Australian National University

THESES SIS/LIBRARY
R.G. MENZIES LIBRARY BUILDING NO:2
THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY
CANBERRA ACT 0200 AUSTRALIA

TELEPHONE: +61 2 6125 4631
FACSIMILE: +61 2 6125 4063
EMAIL: library.theses@anu.edu.au

USE OF THESES

This copy is supplied for purposes of private study and research only. Passages from the thesis may not be copied or closely paraphrased without the written consent of the author.

THE AUSTRALIAN LIBRARY NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

NOT FOR LOAN

THE TRANSFORMATION OF BUDDHIST VINAYA IN CHINA

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

in the Australian National University

1982

by

Tso Sze-bong

This thesis is based on my own research carried out from 1977 to 1982 at the Australian National University.

Tso Sze-bong

28/5/82

ABSTRACT

The first chapter of this thesis discusses how the Chinese Monastic Order developed the Chinese Monastic Rule some two hundred years before the introduction of the Vinayas (rules of monastic discipline) of the different Indian Buddhist schools into China, and how the different sects of the Chinese Disciplinary School were established after the Vinayas were introduced.

The second chapter indicates the reasons why the Chinese Monastic Order originally in the Mahāyānist tradition should have adopted the Hīnayānist Vinaya to govern the conduct of the clerics. This chapter also discusses how the Buddhist disciplinarians, in interpreting the Indian developed Vinaya, fought a hopeless battle to make its rules acceptable in a Chinese milieu, and gives some examples of the enthusiastic clerics who faithfully observed the Vinaya rules.

The third chapter indicates the internal factors, such as the cultural conflict between Indian and Chinese traditions, the differing economic structure of the monastic establishments of the two countries, and the contempt felt by the Chinese Mahāyānists for the Hīnayānism, that lead the priests to stray from the Vinaya.

The fourth chapter outlines the external factors, such as the interference of the imperial government with the Monastic Order, the infiltration of unfaithful elements into the Order and the measures taken by the monastic establishments to meet the pressures of secular society, which encouraged the priests to stray from the Vinaya.

The last chapter discusses how Master Huai-hai of Ch'an Buddhism took the revolutionary course of abandoning the Vinaya which did not meet the needs of a Chinese environment, and establishing instead the 'Ch'ing-kuei (Pure Rule)' for monastic administration which was welcomed by the clerics and spread throughout the whole of China after the tenth century A.D.

THE TRANSFORMATION OF BUDDHIST VINAYA IN CHINA

CONTENTS

Preface		1
Chapter I	The Development of the Disciplinary School in China.	4
I.	The Disciplinary Pioneers Before the Vinayas were Introduced into China.	4
II.	The Development of the Sarvāstivādavinaya Sect.	18
III.	The Development of the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect.	30
IV.	The Other Vinayas in China.	41
	(A) The Mahāsāṅghikavinaya Sect.	41
	(B) The Mahīsāsakavinaya Sect.	43
	(C) The Samatapāsādika.	45
	(D) The Vinaya of the Kāśyapīya School.	45
	(E) The Disciplinary Scriptures of the Mūlasarvāstivāda School.	46
V.	The Rise and Fall of the Dharmaguptavinaya School.	52
Chapter II	Struggles for the Establishment and Maintenance of the Vinaya in Chinese Monastic Order.	118
I.	The Task of Interpreting the Vinaya.	118
II.	The Aspects of Practising the Vinaya Rules Recorded in the Three 'Biographies of Eminent Buddhist Monks'.	142
	(A) No Killing.	142
	(B) No Lying.	145
	(C) No Intoxicating Liquors	146

(D) Put on Robe in Indian Style. 148

(E) Use of Mats made from Fleece for Sitting or Lying. 149

(F) Do not Touch any kind of Money. 150

(G) Use no Bronze Bowl. 150

(H) Collecting Alms for Survival. To take One Meal at Noon and Vegetarianism. 152

(I) No Involvement in Military Affairs. 155

(J) No Trifling or Joking. 156

(K) No Expectorating in the Monastery. 157

(L) Practising the Summer Retreat. 158

(M) Use of the Jar for 'Clean Water'. 158

(N) Eat None of the Five Parivayayas. 159

(O) No Adultery. 160

Chapter III Buddhist Priests Who Strayed from the Vinaya---

Internal Factors. 193

I. The Conflict Between the Culture of India and China. 194

(A) The Relationship between Priest and Prince. 194

(B) The Problem of Taking One Meal a Day. 197

(C) The Problem of Begging for Survival. 198

(D) The Problem of Involvement in Physical Labours. 201

(E) The Different Ways of Making Donations. 205

II. The Influence of Chinese Tradition on Individual Priests. 205

III. The Economic Structure of the Monastic Order in China. 217

IV. The Mahāyānists' Contempt for Hīnayānism in China. 232

Chapter IV. Buddhist Priests Who Strayed from the Vinaya---

External Factors. 257

I. Unfaithful Elements Who Took Refuge in the Monastic Order. 257

II. Interference of the Imperial Government with the Monastic Order. 269

(A) The Appointment of Monastic Officials. 269

(B) The Direct Control of the Monastic Order by the T'ang Government. 272

(C) The Buddhist Priests Under the Control of Secular Law. 274

(D) The Direct Control of Monastic Ordination by the T'ang Government. 278

(E) Honouring Outstanding Priests as a Way of Imperial Control. 281

Chapter V. Revolution in the field of Monastic Discipline---

The Formation of the Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei and Its Popularity. 317

I. Master Huai-hai and the Earliest Aspect of His Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei 318

II. The Ch'ih-hsiu Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei and Preceding Versions. 325

III. The Differences and Agreements Between the Vinaya and the Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei. 330

IV. Monastic Administration Under the Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei. 336

(A) The Administrators of the Western Wing. 338

(B) The Administrators of the Eastern Wing. 340

(C) The Other Administrators. 342

Conclusion 372

Appendices:

Table I Buddhist Monks Who are Recorded in KSC, HKSC and SKSC; as Having (1) Begged for Survival. (2) Taken One Meal a day Before Noon and (3) Who were Vegetarians for their Entire Ordained Life. 383

Table II Kitchens in Monasteries and Shrines that are Recorded in HKSC and SKSC. 392

Table III The Labours of the Śrāmaṇera in the Chinese Monastic Order that are Recorded in the KSC, HKSC and SKSC. 398

Table IV Buddhist Monks Who Received a Good Education before Entering the Order as Recorded in the KSC, HKSC and SKSC. 401

Table V Buddhist Monks Who became Men of Secular Education after having Entered the Order Recorded in the KSC, HKSC and SKSC. 429

Table VI Monks Who Despised Wealth Recorded in the KSC, HKSC, and SKSC. 416

Table VII The Buddhist Transgressors and their Transgressions Recorded in the KSC, HKSC and SKSC. 421

Table VIII Agreements amongst the Rules in the Śīlas for Monks of the DRMGTV, SVSTVDV and MHSGKV. 429

Glossary 449

Abbreviation 485

Bibliography 486

Addendum to Chapter IV

III The Priests Gratified the Secular Society 285

(A) Ostentatiously Decorating the Monastery 285

(B) Opening the Monastery to the Society as a Place of Amusement 287

(C) Allowing Poor Intellectuals to live in the Monastery 288

(D) Allowing Females to Loiter around the Monastery 290

(E) Allowing the Laity to Hold Funerals in the Monastery 293

PREFACE

After the introduction of Indian Buddhism into China, cultural and social differences between the two countries caused conflicts. Faithful Buddhists of the dynastic periods, whether priests or laymen, had already overcome many difficulties in an endeavour to harmonise Buddhism with the traditional Chinese culture. The battle over the disciplinary code is a practical example. There were other battles over the acceptance of Buddhist doctrines, but the struggle over the disciplinary code concerned the survival of an Indian way of monastic life in a Chinese milieu.

This thesis traces the history of the progress, from the end of the 2nd century to the beginning of the 20th century A.D., in adapting the Buddhist Vinaya to a Chinese milieu. As I have never been a participant in monastic life, the result of my research may be reminiscent of the work of 18th century European pastoral poets. Even so, some of my discoveries in this thesis, I believe, could not have been made by a monk-scholar involved in the same sort of research.

Since the beginning of 1977 I have become indebted to some of my friends and colleagues for both academic and financial assistance.

In the academic field I should like to express my special thanks to Professor Liu Ts'un-yan, Head of the Department of Chinese, Dr. H.J. Gardiner and Mr. Joseph Wong of the Department of Asian History and Civilizations, Sr. Julien Williams of Ursula College, Miss Merrilyn Lincoln of the editorial staff of the Australian Dictionary of Biography, Dr. Paul Harrison and Dr. Hisashi Matsumura of my Department, the Department of South Asian and Buddhist Studies.

In particular, I am indebted to Mr. H.J. Gibbney of the editorial staff of the Australian Dictionary of Biography and Mr. John Jorgensen of the Department of Asian History and Civilizations. Without their invaluable assistance, both academically and linguistically, I would probably have worked harder and taken longer to complete my thesis. Miss E.J.J.C. Kat, secretary to my department, provided an impeccable typescript - she helped me enormously. The above-mentioned friends and colleagues are all working now, or have worked in the Australian National University.

As I have already spent more than five years in completing my thesis on a scholarship lasting only three years, financial assistance, mainly from friends among Buddhist clerics in Singapore and in Hong Kong, were important to me. Firstly, I am grateful for the approval by Dr. R.R.C. de Crespigny, Dean of the Faculty of Asian Studies A.N.U., helping me to extend my scholarship for three months in 1980. Secondly, I would like to express wholehearted thanks to Ven. Kong Hiap (Kuang-chia), ex-abbot of Lung-shan Monastery, Singapore. Benevolently, he financially supported me for a considerable time after my scholarship was terminated. Dr. Ven. Chang Shêng-yen, Director of Ch'an Meditation centre, the Institute of Chung-hwa Buddhist Culture, New York, has also made a financial donation to me. Thirdly, I wish to express my profound thanks to Ven. Chan Siong Khye (Sêng Ch'ang-k'ai), publisher of Nan-Yang Fo-chiao ('Nanyang Buddhist', a Buddhist magazine) in Singapore; Ven. Kok Kwong (Chioh-kuang), President of the Hong Kong Buddhist Association and the publisher of Hsiang-kang Fo-chiao ('Buddhism in Hong Kong', a Buddhist magazine), and Ven. Sik Ching Chin (Shih Ch'êng-chên), Editor-in-Chief of that magazine, Hong Kong. All of them have continued paying double the normal manuscript-fee for my contributions to their magazine in order to support me financially. I feel embarrassed in becoming a secular Bhikṣu. Moreover,

since the termination of my scholarship, Sr. Angela Cooney, Principal of Ursula College and Sr. Madeleine Ryan, Bursar of the College, allowed me a concession on the accommodation fees as a way of supporting my study. I very much appreciate their kindness and hospitality.

I acknowledge most gratefully the donation from Dr. Philip Sun of the Chinese University of Hong Kong, which is notable as the only contribution from my thousands of 'New Asia' alumni and the only secular contribution.

Dr. T. Rajapatirana, my joint departmental supervisor, has spent five difficult years helping me solve my problems.

Professor J.W. de Jong, Head of the Department of South Asian and Buddhist Studies and my main supervisor, has earned my eternal gratitude. Without the opportunity he provided I would not have been able to enrol for a doctoral degree in my middle age. Moreover, without his supervision and encouragement, I would probably not have completed my thesis. This work is dedicated to him.

CHAPTER I

The Development of the Disciplinary School in China

Within the twenty years from 404 until 424, there were four Vinayas: the Sarvāstivādavinaya; the Dharmaguptavinaya; the Mahāsāṅghikavinaya and the Mahīśāsakavinaya, translated one after the other into Chinese.[1] Each of these Vinayas had been studied and interpreted by the Chinese disciplinarians when being adopted as monastic rules by the Chinese Buddhist establishments from the early period of the 5th century up to the beginning of the 8th century A.D. As the disciplinarians followed the different Vinayas, naturally different disciplinary sects were formed. This was particularly so, because the Vinaya was difficult to learn by oneself, and a master was needed to guide one in one's study of it,[2] and therefore the relationship between master and disciple within each sect became closer.[3] After 709, the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect gradually annexed the other disciplinary sects and developed itself into the only Disciplinary School in China. Besides the above-mentioned Vinayas, the other Śīlas or Vinayas that were rendered into Chinese are also discussed in this Chapter.

I. The Disciplinary Pioneers Before the Vinayas were Introduced into China.

There is a gap of some one hundred and sixty years between the introduction of the first Śīla and the earliest Vinaya into China. Many problems which this thesis will discuss are derived from this situation. About 251, the Indian monk Dharmakāla (n.d.) came to Lo-yang. Even though there were already Chinese who had devoted themselves to the monkhood by this time, they had simply shaved their heads in order to show their divergence from the secular Chinese tradition of keeping one's hair, but they had not received any formal Buddhist ordination.[4] Therefore, the Chinese votaries in Lo-yang

asked Dharmakāla to translate the Buddhist Śīla and Vinaya for them.[5] The Indian monk considered that, as Buddhism had only just started to gain a foothold in China, the voluminous Vinaya with its different cultural background would not be accepted by the Chinese. Nevertheless, he translated the Śīla of the Mahāsāṅghikavinaya and gave it the Chinese title Sêng-chih Chieh-hsin or 'The heart of the Śīla of the Mahāsāṅghikavinaya'(in one fascicle) , for daily practice of the monastery.[6] The Sarvāstivādavinaya, the first Vinaya introduced into China, was not translated into Chinese until after 413.[7] Dharmakāla also invited the foreign monks who were already in Lo-yang to work together to prepare a set of Karma for the religious ordination[8] and began to construct the primitive altar for this ceremony in China.[9] From this time on, the Chinese Monastic Order began to ordain people through a Buddhist procedure.[10] As Dharmakāla was the man who introduced the first Śīla into China, he was canonized as the 'Second Patriarch' of the Dharmaguptavinaya School by the Disciplinarian Yüan-chao (1048-1116) after this School had become the only Disciplinary School in China.[11] This indicates that Dharmakāla was much respected by the Chinese disciplinarians of later generations, even though he had introduced a Mahāsāṅghikaśīla but not a Dharmaguptaśīla.

About 255, the Parthian (Iranian) monk T'an-ti (n.d.) came to Lo-yang and translated the Karma of the Dharmaguptavinaya into Chinese under the title T'an-wu-tê Chieh-mo or 'The Karma of the Dharmaguptavinaya (in one fascicle)'.[12] This work took the place of the Karma that had been prepared by Dharmakāla and others, probably because it was rendered from an original text. The SKSC indicates that before Emperor Hsiao-wên (R. 472-499) of the Northern Wei Dynasty changed his imperial surname from 'Toba' to Yüan in 496,[13] every Chinese monk or nun had, by church tradition, to receive the ordination according to this Karma, regardless of the particular Vinaya that person wished to study or abide by after entering the Order.[14] As Tsan-ning (919-1001), author of the SKSC (T.2061), was not only a monk-historian but

also a master of the Dharmaguptavinaya School with the nickname 'Lü-hŭ or 'The Tiger in Debating of the Vinaya',[15] I think that his word is reliable. Even up to the last years of Emperor Wên (581-604) of the Sui Dynasty's reign (about 601-4), all the Chinese priests were still receiving their ordination according to the Karma of the Dharmaguptavinaya.[16] Therefore, some of the monks converted to the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect from the other disciplinary Sects because they had been ordained according to this Karma. Notable examples are Fa-ts'ung who converted from the Mahāsāṅghikavinaya Sect,[17] and Tao-an who turned away from the Sarvādivādavinaya Sect.[18] Tao-an in particular was the man who developed the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect into the only Disciplinary School in China by annexing all the other disciplinary Sects in about 709.[19] This shows the latent influence of T'an-ti's work on the Chinese Order.

Before 251 there had long been Chinese who had devoted themselves to the Buddhist Order. The existence of Chinese votaries can be traced back to about 165 A.D.[20] How had they governed the conduct among themselves before Dharmakāla's arrival ? Tsan-ning believes that the one fascicled I-chüeh Lü that is said to have been translated by the Parthian monk An Shih-kao (flor. 148-170)[21] in 170 was the first 'Vinaya' introduced into China, and that the one fascicled Pi-ch'iu Chu-chin Lü or 'The Vinaya for Bhikṣus on the Prohibitions (translator unknown)'[22] was the second one.[23] Were these 'Vinayas' the disciplines of the Buddhists of the embryonic period that followed? According to the CSTCC (T.2145), the I-chüeh Lü was in fact an excerpt from the Dīrghāgamasūtra.[24] Since the Vinayas that were translated in the latter periods were all voluminous scriptures,[25] evidently these two works could not have been the real 'Vinayas'. Besides, even if these two works were really disciplinary scriptures, we still cannot find any record as to whether they were followed by the Buddhist priests or not.[26]

S.C. Banerjee indicates that the Ssŭ-shih-êrh-chang Ching or 'Sūtra in Forty-two Sections' (the first Buddhist Sūtra said to have been rendered into Chinese by the Indian monks Kāśyapa-Mātaṅga and Dharmāraṇya [both n.d.] in

57)[27] portrays monastic life and the duties of those ordained in China.[28] It also refers to the two hundred and fifty Prātimokṣa rules.[29] Even though it is still a problem as to whether the surviving Chinese version of this Sūtra (T. 784) is the original text that was handed down from 57 A.D. or not,[30] scholars are now convinced that there existed a Sūtra in Forty-two Sections in some form during the Han Dynasty.[31] T'ang Yung-t'ung (1892-1965) and Chi Hsien-lin even indicate that the content of this Sūtra in Han times probably was not very much different from that in the Taishō (i.e. T. 784) even though the present version has been supplemented.[32] The Buddhist votaries of Han China probably learnt in a rudimentary fashion from this Sūtra in the early period the basic rules of conduct of the monkhood; such as begging for survival, taking one meal before noon, strictly avoiding involvement with women and wealth, etc.[33] But this Sūtra is actually not a disciplinary scripture; the priests of Han China probably only made reference to it in order to guide their own conduct. Because they needed rules to govern their community, they probably extracted materials from this Sūtra and some other translated scriptures in order to organize, step by step, a set of rules for the administration of the Monastic Order. As this set of rules was developed in a Chinese milieu, it would have been influenced to some extent by the traditional Chinese normans and customs. Even after Dharmakāla had already rendered the first Śīla into Chinese, the monastic rules formed by the Chinese seem to have kept on developing without interruption. I have made the above assumption because I have found evidence in the historical materials of Chinese Buddhism of a lot of practices which were at variance with those rules recorded in the Buddhist Śīlas. These practices were followed in Chinese monasteries before the Śīlas and Vinayas were introduced into China. Even when the Buddhist disciplinary scriptures were translated one after another into Chinese and were put into practice by the Chinese Monastic Order, the above-mentioned Chinese practices were still operating customarily in the monasteries. In order to clarify my

discussion I have listed the dates when the Vinayas, popular in China, were translated:

The Dharmaguptavinaya and its Śīla in 412.[34]

The Sarvāstivādavinaya and its Śīla about 413.[35]

The Mahāsāṅghikavinaya and its Śīla in 418.[36]

The Mahīśāsakavinaya and its Śīla in 424.[37]

Details of these Chinese practices are as follows:

(1) Corporal Punsihment of Monks for Transgressing the Rule. Fa-yu (n.d.) was a disciple of Master Tao-an (314-385).[38] When King Fu Chien (R.357-384) of the Former Ch'in State sent his troops to occupy Hsiang-yang City (in Hupeh Province) of the Eastern Chin Dynasty in 379,[39] Tao-an was captured and sent to Ch'ang-an,[40] but Fa-yu escaped to Chiang-ling City (in the same Province) and received four hundred odd disciples in the Ch'ang-sa Monastery there.[41] Among his disciples, there was a monk who broke the rules by drinking liquor and not burning incense in the evening. Fa-yu simply gave him some punishments, but did not expel the man. After Master Tao-an heard of this in Ch'ang-an, he sent someone to Fa-yu with a bamboo tube containing a bramble twig. When Fa-yu opened the strip which had Tao-an's signature on it and which was stuck across the mouth of the tube, he knew that his master had reprimanded him for not disciplining his disciple strictly enough. Thereupon he immediately gathered together all the monks of his monastery to burn incense. After that Fa-yu came out to salute the bamboo tube, lay prostrate on the ground and asked the Karmadāna of his monastery to flog him with the bramble twig three times in order to show that he accepted his master's condemnation. His behaviour moved the clergy and the laity of the whole city.[42] The above story shows that Buddhist masters could confer corporal punishment on their disciples.

Fa-shang (495-586) was appointed 'T'ung-shih ('Sêng-t'ung' or 'Controller of the Buddhist Priests') by the government of the Eastern Wei and the Northern Ch'i Dynasties and he held that post for a period of nearly forty years.

During his appointment, Fa-shang was determined to strengthen the proper procedure of the Vinaya. Therefore, he never flogged a priest who had transgressed a rule.[43] Tzŭ-tsang (n.d.) was the local 'Controller of the Buddhist Priests' of I State (present Szechuan Province) in the Sui Dynasty (581-618). He lectured the Buddhist monks very harshly: if a monk did not bring with him two jars, one containing water for drinking and the other containing water for cleansing purposes,[44] and did not put on his robe when going out, or strayed from burning incense or offering flowers to the image of the Buddha, etc., the man would receive a flogging as punishment.[45] As Tzŭ-tsang was the master of Prince Hsiu (flor.581-619), the Governor General of the State,[46] no one among the monks in that state dared to come forward to admonish him for his harshness.[47] Throughout his life, Ling-yu (518-605) had never scolded or flogged his disciples for their transgressions.[48] Tao-yen (+ 662) similarly imitated Ling-yu in his attitude towards the transgressions of his child-novices.[49]

The above cases indicate that the tradition of flogging transgressors was still operating in the Chinese Order even when the Vinayas were being practised in China, despite the fact that according to the Vinaya of the Indian tradition, a priest should never receive corporal punishment. One cannot find any statement in the Vinaya scriptures concerning a Buddhist priest who could receive such a punishment.[50] As the Chinese traditionally emphasized: " ..... the stick to be employed in schools",[51] the tradition of flogging in the Chinese Order was evidently influenced by the Chinese cultural background. Even now, this tradition of flogging is still continuing in the Chinese Order.[52] I believe that the 'Pang-he (rebuke of a student by hitting him with a stick and yelling at him)' tradition of Ch'an (Japanese 'Zen') Buddhism is probably also derived from this.

(2) Kitchens in the Monastery. According to Indian tradition, a monastery should have no permanent kitchen for the priests. Cooking is allowed only in such circumstances as: (a) in case of an illness that has

prevented a priest from going out to beg, monks were allowed to cook rice gruel for him;[53] (b) in case of a grain price-increase that meant that the laity was unable to afford to give food away, priests were allowed to cook food stuffs that they had collected.[54] In China, each monastery has a permanent kitchen for their members. In the HKSC (T.2060) and the SKSC alone we can find twenty-seven monasteries that had kitchens. The earliest one recorded existed before 513 and the last one in 716.[55] In this situation the majority of Chinese priests strayed from the Indian tradition of 'begging for survival'. Those who remained faithful to this tradition are especially noted in the KSC (T.2059), HKSC and SKSC.[56] Sometimes a monk who survived by begging would even give cause for jealousy and hatred on the part of other monks against him, for his behaviour brought embarrassment to them. The dilemma of Yüan-chao and his followers is a good example.[57]

(3) The Labour of the Śrāmaṇeras in the Monastery. In China, a Śrāmaṇera was always being told to do some labour for the monastery, such as cultivating the farming lands of the monastery; collecting water, firewood or wild vegetables for the monks and cooking for them; attending their masters, etc.[58] The earliest case was that of Master Tao-an who cultivated the farming land of his monastery for three years (325-327) from the age of twelve when he became a Śrāmaṇera.[59] In India, a Śrāmaṇera's duty was only to attend to his own master.[60]

(4) Seven days of Mourning after a Death. According to the Indian tradition, when a Bhiksu passed away, his body was to be taken immediately to the cremation-place to be burnt. While his corpse was burning, all his friends assembled to mourn him and a skilled man was engaged to recite a 'Sūtra on impermanence' for him. Then the funeral was completed and everyone went home.[61] In China, the Buddhist priests were probably so influenced by the secular tradition that they always mourned their master, and sometimes even their secular parents, for three years or longer.[62] When Master Hui-yüan's (334-416) life was about to come to an end, he

considered that his disciples probably would grieve for a long time. Therefore, he told them that he would only allow them to lament for seven days after his death.[63] Thus this 'Seven-day Mourning' had already become a tradition of Chinese Buddhism. In the year 509, Emperor Hsüan-wu (R.500-515) of the Northern Wei Dynasty approved an appeal by Hui-shên (n.d.), the 'Controller of Buddhist Priests' that " ... if he (a Buddhist priest) hears from afar the sad news of the decease of his father or his mother or his three (superior) masters (of his ordination), he is permitted to mourn for three days. If it happened before his very eyes, the time is limited to seven days."[64] However, the 'Three Years' Mourning' survived until the Tripitaka Master I-ching (635-713) composed his NHCKNFC (T.3125) (before 691).[65]

(5) The Personal Wealth of the Monks. According to most of the Śīlas, a monk is not allowed to take gold or silver with his own hands, nor ask someone to take these materials for him.[66] Moreover, he is not allowed to buy any supplies with gold or silver, nor to be involved in any kind of business transaction.[67] But in China a monk was allowed to keep his personal wealth and sometimes he could become very rich.

