monastic Discipline*]), but it should be noted that the *Taishō* edition – in other words the text kept in (the second version of) the Korean Tripitaka as well as in the Song, Yuan and Ming editions – bears some fundamental differences in structure from *Wubai wenshi (jing)*, which was composed much earlier.<sup>14</sup> In short, *Taishō* 1483 is an apocryphon, and its two sections, the first fascicle and the epilogue,

<sup>9</sup> *Gaoseng zhuan* (T, vol. 50) 2, p. 333C4–12.

<sup>10</sup> Funayama Tōru, “Mokuren mon kairitsu chū gohyaku kyōjūji no genkei to hensen” 目連問戒律中五百輕重事の原形と變遷, *THGH* 70, 1998, pp. 245–46.

<sup>11</sup> *Owari shiryō, Nanatsu dera issaikyō mokuroku* 尾張史料 七寺一切經目錄 (Nagoya: Nanatsudera issaikyō hozonkai, 1968), pp. 90, 158. I am greatly indebted to Prof. Ochiai Toshinori 落合俊典 for acquiring a photocopy of the *Wubai wenshi jing* kept in this collection.

<sup>12</sup> *Kyōto Myōrenji zō Matsuosha issaikyō, chōsahōkokusho* 京都妙蓮寺藏松尾社一切經調查報告書 (Tokyo: Ōtsuka kōgeisha, 1997), p. 405, no. 2754.

<sup>13</sup> *Natori Shingūji issaikyō, chōsahōkokusho* 名取新宮寺一切經調查報告書 (Sendai: Miyagiken bunkazai hogokyōkai, 1980), p. 226, no. 1807. I thank Mr. Kajiura Susumu 梶浦晉 for helping me obtain photocopies of the *Wubai wenshi jing* kept in *Matsuosha issaikyō* and *Shingūji issaikyō*.

<sup>14</sup> See Funayama, “Mokuren mon,” pp. 203–90; but it was only after this publication appeared that that I was able to look at the *Nanatsu dera* version of *Wubai wenshi jing*.

are later additions to make it appear as if it were a *sūtra* spoken by the Buddha himself. Setting those two parts aside, the remaining fascicles constituting the body of the text from fascicle 2 onward, are basically identical to the text of *Wubai wenshi jing*, if we ignore variant readings.

The view that the *Five Hundred Questions* should be ascribed to Vimalākṣa was expressed by Tang masters, such as Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667) and Daoshi 道世 (d. 683?), and followers of the former as well.

In *Sifen lü jiemo shu* 四分律羯磨疏 (*Auto-commentary on the Explanation of the Karmavācānā of the Sifen lü*), Daoxuan asserts that “This *Five Hundred Questions* is the oral instruction of Vimalākṣa.”<sup>15</sup>

A similar idea is expressed also in *Guanzhong chuangli jietan tu jing* 關中創立戒壇圖經 (*Illustrated Scripture on the Precepts-platform Created in Guanzhong*),<sup>16</sup> one of the latest works of the same author. Likewise, Daoshi draws the same conclusion in *Pini taoyao* 毘尼討要 (*Investigation into the Vinaya*), fascicle 3, where he explains: “The (*Scripture of*) *Five Hundred Questions* is the one that was translated through the mouth of Tripiṭaka master Vimalākṣa from the Western Regions.”<sup>17</sup>

Furthermore, similar expressions are found in the later commentaries on Daoxuan’s works.<sup>18</sup> Hence we have little grounds for denying these testimonies. That is to say, most of *Taishō* 1483 can safely be recognized as Vimalākṣa’s lecture at Jiangling around 414 AD.

This scripture comprises questions and answers regarding the monastic code of behavior. Questions are put forward from the side of Chinese monks, and the answers are furnished by an Indian authority, Vimalākṣa. Among the questions, we find some typically Chinese elements. For example, there is a question as to whether or not a monk may use *qiqi* 漆器 (lacquer ware) as a food vessel, in spite of the general rule that the food vessel of a monk should be iron or porcelain. For this question, the answer made from the Indian standpoint runs: “Neither the use of lacquer ware nor wooden bowl is allowed

<sup>15</sup> 此五百問，卑摩羅叉口訣也；see series 1 of Maeda Eun 前田慧雲 and Nakano Tatsue 中野達慧, eds., *Dai Nippon zokuzōkyō* 大日本續藏經 (Kyoto: Zōkyōshoin 藏經書院, 1905–12; hereafter, Z1), box 64, book 5, folio 487, verso 下, l. 6. “*Jue* 訣” is my emendation; Z1 reads “決”

<sup>16</sup> T no. 1892, vol. 45, p. 807c22–23.

<sup>17</sup> Z1, box 70, book 2, folio 136, verso 上, ll. 13–14: 五百問事，乃是西域三藏卑摩羅叉口自翻出。Note that the word “translate” (*yi* 譯 or *fan* 翻) is sometimes used in an ambiguous way, even for literature which is not translation in the strict sense. For example, *Datang xiyu ji* 大唐西域記 is sometimes described as Xuanzang’s translation 玄奘譯 in the sense of an authorized text, although it is by no means a translation (cf. T, vol. 51, p. 868c, etc.: 三藏法師玄奘奉詔譯, 大總持寺沙門辯機撰; and T, vol. 55, p. 722B22: 玄奘譯 concerning *Datang xiyu ji*).

<sup>18</sup> The views of Daoxuan and Daoshi, as well as of their followers in later periods, are introduced and translated in Funayama, “*Mokuren mon*,” pp. 238–42.

at all.”<sup>19</sup> Likewise, for the question of whether monks are permitted to practice a special breathing technique called *fuqi* 服氣 in order to cure disease, the answer is interesting: “No. It is not allowable, because it ends up being the same as the case of non-Buddhists.” This might be a reference to the Taoist methods of breathing.<sup>20</sup>

In this way, the *Scripture of Five Hundred Questions* is an incomparably interesting and significant text since it turns out to have derived from the mouth of Vimalākṣa, Kumārajīva’s *vinaya* teacher, based on the teachings of the Sarvāstivāda School.

