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The Term "hīnayāna" Given the fact that all extant versions of the Ugra freely use the term *Mahāyāna*, it is noteworthy that the corresponding term *hīnayāna*('low vehicle", ''inferior vehicle") does not occur in any version of our text.

所有Ugra 經的版本都有用到大乘這個詞，值得注意小乘一詞並未出現。

In this respect the Ugra quite typical of bodhisattva sūtras translated into Chinese during the latter Han dynasty. 典型漢譯菩薩經典

for as Paul Harrison has shown. Items that can be equated with the word hīnayāna appear only rarely（小乘及等義詞罕見）, occurring a total of four times in the entire corpus of eleven such texts, which means that the majority do not contain it a all [[1]](#footnote-0), Considerably more frequent—though still not as numerous as the occurrences found in later sutra translations—are terms that can be equated with either *bodhisattvayāna* or *mahāyāna*. [[2]](#footnote-1) 菩薩乘或大乘經常出現。

The unequal distribution of the terms hīnayāna and *mahāyāna* in these early translations might seem odd, given their obvious terminological symmetry. 初期翻譯中這樣的對稱術語但又分布不等的情況看似怪異。

But the symmetry is only apparent. 但「對稱」只是表面上的。While the two terms are grammatically parallel （文法上平行）, conceptually（概念上並非對稱）—and chronologically（有時序）, so the evidence strongly suggests—they are not. As Hubert Durt has pointed out. in the earliest literature the term *bodhisattvayāna* and other synonyms appear to predominate.早期文學作品大量使用菩薩乘及同義詞。 while the term *mahāyāna* only gradually came to be accepted a standard.[[3]](#footnote-2) 大乘這個術語慢慢才成為標準。

And it was even later, to the evidence assembled by Harrison and others would seem to suggest, that the word *mahāyāna* came to be paralleled by the strongly pejorative term *hīnayāna[[4]](#footnote-3).* 大乘 這個詞帶有對 小乘 的強烈貶意。

What are we to make, then, of the fact that the term *hīnayāna* does not appear in our text?為什麼文本中沒有出現小乘呢？ As we have seen, there are at least three possible explanations for the absence of a given concept or term: (1) that the authors had never head of it, 作者未曾聞(2) that they knew it and took it for granted, considering it too obvious to require special mention; 不值一提的常識or (3) that they knew it and rejected it. choosing not to mention it because they viewed it as unworthy of consideration.[[5]](#footnote-4) 排斥不提，不值得關注。

 Which of these possibilities offers the most likely explanation for the absence of the term *hīnayāna*? To decide among these options we must first ask several questions: (1) Is the understanding of the śrāvaka path embodied in the term *hīnayāna* required or implied by other things that are present in our text? 文本是否呈現出這樣的這樣的解讀：聲聞道需要（某處暗示）被包含在“小乘”這個詞。 (2) On the contrary, is that same understanding contradicted矛盾 by the content of our text? And finally, 此解讀是否和文本的內容衝突 (3) does our text contain anything that could be described as a less fully developed—that is, an earlier—version of that concept? 此文本是否含有那個概念的未發展成熟（早期）版本。

The first and second questions represent two mutually exclusive possibilities（互斥）, and it is quite clear where the Ugra falls on this issue. For the notion of the śrāvaka path as a despised "inferior vehicle" is explicitly and emphatically contradicted by the contents of our text（貶低聲聞道明顯違反本經意旨）. The bodhisattva is repeatedly reminded that his duty as a candidate for Buddhahood is to prepare himself to teach others the śrāvaka path（菩薩，作為佛的人選，反覆被提醒有教導聲聞的任務）, and that members of the śrāvaka vehicle am worthy of respect even if they have broken the precepts（聲聞乘行者 即使破戒也應尊重）. In sum, to use the term hīnayāna would violate a central tenet of our text: the ultimate worthiness of the śrāvaka path itself

As noted in the previous chapter. it has sometimes been suggested that the use of the term mahāyāna marks the emergence of the bodhisattva "movement" （“大乘”的使用標誌著 菩薩運動形成了獨立教團）as a separate institution or organization. As we have seen, however, the Ugra itself—which uses the term mahāyāna quite freely yet portrays bodhisattvas as living within the framework of the traditional monastic sangha（但ugra 中菩薩還是作為在傳統僧團的一員）—contains evidence that this is not the case（此時菩薩行者未從聲聞僧團獨立出來）. But the term *hīnayāna* , I would suggest, does indeed function as such a marker.（小乘可以作為菩薩脫離聲聞僧團的標誌） While it is entirely possible (though not necessarily easy, as we have seen in Chapter 4) for practitioners of the traditional path to Arhatship to inhabit a religious community together（菩薩與聲聞共住） with others who are pursuing a path to Buddhahood that is viewed as superior（以佛果為目標的菩薩被視為更優勝）, it is unlikely that any semblance of harmony could be maintained within such a community（但聲聞菩薩共住的僧團） if bodhisattvas were referring to the religious frontier(開疆者) of their śrāvaka coreligionists（僧聞同修） as "low" or “debased". The fact that the Ugra is free of any occurrence of this pejorative and divisive term may thus be taken as yet another indication that it is the product of a community in which both the bodhisattva and the śrāvaka paths were still viewed as legitimate合法的, indeed admirable, religious vocations 神職.

1. See Harrison 1987. p.72 [↑](#footnote-ref-0)
2. By Harrion’s count the term *mahāyāna*. whether transliterated or translated as “great Way”, appears only about twenty times in these same texts (loc. cit.). From both Harrison's list of authentic 2nd-century translations and from the nearly identical list given in Zürcher 1991 we should probably delete T630, the Ch’eng-chü kuang-ming ting-i ching 成具光明定意經attributed to Chih Yao 支曜 (late 2nd century). which is almost certainly a later apocryphon（密秘經典、靈知）. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
3. Durt 1994, p.778. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
4. It is important to point out that the term hīnayāna does not mean "small vehicle.” The Indies epithet hīna-, from the root √ha "discard, shun; be deficient.” carries a range of strongly negative associations, including "lower, weaker, inferior劣, deficient不足, defective缺陷. Low, “vile"卑鄙 and “mean”邪惡 (nee MW 1296b-c): the standard Tibetan equivalent theg-pa dman-pa "low vehicle” accurately captures this negative connotation負面意涵. as does the expression lieh-sheng 劣乘 “inferior vehicle" used by Dharmarakṣa竺法護 and some other early Chinese translators. In fact, the English expression “small vehicle" is not based on the Indian term at all, but on the Chinese expression hsiao-sheng “little- vehicle” used by Kumārajīva鳩摩羅什 and others. It may well be that Kumārajīva (whose own background was originally Sarvāstivādin說一切有部) deliberately chose a less offensive攻擊性較小, though technically inaccurate不精確, expression to translate hīnayāna. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
5. 5. See above. Chapter 3. p. 69. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)