E. Zürcher

THE BUDDHIST CONQUEST OF CHINA
THE BUDDHIST CONQUEST OF CHINA
THE BUDDHIST CONQUEST OF CHINA
THE SPREAD AND ADAPTATION OF BUDDHISM IN EARLY MEDIEVAL CHINA

BY

E. ZÜRCHER

NOTES — BIBLIOGRAPHY — INDEXES

LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1959
Copyright 1959 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands.
All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means without written permission from the publisher.

FEB 17 1960
TABLE OF CONTENTS

NOTES .................................................. 321
BIBLIOGRAPHY ........................................... 441
INDEX OF CHINESE NAMES AND TERMS .................. 448
INDEX OF NAMES AND TERMS OTHER THAN CHINESE .... 460
NOTES

CHAPTER ONP

1. The first Chinese who is known to have mastered Sanskrit is the late fourth century translator Chu Fo-nien (cf. p. 202); before that time, some Chinese monks and laymen like Nieh Tao-chen, Nieh Ch'eng-yüan (cf. p. 68) and Po Yüan (p. 76) appear to have acquired some linguistic training as assistants of foreign translators. On the other hand, some foreign missionaries were well-versed in Chinese (K'ang Seng-hui, Chih Ch'i'en, Dharmarakṣa, Kumārajiva). However, the most prominent Chinese masters and exegetes of this period (people like Chih Tun, Tao-an, Chu Fa-t'ai, Hui-yüan etc.) ignored Sanskrit altogether. Cf. R. H. van Gulik, Siddham, an Essay on the History of Sanskrit Studies in China and Japan, Nagpur 1956, esp. p. 12-14.


3. For the terms hsüan-hsüeh and "Neo-Taoism" cf. below, p. 87 and p. 289.


5. Wang I-t'ung 王伊園, Wu-ch'ao men-ti 毛朝門庭 ("The social, political and economic aspects of the influential clans of the Southern Dynasties"), 2 vols., published by the Institute of Chinese Cultural Studies of the University of Nanking (大 來中 国 文 化研究 所), Ch'engtu 1943.


7. On this work see below, p. 10, sub (1).

8. KSC VI 358.1.6.

9. ib. VI 364.2.27.

10. ib. VI 365.1.9.

11. ib. VII 367.2.1.

12. ib. VI 362.3.15.

13. ib. I 327.3.8.


15. ib. IV 351.1.6.


18. E.g., Fa-hsien 法顯 (KSC III 337.2.21), Tao-sui 道遂 (ib. IV 350.2.13), Tao-an 道安 (ib. V 351.3.4), Fa-k'uang 法勳 (ib. V 356.3.7), Tao-heng 道恆 (ib. VI 364.2.26), Seng-ch'ē 神顗 (ib. VII 370.3.3).

19. ib. I 327.1.13 and 327.2.29.

20. ib. IV 347.3.12.

21. ib. IV 350.3.12.

22. ib. V. 356.2.25.

23. ib. VI 363.1.29.

24. ib. IV 347.1.18.

25. ib. IV 348.2-8.
28 ib. V 351.3.3.
27 ib. VI 357.3.20.
29 For the other important aspect of the saṅgha, that of “political neutrality”, which is characteristic of at least one famous Buddhist centre in the late fourth century, cf. below, p. 216.
31 The basic source for the Buddhist theory concerning the origin of the castes is Agāññasutta, Digha XXVII. 21 sqq. = Dialogues III. 77 sqq. For the parable of the ocean and the rivers see e.g., Tseng-i a-han (T 125) XXI 658.3.10. Cf. also the fourth of the five dreams of the Buddha on the night before his Enlightenment, in which he saw that four birds of different colours, symbolizing the members of the four castes, came from the four quarters and, falling at the Buddha’s feet, became white; Anguttara III. 240 = Gradual Sayings III p. 176; Mvst. II. 136, trsl. J. J. Jones vol. II p. 131.
33 ib. V 364.2.7.
34 ib. VI 363.2.3.
35 ib. VI 363.2.22.
36 ib. 362.2.12.
37 ib. VI 361.1.23; T’ang Yung-t’ung, History, p. 359-360.
CHAPTER ONE

50 Ssu-pu cheng-wei ch. III, ed. by Ku Chieh-kang in 古籍考辨叢刊, p. 46.
51 In ch. IV of his Chou-kao shu-lin 舊唐書林.
52 In his 耆子理學編鑑, in YCHP XX, 1936, p. 1-23.
54 In his 漢魏兩晉南北朝佛教史 (hereafter referred to as History), p. 76-77.
55 In "Le songe et l'ambassade de l'empereur Ming; étude critique des sources", BEFEO X, 1901, p. 95-130.
57 In his 道教の基礎的研究 (Tōkyō 1952), p. 332-436.
58 This may refer to his stay on Mt. Lu in 402 AD, when he took part in the collective “vow” before Amitābha, cf. KSC VI 358.3.19 and below, p. 218.
60 The text of the Pai-hei lun is not included in HMC or KHMC, but it is found in Sung-shu 97.6b sqq.; translated by W. Liebenthal in Mon. Nipp. VIII, 1952, p. 365-373.
62 In Mon. Nipp. VIII, 1952, p. 343, note 4 to his translation of this text.
63 CS 82.6b.
64 According to CS 82.7b, his youngest son Fang 朽 was seven or eight years old when Yü Liang was military governor of Ching-chou, i.e., 334-338 AD; consequently Fang had been born before 332.
65 CS 82.7a.
66 CS 92.19a.
67 CS 10.6a.
68 CS 85.7a-b.
69 As is done by T’ang Yung-t’ung, History, p. 352. There is another important source, frequently mentioned in our notes but not included in the list in this chapter because of its northern origin: the series of five (or four) treatises by Seng-choa 營堅 composed at Ch’angan between 404 and 414, viz.:

Wu pu-ch’ien lun 物不還論 (“On the immutability of things”, ca. 410), Pu-chen k’ung lun 不真空論 (“On the emptiness of the unreal”, ca. 410); Po-jo wu chih lun 假名無知論 (“On prajñā not having (conscious) knowledge”, ca. 405), “Answer to Liu I-min ” 答劉應民 (preceded by the text of the letter in question, written 408 AD by Liu Ch’eng-chih 劉程之, one of Hui-yüan’s lay disciples on Lu-shan), Nieh-p’an wu ming lun 涅槃無名論 (“On the namelessness of Nirvāṇa”; of doubtful authenticity, but in any case first half 5th cent.; cf. T’ang Yung-t’ung, History, p. 670 and Shih Chūn 石峻, “Tu Hui-ta Chao-lun-shu shu so chien” 論慧達論疏述所見, Pei-p’ing t’u-shu-ku-an t’u-shu chi-k’an, new series V. 1, 1944, who both deny its authenticity; W. Liebenthal, The Book of Chao p. 167-168 who regards it as an original work with later interpolations; survey of various opinions and arguments in favour of its authenticity by Ōchō Enichi 楢巌慧日 in Jōron Kenkyū 論証研究, Kyōto 1955, p. 190 sqq.). All authorities reject the introductory chapter entitled Tsung-pen-i 宗不儀 as spurious. The treatises were put together some time during the first half of the 6th century under the name of Chao-lun 論 (T 1858). Excellent Japanese translation by Tsukamoto Zenryū 塩々至隆 (who dates the author 374-414) and his collaborators in Jōron Kenkyū p. 1-109; a very free and sometimes misleading translation has been given by W. Liebenthal in The Book of Chao (Mon. Ser. Monograph XIII, Peking 1948).
CHAPTER TWO


2 *Li-tai SPC* I, T 2034 23.3; Fa-lin 懶琳, *P’o hsieh lun* 破邪論 in *KHMC* XI 166.1.4 = *Fa-yüan chu-lin* XII, T 2122 p. 379.1.6. All these sources refer to the catalogues of Tao-an and Chu Shih-hsing 朱士行. There is no trace of Shih-li-fang in Tao-an’s work (cf. below, note 65) as far as it has been incorporated in the CSTCC. The so-called Han catalogue of Chu Shih-hsing 朱士行漢籍, regularly quoted in *Li-tai SPC*, is a late and highly unreliable product, perhaps made to replace a lost original of the third century. It is never mentioned in catalogues earlier than the *Li-tai SPC*, and since the compiler of the latter work himself declares that he did not see it, it probably never existed as an independent work. Cf. Hayashiya Tomojiro 福崎文郎, *Kyōoku kenkyū 經籍研究*, Tōkyō 1941 p. 241-281; Tokiwa Daijō 宇盤大俊, (Gokan yori Sō Sei ni itaru) yakkyō sōroku (根據從宋齊之至的略記), Tōkyō 1938, p. 77-86. On Shih Li-fang see also T’ang Yung-t’ung, *History* p. 7-8.

3 *Li-tai SPC* XV T 2034 127.6 in the list of “lost catalogues”; cf. *Ta T’ang NTL* X (T 2149) 336.2.12; *K’ai-yüan SCL* X (T 2154) 572.3.5; *Chen-yüan SCML* (T 2156) 897.1.5; Bagchi, *Canon*, introd. xxxii-xxxiii; Hayashiya, *op. cit.*, p. 222 sqq. The work in question is never quoted or referred to, and has probably never existed even as a forgery.

4 See HS 6.15a, H.H. Dubs, *HFHD* II. 63.

5 Ed. *Erh-yu t’ang ts’ung-shu* 二酉聿雲 § p. 5b (fragments collected by Chang Shu 陳時, 1821).


7 In *BEFEO* X, 1910, p. 629-636, esp. p. 631 sqq.

8 Quoted in Chu’hsüeh chi 初學記 VII. 12a.

9 *KSC* I 325.1.19.

10 *Ming fo lun* 明佛論, *HMC* II 12.3.8.


12 *KHMC* II 101.1.19: 蕭家西域道俗兼大夏遺、云有昔天竺國有浮屠之 教.

the Golden Man”, *TP* 34, 1938, p. 174-178, and Tsukamoto Zenryū’s remarks in *Yünkang* vol. XVI, supplement p. 27.

14 Quoted in Yen Shih-ku’s commentary to *HS* 55.7b; 蘭学徒佛徒闻金人说. *Shih-shuo hsin-yü* comm. Ib/16b quoting *Han-wu ku-shih* 漢武故事; *Wei-shu* 114.1a, Ware, op.cit. p. 107-109, cf. *Fa-yüan chu-lin* XII, T 2122 p. 378.3; condensed version in *KHMC* II 101.1.16.

15 *SHY* comm. IB/16a.

16 In the review mentioned in note 7, p. 635.

18 *Yen-shih chia-hsiün* XVII (section ☞); p. 37 (ed. *Chu-tzu chi-ch'eng*). In any case the passage in question was already used by Buddhists at the beginning of the fifth century for propagandistic purposes, cf. Tsung Ping, *Ming fo lun* in *HMC* II 12.3.8; 劉向列仙記第七十四人在漢經. In *Fa-yüan chu-lin* XII (T 2122) p. 379.1 and C, p. 1028.3 we find a more detailed explanation based upon a passage from the *Wen-shu-shih-li pan-nieh-p'an* 華之紀紀, in which the Bodhisattva Mājūśrī 450 years after the Buddha’s Nirvāṇa preached the doctrine to 500 tirthikas (here rendered by 仙人 “Immortals”!) in the Himālayas 市山. Tao-shih 塔生, the compiler of the *Fa-yüan chu-lin*, then identifies these “Snow mountains” with the Ts’ung-ling 紫陵 (the Pamir plateau) and concludes that the “immortals” mentioned here were inhabitants of Central Asian countries East of the Ts’ung-ling, whose fame had spread to the East in Former Han times when China had established relations with these countries.


21 Maspero, op.cit., p. 129-130.

22 *CSTCC* VI 42.3.15 sqq.

23 The *Han fa-pen nei-chuan* is mentioned for the first time in the description of a debate between Buddhists and Taoists at Loyang, held under imperial auspices in 520 AD (*HS* KSC XXIII 624.3.26 = *KHMC* I 100.3.10, cf. also below, p. 273) and seems to be a product of the North. Cf. H. Maspero in *BEEEEO* X, 1910, p. 225-227 and ib. p. 118-120; P. Pelliot in *TP* XIX, 1920, p. 388-389. The work consisted of five chüan; a summary of its contents is given in *HS* chi ku-chin fo-tao lun-heng 傳著於公論論衡 T 2105, p. 397.2-401.3, and in *KHMC* I 98.3.11 sqq.; also quoted in *Fa-yüan chu-lin* XVIII 416.3, XL 600.2 and LV 700.2. At the end of his summary the compiler of the *KHMC* remarks that some critics regard the *Han fa-pen nei-chuan* as a recent product without any historical base, and he defends its authenticity by pointing to the *Wu-shu* 孫書 which also contains the story of the Buddha-Taoist contest in 69 AD. Nothing could be less surprising, for the so-called *Wu-shu* (also quoted in T 2105 and in *KHMC* I) is another, still later, Buddhist forgery concocted from passages from *KSC* and *Han-fa-pen nei-chuan* (cf. below, note 150).

24 *KSC* I 324.2.27.

25 *CSTCC* VII 49.1.23 and XIII 97.2.14.

26 *KSC* I 326.3.3.

27 *CSTCC* XIII 98.2.11.

28 *CSTCC* XIII 96.1.20.

29 ib. 96.2.1; *KSC* I 325.1.13.

30 Colonies of foreigners, named after their place of origin, existed already on Chinese territory in Former Han times. Thus the chapter on geography of the *Han-shu* mentions a Yüeh-chih tao 美弋, one of the twenty-one prefectures (hsien) of An-ting 安廷 commandery, in present-day Kansu (*HS* 28 B.5a), and a Ch’iu-tzu 羦州 hsien in Shang 陜 commandery (Shensi) (ib. 6a). According to all commentators, these were settlements of Yüeh-chih and Kuchean immigrants (although these Yüeh-chih may have belonged to the “Small Yüeh-chih” of Western Kansu
rather than to the "Great Yüeh-chih" who after their trek around the middle of the second century BC had settled in Bactria. See also P. A. Boodberg, "Two notes on the History of the Chinese Frontier", *HJAS* I (1936), pp. 283-307, esp. p. 286-291 for Ch’iu-tzu hsien in Kansu and an "Aqsu" in Shensi, and H. H. Dubs, *A Roman city in Ancient China* (The China Society, London 1957) for a possible "Alexandria" (アクサ) in central Kansu (cf. *Han-shu pu-chu*, large edition, 28 Bl.16a). It is no doubt due to the presence of such early Western immigrants that some faint but unmistakable traces of Buddhist influence are to be found in early Han literature and art. Chavannes (*Cinq cents contes et apologies* vol. I, p. xiv-xv) has already called the attention to the occurrence of Buddhist themes in *Huai-nan tzu*; another remarkable example in the field of art is the representation of two six-tusked elephants on a bas-relief from T’eng-hsien 鶴麟 (S. Shantung) which probably dates from the middle of the first century (cf. Lao Kan 老幹, "Six-tusked elephants on a Han bas-relief", *HJAS* XVII, 1954, p. 366-369; picture of the relief *ib.* and in *Corpus des pierres sculptées Han*, Peking 1950, vol. I, pl. 113). Of course the influence may have been very indirect, and the occurrence of such themes does not imply any knowledge about their Buddhist provenance and original significance.

31 *CSTCC* XIII 97.3.8; cf. *KSC* I 325.1.27.


34 T'ang Yung-t'ung, *History* p. 51.

35 *HHS* 77.11b sqq. Translation of Pan Yung's biography by Chavannes in *TP* VII, 1906, p. 245-255; cf. also Chavannes in *TP* VIII, 1907, p. 218.

36 *HHS* 77 (biogr. of Pan Ch'ao), p. 9b.

37 *Tung-kuan Han-chi* 汉書疏記 quoted in comm. to *HHS* 77.9b.

38 *HHS* 118.18a: 河西都尉兼賓使浮圖不殺代, 而詩文有法事道之功者所傳述; again quoted or paraphrased by Fan Yeh *ib.* p. 10a: 作浮圖不殺代.

39 The whole section on the Western Region of Fan Yeh's *Hou-Han shu* (ch. 118) was indeed mainly based upon a report written by Pan Yung in 125 AD, cf. *ib.* p. 4b; Chavannes in *TP* VIII, 1907, p. 145.

40 About routes in Han times see Sun Yü-t'ang 孫叔敖, "Han-tai ti chiao-t'ung" 漢代的交通 in *Chung-kuo she-hui ching-chi shih chi-k'an* 中國社會經濟史集刊 VII.1, 1944; Lao Kan 老幹, "Lun Han-tai chih lu-yün yü shui-yün" 論漢代之陸運與水運 in *CYYY XV*, 1947, p. 69-91; Utsunomiya Kiyoyoshi 宇津宮清吉, *Kandai shakai-keizai-shi kenkyū* 漢代社會經濟史研究, Tōkyō 1955, esp. ch. III (西漢時代の都市).

41 Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, *op.cit.*, p. 7-10.

42 As Maspero has pointed out (*J.As.* 1934, p. 90 note 1), it is better to take the term Huang-lao 黄老, when it occurs in Han texts, as referring to Huang-lao (chün) 黃老君, the main deity of the early Taoist pantheon who was especially venerated by the Yellow Turbans, and not as denoting two persons, the Yellow Emperor and Lao-tzu, which seems to be a later scholarly interpretation of the term.

43 *HHS* 72.4b.

44 T'ang Yung-t'ung, *History*, p. 54.

we find how in the edict of 446 ordering the extermination of Buddhism under the course of a campaign against “heterodox cults” in general. In the same way Buddha by gods and

reads

occupy the verbal position. The p’an, singing of hymns. The ceremony is held in commemoration of the washing of the occasion a statue of the Buddha—preferably one showing his Nan-hai chi-kuei chuan of which we find are apparently thought as “hanging” Indian custom of which I-ching gives a detailed account in the fourth chapter of

This is the first mention made in Chinese sources of the annual festival of “bathing the Buddha” ( fou-hsi, fou-hsi) held on the traditional date of the Buddha’s birthday, i.e. on the eighth day of the fourth month of the lunar calendar. On this occasion a statue of the Buddha—preferably one showing Siddhārtha as a babe taking his first steps and uttering the famous stanzas of his first “lion’s roar”—is washed with water perfumed with the “five kinds of incense” ( 五香 ) under the singing of hymns. The ceremony is held in commemoration of the washing of the Buddha by gods and nāgas immediately after his birth (cf. e.g. the late second or early third century Hsiao-hsing pen-ch’i ching ch. I, Kyōto ed. XIV. 3 p. 226 B 1). The liturgy is described in several canonical works which still figure in the Chinese tripitaka: T 695 Kuan-hsi fo-hsing-hsiang ching (1 ch., ascribed to Fa-chü 法缺, ca. 300 AD), T 696 Mo-ho-ch’a-t’ou ching 莫訶動頭經 (1 ch., trsl. by Sheng-chien 師前, ca. 400 AD), and especially the two versions of the Yü hsiaoj (or fo) kung-te ching, fou-hsi (or fou) 般若经 and T 697 and 698, translated in the early eighth century by Ratnacinta ( 輔教慈 ) and by L-ching respectively. It is puzzling that our text seems to imply that this (annual) ceremony was held more than one time by Chai Jung ( 伽葉 義) whenever there was... always...”), whereas according to his biography he cannot have been living in that region longer than one year. This may simply be due to the historian’s lack of accuracy, or to his desire to stress Chai Jung’s prodigality. On the other hand, it may be that at the end of the second century the ceremony of “bathing the Buddha” had not yet become an annual religious festival only to be held on the eighth day of the fourth month. In T 698 it is described as a part of the daily cult, and this agrees with the Indian custom of which L-ching gives a detailed account in the fourth chapter of his Nan-hai chi-kuei chuan IV, T 2125 p. 123.3.1; trsl. Takakusu p. 147.
For the Chinese sources see note 48; the earliest source (mentioned by Li Hsien-lieh (651-684) in his HHS commentary loc.cit.) is the Hsien-ti ch’un-ch’iu 晁文公紀, compiled by Yuan Yeh 溫肇 in the early third century. Cf. Pelliot in \textit{BEFEO} VI, 1906, p. 394-395; Ōtani Seishin on p. 85-91 of the article mentioned in note 50; T’ang Yung-t’ung, \textit{History} p. 71-73; Fukui Kōjun, \textit{op.cit.} p. 93-99; Maspero in J.\textit{As.} 1934, p. 92.


\textit{Cheng wu lun} 聊問 (first half fourth century), \textit{HMC} I 8.3.13. The Buddhist author of the \textit{Cheng wu lun} hastens to declare that Chai Jung violated the four most basic Buddhist commandments (not killing, not lying, not stealing and not drinking wine) and therefore was a wretched sinner. A Buddhist treatise by Hui-jui 惠諦 which probably was written about 428 AD, the \textit{Yu i lun} 欲意論 (trsl. by W. Liebenthal: “A Clarification (Yü-i Lun)”, \textit{Sino-Indian Studies} V. 2, 1956, p. 88-99) seems to allude to Chai Jung’s Buddhism where it says (CSTCC V 41.2.10): “At the end of the Han and the beginning of the Wei, the chancellor of Kuang-ling and the chancellor of P’eng-ch’eng joined the Order, and were both able to maintain the great light (of the Doctrine)”. The chancellor of Kuang-ling must refer to Chai Jung, although, strictly speaking, at that moment this function was filled by another magistrate, Chao Yü 高烈 (cf. Fukui, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 98-99, who thinks that this person is actually meant here). The chancellor of P’eng-ch’eng in 194 AD was Hsieh Li 戴熙 who indeed appears to have entertained relations with Chai Jung; about his alleged Buddhist sympathies nothing whatsoever is known (cf. T’ang Yung-t’ung, \textit{History} p. 73).

H. Maspero, “Les origines de la communauté bouddhiste de Loyang”, \textit{J.\textit{As.}} 1934, p. 87-107; cf. \textit{Mélanges posthumes} vol. II p. 188-189. Maspero’s theory is based on the single fact that in a colophon of 208 AD (CSTCC VII 48.3.9: 時平三塹碑記, for the date see Maspero, \textit{ib.} p. 95 note 2) we find the name of a Hsu-ch’ang monastery 訃謝幢 at Loyang, the name of which is identical with that of the grandson of a maternal uncle of Liu Ying, viz. the marquis Hsü Ch’ang 許昌, who in 58 AD became head of the Hsü family. According to Maspero, the Hsü-ch’ang ssu originally was Hsü Ch’ang’s mansion at the capital, which after Liu Ying’s fall and the abolition of the kingdom of Ch’u he had given to the former clients of his uncle, some śramaṇas from P’eng-ch’eng who together with him had moved to Loyang, and to which in commemoration of this gesture had been given the name of its donor. Maspero’s construction is ingenuous and convincing: we may safely assume that the identity of the name of the Buddhist monastery with that of the nephew of the first known Chinese Buddhist devotee is not a matter of coincidence. T’ang Yung-t’ung, \textit{op.cit.} p. 68, who seems to be unacquainted with Maspero’s article, still envisages the possibility that Hsü-ch’ang here refers to the city of that name in central Honan, but all early sources agree in saying that the name of this place was changed from Hsü(-hsien) 讳疆 into Hsü-ch’ang only in 221 AD, and there is no reason to assume that the colophon in question was antedated. But Maspero goes certainly too far when he derives the rise of Buddhism at Loyang \textit{in toto} from the establishment of a single and no doubt very insignificant monastery or chapel (the name of which is never mentioned elsewhere) by a nobleman and some monks from the East of China, thus neglecting the two most important factors: the geographical situation and the existence of foreigners at the capital. Maspero is certainly wrong when he uses the close resemblance between the “Bouddhisme taoïsant” of P’eng-ch’eng and that of the later Church of Loyang as an additional proof for his theory (“... je ne peux croire que ce soit par hasard que cette confusion bizarre se montra à un siècle de distance dans deux endroits, ... un mélange aussi étrange, et reposant sur une série d’erreurs et d’incompréhensions monstrueuses”, \textit{ib.} p. 106). It would indeed be very surprising if this “Bouddhisme taoïsant” would show marked regional differences. The formation of early Chinese Buddhism was an almost nation-wide
process, the ideas and beliefs of the cultured part of the population were rather homogeneous, and everywhere, at P'eng-ch'eng, at Loyang, (but, as we shall see, also at Tunhuang and in the extreme South of the empire) the same ingredients combined to form the same characteristic mixture.

58 慈孝, also called Chan Huo 慈孝, and commonly known as Liu-hsia Hui 徽下惠, a “magistrate” from the state of Lu 孫, seventh and sixth century BC, famous for his high moral standards and virtuous conduct; cf. Lun-yü XV. 13 and XVIII. 2 and 8; Mencius II. B 9.2.


HHS 89.1a.


The resemblance between the “Sūtra in Forty-two Sections” and the *Hsiao-ching* was noticed already by the anonymous author of the *Li-tai SPC* (T 2034 ch. IV p. 49.3); Liang Ch'i-ch'ao (*loc.cit.*) draws a parallel between it and the Tao te ching. We could also think of the Lun-yü to which this “sūtra” with its short independent paragraphs (mostly introduced by “The Buddha said . . .”) shows a certain similarity from a stylistic point of view. The work has none of the characteristics of a sūtra, but, as Tang Yung-t'ung has pointed out (*op.cit.* p. 31), the earliest sources (the “Preface” in CSTCC VI 42.3.2.2, third century?, and the Chiu-lu 被騐, mid. fourth century) merely refer to it as “the forty-two sections of (= extracted from?) Buddhist sūtras” 十三経四十二章 and as “the forty-two sections of emperor Hsiao-ming” 楚元星四十二章.


63 The most extensive study on Tao-an's catalogue is Kyōroku-kenkyū 孝行研究 by Hayashiya Tomojirō 濱田友次郎 (Tōkyō 1941, 1343 pp.) in which the author traces the earliest development of Buddhist bibliography in China, giving a reconstruction of Tao-an's catalogue and discussing the form and contents of this work in great detail. Tao-an completed his *Tsung-li chung-ching mu-lu* in 374 (cf. Pelliot in *TP* XII, 1911, p. 675), but there are several indications which show that he added some information after that date (Hayashiya, p. 351-362). There probably were two versions of the catalogue, the final version in one chapter and a kind of preliminary copy in two chüan, generally referred to as (An-kung) chiu-lu 経目bounds ; both versions were still in existence at the beginning of the sixth century (*ib.*, p. 363-381). However, Tokiwa Daijō (Yakkyō sōroku p. 90) regards this “old catalogue of Tao-an” as another name for the same work. The *Tsung-li chung-ching mu-lu* comprised about six hundred titles, beginning with the translations ascribed to Lokakṣema and An Shih-kao, and ending with the translators of the late third century. No titles of scriptures translated after ca. 300 are listed. Tao-an does not appear to have made a distinction between “archaic” and more “modern” translations; the first
known attempt to make such a classification was made by Seng-yu (CSTCC I 4.3-5.2).


67 The following are the earliest documents containing information about translators and translations of Later Han times:

1) CSTCC X 69.3.19 沙蜜十毘婆沙句序 by 葛洪 (var. 体) 谕, second half second century; the earliest known mention of An Shih-kao and his activities as a preacher and as a translator at Loyang.

2) ib. VII 47.3.4 進行 經論記 (anon.); colophon dated November 24, 179 AD, copied in “second year cheng-kuang” 正光二年, probably a mistake for 正光二年 = 255 AD, cf. T’ang Yung-t’ung p. 67. Describes the circumstances of the translation of the Astasahasrikā prajñāpāramitā by Chu Shuo-fo and Lokakṣema and their Chinese assistants; contains the names of Chinese donors.

3) ib. VII 48.3.9 有昧三昧經序, colophon of 208 AD (cf. Maspero in J.As. 1934, p. 95 note 2) reproducing the original colophon which describes the translation of this scripture by Lokakṣema and Chu Shuo-fo, also dated November 24, 179 AD (光和二年 十月八日, cf. no. 2), which is somewhat puzzling. It may be that the translation of both sūtras was carried on during the same period, so that the completion of both texts was celebrated on the same day. In both colophons we find indeed the names of the same assistants (孟福 & 張蓮). Furthermore An Shih-kao, An Hsuan and Yen Fou-t’iao (here written 杨造).

4) ib. VII 50.1.6 偏句序 (first half third century, cf. below, p. 47 sqq.), probably written by Chih Ch’ien 支謙. Mentions two Han translators unknown elsewhere (蓝混 and 聿氏), furthermore An Shih-kao, An Hsuan and Yen Fou-t’iao (here written 杨造).

5) ib. VI 42.3.29 有味序 by K’ang 柯 頒 (mid. third century), esp. p. 43.2.17 sqq.: eulogy on An Shih-kao.

6) ib. VI 46.2.20 進行 經論記 by K’ang 柯, esp. p. 46.3.3 sqq.: a description of the activities of An Hsuan and Yen Fou-t’iao.

7) T 1694 有昧序 (t), preface (p. 9) to this commentary by a certain... Mi (ca. below, p. 54), second half third century: eulogy on An Shih-kao.

8) CSTCC VII 49.1.17 有昧 慕論記 by Chih Min-tu 支謙度 (ca. 300 AD); an account of the translation of this sūtra by Lokakṣema and its transmission by Chih Liang.

T 602, An-pan shou-i ching 安般守息經.

A very early exegetical work of this type, ascribed to An Shih-kao or An Hsuan, has been preserved: T 1508, A-han k’ou-chieh (shih-erh yin-yüan ching) 阿含口解 [十二因縫经]. For this little work and its curious doctrine of the twelve “inner” and the twelve “outer” nīdanas see Bussho kaisetsu daijiten, vol. I p. 4 (article by Akanuma Chizen). For the recital and oral explanation of scriptures and the earliest Buddhist commentaries based upon such explanations see T’ang Yung-t’ung, History p. 114-119.

70 The donors Sun Ho 孙荷 and Chou T’i-li 周提立 are mentioned in the anonymous 經行 經論記, CSTCC VII 47.3.7.

71 Colophons in CSTCC VII 51.2.12 (May 14, 289 AD) and ib. 50.2.8 (December 30 of the same year). But already in 266 there was another Pai-ma ssu, at Ch’angan (colophon in CSTCC VII 48.2.23：於安吉門內向馬門中----), and it seems that around the same date still another monastery of that name had been founded at Ch’ing-ch’eng 京城 (S.W. of Chung-hsiang 興祥 in central Hupei) by a third century An Shih-kao (KSC I 324.1.18 quoting the fourth century Ching-chou chi 聞州記 by Yu Chung-yung 庾仲雍) whose biography seems to have become mixed up with that of his illustrious namesake of the second century (cf. Ōtani Seishin, p. 78-80 of the article mentioned in note 50). In view of the localisation of the “ancient” Pai-ma ssu (outside the Yung gate 國門, West of the city wall) it may be important to note that under the Wei (probably in 255 AD, cf. above, note 67 sub 2) we hear of a “Pu-sa ssu” 菩薩寺 at Loyang, West of the city wall (CSTCC VII 47.3.7).

72 CSTCC VII 48.3.14.
CHAPTER TWO

331

73 Cf. Pelliot in TP XIX, 1920, p. 344-346 (n. 64).
74 Bagchi, Canon p. 8 note 1.
75 CSTCC VI 43.2.17 (K'ang Seng-hui's 安般守室程序); 有著者者安清字世商
76 CSTCC X 69.3.25 (Yen Fou-t'iao's 沙弥十善句面): 有著者者自安
息字世商... So also in T 1694.2 and CSTCC VII 50.1.6.
77 T 1694, ib.: 安般守室者普普見著者其王位之事。 安般守室... So also
K'ang Seng-hui in CSTCC VI 43.1.1: 安息主佛后之子、 讓國典籍、 聽聞佛法。
78 This could be inferred from K'ang Seng-hui's words (ib.): 聽聞佛法。
80 An attempt is made by Léon Wieger in Histoire des croyances religieuses...,
1922, p. 351.
82 T 13, 14, 31, 36, 48, 57, 98, 105, 109, 112, 150a, 150b, 397, 602, 603, 605, 607, 792, 1557. One of the scriptures which Tao-an hesitatingly ascribes to An Shih-kao has also been preserved (T 32). It must be remarked that according to K'ai-yüan SCL XIII 616.2.26 the two versions of the An-pan shou-i ching listed by Tao-an and Seng-yu actually belonged to the same text, one consisting of the first chapter of the other one (cf. 何塞有其, "An Seikô no yakkyô ni tsuite" 安世高之譯経取訳, Toyo gakukô Zôhô, 1924, p. 546-583).
83 T 14 Jen pen yü sheng ching 人本欲生經 (Mahānidānasūtra); T 602 Ta an-pan shou-i ching 大安般守室經 (? Anāpānasmitisūtra); T 603 Yin-ch'ih-ju ching 隱持入經 (? Skandhā-dhātv-āyatana-sūtra); T 607 Tao-ti ching 道地经 (Yogācārabhūmi).
85 First occurrence: CSTCC VII 50.1.5 (注句程序, early third century): 安般世高, 郎師。 註句, 抄写 Eu ... and CSTCC VI 46.3.3 (K'ang Seng-hui's 注解程序, mid. third century): 郎師安般 ... Biographical note about An Hsüan in CSTCC XIII 96.1.8 sqq., KSC I 324.2.25 sqq. It is not clear why Liang Ch'i-ch'ao (op.cit., vol. I, p. 9, note 2) questions the historicity of An Hsüan whom he regards as identical with An Shih-kao.
86 First mentioned as a translator in CSTCC VII 50.1.6 (注句程序, early third cent.); biographical notes in CSTCC XIII 96.1.16; KSC I 324.3.4; see furthermore Maspero in BEFEO X, 1910, p. 228-229; Pelliot in TP XIX, 1920, p. 344-345 note 64. The custom of adopting the ethnikon of one's master by way of a "religious surname" (see below, p. 189 and p. 281) did not yet exist; even as a monk Yen Fou-t'iao is known under his normal surname. But his ming (or tzu?) Fou-t'iao = Buddhadeva is obviously a Buddhist appellation, which he may have assumed at his ordination.
87 CSTCC VI 46.2.19.
88 The title of Yen Fou-t'iao's work is not clear. The "ten (kinds or stages of) understanding" (hui) probably refer to what in the An-pan shou-i ching is called the ten hsia+ 自, viz., the six acts which constitute the anāpānasmiti (散文 gananā, anugama, shrāna, upalaksana, vivartanā, pariṣuddhi), and the Four Truths the realisation of which results from these practices. The word hsia which occurs in archaic Buddhist terminology is indeed given in the early first century dialect-vocabulary Fang-yen 1.1a as an equivalent of hui (自: *g'at > yat; 自: *g'owad > yīwei), current in the region "East of the Passes" and in Chao 迫 and Wei 迫, i.e., in Shansi and Northern Honan. But the sha-mi (sa.mār > sa.mijie = śrāmanera, probably via Kuchean samāne or sammīr, or via Khotanese ssamānā) in the title is puzzling, and I wonder whether this "commented exposition of the novice's ten (points of) understanding" (about which the author's preface says nothing specific) was not simply an enumeration of the "Ten Rules for the Novice" (自彌 + 背) with explanatory notes.
Cf. CSTCC VI 46.3.3 (K'ang Seng-hui's 'Taoist Procedure'); and this refers to both An Hsüan and Yen Fou-t'iao.

Nan-chi 納禮; first occurrence as applied to An Shih-kao, An Hsüan and Yen Fou-t'iao in CSTCC VII 50.1.6 ('Taoist Procedure', early third century). Cf. CSTCC VIII 52.3.12 (Tao-an's Preface to the 'Record of the Procedure') where Lokakṣema and An Shih-kao are qualified as nan-chi 賴敬 (sic!).

T'ang Yung-t'ung (History p. 69-70) quotes the lateral text (偈文) of the San-kung stela 三公碑, of 181 AD as follows: 王子軍王 張 萬 魯 子河 何 凡士.

The colophon to the Pan-chou san-mei ching (208 AD, CSTCC VII 48.3.12) mentions a 河南濟陽孟穆子元士 who also figures in the contemporary colophon to the Tao-hsing ching (ib. 47.3.5), and T'ang Yung-t'ung consequently proposes to restore the second phrase quoted above to 虔士河南孟元士. Most collections of ancient inscriptions contain the main text of the San-kung stela, but a reproduction or transcription of the lateral text is seldom given. According to the Shih-k'o t'i-pa so-yin 宋刻通解索隱 compiled by Yang Tien-hsün 楊殷信 (Shanghai 1941), p. 584, the lateral text is to be found in the first chapter of the Ch'ang-shan chen shih chih 嵐山真石志 by Shen T'ao 沈濤 (1842), which I have not been able to consult; it is, however, reproduced together with some of the comments of the Ch'ang-shan in the Pa-ch'iüng-shih Chin-shih pu-cheng 八瓊室集石補正 by Lu Tseng-hsiang 劉增祥, 5.26a and 32b.

The second text quoted by T'ang Yung-t'ung is the reverse (偈文) of the Pai-shih shen-chün stela 神中石記 by Weng Fang-kang 傅方綱, ch. 11.16a. Here we find "the librationer Kuo Chih, (tzu) Tzu-pi 縱披 which in all probability was the same person as the "Tzu-pi from Nan-hai" 覃詩符 mentioned in the colophon on the Tao-hsing ching (CSTCC VII 47.3.7). On the Taoist title chi-chiu ("liberation") cf. below, ch. VI note 34, but the early date of the inscription makes it very improbable that this title here refers to a high dignitary of the Yellow Turban hierarchy. In Han times the honorary title of chi-chiu was given to members of the local gentry, mostly "learned" (i.e., cultured) individuals, who were used by the local government for consultation; they held no official post, and the title mainly served "to honour excellent people". See Yen Keng-wang 阮景望, Han-t'ai ti-fang hsing-cheng chih-tu 漢代地方行政制度, CYYY XXV (1954) p. 135-236, esp. p. 154 and 177.

CSTCC II 6.2.10; anonymous colophon ib. VII 47.3.4 sqq. (cf. note 67 sub 2); preface by Tao-an to his commentary on the Tao-hsing ching, ib. VII 47.1.12. According to Tao-an, the translation was based on a manuscript which Chu Shuo-fo had brought to Loyang (ib. 47.2.16; 車謫夫師; the use of chi 翅 seems to imply that it was a material manuscript and not a memorized text). The title Tao-hsing, "the Practice of the Way", is a free translation of the original name of the first chapter (Sarvākarajñātacaryā). The earliest catalogues mention another Han time version of the Āstasāhasrika (or of part of it) in one chūan, ascribed to Chu Shuo-fo or to Lokakṣema, a fact which among students of Buddhist bibliography has given rise to the wildest speculations (cf. e.g., Sakaino Kōyō 萊中原, paraprased by Matsumoto Tokumyo, Die Prajñāpāramitā-literatur, 1932, p. 18-19).

CSTCC II 6.2.12; anonymous colophon ib. VII 48.3.9 sqq. (cf. note 67 sub 3).

First mentioned in the preface to a synoptic edition of four versions of this sūtra by Chih Min-tu (cf. note 67 sub 8), ca. 300 AD. CSTCC II 6.11 and VII 49.1.14 indicate January 16, 186 (四月二十二日) as the date of completion. The work had already been lost at the beginning of the sixth century.

The textual history of the first Chinese versions of this scripture is very complicated; the various Japanese scholars who have studied this subject have reached widely divergent conclusions. Hayashiya Tomojirō (Kyōoku-kenkyū, p. 544-578) discusses the opinions of former specialists (notably Sakaino Kōyō and Mochizuki Shinkō) and after a careful comparison of the two versions comes to the conclusion...
that the version in three chüan (T 418) is the original translation by Lokakṣema, the one in one chüan (T 417) being an abstract made from the earlier more extensive text. Beside these there is still another short and archaic version of this sūtra (T 419, 視障悉遮経) which probably also dates from Han times. The Pan-chou san-meì ching, which is mainly devoted to the cult of Amitābha and the means to effect the mental concentration during which the Buddhas are made to appear before one's eyes (現在信仰在日上三昧 pratyutpanna-buddha-sammukhāvasthita-samādhi), was to play a very important role in the late fourth and early fifth century among the adepts of the buddhānusmṛti in Hui-yüan's Buddhist community on the Lu-shan; cf. Demiéville, BEFEO XLIV, 1954, p. 353 note 4, and below, p. 220 sqq.

96 CSTCC III 18.1.1. Seng-yu (ib. II 6.2.13) mentions it as a work of Lokakṣema but adds the remark "now lost". Before Tao-an's time the translation was already ascribed to Lokakṣema by Chih Min-tu (ib. 49.1.22). As to the authenticity of the present text (T 624) the opinions vary. Sakaino Kōyō (Shina-bukkyōshi kōwa 仏教史講話, Tōkyō 1927, vol. I p. 44-45) rejects the attribution to Lokakṣema; Hayashiya (Kyōroku kenkyū p. 625-627) argues in favour of it.

97 KSC 324.3.7.

98 Chih Min-tu in CSTCC VII 49.1.24; ib. XIII 97.2.23 = KSC 325.1.19. Cf. Tao-an's praising remark about him reported in KSC, loc.cit.

99 KSC I 324.3.10. The Indian original of the Chung pen-ch'i ching had been brought from Kapilavastu by T'an-kuo (this transcription Chiawei-lo-wei, AC ka.jwi.là.jiìwài, is no doubt based on a Prākrit form; cf. Pelliot in J.As. 1914, p. 383, who suggests *kavilawai). On the problem of the earliest Chinese Buddha biography cf. Pelliot, TP 1920 p. 263-264, but his hypothesis about a very early, now lost life of the Buddha in Chinese is created pour besoin de la cause, e.q., to support the authenticity of the (in our view spurious) Mou-tzu as a late second century work. The present Chung pen-ch'i ching shows some traces of later redaction in the inserted translations of Indian proper names (e.g., p. 149.1.15 城 this transcription 城), p. 156.1.9: 飛天這言善男; p. 157.1.15 深時這言善言 (read 善言). These could be merely later additions, but it must be noted that in the last two cases the text itself goes on using the Chinese equivalents 善男 and 善言 after their first occurrence in the glosses. The Hsü-hsing pen-ch'i ching is not mentioned by Seng-yu either on his own authority or on that of Tao-an, but this is very probably a mistake, since all later catalogues refer to Tao-an's bibliography for this sūtra.

100 CSTCC VI 43.2.27 (K'ang Seng-hui's preface to the An-pan shou-i ching).

101 HHS 7.13b-14a; Hou-Han chhi 22.12a; Tung-kuan Han-chi 3.8b.

102 See below, ch. VI, note 31.

103 HHS 7.15a, in the historiographer's "judgment" on emperor Huan: 设薰薰以穏浮圖老子, and ib. 118.10a (Hsi-yü chuan) 僧統集好神数祀浮圖老子.

104 On this Taoist technical expression which in archaic Buddhist translations is sometimes used to render samādhi, cf. Maspero, Essai sur le Taoïsme, Mél. posth., vol. II, p. 141 sqq. and p. 196; T'ang Yung-t'ung, History p. 110-111.


106 Cf. Pelliot in TP XIX, 1920, p. 407, note 366. T'ang Yung-t'ung (History p. 57-61 and 104-114, and his "Tu T'ai-p'ing ching shu so chien" 太平經書所見 in Kuo-hsüeh chi-kan V, 1935), has found in this Taoist scripture a great number of passages which testify of Buddhist influence. However, Taoist scriptures in general form a very unstable and unreliable material for this kind of research. As appears from Fukui Kōjūn's very detailed study on the different versions of the T'ai-p'ing ching (Dōkyō no kisokuteki kenkyū, p. 214-255), the T'ai-p'ing ching, like so many Taoist works, was subjected century after century to alteration and interpolation till the eventual fixation of the texts of the various versions by their inclusion in the Taoist canon. We have no guarantee that the passages mentioned by T'ang Yung-t'ung figured in the original text of the second century AD.
J. As. it has for inexplicable reasons been inserted between section 21 and 22 (T 210 p. 205-207, and partially by S. Beal in Dhammapada (London 1878), esp. p. 70-73; cf. also Mochizuki Shinkō in Bukkyō daijiten, p. 1711.1).

CSTCC VII 48.3.9.

T 32 [from T 48.3.3.]

HS 19A.8a mentions among the officials of the Hung-lu ssu an i-kuan ling and an i-kuan ch'eng in this connection it is significant to note that the traditional explanation of the strange name of this office, is “transmitting the sounds”, hung being explained as sheng and lu as ch'uan (cf. gloss by Ying Shao (mid. second century) in Yen Shih-ku's comm. to Hs 96A (Hsi-yü chuan) p. 4a, 6b, 7a, 7b, 8a, 8b, 16b, 20b; 96B p. 8b, 9a, 9b, 14a, 14b, 15a, 15b, 16a, 16b, 17a. I have been unable to find any information about the official status of such interpreters in Han times. In HS 96 they only occur in countries under the jurisdiction of the Chinese governor-general in Central Asia.

KSC I 325.1.20.

CSTCC XIII 96.2.4 = KSC I 325.1.17.

CSTCC XIII 96.1.25; KSC I 326.2.24. The reading Lü-yen is found for the first time in KSC. Chiang-yen must be correct; it is confirmed by the contemporary preface to the Dharmapada (CSTCC VII 50.1.10 and 50.1.25) and by Tao-an’s catalogue (reproduced ib. II 6.3.12).

KSC I 326.2.14.

Cf. J. As. 1912, p. 203-204, esp. p. 207-123.

CSTCC VII 49.3.20 sqq.; the preface has been translated by S. Lévi, op.cit. p. 205-207, and partially by S. Beal in Dhammapada (London 1878), p. 29. In T 210 it has for inexplicable reasons been inserted between section 21 and 22 (T 210 p. 566.2), but here the preface shows traces of a fourth or early fifth century redaction, reading 諢略 Version (p. 566.3.2) where the CSTCC version has 謳略. About the identity of the “master Ko” mentioned here nothing is known. Another unknown name figures in the following phrase from this preface: “But formerly Lan-t'iao An Shih-kao the marquis, the commander (An Hsüan) and (Yen) Fu-t'iao in translating the Hu language into Han (= Chinese) all had mastered the (right) method...” (ib. 50.1.6). T'ang Yung-t'ung (p. 65) regards the words lan-t'iao as a corruption of the text, but there is no reason to do so. The two characters are both regularly used in Buddhist transcriptions, and it is quite likely that they stand for the name of an early translator who, like the “master Ko” mentioned above, does not figure in any other source.

Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, op.cit. p. 130-131.

Cf. Lun-yü VI.16: 子曰，質勝文則野，文勝質則史，文質彬彬，然後君子 For an analogous dictum about the right method of translating Buddhist texts see CSTCC VII 49.2.28.

Tao te ching ch. 81: 道言不逸，逸言不道。

I-ching, Hsi-tz'u part I (chu-shu ed. 7.30b): 人不言，言不盡意，然則聖人之言不可見乎
CSTCC VII 50-1-12, trsl. S. Lévi J. As. 1912 p. 206-207. S. Lévi translates "Le Bouddha a déclaré que si on s'appuie sur le sens, il n'est pas besoin d'ornements; si on prend sa loi, ce n'est pas pour la parure". I do not know whether such a saying has ever been attributed to the Buddha. The traditional meaning of fo-yen as well as the force of ch'i make it preferable to translate as I have done: "As to the buddhavacana . . . .

Biography in CSTCC XIII 97.2.13, much shorter in KSC I 325.1.18 (in the biography of K'ang Seng-hui); earliest biographical information in Chih Min-tu's (see bibliographical chapters in CSTCC VII 49.1.22. The two personal names Ch'ien and Yüeh Styx form a little problem. Earliest nomenclature: Chih Min-tu in CSTCC 49.1.22: 蕅技玉明; id. in VIII 58.2.21: 侍玉技玉明; Tao-an ib. VI 45.2.20: 廓士河南玉明; Tao-an ib. VIII 52.3.13: 侍玉; as author's name in the title of a preface ib. VII 51.3.17: 侍玉明; letter to the monks by Sun Liang (of doubtful authenticity) CSTCC XIII 97.3.17: 侍玉明. "Chih Ch'ien" figures in Seng-yu's bibliographical chapters (ib. II 7.1.25 and V 37.3.3) and in his biography in XIII 97.2.13: 蕅玉技玉明,一名越. In accordance with current usage we have here still used the name Chih Ch'ien, although the earlier sources without exception refer to him as Chih Yüeh or Chih Kung-ming.

CSTCC XIII 97.2.22 = KSC I 325.1.22.

Chih Min-tu in CSTCC VII 49.1.24; CSTCC XIII and KSC I loc.cit.

CSTCC VI 46.2.8.

ib. XIII 97.3.5. According to a late tradition, the reigning family of Wu was already interested in Buddhism before the capital was moved to Chienyeh: the Fo-tsuo t'ung-chi XXXV (compiled 1258-1269; T 2035 p. 331.3.9) reports that in 229 Sun Ch'üan's principal consort née P'an 淑夫人 founded the Hui-pao monastery 當度寺 at Wu-ch'ang, but our sources for the period are silent on this point.

KSC I 325.1.27.

San-kuo chih, Wu-chih 14.593A. It is not impossible that he had come into contact with Chih Ch'ien before 242, when he was already active at the capital as a shang-shu (SKC, Wu-chih 20.633b).

Wu-chih 20.633B and 14.595A.

CSTCC XIII 97.3.17; not in KSC.

CSTCC 97.3.14; not in KSC. Cf. Pelliot in TP XIX, 1920, p. 393, note 302.

Yu Fa-lan's dates are not known. According to his biography (KSC IV 349.3.22 sqq.) he came from Kao-yang (加州) in Northern Hopei where he soon became famous. Like the Chu Fa-lan mentioned in Chih Ch'ien's biography, he lived in the mountains as a hermit. "Later" he went to the South and settled in the mountains of Shan-hsien (山縣) in Western Chekiang; this most probably happened in the second decade of the fourth century when so many prominent monks fled from the North. The people of his time used to compare him to Yu Yuan-kuei 張元跟, i.e., Yu Liang 武亮 (289-340) who must have been one of his contemporaries. He and his pupil Yu Tao-sui 于道邃 died at Hsiang-lin in Indo-China during an unsuccessful attempt to reach India via the southern route. Since Yu Tao-sui at the age of fifteen became his disciple in the North, before Yu Fa-lan had moved to Shan-hsien, (cf. his biography in KSC IV 350.2.13 sqq.), and died together with his master at Hsiang-lin at the age of thirty, it follows that less than fifteen years separate Yu Fa-lan's crossing the Yangtze (310/320) from his death, so that we may conclude that Yu Fa-lan's activities in the South fell in the period 310/320-325/335. Cf. also the late fifth century Ming-hsiang chi quoted in Fa-yüan chu-lin (T 2122) XXVIII 492.1 and LIV 694.3, according to which Yu Fa-lan was still active in the North (Chung-shan, cf. below, note 204) at a "clandestine" vihāra in the period 280-290 AD, but the story seems to be apocryphal.

Chih Ch'ien's period of activity as a translator is indicated by Chih Min-tu (ca. 300 AD, CSTCC VII 49.1.29) as "from the huang-ch'u era (220-226) to the
chien-hsing 庶典 era (252-253)'; Seng-yu (ib. XII 97.3.10) specifies "from the first year huang-ch'u (220) onward". In the earliest sources the number of translations is variously given as 27 (Seng-yu ib.) and 49 (KSC I 325.2.2). Chih Min-tu seems to have had access to an ancient list of Chih Ch’ien’s translations (cf. CSTCC VII 49.2.1 where he says 自有別傳記録未出此位), but he vaguely speaks about “several tens of works” 数十卷, or, according to the Korean edition, “several tens of scrolls” 数十卷.

137 T 54, 68, 76, 87, 169, 185, 198, 225, 281, 362, 474, 493, 532, 533, 556, 557, 559, 581, 632, 708, 735, 790, 1011. One of these (T 68) is not mentioned by Tao-an.

138 Judgment on Chih Ch’ien’s way of translating: Chih Min-tu in his 合首釋義, CSTCC VII 49.1.26: 以時爾南文時則簡略, 故使此經略文麗然, 属彼素言而不足約而成訶; Tao-an in his 教習經抄序, ib. VII 52.3.13: 巧則巧矣, 遲則遜也, 慣雖未而混於終文; Seng-chao 僧肇 in his 無教經抄序, ib. VIII 58.2.9: 依文 [訓之製] 所出, 理源於文, 惜主家音於異人。Most severe is Hui-jui in his 舊穆程序 (403 AD, CSTCC VIII 58.1.4): “In the earlier translation (of this scripture), Kung-ming (Chih Ch’ien) has much embellished the wordings of the text, thereby muddling its meaning, so that the Grand Model was preverted by a faulty text, and its excellent flavour was diluted by frivolous adornment” 晉明前澤顧彼繁滋, 迷其旨, 是故今乘於譯文, 未亦津塗學.

139 Chih Min-tu in CSTCC VII 49.2.1; cf. T’ang Tung-t’ung p. 134.

140 (Tà) ming-tu (wu-chi) ching 大明度 (無極校), CSTCC II 7.1.8. On the glosses to its first chapter see p. 54. The use of tu 度 (for 度 “to cross”) as a translation of pāramitā (“mastery, supremacy, perfection”, derived from parama) is based on a false etymology which derives the word from pāram (“the other shore”, “the opposite side”) and itā (“gone”, fem.), cf. Chavannes, Cinq cents contes et apollogues vol. I, p. 2. Tu-wu-chi 度無極 is actually a double translation. But the interpretation of pāramitā as “gone to the other shore” is certainly of Indian origin, cf. Abh. Kosa IV p. 231 and Lamotte, Traité p. 701; it has also given rise to the Tibetan standard equivalent of pāramitā, pha rol tu phyin pa. A still more fantastic etymology, no doubt based on the half-understood explanations of his Indian informants, is given by Tao-an in the last phrase of his 南經據羅及羅覓經抄序, CSTCC VIII 52.3.25: 摩訶大也, 鈍兩可智性, 理道也, 無極無極 Mahā, i.e., “great”, prajñā i.e., wisdom, pāra i.e. “to go beyond”, mitā “without limit”. It seems that here the term was analyzed into pāra + amita, “the further shore” and “immeasurable”, neglecting the fusion of the two short a which would furnish *pāramitā.

141 If Chih Ch’ien ever made such a version this does not prove that the “Sūtra in 42 sections” is based on an Indian original; he may simply have made a polished redaction of the existing Chinese text. But the tradition which ascribes such a version to Chih Ch’ien is highly suspect, cf. Pelliot, TP XIX, 1920, p. 393.

142 CSTCC XIII 97.3.12 = KSC I 325.2.3.

143 CSTCC XII 97.2.2.

144 Cf. HHS 118.8b (s.v. Ta-Ch’in) and 10a (s.v. T’ien-chu); Liang-shu 54 (introduction to the section on the “Southern barbarians”) 1a.


146 Chavannes, ib. and in BEFEO III, 1903, p. 430, note.


being generally designated by the term *man*. We can hardly go as far as Fukui
who, on account of a certain similarity with Buddhist ceremonies described by
Fa-hsien and other pilgrims, recognizes in this passage the description of a Buddhist
procession. For Chang Chin cf. *SKC comm.* to *Wu-chih* 1.482B.

149 Cf. K'ang Seng-hui's preface to the *An-pan shou-i ching* in *CSTCC VI*, esp. p. 43.2.24, and his preface to the *Fa-ching ching*, *ib.*, esp. p. 46.3.9. It is not impossible that K'ang Seng-hui had been living or roaming
around in China for some time before he came to Chienyeh. According to T'ang
Yung-t'ung (History, p. 136), his preface to the *An-pan shou-i ching* was written
before 229, i.e., at least fifty-one years before his death in 280. Since K'ang Seng-hui,
as T'ang himself observes (*ib.*) must have been in the middle years of his life when he
wrote this preface, he should in that case have been at least some ninety years old
when he died. This is by no means impossible, but the fact—apt to be recorded in
Chinese biographical literature—is nowhere mentioned. However, T'ang Yung-
t'ung's argument, viz. that K'ang Seng-hui when speaking about the activities of
An Shih-kao calls Loyang "the capital", whereas after 229 (the year in which
Sun Ch'üan declared himself emperor of the state of Wu) "the capital" was no
longer Loyang but Chienyeh, is not valid. In connection with the same events Loyang
is in retrospect called "the capital" in an anonymous preface to a commentary to the
*Yin-ch'i-hu ju ching* (T 1694, cf. below, p. 54) which dates from the
middle of the third century and which is certainly of southern provenance. Even
more clear is the case of the anonymous *Cheng wu lun* (cf. above, p. 15) where
the term *ching-lo* "the capital Loyang" is used, although internal evidence
proves that the polemic treatise in question was written in southern China at some
date after 324, at least seven years after the transfer of the Chinese capital to
Chien-k'ang, and at least thirteen years after Loyang had fallen into the hands of the Hsiung-
u invaders.

150 *CSTCC XIII* 96.2.1; somewhat more extensive in *KSC I* 325.1.13, translated by Ed. Chavannes, "Seng-houei", *TP X*, 1909. p. 199-212. Even more legendary is
the account of K'ang Seng-hui's missionary activities at the Wu court given in the
late Buddhist forgery entitled *Wu-shu*, which probably dates from the second
half of the sixth century, after the loss of the original *Wu-shu* (compiled by Wei Yao
and others in the third quarter of the third century); cf. Maspero in *BEFEO X*, 1910, p. 108-109. The (Buddhist) *Wu-shu* is extensively quoted in the *Hsii chi
ku-chin fo-tao lun-henga*, T 2100 p. 402.1.9 sqq. (trsl. by Maspero in *BEFEO X*, 1910, p. 109-110) and in *Fa-yuan chu-lin* LV 700.3; extract in *KHMC I* 99.3.13 sqq. It is not improbable that the *Wu-shu* was chosen as the base for this
Buddhist forgery precisely because of Wei Yao's alleged connection with Chih Chien
(cf. above, p. 49). The important role played in the pseudo-*Wu-shu* by Sun Ch'üan's
director of the palace writers K'an Tse (died 243, *Wu-chih* 8.543b) who there
is made to extol the excellence of the Buddhist doctrine is perhaps connected with
another late (13th cent.) tradition according to which this magistrate had founded
the Te-jun monastery at Mt. Ssu-ming (Chekiang) in 242 (*Fo-tsu t'ung-chi* LIII, T 2035 p. 463.2.25); a tradition which may have originated from the
fact that the name of this monastery, Te-jun, was also the *tsu* of K'an Tse.

151 For this shrine cf. Lu Pi, *San-kuo chih chu-chien* (Peking, 1957) 64.28b.


153 *Wu-chih* 14.593b: 修黄老之術，養養神光

154 *Wu-chih* 2.497a-b.

155 *CSTCC XIII* 97.1.11 = *KSC I* 326.1.18.


157 For the first time mentioned in his biography in *KSC I* 326.1.21; translated by Chavannes, *op.cit.* p. 347-428.
158 CSTCC II 7.1.28; in his biography ib. XIII 97.1.14 called Tao-p’ìn 造品, and Hsiao-p’ìn 小信 in KSC I 326.1.20.
159 K’ang Seng-hui’s commentary to this scripture is mentioned by Seng-yu in his biography (CSTCC XIII 97.1.13) together with several other works, of which only the Liu-tu chi-ching and the Wu-p’ìn are mentioned in his biographical chapters (ib. II 7.1).
160 Of these introductory sections, Chavannes (Cinq cents contes . . . , vol. I) has only translated no. 1 (dāna, p. 2-3), no. 2 (śīla, p. 97) and no. 4 (vīrya, p. 213-214): Section 3 (ksānti) and 5 (dhyāna) have not been translated (v.f. ib. p. 154, note 1 and p. 267, note 1). The section on dhyāna, which should be studied together with K’ang Seng-hui’s preface to the An-pan shou-i ching in CSTCC VI, is one of the most important documents of third century Chinese Buddhism.

NOTES

Quotations from the Ta ming-tu ching in T 1694: p. 10.2.13; 13.2.22; 21.2.19; quotation from the Vimalakirti-nirdeśa p. 15.1.18.

It is not improbable, as T’ang Yung-t’ung suggests (History p. 134), that these glosses were added by Chih Ch’ien himself. Chih Ch’ien was also active as a commentator: a commentary by him on the Liao-pen sheng-ssu ching 造品 逊 经 is mentioned by Tao-an and by Seng-yu in CSTCC VI 45.2.21 and XIII 97.3.13 = KSC I 325.2.4.


None of these translators is mentioned by Tao-an or by Seng-yu; with the exception of An Fa-hsien who does not occur in sources earlier than the Li-tai SPC (597 AD), they all figure for the first time in KSC I 324.3.15 sqq. Since all later bibliographies refer to the (lost) Wei-shih lu 造起録 (compiled by Shih Tao-liu 造起祖, and completed by Chu Tao-tsu 造起祖 around 419 AD, cf. Pelliot in TP XXII, 1923, p. 102) we may assume that this was the source on which the account of the KSC was based. Seng-yu nowhere quotes or refers to the four catalogues (Wei-shih lu 造起録, Wu-shih lu 作起録, Chin-shih (tsa-)lu 作世録 and Ho-hsi lu 造世録) of Tao-liu and Tao-tsu, and seems to have been ignorant of their existence.


The Karmavācāna (the Skt. equivalent of Pāli Kammavācā, cf. Mahāvyutpatti 866.3.6), the formulary of “acts” (karman) in question-and-answer form, to be recited in the upasampad(ā) ceremony, is the basic text for the ordination of monks. For the versions in various languages see H. W. Bailey, “The Tumshuq Karmavācāna”, BSOAS XIII, 1949/1950, p. 549 sqq. The transcription T’an-wu-te 進無德 (AC. *d’ām.mju.tak) for dhammaguptaka probably represents a Prākrit form *dhamma-uttaka, cf. Bagchi, Canon p. 79. The works translated by K’ang Seng-k’ai and T’an-ti mark the beginning of the introduction into China of the canonical scriptures of the Dhammagupta sect, a branch of the Mahiśāsaka, founded by Dharmagupta, but traditionally even traced back to the Buddha’s disciple Maudgalyāyana. In later times the greater part of their canon was translated into Chinese: certainly their whole vinaya (T 1428 Ssu-fen liu 三藏録—the division in four parts is characteristic of this vinaya—tsrl. early fifth century by Dharmayaśas), whereas the Chinese Dirghāgama (T 1 長阿含, tsrl. Dharmayaśas) and the Abhidharma treatise called the Sāriputrābhīdharmasāstra (T 1548, tsrl. Dharmayaśas and Dharmagupta) probably also belong to this school. Cf. A. Bareaux, Les sectes Bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule, 1955, p. 190 sqq.

Mentioned in the Fa-lun mu-lu 法論目録 by Lu Ch’ıeng 陸澄 (ca. 465 AD),


172 KHM C V 118.3.21 sqq.; critical edition by Ting Yen in Ts'ao-ch'iüan-p'ing 傳載纂評 (1865), reprint Peking, 1957, p. 155-159.

173 Wei-shu 114.3a; Ware, "Wei Shou on Buddhism", TP XXX, 1933, p. 121-122; trsl. Léon Hurvitz p. 46.


175 Comm. to Wei-chih 13.176a quoting the Wei-lüeh; Sung-shu 14.17b sqq.

176 CS 3.9a and 24.8b-9a.

177 CS 3.5b, 6b, 12b, 13a, 13b, 14b.


179 See document N. xv. 93 a.b., fragment of an official letter found at the Niya site, text and translation by Chavannes in Stein, op.cit., Appendix A, p. 537. Chavannes' interpretation (acc. to which the titles enumerated in this document belonged to one person, viz. Lung-hui 蘭會, king of Qaraşahr) is not correct; since Wang Kuo-wei (Liu-sha chui-chien, pu-i k'ao-shih p. 2b-3b) has joined to this fragment another one which contains the opening words of this official letter, it appears to be either a proclamation jointly issued by "The kings of Shan-shan, Qaraşahr, Kuchâ, Kashgar and Khotan, who are provisionally appointed by the Chin as Palace attendants and Grand Commandants, (invested as) Grand Marquises Who Uphold-the-Chin (dynasty), allied to the Chin") and these rulers. Another interesting fact, not mentioned by the Chinese annals, but referred to in some fragments of official correspondence found by Stein in Central Asia, is that in 268 AD the Chinese government held a military expedition against Kao-ch'ang (Turfan), cf. Maspero, Les documents chinois de la troisième expédition de Sir Aurel Stein en Asie centrale, London 1953, p. 60.

180 For text and translation of documents of the Western Chin period found at Niya and Lou-lan found by Aurel Stein and Sven Hedin see Chavannes in Ancient Khotan (cf. note 149) p. 537-545; Chavannes, Documents chinois découverts par Aurel Stein, Oxford, 1913, p. 155-200; A. Conrady, Die Chinesischen Handschriften- und Funde Sven Hedins in Lou-lan, Stockholm 1920; Maspero, op.cit., (cf. note 150) p. 52-78; Wang Kuo-wei 莊國維 and Lo Chen-yü 羅振玉 in Liu-sha chui-chien 輯, second revised edition (shortly before 1935; no date).

181 CS 26 (Shih-huo chih) p. 4b; L. S. Yang, "Notes on the Economic History of the Chin dynasty", HJAS IX, 1945-47, p. 154-155. The reforms in question are attributed to the energetic prefect of Tunhuang, Huang-fu Lung 黄符龍 (appointed ca. 251).