#### SARVĀSTIVĀDA-VINAYA-VIBHĀŚĀ

The second piece of evidence for a similar kind of lecture is *Sapo-  
duo pini piposha* 薩婆多毘尼毘婆沙 (or, \**Sarvāstivāda-vinaya-vibhāśā*).<sup>21</sup> The name of the translator is lost 失譯, as well as the name of the original Indian author, but the text can safely be considered to have been translated in the Qin period, for a typical expression *Qin yan* 秦言 (“in the language of Qin”) is repeatedly employed to explain the transcriptions of Indic terms.<sup>22</sup>

The *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya-vibhāśā* is a detailed commentary on *Shi-song lü*. By and large, it is possible to take it as a translation from some Indic text. However, after careful scrutiny, we find several passages peculiar to Chinese culture. These passages constitute not the interlinear notes 夾注 but the body of the text.

For example, a passage is composed on the basis of a famous phrase from *Lunyu* 論語 to explain why the Buddha is mentioned as the first among the Three Jewels.<sup>23</sup> Further, there are several passages referring to the Qin dynasty not only in the normal form such as *Qin yan*, but also as a direct indication of cultural factors in the land of Qin 秦地.<sup>24</sup> Besides, yet another passage shows that certain people at that

<sup>19</sup> *T*, vol. 24, 981B5-6. Funayama, “*Mokuren mon*,” p. 236.

<sup>20</sup> *T*, vol. 24 977C16. Funayama, “*Mokuren mon*,” p. 236.

<sup>21</sup> *T*no. 1440. The word *vibhāśā* (*piposha*) is often rendered as *guangjie* (廣解, “vast explanation”) in Chinese sources (e.g., *T*, vol. 32, p. 158B16; vol. 50, p. 189A25-26).

<sup>22</sup> The Qin period is 351-431: the Former Qin (*qianqin* 前秦) 351-94, the Later Qin (*houqin* 後秦) 384-417, and the Western Qin (*xiqin* 西秦) 385-431. However it should be added that “Qin” does not always imply that the text was translated in China during these Qin periods, for there are some texts that employ the phrase “*Qin yan* 秦言” but were in fact translated outside of that region and time; e.g., *Apitan piposha lun* 阿毘曇毘婆沙論 (*T*no. 1546; e.g., *T*, vol. 28, p. 33A11-12), which was translated in the Northern Liang 北涼. Cf. also *Ru Dasheng lun* 入大乘論 (*T*, vol. 32, p. 47B18; in an interlinear note), *Mohe sengqi lü siji* 摩訶僧祇律私記 (*T*, vol. 22, p. 548B9), and *Shidi yiji* 十地義記 (*T*, vol. 85, p. 236C10).

<sup>23</sup> *T*, vol. 23, p. 506B7: 所謂道弘由人也; cf. *Lunyu* xv/29: “人能弘道, 非道弘人 (論語衛靈公).

<sup>24</sup> *T*, vol. 23, pp. 508C14-24, 533A20-21, 534C5-7.

time (*shiren* 時人) discussed the correlation of the Indian volume-unit *bota* 鉢他 (Pāli: *pattha*; Skt.: *prastha*) to Qin metrology.<sup>25</sup> From these Chinese elements incorporated in the body of the text, it is possible to conclude that *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya-vibhāṣā* is a mixture of a translation of an Indic text, which constitutes the greater part, and a certain amount of exegetical elements that were interpolated perhaps in the process of transcribing the translation.

Next, let us consider the difficult problem regarding the translator. First of all, it is worth mentioning that the views of a *lūshi* 律師 (*vinaya* master; here being anonymous) are introduced more than twenty times throughout the text, and some of them do suggest that he was the Indian *vinayadhara* who had reached China, because there is evidence for his own direct reference to certain circumstances in China.<sup>26</sup> It is, therefore, highly probable that this person was deeply involved in the formation of the text.

My view of the special position of *lūshi*, as well as the hybrid Sino-Indian style discernible throughout the text, is corroborated by the idea of a *vinaya* master in the Tang. In his *Subcommentary on (Fali's 法礪) Commentary on Sifen lü*, Dingbin 定賓 (beginning of the eighth century) pays special attention to several passages that count as evidence for the interpolation of exegesis in the process of translation, when he states: "Looking over the whole of this text, we find some words indicating detailed discussion at the time of translation, transcribed within the treatise." Regarding the *lūshi* who appears in the text, he further declares, "*Lūshi* here (in this text) signifies the person who took the Sanskrit text in his hand (at the time of this translation)."<sup>27</sup>

Then who is this *lūshi*? To begin with, he cannot be Vimalākṣa. This is due to the fact that both this text and Vimalākṣa's *Five Hundred Ques-*

<sup>25</sup> *T*, vol. 23, p. 536c24-28. Note that the original reading *sheng* 升 (*T*, vol. 23, pp. 536c-37a) should be emended to *dou* 斗, based on the quotations of the passage in question as found in the writings of the Tang Nanshan School (e.g., *T*, vol. 40, p. 125a-b).

<sup>26</sup> As regards the *lūshi*, we find the following: one passage in which the *lūshi*, while explaining a certain rule, refers to a situation in the land of Qin 秦地 in his own words (*T*, vol. 23, p. 534c5-7); another in which he introduces alternative interpretations of a sentence in the *vinaya* or explains which of the two is authoritative (527a8-9 and 538b3); one revealing that in spite of his knowledge he hesitates to introduce another interpretation of a sentence in the *vinaya* for some reason (517b12); a passage where the *lūshi* weasels his way out of a definitive answer (518a12-13); and one where he explains the climate in India (556c26 ff). These ensure that the *lūshi* in question is a *vinayadhara* from India and that he came to the land of Qin. As these passages are incorporated into the body of the text, it is almost impossible to assume that they were originally put in interlinear notes in smaller letters. On the contrary, they must have been transcribed as constituting the body of the text from the outset of its formation.

