

AN SHIGAO 安世高 AND THE HISTORY OF THE ANBAN SHOUYI JING 安般守意經

by Florin Deleanu

PART ONE

For more than two hundred years the "meditation *sūtras*" 禪經 translated by An Shigao (fl. 148-170 C.E.), the first translator of Buddhist scriptures into Chinese, were amongst the major sources of information concerning mental cultivation which sustained the spiritual quest of the early followers of the Noble Path in the Middle Kingdom. (1) Six *sūtras*, out of about seventeen translations which can be ascribed to An Shigao with some certainty, deal mainly with meditation related topics while various references to spiritual practice are found in most of the remaining texts. (2) Judging from the number of commentaries written on it as well as from the analogies, most of them superficial from the viewpoint of modern scholarship, with the time-honoured interest of the Chinese in bio-energetical practices, it seems that it was the *Anban shouyi jing* (3) (hereafter abbreviated Asj) or *Sūtra of the Mindfulness of Breathing* which occupied the paramount position amongst these texts. As far as textual evidence allows a glimpse into those remote days of Buddhist practice on Chinese soil, it appears that the majority of the Chinese practitioners understood this small meditation treatise in a way more or less different from the original intentions of its Indian or Central Asian authors, with the unavoidable patterns of intertextuality, mostly inadequate, which any old civilization imposes on new cultural systems coming from outside. No matter how poor the understanding of the Chinese was, it is undeniable that the Asj played a major part in supporting the Buddhist faith by providing its believers with a pattern of verification at a time

when information was scarce and the new religion had not yet gained a large following in the Chinese society.

The extant version of the Asj, entitled *The Greater Sūtra of the Mindfulness of Breathing Preached by the Buddha* 佛說大安般守意經, has two *juan* 卷 (4) and appears to be an extremely corrupt text, in which the original Indian treatise was amalgamated with Chinese commentaries that have somehow managed to creep into the text in a manner one could hardly call systematic. However, early bibliographical sources like Daoan's 道安 *Comprehensive Catalogue of Sūtras* 總理衆經目錄 compiled in the 4th century and Sengyou's 僧祐 *Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集 (hereafter abbreviated Csjj) or *Collection of Notes Concerning the Translation of the Tripiṭaka*, which reflects the situation at the beginning of 6th century, list a *Smaller Sūtra of [the Mindfulness of] Breathing* 小安般經 in one *juan* and a *Greater Sūtra of [the Mindfulness of] Breathing* 大安般經 also in one *juan*. (5) A large number of studies touches upon the Asj and its role in early Chinese Buddhism, but few actually bring a substantial contribution to our understanding of the text. (6) And despite many precious hints, no study has given us hitherto a complete history of the textual formation of the Asj. In what follows, I shall attempt to reconstruct, I must admit, on highly hypothetical bases, the history of this text relying on the scanty material that survived to our days.

I initially intended to devote this study solely to the origin and history of the Asj. This would have been an enlarged version of my paper *On the Compilation Process of the Present Text of the Anban shouyi jing Translated by An Shigao*, published last year in Japanese. (7) However, the recent publication of Prof. Antonino Forte's challenging study *An Shigao 安世高 and His Descendants* (8) enticed me into re-examining the biographical details and historical background of the Parthian translator. I have, therefore, deemed that a digression on An Shigao's life is necessary not only in itself as an attempt to reconstruct the historical facts but also for shedding more light on the process which led to the formation of the Asj. Without the Indian original and Tibetan translations, which usually follow the original quite faithfully, any attempt to in-

investigate the intricate history of the Asj must rely on whatever direct and indirect evidence comes from Chinese historical sources as well as from the painstaking identification and analysis of what we surmise to be the original text(s) and later interpolations.

I AN SHIGAO AND HIS HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Asj was translated into Chinese sometime between 150 and 170 C.E. by the Parthian monk An Shigao. If we leave aside the hagiographical elements which flood An Shigao's biography in Chinese sources, we obtain a sketchy picture of his life, which I consider more or less trustworthy. Born as the crown prince of Parthia 安息國 (9) he was a pious Buddhist follower who observed the precepts strictly long before becoming a monk. Since there is no evidence of the existence of Buddhist scriptures translated into Parthian or any Buddhist vestiges in regions other than those situated in the easternmost parts of the Empire (10) which could benefit from the cultural influence of North-West India and Buddhist Central Asia, we are compelled to conclude together with Henri Maspero (11) that An Shigao was not the heir to the Throne of the Parthian Empire, but most probably the son of a king in one of the vassal territories in the eastern parts Parthia. It appears that during the Arsacid period (247 B.C.E.-226 C.E.) Zoroastrian faith continued to play the dominant role and that the cult of Mithra was wide spread (12), although the dynasty displayed a generous spirit of tolerance, which allowed, for instance, the Greek and Jewish colonies throughout the Empire to preserve their own religious beliefs. (13) This liberal spirit doubtlessly permitted Buddhism to find its way into the eastern parts of the Parthian territory, an event which happened, most probably, sometime after the beginning of our era (14) and must have been accelerated by the support gained by Buddhism under the Kuṣāṇas in Tokharistan. (15) The Parthian Buddhist followers must have been either residents of those areas or merchants who were converted during their travels in Central Asia or India.

Returning to our story of An Shigao's life, it appears that after his father's death his lack of interest in the worldly affairs and strong aspiration after the Noble Path led him to renounce the Throne in favour of his uncle and choose monkhood instead. I think we have no reasons to doubt An Shigao's genuine spiritual quest but we may also conjecture that the instability of the age could have somehow influenced his decision to give up secular matters, a possibility also hinted at by Kang Senghui 康僧會 in his *Preface to the Anban shouyi jing* 安般守意經序 written by the middle of the 3rd century:

[An Shigao] abdicated in favour of his uncle and fled from his home country in a rush. After wandering from place to place, he moved on forward and finally settled in the Capital [of China]. (16)

Having to fight difficult wars against the Roman Empire in the West since the beginning of the 2nd century C.E (17) and threatened by the newly risen Kuṣāṇa Empire, which during Kaniṣka's time (?128/130-151C.E.) (18) came to control the whole Central Asia and Northern India, Parthia's destiny was on the wane.

According to Daoan, Sengyou and Huijiao (19), An Shigao specialized in Abhidharma literature and meditation *sūtras*, a fact equally verifiable from the contents of his translations. He spent a few years travelling in Central Asia and, perhaps, North-West India. Later biographers imply that this was done with the aim of propagating 弘化 the Buddhist faith (20), but it appears equally probable that he may have pursued his studies and spiritual practice. He arrived in China in 148 C.E. and spent more than 20 years in Luoyang 洛陽. Starting with the Former Han dynasty China began to show a strong interest in Central Asia for economic as well as political reasons. Trade relations between the Parthian Empire and Han China had doubtlessly existed for a long time and we find information on Parthia in Sima Qian's 司馬遷 *Records of the Historian* 史記 (21) as early as 97 B.C.E. By the middle of the 1st century C.E., the roads linking China to Central Asia were cut off, but Ban Chao's 班超 expedition in

the Western Regions starting in 80 C.E. re-established Han political influence in Eastern Turkestan and re-opened the trade routes. In the 9th year of the Yongyuan 永元 era (97 C. E.), Ban Chao sent Gan Ying 甘英 on a mission to the Roman Empire. Gan Ying crossed Parthia and reached the Western Sea 西海 in Tiaozhi 條支, a land situated at more than 40,000 *li* or 16,600 kilometres away from Yumen 玉門 and Yangguang 陽關 in the western extremity of Han China. (22) There Parthian traders convinced him to desist from trying to reach the Roman Empire due to the length and dangers of a voyage on the Western Sea. (23) From the end of the 1st century C.E. on contacts between Parthia and China grow. The 2nd century C.E. saw a real boom of interest in Central Asian merchandise and cultural products at the Han Court as well as amongst the Chinese aristocracy. (24) Doubtlessly, together with silk and other exotic products, the prestige of China as a great power and culture must have reached Central Asia and Parthia. Seen against this background of growing economic and cultural contacts, An Shigao's decision to go to China has nothing extraordinary in it, although it is hard to know his exact motivation in choosing the Middle Kingdom. It may be that he was persuaded by Central Asian merchants residing in China that their Buddhist community in Luoyang, most probably, including some Chinese converts, too, needed a spiritual guide in that remote land, which could also offer promising chances for the noble purpose of missionary activities. Or it may be, as Kang Senghui, quoted above, suggests, that he was wandering as a refugee from place to place and, finally, joined a caravan heading along one of the Silk Road routes for the Chinese capital.

We know very little about his activities in Luoyang. It seems that he learned Chinese not long after his arrival there (25), which allowed him to supervise his translations and to communicate directly with his followers and potential converts. The early Buddhist community in Luoyang consisted, most probably, of merchants and residents of Central Asian origin as well as a few Chinese believers. (26) Despite all inherent misunderstandings, Buddhism had been known for many decades on Chinese soil and we have no reasons to doubt that the

exotic faith attracted the interest of a certain number of people, amongst whom we find members of the gentry. The only disciple of An Shigao on whom we have some precise information is Yan Fotiao 嚴佛調, whose *Preface to the Passages Concerning the Ten Wise Precepts of the Novice* 沙彌十慧章句序 fortunately survives today. (27) He appears to be the first Chinese to have become a Buddhist monk (28) as his name 佛調 (*var.* 浮調), * *bhuət-deu* (*var.* * *brou-deu*) in Han pronunciation (29), which is a phonetic transcription of Buddha-deva (30), and the fact that he is called *ācārya* 阿祇梨 seem to suggest. We know that ordination procedure (*upasampad-karman*) requires ten monks, usually three *ācāryas* and seven *bhikṣus* acting as witnesses 三師七證. However, when performed in remote areas where it is difficult to assemble ten monks, a minimum of four *bhikṣus* are necessary to ordain a monk. (31) An Shigao, undoubtedly Yan's master (*upādhyāya*), needed, therefore, at least, three other *bhikṣus*, which hints at the possibility that the Buddhist community in Luoyang at the middle of the 2nd century C.E. may have been larger than most historians have assumed hitherto and that and it may have included other foreign monks whose names, unfortunately, did not survive to later epochs. As far as Yan Fotiao is concerned, it seems that he was a member of the gentry. Not only that he writes in good style but his allusion to the Chinese classics (32) suggests that he had a sound education. We have all the reasons to believe that Yan was one of the close collaborators and editors, to use a modern term, of An Shigao's translations into Chinese, which he apparently did orally and written as well. (33) Fei Changfang's 費長房 *Notes on the Three Treasures over the Centuries* 歷代三寶記 (34) gives us the exact years for some of An Shigao's translations, but information coming from this source should be taken more than *cum grano salis*.

As for the rest, legendary details blur our grasp of historical events. He may have left the capital for the South of China, as our sources indicate, and such a decision could have been motivated by the beginning of the turbulent events that would practically disrupt the life of the North for decades or, simply, because he intended to make new converts in that part of the Empire.

