

派, was formed within the *Jingliang bu* 經量部, Sautrāntika *nikāya*, i.e. Gandhāran Sarvāstivādins, Dārṣṭāntikas, Sautrāntikas. The oldest Chinese *Laṅkāvatāra sūtra*, Guṇabhadra's *Lengqie jing* 楞伽經, T. XVI 670, of 443 CE, comes too late for Kumārajīva<sup>13</sup>. Kumārajīva never makes a clear distinction between Western Sarvāstivādins and Vaibhāṣikas. Kucha was an area of Sautrāntikas. Is that the reason why he does not stress the Vaibhāṣikas "orthodoxy"? He also clearly mentions the seven *abhidharma* texts as two equal, separate groups. On the one hand there is the *Jñānaprasthāna* (body, *śarīra*) and its new *Mahāvibhāṣā*. On the other hand the six parts, "feet", are mentioned as a separate collection (*kāya*). Kumārajīva leaves no doubt about the *Peṭaka*, going back to Mahākātyāyana. The *upadeśas* of this "abhidharma" are most likely Mahāsāṅghika. Even Kumārajīva's own *Da zhidu lun* is an *upadeśa*.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Demiéville, Paul. 1978. *Répertoire du canon bouddhique Sino-Japonais Fascicule annexe du Hōbōgirin*. Paris-Tōkyō: Maison Franco-Japonaise.
- Ghosh, Rajeshwari. 2010. "The Alluring Mysteries of the Kizil Caves: The Interface between Literary Sources and Iconography". In S.Rai (ed.) *Buddhist Culture in Asia: Unity in Diversity*. Vol.1:67-90. Mumbai-New Delhi: Somaya Publications.
- Willemen, Charles. 2008. "Kumārajīva's Explanatory Discourse about Abhidharmic Literature". *Journal of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies* 12: 37-83 (156-110).
- Willemen, Charles. 2011. "Mahāsāṅghika. Some New Ideas". Forthcoming in *Dharmapracicaya*. Vol. in Honor of N.H.Samtani. Delhi: Buddhist World Press.
- Yamabe, Nobuyoshi, and Sueki, Fumihiko. 2009. *The Sūtra on the Concentration of Sitting Meditation*. BDK English Tripitaka Series. Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research.

<sup>13</sup> Bodhidharma (in China ca. 479 ū died ca. 534 A.D.), is said to be from Xiangzhi 香至, Gandhavatī, i.e. Gandhāra, in the *Zutang ji* 祖堂集 (Sodō shū) of 952 A.D., and in the *Jingde chuandeng lu* 景德傳燈錄 (*Keitoku dentō roku*), T. LI 2076: 217a9, of 1004 A.D.. He is said to be the third son of royalty from Gandhāra, in southern India. As is widely known, his practice is closely linked with the *Laṅkāvatāra sūtra*. Here I would like to mention that the nuns from Śrī Laṅkā, who arrived in southern China early in the fifth century, may well have been Mahāsāṅghika nuns who left their homeland for a welcoming South China. The Mahāvihāra monks were very powerful at the time, antagonizing i.a. Mahāsāṅghikas.

## 13

### Kumārajīva and Prajñāpāramitā in China\*

Bill M. Mak

#### Introduction

As the carrier of ideas and religious values, sacred texts provide the religious institution identity as well as continuity and are thus of great importance. In the case of Buddhism which flourished outside its homeland, the translation of the Buddhist scriptures played a particularly important role. Kumārajīva's Chinese translation of the Prajñāpāramitā (PP) texts is one of such examples, of which many had surpassed their parallel translations/retranslations. Some of his works such as the Chinese translations of the Lotus Sūtra and the Diamond Sūtra are recited daily by East Asian Buddhists up to this day, over 1500 years after their creation. These works have taken an incredibly strong root in the East Asian cultures and continue to show vitality not only as translations transmitting religious ideas, but also as works of great philosophical as well as literary values.

In this paper, I would like to examine the relationship between Kumārajīva, the PP texts and their Chinese translations during the crucial and formative period of East Asian Buddhism, namely the Six Dynasties from 3<sup>rd</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> century C.E. By examining the circumstances in which Kumārajīva produced these important translations, I hope to answer the following questions - What motivated Kumārajīva to undertake the retranslation of such voluminous texts which occupied nearly half of the translator's total output? And furthermore, what are the reasons which make these translations last for such a great span of time up to the modern age?

\* I thank Prof. Funayama Tōru for his valuable comments and corrections while I was preparing a draft of this paper. Needless to say all errors remain mine.

## 1.0 Prajñāpāramitā in China prior to Kumārajīva

### 1.1 The translations of Smaller and Larger PP and other philological works

By the designation “Prajñāpāramitā texts”, we refer to a body of texts which took up Prajñāpāramitā, one of the six *pāramitā*-s or Perfections in Mahāyāna Buddhism, as its main subject-matter, reflected through their titles as well as their contents.<sup>1</sup> Though there are no clear evidences as to when and where these text were composed and/or compiled, archeological findings suggest that Prajñāpāramitā texts were in circulation in Northwest India and subsequently in Central Asia by the 1<sup>st</sup> century C.E.<sup>2</sup> During the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> century when Buddhist missionaries from India and Central Asia entered China, PP texts were amongst the earliest Buddhist texts introduced to the Chinese. In 179 C.E., the Yuezhi monk Lokakṣema 支婁迦讖 translated *Daoxing bore jing* 道行般若經, known later as the Smaller PP. Subsequently, a number of retranslations were made on the same text, each time supposedly an improvement of the previous ones in terms of accuracy or style.<sup>3</sup> As Lokakṣema’s translation was the first and had apparently the widest circulation, never supplanted by other retranslations before Kumārajīva’s arrival in Ch’ang-an, *Daoxing* became synonymous with the Smaller PP.

Despite the apparent success of Lokakṣema’s *Daoxing*, Chinese Buddhists from a very early age were well aware of the existence of a “larger” PP text of which the Smaller PP was believed to be an abridgement. Demands for a “true” and more complete PP manuscript in the legendary “West” continued to grow.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For the most comprehensive, though somewhat outdated, survey of PP literature, see Conze 1978. Amongst Kumārajīva’s PP-related outputs are the Larger PP 大品般若, the Smaller PP 小品般若, the Diamond Sūtra (*Vajracchedikā-prajñāpāramitā*) 金剛般若經, the Heart Sūtra 般若波羅蜜多心經 (*Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdayam*) and the Commentary to the Larger PP 大智度論 (*\*Prajñāpāramitopadeśa*) attributed to Nāgārjuna. Furthermore, the Mādhyamika treatises translated by Kumārajīva belong also to the PP system of thoughts.

<sup>2</sup> According to the Indian tradition as it was known to Kumārajīva through his translation of *\*Prajñāpāramitopadeśa* (*Daizhidu lun*), PP was preached by the Buddha himself in the second turning of the Dharma Wheel: 諸天聞般若, 大歡喜踊躍…作是言: 我等於閻浮提見第二法輪轉。《大智度論》卷65〈43 作實相品〉T(1509)25.517a. Modern scholars however see the PP as a key work of the Mahāyāna movement which emerged gradually out of the older Original Buddhism. Conze gave the date of “the elaboration of a basic text” of PP as “ca. 100 B.C. to 100 A.D.” (Conze 1978:1). The earliest fragments of PP manuscript to date belong to the first and fifth *parivarta*-s of the Gāndhārī *Aṣṭa* in the “Split-collection”, carbon-dated to 1st or early 2nd century (Falk 2009:7).

<sup>3</sup> The *Damingdu jing* 大明度經 was the first retranslation of the same text based on the same manuscript but in a more colloquial language, made by Zhi Qian 支謙 in 225 C.E. According to the *Chu sanzang jiji* 出三藏記集 (CSZJJ), at least three more translations of the Smaller PP, none of which extant, were made by Zhu Shufo 竺朔佛, Wei Shidu 衛士度 and Dharmarakṣa 竺法護.

