

The Newly Found Text of the *An ban shou yi jing* Translated by An Shigao

Florin Deleanu

It was in September 1999 that I learned from Professor Ochiai Toshinori 落合俊典 about the discovery of an apparently new version of the *An ban shou yi jing* 安般守意經 (hereafter, ASYJ) translated by An Shigao 安世高 (fl. 148-168 CE). The text had been found in a manuscript scroll among the *Tripitaka* collection of Mt Amano Kongō Temple 天野山金剛寺 (Shingon School, Omuro Sect 眞言宗御室派), located in Kawachi Nagano City 河内長野市 (Ōsaka Prefecture 大阪府). And the big news was, Professor Ochiai added, that the scroll also contained the *Shi er men jing* 十二門經, translated by the same An Shigao as well as the *Jie shi er men jing* 解十二門經 (which at that time was thought to be Daoan's 道安 commentary to this scripture), both texts already recorded as lost by the time of the *Renshou Catalogue* 仁壽錄 (compiled in 602).

The first discoverer of this astonishing scroll is actually Mr Kajiura Susumu 梶浦晋 of the Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University, who has been actively engaged in the survey and study of Buddhist manuscripts stored at various temples throughout Japan. Early in the spring of the same year, Mr Kajiura had asked Professor Ochiai, famous, amongst others, for his discovery and research of the Nanatsu-dera 七寺 texts, for advice concerning the authenticity of what was emerging to be a new discovery. By the end of April, Professor Ochiai had become persuaded that the *Shi er men jing* MS was, in all likelihood, the authentic translation of An Shigao

previously believed to have been lost. Soon after this, Professor Ochiai had a second revelation: the MS also contained a new text of the ASYJ, quite different from the current Taishō Canon 大正大藏經 version. In the summer of 1999, Professor Ochiai set up a research group for the study of these new additions to the An Shigao corpus, and a year later this group as well as another team working mainly on the conservation and detailed cataloguing of the manuscripts found at Kongō-ji received a three-year grant-in-aid from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science. The group eventually plans to publish a facsimile and critical edition of the newly found texts as well as a series of philological and historical studies dedicated to them¹.

The Kongō-ji Text of the *An ban shou yi jing*

The Kongō-ji collection actually contains two similar manuscripts (MS A and MS B)² of the new ASYJ text³. Both are roll manuscripts (卷子本 *kansubon*) in one scroll一卷 and contain the following four

¹ For many of the concrete details of the discovery process, I am indebted to Professor Ochiai's personal communications. The discovery was also reported in the Japanese press. The first article on the Kongō-ji texts appeared in the evening edition of the *Yomiuri Shinbun* 読売新聞 on 14 December 1999. So far, academic contributions reporting or discussing the newly discovered texts include Ochiai 2001, Kajiura 2001, Zacchetti 2002a, and Ochiai 2002. The most comprehensive study is Kajiura 2001 which contains not only a discussion of the newly found texts translated by An Shigao but also a very useful presentation of the history of Kongō-ji as well as the codicologic characteristics and lineage of its large manuscript collection.

² The articles published so far in Japanese agree in calling them 甲本 and 乙本 respectively.

³ In what follows I shall call the newly found text the 'Kongō-ji *An ban shou yi jing*' (abbreviated as K-ASYJ) and refer to the previously known text, *faut de*

texts: Kang Senghui's 康僧會 *Preface to the An ban [shou yi jing]* 安般序⁴, the *An ban shou yi jing* 安般守意經, the *Fo shuo shi er men jing* 佛說十二門經, and *Fo shuo jie shi er men jing* 佛說解十二門經.

MS A has 21 sheets, 29 columns per sheet, 17 characters per column. The ASYJ text starts at line 12, folio 3, with the title *An ban shou yi jing* 安般守意經⁵ and ends at line 1, folio 10. MS B has 19 sheets, 32 lines per sheet, 17 characters per column⁶. The ASYJ text starts at line 30, folio 2, with the same title *An ban shou yi jing* 安般守意經 and ends at line 23, folio 9.

The Kongō-ji collection also possesses a manuscript of scroll II 卷下 of the T-ASYJ text. The title written in ink on a label pasted on the exterior of the roll reads: 佛說大安般經 卷下. Actually, the label on MS A has a similar title: 佛說大安般經 卷上, this time, however, the text being identified as scroll I. Kajiura (2001, 36) is right in concluding that at some later date in the history of the Kongō-ji collection, someone must have regarded these two MSS as scroll I and scroll II of the T-ASYJ, without properly checking the content of the texts.

Both MS A and MS B are in good condition with slight to medium

mieux, as the 'Taishō *An ban shou yi jing*' (abbreviated as T-ASYJ).

⁴ Apart from some minor variants, the *Preface* is similar to the text found in the Taishō Canon (T15.163a-c and T55.42c-43c).

⁵ This is what the Sino-Japanese codicology calls 首題 or 'title at the beginning of the text' as opposed to the 尾題 or 'title at the end of the text'. (The latter reflects the Indian practice of writing the text title at its end.) The 'title at the end of the text' is not, however, absolutely necessary, and, as a matter of fact, neither MS A nor MS B has it.

⁶ 17 characters per column is the general number, but occasionally, depending on the size of the characters, one also finds 16 characters. Furthermore, not all columns are written completely. Usually, when the scribe deemed that a new paragraph or entry began, he started from the beginning of the next column.

⁷ MS B has the following short colophon: 一交了 'One proofreading completed'.

worming, which, however, does not preclude the deciphering of the text. Neither text has a colophon which would permit an accurate dating⁷. We can, however, with fairly good chances of certainty, conjecture their approximate date from the general history of the Kongō-ji collection. There are no records as to when the temple began copying of the *Tripitaka*, but the earliest extant colophon is dated 1079. The majority of the MSS appears to have been copied between the end of Heian 平安 and early Kamakura 鎌倉 periods. This large-scale scribal project roughly seems to come to an end in the Katei 嘉禎 era (1235-1238) (Kajiura 2001, 28-29).⁸

As to the precise relation and chronology of MS A and MS B, we still have no clue. The only thing I would venture to say (admittedly, without expert knowledge of Japanese palaeography) is that the two MSS appear to come from different hands. The important matter for the philologist is that they clearly represent slightly different versions of the same text. Following are some variant readings in our two MSS⁹:

	MS A	MS B
7 1	投	捉
8 9	微	從
9 1	思想盛陰	思想盛陰陰

⁸ Obviously, we shall learn more details and maybe come to a more precise dating when the experts working on the codicologic and palaeographic analysis of our MSS publish their results.

⁹ Here as well as in the synopsis below, the digits on the right side represent the column number in the MS. Usually, Buddhist philology employs 'line' when speaking of Chinese texts. Although 'line' is not a mistake, I prefer to use here 'column', which seems to me more appropriate for codicologic descriptions. (Below, I abbreviate column as 'c' and columns as 'cc'.)

¹⁰ For section titles, I use the same characters as the MS. It goes without saying

1 0 9	色	也
1 1 3 – 1 1 4	前有非今有	非今有
1 1 9	惡墮道	要隨道
1 7 2	心	止

Since, on the whole, MS A seems to offer better readings, I give below a synopsis of the text based on this manuscript:¹⁰

K-ASYJ, MS A

1 – 5 9	安般序 <i>Preface to the An ban</i> (Kang Senghui's Preface) ¹¹
6 0	安般守意經 <i>An ban shou yi jing</i> (the title of the text)
6 1 – 6 2	安般守意 (<i>ānāpānasmṛti</i>): explanation of each word in the compound
6 3 – 6 4	六事 (<i>ṣaṭkāraṇa</i>) the six matters (or rather 'stages')

that, without the Indic original, the Sanskrit equivalents given here are merely tentative. Besides, my choice of the Sanskrit is, admittedly, arbitrary. There is little doubt from An Shigao's phonetic transcriptions of Indic terms that he was reciting or using manuscripts in a Middle Indo-Aryan (Prakrit) language. An absolutely certain reconstruction and identification is far from easy (last but not least, because An Shigao may have spoken with a Parthian accent which 'contaminated' the original pronunciation), but the historical and geographic situation surrounding An Shigao would plead for Gāndhārī. Providing Gāndhārī equivalents for the technical terms in our MS would, however, prove a too daring task. Even if we had the historical certainty that An Shigao's originals were in Gāndhārī, we do not have a complete Buddhist vocabulary of this language. Besides, we would not know precisely what Gāndhārī variety we would have to provide for An Shigao's terminology.

My English renderings try to remain as close as possible to the Chinese original.

¹¹ See note 4 above.

¹² The Sanskrit names of the *ṣaḍkāraṇa* follow the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (p. 339, l. 9 - p. 340, l. 12).

of the mindfulness of breathing are enumerated.

