

Article

Four Challenges Faced by Early Chinese Buddhist Translators: A Case Study of Zhi Qian's Chinese Translation of *Dhammapada*

Zhouyuan Li

School of Literature, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310058, China; zhouyuan.li@dila.edu.tw

Abstract: This study focuses on the translation of Buddhist scriptures into Chinese, specifically the *Faju jing*, a Chinese version of the *Dhammapada* completed in the third century CE. It reveals that the *Faju jing* is not a straightforward translation but a combination of different sources. The translator, Zhi Qian, faced challenges in integrating multiple translation practices, dealing with diverse original Indian languages, incorporating pre-existing phrases from other translators' work, and managing divergent opinions within the translation team regarding the translation style. This multi-layered process of translation, involving the participation of multiple translators, also likely occurred in other early translations. These challenges extended beyond mere comprehension of the Indian text, resulting in potential errors and deviations from straightforward translations. It is possible that some mistranslations were a consequence of integrating multiple traditions within the source text, making it difficult for translators to maintain a consistent linguistic framework and leading to errors. Furthermore, this study highlights the remarkable efforts of Chinese translators who collaborated with foreign monks in translation groups. It emphasizes the important role of Chinese translators in integrating diverse translation processes and refining the language to suit Chinese readers. They incorporated earlier translations and modified the language to align with Chinese forms. Overall, this case study sheds light on the complexity of early Chinese Buddhist translations, influenced by the integration of multiple traditions and the localization of the texts. It underscores the significance of Chinese translators in the translation process and their contributions to the development of Chinese Buddhist literature.



Citation: Li, Zhouyuan. 2023. Four Challenges Faced by Early Chinese Buddhist Translators: A Case Study of Zhi Qian's Chinese Translation of *Dhammapada*. *Religions* 14: 1018. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel14081018>

Academic Editor: Daniel M. Stuart

Received: 13 April 2023

Revised: 14 July 2023

Accepted: 4 August 2023

Published: 8 August 2023



Copyright: © 2023 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Keywords: Chinese Buddhist translation; *Zhong benqi jing*; Zhi Qian; *Dhammapada*

1. Introduction

The translation of Buddhist scriptures into Chinese has long been a subject of scholarly study.¹ It provides valuable insights into how early Chinese society assimilated foreign cultural traditions. However, the limited historical records from this era make it difficult to establish specific details. Fortunately, the *Faju jing* 法句經 (T no. 210), a Chinese version of the *Dhammapada* completed around 224 CE, serves as a unique translation that encompasses complex translation processes.

The *Dhammapada* is an essential Buddhist text available in several languages and has a global influence.² And the Chinese version, the *Faju jing*, has been extensively quoted³ and has significantly contributed to the dissemination of Chinese Buddhism. In-depth analyses of this classic Chinese translation have been conducted by numerous scholars, such as Willemen (1974), Mizuno (1981), Su (2018), Dhammajoti (1995, 2009), and Nattier (2023). It is worth noting that Ji (1993, p. 203) has suggested that the *Faju jing* can help understand other languages, such as Tocharian. Dhammajoti (1995, pp. 91–93) suggests that by studying the *Faju jing*, we can investigate the transmission of other language versions and determine which is the more authentic or which has undergone subsequent modifications. Thus, the *Faju jing* is not only a significant text in the history of Chinese Buddhism but also

plays an essential role in the transmission of Buddhism as a whole. Moreover, since the existing studies have addressed the complex situation of the *Faju jing* from multiple perspectives, it is now necessary to integrate these studies and explore the translation process of the text in a new way.

It is worth noting that Zhi Qian (支謙, fl. ca. 222–254 CE), the primary translator of the *Faju jing*, is a renowned figure in the field of Chinese Buddhist translation and has been extensively studied by scholars.⁴ Zhi Qian lived during the Three Kingdoms period and showed an early interest in learning various languages as well as studying various classics. His teacher was Zhi Liang (支亮, fl. ca. early third century), whose teacher was the famous translator of the Later Han Dynasty, Zhi Loujiachen 支婁迦讖 (Lokaṣema, fl. ca. 170–190 CE). Zhi Qian's experience provided him with a solid foundation for translating Buddhist scriptures. He was responsible for translating many early Mahayana scriptures, including the earliest extant version of Larger *Sukhāvativyūha-sūtra*, the *Da amituo jing* (大阿彌陀經, T no. 362);⁵ the earliest extant version of *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*, the *Pusa benye jing* (菩薩本業經, T no. 281);⁶ and the earliest extant version of *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa-sūtra*, *Weimojie jing* (維摩詰經, T no. 474).⁷ According to Zürcher (2007, p. 50), “he (Zhi Qian) was, in fact, the only important translator in Southern China before the late fourth century”. Thus, studying the life and works of such an important figure in Chinese Buddhist translation can provide valuable insights into the translation practices and habits prevalent in Chinese Buddhist history.

In summary, the in-depth study of Zhi Qian's *Faju jing* can provide a reliable and authentic reference for comprehending the challenges encountered by Chinese Buddhist translators.

2. The First Challenge: Integrating Diverse Translation Practices

The Preface of *Faju jing* provides a comprehensive account of the entire translation process. However, previous scholarship has primarily focused on the discussion of translation style in the Preface, overlooking the translator's integration of diverse translation practices.⁸

The author of the Preface is the translator Zhi Qian himself,⁹ and the specific content is as follows:

曇鉢偈者，眾經之要義。曇之言法，鉢者句也。而《法句經》別有數部，有九百偈，或七百偈及五百偈……近世葛氏傳七百偈，偈義致深。譯人出之，頗使其渾漫……

始者維祇難出自天竺，以黃武三年來適武昌。僕從受此五百偈本，請其同道竺將炎¹⁰為譯。將炎雖善天竺語，未備曉漢，其所傳言或得胡語，或以義出音，近於質直。僕初嫌其辭不雅。¹¹維祇難曰：“佛言：‘依其義不用飾，取其法不以嚴。’其傳經者，當令易曉，勿失厥義，是則為善。”座中咸曰：“老氏稱：‘美言不信，信言不美。’”仲尼亦云：“書不盡言，言不盡意。”明聖人意深邃無極。今傳胡義，實宜經達。

是以自竭¹²受譯人口，因循本旨，不加文飾。譯所不解¹³，則闕不傳。故有脫失，多不出者。……昔傳此時有所不出，會將炎來，更從諮問，受此偈等，重得十三品。并校往故，有所增定，第其品目，合為一部三十九篇，大凡偈七百五十二章。庶有補益，共廣聞焉。(CBETA, T55, no. 2145, pp. 49c20–50a28)¹⁴

The verses of *Tanbo* (曇鉢, Dhammapada) is the essence of all sutras. *Tan* (曇) means teaching (Dhamma), while *Bo* (鉢) means sentences (Pada). There are various versions of the Dhammapada, such as the 900-verse, the 700-verses, and the 500-verse versions...In recent time, Ge Shi (葛氏) has transmitted the 700-verse version. The meaning of the verses is too profound. The translator rendered it in a mixed and disorderly manner...

In the beginning, Weiqinan (維祇難) came from India and arrived in Wuchang in the third year of the Huangwu period (224). I received this text of five hun-

dred verses and asked his fellow monk Zhu Jiangyan (竺將炎) to translate it. Although Zhu Jiangyan was proficient in Indian languages, he was not familiar with Chinese, and his translations sometimes transliterated Indian words, sometimes translating the phonetic words directly,¹⁵ being rather straight forward and unadorned.

At first, I disliked his language for its inelegance. Then, Weiqinan said, “The Buddha said, ‘Relying on the meaning, without any need of adornments; taking the teaching, with any need of decoration’. The one who transmits the scripture must make it easy to understand and not lose its meaning. This is what is considered good”. Everyone in the assembly said, “Laozi (老子) said, ‘Trustworthy words is not beautiful, and beautiful words is not trustworthy’”. Confucius also said: ‘The Scriptures does not thoroughly express the speech, nor does the speech thoroughly express the thoughts’. We should know that the thoughts of the saints are limitless profound”. Now, as the conveying the meaning of the Indian text, it is appropriate to translate it directly and faithfully.

Therefore, I carefully followed the original text from the translator without adding any embellishments. If there were any passages that Zhu Jiangyan did not understand, they were omitted from the translation. As a result, some parts were lost and not translated...

Earlier on, some parts of the text were missing. As Zhu Jiangyan arrived, I consulted with him again and received verses, resulting in a total of thirteen additional chapters. Further additions and revisions were made, and the text was compiled into thirty-nine chapters with a total of seven hundred and fifty-two verses. I hope that this text will be beneficial and widely circulated.¹⁶

The Preface elucidates four crucial points concerning the text’s translation process.

Firstly, it emphasizes that the text underwent two separate translation processes before taking its present form. During the first process, Weiqinan brought a text comprising 500 verses, which was subsequently translated by Zhu Jiangyan. The second process entailed Zhi Qian reconsulting with Zhu Jiangyan and retranslating the text with some revisions and adjustments. Secondly, the Preface explicates the intricacy of the original language of the *Faju jing*. The challenge faced in comprehending certain verses during the first translation process implies that the obstacle was not in the content, which does not involve profound philosophical analysis, but in the language.¹⁷ Thirdly, the Preface emphasizes that the *Faju jing* is a composite text comprised of different traditions.¹⁸

In addition, the Preface to *Faju jing* reveals that Zhi Qian was not only the translator but also responsible for the final editing and organizing of the text. The Preface also suggests that multiple translators contributed to the translation effort. In the first translation, Zhu Jiangyan was the actual translator, while Zhi Qian’s role was to record it in Chinese.¹⁹ In the second translation, the Preface did not identify the real translator, and it should be considered a joint effort by Zhu Jiangyan and Zhi Qian, with Zhi Qian responsible for the final editing. Additionally, the Preface suggests that a team of translators may have worked on the project, with input from various individuals beyond Wei Qinan, Zhu Jiangyan, and Zhi Qian. The Preface employs phrases such as *zuo zhong xian yue* 座中咸曰 (all those present said) and implies that other individuals’ opinions may have been involved.²⁰

In brief, during the translation of this sutra, Zhi Qian had to integrate diverse translation practices from different translators in various processes.

3. The Second Challenge: Dealing with Multilingual Source Materials

One of the most difficult tasks in early Chinese Buddhist translation is dealing with different kinds of languages. The strong relationship between *Faju jing* and the Pāli *Dhammapadam* (hereafter Dhp) is widely acknowledged among scholars, with 26 chapters of the former believed to have been translated from the latter (see Lü 1991, p. 644; Shi 2011, pp. 647–

53). Despite this similarity, scholars have also identified differences between the two versions, leading to the suggestion that these variations may have been influenced by other linguistic traditions, such as the *Gāndhārī Dharmapada* (hereafter GDhp), *Patna Dharmapada* (hereafter PDhp), and *Udānavarga* (hereafter UdV).²¹ Through a comparative analysis of these different linguistic traditions, we can determine their relationship to the *Faju jing*.

Firstly, there are instances where *Faju jing* is identical to the UdV.

Faju jing 17.9d: 漸盈大器 (gradually filling a large container)²²;

Dhp 121d: *udakumbho pi pūratī* (water pot is filled);

PDhp 193d: *udakumbho pi pūratī* (water pot is filled);

GDhp 209d: *udakubho va puyadi* (water pot is filled);

UdV 17.5d: *mahākumbho 'pi pūryate* (large pot is filled).

