

Studies in Āgama Literature – With Special Reference to the Shorter Chinese Saṃyuktāgama. By Marcus Bingenheimer. (Dharma Drum Buddhist College, Special Series 1) Taipei: Shin Wen Feng. 2011. 345 pp. ISBN: 978-957-17-2139-2.

The Chinese canon contains, as is well known, a substantial corpus of translations of non-Mahāyāna *sūtras*, including several collections (*Āgamas*) roughly corresponding to the Pāli *Nikāyas*. The study of this literature, often very challenging from a linguistic and philological point of view, had long remained, with some important exceptions, the preserve of Japanese scholars. However, recent years have witnessed a flourishing of *Āgama* studies by Western scholars: for example, one could mention Paul Harrison's ground-breaking articles on two *Āgama* anthologies ascribable to the 2nd century translator An Shigao (Harrison 1997 and 2002), the numerous important studies by Ven. Anālayo (see especially Anālayo 2011 and 2012), or Antonello Palumbo's masterful monograph centred on the Chinese translation of the *Ekottarikāgama* (2013). Also the recent discoveries of Buddhist manuscripts in the Gāndhārī language have played a role in fostering renewed interest in the study of the Chinese parallels (*Āgama* included) to these important documents (see for example Glass 2007, especially pp. 26-70 and 219-223).

The book under review, which fully belongs to this new wave of *Āgama* studies, consists of a detailed study and a partial annotated translation of a (partial) anonymous Chinese version of a *Saṃyuktāgama*, transmitted in the canon with the title *Bieyi za ahan jing* 別譯雜阿含經 T 100 (hereafter BZA).¹ The author, Marcus Bingenheimer, has published extensively on the Chinese *Āgamas*² and, more generally, on various aspects of Chinese Buddhism. In many ways, this is an

¹The title of this collection (*Other Translation of Saṃyuktāgama* according to Bucknell 2008: 25) is given in contrast to the main *Saṃyuktāgama* transmitted in the Chinese Canon, the *Za ahan jing* 雜阿含經 T 99. The BZA is found in vol. 2 of the *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經, the modern standard edition of the Chinese Buddhist Canon (Tokyo 1924-1932), and in vol. 33 of the *Zhonghua dazangjing* 中華大藏經, another important edition of the canon published in China (Beijing, 1984-1996, hereafter ZH).

²As a recent, important contribution of the author in this field one could mention his co-authorship of the translation of the *Madhyamāgama* (T 26), whose first volume has recently appeared in the BDK English Tripitaka Series: Marcus Bingenheimer, Anālayo, Roderick Bucknell. *The Madhyama Āgama (The Middle Length Discourses)*. Vol.1 Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation & Research, 2013.

important and welcome contribution: it is not common to see early Chinese Buddhist translations being made the object of a historical study and a philologically-oriented annotated translation of this kind. As pointed out in the Introduction (§ 1.1, pp. 2-3) this book is part of a larger project focused on this particular canonical collection, including an impressive digital edition of the entire BZA (see <http://buddhisticinformatics.ddbc.edu.tw/BZA/>).

The book can be subdivided into two main parts: while chapters 1 and 2 form an introductory portion devoted to some general issues pertaining to the BZA, chapters 3-6 contain the annotated translation of four sections selected from this *Samyuktāgama*. Each chapter of this second part is in fact conceived as a kind of short monograph centred on a specific section of the BZA: the relevant translation is always preceded by an essay devoted to particular lexicographical issues. The book is completed by two appendixes, a bibliography, and various indexes. Appendix 1 (pp. 245-302) consists of an extremely useful “Comparative Catalog” of the BZA, listing the available Pāli, Chinese, Sanskrit, and Tibetan parallels to each of its *sūtras*. Appendix 2 (“Simple quantitative comparison of the ZA and the BZA”, pp. 303-308) contains a Stylometric comparative analysis of the BZA and the corresponding portions of the main *Samyuktāgama* collection translated into Chinese, the *Za ahan jing* 雜阿含經 T 99 (hereafter ZA).

The main parts of Chapter 1 (Introduction) are § 1.2, on the date of the translation, and §§ 1.3-1.4, discussing the structure of the BZA. The author follows Mizuno Kōgen in dating the translation to the Western Qin 秦 dynasty (385-431 CE). While I find Mizuno’s argument convincing,³ this section of the book contains some inaccuracies. For instance we read (p. 4) that “his [viz. Mizuno’s] main argument is that the sutras translated in the Former and Later Qin, which were ruled from Chang’an, are generally included in the *Chu sanzang jiji*, which

³ A gloss contained in the BZA (T 100 p. 483b 5-6) suggests that the text was translated during a Qin 秦 dynasty. Three dynasties with this name are known to have existed in North China between 4th and 5th century CE: two – Former and Later Qin – ruled successively over different areas of northern China from their capital Chang’an 長安, while the third, the Western Qin, controlled part of present day Gansu province. Mizuno (1970: 46-47) observed that the BZA is not mentioned in Sengyou’s *Chu sanzang jiji* T 2145, our main bibliographical source for early Chinese Buddhist translations, which is well informed on translations produced in Chang’an during Former and Later Qin, but contains almost no record of works produced under the more peripheral Western Qin, which were generally unknown in Central China (華中). This in turn suggests that the BZA, having remained unknown to Sengyou, is likely to have been translated in the area controlled by the latter dynasty.

was itself written in Chang'an".⁴ But Mizuno does not say that: in fact he explicitly mentions the southern origin of Sengyou's *Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集 T 2145 (see Mizuno 1970: 488), which indeed is one of the most remarkable and representative works of 6th century Southern Buddhism.⁵

On p. 5 the author quotes an interesting observation on the historical background of the BZA by the 18th century Japanese monk 法幢 Hōdō (not Hōdo, as the name is transcribed throughout chapters 1-2) contained in his commentary to the *Abhidharmakośa* (*Abidatsumakusharon keiko* 阿毘達磨俱舍論稽古 T 2252). The incipit of this passage reads as follows (the punctuation is mine):

今檢譯文體裁，蓋在魏晉之間，全非東晉以下語氣。(T 2252 p. 446a 27-28)

The author translates this as:

If we now consider the translation style [of the BZA], it should rather belong to the Wei Jin dynasty [the Western Jin (265-317)]. Nothing in it is of the kind of language used after the Eastern Jin [317-420].

I fail to see how the expression 魏晉之間 could possibly refer just to the Western Jin dynasty (and there has never been a single "Wei Jin dynasty" in Chinese imperial history). I would rather translate this passage as:

Now, if we examine the translation style [of the BZA], it should probably belong to the period encompassing the Wei [dynasty of the Three Kingdoms period, 220-265 CE] and the Jin [i.e., the Western (265-316 CE) and Eastern (317-420 CE) Jin]. It is absolutely not the language used after the Eastern Jin.

The next two paragraphs (§§ 1.3-1.4, the latter being specifically devoted to an analysis of the BZA's *uddānas*, or summary verses listing the subjects of a preceding section) deal with the structure of the BZA collection, and to the changes it underwent over the course of its transmission. Here the author gives a detailed

⁴Cf. also the discussion of the circulation of Western Qin translations on p. 5: "It must be assumed that sutras translated in the Gansu corridor under the rule of the Xianbei Qifu 伏, whose dynasty came to be known as the Western Qin, were not well known in Chang'an in the early 6th century when Sengyou compiled the *Chu sanzang jiji*."

