

## THE CHINESE PSEUDO-TRANSLATION OF ĀRYA-ŚŪRA'S JĀTAKA-MĀLĀ

by JOHN BROUGH

It is hardly surprising that students of Sanskrit literature have for the most part continued to believe in the existence of a Chinese translation of the famous work of Ārya-śūra. Eight years before the publication of the Sanskrit text,<sup>1</sup> Nanjio's catalogue made mention not only of a Chinese version, but in addition a tantalizing commentary, unknown in Sanskrit.<sup>2</sup> In the introduction to his English translation, Speyer<sup>3</sup> referred to Nanjio's entry, and regretted that the Chinese commentary had not been translated into a European language, and was therefore not accessible to him. He need have had no regrets: the "commentary" in question would have given no assistance whatsoever for the elucidation of the Sanskrit. A. O. Ivanovski had already written in Russian on the Chinese text, but his article seems to have remained unknown in western Europe until 1903, when M. Duchesne published a French translation of it.<sup>4</sup>

At this point the absurdity ought to have stopped. Anyone acquainted with the Indian original could now have seen at a glance that there was something seriously wrong. And in fact Paul Pelliot (then 25 years old) saw it immediately, and said so, concisely but unambiguously, in a review<sup>5</sup> of the French translation of Ivanovski's article. Ivanovski, admittedly, could hardly be criticised for failing to perceive the extent of the eccentricity of the Chinese text. We may assume that his article was written before the printed Sanskrit edition could be expected to have reached him, and a vague reference to the Sanskrit text<sup>6</sup> may have been derived simply from the information in Nanjio's catalogue.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *The Jātaka-mālā . . . otherwise entitled Bodhisattva-avadāna-mālā, by Ārya-śūra*, ed. Hendrik Kern, 1891. (Harvard Oriental Series, Vol. I.)

<sup>2</sup> Bunyiu Nanjio, *A catalogue of the Chinese translation of the Buddhist Tripiṭaka*, 1883, No. 1312.

<sup>3</sup> *The Gātakamālā, or Garland of Birth-stories, by Ārya Śūra*, trs. J. S. Speyer, 1895, (Sacred books of the Buddhists, Vol. I) p. xxix.

<sup>4</sup> A. O. Ivanovski, "Sur une traduction chinoise du recueil bouddhique 'Jātaka-mālā'", *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, xlvii, 1903, 298-335. Footnote 1 on p. 298: "Traduit du russe sur le tirage à part de l'original publié dans le t. VII des *Mémoires de la section orientale de la Société impériale russe d'archéologie* (Petersbourg, 1893)".

<sup>5</sup> *BEFEO*, IV, 1904, 752-5.

<sup>6</sup> *RHR*, *loc. cit.*, p. 300.

<sup>7</sup> Other possible sources were L. Feer, in *JAs*, May 1875, 413, and C. Bendall, *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge*,

—Continued on following page

Unfortunately, Pelliot's critique appears to have escaped the attention of Sanskritists in general (including, until very recently, the present writer); and only Ivanovski's article, or rather, a reference to it, came to the notice of the authors of the standard books on the history of Sanskrit literature. Winternitz, for example, remarked in a footnote:<sup>8</sup> "Though the Chinese translation of the Jātakamālā mentions Āryaśūra as the author, it contains only 14 stories, see A. O. Ivanovski in RHR, 1903, t. 47, p. 298 ff." Keith<sup>9</sup> gives only a reference to the same article; while S. K. De<sup>10</sup> remarks, "We have Yi-tsing's testimony, confirmed by the existence of Chinese and Tibetan translations, that the work was at one time popular in India and outside"; and, in a footnote, "The Chinese version contains only 14 stories".

It may be remarked in passing that the Tibetan translation<sup>11</sup> is genuine, and, in the few sample passages which I have checked, shows an excellent comprehension of the Sanskrit original. The Chinese is another story. But there was of course no reason to suspect that the historians of Sanskrit literature had not themselves seen the content of Ivanovski's article.

## A

Ārya-śūra is unquestionably a writer of distinction, and even though we may have little patience with the insensate activities of some of his heroes, we can still admire his sensitive handling of the Sanskrit language and the brilliance of his poetic imagination. It was therefore with much interest that I recently turned to the Chinese version,<sup>12</sup> to see how the translators, Shao-tê 紹德 and Hui-hsün 慧詢, had dealt with a text which,

*Continued from previous page—*  
1883; but these could not have supplied much additional information which could have been helpful. It seems probable, however, that Ivanovski had at least seen the Sanskrit edition before his article was published, since in his list of chapters (*ibid.* p. 333) the title of No. 21 is given as *Cuddabodhi*. The Sanskrit manuscripts, however, have the corruption *Buddhabodhi*, emended by Kern to *Cuddabodhi* on the evidence of the corresponding *Cullabodhi*, *Cūlabodhi* in the Pali *Jātaka* and *Cariyā-piṭaka* respectively. [It may be added that *Cudda-* (or perhaps *Cūda-*, but certainly not *Khudda-*, suggested by Kern, p. 248, as a possible alternative) is supported also by the Tibetan. Here the translator, misreading the name as *Cūda-bodhi*, gave the rendering *gtsug-phud byān-chub*.] But even if Ivanovski saw the Sanskrit edition, he was unable to use it in time. His article would otherwise have been very different.

<sup>8</sup> M. Winternitz, *Geschichte der indischen Litteratur*, II, i, 1913, 214; quoted here from the English translation, revised by the author, *A History of Indian literature*, II, 1933, 276.

<sup>9</sup> A. Berriedale Keith, *A History of Sanskrit literature*, 1928, 67 n.

<sup>10</sup> S. N. Dasgupta and S. K. De, *A History of Sanskrit literature, Classical period*, I, 1947, 80.

<sup>11</sup> *Skyes-paḥi rabs-kyi rgyud*, in Tanjur, Peking edition, *Mdo-hgrel* vol. Ke, fol. 1-152b = *Tibetan Tripiṭaka*, Vol. CXXVIII, pp. 1-63 b 2.

<sup>12</sup> *Taishō Tripiṭaka*, Vol. III, No. 160, pp. 331 ff. The heading of the work places the translators in the Sung period, A.D. 960-1279; but with few exceptions (e.g., Pelliot, *loc. cit.*, p. 754, and *Hōbōgirin*, fasc. annexe, Tables du Taishō Issaikyō, p. 149 s.v. *Shōtoku*, where the wider limits are accepted), most modern writers have simply repeated the dates given by Nanjio, between A.D. 960 and 1127 (Northern Sung).

unlike most of the vast quantity of Buddhist writings translated, is worthy to rank as literature.

There is no possibility of doubt concerning the identity claimed by the Chinese text, which is ascribed to the Bodhisattva Ārya-śūra (Shêng-yung 聖勇) and bears the title *P'u-sa pên-shêng-man lun* 菩薩本生鬘論: *Bodhisattva-jātaka-mālā*.<sup>13</sup> This is certainly not a case where title and author's name have been attached by accident to the wrong book. But the opening invocatory verses proved to be unexpectedly difficult, and certainly did not seem to be a translation of the Sanskrit. Moreover, there are too many verses: more, certainly, than would normally be needed to translate the four stanzas with which the original text opens.

Leaving the verses aside for the time being, we turn to the first story, and read with astonishment that the Buddha, while once sojourning with his monks in the Pañcāla country, rested in a grove and touched the ground with his hand; whereupon, to the accompaniment of the appropriate earthquake, there appeared before them a *stūpa* enshrining the bones of the Bodhisattva who sacrificed his life in ancient times. The Buddha then narrated how the king Mahāratha had three sons, Mahāpra<ṇāda>,<sup>14</sup> Mahādeva, and Mahāsattva; and how the last and youngest of these gave up his life to feed a hungry tigress. This is indeed a familiar story, and indeed Ārya-śūra uses the tigress-motif in his opening Jātaka. But it is immediately obvious that the version here is not Ārya-śūra's, but that of the penultimate chapter (*Vyāghrī-parivarta*) of the *Suvarṇabhāṣottama-sūtra*.<sup>15</sup> Specifically, it is an abridgement of I-ching's translation<sup>16</sup> of the Sūtra. The following brief extracts will suffice to illustrate the relationship of our text to its model.<sup>17</sup>

I-ching (450c)<sup>18</sup> 爾時世尊... 將諸苾芻  
'Jm.' (332b) 爾時世尊 將諸

及於大衆至般遮羅 聚落 詣一林  
大衆詣般遮羅大聚落所至一林

<sup>13</sup> The term *lun* is an addition to the Sanskrit title, and is used only as an indication to the reader that the book in question is not "canonical"—in effect, to prevent the assumption that this is a *ching* 經. (See also below, p. 40, n. 44.) The extant Sanskrit manuscripts attest the titles *Jātaka-mālā* and *Bodhisattva-avadāna-mālā*; and the Tibetan translation, although it normally uses the former, apparently had *-avadāna-* in the colophon of chapter i.

<sup>14</sup> 摩訶波羅 is merely a truncated version of this name, and does not represent "Mahābala" (mistakenly proposed by the editors, T. XVI, p. 451, note).

<sup>15</sup> *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra: das Goldglanz-Sūtra*, ed. Johannes Nobel, 1937, chapter xviii.

<sup>16</sup> T. XVI, No. 665.

<sup>17</sup> In the following extracts, characters are spaced out where necessary, but only to facilitate comparison, and except where omissions are specifically marked (...), each text is continuous.