Faju jing 17.9d uses the term *daqī* 大器 (large container), which is different from the *udakumbho* (water bottle or water jug) in Dhp 121d, PDhp 193d, and GDhp 209d, but it is the same as Skt. *mahākumbho* (large pot, large jar) in UdV 17.5d. Other examples include *Faju jing* 36.2c, which reads 厚為最友 (loyalty is the best friend) and uses the term *you* 友 (friend), which is different from *ñātī* (relatives) in Dhp 204c and PDhp 76c, but the same as *mitra* (friend) in UdV 26.6c and GDhp 162c. Additionally, *Faju jing* 35.16c reads 自覺出塹 (self-wakened and out of the moat), and 35.32b reads 墮塹受苦 (suffering in the moat), both use the term *qian* 塹 (moat), which is different from *paligham* (latch, obstacle) in Dhp 398c and *palipatham* (obstacle, mud, dangerous road) in Dhp 414a, but the same as *parikham* (ditch) in UdV 33.58c and UdV 33.41a.²³ These examples provide evidence for the relationship between *Faju jing* and the UdV:

Secondly, there are instances where *Faju jing* is only identical to the PDhp.

Faju jing 33.2c: 愚為此害賢 (the foolish damages the wise);

Dhp 72c: *hanti bālassa sukkamsam* (it destroys the fool's good happiness);

UdV 13.2c: *hanti bālasya śuklāṃsam* (it destroys the fool's good happiness);

PDhp 177c: *hanti bālassa sukrāṅgam* (it destroys the fool's good quality).

In *Faju jing* 33.2c, it is the *xian* 賢 (wise) that is damaged, which is different from the *sukkamsam/śuklāṃsam* (brightness or happiness)²⁴ that is damaged in Dhp and UdV. However, *xian* 賢 is closer to *śukrāṅgam* (good qualities)²⁵ in PDhp 177c. This demonstrates the connection between the *Faju jing* and the PDhp:

Faju jing 1.17b: 亦非父兄 (neither father nor brother);

Dhp 288b: *na pitā na pi bandhavā* (nor fathers, not even relatives);

UdV 1.40b: *na pitā nāpi bāndhavāḥ* (nor fathers, not even relatives);

GDhp 261b: *na bhoḥ na vi banava* (nor fathers, not even relatives);

PDhp 366b: *na pitā no pi bhātaro* (nor fathers, not even brothers).

In *Faju jing* 1.17b, the character *xiong* 兄 (brother) diverges from *bandhavā* (relatives) in Dhp 288b,²⁶ *bāndhavāḥ* in UdV 1.40b, and *banava* in GDhp 261b, but corresponds with *bh-ātaro* (brothers) in PDhp 366b.

Other analogous instances can be found. For example, *Faju jing* 17.20a uses the character *duo* 墮 (fall) in 有識墮胞胎 (sentient being falls into the womb), which differs from *upapajjanti* (are born, arise) in Dhp 126a²⁷, but aligns with *okrammanti* (enter, fall into) in PDhp 274a. Additionally, in *Faju jing* 31.12d, the character *e* 惡 (evil) appears in 眾惡不犯安 (it is safe to refrain from doing evils), which contrasts with *dukkhassa* (of suffering) in Dhp 331d and *duḥkhasya* (of suffering) in UdV 30.34d, but agrees with *pāpassa* (of evil) in PDhp 65d.

Moreover, as there are several verses in the *Faju jing* that are not found in any other surviving Indian texts, it is only reasonable to suggest that they have originated from unknown sources. The terms *indrakīla* in *Śārīrārthagāthā* and *indakhila* in Dhp 95b both denote

“a bar or bolt for a gate or door”. However, the corresponding verse in *Faju jing* 15.7b (不動如山) employs the term *shan* 山 (mountain), which carries a distinct meaning. Nevertheless, Monier-Williams et al. (1999, p. 166) indicate that *indrakīla* assumes the meaning of “mountain” in the *Mahābhārata*. Additionally, the *Chuyao jing* (出曜經, T no. 212), extensively referencing *Faju jing*, utilizes the term *Anming* 安明 in the phrase 不動如安明, which indeed designates a mountain. This particular instance suggests that *Faju jing* draws from an unidentified or unique source.

Nonetheless, there are also instances that indicate the Chinese translation combines different traditions. One such instance is found in *Faju jing* 18. 5, where the phrase 死入地獄, 如是為十 (die into hell; this is the tenth situation) appears. The Chinese translation includes the phrase *ru diyu* 入地獄 and the numeral *shi* 十. However, in DhP 140d, the phrase *nirayaṃ so upapajjati* (he is reborn in hell) is used, while UdV 28.29d employs *daśamāṃ durgatiṃ vrajet* (the tenth situation is to go to evil destinies).²⁸ These terms differ from the Chinese translation. None of the surviving versions match the Chinese translation, suggesting that the translator may have merged different traditions and made modifications.

These examples demonstrate that the relationship between the *Faju jing* and other various language versions is not limited to specific chapters but can be found throughout the entire text of the *Faju jing*. This implies that the translation of the *Faju jing* was a complex process that involved various sources, and it can be difficult to discern their individual contributions.

4. The Third Challenge: Incorporating and Refining Previous Translations

There are so many Buddhist scriptures that have been translated into Chinese throughout history. It is inevitable that some of them have almost the same content but were translated by different translators. How does the latest translator deal with the work of the previous translators? One of the methods is to revise the work of the previous translators into a new one. Zhi Mindu (支敏度, fl. first half of the fourth century) in *He shoulengyangjing ji* 合首楞嚴經記 (*Note on the Combination of the Śūraṅgama-sūtra*) pointed out that Zhi Qian might have modified the works of Zhi Loujiachen, who was active during the Han Dynasty.²⁹ There have been many academic discussions on the phenomenon of Zhi Qian’s revision of previous translations, including works by Zürcher (2007, p. 50), Okayama (1980, p. 735), Matsuda (1988, pp. 484–85), Harrison (1998, p. 557), and Harrison et al. (2002, p. 180). Nattier (2008, pp. 177–78) suggested that nine of the 24 core texts of Zhi Qian are revisions of previous translations.

4.1. Predecessors’ Translations

The use of predecessors’ works in the *Faju jing* adds another layer of complexity. Nineteen verses within the *Faju jing* display significant similarity to the *Zhong benqi jing* (中本起經, T no. 196), a text translated by Kang Mengxiang 康孟詳 in CE. 196–220.³⁰ However, with the exception of three verses, the remaining sixteen exhibit varying degrees of modification.

Three types of modifications can be identified in the *Faju jing*. The first type involves changes based on different Indian traditions.

Zhong benqi jing: 持戒終老安 信正所止善 智慧最安身 眾惡不犯安.³¹

Faju jing 31.14: 持戒終老安 信正所止善 智慧最安身 不犯惡最安.

Dhp 333: *sukhaṃ yāva jarā sīlaṃ sukhā saddhā patitṭhitā sukho paññāya paṭilābho pāpānaṃ akaraṇaṃ sukhāṃ*.³²

The instance reveals that the verse in *Faju jing* 31.14 bears a striking resemblance to the verse in *Zhong benqi jing*. The two verses are nearly identical, except for the final sentence, where the plural meaning of evil (*zhong* 眾惡) in *Zhong benqi jing* is replaced with the singular evil (*e* 惡) in *Faju jing*. Comparison of various Indic-language versions demonstrates that the term *pāpānaṃ* in DhP 333d is plural, whereas *pāpasya* in UdV 30.20d and *pāpassa* in

PDhp 82d are singular. Thus, Zhi Qian appears to have copied the verse from the *Zhong benqi jing* and subsequently modified it based on the Indic-language versions similar to UdV and PDhp.

Several additional examples demonstrate similar phenomena. For instance, the verse 快哉福報 所願皆成 敏於上寂 自致泥洹 at *Faju jing* 22.13 largely follows the verse 快哉福報 所願皆成 上寂大人 自見泥洹 in *Zhong benqi jing*. However, the third line of the verse in the *Zhong benqi jing* reads 上寂大人 (great being of nirvana), while in the *Faju jing*, it is changed to 敏於上寂 (diligent for nirvana). The meaning of *daren* 大人 (great being) in the context is unclear and lacks any corresponding word in other language traditions. By contrast, the use of *min* 敏 (quick, diligent) in the *Faju jing* makes the reference clearer and corresponds to *kṣipram* (quickly) in UdV 30.11c.

The *Zhong benqi jing* employs the verse 雖壽千年 亦死過去 (one may live for a thousand years and yet die), which is modified in *Faju jing* 1.12 by replacing the term *qian-nian* 千年 (thousand years) with *bainian* 百年 (a hundred years). The substitution aligns more closely with the Indic-language version Skt. *varṣaśataṃ* in UdV 1.30a. Additionally, the sentence 不如尊正諦 (it is better to respect righteousness) in the *Zhong benqi jing* is altered in *Faju jing* 2.18 by replacing *zunzhengdi* 尊正諦 with *xuyujing* 須臾敬 (respect in a moment). This change corresponds to the phrase *muhuttampi pūjaye* in DhP 107d.

The last example of modification found in the comparison of the *Zhong benqi jing* and *Faju jing* is particularly interesting. In the former, the phrase 至道無往返 (ultimate truth leads to no return) is employed, whereas in the latter, *Faju jing* 36.21 modifies this by replacing *zhidao* 至道 (ultimate truth) with *wo* 我 (I). As a result of this change, the sentence now means, “I have already achieved a state of no return”. The modification of the subject is a topic of interest. The phrase in UdV 26.25a is *naivāgatir na ca gatiḥ* (neither coming nor going), while Ud 8.1 reads *neva āgatiṃ vadāmi, na gatiṃ* with the addition of *vadāmi* (I say), indicating that the Buddha himself is speaking the contents of the verse. It is possible that when Zhi Qian translated the *Dhammapada*, he had access to a text similar to Ud 8.1 and included *vadāmi* in his translation, treating “I” as the subject being described.

It is notable that in some cases, the *Faju jing* only makes adjustments to specific words and phrases in the *Zhong benqi jing* without altering the overall meaning of the text. For instance, in the *Zhong benqi jing*, the phrase 誰能致不死 (who can achieve immortality) is used, while in the *Faju jing* 37.1d, the character *shui* 誰 is changed to *shu* 孰. Interestingly, both *shui* and *shu* have been used by Zhi Qian in his other translations, with *Faju jing* utilizing both *shui* (one instance) and *shu* (five instances). It should be noted that the interrogative pronoun *shu* had already replaced *shui* during the Eastern Han Dynasty.³³ Therefore, Zhi Qian’s choice of the older interrogative pronoun reflects the translator’s personal preference.

In the *Zhong benqi jing*, the phrase 是處為泥洹 (this is the place of nirvana) is used, while in the *Faju jing* 36.21d, the word *chu* 處 (place) is changed to *ji* 際 (boundary).³⁴ The reason for this change can be traced to Zhi Qian’s personal preference for translation. Zhi Qian consistently used the character *ji* 際 to translate Skt. *anta* or other similar Indian words. In his translation of the *Faju jing*, for instance, the Indian word Skt. *duḥkhāntaḥ* (the boundary of suffering) is rendered as 苦際:

Faju jing 6.8ab: 諸念、生、死棄 為能作苦際.³⁵

UdV 15.6: *samyojanaṃ jāti jarāṃ ca hitvehaiva duḥkhasya karoti so ’ntam* (By abandoning attachment to bond, birth, and death, one can attain the end of suffering).

Faju jing 36.8ef: 無所樂 為苦際.³⁶

UdV 26.14: *trṣṇākṣayaṃ paśyato hi duḥkhasyānto nirucyate* (For one who sees the cessation of craving, the end of suffering is declared).

The term *ji* 際 can also convey the meaning of “the end or limit of something” in the *Faju jing*. For example, in *Faju jing* 1.12cd, the phrase 為老所壓 病條至際³⁷ (when old age comes and illness strikes, life comes to an end) corresponds to the sentences *anu hy enaṃ*

jarā hanti vyādhir vā yadi vāntakaḥ (he will be destroyed to death by aging or illness) of Udv 1.30d. In this context, *ji* 際 corresponds to the Skt. *antaka* and indicates “the end”.