182 In the fourth century several Chinese versions of the Prajñāpāramitā in 8,000 and in 25,000 lines had already been made, and the bewildering variety of what was rightly regarded as more or less expanded versions of one and the same basic scripture was enhanced by the vague rumors about the existence of still other versions in India. The Chinese (clerical) literati, inveterate bibliographers, tried to elucidate the filiation of these texts by means of various theories. The earliest explanation was that the Aṣṭasāhasrikā p'p' was an abstract made from the Pañcavinśatisāhasrikā. Chih Tun 楚俊 (314-366): "I have heard all previous scholars transmit (the theory) that, after
the Buddha’s decease, the small version (次之, in 8,000 lines) was made as a summary of the large version (大之, in 25,000 lines)” (大之, 25,000 p’p’, CSTCC VIII 55.2.16). In the same way, Tao-an: “After the Buddha’s Nirvāṇa, an eminent scholar abroad (外國高士) summarized the ninety sections (of the 25,000 p’p’) into the Tao-hsing p’in 道行 (= 8,000 p’p’)” (道行經序, CSTCC VII 47.2.15). I do not know of any Indian counterpart of this theory. On the other hand, it is only natural that the Chinese, at a time when the making of such “abstracts” of Buddhist scriptures was much en vogue, came to conclude—contrary to the opinion of modern scholarship—that the smaller version was a secondary product based upon the more comprehensive one. However, Chih Tun also mentions another explanation (ib. 56.1.23): “But formerly I have heard (the following theory). The large as well as the small version are both derived from the basic version (大之). The text of the basic version comprises 600,000 words; at present it circulates in India and has not yet reached China. Now these two abstracts (the 8,000 and 25,000 p’p’) also come from the large text; the way of derivation is not the same, but the small version is the earlier product (of the two). Although these two scriptures both derive from the basic version, yet from time to time there are differences, as the small version contains passages which are lacking in the large one, and vice versa . . . ”. There can be little doubt as to the identity of this “basic text” mentioned by Chih Tun: he must somehow have heard of the existence of the most exuberant product of Mahayāna literature, the Prajñāpāramitā in 100,000 lines. The number of 600,000 words (tzu 章) is certainly a mistake; elsewhere this number is given to denote the extent of the Indian text of the 25,000 p’p’ (cf. above, p. 63). The (perhaps much later) tradition that the largest Prajñāpāramitā was found by Nāgārjuna in the realm of Nāgas (Tāranātha’s Ṛgva-gar choś-ḥyun paraphrased by M. Walleser, “The life of Nāgārjuna from Tibetan and Chinese sources”, As. Maj., Hirth Anniversary volume p. 1-37, esp. p. 10, cf. also Et. Lamotte, Traité p. 941) was probably not yet known in China at that date; it is for the first time mentioned in the “biography” of Nāgārjuna 龍樹菩薩傳 (T 2047 p. 184.3) wrongly ascribed to Kumārajīva. Chi-tsang 吉藏 (549-623) in his Ta-p’in ching yu 大品經論 (T 1696 p. 67.3.29) identifies the largest version of the p’p’ with the original text of the Kuang-tsan ching 光卷經 (T 222, trsl. by Dharmarakṣa), but this is certainly wrong. The Kuang-tsan is nothing but an incomplete version of the 25,000 p’p’ (which, moreover, in Chih Tun’s time was still unknown, cf. p. 70), and Chi-tsang’s theory is probably based on an equally incomprehensible passage in Ta chih-tu lun 67 (T 1509 p. 529.2.23): “(in the p’p’ scriptures) there are some with many and some with few chapters, there are the higher (the larger, 上), the middle and the lower (the smaller, 下) version, (viz.) the Kuang-tsan, the Fangkuang and the Tao-hsing” 春秀有少有上, 中下, 訳, 極, 道行 . If the Ta chih-tu lun is really based on an Indian original, the translator may here simply have substituted the names of three well-known Chinese p’p’ versions, but the last words may as well be an interpolated gloss by Kumārajīva. In any case it is important to note that in Chih Tun’s words we have an allusion to the existence of the Satasāhasrikā p’p’ in the first half of the fourth century, more than three centuries before its translation by Hsüan-tsang in 660-663.

183 According to Chu Shih-hsing’s biography in CSTCC, KSC and all later sources, he went to Khotan in 260 AD. However, our earliest document (CSTCC VII 47.3.11, an anonymous colophon to the Fang-kuang ching) mentions 260 as the year of his ordination. In that case his journey to Khotan took place some time after 260. This may be correct; it would explain why Chu Shih-hsing sent his copy of the 25,000 p’p’ as late as 282, twenty-two years after his departure.

184 Pañcaviṃśatisākāra Prajñāpāramitā, hereafter abbreviated as 25,000 p’p’.

185 According to the Tibetan tradition, which in some essential points agrees with the account of Hsüan-tsang, Buddhism was introduced into Khotan by a monk from Kashmir named Vairocana under the reign of the (almost certainly legendary)


For the Chinese and kharosti documents found at Niya, half-way between Khotan and the Lop-nor region, clearly show how this was a meeting-place of influences from East and West; cf. Maspero, *Documents chinois* p. 53. On the one hand the flourishing of Buddhism is attested by the numerous remains of stūpas and the occurrence of typically Buddhist names of monks and laymen (Budhamitra, Dhammapipla, Pumādeva, Anamdasena) in the kharosti documents, on the other hand we find, besides the early Prākrit idiom which at this period functioned as a *lingua franca* in Central Asia, the Chinese language used in edicts of indigenous rulers (cf. note 179) and even in the private correspondence between members of the royal family at Niya (Chavannes, *Documents chinois*, 940-947).

This is indeed the opinion of Hatani (op.cit., p. 212) and Mochizuki (*Bukkyō daijiten*, p. 222.3).

*KSC*, Wei-chihh 30. 366b comm. quoting the *Hsi-jung chuan* 西埧傳 of the Wei-lüeh. The Chinese and *kharosti* documents found at Niya, half-way between Khotan and the Lop-nor region, clearly show how this was a meeting-place of influences from East and West; cf. Maspero, *Documents chinois* p. 53. On the one hand the flourishing of Buddhism is attested by the numerous remains of stūpas and the occurrence of typically Buddhist names of monks and laymen (Budhamitra, Dhammapipla, Pumādeva, Anamdasena) in the kharosti documents, on the other hand we find, besides the early Prākrit idiom which at this period functioned as a *lingua franca* in Central Asia, the Chinese language used in edicts of indigenous rulers (cf. note 179) and even in the private correspondence between members of the royal family at Niya (Chavannes, *Documents chinois*, 940-947).

The name is variously transcribed as *पुर्णदर्म* (colophon *CSTCC VII* 47.3.14), *पुर्णदर्म* (biogr. *CSTCC*), and, with assimilation of the t(8), *पुर्णदर्म* (Tao-an in *CSTCC VII* 48.1.4). Sakaino’s restitution Punyatāra (op.cit. p. 102) is highly improbable. We may hesitate between Punyadhana and Pūrṇadharma; in the latter case the final -t(8) renders, as often, a foreign r (cf. Karlgren in *TP* XIX, 1920, p. 108-109). The reading *Pūrṇadharma* is...
nearer in meaning to the Chinese translation of the name, Fa-jao 之旅, but -dharma is normally rendered by 之旅*d'ām.

The Chinese master K'ang Fa-lang 之旅 (second half third century) came from Chung-shan; after having travelled to the Western Region he returned to China and settled again at Chung-shan with several hundreds of disciples (KSC IV 347.1.28 sqq.; for his journey to the West see also Ming-hsiang chi quoted in Fa-yüan chu-lin XCV 988.1). Chung-shan was also the place of origin of the psalmist Po Fa-ch'iao 之旅, born ca. 260 (KSC XIII 413.2.25). According to KSC IX 387.1.8, Fo-t'u-teng's famous disciple Chu Fa-ya 之旅 was also a native of Chung-shan, but elsewhere (IV 347.1.18) he is said to have come from Ho-chien 之旅 (Hopei), some hundred miles more to the East (cf. A. F. Wright, “Fo-t'u-teng”, HJAS XI, 1948, p. 367 and p. 349 note 52). Cf. also the probably apocryphal story about a secret vihāra at Chung-shan in the period 280-290 AD in Fa-yüan chu-lin XXVIII 492.1 and LIV 694.3 (quoting the late fifth century Ming-hsiang chi).

Sakaino (op.cit. vol. I p. 107) proposes to identify this “master Chih” with Chih Hsiao-lung 之旅, who according to the KSC studied the Fang-kuang ching together with Chu Shu-lan during its revision in 303-304 (cf. p. 64). This is improbable: according to the KSC (IV 346.3.7 and 23) Chih Hsiao-lung personally took part in the work of revision at Ts'ang-yuan, whereas Tao-an expressly states that “master Chih from Chung-shan” sent people to Ts'ang-yuan to have copies made.

At the end of the third and in the first decades of the fourth century several persons were enfeoffed as king of Chung-shan. In 311, when Liu Yüan's successor, the Hun emperor Liu Ts'ung 之旅, usurped the throne of the still expanding Hsiung-nu empire, he conferred this title upon his nephew Liu Yao 之旅 (CS 102.2a.); in 323 the same title was given to the Hun general Liu Yüeh 之旅 (CS 103.8b.), but little more than one year later he was vanquished and probably killed by his rival, the Hun warlord Shih Lo 之旅 (CS 103.10a. For this battle cf. KSC IX, biography of Fo-t'u-teng, p. 384.1.28 sqq., trsl. Wright p. 343.). When Shih Lo had overthrown the Liu and ascended the throne of the “Later Chao”, he made his nephew Shih Hu 之旅 king of Chung-shan in 331 (CS 105.7a). But hardly anyone of these three can have been the king to whom Tao-an refers. Shih Hu, whose dealing with the Buddhist master Fo-t'u-teng are well-known, must be ruled out—it is highly improbable that the ceremonial entrance of a newly translated sūtra as described by Tao-an took place some forty years after its publication. Before Fo-t'u-teng went to Shih Lo (311 AD) he had stayed at Loyang, where the Fang kuang ching was already much en vogue, and the fact that the copyists were sent to Ts'ang-yuan proves that this event took place when the translators had just finished their task. As to Liu Yao, no member of the Hsiung-nu house of Liu seems to have had any connection with Buddhism, whereas Liu Yüeh spent the few months during which he bore this title in campaigns against Shih Lo, and probably never lived at Chung-shan.

According to CSTCC VII 47.3.23, Chu Shu-lan revised the Fang-kuang ching together with a (further unknown) monk named Chu Fa-ch' i 之旅. In KSC IV 346.3.7 Chih Hsiao-lung 之旅 is said to have taken part in the revision, whereas Chu Fa-ch' i is not mentioned (cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History p. 166). This may well be a copyist's mistake, but Chih Hsiao-lung seems actually to have been at Ts'ang-yuan at this time. In his biography (ib. IV 346.3.23) it is said that he investigated the text of the Fang-kuang immediately after its publication during more than ten days, after which he was able to explain its meaning. Cf. note 205.

KSC VII 47.3.16.
KSCI I 327.3.13, cf. Bagchi, Canon p. 83 note 2. The term kao-tso “elevated seat” (of the expounder of the dharma) occurs already in this sense in the late second century Chung pen-ch’i ching (of the expounder of the dharma) occurs already in this sense in the late second century Chung pen-ch’i ching (196 ch. II, p. 157.3.7 and 8.

The mysterious mid. third century Chu Fa-lan (above, p. 49; a Chinese?) and Chu Fa-hu are the first known examples. Chinese monks like Yen Fou-t’iao (above, p. 34) and even Dharmarakṣa’s contemporary Chu Shih-hsing (read: Hu-kung) retained their normal surnames after their ordination.

Anonymous colophons CSTCC VII 50.2.6, VIII 56.3.16, IX 63.2.14; Chih Min-tu in CSTCC VII 49.2.8.

On this catalogue see Hayashiya, op.cit., p. 296 sqq.

(1) Anon. 彼真天子經記, 266 AD, Ch’angan; CSTCC VIII 48.2.22.
(2) Tao-an, 今敬光譯婆多，about the translation and transmission of the Kuan-ts’an ching (tsrl. 286 AD, Ch’angan) CSTCC VII148.1.1.
(3) Chin-tu, 聲聞記, 308 AD, Ch’angan; ib. VII 48.2.27.
(4) Anon. 稽訶經記, 300 AD, Ch’angan?; ib. 48.3.2.
(5) Chih Min-tu, 聲聞記, quoting colophon on 佛化esi 公録, but no work of this kind is listed among Dharmarakṣa’s works in CSTCC, and this Hu-kung lu may as well refer to the list of translations of Dharmarakṣa in Tao-an’s and Seng-yu’s own catalogue.

On this catalogue see Hayashiya, op.cit., p. 296 sqq.

(1) Anon. 彼真天子經記, 266 AD, Ch’angan; CSTCC VIII 48.2.22.
(2) Tao-an, 今敬光譯婆多，about the translation and transmission of the Kuan-ts’an ching (tsrl. 286 AD, Ch’angan) CSTCC VII148.1.1.
(3) Chin-tu, 聲聞記, 308 AD, Ch’angan; ib. VII 48.2.27.
(4) Anon. 稽訶經記, 300 AD, Ch’angan?; ib. 48.3.2.
(5) Chih Min-tu, 聲聞記, quoting colophon on 佛化esi 公録, but no work of this kind is listed among Dharmarakṣa’s works in CSTCC, and this Hu-kung lu may as well refer to the list of translations of Dharmarakṣa in Tao-an’s and Seng-yu’s own catalogue.
document figures in CSTCC as "anonymous", but its contents prove that it was written by Tao-an; cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, p. 198.

226 CSTCC VII 51.2.8 (cf., note 221, nr. 10).
227 ib. 48.3.2 (note 221, nr. 4).
228 Cf. note 221, nrs. 7 and 16.
229 Cf. note 221, nrs. 10 (May 14, 289), 8 (December 30, 289) and 12 (November 3, 290).
230 Cf. note 221 nr. 9.
231 Cf. Fa-ch'eng's biography in KSC IV 347.3.5 sqq.
232 Fifty-nine works enumerated by Tao-an in the section of his catalogue entitled 沙通業，reproduced by Seng-yu in CSTCC III 18.3.3 sqq.; in his time (early sixth century) only six of these had been preserved. Cf. Hayashiya, op.cit., p. 1038 sqq.
233 Note 221, nr. 3. The Lalitavistara was probably translated at Ch'angan, for the colophon names as Dharmarakṣa's assistant (弟) the śramaṇa Po Fa-chū 佛初 who also figures in the colophon on Dharmarakṣa's version of the Daśabhuḥāmakāvṛti 樂譏一切皆徳理 in CSTCC VII 48.2.27, translated at Ch'angan in 297 AD (note 221, nr. 14).
234 KSC X 388.1.25.
235 Fa-lin's Pien cheng lun 墨正論 (626 AD), T 2110, ch. III p. 502.3.11.
236 KSC IX 383.2.18; trsl. Wright, HJAS XI, 1948, p. 337.
237 Tao-an in CSTCC VII 48.1.19 (note 221 nr. 2) and IX 62.2.25 (note 221, ib.).
238 Mentioned by Tao-an and Seng-yu in CSTCC II 9.3.5 and in his biography, ib. XIII 98.1.23 = KSC I 327.1.3. Dharmarakṣa's original, more extensive, version (CSTCC II 8.3.15) counted also two chiüan; Nieh Ch'eng-yüan seems to have only reduced the number of repetitions and to have added some stylistic improvement. His version has been preserved (T 638).
239 KSC I 327.1.1.
241 Indians: Chu Li 楚利 at Ch'angan, Cheng-jo 鄭灼 at Tun-huang; Kuchean: Po Yüan-hsin 保元信 at Ch'angan, perhaps also Po Fa-chū 保法初 (although this person was active as a pi-shou 筆受 noting down the Chinese text; if he was a foreigner he must have been thoroughly sinicized); Yüeh-chih: Chih Fa-pao 法寶 at Tun-huang; Khotanese: Gitamitra; Sogdian: K'ang Shu 康殊 (again active as a pi-shou).
242 Cf. Demiéville in BEFEO XLIV, 1954, p. 348-349, and above, note 221 nr. 16. I see no way to separate the names and to define their number; T'ang Yung-t'ung (p. 158) punctuates as follows: 賢君孝應策. 承業烏子. 副遣時. 通武. 丈賢. 丈賢第三十餘人....
243 CSTCC VIII 56.3.21 (note 221, nr. 11). Their role as donors is indicated by the formula 功勤助鶴寿.
244 Biogr. CSTCC XIII 98.1.11; KSC IV (biogr. Fa-ch'eng) 347. 2.25.
245 Kumārajiva on the fundamental difference between the doctrine of the Lotus sūtra and other Mahāyāna scriptures in his correspondence with Hui-yüan, Ta-sheng ta i-chang 大乘大義章, T 1856, ch. I p. 126.3.5 and ch. II p. 133.2.19. For the relation between the doctrine of the Prajñāpāramitā and the Lotus and on the ekavyāna see Seng-juĩ's (or rather Hui-juĩ's) preface to the Aṣṭasāhasrikā p'p' (倉書, 小品經序), CSTCC IX 54.3.22, his colophon on the Lotus sūtra (法華經後序) ib. 57.2.24, and Hui-kuan's 智觀 "Essentials of the Saddharmapundarīka" 汝華本集 (ib. 57.1.4). It appears very clearly that Kumārajiva and these members of his school were well aware of the special character of the Lotus sūtra, the contents of which they regarded, in accordance with Ta chih-gen lun ch. 100 (T 1509 754.2.20) as a "secret doctrine" (ghuhyadharma), different from and even conflicting with other scriptures.
246 Before Dharmarakṣa's time there was, as far as we know, only the still extant very incomplete anonymous translation entitled Sa-t'an-fen-t'o-li ching 僧叡法部列經.
CHAPTER TWO

(T 265, 1 ch.) which corresponds to sections 10-12 of Dharmarākṣa's and Kumārajīva's versions, i.e., the 11th parivarita of the present Sanskrit text. In view of the inserted translator's glosses it seems to date from late Han or San-kuo times.

247 Documents mentioned in note 221, nrs. 11 and 12.

248 Cf. the preface to Jñānagupta's translation of the Lotus sūtra, T 264 p. 134.3.

249 Cf. above note 229.

250 CSTCC VIII 57.11.

251 Tao-an in CSTCC VII 48.1.2 and IX 62.3.1 (kāla, kāla); Seng-yu in CSTCC II 12.1.19: kāla (here by mistake placed among the translators of the Eastern Chin). Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, p. 159.

252 Documents mentioned in note 221, sub 2.

253 CSTCC VII 48.1.11.

254 CSTCC II 9.3.19-10.1.3.

255 CSTCC XIII 98.1.27.

256 T 2034 VI 66.3-68.1; T 2154 II 499.2.2 sqq. Cf. Bagchi, Canon p. 136-147.

257 CSTCC IV 30.2.26 (= T 2146 I 121.2.12; T 2147 I 153.1.4; T 2148 I 184.3.8; T 2149 IX 319.3.18).

258 For Chih Chiang-liang-chieh see T 2034 V 56.3; T 2149 II 227.1.23 T 2151 I 352.2.23; T 2154 II 491.2.24; T 2157 III 788.3.22; Ono Gemyō, op.cit. vol. XII p. 47. According to T 2151 and T 2154, his Fa-hua san-meı ching was mentioned in the (apocryphal) catalogue of Chu Shih-hsing and in the early fifth century Wei-shih lu 聖書錄 by Chu Tao-tsu 誠通祖. The ethnikon Chih 布 points to an Indo-scythian origin of the translator. The transcription of his name is not clear; it is translated as (Cheng) wu-wei [a]ṣ ə. Bagchi (Canon p. 308) suggests Kālāsiya (*kjāng.li.ang.ts'ājāp), the first two syllables being a nasalised "Southern" transcription of kāla, such as we also find in the name of the early fifth century translator Kālayāsā मया मया मया (trsl. 吉大略, KSC III 343.3.11; T 2149 IV 260.1.15). S. Lévi (J.As. 1934, p. 16) points out that in the name of Chiang-liang-lou-chih 勝勝左 this same element is translated as chen 陳, and proposes to read this part of the name as Kalyāna-. For Chiang-liang-lou-chih (*kjāng.li.ang.lou.tsī: Pelliot and Bagchi: Kālaruci; S. Lévi: Kalyānarući, trsl. as 陳) see T 2034 VI 65.1; T 2149 II 236.1.8 and 243.2.6; T 2151 II 354.1.26; T 2154 II 497.2.18; T 2157 IV 794.3.6; Pelliot, "La théorie des Quatre Fils du ciel", TP XXII, 1923, p. 97-126, esp. p. 100 sqq.; Bagchi, Canon p. 114-116; S. Lévi, loc.cit.; Ono Gemyō, op.cit., vol. XII p. 58. It may be that Chih Chiang-liang-chieh and Chiang-liang-lou-chih stand for the same Indian name; chieh 極, which very rarely figures in Buddhist transcriptions, could be a mistake for lou 阪 (written 陳). However, as Bagchi remarks, only one of these men is given the ethnikon Chih, and the translation of the names is quite different.

259 Seeming exceptions are the Mou-tzu 战 (cf. ch. I p. 13 sqq.) and the no doubt spurious "letter of Ts'ao Ts'ao" for which see above, p. 56.

260 HMC XII 81.2.7.

261 陳, either meaning "enfeoffed relatives of the emperor" or "rulers of the outlying territories", as in the translation. Here the term probably refers to non-Chinese rulers like Shih Lo, Shih Hu and Fu Chien.

262 HMC XII 76.3.23.

263 Biography of Po Yuän in CSTCC XV 107.1.24 and KSC I 327.1.12; biography of Po Fa-tso in KSC I 327.2.29. The whole of the latter part of this section of the Korean edition of the CSTCC, comprising the story of Po Yuän's discussion with Wang Fou, the life of Po Fa-tso and that of Wei Shih-tu 詩書爾, has been copied from the KSC. The other editions, which no doubt represent the original text, only contain a few concluding phrases about the erection of stūpas over Po Yuän's remains and about the translations made by him. See also below, ch. VI note 33.
CSTCC XV 107.2.3 = KSC I 327.1.18.
CSTCC VII 48.2.1 (note 221 nr. 3).
Chih Min-tu in CSTCC VII 49.1.24; ib. XIII 97.2.23 = KSC I 325.1.19.
CSTCC XV 107 note 37 (read 神論點 inst. of 神論點); KSC I 327.2.28.
CSTCC XV 107.2.5 = KSC I 327.1.20.
CSTCC has the correct reading 神論點; KSC Korean edition has 彼又..., all other editions 彼又...
CSTCC and KSC, loc.cit.
CSTCC XV 107.2.9; KSC I 327.2.6.
KSC I 327.3.4. In CSTCC his name is always written 仏訶; in view of the use of the character 祖 (with radical 113) in the religious name of his elder brother, the reading 仏訶 seems preferable. Maspero (BEFEO X p. 224 note 3), who misspells the name as 仏訶, proposes to identify Po Yuan’s brother with the Fa-tso 仏訶 who occurs once in Fo-t’u-teng’s biography as one of the latter’s disciples (KSC IX 384.3.9; trsl. Wright p. 348). But a monk named Fa-tso 仏訶 also occurs twice in this same biography (384.2.2 and 386.3.7; trsl. Wright p. 343 and 364). However, this monk can hardly have been identical with Po Yuan’s younger brother: the scene in which he figures here took place only a few days before Fo-t’u-teng’s death (January 13, 349), more than forty years after the date at which Po Yuan’s brother was killed according to his biography.
KSC I 327.3.5; Fa-chings's 仏訶 Chung-ching mu-lu 彼訶目録 ch. VI, T 2146 148.2.12.
KSC IV 347.3.14.
ib. 348.1.12.
Wei-shu 114.6b; trsl. Ware p. 141, where his explanation of the names Liu Yüan-chen and Lü Po-ch’iang (“i.e., our Jack Robinson and John Doe”) is absurd; trsl. Hurvitz p. 67.
CSTCC VII 51.2.13; note 221 nr. 10.
CSTCC II 10.1.19; KSC I 327.3.7.
Biography of Chu Shu-lan in CSTCC XIII 98.2.3; less extensive in KSC IV 346.3.1. The original form of his Indian name is not known; hypothetical reconstructions like Śukklaratna (Bagchi, Canon, p. 121, note 1), or even Sangharakṣa (Matsumoto, Prajñāpāramitā-Literatur p. 23) are not convincing. CSTCC goes into great detail about Chu Shu-lan’s grandfather and about his father and uncles, but various elements in this history are organically connected with the obviously legendary account of Chu Shu-lan’s own descent into Hell when he was seemingly dead for a short time, a common theme in Chinese Buddhist hagiography which is also set forth in great detail in Chu Shu-lan’s biography. Seng-yu may have taken this story from a collection of edifying tales such as the Ming-hsiang chi; its late date is betrayed by the fact that the name of Chu Shu-lan’s father, Dharmasiras, is followed by the explanation “in the language of Chi, Fa-shou” 仏訶 柳訶, Ch‘i being the name of the dynasty that reigned from 479 to 501 AD. In the other biographies in CSTCC such glosses are generally introduced by tz’u yün 仏訶, “here called ...”. Cf. Yüeh Kuang’s biography in CS 43.12a-13b.
CSTCC XIII 98.2.19.
CSTCC II 9.3.12. Chu Shu-lan’s translation of the Šūraṅgamasamādhisūtra was not mentioned by Tao-an in his catalogue. The attribution probably goes back to the catalogue of Chih Min-tu (first half fourth century), who also mentions it in his 華嚴經論訶, CSTCC VII 49.2.8.
KSC IV 346.3.13: 華嚴論訶見 此 仏信才 仏信才 華論通訶.
Biography in CS 49.3a-4a.
Biography in CS 50.4a-5a.
CS 49.14b-15a.
CHAPTER THREE

1 *Hsi jung lun* 徐敬論 by Chiang T'ung 江統 (died 310), CS 56.1a sqq.

2 *CS* 97.10a. For the very complicated early history of these immigrated groups, their spread and their routes of infiltration see e.g., the two excellent studies by T'ang Ch'ang-ju 唐長孺: “Wei Chin ts'ahu k'ao” 歐陽修胡考 and “Chin-t'ai pei-ching ko-tsu 'pien-luan'-ti hsing-chih chi wu-hu cheng-chüan ts'ai Chung-kuo-ti t'ung-chih” 曹魏北狄族系的性質及五胡政樞在中國的統治 in his *Wei Chin Nan-pe-ch'ao shih lun-ts'ung* 魏晉南北朝史論集, Peking 1955, p. 127-142 and 382-450.


4 A typical case is the revolt of Chang Ch'ang 張根, described in *CS* 100.2b sqq. In 303 the harvest had been abundant in the region of Chiang-hsia 江夏 (the modern An-lu 安陸 in Hupei), and, as a result, thousands of vagabonds had flocked there together. A local adventurer, Chang Ch'ang, established a revolutionary movement, changed his name into Li Ch'en 李根 (presumably in order to pose as a descendant of Lao-tzu?), defeated all government troops and made Chiang-hsia his headquarters. He announced that “a Saint will appear to be the Lord of the people”, and used to this end a magistrate whose name he changed into Liu Ni 劉尼 and whom he introduced as the expected Saint and as a descendant of the Han imperial family. His success was overwhelming; he built up an elite army of 30,000 "immortal" soldiers who wore red caps and false beards. Within a few months the revolution spread over five provinces. However, in the same year (303) the Chin general T'ao K'an 諸葛仲尼 routed the armies of Chang Ch'ang and exterminated all leaders, and the whole movement collapsed as suddenly as it had started.

5 Translation by W. B. Henning, in “The date of the Sogdian ancient letters”, *BSOAS* XII, 1948, p. 605-606.

6 Most handbooks give 267-330 as the dates of Wang Tao's life; these are based on *CS* 65.5b (biography of Wang Tao) where he is said to have died in the fifth year *hsien-ho* 恆戶 (330) at the age of 64 (Chinese way of reckoning, *i.e.*, 63 real years). However, in the Annals (*CS* 7) he is mentioned several times after 330 (p. 5a sub 335, 6a sub 338), whereas his death is mentioned (ib. 6a) under the year 339 with the exact date (seventh month, day *keng-shen*, *i.e.*, September 8) and with a detailed description of his burial and posthumous honours. The *hsien-ho* 恆戶 in the biography is obviously a mistake for *hsien-k'ang* 恆康, the fifth year of which corresponds to 339 AD.

7 People like Ku Jung 龜榮, Chi Chan 班瓊 and Ho Hsun 胡孫, whose biographies are all in *CS* 68.

8 *TCTC* 90.1065b. This entry apparently refers to the whole official hierarchy established in that year, down to the clerks and scribes; otherwise the enormous number would remain inexplicable. I have found no corresponding passage in *CS* 6 (annals of emperor Yuan) or 24 (section on officials).

9 Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung 湯用彤, “*Yen-i chih pien* 聖意之解”, in his *Wei-Chin hsüan-hsiüeh lun-kao 徽晉玄象論稿, Peking 1957, p. 26-47, esp. p. 34.

10 Among the founders of *hsüan-hsiüeh*, Chung Hui and Ho Yen (cf. below) were high magistrates and politicians; Wang Pi died too early to reach a high post, but he had already begun his official career. Ho Yen was, moreover, an expert ritualist. For the more practical, *i.e.* political and social, aspects of their theories see ch. XI of Hsiao Kung-ch'üan 蕭公權, *Chung-kuo cheng-chih ssu-hsiang shih* 中國政治思想史 (reedition T'ai-pei 1954), and the extremely biased pamphlet by T'ang Yung-t'ung and Jen Chi-yü 任繼愈, *Wei-Chin hsüan-hsiüeh-chung ti she-hui cheng-chih ssu-hsiang luèh-lun* 魏晉玄學中的社會政治思想略論, Shanghai 1956.

On the early history of hsüan-hsüeh in general see e.g., the nine articles by T'ang Yung-t'ung published or reprinted in his Wei-Chin hsüan-hsüeh lun-kao (Peking 1957); Fung Yu-lan (trsl. Derk Bodde), History of Chinese Philosophy (Princeton 1953), vol. II p. 168-236; T'ang Ch'ang-ju, op.cit., p. 311-350 (魏晉玄學之形成及其發展); Hou Wai-lu, op.cit., p. 38-62 and 95-122; Ho Ch'ang-ch'un 賀昌群, Wei-Chin ch'ing-t'an ssu-hsiang ch'u-lun 魏晉清談思想初論 (2nd ed., Shanghai 1947). As we are mainly concerned with the development of hsüan-hsüeh in the late third and early fourth century, we shall not speak here about the first beginnings of this trend of thought, which can be traced back to the late Han period. There is no doubt an historical connection between the earliest phase of hsüan-hsüeh and the late second and early third century centre of ku-wen studies at Ching-chou, the residence of Liu Piao 劉表, cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, Wang Pi chih Chou-i lun-yü hsin-i 王弼之同易論語新義 in T'u-shu ch'i-kan IV (1943) p. 28-40, reprinted in Wei-Chin hsüan-hsüeh lun-kao p. 84-102, translation by W. Liebenthal in HJAS X (1947) p. 124-161, and Wang Yao 王堯 in Chung-ku wen-hsüeh ssu-hsiang 中古文學思想 (vol. I of his Chung-ku wen-hsüeh shih-lun 中古文學史論, 6th ed., Peking 1953) p. 44-79, esp. p. 51 sqq. The characteristic combination of I-ching and Lao-tzu studies dates also from Later Han times: the famous scholar Ma Jung 馬融 (79-166 AD) was the first Confucian exegete known to have written a (no doubt Confucian) commentary on the Tao-te ching; cf. Ho Ch'ang-ch'un, op.cit., p. 14 sqq.

13 I-ching ch. I, wen-yen to hexagram 1 (乾); trsl. Legge p. 417.
17 CS 43.8a (biogr. of Wang Yen 王衍).
19 Wang Pi's comment to I-ching, hexagram 24 (復), chu-shu ed. 3.19b.
20 Ming 墨 (darkened, latent, obscured, obliterated) is one of the basic terms of hsüan-hsüeh. It denotes the "nameless" source of all phenomena versus the phenomena themselves, the "substance" versus the "function", and, as applied to the mind of the Sage, his inner state of non-activity and intuitive unity with the process of Nature. Cf. the many examples given by Hou Wai-lu, op.cit., p. 232-233.
22 ib. 31a. For the argumentation of both parties see the treatise Yen chin i lun 言盡意論 (as quoted in I-wen lei-chü 19.7b and SSHY comm. IB/15b) by Ou-yang Chien 歐陽健 (died 300 AD).
23 Cf. Wang Pi's well-known words (聖人體無,無又不可以説,故不說也) reported in the biography of Wang Pi by Ho Shao 何劭 (died 301 AD), which is quoted in the commentary to SKC, Wei-chih 28.337b, and Kuo Hsiang in the preface
to his Chuang-tzu commentary. For the problem of the relation between words and ideas in medieval Chinese thought see the article by T'ang Yung-t'ung mentioned in note 9.

24 E.g., the passage which says that "the Master's words about (human) Nature and the Way of Heaven cannot be heard" (LY V. 12), Confucius' words "I would prefer not to speak" and "does Heaven speak?" in LY XVII.19, and his statement "My doctrine has one (principle) which goes through it" 命道一以貫之 in LY IV. 15.1 and XV.2.3. In the same way, the "expedient" character of Confucius' teachings could be inferred from passage like LY IV. 2 where he gives two contradictory answers to Tzu-lu and Jan Yu, motivating this by saying "Ch'iu (i.e., Tzu-lu) is reserved, so I urged him on; Yu has (the energy) of more than one man, so I held him back", and finally his dictum that "the highest subjects may be announced to those whose talents are above mediocrity" and not to less gifted persons (LY VI.19).

25 Cf. the treatise Ch'ung yu lun 哲有論 by P'ei Wei 李鯨 (267-300) quoted in his biography, CS 35.5b sqq.


27 Cf. the Ta-Chuang lun 道藏論 by Juan Chi (CSKW 45.9a), and the way in which Hsi K'ang contrasts the teachings of Lao-tzu and Chuang-tzu with each other in his Pu-i 抱璞: 禁如老聃之清净微妙，守玄抱一，將如莊周之斂物變化，洞靈而放逸乎 (Hsi K'ang chi 胡康集, ch. III p. 2a in Lu Hsün's edition, photolithographic reproduction of the manuscript, Peking 1956). Cf. also the controversy between Hsi K'ang and Hsiang Hsiu, the actual author of the Chuang-tzu commentary, documents translated by D. Holzman, La vie et la pensée de Hi K'ang, Leiden 1957, p. 92 sqq.).

28 This particular use of the word fen occurs already occasionally in the Chuang-tzu text itself, e.g., V.1a: 以道觀分而君臣之道明. Cf. P. Demiéville in Annuaire du Collège de France, 48me année, p. 159, and the many examples listed in Hou Wai-lu, op.cit., p. 244 sqq.

29 E.g., comm. 1.5a (故乘天地之正者……); ib. 3a (違道忘我……); ib. 19a: the Sage is 萬物性分之表. All references are to the Ssu-pu pei-yao edition of the Chuang-tzu commentary. For critical notes on the various editions see Wang Shu-min 王叔岷, Kuo Hsiang Chuang-tzu chu chiao-chi 郭象莊子注校記, Academia Sinitica monograph nr. 33, Shanghai 1950.


32 Comm. I 18a.

33 Comm. I 6a.

34 This use of so-i 所以, and especially that of chi and so-i chi is extensively discussed by Hou Wai-lu, op.cit., p. 230 sqq. Like fen, the terms chi and so-i chi occur already in the text of Chuang-tzu: V.26b.

35 Comm. I 11b (無欲無念則不能生者……); ib. 25a (問問夫造物者有邪無邪……); VII. 29a (非唯無不能化而為自化……). Reasoning of this type must have paved the way for the works of Mādhyamika scholastic which were so enthusiastically received and studied by later Chinese clerical literati.

36 Comm. III 6b.

37 Comm. VII.27a: 物物者非物. The term wu-wu 物物 is again borrowed from Chuang-tzu IV. 21b.

The course of Nature, which is Fate, works completely arbitrarily. Cf. the theme for debate posed by Yin Hao 殷浩 (?-356) at a ch'ing-t'an meeting: "Nature, when endowing (us with our inborn qualities) does so without any conscious intention—why then are there just so few good people and so many wicked ones?" (SSHY IB/22b). Tai K'uei 戴逵 (?-396) says in his Shih i lun 謨疑論, in which he questions the reality of karmic retribution, that “wisdom and foolishness, good and evil, excellencies and defects, success and failure are all destiny 分數, and are not the result of accumulated deeds (in the past)” (KHMC XVIII p. 222.1.21).

Here again we shall not speak about the earliest history of ch'ing-t'an, its relation to the “pure judgments” of Later Han times etc., and as far as possible restrict ourselves to a very summary discussion of ch'ing-t'an as it was practised during the period under consideration, i.e., the fourth century AD. General studies on the subject: Liu Ta-chieh 劉大杰, Wei-Chin ssu-hsiang lun 維普思想論 (Shanghai 1939), esp. p. 167-220; Ch'en Yin-k'o 陳寅恪, T'ao Yuan-ming chih ssu-hsiang yü ch'ing-t'an chih kuan-hsi 陶淵明之思想與清談之關係 (Peking 1945); Et. Balazs, "Entre révolte nihiliste et évaison mystique", in Etudes Asiatiques (1948), p. 27-55; the studies by Ho Ch'ang-ch'un and Wang Yao mentioned above, note 12; T'ang Chiung 拓皋, op.cit., p. 289-298 (清談與清議); Hou Wai-lu, op.cit., vol. III, p. 26-45 and 74-94.

Shih-shuo hsin-yü, by Liu I-ch'ing 劉義慶 (403-444); commentary by Liu Chün 劉峻 (better known as Liu Hsiao-piao 劉孝標, 462-521). The original title of the work was Shih-shuo 世說 or Shih-shuo hsin-shu 世說新書; it was anciently divided in 8 or 10 chüan. The present-day title seems to date from the Sung period. It is a collection of more than 950 anecdotes grouped together under 36 headings; nowadays (probably since Tung Fen's 董奉 edition of 1138) divided in three chüan, each of which consists of two parts, in our references indicated as IA, IB etc. We have used the Ssu-pu ts'ung-k'an 光武大伝集解 edition of 1535. For further bibliographical information cf. W. Hung's preface to the Harvard-Yenching index to the Shih-shuo hsin-yü (Index Series no. 12, Peking 1933) and V.T. Yang, “About Shih-shuo hsin-yü”, in Journal of Oriental Studies II (1955), p. 309-315. On the historical background of the work see Utsunomiya Kiyo yoshi 宇都宮清吉 in Kandai shakai keizaishi kenkyū 漢代社會経済史研究, Tōkyō 1955, ch. XII (p. 473 sqq.), W. Eichhorn, “Zur chinesischen Kulturgeschichte des 3. und 4. Jahrhunderts”, ZDMG XCI (1937) p. 452-483, the study of Et. Balazs mentioned above (note 46) and Yoshikawa Kōjirō, "Shih-shuo hsin-yü and its style", Tōhōgakuhō X (1939) p. 86-110. The text of the SSSY has been very imperfectly transmitted and many passages have been altered or re-phrased in later times, as clearly appears from a comparison of the present text with an incomplete copy of a T'ang manuscript of the SSSY (reproduced in the second volume of the 文學叢刊 (Peking 1956) and with quotations preserved in early works (cf. Yuan Chiang's preface to its edition of 1535, and the examples given by W. Hung, loc. cit.). In spite of this, the SSSY and its commentary remain sources of primary importance for the cultural history of medieval China. Unfortunately, a considerable number of anecdotes—mainly bons mots, short and intentionally cryptic sayings and fragments of conversation alluding to contemporary personalities and happenings—are extremely difficult to understand and to interpret, and this difficulty is enhanced by the use
of rare vernacular expressions and syntactic structures. It is only fair to admit that to the Western sinologue at least one third of the book is more or less ununderstandable, and a new extensive commentary on the *SSH Y*, compiled by Chinese scholars with their immense historical and lexicographical knowledge, would be a very important contribution to the study of medieval Chinese history.

48 For the role of "characterization" in *ch'ing-t'an* see T'ang Ch'ang-ju, *op.cit.*, p. 289-297 and Hou Wai-lu, *op.cit.*, vol. III p. 86 sqq. It remained important as a means to influence the "public" (*i.e.*, gentry-)opinion. For the primary importance of this "public opinion" for the official career in medieval times cf. the many examples collected by Chao I 遠翼 in *Nien-erh shih cha-chi* + 二史記 VIII (section 九品中正) p. 6a sqq. (ed. *Kuang-ya ts'ung-shu*).

49 *SSH Y* IIb/3a.  
50 *ib.* IIb/4b.  
51 *ib.* IIb/6a.  
52 *ib.* IIb/16b.  
53 *ib.* IIb/16b.  
54 *ib.* IIb/36b.  
55 *ib.* IA/44b.  
56 *ib.* IA/45a.

The deer's tail fly-whisk 墨庭 was, as the instrument which dispels "impurity", the attribute of the *ch'ing-t'an* adept; cf. Wang I-t'ung, *op.cit.*, vol. I, p. 93-95; Hou Wai-lu, *op.cit.*, p. 66 sqq.

53 *SSH Y* IB/32a.  
54 *ib.* IIb/11b.  
55 *ib.* IIb/11b.

60 The deer's tail fly-whisk 墨庭 was, as the instrument which dispels "impurity", the attribute of the *ch'ing-t'an* adept; cf. Wang I-t'ung, *op.cit.*, vol. I, p. 93-95; Hou Wai-lu, *op.cit.*, p. 66 sqq.

61 *SSH Y* IB/15b-16a.  

63 *CS* 98.1b (biogr. of Wang Tun).  
64 *CS* 73.2b (biogr. of Yü Liang), cf. *TCTC* 93.1097b.  
65 *CS* 73.4b (biogr. of Yü Liang).  
66 *CS* 77.4a (biogr. of Ho Ch'ung).

67 So called in order to distinguish it from the Wang clan from T'ai-yüan 太原 (Shansi), which was also one of the most powerful clans in medieval history; cf. the special study devoted to the vicissitudes of the Wang from T'ai-yüan from Later Han to T'ang times by Moriya Mitsuo 守屋美都雄, *Rikuchō mombatsu no ichi kenkyū* 六朝門閥の研究 (Tōkyō 1951).

68 *KSC* IV 350.3.11.

69 His name is given as Chu Tao-ch'ien in all editions of the *KSC* except the Korean edition which writes Chu Ch'ien 信謨; the *SSH Y* passages mentioned below refer to him as "the monk Fa-shen" 僧法深, Chu Fa-shen 信法深 and Master Shen 申公. The main source for his life is *KSC* IV 347.3.14; furthermore *SSH Y* Comm. IA/10b (no source mentioned, but very probably the *Kao-i shen-men chuan* 高逸神仙傳 (cf. notes 288-290 below) which is also quoted in connection with Chu Tao-ch'ien in *SSH Y* Comm. IA/34b and IA/18b). According to *KSC* he lived from 286-374, and consequently reached the age of 88 (89, according to the Chinese way of counting). The *SSH Y* Comm. IA/10b gives 79 as the age at which he died, but this can hardly be correct. According to the *KSC* (IV 348.1.9), emperor Hsiao-wu (373-397) contributed 100,000 cash to his funeral, and the text of the imperial decree is quoted here, so that it is certain that Chu Tao-ch'ien died in or shortly after 373. On the other hand he is said to have explained Buddhist scriptures at the age of 24 when still living in the North (*i.e.*, not later than ca. 307-310, the early years of the *yung-chia* period), which points to the years 284-287 as the date of his birth. All this perfectly agrees with the dates 286-374 given in the *KSC* biography.
NOTES

70 KSC IV 347.3.17.

71 Cf. SSHY IA/10b, where Huan I speaks about the friendship between his father (Huan Ying) and Chu Tao-ch’ien. The name of Huan I’s father, about whom practically nothing is known, is in CS 74.1a given as Huan Hao 桓皝.

72 KSC IV 347.3.22.

73 SSHY IA/18b.

74 KSC IV 350.3.17; cf. Meidōdenshō 7b-8a. In the period 363-365 he left the capital and settled with more than a hundred disciples on the Pao-shan 保山 at Shih-ning 史寧 (South of the modern Shang-yü 上虞 in N.E. Chekiang), from where he was again summoned to the capital in 375 by emperor Hsiao-wu (cf. below, p. 151).

75 KSC IV 347.1.2.

76 KSC IV 350.3.17; cf. Meisōdenshō 7b-8a. In the period 363-365 he left the capital and settled with more than a hundred disciples on the Pao-shan 保山 at Shih-ning 史寧 (South of the modern Shang-yü 上虞 in N.E. Chekiang), from where he was again summoned to the capital in 375 by emperor Hsiao-wu (cf. below, p. 151).

77 Quoted in SSHY Comm. IA/36a and IB/36a-b, both times as Jen-wu 任武. In the second passage the author’s name is given as Yü 亦 Fa-ch’ang, where 艾 is obviously a copyist’s mistake for 慈. The work is not mentioned by Lu Ch’eng, but it still figures in the Ta-T’ang NTL of 664 AD (T 2149 ch. III p. 248.3.21 and ib. ch. X p. 330.1.13). Another work of the same title and probably of the same genre is mentioned in KSC V 354.2.26 as a work by the northern monk Chih T’an-tun 趇田敦 who lived at the T’ai-shan (Shantung) in the second half of the fourth century.

78 The KSC devotes only a few words to him (IV 347.1.6); there is furthermore one passage in SSHY of doubtful historicity: IIIB/27b, cf. note 88. The comm. (ibid.) quotes some laudatory phrases from the Ming-te sha-men t’i-mu 名德沙門題目 and the Min-tu tsan 慈度録, both by Sun Ch’o 孫焯 (cf. below, note 262), and from a third unspecified source. For his catalogue and his teachings see below, notes 79 and 85. The name is variously written as 慈度 (KSC and CSTCC), 慈度 (SSHY) and 慈度 (Korean ed. of CSTCC VII 49.1.17). The character 慈 is preferable, 艾 and 艾 being substitute forms for the T’ang taboo 慈, see T’ang Yung-t’ung, History, p. 266.


80 CSTCC VII 49.1.16: 北首摩威修記 和 VIII 58.2.21: 北維摩轉記. His synoptic editions of these scriptures are also mentioned by Seng-yu in CSTCC II 10.1.11, where he specifies that they comprised eight and five ch’ien respectively. According to Chih Min-tu’s own words, the synoptic edition of the Vimalakirtinirdeṣa was based on three versions (those of Chih Ch’ien, Dharmarakṣa and Chu Shu-lan), and that of the Śūraṅgamasamādhiṣūtra on four (those of Lokakṣema, Chih Ch’ien—actually a revised and “polished” edition of the first one—Dharmarakṣa and Chu Shu-lan).

81 The first known case is Chih Ch’ien’s combined edition of three dhāraṇī texts, the preface of which has been preserved in CSTCC VII 51.3.18 sqq. (今微摩持陀 慈尼總持三本), cf. T’ang Yung-t’ung, History, p. 132.

82 Chih Min-tu in his colophon on the synoptic edition of the Śūraṅgamasamādhiṣūtra: 至以（i.e., Chih Ch’ien）所定者為母護（i.e. Dharmarakṣa）所出所護之 利（Chu Shu-lan）所譯者繋之, etc. (CSTCC VII 49.2.10).

83 Other fourth century examples are Tao-an’s 釈放光梵譯略解 (preface in CSTCC VII 49.1.1) and Chih Tun’s 釈善品對比要物 (preface in CSTCC VIII 55.1.13).

84 On these different versions see Edward Conze, Literary History of the Prajñāpāramitā (typed copy privately distributed, London 1954) of which the part dealing with Chinese translations and commentaries (p. 109-115) is rather inaccurate and much too short; the same holds good for Matsumoto Tokumyo, Die Prajñāpāramitā-
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Literatur (Bonner Orientalistische Studien, Heft 1, Stuttgart 1932). See also the excellent survey of the Prajñāpāramitā literature and its evolution by Hikata Ryusho in the introduction to his edition of the Sūvīkatavīramī-paripucchā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra (Fukuoka, 1958), p. XIII-L1. As usual, students of Buddhism have been interested mainly in the Chinese translations as secondary material serving to establish the textual history and evolution of the Indian texts; up to now, nobody has attempted to study the earliest Chinese versions as documents of the highest importance for the doctrinal history of early Chinese Buddhism.


86 Fang-kuang ching (T 221) ch. 1 (section 2) p. 4.3.18.

87 It must be remarked that Chih Min-tu's theory has nothing to do with the Buddhist dogma of the non-existence of a permanent ego (我, anātmya). He does not deny the existence of a “soul” or “spirit” 神, but only that of “conscious thought” 心 in the mind of the Sage which is “tranquil” 靜 and “vast like empty space” 空大處. Chih Min-tu’s idea comes nearer to samatha than to anātmya; there is some confusion on this point in T'ang Yung-t'ung's discussion in Wei-Chin hsüan-hsüeh lun-kao, p. 58.

88 According to SSHY IIIB/27b and comm., ib: “When the monk Min-tu was about to cross the Yangtze, he had as his companion a monk from the North ( 北 ). Together they made a plan, saying, “If we go to the South with nothing to (expound) but the old exegesis 舊義, we shall perhaps not manage to make a living”. Then together they created the theory of non-existence of (conscious) thought 心無義”. Later, when both priests were living comfortably, the other monk sent a messenger to Chih Min-tu to tell him that they had now both enough to eat and that it would be indecent and even blasphemous to go on with this trick, but Chih Min-tu continued to propagate his new theory. It is of course very probable that this story has no historical base whatsoever, and that it originated in the Chinese translations as documents of the opponents of Chih Min-tu's theory. For other forms of opposition cf. the heated debate between T'An-i 諸 - and the hsin-wu adherent Tao-heng 道性 at Ching-chou (ca. 365 AD; KSC V 354.3.13), and the correspondence between Liu I-min 劉湛民 (i.e., Liu Ch'eng-chih 劉澄之) and Seng-chao in 409 AD, which forms part of the present Chao-lun (cf. W. Liebenthal, The Book of Chao, p. 90 sqq.; Tsukamoto Zenyū 塚本善隆 and others, Jōron kenkyū 学論研究, p. 36 sqq.).

89 Biographical note in KSC IV 346.3.28; furthermore SSHY IIB 23a, IIIA/17a and IIIB/6b.

90 SSSHY IIB/23a, where only the debate is mentioned, and not the “Buddhist and secular scriptures” as in KSC IV 347.1.9.

91 SSSHY IIB/6b = KSC IV 347.1.11.

92 Probably Yu Yüan-chih 应玄之 or Yu Fang-chih 应方之 who were banished to Yü-chang in 345 (below, p. 110); cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, p. 170.

93 SSSHY IIIA/17a, cf. KSC IV 347.1.13.

94 Chu Fa-yün 趙法濤, alias Chu Fa-wen 趙法濤, cf. below p. 139.

95 Biography in KSC I 327.3.12 and CSTCC XIII 98.3.17; furthermore Kao-tso chuan 高泰傳 quoted in comm. SSSHY IIB/5a and IIIA/50b, and Kao-tso p'ieh-chuan 高泰別傳 quoted ib. 1A/32a; T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, p. 171. The name is written in various ways: 卍字弘多羅 in KSC, 卍字箋 in CSTCC, 卍字箋 in Kao-tso p'ieh-chuan; translated as Chi-yu 正友 in KSC; in the text of the SSSHY always called (the monk) Kao-tso 高生 [暹]. The T'au-ssu chi 塔寺記 (quoted in comm. SSSHY I 1A/32a) says that Kao-tso was (also?) the name given to Śrīmitra's

Zürcher
the trouble of answering”.

The trouble of answering”.

the trouble of answering”.

According to CSTCC II 10.1.16 he translated two versions of the Mahāmāyūrī-

vīḍyā-rājīṇī entitled Ta k'ung-ch'iieh-wang shen-chu 大孔雀王神咒 and K'ung-

ch'iieh-wang tsa shen-chu 孔雀王難神咒. Both works were lost at an early date,

cf. KYSC III, T 2154, p. 503.1.5. The Mahāmāyūrī-vīḍyā-rājīṇī, which later became

one of the basic texts of Tantrism (cf. Mochizuki, Bukkyō Daijiten, p. 688, s.v.

Kūjaku myōōgyō no hō 孔雀明王經法) was very popular in Chinese Buddhism

long before the development of Tantrism in China. In the Taishō-daiizōkyō we find

no less than seven translations of this work (T 982-988) executed between the fourth

and the eighth century. The earliest non-anonymous and approximately datable

version is that made by Kumārajiva (T 988), but it must be noted that this scripture

does not figure among Kumārajiva’s thirty-five translations listed in CSTCC II

10.3-1 1.1. In later catalogues (LTSPC, KYSC etc.) the translation of a third still

existing collection of spells, the Kuan-ting ching 普頂經 (T 1331, ?Mahābhūṣa-

mantra) is attributed to him. This attribution is almost certainly wrong, cf. below,

p. 316-317.

KSC I 328.1.11. Cf. the curious passage in KSC I 328.1.3 where it is told how

at the death of Śrimitra’s admirer Chou I 闕離 (i.e., in 322 AD) the master himself

went to visit the orphans, chanted three pieces of “hymns in a foreign language”

and finally wiped his tears and went away. Identical story in CSTCC

XI 81.2.27 (anonymous colophon); Mi-li’s spurious vinaya-text

is still mentioned in Fa-ching’s 法經 Chung-ching mu-lu 鏡經目錄 of 594 AD: T

2146 ch. V p. 141.1.5.

SSHY IB/5a. Cf. also the story of Wang Tao and the clerical Methusalem

reported in Fa-yuan chu-lin XXXVIII 585.3 (source not indicated).

CSTCC XIII 99.1.8: (Wang Tao) 外國正當有君一人而已耳, (Śrimitra)

若使我等諸君今日呈在此 Somewhat shortened and stylized in KSC I 328.1.6

(here translated): (Wang Tao)外國有君一人而已, (Śrimitra)我和諸君呈在此. Another slightly different version in Ta-T’ang NTL (T 2149) III 244.3.8.

KSC I 328.1.15 sqq. (not in CSTCC).

Pien-cheng lun (T 2110) III 502.3.15. Fa-lin (ib. p. 504.2.8) also enumerates

eight kings (enfeoffed near relatives of the emperor) who according to him sponsored

Buddhism. Six of these cannot be identified, since Fa-lin simply refers to them as

the king of...” without indicating their personal names. The remaining two are

Suu-ma Yu 司馬樞 (248-283 AD, biogr. in CS 38.6b-9b) and Suu-ma Chien 賊

(262-291 AD, biogr. CS 64.1a), but neither their biographies nor those of other

early Suu-ma kings contain anything which might corroborate Fa-lin’s statement.

KSC V 354.3.25, cf. ib. XIII 410.1.18.

Pien-cheng lun (T 2110) III 502.3.16.

CSTCC II 11.3.9 and KSC II 335.2.29.

CSTCC II 11.3.26.

PCNC I 936.2.13.

Fa-yuan chu-lin (T 2122) XLII 616.2.5.; in XXXI 526.2 virtually the same story

given as a quotation from the Nan-ching ssu-chi 南丁寺記.
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112 Allusion to *Chuang-tzu* II (Ch’i *wu-lun*) p. 6.
113 *HMC* XII 76.3.23, cf. *KSC* V (biogr. Tao-an) 352.2.24.
117 *CS* 77.7b-8a.
118 *I-wen lei-chii* 藝文類聚 63; *CCW* 38.6b.
119 According to Fa-lin, emperor Ch’eng also founded two monasteries at the capital (Chung-hsing ssu 中興寺 and Lu-yeh ssu 鹿野寺) where he assembled a hundred (var. a thousand) monks specialized in translation and exegesis (*Pien-cheng lun*, T 2110, III 502.3.18). This Chung-hsing monastery may have been the one at which the dhyāna-master Dharmamitra (347-443) stayed during his first visit to the southern capital (ca. 425 AD; *KSC* III 343.1.1). On the other hand we find that (another?) Chung-hsing ssu was completed under emperor Hsiao-wu of the Liu-Sung dynasty (454-465 AD; *CSTCC* XIV 106.1.22, cf. *KYSCL*, T 2154, ch. V p. 529.3.4). A Lu-yeh monastery is, as far as I know, not mentioned before the year 457 (*CSTCC* V 39.1.23, cf. *Ta-T’ang NTL*, T 2149, ch. IV p. 261.1.20, and *Chung-ching mu-lu*, T 2146, ch. IV p. 138.3.25).
120 *KSC* IV 347.3.24.
121 ib. 348.2.24, cf. below, p. 117.
122 Preserved in *HMC* XII 79.2.12 sqq., and in *Chi sha-men pu-ying pai-su teng-shih* 集沙門普興譜序 (T 2108) I 443.3.18 sqq. They consist of a short introduction by an unknown compiler, the first memorial sent in by Ho Ch’ung and his partisans, a decree promulgated by Yu Ping (on behalf of the emperor) in answer to this memorial, Ho Ch’ung’s second memorial, a second edict issued by Yu Ping, and a third memorial of Ho Ch’ung, altogether six pieces.
123 Biography of Ts’ai Mo, *CS* 77.7a-9b.
124 *KHMC* VI 126.3.7 (section 列代王妃傳略).
125 The reading Hsia 胤 is the correct one; *HMC* has everywhere 胤.
126 *Tzu* Mou-yüan 莫遜, biogr. *CS* 77.5b-6b. He was an uncle of Ho Ch’ung’s partisan Ch’u P’ou 楚禱 (cf. p. 109).
127 *Tzu* Tao-ming 道名, biogr. *CS* 77.iiia-12a; cf. *SSHY* IIA/39a and IIB/5a.
128 *SSHY* IIB/19a.
129 *CS* 77.5a (biogr. Ho Ch’ung).
130 Comm. *SSHY* IIB/12b.
131 An anachronism, cf. p. 150.
132 *SSHY* IIB/6b.
133 ib. IIB/12b. Cf. also the story about Ho Ch’ung’s devotion and his frequent visits to Buddhist temples, in the biography of Ku Chung 龔蒙 (274-346 AD), *CS* 76.11a.
134 *CS* 93.5b.
135 *PCNC* I 935.3.16.
136 *PCNC* I 936.1.6.
137 *PCNC* I 935.3.28.
138 *KSC* IV 350.1.19. In 361 emperor Mu was dying, and Fa-k’ai was summoned to cure him, but “as soon as (Yü Fa-)k’ai had observed his pulse, he knew that (the emperor) would not rise any more, and he did not want to go in again” (in accordance with the general practice to abandon incurable patients, cf. *Hōbōgirin* s.v. *byō* 病 p. 232.1 and P. Demiéville in *BEFEO* XLIV, 1954, p. 401, note 3). The enraged empress issued an edict, saying “As soon as the emperor was slightly
unwell, we have called master Yu to investigate his pulse, but he went only as far as the door and did not proceed, with all kinds of cowardly excuses; he shall be arrested and delivered to the commander of the police”. Then the emperor died indeed, and Yu Fa-k’ai escaped with a whole skin; he retired to the Shih-ch’eng shan 石城山 in the Shan mountains (Chekiang).

139 PCNC I 936.1.23. According to his biography, Seng-chi lived from 330 to 397 AD, but we can hardly assume that the monastery was founded for a fifteen years old novice. There must be a mistake somewhere: either Seng-chi was born earlier, or the monastery was founded later than 345, or it was not founded for this nun.

140 KSC VII 366.3.6.

141 KSC VII 367.1.1. However, the change of the name may have happened some time before 430. According to CSTCC III 21.1.28 (= Ta-T’ang NTL, T 2149, IV 257.3.16), Buddhajiva translated the (?) Mahiśāsakavinaya (T 1421) “at the Lungkuang monastery” in 423 424 AD.

142 Pien-cheng lun (T 2110) III 502.3.18.

143 CS 32.3b = TCTC 103.1215; TPYL 99.4b quoting the Hsiu Chin yang-ch’iu.

144 Chien-k’ang shih-lu quoted by T’ang Yung-t’ung, History, p. 349.

145 The Huan came from Lung-k’ang 龍亢, the modern Huai-yüan 晖遠 in Anhui. The family claimed to descend from Huan Jung 胡粲, a magistrate of the Later Han (CS 74.1a, biogr. of Huan I), but this tradition seems very unreliable. In fact, nothing is known about the eight generations between this Huan Jung and Huan Ying 胡応 (or Hao 彤, cf. above, note 71), the father of Huan I. When Huan Hsiian in 402 had usurped the throne, he was unable to fill his imperial ancestral temple with the required number of tablets for the names “because the names and ranks of those (ancestors) from before his great-grandfather were not illustrious” (CS 99.8a, biogr. of Huan Hsiian).

146 CS 73.12b (biogr. of Yü I), cf. TCTC 97.1146A.

147 In 371, and again in 372 after an attempt of the Yü to regain their power, CS 73.9b (biogr. Yü Hsi 胡). CS ib.; TCTC 99.1175 A.

148 CS 98.11a (biogr. of Huan Wen).

149 CS ib.; TCTC 99.1175 A.

150 For a detailed account of this famous battle see Li Chi-p’ing 李其平, Fei-shui chih ch’uan 浮水之戰, Shanghai 1955.

151 KSC IV (biogr. of Chih Tun) 348.2.10: Chih Tun characterized by Wang Meng as 造微之功不減韓勳 (i.e., Wang Pi); id. in SSHY IIIB/12a-b; comm. ib. quoting Chih Tun p’ieh-ch’uan 支遁傳 (cf. note 154): 王仲祖 (i.e., Wang Meng) 携其造微之功不異王勳. In the same way the monks in the audience of Chih Tun are qualified by Wang Meng as “Wang Pi and Ho Yen behind the alms-bowls” 善事後主何人也, SSHY comm. IIIB 13b-14a quoting Kao-i sha-men chuan (cf. note 289); somewhat different version in KSC IV 349.1.4.

152 Comm. SSHY IIIB 22a quoting 支遁傳 = KSC IV 348.2.16. But according to SSHY IIIB 22a, Hsieh An himself absolutely denied ever to have spoken such words, and declared that P’ei Chi’s 裴智 (the author of the Yü-lin 詔林, a now lost collection of anecdotes like the SSHY, completed in 362 AD) had invented the story. The ideal of a cursory way of reading the classics without detailed philological studies ( 筱) was much en vogue in the fourth century; it agreed with the prevailing hsüan- hsüeh opinion that the written text is only an imperfect and expedient expression of the hidden wisdom of the Sage, and that the student must try to grasp the general principles 筱 underlying the words rather than indulge in a careful and painstaking study of the letter of the text. For this custom cf. T’ang Yung-t’ung, Wei-Chin hsüan-hsüeh lun-kao, p. 30-31.

153 Thus among the persons mentioned here as friends during his first stay at the capital (ca. 340 AD) we find Hsi Ch’ao 胡超 (born 336) and Wang T’an-chih 王坦之 (born 330), which is obviously impossible. In the same way it is said in
Chu Tao-ch’ien’s biography (KSC IV 348.1.6) that Ho Ch’ung conversed with Chu Tao-ch’ien during the reign of emperor Ai (362-366), i.e., at least seventeen years after Ho Ch’ung’s death.

In the case of Chih Tun, the SSHY is at least as important as the KSC as a source of biographical information. Among the 28 short episodes in which his biography in KSC (IV 348.2.8-349.3.20) can be divided, there are only eight which do not figure in the SSHY or in the works quoted in the SSHY commentary. On the other hand, the SSHY contains no less than 82 passages dealing with or mentioning Chih Tun, and most of these have no counterpart in the KSC biography. Sources quoted in the SSHY comm. are Chih Tun pieh-chuan (comm. IIB/11a; IIB/12a-b); Chih Tun chuan (IIB/33a; IIIA/11a-b; ib. 12a; ib. 22a) and Chih Fa-shih chuan (IIB/20a); one of these works is probably identical with the biography of Chih Tun written by Hsi Ch’ao after the master’s death (cf. KSC-IV 349.3.7). Furthermore we find quotations from the Kao-i sha-men chuan (IA/38b-39a; IIB/21a-8b; ib. 21b; ib. 22a; IIA/32a-b; IIB/13b-14a; IIIB/8a), from the Yu-lin 註林 (IB/22a; IIIA/5b-6a; IIIB 21b), and some fragments of Chih Tun’s own writings (IA/42b; IB/18b-19a; ib. 19b). T’ang Yung-t’ung, History, p. 177-181.

KHMC XXX 350.1.17.


First in the Wo-chou 沃州 mountains (E. of Hsin-ch’ang 新唐, Chekiang), where he wrote an “Inscription to the Right of (the Teacher’s) Seat” 為師右記 in order to admonish and stimulate his hundreds of disciples (text in KSC IV 348.3.10 sqq.); later at the Shih-ch’eng shan 相城山 where he founded the Ch’i-kuang ssu 品光寺. According to his biography it was here that he wrote his most important works (ib. 348.3.21).

The Chien-K’ang shih-lu 建康實錄 as quoted in TPYL 653.7a says that Hsü Hsün had changed his two mansions at Shan-yin and at Yung-hsing 永興 into monasteries; both were large and splendid buildings (a fact which strangely contrasts with Hsü Hsün’s “poverty” as a recluse, reported elsewhere!). When the re-building had been finished, he officially reported this feat to emperor Hsiao-wu (reigned 373-397). I have not been able to consult the still existing but rare Chien-k’ang shih-lu (by Hsu Sung 許嵩, in 30 ch.) itself.