<sup>18</sup> References are to the pages of the relevant volume of the Taishō edition.

中。... (451a) 佛告具壽阿難陀。汝  
中。謂阿難曰。汝

可於此樹下爲我敷座。... 爾時世尊  
於此間爲我敷座。佛

卽於座上加趺而坐。... 告諸苾芻。  
坐其上。語諸比丘。

汝等樂欲見彼往昔 苦行菩薩  
汝等欲見我往昔時修行苦行

本舍利不。... (451a 16) 世尊受已告  
舍利已不。... (332c 1) 世尊受已令

諸苾芻。汝等應觀苦行菩薩遺身舍  
衆 諦觀

利而說頌曰。  
而說頌曰。

菩薩勝德相應慧 勇猛精勤六度圓  
菩薩勝功德 勤修六度行

常修不息爲菩提 大<sup>19</sup>捨堅固心無倦。  
勇猛求菩提 大捨 心無倦。

Obviously, the Sung version is in no sense a fresh translation from an Indian original. It is, of course, not unusual for a later Chinese translator to take material from the version of a predecessor, and no stigma of plagiarism would be incurred thereby. Whole sentences may be reproduced verbatim, or with minor alterations, sometimes due merely to stylistic preference in

<sup>19</sup> The "Jātaka-mālā" copy can hardly count as additional evidence in favour of this reading. It is, however, quoted by the editors from two of the sources for I-ching's text, but rejected in favour of 不捨 ("unremittingly", parallel with 不怠 in the previous line). On the other hand, the Sanskrit verse (Nobel, p. 205) ends with the words *sadā dānaniratasya*, and 不捨 would eliminate *dāna-* from the sentence; and if 大 is correct, it would suggest that I-ching's Sanskrit manuscript had *mahā-dāna-* in place of *sadā dāna-*. Unfortunately, the verse as it appears in the Sanskrit edition is, as Nobel says, "textlich recht unsicher und nicht ursprünglich" (although "textlich ganz unmöglich" would have been a truer description); and the textual problem remains unresolved.

Chinese, sometimes to a re-interpretation of the Indian text, or to the use of a different recension of the latter. The relationship between the "Jātaka-mālā" story and its Chinese source, however, is only superficially similar to this situation, as may more readily be seen from the following citations, where the earlier version of "Dharmakṣema"<sup>20</sup> can be brought into the comparison:

Dh. (354a)

I-ch. (451b) 是時大王爲欲遊觀縱賞

'Jm' (332c) 是時大王 縱賞

是三王子於諸園林 遊戲觀看。  
山林。其三王子亦皆隨從。爲求花果  
山谷。三子皆從。

次第漸到 一大竹林憇駕止息。

捨父周旋。至大竹林於中憩息。

至大竹林於中憩息。

... (354b) 轉復前行見有一虎適產

... 次復前行見有一虎產生

次復前行見有一虎產生

七日而有七子。圍繞周匝飢餓窮悴  
七子纔經七日。諸子圍遶飢渴所逼  
七子已經七日。

身體羸瘦命將欲絕。第一王子見是  
身形羸瘦將死不久。第一王子  
第一王子

虎已作如是言。怪哉此虎產來七日。

作如是言。哀哉此虎產來七日。

作如是言。

<sup>20</sup> T. XVI, Nos. 663 and 664, the latter being a revised edition made approximately 180 years later. In the passage quoted here, there are no significant differences between the two.

七子圍繞不得求食。若爲飢逼必還  
 七子圍遶無暇求食。飢渴所逼必還  
 七子圍繞無暇尋食。飢渴所逼必噉

噉子。

噉子。... (451b 24) 第二王子聞此  
 其子。 第二王子聞是

語已 作如是言。...

說已。哀哉此虎 將死不久。

No more evidence is needed. Apart from the shortening of the text by omissions, a few differences in wording may indeed have been intended to act as a disguise; but if so, the disguise is transparent. Small inventiveness was needed to interchange the positions of the near-synonyms 至 and 詣, to substitute 佛 *buddha* for 世尊 *bhagavān*, to use the older but more familiar Prakritic 比丘 *bhikkhu* rather than 苾芻 *bhikṣu*. It seems unlikely that, near the end of the last passage quoted, a feeling for literary style prompted *hsün* 尋 "seek", where I-ching wrote *ch'iu* 求 "seek". It was enterprising, no doubt, to use lines of five syllables instead of seven in the verse at the end of the first section quoted above. Yet in all these ways, the disguise is so thin that we may hesitate to believe that concealment of the method of working was the intention. If the imitators had been challenged in their lifetime, they would have been wise to distract attention from this verse.

Yet again, we cannot argue thus with much confidence. The monks in question seem to have been simple souls without the wit to grasp such a point, too inexpert in the art of forgery to do it well, of a humour too serious—by circumstance if not by nature—to refashion I-ching's verse thus only for their own diversion. Admittedly we must not judge the matter by modern standards: it must be repeated that plagiaristic indebtedness was not as such considered reprehensible. But doubtless the same indulgence would not have stretched to cover downright literary forgery. The fabricators of the "*jātaka-mālā*" did have good reason for trying to camouflage their work. Almost certainly, discovery would have been a double disaster: official censure (at least), and the laughter of their colleagues.

It must have been obvious, of course, that the risk of exposure was negligible. There was no reason why suspicion should be aroused; and if, improbably, it were, then there would be camouflage enough upon which to base a defence not only plausible, but practically impregnable. To master the intricacies of literary Sanskrit must have been fantastically difficult for a

Chinese scholar, without dictionary<sup>21</sup> or grammar-book to help; and a visit from an Indian with a reasonable knowledge of Chinese was most improbable. But even against the unlikely danger from either of these directions there was a simple prophylactic: to lose the Sanskrit manuscript. There was little chance that another copy could readily be procured in China.

There are signs of carelessness in the text which suggest that the writers were working under pressure, and were not given time to revise and prepare their copy for publication. The curious small inconsistencies in the colophons of the later chapters<sup>22</sup> are indicative of an unrevised first draft. So too, in the first story, where I-ching gives the name of Ānanda its full three syllables, 阿難陀 *a-nan-da*, it was common sense to replace this at 332b24, 28, 29 and elsewhere by the more usual *a-nan*; but telltale carelessness to retain *a-nan-da* in 332c7. A memory-trace of this was probably the stimulus which, in the third story (334a16), where the source copied had *a-nan*, evoked *a-nan-da* as an easy method of adding a syllable, and so preserving the prized four-syllable rhythm: a stop-gap method, nevertheless, which could have been bettered on revision with little trouble.

Our *soi-disant* translators undoubtedly knew some Sanskrit—a number of Sanskrit words, one should rather say, since on all the evidence they were innocent of any grammar; but they must have been horrified by the incomprehensibility of this *jātaka-mālā* which was their task to translate. If in addition they were hard pressed by their superiors for a speedy completion of the work, as seems likely from the lack of revision, we may imagine their relief when they found the colophon to the first story: *iti vyāghri-jātakam prathamam*. The Tigress-jātaka was a story they already knew. I-ching's translation of the *Suvarṇabhāsottama-sūtra* was there to be to them a ready help in trouble: which to reject would surely be an act of ingratitude and disrespect towards the great T'ang translator.

It is sad that Ārya-sūra's story says nothing of the Pañcāla-land, nothing of the *stūpa* for the Bodhisattva's bones, nor anything of king Mahāratha and his three sons. It is to be hoped that Shao-tê and Hui-hsün were spared from learning afterwards that Ārya-sūra's Bodhisattva was not

<sup>21</sup> It is unlikely that anything better was available than the glossaries which survive (T. LIV, Nos. 2133-5; Prabodh Chandra Bagchi, *Deux lexiques sanskrit-chinois*, 1929-30), and for a translator these are almost useless. Not only is their range of vocabulary too restricted, but their capacity to mislead is considerable. For example, *chāyā* "shadow", and *abhra* "cloud" are explained quite correctly by the single word *yin* 陰 (T. LIV, pp. 1198b, 1212b); but unless the Chinese reader already knows the Sanskrit words, there is nothing to tell him that they are not synonyms in Sanskrit. Worse, there is no warning to prevent him from taking *yin* in its technical Buddhist sense of *śāndha*; and worse still, no indication that in literary Sanskrit the word *chāyā* can sometimes have the sense of "lustre, beauty", for which *yin* would be impossible as a translation.

<sup>22</sup> A few examples are noted below, p. 42-f.

a young prince, but a learned Brahman who had withdrawn from the world to the woods and hills, where he taught his pupils as the Brahmanical ideal expected of such a one.

The second colophon was again easy: *iti śibi-jātakam dvitīyam*, and who did not know of the famous king Śibi? And a second time Fortune played them the same trick, and this time mischievously persuaded them to display the mistake in their chapter-heading: 尸毘王救鴿命, "King Śibi saves the dove's life". We are thus informed, before we have read a word of the story itself, that this is the fable wherein the king had the fortitude to offer the gift of his own flesh to the falcon as ransom for the life of the terrified dove which, fleeing from its foe, found refuge in the king's resolve never to forsake a fugitive—the two birds being the deities Śakra and Viśvakarman respectively, who had assumed these shapes to test him. But Ārya-śūra tells of how the compassionate king donated his own eyes to Śakra disguised as an old, wretched, blind Brahman, whose lost eyesight he thus restored at the cost of his own.

