Brief Note

Buddhist Translations in the Northern Sung

In 1964 John Brough published an article in *Asia Major* entitled "The Chinese Pseudo-Translation of Ārya-śūra's *Jātaka-mālā*."[1] Brough subjected the Buddhist canonical text *P'u-sa pen-sheng-man lun* 菩薩本生鬘論 to a thorough and erudite analysis, proving in the process that it was not at all what it was supposed to be, namely a translation into Chinese of the *Jātaka-mālā*.[2] The first part of *P'u-sa pen-sheng-man lun* turned out to consist of fourteen stories that were in fact a series of ill-concealed borrowings from various texts, among which *Hsien-yü ching* 賢愚經 was prominent. The link to *Jātaka-mālā* was tenuous in the extreme, and it was apparent that the "translators" had been desperate, often merely identifying a word in the original title and then searching for a related story that was already available in translation. A typical example is the first story, where we are in fact treated to a replay of the tale of the tigress from I-ching's 義淨 (635–713) translation of the penultimate chapter of *Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra*. The second part of *P'u-sa pen-sheng-man lun* presented Brough with rather more problems, until he realized that it was in fact not, as had been assumed, a garbled commentary on the text or a completely different work (also garbled), but rather a "serious" attempt to translate the original. The attempt had not got very far: it was in fact an early draft by someone who had only a smattering of Sanskrit at best. The latter part of Brough's article is an object lesson in the difficulties that the Chinese could face in working out even the correct word divisions in Sanskrit without expert help.

Brough, as a scholar of Sanskrit, was primarily interested (at least in this article) in the *Jātaka-mālā*, not in Chinese Buddhist texts and translations per se. It is presumably for this reason that he simply dated the text as "Northern Sung (960–1127)" and did not go any further into the vexed question of why such a bad translation had been allowed to see the light of day. This reluctance to proceed with the detective work and the eagerness with which he demolished the translators' reputations is perhaps understandable, but it

[1] See *AM* NS 11.1 (1964), pp. 27–53.

[2] *P'u-sa pen-sheng-man lun* is printed in *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經, ed. Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaikyoku 渡邊海旭 (Tokyo: Daizōkyōkai, 1924–1935; hereafter cited as *Taishō*), vol. 3, no. 160.

has had some unfortunate repercussions. The article gives the impression that *P'u-sa pen-sheng-man lun* was not the only such botched job to have survived. Brough thus tended to bolster the view that Buddhism was in general decline throughout the Northern Sung, and, in particular, his article has been read as implying that we need not take the translations carried out during this period too seriously.

Brough's detective work was introduced to Japanese scholars two years later, in 1966, in a four-page summary by Mizuno Kōgen 水野弘元 with whom he had worked in Tokyo. References to the *Jātaka-mālā* article can be found here and there, in Japan and elsewhere, whenever someone wishes to stress the generally low standard of Northern Sung translations.[3] But how can we square this view with what we know of the institute in K'ai-feng 開封 where the work was carried out? The object of this essay is to investigate the matter further and, in the process, to defend at least one of the translators involved from some of Brough's more unwarranted assertions.

Information as to how the translation of Buddhist texts was organized during the Northern Sung is not difficult to find.[4] Almost all translations were carried out by government employees at a central location, an institute set up for the express purpose in K'ai-feng. The government paid for the considerable expenses involved, and all translations were marked "in accordance with imperial edict." This had not been the case in the T'ang and before, when translation centers were more widespread and less under the thumb of the central authorities.

The order to open an Institute for Sūtra Translation 譯經院 in the grounds of the T'ai-ping hsing-kuo-ssu 太平興國寺 in K'ai-feng was given in 980, and the buildings were ready for occupation in 982. In September 983 the name was changed to the Institute for Transmission of the Dharma 傳法院, and a further printing house was added. It was here that the 130,000 woodblocks from Ch'eng-tu arrived, ready for the first printed edition of the Buddhist canon. It was home, therefore, to an event of major importance in the history of the printed word. We do not know exactly how many copies of this first edition were produced, but we do know that the Japanese monk Chōnen 奝然, who was in China from 983 to 987, managed to obtain a complete set and take it back with him to Japan. The Institute itself survived as a translation bureau under the Court of Diplomatic Receptions (the Hung-lu-ssu 鴻臚寺, which also oversaw the administration of Taoist Registrars), providing interpreters and other such services, until 1082, after which time its useful life came to an end and it became no more than a ceremonial shell.