<sup>27</sup> *Sifen lü shu shizong yi ji* 四分律疏師宗義記; Z1, box 66, book 1, folio 77, verso 上, ll. 2-7. For this passage see also Funayama, "Kan'yaku' to 'Chūgoku senjutsu' no aida," pp. 20-21.

tions, mentioned above, belong to the Sarvāstivāda School, but sometimes express incompatible views on one and the same question.<sup>28</sup> Then when we look for other possibilities, it seems there are three persons who may fit the conditions, namely Zhu Fonian 竺佛念,<sup>29</sup> Dharmayaśas (Tanmo yeshe 曇摩耶舍),<sup>30</sup> and Buddhayaśas (Fotuo yeshe 佛陀耶舍).<sup>31</sup> However, with none of them do we find any conclusive evidence for a connection with this *Vibhāṣā*. Besides, there is yet another condition to be satisfied. The text has a preface (*Xu Sapoduo pini piposha xu* 續薩婆多毘尼毘婆沙序) written by Zhishou 智首 (567–635), who was the common master of Daoxuan and Daoshi. According to the preface, Zhishou happened to learn through a conversation with a vinaya master from western Shu, Baoxuan 西蜀寶玄律師,<sup>32</sup> that the ninth fascicle of the text, which was considered to have been lost until that time, was extant in Shu. Excited by this incredible news, Zhishou asked him why this was the case, and learned that Shu was the region where the text was translated 問其所由, 方知此典譯在於蜀.<sup>33</sup> It is a pity, however, that among the three persons, none had a conclusive relationship with the Shu area.<sup>34</sup> Therefore, this matter still remains open to question.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>28</sup> Funayama, “Mokuren mon,” pp. 283–84.

<sup>29</sup> Zhu Fonian 竺佛念 (dates unknown). He was from Liangzhou, not India, but he was well-informed on Indian issues and engaged in the translation of *Shisong lü*.

<sup>30</sup> Dharmayaśas (dates unknown) was called Da piposha 大毘婆沙 because he was well versed in *Piposha lü* 毘婆沙律. He possibly had some connection with the Sarvāstivāda School, because his biography states, “At the age of fourteen, he came to be known to (viz., esteemed by) Furuo duoluo” (年十四, 爲弗若多羅所知; *T*, vol. 50, p. 329B16–17). This person, Furuo duoluo or \*Puṇyatāra in Skt., must be identical to the person bearing the same name that recited *Shisong lü* at Kumārajīva’s request. On the other hand, Dharmayaśas was engaged also in the translation of *Shelifu apitan lun* 舍利弗阿毘曇論 (\**Sāriputra-Abhidharma-sāstra*, *T* no. 1548) which is nowadays regarded as a text belonging to the Dharmaguptaka School, not to the Sarvāstivādin. In this sense, the school-affiliation of Dharmayaśas is not known with certainty.

<sup>31</sup> Buddhayaśas (dates unknown), who wore a red moustache had such a great knowledge of *Piposha* that people called him “Piposha with a Red Moustache” 赤髭毘婆沙 (*T*, vol. 50, p. 334B11–13). However, *Piposha* here may not have had any relation with the *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya*, because he had a connection with the *Vibhāṣā*-commentary on the *Daśabhūmika-sūtra*. For the relationship between Dharmayaśas and this commentary, see the bibliographical explanation of *Shizhu piposha lun* 十住毘婆沙論 [*Vibhāṣā on the Daśabhūmika-sūtra*] in *Huayan jing zhuanji* 華嚴經傳記 (*T*, vol. 51, p. 156B20–24), compiled by Fazang 法藏. Further, Buddhayaśas learned the *Sifen lü* of the Dharmaguptaka School by heart and so he became committed to its translation. In this sense, he appears unrelated to the Sarvāstivāda. However, on the other hand, his biog. at *Chu sanzang ji ji* (*T*, vol. 55, j. 14, p. 102B5) refers to his connection with *Shisong lü*, a reference lacking in the *Gaoseng zhuan* 2 version.

<sup>32</sup> *T*, vol. 23, p. 558c. Neither his dates nor any further information about this master is known elsewhere.

<sup>33</sup> *T*, vol. 23, p. 559A1.

<sup>34</sup> In this respect, we may be able to eliminate Zhu Fonian as a possibility, because he passed away at Chang’an without ever having stayed in the Shu area.

<sup>35</sup> It seems that the remaining two (discussed in n. 31, above) are still possible. According

KUMĀRAJĪVA (ca. 350–409)

Fortunately enough, we have some masterpieces of Kumārajīva, who was fluent in written as well as spoken Chinese. One of them is his own commentary to *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra*, which is kept as a part of *Zhu weimojie jing* 注維摩詰經 (*Taishō* 1775), compiled by Kumārajīva's direct disciple, Sengzhao 僧肇. Also, Kumārajīva's philosophical letters to Huiyuan of Mount Lu 廬山慧遠 (334–416) are extant under the name *Dasheng dayizhang* 大乘大義章, alias *Jiumoluoshi fashi dayi* 鳩摩羅什法師大義 (*Taishō* 1856).<sup>36</sup> Some of Kumārajīva's own verses in Chinese are preserved as well.<sup>37</sup> Further, it is recorded in his biography that he composed the treatise called *Shixiang lun* 實相論 (*Treatise on the Characteristics of Reality*), which was originally intended as a lecture for his patron, emperor Yaoxing 姚興 (r. 394–416) of the Later Qin, though it is now lost.

Apart from these works that were transmitted as Kumārajīva's writings, other texts were passed down as Kumārajīva's translations, for example, *Zuochan sanmei jing* 坐禪三昧經 (*Scripture of Samādhi through Sitting Meditation*); *Taishō* 614. The same is true of *Chanfa yaojie* 禪法要解 (*Essential Exegesis of Meditation Methods*); *Taishō* 616. However, they are not translations but Kumārajīva's editions, as is clearly indicated by previous studies.<sup>38</sup> Neither is written in the *sūtra*-style; they do not commence with the set phrase “Thus have I heard” (*evaṃ mayā śrutam*; Ch.: *rushi wo wen* 如是我聞), nor can one detect any evidence for their being the Buddha's speech, simply because there is no reference to the

---

to his biog., after Dharmayaśas left Chang'an, “Later during the Yuanjia 元嘉 era of the Song (424–53) he went back to the western regions 西域 (which in contexts like these would include India); where he passed away is not clear” (*T*, vol. 50, p. 329C15–16). On the other hand, Buddhayaśas left Chang'an and went back to “*waiguo* 外國” (i.e., India; *T*, vol. 50, p. 334B23). Hence the possibility that both/either of them had once visited Shu cannot be excluded.

