

自語他言  
：文字中的釋道宣

# THE LIFE OF DAOXUAN:

According to Others and His Own Words

ANG ZOU



The Life of Daoxuan:  
According to Others and in His Own Words

自語他言：文字中的釋道宣

Buddhist College of Singapore &  
Kong Meng San Phor Kark See Monastery  
Dharma Propagation Division  
Awaken Publishing and Design  
88 Bright Hill Road Singapore 574117  
Tel: (65) 6849 5342  
Email: [publication@kmfspks.org](mailto:publication@kmfspks.org)  
Website: [www.kmspks.org](http://www.kmspks.org)

1st Edition, May 2019, 100 books  
ISBN 978-981-14-1144-1

© Kong Meng San Phor Kark See Monastery

Printed by  
Unique Press Pte Ltd  
Tel: (+65) 6252 4500 Fax: (+65) 6251 4566

## ABSTRACT

This book focuses on the life of Daoxuan that revealed by the monk himself and that penned down by others. More importantly, it sets out to see why this monk is so linked to and respected in the field of *vinaya*. Is it because a great number of his works are devoted to that subject, or simply that he lives up to the *vinaya* stipulations? Furthermore, it is one of the key tasks of this study to explore why Daoxuan was the first Chinese monk ever to define *hufa* as an ideal that monks should aspire to and installed it as one of the ten categories of the eminent monks in his *Xu gaoseng zhuan*. Daoxuan, at a certain point, even went on to declare the *hufa* as the most prominent among the ten ideals in regards to the survival of the Buddha-dharma. What is his understanding of *hufa*, and since it is so greatly viewed, what does Daoxuan to *hufa*?

Similarly, it is intriguing that Daoxuan was the first monk to cite evidence from *Sifén lüi* nearly two centuries after its introduction into China and considered this text to be Mahāyāna. What were the reason(s) behind his move? Why was it him and not anyone else? Also central to this study is to understand why Daoxuan was the first monk to introduce the recitation of *Yijiao jing*, supposedly the last instructions of the Buddha, to be conducted alongside the full ordination ceremony. To answer all these questions, this research seeks to explore the life of Daoxuan as recorded in the works of others as well as in his own words.

Identifying the largest number ever of books pertaining to the life of Daoxuan, classifying the sources, comparing and contrasting, highlighting the origins of the sources, establishing his extant works, giving conclusions, and offering conjectures are the ways that the present book fulfils its overriding aim: to enhance the understanding of the life of Daoxuan. Through this study, we see Daoxuan emerge from the sources as a diligent student, a tireless traveller, a Mahāyāna-aspired *vinaya* master, a prolific writer, and an indefatigable *hufa* monk. Each of these portrayals defines a separate aspect of his life; however, it is only when they are viewed through the *hufa* perspective that the seemingly independent facets of his life become coherent, so does our understanding of Daoxuan.



# THE LIFE OF DAOXUAN: ACCORDING TO OTHERS AND IN HIS OWN WORDS

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>The Life of Daoxuan .....</b>	1
<b>Part I .....</b>	1
I. Introduction.....	1
I.I Locating the Sources .....	3
I.2 Organizing and Classifying the Primary Sources .....	5
Table 1: The Master Table.....	6
Table 2: Classification of the Sources .....	14
<b>The Life of Daoxuan .....</b>	18
<b>Part II.....</b>	18
<b>According to Others .....</b>	18
II.1 Introduction .....	18
II.2 First-hand Information .....	21
II.3 Stable Information .....	34
II.4 A Flood of Information .....	35
II.5 Summarizing the Information.....	64
II.6 Conclusion.....	86
<b>The Life of Daoxuan .....</b>	89
<b>Part III .....</b>	89
<b>In His Own Words.....</b>	89
III.1 Introduction .....	89
III.2 Daoxuan's Works .....	90
Table 3: The Extant Works of Daoxuan and Works Listed in <i>Da Tang neidian lu</i> .....	92
III.3 Daoxuan's Family.....	98
III.4 Daoxuan's Monastic Life .....	100
III.4.1 The Length of Daoxuan's Career .....	100
III.4.2 Daoxuan's Teachers.....	110
Table 4: Different Terms for Teacher or Master in the <i>Vinaya</i> Texts.....	110
Table 5: Daoxuan and His Teachers.....	112
III.4.2.1 Master Huiyun .....	113

III.4.2.2 Master Zhishou .....	115
III.4.2.3 Master Fali .....	119
III.4.2.4 Master Huixiu .....	119
III.4.2.5 Master Zhichao .....	120
III.4.2.6 Conclusion.....	121
III.4.3 Daoxuan's Travels .....	122
Table 6: Daoxuan's Travels .....	124
III.4.4 Daoxuan's Conversations with the <i>Devas</i> .....	130
Table 7: The Names of the Four Heavenly Kings.....	131
III.4.4.1 The Time and Location of the Conversations .....	133
III.4.4.2 The Nature of the Conversations .....	133
Table 8: The Names of the <i>Devas</i> in Daoxuan's Works .....	135
III.4.4.3 The Previous and Future Lives of Daoxuan .....	136
III.4.4.4 Questions and Answers .....	138
III.4.4.5 Conclusion.....	139
III.4.5 Daoxuan's Relations with Other Tang Masters.....	140
III.4.5.1 Master Falin .....	140
III.4.5.2 Master Xuanzang .....	143
III.4.5.2.1 The Translation Team .....	143
Table 9: The Translation Team.....	143
III.4.5.2.2 The Ximing Monastery .....	148
III.4.5.2.3 Conclusion .....	149
<b>The Life of Daoxuan .....</b>	150
<b>Part IV .....</b>	150
<b>Daoxuan's <i>Hufa</i> Activities.....</b>	150
IV.1 Introduction .....	150
IV.2 The Term Explained: What is <i>Hufa</i> ?.....	151
Table 10: The <i>Hufa</i> masters in <i>Xu gaoseng zhuan</i> .....	152
IV.3 Fighting Fu Yi's Anti-Buddhist Proposal.....	155
IV.3.1 Historical Background .....	156
IV.3.2 Fu Yi and His Anti-Buddhist Proposal.....	156
Table 11: Fu Yi's Anti-Buddhist Proposal .....	161
IV.3.3 Religious Policy during the Wude Era .....	166
Table 12: Gaozu's <i>Sha tai</i> Decree.....	169
IV.3.4 Daoxuan's Response.....	171
IV.3.4.1 Questioning Fu Yi's Personality .....	171
IV.3.4.2 Counter-attacking Fu Yi's Arguments.....	174

IV.4 Protesting against Gaozong's Decrees .....	177
Table 13: Gaozong's Decrees and Daoxuan's Responses .....	179
IV.5 Promoting <i>Vinaya</i> .....	186
IV.5.1 Daoxuan's Source Material for His <i>Vinaya</i> Works .....	186
Table 14: The Four <i>Vinaya</i> Texts.....	187
IV.5.2 Daoxuan's <i>Vinaya</i> .....	188
IV.5.2.1 Establishing <i>Sifen lü</i> as the Principal <i>Vinaya</i> Text .....	188
IV.5.2.2 Proving that <i>Sifen Lü</i> is Mahāyāna .....	191
IV.5.2.2.1 Five Pieces of Evidence .....	191
Table 15: The Five Pieces of Evidence in <i>Sifen lü</i> .....	196
IV.5.2.2.2 Daoxuan's Motivation to Prove that <i>Sifen lü</i> is Mahāyāna.....	197
IV.5.2.3 Differences between Daoxuan's <i>Vinaya</i> and the <i>Vinaya</i> Texts .....	198
IV.5.2.3.1 Constructing a <i>Jietan</i> (Full Ordination Platform).....	199
IV.5.2.3.2 Recitation of <i>Yijiao jing</i> .....	204
IV.5.3 The Impact of Daoxuan's Promotion of <i>Vinaya</i> .....	207
<b>The Life of Daoxuan</b> .....	208
<b>Part V</b> .....	208
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	208
Appendix 1: Kuiji's <i>Chapters on Various Topics of the Teaching of Mahāyāna</i> .....	212
Appendix 2: Dates of the Texts Listed in the Master Table .....	214
Appendix 3: Daoxuan in <i>Fayuan zhulin</i> .....	221
Appendix 4, Part 1: The Evolution of Specific Elements in the Life Story of Daoxuan .....	221
Appendix 4, Part 2: The Evolution of Specific Elements in the Life Story of Daoxuan .....	227
Appendix 4, Part 3: The Evolution of Specific Elements in the Life Story of Daoxuan .....	229
Appendix 4, Part 4: The Evolution of Specific Elements in the Life Story of Daoxuan .....	231
Appendix 5: The Date of <i>Xu gaoseng zhuan</i> .....	233
Appendix 5, Table A .....	234
Appendix 5, Table B .....	235
Appendix 6: Works of Li Yong .....	236
Appendix 7: Comparison of the Story of Miaoshan in X75.1512 and X24.467 .....	238
Appendix 8: Yuanzhao's List of Daoxuan's Texts .....	241
Appendix 9: Comparison of Texts T45.1898 and T52.2107 .....	243
Appendix 10: Points at Which Daoxuan Refers to His Own Presence .....	269
Appendix 11: Huili's List of the Translation Team .....	271
Appendix 12: The Meaning of <i>Hufa</i> in Indian Buddhist Texts .....	272
Appendix 13: <i>Hufa</i> Monks in <i>Xu gaoseng zhuan</i> (Including <i>Fujian</i> ) .....	275
Appendix 14: List of the Officials Petitioned Against to Gaozong's Edict .....	276

<b>ABBREVIATIONS.....</b>	278
<b>CONVENTIONS .....</b>	282
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	283
<b>COLLECTIONS, DICTIONARIES, AND REFERENCE WORKS .....</b>	283
<b>INTERNET COLLECTIONS AND DICTIONARIES.....</b>	285
<b>PRIMARY SOURCES (LISTED BY TITLE) .....</b>	286
<b>A .....</b>	286
<b>B .....</b>	286
<b>C .....</b>	287
<b>D .....</b>	288
<b>E .....</b>	291
<b>F .....</b>	291
<b>G .....</b>	293
<b>H .....</b>	294
<b>I .....</b>	295
<b>J .....</b>	295
<b>K .....</b>	297
<b>L .....</b>	298
<b>M .....</b>	300
<b>N .....</b>	300
<b>O .....</b>	301
<b>P .....</b>	301
<b>Q .....</b>	301
<b>R .....</b>	302
<b>S .....</b>	303
<b>T .....</b>	309
<b>W .....</b>	311
<b>X .....</b>	312
<b>Y .....</b>	313
<b>Z .....</b>	314
<b>SECONDARY SOURCES (LISTED BY AUTHOR) .....</b>	315
<b>A NOTE FROM THE AUTHOR.....</b>	324

# The Life of Daoxuan

## Part I

### I. Introduction

In addition to writing many biographies himself, the Tang Buddhist master Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667)<sup>1</sup> has been the subject of countless works by other authors. Yet, ever since its composition in 988 CE, one text – the *Song gaoseng zhuan* 宋高僧傳 (*The Biography of Eminent Monks Composed in the Song*; hereafter SGSZ)<sup>2</sup> – has overshadowed all others as a source for the historical reconstruction of the life and career of Daoxuan, regardless of the fact that many other sources have the potential to enrich our understanding and provide different perspectives. For instance, the author, Zanning 贊寧 (919–1001), does not present the major events of the master’s life in chronological order. This is hardly surprising as Daoxuan lived through the fall of the Sui Dynasty 隋 (581–619) and the rise of the Tang Dynasty 唐 (618–907), which makes even identifying the precise year of a particular event problematic. However, the inclusion of unsourced and contradictory accounts also casts doubt on SGSZ’s credibility, while a lack of clarity in certain sections allows for multiple interpretations that inevitably cloud our understanding of Daoxuan’s life. More importantly, SGSZ either glosses over or totally omits some of the most important aspects of the master’s life and work.

First, SGSZ’s appraisal of Daoxuan as a *liishi* 律師 (*vinaya* master) seems to rest solely on his renowned expertise in that field and his extensive commentaries on the subject. Second, the text barely touches upon either the prominent position that *hufa* 護法 (literally, ‘to protect the Buddha-dharma’) occupies in Daoxuan’s works or the master’s own *hufa* activities. Third, Daoxuan’s efforts to promote *vinaya*, including his determination to prove that *Sifen lü* 四分律 is Mahāyāna and his construction of a full ordination platform, are largely ignored.

<sup>1</sup> Traditionally, in China, a child is considered to be one year of age on the day of his or her birth. Hence, as we shall see later, even though Daoxuan was born in 596 and died in 667, his age at the time of his death is invariably given as seventy-two, not seventy-one.

<sup>2</sup> Daoxuan’s entry in the *Song gaoseng zhuan* is at T50.2061j14.790b7–791b26. See my translation and study of this entry at II.5 64–81. Details of the reference convention I followed are at 282.

These peculiarities of SGSZ mean that it is of little help when attempting to answer several crucial questions. Should Daoxuan be hailed as a *vinaya* master simply because he lived his life in strict accordance with *vinaya* principles and wrote a large number of studies on the subject? Why was he the first monk to define *hufa* as an ideal to which other Buddhists should aspire, and why did he choose it as one of ten categories into which he grouped eminent monks in his *Xu gaoseng zhuan* 繢高僧傳 (*The Continued Biography of Eminent Monks*; hereafter XGSZ)?<sup>3</sup> Why did he attempt to prove that *Sifen lii* is Mahāyāna, and why had no previous monks felt the need to do this in the two centuries since it had been translated into Chinese? And why did he recommend recitation of *Yijiao jing* 遺教經 – supposedly the Buddha’s final instructions to his followers – in the full ordination ceremony?

Considering these problematic issues with the most widely referenced source for the reconstruction of the life and career of Daoxuan, not to mention his unparalleled importance in the history of Chinese Buddhism, there is clearly an urgent need for a much more comprehensive approach to the study of the master’s life that acknowledges the vast panoply of primary sources that pertain to him. This book is an attempt to meet that need. It is divided into three main parts: having established what the sources are in Part I, Part II examines the accounts of Daoxuan’s life and career that are provided by a variety of other authors; Part III is dedicated to Daoxuan’s personal accounts of his career and various engagements; and Part IV focuses on his *hufa* activities. The aim is to shed light on a wealth of often neglected descriptions and self-descriptions pertaining to the life of Daoxuan in order to emphasize their inherent discrepancies and inconsistencies, as well as the broad range of perspectives that developed with regard to this seminal figure. Hence, while I have attempted to incorporate as many works as possible, my focus is firmly on primary materials, rather than issues raised by modern scholars. This approach highlights the gradual evolution of Daoxuan’s life story from his own time onwards.

---

<sup>3</sup> *Xu gaoseng zhuan* (*The Continued Biography of Eminent Monks*; T50.2060).

## I.1 Locating the Sources

In order not to overlook any reference to Daoxuan, I conducted online keyword searches. The keywords used were ‘宣’, ‘南山’ and ‘西明’. Xuan 宣 is the second character of Daoxuan’s monastic name; Nanshan 南山 is the name of a mountain with which he is often associated, and Ximing 西明 is the name of one of the monasteries where he is said to have resided. The original intention was to search for *combinations* of these characters, such as ‘Daoxuan’, ‘Nanshan Daoxuan’ and ‘Ximing Daoxuan’, but it soon became apparent that such searches bypass a great number of books that contain significant information on Daoxuan. For example, at the most frequently consulted Chinese Buddhist database – the SAT,<sup>4</sup> in some works, Daoxuan is not known by that name but as Xuangong 宣公 (literally, ‘the honourable Xuan’), while in others he is respectfully called the Nanshan *dashi* 南山大師 (literally, ‘the great master of Nanshan’), Ximing *lìushi* 西明律師 (literally, ‘the *vinaya* master of Ximing’) or simply Xuan *lìi* 宣律 (literally, ‘Xuan *vinaya*’).

In addition to a large number of works identified through these online searches, I consulted the standard history of the Tang and searched for any mentions of Daoxuan’s alleged hometown and monastery. Moreover, the primary sources described at the start of this study, as well as modern scholarship on Daoxuan, served as further important channels of information through which I was able to identify a number of works that discuss this important Tang monk. However, while many texts that were written after 1900 were consulted, they were treated as secondary sources because this date marks the beginning of the modern era and likewise the starting point of modern scholarship.

Although the primary intentions were to answer a number of crucial questions and identify as many biographical texts as possible, this book should not be viewed as a comprehensive Daoxuan reader, and I do not claim that it covers every aspect of his life and work. Indeed, given Daoxuan’s unparalleled significance in the history of early Chinese Buddhism, I believe that such a task would be beyond the scope of any single volume. Hence, a degree of selectivity in the subjects covered was inevitable. For instance, several previous authors have discussed Daoxuan’s conception of *jieti* 戒體 (literally,

---

<sup>4</sup> SAT is the official abbreviation of the SAT Daizōkyō Text Database: <http://21dzk.l.u-tokyo.ac.jp/SAT/satdb2015.php>.

‘stipulation’, ‘body’). The master himself uses this term in two of his works and indeed goes to great lengths to explain its meaning.<sup>5</sup> Therefore, this is certainly a topic that merits thorough investigation. However, in light of the fact that this book is primarily an exploration of the development of Daoxuan’s life story, I feel that it is not the place for a meticulous etymological discussion, so I respectfully refer readers to the works of others.<sup>6</sup> Similarly, Daoxuan’s role in the establishment and development of the Buddhist collection at the Ximing monastery 西明寺 deserves more attention than I would be able to give it here. Notwithstanding these and other unavoidable omissions, however, I trust that this book will provide a firm foundation for future research into the life and work of Daoxuan.

The preliminary research revealed some 296 primary sources which relate to Daoxuan’s life or work or simply mention him by name. I refer to the thirty texts written by Daoxuan himself as ‘Daoxuan’s works’, and number them from 1 to 30. The remaining 266 are termed ‘Daoxuan-related works’.

---

<sup>5</sup> Daoxuan uses the term *jieti* a total of twenty-nine times in *Sifenlü shanfan buque xingshi chao* 四分律刪繁補缺行事鈔 (*The Amended Guidelines of Sifen Lü for Practical Monastic Practice*; T40.1804; hereafter XSC) and *Sifen lü shan bu sui ji jiemo* 四分律刪補隨機羯磨 (*The Amended Sifen lü Manual for Day-to-Day Monastic Procedures*; T40.1808). Calculation based on research at [http://cbetaonline.dila.edu.tw/zh/T1804\\_001](http://cbetaonline.dila.edu.tw/zh/T1804_001), accessed on 09/11/2018.

<sup>6</sup> Bodiford, William M., ed., *Going Forth. Visions of Buddhist Vinaya. Essays Presented in Honor of Professor Stanley Weinstein* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2015); Groner, Paul. 2012. “Ordination and Precepts in the Platform Sūtra.” In *Readings of the Platform Sūtra*, ed., Morten Schlütter, and Stephen T. Teiser (New York: Columbia University Press), 134–160; Newhall, Thomas, “A Study of the Concept of *Jieti* ‘The Essence of the Precepts’ in Daoxuan’s (596–667) Vinaya Commentaries,” In *Journal of Chinese Buddhist Studies* 27 (2014), 181–208. For more information on the meaning of *jieti*, see Kuiji’s 窺基 (632–682) chapter on the nature (*faxing* 法性) of *jieti* in *Dacheng fayuan yilin zhang* 大乘法苑義林章 (*Chapters on Various Topics of the Teaching of Mahāyāna*; T45.1861), j3.299a12–316c27, a little-cited primary source written by one of the foremost authorities on the subject as well as a contemporary of Daoxuan. See appendix 1 for an outline of the structure of Kuiji’s chapter (in Chinese).

## I.2 Organizing and Classifying the Primary Sources

Each of the primary sources reflects the context in which it was written, specific circumstances that could have a profound influence on the details that were added or deleted as well as the overall impression of Daoxuan himself. Taken together, they constitute an evolving biography that provides a nuanced basis for further exploration of the master's life, achievements and impact on Chinese Buddhism. Furthermore, I have attempted to identify the first appearance of particular elements in Daoxuan's life story with the aim of inspiring future research into why individual authors chose to include or exclude certain details when compiling their accounts. In addition, I hope that this may shed some light on what Kieschnick terms the 'troubling question of the origins of the biographies' in general.<sup>7</sup>

In order to present the 296 primary sources and the information they contain in the clearest possible manner, I have compiled two tables. The 'master table' (Table 1) lists all 296 texts in chronological order, so number 1 is the earliest work and number 296 the most recent. The title of each text is presented in the second column, the author in the third, the year of composition in the fourth and the page and line numbers where Daoxuan is mentioned in the fifth.<sup>8</sup> For simplicity, I have not included either *pinyin* transliterations or English translations in this table; rather, transliterations are provided when a particular work is mentioned in the main text for the first time.

---

<sup>7</sup> John Kieschnick, *The Eminent Monk: Buddhist Ideals in Medieval Chinese Hagiography*, Studies in East Asian Buddhism (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1997), 11.

<sup>8</sup> Special thanks to Martin Lehnert for suggesting this introduction to the table. See appendix 2 for further details of the dates of all 296 texts.

**Table 1: The Master Table**

No.	Title	Author	Year CE	Place of Information
1.	四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔	道宣	626	T40.1804
2.	四分律拾毗尼義鈔	道宣	627	X44.747
3.	四分律刪補隨機羯磨	道宣	c.638	T40.1808
4.	淨心戒觀法	道宣	c.639	T45.1893
5.	四分律比丘尼鈔	道宣	645	X40.724
6.	新刪定四分僧戒本	道宣	647	X39.707
7.	四分律刪補隨機羯磨疏	道宣	648	X41.728
8.	教誠新學比丘行護律儀	道宣	650	T45.1897
9.	四分律比丘含注戒本	道宣	650	T40.1806
10.	四分律比丘含注戒本疏	道宣	650	W62.309–1026/X39.714
11.	四分刪定比丘尼戒本	道宣	650	X40.722
12.	大唐眾經音譯序	道宣	c.650	Z56.1163j1.813b–c15
13.	釋迦方志	道宣	c.658	T51.2088
14.	釋門章服儀	道宣	659	T45.1894
15.	妙法蓮華經弘傳序	道宣	c.659	T9.262j1.1b13–c11
16.	釋門歸敬儀	道宣	661	T45.1896
17.	集古今佛道論衡	道宣	661	T52.2104
18.	師子莊嚴王菩薩請問經序	道宣	663	T14.486j1.697a19–b8
19.	離垢慧菩薩所問禮佛法經序	道宣	663	T14.487j1.698b25–c11
20.	釋迦氏譜	道宣	c.663	T52.2041
21.	廣弘明集	道宣	664	T52.2103
22.	集神州三寶感通錄	道宣	664	T52.2106
23.	道宣律師感通錄	道宣	664	T52.2107
24.	大唐內典錄	道宣	664	T55.2149
25.	續大唐內典錄	道宣	664	T55.2150
26.	續高僧傳	道宣	c.665	T50.2060
27.	關中創立戒壇圖經并序	道宣	667	T45.1892
28.	量處輕重儀	道宣	667	T45.1895
29.	律相感通傳	道宣	667	T45.1898
30.	中天竺舍衛國祇洹寺圖經	道宣	667	T45.1899
31.	衆經目錄	靜泰	c.667	T55.2148j1.181a3
32.	唐西明寺上座道宣律師舍利塔記	郝文會	668	BKCBj7.493a5–6
33.	法苑珠林	道世	668	T53.2122j10.353c22/j100.1023b20
34.	集沙門不應拜俗等事	彥悰	c.668	T52.2108j3/6
35.	大唐西域求法高僧傳	義淨	674	T51.2066j2.9b12/10c08/c13
36.	南海寄歸內法傳	義淨	674	T54.2125j4.233a27
37.	僧羯磨	懷素	c.676	T40.1809j1.511b26–27
38.	古清涼傳	慧祥	c.679	T51.2098j2.1099b6–7

39.	大唐大慈恩寺三藏法師傳	慧立	688	T50.2053j6.253c28–29/ j10.277b27–c18
40.	大周刊定衆經目錄	明佺	695	T55.2153j1.372c29–373a1
41.	弘贊法華傳	惠詳	c.706	T51.2067j8.38c6
42.	四分比丘戒本疏	定賓	c.710	T40.1807j2.476c9 etc.
43.	四分律疏飾宗義記	定賓	c.711	X42.733j2.22c16
44.	四分律行事鈔批	大覺	712	X42.736j1.610b22/j2.630a16
45.	唐長安西明寺塔	蘇頌	716	WYYHj855.4516b20–4518a9
46.	續古今譯經圖記	智昇	730	T55.2152j1.368b18–19
47.	開元釋教錄	智昇	730	T55.2154j8.562a8– 16/j8.561c25/562a8
48.	開元釋教錄略出	智昇	730	T55.2155j4.742b14–15/ 745b18–20 etc.
49.	淨名經關中釋抄	道液	c.760	T85.2778j1.510c21–22/j2.518b21
50.	止觀輔行傳弘決	湛然	c.766	T46.1912j1.142b20/21/ j2.190a7/196c27
51.	法華文句	湛然	c.767	T34.1719j6.268b13/j8.295b29/ j10.350c17/20
52.	唐大和上東征傳	元開	779	D113.120j1.12a6–10
53.	四分律搜玄錄	志鴻	c.779	X41.732j1.833b21/a8/W91 etc.
54.	大方廣佛華嚴經隨疏演義鈔	澄觀	787	T36.1736j76.601b22
55.	大華嚴經略策	澄觀	c.787	T36.1737j1.707a7
56.	大唐貞元續開元釋教錄	圓照	794	T55.2156j2.764c28/j3.769b22–26
57.	法苑義鏡	善珠	797	T71.2317j6.258a2–5
58.	貞元新定釋教目錄	圓照	799	T55.2157j12.859b3/9–10/862a8–27
59.	傳教大師將來台州錄	最澄	805	T55.2159j1.1056a28
60.	傳教大師將來越州錄	最澄	805	T55.2160j1.1059a20/b25–26
61.	北山錄	神清	c.810	T52.2113j9.627c14
62.	釋門自鏡錄	懷信	c.814	T51.2083j1.804b7–c2
63.	中論疏記	安澄	c.814	T65.2255j2.50c22–23
64.	法華傳記	僧祥	c.815	T51.2068j8.83b22
65.	一切經音義	慧琳	817	T54.2128j3.323c15/j7.349a17/ j97.908c29
66.	南山律師讚	唐穆宗	c.824	QTWj68.712a13–15
67.	戒律傳來記	豐安	830	T74.2347j1.4c20
68.	祕密漫荼羅十住心論	空海	830	T77.2425j4.333c14–19
69.	日本國承和五年入唐求法目錄	圓仁	839	T55.2165j1.1075b9/c18–19
70.	常曉和尚請來目錄	常曉	839	T55.2163j1.1069b12
71.	靈巖寺和尚請來法門道具等目錄	圓行	839	T55.2164j1.1073a24
72.	慈覺大師在唐送進錄	圓仁	840	T55.2166j1.1077b18/28
73.	唐宣公律院碣	嚴厚本	841	JSLj10.259.9
74.	唐法寶律師批	法寶	846	X44.747j2.797a2

75.	惠運禪師將來教法目錄	惠運	847	T55.2168Aj1.1089a11
76.	入唐新求聖教目錄	圓仁	847	T55.2167j1.1087a8–9
77.	惠運律師書目錄	惠運	c.847	T55.2168Bj1.1091b18
78.	新羅國寄還書	自相	849	X44.747j2.796c14
79.	寺塔記	段成式	853	T51.2093j1.1023c28–29
80.	福州溫州台州求得經律論疏記 外書等目錄	圓珍	854	T55.2170.1093c28/1094b16/ 1095c8
81.	日本比丘圓珍入唐求法目錄	圓珍	857	T55.2172j1.1100b/1101b
82.	智證大師請來目錄	圓珍	858	T55.2173j1.1103a5–6/1105a25, etc.
83.	酉陽雜俎	段成式	c.860	YYZZj2.19/xj6.260
84.	宣室志	張讀	c.860	XSZ.1040.7–12
85.	定宗論	蓮剛	c.866	T74.2369j1.319c22–23
86.	菩提場經略義釋	圓珍	879	T61.2230j3.543b6
87.	普通授菩薩戒廣釋	安然	882	T74.2381j1.763b16
88.	授決集	圓珍	884	T74.2367j1.281c10
89.	授菩薩戒儀	圓珍	885	T74.2378j1.632a6
90.	佛說觀普賢菩薩行法經記	圓珍	888	T56.2194j2.252c10
91.	開天傳信記	鄭榮	890	KTCX57.9–58.2
92.	四分律鈔簡正記	景霄	895	X43.737j2.29c13–30c2
93.	教時諍	安然	c.902	T75.2395Aj1.358a29
94.	律宗章疏	榮穩	914	T55.2182 j1.1145a19/27/b3/10/13
95.	北夢瑣言	孫光憲	c.944	BMSY(逸文)j4.436
96.	舊唐書	劉昫	945	JTSj46/j47
97.	釋氏六帖	義楚	954	B13.79j11.236a15/j21.442a11/ 443a7/a13
98.	受菩薩戒法	延壽	c.968	X59.1088j1.367a20
99.	妙法蓮華經釋文	中算	976	T56.2189j2.154b21
100.	太平廣記	李昉	978	TPGJj91.j604/j93.614– 623/j393.3138
101.	往生要集	源信	984	T84.2682j3.80c3
102.	宋高僧傳	贊寧	988	T50.2061j14.790b7–791b26
103.	大宋僧史略	贊寧	999	T54.2126j3.249c4
104.	景德傳燈錄	道原	1004	T51.2076j3.219c20
105.	金園集	遵式	1007	X57.950j1.4a11/j3.19b20/c12/ 20a6/22
106.	涅槃玄義發源機要	智圓	1014	T38.1766j4.35c17
107.	南山祖師禮讚文	智圓	1014	X74.1504j1.1079c6
108.	維摩經略疏垂裕記	智圓	1015	T38.1779j2.731c26/j5.769c28/ 779c6/j10.845a11
109.	閑居編	智圓	1016	X56.949j8.878b20/j35.917c1/ j46.935a15
110.	釋氏要覽	道誠	1020	T54.2127j1.275c3/j2.288b7/ j3.298c21

111.	觀無量壽佛經疏妙宗鈔	知禮	1021	T37.1751j6.232a4
112.	首楞嚴義疏注經	子璿	1030	T39.1799j9.952a25
113.	觀音義疏記	遵式	c.1030	T34.1729j4.958c6
114.	熾盛光道場念誦儀	遵式	c.1030	T46.1951j1.979b16
115.	天竺別集	遵式	c.1030	X57.951j1.27a5/j3.48a23
116.	崇文總目	王堯臣	1041	CWZMj4.311.9/314.9/ 317.1–2/322.1
117.	淨心誠觀發真鈔	允堪	1045	X59.1096j1.519a15
118.	四分律隨機羯磨疏正源記	允堪	1051	X40.726j1.786c20
119.	南部新書	錢易	1056	NBXSj2.18
120.	廣清涼傳	延一	1060	T51.2099j3.1118c26–1119a15
121.	新唐書	歐陽修	1060	XTSj59.1525–1528
122.	南山祖師禮讚文	仁岳	c.1060	X74.1505j1.1079c6
123.	南山祖師禮讚文	允堪	c.1060	X74.1506j1.1081b3
124.	衣鉢名義章	允堪	c.1060	X59.1098j1.599c21
125.	傳法正宗論	契嵩	1062	T51.2080j2.783b9
126.	淨土往生傳	戒珠	c.1064	T51.2071j1.109a1
127.	參天台五臺山記	成尋	1073	D115.481j8.161a14–15
128.	汾陽無德禪師語錄	楚圓	1074	T47.1992j3.619c26
129.	鐸津文集	契嵩	1075	T52.2115j14.722a5
130.	四分律行事鈔資持記	元照	c.1075	T40.1805j1.160a14
131.	四分律刪補隨機羯磨疏濟緣記	元照	c.1075	X41.728j1.83c12
132.	佛遺教經論疏節要	淨源	c.1082	T40.1820j1.846c21
133.	四分律含注戒本疏行宗記	元照	1088	W62.309–1026/X39.714
134.	新編諸宗教藏總錄	義天	1090	T55.2184j2.1173b/1174a–b
135.	三論玄疏文義要	珍海	1091	T70.2299j1.204b8–16
136.	東域傳燈目錄	永超	1094	T55.2183j1.1153b/1154c/ 1155b/1156a
137.	釋門章服儀應法記	元照	1095	X59.1097j1.581b18
138.	律宗新學名句	懷顯	1098	X59.1107j3.707a19
139.	芝園遺編	元照	c.1098	X59.1104j3.648c7
140.	四分刪定比丘尼戒本序	元照	1099	X40.722j1.669a5
141.	大悲成道傳贊	蔣之奇	1100	LZJSj7.151a21–153b16
142.	悉曇要訣	明覺	1101	T84.2706j3.537.26
143.	觀無量壽佛經義疏	元照	c.1107	T37.1754j1.280c24
144.	佛說阿彌陀經義疏	元照	c.1107	T37.1761j1.358c22
145.	校勘義鈔序	元照	c.1107	X44.747j1.753a6–754a15
146.	芝園集	元照	c.1107	X59.1105j2.662b8
147.	佛果圓悟禪師碧巖錄	克勤	1125	T48.2003j10.219b9
148.	石門文字禪	德洪覺範	c.1128	J23B135j19.667c8–14/ j26.705a7–8/706a29–b3
149.	類說	曾慥	1136	LSj6.118

150.	釋門歸敬儀通真記	了然	c.1141	X59.1095j1.450c22–23
151.	釋門歸敬儀護法記	彥起	1150	X59.1094j1.432a6
152.	(翻刻戒壇圖經後序)	惟定	1152	T45.1892.819a12
153.	翻譯名義集	法雲	1157	T54.2131j1.174c16
154.	成唯識論本文抄		c.1160	T65.2262j39.725c19
155.	隆興佛教編年通論	祖琇	1163	X75.1512j13.175a18
156.	護法論	張商英	1171	T52.2114j1.645a19–26
157.	宣首座真贊(東牟集)	王洋	1174	DMJj13.506b5–6
158.	通志二十略	鄭樵	c.1179	TZL1640–1641
159.	郡齋讀書志	晁公武	c.1187	QZDSj9.391–392
160.	興禪護國論	榮西	c.1191	T80.2543j2.8b1
161.	安養抄	良慶	c.1191	T84.2686j5.175a8
162.	遂初堂書目	尤袤	c.1194	SCTSM2043.476b17
163.	大日經住心品疏私記	濟暹	1197	T58.2215j8.743a21
164.	法華經顯應錄	宗曉	1198	X78.1540j1.27b19
165.	樂邦文類	宗曉	1200	T47.1969Aj2.169b16
166.	嘉泰吳興志	李景和	1201	JTWXj17.4832a21–b3
167.	唯識論同學鈔	良算	1202	T66.2263j63.555a9
168.	四明尊者教行錄	宗曉	1202	T49.1937j7.923a18/929b8
169.	天台九祖傳	士衡	1208	T51.2069j1.99c22
170.	律宗問答	俊芻	c.1212	X59.1108j1.707c9/708b7
171.	萬松老人評唱天童覺和尚 頌古從容庵錄	行秀	1224	T48.2004j4.261c14–15
172.	如淨和尚語錄	文素	1229	T48.2002Aj2.131b7–10
173.	唐崇聖寺佛牙寶塔碑	陳思	1232	BKCBj7.489b3–9
174.	南山律師贊(攻媿集)	樓鑰	c.1235	GKJj81.281a17–b2
175.	淨土三部經音義集	信瑞	1236	T57.2207j1.396c27/j2.400b16
176.	釋門正統	宗鑑	1237	X75.1513j8.361b14
177.	菩薩戒通別二受鈔	覺盛	1238	T74.2354j1.57b5
178.	終南家業	守一	1242	X59.1109j1.718b21
179.	西方指南鈔	親鸞	1257	T83.2674j1.860b7/c26
180.	佛祖統紀	志磐	1269	T49.2035j29.296c16–297b20
181.	釋氏通鑑	本覺	1270	X76.1516j8.89c14
182.	觀心本尊抄	日蓮	1273	T84.2692j1.274b24
183.	法華取要抄	日蓮	1274	T84.2693j1.278a29
184.	大日經疏指心鈔	賴瑜	1274	T59.2217j7b25
185.	黑谷上人語燈錄	源空	1274	T83.2611j8.150a24
186.	諸宗經疏目錄	源空	c.1274	D1.90j1.6b5
187.	觀經疏傳通記	良忠	1275	T57.2209j1.500a28
188.	撰時抄	日蓮	1275	T84.2690j1.240b20
189.	諸宗教理同異釋	賴瑜	1276	T79.2528j1.56a24

190.	報恩抄	日蓮	1276	T84.2691j1.258c10–11
191.	三論玄義檢幽集	澄禪	1280	T70.2300j4.425a1
192.	佛光國師語錄	子元祖元	1285	T80.2549j6.190c20–191b2
193.	律宗行事目心鈔	忍仙	1286	T74.2359j1.112c1/114c20/115b22
194.	菩薩戒綱要鈔		c.1290	T74.2358Bj1.98c6–7/99b14–15
195.	類編長安志	駱天驥	1296	LBCAZj9.288
196.	五教章通路記	凝然	1300	T72.2339j11.365c26
197.	三國遺事	一然	c.1302	T49.2039j3.993b29–c11
198.	秘鈔問答	賴瑜	1303	T79.2536j12.494c17
199.	廬山蓮宗寶鑑	普度	1305	T47.1973j2.316c13
200.	律宗綱要	凝然	1306	T74.2348j1.8b28–c8/j2.16b29–c19
201.	菩薩戒問答洞義鈔	英心	1308	T74.2358Aj1.87c9/88b12/91a20/92a2
202.	三國佛法傳通緣起	凝然	1311	D101.102j1.6a13/104j1.8a13/122j3.26a2–3
203.	華嚴五教章問答抄	審乘	1313	T72.2340j2.641b29–c1
204.	梵網戒本疏日珠鈔	凝然	1318	T62.2247j3.21a9
205.	文獻通考	馬端臨	c.1318	WXTKj227.1820c22/1822b22/c8
206.	溪嵐拾葉集	光宗	1319	T76.2410j100.836c4–29
207.	釋摩訶衍論勘注	賴寶	1320	T69.2290j4.636a19
208.	唐大和上東征傳	賢位	1322	D113.140j2.11b9–11/145j2b6
209.	華嚴五教章見聞鈔	靈波	1334	T73.2342j3.104b21
210.	歷朝釋氏資鑑	熙仲	1336	X76.1517j6.188b7
211.	菩薩圓頓授戒灌頂記	惟賢	1339	T74.2383j1.794a9
212.	佛祖歷代通載	念常	1341	T49.2036j12.581c26
213.	宋史	脫脫	1345	SSYj205.5185/5186
214.	三論玄義鈔	貞海	c.1345	T70.2301j1.503c27/505b12/507b1–2
215.	寶冊鈔	果寶	1347	T77.2453j8.826c18
216.	資行鈔	照遠	1349	T62.2248j1.267a29
217.	釋氏稽古略	覺岸	1354	T49.2037j3.818a9–b14
218.	新學行要鈔	仁空	1356	T74.2382j1.758c6/23/786a15
219.	理趣釋祕要鈔	果寶	1356	T61.2241j7.703c5
220.	座右鈔	實道惠仁	1358	T83.2641j1.528a19–20/529a15–16
221.	新修科分六學僧傳	曇噩	1366	X77.1522j4.98c15–99b4
222.	重刊禪林僧寶傳序	戴良	1373	X79.1560j1.490a6
223.	華嚴演義鈔纂釋	湛叡	1375	T57.2205j6.87a19/j7.96b27/c23/27
224.	永源寂室和尚語錄	寂室玄光	1377	T81.2564j2.126c2–3
225.	四度授法日記	嚴豪	1387	T77.2413j2.115c22
226.	義堂和尚語錄	義堂周信	1387	T80.2556j2.519a15–b1
227.	智覺普明國師語錄	春屋妙葩	1404	T80.2560j6.691b6
228.	大日經疏鈔	宥快	c.1416	T60.2218j8.43a28/j53.244c9

229.	神僧傳		1417	T50.2064j6.988c11–989a18
230.	緇門警訓	如晉	1470	T48.2023j4.1063b13–14
231.	三論名教抄	珍海	1481	T70.2306j14.819a5
232.	見桃錄	大休宗林	c.1516	T81.2572j2.436b12
233.	唯識論聞書	光胤	1540	T66.2264j25.895a29
234.	金剛經科儀會要註解	覺連	1551	W92.257b9–258b11/ X24.467j1.661b9–c23
235.	諸回向清規	天倫楓隱	1558	T81.2578j5.686b29
236.	法華開示抄	貞慶	1559	T56.2195j19.406b13/j24.447b20
237.	八十八祖道影傳贊	德清	1584	X86.1608j1.615b6/j2.631b3–23
238.	清涼山志	鎮澄	1596	QLSZj1.15.12–16.2/ j3.94.11–12/997–10
239.	天台山方外志	傳燈	1601	TTSZj1.29.6/j25.581.3
240.	阿育王山志	郭子章	1612	YWSZj1.404a17–405b10/j5.307.10
241.	阿育王山志序	徐時進	1618	YWSZj1.50.2
242.	徑山志	宋奎光	1624	JSZj1.99.6–7/
243.	佛祖綱目	朱時恩	1631	X85.1594j29.607a22/j30.610b6
244.	華嚴五教章不審	實英	1637	T73.2343j4.197a25/j12.242a28
245.	宗要柏原案立	貞舜	1645	T74.2374j2.458c18–459b22
246.	四分戒本約義	元賢	1646	X40.718j1.305c17
247.	毗尼止持會集	讀體	1649	X39.709j1.328b17
248.	重治毗尼事義集要	智旭	1650	X40.719j1.344b19/21
249.	行林抄	靜然	1653	T76.2409j71.454b8
250.	高僧摘要	徐昌治	1654	X87.1626j4.342b15
251.	唯識義私記	真興	1658	T71.2319j2.316a10
252.	歷朝法華持驗紀	周克復	1659	X78.1541j1.74c2
253.	毗尼作持續釋	讀體	1665	X41.730j1.347b23/ 354a17–b7/355b18–c20
254.	釋門章服儀序	不可思議	1665	T45.1894j1.834a20
255.	祇洹圖經跋	乘春	1681	T45.1899j2.896a19/b16
256.	祇洹圖經序	宗覺	1681	T45.1899j1.882b16/17/19
257.	六道集	弘贊	1682	X88.1645j1.115b17–117b12
258.	大乘圓戒顯正論	宗覺	1684	T74.2360j1.130a20
259.	律苑僧寶傳	慧堅	1687	D105.173j5.49a5–176j5.52b14
260.	毗尼關要	德基	1688	X40.720j1.485a20/b12/ 486b23/492c1/494a6
261.	新刻量處輕重儀序	慈光慧門	1688	T45.1896j1.839a21
262.	新刻輕重儀後序	實長春	1688	T45.1896j1.854b12/15–16
263.	雞足山志	范承勳	1692	JZSZj1.38.1
264.	佛像幖幟義箋注	義海	1695	D73.1j1.1a5/43j2.43a4
265.	唐招提寺戒壇別受戒式	惠光	1698	T74.2351j1.34a7/ 35a22–23/37a1/39a24/c6

266.	器朴論	託何	1706	T84.2681j3.32a11
267.	華嚴五教章匡眞鈔	鳳潭	1707	T73.2344j2.347c15–17
268.	大日經疏演奧鈔	果寶	1712	T59.2216j4.41a8
269.	重刻律相感通傳	慧淑	1718	T45.1898j1.874a19
270.	佛門衣服正儀編	鳳潭	1726	D73.146j1.4a16–149j1.7b4
271.	僧服正檢	光國	1730	D73.234j1.4a17
272.	山西通志		1734	SSXTZj160.83.2–8
273.	陝西通志		1735	SSTZj65.36.2–37.4
274.	阿毘達磨俱舍論指要鈔	湛慧	c.1747	T63.2250j1.812a9–17
275.	成唯識論述記集成編	湛慧	c.1747	T67.2266j1.5b22
276.	阿育王志續	琬荃	1757	YWZXj15.877.4
277.	六物辨	普寂	c.1763	D73.499j1.1a11/500j1.2b10/ 505j1.7a17
278.	新刻排科夾註戒本疏記序	即禪	1764	W62.309b9
279.	釋氏法衣訓	慈方	1768	D73.395j1.15b10/11/396j116a11
280.	繒衣光儀	道光	1771	D73.409j1.1a3/410j1.2a11/ 415j1.7b3/8a15
281.	新刻排科夾註戒本疏記序	清月	1773	W62.310b10
282.	大乘比丘十八物圖	敬光	1773	D73.453j1.6b2 /460j1.8b3
283.	新刻排科夾註戒本疏記序	玉線	1773	W62.311a10
284.	大乘法苑義林章師子吼鈔	基辨	1776	T71.2323j2.500a7
285.	阿毘達磨俱舍論法義	快道	1781	T64.2251j1.9c6
286.	攝大乘論釋略疏	普寂	c.1781	T68.2269j4.179c19
287.	西山復古篇	俊鳳妙瑞	1784	T83.2645j1.576c9
288.	因明大疏融貫鈔	基辨	1790	T69.2272j1.6c26
289.	長興縣志	錢大昕	1805	CXXZj25.1649.7–1651.3
290.	全唐文	董誥	1814	QTWj909.9483a–9501b
291.	心要鈔	貞慶	1815	T71.2311j1.60a23
292.	十八種物便蒙鈔	義聞	1819	D73.470j1.4a4
293.	翻刻教誠律儀敘	圓海	1858	T45.1897j1.869a6
294.	圓戒指掌	敬光	1860	T74.2384j1.803a26/b2/c3/ j2.807a27
295.	唐文拾遺	陸心源	1869	TWSYj49.10929a1–10931a7
296.	湖州府志	宋源瀚	1874	HZFZj91.426a5–11

Table 2 shows that all 296 texts were categorized as either ‘Buddhist’ or ‘non-Buddhist’ sources. In addition to appearing in Buddhist canonical works, such as the *Taishō* collection and *Xinbian wan xu zang jing* 新編卍續藏經 (*The New Edition of the Continued Wan Canon*),<sup>9</sup> the great majority of the texts in the former group were written by Buddhists. Hence, unsurprisingly, they tend to present Daoxuan in a rather different light than the non-Buddhist texts.

**Table 2: Classification of the Sources**

Buddhist sources	1. Biography	General
		Specific
	2. Catalogue	Chinese
		Japanese
	3. Commentary	<i>Vinaya</i>
		Non- <i>vinaya</i>
	4. <i>Fayuan zhulin</i>	
	5. Daoxuan’s own works	
Non-Buddhist sources	1. Standard histories	
	2. Other texts	

There are five main subdivisions within the ‘Buddhist’ category, the first of which is ‘Biography’, which in turn is divided into ‘General’ and ‘Specific’ categories. All of the texts in the ‘Biography’ category share certain common features of Buddhist biographies that Kieschnick has correctly identified: ‘very few of the accounts in the Biographies<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Reprint of *Dainihon zokuzōkyō*, 150 vols (Taipei: Xinwenfeng, 1986–1970). An online version of this collection compiled by the Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association (CBETA) was also consulted. Available at: <http://tripitaka.cbeta.org/X>. Throughout this study, when a text from the *Xinbian wan xu zang jing* is cited, the printed version (abbreviated as W) is invariably given priority over the online version (abbreviated as X). That is to say, extracts for translation are all taken from the printed version, but online references are also provided for the convenience of the reader. In addition, any differences between the two versions have been noted. For instance, the title of one text (1551, 233) is *Jinggang jing ke yi hui yao zhu jie* 金剛經科儀會要註解 in the printed version but *Xiao shi Jinggang jing ke yi hui yao zhu jie* 銷釋金剛經科儀會要註解 in the online version. For a study on this text and especially on its significance in Azhali form of Buddhist teaching in Yunnan China see Hou Chong 侯冲, *Yunnan Azhalijiao yanjiu* 云南阿咤力教研究 (Beijing: Zhongguo shuji chubanshe, 2007), 117–119.

<sup>10</sup> The biographies referred to here are the *Liang gaoseng zhuan* (T50.2049), the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* (T50.2060) and the *Song gaoseng zhuan* (T50.2061).

were composed by the compilers of the three collections; most are instead taken directly, word-for-word, or with additions and deletions, from sources available to them'.<sup>11</sup> However, they are not all identical. Featuring prominently in the ‘General’ category are: SGSZ (988, number in the master table 102),<sup>12</sup> *Fozu tongji* 佛祖統計 (1269, 180; hereafter FZTJ)<sup>13</sup> and *Gaozeng zhaiyao* 高僧摘要 (1654, 250; hereafter GSZY).<sup>14</sup> All three of these texts provide fairly comprehensive but general accounts of Daoxuan’s life and work. In contrast, the ‘Specific’ texts focus on a particular aspect of the master’s life, such as his connection with a named site, *sūtra* or fellow master. Three important works in this category are: *Gu Qingliang zhuan* 古清涼傳 (c. 679, 38),<sup>15</sup> *Da Tang da Ci’en sanzang fashi zhuan* 大唐慈恩三藏法師傳 (688, 39; hereafter CESZ)<sup>16</sup> and *Fahuajing xianying lu* 法華經顯應錄 (1198, 194).<sup>17</sup>

The second main Buddhist subdivision is ‘Catalogue’. As the title suggests, each text in this group features a list of works by Daoxuan. These catalogues are further divided into Chinese and Japanese texts, such as *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄 (730, 47; hereafter KYL)<sup>18</sup> and *Ru Tang xinqiu shengjiao mulu* 入唐新求聖教目錄 (847, 76),<sup>19</sup> respectively. It was decided to group these works in this way because all the Chinese texts follow a similar pattern, as do all the Japanese texts. For example, in the Chinese catalogues, the list of Daoxuan’s works tends to be preceded by a brief biographical

<sup>11</sup> Kieschnick, *The Eminent Monk*, 10. For more information on the sources of Buddhist biography, see D.C. Twitchett, ‘Chinese Biographical Writing’, in W.G. Beasley and E.G. Pulleyblank (eds), *Historians of China and Japan* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), 95–114; Arthur F. Wright, ‘Biography and Hagiography: Hui-chiao’s Lives of Eminent Monks’, in Robert M. Somer (ed.), *Studies in Chinese Buddhism* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1990), 73–172; Phyllis Granoff and Koichi Shinohara, *Monks and Magicians: Religious Biographies in Asia* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1994); John Lagerwey, ‘Dingguang Gufo: Oral and Written Sources in the Study of a Saint’, *Cahiers d’Extrême-Asie*, vol. 10 (1998), 77–129. Special thanks to Ester Bianchi for identifying these works and explaining their significance.

<sup>12</sup> The bracketed information after the title of a Daoxuan-related work gives the year of composition followed by the number of the text in Table 1.

<sup>13</sup> *Fozu tongji* (*The Chronicle of the Buddha and the Patriarchs*; T49.2035).

<sup>14</sup> *Gaoseng zhaiyao* (*A Digest of the Life Stories of the Eminent Monks*; X87.1626).

<sup>15</sup> *Gu Qingliang zhuan* (*The Old Record of Qingliang Mountain*; T51.2098).

<sup>16</sup> *Da Tang da Ci’en sanzang fashi zhuan* (*The Biography of the Tripitaka Master of the Great Ci’en Monastery of the Great Tang*; T50.2053). For a translation of the text see Huili, *Da Tang da Ci’en sanzang fashi zhuan*, trans. Li Rongxi (New York: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 1995).

<sup>17</sup> *Fahuajing xianying lu* (*The Collected Records of the Manifestation of the Power of the Fahuajing*; X78.1540).

<sup>18</sup> *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* (*The Kaiyuan Buddhist Catalogue*; T55.2154).

<sup>19</sup> *Ni Tō shingu shōgyō mokuroku* (*The Catalogue of the Newly Acquired Sacred Buddhist Books from the Tang*; T55.2167). For a study on Japanese student monk in China, especially their activities pertaining study and collecting of *vinaya* texts during the early Tang, see Marcus Bingenheimer, “A Biographical Dictionary of the Japanese Student-monks of the Seventh and Early Eighth Centuries: Their Travels to China and Their Role in the Transmission of Buddhism,” in *Buddhismus-studien* 仏教研究 4 (2001): 59–61.

introduction, whereas the Japanese works provide no such introduction. Moreover, grouping all the Japanese catalogues in a single subcategory helps to highlight the popularity of Daoxuan's writing, because at least one of his works features in each and every list of Chinese-composed *vinaya* commentaries that have made their way to Japan. The same cannot be said for any other Tang-period Chinese *vinaya* master.

The third main Buddhist subdivision is 'Commentary', which in turn is divided into *vinaya* and non-*vinaya* works. These texts are distinguishable by the manner in which Daoxuan is presented as well as subject matter: in general, he is highly acclaimed in the *vinaya* commentaries, whereas the non-*vinaya* commentaries often portray him as a figure of secondary importance. For example, *Sifenlüchao jianzheng ji* 四分律鈔簡正記 (895, 92; hereafter JZJ)<sup>20</sup> hails Daoxuan as the leading *vinaya* master of all time, while *Kanjin honzon shō* 觀心本尊抄 (1273, 182)<sup>21</sup> suggests that he was subordinate to another – more powerful – monk who was not a *vinaya* master.

The fourth and the fifth major subdivisions in the Buddhist category are: '*Fayuan zhulin*' 法苑珠林 (668, 33; hereafter FYZL)<sup>22</sup> and 'Daoxuan's own works'. The final subcategory is clearly justified because, taken together, these texts provide vivid insight into how Daoxuan viewed his life and work. Meanwhile, *Fayuan zhulin* merits its own subcategory for two reasons: first, the encyclopedic nature of the text means it does not fit neatly into any other subcategory; second, and more importantly, this work is unique among all 296 sources as the author describes his personal relationship with Daoxuan.

The second major category – 'Non-Buddhist sources' – is much more straightforward as there are only two subdivisions: 'Standard histories' (*zhengshi* 正史),<sup>23</sup> such as *Jiu Tangshu* 舊唐書 (945, 96; hereafter JTS)<sup>24</sup> and *Xin Tangshu* 新唐書 (1060,

<sup>20</sup> *Sifenlüchao jianzheng ji* (A Collection of Some Fine Comments from the Sub-commentaries of the Xingshi chao of Sifen lü; X43.737).

<sup>21</sup> *Guanxin benzun chao* (The Ultimate Sacred Place for the Cultivation of the Mind; T84.2692), j1.274b27-28: *Lizong Daoxuan deng chu cun fanni hou yi xiang gui fu ye* 律宗道宣等初存反逆後一向歸伏也 ('Monks, such as Daoxuan of the Vinaya School, were initially disobedient, but now they are all surrendered at the power of [the Vajrayāna master]').

<sup>22</sup> *Fayuan zhulin* (The Forest of Jewels in the Garden of the Dharma; T53.2122).

<sup>23</sup> The definition of *zhengshi*, the translations of their titles and the presentation or publication date are taken from Endymion Porter Wilkinson, *Chinese History: A New Manual* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2013) unless specified otherwise.

<sup>24</sup> Liu Xu 劉昫, *Jiu Tangshu*, 16 vols. (*Old History of the Tang*; 945 CE; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1975).

121; hereafter XTS);<sup>25</sup> and ‘Other texts’, such as *Youyang zazu* 西陽雜俎 (c.860, 83; hereafter YYZZ)<sup>26</sup> and *Kaitian chuanxing ji* 開天傳信記 (890, 91; hereafter KTCX).<sup>27</sup> All of the standard histories, without exception, merely list Daoxuan’s works, whereas the other texts are more biographical in nature.

---

<sup>25</sup> Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修 and Song Qi 宋祁, *Xin Tangshu*, 20 vols. (*New History of the Tang*; 1060 CE; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1975).

<sup>26</sup> Duan Chengshi 段成式, *Youyang zazu* (*Miscellaneous Morsels from Youyang*; 860 CE; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1981).

<sup>27</sup> Zheng Qi 鄭綮, *Kaitian chuanxing ji* (*Record of the Stories of the Kaiyuan and the Tianbao Eras*), in Ding Ruming 丁如明 ed, *The Kaiyuan tianbao yishi shi zhong* 開元天寶遺事十種 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1985), 49–63.

**This page contains no page number and is intentionally left blank**

# The Life of Daoxuan

## Part II

### According to Others

#### II.1 Introduction

Having explained how the sources were identified, classified and organized, we may now turn to the first of the three main parts of this study: other authors' accounts of the life and work of the *vinaya* master Daoxuan (numbers 31 to 296 in Table 1). As mentioned in the Introduction, I term these texts 'Daoxuan-related works'.

The very first mention of Daoxuan by another author appears in *Zhong jing mu lu* 衆經目錄 (*The Catalogue of the Sūtras*; T55.2148), which Jingtai 靜泰 (?-?) compiled around 667 CE (i.e. roughly one year before Daoshi wrote *Fayuan zhulin*). The passage in question reads:

[At a certain time] in the Xianqing era [656–661], the royal-sponsored collection of Buddhist scriptures was founded. [Daoxuan] endeavoured to group and categorise the texts and all of the texts are now clearly catalogued and deposited [as a result of his efforts]. The *vinaya* master Daoxuan wrote a foreword in the catalogue emphasizing that [his grouping of the texts] was done in such a way that previous [cataloguing] procedures were duly respected. Furthermore, [he] introduced, in addition to the three categories [that were used in earlier catalogues, a new group that he termed] *zazang* – the Miscellaneous Collection. The texts [in this group] are books such as *Fayuan*, *Faji*, *Gaoseng*, *Sengshi* and the like. [According to Daoxuan, he introduced this category] because [these texts] all help to present the Buddha-dharma in a positive light, so they merit allocation [to a new, specific group].

顯慶年際，西明寺成御造藏經，更令隱鍊區格。盡爾，無所間然。律師道宣又為錄序。殷因夏禮，無革前修。於三例外，附申雜藏，即法苑、法集、高僧、僧史之流是也。頗以毘贊有功，故載之云爾。<sup>28</sup>

As this extract demonstrates, Jingtai's sole interest in Daoxuan related to the latter's role in assembling and cataloguing the collection of scriptures at Ximing monastery. Unfortunately, as mentioned earlier, space restrictions mean that I am unable to explore this aspect of the master's life in further detail.<sup>29</sup>

Daoxuan was also mentioned on a stone inscription by Hao Wenhui 郝文會,<sup>30</sup> dated 668 CE: *Tang Ximing si shangzuo Daoxuan lüshi sheli ta ji* 唐西明寺上座道宣律師舍利塔記 (*Inscription of the Sarira Stupa of the Shangzuo of the Ximing Monastery the Vinaya Master Daoxuan of the Tang*).<sup>31</sup> However, only the title of this inscription has been preserved, and this, in itself, contributes little to the current investigation. Therefore, I believe it is reasonable to treat *Fayuan zhulin* as the first significant account of Daoxuan's life and work.

*Fayuan zhulin* (number 33 in Table 1) provides the only first-hand – as well as the first meaningful – description of Daoxuan in the canon. Given its unique status as a first-hand account, the whole of the second section (II.2) is devoted to this text.

Although there are considerable differences among the remaining works (numbers 34–296), they may be categorized into three distinct groups on the basis of their shared characteristics (sections II.3– II.5, below). First, all of the texts written between 674 and 858 CE (numbers 35–82 in Table 1) provide very similar accounts of Daoxuan's life. Moreover, almost all of their accounts of Daoxuan can be traced back to *Fayuan zhulin*. In

<sup>28</sup> T55.2148j1.181a1–5. Please note that I added all of the punctuation marks in the Chinese extracts, and these do not necessarily correspond precisely with the punctuation in the English translations. Furthermore, no indentation is made to the Chinese passages throughout this study.

<sup>29</sup> For a study on Jingtai's *Zhong jing mu lu* and an alternative translation of part of the extract see Stefano Zucchetti, 'Zhongjing mulu 眾經目錄 – The Catalog of All Canonical Scriptures', in Claudia Wenzel and Sun Hua (eds.), *Zhongguo fojiao shijing* 中國佛教石經 – Buddhist Stone Sutras in China – Sichuan Province, volume 3 *Wofoyuan Section C*. (Wiesbade: Harrassowitz Verlag – Hangzhou: China Academy of Arts Press, 2016), 65–96. Daoxuan uses the word *pizan* a number of times and the only occasion he uses it to comment his own work is found in his *Da Tang neidian lu* 大唐內典錄 (*The Buddhist Catalogue of the Great Tang*; T55.2149), j5.282b9. More on *pizan* see Zucchetti, 'Zhongjing mulu', n. 463. Special thanks to Stefano Zucchetti for pointing out the unique significance attached to Jingtai's account on Daoxuan and generously sending me the relevant materials. For a study on Buddhist catalogues, especially those compiled during the Tang era, see Jan Nattier, A Guide to the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations: Texts from the Eastern Han 東漢 and Three Kingdoms 三國 Periods (Tokyo: Soka University, 2008), 15–16, 21–23, 59–61.

<sup>30</sup> I have not been able to find any further information on Hao Wenhui.

<sup>31</sup> *Baoke Congbian* 寶刻叢編 in *Lidai Beizhi Congshu* 歷代碑誌叢書. Nanjing: Jiangshu guji chubanshe, 1998, j7.493a5–6.

light of this consistent narrative, which endured over almost two centuries, I have labelled this the era of ‘Stable Information’ (section II.3).

The next shared characteristic is evident in works written between *c.*860 and 984 CE (numbers 83–101 in Table 1). Between them, these texts introduced a host of new details to the life story of Daoxuan, so I have titled this period ‘A Flood of Information’ (section II.4). Finally, works that were written between 988 and 1874 (numbers 102–296 in Table 1) merely tended to collate information that was introduced in earlier texts; they very rarely provide any additional biographical details relating to Daoxuan. Hence, I have termed this period ‘Summarizing the Information’ (section II.5).

To summarize, all of the Daoxuan-related works have been grouped into four eras. The first of these comprises just one year and one text (668, number 33); the second spans 674 to 858 and includes forty-eight works (numbers 34–82); the third stretches from *c.*860 to 984 and features nineteen texts (numbers 83–101); and the final period encompasses most of the next nine centuries (988–1874) and 194 works that mention Daoxuan (numbers 102–296).

## II.2 First-hand Information

As mentioned above, we begin with one of the earliest extant accounts of Daoxuan, which appears in Daoshi's 100-scroll Buddhist encyclopaedia entitled *Fayuan zhulin* (668, 33).<sup>32</sup>

His account reads as follows:

The *vinaya* master<sup>33</sup> Daoxuan of the Ximing monastery<sup>34</sup> of Chang'an. [His] moral stature [is so great that he is like] a mirror [against which] other

---

<sup>32</sup> According to his entry in the SGSZ (T50.2061j4.726c7–727a3), Daoshi worked alongside Daoxuan to disseminate the *vinayas* and encourage others to study them. It provides no date of birth or death, but three later biographies suggest that he passed away in the first year of the Hongdao era 弘道 (683) or the second year of the Yongchun era 永淳 (also 683): *Longxing fojiao biannian tonglun* 隆興佛教編年通論 (*A General Annal of Buddhism Compiled in the Longxing Era*; 1163, 155; hereafter LXBN), X75.1512j14.177c10–13; *Fozu lidai tongzai* 佛祖歷代通載 (*A General Record of the Buddha and the Patriarchs*; 1341, 212; hereafter FZTZ), T49.2036j12.583c11–15; and *Shishi jigu lue* 穩氏稽古略 (*The Gist of the Study of the History of Buddhism*; 1354, 210; hereafter SSJG), T49.2037j3.819c4–5. *Fozu tongji* 佛祖統紀 (*The Chronicle of the Buddhas and the Patriarchs*; 1269, 180), T49.2035j39.369b19, also links Daoshi to the second year of the Yongchun era, but the text is very unclear as it simply reads: ‘er’nian Ximing si shamen Daoshi 二年西明寺沙門道世 (the second year, the monk Daoshi of the Ximing monastery)’. Daoxuan himself mentions Daoshi four times in three of his works: *Guang hongming ji* 廣弘明集 (*The Extended Collection [of Events and Stories] to Help the Spread [of the Buddha-Dharma]*; 664, 20; hereafter GHMJ), T52.2103j21.246c4; *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* 集神州三寶感通錄 (*The Collection of Stories of the Sympathetic Resonance of Shengzhou*; 664, 21; hereafter JGTL), T52.2106j1.435a17–18; and *Da Tang neidian lu* 大唐內典錄 (*The Buddhist Catalogue of the Great Tang*; 664, 23; hereafter NDL), T55.2149j5.283c8/j10.332c16. None of these includes any biographical information on Daoshi. However, we know that Daoshi became a monk at a very young age and that he ‘was a fellow student monk (of Daoxuan) and (they) received full ordination under the same master on the same day’ (*Lüshi shi yu tongxue sheng tan zhi ti tong shi shouye* 律師是余同學昇壇之日同師受業 FYZL, T53.2122j10.354b16–17). All of the the *vinaya* texts agree that the minimum age for full ordination is twenty (e.g. T22.1421j17.115b27/1425j19.378b4/1428j17.679c26 and T23.1435j21.156a7). However, even with the benefit of this information, it is impossible to know precisely when Daoshi was born. For more information on *Fayuan zhulin*, see, among others, S. F. Teiser, ‘T’ang Buddhist Encyclopedias: An Introduction to Fa-Yüan Chu-Lin and Chu-Ching Yao-Chi’, *Tang Studies*, vol. 3 (1985), 109–128; Wu Fuxiu 吳福秀, ‘《法苑珠林》分类思想研究’ (Ph.D. diss., Huazhong Normal University 华中师范大学, 2009); Li Huawei 李华伟, ‘《法苑珠林》研究—晋唐佛教的文化整合’ (Ph.D. diss., University of Nankai 南開大學, 2014), which also contains a brief account of the life of Daoshi at 8–10; and Alexander Ong Hsu, ‘Practices of Scriptural Economy: Compiling and Copying a Seventh-Century Chinese Buddhist Anthology’ (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 2018).

monastics [should measure their own behaviour. His] conduct is outstanding, [even among] the most serious monks. [Daoxuan] continued to endure the hardship of austerity until the very end of his life. [He was] fortunate to receive guidance from a teacher at a very young age. Over the fifty years [of his career, Daoxuan] undertook extensive journeys to search for the Path. [It was his] life's ambition to establish [the Buddha-dharma]; wherever something was worth seeing [he would record it and use it to] complement [the establishment of] the Buddha-dharma. [He] collected stories of the outstanding example and other beautiful Buddhist records [of the monastics] and compiled [them into texts that total] over one hundred scrolls [in length]. Indeed, gathering these high moral models was done with a profound purpose.

---

<sup>33</sup> *Lüshi* 律師 is generally rendered as ‘*vinaya* master’. However, no definition of the term is given in any of the *vinaya* texts. Throughout this book, when I speak of the *vinaya* texts, I mean the four texts that Daoxuan consulted in the course of his work: the *Sarvāstivāda vinaya*, *Shisong lü* 十誦律 (404 CE, T23.1425; hereafter SSL); the *Dharmaguptaka vinaya*, *Sifen lü* 四分律 (408 CE, T22.1428; hereafter SFL); the *Mahāsāṃghika vinaya*, *Mohe Sengqi lü* 摩訶僧祇律 (418 CE, T22.1425; hereafter SQL); and the *Mahīśāsaka vinaya*, *Wufen lü* 五分律 (424 CE, T22.1421; hereafter WFL). According to the *Samantapāśādikā*, *Shanjianlù Piposha* 善見律毗婆沙, T24.1462j6.716c6–10, one of the earliest *vinaya* commentaries and one to which Daoxuan frequently refers, a Buddhist monk may be called a *lüshi* when he is able to: recite an entire *vinaya* text fluently (presumably the one with which he is ordained), fully understand its meaning and answer in accordance with the spirit of the *vinaya* text whenever he is questioned; memorize the entire *vinaya* text; and demonstrate that he has learned the *vinaya* from a master who is the latest in a line of masters that may be traced all the way back to the Buddha. The *Samantapāśādikā* was translated in the sixth year of Yongming era 永明: that is, 488 CE. (S.v. ‘Samghabhadra’ 僧伽跋陀羅 on the Buddhist Studies Person Authority Database 人名規範檢索 (online Beta Version; hereafter BPAD) gives the year of translation as the seventh year of Yongming (489), but this is likely an error. See evidence at T49.2034j11c2–3.) In this study, the Sanskrit and the Japanese spellings of authors’ names and *Taishō* text titles are taken from *Hōbōgirin* 法寶義林 (Tokyo: Imprimerie Shōwa kōgyō shashin insatsusha, 1978) unless specified otherwise.

<sup>34</sup> A number of texts mention the building of the Ximing monastery and invariably state that it was constructed ‘for the crown prince (*wei taizi* 為太子)’. Four crown princes were successively picked up during the reign of Gaozong 高宗 (r. 649–683). See JTS, j4.70.11/75.6/j5.100.11/106.14 and XTS, j3.54.12/57.4/72.1/75.13. The crown prince at the time of *Fayuan zhulin* was Li Hong 李弘 (652–675), who was given the title in 656 but died in 675. Daoxuan was the first author to record the building of the Ximing monastery. In the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, T50.2060j4.457c26–27, he writes that it was built in 659. This is confirmed by Huili 慧立 (615–?) in the CESZ (688, 39), T50.2053j10.275b23, who elaborates that the imperial order to construct the monastery was issued in 656, the building work took three years, and the project was completed in the sixth month of 659. For the establishment of the Ximing monastery, see, among others, Wang Xiang 王翔, *Ximing Monastery: History and Imagination in Medieval Chinese Buddhism* (Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing, 2015), 30–41; and Dorothy C. Wong, *Buddhist Pilgrim-Monks as Agents of Cultural and Artistic Transmission: The International Buddhist Art Style in East Asia, ca. 645–770* (Singapore: NUS Press, 2018), 10–16. Special thanks to Stefano Zacchetti for pointing out Wang’s book for me. For the term *si* 寺 see, James Robson, “Monastic Space and Sacred Traces: Facets of Chinese Buddhist Monastic Records,” in *Buddhist Monasticism in East Asia: Places of Practice*, eds. James A. Benn, Lori Meeks, and James Robson (London and New York: Routledge, 2010), 45–48.

長安西明寺道宣律師者，德鏡玄流，業高清素，精誠苦行，畢命終身，早得從師。五十餘年，栖遑問道，志在住持。但一事可觀，資成三寶。緝綴儀範百有餘卷，結集高軌，屬有深旨。

In the middle of spring in the second year of the Qianfeng era [667 CE] of the great Tang, he was in Qing gong<sup>35</sup> in the south of the capital,

<sup>35</sup> The Chinese term is *qing gong* 清宮 (literally, ‘clear, palace’). Used here as a placename, this is the first time it appears in a biography of Daoxuan. The same characters appear in the same context in the FZTJ (1269, 180), the FZTZ (1341, 212), the GSZY (1654, 250) and *Ritsu en sōbō den* 律院僧寶傳 (*Biographies of the Precious Monastics in the Field of Vinaya*; 1687, 259; hereafter LYSZ). In other Daoxuan-related works, slightly different Chinese characters are used in similar contexts: *qing guan* 清官 (literally, ‘clear, official’) appears in the SGSZ (988, 102), *Shimen zhengtong* 釋門正統 (*The Orthodox Tradition of the Buddhist Religion*; twice; 1237, 176; hereafter SMZT), the *Xin xiu ke feng liuxue seng zhuang* 新修科分六學僧傳 (*Newly Compiled: The Six-pāramitā Grouped Monastic Biography*; 1366, 221; hereafter LXSZ), and *Sheng seng zhuan* 神僧傳 (*The Accounts of the Marvellous Master*; 1417, 222; hereafter SSZ). Fujiyosi Mashumi 藤善眞澄, in his *Dōsen den no kenkyū* 道宣傳の研究 (*A Study of the Life of Dau-Xuan*; Kyoto: Kyoto University Press, 2002; hereafter DSKK), 105 and 158, suggests that Daoxuan uses *qing guan* and *zun shan* 遵善 (literally, ‘to follow, wholesome’) as placenames in this context. However, *qing gong*, *qing guan* and *zun shan* are not listed as Tang-era placenames within the capital city, Chang’an, in any of the following established sources: ① Li Tai 李泰, *Kuo Di zhi ji jiao* 括地志輯校 (*The Collected and Annotated [Parts of] the Comprehensive Record of the Land [of the Tang]*; 642 CE; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980; hereafter KDJ); j1.9.7–14.10; ② Li Jifu 李吉甫, *Yuanhe junxian tu zhi* 元和郡縣圖志 (*The Yuanhe Maps and Records of Commanderies and Counties*; 813 CE; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983; hereafter YHJX), j1.4.13–8.9; ③ JTSj38–41 (945, 96); ④ Yue Shi 樂史, *Taiping huanyu ji* 太平寰宇記 (*The Geography of the Land of His Heavenly Rule Composed in the Taiping Era*; c. 983 CE; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983; hereafter TPHY), j25.527.8–539; ⑤ XTSj37–43b (1060, 121); ⑥ Song Minqiu 宋敏求, *Chang'an zhi* 長安志 (*The History of Chang'an*; 1076 CE; Taipei: Chengwen chubanshe youxian gongsi, 1931; hereafter CAZ), j12.281–301; and ⑦ Luo Tianxiang 駱天驥, *Leibian Chang'an zhi* 類編長安志 (*The Subject Matter Arranged History of Chang'an*; 1296 CE; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1990; hereafter LBCA), j2.41–45/59.3–72/j3.79.14–81.9/84.3–87.6/92.13–93.8/j4.126.3–j5.145.8. Hence, one might be tempted to identify *qing gong* 清宮 with the *tai qing gong* 太清宮 or the *hua qing gong* 華清宮 – two of the many palaces in the capital in the Tang period. Unfortunately, though, *tai qing gong* and *hua qing gong* are both mentioned for the first time long after the composition of *Fayuan zhulin*, in the Tianbao era 天寶 (742–756) – at CAZj8.193.9 and YHJXj1.7.11, respectively. Of course, none of this should be taken as hard evidence that *qing gong/qing guan* and *zun shan* were not placenames in 667, the year when Daoxuan mentioned them, for at least for two reasons. First, Daoxuan clearly states that an event took place at ‘*qing guan zun shan*’, and his account was witnessed by more than hundred people, thirty-nine of whom signed their names in testimony. Second, even though these placenames appear only in Daoxuan’s own texts and Daoxuan-related works, he associates them with verifiable locations – the Feng River (*fengshui* 豊水) and the Fu River (*fushui* 福水) – which are mentioned at YHJXj12.286.7–9/292.1 (*fushui* 福水 as *fuyan* 福堰) and TPHYj25.524.14/525.2. In *Guanzhong chuang li jietan tu jing* 關中創立戒壇圖經 (*The Illustrated Discourse on the Newly Built [Jetavana] Platform in Guanzhong*; 667, 27; hereafter JTTJ), j1.817b19–20, he states: ‘the places called *qing guan* and *zun shan* are at the south bank of the rivers Feng and Fu (*li* [?] *fu er shui* *zhi* *yin xiang* *yue* *qing guan* *li* *cheng* *zun shan* 潤福二水之陰鄉曰清官里稱遵善).’ In light of this, I feel it is reasonable to assume that *qing guan* (or *qing gong*) and *zun shan* were both places in Tang-era Chang’an, but they were considered too small to merit inclusion in the gazetteers and histories cited above. (My translation of the title of JTTJ is based on its content and the title of another discourse from the same year: *Zhongtianzu shewei guo qihuan si tu jing* 中天竺舍衛國祇洹寺圖經 (*The Illustrated Discourse on the Jetavana Monastery in Central India*; 667, 30; hereafter QYTJ). In these two texts, Daoxuan gives the impression that the platform in Guanzhong is a precise replica of the one in the Jetavana monastery. In other words, even though he uses the word *chuang* 創 (literally, ‘to invent’) in the title of his discourse on the Guanzhong platform, we should not infer that he designed or invented it himself. Rather, both JTTJ and QYTJ suggest that he introduced – or, more precisely, *reintroduced* – the platform to China. See my study on his building of the platform at IV.5.2.3.

[where] the old Jinye monastery<sup>36</sup> [once was. When Daoxuan lived there he] enjoyed the serenity and practised the Path.

粵以大唐乾封二年仲春之節，身在京師城南清宮故淨業寺，逐靜修道。

He was advanced in years<sup>37</sup> and his physical strength was declining. [In his] mind were the sentient beings, and [he] longed for the three rounds.<sup>38</sup> At a certain point in time, because some [of his] previous *karmas* [came to fruition], some *devas* came to care for [him, his] illness gradually improved. [Thereafter, Daoxuan] practised [more] vigorously. This generated a response, although that was not his intention.

年至桑榆，氣力將衰，專念四生，又思三會。忽以往緣幽靈顧接，病漸瘳降，勵力虔仰，遂感冥應。

From time to time, four kings and their ministers and retinues from the celestial world would arrive at the door of the *vinaya* master Daoxuan's chamber. [One day, he heard the sound] of a human footstep. The *vinaya* master enquired: 'Who [is there?'] Someone] answered: ['It is I,] disciple

---

<sup>36</sup> This is the first mention of *jinye si* 淨業寺 (literally, 'clear, *karma*, monastery') in a biography of Daoxuan. It appears frequently in subsequent Daoxuan-related works, all of which locate it within the capital, Chang'an, but none of these provide further information, such as when it was built, why it was established, who resided there and so on.

<sup>37</sup> The Chinese term is *sangyu* 桑榆, which is often used in Chinese literature in reference to the latter stages of life. For instance, the Tang official historians Li Yanshou 李延壽 (?–?) and Wei Zheng 魏征 (580–643), who were contemporaries of Daoshi (the author of *Fayuan zhulin*), use it in precisely this manner in *Beishi* 北史 (*History of the Northern Dynasties*; 659 CE; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974; hereafter BS), j82.2766.3, and *Suishu* 隋書 (*History of the Sui*; 636 CE; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1973; hereafter SS), j37.1118.5, respectively.

<sup>38</sup> The Chinese term is *sanhui* 三會 (literally, 'three meetings'). According to Daoshi in *Fayuan zhulin*, T53.2122j8.334c12–335.4, this term refers to the Buddha's preaching of the dharma when a large number of disciples will achieve the highest spiritual stage of liberation. At T53.2122j25.472c2, Daoshi continues that the Buddha Maitreya 眇勒 will have *sanhui* or three rounds of preaching the dharma. The notion that the Buddha Maitreya will undertake three rounds of preaching is found in the *Mile Xiasheng Jing* 眇勒下生經 (*The Discourse on the Coming of the Buddha Maitreya*; translated by Dharmarakṣa 竺法護 (239–316)), T14.453j1.422b29–c12. (However, in Daoxuan's *Da Tang neidian lu*, T55.2149j6.291, Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什 (344–413) is identified as the translator of a *sūtra* with the same title.)

Zhang Qiong.<sup>39</sup> The *vinaya* master continued: ‘From where [do you come], devotee?’

時有諸天四王臣佐，至律師房門，似人行動蹀足出聲。律師問言，是誰。  
答言，弟子張瓊。律師又問，何處檀越。

[Zhang Qiong] answered: ‘[I am] the fifteenth son of the Heavenly King of the South in the first realm of existence.<sup>40</sup> The King has ninety-five sons. [All of them] reign exceptionally well, each [in his own] territories and cities. Under [their] rule, [irrespective of whether they live] in the water or on the land, [their subjects are] categorized as monastics or laity. [Their subjects are also] identified as either law-abiding citizens or offenders. The Buddha has personally entrusted all [ninety-five sons] to help both the decent citizens and the corrupt ones. [This assistance will not only ensure that] the Buddha’s teaching will continue to flourish [but will allow those who have received the aid] to cultivate and accumulate merit.’

答言，弟子是第一欲界南天王之第十五子。王有九十一子，英略神武，各御邦都，所統海陸，道俗區分，持犯界別，並親受佛教，護持善惡，使遺法載隆，積殖其功也。

---

<sup>39</sup> Before Daoshi’s time, a person called Zhang Qiong is mentioned in BS at BSj53.1913.3–8 and in Li Baiyao 李百藥, *Bei Qi Shu* 北齊書 (*History of the Northern Qi*; 636 CE; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1972; hereafter BQS) at j20.265.9–13, but neither of these sources links him to Buddhism. Hence, the person mentioned by Daoshi might be someone else entirely.

<sup>40</sup> The Chinese term is *Yujie* 欲界, a translation of *Kāmaloka*. In Buddhist texts, this is one of the three realms of existence. It is where sentient beings dwell and the realm into which they are reborn, in accordance with their individual *karmic* retribution. See a concise explanation of the term in *The Princeton Dictionary of Buddhism* (hereafter PBD), 411. See also Lamotte Étienne, History of Indian Buddhism: from the Origins to the Śāky Era, trans. Sara Webb-Boin (Louvain: Peeters Press, 1988), 685; Ataru Sotomura, *The Buddhist Heavens 天: Source Manual for Iconographic Research on the Buddhist Universe, Part II* (Singapore: The Nalanda-Sriwijaya Centre Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2015): 5–14.

(Having referred to the *sūtras*, [I believe] this must be one of the sons of the King of the South, Piliuli,<sup>41</sup> one of the four Heavenly Dharma-protecting Kings. They are called the dharma-protecting kings with good reason, as they are responsible for ensuring the wellbeing of the Buddha-dharma.)<sup>42</sup>

依經即是護世四王南方毘留離王之子，常加守衛不徒設也。

The *vinaya* master further enquired: ‘Devotee, it is such an honour that you pay me a visit, despite my poor morality. Why do you not come in [but continue to stand] on the doorstep?’ [Zhang Qiong] answered: ‘[As I am a] disciple who has not obtained your permission, I do not feel at liberty to enter.’ The *vinaya* master said: ‘You may come in and take [a] seat.’ Having entered [the chamber, Zhang Qiong paid] homage [to the master and] sat down politely.

律師又問，檀越既不遺德劣故來相看，何故門首不入。答云，弟子不得師教，不敢入。律師云，願入就座。入已，禮敬伏坐。

The *vinaya* master proceeded to ask another question: ‘Devotee, since you sincerely believe in the Three Jewels, and the Buddha has entrusted you with protecting [the Buddha-dharma, and] now [that you have] kindly come to visit me, why don’t [you] reveal yourself?’ [Zhang Qiong] answered: ‘my physical body is different from those of others; [moreover, its] brightness and colour are unusual. [To reveal a body like this would]

---

<sup>41</sup> The Chinese term is Piliuli 毘留離, a transliteration of Virūḍhaka. This appears only once in a single *Taishō* text – the *Guanding jing* 灌頂經 (*Abhiṣeka Sūtra*) at T21.1331j7.516a29. A number of other Chinese characters are also used in reference to Virūḍhaka, such as 毘樓勒 at T1.1j5.30b21, 毘勒迦 in the *Qi shi jing* 起世經 (*The Discourse on the Origin of the Universe*) at T1.24j6.339c28–29, 毘樓博叉 in the *Mahāmāyāsūtra* 摩訶摩耶經 (*The Discourse on Mahāmāyā*) at T12.383j1.1009b1, 毘留茶俱 in the *Mahāvaipulyamahā* 大集經 (*The Great Assembly of the Mahāyāna Discourses*) at T13.397j43.282b15–16 and 毘流波叉 at T25.1509j54.443b11. Many texts, including these five, assert that the King of the South and the other Heavenly Kings have certain numbers of sons and attendants, but Zhang Qiong is never mentioned by name. Huilin 慧琳 (737–820), in *Yi qie jing yin yi* 一切經音義 (*Translations and Readings of the Words in Buddhist Books*; 817, 64), T54.2128j2.317b5, states that *piliuli* 毘瑠璃 is a precious product that is only found in the Kingdom of the South. Given the resemblance between these characters and 毘留離, and the fact that 毘瑠璃 and 毘留離 were both connected to the Kingdom of the South, some Chinese Buddhist writers may have treated the two terms as synonymous. See more study on the heavenly kings at III.4.4.

<sup>42</sup> This comment was made by Daoshi himself at this point in the text.

greatly disturb the minds of many. Having a conversation with you, Master, is satisfying enough; please allow me not to reveal [my physical] body.'

律師又問，檀越既篤信三寶，又受佛屬護持，善來相看，何不現形。答言，弟子報身，與餘人別，光色又異，驚動眾心，共師言論足，得不勞現身。

The *vinaya* master asked another question: 'Poor me, since the coming of spring, [my] physical strength has been declining gradually, and the physicians and [their] prescriptions are no help. [I] wonder if the end [of my life] is still in the distance or close at hand.' [Zhang Qiong] answered: 'Vinaya master, your life is about to come [to its] end, [but] do not concern [yourself with] physicians and prescriptions.' The *vinaya* master enquired further: 'When, precisely, will be the end of [my] life?' [Zhang Qiong] replied: '[Is it] necessary to say the [exact] time? I know [that you], *vinaya* master, will expire [at a time] not far [from now]. Then you will be] reborn in the Fourth Heaven, [where] the Buddha Maitreya<sup>43</sup> is.'

律師又問，貧道入春已來，氣力漸弱，醫藥無効，未知報命遠近。答云，律師報欲將盡，無煩醫藥。律師又問，定報何日。答云，可須道時，但知律師不久報盡，生第四天，彌勒佛所。

The *vinaya* master asked: 'Who is your companion?' [Zhang Qiong] answered: '[He is my] third-oldest brother, Zhang Yu.<sup>44</sup> [He is] wise, diligent and outstanding in spiritual penetration. [He has] great faith in the teaching of Śākyamuni. [My brother has] composed [a book entitled] *Qihuan Tujing*.<sup>45</sup> [It is] over one hundred scrolls [in length. This book from] the Heavenly Kingdom is marvellous; hearing just one word from [it] would be too opulent for those who are not in Heaven.' The *vinaya* master, after

<sup>43</sup> The Buddha Maitreya 彌勒佛, who is the believed successor of the Buddha Śākyamuni 釋迦牟尼佛 in all Buddhist traditions, is also known as the Bodhisattva Maitreya. This Bodhisattva now abides in Tuṣita heaven. The Buddha Maitreya and the Bodhisattva Maitreya are used interchangeably in this book throughout. See an introduction to Maitreya at PBD, 517.

<sup>44</sup> This is the first time that the name Zhang Yu 張璵 appears in a Daoxuan-related work.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. QYTJ (667, 30; T45.1899). Note that *Qihuan* 祇桓 is the abbreviated Chinese transliteration for Jetavana and the second word in the name is presented with a number of different characters in the *Taishō* collection, such as *yuan* 園 (e.g. T1.1j12.72c16), *huan* 涣 (e.g. T2.125j22.663a19). For a study on a non-imagined Indian monastery see, Le Huu Phuoc, *Buddhist Architecture* (MN: Grafikol, 2012): 53–57.

hearing these words, immediately looked [for Zhang Yu in order to] ask [him to] hand over [the *Qiyuan Tujing*, as it] would provide inspiration for monastics and the laity.

律師又問，同伴是誰。答云，弟子第三兄張璵。通敏超悟，信重釋宗，撰祇桓圖經百有餘卷。列峙天宮，無聞地府。律師承此，及踊思尋之，請述，用開道俗。

[There was] another *deva*: Wei Kun<sup>46</sup> [-] one of the eight generals of the Heavenly King of the South. Altogether, the four Heavenly Kings have thirty-two generals, and this [Wei Kun] is the[ir] leader. [He was] born wise and bright [and] he freed himself from sensual desire [in] the early [stages of life]. [His] abstinence from sexual conduct<sup>47</sup> is clean and pure. [He] honours the practice of non-sexual conduct.<sup>48</sup> [As he] received instruction directly from the Buddha himself, [Wei Kun is] always thinking of spreading and defending [the Buddha-dharma].

又有天人韋琨，亦是南天王八大將軍之一臣也。四天王合有三十二將，斯人為首。生知聰慧，早離欲塵，清淨梵行，修童真業，面受佛囑，弘護在懷。

---

<sup>46</sup> This is the first time that the name Wei Kun 韋琨 appears in a Daoxuan-related work.

<sup>47</sup> The Chinese expression is *fanxing* 梵行, which Buddhist texts often use to mean ‘celibacy’. See s.v. ‘brahmacarya’ in PBD, 142. However, according to the information provided in *Dazhidu lun* the *Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra* 大智度論, T25.1509j32.211b5–7, *fanxing* entails more than maintaining celibacy; it involves the total eradication of all sexual desire. Daoxuan concurs with this definition of the term. For example, in XSC (626, 1), T40.1804j2.61c12, he condemns conducting an ill-mannered conversation with a woman as an act of non-*fangxing* 非梵行.

<sup>48</sup> The Chinese expression is *tongzhen* 童真 (literally, ‘child, truth’), which is used in a number of different senses in Buddhist texts. In *Bieyi za ahan jing* 別譯雜阿含經 (*The Other Translation of the Samyuktāgama*), T2.100j6.417c20, for example, it denotes virginity. In the translation of the *Āngulimālīyasūtra*, *Yangjuemoluo jing* 央掘魔羅經, T2.120j2.530a22, it is used with *jie* 戒 to form *tongzhen jie* – a synonym for the precepts of *śrāmanera* 沙彌戒. In the translation of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra*, *Da boreboluomiduo jing* 大般若波羅蜜多經, T5.220j3.13a15, it is combined with *di* 地 to make *tongzhendi* 童真地 – the state of being a Buddhist monastic. In the translation of the *Avatamsakasūtra*, *Dafangguang fo huayang jing* 大方廣佛華嚴經, T9.278j8.445a1, it is again fused with *di* 地, but in this instance the word denotes one of the ten stages that a bodhisattva undergoes before attaining enlightenment. As the *sūtra* explains, ‘this is called the stage of *tongzhen* is because it is without sensual desire (*wu se yu gu ming tongzhen di* 無色欲故名童真地’). In the *Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra*, T25.1509j35.317a29/b10/18, *tongzhen* is used as a synonym for *fanxing* – non-sexual conduct. Daoshi uses it a number of times in *Fayuan zhulin*, almost always as a synonym for *fanxing*, with the sole exception at T53.2122j16.408a22, where it is given as the name of a monk. In light of Daoshi’s usual use of the term, I have translated *tongzhen* as ‘non-sexual conduct’, even though this replicates the translation of *fanxing*.

The three continents<sup>49</sup> are all under [Wei Kun's] supervision; [he is] the most outstanding [of those who are] founding [the Buddha-dharma]. [He is] selfless and [his character is] spotless. [He is] concerned with the fourfold communities [of Buddhism].<sup>50</sup> [He is] clear-sighted, knows the people and knows [how to] inspire [them. He has] provided great help to [followers of] the five-level teachings.<sup>51</sup> Wherever there is [a practice of] the teaching of the Buddha, [even if the practice is] corrupted, [wherever] the monastics

<sup>49</sup> The Chinese term is *sanzhou* 三洲, a cosmological term that occurs frequently in Buddhist texts. In the translation of the *Dīrghāgama*, *Chang ahan jing* 長阿含經, T1.1j18.115b13–21, we learn that the Buddha told his disciples that there are *four* continents 四洲 around Mount Sumeru 須彌山: Uttaraku to the north; Pūrvavideha to the east; Aparagodaniya to the west; and Jambudvipa to the south. In *Fayuan zhulin*, T53.2122j7.327c25, citing an unnamed source ('some said' *you shuo* 有說), Daoshi comments that the northern continent is a land where the inhabitants are 'free from unpleasant karmic retribution (*shou chun jing yeguo chu* 受純淨業果處)'. Moreover, in another book, *Zhujing yao ji* 諸經要集 (*The Collection of the Essentials from Various Texts*), T54.171j18.171a7–8, he reiterates that this continent is a land 'free from unpleasant karmic retribution' and this time provides a source: the translation of the *Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāstra*, *Apidamo da piposha lun* 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論, T27.1545j172.866c5–6. Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that Daoshi depicts Wei Kun as supervising the Buddhists in three continents because the northern one does not need his attention. When relating the story of Wei Kun, Daoshi cites Daoxuan's *Gantong* 感通 (literally, 'sympathetic resonance') as his source. Three of Daoxuan's works feature this term in the title. In the JGTL, T52.2106j3.423a21–22, an arahant by the name of Bintou 賓頭 (賓頭 is an often seen abbreviated Chinese transliteration for Piṇḍola-Bhāradvāja) is said to have responsibility for disseminating the teaching of the Buddha in the *sanzhou* 三洲. There is no mention of a divinity named Wei 爰 here. However, in both *Lixiang gantong zhuan* 律相感通傳, T45.1898j1.875a2–5, and *Daoxuan lüshi gantong zhuan* 道宣律師感通錄 (*The Recordings of the Sympathetic Resonance of Vinaya Master Daoxuan*), T52.2107j1c12–15, Daoxuan records a conversation with a divinity whom he addresses as 'Wei Jiangjun 爰將軍' (the General Wei). As to why the Buddha entrusts this general with protecting the Buddhist community in just three continents, rather than all four, Daoxuan explains that Buddhism is rare in the northern continent (*shao you fofa* 少有佛法). Hence, even though he cites Daoxuan as his source, it seems that Daoshi, not Daoxuan, was the first author to name the general/divinity Wei Kun 爰琨.

<sup>50</sup> The Chinese term is *sibu* 四部, rendered here as 'the fourfold communities' because Daoshi uses it as an umbrella term for *bhikṣu* 比丘, *bhikṣunī* 比丘尼, *upāsaka* 優婆塞 and *upāsikā* 優婆夷 at T53.2122j97.1000b1 in *Fayuan zhulin*. Note that in *vinaya* texts, *sibu* is sometimes presented as *sizhong* 四眾 (literally, 'four, group'), e.g., at T22.1421j1.2b14–14/1425j32.492b11/1428j58.1001b7–8, and T23.1435j50.370c2–3.

<sup>51</sup> The Chinese term is *wucheng* 五乘 (literally, 'five vehicles'). Daoshi uses this term only once in *Fayuan zhulin* and offers no definition. Daoxuan uses the same term in *Xingshi chao* 行事鈔, but similarly provides no definition. In *Sifenlüi xingshi chao zichi ji* 四分律行事鈔資持記 (*Commentary to Help Upholding the Vinaya for the Manual for Practice Based on the Sifen lü*; c. 1075, 130; hereafter ZCJ), T40.1808j1.160b24, Yuanzhao 元照 (1048–1116) explains that *wucheng* comprises teachings for human being (*ren* 人), heavenly being (*tian* 天), *śrāvaka* (*shengwen* 聲聞), Pratyeka-buddha (*yuanjue* 緣覺) and Buddha (*fo* 佛). However, given that Daoxuan uses this term when praising a Buddhist translator in another text, I believe that the last of these should be bodhisattva 菩薩, rather than Buddha. This occurs in the preface of *Shizi zhuangyan wang pusa qingwen jing* 師子莊嚴王菩薩請問經 (*The Discourse on the Questions Asked by the Bodhisattva Shizizhuangyanwang*) at T14.486j1.697a25: '[He] exceeded in wisdom all [the beings of] the five vehicles 智越五乘.' Since Buddhahood is the highest spiritual achievement, the Buddha should have the greatest wisdom, too. Therefore, I believe that the final category should be bodhisattva. A famous Chinese Buddhist commentary composed before Daoxuan's time, *Miaofa Lianhua jing wenju* 妙法蓮華經文句 (*The Annotated Lotus Sūtra*), at T34.1718j7.92a14, similarly specifies that the final category is bodhisattva.

and Buddhist statues are in danger, [Wei Kun would do] nothing but help and defend [them].

周統三洲，住持為最。亡我亡瑕，殷憂於四部，達物達化，大濟於五乘。  
所以四有佛教，互涉頽綱，僧像阽危，無非扶衛。

[Wei Kun considered it] a great honour [that the *vinaya* master] conversed with him] a number of times. [He] devised a good plan, but did not relate it immediately [to Daoxuan. Wei Kun] praised [Daoxuan because he has] collected, edited, composed and transcribed the stories and events of the enlightened ones and [their] establishment [of the Buddha-dharma]. Daoxuan, upon hearing this, even though [he] was sick and weak, took [his] pen and wrote down [what Wei Kun said. Daoxuan] recorded what [he] heard, [and the length of that record was] ten scrolls. The *vinaya* master was rather worried. [He] worried that there was not much time left [for him, and he was] concerned that the *devas* would soon return. There were little time [to consider] other aspects [of what he was writing]. His handwriting was unclear, and his phrasing was inelegant.

屢蒙展對，曲備嘉猷，歎律師緝敘餘風，聖迹住持，刪約撰集。於是律師，既承靈囑，扶疾筆受，隨聞隨錄，合成十卷。律師憂報將盡，復慮天人將還，筆路蒼茫，無暇餘事，文字亦復疏略。

Focusing meticulously on understanding Wei Kun[’s words], the format and style [of the writing] were now low priorities [for Daoxuan. He questioned Wei Kun on] all of the issues [about which he was] uncertain, regardless of whether they were big or small, [as long as they] related to the establishment and dissemination of the teaching, [so all] doubt could be dispelled [and] the suspicions [in his] mind could be removed. [When transcribed, his questions and the corresponding answers amounted to] three thousand eight hundred entries.

但究聖意，不存文式。所有要略住持教迹不決者，並問除疑，以啟心惑。  
合有三千八百條。

[Daoxuan] collated [these questions and answers into] ten chapters. The first [chapter] relates to the Council's<sup>52</sup> protocols. The second [chapter] records the *gathas* of the female *devas*. The third [chapter] concerns the protection of the relics. The fourth [chapter] relates to the monastic robe and the alms bowl.<sup>53</sup> The fifth [chapter] concerns the *sūtras* and the statues. The sixth [chapter] tells the entrustment of the objects that the Buddha used. The seventh [chapter] describes [the events that took place] before and after the Council. The eighth and the ninth (these two [chapters] are unwritten, and [their] titles are missing).<sup>54</sup> The tenth [chapter] provides sacred examples of the establishment [of the Buddha-dharma].

勒成十篇。一敘結集儀式,二敘天女偈頌,三敘付囑舍利,四敘付囑衣鉢,五敘付囑經像,六敘付囑佛物,七敘結集前後,第八第九(此二不成闕於名字),十敘住持聖迹。

The words of the *devas* were presented to the *vinaya* master, and he humbly received the last messages of the Buddha. [Daoxuan] was delighted by every utterance of the *devas*. His ears were tired, his eyes were exhausted, yet they caused him no discomfort. Rather, [he] lamented not knowing sooner [what the *devas* had said] and regretted that [his early works] were not thorough. Now, having ensured that nothing could contravene the teaching of the *tripitaka*, on the basis of the words of *devas*, [Daoxuan] collated [what he had] recorded. Therefore, [even though he] heard [the words] from the *devas*, [they should be taken] as being spoken by the Buddha.

律師既親對冥傳,躬受遺誥,隨出隨欣,耳目雖倦,不覺勞苦,但恨知之不早,文義不周。今依天人所說,不違三藏教旨,即皆編錄。雖從天聞,還同佛說。

<sup>52</sup> The Chinese term is *jieji* 結集, a frequently used translation of *samgīti*. See a concise explanation of the term at s.v. ‘council’ in PBD, 198.

<sup>53</sup> See concise explanations of *yi* 衣 at s.v. ‘*cīvara*’ and ‘*tricīvara*’ in PBD, 197 and 922, and of *bo* 鉢 at s.v. ‘*pātra*’ in PBD, 639.

<sup>54</sup> This comment was made by Daoshi himself at this point in the text.

From the second month until the sixth month, every day [the *devas*] came to present [what they had to say]; not a single moment passed by in idleness. On the third day of the tenth month, in early winter, the *vinaya* master's physical strength was deteriorating. [At that time,] the smoke of incense and the pennants were [visible] everywhere in the sky. The *devas* and the achievers of emancipation uttered at the same time: '[We] are from the Tuṣita Heaven and come to welcome the *vinaya* master [Daoxuan].' The *vinaya* master sat upright [and] with a focused mind [held his] palms together. With a sober face, [he] passed away. At the moment of his departure, the monastics and the laity [who were present], over a hundred in number, all saw the smoke of incense and flowers [as the master was] welcomed and ascended into the air.

始從二月迄至六月，日別來授無時暫閑，至初冬十月三日，律師氣力漸微，香幡遍空，天人聖眾同時發言，從兜率天來請律師，律師端坐，一心合掌，斂容而卒，臨終道俗百有餘人，皆見香華迎往昇空。

The *vinaya* master was one of my fellow students. On the day when we stepped up to the platform, we received full ordination from the same master. [Our] practices are not the same, [but when it comes to] collecting [information we are] identical. Whether [it is] seen or heard, regardless of whether it is profound teaching or a simple record of events, [we] gather, collect [and] arrange [the information into different] chapters and sections [in our works]. All [we have done] is meant to safeguard the teaching passed down by the Buddha, establish [the Buddha-dharma and] benefit [the sentient beings].

律師是余同學。昇壇之日，同師受業，雖行殊薰祓，好集無二，若見若聞，隨理隨事，據摭眾記，簡略要集，編錄條章，並存遺法，住持利益也。<sup>55</sup>

Reflecting on Daoshi's narrative, a number of points are worth noting. First, Daoxuan and Daoshi studied under the same master at the same time. Second, Daoxuan was a prolific writer and all his works were dedicated to the establishment of the Buddha-dharma. Third,

<sup>55</sup> T53.2122j10.353c22–354b19. Daoshi mentions Daoxuan or cites his work twenty-three times in his FYZL. See appendix 3 for the detail of the entries.

he became a monk at a very young age. Fourth, during his monastic career, he travelled tirelessly in search of the Path and to collect information that would help to establish the Buddhist religion. Fifth, he died on the third day of the tenth month in 668 CE in the expectation of being reborn in the Tuṣita Heaven. Sixth, Daoshi focuses at length on conversations between Daoxuan and a number *devas* that he claims continued for some five months – from the second until the sixth month of 668.

In addition to these points, it is worth mentioning that Daoshi's narrative is structured into three distinct parts. First, he presents what we might term an overall evaluation. Next, he focuses on particular episodes from Daoxuan's life, especially his exchanges with the *devas*. Finally, after explaining his own relationship with Daoxuan, he provides a laudatory conclusion. Some later authors imitate this three-part structure, and the influence of Daoshi's narrative is especially evident in the texts that fall into our second period: the era of stable information.

## II.3 Stable Information

Having studied Daoshi's account, we now examine texts written in the next era – the period of stable information (674–858 CE, numbers 35–82). As mentioned earlier, *Fayuan zhulin* is divided into three sections: an overall evaluation, a description of episodes in the life of Daoxuan and a laudatory conclusion. The first and third of these sections proved influential in the subsequent era. For example, both KYL (730, 47) and *Zhenyuan xingding shijiao mulu* 貞元新定釋教目錄 (799, 58; hereafter ZYL)<sup>56</sup> almost precisely reproduce the beginning and the end of Daoshi's narrative.<sup>57</sup> On the other hand, the authors of these two works – Zhisheng 智昇 and Yuanzhao 圓照, respectively – do not include a descriptive section. An earlier text, CESZ (688, 39), does relate the exchanges between Daoxuan and the *devas*, but its author – Huili 慧立 (614–?) – uses this part of the narrative to extol the extraordinary virtue of Xuanzang 玄奘 (602–664).<sup>58</sup>

Moreover, this is not the only new development in the biography of Daoxuan. For example, it is in this period that he is first addressed as 'Nanshan *lüshi* 南山律師' (the *vinaya* master Nanshan)<sup>59</sup> and 'Xuangong 宣公' (the Honourable Xuan).<sup>60</sup> Both of these titles reflect the writers' deep respect for Daoxuan, with the latter overwhelmingly used by authors of *vinaya* commentaries.

These subtle developments aside, most of the biographical information pertaining to Daoxuan is reproduced consistently in works dating from the period of stable information. For instance, they all reiterate Daoshi's claims that Daoxuan travelled extensively in search of the Path, authored a number of books and defended the Buddha-dharma. By contrast, the works of the next period would introduce readers to a host of new events in the life story of Daoxuan.

<sup>56</sup> See KYL, T55.2154j8.562a08, in ZYL (*The Zhenyuan New Buddhist Catalogue*; 799 CE), T55.2157j12.859b9.

<sup>57</sup> KYL, T55.2154j8.562a8–9, is the first work to give Daoxuan's family name – Qian 錢 – and to trace his origins to the legendary Peng Zu 彭祖, who was said to have lived to the age of 800 or more. More study on Daoxuan's family name see DSKK, 37–68.

<sup>58</sup> T50.2053j10.277c7–16. This is the first occasion in a Daoxuan-related work that we are told that Daoxuan asked the *devas* for information about Xuanzang, one of Daoxuan's fellow monks who worked with him on translations. More discussion on *deva* is at III.4.4 and on Daoxuan's relation with Xuanzang at III.4.5.2.

<sup>59</sup> T40.1807j2.476c9. Chinese Buddhist writers often designated monks in terms of the places with which they were most associated, especially when the monk in question was highly respected.

<sup>60</sup> *Sifen lü sou xuan lu* 四分律搜玄錄 (*Investigation: Study on [Daoxuan's Xingshi Chao]*; Zhihong 志鴻; c.779, 53), X41.732j1.833a9.

## II.4 A Flood of Information

*Youyang zazu* 西陽雜俎 (c.860, 83; YYZZ) marks the beginning of the flood of information period (c.860–984 CE, numbers 83–101), and it is also the first non-Buddhist text to provide details about Daoxuan’s life. The narrative reads as follows:

Sun Simiao<sup>61</sup> once lived in seclusion on Zhongnan Mountain and he came into contact with the *vinaya* master [Dao]xuan. Every time [they] met, they would discuss each other’s ideas. On one occasion, there was a severe drought and a monk from the Western Regions (‘*xi yu* 西域’) offered to pray for rain<sup>62</sup> at the designated ritual site, by the Kunming Pool.<sup>63</sup> An imperial decree instructed the relevant government department [to supply] the incense and the lamps [that were needed for the ritual]. In about seven days, the water level of the pool fell by several *chi*.<sup>64</sup>

孫思邈嘗隱終南山，與宣律和尚相接。每來往，互參宗旨。時大旱，西域僧請於昆明池結壇祈雨。詔有司，備香燈。凡七日，縮水數尺。

<sup>61</sup> Sun Simiao 孫思邈, a mystical Tang figure, was famous at the time and thereafter for his skill in Chinese herbal medicine. See 37 for more details. Nathan Sivin, *Chinese Alchemy: Preliminary Studies* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968), 81–144 provides some valuable insights into Sun’s biography and hagiography. Many thanks to T. H. Barrett for highlighting this reference. Gan Zuwang 干祖望, *Sun Simiao pingzuan* 孫思邈評傳 (*A Critical Biography of Sun Simiao*; Nanjing: Nanjing University Press, 1995), 88–89, asserts that Sun Simiao first met Daoxuan in 612 and Daoxuan was the only monk friend of Sun Simiao. Unfortunately, Gan offers no source for his assertion.

<sup>62</sup> In *Yiwen leiju* 藝文類聚 (*The Collection of Literature Arranged by Categories*; 624 CE; Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1985; hereafter YWLN), j100.1726.5–1728.13, a well-known Tang official, Ouyang Xun 歐陽詢 (557–641), points out that Chinese rulers had traditionally prayed for rain – *qiyu* 祈雨 – in times of drought.

<sup>63</sup> According to *Xijing zaji* 西京雜記 (*The Miscellaneous Recordings of Chang’an*; c. 283–343 CE; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1985; hereafter XJZJ), j1.1.7–8, the Emperor Wu of the Han 漢武帝 (r. 141–87 BCE) ordered the Kunming Pool to be dug so that his army could hone their skills in water combat. There was a Buddhist connection even before the pool was filled with water. According to LBCA j8.258.5–9, Emperor Wu asked his courtiers to explain the black ashes that the workmen found at the bottom of the pit, but none of them was able to provide an answer. However, several generations later, during the reign of Emperor Ming of the Han 漢明帝 (58–75 CE), a Buddhist text explained that the ashes were remnants of the destruction of the universe in the preceding *kalpa* 劫. See s.v. ‘*kalpa*’ in PBD, 409. For more on the Kunming Pool, see Erik Zürcher, *The Buddhist Conquest of China: The Spread and Adaptation of Buddhism in Early Medieval China* (3d edn; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 20.

<sup>64</sup> The Chinese term is *chi* 尺 – a unit of measurement – but its value varied over time so the precise length of one *chi* is hard to determine. However, in *Zhongguo li dai du liang heng kao* 中國歷代度量衡考 (*A Study of the Measurement Systems of the Different Chinese Dynasties*; Beijing: Kexue chubanshe, 1992), 88b.22, Qiu Guangming 丘光明 suggests that one Tang-era *chi* was 30.3 centimetres. The conversion of the ancient measurement units in this book is done in light of Qiu Guangming’s work, or otherwise specified.

It happened that an old man paid Daoxuan a visit at night. Crying for help, he said: ‘Master, I am, in fact, the dragon of the Kunming Pool. It has not rained for a long time, but this has nothing to do with me. The barbarian monk covets my brain. He wants to use it as an ingredient in one of his formulas. However, he deceived the Emperor by saying that he has been praying for rain. My life is in imminent danger. I beg you, Master, with your dharma power, please protect me.’ Daoxuan humbly declined: ‘I am afraid I am only a monk who is practising the *vinaya*. Please go now to the learned Sun Simiao.’ The old man then went to the stone chapel where Sun Simiao was living and cried for help. Sun Simiao replied: ‘I know that there are three thousand magical formulas at the Dragon Palace of the Kunming [Pool]. I will help you if you hand them over to me.’

忽有老人，夜詣宣律和尚求救，曰，弟子昆明池龍也。無雨久，匪由弟子。胡僧利弟子腦，將為藥。欺天子，言祈雨，命在旦夕，乞和尚法力加護。宣公辭曰，貧道持律而已，可求孫先生。老人因至思邈石室求救。孫謂曰，我知昆明龍宮有仙方三千首爾。傳與予，予將救汝。

The old man responded: ‘Unauthorized circulation of these prescriptions is prohibited by the Heavenly God. Alas, since this is a matter of life and death, I should hold nothing else tight.’ Shortly afterwards, [the dragon] returned, holding the precious prescriptions in his hands. Sun [Simiao] said: ‘Make your way back quickly, and do not worry about the barbarian monk.’ Thereafter, the water in the pool rose so rapidly that within a few days it flowed over the edge. Ashamed and enraged, the barbarian monk died. Later, Sun [Simiao] compiled a three-thousand-scroll work titled *Qianjin Fang*.<sup>65</sup> One magical formula was written on each of the scrolls.