The initial funding of the whole enterprise had strong imperial backing, since the work of translation was seen as a necessary adjunct to an administration that intended to found a dynasty. Interpreters would be needed if the Sung were to extend their borders to the west, and information about these regions was often best obtained from traveling monks. There is a record that in the early years of the Sung a monk called Tao-yüan 道圓 returned from an eighteen-year trip to India, bringing back with him a large quantity of relics and palm-leaf manuscripts; he was accompanied by an Uighur envoy. It may have been reports from these men that caused the emperor T'ai-tsung 太宗 to encourage others to venture farther west. In 966 a monk called Hsing-ch'in 行勤 declared his desire to go to India via Khotan and Kashmir in the company of 157 like-minded men in order to search for more sūtras. The emperor not only encouraged them but gave them 30,000 cash. There is another record of 300 monks who had left in 946, returning with more sūtras in 976.

All this suggests that the Institute may well have been set up to handle a sudden influx of new material that needed translation. Fortunately, together with the material came monks capable of dealing with it, among whom we find the three most important translators during the early years of the Institute: Fa-t'ien 法天, who arrived in 973, T'ien Hsi-tsai 天息災, given the name Fa-hsien 法賢 in 987, and Shih-hu 施護 (Dānapāla). All of them could apparently speak Chinese; the last two were cousins from Kashmir, and arrived in 980. The success of the Institute depended on three factors: a sufficient supply of new texts, a sufficient supply of scholar-monks who could read these texts, and continued imperial support. In the early years all three preconditions were fulfilled, and a succession of emperors (and possibly empresses) seems to have had a personal stake in the whole operation.

It is, of course, unwise to characterize Buddhism in the Sung as if it were monolithic, an entity subject to a fixed state policy. The bureaucracy,

[3] Mizuno Kōgen's review can be found in *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 14 (1966), pp. 801–5. For three typical uses of Brough's article, see Nakamura Kikunoshin 中村菊之進, "Sō Denpōin yakukyō sanzō Yuijō no denki oyobi nenpu" 宋伝法院訳經三蔵惟浄の伝記及び年譜, in *Bunka* 文化 41.1–2 (1977), pp. 1–59; N. Iyanaga, "Récits de la soumission de Maheśvara par Trilokyavijaya," in M. Strickmann, ed., *Tantric and Taoist Studies*, Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques 22 (Bruxelles: Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises, 1985) 3, p. 736; and Robert E. Buswell, Jr., "Introduction," in *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha* (Honolulu: U. of Hawaii P., 1990), p. 11.

[4] The main details for this section have been culled from the following: Nakamura, "Sō Denpōin," which contains a detailed chronology of major events from 973–1051; Jan Yün-hua, "Buddhist Relations Between India and Sung China," *History of Religions* 6 (1966), pp. 24–42, 135–68; and Makita Tairyō, 牧田諦亮, *Ajia bukkyōshi Chūgoku hen* アジア仏教史中国編 (Tokyo: Kōsei shuppansha, 1976) 2, pp. 29–46.

through the examination system, was closed to Buddhist and Taoist clergy alike, and yet Buddhist monastic complexes flourished, offering a wide range of sectarian choices, from Ch'an to Hua Yen and T'ien-t'ai. Monasteries wielded considerable economic influence in their own right and were a major presence in K'ai-feng. Considerable resources were sometimes lavished on them.[5]

Why, however, did a succession of emperors show such a proprietary interest in the Institute and its work? Official visits were paid on a number of occasions and special solicitude was shown to the scholar-monks whenever they fell ill. When they died, it was expected that the government would cover all necessary expenses. Emperor Chen-tsung 眞宗 took a particular interest in the translation techniques used, and the Institute itself was repaired and further enlarged on imperial order in 1028. Imperial prefaces were willingly written on many occasions; moreover, the Institute customarily presented the reigning emperor with a new translation on his birthday. As we have remarked, all work was labeled "in accordance with imperial edict." Translations were stored away rather than being immediately disseminated to other monks and temples, as had been general practice during the T'ang.

The evidence presented by Nakamura Kikunoshin suggests that entry into the printed canon was not automatic but rather carefully policed. Initially, of course, translations must have been produced in manuscript form. Those copies offered to the emperor himself would presumably have found their way into his own private library, the T'ai-ch'ing lou 太淸樓. The majority were simply deposited in another library. But where? It is unlikely that they were placed in the Imperial Library. The four institutes that comprised this library were destroyed by fire in 1015, an event that the Buddhist records do not consider as a particular disaster. It is more likely that translations were first deposited in the library of the Institute itself. The decision as to whether they should be included in the canon 入藏 was presumably made at a later stage, although this is difficult to verify in most cases.[6]