When the method of genesis of the first story is beyond reasonable doubt, it would be ingenuous to expect that the second might be generically different. No time need be wasted, therefore, in seeking comparisons among Śibi-stories in Sanskrit or Tibetan; and we can quickly see that, although several others in Chinese are very similar in substance, the version in the well-known collection of tales, the *Hsien-yü ching*<sup>23</sup> 賢愚經, has the required type of verbal correlation: for example—

Hs. (351c) 帝釋報言。吾將終矣。死

Jm. (333b) 帝釋謂言。吾將逝矣

證已現。如今世間佛法已滅。亦復  
思念世間佛法已滅 諸大

無有諸大菩薩。我心不知何所歸依。  
菩薩不復出現。我心不知何所歸趣。

... 毘首羯摩復答 天帝。菩薩大人  
... 毘首 白言。今於 菩薩

不宜加苦正應供養。 不須以  
正應供養 不宜加苦無 以

<sup>23</sup> T. IV, No. 202; Tibetan version (translated from Chinese), *Hdzaris-blun*, edited and translated by I. J. Schmidt, *Der Weise und der Thor*, 1843.

此難事 逼 也。爾時帝釋便說偈言。  
難事而逼惱也。時天帝釋而說偈曰。

我亦非惡心	如真金應試
我本非惡意	如火試真金
以此試菩薩	知爲至誠不。
以此驗菩薩	知爲真實不。

It is worth remarking that the *Hsien-yü ching* also contains a version of the Tigress-story, closely akin in substance to that in the *Suvarṇabhāsotama-sūtra*, but in its wording independent of the Chinese translations of the latter. In the *Hsien-yü ching*, however, where it is the second main story, it is immediately preceded by that of Śibi. This juxtaposition, we may suspect, was at least one reason for avoiding this version in the first story of the "*Jātaka-mālā*": for the *Hsien-yü ching* was in fact a favourite quarry which supplied a fair quantity of the materials used in the fabrication of the "*Jātaka-mālā*" stories.<sup>24</sup>

After a start which must have pleased them, the Chinese translators encountered trouble in the third title, *Kulmāṣapīṇḍī-jātaka*: the word *kulmāṣa* "gruel" was not in their vocabulary. Making the best of the remainder, they entitled the chapter 如來分衛緣起 "*Tathāgata-pīṇḍapāta-jātaka*",<sup>25</sup> and under this heading they set forth the barbaric, stupid story of Sujāti. This is *Hsien-yü ching* No. 7, adapted as before, although now with rather more enterprise in rephrasing the model. A connexion with the title is indeed provided by the "story of the present", which begins with the Buddha and Ānanda setting off on a begging-round. Such a tenuous justification for the term *pīṇḍapāta* in the title may seem absurd when we recall the hundreds of times that this stereotyped opening is used in Buddhist texts. But the choice here was probably not unconnected with the fact that in the *Hsien-yü ching* this is the first story, after that of the tigress, which begins thus.

The remaining stories need not detain us long. Enough has been said to show that the book as a whole is devoid of intrinsic worth, and it would be time wasted to attempt to account for all the details. A few points, nevertheless, may be of interest.

<sup>24</sup> Ivanovski, *loc. cit.*, noted that many of the stories in the Chinese "*Jātaka-mālā*" occur also in the *Hsien-yü ching*, but apparently did not suspect the nature of the textual relationship between the two works.

<sup>25</sup> The term 緣起, frequent elsewhere as a rendering of *pratitya-samutpāda*, is used in the titles of all fourteen stories here, and must be intended as a translation of *jātaka*. This can of course be justified without any doctrinal difficulty. A similar double employment is more familiar in the case of 因緣.

JM iv, *Śreṣṭhi-jātaka*. Few designations of lay persons can be more frequent in Buddhist tales than *śreṣṭhin-* "rich merchant, leading citizen", 長者. The title of the corresponding story in the Chinese text is due to the word having been misread as *śreṣṭha-* "best": 最勝神化, probably to be understood as *śreṣṭha-prātihārya*. As in the preceding story, there is no point of subject-matter shared with the Sanskrit text. With *Hsien-yü ching* No. 14, on the other hand, and in spite of divergences, the narrative shows verbal agreements of a sort which can hardly be accidental.

JM v, *Aviśahya-jātaka*. Here the personal name or epithet *Aviśahya* "Invincible" has engendered an attempt at etymology. The Chinese story tells how the Tathāgata suffered no ill effects from eating poison: 如來不為毒所害. Clearly, the word has been analysed as *a-viśa-*, with the final *-hya* being perhaps thought of as some derivative (grammatically mysterious) of the verbal root *han-*. (But the compounds which do in fact exist, *viśa-ha-*, *viśa-ghna-*, *viśa-ghāta-*, "antidote", might have threatened to reverse the sense.) For the subject-matter, we may compare the "*Candra-prabha-kumāra-sūtra*",<sup>26</sup> but no indisputable textual indebtedness has been traced.

JM vi, *Śāsa-jātaka*. As in the first two stories, the title was understood. Likewise, the version in the Chinese text here agrees only in the motif, while the differences in details of the narrative suffice to prove that Ārya-sūra's text contributed nothing but the title. The source was chapter vi of the *P'u-sa pēn-yüan ching*<sup>27</sup> 菩薩本緣經, abridged and slightly altered here and there, but with many phrases and sentences lifted intact.

JM vii, *Agastya-jātaka*. The colophon was either missed, or passed over as incomprehensible. We are given instead a story which has no connexion whatever with the Sanskrit text: 慈心龍王消伏怨害—how the compassionate king of the *nāgas* overcame the hostility (of the *Garuḍa*). This was annexed from the same work as the preceding story.<sup>28</sup> But whilst this proximity was providential, we may presume that a more precise motive prompted the choice of this story rather than another: the fact that the Sanskrit text,<sup>29</sup> a line or so after the colophon of vii, has the words *bodhisattovaḥ kila . . . sarvasattova-maitramanā maitrabala nāma rājā babhūva*. Although we cannot expect exact information about the script of the Sanskrit manuscript used, it is not altogether beyond conjecture that an unpractised reader might well confuse *ma* ढ and *ga* ण in a manuscript available at the date in question, especially if the writing was faded or rubbed.

We may reasonably suppose that the Chinese chapter-heading (which is apposite to the story, although not supplied by the model) reflects parts of the Sanskrit passage quoted: *maitramanāḥ* "of compassionate mind", and *nāma rājā* misread as "*nāgarājā*", giving rise to 慈心 and 龍王 respectively.

JM viii, *Maitrībala-jātaka*. Here for the first time, and only here, there are no major disagreements in substance, and we might just possibly be persuaded that this could be an abridgement made directly from Ārya-sūra's version. This story is in fact the only one which might have given support to those who have been prepared to assert that the Chinese "*Jātaka-mālā*" is in some sense and in some parts genuine. Nor would such a theory be disturbed by the fact that the Chinese shows not the slightest glimmer of Ārya-sūra's poetical excellence, since the whole book testifies that Shao-tē and Hui-hsün were deaf and blind to any qualities of literature. But the agreement, such as it is, with the Sanskrit *Jātaka-mālā* is an accident for which they were not responsible, their own version being pilfered as before from an earlier text in Chinese: *Hsien-yü ching* No. 13.

[In the chapter-colophon, the Sanskrit edition has the form *Maitrībala*,<sup>30</sup> but *Maitrabala* in the passage quoted above, no manuscript variants being cited for either. In his translation (p. 56 n.) Speyer assumed that the latter was merely a misprint, whereas Edgerton omitted *Maitrībala* from his dictionary, and insisted that *Maitrabala* was not to be emended—an arbitrary assertion, it seems, since no reason was given, and therefore worthless to a textual critic. The choice between the readings here is after all a trivial matter; but for other reasons we may notice in passing that the text of the *Hsien-yü ching* gives a transcription of the name as well as a translation: 彌佉拔羅. The second syllable cannot possibly be correct: 佉 is very frequent indeed, but as a rendering of an Indian *kha*; and, moreover, the corruption must almost certainly have occurred in the transmission of the Chinese text, and not in an Indian manuscript. Akanuma<sup>31</sup> suggested that the character was doubtless due to a scribal error. He refrained from proposing an emendation, but some lines later quoted the *Fan fan-yü*<sup>32</sup> 翻梵語, which gives 羅 in place of 佉, and does not mention the corrupt form at all. Although the source is not given, the identity of the name is confirmed by the comment, whose aim is to provide more correct Sanskrit forms in place of the "incorrect" (i.e., for the most part Prakritic) transcriptions of the older translators: 應云彌多羅婆羅。經曰慈力。If we can trust this evidence, we have at least an indirect attestation of a Prakrit \**Metrabala*. The Sanskrit form given by the *Fan fan-yü*, on the other hand, incurs the suspicion of having been reconstructed by the compiler from the transcription which he considered incorrect: it is not in itself reliable evidence for *Maitrabala*. At the best, these transcriptions suggest that Edgerton's opinion should not be rejected out of hand, but they do not prove that *Maitrībala* is wrong in the text of the *Jātaka-mālā*.

Two Chinese transcriptions were earlier discussed by H. W. Bailey,<sup>33</sup> in which *l-* corresponds to *-tr-* in an Indian word (or a Central Asian version of the same):

<sup>30</sup> Confirmed by Bendall, *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge*, p. 92.

<sup>31</sup> Akanuma Chizen, *Indo Bukkyō koyū-meishi jiten*, p. 397.