The first case to be considered is the legend of An Shih-kao, who asked someone to sell a chest of his belongings for him in order to get money to buy a slave in Yang-chou (present Chiang-tu) about 278-280;[68] this suggests that a monk in China in the early period could be involved in buying and selling. The next case is of the Gandhara monk Dharmarakṣa (flor. 266-308) of the Ch'ang-an area[69], who was very rich. A nobleman of Ch'ang-an came on the pretext of asking Dharmarakṣa whether he could borrow two hundred thousand copper coins for urgent use, in order to test whether this monk was a miser or not. As Fa-ch'êng (n.d.), Dharmarakṣa's disciple had promised the loan on behalf of Dharmarakṣa, the following day, that nobleman came with one hundred members of his family to beg that all of them be received as Dharmarakṣa's lay disciples. He then told the monk

that he did not really need this sum of money.[70] Another case of private wealth is that of Chih-tun (313-366) who once tried to buy a scenic hill from another monk, Chʃu Tao-ch'ien (286-374).[71]

The above stories tell how rich the Chinese monks could become. As the Mahāsāṅghikaśīla does not contain the rules 'Do not take gold or silver in one's own hands and do not ask someone to take it for one', 'Do not use gold or silver to buy supplies',[72] and as the Śīla that was translated by Dharmakāla was derived from the Mahāsāṅghikaśīla, the Chinese monks of the period before 412 probably did not know that they were not allowed to keep and to manage money themselves. However, even after the Vinayas and Śīlas listed above were all rendered into Chinese and were put into practice, there are many stories about the personal wealth of monks still to be found in the Buddhist histories.[73] In this situation, those who refrained from gathering wealth were especially noted by the authors of the 'Biographies of Eminent Buddhist Monks'.[74]

The practices that are mentioned above are so different from the rules of the Indian Śīla that it is evident that they were gradually developed by some anonymous Han Dynasty pioneers in the practice of discipline. Even when the first Śīla was translated about 251, such an early translation would probably have been rough and thus not so easy to comprehend for the Chinese votaries. Therefore, the above practices kept on developing and were put into practice by the Chinese monasteries. When the Chinese versions of the complete Vinayas and Śīlas came out in 412-3, the above practices had already been in vogue for some two hundred and fifty years. Therefore, they could not be eliminated, even when the translated disciplinary scriptures were adopted by the Chinese Buddhist establishments. This is probably the reason why such practices survived even after 413. Further, those practices seem to have been recognized by the dynastic governments, for in 508, Emperor Hsüan-wu of the Northern Wei Dynasty issued an imperial edict to the Monastic Order of his realm, in which he stated:

> White garments (laymen) and black robes (Buddhist priests) are distinct from each other, and their laws and regulations also differ ... from this time forward, monks who commit murder or any more serious crime shall be dealt with according to secular customs. For all other crimes they shall be handed over to the Chiao-hsüan (Illuminator of Mysteries) and handled according to the 'Nei-lü' and the 'Sêng-chi' .....[75]

In this statement the Chinese term 'Nei-lü' means 'Inner Discipline' and 'Sêng-chi' means 'Monastic Rule'. The Chinese Buddhists always use the term 'Inner' to mark something that belongs to Buddhism, such as 'Nei-tien (Inner Scripture)' or 'Nei-hsüeh (Inner Study)', etc. Therefore, the 'Nei-lü' here must mean the 'Vinaya'. As this edict mentions the 'Nei-lü' separately from the 'Sêng-chi', these two must have been different things. The TSSSL (T.2126) says:

> ..... apart from the field of Vinaya, there is the Sêng-chi... I (Tsan-ning) observe the fact that those works of the 'Sêng-chi' that were customarily employed in the Monastic Order of the Northern Wei Dynasty and the Southern Dynasties were all lenient, without any severity .....[76]

As the 'Sêng-chi' were the rules that 'were customarily employed' in the Monastic Order, I can venture to say that the Sêng-chi must have been the monastic rules that had been developed from the Chinese Buddhist practices dating from before 412-3, and that the above-mentioned monastic practices in China are in fact a part of it. The above edict shows the fact that both the Vinaya and the Chinese developed monastic rules which were adopted by the Chinese Order in order to govern the conduct of the clergy. The 'Sêng-chi (for convenience I will hereafter call it the 'Chinese Monastic Rule')' probably gained a position in the Order just as the consuetudinary law had gained acceptance in the legal field of the secular world. The name 'Sêng-chi' appears first in the CSTCC, which says that it was a one-fascicled compilation prepared by Prince Ching-ling (Hsiao Tzŭ-liang, 460-494) of the Southern Ch'i Dynasty for the conduct of the Buddhist clergy.[77] In 493, Emperor Hsiao-wên of the Northern Wei Dynasty issued an

imperial edict ordering the establishment of a set of 'Sêng-chi' in forty-seven rules for the priests.[78] Again, in the year 508, Emperor Wu (R.502-549) of the Liang Dynasty issued an edict to the monk Fa-yün (467-529), instructing him to prepare a 'Sêng-chi' in order to form a 'standard monastic rule for the present and for the future' of the Monastic Order.[79] In the Northern Ch'i Dynasty (550-577), the Disciplinarian Hui-kuang (508 †), the 'Fifth Patriarch' of the Dharmaguptavinaya School,[80] composed a 'Sêng-chi' in eighteen rules.[81] In the Sui Dynasty, Ling-yu (518-605), a specialist on the Dharmaguptavinaya, compiled the Sêng-ni Chi or 'Monastic Rules for Monks and Nuns'.[82] As both Hui-kuang and Ling-yu were disciplinarians, and because their works as mentioned above were not commentaries on the Dharmaguptavinaya, evidently these two works pertained to the Chinese Monastic Rules. They had probably extracted material from the Dharmaguptavinaya in order to enrich the contents of their compilations. However, because of the popularity of the Pɔ-chang Ch'ing-kuei (hereafter referred to as Ch'ing-kuei) in China in the period after the T'ang Dynasty (618-907),[83] all of the rules of the Chinese Monastic Rule were later lost. Only some of its fragments, the above-mentioned 'practices', are still recorded in the Buddhist histories.

As mentioned above, the Chinese Monastic Ruleswere still practised even after the Śīla and the Vinaya had already been employed in the Chinese Order (the facts should be strongly reflected in the financial and catering systems of the Chinese monasteries of the T'ang Dynasty and the pre-T'ang times).[84] This was probably one of the latent factors that lead to the decline in the practice of the transplanted Indian discipline and its final replacement in China by the Ch'ing-kuei.[85]

We should now return to the discussion of the disciplinary pioneers. After Dharmakāla and T'an-ti, the first pioneer who should be mentioned is Chih-tun. Chih-tun led one hundred odd monk-disciples in Chekiang, some of whom strayed from the conduct of the discipline. Chih-tun wrote a note of

instruction on the side of their seats which read: "Be encouraged, be encouraged. The Way of Truth is not far off. So why do you keep on hesitating?.....you should simply study the religious rules and follow them....."[86] As he lived in a period before the translation of the Vinaya, the 'religious rules' that he encouraged his disciples to follow must have been either the Chinese Monastic Rule or the Śīla that was translated by Dharmakāla.

Master Tao-an is the second pioneer who should be mentioned. The importance of Master Tao-an's contributions toward the disciplinary field of Chinese Buddhism, such as: (1) his advocacy of the importance of the discipline for the Monastic Order and his strict discipline of his disciples; (2) his establishment of his own rules in three categories before the introduction of the Vinayas into China; and (3) his encouragement of the translation of the Vinaya, has already been discussed by several scholars,[87] so it would be superfluous to repeat their convincing discussions here. The TS SSL says that the Chinese Monastic Rule was initially established by Master Tao-an.[88] As I have indicated above, this does not seem to be very correct. His 'rule in three categories', i.e. (a) on the offering of incense as an indication of faith to the Buddha, and the method of ascending the platform to lecture on the Sūtras, (b) on the manner of worshipping the image of the Buddha and of dining, and how the circumambulation of the Buddha figure six times a day was to be performed; and (c) on the Uposatha (fortnightly ceremony), the way of despatching a priest on a mission and the procedure for holding a confession.[89] In particular, it seems to be somewhat like a Buddhist Karma rather than a monastic rule; for it concerns the religious ritual rather than the conduct of the priests. Nevertheless, Master Tao-an really had contributed to a great extent toward strengthening of the monastic discipline before the translation of the Vinaya. After Tao-an, Master Hui-yüan (334-416) also encouraged the translation of the Sarvāstivādavinaya.[90] Later, we find other pioneers such as Tao-chêng (flor.380-385), whose secular name was Chac Chêng, who had

originally served King Fu Chien of the Former Ch'in State as the 'Pi-shu Lang (Gentleman of the Imperial Library),[91] and 'Chu-tso Lang (Gentleman of Writing)'[92] and was one of the king's trusted advisors.[93] He had enthusiastically supported the translation centre in Ch'ang-an[94] and he had even participated in the work of polishing the translated drafts before he entered the Order.[95] After King Fu Chien's violent death in 385, he devoted himself to the monkhood and concentrated on the study of the Sūtra and Vinaya.[96] The Vinayas of the Sarvāstivādin and of the Dharmagupta Schools had not yet been translated into Chinese, but a portion of the Sarvāstivādavinaya had already been rendered into Chinese in his lifetime. In the year 382, Kumārabodhi (n.d.) brought some Buddhist texts with him to Ch'an-an. As Master Tao-an knew that Kumārabodhi's Kashmirian companion Yeh-shê (Yaśas? n.d.) had memorised a version of the Vinaya, he asked the man to recite the text verbatim for him.[97] Kumārabodhi copied down the Sanskrit words that Yeh-shê had recited, while the Chinese monk Chu Fo-nien (flor. 378-413)[98] rendered this Sanskrit text orally into Chinese and the monk T'an-ching wrote it down.[99] Then the Chinese version was given the title P'i-na-yeh or 'Vinaya'.[100] Probably the 'Vinaya' that Tao-chêng studied was this one, for Tao-chêng had been a colleague of Master Tao-an in the Ch'ang-an translation centre before he entered the Order.[101]

Another pioneer was T'an-i (313-394) who followed Master Tao-an and entered the Order in his sixteenth year (328). He became famous for self-discipline.[102] As Master Tao-an had prepared his own rule in three categories after 365, when he was in Hsiang-yang,[103] T'an-i probably would have behaved himself according to either his master's rule or the traditional Chinese Monastic Rule. A third pioneer was Hsien-hu (+ 401), a monk of Szechuan, who followd the rules so strictly that he never boke a single on in his whole career.[104] As the Shih-sung Pi-ch'iu Chieh-pên or 'The Śīla of the Sarvāstivādavinaya for Bhikṣus' had already been translated into

Chinese in Ch'ang-an in 379,[105] and was introduced into the Yangtzŭ River Valley before 381,[106] the 'rules' that Hsien-hu followed were probably either this Śīla or the Chinese Monastic Rule. Szechuan is in the Yangtzŭ Valley and is a neighbouring province to the Ch'ang-an area. Later, Hui-an (died ca. 428), a monk of Mount Lu (in Kiangsi Province), was made famous by strictly obeying the rules before he went to Ch'ang-an to see Kumārajīva (334-413).[107] As Kumārajīva had arrived in Ch'ang-an in 401 and died there in 413,[108] and both translated drafts of the Sarvāstivādavinaya and the Dharmaguptavinaya had come out before Kumārajīva's death,[109] Hui-an's case was probably akin to that of Hsien-hu's. In other words, the 'rules' that he obeyed would probably have been the same rules that were kept by Hsien-hu. T'an-ch'ien also kept to the rules rigidly before he went to Ch'ang-an from the upper reaches of the Yellow River to follow Kumārajīva.[110] I think that his case also somewhat like that of Hui-an's.

Finally, I should like to discuss the case of the famous pilgrim Fa-hsien (died before 423).[111] Fa-hsien, distressed at the imperfect state of the Buddhist Vinaya scripture in China, entered into an agreement with four other monks to go together to India in order to obtain the Śīla and the Vinaya.[112] They departed from Ch'ang-an in 400 (or 399),[113] some seventeen years after the translation of the P'i-na-yeh that was made in the same city. Perhaps they had been so encouraged by the appearance of this Vinaya scripture that there arose in them the idea of going to India in search of more scriptures. Master Tao-an had instructed in the preface of the P'i-na-yeh that it is important to choose carefully the disciple to whom this Vinaya should be taught; those who had been ordained in the Order for less than five years should not be allowed to read this Vinaya.[114] According to what Tao-an has written, this Vinaya was probably jealously kept by the monks of Ch'ang-an, so it is probable that Fa-hsien and his comrades on the pilgrimage had no chance to read it before they began their journey.

Fa-hsien obtained the original text of the Śīla and the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṅghika School and a copy of the Sarvāstivādavinaya in Central India.[115] The latter was written down from someone's recitation.[116] He also found the Mahīśāsakavinaya in Sri Lanka by accident.[117] How these two Vinayas were translated into Chinese will be discussed further in Section IV of this Chapter. The fact that Fa-hsien was attracted to the Mahāsāṅghikavinaya in the first place, and emphasized in his Kao-sêng Fa-hsien Chuan (T.2085) that this Vinaya was"..... practised by priests generally while Buddha was still alive",[118] is probably related to the fact that the first Śīla introduced into China was a Mahāsāṅghikavinaya scripture, and indicates how influential the translation of Dharmakāla was among the Chinese clergy before the translation of the Vinayas.

II. The Development of the Sarvāstivādavinaya Sect.

According to the Buddhist bibliographical works, the first disciplinary scriptures introduced into China was a work belonging to the Sarvāstivādin School, the Pi-ch'iu-ni Chieh-ching or 'The Śīla of the Bhikṣuṇīs' translated by Dharmarakṣa (flor. 266-308).[119] Up to 379 two scriptures of the same kind had also been rendered into Chinese. The Shih-sung Pi-ch'iu Chieh-pên or 'The Śīla of the Sarvāstivādavinaya for Bhikṣus' was recited by T'an-mo Ch'ih (n.d.), a monk from the Western Regions, and the Chinese monk Chu Fo-nien rendered the words from Ch'ih's mouth into Chinese in Ch'ang-an.[120] The Pi-ch'iu-ni Ta-chieh or 'The Great Śīla for Bhikṣuṇīs' was brought into China from Kucha by the monk Sêng-shun (n.d.), and then was translated by Ch'ih and L'ien, the translators of the former text, in the same city.[121] Both of these two works were sponsored by Master Tao-an.[122] As Master Hui-yüan, Tao-an's most outstanding and famous disciple in the Yangtzŭ Valley,[123] would have received copies of those Śīlas through special delivery,[124] they were introduced into this Valley before 381.[125] After better translations of the same texts had been prepared by Kumārajīva and others, all three became obsolete and were finally lost before 730.[126]

About 404 Punyatara (+ 404) arrived in Ch'ang-an from Kashmir.[127] Yao Hsing (R. 394-415), king of the later Ch'in State, welcomed him as a distinguished guest, and Kumārajīva, who had already begun his career as translator there,[128] also respected him for his good behaviour that was in accordance with the Vinaya.[129] In this period, the Vinayas of other sects had not yet been introduced into China. When the clergy of the Ch'ang-an area heard that Punyatara had a thorough grasp of the Sarvāstivādavinaya (hereafter referred to as SVSTVDV), hundreds of learned monks came to ask him to recite the words of the original text for them in 404. Then the recited text was rendered into Chinese in front of these monks by Kumārajīva.[130] Unfortunately, Punyatara passed away in the same year[131] when only two-thirds of the words had been recited and translated into Chinese. Nevertheless, Kumārajīva translated the Śīla for monks of this incomplete Vinaya before the arrival of Dharmaruci.[132] In the autumn of the following year, Dharmaruci (n.d.) came from the Western Regions.[133] When Hui-yüan heard that this western monk was also a specialist in Vinaya, he sent a letter from his monastery in the Yangtzŭ Valley to him, persuading him to continue the unfinished work of Punyatara.[134] After having received this letter and at the request of King Yao Hsing, Dharmaruci then recited the rest of the SVSTVDV text[135] and worked together with Kumārajīva to finish the translation.[135A] When the Chinese version, entitled Shih-sung Lü or 'The Recitable Vinaya in Ten Parts',[136] appeared, Kumārajīva disliked the draft, because it was rather verbose.[137] Even though this version had never been polished after the death of Kumārajīva in 413, it was recognized as a faithful translation of the original ideas for it had been carefully revised.[138] After having completed this translation Dharmaruci left Ch'ang-an to visit other parts of China where the Vinaya had not yet been preached. No one knew where he died but someone said that he passed away in the Ho-hsi region (in present Kansu Province).[139]

The SVSTVDV then became the dominant discipline adopted by the monastic establishments of the Yangtzŭ Valley. Hui-yüan was to be a remarkable pioneer in practising this Vinaya. His biography in KSC says that he used to take the 'Han-shih-san (the medical powder taken with cold provisions as its accompaniment)' as did his contemporaries among the gentry. The poisonous ingredients in this powder finally became active and poisoned him in the beginning of the eighth month of the twelfth year of the I-hsi Era (416) and on the sixth day of that month (13th September) his condition became critical.[140] When the reverend elders all knocked their heads upon the ground in order to beseech him to take some bean-wine as an antidote, he refused because it would be contrary to the Vinaya.[141] When they persuaded him to drink some rice juice, he declined it for it was already past noon.[142] When they asked him to drink a mixture of honey and water, he told the disciplinarian of his Tung-lin Monastery to check the Vinaya to see whether honey is allowed to be taken in the afternoon or not.[143] Before the outcome was known, he expired.[144] As he has asked Dharmaruci to continue Punyatara's translation, I believe that copies of both the Śīla and Vinaya would immediately have been sent to him from Ch'ang-an, once they had been rendered into Chinese. Therefore, what he kept faith in and what the disciplinarian had to check was the SVSTVDV. The above story shows that this Vinaya was practised in Hui-yüan's monatery in the middle reaches of the Yangtzŭ River.

As to the propagation of this Vinaya in the Yangtzŭ Valley, Vimalākṣa (died after 413) played a more important role.[145] This Kashmirian monk originally preached the Vinayapiṭaka in Kucha and Kumārajīva had once been his follower.[146] Later he learned that Kumārajīva was successful in preaching the Buddhist doctrines in translation[147] in Ch'ang-an, and he came to join his former disciple in 406 in order to preach the Vinaya doctrines to the Chinese.[148] The monks Sêng-yeh (367-411) and Hui-hsün (375-458) of the Yellow River Valley came to Ch'ang-an to learn Buddhist

scriptures, especially the newly translated Shih-sung Lü[149] from Kumārajīva. I suppose that Vimalākṣa would have taken part in Kumārajīva's preaching as the latter collaborated in his translations. After Kumārajīva's death in 413, Vimalākṣa left Ch'ang-an and wandered southward to Shou-ch'un city (the present Shou city of the Anhwei Province) and stayed in the Shih-chien Monastery. There he gathered together a great number of disciplinary monks and promulgated the Vinaya doctrines to them. At the same time he subdivided the Shih-sung Lü into sixty-one fascicles from fifty-eight fascicles.[150] This version became the definitive one; it has survived till the present day. Afterwards, Vimalākṣa proceeded southwards to Chiang-ling city (of the Hupeh Province) and spent his Varsā at the Hsin Monastery. Concurrently, he preached the Shih-sung Lü there.[151] As he could already speak Chinese, he was able to teach the monks, who, desiring to obtain a thorough understanding of the disciplinary doctrines, flocked to see him and ask questions. Then, after having received his instruction, most of them understood the various individual rules of the Vinaya.[152] Among these monks, Hui-kuan (died about 438) of the Tao-ch'ang Monastery used to ask questions on the rules during Vimalākṣa's preaching.[153] He especially wanted to know their severity, whether it was 'light' or 'heavy'. He revised his own notes, compiled them into two fascicles and sent them to the capital of the Eastern Chin Dynasty, i.e. Nanking.[154] Monks and nuns of the capital territory hastened to copy this so-called Tsa-wên Lü-shih or 'Miscellaneous Questions (and Answers) on the Affairs Concerning the Vinaya'[155] and to practise accordingly.[156] There was a proverb among Hui-kuan's contemporaries: "Hui-kuan is so literate in polishing the rough words of Vimalākṣa that the people in the capital rushing to copy out his work have caused the price of paper as well as that of jade to rise."[157] This proverb indicates how influential Hui-kuan's work was in his time. Tao-hsüan (596-667), author of TTNTL, noted that even down to his day, the Tsa-wên Lü-shih was still a popular disciplinary text for reference in the Yangtzŭ Valley.[158] Besides, Hui-kuan also referred to

the Vinayas of other schools in order to extend his own disciplinary knowledge after returning to his Tao-chiang Monastery in the capital. People came every day to inquire about the rules of the Vinaya.[159] Hui-yu (n.d.), another student of Vimalākṣa in Chiang-ling, also preached the SVSTVDV in his home city and the monk-disciplinarians in the west of the middle reaches of the Yangtzŭ River followed and respected him as their master.[160]

Apart from the above-mentioned monks there were some other noted disciplinarians who made contributions to the establishment and maintenance of the Sarvāstivādavinaya sect in the Yangtzŭ areas:

(1) Sêng-yeh, who, as mentioned above, went to Ch'ang-an to learn the Shih-sung Lü from Kumārajīva, afterwards went to the Yangtzŭ Valley and stayed in the Hsien-chü Monastery of Soochow. There he compared and collated the Sarvāstivādaśīla, translated by Kumārajīva,[161] with the Shih--sung Lü, and changed some words of the former according to the latter.[162] Hui-chiao (497-554?),[163] author of the KSC, said that even down to his day these two versions, i.e. Kumārajīva's translation and Sêng-yeh's revision, were both current.[164] Hui-kuan (n.d.)[165] and Sêng-ch'ü (died about 463-464)[166], Sêng-yeh's two disciples, were also very active in preaching the SVSTVDV in the Yangtzŭ Valley.[167] Sêng-ch'ü quoted from the Shih-sung Lü and composed the Sêng-ni Yao-shih or 'The Essentials for Monks and Nuns' in two fascicles in 463.[168] This book exists and is published in Taishō with the title Shih-sung Chieh-mo Pi-ch'iu Yao-yung or 'The Essentials for the Bhikṣu of the Karma of the SVSTVDV'.[169]

(2) Saṅghavarman (n.d.) came from India to Nanking via the desert in 433, and translated the Mātṛkā of the Sarvāstivādin School in the same year. Then he returned to the west by boat in 442.[170] His translation is published in the Taishō (T. 1441) and is classified as one of the disciplinary scriptures of the Sarvāstivādin School. I suppose that this work was very helpful for the disciplinary interpreters of the past.

(3) Hui-hsün, as well as Sêng-yeh, received lectures on the SVSTVDV from

Kumārajīva. He went to the Yangtzŭ Valley about 421, and stayed in Kuang-ling (present Chiang-tu city of the Kiangsu Province) to preach the Vinaya. In about 438 he went to Nanking to live in the Tao-ch'ang Monastery.[171] As his fellow monk in this monastery, Hui-kuan, was also a specialist in the SVSTVDV,[172] he asked Hui-hsün to move to another monastery in order to guide other monks with his knowledge of the disciplines. Hui-hsün dwelled in the Ch'ang-lo Monastery till his death.[173]

(4) Sêng-yin (b.d.), a native of Shensi, learned the SVSTVDV in his homeland and then wandered to Szechuan and preached there. Then he went eastward to the middle reaches of the Yangtzŭ River and was respected by Prince Liu Hsiu-yu (445-471) and Prince Liu Hsiu-jo (448-471), governors-general of the Ching State of the Liu-Sung Dynasty in ca. 466-471.[174] Ch'êng-chü of the Shang-ming monastery in Chiang-ling city (capital of the Ching State) was also a monk disciplinarian of this Vinaya in the same period.[175]

(5) Fa-ying (416-482), a native of Tun-huang, followed Fa-hsiang (n.d.) to the capital of the Liang State (i.e. Ku-ts'ang, present Wu-wei city, of Kansu Province) and became a Vinaya specialist. He went to Nanking about 452-3, and Emperor Hsiao-wu (R. 454-461) of Liu-Sung appointed him 'Sêng-chêng' or 'Controller of the Buddhist Priests' of the capital territory. Then he resigned and gave lectures on the Vinaya. When Emperor Kao-ti (R. 479-482) of the Southern Ch'i Dynasty assumed control over Liu-Sung, Fa-ying was once again appointed 'Sêng-chêng'.[176] As Kumārajīva had just translated the Śīla for monks of the SVSTVDV into Chinese, Fa-ying quoted materials directly from the body of the same Vinaya to prepare the Śīla for nuns in the middle of the T'ai-shih Era (about 469)[177], accompanied by a Karma.[178]

(6) Chih-tao (412-482) of Nanking, was a Vinaya specialist and led a simple vegetarian life. When the Northern Wei Dynasty restored Buddhism in 454 after the persecution of 446, there was a lack of Buddhist

disciplinarians to give guidance in the procedures of religious ordination. Chih-tao gathered some ten southern monk-disciplinarians together, went to the dominion of Northern Wei, stayed in the Yin-shui Monastery of Hu-lao City (present Fan-shui city, Honan Province) and called in the monks of the Yellow River Valley in order to preach to them the Vinaya and the procedures of ordination. In this way the disciplinary tradition of the Northern Wei was rebuilt.[179] At the same time Ch'ao-tu (n.d.), who, like Chih-tao, was well versed in both the Sarvāstivāda and Dharmagupta Vinayas, composed the Lü-li of 'The Regulations of Vinaya' in seven fascicles.[180]

(7) Fa-lin (+ 495) studied the SVSTVDV intensively when he entered the order in Szechuan and complained about the lack of good disciplinary teachers to consult. When Sêng-yin went to Szechuan before 466, Fa-lin followed him day and night. Till Sêng-yin's return to Shensi, Fa-lin also travelled with him and afterwards spent some years in Shensi to learn the Vinayas of different schools. Then he returned to Szechuan and became a master respected by the local monks and nuns.[181]

(8) Fa-hsien (died about 498),[182] a native of Ho-hsi, entered the order in Northern Szechuan and then went to Nanking in 439.[183] As he was a disciplinatian of the SVSTVDV,[184] he was appointed 'Controller of the Buddhist Priests' together with Hsüan-ch'ang (died about 459),[185] the Shensi monk. About 488 they shared the governing of the clergy in the northern and southern part of the Yangtzŭ Valley.[186]

(9) Chih-ch'êng (430-501) entered the order in Szechuan in his thirtysixth year and studied the SVSTVDV. Later he went to Chiang-ling to follow Sêng-yin and Ch'êng-chü to advance his disciplinary knowledge and to learn Dhyāna. From there he went to Nanking, listened to Fa-ying's lecture on Vinaya and his pointed questions were admired by all those who attended the lecture. Fa-hsien happened to listen to that lecture and invited Chih-ch'êng to follow him to his Ting-lin Monastery. There Chih-ch'êng made an intensive study of the Vinaya. When he gave lectures on Vinaya in Yü-hang (in Chekiang

Province) and in Nanking, hundreds of monks took notes.[187] He composed the Shih-sung I-chi or 'Notes on the Doctrines of the SVSTVDV in eight fascicles.[188] His interpretations of Vinaya became prevalent and were quoted and learned by Buddhists during the Southern Ch'i (479-502) and the Liang (502-557) Dynasties.[189] Ts'ung and Ch'ao (both n.d.), his disciples, were also noted disciplinarians.[190]

(10) Sêng-yu (445-518), disciple of both Fa-ying[191] and Fa-hsien,[192] was an outstanding scholar not only of the Vinaya, but also in secular studies of history and bibliography.[193] Prince Ching-ling of the Southern Ch'i Dynasty used to invite him to lecture on the Vinaya and each lecture was attended by seven or eight hundred persons. About 488, Sêng-yu was ordered by imperial edict to make a census of the Buddhist priests in Wu Prefecture. At the same time he preached the SVSTVDV and the procedures of ordination to the priests there. During the Liang Dynasty, when an important problem arose in monastic affairs, Emperor Wu used to order that the case be brought before Sêng-yu for judgement, even though Sêng-yu was not a 'Controller of Buddhist Priests'. Moreover, if there were some royal consorts who desired to take refuge in Buddhism, the emperor had Sêng-yu summoned to the palace by sedan-chair for the confirmation of the lay-woman's five commandments.[194] In the whole of his religious career Sêng-yu received eleven thousand white (laymen) and black (priests) disciples.[195]

(11) Fa-ch'ao (456-526) followed Chih-ch'êng in his last years to learn the SVSTVDV. After Chih-ch'êng's death in 501 he became the leading disciplinarian in Nanking. Emperor Wu of Liang appointed him Controller of Buddhist Priests of the capital territory. The emperor considered that the contents of the Vinaya were so huge in scale that it was difficult to find a specific paragraph in it. He therefore told Fa-ch'ao to quote materials from the Vinayas of different schools, to simplify them and, adding the Chinese Monastic Rule, to compile the Ch'u-yao Lü-li[196] or 'The Important Regulations From the Vinayas' in fourteen fascicles.[197] Emperor Wu ordered the Monastic Order in his whole realm to use this book as a guide.[198]

(12) Tao-ch'an (458-527), a native of Chiao-chih (the present Hanoi in Vietnam),[199] went to Nanking ca. 483-484 to learn Dhyāna and Vinaya.[200] He became famous for his knowledge of the SVSTVDV and monks and nuns there paid their respect to him. Moreover, thousands of people in the capital took refuge in him as his disciples; he spent his last years in Nanking.[201]

(13) T'an-yüan (died about 575), native of Nanking, was a leading preacher of the SVSTVDV during the Ch'en Dynasty. Emperor Hsüan (R. 569-582) issued an edict commanding that lecture courses on the Vinaya be established in all leading monasteries in the capitals of all states. Priests who had been ordained for not more than five years had to attend this course in order to strengthen their monastic morals. T'an-yüan was appointed director-general of this nationwide course. Then T'an-yüan chose twenty monks from each prefecture and sent them to Nanking to be trained as lecturers to preach the Vinaya in their local areas after their return. When a monk had completed the training T'an-yüan examined him in front of the other trainees who numbered three hundred. If he could answer the questions from the congregation satisfactorily he was sent back to his native land to preach. The power of the Vinaya during the Ch'en Dynasty increased, and T'an-yüan was appointed 'Sêng-chêng' of the nation for his merit.[202] T'an-yüan composed the Shih-sung Shu or 'The Commentary to the SVSTVDV' in ten fascicles,[203] and the Chieh-pan Shu or 'Commentary to the Śīla'[204] and the Chieh-mo Shu or 'Commentary to the Karma',[205] both in two fascicles.