We know that, apart from Luoyang, there existed other Buddhist centres in the East and South. (35) Later biographers describe the violent conditions of his death as a *karmic* retribution and place it in Kuaiji 會稽 (36), in present Zhejiang, which was a Buddhist centre during the Later Han dynasty. It is possible that the Parthian monk died an unnatural death and this could have led to interpreting the tragic event in Buddhist terms. Anyway, since Yan Fotiao writes about the great misfortune of losing his *ācārya* 和上 (37), it seems that An Shigao died on Chinese soil

This is the general picture of An Shigao's life provided by Buddhist sources and no modern scholar has questioned its basic details until very recently when Prof. Antonino Forte advanced a totally different hypothesis based on new historical and epigraphical evidence. According to Prof. Forte, An Shigao was a Parthian "attending son" 侍子 or "hostage son" 質子 at the Han Court and some of his descendents appear later on in Chinese history playing more or less important political roles. In religious matters, An Shigao was a lay Mahāyānist follower and, through his position, he may have been behind the Buddhist ceremonies with which the Luoyang imperial Court seems to have been associated. All later Buddhist literature appears to Prof. Forte a "tendency to idealize the personage, and to work in a kind of association between his life and Śākyamuni's life. (38)

It is beyond any doubt that the new sources revealed by Prof. Forte will become important reference materials for any future discussion of early Chinese Buddhist history and that his reconstruction of the events remains a possibility, but I would contend that these documents cannot be adduced as a conclusive proof for rejecting An Shigao's traditional biography. Here are my reasons for questioning Prof. Forte's hypothesis:

(1) It is very doubtful that the Parthian Empire would have had any reasons to send one of its princes as a hostage to such a distant country, which apart from trade relations, had no major relevance to its politics. According to Lien-sheng Yang, such external hostages, who appear frequently throughout Chinese

traditional history, were "taken by a powerful state from a weak state, by a suzerain from its vassal states or dependent tribes". (39) China and Parthia had never been in such a relation of dependence. According to the *History of the Former Han Dynasty* 漢書, "Parthia did not belong to the General-Protector [of the Western Regions] 都護". (40) In another context, after mentioning the fact that 376 leaders from 50 lands in the Western Regions received official seals 印綬 conferred by the Han dynasty in order to attract these territories within its sphere of influence as vassal states, it adds:

However, lands like Sogdia 康居, Tukhāra 大月氏, Parthia 安息, Gandhāra 罽賓 (41), Arachosia 烏弋 (42), being extremely remote, were not amongst these [vassal lands]. When they sent tribute, [the Han Court] bestowed rewards 報 on each of them (43), but they were neither controlled nor ruled [by the Chinese Empire]. (44)

The *History of the Later Han Dynasty* 後漢書 equally mentions Parthia as an independent country:

In the sixth year [of the Yongyuan 永元 era, i. e., 94 C. E.], Ban Chao attacked and defeated Yanqi 焉耆. (45) Thereupon, more than fifty states sent hostages and became vassal countries. [However,] Tiaozi 條支 (46), Parthia 安息 and all the other countries up to the sea shore (47) at 40,000 *li* [away from China] sent tribute making use of many interpreters [to convey their messages to the Han Court]. (48)

It is obvious that there is a clear-cut distinction between vassal states which sent hostages and countries situated outside the Chinese sphere of influence that gave tribute, which, anyway, meant nothing more than conveying the intention of these countries to establish relations with the Middle Kingdom. In most of the cases, these "tributes" were nothing more than exotic presents

such as the lion and the "big bird" sent by the Emperor of Parthia in 101 C.E. (49).

Prof. Forte further argues that the appellation 安侯世高 or Shigao, Marquis of An, which first appears in an anonymous *Preface to the Dharmapada sūtra* 法句經序 (50), is not a mere form of respectful address (51), but a title "applied to him because of his aristocratic origins and which served to assign to him a precise status in the Chinese society." (52) It is true that 侯 or Marquis was one of the titles which the Chinese Court conferred upon military leaders and nobles of non-Chinese peoples for their services or as a means to control them. (53) However, even if we suppose that An Shigao had been a "hostage son" and had been conferred a title, one would expect the *History of the Later Han Dynasty* or any other major historical source to mention this unusual presence which would have meant a lot for China's political prestige in Central and Western Asia. Not only that An Shigao's name does not appear in such documents, but we find no mention whatsoever in official Chinese histories of Parthians being granted titles or honours. (54)

(2) An Shigao first appears mentioned as a Parthian "attending son" at the Han Court in the biographies of An Tong 安同 (d. 429) and his son An Yuan 安原 (d. 435) recorded in the *History of the Wei Dynasty* 魏書 (55) and the *History of the Northern Dynasties* 北史 (56). Next we find him in the *Compendium of Surnames Compiled in the Yuanhe Era* 元和姓纂 (57), the *New History of the Tang Dynasty* 新唐書 (58), and the *Comprehensive Description [of Institutions]* 通志 (59), in the genealogy of the Grand Minister Li Baoyu 李抱玉 (704-777). The problem is that the latter does not mention An Tong and An Yuan amongst Li Baoyu's ancestors, although both lineages claim to spring from the same An Shigao. One may argue that we have here two branches of the same clan but it seems to me unusual for Li Baoyu's genealogists to omit An Tong who was by no means a minor figure in the epoch. (60) It is true that the funerary inscription on stele of An Zhongjing 安忠敬 (661-726), Li Baoyu's father, written by Zhang Yue 張說 (667-730) mentions An Tong by his posthumous name Gaoyang 高陽 as part of the same genealogy. (61)

However, we can surmise that Zhang Yue, a fine poet and man of letters, was aware of the An Tong's genealogy recorded in the *History of the Wei Dynasty* and the *History of the Northern Dynasties* and considered it appropriate to include him in the same lineage with that of An Zhongjing. On the other hand, we may assume that all other sources based their genealogical descriptions on Li Bao-yu's family traditions which regarded An Shigao as their ancestor and ignored the fact that a similar claim had been made centuries ago by An Tong's family. I would contend that we have here two different families originating from Parthia who tried to add more weight and dignity to their history by tracing back their genealogies to An Shigao, the Parthian monk of princely origin. (62) Needless to say that it is impossible to decide whether such genealogies were "doctored" in order to upgrade the family status or whether they were based on a dim memory circulating amongst naturalized Parthian families which retained An Shigao's name and noble origin but lost any trace of his activity as a Buddhist missionary. This is basically my interpretation of these newly revealed sources and I hope that the discussion below will further confirm this conclusion.

(3) The literary and epigraphical evidence discovered by Prof. Forte gives contradictory information concerning the actual place where An Shigao and his descendents settled in China. The sources are divided between Liaodong 遼東, in the South of modern Liaoning, and Liangzhou 涼州, in modern Gansu. Prof. Forte succeeds in arranging all the details into a coherent picture which is plausible as long as we accept the fundamental presupposition that An Shigao was indeed a "hostage son" at the Han Court. However, if we base our investigation on the traditional account found in Buddhist sources, as I actually do, the very fact that the sources above speak of two places of original settlement would seem to indicate that we have to deal with two different families claiming a common ancestor. Furthermore, we are confronted with a problem which appears to me to be at least as important. As far as the settlement of the "attending son" himself is regarded, the *Compendium of Surnames Compiled in the Yuanhe Era* (63) tells us that An Shigao left Luoyang at some stage and settled in the territory

of Liang 涼土, modern Gansu. The inscription on the stele of 'An Lingjie says, "In the Han years the 'son in attendance' first settled in the region of the Crows' Fortress 烏城" (64), in Gansu. (65) We remember, however, that all Buddhist sources indicate that An Shigao left for the South of China on a route which included Mount Lu 廬山 in Jiangxi (66), Canton 廣州, and Kuaiji 會稽 in Zhejiang. To be sure, I do not suggest that we have to accept all the details found in Buddhist sources. On the contrary, the hagiographical accretions which usually characterize their accounts compel the modern researcher to be more than prudent in their interpretation. But even if we go as far as rejecting these exact locations mentioned in the Buddhist sources, there is one geographical element which stands in sharp contrast with the historical documents revealed by Prof. Forte and this is the fact that while in the former An Shigao leaves Luoyang for the South of China in the latter we find An Shigao, the "attending son", settling down somewhere in Gansu, a north-western region of the Middle Kingdom. It seems to me that it is in the logic of the creation of hagiographical accounts, a genre in itself drifting between fiction and history, to keep such structurally "solid" nuclei as geographical elements unless strong altering factors of religious nature or inner coherence act and modify the basic data. And I can think of absolutely no possible reasons which could have made Buddhist authors to choose the South of China other than an authentic tradition recording An Shigao's activity in the region. In other words, there was no impediment in setting the same hagiographical stories in the West of China if An Shigao really visited or lived in those regions. This brings me once again to the conclusion that the account found in the non-Buddhist sources is either a deliberate creation of the family genealogists or a confusion which resulted in making An Shigao the ancestor of two different clans of Parthian origin.

(4) Prof. Forte concludes that early Buddhist authors knew about An Shigao's real origins but they preferred to build the image of a devout monk and create a biography closely resembling Śākyamuni's life. (67) I fail to see, however, what could have been the motivation of these Buddhist authors to alter reality

to such a degree. First, a Buddhist "attending prince" at the Han Court, with a potential influence on the fate of his religion on Chinese soil, would have been a major feature of his story which, far from being omitted from his biography, would have become an element Buddhists of later times could take special pride in. Second, being a lay follower would have not disqualified An Shigao from receiving about the same attention and respect, as the biographies of An Xuan, Zhi Qian, etc. do actually prove. The only notable change would have been that Huijiao could have no longer dedicated him a special chapter in his Gsz and would have included him as a lay follower in the biography of a Han monk. However, this would have impaired An Shigao's prestige in no way and works based on different criteria, like the Csjj, could have still honoured him with a chapter of his own. (68) Third, we must not forget that An Shigao was not holding the special position of the first known Buddhist translator and propagator on Chinese soil which modern scholarship usually acknowledges. Traditionally, Chinese Buddhists believed that the first missionaries who had brought the Noble Law to the Middle Kingdom had been * Kāśyapa Mātāṅga 攝摩騰 and *Dharmaratna 竺法蘭 in the second half of the 1st century C.E. (69) Fourth, as far as the biographical similarity between Śākyamuni and An Shigao is regarded, there is nothing so extraordinary about renouncing the Throne and choosing instead the tranquil path of monkhood, especially in times of political and social turbulence. History of religion knows so many other similar cases that there is no need to suppose here the work of hagiographical imagination.

Lastly, a few words on Prof. Forte's assumption that An Shigao was behind the Buddhist ceremonies performed at the Han Court: (70) I think that the lack of certain evidence should rather make us share Zürcher's circumspection concerning the possibility of a direct relationship between the Court and the Buddhist community. (71) This leaves, nevertheless, open the possibility that An Shigao or some his followers may have inspired a certain interest in the new "exotic" faith in an indirect manner. The contacts, if they existed at all, must have been superficial and, most probably, were never associated with any serious at-

tempt of the Court to understand or practice the Buddhist Way.

(5) Prof. Forte holds that the earliest Buddhist accounts on An Shigao are too vague and do not necessarily imply that he was a monk. (72) I find it hard to accept that these early authors were trying to "blur" An Shigao's identity in any way. It is true that we find no expression directly pointing at An Shigao's status of *pravrajita* or monkhood but this is in itself no proof whatsoever that he was an "attending prince" or that these accounts were trying to hide such a reality. On the contrary, the few lines on An Shigao's life which we find in the *Prefaces* written by early authors like Yan Fotiao (73), Chen Hui 陳慧 (fl. beginning to middle of 3rd century C.E.) (74), and Kang Senghui (d. 280 C.E.) (75) suggest an intense spiritual quest and dedication which better characterize a monk than an "attending son" living a busy life at the imperial Court. Take, for instance, the following sentence which is also discussed by Prof. Forte: "[An Shigao] renounced the glory of the Throne and, content with poverty, he delighted in (or aspired after) the [Buddhist] Path" 捐王位之榮安貧樂道. (76) It is hard to see why an "attending prince" would be described as being "content with poverty", a phrase by far more suitable to describe the life of an ascetic. 樂道 has two possible readings: one is "delight in the Path" (77), read *le dao*, an old Chinese term which we first find in the *Meng Zi* 孟子 (78) and used to describe detachment from secular matters and a life dedicated to spiritual joys or strict adherence to one's principles. Incidentally, as a Buddhist technical term, it is also used to translate *prīti* or the joy of practising the Way, which represents the third of the seven factors of enlightenment (*sapta bodhyaṅgāni* 七覺支). The second meaning of 樂道 i.e., "aspiring after or yearning for the Path", read *yao dao*, is often used to denote lofty aspirations. As a Buddhist term, it stands for the Sanskrit *adhimukta*, i.e., "inclined to", or *ruci*, i.e., "taking pleasure in", "desirous of", "longing for", etc. Whatever its meaning may be, 樂道 seems to suggest an earnest dedication to the Buddhist Teaching, which again makes one think of a monk rather than an *upāsaka* caught up in the worldly affairs of the Court.