In general, in the *Zhong benqi jing*, the phrase 是處為泥洹 can be understood as “this state/situation/context is Nirvana”, while in *Faju jing* 36.21d, the phrase 是際為泥洹 emphasizes that “this end/limit (of suffering/samsara) is nirvana”. This change indicates Zhi Qian’s careful consideration of the nuances of the Indic language sources and the flexibility of the Chinese language. This demonstrates Zhi Qian’s scholarly rigor and his commitment to accurately conveying the teachings of Buddhism to Chinese readers.

Another special situation is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. The corresponding relationships of the *Zhong benqi jing* and the *Faju jing* in different Indian texts.

| <i>Zhong benqi jing</i> | <i>Faju jing</i> 1.12 | Sn 589 | Udv 1.30 |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| 雖壽千年 亦死過去 | 雖壽百歲 亦死過去 為老所壓 病條至際 | <i>api ce vassasatam jīve bhiyyo vā pana mānavo ñātisaṃghā vinā hoti jahāti idha jīvitam</i> | <i>yo 'pi varṣasatam jīvet so 'pi mṛtyuparāyaṇaḥ anu hy enam jarā hanti vyādhir vā yadi vāntakaḥ³⁸</i> |
| | <i>Faju jing</i> 1.8 | | Udv 1.22 |
| 合會有離 | 常者皆盡 高者亦墮 合會有離 生者有死 | | <i>sarve kṣayāntā nicayāḥ patanāntāḥ samucchrayāḥ samyogā viprayogāntā maraṇāntam hi jīvitam³⁹</i> |
| | <i>Faju jing</i> 1.17 | Dhp 288 | |
| 無親可恃 | 非有子恃 亦非父兄 為死所迫 無親可怙 | <i>na santi puttā ttānāya na pitā no pi bhātaro antakenādhībūtassa nāsti ñātīsu ttānata⁴⁰</i> | |

Table 1 illustrates that the four-line verse found in the singular form in the *Zhong benqi jing* is distributed across three verses of the first chapter of *Faju jing*. It is evident that the content and sequence of the verse in the *Zhong benqi jing* deviates from all known Indic language versions. Nevertheless, all three verses in the *Faju jing* can be traced back to the Indic language versions, and the content and sequence display a higher degree of similarity. They belong to the same system as Udv 1.30, Udv 1.22, and PDhp 366. Notably, examples of splitting the verses of *Zhong benqi jing* and placing them in different verses of *Faju jing* can also be found in two other places.⁴¹

As evident from the discussion above, the *Faju jing* not only preserved the content of the *Zhong benqi jing* but also made certain modifications. These changes range from individual word changes to entire sentence modifications and even scattering complete verses in different sections. Some of the alterations in the *Faju jing* can be traced back to the Indic language versions. However, for certain changes, the reason behind them remains unknown. It is evident from the differences in expression that the translator consulted an unknown tradition during the translation process.

4.2. Zhi Qian’s Other Translations

Zhi Qian not only incorporated verses from his predecessors but also from his own translations. Fourteen verses in the *Faju jing* can be found in other texts translated by Zhi Qian, such as the *Taizi ruiying benqi jing* 太子瑞應本起經 (T no. 185), *Liaoben shengsi jing* 了本生死經 (T no. 708), and *Beijing chao* 李經抄 (T no. 790). With the dating of Zhi Qian’s translations being unclear, it becomes challenging to ascertain whether the *Faju jing* de-

rived from his other translations or vice versa. Nevertheless, through a comparative analysis of the similarities between them, one can discern the translator's diverse considerations during the process of translation.

The connection between the *Faju jing* and the *Taizi ruiying benqi jing* is evident in verse 貪婬致老 瞋恚致病 愚癡致死 除此三者 乃可得道 (Greed and lust cause aging, anger causes illness, foolishness and ignorance cause death; only by eliminating these three can one attain the way). In *Faju jing* 28.12, the last two sentences of the verse are condensed into a single sentence 除三得道 (eliminating three to attain the way).⁴²

Another example list below:

Taizi ruiying benqi jing: 無病第一利 知足第一富 善友第一厚 無為第一安.⁴³

Faju jing 36.2: 無病最利 知足最富 厚為最友 泥洹最快.⁴⁴

Dhp 204: ārogyaparamā lābhā, santuṭṭhiparamaṃ dhanam, vissāsaparamā ñātī, nibbānaṃ paramaṃ sukham.⁴⁵

Udv 26.6: ārogyaparamā lābhā, samtuṣṭiparamaṃ dhanam, viśvāsaparamaṃ mitraṃ, nirvāṇaparamaṃ sukham.⁴⁶

In this instance, a distinction can be observed between the *Taizi ruiying benqi jing*, which employs a five-character-verse sutra, and the *Faju jing*, which uses a four-character-verse. This difference is attributed to the use of different words to correspond to the Pa. *parama* (highest, supreme). Specifically, the *Taizi ruiying benqi jing* utilizes the disyllabic word *diyī* 第一 (first), whereas the *Faju jing*, uses the monosyllabic *zui* 最 (most).

It is worth noting that both the *Faju jing* and the Indic language versions share a similar structure of linking an abstract quality to a worldly benefit through four lines. However, the phrase 厚為最友 (loyalty is the best friend) in the *Faju jing* diverges from 善友第一厚 (good friends are most trustworthy) in the *Taizi ruiying benqi jing*. The former highlights the abstract quality of *hou* 厚 (loyalty), which corresponds to Pa. *vissāsa* and Skt. *viśvāsa* (closeness, trust), while the latter underscores the significance of “good friends” and their trustworthiness. The latter form of content is different from all the other traditions.⁴⁷

In general, three verses in the *Faju jing* exhibit similarities with those in the *Taizi ruiying benqi jing*, with one verse abbreviated and one modified. This suggests that the translation of the *Taizi ruiying benqi jing* preceded that of the *Faju jing*, and Zhi Qian drew from and adapted the former when translating the latter.

The second point of comparison concerns the relationship between the *Faju jing* and the *Liaoben shengsi jing* 了本生死經 (T no. 708).⁴⁸ Notably, they differ in the wording of the second sentence.

Faju jing 37.15: 性癡淨常想 樂身想疑想 嫌望非上要 佛說是不明。

Liaoben shengsi jing: 性癡淨常想 樂想身想疑 嫌妄非上要 佛說是不明.⁴⁹

Further scrutiny reveals that the syntax of *le shen xiang* 樂身想 (the concepts of happiness and body) in the *Faju jing*'s second sentence follows a pattern of “object 1 (樂), object 2 (身) + verb (想)”, which is consistent with the phrasing of the first sentence, *jing chang xiang* 淨常想 (the concepts of purity and eternal constancy). On the other hand, the phrase 樂想身想疑 in the second sentence of the *Liaoben shengsi jing* is unclear in meaning. Overall, the phrasing of the *Faju jing*'s verse appears to be more reasonable.⁵⁰

Finally, the relationship between the *Faju jing* and the *Beijing chao* 李經抄 (T no. 790)⁵¹ can be examined. The former contains ten verses that are highly correlated with the latter but with some modifications to the wording.⁵² It is evident that the *Faju jing* has made efforts to conform to the Indic language tradition.

The sentence 快心放意 (unrestrained and indulgence of the mind) in *Beijing chao* uses the phrase *fangyi* 放意 (indulgence), which does not have a direct equivalent in the Indic language tradition. However, the sentence 快心作惡 (unrestrained and committing evil actions) in *Faju jing* 13.9 utilizes *e* 惡 (evil), which can be associated with the term *pāpakam*

(evil) in Dhp 66c. The sentence 有佛興快 (having the Buddha on earth is something to be happy about) in *Beijing chao* uses *fo* 佛, which is in the singular form and corresponds to *buddhasya* in Udv 30.22a. In contrast, the sentence 諸佛興快 (having the Buddhas on earth is something to be happy about) in *Faju jing* 22.21 uses *zhufo* 諸佛, which is in the plural form and corresponds to *buddhānam* in Dhp 194a.

In *Beijing chao*, the phrase 消毀其形 (destroy its form) has no exact corresponding term in the Sanskrit text. However, in *Faju jing* 26. 4d, the phrase 反食其身 (eat its body) is used. The character *shi* 食 (eat) corresponds to the term *khādati* (eat) in Dhp 240d and Udv 9.19d. Furthermore, while the phrase 攝意從正 (control the mind to be correct) is used in *Beijing chao*, the phrase 制根從止 (control the faculty to be calm)⁵³ is used in *Faju jing* 15.5. Here, *yi* 意 (mind) and *gen* 根 (faculty) correspond to Pa. *indriyāni* (faculties of sense) in Dhp 94a. Strictly speaking, *gen* 根 is closer to *indriyāni* than *yi* 意, which is just one of the six faculties.

The comparisons made between the *Faju jing* and *Beijing chao* suggest that they contain similar concepts but differ in their specific phrasing. The *Faju jing* exhibits a deliberate effort to adhere to the Indian text. It is possible that when translating the *Faju jing*, Zhi Qian incorporated the content of *Beijing chao* but made modifications based on the original Indian text.

5. The Fourth Challenge: Adapting to Diverse Translation Style

Translators inevitably have their own preferences when translating, but since translation is a complex process that requires translators to balance different kinds of situations, the translation style may have changed a lot. As a Chinese translator, Zhi Qian was known for his high cultural level and preference for an elegant translation style.⁵⁴ This preference is evident in his revisions of previous works, where he made modifications to reflect his preferred style.

One such example is Zhi Qian's translation of the *Da mingdu jing* 大明度經 (T no. 225), where he largely followed the *Daoxing banruo jing* 道行般若經 (T no. 224) translated by the Eastern Han dynasty translator Zhi Loujiachen. Scholars have compared these two texts and concluded that Zhi Qian's modifications made the text more concise, elegant, and neat compared to the original version, which was long, disorganized, and plain (see Nattier 2010, pp. 309–11; Hu 2012, pp. 225–26; Ji 2013, pp. 129–31). However, it should be noted that the rules summarized by scholars mainly focus on the *Da mingdu jing*. When examining the translation of the *Taizi ruiying benqi jing*, which contains several passages rewritten from *Zhong benqi jing*, different rules can be seen. For example, the *Taizi ruiying benqi jing* supplements the sentence components of the *Zhong benqi jing* and breaks the neat four-character format used by the latter from a grammatical perspective (see Li 2020a, pp. 262–66).

Furthermore, a crucial discussion can be found in the Preface of the *Faju jing*. Initially, Zhi Qian believed that the expression of Zhu Jiangyan's original translation was not elegant (其辭不雅), but after being persuaded by Weiqinan and others, Zhi Qian adopted the translation policy of following the original text's meaning and not overly embellishing it (因循本旨, 不加文飾). The examples of translation revisions in this article also demonstrate the translator's emphasis on the source text, indicating that Zhi Qian considered how to conform to the original meaning to a great extent during the translation process.

In other words, Zhi Qian's preference for an elegant translation style was a feature during a certain period of his long translation process and cannot represent his entire preference.⁵⁵ Before translating the *Faju jing*, his preferred translation style was likely more elegant. However, it is highly likely that during the process of translating the *Faju jing*, he reconsidered his approach and opted for a simpler translation style that was closely aligned with the Indian text in order to meet the expectations of the translation team.⁵⁶

6. Rethinking the Factors behind “Mistranslation”

Based on the aforementioned research, the four challenges faced by early Chinese Buddhist translators can be clearly identified. These findings greatly contribute to our under-

standing of Chinese translations, particularly shedding light on the notable phenomenon of “mistranslation”.