(14) Chih-wên (509-599), a native of Nanking, was a specialist in the SVSTVDV. In about 535-6 he was appointed 'Ta Lü-tu' or 'Grand Deputy-Controller of Vinaya for the Buddhist Priests'.[206] In 541 the monks of Ling-wei Monastery, of Wa-kuan Monastery and of other monasteries in Nanking sent an appeal to the court, asking for an imperial edict to be issued inviting Chih-wên to give lectures on the Vinayapitaka in Kuang-yeh Monastery.[207] As the Liang Dynasty had suffered from a series of civil wars, and because the districts along the Yangtzŭ River had become battle fields

since 551, Chih-wên fled to Min (the present Fukien Province) and preached the Vinaya in Chin-an (the present Fu-chou city). Not only did disciplinarians like Sêng-tsung, Fa-chun and others consult him about the Vinaya, but also the laity were so moved by him that the wine-manufacturers smashed their equipment and the fishermen burnt their fishing nets. When the Ch'en Dynasty was established in 552, he returned to Nanking and received more disciples. In 590, when China was reunited by the Sui Dynasty, Chih-wên was appointed priest-controller of his local area. During the civil war, priests of the Yangtzŭ Valley had strayed from the Vinaya and many bad elements had infiltrated the Order by improper means. Chih-wên considered it his duty to cast out the dead wood and to punish the wrongdoers according to the Vinaya and the Chinese Monastic Rule. Therefore, every newly appointed governor of Tan-yang Prefecture (centered around Nanking) had to pay homage to Chih-wên when he took up office.[208] Chih-wên composed a commentary on the SVSTVDV in twelve fascicles.[209] During his career he had ordained three thousand monks and nuns.[210] Among those disciples, Tao-chih and Fa-ch'êng were noted disciplinarians, and both of them had many disciples in Nanking.[211]

(15) Tao-ch'êng (532-599) followed Chih-wên in the early Ta-t'ung Era (about 535-7). He was able to preach the SVSTVDV after having listened only twice to Chih-wên's lectures, and the high monks of Nanking all praised him as the 'Splendid Junior'. During his life he gave one hundred and forty lectures on Vinaya.[212] He composed commentaries on the SVSTVDV and its Karma.[213] His disciples, Hui-tsang, Fa-hsiang and others went about their preaching.[214]

(16) Hui-min (died about 648-9) entered the Order in Soochow and learned the SVSTVDV from disciplinarian Chih (not Chih-wên) of the Chu-yüan Monastery in Nanking. After his master's death he travelled in Chekiang for several years. Then he went back to Soochow and stayed in the T'ung--hsüan Monastery for seventeen years, living a strict life of Vinaya

practice with his disciples. Even at the end of the Sui Dynasty, when China was once again involved in civil wars, and the priests and laymen of Soochow ran away to other places to escape starvation, Hui-min's group stayed there. After the T'ang Dynasty reunited China in 621, Hui-min moved to Hai-yu Mountain with his disciples, stayed there for twenty years till his death. During his seclusion hundreds of people used to come from afar to ask him about Vinaya.[215] He revised the ancient commentaries on the Vinaya and corrected the errors in them, and composed the Shih-sung Szŭ-chi or 'The Private Notes on SVSTVDV' in thirteen fascicles,[216] the Sêng-ni Hsing-shih or 'Practices for Monks and Nuns' and the Ni-chung Chieh-mo or 'The Karma for Nuns',[217] the last two in two fasciles.[218]

As a result of the annexation of the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect in the Yangtzŭ Valley (see Section V, notes 455 to 518), Hui-min is the last disciplinarian of the Sarvāstivādavinaya Sect recorded in the so-called 'Three Biographies of Eminent Buddhist Monks'. From what has been said above we can see that the SVSTVDV was prevalent in the upper, middle and lower reaches of the Yangtzŭ River Valley from the fourth century to the middle of the seventh century; especially in the provinces of Szechuan, Hupeh, Kiangsi, Anhwei and Kiangsu through which the Yangtzŭ River flows. As Chih-wên sought refuge in Fukien, while Chih-ch'êng and Hui-min had travelled in Chekiang, this Vinaya also came to be practised in these two places. Tao-ch'an was a native of Hanoi and went to Nanking to learn this Vinaya, and as a result it was also introduced into Vietnam. Even though Tao-ch'an himself spent his last years in Nanking, some of his disciples may have been Vietnamese and they probably returned home to preach. Finally, since T'an-yüan had led a nationwide course on Vinaya during the Ch'en Dynasty, this Vinaya spread throughout the whole Yangtzŭ Valley after 575.

Let us look back to the Yellow River Valley where the SVSTVDV was translated into Chinese. Did this Vinaya also prevail there as well as in the

Yangtzŭ Valley ? T'ang Yung-t'ung says that before the emergence of Hui-kuang (flor. 508+), the master of the Dharmaguptavinaya in the Northern Ch'i Dynasty, the SVSTVDV and the Mahāsāṅghikavinaya were influential in the monastic establishments of the Yellow River Valley.[219] Even though T'ang does not give any evidence to prove his point, we can still find some traces of the influence of the SVSTVDV in the North. When the SVSTVDV was translated in the Ch'ang-an area, it had been prevalent in Shensi. Sêng-yin and Hsüan-ch'ang learned this Vinaya there in their homeland. Dharmaruci is said to have passed away in Ho-hsi, a neighbouring area to Shensi. Fa-hsiang, Fa-yin, Fa-li[220] and Fa-hsien all received their knowledge of this Vinaya there in their homeland. Furthermore, the mong Sêng-tsun (flor. 446) who also specialised in this Vinaya, lived in the State of Kao-ch'ang (present Turfan City, Singkiang Province)[221] which had been established by migrants from the Ho-hsi area.[222] Sêng-yeh was a native of Honei (present Ts'in-yang City, Honan Province)[223] and Hui-hsün was a native of Chao-chün (present Chao-ch'êng City, Shansi Province).[224] Both came to Ch'ang-an to learn this Vinaya. Even though they were prominent in the Yangtzŭ Valley, their biographies presuppose that other anonymous disciplinarians from other parts of the Yellow River Valley also came to Ch'ang-an to learn this Vinaya. Furthermore, Chih-tao and his comrades went to the Yellow River Valley to help re-establish the disciplinary tradition of the Monastic Order during the Northern Wei. Chih-tao himself was a specialist in both the SVSTVDV and the Dharmaguptavinaya. According to Tsukamoto Zenryū's research, the monk T'an-yao (flor. 446-497)[225] relied especially on the SVSTVDV and the Mahāsāṅghikavinaya in order to establish the economic organization of the Saṅgha and Buddha Households for the Monastic Order of the Northern Wei,[226] which implies the prevalence of the Shih-sung Lü in the Yellow River Valley. Ch'en Yin-k'o (1912-1971) says that K'ou Ch'ien-chih (+ 448), the leading Taoist of the Northern Wei Dynasty, quoted from the SVSTVDV in order to prepare the disciplinary rules of Taoism.[227] Unfortunately, his argument is not convincing.[228]

III. The Development of the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect.

Even though T'an-ti had translated the Karma of the Dharmagupta Vinaya into Chinese around the year 255,[229] the body of this Vinaya and its Śīla were introduced into China more than 150 years later, in 410. Before 410, Buddhayaśas (n.d.), the Kashmirian monk, came to Ch'ang-an from Kucha to join Kumārajīva, his former disciple.[230] Yao Shuang (n.d.), the 'Ssu-li Hsio-wei' or 'Colonel Director of the Retainers'[231] of the Later Ch'in State, knew that Buddhayaśas had mastered the Dharmaguptavinaya and asked him to recite the original words of it in order that it may be translated into Chinese.[232] As King Yao Hsing did not believe that Buddhayaśas was able to remember every word of the original text, he told the Kashimirian monk to read forty sheets of herbal formulas[233] and a similar extent of 'Min-chi' or 'registers of population',[234] totalling fifty thousand Chinese characters.[235] The king gave three days for reading, and then told Buddhayaśas to recite all the characters in order to test the monk's power of memory.[236] After the test, Buddhayaśas, not having missed even a single character, started the translation of this Vinaya in 410.[237] Buddhayaśas recited the original text and explained its ideas in front of the congregation and Chu Fo-nien rendered his foreign words into Chinese;[238] while Tao-han (n.d.) copied them with the pen, then revised and compiled them into a Chinese version.[239] The translation was completed in 412 and entitled Ssŭ-fên Lü or 'Vinaya in Four Parts'.[240] The Śīla for monks was also translated at the same time.[241] Before the appearance of Hui-kuang in the Northern Ch'i Dynasty, we can only find a few pioneers who studied and practised this Vinaya. In 431, Guṇavarman (367-431), the Kashmirian monk, came to the Yangtzŭ Valley. He rendered the 'Karma of the Dharmaguptavinaya for Nuns' into Chinese in Nanking in the same year. From this time on, the Chinese nuns received ordination according to the correct procedure.[241A] Before that, the monastic order in China did not even know that at least ten women had to present themselves

for ordination at a ceremony for the ordination of nuns.[242] As mentioned in the previous section, Chih-tao (412-482) and his contemporary monk Ch'ao-tu were both well versed in the Sarvāstivādas and Dharmaguptavinaya. In 504, Sêng-shêng (died about 510),[243] the monk of the Ling-yao Monastery in Nanking, cited sections from the Dharmaguptavinaya (hereafter referred to as DRMGTV) in compiling the Chao-chieh Pi-ch'iu-ni Fa or 'A Guide for the Bhiksunīs on the Discipline' in one fascicle.[244]

In the Yellow River Valley, the first pioneer whose date is known is Sêng-ta (475-556). He entered the order when he was fifteen (489) and after his ordination in his twentieth year (494), he learned of the lore of Vinaya. In 496 he was invited by Emperor Hsiao-wên of the Northern Wei Dynasty to give lectures on the DRMGTV to the monasteries.[245]

Another pioneer was Fa-ts'ung (n.d.) of Emperor Hsiao-wên's period.[246] Fa-ts'ung was originally well versed in the Mahāsāṅghikavinaya.[247] One day he reflected: "As I entered the order through the ordination prescribed by the Karma of the DRMGTV,[248] why should I not make a thorough study of this vinaya?"[249] Thereupon he gave up his preaching of the Mahāsāṅghikavinaya and turned to the promulgation of the DRMGTV.[250] Fa-ts'ung just gave lectures to his disciples without preparing any commentaries. Among his disciples was Tao-fu (n.d.) who compiled a commentary to this Vinaya in six fascicles and it became the forerunner of this genre of Buddhist literature in China.[251]

Hui-kuang (508+)[252] followed Buddha the Master of Dhyāna (n.d.)[253] in Lo-yang as a Śrāmanera in this thirteenth year.[254] Master Buddha advised his disciple that the practice of the Vinaya was the foundation for the development of one's wisdom, and that Hui-kuang would have to attend and listen to some lectures on the Vinaya before his ordination into monkhood in his twentieth year.[255] In this period, even though Tao-fu had already left a commentary to the DRMGTV, it was but 'K'o-wên'[256] or 'systematized procedure for preaching' to preach without any interpretations.

Therefore Hui-kuang learned the doctrines of the DRMGTV from someone's verbal instructions.[257] After he was ordained, he went to listen to the lectures on other Vinayas and then, himself, gave lecture on the Mahāsāṅghikavinaya four years later. As his lectures were not successful and failed to draw an audience, he discovered that it was due to the inadequacy of his own knowledge of Buddhism. He then abandoned his lectures and went to listen to the lectures on the Sūtra and on the Abhidharma in Lo-yang and other cities.[258] In 508, Hui-kuang assisted Ratnamati (n.d.), the Indian monk, in translating the Daśabhūmi Vyākhyāna in Lo-yang,[259] and guided by this newly translated scripture, formulated his own exposition of the DRMGTV.[260] When the Northern Ch'i Dynasty was established in 550, Hui-kuang was appointed 'Sêng-tu' or 'Deputy Controller of the Buddhist Priests', and being summoned to Yeh (the present Lin-Chang City of Honan Province) the capital of the Dynasty, he died there.[261] Hui-kuang enlarged Tao-fu's commentary into ten fascicles from six,[262] and also composed a new commentary to the DRMGTV in one hundred sheets of paper.[263] Besides, he also revised the Śīla and the Karma of the DRMGTV and these two works were recited by the contemporaries of Tao-hsüan in the early T'ang Dynasty.[264] Again, he composed the Ta-ch'êng Lü I-chang or 'The Interpretations on the Discipline of the Mahāyāna School' and the Sêng-chi or 'The Chinese Monastic Rule (in eighteen rules)'.[265] Among Hui-kuang's disciples, Tao-yün (n.d.) was a credit to his master. Tao-yün continued to preach the Vinayapitaka and also composed a commentary in nine fascicles. He received a great many disciples, training them into good missionaries on the Vinaya with grave demeanour and forbearing conversations.[266] Tao-hui (n.d.), another disciple of Hui-kuang, abridged Tao-yün's commentary into seven fascicles from nine and added some of his own interpretations of Tao-yün's work.[267] T'an-yin (n.d.) at first followed Tao-fu to learn the Vinaya but later, after attending Hui-kuang's lectures, became one of Kuang's outstanding disciples.[268] Not only did T'an-yin preach in Yeh, the capital

of the Northern Ch'i, but he also made his influence felt in the areas of Yen (present Hopeh Province) and Chao (present Shansi Province).[269] Tao-p'ing (488-559) who spent his Varṣā in the Shao-lin Monastery (in Mount Sung of the Honan Province) in the eighth year (i.e. 516) after his ordination (in 507) is also said to have listened to Hui-kuang's[270] sermons on the Dharmaguptaśīla and some Mahāyāna scriptures.[271] After ten years with Hui-kuang, Tao-p'ing left his master to go to Chao and Wei (present Northern Honan Province) to preach the Nirvāṇasūtra, the Daśabhūmi and the DRMGTV.[272] About 531, An-lin (507-584) went to the Northern Wei from the Yangtzŭ Valley to follow master Jung of the Szŭ State (present Lo-yang area) to obtain instruction in Sūtra and Abhidharma. Master Jung trained his disciples very strictly in accordance with the Vinaya.[273] After that, An-lin went to the Shao-lin Monastery to learn the Daśabhūmi from Hui-kuang[274] and then stayed in Northern Wei for twelve years.[275] During that period, he gave twenty lectures on the DRMGTV. In 547, he returned home to the Yangtzŭ Valley but gave no lectures on the Vinaya.[276]

From this time on, the lower and the middle reaches of the Yellow River, i.e. the territory of the Northern Ch'i, became the centre of the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect and attracted many disciplinarians.[277] This sect even expanded to the upper reaches of the Yellow River Valley and annexed the Mahāsāṅghikavinaya Sect there. There were some remarkable disciplinarians who along with their disciples contributed to the establishment and maintenance of this sect in the whole Yellow River Valley.

(1) Fa-yüan (524-587) was ordained by Fa-shang (495-580), the 'Chao-hsüan T'ung' or 'The Controller of the Office of Illuminator of Mysteries' of the Northern Ch'i in Yeh. He concentrated on the study of the Vinaya-piṭaka and prepared commentaries on the four prevailing Vinayas in China, i.e. the SVSTVDV, DRMGTV, Mahāsāṅghikavinaya and Mahīśāsakavinaya. As Fa-yüan was so skilled in debating, people called him 'Lü-hu' or 'The Tiger in Debating on the Vinaya'. Except for two fascicles of his ten fascicled commentary

on the DRMGTV which still survived in the period of Tao-hsüan (596-667), all his works on the discipline were already lost.[278] Tao-hsing (aged over eighty in 665), his disciple, followed Fa-yüan's interpretations in preaching this Vinaya in the T'ang Dynasty.[279] Tao-an (n.d.), his other disciple, observed the Vinaya so rigidly that he would never attend any Buddhist congregation if such a meeting involved the slightest contravention of the Buddhist code of discipline.[280]

(2) Ling-yü (519-605) entered the order in the Chao Prefecture (in present Hopeh Province). He heard of the fame of Hui-kuang and went to Yeh in order to follow him. Unfortunately, Hui-kuang had passed away seven days before he arrived. With grief and regret, Ling-yü turned to listen to Tao-p'ing's sermon on the Daśabhūmiśāstra, for p'ing's knowledge of this Śāstra was received directly from Hui-kuang.[281] After three years, Ling-yü returned home to the Ting State (the present Ting City in Hopeh Province) and received ordination in his twenty-second year. After his ordination Ling-yü spent eight days reciting and writing all the 242 rules of the Dharmaguptaśīla and the 210 rules of the Mahāsāṅghikaśīla.[282] Then he went to the Valley of the Chang River to follow T'an-yin, another disciple of Hui-kuang, in order to learn the DRMGTV. After twelve years of visiting different places and listening to Buddhist lectures, Ling-yü became a specialist not only on Vinaya but also on Sūtras and Śāstras; hence the great success of the sermons he preached in the capital, Yeh. People in the capital called him "Yü, the Bodhisattva". When the Northern Ch'i was conquered by the Northern Chou in 557 and the Chou government administered its policy of persecuting the Buddhists and the Taoists in the Ch'i territories,[283] Ling-yü gathered about twenty monks together to live in the lay-community.[284] They wore coarse hempen mourning garments to mourn their bleak situation, discussing Buddhist doctrines in the evening and studying the secular treatises in the day time. During this period, Ling-yü supported his companions with the income from his fortune-

telling.[285] After the Sui Dynasty was established in 581, Ling-yü declined with thanks the imperial appointments of 'Tu-t'ung (Deputy Controller of the Buddhist Priests)' in 583 and of 'Kuo-t'ung (Controller of the Buddhist Priests)' in 591.[286] Among his fifty-one works on Buddhism, as well as on secular matters, there were two disciplinary works: a commentary on the DMRGTV in five fascicles and the Sêng-chi or 'Chinese Monastic Rules'.[287]

(3) Fa-k'ai (n.d.) learned the DRMGTV in Yeh from both Tao-yün and Tao-hui. When the Northern Ch'i surrendered their regime to the Northern Chou, and the Chou policy of persecuting Buddhism spread to the territories of the Ch'i, Fa-k'ai went to the Valley of the Huai River, the area bordering the Ch'i, to escape this situation.[288] Fa-k'ai was among the delegates when Emperor Wên of the Sui Dynasty dispatched thirty monks in 601[289] to carry the sacred relics of the Buddha to various prefectural centres where stūpas were built to enshrine them.[290] Among those delegates were other disciplinarians of the DRMGTV. They were Chüeh-lang,[291] Tao-tuan,[292], Hsüan-ching,[293] and Tao-shên.[294]

(4) Hung-tsun (530-608) played an important role in the spread of the DRMGTV to the Upper reaches of the Yellow River, even though he was not canonized as one of the 'Nine Patriarchs'.[295] He specialised in the study of the Vinaya after his ordination. First he went to the Shao-lin Monastery to receive a knowledge of the essentials of the Vinaya from Tao-yün, and then he went to Yeh to listen to Tao-hui's lectures on the DRMGTV. As most of the five hundred of Tao-hui's disciples looked for plausible arguments with which to please people when lecturing to them, and were not serious students of the doctrine, they could not comprehend the true meaning of the Vinaya. Tao-hui seemed to condone this attitude to study among his disciples. Even though Hung-tsun grasped the Vinaya to some extent, he was not shown any regard by his master, because he never assumed the attitude of his fellow disciples. One day, Hung-tsun tied up the scrolls of Tao-hui's commentary, brought them to the lecture hall and in

front of the congregation told Tao-hui: "I have followed you for days, yet you have shown no regard for my performance; therefore, I come to say goodbye and return to you the text that I have used." After saying that, he placed the commentary on his own seat and departed.[296] Hung-tsun then returned to Tao-yün's place and the latter arranged for him to give lectures, with which Hung-tsun always gained the respect of his audience. As Hung-tsun found that the doctrines of the Vinaya related to the contents of the other Piṭaka, he attended lectures on the Abhidharma and also strove to learn the Dhyāna. After ten years, he resumed his study of the DRMGTV. When the Northern Ch'i Dynasty was established, the emperor appointed him 'Tuan-shih Shā-man' or 'Judge for the Buddhist Priests', and told him to punish the priests in accordance with the 'inner discipline (the code of the Vinaya)' when they offended against the secular law.[297] In 596, Hung-tsun was appointed 'Chiang-lü Chung-chu' or 'Chief Lecturer on the Vinaya to the Priests', by Emperor Wên in Ch'ang-an, the capital of the Sui Dynasty. As the Monastic Order of the Ch'ang-an area had adopted the Mahāsāṅghikavinaya as their code of religious discipline since the Northern Wei (386-534),[298] no one came to listen to his lectures on the DRMGTV.[299] Therefore, Hung-tsun gave lectures on the Saddharma-puṇḍarīkasūtra in the daytime and preached the DRMGTV in the evening in order to attract people to listen to his sermons on the Vinaya through his lectures on the Sūtra.[300] Gradually, the audiences at his sermons on the Vinaya increased and by the time the HKSC was compiled in 665, the Mahāsāṅghikavinaya was no longer preached or practised in the Ch'ang-an area.[301] Hung-tsun prepared the Ta-chʻun Ch'ao, or 'Quotations exclusively from the Vinaya' in five fascicles in order to help the understanding of the Vinaya scriptures.[302] Among his disciples, Tao-hung, Fa-shêng and Hung-yüan (all n.d.) were noted disciplinarians.[303]

(5) Chih-shou (567-635) of Kansu, was born in the Valley of the Chang River (the area bordering the Shansi and Honan provinces). He entered the

Order in the Hsiang State (Yeh area of Honan) in his childhood under Chih-min (n.d.), the meditator. Chih-shou was interested in Vinaya and used to listen to the lectures on Buddhist discipline. As his master Chih-min was not a disciplinarian, Chih-shou was uncertain as to whether the ordination that he received in his twenty-second year was in conformity with the rules of the Vinaya or not. Therefore, he prayed in front of a stūpa, begging for a Buddhist manifestation to prove the perfection of his ordination. While praying, he felt that the Buddha came down from the sky and placed a hand upon the crown of his head to indicate that his ordination had been properly conducted. Then he paid more attention to the doctrines of the Vinayas of different schools.[304] Later, he listened to the lectures on the Discipline by Tao-hung (n.d.), the 'Seventh Patriarch' of the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect in China,[305] and among the seven hundred disciples gathered on those occasions he was the leading one.[306] Thereafter he inaugurated his own lectures on the DRMGTV' before his thirtieth year. After the Sui Dynasty was established, he followed Ling-yü and went to Ch'ang-an to give lectures on the Vinaya. There he spent four years reading through the whole Tripiṭaka seeking passages which had a bearing on the contents of the Vinaya. Concurrently, he compared and collated the ancient commentaries on the Vinaya and revised the incorrect interpretations among them according to the materials he had just found. Next, he compiled the Wu-pu Ch'ü-fên Ch'ao, or 'The Distinguished Quotations from the Vinayas of Five Schools', in twenty-one fascicles, in order to indicate the points of difference and of agreement between the five Vinayas which prevailed in China. Also his work distinguished between those ancient interpretations of the Vinaya which were acceptable in his day and those which were not.[307] Since Hung-tsun, who was then preaching the DRMGTV in the Ch'ang-an area, merely gave lectures without instructing his disciples on their personal conduct and the ritual as laid down in the Vinaya, his disciples were requested by him to join Chih-shou's disciples because Chih-shou had already instituted

courses of instruction on their personal conduct and the ritual in accordance with the Vinaya for his own group of disciples. The DRMGTV was thus gradually taking the place of the Mahāsāṅghikavinaya in the Ch'ang-an area.[308] In 627 the Indian Tripiṭa Master Prabhākaramitra (565-633),[309] brought with him a large number of Sanskrit texts.[310] Emperor T'ai-tsung (R. 627-649) of the T'ang Dynasty ordered the organisation of a translation centre to render those texts into Chinese and Chih-shou was appointed one of the assistants, the 'Chêng-i' or 'Doctrinal Examiner',[311] in the centre to take care of the doctrines that related to the Vinaya.[312] In 634, Chih-shou was appointed abbot of the Hung-fu (Great Blessing) Monastery, a monastery which was constructed as a memorial for Emperor T'ai-tsung's late royal mother.[313] When Chih-shou died in the following year, he was honoured by a state funeral and became the first Buddhist monk who won such a high honour since the Sui Dynasty.[314]

(6) Fa-li (569-635), born in the Yeh area, followed Ling-yü to obtain ordainment, but while yet in his homeland, learned the DRMGTV from Disciplinarian Chung-hung (n.d.). Then he went to the Yangtzŭ Valley to attend lectures on the SVSTVDV and to debate with others who assembled there.[315] He then returned to Yeh to conduct his own lectures.[316] In his whole career he gave forty lectures on the entire DRMGTV in Yeh and compiled the Ssŭ-fên Lü Shu or 'The Commentary on the DRMGTV', in ten fascicles[317] and the Chieh-mo Shu, or 'The Commentary on the Karma of the DRMGTV', in three fascicles.[318] His commentary on the Vinaya then became very influential and authoritative in the T'ang time[319] and the disciplinarians who studied Fa-li's commentary were called 'Tung-t'a Lü-tsung' or 'The Disciplinarians who Follow the Pagoda in the East' by the T'ang Buddhists.[320] Among Fa-li's disciples, Man-i (flor. 626-655) and T'an-kuang (flor. 665) are noteworthy. Man-i met Fa-li in Yeh about 626 and followed the latter in order to learn the DRMGTV from him. Then he gave his own lectures on the Vinaya for some thirty years, and afterwards passed his

lectureship on to his disciple, Disciplinarian Ta-liang (n.d.). Later on, Ta-liang made T'an-i (n.d.) his successor as a preacher. Many disciplinarians in the T'ang Dynasty were trained by Man-i and his successors.[321] T'an-kuang followed Fa-li in Yeh, and Tao-shuo (n.d.)[322] in Wei-chou (present Chi City of Honan Province) to learn the Vinaya.[323] Fa-li praised him highly, saying: "Oh, this man, I suppose, would probably introduce my interpretations of the Vinaya to the western part of the Yellow River Valley." In fact, though a little bit of his master's dream was realised when T'an-kuang recommended Disciplinarian Chün-tu (flor. 665) to the Hsi-ming Monastery in Ch'ang-an, a city in the western part of the Yellow River Valley, to preach the Vinaya there, he himself stayed in Lo-yang, a city in the east of the Valley, to coach disciples till Tao-hsüan's time in 665.[324]

(7) Hsüan-wan (562-636), after his ordination, followed Hung-tsun in Ch'ang-an to learn the DRMGTV for three years and then inaugurated his own lectures in the Sui Dynasty.[325] About the year 627-28, Emperor T'ai-tsung of the T'ang Dynasty invited him to administer the Śīla of the Bodhisattva to the crown prince and the other royal princes. Later on, an edict was issued asking him to come to the palace to ordain the empress, the royal concubines and the princesses. As his reputation spread, people sought to follow him in large numbers, so much so that three thousand Chinese as well as foreign monks and nuns received their ordination from him, and over two hundred thousand laymen, including the enfeoffed princes; lords; officials and even lictors, gained their entry into the religion of Śaraṇ-gamana through him.[326] He also persuaded the emperor to issue an edict prohibiting the slaughter of animals in 635.[327]

(8) Tao-ch'êng (flor. 658-686) lived in Ch'ang-an and began to preach the DRMGTV in 658. The outstanding disciplinarians Wên-kang (636-727) and Huai-su followed him seeking instruction. About 686, Empress Wu Tsê-t'ien (R. 684-704) appointed him 'Doctrinal Examiner' to assist the Tripitaka Master Divākara (613-687), in the work of translation.[328]

(9) Huai-su (624-697) followed the Tripiṭa Master Hsüan-tsang (602-664), and entered the order in Ch'ang-an in 645.[329] After his ordination he concentrated his attention on the study of the Vinaya. In 670, dissatisfied with Fa-li's commentary, he decided to compile a new commentary to take its place.[330] In 676, he listened to the Disciplinarian Tao-ch'êng's lecture in order to get some useful information that would enable him to finalise his own compilation.[331] In 682 he completed a new commentary in ten fascicles,[332] in which he condemned the commentaries compiled in ancient times saying that they contained sixty percent misinterpretations.[333] In his new commentary, thousands of new interpretations were added.[334] People than called Huai-su's commentary the 'Hsin-chang' or 'The New Interpretation', and Fa-li's work the 'Chiu-shu' or 'The Old Commentary'. Those who learned Huai-su's commentary were called the 'Hsi-t'a Lü-tsung' or 'The Disciplinarians Who Follow the Pagoda in the West'.[335] About 727, Disciplinarian Ting-pin (n.d.) of the Mount Sung compiled the Shih-tsung Chi[336] as an interpretation of Huai-su's work.[337] As only the Śīla for monks of the DRMGTV had already been translated,[338] Huai-su extracted materials from the body of this Vinaya to compile the Ssu-fên Pi-ch'iu-ni Chieh-pên or 'The Śīla for the Bhikṣunīs of the DRMGTV', in one fascicle and at the same time he also used select materials to compile the Ssŭ-fên Pi-ch'iu Chieh-pên or 'The Śīla for Bhikṣus of the DRMGTV' which was of a similar length.[339] Besides, the Ssŭ-fên Sêng Chieh-mo or 'The Karma of the DRMGTV for Monks' in one fascicle and the Ni Chieh-mo or the 'Karma for the Nuns' of a similar length were also compiled from extractions taken from the above-mentioned materials.[340]

Only those personalities who could be regarded as the most outstanding have been discussed above, Others, whose names are recorded in our sources as merely having been disciples of Masters of the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect and whose connections with this Sect have not been of any consequence, have not been treated in the above discussion. Mention should be made, how-

ever, of one disciplinarian, the Tripitaka Master I-ching, who was originally a follower of the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect and had learned both the commentaries compiled by Fa-li and Tao-hsüan before his visit to India and the Malay Archipelago.[341] Ting-pin says that in the year 705, the monk Tao-lin (n.d.) in Ch'ang-an censured I-ching claiming that he had composed a Gāthā (hymn) in Chinese on the DRMGTV and, pretending that it was his translation, had inserted it into the Chinese version of this Vinaya.[342] This story hints at how zealous I-ching was in propagating the DRMGTV. Like the others, he too was a native of the Yellow River Valley. From the time when Tao-hsüan followed Chih-shou in Ch'ang-an about 611, this Sect began to spread to the Yangtzŭ Valley and then in due course blossomed all over the whole realm of China. This will be discussed in Section V of this Chapter.