5 This goes for both the T'ai-ping hsing-kuo-ssu and the much larger and prestigious Hsiang-kuo-ssu, on which see the detailed study by A. C. Soper, "Hsiang-kuo-ssu, an Imperial Temple of Northern Sung China," *JAOS* 68 (1948), pp. 19–45. A useful map of K'ai-feng with major landmarks can be found in D. Kuhn, *Die Song-Dynastie* (Wienheim: Acta Humanoria, V. C. H., 1987), p. 218

6 For more information on libraries in the Sung, see John H. Winkelman, "The Imperial Library in Southern Sung China, 1127–1179," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* NS 64.8 (1974). The T'ai-ch'ing-lou (erected in 979 and carried off by the Jurchen in 1127) was reserved for the emperor's private use. Each government department had its own small reference library, but the main resource for scholars and historians was the Imperial Library, known as the Ch'ung-wen-yüan 崇文院. In the early days of the dynasty this term referred

It would seem, therefore, that access to these manuscripts was restricted; only after the texts were approved for inclusion in the printed canon would they have reached a larger audience. What lay behind this unusual degree of care? Pressure from sects already powerful in China, unwilling to countenance new texts and new ideas, has been cited as a possible factor, but the answer is more likely to lie in the very nature of the texts. In fact, fully forty per cent of the works that we know to have been translated at this time and that are now included in the canon were tantric in nature. These texts included a number of *yogānuttaratantras*, such as the *Guhyasamājatantra* (translated by Shih-hu in 1002) and the *Hevajratantra* (translated by Fa-hu 法護 in 1054–1055), many of which are fundamental to the Tibetan tradition.[7] As Charles Willemen has shown, the more explicit parts seem to have been censored from the printed versions, quite probably by the translators themselves, and a correct understanding of what actually went on in the esoteric rituals could not be obtained if all one had to rely on was the Chinese version.[8] As is well known, the higher yoga tantras are marked by their general absence from the Chinese canon, and it may well have been that many more were in fact translated at the Institute but never printed, for obvious reasons.

It is normally argued that esoteric Buddhism never really survived the suppression at the end of the T'ang and that it fell to the Japanese to take over this form of Buddhism as Shingon. But this is to ignore the continued fascination with spells and magic that informed much that went on at court and elsewhere since the sixth century.[9] Evidence of imperial concern in Taoist magic is well documented, particularly under Chen-tsung,[10] and we also

to the complex that housed a number of important libraries and it only came into being as a proper administrative unit in 1082, the same year in which the Institute for Transmission of the Dharma became officially moribund.

7 The *Taishō* numbers are 882–91. For details turn to Takeuchi Kōzen 武内孝善, "Sōdai hon'yaku kyōten no tokushoku ni tsuite" 宋代翻訳経典の特色について, *Mikkyō bunka* 密教文化 113 (Feb. 1975) pp. 27–53. This article is an important source of information. It includes a chronology of works translated in the period 982–1037 and has a series of tables analyzing the results. The Chinese records are careful to distinguish between north, south, west and central India, Nepal, Kashmir, and Sri Lanka when identifying national origins. They also draw linguistic distinctions between "central Indian" (67% of texts), "central Indian in Sri Lankan script," "central Indian in Kucha script," "west Indian," and "north Indian." It is of interest that 12 of the 13 texts in "Kucha script" were Hinayāna works.

8 Charles Willemen, trans., *The Chinese Hevajratantra*, Orientalia Gandensia 8 (Rijksuniversiteit te Gent, 1983), p. 29.

9 See Charles D. Orzech, "Seeing Chen-Yen Buddhism: Traditional Scholarship and the Vajrayāna in China," *History of Religions* 29.2 (1989), pp. 87–114.

10 Suzanne E. Cahill, "Taoism at the Sung Court: The Heavenly Text Affair of 1008," *Bulletin of Sung-Yuan Studies* 16 (1980), pp. 23–44. This affair was taken seriously enough to cause a change of era-name.

know that tantric spells were used in prayers for rain and similar ceremonies. It is only reasonable to suppose that the court also interested itself in the more sexual elements of these higher tantric texts. One is on dangerous ground here, but the nature of the majority of the texts handled at the Institute at K'ai-feng surely remains as something more than mere historical accident.