Scholars have previously observed that early translators of Indian texts into Chinese committed errors, which could be ascribed to the confusion between Middle Indic languages and Sanskrit or the translators’ intentional misinterpretation resulting from their cultural context.⁵⁷ For instance, *Faju jing* 28.4a translates *sabbe saṅkhārā dukkhā* in Dhṛp 278a as 生死非常苦 (rebirth is extremely painful). Su (2016, p. 126) suggests that the mistranslation of Pa. *saṅkhārā* (all formations) as *shengsi* 生死 (birth and death, Skt. *samsāra*) may stem from confusion arising from the occurrence of *-kh/-s-* in the original Gandhari language.

However, as demonstrated above, the Chinese rendition of the *Dhammapada* faced four distinctive challenges in its translation process. It is important to note that these challenges potentially played a significant role in the production of a final product that deviated from a straightforward translation. Therefore, some translation errors were probably due to the integration of multiple traditions within the source text, posing difficulty for translators to maintain a consistent linguistic framework in their translations and making them susceptible to errors.

For instance, in Dhṛp 59b, the sentence *andhabhūte puthujjane* (amongst ignorant ordinary people) is translated in the *Faju jing* 12.17b as 凡夫處邊 (normal people at the edge). This could be due to confusion between Skt. *andha* (blind, dark) and Skt. *anta* (boundary), as both can be pronounced similarly to *anda* in Gandhari.⁵⁸ However, according to Su (2016, p. 127), in the *Faju jing* 19.1c, the term *andhakārena* (darkness) in Dhṛp 146c was accurately translated as *youming* 幽冥, indicating that the translator had a proper understanding of the word *andha* (blind, dark, ignorant).

Moreover, *Faju jing*’s source texts often contain colloquial words, which can have various interpretations, necessitating the translators to randomly select one. For example, *Faju jing* 1.8a reads 常者皆盡 (all that is constant will cease), corresponding to *sarve kṣayāntā nicayāḥ* (all that is accumulated will eventually be destroyed) in Udṛv 1.22a. The term *changzhe* 常者 (constant) in *Faju jing* corresponds to Skt. *nicayāḥ* (accumulation, heap) in Udṛv 1.22a. However, these two terms have different meanings. In fact, the term *nicaya* (accumulation, heap) may drop the final syllable and become **nica* in Prakrit. Moreover, Skt. *nitya* (constant, eternal) may also become **nica*.⁵⁹ Therefore, when presented with **nica* in the original text, Zhi Qian faced the task of making a decision and translated it as 常者 (constant), which differs from the intended meaning of the extant Indian text.⁶⁰

Additionally, errors may arise if the quotes in the *Faju jing* do not match their source texts exactly. For example, one edition of *Zhong benqi jing* includes the following passage: 我行無師保 志獨無伴侶 積一行作佛 從是通聖道 (I walk without a teacher, with determination and no companions. I practice one path to become a Buddha and follow the holy way). However, some editions of the text replace the word *banlü* 伴侶 (companions) with *denglü* 等侶 (equals). The corresponding verse, Udṛv 21.4, reads: *ācāryo me na vai kaścīt sadṛśas ca na vidyate eko ’smin loka sambuddhaḥ prāptaḥ sambodhim uttamām* (No one is my teacher, and no one is my equal. I am alone in this world, and I have attained supreme enlightenment). The term *banlü* 伴侶 or *denglü* 等侶 corresponds to the Skt. *sadṛśa* (similar, same, matching), so 等侶 is considered the correct word. Furthermore, the *Zhong benqi jing* describes the story of Śākyamuni’s first sermon to his five original companions, which means “no companions” is not true. Therefore, *denglü* 等侶 is more appropriate in this context. However, the *Faju jing* inherited the wrong editions and utilized *banlü* 伴侶.

Another instance of a translation error can be observed in the *Faju jing* 15.7c, wherein the phrase 真人無垢 (true man without defilement) appears, corresponding to Udṛv 17.12c and Dhṛp 95c. The term *zhenren* 真人 (true man)⁶¹ carries a distinct meaning, differing from *hrada* (lake) in Udṛv 17.12c and *rahada* (lake, pond, water) in Dhṛp 95c. It is evident that the translators may have made a mistake, but how did it happen? It is noteworthy that Skt. *arhant* (Arhat) can take the form of **rahada* in Gandhari.⁶² Therefore, when faced with the word **rahada*, which can be interpreted as Skt. *arhant* or Pa. *rahada*, the translator made a choice and believed it referred to Arhat, so he translated it as “true man”.⁶³ However, it

should be noted that the content of Dhṛp 95 appears not only in *Faju jing* 15 but also in *Faju jing* 36. The latter translates the verse as 淨如水無垢 (pure like water, free from impurities) and correctly renders the meaning of the Pa. *rahada*.⁶⁴

In fact, the case of the translation error in the *Faju jing* is more intricate than previously discussed. The sentence 真人無垢, which appears in the *Faju jing*, was directly inherited from the *Zhong benqi jing*, indicating that the *Faju jing* inherited the errors from its source. The Chinese translations encompassed not only multiple Indian traditions from the original text but also integrated various other traditions due to the utilization of works by other translators. These factors contributed to a higher likelihood of errors in the translation process.

This multi-layered process of translation, involving the participation of multiple translators, is likely to have also been a common occurrence in other early translations. An example illustrating this is the *Shisong lü* 十誦律 (Ten Recitations Vinaya, T no. 1435), originally translated by Furuoduolu 弗若多羅 and Jiumoluoshi 鳩摩羅什 (Kumārajīva). However, the translation was only partially completed due to Furuoduolu's death. Subsequently, Tanmonanti 曇摩難提, the Indian monks, collaborated with Kumārajīva and completed the remaining sections, resulting in a total of 58 volumes. Later, Beimoluocha 卑摩羅叉 revised the text, bringing the total number of volumes to 61.⁶⁵

Comprehending the practice of integration in translation can provide fresh insights into certain unique phenomena. A notable example of such a phenomenon is the occurrence of overlapping translations and double translations, as identified by Nattier (2004, pp. 8–9). Overlapping translations occur when a portion of an expression, typically one syllable, is interpreted as belonging to two distinct words and is consequently translated twice. For example, the Chinese term *duwuji* 度無極 corresponds to the Skt. *pāramitā*, representing an overlapping translation of *pāramitā* (度) and *amita* (無極). Similarly, the Chinese term *xinjie* 信解 corresponds to the Skt. *abhimukti*, constituting an overlapping translation of *abhimukti* (信) and *mukti* (解). Double translations, on the other hand, refer to the practice of assigning two different interpretations to a single term. For instance, in Zhi Qian's translations, the Chinese term *yuanyijue* 緣一覺 corresponds to the Skt. *pratyekabuddha*. This represents a double translation, as it encompasses two similar terms in Prakrit: *pratyeka* (一) and *pratyaya* (緣).

These linguistic phenomena were not uncommon in early Chinese translations of Buddhist scriptures.⁶⁶ Two main explanations for their occurrence have been suggested in existing research: either the translators lacked a proper understanding of the source text's true meaning, or they intended to convey multiple meanings simultaneously.⁶⁷ However, these phenomena can be understood within the framework of the translation process, which involves the layering of different versions rather than being a singular, isolated event. The collectors documented the outcomes of various translation processes, which occasionally resulted in double translations. In the similar case of *Faju jing*, a notable outcome is the presence of 35 sets of verses with identical content but varying wording (see Mizuno 1981, pp. 314–37; Li 2015, pp. 39–52; Su 2014). The translations of these verses often align with either the Pāli version or the Sanskrit/Gandhari language versions, indicating that the Chinese translations have preserved content from different traditions.

In the seventh century, a similar phenomenon can be seen in the translation work of Xuanzang 玄奘 in the *Shuo wugoucheng jing* 說無垢稱經 (T, no. 476). Xuanzang used the term *yaoshi* 要施 to translate Skt. *nimantraya* in the *Vimalakīrtinīrdeśa*, which means “to invite” (要) or “offer anything to” (施). It appears that Xuanzang employed a double translation. However, upon examining previous corresponding Chinese versions, it is evident that both Zhi Qian and Kumārajīva used the character 要. This indicates that Xuanzang inherited the 要 and found that it did not adequately convey the true meaning of “offer anything to” in this particular context.⁶⁸ As a result, the addition of the character 施 in the translation of 要施 serves as another example of the integration of different traditions within the translation process.

Drawing upon the preceding research, it becomes evident that the challenges faced by translators extended beyond their proficiency in comprehending the Indian text. In the early stages of translation history, they were confronted with the task of not only adapting to a single Indian text but also choosing a method of combining multiple complex sources.

7. Unveiling the Role of Native Chinese Translators

Zhi Qian, a renowned figure in Chinese Buddhist history, was a native of China and played a significant role as an early Chinese translator in translation groups. Based on the four types of challenges mentioned above, we can gain a deeper understanding of his contributions to the translation process. This understanding can, in turn, shed light on the roles of other Chinese translators within the translation groups led by foreign monks.

Although previous research has highlighted the importance of Chinese translators' language skills, there is limited concrete evidence regarding their specific translation practices. As a matter of fact, the biographies featured in *Gaoseng zhuan* 高僧傳 (T no. 2059) provide concrete examples of the Chinese translators' actual practices in these translation groups:

時有清信士聶承遠，明解有才，篤志務法，護公出經，多參正文句……又有竺法首、陳士倫、孫伯虎、虞世雅等，皆共承護旨，執筆詳校 (CBETA, T50, no. 2059, p. 327a1-7)

At that time, there was a male lay disciple named Nie Chengyuan 聶承遠, who had a thorough understanding of the principles and was talented, with a firm commitment to Buddhism. He often helped to review and correct the scriptures translated by Zhu Fahu 竺法護. Zhu Fashou 竺法首, Chen Shilun 陳士倫, Sun Bohu 孫伯虎, Yu Shiya 虞世雅 and others also followed Zhu Fahu's intentions and carried out detailed corrections.

跋澄又齋《婆須蜜》梵本自隨，明年，趙正復請出之，跋澄乃與曇摩難提及僧伽提婆三人共執梵本，秦沙門佛念宣譯，慧嵩筆受，安公、法和對共校定。(CBETA, T50, no. 2059, p. 328b12-14)

Sengjiabacheng 僧伽跋澄 carried the Indian version of the *Poxumi* 婆須密 with him. The following year, Zhao Zheng 趙正 invited him to translate it. Sengjiabacheng 僧伽跋澄, Tanmonanti 曇摩難提, and Sengjiatipo 僧伽提婆 worked together with the Indian text. Chinese monk Zhu Fonian 竺佛念 preaches and translates the text. Huisong 慧嵩 made a record in Chinese, and Dao'an 道安 and Fahe 法和 helped to review and correct this text.

請跋摩譯焉，泰即筆受，沙門慧嵩、道朗與義學僧三百餘人，考正文義，再周方訖，凡一百卷，沙門道挺為之作序 (CBETA, T50, no. 2059, p. 339a16-25)

Sengjiabamo 僧伽跋摩 was invited to undertake the translation, with Daotai 道泰 entrusted to record. Alongside Huisong 慧嵩, Daolang 道朗, and over three hundred monks who specialized in Buddhist teachings and doctrines, they collaborated to verify the accuracy and meaning of the text. This process took two years to complete, resulting in the translation of one hundred volumes. Monk Daoshan 道挺 wrote the Preface for the scripture.

As we can see above, numerous Chinese individuals participated in the initial Buddhist translation process. Their roles are commonly described as *canzheng wenju* 參正文句, *xiangjiao* 詳校, *jiaoding* 校訂, or *kaozheng wenji* 考正文義, which involved editing the final text. However, the specific details of these roles and their associated practices remain unclear.