IV. The Other Vinayas in China

Apart from the dominant Vinayas, i.e. those of the Sarvāstivādin and the Dharmagupta Schools, the Vinayas of other Schools were translated into Chinese, and some of them were once practised in the monastic establishments of certain districts. I should like to devote some pages to a description of the survival of these Vinayas in Chinese Buddhist history.

(A) The Mahāsāṅghikavinaya Sect.

The Mahāsāṅghikavinaya and its Śīla were obtained from Central India by Fa-hsien,[343] and then brought back by him to China about 412.[344] In 415 Buddhabhadra (359-429) was expelled by the monks in Ch'ang-an and took refuge in Nanking.[345] Fa-hsien went there in the following year from Ch'ing State of the Eastern Chin Dynasty (present Shantung Province) to ask Buddhabhadra to work with him on the translation of this Vinaya and of some other sacred scriptures that he had brought from overseas. The two men organized a translation centre in the Tao-ch'ang Monastery in Nanking.[346] The Chinese version of this Vinaya and its Śīlas for monks and nuns came out in 418, and the Chinese titles that were given to them are:

Mo-ho Sêng-chih Lü or the Mahāsāṅghikavinaya (in forty fascicles, hereafter referred to as MHSGKV); Mo-ho Sêng-chih Lü Ta Pi-Ch'iu Chieh-pên or the 'Śīla for the Great Bhikṣus of the MHSGKV (in one fascicle)' and Mo-ho Sêng-chih Pi-ch'iu-ni Chieh-pên or the 'Śīla for Bhikṣunīs of the MHSGKV (in one fascicle)'.[347] This was some 168 years after Dharmakāla's translation of the Śīla of this Vinaya in about 251.[348]

T'ang Yung-t'ung has said that in the Liu-Sung Dynasty (420-479), apart from the monks of the Chih-yüan Monastery in Nanking who used the MSHGKV, the other monasteries of the Yangtzŭ Valley probably adopted the SVSTVDV.[349] His statement is not quite correct, because I have found some disciplinarians who specialized in MHSGKV who belonged to other monasteries during the Liu-Sung period. In his youth Hui-hsün (357-458) studied Buddhism under Kumārajīva in Ch'ang-an. He had a thorough knowledge of the sacred scriptures, and was expecially versed in both the SVSTVDV and the MHSKGV. At the beginning of the Liu-Sung Dynasty, he returned to Kuang-ling (present Chiang-tu City of the Kiangsu Province) to preach the Vinaya.[350] Even his Biography in KSC does not mention which Vinaya he preached, but the fact that his disciple Tao-ying (396-478) was a specialist in MHSGKV, indicates that his preaching included this Vinaya.[351] Tao-ying lived in the Hsien-hsin Monastery in Nanking.[352] In the same monastery lived Hui-yü (flor. 480-1), who preached the same Vinaya.[353]

This Vinaya was more popular in the Yellow River Valley than in the Yangtzŭ Valley, especially in the upper reaches of the Yellow River, i.e. the Ch'ang-an area.[354] Owing to inadequate information we cannot tell how it spread to the north. The only explanation is that both Buddhabhadra and Hui-hsün maintained their relations with the monastic establishments in Ch'ang-an. The disciplinarians who contributed to the establishment and maintenance of this Vinaya in the Yellow River Valley were:

(1) T'an -ch'ung (511-590), a native of Shansi, who read through the MHSGKV ten times and then gave lectures on it in Ch'ang-an. He used to

attract audiences of some three hundred people. He was respected by Emperor Wu of the Northern Chou Dynasty (R. 561-578) because the two hundred monk-disciples that he led never broke the rules.[355]

(2) Ling-tsang (519-586), also a native of the same province, was famous for his mastery of MHSGKV. Before Emperor Wên of the Sui Dynasty made himself monarch, he was a friend of Ling-tsang, and after he took over the throne from Emperor Ching of the Northern Chou (R. 579-581), he still maintained his friendship with the monk. In 584, because of the drought in the Ch'ang-an area, the emperor led his people to Lo-yang for food. Ling-tsang followed and ordained some ten thousand laymen as monks. The emperor himself said: "I, your disciple, am the emperor of the laity, and you, master of Vinaya, are emperor of the Monastic Order."[356] In the Sui period there was also Ming-k'uang (n.d.) of Lo-yang who specialized in this Vinaya and received more than one hundred disciples there.[357]

(3) Sêng-huang (died ca. 619-20), a native of Szechuan, orginally learned the SVSTVDV. After 561 he went to Ch'ang-an to study the MHSGKV. After the establishment of the Sui Dynasty he was appointed Sêng-chêng of his homeland.[358]

(4) Hui-chou (died ca. 627-9), a native of Shansi, was famous for his knowledge of the MHSGKV, and after the age of thirty he moved to Ch'ang-an.[359]

According to my researches, Hui-chou was the last monk to practise this Vinaya. After Hung-tsun and Chih-shou preached on the DRMGTV in the upper reaches of the Yellow River, the preaching and practising of the MHSGKV vanished in the Ch'ang-an area.[360] Only Chih-shêng (flor. 730), a Ch'ang-an monk and author of KYSCL, still demonstrates knowledge of this Vinaya in his work.[361]

(B) The Mahīśāsakavinaya Sect

The Mahīśāsakavinaya was also obtained by Fa-hsien in Sri Lanka,[362] but he had no opportunity to translate it into Chinese before his death. When in 423 the Kashmirian monk Buddhajīva (n.d.) came to the Yangtzŭ Valley, the

monks in Nanking, hearing that he was a specialist in this Vinaya, organized a translation centre in the Lung-kuang Monastery and invited him to translate it for them. The Chinese version which came out in the following year was entitled Mi-sha-sê Pu Ho-hsi Wu-fên Lü or 'The Vinaya of the Mahīśāsaka School in Five Parts (in thirty-four fascicles)'.[363] As Fa-hsien did not bring back with him the Śīla and the Karma of this Vinaya, the translators at the Lung-kuang Monastery used materials from the body of the translation to compile its Śīla and Karma.[364] The Śīla was given the title Mi-sha-sê Wu-fên Chieh-pên or 'The Śīla for Monks of the Mahīśāsakavinaya in Five Parts (in one fascicle)'.[365] Because Buddhajīva and his assistants had not prepared a Śīla for nuns, a monk called Ming-hui (n.d.) used materials from the body of the Vinaya to compile one in 522. He gave it the title Wu-fên Pi-ch'iu-ni Chieh-pên or 'The Śīla for the Bhikṣuṇīs of the Vinaya in Five Parts (in one fascicle)'.[366]

The Mahīśāsakavinaya (hereafter referred to as MĪŚSKV) was not popular with Chinese Buddhists. I can find only a few monks in the T'ang Dynasty who had something to do with this Vinaya. Ai-t'ung (flor. 706), a native of Kansu, gave lectures on this Vinaya after his ordination.[367] As the Karma prepared by Buddhajīva and his assistants had been lost by his time, he used materials from the body of the Vinaya once again to prepare a new one, and give it the title Mi-sha-sê Chieh-mo Pên or 'The Karma of the MĪŚSKV (in one fascicle)'. His work was welcomed by the followers of the Mahīśāsaka-vinaya Sect.[368] About 706, Ai-t'ung was appointed 'Doctrinal Examiner' in the translation centre in Ch'ang-an to assist the Tripiṭaka Master I-ching in rendering into Chinese the Vinaya texts which he had brought from overseas.[369] Ai-t'ung also compiled a commentary to the MĪŚSKV in ten fascicles before his death. Unfortunately his work was destroyed by fire during the An Lu-shan Rebellion (755-762).[370] In his KYSCL Chih-shêng shows his knowledge not only of the MHSGKV, but also of this Vinaya.[371] We also read of Ch'i-han (718-775), in the Yangtzŭ Valley, who, according to the MĪŚSKV, had attended an

altar to receive his ordination in the Yung-ting Monastery in Wu-hsing (in Chekiang Province) in 750.[372] The above information concerning Chih-shêng and Ch'i-han indicates the fact that although the Dharmaguptavinaya School won imperial favour when the Monastic Order of the whole nation was ordered to adopt their Vinaya as the chartered rule about 709,[373] the Mahīśāsakavinaya Sect was still in existence here and there some forty years later.

(C) The Samantapāsādikā

The first disciplinarian of the Samantapāsādikā (commentary on the Pāli Vinaya, hereafter referred to as SMTPSDV), to come to China was the Kashmirian monk Dharmayaśas (flor. 399-414). He arrived in Canton about 399 and then went to Ch'ang-an about 409 and worked in the translation centre there till 414. Even though he participated in works of translation he never got the opportunity to render into Chinese the Vinaya which he had memorised.[374] Before the year 488 Saṅghabhadra (n.d.) and his teacher, an unnamed foreign Tripiṭaka master, brought with them the text of this Vinaya to China by sea. They arrived in Canton, where the Tripiṭaka master stayed for only a while before leaving the text with his disciple and sailing home. Saṅghabhadra worked together with the Chinese monk Sêng-i (n.d.) to translate the text into Chinese in the Chu-lin Monastery of Canton in 488.[375] The Chinese version came out in eighteen fascicles and was given the title Shan-chien Pi-p'o-sha Lü.[375A] Even though this Vinaya was translated into Chinese, I cannot find mentioned anyone in Chinese Buddhist history who learned or practised it.

(D) The Vinaya of the Kāśyapīya School.

The first Chinese Buddhist who tried to go to India to search for the Vinaya of the Kāśyapīya School was the monk Fa-hsien. He embarked on his pilgrimage to India to visit the holy relics in 475. He went overland from Nanking to Khotan, planning to enter India from there. Unfortunately, the

planks which spanned a particularly dangerous section of the route across the K'un-lun Shan range had collapsed and he was unable to proceed.[376] Sêng-yu, his disciple, says that Fa-hsien had vowed to search for this Vinaya.[377] I suppose that he might have made such a vow after arriving in Khotan and hearing about this Vinaya there. The Brahmin Gautama Prajñāruci (n.d.) came in 539 to the realm of the Eastern Wei Dynasty (534-550) and participated in the translation work in Yeh.[378] As the Śīla of the Kāśyapīyavinaya had already been discovered abroad and brought to China by some pilgrims, Kao-ch'êng (520-548), the 'Shih-chung Shang-shu Ling' or 'Palace Attendant-cum-Prefect of the Master of Writing', asked the Brahmin to translate it into Chinese in 543.[379] The Chinese version came out in about 540-1[380] and was given the title of Chieh-t'o Chieh-pên Ching or 'The Śīla for Salvation (in one fascicle)'.[381] About 644, when the Tripiṭaka Master Hsüan-tsang was on his way back to China; while crossing the Indus River he lost some of the sacred scriptures that he had collected. Those scriptures included the Kāśyapīya texts. Nevertheless, he sent someone to Uddiyāna for fresh copies of the Tripiṭaka of the Kāśyapīya School and brought them with him to China.[382] Unfortunately this Tripiṭaka, including the body of its Vinaya was never rendered into Chinese.

(E) The Disciplinary Scriptures of the Mūlasarvāstivāda School.

After twenty-five years of pilgrimage (671-695) in India and the Malay Archipelago, the Tripiṭaka Master I-ching returned to China with a quantity of Sanskrit texts.[383] At first, he was appointed by Empress Wu Tsê-t'ien to assist the Khotan Tripiṭaka Master Śikṣānanda (652-710) in translating the Buddhist scriptures; then, in 700, he became Chief Translator directing a group of assistants who dealt with the texts he had brought back.[384] Among the Chinese versions that arose from these texts, there are a considerable number of the disciplinary scriptures of the Mūlasarvāstivāda School. The following are listed in the KYSCL:[385]

(1) Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu P'i-na-yeh or Mūlasarvāstivādanikāyavinaya (T. 1442) in fifty fascicles.

(2) Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu Pi-ch'iu-ni P'i-na-yeh or Mūlasarvāstivāda-Bhikṣunī-Vinaya (T. 1443) in twenty fascicles.

(3) Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu P'i-na-yeh Tsa-shih or Vinayakṣudravastu Mūlasarvāstivāda (T. 1451) in forty fascicles.

(4) Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu Ni-t'o-na-mu-tê-chia or Mūlasarvāstivādanikāyamātṛkānidāna (T. 1452) in ten fascicles.

(5) Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu Chieh-ching or Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya Sūtra (T. 1454) in one fascicle.

(6) Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu Pi-ch'iu-ni Chieh-ching or Mūlasarvāstivāda-bhikṣunīprātimokṣa Sūtra (T. 1455) in one fascicle.

(7) Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu Pai-i Chieh-mo or Mūlasarvāstivādaikaśatakarman (T. 1453) in ten fascicles.

(8) Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu Pi-na-yeh Sung or Mūlasarvāstivādanikāyavinayagāthā (T. 1459) in five fascicles.

(9) Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu P'i-na-yeh Tsa-shih Shê-sung or Mūlasarvāstivādavinayakṣudrakavastūddāna (T.1457) in one fascicle.

(10) Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu Ni-t'o-na-mu-tê-chia Shê-sung or Mūlasarvāstivādanikāyavinayanidānāmātṛkāgāthā (T. 1456) in one fascicle.

(11) Kên-pên-Sa-p'o-to-pu Lü-shê or Mūlasarvāstivādavinayasaṁgraha (T.1458) in two fascicles.

Apart from the above list, some other translation appear in the CYHTSCML (T. 2157);[386] they are:

(12) Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu P'i-na-yeh yao-shih or Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya Bhaiṣajyavastu (T. 1448) in eighteen fascicles.[387]

(13) Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu P'i-na-yeh P'o-sêng-shih or Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya Saṅghabhedavastu (T.1450) in twenty fascicles.[388]

(14) Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu P'i-na-yeh Ch'u-chia-shih or Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya Pravrajyāvastu (T. 1444) in four fascicles.[389]

(15) Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu P'i-na-yeh An-chü-shih or Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya Varṣāvastu (T. 1445) in one fascicle.[390]

(16) Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu P'i-na-yeh Sui-i-shih or Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya Pravāraṇāvastu (T. 1446) in one fascicle.[391]

(17) Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu P'i-na-yeh P'i-ko-shih or Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya Carmavastu (T. 1447) in two fascicles.[392]

(18) Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu P'i-na-yeh Ch'ieh-ch'ih-na-i-shih or Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya Kathinavastu (T. 1449) in one fascicle.[393]

There are eighteen translated versions in all that cover one hundred and eighty-eight of the fascicles. This is the biggest single translation among the translations of the Vinaya scriptures. I-ching also extracted short stories from the above versions (numbers 1 and 2) to prepare separately forty-two Buddhist scriptures (they cover forty-nine fascicles) and gave them new titles to show the Chinese Buddhists that the contents of the above Vinayas he had translated were not so boring but contained many interesting tales.[394]

Even though the above eighteen Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya scriptures had been introduced into China, I can find no record of the Vinaya of this School having been adopted and put into practice by some of the Chinese monasteries. Had I-ching had the same idea as Tao-an and done the same thing as the latter had done about 709,[395] the Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya would probably have become the chartered discipline for the Chinese Order before the DRMGTV won such a good chance. I-ching was welcomed by Empress Wu Tsê-t'ien herself in front of the eastern gate of Lo-yang when he returned from the South Seas in 695 and later Emperor Chung-tsung (R.684, and 705-710) acted once as his scribe in the translation centre in Ch'ang-an in 707.[396] As the imperial favours he granted were more than those granted to Tao-an, the odds were in I-ching's favour if he wanted to annex the other disciplinary sects like Tao-an. In my opinion, I-ching would not do what Tao-an had done, because:

Firstly, he was originally a sectarian of the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect[397] and a native of the Yellow River Valley.[398] Secondly, the Yellow River Valley

had long been the dominion of the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect before it developed into the only Disciplinary School in China after 709.[399] As I-ching was preaching as well as translating in Lo-yang and Ch'ang-an, there would have been no reason for him to betray his own Sect and to challenge the Buddhist establishment of his native Valley so seriously. Besides, even though he might have had such an idea, the ruling class of the T'ang Dynasty would not have given him support unless they could see advantage. The reason why Emperor Chung-tsung decided to follow Tao-an's argument and put it into practice was that it was useful to cast more imperial power upon the Buddhist churches of the conquered Yangtzŭ Valley.[400] But the Yellow River Valley was the bastion of the ruling class of the T'ang Empire. Thirdly, I-ching who had brought in the Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya scriptures and composed the NHCKNFC, would probably only have intended introducing more informative materials for the Chinese disciplinarians to interpret the Vinayas which were popular in China in his time.[401] He would not have been as ambitious as Tao-an in seeking aid from the imperial power to expand his own Sect.[402]

Besides I-ching, there were also some other Chinese Buddhist monks who went to India or the Buddhist kingdoms in the Malay Archipelago to learn the Vinaya of this School. They were: (1) Disciplinarian Ta-tsin (flor. 683-691) who went to Śrīvijaya (present Sumatra) in 683, stayed there for three years to learn Sanskrit and received his ordination there.[403] Then he returned to China in 691.[404] As the Mūlasarvāstivādanikāya had been almost universally adopted by the Buddhist establishments of the Malay Archipelago at that time,[405] Ta-tsin was evidently ordained through the Karma of the Mūlasarvāstivāda School. (2) Bhikṣu Tao-hung (n.d.) went to Śrīvijaya after I-ching's pilgrimage and studied the Vinaya there.[406] Then he translated the Vinaya prevailing in Śrīvijaya into Chinese and planned to transmit it to his homeland.[407] From the former discussion we know that the Vinaya he studied must have been the Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya.

(3) Wu-k'ung (flor. 731-790), secular surname Ch'ê, was originally one of the attachés to the envoy of the T'ang Dynasty to Kashmir. When this team of diplomats arrived in Gandhāra in 753, Ch'ê was too sick to follow the envoy further and remained there for convalescence. After he was cured, he devoted himself to the Monastic Order there and received his religious name 'Dharmadhātu' from a Tripiṭaka master.[408] Thus Dharmadhātu learned the Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya in Gandhāra.[409] When he returned home in 789, Emperor Tê-tsung (R. 780-804) conffered on him a Chinese religious name 'Wu-k'ung'.[410]

Even though others followed I-ching to learn the Vinaya of this School, it was never put into practice by the Chinese Monastic Order in the T'ang and the Sung (960-1279) Dynasties. Fortunately, the discipline of this School seems to have found its chance in the Yüan (Mongol) Dynasty (1206-1368). In the year 1269, thirty-six years after the Mongols conquered the Tartar Chin Dynasty (1115-1234) in the Yellow River Valley in 1234,[411] Emperor Shih-tsu (Setsen Khan, R. 1260-1294) appointed the Tibetan Lama 'Phags-Pa (1235-1280)[412] as 'Ti-shih' or 'Imperial Preceptor'.[413] As 'Phags-Pa received the ordination of the Mūlasarvāstivāda School in Tibet,[414] the emperor told him to extract materials from the Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya scriptures to prepare (1) Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu Ch'u-chia Shou-chin-yüan Chieh-mo or 'The Procedure of the Karma for Ordination of the Mūlasarvāstivāda School' in 1270,[415] (2) Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu Pi-ch'u Hsi-hsüeh Lüeh-fa or 'A Brief Introduction of the Śīla for Bhikṣus of the Mūlasarvāstivāda School' in 1271[416] (both in one fascicle), and ordered some high-ranking officials to render them into Chinese in order to circulate them among the Chinese Monastic Order.[417] Apparently the Mongol Khan (the emperor) wanted in this way to extend his sovereignty over the Order as well as over the Chinese community of the conquered Yellow River Valley. Even though there is no further evidence on this point to be found, we can assume that the Buddhist establishments under Mongolian rule would

have been reluctant to use the first work of hPhags-Pa as their guide for ordination and his second work for the governing of monastic conduct. The so-called 'Imperial Preceptor' especially was the leader of the 'Tsung-chih Yüan' or 'The Bureau of Total Control', which controlled the Buddhist clergy in China and Tibet.[418] In the year 1295, seventeen years after the Mongols conquered the whole of China in 1279,[419] Emperor Ch'êng-tsung (Oeuldjatou Khan, R. 1295-1307) conferred on the 'Imperial Preceptor' in his fourth term of office a jade seal on which was engraved 'Ta-yüan Ti-shih T'ung-ling Ch'u-kuo Sêng-ni Chung-hsing Shih-chiao Chih-yin' or 'The Seal of the Imperial Preceptor of the Great Yüan Dynasty Who Leads the Monks and Nuns of the Nations (Under the Mongol) to the Advance of Buddhism', granting him authority in the Monastic Order of the Mongol Empire.[420] Probably the abovementioned works by hPhags-Pa spread to the Monastic Order throughout China as guides for monastic administration around this period.[421]

In the modern period there was one monk who tried to promulgate this Vinaya. Before he accepted the advice of his friend and changed his mind to study Tao-hsüan's Quotation and the DRMGTV, Yen-yin (well-known as Hung-i, 1880-1942), the famous modern disciplinarian, had spent years studying the Mūlasarvāstivādanikāyavinaya scriptures.[422] In 1932, Disciplinarian Hung-i began three courses of the Vinayas in Chekiang; the first was on the Quotation, the second on the Mūlasarvāstivādanikāyavinaya, and the third was a comparative course on these two. He gave lectures on the Quotation first and planned to teach the other two later.[423] Unfortunately, after lecturing for only half a month, his first lecture was interrupted for some reasons and he gave the whole thing up.[424] Even though it appears that he never had another chance to give the second course,[424A] Hung-i still wrote some essays on the Mūlasarvāstivādanikāyavinaya scriptures in order to introduce them to the people and to guide the Buddhists to study them.[425]

V. The Rise and Fall of the Dharmaguptavinaya School.[426]

In 611, when Tao-hsüan (596-667) entered the Order in Ch'ang-an, there begins a prospective new era of the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect in China. Tao-hsüan was a native of Tan-t'u (present Chên-chiang City in the Kiangsu Province). His father was the 'Li-pu Shang-shu' or 'Minister of Personnel' of the Ch'en Dynasty.[427] When the Ch'en Dynasty was overthrown by the Sui Dynasty in 589, Emperor Hou-chu (R. 583-589) of the Ch'en and the officials at his court along with their families were escorted by troops from Nanking to Ch'ang-an.[428] It was thus that Tao-hsüan and his father were forced to migrate to the Yellow River Valley. Tao-hsüan, who at the age of sixteen followed Hui-yün (564-635)[429] as a novice in Ch'an-an, then received his ordination from Chih-shou about the year 615 and followed the latter in order to learn the Vinaya.[430] In the beginning, after listening to an entire lecture on the Vinaya, Tao-hsüan could not bear to listen to any more lectures on it. When he prepared to give up the study of the Vinaya and to turn to the study of the Dhyāna, Hui-yün was critical of his attitude of studying and forced him to go on listening to the lectures on the Vinaya. Tao-hsüan continued with his lessons, but was still in touch with Chih-shou ten years after having finished his course.[431] After he had listened to twenty lectures on the entire DRMGTV, Tao-hsüan lived in solitude at the Hand-shape Valley of Mount Chung-nan and practised the Dhyāna.[432] Later he was appointed abbot of the Hsi-ning Monastery in Ch'ang-an and, in 645, was selected to be an assistant at the translation centre which was headed by Tripitaka Master Hsüan-tsang.[433] As Tao-hsüan was so faithful in preaching and practising the Vinaya, he gained a reputation in both China and India.[434] Among his two hundred and twenty fascicled publications on Buddhist biography, bibliography, collected documentaries and Vinaya commentary, the Quotation[434A] became the most influential commentary of the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect in the ensuing period.[435] Many disciplinarians gave lectures in accordance with this commentary[436] or prepared interpretations to promulgate it.[437] As Tao-hsüan had once resorted to Mount Chung-nan for solitude,

people referred to his commentary as Nan-shan Ch'ao or 'The Quotation by the Master of Mount Chung-nan'.[438] Also it was abbreviated into Hsing-shih Ch'ao or 'The Quotation for Practice'[439] or even simplified as Ch'ao or 'The Quotation'.[440] Those disciplinarians who followed Tao-hsüan's commentary were called 'Nan-shan Tsung' or 'The Sectarians of the Master of Mount Chung-nan'.[441]