<sup>32</sup> T. LIV, No. 2130, p. 1010b. Hsüan-tsang mentions the story twice, *Hsi-yü-chi*, ch. iii and x, T. LI, No. 2087, pp. 883b and 929a, but gives only the translated form of the king's name.

<sup>33</sup> BSOAS, XI, 1946, 779-80.

<sup>26</sup> T. XIV, Nos. 534, 535, 536; Ivanovski, *loc. cit.*

<sup>27</sup> T. III, No. 153, p. 64c.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 68b.

<sup>29</sup> P. 41, lines 2-4. No difficulty is raised by the fact that these words come at the beginning of chapter viii in the Sanskrit, if we may suppose (as is probable) that the title of viii in the Chinese was identified from the chapter-colophon, several pages later.

彌勒 *mjiē-lak*<sup>24</sup>: \**Metra*ka,<sup>25</sup> Sk. *Maitreya*

初利 *tāu-lji*<sup>26</sup>: Khot. *tāvatrīśā*, Sk. *trayastrimśā*

The transcription 彌羅拔羅 *mjiē-lā-b'uat-lā*, \**Metrabala*, may then be added to these; and a fourth example may be seen in 彌蘭 *mjiē-lān*, 彌蓮 *mjiē-liān*, which I cited in an earlier article<sup>27</sup> as renderings of the name which, in the surviving Sanskrit versions, appears as *Maitrakanyaka* and *Maitrāyājña*. At the time, it did not seem clear which Indian form had given rise to these. The article in question, however, attempted to show that the surviving forms of the name in Buddhist Sanskrit were distortions due to misinterpretation of Middle Indian, and that the underlying Brahmanical Sanskrit was the familiar clan-name *Maitrāyana*/\**Maitrāyanya*. The parallels quoted above then indicate for these Chinese transcriptions an Indian \**Metra*na, standing in the same historical relationship to *Maitrāyana* as, for example, Pali *Kaccāna*, *Moggallāna* to Sk. *Kātyāyana*, *Maudgalyāyana*. The suggestion of contamination by the name Menander/Milinda is therefore superfluous, and the use of the same Chinese *mjiē-lān* to transcribe the latter is a mere coincidence.

Although the name-equivalences in this small group can be accepted as certain, the phonological problem involved appears to need further examination; but this is not the place to pursue it.

An important point remains. In the same article<sup>28</sup> I complained that Akanuma had invented a "Pāli *Mettakanāka*"—a non-existent name. Here also, s.v. *Maitribala* [for which read *Maitribala*] he gives a similarly fictitious "Pāli *Mettibala*"; and the same invention appears even in Mochizuki's great dictionary.<sup>29</sup> No one would wish to belittle these scholarly works of reference; but ghost-words are always a nuisance, and these examples show that a "Pāli equivalent" in the dictionaries may be nothing more than a hypothetical construction, which may or may not be attested in actual texts. Such words cannot safely be used unless there is independent confirmation of their existence.]

In the eighth story, the Chinese text by mere chance had come slightly closer than before to the subject-matter of the original *Jātaka-mālā*, although still not very close. From the ninth story onwards, it appears to drift away from even the semblance of a connexion with the Sanskrit.

With the exception of Pelliot, who refused to admit that these 14 Chinese stories had anything to do with Ārya-sūra,<sup>40</sup> the few western

<sup>24</sup> Reconstructed forms as in Karlgren, *Grammata Serica Recensa*.

<sup>25</sup> On the final *-ka* (in origin due to a spelling convention in the Kharoṣṭhī script), see Bailey, *loc. cit.*, and my edition of the *Gāndhāri Dharmapada*, introduction, pp. 91-2.

<sup>26</sup> See also E. G. Pulleyblank, *Asia Major N.S.*, IX, 1963, 217.

<sup>27</sup> "Some notes on *Maitrakanyaka*: *Divyāvadāna xxxviii*", *BSOAS* XX, 1957, 117. (The character 蘭 printed there should be corrected as above: it was taken from Chavannes, *Cinq cents contes et apologues*, i, 132 n, where, however, it is a misprint; and I had failed to observe that the correction had been made in the index of the same work, iv, 305.)

<sup>28</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 117 n.

<sup>29</sup> Mochizuki Shinkō, *Bukkyō daijiten*, III, 2848a. In the same place, the corrupt transcription with 佳 is cited simply as an alternative form, with no indication that it is erroneous.

<sup>40</sup> BEFEO, IV, 753: "Là même où les sujets du texte chinois correspondent à ceux de la *Jātaka-mālā* sanscrite, comme dans les jātakas de la tigresse, du roi des Çibis ou du lièvre, il y a divergence absolue, aussi bien dans les circonstances que dans les termes du récit"; p. 755, "Ces récits . . . bien qu'ils ne puissent à aucun titre être regardés comme une traduction de la *Jātaka-mālā*, ne sont pas sans quelque rapport avec elle: les sujets de leurs 1er, 2e, 6e paragraphes sont bien ceux des 1er, 2e, 6e jātakas de l'ouvrage sanscrit". But while this is true as far as it goes, there can be no doubt that the Chinese authors intended that their work should be accepted by their contemporaries as a genuine translation of Ārya-sūra's *Jātaka-mālā*.

scholars who have mentioned them seem to have taken it for granted that they are 14 from the 34 Jātakas of the Sanskrit *Jātaka-mālā*. For obvious reasons, Ivanovski's article can hardly be directly responsible. The origin of the legend is almost certainly the statement in Nanjio's catalogue, "The first 4 fasciculi [of the Chinese text] contain fourteen Jātakas of Śākyamuni, being Āryaśūra's text": a natural enough guess at a time when the Sanskrit had not yet been published.

In the present century, one or two writers have been slightly more cautious. Mochizuki, noting that the Tibetan version also had a total of 34 chapters, remarked that the first eight in the Chinese, and especially i, ii, vi and viii, showed close affinities.<sup>41</sup> Perhaps this may seem not quite cautious enough; but there is at least no suggestion that ix-xiv are related to the original.

The whole of the Chinese text was rendered into Japanese<sup>42</sup> by Oka Kyōsui 岡敬遠, who wrote in his preface that, by and large,<sup>43</sup> the Chinese corresponds to the Sanskrit original in i-viii. He did, however, explicitly add that ix-xiv must have come from some other source or sources.

But in truth, these later stories are hardly in worse case than most of the earlier ones. Possibly the workers were weary of the trouble of trying to trace Chinese materials to match Sanskrit chapter-titles which they seldom understood; or else they no longer sought, or simply failed to find, the colophons in their manuscript. The latter hypothesis has the advantage of providing a simple reason for the excess of titles in the first section of the Chinese—a discrepancy which has troubled more than one scholar. The actual number, fourteen, is of course fortuitous; but if the later Sanskrit colophons had been traced, even if not understood, then surely the mistake of including more than ten stories in this section would have been prevented.

Although sections ix-xiv of the Chinese, in contrast to the preceding part of the text, no longer correlate with the Sanskrit chapters, their nature is essentially the same. Ivanovski had already noted a resemblance between ix and *Hsien-yü ching* v (p. 354). A comparison of the two shows once more that the latter provided much of the actual wording for the "*Jātaka-mālā*"; while the greater part of xiv can be found verbatim in chapter xxiii (pp. 376 ff.) of the same work. It is a reasonable conjecture that the intervening sections were likewise plagiarized from other pre-existing Chinese texts, with or without the addition of some freshly invented material. But the subject-matter is too trivial to justify further time spent in research on the origins of these chapters. Nor is there much point in trying to account for

<sup>41</sup> *Op. cit.*, V, 4662. From the context, however, it seems possible that the comparison was made only with the Tibetan version. Mochizuki also mentions Kern's edition of the Sanskrit, Speyer's English translation, and the French translation of Ivanovski's article; but he also had missed Pelliot's reply.

<sup>42</sup> *Kokuyaku issaikyō, Hon'enbu* 國譯一切經, 本緣部 1929, 1932, V, 267-VI, 51.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, V, 259. The assertion seems unduly rash, even if the reservation in the word *hobo* 略 is interpreted as liberally as possible.

the choice of these stories rather than others. But it is more than likely that the grain of conscience which compelled the translators to maintain in the first eight stories some link with the Sanskrit, so far as they were able, continued to operate, and that the later titles were probably suggested at least by words or phrases picked out from the Sanskrit manuscript. For example, the heading of ix, 開示少施正因功能, may conceivably be an attempt at extracting some meaning from the words in the Sanskrit text (p. 52, 2-3) . . . *prakṛtibhīḥ prakāyamāna-danḍanīti-sobhaḥ samyak-pravṛtta-vārtā-vidhīḥ*. This phrase is suitably located near the beginning of ix in the Sanskrit; and 開示 is a standard rendering of *prakāśayati*, as is 正 for *samyak*, while 因 might have seemed a fair approximation either for *pravṛtta-* (easily confused with *pravṛtti-*) or for *prakṛti-*. It is irrelevant that neither Sanskrit word could be correctly translated thus in the passage quoted, where *prakṛtibhīḥ* denotes the king's subjects—a meaning not unduly rare, but less likely to have been known by our translators than, say, "origin, origination". There is in any case ample proof that they understood only some isolated Sanskrit words, and could seldom construe sentences. We need not speculate further on the manner in which such a Chinese chapter-title might have been constructed.