---

<sup>65</sup>*Qianjin Fang* 千金方 (*The Invaluable Life-saving Formula*) is published in *Zhengtong Daozang* 正統道藏 (*The Daoist Canon of the Zhengtong Era*; Taipei: Xinwenfeng chuban gongsi, 1985), vols. 44–45, 183. My translation of the title *Qianjin Fang* is based on a sentence in *Zhengtong Daozang* at 44.3b5–6: ‘ren ming zhi zhong you gui qian jin yi fang ji zhi de yu yu ci gu yi wei ming ye 人命至重有貴千金一方濟之德踰於此故以為名也.’ For details of the ten of the formulas in English, see Dan Bensky and Randall Barolet, *Chinese Herbal Medicine: Formulas and Strategies* (Washington, DC: Eastland Press, 1990), 58, 76, 91, 127, 207, 226, 381, 385 and 396, where *Qianjin* [*yao*] *Fang* is rendered as Thousand Ducat Formulas.

老人曰，此方上帝不許妄傳。今急矣，固無所吝。有頃，捧方而至。  
孫曰，爾第還，無慮胡僧也。自是池水忽漲，數日溢岸。胡僧羞恚而  
死。孫復著《千金方》三千卷，每卷入一方。<sup>66</sup>

Who was this Sun Simiao? In his official biographical entries in JTS and XTS, he is depicted as widely read and famous in his time for his expertise in Chinese herbal medicine and the accuracy of his prediction.<sup>67</sup> Daoxuan is not mentioned in either of these biographies. Furthermore, while both JTS and XTS acknowledge his broad range of interests, only the former specifically states that Sun Simiao was ‘interested in Buddhist texts’.<sup>68</sup> This fascination with Buddhism is confirmed by the Tang master Fazang 法藏 (643–712) in a work he composed around the year 705.<sup>69</sup> Once again, there is no mention of Daoxuan, but Fazang suggests that Sun Simiao was not only interested in Buddhist texts – and especially the *Huayan jing* 華嚴經 – but a devout Buddhist himself.<sup>70</sup>

Therefore, *Youyang zazu* (c.860, 83) seems to be the first text to establish a link between Sun Simiao and Daoxuan when relating the story of a severe drought, praying for rain, a dragon disguised as an old man and Sun Simiao’s compilation of a Chinese herbal medicine book entitled *Qianjin Fang*.

<sup>66</sup> YYZZj2.19.5–11. A very short poem at YYZZxj6.15–16, with authorship attributed to Daoxuan, mentions Daoxuan’s monastic robes 三衣 and the palace of the dragon. In his *Xuanshi zhi* 宣室志 (*Collected Stories of Xuanshi*; c.860, 84; in *Tang Wudai Biji Xiaoshuo Daguan* 唐五代笔记小說大觀, vol. 2; Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2000), 1040.7–12, Zhang Dou 張讀 mentions a story, attributed to Liu Yuxi 劉禹錫 (772–842), that features Daoxuan, his robes and a dragon known as *jiaolong* 蛟龍, who sought shelter under Daoxuan’s finger. An identical story is found in Li Fang 李昉’s *Taiping guangji* 太平廣記 (*The Extensive Records of the Taiping [Xingguo] Era*; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1961; 978, 99; hereafter TPGJ) at j393.3138.3–7. For further discussion of TPGJ’s account of Daoxuan and a dragon, see 61–63. For a brief explanation of *yi* 衣, see s.v. ‘*cīvara*’ and ‘*tricīvara*’ in PBD, 197 and 922.

Note that of the three currently available editions of *Xuanshi zhi* – the one that is cited above, one that forms part of *Biji xiaoshuo daguan* 筆記小說大觀 (Yangzhou: Jiangshu guangling guji keyin she 江蘇廣陵古籍刻印社, 1983), 105–140, and one that appears alongside *Duyi zhi* in a 1983 collection published by Zhonghua shuju 中華書局 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983) – only the latter includes a part titled *Jiyi* 輯佚 (literally, ‘To collect the lost’; 152–212). In addition, on 155–156, Zhonghua shuju edition includes the aforementioned story of Daoxuan, Sun Simiao and a dragon that appears in *Taiping guangji*. Special thanks to T. H. Barrett for highlighting the Zhonghua shuju edition of *Xuanshi zhi* and pointing out the differences between the three versions. As regard to the differences between the various versions of the *Taiping guangji*, see Zhang Guofeng 张国风, *Taiping guangji banben kaoshu* 太平廣記版本考述 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2004).

<sup>67</sup> JTSj191.5094.13–5097.2, XTSj196.5596.13–5598.9.

<sup>68</sup> JTSj191.5094.13–14: ‘*jian hao shi dian* 兼好釋典’.

<sup>69</sup> Fazang’s account of Sun Simiao – the earliest Buddhist biography of him – is in *Huayanjing zhuan ji* 華嚴經傳記 (*The Story of the Mahāvaipulyabuddhāvatāraṇasakasūtra*) at T51.2073j5.171b24–c19. For more information on Fazang, see Chen Jinhua, *Philosopher, Practitioner, Politician: The Many Lives of Fazang* (643–712) (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2007).

<sup>70</sup> A number of *sūtras* in the *Taishō* collection feature *Huayan Jing* in the title: T9.278 and T10.279/293/295/300/303.

At this point, it is worth noting that another non-Buddhist work (not in our master table), *Du yi zhi* 獨異誌 (hereafter DYZ),<sup>71</sup> which was in circulation around the same time as YYZZ, includes almost all of the same elements (with the notable exception of the role played by Daoxuan). The narrative reads as follows:

During the rule of the Empress [Wu Zetian] of the Tang,<sup>72</sup> the scholar Sun Simiao was living in the Song Mountain, engaging in [his] practice. At a certain point in time, a severe drought broke out. An imperial order summoned more than one thousand virtuous Buddhist monks to attend a reading of the *Renwang jing*<sup>73</sup> at the Tiangong monastery<sup>74</sup> and pray for the grace of rain. Among the audience, there were two men with bright white beards and eyebrows. The expounder, a monk named Tanlin,<sup>75</sup> sent someone to these two elderly gentlemen with a message that read: ‘After the reading, please come to the yard.’ When [they] arrived, [Tanlin] asked [them] where they had come from. The two elderly gentlemen answered:

<sup>71</sup> *Du yi zhi* 獨異誌 (*Stories of the Peculiar and the Unknown*; Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2000), 912.13–23. The authorship of this book is disputed, but it was certainly composed during the Tang. The final historical figure to feature in the text (at DYZj2.931.18–20) is the Tang Emperor Wenzong 唐文宗 (r. 826–840). Therefore, it might have been written several decades before YYZZ was composed in 860. In any case, the DYZ surely dates to no later than 907, the final year of the Tang Dynasty. In other words, the YYZZ and the DYZ were both circulating during our flood of information era (860–984). My translation of the title *Du yi zhi* is based on the information the text provides at 903.2: ‘du yi zhi zhe ji shi shi zhi du yi ye 獨異誌者記世事之獨異也.’

<sup>72</sup> The Chinese phrase is *tianhou chao* 天后朝 (literally, ‘the reign of the Heavenly Empress’, i.e., Wu Zetian). JTSj6.115.13 says that this reign began in the sixth year of the Yonghui era 永徽 (655), while XTSj4.81.15 suggests that it started in the first year of Shangyuan era 上元 (674). JTSj6.132.9–14 and XTSj4.105.11–13 agree that Wu Zetian abdicated and died in 705. Hence, ‘the reign of the Empress Wu Zetian’ may refer to either 655–705 or 674–705, as neither source is more credible than the other.

<sup>73</sup> Literally, ‘the discourse of the human king’. However, this title does not appear in the *Taishō* collection. Hence, it is probably safe to assume that the author meant to write ‘*Renwang jing* 仁王經’, the abbreviated form of *Renwang boreboluomi jing* 佛說仁王般若波羅蜜經 (*Karunikarāprajñāpāramitā sūtra?*), which is at T8.245.

<sup>74</sup> According to Zhipan 志磐, in FZTJ at T49.2035j39.364a26/j53.464a13, the Tiangong monastery was originally the residence of Li Shimin (later Emperor Taizong of the Tang) in the eastern capital (Luoyang 洛陽) of the Sui, and he donated it for conversion into a monastery in the sixth year of Zhenguan (632 CE). However, in *Shishi jigu liue* 釋氏稽古略 (*The Gist of the Study of the History of Buddhism*; 1354, 210), T40.2037j3814c7–8, Jue'an 覺岸 argues that the building was located in Taiyuan 太原, not Luoyang, and that it was converted into a monastery to commemorate Taizong’s deceased mother. Taizong had strong links to both Luoyang and Taiyuan before he ascended the throne, but the information provided at JTSj3.52.14–53.4, XTSj2.26.11 and ZZTJj187.5868.3 suggests that he spent most of his childhood at the latter, so it seems likely that the monastery was situated there.

<sup>75</sup> The name Tanlin occurs several times in the *Taishō* collection, but none of these figures lived during the Tang Dynasty (618–907), so we have no further information on *this* Tanlin.

‘We are the dragons of the Rivers Yi and Luo.<sup>76</sup> [We came in the hope that], after listening to the true words [of the *sūtra*, we] would be able to improve and change [our situation?].’

唐天後朝，處士孫思邈居於嵩山修道。時大旱，有敕，選洛陽德行僧徒數千百人，於天宮寺講《人王經》，以祈雨澤。有二人在眾中，須眉皓白。講僧曇林遣人謂二老人曰，罷後可過一院。既至，問其所來。二老人曰，某，伊洛二水龍也，聞至言當得改化。

[The monk Tan]lin continued: ‘You respectable pair, do you know that this *sūtra* is being read to pray for rain?’ [They] answered: ‘How is it possible we do not know? We also know that the rain will fall only when the heavenly order<sup>77</sup> is given. Under normal circumstances, no one would dare to take the liberty of making it rain.’ [The monk Tan]lin sighed: ‘What can be done about it?’ The two elderly gentlemen said: ‘Once a practitioner wrote a petition to Heaven[; after the Heavenly God] saw [it,] rain poured down. [Maybe after a petition is submitted] we could do our best to help.’ [The monk Tan]lin went [to the court and] related [the elderly gentlemen’s words to the Empress] Wu Zetian. Men were sent to Songyang to summon [Sun] Simiao. In the palace, [Sun] Simiao composed an emergency petition [to Heaven].

林曰，講經祈雨，二聖知之乎。答曰，安得不知。然雨者，須天符乃能致之，居常何敢自施也。林曰，為之奈何。二老曰，有修道人，以章疏聞天，因而滂沱，某可力為之。林乃入啟。則天發使嵩陽召思邈，內殿飛章。

<sup>76</sup> Today, these rivers are in He'nan Province 河南省. The Luo is a tributary of the Yellow River 黃河, while the Yi is a tributary of the Luo.

<sup>77</sup> The Chinese phrase is *tian fu* 天符, (literally, ‘Heaven, order’). JTSj43.1817.3 and XTSj46.1185.3 explain that the *fu* 符, one of six official documents in the Tang era (see more at n. 449), was the means by which a superior would issue an order to his subordinates. *Tian fu* is also found at JTSj23.901.15–902.4 (specifically at 902.3), which gives details of an inscription that Emperor Xuanzong 唐玄宗 (r. 712–756) wrote for a stone tablet to be erected on the Mountain of Tai 泰山. This inscription begins by lamenting his own poor morality, but then goes on to say that he has managed to rule the country and his subjects in a righteous manner by the grace of the Heavenly God. It continues that, since he has accomplished *tian fu*, he shall make a sacrifice to the Heavenly God at the Mountain of Tai. This suggests that *tian fu* is the emperor’s mandate to rule, issued by the Heavenly God. Taking into consideration the usual meaning of *fu* in the Tang period, and the use of *tian fu* in Xuanzong’s inscription, I feel it is justifiable to reject other possible readings of *fu* – such as talisman or charm – and translate *tian fu* as ‘the heavenly order’. Note that John Knoblock and Jeffrey Riegel, *The Annals of Lü Buwei* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), 424 and Homer H. Dubs, *The History of the Former Han Dynasty* (Baltimore: Waverley Press, 1955), vol. 3, 207, render *tian fu* as ‘heaven’s token’ and ‘portents from Heaven’, respectively. Special thanks to T. H. Barrett for pointing out these references.

That very evening, rain fell heavily from the sky. [Sun] Simiao himself was confused. [After returning from the court, he] paid a visit to the recital. [He] said to [Tan]lin: ‘I have been practising for fifty years, [yet my mind was] not read by Heaven. What is the reason?’ The two elderly gentlemen were asked [the same question. They] answered: ‘[If one’s] mind is not [devoted to] the welfare of human beings, how could [such a mind become] immortal?’ Therefore, [Sun] Simiao returned to Qingcheng Mountain in Shu. [He] composed a thirty-scroll [work entitled] *Qianjin Fang*. [At the very moment when] he completed [this text], in broad daylight, [he] ascended into the air [that is, gained immortality].

其夕天雨大降，思邈亦不自明。退詣講席，語林曰，吾修心五十年，不為天知，何也。因請問二老。二老答曰，非利濟生人，豈得升仙。於是思邈歸蜀青城山，撰《千金方》三十卷。既成，而白日沖天。<sup>78</sup>

The stories told in DYZ and YYZZ are remarkably similar: they both feature a drought, an imperial order, praying for rain, a book of remedies entitled *Qianjin Fang*, dragons and so on. Above all, they seek to describe the circumstances in which Sun Simiao compiled his masterpiece, *Qianjin Fang*.<sup>79</sup> However, they also differ in a number of crucial respects, not least of which is the fact that Daoxuan plays a prominent role in YYZZ by sending the dragon to Sun Simiao yet does not even appear in DYZ. Nevertheless, I feel that the latter text merits inclusion in this study of Daoxuan because it reveals that it was not only his biography that was adapted in the flood of information period. This was a time when the life stories of many important historical figures were altered and embellished by enthusiastic authors.

Having taken a slight detour into DYZ, we now return to Daoxuan’s life story and specifically a relationship that is described for the first time in KTCX (890, 91):

<sup>78</sup> DYZ, 912.13–23. Cf. *Du yi zhi* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983), 11–12.

<sup>79</sup> His authorship of *Qianjin Fang* is also affirmed at JTSj191.5096.15 and elsewhere.

The Tripitaka master Wuwei<sup>80</sup> arrived from India.<sup>81</sup> He was welcomed and brought to an audience with the Emperor, who displayed faith in and respect towards the master as soon as they met. The Emperor said to the Tripitaka master: ‘You have come far, Master. I hope [your journey] did not exhaust [you] too much. Is there a particular place where you wish to take some rest?’ The Tripitaka master replied respectfully: ‘Your Majesty, when I was in India, I heard that the *vinaya* master Daoxuan of the Ximing monastery is foremost in observing the *vinaya* stipulations. I would like to go and live under his tutelage.’<sup>82</sup> The Emperor granted his request.

無畏三藏自天竺至，所由引謁。上見而敬信焉。上謂三藏曰，師自遠而來，困倦，欲於何方休息耶。三藏進曰，臣在天竺國時，聞西明寺宣律師持律第一，願依止焉。上可之。

The *vinaya* master [Dao]xuan was very strict in observing the rules, and his religious practice was conducted in utmost purity.<sup>83</sup> The Tripitaka master drank wine and ate meat. His conversation and conduct were vulgar and loose. Sanwuwei was often drunk and became loud. He made the bedding filthy. The *vinaya* master [Dao]xuan was greatly disturbed and unhappy.

---

<sup>80</sup> This master is in all probability meant Śubhakarasiṃha (637-735), who is known in Chinese as Shanwuwei 善無畏. See ‘Shanwuwei’ at T50.2061j2.714b7–716a17.

<sup>81</sup> The Chinese phrase is *tian zhu* 天竺, a transliteration of ‘Hindu’, which was used to describe what we know today as India. According to JTSj198.5306.6–5309.6 and XTSj221a6236.11–6239.6, there were five separate countries in Tang-era India, each of which was known as Tianshu and distinguished by its position on the subcontinent. So, for example, the country in the south of the Indian subcontinent was known as Nan Tianshu (the Country of Southern India). JTS and XTS both attest that official communication was established between Tang China and these five Indias. In some Buddhist texts, the whole subcontinent is referred to as Wutian 五天 (literally, ‘the five Indias’). Examples may be found in *Tang fan fandui ziyan boreboluomiduo xin jing* 唐梵翻對字音般若波羅蜜多心經 (the literal Sanskrit–Chinese translation of the *Prajñāpāramitā Hṛdaya Sūtra*), T8.256j1.851a13, and in *Fo mu dakongquemingwang jing* 佛母大孔雀明王經 (*The Buddha Born Mahāmāyūrī Sūtra*), T19.982j1.415a24. Throughout this book, Tianshu is rendered as India.

<sup>82</sup> The Chinese term is *yizhi* 依止 (literally, ‘to depend (on someone or something) to stop’). However, it is used in *vinaya* texts to describe the relationship between a *bhikṣu* and a particular place or person. For example, in the *Wufen lü*, T22.1421.7b28, *yizhi* is used in the sense of ‘to live in’ a specific place, while in the *Sifen lü*, T22.1428j34.804a2, it means ‘to mentor’ someone. In all *vinaya* texts, when two monks are described as being in a *yizhi* relationship, one will be guiding or mentoring the other. Moreover, without exception, the monk who requests the relationship is the one who is guided, indicating that the two monks assume the roles of master and pupil. Until now in KTCX, Daoxuan was the master and Sanwuwei his pupil.

<sup>83</sup> The Chinese expression is *fen xiu jing jie* 焚修精潔. *Fen* (literally, ‘to burn’) is often used with *xiang* 香 (literally, ‘incense’) to make *fen xiang* 焚香 (‘burn incense’). More about *xiang* at n. 168.

宣律禁誠堅苦，焚修精潔。三藏飲酒食肉，言行粗易，往往乘醉而喧，穢汙綱席。宣律頗不甘心。

In the middle of one night, having caught some lice, Daoxuan threw them onto the ground. At almost exactly the same moment, the already half-drunk Tripitaka master shouted out: ‘Vinaya Master, you are murdering the sons of the Buddha!’ Only then did the *vinaya* master [Dao]xuan realize [that he was in the presence of] an extraordinary man. Having adjusted [his] robes [so they were decent], Daoxuan accorded [Sanwuwei] the utmost deference, as if he regarded him as his own teacher.

忽中夜，宣律捫虱，將投於地。三藏半醉，連聲呼曰，律師撲殺佛子。宣律方知是神異人也。整衣作禮，投而師事之。

Daoxuan was meticulous and earnest. He even engaged in religious activities<sup>84</sup> at night. On one occasion, Daoxuan stumbled and was about to fall down the steps. At that very moment, he felt someone support him. Daoxuan took a good look [and saw that] it was a youth. Daoxuan asked immediately: ‘Good man, you are here in the middle of the night. Who are you?’ This youth replied: ‘I am not an ordinary person. I am Nezha,<sup>85</sup> the son of the Heavenly King Pishamen.<sup>86</sup> Because I protect the Buddhadharma, I also protect you. I have been doing this for a long time.’ Daoxuan said: ‘I practise the teaching, and there is nothing in particular to concern Your Highness. Your Highness is powerful and free. If there are any objects worthy of veneration in the Western Regions, could you please send me one or two?’

---

<sup>84</sup> The Chinese term is *xing dao* 行道 (literally, ‘set the Path in motion’). Yuanzhao 圓照 (718–799) was probably the first Chinese author to attempt to define it in one of his texts (794, 55). In *Da Tang Zhenyuan xu Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 大唐貞元續開元釋教錄 (The Zhenyuan Era Composed the Continued Kaiyuan Catalogue of the Great Tang), T55.2156j2.761b20–25, he relates *xing dao* to several tasks, including reciting *sūtras*, performing the circumambulation, giving dharma lectures and so on. For simplicity, I have rendered the term as ‘to engage in religious activities’.

<sup>85</sup> Special thanks to Li Linghong 李凌虹 for pointing out my error in spelling Nezha as ‘Nazha’. For a study on Nezhai see Li Fengmao 李豐楙, ‘從哪吒太子到中壇元帥：中央－四方思維下的護境象徵’, in 中國文哲研究通訊, 第 19 期, 2 (2006), 34–57. Special thanks to Christoph Anderal for drawing my attention to the link between Nezha and Daoist deities and pointing out for me some of the insightful sources on this subject.

<sup>86</sup> The Chinese term Pishamen 毘沙門 is a transliteration of Vaiśravaṇa, the name of one of the four Heavenly Kings. See more on Pishamen at III.4.4.

宣律精苦之甚，常夜行道。臨階墜墮，忽覺有人，捧承其足。宣律顧視之，乃少年也。宣律遽問，弟子何人，中夜在此。少年曰，某非常人，即毗沙王之子，那咤太子也。護法之故，擁護和尚久矣。宣律曰，貧道修行，無事煩太子。威神自在，西域有可作佛事者，願太子致之。

The Prince said: ‘I have a tooth relic of the Buddha, which I have kept carefully for a long time. However, I am prepared to sacrifice my life,<sup>87</sup> so why would I delay any further in offering you [this relic]?’ Daoxuan then made the necessary request. This tooth relic of the Buddha is now kept in the Chongsheng monastery.

太子曰，某有佛牙，寶事雖久，頭目猶舍，敢不奉獻。宣律求之。即今崇聖寺佛牙是也。<sup>88</sup>

The second part of this narrative is noteworthy because, while it covers the familiar ground of a conversation between Daoxuan and a *deva*, the *deva* in question – Nezha – is a new addition to the master’s biography. Moreover, the manner in which that conversation begins is interesting: Daoxuan is about to fall while engaged in his religious practice, and Nezha helps him to regain his footing. Similarly, at the end of the story, Nezha presents Daoxuan with a long-treasured tooth relic of the Buddha. Once again, this is the first time that this significant gift is mentioned in any biography of Daoxuan. The first part of the narrative is more straightforward as it simply describes the relationship between Daoxuan and Sanwuwei, another important Tang master. In total, then, KTCX (890,90) introduces three new elements to the life story of Daoxuan – the monk Sanwuwei, the *deva* Nezha and the sacred tooth relic of the Buddha.

However, five years later, in JZJ (895, 92), the author Jingxiao 景霄<sup>89</sup> would go much further and add a host of new details to Daoxuan’s life account:

---

<sup>87</sup> The Chinese expression is *tou mu you she* 頭目猶捨 (literally, ‘even to give up head and eyes’).

<sup>88</sup> KTCX, 57.9–58.2.

<sup>89</sup> There is a biography of Jingxiao in *Song gaoseng zhuan*, T50.2061j16.810a4–17, but it is extremely brief and does not even offer a precise year of birth or death. However, we know from JZJ itself that it was composed in 895, which makes it one of the earliest extant sub-commentaries of Daoxuan’s *vinaya* work *Xingshi chao*. Information of the date is at X43.737j1.22b6: *zhi jin Qianning er nian* 至今乾寧二年 (895). For more on Jingxiao, see n. 215.

The dharma name of the author of [Xingshi] *chao* is Daoxuan. Dao 道 means the dharma, *xuan* 宣 is to spread over. [So his name means] to spread the dharma and to make it known to all the sentient beings. The great master<sup>90</sup> [Daoxuan], in his three births, is foremost in upholding the *vinaya* rules. His first birth was in the Qi Dynasty<sup>91</sup> [479–502], the dharma name was Senghu.<sup>92</sup> [He] lived at the Yingle monastery on the Sicheng Mountain in Yanxuan of the Yuezhou. The stone cliff of that mountain is precipitous, measuring several tens of *zhang*<sup>93</sup> in height.

---

<sup>90</sup> The Chinese term is *dashi* 大師. For more on *dashi*, see n. 215.

<sup>91</sup> See more discussion of the first birth in the immediate next footnote.

<sup>92</sup> *Gaoseng zhuan* 高僧傳 (*The Biography of Eminent Monastics [Composed in the Liang dynasty]*); by Huijiao 慧皎; T50.2059; hereafter GSZ) and XGSZ list three Chinese masters with the name Senghu 僧護, at GSZ, T50.2059j8.412a8–b16/j24.381a22–26 and XGSZ, T50.2060j15.693c15–26. We are told that these three Senghus were active, respectively, ‘in the middle of the Jianwu era 建武 of Bei Qi 北齊’ (Northern Qi), ‘in the middle of the Tianjian era 天鑒’ and ‘during the reign of Gao Qi 高齊’ (so called because the family name of the founder of this dynasty was Gao 高; this era is also known as Bei Qi in some Chinese history texts). In trying to determine the identity of the Senghu who features in JZJ, we can probably eliminate the third Senghu because, while GSZ and XGSZ relate that he built a stone statue 石像, they do not mention who or what this statue depicted and, more importantly, assert that he completed it during his lifetime. By contrast, JZJ states that Senghu died before finishing his statue of the Buddha Maitreya. This leaves the first two options, but we immediately encounter a problem, because BSj6–8 and BQSj1–8 both insist that Jianwu was not an era name in the Bei Qi period (550–577). Rather, it was one of the era names of the Nan Qi 南齊 (Southern Qi; 479–502) or Xiao Qi 蕭齊 period (so called because the family name of its founder was Xiao 蕭). Moreover, the era name Tianjian 天鑒 is problematic, too. According Yao Silian 姚思廉’s *Liangshu* 梁書 (*History of the Liang*; 636 CE; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1973; hereafter LS), j1–6, and Li Yanshou 李延壽’s *Nanshi* 南史 (*History of the Southern Dynasties*; 659 CE; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974; hereafter NS), j6–7, Tianjian 天鑒 was not an era name during the Liang Dynasty. Nevertheless, after examining other contexts in which Tianjian 天鑒 appears in GSZ and XGSZ, such as at GSZj8.381b13 and XGSZj29.691.24–25, it seems clear that these characters were used in place of Tianjian 天監 (502–519) – the first era name adopted by the founding emperor of the Liang Dynasty, Wudi 梁武帝 (r. 502–549). This information is useful in helping us identify JZJ’s Senghu. Jingxiao informs us that, just prior to his death, Senghu predicted that he would be reborn and return to this world to complete his project. He also tells us that the reborn Senghu (now known as Sengyou) was already a famous monk in the sixth year of the Tianjian era (507). Therefore, Senghu (in his earlier incarnation) must have lived and died before the start of that era. Consequently, GSZ and XGSZ’s second Senghu cannot be the JZJ Senghu. This leaves us with just one option – the first Senghu, who was active in the Jianwu era. Furthermore, GSZ’s biography of this Senghu closely resembles the story told in the JZJ. The only remaining issue is that GSZ, T50.2059j8.412a15, asserts that this Senghu lived ‘in the middle of the Jianwu era of the Bei Qi 北齊建武中’. Hence, we must assume that this is an error and should read: ‘in the middle of the Jianwu of the Nan Qi 南齊建武中’. Similarly, the biography provided at s.v. ‘Senghu’ in BPAD, which describes him as ‘a monk of the Nan Liang 南梁’ (502–557), should be considered erroneous, because all other sources indicate that Senghu was active, and indeed famous, prior to that period. See more on the three lives (births) of Daoxuan at III.4.4.3. For a study on Liang Wudi (Xiao Yan 蕭衍 [464–549]) and his connection with Buddhism see Tom De Rauw, “Beyond Buddhist Apology: the Political Use of Buddhism by Emperor Wu of the Liang Dynasty (r. 502–549).” PhD diss., University of Ghent, 2008.

<sup>93</sup> The Chinese term is *zhang* 丈, a unit of measurement whose value varied over time. JTSj48.2089.10–11 states that one *zhang* was equivalent to ten *chi* 尺 (3.03 metres). See the next note for more details on *chi*.

鈔主法名道宣也。道者法也，宣者遍也，顯揚弘演，遍示有情也。大師三生，持律第一。第一生在齊朝，法名僧護，住越洲剡懸石城山隱樂寺。其山石壁峭峻，高數十丈。

On [the cliff,] a flame was faintly visible, but its outline was clear and resembled the image of the Buddha. Whenever [Senghu] walked by,<sup>94</sup> [there would be] auspicious signs [, such as] a heavenly melody or an unfamiliar but pleasant fragrance. Therefore, [Senghu] vowed to build a ten-zhang-high [statue of the Buddha] Maitreya, with the intention of [venerating this statue as if it was] the ten-thousand-zhang-high [body of] the coming [Buddha Maitreya, and] in the hope that whoever was involved [in building the statue] would attend the three rounds of gatherings<sup>95</sup> [where

---

<sup>94</sup> The Chinese term is *jīng xíng* 經行, seemingly a translation of the Sanskrit term *cāñkramati*, and often rendered in English as ‘walking meditation’. However, this is far from the only usage in Chinese Buddhist texts. For example, it can mean simply ‘walking’, as in the Chinese translation of the *Arthavargīyasūtra*, *Fo shuo yi zhu jing* 佛說義足經 (*A Collection of the Meaningful Words of the Buddha*), T4.198j1.176a3, where a beautiful lady walks in the mountains. Moreover, it may be combined with other phrases – such as *xuán fù* 旋復 (literally, ‘circle repeatedly’) and *zhōu za* 周匝 (literally, ‘turn’) – to mean ‘circumambulation’. Such combinations are found, respectively, in *Fo shuo baiyi jinchuang er poluomen yuanqi jing* 佛說白衣金幢二婆羅門緣起經 (*The Birth Story Spoken by the Buddha of the Two Brahmins the Baiyi and the Jinchuang*), T1.10j1.216b19, and the translation of the *Lalitavistarasūtra*, *Fangguang da zhuangyan jing* 方廣大莊嚴經 (*The Mahāyāna sūtra of the Solemn Decoration*), T3.187j10.600c29. It is also sometimes paired with the phrase *lái wǎng* 來往 (literally, ‘come and go back’) to mean walking back and forth, as in *Sifēn lü*, T22.1428j11.641b23. According to the *Taishō* texts, the Buddha frequently advised his disciples to engage in *jīng xíng* either during meditation (e.g. T1.26j8.473c19–474a8) or to ward off drowsiness (e.g. T23.1435j56.b21–c1). It is unclear whether one of the three aforementioned forms of *jīng xíng* – simply walking, circumambulating, or walking back and forth – is preferable to the others during meditation. However, taking into consideration the expression *jīng xíng dào tóu* 經行道頭 (literally, ‘the end of the path for *jīng xíng*’), which appears in the translation of the *Madhyamāgama*, *Zhōng ahan jing* 中阿含經 (*The Middle-length Discourses*) at T1.26j6.460b19, in *Za baozang jing* 雜寶藏經 (*The Sūtra of Miscellaneous Treasures*) at T4.203j5.472b29, and in Xuanzang’s (602–664) *Da Tang Xiyu ji* 大唐西域記 (*The Records of the Western Regions of the Great Tang*; hereafter XYJ) description of a walking path used by the Buddha during meditation that was fifty *bu* 步 (literally, ‘one step’) in length, T51.2087j5.893b14–15, it is reasonable to conclude that *jīng xíng* – in the sense of walking meditation – involves walking back and forth in a straight line. Furthermore, Fotuoboli 佛陀波利, an Indian meditation master and a translation monk, mentions straightforwardly in 677 CE that ‘*jīng xíng* is walking back and forth (*jīng xíng zhe zhí lái zhí wǎng* 經行者直往直來)’ when it is discussed in the context of meditation, *Xiū chán yáojué* 修禪要訣 (*Key to Meditation*; X63.1222), j1.15c14. See Fotuoboli’s biography at T50.2061j2.717c15–718b7. However, to avoid confusion, I have translated it simply as ‘walked by’, and leave it for readers to decide if this means a casual stroll, a bracing walk to stave off tiredness or part of Senghu’s meditative practice. According to the information provided at JTSj48.2088.9, one *bu* equalled five *chi* 尺. Unfortunately, as we have seen, it is difficult to establish a precise length for one *chi*, but Qiu Guangming’s proposal of 30.3 centimetres during the Tang era is credible. On this basis, we may estimate the length of the Buddha’s walking path at 75.75 metres.

<sup>95</sup> See explanation on *sanhui* at n. 38.

the Buddha Maitreya would preach the dharma. Construction of the statue] began in the middle<sup>96</sup> of the Jianwu era [(i.e. 494–498)].

中有似佛焰光之形。每於經行，常聞天樂，異香之瑞。遂發願，造十丈彌勒，以擬當來千尺之身，使凡厥有緣，並願同登三會。建武年中起手。

[But] one year after [the project had been] launched, [Senghu] passed away at the age of one hundred and twenty due to illness. Just before his passing, [he] declared emphatically: ‘I never expected to see the completion [of this project] within just one lifetime, but I am confident that my vow shall certainly be fulfilled in the second birth.’

僅至一年方成，向獲過疾而終，春秋一百二十。臨終誓曰，本不期一生，願第二生必就。

Time passed, and it was now the sixth year of the Tianjian era [507] of the Liang [502–557]. There was [a man named] Lu Xian,<sup>97</sup> the district magistrate of Shifeng in Taizhou,<sup>98</sup> which is now known as Tangxing. On the way back to the capital after fulfilling his official duties, he passed by and stayed overnight at Yanhan.<sup>99</sup> That night, [in a dream, Lu Xian] saw

<sup>96</sup> Whenever the context has the era name mentioned with *zhong* 中 (literally, ‘middle’), no decision is attempted on which year should be the ‘middle’ of that era. The date comes immediately after that era name in the parenthesis covers the whole of that era and this practice is adopted throughout this study, or otherwise specified.

<sup>97</sup> In the *Taishō* collection, the name Lu Xian 陸咸 only ever appears in relation to the construction of this statue of the Buddha Maitreya. Moreover, the standard history books for this period provide no further information about him. Nevertheless, Guanding 灌頂 (561–632) mentions Lu Xian and the statue of the Buddha Maitreya in one of his ceremonial letters in his *Guoqing bai lu* 國清百錄 (*The Miscellaneous Records of the Guoqing [Monastery]*; hereafter GQBL), T46.1934j3.809b12. This letter was read on the twenty-first day of the tenth month of the seventeenth year of the Kaihuang era (i.e. 597 CE; T46.1934j3.809c3–4). Therefore, while we have no further details about this official, the story of his dream and his role in the erection of the statue continued to circulate for many years, as is evident in the fact that it appears in the GSZ (519), Guanding’s letter (597) and the JZJ (895), among other texts. There is more information on Guanding at n. 258.

<sup>98</sup> Taizhou is in present-day Taizhou City, Zhejiang Province 浙江省.

<sup>99</sup> Yan and Han are the names of two districts in Kuaiji 會稽, a Tang-era prefecture that roughly equates to modern-day Zhejiang Province. However, the placename Yanhan 劍漢, as at JTSj40.1590.6, may be read as: ‘Yan, a District name of the Han’ (206 BCE–220 CE).

three Indian monks. They said to him: ‘His Highness of Jian’an<sup>100</sup> has fallen ill and has not yet recovered. If [he could] commence and complete the construction of a sacred statue in this good place, Shicheng, [he] shall certainly make a full recovery.’<sup>101</sup> The official Lu returned to the capital, [but by then] he had completely forgotten [what the Indian monks had said].

至梁天監六年，有台洲始豐縣令（今改為唐興也）陸咸，罷邑返京，路經剡漢止宿。夜夢見三梵僧，語云，建安殿下，感患未瘳，若能修聖石城，聖像成就，□獲痊差。陸令歸京，並忘此事。

Several years later, a monk arrived at his home and requested lodging. [This monk] said to [Lu Xian]: ‘Why did you not do what I advised you to do at the time of your departure from Yan?’ The official Lu immediately remembered the dream he had had earlier. After the monk had departed, [Lu Xian] thought [about the dream] again and suddenly declared: ‘That monk was the third one I saw in the dream.’ [He] related this matter to the Lord of Jian’an, and (the Lord of Jian’an?) accordingly reported it [to the court]. An imperial order was issued to start the construction [of the statue. The government] honoured<sup>102</sup> the *vinaya* master Sengyou (445-518)<sup>103</sup> with the commission to oversee the construction of the statue. The project started in the twelfth year of the Tianjian era and was completed fifteen years later. The height of the upper body of the statue was five *zhang*,

<sup>100</sup> His Highness of Jian’an, Xiao Wei 蕭偉 (476–533), was a younger brother of Emperor Wu of the Liang Dynasty 梁武帝 (r. 502–549). He was named Commandery Prince of Jian’an 建安郡王 in 502 and Commandery Prince of Nanning 南平郡王 in 519. See his entries at LSj22.346.7–348.13 and NSj52.1290.15–1292.6. Both of these biographies, at LSj22.348.1–12 and NSj52.1292.3, state that Xiao Wei enthusiastically embraced the Buddha’s teaching in his old age (*wan nian chongxin foli* 晚年崇信佛理). However, NSj52.1291.5–6 asserts that he had previously demolished and melted down bronze statues of the Buddha in the monasteries of Xiangyang 襄陽 (modern-day Xiangyang City in Hubei Province 湖北省) to help fund the Emperor’s military campaigns and had executed some monks who had attempted to hide their valuables. Subsequently, he was said to have suffered a disgusting disease (*e ji* 惡疾) – in all likelihood the illness that is mentioned at this point in the JZJ.

<sup>101</sup> One character is missing from the original text. My addition of ‘certainly’ is based on the word ‘*bi* 必’, which appears in a similar context at T50.2059j8.412a24.

<sup>102</sup> The Chinese term is *chan* 諂 (literally, ‘to flatter’), translated here as ‘honoured’ as the commission to oversee the construction of such a prestigious project would have been considered a great honour.

<sup>103</sup> See Sengyou’s entry in GSZ, T50.2059j11.402c3–403a2, and discussion on this monk at ns. 83, 97.

and the entire erection was ten *zhang*. [The name of the monastery] was changed to Shicheng.<sup>104</sup>

後經歲年，有一僧來宅寄宿，因話云，剗後所囑，何不施行。陸令既戀前夢。此僧去後思審，方乃語之，此僧正是夢處中，見第三之者。即以事啟建安王。以事聞奏，勅下修之。諭僧祐律師，專任修像也。天監十二年興功，過十五年畢。坐軀高五丈，立形十丈，改為石城寺也。

This Sengyou was, in fact, the second birth [of Daoxuan. His] family name was Yu. His ancestors were natives of Xiapi Pengcheng and moved to Jianye<sup>105</sup> after securing a government position. When [Seng]you was seven years old, he entered Jianchu monastery and did not want to return home [because his parents?] wanted [him] to get married [one day]. [He] ran away [and] went to master Fada<sup>106</sup> of the Dinglin monastery on Zhong Mountain, under whom he received full ordination and mastered the *vinaya*.

僧祐律師即第二生身。俗姓俞氏，其先祖彭城下邳人也（皮音）。又因官唐於建業。祐年七歲，因入建初寺，不肯還家，至年長大，欲為婚娶，遂即迴避投鐘山定林寺，法達和尚，求受具戒，學精律部。

[Seng]you was born dexterous and bright-minded. Whenever a construction [was planned] in the country, [he] was always favoured with the royal commission to oversee [the project]. In the seventeenth year of the Tianjian era, [Sengyou] passed away at his home monastery. More information [about Sengyou] is available in the biography of the monastics.

祐為姓巧麗，國內凡有修飾，皆蒙勅委主持。梁天監十七年，終於本寺。廣如僧傳中（云云）。

<sup>104</sup> At YWLJj76.1302.10–1033.1, one of the most distinguished scholars of the Tang Dynasty, Ouyang Xun 歐陽詢 (557–641), records a stone inscription composed by Liu Xie 劉勰 (?–520) which praises the Buddha Maitreya statue that was constructed under the supervision of Sengyou.

<sup>105</sup> Jianye 建業 was an early name of present-day Nanjing, Jiangsu Province 江蘇省.

<sup>106</sup> Little is known about the life of Fada, aside from information provided at T50.2059j11a25–b8: he was the *seng zheng* 僧正 (the chief monk appointed by the court to oversee Buddhist affairs) of Beiwei 北魏 (386–534) and he faithfully followed the teaching of the *Mahāyāna sūtras* in the hope of mitigating his *karmic* retribution, which would otherwise be very unpleasant. Sengyou's entry in GSZ, T50.2059j11.402c3–403a2, mentions that he was a native of and became a monk in Jianye, the capital of Liu Song 劉宋 (420–479), which was a rival of Beiwei. Therefore, it seems highly unlikely that the Fada in GSZ was the same Fada who officiated at Sengyou's full ordination.

The third birth is this life. [In this life, he was] born in the Sui Dynasty [581–618], [and] his family name was Qian. His various biographies, without exception, say [he] was a native of Huzhou Changcheng.<sup>107</sup> (The biographical sketch and the stone inscription say the same.)<sup>108</sup> One particular account mentions that, according to the Qian family tree, the grandfather [of Daoxuan] was a native of Changcheng, [while] the master [himself] was born in the capital. It also says that [Daoxuan's] great-grandfather was the chief of palace guards during the Chen Dynasty [557–589]. [His] grandfather was the Governor of Chengliu.<sup>109</sup>

第三生即今身也，生隋朝，俗始錢氏。諸記中，皆云湖州長城人（行狀碑文亦同）。表云，准錢氏譜說，祖父即長城人，大師在京兆生也。彼云，曾祖是陳朝駙馬都尉，祖為陳留太守。

The name [of his] father was Shiseng 士申. (Some substitute 由 for [申]; this is incorrect.)<sup>110</sup> [His father was] the minister at the Ministry of Personnel. When the Sui Dynasty defeated the Chen Dynasty, Qian Shen and the last emperor of the Chen were captured and sent to Chang'an. Later, the [last emperor of] the Chen died while still held captive by the Sui.<sup>111</sup> However, [the court of] the Sui pardoned [Qian] Shen. Time passed and in the sixteenth year of the Kaihuang era [596], the great master was born. The

<sup>107</sup> Changcheng 長城, the name of a District 縣 during the Sui Dynasty, is in present-day Changxing County 長興县, Zhejiang Province. The territory and the local government site 治 of this place changed over time. For the detail of the changes see *Changxing xianzhi* 長興縣志 (The History of Changxing County; Qian Daxin 錢大昕. Taipei: Chengwen chubanshe, 1976; hereafter CXXZ), j1.95/99, and in *Huzhou fuzhi* 湖州府志 (The History of Huzhou; in *Zhongguo Fangzhi Congshu* 中國方志叢書; Taipei: Chengwen chubanshe, 1960; hereafter HZFZ), j335–36. See further discussion on the birthplace of Daoxuan at III.3.

<sup>108</sup> This comment was made by Jingxiao himself at this point in the text.

<sup>109</sup> Chengliu was a prefecture that straddled present-day Kaifeng 開封 and Fengqiu 封丘, He'nan Province.

<sup>110</sup> This comment was made by Jingxiao himself at this point in the text.

<sup>111</sup> The Chinese expression is *hou zao Sui zei* 後遭隋賊 (literally, ‘was later killed by the Sui’). However, the entry for Chen Shubao 陳叔寶 (r. 582–589), the last emperor of the Chen Dynasty 陳朝 (557–589), in Yao Silian 姚思廉’s *Chenshu* 陳書 (*History of the Chen*; 636 CE; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1972), j6.119.4–8, and NSj10.310.9–311.2 both suggest that he died from excessive consumption of wine. The Sui Emperor Wendi 隋文帝 (r. 581–604) may well have encouraged this overindulgence by keeping his erstwhile rival well supplied with alcohol, but this hardly amounts to ‘killing’ him. Moreover, NSj10.309.11–310.2 states that Wendi pardoned all of the prisoners who had been sent to Chang’an (presumably including Chen Shubao).

master was the elder of [Qian] Shen's two children. (Clearly, then, on the basis of this account, the master was born and brought up in the capital.)<sup>112</sup>

父名士申(有作由字者錯也),即吏部尚書。陳被隋所收,其錢申,此時與陳後主,一時收獲入長安。陳王後遭隋賊。車却免傷害。遇隋開皇十六年,方產大師。大師即申二息之長(據此所說,即大師是京兆生長明矣)。

The family name<sup>113</sup> of his mother was Yao 姚. She dreamed the moon had entered her chest and heard an Indian monk's voice: 'Good lady, in your womb is the *vinaya* master Sengyou of the Liang Dynasty. You should let [him] become a monk; he will greatly promote the teaching of the Buddha.' [The unborn child] stayed in her womb for twelve months, and he was born on the eighth day of the fourth month in the sixteenth year of the Kaihuang era of the Sui [596], the year of *bingchen*.<sup>114</sup> In [his] early childhood, [he] was distinguished from ordinary children.<sup>115</sup> By the age of ten, [he] was well read. [When he was] twelve, [he was] already very good at letters. [When he was] fifteen, [he] sighed: 'Fame and an official position are not things one could hold for long.'<sup>116</sup>

母性姚氏,夢見有月貫懷,又夢梵僧語云,仁者所懷,即梁朝僧祐律師,宣縱出家,大弘佛教。凡在胎十二月,隋開皇十六年丙辰四月八日誕生。齠生之日,使異常童。十歲遍覽群書,十二善閑文藻,十五喟然歎曰,世間榮祿,難可常保。

---

<sup>112</sup> This comment was made by Jingxiao himself at this point in the text.

<sup>113</sup> The Chinese character is *xing* 性, which has a number of meanings, including 'nature', 'gender', and 'quality' and so on, none of which fits this context. Hence, I have assumed that this was an error and the intention was to write *xing* 姓 ('surname').

<sup>114</sup> The Chinese term is *bing chen* 丙辰. It is one of the combinations in *ganzhi* 干支 ('sexagenary cycle'). See an introduction of the *ganzhi* system in Endymion Wilkinson, *Chinese History: A New Manual* (Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Asia Center, 2013), 496–498.

<sup>115</sup> From the text, it is unclear whether Daoxuan's parents or the force of his past karma distinguished him from the other children. (The inclusion of the word *shi* 使 in this sentence means that Daoxuan did not distinguish himself, as such. Someone or something else singled him out from the crowd.)

<sup>116</sup> This is the first account to link certain signs (e.g. the moon and an Indian monk's voice) to Daoxuan's conception. See appendix 4, Part 1 for further details. For a study of the concept of the gifted child in Buddhist contexts, see Miriam Levering, 'The Precocious Child in Chinese Buddhism', in Vanessa R. Sasson (ed.), *Little Buddhas: Children and Childhoods in Buddhist Texts and Traditions* (New York: Oxford University Press, AAR Religion, Culture, and History, 2013), 124–156. Special thanks to Ester Bianchi for bringing this chapter to my attention.

Therefore, [he] abandoned all the things<sup>117</sup> [that would interest other children of his age] and devoted [himself] wholeheartedly to Buddhism. [He chose] the dharma teacher Huiyun<sup>118</sup> of the Riyang monastery as his master. [Daoxuan began to] recite the *sūtras* when he was sixteen, and in a period of twenty days, he was able to recite Flower *Sūtra*.<sup>119</sup> [He was] tonsured at the age of seventeen. In the eleventh year of the Daye era [615], the twenty-year-old [Daoxuan], blessed by the great favour of the court, received full ordination under the master Shou.<sup>120</sup>

於是棄竹馬，臥龍劍，歸心於釋門，事日嚴寺慧願法師。十六念經，兩旬之間，念花經部，一十七落髮。至大業十一年，年滿二十，天降鴻恩，依首和尚受具。

[At his full ordination,] after holding a jewelled box respectfully and then resting it on his head, he started circumambulating the stupa. Some relics<sup>121</sup> were invoked and appeared in the box. Only then did the religious

<sup>117</sup> The Chinese expressions are *qi zu ma* 売竹馬 (literally, ‘to abandon the bamboo-made horse’) and *wo long ren* 臥龍劍 (literally, ‘to lay down the dragon-shaped sword’), two items that Jingxiao’s readers would have associated with children’s play. For clarity, I decided to render them simply as ‘things’.

<sup>118</sup> Daoxuan provides a biography of this master in XGSZ, T50.2060j14.533c11–534b9, where he calls him one of the pre-eminent monks of his time and suggests that he was particularly good at understanding and expounding the teaching of the Buddha. Daoxuan-related works render Daoxuan’s first master in three different ways. The first is 慧願, as in JZJ (895, 92) and LYSZ (1687, 199); the second is 智願, as in SGSZ (988, 102), LXSZ (1366, 221), GSZY (1654, 250), *Pini zuochi xushi* 毗尼作持續釋 (*A Continued Elaboration on Vinaya Karman*; 1665, 245; hereafter PNZC) and Dong Hao 董皓’s *Quan Tang wen* 全唐文 (*Complete Prose Literature of the Tang*; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983; 1814, 290; hereafter QTW); the third is 願公 in SMZT (1237, 176), as in FZTJ (1269, 180) and LDTZ (1341, 212). The character 願 is said to have two readings according to Zhang Yushu 張玉書 and Chen Tingjing 陳廷敬’s *Kangxi zidian* 康熙字典 (*Kangxi Dictionary*; 1710), 1569, as *yun* and *jun*. It is not known when this double reading originated. On the other hand, *Yi qie jing yin yi* (817, 64), T54.2128j93a29–b1, states that the reading of 願 ‘as in Xu gaoseng zhuan’ is *yun*. [Yun] is part of the given names of certain monks.’ *Yi qie jing yin yi* is the first of the Daoxuan-related works to mention this reading of 願. In this study, I read 願 as *yun*. Nevertheless, some present-day pinyin 拼音 sources recognize 願 only as *jun*. For the relationship between Daoxuan and Huiyun, see III.4.2.1.

<sup>119</sup> The Chinese term is *hua jing* 華經 (literally, ‘flower *sūtra*’). However, there is no Flower *Sūtra* in the *Taishō* collection. Hence, I believe that this probably refers to *miao fa lianhu jing* 妙法蓮華經 (T9.262) on the basis of Daoxuan’s foreword at T9.262j1.1b13–c11, which is effusive in its praise for this *sūtra*.

<sup>120</sup> Here Shou is Zhishou 智首, Daoxuan’s *vinaya* teacher. In his *Xu gaoseng zhuan* at T50.2060j22.614a1–615a24 Daoxuan has an entry for Zhishou under one of the ten sections ‘minglì 明律’ (literally, ‘the masters who penetrate the *vinaya*’) and speaks Zhishou as one of the most important *vinaya* masters of his time. See Daoxuan and Zhishou at III.4.2.2.

<sup>121</sup> According to Daoshi in FYZL (668, 33), T53.2122j40.598c10–13, *sheli* is the Chinese transliteration of a Sanskrit term, *śarīra* (literally, ‘the remains and bone’). See more on the term at PBD, 778. For study on *sheli* see Gregory Schopen, *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks: Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1997): chapters 8–9.

[full ordination] ceremony begin. After receiving full ordination under the great *vinaya* master [Zhi]shou, [Daoxuan] listened and studied the *Vinaya Piṭaka*. After attending only one round [of lectures, he felt he had] already grasped the essence [of the *vinaya*, so he] expressed a desire for solitude in the mountains.

頂戴寶函，遶塔行道，感舍利降函，方崇法事。受具已後，依首律大師，聽習律藏，一遍入神俗，便欲歸山宴寂。

[He] was reproached by [his] tonsure master [Huijun]: ‘Listen, from the beginning of the time, it has always been this way: after learning how to read the musical note, only then one would be able to understand the entire composition. Similarly, one’s participation in and withdrawal from his learning should be undertaken at the proper time. [You must] put in the necessary effort and complete the task,<sup>122</sup> [and you] should not leave the *vinaya* [lectures.]’ The master Huiyun] insisted that [Daoxuan should] listen to [the *vinaya* lecture] again. During [the lectures, Huiyun] himself assumed responsibility for and fulfilled all of the monastic duties [that had been assigned to Daoxuan, while Daoxuan] carefully studied [the *vinaya*] a total of twenty times.

被受業師呵曰，夫適遐自爾，因徵知章，修捨有期，功口須滿，不宜去律，抑令更聽，其間僧事，自代為之。依位披尋滿二十遍。

At the time of the transition of power between the Sui [581–619] and the Tang [618–907] dynasties, [activities such as] delivering Buddhist

---

<sup>122</sup> The second Chinese character is missing from this four-character expression, but, given the similarities between this account and SGSZ, T50.2061j16.790b22, I used the first character from the latter as the second character here. This makes the full expression *gong yuan xu man* 功願須滿 (literally, ‘the effort’, ‘the vow’, ‘must’, ‘be fulfilled’). However, neither JZJ nor any other Daoxuan-related text elaborates on what this vow may have been. Hence, to avoid confusion and notwithstanding the risk of oversimplification, I decided to translate the inserted character *yuan* (‘vow’) as ‘task’.

lectures and offering refuge were temporarily suspended.<sup>123</sup> Only in the fourth year of Wude [621] [could he] listen [to the lectures] again. The master [Zhi]shou invited [Daoxuan] to lecture [on his behalf].<sup>124</sup> Knowing that the wording [of Zhishou's *vinaya* works?] could be improved<sup>125</sup> in places, [and] aware [that he] had not yet fully grasped [the teaching of the *vinaya*], [Daoxuan] asked to decline [the invitation. However,] his request was not accepted, [so he] tentatively repeated the words [of Zhishou].

時值隋唐交禪講歸權停。武德四年，方遂再聽。首大師令命覆講，自知文句缺然，未是心證，遂不取受，辭不獲已，方乃覆文。

In the ninth year of Wude [626], because the Tang Gaozu (r. 618–626) [had ordered the] obliteration<sup>126</sup> of the Buddhist monks and nuns, [Daoxuan] went into hiding on Zhongnan [Mountain], where he wrote his

<sup>123</sup> The Chinese sentence is *shi zhi Sui Tang jiao shan jiang gui quan ting* 時值隋唐交禪講歸權停. The sixth of these ten characters, 禪, has two possible readings: *shan* (literally, ‘hand over the throne’) and *chan* (literally, ‘meditate’). This means that there are two possible translations of the sentence: the one that appears in the quoted extract and ‘Because it was the time [when the dynasty] changed from the Sui to the Tang, [activities such as] practising meditation, delivering Buddhist lectures and offering refuge were temporarily suspended.’ Given the context, both of these translations seem equally valid. As for why the activities were suspended, there is nothing to suggest that either the Sui or the Tang government introduced legislation to prohibit them. Rather, as JTSj1.4.15–10.7, XTSj1.2.11–8.8 and ZZTJ185–188 all indicate, Chang'an 長安, where Daoxuan was living at the time, experienced considerable turmoil during the transition (618–619), so it was probably the Buddhist community itself that took the decision to suspend some of its activities until peace was restored.

<sup>124</sup> Here, the Chinese expression is *fu jiang* 覆講 (literally, ‘cover, talk’). In the *Taishō* collection, this phrase first appears (see more at the end of this note) in Huijiao’s GSZ (519). Thereafter, later authors, such as Daoxuan in XGSZ (c. 665, 26; See appendix 3 for the date information of the XGSZ) and Zanning in SGSZ (988, 102), use it to denote a master’s invitation to a student to deliver a dharma lecture on his behalf. When these requests are made, the student monk is invariably pre-eminent among his classmates in the master’s field of expertise: for instance, the master Fotucheng 佛圖澄 and his student Dao'an 道安, the master Yan 衍法師 and his student Linggan 靈幹 and the master Song 嵩法師 and his student Daoyin 道因 at, respectively, T50.2059j5.351c17–20, T50.2060j12.518b1–3 and T50.2061j2.717a6–11. However, as we shall see at the end of this paragraph, Daoxuan did not deliver a lecture but simply repeated the words of Zhishou, as indicated by the expression *fu wen* 覆文 (literally, ‘cover the words’). A contemporary of Huijiao, Fayun 法雲 also uses *fu jiang* in a similar fashion in his *Fahuajing yi ji* 法華經義記 (*Explanatory Notes on Fahua Jing*), T33.1715j7.651c24/652c16/17/653a10/23/26/b4/c15/654a2/4/5/6/b27/658a8/9/16/18. We know from his entry in Daoxuan’s XGSZ at T50.2060j15.463c13–465a19 that Fayun dies in 529 at the age of sixty-three. Nevertheless, the date of his *Fahuajing yi ji* is unknown.

<sup>125</sup> The Chinese phrase is *wen ju que ran* 文句缺然 (literally, ‘the incompleteness of the words and sentences’), but we are not told which words and sentences. My tentative suggestion that this is a reference to Zhishou’s *vinaya* works is based on information provided in *Liang chu qingzhong yi* 量處輕重儀 (*Guidelines for the Classification and Handling of Monastic Property*; 667, 28), T45.1895j1.840a2–3, where Daoxuan uses the expression *shan bu jiu zhang* 刪補舊章 (literally, ‘[I (Daoxuan)] have introduced some amendments to this work [by Zhishou]’) when commenting on a particular aspect of Zhishou’s *vinaya* work.

<sup>126</sup> The Chinese expression is *sha tai* 沙汰, which has a number of meanings, one of which is ‘obliterate’. More discussion on *sha tai* is at IV.3.

*Shichao*.<sup>127</sup> In the eighth year of the Zhenguan era [634], in the Yici Valley of Xianzhou,<sup>128</sup> [Daoxuan] revised [Xingshi chao] and composed two other commentaries – the *Jiemo* and the *Jiixin*.<sup>129</sup> [These texts,] without exception, were venerated by the dragons and the *devas* and received with offerings of incense and flowers. Whenever a monastic or a layperson [approached him] for some advice, [Daoxuan would] kindly favour them with a prediction.<sup>130</sup>

至武德九年，過唐高祖，沙汰僧尼，遂遁迹終南，製此事鈔。貞觀八年，顯於洲益，詞谷重修，并製羯磨戒心兩疏。莫不龍天歸敬，奉獻香花，或縕素諮詢，皆蒙預記。

[Daoxuan's] three robes were made of simple fabric, never silk or cotton. [He] meditated all day long and ate only one meal a day. He maintained these practices throughout [his monastic career, and] never

<sup>127</sup> The Chinese characters are *shichao* 事鈔, a common abbreviation in Daoxuan-related works for *Sifen lü shanfan buque xingshi chao* (634, 2; T40.1804).

<sup>128</sup> The Chinese term is *xian yu zhou* 顯於洲. Judging from the context and similar passages in other Daoxuan-related works, the characters seem to be in the wrong order; the author probably meant to write *yu xian zhou* 於顯洲 (literally, ‘in the canton of Xian’). However, there was no such place as Xian during the Tang era. Hence, Xian 顯 is probably a misprint of the character *Xi* 隰, a place that Daoxuan did visit regularly. *Xi* is in present-day Shanxi Province. S.v. *Xi* at *Zhongguo lishi da cidian: lishi dili juan* 中国历史大辞典 (*Comprehensive Dictionary of Chinese History: Terms of Historical Geography*; Shanghai: Shanghai cishu chubanshe, 1996; hereafter LLCD), 1026, and a general history of *Xi*, Qian Yikai 錢以燦’s *Xizhou zhi* 隰州志 (*The History of Xizhou*, in *Zhongguo Fangzhi Congshu* 中國方志叢書; Taipei: Chengwen chubanshe, 1960).

<sup>129</sup> The Chinese terms are *Jiemo* 獶磨 and *Jiixin* 戒心. The former probably denotes one of Daoxuan’s *vinaya* commentaries, *Sifen lü shan bu sui ji jie mo* 四分律刪補隨機羯磨 (*The Amended Manual of Sifen lü for Day-to-Day Monastic Procedures*; c.638, 3; T40.1806), while the latter (literally, ‘*vinaya* heart/essence’) probably denotes *Sifen lü bhikṣu han zhu jie beng* 四分律比丘含注戒本 (*The Prātimokṣa of Sifen lü with Annotations*; 650, 9; T40.1806).

<sup>130</sup> The Chinese expression is *jie meng yu ji* 皆蒙預記 (literally, ‘all favoured with a prediction’). The expression *yu ji* does not appear in any other biography of Daoxuan, and Jingxiao’s use of it here likely reflects his deep personal respect for the master. Moreover, it appears only once in the *Taishō* texts, in *Fo shuo fadeng bonihuan jing* 佛說方等般泥洹經 (*The Discourse on Mahāyāna Nibban Preached by the Buddha*) at T12.378j1.919a1, where the Buddha tells his disciples that those who were in the audience when he preached this *sūtra* will reap rich *karmic* rewards. Hence, *yu ji* seems to be very similar to *shou ji* 授記, a term which appears much more frequently in the *Taishō* collection when predictions are made: for example, where someone will be reborn, as at T1.1j5.34b4–c19; a monastic’s future spiritual achievements, as in the *Pravāraṇasūtra* 佛說解夏經 (*The Sūtra Preached by the Buddha at the End of the Summer Retreat*), T1.64j1.862a4–6; or precisely when a bodhisattva will become a Buddha, as at T7.220j451.279a28–b5. However, notwithstanding the term’s broad application in relation to a wide variety of predictions, as these three examples indicate, it is used almost exclusively in texts attributed to the Buddha.

compromised. Whenever he walked, he was modest in his steps.<sup>131</sup> At any time, if a flea or some such was found [on his body?], [he would] let [the creature] do as it pleased. [He acquired a] great reputation for his high moral principles, even in the land of India. This was the reason [why] the arahant Piṇḍola<sup>132</sup> came to converse [with Daoxuan], and the long-eyebrowed Indian monk praised [Daoxuan] at length [for his] introduction of the [ordination] platform.

三衣准布，繒纊不兼，常坐一食，始終無改，行口促涉，蚤虱任遊。德望既高，名振天竺，故得賓頭羅漢，語話周施，長眉梵僧讚述增壇事。

[When] the Tripitaka master of the Tang<sup>133</sup> [was about to start his] translation of numerous *sūtras*, [he] invited the master [Daoxuan] to visit him, and together [they would] oversee [the translation]. Thereafter, deeply fascinated by the words of the Buddha, [Daoxuan wrote commentaries that totalled] over two hundred and thirty scrolls. All [of these works] have been well read across the generations.

唐朝三藏，翻譯眾經，即命大師，親同典教。而著迷法門文記，凡二百三十餘卷，並行於代。

In the second month of the spring of the second year of the Qianfeng era [667] in the reign of the Gaozong (r. 649–683), not on Daoxuan's initiative, the *devas* were invoked [by his virtue]. They came and conversed with the master. [They told him that he would] pass away later that year and would be reborn in the palace of [the Buddha] Maitreya. [The *devas*]

<sup>131</sup> In the original text, the four-character expression is 行口促涉, with the second character absent and the fourth likely a misprint. However, given the similarities between this extract from the JZJ and SMZT, X75.1513j8.361, I inserted and translated the complete phrase 行必促步 from the latter.

<sup>132</sup> The Chinese term is Bintou 寶頭, a common Chinese transliteration and abbreviation of Piṇḍola-Bhāradvāja. Piṇḍola was one of the Buddha's great disciples, although the Buddha rebuked him for displaying his supernatural powers to lay people in exchange for a valuable sandalwood alms bowl. This rebuke and the consequent promulgation of a corresponding *vinaya* rule are recorded in *Sifen lù*, T22.1428j51.946b29–c25. Moreover, in the *Shisong lù*, T23.1435j37.269a26–b4, the Buddha banishes Piṇḍola and condemns him to spend the rest of his life anywhere but Jambudvīpa 閻浮提 (where the Buddha himself resides). However, a fifth-century translated *sūtra*, *Qing Bingtoulu fa* 請賓頭盧法 (*The Ritual for Invoking Piṇḍola*), T32.1689j1.784b9–11, offers a different perspective on Piṇḍola's fate: the Buddha wants him to remain as a sacred figure on earth, rather than gain access to Nirvāṇa 涅槃, so that future Buddhists may make offerings to him and thus gain merit.

<sup>133</sup> That is, Xuanzang 玄奘. See Daoxuan and Xuanzang at III.4.5.2.

cordially left a packet of incense. [They told Daoxuan that] it was called *jilin xiang*<sup>134</sup> and that it was often used by *devas*. Having said what they had come to say, [the *devas*] left. On the third day of the tenth month [later that year], a feast for all<sup>135</sup> was organized. That afternoon, the monastics and the lay people [at the feast] heard music from Heaven and smelled a fine fragrance. At that precise moment, [Daoxuan,] with a sober expression, expired. [He was] seventy-two years old, and his career spanned fifty-two years.

至高宗乾封二年仲春月，冥感天人，與師言論云，今歲當遷神，生彌勒宮，并留香一裹云，是棘林香。天眾常燒者，言說而去。至十月三日，設無遮大會，午時道俗咸聞天樂異香，於是歛容而化。春秋七十二，僧臘五十二。

[Daoxuan's body was] initially buried at Shan Valley.<sup>136</sup> [However,] in the third year [of the Qianfeng era (668), the Emperor] enquired [about Daoxuan]. At that time, the monk Zhenglun,<sup>137</sup> who was then the *sizhu*<sup>138</sup> of

<sup>134</sup> In the *Taishō* collection, the term *jilin xiang* 棘林香 appears only in Daoxuan-related works. It must be some form of incense (as is indicated by the character *xiang* 香), but the sources provide no further details.

<sup>135</sup> The Chinese expression is *wu zhe* 無遮 (literally, ‘no cover’; *pañcavārṣika*). My translation is based on Daoxuan’s *Xingshi chao* at T40.1804j1.22b29, where *wu zhe* denotes food that should be shared among everyone, regardless of the number of people in attendance. For more information on the term *wu zhe*, see Wong, *Buddhist Pilgrim-Monks*, 16. Wendi L. Adamek, *The Mystique of Transmission: On an Early Chan History and Its Contexts* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), 188–189.

<sup>136</sup> Literally, ‘Excel at Valley’. Five Daoxuan-related works mention his burial site by name, although only JZJ terms it *Shan Gu* 檀谷. SGSZ (988, 102), *Xin xiu ke feng liuxue seng zhuang* 新修科分六學僧傳 (*Newly Compiled: The Six-pāramitā Grouped Monastic Biography*; 1366, 221; hereafter LXSZ), GSZY (1654, 250) and LY SZ (1687, 259), all refer to it as *Tan Gu* 壇谷 (literally, ‘Valley of the Platform’). Unfortunately, I was unable to find either of these placenames in any of the following sources (and specifically their sections on Chang’an and/or Zhongnan Mountain): *Shan hai jing* 山海經 (*The Classic of Mountains and Seas*; c. third century BCE–second century CE; Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1980), 27–28; LBCA j3.95/j6.164; Wang Qi 王圻’s *Sancai tuhui* 三才圖會 (*The Collected Illustrations of the Three Principles*; 1607 CE; Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1985), j8.296; Cheng Dachang 程大昌’s *Yong lu* 雍錄 (*The Miscellaneous Records of the Mountain Guarded Region*; hereafter YL; title translation based on a sentence at YL j1.380b10–11: *yong yong ye si mian you shan yong se wei gu ye* 雍壅也四面有山壅塞為固也; reprinted in *Song Yuan fangzhi congkan* 宋元方志叢刊; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1989), j5.442b18–444b13; and Mao Fengzhi 毛鳳枝’s *Shaanxi Nanshan gu kou kao* 陝西南山谷口考 (*A Study on the Valleys of the Zhongnan Mountain of Shaanxi*; 1868 CE; Beijing: Xianzhuang shuju, 2004; hereafter NSGK). Similarly, in the *Taishō* collection, there is no mention of *Shan Gu*, while *Tan Gu* appears only once (in the SGSZ), specifically in relation to Daoxuan. However, in light of the fact that NSGK, 193b8 and 194b15–18, gives the name of a valley on Zhongnan Mountain as *Tan Gu* 壇谷 (literally, ‘Sandalwood Valley’), it may well be that both *Shan Gu* 檀谷 and *Tan Gu* 壇谷 are simple misprints, especially as the mountain is famous for its sandalwood (see TPHY j25.522.6). Zhu Shijia 朱士嘉’s *Song-Yuan fangzhi zhuanji suoyin* (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1986) includes an index for *Song yuan fangzhi congkan*.

<sup>137</sup> No work in the *Taishō* collection mentions a monk by the name of Zhenglun 正倫, and I can find no further information about him elsewhere.

<sup>138</sup> Literally, ‘the owner’ of a monastery; that is, the abbot.

Fengde monastery, responded in detail [to the enquiry] and sought permission to deal [with Daoxuan's remains] in accordance with the Indian tradition. [Therefore, Daoxuan's body] was cremated, and relics were seen [among the ashes]. Three stupas were erected. One was at Fengde monastery, one at Anfeng Fang<sup>139</sup> and one at Lingan monastery. In the fourth year of the Xiantong era [863], the relics enshrined at Anfeng Fang, together with the relics kept at the Lingan monastery, were relocated and stored inside a single stupa.

初定於擅谷。至三年，勅問所右。時有豐德寺，寺主僧正倫，具事奏聞，請依西國法荼毗，得舍利，立塔三所。一在豐德寺，一在安豐坊，一在靈感寺。咸通四年，并安豐坊舍利，入靈感寺，同起一塔。

Generations have passed [since Daoxuan's time], but [his] inspirational influence has continued to prevail. In the fifteenth year of the Xiantong era [874], the Emperor Zizong [Yizong?] was concerned about his rule.<sup>140</sup> To recognize [Daoxuan's] memorable meritorious deeds, [the Emperor] conferred the posthumous title of Chengzhao [on Daoxuan]; to honour his lifelong virtuous practice, [he] bestowed the name Jingguang on his stupa. With the power of Chengzhao (which means clear sunlight), a mirror will never be dimmed [and likewise] the teaching of the *vinaya* [will never be sullied]; with the grace of Jingguang (which means bright sunshine), a pearl shall shine in glory forever [and likewise] the words of

<sup>139</sup> *Liangjing xin ji ji jiao* 兩京新記輯校 (*The Edited New Record of the Two Capitals*; Wei Shu 韋述, Xin Deyong 辛德勇. In *Chang'an shiji chongkan* 長安史蹟叢刊. Wei Quanrui 魏全瑞. Xi'an: Sanqin chubanshe, 2006; hereafter LJXJ), j3.29.1, states that Anfeng Fang was a neighbourhood in the south of the city of Chang'an. There is no evidence that it ever housed a monastery.

<sup>140</sup> The original Chinese phrase is *si zi xia lin* 恩諧下臨 (literally, ‘think, consult, step down, come’), which makes little sense. Moreover, there is no evidence of a Tang emperor named Zizong 諧宗, although an emperor named Yizong 懿宗 reigned in the Xiantong era. In light of this, I decided to swap the first and second characters and treat *zi* 諧 as a misprint of *yi* 懿, which gives us *yi si xia lin* 懿思下臨 and the rather tentative translation that appears in the extract. However, this phrase remains problematic. JTSj19a.683.12/684.12 and XTSj9263.11 both indicate that Emperor Yizong died in the seventh month of the fourteenth year of the Xiantong era (873). Therefore, he could not have conferred a posthumous title on Daoxuan, as indicated in the next sentence, in the fifteenth year of the Xiantong era (874). Nevertheless, JTSj19a and XTSj9.255–263.11 both suggest that Yizong was an enthusiastic supporter of Buddhism, so it is entirely plausible that he did indeed grant posthumous honorifics to famous Buddhist masters. Hence, it may be that later authors noticed the error in the year and made educated guesses as to what it should have been. SGSZ and LYSZ both assert that Daoxuan received his posthumous title in the tenth year of Xiantong (869); SSJG states that Yizong granted the honour in the eleventh year of that era (870); while SMZT, FZTJ and FZTZ all relate the story without mentioning the year.

the discipline [will never be concealed].<sup>141</sup> These words were well chosen [and] indeed that is why the *vinaya* School has prospered.

雖年代遷移，而遺風不墜。去咸通十五年，諭宗皇帝，思諭下臨，追曩日之嘉猷，謚名澄照，記平生之德行，塔號淨光。澄照彰律鏡不昏，淨光顯戒殊不耀，教宗興盛，良在於茲。<sup>142</sup>

The preceding account comprises the earliest extant account of Daoxuan by a commentator on his *vinaya* text *Xingshi chao*. Moreover, it provides a wealth of new descriptions pertain to Daoxuan. First, while KYL (730, 47)<sup>143</sup> had previously recorded the master's family name as Qian 錢, JZJ offers unprecedented details about his grandfather and his father as well as his mother's family name. It then tells us that Daoxuan's conception was marked by an auspicious sign and a prediction when his mother dreamed that the moon entered her chest and the spirit of an Indian monk informed her that her unborn child was the reincarnation of the Liang-era *vinaya* master Sengyou<sup>144</sup> and that he would disseminate the teaching far and wide.

JZJ also introduces the story of the three lives of Daoxuan, relating that he first lived as the master Senghu in the Qi Dynasty (479–502), then as the master Sengyou in the Liang Dynasty (502–557) and finally as the master Daoxuan in the Tang Dynasty (618–907). Moreover, it suggests that the name 'Daoxuan' indicates that he nurtured the goal of spreading the teaching of the Buddha over the course of several lifetimes. Finally, at the end of the narrative, we learn that the master received a number of posthumous honours. For example, we learn that the Tang Emperor Gaozong (r. 649–683) ordered the erection of three stupas to enshrine his remains in the third year of the Qianfeng era (668). In addition to listing these posthumous honours, Jingxiao clearly articulates his personal respect for the master by addressing him as *dashi* 大師.<sup>145</sup>

<sup>141</sup> The original Chinese characters are *zhang jie shu bu yao* 彰戒殊不耀 (literally, 'manifest', 'vinaya', 'special', 'not' 'shining'). In other words, somewhat perversely, the suggestion seems to be that the *vinaya* will be dull, rather than bright. Given the context, I have assumed there are two misprints here, and have substituted *zhu* 珠 for *shu* 殊 and *pi* 盱 for *bu* 不. This correction was informed by the evident parallel structure of the two sub-clauses: Chengzhao (the posthumous title) → Jinguang (the name of the stupa), *zhang* (to manifest) → *xian* (to demonstrate), *liu* (vinaya) → *jie* (discipline), *jing* (mirror) → *zhu* (pearl), *bu* (never) → *pi* (greatly), *hun* (to become dusty) → *yao* (to shine).

<sup>142</sup> W68.164a7-165b14, see also X43.737j2.29c13–30c2.

<sup>143</sup> T55.2154j8.562a8.

<sup>144</sup> X43.737j2.30a3.

<sup>145</sup> Literally, 'great master'. See further discussion on *dashi* at n. 216.

JZJ is also the first Daoxuan-related work to mention *zhuji* 諸記 (literally, ‘various records’), *xingzhuang* 行狀 (literally, ‘account of deeds’) and *beiwen* 碑文 (literally, ‘stone inscription’), which suggests that the master’s life story had been recorded in a variety of literary forms by the end of the ninth century.

JZJ marks the peak of the flood of information period (*c.*860–984, 83–101) in light of the sheer volume of fresh details that it introduces into Daoxuan’s biography. However, a subsequent text – Li Fang’s *Taiping guangji*<sup>146</sup> (978, 100; hereafter TPGJ) – includes a valuable piece of information that even Jingxiao fails to mention:

In the middle of the Wude era [618–626], the *vinaya* master [Dao]xuan of Zhongnan Mountain was practising and upholding the *vinaya* rules.<sup>147</sup> [...]<sup>148</sup> At that time, there was a practitioner<sup>149</sup> named Falin. [He] drank wine [and] ate meat. [He was] unconcerned [about the morals of the people with whom he] associated. [He] even had wife and children.

唐武德中，終南山宣律師修持戒律，感天人章將軍等十二人自天而降，旁加衛護，內有南天王子張璵，常侍於律師。時法琳道人飲酒食肉，不擇交遊，至有妻子。

The *vinaya* master was [living] in the city [and] Falin passed by [his residence]. The *vinaya* master paid [him] no respect. The son of the Heavenly King (who was visiting Daoxuan at that time) said to the *vinaya* master: ‘What sort of person do you consider yourself to be?’ The *vinaya* master replied: ‘I am rather an enlightened one.’ ‘Enlightened?’ replied the

<sup>146</sup> In total, Daoxuan is mentioned on six occasions in TPGJ: j21.142.3–8, j91.604.7–15, j92.610.2–13, j93.614–623, j393.3138.3–7 and j425.3457.5–7. To avoid repetition, I have not translated all of these passages here.

<sup>147</sup> The precise meaning of ‘Zhongnanshan Xuan liishi xiuchi jieliu 終南山宣律師修持戒律’ is unclear. It could be read as ‘Daoxuan was practising *vinaya* on Zhongnan Mountain’ or Li Fang’s intention may have been to use the mountain’s name as a title with which to address Daoxuan, as many other authors did. However, other Daoxuan-related works attest that Daoxuan was first associated with Zhongnan Mountain in the ninth year of Wude (626) – the final year of that era – not, as Li Fang states here, ‘in the middle of Wude’. Therefore, I have interpreted Li Fang’s use of Zhongnan Mountain as a title for Daoxuan.

<sup>148</sup> To avoid repetition, I have omitted thirty-one words – from the fifteenth character at j91.604.6 to the sixth character at j91.604.7. This section describes the *devas*’ visits to Daoxuan, as outlined previously in FYZL.

<sup>149</sup> There was a famous Buddhist monk named Falin who lived in the Tang era. However, in light of the description provided here, it seems unlikely that the TPGJ’s Falin is the one who appears in Daoxuan’s *Xu gaoseng zhuan* at T50.2060j24.636b23–639a7. Therefore, I decided to render the term ‘daoren 道人’ simply as ‘a practitioner’. See more on Falin at III.4.5.1 and at IV.3.

Prince. ‘No, you are not yet. You are [merely] an arahant.<sup>150</sup> The practitioner Falin is, in fact, enlightened.’<sup>151</sup> The *vinaya* master replied: ‘Him? Violating the *vinaya* rules as he does, how can he be enlightened?’ The Prince explained: ‘He is a bodhisattva; [his level of achievement] is incomprehensible to you, dear Master. However, if he happens to come this way again, Master, please treat him with kindness.’ The *vinaya* master’s attitude [towards Falin] then changed.

律師在城內，法琳過之，律師不禮焉。天王子謂律師曰，自以為何如人。律師曰，吾頗聖也。王子曰，師未聖，四果人耳。法琳道人即是聖人。律師曰，彼破戒如此，安得為聖。王子曰，彼菩薩地位，非師所知。然彼更來，師其善待之。律師乃改觀。

Sometime later, Falin was drunk. All of a sudden, he [decided to pay] a visit to the *vinaya* master [Daoxuan. Falin] sat on [Daoxuan’s] bench<sup>152</sup> and vomited. [The vomit spewed] all over the bench. Although [it was] extremely malodorous and filthy, the *vinaya* master did not dare to leave him. Thereupon [Falin] stretched his hand[s] and grabbed some valuables, [which Daoxuan had intended to use as] offerings. [Falin] put [what he had taken] into [his] sleeves and left immediately. [He] exchanged [the

<sup>150</sup> The Chinese term is *siguo* 四果 (literally, ‘four fruit’), which is used in Chinese Buddhist texts as a synonym for *aluohan* 阿罗汉 (‘arahant’), especially when it is prefixed with *di* 第 (literally, ‘the’). For example, it is used in this way in *Dacheng bensheng xindiguan jing* 大乘本生心地觀經 (*The Sūtra of the Mahāyāna Mind Contemplation*), T3.159j6.320a7. On the other hand, it can also be used to refer collectively to the four spiritual achievements, as in *Wenshushili wen jing* 文殊師利問經 (*The Sūtra of the Questions Forwarded by Mañjuśrī*), T14.468j1.500b19. I decided to render *siguo* as ‘arahant’ in the extract because in this context the *deva* is clearly referring to a certain stage of spiritual achievement, rather than using the word in the collective sense. Indeed, this stage is contrasted with Falin’s religious attainment, who is described as a ‘bodhisattva’. See also n. 152 for further discussion, as well as PBD, 60 and 62, and Nakamura Hajime 中村元, *Bukkyōgo daijiten* 佛教語大辭典 (Tokyo: Tokyo Shoseki, 1981), 509b, for concise definitions of the term. Special thanks to Stefano Zucchetti for highlighting previous errors in this note and providing the latter reference. See the term also Vasubandhu, *Abhidharmaśa-Bhāṣya* of Vasubandhu, trans. into French Louis Be La Vallée Poussin, annotated English translation by Gelong Lodrö Sangpo (Delhi: Motilal Banarsi Dass Publishers Private Limited. 4 Volumes), vol. 3, 1982–1984. Special thanks to Bart Dessein for improving my understanding of the terminology and lending me his own collection of the *Abhidharmaśa-Bhāṣya* of Vasubandhu.

<sup>151</sup> Given the context, I decided to render *sheng* 聖 as ‘enlightened’, rather than ‘a saint’. In Buddhist texts, *siguo* 四果 can denote the arahant stage, the highest level of spiritual achievement that a monastic may achieve in what is now known as Theravada Buddhism. For information on the various aspects of this branch of Buddhism, see Kate Crosby, *Theravada Buddhism: Continuity, Diversity, and Identity* (Malden, MA, and Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2014).

<sup>152</sup> The Chinese term is *chuang* 牀. My translation – ‘bench’ – is based on detailed information provided by the famous Tang courtier and scholar Yu Shinan 虞世南 (558–638) in *Beitang shuchao* 北堂書鈔 (*The Encyclopedia [Compiled in] the North Hall*; Beijing: Zhongguo shudian, 1989), j133.530a–531b3.

valuables] for wine and meat. [Thereafter, whenever he was] short of cash, [he would return to Daoxuan] and take more. The *vinaya* master gave [him more valuables] every time [he] saw [Falin].

後法琳醉，猝造律師，直坐其床，吐於床下，臭穢雖甚，律師不敢嫌之。因以手攫造功德錢，納之袖中徑去，便將沽酒市肉，錢盡復取。律師見即與之。

Later, the Emperor Gaozu (r. 618–626) of the Tang, on the advice of [some] Daoist priests, decided to eliminate Buddhism. Falin debated with those Daoist priests. The Daoist priests were overcome with shame. For the sake of the Buddha-dharma, [Faln] also dared to argue with the Emperor Gaozu [even at the risk of] offending [him]. Because of Falin's efforts, the Buddha-dharma remained unharmed. The *sūtras* speak of *hufa* bodhisattvas [who defend the Buddha-dharma]; surely Falin deserves to be called [one of them].

後，唐高祖納道士言，將滅佛法，法琳與諸道士競論，道士慚服，又犯高祖龍顏，固爭佛法，佛法得全，琳之力也。佛經護法菩薩，其琳之謂乎。<sup>153</sup>

At the conclusion of this extract, Li Fang (925–996) names his source as *Gantong ji*. However, I could find no trace of this passage, nor anything resembling it, in any text with that title.<sup>154</sup> In other words, TPGJ itself is our earliest extant source for the relationship between Daoxuan and Falin. Later, Li Fang tells the story of Daoxuan and a dragon that differs significantly from the version that appears in YYZZ (c.860, 83):

Liu Yuxi (772–842)<sup>155</sup> of the Tang says: Daoxuan is the most outstanding upholder of the *vinaya* rules. One morning, crashing thunder rolled continuously around [Daoxuan's] hut. [Dao]xuan said: ‘I honour [all the rules of] *vinaya* [and I have] committed no offence. But if to speak about the karma of [my] previous lives, [it is] not [something I would] know.’

<sup>153</sup> TPGJj91.604.7–15.

<sup>154</sup> Of all the texts in the *Taishō* collection, only three of Daoxuan's works (T45.1898, T52.2106 and T52.2107) include the word *gantong* 感通 in the title, but none of these features the story in question.

<sup>155</sup> Liu Yuxi was a courtier, poet, philosopher and essayist who was active during the Tang Dynasty. See his entries at JTSj160.4210–4213.9 and XTSj168.5128.10–5132.2.

唐劉禹錫云，道宣持律第一。忽一旦，霹靂繞戶外不絕。宣曰，我持律，更無所犯，若有宿業，則不知之。

Then he removed his three robes [and threw them] outside the hut because he thought some dragons [might be able to] shelter [beneath them]. However, even with his robes outside, he continued to hear the sound [of thunder]. [Dao]xuan then looked [closely] at his ten fingernails. There was a dot, about the size of linseed, on the little finger of [his] right hand. [Daoxuan felt] apprehensive, so [he tried to] shake [the dot off his finger and into] a hole in a bookcase. With just one move, half of the little finger vanished.

於是褫三衣於戶外，謂有蛟螭憑焉。衣出，而聲不已。宣乃視其十指甲，有一點如油麻者，在右手小指上。疑之，乃出於隔子孔中，一震而失半指。

[In fact,] the black dot was sheltering dragons. [Liu] Yuxi comments: ‘Even dragons, who are especially adept at finding shelter, could not escape [*karmic retribution?*].’ Therefore, [we may conclude that] everyone has a fixed course, and how it is possible to make an escape.

黑點是蛟龍之藏處也。禹錫曰，在龍亦尤善求避地之所矣，而終不免。則一切分定，豈可逃乎。<sup>156</sup>

Li Fang cites a text entitled *Jiahua lu* as the source of this extract. However, neither of the two extant texts with *jiahua* in the title includes this story.<sup>157</sup> Similarly, it does not appear in the collected works of the credited author, Liu Yuxi – *Liu Yuxi ji*.<sup>158</sup> TPGJ includes one further reference to Daoxuan and a dragon:

[Once] a dragon found shelter on the middle finger of the *vinaya* master the Nanshan [Dao]xuan. This is certainly not just idle gossip.

<sup>156</sup> TPGJj393.3138.3–7.

<sup>157</sup> I searched through two books in the Tang Wudai biji xiaoshuo da guan 唐五代筆記小說大觀 (Ding Ruming 丁如明, Li Zongwei 李宗為, and Li Xueying 李學穎. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2000) with the word *jiahua* 嘉話 in the title – Liu Su 劉諾’s *Sui Tang jiahua* 隋唐嘉話 (*The Famous Sayings of the Sui and the Tang*), and in Wei Xuan 韋絢’s *Liubinke jiahua lu* 劉賓客嘉話錄 (*The Recordings of the Wise Words of Liu Bingke*) – but neither includes anything that resembles the above extract.

<sup>158</sup> *Liu Yuxi ji* 劉禹錫集 (*Anthology of Liu Yuxi*; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1990).

南山宣律師乖龍入中指節，又非虛說。<sup>159</sup>

On this occasion, Li Fang cites the *Beimeng suoyan*<sup>160</sup> (c. 944, 95; hereafter BMSY) as his source and this text does indeed contain an identical story. Thus, although the fingers are different in the two sources (the little finger of the right hand in TPGJ and the middle finger in BMSY), we can say that BMSY is the first extant source to introduce the story of Daoxuan and the dragon *guailong*, who sought shelter on his finger.

Hence, the dragon *guailong*, the dragon *jiaolong*, the *deva* Nezha, the monk Sanwuwei, the practitioner Falin, the learned Sun Simiao, the three lives of Daoxuan and many other aspects of the master's life story were recorded for the first time in the flood of information period (c.860–984). Subsequent generations of biographers then had the task of summarizing and collating all of this new information, which they did between 988 and 1874.

---

<sup>159</sup> TPGJj425.3547.5–7.

<sup>160</sup> *Beimeng suoyan* 北夢瑣言 (*The Miscellaneous Collection of the Sayings Dreamed at the North [Bank of the River Jing]*). By Sun Guangxian, 孫光憲. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2002) at its Supplement (*buyi* 補遺) j4.436. As to why a dragon needs to find a shelter, according to the story in this book, is because: they were a special kind of dragon, whose duty was to give rain. They were known as *guailong* 乖龍. However, some of them were too tired (supposedly from their duty in giving rain) and wanted to evade their duty. Yet, the *guailong* were closely watched (and probably supervised) by the God of Thunder (*Leishen* 雷神), they looked everywhere for a place to hide.

## II.5 Summarizing the Information

The fourth period is marked by the way in which Daoxuan's biographers collate information provided by previous generations of writers. The prime example of this tendency is Zanning's *Song gaoseng zhuan* (988, 102),<sup>161</sup> which has also been the most widely cited source in other biographies of Daoxuan over the past thousand years. Its narrative reads as follows:

The biography of Daoxuan of the Ximing monastery in the capital of the Tang (Daci).<sup>162</sup> Shi Daoxuan, [his] family name is Qian. [He hailed] from Dantu.<sup>163</sup> Some say [he was] from Changcheng.<sup>164</sup> His forefather was a descendant of Rangzhi, the Governor of Guangling. Time passed, and the Taishiling Lezhi wrote a one-hundred-scroll text entitled *Tianwen jizhan*.<sup>165</sup> The given name of Daoxuan's deceased father was Shen. His father was the Director of the Ministry of Rites. All [of the members of Daoxuan's family] lived lives of high moral rectitude and cultivated virtuous deeds in every possible way. Such were the relatives of Daoxuan – meritorious and decent throughout the generations.

唐京兆西明寺道宣傳(大慈)。釋道宣，姓錢氏，丹徒人也，一云長城人。其先出自廣陵太守讓之後。洎太史令樂之，撰天文集占一百卷。考諱申，府君陳吏部尚書。皆高矩令猷，周仁全行，盛德百代，君子萬年。

After she conceived, his mother dreamed that the moon entered and filled her womb. In another dream, she heard an Indian monk saying to her:

<sup>161</sup> Zanning submits his SGSZ in 988, the date is given at T50.2061j1.710a10: *Duangong yuannian* (988)...Zan...shang 端拱元年...贊寧...上 ('Submitted by Zanning...in the first year of the Duangong era'). Duangong is the third era name of Song Taizong 宋太宗 (r. 976-997), it lasts from 988 to 989.

<sup>162</sup> As we shall see later, Daci was one of Daoxuan's disciples. In *Song gaoseng zhuan*, presenting a master's biography in this way is known as *fujian* 附見 (literally, 'also noted down').

<sup>163</sup> Today, this is a district of Zhenjiang City, Zhejiang Province.

<sup>164</sup> The name of a county during the Sui Dynasty; now Changxing County, Zhejiang Province. See note of this placename at n. 107.

<sup>165</sup> *Tianwen jizhan* 天文集占 (*A Collection of Works on Astrology*) is mentioned at SSj34.1018, JTSj47.2037 and XTSj59.1544. However, these sources either do not name the author or cite someone other than Qian Lezhi 錢樂之. Nevertheless, Shen Yue 沈約's *Songshu* 宋書 (*Song History*; 488 CE; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974), j12.262, names Qian Lezhi as the court's Grand Astrologer, so he must have been an outstanding figure in the fields of 'astronomy, astrology and mathematics' (*tianwen lisuan* 天文歷算).

‘The one you have conceived is, in fact, the *vinaya* master Sengyou of the Liang Dynasty [502–557], and this [Seng]you is the Senghu of the Yinyue monastery of Yanxi of the Nan Qi [479–502]. I advise you to let him become a Buddhist monk [as he will] establish the teaching of the Buddha.’ [He was] in [his mother’s] womb [for] twelve months and was born on the eighth day of the fourth month.

母娠，而夢月貫其懷。復夢梵僧語曰，汝所妊者即梁朝僧祐律師，祐則南齊剡溪隱嶽寺僧護也。宜從出家崇樹釋教云。凡十二月在胎，四月八日降誕。

At the age of nine, [he was already] able to compose a poem. At the age of fifteen, [he started to] dislike the lay life [and began to] read and study various *sūtras*. [He] became a student of the *vinaya* master Zhijun 智顥. When he reached the age of sixteen, he became a novice, not merely because of his desire to become a monk, but because [he wanted] to eliminate [all] defilements and wrongdoings.<sup>166</sup>

九歲能賦，十五厭俗誦習諸經，依智顥律師受業。洎十六落髮，所謂除結，非欲染衣。

Hence, [Daoxuan] was ordered to live in the Riyen monastery.<sup>167</sup> [Although he was only] twenty, [he] earnestly [tried] to follow [the precepts. He practised] contemplation wholeheartedly. [As a result], relics [miraculously] appeared in a jewelled box. In the middle of the Daye of the Sui [605–618], under the *vinaya* master Zhishou, [Daoxuan] received full ordination. In the middle of Wude [618–626], [he] contemplated leaving in

<sup>166</sup> In Chinese, the phrase is ‘*sui wei chu jie fei yu ran yi* 所謂除結非欲染衣’, which can also be translated as: ‘which caused [him] to eliminate *jie* 結 [defilements] and *fei* 非 [wrongdoings] as well as his yearning for *ran yi* 染衣 [monastic robes]’.

<sup>167</sup> In Chinese, the term is ‘Riyen *daochang* 日嚴道場’. According to *Suishu*, j28.802, in the middle of the Kaihuang era (581–600), the Emperor Wen of Sui 隋文帝 (r. 581–604) issued a decree that declared all Buddhist monasteries should be termed *daochang* 道場 rather than *fosi* 佛寺. By contrast, in *Dasong sengshi lue* 大宋僧史略 (*A Brief History of the Monastic [Compiled in] the Great Song*; 999, 102; hereafter SSSL), T54.2126j1.236c28, Zanning insists that the Emperor Yang of Sui 隋煬帝 (r. 604–618) issued this decree in the middle of Daye era (605–618). However, in *Xu gaoseng zhuan* (c. 665, 26), T50.2060j18.573b14–18, Daoxuan asserts that monasteries were called *daochang* as early as the fourteenth year of the Kaihuang era (594), so the *Suishu* account would seem to be more reliable than Zanning’s.

order to practise meditation [after he had] heard just one round [of *vinaya* lectures]. The master [Hui]jun condemned him: ‘It has always been like this: you know only one [musical] note [and you think you will be able to] appreciate a whole composition. You must make the correct decision about when it is time to study and when [it is time] to leave. [You must] try your best to complete [your] task, [and you] should not leave the *vinaya* [lectures].’ [Huiyun] insisted that Daoxuan should attend twenty rounds [of *vinaya* lectures].

便隸日嚴道場，弱冠，極力護持，專精克念，感舍利現於寶函。隋大業年中，從智首律師受具。武德中依首習律，纔聽一遍方議修禪。頤師呵曰，夫適遐自邇，因微知章，修捨有時，功願須滿，未宜即去律也。抑令聽二十遍。

Only once he had done so did he go to live in the hermitage and start to practise meditation and cultivate wisdom. The place [where he] sought solitude was the valley of Fangzhang on Zhongnan Mountain. Water was scarce [in] this place. The *devas* gave him a sign [which Daoxuan followed], and, after he had dug into the ground to a depth of only a few *chi*, water gushed up like a fountain. Hence, the monastery acquired the name the Monastery of the Clear Spring. The wild animals all became tame and took refuge [under Daoxuan’s protection]. The flowers were fine and fragrant, and the wonderful plants were luxuriant [in the valley?]

已，乃坐山林，行定慧，晦迹於終南倣掌之谷。所居乏水，神人指之，穿地尺餘，其泉迸涌，時號為白泉寺。猛獸馴伏，每有所依，名華芬芳，奇草蔓延。

At the end of the Sui era, [Daoxuan] moved to Chongyi Jingshe. A year later, he moved to the Fengde monastery. On one occasion [when he was] sitting alone, a dharma-protecting guardian came and said: ‘In Qingguan Village, [there is a plot of land] that once housed the old Jingye monastery. The land is auspicious. [In that place,] your goal of practising the teaching of the Buddha will be realized.’

隨末，徙崇義精舍，載遷豐德寺。嘗因獨坐，護法神告曰，彼清官村故淨業寺，地當寶勢，道可習成。

On hearing this prediction, [Daoxuan maintained his] meritorious behaviour<sup>168</sup> and practised *banzhou* meditation.<sup>169</sup> Around that time, a group of dragons<sup>170</sup> arrived and paid their respects [to Daoxuan; they assumed] the appearance of human men and women. A *śrāmanera* [novice monk] with a hazy mind looked at [them] furtively with indecent thoughts. The dragons became furious and were about to capture [this *śrāmanera*, but they] regretted immediately. The dragons threw [spat?] their poison into the well. After relating the details [to Daoxuan, they] left. Then [Dao]xuan ordered

<sup>168</sup> The Chinese term is *gongde xiang* 功德香 (literally, ‘the incense of merit’). This is sole occasion when it appears in one of Zanning’s texts. If we follow the usage in *Fangguang da zhuangyan jing* 方廣大莊嚴經 (*The Sūtra of the Great Decoration of Mahāyāna*), T3.187j8.588c19, *xiang* 香 should not be read as actual incense but as a metaphor to modify *gongde* 功德: hence, ‘the merit is like the burning of incense [whose fragrance is sweet and can be smelled from a great distance]’. In *Guang hongming ji*, T52.2103j27.321a24, Daoxuan similarly uses *xiang* as a metaphor to modify *gongde*. Alternatively, the phrase may be read simply as: ‘[Daoxuan] burned the incense for merit’ or ‘[Daoxuan] burned the incense, which was called *gongde*’.

<sup>169</sup> The Chinese term is *banzhou ding* 般舟定 (literally, ‘the meditation of *banzhou*’). SGSZ does not mention this form of meditation in the biography of any other master, and it is the first text to suggest that Daoxuan practised it. Moreover, Zanning does not clarify what *banzhou* meditation entailed. Some information is provided in the *Pratyutpannasamādhisūtra*, translated as *Banzhou sanmei jing* 般舟三昧經, T13.418j1.904b22, which states, ‘all the current Buddhas are present at the *samādhi* [meditation] 現在佛悉在前立三昧’, but then prescribes the Buddha Amitābha 阿彌陀佛 as the principal object of contemplation. By contrast, in the *Daśabhūmikavibhāṣa*, translated as *Shizhu piposa lun* 十住毘婆沙論, T26.1521j9.68.20–22, when the question of how one might enter *banzhou* meditation is raised, the answer is that one should contemplate the beautiful features of all the Buddhas, such as their thirty-two physical characteristics, their flawless compassion and so on. Notwithstanding these contrasting instructions on how to enter *banzhou* meditation, it was clearly a highly significant aspect of Buddhist practice, as the *Dazhidu lun*, T25.1509j35.314a23, figuratively pairs it with *prajñā* (wisdom) as ‘the father and mother’ from whom a Buddha is born. Special thanks to Stefano Zacchetti for pointing out that 般 should be read as *ban*, not *bo*, and recommending Kehong 可洪’s valuable glossary (completed in 940 CE), the *Xinji zang jing yinyi suihuan lu* 新集藏經音義隨函錄: 般舟 上北槃反, which appears in *Koryō taejanggyōng* 高麗大藏經 (Seoul: Tongguk Taehakkyo, 1976), vol. 35, text 1257, 440a7. However, it is worth noting that today’s Buddhist practitioners often pronounce 般舟 as *bozhou*.

<sup>170</sup> In his dairy *Nittō guhō junreikōki* 入唐求法巡禮行記 (*The Record of the Pilgrimage to China in Search of the Law*; Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1986), j3.122.4–7, Ennin 圓仁 (794–864), a famous Japanese Buddhist master who studied in China, mentions that five hundred ‘poisonous dragons’ (*du long* 毒龍) surrendered to the bodhisattva Mañjuśrī and became Buddhists on Mount Wutai 五台山. Similarly, according to a passage in *Da Tang chuanzai* 大唐傳載 (*The Recording of the Heard Stories of the Great Tang*; 834 CE; Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2000), j1.898.4–7, five hundred poisonous dragons lived in a pool on Mount Wutai. Only male Buddhists could approach the pool; any woman who ventured too near would be overcome by a poisonous vapour (presumably emitted by the dragons). In *Yiwen leiju*, j98.1703.8–1705.13, and Du You 杜佑’s *Tongdian* 通典 (*The Comprehensive Institutions*; 801 CE; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1988; hereafter TD), j44.1236.11–12, dragons are depicted as auspicious creatures because they have ‘scales’ (*lin* 鱗). For a study and translation of Ennin’s *Nittō guhō junreikōki*, see Edwin O. Reischauer, *Ennin’s Travels in T’ang China* (New York: Ronald Press, 1955) and Ennin, *Ennin’s Diary: The Record of a Pilgrimage to China in Search of the Law*, trans. Edwin O. Reischauer (New York: Ronald Press, 1955). Special thanks to Stefano Zacchetti for recommending these two valuable sources.

[the well to be] sealed. Some people tried to open it secretly, [but] smoke emerged every time.

聞斯卜焉，焚功德香，行般舟定。時有群龍禮謁，若男若女，化為人形。沙彌散心，顧盼邪視。龍赫然發怒，將搏攫之，尋追，悔吐毒井中，具陳而去。宣乃令封閉，人或潛開，往往煙上。

[On the] subject of the [dragons'] supernatural powers: once they came and offered a basket of rare flowers. [These flowers] were the same shape as a jujube flower and the same size as an elm flower. [Their] scent was rich and fragrant, and they continued to smell fresh even after years. Also, they sometimes presented sacred fruit,<sup>171</sup> [which was] sweet and shiny. Not something one would expect in this human world.

審其神變，或送異華一奩，形似棗華，大如榆莢，香氣馝馞，數載宛然。又供奇果，季孟梨柰，然其味甘，其色潔，非人間所遇也。

Some [of Daoxuan's] disciples engaged in secret practices. With penetrating power developed through meditation, [Daoxuan or the dragons?] first acquired an understanding of the temperaments [of these disciples] and then gave [each of them] a method [of practice] in exact accordance with the[ir] individual needs. This was just one example [of Daoxuan's or the dragons' great deeds?]<sup>172</sup>

<sup>171</sup> The Chinese phrase is *ji meng li nai* 季孟梨柰. The meaning of this expression is unclear in this context, but information provided in XJZJj1.6.8–7.1 seems to indicate that a fruit named *nai* is precious. In *Yiwen leiju*, Ouyang Xun 歐陽詢 (557–641) provides entries for *li* and *nai* at j86.1473.5–1475.2 and j86.1483.4–1484.2, respectively. In *Da Tang Xiyu ji* 大唐西域記, Xuanzang 玄奘 (602–664) uses the term *linai* 梨柰 at T51.2087j1.870a7/j2.878a23/j12.940b28. However, it is unclear whether he means two distinct fruits called *li* and *nai* or one fruit called *li'nai*. In *Wenxian tongkao* 文獻通考 (*The Comprehensive Examination of Literature*; 1037 CE; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1986; hereafter WXTK), j339.2663b15, Ma Duanlin 馬端臨 discusses a fruit called *bainai* 白柰 that is found in Dashi 大食 (an ancient empire in the region of the Arabian Peninsula). In *Leishuo* 類說 (*The Collected Literature Arranged by Subject Matter*; 1136 CE, 102; Beijing: Shumu wenxian chubanshe, 1987; hereafter LSZ), j3.53b7–13, Zeng Zao 曾慥 adds that this fruit ‘is offered on the table and is partaken by the assembly of the divinities’. Therefore, even though it is impossible to know the precise nature of this fruit or fruits, it or they certainly seem to be exotic and unusual. Hence, I decided to translate *ji meng li nai* simply as ‘precious fruit’.

<sup>172</sup> This paragraph – from the thirteenth character at T50.2061j14.790c6 to the fourth character at T50.2061j14.790c8 – is rather enigmatic as it is difficult to determine if the text is describing the dragons' or Daoxuan's tutelage of his disciples. A similar account occurs in only one other Daoxuan-related work, the SSZ (1417, 222), from the fourteenth character at T50.2064j6.988c27 to the second character at T50.2064j6.988c28, but this is equally opaque. Hence the tentative translation that appears here.

門徒嘗欲舉陰事，先是潛通，以定觀根，隨病與藥，皆此類者。

There was a retired scholar named Sun Simiao. [He] used to live on Zhongnan Mountain. [He] came into contact with Daoxuan and befriended him. Every time [they] met, they would spend their time exchanging ideas and debating all day long. At one time, there was a drought and a monk came from the Western Regions to pray for rain<sup>173</sup> at the designated ritual site at the side of the Kunming Pool. The incense, the lamps and the other items needed [for the ritual] were supplied by imperial decree. For seven days, the water in the pool rose by several *chi* each day.

有處士孫思邈，嘗隱終南山與宣相接，結林下之交，每一往來議論終夕。時天旱，有西域僧，於昆明池結壇祈雨。詔有司備香燈供具，凡七日池水日漲數尺。

An old man visited Daoxuan at night crying for help. In a rather flustered manner, he said: ‘Master, I am, in fact, the dragon of the Kunming Pool. It is not supposed to be a time of rain. [Whether it rains or not] is at the discretion of Heaven, not something over which I have any control. But this barbarian monk is deceiving the Emperor by saying that he has been praying for rain. He is, in fact, taking advantage of me. My life is in imminent danger. I beg you, Master, with your dharma power, please protect me.’ Daoxuan replied: ‘I do not have the necessary means to save you. Go now to Sun Simiao.’

有老人夜詣宣求救，頗形倉卒之狀，曰，弟子即昆明池龍也。時之無雨，乃天意也，非由弟子。今胡僧取利於弟子，而欺天子，言祈雨。命在旦夕，乞和尚法力加護。宣曰，吾無能救爾，爾可急求孫先生。

The old man then went to the stone chapel where Sun Simiao lived [and] cried repeatedly that he had been wronged. He said: ‘It was only because the *vinaya* master Xuan told me to do so that I dared to come to

---

<sup>173</sup> According to *Yiwen leiju*, j100.1726, Chinese rulers had long supported the practice of *qiyu* 祈雨 – praying for rain in times of drought.

you.' Sun Simiao replied: 'I know that thirty magical formulas are stored at the Dragon Palace in the Kunming Pool. I will help you if you show them to me.' The old man responded: 'Those prescriptions belong to Heaven; their circulation is prohibited. Alas, as this is a matter of life and death, it is obvious [that I should hold] nothing stingy.' Shortly afterwards, [the dragon] returned, holding the precious prescriptions in his hands. [Sun Si]miao said: 'Make your way back quickly, and do not worry about the barbarian monk.' Thereafter, the water in the pool rose so swiftly that within a few days it had flowed over the edge. The barbarian monk had now exhausted all his tricks and could do nothing more.

老人至思邈石室，冤訴再三，云，宣律師示我，故敢相投也。邈曰，我知昆明池龍宮有仙方三十首，能示余，余乃救爾。老人曰，此方上界不許輒傳，今事急矣，固何所惜。少選，捧方而至。邈曰，爾速還，無懼胡僧也。自是池水大漲，數日溢岸，胡僧術將盡矣，無能為也。

When the Ximing monastery was built by imperial decree, Daoxuan was appointed its *shangzuo*.<sup>174</sup> The Tripitaka master [Xuan]zang also came and lived [at the monastery]. An imperial order instructed Daoxuan to participate in [Xuanzang's] translation [work]. On one occasion, he was

---

<sup>174</sup> *Shangzuo* 上座 (literally, 'the foremost seat') is a term used in *vinaya* texts to denote monastic seniority. According to the translation of the *Mahīsasaka vinaya*, *Wufen lü* 五分律, T22.1421j18.128b14–15, the most senior *bhikṣu* in any monastery becomes that institution's *shangzuo*. However, each monastery does not necessarily have only one *shangzuo*. For example, *Wufen lü*, T22.1421j10.72c9–10, the translation of the *Mahāsāṃghika vinaya*, *Mohe sengqi lü* 摩訶僧祇律, T22.1425j32.490c21, the translation of the *Dharmaguptaka vinaya*, *Sifen lü* 四分律, T22.1428j54.967b6–7, and the translation of the *Sarvāstivāda vinaya*, *Shisong lü* 十誦律, T23.1435j34.245c16–17 all term the most senior monk '*diyi shangzuo* 第一上座' and the second most senior monk '*di'er shangzuo* 第二上座'. In most cases, the term *shangzuo* and the monk's or nun's seniority also indicate that he or she is highly advanced in Buddhist training, and especially *vinaya*. Therefore, *vinaya* texts often describe the *shangzuo* leading the fortnightly recitation of the *Prātimokṣa*. On the other hand, we are sometimes told that a *shangzuo* should not recite the *Prātimokṣa*, as in *Sifen lü*, T22.1428j35.819a13. Furthermore, while the *vinaya* texts clearly indicate that *shangzuo* is an honorary title that is granted by a monastic's fellow monks or nuns solely in recognition of their seniority, in Daoxuan's time the Chinese government started to appoint *shangzuos*. For example, an inscription in *Quantangwen Buyi* 全唐文補遺 (*The Collected Works Supplementary to Quan Tang Wen*; 656 CE; Xi'an: Sanqing chubanshe, 1994; hereafter QTWBY), vol. 7, 9b22–10a1, records that Zhishou – Daoxuan's *vinaya* teacher – was promoted from *sizhu* 寺主 (generally translated as abbot) to *shangzuo*. See a topical introduction of the monastic positions in *Xianmi weiyi bianlan* 顯密威儀便覽 (*An General Guide to the Deportments of Xian and Mi*; Ryōkai Sonshin 亮快存心; 1738) at D73.339j2.18.8–19.14. See further discussion on the length of a monks' career and Daoxuan's position of Shangzuo at, respectively, III.4.1 and III.4.5.2.2.

escorting the relics of the Buddha<sup>175</sup> to the Wuyou Wang<sup>176</sup> monastery in Fufeng [when] a decree was issued ordering Buddhist monks to prostrate themselves. Daoxuan wrote to the ministers of the court.<sup>177</sup> This was how he defended the Buddha-dharma.

及西明寺初就，詔宣充上座。三藏奘師至止，詔與翻譯。又送真身，往扶風無憂王寺。遇勅令僧拜等，上啟朝宰，護法又如此者。

He wrote [a number of] texts on Buddhism, [such as] *Guang hongming ji*, *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, *Sanbao lu*, *Jiemo*, *Jieshu*, *Xingshi chao*, *Yi chao* and others. [Altogether, they amount to] over two hundred and twenty scrolls. His three robes were made of simple fabric.<sup>178</sup> Daoxuan ate a meal of very simple food<sup>179</sup> only once a day. Whenever he walked, he used a cane; whenever he sat, [he] never leaned on the bench. Whenever fleas or such [creatures] found shelter on his body, the imperturbable Daoxuan would remove and release them either onto the ground or into the woods, so [they] were free to leave. Daoxuan took care of himself, yet developed no attachment to his physical body. Once, he built a platform, and a monk with long eyebrows suddenly came to talk about the Path. For those who know, this was, in fact, [the arahant] Piñdola. On another occasion, a non-returning

<sup>175</sup> The Chinese term *zhenshen* 真身 (literally, ‘the true body’) has multiple meanings in Buddhist texts. For instance, it may be used metaphorically to mean the Śākyamuni Buddha’s monastic robe, as in *Dacheng liqu liuboluomiduo jing* 大乘理趣六波羅蜜多經 (*The Sūtra of the Essence of the Six Pāramitā of the Mahāyāna*), T8.261j10.916a15. Or it may mean the Dharmakāya 法身, one of the *Trikāya* 三身 (‘Three Bodies’) of a Buddha, as in the translation of the *Mahāyānasamgraha*, *She Dacheng lun* 摄大乘論, T31.1592j1.97a24. My translation here – ‘relics of the Buddha’ – is based on *Fozu Tongji*, T49.2035j39.367b15, and *Fayuan Zhulin*, T53.2122j38.587a3, where *zhenshen* is used definitively in that sense. See s.v. ‘*Trikāya*’ in PBD, 923, for an explanation of the term. See QTWBY, vol. 1, 464a10–466a4, for a description of the generous offerings that were made to the relics of the Buddha.

<sup>176</sup> Literally, ‘King of No Sorrow’. In the *Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra*, T25.1509j12147a18, Kumārajīva (344–413), one of the most renowned translators in Chinese Buddhist history, writes that some Buddhist texts use *Wuyou* 無憂[王] in place of Aśoka 阿育王 (r. c. 268–232 BCE), the great Indian emperor.