<sup>4</sup> One should bear in mind that to the Chinese mind of 2nd or 3rd century C.E., the idea of the “West” was still somewhat nebulous despite Zhang Qian’s 張騫 renowned exploration of Central Asia in 2nd century B.C.E. Beyond the Jade Gate 玉門關 (near today’s Dunhuang), the entire landmass of Eurasia together with India was known as the *Xiyu* 西域 or the Western Region. The idea of a sacred text in the “West” had undoubtedly inspired dedicated Chinese Buddhist to seek out the true text as well as stimulated public imagination.

In 257 C.E., the Chinese monk Zhu Shixing 朱士行 obtained the Larger PP in Khotan, which was eventually partially translated by Dharmarakṣa as *Guangzan jing* 光讚經 in 286 C.E.<sup>5</sup> Five years later, in 291 C.E., the text was translated in its entirety by \*Mokṣala 無叉羅 as *Fangguang jing* 放光經, which was extremely well received and was widely preached by Chinese monks in the subsequent decades. *Fangguang jing*, more expansive in contents, was believed to be a more complete version of the shorter *Daoxing jing*, which was often criticized for its obscure, and by then archaic language.<sup>6</sup> The availability of the translations of the Larger PP together with the older Smaller PP translations in the early years of the 4<sup>th</sup> century offered the opportunity of comparative analyses.<sup>7</sup> In 382 C.E., a translation team consisting of Dharmapriya, Buddharakṣa and Zhu Fonian prepared a “critical edition” of the Larger PP through comparison of the Sanskrit manuscript with the two, by then most authoritative PP texts, viz., Lokakṣema’s *Daoxing* and Mokṣala’s *Fangguang*.<sup>8</sup> The result was essentially a retranslation of the parts which were found missing or different, together with notes on variations. Such meticulous philological works reflected the intense interest in these texts leading up to the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>9</sup> Yet the ultimate solution would be a complete retranslation of the two texts, a task which awaited Kumārajīva seventeen years later when he was brought to the capital of China in 402 C.E.<sup>10</sup>

### 1.2 Popularization and indigenization of Prajñāpāramitā thoughts

To fully appreciate the atmosphere of the Buddhist community in Chang’an before Kumārajīva’s arrival in 402 C.E., one should bear in mind that starting from the early 4<sup>th</sup> century, Chinese Buddhism underwent rapid indigenization through a process known as *geyi* 格義. Though often criticized as misconstruction of Buddhist ideas as a result of misleading translation, and that the discussion contained therein was driven by concerns of indigenous

<sup>5</sup> As Tang had noted, Dao’an insisted on recording all translations even if they were incomplete, which is the case of *Guangzan*, a partial translation of Larger PP of which Dao’an received a copy only years after he received *Fangguang* (Tang 1938:208-9).

<sup>6</sup> See Dao’an’s preface to the *Daoxing jing* in the CSZJJ. T(224)8.425a.

<sup>7</sup> As Zhi Daolin 支道林 did in his *Daxiaopin duibi yaochao* 大小品對比要抄. Only the Preface of this work by the author himself survived and was recorded in the CSZJJ. T(2145)55.55a.

<sup>8</sup> The traditional attribution of this edition, titled 摩訶鉢羅若波羅蜜經抄, to T226 has been disputed, see Kajiyoshi 1944:77-87; Yinshun 1981:602.

<sup>9</sup> For a comprehensive review of the Chinese translation of PP texts, especially those prior to Kumārajīva, see Kajiyoshi 1944:1-87, Yinshun 1981:591-619.

<sup>10</sup> Or more precisely, the priority would be given a more thorough translation of the Larger PP which was at any rate thought to be the basis of the Smaller PP. Kumārajīva did exactly just that or possibly at the request of his patron, and only 4 years after the retranslation the Larger PP was completed (in tandem with the translation of DZDL) did he begin on the retranslation of the Smaller PP at the request of prince Yao Hong 姚泓. CSZJJ T(2145)55.54c.

scholars of Dark Learning 玄學 rather than genuine Buddhist concerns,<sup>11</sup> *geyi* was nonetheless an important bridge that connected the Chinese intellectuals to the foreign religious philosophy. With respect to the PP, this transitional stage of indigenization was evinced by the emergence of the so-called Six Branches and Seven Schools 六家七宗 who proposed different interpretations of the philosophy of the PP.<sup>12</sup> As the Buddhist community continued to mature, *geyi* gradually phased out, and there was a greater desire to understand the original texts and what they truly meant, thus demanding a more sophisticated way of reading the texts. Amongst the most influential proponents of this idea was Dao'an 道安, who besides being a seminal figure in the history of Chinese Buddhism, was also a lifetime preacher of PP texts. Dao'an was remembered in particular for his observations through his long career working with the translations of PP texts, of the "five losses and three things ought not to be changed" 五失本三不易.<sup>13</sup> Up to the end of Dao'an's life (c. 385), there was a feeling within the Buddhist community that there was still much to be desired with regards to the Chinese translation of PP texts. Besides the lingering problems of *geyi*, the relation among the texts of different Buddhist schools was never clear to the early Chinese Buddhist, in particular, the position of Mahāyāna. In that regard, the obscure language of the early PP translations certainly did not help. Doctrinally speaking, many of Kumārajīva's translations have a clear Mahāyāna orientation, which laid the foundation as well as some of the subsequent development of Mahāyāna Buddhism in China.<sup>14</sup>

## 2.0 Kumārajīva and Prajñāpāramitā

According to his biography in Huijiao 慧皎's *Gaoseng zhuan* 高僧傳 (GSZ), Kumārajīva, who had an illustrious career as a learned monk and preacher prior to his arrival in China, was well trained in the Āgamas and Abhidharma during his stay at various monasteries in Kashmir and Kashgar. Sometime during his teenage years (c. 355-363 C.E.), Kumārajīva was converted to Mahāyāna after his encounter with the monk Sūryasoma, a prince of Shache 莎車.<sup>15</sup> Subsequently, he returned to his native Kucha 龜茲 and received his full

<sup>11</sup> Zhou 1990:255ff.

<sup>12</sup> On the doctrines of the various indigenous schools, see Tang 1938:229-277.

<sup>13</sup> For a long time, this set of observations noted in his preface to *Lokakṣema's Daoxing* was understood by both traditional Chinese and Western scholars as the "Five Losses and Three Difficulties". I have adopted Ōchō's suggestion that 易 should be interpreted verbally as "change" (Ōchō 1958:251; see discussion in Hurvitz/Link 1974:426) since it fits better to the context of the preface.

<sup>14</sup> One of the main contributions of Kumārajīva's translations from a doctrinal point of view is that for the first time, Chinese Buddhists saw the difference between the Mahāyāna and the Theravāda from the point of view of the former. Subsequently, Buddhist polemics no longer followed the indigenous paradigm of the Dark Learning but rather directly from the Buddhist perspective (Zhou 1990).

<sup>15</sup> *Shache* 莎車 was first mentioned in Han records and has been identified by scholars as Yarkhänd. Pelliot reconstructed *Shache* as \*Sāka/Sāka (Pelliot 1963:879).

ordination at the age of twenty. For some years, Kumārajīva stayed in Kucha and began his career as a preacher. It was during his twenty-six years' stay in his native land that a miraculous event concerning a manuscript of the Larger PP took place:

於是留住龜茲，止于新寺。後於寺側故宮中，初得放光經。始就披讀，魔來蔽文，唯見空牒。什 [3] 知魔所為，誓心踰固。魔去字顯，仍習誦之。復聞空中聲曰："汝是智人，何 [4] 用讀此？" 什曰："汝是小魔，宜時速去，我心如地，不可轉也！" 停住二年，廣誦大乘經論，洞其祕奧。龜茲王為造金師子座，以大秦錦褥鋪之，令什升而說法。

[After being prompted by his mother to preach in China prior to her departure to India, Kumārajīva ] rested in Kucha, staying at \**Navavihāra*. Later, inside a former palace next to the *vihāra*, he received *Fangguang jing* [i.e., the Larger PP] for the first time. As soon as he started reading it, the Māra concealed the text, causing him to see only a blank manuscript. Kumārajīva knowing that it was the doing of Māra, resolved to overcome the challenge. The letters appeared after Māra departed and he continued to study and recite it. [Some time later,] again he heard a voice from the sky saying, "You are a genius. Why would you need to read this?" Kumārajīva answered, "You petty Māra, begone without delay. My mind is imperturbable like the earth!" During his sojourn of two years, he extensively preached the Mahāyāna sūtras and commentaries, making their mysterious and profound meanings clear. The King of Kucha made a Lion's Seat in gold, covered with fine Roman textile and made him ascend on it to preach.<sup>16</sup>