<sup>36</sup> For the critical edn. and annotated trans. of *Dasheng dayi zhang*, see *Eon kenkyū*, *Ibun-hen* 慧遠研究, 遺文篇, ed. Kimura Eiichi 木村英一 (Tokyo: Sōbunsha, 1960).

<sup>37</sup> For these verses, see Saitō Takanobu 齊藤隆信, “Shiken to Kumarajū yaku Butten ni okeru ge no shiritsu” 支謙と鳩摩羅什譯佛典における偈の詩律, *Bukkyō shigaku kenkyū* 43.1 (2000), pp. 78–82.

<sup>38</sup> Ikeda Eijun 池田英淳, “Kumarajū yakushutsu no zen kyōten to Rozan Eon” 鳩摩羅什譯出の禪經典と廬山慧遠, in *Taishō daigaku gakuho* 大正大學學報 26 (1937), pp. 101–18 (esp. 103–14). According to the author, in the second half of *Zuochan sanmei jing*, there is an expression of Kumārajīva's own ideas, mainly based on *Da zhidu lun* 大智度論, whose origin is also, at this juncture, unclear. On the other hand, *Chanfa yaojie* was, as Ikeda states, compiled through borrowing some passages verbatim from *Zizaiwang pusa jing* 自在王菩薩經 (*T* no. 420) which was certainly translated by Kumārajīva. These views are introduced and supported in ōchō and Suwa, *Rajū*, pp. 216–17. Cf. Tōdō Kyōshun 藤堂恭俊, “Kumarajū yakushutsu to iwareru zen kyōten no setsuji suru nen Butsu kan” 鳩摩羅什譯出と言われる禪經典の説示する念佛觀, in Fukui hakase shōju kinen kai, ed., *Fukui hakase shōju kinen, Tōyō shisō ronshū* 福井博士頌壽記念, 東洋思想論集 (Tokyo: 1960), p. 398.

Buddha. It seems that *Zuochan sanmei jing*, in particular, was established at the request of Sengrui 僧叡 immediately after Kumārajīva's relocation to Chang'an from Guzang 姑臧 (present-day Wuwei) at the end of December in the third year of Hongshi (401 AD). Some scholars claim, on the other hand, that they should be ascribed not to Kumārajīva but to Sengrui himself.<sup>39</sup> At any rate, it is an interesting fact that Kumārajīva's teaching at Chang'an took place at the outset in the form of his own lecture on the Indian method of meditation as a kind of compendium, and that it was passed down to later generations as if it were a translation of an Indic text.

BODHIRUCI (d. 527)

The work titled *Jin'gang xian lun* 金剛仙論 (*Taishō* 1512) is a commentary on Vasubandhu's 天親 *Jin'gang bore boluomi jing lun* 金剛般若波羅蜜經論 (*Treatise on the Diamond Sūtra of the Perfection of Wisdom*) *Taishō* 1511. If we follow the information under the headings of fascicles 5, 6 and 9, it is "a translation by Tripiṭaka master Bodhiruci at Luoyang in the second year of Tianping, during Wei (535 AD) 魏天平二年菩提流支三藏於洛陽譯." In spite of this information, a careful examination of the contents themselves leads us to the conclusion that it is not a pure translation but a kind of lecture made by Bodhiruci (Puti liuzhi 菩提流支, or, 菩提留支) regarding Master Jin'gang xian's subcommentary on Vasubandhu's commentary on the *Diamond Sūtra*.<sup>40</sup> As has already been pointed out,<sup>41</sup> we find in the text at least three remarkable elements that are particular to Chinese Buddhism:

1. The text mentions the notion of *sanshi xin* 三十二心,<sup>42</sup> which implicitly presupposes the system of bodhisattva paths comprised of *shizhu* 十住, *shixing* 十行, and *shihuixiang* 十迴向 in this sequence as the pre-

<sup>39</sup> Tsukinowa Kenryū 月輪賢隆, *Butten no hihanteki kenkyū* 佛典の批判的研究 (Kyoto: Hyakka'en, 1971), p. 55.

<sup>40</sup> For "Jingang xian 金剛仙," the following Skt. forms have been assumed so far: 1. Vajrasī (by G. Tucci, E. Frauwallner, A. Hirakawa, etc.), 2. either Vajrasī or Vajrasena (H. Ui), and 3. Vajrasī (E. Conze). Cf. Takemura Makio 竹村牧男 and Ōtake Susumu 大竹晉, *Kongō sen ron, jō* 金剛仙論, 上 (Tokyo: Daizō shuppan, 2003), pp. 9–36 ("Kongō sen ron kaidai" 金剛仙論解題), esp. p. 14. On authorship, see Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信亨, "Kongō sen ron no sakusha ni tsuite" 金剛仙論の作者について, in idem, *Bukkyō shi no sho kenkyū* 佛教史の諸研究 (Tokyo: Mochizuki bukkyō kenkyūsho, 1937), pp. 167–72.

<sup>41</sup> Ōtake Susumu, "Kongō sen ron no seiritsu mondai" 金剛仙論の成立問題, in *Bukkyō shigaku kenkyū* 44.1 (2001), pp. 49–70; and Takemura and Ōtake, *Kongō sen ron*, pp. 23–33.

<sup>42</sup> The word *sanshi xin* is found in *T*, vol. 25, p. 848B20. For a similar view expressed by Bodhiruci in another of his texts, see n. 48, below. For the formation of the notion of *sanshi xin* in 5th-c. China, see Funayama Tōru, "Gikyō *Bonmōkyō* seiritsu no sho mondai" 疑經梵網經成立の諸問題, *Bukkyō shigaku kenkyū* 39.1 (1996), pp. 60–67.