Following is their detailed description:¹²

6 4 – 7 5	數 (<i>gaṇanā</i>) counting
7 5 – 7 7	隨 (<i>anugama</i>) pursuing
7 7 – 8 0	止 (<i>sthāpanā</i>) focusing
8 1 – 1 0 8	觀 (<i>upalakṣaṇā</i>) observation
1 0 9 – 1 2 0	還 (<i>vivarta</i>) turning
1 2 1 – 1 2 6 ¹³	淨 (<i>pariśuddhi</i>) purification
1 2 7 – 1 5 7 ¹⁴	四意止 (<i>catvāri smṛtyupasthānāni</i>) the four bases of mindfulness
1 5 8 – 1 6 2	四斷意 (<i>catvāri samyakprahāṇāni</i>) the four mental eradications ¹⁵
1 6 3 – 1 8 3 ¹⁶	四神足 (<i>catvāra ṛddhipādāḥ</i>) the four miraculous bases
1 8 4 – 1 9 0	五根 (<i>pañcendriyāni</i>) the five faculties
1 9 1 – 1 9 9	五力 (<i>pañca balāni</i>) the five powers
2 0 0 – 2 0 8	七覺種意 (<i>sapta bodhyaṅgāni</i>) the seven kinds of

¹³ The exact limits of this passage are not clear. All the five preceding stages end with a brief explanation concerning their role, introduced by the question 何用是…(i.e., 何用是數；何用是隨；何用是止；何用是觀；何用是還). No such question concludes the passage on purification 淨. Furthermore, the beginning of the next passage is not clearly marked either (see note 14 below).

¹⁴ No formal sentence announces the beginning of the exposition of the thirty-seven factors conducive to awakening (*saptatrimśad bodhipakṣikā dharmāḥ*) or, at least, their first set of categories, i.e., the four bases of mindfulness. Some groups of the factors are introduced with the question 'what is…?' (e.g., c. 158: 四斷意何等).

¹⁵ An Shigao's usage of 斷 indicates that he understood the term as *prahāṇa* rather than *pradhāna*.

¹⁶ The *catvāra ṛddhipādāḥ* passage itself appears to end at c. 181. Cc. 181-

	mental [practices conducive to] awakening
2 0 9 – 2 1 7	八種道行 ¹⁷ (<i>āryāṣṭāṅgamārga</i>) the eight kinds of practices of the way
2 1 7 – 2 2 4 ¹⁸	止 (<i>śamatha</i>) tranquillity and 觀 (<i>vipaśyanā</i>) insight as well as the realisation (? <i>abhisamaya</i>) of the four truths 知受解四諦
2 2 5 – 2 2 9	慧 (<i>prajñā</i>) wisdom and 脫 (? <i>vimukti</i>) liberation ¹⁹
2 2 9 – 2 4 1	四解 (<i>catuḥ pratisamvid</i>) the four comprehensions
2 4 1 – 2 4 9	道迹 (also transcribed as 須陀洹) (<i>srota-āpanna</i>) [the one who] follows [i.e., has entered] the path
2 5 0 – 2 5 6	往來 (also transcribed as 斯陀含) (<i>sakṛdāgāmin</i>) [the one who] comes back [once]

183 deal with 定根 or the faculty of concentration (?*samādhindriya*), which, the text says, is practised in the four abandonments 四棄. The latter term probably refers to the four trances (*dhyāna*). Cf. T-ASYJ, T15.171c19 ; also Kang Senghui's *Preface to the An ban shou yi jing*, which states that 'dhyāna means abandonment' 禪棄也 (T15.163a21; T55.43a16; the same sentence appears in both Kongō-ji MS A and MS B as 禪棄.). 定根 is one of the five faculties which form the subject of the next passage, but, usually, it is not the first item in the *pañcendriyāni* list. Furthermore, the next passage contains a typical definition of 定根, (c. 188) which is, as expected, the fourth member of the five faculties. Samādhi, on the other hand, is also an essential component of the four bases of spiritual growth (*catvāra ṛddhipādāḥ*) and, though the term 定根 itself suggests the five faculties, its unusual pelace and the existence of a definition of *samādhindriya* in passage on the *pañcendriyāni* have made me include cc. 181-183 in the paragraph on the four miraculous bases.

¹⁷ I hesitate whether 行 should be read as part of the compound or regarded as an independent word, i.e., 'the practice of the eight kinds of the way'.

¹⁸ It is not clear to me where this passage actually starts.

¹⁹ A very difficult part of the text. To start with, I do not know whether it should be considered a passage in itself or a part of the previous passage. Tentatively, I should say that these lines seem to deal with the *prajñāvimukti* and *cetovimukti*.

- 2 5 7 – 2 6 5 不還 (also transcribed as 阿那含) (*anāgāmin*) [the one who] does not return
- 2 6 5 – 2 7 4 无所著 (also transcribed as 阿羅漢) (*arhat*) [the one who] has no attachment
- 2 7 5 – 2 8 1 師云 'the master says': three brief commentarial remarks suggesting different combination patterns of the six matters 六事 with the four trances 禪, the thirty-seven factors conducive to awakening, and the four fruits of the spiritual practice.²⁰

If we exclude Kang Senghui's *Preface* and the final commentarial passage, we could divide the text into five main sections:

²⁰ It is not clear whether this passage is a part of the scripture translated by An Shigao (in which case 師 would refer to the views of an Abhidharma scholar cited by the initial compilers of the ASYS or, equally possible, an Indian/Central Asian master whose comments were later added to the text) or it represents a commentarial appendix authored in China. Indian Buddhist treatises often cite, polemically or not, opinions expressed by other masters (such as the frequent *ity apare* in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*). We also find examples of scriptural texts side by side with commentaries (see, for instance, the *Saṅgītisūtra* with an unidentified commentary in Fragment 15 of the British Library Kharoṣṭhī Collection; Salomon 1999, 24-26; 49; 171-175). If this commentarial passage was, however, composed in China, then the most likely candidates are An Shigao himself, Chen Hui 陳慧 (fl. in the first half of the 3rd century) and/or Kang Senghui (?-280). According to his *Preface*, Kang Senghui's commentary (no longer extant) faithfully reflected the interpretations of the ASYJ as transmitted by his master Chen Hui. Judging from the *Preface*, the only surviving textual witness, Kang Senghui/Chen Hui also devised a combinatorial pattern of the six matters and four trances, similar in approach to our passage in the K-ASYJ. It is also important to mention here that in Chen Hui's *Commentary on the Yin chi ru jing* 陰持入經註 (T33.9b-24c), we also find glosses introduced by the heading 'the master says' 師云.

There are further reasons which make the passage rather intriguing. One of

- § 1 Definition of the *ānāpānasmṛti* (cc. 61-62)
- § 2 Exposition of the six matters (cc. 63-126)
- § 3 Exposition of the thirty-seven factors conducive to awakening (cc. 127-217)
- § 4 Exposition of doctrinal categories related to spiritual cultivation, e.g., tranquillity, insight, realisation of the four truths, etc. (cc. 217-241)
- § 5 Exposition of the four fruits of the spiritual practice (cc. 241-274)

Let us now compare the above content with the T-ASYJ, for the synopsis of which I rely on Aramaki's seminal study on this text (1971, 36-42):²¹

T-ASYJ

A 1 6 3 c 1 2 – 1 7

Preface of the text

its sentences (師云: 數息為一禪, 相隨為二禪, 止為三禪, 觀為四禪。cc. 275-276), also occurs in the *Jie shi er men jing* text (cc. 409-410 in the same scroll), without being, however, introduced by the phrase 師云. (I am indebted to Dr Zaccchetti for drawing my attention to this similarity.) Another of its sentences (師云: 數息為四意止, 相隨為四意斷, 止為四神足, 觀為五根五力, 還為七覺意, 淨為八道行。cc. 277-279) has a practically identical parallel in the T-ASYJ (T15.164b18-19), the latter also lacking the introductory formula 師云. Another irregularity is that this passage uses some slightly different technical terms which correspond to the T-ASYJ rather than to the main text of the K-ASYJ (see notes 36, 38, and 41 below). Then, what could be the purpose of such a short commentarial fragment? Adding a commentary after a scripture can certainly assist its students, but one would expect it to be a work of larger proportions elaborating upon the text or glossing difficult terms rather than only seven columns flimsily juggling with doctrinal categories.

²¹ As far as the passage titles below are concerned, I have tried to keep them as close possible to the wording of Aramaki 1971, but I am responsible for the English rendering of the Chinese technical terms and the Sanskrit equivalents in brackets. The capital letters on the left represent the section numbering adopted

- B 1 6 3 c 1 7 – 1 6 4 a 1 3 Explanation of the meaning of 安 (*āna*), 般 (*apāna*), and 守意 (*smṛti*)
- C 1 6 4 a 1 3 – 1 5 Announcing the overall structure of the ASYJ
- D 1 6 4 a 1 5 – 2 7 Explanation of mindfulness 守意 (*smṛti*)
- E 1 6 4 a 2 7 – b 2 6 Exposition of the six meditative methods (i.e., 數息, 相隨, 止, 觀, 還, 淨)
- F 1 6 4 b 2 7 – c 2 5 Exposition of counting 數息 (*gaṇanā*)
- G 1 6 4 c 2 6 – 1 6 5 a 3 Apparently, part of a commentary on the sixteen excellent [practices] 十六勝 (*śoḍaśākāraparicaya*)²²
- H 1 6 5 a 3 – 1 9 Four types of mindfulness of breathing 安般守意, elimination of the two evils 除兩惡, and the sixteen excellent [practices]
- I 1 6 5 a 1 9 – 2 8 Part of a commentary on the sixteen excellent [practices]
- J 1 6 5 a 2 8 – c 7 Exposition of counting
- K 1 6 5 c 8 – 1 7 Probably, interpolation of a sutra passage on observation 觀 and its commentary
- L 1 6 5 c 1 7 – 1 6 6 b 1 6 Further exposition of counting
- M 1 6 6 b 1 7 – c 1 3 Exposition of pursuing 相隨 (*anugama*)

by Aramaki, and the numbers show the page, segment, and column in vol. 15 of the Taishō Canon.

