


BUDDHA'S WORD IN CHINA *

 J. W. de Jong

In the past, the general view of China has often been that of a country which existed for many centuries without change, free from all influence from foreign ideas. However, the study of China has shown that nothing could be further from the truth than this idea. In the long course of its history, China has undergone many foreign influences and continues to experience them even today. These influences have manifested themselves in many different fields. In that of religion, one can name six foreign faiths, all of which entered China during the first millennium of our era: Buddhism, Mazdaism, Manichaeism, Nestorianism, Islam, and Judaism. Of all these foreign religions, none has been more successful than Buddhism. There is no doubt that Buddhism existed already in China in the first century AD. During its almost 2,000-year-long history there, Buddhism exerted a great influence on many different aspects of Chinese life. In the view of one of the leading scholars in the field of Chinese Buddhism, Paul Demiéville, Buddhism dominated Chinese philosophical thought from the fourth to the tenth century. During that period, it is in Buddhism that the key to all creative thought is to be found, whether such thought was inspired by Buddhist ideas, or, on the contrary, directed against them.¹ Not less important, perhaps, is the contribution Buddhism has made to Chinese art. The cave-temples of Yün-kang and Lung-men are a lasting testimony to the great period of Chinese Buddhist sculpture. In many other fields, too, the influence of Buddhism has been of great significance for Chinese culture. In order to understand the role played by Buddhism in China is necessary first to understand how Buddhism came there.

Buddhism is the oldest of the three universal religions. It arose more than four centuries before Christianity, and more than ten before Islam. These three religions have some very important characteristics in common. They all go back to a founder whose life and actions were piously recorded by his followers. In the second place, all are universal religions. Their message is directed to everybody, without distinction of race or social status. Finally,

* The 28th George Ernest Morrison Lecture in Ethnology, delivered by J. W. de Jong, Professor of South Asian and Buddhist Studies in the Faculty of Oriental Studies, Australian National University, on 18 October 1967, and first published by the University in 1968 dedicated "To Pamela and Otto" [van der Sprenkel]. [—Ed.]

I have not been able to consult a number of articles, mainly Japanese. For this reason some bibliographical references are incomplete or perhaps inaccurate. Nevertheless, I have thought it better to include them, rather than omit them altogether or delay publication unduly. [J. W. de J.]

¹ Paul Demiéville, "La pénétration du Bouddhisme dans la tradition philosophique chinoise," *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale*, vol. 3 (1956), pp. 19–20.

ABBREVIATIONS

Abb. Ak. d. Wiss., Berlin	Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
BEFEO	Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient
BSOAS	Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies
JA	Journal asiatique
JRAS	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society
SBPAW	Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch historische Klasse
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgen- ländischen Gesellschaft.
T	Taishō shinsbū daizōkyō 大正新脩大藏經
TP	T'oung Pao

they all possess sacred scriptures which contain their fundamental teachings. There is, however, a great difference between these religions in the way in which they spread from their original homeland to other countries and peoples. The propagation of Christianity and Islam was often associated with military conquest or commercial expansion. The spread of Buddhism, on the contrary, was mainly due to individual missionaries who were without any support from worldly powers. The main concern of these missionaries was to bring the message of the Buddha, as laid down in the sacred writings, to other peoples in order to deliver them from the sufferings of *samsāra*, or transmigration. These sacred scriptures of the Buddhists are very voluminous. They do not consist of a single volume like the Bible or the Koran. Both the Christians and the Moslems soon codified their scriptures into a canon. In Buddhism, however, only some of the older schools have established, in the course of time, a collection of texts with the status of a canon, and from only one of them, the school of the Sthaviras, the elders, has a complete canon been preserved. This collection contains, in its latest edition, no less than forty volumes.² However, the later Buddhism schools never arrived at establishing a well defined canon.

As I have already mentioned, Buddhism is the oldest of the universal religions. Never before in the history of mankind had it been so expressly stated that a doctrine was to be taught to everybody capable of understanding it. According to the Buddhist tradition, as soon as the Buddha had obtained a small number of followers he addressed them with the following words:

O monks, I have been delivered from all bonds both divine and human. Monks, you are delivered from all bonds both divine and human. O monks, you must lead the religious life for the advantage of many people, for the happiness of many people, out of compassion for the world, for the benefit, the advantage and the happiness of Gods and men. Let not two go together. Monks, teach the doctrine which is good at the beginning, good at the middle, good at the end, in the spirit and in the letter. Proclaim the pure conduct, complete in its entirety and purified. There are human beings who by nature have few passions. Through not hearing the doctrines they will perish. They will be the ones who will understand the doctrine.³

During the forty-five years which elapsed after the illumination of the Buddha until his *Nirvāṇa*, he himself untiringly taught the doctrine. When he was at the point of entering into *Nirvāṇa*, he said to his cherished disciple, Ānanda: "O Ānanda, I have taught the doctrine without making any distinction between esoteric and exoteric."⁴ With these words the Buddha stressed the fact that the doctrine had been taught by him in its entirety. The Buddha told Ānanda that from now on the doctrine itself, the *Dharma*, was to be the only refuge for the followers of Buddha.⁵

After the Buddha's *Nirvāṇa*, his disciples continued the work of propagating the doctrine. More than a century after the *Nirvāṇa* of the Buddha, in the middle of the third century BC, Buddhism was actively fostered by King Aśoka whose realm occupied almost the entire Indian sub-continent. From a

² *The Tipiṭaka in the approved Sixth Synod edition* (Rangoon, 1956; 2nd ed. 1958). On this edition see Frank-Richard Hamm, "Zu einigen neueren Ausgaben des Pali-Tipiṭaka," *ZDMG* 112 (1962): 353–78; see also *ibid.*, p.429.

³ Vinaya, Mahāvagga, I.11.1, *The Vinaya Piṭaka*, ed. Herman Oldenberg (London, 1879), vol.1, pp.20–1.

⁴ Mahāparinibbānasuttanta, 2.25, *Dīgha Nikāya*, vol.2 (London: Pali Text Society, 1903), p.100.

⁵ Mahāparinibbānasuttanta, 2.26; 6.1, *ibid.*, pp.100, 154.

doctrine known only to a few people in a small region, the present-day Bihar, Buddhism had become one of the major religions of India. Of particular importance for the expansion of Buddhism outside India is the fact that in the third, second, and first centuries BC, north-western India became a more and more important centre of Buddhism. The north-west has always played a significant part in ancient Indian history. From Alexander the Great, foreign invaders have always penetrated India through the passes in north-western India. On the other hand, it was by this same route that Indian culture was able to spread its influence to Central Asia and to China. It is from the north-west, from Kashmir and Afghanistan, that Buddhism penetrated into Central Asia and from there into China. The earliest testimony concerning the existence of Buddhism in China dates from the year 65 AD.⁶ It is very likely that Buddhism had already penetrated into China by the first half of the first century AD.