SSH Y IIB/15b: 王敬业 是起僧人. For the expression ch’ao-wu cf. the words spoken to Kumārajīva by the Tibetan ruler Yao Hsing (KSC II 332.2.11): 大師聰明持戒，天下著二一一 Wang Hsiu was the son of Wang Meng, an able calligrapher and ch’ing-t’an specialist in spite of his youth; he died at the age of 23. (CS 93.6b). Connections with Buddhism: SSHY IIB/20b-21a where he holds a heated debate with Hsü Hsün at the “Western Monastery” 西寺 at K’uai-chi, Chih Tun acting as a host, and SSHY IIB/26a-b where he discusses the well-known hsüan-hsiieh problem whether “the Saint has emotions or not” 聖人有情不 with a certain monk Seng-i 僧惠 (elsewhere unknown) at the Wa-kuan ssu at Chienk’ang.

SSH Y IIB/16b.

ib. 32a.

ib. 11a.

SSH Y IA/38b-39a; KSC IV 348.2.23.

SSH Y IA/42b; KSC IV 348.2.25.

Chih Tun describes the Ch’ang-shan 長山 at Tung-yang 東陽 in a few words (SSH Y IA/45a); characterizes the essential difference between Northern and Southern scholarship by means of a clever metaphor (IB/17a); funny remark about his endless conversation with Hsieh I 謝壹 (IB/21b); id. about playing chess (IIIA/34a); ridicules Wang T’an-chih 王坦之 (IIIB/21b); pungent remark about Wang Hui-chih and Wang Hsien-chih 王徽之,王義之 (IIIB/23b); puts Wang Meng in his place (IB/21b, cf. IIB/11b and KSC IV 349.1.2).
For the term tu-chiang cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, p. 117.

SHSY IB/21a-b; KSC IV 348.3.25.

SHSY IB/20a-b; cf. KSC loc.cit. where this passage has become mixed up with the one translated above. The unknown disciple of Chih Tun who wrote the preface to the commentary on the Śāraṅgamasamādhīsūtra (cf. below, p. 140) speaks also about “the Three Vehicles” as one of the basic subjects of Chih Tun’s teachings. Perhaps something more can be known about it. The SHSY comm. ibid. gives a rather long discussion about the difference between the three yāna, quoted, as the Comm. says, from the “Lotus sūtra” in Chinese. This is, however, certainly not the source of the question; it is obviously a fragment of some early treatise or commentary written by a Chinese, and the fact that it figures here might indicate that it was written by Chih Tun himself. The first words 楞伽經 could of course easily be a mistake for 楞伽論 or 楞伽論節. Now we find in the table of contents of Lu Ch'eng’s Fa-lun (CSTCC XII 83.1.4 sqq.) a list of works of Chih Tun (cf. below, note 213), and among these a “Discussion of the Three Vehicles” (ib. 83.3.12). Moreover, this work is immediately preceded by a Fa-hua ching lun, without author’s name, but followed by a continuous series of five works by Chih Tun. It seems probable that the fragment quoted in the SHSY comm. was part of one of these treatises. Doctrinally, the fragment is not very interesting; it is mainly an attempt to define the meaning of the terms 廣闊 (śrāvaka), 繩索 (pratyekabuddha) and 菩薩 (bodhisattva). A somewhat more detailed and interesting description of the Three Vehicles can be found in the preface to a commentary on the An-pan shou-i ching by the contemporary Buddhist scholar Hsieh Fu 謝敷 who also belonged to the circle of Chih Tun (cf. below, p. 136 and note 283): CSTCC VI 44.1.14 sqq. For the speculations about the Three Vehicles and the stages of the Bodhisattva career in early Chinese Buddhism see Ōchō Enichi 與照敬日 in Jōron Kenkyū, p. 184-186.

The relation between “talents” and “(human) Nature” existed, was one of the most important themes of discussion and speculation in the third century; in the fourth century it still formed, in a more abstract and theoretical way, one of the most fashionable topics of ch'ing-t'an (cf. SHSY IB/19b; ib. 23b-24a; ib. 27a). See T'ang Ch'ang-ju, op.cit., p. 298-310 and D. Holzman, La vie et la pensée de Hi K'ang, p. 8-9.

SHSY IB/23b-24a.

The title of ch. XXXI of the Chuang-tzu.

SHSY IB 25a-b.

ib. IB/20b-21a.

SHSY IB/22a-b and IIIB/12b-13a.

Yü-lin 註林 quoted in comm. SHSY IIIA/5b-6a.

七尺之軀, lit. “(my) body of seven feet” (in Han times the foot was only ca. 23 cm.); the expression occurs for the first time in Hsün-tzu ch. I p. 7-8.

SHSY IIIB/11a.

ib. 23b.

編布筆衣; I have not been able to find the meaning of the character 編 in any dictionary.

鄭康成, i.e., the famous Confucian scholar and exegete Cheng Hsüan 鄭玄 (127-200 AD).

SHSY IIIB/21b, and comm. ib. quoting the Yü-lin 註林; here the words mentioned in note 179 do not occur.

SHSY IIIB/22b.

SHSY IIIB/32b.

Fei Chuang lun 渡莊論, quoted in his biography, CS 75.4a-5a.

SHSY IB/18b-19a.

SHSY IB/20a; KSC IV 348.3.4.
The Lan-t'ing chi hsü, a typical hsüan-hsüeh product with the transitoriness of all feelings and emotions as its central theme, has been reproduced in Wang Hsi-chih's biography (CS 80.4a-b); a condensed and somewhat different version is quoted in the SSHY comm. (IIIA/8b) under the title Lin-ho hsü (IIB/349.1.2 sqq.). The CS version is the one which is found in all ku-wen collections. Translations: Zottoli, Cursus litterarum Sinicae (Shanghai 1880), vol. IV, p. 295-297; W. Grube, Geschichte der chinesischen Literatur, p. 253-254; G. Margoulies, Le kou-wen chinois (Paris 1926), p. 126-128.

As a priest, Chih Tun has or claims to have the privilege to use his personal name (ming) when addressing the emperor, instead of saying "your subject", as all other people with very rare exceptions were obliged to do. This habit of "not calling oneself 'subject'" symbolizes the independent and un-worldly position of the monk in his relation with the temporal authorities.

"to carve purity" (i.e., to make ornaments, to adorn what is originally pure and simple?) does not make sense, especially not as a parallel to the following, "to revert to simplicity". The text is probably corrupt.


Apparently an illusion to Tso-chuan, 27th year of duke Hsiang (chu-shu ed. 38.12a): "其主禮於鬼神無隠（Couvreur vol. II p. 488). According to K'ung Ying-ta's commentary, this phrase must be interpreted as "His (i.e., Fan Wu's) liturgists explain the truth (in their eulogies about his conduct) to the spirits, and (in their prayers) there are no words for which he (Fan Wu) must be ashamed". Chih Tun writes , which as far as I can see only can be translated as "to remove the evil imprecations of Ch'en Hsin". It follows that Chih Tun regarded as a proper name, and that he interpreted the Tso-chuan passage as "(but) his liturgist Ch'en Hsin (speaks) shameless words to the spirits". This may be an example of Chih Tun's "cursory way of studying the scriptures" (above, note 152)!

Cf. Lun-yü VII.34: 子曰，丘之始聞丘.

Cf. Tao te ching 39: "道得一以養……王侯得一以為天下貞."

圍上, var. 圍上, was the round altar on which the emperor performed the sacrifice to Heaven at the time of the winter solstice, cf. Kuang-ya, section 釋天.

元, cf. the first words of the I-ching (hexagram ch'ien): 乾元亨利, Ch'ien, the pure yang hexagram which stands for power and supreme authority is here used as a symbol for the renewed glory of the Chin dynasty.


KSC IX 385.2.13; the translation given here is that of A. F. Wright, p. 352.


Cf. Tao-te ching ch. 35: "乾天之，天下順．"

Lun-yü XVII.19: "天何言哉，四時行焉．"
KSC IV 349.2.20 has 開; SSHY has 指 “saw him off”.

For this pavilion see comm. SSHY IIA/32a-b.

SSHY loc.cit.; KSC IV 349.2.19.

KSC IV 349.2.22.

For the problem of the place of his death see below, note 212.

SSHY IIIA/12a = KSC IV 349.3.12. Analogous words in the “Preface to a Poem written at the Grave of the Master of the Doctrine” 遊語巻下詩序 by Wang Hsün 上姆 (a grandson of Wang Tao, lived 350-401) who visited Chih Tun’s grave in 374 (quoted in the comm. SSHY, loc.cit.). According to the KSC, there were different traditions concerning the place where Chih Tun had died. Hui-chiao himself agreed with those who located his grave at the Wu-shan 屋山 near Yü-yao 餘姚 in K’uai-chi; according to others he died at Shan 萬, which is also the opinion of the “Biography of Chih Tun” quoted in comm. SSHY IIIA/12a. The latter opinion is corroborated by Wang Hsün’s words in his preface (written only eight years after Chih Tun’s death): “I went to Mt. Shih-ch’eng in Shan; here is the grave-mound of the Master of the Doctrine . . .”.

KSC IV 349.3.18 mentions the “Collected Works of Chih Tun” in ten chiian; the (Sha-men) Chih Tun chi still figures in the bibliographical sections of the Sui-shu and both T’ang-shu. Sui-shu 35.5b: “in eight chiian”, with the remark; “according to the Liang (catalogue, probably that of Juan Hsiao-hsü 阮孝緒, 523 AD) in thirteen chiian”. Both T’ang-shu bibliographies have 10 as the number of chiian, like KSC (庚書籍署文志 p. 337). Chih Tun’s collected works no doubt contained all those treatises, poems and fragments which we now find in collections like HMC and KHMC or as quotations dispersed in KSC, the SSHY comm. and other works. All existing fragments have been collected by Yen K’o-chün (CCW 157.3b-15a). Hsu Kan’s 徐幹 edition of the surviving fragments in his Hsi-shih ts’ung-shu 徐氏叢書, published in 1886 and 1888 (mentioned by A. F. Wright in HJAS XI, 1948, p. 326 note 16) was not accessible to me. An anonymous Ming manuscript copy of “collected works of Chih Tun”, formerly in the National Library, Peking (Library of Congress microfilm 500/592-618) is incomplete and very inaccurate. When in the third quarter of the fifth century Lu Ch’eng compiled his huge collection of Buddhist Chinese literature, the Fa-lun 法論, he included eighteen treatises and letters of a doctrinal nature selected from Chih Tun’s works. The titles are as follows (CSTCC XII 83.1.4 sqq.):

1. “On wandering in the Mystery (by realizing) the identity (of Emptiness) with Matter” 有起識玄論 (followed by a letter of Wang Ch’ia, cf. below, p. 134, and an answer by Chih Tun). The “Essay on Mysterious Contemplation, from Chih Tao-lin’s Collected Works” 行道林集妙觀章 quoted in comm. SSHY 11B/19b seems not to have been the same work (cf. T’ang Yung-t’ung, History, p. 259).


3. “An explanation of the Theory of Fundamental Non-being being identical with Matter” 論根本非義 (followed by a letter by a certain Wang Yu-kung 王友恭 and Chih Tun’s reply. I have not been able to trace Wang Yu-kung’s identity; perhaps it is a mistake for Wang Kung 王恭, a grandson of Wang Meng, who died in 398 and who acc. to SSHY IIB/34b and 36a knew Chih Tun personally).

4. Letter to Chih Tun by Hsi (Ch’ao) 邢玄法師書, and

5. Letter to Hsi Ch’ao by Chih Tun 支書與邢書.

6. “Guide to the Tao-hsing (ching)” 道性指歸 with questions by “Ho Ching” 何敬, and answer by Chih Tun. Ho Ching seems to be an error for Ching-ho 敬和, i.e., Wang Ch’ia, who in his letter (cf. below, p. 134) indeed speaks about this treatise and the master’s elucidations.
(7) “On the Lotus Sūtra” 注華經論 (no author’s name, but probably also by Chih Tun, cf. above, note 168).
(8) “A discussion of the Three Vehicles” 三乘論．
(9) “(Exhortative) Inscription to the Right of the (Teacher’s) Seat” 坐右銘 cf. above, note 157; text preserved in KSC IV 348.3.10 sqq.
(10) “An exhortation to study the Way” 進學誠．
(11) “Essay on (?) the Urgency of Understanding” 勸悟章, written ca. 365 at the death of his friend Fa-ch’ien 注序, cf. below, p. 140.
(12) Answer by Chih Tun to Hsieh Ch’ang-hsia 謝夷退 (identity unknown).
(13) “Preface to the Collected Discussions held by the Monks of the Prajñā Terrace (Monastery?) concerning the (monastic) Rules and Regulations” 般若堂集議筵規序 (subject matter unknown; apparently some documents relating to a discussion of the Vinaya rules attended or presided by Chih Tun).
(14) “Preface and commentary on the Four (stages of) Trance (as described in) the Pen-ch’i (ching)” 布起四禪序 譯起四禪論。Probably an explanation of the passage dealing with the four dhyāna stages either of the Hsiu-hsing pen-ch’i ching 修行本起經 (T 184 ch. II, Kyôto ed. XIV. 3 p. 231. A1) or of the T’ai-tzu jui-ying pen-ch’i ching 太子瑞應本起經 (T 185 ch. I, Kyôto ed. ib. p. 237. A1), the same passage(s) which formed the source of Chih Tun’s summary description of anāpāna in his description of Śākyamuni’s life, cf. Appendix III p. 178 and ib. note 151.
(15) “Outline of and examples (drawn from) the Pen-yeh (ching)” 布起略例．Note that the title of this treatise is strikingly similar to Wang Pi’s famous Chou-i liêh-li 周易略例. The scripture in question may have been Chih Ch’ien’s P’u-sa pen-yeh ching 菩薩本業經 (T 281), or else the somewhat later version by Nieh T’ai-chen, Chu p’u-sa ch’iu fo pen-yeh ching 諸菩薩本業經 (T 282).
(16) “Preface to a commentary on the Pen-yeh ching” 符起注序.
(17) “Eulogy on a portrait of Dharmarakṣa” (sic!) 撰造像儀。 Some lines of this eulogy are quoted in KSC I 326.3.21 (biogr. Dharmarakṣa).
(18) “Letter to a Korean Monk” 致高句麗僧人書 (quoted in KSC and SSHY comm., cf. below, note 301).
Chih Tun’s biography in KSC mentions furthermore:
(19) “On the Saint not having Discursive Knowledge” 善法無論, also mentioned in T 2149 (Ta-T’ang NTL) III 244.3.25 (曾here written 聞);
(20) “To solve what is obscure” 琢磨論, also mentioned in T 2149 ib.
(21) “Commentary on the An-pan (shou-i) ching 安般般論．
(22) Chih Tun’s memorial of 365 AD, cf. above, p. 120 sqq.
Of these works only two have been completely preserved (nr. 9 and 22); of five more some fragments are known (the two treatises mentioned sub 1; furthermore nrs. 7 or 8, 17 and 18). In addition, we have fragments or the complete text of the following works, not listed by Lu Ch’eng or in Chih Tun’s biography:
(23) Eulogy on a Portrait of Yü Fa-lan 于法蘭 (quoted in Yü Fa-lan’s biography, KSC IV 350.1.8).
(24) Inscription on a portrait of Yü Tao-sui 于道邃 (quoted ib. 350.2.22).
(25) “On the meaning of (the chapter of Chuang-tzu entitled) Hsiao-yao (yu)” 逍遥論 (quoted in SSHY comm. 1B/19a).
(26) “Preface to a synoptic extract of the Larger and Smaller Versions of the Prajñāpāramitā” 大小品對比要略序 (preserved in CSTCC VIII 55.1-56.3, cf. below, p. 124 sqq.).
(27) “Eulogy on an image of the Buddha Śākyamuni, with preface” 譯像文序 譯像序序, id. on an image of Amitâbha, and eulogies on Mañjuśrī,
Maitreya, Vimalakirti and other Bodhisattvas; in total thirteen poems, in *KHMC* XV 195.3–196.2.

(28) Several groups of miscellaneous poems on the Buddha’s birth-day, on fasting, on living in the mountains, on a painting of a dhyāna-master in trance etc., in total seventeen poems, in *KHMC* XXX 349.2–351.2.

(29) “Inscription on the T’ien-t’ai mountain” 天台山铭, short fragment of its preface quoted in Li Shan’s 李善 commentary on Sun Ch’o’s 孫釋 Yu T’ien-t’ai shan fu 遗天台山赋 in *Wen-hsuan XI* (ed. Wan-yu wen-k’u 万羽文库 p. 224).

The so-called “Letter of Chih Tao-lin to Huan Hsuan about the provincial registration of the clergy” in *HMC* XII 85.3 is dated 399 AD and consequently cannot have been written by Chih Tun, cf. above, p. 16 nr. 14, and ch. IV, note 177.

Finally we may mention the fact that in some minor Buddhist bibliographies the translation of two scriptures (阿闍佛利諸菩薩所成品 and 方等法華經) is attributed to Chih Tao-lin (Chih Tun): T 2151 (古今譯經通記) II 356.1.7, and all editions except the Korean one of T 2153 (大藏新定經目録) II 385.3.1 and IV 392.2.14. Here Chih Tao-lin 支道林 is clearly a mistake for Chih Tao-ken 支道勤, a further unknown monk who according to T 2149 (Ta-T’ang NTL) III 244.3.13 translated these works in the period 326-343. Both scriptures had already been lost at the time of the compilation of T 2154 (K’ai-yüan SCL, 730 AD), cf. ib. XIV 626.3.19 and 628.3.27.


215 非是空,非色滅. This is a paraphrase of a passage of the *Vimalakirti-nirdesa* (version of Chih Ch’ien, T 474 ch. II p. 531.2.7) “The Bodhisattva Priyadarśana said (to Vimalakirti, when asked to define the nature of non-duality 不二): ‘The world is just (identical with) emptiness; (consciously) to make it so forms a duality. Matter is emptiness: it is not so that matter (must be) destroyed (to reach) emptiness, but the very nature of matter is emptiness. (The same may be said of the other skandhas; thus) knowing (必須, vijñāna, Consciousness) is emptiness: it is not so that knowing (must be) destroyed (to reach) emptiness, but the very nature of knowing is emptiness. This realization of the (true) nature of the five darkening elements (五陰, skandha) constitutes the way leading to (入 “entrance” = dhammapatikha) non-duality’. The words used here for “matter is emptiness...” etc. are 不是空, non-duality. It is interesting to note that in the corresponding passage in Kumārajiva's version (T 475 II 551.1.1) this phrase runs as follows: 非是空, non-duality, which is practically identical with Chih Tun’s own formulation. Kumārajiva’s Chinese collaborators and redactors of his translations—people who, like Seng-chao, must have been fully conversant with the writings of the Chinese Buddhist exegetes of their times—may have been responsible for this rendering.

216 不自色: I follow T’ang Yung-t’ung’s reading (History, p. 259) who adds the three characters 不自色 in accordance with the first sentence of the first fragment translated above.


218 The standpoint of the adherents of this theory as formulated by Seng-chao in *Chao-lun* 羣論 (section 不是空論), T 1858 p. 152.1; Liebenthal, *The Book of Chao*, p. 58-59; Jörön Kenkyū, p. 15.

219 Chung-tzu comm. VII 27a; cf. above, p. 92.

220 *Chao-lun*, *loc.cit.*: 此真語 (read, with Yüan-k’ang’s comm., 悟) 不自色, 不領色之非色也，and Yüan-k’ang’s remarks to this passage (Chao-lun shu ch. I, T 1859, p. 171.3).

221 *CSTCC* VIII 55.1-56.3.
CHAPTER THREE

222 Cf. Tao te ching ch. I: "玄之又玄, 無窮之門."
223 CSTCC VIII 55.1.14.
224 The text has "十位之稱乎未足定號般若之尊乎數迹之名"; in view of the parallelism, 定 is obviously a mistake for 之.
225 名乎彼, lit. "that one", "the other" as opposed to "this one" or "I" in the subject. Cf. Chuang-tzu ch. II (義物論), p. 8: 非彼無我.非我無所取, and ib. p. 10: 是彼是我也,彼亦是也...果且有彼是手哉,果且無彼是手哉.彼是使其了無謂之道極
227 CSTCC VIII 55.1.24.
228 ib. 55.1.29.
229 ib. 55.2.3.
231 CSTCC VIII 55.2.22.
232 ib. 56.1.2.
233 ib. 55.3.20.
234 ib. 55.2.9.
235 In his "善思菩薩論", KHMC XV 197.1.29.
236 Yü Tao lun 善道論, HMC III 16.2.18.
237 Wang Pi in his commentary ad TTC XIV and TTC VI, translated above, p. 89.
238 Biography to Chih Tun, KSC IV 348.3.22 (not mentioned elsewhere).
239 HMC XIII 89.1.21, cf. below, Appendix B p. 175).
240 KHMC XV 197.2.1 (善思菩薩論).
241 ib. 196.2.28.
242 Most editions have 五味, which makes no sense to me. I read, with the Palace edition, 五味 "the five tastes", to be interpreted not in the Buddhist sense (paicarasa, cf. Mochizuki, Bukkyō daijiten, p. 1299b), but rather as in Tao te ching XI (五味合人口爽), standing for sensual pleasure.
243 阿毘陏経; probably Chih Ch'ien's version of the Sukhāvatīvuyāha, T 362.
244 KHMC XV 196.3.9.
245 According to the very unreliable Ming-hsiang chi 真祥記 by Wang Yen 工絃 (late fifth century), quoted in Fa-yüan chu-lin (T 2122) ch. XLII, p. 616.2.15, Wei Shih-tu, his master Chüeh Kung-tse 銘公戸 (elsewhere unknown) and his mother should all have been Amitābha devotees. The KSC (I 327.3.7) does not mention this. In any case, scriptures wholly or partially devoted to the cult and the "visualization" of Amitābha and his paradise existed in China since the late second century (cf. Tsukamoto Zenrū 総不喜善, Shina bukkyōshi kenkyū 支那仏教史研究, Hoku-Gi hen 北魏篇, Tōkyō 1942, p. 619 sqq.).
246 KSC VI 358.3.21, wrongly described as taking place at Ch'angan, cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, p. 217-218.
247 CSTCC XV 109.3.16; KSC VI 358.2.12.
248 KSC IV 348.2.21. The gist of Chih Tun's exegesis of the Hsiao-yao chapter may be found in the long quotation from his Hsiao-yao lun preserved in the commentary of SSY IB 18b-19a; this exposition of his ideas may have been one by which he won Wang Hsi-chih's friendship and admiration (ib. 20a). It is not identical with his "commentary to the Hsiao-yao chapter", for which see next note. It was on account of Chih Tun's mastery in explaining Chuang-tzu that Sun Ch'o in his Tao-hsien lun 道真論 compared him with Hsiang Hsiu (quoted in comm. SSY IB 20a and KSC IV 349.3.8). For Chih Tun's exegesis of this chapter and his relation to Hsiang Hsiu and Kuo Hsiang see Ch'en Yin-k'o 陳寅恪, "Hsiao-yao yu Hsiang-Kuo i chi Chih Tun i t'an-yüan"透迤游向上遊義及支遷義探源, in Ch'ing-hua hsüeh-pao XIII.2 (1937), and Hou Wai-lu and others, op. cit., vol. III, p. 260-262.
To judge from these little fragments, Chih Tun's commentary was not only philosophical, but also philological, explaining the meaning of individual words and expressions.

According to the Buddhist scriptures, Saintliness can be effected by spiritual purification. (On account of this) Chien-wen said: '(Only) those who are free from (conscious) knowledge may reach the highest summits, but in (all) other cases the work of self-cultivation still cannot be regarded as devoid (of reality)'.

Huan Wen once "characterized" Sūrīnītra (SSHY I 11 B/5a, cf. KSC I 327.3.15). According to a probably apocryphal story in Ming-hsiang chi (quoted in Fa-yuan chu-lin XXXIII 545.1.22; much shorter version in his biography CS 98.14a), he became a devout Buddhist in the last years of his life and entertained a nun who by means of a miraculous sign warned him to abandon his plans to rebel and to usurp the throne.

According to a probably apocryphal story in Ming-hsiang chi (quoted in Fa-yuan chu-lin XXXIII 545.1.22; much shorter version in his biography CS 98.14a), he became a devout Buddhist in the last years of his life and entertained a nun who by means of a miraculous sign warned him to abandon his plans to rebel and to usurp the throne.

The binome a-tu 阿堵 is a typical vernacular expression which occasionally appears in medieval literary texts. It seems to be roughly equivalent to pi "that one, yonder", and is often used, like pi, in a pejorative sense. Cf. P'ei Hsüeh-hai 彭學海, Ku-shu hsü-tzu chi-shih 古書虛字集釋 (Shanghai 1934), ch. IX, p. 764, who regards 阿 as a protheticum and 堆 as a variant of 堆 (in the sense of "this one") ; Chu Ch'i-feng 車其風, Tzu-t'ung 藤通 (Shanghai 1934), p. 2060.3 (who regards it as equivalent to 阿這個); Tz'u-hai 特海 p. 1416.5 where this phrase from SSHY is misquoted as 阿應在阿堵上, which would mean exactly the opposite: "Truth must be comprised therein".

For the important role played by the Vimalakirti-nirdeṣa in early gentry Buddhism see also Tsukamoto Zenshū, Shīna būkkyōshi kenkyū ch. VI (p. 35-42).

E.g., Kumārajiva himself in the early fifth century commentary to the Vimalakirti-nirdeṣa (combined glosses of Seng-chao, Kumārajiva and Tao-sheng) 注維摩詰 (T 1775) ch. X, section 13, p. 414.1.1: 此經略述聖經聖義，開簡略了。
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260 *SSHY* IB/19b, in a conversation between Chih Tun and Wang T'an-chih.

261 Cf. Chang Yen-yuan, *Li-tai ming-hua chi* V. 180 and 183 s.v. Ku K'ai-chih, who gives also a highly improbable story about its original function (viz. to raise money by the admission fees of visitors who came to see the picture), quoted from the *Ching-shih ssu-chih* 經世志記, cf. also O. Sirén, *Chinese Painting* (London 1956), vol. I, p. 28. It was a mural painting executed in a small hall north of the Wa-kuan ssu.


263 *HMC* III 16.2-17.3; contents summarized by M. H. Wilhelm, *op. cit.*, p. 269-271. The present text seems to be incomplete, as it does not contain a passage quoted in *KSC* IV 350.2.26.

264 *HMC* III 16.2.12. Most editions have 當中 "within the world", or, strictly speaking, "within the imperial domain". The Korean edition reads 龍中 "in the dark", which makes better sense. I take 當中 to be a mistake for 龍中, cf. *Chuang-tzu II* (畫物論) p. 10: 始得其龍中以應無窮.

265 *Ka K'ai-chih*, quoted in *Ch'ü-hsiëh chi* ch. 23.3b.

266 *KHMC* XXVIII 323.1. According to *SSHY* IIB/14b and *KSC* V 355.1.6 he was one of the admirers of Chu Fa-t'ai 趙法汰 (320-387), the famous preacher of northern origin who had studied with Tao-an and who shortly after 365 arrived at Chienk'ang. This must be a mistake. According to *CS* 65.6b (biogr. of Wang Ch'ia)他 died in 358 at the age of 35, whereas according to the *Chung-hsung-shu* 中興書 (a fifth century history of the Eastern Chin by Hsi Shao 謝超, quoted *comm. SSHY* IIB/14b) he was 25 years old when he died. The latter figure is less probable, in view of the many official posts he had successively filled according to his *CS* biography. Moreover, his eldest son Wang Hsun 王邃 had been born in 350 AD (CS 65.7b), and it is improbable, though not impossible, that Wang Ch'ia was at that time 17 years old instead of 27.

267 No biography in *CS*; some biographical information in *Hsü Chin yang-ch'iu* quoted in *comm. SSHY* I A/40a. I.

268 *SSHY* IB/33b-34a, and *comm. ib*.

269 In *SSHY* IIIA/17b we read how he lived in a mountain cave, and there freely accepted the gifts of the regional aristocracy. Hsi Ch'ao had several "recluse-protégés": whenever he heard about someone who wanted to become a "retired gentleman", he sustained him with large sums of money and built a house for him; he did so among others for the painter-recluse Tai K'uei 戴逵 (*SSHY* IIIA/17b-18a). His father Hsi Yin was the patron of the Buddhist hermit-scholar Hsieh Fu (cf. below, p. 136). About this arcadic "recluse life", which became a fashion among the fourth century gentry, see Wang Yao, "Lun hsi-ch'i yin-i chih feng" 論希奇特風 in *Chung-ku wen-jen sheng-huo* 中古文人生活 (sixth impr., Peking 1953), p. 77-109. Gentry-monks like Chih Tun who were patronized in the same way by prominent members of the gentry no doubt profited by this prevailing custom. Even in the North, under the foreign rulers, this curious fashion existed. When Shih Hu (333-349) was irritated by the repeated refusal of the eccentric hermit and I-ching specialist Yang K'o 楊逹 to take office, the monk Tao-ch'in 毛Spinner (one of Fo-t' u-teng's disciples) is said to have justified Yang K'o's behaviour by saying to Shih Hu: "How could you
allow the (future) Annals of the Chao (empire) to remain without biographies of recluses?" After which the Hun ruler, impressed by the argument, let Yang K'o in peace and gave him, moreover, a regular allowance to sustain himself in his hermit life (KSC IX 386.1.17, trsl. A. F. Wright, HJAS XI, 1948, p. 360; biogr. of Yang K'o in CS 94.14a).

270 SSHY IB/20b-21a; IB/21a-b = KSC IV 348.3.25 and IB 25a-b.

271 CS 67.12b.

272 KSC IV 349.1.9.

273 SSHY IA/42b.

274 SSSHY III/32b; CS 67.10b.

275 SSSHY IIIA/3b. Probably not without some hidden satisfaction, the Buddhist physician found that his patient was suffering from a terrible constipation caused by eating an enormous quantity of Taoist paper charms!

276 SSSHY IIIB/21b.

277 SSSHY IIIB/21b.

278 SSSHY IIIB/21b.

279 Quoted in comm. to SKC, Wei-chih 28.337b, biogr. of Chung Hui.

280 Quoted in comm. SSHY IIIA1/8a. Cf. also Fa-yuan chu-lin XVIII p. 418.1, quoting Ming-hsia-chi.

281 Both Hsieh Fu and Tai K'uei were known as famous devotees as early as the beginning of the fifth century, even at the court of the Later Ch'in at Ch'angan, cf. the letter of Yao Hsing in KHMC XI 74.2.

282 CSTCC VI 43.3.25 sqq. As Hsieh Fu himself says in his preface, his commentary consisted of explanatory notes to the numerical categories  数 of this dhyāna scripture; he had included the parallel passages copied from other scriptures of this type: the “Large” (sūtra on) ānāpāna, the Hsiu-hsing (tao-ti ching)  行 (通比説) etc. (ib. 44.2.22). According to a note by Seng-yu in CSTCC VII 49.1.17, Hsieh Fu also wrote a commentary on Chih Min-tu's “synoptic edition” of the three versions of the Śūramgamasamādhiśūtra.

283 Quoted in Li Shan's commentary to Wang Chien's 王僧  "Epitaph of Ch'u Yüan" in Wen-hsüan LVIII.1266.

284 Hou-Han chi 10.5a (passage quoted in Li Hsien's commentary to HHS 72.4b).

285 KSC IV 348.3.26.

286 CSTCC VI 43.3.25 sqq. Perhaps identical with the Chu Fa-chi from T'ai-yang 太陽 who instructed Tao-an in the Yin-ch'ih-ju ching around the middle of the fourth century, when Tao-an was living at Huo-tse 胡州 (Shansi), cf. KSC V (biogr. of Tao-an) 351.3.25 and CSTCC VI 45.1.8 (Tao-an's Preface to the Yin-ch'ih-ju ching). T'ang Yung-t'ung (History, p. 198) proposes to read Ta-yang 大陽 for T'ai-yang, Ta-yang (near the modern P'ing-lu 平陸 in southern Shansi) being comparatively near to Huo-tse. It may be that Fa-chi in the second half of the fourth century went from Shansi to the South-East, and there composed the Kao-i sha-men chuan, which was devoted to the lives of prominent monks of the "Eastern Region" (cf. next note).

287 Also mentioned in T 2149 (Ta-T'ang NTL) III 248.3.24 and ib. X 330.2.5.
Several times quoted in the *com.* SSHY, always about Chu Tao-ch’ien, Chih Tun and Yu Fa-k’ai. The last fact mentioned in these passages is Chih Tun’s death (366 AD), wrongly localized at Loyang (IA/38b-39a). This kind of collection of idealized biographies was popular in the fourth century; the Kao-i sha-men chuan may have been patterned after such works as the Kao-shih chuan 聖士傳 by Huang-fu Mi 王阜, the Kao-shih chuan by Yu P’an-tso 榮然佐, the Chih-jen Kao-shih chuan-tsan 至人高士傳赞 by Sun Ch’o 孫绰, the I-jen kao-shih chuan 至人傳 by Hsi Ts’o-ch’i 黄楚重, the Yin-i chuan 隱逸傳 by Ko Hung 戴洪, the Ming-shih chuan 名士傳 by Yuan Hung 隆宏 etc.

Comm. SSHY IA/10b and 39a. Furthermore it says that Chu Tao-ch’ien died at the age of 79 (Chinese counting) instead of 89, cf. above, note 69, but this may be due to a抄ist’s mistake.

**KSC IV 348.2.2.**

**KSC IV 348.2.5.** Around the same time we find in the North, at Loyang, another famous calligrapher-monk-physician, An Hui-tse 安慧則, who excelled in making miniature manuscripts of sūtras which were highly valued. He managed to copy the whole text of the Pañcavimsatisāhasrikā p‘p’ on one scroll (*KSC X* 389.2.14). He is, incidentally, the last known monk who by his religious surname (An) preserved the memory of the Parthian missionaries who once laid the foundations of Chinese Buddhism.

**KSC IV 348.1.25;** here no place of origin is indicated. In view of his being a pupil of Chu Tao-ch’ien, probably around the middle of the fourth century, he can hardly be identified with the Chu Fa-yu who figures at Loyang in an anonymous colophon dated 300 AD (*CSTCC VII* 48.3.5, 見劫經記).

**KSC, ib.**

Only one sentence is devoted to him in *KSC IV 348.1.2* (法曆). Furthermore Chi-tsang’s 见藏 Chung-kuan lun-shu 中觀論疏 (T 1824) IB.29.2 and Ancho’s 安澄 subcommentary Chaiganzoki 中觀頌記 (T 2225) ch. III p. 94.2 (法曆). The identity of “Fa-yün” and “Fa-wen” is certain; additional proof is provided by the table of contents in Shūsho’s 菩薩 Meisōdenshō 名僧傳物 (Kyōto ed. II. 2.7.1) p. 2A1, where we find an “intermediate” form 當法曆.


**KSC IV 348.1.10;** Kao-i sha-men chuan quoted comm. SSHY IIIB/8a.

**KSC IV 348.1.12; comm. SSHY IA/10b** (no source mentioned, but probably also a quotation from the Kao-i sha-men chuan).

**SSHY IB/18a-b.**

Chih Tun’s words of mourning SSHY IIIA/11a-b and *KSC IV 349.3.14.*

Chu Fa-t’ai at the death of his pupil T’an-erh 見於 KSC V 355.1.14.

**CSTCC VII 48.3.17.**

ib. 49.1.11.

**KSC IV 350.2.13.** In a passage from Sun Ch’o’s Ōu tai lun (quoted ib. 350.2.26; not in the present text of the Ōu tai lun in *HMC*), Yu Tao-sui and the northern monk Chu Fa-hsing 至法道死 at Loyang are praised as famous masters of the present time; this was apparently written before Tao-sui’s journey to the South.

Cf. the article byo by P. Demiéville, in *Hōbōgirin,* p. 224-265, esp. p. 244, Ch’en Yin-k’o 陳因孝, “San-kuo chih Ts’ao Ch’ung Hua T’o chuan yu Yin-tu ku-shih” 三國志曹沖華傳與印度故事, *Ch‘ing-hua hsüeh-pao* VI. 1, and Ho Ch’ang-ch’ün 郝昌愉, *Wei-Chin ch‘ing-t’an ssu-hsiang ch‘u-lun* 趙善清談思想
in (Shanghai 1947), p. 2-4. Chih Tun himself seems also to have been interested in medicine. In a letter to Chih Tun (quoted KSC IV 348.2.29), Hsieh An praises the medicinal herbs which can be found in the mountains of Wu, and Chih Tun himself says in a preface describing a fasting ceremony at Wu (八閬奏詩序, KHMC XXX 350.1.20): “At the morning of the fourth day, all worthies went away. But since I enjoyed the stillness of the solitary dwelling-place, and also because I had the intention to dig out (some) medicinal herbs, I remained there alone . . .”. According to the Kao-i sha-men chuan (quoted comm. SSHY IB/22b) there was in Chih Tun’s medicinal activities even an element of rivalry with the school of Ōu Fa-k’ai: “Later, (Ōu Fa-k’ai) used to wrangle with Chih Tun, and that is why Chih Tun when he was living at Shan-hsien took up the study of medicine”. It may furthermore be significant that Yin Hao, one of the first serious lay students of Buddhism from the highest gentry (cf. p. 130 sqq.), was also known for his medicinal skill, although he did not practise it in the later years of his life (SSHY IIIA/32a).

Chih Tun seems also to have had some contact with Ōu Fa-lan; acc. to KSC IV 350.1.8 he wrote a posthumous eulogy (quoted ib.) on a portrait of Ōu Fa-lan which he had ordered. Chih Tun wrote also a commemorative inscription on a portrait of Ōu Tao-sui which had been made by Hsi Ch’ao (quoted ib. 350.2.21).

Chuang-tzu II (歿物論), p. 16. In the commentary of Hsiang/Kuo to this passage (I. 23b) the Saint is also called the “great awakened one” 大覺者.

The term shih-han 詩含 “stored impressions”, which in later times was used to denote Ōu Fa-k’ai’s theory, seems also to be to be based on a passage of Tsung Ping’s Ming fo lun: HMC II 10.2.11, cf. T’ang Yung-t’ung, History, p. 265.

HMC II 10.3.9: 光而有德, 法身之謂也.

SSHY IB/22a-b; KSC IV 350.1.22. Chih Tun seems also to have had some contact with Ōu Fa-lan; acc. to KSC IV 350.1.8 he wrote a posthumous eulogy (quoted ib.) on a portrait of Ōu Fa-lan which he had ordered. Chih Tun wrote also a commemorative inscription on a portrait of Ōu Tao-su which had been made by Hsi Ch’ao (quoted ib. 350.2.21).

SSHY IB/22a-b; KSC IV 360.1.25.

CSTCC XII 83.1.10.

KSC IV 350.2.29.

Biogr. in Sung-shu 93.5b; Nan-shih 75.5b.

KSC IV 350.3.11; not mentioned in bibliographical sources.

KSC V 357.1.8.

The KSC text has “a thousand images” 千像; perhaps a mistake for 十 “ten”?


KSC XIII 413.3.5.

KSC ib. See also above, p. 56 (Ts’ao Chih).

Biogr. in KSC V 356.3.7.

KSC V 357.1.29 sqq. (in the biogr. of Chu Tao-i).
339 KSC V 357.2.5. The last words of my translation “people from primeval times” render the Chinese 首主民: “people of the era of the highest (first) Emperor”, i.e., of the times of primordial simplicity and unspoilt happiness under the mythical emperor Fu Hsi (traditionally placed at the beginning of the third millennium BC).

330 KSC XI 395.3.5; also called T’an-kuang 彭光.

331 KSC XI 385.2.7. According to another tradition, also recorded by Hui-chiao, the evil star had been exorcised by Po Seng-kuang and not by Chu T’an-yu. Perhaps the same person as the Chu Tao-yu or Po Tao-yu mentioned in Fa-yüan chu-lin XXXIX 594.3?

332 KSC XI 396.3.10.

333 KSC V 355.2.5.

334 ib. 355.2.17.

335 ib. 355.2.21: 有所便有数,有数则有盡,神統無盡故知無形果。This opposition of the spiritual principle versus the ever-changing and limited entities is in keeping with hsüan-hsiieh thought. Cf. the commentary of Han Po 禪仙 by I-ch’ing, Hsi-tz’u I, to the text 隱屃不測之謂神 (chu-shu ed. 7.13b), an important passage where shen is explained as the immaterial and everlasting principle of order and spontaneity in nature.

336 ib. 355.2.25.

337 KSC V 355.3.1. Chu Seng-fu’s own treatise Shen wu hsing lun does not occur in the list of contents of Lu Ch’eng’s Fa-lun (CSTCC XII 82.3 sqq.), but it is still mentioned in T 2149 (Ta-T’ang NTL, 664 AD) III 248.3.2 and X 330.1.11.

338 Biography KSC V 354.2.29; ib. (biogr. Tao-an) 351.3.26; in 安法師傳 quoted in comm. SSHY IB/24b-25a; mentioned as 接州道人 金陵 in the 雲憎經 十佳胡名漢書 (CSTCC IX 62.3.9) in connection with the sending of a copy of the Daśabhūmikasūtra from Hsiang-yang to Chien-k’ang in 376 AD.

339 KSC V (biogr. Tao-an) 352.1.13; slightly different version in comm. SSHY IIB/14b, quoting the Ch’in-shu 史書 by Chü P’in 秋’en (a history of the “Tibetan” empire of the Former Ch’in, completed in 451 AD by Chü Pin and based on an unfinished history by Chao Cheng 趙承); cf. Wu Shih-chien 武士堅, Pu Ch’in-shu 朴成, Pu Ch’in-shu ching-chi chih 稲書 稲書 (Erh-shih-wu shih pu-pien, vol. III, p. 3862c).

The KSC text has “the governor of Ching-chou, Huan Wen 恆文”; as demonstrated by T’ang Yung-t’ung (History, p. 204), this must be a mistake for Huan Hsu, who had this function in 365.

340 KSC V 354.3.13.

341 The table of contents of Lu Ch’eng’s Fa-lun (CSTCC XII 83.1.11) mentions an essay about 心無無 by Huan Hsüan, together with objections by Wang Mi 王芪 (360-407) and an answer by Huan Hsüan.

342 Correspondence mentioned in KSC V 355.1.15. We have only one short text which treats some aspect of Chu Fa-t’ai’s teachings: SSSY IB/24b-25a, where he states that the six abhijñā and the three vidyā are merely different expressions for the same thing. However, this isolated utterance does not give us a clue to his other ideas, and does not seem to have any relation with the “theory” attributed to him—the subject is purely scholastic. Chu Fa-t’ai means to say that the six abhijñā, like the three vidyā, symbolize the acquisition of perfect knowledge in the three times (present, past, future): divyāsrotta, divyacakṣus, rddhi, pararajñānāna and āśravakṣaya are connected with the present and correspond to the vidyā of āśravakṣaya; divyacakṣus is also connected with the future, since it implies the power to see future events, whereas the sixth abhijñā and the third vidyā, viz. that of pūrvanivāsānusmṛti, refer to the past. The source of Chu Fa-t’ai’s theory is unknown to me; in Abh. Kośa VII 108 the three vidyā are said to be identical with the last three abhijñā, viz. those of pūrvanivāsānusmṛti, cyutypapādaṣajñāna (i.e., divyacakṣus) and āśravakṣayaṣajñāna, since these make an end to erroneous thought in the past, the future and the present, respectively.
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NOTES

344 CSTCC XI 80.1.7 (in the anonymous 比丘尼戒本所出本序), and ib. 81.2.13 (in Dharmaratna’s 比丘大戒二百六十事, dated 381 AD).

345 KSC V 355.1.2.
346 KSC V 355.1.13.
347 KSC VII 366.2.24 = CSTCC XV 110.3.13.
348 KSC IV 349.2.19.
349 KSC IV 347.3.28. It was probably at this time, during Chu Tao-ch’ien’s second stay at the capital, that he was reproached for his relations with the upper ten by the courtier Liu T’an 刘طن (a son-in-law of emperor Ming), who asked him: “Why do you, a priest, frequent the (noble mansions with their) vermillion doors?”, where-upon Tao-ch’ien gave the famous reply: “You yourself see their vermillion doors; to me, poor priest, they are but the grass curtains (of humble huts)” (SSHY IA/34b = KSC IV 348.1.4). SSHY (ib.) mentions another tradition according to which Chu Tao-ch’ien’s opponent would not have been Liu T’an, but Pien Hu 比 slicing, but this is impossible, as Pien Hu, a high magistrate and close collaborator of Wang Tao, had died already in 328, when the king of K’ai-chi Susma Yu (in whose presence this conversation is said to have taken place) was only eight years old.

350 KSC IV 350.3.5.
351 KSC V 357.1.17.
352 KSC V 354.3.25 and XIII 410.1.18. The KSC must be wrong in saying that Chu Seng-fu (cf. p. 147) lived at the Wa-kuan ssu “at the end of the Western Chin”, i.e., ca 315 AD (KSC V 355.2.16). This may be the origin of Fa-lin’s statement (cf. above, p. 104) that this monastery had already been founded by emperor Yuan.

353 KSC XIII (biography of Hui-shou) 410.2.11.
354 KSC V 354.3.21.
355 CS 13 (T’ien-wen chih) p. 12a.
356 SSHY IA/37b, cf. TCTC 103.1217a. For the imperial request forwarded to Fa-k’uang see KSC V 356.3.29. This Ch’ü An-yuan, prefect of T’ang-i, seems to have been an expert in matters of portents and exorcism, for when—also under Chien-wen—crows had come to nestle on the T’ai-chi Hall 太極殿, he was again consulted to explain the meaning of this sign (PCNC I 936.2.22).

357 For emperor Ai’s Taoist inclinations cf. CS 8 (Annals) 8a. Before his accession to the throne, emperor Chien-wen served a famous “pure water master” 水道士, who was called at the capital Wang P’u-yang 王璞陽, and lodged him in a room in his own mansion at K’ai-chi (PCNC I 936.2.12). He also made use of the advice of a famous Taoist master named Hsü Mai 虢 mai (CS 31.6b, biogr. of empress Li 吕), who likewise had close contacts with Wang Hsi-chih with whom he used to collect herbs and to take drugs (CS 80.5b, biogr. of Wang Hsi-chih, and ib. 8a, biogr. of Hsü Mai).

358 CS 9 (Annals) 1a, TCTC 103.1217a, and passim in SSHY, where many ch’ing-t’an meetings are described as taking place in his mansion at K’ai-chi.

359 Pien-cheng lun (T 2110) III 502.3.19.
360 KHMC CV 202.2.13.
361 KSC XIII 409.2.17.
362 CS 32.7a. According to PCNC II 938.1.9, the nun Tao-ch’iung 道鍾 was highly esteemed by “the empress during the t’ai-yüan era (376-396)”; this may also refer to empress Wang.

363 CS 84.3a. The practice of chanting Buddhist sūtras just before the execution is already attested in 324 AD at the execution of Chou Sung 周่ง (CS 61.3b). It does not appear from the texts whether this was done as a prayer for help by repeating the Buddha’s name or the trisarana formula, or as a mental preparation for death.

364 Text of the decree in KSC IV 348.1.19.
365 KSC IV 350.3.28.
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368 KSC V 355.1.9. Cf. the edict deploiring Chu Fa-t'ai's death in the "Court Diaries of the t'ai-yüan era" as quoted in comm. SSHY IIIB/14b.

369 KSC IV 350.3.26.

368 Letter to Tao-an KSC V 352.3.20, written before 379 when Hsiang-yang was captured and Tao-an was brought to Ch'angan; letter to Ling-tsung in PCNC I 936.3.10.

369 KSC XIII 409.2.27.

370 CS 9.6b. According to TCTC 104.1233, the Second Supervisor of the Masters of Writing Wang Ya 冬雅 remonstrated in vain against the establishment of the vihāra.

367 KSC IV 350.3.26.

368 Letter to Tao-an KSC V 352.3.20, written before 379 when Hsiang-yang was captured and Tao-an was brought to Ch'ansan; letter to Ling-tsung in PCNC I 936.3.10.

370 CS 9.6b. According to TCTC 104.1233, the Second Supervisor of the Masters of Writing Wang Ya 冬雅 remonstrated in vain against the establishment of the vihāra.

371 KSC XIII 413.3.3.

372 KSC V 357.1.5.

373 KSC XII 410.2.3 (biogr. of Hui-li 華力) where it is said that the statue was placed in the Wa-kuan monastery at Chien-k'ang; Liang-shu 54.11a (section of the Southern Barbarians) = Nan-shih 78-11a; S. Lévi, "Les missions de Wang Hien-ts'e dans l'Inde", J. As. 1900, p. 316 sqq., p. 411 (where the name of the Singhalese monk is wrongly given as Tan-mo I-yuen 謝達; yüan here obviously belongs to the next sentence 進獻此像), p. 414 where the passage in Liang-shu is wrongly referred to as "section de Ou-ti") and p. 422-423; Fa-lin's Pien-cheng lun (T 2110) III 502.3.21.

368 The earliest (now lost) source for the story of the Singhalese mission may have been the anonymous "Account of the white jade statue presented by (the king of) Ceylon at the time of the Chin emperor Hsiao-wu" 晋本武世師子國獻白玉像記, mentioned in the table of contents of Seng-yu's Fa-yüan ts'a-yüan yüan-shih chi 法苑彌勒原始記 in CSTCC XII 92.3.2. Since this title figures in the section "Miscellaneous portraits and images", this work must have been an illustrated description or a painting with accompanying text representing the presentation of the jade statue or the statue itself.

374 Var. T'an-mo-ts'o 捨摩 (ts'wāt), Pien-cheng lun (T 2110) III 502.3.21.

375 KSC XIII 410.2.3 (biogr. of Hui-li 華力) where it is said that the statue was placed in the Wa-kuan monastery at Chien-k'ang; Liang-shu 54.11a (section of the Southern Barbarians) = Nan-shih 78-11a; S. Lévi, "Les missions de Wang Hien-ts'e dans l'Inde", J. As. 1900, p. 316 sqq., p. 411 (where the name of the Singhalese monk is wrongly given as Tan-mo I-yuen 謝達; yüan here obviously belongs to the next sentence 進獻此像), p. 414 where the passage in Liang-shu is wrongly referred to as "section de Ou-ti") and p. 422-423; Fa-lin's Pien-cheng lun (T 2110) III 502.3.21.

376 Kao-seng Fa-hsien chuan (T 2085) 865.3.24; CSTCC IV 21.1.14.

377 Fa-hsien did the journey in less than a year, of which he spent more than five months on Java. The normal duration of the journey from Java to Canton in the first half of the fifth century was fifty days (T 2085 p. 866.1.29; trsl. Beal, Records vol. I p. LXXX; Giles p. 79).

378 It is remarkable that the Annals of the Chin-shu do not mention any "tribute" from the "Southern Barbarians" under the first years of the i-hsi era. However, under the year 413 we find the following entry:

"In this year Korea, Japan, as well as the South-western barbarians, T'ung-t'ou 鍾頭 and Ta-shih 天师 all sent tribute of regional products" (CS 10.7b).

As far as I know, the name Ta-shih does not occur elsewhere, but it seems not unreasonable to suppose that it stands for Ta Shih (-tzu-kuo) = Ceylon, and that the "tribute" of 413 AD may refer to the arrival of the śramaṇa T'an-mo-i. In that case, his departure from Ceylon must have taken place long after 400. This hypothesis is corroborated by the fact that in the oldest account (KSC XIII) the envoy is said to have arrived during the i-hsi period and not, as the Liang-shu puts it, at its beginning.

It is consequently impossible to define the Singhalese king who sent the image. S. Lévi (op.cit., p. 423) takes him to be Upatissa II, but this ruler (who according to Geiger's chronology, preface trsl. Gūlavamsa p. XI, reigned 522-524) lived in any case later than the Mahānāma who is certainly to be identified with the Cha-li Mo-ho-nan 刺喇摩訶南 ("Kṣatriya Mahānāma") who in 428 sent an envoy with a letter to emperor Wen of the Liu-Sung dynasty (Sung-shu 97.4b). If we keep to Geigers chronology, which is primarily based on some scanty data from Chinese sources (Mahānāma's letter mentioned above, and the hsing-chuan of Wang Hsüan-ts'e quoted in Fa-yüan chu-lin XXIX), and maintain the traditional dates 362-389
for Meghavanna’s reign, then any of his three successors: Jetthatissa II, Buddhadasa and Upatissa I (who together are said to have reigned from 389 till 409) could be the king in question.

379 Ch’ien-mu 陳母, a rare binome for which the meaning “old lady” is given (Tz’u-t’ing, p. 1321; Tz’u-hai, p. 383.2). These influential females at the court, also mentioned (in the same connection) in CS 27 (Wu-hsing chih part I) p. 5b, are no doubt identical with the “wet-nurses” who, according to the memorial of Hsu Yung (quoted below) “entered into cliques and parties” together with monks and nuns. The influence of wet-nurses at the imperial court is not without precedent: according to HHS 5.19b and 10B.1b-2a (cf. Hulsewé, Han Law, p. 165, nr. 9) the wet-nurse Wang Sheng 王盛 was banished in 125 AD for having taken part in the actions of rival cliques on account of which she was found guilty of “great impiety” 大不道. I have been unable to trace the name(s) of the wet-nurse(s) in question, nor have I found other accounts of their activities.

380 CS 64.8a. Ssu-ma Tao-tzu founded the Chih-ch’eng 池城 monastery for the dhārani specialist Chu Seng-fa 車僧法 (KSC XII 406.3.19), and the Chien-ching nunery for Miao-yin, cf. below. Already in 380 AD he had founded the Chung-ssu 中寺 (i.e., “Palace monastery”?) at Chienk’ang, cf. the memorial inscription by Wang Seng-ju 王僧居 (465-522) quoted in IWLC 77.4b.

381 Cf. note 279. Here the normal word for wet-nurse, ju-mu 奶母, is used.

382 CS 64.8b.

383 PCNC I 936.3.20.

384 ib. 936.3.24.

385 ib. 936.3.27. The last phrase may be a cliché; it is also said of the monk Hui-lin 惠琳, “the black-robed minister” (so called on account of his enormous influence at the court in the period 424-453, cf. TCTC 120.141 8a under yüan-chia 3 = 426 AD) in his biography in Sung-shu 97.8b. The phrase occurs already frequently as a cliché in the Han-shu, where it is always used to suggest great fame and influence.

386 PCNC I 936.3.27.

387 CS 64.8b.

388 HMC VI 35.1 sqq. In view of the date, the author of the Shih po lun can hardly be identical with the person of this name mentioned above, p. 148. According to his biography (KSC VI 364.2.23 sqq.) he lived 346-417 AD, so that he in 365 AD was nineteen years old. According to the same source, this was exactly the year in which he became a monk (after the death of his mother), probably in the North.

389 KSC VII 367.2.22.

390 KSC VII 371.2.3.

391 Nan-shih 1.13a.

392 CS 10.10a.

393 Sung-shu 52.8b. Cf. Sung-shu 68.5b, where Liu I-k’ang 劉義康, king of P’eng-ch’eng (409-451), is said to have refused to drink poison for the same reason, and with the same alternative solution.

APPENDIX CHAPTER THREE
Reading, with most editions of the HMC, 船 in stead of 船.

For the expression p'ian-pi 聯整 cf. A. Waley, Analects, Textual Notes XVI. 4.

正朝: the “correct” (legitimate) dynasty? The Palace edition reads 正朝 “at the court”.

Reading, with T 2108, 祝 in stead of ！.

Reading, with T 2108, 船 in stead of 船 or 伴.

Reading, with most editions of the HMC, 船 in stead of 船.

The rare sheng-ting 聲聽, which means “the emperor’s hearing (power)”, is probably a mistake for sheng-ts'ung 聲聴.

Reading, with T 2108, 乃 in stead of 及.

Reading, with T 2108, 末聖 in stead of 末聖.

Reading, with T 2108, 小 in stead of 大.

Here both HMC and T 2108 are corrupted.

T 2108: 王教〇〇〇〇〇則亂

HMC: 王教不德不一二之則亂.

The two readings must apparently be combined as follows: 王教則亂不一, 二之則亂.

Reading, with 2108, 往往偽偽之在與在偽其事. In the next phrase I also adopt the reading of T 2108: 伪之身偽之家 可及 in stead of 偽之家 可(var. 矣).

I follow the reading 曱行 “to practise both (Confucianism and Buddhism?)” of the HMC; T 2108 has 卍行 “to guide one’s steps”? (cf. expressions like 指南).

Reading, with most editions of HMC, 船 in stead of 伪.

今沙門之儀戒 師然及為其體一而己矣. Tentative translation; T 2108 has 師然 in stead of 師師然.

天順恢恢張而不失，cf. TTC 73, trsl. Duyvendak p. 151. The meaning here is that the ideal ruler can afford to be liberal and to allow his subjects to follow their own inclinations.

The first section describes the formal declaration by which one becomes an upāsaka, according to the more complicated procedure of the Sarvāstivādins, which consisted of pronouncing the formula of the Triple Refuge (trīśaraṇa) and accepting the Five Commandments or Prohibitive Rules (pañcaśīla). In this, the ceremony differed from the one attested in the Pāli canon, according to which one becomes an upāsaka by merely pronouncing the trīśaraṇa formula. This became a point of controversy, discussed by the scholiasts of various sects, cf. Abh. Kośa IV 71-76; Lamotte, Traité, p. 829 note 3. The classical form of the trīśaraṇa(-gamana, 三帰) is:

(1) Buddhāṃ saranaṃ gacchāmi (dvipādānām agryam) 綫合信(兩足尊)
(2) dharmam sar.g. (virāgānām agryam) 綫合信(離欲尊)
(3) sangham sar.g. (gānānām agryam) 綫合信(本尊)

Hsi Ch’ao gives a Mahāyāna version of this formula, as appears from the “pluralism” of his 三世十方佛, and renders dharmā in this formula by 十二部經, the “twelve classes of scriptures” in which the dharma is contained.

Kuei-ming 綫合 means no doubt “to surrender one’s life”, or “one’s fate” to a higher authority. In Buddhist Chinese literature it is sometimes explained as “(to turn towards =) to comply with (緬) the orders (or authority, 合)”, sc. of the Buddha (Fa-tsang 法藏, Ta-sheng ch’i-hsin lun i-chi 大乘起信論義記, T 1846, ch. I p. 246.3.27).

南無 (A.C. *nām.mīu) = namas (with dative: “homage to . . ., salutation to . . .”), or rather nama . . ., the form used before voiced consonants, which is far more frequent. For a fancy explanation of 南無 (“in the South there is none”) in a Chinese apocryphal work, see below, p. 301.

Cf. Sun Ch’o in his Yū tao lun (above p. 133) and Yū Fa-k’ai (above, p. 142).

The Five Rules together with the Triple Refuge form the religion of the layman.
NOTES

(upāsaka-pañcaśila-samvara). They are the following: to abstain from (1) destruction of life, prāṇātipāta 杀生; (2) taking what is not given, adattādāna 偷盗; (3) unchastity, kāmamithyācārā 邪淫; (4) falsehood, mṛśāvāda 謊語; (5) intoxicating liquors, surāmairevapramāda 酒誑.

26 For the thirty-six evils of drunkenness see Ta-chih-t'u lun 大智度論 (T 1509) 13.158.2. Lamotte, Traité, p. 817-819, and the sources mentioned there. In China, abstinence from alcoholic drinks originated not before the early third century in Taoist circles, no doubt under Buddhist influence (cf. Fukui Kōjun, Dōkyō no kisokuteki kenkyū, p. 91 and 130).

27 Chai 禪, an ancient term denoting the ritual purification which the celebrant had to undergo before offering, and the period of self-purification during which he "prevents (contact with) nefarious things, suppresses his desires, and does not (allow) his ears to listen to music" (Li-chi XXII, chapter Chi-t'ung 布統, chu-shu ed. 49.4b; trsl. Couvreur II.324). Hence used in Buddhist works as a translation of uposatha (upavasatha, uposadha) denoting, for the layman, the six fast-days of each month (viz. the 8th, the 14th, the 15th, the 23rd, the 29th and the 30th day of each month) and, in addition, the three months of fasting each year ({kṣa}), originally the first three Indian seasons, viz. the first, the fifth and the ninth month of the year. Cf. Abh. Koša IV 65-69. On the uposatha-days the layman keeps eight instead of the usual five rules (八戒, ṛṣṭāṅgaśīla). A curious motivation why these six days of the month are chosen is given in the T'ien-t'ı pen-ch'i 天地 Invocation quoted in Ta-chih-t'u lun (T 1509) 13.160.1 (not in one of the existing versions of this sūtra), trsl. Lamotte, Traité p. 835 sqq.: these are said to be the days on which the demons are particularly malicious. For the term (u)posadha etc. see S. Lévi, "Observations sur une langue précanonique du Bouddhisme", J.As. 1912.2 p. 501 sqq.

28 四無量, mostly called 四無量, the four apramāṇa (or brahmavāhīra) "infinities", cf. below, note 76.

29 Reading, with most versions, 玄感發.

30 The Six Remembrances or Six kinds of Mindfulness 六思念 (anusmṛti), which especially belong to the religion of the layman (Mochizuki, Bukkyō daijiten p. 5073.3 sqq.), are (1) remembrance of the Buddha, buddhānusmṛti, (2) of the Doctrine, dharmānusmṛti, (3) of the Community, saṅghānusmṛti; (4) of the Rules, silānusmṛti, (5) of Charity, tyāgānusmṛti, (6) of the Gods, devānusmṛti or devatānusmṛti. Cf. Mvy. 1148-1154; for other lists of eight and ten anusmṛti cf. Mochizuki p. 4223.1 and 2346.2. A very detailed explanation of each term in Ta-chih-t'u lun ch. XXI, where the whole of section 36 is devoted to the anusmṛti (here a list of eight, as in the first section of the 25.000 p'p'). Hsi Ch'ao here again renders dharma by "scripture(s)", cf. note 21.

31 The devatānusmṛti is a mental concentration on the glory of the gods, and the possibility of being reborn in their abode by observing the Rules of the religious life, cf. Ta-chih-t'u lun, ib. For the uninitiated Chinese reader t'ien must have been ambiguous: "gods" and "heaven" as the dwelling-place of the gods, but also Heaven as an impersonal principle, Nature.

32 The Ten Good Works (kusala-karmāṇi), negative rules prohibiting the sins of body, speech and mind, are the following (in the usual order, and with the Chinese equivalents used by Kumārajiva): To avoid the bodily acts of (1) killing living (beings), prāṇātipāto 取生, (2) taking what is not given, adattādāna 偷盗, (3) unchastity, kāmamithyācārā 邪淫;

the vocal acts of (4) falsehood, mṛśāvāda 謊語, (5) harsh language, pārasya 意口, (6) calumny, paśyunta 聽言, (7) idle talk, sambhina-pralāpa 絕語;

the mental acts of (8) covetousness, abhidyā 貪欲, (9) malice, vyāpāda 惱恚, (10) false views, mithyādṛṣṭi 無見. Of course Hsi Ch'ao did not know the Sanskrit equivalents of the terms he uses here; I have translated them in my text as they would probably have been interpreted by the Chinese reading public of his days. Hsi Ch'ao
has placed the mental acts before the vocal acts: 妨 = 貪欲， 愡 = 頕善， 欲 = 妄見.

The meaning of this statement is not clear. Kāmamithyācāra comprises all sinful actions of a sexual nature (Abh. Kosa IV.146 sqq.; four kinds defined ib. 157).

凡在有方之境； for the expression 有方 cf. Hui-yuán in Sha-men pu-ch'ing wang-che lun 沙門不敬王者論 section 2 (HMCV 30.3.1); 凡在有方同業生於大心。

三界 = trailokyā, consisting of the Realm of Desire (kāmādhūtu 欲界， i.e., the six heavens of desire, the human world and the hells), the Realm of Visible Form (rupadhūtā 世界) and the Formless Realm (arūpyadhūtā 無色界).

頑妄 = preta.

For the problem of a partial observation of the Rules cf. Mochizuki, p. 1118.3 sqq.; Lamotte, Traité, p. 821; Abh. Kosa IV.73 sqq. (different kinds of laymen, those observing only one vow, two vows etc., rejected by Sautrāntikas, advocated by Vaibhāṣikas).

Reading, with the Ming edition, 仍 instead of 仍.

三界道， durgati, viz. animals, pretas and inhabitants of the hells.

Yin 陰 is an archaic translation of skandha, the five elements of the pseudo-personality. It is not clear why yin was used to render skandha (“bulk, quantity, agglomeration”); in Chinese Buddhist texts it is never used in opposition to yang. Probably yin 隱 (“darkness, shade, the dark(ening) element” which covers man’s spirit? Cf. T’ang Yung-t’ung, History, p. 139, and the early third century commentary on the Yin-ch’ih-ju ching (T 1694) ch. I p. 9.3.8, where the term yin, here especially applied to vijnāna, is explained as “invisible”.

The five skandhas are (1) visible matter, rūpa 世， (2) feeling, vedanā 感， (3) conceptions, sammjnā 思， (4) predispositions or actions of the will, samskāra (plur.) 想, (5) consciousness, vijnāna 行 (the English terms are of course only approximative and rather unsatisfactory translations). The Chinese equivalents are those used by Kumārajiva; those given by Hsi Chao are the ones which occur already in Lokakṣema’s Tao-hsing ching (Aṣṭasāhasrikā p’p’; T 224), and which had probably been popularized in the early fourth century by this very influential scripture.

It goes without saying that this splitting up of the Chinese equivalents of vedanā and sammnā and the interpretation of each part of these terms is a purely Chinese invention; in fancy explanations like these we have probably an echo of Chih Tun’s exegesis of the Tao-hsing ching and other scriptures.

The five Hindrances (nivarana) are (1) desire for lusts, kāmacchanda 貪欲, (2) malice, vyāpāda 嫖悪, (3) torpor and drowsiness, sthānamididdha 作沈睡眠, (4) the sin of frivolity, auddhatyakaukriya (auddhata in this sense, not as normally in Skt. “haughtiness, disdain”, cf. Edgerton, p. 161b) 轟軻, (5) doubt, vicikitsā 疑; cf. Abh. Kosa V.98. Hsi Ch’ao has 妄 for rāga, places (5) before (4), and renders sthānamididdha and vicikitsā very inadequately by 潰 and 彼 “wrong views”.