- liminary steps to attain the first of ten *bhūmis* (*shidi* 十地). This view is popular only in Chinese Buddhism after the middle of the fifth century, and not identified in any source materials for Indian Buddhism.
2. A passage of *Da zhidu lun* 大智度論 is quoted, although the quotation is not exactly the same text as in the original. Likewise, there is a reference to *Shigong* 什公 (that is, Kumārajīva) in the text.<sup>43</sup>
  3. At the very beginning of the text, the author explains the meaning of the title, by dismantling it into *jin'gang* (*vajra*, diamond), *bore* (*prajñā*, wisdom), *boluomi* (*pāramitā*, perfection), *jing* (*sūtra*, scripture) and *lun* (treatise) in this sequence. Such a method of explanation at the beginning of a commentary is usually not conducted in the case of Indian texts.<sup>44</sup>

These factors are understandable only when we regard the text as reflecting some kind of lecture specially made for a Chinese audience. Historically speaking, the view that *Jin'gang xian lun* is not a translation, but a composition of Bodhiruci is found in Yuance's [Kor.: Won-chuk] 圓測 commentary to the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*,<sup>45</sup> as well as in some of the Tang-era Buddhist catalogues of scriptures. For instance, in an interlinear note in fascicle 12 of *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄, Zhisheng 智昇 states that *Jin'gang xian lun* should not be recorded in the list of Bodhiruci's translations because "it is the commentary on Vasubandhu's treatise, compiled by Bodhiruci, Tripiṭaka master of the original (that is, Northern) Wei 元魏三藏菩提留支所撰," and because "it is not a translation of a Sanskrit text 非梵本翻傳."<sup>46</sup>

Interestingly, a recent article reports that Bodhiruci had composed yet other writings on Yogācāra Buddhism.<sup>47</sup> When cited in later works, they are called *Bie po zhang* 別破章 (A *Separate Thesis of Refutation*), *Fajie xing lun* 法界性論 (*Treatise on the Nature of Dharma-dhātu*),<sup>48</sup> and *Ru lengjia*

<sup>43</sup> The quotation is found in *T*, vol. 25, p. 827B11-12, and the reference in *T*, vol. 25, p. 867A1. For the details of these two points, see Ōtake's articles cited in nn. 40, 41.

<sup>44</sup> This point is not indicated in Ōtake's articles. For this, see Funayama, "Kan'yaku' to 'Chūgoku senjutsu' no aida," pp. 21 and 28 (n. 38).

<sup>45</sup> The Tang commentator Yuance (613-696) introduces the text in question as "Bodhiruci's *Jingang xian lun*" 菩提留支金剛仙論; see *Jieshenmi jing shu* 解深密經疏, j. 1; Z1, box 34, book 4, folio 301, recto 上, ll. 1-2.

<sup>46</sup> *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* (*T*, vol. 55) 12, p. 607B18-19).

<sup>47</sup> Ōtake Susumu, "Bodairushi no ushinawareta san chosaku" 菩提留支の失われた三著作, *Tōhōgaku* 東方學 102 (2001), pp. 34-48.

<sup>48</sup> This lost work probably was an elucidation of the *Ru fajie pin* 入法界品 (*Gaṇḍavyūha*) of *Huayan jing* 華嚴經, on the basis of employing the theory of forty-two stages of bodhisattva praxis that had been established for the first time in the Chinese Buddhist apocryphon as *Pusa yingluo benye jing* 菩薩瓔珞本業經. For details, see Aoki Takashi 青木隆, "Hokkai shō ron ni tsuite" 法界性論について, *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 36.2 (1988), pp. 251-58.

*jing shu* 楞伽經疏 (*Commentary on the Lankāvatāra-sūtra*), although none is extant. From the fragments of these works as well as the above-stated *Jingang xian lun*, it appears that Bodhiruci was quite familiar with the wording and theories developed in the contemporary Chinese Buddhist scholasticism of the Dilun 地論 School in the North.

PARAMĀRTHA (ZHENDI 真諦, ALIAS KULANĀTHA, 499–569)

As is generally known, some of Paramārtha's commentaries on *sūtras* and *śāstras* are not translations but his own lectures presented in south China (for example, Guangzhou 廣州).<sup>49</sup> This means that along with producing translations of Indic texts, he produced his own commentaries on the works, as expounding his own views. In fascicle 7 of *Kaiyuan shijiao lu*, Zhisheng states as follows:

Further, *Changfang's Catalogue* (namely, *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶紀), (*Datang*) *neidian lu* 大唐內典錄, and so forth add thirteen texts such as the *Explication of the Authentic Treatise*, (which amount to) one hundred and eight fascicles. Now they are not recorded here (in the present catalogue), because all of those commentaries on the *sūtras* and *śāstras* are Paramārtha's compositions, and not the translations from the Sanskrit 並是經論義疏, 真諦所撰, 非梵本翻.<sup>50</sup>

According to *Lidai sanbao ji* and *Datang neidian lu*, the expression "thirteen texts" most probably denotes the following works:<sup>51</sup>

*Explication of the Authentic Treatise* 正論釋義

*On Buddha Nature* 佛性義

*On Meditation* 禪定義

*Commentary on the Abhidharmakośa (bhāṣya)* 俱舍論疏

*Commentary on the Vajracchedikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* 金剛般若疏<sup>52</sup>

<sup>49</sup> For classic studies of Paramārtha's life and writings, see Ui Hakuju 宇井伯壽, "Shintai sanzō den no kenkyū" 真諦三藏傳の研究, in idem, *Indo tetsugaku kenkyū, dairōku* 印度哲學研究第六 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1965), pp. 3–130. Su Gongwang 蘇公望, "Zhendi sanzang yishu kao" 真諦三藏譯述考, in *Fodian fanyi shi lun* 佛典翻譯史論, vol. 38 in Zhang Mantao 張曼濤, gen. ed., *Xiandai Fojiao xueshu congkan* 現代佛教學術叢刊 (Taipei: Dacheng wenhua chubanshe, 1978), pp. 67–108 (orig. published in the journal *Weimiao sheng* 微妙聲 2.6 [1936–37]).

<sup>50</sup> *T*, vol. 55, p. 546c25–28.