The first Buddhist missionaries did not come from far away India but from countries situated both west and east of the Pamir. The most important centre of Buddhism west of the Pamir was the country of the great Yüeh-chih. From here Buddhism spread east to Parthia and north to Sogdiana. To the east of the Pamir is the Tarim basin, bordered to the north by the T'ien-shan and to the south by the K'un-lun ranges. This country, which today is called East Turkestan, or Chinese Turkestan, has been the meeting place of the cultures of India and China. It is for this reason that the great discoverer, Sir Aurel Stein, gave the name Serindia to Chinese Turkestan. In this region existed a series of small states which played a great role in the transmission of Buddhism from India to China. These states are to be found in the northern and the southern parts of the Tarim basin. Through these northern and southern states led the two main routes which connected north-western India and China. The southern route passed, travelling from west to east, through the states of Kashgar, Yarkand, Khotan, Lou-lan, and finally ended at Tun-huang in the extreme north-west of China. The northern route passed through Aksu, Kucha, Karashar, and Turfan and also ended at Tun-huang. It is in the old remains along these routes that very important discoveries have been made between the end of the nineteenth century and World War I. Scholars from Russia, England, Germany, Japan, and France discovered many Buddhist sites. Excavations brought to light the remains of Buddhist buildings in which many pieces of sculpture, wall paintings, and other works of art inspired by Buddhism were found. Above all, and of the greatest importance, were the great quantities of manuscripts found in several places. The great majority of these manuscripts were Buddhist texts written in various languages and different scripts. Many were written in Sanskrit or other Indian languages or in Chinese, but some were written in languages almost entirely or entirely unknown at the time of their discovery: Iranian languages such as Sogdian and Khotanese, and two languages of undetermined affiliation. In 1908 it was shown that these two languages belonged to the Indo-European family.⁷ Some scholars thought that they were the languages of the Tokharians who

⁶ Éd. Chavannes, "Les pays d'occident d'après le *Wei lio*," *TP6* (1905): 550, n.1. The relevant passage in the *Hou Han shu* has been studied by many scholars. For bibliographical references see E. Zürcher, *The Buddhist conquest of China* (Leiden, 1959), p. 327, n. 47; Tsukamoto Zenryū 塚本善隆, *Gi-sho Shaku-Rō-shi no kenkyū* 魏書釋老志の研究 (Kyoto, 1961), pp. 147–51.

⁷ E. Sieg and W. Siegling, "Tocharisch, die Sprache der Indoskythen. Vorläufige Bemerkungen über eine bisher unbekannte indogermanische Literatursprache," *SBPAW* (1908): 915–32.

⁸ For a bibliography of Central Asiatic studies see *Saiiki bunka kenkyū* 西域文化研究, vol. 1 (Kyoto, 1958), pp. 53–87; vol. 2 (Kyoto, 1959), pp. 1–27.

⁹ Hatani Ryōtai 羽溪了諦, *Saiiki no bukkyō* 西域の佛教 (Kyoto, 1914), translated into Chinese by Ho Ch'ang-ch'ün 賀昌群, *Hsi-yü chib fo-chiao* 西域之佛教 (Shanghai, 1933; 2nd. ed. 1956).

¹⁰ For the Sino-Swedish Expedition from 1927 to 1935 see *Reports from the scientific expedition to the north-western provinces of China under the leadership of Dr. Sven Hedin* (Stockholm, 1937, and later years).

¹¹ Cf. *Mémoires de la délégation française en Afghanistan* (Paris, 1928, and later years).

¹² For a recent survey of the results of these excavations see B. Ya. Stavisky, *Mezdu Pamirom i Kaspiem (Srednyaya Aziya v drevnosti)* (Moscow, 1966).

are known to us from Greek sources as the inhabitants of ancient Bactria. For this reason these languages were called Tokharian A and Tokharian B, or West Tokharian and East Tokharian. Other scholars, however, have objected to the name Tokharian being given to these languages. They proved that the so-called Tokharian A was the indigenous language of Karashar, of which the old name is Agni; and that Tokharian B was the indigenous language of Kucha. They therefore proposed naming these languages Agnean and Kuchean.

The discovery of all these manuscripts opened up new fields of research for linguistic and Buddhist studies. They were also of great consequence—which is our concern here—for the history of Buddhism in China. It was already known from Chinese sources that missionaries had come from the countries west and east of the Pamir, countries collectively called the 'Western Regions' by the Chinese. Chinese Buddhists had also travelled to these regions. With these discoveries, however, concrete evidence of the importance of Buddhism in this part of the world has, for the first time, become available. As a result, there is today a plethora of material on the history of Buddhism in Central Asia.⁸ It is to be hoped that in the future a scholar will write a comprehensive and up-to-date book on Central Asian Buddhism. At present the most detailed work in this field is a Japanese work published in 1914.⁹ Although it contains much information, it is, of course, not up to date, and in the second place, it does not contain a critical examination of the traditions found in the different sources. Few expeditions by Western scholars have been undertaken since World War I¹⁰ but the publication of the material already obtained continues and, if every document is to be studied in detail, will continue for quite some time. However, new material has been brought to light in a number of other areas. Very important results have been obtained by the excavations undertaken by the French in Afghanistan.¹¹ Also in more recent years, Russian scholars have been very actively digging in the Soviet Republics north of Iran, Afghanistan, and East Turkestan.¹² New discoveries can be expected at almost every moment. Nevertheless, if one takes into account the dates of the documents already obtained from Central Asia, it is not to be expected that much information will be forthcoming from this source concerning the period extending roughly from the beginning of our era to about 400 AD. Most of the documents are of a later date. There are certainly some that go back to this period but they are almost entirely of a secular nature and do not give any information about Buddhism in Central Asia. For this reason we are still forced to rely mainly on Chinese sources.

These sources give much information about the first four centuries, but one must not forget the fact that most of them belong to a later period and the information which they contain has to be sifted critically before it can be used for the reconstruction of the history of Buddhism in Central Asia. One thing, however, is quite obvious. The main source from which Chinese

Buddhism was nourished in the first centuries of its existence was Central Asia. According to a Chinese tradition, in the year 2 BC a Chinese named Ch'in Ching-hsien 秦景憲 was orally taught Buddhist *sūtras* by the envoy of the Prince of the Great Yüeh-chih, I Ts'un 伊存.¹³ Modern scholars reject this story as apocryphal. The interesting point in it, however, is the fact that it refers to the explanation of Buddhist *sūtras*. As already remarked, Buddhism was brought to China by missionaries who came there as individuals. They went to China in the first place with the intention of explaining and preaching the Buddhist *sūtras*. In the propagation of Buddhism, the main stress was always put on the Buddhist scriptures. Of course, Buddhism contains many more elements than its sacred writings. Buddhism, as a religion, implies an organisation of monks, the building of monasteries and *stūpas*, the making of sculptures of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, and the performance of rites and practices. The sacred texts are, however, the *conditio sine qua non* for the existence of Buddhism. Buddhism in China depended, above all, on a knowledge of the sacred scriptures.

Although it is probably not an historical fact that the envoy of the Prince of the Yüeh-chih was the first to bring the word of the Buddha to China, there is no doubt that in the early period of Chinese Buddhism it was mainly the missionaries from the Western Regions who were responsible for the spread of Buddhism to China. In his studies on Buddhism and the Western Regions, Liang Ch'i-ch'ao has brought together information from Chinese biographies of Buddhist monks concerning the origin of the monks who came to China in the first period of Chinese Buddhism up to the end of the period of the three kingdoms in 265 AD.¹⁴ It is evident from his lists that the great majority of foreign monks came from the Western Regions. In the following period, from 265 till the end of the (Liu) Sung dynasty in 479, most of the monks came from Kashmir in north-western India. It is only in the period from 479 till the end of the Sui dynasty in 618 that most are found to have come from the sub-continent as a whole.

Chinese sources do not tell us only about foreign monks who came to China in order to spread the doctrine, but also about Chinese pilgrims who went to the Buddhist countries. Their motives were different: some went there to search for the sacred books; others hoped to be instructed in the sacred doctrine by monks in India; others again wanted to see the sacred places of Buddhism; some, finally, went to foreign countries in order to invite famous teachers to come to China.¹⁵ Of all these motives, the most important seems to have been the first, the desire to obtain the sacred texts. According to the Chinese sources, in the early period the Chinese pilgrims mainly went to the Western Regions. The first Chinese pilgrim whose name is recorded is Chu Shih-hsing 朱士行, who in 260 AD travelled to Khotan in the southern part of the Tarim basin.¹⁶ His example was followed by others. For the period until the middle of the fifth century, Chinese sources already mention many names of pilgrims who undertook long and arduous voyages.¹⁷ In the

¹³ James R. Ware, "Wei shou on Buddhism," *TP* 30 (1933): 110. See also Zürcher, *The Buddhist conquest of China*, pp.24–5, p.326, notes 32–4; Tsukamoto, *Gi-sho Shaku-Rō-shi no kenkyū*, p.86.