The case study of *Faju jing* illustrates the crucial role of Chinese translators in integrating diverse translation processes and determining the final style of translation. In the course of their work, they also refined the language and produced the final text. Notably, one of the major responsibilities of Chinese translators was to modify the language to conform to established forms in China, facilitating comprehension by Chinese readers of the

newly translated texts. To achieve this, Chinese translators employed two primary methods for refining their translations.

The first method involved utilizing the accomplishments of earlier translators as a foundation and then replacing certain portions of text based on Indic sources or their own aesthetic criteria. For example, Zhi Qian's *Da mingdu jing* was translated based on Zhi Loujiachen's *Daoxing banruo jing*,⁶⁹ and Zhu Fahu 竺法護 (Dharmarakṣa)'s *Puyao jing* 普曜經 (*Lalitavistara*) was translated based on Zhi Qian's *Taizi ruiying benqi jing*.⁷⁰ Although utilizing existing translations as a foundation for new works is a clever technique, it poses practical difficulties. The most significant challenge is striking a balance between preserving the integrity of the previous translations and adapting to the new Indian text. If a translator seeks to blend these two traditions into a new one, the process can be intricate and daunting. As evidenced in the revision of *Taizi ruiying benqi jing*, the translator combined elements of both Indian text and pre-existing translations, utilizing the former to frame the beginning and end of the story and the latter as a basis for the main portion (see Li 2020a, pp. 245–46). Such an approach necessitated consulting and integrating two distinct texts simultaneously, a task requiring a deep comprehension of the language and cultural context of each source.

Another method is to use the original text in an Indic language as the basis for translation and selectively incorporate existing phrases and sentences from previous translations. For instance, the *Faju jing* preserves 19 verses from the *Zhong benqi jing*, while *Zengyi ahan* 增壹阿含 (*Ekottarikāgamaḥ*, T no. 125) includes multiple verses from the *Faju jing*. It is noteworthy that the *Faju jing* splits one verse from the *Zhong benqi jing* and distributes it across four distinct verses, indicating the translator's familiarity with prior translations. This type of approach necessitates a comprehensive understanding of existing Chinese Buddhist literature, and only those with extensive knowledge can flexibly integrate the works of their predecessors.⁷¹ Consequently, this strategy reflects the translator's expertise and competence.

This line of inquiry can be extended to shed light on the roles of other Chinese translators in their respective teams. For instance, just as mentioned above, the translation of the *Wufen lü* 五分律 (Five Part Vinaya, T no. 1421) in the fifth century involved Faxian's 法顯 provision of the Indian scripture and the participation of two translators from the Western Regions, Zhisheng 智昇 and Fotuoshi 佛馱什. Additionally, the team included two prominent Chinese exegetical monks, Daosheng 道生 and Huiyan 慧嚴, who were responsible for *zhibi canzheng* 執筆參正 (verifying the correct version).⁷² The specific contributions of these two monks are not well documented, but it is apparent that some of the expressions in the *Wufen lü* are consistent with those in earlier vinaya texts, such as the sentence 欲得好心莫放逸，聖人善法當勤學 (To attain a good heart, do not indulge in idleness; diligent study of the virtuous dharma is what the saints do), which is also found in the previously translated *Mohe sengqi lü* 摩訶僧祇律 (*Mahāsāṃghika-vinaya*, T no. 1425).⁷³ It can be concluded that it is Daosheng and Huiyan that polished *Wufen lü* and made some of the text more familiar to the readers.⁷⁴

8. Conclusions

The process of translating Buddhist scriptures into Chinese has been the subject of extensive scholarly investigation. In this study, a detailed examination of the *Faju jing*, including its Preface, original language, and rewriting phenomenon, reveals that it is not a simple translation but a fusion of different sources. Zhi Qian, the translator, faced four major challenges: harmonizing diverse translation practices, integrating the work of previous translators into a cohesive text, navigating various original languages, refining the translation by incorporating pre-existing phrases from earlier works, and dealing with differing opinions on translation style within the translation team.

It becomes apparent that the challenges encountered by the translators went beyond their ability to understand the Indian text. They were faced with the task of not only adapting to a single Indian text but also choosing a method to blend multiple complex sources.

Consequently, some translation errors may have arisen from the integration of diverse traditions within the source text, making it difficult for translators to maintain a consistent linguistic framework for translating, making their work susceptible to mistakes.

Moreover, this case study highlights the critical role played by native Chinese translators in integrating diverse translation processes and determining the final style of the translation. Throughout their work, they refined the language and produced the final text. Specifically, Chinese translators were entrusted with the responsibility of adapting the language to conform to established forms in China and to make it easier for Chinese readers to understand the newly translated texts. They employed two primary approaches to achieve this objective.

The first approach was to use the achievements of previous translators and selectively replace parts of the text based on Indian sources or one's own aesthetic criteria. The second approach was to use the original Indian text as the basis for the translation while selectively incorporating existing phrases and sentences from previous translations. These strategies made the final work more comprehensible to Chinese readers. All of this work reflects the significant contributions made by Chinese translators within translation groups led by foreign monks.

In conclusion, this study sheds light on the complex nature of the translation process and the role of Chinese translators in integrating diverse sources and refining translations. It underscores the challenges faced by translators and the multi-layered nature of early Chinese Buddhist translations. The findings contribute to a deeper understanding of the translation practices employed during this period and highlight the importance of considering the role of Chinese translators in the production of early Buddhist translations.

Funding: This research was funded by the Numata Research Fellowship of Ryukoku University.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Abbreviations

| | |
|-------|--|
| | Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association: based on the <i>Taishō shinshū Daizōkyō</i> . |
| CBETA | Citations for CBETA are referenced and enumerated according to the volume order, text number, page, column, and line, e.g., CBETA 2022.Q4, T30, no. 1579, p. 517b6-17. The variant readings of the Song, Yuan, Ming, and Korean editions cited in this article are only indicated at places where they affect the meaning of the text. |
| Dhp | <i>Dhammapada</i> (based on von Hinüber and Norman 2014) |
| Dhp-a | <i>Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā</i> (based on Norman 1993) |
| GDhp | <i>Gāndhārī Dharmapada</i> (based on Brough 1962) |
| Gd. | <i>Gāndhārī</i> |
| Pa. | Pāli |
| PDhp | <i>Patna Dhammapada</i> (based on Ānandajoti 2017) |
| Pkt. | Prakrit |
| Skt. | Sanskrit |
| Sn | <i>Suttanipāṭa</i> (based on Andersen and Smith 1990) |
| T | <i>Taishō shinshū Daizōkyō</i> 大正新脩大藏經. 85 vols., ed. Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡邊海旭. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924–1934. |
| Ud | <i>Udāna</i> (based on Steinthal 2002) |
| Udv | <i>Udānavarga</i> (based on Bernhard 1965) |

Notes

¹ See Boucher (1996), Funayama (2013), and Nattier (2008) for further discussion of Chinese Buddhist translation.

- 2 The Pali *Dhammapada* has multiple modern translations, such as those by S. Radhakrishnan (1996), Kalupahana (1986), and Norman (1997).
- 3 The famous four Āgama Sūtras widely use verses from the *Faju jing*, and later Buddhist scriptures also quote it continuously. For example, both the *Chang ahan jing* 長阿含經 (*Dīrghāgama*, T no. 1) and the *Zengyi ahan jing* 增壹阿含經 (*Ekottarikāgama*, T no. 125) quote the verse 夫士之生 斧在口中 所以斬身 由其惡言 from *Faju jing* (CBETA, T04, no. 210, p. 561, c19-21; T01, no. 1, p. 126, b1-2; T02, no. 125, p. 603, c8-9).
- 4 See the following works, Nattier (2007a, 2007b, 2008, 2009, 2010), Karashima (2015, 2016b), Radich (2016), and Saito (2001).
- 5 According to *Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集 (CBETA, T55, no. 2145, p. 6c25), *Da amituo jing* was translated by Zhi Qian. However, there have been many scholars who have questioned this attribution based on the translation style, suggesting that the sutra was actually translated by Zhi Loujiachen 支婁迦讖 or that it was originally translated by Zhi Loujiachen and then revised by Zhi Qian. Fujita (2007, pp. 39–46) has analyzed the opinions of different scholars and proposed a compromise view. He believes that Zhi Qian is the most likely translator of this sutra, but he does not rule out the possibility of Zhi Loujiachen's involvement.
- 6 According to Nattier (2005), Zhi Loujiachen is believed to have previously translated a complete version of the *Dousha jing* 兜沙經, which was later divided into three separate texts: *Dousha jing* 兜沙經 (T no. 280), *Zhupusa qiufo benye jing* 諸菩薩求佛本業經 (T no. 282), and *Pusa shizhu xingdaopin* 菩薩十住行道品 (T no. 283). For the most recent research on the topic, refer to Han et al. (2021a) and Han et al. (2021b).
- 7 The information about Zhi Qian's life is mainly based on his biography in *Chu sanzang ji ji* (CBETA, T55, no. 2145, p. 97, b13-c18) and the *He shoulengyangjing ji* 合首楞嚴經記 (Note on the Combination of the Śūramgama-sūtra. CBETA, T55, no. 2145, p. 49, a18-b17). Modern scholars have extensively researched Zhi Qian's life, and the most detailed study available to date is Deng (2008), which concludes that Zhi Qian was born between 194 and 199 CE, died between 253 and 258 CE, and migrated to Wu in the South around 220 CE, when he was between 22 and 27 years old.
- 8 See Cao (2006), Wang (2011), Wang (2012), and Huang (2015) for a discussion on the Preface.
- 9 The Preface to the *Faju jing* does not identify the author by name but instead uses the first-person pronoun *pu* 僕 (I) to describe the process of translation with Weiqinan 維祇難 and Zhu Jiangyan 竺將炎. However, the *Chu sanzang ji ji* attributes the translation of the *Faju jing* to Zhi Qian, suggesting that he is likely the author of the Preface. The earliest identification of the author was in the *Zhenyuan xinding shijiao mulu*, which states that Zhi Qian is the author of the Preface (《法句經》二卷……謙製序, CBETA, T55, no. 2157, p. 784, c21). Several modern scholars also support this attribution, including Mizuno (1981, p. 269), Su (1995, p. 284), and Nattier (2008, p. 115).
- 10 The Indian monk's name 竺將炎 is recorded as 竺將焰 in the Preface conserved in the first volume of *Faju jing*. These two names pronounce nearly the same.
- 11 The *Chu sanzang ji ji* contains the phrase 近於質直, 僕初嫌其辭不雅, while a variant version is found *Faju jing* that reads 迎質真樸, 初謙其為辭不雅 (CBETA 2023, T04, no. 210, p. 566c8-9). The latter version is considered less natural in terms of its meaning.
- 12 The character *jie* 竭 is utilized in the seventh volume of *Chu sanzang ji ji*, while a variant version in the first volume of *Faju jing* reads *ji* 偈 (CBETA, T04, no. 210, p. 566c14-15). Scholars such as Mizuno (1981, p. 267), Dhammajoti (1995, p. 47), Lü (1996, p. 108), and Nakajima (1997, p. 66) have employed the character *jie* 竭 to signify the utmost acceptance of a translator's rendition. On the other hand, Nakatani (1988, p. 129) has selected the character 偈, denoting a willingness to receive a translator's verse directly from their mouth. Both interpretations hold merit.
- 13 Regarding the term *bujie* 不解, Maki (1958, p. 116), Mizuno (1981, p. 267), Nakajima (1997, p. 66), and Lü (1996, p. 108) all argue that it means "cannot understand", while Dhammajoti (1995, p. 47) believes it means "not explained". Dhammajoti is mistaken. If Zhu Jiangyan had not provided an explanation, then Zhi Qian could have simply asked for one rather than creating a flawed translation.
- 14 Two versions of the Preface of the *Faju jing* (法句經序) have survived. One is located at the end of the first scroll of the *Faju jing* (CBETA, T04, no. 210, p. 566b13-c26), while the other is found in the seventh scroll of *Chu sanzang ji ji* (CBETA, T55, no. 2145, pp. 49c20–50a28). These versions differ slightly, and a detailed comparison is available in Mizuno (1981, pp. 264–70). This article uses the version of the *Chu sanzang jiji* and notes those noteworthy differences in different editions of each character.
- 15 The phrase 以義出音 is not easily understandable. Huang (2020, p. 159) conducted a comparison of translations by Samuel Beal, Sylvain Lévy, and Diana Yue and found that none of them included a translation of the word *yi* 以. Huang (2015, p. 13) translated the phrase as "transliteration in order to preserve the original meaning". However, the meaning of *yi* 以 as "in order to" is uncommon, even in the *Faju jing*. In the subsequent sentence of the Preface, 佛言依其義不用飾, 取其法不以嚴 (CBETA, T55, no. 2145, p. 50a13-14), the character *yi* 以 and *yong* 用 are used interchangeably. It can be inferred that the sentence 或得胡語, 或以義出音 refers to "either recording the sound of Indian words directly or expressing the meaning of transliterated words through direct translation".
- 16 There are differences in the translations of the Preface, as Huang (2020) demonstrates.
- 17 The Preface highlights that the *Dhammapada* exists in various versions and is a canonical text that must be studied by Buddhist practitioners from India. It is, therefore, plausible that Weiqinan and Zhu Jiangyan learned diverse versions of the *Dhammapada* from different regions, and these versions may have been written in regional dialects, leading to difficulties in translation. See Mizuno (1981, p. 268) and Maki (1958, pp. 116–17) for further discussion.