I have not found the source of this quotation. According to the Buddhist doctrine of acts (karman), it is indeed the good, sinful or morally indifferent intention which is all-important. Every corporal sinful deed (kāyakarman) or vocal deed (vākkarman) as well as (according to the Sautrāntikas) the material state of sinfulness (called avijñāpatti, “non-information”) are both the result of a primary mental act (manas-karman) which thus forms the base of all activity. Cf. Abh. Kosa IV.2. sqq., et Et. Lamotte, “Le Traité de l’Acte de Vasubandhu, Karmapiddhapakarana”, MCB IV, p. 151-288, for the opinions of different sects on the act and the process of karmic retribution; for the Sarvāstivāda doctrine on this subject esp. p. 154-160. Already in “pre-Buddhist” times Chinese Confucian literati had different opinions about the important problem what should be punished: the (corporal) act or the intention. The latter standpoint—of course without the religious justification later provided by Buddhism—is clearly voiced e.g., in Yen-t’ieh lun 55 (ch. 利德) SPPY ed. 10.3a; cf. Hulsewé, Remnants of Han Law I p. 251 sqq.
The six (or twelve) āyatana comprise the five sense-organs with their respective objects (the eye and visible forms, rūpa; the ear and sound, śabda; the nose and odour, gandha; the tongue and savour, rasa; the body and tangible things, spāraṣṭra or sparsā), and a sixth sense-organ manas ("mind", here translated by 心) with the mental phenomena (dharma) as its object.

Hsi Ch’ao is led astray by the Chinese translation: shih 知 “knowing” (or “remembering”) as the sixth of the sense-organs stands actually for manas, whereas as the fifth of the skandhas it renders vijñāna.

A quotation from the anonymous Pan-ni-huan ching 般泥洹經, T 6 ch. I p. 181.1.26: 心作 天, 心作 人, 心作 有, 神生 獸, 神生 地。心 所為也 ; cf. also T 5, another version of this (?) Mahāpāramitāsūtra ascribed to Po Yuan (late third cent.), ch. I p. 165.3.10: 心取 獸, 心取 天, 心取 人, 心取 有, 神生 鳥, 神生 蟲, 心取 地。心取 餓鬼, 形成 者, 心 所為。...

Allusion to Chung-yung I.2: 故君子 惟其 獨也。

 Cf. I-ching, Hsi-tzu’u I (Chu-shu ed. 7.17b): 君子居其室出其言善則千里之外應之.

 Cf. Chung-yung I.2: 或見乎隱, 莫顯乎微

Tao-an mentions in his catalogue two versions of the Shih-erh men ching, a smaller and a larger one, both in one chapter and ascribed to An Shih-kao (CSTCC II 5.3.26-27); he wrote commentaries on both versions, which still existed in the early sixth century (CSTCC V 39.3.8). The two versions are already listed among the “lost scriptures” in the Chung-ching mu-lu of 602 AD (T 2147 V 178.1.12). Tao-an’s preface to his commentary on the larger version has been preserved (CSTCC VI 45.2.26 sqq., annotated Japanese translation in Ui Hakuju 宇井伯壽, Shaku Dōan kenkyū 釋道安研究, Tōkyō 1956, p. 94 sqq.); to judge from this preface, it was a scripture mainly devoted to dhyāna. Elsewhere (below, p. 170) Hsi-ch’ao quotes the “Shih-erh men ching”, without specifying whether he means the larger or the smaller one; that he here mentions a “separate version” of this scripture proves that he knew two redactions of this text, very probably the same as those mentioned by Tao-an.

Allusion to Lun-yü IV.10: 子曰：君子 於天下也，無適 也，無莫 也，義之 典比。

The meaning of this phrase is not clear. In the foregoing lines the author has said that according to the Buddhist doctrine we must be constantly aware of the treacherous movements of our minds, and that we must try to control its dangerous activity. This would mean that the Buddhist devotee, contrary to the Confucian ideal exemplified by Confucius, indeed consciously “sets his mind for some (good) things” and “against other (evil) things”. As I have interpreted the last phrase, Hsi Ch‘ao then seems to conclude that the Buddhist mental discipline, as a lower preparatory stage of self-cultivation, is inferior to the mental freedom and unconscious “natural” morality of the Confucian Sage, the chiin-tzu.

This looks like a quotation, but I have been unable to trace it.

Reading, with the Korean edition, 作 instead of 定.

Reading, with the Korean edition, 作 instead of 定.

Cf. Chuang-tzu XXIII (庚桑楚) p. 150: 其不 善乎，顚倒 中者，人 得而 課之， 人不 善乎，顚倒 之中， 課之。謂之為， 善乎，似之， 之者， 課之。

There were various sūtras named Cheng-chai ching. The one quoted here may have been the one attributed to An Shih-kao in Ta T’ang NTL (T 2149) I 222.3.28 and later catalogues (listed as “lost” in K’ai-yüan SCL, T 2154 I 480.3.12). On the other hand, there were two versions of a P’u-sa chai ching or P’u-sa chai-fa (ching) 菩薩戒, translated by Dharmarakṣa, one of the many variant titles of which was (P’u-sa) cheng-chai ching. The textual history of these two works is far from clear. Seng-yu (CSTCC II 8.3.3 and 9.2.26) mentions both a P’u-sa chai-fa and a P’u-sa chai ching, giving for the first one the variant titles of 菩薩正戒經
and 菲的, and for the second one 菲首等著重的, and adding that the latter work had already been lost. But both works are mentioned without comment as to their being preserved or not in Fa-ching’s Chung-ching mu-lu, T 2146, V 139.2.12. Both works are mentioned as “lost” in Ching-t’ai’s 靜齋 Chung-ching mu-lu of 666 AD, T 2148, V 214.3.16. occur again as extant works in Ta-T’ang NTL, T 2149, II 234.1.12 and 235.2.19 and in Ku-chin i-ching t’u-chi T 2151, II 353.3.16 and 354.1.6, to be finally definitively listed as “lost” in Ta-chou k’an-ting chung-ching mu-lu, T 2153, XII 443.2.24. In the third place the catalogues from Fa-ching’s Chung-ching-mu-lu, T 2146, onward mention an apocryphal work named Fo-shuo cheng-chai ching 佛教正論: T 2146, IV 138.3.9; T 2147, LV 174.2.15 etc.; the last catalogue in which it is mentioned is the Chen-yüan hsin-ting shih-chiao mu-lu of 799-800 AD, T 2157, XXVIII 1020.3.25.

60 This looks like a quotation, but I have been unable to trace its source.
61 Ch’en P’ing (died 178 BC), general and counsellor of the first Han emperor, a strategist famous for his “tricks” (biography in Shih-chi 56.1a and HS 40.12a). Hsi Ch’ao summarizes Ch’en P’ing’s words reported in Shih-chi 56.8b.
62 Yen Hui 領 回 (traditional dates 514-483 BC), Confucius’ favourite disciple, died young (Lun-yü VI.2, IX.20; IX.21; XI.6, 8, 9, 10; Shih-chi 67.2a). Jan Keng 賢耕, another of his disciples, died prematurely of a terrible disease (Lun-yü VI.8; Shih-chi 67.3a). For the Confucian disapproval of the “hegemons” of Ch’i and Chin cf. e.g., Lun-yü XIV.16 and Mencius IB.7.1.
63 Cf. Shu-ching I.ii.12 (商典): 殲 sẽ 孤山 (Chu-shu ed. 3.14b) and ib. II.17: 南四 他受之；其能治水土。惟時懲哉…… (Chu-shu ed. 3.21a); Shu-ching IV.iv.3 (洪範): 孫則殄死，焉乃嗣興 (Chu-shu ed. 20.2b); Shih-chi 2.1b.
64 Most editions have 謤, a rare variant of hsii 諤. The Korean ed. has 謤 instead of 謤, which does not make sense here.
65 Ssu-tsui 四罪: the four punishments inflicted by Shun upon the four great criminals, cf. Shu-ching I.ii.12.
66 The creation of the “punishment of arresting the wife and children of the criminal” is traditionally ascribed to Shang Yang, the originator of the School of Law, when he was chief-minister in the feudal state of Ch’in in the middle of the fourth century BC, cf. “The Origins and Nature of Chattel Slavery in China” by E. G. Pulleyblank, in Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient, I (1958), p. 185-220.
68 Allusion to Shu-ching I.III.5 (大矣譏): “Accordance with what is right is (followed by) good fortune, and compliance with refractoriness (is followed by) misfortune, like (body and voice are followed by) shadow and echo” 惠德言。從訕丠，惟肯影 (chu-shu ed. 4.3b).
69 Allusion to Tao te ching 73: 天網恢恢，疏而不失. The “net of Heaven”, from which nothing can escape, here symbolizes the universal and ineluctable process of karmic retribution.
70 For this (lost) scripture cf. above, note 51. The subject dealt with in this fragment is the (usually ninefold) meditation on the repulsive nature of the body, the “contemplation of the impure” (asubhábhavá, 不淨觀).
71 The Ch’ a-mo-chieh ching 楚摩竭經 (T 533, ? Kṣemamkāra-prāprccchā), var. P’u-sa sheng-ti ching 菩薩生地經, is a short sūtra devoted to the virtue of ksānti. It was translated by Chih-ch’ien, and already mentioned as such by Tao-an (CSTCC II 7.1.2). The phrases quoted here occur in T 533 814.1.17 sqq., but there the text has 恶毒為本 (instead of 大).
72 Quotation from Fa-chü ching (Dharmapada, Udānavarga) T 210, ch. II, section 36 (涅槃品), p. 573.3.8: 受辱心如地。行恥如門閾 (var. 闕). Hsi Ch’ao has k’un 闕 instead of yü 闕, both words meaning “threshhold”. No corresponding verse
in the Tibetan Udana-varga (verse 2 of the section "Nirvana", trsl. W. W. Rockhill, Udana-varga p. 116, deals also with Patience, but runs quite differently); the Japanese editors of T 210 refer to Dhammapada 95 (ed. Fausböll p. 18: Pathavisamo no viruñjati/ indakhilapamo taddi substtato . . . ), where the same similes are used, but about the pious monk and not about khanti.

73 The Ch'eng-chü ching is the Ch'eng-chü kuan-ming ting-i (var. san-meii) ching 成具光明定意 (var. 三昧) 經, translated around the beginning of the third century by Chih Yao 支曇 (T 630). The scripture is mentioned by Tao-an (CSTCC II 6.3.1), and seems to have been very popular in the fourth century; according to Tao-an's biography (CSTCC XV 108.1.8 = KSC V 351.3.12) it was one of the first sūtras which Tao-an as a śramañera had to memorize. Beside this translation there seems to have been a second version, ascribed to Lokakṣema (CSTCC II 6.2.15, not mentioned by Tao-an; ib. 15.1.8; mentioned as "lost" in T 2148 V 213.2.15). For the passage quoted by Hsi-Ch'ao see T 630 453.1.12.

74 The Hsien che te ching in one ch. is mentioned among the translations of Chih Ch'ien in CSTCC II 7.1.13, and in later catalogues (T 2149, Ta-T'ang NTL II 228.2.7; T 2151, Ku-chin i-ching t'ü-ch'i I 351.3.6); mentioned as "lost" in T 2154 (K'ai-yüan SCL) II 489.1.14. The words quoted here from this sūtra are surprisingly similar to Confucius' own definition of the virtue of "consideration" or "reciprocity" 忠, attributed to him in Lun-yü XV, 13: 自所不欲, 勿施於人.

75 Cf. Lun-yü IV.15: 夫子之道, 忠恕而已矣.

76 The four "Infinitudes" (apramāṇa 無量心) or brahmavihāra are four forms of meditation (bhāvanā) which serve as antidotes against the evils of enmity, lack of compassion, dissatisfaction and attachment: (1) love, maitṛi 慈, (2) compassion, karunā 悲, (3) joy, muditā 欣, (4) indifference, upakṣā 棄. I do not know the source of Hsi Ch'ao's curious description of the fourth apramāṇa.

77 For this use of shu 故 cf. above, p. 147 and note 335.

78 Quotation from Chih Ch'ien's T'ai-tzu jui-ying pen-ch'i ching 太子瑞應奉起經, Kyōto ed. ch. I p. 236. A.I. Cf. also Fa-chü ching 仏記經 T 210 ch. I p. 566.2.3: 世皆有死, 三界無安, 諸天難樂, 福盡亦衰 (no corresponding verse in the Lokavagga of the Dhammapada).

79 T 630 (cf. note 73) p. 457.1.4: 夫識者有盡有是者有往來者有飲食.

80 Paraphrase of T 6, ch. II p. 189.2.21, Mahākāśyapa's words after the Buddha's decease: 生有生, 生則有生, 生之道也則生滅滔滔. All editions have 生有生; the reading in Hsi Ch'ao's quotation is obviously the correct one. The last words in the quotation (快, instead of 慈) may be explained by the fact that Hsi Ch'ao confused the passage quoted above with another phrase from the same sūtra (T 6 ch. II 187.1.22): 無生不死, 死而不滅唯涅槃.

81 Quotation from the T'ai-tzu jui-ying pen-ch'i ching (cf. note 78), Kyōto ed. ch. I p. 236 A2.

82 竟期舍忘心, or, with the Korean ed., 期請忘心 "in the expectation (or: with the final aim) to forget (all conscious) thought?"

83 Cf. what Hsiang Hsiu (or Kuo Hsiang) says, in almost identical terms, about the spontaneity of all operations in Nature without any substrate or creative power (above, p. 92). This is one of the clearest examples in early Chinese Buddhist literature of the identification of karman with the Chinese concept of the inexorable "course of nature":

84 評歌不足, 價以手舞, a paraphrase of a passage from the preface to the Odes, chu-shu ed. I.i p. 5a.

85 The classical formula of the first of the Four Noble Truths (ārya-satyāni), that of Suffering.

86 The term yuān-tui 無對 does, as far as I know, not belong to the normal Buddhist vocabulary as used in translated scriptures. My translation is tentative; here it seems to indicate the karmic process of cause and effect. Yuān-tui does occur in Tao-an's
preface to the Shih-fa chü-i (ching) 十法句義經序 in CSTCC X 70.1.13; there the author says that the Buddha "Adapted himself to the world, and therefore administered the medicine (of the Doctrine) in accordance with the therapy (lit. "the antidote")" 從俗教化而授藥, but this is obviously quite another application of the term.

87 Allusion to the well-known metaphor in Chuang-tzu XXIX (ch. 153) p. 198: 忽然無異騄騄之騄過陳也 (said of the short duration of human life in comparison to that of Heaven and Earth).

88 Cf. Lieh-tzu VII (ch. 業果) p. 78: 生則克奪,死則舍骨,生則覆骨,死則覆骨一死,無知其果

89 Tentative translation, 請以數數, kai in the sense of 偕, 伴, 同; shu-t’u probably for 渾達[達] which expression is regularly used to denote that several different ways may lead to the same goal(cf. I-ching, Hsi-tz’u’s Il.3b: 天下同歸而殊途), the "common goal" in this case being death and decay.

90 Probably a paraphrase of T’ai-tzu jui-ying pen-ch’i ching, Kyōto ed. ch. I p. 236 B 1: 物生有死,事成有敗,理則有意,事則有無,物物相著,皆當歸空

91 Or, perhaps: "by investigating (its nature) to find rest in it 拐而安之?

92 Quotation from Chih Ch’ien’s version of the Vimalakirti-nirdesa, T 474, ch. I, p. 523.1.25: 又一切法可知見者如水月形,一切諸法從性生: cf. Kumārajīva’s version T 475, ch. I, p. 541.2.26; somewhat more extensive translation (or a more "developed" text?) in Hsüan-tsang’s version, T 476. I 563.3.9.

93 時不待 is certainly a mistake ("we shall be impeded wherever we go"). The meaning must be parallel to that of the preceding 蟄遇而衰, and the mistake may be caused by confusion with the foregoing 無往不至. Pu 不 may be wrong for � рассматривать, lit. "causes of dissension; offense".

94 Viz., in Vimalakirti-nirdesa, version of Chih Ch’ien, T 474 II 528.3.1: 論如天 刑夫果時,非人得其便; identical in the Kumārajīva version, T 475 II 548.1.3 and the Hsüan-tsang version, T 476 IV 573.3.8. 非人 is the standard equivalent of kimnara.

95 非常 is in early Buddhist texts sometimes interchanged with 無常 for anitya. The term 非常 does not belong to the normal ancient Buddhist vocabulary; it occurs, however, in K’ang Seng-hui’s Liu-tzu chi-ching 六度集經 (T 152). The “four aspects of what is not permanent” here enumerated are, in fact, the four aspects of the duḥkhasatya, viz., anitya, duḥkha, śānyā and anātmaka, cf. e.g., Abh. Kosā LVP VII.31.


97 槿觀, cf. Tao te ching 26, where this term must probably be interpreted as "in his camp with watch-towers" ( 槿 = 槿, cf. Kao Heng 高亨, Lao-tzu cheng-ku 老子正詁 (2nd ed., Shanghai 1948) p. 62-63; Duyvendak trsl. p. 65). But, to judge from the context here, the medieval Chinese interpretation seems to have been as given in the translation. The pseudo Ho-shang Kung commentary paraphrases it as "palace" 宮闕; Wang Pi gives no comment.


99 Hypothetical translation of 出息不顕. The meaning of 覺 here is obscure. It may be a mistake for 住 (both Arch. *pōg > AC *pāu); hence "(even a single) exhalation (can)not be preserved".

100 This passage is no doubt a quotation from, or a paraphrase of, a chapter of the "Sūtra in Forty-two Sections", probably the first Buddhist scripture in Chinese (see above, p. 29). It substantially agrees with ch. 38 of the present text (trsl. Hackmann p. 234; T 784 p. 724.1), but there are considerable differences in the wording of this passage: (Hsi Ch’ao’s quotation) 佛問諸弟子,何謂無常,一人口,一日
Mark the Chinese conclusion: the cessation of birth is a means to attain immortality!

See Dharmarakṣa's version of the Lalitavistara, P'u-yao ching 普曜經, Kyōtō ed. (IX.8) ch. IV, section 13, p. 725 A2, in a passage which is lacking in the Sanskrit and Tibetan texts of the Lalitavistara: 不處生死, 不住泥洹, 便不退轉菩薩行。無所從生, 所生於諸所生悉無所生。 To the Chinese Buddhists these phrases seem to have constituted an almost proverbial description of the Bodhisattva ideal: we find it also quoted (implicitly) by Yū Fa-k'ai's Huo-shih erh-ti lun 晓諦二論 (cf. above, p. 142), and by Hui-yuan in his preface to the Yogacārabhūmi, ("The dhūya-sūtra of Dharmatīra", 達摩多羅禪程), CSTCC IX 66.1.9.

114 Cf. T 6 ch. I p. 181.1.21: 心識情体則不生死也, 種善者則受生之報, the second is to be deleted.

115 四空 or 四空定 are the last and highest four of the twelve dhāvā-states (十二門), corresponding to the four immaterial spheres (ārūpyadhātu): (1) the state of boundless space, ākāśanantyāyatanā 空無邊處; (2) the state of boundless consciousness, vijnānāntyāyatanā 識無邊處; (3) the state of nothingness, ākīmacanāyatanā 無所有處; (4) the state of neither perception nor non-perception, naivasamjñānāsamyāyatanā 非有想非無想處.

116 十八天: the eighteen heavens of form (rūpadhātu).

117 有馬, a Taoist term, in Buddhist texts regularly used for samāskṛta. It is not clear whether here it should be interpreted in the "Taoist" or in the "Buddhist" sense. I have chosen the first alternative, in the first place because the author of the Feng fa yao does not seem to have been well-versed in Buddhist technical terminology, and secondly because he probably would never have made a distinction of this kind at all, merely interpreting yu-wei as the opposite of wu-wei 無為 = Nirvāṇa.

118 Cf. Chih Ch'ien's version of the Vimalakirti-nirdeśa, T 474 I 522.2.12: 又有著 後師說馬易道……邇間, 不及佛處, 馬歸八難, 馬在眾生不信之處, 不得 生死之道。A slightly more extensive translation in Kumārajiva's version, T 475, I, 540.3.4, and in that of Hsüan-tsang, T 476, I, 562.2.17.

119 Also a quotation from Chih Ch'ien's version of the Vimalakirti-nirdeśa, T 474 I 520.1.14: 假如有人欲度空中造立寶室, 終不能成, 如是種子著覆欲人 反故取佛國願取佛國者, 非於空也。More detailed translation in Kumārajiva's version, T 475 I 538.1.26, and in that of Hsüan-tsang, T 476 I 559.1.23.

120 The practice of the first four pāramitās is "purified" by praṇā, which makes
one realize, at the level of absolute truth, the utter unreality of all actions, including
the practice of the religious virtues of dāna, śīla etc., thus emancipating the devotee
from clinging to the merit of his actions and to the objects of his devotion.

Allusion to Lun-yü IV.15.1: 見道一貫之.

四色 and 無執 are obviously stylistic variations of 四大 (mahābhūta, the
Four Great Elements) and 無我 (nairātmya, the absence of a permanent ego).

今際, perhaps a variation of 實際 = bhūtakoṭi?

方筹, vaipulya (sūtras), more specifically used to denote the prajñāpāramitā
scriptures.

The purport of this last sentence is not clear to me. Does the author mean
to say that in the Prajñāpāramitā scriptures the “present” is said to be as illusory
as the future and the past?

住人, allusion to Lun-yü VI.28.2: 天仁者已欲立而立人,已欲達而達人
here ingeniously applied to the ideal of Bodhisattvahood.

相習, lit. “The Chou of the (ruling family named) Chi”. Chi being, according
to tradition, the name adopted by the first ancestor of this family, the legendary
“Prince Millet”, Hou-chi 后稷; cf. Shih-chi 4.1b. Chih Tun does not specify the
date, but “the end of the Chou” no doubt refers to the end of the Western Chou
(traditional dates 1122-771 BC). For Chinese speculations about the date of the
Buddha’s birth cf. below, p. 271 sqq.

Māyā belonged to the Śākya clan (Oldenberg, Buddha, p. 118), and Gautama
was the common name of this gotra, given to all members descended from the same
supposed ancestor (cf. E. J. Thomas, Life of Buddha, p. 22). Hence Chih Tun is wrong
in deriving the Buddha’s name from that of his mother; moreover, the appellation
Gautami mostly refers not to Māyā, but the Buddha’s aunt, Mahāprajāpati.

(Couvreur p. 305: “magnopere suscipias”); ib. IV. 25.6 (ch. Čūn-ya 君氏): 惟承武
承武 (Couvreur p. 371: “late subsecuta sunt regis opera”).

吸中和之誠化: cf. Chung-yung I. 4: 孝慈義樂未發言之中,發而皆申節
謂之和. As applied to India = Madhyadesa (中園), cf. Mou-tzu I (HMC I 1.3.26), trsl.
Pelliot p. 291 and p. 343, note 55; see also below, p. 266. This and the next phrase
form a barely recognizable description of the “four great surveys” (catvāri mahāvi-
lokitāni) made by the Bodhisattva in the Tuṣita heaven before descending into his
mother’s womb, as to the time (kāla), the continent (dvīpa), the country (deṣa) and
the family (kula) to be chosen for his last birth.

Reading, with most editions, 龍然. The 浮 in the Korean edition is obviously
a mistake caused by the variant form 龍.

弱而能孚, said about the Yellow Emperor in Shih-chi 1.2a (cf. also below,
p. 270, where Tsung Ping uses the same Shih-chi passage to prove that the Yellow
Emperor and other culture-heroes of the dawn of history were in reality Bodhisattvas).
Here this is of course an allusion to the first words of the Buddha, the “lion’s roar”
he uttered immediately after his birth.


Cf. above, note 98.

逆旅, an ancient term for a hostel or inn, cf. Tso-chuan, Duke Hsi 2 (chu-shu

粉碎, cf. Ch’u-t’zu, Chiu-chang 九章, section 惟恐: 心體結而粉碎; in
Wang I’s 王逸 commentary explained as “bent down” 然 and “distressed” 難.

區外, lit. “outside the district”, probably a stylistic variation of the expression
方外, as in Chuang-tzu VI, ch. 大宗師, p. 44: 彼遊方之外者也: “outside all
worldly limitations”, “beyond this world”.

APPENDIX CHAPTER THREE

381
 NOTES

141  常人 usually means “poet”; I do not see what “bard” may be meant here. Does it refer to the deva who according to T'ai-tzu yung-ying pen-ch'i ching II (Kyóto ed. p. 235.B2), at that time the most popular source for the Buddha's early life, came to urge Siddhartha to leave to palace?


143  進道, lit. “those who possessed the Way”.

144  Allusion to the Buddha's stay with the ascetics Ārāda (Pāli: Ájāra) Kālāma and Udraka R̆maputra (Pāli: Uddaka R̆maputta) before his solitary practice of austerities during six years.

145  明發, cf. Shih-ching, Ode 196 (II.V.2.1, 小宛): 明發不寐,有懽二人 ,

146  無待, cf. Chuang-tzu I (逍遥遊) p. 3: 猶有所待者也 …… Ch'ing-chù 輕舉, “to rise lightly”, is commonly said of Taoist immortals; for another case in which it is used in a Buddhist sense, cf. above, p. 149 (letter of Tao-i).


148  Allusion to two Lun-yü passages: IV. 2, 仁者安仁,知者利仁, and VI.23, 知者樂水,仁者樂山

149  The vow not to leave the seat before having attained Enlightenment. In the narrative we have already reached the “place of Enlightenment” (bodhimanda, 道場).

150  Reading, with the Yuan and Ming editions, 偃&q; . Yün 偃 is redundant and breaks the parallelism.

151  This passage is obviously a description of the ānāpānasati, but the details are far from clear. The 四業 may refer to the four “operations” of this respiratory technique as described in Saṅgharakṣa’s Yogācarabhūmi (cf. P. Demiéville in BEFEO XL IV, 1954, p. 414; these are actually five out of a series of six operations mentioned elsewhere (e.g., T 618 I 306.1.26 sqq.; Abh. Kośa VI 154-155), viz. nrs. 1, 2, 4 and a combination of 5 and 6 of the six operations (1) “counting”, ganaṇā 数 ; (2) “following”, anugama 随 ; (3) “staying”, sthāna 止 ; (4) “observing”, upalakṣaṇa ि; (5) “turning”, vivartanā 轉 ; (6) “purification”, pariśuddhi 细 ). In the early and very popular Buddha-biographies, the Hsiu-hsing pen-ch'i ching (Kyóto ed. ch. II, p. 231A1) and the T'ai-tzu jui-ying pen-ch'i ching (Kyóto ed. ch. I, p. 237A1) we also find the series of six: 一數 二隨 三止 四觀 五還 六淨. This may be the source of Chih Tun’s 二隨 ,三止 等 etc. in the following phrases. But from the way in which these terms are used and from the fact that in this parallel style they are made to match expressions like 四業 ;五隨 ;六精 and 五內; it would appear that Chih Tun believed these to mean “the two 随 ”, “the three 止 ” , “the four 理 ”, as in the translation. Hence 進退; parallel with 二隨: “speeding (the exhalation) and welcoming (the inhalation)” ? “Easily tracing its circuit”: tentative translation of the obscure 篇述 ; the anugama operation consists of “following” the breath as far as possible inside and outside the body. I do not know what is meant by the 八記 .

152  五隨 . For the use of the word yin to render skandha cf. above, note 40.

153  遷府, “sent back to the (magistrate’s) office”, apparently a metaphor borrowed from official life.

154  六精 , cf. above, note 46.

155  五內 seems to be a variant of 五根, the five faculties (pañcendriyaḥ), the material bases of sensory perception: eye, ear, nose, tongue and body (as the “organ” of touch). “The five intestines”, which is the common meaning of 五内’, seems hardly appropriate here.

156  太素, cf. the cosmogony described in Lieh-tzu I (ch. 天瑞) p. 2: 太初者,氣之始也,太始者形之始也, 太素者質之始也.

157  七住, the seventh stage (bhūmi) of the Bodhisattva career, which according to some sources is the “critical” stage during which the Bodhisattva obtains the “equanimity towards the non-origination of dharmas” (無生法忍, anutpattika-dharmakṣaṇī) and is released from the material body (肉身, māṃsakāya), instead of which he is endowed with a “body born from the dharmadhātu” 放性生身.
This is in accordance with the doctrine of the Prajñāpāramitā (cf. e.g., Fang-kuang ching, T 221 ch. XIV p. 27.3.9; Kumārajiva’s version of the 25,000 p’ī’ī, T 223 ch. VI p. 257.2.14; Ta-chih-tu lun, T 1509 ch. X p. 132.1.25 = Lamotte, Traité p. 588; ib. ch. XXIX, p. 273.2.17; Seng-choa’s commentary on the Vimalakirti-nirdeśa, Zinshō mezogaku T 1775 ch. VI p. 382.2.15). This was certainly also the opinion of Chih Tun. According to him the actual Enlightenment took place at the seventh stage, as appears from a phrase in an eulogistic “biography” of Chih Tun, but also because in this scripture the “critical stage” is placed in the 8th bhūmi, called Acalā 不動 (cf. Daśabhūmika VIII B p. 64, trsl. Kumārajiva T 286 ch. III p. 521.2-522.1; Bodhisattvabhūmi p. 348.18; L. de la Vallée Poussin, “Carrière du Bodhisattva” (app. Siddhi), p. 736; S. Lévi, Sutrālakārā vol. II, p. 123, note).

158 The 六地 seems to refer to the six pāramitā.

159 Allusion to the famous metaphor in Chuang-tzu XXVI (ch. 外物) p. 181, often used in Chinese Buddhist literature to elucidate the expedient nature of the doctrine: 當者所以在意、增益而忘義，言者所以在言、增益而忘義.

160 論訶立: an allusion to Lun-yü II.4.2: 二十而立; hence literally: “when in years he had arrived at the age when his mind had been ‘firmly set’”, i.e., at the age of thirty.

161 置, as a Buddhist technical term = vāsanā.

162 生, as an allusion to Lun-yü XVI.9: 生而死之着上也.

163 置, the five kaśāya “sediments”, impurities, always referring to the evils of a kalpa in its phase of decay: (short) duration of human life (āyuḥ-kaśāya 人壽); (wrong) views (drṣṭi-ka., 見); depravities (klēsa-ka., 煩惱); (misery of) beings (sattva-ka., 羣生); (degeneration of) the eon (kalpa-ka., 劫); cf. Mvy 2335-2340.

164 The first six of the standard list of seven Buddhas, of which Śākyamuni is the last one: Vipaśyin, Śikhin, Viśvabhū, Krakū-chandha, Kanakamuni, Kāśyapa. The first three do not belong to the present cosmic period (bhadrakalpa) but lived in the preceding eon (Vvūhakalpa); cf. Hōbōgin s.v. Butsu, p. 195-196.

165 Or, reading 微 instead of 微, “in order to prove their tradition”.

166 純六: the normal height of the Buddha in his nirmānakāya.

167 慾度 黃中: tentative translation. In view of the context we should expect something which refers to the body of the Buddha. The meaning “yellow inner (garments)”, as in the I-ching, second hexagram, 君子黃中通理, makes no sense here, nor does the variant reading 善中. We might suppose that 黃中 is a mistake for 黃 which is said to have been the basic measure from which all other measures were derived, cf. e.g., HS 21A.15b: “The measures of length . . . arose originally from the length of the huang-chung . . .; The measures of capacity . . . arose originally from (the contents of) the huang-chung . . .; the weights . . . arose originally from the weight of the huang-chung (trsl. H. H. Dubs, HFHD I p. 276-277). If this would be true, then the phrase might be translated as “he displayed the proportions (of the Buddhakāya which was in accordance with) the huang-chung”. But this is, after all, not very likely in view of the considerable difference in pronunciation of the characters 中 and 之 in Ancient Chinese (中 = *tiuŋ versus 之 = *diwong).

168 The “golden colour” (svārṇa-varṇa) of the Buddha is one of his 32 characteristics (lakṣāṇa).

169 Shu-hu 傲忽, cf. Ch’u-tzu, T’ien-wen : 傲忽馬在, explained by Wang I as “lightning” (actually “the fast one”?). Cf. also Ch’u-tzu, Chiu-ko 九歌, section
Shao ssu-ming: 俨然而来兮忽而逝。In Chuang-tzu VII (ch. 應帝王) p. 51, Shu “the fast one” and Hu “the quick one” figure as two imaginary rulers.

The eight qualities of the Buddha’s voice (beautiful, flexible, harmonious, not effeminate etc.). Various lists, cf. Hōbōgirin s.v. Bonnon, p. 133-135, and Mochizuki, Bukkyō Daijiten p. 4204. “Being endowed with a brahma-voice” (梵音, brahma-svaraḥ) is, moreover, one of the thirty-two lakṣaṇa of the Buddha.

Allusion to the Buddha’s “halo of one fathom” (丈六, vyāmaprabhā) which always surrounds his body and which is one of the thirty-two lakṣaṇa, or to the dazzling light which is manifested by the Buddha at important occasions in his life (his birth, his enlightenment, the revelation of various sūtras etc.) and which spreads through the whole universe.

未兆, cf. Tao te ching 20: 我獨怕兮其未兆。

 Cf. I-ching, hexagram 1: 六神終始, 六位時成。

曲成, cf. I-ching, Hsi-tz’u I, p. 3a: 曲成萬物而不遂; comm. by Han Po: 曲成者, 乘變以應物, 像一方者也。

三皇, abbreviation of 三皇五帝, the legendary rulers of the most distant past.

太虛, as in Chuang-tzu XXII (ch. 知北遊) p. 143: 是以不逓乎混常, 不返乎太虛; cf. Sun Ch’o 智绰, Yu T’ien-t’ai fu 游天台山賦 (Wen-hsüan XI.224): 太虛遼廓而無際, comm. by Li Shan: 太虛, 天也。

二儀, actually denoting yin and yang.

蒙闇, cf. I-ching, Hsi-tz’u I p. 1b: 恭以易怒, 坤以簡能。

大和, cf. I-ching hex. 1, t’uan: 保合大和乃利貞。

 Cf. I-ching, hexagram 26, t’uan: 日新其德 and Ta-hsiieh II.1 英日新, 日日新。 Here in a different application, referring to the momentariness of all existence.

His excellence being (by itself) already like (the refined, true) blue, he (refined and) made (true) blue the (inferior nature of men which might be compared to coarse) indigo”; based on the well-known proverb 色出於藍, “blue comes from indigo (but it excels indigo)”, mostly referring to a disciple who surpasses his master. Here rather “to improve one's nature by study”, as in the Hsün-tzu passage which is the source of the proverb, Hsün-tzu I p. 1: 色取之於藍而青於藍, 水水為之而寒於水, H. H. Dubs' translation p. 31.

Probably the same misunderstanding as in Mou-tzu who speaks about the “840 millions of chüan” of the Buddhist canon 八億四千萬卷, where 仍 must be interpreted as “a hundred million”, cf. Pelliot, TP XIX (1920) p. 343 note 56. In both cases the number is based on the tradition of the 84,000 articles or sections of the doctrine (caturāsīti-dharmaskandha-sahasrāni) of the Tripitaka, cf. H. Kern in his translation of the Saddharmapundarika (Oxford, 1909), p. 241, note.

I have been unable to find this expression in the Tao-hsing (ching) (T 224). I suppose that Chih Tun alludes to the emptiness (無) of all dharmas in the three times (present, past, future), the basic message of the Prajñāpāramitā, repeated in endless variations throughout this kind of literature.

曾玄, 韜 being used for 遲, a term for the ancient pentatonic scale of Chinese music.

The first notes of the ancient pentatonic scale of Chinese music.

Fu Hsi is here mentioned as the reputed inventor of the eight trigrams on which the symbols of the I-ching are said to be based.

Chiu, i.e., Hsien Yuan 辰, the name of the Yellow Emperor.

Mencius and Confucius, who were born in these states.

Sahā-lokadhātu, “the realm of endurance”, the name of the world-system in which we live.

For the transcription wei-wei = Kapilavastu cf. below, p. 301.
Probably an allusion to the last words of the Buddha in which he declared that “all conditioned things are perishable”.

“Six ferries”: the six “fords” symbolizing the pāramitā in this metaphorical passage.

Hinayāna, Pratyekabuddhayāna, Mahāyāna.

This series of metaphors about the Buddha’s death seem un-Chinese in spirit and style. On the other hand they do not correspond to the stereotyped Indian images symbolizing this event: the lamp of the doctrine (dharmapradīpa) which has gone out, the eye of the world (lokacakkus) which has been closed, the tree of the doctrine (dharmarūksa) which has fallen down etc.

果忘天下，便天下兼忘難，cf. above, note 107. This is virtually the end of Chih Tun’s sketch of the Buddha’s life. In the last lines of his preface, not translated here, Chih Tun expresses his grief at not being able to meet the Buddha, and declares to have written an eulogy on Śākyamuni in order to show his feelings of reverence. Then follows the eulogy itself, which is both uninformative and unreadable.

3. Ui Hakju 学府, Shaku Dōan kenkyū 談道安研究, Tōkyō 1956; a special study on several aspects of Tao-an’s career by Arthur E. Link (University of Michigan) has been announced by the author (TP XLVI, 1958, p. 2); a critical translation of Tao-an’s biography in KSC V 351.3 sqq.—the main source for history of his life—has been published in TP XLVI, 1958, p. 1-48. For a comparison between Tao-an’s biographies in KSC and CSTCC see A. E. Link, “Remarks on Shih Seng-yu’s Chu san-tsong chi chi as a source for Hui-chiao’s Kao-seng chuan as evidenced in two versions of the biography of Tao-an”, Oriens X (1957), p. 292-295.
4. Cf. below, note 121.
5. KSC IX 384.2; trsl. Wright p. 346.
6. Apart from Tao-an and Chu Fa-ya who have their own biographies in CSTCC and KSC, the following Chinese disciples are mentioned in Fo-t’u-teng’s biography: Fa-shou 法首 (trsl. Wright p. 341: “otherwise unknown”, but cf. below, p. 183), Fa-tso 法佐 and Fa-ch’ang (cf. ch. II, note 272), Fa-ch’ang 法常 and Seng-hui 僧慧, (not mentioned elsewhere). Fo-t’iao 佛調 (“Buddhadeva”) and Hsü-p’u-t’i 欣普提 (“Subhūti”) are mentioned as monks who came “from India and Sogdiana”; Chu 竹 Fo-t’iao has a short biography in KSC IX 387.3, but there nothing is said about his alleged non-Chinese origin. Cf. below, p. 182.
7. KSC IX 384.2.25; trsl. Wright p. 346. Here and in other quotations from Fo-t’u-teng’s biography I follow the excellent translation by A. F. Wright.
8. Fo-t’u-teng’s biography mentions the Kuan-ssu 官寺 (“official” or “government” temple? cf. Wright, p. 343 note 21) and the Chung-ssu 中寺. After 335 Fo-t’u-teng stayed with his disciples at the Chung-ssu at Yeh (HSC IX 384.3; Wright p. 347 note 43), and in Tao-an’s biography (KSC V 351.3.15) Tao-an is also stated to have joined Fo-t’u-teng at the Chung-ssu. A. E. Link, in his “Biography of Shih Tao-an”, TP XLVI, 1958, p. 7, renders Chung-ssu as “Central Temple”, but it is preferable to interpret it as “The temple (or monastery) inside”, i.e., the Palace Monastery. We might even go farther and suppose that kuan-ssu 官寺, the name of one of the monasteries at Yeh, is a corruption of kung-ssu 官寺, 官 and 官 being of course easily confused with each other. A “Palace Temple” especially sponsored by the members of the ruling Chieh family is, in view of all we know about Buddhism at Hsiang-kuo and Yeh, much more probable than an “Official Temple” with its “bureaucratic” associations. It is true that the Fa-yüan chu-lin (ch. XIV, T 1222 p. 388.1.14) mentions a bronze statue of the time of Shih Hu, which bore the inscription “Made
by the monks of the kuan-ssu Fa-hsin and Tao-hsing in the sixth year chien-wu (340 AD), the year (with the cyclical signs) keng-tzu”, but the author does not appear to have seen the statue which miraculously manifested itself in 437 AD, and, in general, the reports of early Buddhist authors about inscribed statues etc. are very unreliable.

9 See for Shih Hu’s megalomaniac building projects and his display of luxury Yeh-chung chi, p. 10a; for a curious description of a Buddha statue surrounded by moving puppets representing śramanas see ib., p. 10a of the Wen-ying-tien chü-chen pan ts’ung-shu edition.


11 Cf. above, note 6.

12 On the “dissolution of the body” of the Taoist immortal (斐斐) see e.g., Pao-p’u tzu II p. 6, and H. Maspero, “Les procédés de ‘nourrir le principe vital’ dans la religion taoiste ancienne”, J.A.s. 1937, p. 177-152 and 353-430, esp. p. 178 sqq., and Le Taoïsme, p. 84, 85, 196, 218.

13 CS 107.1b: 胡運將棄, 賓客復興, 言若 pérd人以厭其氣

14 Cf. A. F. Wright, op.cit., p. 325: “... and, had he reached there at a less disturbed time, he would no doubt have become a great translator and exegete”; Arthur E. Link, op.cit., p. 7 note 6: "Judging from the studies pursued by the disciples of Fo-t’u-teng, it would seem that the latter’s specialization lay in the Prajñā-pāramitā literature”.

15 CS 106.4 a-b. 

16 Cf. Tao-an’s 比丘大戒庯, CSTCC XI 80.2.1, in which, when speaking about the incompleteness of the monastic rules in China in earlier times, he says: 至澄和上 (i.e., Fo-t’u-teng) 多所正義, 余昔在鄂部其

17 Cf. the biographies of the nuns Ching-chien 安令薇 and An Ling-shou 安令薇, PCNC I 934.3-935.1; A. F. Wright, “Biography of the Nun An Ling-shou”, HJAS XV (1952) p. 193-197.

18 KSC V 351.3.3. 

19 Colophon on the 聖法印經, CSTCC VII 50.2.4 and 51.1.27. In CS 107.9a (biography of Jan Min 冉閔) it is told how a certain monk Fa-jao 释法鏡 made a false prediction as to the issue of Jan Min’s decisive battle with Yen (precisely the kind of prognostication practised before by Fo-t’u-teng) at Yeh in 352 AD. This name is identical with the Chinese translation given for Fu-ju-t’an 五力唐, the name of the disciple who in 282 AD brought the Sanskrit text of the 25,000 p’p’ from Khotan to Loyang (cf. ch. II, note 201), but in view of the dates it is highly improbable that the same monk is meant, although the name Fa-jao is unusual. For the —in our view untenable—hypothesis of Maspero which identifies Fo-t’u-teng’s disciple Fa-tso with Po Fa-tso 佛法孫, the brother of Po Yuan, cf. above, ch. II note 272.

20 In Fo-t’u-teng’s biography, KSC IX 387.1 (Wright p. 367), he is said to have come from Chung-shan 中山, the modern Ting hsien, Hopei.

21 From Chung-shan; biography in KSC IV 347.1, cf. also above, ch. II note 204.


24 In his Yü i lun 喻疑論, CSTCC V. 41.2.12, trsl. Liebenthal p. 90. The reading 格義 occurs only in the Ming edition; the other versions have 裨義.


26 Seng-lang is not said to have studied under Fo-t’u-teng in his biography in
KSC V 354.2 or in that of Fo-t’u-teng, but he is stated to have been one of the latter’s disciples in Shui-ching chu, ed. Wang Hsien-ch’ien VIII.13a-b; cf. also Miyagawa Hisayuki 美川喜志 ‘Shin no Taizan Jiku Sōrō no jiseki’ 般の泰山僧侶の事跡, Tōyōshi kenkyū III, p. 184-209; cf. also next note.

The only date given in his biography is 351 AD, the year in which he settled at the T’ai-shan. However, other documents pertaining to Seng-lang allow us approximately to define his dates. In KHMC XXXV we find a series of ten complimentary letters which, judging from their contents, accompanied the presents sent to Seng-lang by some contemporary rulers of the various Northern and Southern states, together with Seng-lang’s very diplomatic answers. If these letters are authentic (their remarkable uniformity in style and wordings seems somewhat suspect) they form a highly interesting example of the way in which this famous priest was courted by several rulers, all of whom apparently tried to win his favour and to employ him (a fact which is confirmed by his biography). The letters bear the names of the following monarchs: (1) T’o-pa Kuei 佗跋, since 386 king of Wei, emperor since 398, died 409 AD; (2) Ssu-ma Ch’ang-ming 司馬昌明, i.e., the Chin emperor Hsiao-wu, reigned 376-396 (the fact that he is referred to by his personal name may indicate that these letters were actually compiled and published in the North, where the Eastern Chin rulers were considered “illegitimate”); (3) Fu Chien 傅堅, emperor of the Former Ch’in, reigned 357-384; (4) Mu-jung Ch’ui 蒙容贵, emperor of the Southern Yen, reigned 400-405; (6) Yao Hsing 耶聖, emperor of the later Ch’in, reigned 394-416. The letter of Mu-jung Te with Seng-lang’s reply obviously constitutes a terminus post quem for Seng-lang’s death which must have taken place after 400 AD, at which date he was still living at the T’ai-shan, some fifty years after his first arrival there. On the other hand he is stated to have died at the age of 84, so that the dates of his life may approximately be fixed at 315-400 AD, perhaps a few years later.

The KSC places Tao-an’s activities at Huo-tse, Fei-lung shan, Heng-shan and Wu-i after the fall of Shih Hu and before Shih Tsun’s request to enter the Hua-lin yuan 廬林苑 which was enlarged by him and probably changed into a monastery. This would mean that all these peregrinations took place in less than one year (349 AD), which is obviously impossible, as has been clearly demonstrated by Tang Yung-t’ung, History, p. 194. Ui (op. cit., p. 6) proposes to place the whole Huo-tse period before Tao-an became Fo-t’u-teng’s disciple, i.e., between his ordination (ca. 331 acc. to Ui) and his arrival at Yeh (in or shortly after 335). The KSC biography does say that Tao-an’s first (unknown) master “Gave him the full ordination (upasampada) and allowed him to travel for study”, and since the full ordination was generally obtained at the age of ca. 19 years, there may have been a period of some five years of which nothing is reported in Tao-an’s biographies. However, we see no reason to fill this blank by transposing the Huo-tse period from ca. 349 to ca. 330. In fact, we do not know anything definite about Tao-an’s youth except the usual biographical data (original surname, family, place of origin) given in the opening line of his biography; the anecdotes about his extraordinary ability in memorizing texts are, of course, of very doubtful historicity. On the other hand, it remains obscure why Shih Tsun had to invite Tao-an to come to the newly constructed monastery in the Hua-lin yūan at Yeh—this seems to imply that Tao-an was not living at Yeh in 349 AD but had retired to some safer place before, unless the text merely means to say that Tao-an was invited to come over from one monastery at Yeh to the other one built or enlarged by the emperor. Nothing is further known about Shih Tsun’s building activities in this field; the Hua-lin park itself had been
the result of one of Shih Hu's enormous construction projects. It had been laid out shortly after 347, when 160,000 people were commandeered to transport the earth needed for it (Yeh-chung chi p. 5a, CS 107.1b). In this summary account of Tao-an's early years we follow the chronology proposed by T'ang Yung-t'ung (History, p. 195 and 197-200) which is still the most satisfactory.

30 KSC V 351.3.28 (Link, op.cit., p. 12-13): 於太行懸山創立寺塔,改號 ("changed their garments", i.e., "became monks") 從化者中分河北.

31 KSC V (biography of Chu Fa-t'ai) 354.3.5; in Tao-an's biography in KSC and in the Ch'in-shu 史記 by Chu P'in 車勤 (ca. 440 AD, quoted in SSHY comm. IIB/14b) the number of Fa-t'ai's disciples is not indicated.

32 According to his biography in KSC V 354.1.19, he went with his disciples to Shu "during the troubles of the Shih clan", i.e., already in 349 AD, but cf. the biography of Tao-an, KSC V p. 352.1.14 (trsl. Link p. 15).

33 Tao-an's commentary to An Shih-kao's Jen-pen-yü-sheng ching 本願徳生經 has been preserved. (T 1693, in one chüan, preface ib. and in CSTCC VI 4.5.1). CSTCC contains furthermore the following prefaces to his early commentaries: 通德序 (CSTCC X 69.1); 陰持入序, ib. VI 44.2; 宇般注序, ib. 43.3; 了可生死序, ib. 45.2; 十二門序, ib. 45.2; 大十二門序, ib. 46.1; 十法句義 (序), ib. X 70.1. For Tao-an's literary works in general see Ui, op.cit., p. 52-63; Ui does not include the 演繹十住梵名并序, indicated in CSTCC IX 6.2.1 as "anonymous", but in view its of contents no doubt written by Tao-an during his Hsiang-yang period, cf. below, p. 196.

34 CSTCC X 70.1.20 sqq. On this work cf. Ui, op.cit., p. 102.

35 Lit. "the throat and bosom".


37 History, p. 247-249.

38 An example from his preface to the An-pan shou-i ching (CSTCC VI 43.3.8 sqq.): "...By the different steps (= the six operations of ānāpāna) one 'diminishes and diminishes again until one reaches the point of non-activity' (Tao-te ching 48); by the various degrees (= the four stages of dhyāna) one forgets and forgets again until one reaches the point of 'having no desire' (Tao te ching 1). Because of (this state of) 'non-activity' there will be no circumstances that do not suit (one's purpose); because of (this state of) 'having no desire' there will be no matters which do not succeed. As there are no circumstances which do not suit (one's purpose), one is able 'to open up the understanding of beings' (I-ching, Hsi-ts'ü I, p. 26b); as there are no matters which do not succeed, one is able 'to complete the task' (of Enlightenment) (I-ching, ib.). From him who has 'completed the task' the myriad (phenomena of) Being naturally become separated (自彼), and one who has 'opened up the beings' causes 'the whole world to forget himself' (Chuangtzu, XIV, p. 88)." See also Tao-an's hsüan-hsüeh-like description of nirodha-samapatti in his commentary on the Jen-pan-yü-sheng ching, T 1693 p. 9.1.20.

39 Tao-an himself says in his 今放玄要論略解序 (CSTCC VII 48.1.19) that he had formerly obtained one section of Dharmarākṣa's version of the 25,000 p'p' when he lived "in Chao 趙 and Wei 焉" (roughly: Shansi and N. Honan). Hui-yüan is said to have been converted to Buddhism by listening to Tao-an's explanation of the Prajñāpāramitā at Mt. Heng in 354 AD (KSC VI, biography of Hui-yüan, p. 358.1.2).

40 See e.g., his 大十二門序, CSTCC VI 46.2.8.

41 See his prefaces to the 人本欲生經 (CSTCC VI 45.1) and to the 十二門經 (ib. 45.2).
42 See the [成因緣果] 賢劫諸佛 by Tao-an (T 1464, preface, p. 815.1.9): 境流眾有自來受變無盡時門 所持之理遇而使出，於十二部 (the “twelve classes” of Buddhist scriptures) 無陷謬 (vaipulya, c.q. the Prajñāpāramitā) 部最多。此即通行之方差 (vaipulya) 經偏忘相似故因風易行也

43 Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung's emendation of the passage from the Meisōdenshō which states that Tao-an founded the T'an-ch'i ssu at the age of 52 (Chinese counting, i.e., in 364 AD); T'ang reads “fifty-three” (i.e., in 365 AD), the very year of Tao-an's arrival at Hsiang-yang (History, p. 196).

44 Cf. MSCC 5.5a. For t'an 檀 = “rosewood” cf. A. E. Link, TP XLVI (1958) p. 19 note 4. However, Mr. E. H. Schafer, quoted in this note, is wrong in supposing that the name chan-tan 檀檀 only appears in literature with the meaning “sandalwood” in 454 AD: it occurs in this sense already in SSHY IA/39b reporting the words spoken by Chih Tun to Chu Tao-ch'ien at Chien'k'ang, during the latter's stay at the capital, i.e., shortly after 362 AD (cf. above, p. 149). In translated scriptures the term occurs much earlier, e.g., already in the late second century Pan-chou sun-me; ching, T 417 p. 900.1.19 = T 418 p. 907.1.19.

45 KSC V 352.2.8; Link, op.cit., p. 20. “Sixteen feet” 六，cf. above, ch. III, note 166 of the Appendix.

46 KHMC XV 198.2. For this miraculous statue cf. also KHMC XV 202.1.27 and Fa-yüan chu-lin, T 2122, XIII 384.2. According to the latter (much legendarized) account, the image represented Amitābha.

47 As Mr. Link remarks (op.cit., p. 21, note 4), this 金箔像 very probably refers to what is commonly called 菩佛, i.e., a representation of the Buddha's parinirvāṇa. As far as I know this is the second mention of such a statue in Chinese literature, the earliest one being found in SSHY IA/32b reporting the words spoken by Yü Liang 廿亮 (died 340 AD) when he saw a “reclining Buddha” 菩佛 in a temple: “This man is exhausted by being a ford and a bridge (for mankind)” 此子疲於津梁. For another mid. 4th century representation of the parinirvāna (a mural painting?) cf. SSHY IA/35b.

48 Cf. the letter of Hsi Ts'o-ch'ih, quoted below: “Teachers and pupils number several hundred ...”, and Tao-an's 漢議檀十住梵名并書釈, CSTCC IX 62.8.8: 漢陽時崇齋有三百人…….

49 KSC V 352.3.22, Link op.cit., p. 27.

50 For a discussion of the contents of these rules see T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, p. 213-217 and Ui, op.cit., p. 24-27.

51 Shih Fa-yü 輔法遇, who in 379 settled at Chiang-ling and who because of his negligence in maintaining the monastic discipline among his pupils received from Tao-an—then living at Ch'angan—a tube filled with a branch of torms as a token that he deserved punishment, which Fa-yu is said respectfully to have undergone. See his biography in KSC V 356.1, translated by A. E. Link, op.cit., (Appendix B), p. 45-47.

52 彤陽 “(the arts of) yin and yang” comprise several branches of pseudo-science; the translation “soothsaying” (Link, op.cit., p. 26) is too specific.

53 Most editions have 仁術. If the reading 仁術 of the Korean edition (corroborated by CSTCC XV 108.2) is correct, this Fa-lan no doubt refers to Yü Fa-lan (above, p. 140), not to the probably legendary Chu 舜 Fa-lan of the first century AD (cf. A. E. Link, op.cit., p. 26 note 2).

54 Not known from other sources. CSTCC, loc.cit., gives Fa-tsu 法租, which probably refers to Po Yuan 保延 (tzu Fa-tsu), for whom see above, p. 76.

55 KSC V 352.3.10 sqq.; CSTCC XV 108.2.12; trsl. Link, op.cit., p. 25-26.

56 KSC V 352.1.14: 彼多君子,好尚正流；variant reading in Chü P'in's 本論 Ch'in-shu 章書 quoted in SSHY comm. IIB/14b: 彼多君士,好尚可托．

57 Quoted in Tao-an's biography, KSC V 352.2-3 (trsl. Link p. 22-24); complete text reproduced in HMC XII 76.3.
Tao-an replied 'Shih Tao-an who fills Heaven!' The term "filling Heaven" is not convincing. In the first place Tao-an had just received Hsi Ts'o-ch'ih's letter, and therefore the whole anecdote would be an elaboration of this theme. We read e.g., in Shih-shuo hsin-yü III B/4b how the famous ch'ing-t'an adept Lu Yun (tz'u Shih-lung) met the young Hsun Yin (tz'u Ming-hao) at the home of Chang Hua (232-300 AD). "Lu raised his hand and said: 'Lu Shih-lung from among the clouds!' Hsun Yin retorted: 'Hsun Ming-hao from under the sun!'" The same story occurs also in Lu Yun's biography in CS 54.9a. He regarded this story as apocryphal (History, p. 206). In the second place, the curious way of introducing oneself by an exchange of bons mots was practised in ch'ing-t'an circles as early as the end of the third century. We read in Fa-yuan chu-lin XIII 385.1.15 that the two debaters go on exchanging puns on each other's names. The same story occurs also in Lu Yun's biography in CS 54.9a.

The earliest list is the one drawn up by Tao-an himself, and reproduced in CSTCC V 352.3.5; CSTCC XV 108.2.8: "As soon as they were seated, (Hsi) said: 'Hsi Ts'o-ch'i'ih of (the whole realm) within the Four Seas!'" (here referring to Hsiang-yang) (written at Ch'angan in 382 AD, in the table of contents of Lu Ch'eng's Fa-lun (CSTCC XII 83.2. and 84.3) we find furthermore the titles of three letters written to Tao-an by Chu Fa-t'ai (inquiring after the meaning of the Three Vehicles) date three on Mokgala's Fang-kuang ching, and "the spirit" respectively). The same source mentions a letter to Tao-an by Fu Hsuan-tu (written at Ch'angan in 382 AD, in the latter work the event is dated "second year yung-ho") (KSC V 352.2.4 (trsl. Link p. 18-19). In Fa-yuan chu-lin XIII 385.1.15. In the latter work the event is dated "second year t'ai-ho" (367 AD).

In the list mentioned in Historical Records of the Six Dynasties, three on Mokgala's Fang-kuang ching, and "the spirit" respectively). The same source mentions a letter to Tao-an by Fu Hsuan-tu (written at Ch'angan in 382 AD, in the latter work the event is dated "second year yung-ho") (KSC V 352.2.4 (trsl. Link p. 18-19). In Fa-yuan chu-lin XIII 385.1.15. In the latter work the event is dated "second year t'ai-ho" (367 AD).

The earliest list is the one drawn up by Tao-an himself, and reproduced in CSTCC V 39.2 sqq.; it contains the titles of nine commentaries and exegetical treatises and of five other works on different subjects: a list of devas (三界諸天錄), his famous catalogue of translated scriptures ( 總彙名錄), some letters (cf. above, note 63) and a geographical work on the Western Region (西域志). The list mentions no less than six commentaries on the various versions of the ( trikan ching, two on Dharmarakṣa's Kuang-tsan ching, three on Mokṣala's Fang-kuang ching, and one on Lokākṣema's Tao-hsing ching. It is interesting to note that Tao-an places these commentaries on Prajinapāramitā texts at the beginning of the list, before his much earlier commentaries on dhyāna texts like the 十二門經 etc.; since the works are obviously arranged according to their relative doctrinal importance in Tao-an's
view, this proves the reorientation of his interest from dhyāna to prajhāpāramitā during his Hsiang-yang period when this list was compiled. Later lists comprise more works than enumerated here; cf. Ui, op.cit., p. 52-63, and T’ang Yung-t'ung, History, p. 242-243.

65 See Tao-an’s 合放先考論略序 (CSTCC VII 48.1 sqq.; written in or shortly after 376 AD) and his 演備經十住梵名并義叙 (CSTCC IX 62.1 sqq.; written around the same time, cf. below, p. 196 sqq.)


67 It forms the title of the 14th section (चत्वार्तिक, parivarta) of Lokakṣema’s Tao-hsing ching (T 224) and of the 11th section of Mokṣa’s Fang-kuang ching (T 221) as a translation of tathātā; with the same meaning it occurs e.g., in the early third century 中觀論, T 196 I 155.2.14: 今已八本無,無毫無尊想.


E.g., Tao te ching 25 (有物混成, 先天地生 等等); ib. 42 ( 通生一, 一生二, 二生三, 三生萬物 等等); Lieh-tzu I (ch. 天瑞), p. 2 (有太素, 有太初, 有太始 等等); and esp. Chuang-tzu XII (ch. 天地) p. 73 (有初有無, 無有無名, 一之未渾, 有一而未形, 等等).

69 In a passage from some treatise by Hui-yüan (probably his 法性論 mentioned in his biography, cf. below p. 249), quoted by Hui-ta 惠遠 (second half sixth century) in his Chao-lun shu 論疏, Suppl. Kyōto II B/23.4.

70 CSTCC VII 48.1 sqq.

71 有為 as a Buddhist “technical” term = samskṛta, but here rather in its original Chinese sense of “activity”, the counterpart of 無為 in the previous sentence.

72 KSC V 353.1 (trsl. Link p. 35). Piṇḍola was regarded as one of the Arhats who had voluntarily remained in the world to protect the Doctrine until the coming of Maitreya. On this belief which seems to foreshadow the development of the Bodhisattva doctrine, and of which this is one of the earliest traces in Chinese Buddhist literature, cf. Sylvain Lévi and Ed. Chavannes, “Les Seize Arhat protecteurs de la Loi”, J.As., 1916, II, p. 205-275, and P. Demiéville in BEFEO XLIV, 1954, p. 373 sqq.

73 For this belief, which very probably developed at Kashmir in Hinayānist circles, see P. Demiéville, “La Yogācārabhūmi de Saṅgharakṣa”, in BEFEO XLIV, 1954, p. 339-436, esp. p. 376 sqq.

74 Cf. the titles given by T’ang Yung-t’ung, History, p. 218. However, Itō Giken 伊藤義賢 in his Shina bukkyō seishi 聖教傳記 (Tōkyō 1923), p. 192-193, comes to the conclusion that the base of Tao-an’s belief in Maitreya must not be sought in these scriptures but rather in oral traditions current at this time in China. For a survey of literature on Maitreya in general cf. Et. Lamotte, Traité, p. 4 note 3.


76 KSC V 353.2 (trsl. Link, p. 36-37); P. Demiéville (op.cit., p. 379-380) gives several examples which show that samādhī was considered the means to come into contact with the Tuṣita heaven.

77 Biography of T’an-chieh 圣戒, cf. note 76.

78 HS 30, based on the “Seven Summaries” 七略, a classified catalogue of the books in the imperial library, compiled by the archivist Liu Hsiang 劉向 (died 8 BC) and after his death completed by his son Liu Hsin 劉歆 (died 23 AD). The idea of compiling a bibliography of scriptures was certainly of Chinese and not of Indian or Central Asian origin—it is one of the by-products of the penetration of Buddhism
in a bureaucratic country. In secular bibliography we cannot find any motivation of an ideological nature. It was a purely practical attempt to assemble, arrange and classify books and documents of lasting value, of all types, all times and all schools of thought. The practical nature of Chinese bibliography at its very beginning is also demonstrated by the fact that one of the first known catalogues before Liu Hsiang was one devoted to works on military strategy; cf. Yao Ming-ta’s Chung-kuo mu-lu-hsüeh shih (中國目錄學史, second series, Shanghai 1938), p. 23 sqq.


81 CSTCC IX 62.1 sqq. Indications that it was Tao-an who wrote this letter are the following: the author says to have formerly been at Yeh (昔鄠中亦與同遊……); the great emphasis on bibliographical and historical details concerning the translation of certain scriptures; the author has also lived in the North ( 尋往在河北 唯見一奄……) and is now obviously living at Hsiang-yang; his insistence on the importance of the monastic rules, especially the phrase此乃最急, cf. Tao-an’s words in his preface to the Bihisunipratimokṣa (CSTCC IX.2.25) about theVinaya: 此乃此邦之善者也; the author’s relation with Shih Hui-ch’ang 慧常 at Liang-chou, corroborated by Tao-an’s令放光見略解序, CSTCC VII 48.1.21 sqq.

82 Hui-ch’ang 慧常, Chin-hsing 慈靜 and Hui-pien 慈辯 were three monks, probably disciples of Tao-an (Hui-ch’ang bears here the religious surname Shih which, although not quite unknown before, was made popular by Tao-an at Hsiang-yang only a few years before), who according to Tao-an’s令放光見略解序 (CSTCC VII 48.1.21) had departed for India and who in 373 AD copied for him the Kuang-tsan ching at Liang-chou, a place they had to pass on their way to Central Asia. It seems that Hui-ch’ang never went to India, as he is mentioned as a member of the translation team which in 379 AD at Ch’angan made a Chinese version of the Bhikṣunipratimokṣa (CSTCC XI 81.2.24). Hui-ch’ang and Tao-chin figure also in a colophon on the Śūraṃgamasaṃādhīsūtra translated by the Kuchean Po Yen 常建 in 373 AD at Liang-chou (CSTCC VII 49.2.27), which text they sent to Tao-an at Hsiang-yang, as is shown by this letter, immediately after its completion.

83 KSC VI (biography of Hui-yüan) 358.1.17, cf. below, p. 241.

84 Biography in KSC V 355.3.2; cf. also below, p. 240.

85 Biography in KSC V 355.2.5 sqq.

86 A letter to Hui-yüan extolling the virtues of Tao-an is quoted at the end of his biography in KSC.

87 Biography in KSC V 356.2.3 sqq.

88 Cf. above, Ch. I note 32.

89 [善]印手 [孝業], Ratnamudrāhasta, the name of a Bodhisattva who is mentioned e.g., at the beginning of the Vimalakīrtinirdeśa (version of Kumārajiva, T 475 ch. I p. 537.2.5, version of Chih Ch’ien, T 474 ch. I p. 519.2.8). Tao-an is said to have had a loose piece of skin attached to his left forearm which could be moved up and down, and on account of this characteristic (not a “malformity”, but one of those bodily peculiarities which Chinese historians often ascribe to exceptional people, cf. Fo-t’u-t’eng, above p. 182!) he was called “The Bodhisattva with the Sealed Hand”印手善業. Mudrā here naturally does not mean “(impression of) a seal”; the name must probably be interpreted as “The Bodhisattva with the hands making the gesture of (producing) jewels”, the first of the two explanations given by Kumārajiva in his gloss to this passage of the Vimalakīrtinirdeśa in T 1775, 注唯摩竭, ch. I p. 330.3.5, where印 is explained by印相: 印若相也, 手有出寶之相, 亦曰, 手中有印也. Kumārajiva himself is reported to have called Tao-an “the Saint of the East” (KSC V 354.1.2), cf. also Tsukamoto Zenryū in his note to Shih-Lao chih, trsl. L. Hurvitz, in Yün-kang vol. XVI, suppl. p. 50 (§ 36).