²² I use here the term found in the *Śrāvakaśāstra*, but the precise Indian word used in the original is, obviously, impossible to verify. There is little doubt, however, that the T-ASYJ refers to this practice which is known from a variety of Buddhist sources (see Deleanu 1992b, 50-52).

N	1 6 6 c 1 4 – 1 6 7 a 2	Exposition of focusing 止 (<i>sthāpanā</i>)
O	1 6 7 a 3 – 1 8	Exposition of observation 觀 (<i>upalakṣaṇā</i>)
P	1 6 7 a 1 9 – c 2	Exposition of turning 還 (<i>vivarta</i>) and purification 淨 (<i>parisuddhi</i>)
Q	1 6 7 c 2 – 2 2	Exposition of mindfulness of body (<i>kāyasmṛtyupasthāna</i>)
R	1 6 7 c 2 2 – 1 6 8 a 1 1	Exposition of mindfulness of feeling (<i>vedanāsmṛtyupasthāna</i>)
S	1 6 8 a 1 1 – 2 4	Exposition of mindfulness of mind (<i>cittasmṛtyupasthana</i>)
T	1 6 8 a 2 4 – b 7	Exposition of mindfulness of phenomena (<i>dharmasmṛtyupasthāna</i>)
U	1 6 8 b 1 4 ²³ – 1 6 9 b 3	Continuation of section P; this pas- sage expounds the purification 淨 (<i>parisuddhi</i>) and the four truths 四諦
V	1 6 9 b 4 – c 1 9	Supplementary discussion of the practice of the <i>ānāpānasmṛti</i>
W	1 6 9 c 2 0 – 1 7 0 a 4	A collection of various commentarial re- marks which appear to be a continuation of section U
X	1 7 0 a 5 – 1 7	The thirty-seven factors [conducive to awakening] 三十七品經 (<i>saptatrimśad bodhipakṣikā dharmāḥ</i>)
Y	1 7 0 a 1 7 – b 1 5	The practice of counting the breathing also represents the practice of the thirty-

²³ Juan II (卷下) starts at 168b14. Cc. 168b8-13 are occupied by the sutra title, translator's name, etc.

	seven factors conducive to awakening.
Z 1 7 0 b 1 5 – c 2 7	Definitions of the four bases of mindfulness 四意止 (<i>catvāri smṛtyupasthānāni</i>), the four mental eradications 四意念斷 ²⁴ (<i>catvāri samyakprahāṇāni</i>), the four miraculous bases 四神足念 (<i>catvāra ṛddhipādāḥ</i>), the five faculties 五根 (<i>pañcendriyāni</i>), the five powers 五力 (<i>pañca balāni</i>), the seven mental [practices conducive to] awakening 七覺意 (<i>sapta bodhyaṅgāni</i>), and the eight right practices 八直行 (<i>āryāṣṭāṅgamārga</i>)
A A 1 7 0 c 2 7 – b 2 7	Different explanations of the four bases of mindfulness 四意止
B B 1 7 1 b 2 8 – c 2 0	Different explanations focusing mainly on the mindfulness of body 身觀
C C 1 7 1 c 2 0 – 1 7 2 a 2	Exposition of the four mental eradications 四意斷 ²⁵
D D 1 7 2 a 2 ²⁶ – 1 9	Exposition of the four miraculous bases 神足念
E E 1 7 2 a 1 9 – 2 6	Exposition of the five faculties 五根 and five powers 五力
F F 1 7 2 a 2 6 – b 1 4	Exposition of the seven mental [practices conducive to] awakening 七覺意
G G 1 7 2 b 1 4 – c 4	Exposition of the eight right practices 八直行

²⁴ Aramaki uses 四念斷 in his synopsis but the original reads 四意念斷.

²⁵ Here both the original and Aramaki use 四意斷.

²⁶ Aramaki (1971, 42) does not note the initial line of passage DD.

HH 1 7 2 c 4 – 1 7 3 a 2 3 Supplementary remarks concerning
the thirty-seven factors [conducive to
awakening] 三十七品經

The Textual History of the *An ban shou yi jing*:

On a New Level of Confusion

The K-ASYJ text is one of those discoveries which, at the same time, answer some questions and raise new ones. Let us start with some basic questions. Is the K-ASYJ an authentic An Shigao translation? If so, what does the T-ASYJ represent? What are the historico-philological relations between the two texts?

Since, apart from the two newly discovered MSS, the K-ASYJ text does not appear in any other MS or canon, traditional or modern, printed in China, Korea, and Japan, we have all the rights to question its authenticity. Fortunately, Zacchetti's pertinent findings (2002a) provide us with an important clue. In Chen Hui's 陳慧 *Commentary on the Yin chu ru jing zhu* 陰持入經註 and the anonymous interlinear commentary to *juan* I of the *Da ming du jing* 大明度經, we see quotations from the ASYJ which cannot be found in the T-ASYJ but agree with

²⁷ We must also consider the picture from inside the history of Japanese Buddhism. One cannot completely rule out the possibility that an ancient or early mediaeval Japanese scholar-monk could have imitated the 'An Shigao-ese' style and, presumably based on a thorough knowledge of the Canon, could have deliberately included in his forgery the ASYJ citations in the two commentaries above. This remains only a remote possibility, and there is no direct historical evidence that such a spurious text was produced or, as a matter of fact, that An Shigao's translations were popular at all in the epoch, in particular, and in Japanese Buddhism, in general.

However, intellectual honesty requires a few words about two major figures that could have become involved in a such an erudite fraud. They are Kakuban 覺鑊 (1095-1143) and Myōe 明恵 (1173-1232). The former became ordained and

or are closer to the K-ASYJ. Though the citations are neither numerous nor extensive, it is, nonetheless, reasonable to assume that the K-ASYJ might represent a text which was already in existence in the first half of the 3rd century, when both commentaries were compiled.²⁷

More importantly, the inner arguments of language and style also

received his initiation 灌頂 at Ninna-ji 仁和寺, the head temple of the sect to which Kongō-ji belongs. Kakuban, the founder of the Shingi Shingon School 新義真言宗, was not only a learned scholar but also a fervent practioner. The same can be said of Myōe who is known to have shown great interest in early meditation scriptures 禪經 like the *Wu men chan jing yao yong fa* 五門禪經要用法 (translated by Dharmamitra 曇摩蜜多), the *Zuo chan sanmei jing* 坐禪三昧經 and the *Chan fa yao jie* 禪法要解 (translated by Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什), the *Damoduoluo chan jing* 達磨多羅禪經 (translated by Buddhahadra 佛陀跋陀羅) (cf. Shibasaki, forthcoming, ch. 3 'Myōe to zenkan' 明恵と禪観).

Even if scholar-monks like Kakuban or Myōe had the linguistic ability to forge such a difficult text, we should ask what could be the possible motivation for it. Yes, both Buddhist teachers were deeply interested and involved in spiritual cultivation, but hardly could one imagine Kakuban, the devout theoretician and practioner of Shingon Amidism, or Myōe, the inspired Kegon scholar and meditator, bothering to produce (I suppose, at great pains, even for a genius!) a pure Hinayāna scripture. Even if they showed any interest in such works, as Myōe certainly did, it was for their technical aspect, which they eventually included in a Mahāyāna frame of spiritual cultivation.

Besides, the fact that the K-ASYJ is not known in any other MS or printed version could be seen as a collateral proof of the text not originating from such famous hands. Supposing that Kakuban or Myōe had authored the K-ASYJ, one would expect their disciples and religious communities to have preserved more MSS of the text, which would have eventually spread more throughout the country.

As always, however, counter-arguments can be found. The search for Buddhist MSS in Japan, in spite of the great advances witnessed in recent years, is still in its early stages, and many more surprises may be in store for us. So, one day, we could be faced with new MSS of the K-ASYJ text. Then, one could also argue that even if a famous scholar-monk had been behind the 'spurious' K-ASYJ text, with the passage of years, their religious communities could have forgotten or

plead for the inclusion of the K-ASYJ in the genuine An Shigao corpus. It must be, however, emphasised that we are still far from having attained certainty with regard to the precise number and titles translated by the Parthian monk, and a detailed study of his language and style remains a desideratum. In spite of the immense historico-philological difficulties raised by An Shigao's translations, we have, nevertheless, made important progress in their understanding. Alongside the 'classics' of the field published by Ōtani 1924, Hayashiya 1937, Ui 1971, Aramaki 1971, and Zürcher 1977²⁸ as well as other earlier contributions such as Ōtani 1968 and Kawashima 1976, recent years have seen a renewed scholarly interest in An Shigao's translations (see Zürcher 1991; Deleanu 1992a, 1997a; Satō 1996; Du tr. 1997; Vetter and Harrison 1997; Harisson 1997, 2002; Zacchetti 1997, 2002a, 2002b; Yamabe 1997; Wang 1997; and Hong 2002; and Hong 2002).²⁹

Especially important for our discussion on the language and style

ignored this fact (after all, a forgery should be kept in secret!). This resulted in discarding the text as a Hīnayāna work unworthy of re-copying. Or, to speak in more general terms, one could easily (and rightly!) argue that there is no reason to stick to such famous names as Kakuban and Myōe, despite some thin threads linking them to Kongō-ji and/or early Buddhist meditation texts. An erudite anonymous monk, enjoying the leisurely life of a countryside temple and animated by a strong curiosity for translations of yore, could have tried his hand at an apocryphal text which manages to fool us as a genuine An Shigao translation.