With regard to the actual source of Kumārajīva's PP manuscripts, there is very little we can say for certain since they were apparently already in circulation

<sup>16</sup> While we do not doubt that the account given in GSZ was based on elements of historical veracity, Sengrui's CSZJJ offered us a slightly different reading:

於龜茲帛純王新寺得放光經。始披讀。魔來蔽文。唯見空牒。什知魔所為。誓心逾固。魔去字顯。仍習誦之。後於雀梨大寺讀大乘經。忽聞空中語曰。汝是智人。何以讀此。什曰。汝是小魔。宜時速去。我心如地。不可轉也。停住二年。

Sengrui's passage presented to us a number of key differences: Firstly, the passage preceding the miraculous event recounting Kumārajīva's mother's bidding to his son is missing; secondly, the miraculous event consists in fact of two parts which took place in two different places; thirdly, the laudatory passage following the miracles is also missing. Though CSZJJ and GSZ were composed roughly at the same time in early 6th century, considering Huijiao was still in his twenties when he worked on GSZ while Sengyou was fifty two years older than the former, GSZ is likely the one to have borrowed its materials from CSZJJ. As CSZJJ was a work concerning translations and their translators while GSZ focused on the monks as eminent figures, it is understandable that GSZ would want to highlight to its readers the remarkable events concerning the individual. If this was indeed the case, GSZ had very likely deliberately conflated the events presented in CSZJJ and turned them into a dramatic series of interconnected events, showing the connection between Kumārajīva, PP and the arrival of both into China. In connection with Kumārajīva, it may also be noted that miracles were associated not only with the Larger PP, but also the Smaller PP (T2145.55.54c; Chen2001:51). For further remarks on the difference between the two narratives, see Lu 2004:18-21.

in Central Asia in the early 2<sup>nd</sup> century C.E., particularly in places like Khotan where Mahāyāna Buddhism flourished as a new religious movement.<sup>17</sup> From a textual point of view, of great interest and importance was Kumārajīva's translation of \**Mahā Prajñāpāramitāopadeśa*/ *Daizhidulun* 大智度論 (DZDL), a commentary to the Larger PP attributed to Nāgārjuna. According to Sengrui and also an anonymous postscript in the tenth fascicle of CSZJJ, the hundred fascicles of Kumārajīva's translation of DZDL amounted only to less than a tenth of original of 100,000 *śloka*s.<sup>18</sup> The extensiveness of this commentary suggested a strong tradition of PP scholarship up to 4<sup>th</sup> century C.E. in India.<sup>19</sup>

### 3.0 Kumārajīva's translation of Prajñāpāramitā Texts

On 8<sup>th</sup> February, 402 C.E., through the arrangement of Yao Xing 姚興, the Later Qin King, Kumārajīva arrived in Ch'ang-an, after having been captured by Lü Guang 呂光 almost twenty years earlier when Fu Jian 苻堅 attacked Kucha. Kumārajīva was in his late fifties then and was almost immediately sent to work as the chief translator at Ximingge 西明閣 of Xiaoyaoyuan 逍遙園 in the capital Chang'an. Kumārajīva examined the existing Chinese translations of various Buddhist texts against the Sanskrit texts he had access to. The result was that many discrepancies were found and new translations were deemed urgently needed.

During the first year of his stay in Ch'ang-an, Kumārajīva was apparently still improving his Chinese.<sup>20</sup> As much as he wanted to be engaged in the translation of more challenging works, he completed only a handful of shorter texts, including *Zuochan sanmei jing* 坐禪三昧經<sup>21</sup>, *Amituo jing* 阿彌陀經<sup>22</sup> and *Xianjie*

<sup>17</sup> As pointed out earlier, Khotan was where Zhu Shixing found a copy Larger PP. For the development of Mahāyāna in Central Asia, see Hirakawa 699-704.

<sup>18</sup> See Sengrui's preface to DZDL. T(2145)55.74c. For a detailed studies on this preface as well as its background, see Shih 1980.

<sup>19</sup> Amongst the most widely accepted theory concerning the authorship of DZDL was Lamotte's claim - "D'après les indications fournies par l'auteur, il semble avoir exercé son activité au début du IV<sup>e</sup> siècle de notre ère, dans le Nord-Ouest de l'Inde... en égard à son époque et aux sources qu'il utilise, il semble que l'auteur du *Traité* fut un sarvāstivādin acquis peut-être tardivement au Mahāyāna." (Lamotte 1970:IX-XIV). For an alternative view which disputed the concept of authorship and suggested to approach the issue as a "historical event", see Chou 2004.

<sup>20</sup> Sengzhao's 僧肇 account of Kumārajīva's Śataśāstra suggested that an earlier translation (402 C.E. or before) was deemed unsatisfactory due to his lack of mastery of Chinese, but by 404 C.E. Kumārajīva and his team were able to revise the text to make satisfactory T(2145)55.77b. The account suggested the rapid improvement of Kumārajīva's Chinese and/or the proficiency of his translation team. See also Jizang's 吉藏 account T(1827)236a.

<sup>21</sup> In three fascicles by \*Saṅgharakṣa. According to LDSBJ, Kumārajīva's translation was completed on the 5th day of the 1st month of Hongshi 弘始 (402 C.E.) - T(2034)49.78a.

<sup>22</sup> \**Sukhāvatī-āmṛta-vyūha-sāstra*, also known as *Wuliangshou jing* 無量壽經 in one fascicle. According to LDSBJ, it was translated by Kumārajīva on the 8th day of the 2nd month of Hongshi 弘始 (402 C.E.) and was thought to be the same text as translated by Saṅghavarman in the 4th year of Jiaping 嘉平 252 - T(2034)49.78a.

*jing* (\**Bhadrakalpasamādhi-sūtra*) 賢劫經<sup>23</sup>, before he started translating the monumental DZDL of a hundred fascicles in the summer of the same year. The translation lasted three and a half years and was completed toward the end of 405 C.E. Shortly after the translation of DZDL began, Kumārajīva started translating the Larger PP (403-404 C.E.) concurrently, revising it against DZDL in tandem. During all this time, Kumārajīva was engaged in the translation of other texts as well, most notably the Sarvastivāda vinaya and Āryadeva's Śataśāstra (402/404 C.E.). After completion of the content of DZDL and the Larger PP, Kumārajīva translated a number of shorter, but important sūtras, namely the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* 維摩所說經 of three fascicles and the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* 法華蓮花經 of eight fascicles. He then made a revision of the meditation text *Zuochan sanmei jing* before he spent about three months in 408 C.E. retranslating the Smaller PP. According to CSZJJ, Kumārajīva completed in total the translation of thirty-five titles, amounting to 294 fascicles, almost half of which were the PP or related commentaries.

Year (C.E.)	Title	No. of fascs.	Translation (months)	Revision (months)	Team members
402/404	百論 Śataśāstra	2			
402-405	大智度論 DZDL	100	42		c. 500
403-404	大品般若 Larger PP	24	8	4	c. 500
408	小品般若 Smaller PP	8	3		? <sup>24</sup>
409	十二門論 Dvādaśamukha-Śāstra	1			
409	中論 Mūlamādhyamaka - kārīkā	1			
40?	金剛般若 Vajr. PP	1	?		

Kumārajīva's translation of PP texts and other Mādhyamika commentaries

One should bear in mind that PP was, by far, not Kumārajīva's only specialization as demonstrated by the great variety of texts he had translated, encompassing the entire range of Buddhist literature - śāstra, vinaya and

<sup>23</sup> First translated by Dharmarakṣa as *Xianjie jing* 賢劫經 in seven fascicles in the 1st year of Yuankang 元康 (300 C.E.) - T(2145)55.7b. According to LDSBJ, the Kumārajīva's retranslation of *Yanjie jing* in ten fascicles was completed on the 5th day of the 3rd month of 4th year of Hongshi 弘始 (402 C.E.) - T(2034)49.40a. By the time of Sengyou (c.510 C.E.), this retranslation, which was marked as having only seven fascicles, was no longer extant - T(2145)55.10c.