Among Tao-hsüan's thousands of disciples,[442] Wên-kang (636-727) played a 'genealogical' role in the expansion of the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect in China. Wên-kang, like Tao-hsüan, was a native of the Yangtzŭ Valley (in the Chekiang Province).[443] His father who was himself a 'Shang-shu' of the Ch'en Dynasty, later served in the T'ang Dynasty as a 'Shan-shu Chih-chang' or 'Chief Monitor' of a ministry of the central government.[444] Originally, Wên-kang followed Tao-ch'êng to learn the DRMGTV and later gave his own lectures at the age of twenty-five.[445] In 708 he was summoned to the imperial palace to ordain the nuns who were serving there. While spending his Varsā in the palace, he lectured on the entire DRMGTV to those nuns.[446] His biography in SKSC does not mention that he had been a follower of Tao-hsüan.[447] But in the biography of Tao-hsüan it is stated that Wên-kang received the Dharma from Tao-hsüan.[448] After Tao-hsüan passed away in 667, Wên-kang followed his master's will by escorting the Buddha's tooth relic, that conferred by Nata, to the eastern pagoda of the Ch'ung-shêng Monastery for custody.[449] As the Buddha's tooth relic was received from that Deva in Hsi-ming Monastery and Tao-hsüan became its abbot before 645,[450] Wên-kang would have followed Tao-hsüan around that period. Wên-kang himself had about fifty disciples, of whom Tao-an was one.[451]

Tao-an (654-717), originally a native of Honan, was born in Kuang-chou (present I-yang area of the Kiangsu Province).[452] Since he made himself famous through his elegance and fluency when preaching the Prātimoksa of the SVSTVDV in Chekiang, Emperor Chung-tsung invited him to come and live with

some other eminent monks in the royal palace.[453] As Emperor Chung-tsung really came to power in his second period of rule,[454] Tao-an would probably have been invited to come to Ch'ang-an after 705. When Tao-an entered the palace, the emperor obliged all his royal consorts to circumambulate him and to pay homage to him.[454A] As mentioned above, Wên-kang preached the DRMGTV in the palace in 708, and probably it was upon listening to his sermons that Tao-an turned his interest to the Vinaya as it prevailed in the Yellow River Valley, the latter thereafter becoming a disciple of the former. After he renounced the Sarvāstivādavinaya Sect, Tao-an considered that most of the Buddhist priests of the Yangtzŭ River Valley (from where he came himself) adhered very closely to the SVSTVDV (the Vinaya which he had himself originally studied), but knew hardly anything of the DRMGTV. Therefore he persuaded the emperor to issue an informal edict, one signed in black ink,[454B] to the whole Monastic Order in the T'ang realm to regulate the conduct of the priests in accordance with the DRMGTV.[455] Since this 'edict in black ink' was issued around 709,[456] the DRMGTV became, under imperial charter, the code of discipline that regulated the Monastic Order of the whole nation. Although the 'edict in black ink' was not formally an imperial document, it at least represented the wish of the T'ang ruler. Bound by feudal obligations, the subjects of imperial T'ang did not dare to act contrary to the emperor's wishes; especially as the people of the Yellow River Valley were the conquerors and those of the Yangtzŭ River Valley were the conquered since the reunion of the two Valleys of China by the Sui Dynasty.[457] The Yangtzŭ Monastic Order seems to have had no other choice but to obey the emperor's ill-advised edict humbly and with patience.[458]

With the promulgation of this edict, the Sarvāstivādavinaya Sect was doomed to wither away. Tsan-ning, the author of the SKSC,[459] and a sectarian of the Dharmaguptavinaya School, praised the above action of Tao-an, saying: "By Tao-an's power, this Sect (the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect) has

become the prevailing one in the Valley of the Huai and the Yangtzŭ Rivers."[460] And "Tao-an brought Wên-kang's way (the DRMGTV) to the south from the north. It is to the credit of this man that the truth (of the DRMGTV) has thereby spread to the Wu area (the Yangtzŭ Valley)."[461] Was it Tao-an who really started a new era for the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect ? Except for the SKSC, other Buddhist histories which contain an account of Tao-an never mention that Tao-an had prevailed upon the emperor to issue such an edict,[462] while Yüan-chao, a junior sectarian of Tsan-ning, even avoided mentioning the name of Tao-an. In describing the 'Nine Patriarchs' of the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect in his Chih-yüan I-p'ien or 'Collection of Works Left by the Later Master of the Fungus Garden',[463] Yüan-chao says: "I will not go on describing our sectarians who were later than Tao-hsüan, the Ninth Patriarch. Even though there were so many disciplinarians who, disciples following masters, kept on preaching the DRMGTV since Wên-kang, their contributions were not a match for those of their seniors of the Sect."[464] In other words, Yüan-chao denied Tao-an any contribution to the expansion of their Sect into the Yangtzŭ Valley, even though he was a native of this Valley as was Tsan-ning.[465] Therefore, the SKSC is the only work that recorded the importance of Tao-an for his own Sect.[466] Upon this unique piece of evidence, could we postulate that with Tao-an there began a new era in the history of the spread of this Sect to the Yangtzŭ Valley ?

Although the evidence recorded in the SKSC is unique, its acceptance could be advocated by the following arguments:

(1) In the 'Category of Disciplinarians' of the SKSC no mention is made of a single disciplinarian, after the year 709, who practised in accordance with the SVSTVDV. On the contrary we find in the same book a great many disciplinarians and other monks specialized in other fields, who were natives or residents of the Yangtzŭ Valley and who were well-versed in the DRMGTV.[467] The fact that a large majority of them are said to have

specialized in the Quotation,[468] implies that the DRMGTV was very popular in the Yangtzŭ Valley after 709.

(2) In 778, because disciplinarians who followed Fa-li's Old Commentary and those who followed Huai-su's New Interpretation used to debate with each other on their interpretations of the DRMGTV, Emperor Tai-tsung (R.763-779) made an effort to resolve the many arguments that arose. He appointed fourteen leading disciplinarians in the capital, headed by Ju-ching (flor. 778-781) and Yüan-chao (flor. 727-799), to an editorial board in the Shrine of Vinaya of the An-kuo Monastery to examine the contents of these two controversial commentaries and to combine them into a single commentary which all Buddhist priests could then follow.[469] Following the system prevailing at a translation centre, the members of the editorial board had each a different function to perform to ensure that a detailed check and minute examination of the contents of these two commentaries was made in the process of compiling a single uniform and coherent commentary.[470] In combining the two commentaries into a new one in 781,[471] they worked according to the principles of "If the interpretation in the New Interpretation for a certain rule of the Vinaya is reasonable, we follow the New Interpretation. If for the same rule the interpretation of the Old Commentary is more reasonable, we prefer to adopt the Old Commentary. Even when their interpretations of the same rule do not always agree with each other, we keep both as if each was supported by acceptable arguments. If both of them were lacking in acceptable arguments, we abandon both and search for a new interpretation from the Sūtras and Vinayas by ourselves."[472] When the new commentary was completed, the editorial board considered that the Buddhist priests were already acquainted with the commentaries by Fa-li and Huai-su, and requested Emperor Tê-tsung to allow all three, i.e. the Old Commentary, the New Interpretation and this so-called Hsin-shu or 'New Commentary' to be issued to the Monastic Order so that the priests would be free to make their own choice. The emperor

issued an edict approving their request.[473] The 'New Commentary' had been studied by the monk Shên-ch'ing (died about 812) who composed the ten-fascicled Hsin-lü-shu Yao-chüeh or 'The Key Points of the New Commentary of the Vinaya'.[474] Up to the date when Tsan-ning composed the SKSC in 988, the 'New Commentary' was still surviving.[475] But, only the works of Fa-li and Huai-su can now be found in the Zokuzōkyō.[476] Unless the DRMGTV was the chartered discipline for the Monastic Order of the whole nation, the emperor would not have sponsored the edition of a new commentary for this Vinaya with a view to bring about a compromise between the arguments of the followers of two prevailing commentaries. However, the four years of labour seem to have been wasted as the 'New Commentary' was not able to take the place of either of the two former commentaries and did not survive for very long. It may be asked why the emperor did not sponsor a similar undertaking for the Sarvāstivādavinaya Sect. In my opinion this was due to the fact that the SVSTVDV had already been put aside by the Chinese Monastic Order and that as no one among the priests continued to abide by the Vinaya of that Sect after 709, there was no occasion for the sort of discussion that arose within the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect.

(3) About 812 the Lung-hsing Monastery,[477] in Lang-chou (present Lang-chung City in Szechuan Province) was about to prepare a Sīmābandha for a certain assembly.[478] I-sung (n.d.), an outstanding lecturer on Huai-su's New Interpretation in that monastery, in accordance with the record of the 'distance between the seven trees' in the MHSKGV,[479] decided that each of the four boundaries of Sīmā (the boundary) should be sixty-three steps[480] in length and that all the monks should come within the boundaries of this Sīmā to participate in the assembly.[481] After I-sung's decision was implemented, T'an-ch'ing (n.d.), a specialist on the Quotation, of Mount Nan-yo (or Mount Hêng, in present Hunan Province), heard about this and found that the former has misinterpreted the Vinaya.[482] He therefore travelled from prefecture to prefecture, inquiring about the

opinions of the priests on this matter.[483] He then forwarded his findings to the 'Liang-chieh Kung-tê-shih' or 'Commissioner of Religious Merits' of the government for arbitration,[484] and the latter gathered together the specialists of the Quotation, of the New Interpretation and of the Old Commentary to judge whether the interpretation by I-sung or the one by T'an-ch'ing and his comrades of the Sīmābandha was correct.[485] As I-sung had misinterpreted the wording of the MHSGKV,[486] T'an-ch'ing naturally won the argument in the end.[487] The above shows that an argument among the sectarians of the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect over different interpretations of a statement in their Vinaya occurred even in the Yangtzŭ Valley, the territory that had previously been occupied by the Sarvāstivādavinaya Sect.

From these three instances we can see that the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect had already spread throughout the T'ang Empire after 709. As for the Sarvāstivādavinaya Sect, on the other hand, not only are the activities of its sectarians not attested in either the Buddhist or the secular histories after that year, but also commentaries by the masters of this Sect are no longer recorded in the Buddhist bibliographical works compiled after the T'ang Dynasty.[488] How could this great change have taken place in the Disciplinary School in China ? Except for the action taken by Emperor Chung-tsung as recorded in the SKSC, we cannot find other materials to suggest a different explanation for this change. Therefore, I venture to say that the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect developed into the only Disciplinary School in China after having obtained imperial favour from the ruler of the T'ang Dynasty.[489]

In promulgating the DRMGTV in the Yangtzŭ Valley, the disciples of Tao-an also played a contributing role. After Tao-an's death, his disciple I-wei (n.d.) of Hang-chou carried on his mission of ordaining people of other prefectures into the Order.[490] Hsüan-yen (675-742), whose ancestors had migrated to the Yangtzŭ Valley at the beginning of the Eastern Chin

Dynasty (around 315-7), became a student of Tao-an while still in his teens and later received ordination from him.[491] Then he went to Ch'ang-an to advance his knowledge of the Vinaya. There he met the disciplinarians I and Jung-chi (both flor. 694-5),[492] both of them specialists on the Quotation.[493] At first he studied under them; afterwards he acquired a reputation in the T'ang capital for his adherence to the Vinaya. Later, Hsüan-yen returned to the Yangtzŭ Valley to promulgate the DRMGTV.[494] In 738, Emperor Hsüan-tsung (R.712-756) granted his imperial favour to the Monastic Order by allowing people to enter the Order.[495] Hsüan-yen was invited to ordain the new priests in the area now covered by Kiangsu and Chekiang provinces.[496] Within an area of a thousand miles, ten thousand priests and laymen obtained their ordination from him.[497] Apart from this three thousand people attended his lectures and he had a following of five hundred personal disciples during his whole career.[498] He compiled the Fu-p'ien-chi or 'The Explanatory Chapters (for the Study of the Vinaya)' in ten fascicles and the Chieh-mo Shu-chang or 'A Description of the Karma' in three essays.[499] These two works were often copies by the monks of the Yangtzŭ Valley up until 988, when the SKSC was composed.[500] Shên-yung (710-788), like his master Hsüan-yen, was a descendant of a family which had migrated to the Yangtzŭ Valley. He became ordained under the abovementioned imperial dispensation of 738 and followed Hsüan-yen to learn the Quotation. When his master's Fu-p'ien-chi came out, he read it and immediately grasped its key points.[501] Then he went to follow Hsüan-lang (673-754), the 'Eighth Patriarch' of the T'ien-t'ai School,[502] to learn this School's theory and practice of Dhyāna.[503] Around 749-50 Shên-yung went to Ch'ang-an to preach to the people his interpretation of Vinaya and Dhyāna. Unfortunately, he was forced to leave because of the arrival of An Lu-shan's rebelling troops in 756. From that year up to about 772, he was invited to ordain priests in the area corresponding to the present Kiangsu and Chekiang Provinces.[504] Chien-chên (687-763), a native of Chiang-tu, received the Śīla of the Bodhisattva from Tao-an in

705, and then went to Ch'ang-an in 707.[505] In the following year he obtained his ordination from the disciplinarian Hêng-ching (n.d.) there. Then Chien-chên went to listen to lectures on Buddhism in the two capitals, i.e. Ch'ang-an and Lo-yang.[506] Under the disciplinarian Jung-chi in Ch'ang-an he learned the Quotation, and also he attended nine times the entire series of lectures on the Old Commentary, given by I-wei and others.[507] After that Chien-chên went home to preach the Vinaya.[508] As well as in the present-day Kiangsu Province, he also gave lectures on the Vinaya in Chekiang and Anhwei Provinces.[509] In the year 737, the Japanese monks Yō-ei (+ 749) and Fu-chō (n.d.) came to invite Chien-chên to come to their country to introduce the Vinaya.[510] They first departed for Japan in 743 but were shipwrecked.[511] In 748 they sailed again, but the wind blew them to where is now the Hai-nan Island of the Kwangtung Province.[512] Nevertheless, Chien-chên made a tour, first by water and then by land, of the Buddhist places in the Kwangtung, Kwangsi and Kiangsi Provinces, and then went back to his home in Kiangsu. Wherever he visited, Chien-chên received a warm welcome. There was not a place he went without people asking him to confer ordination upon them. A total of forty thousand people, priests and laymen, received their ordination or the Śīla of the Bodhisattva from him.[513] In 753, Chien-chên embarked from Chiang-tu to make a successful trip to Japan. He preached there until his death in 763.[514] When Chien-chên was still in China, he was regarded as the successor of Tao-an and I-wei in the Yangtzŭ Valley.[515] He gave lectures on the entire DRMGTV with the Old Commentary on forty different occasions. Also he lectured on the entire Quotation seventy times.[516] Among his Chinese monk-disciples, there were thirty-five outstanding ones, especially Hsiang-yen, Tao-chin, Hsi-yü, Fa-chin, Ch'ien-yin, Shên-yung,[517] Ming-lieh and Hui-chung in Kiangsu Province; Jui-chên and Fa-yün in Chekiang Province; Chi-ên in Kiangsi Province; Ling-yü in Honan Province; and Jui-kuang and Ming-chai in Shensi Province. They were all regarded as excellent master.[518]

From the above discussion we can gather why the DRMGTVtook the place of the SVSTVDV in the Yangtzŭ Valley. Tao-an not only persuaded the emperor to force the Monastic Order to adopt the DRMGTV, but he and his disciples, and even the disciples of the next generation, did their best to promulgate this Vinaya in their homelands. This would also be the reason why the Quotation was so popular in the Yangtzŭ Valley after 709.[519] In developing his own Sect into the only 'Disciplinary School' in China, Tao-an's standing was very high from the sectarian point of view. People must wonder why, apart from the SKSC, other Buddhist histories and records mentioned above do not say a single word concerning this important achievement of Tao-an, even when Yüan-chao, a sectarian of the Dharmaguptavinaya School, was among the authors of those works. In my own opinion those authors would have considered that Tao-an not only betrayed the Sarvāstivādavinaya Sect by going over to the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect, but also induced the imperial power to interfere with the rules for administration of the Monastic Order. For these reasons they would have considered Tao-an's activities as a blot on Chinese Buddhist history, which, if mentioned in their works, would only make secular people feel contempt for Buddhism. As mentioned before, Yüan-chao commented on Wên-kang and others by saying that this monk and the other Dharmaguptavinaya disciplinarians of the later periods were no match for their predecessors. This suggests that Yüan-chao looked down not only on Tao-an, but also on Tao-an's master Wên-kang. Gradually, the sectarians even forgot the importance of Tao-an in their School.[520] Among them only Tsan-ning demonstrated his historian's 'zeal for the truth'[521] by recording the activities of Tao-an and his disciples in the SKSC,[522] thus making known to us the key points of this great change in Chinese Buddhist history.

The Dharmaguptavinaya School did not enjoy her hey-day very long. When the Ch'an master Huai-hai drew up a new set of monastic rules, the

'Ch'ing-kuei', and it was welcomed by the Buddhist establishments (see the following chapters), the Dharmaguptavinaya School was doomed to gradual decline. Three instances are representative and reflect the situation of this School in the days of her decline:

(1) Yüan-chao (1048-1116) was a representative of the Disciplinary School in the Sung Dynasty.[523] His importance can be shown in two respects: (a) Among his works on the DRMGTV,[524] the sixteen fascicled Ssŭ-fên Lü Hsing-shih-ch'ao Tzŭ-ch'ih Chi or 'A Guide to the Practice of the Quotation' (hereafter referred to as A guide to the Quotation)[525] is the leading interpretation to the Quotation. (b) The so-called 'Nine Patriarchs of the Dharmaguptavinaya School in China'[526] were canonized by him and were generally accepted by the Buddhists.[527] Yüan-chao vowed to spend his whole career in preaching the Vinaya; also he lived in accordance with the Vinaya tradition by wearing a cotton robe and holding a bowl to beg for food in Hang-chou.[528] Unfortunately, his begging astonished the secular people[529] and embarrassed the other monks of his Hsiang-fu Monastery.[530] In one year Yüan-chao, imitating Tao-hsüan's practice, gave his ordained monk-disciples an ordination once again in order to strengthen themselves with the Vinaya. The other monks of the same monastery picked this as a fault with which to accuse him in court. Yüan-chao was forced to write to the governor of Hang-chou Prefecture in his own defence. His letter reads:

> Some month and some day, the monk Yüan-chao writes this letter after he has bathed and begs to present to Your Excellency the Director-General of Transportation Who Acts Temporarily as a Prefectural Governor[531].... .... In the year 667, Disciplinarian Tao-hsüan re-ordained the monks who had already received an ordination once again in spring and in summer .... this is in fact a routine practice in our School of Buddhism. Those monks accuse me on this account not only because they do not know this religious tradition, but also for some other reasons that I should like to explain. After my visits to Wên-chou and T'ai-chou (present Yung-chia and Lin-hai Cities of the Chekiang Province) in the Hsi-ling

> Era (1068-1077), I returned to the Hsiang-fu Monastery, where I received my ordination, and stayed in its southeastern corner to concentrate my attention on composing some essays on the Vinaya. Some monks from afar knew that I was there and came to study under me. As I considered that Buddhism is declining at the present time and that the priests are straying from the proper observance of the Vinaya, I wished to do something to improve this situation. Therefore, I strengthened my own disciples with the Dhyāna and the Vinaya, instructing them to hold a bowl to beg for alms and to put on a thin cotton cloth in order to acquaint them with the traditional restricted life of monkhood. We continued in this way for years. But to lead a traditional life is in fact opposed to the trend current in the present monastic situation. Other monks of my monastery think that I am deluding the people with such a strange performance ..... I knew that it would offend the others if such an ordinary monk like myself were to follow our traditional practice. As the practices followed by others are different, they have been resentful for a long time. As I re-ordain my own ordained disciples with an ordination, they consider this as a defect with which to accuse me in the court in order to put an innocent man like myself into jail ..... it does not matter if I would even be executed for this reason, but I am afraid that the Vinaya tradition will thereafter soon cease to be followed. I know for certain that Your Excellency the Director-General of Transportation Who Acts Temporarily as a Prefectural Governor is as well qualified as were those great statesmen of ancient times ..... I beg of you to show mercy and to take a real good look into the matter of my case .....[532]

From the letter quoted above, we can see how bad the situation was for an outstanding sectarian of the Dharmaguptavinaya School in the days of its doom. How incredible that a monk who begs for food would thereby embarrass the other monks of the same monastery and cause such serious hatred ? As there is no further information to be found on this case, probably Yüan-chao was finally granted the mercy of the governor. Subsequently Yüan-chao was appointed abbot of the Ling-chih Monastery in 1078 and served there until his death in 1116.[533]

(2) In the year 1325, Shêng-wu (n.d.), a sectarian of the Dharmagupta-vinaya School compiled the ten fascicled Lü-yüan Shih-kuei or 'The Regulation of the Vinaya Field',[534] a set of monastic rules for his School. In its preface, Shêng-wu says:

> When the Ch'an Master Po-chang Ta-chih (Huai-hai) quoted from the Vinaya to prepare the Ch'ing-kuei for the Ch'an Buddhists, and it was well received by the Buddhist establishments throughout China, our Vinaya then became a poor second. Ling-chih (Yüan-chao), the Second Patriarch of our Nan-shan School,[535] has compiled a commentary of the Quotation (A Guide to the Quotation) and it has already been edited into the Chinese Tripitaka in the Hsien-shun Era (1265-1274) through the appeal of Disciplinarian Chi-t'ang Ssu (n.d.) to the court that this work should be made known to the whole Monastic Order. Yet, Yüan-chao's work is not a monastic rule for administration ..... I have quoted from the Quotation, from the other commentaries of the DRMGTV and from the Vinaya itself, and have used quotations from the monastic rules of the Ch'an Buddhism (the Ch'ing-kuei) in order to prepare this Lü-yüan Shih-kuei .....[536]

Even though Shêng-wu says that he has only used quotations from the Ch'ing-kuei, in fact when one compares their respective contents, his work is found to be a close imitation of Huai-hai's work,[537] thus indicating that the monastic rules of the Dharmaguptavinaya School in China had been incorporated into those of Ch'an Buddhism. In the latter period, even a monastery administered by disciplinarians was sometimes called 'Ts'ung-lin' or 'Grove',[538] a colloquial name, originally used for a monastery of the Ch'an Buddhists.

(3) In the year 1965, the monk Chên-hua (1922-....) published his autobiography, Ts'an-hsüeh So-t'an or 'Rambling remarks on my Wandering Career'. He says that he received his ordination in the Lung-ch'ang Monastery of Pao-hua Hill in Kiangsu Province.[539] Even though this monastery bears the presumptuous title of 'The First Leading Monastery of the Disciplinary School',[540] Chên-hua disapproves of the conditions

prevalent when he was there. He exposes that everything in this monastery is too 'formalized',[541] and that his fellow monks would never look into the reality of the Śīla. Also he reveals that the novices of this monastery received the corporal punishment of flogging by willow twig,[542] and that the monks took two meals a day and said embarrassingly: "to eat boiled water" when mentioning their dinner.[543] Both practices are at variance with the Vinaya.

From the above three instances we can see the decline of this School since the Sung Dynasty, even though it continued to produce some outstanding personalities in the days of its decline, and has survived until the present day.[544] I will not discuss the history of this School beyond this point because it is no longer an important factor in the history of Chinese Buddhism.

Chapter I: Notes

1. Cf. Akira Hirakawa, Ritsuzō no Kenkyū or 'A Study of the Vinaya-Piṭaka (hereafter referred to as Vinaya-Piṭaka)', p. 151.

2. For instance, after reading the entire Dharmaguptavinaya eighty times, the monk Hui-chin (560-645) was still not able to understand it. Therefore, he went to listen to Disciplinarian Hung-tsun's (530-608) lectures eight times, and only then did he begin to study it alone (HKSC, p.619a). At first, the monk Hui-hsiu (aged 98 in 665) believed that he could understand the Vinaya alone. After reading one fascicle of a scripture of this kind, he found that he could not formulate a single idea through his reading as to why a monk should have to do this or not do that. Then, he followed Disciplinarian Hung (Tao-hung? n.d.), listening to his lectures on the Dharmaguptavinaya (ibid., p.544c).

3. For instance, the monk Ch'ing-chiang (flor. 711) was ordained by Disciplinarian T'an-i (692-771) and followed the latter to learn Tao-hsüan's Ssŭ-fên Lü Shan-fen Pu-chüeh Hsing-shih Ch'ao or 'Quotations From the Dharmaguptavinaya with Abbreviations and Supplements for Practice' (T.1804, hereafter referred to as Quotation) and the other commentaries on the Dharmaguptavinaya. Then he found that T'an-i's interpretation of the Vinaya did not satisfy him. He left his master, and went to visit other places in order to listen to the lectures by other disciplinarians. He discovered that there were no disciplinarians who gave lectures better than those of his master, so he returned to Chekiang to join T'an-i. In a congregation at T'an-i's monastery, Ch'ing-chiang loudly announced to the assembly: "I, Ch'ing-chiang, have again returned to follow the Vandya." In front of the assembly, T'an-i immediately scolded Ch'ing-chiang for his betrayal. After Ch'ing-chiang had tearfully begged for mercy four times, T'an-i's anger was appeased and so he re-accepted his former disciple, saying: "I will endure this shame for you." (SKSC, p.802a). From this story we can see how serious the sectarian view was among the Chinese disciplinarians.

4. KSC, p.324c.

5. Ibid., p. 325a.

6. Idem. See also LTSPC (T.2034), p. 56b. TTNTL (T.2149), p.226c. KYSCL (T.2154), p.486c. The latter three all call this work Sêng-chih Chieh-pên or 'The Śīla of the Mahāsāṅghikavinaya'. It was already lost before the compilation of the KYSCL in 730.

7. See Section II, notes 130 to 138.

8. KSC, p.325a. KYSCL, p.486c.

9. TSSSL, p.238.

10. See note 8.

11. See Section III, note 251 and Section V, note 527.

12. KSC, p.325a. LTSPC, p.56c. TTNTL, p.227a. KYSCL, p.487a. This work appears in the Taishō Daizōkyō as T.1433 under the title Chieh-mo (Karma). In the Taishō, there is also the one-fascicled T'an-wu-tê-pu Tsa Chieh-mo or 'The Miscellaneous Karma of the Dharmagupta School' (T.1432) that was translated by Saṅghavarman (flor. 252). According to the Account of Saṅghavarman (appended to the Biography of Dharmakāla) in the KSC, it simply mentions that he had translated four Buddhist scriptures, but gives none of their titles. The LTSPC (p.56b-c) and the TTNTL (pp.226c-227a) only record two titles from the above-mentioned four translations, and these two are not Vinaya scriptures. Only the KYSCL records this T'an-wu-tê-pu Tsa Chieh-mo and it remarks that it is a recovery of an unpopular ancient translation (pp.486c-487a). Ochō Enichi says that both versions of the translations by T'an-ti and Saṅghavarman in the Taishō seem not to be the original texts, for the literary style of these two works is very close to the Chinese version of the Dharmaguptavinaya, a translation of some one hundred and sixty years later (see his Chūgoku Bukkyōshi no Kenkyū or 'A Study of the Chinese Buddhist History', pp.26-27). Moreover, in his Vinaya-Piṭaka, Akira Hirakawa gives a more detailed study of this problem and reaches the same conclusion (pp.202-208). Nevertheless, according to historical records, the work of T'an-ti had already influenced the Chinese Monastic Order.