⁵On Sengyou, see Link 1960 (especially pp. 29-40 on the *Chu sanzang ji ji*); on the *Chu sanzang ji ji* and its textual history, see also Palumbo 2003: 197, with n. 87 and 2013: 50 with n. 96 and 164-168.

overview of the recent research on this subject (particularly of Roderick Bucknell's ground-breaking works), providing an interesting and generally convincing discussion of several complex issues. I found this part of the introduction, with its discussion of some ancient editions of the Chinese Buddhist canon, of particular interest.⁶ It is rare to see this subject treated in western scholarship, and the author is certainly to be commended for having devoted so much attention to it.

The BZA has been transmitted, in the various ancient editions of the canon, in two versions, having almost the same content, but arranged differently and consisting respectively of 16 and 20 scrolls (*juan* 卷). On p. 9, the author refers to Roderick Bucknell's hypothesis that the BZA included in the earliest printed edition of the Chinese Buddhist canon, the late 10th-century Northern Song edition known as *Kaibao zang* 開寶藏 ("Canon of the Kaibao [era]", of which only scant fragments survive) was edited in 16 scrolls (*juan* 卷).⁷ Bucknell's argument can be further corroborated thanks to an important source of first-hand information on the *Kaibao zang* that ought to be consulted systematically when reconstructing the textual history of Chinese Buddhist translations: this is Weibo's 惟白 early 12th century detailed survey of the entire canon, the *Dazangjing gangmu zhiyao lu* 大藏經綱目指要錄 (*Shōwa hōbō sōmokuroku* 昭和法寶總目錄 no. 37, pp. 571-772; ZH vol. 56, pp. 116-250), which, as demonstrated by Li Fuhua and He Mei (2003: 78-79), was based on a copy of the *Kaibao zang*. The entry on the BZA in Weibo's work (*Shōwa hōbō sōmokuroku* p. 699b-c; ZH pp. 200-201) describes a BZA in 16 scrolls, leaving no doubts that this was indeed the format of this collection in the *Kaibao zang*.⁸

⁶A terminological problem occurring in some passages of the book dealing with issues of textual history and criticism is the use of "stemma" to refer to a group or family of textual witnesses, rather than to the schematic representation of their relationship, as in this passage on p. 17: "... this manuscript is an ancestor of the stemma of Chinese editions referenced in the Taishō with the sigla 宋元明 and not of the Tripitaka Koreana - Qisha - Taishō stemma" (see also p. 20, n. 74 p. 89 etc.). This use seems slightly imprecise to me: I am not aware that "stemma" as a term of philology is used with a different meaning from that recorded by the online version of the *Oxford English Dictionary* (<http://www.oed.com/>): "A diagram which represents a reconstruction on stemmatic principles of the position of the surviving witnesses in the tradition of the transmission of a text, esp. in manuscript form."

⁷See Bucknell 2008: 26-29. According to Bucknell, "[m]odern catalogues state that the BZA contained in it [viz. in the *Kaibao zang*] consisted of twenty fascicles" (p. 27). This is also true of Tong Wei's monograph, which is specifically devoted to reconstructing the content of the *Kaibao zang* (Tong 1991: 82, entry no. 647).

⁸See also Li and He 2003: 85. In this connection, it should also be noted that three scrolls of the BZA from the 11th century first Koryō national edition of the Canon (itself a direct offspring of the

The final paragraph of chapter 1 (pp. 20-22) discusses an “anomaly”⁹ (to quote the author’s expression) occurring in the Jin edition of the canon.¹⁰ While very interesting in many respects, this discussion contains a few inaccuracies. On p. 21 one reads: “In the early days of printing (10th to 12th centuries), printed sheets were pasted together, fitted with rollers and turned into *juan* scrolls, because this was the manuscript-era format that readers were familiar with. Concertina-style folding, string-bound books and other formats appeared only later. In the Qisha canon, as opposed to the Jin canon, the original numbering of the sheets that were pasted together for each *juan* is preserved.”

I think that there is some confusion here. The so-called “concertina binding”, or “*sūtra* binding” (*jingzhezhuang* 經摺裝), typical of Buddhist texts and already used in some Dunhuang manuscripts dating to the early 10th century (Li Jining 2002: 37), was adopted by the *Chongning zang* 崇寧藏, the earliest private edition of the entire canon produced in Fuzhou between the late 11th and the early 12th centuries (see Zacchetti 2005: 111), which fully belongs to “the early days of printing” as defined by the author. In fact I wonder if the distinction scroll/concertina format is really relevant to the point at issue here.¹¹ It is also not correct that the Jin canon does not contain “the original numbering of the sheets”: the number of each folio (except the first folio of each scroll) is given on the right, immediately before the first column of text.¹²

Kaibao zang, which survives only in part) have been preserved: they are scrolls no. 3 (covering one portion of the BZA translated in the book), 5, and 8. Until recently, photographs of the surviving scrolls of this edition were accessible through the magnificent website of the Research Institute of Tripitaka Koreana (http://kb.sutra.re.kr/ritk_eng/index.do), but at present (September 2014) unfortunately this seems to be no longer the case.

⁹The anomaly consists in the fact that after the *uddāna* found at the end of *sūtra* no. 223 (ZH vol. 33 p. 401c 23-402a 1; cf. T 100 p. 456b 21-23, corresponding to folio 12 of scroll 12 in the second Koryō edition), in the Jin edition (see the next note) there is a second *uddāna* (ZH vol. 33 p. 402a 2-3), also attested in some southern editions collated by ZH and *Taishō*. (Here more precise reference to the original sources would have been helpful.)

¹⁰The so-called *Jin zang* 金藏, or “Jin Canon”, is an early printed edition of the canon produced during the 12th century in north China, during the Jin dynasty (1115-1234). Approximately 5000 scrolls of this canon were discovered in Shanxi province in 1933, while another 555 scrolls printed in the 13th century were found in Tibet in 1959 (see Zacchetti 2005: 99-100). A significant portion of the Jin Canon is reproduced in ZH.

¹¹In the “*sūtra* binding” the sheets of paper are pasted together exactly as in traditional scrolls, the main difference from the latter lying in the fact that folios are folded (usually, for printed editions of the canon, five or six-fold) “in accordion”.

¹²See for example ZH vol. 33, beginning of p. 259c (this is the first folio in the Jin edition of the BZA to be numbered): 別譯雜阿含經卷第一 第二張 不字號, “*Bieyi za ahan jing* scroll 1 folio 2,

Footnote 34 on the same page states that “The BZA text in the Jin canon references the Liao canon edition at the beginning of fascicle 12, saying, ‘in the Liao edition [the following starts] at fascicle 6, sheet 12’”. The passage at issue is in ZH vol. 33 p. 398b (first folio of scroll 12). Even if most of scroll 12 of the BZA in this edition does indeed reproduce the Jin canon, some folios of the latter were damaged, and were thus replaced – as is customarily done in such cases in ZH – with the corresponding folios of the 13th century second Koryŏ edition (see ZH’s apparatus on p. 408b). This is also the case with the initial folio of this scroll: in fact interlinear glosses mentioning variants from the Liao canon¹³ are a distinctive and exclusive feature of the second Koryŏ national canon,¹⁴ which bears witness to remarkable text-critical work at the basis of this edition (on which see Buswell 2006). On the other hand, while it is possible to demonstrate that some time after their carving the woodblocks of the Jin edition were indeed altered, in some cases, on the basis of the Liao canon, the latter is not explicitly mentioned in our only source describing this collation work.¹⁵

Chapter 2 discusses the sectarian affiliation of the BZA. The author, who follows Fumio Enomoto’s attribution of the BZA to the (Mūla)sarvāstivādin tradition (§ 2.3, pp. 40-44), devotes a large part of this chapter (§ 2.1-2.2, pp. 23-40) to discussing and refuting other hypotheses. On the whole, I found this chapter clear and well documented.