¹⁴ Liang Ch'i-ch'ao 梁啟超, *Fo-hsiieh yen-chiu shih-pa p'ien* 佛學研究十八篇 (3rd ed., Shanghai, 1941), no.5: "Fo-chiao yü hsi-yü" 佛教與西域, pp.5–8; no.6: "Yu fo-chiao yü hsi-yü" 又佛教與西域, pp.8–13. See also John Brough, "Comments on third-century Shan-shan and the history of Buddhism," *BSOAS* 28 (1965): 587.

¹⁵ Tang Yung-t'ung 湯用彤, *Han Wei liang-Chin nan-pei-ch'ao fo-chiao shih* 漢魏兩晉南北朝佛教史 (2nd ed., Peking, 1956), p.378.

¹⁶ Cf. P. Demiéville, "Le Bouddhisme, les sources chinoises," section 2048 in *l'Inde classique*, vol.2 (Paris-Hanoi, 1953); Zürcher, *The Buddhist conquest of China*, pp.61–3.

¹⁷ Cf. Tang Yung-t'ung, *Han Wei liang-Chin nan-pei-ch'ao fo-chiao shih*, pp.378–80.

¹⁸ Fa-hsien's account of his travels was translated into French by Abel Rémusat (1836) and into English by Samuel Beal (1869, 1884), James Legge (1886), Herbert A. Giles (1877, 1923), and Li Yung-hsi (1957).

¹⁹ Translated by Édouard Chavannes, *Mémoire composé à l'époque de la grande dynastie Tang sur les religieux éminents qui allèrent chercher la loi dans les pays d'Occident* (Paris, 1894).

²⁰ For bibliographical information on Hsüan-tsang see Kenneth K. S. Ch'en, *Buddhism in China: a historical survey* (Princeton, 1964), p. 523.

²¹ Cf. Ét. Lamotte, "La formation du canon des écritures," *Histoire du bouddhisme indien*, vol. I (Louvain, 1958), pp. 154–210.

²² In the seventh century the *Vedas* were still transmitted orally, cf. I-ching's *Record of the Buddhist religion*, tr. J. Takakusu (Oxford, 1896), pp. 182–3. Al-Birūnī (973–1048) mentions that, not long before his time, Vasukra, a native from Kashmir, had committed the *Veda* to writing; cf. *Alberuni's India*, trans. Edward C. Sachau (London, 1888), vol. 1, p. 126.

beginning most of them went to the Western Regions but gradually they extended their travels to Kashmir, a famous centre of Buddhism. The first pilgrim who seems to have gone further is the famous Fa-hsien 法顯. In 399 AD, when he was almost sixty years old, he left the capital, Ch'ang-an, and went via Tun-huang by the southern route to India. He stayed three years in Patna. On his return journey by ship, he visited Ceylon, where he remained for two years, and Java, where he stayed for five months. In 413 he arrived in Nanking after an absence of fourteen years from China.¹⁸ We cannot here mention the names of the many Chinese pilgrims who went to India after Fa-hsien. I-ching 義淨, who at the end of the seventh century travelled by boat to India and Sumatra, at that time a famous centre of Buddhist studies, wrote a work in which he relates the voyages of sixty pilgrims during a period of only fifty years in the second half of the seventh century.¹⁹ We must, however, name the most famous of all, Hsüan-tsang 玄奘, who left China in 629 and went to India by the northern route through Central Asia. He remained about twelve years in India and returned by way of Central Asia, this time by the southern route. He finally arrived back in 645 in Ch'ang-an where he was welcomed by a great crowd.²⁰

When the Chinese first came into contact with Buddhism, Buddhist literature had already reached great proportions. As mentioned before, only some of the older schools had established a canonical collection of their sacred texts.²¹ With the rise of the *Mahāyāna*, the Great Vehicle, Buddhist scriptures increased more and more, in both number and length, though without codification in one or more canonical collections. For the pious Buddhist, every Buddhist text was part of the Word of the Buddha, the *Buddhavacanam*. Only the learned monks were interested in knowing whether a certain text contradicted the tenets of the school to which he belonged. In some cases they even rejected a text as apocryphal. Needless to say, such doctrinal subtleties were of no concern to Chinese Buddhists in the early period. To them, every Buddhist text, coming from India, the country of the Buddha, was sacred. All texts brought to China were received with great respect.

How did these Buddhist texts arrive in China? They were not always written texts. Some were brought from India and Central Asia by monks who had learned them by heart. One must not forget that in India sacred texts have always been handed down from master to pupil by oral tradition. The holy scriptures of India, the *Veda*, were transmitted orally for centuries before being committed to writing.²² Even today it is still possible to find in India pandits who are able to recite these texts from memory. The importance of the oral tradition is due to the fact that only the spoken word of the teacher possesses authority. Another reason is that written texts can be communicated to persons belonging to impure castes, who are not entitled to hear the sacred teachings. This did not apply to Buddhism, which made no distinction between pure and impure castes. Nevertheless, the sanctity of the spoken word among Buddhists, too, was such that for many centuries the sacred texts

were not committed to writing, although writing was certainly practised both by monks and nuns.²³ Only in the more recent texts of the *Mahāyāna* schools writing is recommended but, it seems, only in order to facilitate the committing to memory of the sacred texts.²⁴ In one of the most famous *Mahāyāna sūtras*, the *Lotus Sūtra*, great merit is promised to those who will write down the text. Immediately after proclaiming the merit of writing, the Bodhisattva Samantabhadra declares: "How much greater will be the mass of merit reaped by those who will preach and recite it, meditate and fix their mind on it."²⁵

There is no doubt that in later times Buddhist texts were written in India on the leaves of palm trees and, mainly in north-western India, on the bark of birch trees. There is an interesting reference in a Buddhist text to ladies who at night were writing Buddhist texts on birch-bark with the help of ink and a writing-reed, called *kalamā* after Greek *kalamos*.²⁶ However, from Chinese sources—there are no Indian sources which give any information on this point—one gains the impression that even in the first centuries AD the number of manuscripts available in India was still very limited. Most of the Buddhist manuscripts mentioned in this period by Chinese sources seem to have come from Central Asia. We have already noted that in 260 a Chinese Buddhist, Chu Shih-hsing, went to Khotan to obtain a Buddhist text. It is in the neighbourhood of this same place that the oldest Indian manuscript actually known has been found. This manuscript, written on birch-bark, dates probably from the second century AD.²⁷ However, it is not impossible that in the earlier periods some manuscripts had already been brought from India itself to China. For instance, according to Chinese sources (admittedly of much later date) a manuscript was brought by an Indian monk to the Chinese capital, Lo-yang, about the middle of the second century.²⁸ Half a century later a biography of the Buddha was translated into Chinese. The manuscript of the text translated is said to have come from Kapilavastu, the capital of the state of the Śākya, where the father of the Buddha had reigned.²⁹ However, during this period the manuscripts generally came from Central Asia. Their number cannot have been very great. According to the sources available only one text, or at most a few, were brought at a time, although some of them were quite voluminous. It is not until the beginning of the fifth century that greater numbers of manuscripts are mentioned. Chih Fa-ling 支法領 brought back from his voyages more than two hundred *Mahāyāna sūtras* which he most probably had collected in Khotan.³⁰ It is only in the sixth century that reference is made to great masses of texts, or bundles, which were brought to China from India itself. They were called 'bundles' because they took the form of piles of palm leaves, or of writing material prepared from birch-bark, held together by a string passing through holes, one or sometimes two, pierced in the leaves. Each such bundle might consist of one or more texts, or if the text was very long, then of only part of it. The house of the Indian translator, Bodhiruci, who worked in the first half of the sixth century in Lo-

²³ Cf. M. Winternitz, *A history of Indian literature*, vol. I (Calcutta, 1927), pp. 32–3. Winternitz's statement, that in the sacred books of Buddhism there is not to be found the least indication that the books themselves were copied or read, is only valid for the older Buddhist literature.