90 KSC V 356.2.15: 立本論九篇，六議旨歸十二首. These treatises are not
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mentioned by Lu Ch'eng, nor by any bibliographical work except Ta T'ang NTL (T 2149) II 248.3.26 and X 330.2.8.

91 Biography in KSC VI 362.1.11.
92 Biography in KSC V 356.2.17.
93 Cf. CS 64.7b.
94 Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, p. 346.
95 KSC V 352.3.26 (trsl. Link p. 27-28).
96 CS 114.3b.

The more extensive version of this story may have figured in some early separate biography of Tao-an, such as the 宋和尚傳 or the 宋法師傳 quoted in the SSHY comm. IB/24b and IIA/32b, the KSC account being an abridgement of this, and the full text being reproduced in the CS. We may as well suppose that it occurred as such in the annals of the Former Ch'in which furnished the materials for this part of the Chin-shu.

97 KSC V 353.1 (trsl. Link p. 32 sqq.); CS 114.3b.
98 CS 114.5a.
100 CS 114.4a; KSC V 253.1. (trsl. Link p. 34). The CS version reads: 可頌慈命。詔按諌略, 剩記冊子本陰, 開其起戈之軌, 焉其不庭, 萬之可也
101 CS 113.9b. The prohibition of the t'u-ch'an was no doubt inspired by political motives, as this kind of apocryphal texts was often consulted and even produced by seditious elements.

102 KSC V 353.1.5 (trsl. Link p. 29).
103 KSC V 353.1.14 (trsl. Link p. 31).
104 KSC V 353.1.6 (trsl. Link p. 30).
105 For the restitution of 僧伽政毘 to Sañghabhadra see P. Demiéville in BEFEO XLIV, 1954, p. 364, note 8.
106 Biography in CSTCC XIII 99.2 and KSC I 329.1.
107 Cf. below, p. 296.
108 See Tao-an's 摩訶鋅羅若波羅蜜經抄序, CSTCC VIII 52.2.23 sqq.; the anonymous colophon on the Yogacarabhumi, ib. X 71.3.2; Chao Cheng's words reported in Tao-an's 菩婆沙序, ib. X 73.3.15; those of Hui-ch'ang reported in Tao-an's 比丘大戒序, ib. XI 80.2.10 sqq.; Chu Fo-nien's words in his 王子法益善目因縁經序, ib VII 51.3.12.
109 See the first documents mentioned in note 108.

110 CSTCC X 71.3.2: (Tao-an) 許竟至湖外,出此以外,悉不可差。Cf. Ōchô Enichi 樂敦慧日, “Shaku Dôan no hanron” 翻譯安の譯論, in Indo-gaku-Bukkyôgaku kenkyû V. 2 (March 1957), p. 120-130.
112 KSC V 352.3.26 (trsl. Link p. 28).
113 T 1547, an abridgement of the Mahâvibhâsa, attributed to a still unidentified ibhidharmika called in Chinese Shih-t'o-p'an-ni 菩薩攴尼.
114 T 1550, an extract from the Abhidharma of the Sarvâstivâdins attributed to (?)Dharmottara or (?)Dharmaśrī 智勝.
115 T 1543, in 30 chuan, also recited by Sañghadeva; attributed to the patriarch Kâtyâyana or Kâtyâyanâputra.
116 T 26, in 60 chuan; T 125, in 51 chuan.
117 CSTCC IX 64.3.17: 惡梵八九之年始遇此經; cf. ib. X 73.3.25: 恶梵八九之年方開其牖耳。
118 Cf. Lun-yü XIX 23.3: 夫子之牆數仞,不得其門而入, 八,不見宗廟之美,百室之富。
According to Tao-an's biography in KSC, he died on a date corresponding with March 5, 385 AD, but this is almost certainly a mistake. Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, p. 196-197.

Earliest biographical sources: the early fifth century 達法師誡 by Chang Yeh 楚齋 (one of Hui-yüan's lay followers, cf. p. 219), quoted in SSHY comm. IB. 27a-b, and Hui-yüan's biography in CSTCC XV 109.2 sqq. and KSC VI 357.3 (translated in the Appendix to this chapter). Surviving fragments of his works collected by Yen K'o-ch'un 顏可俊 in CCW 161-162 (not containing Hui-yüan's correspondence with Kumārajīva, T 1856); on his life and teachings see T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, p. 341-373; Tokiwa Dainosuke 高橋大成, Shina ni okeru bukkōshi to jukyō dōkyō (Tōkyō 1937), p. 56-57; Tsukamoto Zenyū, Shina bukkōshō kenkyū, p. 613 sqq. (about the earliest development of Amidism), and esp. p. 630 sqq. (about Hui-yüan and buddhānusmṛti); Inouye Ichi 石井一, "Rozan-bunka to Eon" (Akōzai, 1934, p. 1-34; J. Šćucki, "Ein Dauist im chinesischen Buddhismus" (trsl. from the Russian by W. A. Unkrig), Sinica XV, 1940, p. 114-129; W. Liebenthal, "Shih Hui-yüan's Buddhism as set forth in his writings", JAOS LXX, 1950, p. 243-259, and for Hui-yüan's theory of the "immortality of the Soul" the sources mentioned above, ch. I note 40; for a translation of his treatise "Jūsen" see Leon Hurvitz, "'Render unto Caesar' in Early Chinese Buddhism", in the Liebenthal Festschrift, Sino-Indian studies V (Santiniketan, 1957), p. 80-114. Cf. Chang Yeh's "Inscription" (SSHY comm. IB.27a): 世尊冠族; for his "poverty" cf. the episode about the candles which he could not buy, in his biography (trsl. below, App. p. 240). The Chia from Yen-men were not one of the great clans; the prominent gentry family of Chia came from P'ing-yuan (Shantung), cf. Wang I-t'ung, op.cit., vol. I, table 30.

Already in 357, when Hui-yüan was 23 years old, Tao-an allowed him to explain the Buddhist scriptures with the help of secular literature (cf. above, p. 12); cf. also Tao-an's words about Hui-yüan reported in the latter's biography (CSTCC XV 109.2.23 = KSC VI 358.2.9): 使道流東國其在遠乎.

Lived 337-412; biography in KSC VI 361.2.

Already in 357, when Hui-yüan was 23 years old, Tao-an allowed him to explain the Buddhist scriptures with the help of secular literature (cf. above, p. 12); cf. also Tao-an's words about Hui-yüan reported in the latter's biography (CSTCC XV 109.2.23 = KSC VI 358.2.9): 使道流東國其在遠乎.

It is interesting to note that Ko Hung here emphasizes the importance of K'uai-chi (one of the strongholds of gentry Buddhism before the early fourth century) as a region of mountains suited to these practices, especially "since the famous mountains of the Central Region (occupied by barbarians) cannot be reached nowadays".

The one North of Ch'ü-chiang 曲江 in Kuangtung, originally named Hu-shih shan 虎帝山; when the monk Shih Seng-lü 駱僧律 was living there during the i-hsi era (405-418 AD), the name was changed into Ling-chi shan. Cf. Shui-ching chu, ed. Wang Hsien-ch'ien, 38.21a.
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138 Quoted in SSHY II B.44b (here called "Lu-sun-shan k'o"), TPYL 41.3b and 41.6a, Shui-ching chu, ed. Wang Hsien-ch'ien, 39.19a; Ch'en Shun-yu's Shi-shen Lu-shan chi (T 2095) I 1027.3 and 1031.6; CCW 162.6b; IWLC 7.20b; Wen-hsüan comm. 12.256; 22.480; 26.583.

139 KSC I 323.2.26 sqq.

140 KSC (loc. cit.) has 賽亭湖廟 which seems to be the correct reading, cf. the fragment of the Lu-shan fu 盧山賦 by Chih T'an-ti (died 411 AD, quoted in I-wen lei-chu 7.22a): 賽亭者化於於亭.

141 A certain Chieh Chhi 賽直, the husband of Hui-yuan's paternal aunt who later became the nun Tao-i 道侶, cf. PCNC I 937.1.9 and below, p. 210.

142 CS 81 (biogr. of Huan I) 6b.

143 Viz., T 2095 (Lu-shan chi, 11th cent.), I 1027.3.19.

144 Cf. Liu I-min's 劉遺民 (i.e., Liu Ch'eng-ch'ih's 劉程之) letter to Seng-chao 僧超 and the latter's answer to Liu I-min, both written in 409 AD (Chao-lun part IV, Jōron kenkyū, p. 36 sqq., trsl. Liebenthal, p. 87 sqq.), and the letter of Lei Tzu-tsung 雷次宗 for which see below, p. 218.

145 Cf. KSC VI (biogr. of Tao-tzu 道祖), 363.1.26: 又有法偏。道性，道役等百有餘人…… ib. (biogr. of Hui-yung 惠豐): 從者百餘…… The 123 persons who took part in the "vow" in 402 AD (cf. p. 219) probably constituted the whole number of Hui-yuan's clerical and lay followers then present at Mt. Lu; according to the anonymous colophon on the ?Abhidharmarādaya 阿毘達磨 (CSTCC X 72.2.23) only eighty monks were gathered when Saṅghadeva translated this scripture in 391 AD.

146 Cf. KSC VI (biogr. of Hui-ch'ih) 361.2.21.

147 Biography in KSC VII 370.1.19.

148 Biography in KSC VI 361.2.14 and Meisōdenshō p. 11b.

149 KSC VI (biography of Fa-an) p. 362.2.

150 PCNC I 937.1.10 and KSC VI (biography of Hui-ch'ih) 361.2.21.

151 Wang Hsün (350-401 AD, biogr. in CS 65.7a), one of the grandsons of Wang Tao, belonged to the intimi of Huan Wen and of emperor Hsiao-wu. According to CS 65.8b (biography of Wang Min 王珉), his "junior style" 小字 was the Buddhist name 法護 ("Dharmarākṣa"). Among the monks sponsored by him we find Tao-i 道逸 (cf. KSC V 357.1.10; also mentioned in Wang Hsün's 游嚴敘略序 in SSHY comm. 1A/46a), Chu Fa-t'ai 茱法汰 (cf. KSC V 355.1.6), Saṅghadeva and Saṅgharaksaka (CSTCC IX 64.1.7, KSC I 329.1.15 and VI 361.2.24) and Hui-ch'ih (KSC VI 361.2.24). Together with his brother Wang Min 王珉 he attended Saṅghadeva's exposition of Abhidharma (SSHY IB/28a, KSC I 329.1.19, CS 65.7b-8a); two letters written by him to Fan Ning 孫寧 (337-401) about his qualities of Hui-yuan and Hui-ch'ih are quoted in KSC VI 361.2.28; see furthermore his "Preface to poems written at the grave of Master Lin (i.e., Chih Tun)" quoted in SSHY comm. IIIA/12a (he visited Chih Tun's grave in 374 AD), and the Buddhist terminology in his 讀武帝表(策文 of 397 AD, quoted in IWLC 13.20b.

152 KSC VI 361.2.25 and Tao-tz'u's 道璽 "Preface to the Madhyamāgama", CSTCC IX 64.1.9.

153 Two letters from Wang Hsün to Fan Ning and one reply by Fan Ning, see above note 151; a letter from Wang Kung 王恭 (?-398 AD) to the monk Seng-chien 僧伽 quoted KSC VI 361.3.2.

154 Before 399 Tao-an's associate Fa-ho 法和 had propagated Buddhism in Shu 蜀 (present-day Ssu-ch'uan) during the years 365-379 AD (KSC V 354.1.20), but little is known about his activities there. Hui-ch'ih's biography shows that ca. 400 Buddhism was already flourishing in this outlying territory, and this appears still more clearly from the biography of Tao-wang 道汪, a disciple of Hui-yuan who around the same time settled at Ch'eng-tu and there entertained close relations with the highest magistracy (KSC VII 371.3).
...
(21) "About the Bodhisattva being born in the five spheres of existence (遍 = gati)"

(22) "About the seven Buddhas"

(23) "About not perceiving Maitreya and not perceiving a thousand Buddhas (in buddhānumāṇīsamādhī)"

(24) "About the Buddha-dharma(s) not being subjected to old age"

(25) "About the mind, thought and cognition of the Spirit"

(26) "About the ten numerical dharmas"

172 In two, var. three ch'iian; cf. Wen T'ing-shih, Pu Chin-shu i-wen chih 補晉書藝文志, in Erh-shih-wu shih pu-pien, vol. III. p. 3705.1, and the works of the same title by Ch'in Jung-kuang 程榮 (ib., p. 3802.1), by Wu Shih-chien 吳士欽 (ib., 3852.1) and by Huang Feng-yüan 黃逢元 (ib. 3897.3).

173 Cf. above, p. 148.

174 SSHY IIIb/15b.


176 He tried to persuade Hui-yüan to give up the religious life, cf. Hui-yüan's biography, KSC VI 360.2.16 (trsl. below, p. 250; Huan's letter and Hui-yüan's answer reproduced in HMC XI 75.1.6); he did the same with Tao-tsu in 404 AD (KSC VI 363.1.16).

177 In HMC XII 85.3.6 we find a document professing to be a letter by Chih Tao-lin (Chih Tun) to Huan Hsüan in which he protests against the proposed registration of the clergy; Ch'in lin-fa ti-chien Accesser to Monastery, dated the fifth day of the fourth month of lung-an 3, i.e. May 25, 399 AD. As we have said before (cf. above, p. 17), the title cannot be correct (Chih Tun died in 3661), but this is not a reason to reject the whole letter as a forgery; in fact, the writers refer in the opening lines to themselves as "We, monks of the capital...". It is, however, difficult to say what could have been Huan Hsüan's role in this registration. In May 399 AD he resided at Chiang-ling as the leader of the military junta against Ssu-ma Tao-tzu, and, although he was at that time already the most powerful man in the central provinces, he cannot have exercised any influence on the policy of the metropolitan authorities towards the clergy. Or do these monks only protest against measures taken against their brothers in the central provinces? The contents of the letter are too vague to affirm or to deny this. In any case, if the letter is authentic and if such a registration was indeed planned or carried out in 399 AD, it is fairly certain that it emanated from Huan Hsüan.

178 Cf. Hui-yüan's statement in the colophon on his 油門不敬王者論 (HMC V 32.2.9), viz. that he and his associates on Mt. Lu had been deeply distressed at the humiliation of emperor An, and that he had composed the treatise for this reason (i.e. as a protest against Huan Hsüan)

179 Cf. below, App. note 125.

180 Lived 392-473, one of the most prominent members of the imperial family of the (Liu)-Sung dynasty; biography in Sung-shu 51.11b. He entertained relations with Hui-yüan's disciple T'an-shun 臧順 for whom he built a monastery at Chiang-ling, cf. KSC VI 363.1.23.

181 Biography of Lu Hsün in CS 100.15b sqq.; biography of Lu Ch'en ib. 44.6a.

182 Mentioned in CS 100.16b at the end of Lu Hsün's biography.

183 Quoted in IWLC 87.20b and TPYL 972.7b.

184 For the Han code see HHS 60.7a (cf. HS 72.25a), and the cases concerning "hiding fugitives from justice" (i.e. HS 60.3b; A. F. P. Hulsewé, Remnants of Han Law I p. 261 nr. 9 and note 20, and p. 266).

185 In 410/411 AD, when Hui-yüan wrote a letter to Yao Hsing in order to clarify the case of the expulsion of Buddhabhādara (cf. below, p. 223), CSTCC XIV (biography of Buddhabhādara) 104.1.1 = KSC II 335.2.15.

186 The biographies of Hui-yüan in CSTCC XV and KSC VI, the poems by Wang
Ch'i-chih 王齊之 in KHMC XXX 351.3.8 sqq.; the biographies of some of Hui-yüan's lay followers in Sung-shu 93.

187 T 2095. For these later traditions see T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, p. 366-371.

188 KHMC XXVII 304.1: 萬佛士劉通民等書.

189 In the Shih-pa hsien chuan, T 2095 (Lu-shan chi III), p. 1039.3.18, and in the still later (13th cent.) Fo-tsu i'ung-chi XXVI (T 2035) 268.1, which, however, say that he stayed on the mountain for twelve years; hence according to these sources he arrived in 399 AD.

190 Cf. above, note 144.

191 Biogr. in Sung-shu 93.3b, Nan-shih 75.7a; cf. Lu-shan chi III, 1039.3; collected fragments of his literary works in CSW 29.9a sqq.

192 Sung-shu, loc.cit.

193 His answer on questions concerning mourning garments posed by Yüan Yü 玉 (T'ung-tien 92.501.1) and his exposition of the mourning rites in reply to questions posed by Ts'ai Kuo 蔡 (T'ung-tien 103.546.3).

194 恐非不答 “I do not open up (the mind) of anyone who is not desirous to explain himself”

195 Sung-shu 93.3b.

196 Biography in Sung-shu 93.3b; Lu-shan chi III 1039.3; fragments of his works in CCW 142.7a.

197 Various fragments quoted in T'ung-tien 97, cf. CCW 142.7a-b, and Yü-han shan-fang chi i-shu 玉巖山房雜著書 vol. 79.

198 When at Hui-yüan's request he wrote a refutation of Tai K'uei's 裴道 務 Shih i lun 婁論 (KHMC XVII 222.2 sqq.), he was obviously already living at the Lu-shan, and this correspondence must have taken place before 396 AD, the year in which Tai K'uei died.

199 Biography in Sung-shu 93.2b, Nan-shih 75.3b; Lu-shan chi III 1040.1; fragments of his work in CSW 20.21.

200 For the Ming fo lun (HMC II 9.2-16.1) see above, p. 15.


202 禪法師敘 , quoted in SSHY comm. IB/27 a-b.

203 Shih-pa hsien chuan, in Lu-shan chi III, T 2095 p. 1042.2.

204 Biography of Pi Cho in CS 49.2b.

205 KHMC XXX 351.3.8 sqq.: 念佛三昧詩四首 and four more eulogies on the Bodhisattvas Sadāparudita and Dharmogata and on the Buddhas, by “Wang Ch'i-chih 嬰之 from Lang-yeh”; paraphrase in English of the four first poems by W. Liebenthal in The Book of Chao, p. 193-195. In Lu-shan chi IV 1042.3.9 and Fo-tsu i'ung-chi XXVI (T 2035), 261.3.17 he figures as “Wang Ch'iao-chih 嬰之 prefect of Lin-ho 涙”。Judging from the form of his personal name, this person must belong to the third generation descendants of Wang Cheng 嶽 who, unlike the members of the other branches of this clan, have almost without exception two-syllable personal names ending in 之. Wang Ch'i-chih must have died before 417 AD, since the monk Tao-heng 諭 (KSC VI 365.1.7), who died in that year, is reported to have written a “lament” at the occasion of his death (KSC VI 365.1.7).

206 CSTCC XII 84.2.5.


208 T 418, ch. I, section 2 (行 言), p. 905.1.6 sqq. = T 417 p. 899.1.11.


211 KHMC XXX, 351.2.21.

212 According to a late tradition this was the Lotus sūtra (cf. P. Demiéville, loc.cit.); probably rather the Sukhāvativyūha, cf. the account of Seng-ch'i's death translated below.
43.3.26 sqq. (for Hsieh Fu's Mahāyāna texts (SBE, vol. XLIX, Oxford, in two volumes).

3. After seven days, the Buddha manifests himself before his eyes, complete with all characteristics of the Buddha-body, and, praising him for his zeal, he tells him to join the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata 謂陀(此) at the city of Gandhavati, who will instruct him. Sadāprarudita then masters a great number of sāmādhī by which he is able to perceive innumerable Buddhas who encourage him and tell him to go to Dharmodgata, but whenever he emerges out of his trance he is distressed at the fact that these Buddhas have disappeared. He therefore constantly ponders on the problem where these apparitions came from and to what place they have gone, and this is the first question which he poses to Dharmodgata who then explains to him the absolute nature of the transcendent Buddha-body which is the dharmakāya. The relation between this story and the visualization of the Buddha by buddhānusmṛti is obvious; in fact, Dharmodgata's problem (viz.,

213 KSC VI 362.2.17 sqq.
214 Reading, with most editions, 此 in stead of 就.
215 KSC VI, 362.2.5 sqq.
216 From Hui-yuán's 念佛三昧詩集序 (preface to the dhyāna-"sūtra" of Buddhhasena), CSTCC IX, 65.2.28.
217 Hui-yüan's 念佛三昧詩集序, KHMCC XXX, 351.2.11.
218 See e.g., K'ang Seng-hui’s preface to the 安般守意經 (mid. third cent.) in CSTCC VI, 43.1.6 sqq., and Hsieh Fu’s 謝敷 preface to the same scripture, ib., 43.3.26 sqq. (for Hsieh Fu cf. above, p. 136).
219 Hui-yuan’s 念佛三昧詩集序, KHMCC XXX, 351.2.16.
220 Preface to the Dhyana-"sūtra", CSTCC IX, 65.3.18.
221 T 618, 速陀羅羅和尚 (Yogacārabhāmi) in two chūan and 17 sections. For the Mahāyānist passage about buddhānusmṛti near the end of the work cf. P. Demiéville, op.cit., p. 363.
222 The story of Sadāprarudita’s quest for Wisdom and his conversation with the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata is found in the last chapters of both the smaller and the larger Prajñāpāramitā. In spite of its narrative and even lively style which curiously contrasts with the unbearable monotony of all other sections, it appears to have been part of the 8.000 and 25.000 pp since very early times, since it already figures in the first Chinese versions of these scriptures (sections 27-28 of Lokākṣema’s 道行經, T 224; sections 88-89 of Mokṣala's 放光經, T 221; sections 27-28 of Kumārajīva’s 小品般若波羅蜜經, T 227; sections 88-89 of his 大般般若波羅蜜經, T 223; Sanskrit text Aṣṭasāhasrikā 30-31, trsl. E. Conze, p. 327 sqq.). The Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita 謂陀(此) is urged by voices from the air to devote himself exclusively to the realization of the Prajñāpāramitā and to go to the East to do so.

By listening to their sermon he is so overjoyed that he forgets to ask where he has to go, and when the voices have disappeared, he is overwhelmed by sadness and regret. For seven days and nights he concentrates his whole mind on the problem how and where to obtain the Prajñāpāramitā. After seven days, the Buddha manifests himself before his eyes, complete with all characteristics of the Buddha-body, and, praising him for his zeal, he tells him to join the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata 謂陀 at the city of Gandhavati, who will instruct him. Sadāprarudita then masters a great number of sāmādhī by which he is able to perceive innumerable Buddhas who encourage him and tell him to go to Dharmodgata, but whenever he emerges out of his trance he is distressed at the fact that these Buddhas have disappeared. He therefore constantly ponders on the problem where these apparitions came from and to what place they have gone, and this is the first question which he poses to Dharmodgata who then explains to him the absolute nature of the transcendent Buddha-body which is the dharmakāya. The relation between this story and the visualization of the Buddha by buddhānusmṛti is obvious; in fact, Dharmodgata’s problem (viz.,

213 KHMCC XXVII 304.2.8 sqq.
214 T 362, 阿彌陀三耶三佛誦誦佛誦過度人道經 (var. 大阿彌陀經) in two chūan.
216 Or, acc. to the Korean edition, “establish your mind in ...” (建心 in stead of 達心).
217 Lit. “the four great elements” (四大, mahābhūta), here denoting the material body? Perhaps rather a mistake for 四支 (支, as often, for 隻): “the four members”, i.e., the body. We could think of a more philosophical interpretation: “By examination (he realized) that the four elements (being illusory) are in no way subject to disease and suffering”, but cf. the account of the death of Liu Ch'eng-chih (trsl. above) who also took leave of the monks without showing any signs of disease.
the actual nature and origin of such apparitions) was the one which Huì-yuán himself
in one of his letters submitted to Kumárājīva (cf. below, p. 228 nr. 11)! For the
eulogies on the image of Sadāprārudita and Dharmodgata cf. above, note 205.

For the “shadow of the Buddha” at Nagarāhāra see J. Przyluski, “Le Nord-
Ouest de l’Inde dans le Vinaya des Mūla-Sarvāstīvādin et les textes apparentés”,
J. As., 1914, p. 565-568; Et. Lamotte, Traité, p. 551-553 and the sources mentioned
there; for the “shadow” on Mt. Lu cf. the article of Inouye Ichii mentioned in note
121, and T’ang Yung-t’ung, History, p. 346-347. The main source for the episode is
Huì-yuán’s “Inscription on the shadow of the Buddha” (with preface and
colophon) in KHMC XV 197.3-198.4; a somewhat deviating version of the five
hymns of which this “inscription” consist is found in Huì-yuán’s biography in KSC
trls. below, App. p. 242, according to the KHMC text). Furthermore there is the
“inscription” by Hsieh Ling-yún (cf. below, note 237). In all editions except the
Korean one, the title of Huì-yuán’s inscription is given as 像影銘. This is
no doubt a case of dittography: the foregoing text, an eulogy on Candraprabha by
Chih Tun, ends with the words 像影銘, and this 像, repeated by careless
copying, has become distorted into 方 (= 方) and joined to the title of the next
piece.

Mentioned among Tao-an’s works in CSTCC V, 40.1.6 and 8.

KHMC XV, 198.1.10 sqq. The identity of the Vinaya-master is not known;
it cannot have been Fa-hsien, who only returned in 413 and who is not known to
have visited Mt. Lu.

Cf. the sixth line of Huì-yuán’s fourth hymn: “its movement faintly (appears
on) the light (plain) silk” 遠微輕素 (ch’ing-su no doubt refers to the painting
material, as it matches the “point of the (painter’s) brush 蠟熾 in the previous line).

Li-tai san-pao chi VII, T 2034, p. 71.1.10.


According to CSTCC XIV, 103.2.28, Buddhahadra came from “Northern
India” (no place of birth specified); KSC II, 334.2-3 mentions two traditions: at the
beginning of his biography (p. 334.2.27) he is said to have been born at Kapilavastu
as a member of the Sākya family which professed to descend from king Amrtdana,
an uncle of the Buddha. This sounds like hagiography, an attempt to enhance Buddhahadra’s holiness by stressing his personal relation with the founder of the religion.
According to the second tradition, also reported in KSC (p. 334.3.17), he came from
Nagarāhāra 那治利城, from a noble family which had been Buddhist since gene-
rations.

KHMC XV, 199.2-3, composed after the return of Fa-hsien who is mentioned
in the preface. Another treatise about the “shadow of the Buddha”, by Yen Yen-
nien 廖延年 (early fifth century) is mentioned by Lu Ch’eng (CSTCC XII 83.3.3).

T 1856, in 3 chiian. Huì-yuán’s letters to Kumārajīva are mentioned separately
in different sections of the table of contents of Lu Ch’eng’s Fa-lun (CSTCC XII
83.1.1 sqq.), which shows that ca. 465, when the Fa-lun was compiled, these had not
yet been collected so as to form a single work. A collection of these letters appears
for the first time in the Chung-ching mu-lu of 594 AD (T 2146 VI 147.1.26: 指問論二
卷.給付答.慧遠問).

These few words of course do not pretend to be an adequate account of Kumārajīva’s life, the basic source for which is his biography in KSC II 330.1-331.1 (trans-
By J. Nobel in Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften,
Phil.-hist. Klasse, 1937). The best recent discussion of his life and activities is found
in Jöron kenkyū, p. 130-146, by Tsukamoto Zenryū, who convincingly demonstrates
that the dates of Kumārajīva’s life must be 350-409 AD; see also T’ang Yung-t’ung,
History, p. 278-340, and Sakaino Kōyō 境野 廣洋, Shina bukkyō seishi 般若佛教精
240 The first letters are reproduced in Hui-yuan’s biography in KSC, trsl. below, p. 246 sqq. These have not been included in T 1856, nor are they mentioned in the Fa-lun mu-lu, probably because they were not considered important from a doctrinal point of view.

241 The Fa-lun mu-lu mentions one letter entitled “About the Spirit” (CSTCC XII 84.3.27, no answer of Kumārajiva listed) which does not figure in T 1856. On the other hand, T 1856 contains one letter (nr. 6, entitled 次問受決法 “more questions about the vyākarana”) which is not mentioned by Lu Ch’eng. The letter nr. 17 in T 1856 is clearly a later redaction in which the contents of more than one letter have been combined; in fact, Lu Ch’eng mentions two documents devoted to the same subject: 間通學 and 重問通學 (p. 84.2.24). Lu Ch’eng’s entry 間法身非色 (p. 83.2.29) certainly refers to nr. 9 of T 1856 (問通色法).

242 An annotated Japanese translation of the Ta-sheng ta i-chang has been prepared by a joint study group under the direction of Tsukamoto Zenryū at the Institute of Humanistic studies (Jimbunkagaku-kenkyūjo) of Kyōto University, and it is to be hoped that this counterpart of the invaluable Jōron kenkyū will be published before long (cf. Jōron kenkyū, Introduction, p. 2).

243 The buddhology of the Ta chih-tu lun recognizes only 仏身 (nirmanakāya) and 法身, the latter referring to the Buddha’s “Dharma-body” (dharmakāya), as well as to his glorified body perceived by the Bodhisattvas (elsewhere denoted as sambhogakāya, “body of enjoyment”)—a fact which still increases the confusion of Hui-yuan’s ideas on this subject.

244 Hui-yuan’s interest in these speculations must very probably be connected with his ideas about the nature of images visualized in samādhi (cf. nr. 11).

245 It is interesting to note that Hui-yuan in this letter uses the Mādhyamika type of syllogism to prove his argument.

246 See below, App. note 132 nrs. 6-9.

247 Cf. SHHY IIIB/44b-45a.

248 Founded, according to CSTCC X 72.2.26 (河恒曼心序, anon., 391 AD), by Wang Ning-chih 王凝之 (?-399), the second son of Wang Hsi-chih, like his father a famous calligrapher and a follower of Taoism (五斗米道); CS 80.6a.

249 HMC V 34.2-3. For the term 三報 cf. below, App. note 47.


252 魏世錫, 葛世錫, 魏世錫 and 河西錫. For the date cf. P. Pelliot in TP XXII (1923), p. 102; biography of Tao-liu and Tao-tsu in KSC VI, 363.1.

253 (a) Letter of Huan Hsuan to the Eight Ministers, HMC XII 80.2 = T 2108, Chi sha-men pu-ying pai-su teng shih, ch. I, 444.3; (b) Reply of the Eight Ministers, HMC XII 80.2 = T 2108 p. 445.1; (c-k) Correspondence between Wang Mi and Huan Hsuan (nine letters), HMC XII, 80.3-83.2 = T 2108, p. 445.1-447.3; (l-n) Huan Hsuan’s letter to Hui-yüan, answer by Hui-yüan and rejoinder by Huan, HMC XII, 83.2-84.1 = T 2108, p. 447.3-448.3; (o) Edict issued by Huan Hsuan granting the clergy the privilege “not to pay homage to the ruler”, HMC XII 84.2; (p-v) remonstrances against this edict and answers by Huan Hsuan (seven documents), HMC XII, 84.2-95.1.

254 In these letters Huan Hsuan is called 太尉, which title he bore from May, 402 till February, 403 (CS 10.3b). On the other hand it is said in the last memorial of the courtiers (document v) that the writer on account of his work far from the capital had not been aware that a discussion had already been held “the spring of the previous
(year)" 去春; since this document is dated the 12th month of the year 403/404, this must refer to the spring of 402/403, hence probably May 402.

255 HMC XII, 80.2.14 = T 2108, I, p. 444.3.19.
256 Cf. Tao te ching 25: 道大，天地大，帝王大，域中有四大而王居其一焉。
257 HMC XII, 80.2.28 = T 2108, I, p. 445.1.3.
258 Magistrate and partisan of Huan Hsuan; biography CS 74.9a; acc. to CS 10.3b he had obtained the functions and titles given here (尚書令, 史部尚書 and 領軍府事) in April/May 402 AD.
259 Not mentioned elsewhere. Perhaps K'ung An-kuo 孔安国 (died 408, short biography in CS 78.2b), one of Ssu-ma Tao-tzu's partisans?
260 Mentioned in passing as 侍中, 尚書 and 美國內史 in the biography of his son Chang Yu 長裕 in Sung-shu 53.1a.
261 Not mentioned elsewhere; of course not the same person as the Shih Tao-pao 諧葆 mentioned above, p. 97.
262 HMC XII 80.3.19; T 2108 I 445.1.25.
263 莫非王右, allusion to Shih-ching, Ode 209 (III.vi.1, Ode 北山): 莫土之濵.
264 Which would mean around the beginning of our era. Does Wang Mi here refer to the tradition of the Yueh-chih envoy of 2 BC (cf. above, p. 24)?
265 HMC XII 81.1.16 = T 2108 I 445.2.18.
266 HMC XII 81.2.22 = T 2108 I 445.3.21.
267 Lun-yü VIII.9: 民可使由之,不可使知之.
268 HMC XII 82.1.25 = T 2108 I 446.2.17.
269 HMC XII 82.3.1 = T 2108 I 446.3.21.
270 HMC XII 83.2.1 = T 2108 I 447.2.20.
271 Cf. Lun-yü II.3: 道之以政, 鼎之以刑, 則民免而無恥 etc.
273 HMC XII 81.3.12 = T 2108 I 446.1.8.
274 HMC XII 82.2.9 = T 2108 I 446.2.29.
275 HMC XII 82.3.13 = T 2108 I 447.1.3.
276 HMC XII 81.2.4 = T 2108 I 445.3.5.
277 HMC XII 82.1.1 = T 2108 I 446.1.26.
278 HMC XII 81.2.10 = T 2108 I 445.3.11.
279 HMC XII 82.1.10 = T 2108 I 446.2.1.
280 HMC XII 81.2.14 = T 2108 I 445.3.14.
281 HMC XII 82.1.18 = T 2108 I 446.2.10.
282 HMC XII 82.2.24 = T 2108 I 446.3.15.
283 HMC XII 83.1.2 = T 2108 I 447.1.21.
284 HMC XII 83.3.2 = T 2108 I 447.3.19; shorter and somewhat different version in Hui-yuan’s biography in KSC, trsl. below p. 250.
285 HMC XII 83.3.10 = T 2108 I 447.3.28.
286 CSTCC XV 110.2.26.
287 The first memorial of the courtiers, submitted immediately after Huan’s edict, bears the curious date 太元二年十二月三日. This nien-hao is not mentioned in any other historical source; CS 10.3b merely states that in the second year yüan-hsing 元興, 11th month keng-ch'en (December 21, 403 AD), emperor An handed over the seal of state to Wang Mi, who brought it to Huan Hsüan, and that Huan on the fourth of the 12th month of that year (January 2, 404) ascended the throne and assumed yung-shih 永始 as his nien-hao. Could t'ai-heng be a nien-hao privately assumed by Huan Hsüan during his dictatorship? In any case the date of the first memorial (十二月三日) must correspond to January 1, 404 AD, i.e., one day before his actual enthronement, and yet it contains the ceremonial terms commonly used when addressing the emperor. The last memorial is dated 始元元年十二月二十四日; again the same problem! But here 始元 may be a mistake for 元始 or 永始; in any
case this date must correspond to January 22, 404 AD, twenty days after Huan's usurpation.

288 HMC XII 84.2.25.
289 HMC XII 84.3.1-85.11.
290 Biography in CS 99.12a.
291 See above, note 121.
292 "Inscription" of Chang Yeh (SSHY comm. IB/27a): "at the age of eighty-three", no date given; "Eulogy" by Hsieh Ling-yün (KHM C XXIII 267.1.20): 417 AD, at the age of 84; CSTCC XV 110.3.3: "at the end of the i-hsi era" (-419) at the age of 83; KSC VI, 361.2.1: 416 AD, at the age of 83.
293 Cf. the account of his death in late Amidist sources like T 2070, 令生西方淨土瑞應傳 p 104.1.16; T 2071, 净土往生傳 p. 110.2.8 sqq., T 2072 令生集 I p. 127.2.6 sqq. etc.

APPENDIX CHAPTER FOUR

1 N.W. of the modern Tai 代 hsien in Northern Shansi.
2 In 346 AD. The "inscription" of Chang Yeh 車野 (quoted in SSHY comm. I B/27 a-b, cf. above, note 121) dates this event when Hui-yüan was twelve (eleven, according to our way of counting) years old, in 345 AD.
3 許子, the modern Hsü-ch'ang hsien in central Honan.
4 In 354 AD, when he was twenty years old according to our way of counting.
5 The region South of the lower Yangtze.
6 I.e., Fan Hsüan 范先是, tsu 臣子, a retired scholar, famous for his knowledge of the Rites. According to his biography (CS 91.8b-9a) he was an orthodox Confucianist, opposed to the study of Lao-tzu and Chuang-tzu and to the anti-ritualistic tendencies prevalent among the gentry in his time. It is remarkable that Hui-yüan, the hsien-hsüeh specialist, wanted to join this moralistic scholiast at the poor little farm at Yü-chang 應車 (the modern Nan-ch'ang 南昌, Kiangsi) where he spent most of his life studying and working in the fields. He was much admired and materially supported by several members of the highest gentry; later, after 376 AD, he and the famous Fan Ning 楊寧 (another conservative Confucianist, since that year prefect of Yü-chang) did much to revive Confucian classical studies in the Kiangsi region.

7 共契; CSTCC XV 109.2.15 has 共契嘉通; the last two characters figure in KSC only in the Korean edition. 嘉通 is a variant form of 嘉廼 "(to practice) noble retirement", cf. I-ching, hex. 33, comment on the fifth unbroken line: 嘉廼, 貞吉, 以正志也.
8 CSTCC XV 109.2.15 has ... "it happened that 'the King's road' was blocked" 有王路不通. For the expression 有王路 (here denoting "government" or "the condition of the empire" in general), cf. Shu-ching IV.4 (ch. 周官): 無有作狄, 通王之路 (trsl. Karlgren p. 32: "Have no aversions and follow the King's road"). The KSC here wrongly refers to the "troubles of the Shih clan" following the death of Shih Hu as the reason why Hui-yüan could not go to the South. These troubles had actually only lasted till 352, after which conditions in the North had been stabilized again. Around 354 AD the region of Hsü-ch'ang and Loyang had become the scene of other wars, cf. above, p. 206. The "inscription" of Chang Yeh (SSHY comm. IB/27a) merely says "the roads were blocked and impassable" 有王路不通.
An anachronism: Tao-an only assumed the religious surname Shih when he was living at Hsiang-yang, i.e., after 365 AD. Cf. above, p. 189.

This happened in 354 AD, according to KSC VI (biography of Hui-yüan's brother Hui-ch'i'ih) 362.2.16. For a discussion of the date, cf. Tang Yung-t'ung, History, p. 344. It seems that Hui-yüan after having given up his plan to cross the Yangtze had returned to the North, perhaps to his native Yen-men, and that he met Tao-an in Western Hopei on his way home. CSTCC says 遠見通當 without specifying the place.

For the term 佛法 = pratirūpaka-dharma cf. E. Chavannes and S. Lévi in J.AS. 1916, p. 194, and P. Pelliot in TP XXV p. 92-94 and XXVI p. 51-52. Actually the "counterfeit Doctrine" means the second stage in the gradual deterioration of the religion, intermediate between the thousand years of "correct" Doctrine and the last phase of "final" Doctrine, at the end of which the dharmā has practically disappeared from the world. Here it hardly means anything more than "Buddhism" in general.

This saying attributed by Hui-chiao to Hui-yuan does not figure in CSTCC or in Chang Yeh's inscription: the expression 九流 goes back to the description of the different "schools of philosophy" in the bibliographical chapter of the Han-shu (HS 30).

I.e., he accepted the tonsure.

I.e., he accepted the tonsure.

The text has 貧族 "poor travellers", which I take to be a mistake for "poor family".

For this disciple see above, p. 199.

For these disciples see above, p. 199. This episode occurs already in Chang Yeh's "Inscription" (SSHY comm. IB/27a).

Cf. KSC V (biography of Tao-an) 352.3.18: 安在樊渃十五載 ..., and trsl. Link, p. 26, note 4.

A mistake; Fu P'i laid siege to Hsiang-yang in 378 and took the city in 379, cf. above, p. 198. CSTCC has 暗天元之初 ...

T 598, Dharmarākṣa's translation of the Sāgarañāgarājaparipṛcchā (trsl. 285 AD, cf. CSTCC II 7.2.24). Apart from the important role played by nāgas ("dragons" 龍) in this sūtra, it does not contain any element especially devoted to exorcism or rain-making. For another early case of the Hai-lung wang ching being recited in order to make rain, see Fa-yüan chu-lin LXIII 764.2, quoting Ming-hsiang chi. According to Fa-yüan chu-lin (ib., 764.3), the two miracles performed by Hui-yüan also occurred in this collection of pious tales, the account of which no doubt was copied by Hui-chiao.

Biography in KSC VI 362.1.11, cf. above, p. 199. The Hsi-lin ssu where he lived had been founded for him in 367 by T'ao Fan 陶範, cf. Tang Yung-t'ung, History, p. 346. T'ao Fan was one of the many sons of T'ao K'an (cf. below, note 41); his name occurs in the latter's biography (CS 66.6b), but nothing is said about his life.

Huan I, who as a general played an important role in the battle on the Fei-shui, became governor of Chiang-chou (residing at Hsun-yang) in 384, and held this post till his death ca. 392; cf. his biography in CS 81.5b-7a. As T'ang Yung-t'ung remarks (History, p. 346), the late tradition according to which the Tung-lin monastery was founded in 386 AD may consequently be correct.

The northern summit of the Lu-shan, the top of which is constantly...
wrapped in a haze, cf. the fragment of Hui-yüan's *Lu-shan chi* quoted in Li Shan's "Liu ting" commentary on *Wen-hsiian* 12.256. 26 Reading 種進去 in st. of 種 (var. 佐) 遂取, cf. the sub-title of Hui-yüan's *Hsien-tsohu*. 27 On this icon and its function cf. above, p. 224. The following hymns occur in a slightly different version in *KHMC* XV 197.3 sqq. In the translation we have in general followed this version, which is probably directly based upon the text of these hymns as the compiler of *KHMC* found them in Hui-yüan’s collected works. Needless to say that the translation of several passages from this difficult and hyper-rhetorical text must remain hypothetical. In spite of its obscurity and extreme artificiality, the Hymns on the Shadow of the Buddha are very interesting as specimens of early Buddhist "metaphysical poetry".

28 大象, cf. *Tao te ching* 35: 大象, 天下無, and ib. 41: 大象無形, 逮陰無名. 29 Reading, with most editions, 章 in stead of 隕. 30 Reading, with most editions of *KHMC*, 南冥. The Korean edition of *KHMC* and most editions of *KSC* have 南極而冥 "its traces disappear, and it is darkened"; the Korean edition of *KSC* has 南冥 in stead of 南冥. 31 Reading, with *KSC* and the Korean edition of *KHMC*, 涼虚; the 涼虚 in the other editions of *KHMC* is obviously a copyist's mistake.

32 Reading, with *KSC* 涼虚 in stead of 涼虚. 33 白毫, āṃrā(kesa), one of the thirty-two laksana, the white curl of hair between the Buddha's eyebrows, represented as emitting a ray of light, either permanently or at special occasions; cf. *Hōbōgirin* s.v. *byakugō*.

34 Reading, with *KSC*, 唐 in stead of 隕. 35 Reading, with *KHMC*, 南 in stead of 隕. 36 Reading, with *KHMC*, 南 in stead of 南. 37 Cf. *Tao te ching* 14: 聽之不聞名 四希, and ib. 41: 大音希聲.

38 Reading, with *KHMC* and the Korean edition of *KSC*, 以 instead of 依. 39 In *KHMC* the four-syllable pattern, maintained throughout the whole text of the hymns, is here broken, the last four lines of IV consisting of six and five syllables. In the *KSC* these lines have been made to accord with the stylistic form of the rest of the poem by eliminating two or one syllable from each line—an attempt at regularization which proves that we here have to do with a secondary and less reliable version.

KHMC: 愛氣俱於軒宇 昏明久而未順 飾翠鏡神儀 依佛若真遇

KSC: 清氣遐軒 昏文未順 飾翠神容 依佛遇遇


41 This episode—of doubtful historicity—takes us back at least sixty years before Hui-yüan came to Mt. Lu. T'ao K'an (259-334), a famous general and magistrate of the late Western and early Eastern Chin, had become military governor of Kuang-chou in 315 AD (cf. his biography in *CS* 66.4a sqq., esp. p. 6b, and *b*. 6.5a). The sources do not mention any other contacts between him and the Buddhist clergy, but one of his sons appears to have sponsored Hui-yung 惠永 at Hsün-yang (cf. above, note 23). The story of the statue occurs in a more detailed and morelegendarized version in *Fa-yüan chu-lin* (XIII 386.3) where it is defined as an image of the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī; no source is indicated. See also T'ao-hsüan's less miraculous account in *KHMC* XV 203.1.22 sqq., and below, p. 279.

42 For the "relics of Asoka" in medieval China cf. below, p. 277.

43 Popular sayings and ditties have often been taken as omens—after the event. For a collection of such songs see Tu Wen-lan 蘇文濤, *Ku yao-yen* 吉詠譚 (1861, reedited Peking 1958).
For these persons cf. above, p. 217 sqq.

無量寿 is actually a translation of Amitâyus “Infinite Life”—a name which probably more appealed to the interest of the Chinese than 無量光 (Amitâbha, “Infinite Light”), the other name by which this Buddha is commonly known, and which stresses the immeasurable light radiating from him rather than his longevity and that of the inhabitants of his paradise. The name Amitâyus occasionally occurs in the Sukhâvativyâha (ch. 31, trsl. F. Max Müller p. 47), but there much more emphasis is laid upon Amitâbha as the lord of all-pervading light; cf. the long enumeration of his different names, all containing an element which means “light” (Amitâbha, Amitaprabha, Amitaprabhâsa, Asamâptaprabha etc.) in Sukhâvativyâha 12 (trsl. F. Max Müller p. 29-30).

The zodiacal sign 氓 indicates a year with the cyclical appellation yin 阴, corresponding in this period with the years 390, 402 and 414 AD. The year 402 AD must be meant here (cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, p. 342).

The three types of karmic retribution, viz., “immediate retribution” 現報 (dsraydharma-vadaniya-karman, “acts to be felt in the present life”), “retribution (after one) birth 生報 (upapadaya-vadaniya-karman) and “retribution in a (still) later (life)” 後報 (aparaparyvayavedaniya-karman), cf. Abh. Kośa IV. 115 and V.216. Hui-yüan was much interested in the scholastic speculations about the process of retribution; his source was very probably the ?Abhidharmahydaya, a Sarvāstivādin compendium translated at his request by Saṅghadeva during the latter’s stay at the Lu-shan in 391/392 AD (T 1550, in 4 ch.), and revised by Hui-yüan himself. A short treatise by Hui-yüan, devoted to this subject, has been preserved: “On the Three Kinds of Retribution” 現報論 (HMC V 34.2, cf. above, p. 16 sub 10).


必感之有物，tentative translation.

叩篇: lit. “investigating the sections (of the sūtras)”?

Probably an allusion to the practice of “visualization” of Amitâbha who as a result of mental concentration upon the Buddha (buddhânusmṛti) appears to the devotee either during this concentration or in his sleep.

子來，cf. Shih-ching, ode 242 (Ta-ya I.8.1, 燦): 經始勿亟, 燳氏子來。

影作神造；tentative translation. For 影圖 I read, with CSTCC XV 109.3.25, 影圖. It cannot be an allusion to the “Shadow of the Buddha” (cf. above) which was only made ca. nine years after this event.

Reading, with most ed. of CSTCC XV 110.1.2, 影嶽 in stead of 影嶽 “clouded mountain-peaks”.

形征, allusion to I-ching, hexagram 11 (泰), on the first unbroken line: 斬子 葳蕤以企業征志 “the grass is plucked out together with its kind. The attack will bring fortune”. Wang Pi’s interpretation: the roots of the grass are interwoven and connected with each other, so that one blade, if extracted, will draw the other with it—in the same way the superior man after having risen to a high position will not forget his old comrades who have lagged behind.

Reading, with CSTCC XV 110.1.4, 影嶽 in stead of 影嶽.

瓊柯: the magic tree of jade on the summit of Mt. K’un-lun, the fruits of which are jewels containing the elixir of immortality; it measures three hundred fathoms in circumference and is a hundred thousand feet tall, cf. Ch’u-ts’u, Li-sao, SPTK ed. I 31b and 44a. This ancient Chinese belief closely resembles the traditional Buddhist representation of the miraculous trees in Sukhâvati, elaborated at great length in Sukhâvativyâha XVI (trsl. F. Max Müller, p. 33 sqq.): there are trees made of gold, silver, beryl, crystal, coral, red pearls, diamonds and various combinations of these, etc. For this resemblance between Sukhâvati and the Taoist fairyland (also traditionally located in the far West) cf. also H. Maspero, Les religions chinoises, p. 72.
T'ang Yung-t'ung (History, p. 368) regards the passage about the blessed seated on lotus flowers as a mere rhetorical ornament, but he also points out that the later tradition about the alleged foundation of the "Lotus Society" 造社 may have been inspired by the same idea.

58 造社: the three durgati, viz. rebirth as inhabitants of Hell, pretas or animals.

59 The origin of the ju-i sceptre, a familiar symbol of the Buddhist doctrine, is rather prosaic: it was an instrument used to scratch itching spots on the back which could not be reached by the hands (hence the name: "according to one's wishes").

The instrument is first attested in secular sources: according to SSHY IIb/5b a metal ju-i was used by Wang Tun 王真 (266-324), and CS 33.12a speaks of one handled by Shih Ch'ung 石崇 (249-300). In an earlier but rather unreliable source, the Shih i chi 拾遺記 (in its present form a compilation of fragments of the original late fourth century work by Wang Chia 王嘉), we read about ju-i made of precious materials in the possession of Sun Ch'üan 孫遼 (181-252 AD) and Sun Ho 孫和 (224-252), cf. Shih i shi, Han-Wei ts'ung-shu ed. 8.3b and 6b. In all these cases the ju-i is not used as a scratcher but as a "play-thing" used to point to persons at a meeting, to beat time when singing, to tap on or to strike against various objects etc., more or less in the same way as the "fly-whisk" was used in ch'ing-t'an (cf. above, p. 95). Like the fly-whisk, the Chinese ju-i may have been taken over by cultured priests in the fourth century AD. On the other hand, a kind of back-scratcher seems to have been one of the objects which regularly figured in the inventory of the Buddhist priests: in Chu Fo-nien's late fourth cent. translation of the ?Dharma-guptakavinaya 四分律 (T 1428) the ju-i is mentioned in a list of such objects (T 1428 XIX p. 694.1.6), and in the early eleventh century Shih-shih yao-lan 極上要覽 (T 2127, by Tao-ch'eng 道誠, 1019 AD) the Sanskrit name for such an instrument is given as 阿那律 anuruddha, "soothed", "pacified", "obliging", "fulfilling one's wishes" (the meaning "scratcher" does not occur in the dictionaries), which is the real meaning of ju-i (T 2127 II p. 279.2.28). It is not clear how and why this humble instrument could become the most venerable attribute of the Buddhist priest, unless we assume that the ju-i 如意 came in some way to be associated with the ju-i pao 如意寶, the "wish-fulfilling gem" (cintāmani) which plays such an important role in Indian Buddhist and non-Buddhist mythology.

60 Not mentioned elsewhere.
61 Not mentioned elsewhere.
62 Yin Chung-k' an became governor of Ching-chou in November 398 (cf. above, p. 113).
63 如意 (= 如意, cf. the expression 如意), implying that a rather long time had elapsed since they began to converse.
64 Cf. SSHY IB/27a-b, and above, p. 213.
65 Lived 360-407. For Wang Mi and his role as "defender of the faith" cf. above, p. 213 and 232 sqq.
66 Not mentioned elsewhere.
67 此下, allusion to Lun-yü II.4.5: 耳順. Since Wang Mi had been born in 360 AD, this letter must have been written in 399 AD, shortly before Huan Hsüan's rise to power.
69 此下, mostly used for "correspondence". All editions except the Korean one have 介, where 介 is obviously a mistake for the cursive form of 介.
70 This seems to be the name of a village; I have been unable to localize it.
71 CSTCC XV 110.1.16 mentions only Fa-ching, about whom nothing further is known. Fa-ling went to Khotan where he assembled a great number of texts; among these was a Sanskrit manuscript of the Avatamsakasūtra in 36.000 ślokas, which was later (in 418-420 AD) translated by Buddhhabhadra at the southern capital (CSTCC
NOTES

IX 6.1.1, 東漢記事，and KSC II, biogr. of Buddhabhadra, p. 335.3.3 sqq.). From Central Asia he returned to Ch'angan ca. 408 AD, probably together with Kumārajiva’s old teacher Buddhayaśas, cf. Sakaino Kōyō 境野重雄, Shina bukkō seishi 支那佛教精史 (Tōkyō 1935), p. 537-540; T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, p. 306, Jōron kenkyū p. 43; W. Liebenthal, the Book of Chao, p. 98, notes 382 and 383.

About Dharmanandini's faulty translation of this work nothing is known from other sources. In its present form the ?Abhidharmahrdaya is an incomplete compendium of Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma attributed to (?)Dharmottara or (?) Dharmasri 法勝. Saṅghadeva first made a complete translation of this work at Loyang ca. 384 AD (cf. CSTCC II 10.3.10); this, in sixteen (var. thirteen) chiüan, has been lost since T'ang times. As stated here, he made a second translation of the A-p'i-t'ān-hsin at Hui-yüan’s request during his stay at Mt. Lu in 391/392 AD, but this was actually an extract of the original text, and this version, in three chiüan, is no doubt the one preserved in the canon (T 1550).

三法度論, another Sarvāstivāda compendium attributed to Vasubhadra 山賢 and Sanghasena 僧伽先, in three (var. two) chiüan; T 1506.

CSTCC X contains two prefaces to Saṅghadeva's (abridged) version of the Abhidharmahrdaya made in 391/392 AD: one anonymous (p. 62.2.16 sqq.) and one by Hui-yüan (p. 62.3.1 sqq.), and Hui-yüan's preface to the San fa-tu lun (ib. p. 63.1.1 sqq.).

Ko-chu, a younger brother of Yao Hsing and an ardent Buddhist who actively took part in the translation activities at Ch'angan. His titles were Regional Inspector for the Metropolitan Area 司隸校尉, General of the Left 左將軍 and Marquis of An-ch'eng 安城侯, cf. CSTCC VIII 57.3.12 (Seng-jui's 法華經序, 406 AD); in CSTCC XI 77.3.2 (Seng-chao’s 般論序, 404 AD) he is only called 左將軍, so that his letter to Hui-yüan probably was written after 404, when he had obtained the title of “General of the Left” mentioned by Hui-yüan. A correspondence on doctrinal subjects between him and Yao Hsing has been preserved in KHMC XVII 228.1-230.1.

承不速之會, tentative translation. The 吳 used here instead of the common 不 probably alludes to the 12th hexagram of the I-ch'ing, named fou 酋, which is held to symbolize the unhappy state in which “Heaven and Earth have no contact with each other, and the beings do not communicate”, cf. T'uan-chuan XII, trsl. Legge p. 224.

懷寶來遊止止; translation uncertain. I have taken Huai-pao to be a proper name; it could also mean “You (Kumārajiva) have come to stay here, carrying the jewel (of the doctrine) in your bosom”, but I do not see how this could be connected with either the preceding or the following sentence.

I do not know what “Three Regions” are meant here.

教令之路 is so obscure that I cannot offer even a hypothetical translation.

八正之路, a variation of 八正道, the “Eightfold Noble Path” (āryāṣṭāṅga-mārga) of Buddhism.

Vāraṇa renders Pūrṇa, here probably the disciple Pūrṇa Maitráyaniputra who frequently figures as one of the interlocutors in the Prajñāpāramitā.

天鹿之器 seems to refer to the filtering-bag (commonly called 鹿水囊), used by Buddhist monks to strain off living creatures from the water they want to use. The 天, which makes no sense here, is probably an error for 水.

vandana = vandana (“obeisance”, “worship”), a formula of salutation, also commonly used by Chinese monks in their correspondence.

I do not know to what scripture Kumārajiva refers or what Bodhisattva he has in mind; throughout the canon we find a great many Bodhisattvas, Gods, Yakṣas etc. considered as “protectors” of the Doctrine in general or of a particular scripture. Or does Kumārajiva mean to say that Hui-yüan answers to the description of that Bodhisattva himself? In that case we may associate these words with the curious
passage in Hui-yüan’s biography (below, p. 248) which already occurs in Chang Yeh’s “Inscription”, and which states that the monks in foreign countries (e.g. Central Asia) used to pay homage to the Master of Mt. Lu at all religious ceremonies. When Kumārajiva wrote this letter (probably ca. 405 AD), Hui-yüan had already become famous as the defender of the Church against Huan Hsüan’s anti-clerical policy, so that the name “Bodhisattva who Protects the Doctrine” could rightly be applied to him. For the use of the term “Bodhisattva” denoting Buddhist masters cf. above, p. 32; applied to Tao-an cf. above, p. 199.

85 因譯傳意,置其能!” an important remark, which shows that Kumārajiva, in spite of what is commonly told about him, was still having considerable difficulties with the Chinese language, and that he probably still made use of interpreters in his correspondence with Chinese like Hui-yüan and Wang Mi.

86 No doubt a kundi (or kundikā), the type of Indian water-vessel commonly known in the West under the name of “sprinkler bottle”: a vessel with a full body and two openings: one lateral orifice on the shoulder used for filling the kundi with water, and one narrow and slightly curved spout on the neck of the bottle, from which the water is drunk, or rather sprinkled into the mouth. Cf. Hōbōgirin p. 265 sqq., s.v. Byō (瓶), and Ananda K. Coomaraswamy and Francis Stewart Kershaw, “A Chinese Buddhist water vessel and its Indian prototype”, Artibus Asiae 1928, 29, p. 122-141. In the latter article the authors state that the kundi, which in India is attested from Maurya or pre-Maurya times onward, does not appear in the archeology and art of the Far East before the eighth century. However, the present text clearly demonstrates that vessels of this type, imported from Central Asia or Northern India by foreign monks, circulated in China at least as early as the beginning of the fifth century.

87 An interesting fact which is not mentioned in Kumārajiva’s biographies or in any other source.

88 For T’an-yung cf. above, p. 210. Hui-yüan’s letter to Dharmaruci has been preserved in the latter’s biography, KSC II 333.2.1 sqq. and in CSTCC III 20.2.5 sqq. (in Seng-yu’s account 記録 of the translation of this work).

89 Cf. CSTCC loc.cit.; KSC II (biogr. of (?) Punyatara 弟多羅) 333.1.14 sqq.; ib. (biogr. of Dharmaruci), 333.2.14 sqq.; ib. (biogr. of Vimalākṣa 習摩羅文) 333.2.26 sqq. The first part of the Sarvāstivāda-vinaya (T 1435, 61 ch.) had been recited by Punyatara, Kumārajiva translating the text into Chinese; the work of translation had begun on December 3, 404 AD. When two-thirds of the text had been translated, Punyatara died, and since Kumārajiva apparently could not “produce” (i.e., recite from memory) the remaining chapters, the work was interrupted. In the autumn of 405 Dharmaruci arrived at Ch’angan and, after having received Hui-yüan’s letter, resumed the recital of the text, Kumārajiva again acting as translator. Still only fifty-eight out of the sixty-one chüan were rendered, and Kumārajiva died before the text had been duly revised. Finally Vimalākṣa, another Vinaya-master from Kashmir who had arrived at Ch’angan in 406, added the three remaining chapters shortly after Kumārajiva’s death. Tantae molis...

90 This episode occurs already in Chang Yeh’s “Inscription”, SSHY IB/27a.

91 An allusion to the tenet of the eternity of the “Buddha-nature” immanent in all individuals, as expounded in the (Mahāyana) Mahāparinirvānasūtra?

92 If this “sūtra” alluded to by Kumārajiva is indeed the Mahāparinirvānasūtra (which is very probable, in view of the purport of Hui-yüan’s words), then this passage can hardly be historical, for there is indeed every reason to assume that Kumārajiva was not acquainted with the contents of this “revolutionary” sūtra at all.

93 For Hui-yüan’s contacts with Yao Hsing cf. above, p. 212.

94 For Yao Sung cf. above, note 75. Cf. the presents sent by Fu Chien to Tao-an, some 40 years earlier, above, p. 188. The CSTCC XV 110.2.4 defines Yao Hsing’s
explained by a possible Central Asian origin of the Ta chih-tu lun. For the nature of the work and the circumstances of its translation cf. P. Demiéville: Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna, Louvain, 1944-1949. The Indian original—if it ever existed!—has been lost so completely that even the title cannot be restored with certainty; it is nowhere mentioned or quoted in Indian Buddhist literature, nor has it ever been translated into Tibetan, in spite of its immense importance as a veritable mine of information on Mahāyāna Buddhism. It was, moreover, never translated into Chinese for a second time, so that Kumārajīva’s translation is the only existing version of this work. The author was no doubt a Sarvāstivādin, well-versed in the Abhidharma of this school which flourished in North-Western India, who had been converted to the Mādhyaṃkika doctrine of which this treatise forms the most comprehensive exposition. Kumārajīva, who was such a convert himself, probably became acquainted with it at Kuchā or at one of the other Serindian centres where he had been living. The somewhat puzzling facts mentioned above could, indeed, be explained by a possible Central Asian origin of the Ta chih-tu lun. For the nature of the work and the circumstances of its translation cf. P. Demiéville in his detailed review of the second volume of the Traité, in J.As., 1950, p. 375-395. The problem of the authorship of the Ta chih-tu lun has recently been discussed in some detail by Hikata Ryusuke in the introduction to his edition of the Sūvakṛtavikrāmi-paripṛcchā (Fukuoka, 1958, p. LII sqq.); the author makes an attempt to separate the later accretions (by Kumārajīva and others) from an ancient nucleus which in his view must indeed be attributed to Nāgārjuna.

Paraphrase of Chuang-tzu XVIII (王傑) p. 111: “緩者不可以慢，剛者不可以激。CSTCC has 慣 in stead of 緩.

Hui-yüan’s preface to the Ta chih-tu lun, composed at Yao Hsing’s request, has not been preserved; it is not listed among Hui-yüan’s works in the table of contents of Lu Chén’s Fa-lun (CSTCC XII 83.1 sqq.), but it is mentioned in Ta T’ang NTL III, T 2149 p. 248.1.23. His preface to the extract of the Ta chih-tu lun is found in CSTCC X 75.2 (大智論抄序). This extract in 20 ch’ian, also known as Po-jo ching wen lun chi 報若經問論集, Ta chih lun yao-lieh 大智論要略 and Shih-lun yao-ch’a 講論要抄, is mentioned in CSTCC II 13.3.12 and V 38.1.18, and in most later catalogues: Fa-ching’s Chung-ching mu-lu (504 AD), T 2146, VI 145.1.1; Ta T’ang NTL (664 AD), T 2149, III 248.1.15 and X 330.1.25; K’ai-yüan SCL (730 AD) T 2154, IV 515.3.9; Chen-yüan hsìn-ting shih-chiao mu-lu 陳元新定釋數目録 (800 AD), T 2157, VI 812.3.1. After the last mentioned date Hui-yüan’s extract is not mentioned any more in bibliographical sources.

立身行道: a quotation from the first chapter of the Hsiao-ching (chu-shu ed. 1.3a; trsl. Legge p. 466), where the highest perfection of filial piety is defined as “to establish oneself (in life) and to tread the Way (i.e., to live according to right principles), and to exalt one’s name for later generations, in order thereby to render illustrious one’s father and mother”立身行道, 報名於後世, 以顯父母, 是之終也. On the Buddhist view, repeatedly brought forward in apologetical literature, that the monastic life is actually the highest fulfilment of filial piety, see below, p. 283.

Huan Hsüan’s letter in which he tries to persuade Hui-yüan to give up the religious life has been preserved, together with Hui-yüan’s answer: HMC XI 75.1-6 sqq.

An allusion to the proverb “Cinnabar may be ground but it cannot be deprived of its redness; stone may be broken but it cannot be deprived of its hardness”, 紫可磨而不可奪其赤, 石可破而不可奪其堅. It first occurs in Lü-shih ch’un-ch’i’u XII.4 p. 119 (trsl. Wilhelm p. 149).
101 The full text of Huan Hsüan’s letter to the Ministers is reproduced in HMC XII 85.1.12 sqq. For Huan Hsüan’s favourable words about the community at Lu-shan, cf. the analogous measure of Fu Chien (337-384 AD) exempting the monastery of Chu Seng-lang 竹僧朗 at the T’ai-shan from state control, KSC V 354.2.14.

102 KSC has here 游津施及; Hui-yüan’s letter as reproduced in HMC XII 85.2.2. reads 混然游津. In both texts 游津 is a mistake for 游京 “to be lost together”, cf. Shih-ching, Ode 194 (II.iv.10.1, 領無正): 若此無罪 游京以鎮.

103 Allusion to Shih-ching, Ode 35 (I.iii.10.3, 谷風): 漫以游鶴.

104 The full text of Hui-yüan’s letter is reproduced in HMC XII 85.1.29 sqq. For the regulations proposed by Hui-yüan cf. below, p. 260.

105 From April/May 402 till January 2, 404; cf. above, p. 155.

106 八座: since Later Han times a general designation of the 六客 six ministers together with the Shang-shu ling 同書令 and the p’u-yeh 述例.