As noted above, chapters 3-6 contain an annotated translation of four sections of the BZA, partly corresponding to the *Bhikkhusaṃyutta*, the *Mārasaṃyutta*, the *Bhikkhunīsaṃyutta*, and the *Sakkasaṃyutta* of the Pāli *Samyuttanikāya*. In fact

character *bu* 不 in the [*Thousand-character text*] sequence”. On the use of the *Qian zi wen* 千字文 (*Thousand-character text*) character sequence as a device for “numbering” the cases containing the scriptures of the canon, see Zacchetti 2005: 64 with n. 76.

¹³The Liao canon (*Liao zang* 遼藏, also known as *Qidan zang* 契丹藏) was a woodblock edition of the canon produced during the first half of the 11th century in North China, under the Liao dynasty, and now almost completely lost (see Zacchetti 2005: 102-104, and especially n. 128 p. 103 on the dating of this edition).

¹⁴The wooden printing blocks of this famous edition of the Chinese Buddhist canon (the so-called *Pālman Taejanggyŏng* 八萬大藏經, or “Canon in eighty-thousand [blocks]”), which are still preserved, were carved between 1236 and 1251. On the interlinear glosses found in this edition see Zacchetti 2005: 101-102; for such notes in the BZA, see Bucknell 2008: 28-30. Incidentally, I do not think that the modern neologism “Tripitaka Koreana”, used by Bingenheimer with reference to the *Pālman Taejanggyŏng* (e.g. see p. 9 and *passim*), is really a historically accurate definition, even if it seems endorsed by the Research Institute mentioned in n. 8 above.

¹⁵On this issue see Zacchetti 2011 (cf. 2005: 100 and 124-125); cf. also n. 15 p. 9 of the book under review.

the author has adopted these Pāli titles in his translation, applying them to the relevant BZA sections, without discussing this choice in the introduction. However, it should be remarked that in the BSZ the thematic sections (*samyuktas*) bear no title, and in fact they are not even identified or marked off in any particular way in the original Chinese text.

Let me start with some general remarks on this part of the book. The translation is generally very good, and indeed often excellent, being fluent and yet faithful to the original Chinese text. This is all the more remarkable, as these often difficult scriptures are being rendered for the first time into a Western language.¹⁶ In preparation for this review I read the whole Chinese text covered by this translation, and in a number of cases it was only after consulting Bingenheimer's version that I was able to grasp the correct understanding of the original text. It is important to bear this in mind when reading the rest of this review, for, in general, it is far easier to point out errors in a translation than to do justice to its positive qualities.

Having said this, I think that a general introduction to the translation, placed in a more strategic position at the beginning of the second part of the book (i.e., before chapter 3), would have been useful. Instead, only a short paragraph at the end of the introduction to just the *Bhikkhusamyutta* section (§ 3.3, p. 58) is devoted to discussing translation policies which are in fact adopted in the entire book. This is far too little for a work of this kind, which, after all, involves several complex translation issues. Thus a number of important questions are addressed only in passing, or even not addressed at all.

The author's decision to render in Pāli the words – mainly names – transcribed phonetically in the BZA (as well as section titles, as remarked above) is a case in point. This question, far from trivial, and in fact full of important implications, is dispatched in just one sentence: "As the intended readership is likely to be more familiar with the Pāli parallels to these texts, Pāli names and terms are in general preferred to Sanskrit ones" (p. 58).

I am not sure that this is a reason strong enough to justify the price of this choice, which is high, particularly in view of the scholarly nature of this book. It amounts to a loss of historical accuracy in the representation of the BZA (which, as noted above, is ascribed by Bingenheimer to the [Mūla]sarvāstivādin school), because while it might not be entirely clear what original language the phonetic

¹⁶The author mentions a Korean translation (n. 12 p. 58) which, however, he has not been able to access.

transcriptions found in this text reflect, it was certainly not Pāli. As the author himself states, “We do not know enough about the original to offer a more precise description of its language. We know for sure that it was neither Pāli nor Sanskrit, but closer to the latter.”¹⁷

If so, one wonders if Sanskrit would not have been a better choice (though it goes without saying that this too would just be a provisional and conventional device), especially because some forms found in the BZA indeed seem to point in this direction. But in any case greater care and consistency in the rendition of phonetic transcriptions would have been preferable. So, for example, while 憍尸迦 (T 100 p. 384c 24), *kiawēikia* in Early Middle Chinese (as reconstructed by Pulleyblank 1991), which seems to correspond quite closely to the Sanskrit Kauśika,¹⁸ is represented in the translation by the Pāli form Kosiya (p. 201), on the next page 因陀羅 *ṅjindala* (T 100 p. 385a 1) – a form, again, seemingly reflecting a Sanskrit original – is indeed rendered with the Sanskrit Indra.

Some inconsistencies in the interpretation of technical terms and idiomatic expressions are noticeable in the translation and could occasionally generate confusion (see for example the renditions of *changye* 長夜 and *fanxing* 梵行 discussed below).

The notes to the translation mainly deal with philological and lexicographical questions, often of considerable interest. Several notes provide Indic equivalents to Chinese terms and words found in the BZA, but this, which at first glance might seem a strength of the book, in fact turns out to be, in many cases, one of its weaknesses. The author seems to place full confidence in Akira Hirakawa’s *Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Dictionary* (1997), which is quoted almost thirty times in the notes to the translation. I venture to say that this confidence is misplaced. Hirakawa’s *Dictionary* is not a particularly sound lexicographical work, chiefly due to a crucial shortcoming: it does not provide references, but a bare list of Sanskrit supposed “equivalents” to a given Chinese word, leaving the reader in the dark as to where and when the latter was actually used to render the former,¹⁹ and

¹⁷Incidentally, this, which is the most explicit discussion of the important issue of the language of the Indic original of the BZA I could find in the book, is buried in a brief footnote in chapter 5 (n. 5 p. 153); cf. also pp. 37-40 for a discussion of Mizuno Kōgen’s hypothesis concerning this question (cf. Mizuno 1970: 50-51), and pp. 153-160.

¹⁸For a Sanskrit fragment corresponding to this portion of the *sūtra*, see Enomoto 1994: 28 no. 1106.

¹⁹It is true that one of the main sources of Hirakawa’s *Dictionary* is Wogihara Unrai’s Sanskrit-Japanese dictionary (Wogihara Unrai 荻原雲来 [ed. by Naoshiro Tsuji]. *Kanyaku taishō Bon-wa*

without quoting the contexts within which these lexical correspondences occur. The usefulness of this *Dictionary* as a tool for the philological study of Chinese translations is very limited, and it should never be trusted blindly.

Also (but not only) as a result of the author's reliance on Hirakawa's *Dictionary*, Chinese words are quoted in the notes with an abundance of alleged Indic parallels which is inversely proportional to the number of actually documented correspondences. A clear example of this rather cavalier approach is in n. 17 p. 59: “*jiafa* 家法 *kula-dhamma*. Both the Indian term and the Chinese term have several shades of meaning within their respective cultures. ...”. However, the Pāli parallel to this BZA *sūtra* (SN II 278-278) does not contain this expression (in fact the compound *kula-dhamma* does not even seem attested in Pāli canonical literature, even though there are a handful of occurrences in later texts), so here the reader is left wondering how the author arrived at this reconstruction.