Solid proof for such a claim, of course, is almost nonexistent. The suppression of the monograph on Taoism and Buddhism in *Sung shih* 宋史 (*The Official History of the Sung*) is particularly irksome in this regard.[11] Sexual intrigue was half of life in the inner quarters of the palace, and the powerful presence of women in the court should not be forgotten. Chen-tsung's empress was the *de facto* ruler near the end of his reign. She in turn ruled the country as regent to Jen-tsung 仁宗 from 1022 until her death in 1033 as dowager empress Liu 劉. She was herself ordained as a Taoist adept soon after Chen-tsung died.[12] The period from 1063 to 1067 was again dominated by a woman, this time the mother of the sickly Ying-tsung 英宗. Specific details about their interest in Buddhism are not available, although we do know that there was a nunnery in K'ai-feng, which served, more often than not, as a repository for unwanted imperial wives.[13] In 1032 a monk called Huai-wen 懷問, received permission to go to the Vikramaśīla Monastery and Bodhgayā to set up a stele in honor of the dowager empress, Jen-tsung's real mother who had died earlier that year. It still stands. This was in fact Huai-wen's third visit to India; on his second trip in 1023 he had done the same for Jen-tsung himself.

Not that the work of the translators escaped bureaucratic disapproval. Some were undoubtedly moved by vested sectarian interests. Others were unhappy at the vast expense and the subsequent drain on government resources. As early as 999 we find the governor of K'ai-feng, Ch'en Shu 陳恕, suggesting that government funding be withdrawn because of excessive cost, and in 1003 he again complained about what he saw to be a general lack of quality among the Chinese monks who had traveled west and who were now living on state support. The response to these complaints was always the same: T'ai-tsung had set the Institute up, and it would be disrespectful to his memory to close it down.

The main dates and events in the life of the Institute are fairly well known. Most of the early work was carried out by the three monks already mentioned. Fa-hsien suggested that a number of Chinese should be recruited, to be trained as translators: perhaps he was already worried that the supply of monks from the west and India would soon dry up. Fifty out of 500 applicants were chosen, among them the young boy Wei-ching 惟淨, who was eleven at the time. He was to be the most important Chinese national at the Institute during its active life, but even here some scepticism has been voiced about his ability to understand the originals without the help of intermediaries.[14] It is known that the Institute had about eighty members at the close of the tenth century. Wei-ching rose rapidly and became third-ranking language assistant in 1001, the only Chinese ever to be given this role. Fa-hsien died on September 4, 1000. Fa-t'ien died on June 12, 1001. The Kashmiri Fa-hu (Dharmapāla) arrived in 1004, and from that time on both Fa-hu and Wei-ching held the same positions as they moved up the Institute's hierarchy. Fa-hu was to die in 1058 at the age of ninety-six. Over the years there are records of one or two monks per year returning from India and the west.

On December 7, 1015, there was an imperial order for a catalog to be produced. This is the well-known *Ta-chung hsiang-fu fa-pao lu* 大中祥符法寶錄, from which much of our information about translators, languages, and scripts comes. In a sense, however, the demand for a catalog marks a watershed, suggesting that the Institute was already moving away from translation and more towards codification. In 1017 Shih-hu died. The records indicate continued personal interest by the emperor. In 1023, on the accession of Jen-tsung, Wei-ching petitioned for retirement on grounds of failing eyesight, but he was persuaded to stay on. There may well have been other grounds, however, because such requests were to multiply. In 1027 both he and Fa-hu asked that the Institute be closed for lack of new work. The same happened in 1030, but on both occasions their request was turned down: they were to wait until further material arrived. The occasional new text did in fact turn up. In 1037 a second catalog, entitled *Ching-yu fa-pao lu* 景祐法寶錄, covering work done since 1011, was presented to the throne. About 1041, another request by Wei-ching to close down the Institute was yet again refused by the court.

It is clear from the above that although texts and scholars were in good supply at the beginning of the period, there was a rapid falling-off by the 1030s, and one suspects that despite the presence of Fa-hu, the Institute

[11] Piet van der Loon, *Taoist Books in the Libraries of the Sung Period* (London: Ithaca Press, 1984), p. 36.

[12] Ibid., p. 36.

[13] See Priscilla Ching Chung, *Palace Women in the Northern Sung* (Leiden: Brill, 1981), pp. 49–50.

[14] See Nakamura, "Sō Denpōin," p. 21.

may never have really recovered true confidence in its ability to handle texts after the death of Shih-hu in 1017. As we shall see, Indians, or at least non-Chinese, were crucial to the enterprise and it would appear that none of the Chinese, not even Wei-ching, really managed to master the original language of the texts. In the first forty years, however, much important work was done. We know from a stone memorial written by Hsia Sung 夏竦 (985–1051) in 1035 that 1,428 sūtras had been brought in during the early years and that at least eighty "Indian" monks had also arrived, some undoubtedly by land across the desert but some via the southern route. By the time Hsia Sung was writing, 564 fascicles had been translated. Since it has been estimated that 727 fascicles (amounting to about 260 sūtras and other works) were translated during the life of the Institute, the lion's share had already been done by this date.