²⁴ Cf. *Vajracchedikā*, ed. E. Conze (Rome, 1957), p. 43, and Conze's translation, *ibid.*, p. 79: "What should we say of him who, after writing it [i.e. this discourse on *dharmā*], would learn it, bear it in mind, recite it, study it, and illuminate it in full detail for others?"

²⁵ Cf. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, ed. H. Kern and Bunyiu Nanjio (St.-Petersbourg, 1912), p. 478, ll. 3–7.

²⁶ *Dīrghavadāna*, ed. E. B. Cowell and R. A. Neil (Cambridge, 1886), p. 532, ll. 9–11. S. Dutt (*Buddhist monks and monasteries of India* (London, 1962), p. 236, n. 3) states that this passage probably dates from the first century BC. A considerably later date is much more likely.

²⁷ Cf. John Brough, *The Gāndhāri Dharmapada* (London, 1962), p. 56.

²⁸ Cf. Zürcher, *The Buddhist conquest of China*, p. 332, n. 92.

²⁹ Cf. Tsukamoto Zenryū, *Shina bukkyōshi kenkyū*, *Hoku-Gihen* 支那佛教史研究 北篇 (Tokyo, 1942), p. 54, n. 9; Zürcher, *The Buddhist conquest of China*, p. 333, n. 99.

³⁰ Cf. T1858, 155c 10–12; T2145, 11c 9–10, 61a 1–2, 104a 19–20; T2059, 335c 3–4, 359b 17–18; T'ang Yung-t'ung, *Han Wei liang-Chin nan-pei-ch'ao fo-chiao shih*, pp. 385–6; W. Liebenthal, *The Book of Chao* (Peking, 1948), p. 98; Tsukamoto Zenryū, ed., *Jōron kenkyū* 肇論研究 (Kyoto, 1955), pp. 43, 100, n. 126; Zürcher, *The Buddhist conquest of China*, pp. 62, 246.

³¹ See the references given by Satō Shingaku 佐藤心岳, "Hoku-Sei bukkuyōkai ni okeru bongo butten no jūshi" 北齊佛教界における梵語佛典の重視, *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 12.1 (1964): 201, n.1.

³² In 522 Hui-sheng 惠生 and Sung-yūn 宋雲 brought back 170 works; cf. Éd. Chavannes, "Voyage de Song Yun dans l'Udyāna et le Gandhāra (518–522 p.C.)," *BEFEO* 3 (1903): 379–80; James R. Ware, "Wei shou on Buddhism," p.163; Tsukamoto Zenryū, *Gi-sho Shaku-Rō-shi no kenkyū*, pp.270–2. In 556 Narendrayāśas arrived in Yeh. At that time there were more than 1,000 bundles of Indian texts in the Tripitaka Hall of the T'ien-p'ing temple, cf. *T* 2060, 432c 6, Éd. Chavannes, "Jinagupta," *TP* 6 (1905): 349 51, n.1. In 581 Pao-hsien 寶暹 and others brought back 260 texts; cf. Éd. Chavannes, *ibid.*, p.346. Paramārtha arrived in 548 in Nanking with 340 bundles, cf. *T* 2149, 266b 11–12; or with 240 bundles, cf. *T* 2034, 88b 3. (According to the *Hsi kao-seng chuan* (*T* 2060, 430b 23–4), 240 is the number of bundles left untranslated by Paramārtha. U. supposes that 240 certainly refers to the number of bundles which he brought to China; cf. U. Hakuju 宇井伯壽, *Indo tetsugaku kenkyū* 印度哲學研究, vol.6 (Tokyo, 1930), pp.48–9.)

³³ *T* 2053, 252c 11–12, 277a 1–2.

³⁴ *T* 2053, 261a 26–262a. Cf. P. C. Bagchi, *India and China* (2nd ed., Bombay, 1950), pp.80–5; Li Yung-hsi, *The Life of Hsüan-tsang* (Peking, 1959), pp.234–40.

³⁵ Cf. P. Demiéville, "A propos du concile de Vaisāli," *TP* 40 (1951): 245–7, n.1; T'ang Yung-t'ung, *Han Wei liang-Chin nan-pei-ch'ao fo-chiao shih*, p.405.

³⁶ Cf. Haneda Tōru 羽田亨, "Kanyaku no butten ni tsuite" 漢譯の佛典について, *Geibun* 藝文 2.2 (ge) (1911); reprinted in his *Ronbunshū*, vol.2 (Kyoto, 1958), pp.348–57. The first to advance this theory seems to have been Tsan-ning 贊寧 in his *Sung kao-seng chuan*, composed from 982 to 988, cf. *T* 2061, 723c (Haneda refers to this passage which was translated by Sylvain Lévi, *BEFEO* 4 (1904): 562–3). Tsan-ning uses the term *chung-i* 重譯, 're-translation', to indicate a Chinese translation which, via one or more Central Asian versions, goes back to an Indian original. It must be remarked that,

yang and Yeh, is said to have contained 10,000 bundles.³¹ Although this number is probably greatly exaggerated, there is no ground for doubting other references to several hundred texts or bundles.³² The interest in Buddhist manuscripts was certainly considerable at that period. This is obvious from the fact that a Chinese military expedition to Lin-i 林邑, in present-day Vietnam, did not hesitate to bring back, as spoils of war, 564 bundles of Buddhist texts. In the next century, the seventh, Hsüan-tsang brought back from India 657 texts in 520 bundles, of which he himself translated 74.³³ However, while he was crossing the Indus, he lost a number of manuscripts. In 654, in reply to a letter from two Indian monks from the Mahābodhi monastery in Bodhgayā, Hsüan-tsang sent a list of the missing texts with a request that they should send them to him.³⁴ From what we can learn from Chinese sources, it seems evident that manuscripts did not arrive in great numbers from India before the sixth and seventh centuries. This can probably be explained by the existence in India at that time of great monasteries which were famous centres of learning, such as, for instance, Nālandā.

Chinese sources also make frequent references to the amazing memory of Indian monks who could recite by heart quite voluminous texts. To mention only a few examples: In 383 Saṃghadeva, a monk from Kashmir, translated from memory a text which, in the Chinese version, contained more than 380,000 characters. Prodigious though his memory was, it appears that he had forgotten a chapter. It was later added from recitation by another monk from Kashmir. In 407 two Indian monks wrote down a text which they knew by heart. It took them a full year, but it was not until six years later, in 414, that they had learned Chinese well enough to be able to translate the text into Chinese. We know of at least one instance in which the Chinese decided to put the memory of an Indian monk to the test. This was in 410 when Buddhayaśas was invited to learn by heart, in three days, forty pages of prescriptions and census registers. He was able to recite them without making any mistakes in the weight of a drug or a census figure. After having been tried in this way Buddhayaśas orally translated a text, which in Chinese ran to more than 630,000 characters.³⁵

The Buddhist texts which arrived in China, whether in the form of manuscripts or by oral transmission, had to be translated into Chinese in order to become accessible to the Chinese. This is not as obvious as it seems to be at first. In the history of religions there are many examples of sacred scriptures which, in other countries, continued to be studied in their original language. Sometimes they are recited without being understood, as is the case, for instance, with the Sanskrit texts which are recited in Bali. With regard to Buddhism, it is sufficient to point out that in Ceylon and in South-east Asia the Buddhist scriptures are studied in the first place in Pāli, a Middle-Indian language. Probably in Central Asia too the Buddhist scriptures were studied for centuries in their original languages. However, China did not have such close cultural contacts with India as did Central Asia. Moreover, the structure

of the Chinese language is fundamentally different from that of Sanskrit, a highly developed analytical Indo-European language. For the Central Asian speakers of Indo-European languages it was, of course, much easier than it was for the Chinese to study the Buddhist texts from India in their original languages.