<sup>24</sup> One may expect the translation team of these smaller works be significantly reduced. In 406 C.E., Kumārajīva moved from Xiaoyaoyuan to Dasi to continue his translation work. In that year, according to Sengrui's account the Lotus Sūtra was translated with the help of General Yao Song 姚嵩 and preached to over 800 monks.



commentarial works.<sup>25</sup> Nonetheless, PP-related texts did occupy a significant place in Kumārajīva's career as a translation, in terms of time spent on the translation as well as actual output. In particular, DZDL and the translation of the Larger PP might be considered Kumārajīva's first major achievement as a translator. His retranslations of the PP-texts were seen as a solution to long-standing textual problems of the Larger vs. Smaller PP. Perhaps even more importantly, his translation of the commentarial works including DZDL<sup>26</sup> as well as Śataśāstra, *Dvādaśamukhaśāstra* and *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* were seen as important contributions to what was believed to be the true understanding of Mahāyāna philosophies.<sup>27</sup> Bearing this in mind, as far as the technical side of these new translations were concerned, Kumārajīva's main objective was to bring out what he believed to be the intended meanings of the original text through careful reading, which contrasted with the more literally minded Xuanzang two centuries later. But more important, as pointed out earlier, the translation of these PP and Mādhyamika texts was part of Kumārajīva's effort to establish "true" Mahāyāna Buddhism in China through "correct" translations.

#### 4.0 Characteristics of Kumārajīva's translations

Given the historical background of the translation of PP texts in China prior to the arrival of Kumārajīva, it is not surprising to see that both King Yao Xing and the Chinese Buddhist community in the early 5th century had very high expectations of Kumārajīva's retranslations, together with the new translation of works such as the Mādhyamika commentaries. Yao Xing supported a large team of scholarly monastics during Kumārajīva's sojourn in Ch'ang-an, as King Fu Jian did during the time of Dao'an, heralding a new age of state-sponsored translation.<sup>28</sup> The scale of Kumārajīva's translation team was however unprecedented, with over five hundred monks collaborating on the translation of DZDL alone. As a result, the final products of some of the best minds and most educated elites in Ch'ang-an were of much higher quality in various aspects than the earlier works, which were expected then to be replaced.

<sup>25</sup> In fact as Kamata has pointed out, Kumārajīva's translations gave access to the Chinese Buddhists for the first time the comprehensive outlook of the Tripiṭaka - sūtra, vinaya and abhidharma (Kamata 2004: 35).

<sup>26</sup> As Chou pointed out, "the exposition of the DZDL put the Chinese Buddhists' groping for the meaning of *prajñāpāramitā* to an end. Whatever later Chinese Buddhists were baffled about what the mind in the enlightened state is like, they just read the DZDL. The DZDL became the solely authoritative work to answer this religiously ultimate question in Chinese Buddhism." (Chou 2004:326).

<sup>27</sup> Before all the Mādhyamika commentaries were translated into Chinese, we have an account of Jizang 吉藏 that in 405 C.E., an Indian Kṣatriya 剎利 arrived in Ch'ang-an through the sea route, examined Kumārajīva's understanding of Mahāyāna doctrines utilizing Śataśāstra and Mūlamadhyamakakārikā, and was thoroughly impressed. According to the account, these two commentarial works were extremely important to Kumārajīva 何故羅什如朗月之照無所愧? 以其善解中百故. T(1824)42.4c.

<sup>28</sup> T'ang 1938:219-227; Zürcher 1972:200-204; Hurvitz/Link 1974:407.

To examine the characteristics of Kumārajīva's translation of PP texts, I would like to follow the tripartite standard of translation, viz., 1) Faithfulness 信; 2) Intelligibility 達; 3) Style 雅.<sup>29</sup>

#### 4.1 Faithfulness

A large part of what motivated the retranslation of PP texts during Kumārajīva's time was the inadequacy deemed of the earlier translations. Other attempts at retranslating the Larger and Smaller PP texts were made but were either considered unsuccessful or unable to reach a wide audience and subsequently became lost. Decades before Kumārajīva's arrival in Ch'ang-an, as summarized by his view of the "five losses and three changes-ought-not-be", Dao'an's advice to his disciples concerning the need for better and more accurate translations was undoubtedly a response to not only Dao'an's personal conviction, but also to the demands of a growingly sophisticated audience.<sup>30</sup> At any rate, the conditions where these new translations were produced were by far more favorable than before. To start with, Kumārajīva himself had an excellent training in Buddhist texts of different schools and even non-Buddhist texts in Sanskrit. Secondly, Kumārajīva was able to make use of the extensive commentary of DZDL to verify and edit the content of the Larger PP, which in turn served as a basis to his later translation of the Smaller PP. Thirdly, with a large team of collaborators who served to cross check the translations against the old ones, Kumārajīva strived to clear all possible doubts which might arise from discrepancies with either the Indic original or the earlier translation. Thus, according to Sengrui, his disciple:

法師手執[1]胡本。口宣秦言。兩釋異音。交辯文旨。秦王躬[2]覽舊經。驗其得失。諮其通途。坦其宗致。與諸宿舊義業沙門釋慧恭、僧晁、僧遷、寶度、慧精、法欽、道流、僧叡、道恢、道[3]標、道恒、道暉等五百餘人。詳其義旨。審其文中。然後書之。(CSZJJ)

[1]胡K: 梵YM [2]覽SYM: 攬K [3]標T: 標K

The Dhrama Master [Kumārajīva] with the Indic text held in his hand, spoke in Chinese. Going back and forth between the two languages, he examined the meaning of the text. The King of Qin [Yao Xing] read the old [translation of the] sūtra to determine its merits and demerits. By inquiring its way of interpretation, its meanings were made plain. Together with over five hundred people, including those senior śramaṇa -s who were experienced with doctrinal matters, such as Shi Huigong, Senglue, Sengqian, Baodu, Huijing, Faqin, Daoliu, Sengrui, Daohui, Daobiao, Daoheng, Daozong, [Kumārajīva]

<sup>29</sup> Though considered by many as cliché amongst Chinese scholars, the three difficulties in translation (譯事三難) proposed by Yan Fu 嚴復 (1854-1921) in the preface of his Chinese translation of *Evolution and Ethics* in fact overlaps with the concerns of Dao'an and Kumārajīva without the specific religious ones.

<sup>30</sup> See Hurvitz/Link 1974:427-30.

thoroughly examined its meaning according to the text before committing it into writing.

While a detailed comparison of Kumārajīva's translations and the older ones or the extant Sanskrit versions would be beyond the scope of this paper, suffice it to say that from a text-critical point of view, these different translations should not be construed as similar. For both the Larger and Smaller PP, chaptering and even the contents of Kumārajīva's translations and the earlier ones reveal significant differences, suggesting that the exemplars they were based on were not the same to start with.<sup>31</sup> Earlier in 382 C.E. Dharmapriya's translation team had no doubt noted the problem of textual discrepancies and took the more scientific approach of separating out minor variants (wordings) from the major variants (passages);<sup>32</sup> Kumārajīva on the other hand took a bolder approach, presented what he believed to be correct and judged the works of his predecessors as inaccurate, or in some cases, simply as wrong.

At any rate, the Indic PP texts in Kumārajīva's possession were taken as definitive, as his treatment on the discrepancies in chaptering would indicate:

[1]胡本唯序品、阿鞞跋致品、[2]魔事品有名。餘者直第其[3]事數而已。法師以名非佛制。唯存序品。略其二目。(CSZJJ)

[1]胡K: 梵YM [2]魔事K: 魔T: 事SYM [3]事K: 品SQYM

In the Indic text, only the prefatory chapter, the chapter of *Avaivartika* and the chapter of *Māra* contain the name [of the chapter], while the rest gave its chapter number only.<sup>33</sup> Dharma Master [Kumārajīva] believed that the names were not given by the Buddha, therefore beside the title of the prefatory chapter which he kept, the other two titles were eliminated.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>31</sup> In the case of the last three chapters of the Smaller PP, viz., the story of Sadāprarudita and Dharmodgata, as Lancaster noted, a significant different plotline was presented in Lokakṣema/Zhi Qians' translation, which differed from all subsequent translations (Lancaster 1968:220). In the Appendix sample (2), one can see the description of *dhyāna* varies from the fourth and the third in the Chinese translation, while the Sanskrit recension, clearly the latest one, gives the reading of the first (*prathama*). Kumārajīva obviously had not taken into consideration the possibility of such textual development.