<sup>177</sup> See Daoxuan and his letters at IV.4.

<sup>178</sup> The Chinese word is *zhu* 荸 – the boehmeria, a plant of the nettle family (Urticaceae). In Sima Qian 司馬遷’s *Shiji* *(Records of the Historian*; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1963), j129.3253, XTSj40.1034, and TDj6.125 we are told this was an important and common source material for clothing in ancient China. To avoid confusion, I decided to render *zhu* as ‘simple fabric’.

<sup>179</sup> The Chinese word is *shu* 蕎, a general term for edible pulses, as indicated by Song Yingxing 宋應星 (1587–1666), one of the most renowned scientists of the Ming Dynasty (1368–1644), in *Tiangong kaiwu* 天工開物 (*The Expectation of the Works of Nature*. 明崇禎十年涂紹煃刊本; 1637 CE), j1.19–20.4. To avoid confusion, I decided to render *shu* as ‘simple food’.

Indian monk came to praise the platform. He extolled: ‘Ever since the passing of the Buddha, of all of those who have lived in the era of the Resemblance Dharma, Master, you are truly the one who has established the *vinaya*.’

撰法門文記，廣弘明集、續高僧傳、三寶錄、羯磨、戒疏、行事鈔、義鈔等，二百二十餘卷。三衣皆綺，一食唯菽，行則杖策，坐不倚床，蚤蟲從遊，居然除受，土木自得，固已亡身。嘗築一壇，俄有長眉僧談道。知者，其實賓頭盧也。復三果梵僧禮壇，讚曰，自佛滅後，像法住世，興發毘尼，唯師一人也。

In the spring of the second year of the Qianfeng era [667], some *devas*, not on [Daoxuan's] initiative but invoked [by his deeds], came to converse [with him] on the subject of the *vinaya*. They said: ‘The errors in *Xingshi chao* and *Qinzhong yi* are due to mistakes in the translation [of these *vinaya* texts]. This is not your fault, but you are kindly asked to correct them.’ Therefore, many of Daoxuan’s works that are in circulation today are amended versions [of these texts]. Then came another *deva* who had composed *Qiyuan tujing*, [which would fill] about one hundred scrolls if it were to be transcribed onto a material such as the human world’s paper or silk. Daoxuan earnestly asked for it [from the *deva*. The *deva*] recited [*Qiyuan tujing* and Daoxuan recorded what he said]. It is two volumes – the first and the second scroll. This *deva* also recited the *gathas* [to Daoxuan]. They are [now] the ten-scroll *Fuzhu yi*.

乾封二年春，冥感天人來談律相，言，鈔文輕重，儀中舛誤，皆譯之過，非師之咎，請師改正。故今所行著述，多是重修本是也。又有天人云，曾撰祇洹圖經，計人間紙帛一百許卷。宣苦告口占，一一抄記，上下二卷。又口傳偈頌號付囑儀，十卷是也。

In the middle of the Zhenguan era, Daoxuan lived as a recluse on Yunshi Mountain in Qinbu.<sup>180</sup> People saw two young *devas* on either side of Daoxuan. One night, Daoxuan was taking a walk. He stumbled and was about to fall down the steps in front of him. [Yet] ‘something’ supported him, so even though he lost his footing, he was uninjured. Daoxuan took a good look and saw that it was a youth. Daoxuan asked immediately: ‘You are here in the middle of the night. Who are you?’ The youth replied: ‘I am not an ordinary person. I am Nezha, the son of the Heavenly King Pishamen. Because I protect the dharma, I support you. [I] have been doing [this] for some time already.’ Daoxuan said: ‘I practise the Teaching, and there is nothing, in particular, that should trouble Your Highness. But as Your Highness is immensely powerful and free, if there is anything worthy of veneration in the Western Regions, could you please send me some of it?’ The Prince said: ‘I have a tooth relic of the Buddha that I have kept carefully for a good long time. However, I am ready to sacrifice my own life, so why would I delay any longer in offering [it to] you?’ Daoxuan made a careful record of and venerated [the tooth relic].

貞觀中，曾隱沁部雲室山。人睹天童給侍左右。於西明寺夜行道，足趺前階，有物扶持，履空無害。熟顧視之，乃少年也。宣遽問，何人中夜在此。少年曰，某非常人，即毘沙門天王之子那吒也。護法之故擁護和尚，時之久矣。宣曰，貧道修行，無事煩太子。太子威神自在，西域有可作佛事者，願為致之。太子曰，某有佛牙，寶掌雖久，頭目猶捨，敢不奉獻。俄授於宣，宣保錄供養焉。

On yet another occasion, a *deva* arrived at the step of the yard. After he had paid his respects [to Daoxuan], he told Daoxuan: ‘*Vinaya* Master, you will be reborn in the palace of Tuṣita Heaven.’ This *deva* also brought with him a packet of something and said that it was *jinlin xiang*. Ten *xun*<sup>181</sup> later, while seating, Daoxuan passed away peacefully. This was the third

<sup>180</sup> The Chinese term is Qinbu 沁部, but this was not a placename in the Tang period. However, if we read *bu* as ‘area’, Qinbu becomes ‘the area/region of Qin’. Mentioned in JTSj39.1471.13 and XTSj39.999.9, Qin was a Tang-era prefecture whose borders approximated those of present-day Qinyuan County in Changzhi City, Shanxi Province.

<sup>181</sup> *Xun*旬 was a Chinese unit of time, with one *xun* equal to either ten days or ten years, according to context. Here, the meaning is ten days, so ten *xun* is equivalent to one hundred days.

day of the tenth month in the second year of the Qianfeng era. Daoxuan was aged seventy-two, and his career was fifty-two years. His disciples buried him in a stone chapel in Tan Valley.<sup>182</sup> Three stupas were erected later. The Emperor Gaozong (r. 628–683) decreed that a fine statue of Daoxuan should be made. The artisan Han Botong<sup>183</sup> sculpted [Daoxuan's] image. All of this was meant to pay tribute to Daoxuan and to express admiration for his impressive monastic legacy.

復次，庭除有一天來禮謁，謂宣曰，律師當生觀史天宮。持物一苞，云是棘林香。爾後十旬，安坐而化。則乾封二年十月三日也，春秋七十二，僧臘五十二。累門人窓于壇谷石室，其後樹塔三所。高宗下詔，令崇飾圖寫宣之真相，匠韓伯通塑續之。蓋追仰道風也。

Over the years, from his full ordination to the day when he passed away, hundreds and hundreds of disciples received dharma or learned the Teaching from Daoxuan. Daoxuan personally tonsured the *vinaya* master Daci,<sup>184</sup> while Wengang<sup>185</sup> was one of the many who received the dharma from Daoxuan. Without letting anyone else know, Daoxuan entrusted the tooth relic he had received from the *deva* to Wengang and asked him to look after it. Wengang presented the relic to Chongsheng monastery for enshrinement in the east stupa. At the beginning of the Dahe era (824–835), the chief minister Wei Chuhou<sup>186</sup> built a stupa for the relic in the west corridor.

宣從登戒壇及當泥曰，其間受法傳教弟子可千百人。其親度曰大慈律師，授法者文綱等。其天人付授佛牙，密令文綱掌護，持去崇聖寺東塔。大和初，丞相韋公處厚，建塔於西廊焉。

<sup>182</sup> See Tan Gu 檀谷 at n. 136.

<sup>183</sup> Han Botong is not mentioned in any other Daoxuan-related work, JTS or XTS.

<sup>184</sup> LYSZj5.178a12–17 states that Daci was a disciple of Daoxuan and the first author to write a commentary on the master's *vinaya* works, while T45.1892j1.816c18 suggests that he was a resident of Ximing monastery in 667. No more is known about his life or work.

<sup>185</sup> During his lifetime, Wengang, one of Daoxuan's students, was a well-known *vinaya* master. See his biographical entry at T50.2061j15.791c15–792b24.

<sup>186</sup> According to his biographies at JTSj156.4182.13–4187.10 and XTSj142.4674–4676, Wei Chuhou (772–828) was an able, high-ranking official in the Tang court. This is the first mention of him in a Daoxuan-related work. Neither JTS nor XTS links him to Buddhism.

Daoxuan's reputation as a monk who observed the *vinaya* rules was well known even in India, and the high calibre of his work was appreciated all over the countries. This was the reason why the Tripitaka master [San]wuwei asked to live under [Daoxuan's] supervision.<sup>187</sup> Upon [his] arrival in China, and after paying homage to the Emperor, the Emperor said: '[You] have travelled from afar. I hope [your journey] did not exhaust [you] too much. Is there a particular place where you wish to live?' The Tripitaka master replied respectfully: 'When I was in India, I often heard that the *vinaya* master Daoxuan of the Ximing monastery is the foremost observer [of the *vinaya* rules]. I wish to go and live under his guidance.' His request was granted.

宣之持律聲振竺乾，宣之編修美流天下，是故無畏三藏到東夏朝謁，帝問，自遠而來得無勞乎，欲於何方休息。三藏奏曰，在天竺時，常聞西明寺宣律師秉持第一，願往依止焉，勅允之。

[Dao]xuan was very strict in his observance of the rules. Once, after catching some lice, Daoxuan wrapped them in soft paper and threw them onto the ground. The Tripitaka master said: 'Listen – that is the sound a sentient being would make if he were suddenly dropped to the ground.' As [this incident] shows, there is a wide variety of behaviour, some of which is not comprehensible to ordinary minds. The *vinaya* categorically states that some behaviour is always prohibited, while other actions are wrong only in particular circumstances.

宣持禁堅牢，捫蟲以綿紙裹投於地。三藏曰，撲有情於地之聲也。凡諸密行或制或遮良可知矣。

---

<sup>187</sup> The Chinese term here is *yizhi* 依止, see *yizhi* at n. 82.

In the second year of the Dali era [767], the Emperor Daizong sent a message to the three monks who were in charge<sup>188</sup> of the monastery: ‘I have heard<sup>189</sup> that there is a tooth relic of the Śākyamuni Buddha and other bodily relics<sup>190</sup> obtained by the *vinaya* master Daoxuan in your monastery. It is the time to call on the Right Gate of the Silver Pavilion<sup>191</sup> and deliver the relics to me. I want to have a good look [at the relics] and pay my respects.’

至代宗大曆二年，勅此寺三綱，如聞彼寺有大德道宣律師傳授得釋迦佛牙及肉舍利，宜即詣右銀臺門進來，朕要觀禮。

In the tenth month of the eleventh year, an edict was issued that a box of incense from the palace should be offered each year to the hall of the late *vinaya* master Daoxuan of Ximing monastery, [so] it could be burned during prayers for the country. In the tenth year of the Xiantong era (869), during the reign of the Emperor Yizong, the monk Lingxiao<sup>192</sup> and

---

<sup>188</sup> The Chinese term is *sangang* 三綱 (literally, ‘three hawsers’), which denotes the three-person board of management in a monastery – typically, in order of seniority, the *shangzuo* 上座, *sizhu* 寺主 and *weina* 维那. For a study of the term *sangang* and Buddhist monastic administration, see Jonathan Alan Silk, *Managing Monks: Administrators and Administrative Roles in Indian Buddhist Monasticism* (New York Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

<sup>189</sup> At first sight, given that *ruwen* 如聞 appears immediately after *sangang* in the text, these characters might be read as the name of one of the monastery’s three hawsers. However, such a name appears only once in the whole *Taishō* collection, at T49.j24.257b2, in relation to the eleventh-century master Fanzhen 梵臻. (Fanzhen’s dates of birth and death are unknown, but T49.2035.314c8–315a11 indicates that he was active in the 1070s.) Having dismissed the notion that *ruwen* might be the name of an eighth-century monk, my reading of it as ‘heard’ is based on its use as such in *Fozu tongji* (1269, 180), T49.2035j41.379.9–10, Zhen Zaozhuang 曾橐莊 and Liu Lin 劉琳’s *Quan Song wen* 全宋文 (*The Complete Collection of the Prose Literature of the Song*; Shanghai: Shanghai cishu chubanshe, 2006), vol. 1, j8.176.14, and *Song da zhaoling ji* 宋大詔令集 (*The Great Collection of the Decrees of the Song*; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2009), j223.861.2.

<sup>190</sup> The Chinese term is *rou sheli* 肉舍利. In FYZL (668, 33), T53.2122j40.598c10–13, Daoshi explains that *sheli* is a transliteration of the Sanskrit term *śarīra* (literally, ‘the remains and bone’; i.e. relics, see at T22.1428j54.966a20), then adds that there are three different types of relic: bone relics, hair relics and bodily relics of the Buddha. In XYJ (646 CE), T51.2087j8.918b10–12, Xuanzang mentions only bone relics and bodily relics. Yet, these two authors’ use of *rou sheli* cannot be verified from other texts in the *Taishō* collection. I have assumed that Zanning merely wanted to distinguish between two different types of relic and so have rendered *rou* simply as ‘other bodily’. Note particularly that one *sūtra* – *Putichang zhuangyan tuoluoni jing* 菩提場嚴陀羅尼經 (*Dhāraṇī: The Solemn Decoration to the Birthplace of Bodhi*), T19.1008.672a10 – mentions *rou sheli*, but it was translated by Amoghavajra 不空 (705–774) at some point between 746 and his death (see T50.2061j7.713a24–25/b13–28). For a study on the term *śarīra* see, among others, Silk, Jonathan Alan, *Body Language: Indic śarīra and Chinese shèlì sheli in the Mahaparinirvana-sutra and Saddharma-pundarika*. Tokyo: Japan, 2006. Special thanks to Stefano Zacchetti for pointing out the book for me.

<sup>191</sup> The Chinese characters are *you yingtai meng* 右銀台門 (literally, ‘right, silver, terrace, door’), a reference to the location of the government department of the Song that dealt with Buddhist affairs.

<sup>192</sup> This is the only mention of a monk named Lingxiao 令霄 in the *Taishō* collection.

Xuanchang<sup>193</sup> of the *zuoyou jie*<sup>194</sup> submitted a memorandum requesting a posthumous honour for Daoxuan. In the same year, the request was granted: Daoxuan received the posthumous title Chengzhao and the name for his stupa was Jingguang. Because [Daoxuan] lived on Zhongnan [Mountain] for a long period of time, [his understanding and interpretation of the *vinaya* was] called Nanshan *lüzong*.

至十一年十月，勅每年內中出香一合，送西明寺故道宣律師堂，為國焚之禱祝。至懿宗咸通十年，左右街僧，令霄玄暢等，上表乞追贈。其年十月勅諡曰澄照，塔曰淨光。先所居久在終南，故號南山律宗焉。

In the first year<sup>195</sup> of the Tianbao era [742] and the first year of the Huichang era [841], respectively, the Governor of Lingchang Li Yong<sup>196</sup>

---

<sup>193</sup> Although there are several potential candidates, it seems likely that this is the Xuanchang who is mentioned in SGSZ at T50.2061j17.808a10–b19 – a famous *vinaya* master who was much admired by the Emperor Yizong.

<sup>194</sup> Literally, ‘left, right, street’. *Zuoyou* has been used frequently throughout history as a prefix to designate a position that is shared by a pair of appointees. See Charles O. Hucker, *A Dictionary of Official Titles in Imperial China* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1985), 522. Translations of Chinese official titles throughout this book are taken from Hucker’s dictionary, unless otherwise specified. In SSSL, T54.2126j2.243c18–19, Zanning states that the left and right street assumed responsibility for Buddhist affairs for the first time during the Kaicheng era (836–840) of the Tang.

<sup>195</sup> The Chinese word is *zai* 載, which has a number of meanings, including ‘carry’ and ‘convey’. However, in this context, it means ‘year’. This reading is based on JTSj9.217.11 and XTSj5.144.3, where we are told that the Emperor Xuanzong (r. 712–756) ordered the use *zai* in place of the previous term for ‘year’ – *nian* 年 – in 744.

and the Director of the Ministry of Works Yan Houben<sup>197</sup> composed texts for Daoxuan's stele in praise of his character and accomplishments.

天寶元載，靈昌太守李邕，會昌元年，工部郎中嚴厚本，各為碑頌德云。

Comment:<sup>198</sup> in a *vinaya* context, the key element in determining what is a violation of the rules and what is not is the [perpetrator's]

<sup>196</sup> JTSj9.221.1 and XTSj5.145.14 both assert that the Tang official Li Yong 李邕 was accused of corruption and executed by imperial decree in the first month of the sixth year of the Tianbao era (747). The former claims he was 'seventy' (*qishi* 七十) when the sentence was carried out, whereas the latter states he was 'over seventy' (*qishi yu* 七十餘). His biographical entries at JTSj190b5039.10–5043.8 and XTSj202.5754–5757 reveal that he was a well-known literatus of his day. In *Chunming tuichao lu* 春明退朝錄 (*History Notes [Recorded] at the Chunming Residence Outside Official Hours*; 1070 CE; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1979), 35.1, the official historian of the Song era, Song Mingqiu 宋敏求 (1019–1079), notes that Li Yong's work was highly valued by literary collectors in the second half of the eleventh century. He was particularly famous for his 'stone inscriptions and tablet hymns' (*bei song* 碑頌), and JTSj190b.5043.4–5 states that many Buddhist monasteries and Daoist temples rewarded him handsomely for the former. Although there are frequent references to his inscription for Daoxuan, its content is unknown. Moreover, while he is consistently named 'Li Yong, the Governor of the Commandery of Lingchang 灵昌太守李邕' in Daoxuan-related works, this title is rather problematic with respect to the year given for the inscription (742). First, as mentioned above, both JTS and XTS give Li Yong's date of death as the first month of the sixth year of Tianbao (747); second, Lingchang was officially designated a *jun* 郡 (commandery) for the first time in 742, the first year of Tianbao (see JTSj38.1436.3); third, *taishou* 太守 (governor) was reinstated as an official Tang title in 743 (having been abolished in 618; see JTSj42.1790.8–9 and XTSj49b.1317.8–9); finally, Li Yong was under investigation for corruption in 746. In light of all this information, if Li Yong designated himself 'Governor of the Commandery of Lingchang' when writing his biography of Daoxuan, he must have composed it between 743 and 745, not in 742. Zhang Xihou 張錫厚's *Quan Dunhuang shi* 全敦煌詩 (*The Complete Collection of Dunhuang Poetry*; Beijing: Zuojia chubanshe, 2006), vol. 14, j33.1659–1667, includes five poems attributed to Li Yong, but none of the five is related to Buddhism. *Jinshi cuibian* 金石萃編 (*The Collection of Stone Inscriptions*; Nanjing: Jiangsu guji chubanshe, 1998), j70.425b6, attributes an inscription for an ordination platform to Li Yong. In *Guixin zashi* 癸辛雜識 (*The Miscellaneous Notes of Guixin Street*; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1988), 40.5–10, Zhou Mi 周密 (1232–1298) points out that the Tang literati and official scholars tended to be sympathetic towards Buddhism and often termed themselves 'disciple' (*dizi* 弟子) in stone inscriptions they composed in honour of Buddhist masters. In his thirty-volume magnum opus *Jinshi lu* 金石錄 (*The Collection of Stone Inscriptions*; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1991; hereafter JSL), j29.670.10/674.3, the Song writer Zhao Mingcheng 趙明誠 (1081–1129) states that the famous Tang literati Liu Yuxi 劉禹錫 (772–842) and Liu Zongyuan 柳宗元 (773–819) also composed stone inscriptions for Buddhist monks. Li Yong is an important figure in any study of Daoxuan (and indeed Tang lay and Buddhist literature) because Daoxuan-related works cite his biography of the master (or *xingzhuang* 行狀) so frequently. Moreover, while this *xingzhuang* has been lost, many of Li Yong's other works are still extant, including his biographical sketches of Xuanzang 玄奘 and other Tang Buddhist masters, and these help to contextualize Daoxuan's life story. See in appendix 4 Li Yong's works.

<sup>197</sup> Little is known of Yan Houben. YYZZj4.239.12 mentions that he wrote a brief study on the origins of the Chinese elegy (*wan ge* 輓歌), while JSLj10.259.9 states that he composed a stone inscription *Tang Xuangong liuyuan jie* 唐宣公律院碣 (*Stone Tablet Inscription to the Vinaya Hall of Master Xuan of the Tang*) but gives no further details of the text. SGSZ is the first Daoxuan-related work to mention him and his Daoxuan inscription, which is lost.

<sup>198</sup> The Chinese term is *xi yue* 系曰 (literally, 'to link further', 'to say'). This phrase appears ninety-nine times in SGSZ, where it is used in two distinct ways: to mark the start of a comment by Zanning; and in conjunction with *tong yue* 通曰 (literally, 'to pass through', 'to say') to form questions and answers. See Kieschnick, *The Eminent Monk*, 9, who notes the first usage of *xi* and translates it as 'addenda'.

volition.<sup>199</sup> Nevertheless, the volition can vary substantially, and thus so can the subsequent judgement. For example, someone has not followed the Path, but with the ill volition he has developed, he declares that he has. In such a case, this person has undoubtedly committed the gravest offence.<sup>200</sup> However, if the *devas* and the dragons truly come to a monk, and that monk talks about their visit, [in such circumstances he should not be] accused of committing the gravest offence [of lying. If he is, the accuser himself may] be guilty of the offence of slander, as in the case of the arahant Po.<sup>201</sup>

系曰，律宗犯即問心，心有虛實故。如未得道，起覆想，說則宜犯重矣。若實有天龍來至我所，而云犯重，招謗，還婆羅漢同也。

Envoy from Heaven paid frequent visits [to Daoxuan]. They either presented Daoxuan with tooth relics of the Buddha or attended to him as his personal assistants. Yet, Daoxuan himself never spoke about them. For example, Daoxuan sent the dragon to the house of the scholar Sun [Simiao].

---

<sup>199</sup> The Chinese character is *xin* 心, which has a number of meanings, including ‘mind’, ‘heart’, and ‘intention’ and so on. The reading here – ‘volition’ – is based on T40.1804j2.54b1–28, where Daoxuan declares: ‘It is true that the ill thoughts in one’s mind are not under the discretion of the *vinaya* … nevertheless, aside from judging what is wholesome and what is unwholesome on the basis of the *vinaya* rules, there is something called volitional restraint (*ye jie* 業戒)’. Daoxuan stresses the importance of taking volition into account when determining whether a monastic has committed an offence, which distinguishes him from contemporaneous *vinaya* masters, who tend to judge the deed rather than the intent of the perpetrator. Zanning’s brief comment suggests that he agrees with Daoxuan.

<sup>200</sup> The Chinese term is *fan zhong* 犯重 (literally, ‘to commit [something] heavy’). This ‘gravest offence’ is addressed in the fourth *pārājika* rule in the *Prātimokṣa*: a fully ordained monk must not tell another person that he has attained a superior human state, such as arahant, or one of the *dhyānas* when he knows that he has not. For study on the stipulations, see, among others, Heirman, Ann. On Pārājika. *Buddhist Studies Review*. (1999). 51–59.

<sup>201</sup> The Chinese characters are *po luohan* 婆羅漢. *Luohan* is a frequently used, if corrupted, Chinese transliteration of ‘arahant’, but this is one of the rare occasions in the *Taishō* collection when it is used in combination with *po*. In this context, I feel the text should be read as *tapo luohan* 脩婆羅漢 (‘the arahant Tapo’; i.e. Dravya Mallaputra). In a famous story, the arahant Dravya was in charge of a monastery’s administrative affairs. However, one monk was unhappy with the lodging that Dravya had allocated to him. Indeed, he grew so angry that he accused the arahant of being motivated by selfishness and fear. According to Buddhist theology, an arahant is free from all defilements, including selfishness and fear, yet the monk continued to criticize Dravya. The Buddha, knowing what had happened, summoned both parties and declared that Dravya was innocent of any offence while his accuser was guilty of slander. The full account of this incident is in *Sifen lü*, T22.1428j3.587a25–588b20. If my reading of *po luohan* is correct (*po luohan* 婆羅漢 → *tapo luohan* 脩婆羅漢 → *tapomoluozi* 脩婆摩羅子), then Zanning’s intention is clearly to support Daoxuan’s position by citing the story of the arahant and his slanderer. In a different context, Yuanzhao 元照 (1048–1116) uses *tapo luohan* as an abbreviation for *tapo mo luozhi* in *Zichi ji* (c. 1075, 130), T40.1805j9.311a15/j16.411c17/415c4. For a study on the practice of repenting, see Eric M. Greene, ‘Atonement of Pārājika Transgressions in Fifth-Century Chinese Buddhism’, in Susan Andrews, Chen Jinhua and Liu Cuilan (eds), *Rules of Engagement: Medieval Traditions of Buddhist Monastic Regulation* (Bochum: Freiburg, 2017), 369–408.

Did he discuss this? Surely not! With respect to the events that took place in the years of the Qianfeng era [666–668], such as visits by a host of *devas* who related the *Qihuan tujing* and the *Fuzhu yi* to Daoxuan, these were simply occasions when the *devas* and the spirits were entrusted to convey messages.

宣屢屢有天之使者，或送佛牙或充給使，非宣自述也。如遣龍去孫先生所，豈自言邪。至於乾封之際，天神合沓，或寫祇洹圖經、付囑儀等，且非寓言於鬼物乎。

Dear reader,<sup>202</sup> have you not read what happened to Mulian in *Shisong lü*?<sup>203</sup> [In that text] many *bhiksus* openly declare that Mulian has committed the offence of lying. The Buddha says that Mulian is innocent because [his] words are spoken in honesty. Given that [a monk] was defamed even at the time of the Buddha, should we be surprised that an eminent monk in this time of the Simulated Dharma has become the target of jealousy? Well, returning to [San]wuwei, could it be that this [San]wuwei is not from the Kaiyuan era, but another [San]wuwei who lived in the Zhenguang era or in the Xianqing era?

君不見十誦律中，諸比丘尚揚言目連犯妄。佛言，目連隨心想說，無罪。佛世猶爾，像季嫉賢，斯何足怪也。又無畏非開元中者，貞觀顯慶已來，莫別有無畏否。<sup>204</sup>

<sup>202</sup> The Chinese word is *jun* 君, which is often translated as ‘gentleman’, but addressing fellow monks in this way sounds strange even today. (Zanning was writing primarily for a Buddhist audience, although we know his text was read by the laity, too.) Hence, I decided to translate *jun* simply as ‘reader’.

<sup>203</sup> The story in question is in *Shisong lü*, T23.1435.12c18–13b29. Mulian 目連 (a frequently used Chinese abbreviation for one of the Buddha’s chief disciples, the Maudgalyāyana 大目犍連) is questioned and condemned as a liar whenever he relates his meditative experiences to his fellow monks. However, the Buddha declares their judgement invalid and insists that Mulian has spoken nothing but the truth. Zanning probably introduced this story in a bid to counter an accusation levelled at Daoxuan by Huaisu 懷素 (634–708). This does not appear in any of Huaisu’s extant works, but in SGSZ, T50.2061j14.792c29–793a1, Zanning writes that Huaisu accused Daoxuan of relating his conversations with the *devas* in clear contravention of the fourth *pārājika* rule. In other words, Zangning is the earliest source of Huaisu’s accusation about Daoxuan. Huaisu’s extant works are at T22.1431, T40.1809/1810 and X42.735.

<sup>204</sup> T50.2061j14.790b7–791b26. Robin Beth Wagner provides an alternative translation of this extract in her thesis ‘Buddhism, Biography and Power: A Study of Daoxuan’s Continued Lives of Eminent Monks’ (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1995), 255–268. For a study on Zanling’s biography of Sanwuwei see Chou Yiliang 周一良, “Tantrism in China,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 8, no. 3/4 (Mar., 1945), 251–272. Chou’s article was published in 1945. See also Zhou Yiliang 周一良, *Tangdai mizong* 唐代密宗, trans. Qian Wenzhong 錢文忠 (Shanghai: Shanghai yuandong chubanshe, 2012), 13–37/129–138.

This extract from SGSZ (988, 102) is the foremost example of the all-inclusiveness of texts composed during the ‘Summarizing the Information’ period. The vast majority of Zanning’s biography of Daoxuan has already appeared in earlier works. For example, Sun Simiao, Sanwuwei and Nezha all feature in YYZZ (*c.*860, 83) and KTCX (890, 91), but now their stories have been collated within a single text. Similarly, the details of Daoxuan’s posthumous honours and his three-life story echo the account provided by Jingxiao in JZJ (895, 92).

However, SGSZ is much more than a simple ‘copy and paste’ exercise. Zanning makes a number of changes to the earlier accounts and occasionally inserts his own comments on the life of Daoxuan. Some of the amendments make his narrative rather difficult to understand, as is apparent in the above translation. By contrast, his comments usually clarify his own understanding and appreciation of the master. Unfortunately, later authors tended to adopt the problematic changes and ignore the helpful comments when writing their biographies of Daoxuan. Inevitably, as we shall see below, this resulted in a number of increasingly ill-informed and misleading accounts.

If one compares Zanning’s account with the earlier texts, it is apparent that he amends Daoxuan’s biography in a number of different ways. First, he sometimes alters a single, crucial character. For example, although the two accounts of the dragon’s appeal for help from Daoxuan and Sun Simiao are very similar in SGSZ (988, 102) and YYZZ (*c.*860, 83), Zanning changes *suo* 缩 (literally, ‘to shrink’) to *zhang* 漲 (literally, ‘to rise’)<sup>205</sup> and thereby fundamentally alters the meaning of the text: we are now told that the water level of the Kunming Pool rose sharply, rather than fell, when the barbarian monk recited his prayers. But if the water level rose, then why did the dragon subsequently need to seek protection from Daoxuan and Sun Simiao, and how would a full pool aid the deceitful barbarian monk’s ambition to harvest the dragon’s brain? As these questions suggest, Zanning’s substitution of one keyword makes the story far less logical and more difficult to understand.<sup>206</sup>

Second, Zanning omits some important pieces of information, as is especially evident when comparing his version of the story of Sanwuwei and Daoxuan with the

<sup>205</sup> *Suo* 缩 is the ninth character at YYZZj.2.19.6, while *zhang* 漲 is the fifteenth character in SGSZ at T50.2061j14.790c11.

<sup>206</sup> The picture formed in YYZZ is that the barbarian monk takes water from the Kunming Pool to give rain, knowing the dragon lives in and is in charge of the Pool. The dragon will die when the water dries out, so the barbarian monk could have his brain.

account that appears in KTCX (890, 91). First, SGSZ neglects to mention that Sanwuwei eats meat, drinks wine and behaves in a reckless manner. Second, while KTCX asserts that this unseemly behaviour ‘greatly disturbed’ Daoxuan and made him ‘unhappy’, the SGSZ gives no indication of his state of mind. Third, in KTCX, Daoxuan ultimately realizes that Sanwuwei is an extraordinary man, whereupon he accords him total deference and regards him as his own master. There is no such realization in SGSZ. Zanning’s decision to omit these three crucial aspects of the two monks’ relationship results in an obviously incomplete and problematic narrative.

Third, Zanning sometimes chooses to interpret information provided by earlier sources in a novel way, most notably in his account of the arahant Piṇḍola. On this occasion, his source was probably JZJ (895, 92), which introduces Piṇḍola and an Indian monk with long eyebrows into Daoxuan’s life story. However, Zanning decides to merge these two characters into a single person when he declares that the Indian monk with long eyebrows ‘was, in fact, Piṇḍola’.

All of this manipulation of earlier sources – by substituting keywords, omitting crucial details and interpreting information in unconventional ways – means that, while Zanning’s biography touches on almost every aspect of Daoxuan’s life that was known in the late tenth century, it remains a frustratingly incomplete and sometimes even incomprehensible account.

In addition collating every aspect of the life story of Daoxuan in a single text (albeit with some seemingly wilful amendments), Zanning leaves readers in no doubt about his personal admiration for the master, especially in his comments on the narrative. He even launches a spirited defence against what he considers the unfounded accusation that Daoxuan violated the fourth *pārājika* rule of the *Prātimokṣa*. Elsewhere in SGSZ, Zanning praises Daoxuan more overtly:

[He] truly is a great man. It is indeed because of [his greatness that] people from all over the country look upon Nanshan [i.e., Daoxuan] as their compass every time they set their *vinaya* practice in motion.

實一代之偉人焉。是以天下言行事者，以南山爲司南矣。<sup>207</sup>

---

<sup>207</sup> T50.2061j17.812a1–2.

Although SGSZ is the most important work in the ‘Summarizing the Information’ period, it does introduce some new details into the life story of Daoxuan. Ironically, though, Zanning does not include these in his biography of Daoxuan but in his account of another great Tang master, Kuiji 窺基 (632–682),<sup>208</sup> a disciple of Xuanzang 玄奘 (602–664):<sup>209</sup>

When Kuiji returned to his home monastery, he associated with the old fellows who had worked on the translation with him. [Hence,] he often visited the *vinaya* master [Dao]xuan. Every day, envoys of the Heavenly Kings would come, either to attend to Daoxuan or to reveal diverse information to him. One day, they arrived only after [Kui]ji had left. [Dao]xuan was astonished [that they had come so late] in the day – towards sunset. [The envoys] responded: ‘Because a Mahāyāna bodhisattva and a great number of [his] accompanying protective *devas* were here, our supernatural power was subdued. That was what happened.’

及歸本寺，恒與翻譯舊人往還，屢謁宣律師。宣每有諸天王，使者執事，或冥告雜務。爾日，基去方來。宣怪其遲暮。對曰，適者大乘菩薩在此，善神翼從者多，我曹神通為他所制故爾。<sup>210</sup>

This is the first time that Kuiji appears in Daoxuan’s life story. Nevertheless, the SGSZ remains the principal exemplar of our final period of study, which was characterized by authors’ incorporation of earlier works into their own texts. Almost two centuries later, the writer of LXBN (1163, 155) would display similarly all-inclusive tendencies by incorporating not only every available piece of pre-SGSZ information but Zanning’s story of Kuiji and Daoxuan. Moreover, like Zanning himself, Zuxiu 祖琇, the author of LXBN, was more than willing to modify his sources as he felt necessary. For instance, his version of the story of Kuiji and Daoxuan reads as follows:

---

<sup>208</sup> The full Kuiji entry is at T50.2061j4.725b17–726c5.

<sup>209</sup> The full Xuanzang entry is at T50.2060j4.446c8–458c13 and there are two individual biographies at T50.2052/2053. For a detailed study of Xuanzang’s life, as presented in XGSZ, see Saitō Tatuya’s ‘Features of the Kongō-ji Version of *The Further Biographies of Eminent Monks* 続高僧伝: With a Focus on the Biography of Xuanzang 玄奘 in the Fourth Fascicle’, *Journal of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies*, vol. 16 (2012), 68–104. See further discussion on the relationship between Daoxuan and Xuanzang at III.4.5.2.

<sup>210</sup> T50.2061j4.726a26–b1.

There was a time when the *vinaya* master [Dao]xuan of Nanshan was very well known, even in the land of India, and had a great reputation for being a master who promoted the *vinaya*. Because of his wholesome deeds, the *devas* came to offer him food from the heavenly realm. [Daoxuan,] feeling a deep loathing for Kuiji's self-indulgence,<sup>211</sup> did not, therefore, accord [him] due respect. One day [Kui]ji paid [Dao]xuan a visit. On that particular day, it was already past noon but the food from Heaven had not yet been delivered. Only after [Kui]ji had bid [Daoxuan] farewell did the *devas* arrive. Daoxuan admonished them for arriving after the proper time.<sup>212</sup> The *devas* said: '[We] just saw a Mahāyāna bodhisattva was here, and the guards were so strict. [We were] unable to enter as we had wished.' Upon hearing this, [Dao]xuan was astonished. Thereafter, [he] respected [Kuiji, regardless of whether he was] in his presence or not.

---

<sup>211</sup> The Chinese expression is *bo Ji san che zhi wan* 薄基三車之玩 (literally, 'despise', 'Kuiji', 'three', 'vehicle', 'it', 'play'). The term *sanche* is one of the most widely used metaphors in Chinese Buddhist texts. For example, in the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka* 妙法蓮華經 (the Lotus Sūtra), T9.262j1.12c16–13b9, the three vehicles are a 'goat-yoked cart' (*yangche* 羊車), a 'deer-yoked cart' (*luche* 鹿車) and an 'ox-cart' (*niuche* 牛車), which denote the three vehicles revealed by the Buddha – the vehicle for the śrāvaka 聲聞乘, the vehicle for the *pratyekabuddha* 辟支佛乘 and the vehicle for the Buddha 佛乘, respectively. However, if we read *sanche* in this way here, we are left asking: why would Daoxuan despise Kuiji for embracing the teaching of the three vehicles? Furthermore, such a reading is contradicted by the subsequent text, in which Kuiji is depicted not as a śrāvaka, nor as a *pratyekabuddha*, but as a Mahāyāna bodhisattva. Therefore, I feel we cannot read *sanche* in this way here. The term appears three times in LXBN, each time in relation to Kuiji: here and twice at X75.1512j13.172a7–11. On the latter two occasions, we are told that Kuiji took *sanche* ('three vehicles') with him whenever he went out: one of the carts would carry meat (*hun* 葦), the second women (*se* 色), and the third supper (*wan shan* 晚膳). Hence, he was known as 'the master of three vehicles' (the *sanche fashi* 三車法師). This story of Kuiji and the three vehicles appears for the first time in the *Taishō* collection in SGSZ (988, 102) at T50.2061j4.725c4–9. This is followed immediately by Zanning's comment that he considers it a 'great slander' (*hou wu* 厚誣), but numerous subsequent writers, including the author of LXBN, chose to ignore his warning and included the story in their biographies of Kuiji. To avoid confusion, I have rendered *sanche* as 'Kuiji's self-indulgence' here. My translation of the character *se* 色 (which has multiple potential meanings) as 'women' is based on a phrase used by Zanning in a Kuiji-related context at T50.2061j4.725c5: *bu duan qing yu* 不斷情慾, which reads as 'not abandoning sensual desire'.

<sup>212</sup> The Chinese expression is *hou shi* 後時 (literally, 'behind the time'). As we learned in the previous paragraph, in this instance the time in question was noon. The term 'noon' appears in numerous contexts in the *vinaya* texts, including in one of the ninety *pāyattiika* rules promulgated by the Buddha for all fully ordained monastics. This rule specifies that every member of the monastic community should eat his or her daily ration of food between dawn and noon. Any consumption of food outside these prescribed hours is considered a violation. The individual *vinaya* texts differ in their accounts of how this rule was formulated and evolved, but they all specify that no food should be eaten after noon. Hence, I rendered *hou shi* as 'after the proper time'. The rule is outlined in the following *vinaya* texts in the *Taishō* collection: T22.1421j8.54a7–29, T22.1425j17.359b21–c3, T22.1428j14.662b8–c24 and T23.1435j13.91a16–c9. See study on the daily peridos of worship, among others, Julian F. Pas, 'Six Daily Periods of Worship: Symbolic Meaning in Buddhist Liturgy and Eschatology', *Monumenta Seria*, vol. 37 (1986–1987), 49–82.

初，南山宣律師以弘律名震五天，感天厨供饌。每薄基三車之玩，不甚為禮。基嘗訪宣，其日過午而天饌不至。及基辭去，天神乃降。宣責以後時。天曰，適見大乘菩薩在此，翊衛嚴甚，故無自而入。宣聞之大驚，於是遐邇增敬焉。<sup>213</sup>

Evidently, the two narratives of Kuiji and Daoxuan in SGSZ (988, 102) and LXBN (1163, 155) share many features. In both, Daoxuan is addressed as *vinaya* master; *devas* visit Daoxuan; Kuiji is described as a Mahāyāna bodhisattva; and so on. On the other hand, the account in LXBN is rather more detailed.

In general, the authors of post-SGSZ biographies of Daoxuan, including the writer of LXBN, abide by the principle of incorporating all of the information relating to the master that was available to them at the time. Some also introduce a handful of new details, but these are usually very minor points rather than significant additions to Daoxuan's life story. Hence, they are not discussed or translated in the main body of this book, although they are outlined in the appendix.<sup>214</sup>

---

<sup>213</sup> X75.1512j14.177b24–c5.

<sup>214</sup> Appendix 4 provides a full list of all the significant elements of Daoxuan's life story and the particular text in which each of these is introduced. However, as mentioned, other Daoxuan-related works sometimes introduce less significant details that do not merit full discussion or translation in the main text of this book. For example, in his discussion of the teaching of *vinaya* in *Risshū Koyo* 律宗綱要 (*The Outline of the Teaching of the School of Vinaya*; 1306, 193; hereafter LZGY), T74.2348j1.8b29, the author Gyōnen 凝然 (1240–1321) addresses Daoxuan as *Fahui pusa* 法慧菩薩 (bodhisattva Fahui). This is the first occasion when Daoxuan is accorded such a title, but there is little more to say about it. Similarly, in Jiang Zhiqi 蔣之奇's (1031–1104) *Dabei chengdao zhuan* 大悲成道傳 (*The Enlightenment Story of the Bodhisattva Dabei [Avalokiteśvara]*) (1100, 140); in Liangzhe jingshi zhi 兩浙金石志; in *Lidai Beizhi congshu* 歷代碑誌叢書; Nanjing: Jiangsu guji chubanshe, 1998), j7.151a21–153b16 (see also *Baqiong jingshi buzheng* 八瓊金石補正; c.1882 CE; in *Lidai Beizhi congshu*, j109.329b6–332a13), the *devas* tell Daoxuan the *Jātaka*-like story of a royal princess named Miaoshan 妙善, one of the many previous lives of the bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara, and the extraordinary sacrifices she made in order to practise the teaching of the Buddha. Jiang Zhiqi, a Song-era (960–1279) courtier and littérateur, relates this story in great detail, and his is the first text to suggest that the *devas* entrusted Daoxuan with such a tale. Moreover, the story appears in many subsequent accounts of Daoxuan's life, such as X75.1512j13.157b12–176a7 (1163, 155), T48.2004j4.261c14–15 (1224, 165), T80.2549j6.190c26–191b2 (1285, 185), and T80.2556j2.519a15–b1 (1387, 219). However, while the story that features in *Dabei chengdao zhuan* meets many of the criteria for detailed study – in that it is richly detailed, appears for the first time in that particular work and was adopted by later authors – it consists of nothing more than an exchange between the *devas* and Daoxuan. Therefore, it affords no great insight into Daoxuan's activities or character, so it is not translated or discussed in depth here. Nevertheless, interested readers may wish to consult Chün-fang Yü's *Kuan-yin: The Chinese Transformation of Avalokiteśvara* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 293–351, for a detailed exploration of Avalokiteśvara and the legend of Miaoshan; and Glen Dudbridge, *The Legend of Miaoshan* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 21–35, for a full translation of Jiang Zhiqi's text; and a study on the story of Mianshao see, Stephen Levine, *Becoming Kuan Yin: the Evolution of Compassion* (San Francisco, CA/Newburyport, MA: Weiser Books, 2013), chapters 4–6. A comparison of the versions of the tale that appear in X75.1512 and X24.467 is provided in appendix 7, which provides an insight into the evolution of certain aspects of the Miaoshan story over time. Special thanks to T. H. Barrett for highlighting Jiang Zhiqi's mention of Daoxuan; prior to his helpful intervention, I had been under the misapprehension that the Miaoshan story first appeared some six decades later, in LXBN (1163, 155).

## II.6 Conclusion

In this part of the book, I have studied the most significant passages from texts that may be described as Daoxuan-related works (*c.*667–1874 CE, numbers 31–296 in Table 1). This has generated a wealth of material, such as Daoxuan’s title, his age, his family background, his birth story, his relationships with other Tang masters, his exchanges with *devas* and so on. In general, I have focused on those texts where particular details of Daoxuan’s life story appear for the first time.

Overall, these texts are remarkably consistent. For example, whenever the master’s family name is specified, it is invariably given as Qian 錢. Similarly, his *vinaya* teacher is always named as Zhishou 智首. Moreover, every source tells us that Daoxuan died in the second year of the Qianfeng era (667) and was then reborn in *Tuṣita* Heaven. Nevertheless, some significant changes in approach are discernible over time, which prompted the decision to group the works into four discrete categories and periods: ‘First-hand Information’ (668 CE); ‘Stable Information’ (674–858 CE); ‘A Flood of Information’ (*c.*860–984 CE); and ‘Summarizing the Information’ (988–1874 CE).

Several distinct trends emerged during the course of the research. First, it was readily apparent that early authors address Daoxuan respectfully with titles that honour his expertise as a *vinaya* master, such as *lüshi* 律師, whereas later authors increasingly employ more affectionate terms, as *dashi* 大師 (literally, ‘great master’), *zushi* 祖師 (literally, ‘the founding master’), and *wuzu* 吾祖 (literally, ‘my own founding patriarch’) either alongside or in place of the forms of address that pay homage to his knowledge.

This tendency reflects not only the individual authors' perceptions of Daoxuan but also the era in which they were living.<sup>215</sup>

Second, works composed in the final two periods (c.860–1874, numbers 83–296) tend to omit or gloss over some details of Daoxuan's biography that feature prominently in texts dating from the first two periods (668–858, numbers 33–82) and concentrate instead on other aspects of his life. For instance, later authors barely mention Daoxuan's extensive travels in search of the Path or his activities in defence of the Buddha-dharma, but they provide extensive details about his personal background, such as his ancestors, his hometown and so on.

Third, the final two periods witnessed the introduction of several new characters into Daoxuan's life story, and these have continued to appear in subsequent biographies. More importantly, whenever one of these figures is introduced, he is invariably portrayed

<sup>215</sup> As mentioned earlier, Jingxiao was the first author to address Daoxuan as *dashi* (literally, 'great master'), in JZJ (895, 92), X43.737j2.30a12. This honorific has a variety of applications in Buddhist-related texts. First, it may be used as a synonym for 'Buddha', especially when a Buddhist monk is comparing the Buddha with others (e.g. in *Za ahan jing* 雜阿含經 *Samyuktāgama*. Translated by Gunabatsudara 求那跋陀羅; T2.99j35.252a1). In such cases, the meaning is straightforward and affectionate: 'my own teacher'. Second, it is sometimes used by the Buddha in reference to himself. For instance, in T24.1462j1.673c7–8, he instructs his disciples to honour *vinaya* as if it is their *dashi* – the Buddha. Third, it may be used by a Buddhist in reference to an eminent monk (e.g. T50.2060j23.626b16–17). Fourth, it is sometimes used as a form of address for respected teachers by the followers of other faiths (e.g. T1.1j15.100b9). Fifth, the Chinese government sometimes honoured an eminent Buddhist monk with the title *dashi*. According to Zanning (in SSSL, T54.2040j3.249b8–11), such a title was first bestowed on the fourteenth day of the eleventh month of the eleventh year of the Xiantong era 咸通 (870). Two official government documents provide further information. First, Wang Pu 王溥's *Wudai huiyao* 五代會要 (*The Institutions of the Five Dynasties Period*; 961 CE; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1978; hereafter WDHY), j12.197.8, records an imperial decree that was issued on the eleventh day of the tenth month of the first year of the Tiancheng era 天成 (926) which states: 'only a very few have been granted the title [*dashi*] since [the start of my rule in 923]'. Second, in *Jiu Wudai shi* 舊五代史 (*The Old History of the Five Dynasties*; 974 CE; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1976; hereafter JWDS), j5.82.1, Xue Juzheng 薛居正 writes that the title was bestowed on the eleventh day of the first month of the fourth year of the Kaiping era 開平 (910), then goes on to list a number of other occasions when it was granted (at JWDSj40.554.1–2/j46.637.8/j49.673.15/j76.996.8) up to the year 937. Clearly, then, the government honoured a number of eminent Buddhist masters with the title *dashi* between 870 and 937. To reiterate, Jingxiao addresses Daoxuan as *dashi* in JZJ, which was composed in 895. Moreover, X43.737j1.1c5 tells us that Jingxiao 'gives *vinaya* lectures all the time (*chang jiang lü* 長講律)'. In short, we may say that he himself was a *vinaya* master. Taking all of this into consideration, it is reasonable to assume that Jingxiao, like many other writers in the third and the fourth periods of this study (860–1874 CE, numbers 82–296), addressed Daoxuan as *dashi* to express his personal respect for the master and to honour him with what was an august official title at the time. My reading of *shihao* 師號 at WDHYj12.197.8 as '[the title] *dashi*' is based on Zanning's comment on the honorific at T54.2126j3.249b2: 'the term *shihao* is meant to confer the title of *dashi* on someone (*shihao wei ci mou dashi ye* 師號謂賜某大師也)'. See also the comment on the title in *Nihon saishi meishō sentoku ki* 日本大師先德明匠記 (*The Accounts of the Great Teachers, the Past Virtuous, and the Wise Masters of Japan*; 1580 CE), D111.267j1.3.17–4.3. In contrast with the multiple applications of the term *dashi*, the meaning of the word *zu* is relatively simple: it clearly displays the author's personal affection for Daoxuan. It is used for the first time in a Daoxuan-related work, as *zushi* in *Tang Fabao lishi pi* 唐法寶律師批 (*Tang Vinaya Master Fabao's Note [on the Colophon of Daoxuan's Shi Pini Yi Chao]*; 846, 73), X44.747j2.797a2, and as *wuzu* in *Nanshan zushi lizan wen* 南山祖師禮讚文 (*The Eulogy for the Late Patriarch Nanshan*; 1014, 106), X74.1504.1078j1.a6. The evolution of Daoxuan's titles over time is outlined in appendix 4 part 1.

as superior to Daoxuan in some way. For instance, in the story of Daoxuan and Sun Simiao, the master admits he is unable to help the dragon from the Kunming Pool and suggests he should visit the wise man. Similarly, Daoxuan is clearly presented as spiritually inferior to Falin, Sanwuwei and Kuiji. A particular incident eventually causes the proud *vinaya* master to realize that these seemingly uncouth monks are in fact bodhisattvas, at which point he belatedly accords them the respect they deserve. Finally, the stories of Daoxuan and the *devas* indicate a considerable lack of knowledge on the part of the master, which the *devas* attempt to address by visiting him each day over the course of several months.

Who was Daoxuan? How did he view his own life? Did he travel widely? Did he act to defend the honour of the Buddha-dharma? Was he a Mahāyāna-inspired monk? What was the nature of his relations with other masters and *devas*? Bearing all of these questions in mind, we shall now proceed to the second part of this study, which focuses on Daoxuan's own works.

# The Life of Daoxuan

## Part III

### In His Own Words

#### III.1 Introduction

In Part II, we explored the life of Daoxuan as seen through the eyes of others – namely, in Daoxuan-related works. The information provided by these sources may be divided into three broad categories: first, the secular aspects of the master’s life, including details of his family, his birth and his parents; second, his monastic life and career, comprising his body of work, teachers, travels, relations with other Tang masters and reported communications with *devas*; and finally, the titles and honorifics that the Chinese court conferred on him after his death.<sup>216</sup> With this information in mind, we may now explore Daoxuan’s personal reflections on his own life.

However, this task is not as straightforward as it might seem. For, while Daoxuan was a prolific writer and biographer of other monks, he rarely discussed his own experiences in his works (numbers 1–30 in Table 1). In fact, only in one of his texts – *Sifen lü hanzhu jieben shu* 四分律含注戒本疏 (*Commentary on the Annotated Prātimokṣa of Sifen Lü*; hereafter JBS)<sup>217</sup> – could an account be termed ‘autobiographical’, and even this includes no more than a brief summary of his life from childhood to mid-fifties. Otherwise, we have to rely on snippets of information that are scattered throughout his other twenty-nine texts: occasional references to his whereabouts at particular moments in time, what he was doing in these places and with whom he was meeting. Nevertheless, when all of these fragments are pieced together, something akin to an autobiography starts to emerge.

<sup>216</sup> See in appendix 4 parts 1 and 4 for a full list of Daoxuan’s posthumous titles.

<sup>217</sup> Note particularly that we do not have a discrete copy of JBS. The referenced text (W62.309–1026/X39.714) is a collated version compiled by a Japanese monk named Rengō Sokkai 蓮合即靜 in 1742 CE (W62.1026b14–16) that combines Daoxuan’s JBS and Yuanzhao’s sub-commentary. The title of Yuanzhao’s sub-commentary is *Sifen lü han zhu jieben shu xing zong ji* 四分律含注戒本疏行宗記 (*The Foundation: A Commentary on the Annotated Prātimokṣa of the Dharmaguptaka vinaya*; 1088, 133). My translation of this title is based on information at W62.322a5, where Yuanzhao emphasizes that the *prātimokṣa* is the ‘foundation of practice’ (*xing zong* 行宗). The commentary was completed in the third year of the Yuanyou era 元祐 (i.e. 1088; see W62.322a15).

First, we shall discuss these sources in depth before exploring the personal information that Daoxuan chooses to disclose within them.

### III.2 Daoxuan's Works

Among the Daoxuan-related works, *Fayuan zhulin* (668, number 33) was the first to include a list of Daoxuan's texts.<sup>218</sup> Thereafter, many others followed suit. The first standard history book to do so was JTS (945, number 96),<sup>219</sup> while Yuanzhao 元照 collated the longest bibliography of works attributed to Daoxuan – consisting of some sixty-one entries<sup>220</sup> – in 1078.<sup>221</sup> Four centuries earlier, Daoxuan himself had included two separate lists of his own works in the *Da Tang neidian lu* 大唐內典錄 (*The Buddhist Catalogue of the Great Tang*; 664, 23; hereafter NDL):<sup>222</sup> the first comprised eighteen texts and the second nine,<sup>223</sup> giving a total of twenty-seven texts written by Daoxuan.

<sup>218</sup> T53.2122j100.1023b20-c14/j10.362b17/j39.591b3.

<sup>219</sup> JTSj46–47.

<sup>220</sup> X59.1104j3.648c7–650c15, ‘Nanshan Lüshi zhuanji lu 南山律師撰集錄’ (A List of the Works of Vinaya Master Nanshan [Daoxuan]) in *Zhiyuan yi bian* 芝園遺編 (*The Collected Works of the Later Master Lingzhi [Yuanzhao]*; c. 1098 CE; 138). In addition to being the longest, Yuanzhao's list is interesting for two other reasons. First, of all the previously published Daoxuan-related works, only KYL (730 CE; 41) makes any sort of reference to the availability (or otherwise) of Daoxuan's work, when the author admits *xun ben wei huo* 尋本未獲 (T55.2154j8.562a15–16): that is, he has been unable to find one particular text. By contrast, Yuanzhao employs a variety of phrases to describe the availability of all of the entries in his bibliography: *jian xing* 見行 ('seen in circulation'; 21 entries); *jian dazang* 見大藏 ('seen in the great collection'; 9); *sheng xing* 盛行 ('exceedingly popular'; 1); *wei jian* 未見 ('not seen'; 27); *jian* 見 ('seen'; 1); *you ben* 有本 ('text is available'; 1); and *xun ben wei huo* ('unable to find'; 1). Second, while Yuanzhao lists sixty-one texts, at the end of the bibliography he states that it contains only fifty-seven entries: *zong wushiqi jian* 總五十七件 (X59.1104j3.650c10). There is no obvious reason for the discrepancy, so it may have been that Yuanzhao simply miscounted. The complete sixty-one-entry bibliography is in appendix 8.

<sup>221</sup> X59.1104j3.651b8.

<sup>222</sup> For the impact of Daoxuan's *Neidian lu* on Chinese Buddhist librarianship, see J.-P. Drège, *Les Bibliothèques en Chine au Temps des Manuscrits* (Paris: EFEO, 1991), 186–189, 212–214. Special thanks to T. H. Barrett for drawing my attention to this source and to one of my friends, who wished to remain anonymous, who helped with translation. For more information on Daoxuan's role as librarian of the Ximing monastery and the collections that were housed in that establishment, see Wang Xiang 王翔, ‘Beiyu xiejing: Tang Chang'an de fojiao tushuguan 貝葉與寫經: 唐長安的佛教圖書館’, *Tang Yanjiu* 唐研究, vol. 15 (2009), 483–529; Wang Xiang, ‘Jiqie yu jiezang: Tang Ximingsi jingzangqun chutan 集篋與結藏: 唐西明寺經藏群初探’ (Assembling Scriptures and Establishing Tripitake: Brief Observation on Scripture Repositories in Ximing Monastery of the Tang Dynasty), *Shoujie Chang'an fojiao yantaohui lunweiji* 首屆長安佛教國際學術研討會論文集 (*Proceedings of the First International Conference on Chang'an Buddhism*), vol. 3 (2000), 432–444; and on the Ximing collections see Fang Guangchang 方廣錫, *Zhongguo xieben dazing jing yanjiu* 中國寫本大藏經研究 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2006); Zhan Ru 湛如, ‘The Buddhist Canon of Ximing Monastery and Tang China’, *Studies in Chinese Religions*, vol. 3:2 (2017), 187–193. Special thanks to Stefano Zacchetti for highlighting these illuminating studies.

<sup>223</sup> T55.2149j5.281a2: *Yishiba bu* 一十八部 ('eighteen items'). The text does not specifically state the number of entries in the second list, but there are nine in total; see T55.2149j10.333a11–21.

However, as we shall see later, there are problems of duplication in these lists. Moreover, not all of the texts that Daoxuan mentions have survived to the present day, let alone all sixty-one of the titles that Yuanzhao attributed to the master. Rather, we have access to fewer than half that number: thirty texts that I term ‘Daoxuan’s works’ or ‘the works of Daoxuan’.

Table 3 lists all of these extant works, plus six that have been lost since Daoxuan included them in his NDL bibliographies. For simplicity, I have not included either *pinyin* transliterations or English translations in the table; rather, transliterations are provided when a particular work is mentioned in the main text for the first time.<sup>224</sup>

---

<sup>224</sup> The numbers 1–30 in this table should not be confused with the numbers in the master table.

**Table 3: The Extant Works of Daoxuan and Works Listed in NDL**

No.	Extant Works	Works Mentioned in NDL	Reference Number in Buddhist Canon
1	四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔	行事刪補律儀	T40.1804
2	四分律比丘含注戒本	注戒本	T40.1806
3	四分律刪補隨機羯磨	注羯磨	T40.1808
4	釋門章服儀	釋門章服儀	T45.1894
5	量處輕重儀	釋門亡物輕重儀	T45.1895
6	釋門歸敬儀	釋門歸敬儀	T45.1896
7	新刪定四分僧戒本		X39.707
8	四分刪定比丘尼戒本		X40.722
9	四分律比丘尼鈔		X40.724
10	四分律刪補隨機羯磨疏	(疏記)	X41.728
11	四分律拾毗尼義鈔		X44.747
12	四分律比丘含注戒本疏	(疏記)	W62.309–1026
13	釋迦氏譜	釋氏譜略	T50.2041
14	釋迦方志	釋迦方志 (R)	T50.2088
15	妙法蓮華經弘傳序		T9.262j1.1b13–c11
16	師子莊嚴王菩薩請問經序		T14.486j1.697a19–b8
17	離垢慧菩薩所問禮佛法經序		T14.487j1.698b25–c11
18	大唐眾經音譯序		Z56.1163j1.813b–c15
19	淨心戒觀法		T45.1893
20	教誠新學比丘行護律儀		T45.1897
21	廣弘明集	廣弘明集 (R)	T52.2103
22	集古今佛道論衡	古今佛道論衡 (R)	T52.2104
23	律相感通傳		T45.1898
24	集神州三寶感通錄	東夏三寶感通記 (R)	T52.2106
25	道宣律師感通錄		T52.2107
26	大唐內典錄	大唐內典錄 (R)	T55.2149
27	續大唐內典錄		T55.2150
28	續高僧傳	續高僧傳 (R)	T50.2060
29	關中創立戒壇圖經并序		T45.1892
30	中天竺舍衛國祇洹寺圖經		T45.1899
		釋門護法儀	
		聖跡見在圖贊	
		佛化東漸圖贊	
		後集續高僧傳 (R)	
		釋門(正行)懺悔儀 (R)	
		刪補律相雜儀	

As mentioned above, Daoxuan himself lists a total of twenty-seven works in the two NDL bibliographies. However, when the two lists are compared, we find that eight titles (including NDL itself) appear in both of them (These are marked (R) in Table 3). In other words, when one takes these duplicate entries into account, Daoxuan lists only nineteen discrete texts. Nevertheless, this should not be considered as a definitive total of his life's work.

First, NDL was composed in 664 – three years before Daoxuan's death – and we know that he continued to write until the very end of his life. Indeed, he completed at least three texts in those three years: namely, the *Lü xiang gan tong zhuan* (number 23 in Table 3), the *Guanzhong chuangli jietan tujing bing xu* (29) and the *Zhong tianzhu shewei guo qihuan si tujing* (*Illustrated Discourse on the Jetavana Monastery in Central India*; 30). Moreover, a careful, line-by-line comparison of texts 23 and 25 reveals that they are almost identical. Nevertheless, I decided to include them as separate entries because they are referenced as such in the *Taishō* collection.<sup>225</sup> Therefore, it might be assumed that Daoxuan composed four texts (23, 29, 30 and 25) after compiling the bibliographies for NDL.

Second, the NDL bibliographies do not specify that Daoxuan wrote *four* forewords to *sūtras*. He simply states that he wrote *xu* 序 (forewords). These are included as four separate entries (15–18) in table 3.<sup>226</sup> Third, in NDL, Daoxuan cites his annotations of and commentaries on *Jieben* (*Prātimokṣa* 戒本) and *jiemo* (*karman* 罪磨) as a single volume, but later bibliographies treat these as two separate works (12 and 10, respectively). Fourth, Daoxuan fails to mention his *Sifen lü shi pini yi chao* (*A Manual: Collected Explanatory Passages from Sifen Lü*; 11) in either NDL bibliography, even though he refers to it repeatedly elsewhere. For example, he mentions it at least fifteen times in XSC.<sup>227</sup>

Finally, in NDL, Daoxuan either admits that he cannot recall some of his earlier works or states that he deliberately omitted them (for some unspecified reason). The

<sup>225</sup> See a comparison of these two texts in appendix 9.

<sup>226</sup> T55.2149j5.281a2.

<sup>227</sup> The fifteen citations are at: T40.1804j1.3c6/c23/7a21/8b1/9b16/12a14/13a10/14a15/j2.15a21/17b9/j3.24c7–8/27a7/29b4/j10.124b9/j11.139b29. *Sifen lü shi pini yi chao* 四分律拾毗尼義鈔 is often abbreviated in Daoxuan's own and Daoxuan-related works as *Yi chao* 義鈔. Surprisingly, the authorship of this text was called into question in Yuanzhao's time. Hence, he felt compelled to explain his reasoning at X44.747j1.753a6–754a15. My translation of the title is based on an extract from this explanation: *Shi yi lan zhu yaoyi bie lu cheng zhang si wen zhi xing yi* 是以攬諸要義別錄成章斯文之興抑 ('Therefore, [Daoxuan] collected all of the important points and compiled them in a separate book. Such was how this book [Yi chao] came into being'), at X44.747j1.753a18–19.

phrase he uses is *yi shi bu wu* 遺失不無 (literally, ‘forgotten’, ‘lost’, ‘not’, ‘without’),<sup>228</sup> which could be interpreted either way. Nevertheless, while a question mark remains over Daoxuan’s precise meaning, there is no doubt that the NDL lists are incomplete. For instance, we know that he compiled an edited *Prātimokṣa* – titled *Xin shanding Sifen seng jieben* (*Newly Edited Sifen Lü Bhikṣu Prātimokṣa*; 7) – in 647,<sup>229</sup> yet he did not include this work in either of the bibliographies.

On the other hand, it should also be mentioned that there is some dispute about Daoxuan’s authorship of five extant texts, all of which have been traditionally attributed to him: the *Sifen shanding bhikṣunī jieben* (*Sifen Lü Bhikṣunī Prātimokṣa: Edited*; 8), the *Sifen lü bhikṣunī chao* (*Guide for Bhikṣunī: In Light of Sifen Lü*; 9), the *Jing xin jie guan fa* (*Methods Recommended for the Cultivation of A Clear Faith [in Mahāyāna]*;<sup>230</sup> 19), the *Jiaojie xinxue bhikṣu xinghu lüyi* (*Guide for Newly Ordained Bhikṣus on the Good Protection of Stipulations*; 20) and the *Xu Da Tang neidian lu* (*The Continued Buddhist Catalogue of the Great Tang*; 27). In JBS Daoxuan mentions that he wrote a single-scroll, annotated *bhikṣunī Prātimokṣa*,<sup>231</sup> which almost certainly corresponds to *Sifen shanding bhikṣunī jieben*. However, it was not until the end of the eleventh century that Yuanzhao first attributed texts 8, 9, 19 and 20 to Daoxuan – more than four hundred years after the master’s death.<sup>232</sup> Yuanzhao added that all four were in circulation (*jian xing* 見行) in his lifetime.

All but one of Daoxuan’s extant works are cited in one or other of the Daoxuan-related works. The sole exception is *Xu Datang neidian lu*, which appears only in the *Taishō* collection.<sup>233</sup> XTS (1060, 121) mentions a *Da Tang Zhenguan neidian lu* 大唐貞觀內典錄 (*The Buddhist Catalogue Composed in the Zhenguan Era*) and a *Da Tang*

<sup>228</sup> T55.2149j5.282b9.

<sup>229</sup> X39.707j1.262b9–10.

<sup>230</sup> My translation of the title is based on Daoxuan’s comment in the same text at T45.1893j1.819c5–8, which reads: *jing xin zhe ... qi yu dacheng qingjing xinxin* 淨心者 ... 起於大乘清淨信心 (literally, ‘this [text] Jingxin [jieguanfa] is to [help you] to develop a clear faith in the teaching of Mahāyāna’).

<sup>231</sup> W62.1025a13.

<sup>232</sup> X59.1104j3.649a9/12.

<sup>233</sup> The editor of the *Taishō* collection commented on the authorship of this book and noted, ‘in some of the previous collections, the authorship of the *Xu Datang neidian lu* was attributed to Zhisheng 智昇 (T55.2150.342, n. 7). Zhisheng was a later contemporary of Daoxuan and the author of KYL (730 CE; 46 in table 1).

*neidian lu* 大唐內典錄 (*The Buddhist Catalogue of the Great Tang*),<sup>234</sup> but NDL cannot correspond to the former as it was composed in the first year of the Linde era (664). However, it may be that Daoxuan composed two distinct *neidian lus* – the first in the Zhenguan era, then another in the Linde era – and the latter came to be known as *Xu 續 ... (The Sequel ...)*.

As such, of the five works mentioned above (8, 9, 19, 20 and 27 in table 3), we may say that the first was probably written by Daoxuan, while some doubts remain over the authorship of the other four. It is not the primary goal of this study to verify Yuanzhao's attribution of texts 8, 9 and 20 to Daoxuan, or to debate whether text 27 warrants inclusion in his canon, although it might be said that the name 'Daoxuan' does appear in the colophons of texts 9, 19 and 20,<sup>235</sup> so it seems highly likely that he wrote them. In any respect, I do not quote from any of these sources, not because of concerns about their authorship, but simply because they do not contain any information that is pertinent to this study. Following a close examination of the contents of all thirty extant works, I grouped the texts into nine broad categories:

---

<sup>234</sup> XTSj59.1526a/1582b. In addition to mentioning these two *neidian lus*, XTS provides the most comprehensive Daoxuan bibliography in any standard official history book – some twenty-four titles. The earlier JTS cites only seven of his works; see JTSj46.2005a/2030a/b/2076b/2079a. Zheng Qiao 鄭樵 (1104–1162), *Tongzhi ershi lie 通志二十略* (*The Twenty Monographs in the Encyclopaedia*; 1161 CE; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1992), 1640 and Qian Daxin 錢大昕 (1728–1804), CXXZ, 1650.5, also include *Da Tang Zhenguan neidian lu* in their bibliographies and attribute it to Daoxuan.

<sup>235</sup> At, respectively, X40.724j1.706a5: *Zhongnan Shan shamen Shi Daoxuan shu* 終南山沙門釋道宣述 ('Passed down by Monk Shi Daoxuan of Zhongnan Mountain'); T45.1893j1.819b17: *Zhongnan Shan shamen Shi Daoxuan zhuan* 終南山沙門釋道宣撰 ('Written by Monk Shi Daoxuan of Zhongnan Mountain'); and T45.1897j1.869a22: *Zhongnan Shan shamen Daoxuan shu* 終南山沙門道宣述 ('Passed down by Monk Daoxuan of Zhongnan Mountain').

1. *Vinaya* works (numbers 1–12 in table 3)
2. Buddhist history (13–14)
3. Forewords to *sūtras* (15–18)
4. General manuals for new monks (19–20)
5. Accounts of the defence of Buddhism (21–22)
6. Collections on the uncanny effectiveness of the Buddha-dharma (23–25)
7. Catalogues of Buddhist scriptures (26–27)
8. Biographies of Buddhists (28)
9. Illustrated discourses (29–30)<sup>236</sup>

<sup>236</sup> This classification is inspired by Yuanzhao's grouping of Daoxuan's work, which was the first such taxonomy. See Yuanzhao's list of Daoxuan's work in appendix 8. As far as I am aware, Hongyi 弘一 (1880–1942) was the first author in the modern era to provide an account on Daoxuan's life and a full list of his work. See Hongyi, 'Nanshan Daoxuan lüshi nianpu 南山道宣律師年譜', in Hongyi dashi quanji bianji weiyuanhui 弘一大師全集編輯委員會 (ed.), *Hongyi dashi quanji* 弘一大師全集 (hereafter HYQJ), 10 vols. (Fuzhou: Fujian renmin chubanshe, 1991), vol. 7, 401–404. Judging from the content of his article, it seems that Hongyi utilized a number of primary sources, such as JBS (650, 10). That said, his narrative relies heavily on SGSZ (988, 102). Hongyi, also known as Li Shutong 李叔同, was one of the foremost promoters of *vinaya* in China's Republican period. For more information on his activities, see Daniela Campo, 'A Different Buddhist Revival: The Promotion of *Vinaya* (*jielü* 戒律) in Republican China', *Journal of Global Buddhism*, vol. 18 (2017), 132–133, 148–149. Many of Daoxuan's *vinaya* works were lost in China, but Hongyi was able to find a number of them in Japan. He started to acquire these texts in 1917 through contacts provided by his former student Liu Zhiping 劉質平 (1894–1978), who was studying in Japan at the time. See *Hongyi fashi quanji* 弘一法師全集, 5 vols. (Beijing: Xingshijie chubanshe, 2013; hereafter HYFSJ), vol. 2, 17. At HYQJ, vol. 1, 194a, Hongyi himself states:

In the spring of the Gengshen year [1920], I fortunately acquired from Japan the ancient version of the three great volumes of Nanshan [Daoxuan] and Lingzhi [Yuanzhao]. They total more than eighty volumes.

庚申之春，自日本請得古版南山靈芝三大部，計八十餘冊。

Nevertheless, it would be another seventeen years before Hongyi could finally announce, 'What a wonderful work of *karma* that the copies of the three great volumes are now finally acquired in their entirety' (*jin zhe yinyuan qiaohe san da bu huiben xiyi qibei* 今者因緣巧合三大部會本悉已齊備; HYFSJ, vol. 3, 64). Note that Hongyi uses the phrase *san da bu* (literally, 'the three great volumes') when referring, collectively, to certain works by Daoxuan and Yuanzhao. On the other hand Campo, 'A Different Buddhist Revival', 132, mentions 'the five *Nansha liu* codes composed by Daoxuan and in *The Revival of Buddhist Monasticism in Medieval China* (New York: Peter Lang, 2007), 2, Huaiyu Chen refers to 'the Five Great Books of the *Vinaya* School' (*Lüzong wu da bu* 律宗五大部), and lists the five texts at 9, n. 5. However, *wu da bu* (literally, 'the five great volumes') does not appear in any of the 296 primary sources that were consulted during the course of the research for this book, nor is it found in either HYQJ or HYFSJ. The phrase *san da bu* is discussed further at ns. 237, 242. Special thanks to Ester Bianchi for highlighting the significance of Hongyi in relation to Daoxuan and the promotion of *vinaya*. For a study on Hongyi see Raoul Birnbaum, "Master Hongyi Looks Back: A Modern Man Becomes a Monk in Twentieth-Century China," in *Buddhism in the Modern World: Adaptations of an Ancient Tradition*, ed. Steven Heine, Charles S. Prebish (Oxford New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 75–124. Some subsequent scholars also offered their lists of Daoxuan's works, e.g., Wang Jianguang 王建光, *Zhongguo Lüzong Tongshi* 中國律宗通史 (Nanjing: Fenghuang chubanshe, 2008), 262–266.

Among the twelve *vinaya* texts, the *Sifen lü shanfan buque xingshi chao* 四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔, the *Sifen lü shanbu suiji jiemo shu* 四分律刪補隨機羯磨疏 and the *Sifen lü hanzhu jieben shu* 四分律含注戒本疏 are the most well-known works.<sup>237</sup> In 1051 Yunkan 允堪 (1005–1062)<sup>238</sup> grouped these together as Daoxuan's *da bu* 大部 ('great volume');<sup>239</sup> then, about sixty years later, Yuanzhao 元照 (1048–1116)<sup>240</sup> did the same and coined the term *san da bu* 三大部 ('three great volumes').<sup>241</sup> Neither of these collective terms was adopted by later biographers,<sup>242</sup> and neither Yunkan nor Yuanzhao offered any explanation for why the three texts (and no others) should be amalgamated. Nevertheless, it is reasonable to assume that they wished to emphasize that these three studies are the most important and/or the most voluminous of all the master's *vinaya* works.

Now that we have established which texts should be attributed to Daoxuan, it is time to explore what those texts reveal about his life, starting with his family.

---

<sup>237</sup> These three texts are often abbreviated in other's reference, respectively, as: *Shanbu chao* 刪補鈔/*Xingshi chao* 行事鈔/*Shi chao* 事鈔/*Chao* 鈔; *Jiemo shu* 羯磨疏/*Ye shu* 業疏; and *Jieben shu* 戒本疏/*Jie shu* 戒疏. Note particularly that Mou Zhongjian 牟鐘鑒, Zhang Jian 張踐, *Zhongguo zongjiao tongshi* 中國宗教通史 (Beijing: Shehui kexuewenxian chubanshe, 2000), 532, state *san da bu* as *Sifen lü hanzhu jieben shu*, *Sifen lü shanbu suiji jiemo shu*, and *Sifen lü shi pini yi chao* as *san da bu*. As far as I am aware, this is the first work to make such a claim, however, it does not give the source for the statement.

<sup>238</sup> Although he was a major commentator on Daoxuan's *vinaya* works and affectionately called him *wu zu* 吾祖 (literally, 'my own ancestral master'; X59.1096j1.518a7), Yunkan was interested in more than *vinaya*. For example, he referred to himself as a Tiantai *shamen* 天台沙門 (i.e. a monk of the alternative Tiantai school of Buddhism; X59.1096j1.518a5). Indeed, this personal interest in both *vinaya* and Tiantai works might have prompted his application of the term *da bu* to Daoxuan's best-known texts. Thereafter, other writers started to use the same phrase in reference to certain *sūtra* commentaries, including Zhiyi 智顥's (538–597) texts on the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka* 妙法蓮華經 (T9.262). For instance, it was used in this way in 1112 and 1202 CE (see T33.1705j1.253a28 and T46.1937.916a10, respectively). See 'Yunkan' at T49.2035.j30.297b21–24.

<sup>239</sup> X40.726j1.786b6.

<sup>240</sup> See 'Yuanzhao' at T49.2035.j30.297b25–19.

<sup>241</sup> X59.1105j1.658b12.

<sup>242</sup> *Da bu* appears only at X75.1513j3.287c20 and *san da bu* only at T60.2218j6.36a15, T62.2248j1.267c15/j2.341b1/j4.860a6/21, T74.2348j1.10b19/12b29–c1, and at T76.2410j100.836c7.

### III.3 Daoxuan's Family

As we saw in Part II, KYL (730, 47) was the first source to give Daoxuan's family name as Qian 錢, the first to state that he was a native of Wuxing 吳興<sup>243</sup> and the first to claim that he was a descendant of the legendary Pengzu 彭祖. More than 150 years later, JZJ (895, 92) introduced his mother's family name – Yao 姚 – and established that Daoxuan was born in Chang'an 長安. Thereafter, every Daoxuan-related work accepted all of this information as fact and reproduced it without further comment or amendment.

Turning to Daoxuan's own works, the expression ‘Wuxing Shi Daoxuan 吳興釋道宣’ (Monk Daoxuan of Wuxing) appears in the colophons of two of his texts.<sup>244</sup> Nevertheless, this expression should not be interpreted as definitive proof that Daoxuan was born in Wuxing. Among the Daoxuan-related works, JZJ (895, 92) was the first to raise the issue of the master's birthplace. Citing evidence from the *History Book of the Qian Family* (*Qian shi pu* 錢氏譜; now lost), the author, Jingxiao, concludes that Daoxuan was actually born in Chang'an.<sup>245</sup> Later, in ZCJ (c.1075, 130), Yuanzhao, the chief commentator on Daoxuan's *vinaya* works, concurs with this conclusion and provides supporting evidence in the form of a reference to a biography of Daoxuan (*Xingzhuang* 行狀; also now lost).<sup>246</sup>

Even though their principal sources cannot be consulted, it seems that Jingxiao and Yuanzhao were correct to name Chang'an as Daoxuan's birthplace. First, we know from the standard official history of the Chen Dynasty (557–589) that all of its chief ministers

<sup>243</sup> The territory of Wuxing was somewhat larger than, but approximated, today's Huzhou City, Zhejiang Province. According to information at SSj31.877.13, it ceased to be the name of a commandery when the Chen Dynasty fell (Chenguo ping 陳國平), a defeat that was marked by the capture of the dynasty's last emperor, Chen Shubao 陳叔寶 (r. 582–589; SSj2.32.5/CSj6.117.10), in the ninth year of the Kaihuang era (589)/third year of the Zhenming era 穎明 (also 589). JTSj40.5–6 and XTSj41.1059.8 both mention that Wuxing became the name of a commandery once again in the first year of the Tianbao era (742). For more details on the history of Wuxing, see CXXZj1.95.3–10/99.3; and for more detail on Huzhou, see *Huzhou fuzhi* 湖州府志 (*The History of Huzhou*; In Zhongguo Fangzhi Congshu 中國方志叢書. Taibei: Chengwen chubanshe, 1960.), j3.35b–36a.

<sup>244</sup> *Shi men zhangfu yi* 釋門章服儀 (*Code on Monastic Robes and Other Clothing*; T45.1894j1.839b11; hereafter ZFY; 659, 14) and *Shijia fang zhi* 釋迦方志 (*The History of the Land of Śākyamuni*; c. 658 CE, 13; T51.2088j2.975a4). My translation of the latter title is based on information at T51.2087j1.948a29–b11, where Daoxuan explains that his intention is to tell the story of the Western Region. For more on *Shijia fang zhi*, see Janine M. Nicol, ‘Daoxuan (c.596–667) and the Creation of a Buddhist Sacred Geography of China: An Examination of the *Shijia fangzhi*’ (Ph.D diss., SOAS, 2017). Special thanks to Janine M. Nicol for generously sending me a PDF of her thesis.

<sup>245</sup> X43.737j2.30a12–13.

<sup>246</sup> T40.1805j1.160a17–19.

were captured and sent to Chang'an in 589.<sup>247</sup> Furthermore, the standard official histories of the Chen and the succeeding Sui Dynasty (581–619) suggest that these prisoners were never allowed to leave Chang'an. For example, the last Chen emperor remained in the city until his death in 604. Second, whenever Daoxuan's father is mentioned in Daoxuan-related works, he is described as a key minister in the court of the Chen Dynasty. In other words, he almost certainly arrived Chang'an with the emperor and the other ministers in 589, then remained there until his death. Of course, it is possible that Daoxuan was born at an earlier date in Wuxing, but all of the sources agree that he died at the age of seventy-two in 667 (see below), so he must have been born in 596<sup>248</sup> when his parents were in Chang'an. In all probability, the colophons used the term '*Wuxing Shi Daoxuan*' simply because that was the ancestral home of Daoxuan's family.

Daoxuan does not offer any information about his mother's life or background in any of his works. Indeed, while we have to assume that the family name of Yao 姚 – introduced by Jingxiao more than two centuries after Daoxuan's death – is correct, there is a notable reluctance on the part of the master himself to discuss either his early life or his family. Fortunately, he is rather more forthcoming with respect to his monastic career.

---

<sup>247</sup> CSj6.117.12: '[Zhenming san nian san yue (589)] Houzhu yu wang gong bai si ... ru yu chang'an [禎明三年三月 (589)] 後主與王公百司 ... 入于長安.' See ns. 111, 244.

<sup>248</sup> Note particularly that in the traditional Chinese way of counting age, he is already one-year old at the day of his birth.

### III.4 Daoxuan's Monastic Life

#### III.4.1 The Length of Daoxuan's Career

In general, Buddhist texts divide the Buddhist community into two broad categories: lay followers and monastics. The lay followers are householders who have taken refuge in the Triple Gems (*Triratna*) or, alternatively, adhere to the five or the eight precepts.<sup>249</sup> They are known as *upāsakas* 優婆塞 (male lay followers) and *upāsikās* 優婆夷 (female lay followers). The monastics, on the other hand, leave their family homes to live within a monastery or a nunnery. The *vinaya* texts specify five discrete categories of monastics: *bhikṣu* 比丘 (monk), *bhikṣunī* 比丘尼 (nun), *śikṣamāṇā* 式叉摩那 (probationer), *śrāmaṇera* 沙彌 (novice) and *śrāmaṇerī* 沙彌尼 (female novice). Of these, only *bhikṣus* and *bhikṣunīs* are fully ordained. The *vinaya* texts<sup>250</sup> explain that a candidate must first approach a fully ordained monk (*bhikṣu*) and ask to become his pupil.

In the interests of brevity, I shall only describe the ordination process for a male candidate. The ordination of female candidates follows an almost identical pattern, although obviously it begins with the candidate asking for guidance from a *bhikṣunī*, rather than a *bhikṣu*.<sup>251</sup> Once the monk has agreed to accept the candidate as his disciple, he offers guidance on taking refuge and the five precepts. Then he shaves the candidate's head (or instructs someone else to do this), dresses him in monk's robes and gives him all of the other essential monastic items, such as an alms bowl. Thereafter (either immediately or sometime later, depending on circumstances), the monk confers *chu jia* 出家 (*pravrajyā*; the initial ordination of going forth) on the candidate, at which point the monk becomes the candidate's *heshang* 和尚 (*upādhyāya*; preceptor)<sup>252</sup> and the candidate

<sup>249</sup> See, among others, Kate Crosby, *Theravada Buddhism: Continuity, Diversity, and Identity* (Malden, MA, and Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2014).

<sup>250</sup> What follows is a simplified account of the ordination process based on information gleaned from a variety of *vinaya* texts. See (WFL) T22.1421j15/ (SQL) 1425j23/ (SFL) 1428j31 and (SSL) T23.1435j21 for full details of the process.

<sup>251</sup> For more information on the ordination of nuns, see, among others, Bhikkhu Bodhi, *The Revival of Bhikkhunī Ordination in the Theravāda Tradition* (Penang: Inward Path Publisher, 2009); and Ann Heirman, 'Some Remarks on the Rise of the Bhiksuni Samgha and on the Ordination Ceremony for Bhiksuni According to the Dharmaguptaka vinaya', *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, vol. 20.2 (1997), 33–85.

<sup>252</sup> In the *vinaya* texts, *heshang* 和尚 and *heshang* 和上 are used interchangeably.

becomes a *shami* (*śrāmaṇera*; novice).<sup>253</sup> This completes the first stage of the ordination process, and the candidate may now progress to full ordination, as long as he has reached the age of twenty<sup>254</sup> and declares that he still wishes to become a *bhikṣu*. The next stage involves the *heshang* inviting the requisite number of *bhikṣus* to a ceremony and joining them to confer full ordination on the *śrāmaṇera*, at which point the latter becomes a *bhikṣu*. Crucially, then, there are two important reference points on the path to becoming a fully ordained monk: the moment when the candidate becomes a *śrāmaṇera*; and the moment when the *śrāmaṇera* becomes a *bhikṣu*.

In Buddhist works, including the *vinaya* texts, a number of characters are used to denote the number of years a *bhikṣu* has spent as a member of the monastic community, including *sui* 歲, *nian* 年, *xia* 夏 and *la* 腊. The first three of these are employed for obvious reasons: *sui* means age; *nian* means year; and *xia* means age or year when used in combination with *varṣa* (*yu anju* 雨安居; ‘the rains retreat’).<sup>255</sup> By contrast, it is far from clear why some Buddhist sources, and especially *vinaya* texts, use *la* when describing a monk’s years of monasticism or age. The most likely explanation is that the term is sometimes used to denote the final month in the lunar calendar – among many other definitions<sup>256</sup> – so the translators of *vinaya* texts might have felt that it was reasonable to use it as a synonym for *sui*, *nian* or *xia*.

The four characters – *sui*, *nian*, *xia* and *la* – are sometimes used as single terms, particularly in *vinaya* texts, but they are much more frequently seen in combinations –

<sup>253</sup> The *vinaya* texts mention a variety of *śrāmaneras*, but only *Sengqi lü* (T22.1425j29.461b9–12) groups them into three categories: *qu wu shami* 驅烏沙彌 (literally, a novice who is able to chase away birds); *ying fa shami* 應法沙彌 (literally, a novice who is ready to receive the ten precepts); and *ming zi shami* 名字沙彌 (a *shami* who is old enough to receive full ordination). For training within the *saṃgha*, among others, Erik Zürcher, ‘Buddhism and Education in Tang Times’, in Jonathan A. Silk (ed.), *Buddhism in China: Collected Papers of Erik Zürcher* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 305–310.

<sup>254</sup> All of the *vinaya* texts agree that the minimum age for full ordination is twenty. See (WFL) T22.1421j17.119a16–18, (SQL) 1425j19.378a28–29, (SFL) 1428j17.67918–19 and (SSL) T23.1435j16.111b25.

<sup>255</sup> In the *vinaya* texts T22.1421j19.129a9/1425j17.365b15/1428j10.630a6/T23.1435j21.150a15, a year is divided into three seasons: *dong* 冬 (i.e. winter), *chun* 春 (i.e. spring) and *xia* 夏 (i.e. summer). *Varṣa*, *yu anju* 雨安居 (literally, ‘the rains retreat’) occurs during the summer and lasts for three months. This explains why *vinaya* texts mostly refer to *yu anju* as *xia anju* 夏安居 (literally, ‘summer retreat’). Without going into detail, it is worth explaining how *xia* 夏 then came to mean age or years of monasticism. For example, a man might receive full ordination and become a *bhikṣu* on the first day of *varṣa*, then immediately start his summer retreat. Three months later, at the end of *varṣa*, the *bhikṣu* would be considered as one year old and would have earned a whole year of monastic credit, even though he had been a monk for only three months. It is in this sense that *xia* is used to mean a monk’s age or number of years in a monastic community in Buddhist texts.

<sup>256</sup> For example, *la* is the name of a foodstuff in at least one Buddhist text. See *Sapoduo pini piposa*, the *Sarvāstivādavinayavibhāṣā* 薩婆多毘尼毘婆沙 (T23.1440 j5.534b24–c12). For study on *Sarvāstivāda*, as a major philosophical school of Hinayāna, see Charles Willemen, Bart Dessein and Collett Cox, *Sarvāstivāda Buddhist Scholasticism* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

such as *jie la* 戒臘, *xia la* 夏臘, *seng la* 僧臘, *nian la* 年臘 and *fa la* 法臘 – especially in Buddhist biographies. All but the last of these combinations<sup>257</sup> are used to describe a monk’s years of monasticism, while different terms – such as *chun qiu* 春秋 (‘spring and autumn’), *su nian* 俗年 (‘secular year’) or *su ling* 俗齡 (‘secular age’) – are used when the biographer discusses a monk’s actual age.<sup>258</sup> However, this is complicated by the fact that years of monasticism may be calculated either from the moment when a candidate becomes a *śrāmanera* or from when he undergoes full ordination and becomes a *bhikṣu*.

With this in mind, I shall attempt to establish the full length of Daoxuan’s monastic career. In Daoxuan-related works, the master’s death is invariably given as the second year of the Qianfeng era, while his age at death is always given as seventy-two.<sup>259</sup> Hence, we may say with some certainty that he lived from 596 to 667 CE in the Gregorian calendar. Furthermore, the only figure that is ever explicitly stated for his years of monasticism is fifty-two. Given that the minimum age for *bhikṣu* ordination is twenty, and Daoxuan was seventy-two when he died, all of the biographers who cite this figure clearly based their calculations on the second of the two possible starting points for a monastic career: the year of full ordination. But what of Daoxuan’s earlier career?

There is a notable lack of consensus with respect to the year of Daoxuan’s *śrāmanera* ordination: 604 (when he would have been nine), 611 (sixteen) and 612 (seventeen) are all cited as possibilities. Moreover, there is even some doubt about the year of his *bhikṣu* ordination, with some sources suggesting 611 (when Daoxuan was only

<sup>257</sup> Guanding 灌頂 (561–632), who later became known as the fifth patriarch of the Tiantai school of Buddhism, uses the term *fa la* 法臘 in *Guoqing bai lu* 國清百錄 (*The Miscellaneous Records of the Guoqing [Monastery]*; 598 CE; T46.1934j3.811b7) – the first appearance of this term in the *Taishō* collection. Thereafter, Buddhist writers used it with increasing frequency. However, the meaning remains unclear. I examined the usage of all five combinations (*jie la*, *xia la*, *seng la*, *nian la* and *fa la*) in some of the most important Buddhist biographies and noted that *seng la*, *xia la* and *fa la* never appear in GSZ; *jie la* and *fa la* never appear in XGSZ; but all five combinations appear in SGSZ. I am inclined to read *fa la* as ‘the age of dharma’; or, to put it another way, the number of years since a monk received dharma. However, this may be incorrect, because in SGSZ *fa la* is not used exclusively for meditation masters (*chanshi* 禪師), who, more than any other monks, are linked to the transmission of dharma. See ‘Guanding’ at T50.2060j19.584a25–585b11, where Daoxuan describes this master as an excellent meditator, a skilful dharma expounder, a prolific commentator and, above all, the only holder/carer of the true spirit and entire teaching of his teacher Zhiyi 智顥 (*neng chi neng ling wei* [Guan] *Ding yi ren* 能持能領唯[灌]頂一人’). See Phyllis Granoff and Koichi Shinohara’s study of Guanding’s account of Zhiyi in *Speaking of Monks: Religious Biography in India and China* (Okaville, New York and London: Mosaic Press, 1992), 98–116.

<sup>258</sup> Of the three terms that may denote the actual age of a monk, *chun qiu* is used most frequently. For example, it appears 138 times in GSZ, 253 times in XGSZ and 152 times in SGSZ. *Su nian* never appears in GSZ, but it is used four times in both XGSZ and SGSZ. *Su ling* appears only in SGSZ, where it is used ten times.

<sup>259</sup> As mentioned, Daoxuan never discussed his early life, so we have to rely on Daoxuan-related works for this information.

sixteen),<sup>260</sup> others 615 (when he was twenty) and yet others dating the ceremony simply to the ‘middle of the Daye era’ (605–618), which, for the sake of simplicity, I assume to mean 611.

Given this range of alternative starting points, and bearing in mind that a monastic career may be judged to begin at either *śrāmanera* or *bhikṣu* ordination, we arrive at four possibilities for the length of Daoxuan’s monastic career:

1. 604–667: Sixty-three years.
2. 611–667: Fifty-six years.
3. 612–667: Fifty-five years.
4. 615–667: Fifty-two years.

The first three of these are based on the various years that the sources give for Daoxuan’s *śrāmanera* ordination (604, 611 or 612); alternatively, the second (fifty-six years) may be based on the year of his *bhikṣu* ordination (if, as some sources suggest, this took place when he was sixteen); while the fourth rests on the assumption that his full ordination took place at the age of twenty.

In order to shed some light on this complex issue, and gain unique insights into other aspects of Daoxuan’s life, it is now time to turn to his sole ‘autobiographical’ text, JBS, in which the fifty-six-year-old master reflects on his past:

How fortunate I am, in this insignificant life of mine, to have been afforded  
a glimpse of the righteous teaching [of the Buddha]. I was still a small child

---

<sup>260</sup> As we have seen, the *vinaya* texts unanimously prescribe the minimum age for full ordination as twenty: *man ershi* 滿二十 (literally, ‘be fully twenty’). Similarly, Daoxuan argues that ‘underaged monks have little chance of making significant spiritual progress’ (*xiao nian bu man ... jin dao wu you* 小年不滿 ... 進道無由'; X40.714j4.131c22–23). Nevertheless, he offers two alternative (younger) minimum ages in JBS, in addition to twenty: 19 years; and 17 years, 7 months and 13 days (X40.714j4.135a23–b22). However, it should be pointed out that Daoxuan himself does not explicitly specify the second figure; rather, Yuanzhao worked it out after following Daoxuan’s reasoning and included it in his commentary on JBS (X40.714j4.131c22). Daoxuan and Yuanzhao cite a number of sources – T22.1421j8.61a14–b24/1425j19.383a12–c22/1428j17.679a21–680c27/j27.756c26–j28.758c28/j34.811a15–19, T23.1435.116b7–117b15/1440j9.559b2–16 – when explaining how they arrived at these figures, but none of these texts refers to a particular age for ordination, so it is difficult to see how they contributed to the two authors’ thinking. On the other hand, we may say that the authors of the *vinaya* texts and Daoxuan himself believed that the age of sixteen was too young for full ordination. For full details of Daoxuan’s thoughts on the minimum age for full ordination, see XSC (T40.1804j7.87b7–c1) and JBS (W62.940b5–948a10; Cf. X40.714j4.131c19–135c6).

when I first embraced the faith [in the Buddha], but many good years passed by in vain because of a lack of instruction and guidance. Only at the age of fifteen did I acquire a teacher. I started to recite the *sūtras* when I was sixteen and became a *śrāmanera* when I was seventeen. In the latter phase of the Daye era [605–618], I was privileged to receive full ordination.<sup>261</sup>

余以輕生，篋筵正法，昔在童稚，即有信心，無緣携接，致及過學。年十有五，方得尋師。十六誦經，十七剃落，大業餘曆，蒙受具戒。

At that time, the Buddha-dharma was suppressed and the monasteries had no visitors. With respect to [learning] the *vinaya*, as I had no tutor to teach me, the best I could manage was to gain a superficial understanding of the texts. I really did not know much about the observance and violation of *vinaya* rules.

于時佛法梗塞，寺門常閑。致於律教，無處師尋，但在守文，持犯不識。

When the Tang era began, there was occasional disorder. It was not possible simply to enter a lecture whenever one wished; one was not free to do so. It was only in the fourth year of the Wude era [621] that I could start to attend lectures. Having listened to one round [of lectures], I wanted to dedicate myself solely to meditation.<sup>262</sup> My master instructed me: ‘Total observation of the *vinaya* [*jie* 戒] is conducive to achieving a clear mind [*ding* 定]. It is only when one has acquired both [total observation of the *vinaya* and a clear mind] that one is able to cultivate wisdom [*hui* 慧]. You have only just begun your studies, so you are not yet familiar with [the *vinaya*. Therefore,] how is it possible for you to gain any insight into

---

<sup>261</sup> This passage is unique because it is the only reference in Daoxuan's extant works to the date of his full ordination.

<sup>262</sup> Daoxuan continues to display a desire for meditation throughout his adult life. For more information, see Chen Jinhua, ‘Alternative View of the Meditation Tradition in China: Meditation in the Life and Works of Daoxuan (596–667)’, *T'oung Pao*, Second Series, vol. 88:4/5 (2002), 332–395; and Eric Greene, ‘Another Look at Early Chan: Daoxuan, Bodhidharma, and Three Levels Movement’, *T'oung Pao*, vol. 94 (2008), 49–114.

observance and violation of the *vinaya* rules? For the time being, just focus on your studies, and I will take care of all your monastic duties myself.’<sup>263</sup>

大唐御世，時遭儉約，乍欲投聽，志不自由。武德四年，方得預聽。纔得一徧，便欲坐禪。和尚教曰，戒淨定明，慧方有據，始聽未閑，持犯焉識。汝且專聽，吾自為汝，知僧役務。

I went and listened to ten rounds of *vinaya* lectures. [But] in my heart, I continued to yearn for meditation. Not a moment passed by without me thinking about it. During discussions about observing and violating the *vinaya* rules, I came to understand them rather well; but I did not investigate the words and the sentences [of the *vinaya* texts] in any great depth. I still wanted to meditate. This time, my teacher said to me: ‘Go and listen to another ten rounds [of lectures], then I will let you do whatever you want to do.’

又往聽律十徧。心樂禪思，不忘晝夜。聞持犯處，多貫心懷，至於文句，並不尋究。又欲坐禪，和尚又曰，更聽十徧，可遂汝心。

I went to the *vinaya* lectures and continued to progress gradually. Later, *Vinaya* Master [Zhi] shou asked me personally to deliver a lecture on his behalf.<sup>264</sup> I thought: ‘I am slow-witted but the words and the sentences [of the lecture] must be improved. [Furthermore,] the reasoning and interpretations are not my own, [yet] I would have to repeat them [as if they were]. Hence, how could I allow myself to deliver this lecture?’ Therefore, I declined the offer. [In total,] I listened to twenty rounds [of lectures] over the course of six years.

---

<sup>263</sup> For Daoxuan’s training in the three learnings (*jie* 戒, *ding* 定, and *hui* 慧) see Chen, *The Revival of Buddhist Monasticism in Medieval China*, 30–34.

<sup>264</sup> The Chinese characters are *fu du* 覆讀 (literally, ‘to cover’, ‘to read’). This is the sole occurrence of the phrase in Daoxuan’s extant works. In the *Bommōkaihonshinichijushō* 梵網戒本疏日珠鈔 (*The Pearl-like Study Note on the Sun-like Commentary of the Brahmajāla Bodhisattva śīla Sūtra*; 1318 CE, 165; T62.2247j41.207b14–15), Gyōnen 凝然 comments that Tang-era students spent their schooldays ‘learning and investigating’ (*fu du jing yan* 覆讀精研) the meanings of the texts that their teachers taught them. Judging from this comment, *fu du* probably comprises rather more than mere rote repetition. See Daoxuan’s study under Zhishou at III.4.2.2. For a comprehensive study on the education during Sui and Tang see Lee, Thomas H. C. *Education in Traditional China A History* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 70–77.

又往律筵，依位伏業。時首律師親命覆讀。自顧愚闇，文句缺然，至於義理，依語謹誦，未是心證，何容覆講，遂不敢受。聽二十徧，時經六載。

In the early years of the Zhenguan era [627–649], I travelled abroad, from lecture to lecture, from cities to mountains, in search of renowned teachers. I then wrote a three-scroll *Chao* that encompassed what I had learned.<sup>265</sup> Before I had time to revise [the text], people were already making copies of it. From the fourth year of the Zhenguan era [630] onwards, I travelled even further afield to learn about the breadth of the dharma. To the north, I visited the regions of Bing and Jin.<sup>266</sup> To the south, I reached the land of Wei.<sup>267</sup>

貞觀初年，周遊講肆，尋逐名師，若山若世。遂以所解，造鈔三卷，未及覆治，人遂抄寫。貞觀四年，遠觀化表。北遊并晉，東達魏土。

*Vinaya* Master [Fa] li<sup>268</sup> was one of the most prominent [*vinaya* masters] of my time. I travelled a long distance to study with him. Unfortunately, though, I was able to enjoy [his company for] only a month before he passed away. The pain in my heart was so intense that I could not find the words to describe it. I had no option but to return to the land of Qin.<sup>269</sup> There [in Qin], I wrote another three-scroll *Chao*, this time for *Vinaya* Master Ze.<sup>270</sup> This *Chao* developed [the ideas of] the previous one, and its overall structure and wording were more coherent once it had been polished. I also wrote a single-scroll *Shan bu jiemo* and a two-scroll commentary on it, as well as a single-scroll *Han zhu jieben* and a three-scroll commentary on it.

<sup>265</sup> By which Daoxuan means his *Xingshi chao*. See more discussion on his works at III.2.

<sup>266</sup> Bing and Jin are in present-day Shanxi Province. For more on Daoxuan's travels at III.4.3.

<sup>267</sup> The territory of Wei is now divided between He'nan and Hebei provinces.

<sup>268</sup> A number of different characters are used for the name of this master. See further discussion at III.4.2.3.

<sup>269</sup> The land of Qin roughly equates to present-day Changzhi City, Shanxi Province. See more on Qin in Yin Guoyuan 陰國垣's *Qinyuan xian zhi* 沁源縣志 (*The History of Qinyuan Country*; Taipei: Chengwen chubanshe, 1976).

<sup>270</sup> There is no information on this master in the *Taishō* collection, aside from this connection with Daoxuan's *Chao*.

有厲律師，當時峯岫，遠依尋讀。始得一月，遂即物故。撫心之痛，何可言之。乃返沁部山中，為擇律師，又出鈔三卷。乃以前本更加潤色，筋脉相通。又出刪補羯磨一卷，疏兩卷，含注戒本一卷，疏三卷。

At that time, my mother was still alive. On many occasions, she sent people to ask me to return home, telling me that her thoughts often turned to me. I decided to return. Many fellow Buddhists and dharma-farers from the Xi region followed me.<sup>271</sup> Thirty of us reached Hebin,<sup>272</sup> where we spent the summer retreat engaging in dharma talks and discussions. A one-scroll *Ni zhu jieben* came out [during the retreat].

于時母氏尚存，屢遣追喚。顧懷不已，乃返。隰列同法相親，追隨極眾，乃至三十，達於河濱，一夏言說。又出尼注戒本一卷。

[Thereafter,] we went our separate ways. I took only a copy of the *Chao* with me; the rest [of my works] were taken to the east. I took my time and journeyed through the regions of Ji and the Lake<sup>273</sup> before arriving at the capital. In the sixteenth year [642], my mother died. It is part of my nature that I do not like to live among crowds or get too close to people. Rather, I prefer to live in solitude in the mountains. Therefore, I went to

---

<sup>271</sup> Xi is in present-day Shanxi Province. The phrase ‘dharma-farers’ is borrowed from Bhikkhu Bodhi, ‘My First Encounter with a Buddhist Monk’, 4 August 2008. Available at: <https://bodhimonastery.org/my-first-encounter-with-a-buddhist-monk-rn.html>, accessed 8/11/2018.

<sup>272</sup> Hebin, a Tang-era placename, is in present-day Yulin City, Shanxi Province. See more on Hebin at YHJXj4.111.7-9, *Zhaoyi xian zhi* 朝邑縣志 (*The History of Changxing County*; Taipei: Chengwen chubanshe, 1976), j1.15.9.

<sup>273</sup> The territory of Ji is now divided between Jiangshu and Zhejiang provinces, while ‘the Lake’ probably equates to Lake Tai 太湖. Note particularly that *jihu* 稽湖 appears twice in the extant works of Daoxuan. One is under discussion and one is in his biography of monk Fatong 釋法通 in *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, T50.2060j24.641c21. Given that Fatong spent his entire life in the North of China and he never visited any place in the South, e.g., the southern provinces of Jiangshu and Zhejiang, it would make little sense to read *jihu* 稽湖 as a placename. In this conjuncture, Zhang Ziyao 張子堯 and Xie Haijin 謝海金 suggested to me during a conversation that *jihu* 稽湖 is in all probability a misprint of *jihu* 稽胡. Guo Shaolin 郭紹林 concurs this opinion and replaces 稽湖 to 稽胡 in his *Xu gaoseng zhuan dianjiao* 繢高僧傳點校 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2014), 934.1/3, adding that *hu yuan zuo hu an jihu wu jie* 胡：原作湖。案：[稽湖]無解 ('In the original text 胡 is 湖. Comment: 稽湖 in this context makes no sense.') 稽胡 ('the Ji barbarian') is the name of a particular group of people who were active in present-day Shanxi 山西 and Shaanxi 陝西 provinces in the early Tang period. 稽胡 appears once in Daoxuan’s works in the biography of monk Huida 釋慧達, T50.2060j25.644c17, and it is indeed used as the *Ji barbarian*. Nonetheless, should we the 稽湖 in the present case a misprint of 稽胡? It is difficult to determine. Until other printed version(s) of Daoxuan’s JBS is available to facilitate a textual comparison, I feel it is more reasonable to read *jihu* 稽湖 as it is in the present context as placenames.

Zhongnan Mountain. But it was the twentieth year [646] before I could fully start my hermitage.

遂爾分手。唯留鈔本，餘並東流。巡涉稽湖，達於京邑。十六年內，母氏云崩，性不狎喧，樂居山野。乃因事故，遂往南山。至二十年，方得巖隱。

Nevertheless, some enthusiasts who were keen to learn the *vinaya* discovered my whereabouts and earnestly asked me to elaborate on my works. I could not deny such requests, so I rewrote the *Jiemo* and added a four-scroll commentary. In the early years of the Yonghui era [650–655], I received another request, asking for [elaboration on] the *Jieben*, including annotation and a commentary. I could not deny [this request], so I annotated the *Jieben* and started to write a commentary on it, which was four scrolls long [when it was finished. However, I fell] ill, so I had to postpone the writing [of the commentary].

有樂戒者，乃復相尋，祈廣其文，事不獲已，又出羯磨并疏四卷。永徽初年，又請戒本及注解疏。情不能已，又出戒本含注并疏四卷，值患停廢。

I was still a long way from fulfilling many of my ambitions. I have probably forgotten one or two of them by now. After receiving further requests, I somehow managed to complete the commentary on the nineteenth day of the ninth month of the second year of the Yonghui era [651]. This commentary covers all of the important issues; and, personally, I believe that it serves as a rather good guide for practical monastic matters. I am old and the end of my life may come any day now. Therefore, I decided to write down what has happened throughout my life. This marks the end of the present work.

心志遼落，昏忘非一。為求不已，至永徽二年九月十九日，方為疏訖。  
粗得開其大務，決事行用，頗有準承。余今暮年，旦夕為命，故以歷之。  
亦絕筆有據耳。<sup>274</sup>

As Daoxuan states at the start of this extract, he became a *śrāmanera* at the age of seventeen and received full ordination in ‘the latter phase of the Daye era’. We know that he was seventeen in 612 and died in 667, so his monastic career was fifty-five years in length if we choose to use his *śrāmanera* ordination as our starting point. On the other hand, while the date of his *bhikṣu* ordination seems to be rather hazier – because he merely states that it took place in Daye *yu li* 大業餘歷 (‘the latter phase of Daye’)<sup>275</sup> – there is a good reason to infer that it occurred in 615. I base this conclusion on the fact that Daoxuan uses a similarly vague expression – Zhenguan *mo li* 貞觀末歷 (literally, ‘the latter phase of the Zhenguan era’) – when discussing the commencement of his hermitage in *Shi men zhangfu yi*, but specifically states that this period of solitude started in the fourth to last year of that era in JBS.<sup>276</sup> Given his similar usage of the two terms, it is reasonable to assume that Daoxuan’s *bhikṣu* ordination occurred in the fourth to last year of the Daye era – 615 – which corresponds to a monastic career of fifty-two years.<sup>277</sup>

In conclusion, while we must acknowledge the lack of consensus in the sources, if we give the greatest credence to Daoxuan’s own account of his ordinations, we may say with some certainty that his monastic career totalled either fifty-five years (if we use his *śrāmanera* ordination as the starting point) or fifty-two years (if we base our calculation on his *bhikṣu* ordination). We may now proceed to a detailed discussion of that career, starting with his teachers.

<sup>274</sup> W62.1024b11–1025b3/X40.174c13–175a17. For an alternative translation of part of this extract (i.e. from the second character at W62.1024b13 to the fifth character at W62.1025a7), see Chen, ‘An Alternative View of the Meditation Tradition in China’, 370–372. For a study of Daoxuan’s personal description of his own life, see Suwa Gijin 謙訪義純, ‘四分律含注戒本疏行宗記にみる道宣の自叙と三種の道宣伝: 道宣伝の再検討’ (*Tao-hsuan’s (道宣) Commentary in Shi-bun-ritu-gan-chu-kai-hon-sho* (四分律含注戒本疏) and His Three Kinds of Biographies), *Bulletin of the Faculty of Humanities of Aichigakuin University* (20, 1990), 375–369. Note that what Suwa calls the ‘Three Kinds of Biographies’ have been consulted in the course of researching this book. They appear as numbers 102, 176 and 180 in Table 1.

<sup>275</sup> The expression *yu li* does not appear after an era name anywhere else in Daoxuan’s works, nor indeed anywhere else in the whole *Taishō* collection.

<sup>276</sup> Daoxuan uses the phrase Zhenguan *mo li* at T45.1894j1.839b5, but clarifies that his hermitage began in the twentieth year of the Zhenguan era (i.e. 646) at W62.1025a15. The final four years of the Zhenguan era were 646–649.

<sup>277</sup> Moreover, 615 is the most likely date as this was when Daoxuan reached the minimum age for ordination as a *bhikṣu* – twenty.

### III.4.2 Daoxuan's Teachers

The *vinaya* texts provide lists of various terms that may be used for a Buddhist master, teacher or mentor. Table 4 lists the six most common terms in the left-hand column and indicates where they appear with an asterisk. Parentheses are used to indicate an alternative phrase with the same meaning.<sup>278</sup>

**Table 4: Different Terms for Teacher or Master in the *Vinaya* Texts**

Term	Source			
	<i>Wufen lü</i> 五分律	<i>Sengqi lü</i> 僧祇律	<i>Sifen lü</i> 四分律	<i>Shisong lü</i> 十誦律
<i>Heshang</i> 和上/和尚	*	*	*	*
<i>Chu jia asheli</i> 出家阿闍梨	*	( <i>Yi zhi shi</i> 依止師)	*	*
<i>Shou jie asheli</i> 受戒阿闍梨	( <i>Jiemo asheli</i> 羯磨阿闍梨)	( <i>Jie shi</i> 戒師)	*	( <i>Jiemo asheli</i> 羯磨阿闍梨)
<i>Jiao shou asheli</i> 教授阿闍梨	*	( <i>Kong jing chu jiao shi</i> 空靜處教師)	*	*
<i>Shou jing asheli</i> 受經阿闍梨	*	( <i>Shou fa shi</i> 受法師)	*	( <i>Shou fa asheli</i> 受法阿闍梨)
<i>Yi zhi asheli</i> 依止阿闍梨	*	*	*	*

The *vinaya* lists associate the final four of these six types of teacher to specific duties. For example, a *shou jie asheli* is in charge of the ordination ceremony;<sup>279</sup> a *jiao shou asheli* teaches the candidate how to behave during the ceremony; a *shou jing asheli* teaches the *sūtras*; and a *bhikṣu* either lives with or studies under a *yi zhi asheli*. By contrast, a single teacher always combines the roles of *heshang* and *chu jia asheli*: that is, a candidate

<sup>278</sup> The sources' lists of teachers appear at: T22.1421j16.113a7–14 (*Wufen lü*); T22.1425j28.458a13–14 (*Sengqi lü*); T22.1428j39.848a3–12 (*Sifen lü*); and T23.1435j49.359c25–27 (*Shisong lü*). Daoxuan cites the *Sifen lü* list in *Xingshi chao* at T40.1804j3.32b5–10.