## B

These fourteen "Jātakas" contained in *chüan* I-IV form only about a fifth of the whole work. At the beginning of V there is an abrupt, disconcerting change to a completely different style, which then continues without intermission until the end of the book. Concerning this part, Nanjio wrote, "the latter 12 fasciculi form a commentary, being divided into 34 sections. But this translation is not good". Since he had no Sanskrit commentary to compare, we may assume that this last statement means that he found the Chinese text in large measure incomprehensible, or at the least incoherent. Ivanovski must have looked at these chapters himself, even if (as Pelliot complained) he scarcely realized the problems which they raised: but except that he noticed the curious point which Nanjio had missed—that the division is not into 34 sections, but into 24, numbered from xi to xxxiv—he had nothing significant to add: "les 12 autres [chapitres] sont, pour ainsi parler, un commentaire théologique (*loun?*)<sup>44</sup> des 'jātakas'. . . . Le texte en

<sup>44</sup> A mistaken guess. Although Pelliot seems to have accepted a modified form of this conjecture, the designation of this part of the work as a "commentary" (probably in the case of Nanjio, certainly in the case of more recent Japanese scholars) has nothing whatever to do with the word 論 in the title of the main work, but was derived from the chapter-colophons of the latter part. But these, as we shall see, cannot be taken at their face value. (It is unfortunate that the mechanical translation of 論 by *śāstra* has won such general acceptance. The Sanskrit word is certainly correctly so translated into Chinese in some contexts; but *śāstra* can hardly ever be correct in the title of a book, and would be especially improbable as the designation of a commentary.)

est extrêmement obscur et le sens est difficile à saisir: la raison en est, vraisemblablement, que la traduction chinoise est mauvaise, attendu que le commentaire est certainement de provenance hindoue." The concluding remark, expressed with such confidence, was foolhardy, to say the least. But worse was to come. The author knew that the Chinese text had only 14 "Jātakas", while the Sanskrit had 34; and it would be hardly fair to censure him for thinking that this was the most significant difference, although he seems also to have been aware, from admittedly inadequate sources, that there were other differences. Even so, his conclusion was surprisingly inept: "On pourrait se croire autorisé à admettre hardiment que le texte sanskrit de la 'Jātakamālā', au temps où fut écrite la traduction, n'était pas encore définitivement fixé, et qu'il variait suivant les régions. . . . Les deux hypothèses sont également peu admissibles; ni le texte sanskrit n'a pu arriver aux traducteurs sous une forme altérée et incomplète, ni les traducteurs chinois n'ont pu le traduire avec négligence et par fragments, laissant ainsi leur tâche inachevée."

Pelliot justifiably rejected this statement. He remarked that he also had not undertaken a thorough examination of these later chapters.<sup>45</sup> Had he done so, he might have been less ready to accept the view that they really were a commentary.<sup>46</sup> He did however add, "Mais de quoi ces douze chapitres sont-ils le 'commentaire'? Leur contenu ne paraît malheureusement pas suffire à nous l'apprendre; ce ne sont que verbeuses dissertations sur la partie philosophique des jātakas, sans que l'obscurité du texte et l'absence de tout détail concret nous permettent, semble-t-il, de dire le plus souvent de quel jātaka il s'agit." (But what, one may ask, is this "philosophic" part of the Jātakas?) He drew attention to the extraordinarily muddled manner in which these last 24 sections are distributed in *chüan* V-XVI, including the case of xxx, the end of which coincides with the end of *chüan* XIV, while its colophon appears as the opening words of XV.<sup>47</sup> Pelliot summarised his views as follows: "La conclusion s'impose à mon sens: nous sommes en présence de deux ouvrages, dont l'un au moins est

<sup>45</sup> I cite this with no intention of censure: his brief review of Ivanovski's article was a glance *en passant* at the problem, at a period when he was engaged in the compilation of more than one work of much greater intrinsic importance than the Chinese "Jātakamālā".

<sup>46</sup> Several times in the article, the word "commentaire" is furnished with quotation-marks; but whatever the reason may have been, the conclusion quoted below shows that there was no intention of denying outright that these chapters were in some sense a commentary.

<sup>47</sup> T. III, p. 377. The *chüan*-length being far from uniform, such anomalies could easily have been avoided. Presumably these divisions were made by an early sub-editor who was too busy to observe the numbered colophons at the end of the chapters. In contrast, the "Jātakas" in the prior portion do not have final colophons, but chapter-titles placed at the beginning of each. A more reasonable division was thus easier: *chüan* I, introductory verses and stories i-iii; II, iv-vi; III, vii-ix; IV, x-xiv. (As would be expected, there are no corresponding groupings in the Sanskrit text.)



incomplet, et qui dans le cours des temps ont été soudés maladroitement en un seul; l'un est un recueil de récits dont la plupart sont des jātakas, l'autre serait une glose sur la *Jātakamālā*." On the following page, however, he was careful to add, "La théorie que je propose ne va pas sans beaucoup d'hypothèse"; and the last sentence of the article is beyond reproach: "Quoi qu'il en soit, ce n'est, on le voit, ni 'la version chinoise de la *Jātakamālā*', ni son 'commentaire', qui jetteront jamais une bien vive lumière sur les passages difficiles du poème d'Ārya Çūra."

It is not surprising that the external characteristics of the Chinese text should have led Oka<sup>48</sup> and Mochizuki,<sup>49</sup> independently of Pelliot's article, to a similar conclusion: that the latter portion is the translation of a different work, the beginning of which has been lost, and which has subsequently been attached to the *Jātaka*-portion of the text. Oka described it as consisting of "fragmentary disquisitions on Buddhist doctrine" (法相の斷片的論述).<sup>50</sup> Mochizuki thought that it might have been translated from another Sanskrit *Jātaka-mālā* text, and remarked that, in contrast to *chūan* I-IV, the language was very difficult.

Three points, then, have been fairly generally agreed: that a second Sanskrit text is involved; that this is in some sense a commentary, lacking the beginning; and that the Chinese version of this is difficult, obscure, badly translated, or fragmentary. This view, even when it has been proposed only as a provisional hypothesis, is at first sight so plausible that it has apparently inhibited a closer examination of the problem. For this reason, it is desirable here to anticipate the argument, and to state that the first two theories are wrong: there is no second Sanskrit text involved, nor are these latter chapters a commentary in any sense. The remarks on the difficulty or incoherence of the text are not without justification, but understate the case considerably: for the chapters in question are in large measure little better than gibberish.

The idea of a commentary is obviously due to the chapter-colophons, of which the first to appear is xi (p. 344c): 菩薩施行莊嚴尊者護國本生義邊十一. For the beginning of this we might at first hazard a mechanical translation into Sanskrit, such as *bodhisattva-dānālamkāra*. This at once reveals the original: *dāna* is confirmed by 布施 in place of 施行 in xii (p. 345b) and many other chapters, but the expression 莊嚴, which frequently translates Sanskrit words for "ornament", is followed in xiii (p. 347a) and xv (p. 349a) by 璽飾 "garland". Whether this was an expansion to define the type of ornament, or an alternative rendering set

<sup>48</sup> Introduction to the Japanese version, *loc. cit.*, pp. 259 f.

<sup>49</sup> *Op. cit.*, V, 4662.

<sup>50</sup> It can hardly be supposed that 法相 was intended here in any precise technical sense, if only because of the impossibility of any precise delimitation in philosophical terms of the subject-matter of these chapters.

down for further consideration, and inadvertently retained beside the other when the fair copy was made (presumably by a copyist from the unrevised draft),<sup>51</sup> it suggests that the colophon should contain, not *alamkāra*, but *mālā*. Thus the translator, reading by mistake *dāna* instead of *avadāna*, has had before him a Sanskrit colophon containing the alternative title of Ārya-śūra's work:<sup>52</sup> *iti bodhisattvāvadāna-mālāyām . . .*; and the locative is perhaps confirmed by the addition of the word "place" in the version in xvii (p. 350b) . . . 莊嚴其處.

The second part of the colophon, mechanically translated, gives us *āyusmad-Rāṣṭrapāla-jātakārtha(-?-)*<sup>53</sup> and undoubtedly the word 義 *artha* "meaning" is the chief cause of the theory that this part of the Chinese text is a commentary. Whether the translator, knowing the manner in which his version was related to his Sanskrit original, intended the sense of "commentary", as a measure of protection for himself, I cannot pretend to guess. The motive for introducing *Rāṣṭrapāla*, we may assume, is the fact that the well known *Rāṣṭrapāla-paripṛcchā* contains a series of verses<sup>54</sup> which summarize fifty of the more famous among the former incarnations of the Buddha. Not unexpectedly, a number of the same *Jātakas* are treated in Ārya-śūra's work: and it is just possible that the translator, whose ideas on the actual contents of the *Jātaka-mālā* were somewhat vague, might

<sup>51</sup> The variations between the colophons provide the main evidence for the lack of revision. Most are minor enough, and are not worth listing in detail here, but the more striking inconsistencies at least would hardly have been allowed to stand if the text had been revised for publication: for example, p. 362b, where a single colophon is given for xxii and xxiii combined.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. p. 27, n. 1; p. 29, n. 13.