How does the so-called pseudo-translation of the *Jātaka-mālā* fit into this picture? The colophon to *P'u-sa pen-sheng-man lun* reads as follows: 宋朝散大夫試鴻臚少卿同譯經梵才大師紹德慧詢奉詔譯. This raises some difficulties. At first sight this would seem to mean "Translated in the Sung in accordance with imperial edict by Shao-te, grand dignitary of the closing court, acting deputy director of the Court for Diplomatic Receptions, also translator of sūtras, grand master excelling in Sanskrit; together with Hui-hsün." We know, however, from other sources, some of which will be discussed in due course, that these official titles in fact belonged to Hui-hsün. Although both men may have conceivably shared some titles, it is highly unlikely that they shared all of them. Honorary titles such as 梵才大師, for example, were bestowed *ad hominem*. This leads the author of a recent article on the subject, Fujiyoshi Masumi, to argue that "Shao-te" does not refer to a monk at all but should either be read in apposition to Hui-hsün (the name of a temple perhaps?) or be simply regarded as a scribal error.[15]

Of a putative Shao-te we know next to nothing. The entry in *Bukkyō daijiten* 佛教大辭典 merely refers back to the colophon in question. The more recent entry in *Sung-jen chuan-chi tzu-liao so-yin* 宋人傳記資料索引, which reads "His provenance is unknown. He was chosen to enter the Bureau for Translation of Sūtras as a boy together with Wei-ching in 983. Together they studied Sanskrit and thereby translated new sūtras that arrived from abroad," is merely a rehash of an entry in *Hsin-hsü kao-seng chuan* 新續高僧傳, itself a product of the Republican Period. The entry is in fact useless and the date 983, as we see below, impossible. Neither does a Shao-te appear in the fairly exhaustive *Sung hui-yao chi-kao jen-ming so-yin* 宋會要輯稿人名索引. All we can say at this point is that this seems to be part and parcel of the same confusion that Brough documents so well in the text of *Taishō* no. 160 itself. In the light of this, then, Brough's two translators may only be one, and Iyanaga Nobumi is a little unwise to comment on Shao-te as "le traducteur bien connu de la version chinoise de la *Jātaka-mālā*, qui, avec Hui-hsün et d'autres, l'a complètement dénaturée: il ne savait pratiquement pas le sanscrit."[16]

There is one extra difficulty here. Shao-te appears once again in the Taishō canon as a translator, responsible for *Taishō* no. 652, *Ta-ch'eng sui-chuan hsüan-shuo chu-fa ching* 大乘隨轉宣說諸法經. The colophon to each of the three volumes reads: 宋明教弁才法師充譯經三藏沙門紹德等奉詔譯. The throw-away "and others" 等 is, however, suspicious, and 明教 was in fact the postumous title given to Fa-hu, who had died in 1058. Mizuno Kōgen, in his summary of Brough's article, took the opportunity to comment on this work in passing. The Sanskrit original is no longer extant, but we know from the inclusion of passages in *Śikṣāsamuccaya* that it was called *Sarvadharmāpravṛttinirdeśa*. The two previous translations, Kumārajīva's 諸法無行經 (*Taishō* no. 650) and a Sui version entitled 諸法本無經 (*Taishō* no. 651), get the translation of the title fairly accurately. *Taishō* no. 652, however, contains at least one serious misreading. *Sarvadharma* is present as 諸法 although not quite in the place one might expect, and *nirdeśa* is presumably translated as 宣說; but *apravṛtti* ("inertness") seems to have been misread as *anupravartin* ("according to" 隨轉), which makes little sense.[17] As we lack the original, no one can exactly "do a Brough" on the contents, but questions do remain. Clearly, then, something is suspicious about these translations and we need to investigate more carefully when they were done and why they were done badly. The repeated requests from the monks themselves to close down the Institute give us a strong clue.

The existence of Hui-hsün is quite well documented. Although he does not appear anywhere else as a translator in the canon, his name does occur

[15] Fujiyoshi Masumi 藤善眞澄 "Sōchō yakukyō shimatsu kō" 宋朝訳経始末攷, *Kansai daigaku bungaku ronshū* 関西大学文学論集 36.1 (1986). A search through the relevant records reveals such names as 德超 (1013), 紹慜 and 紹暹 (1016), 紹頻 (1028), and the era-name 紹聖 for 1094–98, but no 紹德.

[16] Iyanaga, "Récits," p. 736.