(6) Prof. Forte advances "the hypothesis that An Shigao's collaborator An Xuan 安玄 ...received the title of *qi duwei* 騎都尉 because he was in the staff of the administration of the Marquis An".(79) I am afraid that such a hypothesis is not supported by facts and unless Prof. Forte provides a full account of his surmise, we are bound to say that it betrays a misapprehension of the historical events. There is absolutely no source which mentions the existence of any contacts between An Shigao and An Xuan, to say nothing of a collaboration relationship. As we have already seen, An Xuan collaborated with Yan Fotiao, An Shigao's former disciple, but this happened after An Shigao's death. (80) The dates offered by our documents do not encourage either the assumption that there was any relationship between the two Parthians. We remember that An Shigao is said to have come in 148 C.E. to Luoyang where he remained for more than 20 years after which he left for the South of China, where he died a violent death. However, we must also note that both the Csjj and the Gsz give here a rather contradictory account of the exact details and date. They first say that after some 20 years 二十餘年 in Luoyang, i.e., around 170 C.E., An Shigao parted with his co-religionists 同學 (81) in order to go to Canton. Nevertheless, after only few lines, they state that faced with the unrest at the end of Emperor Ling's reign (168-189), An Shigao took his monk's staff (*khakkhara* 杖) and headed towards the South of the [Yangzi] River 江南. (82) As we shall see below, starting with this passage the account of An's life in both works is practically stepping into pure hagiography which, moreover, is affected by some logically inconsistent episodes. Consequently, I tend to believe that the first date, i.e., sometime around 170, has more historical credibility. But even if we accept the second date, i.e., sometime after 180, there could hardly be any chance that An Shigao and An Xuan ever met. An Xuan's biography, found in the same works cited above, relates that he arrived in Luoyang at the end of Emperor Ling's reign (83) which, if we adopt the first date, places it some 10 years after An Shigao's departure from Luoyang and death in the South of China. Even if we consider the second date to be historically trustworthy, the only point in common between the two is that

An Shigao was leaving Luoyang by the time An Xuan was arriving there, which drastically limits the possibility of any contacts, to say nothing of a collaboration between them. The bottom line is, I believe, that if there had been any contacts between An Shigao and An Xuan, Buddhist sources would have not failed to mention it, even if it were in a hagiographical vein.

(7) I also find no factual support whatsoever for Prof. Forte's statement that "An Shigao was simply a Great Vehicle adept who was introducing to the Chinese some of the texts of the Small Vehicle which were considered as the basis of the Great Vehicle". (84) Prof. Forte seems to base his hypothesis on the following three assumptions:

(A) "Hīnayāna works are the basis of Mahāyāna and early translators, even if they belonged to the Great Vehicle, may have felt it necessary to begin with the basis rather than to introduce at once the later doctrinal developments." (85) Such an over-simplified statement neglects the immensely complicated historical process which led to the birth of the Great Vehicle as well as the variety of teachings and practices covered by the term "Mahāyāna". It is, of course, undeniable that there were Buddhist schools which made use of doctrines and Abhidharma developments of the tradition they called the "Lesser Vehicle". It is also true that in order to follow the Mahāyāna philosophical and religious discourse a certain knowledge of the "Hīnayāna" tenets, which was a major target of criticism and re-interpretation, is useful, especially for the scholarly-minded follower. However, it is equally beyond any doubt that Mahāyāna Buddhists were not sharing the view of modern historian who can speak of "later doctrinal developments" and were firmly believing that their teachings originated with Śākyamuni or others Buddhas, being atemporal truths or, at least, having a history as old as the "Hīnayāna" views. Even if we suppose that An Shigao adopted this extremely doubtful plan suggested by Prof. Forte, it is a matter of great concern and surprise that during more than twenty years of residing and propagating Buddhism

in Luoyang the Parthian translator chose only "Hīnayāna" texts and found no time to introduce a single Mahāyāna scripture, leaving thus his Chinese followers with "false ideas" about the nature of the Noble Path. The fact that An Xuan and Yan Fotiao translated a Mahāyāna *sūtra*, another issue raised by Prof. Forte in favour of his theory (86), is of absolutely no relevance for An Shigao himself.

(B) Early authors like Yan Fotiao (87), Chen Hui (88), and Kang Senghui (89) speak of An Shigao as a Bodhisattva 菩薩 but this proves in no way that An Shigao himself was Mahāyāna follower. A clear apprehension of the differences between the two Vehicles would come later in the history of Chinese Buddhism and we can only subscribe to Zürcher's aptly stated view that such an use of the term Bodhisattva "testifies of a touching optimism and a profound ignorance as to the real meaning of this appellation". (90)

(C) Kang Senghui's statement that An Shigao "gradually exposed the true six [perfections by which one] crosses [to the further shore of Liberation] (*ṣaṭ pāramitāḥ*)" 徐乃陳演正真之六度 (91), quoted by Prof. Forte as another proof for his theory, is again in no way relevant for An Shigao's doctrinal adherence. If it proves anything at all, this is Kang's own idiosyncrasies closely associated with *Jātaka* stories as proved in his main translation, the *Ṣaḍpāramitā saṃgrahasūtra* 六度集經 or *Collection of Sūtras [Containing Stories] of the Six Perfections*. (92)

As long as we have no text which transmits An Shigao's own creed, no final conclusion can be drawn and any hypothesis concerning this issue has to take into account external factors such as the doctrinal content of his translations, situation of Buddhism in the regions connected with An Shigao's education as a Buddhist follower, and later Chinese sources. Each of these are far from giving a conclusive proof. The translations themselves are to some degree associated with the translator's own doctrinal stance but other criteria, which, personally,

with the Sarvāstivādins in Wardak, to the West of Kabul. (96) In spite of the differences and rivalry between the two schools, we must not exclude the possibility of certain contacts and influence especially in the cases of foreign monks like An Shigao travelling from place to place and less connected with factionalism. Aware or not, An may have been influenced by other schools and this may appear in his choice of texts which were not perfectly "orthodox" from a Sarvāstivādin viewpoint. However, we must not forget that An Shigao as well as other Indian or Central Asian monks were not always carrying translation projects in the modern sense of the word. As Ui also remarks (97), it is doubtful whether An translated only texts he had memorized or brought with him from the Western Regions. He may have picked up some of them on his way through Eastern Turkestan or found some others in China where they could have been brought by Central Asian merchants or monks who had visited the Middle Kingdom before. (98) Obviously, not all these texts belonged to the Sarvāstivāda orthodoxy but An Shigao may have found that despite some differences, they could serve well the purpose of introducing Buddhist teachings to China. The hypothesis of An's also translating texts which he found on his way or in China could also account for the apparently unsystematic character of An Shigao's selection of *Āgama* 阿含 scriptures.

However, although he knew about the existence of Mahāyāna, An does not appear to have been influenced in any way by the teachings of the Great Vehicle. The only translation which clearly reflects this situation (99) is the * *Pañcaśadanuśāsanyaḥ sūtra* 五十校計經 or the *Sūtra of the Fifty Instructions*. (100) This is a quite unique scripture compiled sometime at the beginning of the 1st century C.E. (101) by Conservative Buddhists as a criticism against the newly risen Mahāyāna movement and thought. Although it does not deny the right of existence of the Mahāyāna, the *sūtra* criticizes many of the Bodhisattva ideals and attempts to subordinate them to the traditional Nirvāṇa and Arhatship goals. For instance, the Buddha admonishes the Bodhisattvas who define their creed as "We wish to lead all people to attain Buddhahood" 我欲使人悉得佛道 by asking them

I ignore, may have worked with the scholar-monks involved in this noble cause, a fact proved by so many translators in the Buddhist history on Chinese soil who left behind "Hīnayāna" and Mahāyāna texts alike or scriptures belonging to different traditions. However, as far as An Shigao is regarded, things appear to be simpler because his translations almost exclusively belong to the Conservative Buddhist tradition or what Mahāyāna followers would denigrate as the "Lesser Vehicle" (*hīnayāna*). To be more precise, doctrinally, most of his translations seem to belong to the Sarvāstivāda 說一切有部 tradition (93), although we must also note the existence of certain differences from what we may call the classical Sarvāstivāda theory. However, their unsystematical character as well as the unclear style of early renderings in Chinese coupled with their long history often plagued by textual deformations do not permit a final conclusion as to the nature of these differences. It may be, as Ui suggests (94), that the texts translated by An Shigao betray the lack of uniformity of the Sarvāstivāda tradition itself, a situation also reflected in the different views expounded by various Vaibhāṣika masters recorded in the *Abhidharma mahāvibhāṣā śāstra* 大毘婆沙論 and continued by the disputes between the Kāśmīra and Gandhāra schools. Some or parts of An's translations may have originated with such "divergent" groups whose views were not adopted in the classical theory. Or it may be that some differences came through An Shigao's close association with the Yogācārya or masters of spiritual cultivation who were active within the Sarvāstivāda tradition but sometimes developed their own interpretation and views on the basis of their experiences in the yoga-praxis. (95) An's own interest seems to have been much orientated towards this practical aspect and he may have found it unnecessary for his Chinese followers to know all the details, especially those related to the intricated Abhidharma system. He may have taken therefore the liberty to omit or re-arrange some parts or details of the originals, making it appear more or less different from the "unabridged" Sarvāstivāda texts. We must not exclude a third possibility: North-West India was not exclusively dominated by the Sarvāstivādins. We find, for instance, the Mahāsāṃghikas 大衆部 living together

"How can lead other people to attain Buddhahood when you have not been able to attain it yourselves" 自不能得佛何能使他人得佛 (102). If this reflects An Shigao's own attitude, and I am tempted to believe that the very choice of such a challenging text proves it does, then we have the picture of a Conservative Buddhist who although accepts the possibility of other ways, was strongly committed to traditional views and practices.