In the past it was assumed that the Buddhist texts from India were all written in Sanskrit. Study of the Chinese translations, especially of the transcription of Indian names, and the linguistic analysis of Indian Buddhist texts have shown that, in India, Buddhist texts were also composed in Middle-Indian languages and in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit. The discovery at the beginning of this century of Buddhist texts in non-Indian languages has led to the supposition that Chinese Buddhist texts were sometimes even translated from Central Asian languages.³⁶ This has recently been affirmed again by van Gulik in his book on Siddham.³⁷ However, to my knowledge, it has not been proved that any specific Chinese text must necessarily have been translated from a text in a Central Asian language. Although many manuscripts containing Buddhist texts in different languages have been discovered in Central Asia, none of them is older than 500 AD. In the opinion of specialists in these languages, the Tokharian manuscripts date from 500 to 700, the Khotanese documents from the seventh to the tenth centuries, and the Sogdian manuscripts mostly from the ninth and tenth centuries.³⁸ The Buddhist manuscripts of an earlier period that have been found in Central Asia are written in Sanskrit or other Indian languages. After 500 AD, as we have seen, great numbers of manuscripts came from India to China. It is, of course, possible that an orally transmitted Buddhist literature in Central Asian languages existed already before 500 AD, and that one or more Chinese texts go back to a Central Asian original. The available evidence is not sufficient to warrant such a conclusion.³⁹

The work of translating Buddhist texts into Chinese was first undertaken in the middle of the second century and continued to the middle of the eleventh century. Thereafter only very few texts were translated. The task confronting the translators was extremely difficult. The texts which arrived

/the Central Asian word for Kubera (which he transcribes as *chü-yün-lo* 拘均羅) does not inspire much confidence in his knowledge and judgment. The association of *Vaiśramaṇa* with the north and hence with Central Asia and especially with Khotan (see *Hōbōgirin* [Tokyo–Paris, 1929–1937], p.79) probably accounts for Tsan-ning's statement.

³⁷ R. H. van Gulik (*Siddham* [Nagpur, 1956], p.47) refers to an article by Wogihara Unrai 荻原雲來, "Kanyaku batten no gengo o ronzu" 漢譯佛典の原語を論ず (*Mujin* 10 [1909], reprinted in *Wogihara Unrai bunsbū* 荻原雲來文集 [Tokyo, 1938], pp.767–809). However, Wogihara does not examine Chinese translations of texts written in Central Asian languages, but of texts written in Indian languages other than Sanskrit. Only incidentally does he refer to translations from Central Asian languages; cf. *Bunsbū*, pp.769, 807–8.

³⁸ For Tokharian see W. Krause, *Tocharisch (Handbuch der Orientalistik)* (Leiden, 1955), p.4; for Khotanese, H. W. Bailey in *Iranistik (Handbuch der Orientalistik)* (Leiden, 1958), p.131; and for Sogdian, W. B. Henning, in *ibid.*, p.55.

³⁹ It is well known that the *Hsien-yü-ching* 賢愚經 (T202) is based upon tales told in the *bu* language in Khotan shortly before 445. Much has been written upon this text; cf. J. Takakusu, "Tales of the wise man and the fool, in Tibetan and Chinese," *JRAS* (1901), pp.447–60; "A comparative study of the Tripiṭaka and the Tibetan Dsañ lun. The wise man and the fool," *Actes du XI^e Congrès des Orientalistes*, vol.2 (1902), pp.11–32; P. Pelliot, *BEFEO* 2 (1902): 299, *ibid.*, 11 (1911): 466, "Autour d'une traduction sanscrite du Tao-tō-king," *TP* 13 (1912): 355–6; "Notes à propos d'un catalogue du Kanjur," *JA* (1914, vol.2): 139; "La version ouigoure de l'histoire des princes Kalyāṇakara et Pāpaṇkara," *TP* 15 (1914): 226–7; "Neuf notes sur des questions d'Asie centrale," *TP* 26 (1929), pp.256–63; B. Laufer, "Loan words in Tibetan," *TP* 17 (1916): 415–22; F. W. K. Müller, "Uigurica, III," *Abb. Ak. d. Wiss., Berlin*, 1922; Sylvain Lévi, "Le Sūtra du Sage et du Fou dans la littérature de l'Asie centrale," *JA* (1925, vol.2): 305–22; H. W. Bailey, "Kāncanasāra," *B. C. Law Volume*, vol.2 (Poona, 1946), pp.11–13; W. Baruch, "Le cinquante-deuxième chapitre du *mJañs-blun*," *JA* (1955): 339–66; Tsumaki Naoyoshi

/since Tao-an, the term *chung-i* is regularly used in catalogues to indicate different translations of the same text. Japanese scholars use the term *chung-i* (jūyaku) in the sense in which it was first used by Tsan-ning. Tsan-ning (loc. cit.) gives the following examples of Central Asian words: Sanskrit *upādhyāya*=Kashgar *bu-shê* 鶴社, Khotan *bo-shang* 和尚; Kubera = *bu* 胡 (Central Asia) *Vaiśramaṇa*. Much has been written on *bo-shang*; cf. Paul Pelliot, *Notes on Marco Polo*, vol.1, (Paris, 1959), pp.211–14. H. W. Bailey interprets it as **vāzā*, from north-western Prakrit **vājāya* (*BS* 13 (1949): 133). However, it has not been found in Khotanese

/texts. It is, of course, very possible that the Prakrit form reached China via Khotan without having been used in Khotanese. This would explain why it was considered to be a Khotanese word by Chinese scholars of later date, such as Hsüan-ying and Tsan-ning, who knew the correct Sanskrit form but were unable to relate to it the Prakrit form underlying *bo-shang*. Pelliot (loc. cit.) admits the possibility that *bu-shê* really represents a Kashgarian word. Nothing is known about the language of Kashgar apart from the fact that almost certainly it was an Iranian language (H. W. Bailey, *BS* 13 [1950]: 651). The fact that Tsan-ning believes that *Vaiśramaṇa* is

/妻木直良, "Tonkō sekishitsu goshu butten nokaisetsu" 燉煌石室五種佛典の解説, *Tōyō gakuhō* 1.3 (1911): 350–65; Matsumoto Bunzaburō 松本文三郎, "Tonkō-bon Dai-ungyō to Kengukyō 燉煌本大雲經と賢愚經, II," *Geibun* 3, pt.1 (jō) (1912): 542–56; Fukui Rikichirō 福井利吉郎, "Tōdaiji-bon Kengukyō" 東大寺本賢愚經, *ibid.*, pt.2 (ge) (1912): 463–83, 546–73; Hikata Ryūshō 干瀉龍祥, *Honjō kyōrui no shisōshi-teki kenkyū* 本生經類の思想史的研究 (Tokyo, 1954), pp.129–30, supplementary volume (fuhon 附篇), pp.67–71; Takahashi Moritaka 高橋盛孝, "Kengukyō tansaki" 賢愚經探査記, *Nihon Chibetto gakkai kaibō* 日本西藏學會々報 9 (1962): 1–2; "Kengukyō to Zanrun" 賢愚經とザン・ルン, *Tōhōgaku* 東方學 26 (1963): 47–55. Matsumoto is the only scholar who has tried to prove that the Chinese text was translated from the Khotanese by pointing out transcriptions which cannot have been derived from Sanskrit originals. However, he did not at all take into account the possibility that the original was not in Sanskrit but in Prakrit. In reconstructing the original forms of Kalyāṇakara and Pāpaṃkara (*Kalyāṇ-ṇagari; *Pābagari or *Pāvagari) Pelliot expressly states that these forms belong to a north-western Prakrit (*TP* 15:227). It must be left to specialists of Khotanese to come to a final conclusion on this matter. It is much to be desired that other Chinese texts also, which are known to have been translated from texts of Central Asian origin, will be studied by specialists in Central Asian languages. Only a careful and systematic study of the transcription used in these Chinese translations can prove their derivation from Central Asian originals. References in Chinese sources alone are not conclusive.