<sup>32</sup> Commenting on a certain abridged (re)translation of PP by Dharmapriya et al, Dao'an wrote, "...as for the parts whose meanings diverged, not knowing which one is correct, both were kept in parallel against each other, with notes frequently made underneath. This amounted to four fascicles. In case when there are differences of one sheet [or] two sheets, [such passages] were translated separately as one fascicle, totaling thus in five fascicles." ... 其義異不知孰是者, [1]輒併而兩存之, [2]往往為訓其下。凡四卷。其[3]一紙二紙異者, 出別為一卷。T55(2145).52b. [1]輒KJ: 輒Q(T)(TZ) [2]往往Q(T)(TZ): 往往KJ [3]一紙二紙異者出別為一卷SZQYM(TZ): 一紙二異者出別為一卷K1: 一經JK2(T)

<sup>33</sup> Amongst the PP mss. extant which belong to the Large PP system, there is none which contains heading titles for each chapter. Conze reconstructed the headings based on Tibetan translation (Conze 1978:41-45).

<sup>34</sup> In the current Chinese canon, however, heading titles are given to each chapter, which according to this description, could only be a later addition.

Given our knowledge of the Indic PP texts, the textual variants contained in Kumārajīva's manuscripts must be considerable, as shown by the fact that Kumārajīva himself found it necessary to modify his translation of the Larger PP on the basis of the commentary DZDL.<sup>35</sup>

## 4.2 Intelligibility

One of the greatest criticism Dao'an directed toward the older translations, *Daoxing* and *Guangzan*, was their awkward phrasing and obscure choice of words. Kumārajīva was undoubtedly trained in traditional Indian linguistics and was thus made aware of the importance of the unity of word (*śabda*) and meaning (*artha*). His concern with faithfulness was nonetheless predicated upon this belief in word-meaning unity and that the ultimate acid test being the intelligibility of the final product:

其事數之名與舊不同者。皆是法師以義正之者也。如陰入持等。名與義乖。故隨義改之。陰為眾。入為處。持為性。解脫為背捨。[1]陰入為勝處。意止為念處。意斷為正勤。覺意為菩提。直行為聖道。諸如此比。改之甚眾。[2]胡音失者。正之以天竺。秦[3]名謬者。定之以字義。不可變者。即而書之。是以異名斌然。[2]胡音殆半。斯實匠者之公謹。筆受之重慎也。(CSZJJ)

[1]陰入K: 除入T [2]胡K: 梵YM [3]名KT: 言SYM

As for doctrinal and numerical items which did not match the older version<sup>36</sup>, all were corrected by the Dharma Master based on their [true] meanings. For example, for terms such as *yin* 陰, *ru* 入, and *chi* 持, where words and meanings diverged from each other, they were amended based on the meaning. *Yin* 陰 became *zhong* 眾 (*skandha*); *ru* 入 became *chu* 處 (*āyatana*); *chi* 持 became *xing* 性; *jietuo* 解脫 became *beishe* 背捨 (*vimokṣa*); *yinru* 陰入 became *shengchu* 勝處 (*abhibhvāyatana*);<sup>37</sup> *nianzhi* became *nianchu* 念處 (*smṛtyupasthāna*); *yiduan* 意斷 became *zhengqin* 正勤 (*samyagvyāyāma*); *jueyi* 覺意 became *puti* 菩提 (*bodhi*); *zhixing* 直行 became *shengdao* 聖道 (*āryamārga*). Besides these, there were many such changes. When the [correct] Indic sound was lost [in the translation], one corrected it with the correct Indian [sound]; when the Chinese word was

<sup>35</sup> Though the text was roughly settled, when it was examined with the commentary, there were still places requiring improvement. Therefore, as one translated the commentary, one corrected [the translation of the sūtra] at the same time (CSZJJ). 文雖粗定。以釋論檢之。猶多不盡。是以隨出其論。隨而正之。 Given the above example, however, it is conceivable that there are considerable amount of variants among even the source texts.

<sup>36</sup> I took *shishu* 事數 as expressing two concepts, namely, doctrinal items and numerical items.

<sup>37</sup> The Taishō reading *churu* 除入 is not found in either *Guangzan* or *Fangguang*. On the other hand, *yinru* 陰入 is noted in *Guangzan*: 倚著諸種諸陰入 T(222)8.174a. The here does not however agree with Kumārajīva's translation of *abhibhvāyatana* as *shengchu* 勝處 as in "eight controls of perceptions". The only item associated with eight in the list of dharma in *Guangzan* and *Fangguang* were *youxing* 由行/*daoxing* 道行 and 正行/賢聖八品道 respectively which are the translations of *aṣṭamakamārga*. As far as I can tell, *abhibhvāyatana* was either not translated or not found in the manuscript which *Guangzan* and *Fangguang* were based on. Sengrui's understanding could therefore possibly be incorrect.

wrong, one corrected it with the [actual] meaning of the word. Those which could not be changed were written out [as it sounded]. Therefore new words appeared in great number, over half of which were of Indic phonetic origin. That was in fact due to the strictness of the craftsman and the consideration of the scribe.

The examples given in Sengyou's Preface illustrated Kumārajīva's organic approach toward intelligible translation delivering the intended meaning: *yi* 義. Therefore, while a word like *skandha* (lit., "sheath") being translated as *yin* 陰 ("shade", "hidden") in the older translations should not be considered wrong, for Kumārajīva, *zhong* 眾 ("collection", "aggregate") accorded better to the doctrinal interpretation. In the case of proper names, phonetic transcriptions were chosen for *ānanda*, *Gaṅgadeva*, *Akṣobhya*, while translation was given to *Suvarṇapuṣpa*.<sup>38</sup> As for technical terms, phonetic transcription was given to *anuttarā samyaksambodhi*, while literal translation was preferred in the case of *āryamārga*. These examples reveal that Kumārajīva did not have a single strategy to achieve his goal of intelligibility; instead he carefully evaluated his choice of words on a case-by-case basis as any translator would do under the best circumstances.<sup>39</sup>

### 4.3 Style

With a highly qualified translation team supporting Kumārajīva's work, his translations strove to be not only faithful and intelligible representation of Buddha's words, but also products of literary merit. Given the highly affected formalism (e.g., *pianli* 駢儷) which dominated the literary world during Kumārajīva's time,<sup>40</sup> his translation free of stylistic verbiage must have been perceived as a major innovation.<sup>41</sup> As the main purpose of religious texts in a foreign land is to proselytize and is therefore functional, the main criterion for the success of Kumārajīva's translations is their intelligibility. Prior to Kumārajīva, Dao'an in his observation of "five losses", had noted that Chinese translations turned the prosaicness of the Indic text into something elaborate,

<sup>38</sup> Appendix sample (1).

<sup>39</sup> Critics would naturally say that Kumārajīva's style is inconsistent. Thus, Xuanzang over two hundred sixty years later would choose a more literal approach, placing more emphasis on form than to meaning.

<sup>40</sup> *Pianli* is a style which pairs up sentences which show near-symmetry in terms of content and parts of speech. Hu Shih described the style as the most "superficial, unnatural and incorrect style" ever created in Chinese literature. As it was impossible for translated literature to fit in such literary mold, these new works had no choice but to adapt a freer form (Hu 1927:229).