Last but not least, if An Shigao had been a Great Vehicle follower, Chinese sources written in most cases by authors with strong Mahāyānist sympathies would have not failed to mention it. Instead, we read that An Shigao was versed in Abhidharma and "*dhyāna sūtras*", which is a rather euphemistic way of admitting that he was a "Hīnayāna" follower. (103)

It is hard to draw a final conclusion after the examination of Prof. Forte's hypothesis. Although my interpretation differs in many ways from his reconstruction of An Shigao's biography, I must stress again that I do not deny the immense importance of his findings. We have, however, to be careful how we "read" these historical and epigraphical sources. All of them are texts compiled centuries after An Shigao's time, the earliest being the *History of the Wei Dynasty* completed by Wei Shou 魏收, styled Boqi 伯起, in the 11th month of the 5th year of the Tianbao 天保 era (554 C.E.). (104) Furthermore, the *Compendium of Surnames Compiled in the the Yuanhe Era* was already lost by the middle of the 18th century and the present text comes from the *Complete Collection of Books Arranged in Four Sections* 四庫全書 whose compilers had to rely on the *Great Encyclopaedia of the Yongle Era* 永樂大典 (105) completed in 1407. Such a textual history naturally diminishes the value of the source as we can never distinguish between original information and later interpolations. From a purely chronological viewpoint, the Buddhist sources I have examined here are by far older going back as early as only few years after An Shigao's death and ending with the beginning of the sixth century. Certainly, one can always doubt the validity of the information provided by religious literature and we have noted indeed the existence of hagiographical and apologetical passages. I believe, however, that

there is a core of data which reflects more or less reality and religious fiction is not an all-pervading principle but has its own motivation and rules of accretion. Buddhist accounts could have transmitted, after all, much of the information found in the sources revealed by Prof. Forte without being detrimental to An Shigao's place and prestige in the history of the Noble Path on Chinese soil. Instead we find a huge gap of information and apprehension between Buddhist sources and historical documents, their only common point being An Shigao's princely origin. My reconstruction of An's life may be criticized of relying too much on Buddhist information and I must indeed admit that I have given priority to these sources due to chronological reasons and a belief that whatever mystification we find in religious literature must have a motivation which I could not detect in the basic data provided by the Buddhist accounts. This leads me to conclude that later historical and epigraphical documents based their information on family genealogies which mistakenly borrowed An Shigao's name in an effort, deliberate or not, to trace back their origins as early as possible. My surmise is that two families of Parthian origin, bearing therefore the same *ethnikon* An 安, who managed to distinguish themselves and achieve political prestige, had to reinforce their new social position with a noble genealogy. Both claimed that their ancestor was an "attending prince" at the Han Court named An Shigao who happened to bear the same name and lived in the same epoch with the famous Buddhist monk An Shigao, although the genealogical records make no mention whatsoever of An Shigao's glorious achievements as a remarkable translator and propagator of Buddhism in China. It is impossible to determine from our sources whether the families themselves decided to upgrade their origin and therefore picked up a Parthian of princely origin as their ancestor or whether they based themselves on some very incomplete information concerning a Parthian of princely origin who had visited China at the end of the Han dynasty and considered in good faith that this fellow country man must have been their ancestor. After all, we can safely assume that most of the naturalized Parthian families in China came to the Middle Kingdom at the end of the 2nd century and beginning of

the 3rd century, a period of unrest and eventual collapse of the Arsacid Empire. We can also surmise that amongst these families of refugees there were also people of noble origin, which naturally increased the chances of the later confusion. We can go on with our inference and conjecture that such a situation affected somehow the forming legends concerning An Shigao, doubtlessly an "exotic" personage who must have strongly appealed to the popular imagination, and contributed to the confused and sometimes contradictory hagiographical details of his biography. Huijiao discusses and eventually rejects four apocryphal accounts which variously record An Shigao's achievements between 265 and 365 C.E. (106) Both Sengyou and Huijiao include in An Shigao's biography a very puzzling episode. They first relate that An had visited Canton in a previous life knowing that he would be killed by a young man as a *karmic* retribution. He was then born as the Crown Prince of Parthia and went again to Canton where he found the man who had killed him in a previous life. Accompanied by his former killer, An went to Kuaiji to be killed again as a form of *karmic* retribution much to the astonishment of his companion who devoted then his life to the Buddhist Law. (107) This amounts to saying that An Shigao visited China and died in similar conditions in two consecutive lives. Sengyou goes as far as stating that An had been a Parthian prince in his former life, too. (108) Robert Shih suggests that behind this episode we may have the possibility of another Parthian monk who had visited China before An Shigao. (109) I contend that it is equally possible that the presence of other Parthian monks and lay followers in the decades which followed An's death could have led to confusion and apocryphal stories. A story of *karmic* retribution which An Shigao not only accepts with dignified calm but actually involves himself actively and goes to find his own killer, whom he compassionately forgives, is definitely in the logic of hagiographical fiction, especially if we accept the idea that An died a violent death which later Buddhists had to explain somehow. However, it is not in the logic of hagiographical imagination to repeat a more or less identical episode within the frame of the same account. We have to admit that some external, confusing factors worked on this story and forced

their way into An's biography in the form of two episodes of *karmic* retribution repeated in more or less similar circumstances.

A quotation from the *Records of Mount Lu* 廬山記 found in the *Comprehensive Description [of Institutions]* 通志 says that "During the Wu dynasty there lived An Gao" 吳有安高. (110) If this citation is authentic and correct, we have another proof that in the decades following An's death, which also coincides with a period when other Parthian monks and families of refugees came and settled in China, An became not only the hero of some hagiographical stories but also of contradictory apocryphal traditions which retained only few features of the real An Shigao. This eventually opened the way for the confusion which would lead An Tong's and Li Baoyu's clans to consider that their first ancestor in China was an "attending prince" named An Shigao. Whatever their true motivation might have been, they had only very scarce information about An Shigao and must have interpreted An's princely origin and his presence on Chinese soil as a "hostage son" or "attending prince" to the Han Court, a practice with a long tradition in China which they must have been quite familiar. Had they known An's brilliant achievements as a Buddhist propagator and translator, they would have undoubtedly mentioned them. Even if they had consciously "doctored" An's identity into that of an "attending prince", a few words about their "ancestor's" contribution to the fate of Buddhism, which enjoyed the protection of most of the dynasties throughout the Chinese Middle Ages, would have been quite useful in consolidating their prestige.

I do not claim that my interpretation of the events is complete and perfect. Admittedly, it fails to cover the complexity of the data we are faced with. To give only one detail, there still remains the problem of An's name. Our Buddhist sources tell us that the Parthian monk was named Qing 清 and styled Shigao 世高. The existence of a *zi* 字 or style certainly points to a Chinese custom, which is, however, quite unusual for a monk. Zürcher explains it as "honorific appellation" "which cannot be taken to mean a 'style' of the Chinese type". (111) The eminent sinologist fails, however, to define what he means by "honorific appel-

lation". After all, a *zi*, which was given to young men to mark their coming of age when they were 20 years old, was performing exactly the role of an "honorific appellation" as using the name 名 of a person by people other than one's parents, sovereign, and teacher was considered impolite. On the other hand, Prof. Forte thinks that since An Shigao was an "attending son", it is natural that he received a style according to the Chinese custom. (112) Since I rejected the possibility of An's being an "attending prince" and critically adopted the picture offered by Buddhist sources, I find such an assumption quite questionable. My guess is that Qing was the translation of An actual name 名 and Shigao was his Buddhist name 法名 given at the time of his ordination. Bagchi's reconstruction of Shigao as "Lokottama" seems to me appropriate enough, although it is not supported by textual evidence. (113) I imagine that what happened is that the first Chinese followers, not familiar with the idea of a Buddhist name taken by a monk at his ordination, interpreted this as a Chinese *zi* and in the good tradition of Chinese biographies asked the Parthian monk his actual name, too. Both were preserved only in Chinese translation (Qing="the Pure One"; Shigao="the Eminent One in the World") without a phonetic transcription which could give us a clue on the original pronunciation. It is interesting to note that Yan Fotiao, An's direct disciple, uses only Shigao, avoiding his master's actual name most probably out of respect. (114) I must admit, nevertheless, that without solid textual evidence the hypothesis that Shigao=Lokottama was An's Buddhist name erroneously equated by his followers with a Chinese *zi* remains at mere conjectural level. (115)

There are still many unsolved problems concerning An Shigao both in his "classical" biography which I adopted here trying, however, to keep the critical perspective of modern scholarship as well as in Prof. Forte's challenging hypothesis. One can only hope that future research will reveal new facts regarding the life and work of the first Buddhist translator and known missionary on Chinese soil.

(To be continued in the next issue)

NOTES

1. See, for instance, Huijiao's 慧皎 *Gaoseng zhuan* (hereafter abbreviated Gsz) or *Biographies of Eminent Monks* 高僧傳, Juan卷 11, Chapter on Meditation 習禪: "The practice of meditation has been transmitted since the propagation of the Buddhist Teaching to the East [i.e., the introduction of Buddhism to China]. In earlier days, [An] Shigao and [Zhu] Fahu [竺] 法護 [i.e. Dharmarakṣa] translated meditation *sūtras*. Sengguang 僧光, Tanyou 曇猷, and so on relied on the teachings [of these *sūtras*] and cultivated their mind, obtaining superior achievements in the end." (*Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經 (hereafter abbreviated T), Vol. 50, p. 400b). Both Sengyuan and Tanyou, whose biographies are found in the same Gsz (cf. *ibid.*, p. 395c and pp. 395c-396b respectively) died at the end of the Taiyuan 太元 era (376-396) during the Eastern Jin 東晉 dynasty. The accounts of their lives are full of thaumaturgical details, but nothing concrete is said about the meditation methods they actually practiced.

2. The exact number of An Shigao's translations has been much debated by traditional and modern bibliographers. It varies from 176 titles given by Fei Changfang 費長房 in the *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶記, compiled in 597 (cf. T49.50a-52c), to only four *sūtras* mentioned by E. Zürcher in *The Buddhist Conquest of China*, E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1972, p. 33; p. 331 (note 83), or five to six translations as advocated by Ono Genmyō 小野玄妙 in *General Introduction to Buddhist Scriptures* 佛典總論, Appenix 別卷 to the *Great Dictionary of Buddhist Books with Explanations* 佛書解説大辭典, Daitō Shuppan-sha, Tokyo, 1936, pp. 30-32. I find that something around seventeen translations, as suggested by the studies of Ōtani Shōshin 大谷勝真 ("On the Scriptures Translated by An Shigao" 安世高の譯經に就いて, *Tōyō Gakuhō* 東洋學報, Vol. 13, No. 4, 1924, pp. 102-139) and Hayashiya Tomojirō 林屋友次郎 ("The Saṃyuktāgama and the Ekottarāgama Translated by An Shigao" 安世高譯の雜阿含と増一阿含, *Bukkyō Kenkyū* 佛教研究, Vol. 1, No. 2, 1937, pp. 11-50), seems to be the most appropriate number. Apart from the *Anban shouyi*

jīng, An Shigao translated the following "dhyāna sūtras":

1) Saṅgharakṣa's *Sūtra of the Spiritual Cultivation Stages* (*Yogācārabhūmi-sūtra*) 道地經, partial translation in one *juan*, T15.230c-236b. (On its comparison with Dharmarakṣa's translation, see Paul Demiéville's excellent study "La *Yogācārabhūmi* de Saṅgharakṣa", *Bulletin de l'École Française de Extrême-Orient*, Tome 54, Fasc. 2, Paris, 1954, pp.339-436).

2) *The Greater Sūtra of the Twelve Gates* (* *Mahādvādaśānaya-sūtra*) 大十二門經, in one *juan*, no longer extant. "The twelve gates" are mentioned in the *Anban shouyi jing*, too, and refer to the four meditative stages (*catvāri dhyānāni* 四禪), four meditative attainments of non-form (*catvārūpya-samāpatti* 四無色定), and the four immeasurables (*catvāry apramāṇāni* 四無量心).

3) *The Smaller Sūtra of the Twelve Gates* (* *Kṣudradvādaśānaya-sūtra*) 小十二門經, in one *juan*, no longer extant.

4) *The Sūtra of Meditation Subjects* (* *Dhyānabhāvanā dharmasamjñā-sūtra*) 禪行法想經, in one *juan*, T15.181b-c. It is a brief text listing thirty meditation subjects, mainly associated with the contemplation of the impure (*aśubha-bhāvanā*). Ui Hakuju 宇井伯壽, "A Study on An Shigao, the First Translator and Propagator in the History of Chinese Buddhism" シナ佛教最初の譯經弘傳者安世高の研究, *Studies in the History of the Translation of Buddhist Sūtras into Chinese* 譯經史研究, Iwanami shoten, Tokyo, 1971, p.347, suggests that it may be related to a similar text in the Chinese translation of the *Ekottarāgama* (T2.780a-b), which contains indeed two *sūtras* mentioning meditation subjects also found in An's text. I surmise, however, that it is not a translation proper, but a meditation aide-mémoire compiled by An on the base of several sources, including the ones cited above. 法想在 the title should be taken as referring to what Pāli texts call *kammaṭṭhāna*, i.e., meditation subjects, forty or thirty-eight in number. My reconstruction of *dharmasamjñā* is supported by the fact that the Pāli equivalent of T2.780a is entitled *Saññā (Aṅguttara Nikāya, X, 56-7)*, where *saññā* (Skt. *samjñā*) is used with a meaning similar to recollection or mindfulness.