<sup>279</sup> T22.1428j39.848a7–8 states, ‘The *shou jie asheli* is the one who carries out the procedure of the ordination (*Shoujie asheli zhe shoujie shi zuo jiemo zhe shi* 受戒阿闍梨者受戒時作羯磨者是).’ In other words, the *shou jie asheli* is the *jiemo asheli*.

receives his initiation (*pravrajyā*) and then his *śrāmanera* and *bhikṣu* ordinations from just one teacher, who is known as either his *heshang* or his *chu jia asheli*, depending on the text. Hence, as far as the *vinaya* texts are concerned, a *bhikṣu* cannot have more than one *heshang*.<sup>280</sup>

Daoxuan's own works suggest that he had five masters who could be described as one or other of the six types of teacher, as defined by the *vinaya* texts: Huiyun 慧顥,<sup>281</sup> Zhishou 智首, Fali 法礪,<sup>282</sup> Huixiu 慧休 and Zhichao 志超. The biographies that Daoxuan provides for all five of these masters in *Xu gaoseng zhuan* indicate that none of them was born in the capital – Chang'an – unlike Daoxuan himself. Furthermore, of the five, we know that Fali lived his entire life outside the capital, whereas the other four either resided in or at least visited Chang'an at some point in their lives.

In the interests of clarity and concision, I shall not attempt to provide detailed accounts of these masters' lives. Rather, I shall focus exclusively on their relations with Daoxuan. Table 5 presents a brief summary of the information Daoxuan provides on his own and his five teachers' whereabouts throughout their lives, most of which is contained in his *Xu gaoseng zhuan*. (Detailed references are given in the sections on the individual masters, below.)

---

<sup>280</sup> As is stated explicitly in *Pini mu jing*, the *Vinayamātrkā* 犇尼母經, at T24.1463j1.806c9–10. A teacher must possess a number of qualities before he becomes a teacher, including seniority. The roles of *heshang*, *chu jia asheli* and *yi zhi asheli* are restricted to *bhikṣus* with ten years' experience, while five years are needed for those who want to become a *shou jie asheli*, *jiao shou asheli* or *shou jing asheli*. See T22.1421j17.114c8–29/1428j34.806a16–c9 and T23.1435j21.149c1–11.

<sup>281</sup> See n. 118 for information on the different renderings of the name of Daoxuan's first master in Daoxuan-related works.

<sup>282</sup> None of the Daoxuan-related works gives details of Daoxuan's study under Fali; some merely mention his name. Three different homophones – 磧, 廐 and 勵 – are used for the second character of this name. Daoxuan employs one or other of the first two, while Daoxuan-related works mostly use 勵. *Yi qie jing yin yi* (817, 64) uses 廐 at T54.2128j26.480b13 and states that the character is used in place of 磧. In this study, I use 磧 throughout, just as Daoxuan does in his biography of Fali in XGSZ.

**Table 5: Daoxuan and His Teachers**

Reign	Daoxuan 道宣	Huiyun 慧顥	Zhishou 智首	Fali 法礪	Huixiu 慧休	Zhichao 志超
Sui Wendi 隋文帝 (r. 581–604)		Started to live in the Riyan monastery (from c. 600)	Started to live in the Chanding monastery 禪定寺 (from c. 603)		Arrived in Chang'an at the age of 45 (591) but left soon thereafter	
Sui Yangdi 隋煬帝 (r. 604–618)	Lived in the Riyan monastery 日嚴寺 at the age of 21 (617)		Started to live in the Da Chanding monastery 大禪定寺 (from c. 605)			
Tang Gaozu 唐高祖 (r. 618–626)	Started to live in the Chongyi monastery 崇義寺 (from 624)	Started to live in the Chongyi monastery (from 619)				Arrived in Chang'an at the age of 48 (618) but later left (before 623)
Tang Taizong 唐太宗 (r. 626–649)	Left Chang'an, at the age of 35 (630), but returned at the age of 45 (640)	Died at the age of 74 (637)	Started to live in the Hongfu monastery 弘福寺 (from 634) but died the following year at the age of 69 (635)	Died at the age of 67 (635)	Met Daoxuan at the age of 98 (645)	Died at the age of 71 (641)

### III.4.2.1 Master Huiyun 慧顥

In his biography of Master Huiyun,<sup>283</sup> Daoxuan addresses this teacher as *heshang* 和上 (*upādhyāya*)<sup>284</sup> and explains that he was a well-versed Daoist priest who became a Buddhist monk in the middle of the Taijian era 太建 (569–582). Daoxuan continues that Huiyun arrived in Chang'an at the end of the Kaihuang era (600) and remained in the city until the end of his life. Furthermore, given that Daoxuan mentions that Huiyun died in 637 at the age of seventy-four, we may deduce that he was thirty-seven when he settled in the capital. Daoxuan himself was just five years old at that point.

Daoxuan gives the name of Huiyun's first monastery in Chang'an as Riyan, and explains that it was located in the south-east corner of the city.<sup>285</sup> He then relates that Huiyun moved to the Chongyi monastery in the south-west of the capital in the second year of the Wude era (619) and remained there until his death in 637.

It is clear that Daoxuan studied under Huiyun at both of these establishments, but none of the Daoxuan-related works specifies the precise length of their master-student relationship. Nevertheless, we know that Daoxuan left Chang'an in the fourth year of the Zhenguan era (630)<sup>286</sup> and returned ten years later (640),<sup>287</sup> by which time Huiyun had already passed away. Hence, depending on which starting point is chosen for Daoxuan's monastic career (604, 611, 612 or 615; see above), we may say that their master-student relationship could have continued for a maximum of 26 years, 19 years, 18 years or 15 years. Fortunately, Daoxuan himself removes three of these options because he clearly states that he lived with Huiyun for 'more than twenty-four years'.<sup>288</sup> In other words, he started to live with Huiyun when he was nine years old in 604. Moreover, one Daoxuan-

<sup>283</sup> T50.2060j14.533c11–534b9.

<sup>284</sup> Although Daoxuan argues that *heshang* is a corrupted transliteration of *upādhyāya* (T50.2060j2.433b20–21), he uses the term throughout his works (albeit sometimes substituting 尚 for 上). One of his contemporaries, Yijing 義淨 (635–713), makes the same observation about *heshang* in *Da Tang Xiyu qiu fa gaoseng zhuan* 大唐西域求法高僧傳 (*The Biography of the Eminent Pilgrimage Monks of the Great Tang*; 674, 34) at T51.2066j2.9a29–b, yet similarly also uses the term – in both 和上 and 和尚 forms – throughout the book.

<sup>285</sup> See the comprehensive and pioneering study on the Tang-era cities Chang'an and Luoyang by Xu Song 徐松 and Li Jianchao 李建超: *Zengding Tang liangjing chengfang kao* 增訂唐兩京城坊考 (Xi'an: Sanqing chubanshe, 1996). For further details of the Riyan monastery, see Wang Yarong 王亞榮, '日嚴寺考——兼論隋代南方佛教義學的北傳', in 中華佛學學報第, 12期 (1999), 193–203.

<sup>286</sup> W62.1025j21b6.

<sup>287</sup> T50.2060j14.534b8–9: *wang huan shi zai* 往還十載 ('[it took] ten years to go back and forth'). We know that Daoxuan left Chang'an in 630, so he must have returned in 640.

<sup>288</sup> T50.2060j14.534a29: *sui ying er ji* 歲盈二紀. This is the only occasion when Daoxuan discusses the length of his stay with Huiyun.

related work – QTW (1814, 290) – seems to confirm this when it states that Daoxuan was ‘nine [when] he received his initial ordination [*pravrajyā* 出家] under *Vinaya* Master Zhiyun 智顥’.<sup>289</sup> However, at first sight, this would seem to contradict what Daoxuan writes in JBS (650, 10), where he tells us, ‘Only at the age of fifteen did I acquire a teacher.’<sup>290</sup>

Given that Daoxuan is unlikely to have made a mistake with respect to the number of years he spent in Huiyun’s company, it is reasonable to assume that he moved to the Riyang monastery at the age of nine in 604, but felt that his Buddhist master-student relationship with Huiyun commenced in earnest only when he was fifteen, in 610. Then, two years later, this relationship was formally established when Daoxuan became a *śrāmanera*.

---

<sup>289</sup> QTWj909.9483a4. Four other Daoxuan-related works (numbers in the master table 102/221/250/253), in addition to QTW, mention Zhiyun. It is unclear why they all refer to him as Zhiyun 智顥, rather than Huiyun 慧顥, the name that Daoxuan himself uses in his biography of his first master. There is evidence of a Tang monk named Zhiyun 智顥; see T50.2061j27.881a22–b24. However, he was born in 777, so he could not have been Daoxuan’s teacher. Furthermore, I have been unable to establish that Daoxuan’s Huiyun ever used a different monastic name. Hence, it seems that either the authors of the five Daoxuan-related works mistakenly transcribed Zhiyun in place of Huiyan or the error was introduced during the printing process. See note 107 for more on the character 顥.

<sup>290</sup> W62.1024b12.

### III.4.2.2 Master Zhishou 智首

Whenever Daoxuan's full ordination is mentioned in Daoxuan-related works, Zhishou is named as the presiding monk. This may lead to the assumption that Zhishou, rather than Huiyun, was Daoxuan's *heshang*. However, Daoxuan never addresses Zhishou as *heshang* in his works, and indeed never mentions him in connection with his full ordination. Rather, in his biography of this *bhikṣu*,<sup>291</sup> he merely states that he 'used to attend [Zhishou's] lectures'.<sup>292</sup> Moreover, as we have seen, he repeatedly addresses Huiyun as his *heshang*, which would make no sense if Zhishou had actually played this very important role.<sup>293</sup>

As *Sengqi lü* emphasizes,<sup>294</sup> it is the duty of the *heshang* to prepare his disciple for full ordination and to make all of the arrangements for the ceremony. For example, the *heshang* must invite the required number of *bhiksus* to assist with the ceremony; of these, the *shou jie asheli* is the most important. Also, the *heshang* must ensure that his disciple is appropriately equipped with robes and an alms bowl. Finally, he should find a suitable location for the ceremony. As Daoxuan's *heshang*, Huiyun probably invited the participating monks to his home monastery – Riyān – where both he and Daoxuan were residing at the time. It is unlikely that he opted for an alternative setting for the ceremony, where he would have been termed a guest monk.

Once all of the preparations and arrangements have been made, the *heshang* sits down with the invited *bhiksus* at the designated location. However, the *shou jie asheli* takes the lead as soon as proceedings begin. By contrast, the *heshang* remains silent but attentive for most of the ceremony. In other words, the *shou jie asheli* is essential for the success of the full ordination ceremony, so he must be familiar with every detail of the procedure. Nevertheless, notwithstanding his largely passive role, the *heshang* – rather than the *shou jie asheli* or anyone else – is the full ordination master.

---

<sup>291</sup> T50.2060j22.614a–615a24.

<sup>292</sup> T50.2060j22.615a20.

<sup>293</sup> In 'Alternative View of the Meditation Tradition in China', 368, n. 101, Chen writes: 'Daoshi makes this clear in his *Fayuan zhulin*: "Vinaya Master [Daoxuan] was my fellow-disciple. On the day when we ascended the [ordination] platform, we received instruction from the same teacher [Zhishou]" (T vol. 53, no. 2122, 354b16–17).' However, in this passage, it is Chen who adds the name 'Zhishou' in square brackets as 'clarification'; *Fayuan zhulin* never introduces Zhishou 智首 as the name of a monk. In fact, the two characters that comprise the name appear only once in that text – as part of the name of a Buddha at T53.2122j34.553c14: *qi fo hao bao zhi shou ru lai* 其佛號寶智首如來 ('the name of that Buddha is Tathāgata Baozhishou') – and in none of Daoshi's other extant works (T53.2122, T54.2123 and X44.743 (W70.207–399)).

<sup>294</sup> T22.1082j23a6–11.

Therefore, it seems highly likely that Huiyun invited Zhishou to serve as the *shou jie asheli* for Daoxuan's full ordination ceremony. This presumption is based on four important facts:

1. First, a *śrāmanera* can have many teachers but only one *heshang*.
2. Second, the *heshang* is responsible for organizing his *śrāmanera*'s full ordination ceremony, which includes inviting another monk to serve as *shou jie asheli* during the proceedings.
3. Third, Zhishou was a respected and renowned *vinaya* expert, as Daoxuan himself acknowledges in his biography of the *bhikṣu*. Therefore, he would have been an ideal choice for *shou jie asheli* as his knowledge would ensure that any ordination ceremony proceeded smoothly.
4. Finally, Huiyun and Zhishou had forged a close relationship since meeting in Chang'an more than a decade prior to Daoxuan's full ordination. We know that they paid frequent visits to each other's monasteries and enjoyed discussing the *vinaya*.<sup>295</sup>

In short, Zhishou was not Daoxuan's *heshang*; he was his *vinaya* teacher. And it was out of respect for his old friend's knowledge of the *vinaya* that Daoxuan's actual *heshang* – Huiyun – invited Zhishou to preside over his student's *bhikṣu* ordination as *shou jie asheli*.

---

<sup>295</sup> One delightful exchange between the two monks is recorded in Daoxuan's biography of Huiyun at T50.2060j14.534a11–13.

Zhishou lived in three monasteries during his time in Chang'an – Chanding, Da Chanding<sup>296</sup> and Hongfu<sup>297</sup> – and we know that he did not move to Hongfu before 634. Hence, Daoxuan could not have studied under Zhishou at that establishment, because the former embarked on his travels in 630. Furthermore, we know that Zhishou was not at Chanding after the start of the Daye era (605) and that Daoxuan started attending *vinaya* lectures only after his full ordination, which took place in the latter phase of that era.<sup>298</sup> Therefore, we can be certain that Daoxuan studied the *vinaya* under Zhishou at Da Chanding, even though none of the Daoxuan-related works specifies where these classes took place.

The Daoxuan-related texts do at least address the length of his period of study under Zhishou; however, the information they provide is contradictory. First, JZJ (895, 92) claims that Daoxuan had his full ordination at the age of twenty (in 615), started attending

<sup>296</sup> *Liangjing xin ji ji jiao* 兩京新記輯校 (hereafter LJXJ), at j3.69–70, provides a brief description of Chang'an's two monasteries, Chanding and Da Chanding. Although the latter is distinguished from the former by the addition of the character *da* 大 (literally, 'great'), this should not be interpreted as signifying that it was larger than Chanding. In fact, none of the extant sources provides any information on either monastery's size. On the other hand, we do know that they shared an identical administrative system (LJXJj3.70.4: *zhidu tong* 制度同). So why was one deemed *da*? Chanding was built in 603 by the Emperor Sui Wendi 隋文帝 (r. 581–604) in memory of his recently deceased wife, the Empress Dugu 獨孤皇后 (544–602), while Da Chanding was built two years later by the Emperor Sui Yangdi 隋煬帝 (r. 604–618) to honour his deceased father, Sui Wendi. Hence, it may be that the latter institution was deemed to merit the designation *da* because it was built as a memorial to an emperor, rather than an emperor's wife. However, there is an alternative explanation: Da Chanding may simply reflect the era name that the Emperor Sui Yangdi chose for his reign – *da ye* 大業 (Daye). He was clearly very fond of the character, so he might have insisted on its inclusion in the name of the monastery he founded in memory of his father. Chen Jinhua, 'The Multiple Roles of the Twin Chanding Monasteries in Sui-Tang Chang'an', *Studies in Chinese Religions*, vol. 1:4 (2015), 344–356, suggests terming the two monasteries 'the *twin* Chanding monasteries', but I feel it is more appropriate to term them 'the *two* Chanding monasteries', simply because they were built in honour of a wife and a father, rather than two siblings. Furthermore, Daoxuan uses the phrase *Liang Chanding* 兩禪定 (literally, 'two Chandings') when referring to the two monasteries collectively at T50.2060j24.632c28–29 and T52.2104j4.382a19. The two institutions were known by a variety of names over the years:

Chanding *si* 禪定寺 → Xi Chanding *si* 西禪定 → Zhuangyan *si* 莊嚴寺/Da Zhuangyan *si* 大莊嚴寺  
Da Chanding *si* 大禪定寺 → Dong Chanding *si* 東禪定寺 → Zongchi *si* 總持寺/Da Zongchi *si* 大總持寺

Note that these terms are not necessarily listed in strict chronological order. For more information on the two Chandings, see T50.2060j15.541a3 and T53.2122j16.408b2. As to why Zhuangyan and Zongchi are used to call, respectively, these two *chandings* the LJXJ suggests at j3.70.4–5 that they are 'nicknames of Emperor Sui Wendi and [his wife] the Empress Dugu in the palace' (*Zhuangyan Zongchi ji Suiwen Xianhou gong zhong zhi hao* 莊嚴總持即隋文獻后宮中之號). No mention of either Zhuangyan or Zongchi is found in *Suishu* 隋書 in the context of Wendi and Dugu, j1–2/36.

<sup>297</sup> Chen, 'An Alternative View of the Meditation Tradition in China', 383, links Zhishou to a number of other institutions, in addition to these three monasteries. However, I shall not discuss them here because there is no evidence to suggest that Daoxuan studied the *vinaya* at any of them. For history and location of the monasteries in Chang'an see Li Fangmin 李芳民, *Tang Wudai fosi ji kao* 唐五代佛寺輯考 (Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 2006), 1–45.

<sup>298</sup> The Daye era lasted from 605 to 618.

Zhishou's lectures later that year, but soon stopped before resuming his studies in 621.<sup>299</sup> By contrast, SGSZ (988, 102), LZGY (1306, 200), LXSZ (1366, 221), and LYSZ (1687, 259)<sup>300</sup> all assert that Daoxuan first studied under Zhishou in the middle of the Wude era (618–629), while SMZT (1237, 176), FZTJ (1269, 180) and FZTZ (1341, 212) insist that he attended *vinaya* classes from 621 onwards.<sup>301</sup>

Clearly, ‘the middle of the Wude era’ is rather vague. To avoid confusion, I took this to mean the exact midpoint of the era – that is 623 – which leaves us with four possible options for the year when Daoxuan commenced his studies under Zhishou: 615, 621 or 623. Furthermore, we know that he could not attend any of Zhishou’s lectures after 630 because he left Chang’an at some point in that year. Hence, in light of the information provided by eight Daoxuan-related texts, we may say that Daoxuan studied under Zhishou for ten or so years (615 and then 621–630), nine years (621–630) or seven years (623–630).

To some extent, Daoxuan clarifies the issue because he explicitly states that he ‘started attending *vinaya* lectures in 621’.<sup>302</sup> However, he then introduces further confusion because he declares that he studied under Zhishou for ‘ten years’, then ‘more than ten years’ and finally ‘six years’.<sup>303</sup> Strikingly, in addition to contradicting himself in these passages, none of these three alternative durations tallies with any of the starting points given in the Daoxuan-related works. Hence, in light of the conflicting evidence, it is impossible to reach a firm conclusion with respect to the precise length of time that Daoxuan studied under Zhishou.<sup>304</sup>

<sup>299</sup> X43.737j2.30a24-b6.

<sup>300</sup> (SGSZ) T50.2061j14.790b19-20, (LZGY) T74.2348j2.16c3-4, (LXSZ) X77.1522j4.98c20, (LYSZ) D105.173j5b3.

<sup>301</sup> (SMZT) X75.1513j8.361b19, (FZTJ) T49.2035j29.297a5, and (FZTZ) T49.2036j12.582a3.

<sup>302</sup> W62.1024j21b15: *Wude si nian fang de yu ting* 武德四年方得預聽.

<sup>303</sup> T50.2060j22.615a20-21/T50.2060j14.534b3-4/W62.1024j21b15-1025a4.

<sup>304</sup> Moreover, we do not know whether Zhishou lectured on the *Prātimokṣa*, the *Dharmaguptaka vinaya* or the entire *vinayapiṭaka*. Once again, the Daoxuan-related works are inconsistent, with some saying that Daoxuan learned Shou *shu* 首疏 (Zhishou’s *vinaya* commentary), others suggesting he was taught *lizang* 律藏 (the *vinayapiṭaka*) and still others saying that he studied *lù* 律 (*vinaya*). Nevertheless, given Zhishou’s renowned expertise in the *vinaya*, it seems unlikely that his lectures focused solely on the rules and precepts. Rather, they probably included discussions of other *vinaya* texts and the commentaries that were available at the time. In the Daoxuan-related works, we are told that he attended the lectures twenty times (JZJ), twenty-one times (LYSZ) and forty times (SMZT), whereas Daoxuan himself writes that he attended twenty-one times. In all of these sources, the Chinese character *bian* 遍 is used as a quantifier after a number (e.g. *san* 三 [‘three’] + *bian* 遍 = three times). Nevertheless, as we do not know the duration of each of Zhishou’s lectures, any attempt to calculate the precise number of hours Daoxuan spent under the tutelage of this master is futile.

### III.4.2.3 Master Fali 法礪

Daoxuan's biography of Master Fali in *Xu gaoseng zhuan*<sup>305</sup> explains that this master never visited Chang'an and that he died in the tenth month of the ninth year of the Zhenguan era (635) at the Riguang monastery in Xiangzhou.<sup>306</sup> Moreover, in *Jieben shu* (650, 10), Daoxuan mentions that he visited Fali with the aim of learning the *vinaya*, but the latter passed away just one month after Daoxuan's arrival.<sup>307</sup>

In summary, then, Daoxuan studied the *vinaya* under Fali for one month in 635 in Xiangzhou, probably within the confines of the Riguang monastery.

### III.4.2.4 Master Huixiu 慧休<sup>308</sup>

According to his biography in *Xu gaoseng zhuan*,<sup>309</sup> Huixiu visited Chang'an in 591. He made this trip in the company of his teacher Lingyu 灵裕 (518–605),<sup>310</sup> whom Emperor Wendi of the Sui (r. 581–604) had invited to the capital. The invitation was issued in the eleventh year of the Kaihuang era (591),<sup>311</sup> but it is unclear how long Huixiu remained in the capital. However, given that his master Lingyu left almost immediately,<sup>312</sup> in addition to the absence of any evidence in the *Taishō* collection that Huixiu extended his stay, we may assume that he similarly remained in the capital for no more than a few months. Furthermore, given that Daoxuan was born in 596 and we know that Huixiu never returned to the capital after 591, we can rule out the possibility that Daoxuan ever studied with this master in Chang'an. In other words, Daoxuan must have studied under Huixiu after he left the capital in 630.

That said, Daoxuan does not explicitly state where this period of study took place or its duration. The most likely location is Xiangzhou, where Huixiu spent much of his

<sup>305</sup> T50.2060j22.615c4–29.

<sup>306</sup> According to LLCD, 616b–617a, the territory of Tang-era Xiangzhou 相州 is now divided between the provinces He'nan and Hebei, with much of it now covered by Anyang City, He'nan.

<sup>307</sup> W62.1025.b17.

<sup>308</sup> None of the Daoxuan-related works mentions this master.

<sup>309</sup> T50.2060j15.544–545b11.

<sup>310</sup> The biography of Lingyu is at T50.2060j9.495–498a22.

<sup>311</sup> T50.2060j9.496b6–8.

<sup>312</sup> In NDL (T55.2149j5.277c23–24), Daoxuan contradicts his own *Xu gaoseng zhuan* account when he writes that the invitation was issued in the *tenth* year of the Kaihuang era (590), and adds that Lingyu left Chang'an in the spring of the following year (591). Either way, though, we may say that Lingyu remained in the city for less than a year.

life both before and after his trip to Chang'an. As for the length of their master-student relationship, Daoxuan writes that he met Huixiu in the nineteenth year of the Zhenguan era (645) but intriguingly adds that the master's health was 'as excellent as before'.<sup>313</sup> Of course, this implies that Daoxuan must have met Huixiu on at least one previous occasion, although he gives no further details. Therefore, Daoxuan and Huixiu may have met for the first time either between 630 and 640 (when neither man was in the capital) or in 645. In addition, Daoxuan does not mention when Huixiu passed away, so it is impossible to know the precise duration of their relationship.

### III.4.2.5 Master Zhichao 志超<sup>314</sup>

In *Xu gaoseng zhuan*,<sup>315</sup> Daoxuan states that Zhichao arrived in Chang'an in the company of more than twenty disciples in the second year of the Yining era (618), whereupon he was invited to settle there. However, in the fifth year of the Wude era (622), the master left Chang'an, never to return. He passed away in the fifteenth year of the Zhenguan era (641) in the Guangyan monastery, Fenzhou.<sup>316</sup>

Therefore, although it is impossible to determine the duration of Daoxuan's period of study under Zhichao, we may conclude that they met for the first time either between 618 and 622 in Chang'an or between 630 and 640 in Fenzhou.

---

<sup>313</sup> T50.2060j15.545a13: *shuang jian ru qian* 爽健如前.

<sup>314</sup> None of the Daoxuan-related works mentions this master.

<sup>315</sup> The biography of Zhichao is at T50.2060j20.591c26–592c20.

<sup>316</sup> Fenzhou equates to present-day Jiexiu City in Shanxi Province. For further details, see *Jiexiu xianzhi* 介休縣志 (*The History of Jiexiu County*; in *Zhongguo Fangzhi Congshu* 中國方志叢書; Taipei: Chengwen chubanshe, 1960).

### III.4.2.6 Conclusion

As the preceding discussion demonstrates, in addition to his *heshang* Huiyun, Daoxuan studied under a number of other masters until at least his late forties. Moreover, each of these teachers had individual areas of expertise. For example, Huiyun was especially skilled in expounding the dharma, Zhishou was a renowned *vinaya* master and Zhichao was an authority on meditation techniques.

Clearly, then, Daoxuan's Buddhist education was extremely diverse. However, it was not easily obtained, because a number of these esteemed masters lived far from Chang'an. Therefore, Daoxuan had only one option: he had to leave the city of his birth and embark on a series of travels to acquire the knowledge he required.

### III.4.3 Daoxuan's Travels

Among the Daoxuan-related works, those dating from the ‘Flood of Information’ and ‘Summarizing the Information’ periods<sup>317</sup> barely mention Daoxuan’s travels. By contrast, authors writing in the ‘First-hand Information’ and ‘Stable Information’ periods<sup>318</sup> are much more interested in this aspect of Daoxuan’s life. For example, both KYL (730, 47) and ZYL (799, 58) mention that Daoxuan travelled to ‘the east and the west of Guan 關 and the south and the north of the He 河’.<sup>319</sup> However, as this quote amply demonstrates, the descriptions they provide are frequently so vague as to be almost meaningless. In this example, Guan is not a specific placename; rather, it was used as a generic term for any strategically important location. Hence, the reader is left none the wiser about Daoxuan’s whereabouts. The master himself is as culpable as any other writer in this respect because he uses the term in reference to at least three different places in *Xu gaoseng zhuan*.<sup>320</sup> Similarly, while the term *he* was often used as shorthand for the Yellow River 黃河, that waterway flows for more than five thousand kilometres through no fewer than eight of China’s provinces, so it is very little help to learn that Daoxuan ventured ‘south and north’ of it.

In addition to ‘Guan’ and ‘River’, we find a host of other, equally ambiguous, generic phrases in Daoxuan’s works, including ‘in the mountains (*shan 山*)’ and ‘in the cities (*shi 世*)’.<sup>321</sup> However, elsewhere, he is much more precise. For example, in NDL (664, 24), he writes that he visited Luoyang 洛陽 in the eleventh year of the Daye era (615).<sup>322</sup> Furthermore, in addition to explicit references to himself – such as *yu* 余 (‘I’, ‘myself’) or *Zhuanzhe* 傳者 (‘the author [of *Xu gaoseng zhuan*]’) – he sometimes uses more nebulous expressions – such as *jin jian* 今見 (literally, ‘now seeing’), *jin zai* 今在 (‘now at’), *jin jian zai* 今見在 (‘now seeing at’) and *jin jian cun* 今見存 (‘now seeing in

<sup>317</sup> Parts II.3 and II.4 in this study.

<sup>318</sup> Parts II.1 and II.2 in this study.

<sup>319</sup> T55.2154j8.562a9–10/2157j12.862a20–21: *Guan zhi dong xi he zhi nan bei* 關之東西河之南北.

<sup>320</sup> T50.2060j4.447c25/j15.543c6/j21.610b27: *Tiemen guan* 鐵門關 (‘Iron Gate Pass’ in present-day Xinjiang Province); *Tong guan* 潼關 (‘Tong’s Pass’ in present-day Shaanxi Province); and *Guan fu* 關輔 (the capital Chang’an and the surrounding area).

<sup>321</sup> W62.1025a5: *ruo shan ruo shi* 若山若世.

<sup>322</sup> T55.2149j5.280a19–20. Luoyang is in present-day He’nan Province. Daoxuan does not mention an earlier trip out of Chang’an, so we may assume that this was his first. He was 19 at age that time.

existence') – that reveal his whereabouts at particular moments in time.<sup>323</sup> Careful consideration of the use of these phrases throughout his works indicates that he not only travelled but travelled widely. Moreover, Daoxuan's texts provide clues in relation to how long he spent on the road and why he embarked on his excursions in the first place.

The single most important source concerning Daoxuan's travels is undoubtedly the autobiography that appears at the end of JBS.<sup>324</sup> This text contains the names of thirty-one different places, each of which was located in one of six present-day provinces: Shaanxi, Shanxi, Hebei, He'nan, Jiangsu or Zhejiang. However, careful analysis of all of his works suggests that he actually visited at least forty-five places, which were distributed across eleven present-day provinces. These are listed, by province, in table 6, which gives a more complete picture of the extent of Daoxuan's travels than his own 'autobiography', JBS. For readability, all of the placenames in the table and the discussion that follows are presented in the simplest possible form. For example, Xiangzhou 相州 ('the Commandery of Xiang') and Xiang bu 相部 ('the land of Xiang') – two expressions that Daoxuan uses for the same region – are conflated and listed, simply, as Xiang 相. Furthermore, for simplicity, places that straddled two present-day provinces, such as Bing 并, are listed just once.

---

<sup>323</sup> Note that my interpretation of expressions such as *jin jian zai* and *jin jian cun* as indicators of Daoxuan's whereabouts do not necessarily apply in other contexts, and indeed the context in which they appear should always be given careful consideration. One major piece of evidence for the interpretation presented here is Daoxuan's statement that he 'journeyed through the regions of Ji and the Lake' (*xun she Ji Hu* 巡涉稽湖; see 108). Note that the word *xun* 巡 has multiple meanings, among which are 'examine', 'make an inspection tour', and 'to patrol back and forth.' Giving that, such a route would inevitably see him passing through a great number of places to which he might apply the likes of *jin jian zai* and *jin jian cun* before he reached Chang'an, China's capital, his ultimate destination and home for the rest of his life. In addition, this interpretation is based on the character of Daoxuan himself. Both he and Daoshi (see T53.2122j10.253c23–25; translation on 21–23/129) give the impression that he would travel any distance to see something that might help to establish the Buddha-dharma (see T55.2149j10.338a6–7: *wu bu mu yue qin ye* 無不目閱親謁). His ten-year journey through China certainly merits further detailed study. Special thanks to Christoph Anderl for suggesting some alternative readings of the phrases under discussion and for drawing my attention to some insightful studies on the subject and certain Dunhuang manuscripts that use the term *jin jian zai* 今見在, for example, the *Zhu fo ruixiang ji* 諸佛瑞相記. For the word *jian* 見 (also read as *xian*) see Qiu Xigui 裴錫圭, *Chinese Writing* 文字學概要. Trans., by Gilbert L. Mattos and Jerry Norman (New Haven, CT: Birdtrack Press, 2000), 194, 342. For a study on Dunhuang manuscripts that offers insight on the aforementioned phrases see Christoph Anderl, 'Linking Khotan and Dūnhuáng: Buddhist Narratives in Text and Image', in *Entangled Religions: Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Religious Contact and Transfer*, 8 (forthcoming, 2018), 1–62. On the other hand, apart from *yu* 余 ('I', 'myself'), on one occasion in ZFY (T45.1894j1.834b15), Daoxuan refers to himself as 'Qinshan kaishi 秦山開士'. According to Zhiyi 智顥 (538–597), in *Renwang huoguo jing shu* 仁王護國般若經疏, at T33.1705j2.260a26–28, and Huilin 慧琳 (737–820), in *Yi qie jing yin yi* 一切經音義, at T54.2128j10.364b, *kaishi* is a translation of bodhisattva (菩薩). For a full list of these expressions and where they appear, see appendix 10.

<sup>324</sup> See my translation of the extract at 105–109.

**Table 6: Daoxuan's Travels**

No.	Province	Placename
1.	Shaanxi 陝西	Yong 雍, Fang 坊, Dan 丹, Yan 延, Sui 緘, Yin 銀, Chang'an 長安
2.	Shanxi 山西	Xi 隴, Qin 沁, Fen 汾, Ci 慈, Lan 巍, Shi 石, Hebin 河濱, Taihang 太行, Wutai 五台
3.	Hebei 河北	Ye 鄖, Lu 潞, Bing 并, Suo 朔, Jin 晉
4.	He'nan 河南	Xiang 相, Luo 洛, Bi 泌, Deng 鄧, Luoyang 洛陽
5.	Jiangsu 江蘇	Hu 湖, Yang 揚
6.	Zhejiang 浙江	Ji 稽, Yue 越, Tiantai 天台
7.	Hubei 湖北	Jing 荊, Xiang 襄, Jiangling 江陵
8.	Sichuan 四川	Yi 益, Jian 簡, Luo 綿, Mianzhu 綿竹, Shifang 什邡
9.	Chongqing 重庆	Fu 潼, Fuling 潼陵
10.	Gansu 甘肅	Liang 涼, Su 肅, Jiuquan 酒泉
11.	Jiangxi 江西	Jiujiang 九江

As mentioned above, in JBS Daoxuan suggests that he visited a total of thirty-one places in six present-day provinces (numbers 1–6 in table 6). However, I will now show that this is an incomplete list because the meticulous reading of his other works reveals that he made trips to at least fourteen other places, in five more provinces (numbers 7–11). I shall not discuss all of these places below, as my intention is simply to indicate the full breadth of Daoxuan's travels, not to engage in detailed analysis of every site he visited.

First, let us look at Daoxuan's visit to Hubei Province. In *Guang Hongming ji* (hereafter GHMJ; 664, 21), he mentions that he saw an auspicious statue of the Buddha in Jing, which is in present-day Hubei.<sup>325</sup>

Daoxuan's works contain at least seven references to trips to Sichuan. For instance, in GHMJ he writes that he spent some time in a monastery in Yi,<sup>326</sup> while in *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gan tong lu* 集神州三寶感通錄 (*Collected Records of the Uncanny Effectiveness of the Triple Gem in China*; 664, 22; hereafter SZGT) he alludes to a visit or visits to the

<sup>325</sup> T52j15.2103.202b4–8: *Jinzhou changshasi ruixian zhe ... zhi jin jian zai* 荊州長沙寺瑞像者 ... 至今見在 ('the auspicious statue in the Changsha monastery, Jinzhou ... [I] saw it').

<sup>326</sup> T52.2103j15.201c22–24: *jin jian cun yizhou* 今見存益州 ('[I] saw it is kept in Yizhou').

province on two separate occasions.<sup>327</sup> In *Xingshi chao*, he explains that he consulted certain *vinaya* commentaries that were in circulation in Sichuan at the time of his research,<sup>328</sup> and saw a particular kind of tree there.<sup>329</sup> Finally, in *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, he writes that he saw monasteries in the counties of Mianzhu and Shifang, both of which are in present-day Sichuan.<sup>330</sup>

The evidence that points to Daoxuan visiting Chongqing is less overt but still convincing. In XGSZ, when describing an inscription (*ming 銘*) in Fu, he writes that each of the characters is the size of a human palm – suggesting that he saw them with his own eyes – but admits that he was unable to decipher them.<sup>331</sup> This inscription clearly left a deep impression on Daoxuan, because he asks the *devas* to explain its meaning in LXGT.<sup>332</sup>

With respect to Gansu, in GHMJ Daoxuan describes a ‘walking’ Buddhist statue in Liang, while in XGSZ he mentions a visit to Su,<sup>333</sup> both of which are in present-day Gansu Province. Finally, in *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, he discusses an artefact that is stored in Jiujiang,<sup>334</sup> in present-day Jiangxi Province.

All of this evidence from other texts clearly indicates that Daoxuan visited Hubei, Sichuan, Chongqing, Gansu and Jiangxi, yet he does not mention any of these provinces in his ‘autobiography’, JBS, which he wrote in 651. Therefore, we must try to establish why this is the case.

<sup>327</sup> T52.2106j1.408a18–20/422b12–14: *jin jian zai yizhou ... yu ceng zhi* 今見在益州...余嘗至 ([I] saw it in Yizhou ... I was there once); *yizhou guangming si ... jin jian zai* 益州光明寺...今見在 ([I] saw [it] in the Guangming monastery in Yizhou). There is no mention of a trip to Sichuan in any Daoxuan-related works. As far as I am aware, Fujiyousi Masumi 藤善真澄 was the first modern scholar to recognize that he journeyed there. Without Fujiyousi’s DSKK, the first evidence in this footnote would otherwise slip away from my awareness. See DSKK, 271.

<sup>328</sup> T40.1804j1.3c6: *Shu bu zhu yu liuchuan zhe bing ju pi kuo* 蜀部諸餘流傳者並具披括 ([I] carefully studied [the commentaries that were] circulating in Shu').

<sup>329</sup> T40.1804j9.105c10–11: *Yu yu shujun qin jian Mulan shu* 予於蜀郡親見木蘭樹 ('I saw Mulan tree in Sichuan').

<sup>330</sup> T50.2060j21.601a10/b1–7: *jin jian zai Mianzhu* 今見在綿竹 ('in Mianzhu, [I] saw [the monastery]'); *Shifang xian ... si jin jian zai* 什邡縣...寺今見在 ('in Shifang County, [I] saw the monastery is still [there]').

<sup>331</sup> T50.2060j25.659a24–25.

<sup>332</sup> T52.2107j1.438b24–25.

<sup>333</sup> T52.2103j15.202b21–26: *Liangzhou nan baili ya zhong nisu xingxiang... jin jian ru ci* 涼州南百里崖中泥塑行像 ... 今見如此 ('In the cliff a hundred *li* south of Liangzhou, there is a walking statue made of mud. [I] saw it. [This is] indeed the case'); T50.2060j25a4–6: *Suzhou Jiuquan xiancheng jin zai cheng xi gu si zhong* 肅州酒泉縣城 ... 今在城西古寺中 ('[It is] in an old monastery in the south of the city of Jiuquan Suzhou').

<sup>334</sup> T50.2060j29.698b22–699a4: *zhi yu Jiujiang ... jin zai shan ge* 止于九江 ... 今在山閣 ('[it is] kept in a pavilion in the mountains in Jiujiang').

A careful reading of Daoxuan's works suggests that he began his travels around China in 630<sup>335</sup> and returned to Chang'an in 640.<sup>336</sup> As we have seen, he lists many of the places he visited in the course of those trips in JBS. However, his account of the post-640 period of his life in that text includes only one further placename: Zhongnan Mountain, in present-day Shaanxi Province, where he says he lived in isolation from 642 to 646, following the death of his mother.<sup>337</sup> However, we know that he continued to live a solitary life for another eleven years because in ZFY (659, 14) he reveals that his period solitude finally ended in the second year of the Xianqing era (657).<sup>338</sup>

This brings us back to the question of why Daoxuan fails to mention some of the places he visited in JBS. Did he deliberately omit them? Did he simply forget about them? Or is it possible that he visited them after he concluded his period of solitude in 657 (six years after JBS was written)?<sup>339</sup> The latter option seems highly unlikely, given that Daoxuan was sixty-two in 657 – a very advanced age to embark on long-distance, arduous journeys, especially as he had complained of declining health six years earlier.<sup>340</sup> Furthermore, he accepted the position of *shangzuo* at the Ximing monastery, Chang'an, in 659,<sup>341</sup> which must have curtailed his opportunities to leave the capital, even if he was sufficiently fit to travel.

Nevertheless, we cannot rule out the possibility that he undertook some expeditions after 657. Equally, though, we cannot be sure that he visited the five provinces that do not feature in JBS between 630 and 640 and simply forgot to mention them in that text or deliberately omitted them. While this leaves considerable uncertainty about the years when Daoxuan visited particular places, we are still able to make four firm assertions with respect to his travels:

---

<sup>335</sup> T45.1895j1.840a4–5: *Da Tang Zhenguan si nian* 大唐貞觀四年 ('the fourth year of Zhenguan').

<sup>336</sup> Daoxuan does not explicitly state that he returned to Chang'an in 640. Rather, I have reached this conclusion on the basis of passages in two separate texts. In JBS (W62.1025a6) he states that he started to travel in the fourth year of Zhenguan (630), while in *Xu gaoseng zhuan* (T50.2060j14.534b8–9) he writes that he returned to the capital 'ten years later' (*wang huan shi zai* 往還十載).

<sup>337</sup> W62.1025a14–15.

<sup>338</sup> T45.1894j1.839b5.

<sup>339</sup> W62.1025b1: *Yonghui ernian jiuyue shijiu ri* 永徽二年九月十九日.

<sup>340</sup> W62.1025a18–b2.

<sup>341</sup> See n. 174 for more details on the role of *shangzuo*.

1. He travelled extensively across eleven present-day provinces: Shaanxi, Shanxi, Hebei, He'nan, Jiangsu, Zhejiang, Hubei, Sichuan, Chongqing, Gansu and Jiangxi.<sup>342</sup>
2. He undertook his first significant journey out of Chang'an – to Luoyang in present-day He'nan Province – in 615 at age of 19.
3. He made some short trips within Chang'an and into the surrounding area (Shaanxi Province) between 627 and 629.
4. He travelled much further afield between 630 and 640.

Now that we have established that Daoxuan travelled extensively throughout China over the course of at least fourteen years (627–640), we may turn to the reasons why he embarked on these journeys.

First, it seems safe to assume that Daoxuan's *vinaya* teacher, Zhishou, served as a great inspiration for many of his trips, especially his visit to Shu 蜀 in present-day Sichuan Province. In his foreword to *Sapoduo pini piposha*, the *Sarvāstivādavinayavibhāṣā*, Zhishou 智首 writes:

In order to obtain a complete copy of [this text, I travelled to] the provinces, [including those on] the eastern side of the Changjiang River, the southern side of the Huai River and the western side of Guan. Wherever a collection of Buddhist scriptures was available, I would look myself [in the hope of finding a complete copy of the text] ... Alas! [I never] found a complete copy ... An imperial decree instructed me to come and live in the [Da] Chanding monastery.<sup>343</sup> With great surprise and pleasure, I met *Vinaya* Master Baoxuan<sup>344</sup> from the western region of Shu. [During one

---

<sup>342</sup> Of course, Daoxuan may well have visited more than eleven provinces. For example, if he took the most direct route from Hu to Chang'an, he would have passed through present-day Anhui 安徽 Province and possibly Shandong 山東 Province, too.

<sup>343</sup> T23.1440j8.23.558c18: *Dong Chanding Shamen Zhishou* 東禪定沙門智首 ('Monk Zhishou of the Eastern Chanding monastery'). Eastern Chanding is an alternative name for Da Chanding that appears less frequently in the *Taishō* collection. To avoid confusion, I have used Da, rather than Dong, throughout. See the discussion on the name of this monastery at n. 297.

<sup>344</sup> Baoxuan appears only three times in the *Taishō* collection (here and at T62.2248j15.597a28/b5), each time in connection with Zhishou. The other two references provide no further biographical information.

conversation,] I casually mentioned the incompleteness of the text. [Bao]xuan said, ‘My hometown has it, and it is complete’ ... What a delightful surprise ... I asked people to go to Shu ... and in the second year of the Daye era [606], I finally had a complete copy of the text.

乃至江左淮右，爰及關西，諸有藏經，皆親檢閱，悉同彫落，罕有具者...比奉詔旨來居禪定，幸逢西蜀寶玄律師。共談此論闕義，玄言，本鄉備有。非意聞之，不勝慶躍...乃託...人...大業二年...躬獲此本。<sup>345</sup>

Zhishou may well have recounted this story during his lectures at Da Chanding, which Daoxuan attended. Alternatively, or additionally, Daoxuan may simply have read the foreword and found it inspirational. Either way, we may surmise that Zhishou’s account of his search for a complete copy of a *vinaya* commentary served as a motivation for Daoxuan to embark on his own travels. It certainly implied that other texts might be preserved in Shu, so it is surely no coincidence that Daoxuan not only travelled there but spent all of his time in the western part of the region.

But that was just one of many trips. So what motivated Daoxuan to embark on his other journeys? We know that he travelled to Xiang specifically to study under Master Fali and enhance his knowledge of the *vinaya*.<sup>346</sup> In addition, though, he provides the following reasons for his travels:

1. To investigate deeply [the teaching of the Buddha] ... everywhere search for different opinions;<sup>347</sup>
2. To widen [one’s] horizons;<sup>348</sup>
3. To open up opportunities for companionship with the wise;<sup>349</sup>
4. To avoid missing any *vinaya* lectures.<sup>350</sup>

<sup>345</sup> T23.1440j8.558c24–559a7. In the *Taishō* collection, this passage appears at the end of the eighth scroll (*juan* 卷) of the text. However, it is at the beginning of the ninth scroll in CBETA.

<sup>346</sup> See Part III.4.2.3.

<sup>347</sup> T45.1895j1.839c17–840a5: *li zhi you qiu ... si chu qiu yi* 力志幽求... 四出求異.

<sup>348</sup> T50.2060j14.534b5: *guang liu wen jian* 廣流聞見.

<sup>349</sup> T55.2149j5.282b7–8: *zhui fang xian you* 追訪賢友.

<sup>350</sup> X41.728j3.233b13: *suo you li xi han bu deng lin* 所有律席罕不登臨.

In conclusion, while Daoxuan sometimes embarked on trips with a specific purpose – to study under a particular master and/or increase his understanding of a particular aspect of the Buddha’s teaching – overall he was motivated by a powerful urge to observe and spread the Buddha-dharma. Daoshi, who received his full ordination alongside Daoxuan, writes:

Over the fifty years [of his career, Daoxuan] undertook extensive journeys to search for the Path. [It was his] life’s ambition to establish [the Buddha-dharma]; wherever something was worth seeing [he would record it and use it to] complement [the establishment of] the Buddha-dharma.

五十餘年，栖遑問道，志在住持，但一事可觀，資成三寶。<sup>351</sup>

Having discussed Daoxuan’s relations with his teachers and his travels around China, we may now turn our attention to a rather more mystical subject: his conversations with the *devas*, which began in the final year of his life.

---

<sup>351</sup> T53.2122j10.353c23–25.

### III.4.4 Daoxuan's Conversations with the *Devas* 天人

As we saw in the previous section, Daoxuan personally observed and contributed to the dissemination of the Buddha-dharma in China over a period of at least fourteen years (627–640). Nevertheless, the Daoxuan-related works barely mention his travels. In stark contrast, as we saw in Part II, they devote considerable attention to a series of mystical meetings that supposedly took place in the final year of the master's life: his conversations with a number of deities known as *tianrens* (*devas*).

In this section, I shall explore Daoxuan's own accounts of where and when these conversations took place, who the *tianren* were, and what they discussed with the ageing master. More importantly, I shall discuss the discrepancies between his own accounts and those of later authors who reported these meetings in the Daoxuan-related works.

First, we must determine what is meant by the term *tianren* 天人, as neither Daoxuan himself nor any of the authors of the Daoxuan-related works deems it necessary to provide a definition. Judging from the contexts in which the word is used in these texts, it refers to one of twelve types of sentient beings who reside within the desire realm (*kāmadhātu* 欲界). These particular god-like creatures are known as the Four Heavenly Kings (*cāturmahrājakāyika* 四天王) and they live in one of the domains of the desire realm – the heaven of Four Great Heavenly Kings.<sup>352</sup> For simplicity, I use *devas* in place of *tianren* and the creatures that are said to have come from the realm of the *cāturmahrājakāyika* throughout this study.

Each of the Four Heavenly Kings corresponds to a cardinal compass point – *Dhṛtarāṣṭra* (East), *Virūḍhaka* (South), *Virūpākṣa* (West) and *Vaiśravāṇa* (North) – and Chinese versions of these Sanskrit names appear in a total of eight passages in the *Taishō* collection, as outlined in the table below. (It should be noted that the Sanskrit names do not appear in any of the Chinese sources.)

---

<sup>352</sup> T1.1j8.348b8–13. S.v. PBD, 363.

**Table 7: The Names of the Four Heavenly Kings<sup>353</sup>**

	<i>Dhṛtarāṣṭra</i> 東方天王	<i>Virūḍhaka</i> 南方天王	<i>Virūpākṣa</i> 西方天王	<i>Vaiśravāna</i> 北方天王
1	<i>Tidilaizha</i> 提帝賴吒	<i>Piloulei</i> 毘樓勒	<i>Piloubocha</i> 毘樓博叉	<i>Pishamen</i> 毘沙門
2	<i>Titoulaizha</i> 提頭賴吒	<i>Pilouleicha</i> 毘樓勒叉	<i>Piloubocha</i> 毘樓博叉	<i>Pishamen</i> 毘沙門
3	<i>Titoulaizha</i> 提頭賴吒	<i>Piloubocha</i> 毘樓博叉	<i>Piloulecha</i> 毘樓勒叉	<i>Pishamen</i> 毘沙門
4	<i>Titoulizha</i> 題頭隸吒	<i>Piliuchaju</i> 毘留茶俱	<i>Piliubocha</i> 毘留博叉	<i>Pishamen</i> 毘沙門
5	<i>Tiduoluozha</i> 提多羅吒	<i>Piliuli</i> 毘留離	<i>Piliubocha</i> 毘留波叉	<i>Pishamen</i> 毘沙門
6	<i>Tidilai</i> 提帝賴	<i>Piliule</i> 毘樓勒	<i>Piliuluo</i> 毘留羅	<i>Pishamen</i> 毘沙門
7	<i>Titoulaizha</i> 提頭賴吒	<i>Piloulejia</i> 毘樓勒迦	<i>Piliubocha</i> 毘婁博叉	<i>Pishamen</i> 毘沙門
8	<i>Pisheshe</i> 毘舍闍	<i>Piluzejia</i> 毘盧擇迦	<i>Bocha</i> 波叉	<i>Pishamen</i> 毘沙門

As we saw in Part II, KTCX (890, 91) introduced the *deva* Nezha (那咤, 那吒) into Daoxuan's biography, and this deity subsequently became the most frequently cited *deva* throughout the Daoxuan-related works. He is invariably described as the crown prince (*taizi* 太子) of the Heavenly Kingdom of the North (i.e. the first-born son of *Vaiśravāna/Pishamen*) and a deity who has great respect for Daoxuan. All of the sources that mention him also refer to the gift he gave to Daoxuan: a precious tooth relic of the Buddha (*fo ya* 佛牙). According to *Nanbu xinshu* 南部新書 (1056; hereafter NBXS), which was compiled by the Song-era (960–1279) courtier Qian Yi 錢易 (968–1026), this relic was kept at the Chongsheng monastery<sup>354</sup> and displayed for public veneration from the eighth to the fifteenth day of the fourth month each year to mark the birthday of the Śākyamuni Buddha. Furthermore, Qian Yi asserts that this tradition began at the end of the Zhenyuan era (805).<sup>355</sup>

<sup>353</sup> The sources are as follows: 1 = T1.1j5.30b20–24; 2 = T1.1j5.35a19–24; 3 = T12.383j1.1009a29–b2; 4 = T13.397j42.282b14–18; 5 = T21.1331j7.516a25–b3; 6 = T1.23j3.293b13–c16; 7 = T1.23j3.339c16–340a10; 8 = T54.2123 j22.447c22/ j12.379c22/ j29.499a13/ j25.464c10. Names of these heavenly kings, cf. n. 33.

<sup>354</sup> The Chongsheng monastery 崇聖寺 was in Chang'an. According to Zanning, it was the home monastery of Wengang 文綱 (636–727), one of Daoxuan's students; see T50.2061j15.791c15–792b24.

<sup>355</sup> Qian Yi, *Nanbu xinshu* (New Book of Nanbu; 1056 CE; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2002), j2.18.14–15.

In a later text, another Song courtier presents the story of how the relic came to be in the monastery as fact. Zhang Shangying 張商英 (1043–1122), once the Councillor-in-Chief (*zaixiang* 宰相) in the court of the Emperor Huizong 宋徽宗 (r. 1100–1126), writes:

Deeply moved by the extraordinary sincerity and strictness the *vinaya* master Daoxuan had demonstrated when he observed the Buddhist precepts, the son of the Heavenly King Pishamen came to attend [Daoxuan]. The master] borrowed a tooth relic that was originally kept in heaven. That is how [we have the relic] here now. Soon after the Emperor Huizong ascended the throne, His Majesty arranged an audience with the relic for himself...His Majesty knows my passion for the Buddha's teaching, [so] he told me the story [of the relic] in person.

道宣律師，持律精嚴，感毘沙門天王之子為護戒神，借得天上佛牙，今在人間。徽宗皇帝，初登極時，因取觀之... 皇帝知余好佛，而嘗為余，親言其事。<sup>356</sup>

This version of the story is slightly different from the one that appears in KTCX. First, we are told that Daoxuan ‘borrowed’ the relic rather than received it from the *deva* as a gift. Second, Zhang Shangying does not specify the name of the prince. However, these are minor inconsistencies, especially as all of the Daoxuan-related works, including KTCX, identify Nezha as Pishamen’s son, the crown prince of the northern Heavenly Kingdom. More importantly, all of the sources agree that this *deva* visited Daoxuan because he was impressed by the master’s knowledge of and devotion to the *vinaya*. In addition, Zhang Shangying’s account suggests that everyone who visited the monastery, including the Emperor, believed that the tooth was a genuine relic and venerated it as such.

In light of this, it seems somewhat surprising that Daoxuan himself fails to mention either the tooth relic or Nezha in any of his texts, even though he records conversations

<sup>356</sup> Zhang Shangying, *Hufa lun* 護法論 (*Treatise on Hufa*; in the *Taishō* collection), T52.2114j1.645a19–26. Zhang Shangying composed this text in the hope of expanding the Buddha-dharma and thus protecting Buddhism in China. He does not specify when it was written, so all we can say is that it must have been between 1100 (when Huizong ascended the throne) and the author’s death in 1122. See ‘Zhang Shangying’ in *Songshi* 宋史 (*The History of Song*; Tuotuo 脫脫. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1977), j351.11095–11098.4. See more on Daoxuan’s tooth relic, Strong, John S, *Relics of the Buddha* (N.L: Princeton University Press, 2004), 187–190.

with a total of eight other *devas*, all of whom he names. However, before we discuss the details of those meetings, we first need to establish where and when they supposedly took place.

### III.4.4.1 The Time and Location of the Conversations

Daoxuan writes: ‘The *devas* started to pay me visits and converse with me frequently from the end of the second month [of 667].’<sup>357</sup> He does not specify when the visits ended, or what he means by ‘frequently’, but our sole first-hand account of Duxianshi’s life story, Daoshi’s *Fayuan zhulin* (668, 33), states, ‘[Daoxuan was] in the Jingye monastery in the south of the capital’<sup>358</sup> ... The exchanges between [Daoxuan and the *devas*] started in the second month [and continued] until the sixth month [of 667]. The *devas*] came to talk to [Daoxuan] every day.’<sup>359</sup> In other words, according to Daoshi, Daoxuan’s conversations with the *devas* took place in Chang’an between late winter and early summer 667. Daoshi subsequently writes that Daoxuan died just four months later, in the tenth month of that year.<sup>360</sup>

### III.4.4.2 The Nature of the Conversations

As mentioned above, all of the Daoxuan-related works concur that the *devas* visited the monk simply out of respect for his devotion to and knowledge of the *vinaya*. However, Daoxuan himself provides three rather different – and more detailed – reasons for the meetings. First, he attributes the deities’ interest in him to a previous *karmic* nexus (*wang yuan* 往緣). Second, he suggests that the *devas* were impressed by his writings, specifically *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, *Guang Hongming ji* and various *vinaya* commentaries, and came to congratulate him on his work. Finally, he reveals that they wanted to clarify a

<sup>357</sup> T45.1898j1.874b28/T52.2107j1.435b9–10: *Jinnian eryue mo shu gan tianren* 今年二月末數感天人. As mentioned earlier, these two texts – T45.1898 and T52.2107 – are almost identical. See 93 and appendix 9.

<sup>358</sup> T53.2122j10.353c26–27/j14.393b18: *Shen zai jingshi chengnan qinggong gu jingye si* 身在京師城南清宮故淨業寺. See discussion on the name and location of this place at n, 27 and 28.

<sup>359</sup> T53.2122j10.354b12: *Shi cong Eryue qi zhi Liuyue ri bie lai shou* 始從二月迄至六月日別來授. See Part II.1 for the full translation of Daoshi’s biography of Daoxuan.

<sup>360</sup> T53.2122j10.354b12–13.

particular aspect of the *vinaya* rules on monastics' use of animal products.<sup>361</sup> At the end of his *Liang chu qingzhong yi* 量處輕重儀 (*Guidelines for the Classification and Handling of Monastic Property*; 667, 28; hereafter QZY), Daoxuan writes that the *deva*, without giving the number or the name of the *deva*, pointed out that his previous classification of leather and fur objects, such as leather sitting mats (*nīśīdana* 臥具/坐具), as 'light' 輕<sup>362</sup> was erroneous, whereupon he acknowledged the mistake and made the necessary changes to the ruling.<sup>363</sup> Nevertheless, the *deva* insisted that the error 'was not Daoxuan's fault'; rather, ultimate responsibility lay with the translators of the *vinaya* texts.<sup>364</sup>

Daoxuan's accounts of his meetings with the *devas* reveal that they broached a variety of other topics, in addition to the correct classification of monastic objects, and that the conversations proceeded primarily in the form of question-and-answer sessions. In *Lü xiang gan tong zhuan* 律相感通傳 (*The Collections of the Stories of the Vinaya Invoked Sympathetic Resonance*. 667, 29; hereafter LXGT), he asserts that a total of eight *devas* conversed with him over the course of these meetings. Table 8 gives their names in the order in which they appear in LXGT.

<sup>361</sup> T45.1898j1.874b29–c13/T52.2107j1.435b10–24.

<sup>362</sup> According to Daoxuan, every object must be categorized as either 'light' 輕 or 'heavy' 重, depending on whether they are monks' and nuns' personal possessions or the property of the whole monastic community. Any light item may be shared among the monastics who live within the confines (*sīmā* 界) of a particular monastery. For example, the robes (*cīvara*) of a deceased monk may be given to any monk who needs them or to the monastic who nursed him during his final illness; see T45.1895j2.849b19–c6. In other words, any light object may be considered as a personal possession and passed on from one monk to another. By contrast, heavy items cannot be redistributed in this way. For example, after obtaining the consent of his monastic community (*samgha*), a monk may accept a house that is built for him as a gift. However, neither he nor his monastery is the owner of that house; see T45.1895j2.848b25–a3. Rather, according to the *vinaya* texts, the property belongs to the whole monastic community that stretches to all four corners of the earth (*si fang seng* 四方僧). Daoxuan provides more detailed guidelines on how to deal with the personal belongings of a deceased monk in *Xingshi chao*, at T40.1804j5.56a10–14/j12.143a19–145c11.

<sup>363</sup> T45.1895j2.854a8–12. Daoxuan composed the original version of *Liang chu qingzhong yi* in the eleventh year of the Zhenguan era (637); see T45.1895j2.853c24. He does not specify when he revised the text, but given that a *deva* pointed out the error, and the *devas* did not start visiting Daoxuan until 667, we may conclude that he made the changes at some point in that year.

<sup>364</sup> T45.1898j1.874c2–3: *Si fei ren guo yi tui yi zhe* 斯非仁過抑推譯者.

**Table 8: The Names of the *Devas* in Daoxuan's Works**

1. Wang Fan 王璠	5. Huang Qiong 黃瓊
2. Luo Shi 羅氏	6. Yao Shi 姚氏
3. Fei Shi 費氏	7. Gou Shi 苟氏
4. Lu Xuanchang 陸玄暢	8. Wei Jiangjun 韋將軍

The first *deva* to visit Daoxuan is Wang Fan, who states that he is an envoy, sent by General Wei of the Heavenly Kingdom of the South 南天韋將軍 (i.e. Wei Jiangjun; number 8 in table 8).<sup>365</sup> Fei Shi, the third visitor, similarly declares that he is one of General Wei's subordinates.<sup>366</sup> After conversations with four more *devas*, Daoxuan finally meets the general himself.<sup>367</sup> Seven of the eight *devas* discuss Buddha-dharma issues with the master, with the sole exception being Yao Shi, who merely introduces himself. As mentioned above, Wang Fan gives Wei Jiangjun's residence as the Heavenly Kingdom of the South (*Virūḍhaka*), and since Wang Fan himself and Fei Shi describe themselves as the general's envoys, it is reasonable to assume that they are from the same domain. Neither Daoxuan himself nor the Daoxuan-related works provide any information on the origins of the other five *devas*.

Daoxuan's conversation with the fourth *deva*, Lu Xuanchang, is of particular interest in the context of this study as it focuses on the master's previous and future lives.

<sup>365</sup> T45.1898j1.874c21–22/T52.2107j1.435c3–4: *Dizi shi Niantian Wei jiangjun xia zhi shizhe* 弟子是南天韋將軍下之使者 ('I am the envoy of General Wei of the Heavenly Kingdom of the South').

<sup>366</sup> T45.1898j1.874c28–29/ T52.2107j1.43510–11: *Wei jiangjun xia* 韋將軍下 ('under General Wei').

<sup>367</sup> T45.1898j1.881c15/T52.2107j1.442a6: *Zuihou yi zhao Wei jiangjun zhi* 最後一朝韋將軍至 ('on the last day/morning, General Wei came').

### III.4.4.3 The Previous and Future Lives of Daoxuan

The first of the Daoxuan-related works to mention the master's past lives was Jingxiao's JZJ (895, 92). It was also this author who coined the term *san sheng* 三生 (literally, 'three lives') in reference to Daoxuan's manifestations in human form. According to Jingxiao, these three lives were: Senghu 僧護, during the Qi Dynasty 齊 (479–502); Sengyou 僧佑, during the Liang Dynasty 梁 (502–557); and Daoxuan himself, during the Tang Dynasty 唐 (618–907).<sup>368</sup> JZJ and other Daoxuan-related works invariably locate Daoxuan's *future* life in the heavenly palace of the Bodhisattva Maitreya.<sup>369</sup>

Daoxuan himself never uses the term *san sheng* in reference to his own life/lives on earth, but this does not mean that he ignores the subject entirely. Indeed, as mentioned, he discusses both his previous lives and his future life with the *deva* Lu Xuanchang, as the following extract demonstrates:

The *deva* [Lu Xuanchang] said to me: 'Master, you were the most outstanding *vinaya* master during the Liang Dynasty ... [After that life], you were reborn in [the heavenly palace and] met with the Bodhisattva Maitreya... Now you have been reborn in this human world ... but your [present] life will come to an end soon ... I said: 'Given that, will there still be time for me to read all of the Buddhist texts [again]?'... [The *deva*] replied: 'The place where you were reborn before [i.e. the heavenly palace of the Bodhisattva Maitreya] wants you to return soon'.

天問余云，師本在梁，已為持律之首... 及生見慈尊... 今生人間... 計師報命已終。余問，若爾，意欲更讀藏經... 可得遂不... 答云... 生處復欲師到。<sup>370</sup>

In this exchange, Daoxuan calmly accepts the *deva*'s account of one of his previous lives, the news that his current life is drawing to a close and the information regarding the place

<sup>368</sup> See the full translation of Jingxiao's account at 40–54.

<sup>369</sup> The Buddha Maitreya who is the believed successor of the Buddha Śākyamuni in all Buddhist traditions, is also known as the Bodhisattva Maitreya. This Bodhisattva now abides in Tuṣita heaven. The Buddha Maitreya and the Bodhisattva Maitreya are used interchangeably in this book throughout.

<sup>370</sup> T45.1898j1.879c5–16/T52.2107j1.439c26–440a8.

where he will be reborn. In other words, he raises no objections when Lu Xuanchang informs him that he was a famous *vinaya* master during the Liang Dynasty or that he has already spent some time in Maitreya's heavenly palace and will do so again. His lack of surprise suggests that he was already well aware of these aspects of his life/lives. Furthermore, in JTTJ (667, 27), he describes two monks as 'examples [for other monastics] in Qi and Liang' and goes on to say, 'now [I am] following in their footsteps'.<sup>371</sup>

It is unclear whether he believes these 'examples' were his own Qi- and Liang-era selves or cites them simply as inspirations for his own construction of a full ordination platform (*jiutan* 戒壇).<sup>372</sup> However, given repeated assertions in Daoxuan-related works that the Qi master Senghu and the Liang master Sengyou were indeed the previous lives of Daoxuan, it is reasonable to assume that Daoxuan himself viewed them in that light, too; in which case he was the first author to make any reference to his two previous lives, in the final year of his third life.

---

<sup>371</sup> T45.1892j1.818b9–14: *Qi Liang zuo gui gan zun wang ze* 齊梁作軌敢遵往則.

<sup>372</sup> Daoxuan built a platform not far from Chang'an and conducted a full ordination ceremony there in 667. See my study on this platform at IV.5.2.3.

### III.4.4.4 Questions and Answers

After this brief detour into the three lives of Daoxuan, we may now return to his conversations with the *devas*. As mentioned above, the meetings are usually presented as question-and-answer sessions between the master and whichever deity is visiting him that day. In total, there are forty-five pairs of questions and answers, with the master asking all but seven of the questions. However, this should not be interpreted as evidence that the *devas* are more advanced than Daoxuan in terms of their understanding of the Buddha's teachings. Rather, they are able to answer his questions simply because of their longevity. For example, Fei Shi is able to point out Daoxuan's error because he was present in the audience when the Buddha promulgated the *vinaya* guidelines. Similarly, Lu Xuanchang is particularly knowledgeable about the sacred sites because he has witnessed much of their history in person.

Of the *devas'* seven questions to Daoxuan, one is designed merely to start the conversation while another prompts a chance of subject.<sup>373</sup> The remaining five are all posed by Lu Xuanchang, who asks Daoxuan to elaborate on certain *vinaya* issues.<sup>374</sup> During these exchanges, the *deva* admits '[Master,] I am just a lay follower. My knowledge of the *vinaya* is not wide. Master, please say a few words about it. I am more than happy to listen.'<sup>375</sup> In other words, this *deva* appreciates and admires Daoxuan's expertise in *vinaya* matters.

---

<sup>373</sup> T45.1898j1.879b12/879c5.

<sup>374</sup> T45.1898j1.879c17/880a7/17/22/881a29. For a study of the questions and answers between Daoxuan and the *devas*, especially with respect to the kasāya robe, see Koichi Shinohara, 'The Kasāya Robe of the Past Buddha Kāśyapa in the Miraculous Instruction Given to the Vinaya Master Daoxuan (596–667)', *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal*, vol. 13 (2000), 299–367.

<sup>375</sup> T45.1898j1.880a25–26: *Dizi suren wei guang zhi lü Shi ke shuo zhi lei wen si yao* 弟子俗人未廣知律師可說之樂聞斯要.

### III.4.4.5 Conclusion

In conclusion, all of the sources agree that Daoxuan's conversations with the *devas* took place in Chang'an in 667 and continued for approximately four months. A total of eight *devas* visited the master and discussed various aspects of the Buddha-dharma with him. Yet, these deities are never presented as Daoxuan's instructors; rather, they are all depicted as admirers of his excellent work, with Lu Xuanchang going one step further when he requests the master's guidance on a number of *vinaya* issues.

Furthermore, although Daoxuan makes no explicit reference to his past and future lives in his accounts of his conversations with the *devas*, his serene response when Lu Xuanchang raises the subject, as well as his reference to two Qi- and Liang-era monks in another work from the same year, leads to the conclusion that the master himself was the originator of the *san sheng* tradition in 667.

Finally, while many of the Daoxuan-related works name Nezha as one of the *devas* who visited Daoxuan in the final year of his life and insist that he gave the master a tooth relic of the Buddha, and while other sources treat this story as historical fact, Daoxuan himself makes no mention of either the deity or the relic in any of his works.

### III.4.5 Daoxuan's Relations with Other Tang Masters

Having explored Daoxuan's conversations with the god-like *devas* in the previous section, we now move on to his relationships with two human masters – Falin 法琳 and Xuanzang 玄奘. The former is worthy of study simply because he features so prominently in both Daoxuan's works and many of the Daoxuan-related texts,<sup>376</sup> while the latter merits close attention because Daoxuan clearly held this former colleague in unusually high esteem. Both of these monks are significant figures in the history of Chinese Buddhism in their own rights, but given the subject of this study, I shall not investigate their lives in great depth. Rather, I shall focus exclusively on their relationships with Daoxuan.

#### III.4.5.1 Master Falin<sup>377</sup>

Falin was an outstanding monk, best known for his vigorous and effective defence of the Buddha-dharma against anti-Buddhist moves during the first two decades of the Tang Dynasty, which he maintained until his death in 640.<sup>378</sup>

Li Fang's TPGJ (978, 99) was the first of the Daoxuan-related works to include details of Daoxuan's relationship with Falin.<sup>379</sup> As we saw in Part II.4, Li Fang records that the two monks met in the middle of the Wude era (618–626), that Falin drank wine, ate meat and even had a wife and children, and that the strict *vinaya* master Daoxuan was initially disgusted by his uncouth acquaintance's behaviour and so accorded him no respect. Then, finally, on the advice of a *deva*, Daoxuan revised his opinion of Falin and realized that he was actually a brave defender of the Buddha-dharma.

---

<sup>376</sup> By contrast, while many Daoxuan-related works discuss a close relationship between Daoxuan and the learned Sun Simiao, the former does not mention the latter in any of his own works, so Sun Simiao does not merit inclusion in this section. (The last two characters of his name, *si miao* 思邈 do appear Daoxuan's XGSZ, at T50.2060j17.561b5, but in that instance they are the names of two monks – Master Si 思 and Master Miao 邇.) Two other renowned Tang masters – Shanwuwei 善無畏 and Kuiji 窺基 – are not discussed here for the same reason. For Daoxuan-related works' accounts of Daoxuan's relations with Sun Simiao, Shanwuwei and Kuiji, see Part II.4.

<sup>377</sup> See Daoxuan's biography of Falin in XGSZ, at T50.2060j24.636b23–639a7, as well as another biography of the same master, by Yancong 彦悰: *Tang Hufa shamen Falin Bie Zhuan* 唐護法沙門法琳別傳 (*The Biography of the Tang Hufa Monk Falin*; T50.2051). For further details of Falin's role in combating Daoist attempts to eliminate Buddhism in China, see Part IV.3.

<sup>378</sup> T50.2051j3.212b5.

<sup>379</sup> TPGJj91.604.7–15. See 59–61 for the full translation of this passage.

On the other hand, Daoxuan's XGSZ and Yancong's *Tang Hufa shamen Falin Bie Zhuan* both assert that Falin launched his defence of Buddhism against Daoist oppression in the fourth year of the Wude era (621).<sup>380</sup> For instance, he sent a petition to the court that included the following sentence:

Those who admire the virtue [of the Buddha] abandon all of the unwholesome activities and lead an upright life; those who follow the example [of the Buddha] exercise self-restraint and cultivate wholesome deeds.

慕其德者，斷惡以立身。欽其風者，潔己而修善。<sup>381</sup>

In light of Falin's obvious distaste for 'unwholesome activities' and advocacy of 'self-restraint' in this petition, Li Fang's depiction of an alcohol-swigging, meat-eating, vomiting monk who paid regular, unwelcome visits to Daoxuan around that time seems fanciful, at best.

Moreover, as is evident from Daoxuan's own texts,<sup>382</sup> he clearly held Falin in high regard. For instance, in XGSZ, he writes, 'Falin's works and deeds [should serve as] the example to be followed by generations to come.'<sup>383</sup> In addition, there is no hint in Daoxuan's works that he ever felt a lack of respect towards Falin because of personal experience of the older monk but later changed his mind on the advice of a *deva*. This is hardly surprising given that Daoxuan himself and the Daoxuan-related texts are remarkably consistent in dating his meetings with the *devas* to the final year of his life

<sup>380</sup> T50.2060j23.636c13, T50.2051j1.198c10.

<sup>381</sup> T50.2051j1.199a2–3.

<sup>382</sup> In addition to the biography in XGSZ, Daoxuan discusses Falin's courageous protection of the Buddhadharma in GHMJ, at T52.2103j5.118c11–12/j11.160c21–168b13/j18.230c19-b2/j25.283a22-b7, *Ji gujin fodao lunheng* 集古今佛道論衡 (*The Collected Records of Past and Present Buddhist–Daoist Debates*; 661; 17), at T52.2104j3a9–381a15/382b12–26/385a12–c12, and NDL, at T53.2149j5.280c26/281a15/281b16–c8/332c25–28.

<sup>383</sup> T55.2149j5.281c8: *qi yiwen wangxing ke wei wan dai zongxia* 其遺文往行可爲萬代宗轄.

(667),<sup>384</sup> whereas Falin died in 640. (It should be remembered that the account in TPGJ states that the still disreputable but now respected Falin continued to visit Daoxuan long after the latter's meeting with the *deva*.)

Hence, Li Fang's account is so flawed that it is safe to assume that Falin and Daoxuan never even met, let alone participated in an evolving personal relationship, especially as Daoxuan never mentions meeting the older monk in his own work. Moreover, it seems that he never had anything but the greatest respect for his senior colleague, based on Falin's tireless efforts on behalf of the Buddha-dharma.

---

<sup>384</sup> For instance, at T45.1898j1.874b28: *Jinnian eryue mo shu gan tianren* 今年二月末數感天人 ('Approaching the end of the second month this year [667], the *devas* came a number of times'). This is just one of several passages in the texts Daoxuan wrote in the final year of his life when he gives a specific date for the meetings. Of all the Daoxuan-related works, only TPGJ and *Shaanxi tongzhi* 隸西通志 (*The General History of Shaanxi*; in *Zhongguo Fangzhi Congshu* 中國方志叢書; Taipei: Chengwen chubanshe, 1960) date one of the *deva* conversations to the middle of the Wude era – more than forty years prior to the year given by Daoxuan himself and the vast majority of other authors. Hence, both authors may have consulted an inaccurate source that has since been lost, or the author of *Shaanxi tongzhi* simply copied TPGJ.

### III.4.5.2 Master Xuanzang 玄奘<sup>385</sup>

Xuanzang started translating Buddhist texts soon after his return to China from India in 645 and thereafter became one of the most well-known monks of the Tang period. In the Daoxuan-related works, his relationship with Daoxuan is discussed in two contexts: their work together in a translation team and their residency at the Ximing monastery.

#### III.4.5.2.1 The Translation Team

First, we need to establish when the translation team was established, where it worked and the role that Daoxuan played within it. Unfortunately, though, there is considerable ambiguity in the Daoxuan-related works with respect to when the team was founded and where it was based (see table below).

**Table 9: The Translation Team**

Date	Location
In the middle of the Zhenguan era (627–649)	Hongfu <i>si</i> 弘福寺 (the Hongfu monastery, Chang'an) <sup>386</sup>
The second day of the sixth month of the nineteenth year of the Zhenguan era (645)	(no mention)
In the nineteenth year of the Zhenguan era (645)	Ximing <i>si</i> 西明寺 (the Ximing Monastery, Chang'an)
When the Ximing monastery was built (after 656)	(no mention)

<sup>385</sup> See Daoxuan's biography of Xuanzang at T50.2060j12.446c8–458c13, and another biography of the same master by Huili 慧立, *Da Tang Daci'en sanzang fashi zhuan*, (T50.2053).

<sup>386</sup> Hongfu *si* was built in the eighth year of the Zhenguan era (634) on the order of the Emperor Taizong; see T49.2035j39.364b21, T50.2060j22.614c19–21.

Of all the Daoxuan-related works, only GSZY (1654, 250) dates the establishment of the translation team to the rather vague ‘in the middle of the Zhenguan era’.<sup>387</sup> Similarly, only Huili’s CESZ (688, 39) offers the extraordinarily specific ‘second day of the sixth month of the nineteenth year of the Zhenguan era’ for the same event.<sup>388</sup> However, it should be said that Huili himself was a member of the team, and his text is the only source to provide a detailed, first-hand account of the translators’ activities. Therefore, CESZ is a highly significant document in any exploration of Daoxuan’s relationship with Xuanzang. Five Daoxuan-related texts opt for the rather less precise ‘in the nineteenth year of Zhenguan’,<sup>389</sup> while Zanning (in SGSZ; 988, 102)<sup>390</sup> and three later authors link the establishment of the translation team to the founding of the Ximing monastery in 659.<sup>391</sup>

According to Xuanzang’s entry in one of the standard histories of the Tang Dynasty, the translation team began its work at the Hongfu monastery in 645 on the order of the Emperor Taizong (r. 626–649).<sup>392</sup> The following year, Xuanzang sent the court a report of what the team had accomplished up to that point.<sup>393</sup> To summarize, the official records confirm that Xuanzang began his first translating task at the Hongfu monastery in 645. Of course, this correlates with the year given in most of the Daoxuan-related works and means that the precise day suggested by Huili remains a possibility. The latter slightly conflicts with Daoxuan’s account of the team’s formation, because he dates it to the *fifth* month of 645,<sup>394</sup> rather than the *sixth*.<sup>395</sup> However, the important point is that these two writers, several other Buddhist authors and the official history of the era all agree that the translation team started its work at the Hongfu monastery in 645. Hence, we may say that the four authors who date the team’s formation to later than 659 and locate its activities in the Ximing monastery are surely mistaken.

---

<sup>387</sup> X87.1626j4.342c20.

<sup>388</sup> T50.2053j6.253c19: [Zhenguan] shijiū nián xià liú yuē wuxū [貞觀] 十九年夏六月戊戌.

<sup>389</sup> (SMZT; 1237, 176) X75.1513j8.361c3–4, (FZTZ; 1269, 180) T49.2035j29.297a13–14, (FZTZ; 1341, 212) T49.2036j12.582a11–12, (PNZC; 1665, 245) X41.730j1.355c11–12 and (LYSZ; 1687) D105.175j5.50a8–9.

<sup>390</sup> T50.2061j14.790c22–24.

<sup>391</sup> (LXSZ; 1366, 221) X77.j4.99a21–22, (GSZY; 1654, 250) X87.1626j4.342c19–20, and (HZFZ; 1874, 288) j91.426a5–11.

<sup>392</sup> JTSj191.5108.11–12: *Zhenguan shijiū nián ... Taizong ... zhao ... yu Hongfu si fanyi* 貞觀十九年 ... 太宗 ... 詔 ... 於弘福寺翻譯 (‘in the nineteenth year of Zhenguan ... Taizong ... ordered [Xuanzang to start the] translation at the Hongfu monastery’). There is no biographical entry for Xuanzang in XTS.

<sup>393</sup> T52.2119.818j1a–b8.

<sup>394</sup> T50.2060j4.455a16: *wuyue chuangkai fanyi* 五月創開翻譯 (‘in the fifth month, the translation started’).

<sup>395</sup> T50.2053j6.253c19–254a7: *liuyue ... chuang yi* 六月 ... 創譯 (‘in the sixth month, the translation started’).

The Daoxuan-related works are also not entirely consistent with respect to Daoxuan's role within the team. Some say that he was tasked with *zhui wen* 練文 (literally, 'to compose elegant sentences'),<sup>396</sup> while others suggest that his work focused on *bishou runwen* 筆受潤文 (literally, 'to transcribe and refine notes').<sup>397</sup> Daoxuan himself writes that his role involved *zhibi bing shan zhui ci li* 執筆并刪綴詞理 (literally, 'to transcribe, edit and refine the notes').<sup>398</sup> All of these descriptions are quite vague, but they suggest that his main task was to hone literal translations from the Sanskrit and thereby make the texts more eloquent and comprehensible for Chinese readers. If this is a correct interpretation of the evidence, then he must have been an accomplished scholar by 645. Furthermore, both *bishou* and *zhibi* may be translated as 'take minutes', so it seems highly likely that Daoxuan was a swift and very neat calligrapher.<sup>399</sup>

Unfortunately, all of the sources, including Daoxuan himself, are even less forthcoming on the subject of how long he remained a member of Xuanzang's team. However, they do provide a number of clues. First, we know that Xuanzang started his translation project in 645. Second, in JBS, Daoxuan states that, although he retreated to Zhongnan Mountain in 642, he was able to pursue a fully solitary life only from 646.<sup>400</sup> In other words, something caused Daoxuan to call a temporary halt to his hermitage at some point between 642 and 646. It seems certain that the something in question was his recruitment to the translation team that the Emperor Taizong inaugurated under

<sup>396</sup> T50.2053j6.253c27–29, *Xu gujin yi jing tu ji* 繢古今譯經圖記 (*Continued Accounts of the Translators and Their Works*; 730, 46) T55.2152j1.368b18–19.

<sup>397</sup> X75.1513j8.361c4, T49.2035j29.297a14, T49.2036j12.582a12, X85.1594j29.607b4, D105.174j5.50a9.

<sup>398</sup> T50.2060j4.455a17.

<sup>399</sup> At this point, it is worth exploring if Daoxuan himself was familiar with Sanskrit. None of the 296 primary sources offers any firm evidence that Daoxuan was conversant in Sanskrit or indeed any language other than Chinese. Furthermore, a passage in his *Lüxiang gantong zhuan* (667, 29), T45.1898j1.881c12, explicitly seems to indicate that he did not understand Sanskrit: 'Not long [after the *deva* left] another *deva* came and said [to Daoxuan]: "Disciple I am a *deva*, my name is Yao. I have a surname and a first name. They are pronounced as they are in Sanskrit. However, since you, Master, do not understand, [I shall] tell [you my name] in [your] own language"' (*You fu bu jiu you tian lai yun xing yaoshi yun dici tianren zi you xing zi yu tong tianzhu shi ji bu jie hai shu ben yin* 又復不久有天來云姓姚氏云弟子天人自有姓字語同天竺師既不解還述本音). On the other hand, on at least four occasions in his *Xingshi chao* (T40.1804j1.13a22–23/j4.41b27–28/j10.125a18/j11.132c21), Daoxuan refers to discussing *vinaya* guidelines with translation masters and monks from India. He accepts the monks' advice, then uses it as the basis on which to advance his own arguments. Unfortunately, due to the current lack of information on Daoxuan's command of foreign languages (or otherwise), it is impossible to know if these exchanges were conducted in Sanskrit or Chinese. It can only be hoped that fresh sources may shed some light on this question and enable future researchers to address the significant lacunae in modern scholarship regarding the origins of Daoxuan's authority on *vinaya* stipulations. Special thanks to Christoph Anderl for raising this important issue.

<sup>400</sup> W62.1025a14–15: *zhi* [Zhenguan] *ershí nián fāng dé yán yǐng* 至 [貞觀] 二十年方得巖隱.

Xuanzang's leadership in 645.<sup>401</sup> And it is surely no coincidence that Huili describes Daoxuan as 'Monk Daoxuan from the Fengde monastery, Zhongnan Mountain' in his list of the team's members.<sup>402</sup> Thus, it is clear that Daoxuan was involved in the project from the very beginning, irrespective of whether that was in the fifth or the sixth month of 645.

Unlike the date of its launch, there is absolutely no doubt about the team's first mission: to translate the text that became *Da Pusa zang jing* 大菩薩藏經.<sup>403</sup> Huili – the only author to provide a specific end date for this task – writes that the team concluded its work on this text at the end of 645.<sup>404</sup> Meanwhile, Daoxuan states that he saw the project through to its conclusion.<sup>405</sup> As mentioned above, his role seems to have been to refine the literal Chinese translation of the original Sanskrit text. Some twenty years later, when writing his biography of Xuanzang for XGSZ, Daoxuan recalled that other monks then 'took a turn to transcribe' (*geng die lu wen* 更迭錄文) the team's next translations.<sup>406</sup> This statement may be interpreted in one of two ways: either Daoxuan's 'turn' (*dei* 迭) – and indeed his involvement with the team – ended as soon as *Da Pusa zang jing* was completed in late 645, or he worked in shifts with other masters on new translation projects beyond that date.

However, given the completion date of *Da Pusa zang jing* provided by Huili and the fact that Daoxuan described his role only in the context of the translation of that particular text, in all probability he left the team in late 645. Furthermore, we know that Daoxuan began his fully reclusive life on Zhongnan Mountain in 646, so we may safely conclude that he was a member of Xuanzang's translation team for no more than eight

<sup>401</sup> Xuanzang proposed the idea of a translation team when he met Taizong in Luoyang in 645, and the Emperor granted his request; see T30.1579j1.283c2–3/T50.2050j4.454c9–16/455a4–13/T50.2053j4.455a5–12/j6.253c14–19/ JTSj191.5108.11–12. Xuanzang 'then listed one by one what he needed and [their] number' ('nai tiaoshu suo xu ... shu 乃條疏所須 ... 數.' T50.2053j6.253c16–17), but it is unclear whether he asked for certain masters by name. Obviously, if he did, he must have been familiar with Daoxuan's monastic work before drafting the list. On the other hand, if he merely specified the number and the expertise of members he needed, government officials might have contacted Daoxuan and instructed him to join the team. That is to say, Daoxuan was known to the government. For a study of the specific roles and duties of the individuals who joined the translation team, see Sun Hailin 孙海琳 and Yang Zijian 杨自俭, 'Guanyu yichang zhisi de kao bian 关于译场职司的考辨' (*Querying the Sources of a Claim about Tang Dynasty Translation Workshops*), *Yishi zongheng* 译史纵横, vol. 3 (2007), 35–38.

<sup>402</sup> T50.2053j6.253c28–29: *Zhongnan Shan Fengde si Shamen Daoxuan* 終南山豐德寺沙門道宣. Huili provides the monastery affiliation of every team member in this way. See the complete list in appendix 11.

<sup>403</sup> T50.2060j4.455a16/2053.j6.254a7/T52.2119j1.818a.28–29. This text now forms part of *Da Baoji jing* 大寶積經, the *[Mahā]ratnakūṭa* (T11.310j35–j54).

<sup>404</sup> T50.2053j6.254.9–10: *sui mu fang qi* 歲暮方訖.

<sup>405</sup> Daoxuan gives a detailed description of the volume of the text, and explicitly states that the translation is nearly 'si bai zhi 四百紙 (four-hundred piece of paper)', T50.2060j12.455a16–19.

<sup>406</sup> T50.2060j4.455a16–20.

months (counting from Daoxuan's start date of the fifth month of 645) or possibly only seven months (if Huili's start date of the sixth month is correct). It is unclear whether he agreed to join the project only on condition that he could leave by the end of the year, or if he reached the conclusion at some point in the summer or autumn of 645 that the work was not for him and resigned from the team on completion of the *Da Pusa zang jing* translation. Either way, we may assume that he expressed his need for solitude to devote himself full time to numerous colleagues' and friends' repeated requests for elaborations on his *vinaya* works.<sup>407</sup>

However, this did not quite mark the end of Daoxuan's relationship with Xuanzang. More than a decade later, they would be reunited for a short time at the Ximeng monastery.

---

<sup>407</sup> See the translation of this part of Daoxuan's life on 106. For a study on the relationship between Daoxuan and Xuanzang see, among others, Wang Yarong 王亞榮, *Daoxuan pingzhuan* 道宣評傳 (Beijing: Zongjiao wenhua chubanshe, 2017), 120–127. Note particularly that Wang concludes in his monography on 123 that Daoxuan and Xuanzang worked side by side in later's translation team for 'about over three years' (*dayue san nian duo* 大約三年多). However, Wang gives no source for his calculation. Guo Sholin 郭紹林, *Dianjiao* 點校, 1.11, states that Daoxuan joined Xuanzang's translation team *again* at Ximeng si 西明寺 while giving no further reference for his claim.

### III.4.5.2.2 The Ximing Monastery

In the *Taishō* collection, every author who mentions the construction of the Ximing monastery agrees that it was founded in honour of an unnamed crown prince (*wei taizi* 為太子),<sup>408</sup> and all the evidence points to its completion in the sixth month of the fourth year of the Xianqing era (659). Furthermore, the first resident monks were welcomed to the monastery on the fourteenth day of the seventh month of 659,<sup>409</sup> and we know that Daoxuan and Xuanzang were among their number. Unfortunately, no source relates how long Daoxuan remained at the monastery, but we may presume that he was still there in the fourth month of the second year of the Longshuo era (662) because he refers to himself as *Ximing si seng Daoxuan* 西明寺僧道宣 ('Monk Daoxuan of the Ximing monastery') in letters he sent to a variety of recipients around that time.<sup>410</sup>

Xuanzang's residency was far shorter: he left the monastery in the tenth month of the fourth year of the Xianqing era (659), and there is no evidence that he ever returned.<sup>411</sup> Hence, Daoxuan and Xuanzang were fellow-residents of the Ximing monastery for less than four months before the latter's departure – even less time than they had worked together in the translation team in 645.

---

<sup>408</sup> See the detail refenerce infromtion on the construction of Ximing monastery at n 26.

<sup>409</sup> T50.2053j10.275c8.

<sup>410</sup> See this part of Daoxuan's life at IV.4.

<sup>411</sup> T50.2023j10.275c21.

### III.4.5.2.3 Conclusion

In conclusion, Daoxuan and Xuanzang were close colleagues whose respect for each other developed as they worked side by side as members of the latter's translation team and when they met again more than thirteen years later in the Ximeng monastery. Yet, as far as we know, they spent a total of less than one year in each other's company throughout the course of their lives. Nevertheless, in Daoxuan's biography of Xuanzang that appears in *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, his admiration for his erstwhile colleague is palpable:

[When I was in the team, we] talked face to face. Occasionally, [Xuanzang] would comment on how fickle human relationships can become. I watched him closely. [I] listened to what he said and observed what he did, [and I can say that Xuanzang is] truly a man [who] lives up to his reputation [as a great master. He] worked from dawn till late at night. He scheduled his time in precise accordance with the individual tasks of the day. He worked diligently. His mind never strays from the affairs of the Buddha-dharma. When he talks, he does not talk about fame or wealth. When he acts, his actions are solid and decent. [Xuanzang] understands people's characters and the chance occurrences that may lead [them to the Buddha-dharma].

與之對晤，屢展炎涼。聽言觀行，名實相守。精厲晨昏，計時分業，虔虔不懈，專思法務。言無名利，行絕虛浮，曲識機緣，善通物性。

[Xuanzang] does not bow to the rich, nor flatter to gain favour. He knows when and how to talk and act. Whenever he talks, he talks on subjects that are meaningful. Whenever he talks, he talks to resolve [people's] doubts and to enhance [their] understanding. He is not only an outstanding and wise man of our time but the marshal of the Buddhist religion.

不倨不諂，行藏適時。吐味幽深，辯開疑議。寔季代之英賢，乃佛宗之法將矣。<sup>412</sup>

---

<sup>412</sup> T50.2060j4.458b12–17.

# The Life of Daoxuan

## Part IV

### Daoxuan's *Hufa* Activities

#### IV.1 Introduction

*Hufa* 護法, a Buddhist term which literally means ‘to protect the Buddha-dharma’, scarcely features in the Daoxuan-related works when they recount the master’s life story. In contrast, Daoxuan himself gives it a prominent position in his own works. Moreover, his writing on this subject is significant for three reasons. He was the first Chinese writer to define the term as well as the first Chinese biographer to use it as a category when referring to monks whom he cited as models for others to follow.<sup>413</sup> Finally, his focus on *hufa* in his works reflects Daoxuan’s personal battle to protect the Buddha-dharma during his lifetime. However, this is not to suggest that he was the first monk to fight opponents of the Buddha-dharma. In fact, as we shall see, several other monks had previously engaged in *hufa* activities, as defined by Daoxuan himself.

This section of the book is devoted to studying Daoxuan and his *hufa* activities with the aim of answering two important questions:

- How did Daoxuan define the term *hufa*?
- And how did he practise it in his own life?

---

<sup>413</sup> In *The Eminent Monk*, 9, Kieschnick notes, ‘Perhaps the most significant change Daoxuan made was to establish a new category called “Defenders of the [Buddha] Law” (*hufa*) for monks who defended Buddhism from Daoists and from enemies at court.’ On the same page, he uses the expression ‘innovations’ in reference to the changes Daoxuan initiated. However, this should not be read as a synonym for ‘inventions’, because the term *hufa* had appeared in Buddhist texts long before Daoxuan’s compilation of *Xu gaoseng zhuan*. Furthermore, Kieschnick notes only two of three activities that Daoxuan applauded as *hufa* in his *Xu gaoseng zhuan*. The other one is that ‘to promote *vinaya* in order to safeguard the future of the Buddhist community.’ See more on 186. As the present chapter is devoted to exploring Daoxuan’s personal definition and use of *hufa*, I shall not enter into a lengthy discussion of the alternative meanings that are found in other texts, although a brief overview is provided in appendix 12.

## IV.2 The Term Explained: What is *Hufa*?

As far as we can tell from extant sources, Daoxuan was the first Chinese Buddhist to define the term *hufa* and to include a *hufa* section – along with nine other ideals to which monks should aspire – in one of his texts: *Xu gaoseng zhuan*.<sup>414</sup> *Hufa* occupies the fifth position in the list, but Daoxuan highlights its importance by declaring that it would have been first if he had arranged the ten ideals in order of importance.<sup>415</sup> He cites a total of thirteen masters as examples to follow in the *hufa* category, starting with one of the Buddha's most famous disciples, Śāriputra 舍利弗.<sup>416</sup> According to Daoxuan, the other famous disciples were equally meritorious and admirable, but Śāriputra was the most prominent, and his defence and safeguarding of the Buddha-dharma were exceptional.<sup>417</sup> As such, for Daoxuan, *hufa* has a twofold meaning: defending the Buddha-dharma against attack and ensuring its security in the future.

Daoxuan does not give specific details of the attacks that Śāriputra rebuffed, nor offer any advice regarding how the Buddha-dharma might be protected in the future. Nevertheless, his accounts of the *hufa* masters' actions provide some clues. The thirteen *hufa* masters are listed in the table below in the order in which they appear in XGSZ.

---

<sup>414</sup> For a study on Daoxuan's *Xu gaoseng zhuan* and especially on the order of the ten ideals, among others, see Shi Guodeng 釋果燈, *Tang Daoxuan Xu gaoseng zhuan pipan sixiang chutan* 唐道宣《續高僧傳》批判思想初探 (*A preliminary study evaluating the Xu gaoseng zhuan by Daoxuan of the Tang*; Taipei: Dongchu chubanshe, 1992), 93–100.

<sup>415</sup> T50.2060j24.640a29–b16. In addition, in the same text, at T50.2060j1.425b27–28, Daoxuan clarifies that he has grouped certain masters into specific categories on the basis of their individual merits but without any intention to imply that any particular master's merit is limited to the category in which he appears.

<sup>416</sup> The number is given at T50.2060j23.624b15 and j24.632b24. In addition to the primary biographies (*zhengzhuan* 正傳), Daoxuan includes nine secondary biographies (*fujian* 附見). See appendix 13 for masters' names and respective activities.

<sup>417</sup> T50.2060j24.640a27–b4. On Śāriputra, see Nyanaponika Thera and Hellmuth Hecker, *Great Disciples of the Buddha* (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2003), 1–64.

**Table 10: The *Hufa* masters in Daoxuan's *Xu gaoseng zhuan***

1. Shi Tanwuzui 釋曇無最	8. Shi Zhixuan 釋智炫
2. Shi Tanxian 釋曇顯	9. Shi Mingshan 釋明贍
3. Shi Jin'ai 釋靜藹	10. Shi Huicheng 釋慧乘
4. Shi Dao'an 釋道安	11. Shi Zhishi 釋智實
5. Shi Sengnü 釋僧鷗	12. Shi Falin 釋法琳
6. Shi Sengmeng 釋僧猛	13. Shi Cizang 釋慈藏
7. Shi Daozhen 釋道臻	

Ten of the thirteen biographies include direct references to Daoism. According to Daoxuan, six monks (masters 1–6 in Table 10) wrote petitions in defence of the Buddha-dharma in response to Daoist priests' anti-Buddhist attacks, while another four (masters 8, 10, 11 and 12 in Table 10) challenged imperial decrees that were designed to impose Daoist supremacy over Buddhism. As for the remaining three monks, Daoxuan relates that Master Shi Mingshan (9 in Table 10) argued with the Emperor Sui Yangdi 隋煬帝 (r. 604–618) after the latter had insisted that all monks must prostrate themselves before him.<sup>418</sup> Finally, no specific debates with anti-Buddhist figures are mentioned in the entries for Masters Shi Daozhen and Shi Cizang (7 and 13 in Table 10). However, according to Daoxuan, these two monks were both integral to the establishment of the Buddha-dharma in their countries.<sup>419</sup>

We are told that Shi Daozhen implemented numerous regulations as soon as the Chinese government appointed him head of the country's Buddhist monastics (*Da Tong* 大統, literally 'The Great Leader') and that these instructions helped the Buddha-dharma to prosper.<sup>420</sup> Daoxuan provides no further details of the regulations, but his description of Chinese Buddhism prior to their implementation – 'monks gathered [from time to time],

<sup>418</sup> T50.2060j24.632c12–633a2.

<sup>419</sup> Shi Daozhen was *Da Tong* of Xi Wei 西魏 (T50.2060j23.631b4–17), while Shi Cizang was *Da Sengtong* 大僧統 ('The Great Leader of Buddhists') in Kingdom Silla 新羅 (T50.2060j24.639a8–640a8). Silla was a kingdom in the southern and central parts of the Korean peninsula. For a study of fourth–sixth-century government policy on Buddhism, see Antonino Forte, 'Daisōjō 大僧正', in *Hōbōgirin: Dictionnaire encyclopédique du bouddhisme d'après les sources chinoises et japonaises, sixième fascicule* (Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient; Tokyo: Maison Franco-Japonaise, 2003), 1043–1070.

<sup>420</sup> T50.2060j23.631b10–11: *Ji wei sengtong da li ketiao Fofa zai xing* 既位僧統大立科條佛法載興 ('after [he] assumed the position as head of monastics [he] introduced a great number of regulations and rules. The Buddha-dharma prospered').

but the gathering itself was all that they managed to do<sup>421</sup> – implies that there had previously been little in the way of monastic training. In other words, the monks' ignorance of *vinaya* and their lack of practice were apparent. Hence, the regulations were probably imposed in order to improve discipline among the Chinese monastic community.

Daoxuan focuses considerable attention on the deeds of Shi Cizang, not least the master's activities following his return to Silla from Tang in 643:

Buddhism had been introduced to Qingqiu nearly a hundred years before. Yet, in terms of Buddhist practice and observance, it had barely begun. [Cizang] brought this issue to the attention of the men of the court and asked for their opinion. Having discussed the matter, the ministers and officials unanimously agreed that regulations were essential to ensure the [well-being of] the Buddha-dharma. Cizang, as head of the country's monastics, was appointed to oversee the matter. [He] ordered monks, nuns and all the monastic members to promote the practices that they had been following.

正以，青丘佛法，東漸百齡。至於住持修奉，蓋闕。乃與諸宰伯，祥評紀正。時王臣上下，僉議攸歸，一切佛法，須有規猷，並委僧統。藏令僧尼五部，各增舊習。

In addition, [Cizang] introduced positions to oversee [the monastics] and ensure that the fortnightly recitation of the *Prātimokṣa* is performed and that violations are addressed in line with the *vinaya* stipulations. All the monastics have to assemble each spring and winter for assessment, to ensure they know what is right and wrong in the context of *vinaya*. Furthermore, [Cizang] appointed censors to travel around the country and inspect monasteries, impart the Buddha's teachings, attend to the Buddha's images and manage monastic-related affairs. [These envoys are dispatched] on a regular basis. Reflecting on what he has done, [Cizang is] indeed a *hufa bodhisattva*.

---

<sup>421</sup> T50.2060j23.631b9–10: *Seng tu xiang ju zhui liu eryi* 僧徒相聚綴旒而已.

更置綱管，監察維持。半月說戒，依律懲除，春冬總試，令知持犯。又置巡使，遍歷諸寺，誠勵說法，嚴飾佛像，營理眾業，鎮以為常。據斯以言，護法菩薩即斯人矣。<sup>422</sup>

As this extract illustrates, Cizang's actions were closely connected to *vinaya*, and Daoxuan believed that they helped to establish and safeguard the Buddha-dharma. In other words, he considered the promotion of *vinaya* a *hufa* action.

This brings us back to the nature of the attacks against the Buddha-dharma and how Buddhists should respond and protect themselves in the future. First, analysis of the *hufa* entries in XGSZ reveals two distinct types of attack: Daoists' anti-Buddhist proposals; and imperial decrees that compelled monks to comply with regulations that ran counter to the Buddha's teachings. Second, in his entries for Daozhen and Cizang, Daoxuan strongly implies that *vinaya* is essential for protecting Buddhism over the long term. In other words, he believes that a *hufa* monk should not only defend the Buddha-dharma against existing external threats but also promote *vinaya* in order to safeguard the future of the Buddhist community.

In the following section, we shall examine how Daoxuan himself attempted to put these principles into practice.

---

<sup>422</sup> T50.2060j24.639c15–c22.

#### IV.3 Fighting Fu Yi's Anti-Buddhist Proposal

In the previous section, we explored Daoxuan's understanding of the term *hufa* in light of the fact that he defines any monastic who is able to protect the Buddha-dharma against attack and/or promote *vinaya* as a *hufa* monk. In the following sections, we shall investigate Daoxuan's own *hufa* activities: namely, his fight against Fu Yi's anti-Buddhist proposal; his opposition to certain decrees issued by the Emperor Gaozong (r. 649–683); and his promotion of *vinaya*.

The Tang era (618–907) was a tremendously important period in the development of religious life in China as a series of changes and consolidations followed one after the other, sometimes in rapid succession. There was increased interest in both Daoist and Buddhist teachings, and their impact on the imperial rule and political order, from the very beginning of the dynasty onwards. In the first few years of the Tang period, the emperor issued a decree ordering reductions in the number of Daoist and Buddhist monastics as well as a parallel reduction in the number of monasteries. Official Chinese histories, as well as Buddhist texts of the Tang era, notably those of Daoxuan, consistently link the issuing of this decree to Fu Yi 傅奕 (555–639), known as the *Taishi Ling* 太史令 ('Grand Astrologer').<sup>423</sup>

While Daoxuan is viewed as one of the foremost Buddhist historians of his age – an accomplished chronicler who recorded and commented on the actions of others – his own contribution to some of the major events of his lifetime, especially after the aforementioned decree was issued, has been largely ignored. However, his work made him a highly influential figure in early Tang politics. Even though he did not always play an active role in the events themselves, he invariably selected his subjects carefully in order to defend – in a very learned and skilful way – the Buddha-dharma.

In the sections that follow, I will sketch out the historical background, introduce the main actors in the early years of the Tang Dynasty, discuss the emperor's response to anti-Buddhist lobbying, including his promulgation of the decree on Daoism and Buddhism as well as other aspects of imperial religious policy during the Wude era, and finally explore Daoxuan's counter-attack against the decree and the man he identified as its principal instigator.

---

<sup>423</sup> Hucker, *Dictionary*, 482.

#### IV.3.1 Historical Background

In 618 General Li Yuan 李淵 (566–635) seized power from the Sui Dynasty and became the first emperor of the Tang Dynasty, whereupon he adopted the title Tang Gaozu 唐高祖 (r. 618–626) and the era name Wude 武德. According to JTS and XTS, Gaozu appointed Li Jiancheng 李建成 (589–626), his eldest son, crown prince.<sup>424</sup> However, Li Jiancheng was subsequently killed in the so-called Xuanwu Gate Incident (*Xuanwu men zhi bian* 玄武門之變), a palace coup launched by Li Shimin 李世民 (598–649), Gaozu's second son, in 626. JTS, XTS and ZZTJ all record that Gaozu appointed Li Shimin crown prince soon after this incident.<sup>425</sup> Over the next sixty days, even though his father was still officially emperor, Li Shimin assumed control of the instruments of imperial power<sup>426</sup> and effected significant changes in government policy. For instance, he suspended one of Gaozu's most important decrees – supposedly issued after intense lobbying by the astrologer Fu Yi – which had ordered reductions in the number of Buddhist and Daoist monasteries and temples, and similar reductions in the number of monastics themselves.<sup>427</sup> After his father's abdication, Li Shimin took the title Tang Taizong 唐太宗 (r. 626–649) and chose the era name Zhenguan 貞觀.<sup>428</sup>

#### IV.3.2 Fu Yi and His Anti-Buddhist Proposal

Nothing is known of Fu Yi's early life as the official histories mention him only from the start of his official career during the Sui Dynasty (589–618). That career began when he was appointed *yichao lang* 儀曹郎 ('Vice-Director of the Ministry of Rites') in the office

<sup>424</sup> JTSj1.7.3–4, JTSj64.2414.9, XTSj1.7.3 and XTSj79.3540.9.

<sup>425</sup> JTSj1.17.10, XTSj1.19.6 and ZZTJj191.6010.9

<sup>426</sup> JTSj1.17.11, XTSj1.19.7 and ZZTJj191.6012.12.

<sup>427</sup> *Tongdian* 通典 (*Comprehensive Institutions*; an encyclopedic text written in 801 CE; hereafter TD), j68.1894.1, and *Tang huiyao* 唐會要 (*Institutional History of the Tang*; presented to the Song emperor in 961 CE; hereafter THY), j47.836.2–3, XTSj1.19.6–7 and ZZTJj191.6012.7–8.

<sup>428</sup> For more information on Buddhist history during the Sui and Tang eras, see, Tang Yongtong 汤用彤, 'Sui Tang fojiao shigao 隋唐佛教史稿', in *Tang Yongtong quanji* 汤用彤全集, 7 vols. (Shijiazhuang: Hebei renmin chubanshe, 2000), vol. 2. Official religious policy during the reigns of Tang Gaozu, Tang Taizong and Tang Gaozong (i.e. those that are most relevant to this study) is covered at 13–21 and 26–35.

of Han Wang Liang 漢王諒 (575–605; Liang, the Duke of Han),<sup>429</sup> who went on to launch a rebellion against his brother, the second Sui emperor, Yangdi 煙帝 (r. 604–618). Following the rebellion's failure in 604, Fu Yi was sent (*xi* 徒) to Fufeng 扶風 (see below), not far from the Sui capital Chang'an 長安.<sup>430</sup> Arthur Wright suggests this was a reward (presumably for loyalty to the emperor during the rebellion), but the term *xi* is neutral, so Fu Yi's relocation may well have no such implications.<sup>431</sup>

Immediately after founding the Tang Dynasty, Gaozu appointed Fu Yi to an official position. The courtier is said to have used his expert knowledge of astrology to help the new emperor and to have devised a new method of measuring time with a clepsydra (water clock).<sup>432</sup> Also, according to his biographical entry in XTS, he apparently started to lobby Gaozu to introduce certain reforms. This aspect of Fu Yi's engagement at court is revealed in a proposal he presented to Gaozu in which he suggests that:

His Majesty has dispelled chaos and restored peace, but the official titles [and] legislation employed in our court are still those of the old Sui ... It is now the time to refashion the calendar, to change the colour of cloth, to revise the law and regulations, and to replace the official titles.

陛下撥亂反正，而官名律令，一用隋舊...改正朔，易服色，變律令，革官名。<sup>433</sup>

Initially, Fu Yi's official title was *taishi cheng* 太史丞 ('Deputy Grand Astrologer'). Later, he was appointed *taishi ling* 太史令 ('Grand Astrologer'). In his work on Tang Buddhism, Stanley Weinstein suggests:

<sup>429</sup> The position of *yichao lang* is mentioned in the *Suishu* (Book of Sui; compiled by Wei Zheng 魏徵 (580–643) and others in 636; hereafter SS), at j28.794.3–4.

<sup>430</sup> JTSj79.2715.1 and XTSj107.4059.9–10.

<sup>431</sup> Arthur F. Wright, 'Fu I and the Rejection of Buddhism', *Journal of the History of Ideals*, vol. 12 (1951), 39.

<sup>432</sup> JTSj79.2715.4–5, XTSj107.4062.1; see also Wright, 'Fu I', 39.

<sup>433</sup> XTSj107.4059.14–4060.6. See also *Quan Tang Wen* 全唐文 (Complete Prose Literature of the Tang; compiled in 1814 CE; hereafter QTW), j133.1346b13–1347a5.

Li Yuan was an admirer of Fu I [Fu Yi] before the establishment of the Tang, and on assuming the throne promptly appointed him to high office. This would indicate that the anti-Buddhist views of Fu I were well known to Li Yuan before he became emperor and that they did not constitute a barrier to Fu I's immediate promotion to a position of great responsibility.<sup>434</sup>

However, this conclusion is rather problematic for several reasons.

According to both JTS and XTS, the post of *taishi ling* was first offered to another renowned astrologer, Yu Jian 廣儉. However, he declined the role because he believed that securing a government career on the basis of his skills (by which he presumably meant his expertise in astrology) was shameful. Instead, he recommended Fu Yi for the position.<sup>435</sup> However, this does not indicate that Fu Yi received an 'immediate promotion to a position of great responsibility', as *taishi ling* was not a particularly eminent post.

There were nine official ranks (*pins* 品) in the Wude era, each of which was divided into *zheng* 正 ('proper') and *cong* 從 ('minor'). So, the highest rank was 'first proper' and the lowest was 'ninth minor'. Throughout the first ninety-five years of the Tang Dynasty, *taishi ling* was classified as a 'sixth proper' role. Then, in the Kaiyaun era 開元 (713–741), it was slightly elevated to 'fifth minor'. As such, Fu Yi was in the lower half of the ranking system during his whole tenure as court astrologer.<sup>436</sup> It could even be suggested that Gaozu demoted Fu Yi when he summoned him to court because *yichao lang* – Fu Yi's position under the previous dynasty – was a 'fourth proper' role. Overall, then, the *taishi ling* did not play a particularly influential role within the administration of the Tang, although the holder of the title obviously had a number of significant responsibilities.

<sup>434</sup> Stanley Weinstein, *Buddhism under the T'ang* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 8. Weinstein mentions both of Fu Yi's titles in his study; Wright ('Fu I', 39) mentions only *Taishi Ling*.

<sup>435</sup> JTSj79.2715.2–3 and XTSj107.4059.11–12. JTS and the XTS provide little information on Yu Jian, merely describing him as a gentle (*ren* 仁) person. It is only in the biographies of his father at SSj78.1767.11–1768.14 and ZZTJj182.5692.13–15 that we find some explanation as to why Yu Jian was reluctant to accept the post of *taishi ling*.