It is true that all these remain logical and historical possibilities, but, as far as I can see, they are too remote to account for regarding the K-ASYJ as a spurious text.

²⁸ One should also add such general works which contain very useful discussions of An Shigao's translations: Tokiwa 1938, Tang 1938, Hayashiya 1941, Zürcher 1972, Tsukamoto 1979, Ren 1981, and Kamata 1982.

of the K-ASYJ is the *Yin chi ru jing* 陰持入經 (T15.173b-180b). In a ground-breaking contribution, Zacchetti (2002b) showed that this two-scroll Abhidharmic treatise, one of the very few which can be regarded (without too much doubt!) as an authentic translation by An Shigao, is a rendering of a text similar to what survives today as Chapter VI *Suttatthasamuccayabhūmi* of the *Peṭakopadesa*. Though the correspondence between the *Yin chi ru jing* and the extant Pali text is not perfect, there is no doubt that the two texts represent basically the

²⁹ The An Shigao Workshop organised by Professors T. Vetter and Paul Harrison at the International Institute for Asian Studies, Leiden University, 19-20 December 1996, must also be mentioned in this context (see Deleanu 1997b). Not exactly qualifying as an academic contribution, it is, nevertheless, interesting to mention the recent interest in An Shigao's translations shown by practitioners of respiration techniques and meditation. In 1979, Kimura Hiromasa 木村弘昌, a Tokyo University MD and president of the Association of the Path of Harmony 調和道協会, published a book entitled *Lord Śākyamuni's Breathing Method: Learning from the An ban shou yi jing* 釈尊の呼吸法—大安般守意經に学ぶ— (Tokyo: Hakuju-sha) (in 1991, the book reached its 15th edition). Based on Ui's *kundoku* translation (as well as quoting from Pali and Zen sources!), Kimura aims at reconstructing the actual meditation technique expounded in the ASYJ, which he regards as Śākyamuni's path to awakening as well as an ideal method of keeping fit. Of course, not all approaches to Buddhist literature should be academic, and reading scriptures with a spiritual motivation is admittedly much closer to the traditional intentions of their preachers and authors. However, such a corrupt text like the ASYJ, in which the original translation and the commentary (or commentaries) are jumbled up, would require the help of philology (which, at least as a method, is in no way inimical to spiritual goals). Especially since the author sets himself the goal of expounding 'Śākyamuni's breathing method', much more care is necessary in order to differentiate (when possible!) between scriptural and commentarial parts. At least, it is important to emphasise that the ASYJ contains both types of discourse (let alone the fact that it is hugely problematic whether Śākyamuni and earliest Buddhism taught anything similar to the 'six matters' 六事). Furthermore, since health objectives appear to be equally important to the author, a certain dose of

same work. The *Suttatthasamuccayabhūmi* becomes thus the closest Indian original which we have so far for a scripture translated An Shigao. The picture which emerges from the comparison of the *Yin chi ru jing* with the *Suttatthasamuccayabhūmi* is that of a very literal and crude style of rendering. (I am tempted to say that the only thing genuinely Chinese in it is its usage of Chinese characters!). It now appears with more clarity that the 'An Shigao-ese' style is a unique cocktail of literal translation, inclusion of vernacular linguistic elements, and a serious dose of misunderstanding. Although no direct historical evidence survives, the latter element should not be overlooked, especially in an age when translation was in its infancy.³⁰

Without an Indian original, any judgement upon the ASYJ can only be tentative, but the feeling I get from the comparison of the K-ASYJ and the *Yin chi ru jing* is that their style and language is very

historico-philological prudence could even prove beneficial for keeping fit! (For a while, I used to think that this might serve as a good example to persuade governments and administrators that philology really deserves more research funds, but since the Japanese press has not yet reported any cases of victims of non-philologically practised *ānāpānasmṛti*, I suppose that it is wiser not to make the argument too public)

³⁰ My admittedly impressionistic conjecture is that, in spite of what Chinese sources tell us (T55.95a; T50.320b), An Shigao's command of the Chinese language was, at least in the beginning of his career, far from perfect and his Chinese assistants were often at a loss as how to understand the abstruse explanations of their master. To give only one example here, the translation of *saṃskāra* as 生死, literally 'life-death', in such texts as the ASYJ and the *Sapta-sthānasūtra* 七處三觀經 must have come from a confusion between *saṃskāra* and *saṃsāra* (cf. also Vetter and Harrison 1997, p. 213, n. 7). (Incidentally, in the *Gāndhārī Dharmapada*, *saṃskāra* is *saghara* and *saṃsāra* is *satsara*; in the Kuram casket inscription in Niya script *saṃskāra* is *saṃkara*, cf. Brough ed., *Gāndhārī Dharmapada*, p. 75). It is impossible, of course, to know whether An Shigao simply mentioned the sound similarity (homonymity?) of the two words

close. Though terminological differences between the two texts do exist³¹, we see some similarities which cannot be found in the case of the T-ASYJ. For example, the eightfold path (*āryāṣṭaṅgamārga*) is rendered in the K-ASYJ (c. 217) and the *Yin chi ru jing* (T15.174b8) as 八種道行, while the usual translation preferred by the T-ASYJ is 八直

in the Prakrit idiom which he or his MS used or, less likely, he indulged in a commentarial paranomasia in which *saṃskāra*, as the second member of the twelvefold chain of dependent arising, was equated with or explained as the basic element determining one's *saṃsāra*. Whatever the source of the confusion might have been, this casts unfavourable light upon An Shigao's Chinese ability. Had he known even the rudiments of the written language, the Parthian master could not have failed to notice the different sense of 生死. One may speculate that this is a usage confined to An Shigao's earliest translations (though it must be noted that this curious rendering outlives An Shigao and also appears in Lokakṣema's translations) and, later on, he and/or his team may have realised the mistake and replaced the above character with 行 for *saṃskāra* (as we see in the *Yin chi ru jing* 陰持入經 and the *Dao di jing* 道地經). Interesting to note in this connection is the fact that the K-ASYJ hesitates between 生死 and 行 for the translation of *saṃskāra* and 生死 is apparently used for both *saṃskāra* and *saṃsāra*. Actually, this hesitation seems to be occasionally found also in the *Yin chi ru jing* (see T15.174a19).

These critical remarks should not be interpreted as an attempt to underestimate the efforts of this admirable team of dauntless men who were beginning what is probably the longest translation project in human history. The odds confronting An Shigao and his Chinese disciples, who must have been a far cry from the later professional teams of a Kumārajīva or Xuanzang, were obviously overwhelming. It was the first attempt in the history of the Middle Kingdom (and, as a matter of fact, in Buddhist history!) to translate sacred writings and theoretical treatises which, even nowadays, after two centuries of modern Buddhist studies, remain hugely challenging. And all this without dictionaries, translation manuals, library facilities, let alone intensive summer courses of Chinese, Net-dictionaries, and chat lists. Yet, objectively speaking, in spite of his undeniable achievements and historical role, An Shigao's style does remain crude and often unintelligible.

³¹ The lack of complete parallelism could be explained as resulting from the two

or 八行.³² Both the K-ASYJ and the *Yin chi ru jing* frequently use 度世, which occurs nowhere in the T-ASYJ.

Let us now return to the relation between the K-ASYJ and the T-ASYJ. It may come as a surprise, but in spite of undeniable similarities between the two texts, we also find an important number of differences in terminology and content. Let us, however, start, with some parallel passages and similar sentences:

K-ASYJ 何等爲安？何等爲般？何等爲安般守意？入息爲安。出息爲般。
(cc. 61-62)³³

T-ASYJ 何等爲安？何等爲般？安名爲入息。般名爲出息。(T15.165a5-6)

K-ASYJ 譬如日出作四事。一壞冥。二見明。三見色萬物。四成熟萬物。
(cc. 221-222)

T-ASYJ 譬如日出作四事。一壞冥謂慧能壞癡。二見明謂癡除獨慧在。三見色萬物，爲見身諸所有惡露。四成熟萬物，設無日月萬物不熟。
(T12.169a4-7)³⁴

K-ASYJ	T-ASYJ
還爲何等還五陰知見滅盡處 (c. 109)	還五陰者 [...] ³⁵ (T15.167a26)
	何等爲便知見滅盡處謂 [...] (T15.167a28)

texts having been translated in different periods of An Shigao's career and/or because of different Chinese assistants.

³² There is only one occurrence of 八種道 in the T-ASYJ (T15.164b14).