<sup>41</sup> For discussion of the impact of Kumārajīva's impact to Chinese colloquial literature, see Hu 1988:229-243.

resulting in some inevitable "loss".<sup>42</sup> Kumārajīva was aware of his limitation<sup>43</sup> and took a pragmatic approach by striking a balance between literality and artistry.<sup>44</sup>

At any rate, the translation was a collaborative effort<sup>45</sup> and the final products, in particular, his translation of the PP texts turned out to be highly successful due to their stylistic traits.<sup>46</sup> Despite the prosaicness of these translations, they were readily received by the Chinese readers for a number of reasons as pointed out by earlier scholars including Chen Yinke, Hu Shih and Jin Kemu. First, the largely dialogical framework adopted by the PP texts was analogous to didactic works like Analects and Mencius which had a long tradition in China. Secondly, it reminded the Chinese audience of a form of dramatic prose known as *fu* 賦 which the literate Chinese were already familiar with.<sup>47</sup> Such works contained distinct elements such as characters, dialogues, setting and a plot, dramatic elements not unlike the PP texts. In particular, this literary form contained a lot of repetition as narrative effects, a noteworthy trait of Mahāyāna literature in general as well. Finally, the content of Mahāyāna texts themselves was fascinating to the Chinese readers - drama filled with witty dialogues interspersed with miraculous episodes. Thus, with literary prototypes to model upon and contents which captivated the imagination of

<sup>42</sup> "Secondly, the Indic sūtra has preference over prosaicness while Chinese prefers an elaborated style." 二者胡經尚質。秦人好文。傳可眾心。非文不合。斯二失本也。An example would be Zhi Qian's *Damingdu jing*, which is essentially a retranslation of Lokakṣema's *Daoxing* using the same manuscript but with a new literary language.

<sup>43</sup> Thus in CSZJJ, Kumārajīva described translation as "chewing up rice to offer to others, which lost not only its original flavor but also induced disgust." 但改梵為秦，失其藻蔚，雖得大意，殊隔文體。有似嚼飯與人，非徒失味，乃令歐穢也。T(2145)55.101c.

<sup>44</sup> The balance between the two styles are well known in Chinese literature as noted in the Analects 質勝文則野，文勝質則史《論語·雍也》. In a well known anecdote in GSZ, Kumārajīva once commented Dharmarakṣa's translation of a passage in the Lotus Sūtra as too literal and approved Sengrui's proposal of a more eloquent expression 昔竺法護出《正法華經·受決品》云：“天見人，人見天”。什譯經至此，乃言：“此語與西域義同，但在言過質。”叡曰：“將非人天交接，兩得相見。”什喜曰：“實然，其領悟標出，皆此類也。”T(2059)50.364b. Though the alleged passage was not attested in the extant translation of Dharmarakṣa, it nonetheless reflected the attitude of Kumārajīva and his disciples concerning style (see Hu 1928:242 and also comments in Yoshigawa/Funayama 2009-10 II:284 fn2).

<sup>45</sup> From various passages, Sengrui appeared to be one of the main embellishers of Kumārajīva's translation (See T(2145)55.101c; T(2059)50.364b). The large assembly of monks, as many as five hundred during the translation of DZDL and the Larger PP, must have played an important role as well. The lack of division of labor and a clear workflow resulted however in various pre-approved versions of the Greater PP "leaking out" before the final proofreading took place - T(2145)55.53b.

<sup>46</sup> One may detect a somewhat apologetic tone of Sengrui in his preface to Kumārajīva's Larger PP in CSZJJ - "We hope that the wise [readers] who believed in faithfulness toward the original text would evaluate carefully to realize its [true meaning] and not to be misled at the prosaicness of the translation, or to become annoyed by the textual variations and become intimidated." 幸冀遵實崇本之賢，[1]推而體之，不以文揆見咎，煩異見[2]慎也。[1]推Z(T)：推K [2]慎KZ：情SYM - T2145.55.52c.

<sup>47</sup> *Fu* emerged during the late Warring State Period (3rd century B.C.E.) and continued to be developed throughout the Three Kingdom Period (3rd century C.E.) An example of works quoted by Prof. Jin Kemu included Song Yu's 宋玉 Gaotang fu 《高唐賦》，Sima Xiangru's 司馬相如 Zixu fu 《子虛賦》，Mei Cheng's 枚乘 Qifa 《七發》 and Cao Zhi's 曹植 Luoshen fu 《洛神賦》(Jin 1982:134).

the audience, Kumārajīva's new translations must have struck the audience at that time as something both new and strangely familiar. Unremarkable as they are in the vast world of Indian narrative literature, the translations of Mahāyāna texts, especially those of Kumārajīva's, opened up a new genre in Chinese literature characterized by romantic fantasy, dramatic plots and dialogue and elegant prose - a genre which continued to thrive throughout the subsequent ages, harking back constantly to their foreign prototypes.<sup>48</sup>

### 5.0 Legacy and Influences

Due to the great fame and achievement of Kumārajīva, his translations had undoubtedly gained popularity even during his lifetime, and had spread through his disciples to the rest of China. A further thrust of the popularization of these works took place a century later when Emperor Liang (reigned 502-549 C.E.) converted practically his entire kingdom into Buddhism. Amongst the Mahāyāna texts which Emperor Liang preached personally was the PP, to which he wrote a lengthy preface. By the time of the T'ang Period, Kumārajīva's translation of Vajracchedikā PP had become widely popular among the Chinese gentry.<sup>49</sup> Like his predecessors, Xuanzang found discrepancies between the older translations and the latest Sanskrit manuscripts he brought with him from India and justified to the emperor of the time the need for retranslation.<sup>50</sup> Despite Xuanzang and his contemporaries having the opinion that Kumārajīva sacrificed accuracy for the sake of style, Xuanzang's retranslations never superseded Kumārajīva's with the sole exception of his retranslation of the Heart Sūtra which remains probably the only widely known translation of Xuanzang.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. classical fantastic works such as *Liexian zhuan* 《列仙傳》, *Xiyou ji* 《西遊記》 and *Fengsehn zhuan* 《封神傳》 (Hu 1928:248).

<sup>49</sup> The traditional account of Huineng the Sixth Patriarch of Chan attaining Enlightenment through hearing Kumārajīva's translation of the Vajracchedikā-PP attests to the popularity as well as sanctity attributed to his works.

<sup>50</sup> Xuanzang's criticism toward Kumārajīva's translation of the Vajracchedikā PP as noted in his biography *Datang daci'ensi sajang fashi zhuan* 大唐大慈恩寺三藏法師傳 is mainly toward the missing words/phrases. Emperor Tai's criticism of "distortion of meaning through embellishment" is also of interest and such sentiment was also echoed in other supporter of Xuanzang's new translation (See next note). 帝又問：《金剛般若經》一切諸佛之所從生，聞而不謬，功逾身命之施，非恒沙珍寶所及。加以理微言約，故賢達君子多愛受持，未知先代所翻，文義具不？法師對曰：此經功德實如聖旨，西方之人咸同愛敬。今觀舊經，亦微有遺漏。據梵本具云『能斷金剛般若』，舊經直云『金剛般若』。欲明菩薩以分別為煩惱，而分別之惑，堅類金剛，唯此經所詮無分別慧，乃能除斷，故曰『能斷金剛般若』，故知舊經失上二字。又如下文，三問闕一，二頌闕一，九喻闕三，如是等。什法師所翻舍衛國也，留支所翻婆伽婆者，少可。帝曰：師既有梵本，可更委翻，使眾生聞之具足。然經本貴理，不必須飾文而乖義也。故今新翻《能斷金剛般若》，委依梵本。奏之，帝甚悅。T50(2053)259a. Xuanze 玄則 in his preface to the second division of Xuanzang's "Great PP of sixteen parts" made the following comparisons between the three versions of the Greater PP: "Though [Kumārajīva's] *Greater* [PP] when compared to [\*Dharmarakṣa's] *Guangzan* [jing, may be considered] as much more beautiful as enriched by great degrees in terms of diction然《大品》之於《光讚》，詞倍豐而加美，即明此分之於《大品》，文益具而彌正，攢輝校寶，豈不盛歟。T(220)7.220.1a

After Kumārajīva had passed away, his three thousand disciples, including Sengzhao 僧肇 and others continued to preach Mādhyamaka philosophies based on Kumārajīva's translation of PP texts and commentaries. Subsequent to the political turmoil toward the end of the Six Dynasty Period, Mādhyamaka teachings continued to spread throughout China and in the Sui Dynasty, the School of Three Treatises 三論宗 was founded by 吉藏 (549-623 C.E.) with the support of various emperors. The school continued to grow throughout the T'ang Dynasty until Emperor Wu's destruction of Buddhism (841-846 C.E.). Nonetheless, Kumārajīva's translations became firmly established as part of the tradition, absorbed into all indigenous Buddhist schools including Tiantai, Pure Land and Ch'an.