<sup>436</sup> See Hucke, *Dictionary*, 482. For information on the rank and duties of the *taishi ling*, see TDj40.1096.13, JTSj43.1855.9–14, XTSj47.1215.10–1216.7, ZZTJj191.6001.1 and *Wenxian tongkao* 文獻通考 (*Comprehensive Examination of Literature*; compiled by Ma Duanlin 馬端臨 (1254–1323) in 1317; hereafter WXTK), j56kao512a18–27. On the ranking of the whole of Tang officialdom, see JTSj42–44 and XTSj46–49b. Care should be taken not to confuse *taishi ling* – which had a rank of 'three minor' (XTSj47.1214.11) – with the *taishi ling* title that was given to Fu Yi. Although they shared an identical name, the departments and responsibilities were different.

Similarly, it is impossible to verify Weinstein's claim that Fu Yi's anti-Buddhist views were 'well known' to Li Yuan before he became emperor. First, there is no evidence that Fu Yi publicly expressed any anti-Buddhist sentiments during his tenure as *yichao lang* under the Sui Dynasty, nor that he even *held* such views at that time. His first known anti-Buddhist document is a proposal to the new emperor after the founding of the Tang Dynasty. It could be argued that his pre-Tang connection with the *Tongdao guan* 通道觀 ('Abbey of the Pervasive Dao') – a centre of Daoist scholarship established by the Emperor Wu of the Northern Zhou Dynasty 周武帝 (r. 560–578) in 574 – suggests anti-Buddhist leanings.<sup>437</sup> However, this is a rather far-fetched assumption. Although the *Tongdao guan* was accused of anti-Buddhist activity, that does not necessarily make Fu Yi an anti-Buddhist partisan. Buddhist monks, including a number of eminent masters, visited and even resided at the *Tongdao guan*,<sup>438</sup> and even if Fu Yi did display anti-Buddhist tendencies in the Sui era, there is no reason to conclude that Gaozu was aware of the astrologer's beliefs.

Finally, one more of Weinstein's comments should be treated with extreme caution. He claims that Fu Yi 'had been held in high esteem by Li Yuan ever since the latter had held the post of magistrate (*taishou*) of Fu-feng under the Sui'.<sup>439</sup> However, in their biographies of Gaozu, neither JTS nor XTS, nor indeed ZZTJ, suggests that he was ever 'magistrate of Fu-feng' during the Sui Dynasty.<sup>440</sup> According to the first two sources, he was *taishou* 太守 in the commanderies (*juns* 郡) of Xingyang 榮陽 (in today's He'nan Province) and Loufan 樓煩 (in today's Shanxi Province), but neither of these official histories mentions a posting to Fufeng (in today's Shaanxi Province).<sup>441</sup>

As mentioned above, we know that Fu Yi was sent to Fufeng in the first year of the Daye era (i.e. 604, two years before the area became a commandery).<sup>442</sup> However, as it is

<sup>437</sup> On the *Tongdao guan*, see *Beishi* 北史 (*History of the Northern Dynasties*; compiled by Li Yanshou 李延壽 (?–?) in 659; hereafter BS), j10.361.2, and *Zhoushu* 周書 (*Book of Zhou*; compiled by Linghu Defen 令狐德棻 (582–666) in 636), j5.85.6. See also Gil Raz, *The Emergence of Daoism* (New York: Routledge, 2012), 27.

<sup>438</sup> T50.2060j2.436c11, j11.512b9 and j23.629b20.

<sup>439</sup> Weinstein, *Buddhism*, 7.

<sup>440</sup> JTSj1, XTSj1 and ZZTJj182–184, 186.

<sup>441</sup> JTSj1.2.4 and XTSj1.2.1. According to SSj30.853.13, Loufan became a commandery in the fourth year of Daye, so Gaozu must have become *taishou* of the region in that year or later. Although JTS and XTS agree on the locations and the title, they give slightly different timings for these appointments: JTS says that Li Yuan received both titles at the beginning of the Daye era, while XTS states that he was appointed in the middle of that era.

<sup>442</sup> SSj29.809.12 and *Yuanhe junxian tuzhi* 元和郡縣圖志 (*Yuanhe Maps and Records of Prefectures and Counties*; compiled by Li Jifu 李吉甫 (758–814) in 813), j2.40.12.

far from certain that Gaozu ever served as a *taishou* in the region, there is little reason to think that he met or even heard about Fu Yi around that time. Hence, it is impossible to corroborate any link between Fu Yi and anti-Buddhist sentiment within Daoism, or indeed any pre-Tang link between Fu Yi and Li Yuan, notwithstanding the assertions of Weinstein and Wright. On the other hand, some early link to Daoism is plausible, because Fu Yi apparently compiled a commentary on the work of Laozi.<sup>443</sup>

Following the foundation of the Tang Dynasty, however, Chinese sources frequently portray Fu Yi as strongly anti-Buddhist. For instance, *Da Tang xinyu* 大唐新語 (*A New Account of the Tales of the Great Tang*; a compendium of historical anecdotes and biographical sketches of members of the imperial court, officials, literary figures and so on, from the founding of the Tang Dynasty until the Dali 大曆 era (766–779); hereafter DTXY) declares: ‘Fu Yi firmly attacks Buddhism; he hates it like an enemy.’<sup>444</sup> Similar characterizations can be found in ZZTJ, which claims that Fu Yi warned his son not to learn from any Buddhist book.<sup>445</sup> However, his anti-Buddhist views are best represented by the strongly worded proposal he submitted to Gaozu to abolish (*fei* 廢) Buddhism throughout China. Several historical (non-Buddhist) texts discuss this petition, including TD, DTXY, JTS, THY, XTS, ZZTJ and *Quan Tang wen* 全唐文 (*Texts of the Tang*; compiled in 1814; hereafter QTW).<sup>446</sup> Full details of these sources’ accounts of the proposal are provided in Table 11, where the sources are presented in chronological order of publication/compilation.

---

<sup>443</sup> JTSj47.2027a14 and XTSj59.1516b15. Unfortunately, this commentary has been lost.

<sup>444</sup> DTXYj10.155.1.

<sup>445</sup> ZZTJj195.6151.4–5: [Fu] *Yi lin zhong jie qi zi wu de xue foshu* 突臨終戒其子無得學佛書.

<sup>446</sup> TDj68.1893.10–15, DTXYj10.155.2–5, JTSj79.2715.6–2716.14, THYj47.835.11–836.1, XTSj107.4060.9–4061.8, ZZTJj191.6001.1–6002.12, QTWj133.1345a8–1346b12 and 1347a6–b13.

**Table 11: Fu Yi's Anti-Buddhist Proposal**

	Source	Title	Time of submission (all in the Wude era)	Number of articles	Mention of Zhang Daoyuan and his title?	Mention of Xiao Yu and his title?
1	TD (801)	No title, but an introduction that reads: '[Fu Yi] submits a memorandum [shu 疏] to eliminate Buddhism [shang shu qing qu shijiao 上疏請去釋教]'	The seventh month of the seventh year (624)	Not mentioned	Yes <i>taipu qing</i> 太僕卿	Yes <i>shangshu you puye</i> 尚書右僕射
2	DTXY (806)	No title, but an introduction that reads: '[Fu Yi] submits a memorandum to eliminate Buddhism [shang shu qing qu fojiao 上疏請去佛教]'	Not mentioned	Twelve, but no content provided	No	No
3	JTS (945)	No title, but an introduction that reads: '[Fu Yi] submits a memorandum to eliminate Buddhism [shang shu qing chu qu shijiao 上疏請除去釋教]'	The seventh year (624)	Eleven, but no content provided	Yes <i>taipu qing</i>	Yes <i>zhongshuling</i> 中書令
4	THY (961)	No title, but an introduction that reads: '[Fu Yi] submits a memorandum to eliminate Buddhism [shang shu qing qu shijiao 上疏請去釋教]'	The fourteenth day of the seventh month of the seventh year (624)	Not mentioned	Yes <i>taipu qing</i>	Yes <i>shangshu you puye</i>
5	XTS (1060)	No title, but an introduction that reads: '[Fu Yi] submits a petition to criticize Buddhism radically [shang shu ji di futu fa 上疏極詆浮圖法]'	The seventh year (624)	Twelve, but no content provided	Yes <i>taipu qing</i>	Yes <i>zhongshuling</i>
6	ZZTJ (1086)	No title, but an introduction that reads: '[Fu Yi] submits a memorandum to request the removal of Buddhism [shang shu qing chu fo fa 上疏請除佛法]'	The fourth month of the ninth year (626)	Not mentioned	Yes <i>taipu qing</i>	Yes No title provided
7	QTW (1814)	a Official document ( <i>biao</i> 表) to request the abolition of Buddhism, titled <i>Qing fei fo fa biao</i> 請廢佛法表	The twenty-first day of the sixth month of the fourth year (621)	Eleven, with full content provided	No	No
		b Memorandum to request the removal of Buddhism, titled <i>Qing chu shijiao shu</i> 請除釋教疏	Not mentioned	Not mentioned	No	No

As Table 11 indicates, one source (QTW) declares that Fu Yi submitted an official document (*biao* 表) with a list of eleven articles attached and then provides full details of those articles.<sup>447</sup> Three other sources (DTXY, JTS and XTS) state that a list of either eleven or twelve articles (depending on the source) was presented to the emperor ‘in addition’ (*you* 又) to a memorandum (*shu* 疏).<sup>448</sup> The term *you* is rather ambiguous, as it might indicate that the articles were submitted at the same time as the memorandum or in a separate document at a later date.<sup>449</sup> The remaining three sources (TD, THY and ZZTJ) mention only the memorandum.

The texts themselves can be divided into two main groups: numbers 1 and 4, which are very similar to one another; and numbers 2, 3, 5, 6, 7a and 7b. In addition, while they vary in length and use different wording, all display an anti-Buddhist stance, highlighting the ‘barbarian’ (*hu* 胡) origins of the Buddha and his teachings, Buddhist monks’ general uselessness and their negative impact on the Chinese economy, and the threat that Buddhism supposedly poses to the country because it may shorten the emperor’s reign or even his life.

Texts 1 and 4 both suggest that Fu Yi submitted his petition in the seventh year of Wude. By contrast, the sources in the second group give a variety of dates (year four, year seven and year nine). However, we can be fairly certain that year seven is the last possible year of submission, so ZZTJ’s suggestion of year nine (text 6 in Table 11) is probably an error. This is because texts 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 itself all assert that only one of Gaozu’s officials – the *Taipu Qing* 太僕卿 (‘Chief Minister of the Imperial Stud’), Zhang Daoyuan 張道源 (?–624) – felt that Fu Yi’s memorandum was reasonable when it was sent to them

<sup>447</sup> For a translation of the QTW document (7a), see Marc S. Abramson, *Ethnic Identity in Tang China* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008), 62.

<sup>448</sup> *Tang Liudian* 唐六典 (*The Six Legislative Texts of the Tang*; compiled by Li Linfu 李林甫 (683–753) in 739; Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1992; hereafter TLD), j1.10.16–11.3, JTSj43.1817.2-5, and XTSj46.1185.2-5 confirm that there are six types of documents a superior uses while addressing his or her subordinate (*zhi* 制, *chi* 敕, *ce* 册, *ling* 令, *jiao* 教, and *fu* 符), and likewise there are six types a subordinate uses to communicate with his or her superior (*biao* 表, *zhuang* 状, *jian* 篆, *qi* 啓, *ci* 辞, and *die* 牒). For more information on *biao* and *shu*, see Chu Binjie 褚斌杰, *Zhongguo Gudai Wenti Gailun* 中国古代文体概论 (*Comprehensive Guide to Ancient Chinese Literary Style*; Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 1990), 439–446.

<sup>449</sup> DTXYj10.155.5, JTSj79.2716.10 and XTSj107.4061.5.

for discussion,<sup>450</sup> and JTS asserts that he died in the seventh year of Wude.<sup>451</sup> Furthermore, four of the six sources that give a date (texts 1, 3, 4 and 5) declare that the petition was submitted in that year.

Another important figure when attempting to establish the precise date when Fu Yi submitted his proposal is Xiao Yu 蕭瑀 (575–648). Both JTS and XTS state that Gaozu appointed Xiao Yu *neishi ling* 內史令 ('Director of the Department of the Palace Scribe')<sup>452</sup> soon after the founding of the Tang Dynasty, promoted him to *shangshu you puye* 尚書右僕射 ('Right Vice-Director of the Department of State Affairs') in the fourth year of Wude, then elevated him further, to *shangshu zuo puye* 尚書左僕射 ('Left Vice-Director of the Department of State Affairs') in the seventh year of Wude.<sup>453</sup> Xiao Yu remained in this latter position until the end of the Wude era.<sup>454</sup> All four sources that give the date of submission as the seventh year of Wude mention this official, but they disagree over his title, with texts 1 and 4 suggesting he was *shangshu you puye*, while texts 3 and 5 insist he was *zhongshu ling*.<sup>455</sup> Since all of the available biographical data on Xiao Yu indicates that he was *shangshu you puye* by the seventh year of Wude, it is fairly safe to assume that texts 3 and 5 are erroneous on this issue, whereas texts 1 and 4 are probably correct.

QTW's text 7a suggests that the official document and the list of articles were submitted at the same time, whereas text 7b makes no mention of the articles. The compiler of QTW states that "the original [copy of Fu Yi's articles] is lost. [I] have carefully collected and edited all eleven articles from Buddhist sources."<sup>456</sup> I will discuss these sources in more detail below, but for now, suffice to say that all of those that

<sup>450</sup> TDj68.1893.11, JTSj79.2716.10, THYj47.835.11, XTSj107.4061.5 and ZZTJj191.6002.5. In addition, XTSj107.4060.7–8 mentions that Fu Yi once supported one of Zhang Daoyuan's proposals despite strong opposition among other courtiers. This raises the suspicion that Fu Yi and Zhang Daoyuan forged a political alliance. However, they seem to have been quite isolated, since, although they supported each other's proposals, they were unable to muster further support from any other courtiers.

<sup>451</sup> JTSj187.4870.1–2.

<sup>452</sup> JTSj63.2400.6 and XTSj101.3950.6.

<sup>453</sup> Throughout Chinese history (aside from during the Yuan Dynasty), 'left' and 'right' have been common prefixes whenever a pair of appointees are authorized, both normally of the same rank. See Hucker, *Dictionary*, 522 and 582.

<sup>454</sup> XTSj101.3950.12.

<sup>455</sup> According to JTSj42.1786.5, the *neishi ling* was renamed *zhongshu ling* 中書令 ('Director of the Secretariat') in the third month of the third year of Wude (620). Nevertheless, I have been unable to find any reference to Xiao Yu holding that title under Gaozu's administration.

<sup>456</sup> QTWj133.1346a1: *qi wen yi yi wei shishi shu suo yin shang cun genggai jin pouji yu hou* 其文已佚惟釋氏書所引尚存梗概謹哀集于後.

mention a number agree that there were indeed eleven articles. Hence, unsurprisingly, this is the number of articles given in text 7a (and text 3 concurs). However, DTXY (text 2) and XTS (text 5) both claim that there were twelve articles. Unfortunately, texts 2, 3 and 5 offer no further details. Also, none of them suggests that any Buddhist text was used as source material. Maybe the discrepancy over the number of articles was due to a transcription error, or maybe two lists were in circulation at the same time. Either way, only text 7a provides any information relating to what the articles contained. The list below summarizes Fu Yi's *Eleven Articles for the Benefit of the Country and the People* (*Yi guo li min shi shiyi tiao* 益國利民事十一條), as outlined by that source.<sup>457</sup>

1. Becoming Buddhist monastic runs counter to the principle of filial piety; it is also disrespectful to the emperor because monastics do not pay homage to him. Furthermore, becoming a Buddhist monastic contradicts the laws of nature, since monastics do not marry or have children. Any Buddhist monastic who is younger than sixty should, therefore, be forced to do some work for the state, such as military or labour service.
2. There are more than 200,000 Buddhist monastics. Strong and youthful monks might become a threat to the empire.
3. Both the Buddha and his teachings are barbarian in origin. In light of their number, Buddhist monastics and monasteries pose a threat, and indeed some Buddhist monastics have already been involved in a coup. It is therefore advisable to reduce the number of monasteries to just one in each prefecture with two residing monastics. All other Buddhist monastics should return to lay life. This will benefit the empire and the people.
4. Buddhist monastics should wear simple clothing, not made out of silk, and they should eat only once a day. This accords with the Buddha's teachings and helps the poor, as there will be more food for them and less hunger.

---

<sup>457</sup> For an analysis of the articles, see Wright, 'Fu I', 40–45; and Tonami Mamoru, 隋唐佛教文化 (*Buddhist Culture of Sui and Tang*), trans. Han Sheng 韓昇 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2004), 19.

Furthermore, silkworms will not be inappropriately used by Buddhist monastics.<sup>458</sup>

5. Lay people will prosper if Buddhist monastics are prevented from accumulating wealth. It is also advisable to explain to the people that worshipping the Buddha will not bestow high social status and that offering food to Buddhist monastics will not generate wealth.
6. Rulers' lives and reigns are prosperous and long without the Buddha, whereas their lives and reigns are disastrous and short with the Buddha.
7. The barbarians of the west will always reject the teachings of the Duke of Zhou and Confucius.<sup>459</sup>
8. Those who become Buddhist monastics are unfilial to their parents; those who pay homage to the barbarian Buddha are also unfaithful to the emperor.
9. Sending Buddhist monastics back to lay life and telling them to engage in farming and trade will generate wealth for the country and the people.
10. An emperor – who rules by the grace of the Mandate of Heaven – will always introduce reforms and amend the policies of the previous ruler.
11. It is the duty of any faithful servant to admonish the emperor even when doing so risks the latter's wrath.<sup>460</sup>

According to text 7a, then, Fu Yi's first article urged Gaozu to order all monks and nuns under the age of sixty to serve the empire.<sup>461</sup> However, according to other sources (such as TD and JTS), on the seventh day of the twelve month of the second year of Wude (619), Gaozu had already decreed that everyone who had reached the age of fifty should be exempt from all levies and labour services. It was only in the third month of the sixth year of Wude (623) that he stated that those who were sixty or more should be classified as old

---

<sup>458</sup> On silkworms in Buddhism, see Stuart Young, *Conceiving the Indian Buddhist Patriarchs in China* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2015), 186–216.

<sup>459</sup> The Duke of Zhou consolidated the Zhou Dynasty in the eleventh century BCE and is considered as an ideal of proper rule by Confucian tradition.

<sup>460</sup> QTWj133.1346a2–b12.

<sup>461</sup> QTWj133.1346a4.

people.<sup>462</sup> So it seems rather illogical for QTW to claim that Fu Yi submitted these articles in the *fourth* year of Wude (621) because the official starting point for old age was still fifty then. It would be more plausible to suggest that Fu Yi submitted his list of articles either during or after the sixth year of Wude, once the official starting point for old age had been increased to sixty.

In summary, several of the dates given in the seven sources contradict other well-established data. Only the seventh year of Wude (cited as the year of submission in texts 1, 3, 4 and 5) stands up to close scrutiny. We may also infer that Fu Yi did not submit a series of proposals, because all of the sources mention only one memorandum or official document, even though they differ on certain details, such as the date of submission and the number of articles. Notwithstanding these discrepancies in the historical record, Fu Yi's proposal was certainly a significant document. We shall now turn to its impact on imperial religious policy during the reign of Gaozu.

#### IV.3.3 Religious Policy during the Wude Era

Because each new dynasty traditionally established a new corpus of legislation, a government's religious policy can be gauged on the basis of its legislative measures. On the first day of the sixth month of the first year of Wude (618), the first Tang emperor, Gaozu, decreed that the legislation of the previous dynasty should be amended.<sup>463</sup> However, this was only a temporary measure, pending the compilation of a new Tang legal code, which was finally completed in the seventh year of Wude (624).<sup>464</sup> We know that Wude-era legislation was divided into four categories – *lü* 律 (code), *ling* 令 (statute), *ge* 格 (regulation) and *shi* 式 (ordinance) – although no specific details of the legislation

<sup>462</sup> TDj7.155.3, JTSj48.2089.6, XTSj51.1325.11, XTSj51.1342.7, WXTKj10kao109b19 and *Cefu yuangui 冊府元龜* (*Prime Tortoise of the Record Bureau*; an encyclopedia compiled by Wang Qinruo 王欽若 (962–1025) and others in 1013), j486.5511.11–12.

<sup>463</sup> JTSj1.6.13–15, JTSj50.2133.15–2134.2, THYj39.701.5, XTSj56.1408.11–12, ZZTJj185.5792.11 and *Taiping yulan 太平禦覽* (*Imperial Readings of the Taiping Era*; compiled by Li Fang 李昉 (925–996) in 984), j638.2856a27.

<sup>464</sup> The decree announcing this new code is included in the *Tang da zhaoling ji 唐大詔令集* (*Collection of Imperial Decrees of the Tang*; compiled by Song Minqiu 宋敏求 (1019–1079) in 1070; hereafter TZLJ), j82.470.8–16. JTSj1.15.1, THYj39.701.8, XTSj1.17.8 and ZZTJj190.5978.7 all agree with TZLJ that the code was issued in the seventh year of Wude; TLD, j6.183.12, suggests that it was announced in the 'middle' of Wude, which could also equate to the seventh year. For a list of decrees issued during the reign of Gaozu see Togoda On 池田溫, *Tangdai zhaoci mulu 唐代詔敕目錄* (Xi'an: Sanqing chubanshe, 1991), 2–15.

itself have survived.<sup>465</sup> A little more than a decade later, during the Zhenguan era (626–649), another legal code was compiled. Once again, this has not survived, but it is generally believed that it contained regulations relating to Daoist and Buddhist monasticism – the so-called *Daoseng ge* 道僧格 (*Regulations for Daoist and Buddhist Monastics*) – which is said to be mirrored in a Japanese counterpart document, the *Sōniryō* 僧尼令 (*Rules for Monks and Nuns*).<sup>466</sup>

It is surely no coincidence that Fu Yi submitted his anti-Buddhist proposal in precisely the same year as the Wude legal code was completed and disseminated all over the country for implementation (*banxing tianxia* 頒行天下).<sup>467</sup> In light of this fact, two equally valid hypotheses regarding Fu Yi's motivation for drafting and submitting his proposal may be advanced: first, nothing approximating his suggestions had appeared in the Tang legislation that preceded the Wude code, so he submitted his proposal in the hope of having a last-minute impact on the new code's contents; or, second, he saw the code after it was published, found its attitude towards Buddhism unacceptably lenient, and wrote his proposal in response. Either way, his proposal clearly demonstrates that he wanted Gaozu to introduce stricter regulations against Buddhism.

However, if this conclusion is correct, why does Daoxuan state that Fu Yi praised Gaozu as the emperor who ‘abolished’ (*fei* 瘢) and ‘eliminated’ (*chu* 除) Buddhism in his *Gao shi zhuan* 高識傳 (*Biographies of Those of Superior Judgement*)?<sup>468</sup> Moreover, Daoxuan claims that Fu Yi boasted that Gaozu welcomed his proposal and subsequently ordered the destruction of monasteries and *stūpas* in every province.<sup>469</sup> Although it is difficult to verify Daoxuan's version of events, in the ninth year of Wude Gaozu did issue

<sup>465</sup> Wallace Johnson, trans., *The Tang Code* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979), vol. 1, 5. For a primary source, see TLDj6.180.8.

<sup>466</sup> For brief discussions of these codes, see: Kenneth K.S. Ch'en, *The Chinese Transformation of Buddhism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1973), 95–105; Weinstein, *Buddhism*, 17–22; and Ann Heirman and Tom De Rauw, ‘Offenders, Sinners and Criminals: The Consumption of Forbidden Food’, *Acta Orientalia*, vol. 59:1 (2006), 76.

<sup>467</sup> JTSj50.2135.6.

<sup>468</sup> T52.2013b28–c1. Unfortunately, Fu Yi's *Gao shi zhuan* has not survived, so it is difficult to verify precisely what he meant by these terms, or even if Daoxuan is quoting him correctly. This work is also mentioned in XTSj58.1483b11, and both XTS and T52.2103j6.123b10 suggest that it comprised ten scrolls.

<sup>469</sup> T52.2103j7.135a4.

a decree to ‘purify’ (*sha tai* 沙汰)<sup>470</sup> both Buddhism and Daoism, possibly by ‘closing down’ (*ba* 罷) almost every Buddhist monastery and Daoist temple.<sup>471</sup> Table 12 outlines all of the relevant details of this decree, with the main sources of information arranged in chronological order of compilation.<sup>472</sup>

---

<sup>470</sup> *Sha tai* is rendered as ‘to purge’ in Arthur F. Wright, ‘T’ang T’ai-Tsung and Buddhism’, in Arthur F. Wright and Denis Twitchett (eds), *Perspectives on the T’ang* (New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1973), 245. However, in official histories, *sha tai* is more often used in the sense of ‘to purify’. For instance, in the *Record of the Three Kingdoms* (*San guo zhi* 三國志; compiled in third century CE), j38.963.9, and BSj6.232.14, good officials remain in place and are subsequently promoted after an administration has been ‘purified’ (*sha tai*).

<sup>471</sup> QTWj3.38b12.

<sup>472</sup> The sources for Table 12 are as follows: 1 = TDj68.1893.15–1893.1, 2 = DTXYj10.155.5, 3 = JTSj1.16.7–17.9, 4 = THYj47.836.1–3, 5 = XTSj1.19.5–6, 6 = ZZTJj191.6002.14–6003.1, 6012.8 and 7 = QTWj3.38a8–b12.

**Table 12: Gaozu's *Sha tai* Decree**

	Source (year of compilation)	Issuing date in the ninth year of Wude (626)	Suspension date in the ninth year of Wude	Measures to be taken	
1	TD (801)	The second month	The sixth month	Three Buddhist monasteries and three Daoist temples permitted in the capital; all others to be closed down	Monastics who are advanced in age and upright in conduct allowed to remain; all others to be expelled
2	DTXY (806)	The decree is mentioned but no details are provided			
3	JTS (945)	Xinsi (辛巳) day of the fifth month	Gengshen (庚申 = fourth) day of the sixth month	Three Buddhist monasteries and two Daoist temples permitted in the capital and one in each of the other provinces; all others to be closed down	Monastics who are diligent in learning and conduct and obey disciplinary rules allowed to remain; all others to be expelled
4	THY (961)	Twenty-second day of the second month	The fourth day of the sixth month	Three Buddhist monasteries and three Daoist temples permitted in the capital; all others to be closed down	Monastics who are advanced in age and upright in conduct allowed to remain; all others to be expelled
5	XTS (1060)	Xinsi (= twenty-third) day of the fourth month	Dingsi (丁巳 = first) day of the sixth month	No specific details are given, but the teachings of Buddha and Laozi are to be abolished	
6	ZZTJ (1086)	Xinsi day of the fourth month	Gengshen day of the sixth month	Three Buddhist monasteries and two Daoist temples permitted in the capital and one in each of the other provinces; all others to be closed down	Monastics who are diligent in learning and conduct allowed to remain; all others to be expelled
7	QTW (1814)	Not mentioned	Not mentioned	Three Buddhist monasteries and two Daoist temples permitted in the capital and one in each of the other provinces; all others to be closed down	Monastics who are diligent in learning and conduct and obey disciplinary rules allowed to remain; all others to be expelled

The terms *xinsi*, *gengshen* and *dingsi* are all elements in a traditional sexagenary system that is used to record days: *xinsi* corresponds to 18, *gengshen* to 57 and *dingsi* to 54.<sup>473</sup> The day given by JTS (number 3 in the table) – *xinsi* – must be an error as there was no *xinsi* in the fifth month of the ninth year of Wude.<sup>474</sup> All but one of the sources indicate that the order was not in force for very long: between two and four months.<sup>475</sup> (The exception is QTW, which gives no dates.) They also largely agree on the permitted

<sup>473</sup> Endymion Wilkinson, *Chinese History: A New Manual* (Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Asia Center, 2012), 496.

<sup>474</sup> I have converted the Chinese dates into Common Era dates through <http://sinocal.sinica.edu.tw/>, accessed 4/7/2018. See also Pierre Hoang, *Concordance des Chronologies Néoméniques Chinoise et Européenne* (Nanking: Imprimerie de la Mission Catholique, 1910), 185.

<sup>475</sup> As mentioned above (see n. 427), the Li Shimin suspended this decree while still crown prince.

number of monasteries and temples, although none gives details of how many monastics may remain in those communities. The ‘purification’ aspect of the decree relates to the monastic communities’ conduct and, in two cases (TD and THY), age.<sup>476</sup>

Although these historical sources clarify that the decree was in force for a relatively short period of time, they give scant details on its impact. However, it is probably safe to assume that it had a negligible effect on Chinese Buddhist communities; indeed, it is possible that it was never even enforced.<sup>477</sup> Nevertheless, despite Fu Yi’s minimal impact on early Tang legislation, many Buddhist texts are extremely critical of him. The Buddhist community must have found his proposal very unsettling, so the masters, including Daoxuan, might simply have felt that it was incumbent on them to launch a counter-attack. However, there is some evidence to suggest that there was more to it than that, as we shall see in the next section.

---

<sup>476</sup> In this decree, ‘age’ refers to seniority – that is, the length of a monastic’s career. See III.4.1 for further details.

<sup>477</sup> JTSj1.17.9 says, ‘*shi jing bu xing* 事竟不行’ (‘immediately after the edict [was issued], it was not “enforced”’), and it was certainly suspended a few months later, so it seems highly unlikely that it had a significant impact.

#### IV.3.4 Daoxuan's Response

Daoxuan responded to Fu Yi's anti-Buddhist proposal in two ways: first, he attempted to undermine Fu Yi's credibility by portraying him as an immoral person with a grudge against Buddhist monks; and, second, he sharply rejected Fu Yi's accusations of Buddhist impropriety.

##### IV.3.4.1 Questioning Fu Yi's Personality

Daoxuan mentions Fu Yi by name in four of his texts: *Xu gaoseng zhuan*; *Guang hongming ji*; *Ji gujin fodao lunheng*; and *Da Tang neidian lu*.<sup>478</sup> In all of these works, he criticizes Fu Yi and his anti-Buddhist ideas without reservation and consistently refers to him as a 'former Daoist priest' (*qian daoshi* 前道士). On the single occasion when this designation is not used, Daoxuan refers to Fu Yi's close association with Daoist priests who engage in anti-Buddhist activities.<sup>479</sup>

Several other Tang-era Buddhist masters similarly campaigned against Fu Yi. However, in their works, they rarely mention any connection between Fu Yi and Daoism. For instance, Daoxuan hails Falin 法琳 (571–639) as the principal defender of the Buddha-dharma against Fu Yi and his anti-Buddhist ideas during the Wude era.<sup>480</sup> Yet, while Falin discusses Fu Yi extensively in his *Poxie lun* 破邪論 (*Treatise on Destroying Erroneous Views*; T52.2109), he does not even hint at a link between the court astrologer and Daoism.<sup>481</sup> Similarly, in *Fayuan zhulin*, Daoxuan's fellow-monk Daoshi states that Fu Yi is widely read and a skilful exponent of astrology, but does not suggest that he was ever a Daoist priest.<sup>482</sup> The only master to echo Daoxuan's description is Yancong 彥悰, who labels Fu Yi a 'former Daoist priest' and accuses him of working alongside anti-Buddhist Daoist priests in his *Tang hufa shamen Falin biezhuān* 唐護法沙門法琳別傳 (*The Biography of the Tang Hufa monk Falin*).<sup>483</sup>

<sup>478</sup> T50.2060j24, T52.2103j6, T52.2104j3 and T55.2149j5.

<sup>479</sup> T55.2149j5.281b22–25.

<sup>480</sup> T50.2060j24.637b16–17.

<sup>481</sup> Fu Yi is mentioned at T52.2109j1.475a13, b18, c2; 476b5, b24, c10 and 477a23, b2.

<sup>482</sup> T53.2122j79.876b11–28.

<sup>483</sup> T50.2051j1.198c11 and 201b6.

Clearly, then, Daoxuan is very much an exception in highlighting Fu Yi's supposed connection to anti-Buddhist Daoism. Perhaps in light of this, in GHMJ he attempts to substantiate his claim by providing a wealth of detail about Fu Yi's early life:

At first Fu Yi, who had a Daoist background, was not well read. Penniless, he begged Buddhist monks for a loan. When he did not receive what he had expected, Fu Yi started to hate Buddhist monks. More than ever, he was determined to follow his earlier inclination [i.e. to be a good Daoist priest]. At the start of the Wude era, he travelled westwards and arrived at the capital. Upon his arrival, he sought help from a Daoist priest named Wang Kui.<sup>484</sup> Wang Kui had a very good reputation among Daoists, and he was also well known to the people of the city. When he saw that Fu Yi was suffering from cold and hunger, he invited him to stay at his residence.

然素本無，道門起家。貧賤，投僧乞貸，不遂所懷，蓄憤致嫌，固其本志。武德之始，西來入京，投道士王歸。歸道左之望，都邑所知，見其飢寒，延居私宅。

Wang Kui was an innocent and easy-going scholar. He treated Fu Yi in the same way as he treated distinguished guests. But in a couple of days, Fu Yi started a relationship with Wang Kui's wife. He went to her bedroom and chatted throughout the night, without even attempting to avoid suspicion. One of Wang Kui's nephews was a Buddhist monk whose monastery was near Wang Kui's house. When he went to visit his uncle, he discovered by chance the affair between Fu Yi and Wang Kui's wife. Fu Yi was furious, but the monk related everything he had seen to Wang Kui. The latter did not believe him at first and said that: 'Fu Yi was a poor scholar. I accepted and accommodated him at my house. How unreasonable he would be to do such a thing.' The monk replied that: Uncle, if [you] had any

<sup>484</sup> In his *Yi qie jing yin yi* 一切經音義 (*Translations and the Readings of the Words in the Buddhist Books*; 817, 64), T54.2128j97.912a23, Huilin 慧琳 specifies that 'Wang Kui is the name of a Daoist priest' (*Wang Kui daoshi ming* 王歸道士名). Yichu 義楚 gives a short but, in principle, identical account of Wang Kui and Fu Yi in his *Shishi liutie* 釋氏六帖 (*Buddhist Encyclopedia [Modelled after Ba Juyi* 白居易's] *Liutie*; 954, 96), at B13.79j16.341.14–15. However, I have been unable to find further information on Wang Kui elsewhere. Special thanks to T. H. Barrett for pointing out my incorrect transliteration of Wang Kui as 'Wangkui'.

doubts about what [I] had said, you should go and see for yourself.' They went together to the house, and it was indeed as the monk had described.

歸，通人也，待以上賓。三數日間，遂通其婦。入堂宴語，曾不避人。歸有兒子，為僧。寺近歸宅，因往見之。奕大瞋怒。僧便告歸，歸初不信，曰，傅奕貧士，我將接在宅，豈為不軌耶。僧曰，叔若有疑，可一往視。相將至宅，果如所言。<sup>485</sup>

The insinuation is that Fu Yi was utterly amoral, given that he had no hesitation in starting an affair with his host's wife. Daoxuan concludes by asserting that Fu Yi's misconduct had serious consequences. Citing *Mingbao ji* 夥報記 (*Notes on Karmic Retribution*; compiled by the Tang official Tang Lin 唐臨 (600–659); T51.2082),<sup>486</sup> he insists that Fu Yi was reborn in hell because he baselessly rejected and attacked Buddhism throughout his life on earth and continuously slandered and discredited the Buddha and Buddhist monks.<sup>487</sup> However, no such passage appears in the surviving version of *Mingbao ji*; in fact, that text does not mention Fu Yi at all.<sup>488</sup>

Although it is impossible to assess the validity of Daoxuan's sources, it is important to consider the character assassination he commits against Fu Yi, who is portrayed as an insidious man with strong affiliations to anti-Buddhist Daoist institutions and an unjustified grudge against Buddhist monks. This portrayal is more detailed and much more negative, than any of those that appear in the contemporary historical sources

<sup>485</sup> T52.2103j6.124b9–17.

<sup>486</sup> Tang Lin was minister of the Ministry of Personnel (*libu shangshu* 吏部尚書); see T51.2082j1.787b27. His biographies are at JTSj85.2811.8–2814.12 and XTSj113.4183.8–4186.1. Yan Gengwang 嚴耕望, *Tangdai jiaotong tukao* 唐代交通圖考 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2007), j1.4, cites *Mingbao ji* from the *Taishō* collection and the text number '2080' is in all probability a misprint.

<sup>487</sup> T52.2103j7.135a24–b8.

<sup>488</sup> JTSj46.2005a7 and XTSj59.1540b9 both say that *Mingbao ji* consisted of two scrolls; T51.2082, however, refers to three scrolls, so there were probably two versions in circulation. For a study on the history of *Mingbao ji*, see Donald E. Gjertson, *Miraculous Retribution: A Study and Translation of T'ang Lin's Ming-pao chi* (Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series, 1989), 93–117. At 115, Gjertson argues that three texts include the story of Fu Yi. The texts are 'CL' (his abbreviation for *Fayuan zhulin* 法苑珠林), 'KC' (*Taiping guangji* 太平廣記) and 'KJ' (Yamada Yoshio (ed.), *Konjaku monogatarishū* 今昔物語集; Tokyo: Iwanami, 1960). However, note that Gjertson's translation of the story of Fu Yi (at 264–265) does not rely on those three sources; rather, it is rendered directly from the *Mingbao ji* itself – specifically, the Maeda family manuscript (前田家本), 101–103. Yamada, in his edition of *Konjaku monogatarishū*, 238, also refers to this manuscript. On the other hand, two other editions of the *Konjaku monogatarishū* – Haga Yaichi 芳賀矢一's *Kōshō Konjaku monogatarishū* 考証今昔物語集 (Tokyo: Fuzanbō, 1913–1921), 671–672, and 'Konjaku monogatari shū 今昔物語集', in *Kokushi taikei* 國史大系 (Tokyo: Keizai zasshi sha, 1897–1901), j16.439–440 – make no reference to *Mingbao ji* when relating the story of Fu Yi. In other words, the Maeda family manuscript of *Mingbao ji* is the only existing version of this text to include the story of Fu Yi. Special thanks to T. H. Barrett for pointing out Gjertson's pioneering study and his translation of the story of Fu Yi.

or indeed – most strikingly – in the works of other Buddhist masters. So, what caused Daoxuan to launch such a personal attack? Did he feel that Fu Yi’s influence at court was sufficiently extensive to make him a serious threat to Buddhism? In order to answer these questions, we need to turn to Daoxuan’s appraisal of Gaozu, the emperor to whom Fu Yi submitted his proposal.

In marked contrast to his portrait of Fu Yi, Daoxuan never accuses Gaozu of antipathy towards Buddhism. On the contrary, he describes the emperor as an important patron of deep Buddhist faith who ordered the construction of a number of monasteries and even converted one of the capital’s imperial residences into another.<sup>489</sup> Crucially, these celebrations of Gaozu appear almost exclusively in the very passages where Daoxuan disparages Fu Yi,<sup>490</sup> as if to highlight the emperor’s love and respect for Buddhism and the extreme unlikelihood that he would ever do anything to harm it. By presenting the emperor in this way, Daoxuan not only avoids admonishing Gaozu personally but attempts to nurture the relationship between Buddhism and the imperial court. In consequence, he lays all the blame for any repression of Buddhism at Fu Yi’s door and implies that he was motivated not by a desire to help the state or the people (as the astrologer claimed in his proposal), but by a personal, baseless grudge against Buddhist monks.

#### IV.3.4.2 Counter-attacking Fu Yi’s Arguments

In addition to questioning Fu Yi’s personality, in GHMJ Daoxuan enumerates the astrologer’s anti-Buddhist arguments (as outlined in the proposal to Gaozu) and then categorically rejects them.<sup>491</sup> He does not attempt to rebut each accusation in turn and indeed asserts that there is no need to do so, since they have been addressed and disproved many times before. He also remarks that they were written in a haphazard way.<sup>492</sup> Nevertheless, he does offer some specific observations. First, he responds to Fu Yi’s accusation that Buddhist monastics act against the laws of nature because they do not marry and have children by explaining that marriage is linked to desire, and Buddhists’

---

<sup>489</sup> T52.2103j25.283a11–13 and T52.2104j3.379c14–16.

<sup>490</sup> See details at n. 479.

<sup>491</sup> T52.2103j7.134a10–135a3.

<sup>492</sup> T52.2103j7.134b10–12.

conception of desire is different from that of Daoists.<sup>493</sup> In Buddhism, he explains, desire is seen as one of the principal causes of suffering, so Buddhist monastics who avoid it by remaining celibate are acting appropriately.<sup>494</sup> Second, he addresses Fu Yi's complaint that Buddhist monastics show no respect for the emperor by declaring that they should not be obliged to prostrate themselves in his presence, as this would contravene Buddhist teaching. Therefore, once again, their behaviour is entirely in keeping with their beliefs and, hence, appropriate. At first glance, these responses might seem to be relatively straightforward, but they actually display Daoxuan's utter refusal to compromise on any normative issues that contravene Buddhist teaching.

In another passage, this time in one of his *vinaya* commentaries,<sup>495</sup> Daoxuan sharply condemns the suggestion that Buddhism is a 'barbarian' religion:

It is true that since the old days some masters, when they were writing commentaries, frequently employed the terms *hu* ['barbarian'] and *han* ['Han Chinese'] to refer to[, respectively,] the languages of the original texts and the translation. No doubt, these wise masters did this for a good reason. But after careful consideration, [the use of *hu* and *han*] must be avoided, because it discriminates against our ancestors. [Such a practice] is utterly wrong.

自古綴疏，至翻名中，並云，胡音為彼，漢譯為此。智士立言，義不徒發。如斯釋判，沉罔祖宗，全不可也。<sup>496</sup>

---

<sup>493</sup> Daoxuan presents his understanding of Daoist desire at T52.2103j7.134a12–28, where he states that Daoist practitioners marry and raise children. Therefore, their notion of desire is different from that of Buddhists. For a discussion of Daoist elements in Daoxuan's *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, see Elizabeth Kenney, 'Taoist Elements in Further Biographies of Eminent Monks', *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, vol. 47:1 (1998), 19–22; and a study on the believed textual connection between Buddhism and Daoism see, Christine Mollier, *Buddhism and Taoism Face to Face: Scripture, Ritual, and Iconographic Exchange in Medieval China* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008); and for a study on the Daoist and Buddhist interactions during the Northern and Southern dynasties (420–589), a period that Daoxuan makes twice records of the same event in two of his text (e.g., T52.2103j4.112c8–113b16/2104j1.370c18–371c10), see Mark Edward Lewis, *China Between Empires: the Northern and Southern Dynasties* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England, 2009): 196–220. For a study on the culture of sex in China see, among others, Paul Rakita Goldin, *The Culture of Sex in Ancient China* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002), 48–74.

<sup>494</sup> T52.2103j7.134a28.

<sup>495</sup> Hence, this is not a direct response to Fu Yi's proposal. However, as we have seen, Fu Yi makes the same accusation in the third article of his proposal.

<sup>496</sup> W62.340a18–b1/X39.714j1.719b24–25.

Moreover, he points out that the counterpart term for *han* should be *fan* 梵 (literally, *brahma*; a term that is also used in reference to Indian languages), rather than *hu*, because *fan* refers to the true sages and gives an accurate account of their origins.<sup>497</sup> According to Yuanzhao, one of the foremost commentators on Daoxuan's *vinaya* works, Daoxuan means the Buddha when he refers to 'our ancestors' in this passage.<sup>498</sup>

Daoxuan displayed one of the essential characteristics of a *hufa* monk (as outlined by the master himself in his XGSZ) by defending the Buddha-dharma in these texts. However, his *hufa* activity was not restricted to the written word, as we shall see in the next section.

---

<sup>497</sup> W62.340b6–8. For a detailed discussion of *hu* and *fan*, see Daniel Boucher, 'On *Hu* and *Fan* Again: The Transmission of "Barbarian" Manuscripts to China', *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, vol. 23 (2000), 7–28.

<sup>498</sup> W62.340a18–b5.

#### IV.4 Protesting against Gaozong's Decrees

In the previous section, we examined one of Daoxuan's principal *hufa* activities: namely, his counter-attack against Fu Yi's anti-Buddhist proposal. However, he was similarly robust in protesting against a number of decrees that the Emperor Gaozong (r. 649–683) promulgated with the intention of forcing monks to prostrate themselves before himself and other laypeople.<sup>499</sup> In this section, we shall explore the nature of this protest and its consequences.

At the time, Daoxuan was *shangzuo* 上座 of the Ximing monastery and therefore one of that institution's *sangang* 三綱.<sup>500</sup> As we saw in Part II, *shangzuo* is a traditional Buddhist term for the most senior monk in a monastic community,<sup>501</sup> whereas *sangang* does not appear in any Buddhist texts; rather, it was coined only after Buddhism's arrival in China. The earliest extant official document to include the latter term is *Tang liu shu yi* 唐律疏議,<sup>502</sup> which defines *sangang* as the collective noun for the three most senior positions in a monastery: the *shangzuo*, *sizhu* 寺主 and *duweina* 都維那.<sup>503</sup> In its section on officialdom, JTS specifies that the holders of all three positions must possess both *daode gaomiao* 道德高妙 ('high morality') and *wei zhong suo tui* 為眾所推 ('great reputation'), and any candidates for the roles must receive final approval from the *cibu* 祠部 ('Bureau of Sacrifices').<sup>504</sup>

<sup>499</sup> Buddhism faced significant challenges when it made its way from India to China, including whether a Buddhist monk should prostrate himself in front of the emperor and other nobles. Those who were in favour argued that Confucian tradition prescribed that every subject should kneel before his ruler, while those who were against contended that the Buddha's teaching prohibited monastics from prostrating before any member of the laity. Huiyuan 慧遠's (334–416) treatise *Shamen bu jing wangzhe lun* 沙門不敬王者論 (*Monastics Are Not to Prostrate before the Ruler*; T52.2102j5.29c19–32b11) was one of the earliest and best-known works to put the latter case. Sengyou 僧佑's (445–518) *Hongming ji* 弘明集 (*Collection [of Works] on the Promotion and the Spreading [of the Buddha-dharma]*; T52.2102) and Daoxuan's *Guang hongming ji* provide the most comprehensive accounts of the debate between Buddhists and others. For a detailed discussion of this issue, see Eric Reinders, *Buddhist and Christian Responses to the Kowtow Problem in China* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015). Special thanks to T.H. Barrett for drawing my attention to this source.

<sup>500</sup> The literal translations of *shangzuo* and *sangang* are 'head monk' and 'the three hawsers', respectively; see Albert Welter, *The Administration of Buddhism in China* (New York: Cambria Press, 2018), 38–39.

<sup>501</sup> See n. 174.

<sup>502</sup> For a full translation of *Tang liu shu yi*, see Johnson, *The T'ang Code*.

<sup>503</sup> TLSYj6.144.12. The term *da duweina* 大都維那 (literally, 'great *duweina*') appears in the description of a stone inscription dated to the eighth day of the fourth month of the third year of the Xianqing era (658) in *Quantangwen Buyi*, vol. 7, 508a–b. It is unclear why the title was prefixed with 'da', but the intention was probably to bestow extra honour on the deceased monk, and *da duweina* was therefore in all probability, not an actual post.

<sup>504</sup> JTSj44.1885.4–5. There is no mention of *sangang* in the other official Tang history, XTS. See s.v. 'cibu' in Hucker, *Dictionary*, 558.

Whenever a source mentions the three positions, the *shangzuo* is invariably listed first, which suggests that the holder of that title was pre-eminent in his monastery. Indeed, in his *Dasong sengshi lue* 大宋僧史略 (*A Brief History of the Monastic [Compiled in] the Great Song*), Zanning categorically states that ‘the position of *shangzuo* that Daoxuan was appointed to was above *sizhu* and [du]weina’.<sup>505</sup> As such, we may say that Daoxuan was effectively the leader of the Ximing monastery. Furthermore, his appointment to the position of *shangzuo* indicates that he had built a formidable reputation and that the government regarded him as a monk of high morality.

Now that we have established Daoxuan’s elevated position within the monastery, we may proceed to the main topic of this section: his protest against Gaozong’s decrees. In his GHMJ, Daoxuan gives details of the titles and dates of a number of these decrees and his responses to them. To avoid confusion, Table 13 presents all of the titles in *pinyin* and Chinese,<sup>506</sup> while the dates of issue/publication are given in both Chinese era date and Western year. So, for example, the date of the decree *Seng ni bu de shou fumu ji zun zhe libai zhao*, which was issued in the second month of the second year of the Xianqing era (*Xianqing er nian* 顯慶二年), is rendered as ‘2nd month, 2nd year, Xianqing (657)’ in the table.

GHMJ is the most important source of information on this clash between the Chinese government and the country’s Buddhists not only because it was one of the earliest texts to record the dispute but also because the author – Daoxuan – was one of the main protagonists.<sup>507</sup> Nevertheless, alternative accounts of the decrees and related information from other sources are also considered in the discussion that follows.

---

<sup>505</sup> T54.2126j2.245a1–2: *Daoxuan chi wei Ximing si shangzuo lie sizhu weina zhi shang* 道宣勅為西明寺上座列寺主維那之上. Welter, *The Administration of Buddhism in China*, 398, translates the second *shang* 上 in this sentence as ‘ranked above’. However, while the Tang government appointed the *shangzuo* at Ximing, no source uses *pin* 品 (‘rank’) when discussing this position in relation to the other two posts, so I decided to omit the word ‘ranked’ from my translation.

<sup>506</sup> English translations of the titles and bibliographical references will be presented during the subsequent discussion.

<sup>507</sup> Yancong 彥悰 (?–?), a contemporary of Daoxuan, edited a collection titled *Ji shamen bu ying bai su deng shi* 集沙門不應拜俗等事 (*[Reports of and Memorials on] Monks’ Appropriate Etiquette Towards Laypersons*; T52.2108), which recorded Buddhist monks’ relationship with the Chinese court between of 340 and 662. His report on the dispute over Gaozong’s decrees is at T50.2108j3.455c25–j6.474, while his biography is in SGSZ at T50.2061j15.728c15–729a2.

**Table 13: Gaozong's Decrees and Daoxuan's Responses**

1.	<i>Seng ni bu de shou fumu ji zun zhe libai zhao</i> (By Gaozong) 僧尼不得受父母及尊者禮拜詔	2nd month, 2nd year, Xianqing (657) <sup>508</sup>
2.	<i>Shamen deng zhibai jun qin chi</i> (Gaozong) 沙門等致拜君親勅	15th day, 4th month, 2nd year, Longshuo (662)
3.	<i>Shamen buying bai su qi</i> (By Daoxuan) 沙門不應拜俗啟	25th day, 4th month, 2nd year, Longshuo (662)
4.	<i>Shamen buhe bai su qi</i> (Daoxuan) 沙門不合拜俗啟	27th day, 4th month, 2nd year, Longshuo (662)
5.	<i>Xu Fojiao longti shi jian zhu zaifu deng zhuang</i> (Daoxuan) 序佛教隆替事簡諸宰輔等狀	15th day, 5th month, 2nd year, Longshuo (662)
6.	<i>Ting Shamen bai jun zhao</i> (Gaozong) 停沙門拜君詔 <sup>509</sup>	8th day, 6th month, 2nd year, Longshuo (662)
7.	<i>Qing lun bai shi qi</i> (Daoxuan) 請論拜事啟	13th day, 8th month, 2nd year, Longshuo (662) <sup>510</sup>

As Table 13 illustrates, Gaozong issued a decree titled *Seng ni bu de shou fumu ji zun zhe libai zhao* (*Decree: Monks and Nuns Should Not Receive Prostration from Their Parents*) in the second month of the second year of the Xianqing era (657).<sup>511</sup> According to this

<sup>508</sup> Daoxuan does not mention this decree in GHMJ (see discussion below). The title and date of issue are taken from *Tang da zhaoling ji* 唐大詔令集 (*Collection of Imperial Decrees of the Tang*; hereafter TZLJ).

<sup>509</sup> T52.2103j25.289c20–290a6. QTW, j12.148a13–b6, records a decree with identical content under the title *Ling seng dao zhibai fumu zhao* 令僧道致拜父母詔 but gives no date of issue.

<sup>510</sup> This date is not from GHMJ. It is mentioned by Yancong at T52.2108j6.473b7. Eric Reinders, *the Kowtow Problem*, 56, writes ‘Daoxuan’s letter to Wu Zetian of the thirteenth day of the eighth-month 662, protested the requirement to kneel to parents.’ His note (n. 26, p.161) for this sentence reads ‘Dou Lujian, *Jishamen*, 473a–b.’ *Jishamen* is his abbreviation for Yanz(c?)ong’s 彦悰 *Jishamen buying baisu dengshi* (p.58), and the text under question is T52.2108. However, certain issues regarding his statement require attention. First, as far as the 296 primary sources are concerned, Daoxuan never submitted a letter to Wu Zetian. Second, the name Eric cites (at n.26) ‘Dou Lujian’ is also unclear for the following reasons:

1. In (T52.2108j6.) 473a–b, no Chinese words’ pinyin corresponds to Dou Lujian. On the contrary, the immediate official name to 473a–b is Feng Shende 憲神德 (472c25);
2. Yancong has made it very clear that this petition [only has a title and] is not actually written amidst the 662 debate, but written in the 11th year of Zhenguan 貞觀 (637), 472c27;
3. Wu Zetian does not appear in the passage;
4. Daoxuan does not appear in the passage, but his petition (to Yang) indeed follows (473a–473b7).

Eric gives a list of the officials (p.149; extracted from Yancong’s *Jishamen*) and again mentions Dou Lujian (number 6, p.150). In this case, his reference is a petition in ‘juan 5.465a’. The petition itself goes from [juan 5].467a2–12. However, neither Daoxuan nor Wu Zetian is mentioned. In our list, extracted from QTW (1814, 290), we have three men carry the surname of Lu 盧 (numbers 6, 35, and 48 in appendix 14), and none of them refers to Daoxuan or Wu Zetian in their respective petitions. Notwithstanding a possible misinformation in the concerned sentences, however, Eric’s book is no doubt one of most illuminating pieces on the etiquette debates between the emperors and monks of China, especially the one that Daoxuan participated in 662, 51–75.

<sup>511</sup> TZLJ, j113.587.6–9. QTW, j12.147a3–9, records a decree with almost identical content, although the last sentence of the TZLJ version – *suosi ming wei fazhi ji yi jinduan* 所司明為法制即宜禁斷 (‘on the implementation of this decree, the responsible government departments must take action to [ensure that the proscribed practices are] stopped’) – does not appear in QTW. See also THYj47.836.8–11.

decree, the teachings of the Buddha and Confucius were congruent on the subject of hierarchy, be it in a relationship between parents (*fumu* 父母) and their son (*zi* 子) or between the emperor (*jun* 君) and his subjects (*chen* 臣). Therefore, the practice of parents and *zun zhe* (literally, ‘the respectable’) prostrating themselves before monks must cease. The decree does not specify who this *zun zhe* might be, but given its parallel structure – parents–son and emperor–subjects – in all probability the term signifies the emperor in particular and his imperial household in general. In other words, it seems that Gaozong instructed the parents of monks and members of China’s elite to stop prostrating themselves before monastics.

However, there is no evidence of this decree in any of the Buddhist sources, including GHMJ,<sup>512</sup> so it is impossible to determine either its impact or the reaction of the Chinese Buddhist community. Hence, we can only speculate why Daoxuan did not feel the need to counter (or even mention) this decree in his writings, given his active opposition to other anti-Buddhist decrees. Perhaps it was never enforced? Maybe Daoxuan was not aware of it if it was issued during his period of solitude on Zhongnan Mountain?<sup>513</sup> Or maybe he simply felt that prostration was not a particularly important issue? Whatever the explanation may be, on this occasion, he chose to keep his counsel. Five years later, when the emperor promulgated a second decree, Daoxuan’s attitude was very different.

According to GHMJ, Gaozong issued *Shamen deng zhibai jun qin chi* (*Order: Monks Must Prostrate Themselves before the Emperor and Their Parents*) on the fifteenth day of the fourth month of the second year of the Longshuo era (662).<sup>514</sup> The decree stipulates that all monks are now required to prostrate themselves before the emperor (*jun* 君), the empress (*huanghou* 皇后), the crown prince (*huangtaizi* 皇太子) and their own parents (*fumu* 父母). Gaozong justified this command on the basis that it was ‘right to

---

<sup>512</sup> An online search of the contents of this decree at SAT yielded no results.

<sup>513</sup> Daoxuan lived in solitude on Zhongnan Mountain from 645 until 657; the month when he emerged is not known.

<sup>514</sup> T52.2103j25.284.15–25. QTW, j14.164b18–165a7, records a decree with identical content under the title *Ming yousi yi shamen deng zhibai jun qin chi* 命有司議沙門等致拜君親敕, although it gives no date of issue. See also T52.2108j3.455a23–b6.

exercise power [over monks] because, as the emperor, [he was] entrusted [by the Buddha] to implement [rules].<sup>515</sup>

It is unclear whether this decree was entirely unconnected with *Seng ni bu de shou fumu ji zun zhe libai zhao* or whether the emperor's intention was always to test the water with the earlier edict and then go much further if it generated little opposition (as seemed to be the case). Either way, even though he claimed the position of the Buddha's trustee on earth in the later decree, Gaozong did not insist on its immediate enforcement. Rather, he sent it to the relevant government departments and asked for their opinions. The officials responded swiftly but so did the monks by marching in protest against the decree and voicing their objections in several petitions. The number of protestors, both monastic and lay, was unprecedented. According to Daoxuan, some 200 monks demonstrated outside the emperor's official residence, the Penglai Palace 蓬萊宮,<sup>516</sup> just six days after the decree was issued.<sup>517</sup> Meanwhile, a total of 893 government officials expressed their views in yet more petitions to the emperor.<sup>518</sup>

After the demonstration, the protesting monks and other monastics gathered at the Ximing monastery. None of the sources offers any clue as to why this particular venue was chosen. Perhaps Daoxuan, as *shangzuo*, took it upon himself to invite the protestors to the monastery? Perhaps he participated in the demonstration himself – or maybe even organized it – and he and the rest of the demonstrators simply returned to their starting point once they had delivered their petition? Either way, after arriving at Ximing, all of the monks, including Daoxuan, ‘discussed the situation and decided to send joint letters to

---

<sup>515</sup> T52.2103j25.284.15: ‘*Lian he zhi hua fu yi guowang caizhi zhi you liang gui si yi* 連河之化付以國王裁制之由諒歸斯矣’. *Lian he* 連河 is a common abbreviation for *Nilian he* 尼連河/*Xilian he* 熙連河/*Xilian he* 希連河/*Nilian he* 泥連河, all of which are Chinese transliterations of *Nairājanā* – the river that flows alongside the place where Siddhārtha Gautama attained enlightenment and became known as the Buddha. Consequently, *Lian he* is often used as a synonym for ‘the Buddha’ or ‘the Buddha’s teaching’ in Chinese Buddhist texts.

<sup>516</sup> The Penglai Palace was situated in the north-east of Chang'an. It acquired its name in 662 (JTSj4.83.6 and XTSj3.62.4) and thereafter became Gaozong’s official residence.

<sup>517</sup> The protestors submitted a petition drafted by a monk named Weixiu 威秀 of the Da Zhuangyan monastery. Little is known of him as his name appears in the *Taishō* collection only in connection with this protest. The Da Zhuangyan monastery was built in the Kaihuang era (581–600) and was situated in the south-west corner of Chang'an. See LBCAj5.133.11–15 and T50.2050j1.195a13–17.

<sup>518</sup> I calculated this figure on the basis of Daoxuan’s account. At T52.2103j25.289b8–9 (see also T52.2108j6.472a4) he writes that *wubai sanshijiū ren* 五百三十九人 (‘539 officials’) petitioned against the proposal that monks should prostrate themselves before laypeople, while at T52.2103j25.289c2 (see also T52.2108j6.472a27) he writes that *sanbai wushisi ren* 三百五十四人 (‘354 officials’) argued that monks should kneel before the laypeople listed in the decree. On the other hand, neither Daoxuan nor any other author provides the names of any of these officials. I have been able to identify only 59 of them. See appendix 14 for their names.

the ministers and the officials so their voice would be heard'.<sup>519</sup> Three such letters were subsequently written and delivered (numbers 3–5 in Table 13). All three begin, ‘*seng Daoxuan deng qi* 僧道宣等啟’ (literally, ‘for your consideration, submitted by the monk Daoxuan and others’), which indicates that Daoxuan was now not only the head monk (*shangzuo*) of the Ximing monastery but also the leader of all the protestors who had assembled there. According to Daoxuan, he was writing on behalf of more than 300 monks.<sup>520</sup>

The first letter (number 3 in Table 11) was sent to Li Xian 李賢 (654–684),<sup>521</sup> the second son of the Emperor Gaozong and the Empress Wu Zetian 武則天 (624–705) on the twenty-fifth day of the fourth month in 662. It was titled *Shamen buying bai su qi* (*Petition: Monks Should Not Prostrate Themselves before Laypeople*).<sup>522</sup> The second letter (number 4 in Table 13) was sent to Rong Guofuren Yang 榮國夫人楊氏,<sup>523</sup> the empress’s mother, two days later. It was titled *Shamen buhe bai su qi* (*Petition: It is Inappropriate for Monks to Prostrate Themselves before Laypeople*).<sup>524</sup> The third letter (number 5 in Table 13) was a foreword, titled *Xu Fojiao longti shi jian zhu zaifu deng Zhuang* (*Foreword to the Miscellaneous Anthology on the Rise and Fall of Buddhism, Submitted for the Consideration of Ministers and Officials*). It was submitted together with anthology (now lost) on the fifteenth day of the fifth month in 662.

It seems that the letters were not only widely distributed around the court but received a positive reception, if one official’s response is any guide:

---

<sup>519</sup> T52.2103j25c.2842–3: *da ji Ximing xiang yu mouyi gong cheng qizhuang wen zhu liaocai* 大集西明相與謀議共陳啟狀聞諸寮室.

<sup>520</sup> T52.2103j25.286b26/2108j3.457c14.

<sup>521</sup> The name Li Xian does not appear in the letter itself. Rather, it is addressed to: *Yongzhou mu pei wang* 雍州牧沛王 (‘Prince Pei, the Metropolitan Governor of Yong’). Three of Gaozong’s sons held the title Metropolitan Governor of Yong during the emperor’s reign, but Li Xian served in that role from 656 to 672. See his biographies at JTSj81.3590.9–3591.9 and XTSj86.2831.8–2832.13.

<sup>522</sup> T52.2103j25.284c4–25; see also T52.2108j3.455c12–456a4 and QTWj909.9483a7–b5.

<sup>523</sup> According to JTSj43.1821.7–8 and XTSj46.1188.13, *guofuren* 國夫人 (literally, ‘country, consort’) was a Tang-era title that was conferred on the mothers and wives of first-rank officials and dukes (*yiping ji guogong mu qi* 一品及國公母妻). It was often prefixed with another character, such as *rong* 榮 (literally, ‘honour’). However, Yang’s title does not fit the definition provided by JTS and XTS as she was neither the mother nor the wife of a first-rank official or a duke. Rather, she was made a *guofuren* because she was the mother of the Empress Wu. Therefore, I decided not to translate her title into English. According to JTSj183.4727.12 and XTSj206.5836.4, Yang was given the title *guofuren* when Wu Zetian became empress in 655.

<sup>524</sup> T52.2103j25.284c26–285a22; see also T52.2108j6.456a5–b1 and QTWj909.9484a8–b8.

The letters of the honourable [Dao]xuan were thorough and to the point. I could not agree more. In our time, who is taking the dissemination of the Buddha-dharma as his own responsibility? Who is shouldering the burden to help the Buddha-dharma from declining? Who is able to spread the Buddha's teaching amid harsh conditions? [Daoxuan] is exactly such a person.

宣公之啟狀，詳切該博，吾無間然。方今以大法為已任，思正其傾危，能負重道遠者，此其人也歟。<sup>525</sup>

Such a reaction is understandable, given Daoxuan's eloquence – one of the reasons why he had been selected to join Xuanzang's translation team some seventeen years earlier.<sup>526</sup> There is no doubt that he knew how to formulate a highly articulate and convincing argument. But that raises the question why the first two letters were not addressed to the emperor himself, nor even to one of his powerful ministers, but to the empress's mother and Gaozong's younger son, who was only eight years old at the time. Both Yang and Li Xian were faithful Buddhist lay followers, as the letters indicate, but was that sufficient reason to petition them for help? Probably not, in itself. However, if we bring Yang's daughter and Li Xian's mother – the Empress Wu Zetian – into the equation, the monks' choice of addressees suddenly becomes far more logical and, indeed, ingenious, because both JTS and XTS assert that the empress enjoyed enormous power at court, to the extent of having the final say on every piece of legislation after the end of the Xianqing era (661).<sup>527</sup> Hence, it is safe to assume that she played a central role in the issuing of *Ting Shamen bai jun zhao* (*Decree: Monks Are No Longer Required to Prostrate Themselves before the Emperor*; number 6 in Table 13) on the eighth day of the sixth month in 662.<sup>528</sup> In other words, if the monks intended to use Li Xian and Yang as conduits to deliver their message to Wu Zetian, it seems their plan worked.

However, *Ting Shamen bai jun zhao* represented only a partial victory for Daoxuan and his fellow monks. In their letters, they had argued that monastics should not be obliged to prostrate themselves before *any* layperson. Now, in his latest decree, the

<sup>525</sup> QTWj189.1913b17–18.

<sup>526</sup> For Daoxuan's role in the translation team, see III.4.5.2.1.

<sup>527</sup> JTSj6.115.14–15 and XTSj4.81.11–14.

<sup>528</sup> T52.2103j25.290a4–6; see also T52.2108j6.472b17–472c6 and QTWj12.148b4–5.

emperor had magnanimously freed them from their obligation to prostrate themselves before *him*, and indeed other members of the imperial household, but the stipulation that they must kneel before their parents remained. Furthermore, in contrast to the consultation process that had followed the issuing of the earlier decree (number 2 in Table 11), this time Gaozong decided that no discussion was necessary and ordered the relevant government departments to enforce the new rule immediately.

In response, Daoxuan and his fellow monks sent one more letter to Yang on the thirteenth day of the eighth month in 662,<sup>529</sup> titled *Qing lun bai shi qi* (*Petition: For Your Kind Consideration, Discussion on the Issue of Prostrating before Laypeople*; number 7 in Table 13).<sup>530</sup> In addition to praising Gaozong's recent decree, Daoxuan informed Yang that he was concerned that monks would become no different from laypeople if they were forced to prostrate themselves before their parents.<sup>531</sup> Therefore, he was asking for her help on the matter.

Unfortunately, none of the sources contains any information with respect to the reception this letter received, whether it provoked a reaction, or indeed whether Daoxuan continued his campaign by writing more petitions in the final five years of his life. Hence, we must assume that the monks' protest concluded at this point, with some of their aims left unfulfilled. Nevertheless, while Daoxuan and his fellow monks had failed to secure a total victory, they had risen to the defence of the Buddha-dharma and had drawn a clear line in the sand regarding the relationship between monks and emperors. As the leader of this campaign, Daoxuan truly merited the title *hufa* master.

However, as we have seen, Daoxuan believed there was one further aspect of *hufa* activity: unshakeable commitment to and promotion of *vinaya*. This is evident in the following passage from his petition to Li Xian (number 3 in Table 13):

Great is the number of Buddhists, so it is difficult to identify them all. [Some of them] are reckless and have recently committed a crime. [This must have] clouded the emperor's opinion [of monks]. Now, [the emperor

<sup>529</sup> T52.2108j6.473b7.

<sup>530</sup> T52.2103j25.290b22–c4; see also QTWj909.9483b18–9484a7. The title in QTW is: *Shang Rong Guofuren Yang shi lun bai qin wuyi qi* 上榮國夫人楊氏論拜親無益啟 (*Petition Submitted for the Consideration of Rong Guofuren Yang on the Issue that Prostrating before a Layperson is Not Conducive*).

<sup>531</sup> T52.2103j25.290c1/2108j6.473b3 and QTWj909.9484a4–5.

has] issued this unusual decree ordering [monks] to prostrate themselves in front of him and the parents [of the monks]. Nevertheless, [His Majesty is] merciful because [he has allowed the decree to be] discussed. We, the monks, having heard the emperor's clear command, broke into tears [because] the poor behaviour of [some] monks caused the emperor concern.

頃以法海宏曠，類聚難分，過犯滋彰，冒呈禦覽。下非常之詔，令拜君親，垂惻隱之懷，顯疏朝議。僧等荷斯明命，感悼涕零。良由行闕光時，遂令上霑優被。<sup>532</sup>

As this passage indicates, Daoxuan felt that monks' misbehaviour incited the emperor to issue *Shamen deng zhibai jun qin chi*, with the clear implication being that he would not have done so if the Buddhist community had remained untainted. Interestingly, Gaozong attributes no such blame to the monastic community in the decree itself, and no other source suggests that the directive was triggered by monks' misconduct. Yet, Daoxuan's conclusion is entirely consistent with the attitude he displays throughout his work: that is, corruption of the Buddha-dharma provokes external attacks against Buddhism. For example, more than thirty years earlier, when Daoxuan had challenged Fu Yi's anti-Buddhist proposal, he had stressed that the Buddha-dharma would be protected from harm if the monks lived in accordance with *vinaya* principles.<sup>533</sup> In other words, he felt that *vinaya* was an essential component of *hufa*.

Moreover, in *Xingshi chao*, Daoxuan highlights the crucial and indispensable role that *vinaya* plays in the spiritual development of every monk. Indeed, he terms it '*incomparable (mo deng 莫等)*'.<sup>534</sup> Therefore, it should come as no surprise that this eminent *hufa* master chose *vinaya* as the subject of his very first work as well as numerous other texts throughout his life. In the next section, we shall explore how he attempted to promote its principles among his fellow monks.

<sup>532</sup> T52.2103j25.284c11–14/2108j3.455c19–22 and QTWj909.9483a12–15.

<sup>533</sup> See Daoxuan's fight against Fu Yi's anti-Buddhist proposal at IV.3.2.

<sup>534</sup> T40.1804j1.1a7.

## IV.5 Promoting *Vinaya*

This section focuses on one of the most important aspects of Daoxuan's *hufa* activity: namely, his promotion of *vinaya*. After a brief discussion of the *vinaya* texts that were available to Daoxuan during the composition of his own *vinaya* works, I shall explore his attempts to establish *Sifen lü* 四分律 throughout China, the arguments he advanced in support of the notion that *Sifen lü* is Mahāyāna, and his construction of a *jieta* 戒壇 (full ordination platform). The section concludes with an assessment of Daoxuan's success in promoting *vinaya* through these various actions.

### IV.5.1 Daoxuan's Source Material for His *Vinaya* Works

Daoxuan had access to Chinese translations of four *vinaya* texts (*lüzang* 律藏), for which he uses the collective term *si lü* 四律 (literally, ‘four *vinayas*’) throughout his writings.<sup>535</sup> Table 14 lists these four texts, the abbreviations that Daoxuan uses most frequently when citing them in his own works, and the number of times he cites them in his most important *vinaya* commentary, *Xingshi chao*.<sup>536</sup>

<sup>535</sup> T40.1804j1.25a21. Kuiji 窺基 (632–682) coined the term *si lü wu lun* 四律五論 (literally, ‘four *vinayas* five commentaries’) in reference to the Indian *vinaya* texts and commentaries in his *Dacheng fayuan yilin zhang* 大乘法苑義林章 (*Chapters on Various Topics of the Teaching of Mahāyāna*), at T45.1861j303.c27. Yuanzhao (in ZCJ; c. 1075, 130), T40.1805j1.158b3/j4.217c19, and Gyōnen 凝然 (in *Bommōkaihon sho nichiju shō* 梵網戒本疏目珠鈔; 1318, 197), T62.2247j3.20b4, use an even shorter abbreviation – *si wu shi qi* 四五十祇 – when referring to the four *vinayas*.

<sup>536</sup> For more information on the history of *vinaya*, see Ann Heirman and Stephan Peter Bumbacher (eds), *The Spread of Buddhism* (Leiden: Brill, 2007); and Akira Hirakawa 平川彰, *Ritsuzō no kenkyū* (律藏の研究; Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1999–2000).

**Table 14: The Four *Vinaya* Texts**

	Abbreviation	Number of Mentions in <i>Xingshi chao</i>	Indian Title	Taishō Collection Number
1	<i>Wufen lü</i> 五分律	290	<i>Mahīsasaka vinaya</i>	T22.1421
2	<i>Sengqi lü</i> 僧祇律	495	<i>Mahāsāṃghika vinaya</i>	T22.1425
3	<i>Sifen lü</i> 四分律	526	<i>Dharmaguptaka vinaya</i>	T22.1428
4	<i>Shisong lü</i> 十誦律	417	<i>Sarvāstivāda vinaya</i>	T23.1435

Daoxuan regards these Indian texts as *zheng ben* 正本 (literally, ‘the true scriptures’),<sup>537</sup> and he cites all four of them extensively in both *Xingshi chao* and his other *vinaya* works (numbers 1–12 in Table 3). However, while he acknowledges that they are all authentic, he does not give them equal weight. As Table 14 indicates, he cites *Sifen lü* (*Dharmaguptaka vinaya*) more often than the other three texts in *Xingshi chao*, and indeed expresses his intention to ‘establish [its] primacy’.<sup>538</sup>

<sup>537</sup> T40.1804j1.3b23.

<sup>538</sup> T40.1804j1.2b19: *li Sifen wei ben* 立四分為本.

## IV.5.2 Daoxuan's *Vinaya*

### IV.5.2.1 Establishing *Sifen lü* as the Principal *Vinaya* Text

All four of the Indian *vinaya* texts are voluminous. However, in his promotion of *vinaya*, Daoxuan focuses primarily on two aspects of these works: *jies* 戒 (*prātimokṣa*; stipulations) and *jiemos* 翹磨 (*karman*; acts). Individual stipulations and acts are often prefixed with the title of the *vinaya* text in which they appear, such as ‘*Sifen lü prātimokṣa*’ or ‘*Sengqi lü karman*’. Among the many *Sifen lü jiemos*, *shou jie jiemo* 受戒翹磨 (*upasampadā karman*; the act of bestowing full ordination) is the most relevant to Daoxuan’s attempt to establish the primacy of *Sifen lü*. In JMS (648, 7), he declares:

A monk’s *upasampadā karman* and *prātimokṣa* must come from the same *vinaya*, and there should be no debate about this. However, in China, while the *Sifen lü upasampadā karman* has always been used for full ordination, the *prātimokṣa* that is followed is not from that *vinaya*.

如戒一受，願行須同，焉有受依假宗，隨行實教。故神州一統，約受，竝誦四分之文。及論隨行，皆依有部行學。<sup>539</sup>

Here, Daoxuan stresses that there must be consistency between *upasampadā karman* and *prātimokṣa*. Hence, if a monk’s full ordination ceremony corresponds to the *Sifen lü upasampadā karman*, thereafter that monk should observe the *Sifen lü prātimokṣa*. Some four centuries later, Yuanzhao 元照 (1048–1116), one of the chief commentators on Daoxuan’s *vinaya* works, supported the master’s statement in his commentary on JMS:

The very first full ordination was conducted with [the *upasampadā karman*] of *Sifen lü*. Ever since, until the present day, [the *Sifen lü upasampadā karman*] has been faithfully observed [during full ordination ceremonies]

<sup>539</sup> W64.850j15b2–4 (see also X41.728j3.254a2–4). At W64.850j15b7 (see also X41.728j3.254a6), Yuanzhao explains that *yuan* and *xing* are synonyms of *shou* and *sui*, respectively: *yuan xing ji shi shou sui* 願行即是受隨. In his *vinaya* commentaries, Daoxuan often uses *shou* and *sui* in reference to *upasampadā karman* and *prātimokṣa*, respectively.

throughout China.<sup>540</sup> The other *vinayas'* [*upasampadā karmans*] were subsequently translated, but [I have] never heard [any of them] used [during a ceremony].

依四分宗，始行受戒。自此至今天下同遵。他部雖翻，未聞有用。<sup>541</sup>

Significantly, in this passage, Yuanzhao does not simply reiterate Daoxuan's account; rather, he supplements and confirms it with his own eyewitness testimony. In other words, both Daoxuan and Yuanzhao present the use of the *Sifen lü upasampadā karman* for the full ordination ceremony as historical fact throughout China from the moment of Buddhism's arrival in the country. Moreover, many other works in the *Taishō* collection concur that the *first* Chinese full ordination ceremony was indeed conducted in accordance with the *Sifen lü upasampadā karman*.<sup>542</sup> However, it is difficult to confirm that this *upasampadā karman* – and none of the alternatives from the other *vinaya* texts – was subsequently used ‘throughout China’, as Yuanzhao claims. Although numerous full ordinations spanning several centuries are recorded in the *Taishō* collection, only the first is ever linked to a specific *upasampadā karman*. Whenever later ceremonies are described, the text simply states that the monk or monks have been ‘fully ordained’.<sup>543</sup>

It should be stressed that this lack of specificity in the rest of the *Taishō* collection in no way undermines the credibility of Daoxuan's statement regarding the ubiquitous use of the *Sifen lü upasampadā karman* for full ordination ceremonies in China. Indeed, while there is an absence of evidence in support of his claim, there is equally no evidence to the contrary. The more important point is that Daoxuan's intention was to promote *vinaya* and therefore fulfil one of his main responsibilities as a *hufa* monk. He chose *Sifen lü* as the principal Chinese Buddhist *vinaya* simply because he had only ever witnessed full

<sup>540</sup> *Shenzhou yi ting yue shou bing song Sifen zhi wen* 神州一統約受並誦四分之文. An identical passage appears in a text titled *Biao wu biao zhang quanyao chao* 表無表章全要鈔 ([http://cbetaonline.dila.edu.tw/zh/D8888\\_001](http://cbetaonline.dila.edu.tw/zh/D8888_001)). The latter text is often attributed to the Tang-era monk Kuiji. However, it contains Japanese Katakana syllabaries and the Japanese-era name Hong'an 弘安 (1278–1288), so Kuiji could not have been the author. In all probability, *Biao wu biao zhang quanyao chao* is a commentary on one of the chapters in Kuiji's *Dacheng fayuan yilin zhang*, at T45.1861j3.299a12–315c27.

<sup>541</sup> W64.850j15b9–10 (see also X41.728j3.254a9–10).

<sup>542</sup> Among others, Daoshi (FYZL, T53.2122j89.944c13–20) states that the *Sifen lü upasampadā karman* was used for the first full ordination in China, and Buan 豐安 agrees in *Kairitsu denrai ki* 戒律傳來記 (*History of the Introduction of Vinaya [to Japan]*; 830, 66), at T74.2347j1.2b9–10. See also D105.3j1.3b3.

<sup>543</sup> A number of phrases are used for full ordination in the *Taishō* collection, including: *ju zu* 具足, *shou jujie* 受具戒, *jin ju* 進具, *dajie* 大戒, *shou jie* 受戒 and *shou dajie* 受大戒.

ordination in accordance with the *Sifen lü upasampadā karman* in China. Given the consistency between *upasampadā karman* and *prātimokṣa*, Daoxuan insists that all Chinese monks should, therefore, adhere to the *Sifen lü prātimokṣa*.

Crucially, though, while Daoxuan repeatedly asserts the primacy of *Sifen lü* in China, he does not advocate the abandonment of the other three *vinaya* texts. For instance, in *Xingshi chao*, he states:

[I wish to] establish *Sifen [lì]* as the principal [*vinaya*]. On the other hand, when circumstances demand consultation of the other *vinaya* texts in order to administer [monastic] affairs, they should indeed be taken into consideration.

今立四分為本。若行事之時，必須用諸部者，不可不用。<sup>544</sup>

Clearly, then, Daoxuan does not oppose Chinese monastics' use of the other *vinaya* texts. On the contrary, he advocates a principle-based, inclusive attitude towards *vinaya*. His message is twofold: *vinaya* must be honoured, and a monk who is fully ordained in accordance with the *Sifen lü upasampadā karman* may refer to the other *vinaya* texts as long as he continues to respect the primacy of *Sifen lü*.

---

<sup>544</sup> T40.1804j1.2b19–20.

## IV.5.2.2 Proving that *Sifen Lü* is Mahāyāna

### IV.5.2.2.1 Five Pieces of Evidence

In addition to his efforts to establish *Sifen lü* as the principal *vinaya* within China, Daoxuan presents five pieces of evidence in support of his claim that this *vinaya* is Mahāyāna.<sup>545</sup> In *Jiemo shu* (c. 650, 8), he summarizes his case as follows:

*Sifen lü* is clearly Mahāyāna [for the following reasons.]

[First,] the *arhat* Dravya [Mallaputra]<sup>546</sup> displays discontent over his current spiritual status. Why is this the case? Because [he] knows [that his *arhat* status is] insecure. [Second,] the merits [that are accumulated while reciting the *Prātimokṣa*] are deliberately directed to the eventual Buddhahood of all sentient beings. Why is this the case? Because other spiritual statuses are undesirable. [Third,] a monk is addressed as *fozi* [literally, ‘the Buddha’s son’]. Why is this the case? Because there is no other spiritual status [aside from Buddhahood]. [Fourth,] using someone’s abandoned property is not a grave offence [i.e. it does not amount to stealing]. Why is this the case? Because [the rule on this matter] is [premised on] intent. [Fifth, in *Sifen lü*,] objects are not perceived by the senses but by [a monk’s] consciousness. Why is this the case? Because the complete teaching [of the Buddha] speaks of the consciousness. These few examples show that [*Sifen lü*] is entirely different from Hīnayāna. How can [these five pieces of evidence] be ignored?

何況四分通明佛乘。故彌陀厭無學，知非牢固也。施生成佛道，知餘非向也。相召為佛子，知無異乘也。捨財用非重，知心虛通也。塵境非根曉，知識了義也。略引成證，全乖小道，何得不思。<sup>547</sup>

<sup>545</sup> Mahāyāna (Dacheng 大乘) is generally viewed as a branch of Buddhism that includes the key doctrines of the perfection of wisdom, the three bodies of a Buddha, the ultimate attainment of Buddhahood, and so on. See s.v. Mahāyāna PBD, 513. Note that PBD’s pinyin for 大乘 is *dasheng*.

<sup>546</sup> See n. 201. For more information on Dravya and his role in Buddhist monastic administration see Sasaki Michinobu 佐々木理信, ‘Dabba-Mallaputta (陀驃摩羅子) と佛教教團生活営為’, 印度学仏教学研究, vol. 26: 2 (1978), 869–871.

<sup>547</sup> W64j16.865a3–6. See also X41.728j3.261a22–b1.

As far as I am aware, Daoxuan was the first Buddhist master to present these five pieces of evidence from *Sifen lü* in support of the theory that this *vinaya* text is Mahāyāna.<sup>548</sup> However, as the extract indicates, Daoxuan himself is extremely laconic on the subject. Therefore, the following discussion of the passage from *Jiemo shu* (hereafter termed ‘the evidence passage’) makes repeated reference to Yuanzhao’s commentary and elaboration.<sup>549</sup>

The source of Daoxuan’s first piece of evidence is the commentary on the eighth *saṃghāvaśeṣa* rule:

After attaining his arhatship, it happens that the *arhat* Dravya Mallaputra lives in contemplation in a place of serenity. A thought occurs to him and [he] says to himself: ‘This body is insecure. Are there any effective means to become secure? I shall labour to serve [the *saṃgha*.]’

婆摩羅子得阿羅漢，在靜處思惟，心自念言，此身不牢固，我今當以何方便求牢固法耶。復作是念，我今宣可以力供養。<sup>550</sup>

Note that this story of an *arhat* who decides to labour in support of the *saṃgha* appears in all four *vinaya* texts,<sup>551</sup> but the terms ‘body’, ‘insecure’ and ‘secure’ are unique to *Sifen lü*.

<sup>548</sup> At T40.1804j3.26b9–10, having again declared that *Sifen lü* is Mahāyāna, Daoxuan refers to Huiguang 慧光 (469–538). However, he does not articulate the earlier master’s reasoning, and Huiguang’s works have been lost, so there is no hard evidence to suggest that anyone explicitly declared that *Sifen lü* is Mahāyāna prior to Daoxuan. He provides a biography of Huiguang in *Xu gaoseng zhuan* (T50.2060j21.607b18–608b29) and refers to him as *Guang shi* 光師 (literally, ‘Master Guang’) in his *vinaya* commentaries, presumably to indicate his deep personal respect for a man whom he considers the key figure in ‘laying the foundation for the dissemination of *Sifen lü* [throughout China]’ (*Sifen yi bu cao chuang ji zi* 四分一部草創基茲; T50.2060j21.607c22). In addition to the preceding extract from *Jiemo shu*, Daoxuan declares that ‘*Sifen lü* is Mahāyāna’ on at least other three occasions: at T40.1804j3.26b7, W64.j16.854a17 (see also X41.728j3.255c24) and W64j16.863b8 (see also X41.728j3.260b21). However, he does not cite the five pieces of evidence, nor try to explain why *Sifen lü* is Mahāyāna, in any of these works.

<sup>549</sup> As far as I am aware, Yuanzhao is the only sub-commentator on Daoxuan’s commentaries who attempts to explain the five pieces of evidence. By way of contrast, in his *Sifen lü shu shi zong yi ji* 四分律疏飾宗義記 (*For the Decoration of the School: Study on [Fali’s] Sifen Lü Commentary*; c. 711, 42), W66.487j7b13 (see also X42.733j7.243b17), Dingbin 定賓, a Kaiyuan-era 開元 (713–741) *vinaya* master and seemingly a supporter of Fali’s *Sifen Lü* commentary (T50.2061j14.793a2–3), bluntly asserts that Daoxuan’s theory that *Sifen lü* is Mahāyāna is a ‘grave mistake’ (*da shi* 大失). However, he does not elaborate on the reason for his scepticism.

<sup>550</sup> T22.1428j3.587a26–28.

<sup>551</sup> The name of the *arhat* varies across the texts. In *Wufen lü* (T22.1421j3.15a8–14) he is named Tuopolishizi 陀婆力士子; in *Sengqi lü* (T22.1425j6.a19–20) he is Tuobiaomoluozhi 陀驃摩羅子; and in *Shisong lü* (T23.1435j4.22a8–9) he is Tuobiaolishizi 陀驃力士子.

Furthermore, only this text explicitly states that Dravya Mallaputra has attained the spiritual status of arhatship at the point of his decision and that his body (*shen* 身) is insecure. Neither *Sifen lü* nor Daoxuan's commentary specifies what might constitute security, but in the evidence passage Daoxuan leaves no doubt that Dravya Mallaputra's insecurity is due to his spiritual status – his arhatship. Yuanzhao attempts to clarify by suggesting that 'Bodhisattva teaching' (*pusa fa* 菩薩法) results in security.<sup>552</sup>

The second piece of evidence, which forms part of the *Sifen lü prātimokṣa*, is the sole appearance of the term *fodao* 佛道 (literally, 'Buddhahood') in the four *vinaya* texts.<sup>553</sup> By contrast, the third piece of evidence – that a monk should be addressed as *fozi* 佛子 (literally, 'the Buddha's son') – appears in *Sengqi lü* as well as *Sifen lü*.<sup>554</sup> According to Yuanzhao, this term is routinely used in Mahāyāna *vinayas* that are promulgated for the attainment of *focheng* 佛乘 (Buddhahood);<sup>555</sup> therefore, *Sifen lü* is Mahāyāna.

The fourth piece of evidence is *she cai yong fei zhong* 捨財用非重, in which the literal translation of the first two characters is 'abandoned property'.<sup>556</sup> Yuanzhao discusses this piece of evidence with reference to one monastic possession – the *yi* (*cīvara*; 'monastic robe') – in the context of the first *nihsargika pācittika* rule.<sup>557</sup> This states that a fully ordained monk is permitted to possess only three robes at a time. He is also allowed to collect cloth in order to make a new robe if one of his three garments becomes threadbare, but he is not permitted to keep this material indefinitely. (The four *vinayas* specify different periods of time within which the cloth must be turned into a robe, with *Sifen lü* prescribing a maximum of ten days.) Therefore, according to *Sifen lü*, a monk is in violation of the first *nihsargika pācittika* rule if he has failed to fashion a new robe ten

<sup>552</sup> W64.865j16a11. See also X41.728j3.261b6.

<sup>553</sup> T22.1430j1.1030c9. See also T22.1429j1.1029a10.

<sup>554</sup> T22.1428j1.568a26/1425j1.227a19. Note that *fozi* appears in another context in both of these *vinaya* texts, but specifically in reference to Rāhula 罗睺罗, the Buddha's only son.

<sup>555</sup> W64.865j16b1/X41.728j3.261b14. At W64.865j16a17/X41.728j3.261b12, Yuanzhao cites *Fan wang jing* 梵網經 (*Brahmājālaūtra?*) as an example of a Mahāyāna *vinaya* (*dacheng lü* 大乘律). According to tradition, Kumārajīva (344–413) was the translator of *Fan wang jing* (T24.1484), although some scholars view it as apocryphal. For more information, see: Ishida Mizumaro 石田瑞麿, *Bonmōkyō* 梵網經 (Tokyo: Daizō Shuppansha, 1971); Paul Groner, 'The *Fan-wang ching* and the Monastic Discipline in Japanese *Tendai*: A Study of Annen's *Futsū jubosatsukai kōshaku*', in Robert E. Buswell (ed.), *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1990), 251–290.

<sup>556</sup> In the *vinaya* texts, the *nihsargika pācittika* rules cover the use of various possessions and specify which of them a monk may abandon and how. They are listed at: T22.1421j4.23a13–37b6 (*Wufen lü*), T22.1425j8.291a16 (*Sengqi lü*), T22.1428j6.601–633b29 (*Sifen lü*) and T23.1435j5.29c26–63b8 (*Shisong lü*).

<sup>557</sup> W64.865j16b1–2. See also X41.728j3.261b14–15.

days after starting to gather material. At dawn on the tenth day, he must abandon all of the cloth he has amassed over the previous nine days and request forgiveness for his transgression in the presence of his fellow monks. However, these monks are then instructed to return the cloth to the repentant monk, because the aim of the rule is to counteract greed within the *samgha*, not to deprive monastics of essential items.<sup>558</sup> If the monks fail to return the ‘abandoned property’ (*she cai* 捨財) and instead keep it for their own ‘use’ (*yong* 用), they are said to have committed a ‘minor’ (*fei zhong* 非重) offence.

At first sight, this seems to contradict the second *pārājika* rule, which specifies that stealing is one of the gravest offences that a *bhikṣu* can commit. Given that the first monk’s colleagues have kept one of his possessions – his cloth – for themselves, why do they not suffer the usual (severe) consequences of stealing? Both Daoxuan and Yuanzhao stress the importance of ‘intent’ (*xin* 心) in this regard, with the latter adding that only *Sifen lüi* takes this into account.<sup>559</sup> Unfortunately, neither master specifies whether he is referring to the intent of the repentant monk, his fellow monks, or both. However, if their focus is on the intent of the monks who keep the repentant monk’s cloth for themselves, this raises an important question: how do Daoxuan and Yuanzhao know that these monks did not intend to steal? Moreover, *Sifen lüi* is far from unique in this context because no such monk would ever be accused of violating the second *pārājika* rule, regardless of the *vinaya* that his *samgha* observed. This is because all four *vinaya* texts<sup>560</sup> agree that there is no violation of the second *pārājika* rule when the ‘stolen’ item is an ‘ownerless object’ (*wu zhu wu* 無主物),<sup>561</sup> even if the monk intends to steal it. Daoxuan certainly subscribes to this view, as he states: ‘When the object itself is ownerless … even if [the monk] has the intention of stealing [it, he does not] violate [the second *pārājika* rule].’<sup>562</sup> Clearly, then, a monk’s intent is of no consequence when determining whether he has violated the second *pārājika* rule by taking an object that has no owner (as is the case with a bundle of cloth abandoned by a fellow monastic).

<sup>558</sup> Neither Daoxuan nor Yuanzhao states that this is the case, but this is the only logical explanation for why the rule was drafted in this way.

<sup>559</sup> W64.865j16b4. See also X41.728j3.261b17.

<sup>560</sup> This rule is at: T22.1421j1.5b1–7a17 (*Wufen lüi*), T22.1425j2.238a26–j3.244a8 (*Sengqi lüi*), T22.1428j1.572b6–575c2 (*Sifen lüi*) and T23.1435j1.3b8–7b13 (*Shisong lüi*).

<sup>561</sup> The *vinaya* texts also express *wu zhu wu* as *fen sao* 糞掃 (*pamsukūla*; ‘a dust heap’).

<sup>562</sup> T40.1804j5.55a27–29: *ruo wu zhu wu … sui you daoqu zhi xin … bing bu jie fan* 若無主物 … 雖有盜取之心 … 並不結犯. It should be noted that such a monk is not blameless, even though he has not violated the second *pārājika* rule. In the same context, Daoxuan says that such a monk must repent because it was his intention to steal.

Therefore, we may say that when Daoxuan and Yuanzhao highlight the importance of ‘intent’, they must be referring to the intent of the *repentant monk*. If this reading is correct, their point must be that the repentant monk *intended* to abandon the cloth after confessing to violating the first *nihsargika pācittika* rule. Consequently, the cloth became ownerless, so, under the terms of the second *pārājika* rule, his fellow monks cannot be accused of stealing if they seize it for themselves. However, this leads to a pertinent question in the context of the present discussion: why does Daoxuan believe that *Sifen lü* is Mahāyāna simply because it is the only *vinaya* text to raise this issue of the repentant monk’s intent? Unfortunately, his thinking remains unclear.

According to Yuanzhao,<sup>563</sup> the fifth piece of evidence is contained within the commentary on the first *pācittiya* rule – do not lie. This commentary specifies that a *bhikṣu* violates this rule when he sees something but says he has not seen it (and vice versa); when he hears something but says he has not heard it (and vice versa); when he smells something but says he has not smelled it (and vice versa); when he tastes something but says he has not tasted it (and vice versa); or when he feels something but says he has not felt it (and vice versa). The commentary then clarifies that it is not the sense organs themselves – the eye, ear, nose, tongue and skin – that see, hear, smell, taste and feel but rather the corresponding part of the *bhikṣu*’s consciousness. For instance, it is his visual consciousness that ‘sees’ an object, not his eye.<sup>564</sup> However, only *Sifen lü* makes this reference to consciousness; the other *vinaya* texts do not mention it.<sup>565</sup> Given Daoxuan’s assertion in the evidence passage that the *complete teaching* of the Buddha ‘speaks of the consciousness’, it is safe to conclude that he feels that *Sifen lü* encapsulates all of the Buddha’s thinking.

---

<sup>563</sup> W64.865j16b5–7. See also X41.728j3.261b18–20.

<sup>564</sup> T22.1428j11.634b5–11.

<sup>565</sup> The relevant passages in the other *vinaya* texts are at: T22.1421j6.37b14–c6 (*Wufen lü*), T22.1425.324c–325b12 (*Sengqi lü*) and T23.1435j9.63b15–64a5 (*Shisong lü*).

Table 15 lists the five pieces of evidence and Yuanzhao's clarifications, with the latter presented within parentheses.

**Table 15: The Five Pieces of Evidence in *Sifen lü***

1.	The insecurity of arhatship	Security (Bodhisattva teaching)
2.	All other spiritual statuses	Buddhahood
3.	All other spiritual statuses	(Buddhahood)
4.	(The other three <i>vinayas</i> )	Intent
5.	(The other three <i>vinayas</i> )	The complete teaching of the Buddha

It must be admitted that Daoxuan's evidence passage remains extremely difficult to understand, notwithstanding Yuanzhao's attempts to clarify his reasoning. For instance, there seems no logical reason for Daoxuan to link Dravya Mallaputra's insecurity to his *spiritual status*, given that *Sifen lü* itself clearly indicates that it is the *arhat's body* that is insecure. Similarly, the connection he makes between intent and Mahāyāna in the fourth piece of evidence is perplexing.

Nevertheless, irrespective of whether his reasoning is sound or convincing, a number of important points should be made about Daoxuan's evidence passage. First, he does not invent any of the pieces of evidence he cites: all five are indeed contained within *Sifen lü*. Second, only the third piece of evidence – relating to the use of the term *fozi* – appears in another *vinaya* (*Sengqi lü*); all of the others are unique to *Sifen lü*. Third, Daoxuan displays a clear preference for Buddhahood over all other spiritual statuses. Fourth, given that his sole purpose in citing this evidence was to prove that *Sifen lü* is Mahāyāna, it is safe to conclude that Daoxuan identified as a Mahāyāna rather than a Hīnayāna Buddhist.

This raises some interesting questions. Given that *Dharmaguptaka vinaya* was translated into *Sifen lü* in 408 CE, almost two centuries before Daoxuan was born, why was he the first Chinese Buddhist master to identify and present these five pieces of evidence as proof that *Sifen lü* is Mahāyāna? Moreover, why did he feel it was so important to argue this case? Was he motivated solely by personal preference for Mahāyāna, which he felt was best articulated by *Sifen lü*, or were there other reasons for his decision to champion this particular *vinaya* rather than one of the three alternatives?

#### IV.5.2.2.2 Daoxuan's Motivation to Prove that *Sifen lü* is Mahāyāna

Although Daoxuan evidently developed a preference for Mahāyāna Buddhism over the Hīnayāna alternative, his work provides no clue as to why he was so determined to prove that *Sifen lü* is Mahāyāna. Nevertheless, three suggestions may be advanced. First, Daoxuan lived and worked at a time when the translation of Mahāyāna texts into Chinese reached unprecedented levels. Moreover, he participated in that process.<sup>566</sup> Hence, his advocacy of *Sifen lü* as Mahāyāna could be attributed either wholly or partially simply to the fact that he was a practising Buddhist in seventh-century China.<sup>567</sup> Second, given that Daoxuan was the only *vinaya* master of his era<sup>568</sup> to criticize ‘monks who have violated *vinaya* stipulations but excuse themselves on the grounds that they are Mahāyāna monks’,<sup>569</sup> his intention may have been to prove that *Sifen lü* is Mahāyāna in order to develop a framework for dealing with misbehaving monks. In short, his message to his fellow *bhikṣus* might be summarized as follows: ‘if you insist you are Mahāyāna monk, you should follow *Sifen lü*, because *Sifen lü* is Mahāyāna’. Finally, given Daoxuan’s consistent emphasis on the critical importance of *vinaya* to the Buddha-dharma, it is reasonable to conclude that he wished to challenge any suggestion that *vinaya* is Hīnayāna.

While Daoxuan’s theories undoubtedly played a pivotal role in the development of Chinese Buddhism, his campaign to promote *vinaya* was not restricted to his efforts to establish the primacy of *Sifen lü* and to prove that it is Mahāyāna in his written works. Indeed, his final *hufa* act was physical rather than intellectual, as he constructed a full ordination platform in the final year of his life.

<sup>566</sup> For information on Daoxuan’s participation in Xuanzang’s translation team, see III.4.5.2.1.

<sup>567</sup> For further details of Buddhism in seventh-century China, see, among others: Kenneth Ch’en, *The Chinese Transformation of Buddhism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1973); Erik Zürcher, *The Buddhist Conquest of China: The Spread and Adaptation of Buddhism in Early Medieval China* (3d edn; Leiden: Brill, 2007).

<sup>568</sup> Among Daoxuan’s contemporaries, the most important *vinaya* masters were: Zhishou, the author of *Sifen lü shu* 四分律疏 (*The Commentary of Sifen lü*; only the ninth scroll is extant: W66.623–668/X42.734); Fali, the author of *Sifen lü shu* 四分律疏 (*The Commentary of Sifen lü*; W65.357–976/T41.731); Daoshi, the author of *Pini taoyao* 毗尼討要 (*Discussion of the Key Points of Vinaya*; W70.207–399/X44.743); and Huaisu 懷素, the author of *Sifen lü kaizong ji* 四分律開宗記 (*The Commentary of Sifen lü*; W66.669–992–W67.1–216/X42.735).

<sup>569</sup> T40.1804j5.50a11–12: *ruo wu jie qi fei wei fan jiao wang zhi chu bian yun wo shi Dacheng bu guan Xiao jiao* 若汚戒起非違犯教網之處便云我是大乘不關小教. In XSC, Daoxuan dismisses such monks as *song Dachengyu zhe* 詩誦大乘語者 (literally, ‘those who merely read the words of Mahāyāna’), *xue Dachengyu ren* 學大乘語人 (literally, ‘those who imitate the words of Mahāyāna’), *wang xue Dacheng zhe* 妄學大乘者 (literally, ‘those conceited Mahāyāna monks’) and *lan xue Dacheng zhe* 濫學大乘者 (literally, ‘those who abuse Mahāyāna teaching’). For a study on Daoxuan’s understanding of Mahāyāna precepts see, among other, Sato Tatsugen 佐藤達玄. “*Dao-xuan 道宣 and the Mahayana Precepts.*” *Journal of Buddhist Studies* 25, 10 (1994): 438–429.

#### IV.5.2.3 Differences between Daoxuan's *Vinaya* and the *Vinaya* Texts

In 667 CE, Daoxuan oversaw the construction of a full ordination platform on which twenty-seven candidates from several parts of China were ordained.<sup>570</sup> He then recorded the details of these ceremonies in *Guanzhong chuangli jietan tujing bing xu* 關中創立戒壇圖經并序 (667, 27; hereafter JTTJ).

In JTTJ, Daoxuan first summarizes the four elements of full ordination – *ren* 人, *fa* 法, *shi* 事 and *chu* 處 – with reference to *Sifen lü*. In this context, *shi* (literally, ‘monastic business’) means the whole process of full ordination. The *ren* (literally, ‘people’), including the candidate and the ordination masters, must meet their respective requirements and gather at a suitable place: the *chu*. Only then may the masters conduct the *fa* (literally, ‘act’) – the ceremony itself. The *upasampadā karman* that comprises this *fa* stipulates that there should be one motion and three readings of the motion.<sup>571</sup> After the third reading, at the unanimous consent of all the participating masters, the *fa* is endorsed and the *shi* of giving full ordination is lawfully concluded.

Although Daoxuan’s summary of the full ordination process largely corresponds to the detailed instructions that are contained within all four *vinaya* texts,<sup>572</sup> close reading of JTTJ reveals two significant differences between his version of *vinaya* and the original sources: the nature of the ordination platform and the recitation of *Yijiao jing* 遺教經 (*The Discourse of the Last Instructions*) during the ceremony.<sup>573</sup>

<sup>570</sup> At T40.1804j12.155c30, Daoxuan states, ‘the maximum number of candidates at a single full ordination is three’ (*wei jiao san ren* 唯加三人). Therefore, between nine and twenty-seven ceremonies must have been held to ordain the twenty-seven candidates.

<sup>571</sup> A *karman* may consist of only a motion (*bai* 白; *jñapti*), a motion and a single reading (*bai er jiemo* 白二羯磨; *jñaptidvitya karman*), or a motion and three readings (*bai si jiemo* 白四羯磨; *jñapticaturth karman*), depending on the nature of the *shi*. See Daoxuan’s chapter on *jiemo* at T40.1804j1.11a16–14a15.

<sup>572</sup> The four *vinaya* texts cover full ordination ceremonies at: T22.1421j15–17 (*Wufen lü*), T22.1425j23 (*Sengqi lü*), T22.1428j31–35 (*Sifen lü*) and T23.1435j21 (*Shisong lü*).

<sup>573</sup> In the *Taishō* collection, the title of this *sūtra* is *Fo cui boniepan liue shuo jiaojie* 佛垂般涅槃略說教諴 (*The Brief Instructions Given by the Buddha Right before His Nirvāṇa*; T12.389), but it is often termed *Yijiao jing*. It was translated by Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什 (344–413) and consists of 2,661 Chinese characters.

#### IV.5.2.3.1 Constructing a *Jietan* 戒壇 (Full Ordination Platform)

In all but one of the *vinaya* texts,<sup>574</sup> the *chu* (the place where the ordination ceremony takes place) is termed the *jiechang* 戒場 ('venue of full ordination'), and all four texts stipulate that any solid surface may be declared a *jiechang* and used for this purpose as long as the attending monks give their unanimous consent. Hence, according to the *vinaya* texts, a *jiechang* is not a permanent structure that is built specifically to host full ordination ceremonies. Rather, the attending monks are instructed to utilize any appropriate venue, probably on a temporary basis. By contrast, Daoxuan describes his construction of a 2.5-metre-high, three-storey, stone platform<sup>575</sup> to serve as the venue for full ordination ceremonies and insists that such platforms were utilized in the era of the Buddha himself.<sup>576</sup> Elsewhere in JTTJ, he states:

In the second year of the Qianfeng era [667 CE], I built this [platform] to the south of the capital [Chang'an].<sup>577</sup> The original reason for building the platform was to consolidate *vinaya*, which is the foundation of the practices that lead to the various stages of spiritual advancement and lies at the heart

<sup>574</sup> The sole exception is *Wufen lü*, which terms the venue *jietan* 戒壇 ('full ordination platform'). However, in this instance, *jietan* is probably synonymous with *jiechang* as no construction is mentioned in the text.

<sup>575</sup> T45.1892j1.810b24–c5: *Qi xia cheng cong di qi ji ... gao san chi ... di er ceng gao ... si chi wu cun ... di san ceng gao ... si cun* 其下層從地起基 ... 高三尺 ... 第二層高 ... 四尺五寸 ... 第三層高 ... 四寸 ('The first storey is built right on the ground ... and it is three *chi* high ... the height of the second level ... is four *chi* five *cun* ... the third level is ... four *cun*'). In the *Taishō* collection, Huijiao (497–554) is the first author to mention a *jietan*. In GSZ, at T50.2059j3.341b18, he states: *ji yu Nanlin jietan qian yi waiguo fa tupi zhi* 卽於南林戒壇前依外國法闍毘之 ('[the remains of Master Guṇavarman 求那跋摩] were cremated outside the Nanlin Ordination Platform'). The same text indicates that this *jietan* was situated in present-day Jiangshu Province. Huijiao neglects to mention if a full ordination was ever held on the platform, or if the platform was constructed for that purpose. A century later, in *Xingshi chao*, within his account of the first full *bhikṣuṇī* ordination in China at T40.1804j5.51c9–23, Daoxuan states, *tan shang wei ni chong shou* 壇上為尼重受 ('the nuns were reordained on the platform'). He does not specify the name of the platform or whether it was constructed for the purpose, but this is the earliest description in the *Taishō* collection of a full ordination ceremony on a platform. Hence, we may say that Daoxuan was first Chinese monk to establish a direct link between platforms and full ordination. In *Liuzu Dashi fabao tan jing* 六祖大師法寶壇經 (*The Platform Sūtra of the Great Master the Sixth Patriarch*), at T48.2008j1.362c9–12, we are told that the famous Tang master Huineng 慧能 (638–713) received his full ordination on a platform in 676 CE, and that the platform was built by Master Guṇavarman in present-day Guangdong 廣東 Province. However, the text provides no description of this platform. John R. McRae, 'Daoxuan's Vision of Jetavana', in William M. Bodiford (ed.), *Going Forth, Visions of Buddhist Vinaya* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2005), 78–84, provides a detailed description of Daoxuan's platform. See also Tan Zhihui. "Daoxuan's Vision of Jetavana: Imaging a Utopian Monastery in Early Tang." PhD diss., University of Arizona, 2002.

<sup>576</sup> T45.1892j1.818a20: *zhao yu Qishu zhi shi* 肇於祇樹之始. In Buddhist texts, *Qishu* is a common abbreviation for *Qishujiguduyuan* 祇樹給孤獨園 (the Chinese rendering of *Jetavana*), one of the most celebrated monasteries in the time of the Buddha.

<sup>577</sup> See more on the site of this platform at previous n. 35.

of the Buddha-dharma. The Buddha<sup>578</sup> shows his compassion by promulgating *vinaya* [rules]; those who are yet-to-be enlightened eliminate indiscretion when they observe [*vinaya*]. Therefore, the text says: ‘What bestows long life on the Buddha-dharma? Lawfully conducted full ordination … As long as [the ordination ceremony is held in accordance with *vinaya*], the long life of the Buddha-dharma is guaranteed.’<sup>579</sup>

乃以乾封二年，於京郊之南，創弘斯法。原夫戒壇之興，所以立於戒也。戒為眾聖之行本，又是三法之命根。皇覺由此以興慈，凡惑假斯而致滅。故文云如何得知佛法久住。若…如法受戒，是名正法久住。

Thus, the message is clear: it is *vinaya* that defines the status of a *bhikṣu*, and it is *vinaya* that establishes the Buddha-dharma. [A man enjoys the full benefit] of *vinaya* [once he receives full ordination, which is accomplished] through the [*upasampadā*] *karman*. The [*upasampadā*] *karman* itself should be conducted at a certain place, and the place is called a *jietan*.

是知比丘儀體，非戒不存。道必人弘，非戒不立。戒由作業而克，業必藉處而生，處曰戒壇。<sup>580</sup>

Here, in addition to emphasizing the importance of *vinaya*, Daoxuan clearly attaches great significance to the site where full ordination ceremonies are held and specifies that this should be a *jietan* ('platform'). Although he never explicitly states that the *jietan* should

<sup>578</sup> Here, the Chinese term is *huangjue* 皇覺 (literally, ‘royal enlightenment’), which is often used in place of the more familiar Gautama. Of course, Siddhārtha Gautama was a prince who achieved enlightenment, which explains why the term was coined.

<sup>579</sup> Here, Daoxuan is probably quoting from *Samantapāśādikā* 善見律毘婆沙. The passage is at T24.1462j16.786a18–27.

<sup>580</sup> T45.1892j1.807a18–25.

be a permanent structure, we may assume that this was his intention in light of its scale and the fact that it was made of stone.<sup>581</sup>

Of course, Daoxuan's advice contrasts with the *vinaya* texts' full ordination guidelines, in which the emphasis is on flexibility and the use of *any* suitable site for the ceremony, with no hint that a special platform should be constructed for the purpose. So, what motivated Daoxuan to build his platform?

As mentioned above, he traces the platform's origins back to the time of the Buddha, so he may have believed that this was an important aspect of the first ordination ceremonies that had been inadvertently lost over the centuries. On the other hand, he may simply have felt that individual monks and the whole Buddha-dharma would benefit from the establishment of a permanent, designated venue for ordinations. These reasons may have been sufficient in themselves to prompt his decision to construct the *jielan*, but it is conceivable that another factor played a crucial role, too.