13. Wei Hsiu (506-572), Wei Shu or 'The History of the Northern Wei Dynasty', (this is one of the so-called 'Twenty-five Standard Chinese Histories'. In this thesis, all the quotations of the Standard Histories are from the Wu-yin Palace Edition; I-wên Press, Taiwan), Vol. 1, p.107a.

14. SKSC, p.811c.

15. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Chung-kuo Fo-chiao Shih-chuan Yü Mu-lu Yüan-ch'u Lü-hsüeh-sha-mên Chih T'an-t'ao', or 'A Study of the Chinese Buddhist Biographies and Bibliographies Derived from the Vinaya Sect (hereafter referred to as 'Bio. & Biblio.'), Part 1, HYHP, Vol.6, No.1 (1964, Hong Kong), pp.122-126.

16. HKSC, p.614b.

17. See Section III, note 250.

18. See Section V, notes 453 to 456.

19. Idem.

20. Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, Han-wei Liang-chin Nan-pei-ch'iao Fo-chiao Shih, or 'The Chinese Buddhist History of the Han, the Wei, the Two Chins and the Northern and Southern Dynasties (hereafter referred to as History), Vol. I, pp. 46-48. E. Zürcher, The Buddhist Conquest of China (hereafter referred to as Conquest), p.34. Kenneth Ch'en, Buddhism in China --- A Historical Survey (hereafter referred to as Survey), pp. 45-46. Cf. also Yu Chia-hsi (1883-1955), 'Mu-tzŭ Li-hou Lun Chien-t'ao (A Survey on 'Mu-tzŭ on the Settling of Doubts')', in Yu Chiä-hsi Lun Hsüeh Tsa-chu, or 'The Miscellaneous Works of Yu Chiä-hsi (hereafter referred to as Yu's Works), Vol. I, pp.125-127.

21. The name of this 'Vinaya' appears in CSTCC, p.6a. LTSPC, p.52b. TTNTL, p.223b. KYSCL, p.480b. It was lost long before Sêng-yu (444-518) compiled his CSTCC.

22. The name of this 'Vinaya' appears in CSTCC, p.24b. LTSPC,p. 54c. TTNTL, p.255b. KYSCL, p.484a. It was lost long before the compilation of the CSTCC.

23. SKSC, p.811a. As the Chinese Buddhists traditionally used the character 'Lü' to render the Sanskrit term 'Vinaya', Tsan-ning thinks that the lost 'I-chüeh Lü' was probably a disciplinary scripture.

24. CSTCC, p.6a.

25. See the following Sections of this Chapter.

26. In the Vinaya-Piṭaka (pp.189-200), Akira Hirakawa indicates that there are three disciplinary scriptures that were translated in the Later Han Dynasty and which still exist, being listed in the Taishō as T.1467, T.1470 and T.1477. I think that their situation would be somewhat like that of the I-chüeh Lü and the Pi-ch'iu Chu-chin Lü in the embryonic period of the Vinaya in China.

27. CSTCC, p.5c. KSC, p.323a. LTSPC, pp.49c-50a. TTNTL, pp.220c-221a. KYSCL, p.478a-b.

28. S.C.Banerjee, 'The Vinaya Texts in China', Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol.XXV, No.2 (1949, Calcutta), p.93. This article was recommended to me by Dr. T. Rajapatirana.

29. Idem.

30. Cf. E. Zürcher, Conquest, pp. 29-30. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, pp.34-35.

31. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p. 35.

32. Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol. I, pp. 24-33. Chi Hsien-lin, Chung-yin Wên-hua Kuan-hsi-shih Lun-ts'ung or 'Miscellaneous Notes on the History of Sino-Indian Cultural Relationships', pp. 21-22.

33. These rules of conduct are recorded in T. 784, p. 772b, and p. 723a-b. See also Chu Ch'an's translation, The Sūtra of 42 Sections, Section 4 (p.11), Sections 23-26 (pp.17-18) and Sections 29-31 (pp. 18-19).

34. See Section III, Note 237.

35. See Section II, Note 138.

36. See Section IV, (A), Note 347.

37. See Ibid (B), Notes 363 and 364.

38. KSC, p. 356a.

39. Fang Hsüan-ling (580-649), et al., Chin Shu or 'The History of the Chin Dynasty', vol. I, p. 108b and Vol. 3, p.1425b.

40. KSC, p. 352c.

41. Ibid., p. 356a.

42. Idem.

43. HKSC, p. 485b-c.

44. According to the NHCKNFC, a Buddhist priest in India has to carry two jars with him. One jar is made of earthenware or porcelain and contains the water for drinking, while the other jar is made of copper or iron and contains water for cleansing purposes (such as washing the right hand and rinsing the mouth after the meal, cleansing the fingers of his left hand after having been to the toilet, etc.). See NHCKNFC, pp.207b-208a; cf. also its translation, A Record of the Buddhist Religion As Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago (hereafter referred to as Buddhist Practices) by J. Takakusu (1886-1945), pp. 26-28. Even though the Chinese never had the custom of specifically cleansing the fingers of the left hand after having been to the toilet, the Chinese monks probably still carried with them the jar of water for washing their hands after taking their meal in ancient periods.

45. HKSC, p. 660b.

46. According to the Sui Shu or 'The History of the Sui Dynasty' by Wei Chêng (579-642) and others, Prince Hsiu was enfeoffed 'Prince of Shu' and appointed Governor-General of the I State in 581. In the year 582, he was promoted to a position as a high ranking central official and returned to the capital to take up his appointment, where he remained until 592, when he was once again returned to his position as a governor-general of the same State until 602 (Vol.2, pp.610b-612a).

47. HKSC, p. 660b.

48. Ibid., p. 497b.

49. Ibid., p. 676c.

50. I have read through the Chinese version of the Dharmaguptavinaya and its Śīla and compared them with other Vinayas and Śīlas, and have found no evidence of corporal punishment. In his Quotation, Tao-hsüan protests strongly against corporal punishment in Chinese Buddhist tradition. He says that since Buddhism was established such punishment never existed in India (p. 21b and p. 33b-c). He also stresses that to borrow from the secular method for punishing a religious transgressor would lead to the decline of morality among the clergy, for this is not a good way to help one to reflect on one's wrongdoings (p.18c). But in India there had once been a Chinese monk who was appointed abbot of a monastery there and that abbot flogged the transgressors of the Vinaya in his monastery (see Chapter II, Section I, Note 92).

51. Shang-shu or 'Book of Documents', in SSCCS, Vol. I, p.40b. See also James Legge (1815-1895), tr., The Shoo King or The Book of Historical Documents, in CC, Vol. 3, p. 38.

52. Cf. Section V, note. 542.

53. Ssŭ-fên Lü or Dharmaguptavinaya (T.1428), p.874c.

54. Ibid., p.876a.

55. See Appendix, Table II.

56. Ibid., Table I.

57. See Section V, Note 532.

58. See Appendix, Table III.

59. KSC, p. 351c.

60. Ssŭ-fên Lü, p.931c. NHCKNFC, p.221c. J.Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, p. 116.

61. NHCKNFC, p.216c. J. Takakusu, tr., Ibid, pp. 81-82.

62. This will be discussed further in the following chapters.

63. KSC, p. 361b.

64. The 'Shih-lao Chih' or 'Treatise on Buddhism and Taoism' of the Wei Shu (hereafter referred to as Treatise), Vol.3, p.1447a. See also Leon Hurvitz's translation, the 'Wei Shu, Treatise on Buddhism and Taoism (in Yun-kang, Supplement and Index, Vol. XVI, edited by Seiichi Mizuno and Toshio Nagahiro), p.85 (This translation was pointed out to me by Mr. John Jorgensen.).

65. NHCKNFC, p.216b-c, J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices,p.81. In 691 I-ching asked the Disciplinarian Ta-tsin (n.d.) to take the compositions and translations (including the NHCKNFC) that I-ching had prepared during his pilgrimage in India and the Malay Archipelago, for him on Ta-tsin's way back to China from Śrīvijaya (present Sumatra). See TTHYCFKSC (T.2066), p.10b. Even though I-ching was still in the South Seas, he may have heard news about the monastic activities in China, for there were many pilgrims who went to India via Śrīvijaya by the maritime route in this period (cf. Chapter II, Section I, notes 98, 102 to 109).

66. Ssŭ-fên Sêng Chieh-pên or 'The Śīla for Monks of the Dharmaguptavinaya (T.1434)', p.1025c. Shih-sung Lü Po-lo-ti-mu-ch'a Ta Pi-ch'iu Chieh-pên or 'Prātimoksa of the Sarvāstivādavinaya for the Greak Bhiksus (T.1436)', p.473b-c. Mi-sha-sê Wu-fên Chieh-pên or 'The Śīla for Monks of the Mahīśāsakavinaya in Five Parts (T.1422)', p.202b. Chieh-t'o Chieh-pên Ching or 'The Śīla For Salvation (T.1460)', pp.661c-662a. Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu Chieh-ching or Mūla-sarvāstivādavinaya Sūtra (T.1454), p.503b.

67. Idem. Also see Mo-ho Sêng-chih Lü Ta-Pi-ch'iu Chieh-pên or 'The Śīla for the Great Bhiksus of the Mahāsāṅghikavinaya (T.1426)', p.551c.

68. This legend is quoted in the KSC, p.324a. An Shih-kao was in China in the years 148-170, but according to this legend he was still alive in 280.

69. For the date of Dharmaraksa see T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol.I, pp.115-118.

70. KSC, p. 347b-c.

71. Ibid., p. 348a.

72. Cf. Notes 53 and 54.

73. This will be discussed further in Chapter III.

74. See Appendix, Table VI.

75. Wei Hsiu, Treatise, Vol.8, p.3040 (specially quoted from the Chung-hua Bookshop Edition, Peking, 1974). The original text of the phrase ".... handled according to the 'Nei-lü' and the 'Sêng-chi'" reads: "I Nei Lü Sêng Chi Chih Chih". In all other editions of the Wei Shu, the sixth character 'Chih (handle)' is missing. The editorial board of the Chung-hua edition discovered this character in a quotation of this treatise found in the Ts'ê-fu Yüan-kuei or 'The Encyclopaedia of Historical Documents for Political References' (see Ibid., p.3059). Also see KHMC (T.2103), p.140. TSSSL, p.241b. Cf. Leon Hurvitz, tr., p.84.

76. TSSSL, p.241a-b.

77. CSTCC, p.85c. Prince Ching-ling was one of the strongest supporters of Buddhism during the Southern Dynasties. Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol. II, pp.31-34. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, pp.123-124. For Ching-ling's Biography, see Hsio Tzŭ-hsien's (489-537) Nan-ch'i Shu or 'The History of the Southern Ch'i Dynasty', pp.328-333a.

78. Wei Hsiu, Treatise, Vol.3, p.1446b. Leon Hurvitz, tr., p.80.

79. HKSC, p.464b. TSSSL, p.241b. This work has never appeared in the Chinese Buddhist bibliographies.

80. See Section III, note 249.

81. See Ibid., note 263.

82. LTSPC, p.105a. TTNTL, p.277c. HKSC, p. 497c.

83. Will be discussed further in Chapter V.

84. Will be discussed further in Chapter III.

85. Will be discussed further in Chapter V.

86. KSC, p.348. TSSSL, p.241b.

87. Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol.I, pp.154-157. Ōchō Enichi, pp. 63-124. E.Zürcher, Conquest, pp.187-189. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, pp. 99-100.

88. TSSSL, p.241a-b.

89. KSC, p.333b. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p.99.

90. See Section II, Note 134.

91. CSTCC, p.99a. KSC., p.328b.

92. KSC , p.328c.

93. Cf. E. Zürcher, Conquest, p.203.

94. Cf. Tang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol.I, pp.160-165. E.Zürcher, Conquest, pp.202-203. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Lun Chung-kuo Fo-chiao I-ch'ang Chih I-ching Fang-shih Yü Ch'êng-hsu' or 'Methods and Procedures Used in Translating Buddhist Sūtras at Translation Centres in China during the Dynasties from Han to Sung (hereafter referred to as 'Translation Centres')', HYHP, Vol.5, No.2, Hongkong, 1963, pp.305-306.

95. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Translation Centres', p.283.

96. KSC, p.328c. Cf. E. Zürcher, Conquest, p.203.

97. T.1464, p.851a.

98. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Lun Liang-han Ts'i Nan-pei-ch'ao Ho-hsi Chih K'ai-fa Yü Jü-hsüeh Shih-chiao Chih Chin-chan' or 'The Cultivation of Ho-hsi (Regions West of the Yellow River) as from the Han Dynasty to the Epoch of the Division Between North and South and Its Relation to the Propagation of Both Confucianism and Buddhism in These Regions (hereafter referred to as 'Ho-hsi')', HYHP, Vol.5, No.1, Hongkong, 1960, pp.119-125.

99. T.1464, p.851a.

100. Idem. Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol.I, p.156. Ōchō Enichi, pp. 143-145. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p.100. This work appears in the Taishō as T.1464, in ten fascicles. According to its preface that was composed by Master Tao-an (in T.1464, p.851a-b),this work was in four fascicles when it came out. Akira Hirakawa considers that the literary style of the P'i-na-yeh is rather rough and unpolished (Vinaya-Piṭaka, p.153).

101. See note 94.

102. KSC, p.355c.

103. Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol.I, p.142 and pp.154-155.

104. KSC, p.396c.

105. See Section II, note 120.

106. Cf. Ochō Enichi, pp.117-125.

107. KSC, p.370a.

108. Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol.I, pp.218-221.

109. See Sections II, notes 135 to 138, and III, notes 237 to 240.

110. KSC, p.370a.

111. The date of Fa-hsien is according to Ch'en Yüan (1880-1971), Shih-shih I-nien Lu or 'A Study on the Dates of the Buddhist Monks in China (hereafter referred to as Dates of Monks)', p.9.

112. Fa-hsien, Kao-sêng Fa-hsien Chuan or 'The Eminent Monk Fa-hsien's Record of the Buddhistic Kingdoms (T.2085)', p.857a. See also its translations: (1) The Travels of Fa-hien , A Record of the Buddhistic Kingdoms by J.Legge, pp.9-10. (2) The Travels of Fa-hsien by H.A. Giles (1845-1935), p.1.

113. Fa-hsien, p.857a. J.Legge, tr., p.9; H.A. Giles, tr., p.1. Many earlier scholars have stated that the year Fa-hsien departed was 399. In addition to Legge and Giles, other scholars that I have found adopting this date are: (1) T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol.I, p.277. (2) Adachi Kiroku, Kōshō Hokken Den or 'A Study of Hokken's (Fa-hsien's) Record of the Buddhistic Kingdoms', pp.1-4. In his revised version of the same work, the Hokken Den - Chū-a Indo Nankai Kikō no Kenkyū, or 'A Study of Hokken's Record of his Travels in Central Asia, India and the South Seas', he still retaines the same point of view (see pp.1-4). (3) Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p.89. According to my own research I believe that the date of Fa-hsien's departure was in 400 (cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Ho-hsi', pp.134-137. For this reason I have put both dates in this paper.

114. T.1464, p.851b.

115. Fa-hsien, p.864b. J.Legge, tr., p.98. H.A.Giles, tr., p.64.

116. Idem.

117. Ibid., p.865; Legge, tr., ibid., p.111; Giles, tr., ibid., p.76.

118. See note 115.

Notes to Section II.

119. CSTCC, p.9b. LTSPC, p.64. The latter says that the first text introduced into China was a Sarvāstivādin work on Śīla.

120. CSTCC, p.10a, see also p.80, the quotation from Tao-an's 'Pi-ch'iu Ta-chieh Hsü', the preface to this scripture.

121. Idem., See also pp.81b-82a, the quotation from'Kuan-chung Chin-ch'u Ni Êrh-chung T'an-wên Hsia-tso Tsa-shih-êrh-shih Ping Tsa-shih Kung-chuan Ch'ien-chung-hou San-chi' or 'The Joint Prefaces that are Separately Located at the Head, the Middle and the End of the one Fascicled Disciplinary Scripture Concerning the Varsā and Other Affairs of the Nuns That have been Newly Translated in the Ch'ang-an Area'.

122. Cf. T'ang Tung-t'ung, History, Vol.I, pp.154-156.

123. KSC, p.358a. Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol.I, p.248. E.Zürcher, Conquest, p.205. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, pp.103-104 and p.112.

124. KSC, the Biography of T'an-yung, says that before entering the Order, T'an-yung was a military general of the Former Ch'in State. After being defeated by the Chin Dynasty in 383, he followed Master Tao-an as a monk-disciple. After Tao-an had passed away in 385, he went southward to Mount Lu to follow Hui-yüan as his new master. After that he conveyed letters from Hui-yüan to Kumārajīva back and forth between Ch'ang-an and Mount Lu for more than ten years (p.62c). This sort of correspondence between these two Buddhist centres had probably started before T'an-yung's time but it would not have been so frequent.

125. Ochō Enichi, pp.117-142.

126. KYSCL put the names of those books in the catalogue of 'Yu-i Wu-pên Lu' or 'The Catalogue of Lost Works whose translators are known' (p.648b-c). The KYSCL was compiled in 730.

127. KSC, p.333a.

128. Kumārajīva pursued his career as a translator in Ch'ang-an from 402 till his death in 413. Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol.I, pp.219-221.

129. KSC, p.333a.

130. Idem. Kumārajīva translated the words recited by Puṇyatara in front of the congregation. This was a tradition of the teamwork translations of his time. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Translation Centres', pp.241-248. A new detailed English summary of this article was published in Nan-yang Fo-chiao (Nanyang Buddhist), No.109 (Singapore, 1978), p.45. Cf. also J.W.de Jong, Buddha's Word in China, 28th George Morrison Lecture, pp.13-14.

131. KSC, p.333a.

132. Ibid., p. 401a, the Biography of Sêng-yeh. The Biography says: "... in the past when Kumārajīva was in Ch'ang-an, he translated the Sarvāstivādaśīla, before the Vinaya was translated. With the arrival of Dharmaruci during the Later Ch'in, the Vinaya was then taught..." Of course we must understand that what the Biography means is that the completion of the translation of this Vinaya was made due to the arrival of Dharmaruci. I have two theories as to where the text of the Śīla came from. First of all, Puṇyatara could have recited a text of the Śīla in a foreign language before his death, and Kumārajīva may have translated it before Dharmaruci's arrival. It is said in the CSTCC that when Saṅghabhadra (n.d.) recited the original text of the Abhidharmavibhāṣā in 381 in Ch'ang-an, Dharmanandin (n.d.) copied down his words. Buddharakṣa (n.d.) rendered these words into Chinese and the Chinese monk Chih-min (n.d.) noted them down (p.99a). When Puṇyatara was still alive, Kumārajīva could have done the same thing as Dharmanandin had done. Secondly, Kumārajīva had learned this Vinaya from Vimalākṣa in Kucha (see Note 146). As the SVSTVDV was learned by heart by every monk of the Sarvāstivādin School (see Note 136), Kumārajīva would have remembered the 252 rules of the Śīla, even though he was probably unable to remember verbatim the words of the Vinaya. Therefore he may have rendered the Śīla into Chinese from memory.

133. KSC, p.333a.

134. Ibid., p.333b. See also CSTCC, p.110a.

135. KSC, p.403b, the 'Ming-lü-p'ien Lun' or 'The Conclusion to the Category of the Disciplinarians'.

135A. Ibid., p.333b. For the study of the translation of the SVSTVDV see also P.Demiéville (1894-1978), 'A propos du concile de Vaiśālī', T'oung Pao, 40 (1951), pp. 242-250. Cf. Akira Hirakawa, Vinaya-Piṭaka, pp.121-128.

136. According to p.20 of the CSTCC, the Sarvāstivādin scholars considered that the rules of the Vinaya should be learned by recitation. This is the reason why the Chinese called this Vinaya a 'recitation'.

137. KSC, p.333b.

138. Idem.

139. Idem.

140. Ibid., p.361a-b. Cf. Yü Chia-hsi, 'Han-shih-san K'ao (A Study on the Medical Powder taken with Cold Provisions as its Accompaniment)', Yu's Works, Vol.I, pp.192-193. Yü says that this powder was a sort of tonic medicine but with latent poisonous ingredients (pp.182-186 and pp.207-208). E. Zürcher translated Hui-yüan's Biography in the KSC into English (Conquest , pp. 240-253). He rendered the Chinese expression 'Tung-san' as 'took a purgative' (p.253). As the bean-wine, the rice juice and the honey are all antidotes for poisons, especially for Han-shih-san (see Note 143), I prefer Yü Chia-hsi's explanation. In the above phrase, Tung-san must be rendered by '(the poison within the) powder became active (i.e. potent)'.

141. KSC, p.361b. Cf. E. Zürcher, Conquest, p.253. According to the Shih-sung Po-lo-ti-mu-ch'a Ta Pi-ch'iu Chieh-pen or 'The Prātimokṣa of the SVSTVDV for the Great Bhikṣus (T.1436)', translated by Kumārajīva (hereafter referred to as Prātimokṣa for Bhikṣus), p.476a, monks are not allowed to drink wine in any circumstances. Cf. Yu Chia-hsi, Yu's Work, Vol.I, p.193.

142. KSC, p.361b. Cf. E. Zürcher, Conquest, p.253. According to Prātimokṣa for Bhikṣus, p. 475a, monks are not allowed to eat at the wrong time (i.e. after noon). Cf. Yu Chia-hsi, Yu's Works, p.193. The Tung-lin Shih-pa Kao-hsien Chuan or 'The Biographies of the Eighteen Eminent Personalities of the Tung-lin Monastery' (in the Zokuzōkyō [1967 Hongkong Reprint], Vol.135, contains a Biography of Hui-yüan in whi is mentioned that Hui-yüan refused to take bean-wine and rice-juice for the following reasons: "There is no such alternative (as taking wine as an antidote) recorded in the Vinaya", and, "at present it is already past noon" (p.4b). As it gives more detailed information than the KSC, Yu Chia-hsi quoted this in his work to support his argument. The 'Eighteen Eminent Personalities' includes a biography of the Indian monk Buddhayaśas (n.d.). Buddhayaśas had neither visited the Tung-lin monastery in Mount Lu, nor even the whole Yang-tzŭ Valley (see KSC, pp.333c-334b). My work, 'Ch'uan-shoh Yü Shih-

shih Kuan-hsi I Li-chêng ---- Lu-shan kuei-tsung Szŭ Chu Ch'uan-shoh so t'ou-lu Chih Chung-kuo Lü-tsung Hsiao-chang Shih' or 'A Case Study of the Relationship between Legends and Historical Facts ---- The Vicissitude of Two Sects of the Chinese Buddhist Disciplinary School as Revealed in Some Legends of the Kuei-tsung Temple on Mount Lu (hereafter referred to as 'Disciplinary School'), Nanyang University Journal, Vol. VI, Part I, Humanities, 1972, Singapore), also indicates the fact that the legend about Buddhayaśas' visit to Mount Lu and his stay there gradually developed after 710 when the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect became the only Disciplinary School in China (p.187). Therefore I suppose that the above-mentioned book was composed after the legend had come into being. Hence the detailed description of Hui-yüan's attitudes towards the Vinaya found in that book would be the anonymous author's own invention. His words were the fruit of his own imagination and were not based on new materials to which Hui-chiao (497-554?, see note 163), author of the KSC, did not have access. For these reasons I have excluded this book from the bibliography.

143. KSC, p.361b. Cf. Zürcher, Conquest, p.253. As it is not recorded in the Prātimoksa for Bhiksus whether honey can be taken after noon or not, the disciplinarian had to go through the Vinaya to search for relevant information. Moreover, I have read in Sun Szŭ-mo's (+ 692) Pei-chi Ch'ien-chin Yao-fang or 'The Effective Herbal Prescriptions for Preparedness and Emergency', an authoritative Chinese medical compilation of the 7th century A.D., that salted bean-wine, rice-gruel and honey are prescribed as 'antidotes' (pp.429-436). Salted bean and wine in particular are general ingredients in the antidotes for 'Han-shih-san' (pp.433-436).

144. KSC, p.361b. Cf. E.Zürcher, Conquest, p. 523.

145. KSC, p.333b-c.

146. Ibid., p.333b.

147. In a Buddhist translation centre in China, the chief translator interpreted the original text sentence by sentence or paragraph by paragraph in front of the participants like a preacher. See note 130.

148. KSC, p.333b.

149. Ibid., p.401a.

150. Ibid., p.333b-c.

151. Ibid., p.333c.

152. Idem.

153. Idem. Also see KYSCL, p.507, footnote to the last paragraph.

154. Idem. The Biography of Hui-kuan in KSC does not mention that Hui-kuan had once attended Vimalākṣa's lecture on the Vinaya and had taken notes. According to it he was well versed in the SVSTVDV and gave references from the Vinayas of other schools in order to enlarge his knowledge of the Vinaya. (p.368b).

155. The title of Hui-kuan's work can be found in LTSPC, p.70a, TTNTL, p.246c, KYSCL, p.507a. The former two misunderstood that this work was a translation by Vimalākṣa. The last one quoted the KSC to prove that it was Hui-kuan's compilation of Vimalākṣa's words.

156. KSC, p.333c.

157. Idem. From this proverb, I suppose that Vimalākṣa could not express himself very well in Chinese, even though he was able to speak it (see Note 152).

158. TTNTL, p.264c. Moreover, both KSC (composed about 553-555), p.333c, and LTSPC (compiled in 597), p.70c-71a, mention that this book was very popular in their time. The book has long been lost.

159. KSC, p.368b.

160. KSC, p.400c. CSTCC quotes the preface the catalogue of Sêng-yu's Sa-p'o-to-pu Chi or 'The Accounts (of the Masters) of the Sarvāstivādin School (pp.89-90a, hereafter referred to as Sarvāstivādin Accounts)'. In that catalogue Hui-yu's name is listed as one of the outstanding disciplinarians of the SVSTVDV (p.90a).

161. i.e. Prātimokṣa for Bhikṣus. See note 141.

162. KSC, p.401a. His name is listed in the catalogue of the Sarvāstivādin Accounts, p.90a.

163. For Hui-chiao's dates see Arthur F.Wright, 'Biography and Hagiography, Hui-chiao's Lives of Eminent Monks', Silver Jubilee volume of the Zimbun-Kagaku-Kenkyūsyo, 1954, Kyoto University, p.339.

164. KSC, p.401a. Sêng-yeh's version is not found in any Buddhist bibliographical work. The Taishō contains only Kumārajīva's translation (T.1346.).

165. His account is appended to the Biography of Sêng-yeh (p.401a) and his name is also listed in the catalogue of the Sarvāstivādin Accounts (p.90a).

166. KSC, p.401a-b. His name is listed in the Catalogue of the Sarvāstivādin Accounts (p.90a).

167. See notes 165 and 166.

168. KSC, p.401b. His work is recorded in (1) CSTCC, p.13a, with the title Shih-sung Chieh-mo (The Karma of the SVSTVDV) or Lüeh-yao Chieh-mo (The Karma in Outline). (2) LTSPC, p.93, with the title Shih-sung Sêng-ni Yao-shih Chieh-mo (The Essential Affairs in the Karma for monks and nuns in the SVSTVDV). (3) TTNTL, p.261a, with the same title as in LTSPC. (4) KYSCL, p.532a, with the same title but with a note that it contains only 'one fascicle'. As the present version of this book in the Taishō contains only one fascicle (T.1439), I suppose that this book was reduced from two into one fascile before the compilation of the KYSCL in 730.