### Conclusion

Though Kumārajīva's contribution to Chinese Buddhism was multifaceted and the Buddhist texts he brought to China were of a great variety, ranging from sūtra to vinaya, and from dhyāna-texts to abhidharma, PP and Mādhyamika texts held a special position in terms of his personal history, his career as a translator, as well as a legacy to Chinese Buddhism and society. The large success of Kumārajīva's translation of PP texts was closely connected to the development of Chinese Buddhism when new translations of PP texts and a more refined hermeneutical language were urgently sought after by the increasingly sophisticated Chinese converts and gentry audience. With royal patronage, Kumārajīva and his large team of collaborators produced some of the finest prose translations of his time, half of which turned out to be PP-related texts and Mādhyamika commentaries.

From a more personal point of view, Kumārajīva from a very early age took a keen interest in Mādhyamika commentaries as a basis of his Mahāyāna faith and philosophy. The miraculous incident associated with Larger PP and not other texts during Kumārajīva's earlier years in Kucha, though somewhat exaggerated in the hands of Chinese writers, pointed nonetheless to his close relationship with the PP. Kumārajīva's new translations, done in an innovative, colloquial yet artistic style, were well received by the Chinese readers and remained unrivalled by the subsequent retranslations. These texts were subsequently absorbed into all schools of Chinese Buddhism in the following 1500 years and became part of not only Chinese Buddhist tradition, but also the wider Chinese literary tradition whose impact continues to be felt.



ABBREVIATIONS

AP	Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā
AdP	Aṣṭadaśasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā
CSZJJ	<i>Chusanrang jiji</i> 《出三藏記集》 by Sengyou 僧祐 (T2145). Early 6 <sup>th</sup> c. (51? C.E.)
DDJ	<i>Daodejing</i> 《道德經》
DZDL	<i>Daizhidulun</i> 《大智度論》 attributed to Nāgārjuna, trans. by Kumārajīva (T1509)
GSZ	<i>Gaosengzhuan</i> 《高僧傳》 by Huijiao 慧皎 (T2059). Early 6 <sup>th</sup> c. (519 C.E.+)
KYK	Kokuyaku issaikyō 国訳一切經
KYSJL	<i>Kaiyuan shijiao lu</i> 《開元釋教錄》 by Zhisheng 智昇 (T2154). 730 C.E.
LDSBJ	<i>Lidai sanbao ji</i> 《歷代三寶記》 by Fei Changfang 費長房 (T2034). 597 C.E.
PP	Prajñāpāramitā
T	Taishō shinshū daizōōkyō ō 大正新脩大藏經
X	Wanxuzang 讖藏
XGSZ	<i>Xu gaosengzhuan</i> 《續高僧傳》 by Daoxuan 道宣 (T2060). Mid 7 <sup>th</sup> c. (645 C.E.+)
Z	Zürcher (see below)
ZZML	<i>Zhongjing mulu</i> 《眾經目錄》 by Fajing et al. 法經等 (T2146). 594 C.E.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Chen Yinke 陈寅恪. 2001. *Chen Yinke ji - dushu zhaji sanji* 陈寅恪集-读书札记三集. Beijing: Sanlian shudian.

Chou Po-kan. 2004. "The Problem of the Authorship of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa*: A Re-examination." 臺大歷史學報 34:281-327.

Conze, Edward. 1978. *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature*. Tokyo: Reiyukai.

Falk, Harry. 2009. *The 'Split' Collection of Kharoṣṭhī Texts*. Unpublished manuscript.

Harrison, Paul. 1993. "The Earliest Chinese Translations of Mahāyāna Buddhist Sūtras: some notes on the works of Lokakṣema." *Buddhist Studies Review* 10 (2): 135-177.

Hikata Ryusho. 1958. *Suvikrāntavikrāmi-pariprcchā-Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*. Fukuoka: Kyushu University.

Hirakawa Akira 平川彰. 1978. *Daijō bukyōōto-wa nani ka* 大乘佛教とは何か. Tokyo: Shunjāsha.

Hu Shih 胡適. 1928. *Baihua wenxue shi* 白話文學史. Shanghai: Xinyue shudian. Reprinted in *Hushi xueshu wenji* 胡适学术文集. 1988. 129-396. Beijing: Zhonghua shudian.

Hurvitz, Leon and Arthur E Link. 1974. "Three Prajñāpāramitā Prefaces of Tao-An." In *Mlanges de Sinologie offerts ... Monsieur Paul Demiéville*, vol. 2. Bibliothèque de L'Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises volume XX. Paris. 403-470.

Jin Kemu. 1982. "Zenyang du hanyi fojing - luejie Jiumoluoshi jiantan wenti" 怎样读汉译佛典——略介鸠摩罗什兼谈文体." *Dushu* 读书 2:127-135.

Kajiyoshi Kōun 梶芳光運. 1944. *Genshi hannnyakyō no kenkyū* 原始般若經の研究. Tokyo: Sankibō.

Kamata Shigeo 鎌田茂雄. 1994. *Jiumoluoshi dui dongyafojiaoshi de yingxiang* "鸠摩罗什对东亚佛教史的影响." Trans. by Liu Jian 刘建. 《世界宗教研究》第二期. 第五次中日佛教学术会议专辑.

Karashima Seishi. 2010. *A Glossary of Lokakṣema's Translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.

Lancaster, Lewis. 1968. *An Analysis of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā from the Chinese Translations*. PhD Thesis. Wisconsin University.

Lamotte, Étienne. 1970. *Le Traité, de La Grande Vertu de Sagesse, Tome III*. Louvain: Institut Orientaliste.

Lu, Yang. 2004. "Narrative and Historicity in the Buddhist Biographies of Early Medieval China: The Case of Kumārajīva ." *Asia Major (Third Series)* 17 (2): 1-43.

Lu Yang 陸揚. 2005. "Jiedu Jiumoluoshi: Jietan Zhongguo zhongguzongqi de fojiao wenhua yu shixue" 解讀《鳩摩羅什》：兼談中國中古早期的佛教文化與史學." *China Scholarship* [Zhongguo Xueshu] 中國學術 6 (3).

Nakajima Ryūzōō 中嶋隆藏. 1997. *Shutsusanzōki Shū Jōkan Yakuchū* 出三藏記集序卷訳注. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten.

Ōchō Enichi, 横超慧日. 1958. *Chūkoku bukyōō shoki no honyakuron* "中国仏教初期の翻訳論." In *Chūkoku bukyōō no kenkyū* 中國佛教の研究. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

Pelliot, Paul. 1963. *Notes on Marco Polo II*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.

Robinson, Richard. 1967. *Early Mādhyamika in India and China*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Shih, Robert. 1980. "La préface du Ta tche che louen par Seng-Jouei." In *Indianisme et bouddhisme : mélanges offerts à Mgr. Étienne Lamotte*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Universit, catholique de Louvain, Institut orientaliste. 313-328.

Tang Yongtong 湯用彤. 1938. *Hanwei liangjin nanbeichao fojiaoshi* 漢魏兩晉南北朝佛教史. Changsha: Shangwu yinshuju.

Yinshun 印順. 1981. *Chuqi dacheng fojiao zhi qiyuan yu kaizhan* 初期大乘佛教之起源與開展. Taipei: Zhengwen.

Yoshikawa Tadao and Funayama Tōru 吉川忠夫, 船山徹. 2009-2010. *Kōsōden* 高僧伝. Vol. 1-4. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Ui Hakuju 宇井伯壽. 1956. *Shaku dōōan kenkyū* 釋道安研究. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Zacchetti, Stefano. 2005. In Praise of the Light : A Critical Synoptic Edition with An Annotated Translation of Chapters 1-3 of Dharmarakṣa's Guang Zan Jing. Vol. 8 of Bibliotheca philologica et philosophica Buddhica. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.