<sup>51</sup> *Lidai sanbao ji* 9, *T*, vol. 49, p. 88A. *Datang neidian lu* 5 (*T*, vol. 55) 5, p. 273c. In identifying "thirteen texts" out of fifteen beginning from *Zhenglun shiyi* (*Explication of the Authentic Treatise*) in the list of Paramārtha's translations in *Lidai sanbao ji* and *Datang neidian lu*, I do not count *Posoupandou zhuan* 婆藪槃豆傳 (Biography of Vasubandhu) and *Fan waidiao yu* 翻外國語, because these are already listed in *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 7 as Paramārtha's (genuine) translations; *T*, vol. 55, pp. 545c24, 546a12. Whether these two are really his translations is another matter. See also nn. 57, 58, below.

<sup>52</sup> It might be the case that the introduction of this work was called "Qishi ji" 七事記, which was sometimes treated as an independently disseminated work. On this issue, see Ui, "Shintai sanzō den," p. 85, and Funayama, "'Kan'yaku' to 'Chūgoku senjutsu' no aida," p. 28, n. 41.

- Commentary on (the Distinctions between) the Eighteen Nikāyas* 十八部論疏<sup>53</sup>  
*Commentary on the Saṃdhinirmocana-sūtra* 解節經疏  
*Commentary on the \*Anuttarāśraya-sūtra* 無上依經疏  
*Commentary on the \*Tarkaśāstra* 如實論疏  
*Commentary on the Catur(-ārya-)satya-śāstra* 四諦論疏  
*Commentary on the Refutation of the Ātmavāda (in the Abhidharmakośa IX)*  
 破我論疏  
*Commentary on the Theory of Sixteen Truths Found in the Suixiang lun* 隨相論  
 中十六諦疏  
*General Preface to Sūtras* 衆經通序

It is interesting that, of these thirteen texts whose details are not known elsewhere, at least one corresponds to a text preserved in the *Taiishō Tripitaka* as Paramārtha's translation. Namely, the *Commentary on Sixteen Truths Found in Suixiang lun* should be the same as *Taiishō* 1641, *Suixiang lun* 隨相論.<sup>54</sup> To put it differently, it seems possible to assume that, if we examine each case in minute detail, what are called "Paramārtha's translations" in the extant canon may contain more such cases.

Even apart from the above thirteen dubious texts, we can also further point out some texts, if not all, possibly as Paramārtha's own writings. Namely:<sup>55</sup>

- Commentary on the Twenty-two Lucid Explanations concerning the Vinaya*  
 律二十二明了論疏<sup>56</sup>  
*Commentary on the Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra* 金光明經疏  
*Commentary on the Renwang bore (jing)* 仁王般若(經)疏  
*Exposition on the Ninefold Cognition* 九識論義記<sup>57</sup>  
*Exposition on the Turning of the Dharma Wheel* 轉法輪義記

<sup>53</sup> Ui, "Shintai sanzō den," pp. 98–99. This must be the same work as *Buzhi (lun) shu* 部執(論)疏 (or *Buzhi lun ji* 部執論記), which is often cited by Yuance 圓測, Dingbin 定賓, Dajue 大覺, and others.

<sup>54</sup> For this identification see *ibid.*, pp. 96–97. On the other hand, a recent article casts doubt on the identification of Tno. 1641 with *Suixiang lu zhong shiliu di shu*, compiled by Paramārtha, although the argument itself does not look persuasive to me; Yoshizu Yoshihide 吉津宜英, "Shintai sanzō yakushutsu kyō ritsu ron kenkyū shi" 眞諦三藏譯出經律論研究誌, *Komazawa daigaku Bukkyōgakubu kenkyū kiyō* 駒澤大學佛教學部研究紀要 61 (2003), p. 241.

<sup>55</sup> The texts appear in the list of Paramārtha's works given in Buddhist catalogues like *Lidai sanbao ji* 9 (*T*, vol. 49, pp. 87c–88b) and 11 (*T*, vol. 49, pp. 98c–99a) and *Datang neidian lun* 4 (*T*, vol. 55, p. 266a–b) and 5 (*T*, vol. 55, pp. 273a–74a).

<sup>56</sup> As already known, a large number of fragmentary quotations from *Mingliao lun shu* are found in Dingbin's *Sifen lü shu shizongyi ji*, as well as in Dajue's *Sifen lü chao pi* 四分律鈔批.

<sup>57</sup> Ui, "Shintai sanzō den," pp. 77–79. A recent article claims that this work was composed by a scholar of the Dilun School and not by Paramārtha; see Yoshimura Makoto 吉村誠, "Shōron gakuha no shinshiki setsu ni tsuite" 攝論學派の心識説について, *Komazawa daigaku Bukkyōgakubu ronshū* 駒澤大學佛教學部論集 34 (2003), pp. 223–42. An evaluation of the correctness of this view will be a topic of future research.

*Commentary on the Madhyāntavibhāga* 中邊分別論疏

*Commentary on the Mahāyāna-Vijñāptimātratāsiddhi* 大乘唯識論注記

*Commentary on the Mahāyānasamgraha* 攝大乘論義疏<sup>58</sup>

*Biography of (the Buddhist Master of the Law) Vasubandhu* 婆藪槃豆(法師)傳<sup>59</sup>

*Translation of Foreign Words* 翻外國語<sup>60</sup>

Next, two short but noteworthy comments disclose that Paramārtha was aware that the audience was Chinese. Commenting upon a passage which mentions the word *vīṇā*,<sup>61</sup> Paramārtha explains, “A *vīṇā* 毘拏 (*pina*) is a musical instrument. Roughly speaking, it looks like a *piba* 毘巴 found here (in China).”<sup>62</sup> Another easy-to-follow piece of evidence for Paramārtha’s awareness of a Chinese audience is that when he needs to mention two personal names in a certain illustration, he sometimes takes Zhang 張 and Wang 王 as representatives of popular names,<sup>63</sup> instead of referring to Devadatta and Yajñadatta as Indian stock examples. This occurs only because Paramārtha spoke to a Chinese audience.