5) *The Sūtra of the Aggregates, Realms and Sense-fields* (* *Skandhadhātva-*

yātana-sūtra) 陰持入經, in two *juan*, T15.173b-180c. It is a rather unsystematic collection of explanations connected with the categories listed in the title as well as with spiritual cultivation aspects, such as the thirty-seven factors supporting the Awakening (*saptatṛiṃśad bodhipakṣa* 三十七道品), tranquility (*śāmatha* 止), insight (*vipaśyanā* 觀), the four approaches (*catvāraḥ pratipannāḥ* 四向) and four fruits (*catvāri phalāni* 四果).

It must be noted, however, that the reconstructions above are only tentative and suffer from the deficiency of using Sanskrit instead of Gāndhārī which seems to have been the original language of An Shigao's translations (v. infra)

3. According to the Ven. Bhikṣuṇī Huilian 慧旻連, in modern Taiwan 安般守意經 is read "Anbo shouyi jing". I found, however, that the "ban" reading of 般 is closer to the original pronunciation of 安般 **an-puan* which is an obvious phonetic transcription of the Indian *ānāpāna* or "breathing in and out". For the delicate matter of reconstructing the Chinese pronunciation at the end of the Later Han Dynasty, I have mainly relied on the *Great Sino-Japanese Dictionary Published by Gakken* 學研·漢和大字典, ed. Tōdō Akiyasu 藤堂明保, Gakushū Kenkyūsha, 1978. However, since Tōdō gives ancient (Zhou-Qin) and middle (Sui-Tang) pronunciations only, leaving out the epoch we are dealing with, I have also consulted Ting Pang-hsin 丁邦新, *Chinese Phonology of the Wei-Chin Period: Reconstruction of the Finals as Reflected in Poetry* 魏晉音韻研究, Institute of History and Philology, Acadēmia Sinica, Special Publications, No. 65, Taipei, Republic of China, 1975, whose conclusions, compared to the original Indian words which phonetic transcriptions are supposed to approximate, prove quite useful. However, I am responsible for whatever mistakes which may have resulted from my hazardous attempt of reconstructing the pronunciation used in An Shigao's translations, which is seriously impaired by the fact that An Shigao's own pronunciation of Gāndhārī words may have been more or less deformed by the accent of his native tongue and that his main collaborator and disciple Yan Fotiao was original from Linhuai 臨淮 (cf. T50.324c), situated in present Anhui Province 安徽省, speaking, therefore, a south-eastern dialect (for Han dialects,

cf. Ting, op. cit., p. 262)

4. T15.163a-173a.

5. T55.5c and 6a.

6. Deserving special mention are Ui Hakuju, op.cit. pp.1-467 and Aramaki Noritoshi's 荒牧典俊 "From Indian Buddhism to Chinese Buddhism: The *Anban shouyi jing* and Its Prefaces by Kang Senghui, Daoan and Xie Fu" インド佛教から中國佛教へ: 安般守意經と康僧會・道安・謝敷序など, *Bukkyō shigaku* 佛教史學, Vol.15, No.2, 1971, pp.121-165.

7. デレアヌ フロリン、安世高譯『安般守意經』現行本の成立について、*Tōyō no shisō to shūkyō* 東洋の思想と宗教, No. 9, 1992, pp.48-63.

8. *Bukkyō shigaku kenkyū* 佛教史學研究, Vol. 35, No. 1, 1992, pp.1-35.

9. 安息 is usually considered to be a phonetic transcription of Arsak or Arsacid Dynasty that established and ruled the Parthian Empire. However, even if we assume that the original pronunciation was more or less altered in the process of adapting it to the Chinese, it would be unnatural to use 安息 *an-siāk to approximate "Arsak". I would rather argue that both phonetically and historically it appears more appropriate to consider *an-siāk a phonetic transcription of Anthioch, i.e., modern Merv, which was, most probably, the city reached by Zhang Qian's 張騫 messengers around 119 B.C.E. (cf. Sima Qian 司馬遷, *Records of the Historian* 史記, *Juan* 123, *Zhonghua shuju*, Vol. 10, pp. 3157-3169) and regarded by them as synonymous with the name of the whole Parthian Empire. Later on the place was called Mōuru, i.e., modern Merv, which was transcribed as 木鹿城 (see, for instance, the *History of the Later Han Dynasty* 後漢書, *Juan* 88, *Zhonghua shuju*, Vol. 10, p.2918, which describes it as the Western frontier of the Empire, placing it at 20,000 *li*, i.e., ca. 8,300 km, away from Luoyang 洛陽, and calls the whole region "Little Parthia" 小安息), but 安息 was already a term too well established to be changed and its etymology must have become, anyway, unclear by that time. Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信亨 ("On An Shigao's Achievements" 安世高の事蹟に就て, first published in 1904 and later included in *A Study on Pure Land Buddhism* 浄土教之研究, Kanao bunendō, Tokyo, 1922, p. 417)

also considers 安息 to be a phonetic transcription of "Anthioch". Mochizuki does not elaborate upon the reasons of his his assumption, simply stating that the Chinese took Antioch for the name of the whole country. Incidentally, Mochizuki ventures to suggest that King Manqu (* *Muan-k'iuət*) 滿屈王, who appears in the *History of the Later Han Dynasty* (op.cit., p.2918) as sending a lion and a "big bird" (ostrich?) to the Chinese Court in the 13th year of the Yongyuan era (101 C.E.) may be An Shigao's father (ibid., p. 418). It goes without saying that historical information is too scarce to permit such an identification.

10. The easternmost territories under Parthian control included the western regions of modern Afghanistan and Pakistan. For Buddhist monastic sites in these areas, see Xinru Liu, *Ancient India and Ancient China: Trade and Religious Exchanges, AD 1-600*, Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1988, pp.192-4. Buddhist texts and a 8.5 cm statue of a seated Buddha dating from the 1st-2nd centuries C.E. and originating from Gandhāra were also discovered in Merv in what appears to be a *stūpa*. Merv is, however, the westernmost Buddhist site in Asia.

11. *Taoism and Chinese Religion*, Translated by Frank A. Kierman, Jr., The University of Massachusetts Press, 1981, p.404 (English translation of the *Le Taoïsme et les religions chinoises*, Gallimard, 1971).

12. cf. Mircea Eliade, *Istoria credințelor și ideilor religioase*, Traducere de Cezar Baltag, Editura științifică și enciclopedică, București, 1986, Vol. 2, pp.298-320 (Romanian translation of the *Histoire des croyances et des idées religieuses*, Payot, Paris, 1978). Étienne Lamotte, *History of Indian Buddhism from the Origins to the Śāka Era*, Translated by Sara Webb-Boin, Université Catholique de Louvain, Institute Orientaliste Louvain-la-Neuve, 1988, pp.492-494 (English translation of the *Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien, des origines à l'ère Śāka*, Bibliothèque du Muséon, Louvain, 1958).

13. Lamotte, op. cit., p. 494.

14. G.A. Koshelenko, "The Beginning of Buddhism in Margiana", in *Ariana Antiqua*, XIV, fasc. 1-2, Budapest, 1966, p. 180 (Quoted by B.N. Puri, *Buddhism in Central Asia*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1987, p. 97).

15. cf. P.C. Bagchi, *India and China*, Calcutta, 1944, p. 30 (Quoted by B.N. Puri, op. cit., p. 97). Both Bagchi and Puri suggest that Buddhism was transmitted to Parthia by the Tokharians and that Parthian monks were trained in Tokharestan before proceeding to China. The role of the Tokharians seems to me, however, to be over-emphasized and this leads to overlooking the importance held by the well-established Buddhist centres in North-West India.

16. T55.43b. The sentence 翔而後進 is not easy to interpret as 翔 has both the meaning of "wandering from place to place" and "abiding", "remaining" (cf. Morohashi Tetsuji 諸橋徹次, *Great Sino-Japanese Dictionary* 大漢和辭典, Daishūkan shoten, Compact edition, 1976 (1958) Vol. 9, p. 111). However, I found that the former meaning is closer to the basic semantic sphere of 翔, i.e., "flying", and more appropriate in the context of describing the fate of a refugee. Furthermore, if it meant "abiding", one would expect the verb 翔 to be followed by a noun phrase specifying the place.

17. cf. *History of the World* 世界の歴史, Vol.5: *The Western Regions and Islam* 西域とイスラム, ed. by Iwamura Shinobu 岩村忍, Chūō kōron-sha, 1976 (1968), pp. 141-7.

18. The years of Kaniṣka's rule have been much debated. I have adopted here the dates advocated by Ogasawara Senshū 小笠原宣秀 and Oda Yoshihisa 小田義久 in *Compendium of Buddhist History in the Western Regions* 要説・西域佛教史, Hyakka-en, 1986 (1980), p.39, p.110.

19. T55.43c, 46a, 46b; T55.95a; and T50.323b respectively.

20. T55.95a; T50.323b. Judging from his translations and phonetic transcriptions, Kaśmīra and/or Gandhāra seem the most probable places where An Shigao received or completed his Buddhist education. Kang Senghui, T55.43b, Sengyou, T55.95a, Huijiao, T50.323a, equally mention the fact that he was well versed in medical sciences. If this not a later Chinese accretion, this detail may also hint at his links to a North-West Indian tradition. We know that Buddhism has shown a favourable attitude towards medical care since its earliest days and many of its missionaries were closely associated to medicine. Taxila, in North-

West India, was one of the most renowned centres of medical education in a close symbiotic relationship to the Buddhist church (cf. Kenneth G. Zysk, *Asceticism and Healing in Ancient India: Medicine in the Buddhist Monastery*, Oxford University Press, New York, Oxford, 1991, pp. 46-7).

21. op. cit., p. 3162.

22. The exact location of 條支 and 西海 is extremely difficult to determine. The *Records of the Historian*, op. cit., p. 3163-4, *History of the [Former] Han Dynasty* 漢書, Juan 96-A, Zhonhua shuju, Vol. 12, p.3888, *History of the Later Han Dynasty*, op. cit., p. 2918, mention 條支 as being situated at the West of Parthia. Usually, it is considered that 條支 stands for the land along the Tigris River (see, for instance, *Mochizuki's Great Encyclopaedia of Buddhism* 佛教大辭典, ed by Mochizuki Shinkō, Sekai seiten kankō kyōkai, revised edition, 1974, Vol. 1, p. 86), which is indeed phonetically close to the Chinese 條支 * *dög-kiēg*, and 西海 represents the Mediterranean Sea. However, things are not so simple and the following translation from the *History of the Later Han*, op. cit., p. 2918, clearly shows that a precise location is a very delicate task:

The capital 城 of the country of Tiaozhi 條支國 is situated on mountains and has a circumference of more than 40 *li* [i.e., ca. 166 km]. It faces the Western Sea 西海, whose waters surround it from the South, North and East, making it inaccessible from three directions. It is connected to the land only through its north-western corner. [The climate of] the land is hot and humid.....Turning back to the North and then to the East, one reaches Parthia after more than 60 days of travelling by horse. In later times, [Parthia] made Tiaozhi a vassal country and appointed generals to supervise all its cities.

One thing appears quite sure and this is the fact that the Western Sea does not denote here the Mediterranean. First, it is impossible to find a peninsula on the eastern shore of the Mediterranean corresponding to the description

above. Second, the Parthian merchants who convince Gan Ying to renounce his plans to reach the Roman Empire tell him: "The sea is vast and those having good winds cross it in three months while those having slow winds need two years. Therefore, all those setting out on a journey on this sea take provisions for three years" (ibid.). It is obvious that if 西海 had been the Mediterranean Sea, Gan Ying would have already been on territories belonging to the Roman Empire having no need for Parthian merchants as intermediaries and being equally able to take a land route to Rome. Geographically and historically, it seems more appropriate to identify the Western Sea with the Persian Gulf and locate Tiaozhi somewhere on its western shore. The most difficult problem is to determine what the Chinese historiographer meant here by Parthia. If he referred to 安息 as the whole Parthian Empire, which included both the Tigris and Euphrates in its territory, then Tiaozhi was situated anywhere from around modern Ad Damman in Saudi Arabia, in which case Cape Tannūrah would correspond geographically to the location of the Tiaozhi capital detailed above, to Oman, where Al Hajar Mountains would fit the description of the capital region as a mountainous one. We know that centres like Gerrha, on the western shore of the Persian Gulf, and Omana, on the shore of the Gulf of Oman, flourished since ancient times. If, however, 安息 is used here in its narrow sense of the original homeland of the Parthian tribes in Northern Iran and Southern Turkmenia, then Tiaozhi refers to a region close to the Tigris, corresponding more or less to modern Kuwait.