These notes betray a somewhat simplistic view of Chinese Buddhist translations. My own experience in working on these texts (especially the early ones) is that even when we have several Indic parallels to a given Chinese version, it may often prove difficult or even impossible to identify the specific original terms underlying a particular Chinese word. This is chiefly due to two reasons: fluidity in the textual development and transmission of Indian Buddhist literature on the one hand, and rather flexible translation policies in China on the other.

Here I will confine myself to just two examples.

A passage from *sūtra* 20 of the BZA (T 100 p. 380b 4-5: 嗜欲在心, “desire pervaded [his] mind”) is translated on p. 100 as “his mind desiring sensuality”.²⁰ The expression *shiyu* 嗜欲 is then discussed in n. 100 on the same page as follows: “*shiyu* 嗜欲 **paribhoga-kāma*. The expression appears in the BZA (6 times), in the ZA (twice) and in various *Udānavarga* texts (T.210, T.211, T.212), pointing again to a common tradition for these texts.”

I find this note misleading, as it gives the impression that the equivalence *shiyu* 嗜欲 = **paribhoga-kāma* (which, incidentally, does not seem to be attested in Pāli) is unproblematic and well attested. But then one wonders why, if so, no detailed reference to any Indic parallel is provided. The disyllabic word *shiyu* al-

daijiten 漢訳対照梵和大辞典, Tokyo, 1978), which lists the Chinese translations of many Sanskrit words, providing basic references (see Hirakawa 1997: 3-7). Yet even Wogihara's dictionary does not go beyond quoting the titles of the Sanskrit scriptures in whose translations these renditions are attested.

²⁰ Another occurrence of this word (世間嗜欲, in BZA no. 21, T 100 p. 380c 12) is rendered, more accurately, as “worldly desires” (p. 103).

ready occurs in pre-Han classical Chinese (see HD vol. 3 p. 456a; note also the form 嗜欲, HD vol. 8 p. 641b, which is attested even earlier), so we are not facing a calque produced *ad hoc* to render a particular Indic expression. In fact, a closer analysis of two occurrences of *shiyu* in the BZA and in another early translation, compared with their available Pāli and Sanskrit parallels, shows that the picture is not nearly as simple as depicted by the author.

We can start from the passage at issue (BZA *sūtra* no. 20): 有一比丘在天祠邊，心念惡覺，嗜欲在心。(T 100 p. 380b 4-5; tr. p. 100: “At a *deva* shrine [he saw] a monk, his thoughts filled with evil, his mind desiring sensuality”). This corresponds to AN I 280: *addasā kho bhagavā ... aññataraṃ bhikkhuṃ rittassādaṃ bāhirassādaṃ ...* (“the Blessed One saw a certain monk enjoying empty and outward things ...”). As such, this Pāli passage would not seem to contain any clear parallel of *shiyu zai xin* 嗜欲在心 (“desire pervaded [his] mind”). It is interesting, though, that Buddhaghosa’s commentary, the *Manorathapūraṇī* (PTS ed. vol. 2 p. 378), glosses *bāhirassādaṃ* as “enjoying outward things out of pleasure in objects of sensual desire (*kāmaguṇasukhavasena*)”. It is thus possible that the BZA here reflects a similar interpretation, or perhaps even a variant in its original stemming from it (cf. Anālayo 2010 for similar patterns of textual development).

In the *Faju jing* 法句經, an early 3rd century Chinese translation of a *Dharma-pada*, 亦莫嗜欲樂 (T 210, p. 562, c4; for a convenient synoptic edition see Mizuno 1981: 92-93) corresponds to *Dhammapada* 27b (von Hinüber and Norman 2003: 8): *mā kāmaratisanthavaṃ*,²¹ i.e., “... nor to acquaintance with delight in sensual pleasures” (the verb is in the preceding *pāda*: *mā pamādam anuyuñ-jetha*: “You should not apply yourselves to carelessness ...”; I have quoted K.R. Norman’s translation, 2000: 4).

I will refrain from pushing this analysis of *shiyu* 嗜欲 – in itself, admittedly, a fairly trivial matter – any further. The point I am trying to make is – simply – that

²¹This reading is confirmed by the parallel in the *Udānavarga* (IV *Apramādavarga* 12, ed. Bernhard 1965: 129: *kāmaratisamstavam*) collated by Mizuno (loc. cit.). In the note on this passage of his *Dhammapada* translation, Norman remarks (2000: 68): “It would also be possible to explain *kāmaratisanthava* as a dvandva compound: ‘sensual pleasures, delight and acquaintance’”. On the Gāndhārī parallel, see Brough 1962: 137, no. 129-130; see also p. 214 for the commentary on stanza 129. There Brough also discusses this Chinese translation (亦莫嗜欲樂). He does not interpret the string 嗜欲 as a disyllabic word but, quoting Sylvain Lévi’s rendition (“ne recherchez ni désir ni plaisir”), he takes instead *shi* 嗜 as verb and *yu* 欲 and *le* 樂 as its objects, representing respectively *kāma* and *rati*. This too seems a possible interpretation of this particular passage, especially in view of its Indic parallels which suggest a certain stability in the textual transmission, and hence corroborate that *kāmarati*- is indeed the original underlying this Chinese translation.

establishing lexical equivalences between Chinese translations and Indic parallels is, as already pointed out above, a much more complex matter than is suggested by some of the notes contained in this book.

Another example is provided by the discussion of the expression *wuyu* 五欲 (lit. “five desires”) in n. 45 p. 130: “*wuyu* 五欲, **pañca kāma*. The prevalent term in Pāli, *pañca kāma-guṇā*, is well attested in the Chinese *Āgamas*, as *wu yu gongde* 五欲功德, with over 200 occurrences, but none in the BZA. The term 五欲 appears 46 times in the BZA, though never, as far as I can see, followed by something which might mean *guṇā*. 五欲 does not in itself specify whether what is referred to is pleasurable sensory objects or the mental response to these.”

My objection to this is that Chinese translations – particularly the early ones – are never to be taken as rigid calques of their Indic originals, and in fact it is easy to quote many passages where *wu yu* 五欲 (a well-established expression in Buddhist Chinese) appears to be used alone to translate *kāmaguṇa*.²²

I think that there is an important methodological issue at stake here: what we really need to establish when studying Chinese Buddhist translations from a philological and lexicographical point of view is not a set of generic, perhaps possible but unverified, lexical equivalences (such as those provided by Hiraakawa’s *Dictionary*), but specific and actually attested correspondences between a *particular* Chinese translation and its Indic parallel (or parallels). Doing this requires long and generally tedious work, which is however the price we have to pay for a solid understanding of Chinese Buddhist translations. Of course, it is crucial that we remain aware of the fact that the available *parallel* (or parallels) is unlikely to be the actual *original* of a given Chinese word (and indeed this is a common situation when comparing Chinese *Āgama* translations with their Pāli or Sanskrit parallels), but identifying and analysing such parallels remains an indispensable preliminary step in any serious study in this field.

In other words, the lexicographical model here should be the glossary *à la* Karashima (1998, 2001, and 2010), rather than the general dictionary exemplified by Hiraakawa 1997. We have not yet reached the stage when we can afford the confidence to provide Indic originals of Chinese translations in the way suggested by the notes in this book. In a work such as this, it would have been far more useful (and more meritorious in academic terms) to provide a systematic comparison of

²²For example, *wu yu* 五欲 it is often used to render *pañca- kāmaguṇa-* in translations by Dharmarakṣa (e.g. see Karashima 1998: 479, and Zacchetti 2005: 202-203, § 2.7-2.8) and Kumārajīva (see Karashima 2001: 292).

the BZA *sūtras* with all the available Sanskrit and Pāli parallels (always providing references to the PTS editions of the latter), as has been done in a number of cases (e.g. see n. 43 p. 129).