³³ The punctuation in all passages cited here belongs to me. The K-ASYJ employs no punctuation at all. As well-known, the T-ASYJ uses only the traditional 〇 mark.

³⁴ The simile of the sun is also found in the T-ASYJ (T15.168c26-28) as an image of the four noble truths. In the K-ASYJ, it is employed as a simile of *śamatha* and *vipaśyanā*, but the sentence on tranquillity and insight is immediately preceded by a discussion of the four noble truths. The canonical *locus classicus* of this simile is the *Suriyupamā* (SN V 78-79, 442-443, cf. also SN V 29-32).

Interesting to note that the *Yin chi ru jing* contains a passage closer to the K-ASYJ: 譬如日出上至竟，爲現作四事。致明、壞冥、現色、現竟。(T15.179b11-12) (cf. *Petakopadesa*, p. 134, ll. 24-26). (I am indebted to Dr Zacchetti for drawing my

分別止觀生死 (c. 1 1 4) 爲分別觀生死者 [...] (T15.167b14-15)

見上頭无息所從來 視上頭無所從來者謂 [...]

(c. 1 1 4) (T15.167b17-18)

後觀無有迹處 (c. 1 1 5) 後視無處所者 [...] (T15.167b22)

未得道迹會不得中命盡 未得道迹會不得中命盡謂 [...]

(c. 1 1 7) (T15.167b24)

淨爲何等爲舍結 (c. 1 2 1) 第六淨棄結者 [...] (T15.167a19)

Such similar passages are, however, very few. More numerous are the divergences. Here is a list of differences in basic terminology:

K-ASYJ

隨

慧

七覺種意³⁸

擇法覺種意

精進覺種意

喜覺種意

T-ASYJ

相隨

點、點慧、慧³⁷

七覺意

法識覺意

力覺意

愛覺意

attention to this parallel passage in the *Yin chi ru jing*).

³⁵ As indicated by 者 or 謂, the text continues with the explanation of the respective phrase, which is marked here by [...].

³⁶ However, in the section beginning with 師云 'the master says' (cc. 275-281), the text uses 相隨. This may be taken as a collateral proof that this section is a commentarial addendum different in nature and style from the main text.

³⁷ T-ASYJ employs mainly 點. The other two are rarely seen: 點慧 only once (T15.164b15) and 慧 three times (twice at T15.169a5; once at T15.169a7).

³⁸ However, in the section beginning with 師云 'the master says', we have 七覺意 (c. 278).

³⁹ Most likely, a scribal error for 息覺意.

⁴⁰ I follow here what the Taishō editors call the three editions of Song, Yuan, and Ming. The Taishō text itself, probably following the Korean Canon, has 守意覺. Nothing is said in the note, but I surmise that the same reading is found in the so-called Old Song edition, too.

⁴¹ In the section beginning with 師云 'the master says', the text uses 八道行.

止覺種意	息意覺 ³⁹
觀覺種意	守覺意 ⁴⁰
八種道行 ⁴¹	八直、八行
直正念意	直念
正定 ⁴²	直定

We can also mention here the fact that the expression 如應有諦 (probably rendering *yathābhūtam*) frequently employed in the K-ASYJ, is not found in the T-ASYJ. On the other hand, the T-ASYJ contains an important group of categories called the ‘ten [kinds of] wisdom’ 十點⁴³, which does not appear in the K-ASYJ under this or any other appellation.

We also find important differences in the general structure and content. A notable one is the *nidāna* (admittedly, as we shall later see, not a usual one), which is found only in the T-ASYJ. The synopses above clearly show that though both texts share the common theme of the *ānāpānasmṛti* and, inevitably, many of the theoretical and practical categories necessary for its discussion, discrepancies do exist. For instance, the sections on the realisation of the four truths 知受解四諦, wisdom 慧 and liberation 脫, and the four comprehensions 四解 in the

These similarities add considerable complexity to the relation between the K-ASYJ and the T-ASYJ (see also note 20 above).

⁴² The K-ASYJ is not, however, consistent in its usage of 正. Amongst the individual *āryāṣṭāṅgamārga* members, we find renderings like 直見 and 直行.

⁴³ Cf. 安般守意有十點。謂：數息、相隨、止、觀、還、淨、四諦。(T15.164a14) .

⁴⁴ We must, however, keep in mind that, as we shall discuss later, the T-ASYJ represents a mixture of the original translation (or what appears to be so) and Chinese commentaries and we cannot be sure what the exact nature of these sections is.

⁴⁵ See the *Chu san zang ji ji* 出三藏記集 (T55.5c23 and 6a15).

⁴⁶ See T49.50b6 and 20; T55.128a15-16; T55.154a26-27; T55.186c10 and 13; T55.298c22-23 and 26-27; T55.467a29-b1; T55.480a3-4 and 693b12-13. Cf. also

K-ASYJ lack in the T-ASYJ. On the other hand, the T-ASYJ deals more extensively with of the six matters 六事 and also contains a presentation of the sixteen excellent practices 十六勝, of which the K-ASYJ does not say a word.⁴⁴

How can we explain these differences as well as the small number of clearly similar passages? What is the relation between the K-ASYJ and T-ASYJ? What, after all, is this newly found K-ASYJ? Unfortunately, no ready answer is available, but a few clarifications as to why we cannot provide it are possible. Starting with Daoan's 道安 catalogue (compiled in 374)⁴⁵, the Chinese bibliographical tradition was unanimous in speaking of two closely related texts translated by An Shigao. They appear with slightly different titles, but, in essence, all catalogues record a *Smaller Ānāpāna Scripture* 小安般經 and a *Larger Ānāpāna Scripture* 大安般經.⁴⁶ Both texts appear to have circulated until the middle of the 7th century.⁴⁷ Without clear manuscript evidence, it is dangerous to engage in any further speculation concerning the relation of these two scriptures known to mediaeval Chinese bibliographers with our extant ASYJ texts. The next certain thing is the second edition of the Korean Canon 高麗再雕版 (compiled between 1236-1251)⁴⁸ as well as its colophon to the ASYJ, also reproduced in the Taishō

Deleanu 1992a, 55-56, and Ochiai 2002, 31-33, which contain detailed presentations of the catalogue data.

⁴⁷ The first bibliographical evidence to this effect comes from the so-called *Jingtai's Catalogue* 靜泰錄 (compiled in 665). The catalogue appears, however, to contain a mistake as far as the title of the lost text is concerned. It records two *Ānāpāna Scriptures*, both called the *Larger Ānāpāna Scripture* 大安般經 (T55.186c10 and 13). Fortunately, *Jingtai's Catalogue* gives not only the number of scrolls 卷 for each text but also the number of their sheets 紙. In our case, the first *Larger Ānāpāna Scripture*, which was extant at that time, had thirty sheets, while the second one, which is declared 'lost 失本', had twenty sheets. It would seem, therefore, that, in spite of the recorded title, the lost text was the

Tripitaka (T15.173a). The author of the colophon, most likely Sugi 守其, complains of the corrupt state of the text in which the original scripture and its commentary (or commentaries) mix in a way that makes them indistinguishable.⁴⁹

We know from the extant prefaces collected in the *Chu san zang ji* 出三藏記集 that the following five scholars wrote commentaries on the ASYJ: Chen Hui 陳慧 (fl. in the first half of the 3rd century), Kang Senghui 康僧會 (?-280)⁵⁰, Daoan 道安 (312-385), Zhi Dun 支遁 (314-366), and Xie Fu 謝敷 (fl. middle of the 4th century).⁵¹ Various hypotheses concerning the authorship of the commentary included in the T-ASYJ have been put forward, but in the absence of the actual texts, they remain mere guesses.⁵² In general, we can speak of three styles co-existing in the T-ASYJ: (1) what appears to be an original text of the translation, (2) commentarial passages, themselves of various types

Smaller Ānāpāna Scripture.

⁴⁸ Case 甚 302 containing the *Da an ban shou yi jing* 大安般守意經 was carved in 1243 (Lancaster 1979, 309).

⁴⁹ The ASYJ contained in the Korean Canon (which we know from its modern facsimile reproduction) is basically the same text as the one found in the Taishō edition.

⁵⁰ On the relation between Chen Hui and Kang Senghui, see note 20 above.

⁵¹ Besides, we should add the possibility of an early commentary by An Shigao himself, parts of which may have also been included in the present T-ASYJ. More on this will be said below.

⁵² In Deleanu 1992a, 52-55, I present some of these hypotheses and, on the basis of stylistic comparison, advance my own theory that the commentarial passages in the T-ASYJ represent a collection, chaotic as it may be, from all the commentaries listed above. I am now less optimistic as to the possibility of such identifications. I still believe, however, that there are no a priori reasons to decide that the commentarial passages in the T-ASYJ should be regarded as the work of a single author (though this, too, remains a possibility).