107 Reading, with the Korean edition of KSC and HMC XII 83.3.5, 毋使害行之事.

108 The text of Hui-yüan’s letter as quoted here considerably deviates from the one reproduced in HMC XII 83.3.10 sqq. Cf. above, p. 237.

109 棟, one of the stereotyped expressions denoting the “retired life”.

110 On January 2, 404 AD. Cf. above, p. 156.

111 Huan Hsüan’s order was of course an imperial edict 令, since he had already ascended the throne. In KSC this document is called a “letter” 出, probably on account of the “illegal” character of Huan’s rule, but in HMC XII 84.2.25 it is indeed entitled 諭慧 (Huan’s abortive Ch’u dynasty) 諭道人不致理這.

112 For considerably different version of Huan’s edict see HMC XII, loc.cit.

113 KSC has 改興其教 which makes no sense. I follow the HMC text which reads 改興其教年. My translation remains tentative: 計 in the sense of 計 “to grant”, “to let them have …”?

114 促, allusion to I-ching, hexagram 15 (誼): 謫尊而光.

115 禮敬為本 (trsl. Hurvitz p. 20 mistranslated as “Propriety and reverence have their foundation herein”), allusion to the opening words of the Li-chi (Ch’ü-li, I 1): 由禮口, 各不敬.

116 Reading, in accordance with the Yuan and Ming editions and the version of HMC, 天然故… in stead of 大德故…

117 The text of the Sha-men pu-ching wang-che lun in HMC V 30.2.15 reads 廣開“widely to open …”.

118 在宥: for this expression cf. Chuang-tzu XI (ch. 在宥) p. 62: 間在宥天下, 不開何天下也. etc. Lit. “to let the people dwell (in freedom) and to be lenient towards (them)”.

119 不兼應者,物不能兼受也; it is not clear what Hui-chiao means by this gloss. Does it refer to Buddhism and Confucianism?

120 萬神頻繁,隇行東西. These words do not occur in the text of the fifth section of Hui-yüan’s treatise as reproduced in HMC V 31.2.10 sqq.

121 In March-April 404 AD, cf. below, note 123.

122 Ho Wu-chi was one of Liu Yu’s partisans; he played an important role in the latter’s offensive against Huan Hsüan in 404 AD, after which he obtained the title 西園將軍 mentioned here. He died in the war against Lu Hsun in 410 AD, cf. his biography in CS 85.6a sqq. He does not appear to have been a Buddhist; HMC V 32.3 contains a letter with objections 謹 raised by him against Hui-yüan’s treatise on the kāśāya worn by the monks, 沙門祖眾論.

123 陽月 normally denotes the tenth month of the lunar calendar, but this does not correspond with the date on which emperor An passed Hsun-yang, i.e., between March 22, 405 when he left Chiang-ling and April 29 when he reached Chienk’ang (cf. CS 10.5a), i.e., in spring. 陽月 stands no doubt for 春月, the character 春 being taboo since 371 AD, as it occurred in the personal name of empress Cheng 春, the principal consort of emperor Chien-wen. For the same reason the title of various
historical works composed between that date and the end of the Chin dynasty contain the expression 漢秋 in stead of 漢秋, such as Sun Sheng's 漢秋 Chin yang-ch'iu 漢秋, Hsi Ts'o-chih's 漢秋 Han-Chin yang-ch'iu 漢秋 and T'an Tao-luan's 漢秋 Hsii Chin yang-ch'iu 漢秋.

On March 22, 405 AD, cf. previous note.

Hsieh Ling-yun (385-433 AD, biogr. in Sung-shu 67.1a) was one of the most famous poets and calligraphers of his time. His career began under Liu Yu; after having filled various high posts in the first years of the Sung dynasty, he was suspected of plotting rebellion and executed in 433. Hsieh Ling-yun was a devout and learned Buddhist who actively took part in the ideological controversies which in the early fifth century rose in Buddhist circles, notably about the problem of “Sudden Enlightenment”; he was also active in the field of translation (c.q. the revision of translated scriptures) and exegesis. Although all this actually belongs to a phase of Chinese Buddhism which falls outside the scope of this study, we may give the reader an impression of the intensity of his Buddhist interests by listing the following data:

1. Hsieh Ling-yun had contacts with several Buddhist masters. Contact with Chu Tao-sheng 蔡道生 appears from his exposition of the latter's doctrine of “Sudden Enlightenment” 突悟 in his Pien-tsung lun 讀梵論, KHMC XVIII 224.3.25 sqq.
2. ib. various letters on the same subject to and from other monks.
3. He wrote eulogies on Hui-yuan and on T'an-lung 塔隆, text in KHMC XXIII 226.2.3 sqq.
4. and a “hymn on Amitāyus” 西方佛頌, quoted in IWLC 76.11a;
5. his “eulogy on a picture of the Jetavana made by Fan T'ai (范泰), 和范泰錦 華廬想像 見 and his “Eulogy on the ten similes of the Vimalakirti-sūtra” 維摩鮮十譬贊 in KHMC XV 200.1.12 sqq.;
6. his “inscription (dealing with) the shadow of the Buddha” 佛影誌 in KHMC XV 199.2.6.
7. Together with the monks Hui-yen 慧嚴 and Hui-kuan 慧觀 he revised Dharma-kṣēma's version of the (Mahāyāna) Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra in 36 ch., known as the Southern Recension (= T 375).

I.e., the Sang-fu-ta-chi 婆闍大記, a chapter of the Li-chi (ch. 45 of the chu-shued.).

On secular studies on Mt. Lu cf. above, p. 230.

Chang Yeh states in his “Inscription” that Hui-yüan had not left the mountain since his sixtieth year, i.e., during the last twenty-three years of his life.

According to Hsieh Ling-yün’s “Eulogy” (廬山慧運法師碑, KHMC XXIII 267.1.20), Hui-yüan died at the age of 84 on the sixth day of the eighth month of i-hsi 13, i.e., September 2, 417 AD. On the other hand, Chang Yeh says in his “Inscription” that he was 83 when he died.

Not mentioned elsewhere. Hui-yüan’s grave is described in Lu-shan chi ch. I, T 2095 p. 29.1.25 sqq.

Hsieh Ling-yün’s epitaph, with an introduction by Chang Yeh, is mentioned in Ch’en Shun-yü’s 陳舜俞 Lu-shan chi 廬山記, ch. V (T 2095, p. 1048.2.9).

Apart from Hui-yüan’s letters to Kumārajiva, which have been separately
transmitted in the collection Ta-sheng ta i-chang 大乘大義章 (cf. above, p. 226),
the table of contents of Lu Ch'eng's Fa-lun (CSTCC XII 83.1 sqq.) mentions twenty-
one treatises and letters, nine of which have been preserved (marked below with an
asterisk): (1) 法性論, in two sections; (2) Answer by Hui-yüan to a letter entitled
論真人造極, the author of which is not mentioned; (3) 妙法蓮華經序; (4)
無二乘統略; (5) * 三法度序; (6) 注社節度序; (7) 外寺僧節度序;
(8) 節度序; (9) 比丘尼節度序; (10) * Correspondence with Huan Hsüan,
three letters” (no doubt those pertaining to the question of the Rites); (11) *Reply to Huan
Hsüan's letter about the selection of the clergy; (12) The treatise 江門不滅王書信,
in five sections; (13) *The treatise on the monk's garment, 江門粗絵談; (14)
釋絵序; (15) 釋神足; (16) * 阿毘曼心識; (17) 釋三報論; (18) 招應護論;
(19). 辯心意見; (20) 辯神名; (21) 答寄名. Hui-yüan's biography mentions
furthermore his extract of the Ta chih-tu lun (cf. above, note 97) and contains quota-
tions from his first two letters to Kumārajīva (above, p. 246-248), and the full text
of his hymns on the Shadow of the Buddha (cf. above, p. 242-243 and note 27);
in HMC XI 75.1 we find furthermore his answer to Huan Hsüan's request to give
up the religious life, 供奉大乘罷譜書; in KHM C XV 198.2 his eulogy on a Buddha
image at Hsiang-yang; ib. XVIII 222.2 his answer to a letter from Tai K'uei 敬遠;
ib. XXVII 304.1 his letter to Liu I-min and other lay devotees; ib. XXX 351.2 his
preface to a collection of poems on Buddhānusmrti-samādhi 念佛三昧詩序; parts
of his Lu-shan chi are quoted in SSHY comm. II B'4b, Wen-hsüan comm. 12.256,
22.480, 26.583, IWLC 7.20b, Shui-ching chu 39.19a, T 2095 I 1027.3 and 1031.6, and
TPYL 41.3b and 41.6a, and a fragment of his letter to the rebel Lu Hsün is reproduced
in IWLC 87.20b and TPYL 972.7b.

CHAPTER FIVE

1 Digha II.36 p. 60-61, Dialogues I p. 77, Ch'ang a-han (T 1) XVII (27) 109.1.24.
2 Each and every school of classical and post-classical Chinese philosophy is
primarily concerned with the same fundamental problem: how must the world be
governed? Each answer to this question represents what has strikingly been called by
M. Granet “une certaine recette d'action civilisatrice” (La pensée chinoise, p. 17).
3 Cf. H. Maspero, La Chine antique, 2nd ed., p. 163. Ancestor worship was the
private duty of each individual family and could only be practised by the direct
descendants of the deceased. In Confucianism the originally religious function of
the ruler has to some extent been secularized, the pontifex maximus (who was the
emperor himself) being at the same time the highest dignitary in the bureaucratic
hierarchy of the empire.
4 These elements may certainly be regarded as resulting from Buddhist influence
or from conscious imitation of Buddhist institutions, cf. Fukui Kōjun 福井康順,
Dōkyō no kisokuteki-kenkyū 通教の基礎的 研究 (Tokyō 1952) p. 112 sqq.
6 On the other hand, some attempts were made to prove the “Buddhist origin”
7 Fa-lin 造琳, Pien-cheng lun 範正論 (written in 626 AD) III (T 2110) 502.3.9
and Shih-chia fang-chih 釋迦方志 II, T 2088, 973.3. The provenance of these numbers
is unknown. Fa-lin's work, a polemic treatise, is rather unreliable; in the previous
chapters we have had opportunity to demonstrate some glaring errors which it
contains. Moreover, the fact that nuns are mentioned must arouse our suspicion:
Ching-chien 憲檢, who according to PCNC I (T 2063 p. 934.3.2) was the first Chinese
nun, was ordained some years after 313, i.e., in one of the very last years of the period
to which Fa-lin's figures refer.
8 Lo-yang ch'ieh-lan chi, 洛陽伽藍記 by Yang Hsüan-chih 楊衒之 (ca. 547),
introduction, p. 1a and ch. 4.3b. The number 42 is confirmed by Wei Shou’s *Shih-Lao chih*, *Wei-shu* 1.4.3a, trsl. Ware p. 123, trsl. Hurvitz p. 47.

9 *Pien cheng lun* III (T 2110) 503.2.1. Cf. J. Gernet, *Aspects économiques* p. 3.

10 The title of a treatise by Hui-yüan, cf. above, p. 15 nr 6.


12 ib. 30.2.11 sqq.

13 *Pien cheng lun* III (T 2110) 503.2.1. Cf. J. Gernet, *Aspects économiques* p. 3.

14 See above, p. 106 sqq. and p. 231 sqq. The controversy about the Rites was essentially a southern phenomenon. In the North, the dignitaries of the state-sponsored church saw no objection in submitting to temporal powers and occasionally even encouraged the monks to “pay homage to the Ruler”. Most characteristic are the words attributed to Fa-kuo (died 420 AD), house-chaplain of emperor T’ai-tsu of the Toba Wei: “‘T’ai-tsu is intelligent and loves the Way. As he is the Tathāgata of the present time, the *śramanas* should pay him all homage’. Hence he always did obeisance (to the emperor), saying to others: ‘The one who is able to expand the Way (i.e., to make the religion prosper) is the lord of men. I am not bowing before the emperor, I am just paying homage to the Buddha!’” (*Shih-Lao chih*, *Wei-shu* 114.3b; trsl. Ware p. 128; trsl. Hurvitz p. 53).

15 *HMC* XII 84.3.3 = T 2108 II 451.2.21.

16 *HMC* XII 84.3.14 = T 2108 II 451.3.1.

17 Cf. *Tao te ching* ch. 25: “The Way is great, Heaven is great, Earth is great and the King is great. There are in the world four great ones and the King is one thereof. The King patterns himself on Earth, the Earth patterns itself on Heaven, Heaven patterns itself on the Way, and the Way patterns itself on the Natural” (trsl. Duyvendak, p. 65).

18 *HMC* XII 84.3.19 = T 2108 (Chi sha-men . . . teng shih) II 448.1.8.


20 *HMC* V 32.2.6 = T 2108 II 451.2.8.

21 In the preceding phrases in this letter Hui-yüan has exemplified this principle by referring to *Lun-yü* III.17, where Tzu-kung is rebuked by Confucius because he wished to do away with the offering of a sheep, the only vestige which had remained of the ancient ceremony of “announcing the first day of the month” (kao shuo 功募能).

22 *HMC* XII 84.1.23.

23 Under Shih Hu (reigned 335-349, *KSC* IX 385.2.28; the order to investigate the *sangha* was issued shortly before Wang Tu's memorial, i.e., probably in 335, cf. below, note 74); (2) under Fu Chien (reigned 357-385), *KSC* V 354.2.14; (3) under Huan Hsüan, shortly before 402, cf. above p. 214 and 250; (4) under emperor Hsiao-wu of the Liu-Sung dynasty in or shortly after 435 (*Sung-shu* 97.6a); (5) a local selection, privately undertaken by Tu Pa 披法, prefect of Fu-liu 梁（Chekiang), at some date in the first half of the fourth century (*PCNC* I 935.1.29).

24 *HMC* IX 385.3.2.

25 *KSC* IX 385.2.29.

26 *HMC* XII 85.1.17; answer by Hui-yüan ib. 85.1.29.

27 *KSC* IX 385.1.14.
The conception of “hidden saintliness” is traditional in Chinese thought; the Mahayanaist doctrine of the “expediency” (upāya, fang-pien 方便) of the Saint may also have provided a justification for this attitude. "Ce que traduit l’attitude générale des moines chinois à l’égard des règles de la discipline, c’est cette idée: on ne sait jamais ou la sainteté peut se cacher. Ce peut-être sous les formes les plus profanes et les plus contraires à la décence religieuse" (Gernet, Aspects économiques du Bouddhisme, p. 241).

32 The conception of “hidden saintliness” is traditional in Chinese thought; the Mahayanaist doctrine of the “expediency” (upāya, fang-pien 方便) of the Saint may also have provided a justification for this attitude. “Ce que traduit l’attitude générale des moines chinois à l’égard des règles de la discipline, c’est cette idée: on ne sait jamais ou la sainteté peut se cacher. Ce peut-être sous les formes les plus profanes et les plus contraires à la décence religieuse” (Gernet, Aspects économiques du Bouddhisme, p. 241).

33 32?q, lit. “from families liable to statute labour” (and hence from the lower classes, because the higher and more prosperous strata of society could obtain exemption).

34 HMC XII 85.2.1.

35 HMC XII 85.3.14.


37 HMC XI 69.1.13, Sung-shu 97.5b. For the scarcity of bronze and the prohibition to use it for casting images ca. 420 AD, cf. KSC XIII 410.3.23 and 411.1.4 sqq.


39 Mou-tzu section XVI, HMC I 4.1.15, trsl. Pelliot p. 306. Wu-wei 無为 is in Buddhist treatises regularly used for Nirvāṇa; for the Chinese readers the term remained no doubt associated with the idea of quietism, and in view of the context where wu-wei is opposed to the blameworthy “activities” of monks I have preferred to give a literal translation.

40 Chin-shu 64.8b.

41 32?q, lit. “from families liable to statute labour” (and hence from the lower classes, because the higher and more prosperous strata of society could obtain exemption).

42 In his introduction (HMC VI 35.1.7), Tao-heng says that during the i-hsi era (405-418) two gentlemen named Yüan and Ho 何 had written a polemic essay about the five greatest evils of their time, which they had called the “Five subversive (elements)”, wu heng 五衡, in imitation of Han Fei-tzu’s well-known treatise “the Five Vermin”, wu tu 五蠹. Tao-heng, seeing that the Buddhist clergy figured among these, feared lest “the minds of his contemporaries, blinded and dazzled, would forever be lost in heretical errors”, and therefore composed his Shih po lun to prove the fallacy of these reasonings. The identity of Yüan and Ho is unknown. Ho is identified by T’ang Yung-t’ung (History, p. 350) with the general Ho Wu-chi 何無恤 (?-410), who shortly before his death engaged in a polemic correspondence with Hui-yüan about the offensive character of the monk’s dress (see above, p. 16 no. 8). On the other hand one may think of Ho Ch’eng-t’ien 何承天 (370-447) who during the i-hsi era was an erudite (po-shih) at the imperial academy (Sung-shu 64.7a) and consequently in a position at the capital in which he could very well have published a moralistic treatise as described by Tao-heng. He was a fervent anti-Buddhist, cf. HMC III 18.1.19 sqq. and KHMC XVIII 224.1.22.

43 HMC VI 35.2.6.


45 ib. 4.1.22.

46 HMC XII 84.1.14.

47 Cheng wu lun 正詐論 (cf. above, p. 15 nr. 2), HMC II 8.2.22. The expressions in the last lines refer to well-known Taoist dietetic and respiratory practices such as “abstinence from cereals” 避穀, 絕穀, the accumulation of the “breath of life” 生氣, “circulation of the breath” 行氣 etc., the cultivation of which was believed to result in immortality in an ethereal and indestructible body. Cf. H. Maspero,
Les procédés de ‘nourrir le principe vital’ dans la religion taoïste ancienne”, J. As.
CCXXIX, 1937, p. 177-252 and 353-430; id. Le Taoisme, p. 98 sqq.

Digha II 40 p. 62; Dialogues I p. 78; Ch’ang a-han T 1 XVII (27) p. 109.2.7
(much shorter version).

Milinda-pañha trsl. Rhys Davids p. 49, trsl. Finot p. 67; Chinese versions:


These words look like a quotation; I have been unable to trace them to their source. Close parallels of the saying occur e.g. in San-kuo chih, Wei-chih 6.26b (biography of Yuan Shu: 若速而反 反……) and Nan-shih 61.2b (biography of Ch’en Po-chih: 速 返反……).

HMC XI 75.1.13.

Pai-hei lun 由黑論 (cf. above, p. 15 no 5), Sung-shu 97.7b, trsl. Liebenthal p. 370.

HMC XII 80.1.1. (= T 2108 I 444.2.3.).

Buddha, pratye-kabuddha, bodhisattva and śrāvaka.

Liu ch’iin 宋: father and mother, elder and younger brothers (and sisters),
wife and children (gloss by Ying Shao 聽訟 quoted by Yen Shih-ku 閻師古 ad Han-shu 48.6b). There are, however, several other lists of “six relatives”, cf. Tz’u-hai p. 158.3 s.v. liu ch’iin.

HMC V.30.1.11 and 30.2.15, trsl. Hurtviz p. 19 and 22. The last words, tsai-yu
在省, are the title of the eleventh chapter of Chuang-tzu, explained by Kuo Hsiang as
“If (the ruler) is lenient and leaves (the people) to themselves, then they will (auto-
matically) be orderly”; cf. also Wang Hsien-ch’ien 王先謙 in Chuang-tzu chi-chieh III p. 62 for two other interpretations: (1) 在 = ch’a 査 “to investigate”, (2) 在 = ts’un 得 “to hold”, to preserve”.

HMC II 16.1.6. For the last sentence cf. Lun-yü II.3.

Pa nan 帕難 = aštāv akṣanāḥ, the eight kinds of inopportune birth, i.e., birth
poverty of which one cannot meet a Buddha or is unable by one’s mental qualities
recognize and accept the doctrine. Standard list Mvy 2299-2308.

HMC VI 36.2.10.

The “abolition of punishments”, 剃除[而不用] is one of the results of ideal
government. The expression is a cliche, cf. Dubs and collaborators, History, vol. II,
p. 36, n. 5.1.

HMC XI 69.3.9, partly reproduced in KHMC I 100.1.17 and KSC VII 367.3.23.
Ho Shang-chih was a fervent Buddhist, see the preface to the Sheng-man
HMC XI 75.1.13.

San-kuo chih, translated “The rude tribes of the East and North have their princes,
and are not like the states of our great land which are without them”. Ho Yen (chu-shu
ed. 3.4a) takes 不如 in its normal sense: “The rude tribes with their rulers are still
inferior to China with its anarchy”.

Mencius IIIA/IV.12, Legge p. 129.

Li-chi la (Ch’ü-li) 7 (27) (chu-shu ed. 1.12a; Legge p. 65; Couvreur p. 8): 人生十年日劫業, 二十曰弱冠.

Mou-tzu, section XIV, HMC I 3.3.10; trsl. Pelliot TP XIX, 1920, p. 303.

On this expression see Pelliot’s remark in TP 19 (1920) p. 350, note 90.


Li-chi III (Wang-chih) 3.14, chu-shu ed. XII.26b; trsl. Couvreur p. 295: 中國
戎夷, 西方之民皆有性也, 不可推移.

性相近，性相遠也. According to Ho Ch’eng-t’ien, the author
of this passage, Confucius did not mean to say that all people, including the barbarians, originally are similar in nature; this holds only good for the Chinese, for it was the superiority of the Chinese national character which enabled him to expound such a broad-minded and humanitarian doctrine. It goes without saying that Ho Ch'eng-t'ien is violating the spirit of Confucianism. No doubt the barbarians are despicable, rude, violent and not to be imitated, but "when a superior man dwells among them, what rudeness would there be?" (Lun-yü IX, 13.2). Once drawn within the sphere of Chinese civilisation they become acceptable in spite of their foreign origin.

71 Ho Ch'eng-t'ien in his answer to Tsung Ping (cf. above, p. 15 no. 5), HMC III 19.3.27. The theory of the fundamental difference between the Chinese and other people, but free from any nationalistic bias, was used by Hsieh Ling-yün 謝靈運 (385-433) to defend Tao-cheng's doctrine of Sudden Enlightenment (tun-wu 頓悟) as being more suited to the Chinese temper and inborn abilities, KHMC XVIII 224.3.25.

72 Liu 六夷, lit. "the Six (kinds of) Eastern Barbarians". The oldest sources mention the "Four I" (Mencius IA 7.16, here 而, as often, "at the four sides, all around") and the "nine I" (Lun-yü IX.13, Erh-ya IX, chu-shu ed. VII.8b). Here I is no doubt used for "barbarian" in general.

73 HMC XII 81.1.25.

74 KSC IX 385.3.4 = Chin-shu 95.12b. For a discussion of the date of this memorial (based on TCTC 95 p. 1122b) see H. Maspero, "Communautés et moines Bouddhistes chinois aux IIIe et IVe siècles", BEFEO X, 1910, p. 223 note 1.

75 HMC III 21.3.5.


77 Chin Mi-ti was the son of the Hun chieftain of the Shiu-ch'u 休屠; he became a court official and was greatly favoured by emperor Wu. In 88 BC he saved the emperor's life by striking down the courtier Ma Ho-lo 馬何羅 (whose surname was posthumously changed into Mang 蒼) when the latter was about to enter the emperor's bedroom with a dagger. Chin Mi-ti was ennobled as a marquis in 87 BC and died shortly afterwards. See his biography in Han-shu 68.20b sqq.

78 Tao-hsüan 道玄 in his Lieh-tai wang ch'en chih-huo chieh 列代上聖法統解 (664 AD), KHMC VI 127.1.3.

79 Hui-yüan in his Sha-men t'an-fu lun (cf. above, p. 16 no. 8), HMC V 32.2.19.

80 A translation which already figures in the "Sūtra in forty-two chapters", T 784, p. 723.3.26.

81 Mou-tzu, section 1, HMC I 1.3.25; trsl. Pelliot p. 291.

82 Mou-tzu, section XIV, HMC I 3.3.21; trsl. Pelliot p. 304.

83 Tao-hsüan, op.cit., p. 126.3.18.

84 Wang Mi in his answer to Huan Hsüan, HMC XII 81.3.15.

85 委內外名之耳：read 之名之名? . The "inner teaching" 內教 is Buddhism; refers to all secular doctrines.

86 Sun Ch'io 孫綽, Yü tao lun 喻道論 (cf. above, p. 133), HMC III 17.1.7.


88 As e.g. the "opponents" in Mou-tzu and Shih po lun ,cf. above, p. 262.

89 Mou-tzu section IV, HMC I 2.1.20, trsl. Pelliot p. 293.

90 ib. section VIII, HMC I 2.3.9, trsl. Pelliot p. 296.

91 Tsung Ping, Ming fo lun (cf. above, p. 15 no. 3), HMC II 9.2.6.

92 Mou-tzu section V, HMC I 2.2.3, trsl. Pelliot p. 293 (where Pelliot mistranslates the opponent's last words 譬以為煩而不欲矣 as "J'en éprouve de la répugnance et je n'en veux pas". The use of yao as "to want" is modern; the phrase must be interpreted as "I regard this as cumbersome and not (expressing) the essential")
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allude to the beginning of the rika.

consequently contains a standard paraphrase given in all Chinese commentaries) and as "true" in the text on

continually emit their light; all the movements under the sky are constantly subject to the immense number of worlds in this "metagalactic system", the second one referring to this one and the same rule". A tentative more literal translation would be "The appearance (natural) way of Heaven and Earth consists of making firm-and-correct their (view:)

referring to the equally tremendous number of cosmic periods that have elapsed. It must be noted that the expression (sic!) thousand worlds"

unification')". This is far from clear. The main difficulty is that the exact meaning of chen(g) is here translated as "firm-and-correct" (i.e., chen-cheng 竭立, the standard paraphrase given in all Chinese commentaries) and as "true" in the text on

These numbers are enigmatic. I think that Liebenthal is right in supposing (op.cit., p. 380 note 190) that Tsung Ping misunderstood the term san-ch'ien ta-ch'ien shih-chieh 三千大千世界 = trisāhasramahāsāhasro lokadhātuh, usually erred by the horrible expression (invented by Abel Rémusat) "trichiliomegachiliocosmos". Tsung Ping seems to have interpreted this term as 3 × 1000 worlds, and to have multiplied this number by four, i.e., one group of 3,000 worlds in each of the four directions. Indian Buddhist cosmology is less modest in its assumptions. One thousand worlds, each consisting of four continents, one moon, one sun and several heavens and hells, constitute a "little chiliocosmos", sāhasraś cūdiko lokadhātuh. One thousand universes of this kind form one "dichiliocosmos", dvisāhasraḥ madhyamo lokadhātuh, and one thousand universes of this type form one trichiliomegachiliocosmos, which consequently contains 1.000.000.000 worlds. Cf. Abh. Kośa IV p. 170. However, it must be noted that the expression "three thousand suns and moons and thirteen (sic!) thousand worlds" 三千日月萬三千十地 occurs already in the late Han Hsiu-hsing pen-ch'i ching 修行牵起经 (Kyoto ed. XIV, 3 p. 226.A.1).

Allusion to the Buddhist expression Heng-(ho)-sha shih-chieh 帝[河]沙世界 = Gangānadvikalakopamā lokadhātavaḥ "worlds as numerous as the sands of the Ganges". I take yüeh 侶 in the sense of shu 數 "to count", being parallel with chi "to record" in the next phrase. Liebenthal's translation (p. 381) is certainly wrong: the sentence consists of two independent phrases in parataxis, the first one referring to the immense number of worlds in this "metagalactic system", the second one referring to the equally tremendous number of cosmic periods that have elapsed. Liebenthal rightly remarks that this sentence (actually only the last phrase) seems to allude to the beginning of the Pāravya-parivarta (ch. VII) of the Saddharmapundarika.

Hsien-yüan 軒轅 was according to Shih-chi 1.2a the personal name of the Yellow Emperor.

The expressions which here and in the following phrases characterize the various classics are taken from Li-chi XXIII.1 (Li-chieh), Couvreur, vol. II, p. 353.

Chen-kuan 貞觀, an enigmatic expression occurring in the I-ching, Hsi-tz'u II, Chu-shu ed. VIII.3a, Legge p. 380: 天地之道貞觀也,日月之道貞明也,天下之動貞夫一也. Legge translates, very freely: "By the same rule, heaven and earth, in their course, continually give forth (their lessons); the sun and moon continually emit their light; all the movements under the sky are constantly subject to this one and the same rule". A tentative more literal translation would be "The (natural) way of Heaven and Earth consists of making firm-and-correct their (view:) appearance (?); the way of sun and moon consists of making firm-and-correct their brightness; (all) movements in the world (become) firm-and-correct by unity (or 'unification')". This is far from clear. The main difficulty is that the exact meaning of chen(g) is here translated as "firm-and-correct" (i.e., chen-cheng 竭立, the standard paraphrase given in all Chinese commentaries) and as "true" in the text on
p. 269, is not known. It occurs in the 't'uan-tz'u on the first hexagram among other ancient divinatory technical terms, none of which is clear. At the present state of our knowledge of the I-ching (a subject which so far has meticulously been avoided by practically all serious scholars) it seems premature to offer a less vague translation than I have given in the text.

105 An allusion to the story in Chuang-tzu XXV p. 170 about two microscopic kingdoms, each one situated on one horn of a snail, which are engaged in an endless war with each other—an interesting parody on the Warring States.

106 In all ed. this passage runs as follows 趙於演繹之域本應未治之處感且的事之一生之內耳，which is incomprehensible. Liebenthal translates (p. 381): "but that it is insufficient to solve the problems of one life", leaving 和 ear out. It makes no sense to take ning either as an interrogative particle or as a particle denoting preference ("rather... than"). I have interpreted it as a full word with its usual meaning of "to pacify, to tranquilize". If this is correct, fa 之 must be a mistake for chih 之 "them", i.e., the warlike Liliputians or "the people" in general. Ch'ieh 億 = ku-ch'ieh 契且, "for the time being, provisionally".

107 Tsung Ping, Ming fo lun, HMC II 9.2.29 sqq. For the last words cf. Chuang-tzu II (寶物論) p. 13.

108 生而至靈弱而能言，Shih-chi 1.7a (Mém. Hist. I p. 26); said of the Yellow Emperor (trad. 2697-2597 BC).

109 自言其名，Shih-chi 1.7b (Mém. Hist. I p. 40); said of Ti-ku 帝賜 (trad. 2435-2365 BC).


112 嶽岡 cf. Shih-chi 1.4a (Mém. Hist. I p. 30). Fan (var. Huan) and Tai, cf. Shih-chi 1.4a (Mém. Hist. I p. 29): 竄丸 (var. Chi 丸 and Fan 丸) 山及寺名. K'ung-t'ung shan is traditionally identified with the mountain of the same name near Lin-ju hsien 林汝縣 in Honan; Huan-shan is located in Lang-yeh 龍漿 (Shantung); the Tai-tsing is the eastern summit of the T'ai-shan in Shantung. Here Tsung Ping probably refers to the story in Lieh-tzu V (湯問) p. 54.

113 Cf. Shih-chi 1.7a (Mém. Hist. I p. 37-38): 北至于幽陵，南至于交趾，西至于流沙，東至于蟠木；said of the travels of Chuan-hsiu. In the same way the fabulous country of Hua-hsiu 華紡, which Huang-ti visited in a dream acc. to Lieh-tzu II.13, is identified with India by Tao-hsüan 道宣 in KHMC I 98.3.1 and VI 127.1.13, referring to Wang Shao 王邵 (second half sixth cent.) for this explanation.

114 至道之精，莊子冥冥，Chuang-tzu X1.65.

115 The sūramgamasamādhi is described as being identical with the Buddha-nature, which may have been the reason why Tsung Ping takes "the essence of the highest Way" to refer to this samādhi.

116 得吾道者首為皇王，Chuang-tzu X1.66.

117 衛行皇帝，an archaic rendering of cakravrtila, which in the next line is rendered, as usual, by chu'an lun sheng-wang 跳輪聖王. This whole passage is strongly reminiscent of Hsiu-hsing pen-ch'i ching 修行本紀 (T 184, translated at the end of the second century by Chu Ta-li 符大立 and K'ang Meng-hsiang 賢孟祥), Kyōto ed. XIV.3 p. 225B1: 從上來下，為諸輪聖王，衛行皇帝, which phrase we find repeated in Chih Ch'ien's translation of the T'ai-tzu jui-ying pen-ch'i ching 太子瑞應本紀 (T 185, trsl. 222-229), Kyōto ed. XIV.3.

118 失吾道者首為皇王，Chuang-tzu X1.66.

119 惟夫之與，itself 之 with the last half of the sentence is a literal quotation. Acc. to Chuang-tzu, Ta-kei 太隗 was the name of a mythical being living on Mt. Chū-tz'u 車茨, whom Huang-ti (trad. 2694-
2597 BC) intended to visit. When he asked the way from a boy who was tending horses, the boy’s answer made such an impression on him that he “bowed twice, knocked his head, called him the Heavenly Master and retired”, giving up his journey to Ta-kuei. The term t’ien-shih 天師 is obviously interpreted by Tsung Ping as an elliptical form of t’ien-jen-shih 天師 “teacher of gods and men”, one of the ten epithets of the Buddha (see note).

十覲: the ten stereotyped epithets of a Buddha, a standard series of honorific terms which frequently occurs in Buddhist scriptures (e.g. Saddharmapundarika, passim; cf. E. Lamotte, Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse, p. 115 sqq.): (1) the tathāgata 如來 (2) arhat 應供 (3) the perfectly enlightened, samyaksambuddha 真僧行 (4) endowed with wisdom and practice, vidyācaranasampanna 明行足 (5) well-known, sugata 善逝 (6) knower of the world, lokavid 世間解 (7) charioteer (or chief) of men who must be tamed, puruṣadamyasirathi 諦御師 (8) master of gods and men, Sisri devamanusyinim (9) Buddha the Lord, Buddho bhagavat 佛世界. The Chinese equivalents listed here are those used by Kumārajiva in the first decades of the fifth century. Cf. also Hōbōgin p. 192 (s.v. Butsu).

120 Trad. 2852-2205 BC.
121 HMC II 12.2.4. sqq.
122 Fen-tien 境典, i.e., the “three fen and five tien” 三境五典, the (hypothetical) historical records of the Three Sovereigns and the Five Emperors.
123 HMC II 9.3.20 sqq., trsl. Liebenthal p. 382.
124 太史, cf. Shih-chi 4.10a (Mém. Hist. I p. 328); according to tradition he should have been active as a historiographer under king Ch’eng at the beginning of the Chou dynasty (trad. ca. 1100 BC).
125 卜商, a disciple of Confucius, better known under his tsu Tzu-hsia 子夏, praised in Lun-yü XI.2 (cf. XIX. 4, 5, 6, 13) for his literary skill.
126 read 皆 in stead of 皆.
127 HMC III 20.3.16 sqq.
128 E.g. KHMC IV 115.1.13 and ib. XI 166.1.2.
129 Sui-shu 35.18b.
130 東海之內,北海之隅,有國曰朝鮮天毒,其人水居,倏人愛人. (Shan hai ching chien-su 山海經篇篇, ed. Ssu-pu peti-yao ch. 18.1a). The text reproduced here (after the edition of 1809) reads 翼, but the annotator Hao I-hsing 懷行 (1757-1825) rightly adopts in his subcommentary the reading 翼 which is corroborated by all early quotations.
131 In fact, the character tu 奨 occurs also in Shen-tu 身毒, the transcription of the name of N.W. India in Shih-chi 123.5b, and Yen shih-ku (581-645) in his commentary to Han-shu 96A.10a identifies this Shen-tu with T’ien-tu 天毒 = T’ien-chu 天竺. In his so-yin commentary to Shih-chi 123.5b, Ssu-ma Chen (eight century) says that Shen-tu must be pronounced as Ch’ien-tu 乾毒. This is certainly wrong. If we compare the archaic and ancient pronunciation of the words in question:

*t’ien-chu 天竺, Arch. *t’ien.tōk, Angh. *t’ien.tjuk
*t’ien-tu 天毒, Arch. *t’ien.tōk, Angh. *t’ien-tuok

it is obvious that 奨 must have its normal pronunciation.
132 The words of Kuo P’u are actually as follows: “T’ien-tu is the same as T’ien-chu 天竺. (The inhabitants) attach great value to virtuous conduct (道德). They have a script (of their own) and gold and silver currency. Buddhism has come from this country...” (Shan hai ching chien-su, loc.cit.).
133 HMC II 12.2.27.
134 KHMC I 98.3.5.
135 Sui-hua chi li ch. 3, in Shuo-fu (ed. of 1647) ch. 69.
The story in Lieh-tzu runs in outline as follows. King Mu of Ch'in, who actually were "Buddhist genii" of a Buddha. Cf. also Wang Chin's commentary to this passage. The text of this story is given in T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, p. 3-4. It is found here in the Tao-hsüan lù-shih kan-t'ung-lù, 通寳異聞記通傳, also named Kan-t'ung-chuan 通傳, a collection of highly apocryphal stories ascribed to the famous Vinaya-master Tao-hsüan (596-667), T 2107 p. 436.2.17 sqq. The story runs as follows: Duke Mu of Ch'in 泰篤公 (659-621 BC) has somehow obtained an image of the Buddha and allows it to be defiled by his horse, after which he becomes ill. His counsellor Yu Yú 由余 (cf. above, note 76) tells him how Buddhism had come to China under the Chou king Mu. Anciently King Mu was visited by magicians who actually were "Buddhist genii" 僧祇. The king builds for them a high tower as a place of worship, becomes a devout Buddhist and performs many good works. These magicians were no others than Mahājāra and Maudgalyāyana who had gone to the East to convert him. This story is no doubt based upon the well-known passage in Lieh-tzu about the magician from the West visiting King Mu (see below, note 155). The Kan-t'ung-chuan is not mentioned in any Chinese catalogue and seems to have disappeared from China at a very early date. However, it is certainly as old as the beginning of the ninth century as we find it mentioned in the various lists of Buddhist writings which were taken to Japan by Ennin (794-864): the Nihonkoku jōwa gonen nittō guhō mokuroku 日本國承和五年八房未法目録 839, (T 2165 p. 1075.2.27), the Jigaku-daishi zaitō sōshinroku 慈覺大師在唐追録 840 (T 2166 p. 1077.2.28) and the Nittō shin gu shōgyō mokuroku 八房新來聖教目録 847 (T 2167 p. 1086.3.18).

See for the date of the discovery and the editing Kanda Kiichirō 神田喜一郎, "Kyō-chō-sho shūsudo shimatsukō" 河静寺出土拓未考 in Shinagaku-setsurin 支那學論林 p. 10.32 (article dated 1934). For a review of studies on and translations of the Mu t'ien-tzu chuan see Cheng Te-k'un in JNCBRAS LXIV, 1933, p. 124.

This is the story which, as we have seen above (note 148), has further developed into a real Buddhist legend. The story in Lieh-tzu runs in outline as follows. King Mu is visited by a magician from the extreme West; he is lavishly treated by the Chinese monarch, who tries to please him by building a splendid palace for him. The magician, in order to show the king the imperfection of this earthly splendour, transports him
to a fairy palace in the “Central Heaven” 中天, where the king seems to stay for tens of years amidst celestial pleasures. Then the magician takes him again to a region of darkness and silence, where neither sun and moon nor seas and rivers are to be seen. King Mu becomes afraid and confused, and asks his mysterious companion to make him return to earth. At that very moment he is back in his palace: “He was sitting on the same place as before (he started his journey); the same servants waited upon him. When looking before him he noticed that the wine (in his cup) had not yet become clear, and his meat was still moist. When the king asked his servants whence he had come, they told him: ‘Your Majesty was just silently (sitting) here’. After-wards the magician explains the situation to the bewildered king: “I have made a spiritual journey 神遊 with Your Majesty; why then should the body move?”

The very nature of the story reveals its non-Chinese origin: the phenomenon of time and its relativity has never attracted the attention of Chinese thinkers. However, I have been unable to find a comparable theme in Buddhist literature, although the concept of the “spiritual journey” by which enormous distances are covered without moving the body has some resemblance with Milinda-pañha III.33 (trsl. Rhys Davids vol. I p. 126-127, Finot p. 136). The motif does occur in later Indian literature, e.g., in the story of the unsuccessful apprenti sorcier Candrasvāmin in Kṣemendra’s Brhatkathā (story XVIII, trsl. by U. Uhle in Vētala-Pantičchavinsati, die fünfundzwanzig Erzählungen eines Dämons, München 1924, p. 175 sqq.) and in Somadeva’s Kathāsaritsāgara ch. 92 (trsl. Tawney-Penzer vol. VII p. 71 sqq.). In his Appendix to vol. VII of his edition of Tawney’s translation of the Kathāsaritsāgara, N. M. Penzer refers to various analogous stories in Arabian literature, notably a fragment from the tales of the “Forty Vazirs” and the tale of Warlock and the young cook of Baghdad (for which see Penzer, op.cit., p. 224 note 3) from the Arabian Nights. The most surprising parallel to the story in Lieh-tzu is furnished by the legend(s) of the mi’rāj, the miraculous ascension of the prophet, according to which Muhammad was taken away from his bed, “and God Most High showed him the Seven Heavens, the Eight Paradises and the Seven Hells, and spake with him ninety thousand words, and when he returned to his place he found his bed still warm, and the water had not wholly run out of an ewer which had been upset beside him, so he straightway raised the ewer from the ground”. Both Gibb and Penzer believe that the origin of this motif must be sought in the hallucinations provoked by “some intoxicating preparation like hashish”. The occurrence of the same theme in a Chinese work of the late third century makes this explanation very doubtful, unless we must assume that the use of such drugs was widely spread in India or the Near East as early as that date. See also S. Thompson, Motiv-index of Folk-literature, second ed., Copenhagen 1955, vol. II no. D 2012.

157 E.g. Huai-nan tzu VII.106 = Lieh-tzu II.22; Huai-nan tzu X .164 = Lieh-tzu VIII.89; Huai-nan tzu XX.348 = Lieh-tzu VIII.90. The famous chapter Yong Chu 永朱, in which the “hedonistic” theories of that philosopher are developed, is exten-sively quoted in Han-shu XX 23.1.a (= Lieh-tzu 7.6a, SPTK ed.), cf. Hulsewé, Han Law p. 351 note 5. In spite of this, Feng Yu-lan, who like Chi Hsien-lin and T’ang Yung-t’ung regards the whole text of the present Lieh-tzu as a post-Han forgery, devotes ten pages in his History of Chinese Philosophy (trsl. Derk Bodde, vol. II p. 195-205) to a detailed discussion of the Yang Chu chapter as a splendid example of the pessimism and hedonism in the third century AD!

158 Shih-i chi, ed. Pi-shu erh-shih-pa chung 玉書 + 八誼 ch. 4 p. 2b.
159 Chin-shu 95.17a.
160 KSC V (biogr. of Tao-an) 353.3.12 sqq.
161 Cf. below, p. 313.
The following works are mentioned by Seng-yu in CSTCC at the beginning of the sixth century:

1. **A-yü wang yü fo-so sheng ta ching-hsin ching** 阿育王於佛所生大敬信經, 1 ch., translator unknown, CSTCC IV 25.2.3.

2. **A-yü wang huo kuo-pao ching** 阿育王護果報經, 1 ch., translator unknown, ib. In the Ta-Chou k' an-ting chung-ching mu-lu of 695 AD (T 2153 IX 428.1.14 and 19) the translation of these two works is attributed to Dharmarakṣa; at that date the scriptures themselves had already been lost.

3. **A-yü wang kung-yang tao-ch' ang shu ching** 阿育王供養道長樹經, 1 ch., mentioned in CSTCC 25.2.4 as an anonymous translation, but in Ta-T'ang NTL (T 2149) III 245.2.27 ascribed to (?) Dharmaratna (Chu T'an-wu-lan 諸遠無爛, late fourth century). It had already been lost at the time of the compilation of T 2153 (695 AD).

4. **A-yü wang tso hsiao-ehr shih ching** 阿育王作小兒時經 1 ch., mentioned in CSTCC IV 33.3.27 as an anonymous translation among the lost sūtras.

5. **Hsiao A-yü wang ching** 小阿育王經, 1 ch., ib., id.

6. **A-yü wang she-shih huan-shu chü-yüan chi** 阿育王捨施還願經, 1 ch., mentioned as an anonymous translation in CSTCC IV 25.2.5, but in T 2153 IX 428.1.28 ascribed to Dharmarakṣa, referring to the catalogue of Tao-an. The text had already disappeared before the time of the compilation of T 2153 (695 AD).

7. **(A-yü wang) t'ai-tzu (var. hsi) (fu-i) huai mu yin-yüan ching** 子阿育王太子法師如意護母因緣經, 1 ch., translated by Chu Fo-nien 薔佛尼 and Dharmaranatā at Ch'angan in 391 AD, with a preface by Chu Fo-nien, cf. CSTCC II 10.3.4 and VII 51.2.14. Ta-T'ang NTL (T 2149) III 252.1.16 and K'ai-yüan SCL (T 2154) IV 511.2.18 and 512.1.15 wrongly speak of two translations, one by Dharmaranatā and one by Chu Fo-nien. This work still exists: T 2045, a metrical translation of a Sanskrit original containing the story of Kunāla (cf. Divyāvadāna p. 405 sqq.) which according to Chu Fo-nien's preface consisted of 343 sūkṣmas.

8. **(A-yü wang) yün chuan, cf. next note.**

9. **In Ta-T'ang NTL (T 2149) L 224.1.11 it is said that there was already at the end of the second century an A-yü wang t'ai-tzu huai mu yin-yüan ching 阿育王太子如意護母因緣經 (cf. above, sub 8) translated by Lokakṣema; the catalogue refers to CSTCC, in which this translation is not mentioned.

An Fa-ch'ìn does not figure either in the Kao-seng chuan or in the biographical chapters of the CSTCC. In CSTCC V 38.3.5 Seng-yu mentions a Ta A-yü wang ching 大阿育王經, which by Tao-an had been classed among the “suspected” (疑) scriptures; this work consisted of only one chiān. The present A-yü wang chiān occurs under the name of An Fa-ch'ìn in Ta-T'ang NTL (T 2149) II 236.1.12 with the title Ta A-yü wang ching, in five chiān; for the attribution to An Fa-ch'ìn this catalogue refers to the Chin-shih ts'a-lu 僧伽師統 (cf. P. Pelliot in TP XXII, 1923, p. 102). The A-yü wang chuan (Aśokarājāvadāna) has been translated in its entirety by J. Przyluski, La Légende de l'Empereur Aśoka, Paris 1923, p. 225 sqq. A second Chinese translation, made in 512 AD by Seng-chia-p'o-lo 佛陀像讃 (cf. Shāṅkhaśāstra), has also been preserved: A-yü wang ching 阿育王經, 10 ch., T 2043.

See e.g., A-yü wang chuan (T 2042) I 102.1.14 sqq., trsl. Przyluski p. 242; A-yü wang ching (T 2043) I 153.1.12 sqq.; A-yü wang hsi huai mu yin-yüan ching (T 2045) 179.2.14; Shan-chien lü p'i-p'o-sha 善見律窪婆沙 (T 1462, Samantapāsādikā, trsl. by Saṅghabhadra 488/489 AD) I p. 681.2.5 sqq.

Shui-ching chü 23.206b.

Wei-shu 114 (Shih-Lao chih) 2b (trsl. Ware p. 119; trsl. Hurvitz p. 42) = KHMC II 101.3.6.
NOTES

167 KSC I 325.2.12 - CSTCC XIII 96.2.12.

168 Ming-hsiang chi, quoted in Fa-yüan chu-lin XIII 383.2; KSC I 326.1.1; KHMC XV 202.1.27. According to the (very unreliable) Ming-hsiang chi quoted in Fa-yüan chu-lin XIII 386.2, this same golden statue should have been rediscovered in 405 near the palace gate at Chienk'ang by no one else than Wang Mi (for whom see above, p. 213).

169 Correspondence between Li Miao 李森 and the monks Fa-ming 法明 and Tao-kao 道杲, HMC XI 71.3.18.

170 KSC IX 385.2.22.

171 HMC XI 72.1.10 (cf. note 169) and Tsung Ping's Ming-fo lun, HMC II 12.3.11.

172 KHMC XV 202.1.9.

173 KSC XIII 409.3.18, cf. KHMC XV 202.2.1 and Fa-yüan chu-lin XII 379.3 and 383.2 quoting Ming-hsiang chi.

174 This mountain seems not to be mentioned elsewhere.

175 KSC X 388.3.19, based on Ming-hsiang chi (cf. Fa-yüan chu-lin XXVIII 492.1).

176 KSC XIII 409.2.17 sqq. The early life of Liu Sa-ho had already developed into a legend before the beginning of the fifth century. The story of his sinful life, his descent into Hell, his salvation by Kuan-yin, his conversion and resurrection were described in great detail in the Ming-hsiang chi 明遠記 by Wang Yen 王績 (written some time after 479, cf. Arthur F. Wright, “Hui-chiao's Lives of Eminent Monks” p. 418); long quotations of this part of the Ming-hsiang chi are to be found in Fa-yüan chu-lin XXXI 516.3 and LXXXVI 919.2, cf. also Lu Hsün 陸迅, Ku hsiao-shuo 謎說 (in Lu Hsün ch'üan-chi, vol. VIII) p. 596-598. At the beginning of Hui-ta's biography in the KSC this legend is referred to in a few words, but the rest of the account of his life does not seem to contain much legendary material. Cf. also Ōtani Seishin 大谷盛真 in Tōyōgakuhō XI, 1921, p. 69-101, esp. p. 95 sqq.

177 KSC XIII 409.2.24.

178 KHMC XV 203.3.11.

179 Cf. Ming-hsiang chi quoted in Fa-yüan chu-lin XIII 383.3 and 385.1.

180 KSC XIII 410.1.1.

181 KHMC XV 202.4.4.

182 KSC V 355.3.28.

183 KSC VI 358.3.3; cf. above, p. 243 (biography of Hui-yüan).

184 KHMC XV 203.1.22.

185 HMC XI 72.1.13.

186 KHMC XV 202.1.12.

187 Fa-yüan chu-lin XXXVIII 584.3-585.1.

188 T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, p. 6.

189 Cf. the “Account of the (miraculous) responses of the relics” 宮法應記 by Wang Shao 王紹 (KHMC XVII 223.2.25 sqq.) and the impressive list of miracles reported to the court from forty-four shrines which by imperial order had been established all over the empire (ib. 216.3.7 sqq.). Both documents date from 602 AD. At this period there seems to have been a sudden profusion of “relics” found at the most improbable places: in the course of the year 601 both the emperor and the empress repeatedly discovered them in their food when they were eating! (ib. 216.2.28). Among the objects which are reported to have been found by excavation or to have miraculously manifested themselves in or near these shrines we find not only Buddhist objects such as relics, stone or bronze statues and stone cases with relics or images, but also traditional Chinese portents like inscribed stones, luminous emanations, sweet dew, auspicious animals (e.g., white cranes, tortoises, pheasants) etc.

190 Cf. Hsiao-ching XI (chu-shu ed. 6.3a; trsl. Legge p. 481): “Three thousand (crimes) are covered by the Five Punishments, but no sin is greater than lack of..."
filial piety” 五刑之屬三千，而誅大於不孝。Similarly, in *Chou-li* 10.26a the “punishment for lack of filial piety” 不孝之刑 ranks first among the “Eight Punishments” 八刑.

192 Cf. Mencius IVA/XXVI.1 (trsl. Legge p. 189). The absence of posterity means the termination of the sacrificial rites; it consequently is an offense against the ancestral lineage as a whole.


194 Cf. above, p. 16 sub 8, and e.g., *Mou-tzu* XI (HMC I 3.1.23), trsl. Pelliot p. 300. To be dressed according to the norm 純 is one of the elements of the Confucian code of conduct, cf. *Hsiao-ching* ch. IV (chu-shu ed. II.3a), trsl. Legge p. 469.

195 Cf. the documents in *HMC* XII 77.2-79.2.

196 *KHC* V 352.3.29. The use of *Shih* as a religious surname was not quite without precedent: already in the first half of the fourth century we hear of the monk Shih Tao-pao 諸道寳 who was active in Chienk’ang (*KHC* IV 350.3.12, cf. above, p. 97).

197 *Tseng-i a-han* XXI, T 125 658.3.10: “Just as the four rivers which come from the lake Anavatapta lose their names when they stream forth into the sea and are only called “the sea”, so the members of the four castes who go out of their families and join the order lose their own family names and are only called ‘monks, sons of Śākya’. In this famous passage the last words, sha-men shih-chia-tzu 沙門釋迦子, are a misleading translation of sramana-Śākyaputriyāḥ which actually does not mean “monks, sons of Śākya” but “monks belonging to the son from the Śākya(-clan),” i.e., followers of the Buddha. Here it was apparently taken as an equivalent of the equally common epithet buddhaputra 佛陀 or jinaputra, cf. Hōbōgirin p. 171, s.v. Bushi.

198 *KHC* VII 366.2; he was named after his master Chu Fa-t’ai 楔 possibilities (320-387), who was also a Chinese monk. Fa-t’ai is stated to have studied together with Tao-an (*KHC* V 354.2.29) who seems also to have had Chu as his religious surname before he adopted Shih (ib. 254.1.16).

199 Hulsewé, *Remnants* p. 335.


201 *Loc.cit.*

202 The notion of religious suicide of Buddhist monks does occur in Indian Buddhism, but in a different fashion. Here it probably never was more than a rhetorical scholastic problem: what are the karmic consequences (if there are any) in the case of someone committing suicide at the very moment of reaching the state of Arhat? The most famous example is the suicide of Godhika (*Samyutta* I. 120, trsl. Rhys Davids I. 149-153; different version in *Samyuktāgama*, T 99 XXXIX.109; *Abh. Kośa* VI.262) who after having six times fallen away from the “temporary state of emancipation” (sāmayikī vimukti), finally made an end of his life on attaining it the seventh time. The story of the monk who cut his throat to escape from the “three robbers” (lust, hate and ignorance) as narrated in Fa-hsien’s *Fo-kuo chi* (T 2085 p. 863.1.17; trsl. Beal p. LXI; Giles p. 52) may be based on the story of Godhika’s suicide; Fa-hsien visited the spot at which this was supposed to have taken place, some three li east of the old city of Rājagṛha. In all these cases suicide is used as a device to escape from rebirth. In Chinese Buddhism, inspired by Mahāyāna devotional concepts, it is essentially a self-immolation, a sacrifice performed in homage of the Buddha. Cf. also Et. Lamotte, *Traité* vol. II p. 740-742 for the concept of suicide in Indian Buddhism.

203 Bhaisajyarakṣa-pūrvavyāga-parivarta 薬王護命本生經, ed. Dutt p. 271 sqq.; trsl. Burnouf p. 242; T 262 VI (23) 53.1 = T 263 IX (21) 125.1 = T 264 VI (22) 187.3.

204 *I.e.*, in or shortly after 396 AD, cf. *TCTC* 108.1280b.

205 *KHC* XII 404.3.11 sqq.

206 ib. 404.3.22.

& an allusion to Lun-yü II.8.

HMC III 17.1.19; the words of the imaginary opponent in Sun Ch’o’s Yü tao lun (cf. above, p. 133).

CSTCC VI 46.2.27.


Shih-erh-pu ching 十二部經 is the Chinese equivalent of the “twelve section of the Buddha-word” (dvādasāṅgabhavacanama) or “the twelve proclamations of the doctrine” (dvādasadharma-pravacanama), in Sanskrit Buddhist scholastic literature denoting the traditional list of twelve categories of sacred literature, part of which corresponds to the nine arīgas of the Pāli scriptures. Neither of these lists corresponds to the real division of the canon. Sanskrit terms in Mvy 1266-78; Chinese equivalents cf. Mochizuki, Bukkyō daijiten p. 2337.3. Sun Ch’o’s assertion that the scriptures of four of these classes are exclusively devoted to the propagation of filial piety is very surprising; we cannot even guess which classes he may have had in mind. The words 四egas, which I have translated as “four of which (classes)”, could also be interpreted as “the fourth out of these (twelve classes)”, taking 四 as elliptical for 第四. But also in that case it would be impossible to make out what particular class was meant: in the various lists the order of the twelve genres is not the same. Moreover, the Sanskrit names (sūtra, geya, vyākaraṇa etc.) are most often transcribed in Chinese characters but not translated; Sun Ch’o most probably did not know them at all, and either repeated in his treatise this argument from hearsay, or devised it himself in order to dumbfound his antagonists.

HMC III 17.1.27 sqq.

Mou-tzu, section XV, HMC I 4.1.12; trsl. Pelliot p. 305.

The latter way of argumentation is also found in the Shih-Lao chih (Wei-shu 114.1b; trsl. Ware p. 113; trsl. Hurvitz p. 33, and Tsukamoto’s remarks ib.), where the five commandments of Buddhism are identified with the five social virtues (仁義禮智信) of Confucianism.

APPENDIX CHAPTER FIVE

The spurious Chu-shu chi-nien has been translated by J. Legge in Chinese Classics III, The Shoo king, prolegomena ch. IV p. 105-183; before Legge a French translation had already been made by Ed. Biot in J.As., 1841, p. 537-578 and 1842, p. 381-431.


Although the T’ai-p’ing yü-lan (completed 983) itself is a comparatively late compilation, this quotation is probably reproduced from a much older source: for the pre-T’ang period the compilers of the T’ai-p’ing yü-lan have almost integrally taken over the contents of some earlier encyclopedias, notably the Hua-lin pien-lüeh 華林通略 which was compiled between 516 and 524; cf. Tjan Tjoe Som, Po Hu T’ung vol. I (Leiden 1949) p. 60-61.
The present (spurious) text of the Chu-shu chi-nien contains the following phrase, which is no doubt an expanded version of the original entry:

“In the nineteenth year, in spring, a comet appeared in the constellation Tzu-wei.”

(Wang Kuo-wei, Chin-pen Chu-shu chi-nien shu-cheng, Posthumous works, third series, ch. 2 p. 6a; trsl. Legge p. 151. Since neither the Chou-shu i-chi, based upon the original Chu-shu chi-nien, nor the quotation from the latter work in the TPYL mention the “nineteenth year” as the date of the ominous event, it is certain that these words did not figure in the original text.

For completeness’ sake we must mention a third way of dating the Buddha’s Nirvāṇa which is found in early Chinese sources. In the account of his stay at Ceylon (412 AD), Fa-hsien reports a (Singhalese?) tradition, according to which at that date 1497 years had elapsed since the Buddha’s entry into Nirvāṇa (T 2085 p. 865.1.27; trsl. Beal p. lxxv; Giles p. 71). The origin of this tradition is not clear; it never became popular in China, and we find it severely criticized as lacking scriptural evidence in Fa-yüan chu-lin C (T 2122) p. 1028.3.

CHAPTER SIX


“Neo-Taoism” is in this sense used by Fung Yu-lan, cf. his Short History of Chinese Philosophy, New York 1948, p. 211: “By the revival of Taoism, I here mean that of Taoist philosophy. This revived Taoist philosophy I will call Neo-Taoism.” The term Neo-taoisme had previously been used by Pelliot to denote exactly the opposite, the Taoist religion of the Yellow Turbans (cf. TP XIX, 1920, p. 414 note 385). Cf. also our remarks above, p. 45 and p. 87.

An early commentary on the Tao te ching with the cryptic title of Hsiang-erh chu has been discovered among the Tun-huang manuscripts at the British Museum. This text (S 6825) is no doubt the most extensive and reliable source on early Taoist doctrine in existence. An annotated edition of the Hsiang-erh chu has recently been published by Jao Tsung-i 饒宗頤 under the title Tun-huang lu-ch’ao hsieh-pen Chang t’ien-shih Tao-ling chu Lao-tzu Hsiang-erh chu chiao-chien (Hong Kong, 1956), cf. also Ch’en Shih-hsiang 楊世祥, “‘Hsiang-erh’ Lao-tzu tao-ch’ing Tun-huang ts’an-chüan lun-cheng” 想爾老子道經校譜論證, in CHHP, new series, 1.2 (T’aipei, April 1957) p. 41-62. The commentary is attributed to no one else than Chang Ling, the first patriarch of the Taoist church (mid. second cent. AD). Unlike Jao Tsung-i, we feel some hesitation to accept this attribution, which after all is not attested anywhere until some five centuries after the lifetime of Chang Ling. However, the general contents of the work completely agree with the scanty information from other sources about the first phase of the Taoist religion, and this together with the fact that there is no perceptible trace of Buddhist influence in matters of doctrine or terminology proves that we have to do with a very old and extremely valuable document.


ib. p. 223.
Sha-lu is recorded as a disciple of Lao-tzu in the Chavannes version of the Hua hu story. After related the story of the Buddha's birth, the Shigaku theory according to which Yin Hsi was ordered by Lao-tzu to become the Buddha had already developed as early as the third century AD. Cf. also Shibata Norikatsu (op. cit., p. 357-447, part of which is devoted to the edicts of 1255 and 1258 pertaining to the proscription of the Hua hu story in which Lao-tzu's disciple Yin Hsi figures as the Buddha, certainly would make sense. However, as a disciple “les disciples qui dépendent du Bouddha” seems rather forced; in that case we would rather expect something like “les disciples” or “les disciples qui dépendent du Bouddha”. In a previous article, “Inscriptions et pièces de chancellerie chinoises de l'époque mongole”, TP V (1904), p. 357-447, part of which is devoted to the edicts of 1255 and 1258 pertaining to the proscription of the Hua hu story, and other Taoist apocrypha, Chavannes interprets “les disciples qui dépendent du Bouddha”, as far as they occur in later sources, as “les disciples de Bouddhiste”, adding, however, that the original meaning could very well have been “devint le Bouddha”. The latter interpretation certainly applies here as well as in the phrase translated above from Hsiang K'ai’s memorial: Lao-tzu is represented as personally converting the barbarians, and there is no evidence that the theory according to which Yin Hsi was ordered by Lao-tzu to become the Buddha had already developed as early as the third century AD. Cf. also Shibata Norikatsu, “Rōshi-kekokyō gisakusha-den ni tsuite” (in Rōshi kekokyō gisakusha-den ni tsuite), Shigaku zasshi XLIV (1933) p. 59-81 and 200-232, esp. p. 218 sqq.

T 2110 ch. V, p. 522.2.13 sqq.


Lit. “a top-knot”, 32 sq.

S. Lévi (in J. As. 1897, p. 16 and 1900, p. 461-462) has demonstrated that this sha-lù (Arch. *sa.ljuikt > Anc. *sa.ljuikt) must be a very archaic rendering of the name Sāriputra or of a corresponding Pāli form *Sariyut.

In India (天竺) there was also a divine man named Sha-lù. Formerly, in the first year of Yüan-shou (2 BC) during the reign of the Han emperor Ai, the po-shih ti-tzu Ching Lu 楞嚴 was charged with a mission to the Great Yüeh-chih (for this
reinstated’.” What connection this legend had with Ching Lu’s visit to the Yueh-chih
This does not make much sense: if we read this phrase in connection with the preceding
reinstated” was nobody else than the crown-prince who instructed the Chinese envoy
and by the other circumstances of his birth at Lumbini and therefore
work is indeed identical with the
confirmed by Ch’en
ch’eng
chuan speaks about a crown-prince who also
court remains obscure, but in view of both the context of the phrase in P’ei Sung-chih’s
hence, it does not deal with
passage to which
“Buddha”. Thus it does not deal with
version and of the additional information furnished by Ch’en
much more closely than the muddled extract given by P’ei Sung-chih: the
version) but with a replica, a come-back, in short: with “one who was called ‘the
there must have been some connection of this kind, and there is no reason to bring
the story of the “reinstated” in connection with the hua-hu theory.

28 T 2110 ch. VI, p. 534.3.17 = KHMCI XIII, p. 185.2.2: 魏書外國傳皇甫謐
高士傳並曰, 森門浮圖經老氏所作
高士傳並曰, 森門浮圖經老氏所作
29 T 2110 ch. VI p. 522.2.7: 皇甫謐云, 老子出關八天竺國, 數胡王為浮圖。

29. Cf. Su-k’u ch’üan-shu tsung-mu ch. 57.6a.

31. For the text of the Lao-tzu ming see the Chin-shih lu 金石錄 by Chao Ming-ch’eng 趙明誠 (mid. 12th cent.), ed. by Lu Chien-ts’eng 盧見曾 (1690–1768) in
1762, ch. 15, p. 11a, and the Li-shih 錄籙 by Hung Kua 洪逵 (1117–1184), ed. SPTK
3.1a. The stela with the inscription is already mentioned in the Shui-ching chu 水經注
by Li Tao-yüan 李道源 (early sixth cent.); already here the text is said to have been
composed by Pien Shao, who wrote it at the occasion of a sacrifice made by imperial
order by the courtier Kuan Pa 可蕃. Chao Ming-ch’eng and Hung Kua also attribute
the inscription to Pien Shao. This attribution seems to be well-founded, although
in the text of the inscription the author’s name is not mentioned. We read in HHS
7.12a that emperor Huan in January/February 165 ordered the courtier-in-constant-
attendance (chung ch’ang-shih 中常侍) Tso Kuan 在蕃 to perform a sacrifice to
Lao-tzu at Hu-hsien 亳縣 (for the particular pronunciation cf. So-yin comm. to
Shih-chi 63.1b) in Honan, the reputed birth-place of the sage, and in December 165
January 166 the courtier Kuan Pa 可蕃 was sent out for the same purpose (ib. 13a).
Hu-hsien was the capital of the kingdom of Ch’en 鮮國, where Pien Shao according
to his biography had been or possibly at that moment even was “chancellor”, hsiang
相 (HHS 110 A.16a). This information, combined with the fact that Pien Shao in
his biography is said to have composed, inter alia, “inscriptions” (篆), makes it
rather probable that he was indeed the author of the Lao-tzu ming. There is one
difficulty: Ou-yang Hsiu 歐陽修 (1007–1072), who must still have seen the stela with
its inscription, describes it in great detail in ch. 2 of his Chi ku lu 集古錄 (Ou-yang
Wen-chung kung chi 歐陽文忠公集, ed. SPPY, ch. 135.2a); however, he does
not mention Pien Shao as the author of the text, but remarks on the contrary that
some people held it to be a work of the famous scholar Ts’ai Yung 蔡邕 (133–192 AD).
There is, indeed, some slight support for this attribution: according to Ts'ai Yung's biography (HHS 90B.10b), one of the courtiers who recommended him (and with whom he consequently must have been in close contact) was the powerful eunuch Tso Kuan 左僕, the same person who early in 165 AD was sent out to perform the sacrifice to Lao-tzu at Hu-hsien. We could suppose that Ts'ai Yung had done the writing; he was the greatest calligrapher of his time, his most renowned work being the text of five or six canonical scriptures in large li-shu which he was commissioned to write out in 166 AD in vermilion ink upon the stone tablets in which they were to be engraved. However, Ou-yang Hsiu definitely says that according to some people Ts'ai Yung “made” (作) the inscription, which implies that he was held to have composed the text and not merely to have written it out.