<sup>53</sup> No plausible retranslation can be proposed for 邊 "boundary, side", which in Buddhist texts translates such words as *anta*, *paryanta*, *śīmā*, *pārśva*. For the Sanskrit, although *artha* can occur as part of a compound in a commentary-title, the word cannot by itself bear the sense of "commentary". These considerations indicate that the Chinese expression, as so frequently in this text, may have resulted from a misunderstanding of the Sanskrit manuscript. A chapter-colophon is not part of the text, and manuscripts often vary considerably. If the translators' Sanskrit manuscript had, for example, . . . *ekādaśo 'adhyāyaḥ samāptaḥ* (a type familiar in manuscripts of numerous other texts), we may suspect that the last word was read as *samantaḥ*, and conceivably (though this is more speculative) that "artha" was extracted from the end of the word *adhyāyaḥ*. This can hardly be more than a very hesitant suggestion. In support, however, it may be noted that such a confusion would be relatively easy in a script similar to the "śiddham" writing, which is one of the very few forms of Indian script with an upward curve in the left-hand stroke of *na* (in contrast to Nāgarī न, and others). Conveniently, all four signs involved can be inspected in one place (though in a form fixed by printing), T. LIV, p. 1194c: line 13 *pta* (in *samāptā*), 16 *nta* (in *bhadanta*); 19 *rtha* (in *paramārtha*) and *ya* (in *yad*). In an earlier manuscript hand in a similar tradition, (*adhyāyaḥ samāptaḥ*) could easily have been misread by unpractised readers as (*a*)*rthah samantaḥ*. This would explain perfectly the collocation 義邊 — except for one very considerable difficulty: what on earth could the translators have imagined that such an expression might mean?

<sup>54</sup> Ed. L. Finot (*Bibliotheca Buddhica*, Vol. II, 1901; reproduced in *Indo-Iranian reprints*, II, 1957), p. 21 ff.

have thought that the latter could be described as giving in detail the sense (義) of the Jātakas to which the *Rāṣṭrapāla-pariprechā* makes allusion. Such an explanation would at least make it unnecessary to think of a commentary.

However this may be, we need spend no time in looking for a "*Rāṣṭrapāla-jātakārtha*" in Sanskrit. If nothing more, this is simply dust in our eyes here.

A brief inspection shows that (apart from oversight) the chapters of this part, except xi,<sup>55</sup> have an identical phrase very near the beginning:<sup>56</sup> 所謂隨順聽聞. In the Sanskrit text, each chapter begins by enunciating an ethical proposition, and the Jātaka which follows is presented as an outstanding illustration of this opening maxim, in each case being introduced by the familiar formula *tadyathānusrūyate* "—just as it is handed down by tradition".<sup>57</sup> The Chinese phrase quoted above certainly represents this Sanskrit formula, although it is by no means a correct translation.

This fact alone is enough to disprove the idea that the text here is a commentary. In the first chapter of a work, such a phrase might indeed have been explained by a conscientious commentator: but not even the most scrupulous commentator would repeat it—and without even a note to say "explanation as before"—at the beginning of each and every chapter of the book.

Similarly, each Jātaka is rounded off by the words *tad evaṃ* "Thus, then, . . ." followed by a restatement of the opening maxim. The Chinese version also has a standard phrase near the end of most chapters: 彼天 "That god . . .". Perhaps we should not be shocked by this.<sup>58</sup> Still, we have proof of an identical method of bringing a chapter to its close: *tad evaṃ* in the original, grotesquely interpreted as "*ta devaṃ*".

Undeniably, the Chinese is based on a Sanskrit text which is not a commentary, but is at least of the same genre as the Sanskrit *Jātaka-mālā*. To this we add the agreement in the total of 34 chapters, the observation by

<sup>55</sup> To avoid ambiguity—since there is an overlap in the numbering of the chapters in the two sections of the Chinese text—all chapter numbers henceforth refer to the latter portion, unless the earlier is explicitly designated. In most cases, however, page references to the Taishō text will serve to prevent confusion.

<sup>56</sup> Some minor variations (far fewer than in the colophons) are probably accidental, either in the original draft or in later copying, and are not worthy of special listing.

<sup>57</sup> In Speyer's translation, "This is shown by the following" is rather too free a paraphrase. On this phrase, which is deliberately set in contrast to the canonical *evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasmin samaye*, see my comments in *BSOAS*, XIII, 2, 1950, 426. The rendering "just as if . . ." for *tad-yathā* (Edgerton, *BHSD*, s.v.) suits many contexts; but the word "if" is out of place in the application of the phrase considered here.

<sup>58</sup> The same trap, after all, can still operate on occasion. A similar Pali phrase (*Jāt.*, VI, 26), slightly corrupted, caught not only the editor, but at least two translators as well. Lüders corrected *yaṃ yaṃ deva-* to *yaṃ yad eva*, thus eliminating the intrusive "god" from the verse. See *Gāndhāri Dharmapada*, p. 222.

Pelliot that "le paragraphe 32 sur le bon exercice de la royauté paraît en rapport avec le 32e jātaka de l'ouvrage sanscrit", and the fact that at the end of chapter xii (p. 345b) four additional words are inserted in the colophon after 護國, namely 往梵天生 "former incarnation as the god Brahmā". (In the Sanskrit, admittedly, the title of xii is *Brahmaṇa-jātaka* "The Jātaka of the Brahmin"; but we are by now accustomed to this type of approximate mistranslation.) Even without further evidence, we might by now begin to suspect that the Chinese is by no means a different work, but is intended in some way as a rendering of Ārya-śūra's *Jātaka-mālā*. A comparison of passages in corresponding positions in corresponding chapters in the two languages shows that this is in fact so. The Chinese version is indeed hardly close enough to its original to admit it to the status of translation, but is at least as near to a translation as was possible on the basis of a restricted knowledge of Sanskrit. It is not even a free paraphrase, but almost throughout a mistranslation, a nonsensical jumble of platitudes which nevertheless follow the original text as closely as the translator's limited Sanskrit vocabulary allowed: a "quasi-translation", if I may be allowed the term. If several distinguished scholars have failed to see it, this is doubtless because their better acquaintance with Chinese must have brought into prominence the great differences between the Chinese and the Sanskrit, thus obscuring the agreements. On the other hand, a Sanskritist with too little reading experience in Chinese had some advantage here (if only on this one occasion), being forced to dissect the Chinese text slowly, phrase by phrase. The immediate question was whether Pelliot was justified in the suggestion of "une glose sur la *Jātakamālā*". The attempt to find points of contact led to a very different result. Although the Chinese sentences remained hopelessly obscure, there was no sign that they commented on anything whatever in the Sanskrit text; and *a fortiori* they were not a translation of it. This was certain, even while the drift of the discussion continued to elude me. But soon there began to appear frequent word-correspondences, at quite short intervals, and in almost identical sequences in the two texts. It is impossible that this could have happened accidentally.

From xii onwards, the opening words of each section in the Chinese regularly show agreements with the Sanskrit, in the sentence preceding the phrase *tadyathānusrūyate* in the chapter bearing the same number. In no case is the Chinese a genuine translation of the Sanskrit sentence in question; but the agreements are too many to be due to chance, and the order of succession of the chapters is identical. A few chapter-openings will illustrate this.

xiii (p. 80) *tivraduḥkhāturāṇām api satām nica-mārga-niṣpranayatā bhavati svadhairyāvāṣṭambhāt*. "Even when afflicted by the ill of grievous suffering, good men find the path of wickedness altogether repulsive; for their

steadfast courage is unshakable."—xiii (p. 345b) 彼若纏縛煩惱真實修出世道自在有力。Here 煩惱 for *duḥkha*, 真實 for *satām*, 道 for *mārga* are certain; and 自在 reflects *svadhairya* (possibly through some vague confusion with *aiśvarya*, although 自 alone means *sva*-). The whole phrase 出世道 should mean *lokottara-mārga*; but this may be an after-thought, since 出 would reasonably translate *niṣkramaṇa*, as a misunderstanding of *niṣpraṇaya*-. And it seems very probable that 彼若 is an attempt to interpret *tīvra* as "te iva".

xiv (p. 88) *dharmāstrayam satya-vacanam apy āpadam nudati prāg eva tatphalam iti dharmānuvartinā bhavitavyam*. "Bearing in mind the fact that a simple Word of Truth based on righteousness dispels danger—and how much more the fruit of righteousness itself—a man ought live in conformity with righteousness."—xiv (p. 347a) 寂靜之法力用真實勤修無倒希果報行隨順教法。The first four characters here could reasonably be retranslated as *śamasya dharmah*: the relationship to *dharmāstrayam* of the original is clear; *satya* and similar words were usually recognized, and regularly rendered by 真實。The phrase 勤修 can translate words such as *utsāha*, *vyāyāma*, *yatna*, and also *prayoga*; and here the last mentioned may have been twisted out of *prāg eva* of the original. Against *phalam* can be set 果報 *phala-vipāka*. The concluding phrase reflects *dharmānuvartinā*: 法 *dharma* hardly needs mention: and 隨順 "follow" is an almost automatic response to *anu-* in countless places in the book.

xv (p. 95) *śīlavatām ihāvābhiprāyāḥ kalyāṇāḥ samādhyanti prāg eva paratreṭi śīlavīśuddhau prayatitavyam*. "Remembering that the fair intentions of moral men are successful in this present life—and how much more in future existences—a man should strive for pureness in morals."—xv (p. 348b) 持戒修行精進無減不捨晝夜清淨無倒。Contact is not so good here; but 持戒 for *śīlavatām* and 清淨 for *śīlavīśuddhau* are certain. It is probable that 夜 *rātri* has been extracted from *paratra*, and thence filled out into "day and night" by exercise of imagination.

xvi (p. 98) *satya-paribhāvitām vācam agnir api na prasahate langhayitum iti satya-vacane 'bhiyogaḥ karaṇīyah*. "When a man knows that even fire is powerless to overcome a statement that is absolutely true, it is obvious that truthful speech should be his constant aim."—xvi (p. 349a) 圓滿真實演說相應無量力用煩惱如火一合相貌。As in the preceding example, much of the Chinese has no obvious motivation from the Sanskrit. But the first four characters are undoubtedly intended for *satya-paribhāvitām*; 演說 must reflect *vācam*; and any possible hesitation must be overcome by the appearance of the phrase "like fire" in the Chinese version.