⁴⁰ Cf. Tokiwa Daijō 常盤大定, *Go-Kan yori Sō-Sei ni itaru yakkyō sōroku* 後漢より宋齊に到る譯經總錄 (Tokyo, 1938), pp.159–81; Hayashiya Tomojiro 林屋友次郎, *Kyōroku kenkyū* 經錄研究 (Tokyo, 1941), pp.381–428.

⁴¹ Cf. Tokiwa, *Go-Kan yori Sō-Sei ni itaru yakkyō sōroku*, "Yakkyōsū taishōhyō" 譯經數對照表, pp.1–4; Hayashiya Tomojiro, *Iyaku kyōrui no kenkyū* 異譯經類の研究 (Tokyo, 1945), pp.1–2 of the English résumé; "Ta-tsa ng sheng-chiao fa-pao piaomu" 大藏聖教法寶標目, *Shōwa Hōbō*

in China belonged to different Buddhist schools. They were composed not only in Sanskrit but also in other Indian languages, languages greatly differing in structure from Chinese. Last, but not least, the Buddhist concepts were foreign to the Chinese mind. Nevertheless, the difficulties were overcome, although not always with complete success.

The number of translations increased rapidly, as appears from a catalogue of Chinese Buddhist texts compiled in 374 by the famous monk, Tao-an 道安. This catalogue has not been preserved, but has been reconstructed from a catalogue published in the beginning of the sixth century.⁴⁰ Tao-an's catalogue contained 611 texts, of which 561 were translations, the fifty others being apocryphal texts and commentaries. Tao-an carefully arranged these 561 translations under five heads. One: translations, where the author was known, listed in chronological order; two: translations of which the author was unknown; three: variant versions produced in Kansu; four: variant versions produced in Ch'ang-an; five: variant versions in archaic style. Tao-an's catalogue did not extend beyond the beginning of the fourth century and comprised a period of only little more than a century and a half. He lived in a time of war, when communications between the different parts of China were difficult. Therefore the number of existing translations must certainly have been greater than the 561 mentioned by Tao-an in his catalogue. After Tao-an, the volume of translations increased enormously.⁴¹ It is difficult to know from the later catalogues how many translations were actually made, because these include a great number of lost translations of doubtful authenticity; the number must have been in the thousands. The most recent edition of the Chinese Buddhist Canon, the so-called Taishō edition, published from 1924 to 1934, contains about 1,700 translations.⁴² This certainly represents only a part of all the translations which have been made in China. In the passage of centuries many texts have been lost and many manuscripts have yet to be published.

How were these texts translated into Chinese? There were no Sanskrit Chinese dictionaries and no grammars. It is not until after 600 that manuals began to be compiled for students.⁴³ Even if we find a dictionary mentioned somewhere, it bears little resemblance to dictionaries as we know them. For instance, in 1035 there is a record of a dictionary of Indian words being presented to the Emperor, but this work does not contain anything more than an explanation of Indian sounds and syllables and their mystic meaning.⁴⁴ In

/sōmokuroku 昭和法寶總目錄, vol.2 (Tokyo, 1929), pp.773b–4b. According to this catalogue, from 67 to 1306, 194 translators translated 1,440 texts in 5,586 chapters. Ono Gemmyō 小野玄妙 enumerates altogether 202 translators in chronological order; cf. *Bussbokaisetsu daijiten* 佛書解説大辭典, vol.12 (Tokyo, 1936), pp.1–188. For the translators see also Nanjio Bunyiu, *A catalogue*

/of the Chinese translation of the Buddhist Tripiṭaka (Oxford, 1883), Appendix 2, pp.381–458; P. C. Bagchi, *Le Canon bouddhique en Chine*, vols.1–2 (Paris, 1927–1938), *India and China* (2nd ed., Bombay, 1950), pp.203–20; *Hōbōgin, fascicule annexe. Tables du Taishō Issaikyō* (Tokyo, 1931), pp.127–52; P. Damiéville, "Le bouddhisme, les sources chinoises," sections 2067–2100.

the early period of Chinese Buddhism, as we have mentioned already, the Chinese did not go to India and Indians did not come to China. It was mainly men from Central Asia who were responsible for the introduction of Buddhism and for the translations of Indian texts. Living in Central Asia, in countries which were subjected to the influence of Chinese culture, or having settled in the Western Regions of China, they knew enough Chinese to be able to translate Indian texts into Chinese.

Translators did not work alone. With very few exceptions, all translations were the result of team-work. Chinese sources provide a great deal of information about the way in which these teams functioned, and these sources have been carefully studied by scholars, mainly Chinese and Japanese.⁴⁵ Most useful is an article published four years ago by Tso Sze-bong, bringing together information on translation techniques which can be found in such Chinese works as catalogues of Chinese translations, biographical works, and prefaces to translations.⁴⁶ It appears from these sources that already in the early period several persons were engaged in the making of a single translation. One man would hold the Indian text in his hand and read it, or recite it from memory; he was called the main translator, and in many cases only his name has been attached to the translation. A second person was charged with the translation from Sanskrit into Chinese. A third person, finally, wrote it down or 'received it with the pen' as the phrase goes in Chinese. The work of translating took place in public. The chief translator not only recited the text but also explained it. His explanations were written down by his disciples, who later compiled commentaries to the text. Sometimes many hundreds or thousands of people were present at these translation centres. Questions would be asked about difficult problems, and the answers of the chief translator were written down. These notes were later consulted for the verification of the translation. It does not seem likely that at these gatherings many people were able to ask questions about the meaning of the text, as Tso Sze-bong seems to imply.⁴⁷ For most of them the recitation and explanation of the Indian text by a famous translator must have been a sacred ceremony which they attended with religious devotion. Once the translation was written down, it was again revised and the style polished. Sometimes the meaning of the original was changed during this process. A famous example of stylistic improvement is to be found in the biography of the Chinese monk, Seng-jui 僧叡, a pupil of the famous translator, Kumārajīva (active about 400 AD). When Kumārajīva was translating the famous *Lotus Sūtra*, he apparently consulted at the same time an older translation made by Dharmarakṣa. When they arrived at a passage where Dharmarakṣa had translated: "The Gods see the men and the men see the Gods," Kumārajīva remarked that the translation was correct but the wording too coarse. Then Seng-jui proposed a translation: "The men and the Gods are in mutual relation and see each other." Kumārajīva gladly accepted this suggestion.⁴⁸

It is obvious that these translations could not have been made without material support. To begin with this was given by lay followers, but soon,

⁴² The first 32 volumes of this edition contain 1,692 translations; cf. Demiéville "Le bouddhisme, les sources chinoises," section 2046. Hayashiya (*Iyaku kyōrui no kenkyū*, p.1 of the English résumé) mentions 1,711 translations without explaining how he arrives at this number.

⁴³ Cf. P. C. Bagchi, *Deux lexiques sanskrit-chinois*, vols.1-2 (Paris, 1929-1937); van Gulik, *Siddham*, pp.31-5.

⁴⁴ Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信亨, "Tenjiku jigen" 天竺字源, *Bukkyō daijiten* 佛教大辭典, vol.4 (Tokyo, 1936), pp.3809a-10a; van Gulik, *Siddham*, pp.91-6; Jan Yün-hua, "Buddhist relations between Indian and Sung China," *History of Religions*, vol.6 (1966), p.158.