The idea of the successive manifestations of Lao-tzu has probably been formed under Buddhist influence in the course of the second century AD; cf. also the curious enumeration of avatāras of Tung-fang Shuo from the era of the Yellow Emperor onward, given by Ying Shao 應劭 (ca. 140-206 AD) in his Feng-su t'ung-i 風俗通義 (ed. Centre Franco-Chinois, Peking 1943) p. 16.

32 HHS IIOA.16a.
33 According to Po Yüan's biography in KSC I 327.1.13, his original surname was Wan 万; he was not only Chinese, but even the son of a Confucian scholar named Wan Wei-ta 萬威達. I do not see the reason of Pelliot's statement that “son de famille était Po 普, dont Wan est ne par altération graphique” (BEFO VI, 1906, p. 380 note 2). For Po Yüan see above, p. 76.

34 Chi-chiu 諸酒, originally a honorific term designating the eldest among the guests at a banquet who was entitled to pour out the wine as a sacrifice. During the Han it was a semi-official title given to various prominent personalities (see above, ch. II, note 91); under the Chin it became the official title of a magistrate attached to the State College (kuo-tzu chien 國子監) and remained so till the end of the Ch'ing dynasty in the 20th century. In T'ang times chi-chiu also designated a master of ceremonies at the court of a king (cf. des Rotours, Traité des fonctionnaires, vol. I, p. 442, note 5). However, the term chi-chiu had developed quite another function in the second half of the second century AD: it then became one of the highest official titles in the theocratic hierarchy of the “Eastern” Yellow Turbans led by Chang Lu 長屠. In this organisation the “libationers” formed a kind of regional supervisors, each being entrusted with the control over a large diocese. Their rank was immediately below that of Chang Lu, the “Lord Master-of Heaven” 天師屠 himself. In later times the title has come denote a Taoist dignitary of a much lower grade, a member of a kind of parish council presided by the Taoist master (道師), and it is no doubt in this sense that the term is used here. Cf. Maspero, Le Taoisme, p. 153 and p. 45, Fukui Kōjun, op.cit., p. 36, 53, 59, 114), Kenneth K. S. Ch'en, “Buddho-Taoist mixtures in the Pa-shih i hua t'u”, HJAS IX (1945-'47), p. 1-12, esp. p. 4.

35 By Tao-liu 道流, completed by Chu Tao-tsu 車道祖, who died in 419; quoted in Fa-lin's Pien cheng lun 篠正論 ch. V, T 2110 522.2.24.
36 Also named Chung-seng chuan 宗僧傳, in 20 ch., cf. Liang-shu 30.3a; quoted in the commentary of Ch'en Tzu-liang 晁子良 (probably first half seventh cent.) to Pien cheng lun V, T 2110 522.3.1.
37 For this work see Arthur F. Wright, “Hui-chiao's Lives of Eminent Monks”, p. 417, VI. The passage in question is quoted in Ch'en Tzu-liang's commentary to Pien cheng lun, loc.cit.

38 It must be remarked that the KSC does not copy the biography of Po Yüan in CSTCC X 107.2.29 sqq.: the account of Li T'ung's visit to hell and of Wang Fou's activities only occurs in the Korean edition of the CSTCC, where the text literally agrees with and obviously has been copied from the KSC, whereas the Sung, Yüan and Ming editions do not mention this story at all. In the above-mentioned article by Shibata Norukatsu (see note 19) the author rejects—on absolutely insufficient
grounds—the authenticity of the quotations from the Kao-seng chuan of P'ei Tzu-yeh, the Yu-ming lu and the Chin-shih tsa-lu which we have translated above, declaring them all to be forgeries or late interpolations based on Hui-chiao's Kao-seng chuan. He consequently takes the KSC as the first account of the story of Wang Fou—a story which he therefore regards as pure fiction. This certainly goes too far. We cannot help feeling that Shibata has started from the firm conviction that the whole story of Wang Fou is a late tradition without any historical value, and that he has set out to demonstrate this by rejecting as spurious all texts which tend to prove the opposite. In such a way almost anything could be proved.


Yoshioka Yoshitoyo 吉岡義豊 has given a useful synoptic list of the titles of Taoist scriptures (including the Hua hu ching) quoted in Buddhist treatises, in Dōkyō kyōden shi ron 道経兼类史論, Tōkyō 1955, p. 407-422.


末, add 李, cf. KHMC IX 145.3.18 (Hsiao tao lun quoting the Wen-shih chuan 文始傳): 王永表憐憐.

Che-fu 底沃 or che-i 甚衣, the russet garments worn by criminals. The custom dates from pre-Han times and is already mentioned in Hsün-tzu (chapter Cheng-lun 正論, Hsün-tzu XVIII.218) where it is given as an example of "symbolic punishment", hsiaang-hsing 賦刑. In a fragment from the Feng-su t'ung-i quoted in TPYL (ed. Centre franco-chinois, Pékin 1943, p. 110) is said that Ch'in Shih-huang-ti ordered the conscript labourers who built the Great Wall to wear the read dress of criminals in order to make the fugitives easily recognizable, cf. also Chavannes, Mém. hist. vol. II, p. 156, note 1. See further Dubs, HFHD, vol. II, appendix II, p. 123 sqq.: "Punishments by altering the clothing"; Karlsgren, "Glosses on the Book of Documents", BMFEA XX, 1948, p. 87, gloss 1267; Wilbur, Slavery in China during the Former Han Dynasty, p. 273, note 5; Hulsewé, Remnants of Han Law, p. 347.

P'ien-i 盤衣, "incomplete dress", refers to the monk's gown (kāsāya) which leaves the left shoulder bare.

T 2110 (Pien cheng lun) VI 535.1.10 = KHMC XIII 185.2.13 sqq. The last phrases (from "This is why a grave disease . . .") occur only in the version of the Pien cheng lun which is reproduced in KHMC.

Chang-luü 丈六, the height of the mirmānakāya 六尺 of the Buddha.

Quoted in Hsiao tao lun, KHMC IX 144.2.14 sqq.

Liu (shen)-t'ung 申 (申) 同 = sad-ābhiñā, the six supernatural powers acquired by a Buddha, an Arhat or a Bodhisattva of one of the highest stages: (1) magic power, rddhi, 如意; (2) the "divine eye", divyacakṣus, 天眼; (3) the "divine ear", divyaśrūtra, 天耳; (4) the knowledge of other people's thoughts, paracittajñāna, 他心智; (5) the power of remembering previous existences, pūrvanivāsāmuñśriti, 自積宿命; (6) the knowledge of the destruction of (evil) outflows, āśravakāavyajñāna, 磚盡智. More frequent is a list of five abhiñā in which the last one is lacking. Cf. Lamotte, Traité p. 328-333; survey of different lists and detailed discussion of each term in Har Dayal, Bodhisattva doctrine, p. 106-134. It is only natural that the transcendent powers of perception (觀眼、觀聽) and the power of levitation (飛身) of
the Taoist adept came to be amalgamated with the five or six abhijñā of the Buddhist Saint, notably with the “divine eye”, the “divine ear” and with the _rddhī_, which indeed includes the power of flying through the air as one of the four kinds of magic transportation (_gamana_). In fact, we find this identification already made in the second chapter of Chih Ch’ien’s _T’ai-tzu jui-ying pen-ch’i ching_.

The explanation is given for _yu-p'o-i_ and explanations of Sanskrit words are not seldom found in Taoist aporypha. The word _ssu-ta_ “penetrating the four (quarters)”, as it is quoted in the _Yin Hsi_ with additions dating from the second half of the sixth century, see Fukui Kōjun, _op. cit_. (p. 108) regards the “three kinds of wisdom” as the starting-point of the evolution of the series of five or six _abhijñā_, but it is rather futile to speculate about the historical development of such notions of Buddhism in its very first stage of scholastic elaboration. “Superhuman qualities” (_uttarimana-sa-dhamma_) acquired by the monk in the course of his training are mentioned in the earliest part of the Buddhist canon (_Pāṭimokkha_). Such supernormal powers and the methods to acquire these no doubt belong to the earliest nucleus of Buddhism, irrespective of their number or way of classification, and are probably even pre-Buddhist, belonging to the realm of _yoga_ which was, if not the very essence, at least an essential part of the primitive doctrine (cf. L. de la Vallée Poussin, _Nirvāṇa_, Paris 1925, p. 10 sqq.). The _ssu-ta_ of our text may be the result of a confusion of _san-ta_ with the expression _ssu-ta_ “penetrating the four (quarters)”, as it _e.g._, occurs in _Tao te ching_ 10: _四道_、_能無知乎_。“In penetrating the four quarters with your intelligence, can you be without knowledge?” (trsl. Duyvendak, reading 知 as 為, cf. p. 36 and 39). In this text from the _Wen-shih chuan_ it is evident from the context that the term _ssu-ta_ (balancing _liu-t'ung_ 六通) can only be interpreted as “the four _ta_”. The _ssu-ta_ mentioned in _Chou-li_ 15.23a (凡為邑書四通或其附事) are of course out of the question.

_Ssu-ta_ is probably a mistake for _san-ta_ 三達, _i.e._, the three kinds of wisdom (_tisro vidyāḥ_) which the Buddha attains at the moment of Enlightenment, and which are identical with three of the _abhijñā_ mentioned in the previous note: _divyacakṣus_ (also written _pārvanivāsānusmṛti_ 自識宿命 and _āśrava-kṣayajñāna_ 滅盡智). Har Dayal (op. cit., p. 108) regards the “three kinds of wisdom” as the starting-point of the evolution of the series of five or six _abhijñā_, and it is rather futile to speculate about the historical development of such notions of Buddhism in its very first stage of scholastic elaboration. “Superhuman qualities” (_uttarimana-sa-dhamma_) acquired by the monk in the course of his training are mentioned in the earliest part of the Buddhist canon (_Pāṭimokkha_). Such supernormal powers and the methods to acquire these no doubt belong to the earliest nucleus of Buddhism, irrespective of their number or way of classification, and are probably even pre-Buddhist, belonging to the realm of _yoga_ which was, if not the very essence, at least an essential part of the primitive doctrine (cf. L. de la Vallée Poussin, _Nirvāṇa_, Paris 1925, p. 10 sqq.). The _ssu-ta_ of our text may be the result of a confusion of _san-ta_ with the expression _ssu-ta_ “penetrating the four (quarters)”, as it _e.g._, occurs in _Tao te ching_ 10: _明也四道_、_能無知乎_。“In penetrating the four quarters with your intelligence, can you be without knowledge?” (trsl. Duyvendak, reading 知 as 為, cf. p. 36 and 39). In this text from the _Wen-shih chuan_ it is evident from the context that the term _ssu-ta_ (balancing _liu-t'ung_ 六通) can only be interpreted as “the four _ta_”. The _ssu-ta_ mentioned in _Chou-li_ 15.23a (凡為邑書四通或其附事) are of course out of the question.

55 _Ssu-ta_ is probably a mistake for _san-ta_ 三達, _i.e._, the three kinds of wisdom (_tisro vidyāḥ_) which the Buddha attains at the moment of Enlightenment, and which are identical with three of the _abhijñā_ mentioned in the previous note: _divyacakṣus_ (also written _pārvanivāsānusmṛti_ 自識宿命 and _āśrava-kṣayajñāna_ 滅盡智). Har Dayal (op. cit., p. 108) regards the “three kinds of wisdom” as the starting-point of the evolution of the series of five or six _abhijñā_, and it is rather futile to speculate about the historical development of such notions of Buddhism in its very first stage of scholastic elaboration. “Superhuman qualities” (_uttarimana-sa-dhamma_) acquired by the monk in the course of his training are mentioned in the earliest part of the Buddhist canon (_Pāṭimokkha_). Such supernormal powers and the methods to acquire these no doubt belong to the earliest nucleus of Buddhism, irrespective of their number or way of classification, and are probably even pre-Buddhist, belonging to the realm of _yoga_ which was, if not the very essence, at least an essential part of the primitive doctrine (cf. L. de la Vallée Poussin, _Nirvāṇa_, Paris 1925, p. 10 sqq.). The _ssu-ta_ of our text may be the result of a confusion of _san-ta_ 三達 with the expression _ssu-ta_ “penetrating the four (quarters)”, as it _e.g._, occurs in _Tao te ching_ 10: _四道_、_能無知乎_。“In penetrating the four quarters with your intelligence, can you be without knowledge?” (trsl. Duyvendak, reading 知 as 為, cf. p. 36 and 39). In this text from the _Wen-shih chuan_ it is evident from the context that the term _ssu-ta_ (balancing _liu-t'ung_ 六通) can only be interpreted as “the four _ta_”. The _ssu-ta_ mentioned in _Chou-li_ 15.23a (凡為邑書四通或其附事) are of course out of the question.

56 Quoted in _Hsiao tao lun_, _KHMC_ IX 145.3.11. On the _Wen-shih chuan_, a Taoist apocryphal work, the nucleus of which was a hagiographic account of the life of Yin Hsi with additions dating from the second half of the sixth century, see Fukui Kōjun, _op. cit._, p. 291 sqq., and H. Maspero, _Le Taoisme_, p. 176, note 3.

57 Read, with the Ming edition, 始者 i.st. of 始老.

58 Quoted in _Hsiao tao lun_, _KHMC_ IX 145.3.22.

59 ib. 145.3.17.

60 ib. 151.1.17.

61 The quotation from the _Ch’u-chi_ has 考殺 “tried and killed”; I read, with the quotation from the _Tsao-li t’ien-ti ching_ (cf. below, note 62), 跡殺 “slew”, taking 考 (also written 無) to be a graphic error for 跡.

62 ib. 144.2.20; id. quoted from the _Tsao-li t’ien-ti ching_ 進立天地等, ib. p. 150.1.4.

63 ib. 147.2.16. It may be remarked in passing that such phantastic etymological explanations of Sanskrit words are not seldom found in Taoist apocrypha. The word _Yu-p’o-sai_ (upāsaka) is connected with a story about an Indian king who was distressed (yu, 愁!) about his son who had to guard the pass (sai) against bands of robbers (the p’o is not accounted for, much to the amusement of the author of the _Hsiao tao lun_ who asks where the “mother-in-law” comes in); an analogous explanation is given for _yu-p’o-i_ (upāsikā) (quoted in _Hsiao tao lun_, _KHMC_ IX 147.2.26). Because the Buddhists “destroy and damage” (_t’u-hai_ 傷害) their natural complexion, the name of the Buddha contains the syllable _t’u_ 虧 “to slaughter” in the archaic transcription _Fou-t’u_ 浮屠; _sang-men_ 僧門 (apparently a variant of the archaic _sang-men_ 僧門 = _śrāmaṇa_) means “the gate of (mourning) death”, etc. (_San-p’o lun_ 三破論, a Taoist polemic treatise by Chang Jung 莊錫 (died 497) quoted in the _Mieh huo lun_ 淫惑論 by Liu Hsieh 劉懿, _HMC_ 50.3.5).
Penshe apocrypha (see below, p. 306) is also opposed to Buddhism as yang is to yin. However, the tradition that Lao-tzu was born from his (Chinese) mother's left side is much older than Buddhism. According to the legendary account of the Buddha's birth, the Bodhisattva

According to the legendary account of the Buddha's birth, the Bodhisattva entered Maya's womb in the form of a white elephant with six tusks when she was having a siesta during the Midsummer Festival. In the early Chinese accounts of the Buddha's life (T 184, T 185) the future Buddha is said to have descended from the Tushita heaven seated on a white elephant; the same tradition is found in the Mou-tzu and in Fa-hsien's itinerary (cf. Pelliot in TP XIX, 1920, p. 336 note 35). Here, however, we find no trace of this story, the only element which has remained from the original legend being that Lao-tzu's avatāra took place when the queen "was sleeping in the daytime". Lao-tzu, who as a Taoist adept has the power to transform his body, apparently changes himself into the light of the sun which shines upon the queen's body. The miraculous conception through the mouth is a theme which figures in a number of Chinese stories about the birth of very prominent men; in these legends the conception results from swallowing some object, particularly eggs. Cf. e.g., Shihi-ching, ode 245 (Ta-ya II.1, Legge p. 465, Couvreur p. 347, Karlgren p. 260), Shih-chi 3.1a (Mém. hist. I 173-174); Shih-chi 5.1a (Mém-hist. II 1-2).

The original text of the Hsüan-miao nei-p'i-en (or Hsüan-miao ching 無妙經) probably read "the right arm-pit" 右腋, in keeping with the Indian tradition about the Bodhisattva's miraculous birth at Lumbini. The earliest source in which this passage occurs (the I-Hsia lun 異夏論 of ca. 470 quoted in HMC VI 37.2.17 and in Nan-Ch'i shu 54.4a = Nan-shih 75.11a) reads 右 "right", whereas according to later quotations from the same scripture (in Hsiao tao lun) Lao-tzu was born from Ch'ing-miao's left side. The change from right to left is understandable: in general, left is the direction which corresponds with the male principle (yang) (cf. M. Granet, Pensée chinoise, p. 369); Lao-tzu is born as a man and teacher and has used the essence of the sun to incarnate himself, whereas the Taoist doctrine according to other apocrypha (see below, p. 306) is also opposed to Buddhism as yang is to yin. However, the tradition that Lao-tzu was born from his (Chinese) mother's left side is much older than Buddhism. According to the legendary account of the Buddha's birth, the Bodhisattva entered Maya's womb in the form of a white elephant with six tusks when she was having a siesta during the Midsummer Festival. In the early Chinese accounts of the Buddha's life (T 184, T 185) the future Buddha is said to have descended from the Tushita heaven seated on a white elephant; the same tradition is found in the Mou-tzu and in Fa-hsien's itinerary (cf. Pelliot in TP XIX, 1920, p. 336 note 35). Here, however, we find no trace of this story, the only element which has remained from the original legend being that Lao-tzu's avatāra took place when the queen "was sleeping in the daytime". Lao-tzu, who as a Taoist adept has the power to transform his body, apparently changes himself into the light of the sun which shines upon the queen's body. The miraculous conception through the mouth is a theme which figures in a number of Chinese stories about the birth of very prominent men; in these legends the conception results from swallowing some object, particularly eggs. Cf. e.g., Shihi-ching, ode 245 (Ta-ya II.1, Legge p. 465, Couvreur p. 347, Karlgren p. 260), Shih-chi 3.1a (Mém. hist. I 173-174); Shih-chi 5.1a (Mém-hist. II 1-2).
older than the sixth century. In Lao-tzu’s “biography” in the _Shen-hsien chuan_ 神仙傳 by Ko Hung 考洪 (mid. fourth cent.) it is already said that he “ripped open his mother’s left arm-pit and was born” 割母左腋而生 (ed. _Shuo-k’u_ 1.1a).

71 These lines are of course a Taoist adaption of the famous stanzas which the future Buddha is said to have recited immediately after his birth. For the Buddhist tradition and the many different versions of the Buddha’s first words see P. Mus., _Barabudur_, p. 475 sqq.; additional information, esp. from Chinese sources, in Et. Lamotte, _Traité_ p. 6 note 3. The text of the stanzas which we find here recited by Lao-tzu is identical with the one contained in Chih-ch’ien’s translation of the _Tai-tzu jui-ying pen-ch’i ching_, cf. above, note 68. It must be noted that the words “This is my last birth” 是最後化身 (iyan ma paścimājātih), which occur in all other versions, are lacking this short biography of the Buddha as well as in the text of the _Hsuan-miao nei-p’ien_.

72 _Hsuan-miao nei-p’ien_ 玄妙內篇 (once quoted as _Hsuan-miao ching_ 玄妙經 in _Hsiao tao lun_, _KHMC_ IX 148.3.19), quoted in Ku Huan’s _I-Hsia lun_, which in turn is reproduced in (1) Cheng erh-chiao lun, 正二教論 by Ming Seng-shao 明僧紹 (early sixth cent.), _HMC_ VI 37.2.15; (2) Nan-Ch’i shu 54.4a; (3) _Nan-shih_ 75.11a; furthermore quoted in Chen Luan’s _Hsiao tao lun_ (570 AD) in _KHMC_ IX 146.1.9, 148.2.24, 148.3.19.

73 This scripture is only known from a few short quotations in _Hsiao tao lun_. The title is incomprehensible; besides _Hsiao-ping_ 懷經 the variant title _Hsiao-shui_ 懷水 occurs in the bibliographic sections of both _T’ang_ histories (_T’ang-shu_ ch. VI, p. 602.1.17; additional information, esp. from Chinese sources, in _Et. Lamotte, Traité_ 1.7): “This is the power of the famous stanzas which the Buddha(s)” is not clear to me what meaning must be attached to this well-known formula in this context.

74 Quoted in _Hsiao tao lun_, _KHMC_ IX 146.1.6.

75 _Ch’eng fo wei-shen_ 永佛威神, the standard translation of _buddhasya_ (or _buddhanām_ adhipātāna), “by the controlling (or: sustaining) power of the Buddha(s)”.

76 This scripture is only known from a few short quotations in _Hsiao tao lun_. The title is incomprehensible; besides _Hsiao-ping_ 懷經 the variant title _Hsiao-shui_ 懷水 occurs in the bibliographic sections of both _T’ang_ histories (_T’ang-shu_ ch. VI, p. 602.1.17; additional information, esp. from Chinese sources, in _Et. Lamotte, Traité_ 1.7): “This is the power of the famous stanzas which the Buddha(s)” is not clear to me what meaning must be attached to this well-known formula in this context.

77 Quoted in _Hsiao tao lun_, _KHMC_ IX 145.3.18.


80 T 2139 p. 1267.2.9 sqq.
81 Cf. Fukui Köjun, _op. cit._, p. 258; Chavannes-Pelliot, _Traité manichéen_, p. 126.
82 Wei-shu 102.3a = _Pei-shih_ 97.3b.
83 I read, with _T’ang Yung-t’un_ ( _op. cit._, p. 464), 無言 instead of 無二.
84 _San-p’o lun_ 破諦 by Chang Jung 張融 (died 497), quoted in _Mieh huo lun_ 謎絶論 by Liu Hsieh 劉旋 (early sixth cent.), _HMC_ VIII, 50.3.20.
85 _ib_. 50.3.23.
86 _Hua hu ching_, quoted in the _Pei-shan lu_ 北山録 by the monk Shen-ch’ing 神清 (T 2113, early ninth cent.) ch. V, p. 602.1.17.
87 Read (with the Yuán, Ming and Palace ed.) 散虑 in stead of 聚慮. For the expression ch’ii yu, “to share the hind”, cf. _Li-chi_ I (Ch’ü-li, _chu-shu_ ed. I.11a, trsl. Couvreur 1.7): “it is because the birds and wild beasts have no Rites that (among them) father and son live together with the same female”.
88 _Cheng wu lun_, _HMC_ I 7.1.24 sqq.
Shun hai ching, cf. above, p. 271.

Words of the Han general Pan Yung quoted in HHS 118 (Hsi-yü chuan), and again paraphrased by Fan Yeh ib. p. 10a: 佛言: 《善法要不致死》. Cf. above, p. 26.

Hou-Han chi 10.5a.

Quoted in Nan-Ch'i shu 54.5a = Nan-shih 75.12b.

"The words 大乘守善 ("the observation of what is good in the Mahāyāna") make no sense here and moreover interrupt the parallelism of the phrase; they seem to have crept into the text, probably as a result of careless copying.

"Ch'i-ch'u 七女, the "seven grounds for divorce", cf. K'ung-tzu chia-yü (ed. T'ung-wen shu-chii) VI.11b; the list corresponds to that of the ch'i-ch'ü 七女 of the Ta-Tai li-chi ch. XIII (section 80, 未命), p. 6a, trsl. R. Wilhelm, Das Buch der Sitte, p. 248. Neither of these lists includes drinking wine, which probably fell under the category of yin 性, "debauchery".

"Shou i 守一, "guarding unity" or "keeping to the One", originally a Taoist term indicating a certain state of mental concentration; in early Chinese translations of Buddhist scriptures it is also used for dhyāna. The expression probably derives from Chuang-tzu XI.65: 守一 以處其和, or from the opening words of Tao te ching 10: 戴德魂抱一. Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, p. 110-111 and Jao Tsung-i 趙守義, Lao-tzu hsiang-erh chu chiao-chien 老子想爾注校诠 (Hongkong 1956), p. 63-65. However, in this context it must mean something quite different: "to guard (one's chastity) with concentrated attention"?

Quoted in Hsiao tao lun, HMC IX 146.3.2. The explanation of Buddhist ideas in terms of traditional Chinese cosmology (yin-yang and the five elements) was by no means restricted to Taoist circles. It occurs in a much more developed form in the remaining fragments of the Buddhist forgery known as "The Sūtra of Trapuṣa and Bhallika", 布利舍經, a popular apocryphal work composed ca. 460 AD by the famous organizer of the Northern Church, T' an-yao 愛度. Here we find a bizarre classificatory system in which the five Buddhist commandments are made to correspond to the five planets, the five sacred mountains, the five intestines, the five elements, the five (mythical) emperors, the five colours, etc. Cf. Tsukamoto Zenryū, 支部の在家仏教特に真浄浄教の一経典, in Tōhōgakuhō III, 1941, p. 313-369, esp. p. 331 sqq.

Here the term ch'u-ch'u 出處 balances the fa-chih 去地 of the previous sentence, and consequently must not be interpreted as an antithetic compound ("departure and stay"), but as attributive word-group: "departing-place, point of departure". Hurvitz (p. 27) mistranslates: "... that the departure from the private life and the remaining in it are truly different".

Hui-yuan here paraphrases the passage from the T'ai-tzu jui-ying pen-ch'i ching translated above (cf. note 104).

Here the term ch'u-ch'u 出處 balances the fa-chih 去地 of the previous sentence, and consequently must not be interpreted as an antithetic compound ("departure and stay"), but as attributive word-group: "departing-place, point of departure". Hurvitz (p. 27) mistranslates: "... that the departure from the private life and the remaining in it are truly different".
Cf. Fukui Kōjun, op.cit., p. 294-296. A work named Hsi-sheng ching 西昇經 occurs in the Taoist canon (Tao-t'ang vol. 346-347 and 449-450); it professes to be a record of Lao-tzu's words to Yin Hsi before their departure to the West. This work indeed begins with the words: "Lao-tzu ascended to the West to open up (開 instead of 開!) the Way in Chu-ch'ien; (there) he was called Master Ku. He skilfully entered Nirvāṇa; without having either beginning or end he will exist continuously." 老子西昇道經 (開蒙先生善入無為不終不始, 永存綿綿) But on the other hand the rest of the present text of the Hsi-sheng ching does not contain any reference to the hua hu legend, so that this work cannot be identical with the ancient Hsi-sheng ching which we find often quoted in Buddhist apologetic treatises as one of the main exponents of the hua hu story. Cf. also P. Pelliot in BEFEO III, p. 322-327; IV 379 and VIII 515-519, and Kenneth K. S. Ch'en in HJAS 1X p. 2 note 4.

Quoted in Hsiao tao lun, KHMC IX 152.1.13; same phrase quoted from the (Lao-tzu) hsi-sheng ching 老子西昇經 in Tao-an's Erh-chiao lun 二教論, KHMC VIII 139.3.6, and in Fa-lin's Pien cheng lun ch. V, T 2110, p. 524.1.18.

I read 老子去後 instead of 去後, cf. in the next phrase the words 老子去後百年, She-wei 吉衛 (Śrāvastī) seems to be a mistake for Wei-wei 維衛 (Kapilavastu, cf. supra, p. 301 and note 67).

This number is certainly a mistake. Since practically all texts agree in saying that the Buddha entered Nirvāṇa at the age of eighty, I propose to correct this "forty-nine" 四十九 into "seventy-nine" 七十九.

This passage is certainly based upon ch. III of the (Mahāyāna) Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra (trsl. by Dharmakṣema in 414-419 AD, T 374 p. 379.3-380.1 = Southern recension, T 375, p. 619.2-620.1), where we find the twenty-two stanzas in which the Bodhisattva Kāśyapa puts thirty-odd questions to the Buddha. The number 36 seems incorrect; I have been unable to count more than 32 questions in this passage. It must be noted that here Lao-tzu is not identified with the disciple Mahā-kāśyapa, the aged śrāvaka from Sāgala, but with a Bodhisattva named Kāśyapa who only seems to occur in the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra. In this sūtra he is described as a young man from a brahman family, born in the village of To-lo 多羅 (Tālā?).

Quoted in Hsiao tao lun, KHMC IX 148.2.27.

The village of To-lo is mentioned in the Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra (loc.cit.) as the birth-place of the Bodhisattva Kāśyapa, see note 115 above.

Quoted in Hsiao tao lun, KHMC IX 149.1.2.

I read, with T 2109 p. 162.2.12, ts'ai 擡 inst. of chiang 将.

Yu-lan hua 優曇花, the blossoms of the udumbara tree (ficus glomerata) which symbolize the appearance of a Buddha in the world on account of their extreme rarity (the tree is said to produce fruits without having flowered). Cf. Mochizuki, Bukkyō daijiten p. 224.2.

Quoted in Hsiao tao lun, KHMC IX 151.3.28 and in Fa-lin's P'o hsieh lun 破邪論 ch. I, T 2109 p. 477.3.17 (= KHMC XI 162.2.12). In Fa-yüan chu-lin LV 706.1 these lines and the next four ("Why is the Buddha born so late . . .") are not separated but quoted as one continuous poem.


Quoted by Chen Luan in Hsiao tao lun, KHMC IX 152.1.14, by Fa-lin in P'o hsieh lun ch. I, T 2109, p. 477.3.9 (= KHMC XI 161.3.2) and by Tao-hsian in KHMC I 98.2.27; cf. also Fa-yüan chu-lin LV 705.3.

Fu lang 符諭, tzu Yuan-ta 蘇達, was the son of an elder brother of Fu Chien 符堅, the Tibetan ruler of the Former Ch'in dynasty; he has a short biography in CS 114.7a. Under Fu Chien he was made General Commander of the East 鎮東將軍 and governor of Ch'ing-chou 青州. When the Tibetan army was completely routed at the famous battle of Fei-shui 柔水 (383), he surrendered to the Chin (according
to CS 9.7b, his surrender took place in November 383), and was subsequently sent to the Chin court at Chienk'ang, where he was given a honorary function in the palace. His scholarly abilities, his proficiency in ch'ing-t'an and his great renown as a gastronomer made the Tibetan prince very popular at the Chinese court; among his acquaintances we find the Buddhist master Chu Fa-t'ai 車法太子 (Chiin-shu 奉書, by P'ei Ch'ingt-jen 戴景仁, quoted in Comm. to SSHY III 14a, and CS 114.7a). Before long, he incurred the enmity of the powerful war-lord Wang Kuo-pao 王國寶 who caused him to be executed. Acc. to CS 114.17b his execution took place when Wang Kuo-pao's brother Wang Ch'en 王侖 had just been nominated governor of Ching-chou, which acc. to TCTC 107.1266a took place in August/September 390. Fu Lang was the author of a philosophical work patterned after the Chhauang-tzu, the Fu-tzu 超子, in 30 (var. 20) chüan, which has been lost, probably since late T'ang times. Yen K'o chün 楊可均 has collected some fifty fragments of this work, mostly quotations found in early encyclopedias, and has published these in ch. 152 of his monumental Ch'üan Chin wen 觀今文 (see also the remarks in his preface to this chapter). Apart from the phrase which we have translated here, the existing fragments of the Fu-tzu do not contain any Buddhist ideas or themes. But Buddhist influence is very clear in the first lines of his "farewell-poem" which he composed immediately before his execution: "From what cause do the four Great Elements 四大: mahābhūta arise? They are gathered and dispersed (again) without end . . . " In Buddhist texts the title of the Fu-tzu is invariably written 超子, with the "bamboo" radical instead of the "grass" radical. This is, however, no indication that another work is meant. In fact, we find the same reading in the bibliographical sections of the Sui-shu (ch. 34.2b), the Chiu T'ang-shu (ch. 27.3a) and the Hsin T'ang-shu (ch. 49.3a), as well as in TCTC 107.1266a. In all bibliographies the Fu-tzu is included in the section of the "Taoist philosophers".

125 Quoted in Hsiao tao lun, KHMC IX 152.1.13, in Fa-lin's P'o hsieh lun ch. I, T 2109 p. 478.3.6 (= KHMC XI 161.3.3) and by Tao-hsüan in KHMC I 98.2.27; cf. also Fa-yüan chu-lin LV 705.3.

126 The oldest Chinese account of the story of Sūmādha is to be found in the first chapter of the late second century Hsiu hsing pen-ch'i ching 希精本起經 (T 184, Kyōtō ed. p. 224B2 sqq.). For an extensive bibliography on this subject see Lamotte, Traité, vol. I, p. 248, n. 2.


128 CSTCC V 39.1.15; also mentioned as a forgery in T 2146, Fa-ching's Chung-ching mu-lu, ch. II, p. 126.3.30 and in T 2147, ch. IV, p. 173.3.4.

129 T 2146, ch. II, p. 126.3.19, also mentioned in T 2147, ch. IV, p. 173.2.20.

130 In the present canon we find two early versions of this sūtra: (A) T 534, Yüeh-kuang t'ung-tzu ching 月光童子經, the translation of which is unanimously ascribed to Dharmanaraka; this text does not contain the prediction of Yüeh-kuang's future life in China; (B) T 535, the Shen-jih ching 申日經, a somewhat condensed (or not yet developed) version of the same sūtra, which in the Taishō edition of the canon is attributed to Dharmanaraka just like the preceding work, but which, according to an anonymous colophon at the end of the scripture, would actually have been translated by Chih Ch'ien. The latter attribution may be correct: firstly, because it is highly improbable that Dharmanaraka translated the same sūtra twice, and secondly, because the earliest catalogues all mention a Yüeh-ming t'ung-tzu ching 月明童子經 (clearly a variant title of the same sūtra) translated by Chih Ch'ien (CSTCC II 6.3.26; T 2146 ch. I p. 115.3.22 etc.). The text of T 535 contains, moreover, a translator's (or editor's) note to the name of the crownprince (transcribed
ever, here we have certainly to do with a typically Chinese version of this legend, ch. XX, p. 669.3.6; in T 21 57 (Fa-ching’s attribution.

It is not necessarily a Chinese invention: the country of theUnnamedQUI.

tribes which is given in this stitra: 慈義, 鳥長, 繰莊, 疏勒, 大宛, 子塚, 及諸老康安秋

For a detailed discussion of the different early versions of the Shen-jih ching see Hayashiya Tomojirō (林尾友次郎), *Iyaku kyōrui no kenkyū* (異譯經變的研究, Tōkyō 1945, ch. VIII (p. 410-435).

131 T 535, p. 819.2.1.

132 T 545, ch. II, p. 849.2.20.

133 The Ch‘ing-ching fa-hsing ching in one ch‘uan is mentioned by Seng-yu among the “anonymous translations” in *CSTCC* IV 29.1.21; the same qualification in Ta-T‘ang nei-tien lu ch. I, T 2149, p. 225.3.14 and in Ku-chin i-ching t‘u-chi 古今譯經圖紀 ch. I, T 2151 p. 351.1.4. It is classed among the “suspected scriptures” in T 2146 (Fa-ching’s Chung-ching mu-lu) ch. II p. 126.2.17; id. in T 2147 (Yen Ts‘ung’s Chung-ching mu-lu) ch. IV, p. 172.3.8; T 2154 (K’ai-yüan shih-chiao lu) ch. I, p. 485.1.21 and ch. XX, p. 669.3.6; in T 2157 (Chen-yüan hsin-ting shih-chiao mu-lu 貞元新定釋教目錄) ch. XXVIII, p. 1015.3.20 with the remark 記記孔老顏回事, etc. The only catalogue in which the work is attributed to a translator is T 2153 (Ta-Chou k‘anting chung-ching mu-lu) ch. VII, p. 411.1.14: here the sūtra is said to have been translated by Dharmarakṣa, for which information the compilers of the catalogue refer to a mysterious bibliography entitled Ta-yü-lo lu 迪贊多羅録 (“the Catalogue of Dha[r]mottara?”). This catalogue is only known from T 2153, where it is quoted or referred to a few times; no further information is given about the date of its composition or about the author. Of course we should not attach any value to this attribution.

134 *CSTCC* IV 29.1.21.

135 *KHMC* XXIV 279.3.6: 是以闔里儒童闔禮經於洙澳，苦縣迦葉遷妙道於流沙

136 T 1331 ch. VI, p. 512.2.4: 閒浮界內有震旦國，我連三聖，在中化道，人民慈愛，義義具足


138 *CSTCC* V 39.1.21; T 2146 (Fa-ching’s Chung-ching mu-lu ) ch. IV 138.3.25.

139 Quoted in *Po Ku tao-shih I-hsia lun* 敦顧道士夷夏論 by Hui-t‘ung 慧 (var. 慧) 道 (late fifth century); *HMC* VII 45.3.9.

140 但貴賢行西路，Samantabhadra (善賢) is, as far as I know, not credited with any missionary activities in the West; on the contrary, he is commonly associated with the Eastern quarter.

141 Read 等 instead of 業.

142 Jung-hua lun 蒙華論 by Seng-min 僧敏 (late fifth cent.), *HMC* VII 47.2.11.

143 Quoted in Tao-an’s *Erh-chiao lun*, *KHMC* VIII 140.1.6. A different version of the same “sūtra” is quoted by the T‘ien-t’ai master Chih I 智顗 (547-606) in the...
first chapter of his Wei-mo-ching hsüan-shu (written in 604): here the Bodhisattva Candraprabha 月光 is identified with Yen Hui, the Bodhisattva Kuang-ching 光淨 with Confucius, and Kāśyapa with Lao-tzu (T 1777 p. 523.1.16).

144 Quoted in Hsi san-p’o lun 斋三破論 by Seng-shun 僧順 (late fifth century), HMC VIII 53.3.1.

145 Quoted in Fa-lin’s P’o hsieh lun, T 2109 p. 478.3.8. I have been unable to find any bibliographical data concerning this Nei-tien t’ien-ti ching.

146 Quoted in Fa-lin’s P’o hsieh lun, T 2109 p. 477.3.22 (= KHMC XI 162.2.17 and Fa-yüan chu-lin LV 706.1). I have not found any further information concerning the Lao-tzu ta-ch’üan p’u-sa ching.

147 The text of this edict, which does not occur in the Annals of the Liang-shu, is reproduced in KHMC IV 112.1.27: She shih Li-Lao tao fa-chao 侍事李老討法詔.

148 Quoted in Tao-an’s Erh-chiao lun, KHMC VIII 140.1.18. The Hsü-mi ssu-yü ching is mentioned among the “forgeries” in Fa-ching’s Chung-ching mu-lu (T 2146 ch. II, p. 127.1.10) with the remark that this work, together with twenty-two other “sūtras”, had been concocted by “the King of Ching-ling, Hsiao Tzu-liang” 侯子良. Hsiao Tzu-liang was the second son of emperor Wu of the Southern Ch’i dynasty (483-494); he lived from 460-494 and was a great lover and patron of literature and a devout Buddhist, cf. his biography in Nan-Ch’i shu 40.1 and Nan-shih 43.9. The Hsü-mi ssu-yü ching is furthermore mentioned in T 2147 (Yen-tsung’s Chung-ching mu-lu) ch. XV p. 472.2.28; T 2154 (K’ai-yüan shih-chiao lu) ch. XVIII p. 675.3.24; T 2157 (Chen-yüan hsin-ting shih-chiao mu-lu) ch. XXVIII p. 1020.1.13 and 1022.1.10.

149 Quoted in Fa-lin’s Pien cheng lun T 2110 p. 521.2.2 (= KHMC XIII 181.1.7). Cf. also the Tsao-li t’ien-ti ching (above, note 62) quoted in the Wei-mo-ching hsüan-shu (ch. I, T 1777 p. 523.1.14) by Chih-i 崔頣 (604 AD): 聲意肇鬱 佛頂示號載八正道於未化之喧。

150 Quoted in Fa-lin’s Pien cheng lun, T 2110 p. 521.2.2 (= KHMC XIII 181.1.7). Cf. also the Tsao-li t’ien-ti ching (above, note 62) quoted in the Wei-mo-ching hsüan-shu (ch. I, T 1777 p. 523.1.14) by Chih-i 崔頣 (604 AD): 聲意肇鬱 佛頂示號載八正道於未化之喧。

151 Cf. Mochizuki, Bukkyō daijiten p. 528.2.

152 Cf. Sukhāvatīvyūha (larger version) 34, trsl. F. Max Müller p. 52; T 360.

NOTES

154 *Pien cheng lun* ch. V, T 2110 p. 521.2.3.
156 ib. p. 477.3.5.
157 Hao-ming shan 山 (var. 山) was the name of a mountain some two hundred li from Ch’engtu (Ssuch’uan); according to tradition Chang Ling had lived there in order to ‘study the Way’. Cf. Fukui Kôjun, *op.cit.*, p. 16.
159 I do not know the identity of the masters Han P’ing-tzu and Chien P’ing-tzu, Wu Shih 武王子 is certainly a mistake for Yü 夏 (or Kan 范) Shih 孙 (or Chi 季) the Taoist master who is mostly called Yü Chi, the founder of the T’ai-p’ing tao 太平道 branch of the early Taoist church (first half second cent. AD); for the many variant ways of writing his name see Fukui Kôjun, *op.cit.*, p. 63.
160 Read 夏 instead of 武王子.
161 Quoted in *Hsiao tao lun*, *KHMC* IX, 147.3.15.
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I. INDEX OF CHINESE NAMES AND TERMS

Arabic figures refer to the pages of the text, Roman figures to the chapters, and Arabic figures preceded by Roman ones to the notes (e.g. III.115 = note 115 to ch. III). In names of monks the “religious surname” Shih has been omitted.

a-ch'i-li (ācārya) 32.
A-han k'ou-chich II.69.
A-mi-t'o ching 50.
A-tu (“that one”) III.256.
A-yu wang chuan 70, 277; V.163.
A, Han emperor — 24.
An, Chin emperor — 86, 113, 156, 158, 211, 238, 252; IV.178.
An (ethnikon) 281.
An Ch'ing, see An Shih-kao.
An Fa-ch'in 70, 277; V.163.
An Fa-hsien (?Dharmabhadra) 55.
An fa-shih chuan IV.97.
An ho-shang chuan IV.97.
An-hsi (Parthia) 32.
An Hsiian 23, 32, 34, 53.
An-lo ssu (at Chien-k'ang) 150.
An pan chieh 54.
An Shih-kao 23, 30, 32-34, 47, 53, 54, 139, 186, 208; II. 82, 85.
An-yang (SukhBvati) 128.

Ch'a-mo-chieh ching 170; App. III.71.
Chai Jung 27-28; II.56.
Chan Chi 29; II.58.
ch'an, see dhvāna.
Chang family, rulers of Liang-chou 58.
Chang Chan 274-275.
Chang Ch'ang (early 4th cent.) III.4.
Chang Ch'ang (early 5th cent.) 232.
Chang Ch'ien 20-21, 22, 251, 320.
Chang Chin 51.
Chang Ch'üan 219, 244.
Chang Fu 76-77.
Chang Heng 29.
Chang Hua IV.58.
Chang Jung VI.63.
Chang Kuang 77.
Chang Lien 35.
Chang Ling 290, 319-320; VI.4.
Chang Lu 290; VI.34.
Chang Pien 282.
Chang T'ien-hsi 198.

Chang Yeh 219, 244; IV.121, 291; App. IV.2, 6, 19, 84, 128, 131.
Chang Yen 21.
Chang Yen-yüan 105; III.115, 261.
Chang Yin 188.
Chang Yü 206.
fall of — (311 and 316 AD) 84;
— captured by Liu Yü (418 AD) 157.
Ch'ang-kan ssu (at Chienk'ang) 150, 279.
Ch'ang-sha ssu (at Chiang-ling) 190, 199, 279.
Chao, king — of Chou 273, 286-287;
— of Yen 276.
Chao Cheng 135, 203, 296; III.339.
Chao I III.48.
Chao-lun I.69; III.88, 218.
Ch'ao-jiikt-(ming) san-mei ching 68.
Ch'ao-hsien 271.
che-fu (“russet garments”) VI.49.
chen-kuan V.104.
Chen-kuan kung-ssu hua-shih III.116.
Chen Luan 296, 302, 305.
Ch'en Hui 36, 53, 54.
Ch'en-liu 59, 63, 79, 116.
Ch'eng, Chin emperor — 86, 96, 104, 106, 160; III.119.
Ch'eng-chü (kuang-ming ting-i) ching 170, 171; App. III.73.
ch'eng-lu p'an (“dew receiver”) 28, 188, 278; II.50.
Ch'engtu 21, 282.
chi (“traces”) 91, 133, 266.
chi-chiu (“liberation”) 35; II.91; VI.34.
Chi-chüan 78.
books discovered at — 275, 286.
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Chi Hsien-lin 275.
Chi-ku lu VI.31.
Chi Sang 84.
Chi-se, see “Matter as Such”.
Chi-se yu-hsian lun 134.
Chi sha-men pu-ying pai su teng-shih 15.
Chi-tsang 138; II.182; III.311.
Chi-kuang ssu (in the Shan mts.) 143; III.157.
Chi-i-lu 151.
Chi-i-chieh (“Seven Summaries”) IV.79.
Chia, Chia empresse — 58.
Chia clan IV.122.
Chia-hsiang ssu (at Jo-yeh shan) 144.
Chia-tun (“noble retirement”) 138.
Chiang Kuan 94.
Chiang-liang-lou-chih 71; II.258.
Chiang-ling 113, 114, 148, 156, 180, 188, 190, 199, 207, 209, 218, 279; IV.180.
Chiang T'ung 307; III.1.
Chi'iang people 82.
Chiao-chou, Chiao-chih 13, 23, 36, 43, 51-52, 71, 141.
Chiao-tao 196.
Chieh people 82, 84, 85, 111, 181, 185.
Chieh Chi IV.141.
Chieh-mo (Karmavacanā) 56.
Ch'ieh-wu chuang 140.
Chien-ching ssu (at Chienk'ang) 153; III.380.
Chien-chu ssu (at Chien-k'ang) 52, 278.
Chien-fu ssu (at Chienk'ang) 109.
Chien-k'ang (before 317 named Chien-yeh, q.v.) 59, 65, 74, 85, 102, 103, 104.
Chien-k'ang shih-lu III.158.
Chien Ping-tzu 320.
Chien-t'o-lo 278.
Chien-yeh 24, 36, 43, 45, 46, 48, 51, 52, 59; re-named Chien-k'ang 59.
Ch'ien-k'ou shan 185.
Ch'tien-mu (“old lady”) III.379.
Ch'i (“crude material”) 47.
Chih (ethnikon) 65, 189, 281.
Chih-ch'eng ssu (at Chien-k'ang ?) III.380.
Chih Chiang-liang-ch'ien 71; II.258.
Chih Ch'ien (Chih Yüeh, Chih Kung-ming) 23, 24, 36, 47, 48-51, 54, 55, 61, 65, 74, 76, 116, 146, 272; II.125, 136, 138, 141, 162; III.81; IV.130.
Chih Fa-hu 65.
Chih Fa-lang 62.
Chih fa-shih chuan III.154.
Chih Hsiao-lung 78-79, 98; II.205, 210.
Chih huo lun 13.
Chih kuaï 20.
Chih Kung-ming, see Chih Ch'ien.
Chih Liang 32, 36, 48, 76.
Chih Lou-chia-ch'ien, see (?) Lokakṣema.
Chih Min-tu 99-102, 103, 123, 126, 195; III.78, 80, 87, 88.
Chih T'an-chiang 185.
Chih T'an-ti IV.140.
Chih T'an-tun III.77.
Chih T'an-yüeh 144, 151.
Chih Tun works of — III.213, 248, 249, 316; IV.177.
Chih Tun chuan III.152, 154, 212.
Chih Tun pieh-chuan III.151, 154.
Chih Yao 32; App. III.73.
Chih-yen IV.168.
Chih-yüan ssu (at Chienk'ang) 213; IV.168.
Chih Yüeh, see Chih Ch'ien.
Chin-chung ching-pu 151.
Chin-hsing IV.82.
Chin Mi-ti 266; V.85.
Chin-shih ts'a-lu 294, 302, 316; II.164; V.163.
Chin-shu 71, 201, 276 and notes, passim.
Chin yang-ch'iu 109, 135.
Ch'in Ching-hsien, see Ching Lu.
Ch'in Hsi-t'ien App. III.2.
Ch'in-lun 51.
Ch'in Shih-huang-ti 20, 21, 269, 270.
Ch'in-shu (by Chü P'in) III.339; IV.31, 56.
Ch'in-shu (by P'ei Ching-jen) VI.124.
Ching-chien (mun) V.7.
Ching-chou 113, 148, 243.
Ching-chou chi II.71.
Ching-chüeh, see Niya.
Ching-hsien 27.
Ching Lu 24-25.
Ching-lun tu-lu 99.
Ching Lü, Ching Ni, see Ching Lu.
Ching-t'u (sect) 219.
Ch'ing-ching fa-hsing ching 313, 314, 316, 317; VI.133.
Ch'ing-miao (Mäyä) 301; VI.68.
Ch'ing-t'an 75, 76, 78, 87, 93-95, 99, 102, 103, 116, 117-119, 130, 132, 134, 141, 150, 190, 211; III.11, 45, 46; IV.58.
Ch'ing-yüan ssu (at Chienk'ang) 110.
Chiu-ch'üan 59, 67, 68.
Ch'iu-ch'ung shan 49.
Cho Ch'ien 7, 8, 200.
Cho-yang palace 37.
Chou, Duke of — identified with Buddhist saints 133, 252, 267, 317-318.
Chou Ch'eng 206.
Chou Hsü-chih 17, 217, 218, 231, 244.
Chou I III.98.
Chou-li V.191.
Chou-shu i-chi 273, 286-287.
Chou Sung (Chou Chung-chih) 15; III.363.
Chu (ethnikon) 65, 68, 98, 189, 281.
Chu Chiang-yen 47, 48, 55.
Chu-ch’ien (India?) 311.
Chu Fa-ch’i 138, 185; III.288.
Chu Fa-ch’i II.210.
Chu Fa-ch’ung 143-144.
Chu Fa-hsing 111.288.
(Chu) Fa-i (disciple of Chu Shih-hsing) 63.
Chu Fa-i (disciple of Chu Tao-ch’ien) 99, 151.
Chu Fa-k’uang 7, 144, 150, 151, 181, 184, 186, 188, 190, 191, 197, 207; III.266, 338; IV.62, 151; VI.124.
Chu Fa-wen, see Chu Fa-yun.
Chu Fa-ya 8, 12, 181; II.204.
Chu Fa-yen 146, 150.
Chu Fa-yu 183.
Chu Fo-nien 202.
Chu Fo-shuo, see Chu Shuo-fo.
Chu Fo-t’ai 182, 185; IV.6.
Chu Fu 14.
Chu Hao 14.
Chu Hsü 190, 198.
Chu Li 69.
Chu Lü-yen, see Chu Chiang-yen.
Chu Po-k’un I.40.
Chu Seng-fa III.380.
Chu Seng-fu (master at Chienk’ang) 147-148, 191; III.335, 352.
Chu Seng-fu (disciple of Fo-t’u-teng) 185, 199.
Chu Seng-lang 185, 207; IV.26, 27.
Chu Seng-tu 6, 7.
Chu Shih-hsing 61-63, 141; II.183, 191, 198; so-called Han Catalogue ascribed to — II.2.
Chu-shu chi-nien 272, 274, 286-287.
Chu Shu-lan 23, 63, 64, 78, 98; II.279, 282.
Chu Shuo-fo 32, 35.
Chu Ta-li 32, 36.
(Chu) Tan-kuo 32, 36.
Chu Tan-yu 146, 150.
Chu Tao-hu 48.
Chu Tao-i 144, 145, 149.
Chu Tao-lin 145.
Chu Tao-sheng 149, 281; App. IV.125.
Chu Te-ch’eng 68.
Chu Wen-sheng 68.
Chu Yu-ts’eng 286.
Ch’u clan 86, 107, 110, 149.
Ch’u, empress — 107, 109-110, 112, 151, 153.
Ch’u, ephemeral — dynasties founded by — Huan Hsüan 110, 156.
Ch’u-chi 299-300, 301.
Ch’u Hsia 107, 160, 250.
Ch’u P’ou 107, 109, 110.
Ch’u san-tsang chi chi 10, 308.
ch’uan-tu 50.
ch’uan-i (“transmitted”, preliminary translation) 31.
Chuang, king — of Chou 271-272.
Chuang-tzu commentary (by Hsiang Hsiu/Kuo Hsiang) 87, 90-92, 119, 129.
Chuang-tzu yin-i 129.
Chuang-wang pieh-chuan 272.
Ch’un-ch’i 272.
chung-cheng 44, 93.
Chung-ching mu-lu (by Fa-ch’ing) 77, 308; IV.237.
Chung-hsin (cheng-hsing) ching 55.
Chung-hsing shu III.266.
Chung-hsing ssu (at Chienk’ang) III.119.
Chung Hui 87; III.10.
Chung-kuan lun-shu III.311.
Chung pen-ch’i ching 36; II.99, 212.
Chung-shan 64; II.204; IV.20; king of — 64; II.206.
Chung-ssu (at Hsiang-kuo and at Yeh) IV.8.
ch’ung-yu (“those who exalt being”) 90.
Ch’ung-yu lun III.25.
Chü Pin III.339; IV.31, 56.
chü-shih, see “Retirement”.
Chü An-yüan 150; III.356.
chü’an-chü(-che), donors 31.
Chü’an 201.
Chüeh Kung-tse III.245.
Erh-chiao lun 272.
Fa-an 210.
Fa-ch’ang IV.6.
Fa-ch’eng (3rd cent. AD) 67, 68.
Fa-ch’eng (early 5th cent. AD) 158.
Fa-ch’en 140.
Fa-ching 246.
Fa-ching ching 34, 53, 54.
Fa-chü ching 47, 55, 170.
Fa-ho 185, 186, 202; IV.154.
Fa-hsien 62, 105, 152, 224; III.377; IV.230; V.203; VI.69.
Fa-hsing lun 249.
Fa-hu, see Dharmarākṣa.
Fa-hua i-shu 144.
Fa-hua san-mei ching 71.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fa-hua tsung-yao</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa-i</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa-jao</td>
<td>IV.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa-li</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa-lin</td>
<td>104, 110, 150, 291, 296; V.7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa-lun</td>
<td>10, 13, 72, 134, 136, 213, 226, 308; III.168, 213, 342; IV.62, 237, 240.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa-mieh-chin ching</td>
<td>V.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa-ming</td>
<td>V.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa-shih</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa-shou</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa-t'ai ssu (in the Shan mts.)</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa-tao</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa-tz'u</td>
<td>V.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa-wei</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa-yü (at Chiang-ling)</td>
<td>199, 241; IV.51.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa-yü (at P'u-pan)</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa-yüan tsya-yüan yian-shih chi</td>
<td>308; III.375.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan Hsuan</td>
<td>11, 12, 19, 188, 193, 197, 204; II.182, 206, 210; IV.64.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan Ning</td>
<td>11, 12, 19, 188, 193, 197, 204; II.182, 206, 210; IV.64.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan T'ai</td>
<td>App. IV.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fang-kuang ching</td>
<td>63-65, 70, 77, 78, 79, 101, 131, 139, 147, 149, 191, 192, 193, 197, 204; II.182, 206, 210; IV.64.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen</td>
<td>90-92, 234; III.28, 45.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen-t'o-li (Pundarika)</td>
<td>299, 300, 301.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fung fa yao</td>
<td>17, 127, 132, 135, 137, 164-176; III.279.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feng Huai</td>
<td>107, 119, 129, 160.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feng-su t'ung-i</td>
<td>VI.31, 49.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fo-po ching</td>
<td>315.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fo-shuo kuo-wang wu-jen ching</td>
<td>275.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fo-ssu (&quot;Buddha-monastery&quot;, at Loyang)</td>
<td>32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai</td>
<td>302, 303.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fo-tsu t'ung-chi</td>
<td>II.129; IV.161, 188, 204.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fo-t'u-teng</td>
<td>67, 114, 121, 146, 148, 181-183, 278; II.206.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—'s disciples</td>
<td>184-185; II.272.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fo-yung ming (by Hui-yüan)</td>
<td>224, 225, 242-243; IV.228; App. IV.26, 27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— (by Hsieh Ling-yün)</td>
<td>225; IV.228; App. IV.125.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— (by Yen Yen-nien)</td>
<td>IV.236.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fu Chia</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fu Chien</td>
<td>111, 112, 114, 146, 188, 197, 198, 200-202, 264, 276; IV.27; V.27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fu-chou shan</td>
<td>200.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fu Hsi</td>
<td>293, 318-319.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fu I</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fu Lang</td>
<td>276, 313; VI.124.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fu-nan</td>
<td>45, 51, 57.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fu Pi</td>
<td>198, 201.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fu T'ao</td>
<td>IV.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fu-tzu</td>
<td>276, 313; VI.124.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fung Yu-lan/Bodde</td>
<td>D. III.12, 15, 18, 26, 85, 194, 214, 311; IV.66; VI.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hai lung-wang ching</td>
<td>241; App. IV.22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han-ch'i ssu (at Wu-ch'ang)</td>
<td>243, 279.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han fa-pen nei-chuan</td>
<td>22, 63, 273; II.23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han Lin</td>
<td>36.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han-ju (ascribed to Chu Shih-hsing)</td>
<td>II.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han-men (&quot;cold home&quot;)</td>
<td>6, 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han O</td>
<td>272.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han P'ing-tzu</td>
<td>320.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han Po</td>
<td>89; III.335.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han-shu</td>
<td>15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— (i-wen chih)</td>
<td>195.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han-shu yin-i</td>
<td>21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han-wu ku-shih</td>
<td>II.15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heng-shan</td>
<td>185, 206, 207.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho, Chin empress</td>
<td>109.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho Ch'ing-ch'un</td>
<td>II.1; III.12, 46, 307.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho Ch'ing-ch'un</td>
<td>15, 265, 270, 305; V.42, 79.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho-chien, king of — (Ssu-ma Yung)</td>
<td>76.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho Chun</td>
<td>109.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho Ch'en-hsi</td>
<td>111.164.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho-hou ssu (at Chienk'ang)</td>
<td>109.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho-hui chia</td>
<td>II.164.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho-lien po-po</td>
<td>157.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho Mo</td>
<td>143.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho-nan (vandamam)</td>
<td>App. IV.83.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho Shang-chih</td>
<td>264; V.70.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho Wu-chi</td>
<td>16, 252; App. IV.121; V.42.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho Yen</td>
<td>46, 87, 89, 95; III.10; V.41, 71.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hou (Hou) Cheng-jo</td>
<td>66.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hou-Han chi, description of Buddhism in —</td>
<td>137; II.47.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hou-Han shu (by Fan Yeh)</td>
<td>20, 25, 37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hou-Han shu (by Hsieh Ch'eng)</td>
<td>272; II.216.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hou Wai-lu</td>
<td>111.11, 12, 20, 26, 28, 34, 40, 46, 48, 60, 248.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsi clan, Buddhism and Taoism in the —</td>
<td>135.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsi Ch'ao</td>
<td>17, 112, 113, 120, 121, 122, 127, 130, 134-135, 137, 143, 145, 148, 150, 188, 190; III.153, 154, 269, 316; works of — III.279.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsi-ching fu</td>
<td>29.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsi Chü-hsi</td>
<td>113, 135.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsi-chung chuan (of the Wei-lüeh)</td>
<td>291, 292, 295; VI.25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsi-chung lun</td>
<td>307; III.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsi K'ang</td>
<td>87, 90; III.27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsi-lin ssu (on Mt. Lu)</td>
<td>199, 210, 217; App. IV.23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsi Shao</td>
<td>III.266.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsi-sheng ching</td>
<td>311-312, 313; VI-110.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Hsi-ssu ("Western Monastery", at K'uai-chi) 134; III.159.
Hsi T'an 109, 135.
Hsi Ts'o-ch'ih 72, 105, 189, 190, 315, 317; IV.48, 58.
Hsi wang-mu 289.
Hsi Yin 109, 135, 136.
Hsi-yü chih (by Tao-an) 224.
Hsi-yü chuan (of Han-shu and Hou-Han shu) 40.
Hsi-yü chuan (= Hsi-jung chuan?) 291, 292, 295-296, 297; VI.25.
Hsia-p'ei 27, 28, 144.
Hsian-chiao (pratirūpa-dharma) App. IV.11.
Hsia T'an 109, 135.
Hsia-ching 30, 281; App. IV 98; V.191.
Hsia-kao:seng chuan 273.
Hsiao Ch'i 276.
Hsiao-ch'ing 30, 281; App. IV 98; V.191.
Hsiao Kung-ch'uan 111.10.
Hsiao Mu-chih 261.
Hsiao Nung-ch'iu shan 144.
Hsiao Tzu-liang VI.149.
Hsiao-wu, Sung emperor — 261; V.27.
Hsiao-yao lun 129; III.248.
Hsiao-yao yu chapter of Chuang-tzu 119, 128-129; Chih Tun's commentary on the — 129; III.248, 249.
Hsieh clan 86, 112.
Hsieh An 86, 94, 112, 116, 117, 118, 121, 134, 141, 144, 189; III.152.
Hsieh Ch'ing 139.
Hsieh Fu 136-137, 139, 145; III.168, 282, 283; IV.222.
Hsieh Ho 105.
Hsieh I 112.
Hsieh Kuang 107, 160.
Hsieh K'un 79.
Hsieh Ling-yün 207, 215, 225, 252, 253; IV.228, 291; Buddhist works by —, App. IV.125, 129, 131; V.79.
Hsieh Shang 94, 95, 112.
Hsien-che te ching 170; App. III.74.
Hsien-pi 82, 83, 111, 157.
Hsien tsung lun 77.
Hsien-an 111, 131, 154.
Hsin-t'ing hill 151.
Hsin-wu i (theory of the non-existence of mind or conscious thought) 100-102, 139, 191, 207; III.87, 88, 342.
Hsin-yang 210.
Hsin-yeh 186.
Hsii Ch'ang 32; II.13.
Hsii Ch'ang ssu (at Loyang) 67.
Hsii-ch'u, king of — 21; II.13.
Hsii-hsing pen-ch'i ching 36, 50; II.53; App. III.151; V.117.
Hsien-chu (orya) 74, 82-83, 157.
Hsii Ch'ang 32; II.57.
Hsii-chu (orya) 32; II.57.
Hsii chi ku-ch'in fo-tao lun-heng II.23, 150.
Hsii Chin yang-ch'i u 136; III.262.
Hsii Hsün 117, 118, 130, 132, 134; III.158, 262.
Hsü Kan III.213.
Hsü kao-seng chuan 273.
Hsü Mai III.357.
Hsii-mi hsia-chung ching 313, 319.
Hsü-mi ssu-yü ching 313, 318; VI.149.
Hsü po-wu chih 292.
Hsü-p'u-t'i ("Subhūti", disciple of Fo-t'uteng) IV.6.
Hsü Yin IV.58.
Hsu Yung 153.
Hsüan-hsüeh ("Dark Learning") 13, 46, 66, 73, 77, 87-92, 93, 95, 100, 101, 114, 116, 124-126, 137, 146, 205, 206, 213, 267, 289; III.12.
Hsüan-miao nei-p'i'en 301, 303; VI.68, 70, 72.
Hsün-yang 156, 199, 208, 210, 215.
Hsü-ch'i (Tiger Brook) 211.
Hsü-ch'iu shan 144.
Hsü-hsien 37; VI.31.
Hsü-mu Fu-chih 79.
Hsü Shih 13; II.148.
Hsü To 273.
Hsü Ying-lin 13.
Hua-hu theory 37, 280, ch. VI passim.
Hua-hu ching 77, 293 sqq., passim; prohibition of the — 298; VI.19.
Hua-jen (māyākāra) 275.
Hua-lin pien-liieh App. V.3.
Hua-lin yün IV.29.
Hua-li 290.
Hua-nan tsu II.30.
Huan (māyā) 275.
Huan Ch'ien 232.
Huan clan 86, 98, 110, 113, 213; III.145.
Huan, Han emperor — 26, 293; VI.31.
Huan Hsüan 15, 16, 17, 72, 86, 94, 107, 110, 147, 148, 153, 154-157, 205, 211, 212, 213, 214-215, 231-238, 249-251, 252, 256, 259, 260, 261, 265, 305; III.145, 342, IV. 177; App. IV.84; V.27.
Huan-hua tsung 144.
Huan Huo 148, 190; III.340; IV.60.
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Huan I (early 4th cent.) 79, 98, 104, 110.
Huan I (died ca. 392) 209, 241; App. IV.24.
Huan Ying (var. Hao) 98; III.71, 145.
Huang-fu Mi 21, 292.
Huang-hsing ssu (at Ch‘enk‘ang) 26, 27, 37, 53, 289; II.42.
Huang-lao (chiin) 26, 27, 37, 53, 289; I.42.
Huang-ti 269, 289; App. III.135.
Hui, Chin emperor - 67, 76.
Hui-chan (nun) 109.
Hui-ch'ang 197; IV.82.
Hui-chiao 10, 138.
Hui-ch‘ih 8, 199, 206, 207, 210-211, 213, 240; IV.151.
Hui-i 282.
Hui-jui 6, 184, 203; II.56, 198, 245; App. IV.125.
Hui-kuan 11.245; App. IV.125.
Hui-li 104, 149-150.
Hui-lin 15; III.385.
Hui-ming 316.
Hui-pao 245.
Hui-pao ssu (at Wu-ch‘ang) 11.129.
Hui-pien IV.82.
Hui-shao 282.
Hui-she (charitable settlements) 254.
Hui-shen (“abandoning the body”, religious suicide) 282.
I, the historiographer — 270.
I (theory, exegesis) 100, 116, 123, 137, 142-143, 191-192, 207, 214.
I (“untrammeled”, “free and unconventional”) 138.
I-ch‘ing (“Book of Changes”) 9, 12, 46, 88-89, 90, 95, 149, 178, 213, 214, 230, 245; V.104.
I-ch‘ing (Buddhist author) II.53.
I-ch‘u shih-erh men ching 167.
I-hsia lun 310; VI.70, 72.
i’p‘u-sai (upasaka) 27, 29.
i-she (charitable settlements) 254.
i-shen (“abandoning the body”, religious suicide) 282.
I-yüan 56.