(one could perhaps say ‘sub-styles’), which try to clarify the meaning of the scripture within the limits of Buddhist scholastics (at least, as much as the early Chinese scholars could master it at that time), and (3) more daring interpretative passages which engage in (what appear to us today) as fanciful parallels and connections between Buddhist categories and Taoist concepts.⁵³

It is hard to know exactly when the commentarial passages got messed up with the text, but it is not so difficult to imagine how. An Shigao’s translations constituted a major source of information and inspiration for spiritual practice until the beginning of the 5th century. The growing understanding of and devotion to Mahāyāna Buddhism as well as Kumārajīva’s and Buddhābhaddra’s much more refined and intelligible translations of meditation scriptures 禪經 relegated An Shigao to a mere figure of the past. What was probably compiled as a handy edition of scriptural text cum commentary (or collection of commentaries) became increasingly difficult to understand and in the process of scribal transmission, the corruption took a heavy toll on the intelligibility of the text. This is, in broad lines, the historical and textual profile of the present T-ASYJ.

Can we determine which of the two *Ānāpāna* scriptures the T-ASYJ is based upon, and, indirectly, infer which text the K-ASYJ represents? Unfortunately, no! Besides, we cannot exclude the possibility

⁵³ See, for instance, 安爲清, 般爲淨, 守爲無, 意名爲。是清淨無爲也。(T15.164a4-5).

⁵⁴ 持宿命觀 大安般云信本因緣知從宿命有名直見 (T1.816c28). T-ASYJ (T15.172b21) reads: 信本因緣知從宿命有是名爲直見. This correspondence has also been noticed by Ui (1971, 316) and Aramaki (1971, 45). On the other hand, the K-ASYJ (c. 234) has: 彼如應有諦從本生有亦從本因緣者是名陰種也. Cf. also ochiai 2002, 34-35

⁵⁵ Ui’s *kundoku* translation (1971, 201-244) distinguishes between the scriptural text and the commentary. Many of Ui’s decisions, however, are controversial or, at best, mere guesswork. I must, nevertheless, confess that earlier I also accepted the premise that such an identification was possible, and my article

of a scriptural ‘concoction’ having included fragments from both *Ānāpāna* scriptures rather than being based only upon one of them. It is tempting to conjecture that the K-ASYJ is the *Smaller Ānāpāna Scripture* and the scriptural text in the T-ASYJ is the *Larger Ānāpāna Scripture*. Several factors would appear to support such an identification: the K-ASYJ is (or, rather, seems to be) much shorter; the exposition of the six matters 六事 is much more detailed in the T-ASYJ; and the citation from the *Larger Ānāpāna Scripture* found in the brief interlinear commentary at the end of the *Sì dì jīng* 四諦經, also translated by An Shigao, almost perfectly matches the text of the T-ASYJ, but is only faintly echoed in the K-ASYJ (Ochiai 2002, 34-35).⁵⁴

Optimism concerning these factors is, however, far outweighed by doubt. Let me start with the last of the factors above. We have no idea as to who may have authored the brief commentarial note and how reliable his ASYJ MS (first of all, its title!) may have been. Much more problematic remain, however, the first two factors, which are based on a rather naïve assumption that we can distinguish between the scriptural part and the commentarial passages in the T-ASYJ.⁵⁵ My remarks above regarding the three styles found in this text should be taken as a general statement. There are no practical criteria which could work all throughout the text. Some passages, like those where the *ars combinatoria* à la Taoïste is at its peak, could be safely declared

(1992a, especially 52-55) reflects this assumption.

⁵⁶ Ochiai (2002, p.36,n.20) points out that by the beginning of the Tang Dynasty the average size of a MS sheet appears to have been 28 columns with 17 characters per column, which gives a total of about 476 characters for one sheet. Even if we suppose slight variations per column and incomplete columns (like, for instance, paragraph end, etc.), the discrepancy between the sheet number of the text recorded by *Jingtai's Catalogue* and the K-ASYJ remains too substantial to regard the two texts as identical.

⁵⁷ For citations from the ASYJ in early commentaries, see also Aramaki 1971,

as commentarial intrusions. Others, especially those followed by 者 or 謂 and agreeing with the K-ASYJ can be regarded as scriptural passages. But in between these two extremes lies a grey zone for which we have no precise textual ‘rulers’ to decide. There is no doubt that as research on An Shigao, in general, and the two ASYJ texts, in particular, advances, a patient (and, I assure you, quite tedious) study may reveal more clues on how we can divide the text. I am, nonetheless, sceptical as to the possibility of a completely sound achievement in this respect and, directly linked to this, of a certain identification of which of our two ASYJ texts is the *Smaller Ānāpāna Scripture* and which is the *Larger Ānāpāna Scripture*. On the other hand, I do not deny the possibility that new discoveries and findings may shed light on the issue.

There are many other questions which we cannot answer, at least not for the time being. One is if the K-ASYJ is the *Smaller Ānāpāna Scriptures*, how can we explain the discrepancy in the number of 20 sheets recorded by *Jingtai’s Catalogue* and only 8 sheets of the Kongō-

45.

⁵⁸ Four citations in the *Yin chi ru jing zhu* are introduced as 安般解云. It is difficult to decide whether we should read this as ‘the *Ānāpāna* explains and says:’ (as Ui 1971, 114-201, does) or take 解 as meaning here the *Commentary to the Ānāpāna* (as interpreted by Aramaki 1971, 45, Zurcher 1972, 54, Kawashima 1976, 235; Deleanu 1992a, 50-52). If so, then which commentary does it actually quote?

The different hypotheses which have been put forward are discussed in my earlier article (1992a, 50-52). In the same paper, I also argued that 解 may represent An Shigao’s own commentary (probably oral explanations noted down by his disciples). Though I am less categorical now, I still think that this possibility cannot be ruled out completely.

In this context, we may also discuss another possibility: both of the ASYJ texts were actually compiled by An Shigao himself as meditation treatises for the Chinese practitioners. Indeed there are no a priori reasons to discard such a

ji MS (cf. Ochiai 2002)?⁵⁶ Another problem is that only two out of five quotations in the *Yin chi ru jing zhu* have equivalent in the K-ASYJ (cf. Ochiai 2002; Zacchetti 2002a).⁵⁷ After all, what does ‘larger’ in the *Larger Ānāpāna Scripture* actually mean? Did the original Indian or Central Asian text exist in a smaller and larger version (like many pairs of *suttas* in the Pali Canon entitled *Cūḷa- and Mahā-*)? Or did An Shigao decide to produce a new version of the ASYJ including new textual references linked to the mindfulness of breathing or/and his own comments?⁵⁸ Is the irregular *nidāna* of the T-ASYJ (佛在越祇國舍羈瘦國。亦說一名：遮匿迦羅國。T15.163c15-16)⁵⁹ part of the original text? Or is it a later interpolation (added by An Shigao or Chinese commentators)?⁶⁰ How are we to judge a phrase like 中信者謂 in the T-ASYJ (T15.167a17-18), which appears to be a citation but is not found at any other place in the T-ASYJ or in the K-ASYJ?⁶¹ Should we interpret

hypothesis, but, on the other hand, there are no sources hinting at this ‘scenario’. It thus appears more prudent, in the absence of positive evidence, to stick to the tradition and speak of translation 譯 rather than of compilation 撰.

⁵⁹ Aramaki (1971, 18-20) identified the Pali parallels of the passage as well as the three toponyms, which appear to be Vṛji/Vājji, Śākya/Sakya, and Icchānaṅgala (see also Deleanu 1992a, 49). As suggested by Ui (1971, 33-34), 瘦 must be the locative ending *-ṣu/-su*, which was mistakenly incorporated in the phonetic transcription (another proof on how little An Shigao could check the quality of his Chinese translations).

⁶⁰ I tend to believe that the latter of the last two alternatives is more likely, but I have no clue as to whether this represents An Shigao’s own addition or a later Chinese commentarial interpolation. As for the original ASYJ itself, it appears to me more realistic to assume that it was a post-canonical treatise without any *nidāna*, a structure which is faithfully reflected by the K-ASYJ.

⁶¹ The K-ASYJ contains 中相 (c. 103) but this does not appear to have any relation with 中信. The latter probably represents a passage which had been lost or not included in the T-ASYJ. Or maybe neither the K-ASYJ nor the T-ASYJ contain the complete text of the ASYJ translated by An Shigao.

the discrepancies in the rendering of equivalent technical terms in the two texts as representing different translation periods or teams in An Shigao's activity? Or do they suggest a more complicated formation process? Or do they actually cast doubt as to the attribution of the K-ASYJ to the corpus of the Parthian monk? If we have to deal with supposedly two kindred texts like the *Smaller Ānāpāna Scripture* and the *Larger Ānāpāna Scripture*, is it normal to find only such a limited number of similar passages?

All these questions and doubts do in no way diminish the value of the newly discovered K-ASYJ. No one will fail to notice that, unlike the T-ASYJ, the K-ASYJ constitutes, apart from the short commentarial passage at the end, a non-corrupted text, in all likelihood a translation of an Indian or Central Asian original. This does not mean that the old (but not so good) T-ASYJ should be discarded, but if one wishes to have a glimpse (blurred as it may be by the crude translation style) at the *ānāpānasmṛti* theory and practice conveyed by the original, then the K-ASYJ is the right text to begin. It is true that its discovery may raise many new questions and confuse the picture more than before, but, at least, we can conclude that it brings us onto a new level of confusion.

⁶² In this respect, we can also remember that the simile of the sun also occurs in SN V (see note 34 above).