⁴⁵ Cf. Walter Fuchs, "Zur technischen Organisation der Übersetzungen buddhistischer Schriften ins Chinesische," *Asia Major* 6 (1930): 84-103; Liang Ch'ü-chao, *Fo-hsiieh yen-chiu shih-pa p'ien*, (cf. n.14), no.10: "Fo-tien chih fan-i" 佛典之翻譯; Ōchō Enichi 横超慧日, *Chūgoku bukkyō no kenkyū* 中國佛教の研究 (Kyoto, 1958), pp.219-55, "Kumarajīva no honyaku" 鳩摩羅什の翻譯, *Daigaku gakubō* 大學々報, 37.4 (1958): 1-25; Kenneth Ch'en, "Some problems in the translation of the Chinese Buddhist Canon," *Tsing-hua Journal of Chinese Studies*, n.s. 2.1 (1960): 178-86; T'ang Yung-t'ung, *Han Wei liang-chin nan-pei-ch'ao fo-chiao shih*, pp.402-14; Zürcher, *The Buddhist conquest of China*, passim; Demiéville, "Le Bouddhisme, les sources chinoises," sections 2067-9.

⁴⁶ Tso Sze-bong 曹仕邦, "Lun Chung-kuo fo-chiao i-ch'ang chih i-ching fang-shih yü ch'eng-hsü" 論中國佛教譯場之譯經方式與程序, *Hsin Ya hsiueh-pao*, vol.5 (Hongkong, 1963), pp.239-321.

⁴⁷ Ibid., p.252; but see p.292.

⁴⁸ Cf. T 2059, 364b 2-6; J. Nobel, "Kumārajīva," *SBPAW* (1927), p.232; Arthur F. Wright, "Seng-jui alias Hui-jui," *Liebertal Festschrift* (Santinketan, 1957), p.276; Kenneth Ch'en, *Tsing-hua Journal of Chinese Studies*, n.s. 2.1 (1960): 180; Tso Sze-bong, "Lun Chung-kuo fo-chiao i-ch'ang chih i-ching fang-shih yü ch'eng-hsü," p.291; K. K. S. Ch'en, *Buddhism in China* (Princeton, 1964), p.368, n.2; Richard H. Robinson, *Early Mādhyamika in India and China* (Madison, 1967), p.80.

⁴⁹ T 2053, 253c 19–254a 6; Tso Sze-bong, “Lun Chung-kuo fo-chiao i-ch'ang chih i-ching fang-shih yü ch'eng-hsü,” pp.257–8.

⁵⁰ T 2053, 253c 1–8.

⁵¹ Cf. Robinson's examination of Kumārajīva's translation of the first sixteen stanzas of the *Chung-lun* (T 1564, 1–3), *Early Mādhyamika in India and China*, pp.83–8; Hayashiya Tomojirō's study of An Shih-kao's terminology, “Anseikō-yaku no Zōagon to Zōichagon” 安世高譯の雜阿含と增壹阿含, *Bukkyō kenkyū* 佛教研究 1.2 (1937): 11–50, esp. 16–20, 29–32.

especially in the north where non-Chinese dynasties reigned, official patronage was extended to the work of translating. After the re-unification of China in 589, Buddhism received great support from the emperors. They also vigorously promoted the work of translating. Official supervisors were appointed to assist the translation centres. At the same time there was also an important change in the methods of translating. It now became entirely the work of specialists, each of whom was made responsible for a particular aspect of the work. Hsüan-tsang, who translated many texts, was assisted by a team of twenty-three specialists, as well as by a number of scribes.⁴⁹ He was one of the very few Chinese who had learnt Sanskrit exceptionally well, and was able to translate texts without the help of foreigners. Hsüan-tsang did not want to be bothered by intruders during his work. He therefore requested the Emperor to allow him to go to a quiet place away from noisy towns and villages, but the Emperor wanted to keep him in the capital, and built a special monastery for him.⁵⁰

A study of the methods of translation can only indirectly throw light on the quality of the translations. In this respect much work remains to be done by scholars. Only very few Chinese translations have been critically compared with their Indian originals or with other translations from Indian languages; in particular, those in Tibetan. With very few exceptions, no systematic study has been undertaken of the terminology used by each translator, although this would be of great importance in helping to evaluate the translations and decide their attribution, which is often doubtful.⁵¹ It is at present only possible to make a few general observations. In the beginning, the translators tried to use existing Chinese philosophical and religious terminology, especially Taoist terminology, in order to convey Buddhist concepts. Only gradually was a specific Chinese terminology for Buddhist concepts worked out. At the time of Kumārajīva, special attention began to be paid to the style of the translation, and many of them from that period are very readable, though they do not always strictly adhere to the letter of the original, as we have seen in the passage from the *Lotus Sūtra* quoted earlier. The translations of Hsüan-tsang are probably the most accurate ever made in China, but Chinese Buddhists have usually preferred Kumārajīva's translations for the excellent Chinese in which they were written.

The Chinese translations vary greatly in quality. It is not always easy to understand their meaning, and in many cases it is clear that the translation only very imperfectly represents the original. Nevertheless, the value of these translations is considerable. Of the immense Buddhist literature which once existed in India, only a small part has been preserved in its original form. If one wants to study Buddhist literature, it is absolutely necessary to consult the translations. Only in two languages, Tibetan and Chinese, does there exist a great number of Buddhist texts translated from Indian originals. The Chinese Buddhist Canon contains many texts which were not translated into Tibetan. Although the Chinese translations are never as literal and precise as the Tibetan ones, for which a uniform terminology was soon created, the former possess nevertheless one important advantage over the latter. Chinese

translations, almost all of them, date from the second to the eleventh centuries, while in Tibet the task of translating did not begin before the eighth century. Apart from their intrinsic value for the history of Buddhism in China, the Chinese translations therefore are also of great importance for the study of Indian Buddhism, particularly for the period before the eighth century. By studying them it is possible to learn of the existence of many Indian texts, of which no original has been preserved. The date of translation gives us the *terminus ante quem* of their composition. Finally, the contents and the form of the lost Indian originals, though not, of course, the exact wording, can be reconstructed from the Chinese versions. In the course of centuries many Indian Buddhist texts were gradually added to, and this process of expansion can in several cases be studied by means of successive Chinese translations. For these reasons, no student of Buddhism, even if he is interested only in Indian Buddhism, can neglect the enormous corpus of Chinese translations.

In India, by far the greater part of the texts which existed only in manuscript form were lost. Although after the middle of the eleventh century Buddhism declined in China, this did not happen there. Already at the end of the sixth century Chinese monks were anxious lest the Buddhist doctrine might disappear, for they had learned from Indian texts that three periods in the history of the Buddhist doctrine could be expected: the first, the period of the true doctrine, the *Saddharma*; the second, the period of the counterfeit doctrine; and the third, the period of the end of the doctrine, in Chinese *mo-fa* 末法.⁵² Texts relating to this theory were translated in the sixth century, but greater poignancy was given to their fears that the final period of the doctrine now confronted them by the fact that in 574 the faith was suffering persecution in Northern Chou, one of the kingdoms ruling in northern China.⁵³ Although this persecution continued for only a few years, it seems to have made a deep impression. In order to ensure the preservation of the texts of the scriptures for the future, when, after the disappearance of the doctrine, Buddhism would again revive, it was decided to engrave them on stone. At the end of the sixth century, in a number of different parts of China, this task was begun. The most important of these undertakings was due to a monk named Ching-wan 靜琬, who, early in the seventh century, conceived the idea of engraving the entire Buddhist Canon. He pursued this work until his death in 639, after which it was continued by five generations of his disciples. Only then was the work interrupted. However, in the eleventh century it was taken up again, and many new texts were added to those already engraved. This Mountain of the Stone *Sūtras*, as it is called in Chinese, is famous. Situated forty miles south-west of Peking, it was thoroughly studied by a group of Japanese scholars in 1934.⁵⁴ Even here, though, where a larger number of texts was engraved than anywhere else in China, still only a part of the entire Buddhist Canon is preserved.