Paramārtha’s awareness of his Chinese audience is prominent also in his employment of some theories and terms that are conspicuous in Chinese apocryphal *sūtras*. For example, just like Bodhiruci, Paramārtha mentions the bodhisattva practice comprised of such elements as *shixin* 十信, *shijie* 十解,<sup>64</sup> *shixing*, and *shihuixiang*, which should be practiced prior to the well-known ten stages (*shidi*, or *daśabhūmi*).<sup>65</sup> This system is one of the typical results of the Chinese Buddhism origi-

<sup>58</sup> For fragments of this work, see Ui Hakuju, *Shō daijō ron kenkyū* 攝大乘論研究, (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1935), pp. 117–30.

<sup>59</sup> Takakusu suggests the possibility that the “Biography of Vasubandhu” was not a genuine translation of an already existing Indic text but Vasubandhu’s biography as narrated by Paramārtha; J. Takakusu, “The Life of Vasubandhu by Paramārtha (A.D. 499–569),” *TP* 2d ser. 5 (1904), p. 293, n. 110.

<sup>60</sup> Though Zhisheng refers to this text as Paramārtha’s translation (see above, n. 50), the text bearing such a name cannot be a translation in the strict sense.

<sup>61</sup> Skt.: *vīṇā*, Tib.: *pi bang*; see *Jiejie jing*, trans. Paramārtha, *T* no. 677, vol. 16, p. 713B25–26. For the Tibetan translation see *Samdhinirmocana Sūtra: L’explication des mystères*, ed. Étienne Lamotte (Louvain and Paris, 1935), p. 46, chap. 3, 6, ll.4–7.

<sup>62</sup> *Jieshenmi jing shu* 2 (by Yuance); Z1, box 34, book 4, folio 347, recto 下, l. 12.

<sup>63</sup> This is found even in Paramārtha’s “translations”: *Foxing lun* 佛性論 1 (*T*, vol. 31, pp. 789C4–6, 792C24) and *Sidi lun* 四諦論 4 (*T*, vol. 32, p. 397B22–23). Further, he refers to Zhang, Wang, and Li 張王李 in the case of three persons, as per the fragment of Paramārtha’s *Commentary on Mingliao lun* 明了(論)疏, cited in *Sifen lü shu shizong yi ji* (Z1, box 66, book 2, folio 173, recto 上, l. 16, to 下, l. 6) by Dingbin. On the other hand, Paramārtha’s translation of *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (*T*, vol. 29, p. 308B10) has Tianyu 天與 and Ciyu 祠與 as the literal translation of Devadatta and Yajñadatta, without modifying them into Zhang and Wang.

<sup>64</sup> For Paramārtha’s preference of *shijie* 十解 over the synonymous *shizhu* 十住, see Mizuno Kōgen 水野弘元, “Gojūni tō no bosatsu kiai setsu” 五十二位等の菩薩階位説, *Bukkyōgaku* 佛教學 18 (1984), pp. 15–17.

<sup>65</sup> Funayama Tōru, “Ryūju, Mujaku, Seshin no tōtatsu shita kiai ni kansuru sho denshō” 龍樹, 無著, 世親の到達した階位に關する諸傳承, *Tōhōgaku* 105 (2003), p. 126.

nally advocated in *Pusa yingluo benye jing* 菩薩瓔珞本業經 (*Taishō* 1485), composed probably in China in the second half of the fifth century.<sup>66</sup>

Strictly speaking however, the real problem would lie not in Paramārtha's lectures as they stand, but in the fact that he sometimes interpolated his own interpretation in an implicit way within his translation. For example, the above-mentioned peculiar wording such as *shixin*, *shijie*, and so forth, is found in his translation of the *Mahāyānasamgrahabhāṣya* by Vasubandhu,<sup>67</sup> while no equivalent is employed in other translations of the concerned text, to say nothing of the Tibetan translations. Yet another piece of evidence for Chinese features remarkable in the same work by Paramārtha is his way of interpreting the word *huanxi* 歡喜 (*pramuditā*) as the bodhisattva's first stage (*prathamā bhūmi*) by means of splitting it into *huan* 歡 and *xi* 喜,<sup>68</sup> as denoting contrastive notions. Obviously, such an explanation is not possible in the Sanskrit language, simply because *pramudita* signifies a single concept. In like manner, the term *runhua* 潤滑, equivalent to Skt. *snigdha* "lubricant," is divided into *run* 潤 and *hua* 滑 as two separate notions in *Foxing lun* 佛性論.<sup>69</sup> A similar way of explanation can be found in Paramārtha's other works, too.

Furthermore, it seems quite certain that Paramārtha did produce his own commentary on the *Renwang bore boluomi jing* (*Scripture of Benevolent Kings*) *Taishō* 245, which is transmitted as a translation of Kumārajīva, but in fact is a Chinese composition.<sup>70</sup>

Paramārtha's commentary, *Renwang bore (boluo mi jing) shu* 仁王般若疏,<sup>71</sup> is called the *Original Commentary* (*Benji* 本記) by the Tang commen-

<sup>66</sup> For the formation of this apocryphon as well as a bibliography on previous studies relating to the formation of the *sūtra*, see Funayama, "Gikyō *Bonmōkyō*."

<sup>67</sup> See *I*, vol. 31, p. 229B21; also *I*, vol. 31, pp. 174C5-7, 177C18-19, and 199B22-23. This issue is pointed out in Mizuno, "Gojūnii tō," pp. 15-17.

<sup>68</sup> *I*, vol. 31, p. 206A17: 捨自愛名歡, 生他愛名喜 "To abandon affection for oneself is called *huan*, and to produce affection for others is called *xi*." The significance of this passage is addressed in Nagao Gadjin 長尾雅人, *Shō daijōron, Wayaku to chūkai, ge* 攝大乘論和譯と注解, 下 (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1987), p. 60, where Nagao is inclined to assume that some interpretations by Paramārtha's disciples are mixed into the translation. I would like to claim, on the contrary, that such exegetical interpolations are not mistakes by the disciples but represent an aspect of Paramārtha's translation.