In 653 CE, the *Tang lü shu yi* (*Tang Code*) declared, '[in] all cases of unauthorized ordainment as a Buddhist or Taoist priest [the authorities should] punish both the person who is ordained as well as the person who performs the ordainment by one hundred blows with the heavy stick'.<sup>582</sup> Furthermore, this code provided the following clarification: 'unauthorized ordainment refers to those who become Buddhist or Taoist priests or nuns

---

<sup>581</sup> At T45.1892j1.816b20, Daoxuan mentions that the first session of the full ordination ceremony was held on the eighth day of the second month of 667, soon after the platform was erected, and that an Indian monk visited it in the ninth month of the same year. Hence, it must have stood for at least six months. The Indian monk, whom Daoxuan names as Shijiamiduoluo 釋迦蜜多羅 in JTTJ, is probably the origin of the figure who is termed the *san guo fanseng* 三果梵僧 ('non-returning Indian monk') or Bindou Luohan 寶頭羅漢 ('the arhat Piṇḍola-Bhāradvāja') in many Daoxuan-related works. In JTTJ, Daoxuan gives this monk's age as ninety-nine *xia* 夏, which would have made him at least 119 years old at the time of their meeting. He specifies that the visitor is a *san guo* monk in LXGT (T45.1898j1.876b4–5), but never makes any connection between Shijiamiduoluo and the arhat Piṇḍola-Bhāradvāja in his own works. See previous notes on Bintou: nn. 49 and 132.

<sup>582</sup> Translation from Johnson, 1979, vol. 2, 128. However, the original source (TLSYj12.235.9) reads: *zhu si ru dao ji du zhi zhe zhang yi bai* 諸私入道及度之者杖一百. Hence, it contains no characters that may be translated as 'as a Buddhist or Taoist priest'. Furthermore, in n. 20 on the same page, Johnson states, 'the person also must return to his/her original status as provided by Vol. I, 197, Article 36'. However, neither his own translation of that article (vol. 1, 197–200) nor the original source (TLSYj4.96.8–98) includes the phrase 'return to his/her original status' (*huan su* 還俗).

without official authorization. This is called unauthorized ordainment.<sup>583</sup> Approximately forty years later, and certainly by 694, the government initiated the practice of ‘send[ing] a *yushi* 御史 [censor] to oversee the full ordinations that are held in the two capitals [Chang’an and Luoyang]’.<sup>584</sup> Clearly, then, the Tang government was keen to regulate the ordination of Buddhist monastics, if necessary by inflicting severe punishment on any monks who participated in an unauthorized ceremony.

At this point, it is useful to reiterate the four essential elements of a legitimate full ordination ceremony: *ren* (the participants), *fa* (the *upasampadā karman*), *shi* (the full ordination process) and *chu* (the venue for the ceremony). Assuming that the government had no wish to eradicate Buddhism in China but felt a need to regulate the ordination of new recruits, we may say that its primary concern was with the first of these elements – specifically, the number of candidates and the quality of those candidates and the attending masters. Of course, maintaining control over the participants would be much more straightforward if the authorities could ensure that every ordination ceremony were held at a designated, permanent venue, as opposed to any one of countless temporary sites scattered throughout the country. The establishment of a single location for ordination would enable the government to decide precisely when and how often the ceremonies were held as well as the number of candidates at each event. It could even start to dictate

---

<sup>583</sup> Johnson, 1979, vol. 1, 198. The original source (TLSYj4.97.5) reads: *si ru dao wei daoshi nüguan seng ni tong bu yin guan du zhe shi ming si ru dao* 私入道謂道士女官僧尼同不因官度者是名私入道. Therefore, note that the order in the original source is ‘Daoist priests, women Daoist priests, monks and nuns’. It is important to note that Johnson altered this order in his widely cited translation. The Emperor Gaozong (r. 649–683) pronounced the Tang Code in 653, so it represented official government policy on Daoism and Buddhism and related affairs. Throughout TLSY, whenever the four categories are mentioned, the order is invariably *daoshi nüguan seng ni* 道士女官僧尼, so priority is clearly given to Daoists. It is not known if Gaozong ever issued a separate decree to specify this pre-eminence, but his father, the Emperor Taizong (r. 626–649), did issue such an order in the second month of the eleventh year of the Zhenguan era (637). The title of this decree was *Daoshi nüguan seng ni zai seng ni zhi shang zhao* 道士女冠在僧尼之上 (*Decree: Men and Women Daoist Priests Take Priority over Monks and Nuns*), TZLJj113.586.21–587.5. See also T50.2060j24.635b17–c5/QTWj6.73a17–b13. As far as we know, the priority transferred to Buddhists only in the third month of the second year of the Tianshou era 天授 (691) on the order of the Empress Wu Zetian (r. 690–705). The title of her decree was *Shijiao zai Daofa zhi shang zhi* 釋教在道法之上制 (*Order: Buddhism Takes Priority over Daoism*), TZLJj113.587.10–13. Therefore, the order given in Johnson’s translation not only diverges from the original source but seems to misrepresent official government policy during Gaozong’s administration. Furthermore, Johnson’s translation reads, ‘If someone falsely accuses a Taoist or Buddhist priest or nun to the court of an offense that would require that they return to lay life’ (vol. 1, 146), while the original source (TLSYj3.66.5) declares, *ruo wugao daoshi nü guan ying huan su zhe* 若誣告道士女官應還俗者. Neither *seng* (‘monk’) nor *ni* (‘nun’) appears in the original sentence, so Johnson must have taken it upon himself to insert the phrase ‘Buddhist priest or nun’.

<sup>584</sup> THYj49.863.12: *liang jing du seng ni yushi yi ren li zhi* 兩京度僧尼御史一人蒞之. The date is not specified, but in the same context we are told that Cibu 祠部 (Bureau of Sacrifices) is responsible for keeping a record of all of China’s monks and nuns, and we know that the Empress Wu Zetian handed that responsibility to the bureau in 694 (THYj49.859.11).

which masters were allowed to officiate. In short, a facility such as Daoxuan's platform would have allowed the Tang government to keep China's Buddha-dharma on a tight rein.

Less than two hundred years after the construction of Daoxuan's platform, the Tang monk Zongmi 宗密 (780–841) reported: 'In this country, full ordinations are conducted on official platforms [*guan tan* 官壇] ... [Ceremonies are held] once a year, or once every three or two years, depending on the circumstances.'<sup>585</sup> This suggests that the government was in full control of Buddhist ordination ceremonies by the first half of the ninth century. For instance, it was regulating the frequency of the ceremonies and the number of candidates who were ordained on each occasion. Such a tight level of control would have been impossible in the absence of official, government-approved platforms. In his *Da Song seng shi lue* (999, 102), the Song monk and historian Zanning notes:

On the fifth day of the fourth month of the sixth year of the Dali era [771], a decree was issued requesting 'the monks and nuns in the capital city each to assemble a ten-master team to conduct a full ordination ceremony on the platforms'. Since then, this practice [the formation of a team by government decree] has become the norm, and the vacancies [positions on the team] are filled immediately. The title bestowed on each of these masters – platform-ordination master<sup>586</sup> – marks the start of the government's use of *master* [a common designation denoting honour and virtue in Buddhist texts] as an official honorific title.

<sup>585</sup> *Yuanjue jing da shu shiyi chao* 圓覺經大疏釋義鈔 (*Explanatory Note on the General Commentary to the Sūtra of Absolute Enlightenment*; see also T17.842), at W14.556j3b.556a6–13/X9.245j3.533c17–24: *ci guo jin shi guantan shou juzu jie ... huo yi nian yi du huo san nian er nian bu deng shu kai* 此國今時官壇受具足戒 ... 或一年一度或三年二年一度不等數開. From the context, it is unclear whether Zongmi is discussing all official platforms throughout China or one particular platform. I opted for the former in this translation. In '戒壇の原意', 印度学仏教学研究, vol. 10:2 (1962), 680–700, 681, Hirakawa Akira suggests that full ordination on a platform became the norm in China after Daoxuan established the procedure: *Dōsen no jidai ni wa kaidan-jō no sahō mo kakutei shita nodearou. Sonogo shina ni oite mo, jukai wa kaidan-jō ni oite okonau to iu koto ga ippan-ka shita nodearou to omowa reru* 道宣の時代には戒壇上の作法も確定したのであろう。その後シナにおいても、受戒は戒壇上において行なうということが一般化したのであろうと思われる。

<sup>586</sup> The Chinese expression here is *lintan dade* 臨壇大德. Yijing 義淨 (635–713), one of the foremost monks of the Tang era, uses the phrase *lintan zhe* 臨壇者 (literally, 'people who are present on the platform') when referring to full ordination masters in his *Nanhai ji gui Neifa zhuan* 南海寄歸內法傳 (*A Record of Buddhist Practices Sent Home from the Southern Sea*; 674 CE, 35), at T54.2125j3.220a11. However, in his *vinaya* translations (T23.1442–1447, T24.1448–1459), he never uses the character *tan* 壇 in connection with full ordination ceremonies or masters. Furthermore, he does not provide a description of the full ordination platform in *Nanhai ji gui Neifa zhuan*. On the other hand, *dade* is believed to be the translation of 'bhadanta', a term of respect that junior monks often employed when addressing senior colleagues in the time of the Buddha. For simplicity, I have substituted 'master' here.

大曆六年辛亥歲四月五日，勅京城僧尼，臨壇大德各置十人，以為常式，有闕即填。此帶臨壇而有大德二字，乃官補德號之始也。<sup>587</sup>

The communities of monks and nuns probably nominated the ten masters themselves. However, the government still had to approve the list and then cemented its authority by conferring titles on the nominated masters who officiated at the ceremonies, with the effect that the full ordination process became official government business. In other words, the permanent platform enabled the government to establish full control over not only the candidates but also the officiating masters.

Interestingly, there is no mention of permanent platforms in official government documents prior to Daoxuan's construction of his *jielan* in 667. However, while it seems likely that he intended his platform to be a permanent structure, a lack of information in the sources means we do not know if he constructed it either on the orders of the Tang government or on his own initiative to facilitate increased government control over the Buddha-dharma. Similarly, it is impossible to know if the government's later pronouncements relating to the use of official platforms and its introduction of the title 'platform-ordination master' were directly inspired by or connected to Daoxuan's *jielan*.

#### IV.5.2.3.2 Recitation of *Yijiao jing*

*Yijiao jing* 遺教經 is a 2,661-word text that is attributed to the Buddha shortly before his passing. In JTTJ, Daoxuan prescribes two recitations of this text – one immediately before the full ordination ceremony and one immediately after its conclusion.<sup>588</sup> There is no evidence that such recitations formed part of the traditional ordination ceremony prior to this point, and they are certainly not stipulated in the *vinaya* texts. However, as with Daoxuan's erection of a permanent platform, there is also nothing to suggest that supplementing the ceremony in this way invalidates the candidates' ordination.

---

<sup>587</sup> T54.2126j3.249c9–12.

<sup>588</sup> T45.1892j1.810c20–22: *xian song Yijiao jing ... ji shoujie qi you song Yijiao [jing]* 先誦遺教經 ... 及受戒訖又誦遺教。Elsewhere, JTTJ mentions *bie shi gao zuo* 別施高座 ('a high seat that is separately prepared [on the platform]'; T45.1892j1.810c20) and *xian chai yi seng* 先差一僧 ('an individual monk is appointed beforehand'; T45.1892j1.816a1–2), which suggests that someone other than the candidate and the officiating masters recites the text, and that he remains on the platform only for the period of recitation.

Daoxuan probably chose this text because it represents the Buddha's final instructions to the Buddha-dharma. Indeed, in JTTJ, he says that 'it is as if the Buddha is issuing the instructions in person'<sup>589</sup> during the recitations, and 'the monks, while listening, are weeping silently'.<sup>590</sup> Moreover, it is safe to assume that he favoured this particular *sūtra* because of its unusual emphasis on *vinaya*. However, as with his construction of the *jietai*, there is also a possibility that he was motivated to include it in the ceremony in the hope of improving relations with the Tang government.

In the fourteenth year of the Zhenguan era (640), the Emperor Taizong (r. 626–649) issued a decree entitled *Fo Yijiao jing shi xing chi* 佛遺教經施行敕 (*Decree: [Teaching of] the Yijiao jing to be Enforced*), which includes the following extract:

What is *Yijiao jing*? It was preached by the Buddha before his *nirvāṇa*. The instructions it contains are comprehensive. Yet, in this time of decline,<sup>591</sup> monks and lay followers have shown little respect [for this text]. Alas, the Great Path is being obscured, the Wonderful Words are no longer heard. Deeply concerned with the Buddha's teaching, [I] want to set it right and make it prosper. [Now, I order] the relevant officials to deploy ten scribes to produce a good number of copies [of *Yijiao jing*. The teaching of this text] must be enforced.

遺教經者，是佛臨涅槃所說，誠勸弟子，甚為詳要。末俗縉紳，並不崇奉。大道將隱，微言且絕，永懷聖教，用思宏闡。宣令所司，差書手十人，多寫經本，務在施行。

All of the costs [incurred in the purchase of] paper, brushes, ink and so on [to make the copies] will be borne by the government. Every officer with a rank of five or above and the governor of every prefecture will be supplied with a copy. Upon seeing monks and nuns behaving in ways that

<sup>589</sup> T45.1892j1.808a2: *ru Fo yue chi* 如佛約勅.

<sup>590</sup> T45.1892j1.810c21: *zhu bhikṣu wen jie xi ti qi* 諸比丘聞皆悉涕泣.

<sup>591</sup> *Mo* 末 [*fa* 法] is the last of the three stages the Buddha-dharma is to undergo, the first two are *Zhengfa* 正法 (literally, [the period of] the Authentic Dharma), *Xiangfa* 像法 (Literally, [the period of] the Semblance Dharma). For a study on the subject of *mofa* see Jan Nattier, *Once upon a Future Time : Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline*. Berkeley (Calif.) : Asian humanities press, 1991.

contradict the words of this text, these officials, either acting on their own initiative or in the name of the government, should urge and encourage [the offenders] until they are persuaded to follow [*Yijiao jing*].

所須紙筆墨等，有司準給。其官宦五品已上，及諸州刺史，各付一卷。若見僧尼行業與經文不同，宜公私勸勉，必使遵行。<sup>592</sup>

If all of the officials mentioned in this document duly received a copy of *Yijiao jing* (as we must assume they did), a large proportion of Tang officialdom would have been well acquainted with the text by 667, when Daoxuan advocated its use during ordination ceremonies. Moreover, we know that he was aware of the decree: he was a resident of Chang'an in the year when it was issued<sup>593</sup> and mentions it in XGSZ (c. 665, 26).<sup>594</sup> Therefore, he may have thought that the best way to maintain good relations with the authorities was to ensure that all new monastics were inculcated with the tenets of *Yijiao jing* from the very start of their monkhood. There is no way to know for sure if it was this that prompted his recommendation that the text should be recited – twice – during every full ordination ceremony, but it is certainly a credible explanation for what motivated him to supplement the *upasampadā karman* in this way.

---

<sup>592</sup> QTWj9.109b8–17. See also T50.2060j24.638a22–26/T52.2104j3.385a12–19, W133.706j16b18–707j16a3/X77.1522j16.208a20.

<sup>593</sup> Daoxuan returned to Chang'an in 640. See n. 287.

<sup>594</sup> T50.2060j24.638a26.

#### IV.5.3 The Impact of Daoxuan's Promotion of *Vinaya*

Over the centuries, Daoxuan's promotion of *Sifen lü* has attracted considerable attention, with countless scholars consulting and commenting on all of his *vinaya* works, and especially *Xingshi chao*, with the aim of increasing their own knowledge and understanding of *vinaya*. For instance, when recalling the five years he spent studying *vinaya* after his full ordination, Yijing 義淨 (635-713) comments, '[*Xingshi*] *chao* and other works of the *vinaya* master Daoxuan explain the subject rather well and [get] right to the point'.<sup>595</sup> Indeed, according to *Xingshi chao zhu jia ji biaomu* 行事鈔諸家記標目 (*List of the Commentaries on Xingshi chao*), at least sixty-two masters wrote a sub-commentary on *Xingshi chao* in the four centuries following the publication of Daoxuan's text.<sup>596</sup> By this measure alone, it may be said that Daoxuan's efforts to promote *Sifen lü* achieved unparalleled success.

However, his influence extended far beyond the realm of literature, and indeed beyond the borders of China. Visiting Japanese student monks invariably returned home with copies of his *vinaya* texts,<sup>597</sup> while the account of his *jietan* in JTTJ inspired the Chinese monk Jianzhen 鑒真 (688–763) to travel to Japan, build his own platform and conduct the country's first full ordination ceremonies on it in the 750s.<sup>598</sup> Hence, it is undeniable that Daoxuan played a pivotal role in the promotion of *vinaya* in East Asia.

---

<sup>595</sup> Quote from *Nanhai ji gui Neifa zhuan* at T54.2125j4.233a27: *Xuan lüshi zhi chao shu qie tan zhong zhi* 宣律師之鈔述竊談中旨.

<sup>596</sup> W70.198–201/X44.741. This text is attributed to a Song-era (960–1279) monk named Huixian 慧顯, but the date when it was written is not known and there is no biographical information on the author. The version cited here was said to be 'edited' (*gai lu* 改錄) by a Japanese monk named Kai Getsu 戒月 (?–?) around 1702 (*Yuanlu renwu* 元祿壬午; X44.740j1.294a12–13). In his LYSZ (1687, 259), Eken 慧堅 (1649–1704), another Japanese monk and a biographer, also attests to *Xingshi chao*'s enduring popularity when he writes that at least sixty sub-commentaries have been written, but before adding, 'that only reflects what has been recorded' (D105.173j5.54b6–7). For a study on the sub-commentators see Sato Tatsugen 佐藤 達玄. "On the Sixty Researchers on the Hsing-hsia-ch'ao 行事鈔六十家攷." *Journal of the Faculty of Buddhism of the Komazawa University* 駒澤大學佛教學部研究紀要 35 (1977-03): 19–38/ 36 (1978-03): 32–54.

<sup>597</sup> See Table 2 and page 15 for more on the export of Daoxuan's works to Japan.

<sup>598</sup> T74.2347j1.2b9–10/D105.8j1.8b3–4; Höshin 法進, *Tōdaiji jukai hōki* 東大寺受戒方軌 (*Ordination Ceremony Description of Tōdaiji [Japan]*; T74.2349); Jippān 實範, *Tōdaiji Kaidanin jukai shiki* 東大寺戒壇院受戒式 (*Ordination Ceremony Description of the Platform Complex Tōdaiji [Japan]*; T74.2350); Ekō 惠光, *Tōshōdaiji kaidan betsū jukaishiki* 唐招提寺戒壇別受戒式 (*A Separate Ordination Ceremony Description of the Platform Tōshōdaiji [Japan]*; T74.2351). For the transmission of *vinaya* to Japan see, among others, Marcus Bingener, "A Biographical Dictionary of the Japanese student-monks of the Seventh and Early Eighth Centuries: Their Travels to China and Their Role," *the Transmission of Buddhism* (München: Iudicium-Verl., 2001), 59–61.

# The Life of Daoxuan

## Part V

### Conclusion

This book has focused on the life of Daoxuan that revealed by the monk himself and that penned down by others. Specifically, it has attempted to establish why this monk is so closely associated with and respected in the field of *vinaya*. Is the answer simply that he devoted a great number of works to this subject, or is he hailed as the consummate *vinaya* master because of the fine example he set in his own life?

Another key task of this study has been to explore why Daoxuan was the first Chinese monk to define *hufa* as an ideal to which other monks should aspire, and why he chose it as one of ten categories into which he grouped eminent monks in his biographical dictionary, *Xu gaoseng zhuan*. He even went so far as to declare that *hufa* is of paramount importance with respect to ensuring the survival of the Buddha-dharma. In light of this understanding of *hufa* and its significance, it was imperative to explore Daoxuan's own *hufa* activities during his lifetime.

This book has also explored why Daoxuan championed *Sifen lü* and insisted that it is Mahāyāna. Why did he embark on this campaign, and why was he the first monk to do so, given that the text had been translated into Chinese almost two centuries before Daoxuan was born? Equally, why did he recommend recitation of *Yijiao jing* – supposedly the Buddha's final instructions – during full ordination ceremonies and build a permanent platform on which those ceremonies could take place? I have attempted to answer these questions by investigating them through the prism of Daoxuan's life and works.

Given that the most frequently cited source of biographical information on Daoxuan – his entry in *Song gaoseng zhuan* – is notoriously unreliable and inconsistent, the first step was to identify and consult more dependable primary sources. Online keyword searches and archival research revealed references to Daoxuan's life in some 296 works spanning the seventh to the nineteenth century and countless contemporary scholarly works. In itself, the sheer scale of this corpus gives some indication of the master's unparalleled significance in Chinese Buddhist history. However, there is little merit in simply listing every mention of Daoxuan in each of these works. The aim of this study is to enhance our understanding of Daoxuan's life by attempting to answer the

aforementioned questions, not to create a ‘Daoxuan reader’. To that end, I have taken a much more comprehensive approach to the study of the master’s life that acknowledges the vast panoply of neglected primary sources pertaining to him and focused on presenting and commenting on the most salient points.

First, I compiled a list of all 296 primary sources in chronological order (Table 1). Numbers 1–30 comprise ‘Daoxuan’s works’, while the remaining 266 are ‘Daoxuan-related works’. The next step was to explore the ‘Daoxuan-related works’ in Part II, ‘The Life of Daoxuan, According to Others’. This part of the book is divided into four major sub-sections: ‘First-hand Information (668 CE; Section II.2)’, ‘Stable Information (674–858 CE; Section II.3)’, ‘A Flood of Information (c. 860–984 CE; Section II.4)’ and ‘Summarizing the Information (988–1874 CE; Section II.5)’. One of the principal aims of Part II was to ascertain when various episodes from Daoxuan’s life appear in the sources for the first time. For example, we learned that the link between Su Simiao and Daoxuan is established in YYZZ (c. 860, 83), the connection between Daoxuan and Shanwuwei is first reported in KTCX (890, 91) and BMSY (c. 944, 95) is the earliest extant source to mention the dragon *guailong*. Part II also includes an exploration of the inconsistencies in the Daoxuan-related works. It reveals that works composed in the final two periods under study (c. 860–1874, numbers 82–296) tend to omit or at least gloss over several details of Daoxuan’s biography that feature prominently in texts dating from the earlier periods (668–858, numbers 33–81) and concentrate instead on other aspects of his life. For instance, later authors barely mention Daoxuan’s extensive travels in search of the Path or his *hufa* activities in defence of the Buddha-dharma, yet they provide extensive details about his personal background, such as his ancestors, his hometown and so on.

However, while the shift in focus across the centuries is undeniable, Part II also reveals that there is remarkable consistency in the Daoxuan-related works. For instance, whenever the master’s family name is specified, it is invariably given as Qian 錢. Similarly, his *vinaya* teacher is unerringly named as Zhishou 智首. Moreover, every source agrees that Daoxuan died in the second year of the Qianfeng era (667) and was then reborn in Tuṣita Heaven. Also, all of the Daoxuan-related works closely associate Daoxuan with *vinaya* and hail him as a *vinaya* master (*lüshi* 律師). Some of the sources imply that his expertise in this field is the result of his own strict observation of *vinaya*’s

strictures, while others emphasize his production of numerous, ground-breaking commentaries on the subject.

Part II amply demonstrates that there is a rich seam of fascinating biographical information in the Daoxuan-related works. However, after studying these texts in depth, a number of crucial questions remained unresolved. Why did Daoxuan make *hufa* one of his ten ideals in *Xu gaoseng zhuan*? Why was he so determined to prove that *Sifen lü* is Mahāyāna? And why did he insist that *Yijiao jing* should be recited during the full ordination ceremony?

The answers to these and many other questions can be found only in the master's own works. Hence, these thirty texts are the subject of Part III, 'The Life of Daoxuan, in His Own Words', where, in marked contrast to the vast majority of Daoxuan-related works, the master is given an opportunity to speak for himself. He does not disappoint, because he provides a wealth of information on his teachers, travels, conversations with the *devas* in the final year of his life and relations with other Tang masters.

There is, though, an underlying theme in almost all of Daoxuan's work: the prominent position he gives to *hufa*. Hence, Part IV is devoted to the master's personal battle to protect the Buddha-dharma through a lifetime of *hufa* activity. This comprised not only defending the Buddha-dharma against external threats but also promoting *vinaya* in order to safeguard the future of the Chinese Buddhist community. For instance, he campaigned against Fu Yi's anti-Buddhist proposal (Section IV.3), led the protest against the Emperor Gaozong's decrees (Section IV.4) and went to great lengths to promote *vinaya* in his writings (Section IV.5). All of this activity, and indeed his personal commitment to strict observance of *vinaya* principles, mean that he fully merits the honorifics 'vinaya master' and 'hufa monk'.

While Daoxuan's own works obviously provide unique and compelling insights into his life and thinking, they do not always tell the whole story. Therefore, whenever possible, this book has compared and contrasted his accounts with those of later authors. For example, although Daoxuan discusses his conversations with the *devas* at length, several Daoxuan-related works shed further light on the subject.

It has been possible to draw a number of firm conclusions through a close analysis of the sources. For example, according to the *vinaya* texts' strict definition of 'full ordination master' (*heshang* 和尚), it may be said that Zhishou was *not* Daoxuan's

*heshang* – a finding that contradicts every Daoxuan-related work that mentions the relationship between the two men (III.4.2.2). Similarly, with respect to Daoxuan’s supposedly arduous, personal encounters with Falin, I was able to establish not only that the Daoxuan-related works’ depiction of an alcohol-swilling, meat-eating, vomiting monk is far from accurate but also that Daoxuan never even met him (III.4.5.1).

Of course, a lack of information in the source material and contradictory accounts mean that it is sometimes impossible to reach a definitive conclusion. On such occasions, this study has endeavoured to weigh the evidence with an open mind, regardless of whether it is contained within Daoxuan’s own or the Daoxuan-related works, before advancing an unbiased opinion. For instance, this approach was adopted when discussing when and where Daoxuan studied under a number of teachers (Section III.4.2). Similarly, his motivation must remain a subject of debate. For instance, his determination to prove that *Sifen liu* is Mahāyāna (IV.5.2.2) could well be attributed to personal preference, his realization that discipline had to be established among China’s misbehaving Mahāyāna monks, the period in which he lived (when Mahāyāna Buddhism was exceedingly prevailing), or a combination of all three. And while we may say that his construction of a full ordination platform (IV.5.2.3.1) enabled the authorities to increase their control over China’s Buddhists, and his inclusion of *Yijiao jing* (IV.5.2.3.2) in the full ordination ceremony was probably inspired by the Emperor Taizong’s respect for that text, there is no way of knowing if these actions were motivated solely – or even primarily – by a simple desire to please the government.

However, while some ambiguities inevitably remain, this book has identified more works pertaining to the life of Daoxuan than any previous study, classified those sources to facilitate contrast and comparison, highlighted when certain aspects of Daoxuan’s life appear in the corpus for the first time, compiled a complete list of his extant works, drawn firm conclusions when possible and advanced evidence-based theories when not. In this way, it has fulfilled its principal aim: to enhance our understanding of the life of the *vinaya* master Daoxuan. Throughout the course of this study, we have seen a diligent student, a tireless traveller, a peerless proponent and exemplar of *vinaya*, a prolific writer and an indefatigable defender of the Buddha-dharma – a series of roles that were all defined and inspired by his commitment to *hufa*. It is only by viewing him in this light that we are able to gain a complete understanding of Daoxuan.

## Appendix 1: Kuiji's *Chapters on Various Topics of the Teaching of Mahāyāna*

窺基 (632-682) 大乘法苑義林章

第3卷 表無表色章 (T45.1861j3.299a12-316c27)

1.	辨名	列名 <sup>599</sup>	表色 (作色)	身表業				
				語表業				
				意表業				
			無表色 (無作色)	律儀無表				
				不律儀無表				
				非律儀非不律儀無表				
			釋名					
2.	出體	假身表業以色處中表色為性 (能動身思說名身業)						
		假語表業以聲為體 (能發語思說名語業)						
		意表以前二思為體 (審決二思意相應故作動意故)						
3.	假實分別							
4.	具支多少	支分義	受具足支					
			受隨法學處支					
			隨護他心支					
			隨護如所學處支					
		支類義 (唯有身三語四七支律儀)						
5.	得捨分齊	得	得緣	差別緣	得具足別解脫緣			
					四律			
				五論				
				羯磨得別解脫緣				
			無差別緣					
			時節					
			捨	捨相: 初得功能念念增長令不新長但順舊住不同前位更不新生				
				捨所學處				
				犯根本罪				
				形沒二形生				
				善根斷				
			棄捨眾同分 (命終)					
6.	依地有無							
7.	四大造性	表與無表律儀皆依所防身語以假名色						
8.	應成差別	資所成						
		師所成						
9.	先後得捨							
10.	釋諸妨難							

<sup>599</sup> Note that what Daoxuan refers to in connection with *jieti* as *zuo* 作 and *wu zuo* 無作 correspond, respectively, to *biao se* 表色 (*vijñaptirūpa*) and *wu biao se* 無表色 (*avijñaptirūpa*).

### (Appendix 1)

表無表色章--得具足別解脫緣四律

	十誦律 薩婆多宗	四分律 法藏部	僧祇律 大眾部	五分律 化地部
1.	自然得	善來	自覺具足	自然
2.	見諦得	上法 (自然)	善來	善來
3.	善來得	三歸	十眾	三歸
4.	自誓得	八敬	五眾	八不可越
5.	論議得	羯磨		羯磨
6.	受重法			
7.	遺信得			
8.	邊五得			
9.	羯磨			
10.	三歸			

表無表色章--得具足別解脫緣五論

	毘尼母論	磨得勒伽論	善見論	薩婆多論	明了論
1.	善來	自然	善來	見諦	善來
2.	上受	見諦	三歸	善來	三歸
3.	勅聽	問答	敬授 (見諦)	三語 (遺信)	略羯磨 (見諦)
4.	三歸	三歸	問答	三歸	廣羯磨
5.	八敬	自誓	受重法	自誓	善來 (尼)
6.	遺信	五眾	遣使	八法	遣使
7.	羯磨	五眾	八語	白四	廣羯磨 (遺信二部)
8.		八重法	四語		
9.		遺信			
10.		二部			

表無表色章--羯磨得別解脫緣

	四分律	僧祇律 (六緣) <sup>600</sup>	毘尼母論
1.	羯磨者比丘若受大戒者僧數滿足緣 (能秉僧)		和上如法
2.	白四羯磨如法成就教法成就緣 (所秉法)		闍梨如法
3.	得處所者結界成就界內不別眾緣 (秉法處所)		七僧清淨
4.	住比丘法中者年歲滿足身無遮難緣 (所為事)		羯磨稱文
5.			界內和合不別

<sup>600</sup> Kuiji has it here that *Sengqi lü liu yuan ji shi ba biqu wen* 僧祇律六緣即是釋八比丘文 ('what mentions in the *Sengqi lü* the six conditions is, in fact, the explanatory note to the eight kinds of *bhikṣus*'), T45.1861j3.305c8–9. However, the *Sengqi lü* (T22.1425j3) has no mention of either six conditions or the eight kinds of *bhikṣus*. On the other hand, a reference to the eight kinds of *bhikṣus* is found in the *Sifen lü* (T22.1428j1.571a24–27): *mingzi bhikṣu* 名字比丘, *xiangshi bhikṣu* 相似比丘, *zicheng bhikṣu* 自稱比丘, *shanlai bhikṣu* 善來比丘, *qiqiu bhikṣu* 乞求比丘, *zhuo gejieyi bhikṣu* 著割截衣比丘, *po jieshi bhikṣu* 破結使比丘, and *shou dajie baisijiemо rufa chengjiu dechusuo bhikṣu* 受大戒白四羯磨如法成就得處所比丘.

## Appendix 2: Dates of the Texts Listed in the Master Table<sup>601</sup>

1. 四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔 T40.1804j12.156c27: 唐武德九年六月 (626).
2. 四分律拾毗尼義鈔 X44.747j1.753b8: 貞觀之初(元年) (627).
3. 四分律刪補隨機羯磨 T40.1808j2.510c9: 唐貞觀中 (c.638)
4. 淨心戒觀法 T45.1893j1.819b20: 時在隨州興唐伽藍夏安居 (c. 639)
5. 四分律比丘尼鈔 X40.724j3.776c12: 貞觀一十九季 (645).
6. 新刪定四分僧戒本 X39.707j1.262b9: 貞觀二十一有年仲冬 (647).
7. 四分律刪補隨機羯磨疏 X41.728j4.344c20: (貞觀)二十二年 (648).
8. 教誠新學比丘行護律儀 HYQJ, vol.7, 403a: 永徽元年 (650)
9. 四分律比丘含注戒本 X40.714j4.175a13: 永徽初年 (650).
10. 四分律比丘含注戒本疏 X40.714j4.175a13: 永徽初年 (650).
11. 四分刪定比丘尼戒本 X40.714j4.175a13: 永徽初年 (650).
12. 大唐眾經音譯序 BPAD (c.650).
13. 釋迦方志 T51.2088j1.948a6: 大唐之有天下也將四十載 (c.658).
14. 釋門章服儀 T45.1894j1.839b5: 顯慶四年重於西明寺更為陶練 (659).
15. 妙法蓮華經弘傳序 T9.262j1.1c5-6: 自漢至唐六百餘載 (c.659).
16. 釋門歸敬儀 T45.1896j1.854c5: 大唐龍朔元年 (661).
17. 集古今佛道論衡 T52.2104j1.363a3: 唐龍朔元年 (661).
18. 師子莊嚴王菩薩請問經序 T14.486j1.697b2: 龍朔三年 (663).
19. 離垢慧菩薩所問禮佛法經序 T14.487j1.698c4: 龍朔三年(663).
20. 釋迦氏譜 T50.2041j1.84b23: 余年迫秋方命臨悲谷, 又內典錄有提及. (c.663)
21. 廣弘明集 T52.2103j1.97a5: 唐麟德元年 (664).
22. 集神州三寶感通錄 T52.2106j3.435a13: 麟德元年夏六月二十日(664).
23. 道宣律師感通錄 T52.2107j1.435a25: 麟德元年 (664).
24. 大唐內典錄 T55.2149j1.219a5: 麟德元年甲子歲 (664).
25. 繢大唐內典錄 T55.2150j1.342b19: 麟德元年 (664)..
26. 繢高僧傳 T50.2060j22.624a24: 今麟德二年 (c.665).
27. 關中創立戒壇圖經并序 T45.1892j1.807a6/18: 乾封二年 (667).
28. 量處輕重儀 T45.1895j1.839c14: 乾封二年 (667).
29. 律相感通傳 T45.1898j1.874b14: 唐乾封二年仲春 (667).
30. 中天竺舍衛國祇洹寺圖經 T45.1899j1.882c13: 唐乾封二年季春 (667).
31. 衆經目錄 T22.2148j1.181a10-13: 麟德元年正月二十六...首末三年. (c.667).
32. 唐西明寺上座道宣律師舍利塔記. BKCBj7.493a6 乾封三年 (668).
33. 法苑珠林 T53.2122j1.269b10: 大唐總章元年 (668).
34. 集沙門不應拜俗等事 不可知. 法苑珠林無載, 又其人為道宣同時, 故推之 (c.668).
35. 大唐西域求法高僧傳 T54.2125j4.233b14: 咸亨四年 (c.674).

<sup>601</sup> The vast majority of texts in Table 1 give a specific date of composition. However, when no such date is included in the work itself, an estimate (which is indicated by ‘c.’) is made on the basis of certain pieces of information. If nothing other than the author’s year of death is known, this is given as the approximate date of composition. It is marked as *qu qi zu nian* 取其卒年 (literally, ‘to take the year of authors’ death’). If a text by a particular author gives a year of composition while a related work by the same author does not, the date of the first text is given as the approximate date of the second (e.g. numbers 185 and 186). If a text can be dated to a particular era (*mou nian jian* 某年間), the middle year of that era is given as the approximate date of composition. Finally, when a text provides a year but other well-established sources indicate that this is incorrect, the final year of the era in which the given date fell is given as the approximate year of composition (e.g. number 214).

36. 南海寄歸內法傳 T54.2125j4.233b14: 咸亨四年 (c.674).
37. 僧羯磨 無法判斷, 以懷素入住西太原寺時間. (c.676).
38. 古清涼傳 T51.2098j1.1094c10: 今上麟德元年 (c.679).
39. 大唐大慈恩寺三藏法師傳 T50.2053j1.220c7: 垂拱四年 (688).
40. 大周刊定衆經目錄 T55.2153.j15.475a18: 天冊萬歲元年十月二十六日 (695).
41. 弘贊法華傳 T51.2067j10.47c1: 即神龍二年三月一日也. (c.706).
42. 四分比丘戒本疏 T40.1807j2.476c9: 南山律師云(及其它多處提到). (c.710).
43. 四分律疏飾宗義記 (此書被四分律行事鈔批 X42.736 引用). (c.711).
44. 四分律行事鈔批 X42.736j14.1063c7: 唐大極元年夏五月十二日 (712).
45. 唐長安西明寺塔 WYYHj855.4518a1-2: 開元神武皇帝御十方之四載 (716).
46. 繢古今譯經圖記 T55.2152j1.367c25: 開元庚午歲 (730).
47. 開元釋教錄 T55.2154j1.477a5: (開元)庚午歲 (730).
48. 開元釋教錄略出. 全同 T55.2154 (730).
49. 淨名經關中釋抄 T85.2777j1.440a27. 道液法師. 中京之名始於唐肅宗. (c.760).
50. 止觀輔行傳弘決 T46.1912ja.141b6-7: 永泰首元興唐八葉之四載. 永泰只有二年. 取其末. (c.766).
51. 法華文句 T34.1719j10.359c13-15: 適與江淮四十餘僧往禮臺山因見不空三藏門人含光奉勅在山修造.  
含光 766/767 年在五台山 T52.2120j2.834b5/835c12. 取其末. (c.767).
52. 唐大和上東征傳 D113.122j1.14b14/T51.2089j1.994b19: 寶龜十年 (779).
53. 四分律搜玄錄 無法斷定. 取澄觀序 X41.732j1.833a5 (c.779).
54. 大方廣佛華嚴經隨疏演義鈔 (T36.1736) T50.2061j5.737b7-8: 貞元三年十二月 (787).
55. 大華嚴經略策 成書時間不可確定, 但此書為說明前疏 (T36.1736)而做. (c.787).
56. 大唐貞元續開元釋教錄 T55.2156j3.766a24: 貞元十年 (794).
57. 法苑義鏡 善珠法師. 無法判定, 取其卒年.(c.797)
58. 貞元新定釋教目錄 T55.2157j1.771b2:大唐聖神文武皇帝貞元十六年庚辰 (799).
59. 傳教大師將來台州錄 T55.2159j1.1055b7-8: 延曆二十四年七月十五日 (805).
60. 傳教大師將來越州錄 T55.2160j1.1060a10: 大唐貞元二十一年 (805).
61. 北山錄 T52.2113j1.573a15: 元和時 (c.810).
62. 釋門自鏡錄 T49.2036j15.619c2-3: 元和九年 (c.814).
63. 中論疏記:安澄法師. 無法判定, 取其卒年. (c.814).
64. 法華傳記 無法判斷, 依其故事及引用釋門自鏡錄 (c.815).
65. 一切經音義 T54.2128j1.312a1-2: 元和十二年二月三十日(817).
66. 南山律師讚 唐穆宗. 時間不可定,取其卒年. (c.824).
67. 戒律傳來記 T74.2347j1.4c27:天長七年 (830).
68. 祕密漫荼羅十住心論.
- <https://www.weblio.jp/content/%E7%A7%98%E5%AF%86%E6%BC%AB%E8%8D%BC%E7%BE%85%E5%8D%81%E4%BD%8F%E5%BF%83%E8%AB%96> (830).
69. 日本國承和五年入唐求法目錄 T55.2165j11076b7:大唐開成四年四月(839).
70. 常曉和尚請來目錄 T55.2163j1.1069a13:承和六年九月(839).
71. 靈巖寺和尚請來法門道具等目錄 T55.2164j1.1072a14: 承和六年十二月 (839).
72. 慈覺大師在唐送進錄 T55.2166j1.1078b21: 承和七年正月十九日 (840).
73. 唐宣公律院碣 JSLj10.259.9: 嚴厚本撰柳公權正書會昌元年 (841).
74. 唐法寶律師批 X.44.747j2.797a4: 去會昌五年春 (846).
75. 惠運禪師將來教法目錄 T55.2168Aj1.1089a16: 承和十四年六月三十日 (847).
76. 入唐新求聖教目錄 T55.2167j1.1087b21: 承和十四年月日 (847).
77. 惠運律師書目錄 T55.2168A1089a16: 承和十四年六月三十日 (c.847).
78. 新羅國寄還書 X.44.747j2.796c19: 大中三年五月三日(849).
79. 寺塔記 T51.2093j1.1022c3: 大中七年 (853).

80. 福州溫州台州求得經律論疏記外書等目錄 T55.2170j1.1092c23:大中八年 (854).
81. 日本比丘圓珍入唐求法目錄 T55.2172j1.1101c25:巨唐大中十一年十月日(857).
82. 智證大師請來目錄 T55.2173j1.1107c25:巨唐大中十二年五月十五日(858).
83. 西陽雜俎其書 p.2:大約公元八百六十年. (c.860).
84. 宣室志 成書年代不可考. 其書 p.1056 提到大中年號. 故取其最後. (c.860).
85. 定宗論 無法確定. 在其 T74.2369j1.316b7-9 中提及安慧被立為座主. 根據  
[https://ja.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E5%AE%89%E6%85%A7\\_\(%E5%A4%A9%E5%8F%B0%E5%AE%97\)](https://ja.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E5%AE%89%E6%85%A7_(%E5%A4%A9%E5%8F%B0%E5%AE%97)),  
 安慧在 864 年被立為座主. 又 868 圓珍為座主. 所以, 蓮剛的定宗論應該在 864 後, 868 前. 又, 蓮剛沒有其他著作可以參考 (包括大日本全書). 故取其中. (c.866).
86. 菩提場經略義釋 T61.2230j5.564c8: 元永二年己亥九月七日. 元永年號不存在. 依智證大師生年推之, 己亥為 879 年, 其時為日本元慶年. (879).
87. 普通授菩薩戒廣釋 T74.2381.757a21: 元慶六年四月十五日(882).
88. 授決集 T74.2367j1.281c15-16: 日本元慶八年甲辰二月二十三日甲寅 (884).
89. 授菩薩戒儀 T74.2378j1.630a7: 仁和元年四月十三日(885).
90. 佛說觀普賢菩薩行法經記 T56.2194j2.254a13: 仁和四年六月二十一日 (888).
91. 開天傳信記 XTSj183.5384 云: “大順後王政微繁每以詩謠託諷”. JTSj179.4662 (890).
92. 四分律鈔簡正記 X43.737j1.22b6: 至今乾寧二年乙卯 (895).
93. 教時諍 <http://www.hieizan.or.jp/about/soshi> (c.902)
94. 律宗章疏 [http://cbetaonline.dila.edu.tw/zh/ZW0066\\_001](http://cbetaonline.dila.edu.tw/zh/ZW0066_001) (914).
95. 北夢瑣言 無法確認. 但其人在 (926-963) 間仕南平, 又可以肯定 p.467.9/469.8 其卒於 968. 又從其書命名 p.471, 又其在 963 勸主獻城, 又宋太祖聞其文名, 所以推其書在 (926-963) 間完成. 取其中. (c.944).
96. 舊唐書 JTSp5405 阮序云:至後晉開運二年方撰成奏上 (945).
97. 釋氏六帖 SGSZj7.751c9: 至顯德元年畢進呈 (954).
98. 受菩薩戒法 FZTJ (T49.2035j26.264c16) 大師入/卒永明寺 (961/975), 取其中. (c.968).
99. 妙法蓮華經釋文 T56.2189j1.144.21: 景子年建酉月朔五日 (976).
100. 太平廣記 ZZSLj11.325: 太平興國二年...明年書成名太平廣記 (978).
101. 往生要集 T84.2682j389b6: (永觀二年甲申)明年夏 (984).
102. 宋高僧傳 T50.2061j1.710a10: 端拱元年乾明節 (988).
103. 大宋僧史略 T54.2126j1.235b7: 咸平二年重更修治 (999).
104. 景德傳燈錄: T49.2035j44.402c23 景德元年(1004).
105. 金園集 X57.950j3.20a16: 景德四年丁未十月二十二日 (1007).
106. 涅槃玄義發源機要 T38.1766j1.15b23-24: 大中祥符七年甲寅正月(1014).
107. 南山祖師禮讚文(智圓): X56.949j8.878b22: 染筆大中祥符七年 (1014).
108. 維摩經略疏垂裕記 T38.1779j1.711a24-b7: 大中祥符八年...十二月十三日 (1015).
109. 閑居編. X56.948j1.865c6: 大宋大中祥符九年丙辰歲夏五月十日 (1016).
110. 釋氏要覽 T54.2127j1.257c11: 皇宋天禧四載秋既望 (1020).
111. 觀無量壽佛經疏妙宗鈔 T37.1751j1.195a15: 天禧五年歲在辛酉 (1021).
112. 首楞嚴義疏注經 T39.1799j1.823a29: 大宋天聖八年 (1030).
113. 觀音義疏記 成書年代不可知. 依其天竺別集. (c.1030)
114. 煥盛光道場念誦儀 成書年代不可知. 依其天竺別集. (c.1030).
115. 天竺別集 X57.951j3. 46a21: 天聖八年歲次庚午正月十五日. 取其最晚. (c.1030).
116. 崇文總目 CWZMP404 附錄: 慶曆元年十二月己丑(1041).
117. 淨心誠觀發真鈔 X59.1096ja.518a14: 慶曆五年歲次乙酉三月既望(1045).
118. 四分律隨機羯磨疏正源記 X40.726j1.786b18: 大宋皇祐三年辛卯正月(1051).
119. 南部新書 其書序言中: 嘉佑元年十一月十二日(1056).
120. 廣清涼傳 T51.2099j1.1101b10: 聖宋嘉祐紀號龍集庚子正月望日(1060).
121. 新唐書 XTS, p.6472: 嘉佑五年六月(1060).

122. 南山祖師禮讚文(仁岳) X77.1524j2.376a12: 治平元年春 (c.1060)
123. 南山祖師禮讚文(允堪). 無法斷定. 參考《正源記》和其它讚的時間推之. (c.1060).
124. 衣鉢名義章 無法確定, 以作者允堪其它書推之. (c.1060).
125. 傳法正宗論: T51.2078j1.716a14-16: 嘉祐之辛丑歲... 明年三月十七日 (1062).
126. 淨土往生傳 (T51.2071) T49.2035j47.426b25: 治平初 (1064-1067). (c.1064).
127. 參天台五臺山記 D115.427b3: 大宋國熙寧六年 (1073).
128. 汾陽無德禪師語錄 T47.1992j1.595b14: 守郡楚北 (楊億終其一身只在大中祥符七年官任汝州. 可視為楚北. 其年九月尊上玉皇聖號 SSYj8.157.1, 楊億傳/請歸: SSYj305.10079.6-10084.1/10083.5. 故). (1074).
129. 鐸津文集 T52.2115j1.648c16-17: 熙寧八年十二月五日(1075).
130. 四分律行事鈔資持記. 無法斷定年代, 依靠芝園遺編》推之. (c.1075).
131. 四分律刪補隨機羯磨疏濟緣記. 無法斷定, 依《芝園遺編》推之. (c.1075).
132. 佛遺教經論疏節要 依作者傳記 HYSZj8.141-156: 元豐中 (c.1082).
133. 四分律含注戒本疏行宗記. X39.714j1.710a21: 元祐三年 (1088).
134. 新編諸宗教藏總錄 T55.2184j1.1166a1: 時後高麗十三葉在宥之八年歲次庚午(只有一個庚午). (1090).
135. 三論玄疏文義要: 無法判定. 取珍海法師卒年. (1091).
136. 東域傳燈目錄 T55.2183j1.1145c12: 寬治八年(1094).
137. 釋門章服儀應法記 X59.1097j1.581c1: 紹聖二年安居中(1095).
138. 律宗新學名句 X59.1107j1.669c14: 紹聖改元前安居日(1098).
139. 芝園遺編 X59.1104j1.641b1: 紹聖五年二月十五日 (c.1098).
140. 四分刪定比丘尼戒本 X40.722j1.669b4: 元符己卯祖忌日 (1099).
141. 大悲成道傳贊 LZJSj7.153b8: 元符三年五月 (1100).
142. 悉曇要訣 [\(1101\).](https://kotobank.jp/word/%E6%82%89%E6%9B%87%E8%A6%81%E8%A8%A3-74155)
143. 觀無量壽佛經義疏 成書年代不可定. 依最後. (c.1107).
144. 佛說阿彌陀經義疏 成書年代不可定. 依最後. (c.1107).
145. 校勘義鈔序 成書年代不可定. 依最後. (c.1107).
146. 芝園集. 無法斷定. 取其最後只年限 X59.1105j1.658a1: 大觀元年 (c.1107)
147. 佛果圓悟禪師碧巖錄: T48.2003j10.224b17: 宣和乙巳春暮上 (1125).
148. 石門文字禪. 無法斷定. 取作者卒年. (c.1128).
149. 類說 其書序云: 此書成於紹興六年曾公慥之手. (1136).
150. 釋門歸敬儀通真記. 無法斷定. 取 X75.1513j7.339a2 之卒年 (c.1141).
151. 釋門歸敬儀護法記 X59.1094j1.432a20-21: 紹興二十年歲次庚午(1150).
152. 翻刻戒壇圖經後序 T45.1892.819a20: 紹興二十二年十二月朔 (1152).
153. 翻譯名義集 T54.2131j1.1055b3: 紹興丁丑重午日(1157).
154. 成唯識論本文抄 <http://db3.ninjal.ac.jp/SJL/getpdf.php?number=0870010320cs> (c.1160).
155. 隆興佛教編年通論 X75.1512: 以書名推之 (1163).
156. 護法論 T52.2114j1.638a7: 乾道辛卯六月望日 (1171).
157. 宣首座真讚. DMJ(序)p,299b4: 淳熙元年十月一日 (1174).
158. 通志二十略 WXTKj201.1685: 淳熙(1174-1189)間 (c.1179).
159. 群齋讀書志 QZDS(序)p,1: 淳熙七年至十四年之間 (c.1184).
160. 興禪護國論 T80.2543j1.17a21-b10: 大宋乾道九年...首尾一十八年. (c.1191).
161. 安養抄. 無法確定取作者卒年: 建久二年二月廿九日卒 (c.1191).
162. 遂初堂書目. 無法確定, 取作者卒年前 (c.1194).
163. 大日經住心品疏私記 T58.2215j3.705c8: 建久八年八月十五日(1197).
164. 法華經顯應錄 X78.1540.j1.21b24: 慶元四季中秋日(1198).
165. 樂邦文類 T47.1969Aj1.149a14: 慶元庚申中元日 (1200).
166. 嘉泰吳興志 JTWX (序)p,4679b1-2: 嘉泰改元臘月 (1201).

167. 唯識論同學鈔 T66.2263j68.595b8-9: 建仁二年十一月十日午時 (1202).
168. 四明尊者教行錄 T46.1937j1.856c1: 嘉泰二年壬戌歲臘月 (1202).
169. 天台九祖傳 T51.2069j1.97a27-28: 嘉定改元臘月望日 (1208).
170. 律宗問答. 無法確定. 依定源法師之 pp.183/194 推之. 又見 D115p.521 (c.1212).
171. 萬松老人評唱天童覺和尚頌古從容庵錄: T48.2004j1.226c23: 甲申 (1224).
172. 如淨和尚語錄 T48.2002.j1.121b14: 紹定二禪歲在己丑. (1229).
173. 唐崇聖寺佛牙寶塔碑 BKCBj7.489b3 (1232).
174. 南山律師贊 無法斷定. 依序文中 (GKJp.266a15) 真德秀之卒年. 見 SSYj437.12957.9-12965.1. (c.1235).
175. 淨土三部經音義集 T57.2207j1.383b17: 嘉祐第二之歷...春正月(1236).
176. 釋門正統 X75.1513j1.254b21: 皇宋嘉熙改元三月十日(1237).
177. 菩薩戒通別二受鈔 T74.2354j1.58b22: 嘉祐四年戊戌九月(1238).
178. 終南家業 X59.1109j1.718b19: 淳祐壬寅佛忌前一日(1242).
179. 西方指南鈔 TT83.2674j2.874c19: 康元二年丁巳 (1257).
180. 佛祖統紀 T49.2035j1.129c28: 宋咸淳五年歲在己巳八月(1269).
181. 釋氏通鑑 X76.1516j1.1a22: 時間淳六年菊節 (1270).
182. 觀心本尊抄 T84.2692j1.278a9: 文永十年太歲癸酉 (1273).
183. 法華取要抄 <https://ja.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E6%97%A5%E8%93%AE> (1274).
184. 大日經疏指心鈔 T59.2217j1.585a15: 文永十一年 (1274).
185. 黑谷上人語燈錄 T83.2611j1.105a:24: 文永十一年臘月如來成道日(1274).
186. 諸宗經疏目錄 (黑谷上人語燈錄). 此書引文全同 T83.2611j8.150a24. 又兩書為同一作者. (c.1274).
187. 觀經疏傳通記 T57.2209j1.497a9: 建治元年(1275).
188. 撲時抄 <https://ja.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E6%92%B0%E6%99%82%E6%8A%84> (1275).
189. 諸宗教理同異釋 T79.2528j1.60b20: 建治二年 (1276).
190. 報恩抄 <https://ja.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E6%97%A5%E8%93%AE>. (1276).
191. 三論玄義檢幽集 T70.2300j1.379a21: 於時弘安三年十一月二十一日 (1280).
192. 佛光國師語錄: T80.2549j3.162b2: 弘安八年六月. 取最後之時間. 祖元法師弘安九年去世. (1285).
193. 律宗行事目心鈔 T74.2359j3.129c23-24: 弘安九年二月十九日(1286).
194. 菩薩戒綱要鈔 T74.2358Bj1.103a2/110a29: 興正菩薩. 作者及時間不可定. 取興正菩薩之卒年. (c.1290).
195. 類編長安志: 書後 p.328 黃永年序云: 元貞二年纂成《類編長安志》(1296).
196. 五教章通路記 T72.2339j2.307b27: 正安二年 (1300).
197. 三國遺事 T49.2039j1.953c12: 其書以元至元大德間成 (c.1032).<sup>602</sup>
198. 秘鈔問答 T79.2537j10.603b2 (嘉元元年) 翌年正月(1303).
199. 墓山蓮宗寶鑑 T47.1973j2.304c16: 大德九年乙巳 (1305).
200. 律宗綱要 T74.2348j2.17a21: 當于大日本國嘉元四年丙午(1306).
201. 菩薩戒問答洞義鈔 T74.2358Aj197c23-24: 德治第三之曆戊申(1308).
202. 三國佛法傳通緣起 D101.130j3.34b6: 應長元年辛亥七月五日(1311).
203. 華嚴五教章問答抄 T72.2340j15.767c5: 正和第二癸丑八月二十四日(1313).
204. 梵網戒本疏日珠鈔 T62.2247j50.262c12: 文保二年歲次戊午五月(1318).
205. 文獻通考: 據《抄白》延祐五年之前此書已成,故以此為期. (c.1318).
206. 溪嵐拾葉集 T76.2410j68.731a25: 文保三年正月十一日(1319).
207. 釋摩訶衍論勘注 T69.2290j24.865a20-21: 元應二年八月十九日(1320).
208. 唐大和上東征傳 D113.147j2.18b10: 元亨二年六月(1322).
209. 華嚴五教章見聞鈔 T73.2342j8.175b4: 於時建武元年十月十八日 (1334).

<sup>602</sup> For a translation of this text, see Ha Tae-Hung and Grafton Mintz, *Samguk Yusa: Legends and History of the Three Kingdoms of Ancient Korea* (Seoul: Yonsei University Press, 1972). Special thanks to T. H. Barrett for drawing my attention to this translation.

- 210.歷朝釋氏資鑑 X76.1517j12.254c19: 至元后丙子歲臘月(1336).
- 211.菩薩圓頓授戒灌頂記 T74.2383j1.787b23-24: 延元四年己亥九月(1339).
- 212.佛祖歷代通載 T49.2036j1.477b20:至正元年六月十一日(1341).
- 213.宋史 其書末 p.14253 《進宋史表》云:至正五年(1345).
- 214.三論玄義鈔 T70.2301j3.531c27: 康永二十三年. 康永唯四年 (c.1345).
- 215.寶冊鈔 T77.2453j8.836b28: 貞和三年五月五日(1347).
- 216.資行鈔 T62.2248j28.860a5: 于時貞和五年八月(1349).
- 217.釋氏稽古略 T49.2037j1.737a8: 至正十四年秋九月(1354).
- 218.新學行要鈔 T74.2382j1.786c14: 延文元年八月二十五日(1356).
- 219.理趣釋祕要鈔 T61.2241j12.746a4: 延文元年丙申十一月十八日(1356).
- 220.座右鈔 T83.2641j1.531c27: 延文三年九月十一日(1358).
- 221.新修科分六學僧傳 X77.1522j1.65b5:至正丙午六月望 (1366).
- 222.重刊禪林僧寶傳序 X79.1560j1.490/W137.439b13-14: 洪武六年臘月(1373).
- 223.華嚴演義鈔纂釋 T57.2205j38.366a27: 于時永和元年九月二十四日(1375).
- 224.永源寂室和尚語錄 T81.2564j2.134a5: 永和丁巳冬節之前三日(1377).
- 225.四度授法日記 T77.2413j4.137c14: 至德四年丁卯三月十日(1387).
- 226.義堂和尚語錄: T80.2556j2.524b18-22: 丙午歲冬...倒指已閱二十年(1387).
- 227.知覺普明國師語錄 T80.2560j1.633a23: 永樂二年 (1404).
- 228.大日經疏鈔 成書年代不可知, 取其卒年. (c.1416).
- 229.神僧傳 T50.2064j1.948b13: 永樂十五年正月初六日 (1417).
- 230.緇門警訓 T48.2023j1.1041a23: 成化六年歲次庚寅春三月 (1470).
- 231.三論名教抄 T70.2306j3.721c24: 文明十三年 (1481).
- 232.見桃錄 T81.2572j1.412c10: 永正十三年 (c.1516).
- 233.唯識論闡書 T66.2264j27c20-23: 天文九庚子正月十二日(1540).
- 234.銷釋金剛經科儀會要註解 W92.236a3: 大明嘉靖三十年龍集辛亥四月 (1551).
- 235.諸回向清規 T81.2578j5.687c7: 永祿太歲丙丑 (1558? 其年無丙丑).
- 236.法華開示抄 T56.2195j28.482a24: 永祿二年己未六月十三日(1559).
- 237.八十八祖道影傳贊. X86.1608j1.616a4: 萬曆甲申中 (1584).
- 238.清涼山志, p.7: 明萬曆丙申秋 (1596).
- 239.天台山方外志, p.33: 皇明萬曆歲在辛丑孟冬(1601).
- 240.阿育王山志, p.11: 皇明萬曆壬子(1612).
- 241.阿育王山志序, p.51: 萬曆戊午年五月(1618).
- 242.徑山志, p.19: 天啟甲子秋九月(1624).
- 243.佛祖綱目 X85.1594j1.555c7: 卒業於崇禎四年之辛未 (1631).
- 244.華嚴五教章不審 T73.2343j20.300a5-6: 寬永拾四年丁丑三月十一日 (1637).
- 245.宗要柏原案立 T74.2374j6.564c20: 于時正保二年 (1645).
- 246.四分戒本約義 X40.718j1.305b1/W63.257b4: 歲次丙戌冬一陽月朔旦 (1646).
- 247.毗尼止持會集 X39.709j1.320a18: 順治己丑年前安居日 (1649).
- 248.重治毗尼事義集要 X40.719j17.483c24/W63.612b16: 庚寅八月 (1650).
- 249.行林抄 T76.2409j71.459c19: 承應二卯月七日 (1653).
- 250.高僧摘要 X87.1626j1.282a23: 甲午歲菊月登高日 (1654).
- 251.唯識義私記 T71.2319j6.418b12: 明曆四戊戌年 (1658).
- 252.歷朝法華持驗紀 X78.1541j1.74c2: 彼《觀音持驗記》云: 順治己亥 (1659).
- 253.毗尼作持續釋 X41.730j1.347c11/W65.4j1b4: 康熙乙巳歲前安居日(1665).
- 254.釋門章服儀序 T45.1894j1.834b8: 寬文五年乙巳之冬 (1665).
- 255.祇洹圖經跋 T45.1899j2.896a21: 日本天和元年十一月下旬六日 (1681).
- 256.祇洹圖經序 T45.1899j1.882c7: 天和元年龍集辛酉臘朔 (1681).

- 257.六道集 X88.1645j1.107b22: 康熙二十一年壬戌 (1682).
- 258.大乘圓戒顯正論 T74.2360j1.130b9: 貞享元龍集甲子蕤賓穀日 (1684).
- 259.律苑僧寶傳卷 D73.125b5: 貞享四年 (1687).
- 260.毗尼關要 X40.720j1.485b15/W63.615j1b18: 康熙戊辰歲春 (1688).
- 261.新刻量處輕重儀序 T45.1896j1.839b7: 貞享五年歲在戊辰中秋望旦(1688).
- 262.新刻輕重儀後序 T45.1896j1.854b26: 貞享五年八月十五日(1688).
- 263.雞足山志, p.25: 康熙三十一年歲次壬申孟秋 (1692).
- 264.佛像標幟義箋注 D73.1a16: 元祿乙亥 (1695).
- 265.唐招提寺戒壇別受戒式 T74.2351j1.40a25: 元祿十一年九月十一日(1698).
- 266.器朴論 T84.2681j3.32c15: 寶永三丙戌 (1706).
- 267.華嚴五教章匡貞鈔 T73.2344j1.301c4: 寶永丁亥夏 (1707).
- 268.大日經疏演奧鈔 T59.2216j1.1c2: 正德二龍集壬辰 (1712).
- 269.重刻律相感通傳 T45.1898j1.874b8: 享保戊戌歲三月既望日 (1718).
- 270.佛門衣服正儀編 D73.144a9: 享保丙午 (1726).
- 271.僧服正檢. D73.234j1 序言享保庚戌 (1730).
- 272.山西通志 四庫版 卷首 p.7.4: 雍正十二年 (1734).
- 273.陝西通志 四庫版 卷首 p.61.2: 雍正十三年二月 (1735).
- 274.阿毘達磨俱舍論指要鈔 <https://kotobank.jp/word/%E4%BF%A1%E5%9F%B9-1083216#E3.83.87.E3.82.B8.E3.82.BF.E3.83.AB.E7.89.88.20.E6.97.A5.E6.9C.AC.E4.BA.BA.E5.90.8D.E5.A4.A7.E8.BE.9E.E5.85.B8.2BPlus.> (c.1747).
- 275.成唯識論述記集成編 <https://kotobank.jp/word/%E4%BF%A1%E5%9F%B9-1083216#E3.83.87.E3.82.B8.E3.82.BF.E3.83.AB.E7.89.88.20.E6.97.A5.E6.9C.AC.E4.BA.BA.E5.90.8D.E5.A4.A7.E8.BE.9E.E5.85.B8.2BPlus.> (c.1747).
- 276.阿育王志續 (BPAD): 清乾隆二十二年 (1757).
- 277.六物辨 <https://kotobank.jp/word/%E6%99%AE%E5%AF%82-1105657> (c.1763).
- 278.新刻排科夾註戒本疏記序 W62.310a14: 明和元年甲申冬安居日(1764).
- 279.釋氏法衣訓 D73.381a13: 明和戊子. (1768).
- 280.繒衣光儀 D73.410b15: 龍飛辛卯 (1771).
- 281.新刻排科夾註戒本疏記序 W62.311a4: 安永二年龍次癸酉二月中 (1773).
- 282.大乘比丘十八物圖 D73.453b12: 安永第二季 (1773).
- 283.新刻排科夾註戒本疏記序 W62.311b2: 安永二年仲秋之日 (1773).
- 284.大乘法苑義林章師子吼鈔 T71.2323j1.473a5: 安永第五春 (1776).
- 285.阿毘達磨俱舍論法義 T64.2251j1.51a2: 天明七乙未年 (1781).
- 286.攝大乘論釋略疏成 <https://kotobank.jp/word/%E6%99%AE%E5%AF%82-1105657> (c.1781).
- 287.西山復古篇 T83.2645j1.576a13: 天明四年二月望日 (1784).
- 288.因明大疏融貫鈔 T69.2272j7.118a7: 釋基辨其年七十三歲 (1790).
- 289.長興縣志 CXXZj1.11: 嘉慶乙丑冬十月 (1805).
- 290.全唐文 文末上全唐文表: 嘉慶十九年 (1814).
- 291.心要鈔 T71.2311j150c13: 文化十二乙亥年孟冬日 (1815).
- 292.十八種物便蒙鈔序言 D73.457a7 文政己卯 (1819).
- 293.翻刻教諭律儀敘 T45.1897j1.869a17: 安政戊午春正月 (1858).
- 294.圓戒指掌 T74.2384j1.798c5: 安政七歲次庚申春二月 (1860).
- 295.唐文拾遺. 無法判斷,取流行之說法. (1869).
- 296.湖州府志. HZFZj91.426a5. (1874).

### Appendix 3: Daoxuan in *Fayuan zhulin*

Entry in <i>Taishō T53.2122</i>		Number of references	Entry within FYZL	Daoshi's Remark
j10.	353c22-355c18	3	灌帶部第二	是余同學
	362b17-c8		剃髮部第三	道宣律師感應記
j11.367c16-368b20		1	食糜部第五	住持感應記
j12.376a25		1	七百結集部第四	
j14.393b17-397b7		3	觀佛部感應緣之餘	刪繁補闕隨機而作
j16.408b18		1	發願部第五	右二驗出唐高僧傳
j18.421b23		1	感應緣	貞觀十一年
j35.560a24		4	然燈篇第三十一	乾封二年仲春二月
j38.	586a12	3 <sup>603</sup>	故塔部第六	配住西市南長壽坊崇義寺
	589b14			
j39.	591b3-593a3	2	伽藍篇第三十六	
	597c28-b13			
j94.980c25-981a16		1	穢濁篇第九十四	
j98.1008a16-1009a9		1	法滅篇第九十八	
j99.1017a17-b24:		1	雜要篇第九十九	
j100.1023b20-23c14		1	傳記篇第一百杂集	
		(Total 23)		

### Appendix 4, Part 1: The Evolution of Specific Elements in the Life Story of Daoxuan<sup>604</sup>

Text Number in Table 1	Monastery Affiliation	Title	Signs Prior to Conception	Three-Birth Story
1-28 NF				
29				(僧護/僧佑)*
30 NF				
31		律師*		
32	西明寺*	上座*/律師		
33	西明寺	律師		
34	西明寺	律師		
35		律師		
36		宣律師		
37		皇朝宣律師*		
38		律師		
39		沙門*/上座*/律師		
40		唐朝僧*		
41		律師		

<sup>603</sup> The total number of references in this section should be four, but one is a double reference (*lùishi wen si tianwang* 律師問四天王).

<sup>604</sup> Notes in appendix 4: NF None of the four elements features; \* First appearance.

42		南山律師*		
43		南山律師		
44		南山律師/南山*		
45	西明寺	上座		
46	豐德寺*	沙門		
47		沙門		
48	崇義寺*/西明寺	沙門		
49		終南宣律師*/宣律師		
50		南山/南山鈔主*		
51		南山		
52		南山/終南山宣律師		
53		鈔主/南山/宣公*		
54		宣公/南山		
55		宣公		
56	西明寺	上座/釋氏		
57		宣律師		
58	終南山豐德寺	沙門		
59	終南山	律師		
60	終南山	律師		
61		譯經之高僧*		
62		律師		
63		律師		
64	西明寺	律師		
65	終南山	沙門		
66		肇律宗主*		
67		南山律師		
68		律師		
69	終南山靈感寺*	大律師*/大德/律師		
70 NF				
71	太一山*	沙門		
72		沙門		
73		宣公		
74		南山祖師*		
75 NF				
76	終南山靈感寺/西明寺	大律師/故大德*/律師		
77 NF				
78		南山律祖*		
79		宣律師		
80		南山		
81	西明寺	故大德宣公		
82	西明寺	南山/故大德宣公		
83		宣律和尚*		
84 NF				
85	南山	律師		
86		南山		

87 NF				
88		南山/大師*		
89		南山		
90	終南山	律師		
91	西明寺	律師		
92		澄照*/鈔主/大師	月*/梵僧*	三生*/僧佑/僧護
93		律師		
94	終南山			
95		南山宣律師		
96 NF				
97		宣律師		
98 NF				
99	終南山			
100	西明寺/終南山	律師		
101		律德		
102	西明寺	終南上士澄照大师*/宣師	月/梵僧	僧佑/僧護/三生
103	西明寺	上座/大德		
104		律師		
105		南山		
106		南山		
107		吾祖聖師*	明月	
108		南山		
109 NF				
110		律師		
111		南山		
112		南山		
113		南山		
114		南山		
115		南山		
116 NF				
117		大師		
118		吾祖/沙門/大師		
119		宣律師		
120		律師		
121 NF				
122		南山祖師		
123		南山祖師		
124		南山		
125		宣律師		
126		(但言諸師)		
127 NF				
128		宣律		
129		宣		
130		大師/祖師		前身 (僧佑)
131		南山徵照大師		

132		南山		
133–134 NF				
135		宣律師		
136	寶積寺*/終南山	沙門		
137		祖師		
138		南山		
139		南山律師/九祖南山澄照律師*		
140		南山祖師		
141		終南宣律師		
142		律師		
143		南山		
144		南山		
145		我祖師*		
146		南山律師		
147		律師		
148		律師/沙門		
149		律師		
150		吾祖徵照律師/上座/大師		
151		南山祖師		
152		吾祖		
153		上座/律師		
154 NF				
155		南山律師	月/梵僧	僧佑
156		律師		
157		宣首座*		
158 NF				
159 NF				
160		律師		
161		律德		
162 NF				
163		律師		
164		律主	月/梵僧	僧佑/僧護
165		(但言諸師)		
166	豐德寺		日*/僧*	僧佑
167		南山		
168		南山/南山宗		
169		南山律師		
170		吾祖/南山律師祖		
171		律師		
172		南山律師		
173		沙門		
174		南山律師		
175		南山		
176		終南上士/澄照大師	月/梵僧	僧佑
177		南山律師		

178		吾祖南山澄照大師		
179		律師		
180		九祖南山律師	梵僧	僧佑
181	西明寺	律師		
182		律宗道宣		
183		元祖*		
184 NF				
185		律師/高祖		
186		律師		
187 NF				
188	終南山	律師		
189		律師		
190		律宗道宣		
191		南山		僧佑/僧護
192		律師		
193		南山/南山大師		
194		南山大師		
195		律師		
196		南山大師		
197		宣律師		
198	大唐	律師		
199		南山		
200		南山/九祖/高祖/大師/律主		三生
201		南山大師/南山		
202		宣/南山宣師/南山律師/南山大師		
203		南山		
204		南山大師		
205		唐僧		
206		律師		
207		南山		
208		終南山宣律師/律師		
209		南山		
210		宣公		
211		南山		
212		南山律師	月/梵僧	僧佑
213	終南山/大一山			
214		南山		
215		南山大師		
216		我祖師/大師/南山		
217	終南山	律師	月/梵僧	僧佑
218		南山/宣師		
219 NF				
220		南山		
221			月/梵僧	僧佑/僧護
222 NF				

223		南山		
224		律師		
225	終南山	律師		
226		律師		
227		律師		
228		南山律師/南山		
229			月/梵僧	僧佑/僧護
230		終南山/律師		
231		律師		
232–233 NF				
234	終南靈感寺	律師		
235	終南山	律師		
236 NF				
237		宣律師		
238		宣公/宣律師	日輪*	
239		唐道宣律師/南山		
240		宣律師		
241		宣律師		
242		宣律師		
243			月/梵僧	僧佑
244		南山		
245		南山律師		
246		宣律師		
247		宣祖/南山宣律師		
248		南山/宣公		
249 NF				
250			月/梵僧	僧佑/僧護
251		南山		
252		律師/南山教主*/澄照大師		
253		祖		
254		南山		
255		祖		
256		南山教主澈照大師/律主/我祖		
257 NF				
258		南山教主		
259	終南山/豐德寺	澈照大師	白月*/梵僧	僧佑/僧護
260		南山澄照/南山		
261		我高祖南山法慧大師*		
262		法惠大師*/祖宗*		
263		唐律師		
264		南山律師		
265		南山/南山大師		
266		律師		
267		南山宗		
268 NF				

269		唐終南山澈照大師		
270		宣師/南山澄照/宣律師/南山師/南山		
271		南山師		
272		律師	日	
273		宣律/律師		
274		律師		
275		南山		
276 NF				
277		南山		
278		澄照大師		
279		南山/南山律師		
280		澄照師/南山		
281		澄照大師/南山		
282		終南/南山		
283		終南鼻祖		
284–285 NF				
286		南山		
287		南山		
288		南山		
289–290 NF				
291		終南		
292		南山		
293		南山大師		
294		南山		
295–296 NF				

#### Appendix 4, Part 2: The Evolution of Specific Elements in the Life Story of Daoxuan

Text Number in Table 1	Time in Mother's Womb	Date of Birth (in Kaihuang Era)	Date of Śrāmaṇera/Bhikṣu Ordination	Date of Death (in 667 CE)/Age
1–8 NF				
9			十七/大業余歷	
10–32 NF				
33			早得從師	初冬十月三日* ([僧臘]五十餘年)*
34–46 NF				
47			少尋教相	
48–57 NF				
58			少尋教相	
59–91 NF				
92	十二月*	十六年四月八*	十七	十月三日/七十二*(僧臘五十二)*
93–101 NF				

102	十二月	四月八	十六	十月三日/七十二 (僧臘五十二)
103–119 NF				
120			長親師席	
121–154 NF				
155			年壯	八月*
156 - 159 NF				
160			十六	
161–165 NF				
166 <sup>605</sup>		(唐初四月八)*	十三*	(冬)
167–175				
176	彌十二月		十七/二十	Identical to SGSZ (102)
177–179 NF				
180	彌十二月	十五年*	十七/二十	十月三日
181–199 NF				八月
200			/三十	丁卯十月三日/七十二 (僧臘五十二)
201–205 NF				
206				十月三日/七十二歲
207–211 NF				
212	彌十二月		十七/二十	十月三十日
213–216 NF				
217			及長出家	十月初三日
218–220 NF				
221			十六/大業間	Identical to SGSZ (102)
222–228 NF				
229			弱冠	Identical to SGSZ (102)
230–242 NF				
243			十六?/十六?	十月三十日
244–249 NF				
250		四月八	十六/大業年中	
251 NF				
252				十月三日
253–258 NF				
259	十二月	十六年四月八	十七/二十	Identical to LZGY (200)
260–272 NF				
273			弱冠	十月
274–289 NF				
290			九歲/十六	二年/七十二
291–295 NF				
296			十五厭俗	

<sup>605</sup> Note that this is the only text to date Daoxuan's birth to the early Tang (*Tang chu* 唐初). It does not mention the year of his death or his age when he died; instead, it merely states that he died in winter (*dong* 冬).

## Appendix 4, Part 3: The Evolution of Specific Elements in the Life Story of Daoxuan

Text Number in Table 1	Names of the <i>devas</i> , Related Events and Objects			Bintoulu 賓頭盧
	Zhang Qiong 張瓊	Wei Jiangjun 韋將軍	Nezha 哪吒	
1–21 NF				
22	See full list of names in Table 8			
23–28 NF				
29	See full list of names in Table 8			(中印度三果僧釋迦蜜多羅)*
30–32 NF				
33	Except for ‘張瓊撰祇桓圖經’ and the name ‘韋琨’, all <i>deva</i> -related sections are identical to Daoxuan’s own accounts (23, 29)			
34–38 NF				
39	韋將軍 (決疑)			
40–53 NF				
54				(師子國三果僧)*
55–90 NF				
91		那咤* (托足*/佛牙*)		
92				賓頭盧*/長眉梵僧二人*
93–99 NF				
100	Except for ‘[鳩摩羅]什師德行’, all <i>deva</i> -related sections are identical to the accounts in FYZL (33)			
101 NF				
102		那咤 (托足/佛牙)		賓頭盧/三果梵僧二人
103–106 NF				
107		那咤 (捷疾*獻佛牙)		
108–118 NF				
119		那咤 (佛牙)		
120–148 NF				
149		那咤 (托足/佛牙)		
150–152 NF				
153		那咤 (佛牙)		
154 NF				
155	張瓊			賓頭盧
156		(毘天王之子佛牙)		
157–163 NF				
164		那咤 (托足)		
165–171 NF				
172		韋將軍 (捧足) *		
173–175 NF				
176		那咤 (托足/佛牙)		
177–179 NF				
180		那咤 (托足/佛牙)		

181	張瓊	韋將軍 (決疑)	(張瓊授佛牙/寶掌二物)	
182–194 NF				
195		韋將軍 (捧足)		
196 NF				
197			(佛牙)	
198–216 NF				
217	張瓊			
218–226 NF				
227	張瓊		(張瓊獻佛牙)	
228 NF				
229	張瓊		那吒 (托足/佛牙)	
230–242 NF				
243	張瓊		(張瓊托足)	
244–249 NF				
250			那吒 (托足/佛牙)	
251 NF				
252		韋將軍		
253–256 NF				
257			那吒 (托足/佛牙/寶掌)	
258 NF				
259	張瓊	韋琨 (決疑)	那吒 (佛牙)	賓頭盧
260–296 NF				

#### Appendix 4, Part 4: The Evolution of Specific Elements in the Life Story of Daoxuan

Text Number in Table 1	Shanwuwei	Sun Simiao	Long (Dragon)	Other Items
	善無畏	孫思邈	龍	其它
1–38 NF				
39				引證玄奘三藏*
40–46 NF				
47				彭祖*
48–69 NF				行記*及讚各一卷*
70–75 NF				
76				行記及讚各一卷
77–80 NF				
81				碑銘等*
82				碑銘等
83		孫思邈*	龍(雨)*	持律第一*
84			蛟龍*	
85–90 NF				
91	無畏*			
92			龍	母姓姚*/釋名*/高宗年立塔*/行狀*/碑文*/咸通年謚號澄照淨光*
93–94 NF				
95			乖龍*	
96–99 NF				
100				法琳道人*/異僧類*/ 引證鳩摩羅什*/劉禹錫*
101			龍	
102	無畏	孫思邈	龍(井水/雨)	窺基*/李邕*/韓伯通*/嚴厚本*
103–108 NF				
109				南山傳*
110–117 NF				
118				大部有三*/嚴厚本/字法遍*
119–140 NF				
141				妙善故事*
142–148 NF				
149	無畏			
150–154 NF				
155		孫思邈		窺基/妙善故事
156–169 NF				
170				天台三大部*
171–175 NF				
176	無畏		龍(井水)	南山三大部*
177–179 NF				
180			龍(井水)	法慧大師*
181 NF				

182	無畏 (特例)			
183–196 NF				
197				(義湘法師)*
198–199 NF				
200				法慧菩薩*/東土菩薩*
201–211 NF				
212			龍 (四年/井水)	
213–216 NF				
217			龍	法慧大師
218–220 NF				
221		孫思邈	龍 (雨/貞觀中/井水)	
222–228 NF				
229			龍 (井水)	
230–242 NF				
243			龍 (武德七年聽法)	
244–249 NF				
250		孫思邈	龍 (雨/井水)	
251 NF				
252			龍	
253–254 NF				
255				南山撰集錄*
256–258 NF				
259	無畏 (特例)	孫思邈(特例)	龍 (井水)	賜號/塔/謚
260 NF				
261				法慧大師
262				法惠大師*
263–295 NF				
296				李邕/嚴厚本

## Appendix 5: The Date of *Xu gaoseng zhuan*

The year when Daoxuan concluded his *Xu gaoseng zhuan* has long been a subject of debate among Buddhist scholars. The author himself asserts that he completed the text in 645 CE (*Zhong Tang Zhenguan shi you jiu nian* 終唐貞觀十有九年).<sup>606</sup> However, he includes details of several events that took place in later years, five of which are discussed by Chi Limei 池麗梅.<sup>607</sup> The last of Chi's examples occurred in the twenty-third year of the Zhenguan era (649 CE),<sup>608</sup> but we know that some of the events that Daoxuan describes in *Xu gaoseng zhuan* took place even later.

As Table A indicates, Daoxuan mentions a total of fifty-five dates that equate to later than 645 CE. Table B shows that thirty of the fifty-five fall within the Zhenguan era, with nineteen taking place in 649, the latest year suggested by Chi when presenting her five examples (which correspond to numbers 3, 8, 14, 31 and 53 in Table A).<sup>609</sup> However, as number 35 in Table B indicates, in the *Taishō* collection version of *Xu gaoseng zhuan* Daoxuan mentions 'the second year of the Linde era' (*Linde er nian* 麟德二年, 665 CE), so I have assumed that the text was completed in that year.

---

<sup>606</sup> T50.2060j1.425b22. For a study on the date of *Xu gaoseng zhuan* see, among others, Chen Yuan 陳垣 (陳文會). *Zhongguo fojiao shiji gailun* 中國佛教史籍概論 (Gaoxiong: Fuwen tushu chubanshe, 1984), 28–38.

<sup>607</sup> Chi Limei 池麗梅, '道宣の前半生と『續高僧伝』初稿本の成立 (The First Half of Daoxuan's (596–667) Life and the Formation of the First Version of the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* 繼高僧傳 Completed in the Zhenguan Era (627–649)', 日本古写経研究所研究紀要 (*Journal of the Research Institute for Old Japanese Manuscripts of Buddhist Scriptures*), vol. 1 (2016), 90, n. 3.

<sup>608</sup> Chi does not explain why she chose only these five examples. She may have studied only the 'first manuscript' (*chugao ben* 初稿本) of the *Taishō* collection version of XGSZ, or possibly another version entirely. (As she states in n. 3: 貞觀十九年以後の記事は、刊本大蔵經本に限らず、現存最古の形態を温存している日本古写経本の中にも多数確認されている。)

<sup>609</sup> Note that Chi's third example reads: 貞觀二十三年 [649] 四月八日に入滅した閩州摶山栖霞寺の習禪高僧「智聰伝」(卷二十). However, the date is 貞觀二十二年 [648] in the *Taishō* collection version, at T50.2060j20.595b14. The *Taishō* editor (n. 21 at T50.2060j20.595) explains that the date is given as 貞觀二十三年 in some versions of the XGSZ.

## Appendix 5, Table A

No.	Name and Entry in T50.2060	Context	Category
1.	釋慧璧 j13.531a28	貞觀之末年七十餘伊人不遠	義解
2.	釋三慧 j14.534c10	貞觀中召入翻譯(卒, 不詳何年)	義解
3.	釋智凱 j14.538a11	貞觀二十年卒	義解
4.	釋法敏 j15.538b27	貞觀十九年八月二十三日卒	義解
5.	釋慧璿 j15.539a8	貞觀二十三年七月十四日卒	義解
6.	釋靈睿 j15.539c12	貞觀二十年卒	義解
7.	釋法常 j15.540c14	貞觀十九年六月二十六日卒	義解
8.	釋道洪 j15.547a20	貞觀末年卒	義解
9.	釋義褒 j15.547b20	(顯慶三年入內辯論)	義解
10.	釋道綽 j20.593c11	綽今年八十有四而神氣明爽	習禪
11.	釋明淨 j20.594b2	(不測其存沒. 貞觀三年祈雨, 太宗為其度僧三千)	習禪
12.	釋慧熙 j20.594c16	(應為貞觀十九年后卒, 與窺基法師有故)	習禪
13.	釋世瑜 j20.595a8	貞觀十九年四月八日卒	習禪
14.	釋智聰 j20.595a28	貞觀二十二年四月八日卒	習禪
15.	釋無礙 j20.26.599a	貞觀十九年二月二十八日卒	習禪
16.	釋法顯 j20.599c5	永徽四年正月十一日午時卒	習禪
17.	釋玄爽 j20.600a14	顯慶三年卒	習禪
18.	釋惠仙 j20.600b2	永徽六年十一月十七日卒	習禪
19.	釋惠寬 j20.600b29	永徽四年夏六月二十五日卒 于/寺今見在/修營至今	習禪
20.	釋僧倫 j20.601c1	貞觀二十三年五月十三日四更卒	習禪
21.	釋靜之 j20.601c28	顯慶年春三月召入西明/五年春三月二十七日卒	習禪
22.	釋智巖 j20.602a25	永徽五年二月二十七日卒 ( <i>Taishō</i> 卷數有誤)	習禪
23.	釋善伏 j20.602c22	顯慶五年卒(卷數有誤)	習禪
24.	釋解脫 j20.603b11	永徽中卒今靈軀尚在(五台山佛光山寺)(卷數有誤)	習禪
25.	釋法融 j20.603c17	顯慶二年閏正月二十三日/傳者重又聞之 (604b1) (卷數有誤)	習禪
26.	釋惠方 j20.605b25	貞觀二十一年冬初卒(卷數有誤)	習禪
27.	釋道信 j20.606b2	永徽二年閏九月四日卒(卷數有誤)	習禪
28.	釋惠明 j20.606b29	龍朔年/與其言論無得為先...莫知定所(606c13-14) (卷數有誤)	習禪
29.	釋慧進 j22.618c25	(附見) 道瓊/貞觀十九年正月十五日/余聞往焉欣然若舊	明律
30.	釋道亮 j22.619b2	今貞觀十九年...見處義興(長安)	明律
31.	釋慧旻 j22.619c2	貞觀末年八月十一日旦卒	明律
32.	釋道胄 j22.623a5	顯慶四年卒	明律
33.	釋道興 j22.623a23	顯慶四年卒/永徽三年玄奘法師送舍利令供養	明律
34.	釋明導 j22.623c16	麟德元年/今年六十餘	明律
35.	釋曇光 j22.624a24	今麟德二年東都講說	明律
36.	釋曇遷 j23.641a18	武德八年卒/傳者親往其寺不及其人(并部興國寺)/名行僧道綽	感通
37.	釋弘智 j24.642a17	永徽六年五月九日卒	感通
38.	釋道會 j24.642b16	貞觀末卒	感通
39.	釋智勤 j24.643a10	顯慶四年五月十六日卒	感通
40.	釋智則 j25.655a19	自貞觀來/余親目見(在辯才寺)	感通
41.	釋通達 j25.655b7	貞觀已來	感通

42.	釋明琛 j25.655c24	其伴目驗斯報(現身變蛇)至鄰說之(道宣親見其圖)	感通
43.	釋法慶 j25.661a29	(附見)雍州渭南人單道琮者云永徽五年	感通
44.	釋德山 j25.661b8	(附見益州草堂寺旭上)同共目之	感通
45.	釋道悅 j25.661c21	永徽中(卒而復見)	感通
46.	釋慧因 j25.663b27	貞觀十九年大旱(卒年不知)	感通
47.	帝示階 j25.664b8	貞觀年中/今在幽州出家	感通
48.	釋法聰 j25.664c3	顯慶元年冬卒	感通
49.	釋明隱 j25.665a11	近龍朔中	感通
50.	釋明濬 j25.665b26	永徽二年三月卒	感通
51.	釋明解 j25.665c5	(附見)龍朔之中卒	感通
52.	釋法沖 j25.666a3	至今麟德年七十九米食不減	感通
53.	釋會通 j27.683c18	貞觀末年	遺身
54.	釋智通 j29.698a12	貞觀二十三年十月十三日卒	興福
55.	釋慧常 j30.704c21	(附見)曇寶禪師(貞觀中)	雜科

**Appendix 5, Table B**

Year Name	Number in Table A
Zhenguan 貞觀 (627–649; 30 cases in total)	(Clearly in 649 CE; 19): 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 20, 26, 29, 30, 31, 38, 46, 53, 54
	(Probably in 649 CE; 11): 2, 10, 11, 12, 36, 40, 41, 42, 44, 47, 55
Yonghui 永徽 (650–655; 10)	16, 18, 19, 22, 24, 27, 37, 43, 45, 50
Xianqing 顯慶 (661–665; 9)	9, 17, 21, 23, 25, 32, 33, 39, 48
Longshuo 龍朔 (661–663; 3)	28, 49, 51
Linde 麟德 (664–665; 3)	34, 35, 52

## Appendix 6: Works of Li Yong 李邕<sup>610</sup>

No.	Reference	Entry
1.	T48.2023j8.1084a22-23	(提到李邕)*
2.	T50.2061j14.792b21	為文綱律師碑
3.	T50.2061j18.823a11	為僧伽法師碑
4.	T50.2061j19.834c17-18	滑臺守李邕著碑文並書釋懷道
5.	T50.2061j29.893a21-22	(提到李邕)*
6.	T51.2095j1.1027c26-27	東林寺碑前陳州刺史李邕開元十九年七月十五日
7.	T51.2095j5.1048b19-20	東林寺碑前陳州刺史李邕開元十九年七月十五日
8.	T51.2097j2.1078a16	(東林寺)*
9.	T55.2159j1.1056b3	天台山國清寺碑一卷七紙
10.	T55.2159j1.1056b7	南岳記一卷三紙
11.	T55.2165j1.1075c11	揚州東大雲寺演和上碑並序一卷
12.	T55.2165j1.1075c14	唐故大律師釋道圓山龕碑並序一卷
13.	T55.2165j1.1075c15-16	大唐大慈恩寺翻經大德基法師墓志銘並序一卷
14.	T55.2165j1.1075c17	大慈恩寺大法師基公塔銘並序一卷
15.	T55.2165j1.1075c18	唐故終南山靈感寺大律師道宣行記一卷
16.	T55.2165j1.1075c19	大唐西明寺故大德道宣律師讚一卷
17.	T55.2165j1.1075c20	天台大師答陳宣帝書一卷
18.	T55.2167j1.1086c28	揚州東大雲寺演和上碑並序一卷
19.	T55.2167j1.1087a4	唐故大律師釋道圓山龕碑並序一卷
20.	T55.2167j1.1087a5-6	大唐大慈恩寺翻經大德基法師墓志銘並序一卷
21.	T55.2167j1.1087a7	大慈恩寺大法師基公塔銘並序一卷
22.	T55.2167j1.1087a8	唐故終南山靈感寺大律師道宣行記一卷
23.	T55.2167j1.1087a9	大唐西明寺故大德道宣律師讚一卷
24.	T55.2167j1.1087a10	天台大師答陳宣帝書一卷
25.	T55.2170j1.1095c3	福州大律故懷道闍梨碑頌一卷括州李邕
26.	T55.2173j1.1107a3	唐西明寺故大德宣公律院碣一本 (無名)
27.	X88.1651j2.383b20-384a24	唐故白馬寺主翻譯惠沼神塔碑 (并序)
28.	X88.1651j2.381c9-382b4	大唐大慈恩寺法師基公碑 (朝請大夫檢校史部侍郎李又)
29.	BKCBj6.451a.2-3	唐魏州刺史狄仁傑生祠碑
30.	BKCBj6.482a12-15	唐雲麾將軍李秀碑
31.	BQJSj57.205	靈岩寺碑頌
32.	QDHSj33.1660	忽聞天子訪沈淪
33.	QDHSj33.1663	明時奉遣出皇州
34.	QDHSj33.1663	綵雲篇
35.	QDHSj33.1664	秋夜泊江渚
36.	QDHSj33.1665	我有方寸心
37.	QTSj3.27.13-15	李隆基.送李邕之任滑臺 *
38.	QTSj115.1168	銅雀妓
39.	QTSj115.1168	詠雲
40.	QTSj115.1168	登歷下古城員外孫新亭

<sup>610</sup> Note: \* Works of other authors that mention or contain important information about Li Yong.

41.	QTSj115.1168	奉和初春幸太平公主南莊應制
42.	QTSj168.1740.9-11	李白. 上李邕 *
43.	QTS j216.2252.1	杜甫. 奉贈韋左丞相丈二十二韻 *
44.	QTS j775.8783.8-9	范夜. 失題 *
45.	QTWj251.2535b5-9	授李邕戶部郎中制 *
46.	QTWj261.2646a	石賦
47.	QTWj261.2646b	鵠賦
48.	QTWj261.2647a	春賦
49.	QTWj261.2648a	日賦
50.	QTWj261.2648b	鬥鴨賦
51.	QTWj261.2649b	賀章仇兼瓊克捷表
52.	QTWj261.2649b	賀加天寶尊號表
53.	QTWj261.2650a	賀新殿鍾鳴表
54.	QTWj261.2650b	賀感夢聖祖表
55.	QTWj261.2651a	辭官歸滑州表
56.	QTWj261.2651a	為濠州刺史王弼謝上表
57.	QTWj261.2651b	淄州刺史謝上表
58.	QTWj261.2651b	謝入朝表
59.	QTWj261.2652a	謝元宗書上考表
60.	QTWj261.2652b	謝敕書及彩綾表
61.	QTWj261.2652b	第二表
62.	QTWj261.2653a	謝賜遊曲江宴表
63.	QTWj261.2653b	謝恩慰諭表
64.	QTWj261.2654a	進喜雪詩表
65.	QTWj261.2654a	進文馬表
66.	QTWj261.2654b	諫鄭普思以方技得幸疏
67.	QTWj261.2655a	謝恩命遣高將軍出錢狀
68.	QTWj261.2655a	又駁韋巨源謚議
69.	QTWj261.2656b	端州石室記
70.	QTWj261.2657a	崧台石室記
71.	QTWj261.2657a	越州華嚴寺鍾銘 (並序)
72.	QTWj261.2657b	滑州大廳銘
73.	QTWj261.2657b	大照禪師塔銘
74.	QTWj261.2661a	晴熱帖
75.	QTWj261.2661a	藤偈
76.	QTWj261.2661a	國清寺碑 (並序)
77.	QTWj261.2663a	葉有道碑 (並序)
78.	QTWj261.2664b	秦望山法華寺碑 (並序)
79.	QTWj261.2666a	袁州曲阜縣孔子廟碑 (並序)
80.	QTWj261.2667b	楚州淮陰縣婆羅樹碑
81.	QTWj261.2668b	鄭州大雲寺碑
82.	QTWj261.2669b	嶽麓寺碑
83.	QTWj261.2671b	靈岩寺碑 (並序)
84.	QTWj261.2672b	大唐泗州臨淮縣普光王寺碑
85.	QTWj261.2673b	嵩嶽寺碑

86.	QTWj261.2675b	大相國寺碑
87.	QTWj261.2676b	海州大雲寺禪元卯
88.	QTWj261.2677b	東林寺碑 (並序)
89.	QTWj261.2679a	五台山清涼寺碑
90.	QTWj261.2680a	大唐贈歙州刺史葉公神道碑
91.	QTWj261.2681a	贈安州都督王仁忠神道碑
92.	QTWj261.2682b	長安縣尉贈隨州刺史王府君神道碑
93.	QTWj261.2684a	唐贈太子少保劉知柔神道碑
94.	QTWj261.2686a	中大夫上柱國鄂州刺史盧府君神道碑
95.	QTWj261.2687a	逸人竇居士神道碑
96.	QTWj261.2688b	桂府長史程府君神道碑
97.	QTWj261.2689b	唐故云麾將軍右武衛大將軍贈秦州都督彭國公謚曰昭公李府君神道碑 (並序)
98.	QTWj261.2691a	左羽林大將軍臧公神道碑
99.	QTWj261.2694a	唐東京福唐觀鄧天師碣
100.	QTWj261.2695b	羽林大將軍臧公墓誌銘
101.	QTWj261.2696b	雲麾將軍碑

## Appendix 7: Comparison of the Story of Miaoshan in X75.1512 and X24.467<sup>611</sup>

1. 律師嘗問天神觀音大士緣起
2. 師問天曰吾聞觀音大士於娑婆大有因緣顯化何地最勝天曰菩薩示現無方而肉身降跡香山為勝師曰香山今在何處天曰嵩岳之南二百餘里三山並列中為香山即菩薩之地山之東北
3. 天神對曰
- 4.
5. 往昔過去劫有王曰莊嚴夫人曰寶應
6. 乃過去有王名妙莊嚴主夫人名寶德
7. 生三女長曰妙顏曰妙音季曰妙善
8. 王無太子惟有三女長妙顏次妙音小妙善
9. 妙善始孕夫人夢吞月及誕之夕大地震動異香天華遍及內外國人駭異既生不浴而鮮潔梵相端嚴五色雲覆其身國人曰聖人出世之徵也父母雖奇之然心邪遂惡菩薩長成自然慈婉衣服華鮮日中一食宮中號曰佛心娘子宮娥沐化咸遷善離欲王稍憎之
- 10.
- 11.
12. 三女之中二女已配唯第三女進止容儀超然拔俗常服垢衣不華飾日止一食不茹葷辛齋戒修行無有退志
13. 將欲擇配妙善廉知曰富貴不長有榮華如泡幻雖陵以賤役絕無悔心
14. 王謂妙善曰汝今出幼當招駙馬妙善曰愛河浪闊苦海淵深豈貪一世之榮而沉多劫之苦志求出家修行學道
15. 王同夫人召而誘之則曰若免三患當從嚴命王曰何謂三患妙善曰一者世人少時面如珂月及老髮白面皺行住坐臥百不如少二者肢體康強步武若飛忽一病至臥于床枕無一可喜三者姻戚集會骨肉滿前一旦無常父子雖親豈能相代三患若免從婚可得若未能者不如出家務道了達本心諸患自滅

<sup>611</sup> Note: Odd numbers are passages from X75.1512 and even numbers are passages from X24.467. Source at (隆興佛教編年; 1163, 155) X75.1512j13.175b12–176a5 and (金剛經科儀會要註解; 1551, 233) X24.467j1.661b10–c23.

- 16.
17. 王怒責令治圃裁損飲膳二姊亦私往奪其志妙善固守不回夫人親諭之
18. 王怒擯後花園絕其飲食令母苦勸而招駙馬
19. 妙善曰
20. 妙善曰
21. 一切世間恩愛纏縛無有出期骨肉會合當必離散願母自寬幸有二姊虞侍無以妙善為意也夫人及姊因奏王捨之出家
22. 虛空有盡我願無窮
23. 王怒
24. 王聞大怒
25. 召諸尼誠之必欲苦楚令退志
26. 詔白雀寺尼僧惠真領去寺內種菜設計勸勉回宮
27. 尼等恐懼以麞務柴水杵臼園蔬任之感圃蔬冬茂厨側湧泉久而妙善無退意王聞有泉蔬之異
- 28.
- 29.
30. 妙善曰豈不聞障人出家萬劫受芒汝等敢違佛門利益甘受三塗業報尼曰我奉王命非干我事妙善不允堅欲出家尼奏王
31. 大怒
32. 王大怒
33. 遣武士取首并殺尼眾
34. 令軍圍寺盡斬尼眾火焚僧房
35. 使者將至忽雲霧如山咫尺莫辨及霽獨失妙善所在
- 36.
37. 為神捧至他巖卜居
38. 公主被龍神攝在香山之下毫髮無損
39. 神曰地薄不任凡三遷而後得今香山
- 40.
41. 妙善居之木食潤飲
42. 結菴而居草衣木食人莫知之
- 43.
44. 已經三載時王因是毀寺殺僧罪業故
45. 久之王得迦摩羅疾偏身腐爛寢食輒然國醫皆莫能差將殂
46. 感迦摩羅疾寢息不安醫治不瘥榜詔四方人治之
47. 有僧言善療
48. 時有異僧曰吾有神方可療王疾僧言善療王曰汝有何藥
49. 然須無嗔人手目
50. 僧曰用無嗔人手眼合藥服之即瘥
51. 王甚難之
52. 王曰此藥難得
53. 僧曰王境內西南香山有菩薩修行王若遣使求之二物必得
54. 僧曰不難今王國內西南有香山絕頂有一仙人修道行滿此人無嗔求之必與
55. 王不獲已命內侍往道其意
56. 王令侍臣持香入山拜仙人曰君王有疾敢勞僕人求其手眼以救王命當令發心
57. 妙善曰我父不敬三寶毀滅正教誅無罪之尼此招報也
- 58.
59. 即忻然剗目斷臂授使者
60. 僕人聞已刀剗其兩目斷其雙手付與侍臣
- 61.
62. 爾時大地悉皆震動侍臣迴國
63. 復告以勸王改往趣善無惑邪法及奉二物

- 64.
65. 僧以成藥王餌之立効
66. 令僧合藥王乃服而病愈
67. 厚謝醫僧僧曰謝我何為當謝施手目者僧忽不見王驚神助
- 68.
69. 遂命駕同夫人二女入山謝菩薩
70. 其王嚴駕至香山拜謝瞻禮
71. 相見未語夫人識之乃妙善也不覺哽噎涕淚
72. 王見僊人無有手眼身不完具王及夫人左右窺視深生哀念僊人形相頗類我女
73. 妙善曰夫人憶妙善否我念父王之恩報以手目
74. 僊人曰我即妙善是也兒奉手眼上報父恩
75. 王及夫人聞語抱持哭之慟
76. 王聞之抱持大哭
- 77.
78. 王曰朕乃無道使令我女受大苦痛僊人曰吾非苦痛我捨肉眼得金剛眼捨凡夫手得金色臂誓願不虛必得是果
79. 夫人欲以舌舐其目未及之間
- 80.
81. 忽然祥雲周覆天樂發聲動地雨華乃現千手千眼聖像當空堂堂從者萬數
82. 於是天地震動僊人乃現千手千眼大悲觀世音菩薩身相端嚴光明晃耀巍巍堂堂如星中月
83. 慶悲之聲震響山谷須臾菩薩還復本身儼然而逝王及夫人二姊閻維收舍利即山建塔
84. 王於夫人合國人等皆發善心歸向三寶菩薩遂入三昧端然入滅矣
85. 宣又問菩薩處處化身豈應獨在香山耶神曰今震旦境內唯香山最殊勝山在嵩嶽之南二百里今汝州香山是也
- 86.

## Appendix 8: Yuanzhao's List of Daoxuan's Texts

No.	Text Title	Scroll Number	Yuanzhao's Remark
1.	四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔	三卷	見行 以下宗承律藏
2.	四分律拾毗尼義鈔	三卷	見行
3.	四分律刪補隨機羯磨	二卷	見大藏
4.	四分律刪補隨機羯磨疏	四卷	見行
5.	四分律含註戒本	二卷	見行
6.	四分律含註戒本疏	四卷	見行
7.	四分律刪定僧戒本	一卷	盛行
8.	四分律比丘尼鈔	三卷	見行
9.	四分律註比丘尼戒本	二卷	未見
10.	四分律刪定尼戒本	一卷	見行
11.	量處輕重儀	一卷	見行
12.	釋門章服儀	一卷	見行
13.	護三寶物儀	二卷	未見
14.	律相感通傳	一卷	見行
15.	教誡新學比丘行護律儀	一卷	見行
16.	釋門集僧軌度圖經	一卷	見行
17.	關中創立戒壇圖經	一卷	見行
18.	淨厨誥	一卷	見行
19.	護僧物制	一卷	見行
20.	淨心誠觀(最早出現)	一卷	見行
21.	教俗士設齋儀	一卷	未見
22.	妙法蓮華經苑	三十卷	未見 以下弘贊經論
23.	妙法蓮華經音義	一卷	未見
24.	妙法蓮華經弘傳序	一卷	見
25.	眾經律論音義敘致	一卷	未見
26.	諸經要集	二十卷	見大藏
27.	大唐內典錄	十卷	見大藏
28.	注時非時經	一卷	未見
29.	廣弘明集	三十卷	見大藏 以下護法住持
30.	結集正教住持遺法儀	六卷	有本
31.	集古今佛道論衡	三卷	見大藏
32.	東夏三寶感通錄	三卷	見大藏
33.	釋門護法儀	一卷	未見
34.	護法住持儀	一卷	未見
35.	佛法東漸圖贊	二卷	未見
36.	佛教東漸化跡	一卷	未見
37.	聖跡見在圖贊	一卷	未見
38.	住法圖贊	一卷	見行
39.	釋迦略譜(或云釋氏譜)	二卷	見大藏
40.	釋迦法誌	四卷	見大藏
41.	感應圖錄	一卷	未見
42.	感通記	十卷	未見

43.	付囑儀	十卷	未見
44.	釋門正行懺悔儀	三卷	未見 以下禮敬行儀
45.	六時禮佛懺悔儀(或云六時禮文)	一卷	見行
46.	集佛經六時行道儀	一卷	見行
47.	釋門歸敬儀	一卷	見行
48.	續高僧傳	三十卷或三十二卷	見大藏 以下圖傳雜錄
49.	後集高僧傳	十卷	開元錄云尋本未獲
50.	高僧傳音義	一卷	未見
51.	高僧傳鈔(一云高僧要錄)	一卷	未見
52.	祇桓寺圖	二卷	未見
53.	圖經	一卷	未見
54.	終南山靈感傳	二卷	見行
55.	袞法師別傳	一卷	未見
56.	廬山遠大師文集	十一卷或云十卷	未見
57.	支道林集	十卷	未見
58.	南山文集	十卷	未見
59.	西明寺錄	三卷	未見
60.	初撰西明寺記	一卷	未見
61.	終南山化感寺制	一卷	未見

**Source:** Nanshan Lüshi zhuanji lu 南山律師撰集錄, in *Zhiyuan Yi Bian* 芝園遺編  
(c. 1098 CE, 138; X59.1104j3.648c7-650c15).

## Appendix 9: Comparison of T45.1898 and T52.2107<sup>612</sup>

1. 律相感通傳
2. 宣律師感天侍傳
3. 唐乾封二年仲春終南山沙門釋道宣撰
4. 麟德元年終南山釋道宣撰
5. 余曾見晉太常于寶撰搜神錄述晉故中牟令蘇韶有才識咸寧中卒乃晝現形於其家諸親故知友聞之
6. 余曾見晉太常于寶撰搜神錄述晉故中牟令蘇韶有才識感冥中卒乃晝見形於其家諸親故知友聞之
7. 並同集飲噉言笑不異於人或有問者中牟在生多諸賦述言出難尋
8. 並同集飲噉言笑不異於人或有問者中牟在生多諸賦述言出難尋諸敘
9. 請敘死生之事可得聞耶韶曰何得有隱索紙筆著死生篇其
- 10.
11. 詞曰運精氣兮離故形神渺渺兮爽玄冥歸北帝兮造酆京崇墉欝兮廓崢嶸升鳳闕兮謁帝庭邇卜商兮室顏生親大聖兮項良成希吳季兮慕嬰明抗清論兮風英英敷華藻兮文粲榮庶擢身兮登崑瀛受祚福兮享千齡
12. 詞曰運精氣兮離故形神渺渺兮爽玄冥歸北帝兮造酆京崇墉欝兮廓崢嶸叔鳳闕兮詞帝庭邇卜商兮室顏生親大聖兮頌梁成希吳季兮英嬰明抗清論兮風英英敷花藻兮文粲榮庶擢身兮登崑瀛受福祚兮享千齡
13. 餘多不盡初見其詞若存若亡
14. 餘多不盡錄初見其詞若存若亡
15. 余見梁初江泌女誦出淨土大莊嚴等三十餘經逮于即目猶有斯事
16. 余見梁初江泌女誦出淨土大莊嚴等三十餘經逮于即目上有斯事
17. 往緣有幸近以今年二月末數感天人有若曾面
18. 生緣有幸近以今年二月末數感天人有若曾面
19. 告余云所著文翰續高僧傳廣弘明集等裨助聖化幽靈隨喜無不讚悅至於律部抄錄疏儀無足與貳
20. 告余云所著文翰續高僧傳廣弘明集裨助聖化幽靈隨喜無不贊悅至於律部抄錄疏儀無足與二
21. 但於斷輕重物少有疎失斯非仁過抑推譯者
22. 但於斷輕重物少有疎失斯非逾抑惟譯者
23. 如何以王貴衣同於白衣俗服相從入重乃至氍毹同法衣相量者亦在輕收
24. 如何以王貴衣同於白衣俗服相從非重乃至氍毹同法相量者亦在輕收
25. 且王著貴衣同比丘之三衣也價直十萬者故曰貴衣用以施僧可同輕限
26. 且王著貴衣同比丘之三衣也價直十萬者故曰貴衣用以施僧可同輕限
27. 白衣外道之服斯本出家者絕之三衣唯佛制名著者定得解脫是故白衣俗服佛嚴制斷若有亡者並在重收
28. 白衣外道之服斯本出家者絕之三衣惟佛制名著者定得解脫故白衣俗服佛嚴制斷若有亡者並在重收
29. 至於氍毹三衣相量同三衣也
30. 至於氍毹三衣相量同三衣也
31. 邊方開皮臥具亦是三衣條葉在外柔毛在內寒酷之國佛開為道必至布鄉還非輕限
32. 邊方開皮臥具亦是三衣條葉在外柔毛在內寒酷之國佛開為道必至布鄉還非輕限
33. 可改前迷宜從後悟如來在日尚有後制廢前何況於今不存迷悟之事也
34. 可改前迷宜從後悟如來在日尚有後制廢前何況於今不存迷悟之事也
35. 余問所從來
36. 余問所從來
37. 有一天人來禮敬敘暄涼已曰弟子姓王名璠是大吳之蘭臺臣也
38. 有一天來禮敬敘暄涼已曰弟子姓王名璠是大吳之蘭臺臣也
39. 會師初達建業孫主即未許之令感希有之瑞為立非常之廟
40. 會師初至建鄴孫主即來許之合感希有之瑞為立非常之廟
41. 于時天地神祇咸加靈被於三七日遂感舍利

<sup>612</sup> Note: Odd numbers are passages from T45.1898 and even numbers are passages from T52.2107.