Before moving on to discussing some specific passages of the translation, let me add a further observation – again, more a general remark prompted by the importance of this book, especially as a potential model for future similar translations.

The study of Medieval Chinese (and, more specifically, of the language of Chinese Buddhist translations) is nowadays a flourishing field, especially in mainland China. It is important, when working on Chinese Buddhist translations, to take into account the research by Chinese and Japanese sinologists specializing in Medieval Chinese. This is rarely done in western publications, and, unfortunately, the book under review is no exception.

I think that here, too, we are facing a general and more important issue of method. Chinese Buddhist translations are written in a variety – or, more properly, in several varieties – of written Chinese, certainly influenced, to varying degrees, by their Indic originals, but also open to other linguistic influences: especially that of medieval (colloquial) Chinese, but also of literary Chinese. To properly understand these texts, it is not enough to consult Pāli and Sanskrit parallels; ideally, one has to be aware of their complex linguistic background also on the Chinese side.²³

In the following pages I will list my remarks on some specific passages of the translation.

- p. 62: “Then he turned into a small child adorned with jewels, pearls and jade, his body beautiful” (T 100 p. 374b 16: 又化作小兒，眾寶瓔珞莊嚴其身) → “Then he turned into a small child with a string of various jewels adorning his body”.

- p. 63: “You should not develop a covetous mind, as Devadatta has done” (T 100 p. 374b 26-27: 汝等不應於提婆達[v.l. + 多]所生願羨心). I do not think that the Chinese allows this interpretation. Here *suo* 所 has to be construed with the preceding noun, and means “towards, with respect to”.²⁴ So I would in-

²³See the important methodological remarks by Dong Zhiqiao, one of the best contemporary specialists in Medieval Chinese, in his review article on the modern annotated versions of two Chinese Buddhist translations (Dong 2007: 64-74; see especially pp. 64-65).

²⁴On this usage, see for example Ōta 1988: 16.

interpret this passage as “you should not generate envy²⁵ towards Devadatta”, or, in plain English, “you should not envy Devadatta”. One of the Pāli parallels to this BZA *sūtra* has a passage of a similar tenor: *mā bhikkhave Devadattassa lābhasakkārasilokam pihāyittha* (SN II p. 242).

In the BZA there are also other occurrences of the *yu* 於 ... *suo* 所 construction before the verb *sheng* 生 (“to produce, to generate etc.”): e.g., 汝今勿於彼二人所生嫌恨心 (T 100 p. 470a 20-21), literally “now you should not generate hatred towards those two persons”.²⁶

- p. 63: “This Devadatta will harm himself for the sake of gain and profit”; 此提婆達必為利養之所傷害 (T 100 p. 374b 27-28). Here the coverb *wei* 為 does not mean “for the sake of”, but introduces the agent in the passive construction *wei* 為 ... *zhi suo* 之所 + verb, particularly frequent in Medieval Chinese (Yang and He 680-681; Ōta 1988: 53). Therefore this passage is to be rendered as “this Devadatta will certainly be harmed by profit”. The same passage²⁷ is repeated on p. 374c 2-3.

- p. 63: “Devadatta ... will suffer because of this in the long night [of rebirths in ignorance]” (T 100 p. 374c 2: 長夜受苦) → “he will suffer for long time”. The Buddhist Chinese idiom *changye* 長夜, “(for) a long time”, is well known and studied (e.g. see Karashima 1998: 36-37; Li Weiqi 2004: 40-41). This expression, already attested in pre-Buddhist literature with the more literal meaning of a “very long/endless night” (see HD vol. 11 p. 590a), came to be used in Buddhist translations as a calque of the Sanskrit compounds *dirgharātra-*, *cirarātra-*²⁸ (Pāli

²⁵ *Yuanxian* 願美 is a disyllabic word (not recorded in HD and very rare in the canon); see Zacchetti forthcoming § 2.3. Incidentally, CBETA Reader 2014 suggests amending 美 (which is also the form found in the Jin canon (see ZH vol. 33 p. 260a 14) to 羨; this, however, seems unnecessary, as the former is simply a graphical variant of the latter.

²⁶ Note also 汝等今者勿於彼所生下劣想 in BZA 2 (T 100 p. 374a 27), appropriately translated on p. 61 as “You must not think that he is inferior”. Here 於 ... 所生 ... 想 probably reflects an underlying *-saṃjñām utpādayati* + locative (see BHSD p. 552); cf. for example the following passage from Kumārajīva’s translation of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*: 我等初見此土，生下劣想 (T 475 p. 554a 28-29), “when we first saw this land, we considered it inferior”, corresponding to *asmābhir iha buddhakṣetre hīnasamjñotpādītā* in the Sanskrit text (see *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa: A Sanskrit edition based upon the manuscript newly found at the Potala*. Tokyo: Taishō University 2006, p. 104, f. 63a 4).

²⁷ Note, however, that in this case the coverb occurs in the disyllabic form 為於 (為於利養之所危害), rare, but attested elsewhere in the canon (see Zacchetti forthcoming § 2.4).

²⁸ While *dirgharātra* seems to be more frequent in Buddhist Sanskrit (especially in the adverbial accusative: see BHSD p. 265; SWTF vol. 2 p. 444), *cirarātra-* too is attested (see SWTF vol. 2 p. 255; *cirarātram*; Karashima 2012 vol. 1 p. 38, § 4.18: *cirarātrāya* [adv.]).

dīgharatta-, *ciraratta-*), especially frequent in adverbial forms.

The treatment of this expression is inconsistent throughout the book. In two other passages, *changye* 長夜 is translated, as in its first occurrence, with a slightly negative nuance which seems unjustified (“in the long night [of *saṃsāric* existence]”, p. 100; “during the long night [of *saṃsāra*]”, p. 209). However, elsewhere *changye* is simply rendered as “always” (p. 224 and 233). The reasons for these variations are not altogether clear: from a contextual point of view, these passages do not seem substantially different from the one translated on p. 209.

Only in footnote 75 on p. 215, where 長夜入寂定 (BZA *sūtra* 41, T 100 p. 387a 17) is translated as “[Those who have left home ...] enter silent meditation for a long time”, do we find a discussion of this expression: “*changye ru jiding* 長夜入寂定; ZA: 長夜入正受; SN: *cirarattasamāhite*. 長夜 here as in Pāli *cirarattam* ‘for a long time,’ not *ciraratti* ‘long night [of *saṃsāra*]’.”

I wonder where this interpretation comes from (no other reference is provided here), but at any rate it does not appear to be accurate: apart from other considerations, I could not find any attestation of the compound *ciraratti* (which, as one could infer from this note, seems implicitly assumed by the author to be the form underlying the other occurrences of *changye* 長夜 listed above) in Pāli canonical literature.²⁹

- p. 67: “upright, endowed with pleasant appearance” (T 100 p. 375a 22: 容儀端正) → “of beautiful appearance” (this might correspond to *pāsādiko* in the Pāli parallel in AN IV p. 166, though the overall context there is quite different). On the use of *duanzheng* 端正 (also written 端政) in the sense of “beautiful, of pleasant aspect” in medieval Chinese, and especially in Buddhist sources, where this expression is particularly frequent, see for example Wang Yunlu and Fang Yixin 1992: 133-135; Li Weiqi 2004: 88-90.