[17] The entries for *Taishō* nos. 650 and 651 in Lewis R. Lancaster, comp., *The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue* (Berkeley: U. of California P., 1979), p. 72, reconstruct the Sanskrit title as *Sarvadharmapravṛttinirdeśa*, but this omits the negative and should be amended accordingly. It is of interest that neither *Taishō* no. 160 nor *Taishō* no. 652 appears in the Korean canon at all—further proof of their extremely late date.

in a number of other reliable records.[18] He was known as a good poet and a diligent scholar. He arrived in K'ai-feng from T'ien-t'ai 天台 sometime between 1023 and 1031. He was put to work on catalogs, possibly being given the task of adding T'ien-t'ai texts to the growing canon, because there were very few monks of that particular persuasion in northern China at the time. He returned to the south for some time and lived at the Ching-ming-ssu 淨名寺 in Lin-hsien 臨縣. He was called back to K'ai-feng to work on sūtra translation about 1060 or soon thereafter.

We are in fact fortunate in having independent corroboration of Hui-hsün's presence at K'ai-feng in the form of the diary entitled *San Tendai Godai san ki* 参天台五台山記, written by the Japanese monk Jōjin 成尋 (1011–1081). Jōjin arrived in China with a retinue of seven followers in 1072 at a ripe old age. His intention was to make pilgrimages to T'ien-t'ai shan, where his sect had been founded, and to Wu-t'ai shan, where Mañjuśrī had been known to manifest himself on occasions.[19] He was to die in China, but five of his retinue returned to Japan in 1073 with his diary and many Buddhist texts. Having spent some four months in the south, Jōjin traveled up the canal system to K'ai-feng, arriving there in the tenth lunar month of 1072.

He was fortunate in his treatment. The Sung court was interested in opening up trade with Japan, since they made considerable profit from taxing the proceeds of foreign trade, so he was given semidiplomatic status. He was lodged at the Institute for Transmission of the Dharma, and in very short order was granted imperial audience. The diary gives a rare glimpse into court ritual and the kinds of question that were considered important. He was immediately granted permission to travel north to Wu-t'ai shan, which was fortunately still accessible at that stage from the south via T'ai-yüan. It was, however, only just within the northern jurisdiction of the Sung. He left for Wu-t'ai on December 13, 1072. There he succeeded in having a vision of Mañjuśrī during his short four-day stay and then returned to K'ai-feng and the Institute, where he remained until his return south in the spring of 1073.

The latter part of Jōjin's diary, covering the early months of 1073, is a mine of information, not only about the Institute but also the palace, for Jōjin was asked to conduct special prayers for rain in the presence of the emperor. He records in some detail the esoteric texts he read and the con-

[18] For a list of such sources see Fujiyoshi, "Sōchō yakukyō shimatsu kō," pp. 405–7.

[19] For more details about the diary see Robert Borgen, "*San Tendai Godai san ki* as a Source for the Study of Sung History," *Bulletin of Sung-Yuan Studies* 19 (1987), pp. 1–16, and Charlotte von Verschuer, "Le voyage de Jōjin au mont Tiantai," *TP* 77 (1991), pp. 1–48.

versations he had with Chinese, both Buddhist and Taoist, and Indians. The list of books that he sent back with his followers is not extant. This is unfortunate because the shipment may well have contained tantric texts that were not in the end incorporated into the Chinese canon. It is possible indeed that it is these works that lie behind the emergence of the "left-handed" Tachikawa sect, said to have emerged in Japan early in the twelfth century.

On his arrival in K'ai-feng, Jōjin took care to list the dignitaries he met at the Institute. Of a Shao-te there is no mention at all, but the top three officials are listed as follows:

1. 西天譯經三藏朝散大夫試鴻臚卿宣梵大師賜紫日稱 "Jih-ch'eng, the western Indian, receiver of the purple robe, grand master proclaiming Sanskrit, translator of sūtras, tripiṭaka, grand dignitary of the closing court, acting director of the Court of Diplomatic Receptions."
2. 朝散大夫試鴻臚少卿同譯經宣秘大師賜紫慧賢 "Hui-hsien, receiver of the purple robe, grand master proclaiming secrets, grand dignitary of the closing court, acting deputy director of the Court for Diplomatic Receptions, jointly translator of sūtras."
3. 詔同譯經梵才大師賜紫惠(慧)詢 "Hui-hsün, receiver of the purple robe, grand master excelling in Sanskrit, jointly translator of sūtras by imperial edict."[20]

In 1072 then, Hui-hsün ranked third after the director and the deputy, of whom there seemed to be only one in post. Hui-hsün was attentive to Jōjin's needs throughout his stay, giving him advice on how to handle the authorities and helping him write his letters and requests in the correct form of Chinese. Although, as we have argued, things were definitely in decline by this time, there is no sign in Jōjin's diary that he realized this. Given that he knew no Sanskrit and could not speak Chinese, this is perhaps hardly surprising.