42. 于時天地神祇咸加靈被於三七日遂感舍利
43. 吳主手執銅餅傾銅盤內舍利所衝盤即破裂乃至火燒鎚試俱不能損
44. 吳主手執銅瓶寫銅槃內舍利所衝槃即破裂乃至火燒鎚試俱不能損
45. 闢澤張昱之徒亦是天人護助入其身中令其神爽通敏答對諧允今並在天弘護佛法為事
46. 闢澤張昱之徒亦是天人護助入其身中令其神爽通敏答對諧允今並在天上弘護佛法為事
47. 弟子是南天韋將軍下之使者將軍事務極多擁護三洲之佛法
48. 弟子是南天韋將軍下之使者將軍事務極多擁護三州之佛法
49. 有鬪詮陵危之事無不躬往和喻令解
50. 有鬪詮陵危之事無不躬往知喻
51. 今附和南天欲即來前事擁隔不久當至且令弟子等共師言議
52. 令附和南大欲即至前事擁隔不久當至且令弟子等共師言散
53. 不久復有天來云姓羅氏蜀人也言作蜀音廣說律相
54. 不久復有天來云姓羅氏蜀人也言作蜀音廣說律相
55. 初相見時如俗禮儀敘述緣由多有次第遂有忽忘
56. 初相見時如俗禮儀敘述緣由多有次第遂有忽忘
57. 次又一天云姓費氏禮敬如前云弟子迦葉佛時生在初天
58. 又一天來云姓費氏禮敬如前云弟子迦葉佛時生在初天
59. 韋將軍下諸天貪欲所醉弟子以宿願力不受天欲清淨梵行偏敬毘尼
60. 韋將軍下諸天以貪欲醉弟子以宿願力不戀天欲清淨梵行偏敬毘尼
61. 韋將軍童真梵行不受天欲一王之下有八將軍四王三十二將周四天下往還護助諸出家人
62. 韋將軍童真梵行不受天欲一王之下有八將軍四王三十二將周四天下往還護助諸出家人
63. 四天下中北天一洲少有佛法餘三天下佛法大弘然出家人多犯禁戒少有如法
64. 四天下中北天一州少有佛法餘三天下佛法大弘然出家人多犯禁戒少有如法
65. 東西天下少有點慧煩惱難化
66. 東西天下人少點慧煩惱難化
67. 南方一洲雖多犯罪化令從善心易調伏佛臨涅槃親受付囑
68. 南方一洲雖多犯罪化令從善心易調伏佛臨涅槃親受付屬
69. 並令守護不使魔撓若不守護如是破戒誰有行我之法教者
70. 並令守護不使魔娆若不守護如是破戒誰有行我之法教者
71. 故佛垂誠不敢不行雖見毀禁愍而護之見行一善萬過不咎事等忘瑕不存往失
72. 故佛垂誠不敢不行雖見毀禁愍而護之若見一善萬過不咎事等忘瑕不存往失
73. 且人中臭氣上薰於空四十萬里諸天清淨無不厭之但以受佛付囑令守護法
74. 且人中臭氣上薰於空四十萬里諸天清淨無不厭之但以受佛付屬令守護法
75. 佛尚與人同止諸天不敢不來
76. 尚與人同止諸天不敢不來
77. 韋將軍三十二將之中最存弘護
78. 韋將軍三十二將之中最存弘護
79. 多有魔子魔女輕弄比丘道力微者並為惑亂
80. 多有魔子魔女輕弄比丘道力微者並為惑亂
81. 將軍恓惶奔赴應機除剪
82. 將軍恓遑奔赴應機除剪
83. 故有事至須往四王所時王見皆起
84. 故有事至須往四王所時王見皆起
85. 為韋將軍修童真行護正法故
86. 為韋將軍修童真行護正法故
87. 弟子性樂戒律如來一代所制毘尼並在座中聽受戒法
88. 弟子性樂戒律如來一代所制毘尼並坐中聽受戒法

89. 因問律中諸隱文義無不決滯  
90. 因問律中諸隱文義無不決滯  
91. 然此東華三寶素有山海水石往往多現但謂其靈而敬之顧訪來由莫知投詣  
92. 然此東華三寶素有海水石往往現多謂其靈而敬之顧訪失由莫知投詣  
93. 遂因此緣隨而咨請且泛舉文相以理括之未曾博觀不可以語也  
94. 遂因此緣而便諮詢且泛文相以理括之未曾博觀不可以語也  
95. 余少樂多聞希世拔俗之典籍  
96. 余少樂多聞希世拔俗之典籍  
97. 故搜神研神冥祥冥報旌異述異志怪錄幽曾經閱之非疑慮  
98. 故搜神研神冥祥冥報旌異述異志怪錄幽曾經閱之故非疑慮  
99. 況佛布天人之說心進勇銳之文護助形神守持城塔事出前聞非為徒說  
100. 況佛希人之說心進勇銳之文護助形神守持城塔事出前聞非為徒說  
101. 後諸緣敘並依出而疏之  
102. 後諸緣敘並依出而疏之  
103. 初問佛事  
104. 初問佛事  
105. 益州成都多寶石佛者何代時像從地涌出  
106. 益州成都多寶石佛者何代時像從地踊出  
107. 答曰蜀都元基青城山上今成都大海之地  
108. 答蜀都元基青城山上今之成都大海之地  
109. 昔迦葉佛時有人於西耳河造之擬多寶佛全身相也在西耳河鷲頭山寺  
110. 昔迦葉佛時有人於西耳河造之擬多寶佛全身相也在西耳河鷲頭山寺  
111. 有成都人往彼興易請像將還至今  
112. 有成都人往彼興易請像將還至今  
113. 多寶寺處為海神蹈舡所沒  
114. 多寶寺處為海神蹋船所沒  
115. 初取像人見海神子岸上遊行謂是山怪遂殺之  
116. 初取像人見請像將還至今海神子岸上遊行謂是山芝遂殺之  
117. 因爾神瞋覆沒人像俱溺同在一舡  
118. 因爾神嗔覆役人像俱溺同在一船  
119. 多寶佛舊在鷲頭山寺古基尚在仍有一塔常發光明  
120. 多寶佛舊在鷲山寺古基尚在仍有一塔常有光明  
121. 今向彼土道由朗州過大小山算三千餘里方達西耳河  
122. 今向彼土道由郎州過三千餘里方達西河  
123. 河大闊或百里五百里中有山洲亦有古寺經像而無僧住經同此文時聞鐘聲  
124. 河大闊或百里五百里中山洲亦有古寺經像而無僧住經同此文時聞鍾聲  
125. 百姓殷實每年二時供養古塔  
126. 百姓殷實每年二時供養古塔  
127. 塔如戒壇三重石砌上有覆釜其數極多  
128. 塔如戒壇三重石砌上有覆釜其數極多  
129. 彼土諸人但言神塚每發光明人以蔬食祭之求福祚也  
130. 彼土諸人但言神塚每發光明人以蔬食祭之求福祚也  
131. 其地西北去嵩州二千餘里  
132. 其地西去嵩州二千餘里  
133. 去天竺非遠往往有至彼者云云  
134. 問去天竺非遠往往有至彼者云云  
135. 至晉時有僧於地見土墳出

- 136.至晉時有僧於地見土墳出  
137.隨出隨除終不可平後見坼開深怪其爾  
138.隨除終不可平後見坼開復怪其爾  
139.乃掘深丈餘獲像及人骨在軒  
140.掘深丈餘獲像及人骨在船中  
141.其髑髏骨肘脛悉龐大數倍過今人即迦葉佛時閻浮人壽二萬歲時也  
142.其髑髏骨肘脛悉龐大數倍過今人即迦葉佛時閻浮人壽二萬歲時也  
143.今時命促形小固其常然  
144.今時命促形小固其常然  
145.初出之時牽曳難得弟子化為老人指揮方便須臾得出  
146.初出之時牽曳難得弟子化為老人指撝方便須臾得出  
147.至周滅法暫隱隋興重更出之  
148.周滅法暫隱還興重更出之  
149.蜀人但知其靈從地而出亦不測其根源  
150.蜀人但知其靈從地而出亦不測其根原  
151.見其華趺有多寶字因遂名為多寶佛遂名多寶寺也  
152.見其花趺有多寶字因遂名為多寶佛名多寶寺也  
153.余問多寶隸書出於亡秦之代如何迦葉佛時已有神州書耶  
154.余問多寶隸書出於三秦之代如何迦葉佛時已有神書也  
155.答云亡秦李斯隸書此乃近代遠承  
156.答曰秦李斯隸書此乃近代遠承  
157.隸書之興興於古佛之世  
158.隸書之興興於古佛之世  
159.見今南洲四面千有餘洲莊嚴閻浮一方百有餘國  
160.見今南州四面千有餘州莊嚴閻浮一萬百有餘國  
161.文字言音同今唐國但以海路遼遠動數十萬里譯者莫傳  
162.文字言音同今唐國但以海路遼遠動數十萬里譯者莫傳  
163.故使此方封懷守株不足怪也  
164.故使此方封守株柱不足怪也  
165.師不聞乎  
166.師不聞乎  
167.梁顧野王大學之大博士也周訪字源出沒不定  
168.梁顧野王太學之大博士也周訪字源出沒不定  
169.故玉篇序云有開春申君墓得其銘文皆是隸字  
170.故玉篇序云有開春申君墓得其銘文皆是隸字  
171.檢春申是周代六國時也  
172.檢春申君是周代六國同時  
173.隸字則非吞併之日也  
174.隸文則吞併之日也  
175.此國篆隸諸書猶有茫昧  
176.此國篆隸諸書尚有茫昧  
177.寧知迦葉佛時之事乎非其耳目之所聞見也  
178.寧知迦葉佛之事乎非其耳目之所聞見也  
179.余又問  
180.又問  
181.今京城西高四土臺俗諺云是蒼頡造書臺如何云隸字古時已有  
182.今京城西高四土臺俗諺云是蒼頡造書臺如何云隸字古時已有

- 183.答云
- 184.答云
- 185.蒼頡於此臺上增土造臺觀鳥跡者非無其事且蒼頡之傳此土罕知其源
- 186.蒼頡於此臺上增土造臺觀鳥迹者非無其事且蒼頡之傳此土罕知其源
- 187.或云黃帝之臣或云古帝王也鳥跡之書其變一途今所施有無益之言不勞述也
- 188.或云黃帝之臣或云古帝之王也鳥迹之書時變一途今所絕有無益之言不勞述也
- 189.又有天人姓陸名玄暢來謁
- 190.又有天人姓陸名玄暢來謁
- 191.云弟子周穆王時生在初天本是迦葉佛時天人為通化故周時暫現
- 192.云弟子周穆王時初生在天本是迦葉佛時天為通化故用暫現
- 193.所問京西高四臺者其本迦葉佛於此第三會說法度人
- 194.所問高四臺者其本迦葉佛於此第三會說法度人
- 195.至穆王時文殊目連來化穆王從之即列子所謂化人者是也
- 196.至周穆王時文殊目連來化穆王穆王從之即列子所謂化人是也
- 197.化人示穆王高四臺是迦葉佛說法處因造三會道場
- 198.化人示穆王高四臺是迦葉佛說法處因造三會道場
- 199.至秦穆公時扶風獲一石佛穆公不識棄馬坊中穢污
- 200.至秦穆公時扶風獲一石佛穆公不識棄馬坊中穢污
- 201.此像護像神瞋令公染疾
- 202.此像神瞋令公染患
- 203.公又夢遊上帝極被責教覺問侍臣由
- 204.公又夢遊上帝極被責數覺問侍臣由
- 205.余答云臣讀古書周穆王時有化人來此土云是佛神
- 206.余答云臣讀古書周穆王時有化人來此土云是佛神
- 207.穆王信之於終南山造中天臺高千餘尺基址見存又於蒼頡臺造神廟名三會道場
- 208.穆王信之於終南山造中天臺高千餘尺基趾見在又於蒼頡臺造神廟名三會道場
- 209.公今所患殆非佛神為之耶
- 210.公今所患殆非佛神為之耶
- 211.公聞大怖語由余曰吾近獲一石人衣冠非今所製棄之馬坊將非是佛神耶
- 212.公聞大怖語由余曰吾近獲一石人衣冠非今所制棄之馬坊將非此是佛神耶
- 213.由余聞往視之對曰此真佛神也
- 214.由余聞往視之對曰此真佛神也
- 215.公取像澡浴安清淨處像遂放光
- 216.公取像澡浴安清淨處像遂放光
- 217.公又怖謂神瞋也宰三牲以祭之諸善神擎棄遠處
- 218.公又怖謂神瞋也宰三牲以祭之諸神擎棄之遠處
- 219.公又大怖以問由余答曰臣聞佛神清潔不進酒肉
- 220.公又大怖以問由余答云臣聞佛神清潔不進酒肉
- 221.愛重物命如護一子所有供養燒香而已所可祭祀餅果之屬
- 222.愛重物命如護一子所有供養燒香而已所可祭祀餅果之屬
- 223.公又大悅欲造佛像絕於工人又問由余
- 224.公大悅造像絕於工人又問由余
- 225.余答曰昔穆王造寺之側應有工匠
- 226.余答曰昔穆王造寺側應有工匠
- 227.遂於高四臺南村內得一老人姓王名安年百八十
- 228.遂於高四臺南村內得一老人姓王名安年百八十
- 229.自云曾於三會道場見人造之

- 230.自云曾於三會道場見造之  
231.臣今年老無力能作所住村北有兄弟四人曾於道場為諸匠執作請追共造  
232.臣今老年無力能作所住村北有兄弟四人曾於道場內為諸匠執作請追共造  
233.依言作之成一銅像相好圓備公悅大賞齋之  
234.依言作之成一銅像相好圓備公悅大賞賚之  
235.彼人得財並造功德於土臺上造重閣高三百尺  
236.彼人得財並造功德於土臺上造重閣高三百尺  
237.時人號為高四臺也或曰高四樓  
238.時人號為高四臺或曰高四樓  
239.其人姓高大者名四或曰兄弟四人同立故也或取大兄之名以目之故高四之名  
240.其人姓高大者名四或曰兄弟四人同立故也或取大兄之名因之名樓故高四之名  
241.至今稱也  
242.至今稱也  
243.又問目連佛在日已終如何重現  
244.又問目連佛在已終如何重見  
245.答曰同名六人此曰小目連非大目連也  
246.答曰同名六人此曰目連非大目連也  
247.至宇文周時  
248.至宇文周時  
249.文殊師利化為梵僧來遊此土云欲禮拜迦葉佛說法處并往文殊所住之處名清涼山  
250.文殊師利化為梵僧來遊此土云欲禮拜迦葉佛說法處并文殊所住處名清涼山  
251.遍問道俗無有知者  
252.遍問道俗無有知者  
253.時有智猛法師年始十八返問梵僧何因知有二聖餘跡  
254.時有智猛法師年始十八返問梵僧何因知有二聖餘迹  
255.答云在秦都城南二十里有蒼頡造書臺即其地也  
256.答云在秦都城南二十里有蒼頡造書臺即其地也  
257.又云在沙河南五十里青山北四十里  
258.又云在沙河南五十里青山北四十里  
259.又問沙河青山是何語  
260.又問沙河青山是何語  
261.答云渭水終南山也  
262.答云渭水終南山也  
263.此僧便從渭水直南而涉遂到高四臺便云此是古佛說法處也  
264.此僧便從渭水直南而出遂到高四臺便云此是古佛說法處也  
265.于時智猛法師隨往禮拜不久失梵僧所在  
266.于時智猛法師隨往禮拜不久失梵僧所在  
267.智猛長大具為太常韋卿說之請其臺處依本置寺遂奏周王名三會寺  
268.智猛長大具為太常韋卿說之請其臺處依本置寺遂奏周王  
269.至隋大業中廢入大寺因被廢毀配入菩提寺  
270.  
271.今菩提寺西堂佛首即三會寺佛也  
272.菩提寺西當陽佛首即三會寺佛也  
273.釋迦如來度迦葉後十二年中來至此臺其中見有迦葉佛舍利  
274.釋迦如來度迦葉後十二年中來至此臺其下見有迦葉佛舍利  
275.周穆王身遊大夏佛告彼土有古塔可返禮事王問何方  
276.周穆身遊大夏佛告彼云有古塔可返初事王問何方

- 277.佛答在鄆京之東南也西天竺國具有別傳  
278.佛答在鄆京之東南也西天竺有別傳  
279.去歲長年師子國僧九十九夏三果人也聞斯聖跡跣行至此尋清涼山  
280.去歲長年師子國僧九十九夏三果人也聞斯勝迹跣行至此尋清涼山  
281.國家供送今夏在彼所願應遂也  
282.國家供送今夏在彼所願應遂  
283.余問曰  
284.余問  
285.自昔相傳文殊在清涼山領五百仙人說法  
286.自昔相傳文殊在清涼山領五百仙人說法  
287.經中明文殊是久住娑婆世界菩薩  
288.經中明文是久住娑婆世界菩薩  
289.娑婆則大千總號如何偏在此方  
290.娑婆則大千總號如何偏在此方  
291.答曰文殊諸佛仙之元師也隨緣利見應變不同大士之功非人境界不勞評泊  
292.答云文殊諸佛之元師也隨緣利現應變不同大士之功非人境界不勞評薄  
293.但知多在清涼五臺之中  
294.聖智多在清涼五臺  
295.今彼見有五臺縣清涼府仙華山往往有人見之不得不信  
296.縣清涼府仙花山往往有人到不得不信  
297.又問  
298.又問  
299.今五臺山中臺之東南四十里見有大孚靈鷲寺兩堂隔澗猶存南有華園可二頃許  
300.今五臺山中臺之東南三十里見有大孚靈鷲寺兩堂隔澗猶在南有花園可二頃許  
301.四時發彩人莫究之或云漢明所立或云魏孝文帝作互說不同如何  
302.四時發彩人莫究之或云漢明所立又云魏孝文作互說不同如何  
303.答云俱是二帝所作  
304.答云俱是二帝所作  
305.昔周穆之時已有佛法此山靈異文殊所居周穆於中造寺供養及阿育王亦依置塔  
306.昔周穆之時已有佛法此山靈異文殊所居周穆於中造寺供養及阿育王亦依置塔  
307.漢明之初摩騰天眼亦見有塔請帝立寺山形像靈鷲名曰大孚  
308.漢明之初摩騰天眼亦見有塔請帝立寺山形像似靈鷲名大孚  
309.孚者信也帝信佛理立寺度人  
310.孚信也帝信佛理立寺勸人  
311.元魏孝文北臺不遠常來禮謁見有人馬行跡石上分明其事可知  
312.元魏孝文北臺不遠常來禮謁見人馬行迹石上分明其事可知  
313.豈惟五臺今終南太白太華五岳名山皆有聖人為住  
314.豈惟五臺今終南山太白太華五岳名山皆有聖人為住  
315.佛法處處有之  
316.佛法處處有之  
317.人有供設必須預請  
318.人有供設必須預請  
319.七日已前在靜室內安置軟座燒香列疏閉戶祈求無不感應至時來赴  
320.七日已前在靜室內安置壇座燒香列疏閉戶祈求無不感應至時來赴  
321.凡聖難知若不爾者緣請者多希來至飯  
322.凡聖難知若不爾者緣請既多希來至飯  
323.今時有作賓頭盧聖僧像立房供養亦是一途

- 324.今時有作賓頭盧聖僧像立房供養亦是一途  
325.然須別施空座前置椀鉢至僧食時令大僧為受不得以僧家盤盂設之  
326.然須別地空座前置椀鉢至僧食時令大僧為受不得僧家槃斫設之  
327.以凡聖雖殊俱不觸僧食器  
328.以凡聖雖殊俱不觸僧食器  
329.若是俗家則隨俗所設  
330.至俗家則俗所設  
331.若不置前靜室等者止可諸餘聖眾或可降臨以三天下同一供養隨緣別訏故  
332.若不前置靜室等者止可諸餘聖眾或可降臨以三天下同一供養隨緣別赴  
333.此賓頭盧難一遭遇  
334.此賓頭盧難一遭遇  
335.又問  
336.又問  
337.今涼州西番(音盤)和縣山裂像出何代造耶  
338.今涼州西番(音槃)和縣山裂像出何代造耶  
339.答曰迦葉佛時有利賓菩薩見此土人不信業報以殺害為事  
340.答曰迦葉佛時有利賓菩薩見此山人不信業報以殺害為事  
341.于時住處有數萬家無重佛法者菩薩救之為立伽藍  
342.于時住處有數萬家無重佛法者菩薩救之為立伽藍  
343.大梵天王手造像身初成已後菩薩神力能令此像如真佛不異遊步說法教化諸人  
344.大梵天王手造像身初成以後菩薩神力能令此像如真佛不異遊步說法教化諸人  
345.雖蒙此導猶不信受  
346.雖蒙此導猶不信受  
347.于時菩薩示行怖畏手擎大石可於聚落欲下壓之菩薩佯怖勸化  
348.于時菩薩示行怖畏手擎大石可落欲下壓之菩薩佯怖勸化  
349.諸人便歎迴心信敬於佛  
350.諸人便歎迴心信敬於佛  
351.所有殺具變成蓮華隨有街巷華如種植瑞像自此方攝神力  
352.所有殺具變成蓮花隨有街巷花如種植瑞自此方攝化神力  
353.菩薩又勸諸清信士女令造七寺  
354.菩薩又勸諸清信士令造七寺  
355.南北一百四里東西八十里彌山亘谷處處僧坊佛堂  
356.南北一百里東西八十里彌山亘谷處處僧坊佛堂  
357.經十三年方得成就同時出家有二萬人在七寺住經三百年  
358.經十三年方得成就同時出家有二萬人在七寺住經三百年  
359.彼諸人等現業力大昔所造惡當世輕受不入地獄  
360.彼諸人等現業力大昔造惡業當世輕受不入地獄  
361.前所害者在惡趣中又發惡願  
362.前所害者在惡趣中又發惡願  
363.彼害我者及未成聖我當害之若不加害惡業便盡我無以報  
364.彼害我者及未成聖我當害之若不加害惡業便盡我無以報  
365.共吐大火焚燒寺舍及彼聚落一時焚蕩  
366.共吐大火焚燒寺舍及彼聚落一時焚蕩  
367.縱盜得活又以木水漂溺殺之無一孑遺  
368.縱盜得活又以大水而漂殺之無一孑遺  
369.時彼山神寺未破前收取此像遠在空中寺破已後下  
370.時彼山神寺未破前收取此像遠在空中寺破以後下

- 371.內石室安置供養年月既久石生室滅至劉薩訶禮山示像  
372.內石室安置供養年月既久石生室滅至劉薩何禮山示其像者  
373.其薩訶者前身元是利賓菩薩身首別處更有別緣  
374.前身元是利賓菩薩身首別處更有別緣  
375.又問  
376.又問  
377.江表龍光瑞像人傳羅什將來有說扶南所得如何  
378.江表龍光瑞像人傳羅什將來就扶南所得如何  
379.答曰非羅什也斯乃宋孝武征扶南獲之  
380.答非羅什也斯乃宋孝武征扶南獲之  
381.昔佛滅後三百年中北天竺大阿羅漢優婆質那以神力加工匠  
382.昔佛滅後三百年中北天竺大阿羅漢優婆質那以神力加工匠  
383.三百年中鑿大石山安置佛窟從上至下凡有五重高三百餘尺  
384.三百年中鑿大石山安置佛窟從上至下凡有五重上重高三百餘尺  
385.請彌勒菩薩指揮作檀像以處之  
386.請彌勒菩薩指作檀像處  
387.玄奘法師傳云高百餘尺聖跡記云高八丈足趺八尺六齋日常放光  
388.玄奘師傳云高百餘尺聖迹記云高八丈足符八尺六齋日常放光  
389.其初作時羅漢將工人上天三往方成  
390.其初作時羅漢將工人上天三往方成  
391.第一栴檀第二牛頭栴檀第三金像第四玉像第五銅像凡夫  
392.第二牛頭栴檀第三金第四玉第五銅像凡夫  
393.今見止在下重上四重閉石窟映徹見人藏腑  
394.今止在下重四重閉石窟映徹見人藏腑  
395.第六百年有佛奈遮阿羅漢生已母亡生扶南國  
396.第六百年有佛奈遮羅漢生母在扶南國  
397.念母恩重從上重中取小檀像令母供養  
398.念母重恩從上重中取木檀像令母供養  
399.母終生楊州出家住新興寺獲悟三果宋孝武征扶南獲此像來都亦是羅漢神力  
400.母終生楊州出家住新興寺獲悟三果宋孝武征扶南獲此像來都亦是羅漢神力  
401.母今見在時往羅浮天台西方諸處  
402.母今見在時往羅浮天台西方諸處  
403.昔法盛曇無竭者再往西方有傳五卷略述此緣  
404.昔往曇無竭者再往西方有傳五卷略述此緣  
405.何得云什師背負而來耶  
406.何得云什師背負而來耶  
407.余問  
408.余問  
409.什師一代所翻之經至今若新受持轉盛何耶  
410.什法師一代所翻之經至今若斯受持轉盛何耶  
411.答曰其人聰明善解大乘以下諸人並皆俊艾一代之寶也絕後光前仰之所不及  
412.答云其人聰明善解大乘以下諸人皆俊乂一代之寶也絕後光前仰之所不及  
413.故其所譯以悟達為先得佛遺寄之意也  
414.故其所譯以悟達為先得佛遺寄之意也  
415.又從毘婆尸佛已來譯經  
416.  
417.又問

- 418.又問  
419.俗中常論以淪陷戒檢為言  
420.俗中常論以淪陷戒檢為言  
421.答此不須評非悠悠者所議  
422.答此不須相評非悠悠者所議  
423.什師今位階三賢所在通化然其譯經刪補繁闕隨機而作  
424.羅什師今位階三賢所在通化然其譯經刪補繁闕隨機而作  
425.故大論一部十分略九自餘經論例此可知  
426.故大論一部十分略九自餘經論例此可知  
427.自出經後至今盛誦無有替廢冥祥感降歷代彌新以此證量深會聖旨  
428.自出經後至誠讀誦無有替廢冥祥感降歷代彌新以此詮量深會聖旨  
429.及文殊指授令其刪定特異恒倫豈以別室見譏頓忘玄致殊不足涉言也  
430.又文殊指授令其刪定特異恒倫豈以別室見譏頓忘玄致殊不足涉言耳  
431.又問  
432.又問  
433.防州顯際寺山出古像者何代所立  
434.坊州顯際寺山出古像者何代所立  
435.答云像是秦穆公所造像出處是周穆王造寺處也  
436.答云像是秦穆公所造像出是周穆王造寺處也  
437.佛去世後育王第四女又造像塔於此供養  
438.佛去世後育王第四女又造像塔於此供養  
439.于時此寺有三果人住中  
440.于時此寺有一三果人住中  
441.秦相由余常所奉敬  
442.秦相由余所奉敬  
443.往者迦葉佛時亦於此立寺  
444.往者迦葉佛時亦於此立寺  
445.是彼沙彌顯際造也仍其本名以為寺額  
446.是彼沙彌顯際造也仍其本名以為寺額  
447.又問  
448.余問  
449.今玉華宮南檀臺山上有塼塔面別三十步下層極壯四面石龕旁有碎塼  
450.今玉華宮南檀臺山有飄塔面別三十步下層極壯四面石龕旁有碎飄  
451.又有三十餘窯塼古老莫知何代然每聞鐘聲  
452.又有三十餘窯飄古老莫知何代然每聞鍾聲  
453.答云此穆王寺也名曰靈山至育王時勅山神於此造像  
454.答云此穆王寺也名曰靈山至育王時勅山神於此造塔  
455.西晉末亂五胡控掘劉曜都長安  
456.西晉末亂五胡控權劉曜都長安  
457.數夢此山佛見在塼塔中坐語曜曰汝少飲酒莫耽色欲黜去邪佞進用忠良  
458.數夢此山佛現在飄塔坐語曜曰汝少飲酒莫耽色欲黜去耶佞進忠良  
459.曜不能從  
460.曜不能從  
461.後於洛陽酒醉落馬為石勒所擒  
462.後於洛陽醉落馬石勒所擒  
463.初曜因夢所悟令人尋山訪之  
464.初曜因夢所悟令人尋山訪之

465. 遂見此像坐小塲塔與夢符同便毀小塔更作大者  
466. 遂見此像坐小勑塔與夢符同便毀小塔更作大者  
467. 高一十九級並造寺宇極存壯麗寺名法燈度三百僧住之  
468. 高一十九級并造寺宇極好莊麗寺名法燈度三百僧住之  
469. 曜沒趙後  
470. 曜如趙後  
471. 寺有三十二人修得三果  
472. 寺有三十二人修得三果  
473. 仙神於今塔後又造一寺供養三果僧  
474. 山神於今塔後又造一寺供二果僧  
475. 神往太白採取芝草供養聖僧皆獲延齡  
476. 神往太白採取芝草供養聖僧皆獲延齡  
477. 寺今見存凡人不見所聞鐘聲即寺鐘也  
478. 寺今見在凡人不見所聞鍾聲即寺鍾也  
479. 其塔本基雖因劉曜仍是穆王立寺之處又是迦葉如來之古寺也  
480. 其塔本基雖因劉曜仍是穆王立寺之處又是迦葉如來之古寺也  
481. 貞觀年中玉華山北慈烏川山上常見鹿集逐去還來  
482. 貞觀年中玉華北慈烏川山常見鹿集逐去還來  
483. 有人異之於鹿集處掘深一丈獲一石像長丈許  
484. 有人異之於鹿集處掘深一丈獲一石像長丈許  
485. 又問  
486. 又問  
487. 荊州前大明寺栴檀像者云是優填王所造依傳從彼模來至梁今京師又有何者是本  
488. 荆州前大明寺栴檀像者云是優填王所造依傳從彼摸來至梁今京師又有何者是本  
489. 答云大明是其本像  
490. 答云大明是其本像  
491. 梁高祖既崩像來荊渚至元帝承聖三年周平梁後收國寶皆入北周  
492. 梁高既崩像來荊渚至元帝承聖三年周平梁後收簿寶物皆入北周  
493. 其檀像者有僧珍法師藏隱房內多以財物賂遺使人像遂得停  
494. 其檀像者有僧珍法師藏隱房內多以財物賂遺使人像遂得停  
495. 隋開皇九年高祖遣使人柳顧言往迎寺僧  
496. 隋開皇九年文祖遣使人柳顧言往定寺僧  
497. 又求像令鎮荊楚  
498. 又求像令鎮荊楚  
499. 顧言既是鄉人從之令別刻檀像將往供旨  
500. 顧是鄉人從之令別剋檀將往恭旨  
501. 當時訪匠得一婆羅門僧名真達為造  
502. 當時匠得一婆羅門僧名真達為造  
503. 即今興善寺像是也亦甚靈異  
504. 即今興善寺像是也亦甚靈異  
505. 本像在荊州  
506. 本像在荊  
507. 僧以漆布漫之相好不及舊者  
508. 僧以漆布漫之相好不及舊者真  
509. 本是作佛生來七日之身今加布漆乃同壯年相狀故殊絕異於元本  
510. 本是作佛生成七日之身令加布漆乃與壯年相符故殊絕異於元本  
511. 大明本是古佛住處靈像不肯北遷故也

- 512.大明本是古佛住處靈像不肯北遷故也
- 513.近有長沙義法師天人冥讚遂悟開發剝除漆布真容重顯大動信心
- 514.近有妙義法師天人冥讚遂悟開發剝除漆布具容重顯大動信心
- 515.披覲靈儀全檀所作本無補接光趺殊異象牙彫刻卒非人工所成興善像身一一乖本
- 516.披覲靈儀合檀所作本無補接光趺殊異象牙彫刻卒非人工所成興善像身一一乖本
- 517.又問荊州河東寺者此寺甚大余與慈恩寺嵩法師交故積年其人即河東寺雲法師下之學士也云此寺本曾住萬僧震旦之最聞之欣然莫測河東之號請廣而述之亦佛法之大觀也答曰晉氏南遷郭璞多聞之士周訪地圖云此荊楚舊為王都欲於礮州置之嫌逼山遂止便有宜都之目也下至松滋地有面勢都邑之象乃掘坑秤土嫌其太輕覆土本坑土又不滿又見有一小堂子周迴有塑像云此地已屬三寶便止自昔金陵王氣於今不絕固當經三百年矣便都建業仍於此地置河東郡遷裴柳薛杜四姓居之地在江曲之間類蒲州河曲故有河東名也東西二寺者符堅伐晉荊州北岸並沒屬秦時桓沖為荊州牧要翼法師度江造東寺安長沙寺僧西寺安四層寺僧符堅敗後北岸諸地還屬晉家長沙四層諸僧各還本寺東西二寺因舊廣立自晉宋齊梁陳代僧徒常有數萬人陳末隋初有名者三千五百人淨人數千殿一十二間唯兩柱通梁五十五尺欒櫨重疊國中京觀即彌天釋道安使弟子翼法師之所造也自晉至唐曾無虧損殿前有四鐵鑊各受十餘斛以種蓮華殿前塔宋譙王義季所造塔內塑像及東殿中彌勒像並是初利天工所造西殿中多金銅像寶帳飛仙珠幡華珮並是四天王天人所造寺內僧眾兼於主客出萬餘人當途講說者五十三人得其聖果各領千僧餘小法師五百餘人十誦律師有四十九人得聖果大小乘禪師八百餘人其得聖果者二百四十四人徒眾嚴肅說不可盡寺法立制誦經六十紙者免維那誦法華經度者免直歲寺房五重並皆七架別院大小合有十所般舟方等二院莊嚴最勝夏別常有千人寺中屋宇及四周廊廡等減一萬間寺開三門兩重七間兩廈殿宇橫設並不重安約準地數取其久固所以殿宇至今三百年餘無有損敗東川大寺唯此為高映曜川原實稱壯觀也又問彌天釋氏宇內式瞻云乘赤驢莉朝夕而見未審如何答實也今東寺見有驢臺存矣後人崇敬其處於上植樹周砌石池蓮華莊嚴供養此印手菩薩不思議之跡也又一本云乘驢事虛也問曰若爾傳虛何為河東寺尚有驢臺[巾\*見]山南有驢村據此緣由則乘驢之有地也答曰非也後人築臺於上植樹供養焉有佛殿之側頓置驢耶又中驢之名本是閩國郡國之故地也後人不練遂妄擬此事兩本所說各異故備錄之
- 518.
- 519.又問
- 520.又問
- 521.蜀地簡州三學山寺空燈常明者何
- 522.蜀地簡州三學山寺空燈常明者何
- 523.答曰山有菩薩寺迦葉佛正法時初立有歡喜王菩薩造之
- 524.答云山有菩薩寺迦葉佛正法時初立有懼喜王菩薩造之
- 525.寺名法燈自彼至今常明空表有小菩薩三百餘人斷粒遐齡常住此山
- 526.寺名法燈自彼至今常明空表有小菩薩三百人斷粒遐齡常住此山
- 527.此燈又是山神季特續後供養特舊蜀主故至正月處處然燈以供養佛寺
- 528.燈又是山神李特續後供養特舊蜀主故至正月處處然燈以供養佛寺
- 529.又問
- 530.又問
- 531.涪州相思寺側多有古跡篆銘勒之不識其緣
- 532.涪州相思寺側多古迹篆銘勒之不識其緣
- 533.答曰迦葉佛時有山神姓羅名子明蜀人也
- 534.答云此迦葉佛時有山神姓羅名子明蜀人也
- 535.舊是持戒比丘生憎破戒者發諸惡願令我死後作大惡鬼噉破戒人
- 536.舊是持戒比丘生憎破戒者發諸惡願令我死後作大力鬼噉破戒人
- 537.因願受身作此山神多有眷屬所主土地東西五千餘里南北二千餘里
- 538.因願受身作此山神多有眷屬所主土地東西五千餘里南北二千餘里
- 539.年噉萬人已上此神本曾為迦葉佛兄後為弟子
- 540.年噉萬人以上此神本曾為迦葉佛兄後為弟子

- 541.彼佛憐愍故來教化種種神變然始調伏與受五戒  
542.復佛怜愍故來教化種種神變然始調伏乞受五戒  
543.隨識宿命因不噉人恐後心變故佛留跡育王  
544.隨識宿命因不噉人恐後心變故佛留迹育王  
545.於上起塔在山頂神便藏於石中  
546.於上起塔在山頂神便藏於石中  
547.塔是白玉所作其神見在郭下寺塔育王所立事見付囑儀  
548.塔是育王所作其神見在其郭下寺塔育王所立事現付囑儀  
549.南海循州北山興寧縣界靈龕寺多有靈跡  
550.南海循州北山興寧縣界靈龕寺多有靈跡  
551.此乃文殊聖者弟子為此山神多造惡業文殊愍之便來教化  
552.此乃文殊聖者弟子為此山神多造惡業文殊愍之便教化  
553.遂識宿命請為留跡我常禮事得離諸惡  
554.遂識宿命請為留跡我常禮事得離諸惡  
555.文殊為現今者是也  
556.文殊為現今者是也  
557.貞觀三年山神命終生兜率天  
558.貞觀三年山神命終生兜率天  
559.別有一神來居此地即舊神親家也  
560.別有一神來居此地即舊神親家也  
561.大造諸惡生天舊神愍之下請文殊為現小跡以化後神  
562.大造諸惡生天舊神憐之下請文殊為現小跡以化後神  
563.又從正法故今此山大小跡現莫不匪由焉事見付囑儀  
564.又從正法故今此山大小跡現莫不匪由焉事現付囑儀  
565.又問  
566.又問  
567.泌州北山見今石窟中佛常有光明者何  
568.見今泌州北山石窟中山常有光明者何  
569.答云此窟迦葉佛二時備有往昔周穆王第二子造迦葉佛像  
570.答此窟迦葉佛釋迦佛二時備有往昔周穆王第二子造迦葉佛像  
571.又問  
572.又問  
573.渭州終南山有佛面山七佛澗者事  
574.渭州終南縣山有佛面山七佛澗者事  
575.同於前南山庫谷大藏  
576.同於前南山庫谷大藏  
577.是迦葉佛自手所造之藏也  
578.是迦葉佛自手所造之藏也  
579.今見有十三緣覺在谷內住  
580.今現有十三緣覺在谷內住  
581.又曰今諸處塔寺多是古佛遺基育王表之故福地常在不可輕也  
582.又曰今諸處塔寺多是古佛遺基育王表之故福地常在不可輕也  
583.今有名塔如常所聞無名藏者隨處亦有  
584.今有名塔如常所聞無名塔者隨處亦有  
585.河西甘州郭中寺塔中有古佛舍利及河州靈巖寺佛殿下亦有舍利  
586.河西甘州郭中寺塔下有舍利及河州靈巖寺佛殿下有舍利  
587.秦州麥稜岸殿下亦有舍利山神藏之

- 588.秦州麥積崖佛殿下有舍利山神廢之  
589.此寺周穆王所造名曰靈安經四十年常有人出  
590.此寺周穆王所造名曰靈安經今四十年常有人出  
591.荊州長寧寺塔是育王造  
592.荊州長寧寺塔是育王造  
593.下有舍利入地丈餘石函五重盛碎身舍利  
594.下有舍利入地丈餘石函五重盛碎身骨  
595.益州三塔大石今名福感武擔今名靜亂雒縣今名寶興並有神異如別傳之  
596.益州三塔大石今名福感武擔今名靜亂雒縣今名寶興並有神異如別傳  
597.又問  
598.又問  
599.楊州長干塔鄖縣塔是育王者非耶  
600.楊都長干塔鄖塔是育王者非  
601.答曰是昔劉薩訶感靈  
602.答云是昔劉薩何感  
603.今往楊州登越城望見長干有異氣因標掘獲如今傳所明  
604.今往楊州上越城望見長干有異氣因標掘獲如今傳所明  
605.余問  
606.余問  
607.若爾已有長干便為佛刹不  
608.若爾已有長干便為佛刹不  
609.答非刹干也干是地之長隴名隴為干塔逼長隴之側  
610.答非刹干也是地之名名隴為干塔逼長隴之側  
611.書不云乎包括干越越地多長隴也  
612.書不云乎包括干越干越名隴也  
613.臨海鄖縣塔者亦是育王古塔  
614.臨海鄖縣塔者亦是育王造  
615.小塔是賢劫初佛中者有迦葉佛臂骨  
616.是賢劫初佛中者有迦葉佛臂骨  
617.非人所見羅漢將往鐵圍山留小塔  
618.非人所見羅漢將往鐵圍山留小塔  
619.從地涌出為開俗福也  
620.  
621.其塔大有善神恒現二魚井中鰻鱣魚護塔神也  
622.其塔大有善神且現二魚井中鰻鱣魚護塔神也  
623.其側有佛足跡石上者云是前三佛所蹈處也  
624.其側有足跡石上者云是前三佛所蹈處也  
625.  
626.從地踊出為開俗福也  
627.昔周時此土大有人住故置此塔  
628.昔周時此土大有人住故置此塔  
629.又問  
630.又問  
631.若爾周穆已後諸王建置塔寺何為此土文紀罕見  
632.若爾周穆已後諸王逢置塔時何為此土文記罕現  
633.答云立塔為於前緣多是神靈所造人有見者少故文字少  
634.答云靈塔為於前緣多寶是神靈所造人有見者少故文字少

- 635.傳楊雄劉向尋於藏書往往見有佛經豈非秦前已有經塔  
636.傳楊雄劉向尋於廟書往往見有佛經豈非秦前已有經塔  
637.今衡嶽南可五六百里在永州北  
638.今衡岳南可五六百里在永州北  
639.有大川東西五百餘里南北百餘里川中昔有人住數十萬家  
640.有大川東西五百餘里南北百餘里川中昔有人住數十萬家  
641.今生諸巨樹大者徑二三丈下無草木深林可愛中有大江東流入湘江尋澗覓之即得  
642.今生諸巨樹大者徑三二丈下無草木深林可愛中有大江東流入湘江尋澗見之即得  
643.川南有谷北出入谷有方池四方砌石水深龍居有犯者輒雷震山谷  
644.川南有谷北入谷有方池四方砌石水深龍居有犯者輒雷震山谷  
645.左側多出橘柚楊梅之屬列植相次  
646.左則多山果橘柚楊梅之屬列植相次  
647.池南有育王大塔石華捧之  
648.池南有育王大塔石花捧之  
649.上以石龕覆而與地平  
650.以石龕覆與地平  
651.塔東崖上具有碑記篆書可識登梯抄取足知立塔之由  
652.塔東崖上具有碑記篆書可識登梯抄取足知立塔之由  
653.衡山南大明師置寺處亦有石塔云云  
654.衡山南大明師置寺處亦有古塔云云  
655.其寺南北十餘里七處八會流渠靜院處處皆立  
656.其寺南北十餘里七處八會流渠靜院處處皆立  
657.又問  
658.又問  
659.此土常傳佛是殷時周昭魯莊等互說不同如何定指  
660.此土常傳佛是殷時周昭魯莊等互說不同如何定指  
661.答曰皆有所以  
662.答曰皆有所以  
663.弟子夏桀時生  
664.弟子夏桀時生  
665.天具見佛之垂化  
666.具見佛之垂化  
667.且佛有三身法報二身則非人見並化登建已上  
668.且佛有三身法報二身則非人見並登地已上  
669.唯有化身普被三千百億天下  
670.唯有化身普被三千百億天下  
671.故有百億釋迦隨人所感前後不定  
672.故有百億釋迦隨人所感前後不定  
673.或在殷末或在魯莊俱在天千之中  
674.或在殷末或在魯莊俱在大千之中  
675.前後咸傳一化感見隨機前後法報常自湛然不足疑也  
676.前後咸傳一化感見隨機前後法報常自湛然不足疑也  
677.又問  
678.又問  
679.今時瑞像多者云育王第四女所造其事幽遠難得其實  
680.今諸瑞像多云育王第四女所造其事幽遠難得其實  
681.答云育王第四女厥貌非妍久而不出常恨其醜乃圖佛形相好異佛還如自身

- 682.答云育王第四女厥貌非妍久而未出常恨其醜乃圖佛形相好異佛還如自身  
683.成已發願  
684.成已發願  
685.佛之相好挺異於人如何同我之形儀也  
686.佛之相好挺異於人如何同我之形儀也  
687.以此苦邀彌經年月後感佛現忽異昔形  
688.以此苦邀彌經年月後感佛現忽異昔形  
689.父具問之述其所願  
690.父具問之述其所願  
691.今北山玉華荊州長沙楊都高惺及今崇敬寺並是其像或書光趺  
692.今非山玉華荊州長沙楊都高惺及今崇敬並是其像或書光趺  
693.人罕識者  
694.人罕識者  
695.育王令諸神鬼所在將往開悟佛法  
696.育王令諸神鬼所在將往開悟佛法  
697.今諸像面莫匪女形  
698.今諸像面莫匪女形  
699.崇敬寺地本是戰場西晉將末五胡大起兵戈殺害此地極多地下人骨今猶見在  
700.崇敬寺地本是戰場西晉末五胡大起兵戈殺害此地特多地下人骨今由見在  
701.所殺無辜殘害酷濫故諸鬼神携以鎮之令諸冤魂得生善念  
702.所殺無辜殘害枉濫故諸神鬼携以鎮之令此冤魂得生善念  
703.周朝滅法神亦徙之隋主載隆佛還重起  
704.周滅佛法神亦從之隋祖載隆佛還重起云云  
705.又問  
706.又問  
707.諸神自在威力殊大  
708.諸神自在威力殊大  
709.至如蜀川三塔咸名大石人有掘者莫測其源  
710.至如蜀川三塔咸名大石人有掘者莫測其源  
711.至如秦川武功一塔古老相傳名曰育王塔三十年中一度出現貞觀已來兩度曾出  
712.至如秦川武功一塔古者相傳名曰育王三十年中一度出現貞觀已來兩度出現  
713.雖光瑞殊壯而舍利如指骨在石函中如何狹陋若此  
714.光瑞殊壯而舍利如指骨在石臼中如何陝陋若此  
715.答云諸鬼神中貧富不定各是往業如人不殊天中亦爾隨其所有而用供養此塔云云  
716.答曰諸鬼神中貧富不定各是往業如人不殊天中亦爾隨其所有而用供養此塔云云  
717.又問  
718.又問  
719.幽冥所感俗中常有疑以神去形朽而猶重來  
720.幽冥所感俗中常有疑以神與形朽而猶重來  
721.如記傳中或經七日百日至三年者識來形起如生不殊  
722.如記傳中或經七日百日至三年者識來形起如生不殊  
723.如經中云錄其精神在彼王所五三七日者何耶  
724.如經中云錄其精神在彼王所五三七日何也  
725.答曰人稟七識識各有神心識為主主雖前往而餘神守護不足怪也  
726.答曰人稟七識識各有神心識為主主雖前往而餘神守護不足怪也  
727.彼問余云  
728.敢問余云

- 729.師言受戒一戒幾神  
730.師言受戒一戒幾神  
731.余云見五戒中一戒五神未知大戒如何  
732.余答云見五戒中一戒五神未知大戒如何  
733.答云僧之受戒有二百五十神若毀一重戒唯一神不在則二百四十九神恒隨犯戒者  
734.答僧之受戒有二百五十神若毀一重戒唯一神去則二百五十神恒隨戒者  
735.又問  
736.  
737.苟舊(此見反)者綿州巴西縣人也得第二果客遊新繁村中教學  
738.苟[廿/積]綿州巴西縣人得第二果客遊新繁村中教學  
739.其人不食酒肉村人多信外道與其酒肉令食  
740.其人不貪酒肉村人多信外道與食  
741.其人不食村人遂打之  
742.其人不食村人遂打  
743.其人能書村人從乞不與又更被打復不禮遇遂即慎惱因發誓願  
744.其人能書村人從乞不相禮遇遂即懊惱因發誓願  
745.於村外草中仰臥以筆向空書之村人怪問  
746.於村北草中仰臥以筆向空書之村人怪問  
747.答云我書經本遭天看讀不許人見  
748.答云我書經本遭天看讀不許人見  
749.上界諸天將天中紙向下承筆遂寫得金剛般若經一卷經于七日方始得了  
750.上界諸天將中天紙向下承筆遂寫得金剛般若經一卷經于七日方始得了  
751.諸天於上造作寶蓋覆之地遂無草  
752.諸天於上造作寶蓋覆之地遂無草  
753.放牛小兒避雨多於其下村人怪其衣燥答云我於苟先生寫經處避雨  
754.放牛小兒避雨多於其下村中怪其衣燥答云我於苟先生寫經處避雨  
755.村人因此遂即信敬今於其處以木為欄不許侵污每至齋日村人於中設會  
756.村人因此遂即信敬今於其處以木為欄不許侵行每至齋日村人於中法會云云  
757.又問  
758.  
759.鼓山竹林寺名  
760.鼓山竹林寺名  
761.何代所出  
762.  
763.答云是  
764.  
765.迦葉佛時造周穆王於中更重造寺穆王佛殿並及塑像至今見存  
766.迦葉佛時造周穆王於中更重造寺穆王佛殿并及塗像至今現存  
767.山神從佛請五百羅漢住此寺  
768.山神從佛請五百羅漢住此寺  
769.即今見有二千聖像遶寺  
770.即今見有二千聖僧遶寺  
771.左側見有五萬五通神仙供養此寺餘者云云  
772.左側見有五萬五通神仙供養此寺餘云云  
773.已後論律相  
774.已後論諸律相  
775.天問余云

- 776.問余云
- 777.師本在梁已為持律之首大有著述論名人皆聞之建初定林咸其所住
- 778.師本在梁朝已為稱首大有著述論名人皆聞之建初定林咸其所住
- 779.及生見慈尊少有慢惰亦大有決律相故今生人間
- 780.及生見慈尊少有慢情亦大有決律相故今生人間
- 781.今之所解百不存一然有所注記鈔儀並是曾聞餘習計師報命已終過一年矣
- 782.今之所解百不存一然有所注記抄儀並是曾聞餘習計師報命已終過一年矣
- 783.今則以傳錄餘業慈力所薰天人扶助故日復一日
- 784.今則以傳錄業餘慈力所熏天人扶助故日復一日
- 785.師豈不知去年已來無降損日但枯喪耳如枯樹朽車無由更壯
- 786.師豈不知去年已來無降損日但枯喪耳如枯樹朽車無由更壯
- 787.余問
- 788.余問
- 789.若爾意欲更讀藏經抄錄要行見事可得遂不
- 790.若爾意欲更讀藏經抄錄要行見事可得遂不
- 791.答云師前讀藏經太龐但究與律相扶者
- 792.答云師前讀經大龐但究與律相符者
- 793.至於優柔文義過非深細必欲重讀隨分亦應得耳
- 794.至於優柔文義過非深細必欲重讀隨分亦應得耳
- 795.無奈報命久終生處復欲師到
- 796.無奈報命久終生處復欲師到
- 797.師常觀不願早生在人有弘律教幸願悉之
- 798.常勸不願早生在人有弘律教幸願悉之
- 799.又曰前所製章服儀靈神感喜自佛法東傳六七百年南北律師曾無此意
- 800.又曰所製章服儀靈神咸喜自法東傳六七百年南北律師情無此意
- 801.安用殺生之財而為慈悲之服全不然也師何獨拔此意
- 802.安用殺生之財而為慈悲之服全不然故也師獨拔此意
- 803.答曰
- 804.答曰
- 805.余讀智度論見佛著龐布僧伽梨因懷在心何得乖此
- 806.余讀智度論見佛著龐布僧伽梨因懷在心何得乖此
- 807.及聽律後便見蠶衣
- 808.及聽律後見蠶衣
- 809.臥具縱得已成並斬壞塗堆由此重增景仰古昔周朝老僧咸著大布衣一生服一補者咸布乃至重二三斤者  
復見西來梵僧咸著布氈具問答曰五天竺國無著蠶衣
- 810.
- 811.由此興念著斯章服儀通瞻古今成教融會臥具三衣
- 812.由此興念著新章服儀通瞻古今成教融會臥具三衣
- 813.且凡情瑣細保固尤重身服所接莫匪損生焉肯捐捨著茲法服
- 814.且凡情瑣細因尤重身服所接莫匪損生焉肯捐捨著於法服
- 815.又法服所擬本顯慈仁之心非仁無以拔濟濟必由慈而護
- 816.又法服所擬本顯慈仁之心非仁無以拔濟濟必由慈而獲
- 817.故佛心者大慈也殺生而行慈未見其可
- 818.故佛心者大慈也殺生而行慈未見其可
- 819.故沈隱侯之著論也五畝之宅樹之以桑
- 820.故沈隱侯之著論也五畝之宅樹之以桑
- 821.則年六十者容色已衰內假縑纊外存大布

- 822.則年六十者容氣已衰內假縑纊外存大布  
823.所以大布之服通於富貴貧賤也  
824.所以大布之服通於富貴貧賤也  
825.今猶通行於王臣古法不改  
826.今猶通行於王臣古法不改  
827.有老少之殊故致降殺之異  
828.俗有老少之殊故致降殺之異  
829.道無損害之理長少咸一法衣  
830.道無損害之理少長咸一法衣  
831.法是慈化焉通損害也云云  
832.是慈化焉通損害也云云  
833.又曰三衣破緣而縫江表咸然此何不爾  
834.又曰三衣破緣而縫江表咸然此何不爾  
835.余曰  
836.余曰  
837.四分無文故絕二縫  
838.四分無文故絕三縫  
839.答曰十誦有文何得不用此制有以不可不行云云  
840.答十誦有文何得不用此制有以不可不行云云  
841.又大衣重作師比行之然於上葉之下乃三重也豈得然耶  
842.又大衣重作師比行之然於上葉之下乃三重也豈得然耶  
843.即問其所作  
844.即問其所作  
845.便執余衣以示之  
846.便執衣以示之  
847.此葉相者表於稻田之塍疆也以割截衣段就裏刺之去葉  
848.此葉之下乃三重也此葉相者表於稻田之塍疆也以割截衣段就裏刺之去葉  
849.麌麥許  
850.  
851.  
852.橫表已後  
853.此則條內表田葉上表渠相豈不然耶  
854.此則條內表田畝葉上表渠相豈不然也  
855.今則通以布縷一非割截二又多重既非本制非無著著之失  
856.今則通以布縷一非割截二又多重既非本制非無著著之失  
857.然猶全單之者正從得失為論  
858.然猶令革之者止從得失為論  
859.又問余云  
860.又問余云  
861.坐具兩重斯成本制割截後更接但是一邊一頭意者接於四面通皆周緣如何  
862.坐具兩重斯成本制截後更接但是一邊一頭意者接在四面通皆周緣如何  
863.余云  
864.余云  
865.今信誠教不徒設也律云於本制外廣長更增半搨手  
866.今信成教不徒設也律云於本制外廣長更增半牒手  
867.據文止是一廣一長不云四周之廣長也在事非無不便猶勝跋闋之蹤  
868.據文止是一廣一長不云四周之廣長也在事非無不便猶勝跋闋之蹤

- 869.便默然  
870.便默然  
871.又問余云  
872.又問余云  
873.今見比丘行者以坐具置左肩上情有不忍  
874.今見比丘行者以坐具置左肩上情不忍可  
875.何者坐具資下之具如何忽在上肩  
876.何者資下之物如何在左肩上  
877.又衣角多在左手今則如何在左肩上  
878.  
879.弟子俗人未廣知律師可說之樂聞斯要  
880.弟子俗人未廣知律師可說之樂聞斯要  
881.余曰  
882.余云  
883.坐具在肩斯誠教也  
884.坐具在肩斯成教也  
885.舍利弗初起祇垣外道雲踊  
886.舍利弗初起祇桓外道雲踊  
887.須達命舍利弗乃具修威儀以尼師壇置左肩上庠序入大眾中至高座取而敷之  
888.須達往命舍利弗乃具修威儀以尼師壇置左肩上庠序入大眾中至高座取而敷之  
889.又諸律論多處有文  
890.又諸律論多處有文  
891.比丘食已入定出定以尼師壇在左肩上入林坐禪  
892.比丘食已出定已尼師壇在左肩上又入林坐禪  
893.且三衣右角皆在左肩坐具安上又加鉢袋於上  
894.具三衣右角在左肩坐具安上又加盞袋於上  
895.故善見云鉢袋貫左肩青色分明豈非古人行事也  
896.故善見云盞袋貫左肩青色分明豈古人之行也  
897.今則三衣下置左肘  
898.今則三衣下置左肘  
899.坐具藏于內臂及論方坐若食若語並在左[骨\*委]  
900.坐具藏于內臂乃論方坐若語並在左體  
901.鉢袋絡左膊  
902.盞袋絡左膊  
903.下垂左腋  
904.下垂左膝  
905.時代訛變遂失本源  
906.時代訛變遂失本原  
907.余見古之瑞像今此方見制者  
908.余見古之瑞像今此方見制者  
909.莫不以衣搭於左肩然後取衣角共左臂內衣角屈而捉之努出二角如羊耳之相  
910.莫不衣搭於左肩然後取衣角共左臂內衣角屈而捉之恐出二角如羊耳之相  
911.斯則俯同此律亦是聖之楷摸  
912.則俯同此律亦是聖人楷摸  
913.焉有行則收來左肩坐則放縱左髀未見正文所許終是放逸威儀  
914.焉有行則收束左臂坐則放縱左髀未見正文所許終是放逸威儀  
915.又坐具之制本為護於身衣及僧臥具也其中表裏俱淨不同此土之僧

- 916.又坐具之制本為護於身衣及僧臥具也其中表裏俱淨不同此土之僧  
917.故經中乞食已還至本處收衣鉢方始洗之而坐  
918.故經中乞食已還本處收衣鉢方始洗足而坐  
919.至於革屣拭刮綱系如面手焉故身衣俱淨在肩無有不淨之者  
920.至於革屣拭刮綱系如面手焉故身衣俱淨無有不淨之者  
921.此土之僧身之臭穢焉可以言左古便利曾不澡除內外衣裳曾何澣濯  
922.此土眾僧身之臭穢焉可以言左右便利曾不澡除內外衣裳曾何澣濯  
923.三衣少備裙袴尤多人見猶有厭其腥臊天聞義當悲其忍辱  
924.三衣少備襪袴尤多人見尚有厭之其腥臊而聞義當悲其忍辱  
925.據此誠文今在肩上觀事止可藏於臂中  
926.據此成文今在肩上觀事止可藏於臂中  
927.如有依法沙門不行惡習內外俱淨形服可觀豈得背佛誠言不順左肩之法  
928.如有依法沙門不行惡習內外俱淨形服可觀豈得背佛誠言不順左肩之法  
929.故十誦鼻奈耶云三衣之鉤紐也前去緣四指施鉤後去緣八指施紐  
930.故十誦鼻奈耶等三衣之鉤紐也前去緣四指施鉤後八指施紐  
931.以右角挑左肩上後紐綴於前鉤  
932.以右角挑左肩上紐綴於前鉤  
933.今則一倍反之豈是教文所許但以凡僧識想  
934.今則一倍反之豈是教文所許但以凡僧識想  
935.憑準正教及以見緣如有差違賜垂箴誨  
936.憑準正教及以見緣如前差違賜垂箴誨  
937.諸非人等咸皆默然  
938.諸非人等咸皆默然  
939.次後不久有一天人來云弟子黃瓊致敬已云  
940.次後復有一天人來云弟子黃瓊致敬已云  
941.向述坐具殊有可觀憑準經論無差違者然始終不備故重仰論  
942.向述坐具殊有可觀憑準經論無差違者然終始不備故重却論  
943.元佛初度五人爰及迦葉兄弟並制袈裟左臂坐具在袈裟下  
944.元佛初度五人爰及迦葉兄弟並製袈裟左臂坐具在袈裟下  
945.西天王臣皆被白氈搭左肩上  
946.西方王臣披白氈搭左肩上  
947.故佛制衣角居臂異俗頌鞞比丘威儀度物爾時法服猶未搭肩  
948.故佛制衣左臂異俗頌鞞比丘威儀度物爾時法服猶未搭肩  
949.後度諸眾徒侶漸多年少比丘儀容端美入城乞食多為女愛  
950.後度諸眾徒侶漸多年少比丘儀容端美入城乞食多為人愛  
951.由是佛制衣角在左肩後為風飄聽以重物鎮上  
952.由是佛制衣角左肩後為風飄聽以重物鎮上  
953.比丘不達佛意自造鎮衣之物種種莊嚴諸俗譏嫌比丘以事白佛  
954.比丘不達佛意自造鎮衣之物種種莊嚴諸俗譏論比丘以事白佛  
955.言我前聽安重物即是尼師壇餘者不合  
956.佛言我前聽安重物即是尼師壇餘者不合  
957.後王舍城外道名達摩多稱一切智所著衣服並皆鮮淨日易一衣日三十浴  
958.後王舍城外道名達摩多稱一切智所著衣服並皆鮮白日易一衣日三十浴  
959.所食皆以香薪香炭作之所住皆以香材塗泥皆以香汁園林皆植香樹  
960.所食皆以香薪香炭作之所住皆以香材塗泥皆以香汁園林皆植香樹  
961.所種花藥皆是香者流泉池水皆聚牛頭檀香內水中以為香潔  
962.所種花藥皆是香者流泉池水皆聚牛頭香內中水為香潔

- 963.雖帝釋歡喜之園未能加也  
964.雖帝釋歡喜之園未能加也  
965.世尊爾時將諸比丘入城乞食執持衣鉢坐具在肩  
966.世尊爾時將諸比丘入城乞食執持衣鉢坐具在肩  
967.有諸外道語達摩多言今瞿曇沙門入城乞食可往言論降從大師  
968.有諸外道語達多言今瞿曇沙門入城乞食可往言論降從大師  
969.時達摩多領諸徒眾身披白氈所披一張價直千兩紫磨黃金將至佛所  
970.時達摩多領徒眾披一領氈價直千兩紫磨黃金將至佛所  
971.時大梵天王請佛昇天外道至唯見比丘便問比丘肩上片布持將何用  
972.時大梵王請佛上天外道來唯見比丘便問比丘肩上片布持作何用  
973.答曰擬將坐之  
974.答曰擬將坐之  
975.又問汝所披衣名何等  
976.又問汝所被衣名何等耶  
977.聖答云忍辱鎧也  
978.答云忍辱鎧也  
979.又問何名忍辱鎧  
980.又問何名忍辱鎧  
981.答曰即是為三寶之相上制天魔下降外道  
982.答曰即此為三寶之相上制天魔下降外道  
983.達摩多云  
984.達摩云  
985.此衣既為可貴有大威靈豈得以所坐之布而居其上為是瞿曇教汝為是汝自為之  
986.此衣既為可貴有大威靈豈得以所坐之布而居其上為瞿曇教汝為是汝自為之  
987.諸比丘咸皆默然  
988.時比丘咸皆默然  
989.外道云若瞿曇教汝此法不足可尊云何自稱一切智人  
990.外道云瞿曇教汝此法不足可尊云何自稱一切智人  
991.若是汝自為之師何復不教汝耶  
992.若汝自為之師何不復教汝耶  
993.比丘食訖還僧坊中以事白佛  
994.比丘食訖還僧坊中以事白佛  
995.由此佛制還以衣角居于左臂坐具還在衣下  
996.由此佛制還以衣角居于左臂坐具還在衣下  
997.於後比丘披著袈裟多不齊整諸離車子譏言無有威儀所披衣服狀如姪女猶如象鼻  
998.於後比丘披著袈裟多不齊整諸離車子譏言無有威儀所披衣服狀如姪女猶如象鼻  
999.由此始制上安鉤紐令以衣角達于左臂置於腋下不得令垂如上過也  
1000. 因此始制上安鉤紐今以衣角達于左臂置於左腋下不得令垂如上過也  
1001. 前引舍利弗事  
1002. 前引舍利弗事  
1003. 此乃前開不見後制義須綸綜  
1004. 此方前開不見後制義須綸綜  
1005. 往者鷄鳴之詩掣壺掌漏刻之官齊侯無道官失其守  
1006. 往者雞鳴之詩掣壺掌漏刻之官齊無道官失其守  
1007. 諸侯來朝顛倒衣裳詩人刺之可不鏡哉  
1008. 諸侯朝顛倒衣裳詩人刺之可不鏡哉  
1009. 書云冠雖賤不可以居下屨雖貴不可以居上此言雖小可以況大

1010. 書云冠雖賤不可以居下屢雖貴不可以居上此言雖貴不可以上此言雖小可以況大  
1011. 古人或詢芻蕘伏願仁慈不以人微廢教也  
1012. 古人或詢諸芻蕘伏願仁慈不以人微廢教也  
1013. 余備聞雅論前代憲章斯則一化之所宗承三藏之弘轍也  
1014. 余備聞雅論前後憲章斯則一化之所宗承三藏之弘徹也  
1015. 如或鏗執頓拒未聞何殊結集永開八事之緣不遵上座重結之相也  
1016. 如或鏗執頓拒未聞何殊結集永開八事之緣不遵上座重結之相也  
1017. 縱無此示情或廣之五分律中餘方不為清淨者雖制不行據此可依準的  
1018. 縱無此示情或廣之五分律中餘方不為清淨者雖制不行據此可依准的  
1019. 況復天人賜降周統開制恨知之晚也  
1020. 況復天人賜降周統制開恨知之晚也  
1021. 然於現教事等亡篇仰以信之亦同飲光之罰歡喜也如是云云  
1022. 然於現教事等云篇仰以信之亦同飲光之罰懼喜也如是云云  
1023. 又云元制坐具之意用表塔基之相僧服袈裟在上以喻法身之塔  
1024. 又云元制坐具之意用表塔基之相僧服袈裟在上以喻法身之塔  
1025. 塔基既不偏邪坐具寧容長廣縱使四周具貼不違半搢之文  
1026. 塔基既無偏邪坐具寧容縱廣使四周具帖不違疋手之文  
1027. 但以翻譯語略但云各半搢手十字而論即是四周之義  
1028. 但以翻譯語略但云各增半疋十宗而論即是四周之義  
1029. 又問  
1030. 又問  
1031. 比見西域僧來多縫衣葉者何  
1032. 比見西域僧來多縫衣葉者  
1033. 答曰此佛滅後將二百年北天竺僧與外道同住  
1034. 答曰此佛滅後將二百年北天竺僧與外道同住  
1035. 外道嫉之密以利刀內衣葉中同往王所  
1036. 外道嫉之密以利刃內衣葉中同往王所  
1037. 外道告王沙門釋子內藏利刀將欲害王因即檢獲由此普誅一國比丘  
1038. 外道告王沙門釋子內藏刀刃將欲害王因即檢獲由是普誅一國比丘  
1039. 時有耶舍阿羅漢令諸比丘權且縫合為絕命難此乃北方因事權制非佛所開  
1040. 時有耶舍羅漢令諸比丘權且縫合為絕命難此乃北方因事權且立制非佛所開  
1041. 今有南方比丘皆悉縫合有無識者亦學縫之  
1042. 今有南方比丘皆亦縫合有無識者亦學縫之  
1043. 又問余曰  
1044. 又  
1045. 戒壇之興佛所重也祇垣一寺頓結三壇兩居佛院  
1046. 今日戒壇之興佛所重也祇桓一寺頓結三壇兩居佛院  
1047. 唯佛所登為集諸佛登壇而論僧尼結戒也  
1048. 唯佛所登為集諸佛登壇而論僧尼結戒也  
1049. 僧院一壇為受具者莊嚴列窟如須彌座神王石柱守護不虧下至水際經劫無沒  
1050. 僧院一壇為受具者莊嚴別窟如須彌座神景石柱守護不虧下至水際經劫無沒  
1051. 北天竺東見有石壇相狀弘偉師今何緣特立壇相天人幽顯莫不讚悅  
1052. 北天竺東見有石壇相狀弘律師今何緣特立壇相天人幽顯莫不贊悅  
1053. 余答云  
1054. 余答云  
1055. 曾見僧傳南林戒壇意便重之故仰則也  
1056. 曾見僧傳南林戒壇意便重之故仰則也

1057. 彼云豈唯一所今重幽求  
1058. 彼云豈惟一所今重幽求  
1059. 南方大有初昔宋求那跋摩於蔡州立壇晉竺法汰於瓦官寺立壇  
1060. 南方大有初昔宋求那跋摩於蔡州立壇晉竺法護於瓦官寺立壇  
1061. 晉支道林於石城沃州各立一壇晉支法領於若耶謝敷隱處立壇  
1062. 晉支道林於石城汾各立一壇晉支法存於若耶溪謝敷隱處立壇  
1063. 竺道壹於洞庭山立壇竺道生於吳中虎丘寺立壇宋智嚴於上定林寺立壇  
1064. 竺道一於洞庭山立壇竺道生於吳中虎丘山立壇宋智嚴於上定林立壇  
1065. 宋慧觀於石梁寺立壇齊僧敷於蕪湖立壇梁法超於南澗立壇  
1066. 宋慧觀於石梁寺立壇齊僧敷於無湖立壇梁法超於南澗立壇  
1067. 梁僧祐於上雲居栖霞歸善愛敬四處立壇  
1068. 梁僧祐於上雲居栖霞歸善愛敬四處立壇  
1069. 今荊州四層寺刹基長沙刹基大明寺前湖中並是戒壇  
1070. 今荊州四層刹基長沙刹基大明寺前湖中並是戒壇  
1071. 今以事斷江左渝州已下迄于江淮之南通計戒壇總有三百餘所  
1072. 今以事斷江右渝州已下迄于江淮之南通計戒壇總有三百餘所  
1073. 山東河北關內劍南戒壇事不絕故使江表佛法經今四五百年曾不退廢由戒壇也  
1074. 山東河北關內劍南戒壇事不絕使江表佛法今四五百年曾不退退由戒壇也  
1075. 戒為佛法之初源本立而不可傾也自此河之左右曾不聞名由此佛法三被誅殄  
1076. 戒為法之初元本立而不可傾也自北河之左右曾不聞名由此佛法三被誅殄  
1077. 又江漢之南山川秀麗綺錯見便忘返者土地之然也  
1078. 又江漢之南山川秀麗綺錯見便忘返者土地之然也  
1079. 人依外報故使情智聰敏形心勇銳遂能詳度佛教深有可依無所疑慮不可忘廢也  
1080. 人依外根故使情智聰敏形心勇銳也遂能詳度佛教深有可依無所疑慮不可忘廢也  
1081. 中原兩河晉代南度之後分為一十六國以武猛相陵佛法三除  
1082. 中原兩河晉氏南渡之後分為一十六國以武猛相陵佛法三除  
1083. 並是北狄之胤本非文地隨心即斷曾未大觀豈不然乎  
1084. 並是北狄之亂也本非文地隨心即斷曾未大觀豈不然乎  
1085. 戒壇之舉住持之成相也眾僧說戒受戒咸往登之事訖東迴左轉南出而返也  
1086. 故戒壇之舉住持之式相也眾僧說戒受戒咸往登之事訖東迴左轉南出而返也  
1087. 余問  
1088. 余曰  
1089. 經中咸言右旋右脇右遶等相今云左遶如何  
1090. 經中咸言右旋右繞右脇等相今云左遶如何  
1091. 答云天常法爾人常乃右也故日月星辰皆左行也  
1092. 答云天常法爾人乃右也故日月星辰皆左行也  
1093. 天氣風轉遂從西沒不見月之始生也  
1094. 天氣風轉遂從西沒不見月之始生也  
1095. 初在西方漸漸而東亦從西沒漸上東迴也西沒風轉也  
1096. 初在西方漸漸而東亦從西沒漸上東迴也西沒風轉也  
1097. 地上蔓草生必左旋此是天常也  
1098. 地上蔓草生必左旋此天常也  
1099. 今有西從日月之轉人謀也佛亦從之左轉者此方不為清淨也  
1100. 有西從日月之轉人謀也佛亦從之左轉者此方不為清淨也  
1101. 故如來右脇而臥首北面西觀本生地佛法久流於此方制諸比丘悉右脇臥云云  
1102. 故如來右脇而臥首北面西觀本生地佛法久流之方也制諸比丘悉右脇臥  
1103. 因從請出祇垣圖相遂取紙畫分齊一一諸院述其源流如別可有百紙

1104. 因從請出祇桓圖相遂取紙畫分齊一一諸院述其源流如別可有數紙
1105. 又復不久有天來云姓姚氏云弟子天人自有姓字語同天竺師既不解還述本音云云
1106. 不久復有天來云姓姚氏云云弟子天人自有姓字語同天竺師既不詢還述本音
1107. 不久復有天來云姓苟氏
1108. 不久復有天來云姓苟氏
1109. 云弟子本相州人也往以夏殷多難將家入白鹿山山中素有辟支佛住云云
1110. 云弟子本相人也往以夏殷多難將居家入白鹿山山素有辟支佛住云云
1111. 最後一朝韋將軍至致敬相問不殊恒禮
1112. 最後一朝韋將軍至致敬相聞不殊恒禮
1113. 云弟子常見師在安豐坊初述廣弘明集割斷邪正開釋明顯異於前者
1114. 云弟子常見師在安豐坊初述廣弘明集剖斷邪正開段明顯於前者
1115. 甚適幽心常欲相尋但為三天下中佛僧事大鬪訟興兵攻伐不已
1116. 甚適幽旨常欲相尋但為三天下中佛僧事大鬪訟興兵攻伐不已
1117. 弟子職當守護慰喻和解無暫時停所以令前諸使者共師言議今暫得來不得久住
1118. 弟子職當守護勸喻和詞無暫時停所以令前諸使者共師言議今暫得來不得久住
1119. 師今須解佛法衰昧天竺諸國不及此方此雖犯戒太途慚愧
1120. 師今須解佛法衰昧天竺諸國不及此方此雖犯戒大途慚愧
1121. 內雖陵犯外猶慎護故使諸天見其一善忘其百非
1122. 內雖陵犯外猶慎護故使諸天見其一善忘其百非
1123. 若見造過咸皆流涕悉加守護不令魔子所見侵惱
1124. 若見造過咸皆流涕悉加守護不令魔子所見侵惱云云
1125. 余問
1126. 余問
1127. 欲界主者豈非魔耶以下諸天皆非魔屬耶
1128. 欲界主者豈非魔耶以下諸天皆非屬耶
1129. 答曰魔若行惡四天帝釋皆所不從若下二天行諸善法魔及魔子無如之何
1130. 答云魔若行惡四天帝釋皆所不從若下二天行諸善法魔及魔女無如之何
1131. 此方僧勝於大小乘曾無二見悉皆奉之
1132. 此方僧勝於大小乘曾無二見悉皆奉之
1133. 西土不爾諸小乘人獲大乘經則投火中小僧皆賣於北狄耆者奪其命根不可言述
1134. 西土不爾諸小乘人獲大乘經則投火中小僧賣於北狄老者奪其命根不可言述
1135. 今菩提大寺主威猛象有八萬僧戶數十萬王征不得
1136. 今菩提大寺寺主威猛象有八萬僧戶數千萬王征不得
1137. 遠塔之下日有金帛收已自納
1138. 遠塔之下日有金帛收已自納
1139. 廚內生魚積成大聚羊腔懸之劇屠宰肆然亦守護不令惡鬼害之
1140. 廌內生魚頭積成大聚羊腔懸之劇於屠肆然亦守護不令惡鬼害之
1141. 余問曰
1142. 問曰
1143. 可無善神龍王何因縱其造罪
1144. 可無善神龍王何因縱其造罪
1145. 答曰血食之神咸來嚮衛諸受佛語者守護大乘寺僧
1146. 答曰血食之神咸來嚮衛諸受佛語者守護太乘寺僧
1147. 余曰
1148. 余曰
1149. 常見此國以殺戮為功每願若死生龍鬼中有大勢力令其不殺如何此神還縱其殺者
1150. 常見此國以殺戮為功每願若死生龍鬼中有大勢力令其不殺如何此神還復縱殺者

1151. 答曰並是眾生惡業所致魚羊還債是其常理  
1152. 答曰並是眾生惡業所致魚羊還債此是常理  
1153. 余問  
1154. 余曰  
1155. 還債之業誠是可嘉然彼殺噉無不由惑  
1156. 還債之業誠是可嘉然彼殺噉無不由惑  
1157. 惑是貪嗔癡貪癡之惑結在惡道如何諸神故縱造耶  
1158. 惑是貪癡貪癡之惑結在惡道如何諸神故縱造也  
1159. 答曰亦是業定諸佛不能除況諸神者生此國中正念既失便縱其殺  
1160. 答曰亦是業定諸佛尚不能除況諸神者生此國中正念既失便縱其殺  
1161. 余曰  
1162. 余曰  
1163. 先有此願脫生失念墮彼如何  
1164. 先有此願脫生失念隨彼如何  
1165. 答曰自非觀行明白在涅而不縕方可得行此也  
1166. 自非觀行明白在泥不淄方可行此  
1167.  
1168. 又問彌天釋道安宇內式瞻云乘赤驢荊襄朝夕而見未審如何答曰虛也  
1169.  
1170. 又曰若爾傳虛何為河東寺上有驢峴山南有中驢村據此行由則乘驢之有地也答曰非也後人築臺於上植樹供養焉有佛殿之側頓置驢耶又中驢之名本是閻國郡國之故地也後人不練遂妄擬之云云  
1171. 韋將軍所言既終作禮而退  
1172.  
1173. 律相感通傳卷終  
1174.  
1175.  
1176. 道宣律師感通錄

## Appendix 10: Points at Which Daoxuan Refers to His Own Presence

Title and <i>Taishō</i> Number	Entry
四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔 T40.1804	1. j3.105c10 予於蜀郡親見 2. j3.133c3 (佛像) 今在楊州長樂寺 (Unclear; hereafter U) 3. j3.133c7 (佛像) 今在京師
關中創立戒壇圖經并序 T45.1892	1. j1.808c17-18 今在忉利天 (Exception; hereafter E) 2. j1.810c22 其事見在 (E) 3. j1.814b6 今見講解諸家 (E) 4. j1.817a21 於今見在 (E)
淨心戒觀法 T45.1893	1. j1.820a5 今見解法人等 (E)
釋門章服儀 T45.1894	1. j1.834b15 秦山開士
釋門歸敬偈 T45.1896	1. j2.863a26 今見梵僧來至佛前
律相感通傳 T45.1898 (E)	1. j1.877a8-9 凡夫今見 2. j1.877a14 母今見在 3. j1.877b18-19 寺今見存 4. j1.878c1 今見有十三緣覺在谷內住 5. j1.879c1-2 至今見存 6. j1.879c2 卽今見有 7. j1.880a22 今見比丘行者
中天竺舍衛國祇洹寺圖經 T45.1899 (E)	1. j2.893a21 今在彌勒佛所 2. j2.894a16 今在色界
釋迦氏譜 T50.2041	1. j1.92b13 塔今見在 (E) 2. j1.96c9 今在空存 (U)
續高僧傳 T50.2060	1. j1.430b24-25 今見譯訖 2. j2.434b12-13 今見翻諸經 3. j3.440a8 今見領徒本國匡化 (E) 4. j7.482c12 今見若此 (E) 5. j16.557b28 今見在城中 (浙江) 6. j19.586b4 鐘今見在佛隴上寺 7. j20.595a7 今見在具諸聞覩 8. j20.598a7 (鄧州寧國寺浮圖) 今見在 9. j20.601a10 捨宅為寺于今見在 (綿竹) 10. j20.601b7 (什邡淨慧寺) 寺今見在 11. j23.626a11 昔聞今見 (E) 12. j24.643a23 所居三所即今見存 (鄧州) 13. j25.647c21 於今見存 (相州鼓山) 14. j25.654a23 於今見在 (太行山) 15. j25.663b12 今見在 (鄆) 16. j25.663c26 (娑羅樹) 今見在此 (E) 17. j16.558a28 (碑) 今在苑內 (長安) 18. j16.558c12 (曇相之圖像) 今在京師禪林寺 19. j22.616a22 (丈六釋迦金像) 今在本寺 (長安) 20. j24.633c25 (龜茲國檀像) 今在洛州淨土寺 21. j25.645a5 今在城西古寺中塑像手上 (肅州酒泉縣城) 22. j25.664b17 今在幽州出家 (E) 23. j27.679b19 今在寶園寺中 (涪陵)

	24. j28.689b16-17 今在雍州之新豐 (E) 25. j29.692b19-20 今在相州鄴縣大慈寺 26. j29.699a4 (佛像) 光相超挺今在山閣 (九江) 27. j20.603b14 今猶故堂十餘見在 (五台山) 28. j1.430c13-14 傳者以為神用不同 29. j8.484b22 傳者具書 (釋慧順) 30. j9.497c13-14 故傳者不漏其節 (釋靈裕 相州) 31. j15.547b18 傳者目其梗概要妙固多略耳 (釋道洪 卒慈恩寺) 32. j16.555b23-24 傳者親閱行圖故直敘之于後耳 33. j19.587b28 傳者嘗同遊處故略而述之 34. j20.592c18-19 傳者昔預 (釋志超) 筵蒙諸惠誥既親承其績故 35. j20.594a18-20 傳者重其陶鑿風神研精學觀故又述其行相 36. j20.604b1 傳者重又聞之故又重緝 37. j20.605b13 傳者抑又聞之 38. j21.613b5-6 傳者目驗生常景行故直筆書 39. j23.625c8 傳者曰 (E) 40. j24.641c11-12 傳者親往其寺不及其人 (沙門智滿) 41. j27.681a1-2 余曾同聚目悅斯人 (釋普濟/終南山)
釋迦方志 T51.2088	1. j1.954c16-17 佛鉢寶臺經數百年今在波斯王宮 (E) 2. j2.962c8-9 燈猶不滅今在深室 (E) 3. j2.962a2 唐言戒賢今見在 (E) 4. j2.972a26 (佛像) 今見在殿圖寫殷矣
廣弘明集 T52.2103	1. j1.100a15 今見章醮似俗酒脯碁琴行之 2. j2.104a3 (道人尸殮伏地) 今見存焉莫測時代 (在朔州/U) 3. j15.201b26 (越州鄖縣塔) 今見神瑞 4. j15.201c22-23 今見存益州北百里雒縣城 5. j15.202a14/a16 (并州) 今見尼住為淨明寺/(榆社縣) 見有僧住 6. j15.202b7-8 (荊州) 至今見在 7. j15.202b26 (涼州) 今見如此 8. j15.203a11 (襄州) 今見在
集古今佛道論衡 T52.2104 (E)	1. j3.387b10 (玄奘) 今在北山玉華宮寺領徒翻經 2. j4.389b7 今在天庭得親談論 (U)
集神州三寶感通錄 T52.2106	1. j1.408a18 今見在益州 2. j2.414c16-17 (像) 今見在圖寫殷焉 (U) 3. j2.415a17 (襄陽啟法寺) 今見存焉 4. j2.415b7 今見在 (長安) 5. j2.416b23 今見在江陵長沙寺 6. j2.419c5 今見在 (江陵城北靜陵大明寺) 7. j2.420c4 像今見在 (晉州) 8. j2.421c9 乃今見存 (坊州西南慈烏川) 9. j2.422b14 今見在 (益州光明寺) 10. j2.422b25 今見在村中 (雍州鄠縣) 11. j2.430a25 今見在化度寺圓滿師處 (長安)
大唐內典錄 T55.2149	1. j1.221a24 (漢法本內傳) 今見存焉 2. j3.246c5 今見所傳蓋其文也 3. j5.275c23 又今見翻 (E) 4. j10.342a13 今見在化度寺圓滿師處

## Appendix 11: Huili's List of the Translation Team

Assignment	Monastery Affiliation	Name of the Monk
Zhengyi 證義 (number of the assignment 12)	Jing Hongfu si 京弘福寺	Lingrun 靈潤
	[Jing Hongfu si 京弘福寺]	Wenbei 文備
	Luohan si 羅漢寺	Huigui 慧貴
	Shiji si 實際寺	Mingyan 明琰
	Baochang si 寶昌寺	Faxiang 法祥
	Jingfa si 靜法寺	Puxian 普賢
	Fahai si 法海寺	Shenfang 神昉
	Kuozhou Fajiang si 廬州法講寺	Daoshen 道深
	Bianzhou Yanjue si 汴州演覺寺	Xuanzhong 玄忠
	Puzhou Pujiu si 蒲州普救寺	Shentai 神泰
	Mianzhou Zhenxiang si 綿州振嚮寺	Jingming 敬明
	Yizhou Duobao si 益州多寶寺	Daoyin 道因
Zhuwen 緘文 (9)	Jingshi Puguang si 京師普光寺	Qixuan 栖玄
	Hongfu si 弘福寺	Mingjun 明濬
	Huichang si 會昌寺	Bianji 辩機
	Zhongnanshan Fengde si 終南山豐德寺	Daoxuan 道宣
	Jianzhou Fuju si 簡州福聚寺	Jingmai 靜邁
	Pujiu si 普救寺	Xingyou 行友
	[Puzhou] Qiyan si [蒲州]接巖寺	Daozhuo 道卓
	Binzhou Zhaoren si 濱州昭仁寺	Huili 慧立
	Luozhou Tiangong si 洛州天宮寺	Xuanze 玄則
Zixue 字學 (1)	Jing Da Zongchi si 京大總持寺	Xuanying 玄應
Zhengfanyu fanwen 證梵語梵文 (1)	Jing Da Xingshan si 京大興善寺	Xuanmo 玄謨

Source: *Da Tang Daci'en sanzang fashi zhuan* 大唐大慈恩寺三藏法師傳 (T50.2053j6.253c19–254a6).

Note: In total, twenty-three monks worked with Xuanzang to translate the *Da Pusa zang jing* 大菩薩藏經, which now forms part of *Da Baoji jing* 大寶積經 (the *[Mahā]ratnakūṭa*; T11.310j35–j54).

## Appendix 12: The Meaning of *Hufa* in Indian Buddhist Texts

Apart from being the Chinese rendering of the name of the famous Indian monk Dharmapāla (532–561 CE), the term *hufa* 護法 has a number of other usages in Buddhist texts. After searching for this term in the *Taishō* collection (volumes 1–32, texts 1–1692),<sup>613</sup> I found four distinctive usages, but all four are found in translations. That is to say, prior to Daoxuan, no Chinese monk had ever defined the term in his own texts.

In the first case, *hufa* is used to mean the name of a particular type of *arhat*. According to the *Zhong ahan jing* 中阿含經,<sup>614</sup> when the lay Buddhist follower Anāthapindada 紿孤獨 asked the Buddha about the types of *arhat*, the Buddha replied that *hufa* was as one of the types. An identical usage is found in the *Apidamodapiposha* 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論.<sup>615</sup> These two texts suggest that this particular type of *arhat* acquires the name *hufa* because of his characteristic ability to protect (*hu* 護) the spiritual liberation (*dharma* 法) that he has earned for himself.

*Hufa* is also a noun in the second usage. However, in this instance, it is used to describe the methods (*fa* 法) that afford protection (*hu* 護) to the person who adopts it. In the *Da Baoji jing* 大寶積經, the Four Heavenly Kings<sup>616</sup> ask the Buddha how the people of the world might protect themselves. In reply, the Buddha lists a number of methods, and it is in this context that we find the term *hufa*. This passage reads as follows:

[The Buddha said to the Four Heavenly Kings:] there are two methods that can afford people and the world protection. What are these two? First is to have a sense of shame, knowing for yourself that in your many past lives, you have not lived fully in accordance with the Buddha-dharma. Second is

---

<sup>613</sup> Texts 1–1692 were searched because they are thought to have been composed by the Indian masters 印度撰述. Furthermore, Daoxuan was the first Chinese author to define the term *hufa*. Therefore, if Daoxuan ever referred to a text when he was drafting his interpretation of the term, it must have been composed by an Indian master and translated before the compilation of *Xu gaoseng zhuan* (c.665).

<sup>614</sup> *Zhong ahan jing* 中阿含經 (*Madhyamāgama The Middle-length Discourses*; translated by Gautama Samghadeva 罪曇僧伽提婆; 389 CE; T1.26), j30.616a16–18. Hōbōginrin's 法寶義林 Chinese name 罪雲僧伽提婆 (page. 20) for the translator of this text is inconsistent with that in the *Taishō* collection. I use the *Taishō* version.

<sup>615</sup> *Apidamo Da Piposha lun* (*Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāstra*; translated by Xuanzang 玄奘; 656 CE; T27.1545), j62.319c8–11.

<sup>616</sup> The names of the kings are listed in table 7, 132.

to cherish the idea of serving others, reminding yourself that [you] should investigate deeper into the dharma and [you should] help more people in the world. These are the two methods. Wise men, these are the methods (*fa* 法) that can protect (*hu* 護) the world. When [these methods are] fully adopted, the world is protected.

佛告四天王，復有二事，以用護法世間人民。何謂為二。一曰慚恥。  
從無數劫，不應道法。二曰懷愧。自責，不深入法，救護一切。是為二。  
佛言，諸仁當行是法，以護天下，以能建立如是法行，乃能護世間。<sup>617</sup>

In the third usage, *hufa* means protecting the teaching of the Buddha. In the *Bonihuan jing* 般泥洹經, the Buddha mentions *hufa* when he delivers his last message to his disciples:

[I now say to you,] it is not often that you hear the teaching of the Buddha. You should embrace (*shou* 受) all the *sūtras* and *dharma*s (*fa* 法) I have preached, protect (*hu* 護) them and put them into practice (*chi* 持) ... Those who cherish the teaching themselves and are able to clear others' doubts about the teaching ... are to be called those who embrace, practise and protect the teaching. The community has the right to expel those monks who disregard the words of the *sūtras* and the *vinayas*.

佛所說法，亦難聞。聞已，聞經法當受護持... 令棄邪媚，受四正意，是為受持護法者也。其不承經戒者眾比丘當黜之。<sup>618</sup>

As seen in this extract, those who provide protection are disciples of the Buddha, and what they need to protect is the teaching of the Buddha. Furthermore, this extract displays a double level of protection. First, whenever a monk embraces and practises the teaching, he simultaneously protects it. Second, whenever the community takes action to deal with errant monks, they protect the teaching.

<sup>617</sup> *Da Baoji jing* (*Mahāratnakūṭasūtra*; trans. chiefly by Bodhiruci 菩提流志; 713 CE; T11.310), j13.73b8–12.

<sup>618</sup> *Bonihuan jing* (*Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*; T1.6), j2.182c1–183a9.

In the fourth usage of *hufa* the term refers to the special group of a deity who protects the Buddha-dharma. In this instance, it is often used in combination with *shen* 神 (literally, ‘god’) to form the phrase *hufa shen* 護法神 (*dharma-pāla*).<sup>619</sup>

In summary, in the searched texts, I found, apart from being the Chinese rendering of the name of Dharmapāla, four distinctive usages of the term *hufa*. In the first usage, it is the name of a particular type of *arhat* who is characterized by his capability to protect the spiritual achievement he has gained. In the second usage, it describes the methods that can offer protection to the people of the world. In the third usage, it means the various actions that protect the Buddha-dharma. These actions include the teaching itself, practising the teaching and dealing with those who misbehave. Finally, in the fourth usage, when combined with the term *shen*, it signifies the members of a particular group of deities who protect the Buddha-dharma.

---

<sup>619</sup> *Baoxing tuoluoni jing* 寶星陀羅尼經 (*Dhāraṇī Sūtra of the Auspicious Star*; T13.402), j9.578b18–19, *Tuoluoni ji jing* 陀羅尼集經 (*Dhāraṇīsamuccaya?* T18.901), j5.830b8, *Yaoshi rulai guanxing yigui fa* 藥師如來觀行儀軌法 (*Ritual of the Contemplation on the Meditation Buddha*; T19.923), j1.28c23, and *Zunsheng fo ding xiuyuqiefa yigui* 尊勝佛頂修瑜伽法儀軌 (*Ritual of the Supreme Contemplation of Foding*; T19.973), j2.379b4.

### Appendix 13: *Hufa Monks in Xu gaoseng zhuan* (Including Fujian)

No.	Name	Summary of Their Deeds as Recorded at T50.2060j23.624b15–j24.643b
1.	釋曇無最	元魏正光元年明帝加朝服大赦請釋李兩宗上殿…法師等與道士論義(後不測其終)
2.	釋曇顯	(梁武)帝惑之乃出勅召諸沙門與道士對校道術/竟以放達流俗潛遁人世不知所之
3.	釋靜藹	周武之世道士張賓…前僧衛元嵩/(靜藹)自條身肉/以刀割心捧之而卒(附見慧宣)
4.	釋慧宣	(靜藹親侍沙門爰述芳猷樹碑塔所)
5.	釋道安	天和四年歲…親量三教優劣廢立(附見慧俊/慧影/寶貴)(卒于周世)
6.	釋慧俊	(道安同學)
7.	釋慧影	(道安弟子)有論曰傷學除謗法之愆等
8.	釋寶貴	(道安弟子)翫閱群典講律為務
9.	釋僧彥	周武季世將喪釋門崇上老氏受其符錄(不測所終)
10.	釋僧猛	黃巾之徒紛然構聚猛乃徐搖談柄引敵深渦方就邪宗一一窮破(卒于住寺)
11.	釋道臻	西魏大統(為安定亂世之僧人做出巨大貢獻)
12.	釋智炫	會周武帝廢佛法欲存道教(直接與武帝辯論)(不病而卒)
13.	釋明贍	敬王者(隋煬帝)/佈道[唐]太宗(相顏貌怡然奄爾而逝)
14.	釋慧乘	武德八年駕幸國學將行釋奠堂置三坐擬敘三宗(論三教先後)(終於舊房)(附見道璋)
15.	釋道璋	(慧乘門人/料其後事)
16.	釋智實	武德 法雅/[唐]太宗十一年道先佛後(受杖,後卒大總持寺)(附見普應/法行)
17.	釋普應	牽挽[傳]奕手與談正理(未提及其終)
18.	釋法行	(普應老師)(為眾操持)(後住楚國講遺教論以畢終矣)
19.	釋法琳	辯傅奕/十三年又辯太宗之沙汰僧尼/有勅徙…因疾而卒百牢關菩提寺(附見慧序)
20.	釋慧序	(法琳摯友/料其後事)
21.	釋慈藏	(建寺安僧弘律於新羅)(附見圓勝)(未提及其終)
22.	釋圓勝	(講開律部於新羅)

## Appendix 14: List of the Officials Petitioned Against to Gaozong's Edict

No.	Name	QTW	Opinion of the Officials (Place in Daoxuan's GHMJ)
1.	Linghu Defen 令狐德棻 <sup>620</sup>	j137.1388	不應拜 (the 9th official to appear in GHMJ )
2.	Liu Xiangdao 劉祥道	j162.1655	不應拜 (4th)
3.	Du Junchuo 杜君綽	j186.1887	不應拜
4.	Quan Shancai 權善才	j186.1887	不應拜
5.	Kong Zhiyue 孔志約	j186.1888	不應拜 (1st)
6.	Dou Deyuan 竇德元	j186.1890	不應拜 (2nd) <sup>621</sup>
7.	Liu Shenli 劉審禮	j188.1907	不應拜
8.	Yuan Zhixin 源直心	j189.1913	不應拜
9.	Xuegu Wuren 薛孤吳仁	j201.2029	不應拜
10.	Feng Shende 馮神德	j202.2041	不應拜 (12th)
11.	Cheng Shiyu 程士禹	j202.2048	不應拜 (11th) <sup>622</sup>
12.	Cui Daomo 崔道默	j204.2061	不應拜
13.	Li Hui 李晦	j204.2063	不應拜
14.	Xin Hongliang 辛宏亮	j204.2063	不應拜
15.	Cui Xiuye 崔修業	j204.2063	不應拜
16.	Wang Yuanci 王元策	j204.2064	不應拜
17.	Xu Qing 徐慶	j204.2065	不應拜
18.	Wei Siqui 韋思齊	j204.2065	不應拜
19.	Gao Yaoshang 高藥尚	j204.2065	不應拜
20.	Wang Si 王思	j204.2066	不應拜
21.	Huangfu Gongyi 皇甫公義	j204.2066	不應拜
22.	Liang Xiaoren 梁孝仁	j204.2066	不應拜
23.	Xie Shou 謝壽	j204.2067	不應拜
24.	Wang Qianshi 王千石	j204.2069	不應拜
25.	Liu Daoqing 劉道慶	j204.2069	不應拜
26.	Zheng Qintai 鄭欽泰	j204.2069	不應拜 (3rd) <sup>623</sup>
27.	Wang Quan 王泉	j205.2072	不應拜
28.	Yuan Chengxin 源誠心	j205.2072	不應拜
29.	Yan Liben 閻立本	j153.1569	應拜 (俱拜君親) (10th) <sup>624</sup>
30.	Li Chunfeng 李淳風	j159.1631	應拜 (俱拜君親)
31.	Lü Cai 呂才	j160.1636	應拜 (俱拜君親,可容稽首)
32.	Hao Chujun 郝處俊	j162.1656	應拜 (俱拜君親)
33.	Li Kuan 李寬	j168.1724	應拜 (俱拜君親)

<sup>620</sup> Linghu Defen submitted two petitions, all of the others just one.

<sup>621</sup> In GHMJ, T52.2103j25.28624, Dou Deyuan is referred to by his office: *siyuan* 司元 (both the Ministry of Revenue and that ministry's Census Bureau).

<sup>622</sup> The name of this official is given in GHMJ, T52.2103j25.290a9, as Cheng Shike 程士頤.

<sup>623</sup> In GHMJ, T52.2103j25.287a10, Zheng Qintai is referred to by his office: *sirong* 司戎 (both the Ministry of War and that ministry's Bureau of Military Appointments).

<sup>624</sup> This petition is attributed to Yan Liben in GHMJ, T52.2103j25.289c3–16, but Yan Sijian 楊思儉 in QTW, j203.2055b4–2056a2. It comes under Yan Liben in QTW, j153.1569c16–1570a4, but it is not found in the *Taishō* collection.

34.	Xie You 謝祐	j187.1897	應拜 (俱拜君親)
35.	Dou Lujian 竇盧柬 (豆盧暕 <sup>625</sup> )	j200.2027	應拜 (俱拜君親)
36.	Li Yifan 李義範	j203.2054	應拜 (俱拜君親)
37.	Li Xingmin 李行敏	j203.2054	應拜 (俱拜君親)
38.	Husi Jingze斛斯敬則	j203.2055	應拜
39.	Xiong Yuanyi 熊元逸	j203.2055	應拜
40.	Yang Sijian 楊思儉	j203.2055	應拜
41.	Han Chuyuan 韓處元	j203.2056	應拜
42.	Liu Yuanzhen 柳元貞	j203.2056	應拜
43.	Li Renfang 李仁方	j203.2056	應拜
44.	Zhang Yue 張約	j203.2056	應拜
45.	Yang Siyuan 楊思元	j203.2057	應拜 (俱拜君親)
46.	Ma Dashi 馬大師	j203.2057	應拜 (俱拜君親)
47.	Cui Chongye 崔崇業	j204.2058	應拜 (俱拜君親)
48.	Dou Shangyi 獄尚義	j204.2058	應拜 (俱拜君親) 令
49.	Jiang Zhenzhou 蔣真胄	j204.2058	應拜 令
50.	Li Qia 李洽	j204.2058	應拜 (俱拜君親) 勒 (7th)
51.	Qiu Shenjing 邱神靜	j204.2059	應拜 (俱拜君親) 令
52.	Wei Huaijing 韋懷敬	j204.2059	應拜
53.	Zhao Chongyi 趙崇素	j204.2060	應拜
54.	Wang Sijiu 王思九	j204.2060	應拜
55.	Liu Renrui 劉仁叡	j204.2060	應拜
56.	Cui Andu 崔安都	j204.2061	應拜 (5th/6th) <sup>626</sup>
57.	Zhang Songshou 張松壽	j204.2062	應拜 (法會時不拜, 其他時候拜) (8th)
58.	Yuan Dashi 元大士	j204.2067	應拜
59.	Helan Minzhi 賀蘭敏之	j239.2423	應拜

<sup>625</sup> This is his name as in Yancong's *Ji shamen bu ying bai su deng shi* 集沙門不應拜俗等事, T52.2108j5.465a9/467a2–12. Huilin confirms in his *Yiqie jing yinyi*, T54.2128j88.873a18, the name of this official as 豆盧暕. Note that the reading of 眇 given by Huilin is 'gu xian fan 古限反; gan'. Nevertheless, some present-day *pinyin* 拼音 sources recognize 眇 as 'jian' and 'lan'. In the biography of officials of the Tang official history books (JTS/XTS), I have not been able to find mention of 豆盧暕/竇盧暕. Special thanks to T. H. Barrett for highlighting the different readings of and Huilin's note on this name.

<sup>626</sup> In GHMJ, T52.2103j25.288b28–28, this petition is attributed to Cui Andu and Shen Xuanming 沈玄明.

## ABBREVIATIONS

### (Collections)

- B *Da zang jing bu bian* 大藏經補編  
D *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 大日本佛教全書  
J *Jiaxing da zang jing* 嘉興大藏經 (Online)  
T *Taishō shinshu daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經  
W *Xinbian wan xu zang jing* 新編卍續藏經 (Print)  
X *Xinbian wan xu zang jing* 新編卍續藏經 (Online)  
Z *Zhonghua da zang jing* 中華大藏經

### (Others)

- BKCB *Baoke Congbian* 寶刻叢編  
BMSY *Beimeng suoyan* 北夢瑣言  
BPAD *Buddhist Studies Person Authority Databases*  
BQS *Bei Qi Shu* 北齊書  
BS *Beishi* 北史  
CAZ *Chang'an zhi* 長安志  
CESZ *Da Tang Daci'en sanzang fashi zhuan* 大唐大慈恩三藏法師傳  
CXXZ *Changxing xianzhi* 長興縣志  
CWZM *Chongwen zongmu* 崇文總目  
DMJ *Dongmou ji* 東牟集  
DSKK *Dōsen den no kenkyū* 道宣傳の研究  
DTXY *Da Tang xinyu* 大唐新語  
DYZ *Du yi zhi* 獨異誌  
FYZL *Fayuan zhulin* 法苑珠林  
FZTJ *Fozu tongji* 佛祖統紀  
FZTZ *Fozu lidai tongzai* 佛祖歷代通載  
GHMJ *Guang hongming ji* 廣弘明集

GKJ *Gongkui ji* 攻媿集

GQBL *Guoqing bai lu* 國清百錄

GSZ *Gaoseng zhuan* 高僧傳

GSZY *Gaoseng zhaiyao* 高僧摘要

HYQJ *Hongyi dashi quanji* 弘一大師全集

HZFZ *Huzhou fuzhi* 湖州府志

JBS *Sifen lü bhikṣu han zhu jieben shu* 四分律比丘含注戒本疏

JGTL *Ji Shenzhou Sanbao gantong lu* 集神州三寶感通錄

JSL *Jinshi lu* 金石錄

JTS *Jiu Tangshu* 舊唐書

JTTJ *Guanzhong chuangli jietan tujing bing xu* 關中創立戒壇圖經并序

JWDS *Jiu Wudaishi* 舊五代史

JXJG *Jing xin jie guan fa* 淨心戒觀法

JZJ *Sifenluchao jianzheng ji* 四分律鈔簡正記

JZSZ *Jizushan zhi* 雞足山志

KDZ *Kuo Di zhi ji jiao* 括地志輯校

KTCX *Kaitian chuanxing ji* 開天傳信記

KYL *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄

LBCA *Leibian Chang'an zhi* 類編長安志

LLCD *Zhongguo lishi da cidian: lishi dili juan* 中国历史大辞典

LJXJ *Liangjing xin ji ji jiao* 兩京新記輯校

LS *Liangshu* 梁書

LSZ *Leishuo* 類說

LXBN *Longxing fojiao biannian tonglun* 隆興佛教編年通論

LXGT *Lü xiang gan tong zhuan* 律相感通傳

LXSZ *Xin xiu ke feng liuxue seng zhuang* 新修科分六學僧傳

- LYSZ *Ritsuen sōbō den* 律院僧寶傳
- LZGY *Risshū kōyō* 律宗綱要
- NBXS *Nanbu xinshu* 南部新書
- NDL *Da Tang neidian lu* 大唐內典錄
- NFZ *Nanhai ji gui Neifa zhuan* 南海寄歸內法傳
- NS *Nanshi* 南史
- NSGK *Shaanxi Nanshan gu kou kao* 陝西南山谷口考
- PBD *Princeton Dictionary*
- PNZC *Pini zuochi xushi* 毗尼作持續釋
- QDHS *Quan Dunhuang shi* 全敦煌詩
- QLSZ *Qingliang shan zhi* 清涼山志
- QTS *Quan Tang shi* 全唐詩
- QTW *Quan Tang wen* 全唐文
- QTWBY *Quantangwen Buyi* 全唐文補遺
- QYTJ *Zhongtianzu shewei guo qihuan si tu jing* 中天竺舍衛國祇洹寺圖經
- QZDS *Qunzhai dushu zhi jiaozheng* 群齋讀書志校證
- QZY *Liang chu qingzhong yi* 量處輕重儀
- SFL *Sifen lü* 四分律
- SGSZ *Song gaoseng zhuan* 宋高僧傳
- SMZT *Shimen zhengtong* 釋門正統
- SQL *Mohe sengqi lü* 摩訶僧祇律
- SS *Suishu* 隋書
- SSJG *Shishi jigū lüe* 釋氏稽古略
- SSL *Shisong lü* 十誦律
- SSSL *Da Song sengshi lue* 大宋僧史略
- SSXTZ *Shanxi tongzhi* 山西通志

- SSY *Songshi* 宋史
- SSZ *Sheng seng zhuan* 神僧傳
- SXTZ *Shaanxi tongzhi* 陝西通志
- TD *Tongdian* 通典
- THY *Tang huiyao* 唐會要
- TLSY *Tang lü shu yi* 唐律疏議
- TLD *Tang Liudian* 唐六典
- TPGJ *Taiping guangji* 太平廣記
- TPHY *Taiping huanyu ji* 太平寰宇記
- TTSZ *Tiantai shan fangwai zhi* 天台山方外志
- TWSY *Tangwen shiyi* 唐文拾遺
- TZL *Tongzhi ershi lüe* 通志二十略
- TZLJ *Tang da zhaoling ji* 唐大詔令集
- WDHY *Wudai huiyao* 五代會要
- WFL *Wufen lü* 五分律
- WXTK *Wenxian tongkao* 文獻通考
- XJZJ *Xijing zaji* 西京雜記
- XSC *Sifenlü shanfan buque xingshi chao* 四分律疏繁補缺行事鈔
- XTS *Xin Tangshu* 新唐書
- XYJ *Da Tang Xiyu ji* 大唐西域記
- YHJX *Yuanhe junxian tu zhi* 元和郡縣圖志
- YW LJ *Yiwen leiju* 藝文類聚
- YWSZ *Ayuwang shan zhi* 阿育王山志
- YWZX *Ayuwang zhi xu* 阿育王志續
- YYZZ *Youyang zazu* 西陽雜俎
- ZCJ *Sifenlü shanfan buque xingshi chao zichi ji* 四分律行事鈔資持記

ZHSS *Zhonghua shanshui zhi congkan* 中華山水志叢刊

ZYL *Zhenyuan xingding shijiao mulu* 貞元新定釋教目錄

ZFY *Shimen zhang fu yi* 釋門章服儀

ZZTJ *Zizhi tongjian* 資治通鑑

## CONVENTIONS

References to the *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 大日本佛教全書

e.g.: D113.120j1.12a6

[*Dai Nihon* ][volume number].[page number][scroll number].[original page number][page section][line]

References to the *Taishō shinshu daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經

e.g.: T50.2053j6.253c28

[*Taishō*][volume number].[text number][scroll number].[page number][page section][line]

References to the *Xinbian wan xu zang jing* 新編卍續藏經 (Print)

e.g.: W62.1026b14

[*wan*][volume number][page number].[page section][line]

References to the *Xinbian wan xu zang jing* 新編卍續藏經 (Online)

e.g.: X41.728j1.83c12

[*xu*][volume number].[text number][scroll number].[page number][page section][line]

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### COLLECTIONS, DICTIONARIES, AND REFERENCE WORKS

*Chinese History: A New Manual.* Endymion Wilkinson. Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Asia Center, 2013.

*Ershier zhong da zang jing tong jian* 二十二种大藏经通检. “An Alphabetical Guide to the Texts in the Twenty-two Editions of Da Zang Jing, with Introduction.” Tong Wei 童玮. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1997.

*Dai Nihon bukkyō zensho* 大日本佛教全書. Ed. Takakusu Junjirō 高南順次郎, Mochidzuki Shinkō 望月信亭. Tōkyō: Bussho kangyōkai, 1932. 151 volumes.

*Dai Nihon zokuzōkyō* 大日本續藏經. Kyoto: Zōkyō shoin, 1905-1912. 150 volumes.

*Da zang jing bu bian* 大藏經補編. Ed. Lan Jifu 藍吉富. Taipei: Huayu chubanshe, 1984. 36 volumes.

*A Dictionary of Official Titles in Imperial China.* Hucker, Charles O. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985.

*Hōbōgirin* 法寶義林. Takakusu Junjirō 高南順次郎. Tōkyō (Japon): Imprimerie Shōwa kōgyō shashin insatsusha, 1978.

*Kangxi zidian* 康熙字典. “Kangxi Dictionary.” Zhang Yushu 張玉書, Chen Tingjing 陳廷敬. 1710.

*Li dai shi dao renwuzhi bai bu difangzhi xuanji* 历代释道人物志百部地方志选辑. “Collected and Edited Biographies of Buddhist and Daoist Figures of the Past: from Miscellaneous Local Gazetteers.” Su Jinren 蘇晉仁, Xiao Lianzi 蕭鍊子. Chengdu: Bashu chubanshe, 1998.

*A New Century Chinese-English Dictionary* 新世纪汉英大词典. Hui Yu 惠宇. Beijing: Foreign language teaching and research press, 2003.

*The Princeton Dictionary of Buddhism.* Ed. Robert E. Buswell Jr, Donald S. Lopez Jr. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2013. Downloaded through Ghent University Library 7/23/2017.

*Song dai guanzhi cidian* 宋代官制辞典. “Dictionary for the Terms in the Song Officialdom.” Gong Yanming 龚延明. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1997.

*Taishō shinshu daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經. “Taishō Edition of the Buddhsit Canon.” Ed. Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎. Tokyo: Daizō shuppankai, 1922-1933. 85 volumes.

*Xinbian wan xu zang jing* 新編卍續藏經. “The New Edition of the Continued Wan Canon.” Reprint of Dainihon zokuzōkyō. Taibei: Xinwenfeng, 1986-1970. 150 volumes.

*Zhongguo li dai du liang heng kao* 中國歷代度量衡考. “A Study of the Measurement Systems of the Different Chinese Dynasties.” Qiu Guangming 丘光明. Beijing: Kexue chubanshe, 1992.

*Zhongguo li dai nianpu zong lu* 中国历代年谱总录. Yang Dianxun 杨殿珣. Beijing: Shumu wenxian chubanshe, 1996.

*Zhongguo lishi da cidian: lishi dili juan* 中国历史大辞典. “Comprehensive Dictionary of Chinese History: Terms of Historical Geography.” Shanghai: Shanghai cishu chubanshe, 1996.

*Zhongguo lishi ditu ji* 中國歷史地圖集 (The Historical Atlas of China). Chief Editor. Tan Qixiang 譚其驥. Beijing: China cartographic publishing house, 1996. 8 volumes.

*Zhongguo Fosi Zhi Huikan* 中國佛寺史志彙刊. Ed. Du Jiexiang 杜潔祥. Taibei: Mingwen shuju, 1980. 129 volumes.

*Zhongguo Fosi Zhi Congkan* 中国佛寺志丛刊. Ed. Bai Huawei 白化文, Zhang Zhi 张智. Yangzhou: Guangling shushe, 2011. 130 volumes.

*Zhonghua da zang jing* 中華大藏經. Ed. Ren Jiyu 任繼愈. Beijing: Zhonghua da zang jing bianjiju, 2012. 106 volumes.

*Zhonghua shanshui zhi congkan* 中華山水志叢刊. Ed. Shi Guangming 石光明, Dong Guanghe 董光和, and Yang Guanghui 楊光輝. Beijing: Xianzhuang shuju, 2004. 20 volumes.