169. T.1439, pp. 496-503.

170. KSC, p. 342b-c.

171. KSC, p.401a.

172. Idem. See also notes 153 and 159.

173. Idem.

174. KSC, p.401b. According to Shun Yüeh's (441-513) Sung Shu or 'The History of the Liu-Sung Dynasty', Liu Hsiu-yu was appointed governor-general of the Ching State in 466, and was murdered by Emperor Ming (R.465-472) in 471 (pp.907a-908a). Liu Hsiu-jo received his appointment in 470 and was ordered to commit suicide by the emperor in 471 (p.909). Cf. Ssŭ-ma Kuang's (1019-1086) Tzŭ-ch'ih T'ung-chien or 'The Comprehensive Chinese Chronicle (hereafter referred to as Chronicle)', vol.5, p.4157 and p.4161.

175. His account is appended to the Biography of Sêng-yin (p.401c). His name is listed in the catalogue of the Sarvāstivādin Accounts (p.90a).

176. KSC, p.402a. His name is listed in the catalogue of the Sarvāstivādin Accounts (p.90a).

177. His biography in KSC only says that he prepared the Śīla and the Karma (p.402a), without indicating whether the former is for monks or for nuns. The CSTCC says that he prepared the Shih-sung Pich'iu-ni

178. See note 177.

179. KSC, pp.401c-402a. His name is listed in the catalogue of the Sarvāstivādin Accounts (p.90a). Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, vol.2, p.295.

180. His account is appended to the Biography of Chih-tao (p.402a) and his name is also listed in the catalogue of the Sarvāstivādin Accounts (p.90a). His work has long been lost.

181. KSC, p.402a.

182. Fa-hsien's date follows Ch'en Yüan, Dates of Monks, p.26.

183. KSC, p.411b.

184. As Fa-hsien's name is listed in the catalogue of the Sarvāstivādin Accounts (p.90a), we know that he was one of the disciplinarians of the Sarvāstivādavinaya Sect, although his own Biography only says that he was: "... well versed in Sūtra and Vinaya", without mentioning what disciplinary sect he belonged to.

185. His account is appended to the Biography of Fa-hsien (p.411c). It is not known to which sect he belonged.

186. KSC, p.411c.

187. Ibid., p.402b. His name is listed in the catalogue of the Sarvāstivādin Accounts (p.90a). Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol.II, p.295.

188. KSC, p.402b-c. His work has long been lost.

189. Ibid., p.403b, the 'Conclusion to the Biographies of Disciplinarians'.

190. Their accounts are appended to the Biography of Chih-ch'êng (p.402c).

191. KSC, p.402c.

192. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Bio & Biblio', Part 1, pp.443-444.

193. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, Ibid., pp.445-456.

194. They are: no killing, no stealing, no adultery, no lying and no intoxicating liquors. See Dharmaraksa (385-433), tr., Yu-p'o-sê Chieh Ching or 'Upāsakaśīla Sūtra' (T.1488), p.1084a-b. These five commandments are for both men and women.

195. KSC, p.402c.

196. There is a problem here. Both HKSC and TTNTL are works of Tao-hsüan (596-667). The HKSC says that the Ch'u-yao Lü-i in fourteen fascicles was compiled by Fa-ch'ao (p.607a), while the TTNTL says that this book in twenty fascicles accompanied by other works was compiled by Pao-ch'ang (flor.514) and others by command of Emperor Wu about 510 (p.266c). In the LTSPC Fa-ch'ao's work is not recorded, nor is this book mentioned among the works of Pao-ch'ang (p.98c). I suppose that the Ch'u-yao Lü-i was composed by Fa-ch'ao and that Pao-ch'iang was the editor-in-chief. This book has long been lost; the KYSCL excludes it from the list of the works of the 'Chinese Tripitaka' (p.538a).

197. HKSC, p.607a.

198. Idem.

199. Chiao-chih (Hanoi) was a prefecture of China since the Han Dynasty. See P'an Ku's (32-92) Han Shu or 'The History of the Former Han Dynasty', vol.2, p.647b. Even up to the Sui Dynasty, this prefecture was still in Chinese hands. See Wei Chêng, Sui Shu, vol.1, pp.460b-461a. Therefore, Tao-ch'an went to Nanking from his native land as a Chinese, not as a foreigner.

200. HKSC, p.607b.

201. Idem.

202. HKSC, p.608c-609a.

203. This book is not recorded in TTNTL and has long been lost.

204. Idem.

205. HKSC, p.609b.

206. Ibid., p.611a (the Biography of Tao-ch'êng).

207. Ibid., p.609b.

208. Ibid., p.609b-c.

209. Ibid., p.609c. This book is not recorded in any Buddhist bibliography.

210. Ibid. p.609c.

211. Their accounts are appended to the Biography of Chih-wên (p.609c).

212. HKSC, p.611a.

213. Idem. His work is not recorded in any Buddhist bibliography.

214. Their accounts are appended to the Biography of Tao-ch'êng (p.611a).

215. HKSC, p.619c.

216. This book is not listed in the TTNTL and has long been lost.

217. Idem.

218. HKSC, p.620a.

219. Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol.II, pp. 297-298.

220. He was also a disciple of Fa-hsiang; his account is appended to the Biography of Fa-ying (KSC, p.402a). His name is listed in the catalogue of the Sarvāstivādin Accounts (p.90a).

221. His account is appended to the Biography of Fa-chin (flor.446), his master (KSC, p.404b).

222. Wei Shu, Vol.3, p.1094b. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Kao-ch'ang Kuo Mao-shih Lun-yü Hsiao-ching Li Hsüeh-kuan Tih Yüan-yin Shih-shih' or 'A Preliminary Explanation of the Reason Why Courses on the Mao-shih (Mao Tradition on the Book of Odes), Lun-yü (Analects of Confucius) and Hsiao-ching (Book of Filial Piety) were established in the National Academy of the State of Kao-ch'ang, HYSYHSLK, Vol. VIII (1966, Hong Kong), pp.64-71. This article discusses how the classical studies that were popular in the Ho-hsi area were transplanted to the State of Kao-ch'ang by the migrants.

223. KSC, p.401a.

224. Idem.

225. HKSC, p.427c. Cf. Tsukamoto Zenryū, Shina Bukkyōshi Kenkyū, Hokugihen or 'A Study of the History of Buddhism in China, the Northern Wei Dynasty Section', p.151.

226. Tsukamoto Zenryū, pp.198-200. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p.157.

227. See 'Ts'ui Hao yü K'ou Ch'ien-chih' or 'Ts'ui Hao the Confucianist and K'ou Ch'ien-chih the Taoist of the Northern Wei Dynasty', Ling-nan Hsüeh-pao, Vol. 11 (1957, Canton), pp.120-121.

228. His argument is: K'ou Ch'ien-chih's work is entitled Yün-chung Yin-sung Hsin-k'o Chih-chieh or 'The Newly Conferred Discipline Heard from the Recitation in the Cloud', and the Chinese title for SVSTVDV is Shih-sung Lü. These two titles share the Chinese character 'Sung (recite)' and this implies a relationship between these two works (Ch'en Yin-k'o, p.121).

Notes to Section III.

229. See Section I, Note 12.

230. KSC, p.334b-c.

231. Cf. H.H. Dubs and Rafe de Crespigny, Official Titles of the Former Han Dynasty, p.22a. Although this was an official title of the Former Han Dynasty, this post and title continued to be used in the political system of the Chin Dynasty. See Fang Hsüan-ling, Chin Shu, Vol.1, p.347b. The later Ch'in State was one of the barbarian usurpers of the Chin Dynasty (see Chin Shu Vol.3, pp.1455-1486), therefore, its political system was modelled on that of the Chin.

232. KSC, p.334b.

233. CSTCC, p.102c.

234. Idem. KSC, p.334b, in the same Biography of the same monk, however, KSC says that the material he recited was some 'Chiang-chi (scriptures of the Chiangs)'. As King Yao Hsing belonged to the Chiang tribe (of Tibetan stock), it is possible that the king requested Buddhayaśas to read some documents in his own tribal language. The 'Hsi-chiang Chuan' or 'The Account of the Chiangs in the West', in Fan Yeh's (398-455) Hou-Han Shu or 'The History of the Later Han Dynasty', the earliest account of the Chiang tribe, does not mention whether this tribe had its own written language (Vol.3, pp.1239-1253). But the Chin Shu describes Yao Hsing as a monarch well versed in the Confucian Classics (Vol.3, p.1463a). Therefore I prefer to believe the description of CSTCC that Buddhayaśas was told to read some 'registers of population' rather than the 'scriptures of the Chiangs' as stated in KSC.

235. KSC, p.334b.

236. CSTCC, p.102c. KSC, p.334b.

237. Idem.

238. Idem. The statement that Buddhayaśas had Chu Fo-l'ien to act as interpreter for him indicates that this Kashmirian monk was not conversant with Chinese. Perhaps, I doubt, he was credited with having read and recited the fifty thousand Chinese characters previously mentioned only to emphasize the fantastic power of his memory.

239. Idem. Also see CSTCC, p.63c, the quotation of Sêng-chao's (384-414) 'Ch'ang A-han Ching Hsü' or 'The Preface to the Dīrghāgamasūtra'.

240. CSTCC, p.63c, the quotation of Sêng-chao's 'The Preface of the Dīrghāgamasūtra'. There is a problem regarding the 'fascicles' of the DRMGTV. Sêng-chao's Preface, the earliest reference to the translation of this Vinaya, says that it was in 'forty fascicles', and the Biography of Buddhayaśas in the CSTCC records the same number (p.102c). The number of the 'fascicles' of this Vinaya as mentioned in the other sources is:

KSC (composed about 553-5)		44 fascicles (p.334b).
LTSPC (compiled 597)		45 or 60 fascicles (p.79c).
TTNTL (compiled 664)	*	45 or 60 fascicles (p.254a).
KYSCL (compiled 732)		60 fascicles (p.516b).

*A footnote on that page says: "At present, it is sixty fascicles." From the above description we might surmise that this Vinaya had two versions, each consisting of a different number of fascicles, around the year 597. And up to the year 664, the version in sixty fascicles prevailed. At present, the version of this Vinaya in the Taishō is in sixty fascicles (T.1428). Cf. Akira Hirakawa, Vinaya Piṭaka, pp. 131-135.

241. CSTCC, p.11b. LTSPC, p.79c. TTNTL, p.254a. KYSCL, p.516b. All these four leading Chinese Buddhist bibliographies only say that Buddhayaśas translated 'The Śīla of the DRMGTV for Monks' in one fascicle, but never mentioned whether he had also rendered a 'Śīla for Nuns' into Chinese. The Śīla for monks, Chinese title Ssŭ-fên Sêng Chieh-pen, can be found in the Taishō (T.1430).

241A. CSTCC, p.12b. KSC, p.341a. LTSPC, p.90a. TTNTL, p.258b. KYSCL, p.526a. This work is contained in the Taishō with the title of Ssŭ-fên Pi-ch'iu-ni Chieh-mo Fa or 'The Way of Karma of the DRMGTV for Bhikṣunīs (T.1434).

242. KSC, p.341a-b. This implies that before the translation of the Karma for nuns, a Chinese woman received ordination only according to the Karma for monks that was translated by T'an-ti.

243. KSC, p.381a.

244. CSTCC, p.13c. LTSPC, p.97c. TTNTL, p.256a. The Biography of Sêng-shêng in the KSC does not mention whether he did compose such a guide book or not (p.381a).

245. HKSC, p.552c.

246. Fa-ts'ung's account is recorded in five works: (1) Tsan-ning, the 'Conclusion to the Category of Disciplinarians' of the SKSC, p.798b and p.811c. (2) Yüan-chao's Chih-yüan I-p'ien (Zokuzōkyō, Vol.105), p.283 and p.285. (3) Chih-p'an's (n.d.) Fo-tsu T'ung-chi or 'The Record of the Orthodox Line of Succession of the Patriarchs Descending from the Buddha (hereafter referred to as FTTC, T.2035)', p.296c. This work was composed in 1269. (4) Gyō-nen's (1239-1321) Ritsu-shū Kō-yō or 'An Outline of the Vinaya School', Zoku Daizōkyō, No.2384, p.16. Gyō-nen's date according to Shi-ban's (n.d.) Hon-chō Kō-sō Den or 'The Biographies of Eminent Buddhist Monks in Japan Compiled in This Dynasty', DNBKZS, Vol. 102, p.247a. This book was compiled around 1702. (5) E-ken's (n.d.) Ritsu-on Sō-bō Den or 'The Biographies of the Treasonous Buddhist Monks in the Garden of Vinaya', DNBKZS, Vol.105, p.147b (the Biography of Fa-ts'ung). This book was compiled about 1522-3 (cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Disciplinary School', p.184, footnote 28). Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History Vol.2, pp. 297-8. Although these five works by Chinese or Japanese monks were published long after the death of Fa-ts'ung, their accounts, whether on his date or on his life, agree with each other to some extent. This indicates that they are based upon a single original text, which could perhaps have been the lost sectarian history of the Dharmaguptavinaya School in China. For instance, Tsan-ning of the Sung Dynasty was not only a monk-historian but also a master of the Dharmaguptavinaya School (see Section I, note 15). Another instance is that of Yüan-chao who was also a leading disciplinarian of the same school in the same dynasty (see Section V, note 523). They must have known the history of their own school.

247. Yüan-chao, p.283b and p.285b. FTTC, p.296c. Gyō-nen, p.16a. E-ken, p.147b. E-ken says that Fa-ts'ung was also well versed in the SVSTVDV.

248. Cf. Section I, notes 14 and 16.

249. E-ken, p.147b. See also Yüan-chao, p.283b and p.285b. FTTC, p.296c. Gyō-nen, p.16a.

250. Idem.

251. SKSC, p.811c. Yüan-chao, p.283b, and p.285b. FTTC, p.296c. Gyō-nen, p.16a. E-ken, p.24a (the Biography of Tao-fu). As Tao-fu compiled the first commentary on the DRMGTV, he was canonized as the 'Fourth Patriarch' of the Dharmaguptavinaya School in China. According to Yüan-chao, FTTC and Gyō-nen (the pages as mentioned above), the so-called 'Nine Patriarchs of the Dharmaguptavinaya School' are:

1.	Dharmagugupta	The sage who established this sect of Vinaya in India.
2.	Dharmakāla (flor.251)	The first monk who introduced the Buddhist disciplinary scripture into China.
3.	Fa-ts'ung (flor.472-499)	The first to preach this Vinaya.
4.	Tao-fu (n.d.)	The first to compile a commentary to this Vinaya.
5.	Hui-kuang (flor.508+)	He expanded Tao-fu's commentary from six into ten fascicles.
6.	Tao-yün (n.d.)	Hui-kuang's disciple. He prepared an interpretation of the commentary to this Vinaya.
7.	Tao-hung (n.d.)	Tao-yün's disciple. He composed a commentary on this Vinaya. *
8.	Chih-shou (567-635)	A disciple of Tao-hung. He had a thorough grasp of this Vinaya.
9.	Tao-hsüan (596-667)	Disciple of Chih-shou.

* There is a problem about the name of the Seventh Patriarch for Yüan-chao and Chih-p'an call him 'Tao-hung', but Gyō-nen calls him 'Tao-chao'. For the reason given in my former work, 'Bio.& Biblio.' (Part 2, HYHP, Vol.7, No.1, 1965, Hong Kong, p.311), I prefer the name 'Tao-hung'.

According to my research (Section V) the above 'Nine Patriarchs' were canonized by Yüan-chao and accepted by the Buddhist priests of the following generations (see note 527 of that Section).

252. Hui-kuang's dates are unknown, but his Biography in the HKSC (p.607c) says that he assisted the Indian monk Ratnamati (n.d.) to translate the Daśabhūmi Vyākhyāna into Chinese. Ratnamati began his translation in 508 (see T.1522, Daśabhūmi-Vyākhyāna, p.123, Ts'ui Kuang's (451-523) preface to this sacred scripture. HKSC, p.429a) and finished it in 511 (KHSC, p.482c, the Biography of Tao-ch'ung . Hui-kuang's Biography also says that he was respected by Kao Lung-chi (493-554, his Biography is in Lee Pai-yao's [565-648] Pei-ch'i Shu or 'The History of the Northern Ch'i Dynasty', pp.114a-115b), the 'P'u-yeh on the Left (Supervisor of Judicature)' of the Northern Ch'i Dynasty. Hui-kuang died at the age of seventy (pp.607c-608a).

253. The Biography of Buddha, the Master of Dhyāna, is in the HKSC, p.551a-b. In Mochizuki Shinkō's (1870-1948) Mochizuki Bukkyō Daijiten or 'The Great Dictionary on Buddhism Edited by Mochizuki (hereafter referred to as Mochizuki)', Buddha is called "Buddhaśānta", and is

described as the Indian translator who appeared in the Lo-yang translation centre in 520 (p.270). The Account of Buddhaśānta is appended to the Biography of Bodhiruci in the HKSC (p.429a).

254. HKSC, p.607b.

255. Ibid., p.607c.

256. The 'K'o-wên' by Tao-fu has long been lost. In the Zokuzōkyō there are five 'K'o-wên' on the DRMGTV: (1) Ssŭ-fên Lü Chieh-pên-shu K'o or 'The Systematized Commentary of Tao-hsüan's "Annotated Dharmaguptaśīla" (in eight fascicles)' by Yüan-chao, Vol.62, pp.98-154 (Tao-hsüan's original work (in three fascicles) is in Vol.62, pp. 32-78). (2) Ssŭ-fên Pi-ch'iu-ni Ch'ao K'o-wên or 'The Systematization of Tao-hsüan's "The Practices for Bhikṣunīs Quoted from the DRMGTV" (in one fascicle)' by Yün-k'an (+ 1061), Vol.64, pp.13-25 (Tao-hsüan's Original work [in six fascicles] is in Vol.64, pp. 25-96). (3) Ssŭ-fên Lü Shan-po Sui-chi Chieh-mo K'o or 'The Systematization of Tao-hsüan's "The Applied Karma of the DRMGTV with Abridgements and Supplements" (in four fascicles)' by Yüan-chao, Vol.64, pp.220-259 (Tao-hsüan's original work [in two fascicles] is in T.1808). (4) Ssŭ-fên Lü Hsing-shih-ch'ao K'o or 'The Systematization of Tao-hsüan's Quotation (in twelve fascicles)' by Yüan-chao, Vol.69, pp.1-68 (Tao-hsüan's original work [in twelve fascicles] is in T.1804). (5) Ssŭ-fen Lü Shih-pi-ni-i Ch'ao K'o or 'The Systematization of Tao-hsüan's "The Vinaya Doctrines Quoted from the non-Dharmaguptavinaya Scriptures" (in one fascicle)' by Yüan-chao, Vol.71, pp. 12-29 (Tao-hsüan's original work [in four fascicles] is in Vol. 71, pp.30-73). The contents of all these five 'K'o-wên' are presented in the form of schematic diagrams, indicating the procedure to be followed in explaining each rule of the Vinaya. For instance, on p.135 of the Ssŭ-fên Lü Han-chu Chieh-pên-shu K'o there is the 'Seventeenth Rule' which says: "A monk is not allowed to ask a nun who is not a relative to dye or to wash fleece for him." The scheme for this rule indicates the procedure to be following in praching Tao-hsüan's work as: (1) to state the words of this rule; (2) to explain the content of this rule (a) generally and then (b) in detail; (3) to explain why this rule was legislated, and (4) to point out the purpose of this rule (to inform monks to keep away from women, even nuns). As the abovementioned five works were all compiled in the Sung Dynasty and as Tao-fu's work has long been lost, we have no way of knowing whether Tao-fu systematized the Vinaya in

words or in schematic diagrams. It is possible that Tao-fu's work was in words. Vol. 71 of the Zokuzōkyō contains Chih-hsü's (1599-1655) Fo-shou Chai-ching Chu-k'o or 'The Systematization of the Uposatha-sūtra (translated by Chih-ch'ien [flor. 222-253]) with Commentary' (pp.74a-84a. Chih-ch'ien's original translation is in T.87. This work is also listed in CSTCC, p.7a; LTSPC, p.57c; TTNTL, p.228b and KYSCL, p.488b). This work systematizes the Chai-ching in words.

257. HKSC, p.607. E-ken says that Hui-kuang had once followed Tao-fu in order to learn the DRMGTV (p.26, The Biography of Hui-kuang). It is possible because Tao-fu was a contemporary of Fa-ts'ung (flor. 472-499), while Hui-kuang flourished about 508. They could then have met each other and in due course have become master and disciple. As the HKSC was composed in 665 (see Ch'en Yüan's Chung-kuo Fo-chiao Shih-chi Kai-lün or 'An Outline of the Chinese Buddhist Historical Works', p.29), and E-ken's work was published about 1522-23 (see note 246), I prefer the description of the HKSC.

258. HKSC, p.607c.

259. See Note 252.

260. HKSC, p.607c.

261. HKSC, p.608a.

262. See note 251.

263. HKSC, p.608a.

264. Idem.

265. Idem. The Sêng-chi was perhaps composed when he held the office of Sêng- tu. All the works of Hui-kuang have long been lost.

266. His account is appended to the Biography of Hui-kuang (p.608a), and he is canonized as 'Sixth Patriarch' of his own School (see note 251).

267. His account is also appended to the Biography of Hui-kuang (p.608a). Both Tao-yün's commentary and its simplified version by Tao-hui have long been lost.

268. HKSC, p.608c. This description implies that there was no direct relationship between Tao-fu and Hui-kuang (cf. note 257).

269. HKSC, p.608c.

270. Ibid., p.484c. The text just refers to the monk whom Tao-p'ing went to listen to as 'Kuang-shih' or 'Master Kuang'. That this monk was the same person as Hui-kuang, the disciplinarian, is indicated by the following arguments: (a) Before the establishment of the Northern Ch'i Dynasty in 550, Hui-kuang was living in the Shao-lin Monastery of Mount Sung in Honan (HKSC, p.607c) and after the Northern Ch'i was established, he moved to Yeh (ibid., p.608a). (b) After Tao-p'ing left his master, he gave lectures on not only the DRMGTV but also on the Daśabhūmi (see text, above). As mentioned before, Hui-kuang assisted Ratnamati in translating the Daśabhūmi about 509. The assistants at every translation centre in China would have been trained as exegetes for the preaching of the newly translated scripture (cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Translation Centres', pp.243 and 264) and Hui-kuang would accordingly have taught his disciple both the DRMGTV and the Daśabhūmi. (c) In the Biography of Ling-yü in the HKSC, we are told that Ling-yü learned the Vinaya from Tao-p'ing and that it was 'Tao-p'ing' who 'received teachings directly from Kuang-shih (Hui-kuang)' (p.495c).

271. HKSC, p.484c.

272. Idem.

273. HKSC, p.480b.

274. Idem. The text just refers to the monk whom An-lin listened to as 'Kuang-kung' or 'Master Kuang'. That this monk was the same person as Hui-kuang is indicated by the arguments given at note 270. Also, as Hui-kuang was living in the Shao-lin Monastery in 531, and as An-lin is said to have preached the DRMGTV, it would be reasonable for us to presume that after leaving Master Yung in order to learn the Daśabhūmi from Master Kuang at the Shao-lin Monastery, An-lin learned both the DRMGTV and the Daśabhūmi from Hui-kuang.

275. HKSC, p.480b.

276. Idem.

277. HKSC, p.610a (the Biography of Fa-yüan).

278. Ibid., p.610a.

279. His account is appended to the Biography of Fa-yüan (p.610a).

280. Idem.

281. HKSC, p.495b-c.

282. Idem.

283. The persecution of the Buddhists and the Taoists by Emperor Wu of the Northern Chou Dynasty was started in 574. Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol.II, p.91; Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, pp.184-194.

284. HKSC, p.496a.

285. Idem.

286. HKSC, p.496b.

287. Ibid., p.497c.

288. Ibid., p.675b.

289. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, pp.199-200.

290. HKSC, p. 675c.

291. Ibid., p.612a.

292. Ibid., p.669b.

293. Ibid., p.673c.

294. HKSC, p.674c.

295. Cf. note 251.

296. HKSC, p.611b. In E-ken's work, on the other hand, it is said that Tao-hui insisted upon a rigorous training for his disciples and that Hung-tsun was highly esteemed by the former for his great skill in lecturing (p.156b). It should, however, be noted that Tao-hsüan's date is closer to that of Tao-hui and Hung-tsun than to that of E-ken.

297. HKSC, p.661b. E-ken, p.157a.

298. See Section IV, notes 354 to 359.

299. HKSC, p.611c.

300. Ibid., p.611c. Perhaps Hung-tsun would have quoted some interesting extracts from the DRMGTV in his lectures on the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra in the daytime in order to attract his audiences to come to listen to his lectures on the Vinaya in the evening. In the evening, he would have quoted extracts from the abovementioned sūtra in interpreting the doctrines of the DRMGTV.

301. Idem. For the date of the composition of the HKSC see note 257.

302. HKSC, p.612a.

303. Idem.

304. HKSC, p.614a.

305. See note 251.

306. HKSC, p.614a-b.

307. Ibid., p.614b. Only Fascicle Nine of this work still survives, being edited in Vol.66, pp.311a-332a of the Zokuzōkyō. The editors of the Zokuzōkyō give it the title Szŭ-fên Lü Shu or 'The Commentary on the DRMGTV'.

308. HKSC, p.614b-c.

309. Chih-shou's Biography just says: "...an Indian Tripiṭaka Master ..." without mentioning his name (HKSC, p.614c). In the TTNTL it is said that Prabhākaramitra brought with him Sanskrit texts when he came to China in 627 and that Chih-shou was appointed one of his assistants as the 'Doctrinal Examiner' in the translation centre by the government (p.281a). Therefore, it is very likely that he was "the Tripiṭaka Master" who is mentioned in Chih-shou's Biography. In the Biography of Prabhākaramitra in the HKSC, the date of his arrival in China is not clearly stated (p.440a).

310. TTNTL, p.281a. HKSC. p.614c.

311. On the function of the 'Doctrinal Examiner' in a translation centre, see Tso Sze-bong, 'Translation Centres', pp.288-293.

312. TTNTL, p. 281a. HKSC, p.614c.

313. HKSC, p.614c.

314. Ibid., p.615a.

315. Ibid., p.615c. According to the Biography of Huai-su in SKSC, Fa-li was well versed in all Vinayas of the five Schools that were prevailing in China (p.729c).

316. HKSC, p.615c.

317. Zokuzōkyō, Vol.65, pp.179-488. The present version is divided into twenty fascicles.

318. HKSC, p.615c. His commentary on the Karm of the DRMGTV had already long been lost.

319. See Section V, note 469.

320. SKSC, p.793a.

321. Ibid., p.795a.

322. His account is appended to the Biography of Fa-li (HKSC,p.615c).It says that Tao-shou of Wei-chou was a contemporary disciplinarian of Fa-li and that his centre on the Vinaya was more flourishing than that of Fa-li.

323. HKSC, p.624a.

324. Ibid., p.624b.

325. Ibid., p.616a.

326. Ibid., p.616b.

327. Ibid., p.617a.

328. SKSC, p.791c.

329. Ibid., p.792c.

330. Idem. The text says that Huai-su had followed Fa-li in Yeh to learn the Vinaya for three years. However, at that time, Huai-su began to feel dissatisfied with Fa-li's commentary. They were unable to meet each other as Fa-li had already died in 635.