<sup>69</sup> *Foxing lun* 2 (*I*, vol. 31, p. 797A12-15). The term *runhua* here is a repetition of *runhua-xing* in 796B6 which corresponds to Skt.: *snigdha[bhāva]* in the *Ratnagotravibhāga* (namely in its prose passage on stanza 31).

<sup>70</sup> Mochizuki Shinkō, *Jōdokyō no kigen oyobi hattatsu* 淨土教の起源及發達 (Tokyo: Kyōritsu-sha, 1930), pp. 140-55; idem, *Bukkyō kyōten seiritsu shi ron* 佛教經典成立史論 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1946), pp. 425-41; and Ōno Hōdō 大野法道, *Daijōkaikyō no kenkyū* 大乘戒經の研究 (Tokyo: Risōsha, 1954), pp. 87-92.

<sup>71</sup> Ui, "Shintai sanzō den no kenkyū" pp. 52-54. Su, "Zhendi sanzang yishu kao" p. 77.

tator Yuance 圓測 in his *Renwang jing shu* 仁王經疏.<sup>72</sup> A close examination of the fragmentary passages of the *Original Commentary* in Yuance's work reveals that Paramārtha's commentary was probably based on the *Renwang jing* that is traditionally considered to be a translation by Kumārajīva. This fact leads to the conclusion that Paramārtha himself did not produce his own translation of the *Renwang jing*, a conclusion quite the opposite of the traditional view.<sup>73</sup> Let us clarify the issue by showing some examples:

*Renwang jing* (*Taishō* 245)

不住色, 不住非色, 不住非非色.

(*T*, vol. 8, p. 825c28)

三界愛習順道定, 遠達正土獨諦了.

(*T*, vol. 8, p. 827c16)

返照樂虛無盡源.

(*T*, vol. 8, p. 827c19)

Paramārtha's *Original Commentary* (*Benji*)  
(Cited by Yuance; *Taishō* 1708)

一本記云。不住色者，第一句，遮色。色是色蘊，即質礙義。非色者，第二句，遮四蘊，即了別心等。非非色者，第三句，重遮色心。若具，應言不住非色非非色，為存略故，但言非非色。( *T*, vol. 33, p. 381B19-23)

一本記云。三界愛習一句，謂三界愛皆順如理，不復別見，故言順道定。遠達一句，別前未證見如如，故言獨了。( *T*, vol. 33, p. 396c2-5)

依本記云。言返照者，返照過去地前之事。言樂虛者，緣現在樂，虛而不實樂。言無盡源者，照知未來道後，不可盡其源。

(*T*, vol. 33, p. 397A9-11)

In these passages, the highlighted words in the right column are words from the *sūtra* (*jingwen* 經文; Skt.: *pratīka*) that are cited verbatim and commented upon in Paramārtha's *Original Commentary*.<sup>74</sup> These will clearly reveal that Paramārtha's text was a commentary on a text that had already existed in Kumārajīva's translation, inasmuch as we pre-

<sup>72</sup> For the *Original Commentary* or *benji* as denoting Paramārtha's commentary on the *Renwang jing*, see Ui, "Shintai sanzō den," p. 53. For the list of the fragments of Paramārtha's words found in Yuance's *Renwang jing shu*, see Kimura Kunikazu 木村邦和, "Saimyōji Enjiki ni okeru Shintai sanzō shoden no gakusetsu ni taisuru hyōka (2)" 西明寺圓測における眞諦三藏所傳の學說に對する評價, in *Kenkyū kiyō* 研究紀要 6 (Nagaoka tanki daigaku) (1982), pp. 82-67.

<sup>73</sup> Previous studies (e.g., Ui, "Shintai sanzō den," pp. 52-53) assume that Paramārtha made his own translation of *Renwang jing*, simply following the information in, e.g., *T*, vol. 49, p. 99A2-3. However, its real existence is highly doubtful; Mochizuki, *Jōdokyō*, pp. 141-44.

<sup>74</sup> Similarly, we can collect Paramārtha's commentary on the expression *chunian yuebari* 初年月八日, which is found only in Kumārajīva's translation of *Renwang jing* (*T*, vol. 8, 825B10). (I believe this fact corroborates my idea that Paramārtha utilized Kumārajīva's, without making his own translation.) Concerning this passage, see the commentaries on *Renwang jing* by Zhiyi and Guanding (*T*, vol. 33, p. 263B9-17) and Yuance's commentary on the same scripture (*T*, vol. 33, p. 376C3-5).

sume that Yuance's citations of the *Original Commentary* are correct and trustworthy.

#### CONCLUDING REMARKS

Thus five concrete cases of Indian lectures in China have been brought to our attention. Namely, the (*Scripture of*) *Five Hundred Questions*, Kumārajīva's texts such as the *Scripture of Samādhi through Sitting Meditation*, Bodhiruci's *Jin'gang xian lun*, and some of Paramārtha's own works are the records of lectures by Indian monks for Chinese people. While they are not translations in the strict sense, the *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya-vibhāṣā*, on the other hand, is basically a translation, containing a certain amount of exegetical comments on the occasion of translation. To sum up in a word, they embody the Sino-Indian hybrid nature quite well. It deserves notice that Buddhist scholars such as Bodhiruci and Paramārtha were probably willing to make their comments, through the intentional use of special theories developed in apocryphal *sūtras*, as representing the Chinese mentality, in order to help the audience comprehend difficult doctrines. Here, we may perceive a good example of *upāyakaśalya* 善巧方便. Why then were such lectures sometimes wrongly taken to be translations? It was difficult for those in attendance at a lecture to tell whether the lecture by the Indian authority was composed of only views he learned from his own teacher, or mixed with additions originating from his own interpretation, let alone when the Indian master read the lecture from memory, and when he had to communicate through the medium of an interpreter.

It is strongly expected that we will be able to ascertain more cases of a similar type of literature among the Chinese Buddhist Canon. I hope the present article will merely function as a foothold to open up just such a possibility. This article is of course only a beginning toward clarifying the characteristics of Chinese Buddhist texts. A detailed investigation of each topic awaits future research.

#### LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經  
 Z *Dai Nippon zokuzōkyō* 大日本續藏經