So who did know Sanskrit in 1072? There are signs that the only man left was the director himself, known to us only by his Chinese name Jih-ch'eng. He had arrived from north-central India in 1047, after a three-year journey, "black as ink," as Jōjin noted.[21] Of his expertise there can be no doubt, because a number of reputable translations remain in his name. But what of the others? Jōjin came across one Indian in Wu-t'ai shan, who had in his possession a number of Sanskrit manuscripts (he wanted desperately

[20] Shimazu Kusako 島津草子, ed., *Jōjin ajari no haha shū San Tendai Godai san ki no kenkyū* 成尋阿闍梨母集参天台五台記の研究 (Tokyo: Daizō shuppan, 1959), p. 393.

[21] Ibid., p. 388.

to get back to the capital or go back to India, which is hardly surprising given that it was midwinter and high in the northern mountains). Jōjin also records meeting at least five other Indians in the Institute, although it was clear that they were not being given any special treatment. One of them called T'ien Chi-hsiang 天吉祥 had arrived some twenty years previously together with a Chih Chi-hsiang 智吉祥, who had since died. Jōjin records some interesting conversations with him. The other four were very recent arrivals: two apparently came from northwest India and had come by sea by the southern route, two were from central India and had managed to travel overland. By the time Jōjin left, it was clear that none of them was going to stay. Either the government had grown suspicious of stragglers coming out of the desert, or they had already made up their minds to wind things down at the Institute, or Jih-ch'eng had found that their command of Buddhist Sanskrit was shaky.

And what of Hui-hsün? Near the end of his stay, on May 7, 1073, Jōjin was taken inside the hall where the translation was carried out, and he has left us a short record of what he saw.

> First the Director [Jih-ch'eng] picked up one sheet of the Sanskrit and read it through [out loud]. Then translator-scribe Chih-pao took the Sanskrit phrase by phrase and read it [out loud]. Tripiṭaka-excelling-in-Sanskrit [Hui-hsün] intoned Chinese and another translator-scribe wrote it down. Then the process was repeated as before, phrase for phrase, and in this way a whole page was translated. Then the deputy director, jointly translator of sūtras by imperial edict [Hui-hsien], read out the Chinese. 先大卿取梵文一紙談了次筆受智寶取梵文一句讀之梵才三藏唱漢語筆受書了次讀梵文一句如前如此一紙譯了詔同譯少卿讀漢語了[22]

What is actually going on here? First of all it is difficult to tell whether Jōjin was just being treated to a ceremony that may not have reflected actual practice, or whether he was seeing the real thing in action. If, as we must now surmise, Hui-hsün did not really understand Sanskrit, what does the phrase "intoned Chinese" 唱漢語 mean, and what was Chih-pao actually doing? In order to solve this problem we must look for a moment at the procedures for translation as laid down in the Institute during its heyday. In 982 T'ien Hsi-tsai prescribed the process, or perhaps we should say ritual, as follows:

[22] Ibid., pp. 602–3.

> To the west side of the Eastern Hall powder is spread over a ritual dais, and the four directions are left open, to be occupied by four monks who read Sanskrit. Esoteric spells are chanted for seven days and nights. In addition another wooden dais is constructed and covered with the seed-characters of the enlightened ones set in circles. This is the object of contemplation and it is known as the *mahādharmamaṇḍala*. The enlightened ones are invited to be present, holy water is used for ablutions, offerings are presented of incense, flowers, light, water, food and fruit. There is prayer and circumambulation. Blessings and protection are prayed for to nullify all evil influences.
>
> The first is the *i-chu* 譯主 (master of translation), who sits in a formal pose facing outwards and reads out the Sanskrit text. The second is the *cheng-i* 証義 (philological assistant), who sits to his left and reviews the text with the master. The third is the *cheng-wen* 証文 (text appraiser), who sits to his right, listens to the master reading out the Sanskrit and checks for errors. The fourth is the *shu-tzu-fan-hsüeh-seng* 書字梵學僧 (transliterator), who listens carefully to the Sanskrit and who writes it down in Chinese characters. These are still Sanskrit sounds. The fifth is the *pi-shou* 筆受 (translator-scribe), who turns the Sanskrit sounds into Chinese. The sixth is the *cho-wen* 綴文 (text editor), who alters the position of the characters so that they make proper meaningful sentences. The seventh is the *ts'an-i* 參譯 (proof reader), who compares both texts, Chinese and Sanskrit, so that no faults remain. The eighth is the *k'an-ting* 刊定 (subeditor), who deletes unnecessarily long expressions and who balances the phrasing. The ninth is the *jun-wen* 潤文 (stylist), who holds office with the monks, occupies the south-facing rooms, and who adds the finishing touches.[23]