23. cf. *History of the Later Han Dynasty*, op. cit., p. 2910, 2918, 2931.

24. cf. Tsukamoto Zenryū 塚本善隆, *General History of Chinese Buddhism 中國佛教通史*, Shunjū-sha, 1979, Vol.1, p. 68, 81, quoting from the *History of the Later Han Dynasty*.

25. cf. T55.95a; T50.323b.

26. cf. Zürcher, op. cit., pp. 23-32; Liu, op. cit., pp.139-43; Tang Yongtong 湯用丹, *History of Buddhism during the Han, Wei, Western Jin, Eastern Jin, Northern and Southern Dynasties 漢魏兩晉南北朝佛教史*, Zhonghua shuju, Beijing, 1983, Vol.1, pp. 71-3.

27. T55.69c-70a. Tang, op. cit., p. 46, followed by many other modern scholars, considers that 十慧 in the title is synonymous with "the ten practices of wisdom" 十慧, i.e., the six steps of the mindfulness of breathing and the Four Noble Truths dealt with in the *Anban shouyi jing*, and concludes, therefore, that 沙彌十慧章句 was a commentary to this *sūtra*. Zürcher, op. cit., p. 331, note 88, however, aptly remarks that 沙彌 *śrāmaṇera* in the title rather suggests that the text was an explanation of the ten precepts for the novice. Since Yan's work is no longer extant, we cannot be certain about its exact nature. However, I agree with Zürcher that a collection of passages on Buddhist precepts for the novice is more likely. There is at least another statement in the brief extant *Preface* which seems to hint at this possibility. Yan tells that An Shigao translated Buddhist scriptures which amount to a few million words, but "I have not heard him expounding in detail the ten practices [leading to] wisdom 十慧" (T55.69c). We know that An Shigao concentrated much of his activity on translating and, most probably, teaching meditation theory and practice, which would make it quite unnatural for Yan Fotiao to say that his master did not elaborate on the "ten practices of wisdom" in the sense of the six steps of the mindfulness of breathing and Four Noble Truths. On the other hand, An Shigao apparently did not translate any *vinaya* text. Sengyou mentions a certain 義決律 or 義決律法行經 in one *juan* no longer extant by his time. The 律 in the title may suggest a text connected to Buddhist *vinaya*, but Sengyou cites Daoan who states that the *sūtra* originally belonged to *Dīrghāgama* 長阿含 (T55,6a). The early church in Luoyang, especially after An Shigao's death, must have been in a desperate need for information concerning the rules regulating the life of a novice and this led Yan Fotiao to compile (translate?) passages concerning the ten precepts which his master had transmitted him. As far as 慧 and its synonym 慧 are concerned, they were not used in the epoch only with the technical meaning of *prajñā*. We find 慧 in Zhi Qian's 支謙 (2nd-3rd centuries C.E.) translation of the *Arthakavargīya-sūtra* 義足經 (corresponding to the *Aṭṭhaka-vagga* in the *Suttanipāta*) used to translate *kusala*, i.e., "good", "skillful" (cf. Nakamura Hajime 中村元,

Great Dictionary of Buddhist Technical Terms 佛教語大辭典, Tōkyō shoseki, Compact edition, 1987 (1981), p. 315. Dr. Nakamura only indicates here *gāthā* 783 in the *Suttanipāta* without giving the equivalent in the Chinese text. I imagine that he refers to T4.177c10 which corresponds indeed to *gāthā* 783. For the Pāli text, I consulted *The Sutta-Nipāta*, ed. P.V. Bapat, *Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica* No. 75, Sri Satguru Publications, 1990(1924), p.119). If 慧 in Yan's text was used with the same meaning, then we can reconstruct the 沙彌十慧 as *śrāmaṇera daśa kuśala-karmapathāḥ* 沙彌十善業道 or "the ten good [=wise] courses of action for the novice", which is the usual term for the ten precepts. However, this is only a hypothetical remark which, I must admit, is threatened by another statement in the *Preface*. Here, Yan says, "Wisdom is the foundation of the Way" 慧者道之本也 (T55.69a). It is hard to say whether Yan used "wisdom" in its technical sense of *prajñā* or with the meaning of Buddhist precepts, which are, after all, a foundation of the Way (cf. the "three disciplines" (*tisrah śikṣāḥ* 三學), i.e., morality (*śīla* 戒), meditation (*samādhi* 定), and wisdom (*prajñā* 慧)). A last word on the date of Yan's work: it appears that it was written after An Shigao's death, which must have happened sometime after 170 C.E., when he is said to have left Luoyang. We know, however, that later on Yan collaborates with An Xuan 安玄, another Parthian, in the translation of the *Ugradattaparipṛcchā* 法鏡經. An Xuan arrived at Luoyang at the end of Emperor Ling's 靈帝 reign (168-189 C.E.) (cf. T55.96a; T50.325b-c). On the other hand, Yan laments the death of his master and the lack of a spiritual guide, which suggests that the *Preface* was written before his meeting with An Xuan. As we shall see below, the avoidance of Imperial taboo names is not an absolutely safe criterion but it remains an important element in helping the historian in his work. The Imperial taboo name during Emperor Huan's 桓帝 reign (146-167 C.E.) was 志 which was supposed to be replaced by 意 (cf. Chen Xinhui 陳新會, *Illustrations of Taboo Names Used Throughout History* 史諱舉例, Wenshizhe chubanshe, 1987, p.132). Yan, however, uses 志 in his *Preface* (T55.70a6), which may hint at the fact that the text was written after Emperor Huan's reign. All these details suggest that Yan Fotiao compiled his work around

180 C.E. '

28. Tang, op. cit., vol.1, p. 46.

29. The archaic pronunciation of 調 is *dōg but sometime after the beginning of the Common Era -g is vocalized (-g→-u/o_)(cf. Ting, op. cit., pp. 255-7). A similar change must have taken place with 浮 brog → brou.

30. cf. Ui, op. cit., pp. 5-6.

31. cf. Pāli *Vinayapīṭakam*, ed. by Herman Oldenberg, London, 1879-1883, *Mahāvagga*, IV, 4.1, vol. I, p.319.

32. In his *Preface*, Yan states that "Ten is the perfection (literally, end) of numbers" 十者數之終 (T55.69c). This seems to be a Chinese conception which also appears in such works as the *Commentary* 疏 to the 屯 hexagram in the *Book of Changes*, the *Commentary* 疏 to Fourth Year of the Duke Xi 僖公·四年 in the *Zuozhuan* 左傳, the explanation of 十 in the *Shuowen jiezi* 說文解字. Yan must have been familiar with such interpretations which were part of the education of the learned gentry.

33. T55.69c: 或以口解。或以文傳。

34. T49.50a-52c.

35. On Buddhist centres in the Later Han, see mainly Zürcher, op. cit., pp. 26-8, 41; Liu, op. cit., pp. 141-3.

36. T55.95c; T50.323c.

37. T55.70a: "Struck by misfortune, I met with the distress of [losing my] master" 夙罹凶咎遭和上憂. The basic meanings of 憂 are "anxiety" and "distress", which could allow other readings as well. It is, however, hard to imagine in this context other interpretation than the distress caused by the death of his *ācārya*. For a mere separation, Yan would have had no need for such strong expressions. Furthermore, one of the secondary meanings of 憂 is "mourning". Another meaning is "illness" but the whole context suggests a parting for ever which is best interpreted as death. Ui, op. cit., p. 6, similarly reads 憂 as meaning death.

38. op. cit., p. 24.

39. "Hostages in Chinese History", *Harvard Journal of Asian Studies*, No. 15, 1952, p. 507.

40. *Op. cit.*, p. 3889. The post of General-Protector of the Western Regions 都護 was instituted by the Former Han dynasty.

41. 罽賓 is usually interpreted to mean Kashmir. However, its exact location depends on the epoch: from the Han dynasty to the Western Jin dynasty it denotes Gandhāra; from the Eastern Jin to the end of the Northern and Southern Dynasties it refers to Kaśmīra; during the Sui and Tang dynasties it stands for Kapiśā and Ghazni region (cf. Odawara & Oda, *op. cit.*, p. 49).

42. Usually written 烏弋山離, Arachosia was situated in a region roughly corresponding to the South-West of Afghanistan, North-West of Pakistan, and East of Iran.

43. According to Ven. Bhikṣuṇī Huilian, this refers to the Chinese custom of giving presents in return.

44. *op. cit.*, p. 3928.

45. Karashahr or Yanqi County in modern Xingjiang.

46. See note 22 above.

47. Most likely referring to the Western Sea (see note 22 above).

48. *Op. cit.*, p. 2910. 重譯 refers to the fact that messengers coming from remote regions had to make use of two or more interpreters translating from one language into another until they reached the target language.

49. See note 9 above.

50. T55.50a.

51. It should be noted, however, that the Buddhists themselves perceived this appellation as a respectful form of address. Sengyou clearly says that "An had originally been a member of the royal family and his fame spread abroad. He was therefore called by guests and travellers from the Western Regions 'Marquis An', an appellation which has been in use to our days" (T55.95c). Huijiao, T50.324a, repeats the same thing in roughly similar words.

52. *op. cit.*, p. 23.

53. cf. Kumagai Shigezō 熊谷滋三, "Conferment of Official Ranks and Titles on Non-Chinese Peoples under the Control of the Later Han Dynasty" 後漢の異民族統治における官爵授與について, *Tōhōgaku* 東方學 (*Eastern Studies*), No. 80, July 1990, pp. 48-63.

54. cf. Kumagai, op. cit., especially pp. 50-2.

55. *Zhonghua shuju*, Vol. 3, p. 712.

56. *Zhonghua shuju*, Vol. 3, p. 751.