## INTERNET COLLECTIONS AND DICTIONARIES

*Buddhit Studies Person Authority Databases Projects* 佛學規範資料庫.  
<http://authority.dila.edu.tw>

*Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association* (CBETA), texts 1-2184, 2732-2920 based on the *Taishō Collection* 大正新脩大藏經. <http://www.cbeta.org>

*CiNii*: <https://ci.nii.ac.jp>

*Dangdai hanying cidian* 當代漢英詞典. Lin Yutang 林語堂.  
<http://mario.arts.cuhk.edu.hk/Lexis/Lindict/search.html>

*Digital Dictionary of Buddhism* 電子佛教辭典. <http://www.buddhism-dict.net/db>

*The English Collocations Dictionary Online*. <http://www.ozdic.com>

*Liangqian nian zhongxili zhuanhuan* 两千年中西歷轉換. <http://sinocal.sinica.edu.tw>

*Handian* 漢典. <http://www.zdic.net>

*Hanji quanwen ziliaoku jihua* 漢籍全文資料庫計畫.  
<http://hanchi.ihp.sinica.edu.tw/ihp/hanji.htm>

*Nichiren Buddhism Library*. <https://www.nichirenlibrary.org/en>

*SAT Daizōkyō Text Database*. <http://21dzk.l.u-tokyo.ac.jp/SAT>

*Zhongguo lishi diming* 中國歷史地名.  
<http://archive.ihp.sinica.edu.tw/hplname/placename/basic>

## PRIMARY SOURCES (LISTED BY TITLE)

### A

*Abidatsumakusharon hōji* 阿毘達磨俱舍論法義. “The Wonderful Teaching of *Abhidharmaśāstra* (?)”. Kaidō 快道. T64.2251.

*Abidatsumakusharon shiyōshō* 阿毘達磨俱舍論指要鈔. “An Outline of the Teaching of *Abhidharmaśāstra* (?)”. Taïe 湛慧. T63.2250.

*Annyōshō* 安養抄. “The Land of Bliss: Questions and Answers.” T84.2686.

*Apidamo da piposha lun* 阿毗達磨大毗婆沙論 (*Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra* ?). Wubai Da Aluhan 五百大阿羅漢. Translated by Xuanzang 玄奘. T27.1545.

*Ayuwang shan zhi* 阿育王山志. “History of Aśoka Monastery [in Zhejiang].” Guo Zizhang 郭子章, Wanquan 瞰荃. In *Zhongguo Fosi Zhi Congkan* 中国佛寺志丛刊. Ed. Bai Huawen 白化文, Zhang Zhi 张智. Yangzhou: Guangling shushe, 2011.

*Ayuwang shan zhi xu* 阿育王山志序. “Foreword to the History of Aśoka Monastery [in Zhejiang].” Xu Shijin 徐時進. In *Zhongguo Fosi Zhi Congkan* 中国佛寺志丛刊. Ed. Bai Huawen 白化文, Zhang Zhi 张智. Yangzhou: Guangling shushe, 2011.

*Ayuwang zhi xu* 阿育王志續. “A Sequel to the History of Aśoka Monastery [in Zhejiang].” Wanquan 瞰荃. In *Zhongguo Fosi Zhi Congkan* 中国佛寺志丛刊. Ed. Bai Huawen 白化文, Zhang Zhi 张智. Yangzhou: Guangling shushe, 2011.

### B

*Baoxing tuoluoni jing* 寶星陀羅尼經. “*Dhāraṇī Sūtra* of the Auspicious Star.” Translated by Prabhāmitra 波羅頗蜜多羅. T13.402

*Baqiong jingshi buzheng* 八瓊金石補正. Lu Zengxiang 陸增祥. In *Lidai Beizhi congshu* 歷代碑誌叢書. Nanjing: Jiangsu guji chubanshe, 1998.

*Bashiba zu daoyingzhuan zan* 八十八祖道影傳贊. “Foreword to the Biography of the Eighty-eight Patriarchs.” Deqing 德清. In X86.1608.

*Beimeng suoyan* 北夢瑣言. “The Miscellaneous Collection of the Sayings Dreamed at the North [Bank of Jing River].” Sun Gaungxian 孫光憲. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2002.

*Bei Qi Shu* 北齊書. “History of the Northern Qi.” Li Baiyao 李百藥. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1972.

*Beishan lu* 北山錄. “Book [Composed at] the North of the Changping Mountain [in Sichaun].” Shenqing 神清. T52.2113.

*Beishi* 北史. “History of the Northern Dynasties.” Li Yanshou 李延壽. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1974.

*Beitang shuchao* 北堂書鈔. “The Encyclopaedia [Compiled in] the North Hall.” Yu Shinan 虞世南. Beijing: Zhongguo shudian, 1989.

*Bieyi za ahan jing* 別譯雜阿含經. “The Other Translation of the *Samyuktāgama*”. T2.100.

*Bodaijōkyō ryakugishaku* 菩提場經略義釋. “A General Introduction to Putichang Jing (cf. T19.950).” Enchin 圓珍. T61.2230.

*Bommōkaihonshinichijushō* 梵網戒本疏日珠鈔. “The Pearl-like Study Note on the Sun-like Commentary of the Brahmajāla Bodhisattva śīla Sūtra.” Gyōnen 凝然. T62.2247.

*Bonihuan jing* 般泥洹經. *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*. Translated by Shihu 施護. T1.6

*Bosatsu endon juka ikanjōki* 菩薩圓頓授戒灌頂記. “Notes on the Bestowing of the Round Bodhisattva Precepts.” Yuiken 惟賢. T74.2383.

*Bosatsukai kōyōshō* 菩薩戒綱要鈔. “Accounts on the Outline of the Bodhisattva Precepts.” T74.2358B.

*Bosatsukai mondō tōgishō* 菩薩戒問答洞義抄. “A Guide to the Core Meaning of the Bodhisattva Precepts through Questions and Answers.” Eishin 英心. T74.2358A.

*Bosatsukai tsūbetsu niju shō* 菩薩戒通別二受鈔. “Brief Account on the Two Ways of Conferring the Bodhisattva Precepts: In Conjunction [with *Bhikṣu* Ordination] and A Separated [One].” Kakujō 覺盛. T74.2354.

*Banzhou Sanmei jing* 般舟三昧經 (*Pratyutpannasamādhisūtra*). Translated by Lokakṣema 支婁迦讖. T13.418.

*Bukkō kokushi goroku* 佛光國師語錄. “The Sayings of the Emperor’s Teacher Master Bukkō.” Shigen Sogen 子元祖元. T80.2549.

*Bussetsu kan fugenbosatsu gyōbōgyō ki* 佛說觀普賢菩薩行法經記. “Note on the *Bussetsu kan fugenbosatsu gyōbō gyō* (cf.T9.277).” Enchin 圓珍. T56.2194.

## C

*Cefu yuangu* 冊府元龜. “The Finest Collection from the Storehouse of Literature”. Wang Qinruo 王欽若. Nanjing: Fenghuang chubanshe, 2006.

*Chang ahan jing* 長阿含經 (*Dīrghāgama*). Translated by Zhu Fonian 竺佛念. T1.1.

*Chang'an zhi* 長安志. “The History of Chang’an”. Song Minqiu 宋敏求. Taibei: Chengwen chubanshe. 1931.

*Changxing xianzhi* 長興縣志. “The History of Changxing County”. Qian Daxin 錢大昕. Taibei: Chengwen chubanshe, 1976.

*Chenshu* 陳書. “History of the Chen”. Yao Silian 姚思廉. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1972.

*Chikakufumyōkokushi goroku* 智覺普明國師語錄. “ Sayings of the Emperor’s Teacher Master Chikakufumyō.” Shūnoku Myōha 春屋妙葩. T80.2560.

*Chishengguang daochang niansong yi* 燦盛光道場念誦儀. “Guide to the Communal Recitation of the ‘Fo Shuo Chishengguan Dawede Xiaozi Jixiang Tuoluoni Jing’ (cf.T19.963).” Zunshi 遵式. T46.1951.

*Chishō daishi shōrai mokuroku* 智證大師請來目錄. “List of the Items Brought Back Respectfully by Master Chishō.” Enchin 圓珍. T55.2173.

*Chongkan chanlin sengbao zhuan xu* 重刊禪林僧寶傳序. “Foreword to the Reprint of the Chanlin Sengbao Zhuan.” Dai Liang 戴良. X79.1560.

*Chongke lüxianggantong zhuan* 重刻律相感通傳. “Foreword to the Reprint of the Lüxianggantong Zhuan.” Huishu 慧淑. T45.1898j4.

*Chongwen zong mu* 崇文總目. “Chongwen Catalogue.” Wang Yaochen 王堯臣. Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1936.

*Chongzhi pini shiyi yaolue* 重治毗尼事義集要. “A Critically Revised Collection of the Essentials to Vinaya.” Zhixu 智旭. X40.719.

*Chuanfa zhengzong lun* 傳法正宗論. “A Right Tradition Based Record of the Dharma Transmission.” Qisong 契嵩. T51.2080.

*Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集. “Notes Collected from the Tripitaka”. Sengyou 僧佑. T55.2145.

*Chunming tuichao lu* 春明退朝錄. “The History Notes [taken down] at Chunming Residence Outside the Official Hours”. Song Mingqiu 宋敏求. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980.

*Chūron shoki* 中論疏記. “Commentary on *Madhyamakaśāstra* (cf.T30.1564).” Anchō 安澄. T65.2255.

## D

*Da Baoji jing* 大寶積經 (*Mahāratnakūṭasūtra*). Translated by Bodhiruci 菩提流志. T11.310.

*Dabei chengdao zhuan* 大悲成道傳. “The Enlightenment Story of the Bodhisattva Dabei [Avalokiteśvara].” Jiang Zhiqi 蔣之奇. In *Liangzhe jingshi zhi* 兩浙金石志 in *Lidai Beizhi congshu* 歷代碑誌叢書. Nanjing: Jiangsu guji chubanshe, 1998.

*Daboniepian jing* 大般涅槃經 (*Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*). Translated by Faxian 法顯. T1.7.

*Da Boreboluomiduo jing* 大般若波羅蜜多經 (*Mahāprajñāpāramitā Sūtra*). Translated by Xuanzang. 玄奘. T5.220.

*Dacheng bensheng xindiguan jing* 大乘本生心地觀經. “The Sūtra of the Mahāyāna Contemplation.” Translated by Prajñā 般若. T3.159.

*Dacheng fayuan yilin zhang* 大乘法苑義林章. “Chapters on Various Topics of the Teaching of Mahāyāna.” Kuiji 窺基. T45.1861.

*Dacheng liqu liuboluomiduo ling* 大乘理趣六波羅蜜多經. “The Sūtra of the Essence of the Six Mahāyāna Pāramitā.” Translated by Prajñā 般若. T8.261.

*Dafangguang fo huayang jing* 大方廣佛華嚴經 (*Avataṃsakasūtra*). Translated by Buddhabhadra 佛陀跋陀羅. T9.278.

*Dafangguang fo huayang jing sui shu yanyi chao* 大方廣佛華嚴經隨疏演義鈔. “A Concomitant Commentary to the Treatise of the *Avataṃsakasūtra*.” Chengguan 澄觀. T36.1736.

*Da huayan jing ce lue* 大華嚴經策略. “A General Commentary on the *Avatamsakasūtra*.” Chengguan 澄觀. T36.1737.

*Da ji jing* 大集經 (*Mahāvaipulyamahā*). Translated by Narendrayaśas 那連提耶舍. T13.397.

*Daijō enkai kenshōron* 大乘圓戒顯正論. “Thesis on the Correct Understanding of the Round Precepts of Mahāyāna.” Sōkaku 宗覺. T74.2360.

*Daijōhōongirinjō shishikushō* 大乘法苑義林章師子吼鈔. “The Lion’s Roar: Commentary on [Kuiji’s] *Daijōhōongirinjō* (cf.T45.1861).” Kiben 基辨. T71.2323.

*Dainichikyō jūshibonsho shiki* 大日經住心品疏私記. “A Self-study Aid for the Commentary on *Dainichikyō jūshibonsho* (cf.T18.848j1.1a8-4a8).” Saisen 濟遲. T58.2215.

*Dainichikyōsho ennōshō* 大日經疏演奧鈔. “Following-up Notes on the Deep Meaning of the Commentary on *Dainichikyō* (cf.T18.848).” Gōhō 崇寶. T59.2216.

*Dainichikyōsho shishinshō* 大日經疏指心鈔. “Key-pointing: Note for the Commentary on *Dainichikyō* (cf.T18.848).” Raiyu 賴瑜. T79.2528.

*Dainichikyō shoshō* 大日經疏鈔 . “A Sub-commentary on the Commentary of *Dainichikyō* (cf.T18.848).” Yūkai 翁快. T60.2218.

*Da Loutan jing* 大樓炭經 (*Lokasthāna*?). Translated by Fali 法立, faju 法炬. T1.23.

*Da Song sengshi lue* 大宋僧史略. “A Brief History of the Monastics [Compiled in] the Great Song”. Zanning 贊寧. T54.2126.

*Da Tang chuanzai* 大唐傳載. “Recording of the Heard Stories of the Great Tang.” In *Tang Wudai biji xiaoshuo da guan* 唐五代筆記小說大觀, by 丁如明 Ding Ruming, 李宗為 Li Zongwei and Li Xueying 李學穎. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2000.

*Da Tang Daci'en sanzang fashi zhuan* 大唐大慈恩三藏法師傳. “The Biography of the Tripitaka Master of the Great Ci'en Monastery of the Great Tang.” Huili 慧立. T50.2053.

*Da Tang Hongfusi gu shangzuo Shou lüshi gaode song* 大唐弘福寺故上座首律師高德頌. Guo Guangjing 郭廣敬. In *Quan Tang Wen Buyi* 全唐文補遺. “Collected Works Supplement to Quan Tang Wen”, by 吳鋼 Wu Gang, 8–10. Xi'an: Sanqing chubanshe, 1994.

*Da Tang neidian lu* 大唐內典錄. “The Buddhist Catalogue of the Great Tang.” Daoxuan 道宣. T55.2149.

*Da Tang xinyu* 大唐新語. “A New Account of the Tales of the Great Tang.” Liusu 劉肅. Shanghai: Gudian wenxue chubanshe, 1957.

*Da Tang xiyu ji* 大唐西域記. “The Records on the Western Regions of the Great Tang”. Xuanzang 玄奘. T51.2087.

*Da Tang xiyu qiu fa gaoseng zhuan* 大唐西域求法高僧傳. “The Biography of the Eminent Pilgrimage Monks of the Great Tang”. Yijin 義淨. T51.2066.

*Da Tang Zhenyuan xu Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 大唐貞元續開元釋教錄. “The Zhenyuan Era Composed the Continued Kaiyuan Catalogue of the Great Tang.” Yuanzhao 圓照. T55.2156.

*Da Tang zhong jing yin yi xu* 大唐眾經音譯序. “Foreword to the *Da Tang Zhong Jing Yin Yi*”. Daoxuan 道宣. Z56.1163j1.813b–c15.

*Daoxuan lüshi gantong zhuan* 道宣律師感通錄. “The Recordings of the Sympathetic Resonance of Vinaya Master Daoxuan.” Daoxuan 道宣. T52.2107.

*Dazhidu lun* 大智度論 (*Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra*). Translated by Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什. T25.1509.

*Da Zhou kan ding zhong jing mulu* 大周刊定衆經目錄. “Official Catalogue of Buddhist Texts Published in [the Rule of] the Great Zhou Dynasty.” Mingquan 明佺. T55.2153.

*Dengyō dashi shōrai Daishū roku* 傳教大師將來台州錄. “List of the Items Brought Back by *Dengyō Dashi* from Taizhou.” Saichō 最澄. T55.2159.

*Dengyō dashi shōrai Osshū roku* 傳教大師將來越州錄. “List of the Items Brought Back by *Dengyō Dashi* from Yuezhou.” Saichō 最澄. T55.2160.

*Du yi zhi* 獨異誌. “Stories of the Peculiar and the Unknown.” Li Rong 李冗. In *Biji xiaoshuo daguan* 筆記小說大觀. Yangzhou: Jiangshu guangling guji keyin she 江蘇廣陵古籍刻印社, 1983.

*Du yi zhi* 獨異誌. “Stories of the Peculiar and the Unknown.” Li Rong 李冗. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983.

*Du yi zhi* 獨異誌. “Stories of the Peculiar and the Unknown.” Li Rong 李冗. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2000.

## E

*Eigen jakushitsuoshō goroku* 永源寂室和尚語錄. “Sayings of Master Jakushitsuoshō.” Jakushitsu Genkō 寂室玄光. T81.2564.

*Enkai shishō* 圓戒指掌. “A Compact Guide to the Round Precepts.” Kyōkō 敬光. T74.2384.

*Eun zenji shōrai kyōbō mokuroku* 惠運禪師將來教法目錄. “List of the Religious Items Brought Back by Chan Master Eun.” Eun 惠運. T55.2168A.

*Eun risshi sho mokuroku* 惠運禪師將來教法目錄. “List of the Religious Items Brought Back by Chan Master Eun.” Eun 惠運. T55.2168B.

## F

*Fahuajing xianying lu* 法華經顯應錄. “The Collected Records of the Manifestation of the Power of the Fahuajing”. Zongxiao 宗曉. 1198, X78.1540.

*Fahuajing yi ji* 法華經義記. “Explanatory Notes on *Fahua Jing*.” Fayun 法雲. T33.1715.

*Fahua wen ju* 法華文句. “Commentary on *Fahuajing*.” Zhanran 湛然. T34.1719.

*Fahua zhuan ji* 法華傳記. “History of the Spreading of *Fahuajing*.” Sengxiang 僧祥. T51.2068.

*Fangguang da zhuangyan jing* 方廣大莊嚴經. “The Mahāyāna *Sūtra* of the Solemn Decoration”. Translated by Divākara 地婆訶羅. T3.187.

*Fanke jiaojielüyi xu* 翻刻教誠律儀敘. “Introduction to the Reprint of the *Jiaojielüyi*.” Yuanhai 圓海. In T45.1897j1.

*Fan ke Jietantujing hou xu* 翻刻戒壇圖經後序. “Afterword to the Reprint of the *Jietantujing*.” Weiding 惟定. T45.1892.819a.

*Fanyi mingyi ji* 翻譯名義集. “Collections on Translation Terminology of Buddhism.” Fayun 法雲. T54.2131.

*Fayuan zhulin* 法苑珠林. “The Forest of Gems in the Garden of the Dharma”. Daoshi 道世. T53.2122.

*Fenyang Wude changshi yulu* 汾陽無德禪師語錄. “Sayings of the Chan Master Wude of Fenyang.” Chuyuan 楚圓. T47.1992.

*Fo Bonihuan jing* 佛般泥洹經 (*Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*). Translated by Baifazu 白法祖. T1.5.

*Fo cui boniepan lüe shuo jiaojie* 佛垂般涅槃略說教誠. “The Brief Instructions Given by the Buddha Right Before His Nirvāṇa”. Translated by Kumārajīva 嬉摩羅什. T12.389.

*Fo men yifu zhengyi bian* 佛門衣服正儀編. “Accounts on the Proper Etiquette of Monastic Clothing.” Hōtan 凤潭. D73.

*Fo Mu Dakongquemingwang Jing* 佛母大孔雀明王經. “The Buddha Born Mahāmāyūrī Sūtra”. Translated by Amoghavajra 不空. T19.982.

*Fo shuo Amituojing yi shu* 佛說阿彌陀經義疏. “Concise Explanatory on the *Fo shuo Amituojing* (cf.T12.366).” Yuanzhao 元照. T37.1761.

*Fo shuo Baiyi jinchuang er Poluomen yuangqi jing* 佛說白衣金幢二婆羅門緣起經. “The Birth Story Recounted by the Buddha of the Two Brahmins the Baiyi and the Jinchuang”. Translated by Dānapāla 施護. T1.10.

*Fo shuo Fadeng Bonuoan jing* 佛說方等般泥洹經. “*Sūtra of Mahāyāna nirvāṇa*”. Translated by Dharmarakṣa 竝法護. T12.378.

*Fo shuo jie xia jing* 佛說解夏經 (*Pravāraṇasūtra*). Translated by Faxian 法賢. T1.64.

*Fo shuo Renwang boreboluomi jing* 佛說仁王般若波羅蜜經 (*Karunikarāprajñāpāramitā sūtra?*). Translated by Kumārajīva 嬉摩羅什. T8.245.

*Fo shuo yi zu jing* 佛說義足經 (*Arthavargīyasūtra*). Translated by Zhi Qian 支謙. T4.198.

*Foxiang biaozhiyi jianzhu* 佛像幖幟義箋注. “Commentary on Monastic Clothing [that Distinguishes Buddhism].” Yihai 義海. D73.

*Fo Yijiao jing lun shu jie yao* 佛遺教經論疏節要. “A Summary of the Commentary on *Foyijiaojing* (cf.T12.389).” Jinyuan 淨源. T40.1820.

*Fo Yijiao jing shhixing chi* 佛遺教經施行敕. “Decree: [The Teaching of] the *Yijiao jing* to be Enforced.” Tang Taizong 唐太宗. In *Quan Tang Wen* 全唐文, j9.

*Fozu gangmu* 佛祖綱目. “A General Chronology of the Buddha and the Patriarchs.” Zhu Shi’en 朱時恩. X85.1594.

*Fozu lidai tongzai* 佛祖歷代通載. “A General Recording of the Buddha and the Patriarchs of the Past.” Nianchang 念常. T49.2036.

*Fozu tongji* 佛祖統紀. “The Chronicle of the Buddha and the Patriarchs.” Zhipan 志磐. T49.2035.

*Fuguo Yuanwu chanshi biyan lu* 佛果圓悟禪師碧巖錄. “Biyan Lu: The Sayings of the Chan Master Fuguo Yuanwu.” Keqin 克勤. T48.2003.

*Fukushū Onshū Daishū gutoku kyōritsuron shoki gesho tō mokuroku* 福州溫州台州求得經律論疏記外書等目錄. “Buddhist and None-Buddhist Texts Acquired in Fuzhou, Wenzhou, and Taizhou.” Enchin 圓珍. T55.2170.

*Futsū ju bosatsu kaikōshaku* 普通授菩薩戒廣釋. “Elaboration on the General Ceremony of Bodhisattva Precepts Conferring.” Annen 安然. T74.2381.

## G

*Gaoseng zhaiyao* 高僧摘要. “A Digest of the Life Stories of the Eminent Monks”. Xu Changzhi 徐昌治. X87.1626.

*Gaoseng zhuan* 高僧傳. “The Biography of Eminent Monastics [Composed in the Liang dynasty].” Huijiao 慧皎. T50.2059.

*Gidōoshō goroku* 義堂和尚語錄. “Sayings of Master Gidō.” Gidō Shūshin 義堂周信. T80.2556.

*Gokyōshō tsūroki* 五教章通路記. “A Concise Guide to [Fazang’s] Commentary on *Huayanjing* (cf. T45.1866).” Gyōnen 凝然. T72.2339.

*Guanding jing* 灌頂經. “Discourse on Abhiṣeka”. (Po-Śrīmitra?) 幢尸梨蜜多羅. T21.1331.

*Guanyin yi shu ji* 觀音義疏記. “Guide to the Meaning of the Guanyin [*pusa pumen pin* of the *Lotus sūtra*] (cf.T9.262j7.56c2-58b7).” Zunshi 尊式. T34.1729.

*Guan Wuliangshoufojing shu mian zong chao* 觀無量壽佛經疏妙宗鈔. “Guide to the True Meaning of [Zhiyi’s Commentary on] *Guan Wuliangshoufojing* (cf.T37.1750).” Zhili 知禮. T37.1751.

*Guan Wuliangshoufojing yi shu* 觀無量壽佛經義疏. “A General Guide to *Guan Wuliangshoufojing* (cf.T12.365).” Yuanzhao 元照. T37.1754.

*Guanzhong chuangli jietan tujing bing xu* 關中創立戒壇圖經并序. “Illustrated Discourse on the Newly Built [*Jetavana*] Platform in Guanzhong.” Daoxuan 道宣. T45.1892.

*Guang hongming ji* 廣弘明集. “Extended Collection [of Events and Stories] Helping the Spreading [of the Buddha Dharma].” Daoxuan 道宣. T52.2103.

*Guang Qingliang zhuan* 廣清涼傳. “The Extended Record of the Mountain Qingliang.” Yanyi 延一. T51.2099.

*Guixin zashi* 癸辛雜識. “The Miscellaneous Note of Guixin Street.” Zhoumi 周密. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju,1988.

*Guoqing bai lu* 國清百錄. “Miscellaneous Records of the Guoqing [Monastery].” Guanding 灌頂. T46.1934.

*Gu Qingliang zhuan* 古清涼傳. “The Old Record of the Mountain Qingliang.” Huixiang 慧祥, c.676. T51.2098.

*Gyōrinshō* 行林抄. “Concise Guide to *Vajrayāna* Rituals.” Jōnen 靜然. T76.2409.

## H

*Himitsu mandara jūjūshinron* 祕密漫荼羅十住心論. “Elaborations on the Ten Dispositions of A *Vajrayāna* Practitioner.” Kūkai 空海. T77.2425.

*Hishō mondō* 秘鈔問答. “A Teacher-pupil Exchange on the Topics of *Vajrayāna* Ritual.” Raiyu 賴瑜. T79.2536.

*Hokke kaijishō* 法華開示抄. “Book: Discovering the Meaning of *Fahuajing*.” Jōkei 貞慶. T56.2195.

*Hokke shuyōshō* 法華取要抄. “Accounts on the Essentials of *Fahuajing*.” Nichiren 日蓮. T84.2693.

*Hongming ji* 弘明集. “Collection [of Works] on the Promotion and the Spreading [of the Buddha-dharma].” Sengyou 僧佑. T52.2102.

*Hong zan fahua zhuan* 弘贊法華傳. “The Accounts of the Advocates of *Fahuajing*.” Huixiang 惠詳. T51.2067.

*Hōōng ikyō* 法苑義鏡. “Reference Guide on Miscellaneous Topics of Dharm.” Zenju 善珠. T71.2317.

*Hōonshō* 報恩抄. “The Ultimate Gratitude.” Nichiren 日蓮. T84.2691.

*Hōskushō* 寶冊鈔. “Precious Topicals on [the Teaching of *Vajrayāna*

*Huayanjing zhuan ji* 華嚴經傳記. “The Story of the *Mahāvaipulyabuddhāvatamsakasūtra*.” Fazang 法藏. T51.2073.

*Hufa lun* 護法論. “Treatise on Hufa”. Zhang Shangying 張商英. T52.2114.

*Huzhou fuzhi* 湖州府志. “The History of Huzhou”. In *Zhongguo Fangzhi Congshu* 中國方志叢書. Taipei: Chengwen chubanshe, 1960.

## I

*Immyōdaisho yūkanshō* 因明大疏融貫鈔. “Guiding Through: A Study to [Kuji’s] Commenatry on *Immyōdaisho* (cf. T44.1840).” Kiben 基辨. T69.2272.

## J

*Jiaokan Yichao xu* 校勘義鈔序. “Foreword to the Collated [*Shi Pini*] *Yi Chao* (cf.X44.747).” Yuanzhao 元照. X44.747j1.753a6-754a15.

*Jinggang jing ke yi hui yao zhu jie* 金剛經科儀會要註解. “Explanatory on the Edited Ritual of Jinggang Jing.” Juelian 覺連. W92.235–448/X24.467.

*Ji gujin fodao lunheng* 集古今佛道論衡. “The Collected Records of Past and Present Buddhist–Daoist Debates.” Daoxuan 道宣. T52.2104.

*Ji shamen bu ying bai su deng shi* 集沙門不應拜俗等事. “[Reports of and Memorials on] Monks’ Appropriate Etiquette Towards Laypersons.” Yancong 彥悰. T52.2108.

*Ji Shenzhou Sanbao gantong lu* 集神州三寶感通錄. “Collected Records of the Uncanny Effectiveness of the Triple Gem in China.” Daoxuan 道宣. T52.2106.

*Jiao jie xin xue bhikṣu xing hu liu yi* 教誠新學比丘行護律儀. “Guide for Newly Ordained Bhiksus on the Good Protection of Stipulations.” Daoxuan 道宣. T45.1897.

*Jiexiu xianzhi* 介休縣志. “The History of Jiexiu County.” In *Zhongguo Fangzhi Congshu* 中國方志叢書. Taipei: Chengwen chubanshe, 1960.

*Jikaku daishi zai Tō sōshi roku* 慈覺大師在唐送進錄. “List of Items Sent from Tang by Master Jikaku.” Ennin 圓仁. T55.2166.

*Jingde chuandeng lu* 景德傳燈錄. “Jingde Record of the Transmission of Dharma.” Daoyuan 道原. T51.2076.

*Jing ming jing guangzhong shi chao* 淨名經關中釋抄. “Commentary on Jingmingjing [Composed in] Guanzhong (cf.T14.475).” Daoye 道液. T85.2778.

*Jingshan zhi* 徑山志. “History of Jingshan Monastery [in Zhejiang].” Song Kuiguang 宋奎光. In *Zhongguo Fosi Zhi Huikan* 中國佛寺史志彙刊. Ed. Du Jiexiang 杜潔祥. Taibei: Mingwen shuju, 1980. 129 volumes.

*Jingtu san bu jing ying yi ji* 淨土三部經音義集. “A Guide to the Translations and Translations of the Three Pure Land *sūtras*.” Xinrui 信瑞. T57.2207.

*Jingtu wangsheng zhuan* 淨土往生傳. “Accounts of Those Who Are Reborn in the Pure Land.” Jiezhu 戒珠. T51.2071.

*Jing xin jie guan fa* 淨心戒觀法. “Methods Recommended for the Cultivation of A Clear Faith [in Mahāyāna].” Daoxuan 道宣. T45.1893.

*Jing xin jie guan fazhen chao* 淨心誠觀發真鈔. “Guide to the True Understanding of [the Text] *Jing Xin Jie Guan [Fa]*.” Yunkan 允堪. X59.1096.

*Jinshi cuibian* 金石萃編. “The Collection of Stone Inscription.” Wang Chang 王昶. In *Lidai beizhi congshu* 歷代碑誌叢書. Nanjing: Jiangsu guji chubanshe, 1998.

*Jinshi Lu* 金石錄. “The Collection of Stone Inscriptions.” Zhao Mingcheng 趙明誠. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1991.

*Jinyuan ji* 金園集. “Collected Works [of Master Zunshi of the Jinyuan?] .” Zunshi 遵式. X57.950.

*Jiu Tangshu* 舊唐書. “Old History of the Tang.” Liuxu 劉昫. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1975.

*Jiu Wudaishi* 舊五代史. “Old History of the Five Dynasties.” Xue Juzheng 薛居正. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1976.

*Jizu shan zhi* 雞足山志. “History of Jizu Shan [in Yunnan].” Fan Chengxun 范承勳. In *Zhongguo Fosi Zhi Congkan* 中国佛寺志丛刊. Ed. Bai Huawei 白化文, Zhang Zhi 张智. Yangzhou: Guangling shushe, 2011.

*Jōgyō oshō shōraimokuroku* 常曉和尚請來目錄. “Records of Items Respectfully Brought Back by Master Jōgyō.” Jōgyō 常曉. T55.2163.

*Jōshū ron* 定宗論. “Correct Tradition of the Schools.” Rengō 蓮剛. T74.2369.

*Jōyuishiki ronhom monshō* 成唯識論本文抄. “A Carefully Written Commentary on *Vijñāptimātratāsiddhi* [śāstra]? (cf.T31.1585).” T65.2262.

*Jōyuishiki ronju kkjujōhen* 成唯識論述記集成編. “Fine Clooection of the Works of [Kuji’s] Commentary on *Vijñāptimātratāsiddhi* [śāstra]? (cf.T31.1585).” Tañe 湛慧. T67.2266.

*Ju bosakkai gi* 授菩薩戒儀. “Guide to the Conferring of Bodhisattva Precepts.” Enchin 圓珍. T74.2378.

*Juke sshū* 授決集. “Teachings Collected and [Topically Arranged] Give for [Liangyong 良勇] as Farewell.” Enchin 圓珍. T74.2367.

## K

*Kairitsu denrai ki* 戒律傳來記. “History of the Introduction of *Vinaya* [to Japan].” Buān 豊安. T74.2347.

*Kaitian chuanxing ji* 開天傳信記. “The Record of the Stories of the Kaiyuan and the Tianbao Eras.” Zheng Qi 鄭繁. In *Kaiyuan Tianbao Yishi Shi Zhong* 開元天寶遺事十種, Ding Ruming 丁如明. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1985.

*Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄. “The Kaiyuan Buddhist Catalogue”. Zhisheng 智昇. T55.2154.

*Kaiyuan shijiao lu lue chu* 開元釋教錄略出. “A General Version of the Kaiyuan Catalogue.” Zhisheng 智昇. 730. T55.2155.

*Kanjin honzon shō* 觀心本尊抄. “The Ultimate Sacred Place for the Cultivation of the Mind.” Nichiren 日蓮. 1273, T84.2692.

*Kanjin yōsho denzūki* 觀經疏傳通記 . “Book to Help the Circulation of and Understanding in [Zhiyi’s] Commentary on *Amitāyurbuddhānusmṛtiśūtra* ? (cf. X.22.407).” Ryōchū 良忠. T57.2209.

*Kegon engishō sanshaku* 華嚴演義鈔纂釋 . “A Carefull Study on [Chengguan’s Commentary on] Huayanjing (cf.T36.1736).” Tañe 湛叡. T57.2205.

*Kegon gokyōshō kemmonshō* 華嚴五教章見聞鈔. “Collected Notes on the Study of [Fazang’s] Commentary on Huayanjing (cf. T45.1866).” Ryōha 靈波. T73.2342.

*Kegon gokyōshō kyōshinshō* 華嚴五教匡眞鈔. “Book to Assist the Correct Understanding of [Fazang’s] Commentary on Huayanjing (cf. T45.1866).” Hōtan 鳳潭. T73.2344.

*Kegon gokyōshō mondōshō* 華嚴五教章問答抄. “Questions and Anweres on the Meaning of [Fazang’s] Commentary on Huayanjing (cf. T45.1866).” Shinjō 審乘. T72.2340.

*Kegon gokyōshō shōfushin* 華嚴五教章不審. “Cutting Through: Book for the Understanding of [Fazang’s] Commentary on Huayanjing (cf. T45.1866).” Jitsuei 實英. T73.2343.

*Keiran shūyōshū* 溪嵐拾葉集. “Writings Compiled at the Side of the Distant Mountain Stream, [They are] the Leaves [that I Picked up] Amidst the Mist that Cast by the Endless Suffering.” Kōshū 光宗. T76.2410.

*Kentōroku* 見桃錄. “Colletions of the Owner of [the Cottage] Kentō.” Daikyū Shūkyū 大休宗林. T81.2572.

*Kibokuron* 器朴論. “Thesis [on the Teaching of Pure Land] Humbly [Composed by A Monk of Little Talent].” Takuga 託何. T84.2681.

*Konjaku monogatari shū* 今昔物語集. “Anthology of Tales from the Past” In *Kokushi taikei* 國史大系. Tokyo: Keizai zasshi sha, 1897–1901.

*Kōzengokoku ron* 興禪護國論. “Treatise on Establishing Chan and Protecting the Country.” Eisai 榮西. T80.2543.

*Kuodizhi ji jiao* 括地志輯校. “The Collected and Annotated Comprehensive Record of the Land [of the Tang].” Li Tai 李泰. Ed. He Cijun 賀次君. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980.

*Kurodanishōnin gotō ruku* 黑谷上人語燈錄. “Illuminating: Collection of the Sayings of Master Kuro.” Genkū 源空. T83.2611.

*Kyōjikō* 教時諍. “Treatise on the Debate over the Classification of the Buddha-dharma and Schools [In India, China, and Japan].” Annen 安然. T75.2395.

## L

*Lebang wen lei* 樂邦文類. “A Separate Book List and Collected Passages for the [Consultation of the Believer of the ] Land of Bliss.” Zongxiao 宗曉. T47.1969A.

*Leibian Chang'an zhi* 類編長安志. “Subject Matter Arranged History of Cahng'an.” Luo Tianxiang 駱天驥. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1990.

*Leishuo* 類說. “The Collected and Subject Matter Arranged Literature.” Zengzao 曾慥. Beijing: Shumu wenxian chubanshe, 1987.

*Liang chu qing zhong yi* 量處輕重儀. “Guidelines for the Classing and Handling of Monastic Property.” Daoxuan 道宣. T45.1895.

*Liangjing xin ji ji jiao* 兩京新記輯校. “The Edited New Record of the Two Capitals.” Wei Shu 韋述, Xin Deyong 辛德勇. In *Chang'an shiji chongkan*, 長安史蹟叢刊. Wei Quanrui 魏全瑞. Xi'an: Sanqin chubanshe, 2006.

*Liangshu* 梁書. “History of the Liang.” Yao Silian 姚思廉. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1973.

*Lichao fahua chiyan ji* 歷朝法華持驗紀. “Testimonies of the Good Teaching of *Fahuajing*.” Zhou Kefu 周克復. X78.1541.

*Lichao shishi zi jian* 歷朝釋氏資鑑. “A Compendium of Buddhist Affairs of the Past.” Xizhong 熙仲. X76.1517.

*Ligouhui pusa suo wen li Fofa jing xu* 離垢慧菩薩所問禮佛法經序. “Foreword to *Ligouhui Pusa shuo Wen Li Fofa Jing* (cf.T14.487).” Daoxuan 道宣. T14.487j1.698b25–c11.

*Liubinke jiahua lu* 劉賓客嘉話錄. “The Recordings of the Wise Words of Liu Bingke.” Wei Xuan 韋絢. In *Tang Wudai biji xiaoshuo da guan* 唐五代筆記小說大觀, Ding Ruming 丁如明, Li Zongwei 李宗為, and Li Xueying 李學穎. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2000.

*Liudao ji* 六道集. “Collected Stories of Retribution in the Six Realms of Rebirth.” Hongzan 弘贊. X88.1645.

*Liuwu bian* 六物辨. “Guide to the Six Requisites of Monks.” Fujaku 普寂. D73.

*Liu Yuxi Ji* 劉禹錫集. “Anthology of Liu Yuxi.” Liu Yuxi 劉禹錫. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1990.

*Liuzu Dashi fabao tan jing* 六祖大師法寶壇經. “The Platform *sūtra* of the Great Master the Sixth Patriarch.” Zongbao 宗寶. T48.2008.

*Longxing fojiao biannian tonglun* 隆興佛教編年通論. “A General Annals of Buddhism Compiled in the Longxing Era.” Zhuxiu 祖琇. X75.1512.

*Lushan lianzong baojian* 廬山蓮宗寶鑑. “Introduction to the Precious Pure Land School Based in the Mountain Lu.” Pudu 普度. T47.1973.

*Lüxiang gantong zhuan* 律相感通傳. “The Collections of the Stories of the *Vinaya* Invoked Sympathetic Resonance.” Daoxuan 道宣. T45.1898.

*Lüzong xin xue mingju* 律宗新學名句. “Sentences Break Down: Begingers’ Guide to *Vinaya*.” Huaixian 懷顯. X59.1107.

## M

*Miaofa lianhua jing* 妙法蓮華經 (*Saddharma-puṇḍarīka*). Translated by Kumārajīva 增摩羅什. T9.262.

*Miaofa lianhua jing hong chuan xu* 妙法蓮華經弘傳序. (Foreword to *Miaofa Lianhua Jing*). Daoxuan 道宣. T9.262j1.1b13–c11.

*Miaofa lianhua jing shi wen* 妙法蓮華經釋文. “Sentence to Sentence: Explanation on the Words of *Miaofa Lianhua Jing* (cf.262).” Zhongsuan 中算. T56.2189.

*Miaofa lianhua jing wenju* 妙法蓮華經文句. “The *Miaofa Lianhua Jing* Annotated (cf. T9.262).” Zhiyi 智顥. T34.1718.

*Mile xiasheng jing* 彌勒下生經. “Discourse on the Coming of the Buddha Maitreya.” Translated by Dharmarakṣa 竝法護. T14.453.

*Mingbao ji* 冥報記. “Notes on *Karmic Retribution*.” Tang Lin 唐臨. T51.2082.

*Mohe Maya jing* 摩訶摩耶經 (*Mahāmāyāśūtra?*). Translated by Tanjing 夙景. T12.383.

*Mohe sengqi lü* 摩訶僧祇律 (*Mahāsāṃghikavinaya*). Translated by Buddhabhadra 佛陀跋陀羅, Faxian 法顯. T22.1425.

## N

*Nanbu xinshu* 南部新書. “New Book of Nanbu.” Qian Yi 錢易. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2002.

*Nanhai ji gui Neifa zhuan* 南海寄歸內法傳. “A Record of Buddhist Practices Sent Home from the Southern Sea.” Yijing 義淨. T54.2125.

*Nanshan Lüshi zan* 南山律師讚. “The Eulogy for the Later Vinaya Nanshan.” Tang Muzong 唐穆宗. In Quan Tang Wen, QTWj68.712a13-15. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983.

*Nanshan Lüshi zhuanji lu* 南山律師撰集錄. “A List of the Works of Vinaya Master Nanshan [Daoxuan].” Yuanzhao 元照. In *Zhiyuan Yi Bian* 芝園遺編. X59.1104.

*Nanshan zushi lizan wen* 南山祖師禮讚文. “The Eulogy for the Later Patriarch Nanshan.” Zhiyuan 智圓. X74.1504.

*Nanshan zushi lizan wen* 南山祖師禮讚文. “The Eulogy for the Later Patriarch Nanshan.” Renyue 仁岳. X74.1505.

*Nanshan zushi lizan wen* 南山祖師禮讚文. “The Eulogy for the Later Patriarch Nanshan.” Yunkan 允堪. X74.1506.

*Nanshi* 南史. “History of the Southern Dynasties.” Li Yanshou 李延寿. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1975.

*Niepan xuanyi fayuan jiyao* 涅槃玄義發源機要. “Key to Unlock the True Meaning of [Zhang'an's] Commentary on *Niepanjing* (cf. T38.1765).” Zhiyuan 智圓. T38.1766.

*Nihom(n?) biku Enchin ni Ttō guhō mokuroku* 日本比丘圓珍入唐求法目錄. “List of the Items [Obtained] by bhikṣu Enchin in Tang.” Enchin 圓珍. T55.2172.

*Nihonkou Jōwa gonenn i Ttō guhō mokuroku* 日本國承和五年入唐求法目錄. “List of the Items [Obtained] in Tang in the Fifth Year of the Chenghe Era of Japan.” Ennin 圓仁. T55.2165.

*Nihon saishi meishō sentoku ki* 日本大師先德明匠記. “The Accounts of the Past Great Teachers, Virtuous, and the Wise Masters of Japan.” Jōchin 定珍. D111.

*Nittō guhō junreikōki* 入唐求法巡禮行記. “The Record of A Pilgrimage to China in Search of the Law.” Ennin 圓仁. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1986.

*Nittō shingu shōgyō mokuroku* 入唐新求聖教目錄. “The Catalogue of the Newly Acquired Sacred Buddhist Books from the Tang.” Ennin 圓仁. T55.2167.

## O

*Ōjōyōshū* 往生要集. “The Essential: Passages Collected for the Pure Land Aspired.” Genshin 源信. T84.2682.

## P

*Pini guanyao* 毗尼關要. “Concise Points of *Vinaya*.” Deji 德基. X40.720.

*Pini mu jing* 毘尼母經 (*Vinayamāṭṛkā?*). T24.1463.

*Pini taoyao* 毗尼討要. “Discussion over the Key Points of *Vinaya*.” Daoshi 道世. W70.207-399/X44.743.

*Pini zhichi huiji* 毘尼止持會集. “*Vinaya Prātimokṣas* Collected.” Douti 讀體. X39.709.

*Pini zuochi xushi* 毗尼作持續釋. “A Continued Elaboration on *Vinaya Karman*.” Douti 讀體. X41.730.

*Putichang Zhuangyan Tuoluoni Jing* 菩提場莊嚴陀羅尼經. “*Dhāraṇī*: The Solemn Decoration to the Birthplace of Bodhi.” Translated by Amoghavajra 不空. T19.1008.

## Q

*Qianjin Fang* 千金方. “The Invaluable Life-saving Formula.” Sun Simiao 孫思邈. In *Zhengtong Daozang* 正統道藏. Taipei: Xinwenfeng chuban gongsi, 1985; vols. 44–45.

*Qihuan tujing ba* 祇洹圖經跋. “Postscript to [Daoxuan’s] *Qihuan Tujing*.” Noriharu 乘春. In T45.1899j2.896a19/b16.

*Qihuan tujing xu* 祇洹圖經序. “Foreword to [Daoxuan’s] *Qihuan Tujing*.” Sōkaku 宗覺. In T45.1899j1.882b16/17/19.

*Qing Bingtoulu fa* 請賓頭盧法. “The Ritual for Invoking Piñdola.” Tran. Huijian 慧簡. T32.1689.

*Qingliang shan zhi* 清涼山志. “History of the Mountain Qingliang.” Zhencheng 鎮澄. In *Zhongguo Fosi Zhi Congkan* 中国佛寺志丛刊. Ed. Bai Huawei 白化文, Zhang Zhi 张智. Yangzhou: Guangling shushe, 2011.

*Qing lun bai shi qi* 請論拜事啟. “Petition: For Your Kind Consideration, Discussion on the Issue of Prostrating before Laypeople.” Daoxuan 道宣. In *Guang Hongming ji* 廣弘明集, j25.

*Qi shi jing* 起世經. “The *Sūtra on the Origin of the Universe*.” Jñānagupta 閻那崛多. T1.24.

*Quan Dunhuang shi* 全敦煌詩. “Complete Collection of the Poetries Preserved in Dunhuang.” Zhang Xihou 張錫厚. Beijing: Zuojia chubanshe, 2006.

*Quan Song Wen* 全宋文. “Complete Collection of the Prose Literature of the Song.” Zhen Zaozhuang 曾棗莊, Liu Lin 劉琳. Shanghai: Shanghai cishu chubanshe, 2006.

*Quan Tang shi* 全唐詩. “Comlete Collection of Tang Poem.” Peng Dingqiu 彭定求. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980. 25 volumes.

*Quan Tang Wen* 全唐文. “Complete Prose Literature of the Tang.” Dong Hao 董浩. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983.

*Quan Tang Wen Buyi* 全唐文補遺. “The Collected Works Supplement to Quan Tang Wen.” Ed. Wu Gang 吳剛. Xi'an: Sanqin chubanshe, 1994.

## R

*Reiganji Oshō shōrai hōmondōgu tō mokuroku* 靈巖寺和尚請來法門道具等目錄. “Record of Ritual Implements and Other Items Respectfully Brough Back by the Master of the Reigan Monastery.” Engyō 圓行. T55.2164.

*Renwang huoguo jing shu* 仁王護國般若經疏. “Commenatry on *Renwang Huoguo Jing*. (cf. T8.245).” Zhiyi 智顥. T33.1705.

*Rishushanku hiyōshō* 理趣釋祕要鈔 “Secrets to the True Meaning of *Prajñāpāramitānayaśatapañcāśatikā*? (cf. T19.1003).” Gōbō 崇寶. T61.2241.

*Risshū gyōji mokushinshō* 律宗行事目心鈔. “A Comprehensive Guide to the Daily Practices With Reference to the Teaching of Vinaya School.” Ninsen 忍仙. T74.2359.

*Risshū kōyō* 律宗綱要. “The Outline of the Teaching of the School of Vinaya.” Gyōnen 凝然. T74.2348.

*Risshū mondō* 律宗問答. “Questions and Answers on the Teaching of Vinaya School.” Shunjō 俊芻. X59.1108.

*Risshū shōsho* 律宗章疏. “Comprehensive List of the Texts, Commentaries, and Other Works on Vinaya.” Eion 榮穩. T55.2182.

*Ritsuen sōbō den* 律院僧寶傳. “The Biography of the Precious Monastics in the Field of Vinaya.” Eken 慧堅. D105.

*Rujing heshang yulu* 如淨和尚語錄. “Sayings of Master Rujing.” Wensu 文素. T48.2002A.

## S

*Saihōshinashō* 西方指南鈔. “Compass for A Rebirth in the Pure Land.” Shinran 親鸞. T83.2674.

*Sancai tuhui* 三才圖會. “The Collected Illustrations of the Three Principles.” Wang Qi 王圻, Wang Siyi 王思義. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1985.

*Sangoku Buppō dentsū engi* 三國佛法傳通緣起. “The Outline of the Spreading of Buddhism in the Three Countries [India, China, and Japan].” Gyōnen 凝然. D101.

*San guo yi shi* 三國遺事. “The Supplementary Book to the History of the Three Kingdoms [of the Korean Peninsula].” Yiran 一然. T49.2039.

*San guo zhi* 三國志. “Record of the Three Kingdoms.” Chen Shou 陳壽. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1964.

*Sanron gengi kennyūshū* 三論玄義檢幽集. “Collected Notes on the Thorough Investigation of the Teaching of [Jizang’s] Sanron Gengi (cf. T45.1852).” Chōzen 澄禪. T70.2300.

*Sanron gengi shō* 三論玄義鈔. “Study to [Jizang’s] Sanron Gengi (cf. T45.1852).” Chinkai 珍海. T70.2301.

*Sanron genshomon giyō* 三論玄疏文義要. “Key to the Meaning of [Jizang’s] Sanron Gengi (cf. T45.1852).” Jōkai 貞海. T70.2299.

*Sanron myōkyōshō* 三論名教抄. “Terminology and Meaning: Collected from [Jizang’s] Sanron Genji (cf. T45.1852).” Chinkai 珍海. T70.2306.

*San Tendai Gotaisan ki* 參天台五臺山記. “Records of the Pilgrimages to Mount Tiantai and Wutai.” Jōjin 成尋. D115.

*Sapoduo pini piposa* 薩婆多毘尼毘婆沙 (*Sarvāstivādavinayavibhāṣā*?). T23.1440.

*Seizan fukkohen* 西山復古篇. “The Origin: A Bigographhy in Tribute to Master Xishan [of Japan].” Shunhō Myōzui 俊鳳妙瑞. T83.2645.

*Sengfu zhengjian* 僧服正檢. “Othdogcy Study on the Monastic Clothing.” Guangguo 光國. D73.

*Seng jiemo* 僧羯磨. “Karman of Monks.” Huaisu 懷素. T40.1809.

*Seng ni bu de shou fumu ji zun zhe libai zhao* 僧尼不得受父母及尊者禮拜詔. “Decree: Monks and Nuns Should Not Receive Prostration from Their Parents.” Tang Gaozong 唐高宗. In *Tang da zhaoling ji* 唐大詔令集, j113.

*Shaanxi tongzhi* 陝西通志. “The General History of Shaanxi.” In *Zhongguo Fangzhi Congshu* 中國方志叢書. Taipei: Chengwen chubanshe, 1960.

*Shakumakaenron kanchū* 釋摩訶衍論勘注. “Investigation on the Text and the Meaning of *Shakumakaenron* (cf. T32.1668).” Raohō 賴寶. T69.2290.

*Shamen buhe bai su qi* 沙門不合拜俗啟. “Petition: It is Inappropriate for Monks to Prostrate Themselves before Laypeople.” Daoxuan 道宣. In *Guang Hongming ji* 廣弘明集, j25.

*Shamen bu jing wangzhe lun* 沙門不敬王者論. “Monastics Are Not to Prostrate before the Ruler.” Huiyuan 慧遠. In *Hongming ji* 弘明集, j5.

*Shamen buying bai su qi* 沙門不應拜俗啟. “Petition: Monks Should Not Prostrate Themselves before Laypeople.” Daoxuan 道宣. In *Guang Hongming ji* 廣弘明集, j25.

*Shamen deng zhibai jun qin chi* 沙門等致拜君親勅. “Order: Monks Must Prostrate Themselves before the Emperor and Their Parents.” Tang Gaozong 唐高宗. In *Guang Hongming ji* 廣弘明集, j25.

*Shan hai jing* 山海經. “The Classic of Mountains and Seas.” Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1980.

*Shang Rong Guofuren Yang shi lun bai qin wuyi qi* 上榮國夫人楊氏論拜親無益啟. “Petition Submitted for the Consideration of Rong Guofuren Yang on the Issue that Prostrating before a Layperson is Not Conducive.” In *Quan Tang Wen* 全唐文, j909.

*Shanjian lü piposha* 善見律毘婆沙 (*Samantapāśādikā*). Translated by Samghabhadra 僧伽跋陀羅. T24.1462.

*Shanxi tongzhi* 山西通志. “The General History of Shanxi.” In *Zhongguo Fangzhi Congshu* 中國方志叢書. Taipei: Chengwen chubanshe, 1960.

*Shaanxi Nanshan gukou kao* 陝西南山谷口考. “A Study on the Valleys of the Zhongnan mountain of Shaanxi.” Mao Fengzhi 毛鳳枝. In *Zhonghua shanshui zhi congkan* 中華山水志叢刊. Shi Guangming 石光明, Dong Guanghe 董光和, and Yang Guanghui 楊光輝. Beijing: Xianzhuang shuju, 2004.

*She Dacheng lun* 摄大乘論 (*Mahāyānasamgraha*). Asaṅga 無著. Translated by Buddhasānta 佛陀扇多. T31.1592.

*Shenjishō* 撰時抄. “Buddhism in Time: Outline of the Spreading of the Teaching.” Nichiren 日蓮. T84.2690.

*Sheng seng zhuan* 神僧傳. “The Accounts of the Marvellous Masters.” T50.2064.

*Shibazhongwu bianmeng chao* 十八種物便蒙鈔. “Guide to the Eighteen Objects of A Monk: For the Convenience of the New Enterers.” Yiwen 義聞. D73.

*Shido juhō nikki* 四度授法日記. “Diary of the Four sessions of Dharma Instruction.” Gongō 嚴豪. T77.2413.

*Shimen zi jing lu* 釋門自鏡錄. “Self-examination: Records of [the Fallen] Monastics.” Huaixin 懷信. T51.2083.

*Shiji* 史記. “Records of the Historian.” Sima Qian 司馬遷. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1963.

*Shijia fang zhi* 釋迦方志. “History of the Land of Śākyā[muni].” Daoxuan 道宣. T51.2088.

*Shijia shi pu* 釋迦氏譜. “History of the Clan of Śākyā[muni].” Daoxuan 道宣. T50.2041.

*Shimen gui jing yi* 釋門歸敬儀. “Buddhist Guide on the Etiquette in Paying Respect.” Daoxuan 道宣. T45.1896.

*Shimen gui jing yi hufa ji* 釋門歸敬儀護法記. “The Dharma Protector: Commentary to [Daoxuan’s] *Shimen Gui Jing Yi*.” Yanqi 彥起. X59.1094.

*Shimen gui jing yi tongzhen ji* 釋門歸敬儀通真記. “The Illuminator: Commentary to [Daoxuan’s] *Shimen Gui Jing Yi*.” Liaoran 了然. X59.1095.

*Shimen zhang fu yi* 釋門章服儀. “Code on Monastic Robes and Other Clothing.” Daoxuan 道宣. T45.1894.

*Shimen zhang fu yi xu* 釋門章服儀序. “Foreword to [Daoxuan’s] *Shimen Zhang Fu Yi*.” (Fukashiji?) 不可思議. T45.1894.

*Shimen zhang fu yi yingfa ji* 釋門章服儀應法記. “The True Bearer: Commentary to [Daoxuan’s] *Shimen Zhang Fu Yi*.” Yuanzhao 元照. X59.1097.

*Shimen zhengtong* 釋門正統. “The Orthodox Tradition of the Buddhist Religion.” Zongjian 宗鑑. X75.1513.

*Shimpen shoshū kyōzō sōroku* 新編諸宗教藏總錄. “The Newly Composed Comprehensive Catalogue of the Collections of the Schools.” Giten 義天. T55.2184.

*Shin'yōshō* 心要鈔. “On Mind: A Topical Study on the Essence.” Jōkei 貞慶. T71.2311.

*Shishi fayi xun* 釋氏法衣訓. “Instructions on Monastic Clothing.” Cifang 慈方. D73.

*Shishi jigu lüe* 釋氏稽古略. “The Gist of the Study of the History of Buddhism.” Jue'an 覺岸. T49.2037.

*Shishi liutie* 釋氏六帖. “Buddhist Encyclopedia [Modeled after Ba Juyi’s] Liutie.” Yichu 義楚. B13.79.

*Shishi tongjian* 釋氏通鑑. “Comprehensive History of Buddhism.” Benjue 本覺. X76.1516.

*Shishi yaolan* 釋氏要覽. “Outline to the History of Buddhism.” Daocheng 道誠. T54.2127.

*Shisong lü* 十誦律 (*Sarvāstivādavinya*). Translated by Puṇyatāra 弗若多羅, Dharmaruci 昙摩流支, and Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什. T23.1435.

*Shittan yōketsu* 悉曇要訣. “Sanskrit Primer.” Myōkaku 明覺. T84.2706.

*Shizhu piposa lun* 十住毘婆沙論 (*Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā*). Nāgārjuna 龍樹. Translated by Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什. T26.1521.

*Shizi zhuangyan wang pusa qingwen jing xu* 師子莊嚴王菩薩請問經序. “The Preface for the Discourse on the Questions Asked by the Bodhisattva Shizizhuangyanwang.” Daoxuan 道宣. T14.486j1.697a19–b8.

*Sho ekōshingi* 諸回向清規. “Guide to the Merit Transferring Ritual on Miscellaneous Occasions.” Tenrin Fūin 天倫楓隱. T81.2578.

*Shoshū kyōsho mokuroku* 諸宗經疏目錄. “Catalogue of the Texts, Commentaries, and Other Works of the Schools.” Genkū 源空. D1.

*Shoshū kyōri dōishaku* 諸宗教理同異釋. “Accounts and Study on the Differences of the Teachings of the Schools.” Raiyu 賴瑜. T79.2528.

*Shoulengyan yi shu zhu jing* 首楞嚴義疏注經. “Annotated Study on *Shoulengyan [Jing]* (cf. T19.945).” Zixuan 子璿. T39.1799.

*Shou pusajie fa* 受菩薩戒法. “Guide to the Conferring of Bodhisattva Precepts.” Yanshou 延壽. W105/X59.1088.

*Shōdaijōron shaku ryakusho* 攝大乘論釋略疏. “A General Study on *Shōdaijōron Shaku* (cf. T31.1595).” Fujaku 普寂. T68.2269.

*Shūyōkashiwabaraanryū* 宗要柏原案立. “Topics on the Essentials of the Buddha-dharma: In Questions and Answers.” Teishum 貞瞬. T74.2374.

*Sifen bhikṣu jieben shu* 四分比丘戒本疏. “Commentary on the *Prātimokṣa* of *Sifen Lü*.” Dingbin 定賓. T40.1807.

*Sifen jieben yueyi* 四分戒本約義. “Concise Guide to the Meaning of *Sifen Lü Prātimokṣa*.” Yuanxian 元賢. W63/X40.718.

*Sifen lü* 四分律 (*Dharmaguptakavinaya*). Translated by Buddhayaśas 佛陀耶舍, and Zhufonian 竹佛念. T22.1428.

*Sifen lü bhikṣu han zhu jieben* 四分律比丘含注戒本. “The *Prātimokṣa* of *Sifen Lü* with Annotation.” Daoxuan 道宣. T40.1806.

*Sifen lü bhikṣu han zhu jieben shu* 四分律比丘含注戒本疏. “Commentary on the Annotated *Prātimokṣa* of *Sifen Lü*.” Daoxuan 道宣. W62/X39.714.

*Sifen lü bhikṣunī chao* 四分律比丘尼鈔. (Guide for *Bhikṣunī*: In Light of *Sifen Lü*). Daoxuan 道宣. W64/X40.724.

*Sifenlüchao jianzheng ji* 四分律簡正記. “A Collection of the Fine Comments from the Sub-commentaries of the Xingshichao of *Sifenlü*.” Jingxiao 景霄. W68/X43.737.

*Sifen lü han zhu jieben shu xing zong ji* 四分律含注戒本流行宗記. “The Foundation: a Commentary on the Annotated *Prātimokṣa* of the *Dharmaguptakavinaya*.” Yuanzhao 元照. W62/X39.714.

*Sifenlü jieben shu* 四分律戒本疏. “Commentary of the *Prātimokṣa* of the *Sifen Lü*.” Dingbin 定賓. T40.1807.

*Sifen lü kaizong ji* 四分律開宗記. “A New Tradition: Commentary on *Sifen lü*.” Huaisu 懷素. W66/X42.735.

*Sifen lü shan bu sui ji jiemo* 四分律刪補隨機羯磨. “The Amended *Sifen lü* Manual for Day-to-day Monastic Procedures.” Daoxuan 道宣. T40.1808.

*Sifen lü shan bu sui ji jiemo* 四分律刪補隨機羯磨疏. “Commentary on the *Sifen Lü Shan Bu Sui Ji Jiemo*.” Daoxuan 道宣. W64/X41.728.

*Sifen lü shan bu sui ji jiemo ji yuan ji* 四分律刪補隨機羯磨疏濟緣記. “To Assist the Requirement: A Sub-commentary to [Daoxuan’s] *Sifen Lü Shan Bu Sui Ji Jiemo*.” Yuanzhao 元照. W64/X41.728.

*Sifen shan ding biquuni jieben* 四分刪定比丘尼戒本. “*Sifen Lü Bhikṣunī Prātimokṣa*: Edited.” Daoxuan 道宣. W64/X40.722.

*Sifen shan ding biquuni jieben xu* 四分刪定比丘尼戒本序. “Foreword to the Edited *Sifen Lü Bhikṣunī Prātimokṣa*.” Yuanzhao 元照. W64/X40.722.

*Sifenlü shanfan buque xingshi chao* 四分律刪繁補缺行事鈔. “The Amended Guidelines of *Sifen Lü* for Practical Monastic Practice.” Daoxuan 道宣. T40.1804.

*Sifen lü shi pini yi chao* 四分律拾毗尼義鈔. “A Manual: Collected Explanatory Passages from *Sifen Lü*.” Daoxuan 道宣. W71/X44.747.

*Sifen lü shu* 四分律疏. “The Commentary of *Sifen Lü*.” Fali 法礪. T41.731.

*Sifen lü shu* 四分律疏. “The Commentary of *Sifen Lü*.” Zhishou 智首. W66.623-668/X42.734.

*Sifen lü shu shi zong yi ji* 四分律疏飾宗義記. “For the Decoration of the School: Study on [Fali’s] *Sifen Lü* Commentary.” Dingbin 定賓. W66/X42.733.

*Sifen lü sou xuan lu* 四分律搜玄錄. “Investigation: Study on [Daoxuan’s Xingshi Chao] (cf. T40.1804).” Zhihong 志鴻. W95/X41.732.

*Sifen lü suiji jiemoshu zhengyuan ji* 四分律隨機羯磨疏正源記. “The Commentary of the Authentic Understanding of the *Dharmaguptaka*[vinaya] for the Manual of the *Karman* of *Shifen lü*.” Yunkan 允堪. W64/X40.726.

*Siming zunzhe jiao xing lu* 四明尊者教行錄. “Records of the Most Venerable Mater Zhili: His Words and His Deeds.” Zongxiao 宗曉. T49.1937.

*Si ta ji* 寺塔記. “A Guide to the Monasteries and *Stupas* [in Chang’an].” Duan Chengshi 段成式. T51.2093.

*Sifenlü xingshi chao pi* 四分律行事鈔批. Dajue 大覺. “A Critical Study on [Daoxuan’s] *Sifenlü Xingshi Chao*.” W67/X42.736.

*Sifenlü xingshi chao zichi ji* 四分律行事鈔資持記. “Helper to the Upholding of Vinaya: Commentary on [Daoxuan’s] *Sifenlü Xingshi Chao*.” Yuanzhao 元照. T40.1805.

*Song da zhaoling ji* 宋大詔令集. “The Great Collection of the Decrees of the Song.” Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 2009.

*Song gaoseng zhuan* 宋高僧傳. “The Biography of the Eminent Monks Composed in the Song.” Zanning 贊寧. T50.2061.

*Songshi* 宋史. “History of the Song.” Tuotuo 脫脫. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1977.

*Songshu* 宋書. “Song History.” Shen Yue 沈約. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974.

*Suichutang shu mu* 遂初堂書目. “Catalogue [Composed by the Scholar of] Suichu Hall.” You Mao 尤袤. In *Shuo fu sanzhong* 說郛三種. Tao Zongyi 陶宗儀. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1988.

*Suishu* 隋書. “History of the Sui.” Wei Zheng 魏徵, Linghu Defen 令狐德棻. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1973.

*Sui Tang jiahua lu* 隋唐嘉話. “The Famous Sayings of Sui and Tang.” Liu Su 劉餗. In *Tang Wudai biji xiaoshuo da guan* 唐五代筆記小說大觀. Ding Ruming 丁如明, Li Zongwei 李宗為, and Li Xueying 李學穎. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2000.

## T

*Taiping guangji* 太平廣記. “The Extensive Records Made in the Taiping[Xingguo] Era.” Li Fang 李昉. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1961.

*Taiping huanyu ji* 太平寰宇記. “The Geography of the Land of His Heavenly Rule Composed in Taiping Era.” Yue Shi 樂史. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2007.

*Taiping yulan* 太平樂覽. “Imperial Readings of the Taiping Era.” Li Fang 李昉. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1959.

*Taizi ruiying benqi jing* 太子瑞應本起經. “The Sūtra of the Wonderful Story of the Prince [Siddhārtha].” Translated by Zhi Qian 支謙. T3.185.

*Tang Chongsheng si Foya baota bei* 唐崇聖寺佛牙寶塔碑. “Stone Inscription to the Precious Stupa of Buddha’s Tooth of the Chongsheng Monastery of the Great Tang.” Chen Si 陳思. In Baoke Congbian 寶刻叢編. In *Lidai Beizhi Congshu* 歷代碑誌叢書. Nanjing: Jiangshu guji chubanshe, 1998.

*Tang da heshang dong zheng zhuan* 唐大和尚東征傳. “Records of the Great Master of Tang and His Voyage to the East.” Genkai 元開. D113.

*Tang da heshang dong zheng zhuan* 唐大和尚東征傳. “Records of the Great Master of Tang and His Voyage to the East.” Ken’i 賢位. D113.

*Tang da zhaoling ji* 唐大詔令集. “Collection of Imperial Decrees of the Tang.” Song Minqiu 宋敏求. Beijing: Shangwu yishuguan, 1959.

*Tang Fan fandui zi yin Boreboluomiduo xin jing* 唐梵翻對字音般若波羅蜜多心經. “The literal Sanskrit–Chinese translation of *Boreboluomiduo Xin Jing*.” Translated by Amoghavajra 不空. T8.256.

*Tang Chang'an Ximing si ta* 唐長安西明寺塔. “Stupa Inscription to the Ximing Monastery of Chang’an.” Su Ting 蘇頤. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1982.

*Tang Fabao lüshi pi* 唐法寶律師批. “Tang Vinaya Master Fabao’s Note [on the Colophon of Daoxuan’s Shi Pini Yi Chao].” Fabao 法寶. In W71/X44.747j2.797a.

*Tang Hufa shamen Falin Bie Zhuan* 唐護法沙門法琳別傳. “The Biography of the Tang Hufa Monk Falin.” Yancong 彥悰. T50.2051.

*Tang huiyao* 唐會要. “The Institutional History of Tang.” Wangpu 王溥. Kyoto: Chūbun shubbansha, 1978.

*Tang Liudian* 唐六典. “The Six Legislative Texts of the Tang.” Li Linfu 李林甫. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1992.

*Tang lü shu yi* 唐律疏議. “The Tang Code.” Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983.

*Tangwen shiyi* 唐文拾遺. “Collected Works of the Tang: In Supplementary to Quan Tang Wen.” Lu Xinyuan 陸心源. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983. Vol.11.

*Tang Ximing si shangzuo Daoxuan lüshi sheli ta ji* 唐西明寺上座道宣律師舍利塔記. “Inscription to the Śarīra Stupa of the Shangzuo of the Ximing Monastery the Vinaya Master Daoxuan of the Tang.” Hao Wenhui 郝文會. In Baoke Congbian 寶刻叢編. In *Lidai Beizhi Congshu* 歷代碑誌叢書. Nanjing: Jiangshu guji chubanshe, 1998.

*Tang Xuangong liuyuan jie* 唐宣公律院碣. “Stone Tablet Inscription to the Vinaya Hall of Master Xuan of the Tang.” Yan Houben 嚴厚本. In *Jingshi Lu* 金石錄. Zhao Mingchen 趙明誠. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1991.

*Tiangong kaiwu* 天工開物. “The Expectation of the Works of Nature.” Song Yingxing 宋應星. 明崇禎十年涂紹煃刊本, 1637.

*Tiantai Jiuzu zhuan* 天台九祖傳. “Biography of the Ninth Patriarch of the Tiantai School.” Shiheng 士衡. T51.2069.

*Tiantai shan fangwai zhi* 天台山方外志. “A Monked Authored History of the Tiantai Mountain.” Chuandeng 傳燈. In *Zhongguo Fosi Zhi Congkan* 中国佛寺志丛刊. Ed. Bai Huawen 白化文, Zhang Zhi 张智. Yangzhou: Guangling shushe, 2011.

*Tianzhu bieji* 天竺別集. “Collected Works [that are Composed in] Tianzhu Monastery.” Zunshi 遵式. X57.951.

*Ting Shamen bai jun zhao* 停沙門拜君詔. “Decree: Monks Are No Longer Required to Prostrate Themselves before the Emperor.” Tang Gaozong 唐高宗. In *Guang Hongming ji* 廣弘明集, j25.

*Tongdian* 通典. “The Comprehensive Institutions.” Duyou 杜佑. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1988.

*Tongzhi ershi lüe* 通志二十略. “The Twenty Monographs in the Encyclopedia.” Zheng Qiao 鄭樵. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1992.

*Tōdaiji jukai hōki* 東大寺受戒方軌. “The Description of the Ordination Ceremony of Tōdaiji [Japan].” Hōshin 法進. T74.2349.

*Tōdaiji Kaidanin jukai shiki* 東大寺戒壇院受戒式. “Ordination Ceremony Description of the Platform-complex Tōdaiji [Japan].” Jippan 實範. T74.2350.

*Tōiki dentō mokuroku* 東域傳燈目錄. “Records of the Dharma Transmission in Japan.” Eichō 永超. T55.2183.

*Tōshōdaiji kaidan betsu jukaishiki* 唐招提寺戒壇別受戒式. “A Separate Ordination Ceremony Description of the Platform Tōshōdaiji [Japan].” Ekō 惠光. T74.2351.

## W

*Wansong laoren ping chang Tiantong Jueheshang song gu congrong'an lu* 萬松老人評唱天童覺和尚頌古從容庵錄. “Master Wansong’s Comment on Master Jue of Tiantong and His Book The Record of Congrong’an.” Xingxiu 行秀. T48.2004.

*Weimojing lueshu chui yi ji* 維摩經略疏垂裕記. “A Beginner’s Guide to [Zhanran’s] Commentary on Weimojing (cf. T38.1778).” Zhiyuan 智圓. T38.1779.

*Wenshushili wen jing* 文殊師利問經. “The *Sūtra* of the Questions Forwarded by *Mañjuśrī*.” Translated by Samghabara 僧伽婆羅. T14.468.

*Wenxian tongkao* 文獻通考. “The Comprehensive Examination of Literature.” Ma Duanlin 馬端臨. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1986.

*Wudai huiyao* 五代會要. “Institutions of the Five Dynasties Period.” Wang Pu 王溥. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1978.

*Wufen liu* 五分律 (*Mahīsasakavinyaya*). Translated by Buddhajīva 佛陀什, Zhudaosheng 竺道生. T22.1421.

## X

*Xianju bian* 閑居編. “Collection of Some Leisurely Compositions.” Zhiyuan 智圓. X56.949.

*Xianmi weiyi bianlan* 顯密威儀便覽. “An General Guide to the Deportments of Xian and Mi.” Ryōkai Sonshin 亮快存心. D73.

*Xijing zaji* 西京雜記. “The Miscellaneous Records of Chang'an.” Ge Hong 葛洪. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1985.

*Xinjin wen ji* 鐸津文集. “A Miscellaneous Collection of Literature [Made by A Native of] Xinjin [in Guangxi].” Qisong 契嵩. T52.2115.

*Xinke liangchuqingzhong yi xu* 新刻量處輕重儀序. “Foreword to the New Print of [Daoxuan's] Liangchuqingzhong Yi.” (Jisen Hemun?) 慈光慧門. In T45.1896.

*Xinke paike jiazhu jieben shuji xu* 新刻排科夾註戒本疏記序. “Foreword to the New Print of the Annotation Included Jieben Shuji [of Daoxuan and Yuanzhao].” Jichan 卽禪. In W62.309b.

*Xinke paike jiazhu jieben shuji xu* 新刻排科夾註戒本疏記序. “Foreword to the New Print of the Annotation Included Jieben Shuji [of Daoxuan and Yuanzhao].” Yuxian 玉線. In W62.311a.

*Xinke qingzhongyi houxu* 新刻輕重儀後序. “Postface to the New Print of [Daoxuan's] Qingzhong Yi.” (Sai Chōshun?) 實長春. In T45.1896j1.

*Xinluo guo ji huan shu* 新羅國寄還書. “Letters Sent Back from the Kingdom of Silla.” Zixiang 自相. In X44.747j2.

*Xin shan ding Sifen seng jieben* 新刪定四分僧戒本. “Newly Edited *Sifen Lü Bhiks Prātimokṣa*.” Daoxuan 道宣. W61/X39.707.

*Xin Tangshu* 新唐書. “New History of the Tang.” Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1975.

*Xingshi Chao zhu jia ji biaomu* 行事鈔諸家記標目. “List of the Commentaries on Xingshi chao.” Huixian 慧顯. Ed. Kai Getsu 戒月. W70/X44.740.

*Xin xiukē fēng liuxue seng zhuāng* 新修科分六學僧傳. “Newly Compiled: The Six-pāramitā Grouped Monastic Biography.” Tan'e 曇噩. X77.1522.

*Xizhou zhi* 隰州志. “The History of Xizhou”. Qian Yikai 錢以壠. In *Zhongguo Fangzhi Congshu* 中國方志叢書. Taipei: Chengwen chubanshe, 1960.

*Xuanshi zhi* 宣室志. “Collected Stories of Xuanshi.” Zhang Dou 張讀. In *Xuanshi zhi and Duyi zhi*. Zhonghua shuju 中華書局. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983.

*Xuanshi zhi* 宣室志. “Collected Stories of Xuanshi.” Zhang Dou 張讀. In *Biji xiaoshuo daguan* 筆記小說大觀. Yangzhou: Jiangshu guangling guji keyin she 江蘇廣陵古籍刻印社, 1983.

*Xuanshi zhi* 宣室志. “Collected Stories of Xuanshi.” Zhang Dou 張讀. In *Tang Wudai Biji Xiaoshuo Daguan* 唐五代筆記小說大觀. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2000. Vol.2.

*Xu Da Tang neidian lu* 繢大唐內典錄. “The Continued Buddhist Catalogue of the Great Tang.” Daoxuan 道宣. T55.2150.

*Xu Fojiao longti shi jian zhu zaifu deng Zhuang* 序佛教隆替事簡諸宰輔等狀. “Foreword to the Miscellaneous Anthology on the Rise and Fall of Buddhism, Submitted for the Consideration of Ministers and Officials.” Daoxuan 道宣. In *Guang Hongming ji* 廣弘明集, j25.

*Xu Gaoseng Zhuan* 繢高僧傳. “The Continued Biography of Eminent Monks.” Daoxuan 道宣. T50.2060.

*Xu gujin yi jing tu ji* 繢古今譯經圖記. “Continued Accounts of the Translators and Their Works.” Zhisheng 智昇. T55.2152.

## Y

*Yangjuemoluo jing* 央掘魔羅經 (*Āṅgulimālīyasūtra*). Translated by Gunabhadra 求那跋陀羅. T2.120.

*Yaoshi rulai guanxing yigui fa* 藥師如來觀行儀軌法. “*Ritual of the Contemplation on the Mediation Buddha*.” Vajrabodhi 金剛智. T19.923.

*Yi bo mingyi zhang* 衣鉢名義章. “Guide to the Monastic Robes and Alms Bow.” Yunkan 允堪. W105/X59.1098.

*Yi qie jing yin yi* 一切經音義. “Translations and the Readings of the Words in the Buddhist Books.” Huilin 慧琳. T54.2128.

*Yi shi dao bu ying bai su zhuang* 議釋道不應拜俗狀. “Petition: Buddhists and Daoist Clerics Should Not Prostrate to Laypersons.” Yuan Zhixin 源直心. In *Quan Tang Wen* 全唐文, j189.

*Yiwen leiju* 藝文類聚. “The Collection of Literature Arranged by Categories.” Ouyang Xun 歐陽詢. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1965.

*Yong lu* 雍錄. “The Miscellaneous Records of the Mountain Guarded Region.” Cheng Dachang 程大昌. In *Song Yuan fangzhi congkan* 宋元方志叢刊, 379-508. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1989.

*Youyang zazu* 西陽雜俎. “Miscellaneous Morsels from Youyang.” Duan Chengshi 段成式. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1981.

*Yuanhe junxian tu zhi* 元和郡縣圖志. “The Yuanhe Maps and Records of Prefectures and Counties.” Li Jifu 李吉甫. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983.

*Yuanjue jing da shu shiyi chao* 圓覺經大疏釋義鈔. “Explanatory Note on the General Commentary to the sūtra of Absolute Enlightenment.” Zongmi 宗密. W14.407-924/X9.245.

*Yushikigi shiki* 唯識義私記. “A Self Study Note on the Meaning of *Vijñāna*.” Shingō 眞興. T71.2319.

*Yuishikiron dōgakushō* 唯識論同學鈔. “Records of Discussions on the Teaching of *Yuishikiron*.” Ryōzan 良算. T66.2263.

*Yushikiron kikigaki* 唯識論聞書. “Study to *Vijñānapratimātratāsiddhi*[śāstra] (cf. T31.1585).” Kōin 光胤. T66.2264.

## Z

*Za ahan jing* 雜阿含經 (*Samyuktāgama*). Translated by Gunabatsudara 求那跋陀羅. T2.99.

*Za baozang jing* 雜寶藏經. “The Sūtra of Miscellaneous Treasures.” Translated by (Kīmkārya?)吉迦夜, Tanyao 曇曜. T4.203

*Zaushō* 座右鈔. “Collections of Uplifting Sayings.” Jitsudō Enin 實道惠仁. T83.2641.

*Zengyi ahan jing* 增一阿含經 (*Ekottarāagama*). Translated by Gautama Samghadeva瞿曇僧伽提婆. T2.125.

*Zengyi guang yi* 繳衣光儀. “The Elegance of the Silk-made Robes.” Daoguang 道光. D73.

*Zhaoyi xian zhi* 朝邑縣志. “The History of Changxing County.” Taibei: Chengwen chubanshe, 1976.

*Zhenyuan xingding shijiao mulu* 貞元新定釋教目錄. “The Zhenyuan New Buddhist Catalogue.” Yuanzhao 圓照. T55.2157.

*Zhiguan fu xing chuan hong jue* 止觀輔行傳弘決. “Key to the Spreading of the Teaching: Commentary on [Zhiyi’s Mohe] Zhiguan (cf.T46.1911).” Zhanran 湛然. T46.1912.

*Zhiyuan ji* 芝園集. “Works of the Master of Zhiyuan.” Yuanzhao 元照. X59.1105.

*Zhiyuan yi bian* 芝園遺編. “The Collected Works of the Later Master of Zhiyuan.” Daoxun 道詢. X59.1104.

*Zhong ahan jing* 中阿含經 (*Madhyamāgama*). Translated by Gautama Samghadeva 瞞曇僧伽提婆. T1.26.

*Zhong jing mu lu* 衆經目錄. “The Catalogue of the *Sūtras*.” Jingtai 靜泰. T55.2148.

*Zhongnan jiaye* 終南家業. “Accounts on the Tradition of the Zhongnan [Vinaya School].” Shou’yi 守一. X59.1109.

*Zhongtianzu shewei guo qihuan si tu jing* 中天竺舍衛國祇洹寺圖經. “Illustrated Discourse on the *Jetavana* Monastery in Central India.” Daoxuan 道宣. T45.1899.

*Zhou shu* 周書. “History of the Zhou.” Linghu Defen 令狐德棻. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1971.

*Zhujing yao ji* 諸經要集. “The Collection of the Essentials from Various Texts.” Daoshi 道世. T54.2123.

*Zimen jingxun* 緇門警訓. “Anthology of the Mottos of the Masters.” Rujin 如晉. T48.2023.

*Zizhi tongjian* 資治通鑑. “Comprehensive Mirror in the Aid of Governance.” Sima Guang 司馬光. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1976.

*Zunsheng fo ding xiu yuqiefa yigui* 尊勝佛頂修瑜伽法儀軌. “*Ritual of the Supreme Contemplation of Foding*.” Śubhakarasiṁha 善無畏. T19.973.

## SECONDARY SOURCES (LISTED BY AUTHOR)

Abramson, Marc S. *Ethnic Identity in Tang China*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.

Anderl, Christoph. “Linking Khotan and Dūnhuáng: Buddhist Narratives in Text and Image”, in *Entangled Religions: Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Religious Contact and Transfer*, 8 (forthcoming, 2018): 1–62.

- Ataru Sotomura. *The Buddhist Heavens 天: Source Manual for Iconographic Research on the Buddhist Universe, Part II*. Singapore: The Nalanda-Sriwijaya Centre Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2015.
- Barrett, T. H. *Taoism under the T'ang*. London: Floating Worly Editions, 2006.
- Bensky, Dan and Randall Barolet. *Chinese Herbal Medicine: Formulas and Strategies*. Washington, DC: Eastland Press, 1990.
- Benskey, Dan, Andrew Bensky and Randall Barolet. *The Chinese Herbal Medicine: Formulas and Strategies*. Washington, DC: Ealtland Press, 1990.
- Bodhi, Bhikkhu. "My First Encounter with a Buddhist Monk," 4 August 2008 at <https://bodhimonastery.org/my-first-encounter-with-a-buddhist-monk-rn.html>, accessed on 8 November 2018.
- Bodhi, Bhikkhu. *The Revival of Bhikkhunī Ordination in the Theravāda Tradition*. Penang: Inward Path Publisher, 2009.
- Bodiford, William M., ed., Going Forth. Visions of Buddhist Vinaya. Essays Presented in Honor of Professor Stanley Weinstein. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005.
- Bokenkamp, Stephen.R. *A Medieval Feminist Critique of the Chinese World Order: the Case of Wu Zhao* (r. 690-705). *Religion* 28.4 (1998). 383–392.
- Boucher, Daniel. "On *Hu* and *Fan* Again: The Transmission of 'Barbarian' Manuscripts to China', *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 23.1 (2000). 7–28.
- Buswell, Robert E. and Donald S. Lopez. *The Princeton Dictionary of Buddhism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013.
- Campo, Daniela. "A Different Buddhist Revival: The Promotion of Vinaya (*jielü* 戒律) in Republican China," *Journal of Global Buddhism* 18 (2017). 129–154.
- Chen Jinhua. "An Alternative View of the Meditation Tradition in China: Meditation in the Life and Works of Daoxuan (596-667)." *T'oung Pao*, Second Series, vol. 88:4/5. 332–395.
- Chen Jinhua. *Monks and Monarchs, Kinship and Kingship*. Kyoto: Scuola Italiana di Studi sull'Asia Orientale, 2002.
- Chen Jinhua. *Philosopher, Practitioner, Politician: The Many Lives of Fazang (643–712)*. Leiden Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Ch'en, Kenneth. *The Chinese Transformation of Buddhism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1973.
- Chen Yuan 陳垣 (陳文會). *Zhongguo fojiao shiji gailun* 中國佛教史籍概論. Gaoxiong: Fuwen tushu chubanshe, 1984.

Chi Limei 池麗梅. 道宣の前半生と『続高僧伝』初稿本の成立 in 日本古写経研究所研究紀要 1, 2016-03. 65–95.

Chou Yiliang 周一良. “Tantrism in China,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 3/4 (Mar., 1945), 241–332.

Chu Binjie 褚斌杰. *Zhongguo Gudai Wenti Gailun* 中国古代文体概论 (*Comprehensive Guide on Ancient Chinese Literary Style*). Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 1990. 439–446.

Crosby, Kate. *Theravada Buddhism: Continuity, Diversity, and Identity*. Malden, MA, and Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2014.

Drège, J.-P. *Les Bibliothèques en Chine au Temps des Manuscrits*. Paris: EFEO, 1991.

Dubs, Homer H. *The History of the Former Han Dynasty*, Volume Three. Baltimore: Waverley Press, 1955.

Dudbridge, Glen. *The Legend of Miaoshan*. Oxford New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Ennin 圓仁. *Ennin's Diary: The Record of a Pilgrimage to China in Search of the Law*. Translated by Edwin O. Reischauer. New York: Ronald Press, 1955.

Fang Guangchang 方廣錫 *Zhongguo xieben dazing jing yanjiu* 中國寫本大藏經研究. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2006.

Forte, Antonino. “Daisōjō 大僧正.” In *Hôbôgirin, Dictionnaire encyclopédique du bouddhisme d'après les sources chinoises et japonaises, sixième fascicule*. Paris: Librairie d’Amérique et d’Orient; Tokyo: Maison Franco-Japonaise, 2003. 1043–1070.

Fujiyosi Masumi 藤善 真澄. *Dōsen den no kenkyū* 道宣傳の研究 *A Study for the Life of Dao-Xuan*. Kyoto: Kyoto University Press, 2002.

Gan Zuwang 干祖望. *Sun Simiao pingzhuan* 孫思邈評傳 (*A Critical Biography of Sun Simiao*). Nanjing: Nanjing University Press, 1995.

Gjertson, Donald E. *Miraculous Retribution: A Study and Translation of T’ang Lin’s Ming-pao chi*. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series, 1989.

Goldin, Paul Rakita. *The Culture of Sex in Ancient China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002.

Granoff, Phyllis and Koichi Shinohara. *Speaking of Monks: Religious Biography in India and China*. Okaville, New York and London: Mosaic Press, 1992.

Granoff, Phyllis and Koichi Shinohara. *Monks and Magicians: Religious Biographies in Asia*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsi Dass Publishers, 1994.

Greene, Eric M. “Atonement of Pārājika Transgressions in Fifth-Century Chinese Buddhism.” In *Rules of Engagement Medieval Traditions of Buddhist Monastic Regulation*. Edited by Susan Andrews, Jinhua Chen, and Cuilan Liu, 369–408. Bochum: Freiburg, 2017.

Greene, Eric. “Another Look at Early Chan: Daoxuan, Bodhidharma, and Three Levels Movement.” *T’oung Pao* 94 (2008): 49–114.

- Groner, Paul. "The Fan-wang ching and the Monastic Discipline in Japanese Tendai: A Study of Annen's Futsū jubosatsukai kōshaku." In *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*. Edited by Robert E. Buswell, 251–290. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1990.
- Groner, Paul. "Ordination and Precepts in the Platform Sūtra." In *Readings of the Platform Sūtra*, edited by Morten Schlütter, and Stephen T. Teiser, 134–160. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.
- Guo Shaolin 郭紹林. *Xu gaoseng zhuan dianjiao* 繢高僧傳點校. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2014.
- Haga Yaichi 芳賀 矢一. *Kōshō Konjaku monogatarishū* 考証今昔物語集. Tokyo: Fuzanbō, 1913–1921.
- Ha Tae-Hung and Grafton Mintz. *Samguk Yusa: Legends and History of the Three Kingdoms of Ancient Korea*. Seoul: Yonsei University Press, 1972.
- Heirman, Ann. "Some Remarks on the Rise of the Bhiksunisamgha and on the Ordination Ceremony for Bhiksunis According to the Dharmaguptakavinaya." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*. 20.2. (1997). 33–85.
- Heirman, Ann. "On Pārājika." *Buddhist Studies Review* 1. (1999). 51–59.
- Heirman, Ann. "The Chinese Samantapasadika and its School Affiliation." *Zeitschrift Der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft*. 154.2. (2004). 371–396.
- Heirman, Ann. "Buddhist Nuns through the Eyes of Leading Early Tang Masters." *Chinese Historical Review*. Vol. 22.1. (2015). 31–51.
- Heirman, Ann and Stephan Peter Bumbacher, eds. *The Spread of Buddhism*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Hirakawa Akira 平川 彰. "戒壇の原意." 印度学仏教学研究 (10.2; 1962): 680–700.
- Hirakawa Akira 平川 彰. *Ritsuzō no kenkyū* (律藏の研究), vols. 1 and 2. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1999–2000.
- Hoang, Pierre. *Concordance des Chronologies Néoméniques Chinoise et Européenne*. Nanking: Imprimerie de la Mission Catholique, 1910.
- Hongyi 弘一. "Nanshan Daoxuan lüshi nianpu 南山道宣律師年譜," in *Hongyi dashi quanji* 弘一大師全集, ed. Hongyi dashi quanji bianji weiyuanhui 弘一大師全集編輯委員會, 401–404. Fuzhou: Fujian renmin chubanshe, 1991.
- Hongyi 弘一. *Hongyi fashi quanji* 弘一法師全集. Beijing: Xingshijie chubanshe, 2013. 5 volumes.
- Hou Chong 侯冲, *Yunnan Azhalijiao yanjiu* 云南阿吒力教研究. Beijing: Zhongguo shuji chubanshe, 2007.
- Hsu, Alexander Ong. "Practices of Scriptural Economy: Compiling and Copying a Seventh-Century Chinese Buddhist Anthology." PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2018.
- Hucker, Charles O. *A Dictionary of Official Titles in Imperial China*. Stanford, CA: Stanford, 1985.
- Ishida Mizumaro 石田 瑞麿. *Bonmōkyō* 梵網經. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppansha, 1971.
- Johnson, Wallace. *The T'ang Code*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1979.

- Jones, Russell. *Chinese Names: The Traditions Surrounding the Use of Chinese Surnames and Personal Names*. Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia: Petaling Jaya, 1997.
- Kenney, Elizabeth. "Taoist Elements in Further Biographies of Eminent Monks." *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, vol.47, No.1 (December 1998): 19–22.
- Kieschnick, John. *The Eminent Monk: Buddhist Ideals in Medieval Chinese Hagiography*, Studies in East Asian Buddhism. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1997.
- Knoblock, John and Jeffrey Riegel. *The Annals of Lü Buwei*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000.
- Koichi Shinohara. "The Kasāya Robe of the Past Buddha Kāśyapa in the Miraculous Instruction Given to the Vinaya Master Daoxuan (596~667)." *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* 13 (2000): 299–36.
- Lagerwey, John. "Dingguang Gufo: Oral and Written Sources in the Study of a Saint," *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie*, vol.10 (1998): 77–129.
- Lamotte, Étienne. *History of Indian Buddhism: From the Origins to the Śāky Era*. Translated by Sara Webb-Boin. Louvain: Peeters Press, 1988.
- Lee, Thomas H.C. *Education in Traditional China A History*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Le Huu Phuoc. Buddhist Architecture. MN: Grafikol, 2012.
- Levering, Miriam. "The Precocious Child in Chinese Buddhism," in *Little Buddhas: Children and Childhoods in Buddhist Texts and Traditions*, Vanessa R. Sasson, ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, AAR Religion, Culture, and History, 2013), 124–156.
- Lewis, Mark Edward. *China Between Empires: the Northern and Southern Dynasties*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England, 2009.
- Li Fangmin 李芳民. *Tang Wudai fosi ji kao* 唐五代佛寺輯考. Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 2006.
- Li Fengmao 李豐楙. ‘從哪吒太子到中壇元帥：中央－四方思維下的護境象徵’，in 中國文哲研究通訊, 第 19 期, 2 (2006): 34–57.
- Li Huawei 李华伟. “《法苑珠林》研究—晋唐佛教的文化整合.” PhD diss., University of Nankai 南開大學, 2014.
- Luo Xiaohong 罗小红. *Tang Chang'an Ximingsi kao* 唐長安西明寺考. *Kaogu yu Wenwu* 考古與文物, 2. (2006): 76–80.
- Marcus Bingenheimer. "A Biographical Dictionary of the Japanese Student-monks of the Seventh and Early Eighth Centuries: Their Travels to China and Their Role in the Transmission of Buddhism," in *Buddhismus-studien* 仏教研究 4 (2001): 1–138.
- McRae, John R. "Daoxuan's Vision of Jetavana," in *Going Forth, Visions of Buddhist Vinaya*. ed. William M, 78-84. Bodiford. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2005.
- Mollier, Christine. *Buddhism and Taoism Face to Face: Scripture, Ritual, and Iconographic Exchange in Medieval China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008.

- Nakamura Hajime 中村 元. *Bukkyōgo daijiten* 佛教語大辭典. Tokyo: Tokyo Shoseki, 1981.
- Newhall, Thomas. “A Study of the Concept of Jieti ‘The Essence of the Precepts’ in Daoxuan’s (596–667) Vinaya Commentaries.” *Journal of Chinese Buddhist Studies* 27 (2014): 181–208.
- Pas, Julian F. “Six Daily Periods of Worship: Symbolic Meaning in Buddhist Liturgy and Eschatology.” In *Monumenta Seria*, Vol. 37 (1986–1987): 49–82.
- Phyllis Granoff and Koichi Shinohara. *Monks and Magicians: Religious Biographies in Asia*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsi Dass Publishers, 1994.
- Qiu Guangming 丘光明. *Zhongguo li dai du liang heng kao* 中國歷代度量衡考 (A Study on the Measurement System in the Different Chinese Dynasties). Beijing: Kexue chubanshe, 1992.
- Qiu Xigui 裴錫圭. *Chinese Writing* 文字學概要. Translated by Gilbert L. Mattos and Jerry Norman. New Haven, CT: Birdtrack Press, 2000.
- Nattier, Jan. *Once upon a Future Time : Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline*. Berkeley (Calif.): Asian humanities press, 1991.
- Nattier, Jan. *A Guide to the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations: Texts from the Eastern Han 東漢 and Three Kingdoms 三國 Periods*. Tokyo: Soka University, 2008.
- Raz, Gil. *The Emergence of Daoism*. New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Reinders, Eric. *Buddhist and Christian Responses to the Kowtow Problem in China*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015.
- Reischauer, Edwin O. *Ennin’s Travels in T’ang China*. New York: Ronald Press, 1955.
- James Robson. “Monastic Space and Sacred Traces: Facets of Chinese Buddhist Monastic Records,” in *Buddhist Monasticism in East Asia: Places of Practice*, edited by James A. Benn, Lori Meeks, and James Robson. London and New York: Routledge, (2010): 45–64.
- Saitō Tatuya 斎藤 達也. “Features of the Kongō-ji version of the Further Biographies of Eminent Monks 続高僧伝: With a Focus on the Biography of Xuanzang 玄奘 in the Fourth Fascicle.” *Journal of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies* Vol. 16 (2012): 68–104.
- Sasaki Michinobu 佐々木 理信. “Dabba-Mallaputta (陀驃摩羅子) と仏教教団生活營為.” 印度学仏教学研究 26, 2 (1978-03): 869–871.
- Sato Tatsugen 佐藤 達玄. “On the Sixty Researchers on the Hsing-hsia-ch’ao 行事鈔六十家攷 (1).” *Journal of the Faculty of Buddhism of the Komazawa University* 駒澤大學佛教學部研究紀要 35 (1977-03): 19–38.
- Sato Tatsugen 佐藤 達玄. “On the Sixty Researchers on the Hsing-hsia-ch’ao 行事鈔六十家攷 (2).” *Journal of the Faculty of Buddhism of the Komazawa University* 駒澤大學佛教學部研究紀要 36 (1978-03): 32–54.

- Sato Tatsugen 佐藤 達玄. “ *道宣 and the Mahayana Precepts.” *Journal of Buddhist Studies* 25, 10 (1994): 438–429.*
- Schopen, Gregory *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks: Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997.
- Shi Guodeng 穥果燈. *Tang Daoxuan Xu gaoseng zhuan pipan sixiang chutan* 唐道宣《續高僧傳》批判思想初探 (*A Preliminary Study Evaluating the Xu Gaoseng zhuan by Daoxuan of the Tang*) Taibei: Dongchu chubanshe, 1992.
- Silk, Jonathan Alan. *Body Language: Indic Śarīra and Chinese Shèlì Sheli in the Mahaparinirvana-sutra and Saddharma-pundarika*. Tokyo: Japan, 2006.
- Silk, Jonathan Alan. *Managing Monks: Administrators and Administrative Roles in Indian Buddhist Monasticism*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Sivin, Nathan. *Chinese Alchemy: Preliminary Studies*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Stephen Levine, *Becoming Kuan Yin: the Evolution of Compassion*. San Francisco, CA/Newburyport, MA: Weiser Books, 2013.
- Strong, John S. *Relics of the Buddha*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Sun Hailin 孙海琳 and Yang Zijian 杨自俭. “Guanyu yichang zhisi de kao bian 关于译场职司的考辨 (Querying the Sources of a Claim about Tang Dynasty Translation Workshops),” *Yishi zongheng* 译史纵横, 3 (2007): 35–38.
- Suwa Gijin 諏訪 義純. “『四分律含注戒本疏行宗記』にみる道宣の自叙と三種の道宣伝: 道宣伝の再検討 Tao-hsuan's (道宣) Commentary in Shi-bun-ritu-gan-chukai-hon-sho (四分律含注戒本疏) and His Three Kinds of Biographies.” *Bulletin of the Faculty of Humanities of Aichigakuin University*, 20 (1990): 375–369.
- Tan Zhihui. “*Daoxuan's Vision of Jetavana: Imaging a Utopian Monastery in Early Tang*.” PhD diss., University of Arizona, 2002.
- Tang Yongtong 汤用彤.“*Sui Tang fojiao shigao* 隋唐佛教史稿,” *Tang Yongtong quanji* 汤用彤全集. Shijiazhuang: Hebei renmin chubanshe, 2000. 7 vols.
- Teiser, S. F. “T'ang Buddhist Encyclopedias: An Introduction to Fa-Yüan Chu-Lin and Chu-Ching Yao-Chi,” *Tang Studies*, 3 (1985): 109–128.
- Thera, Nyanaponika and Hellmuth Hecker. *Great Disciples of the Buddha*. Boston, MA: Wisdom Publications, 2003.
- Togoda On 池田 溫. *Tangdai zhaoci mulu* 唐代詔敕目錄. Xi'an: Sanqing chubanshe, 1991.
- Tom De Rauw, “Beyond Buddhist Apology: the Political Use of Buddhism by Emperor Wu of the Liang Dynasty (r. 502–549).” PhD diss., University of Ghent, 2008.
- Tonami Mamoru 研波 护. 隋唐佛教文化 (*Buddhist Culture of Sui and Tang*). Translated by Han Sheng 韩昇. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2004.
- Twitchett, D.C. “Chinese Biographical Writing,” in *Historians of China and Japan*. W.G. Beasley, E. G. Pulleyblank (eds).95–114. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

- Vasubandhu. *Abhidharmakośa-Bhhāṣya* of Vasubandhu. Translated by into French Louis Be La Vallée Poussin, annotated English Translation by Gelong Lodrö Sangpo, Delhi: Motilal Banarsi Dass Publishers Private Limited, 2014. 4 Volumes.
- Xu Song 徐松 and Li Jianchao 李建超. *Zengding Tang liangjing chengfang kao* 增订唐两京城坊考. Xi'an: Sanqin chubanshe, 1996.
- Wagner, Robin Beth. *Buddhism, Biography and Power: A Study of Daoxuan's Continued Lives of Eminent Monks*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Wang Jianguang 王建光. *Zhongguo lüzong tongshi* 中國律宗通史. Nanjing: Fenghuang chubanshe, 2008.
- Wang Xiang 王翔. "Jiqie yu jiezang: Tang Ximingsi jingzangqun chutan 集篋與結藏: 唐西明寺經藏群初探 (Assembling Scriptures and Establishing Tripitake: Brief Observation on Scripture Repositories in Ximing Monastery of the Tang Dynasty)," *Shoujie Chang'an fojiao yantaohui lunweiji* 首屆長安佛教國際學術研討會論文集, 第三卷 (*Proceedings of the First International Conference on Chang'an Buddhism*), vol. 3 (2000): 432–444.
- Wang Xiang 王翔. "Beiyue yu xiejing: Tang Chang'an de fojiao tushuguan 貝葉與寫經: 唐長安的佛教圖書館," *Tang Yanjiu* 唐研究, vol. 15 (2009): 483–529.
- Wang Xiang 王翔. *Ximeng Monastery: History and Imagination in Medieval Chinese Buddhism*. Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing, 2015.
- Wang Yarong 王亞榮. 日嚴寺考--兼論隋代南方佛教義學的北傳. 《中華佛學學報》, 7 (1999): 191–203.
- Wang Yarong 王亞榮. *Daoxuan pingzhuan* 道宣評傳. Beijing: Zongjiao wenhua chubanshe, 2017.
- Wang Zhaoguo 王招國 (Dingyuan 定源). "南宋における俊芻の行歴." *Journal of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies* 国際仏教学大学院大学研究紀要第 17 号 vol. 17 (2013): 157–216.
- Welter, Albert. *The Administration of Buddhism in China*. New York: Cambria Press, 2018.
- Wendi L. Adamek. The Mystique of Transmission: On an Early Chan History and Its Contexts. New York: Columbia University Press (2007):188–189.
- Wilkinson, Endymion. *Chinese History: A New Manual*. Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Asia Center, 2012.
- Willemen, Charles, Bart Dessein and Collett Cox. *Sarvāstivāda Buddhist Scholasticism*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Wong, Dorothy C. *Buddhist Pilgrim-Monks as Agents of Cultural and Artistic Transmission: The International Buddhist Art Style in East Asia, ca. 645-770*. Singapore: NUS Press, 2018.
- Wright, Arthur F. "Fu I and the Rejection of Buddhism," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 12 (1951): 33–47.

- Wright, Arthur F. “Biography and Hagiography: Hui-chiao’s Lives of Eminent Monks,” in *Studies in Chinese Buddhism*, Robert M. Somer (ed.), 73–172. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Wu Fuxiu 吴福秀. “《法苑珠林》分类思想研究.” Ph.D. diss., Huazhong Normal Univeristy 华中师范大学, 2009.
- Yamada Yoshio 山田 孝雄, ed. *Konjaku monogatarishū* 今昔物語集. Tokyo: Iwanami, 1960.
- Yan Gengwang 嚴耕望, *Tangdai jiaotong tukao* 唐代交通圖考. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2007.
- Yin Guoyuan 陰國垣. *Qinyuan xian zhi* 沁源縣志. Taipei: Chengwen chubanshe, 1976.
- Young, Stuart. *Conceiving the Indian Buddhist Patriarchs in China*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2015.
- Yü, Chün-fang. *Kuan-yin: The Chinese Transformation of Avalokiteśvara*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.
- Zacchetti, Stefano. “Zhongjing mulu 眇經目錄 – The Catalog of All Canonical Scriptures”, in Claudia Wenzel and Sun Hua (eds.), *Zhongguo fojiao shijing* 中國佛教石經 – *Buddhist Stone Sutras in China – Sichuan Province, volume 3 Wofoyuan Section C*. (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag – Hangzhou: China Academy of Arts Press, 2016): 65–96.
- Zhang Guofeng 张国风. *Taiping guangji banben kaoshu* 太平廣記版本考述. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2004.
- Zhan Ru. “The Buddhist Canon of Ximing Monastery and Tang China,” *Studies in Chinese Religions*, 3:2 (2017): 187–193.
- Zhou Yiliang 周一良. *Tangdai mizong* 唐代密宗. Translated by Qian Wenzhong 錢文忠. Shanghai: Shanghai yuandong chubanshe, 2012.
- Zhu Shijia 朱士嘉. *Song – Yuan fangzhi zhuanji suoyin* 宋元方志傳記索引. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1986.
- Zürcher, Erik. *The Buddhist Conquest of China: The Spread and Adaptation of Buddhism in Early Medieval China*. 3d edn. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Zürcher, Erik. “Buddhism and Education in Tang Times,” in *Buddhism in China: Collected Papers of Erik Zürcher*, Jonathan A. Silk (ed.), 305-310. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

## A Note from the Author

The present book is a revision of my Ph.D dissertation, ‘The Life of Daoxuan: According to Others and in His Own Words’, submitted to Ghent University in 2018. In this edition, most of the changes made are to the third section of chapter four. I also added some details to the contents of other chapters. This book is devoted to the study of the life and work of the Tang Buddhist monk Daoxuan 釋道宣 (596–667).

Of course, the research was conducted in accordance with the rigorous academic standards of Ghent University, but the author is also inclined to view his effort as a personal spiritual quest. In this regard, he extends special thanks to his teacher Venerable Shi Jiequan 釋界詮 for countless inspirational and timely interventions in which he urged the author to ask: what does one want from one’s monkhood? The answer is simple and clear: one becomes a monk with the aim of putting one’s *samsāra* to a definite purpose and earns for oneself complete cessation of *duḥkha*.

As one of the first candidates to receive his *bhikṣu* ordination after the Cultural Revolution under the procedure introduced by Daoxuan, the author always thought he knew this answer in his heart. Nevertheless, at a certain point in his research, he started to forget his training; his academic discoveries brought such an immense sense of satisfaction that the fundamental quest of every monk quietly and gradually faded from his mind. Therefore, heartfelt gratitude is due to Venerable Shi Jiequan for his powerful tutelage, which helped the author to regain his concentration and continue his journey on the Buddhist Path. However, the author is well aware that everything is open to change, so he respectfully asks readers to spare a moment to say a simple prayer for him and encourage him to remain firmly on his chosen Buddhist Path, and, though challenged, resist the temptations of worldly success.

The author also wishes to thank Venerable Sik Kwang Sheng 釋廣聲, his teacher and the abbot of Kong Meng San Phor Kark See Monastery, Singapore, for his generous financial sponsorship, which has supported the author throughout his college life. Without this continuous support, the author would have had to spend a great deal of time requesting alms to fill his stomach before he could even entertain the thought of attending to his studies.

In terms of the study itself, the author thanks Prof. Dr. Ann Heirman, the supervisor of this research, who has been a great help throughout the project. He wishes to thank her specifically for her academic guidance and professional assistance, and considers the hours they have spent working together on the thesis a time of pure pleasure.

Many other helping hands have been extended in the course of this project and the author thanks all of those who have proffered them for their indispensable contributions to the completion of this study. First, he wishes to express his gratitude to the members of his Doctorate Examination Board for their assistance in the final crafting of the dissertation: Prof. Dr. Stef Slembrouck (Chair of the Board; Ghent University); Prof. Dr. Christoph Anderl (Ghent University); Prof. Dr. T. H. Barrett (SOAS, University of London); Prof. Dr. Ester Bianchi (University of Perugia); Prof. Dr. Martin Lehnert (Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich); Prof. Dr. Stefano Zacchetti (University of Oxford); Dr. Mathieu Torck (Ghent University); and Dr. Ben Van Overmeire (Ghent University).

Over the years, many people offered invaluable help, the author thanks them all. To mention but a few of them: his teacher Venerable Shi Shengkai 釋聖凱 (Tsinghua University), Venerable Shi Fazang 釋法藏, Venerable Shi Zongxing 釋宗性 (Buddhist Academy China), Venerable Shi Zhanru 釋湛如 (Peiking University), Prof. Dr. Kate Crosby (King's College, University of London), Dr. Sean Gaffney, Dr. Antonello Palumbo, Dr. Lucia Dolce (SOAS, University of London). Dr. Guangxing 廣興, Dr. Pu Chengzhong 蒲成中 (University of Hong Kong). Many people read sections of earlier versions of the manuscript, including fellow-Ph.D. students and friends Laurent Van Cutsem, Anna Sokolova, and friends Zhao Chanxi 趙禪溪, Zephyr Chan 陳巽華, Anne and her husband Peter, Dr. Wu Yan 吳衍 and her husband Dr. Li Xiao 李驥. The author thanks them all.

The author's five-year stay at Ghent University was made particularly wonderful and memorable due to the presence of a number of beautiful minds in the Department of Languages and Cultures. To mention but a few of them: Suzanne Burdorf, Li Linghong 李凌虹, Wang Jie 王潔, Mu Yezi 牟燁梓, Dr. Tine Walravens, Dr. Mieke Matthysen, Dr. Mick Deneckere, Inge Claerhout, Dr. Du Chun-Han, Dr. Tzu-Lung Chiu, and Marlies Holvoet. The author also wishes to thank Prof. Dr. Bart Dessein, Sabine Van

Cauwenberghe, Ann Wardenier, Peter De Smet, Nathalie Demeester, and Gitte Callaert for their kind help and professional assistance. Thanks also to Venerable Sakda Hemthep (Ghent University) and Yang Gang 楊剛 (Sichuan University) for their generosity in sharing a great number of crucial source materials with the author.

Prof. Dr. Uta Schaffers (University of Koblenz and Landau) and her husband Prof. Dr. Andreas Niehaus (Ghent University) have been very kind to the author ever since he first met them in Ghent. The author feels privileged to know this wonderful couple, considers them good friends and treasures in his heart all the joyful times they have spent together.

Outside of busy office hours, the author managed to befriend many other fine people, whose friendship means a lot to his work and life. To mention but a few of them: Shi Yuanliu 釋源流 (Buddhist Academy China), Shi Chuansheng 釋傳聖 (Buddhist College of Singapore), Shi Dangjie 釋當戒, Shi Shimin 釋世敏, Shi Ruhuan 釋如幻, Cui Zhuo 崔卓, Dr. Liu Limin 劉麗敏 and her family, Olivia Roth 吳麗雅 and her family, Dr. Wu Yan and her husband Dr. Li Xiao, Satsuki Harada and her family, Prof. Dr. Zhang Xiaorui 張曉瑞 and her husband Prof. Dr. Ishii Makoto 石井誠, Vanessa Lindberg and her husband Viacheslav Bakshaev, Seiko Okayama 岡山誠子, Shiho Yoshida 吉田志保, Kim Sinae 金溪娜, Lee Sunyoun and her family, Zhan Xiao 詹曉 and her family, Susan Roach and her husband Martin, Jennifer and her husband Stuart Patterson, Dr. Li Man 李漫 and his family, Yang Gang 楊剛 (Yunnan Minzu University), Reverend Mark Tips and the salesians at Don Bosco Ghent.

Furthermore, watching his immensely talented eleven-year-old friend Wang Yelin 王燁琳 playing the piano was a source of joy throughout the research. Many thanks to her family for their kindness, too.

The author wishes to thank Venerable Bhikkhu Bodhi for his encouragement and the personal example he sets as a monk who follows his chosen path. Heartfelt gratitude is also due to Shi Chongzhi 釋崇智. Without his friendship and support over the course of past decades, the author would have been unable to make many of the more significant steps in his life, let alone complete this study.

Finally, but importantly, the author wishes to thank his parents – his mother Li Yuqiong 李玉瓊 and his later father Zou Guangyuan 鄒光元 – for introducing him to this world and affording him the best they have to give.

The author is entirely responsible for any errors or flaws in this book. He respectfully quotes one of Daoxuan's many inspirational sayings to conclude this message:

The *vinaya* stipulations are meant to be conducive to the Path

Not to generate worldly gains

*wei dao zhi jie* 為道制戒

*ben fei shi fu* 本非世福

The author

Buddhist College of Singapore

88 Bright Hill Road

Singapore

14-03-2019