It is a fortunate circumstance that the Buddhists did not have to rely on texts engraved in stone for the transmission of their Canon. With the growth of printing, a technique which the Buddhists had made a substantial con-

⁵² Cf. Ét. Lamotte, *Histoire du Bouddhisme indien*, vol.1 (Louvain, 1958), pp.210-22; Tsukamoto Zenryū, "Sekkyōzan Ungōji to sekkoku daizōkyō" 石經山雲居寺と石刻大藏經, *Tōhō gakubō* 5 (supplement) (Kyoto, 1935): 36-47; some bibliographical references in Ch'en, *Buddhism in China*, p. 529.

⁵³ Cf. Tsukamoto Zenryū, "Hoku-Shū no haibutsu nitsuite" 北周の廢佛に就いて, *Tōhō gakubō* 16 (1948): 29-101, and 18 (1950): 78-111, "Hoku-Shū no shūkyō haiki seisaku no hōkai" 北周の宗教廢棄政策の崩壊, *Bukkyō shigaku* 1 (1949): 3-31. Both articles are reprinted in *Gi-shō Shaku-Rō-shi no kenkyū*, pp.357-544.

⁵⁴ *Bōzan Ungōji kenkyū*, *Tōhō gakubō* 5 (supplement) (1935).

⁵⁵ Cf. Th. F. Carter, *The invention of printing and its spread westward* (2nd ed., New York, 1955), pp. 54–6; Paul Pelliot, *Les débuts de l'imprimerie en Chine* (Paris, 1953), pp. 47–8.

⁵⁶ According to a newspaper article (*Canberra Times*, 16 Feb. 1967) a scroll, printed from twelve wooden blocks, was found in the stonework of a South Korean pagoda built in 751. The scroll contains a text translated no later than 704.

⁵⁷ A second almost complete copy was discovered in August 1940 by Sakai Shirō 酒井柴朗 in the monastery Ch'ung-shan in Tai-yüan 太原 (Shansi); cf. Sakai Shirō, "Sō Sekisaban daizōkyō ni tsuite" 宋磧砂版大藏經に就いて, *Pitaka* 8.10 (1940); Yoshii Hōjun 吉井芳純, "Taigen Sūzenji hakken no Sekisaban zōkyō ni tsuite" 太原崇善寺発見の磧砂版藏經に就いて, *Mikkyō kenkyū* 密教研究, vol. 80 (1942), pp. 80, 92. A third copy of the Chi-sha edition is in the Gest Library. It contains 2,330 volumes of the original edition, 868 volumes in various early Ming editions and 2,150 hand-copied volumes; cf. Hu Shih, "The Gest Oriental Library at Princeton University," *Princeton University Library Chronicle* 15.3 (1954): 129–34. On this edition see further *Ying-yin Sung Chi-sha tsang-ching* 影印宋磧砂藏經, introductory volume in 2 parts (*shou-ts'e* 首冊) (Shanghai, 1936); P. Demiéville, *Bibliographie bouddhique*, vols. 7–8 (Paris, 1937), pp. 113–14, in Pelliot, *Les débuts de l'imprimerie en Chine*, pp. 133–4, 138, n. 4 and the literature quoted by him; Mochizuki Shinkō, "Sekisaban daizōkyō" 磧砂版大藏經, *Bukkyō daijiten*, vol. 8 (1958), pp. 152b–4a; Ogawa Kanichi 小川貫弼, *Daizōkyō* 大藏經 (Kyoto, 1964), pp. 63–6. Mention should also be made of the twelfth-century Chin edition of which an incomplete copy was discovered in 1933; see P. Demiéville, *Bibliographie bouddhique*, vols. 7–8, pp. 112–14; idem, *Les débuts de l'imprimerie en Chine*, pp. 137–8; Tsukamoto Zenryū, "Bukkyō shiryō to shite no kinkoku daizōkyō" 佛教史料としての金刻大藏經, *Tōhō gakuhō* 6 (Kyoto, 1935): 26–100; Mochizuki Shinkō, "Kinzo" 金藏, *Bukkyō daijiten*, vol. 8 (1958), pp. 76a–9a; Ogawa, *Daizōkyō*, pp. 42–3. Of this edition 49 rare texts were reprinted in the *Sung-tsang i-chen* 宋藏遺珍 (Shanghai–Peking, 1934–5); cf. Mochizuki Shinkō, "Sōzō-ichin"

tribution to develop, an entirely new situation arose. The Buddhists were among the first to use the new technique on a large scale. The oldest preserved book is indeed a Buddhist text printed in 868.⁵⁵ According to a very recent report, an even older book has been found in a Korean pagoda, and this is said to have been printed between 704 and 751. No scholarly confirmation has yet been published concerning this find.⁵⁶ The Buddhists did not hesitate to print even the entire Buddhist Canon, despite its massive size. From 971 to 983 this collection of texts was printed in southwestern China in an edition that contained no less than 5,048 chapters. The wooden blocks used for this edition numbered more than 130,000. This first edition of the Buddhist Canon, of which only a few fragments have been preserved, was followed by many other editions in China, Korea, and Japan. Of most of the older editions very little remains. Of great importance therefore was the discovery in 1931 of an almost complete set of the so-called Chi-sha edition printed in the thirteenth century in Su-chou.⁵⁷ A photolithographic facsimile of this edition was printed in Shanghai in an edition limited to 500 copies, of which very few were distributed outside China. A copy, however, is in the oriental collection of the Menzies Library. Mention must be made also of the Korean xylographic printing of the thirteenth century, for the only ancient edition of which the original blocks have been preserved.⁵⁸ At the present time this edition of the Canon is being reprinted from the original blocks, and the National Library of Australia is acquiring a copy of this beautiful work as the volumes appear.

Chinese Buddhism is the product of the meeting of the cultures of India and China. The interrelation of these two great cultures constitutes one of the most fascinating chapters in the history of mankind. Without the untiring efforts of so many Buddhist believers in India, Central Asia, and China, it would not have been possible to bring the word of the Buddha to China, to translate it into Chinese, and to spread it by writing and printing. We are deeply conscious of our debt to these men who were prompted by no other motive than the desire to spread the doctrine of the Buddha.

/ 宋藏遺珍, *Bukkyō daijiten*, vol. 8 (1958), pp. 162a–3a. A copy of this reprint is also in the Menzies Library [ANU].

⁵⁸ On this edition see P. Demiéville, *BEFEO* 24 (1924): 198–9; Mochizuki Shinkō, "Kōraizō" 高麗藏, *Bukkyō daijiten*, vol. 2 (1932), pp. 1106–7; Ikeuchi Hiroshi 池内宏, "Kōraichō no daizōkyō" 高麗朝の大藏經, *Tōyō gakuhō* 13 (1923): 307–62; 14 (1924): 91–130, 546–58; Ōya Tokujō 大屋徳城, "Chōsen Kaiinji kyōhan-kō" 朝鮮海印寺經版攷, *Tōyō gakuhō* 15 (1926): 285–362; Ono Gemmyō, "Kōrai daizōkyō chōin-kō," *Butten kenkyū*

/ 佛典研究 4 (1929); Ōya Tokujō 大屋徳城, "Kōraizō no kyūchōhon to shinchōhon to no kōshō ni kansuru jissō-teki kenkyū" 高麗藏の舊雕本と新雕本との考證に關する實證的研究, *Shina bukkyō shigaku* 支那佛教史學 3.1 (1939); Nak Choon Paik, "Tripitaka Koreana," *Transactions of the Korea Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 32 (1951): 62–78; Okamoto Keiji 岡本敬二, "Kōrai daizōkyō-ban no kokusei" 高麗大藏經板の刻成 *Rekishigaku kenkyū* 歴史學研究, special issue (tokushūgō 特集號) (July 1953): 14–23; Ogawa, *Daizōkyō*, pp. 38–9.