57. Chubun shuppan-sha, 1976, p. 91. This text compiled by Lin Bao 林寶 in the 7th year of the Yuanhe 元和 era (812) has a rather complicated textual history which I shall briefly discuss below. At this point, it is important to note that our text, quoting or mentioning the *Records of Mount Lu* 廬山記 (v. infra), uses the name An Gao 安高. Cen Zhongmian and Prof. Forte (op.cit., pp. 3-4) consider that the compiler abbreviated An Shigao's name to An Gao in order to avoid the character 世 which was tabooed during the Tang dynasty. While this remains an interpretation which I do not thoroughly deny, I would like to suggest another possibility which seems to me equally viable. 世 was indeed a taboo name 諱 since it appeared in 世民, the personal name of Taizong 太宗, the second Tang Emperor (626-649). However, the precise rules and ways of avoidance of taboo characters represent a very intricate socio-political phenomenon with great historical variations. According to Chen Xinhui (op. cit., pp. 145-6), the Tang dynasty was quite generous in its laws concerning the taboo names, although the custom continued to be widely spread. In an edict promulgated in the ninth year of the Wude 武德 era (626), when Taizong ascended the Throne, we read: "Avoidance is not necessary if the characters 'shi' 世 and 'min' 民 do not immediately succeed each other". An Imperial Edict of the fifth year of the Xianqing 顯慶 era (660) makes it clear that using substitute characters in order to avoid taboo names is not necessary when copying the writings of the past. Furthermore, even when taboo names were avoided, the most popular method in the epoch was neither deletion nor substitution of the characters but omitting one or more strokes in the character, a practice which actually starts with the

Tang dynasty. This rather free attitude towards taboo characters' is clearly reflected in the Buddhist texts of the age, which use both An Shigao and An Gao. For instance, the *Buddhist Scriptures Catalogue* 衆經目錄 compiled by Jingtai 靜泰 in 665, which is by far closer in time to Taizong's reign, does not seem to be preoccupied with the taboo character 世 and uses An Shigao (T55.186b-187a). Daoxuan 道宣 uses in his *Scriptures of Our Teaching in the Great Tang* 大唐內典, compiled in 664, An Shigao (T55.220c10;222b16,25,28;), Gao (T55.222b22), and An Gao (T55.265b6) apparently without having any specific criteria in mind. Zhisheng 智昇, on the other hand, seems to be concerned to some degree with taboo character 世, without being, however, too rigorous. In his *Catalogue of the Buddhist Teaching Compiled in the Kaiyuan Era* 開元釋教錄, completed in 730, he uses in many instances An Gao and Gao (T55.481a-c(passim);512a26;519a17;524a25;545c10), which does not mean, however, that he avoids An Shigao completely. Zhisheng's attitude is best illustrated in An Shigao's biographical account (T55.481a-c) which, with the exception of a few final bibliographical remarks, practically copies Sengyou's equivalent text in the Csjj but changes in most places Shigao to Gao. Yet this is not an absolute rule. Most probably in order to avoid any possible confusion, Zhisheng mentions in the beginning that An's style was Shigao (T55.481a2) and uses the same Shigao even in less important passages (see, for instance, T55.481a29). I think it is obvious now that the avoidance of taboo characters during the Tang dynasty was not a very strict practice and we should not be so categorical in viewing An Gao in the *Compendium of Surnames in the Yuanhe Era* as an abbreviation due to the practice of avoiding taboo characters, especially if we suppose that this is a citation dating back to the beginning of the 5th century (cf. note 110 below). We must also note that the abbreviation An Gao occurs as early as the Csjj (cf. T55.1a18), compiled at the beginning of the sixth century, when there was no need whatsoever of avoiding the character 世 (for the list of taboo characters during the Northern and Southern Dynasties, cf. Chen Xinhui, op. cit., pp. 138-45). We can only suppose that Sengyou's abbreviation was determined by mere stylistic factors which could

have also worked in the case of the *Compendium of Surnames Compiled in the Yuan-he Era*. Let us remark in the end that An Shigao is not the only name abbreviated in Buddhist sources. For example, Daoxuan abbreviates Kang Senghui's name to Kang Hui (T55.265b6), although *seng* 僧 was not a taboo character.

58. cf. Forte, op. cit., pp. 6-7.

59. cf. Forte, op. cit., pp. 8-9.

60. An Tong served under three Emperors of the Former Qin 前秦 dynasty (334-394) and distinguished himself in both military and civil domains. He was conferred the titles of Marquis of Xinbei 新北侯 and then Duke of Gaoyang 高陽公. He held the posts of Minister of the Left 左輔 and Right Deputy-Commander of the Guards of the Imperial Palace Gate 右光祿大夫. He was posthumously given the title of King of Gaoyang 高陽王 (cf. *History of the Wei Dynasty*, op. cit., pp.712-3). Incidentally, he seems to have been a devout Buddhist as in his later years, "he spent large fortunes to build temples and *stūpas* on large scale" 頗殖財貨、大興寺塔 (ibid., p.713).

61. cf. Forte, op. cit., p. 16-8.

62. An Shigao also appears as ancestor of a certain An Lingjie 安令節 (645-704) whose stele inscription has been first revealed and discussed by Prof. Forte (op. cit., pp. 11-6). It is indeed risky to make any assumptions on the origin of this obscure An Lingjie, but I imagine that we have to deal with a branch of either of the two An clans, i.e., An Tong's and Li Baoyu's lineages, or with a third family equally claiming that their ancestor was An Shigao.

63. op. cit., p. 91.

64. cf. Forte, op. cit., p. 13.

65. cf. Prof. Forte's excellent identification of the Crows' Fortress (op. cit., pp. 13-4). See also the *Great Dictionary of Chinese Toponyms Old and New* 中國古今地名大辭典, Shangwu yinshu-guan, Taiwan, 1982 (1931), pp. 731-2, which places Wucheng 烏城 in the South of Gulang 古浪 County, Gansu Province. Prof. Forte suggests here that An Shigao may have been assigned to a defence post on the western border of the Chinese Empire (op. cit., p. 28, note 44). In another

place, he says, however, that An Shigao probably tried to escape the disorders in Luoyang and decided to go back to his native country. On his way back, something made him give up his plan and he settled in Guzang, in the West of China (op.cit., p.20). Not only that the two hypotheses are contradictory, but even in the case when we accept the theory that An Shigao was an "attending son" at the Han Court, we must question the possibility of a hostage of "barbarian origin" to be assigned a post on the frontier and even more his liberty to leave China of his own free will.

66. An Shigao seems to have been closely associated with Mount Lu. Both Sengyou (T55.95b11-c7) and Huijiao (T50.232b26-c22) record a hagiographical episode of An Shigao's helping a huge serpent find its peace. Huiyuan's *Records of Mount Lu*, a lost work which survives only in quotations (v. infra), mentions a shrine on the side of lake Gongting 宫亭 (T51.1025b; also quoted with slight differences in the *Annotations to the Waterways Book* 水經注, cf. Forte, op. cit., p. 4) as well as a Serpent-Village 蛇村 and Serpent-Hill 蛇岡 (T51.1027a), all of them places connected to this episode. Such legendary details can, however, point at the possibility of An's visit to Mount Lu during his peregrinations in southern China. Ui, op. cit., p. 15, also accepts the possibility of An Shigao's visit to Mount Lu. On this legendary episode, see also Zürcher, op. cit., p. 208 and Hisayuki Miyakawa 宮川尚志, "Local Cults around Mount Lu at the Time of Sun En's Rebellion", in *Facets of Taoist Religion. Essays in Chinese Religion*, edited by Holmes Welch and Anna Seidel, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1979, pp.94-6, which gives a full translation of the relevant passage in the Gsz. Incidentally, Miyakawa translates *mang* 蟒 as "huge python" which is, however, questionable since we do not have to deal with a real snake but a legendary creature measuring more than several *li* (cf. T55.95c6; T50.323c21).

67. op. cit., p. 24.

68. In the Csjj, An Xuan 安玄 (T55.96a) and Zhi Qian (T55.97b-c) have their own biographies despite the fact that they were both lay followers. How-

ever, the Gsz which, as its title indicates, is dedicated to eminent *monks*, includes its account of An Xuan's 安玄 life in Lokakṣema's 支樓迦謙 biography (cf. T50.324b25-c7) and writes about Zhi Qian 支謙 and his achievements in Kang Senghui's 康僧會 biography (cf. T50.325a-b4).

69. cf. T50.322c-323a and 323a respectively.

70. op. cit., p. 24.

71. op. cit., pp. 36-8.

72. op. cit., pp. 21-2.

73. T55.69c-70a.

74. T33.9b.

75. T55.42c-43c.

76. Chen Hui, *Preface to the Sūtra of the Aggregates, Realms and Sense-fields* 陰持入經序 (T33,9b). Prof. Forte discusses it in op. cit., p. 21.

77. This is the reading adopted by Ui, op. cit., p. 8: 道を楽しみ.

78. In Book VII, *Jin Xin* 盡心 Part 1, Meng Zi, speaking about the virtuous men of antiquity, says: "They delighted in their own principles, and were oblivious of the power of the princes" 樂其道而忘人之勢 (James Legge's translation, in the *Chinese Classics*, Vol. II Containing *The Works of Mencius*, Second Edition, Revised, Oxford, 1895 (SMC Publishing Inc., Taipei, 1991, Reprint), p. 452).

79. op. cit., pp. 23-4. The post of cavalry commander 騎都尉 was instituted by the Emperor Wu of the Former Han dynasty 漢武帝 (141-87 C.E.C.) in the second year of the Yuanding 元鼎 era (115 B.C.E.) (cf. "Examination of Official Posts" 職官考 in *General Examination of Documents* 文獻通考; cf. Morohashi, op. cit., vol. 12, p. 532). In the Later Han dynasty, the post became subordinated to the Commander of the Guards of the Imperial Palace Gate 光祿勳 and the number of horsemen and chariots he led varied with the epoch (ibid.). It does not appear amongst the titles bestowed by the Chinese Court upon foreign leaders (cf. Kumagai, op. cit.), which also explains why Chinese histories do not record this particular conferment. Although politically and militarily unimportant, the post was closely related to the defence of the Imperial Palace and the decision

of the Han Court to assign it to a non-Chinese, especially one who was neither an aristocrat nor a powerful leader in the Western Regions, seems rather strange. The only explanation I can find is that An Xuan, who was a merchant, distinguished himself in the trade with the West (cf. Csjj, T55.96a: 遊賈洛陽有功號騎都尉; Gsz, T50.324b) and probably performed some services to the Court or members of the high bureaucracy, who awarded him with an honorific title that had nothing to do with the actual post as such.

80. see note 27 above.

81. T55.95b1-3; T50.323b16-7.

82. T55.95b10-1; T50.323b25-6.

83. T55.96a11; T50.324b27.

84. op. cit., p. 23.

85. ibid., p. 22.

86. ibid., pp. 22.

87. T55.69c25.

88. T33.9b15-6. Chen Hui calls An Shigao 普見菩薩 or All-Seeing Bodhisattva, which Dr. Nakamura (op. cit., p.1179) considers to be equivalent to 普現菩薩 or Avalokiteśvara Bodhisattva. Ui, op. cit., p. 8, suggests two readings: (1) 普見的菩薩 or a Bodhisattva who sees all, 普見 being here just an epithet which does not point at any specific Bodhisattva, and (2) 普見菩薩 = 普現菩薩 similarly equating this term with Avalokiteśvara Bodhisattva. Without more details coming from the author, it is hard to make a decision and we have to conclude that both readings are possible.

89. T55.43b17.

90. op. cit., p. 32. Prof. Forte also quotes this passage but rejects it (op. cit., p. 22-3)

91. T55.43b22-3.

92. T3.1a-52b. Translated sometime between 251-280.

93. Lü Zheng 呂徵, "An Shigao" 安世高, in *A Brief Exposition on the Origin and Development of Buddhist Philosophy in China* 中國佛學源流略講, Zhonghua shu-

Ju, 1979, p. 286, thinks that An's "meditation method is more or less in keeping with the spirit of the Theravāda 上座 tradition (especially the Mahīśāsaka 化地 school) in basing the factors of Enlightenment 道支 on the fields of mindfulness 念住". Lü does not indicate the source of his surmise. I assume it comes from a statement in Vasumitra's 世友 *Survey of the Sects* 異宗論 (*Samayabhedo-paracana cakra*), translated by Xuanzang 玄奘, which says the "All the factors of Enlightenment are included in (*saṃgrhīta*) [or subordinated to (*paryāpanna*)] [the practice of] the fields of mindfulness" 道支皆是念住所攝 (T49.17a7). Without further evidence, this remains a mere hypothesis. The four fields of mindfulness (*catvāri smṛty-upasthānāni*) have been a major aspect of the Buddhist yoga in many schools. Their importance in the texts translated by An Shigao does not necessarily mean that this is a Mahīśāsaka characteristic. On the other hand, Mahīśāsaka communities were active in North-West India (Gandhāra, Uddiyāna) (cf. André Bareau, *Les Sectes bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule*, Saigon, 1955, p. 40). We also know that the Mahīśāsakas were particularly involved in mediation practices (ibid., p. 182) and before becoming a Vijñānavādin, Aśaṅga adhered to the Mahīśāsaka position (cf. Alex Wayman, *Analysis of the Śrāvakaśākhāni Manuscript*, Univ. of California Press, 1961, pp. 25-29). The relation between the early *yogācārin*s and Mahīśāsakas remains to be elucidated, but we cannot exclude the possibility that some of the elements in An Shigao's translations which are different from the Sarvāstivāda "orthodoxy" may originate with the Mahīśāsakas. However, a safe conclusion will be possible only after a careful study of the non-Sarvāstivādin elements in An Shigao's translations in relation to other Buddhist schools.