- p. 68: “In order to practice the path” seems too vague as a translation of 為修梵行 (T 100 p. 375a 28), which corresponds fairly closely to the Pāli parallel in AN IV p. 167: *brahmacariyānuggahāya*, “in order to further the holy life”. Elsewhere in the book the term *fanxing* 梵行 (a calque of *brahmacariya/-carya*) is rendered in a variety of ways, for example: “pure life” (p. 60 = T 100 p. 374a 13), “a pure and chaste life” (p. 71 = T 100 p. 375 c 11), “abstinence” (p. 90 = T 100 p. 378c 26) etc.

²⁹The Sanskrit form *cirarātrim* is recorded in SWTF vol. 2 p. 255 as occurring in a manuscript of the *Udānavarga* (VI.6), corresponding (obviously with the same meaning) to *cirarātram* in Bernhard 1965: 121.

- p. 70: “He often talked a lot, but when the other monks said little in return, he became angry” (T 100 p. 375b 24: 每常多言。若諸比丘少有所說，便生瞋恚。). The strength of *shao you* 少有 ... *bian* 便 is different: I would rather render the Chinese as “he often talked a lot, and if other monks had [even] a little to say, he then became angry”. The point is not that Tīṣya/Tissa gets angry because the other monks say *only* a little, but because they dare to say *even* a little.

- p. 83: “Couldn’t you now use some ‘skillful means’ to revenge my anger?” (T 100 p. 377c 13-14: 而汝今者，寧不為我設諸方便，報彼怨耶?) → “Couldn’t you devise for me any expedients in order to take revenge against him?” (literally: “to take revenge against his hostility”).

- p. 83: “But wouldn’t it be slander to accuse someone who has been pure in keeping the precepts?” (T 100 p. 377c 17-18: 我當云何於淨戒人而作毀謗?) → “How could I slander a person [upholding the] pure precepts?”

- p. 92: “in the last light of the day” (possibly misreading *wei* 未 as *mo* 末? Cf. T 100 p. 379a 24: 天未明曉) → “when the sky was not yet clear”, that is, at dawn (so also the Pāli parallel, in SN I p. 8: *rattiyā paccūsasamayam*; note that the PTS text here has *paccusa-*).

- p. 94: “Whoever says that the signs / arising from name-and-form do truly exist, know that this person / is on the road of death. Perceiving in name-and-form / emptiness and absence of self-nature this is called to respect the Buddhas / for ever free from the realms of existence.”

In the *Taishō* edition (and in the Jin edition, as reproduced in ZH vol. 33 p. 266b-c) this passage reads as follows: 名色中生相，謂為真實有， / 當知如斯人，是名屬死徑。 / 若識於名色，本空無有性， / 是名尊敬佛，永離於諸趣。(T 100 p. 379b 15-18). Here the text is admittedly, at least in part, obscure and the available parallels (SN I pp. 8-12 and ZA no. 1078, T 99 p. 281c 3-282a 21) are of no help in interpreting it. But even if we allow for a certain syntactic flexibility in verses, I am not sure that the initial portion (名色中生相，謂為真實有) can be interpreted as the author does (“Whoever says that the signs / arising from name-and-form do truly exist”): apart from other considerations, the clear parallelism with the following verse (若識 … 無有性) shows that the point here is awareness of the unreality of *nāmarūpa*. According to ZH’s apparatus (p. 271a), the Qisha canon (a printed edition produced between the 13th and 14th centuries), followed by other later editions (e.g. Yuan and Ming in the *Taishō*’s apparatus), reads 名色中生想，and I think that this could well be the correct reading. The construction 中生/起 … 想，corresponding to *saṃjñām utpādayati*

and related forms (see BHSD p. 551), is rather common in Chinese Buddhist translations, although normally *xiang* 想 = *saṃjñā* is preceded by another element modifying it (see Zacchetti forthcoming § 2.1 and cf. n. 26 above). I would then tentatively render this passage as: “If one produces a [wrong] notion with respect to name-and-form, considering³⁰ [it] really to exist, [then] one should know that such a person is called [one who] is on the road of death. If one knows that³¹ name-and-form is fundamentally empty and without [self-]nature, [then] this is called etc.”

- p. 143: (Māra is speaking) “I should go there and try to mislead him” (T 100 p. 383a 22: 我當詣彼，伺求其便) → “I should go there to seek an opportunity [to attack] him”. I do not think that “try to mislead him” is an accurate rendition of *siqiu qi bian* 伺求其便. There is an already considerable literature on this particular use of *bian* 便, which is rather common in the canon, particularly in the idiom *de qi bian* 得其便, “to get an opportunity [for attacking a particular person = *qi* 其]”,³² usually used in Buddhist translations to render the expression *avatāraṃ + √labh* and related forms. See, for example, Matsuo 1988: 39-41, Zhu 1992: 84; Karashima 1998: 23 and 2010: 41-42; Zhang 2000: 226-227. This Chinese idiom seems to reflect a semantic development based on the meaning “opportunity, chance” of *bian* 便, corresponding to Sanskrit *avatāra* / Pāli *otāra* in the sense of “opportunity for attack, weak point etc.” (see BHSD p. 71; Cone 2001: 568). In this particular BZA passage, 伺求其便 seems to correspond quite neatly to *otārāpekkho* (“longing for a weak point”)³³ in the Pāli parallel (SN I 122), even if the narrative frame in the two texts is rather different.

³⁰On *weiwei* 謂為 (“to consider” etc.) in Medieval Chinese, see Wang Yunlu and Fang Yixin 1992: 384-385.

³¹Here *yu* 於 is used as a coverb introducing the object after a transitive verb (on this common usage see, for example, Karashima 1998: 558-560).

³²The idiom *de qi bian* 得其便 occurs in another passage of the same *sūtra*: 魔不得其便 (T 100 p. 383b 14). This is translated on p. 144 as “Māra will not overpower them”. A similar rendition is given also in n. 8 p. 115, where 魔王波旬不得其便 (ZA T 99 p. 344b 19) is translated as “So that King Māra the Bad does not overwhelm him/her.” These are better renditions of this acceptance of *bian* 便, though still not entirely accurate.

³³Bhikkhu Bodhi (2000: 215) translates this expression as “seeking to gain access to him”. As made clear by n. 316 p. 422, this interpretation is based on Buddhaghosa’s commentary (*Sāratthapākāsinī*, London: Pali Text Society, 1929, vol. 1 p. 185), which paraphrases *otārāpekkho* as *evaṃ vivaraṃ apekkhamāno* (“thus looking for a fault”, but lit. also “an opening” or “a leak”). Māra’s thoughts as presented by this passage of the commentary are translated by Bhikkhu Bodhi as follows: “He [viz. Māra] thought: ‘If I see anything improper in the ascetic Gotama’s conduct through the body door, etc., I will reprove him.’”

- p. 143: “Of radiant countenance and with celestial body // all senses [perceiving] happiness, ...” (T 100 p. 383a 25: 光顏顯神體 諸根悉悅豫). The verb *xian* 顯 (“to manifest”) is omitted in the translation. I would then interpret *shenti* 神體 in its normal Chinese meaning (see HD, vol. 7 p. 891a), linking it to the *zhu gen* 諸根 in the following segment: “[your] radiant countenance manifests the fact that all [your] spiritual and physical faculties are entirely delighted”.

The immediately following lines read: 譬如失財者 後還獲於財 / 汝今翫禪寂 歡喜亦如是 (T 100 p. 383a 26-27). In the translation, this has been linked to the preceding line, and rendered as: “... like someone who had lost his fortune // and later regained it. You are idling your time away in the silence of meditation // and the enjoyment that comes with it.”