⁶³ It is interesting to note here that the T-ASYJ, too, shows parallels with the SN V. *Ichhānaṅgala*, one of the places appearing in its *nidāna* (see note 59 above) actually occurs at SN V 325, where it also gives the title of the respective text (Chinese *Āgama* parallel passage at T2.207a; see also *Ichhānaṅgala* again at SN V 328). SN V 327 contains one of the other names, i.e., *Sakya* appearing in its locative form 'Sakkesu' (cf. the Chinese transcription discussed in note 59 above). Both texts belong to the *Ānāpānasam'yutta* and speak of the Buddha's spending the three months of the rainy season in solitary practice of the

The Indian Background

It is rather frustrating that in scientific research you need only one brief sentence to make a negative statement but hundreds or thousands of hours to reach it. Disappointing as it may be, I have to accept this karmic conditioning and announce that I have not been able to find the Indian original of either the K-ASYJ or the T-ASYJ. Of course, most of the themes and doctrines they expound as well as quite a few parallel passages are found in the *Nikāyas/Āgamas* and Abhidharma literature. Particularly close, thematically, at least, seems to be the *Mahāvagga*, Part V of the *Saṃyutta Nikāya*.⁶² The vast majority of its ‘kindred sayings’ is dedicated to the path of spiritual cultivation and related categories. We have thus grouped discourses on the thirty-seven factors conducive to awakening, mindfulness of breathing, stream-entering, four noble truths, etc.⁶³ This, however, does not mean that the ASYJ is a translation of this part of the SN or a corresponding canonical text transmitted by another school.⁶⁴

Furthermore, mindfulness of breathing in the *Nikāyas/Āgamas*,

mindfulness of breathing. This is actually also found in the T-ASYJ: 時佛坐行安般守意九十日 (T15.163c16), etc., immediately following the *nidāna* (cf. Aramaki 1971, 19-20). Another passage in the T-ASYJ (T15.165a3-19), also discussed by Aramaki (1971, 20), actually corresponds to SN V 311-312 and 328-334 (cf. T2.206a and 208a-c respectively).

⁶⁴ It should also be noticed that the order in which these themes are treated in the SN is different from that in the ASYJ.

⁶⁵ Neither do the commentaries (the *Sāratthappakāsinī*, vol. III, pp. 263-275, as well as the *Papañcasūdanī*, part IV, pp. 137-144, commenting upon the *Ānāpānasattisutta*, MN, No. 118) and the subcommentaries (*Tīkā*) contain any reference to the six matters. Like the canonical texts upon which they comment, they deal with the sixteen practices.

⁶⁶ For a history of the practice, see Deleanu 1992b. It seems that not even the first stage of this practice, the counting (*gaṇanā*) of breathing, appears in the *Nikāyas/Āgamas*. As far as I know, the only possible (but not certain)

including the parallel passages mentioned above, is based on the sixteen excellent practices (usually rendered into Chinese as 十六特勝; Pali: *soḷasavatthuka*), with no mention whatsoever of the six matters 六事 or any equivalent meditative techniques.⁶⁵ The latter actually seem to be a later development appearing for the first time in Abhidharma literature.⁶⁶ In the meditation scriptures 禪經 and Abhidharma texts of the Northern Tradition, especially Sarvāstivāda, the technique is divided into six stages, more or less similar to those seen in the ASYJ. The Theravādins, on the other hand, divide it into four stages (*Vimuttimaggā* 解脫道論, T32.428b-431c) or eight stages (*Visuddhimaggā*, pp. 220-242; *Samantapāsādikā*, vol. II, p. 402ff, 善見毘婆沙, T24.745b-750b).

This could actually be regarded as a doctrinal ‘barometer’ indicating the Sarvāstivādin affiliation of both the K-ASYJ and the T-ASYJ.

references to respiration counting are found in the Chinese translation of the *Ekottarikāgama* 增一阿含經 (T2.653b15 and 671a13). The expression in question reads 數入出息, and the translators of the *Kokuyaku issaikyō* (p. 353 and p. 460 respectively) as well as Bronkhorst (1993, 13) render 數 as ‘to count’. Another sense of 數, however, also fitting in the context, is ‘repeatedly’, ‘many times’, etc. Without an Indic parallel, it is hard to determine the precise meaning of the word here, but no matter what its sense may be, the practice described is not a Buddhist one. The context is that of the Buddha’s remembering the extreme ascetic practices which he undertaken before his awakening. The attitude towards such practices is far from positive.

Finally, let us remind that while the T-ASYJ speaks of the sixteen excellent practices, the K-ASYJ contains no reference to them whatsoever. It is very difficult to decide whether the passage treating with the sixteen practices in the T-ASYJ is a commentarial interpolation or part of the original text.

⁶⁷ More recent studies, such as Harrison 1997, especially pp. 279-280; Harrison 2002; Yamabe 1997; and Deleanu 1997a also suggest a Sarvāstivādin affiliation of other texts in the An Shigao corpus. The last two articles as well as Deleanu

Given the central thematic preoccupation of this meditation treatise, its authorship can be linked to one of the groups of Buddhist yogis 瑜伽師 active inside or closely associated with this school.⁶⁷ Especially in its early stages, Sarvāstivāda was probably not a monolithic doctrinal orthodoxy and must have included different groups of monastics sharing a common Vinaya tradition but not necessarily espousing completely identical views.⁶⁸ The texts translated by An Shigao may reflect one of the peripheral communities or, so to speak, a blind alley in the Sarvāstivādin history which did not survive completely into the *Mahāvibhāṣāśāstra* 大毘婆沙論 orthodoxy.

I must stress, however, that this discussion concerning the school affiliation of the text remains largely hypothetical. The exact understanding of the K-ASYJ, a text far from easy (though easier to follow than the T-ASYJ), is still a work in progress. I am sure that as research continues and its results (first and foremost, the publication of the text) are made open to the scholars all over the world, we shall be able to build a much better understanding of the textual formation and doctrinal content of the ASYJ, in particular, and An Shigao and his background, in general. Last but not least, I pray that the wondrous karmic law may again bestow its graces, through the good offices and hard work of devoted scholars like Professor Ochiai and Mr Kajiura, and bless the scholarly community with the discovery of new MSS of related interest.

1992a also discuss the link between An Shigao's translations and the early Sarvāstivādin yogis.

⁶⁸ The necessity of understanding Sarvāstivāda as a composite school is also pointed out by Ui (1971, 453).

Acknowledgements

It is my duty and pleasure to express my sincerest gratitude to the following persons and institutions: Professor Ochiai Toshinori for having given me the opportunity to work on the Kongō-ji text of the *An ban shou yi jing* as a member of the Study Group of the Newly Found Texts Translated by An Shigao, for often sharing with me his extensive knowledge of Sino-Japanese codicology and philology, for the detailed explanations which he and Mr Kajiura kindly gave me and Dr Zacchetti during our visit to Kongō-ji in July 2001, and for providing me with MS photos and articles; Dr Stefano Zacchetti for allowing me to read his seminal studies in draft, for sending me his papers as well as other relevant materials, and for the stimulating discussions which we had on An Shigao and early Chinese translations; the members of the Study Group of the Newly Found Texts Translated by An Shigao, especially Mr Miyake Tetsujō 三宅徹誠, for the very helpful discussions and materials distributed at its meetings; Professors T. Vetter, Paul Harrison, Yamabe Nobuyoshi and Wang Bangwei as well as Mr Kajiura Susumu for kindly sending me their excellent studies; and, last but not least, the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science whose grant-in-aid for scientific research has greatly facilitated our study of the text as well as the presentation of our findings.

A preliminary version of this paper in Japanese was read at the meeting of the Study Group of the Newly Found Texts Translated by An Shigao in November 2002. I greatly benefited from the discussions and suggestions made by my colleagues, mainly Professor Ochiai, Dr Zacchetti, and Mr Kajiura, whom I warmly thank again.

References

Primary Sources, Translations, and Abbreviations

Apart from the *Visuddhimagga of Buddhaghosa*, edited by Henry

Clarke Warren, revised by Dharmananda Kosambi (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, [1950] 1989), I have used the Pali Text Society editions for the canonical texts (*pāli*) and their commentaries (*aṭṭhakathā*). For the subcommentaries (*ṭīkā*), I have used the *Chaṭṭha Saṅgāyana CD-ROM from Dhammagiri*. Version 1.1. (India, Dhammagiri: Vipassana Research Institute). The abbreviation system follows the *Critical Pali Dictionary*. References to the Taishō Canon (abbreviated as T) follow the usual conventions. Other abbreviations of Chinese sources are:

ASYJ: *An ban shou yi jing* 安般守意經

K-ASYJ: Kongō-ji text of the *An ban shou yi jing* 安般守意經

T-ASYJ: Taishō Canon text of the *An ban shou yi jing* 安般守意經

Other primary sources and translations referred at include:

Brough, John ed. [1962] 2001. *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Du Jiwen, annotated translation. 杜繼文釋譯. 1997. *An ban shou yi jing* 安般守意經. Taipei: Foguanshan wenhua chuban.

Hayashi Gohō 林五邦譯, *kundoku* 訓讀 translation, Mizuno Kōgen 水野弘元, revision and introduction, Nara Yasuaki 奈良康明, [2nd] revision. [1933] 1992 (revised ed.) *Kokuyaku issaikyō, Agon-bu* vol. VIII 國譯一切經・阿含部 八. Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha.