Nor is this type of contact confined to chapter-openings. But if, instead of individual words, we compare the running sense of parallel passages, it is small wonder that the connexion between the two texts was not obvious:

Ārya-śūra, ch. xxv

Shao-tê, Hui-hsün<sup>59</sup>

Those of great compassion do in fact feel pity for one who is in affliction, even though he be intent to slay them. As it is told by tradition, the Bodhisattva was once born as a *śarabha*-deer, in a certain wild forest region free from noise—for men did not forgather there—but inhabited by divers herds of deer, dense with trees and undergrowth whose roots were buried deep in the tangled grass, where neither traveller's foot nor wagon-wheel had carved any line of road or boundary: a parcel of land where [there were no adversities, since]<sup>61</sup> the only inequalities were water-courses, anthills, and gullies; and he had strength, swiftness, beauty and courage, and his body, compacted with muscular power, might have been wrought upon the anvil.

When one identifies oneself with, and intensifies, the idea of the Tathāgata-nature, in this way the [bodhisattva-]vow of compassion (*prañidhāna*) and its supreme cultivation become unlimited. This is what is called listening to the teaching of the Bodhisattva. In what manner does one search for Nirvāṇa? The fundamental of birth as a human being (*manuṣya-gatī*) is the transcendental reality (*paramārthasat*); and the various kinds of [*loka*-] *dhātu* are the [places of] origin of the species [of living beings]. Three types of mysteries (*trīṇi guhyāni*)<sup>60</sup> control the three [types of] *karma*; but all the manifold appearances are like shades in the forest. One who is pure in body (*viśuddha-gātra*) must then cultivate mastery of the causal factor ("kāraṇa-vaśitā"?). The Noble [Eightfold] Path is universal, and, as it were, empty (*śūnya*). The power of one's activity will undergo all kinds of changes: the earth produces poison, but the power of religious merit (*puṇya-bala*) can get rid of it. Living beings (*sattva*) are alike . . .

<sup>59</sup> This is to be regarded as an approximation rather than a certain translation. I am most grateful to Professor W. Simon and Dr. K. Whitaker for their assistance, without which I should have been helpless. I need scarcely add that such *bêtises* as remain are due to the fact that in a number of places I have waywardly chosen to gang my ain gait. Some degree of haziness is probably in any case inevitable, when the technical terminology is not always free of ambiguity: for example, is 寂靜 to be taken as Nirvāṇa, or only as tranquillity of mind? But whatever injustice I may have done to the sense intended by the translators—less, I trust, than Ārya-śūra suffered at their hands—the nature of their version is such that an impeccable translation from their Chinese could still not show a noticeable resemblance to the subject-matter of the Sanskrit original.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Mochizuki, *op. cit.*, II, 1682c.

<sup>61</sup> The phrase in brackets is a makeshift to convey the double meaning evoked by the word *viśama*.

The originals, however, show a kinship of a different degree:

ed. Kern, p. 162

*jīghāmsuṃ apy āpadgatam<sup>a</sup> anukampanta  
eva<sup>b</sup> mahākāruṇikā<sup>c</sup> nopekṣante.<sup>d</sup> tad-  
yathānuśrūyate.<sup>e</sup> bodhisattvaḥ<sup>f</sup> kilānya-  
tamasminn aranya-vana-pradeśe nir-  
mānuṣa<sup>h</sup>-sampāta-nirave vividha<sup>i</sup>-mṛga-  
kulādhivāse<sup>k</sup> tṛṇa<sup>l</sup>-gahana<sup>m</sup>-nimagna-  
mūla<sup>n</sup>-vrkṣa-kṣupa-bahule<sup>p</sup> pathika-yāna-  
vāhana-caraṇair avinyasta-mārga<sup>q</sup>-  
sīmānta-lekhe salila-mārga-vaṃśika-  
śvabhra<sup>r</sup>-viśama<sup>s</sup>-bhūmi<sup>t</sup>-bhāge<sup>u</sup> bala<sup>v</sup>-  
java-varṇa-sattva<sup>w</sup>-sampannaḥ<sup>x</sup> sam-  
hananavat-kāyopapannaḥ śarabho mṛgo  
bahūva.*

T. III, 160, p. 364b

一合增上如來<sup>a</sup>性義  
如是<sup>b</sup>悲願崇修無盡<sup>d</sup>  
所謂<sup>e</sup>聽聞<sup>f</sup>菩薩<sup>g</sup>教誨  
云何<sup>h</sup>相貌希求寂靜  
人<sup>i</sup>趣根本真實勝義  
種種<sup>j</sup>界性族類<sup>k</sup>根本<sup>n</sup>  
三<sup>l</sup>種秘密<sup>m</sup>制伏三業  
多<sup>p</sup>種相貌如其林蔭  
身分清淨修因自在  
聖道<sup>q</sup>平等狀若虛空<sup>r</sup>  
造作力用遷變不窮  
地<sup>s</sup>生毒藥<sup>t</sup>福<sup>u</sup>力<sup>v</sup>可除  
有情<sup>w</sup>平等<sup>x</sup>

The correspondences marked in this passage are only samples;<sup>62</sup> and although almost all are certain, it will be seen that many are due to mistakes. It is startling to find that *āpadgatam* has, apparently, been interpreted as *tathāgata-*; the first syllable of *tṛṇa-* “grass” has been read as *tri-* “three”; “secret” might be a sense forced upon *gahana*; but more probably the word was confused with *guhya*; and *śvabhra* “chasm” was doubtless thought to be *śūnya*. Many of the misunderstandings are almost pardonable: *evam* from a wrong word-division, *nopekṣante* confounded with *nopakṣiyante* and *sam* with *sama* (a near-miss which has a precedent in 正等覺 *samyak-sambud-dha*); while *bhāge* can actually mean *fu* 福, in the sense of ‘good fortune, prosperity’, but not of course here (where in any case *fu* must have its Buddhist connotation of *punya*). We should like to believe that 云何 was intended to translate *kila*, since in some contexts (though not here) it might be a reasonable idiomatic rendering: but in fact it reflects only the first syllable transmuted to *kim*. This is made certain a few lines later: Sk. 163, 12 -*śabda-* . . . *kim*, Ch. 364c22 云何聲 “what sound”; Sk.

<sup>62</sup> Although 教誨 “teaching” might be linked with *pradeśe* (through confusion with *deśanā*), the same expression occurs at the beginning of several other chapters, and may therefore be only a suppletion. Perhaps an additional example may be seen in 林蔭 “forest shade”, if we suppose that at this point the word *vrkṣa* was recognized, and that this directed attention back to the earlier phrase, *anyatamasminn aranya-vana-pradeśe*, where *aranya* or *vana* could have provided “forest”, while “shade” could be due to the illusory presence (and barely adequate translation) of *tamas* in the word *anyatamasmin*.

163, 15 *kimcid*, Ch. 364c26 云何心 “what mind”; Sk. 163, 19 *kimcit tṛṇa-*, Ch. 365a2 云何三, with “three” for “grass” as before. Not only here, but everywhere throughout the whole dreary length of the book, specimens by the hundred can be culled where the nature of the misrelation is obvious. Without difficulty it would be possible if unprofitable to conjecture the genesis of many words and phrases in the Chinese when the link is slightly less than obvious.

Few men, I fear, will ever read all of this book to the bitter end; nor can I claim to have tried. But to the bitter end, it can be said, our translators did persevere in the sad labour of forcing what little sense they could from the difficult Sanskrit. This generalized assertion has at least not been contradicted by any of the numerous short samples taken haphazard from many chapters.

Not to exhaust the patience of the reader, but for reassurance that the passages already quoted are typical, it will suffice to give a small selection of illustrations from other parts of the work.

A firm belief that “ten” in Sanskrit is “*darśa*” enabled the translators to bring in the ten good courses of action (*daśa kuśalāni*) whenever they found these two syllables in the Sanskrit text. (The word *kuśala*, indeed, did not appear at these places: but why strain at a gnat?) Thus we find 十善 representing *dadarśa* “he saw” (346a4=83,2; 348c19=96,14) and *darśana* “sight” (345c14=82,1; 346a1,3,9=82, 19 and 21, and 83,5; 347a17=88,17; 348b17=94,20; and many others). Where the sailors long for sight of the shore, *kūla-darśana-*, an added confusion between *kūla* and *kula* “family” has resulted in the words 種族十善 (347b20=90,9). In place of the description (81,4-5) of the lovely Unmādayantī, *parama-darśanīyā strīratna-sammata* “most beautiful, honoured as a jewel among women”, we are given (345b26-27) 無十不善崇三寶 “... free of the ten *akuśalas*, worships the *triratna*”. Similarly a few lines later, “the three jewels” for *strīratna* (345c1=81,9); and 了解三相 “... understands the three *lakṣaṇas*” in place of the Brahmins who understood the art of prognostication in respect of women—*strīlakṣaṇavidah* (345c2=81,10-11). After this, it is disconcerting to find that the translators knew the meaning of *strī* perfectly well: *svargastṛī daityaṃśid vā na hy etan mānuṣaṃ vapuḥ*: 天女自在遠離人趣 (346a8-9=83,4) — granted that *svargastṛī* and *mānuṣaṃ* are the only points where the Chinese makes contact with the Sanskrit phrase in question.