- 18 The Preface notes that the Dhammapada has several versions, consisting of 900, 700, or 500 verses, as recorded by Zhi Qian through his encounters with Weiqinan and Zhu Jiangyan. Scholars such as Mizuno (1981, pp. 23, 269), Maki (1958, p. 119), and Nakatani (1988, pp. 130, 138) have compared different language versions of the Dhammapada and contend that Faju jing includes three different systems. Specifically, Weiqinan's version and the Pāli Dhammapada belong to the same system as the 500-verse version. Zhu Jiangyan's version and the Sanskrit Udānavarga belong to another system of 900-verse version. The unknown source of some parts of Faju jing could have originated from the original 700-verse version by Ge Shi, who is mentioned in the Preface.
- 19 According to the statement 是以自僞受譯人口，因循本旨，不加文飾, it is clear that Zhi Qian wrote the translation into Chinese. This interpretation is also adopted by Sengyou in *Chu sanzang jiji*: 時支謙請出經，乃令其同道竺將炎傳譯，謙寫為漢文 (CBETA, T55, no. 2145, p. 96, a24–25. At that time, Zhi Qian requested the scripture to be produced and entrusted his fellow practitioner Zhu Jiangyan to translate it while Zhi Qian himself wrote it in Chinese).
- 20 For a detailed interpretation of the Preface, refer to Li (2020b, pp. 18–21).
- 21 For further information, refer to the works of Nakatani (1988, pp. 113–16), Dhammajoti (1995, pp. 85–89), and Mizuno (1981, pp. 21–22).
- 22 The notation 9d indicates the fourth line of the ninth verse, and the same notation applies to subsequent references. The references of *Faju jing* are from CBETA, the DhP is from von Hinüber and Norman (2014), the GDhp is from Brough (1962), the PDhp is from Ānandajoti (2017), and the UdV is from Bernhard (1965). The verse numbers cited in this study follow Ānandajoti (2018).
- 23 Regarding the confusion between the Indian words *parikhā* and *paligha*, see Brough (1962, p. 188) and Nakatani (1988, p. 114).
- 24 Norman (1997, p. 11) translates *sukkaṃsaṃ* as “good share” but adds the note “of merit”. This translation is likely based on the commentary of the *Dhammapada*, as DhP-a 5.13 explains *sukkaṃsaṃ ti kusalaḥkoṭṭhāsaṃ* and interprets *sukkaṃsaṃ* as “the good share”. Ānandajoti (2017, p. 95) translates *sukkaṃsaṃ* as “good fortune”. Mizuno (1981, pp. 317–18) translates *sukkaṃsaṃ* as 白分 (happiness) and argues that the phrase *haixian* 害賢 (hurts the wise) in the *Faju jing* should be understood as a mistaken translation for “damage the happiness.”
- 25 Ānandajoti (2017, p. 95) translates *śukrāṅgaṃ* as “good quality”.
- 26 Mizuno (1981, p. 331) suggests that the *Faju jing* rendered *pitā* (father) and *bandhavā* (relatives) in DhP as 父兄 (father and brother) due to the constraints of character count. It is evident that, in this case, Mizuno did not refer to PDhp.
- 27 In DhP 126a, the PTS (Pāli Text Society) version contains the word *upapajjanti*, while the CST4 (Chattā Saṅgāyana Tipitaka Version 4.0) version contains *uppajjanti*. These two words are difficult to distinguish as they share a similar prefix, which could be either *upa-* (towards, close to) or *ud-* (upward). For further discussion, see Rhys and Stede (1979, p. 144).
- 28 The PDhp employs the term *okraṇṇanti*, which is synonymous with Skt. *avakrāṇanti* and Pa. *avakkamanti*. The prefix *ava-* conveys the notion of “downward”, indicating that the term *okraṇṇanti* represents the concepts of “entering” or “falling into”. According to Ānandajoti (2017, p. 141), it can be rendered as “fall back into”.
- 29 *He Shoulengyanjing ji* 合首楞嚴經記: 然此《首楞嚴》自有小不同，辭有豐約，文有晉胡。較而尋之，要不足以為異人別出也。恐是越嫌識所譯者辭質多胡音，異者刪而定之，其所同者述而不改。二家各有記錄耳。 (CBETA, T55, no. 2145, p. 49, b2–6. There are minor differences between versions of the *Shoulengyan Jing*, including variations in word choice and in the preference for translation and transliteration styles. However, upon closer examination, these differences do not appear significant enough to indicate that the text was written by a different author. It has been suggested that these variations may be the result of Zhi Qian's dislike of Zhi Loujiachen's inelegant work with multiple transliterations. As a result, Zhi Qian deleted the parts that were different from Zhi Loujiachen's version, made a new translation, and preserved the parts that were the same as Zhi Loujiachen's work, resulting in the two versions of the text. Both versions have been recorded.)
- 30 The *Xiuxing benqi jing* 修行本起經 (T no. 184), translated by Tan Guo 曇果 and Kang Mengxiang 康孟詳 in the Later Han Dynasty, is closely related to the *Faju jing*. However, the verses that have a relationship between them have basically the same wording, and there are not many changes. Modern scholars such as Nattier (2008, pp. 105–9) believe that the *Xiuxing benqi jing* was not translated in the Eastern Han Dynasty, and its translation was clearly later than the time of Kang Mengxiang. Therefore, this text is not included in the discussion.
- 31 CBETA, T04, no. 196, p. 150, a24–a25.
- 32 DhP 333 can be translated as follows: Holding precepts until old age is joyful, establishing faith is joyful, gaining wisdom is joyful, and not committing any evil is joyful.
- 33 According to Peyraube and Wu (2000, p. 319), it has been noted that nearly all the Eastern Han dynasty commentators used the term *shui* 誰 to explain the term *shu* 孰. This fact illustrates that the use of 孰 as an interrogative pronoun referring to a person was no longer familiar to people during the Later Han period.
- 34 It should be noted that the corresponding Indian-language version of this sentence expresses “the end of suffering” (UdV 26.25d: *duhkhāntaḥ*; Ud 8.1d: *anto dukkhassa*), which differs from *shichu* 是處 or *shiji* 是際.
- 35 In this sentence, the Korean edition utilizes the character *nian* 念, while the Song, Yuan, and Ming editions use the character *yu* 欲. They correspond to Skt. *samyojanaṃ* (bondage) in UdV 15.6c. However, it is unclear which character is correct.

- 36 It should be noted that the characters *ji* 際 and *chu* 除 are visually similar and often confused. In the present passage, the Korean edition uses 際 while the Song, Yuan, and Ming editions use 除. Which character is the original one remains unclear.
- 37 The phrase 為老所壓 has various textual variants. The Korean edition uses the character *yan* 厭, while the Song, Yuan, and Ming editions use the character *ya* 壓. The corresponding term in UdV 1.30c is Skt. *hanti* (to strike, destroy, or harm), thus 壓 should be considered the correct reading. Furthermore, the character *tiao* 條 in the phrase 病條至際 carries the meaning of “reach, arrive, or come”, so the whole sentence means “when illness comes, life comes to an end”, which corresponds to “*vyādhir vā yadi vāntakaḥ*” (causing death by illness) in UdV 1.30d.
- 38 UdV 1.30 can be translated as follows: Even if one lives to be one hundred years old, he will still ultimately succumb to death. He will be damaged by the effects of aging and die due to illness.
- 39 UdV 1.22 can be translated as follows: Everything that comes together will eventually fall apart, those in high positions will eventually fall, what is combined will eventually separate, and life will ultimately lead to death.
- 40 Dhp 288 can be translated as follows: A child cannot offer protection, nor can a father or brother. Those who are seized by death cannot be sheltered by their relatives.
- 41 There are other cases where the four sentences in verse 此要寂無上 畢故不造新 雖天有善處 皆莫如泥洹 of *Zhong benqi jing* are distributed across three verses of *Faju jing* (36.23, 26, 27). Similarly, the eight sentences in verse 信法奉戒 慧意能行 上天衛之 智者樂慈 仁愛不邪 安止無憂 能除患怒 從是脫淵 in *Zhong benqi jing* are distributed across two verses of *Faju jing* (4.7, 7.10).
- 42 Similar contraction phenomena can be observed in Zhi Qian’s translation of the *Da mingdu jing* 大度經, which involves a retranslation of Zhi Loujiachen’s *Daoxing banruo jing* 道行般若經 from the Han dynasty. The translation process resulted in a condensing of the expressions used in the original text. Additional information can be found in works by Nattier (2010) and Ji (2013).
- 43 CBETA, T03, no. 185, p. 480, c25-26.
- 44 CBETA, T04, no. 210, p. 573, a27-28.
- 45 Dhp 204 can be translated as follows: Being free of illness is the greatest benefit, contentment is the greatest wealth, trust is the greatest kin, and nirvana is the greatest happiness.
- 46 UdV 26.6 can be translated as follows: Being free of illness is the greatest benefit, contentment is the greatest wealth, trust is the greatest friend, and nirvana is the greatest happiness.
- 47 It is noteworthy that the *Puyao jing* 普曜經 (T no. 186) draws heavily from the content of the *Taizi ruiying benqi jing*, combining the phrasing in *Faju jing* and *Taizi ruiying benqi jing* and then making modifications, resulting in verse 無病最利 知足最富有 信最友 無為最安 (CBETA, T03, no. 186, p. 530c27-28) (Good health is the most beneficial, contentment is the greatest wealth, trustworthiness is the best friend, non-action is the greatest ease.).
- 48 Regarding the *Liaoben shengsi jing* (T no. 708), there has been debate about its translator. While Zacchetti (2004) and Nattier (2008) argue that the sutra was not translated by Zhi Qian and is more likely a work from the Han Dynasty, Li (2020a, pp. 16–17) suggests that their assertion may be lacking in evidence based on the *Chu sanzang jiji*.
- 49 CBETA, T16, no. 708, p. 816, a10-12.
- 50 The two Chinese translations have slight differences in wording, but the overall meaning is not significantly different. Moreover, the differences in wording may not necessarily be adjustments made by the translators but rather could have been caused by discrepancies in the transmission process over time. The wording in the *Faju jing* is currently more reasonable, and if one tries to translate the verse in the *Faju jing*, it could be rendered as “The original nature is ignorant and foolish, clinging to the concepts of ‘purity’, ‘eternal constancy’, ‘happiness’, ‘body’, and doubt’. Such unrealistic thoughts are not the truth. The Buddha said that kind of attachment is ignorance.”
- 51 The title of *Beijing chao* means to summarize or condense a certain sutra or several sutras. It is unclear whether it was named by Indian tradition or by Zhi Qian. Nattier (2008, p. 133) believes that *Beijing chao* is a revision of Zhi Loujiachen’s *Beiben jing* 字本經, which is not extant. The relationship between them is unknown.
- 52 It should be noted that the differences between the *Beijing chao* and the *Faju jing* are not necessarily mistranslations. In a sense, they also convey the correct meaning of the sutra.
- 53 In this sentence, the Korean edition utilizes the character *zhi* 止, while the Song, Yuan, and Ming editions use the character *zheng* 正. It corresponds to Pa. *samatham* (calm) in Dhp 94a and Skt. *samatāṃ* (equality) in UdV 19.3. Therefore, both these variations make sense.
- 54 The monk Sengyou (445–518) praised Zhi Qian’s translation work as “convey the meaning of the sutras subtly, and the language and content were both elegant (曲得聖義, 辭旨文雅)” (CBETA, T55, no. 2145, p. 97, c8-12).
- 55 Nattier (2008, pp. 118–19) points out that Zhi Qian’s translation style is not consistent. Some of his translations are elegant and prefer the translation of Indian words, while others are simple and prefer the transliteration of words.
- 56 Nattier (2008, pp. 147–148) classifies Zhi Qian’s translations into two periods: an early period during which he translated in the North, producing relatively plain works that featured more phonetic transliterations and had long and convoluted sentences reminiscent of Zhi Loujiachen’s style. The later period occurred when Zhi Qian translated in the South, producing more elegant