I think that this translation is based on a wrong punctuation of the Chinese text: one should put a period before *piru* 譬如, which is typically picked up by the final *yi ru shi* 亦如是. I would render this passage as: “Now in your intensive cultivation of the quiet resulting from *dhyāna*, you are as delighted as someone who has lost his fortune and later regained it.”

- p. 205: “... there were two monks who got into an argument during a meeting” (T 100 p. 385b 8-9: 有二比丘於僧斷事時, 共生忿爭). Although it is not entirely clear to me how we should translate 於僧斷事時 (neither the Pāli parallels listed in Appendix 1, p. 256, nor ZA T 99 p. 291b 28-29 are helpful in this respect), there seems to be little doubt that (*seng*) *duanshi* (僧)斷事 must indicate something more specific than just “a meeting”. *Duanshi* 斷 (probably to be interpreted in the general sense of “deciding a matter”, see Durt 1979: 437 and cf. also Nakamura 1981: 944b) and other related expressions are quite common in the canon, especially in *Vinaya* literature. As pointed out by Silk (2008: 172 n. 40) the expression *duanshi ren* 斷事人 refers to a particular monastic administrator, the “dispute resolver”. So a possible rendition of this BZA passage could be “there were two monks who, during [a meeting for] resolving disputes in the *saṃgha*, etc.”. Be that as it may, this passage would probably have deserved a few lines of discussion in a footnote.

- p. 205: “The *Tathāgata* ... heard [the clamor] clearly with his *deva*-like hearing, which surpasses human hearing and can discern sounds from far away” (T 100 p. 385b 12-13: 如來... 以淨天耳, 過於人耳, 遙聞是聲) → “The *Tathāgata* ... with his pure divine hearing, which surpasses human hearing, heard this clamour from afar” (the subject of the verb *yaowen* 遙聞 is *rulai* 如來).

- p. 223: “We therefore came ourselves // desiring to ask a boon” (T 100 p. 388b 24: 我等故自來，欲乞索所願) → “We have come especially to ask a boon”. On this meaning of *gu* 故 / *guzi* 故自 (*zi* 自 here is simply an adverbial suffix, and need not be translated) as “especially, on purpose etc.”, see Dong and Cai 1994: 205. This particular use of *gu* 故 occurs also elsewhere in the BZA, for example in *sūtra* no. 31: 我故來供養，與佛策使。(T 100 p. 383c 2-3), tr. p. 145: “We have come to worship you and be at your service” (literally: “we have come especially to worship you etc.”).

- p. 225 with n. 87: “Please dispel my doubts!” (T 100 p. 389a 4: 唯願為我法眾疑). The translation is essentially correct, even if the text of the *Taishō* is wrong. The author remarks in n. 87: “The 法 must be a scribal error for 祛 or 去.” In fact the character *fa* 法 is, in all likelihood, an error introduced into the text by the editors of the *Taishō*: in this scroll ZH reproduces the second Koryō canon (on which the *Taishō* is based), which reads *jue* 決 (see ZH vol. 33 p. 285b 16): 唯願為我決眾疑, “please resolve my doubts”.

The same situation occurs again, *mutatis mutandis*, in *sūtra* no. 52 (T 2 100 p. 390c 11: 諸摩訶等圍遶在右); see n. 113 p. 238, where the author correctly observes that “*zai* 在 in this sentence must be a mistake for *zuo* 左.” Here, too, the Koryō canon has the expected reading *zuo* 左 (ZH vol. 33 p. 288a 7), and hence the error 在 must be ascribed to the *Taishō* editors.³⁴

Finally, I list here a few typos or minor imprecisions:

- The name 道安 is transcribed as Daoan in n. 22 p. 15; the correct *pinyin* transcription should be Dao'an, as given on p. 7.

- I wonder if the “Prof. Fan Guangzhang” mentioned in n. 17 p. 12 might not be Prof. Fang Guangchang 方廣錫, the well-known specialist in the Chinese canon.

- p. 59: “paid homage by touching the Buddha’s feet” (T 100 p. 374a 9: 頂禮佛足) → “paid homage by touching the Buddha’s feet with the top of [his] head”.

- p. 67: “Among those teaching the *Dhamma*” → “Among those skilled in expounding the *Dharma*” (T 100 p. 375a 21: 善說法中).

- p. 76: “She got dressed, put on her jewellery” (T 100 p. 376b 24: 著衣服瓔珞, 種種莊嚴, etc.); the string 種種莊嚴 (“she adorned herself in various ways”) is missing from the translation.

³⁴Note that both errors appear corrected in the CBETA Reader 2014.

- p. 218: “Tusita” (T 100 p. 387c 23: 忉利) → Tāvatiṃsa (Trāyastrimśa / Trayastrimśa).

- A work by Enomoto Fumio is quoted several times in Appendix 1 (p. 257 and *passim*) as “Enomoto 1997”, but is not listed in the bibliography. This seems to be the following article: “Sanskrit Fragments from the *Saṃgītanipāta of the *Samyuktāgama*”, in Petra Kieffer-Pülz and Jens-Uwe Hartmann (eds.), *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert On the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 1997, pp. 91-106).

In conclusion: the book under review no doubt constitutes a valuable contribution to the study of *Āgama* literature and of Chinese Buddhist translations in general, and I hope that my criticism does not detract from the considerable merits of Bingenheimer’s work. Probably there is always some unfairness inherent in reviews of works of this kind: it is easy to attract attention to mistakes in matter of detail to the detriment of the work as a whole (and here one might think of Erasmus’ bitter remarks about pedantic critics: “id solum annotant, id solum meminerunt”).³⁵ Let me stress, then, that my observations on this book, and especially on the annotated translation, should be rather seen as a testament to its importance, and to be taken as suggestions for those who contribute in such vital ways to our field by undertaking works of this kind.

References and Abbreviations

AN: R. Morris, E. Hardy (eds.). *Aṅguttara-nikāya*. 5 vols. London: The Pali Text Society 1885-1900.

BHSD: Edgerton, Franklin. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.

Anālayo 2010. “The Influence of Commentarial Exegesis on the Transmission of *Āgama* Literature”. In Konrad Meisig (ed.). *Translating Buddhist Chinese: Problems and Prospects*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010, pp. 1-20.

Anālayo 2011. *A Comparative Study of the Majjhima-nikāya*. 2 vols. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation.

Anālayo 2012. *Madhyama-āgama Studies*. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation.

³⁵Érasme de Rotterdam. *Les Adages* (Jean-Christophe Saladin, ed.). 5 vols. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2011, vol. 3 p. 4 (Adagium no. 2001, “Herculei Labores”).