94. op. cit., pp. 452-3.

95. cf. Nishi Giyū's 西義雄 excellent study "The *Yogācārya* and Their Role in Schismatic Buddhism" 部派佛教に於ける瑜伽師とその役割, *Bukkyō kenkyū* 佛教研究, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1939, pp. 1-48.

96. Lamotte, op. cit., p. 547; Puri, op. cit., p. 103.

97. op. cit., 23.

98. The presence of Buddhist monks on Chinese soil before An Shigao is sug-

gested by the term 桑門 or *śramaṇa* which appears mentioned in the "Biography of King Ying of Chu" 楚王英傳 in the *History of the Later Han*, Juan 32 (op. cit., p. 1428) and Zhang Heng's 張衡 (78-139 C.E.) "Rhymes of the Western Capital" 西京賦 (*Entire Corpus of Works in Prose of the Three Periods of Antiquity, Qin, Han, Three Kingdoms, and Six Dynasties* 全上古三代秦漢三國六朝文, edited by Yan Kejun 嚴可均, Zhonghua shuju, 1983 (1958), Vol. I, p. 764a18). Also cf. Tsukamoto, op. cit., p. 66.

99. While basically agreeing with the fact that An Shigao's translations belong to the Conservative Buddhist tradition, Ui, op. cit., p. 22, believes that some Mahāyāna elements may have found their way in these texts. His assumption is based on the fact that Sengyou mentions amongst An Shigao's translations two scriptures with an obviously Mahāyānist title: (1) *The Sūtra of the Fifty Instructions* 五十校計經 in one *juan*, also called the *The Sūtra of the Fifty Instructions Concerning the Perfection of Wisdom* 明度五十校計 (T55.6a); and (2) *The Sūtra of the Fourteen Wishes* 十四意經 in one *juan*. The *Old Record* 舊錄 says [that its title is] the *Sūtra of the Fourteen Wishes of the Bodhisattva* 菩薩十四意經. It is no longer extant." (ibid.). To my opinion, we have to do with later additions which are basically unrelated to the content of the *sūtras* themselves and reflect the growing popularity of the Mahāyāna ideal amongst Chinese Buddhists. Since the latter text is no longer available, no precise comment can be made on it but as far as the *Sūtra of the Fifty Instructions* is concerned, we can be pretty sure that 明度, which is an archaic translation for the *prajñā-pāramitā*, is irrelevant to the content of this scripture which, far from being an elaboration upon the perfection of wisdom, represents a criticism of the Bodhisattva practices and doctrines (v. infra).

100. T13.394b-407a. The *Taishō daizōkyō* includes this *sūtra* in the *Mahāvai-pulya mahāsaṃnipāta-sūtra* 大方等大集經 as the *Section on the Bodhisattvas of the Ten Directions* (* *Daśadiśibodhisattva-varga* 十方菩薩品) translated by Narendrayāsas 那連提耶舍 (490-589). Ui, op. cit., p. 22, p. 450, considers that the *sūtra* was already lost by the time of Daoan and Sengyou, who were not able to

consult it, and its attribution to An Shigao originates with the *Notes on the Three Treasures over the Centuries* 歷代三寶記, notorious for its unreliable information. However, the Csjj does not record this text as a missing one and there is nothing to suggest that the two monks were unable to consult it directly. I imagine that Ui made here a confusion with another note in the Csjj. The three editions of the *Chinese Tripitaka* compiled during the Song, Yuan, and Ming dynasties, the Old Song edition, and the Tempyō Mss. record it, however, as the *Sūtra of the Fifty Instructions Concerning the Perfection of Wisdom* translated by An Shigao (cf. T13, p. 394, notes 4-6), a title which the editors of the *Taishō Daizōkyō* also insert between brackets in the Table of Contents. Ōtani, op. cit., especially pp. 137-9, Hayashiya, op. cit., p. 21, Fukaura Masafumi 深浦正文, in the *Great Dictionary of Buddhist Books with Explanations*, op. cit., vol. V, p. 206, Mochizuki's *Great Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, vol. IV, p. 3422, and Shizutani Masao 静谷正雄, *The Formation Process of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism* 初期大乘佛教の成立過程, Hyakka-en, 1974, pp. 233-7, consider that this *sūtra* was translated by An Shigao and was mistakenly included in the *Mahāvaiṣṭya mahāsaṃnipāta-sūtra*. Fukaura and Mochizuki's *Encyclopaedia*... convincingly argue that this error dates from the Sui dynasty times when Sengjiu 僧就 arbitrarily attached the *Sūtra of the Fifty Instructions* to the original body of scriptures forming the *Mahāvaiṣṭya mahāsaṃnipāta-sūtra* (on the details of this process and Sengjiu's motivations, see the *Great Dictionary of Buddhist Books*..., vol. VII, p. 478 as well as Mochizuki's *Encyclopaedia*..., *ibid.*, pp. 3422-3).

101. cf. Shizutani's excellent study on this *sūtra* (op. cit., p. 236).

102. T13.396c.

103. See note 19 above. This is not to say that they perceived An Shigao as an exponent of the Lesser Vehicle. On the contrary, we have already seen that many of these authors call him a Bodhisattva. However, most of the early Chinese Buddhists, Daoan included (cf. Sasaki Kentoku 佐々木憲徳, *History of the Evolution of Meditation Theory and Practice during the Han, Wei, and Six Dynasties* 漢魏六朝禪觀發展史論, Pitaka, 1978, pp. 89-90), even when aware of theoretical dif-

ferences between the two Vehicles, did not make a clear-cut distinction between "Hīnayāna" yoga-praxis and Mahāyāna spiritual cultivation. The content of An Shigao's "*dhyāna sūtras*", which is viewed by the modern scholar as part of the Conservative Buddhist tradition, was for many early Chinese Buddhists an efficient way of achieving Mahāyāna ideals.

104. Some clans later on accused the author of unfairly treating their ancestors which eventually made Emperor Xiaozhao 孝昭 (560-561) and Emperor Wucheng 武成 (561-565) of the Northern Qi Dynasty 北齊 order Wei Shou to revise his work (cf. *Explanatory Note to the Edition of the History of the Wei Dynasty*, op. cit., vol.1, pp. 1-2).

105. cf. *The Compendium of Surnames Compiled in the Yuanhe Era, Synopsis 提要 of the Complete Collection of Books Arranged in Four Sections Compiled by Imperial Edict 欽定四庫全書* (in *Compendium of Surnames...*, op. cit., pp. 1-2); *Brief Annotated Catalogue of the [Complete Collection of Books Arranged in] Four Sections, With Additions and Corrections 增訂四庫簡明目錄標注*, Compiled by Shao Yichen 邵懿辰, Continued by Shao Zhang 邵章, Shanghai guji chuban-she, p. 557. Prof. Forte, op. cit., p. 4, also touches upon the history of this text.

106. T50.324a-b. Mochizuki, "On An Shigao's Achievements", op. cit., p. 420, and *Mochizuki's Encyclopaedia...*, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 85 suggest that these apocryphal stories are due to a confusion between An Shigao and An Faqin 安法欽, another Parthian monk who is said to have translated Buddhist scriptures at Luoyang at the end of the 3rd century and beginning of the 4th century. This is a rather enigmatic figure who is ignored altogether by Daoan, Sengyou, Huijiao, being mentioned only in late sources (cf. Zürcher, op. cit., pp.70-1, 423 note 163; *Mochizuki's Encyclopaedia...*, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 93). It is not excluded that this personage was one of the sources of the apocryphal accounts, but I think that this process is by far more complex including confusions with people before and after An Shigao as well as hagiographical accretions.

107. T55.95a27-c16; T50.323b16-324a1.

108. T55.95a28.

109. *Biographies des moines éminents (Kao seng tchouan) de Hui-kiao*, Traduites et annotées par Robert Shih, Première partie: *Biographies des premiers traducteurs*, Université de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste, Bibliothèque du Muséon, Volume 54, 1968, p. 8, note 24.

110. Prof. Forte thinks that the text should be amended as "During the Han dynasty there lived An Gao" 漢有安高 (op. cit., p. 9). Although Han dynasty is historically correct, we cannot rule out the possibility that the confusion with the Wu dynasty (222-280) was recorded as such by Huiyuan. Since the *Records of Mount Lu* by Huiyuan survives only in quotations, it is hard to make any precise comments on its text. Apart from the *Comprehensive Descriptions [of Institutions]*, this work is also mentioned in the *Annotations to the Waterways Book* (see note 66 above) and the *Compendium of Surnames Compiled in the Yuanhe Era*, (op. cit., p. 91), a text with a complicated history itself, which, furthermore, raises the difficult problem of interpreting the reference to the *Records of Mount Lu* as a citation from it (廬山記安高安息王子入侍: "The *Records of Mount Lu* [says:] 'An Gao was a Parthian prince who came to attend [the Han Court]'" or a mere mention to it ("An [Shi]gao, [who appears] in the *Records of Mount Lu*, was a Parthian prince prince who came to attend the [Han Court]"). I am inclined to adopt this latter possibility which is also admitted by Prof. Forte, op. cit., p. 4. We also find quotations from the *Records of the Mount Lu* in the *Shi-shuo xin'yu* 世說新語, the *Tai ping yulan* 太平御覽, the *Yi wen lei ju* 藝文類聚, etc. (cf. Zürcher, op. cit., p. 395, note 138). The extant *Records of Mount Lu*, in five *juan*, found in T51.1025a-1052a, was written by Chen Shun'yu 陳舜俞 in the fifth year of the Xining 熙寧 era (1072), and contains a long quotation from Huiyuan's work which, however, does not include any the above citations or mentions in the *Comprehensive Descriptions [of Institutions]* and the *Compendium of Surnames Compiled in the Yuanhe Era*. We must say, nevertheless, that the quotation found in Chen Shun'wu's work confronts the reader with the problem of determining its end (cf. *Studies on Hui-yüan, Texts and Translations* 慧遠研究·遺文篇, Research Report of the Research Institute for Humanistic Studies of Kyōto

University, ed. by Kimura Ei'ichi 木村英一, Sōbun-sha, 1960, p. 324, note 1; together with the editors of this study, I followed the text partition adopted by Yan Kejun, op.cit., vol. III, pp.2398b-2399a, which, except for its last paragraph, corresponds to T51.1025a17-b29). Chen Shun'wu also uses the Gsz for relating the episode of An Shigao's preaching to the huge serpent (T51.1027 a; see also note 66 above).

111. op. cit., pp. 32-3.

112. op. cit., p. 23.

113. *Le Canon bouddhique en Chine*, quoted after Zürcher, op. cit., p. 32. Zürcher criticizes Bagchi's reconstruction for lack of evidence. Since so many names of foreign monks in China have been reconstructed, I see no reasons for not trying the same thing with "Shigao", admittedly with the prudence dictated by the lack of sufficient information and its unusual *zi* 字 qualification in Chinese sources .

114. T55.69c26.

115. It would interesting to note that since the Ming 明 dynasty (1368-1644) monks and nuns have preferred using styles 字, which, according to traditional manners, is the most respectful form of address. It goes without saying that this custom, which partially survives in modern Taiwan, cannot be used as direct evidence for the Han epoch or the Six Dynasties but I think it is illustrative of the way the Chinese have always perceived the usage of styles. I owe this information to the Venerable Bhikṣuṇī Huilian 慧理蓮, whose generous help and advice I sincerely appreciate.

(June 1993)