Such an elaborate procedure was the culmination of a long process of increasing specialization. Before the Sung, rules varied depending on circumstance. Some of the earliest translations had been carried out by men who had memorized the text; others, such as Kumārajīva, ran a large translation class that generated discussion as it went along. By the T'ang the number of ranks involved had increased substantially. One description of translation techniques prior to the Sung provides evidence of a division of labor similar to that prescribed by T'ien Hsi-tsai, but it is not clear whether this also

[23] *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi* 佛祖統紀 43; in *Taishō*, vol. 49, no. 2035, p. 398b. This passage is based on a very similar description to be found in *Sung hui-yao* 宋會要, *ch.* 200, section on the 傳法院.

included the intermediate stage of transliteration.[24] Is it possible that this stage was simply added to increase the number of posts available, rather than being technically necessary? Certainly we know that in the early days of the Institute it was common for more than one monk to hold the same title, and the temptation to feather one's own nest must have been irresistable.[25]

Clearly, for this kind of complex system to work properly as envisaged in 982 one would have needed at least six scholars capable of reading the original. As we have seen, by Jōjin's time there was only one good Sanskrit scholar left and the number of people involved had obviously been greatly curtailed. It is therefore possible that all Jōjin actually experienced was the initial stages of a mere transliteration. It is also clear from his description that the title *pi-shou* (translator-scribe) no longer meant quite the same thing as it had done previously. It would seem from the 982 rules that the scholar in this position did the actual work of translating into Chinese, but there is no sign that Jōjin recognized them as anything more than simple scribes.

Given the pressures at this late stage, it must be counted a miracle that Jih-ch'eng managed to preside over the production of so many translations that do in fact pass muster. For the last thirty years there had been a number of occasions when Chinese scholars in the Institute had petitioned for its closure, especially after the death of Fa-hu in 1058. And it is here that we must come to the rescue of Hui-hsün himself and save him from Brough's negative judgment. "The monks in question seem to have been simple souls . . . too inexpert in the art of forgery to do it well," writes Brough at one point. They had "good reason for trying to camouflage their work. Almost certainly, discovery would have been a double disaster: official censure (at least), and the laughter of their colleagues. It must have been obvious, of course, that the risk of exposure was neglible . . . To master the intricacies of literary Sanskrit must have been fantastically difficult for a Chinese scholar, without dictionary or grammar-book to help; and a visit from an Indian with a reasonable knowledge of Chinese was most improbable."[26] Brough is here a little out of his depth, as he is when he comes up with the suggestion that the designation 梵才 was "self-bestowed" and a piece of "self-conceit."[27] What Brough did not know when he made these remarks was that when the venerable Jih-ch'eng died five years after Jōjin departed, in 1078, it was Hui-hsün himself who petitioned yet again for his own Institute to be closed

[24] See *Sung Kao-seng chuan* 宋高僧傳 3; in *Taishō*, vol. 50, no. 2061, p. 724b–c.

[25] For further details see Walter Fuchs, "Zur technischen Organisation der Übersetzungen buddhistischer Schriften ins Chinesische," *AM* 6 (1930), pp. 84–103.

[26] Brough, "Chinese Pseudo-Translation," pp. 32–33. [27] Ibid., p. 53.

down. The initial response was unfavorable, but eventually the inevitable was accepted in 1082.

The sad entry in *Sung hui-yao chi-kao* that records Hui-hsün's petition of 1078 reads as follows:

> The translator of sūtras Jih-ch'eng died, and so the translator Hui-hsün and others were all unable to continue their work. They petitioned that the Institute be closed down. The response was an edict that they were to stay in the Institute, study, and continue to edit the catalog of post-1032 translations. The intention was to wait until an erudite Indian monk arrived.[28]

It will be remembered that in 1072, when Jōjin met him, Hui-hsün was one rank below Hui-hsien, who was acting deputy director of the Court for Diplomatic Receptions 試鴻臚少卿. Unless Hui-hsien had died in the meantime (and this is not recorded), Hui-hsün would have only succeeded to that post on the death of Jih-ch'eng in 1078. This is, however, his title on the colophon of *Taishō* no. 160, our *Jātaka-mālā* text. It is probable, therefore, that he was forced to try his hand at the *Jātaka-mālā* sometime between 1078 and 1082, in the very last days of the Institute. It defeated him completely. Whether Shao-te was a real person or just the result of a garbled text, we shall never know. How the half-hearted attempt at a translation ever became printed and so found its way into the canon, we shall never know either. What is certain, however, is that Hui-hsün had no self-conceit and knew exactly the desperate position in which he found himself.

[28] *Sung hui-yao* 200.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Taishō *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經