- Bernhard, Franz 1965. *Udānavarga*. Band I. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (Sanskrittexte aus der Turfanfunden X).
- Bodhi, Bhikkhu 2000. *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha – A New Translation of the Saṃyutta Nikāya*. 2 vols. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.
- Brough, John 1962. *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*. London Oriental Series 7. London: Oxford University Press.
- Bucknell, Roderick 2008. “The Two Versions of the Other Translation of the Saṃyuktāgama”. *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* 21 (2008), pp. 23-54.
- Buswell, Robert E. 2004. “Sugi’s Collation Notes to the Koryō Buddhist Canon and Their Significance for Buddhist Textual Criticism”. *Journal of Korean Studies* 9 (2004): 129-184.
- Cone, Margaret 2001. *A Dictionary of Pāli*. Part I. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.
- Dong, Zhiqiao 董志翹 2007. *Zhonggu jindai hanyu tanwei 中古近代汉语探微*. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.
- Dong Zhiqiao 董志翹 and Cai Jinghao 蔡镜浩 1994. *Zhonggu xuci yufa lishi 中古虚词语法例释*. Changchun: Jilin jiaoyu chubanshe.
- Durt, Hubert 1979. “Chū 籌”. In P. Demiéville (directeur), J. May (rédacteur en chef). *Hōbōgirin - cinquième fascicule (chōotsushō -chūu)*. Tokyo: Maison Franco-Japonaise 1979, pp. 431-456.
- Enomoto, Fumio 1994. *A Comprehensive study of the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama: Indic texts corresponding to the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama as found in the Sarvāstivāda-Mūlasarvāstivāda literature*. Kyoto (Research Report).
- Glass, Andrew 2007. *Four Gāndhārī Saṃyuktāgama Sūtras*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press (Gandhāran Buddhist Texts 4).
- HD: *Hanyu da cidian 漢語大詞典*. 13 vols. Shanghai: Hanyu da cidian chubanshe, 1986-1994.
- 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-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 1997, pp. 261-284.
- Harrison, Paul 2002. “Another Addition to An Shigao’s Corpus? Preliminary Notes on an Early Chinese *Saṃyuktāgama* Translation”. In *Early Buddhism and Abhidharma Thought – In Honour of Doctor Hajime Sakurabe on the Occasion of His Seventy-seventh Birthday 初期仏教からアビダルマへ* (櫻部建博士喜壽記念論集). Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 2002, pp. 1-32.
- von Hinüber Oskar and Norman K.R. (eds.) 2003. *Dhammapada. With a complete Word Index compiled by Shoko Tabata and Tetsuya Tabata*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.

- Hirakawa, Akira 平川彰 1997. *Bukkyō kanbon daijiten* 佛教漢梵大辭典 (*Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Dictionary*). Tokyo: Reiyūkai.
- Karashima, Seishi 辛嶋静志 1998. *A Glossary of Dharmarakṣa's Translation of the Lotus Sutra* 正法華經詞典. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism - Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica I).
- Karashima, Seishi 辛嶋静志 2001. *A Glossary of Kumārajīva's Translation of the Lotus Sutra* 妙法蓮華經詞典. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism - Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica IV).
- Karashima, Seishi 辛嶋静志 2010. *A Glossary of Lokakṣema's Translation of the Aṣṭasāh-srikā Prajñāpāramitā* 道行般若經詞典. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism - Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XI).
- Karashima, Seishi 2012. *Die Abhisamacarikā Dharmāḥ: Verhaltensregeln für buddhistische Mönche der Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins*. 3 vols. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism - Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XIII, 1-3).
- Li Fuhua 李富華 and He Mei 何梅 2003. *Hanwen Fojiao dazangjing yanjiu* 漢文佛教大藏經研究. Beijing: Zongjiao wenhua chubanshe.
- Li, Jining 李际宁 2002. *Fojing banben (Zhongguo banben wenhua congshu)* 佛经版本 (中国版本文化丛书). Nanjing: Jiangsu guji chubanshe.
- Li, Weiqi 李维琦 2004. *Fojing ciyu huishi* 佛经词语汇释. Changsha: Hunan shifan daxue chubanshe.
- Link, Arthur E. 1960. "Shih Seng-yu and his Writings". *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 80.1 (1960), pp. 17-43.
- Matsuo, Yoshiki 松尾良樹 1988. "Kandai yakkyō to kōgoŷyakkyō ni yoru kōgoshi – shotan" 漢代訳経と口語—訳経による口語史・初探. *Zen bunka kenkyūjo kiyō* 禅文化研究所紀要 15 (1988), pp. 25-57.
- Mizuno, Kōgen 水野弘元 1970. "Betsuyaku agon kyō ni tsuite 別譯雜阿含經について" *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 18.2 (1970), pp. 41-51.
- Mizuno, Kōgen 水野弘元 1981. *Hokkugyō no kenkyū* 法句經の研究. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- Nakamura, Hajime 中村元 1981. *Bukkyōgo daijiten* 佛教語大辭典. Tokyo: Tokyo Shoseki.
- Norman, K. R. 2000 (2nd ed.). *The Word of the Doctrine (Dhammapada)*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.
- Ōta, Tatsuo 大田辰夫 1988. *Chūgokugo shi tsūkō* 中国語史通考. Tokyo: Hakuteisha.

- Palumbo, Antonello 2003. "Dharmarakṣa and Kaṅthaka: White Horse Monasteries in Early Medieval China". In Giovanni Verardi and Silvio Vita (eds.), *Buddhist Asia 1. Papers from the First Conference of Buddhist Studies Held in Naples in May 2001*. Kyoto: Italian School of East Asian Studies, 2003, pp. 167-216.
- Palumbo, Antonello 2013. *An Early Chinese Commentary on the Ekottarika-āgama: The Fenbie gongde lun 分別功德論 and the History of the Translation of the Zengyi ahan jing 增一阿含經*. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation.
- Pulleyblank, Edwin G. 1991. *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2008. *Managing Monks: Administrators and Administrative Roles in Indian Buddhist Monasticism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- SN: L. Feer (ed.). *Samyutta-nikāya*. 5 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1884-1898.
- SWTF: *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden und der kanonischen Literatur der Sarvāstivāda-Schule*. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1973-
- Tong, Wei 童玮 1991. *Beisong Kaibao Dazangjing diaoyin kaoshi ji mulu huanyuan* 北宋《开宝大藏经》雕印考释及目录还原. Beijing: Shumu wenxian chubanshe.
- Wang Yunlu 王云路 and Fang Yixin 方一新 1992. *Zhonggu hanyu yuci lishi* 中古汉语语词例释. Changchun: Jilin jiaoyu chubanshe.
- Yang Bojun 杨伯峻 and He Leshi 何乐士 2001 (2nd ed.). *Gu hanyu yufa ji qi fazhan* 古汉语语法及其发展. 2 vols. Beijing: Yuwen Chubanshe.
- 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 光讚經, Being the Earliest Chinese Translation of the Larger Prajñāpāramitā*. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology – Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica VIII).
- Zacchetti, Stefano 2011. "What can we learn from variant readings? New light on the history of the Jin Canon 金藏 from the textual study of the *Guang zan jing* 光讚經". In *The First International Conference of Tripitaka Studies (2010 Foxue yanjiu lunwen ji: diyi jie guoji fojiao dazangjing xueshu yantaohui* 2010 佛學研究論文集: 第一屆國際佛教大藏經學術研討會). Gaoxiang: Foguangshan wenjiao jijinhui, 2011, pp. 307-323.
- Zacchetti, Stefano (forthcoming). "Note lessicali sino-buddhiste". In M. Abbiati and F. Greselin (eds.). *Il liuto e i libri: Studi in onore di Mario Sabattini*. Venezia: Edizioni Ca' Foscari (publication expected in Autumn/Winter 2014).
- ZH: *Zhonghua dazangjing – Hanwen bufen* 中華大藏經 – 漢文部分. 106 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1984-1996.

BOOK REVIEWS

Zhang, Lianrong 张联荣 2000. "Han Wei Liu chao Fojing shici" 汉魏六朝佛经释词. In Wang Yunlu 王云路 and Fang Yixin 方一新 (eds.). *Zhonggu hanyu yanjiu* 中古汉语研究. Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 2000, pp. 225-243.

Zhu, Qingzhi 朱慶之 1992. *Fodian yu zhonggu hanyu cihui yanjiu* 佛典與中古漢語詞彙研究. Taipei: Wenjing chubanshe.

Stefano Zacchetti
Numata Professor of Buddhist Studies
University of Oxford