works that used more phonetic transliterations and had orderly and refined sentences similar to An Xuan 安玄 and Yan Fo-diao's 嚴佛調 styles. However, historical records indicate that Zhi Qian and his team translated the *Faju jing* in 224 in Wuchang, which is located in Southern China. In reality, Zhi Qian spent the majority of his translation career (222–253) in the South due to the Han dynasty's turmoil, with only three years spent in the North. For further information, see Li (2021).

Several sources are available for further reference on this topic, including Nattier (2007b, p. 369; 2008, p. 120; 2009, pp. 109–10), Karashima (1997, p. 169; 2010, p. 37; 2006, p. 363).

Dhammajoti (1995, p. 132) proposed the idea that *anta-bhūte* could be interpreted in a certain way but also noted that *chubian* 處邊 could also provide an explanation within the relevant narrative. Su (2016, p. 127) cited Karashima Seishi's viewpoint to explain the linguistic changes of these two terms in Gandhārī.

For instance, Skt. *nitya* in UdV 15.13d is transformed into *nica* in GDhp 101d.

The text *Faji yaosong jing* 法集要頌經 (T no. 213) serves as a parallel version of the UdV text. Within this text, the corresponding phrase to UdV 1.22a is 聚集還散壞 (CBETA, T04, no. 213, p. 777, b25–26. The gathered things will eventually be scattered and destroyed), which explicitly translates the term Skt. *nicaya* to *juji* 聚集 (gathering).

In ancient translations, *Zhenren* 真人 was used to render the terms *luohan* 羅漢 or *aluohan* 阿羅漢, which correspond to Skt. *arhant*. As seen in Zhi Qian's *Taizi ruiying benqi jing*: 羅漢者，真人也。 (CBETA, T03, no. 185, p. 475, a26–28. Arhant is one who embodies the truth).

Similar examples can be found in Falk (2014, p. 12), such as Gd. *rahada puyae*, which corresponds to Skt. *arhatāmpūjāyai*, meaning “revering the Arhats”.

Dhammajoti (1995, p. 148n13) and Su (2016, p. 128) discussed related issues, but they did not mention that this was a misinterpretation from the *Zhong benqi jing*. Additionally, according to Rhys and Stede (1979, p. 567), it is possible that the relationship between Skt. *hrada* and Pa. *rahada* underwent a process of change as *hrada* > **harada* > *rahada*.

Dhammajoti (1995, p. 148n13) pointed out that in *Faju jing* 14.9a, the term *rahado* in DhP 82a was translated successfully.

A detailed account of the translation process involved in the creation of the *Shisong lü* 十誦律 can be found in the third scroll of *Chu sanzang ji ji* (CBETA 2022.Q4, T55, no. 2145, p. 20a21–b21).

The scholars Zürcher (2007, p. 336), Karashima (1992, p. 119; 1998, p. 566; 2016a, p. 113), Boucher (1998, pp. 489–94), and Karashima and Nattier (2015, p. 370) have extensively examined and discussed this issue.

Further information on the topic can be found in Wu (2020, pp. 396–97) and Nattier (2004, p. 9).

This particular instance was elucidated by Dr. Lu Lu during a reading group discussion on the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* on 28 April 2023. For a comprehensive comparison of different versions of this sutra, readers can refer to *The Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism* (2004, pp. 156–57).

For further reading on this topic, refer to Lancaster (1969), Ji (2013), Nattier (2010), and Karashima (2016b).

See Kawano (2006, 2007) for further information.

This phenomenon bears similarity to the practice of translators adopting pre-existing translated terms such as 般若 (Skt. *prajña*), 涅槃 (Skt. *nirvāṇa*), 無常 (Skt. *anitya*), etc. However, in this case, the translators are incorporating longer segments of pre-existing texts.

The biography of Fotuoshi in *Gaoseng zhuan* provides detailed information on this topic. See CBETA, T50, no. 2059, p. 339a3–13. It should be noted that in earlier records, such as the colophon of the *Wufen lü*, the roles of Daosheng and Huiyan played the role of inviting Fotuoshi to translate the scriptures: 罽賓律師佛陀什，彌沙塞部僧也！以大宋景平元年秋七月達于揚州，冬十一月，晉侍中瑯琊王練，比丘釋慧嚴、竺道生，請令出焉。佛陀什謹執梵文，于填沙門智勝為譯，至明年十二月都訖。 (CBETA, T22, no. 1421, p. 194b22–28. The preceptor Fotuoshi, who belonged to the Mahīśāsaka school and came from Jibin, arrived in Yangzhou in the autumn of the first year of the Jingping reign of the Great Song Dynasty. In the winter of the same year, in the eleventh month, Wanglian 王練, an official who had served as a Shizhong 侍中 during the Jin dynasty and was from Langya 瑯琊, along with Bhikshus Shi Huiyan 釋慧嚴 and Zhu Daosheng 竺道生, invited Fotuoshi to translate the scriptures. Fotuoshi held the Indian text, and the monk Zhi Sheng 智昇, who had come from Khotan, translated it. By the twelfth month of the following year, the translation was completed).

The information is cited from the 27th scroll of *Mohe sengqi lü* 摩訶僧祇律 (CBETA 2022.Q4, T22, no. 1425, p. 447a4–7) and the 7th scroll of *Mishasebu hexi wufen lü* 彌沙塞部和醯五分律 (CBETA 2022.Q4, T22, no. 1421, p. 46a10–13).

In fact, there is a connection between the *Wufenlü* (五分律) and the *Mohe sengqi lü* 摩訶僧祇律 (Māhāsāṃghika Vinaya). This is because Huiyan, who was responsible for revising the *Wufenlü*, participated in the translation of the *Huayan jing* 華嚴經 (Avatamsaka Sūtra) by Fotuobatuoluo 佛陀跋陀羅 (Buddhabhadra). And Fotuobatuoluo was the translator of the *Mohe sengqi lü*.

References

Ānandajoti, Bhikkhu. 2017. Patna Dhammapada: Patna Dhamma Verses (Transcribed by Margaret Cone). Available online: <https://www.ancient-buddhist-texts.net/Texts-and-Translations/Patna-Dhammapada/index.htm> (accessed on 5 January 2020).

- Ānandajoti, Bhikkhu. 2018. A Comparative Edition of the Dhammapada. Available online: <https://www.ancient-buddhist-texts.net/Buddhist-Texts/C3-Comparative-Dhammapada/> (accessed on 5 January 2020).
- Andersen, Dines, and Helmer Smith, eds. 1990. *Sutta-nipāta*. New ed. Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- Bernhard, Franz. 1965. *Udānavarga*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Boucher, Daniel J. 1996. Buddhist Translation Procedures in Third-century China: A Study of Dharmarakṣa and His Translation Idiom. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA.
- Boucher, Daniel J. 1998. Gāndhārī and the Early Chinese Buddhist Translations Reconsidered. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 118: 471–506. [CrossRef]
- Brough, John. 1962. *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Cao, Minglun 曹明倫. 2006. Rereading Zhi Qian's Preface to Chinese Version of Dharmapada 約而意顯文而不越重讀支謙法句經序. *Journal of Sichuan International Studies University* 四川外語學院學報 5: 122–25.
- Deng, Pan 鄧攀. 2008. On Translator Zhi Qian's Life 支謙生平略考. *Journal of Nanjing Xiaozhuang University* 南京曉莊學院學報 4: 22–25.
- Dhammajoti, Kuala Lumpur. 1995. *The Chinese Version of Dharmapada: Translated with Introduction and Annotations*. Sri Lanka: Univ. of Kelaniya.
- Dhammajoti, Kuala Lumpur. 2009. *Fa Ju Jing*, the Oldest Chinese Version of the Dharmapada: Some Remarks on the Language and Sect-affiliation of Its Original. *Buddhist Studies* 37: 1–38.
- Falk, Harry. 2014. The First-century Copper-plates of Helagupta from Gandhāra Hailing Maitreya. *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 17: 3–26.
- Fujita, Kotatsu 藤田宏達. 2007. *A Study of the Three Pure Land Sūtras* 淨土三部經の研究. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店.
- Funayama, Toru 船山徹. 2013. *Making Sutras into Classics (jingdian): How Buddhist Scriptures Were Translated into Chinese* 仏典はどう漢訳されたのか: スートラが経典になるとき. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店.
- Han, Jaehee, Soonil Hwang, and Hyebin Lee. 2021a. Buddhism for Chinese Readers: Zhi Qian's Literary Refinements in the *Foshuo Pusa Benye Jing*. *Religions* 12: 361. [CrossRef]
- Han, Jaehee, Soonil Hwang, Hyebin Lee, and Jens Braarvig. 2021b. Further Reflections on Zhi Qian's *Foshuo Pusa Benye Jing*: Some Terminological Questions. *Religions* 12: 634. [CrossRef]
- Harrison, Paul. 1998. Women in the Pure Land: Some Reflections on the Textual Sources. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 26: 553–72. [CrossRef]
- Harrison, Paul, Kazunobu Matsuda, and Jens-Uwe Hartmann. 2002. Larger Sukhāvativyūhasūtra. In *Buddhist Manuscripts*. Edited by Jens Braarvig. Oslo: Hermes Publishing, vol. 2, pp. 179–214.
- Hu, Chirui 胡敕瑞. 2012. Classical Chinese and Vernacular Chinese in the Han and Wei Dynasties Reflected in Chinese Translations of Buddhist Scriptures 漢譯佛典所反映的漢魏時期的文言與白話. *Study of Traditional Chinese Culture* 國學研究 30: 211–40.
- Huang, Xiaopeng 黃小芄. 2015. A New Vision of Translatology in the Study of Zhiqian's Preface to the *Faju jing* 支謙《法句經序》研究的譯學新視野. *East Journal of Translation* 東方翻譯 5: 11–15.
- Huang, Xiaopeng 黃小芄. 2020. Implicitness in the Translation of "The Preface to Dhammapada" from Chinese to Foreign Languages 《法句經序》漢外翻譯的隱化. *International Sinology* 國際漢學 4: 153–60.
- Ji, Xianlin 季羨林. 1993. *An Introduction to the Study of the Tocharian in Dunhuang and Turpan* 敦煌吐魯番吐火羅語研究導論. Taipei: Xin Wenfeng Press 新文豐出版公司.
- Ji, Qin 季琴. 2013. *A Study on the Vocabulary of Zhi Qian's Translation* 支謙譯經詞匯研究. Chengdu: Bashu Press 巴蜀書社.
- Kalupahana, David J. 1986. *A Path of Righteousness: Dhammapada: An Introductory Essay, Together with the Pali Text, English Translation, and Commentary*. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Karashima, Seishi. 1992. *The Textual Study of the Chinese Versions of the Saddharmapundarikasutra: In the Light of the Sanskrit and Tibetan Versions*. Tokyo: Sankibo Press.
- Karashima, Seishi 辛嶋靜志. 1997. Some New Viewpoints in Philological Studies of Early Mahāyāna Texts 初期大乘仏典の文献学的研究への新しい視点. *Buddhist Studies* 仏教研究 26: 157–76.
- Karashima, Seishi. 1998. *A Glossary of Dharmarakṣa's Translation of the Lotus Sutra*. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- Karashima, Seishi. 2006. Underlying Languages of Early Chinese Translations of Buddhist Scriptures. In *Studies in Chinese Language and Culture: Festschrift in Honour of Christoph Harbsmeier on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday*. Edited by Christoph Anderl and Halvor Eifring. Oslo: Hermes Academic Publishing, pp. 355–66.
- Karashima, Seishi 辛嶋靜志. 2010. The Original Landscape of Amitābha's "Pure Land" 阿彌陀淨土の原風景. *Bulletin of the Research Institute of Bukkyo University* 佛教大学総合研究所紀要 17: 15–44.
- Karashima, Seishi 辛嶋靜志. 2015. An Investigation into the Original Language of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* 試探《維摩詰經》的原語面貌. *Foguang Journal* 佛光學報 1: 73–100.
- Karashima, Seishi. 2016a. Indian Folk Etymologies and Their Reflections in Chinese Translations—brāhmaṇa, śramaṇa and Vaiśramaṇa. *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 19: 101–23.
- Karashima, Seishi 辛嶋靜志. 2016b. A Study of the Language of the Early Chinese Buddhist Translations: Comparison between the translations by Lokakṣema and those by Zhi Qian 早期漢譯佛典の語言研究—以支婁迦讖及支謙的譯經對比為中心. In *Languages*