Pradhan P. ed. 1975. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu*. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Institute.

Ui Hakuju 宇井伯壽, annotated *kundoku* 訓讀 translation. *Bussetsu dai an pan shu i kyō* 佛說大安般守意經. In Ui 1971, 201-244 (for details, see below).

Secondary Sources

Aramaki Noritoshi 荒牧典俊. 1971. 'Indo bukkyō kara Chūgoku bukkyō he: An pan shu i kyō to Kō Sōe, Dōan, Sha Fu Jo nado' イン

- ド仏教から中国仏教へー安般守意經と康僧会・道安・謝敷序などー.
Bukkyō shigaku 仏教史学. 15 (2): 121-165.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes. 1993. *The Two Traditions of Meditation in Ancient India*. 2nd ed. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
- Deleanu Florin デレアヌ フロリン. 1992a. 'An Seikō-yaku *An pan shu i kyō* genkōbon no seiritsu ni tsuite' 安世高譯『安般守意經』現行本の成立について. *Tōyō no shisō to shukyō* 東洋の思想と宗教. 9: 48-63.
- Deleanu, Florin. 1992b. 'Mindfulness of Breathing in the *Dhyāna Sūtras*'. *Transactions of the International Conference of Orientalists in Japan*. 37:42-57.
- Deleanu, Florin. 1997a. 'A Preliminary Study of An Shigao's 安世高 Translation of the *Yogācārabhūmi* 道地經'. *The Journal of the Department of Liberal Arts of Kansai Medical University* 関西医科大学教養部紀要. 17: 33-52.
- Deleanu Florin デレアヌ フロリン. 1997b. 'An Seikō Kokusai Kaigi ni sankā shite' 安世高國際會議に参加して. *Tohōgaku* 東方學. 94: 82-88.
- Harrison, Paul. 1997. 'The *Ekottarikāgama* Translations of An Shigao'. In Petra Kieffer-Pülz and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, eds. *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Swisttal-Oldendorf: Indica Et Tibetica Verlag, 261-283.
- Harrison, Paul. 2002. 'Another Addition to the An Shigao Corpus? Preliminary Notes on an Early Chinese *Samyuktāgama* Translation'. In Sakurabe Ronshu Committee, ed. 櫻部建博士喜寿記念論文集刊行会編 *Studies in Honour of Dr Sakurabe Hajime on the Occasion of His Seventy-Seventh Birthday*. 櫻部建博士喜寿記念論文集. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten.
- Hayashiya Tomojirō 林屋友次郎. 1937. 'An Seikō-yaku no Zōagon to Zōichiagon' 安世高譯の雜阿含と増一阿含. *Bukkyō kenkyū* 佛教研究.

1 (1): 11-50.

Hayashiya Tomojirō 林屋友次郎. 1941. *Kyōroku kenkyū* 經録研究. Part I. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Hong Hongrong 洪鴻栄. 2002. ‘*Bussetsu dai an pan shu i kyō no kenkyū*—Saishoki kakugi bukkyō no kaimei—’ 『仏説大安般守意經』の研究—最初期格義仏教の解明—. *Risshō daigaku daigakuin nenpō* 立正大学大学院年報. 19: 135-144.

Kajiura Susumu 梶浦晋. 2001. ‘Kongō-ji Issaikyō to shinshutsu An Seikō-yaku butten’ 金剛寺一切經と新出安世高譯佛典. *Bukkyōgaku seminā* 佛教学セミナー. 73: 25-43.

Kamata Shigeo 鎌田茂雄. 1982. *Chūgoku bukkyōshi* 中国仏教史. Vol. 1: *Shodenki no bukkyō* 初伝期の仏教. Tokyo: Tōkyō shuppankai.

Kawashima Jōmyō 川島常明. 1976. ‘An pan shu i kyō ni tsuite’ 安般守意經について. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究. 24 (2): 232-235.

Lancaster, Lewis R., in collaboration with Sung-bae Park. 1979. *The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Ochiai Toshinori 落合俊典. 2001. ‘Yomigaetta Chūgoku bukkyō no “genten”: Kongō-ji de hakken sareta An Seikō-yaku *Ju ni mon kyō*’ よみがえった中国仏教の＜原典＞—金剛寺で発見された安世高訳『十二門經』—. *Daihōrin* 大法輪. March 2001: 132-135.

Ochiai Toshinori 落合俊典. 2002. ‘*Dai an pan kyō to Shō an pan kyō*’ 『大安般經』と『小安般經』. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 學佛教學研究. 51(1): 31-36.

Ōtani Shōshin 大谷勝眞. 1924. ‘An Seikō no yakukyō ni tsuite’ 安世高の譯經に就いて. *Tōyō gakuho* 東洋學報. 13 (4): 102-139.

Ōtani Tetsuo 大谷哲夫. 1968. ‘Chūgoku shoki zenkan no kokyūhō to yōsei-setsu no yōki ni tsuite—An pan shu i kyō no ryūkō wo megutte—中國初期禪觀の呼吸法と養生説の「養氣」について—安般

- 守意經の流行をめぐって一. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究. 17 (1): 142-143.
- Ren Jiyou 任繼愈, general ed. 1981. *Zhongguo fojiaoshi* 中国佛教史. Vol.1. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe.
- Salomon, Richard. 1999. *Ancient Buddhist Scrolls from Gandhāra: The British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Satō Yoshihiro 佐藤義博. 1996. 'Shoki kanyaku kyōten no yakugo kenkyū: An Seikō-yaku kyōten to *Ron go oyobi Rō shi wo chūshin ni*' 初期漢訳經典の訳語研究—安世高訳經典と『論語』及び『老子』を中心に. In *Imanishi Junkichi kyōju kanreki kinen ronbunshū: Indo shisō to bukkyō bunka*. 今西順吉教授還暦記念論文集インド思想と仏教文化 Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 399-410.
- Shibasaki Terukazu 柴崎照和. Forthcoming. *Myōe shōnin shisō no kenkyū* 明恵上人思想の研究. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan.
- Tang Yongtong 汤用彤. [1938] 1983. *Han Wei Liangjin Nanbeichao fojiao shi* 汉魏两晋南北朝佛教史. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.
- Tokiwa Daijō 常盤大定. [1938] 1973. *Gokan yori Sō-Sei ni itaru yakukyō sōroku* 後漢より宋齊に至る譯經總録. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai.
- Tsukamoto Zenryū 塚本善隆. 1979. *Chūgoku bukkyō tsūshi* 中国仏教通史. Vol. 1. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- Ui Hakuju 宇井伯壽. 1971. *Yakukyōshi kenkyū* 譯經史研究. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.
- Vetter, Tilmann, and Paul Harrison. 1998. 'An Shigao's Chinese Translation of the *Saptasthānasūtra*'. In Paul Harrison and Gregory Schopen, eds. *Suryacāndrāya: Essays in Honour of Akira Yuyama on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Swisttal-Oldendorf: Indica Et Tibetica Verlag, 197-216.
- Wang, Bangwei. 1997. 'Mahāyāna or Hīnayāna: A Reconsideration of the yāna Affiliation of An Shigao and His School'. In Petra

- Kieffer-Pulz and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, eds. *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Swisttal-Oldendorf: Indica Et Tibetica Verlag, 689-697.
- Yamabe Nobuyoshi. 1997. 'An Shigao as a Precursor of the Yogācāra Tradition: A Preliminary Study'. In *Watanabe Takao kyōju kanreki kinen: Bukkyō shisō bunkashi ronsō* 渡邊隆生教授還暦記念 仏教思想文化史論叢. Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō, 153-194.
- Zacchetti, Stefano. 1997. 'Un problema di critica testuale nel *Foshuo zhuan falun jing* (T 109) attribuito ad An Shigao. *Rivista della Facoltà di lingue e letterature straniere dell'Università di Venezia*. 36 (3): 381-395.
- Zacchetti, Stefano. 2002a. 'On the Authenticity of the Kongōji Manuscript of An Shigao's *Anban Shouyi jing* 安般守意經'. *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the Academic Year 2001* 創価大学国際仏教学高等研究所年報 平成13年度. 5: 157-158.
- Zacchetti, Stefano. 2002b. 'An Early Chinese Translation corresponding to Chapter 6 of the *Petakopadesa* An Shigao's *Yin chi ru jing* T 603 and Its Indian original: a preliminary survey'. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*. 65 (1): 74-97.
- Zürcher, E. 1972. *The Buddhist Conquest of China: The Spread and Adaptation of Buddhism in Early Medieval China*. 2nd edition. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Zürcher, E. 1977. 'Late Han Vernacular Elements in the Earliest Buddhist Translations'. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers' Association* 12 (3):177-203.
- Zürcher, E. 1991. 'A New Look at the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Texts'. In Koichi Shinohara and Gregory Schopen, eds. *From Benares to Beijing: Essays on Buddhism and Chinese Religion in Honour of Prof. Jan Yun-hua*. Oakville, Ontario: Mosaic, 277-300.

100 The Newly Found Text of the *An ban shou yi jing* Translated by An Shigao(Deleanu)

*Reader,
International College
for Advanced Buddhist Studies*