We have already seen two instances where the translators thought that they saw the word *viṣa* “poison”, the syllables having been mistakenly excised from etymologically unconnected words: *Aviṣahya* in the title of the fifth story in the first part, and *viśama* in the longer passage quoted above (364b25=162,14). Let it be said at once that Indian commentators readily employed *viṣa* to interpret *viśaya* (in the meaning “objects of the senses”):

the things of this world are called *viṣaya* because they are "poison" to the religious life. If this is banal and ineffectual even for a sermon, more than one Buddhist writer thought otherwise. But in the present work, no such explanation is possible. The instances are too numerous, too diverse, and the contexts cannot encourage a reversion to the idea of a commentary, in which the word "poison" is an attempt to see some esoteric meaning in the Sanskrit.

A few more instances may be noted where the Chinese version has 毒 by misinterpretation: *viṣama* (353a5=116,5); *viṣāda* "despair", and related words (347a29, b9, b16=89, 20-21, and 90,6); *dvīṣaḥ* "enemies" (348c17=96,10); *bhaviṣyanti* (348b16=94,19); *viṣaya* (370a19=181,21; 351a9=108,7). Not many lines after this last example, the genuine word *viṣa* does occur in the Sanskrit (108,17), but by a sorry trick of fate it has been passed over, unobserved, in the Chinese version.

Because of the technical Buddhist sense acquired by its participle, the verb *arhati* inevitably went awry in the Chinese: *yato naināṃ rājā draṣṭum apy arhati* (81,21-22, and similarly 82,5) "and hence the king should not even see her"; *kṣantum arhati tad bhavān* (115,16) "pray forgive me for this"; *yathārham* (106,4 and 9) "as is right and proper"—we cannot be surprised that in all these places the Chinese version has 如阿羅漢 "like an Arhant" (345c11 and 19; 352c23; 350b27, c2). The use of "Arhant" as a rendering of *gārhasthyam* "the fact of being a householder" (351a19=108,20) may seem rather more audacious; but it is no more so than hundreds of other examples in the text which are based on similarities no closer, and where the Sanskrit word in the original can be identified with equal certainty.

It may well be imagined that the division of words and the analysis of compounds in Sanskrit must have been a constant problem for the translators. If it was, they made no attempt to solve it, nor indeed was there any assistance available; and I suspect that they were quite unaware that any such problem existed. But whether they knew it or not, wrong divisions were exceedingly productive of imagined senses which were not in the original text. One example will suffice: *madhurākṣara-* (121,16) was not correctly understood as *madhura+akṣara-*, but as *madhu+rākṣara-*, whence the word 護 "protect" in the corresponding Chinese passage (354b18).

It seems beyond dispute that in this latter part of the work the translators never grasped the subject-matter of the Sanskrit text at all. On rare occasions they probably understood an isolated phrase, but never a connected passage of any length;<sup>63</sup> and although many single Sanskrit words are represented in the Chinese by possible equivalents (*i.e.*, such as would

<sup>63</sup> This seems a fair deduction from the numerous and widely scattered passages which I have sampled. Their uniformity in character by itself indicates a very high probability that these passages are representative of the whole; but the nature of the limitations, both lexical and grammatical, permits us to go further. It is altogether impossible that the same authors could have done significantly better in those parts of the work which have not been tested.

correctly be included in an entry in a dictionary), many of these are wrong in the contexts in question. It is for this reason—and not in order to ridicule the Sung translators—that examples have been deliberately chosen to illustrate some of the ways in which misunderstandings have arisen from the Sanskrit text. When mistakes of demonstrable origin are included in the reckoning, the points of contact between the Sanskrit and the Chinese are seen to be not only very numerous, but also to be spaced at very short intervals. The corresponding intervals in the two texts are usually not markedly disproportionate in length, and an occasional sharp discrepancy may be due to accidental oversight.

If we segregate the words and phrases engendered by the Sanskrit text, the remainder of the Chinese—which almost certainly is quantitatively the greater part—is remarkably homogeneous. If further evidence had been needed to show that there is no commentary here, that evidence is in this residue. It is constructed almost entirely by selection from a restricted stock of religious platitudes and pious phrases, and is too repetitive to be a commentary on anything.

The method of operation, then, was simple: from their manuscript of the *Jātaka-mālā* the translators took note of any Sanskrit words (as often as not, wrongly identified) for which they could give a Chinese equivalent; and around these as nuclei they proceeded to build phrases, drawing on their stock of religious clichés in order to put something at least in place of the completely unintelligible parts. Perhaps they were consoled by the thought that they were producing something almost as unintelligible in Chinese, which if need be they could account for as "philosophical" and thus necessarily obscure. Perhaps they did their best to think of a really fitting context for a given nucleus; but it is hard to believe that they even half-convicted themselves that their version reflected anything of Ārya-śūra's masterpiece.

After the chapter-colophon of xxxiv in Kern's edition, the final colophon of the book is *kṛtir iyaṃ āryaśūrapādānām*. A similar but not identical Sanskrit colophon must lie behind the words in the corresponding position at the end of the Chinese version: 是謂菩薩修行勝行 "This is called the outstanding deeds of the Bodhisattva's career". It is possible that the "outstanding deeds" are due to a misinterpretation of *kṛtir iyaṃ* . . . "This (book) is the composition of . . ."; but if this is less than certain,<sup>64</sup>

<sup>64</sup> The activities in question could have been suggested merely by the mention of a "bodhisattva-career", or by an awareness that they were appropriate to the theme of *Jātakas*. As a technical term, 修行 is explained by Hsüan-tsang as equivalent to the ten *pāramitās* associated with the *bhūmis*: T. XXXI, No. 1585, p. 516; L. de La Vallée Poussin, *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi, la Siddhi de Hsuan-tsang*, II, p. 620, "Les dix excellents exercices (*paramacaryā*)". See also Mochizuki, *op. cit.*, III, 2278. The sketches of *Jātaka* themes in the Pali *Cariyā-piṭaka* are grouped to illustrate *pāramitās*; and Tāraṇātha records the tradition that Ārya-śūra had a similar intention in his *Jātaka-mālā* (Max Müller, in preface to Speyer's translation, pp. xiv and xvi).

we can restore with confidence the form in which the author's name was given in the colophon: *bodhisattvācāryasūra*-. As the heading of the Chinese version shows, the translators knew that Śūra had the rare distinction of the title Bodhisattva, but they were probably unaware that the honorific prefix *ārya*- was sometimes replaced by *ācārya*. The colophon has obviously been misread as *bodhisattva-cāryā*.

This directs our attention back to the beginning of the book, and clears away the mystery of the opening line of verse in the Chinese, 稽首一切智. The Sanskrit edition begins with the heading *om namaḥ śrīsarva-buddhabodhisattvebhyah*; but this is a scribe's invocation, and would not necessarily be identical in all copies of the work. The manuscript used by the Chinese translators must have had the invocation *namaḥ sarvajñāya*, which they have mistakenly incorporated into the verse. When this obstacle is removed, it is not difficult to see that the remainder of the Chinese verses are of the same nature as the latter portion of the book: they are a "pseudo-translation" of the beginning of Ārya-śūra's text.

We can therefore reject completely the suggestion that the "Jātaka-section" in *chüan* I-IV represents a different work or a different translation which has been attached to the rest by a later accident. The only explanation which fits the facts is that the Sanskrit manuscript was divided into two parts, one for each of the two translators (and their assistants, if any). The discrepancy in size between the two portions is considerable; but whatever may have been the reason for such an unequal division, the second and larger part was taken in hand by the collaborator better equipped in Sanskrit, who did his best to translate it by the method described. Perhaps he did not notice that the first leaf of his portion began abruptly about three-quarters of the way through chapter xi (probably at a point roughly corresponding to p. 76, line 9 or 11 of the Sanskrit edition). This, however, explains both the absence here of the stereotyped phrase which appears just after the beginning of the subsequent chapters, and the very small quantity of material which precedes the colophon to chapter xi.

Meanwhile the other collaborator, less confident of his Sanskrit, sought in existing Chinese translations for stories which could be used as understudies for those in the first part of the original. Finally, when it was realized that the Sanskrit text began with a number of verses, these were likewise dealt with by the method of approximate translation. I remarked at the outset that these verses in the Chinese appeared to be much more numerous than any reasonable translation of the four Sanskrit introductory verses could be. The trouble was that the translator did not realize the point at which the Sanskrit stanzas ended, and he therefore continued to manufacture pious verses on the basis of Ārya-śūra's text. He had in fact worked through almost a third of the Tigress-jātaka (approximately the middle of page 3 of the edition) before he brought his verses to a close.

The names of the translators are prefixed by the designation 梵才; and if the degree of "Doctor of Sanskrit Letters" (as we may perhaps paraphrase it) was self-bestowed, they doubtless regretted it when they were ordered to produce a translation of the *Jātaka-mālā*. If they pretended to more learning than they possessed, this relatively small piece of self-conceit was surely more than expiated by the dreadful labour which they dared not evade.

It is easy now to make fun of them, and I would by no means deny that their book has provided much entertainment. Yet I confess to some sympathy for them, for I suspect that the Sanskrit of the *Jātaka-mālā* was as hopelessly obscure to them as the Chinese of their pseudo-translation was to myself; and I think I know something of how they felt.