- and *Transmission of Buddhist Scriptures* 佛典語言及傳承. Translated by Yunqing Qiu 裘雲青, and Weilin Wu 吳蔚琳. Shanghai: Zhongxi Book Company 中西書局, pp. 54–71.
- Karashima, Seishi, and Jan Nattier. 2015. Qiuluzi 秋露子, An Early Chinese Name for Śāriputra. *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 8: 361–76.
- Kawano, Satoshi 河野訓. 2006. *A Study of Early Chinese Translations of Buddhist Scriptures: Focusing on Dharmarakṣa* 初期漢訳仏典の研究: 竺法護を中心として. Mie: Kogakkan University Press 皇學館大学出版部.
- Kawano, Satoshi 河野訓. 2007. *A Study of Chinese Buddhist Biographies* 漢訳仏伝研究. Mie: Kogakkan University Press 皇學館大学出版部.
- Lancaster, Lewis R. 1969. The Chinese Translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā-Sūtra* Attributed to Chih Ch'ien 支謙. *Monumenta Serica* 28: 246–57. [CrossRef]
- Li, Zhouyuan 李周淵. 2015. Preliminary Study on the Literature Source of Chinese Translation of *Dhammapada* 漢譯法句經文獻源流略考. Master's dissertation, Sichuan University, Chengdu, China.
- Li, Zhouyuan 李周淵. 2020a. A Study of Zhi Qian's Translations of Buddhist Texts in the Three Kingdoms Period 三國支謙譯經研究. Ph.D. dissertation, Dharma Drum Institute of Liberal Arts, New Taipei, Taiwan.
- Li, Zhouyuan 李周淵. 2020b. A Study on the Records of Zhi Qian's Translations in *Chu sanzang jiji* 出三藏記集. *Fuyan Buddhist Studies* 15: 1–51.
- Li, Zhouyuan 李周淵. 2021. Review of Jan Nattier's Study of Zhi Qian 那體慧支謙譯經研究述評. *Chinese Buddhism Review* 汉语佛学评论 5: 251–81.
- Lü, Cheng 呂澂. 1991. An Introduction of *Dhammapada* 法句經講要. In *Anthology of Lü Cheng's Buddhist Studies* 呂澂佛學論著選集. Shandong: Qilu Press 齊魯書社, vol. 2, pp. 643–74.
- Lü, Youxiang 呂有祥, trans. 1996. *Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集. Gaoxiang: Foguang Press 佛光書局.
- Maki, Itsu. 1958. On the Chinese *Dhammapada* with Special Reference to the Preface Attached Thereto. *The Annals of the Hitotsubashi Academy* 9: 109–21.
- Matsuda, Yuko. 1988. Chinese Versions of the Buddha's Biography. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 37: 489–80. [CrossRef]
- Mizuno, Kogen 水野弘元. 1981. *A Study of Dhammapada* 法句經の研究. Tokyo: Shunjusha Publishing Company 春秋社.
- Monier-Williams, Monier, Ernst Leumann, and Carl Cappeller. 1999. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages*. New ed. Greatly enl. and Improved. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Nakajima, Ryuzo 中嶋隆藏. 1997. *Annotation of the Prefaces in Chu sanzang jiji* 出三藏記集序卷譯注. Kyoto: Heirakuji Bookstore 平樂寺.
- Nakatani, Hideaki 中谷英明. 1988. *A Study of Manuscripts from Subashi* スパシ写本の研究. Kyoto: Jimbun Shoin 人文書院.
- Nattier, Jan. 2004. Beyond Translation and Transliteration: A New Look at Chinese Buddhist Terms. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Oriental Society (Western Branch) in Portland, Eugene, OR, USA, October 16.
- Nattier, Jan. 2005. The Proto-History of the Buddhavataṃsaka: The *Pusa benye jing* 菩薩本業經 and the *Dousha jing* 兜沙經. *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 8: 323–60.
- Nattier, Jan. 2007a. A Reassessment of the Dates and Translator Attributions of the *Laonuren jing* 老女人經 (T559) and the *Laomu jing* 老母經 (T561). *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 10: 529–32.
- Nattier, Jan. 2007b. The Names of amitābha/amitāyus in Early Chinese Buddhist Translations (2). *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 10: 359–94.
- Nattier, Jan. 2008. *A Guide to the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations: Texts from the Eastern Han 東漢 and Three Kingdoms 三國 Periods*. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- Nattier, Jan. 2009. Heaven Names in the Translations of Zhi Qian. *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 12: 101–22.
- Nattier, Jan. 2010. Who Produced the *Da mingdu jing* 大明度經 (T225)? A reassessment of the evidence. *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 31: 295–337.
- Nattier, Jan. 2023. On Two Previously Unidentified Verses in Zhi Qian's Hybrid Dharmapada. *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 26: 215–52.
- Norman, H. C. 1993. *The Commentary on the Dhammapada*. Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- Norman, Kenneth Roy. 1997. *The Word of the Doctrine*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.
- Okayama, Hajime 丘山新. 1980. A Hypothesis Concerning the Translator of the *Daamituo jing* 大阿彌陀經訳者に関する一仮説. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 印度學佛教學研究 28: 735–38.
- Peyraube, Alain 貝羅貝, and Fuxiang Wu 吳福祥. 2000. Development and Evolution of Interrogative Pronouns in Archaic Chinese 上古漢語疑問代詞的發展與演變. *Studies of the Chinese Language* 中國語文 4: 311–26.
- Radhakrishnan, Sarvepalli, ed. 1996. *The Dhammapada: With Introductory Essays, Pali Text, English Translation and Notes*. Revised edition. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Radich, Michael 何書群. 2016. Was T474 Revised by “Dharmarakṣa” 竺法護是否修訂過T474? . *Foguang Journal* 佛光學報 5: 15–38.
- Rhys, Davids Thomas Williams, and William Stede. 1979. *The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary*. Bristol: The Pali Text Society.
- Saito, Takanobu 齊藤隆信. 2001. A Study of the Verses in the Classics Translated by Zhi Qian 支謙所譯經典中偈頌の研究. *Fayuan* 法源 19: 63–73.
- Shi, Yinshun 釋印順. 2011. *The Collection of Early Buddhist Scriptures* 原始佛教聖典之集成. Beijing: Zhonghua Press 中華書局, vol. 2.
- Steinthal, Paul. 2002. *Udāna*. Oxford: Pali Text Society.

- Su, Jinren 蘇晉仁. 1995. The Preface to *Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集序言. In *Chu sanzang ji ji*. Edited by Jinren Su. Beijing: Zhonghua Press 中華書局.
- Su, Jinkun 蘇錦坤. 2014. *Faju Xu* and the Duplicated Verses Translated in Chinese Dharmapada. *Satyābhisamaya* 正觀 70: 77–132.
- Su, Jinkun 蘇錦坤. 2016. Issues with Translation Errors and Collation of the *Faju jing* 法句經的校讀與誤譯. *Dharma Drum Journal of Buddhist Studies* 法鼓佛學學報 19: 93–158.
- Su, Jinkun 蘇錦坤. 2018. Mutual Interpretation Between Pāli *Dhammapāda* and Its Chinese Parallels 對應偈頌的相互詮釋. *Fuyan Buddhist Studies* 福嚴佛學研究 13: 25–63.
- The Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism. 2004. *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa: Transliterated Sanskrit Text Collated with Tibetan and Chinese Translations*. Tokyo: Taisho University.
- von Hinüber, Oskar, and Kenneth Roy Norman. 2014. *Dhammapada*. Bristol: The Pali Text Society.
- Wang, Fumei 王福美. 2011. In Language It Is Simply Required That It Convey the Meaning: Rereading Zhiqian's Preface to Dharma-Phrase Sutra 辭達而已矣—重讀支謙的法句經序. *Shanghai Journal of Translators* 上海翻譯 4: 77–80.
- Wang, Dongping 汪東萍. 2012. Interpretation on the Arguments about Wen and Zhi Raised in the Preface of the Chinese Version of Dharmapade 法句經序文質爭論的解讀. *Academic Research* 學術研究 7: 141–46.
- Willemen, Charles. 1974. *Dharmapada: A Concordance to Udānavarga, Dhammapada and the Chinese Dharmapada Literature*. Bruxelles: Institut belge des hautes études bouddhiques.
- Wu, Juan. 2020. Mechanisms of Contact-Induced Linguistic Creations in Chinese Buddhist Translations. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 73: 385–418.
- Zacchetti, Stefano. 2004. Teaching Buddhism in Han China: A Study of the Ahan koujie shi'er yinyuan jing T 1508 Attributed to An Sigao. *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 7: 197–224.
- Zürcher, Erik. 2007. *The Buddhist Conquest of China: The Spread and Adaptation of Buddhism in Early Medieval China*. Leiden: Brill.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.