Jan Keng 169; App. III.62.
Jan Min 184; IV.19.
Jen pen yü sheng ching 186;
Tao-an’s commentary on the — IV.33.
Jen-wu (shih-i) lun 99; III.77.
Jih-nan 51.
Jo-yeh shan 144-145.
ju-i 245; App. IV.59.
ju-i pao App. IV.59.
Juan Chan 78.
Juan Chi 79, 90; III.27.
Juan Fang 79.
Juan Fu 79, 94.
Juan Hsiao-hsü 151-152.
Juan K’an 253.
Juan Pao 199.
Juan Yü 109, 118.
Jung-hua lun VI.142.

K‘ai-yüan shih-chiao lu 30, 66, 68, 70.
K’an-ch‘uan palace 21.
K’an Tse II.150.
K‘ang (ethnikon) 102, 189, 281.
K‘ang Ch‘u 32, 36.
K‘ang Fa-ch‘ang 99, 102, 106.
K‘ang Fa-lang 141; II.204.
K‘ang Fa-shih 138-139.
K‘ang Hsin 138.
K‘ang Meng-hsian 23, 32, 36, 50.
K‘ang Seng-hui 23, 36, 43, 47, 48, 51-55, 61, 74, 278, 283, 284-285; II.149, 150; IV.222.
K‘ang Seng-k‘ai (? Sanghavarmman) 55, 56.
Kao Heng App. III.98.
Kao-li, see Koguryó.
Kao-seng chuan (by Hui-chiao) 10, 138, 201, 209-210, 276, 293-294, and notes, passim.
Kao-seng chuan (by P‘ei Tzu-yeh) 294.
Kao-shih chuan 292; III.289.
Kao-tso (“High Seat”) 103, 209, 210; II.212.
Kao-tso chuan III.95.
Kao-tso pieh-chuan III.95, 98.
Keng-sheng lun 16, 135-136.
Ko, Master — 47; II.119.
Ko-hsien shan 143.
Ko Hung 56-57, 87, III.11; IV.133; VI.70.
ko-i 12, 184, 187; App. IV.18.
k‘ou-chieh (oral explanations) 31.
k‘ou-shou (oral translation) 31.
Ku(-ching) lu 20.
Ku-hua p‘in-lu 105.
Ku Huan 301, 305.
Ku K‘ai-chih 94, 132; III.261.
Ku-shu 155, 214, 231, 250.
K‘uai-chi 26, 94, 106, 116, 117, 134, 158; IV.133.
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Kuan fo san-mei (hai) ching 224-225.
Kuan-hsi fo hsing-hsiang ching II.53.
Kuan-ssu (at Hsiang-kuo) IV.8.
Kuan-ting ching 316-317; III.99.
Kuan Yieh-kuang pu'-sa chü 315.
Kuang-ching, Bodhisattva — 314, 315, 317.
Kuang-chou 71, 243.
Kuang hung-ming chi 13, 20.
Kuang I 79.
Kuang-ling 27-28, 112.
Kuang-shuo p'in 300, 301.
Kuang-t'ing (chapel at Lu-shan) 208.
K'un (father of Yu) 169.
K'un-lun, Mt. — App. IV. 57.
K'un-ming, lake of 20.
Kung, Chin emperor — 86, 158.
Kung-t'ing (chapel at Lu-shan) 208.
K'ung An-kuo IV.258.
K'ung-ch'i so-wen ching 313, 317; VI.145.
K'ung-ch'iieh wang tsa shen-chu 111.99.
K'ung Jung 56.
K'ung Kuo 232.
K'ung Shun-chih 143.
Kuo Hsiang 46, 73, 79, 87, 90, 102, 123, 125, 129, 136.
Kuo P'u 94, 271; III.57, 262.
Kuo-tzu chien (academy for young noblemen) 57.

(Luo) Tzu-pi 35.

Lan-t'iao (translator?) II.119.
Lan-t'ing chi hsü 119; III.189.
Lang-yeh 26, 36, 154.
Lao Kan II.30, 40, 148.
Lao-mu ching 54.
Lao-tzu ch. VI, passim.
identified with Mahákâśyapa 269, 297, 312-318.
Lao-tzu hsü 306.
Lao-tzu hua-hu ching, see Hua-hu ching.
Lao-tzu i-wen fan-hsün 136.
Lao-tzu ming 293; VI.31.
Lao-tzu sheng-hsiian ching 320.
Lao-tzü ta-ch'üan pu'-sa ching 313, 317.
Lao-tzu tsan 134.
Lei Tz'u-tsung 17, 217, 218, 231, 244, 252-253.
Li ("principles") 88, 90, 125-126.
Li-chi 231, 265; App. III.27; App. IV.115; V.103.
Li Chi-p'ing III.150.
Li huo lun, see Mou-tzu.
Li Miao V.169.
Li-tai ming-hua chi III.115, 261.
Li-tai san-pao chi 20, 24, 55, 66, 68, 70.
Li T'ung 294.
Liang Ch'i-ch'ao 13, 20, 26; II.1, 61, 62.
Liang-chou (Kansu), sûtras from — 67;
II.232;
the Kuang-tsan ching at — 70, 197;
other scriptures from — 196-197;
— conquered by Fu Chien 198;
Kumârajiva at — 226.
Lieh-hsien chuan 21, 291.
Liao-pen sheng-ssu ching 54.
Lieh-tzu 274-276; App. III.156.
Lin-chang 182.
Lin-i (Champa) 45, 51, 57.
Lin-lü 116.
Lin-tzu 278.
Ling, Han emperor — 23, 48.
Ling-chiu shan 208.
Ling-chiu ssu (in the Shan mts.) 141.
Ling-tsung (nun) 151.
Ling-yün ssu (on Mt. Lu) 210.
Liu Ch'eng-chih 217, 219, 221, 244, 311; III.88.
Liu Chin 94.
Liu Chün 21; III.47.
Liu Hsi-chih 129.
Liu Hsiang 21, 291; IV.79.
Liu Hsieh VI.63.
Liu Hsin IV.79.
Liu I-ch'ing 294; III.47.
Liu K'e-an III.393.
Liu I-min, see Liu Ch'eng-chih.
Liu Lao-chih 155.
Liu Pei 43.
Liu Sa-ho 279; V.176.
Liu Ta-chieh III.46.
Liu Tou 150.
Liu Tsun 215.
Liu Ts'ung 84.
Liu-tzu chi-ch'ing 14, 53, 54.
Liu Wei 96.
Liu Yao 84-85; II.206.
Liu Ying 26-27; 32, 277.
Liu Yu 28.
Liu Yü 86, 155, 156, 157-158, 215, 216; App. IV.121.
Liu Yüan 58, 83-84.
Liu Yüan-chen 77-78, 98.
Liu Yüan-mou 78.
Liu Yüeh II.206.
Lo Chen-yü II.180.
Lo Han 16, 135-136.
Lo-hsien hall 105.
Lo Pi 286.
Loyang, Buddhism at — 22, 28-36, 57, 59,
66, 67, 68, 69, 78, 114, 141, 181, 255, 262;
fall of — (311 AD) 84, 85;
— recaptured (356 AD) 111-112;
— captured by Liu Yü (418 AD) 157.
Lo-yang ch'ieh-lan chi V.8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lou-fan</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu Ch'en</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu Ch'eng, see Fa-lun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu Chih</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu Hsün (early 5th cent.)</td>
<td>155, 157, 215, 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu Hsün (20th cent.)</td>
<td>V.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu-hun</td>
<td>185-186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu Ku</td>
<td>215, 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu Pi</td>
<td>II.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu-shan</td>
<td>114, 116, 128, 180, 199, 200, 207-208, 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu-shun chi (by Hui-yüan)</td>
<td>208; App. IV.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu-shun chi (by Ch'en Shun-yü)</td>
<td>IV.188, 190, 195, 198, 200, 202, 204; App. IV.130, 131, 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu-shun fu</td>
<td>IV.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu-shih</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu Te-ming</td>
<td>II.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu-yeh ssu (at Chienk'ang)</td>
<td>III.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu Yin</td>
<td>IV.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lun shu</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lun-yü</td>
<td>90, 99, 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung-ch'üan vihāra (on Mt. Lu)</td>
<td>209, 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung-kuang ssu (at Chienk'ang)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung-yüan ssu (at Ch'engtu)</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lü Kuang</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lü Po-ch'iang</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mao-tun</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>men-fa, see Great Families</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meng Fu</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meng I</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi (commentator)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi-li</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi-ti (king of Turfan)</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miao (for Māyā)</td>
<td>VI.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miao-yin (nun)</td>
<td>153-154, 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni-eh huo lun</td>
<td>VI.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min-ch'i</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ming, Han emperor</td>
<td>22, 27, 31, 49, 320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ming, Ch'in emperor</td>
<td>86, 95, 96, 97, 98, 104-105, 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ming, emperor — of the Toba Wei</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ming (“obscured, effaced”)</td>
<td>91, 92, 143, 174, 175; III.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ming-chiao (“doctrine of names”)</td>
<td>86-87, 90, 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ming fo lun</td>
<td>15, 20, 143, 219, 268, 270, 271; II.18; III.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ming-hsiang chi</td>
<td>105; II.135, 195, 198, 204, 205, 279; III.245, 253, 295, 310; V.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ming-kan (nun)</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ming-kuang ju-t'ung (Bodhisattva)</td>
<td>302, 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ming pao-ying lun</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ming-seng chuan</td>
<td>10, 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ming-te sha-men t'i-mu</td>
<td>132; III.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ming-te sha-men tsan</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ming-wei hua-hu ching</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo-ho-ch'a-t'ou ching</td>
<td>II.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mo-yu (“final being”)</td>
<td>87, 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mou-hsien</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mou-tzu</td>
<td>12, 13-15, 52, 130, 261, 264, 266, 284, 285, II.259; VI.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu, Ch'in emperor</td>
<td>86, 96, 109, 149; III.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu, duke — of Ch'in</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu, king — of Chou</td>
<td>273, 275, 276, 286-287; V.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mu, see “characterization(s)”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu-jung clan</td>
<td>111, 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu-jung Ch'ui</td>
<td>IV.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu-hsü, country of</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu t'ien-tzu chuan</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan-ching ssu-chi</td>
<td>III.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan-hai (Canton)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nan-wu (namah)</td>
<td>164, 301; App. III.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni-huan ching</td>
<td>169, 171, 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieh Ch'eng-yüan</td>
<td>68, 69; II.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieh Tao-ch'en</td>
<td>66, 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nü-chi shan</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nü Kua</td>
<td>318-319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-meï shan</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ou-yang Chien</td>
<td>III.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ou-yang Hsiu</td>
<td>VI.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pai-ching (Suddhodana)</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pai-hei lun</td>
<td>V.53, 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pai-ma ssu (at Loyang)</td>
<td>22, 31-32, 69; II.71; — (at Chienk'ang) 107, 119, 129; — (at Hsiang-yang) 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pai-shih shen-chün stela</td>
<td>II.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan Ch'a'o</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan-chou san-mei ching</td>
<td>32, 35, 39, 220-221, 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan Yung</td>
<td>25-26; VI.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P'an, empress</td>
<td>II.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P'an-chü shan</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P'an-yü (Canton)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pao-ch'ang</td>
<td>10, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pao) chi-hsiang, Bodhisattva</td>
<td>318, 319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pao-p'ü tzu</td>
<td>56-57, 87, 207, III.11; IV.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pao) ying-sheng, Bodhisattva</td>
<td>318, 319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pei-shan lu</td>
<td>VI.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P'e Ch'i III.152, 254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P'e Ching-jen</td>
<td>VI.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P'e Hsiao-yüan</td>
<td>III.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P'e Sung-chi</td>
<td>24, 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P'e Wei III.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen-ch'i ching, see T'ai-tzu jui-ying pen-ch'i ching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pen-wu (“fundamental non-being”)</td>
<td>46, 87, 92, 137-138, 191-192; IV.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pen-wu i-tsung (“variant school of fundamental non-being”)</td>
<td>137-138, 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pen-wu tsung (“school of fundamental non-being”)</td>
<td>191-192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen-yeh ching</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P'eng-ch'eng 26-28, 29, 32, 109, 277.
P'eng-tsu 289.
pi-ch'iu (bhikṣu) 32.
Pi-ch'iu-ni chuan 10, 105.
Pi-ko ssu-pu shu mu-lu 151-152.
Pi-mo, or P'i-mo (monastery at Khotan) 303.
Pi-shou 31, 69, 202.
Pi Ying-chih 244.
P'i Yeh 36.
Pien Fan-chih 155, 238.
Pien Hu 94, 96, 104; III.349.
Pien Shao 293; VI.31.
Pien Ssu-chih 238, 257.
Pien-tao fun 57.
Po (ethnikon) 281.
Po Fa-ch'iao 11,204.
Po Fa-chu 70, 76, 183, 196; 11.233.
Po Fa-tso 8, 76, 77; 11.263, 272; IV.19.
Po Fa-tsu, see Po Yuan.
Po Seng-kuang 145-146; 111.331.
Po Tao-yu 144, 145.
Po Yen IV.82.
P'o hsieh fun 296.
pu "hordes") 83.
Pu Shang 270.
P'u (surname) 111.
P'u-pan 63, 280, 282.
P'u-sa ssu (at Loyang) II.71.
P'u-yao ching 67, 174; II.223, 311; App. III.113.

Sa-t'an-fen-t'o-li ching II.246.
San fu tu lun App. IV.73.
San-fu ku-shih 20.
san-kung stela II.91.
San-kuo chih 24, 27, 49, 71.
San-lun school 131.
San-pao lun 16; App. IV.47.
San-p'o lun VI.63.
sang-men (śramaṇa) 27, 29.
Seng-chen 243.
Seng-chi 9, 221-222.
Seng-chi (nun) 110; III.139.
Seng-ch'i chieh-pen 56.
Seng-chien IV.153.
Seng-ch'ing 282.
Seng-i III.159.
Seng-lü IV.137.
Seng-lüeh 8, 9.
Seng-tao 158.
Seng-yu 10, 13, 55, 66, 68, 99, 184, 308; III.375.
Seng-yü 282.
Sha-lü (= Sāriputra ?) 292; VI.24, 25.
sha-men (śramaṇa) 32.
Shi-men pu-ching wang-che lun 15, 231, 237, 238-239, 250-252, 310; App. III.34.
Shi-men t'an-fu lun 16.
sha-mi (śramaṇera) 32; II.88.
Sha-mi shih-hui II.88.
Shan-chien lu p'i-p'o-sha V.164.
Shan-hai ching 271.
Shan-men hsian-i 139.
Shan-shan (Lop nor) 57-58.
Shan Tao-k'ai 182, 185.
Shan-yin 117, 143, 145.
Shang-ming ssu (at Chiang-ling) 199, 209, 241.
She-mo-t'eng, see Kāśyapa Mātāṅga.
shen ("soul", "spirit") 11, 12, 73, 136, 143, 144, 147, 148, 222, 234, 238-239, 244; III.87, 335; IV.62.
Shen erh-ti lun 144.
Shen-hsien chuan VI.70.
Shen-jih ching 315; VI.130.
Shen Nung 293.
Shen-tu (India) V.132.
Shen wu hsing lun 148, 149, 191; III.337.
Shen Yüeh IV.168.
Shih (Śākya) as a religious surname 189, 281; IV.9; V.196.
Shih, Vincent Y. C. VI.5.
Shih-ch'eng shan 141, 143, 146; III.157.
Shih-ch'i 25, 290.
Shih-chia fang-chih V.7.
Shih-ching 9, 231.
Shih Ch'ung App. IV.59.
Shih-erh men ching 48, 170, 186; App. III.51.
"separate version of the —" 167; App. III.51.
Shih-erh yu ching 71.
Shih-erh yu ching (apocryphal —) 313, 319.
Shih-fa chi-i 186.
shih-han tsung ("school of stored impressions of consciousness") 142-143; III.314.
shih-hsiang (bhūtalakṣaṇa) App. IV.17.
Shih Hsieh 51.
Shih Hu 85, 111, 146, 181, 182, 183, 184, 259-260, 264, 265, 278; II.206, 269; V.27.
Shih-i chi 276; App. IV.59.
Shih-i lun (by Tai K'uei) 17; III.45; IV.197; — (by Ts'ao Chih) 56-57.
Shih-li-fang 20.
Shih Lo 84, 85, 146, 181, 182, 183.
Shih-lo (Silā?) 276.
Shih-pa hsien chuan 217; IV.188.
Shih-po lun 157, 262, 264; V.42.
Shih-shih yao-lan App. IV.59.
Shih-shuo hsin-yü 21, 71, 93-95; III.47, 154.
Shih-ssu yin-hsien hsü App. IV.125.
Shih Tsun IV.29.
Shih-t'o-p'an-ni IV.113.
shou-i (used for samādhi) II.104; VI.96.

Shou-leng-yen san-mei ching, see Sūrāngamasādhisūtra.

Shou-yang Mts. 300.

shu (numerical categories, “numbers”) 12, 88, 131, 139, 184, 186, 204; III.283, 335.

Shu (Ssuch’uan) 43.

shu-shu (“arts”) 141.

Shui-nan ssu (at Ts’ang-yuan) 63.

Shui-pei ssu (at Ts’ang-yuan) 64.

Shun, Han emperor 38.

so-i (“that by which . . .”), peculiar use of 91, 125.

so-i chi (“that by which the traces are made”) 89, 133; III.34.

ssu (monastery) 38-39.

Ssuch’uan, penetration of Buddhism into — 185, 186, 211; IV.154.

SSU-fen li (harmanakavina) App. IV.59.

Ssu-ma Hung 105.

Ssu-ma I (1st half 3rd cent.) 44.

Ssu-ma I (mid. 4th cent.) 86, 109, 110, 121.

Ssu-ma Jui 59, 85.

Ssu-ma Pao 200.

Ssu-ma princes, war between the — 58, 67, 72, 83, 85.

Ssu-ma Tan 64.

Ssu-ma Tao-tzu 86, 112-113, 153, 154, 212.

Ssu-ma T’eng 83.

Ssu-ma Tsung 149.

Ssu-ma Yen 44.

Ssu-ma Yung 67, 76.

Ssu-ma Yü, see Chien-wen.

Ssu-pu cheng-wei 13.

Su Chün 96.

Su Yu 273.

Sui-hua chi-li 272.

Sun Ch’o 15, 77, 117, 122, 126, 130, 132-134, 140, 141, 284, 285; II.198; III.78, 248, 262; V.216.

Sun Ch’uan 43, 46, 49, 51, 52, 278; App. IV.59.

Sun En 113, 154-155.

Sun Fang 1.64.

Sun Hao 52, 278.

Sun Ho 49; App. IV.59.

Sun I-jang 13.

Sun Liang 49, 50.

Sun Lin 52.

Sun Sheng 16, 95, 109, 135-136.

Sun T’ai 154.

Sun Teng 49.

Sun Yü-t’ang II.40.

ta (non-conformism, eccentricity) 78-79.

Ta chih-tu lun 65, 212, 225, 227, 249; II.182; App. III.26, 27, 30, 31; IV.242; App. IV.95; Hui-yüan’s summary of the — App. IV.97.

Ta Chuang lun III.27.

ta hung-lu (ch’ing) 38.

Ta k’ung-ch’ueh wang shen-chu III.99.

Ta ming-tu ching 54, 61, 65; II.140.

Ta-sheng ta i-chang 226-229; I.41; II.245; IV.241.

Ta-T’ang nei-tien lu 24.

Ta-yü-t’o-lo lu (“Catalogue of Dharma-totara”) VI.133.

T’a-ssu chi III.95.

Tai (Hsien-pi state of —) 198.

Tai K’uei 17, 122, 136, 316; III.45, 269, 282; IV.197.

Tai Yen 94.

t’ai-chi 88.

t’ai-hsiieh (“great seminar”) 45, 57, 206, 240.

T’ai-i ping ching 38; II.106.

T’ai-i ping yü-lan App. V.3.

Tai-shan 185, 207; IV.27.

T’ai-tzu jui-ying pen-ch’i ching 13, 50, 171, 174, 272, 309, 310; App. III.151; V.117; VI.54, 68, 71.

T’ai-wu, emperor — of the Toba Wei V.27

T’ai-yüan ch’i-chii chu 111.366.

Tan-yang 27, 104.

T’an-ch’i ssu (at Hsiang-yang) 188, 206.

Tan-chieh 6, 7, 8, 200.

Tan-erh 149.

Tan-erh I 9, 199, 241; I.32.

Tan-i (disciple of Chu Fa-t’ai) 148-149; III.88.

Tan-i (disciple of Tao-an) 199, 240, 279.

T’ang Ch’ang-ju 111.2, 12, 46, 48, 169.

T’ang-i 150.


Tao-an (4th cent.) 8, 9, 10, 12, 30, 48, 53, 55, 64, 66, 67, 68, 70, 72, 99, 103, 105, 114, 128, 146, 147, 148, 151, 180, 181, 183, 184-204, 205, 206, 207, 224, 225, 240, 241, 246, 276, 281, 308; II.181; III.830; App. III.51, 73; IV.129.

Tao-an (6th cent.) 272.

Tao-ch’ang ssu (at Chien k’ang) 104-105.

Tao-cheng (clerical name of Chao Cheng, q.v.) 135, 203, 296.
Tao-chin III.269.
Tao-ch'iung (nun) III.362.
Tao-heng 6, 157, 262, 264; III.388; V.42.
Tao-heng (adherent of the hsin-wu theory) 148, 207; III.88, 388.
Tao-hsien lun 122, 132; III.248.
Tao-hsin 71.
Tao-hsing chih-kuei 134.
Tao-hsing (po-jo) ching 35, 61, 65, 79, 120, 147, 149; III.92, 182; App. III.41; IV.64.
Tao-i IV.151, 161.
Tao-i (nun) 210-211; IV.141.
Tao-jung 9.
Tao-jung (nun) 105.
Tao-kao V.169.
Tao-li 9, 200.
Tao-liu 231, 111.164.
Tao-pao (early 4th cent.) 7, 8, 97-98; V.196.
Tao-pao (early 5th cent.) 232.
Tao-shih Ch'ng Ling pieh-chuan 320.
Tao-sung 147, 191.
Tao-ti ching, see Yogiicirabhumi.
Tao-tsu 214, 231; III.164; IV.162, 176.
Tao-tz'u IV.152.
Tao-wang IV.154, 162.
Tao-wen 211.
T'ao Ch'ien (Later Han) 27.
T'ao Fan App. IV.13.
T'ao K'an 16, 243, 279; III.4; App. IV.23, 41.
Te-hu chang-che ching 315.
T'eng Han 190; IV.61.
Ti people 82.
t'ii ("substance") 87, 88, 92.
Tiao Hsieh 94, 96.
T'ien-lu pavilion 21.
t'ien-shih chiao ("doctrine of the Heavenly Master") 135.
T'ien-shui 77.
T'ien-t'ai school 69.
T'ien-tu (India) 271.
T'o-pa Kuei IV.27.
T'o-pa Wei 232.
T'sang-wu 13.
Ts'ang-yuan 63-64.
Ts'ai ku-lai neng-shu jen-ming 138.
Ts'ai Mo 105, 107.
Ts'ai Yung VI.31.
Ts'an p'u-sa lien-chhi fan-pai 51.
Ts'ao Chih 51, 56-57.
Ts'ao P'ei 43.
Ts'ao P'i 20.
Ts'ao Ts'ao 43, 44, 56, 290.
Tso-chuan 272, 286, 287; III.196.
Tso-yu ming ("Inscription to the Right of [the Teacher's Seat]") III.157.
Tsou Yen V.98.
Tsung-li chung-ching mu-lu 10, 30, 70, 195-196, 308; II.65.
Tsung Ping 15, 20, 21, 143, 217, 218-219, 244, 252-253, 263-264, 268-269, 269-271, 305; II.18; III.314; V.79.
tu-chiang, see "antagonist".
tu-hsi (chanting in chorus) 255.
Tu Pa V.27.
Tu Wen-lan App. IV.43.
T'u-shan 286.
Tun-chen (t'-lo so-wen ju-lai san-mei) ching 35, 54.
Tung-an ssu (at Chienk'ang) 120, 149, 211.
Tung Cho 36.
Tung-fang Shuo 20.
Tung-kuan 148.
Tung-kuan Han-chi II.47.
Tung-lin ssu (on Mt. Lu) 209, 210, 213, 239, 241, 280; App. IV.24.

Wa-kuan ssu (at Chienk'ang) 104, 109, 133, 140, 147, 148-149, 150, 158; III.261, 352, 375; IV.162.
Wan Wei-ta 8, 76.
Wang clan from Lang-yeh 85, 86, 95, 97, 106, 107, 135, 156, 212, 219.
Wang clan from T'ai-yuan 211; III.67.
Wang, empress — 151.
Wang Ch'en 199.
Wang Ch'i-chih 219, 224; IV.185, 204.
Wang Chia 276; App. IV.59.
Wang Ch'ia 116, 130, 134; III.266.
Wang Ch'iao-chih, see Wang Ch'i-chih.
Wang Hsieh 95.
Wang Hsiu 94, 117; III.159.
Wang Hsü 113.
Wang Hsün 211, 213; III.212; IV.151, 161.
Wang Hu-chih 117.
Wang Huan IV.168.
Wang Hui (first half 4th cent.) 144.
Wang Hui (early 5th cent.) IV.168.
Wang I 105.
Wang I-chih 119.
Wang I-t'ung I.5; III.60; IV.122.
Wang Kung 113, 151, 154, 213; IV.153.
Wang Kuo-wei 286; II.179, 180.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names and Terms</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wang Meng (early 4th cent.)</td>
<td>8, 95, 116, 118, 134; III.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Meng (collaborator of Fu Chien)</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Mi (confederate of Liu Yuan, early 4th cent.)</td>
<td>8, 95, 116, 118, 134; 111.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Mi (collaborator of Fu Chien)</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Mi (early fifth cent.)</td>
<td>16, 72, 113, 155, 156, 213-214, 231-236, 238, 245-246, 256; III.342; IV.161; letters of — to Kumārajiva IV.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Min</td>
<td>104, 213; IV.151, 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Mo</td>
<td>245; IV.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Mu</td>
<td>IV.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang-wu (shan)</td>
<td>185, 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weng (&quot;culture&quot;)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wen, king</td>
<td>— 266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wen-shih chuan</td>
<td>300, 302, 303; VI.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wen-shu-shih-li pan-mieh-p'an ching II.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wen-tzu (pseudo-)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wu (&quot;non-being&quot;)</td>
<td>73, 88-89, 90, 91-92, 139, 174, 175, 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu (dynasty)</td>
<td>43, 44-45; Buddhism in the state of — 46-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu, Chin emperor</td>
<td>— 57, 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu, Liang emperor</td>
<td>— 279, 317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu, Sung emperor</td>
<td>(= Liu Yü) 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu-ch'ang</td>
<td>46, 47, 96, 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu-chün</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu-wei (&quot;active&quot;, sanskrit)</td>
<td>193; App. III.118; IV.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu-hsien</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu-hsing</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu-i</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu-p' in</td>
<td>53, II.158-159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu Shih (= Yü Chi)</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu-shih lu</td>
<td>II.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu-shu</td>
<td>49, 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu-shu (pseudo —)</td>
<td>II.23, 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wu-wei (for nirvāna)</td>
<td>13, 37, 133, 174, 193; — (in hsüan-hsüeh) 73, 91, 92, 120, 121-122, 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang qian, supremacy of the —</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang Hsin</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang K'o III.269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang Lien-sheng</td>
<td>II.174, 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang Man</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang-shan</td>
<td>137-138, 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yao Hsiang</td>
<td>111, 112, 206, 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yao Hsing</td>
<td>146, 157, 212, 216, 226, 249; III.282; IV.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yao Hsu</td>
<td>280, 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yao Ming-ta</td>
<td>IV.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yao Sung</td>
<td>212, 226, 246, 249; App. IV.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeh</td>
<td>148, 181, 182, 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeh-chung chi</td>
<td>IV.9, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yen, state of —</td>
<td>111, 157, 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yen Chih-t'ui</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yen chin i lun</td>
<td>III.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yen Fo-tiao</td>
<td>34, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yen-hsing ssu (at Chienk'ang)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yen Hui</td>
<td>169; App. III.62; identified with Buddhist saints 309-318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yen Keng-wang</td>
<td>II.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yen K'o-ch'un</td>
<td>IV.121; VI.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yen-men</td>
<td>206, 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yen-shih chia-hsün</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yen Shih-ku</td>
<td>II.13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yen-t'ieh lun</td>
<td>App. III.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yen Yung-wen</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yin Hsin</td>
<td>95, 102, 110-111, 116, 118, 130-132, 206; III.45, 254, 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yin Hsi</td>
<td>290, 291, 294, 299-300, 302, 304, 311, 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yin Chung-k'an</td>
<td>113, 154, 213, 216, 230, 245, 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yin Chung-wen</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### II INDEX OF NAMES AND TERMS OTHER THAN CHINESE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Description</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abhāśvaradeva</td>
<td>319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhidharma</td>
<td>139, 202, 203-204, 230; IV.151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhidharmahṛdayaśāstra (?)</td>
<td>16, 203, 230, 246; App. IV. 47, 72.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhidharmakośa</td>
<td>II.140; App. III.21, 27, 33, 37, 43, 44, 151; App. IV.47; V.203; VI.153.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abhijñā</td>
<td>228; III.343: IV.62; VI.54.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy, see t'ai-hsiieh.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ācārya</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ackerman, W. B.</td>
<td>III.114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhīsthāna</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advisers, monks as — in secular matters</td>
<td>75, 201-202.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āgamas</td>
<td>47, 202, 204.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agaịñasutta</td>
<td>I.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajātāśatrukaukṛtyavinodana</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajātāśattu</td>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akanuma Chizen</td>
<td>II.69; VI.67.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aksaṇa, eight — V.67.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amitābha, Amitāyus</td>
<td>50, 128, 145, 194, 219-223, 244-245, 318, 319; III.245; App. IV.45.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“ananchoretes”</td>
<td>145-147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ananda</td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ānāpānasmṛti</td>
<td>33, 53; App. III.151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anātmya</td>
<td>100, 173; III.87.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchō</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āṇimitta</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“antagonist” (in debate, tu-chiang)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anti-clericalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anti-ritualism</td>
<td>78-79, 87, 90, 122.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anuruddha (“scratcher?”)</td>
<td>App. IV.59.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yū i lun</td>
<td>II.56, 198; IV.24.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yū Liang</td>
<td>86, 95, 96, 98, 99, 102, 104, 106; II.135; IV.47.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yū-lin</td>
<td>III.152, 154, 254.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yū tao lun</td>
<td>15, 130, 132-134, 284; III.306.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yū Tao-sui</td>
<td>140-141; II.135; III.306, 316.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yū Yūn-chih</td>
<td>110; III.92.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yūan, Chin emperor</td>
<td>85, 86, 95, 96, 97, 98, 104, 158; III.95.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yūn-ch‘i (“primeval ether”)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yūan-hua ssu (in the Shan mts.)</td>
<td>140, 141, 143.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yūan Hung</td>
<td>122, 137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yūan K‘o-chih</td>
<td>238, 257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yūan-shih hsien, inscription of —</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yūan Yüeh-chih</td>
<td>154, 238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yüeh Kuang</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yüeh-kuang t‘ung-tzu ching</td>
<td>VI.130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Yū Yu 266; V.84.

Yung (“function”) 87, 88, 89.

Yung-an ssu (at Chienk'ang) 109.

yung-chia era, troubles of the — 84.

Yū 169, 266.

Yū (ethnikon) 281.

Yū, Chin empress — 96.

Yu clan 86, 96, 106.

Yu Ai 79, 94.

Yū Ch'an 106.

Yū-chang 63, 102, 106, 206; App. IV.6.

Yu Chi 38; VI.159.

Yu Chung-yung 11.71.

Yu Fa-k'ai 110, 135, 140-143, 149; 111.138.

Yu Fa-lan 50, 140-141, 189; II.135; III. 316; IV.53.

Yu Fang-chih 110: 111.92.

Yu-hang mts. 116.

Yii hsiang kung-te ching 11.53.

Yu Huan 24, 56, 291.

Yū i 86, 96, 97.

Yu i lun II.56, 198; IV.24.

Yu Liang 86, 95, 96, 98, 99, 102, 104, 106; II.135; IV.47.

Yū-lin III.152, 154, 254.


Yū tao lun 15, 130, 132-134, 284; III.306.

Yū Tao-sui 140-141; II.135; III.306, 316.

Yū Yūn-chih 110; III.92.

Yūan, Chin emperor — 85, 86, 95, 96, 97, 98, 104, 158; III.95.

yüan-ch‘i (“primeval ether”) 88.

Yūan-hua ssu (in the Shan mts.) 140, 141, 143.

Yūan Hung 122, 137.

Yūan K‘o-chih 238, 257.

Yūan-shih hsien, inscription of — 35.

Yūan Yüeh-chih 154, 238.


Yüeh Kuang 78.

Yüeh-kuang t‘ung-tzu ching VI.130.
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Bagchi, P. C. 32; II.19, 74, 79, 258, 279.

bala, the five — 33.
Balazs, Et. 11.46, 47.
Bareau, A. II.168.

“bathing the Buddha” 28, 52, 182; II.53.
Beal, S. II.1, 63, 119.

“being” (yu) 88-89, 90, 92, 174, 175-176, 228.

Bhadrakalpavādāna 67.
Bhaiṣajyarāja 282.
bhājanaloka 319.

bhautika  186.

bhikṣu 32.
Bhikṣuṇī-prātimokṣa IV.82.

Bhāṣya 196, 225; App. III.157.
bhūrapattra 63.

bhūtakoṭi 193, 228, 270.

Biot, E. App. V.1.
bizarre, cult of the — 78-79, 103, 117.

bodhi (see also Enlightenment) 74, 142-143.

Bodhisattva, term — applied to monks and lay devotees 32;
— gnostic Wisdom of the, 100-101, 175-176;
— versus Arhat 228, 229.

“Bodhisattva protecting the Doctrine” App. IV.84.

“Bodhisattva with the Sealed Hand” 199; IV.89.

bons mots 93, 94, 102, 117, 190; III.47, 58.
Boodberg, P. A. II.30; III.3.

Book of Changes, see I-ching.
brahmacārya 254.
brahmavāhāra, four — 164, 170-171, 175; App. III.76.

bronce, as a gift for casting images etc. 158, 190, 210;
scarcity of — and building materials 261.
Buddha, the — as the embodiment of truth 130, 133;
— identified with Chinese sages 133; ch. V (passim);
ten epithets of the —, VI.63.
Buddha-vehicle (as taught in the Saddharma-pundarika) 69.

Buddhabhadra 212, 222, 224, 225; IV.184, 235; App. IV.71.
buddhānusmṛitti 214, 220, 221, 224, 225, 228;
— App. III.30; IV.161, 226, 227; App. IV.51.
Buddhasena 223.
Buddhayaśas 226; App. IV.71.

cakravartin 270, 310; V.117.
calligraphy practised by cultured monks 75, 138-139, 145, 211, 294.
Cambodia 45.

Candraprabha(-kumāra) 314, 315, 317.
Canton, see P'an-yü, Nan-hai, Kuang-chou.
capital punishment 121-122.
castes 9; I.30.
catalogues of Buddhist works, see “bibliography”.
causation, interdependent — (pratityasamutpāda) 123-124, 227, 228.
celibacy 281, 298, 304, 306.
Ceylon 152; III.375, 377, 378.

“change” (hua) versus truth (li) 125-126.
chanting sūtras before execution 151; III.363.

characterology 86, 93.
Chavannes, Ed. 24-25, 275, 292, 295; II.13, 30, 32, 35, 39, 47, 140, 150, 156, 157, 160, 178, 179, 180, 190; IV.73; App.IV.11; VI.17, 19, 21, 25, 45, 49.
cintāmani App. IV.59.
cities, as trade centres 40;
— as centres of Buddhism 59.
collective punishment 169.
commandments (five — ), see Rules
commentaries, earliest Chinese Buddhist 31 53, 54, 65, 136, 140, 143-144, 186, 187, 191, 194; II.159, 161, 162; IV.33, 64.
commiseration (karunā) 171.
compassion 120, 137.
Confucianism 45, 46, 87, 88, 137, 230-231, 234-235, 257, 267; V.78.
Confucius, new evaluation of — 90; III.24;
— identified with Buddhist saints 133, 252, 267, 269, 309-318;
— and the Western Sage 274-276.
conquest of the North, attempted by Yin Hao 110;
— by Huan Wen 110-111;
— by Liu Yü 157.
Conrady, A. II.180.
contemplation (of the body; of the impure) 33; App. III.70.
Conze, E. III.84; IV.227.

Coomaraswamy, A. K. App.IV.86.

cosmic justice, karman as — 92.
court Buddhism, at the capital of Wu 53, 74;
— under the Chin 61, 64, 98, 104-106, 110, 147-159, 189;
— under the Later Chao 61, 182-183;
— under the Former Ch'in 200-204;
— under the Later Ch'in 226;
— at Khotan 62.
covering sins, see nivarana.
Creel, H. G. VI.1.
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cultural superiority, feelings of — 264-266.

dāna 173.
Dāṅdaka mts. 300.
Dark Learning, see hsüan-hsiieh.
Daśabhūmikasūtra 196-197; II.233; App. III.157.
date of the Buddha’s birth and Nirvāṇa, speculations about — 271-274, 286-287.
degeneration, cosmic — 192, 319.
Demieville, P. II.19, 84, 221, 223, 242;
III.28, 138, 203, 230, 307; App. III.151;
IV.73, 74, 76, 77, 105, 206, 211, 226;
App. IV.95, 125.
devatānusmṛti App. III.31.
devotionalism 73, 109, 114, 127-128, 171-172, 180, 194-195, 200, 205.
dhārani 103, 146.
(? ) Dharmabhadra 55.
dharmadhātu App. IV.17.
*dharmadhātujākāya 227; App. III.157.
Dharmaguptakas, karmavācanā of the — 56;
canonical scriptures of the — II.168;
vinaya of the — App. IV.59.
Dharmakāla 55, 56.
dharmakāya 130, 143, 193, 214, 220, 225-229;
IV.227, 242.
Dharmamitra III.119.
Dharmanandin 202, 204, 246; App. IV.72.
Dharmapada 47, 48, 50, 55, 62; II.118, 119;
App. III.72.
(? ) Dharmaphala, see (Chu) T’an-kuo.
dharmarāja 277.
Dharmarākṣa 14, 23, 64, 65-70, 76, 98,
183, 196-197, 275; II.221; VI.130, 145.
Dharmaratna (late 4th cent.) 55; see also
Chu Fa-lan.
Dharmaruci 248; App. IV.89.
(? ) Dharmasatyā 55, 56.
Dharmaśiras 23; II.279.
dharma 101, 214, 225, 228, 270, 309;
App. IV.17.
Dharmatātā 223.
“dharma-wisdom” (fa-hui) vs. True Wisdom
193.
(?) Dharmayukta 55.
Dharmodaya 214; App. IV.72.
Dharmottara IV.114; App. IV.72.
dhīyāna 18, 33, 36, 53, 54, 127, 141, 145-146,
173, 174, 175, 180, 186, 187, 190, 200,
210, 219-223, 229, 246; App. III.116;
IV.64.
Dialecticians, school of — 46.
dialogue (in Buddhist treatises) 93;
in the Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa 132.
Dipām卡拉, Buddha — 313, 314.
dīrgharātra(m) 142.
“dissolution of the body” (shih-chieh) IV.12.
dīvyacakṣus 220.
dīvyārātra 220.
dream, apparition of the Buddha in a —
221, 222, 228.
Drumakinnarājāparipṛcchā 35, 54.
drunkenness, see wine.
Dubs, H. H. II.4, 13, 30, 69; VI.49.
durgātī App. III.39.
Duyvendak, J. J. L. App. III.98; V.17, 19.

Eastern Chin, establishment of the — 85;
periodization of the — 86;
restoration of the —, (404 AD) 86.
eccentricity as an ideal 78-79.
Eichhorn, W. III.47.
Ekottarāgama 204, 281.
elements, five — 88, 306, 308;
four great (mahābhūta) 138, 176, 227, 228;
IV.216, VI.124.
elephant(s), six-tusked — II.30.
“Emotions of the Saint”, ch’ing-t’an theme,
95; III.159.
emptiness (sānyatā) 35, 73, 100, 101-102,
123-124, 127, 134, 139, 173, 175-176,
191, 228;
the four kinds of — 174;
contemplation of — 174.
Enlightenment 74, 100, 142-143, 178; App.
IV.125.
equality, concept of — 73
equanimity, see ksanti.
etymological explanations of Sanskrit words
VI.63.
“evil practices” of monks 261-262, 283.
Evil Works, Ten — 166.
“exaltation of being” (ch’ung-yu) 90, 92,
102, 126.
execution, reciting scriptures or prayers
before — 151.
exegesis (i) 100, 116, 137, 142, 146.
exodus to the South (early fourth century)
59, 85.
exorcism 145-146, 150; III.331, 356; App.
IV.22.
expediency (upāya) 73, 90, 125, 132, 133,
139, 214, 266; V.32.
faith 73, 228, 235.
fasting 27, 75, 164-165; App. III.27.
fatalistic tendency in hsüan-hsiieh 92.
feelings, six —, see āyatana.
Feer, L. II.62.
Ferghana 57, 58.
filial piety (hsiao) and Buddhism 134, 281,
283-285; App. IV.98; V.191.
fire-ordeal 63.
fly-whisk, use of the — in ch’ing-t’an 95;
III.60; App. IV.59.
foreigners on Chinese soil, Buddhism among — 23-24, 72; colonies of foreigners 59; II.30; infiltration of — 82-83.

"forget fullness" (wang, chien-wang) 126, 174.

Former Chao (dynasty) 84.

Former Ch'in (dynasty) 111, 197-198.

formlessness of the "Spirit" 147.

function (yung) 87, 88, 89.

gati, five — 166, 167, 171.

Geiger, W. 111.378.

Gentry, use and definition of the term — 4-6.

Gernet, J. 261; I.2; V.9, 32, 37, 38.

Gitamitra 62, 67.

Godhika V.203.

Godzha V.203.

Good Works, Ten — 165-166, 174; App. III.32; — must be done in secret 168.

Granet, M. V.2; V1.70.

Great Dream (of existence) 142-143.

Great Families 5, 44, 57, 85-86, 156.

Grdhrakata 208.

Great Seminar, see t'ai-hsiieh.

Grube, W. 111.189.

guhyadharma II.245.

Gulik, R. H. van — J.1.

Gunabhadra 105, 122.

Hacksman, H. II.63; App. III.102.

Han Buddhism, earliest documents on — II.67.

Har Dayal VI.54.

Harlez, C. de — II.63.

Hatani Ryõtei II.1, 13, 185.

Hayashiya Tomojirô II.2, 19, 65, 95, 219, 220, 232; III.79.

Henning, W. B. III.5.

heritical teachers 174-175; App. III.108.

"heterodox cults", Buddhism identified with — 27, 52, 183; II.46.

hetupratyaya-sâmâgrî 123.

"hidden Saintliness", concept of — 90.

Hikata Ryusho III.84; App. IV.95.

Hinayâna, coexistence of — and Mahâyâna 34; — at Khotan 62; predominance of — at Kuchâ 62.

historical precedent used as pro-Buddhist argument 108, 133, 233, 235, 258.

Holzman, D. III.27, 169.

"hordes" (pu) 83.

Hulsewé, A. F. P. III.379; App. III.44; V.36, 199; VI.49, 51.

human relationships, the five sacred — 107-108.

Huns, see Hsiung-nu.

Hurvitz, L., 16, 238; I.40; II.11, 46, 173.

IV.121; App. IV.115; V.8, 54, 61; VI.105.

hymns, Buddhist —, see fan-pai.

icons, iconography, see images.

Illusion, School of phenomenal —, see huan-hua tsung.


immortality 73, 87, 136, 143, 230, 239.

Immortalists (Taoist —) 182, 289, IV.12.

immunity to fire of sacred objects 63, 243.

impermanence 11, 172-173; App. III.87, 96.

impersonality (fei-shen) 173.


Indo-China 26.

Indo-scythian, see Yüeh-chih.

ineffability, see words.

Inouye Ichii IV.121, 228.

interpreters 40, 103, II.112, 113; App. IV.85.

Itano Chôhachi I.40.

Itô Giken IV.75.

Jao Tsung-i VI.4, 96.

Japan, tribute from — III.378.

Jivaka 67, 141.

Jñânaprasthâna 203.

kalpa 11, 20, 229, 319.

Kaltenmark, M. VI.14, 15.

Kâma-mithyâçâra App. III.33.

Kapilavastu (chia-wei-lo-wei) II.99; — (wei-wei) VI.67.

Karlgren, B. VI.49.

karmadâna 144.


Kârnâvâcanâ 56; II.168.

kasâya, five — App. III.163.

Kashgar (Su-Le) 58, 62, 226.

Kashmir (Chi-pin) 66, 67, 202, 224, 246, 299, 300, 301, 302.

Kasuga Reichi 11.

Kâśyapa (the Elder — and the Bodhisattva —) 292, 297, 303; VI.115.

Kâśyapa (image of the Buddha —) 278.

Kâśyapa (of Lore)) 278.

Khotan 14, 57-58, 62-63, 66, 68, 303; II.185; App. IV.71.

kleśa 228.

Koguryô, monk from — 77, 116, 140; tribute from — III.378.
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ksānti 170, 173, 282.
Kuchā, Kucheans 57, 58, 65, 66, 68, 69, 76, 103, 226; II.241; App. IV.95.
Kumārabodhi 202.
Kumārajīva 12, 65, 66, 69, 72, 102, 114, 143, 146, 192, 193, 202, 205, 210, 212, 213-214, 225-227, 229, 230, 239, 246-249; II.245; III.159; 215, 258; IV.89, 238; App. IV.17, 84, 85, 89.
kundikā (“sprinkler bottle”) App. IV.86.
kudala-karmci App. IV.86.
lakṣana 178, 227.
Lakṣmi 318.
Lalitavisrara 67, 174; II.223, 311; App. III.113.
Lamotte, É. 11.140, 182; App. III.21, 26, 27, 37, 44, 157; IV.75, 228; App. IV.17, 95; V.120, 202; VI.71, 126.
Later Chao (dynasty) 85, 111, 181.
Later Ch'in (dynasty) 112, 156, 157.
laymen, lay devotees, cultured laymen 12, 38, 46, 68, 69, 194, 211-219.
Legalism, revived — 46, 87, 88.
Legge, J. App. V.1.
Legi, S. 292, II.32, 118, 124, 185, 186, 258; III.375, 378; App. III.27, 157; IV.73; App. IV.11; VI.21, 23.
Liefenthal, W. 15, 16, 17, 101; I 40, 60, 61, 69; II.56, 198; III.12, 85, 88, 214, 218; IV.24, 66, 121, 144, 204; App. IV.71; V.53, 60, 96, 100, 106.
Link, A. E. IV.3, 8, 14, 23, 28, 30, 32, 36, 44, 51, 95, 98, 100, 102, 103, 104, 112; App. IV.20.
literary education, characteristic of the gentry 4-5;
the monastery as a centre of — 9, 138;
lokadhātu 11.
lokānuvarthana 309.
lokottara 309.
Long Night (dirgharātra) 142.
Lop Nor 82.
Lotus sūtra, see Saddharmapundarika.
Love (maitri) 170-171.

“mad monk” 79.
madhyadeṣa 266; App. III.133.
Madhyamāgama 204, 211.
Mādhyamikā 65, 72, 100-101, 124, 142, 192, 212, 225, 228; III.35.
(?) Mahābala, see Chu Ta-li.
mahābhūta 138, 176.
Mahākāśyapa, see Kāśyapa.
Mahālikāpariprāchā 54.
Mahāmāyūri-vidyā-rājñī III.99.
Mahāparinirvānasūtra (Mahāyāna-) 105, 131, App. IV.91, 92; VI.115.
(?) Mahāprajāpāramitā-sūtra, see Ta chih-tu lun.
Mahāsāṅghikas, prātimokṣa formula of the — 56.
Mahāsāṃghikapārāśinta 318.
Mahāyāna Buddhism, coexistence of — and Hinayāna 34;
Lokākṣema credited with the introduction of — 35, 72;
at Khotan 62-63;
the classics of — in China 69-70;
Mahāyāna and hsüan-hsiêh 73.
Maitreya, cult of — 128, 185, 194-195, 199, 200; IV.75.
maitrī 170-171.
Malaya 26.
māṃsakāya App. III.157.
Mānava (Sumedha) 314-315, 317.
Māṇjuśrī II.18.
Margoulin, G. III.189.
Maspero, H. 13, 14, 20, 21, 22, 32, 33, 38-39, 55; II.19, 20, 21, 23, 42, 47, 54, 55, 57, 63, 104, 165, 179, 180, 190, 272;
App. III.2; IV.12, 19; App. IV.57; V.3, 5, 47, 82; VI.3, 34, 56.
Mather, R. App. IV.125.
Matsumoto Tokumyo 11.92, 279; III.84.
matter, see rūpa.
māyā (illusion) 142, 275.
Māyā (the Buddha's mother) 292; App. III.131; IV.68, 69.
māyākāra 275.
medical art and Buddhism 141, 145, 182, 262; III.138, 275, 307.
Meisōdenshō 11; III.298.
messianic notions 58, 308.
Milindapāñha 262-263; V.49.
mind, dangerous nature of the — 167.
all dharmas born from the — 172.
miracles, Buddhist — 22, 52, 53, 114, 145-147, 181, 182, 209, 241, 243-244, 278, 279, 280; III.253; V.190.
Miroku-nyorai kannōshō 11.
Miyagawa Hisayuki 11.
Mochizuki Shinkō II. 61, 109; III.99.
Mohism 46.
Moksala 62, 63, 70, 131, 191.
monastery, monastic life,
at Loyang 22;
at P'eng-ch'eng 28;
the Chinese term for — 38-39;
the — as a centre of secular learning 9, 74;
the — as a hiding-place 74, 259-261;
the — and metaphysical thought 126-127;
the — identified with "retirement" 6, 74, 97-98, 102-103, 143, 145, 216-217;
donation of private mansions to be made into — 32, 150, 188.

money, possession of — by monks 68, 139. moral objections against Buddhism 281-285 moralistic appreciation of Buddhism 137, 205.

Moriya Mitsuo III, 67. mountains, Buddhist masters and — 207-208. Müller, F. Max IV.211; App. IV.45, 57; VI.152.

Mus, P. VI.71.

mysteries (hsüan) 87, 89, 126, 136.

Nagarahara 224, 225, 242; IV.235.

Nägarjuna 101, 212, 225, 249; App. IV.95.

nagas 241, 242, 243; App. IV.22.

nirvāna 166-167; App. III.34.

Nieves (Ching-chüeh) 16, 74, 100, 133, 171, 174, 226, 227, 228, 238, 249, 252.

nīvaraṇa 166-167; App. III.34.

Nobili, J. IV.238.

nirvānākaśa 225, 309, IV.242.

nirodhasamipatti 229.

Nirvāna (see also wu-wei) 28, 52, 146, 183.

nuns 103, 109-110, 153-154, 159, 183, 210-211; III.253.

Ochō Enich i I.69; III.168.

Odes, see Shih-ching.

officials, monks requested or forced to become — 75, 77, 214, 250.


Old Text School 45.

omens, see portents.

ontological problems, interest in — 87.

Ono Gemyō II, 1, 11, 258; III.79.

original non-being, see pen-wu.


painting, Buddhist themes in — 75, 105-106 218, 225; III.261; IV.231.

pācaśīla 164; App. III.21.25.

Pañcavimśatisāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā 14, 61-65, 66, 101; II.182.

paramāṇu 228.

Paramārthaśāntatisa-vinirdeśa 67.

paramārthasatya 87, 142, 144.

pāramitā 100, 173-174; II.140; App. III.121

"worldly" — 174, 175.

parivāta 63, 64.

Parthia, Parthians 23, 25, 32, 33, 55, 70. "partisans of non-being" (kuei-wu) 90, 126.

Paths, Three — 166.

peasant revolts, see revolutionary movements Pelliot, P. 13, 14, 290, 292, 205; I. 38, 39, 46, 47; II.23, 33, 47, 54, 63, 141, 164, 165; IV.251; V.39, 59, 75, 163; VI.2, 21, 33, 45.

periodization of early Chinese Buddhism 72-73, 205.

permission of parents required for novices 283-284.

persecution of Buddhism 52.

physiognomy practised by monks 262.

Pindola 194; IV.73.

pilgrims, Buddhist travellers 59, 61-62, 65, 141, 229, 246; IV.82.

poetry, Buddhist themes in — III.262; App. IV.27.

political influence of the clergy 147, 153-154, 159, 201-202.

political "neutrality" of the monastic community 215-217.

popular Buddhism, scarcity of information on —, 3; glimpses of — 28, 52, 146, 183.

portents 52, 146, 150, 158; III.356; V.189, 190.

popular sayings and ditties used as — App. IV.43.

poverty (of monks), 7, 206, 240; (relative) "poverty" of gentry families 7, 74.

prajñā 73, 74, 100, 124, 173, 174, 213, 222-223.


— and hsiün-hsiüeh 73, 101, 114, 124-126, 137, 187, 190, 191, 193; II.182; III.84; IV.39, 64, 227.

prajñāpāta 101.

prākrit lingua franca in Central Asia II.190.

Prātimokṣa 56.

pratirūpaka-dharma App. IV.11.

pratyutpanna-buddha-saṁmukhāvasthitasamādhi 220.

Pratyutpannabuddha-saṁmukhāvasthitasamādhi-dhisūtra, see Pan-chou san-me i ching.

preaching, see sermons.

prognostication texts *(ch'an)* 27, 308; IV. 101.

Przyuluski, J. IV.228; V.163.

psalmists, see *fan-pai*.

Pulleyblank, E. G. I.4; App. III.66.

Pulleyblank, E. G. II.1.; App. IV.89.

punishment, the four — App. III.65;
the five — V.191;
the eight — V.191;
collective — App. III.66;
“abolition of —” V.69.

Punyatara 248; App. IV.89.

“purity” regarded as characteristic of Buddhism 37, 98, 120, 137, 205, 257; 1.250; as an ideological justification of the “retired life” 90.

Piima App. IV.81.

racial feelings, see nationalism.

rationalism in gentry Buddhism 73, 127, 229.

Ratnamudrghasta (Bodhisattva) IV.89.

rebirth 11, 12, 73, 92, 136, 166, 230, 234.

recluse life, see Retirement.

recollection 166, 167, 229.

reductio ad absurdum (prasariga) 100; IV. 244.

“refeudalization” of society 44.

Refuge, threefold — see trijarana.

registration of the clergy 17, 231, 260-261; IV.177.

relatives of the sinner, karman does not involve — 168-169.

relics of the Buddha 52, 150, 151, 188, 278, 279-280.

Remembrance(s), see anusmyti, buddhānusmyti.


retribution, see karman.

three kinds of — 244; App. IV.47.


ridicule, mocking remarks about Buddhism or Buddhist devotees 109, 118-119.


Rockhill, W. W. II.185; App. III.72.

Roman Orient *(Ta-ch'in)* 51.

Routors, R. des — II 107; VI.34.

Routes and trade centres 40.

Rules, five — for laymen 75, 105, 108, 120, 151, 153, 158, 164, 166, 175, 264; App. III.25;
partial observation of the — App. III.37.

Rules, monastic —, see vinaya.

rūpa 102, 123, 134, 138, 139, 166, 228.

rūpadhītu 186.

sacrifice(s), in Han Buddhism 26-27;
— to Lao-tzu and the Buddha in 166 AD 37, VI.31;
imitation of non-Buddhist sacrificial rites 55.

Sadāprarudita 223; IV.204,227.

Sadādharmapundarika 69, 70, 98, 99, 131, 141, 143-144, 145, 228, 282; II.245, 246;
III. 168; IV.211; V.101.

Sāgaramārgaṇa-japīṇicchā App. IV.22.

Saint, Saintliness *(sheng)* in hsiian-hsiieh 73, 87-88, 91-92, 125, 129-130, 266-267.

Sakaino Kōyō II.61, 92, 201, 205; IV.238;

Sākyamuni, the life of — as described by early Chinese authors 130;
Chih Tun’s eulogy on — 177-179.

samādhi 193, 194, 222, 223.

Samantabhadra VI.140.

Samantapāśadikā V.164.

Samarkand 84.

samatā (see also Equality) 74.

sambhogakāya IV.242.

samketa 101.

sanskrit, knowledge of — 2, 51, 69, 76, 78, 202, 203; I.1; II.107; App. IV.125; V.216.

sāntī 73.

Sārvādharma-bhūta-lakṣāṇa 101.

sārvādharmaśāntīyātā 100.

sārvajñātā 214.

sārvasattvapriyadarśana 282.

Sārvāstivādinīvaya 248; App. IV. 89.

Sārvāstivadīn school 202, 203, 230.

Sattāsaḥsārikā-prajñāpāramitā II.182.

secular historical works, Buddhism in —, 18, 269-271;
Buddhist bibliography patterned after — 195.
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secularization, compulsory — of monks 75, 77, 214, 250, 259-260, 265.

“selection” (sha-t’ai) of the saṅgha 214, 216, 231, 236-237, 250, 259-261; V.27.

self-characterization 99.

sensation, painful or pleasant — 166.

“Seven Sages of the Bamboo Grove” 78.


Shibata Norikatsu IV.19, 38.

Shiratori Kurakichi 11.13.

Shiishinoi 11; 11.298.

Jila 173.

skandha 33, 101, 102, 123, 166, 167, 175; App. 111.40, 41.

Silla 116.

Sūtra in 42 Sections” 14, 22, 29-30, 38, 50; II.62, 141; App. III.102; V.88.

surname, original — of priests, 7.

changing the — at ordination 65, 189, 281; II.86, 213; App. IV.9; V.197.

“Sūtra in 42 Sections” 14, 22, 29-30, 38, 50; II.62, 141; App. III.102; V.88.

svabhāva 100.

syncretism, consciously applied — 12-13, 134.

synoptic editions of Buddhist scriptures (ho-pen) 99-100; III.80, 81, 82, 83.

Takakusu Junjirō II.53.

talents and nature” (ts'ai-hsing) 95, 118; III.169.

Taoism, Taoist arts, Taoist masters 26-27; 33, 37, 38, 53, 56-57, 63, 73, 77, 87, 109, 113, 114, 135, 136, 142-143, 150, 154, 182, 192, 201, 207-208, 226; VI, passim; III. 275, 357; IV.12, 247; App. IV.57; V.47.


Tathāgatajñānamudrāsamādhi 54.

tathātā (“Suchness”) 74, 100, 125, 126, 191, 192-193, 228, 309; IV.67.

temple, see monastery.

termology, Taoist — in Buddhist translations, 33, 184.

misleading — of the early pp' scriptures in Chinese 101.

Terrien de Lacouperie II.1.

Territorial expansion, of Buddhism under the Later Han 40; — under the Western Chin 59-60; — under the Eastern Chin 82; — in the North 114-116.

thaumaturgy, see miracles.

Thomas, E. J. App. III.131.

thought-and-memory 166.

Three Saints, theory of the — going East 313-318.

Tibetans, (proto-) 82, 157, 199.

Tjan Tjo-e-som App. V.3.

Toba Wei, penetration of Buddhism in the state of — 114.

Tokiwa Wei, penetration of Buddhism in the state of — 114.

Tonsure 55, 118, 249, 256, 281, 283, 298,304.

transcription, the Buddhist “system” of — and its secular origin, 39-40.

translation instead of — 50.

“transforming influence” (hua) of the ruler 108;

— of the Buddha 133.

translators; translation teams 31,202-203;

importance of earliest — s 34;

problems of — 47, 203, II.138;

Chih Ch’ien’s — s 50, II.136, 138;

Dharmarakṣa’s — s 66, 69-70;

state-sponsored — projects 114, 201, 202-203;

sūnyatā (see also Emptiness) 73, 100-102, 134, 139, 191, 192, 228.

supernatural powers, see abhijñā.

sūrāngamasmādhisūtra 35, 36, 50, 63, 70, 76, 78, 99, 140, 197, 294; III.80, 82, 168.

Surataparipṛcchā 197.
— a predominantly Northern phenomenon 146;  
Kumārajiva’s — s 114;  
Tao-an’s rules for — 203.  
tribute and envoys 23, 24-25, 57-58, 59, 66, 152, 202; III.375, 378.  
trikāya 225.  
trīṣṭhasramahāsāhasralokadhitu V.100.  
trīṣaṇātra 164, 175; App. III.21.  
Turfan 193, 202.  
Tuṣita heaven 128, 194.  
dr transition of the twelve classes of scriptures 164, 284; V.216.  

Udānavarga, see Dharmapada.  
uḍumbara flowers 313; VI.120.  
Ugraddattaparipṛcchhā 34, 54, 283.  
Ui Hakuju App. III.51; IV.3, 29, 33, 34, 64.  
Unkri, W. A. 12.  
“unverifiable” tenets of Buddhism 234-235, 267-269.  
upamāna 142; III.312.  
upāsaka, archaic transcription of — 27;  
fancy explanation of the term — VI.63.  
upāsikā, rules for the — on fast-days 165;  
fancy explanation of the term — VI.63.  
upāya (see also Expediency) 73, 90, 125, 132, 133, 139, 214, 310.  
upāyakauśalya 309.  
uposatha (upavasatha, [up]posadhā), see fasting.  
utilitarian arguments against Buddhism 262-264.  
Utsunomiya Kiyoyoishi II.40; III.47.  
vagabonds, vagabondage.  
“vagrant people” (liu-min) 5, 259, 260-261.  
vaipulya 14, 61, 137; IV.42.  
Vairocana (monk from Kashmir named —) II.185.  
Vairocana (monk from Kashmir named —) II.185.  
Vaijñavīcikīraṇā-prajñāpāramitā App. IV.125.  
Vallée Poussin, L. de la — VI.55; see also Abhidharmakośa.  
vandana (ho-nan) App. IV.83.  
vāsanā 227, 228.  
Vasubhadra App. IV.73.  
vāyumandala 319.  
Vehicles, Three — 118, 140, 214, 229; III.168; IV.62.  
Vessantara-jātaka 14.  
Vibhāṣa 203.  
vidyā, three — III.343; VI.55.  
Vighna 47, 48, 50, 55.  
vihāra (ching-she) 76, 102-103, 208, 209; II.135, 204;  
— inside the imperial palace 151, 158.  
vijñāna 142.  
Vimalakīrti App. IV.89.  
vimokṣa 254.  
Vipaśyin 278.  
vīra 173, 174.  
visualization, of coloured images 33;  
of Maitreya 194;  
of Amitābha and other Buddhas 194, 214, 220, 221-222, 223; III.245; IV.227, 243; App. IV.51.  
vows 128, 182, 194, 217, 219-220, 244-245; IV.145.  
vākaraṇa 227-228.  
Walleser, M. II.182.  
Ware, J. R. II.2, 13, 15, 276; V.8.  
Whitaker, K. P. K. 56; II.169, 170.  
“White Lotus Society” (Pai-lien she) 219.  
Wieger, L. II.80.  
Wilbur, M. VI.49.  
Wilhelm, M. H. III.262, 263.  
words unable to express the highest truth 89-90, 132.  
worldly things, eight — 171.  
Wright, A. F. 10, 11, 181; II.204, 206, 272; III.213, 262, 269; IV.1, 6, 7, 8, 14, 17; App. IV.125; V. 176; VI.37.  
Yāma 294.  
Yarkand (So-chü) 62.  
Yellow Turbans 38, 43, 154, 235, 254-255, 292; II.42; VI.2.  
Yogacāra Buddhism 2.  
Yogācārabhūmi 54, 66, 186; App. III.151.  
Yoshikawa Kōjirō III.47.  
Yoshioka Yoshitoyo VI.46.  
Zach, E. von — II.58.