Zürcher, Erik. 1972. *The Buddhist Conquest of China*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

APPENDIX

	Sample	(1)
Larger PP	*Mokṣala T221	佛告阿難：是恒伽調弟，當來之世當作佛，號名金華如來，無所著，等正覺。畢女人身，受男子形，後當生於妙樂佛國，於彼國修梵行。是菩薩摩訶薩在所生國，常有金華名號。
	Kumārajīva T223	佛告阿難：是恒伽提婆姊，未來世中當作佛，劫名星宿，佛號金華阿難。是女人畢是女身，受男子形，當生阿閼佛阿鞞羅提國土，於彼淨修梵行。阿難，是菩薩在彼國土，亦號金華。
	Xuanzang T220-2 (cf. T220-3/T220-4)	爾時世尊告慶喜曰：今此天女於未來世，當成如來應正等覺，劫名星喻，佛號金花。慶喜當知，今此天女，即是最後所受女身，捨此身已，便受男身。盡未來際，不復為女。從此歿已，生於東方不動如來，應正，等覺，甚可愛樂佛國土中，於彼佛所勤修梵行。此女彼界，便號金花。
	Sanskrit (Kimura ed.)	<i>evam ukte bhagavān āyusmantamānandam etad avocat: iyam ānanda gaṅgadevā bhaginī anāgate 'dhvani suvarṇapuṣpo nāma tathā gato arhan samyaksambuddho loke bhaviṣyati tārakopame kalpe āyam ānanda etasyā gaṅgadevāyā bhaginīyās caramaḥ strībhāvo bhaviṣyati. iyam ānanda gaṅgadevā bhaginī strībhāvam vivarjya puruṣabhāvaṃ pratilabhyāśobhyasya tathāgatasyārhatāḥ samyaksambuddhasya buddhakṣetre upapatsyate abhiratyāṃ lokadhātau, sa tatra brahmacaryaṃ carīṣyati.</i>
Smaller PP	*Lokakṣema T224	佛言：是恒竭優婆夷，却後當來世，名星宿劫。是中有佛，名金華佛。是優婆夷後當棄女人身，更受男子形，却後當世阿閼佛刹。
	Zhi Qian T225	佛語阿難：是恒竭清信女，却後當來劫，劫名星宿。中有佛名金花，是清信女後於此時，棄女為男，後當生無怒佛刹，從一刹生一佛刹。
	Kumārajīva T227	佛告阿難：是恒伽提婆女人，當於來世星宿劫中而得成佛，號曰金花。今轉女身，得為男子，生阿閼佛土，於彼佛所常修梵行。
	Xuanzang T220-4	爾時世尊告慶喜曰：今此天女於未來世，當成如來應正等覺，劫名星喻，佛號金花。慶喜當知，今此天女，即是最後所受女身，捨此身已，便受男身，盡未來際，不復為女。從此歿已，生於東方不動如來可愛世界，於彼佛所勤修梵行。此女彼界，便字金花。
	*Dānapāla T228	佛言：阿難，今此昂識禰囀女人，終此身已，轉生當得男子之身，生於妙樂世界阿閼佛刹中，於彼如來，應供，正等正覺所，恭敬供養修持梵行。於彼沒已，復生他方諸佛刹中，如是從一佛刹至一佛刹，世所生不離諸佛，常得瞻禮親近供養。譬如轉輪聖王尊貴自在，從一宮殿至一宮殿，自生至終足不履地，今此女人亦復如是。從一佛刹至一佛刹，不離諸佛，乃至於未來世星宿劫中當得成佛，號金華如來，應供，正等正覺，明行足，善逝，世間解，無上士調御丈夫，天人師，佛，世尊，出現世間。
	Sanskrit (Ghoṣa ed.)	<i>evam ukte bhagavān āyusmantamānandam etad avocat: iyam ānanda gaṅgadevā bhaginī anāgate aedhvani suvarṇapuṣpo nāma tathā gato bhaviṣyati arhan samyaksambuddho vidyācaraṇasampannaḥ sugato lokavid anuttaraḥ puruṣadamyasārathiḥ śāstā devānām ca manuṣyāṇām ca buddho bhagavāmlloka utpatsyate, tārakopame kalpe aenuttarāṃ samyaksambodhimabhisambhotsyate. seyam ānanda gaṅgadevā bhaginī strībhāvaṃvivartya puruṣabhāvam pratilabhya itaś cyutvā akśobhyasya tathāgatasyārhata samyaksambuddhasya buddhakṣetre abhiratyāṃ lokadhātāv upapatsyate.</i>

	Sample	(2)	(3)
Larger PP	*Mokṣala T221	持是勇進之意從是東行。去是二萬里。國名香氏。	復遙見其城中央法上菩薩。與諸大眾數百千萬圍遶說法。遙見是已甚大歡喜。其身安隱譬如比丘得第 <sup>四</sup> 迴。又自念言：我今不可於車上載當下步耳。
	Kumārajīva T223	善男子。汝以是勤精進愛樂法故。從是東行。去此五百由旬。有城名眾香。	薩陀波崙菩薩見曇無竭菩薩時。心即歡喜。譬如比丘入第 <sup>三</sup> 迴攝心安隱。見已作是念：我等儀不應載車趣曇無竭菩薩。作是念已下車步進。
	Xuanzang T220-2 (cf. T220-3/T220-4)	(*220-1) 又，善男子！汝以如是勇猛精進愛樂恭敬求法之心，從此東行過於五百踰繕那量，有大王城名具妙香。	(*220-1) 爾時，常啼菩薩摩訶薩最初遙見法涌菩薩摩訶薩故，身心悅樂，譬如苾芻繫念一境忽然得入第 <sup>三</sup> 迴處。既遙見已，作是念言：我等不應乘車而趣法涌菩薩摩訶薩所。作是念已，即便下車整理衣服。
	Sanskrit (Kimura ed.)	-	-
Smaller PP	*Lokakṣema T224	善男子。當作是守念。從是東行索般若波羅蜜。去是間二萬里。國名捷陀越。	是時薩陀波倫菩薩及五百女人。皆遙見如是。見已皆大歡欣踊躍。自念言：我曹義不可於車上載。當下步入國耳。
	Zhi Qian T225	當隨經教進志守淨。從是東行去是二萬里。國名香淨。	闍士及諸女。遙見如斯。欣豫無喻。念曰：吾等義當下車。步入入城。
	Kumārajīva T227	是故善男子。汝以是勤行精進。愛樂法故從是東行。去此五百由旬有城名眾香。	心即歡喜。譬如比丘得第 <sup>三</sup> 迴。見已作是念：我等不應載車趣曇無竭菩薩。即皆下車步進。薩陀波崙與五百侍女恭敬圍繞。各持種種莊嚴諸物。俱詣曇無竭菩薩所。
	Xuanzang T220-4	-	-
	*Dānapāla T228	是故汝應益加精進勇猛堅固。從此東行五百由旬。有一大城名曰眾香。	如是見已。常啼菩薩摩訶薩。心生慶快踊躍歡喜。譬如苾芻得第 <sup>三</sup> 迴樂。一心專注尊重恭敬。即謂長者女言：此城名為眾香。彼菩薩者。是謂法上菩薩摩訶薩。我等今時不應乘車前詣其所。發是言已即各下車。歡喜肅恭步進於前。
	Sanskrit (Ghoṣa ed.)	<i>tena hi tvam kulaputra etenaiva vīryeṇa etenaivotsāhena etayaivārthikatayā etayaiva cchandikatayā anubadhya pūrvām eva diśaṃṣaccha. asti kulaputra itaḥ pañcabhir yojana-śatair gandhavatī nāma nagarī</i>	<i>saha darśanenaiva ca tasyaivaṃrūpam sukhaṃṣ sampratilabhate sma. tadyathāpi nāma prathama-dhyāna- samāpanno bhikṣur ekāgreṇa manasikāreṇa dṛṣṭvā cāsyaitad abhūt. na mama pratirūpam etad bhaved, yad ahaṃṣrathagata eva dharmodgataṃ bodhisattvaṃ mahāsattvaṃ upasaṃkrāmeyaṃ yan nv ahaṃ rathād avatareyaṃ sa tato rathād avātarat.</i>