331. Idem., The text says that he left Fa-li and returned to Ch'ang-an in 676. This seems to be impossible for Fa-li died in 635 and Huai-su entered the Order ten years later in 645. They could thus in no way have been master and disciple. Besides, Huai-su probably never visited Yeh but continued to remain in Ch'ang-an, even after his ordination.

332. Zokuzōkyō, Vol.66, pp.333-495; and Vol.67, pp.1-108; under the title Ssŭ-fên Lü K'ai-tsung Chi or 'An Introduction to the Doctrines of the DRMGTV (in twenty fascicles)'.

333. SKSC, p.792c.

334. Idem.

335. HKSC, p.793a. As Fa-li was living in Yeh, in the eastern part of the Yellow River Valley, people called him respectifully 'The Pagoda in the East (see note 320)'. Because Huai-su was a master in Ch'ang-an in the western part of the Valley, he was respected as 'The Pagoda in the West'.

336. Zokuzōkyō, Vol.66, pp.1-310. The full title of it is Ssŭ-fên Lü-shu Shih-tsung I-chi or 'Some Refinements to the Commentary of the DRMGTV', in twenty fascicles.

337. SKSC, p.793a.

338. See note 241.

339. KYSCL, p.564c and p.694c. SKSC, p.792c. In the Taishō both these works (T.1429 and T.1431) are ascribed to Buddhayaśas. In vol.34, Copy 338 'Shou' of the Ch'i-sha Tripiṭaka, these two works (pp. 14a-24b and pp.46b-60a) are still noted as Huai-su's compilations.

340. KYSCL, p.564c and p.695a. SKSC, p.792c. These two works can be found in Vol.35, Copy 341 'Ruh' of the Ch'i-sha Tripiṭaka. The Ssŭ-fên Sêng Chieh-mo (pp.35a-77b), and the Ni Chieh-mo (pp.78a-117b) are both divided into three fascicles.

341. I-ching, NHCKNFC, p.233a. J.Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, p.209.

342. Ting-pin, p.36b.

Notes to Section IV.

343. See Section I, note 115.

344. Cf. Tang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol. I, p.279.

345. CSTCC, pp.103c-104a. KSC, p.335b. Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol.I, p.228. Buddhabhadra's name is listed in the catalogue of the Sarvāstivādin Accounts (p.90a).

346. CSTCC, p.112b. KSC, p.338b.

347. CSTCC, p.21a (Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol.I, p.288). Other Buddhist bibliographies that were compiled in later periods, e.g. the LTSPC (p.71a), the TTNTL (p.247a) and the KYSCL (p.505b-c), all say that these three works were completed in 416. They now appear in the Taishō as T.1425, T.1426 and T.1427. Cf. Akira Hirakawa, Vinaya-Piṭaka, pp.137-141.

348. See Section I, notes 4 to 6.

349. Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol.II, p.295.

350. KSC, p.401a.

351. Ibid., p.401c.

352. Idem.

353. His account is appended to the Biography of Tao-ying (KSC, p.401c).

354. Cf. Section III, the accounts of Fa-ts'ung (note 247), Hung-tsun (note 298) and Chih-shou (Note 308).

355. HKSC, p.568a-b.

356. Ibid., p.610b-c.

357. His account is appended to the Biography of Tao-yo (HKSC, p.527a-b), his brother.

358. HKSC, p.694c.

359. Ibid., p.697c.

360. Cf. note 356.

361. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Bio.& Biblio.', Part 3(HYHP, Vol.7, No.2, 1966, Hong Kong), pp.82-85.

362. See Section I, note 116.

363. KSC, p.339a. LTSPC, p.87b. TTNTL, p.259c. KYSCL, p.523c. Of the above works only the KYSCL says that this work is in thirty fascicles. The version of this Vinaya now in the Taishō is in thirty fascicles (T.1421). Cf. Akira Hirakawa, Vinaya-Pitaka, pp.142-144.

364. KSC, p.339a. LTSPC, p.87b. TTNTL, p.259c. KYSCL, p.523c. The Śīla still survives, and appears in the Taishō as T.1422. The Karma has long been lost.

365. Idem.

366. KYSCL, p.528a. This work appears in the Taishō as T.1423.

367. SKSC, p.796a.

368. Idem.

369. KYSCL, p.571a. SKSC, p.796a. This work appears in the Taishō as T.1424.

370. SKSC, p.796b.

371. See note 361.

372. SKSC, p.799c.

373. See Section V, notes 455 to 458.

374. KSC, p.329b-c.

375. CSTCC, p.13b. LTSPC, p.95b-c. TTNTL, p.262b. KYSCL, pp.535c-536a. Cf. Akira Hirakawa, Vinaya-Pitaka, p.261.

375A. This work appears in the Taishō as T.1462. It has been translated into English by P.V. Bapat and A. Hirakawa and given the title Shan Chien P'i-P'o-Sha. A Chinese Version by Saṅghabhadra of Samantapāsādikā (588 pages). This work is recommended to me by Professor J.W. de Jong.

376. CSTCC, p.13b-c and p.21b. KSC, p.411b-c. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Bio & Biblio', Part 1, pp.443-445.

377. CSTCC, p.21b. Cf. Akira Hirakawa, Vinaya-Piṭaka, pp.145-146.

378. LTSPC, p.87a. TTNTL, p.270a. KYSCL, p.542c.

379. See T. 1460, p.659a, where the 'I-ching Yüan-ch'i' or 'The Account of this Translation' by Sêng-fan (n.d.) is cited. Sêng-fan was an amanuensis or 'Pi-shou' to Prajñāruci (TTNTL, p.270a).

380. LTSPC, p.87a. TTNTL, p.270a. Cf. Akira Hirakawa, Vinaya-Piṭaka, p.146.

381. This work can be found in T.1460, pp.659-665b.

382. Hui-li (n.d.), TTTTÊSSTFSC (T.2053), p.249b-c. Hui-li was a contemporary of Hsüan-tsang. Also see the translation by Samuel Beal (1825-1889), The Life of Hiuen-tsiang, pp.191-192, and the paraphrase by Arthur Waley (1889-1966), The Real Tripiṭaka, pp.71-72.

383. KYSCL, p.568b. CYHTSCML, p.869. SKSC, p.710b.

384. Idem.

385. KYSCL, pp.567c-568a. Cf. Akira Hirakawa, Vinaya-Piṭaka, pp.147-148.

386. CYHTSCML, pp.868c-869a. Cf. Akira Hirakawa, Ibid., pp.148-150.

387. In the year 1931 a quantity of Sanskrit Buddhist texts was discovered in Gilgit, Kashmir. These texts were edited by Dr.Nalinaksha Dutt and his assistants under the title Gilgit Manuscripts. A fragment of this Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya scripture can be found in Vol.III, pt. 1, of the above edition. Cf. Chi Hsien-lin, 'Chi Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu Fan-wên Yüan-pên Ti Fa-hsien' or 'A Note on the Discovery of the Sankrit Texts of a Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya Scripture', pp.117-118 (Chou Shu-t'ao Hsien-shêng Liu-shih Shêng-jih Chi-nien Lun-wên Chi or 'Studies Presented to Mr.Chou Shu-t'ao on His Sixtieth Birthday').

388. A fragment of the Sanskrit text can be found in the Gilgit Manuscripts Vol.III, pt.4, pp.211-255. Also see The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu, pts. 1-2, 1976-1978.

389. Gilgit Manuscripts, Vol.III, pt.4, pp.1-68.

390. Ibid., pp.131-155.

391. Ibid,, pp.117-130.

392. Ibid., pp.157-210.

393. Ibid., pt.2, pp.149-170 (1942, Srinagar, Kashmir). Cf. Yamada Ryūjō, Bongo-butten no Shobunken or 'On the Documents of Sanskrit Buddhist Texts', pp.59-60. (This work is recommended to me by Dr. Hisashi Matsumura).

394. KYSCL, p.569a. For the list of these forty-two scriptures see Ibid., pp.659b-660a. CYHTSCML, p.997. Among them only the two fascicled Fo-wei Nan-t'o Shou Ch'u-chia Ju-t'ai Ching or 'The Buddha Preaches to Nanda on the Topic of Devoting oneself to the Monastic Order and Taking Possession of a Foetus Sūtra' (extracted from the Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu P'i-na-yeh Tsa-shih) has survived until now and can be found in Part Fourteen of the Ta-Pao-chi Ching or Mahāratnakūta (T.310).

395. See Section V, notes 455 to 458.

396. KYSCL, p.568b-c. CYHTSCML, p.869a-b. SKSC, p.710b-c.

397. See Section III, notes 341 and 342.

398. There are two different records on I-ching's nativity. Both, the 'Ta-t'ang Chung-hsing San-tsang Shêng-chiao Hsü' or 'A Foreword to the Buddhist Scriptures Translated in the Period After the Great T'ang Dynasty Resumed Her Regime (in Vol.136 'Ch'ang', p.1b of the Ch'i-sa Tripiṭaka)' by Emperor Chung-tsung of T'ang China in 705 (cf. KYSCL, p.568b. CYHTSCML, p.869b. SKSC, p.710c), and the SKSC, p.710b, say that I-ching was a native of Fan-yang (present Ts'ao-chou City of Hopeh Province). J.Takakusu adopts this nativity in his work (Buddhist Practices, p.xxv); while both the KYSCL, p.568b and the CYHTSCML, p.869a, say that I-ching was a native of Ch'i-chou (present Ch'i-nan City of Shantung Province), and Ch'en Yüan believes this nativity is correct (Dates of Monks, p.104). The abovementioned two cities are all in the lower reaches of the Yellow River.

399. See Sections III (notes 246 to 342) and V (notes 455 to 489).

400. See Section V, note 457.

401. Will be discussed further in the next Chapter.

402. Cf. note 400.

403. TTHYCFKSC, p.10b.

404. Idem.

405. NHCKNFC, p.205b. J.Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, p.10

406. TTHYCFKSC, pp.11c-12a.

407. Ibid., p.12a. His translation was never brought back to China.

408. Yüan-chao, Ta-t'ang Chên-yüan Hsin-i Shih-ti-ching-têng Chi or 'The Account of the Daśabhūmikasūtra and Other Scriptures, Translated in the Chên-yüan Era (785-804) of the Great T'ang Dynasty (T.780)', pp.715c-716a. SKSC, p.722b.

409. Idem.

410. Yüan-chao, p.717b.

411. Sung Lien (1310-1381) and others, Yüan Shih or 'The History of the Yüan Dynasty', Vol.1, p.45.

412. The date of hPhags-Pa, cf. Miyoko Nakano, 'Ti-shih Pa-ssŭ-pa Hsing-chuang Chiao-chêng' or 'An Annotation on the Ti-shih Pa-Pa Hsing-Chuang (A Conduct [sic] of Bla-ma Phags-Pa) by Wang P'an', HYHP, Vol.9, No.1, p.95 and p.106 (1969, Hong Kong).

413. Yüan Shih, Vol.5, p.2164. Cf. Miyoko Nakano, pp.102-3. For the English translation of the term 'Ti-shih', I am indebted to Professor Kenneth Ch'en (Survey, p.419).

414. Nien-ch'ang (flor. 1282-1334), Fo-tsu Li-tai T'ung-ts'ai or 'General Chronicle of Buddha and the Patriarch under Successive Dynasties (T.2036)', p.705b. Huan-lun (n.d.), Shih-shih Chi-ku Lüeh Hsü-chi or 'A Continuation of the Abstract of Historical Researches on Buddhism (T.2038)', p.904c. The latter was compiled in 1638.

415. This work appears in the Taishō as T.1904. Hishimoto Ryūzan says that this work is more detailed than the Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu Pai-i Chieh-mo, translated by I-ching (see Ono Gemmyō, Busshu Kaisetsu Daijiten or 'The Great Dictionary of Buddhist Bibliography', Vol.3, p.533a). For the date of this work see T.1904, p.905a. See also Nien-ch'ang, p.705b.

416. This work appears in the Taishō as T.1905. For its date see Ibid., p.915a.

417. T.1904, p.905a and T.1905, p.915a.

418. Yüan Shih, Vol.3, p.1069b. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, pp.419-420.

419. Yüan Shih, Vol.1, p.132b.

420. Ibid, Vol.5, p.2164b. The abovementioned 'Tsung-chi Yüan' that was led by the 'Imperial Preceptor' was changed to 'Hsüan-chêng Yüan' or 'The Bureau of Policy Proclamation' in 1288. See Ibid., Vol.3, p.1069b. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p.419.

421. I would like to devote further research to this subject after my thesis is completed. The problem will not be discussed further here as it is not relevant to my thesis.

422. Hung-i, Nan-shan Lü-yüan Wên-chi or 'Collection of Essays Concerning the Study of Tao-hsüan's Quotation', p.91.

423. Ibid., p.74.

424. Idem.

424A. I have read through Lin Tzŭ-ch'ing's Hung-i Ta-shih Nien-p'u or 'The Nien-p'u (biography arranged according to the successive stages of one's career) of Master Hung-i', and have found that after 1932, Hung-i had only done some research on the Quotation and given some lectures on it (p.140, p.156, p.170, p.198, pp.219-220 and p.234), or on the other works of Tao-hsüan on the Dharmaguptavinaya scriptures (pp.140, 142, 149, 150, 160, 176 and 182), in the remaining part of his life. I have not found that Hung-i ever gave lectures on the Mūlasarvāstivādanikāyavinaya scriptures again.

425. These essays can be found in Nan-shan Lü-yüan Wên-chi, pp.1-6, pp.9-10, pp.10-12 , p.79 and p.91.

Notes to Section V.

426. This section is based upon my former work, the 'Disciplinary School'.

427. SKSC, p.790b.

428. Yao Szŭ-l'ien (+637), Ch'en Shu or 'The History of the Ch'en Dynasty', p.59. Ssŭ-ma Kuang, Chronicle, Vol.6, p.5516.

429. Hui-yün's Biography is in the HKSC, pp.533c-534b. On the last page, Tao-hsüan states that he had served Hui-yün for ten years.

430. SKSC, p.790b.

431. Idem. See also Tao-hsüan's comment in HKSC, p.615a.

432. Idem.

433. SKSC, p.790c. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Translation Centres', pp.257 and 261.

434. Ibid., p.791.

434A. For the original title of this work see Section I, Note 3.

435. Ibid., p.790. In the TTNTL, Tao-hsüan's own work, it is referred to as Hsing-shih Shan-pu Lü-li or 'The Vinaya Rules for Practice with Abridgements and Supplements' in three or in six fascicles (p.282a). I suppose this was its original title. The title I have used is that recorded in the Taishō (T.1804). In the KYSCL, this book is not catalogued.

436. See Note 467.

437. According to the Hsing-chih Ch'ao Chu-chia Piao-mu or 'A Catalogue on the Interpretations to the Quotation' compiled by the monk Hui-hsien (n.d.) of the Sung Dynasty and revised by Kai-getsu (n.d.) the Japanese monk, there were sixty-three interpretations based upon this work from the T'ang Dynasty to the beginning of the Sung (Zokuzōkyō, Vol.70, pp.99-101). In Zokuzōkyō there are some interpretations of the Quotation; they are: Ssŭ-fên Lü Hsing-shih-ch'ao P'i or 'The Comments on the Quotation'* in twenty-eight fascicles by Ta-chʼeh (n.d.) of the T'ang Dynasty (Vol.67, pp.109-515 and Vol.68, pp.1-53); Ssŭ-fên Lü Hsing-shih-ch'ao Chien Cheng Chi or 'A Revision of the Quotation'* in seventeen fascicles by Ching-hsiao (n.d.) of the Wu-yüeh State (908-930) (Vol.68, pp.54-528); Ssŭ-fên Lü Hsing-shih-ch'ao K'o or 'The Systematization of the Quotation (See Section III, Note 256) by Yüan-chao (Vol.69, pp.1-68); Ssŭ-fên-Lü Hsing-shih-ch'ao Tzŭ-ch'ih Chi or 'A Guide to the Practice of the Quotation'* in sixteen fascicles by Yüan-chao (Vol.69, pp.69-498, and Vol.70, pp.1-89). The works indicated with an asterisk are also listed in the work of Hui-hsien and Kai-getsu.

438. SKSC, p.797c; p.801c; p.806c; p.809b; and p.810b. This work is also called Nan-shan Lü-ch'ao or 'The Quotation on the Vinaya by the Master of Mount Chung-nan', see Ibid., p.802c and p.807c. As it is quoted from the DRMGTV, it was also called Ssŭ-fên Lü Ch'ao or 'The Quotation from the DRMGTV', see Ibid., p.798b; p.799c and p.802c.

439. Ibid., p.798b. It is also called Chung-nan Shih-ch'ao and Nan-shan Shih-ch'ao or 'The Quotation for Practice by the Master of the Mount Chung-nan', see Ibid., pp.800b and 806c.

440. Ibid., pp.792 and 809.

441. Ibid., pp. 793c, 795a, 800c, 804b and 806b.

442. Ibid., p.791a.

443. Ibid., p.791c.

444. Idem.

445. Idem.

446. SKSC, pp.791c-792b.

447. Ibid., p.792b.

448. Ibid., p.791a.

449. Idem. Cf. Ch'en Yüan, 'Fo-ya Ku-shih' or 'The Stories of the Buddha's Tooth Relic', in Ch'en Yüan Hsien-shêng Chin Nien-lien Shih-hsüeh Lun-wên Chi or 'A Collection of Mr. Ch'en Yüan's Essays on historical studies Published in the Past Twenty Years', p.35. The original essay was published in Jen-min Jih-pao, 20 July 1961 (Peking).

450. SKSC, p791a. Cf. Notes 431 and 433.

451. Ibid., pp.792b and 793c.

452. Ibid., p.793a.

453. Ibid., p.793b.

454. Liu Hsü (888-947) and others, Chiu T'ang Shu or 'The Old History of the T'ang Dynasty', Vol.1, pp.98-106a.

454A. SKSC, p.793b.

454B. In 199 B.C. Emperor Kao-tsu (R.206-195 B.C.), founder of the Former Han Dynasty, began to enfeoff meritorious statesmen and generals who had assisted him in establishing the Han Empire, with noble rank. The emperor conferred on each of these nobles an iron plate containing a statement in engraved characters, painted in vermilion, as certificates for their feoffs (Han Shu, Vol.1, pp.43a and 225a). In 535, when Yü-wên T'ai (505-556), the dictator of the Western Wei Dynasty (535-557), came to power as prime minister (Ling-hu Tê-fên's [583-666] Chou Shu or 'The History of the Northern Chou Dynasty',

p.17a), and he adopted Su Ch'o's (498-546) suggestion that all the administrative reports, appeals and the like should be written in black ink; and all the decrees, orders and other documents issued by the government were in vermilion ink (Ibid., p.160b). Later, the throne of the Western Wei was taken over by the Yü-wên family and the Northern Chou Dynasty was established in 556 (Ibid, p.26a). As Ch'en Yin-k'o has shown that the political system of the T'ang Dynasty was derived from three sources: (1) the system that had operated from the Han Dynasty up to the Northern Ch'i Dynasty; (2) the system of the successive dynasties of Liang and Ch'en (557-584); and (3) the system of the successive dynasties of Western Wei and Northern Chou Dynasty (see his Sui-t'ang Chih-tu Yüan-yüan Lüeh-lun Kao or 'A Survey on the Sources of the Political System of the Sui and the T'ang Dynasties', pp. 1 and 16-17); and as the decrees issued by the Han Dynasty and the Northern Chou Dynasty were all written in vermilion ink, we know that the formal imperial edict of the T'ang Dynasty must have been written in this ink.

455. SKSC, p.793c.

456. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Disciplinary School', pp.184b-185.

457. Idem.

458. Idem.

459. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Bio. & Biblio.', Part 3, pp.122-124.

460. SKSC, p.793c.

461. Ibid., p.812a.

462. These accounts of Tao-an are recorded in: (a) Tsu-hsiu's (n.d.) Lung-hsing Fo-chiao P'ien-nien T'ung-lun or 'A Buddhist Chronicle with Text and Commentary Compiled in the Lung-hsing Era (1163-4)' (Zokuzōkyō, Vol.130, pp.209a-356b), p.284a; (b) FTTC, p.372c; (c) Pên-chüeh's (n.d.) Shih-shih T'ung-chien or 'A Comprehensive Buddhist Chronicle (compiled before 1270)', (Zokuzōkyō, Vol.131, pp.271a-503a), p.464a; (d) Chüeh-an's (flor. 1286-1355, according to Ch'en Yüan's Dates of Monks, p.326) Shih-shih Chi-ku Lüeh or 'A Survey of the Historical Affairs on Buddhism' (T.2037), p.823c. Though both T'an-[illegible]'s (flor. 1366) Hsin-hsiu K'o-fên Liu-hsüeh Sêng-chuan or 'The Newly Compiled Classified Biographies of Buddhist Monks According to their Merits in the practice of the Six Pāramitās

(Zokuzōkyō, Vol.133, pp.210a-490b)' and E-ken's work (see Section III, Note 246) have the 'Biography of Tao-an', and each of them record the incident of the 'edict in black ink'. When one compares their contents, it is clear that T'an-ngo's work (p.249a) is an adaptation from the Biography of Tao-an contained in the SKSC and that E-ken's work (p.61a) was no different (cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Disciplinary School', p.184).

463. In Zokuzōkyō, Vol.105, pp.257b-288b.

464. Ibid., p.285b.

465. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Bio. & Biblio.', part 3, p.122 for Tsan-ning. See Tsung-chien (n.d.), Shi-man Chêng-t'ung or 'The Buddhist Orthodoxy (Zokuzōkyō, Vol.130, pp.357a-463a)', p.460a, and FTTC, p.297b, for Yüan-chao. Both of them were natives of Chekiang province.

466. See Note 462.

467. These monks are listed in the table below, in which their specializations are also indicated (Abbreviations: 'Q' for Tao-hsüan's Quotation, 'N' for Huai-su's New Interpretation, and 'O' for Fa-li's Old Commentary and 'NC' for New Commentary [Cf. Note 474]:

Name:	Date:	Birthplace:	Specialisation:	Page:
Disciplinarian Hsiu	Flor.645	Hupeh		794c
Hsüan-yen	674-742	Chekiang	Q	795b
Fa-shên	Fl.742-3	+Kiangsu	O	808b.
Hsüan-lang	673-754	Chekiang	Q	875c.
I-hsüan	Fl.742-755	Kiangsu	O, Q	800b.
Tao-kuang	682-760	+Chekiang		797a.
Chien-chên	687-763	Kiangsu		797a-b.
Shou-chih	700-770	Chekiang	Q	797c.
T'an-i	692-771	Chekiang	O, Q.	798b-c.
Chih-hung	Died before 772	Chekiang	Q	801c.
Ch'ing-chiang	Fl.773	Chekiang		802a.
Lang-jan	724-777	Kiangsu	Q	799c.
Ta-i	691-779	Chekiang		800a.
Pien-hsiu	714-780	Kiangsu ?		800c-801a.
Tao-tsun	714-784	+Chekiang	Q	879a.
Shên-hao	716-790	Kiangsu	Q	802c-803a.
Ling-ch'ê	Fl.780-790	Chekiang		802b.

Name:	Date:	Birthplace	Specialisation	Page:
Chao-jan	died before 792	Chekiang		891c
T'an-ch'ing	Fl. 812	Hunan	Q	804b
I-sung	Fl. 812	+Szechuan	N	804b.
Ch'êng-kuan	died ca. 812	Chekiang	Q	737a.
Shên-ch'ing	died ca. 812	Szechuan	NC	741a
Ch'ing-ch'ê	Fl. 813	+Kiangsu	Q	806c
Shang-hêng	739-815	Kiansi	Q	806c.
Fa-yung	747-835	Szechuan	Q	894c
Tsung-mi	780-841	Szechuan	Q	742a
Kuang-hsiu	771-843	Chekiang		895a
Wên-chih	778-861	Chekiang		881b-c
T'an-fu	Fl.871-3	+Chekiang		808a
T'an-hsiu	Fl.860-873	+Chekiang		882a
Ch'ang-t'a	801-874	+Kiangsu	Q	807c.
Hsüan-ch'ang	797-875	Anhwei		818a-b
Yüan-piao	Fl.880-1	Chekiang	Q	809b
Yün-wên	805-882	+Chekiang		808b-c
Wên-hsi	821-900	Chekiang		783c
Ācārya Shou	Fl.902-5	Anhwei	Q	809b-c
Hui-tsê	835-908	Kiangsu	Q	809a
Wu-tso	died ca.907-911	Kiangsu	Q	896c
Hsing-tao	895-956	Chekiang	Q	871a-b
Hao-tuan	889-961	Chekiang	Q	750c
Wu-ên	912-986	Kiangsu	Q	752a
I-chi	919-987	Chekiang		752b
Hsi-chüeh	864-984*	Chekiang	Q	810b

*According to Ch'en Yüan, Dates of Monks, p.176.

Of the above forty-three monks who studied the DRMGTV, twenty-four specialized in the Quotation, and of those twenty-four two were associated with Fa-li's Old Commentary as well. One monk specialized only in Huai-su's New Interpretation, and another only in the Old Commentary. Besides, there was also one who studied the New Commentary. On the other hand, the monks of the Yellow River Valley who studied the DRMGTV as recorded in the SKSC seem to be less in number than those in the Yangtzŭ Valley after Tao-hsüan's death. The following is a list of these monks tabulated as above:

Name:	Date:	Birthplace	Specialisation:	Page:
Ming-k'o	n.d.*	Shantung	Q	792b
Ch'ung-yeh	died ca.727	+Shensi		795a
Ju-ching	fl.778-781	+Shensi		801a
Wu-ming	722-793	Honan		817a
Yüan-chao	fl.727-799	Shensi		804b-c
Tao-ch'êng	+803	Shensi	Q	806b
Wu-yeh	750-811	Shensi		772b
Chên-chün	847-924	+Honan	N	810a-b
Ch'êng-ch'u	889-959	Honan	N	810c-811a

*He was a disciple of both Tao-hsüan and Wên-kang.

Note: the (+) mark in the above two tables shows that the monk lived in this province but his place of birth is unknown.

Among these nine Buddhist monks two specialized on the Quotation and two on Huai-su's New Interpretation.

468. Also see table in Note 467.

469. Yüan-chao, Ta-t'ang Chên-yüan Hsü K'ai-yüan Shih-chiao Lu or 'A Continuation of the Catalogue of K'ai-yüan Era Compiled in the Chên-yüan Era of the Great T'ang Dynasty' (T.2156), pp.760a-762c. SKSC, p.801a and p.804b-c.

470. The work of the editorial board was divided into that of: 'Pi-hsüeh Jun-seh Ch'ien-ting* (Corrector-cum-Polisher)'; 'Pi-shou Chêng-tzŭ Ch'ien-ting (Receiver by Pen-cum-Etymologist of Chinese Characters)'; 'Pi-shou Tsuan-wên Ch'ien-ting (Receiver by Pen-cum-Composition Composer)'; 'Pi-shou Chêng-i Ch'ien-ting (Receiver by Pen-cum-Doctrinal Examiner)' and 'Chêng-i Ch'ien-ting (Doctrinal Examiner)'. See Yüan-chao, p.761a (* The title 'Ch'ien-ting' here means the 'Examiner'). The titles of these editors were similar to those of the assistants in a traditional translation centre (Cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Translation Centres', pp.276-289). This is because the team of editors would first have to examine the doctrines that were contained in these two commentaries. Therefore, the work of 'Doctrinal Examiner' was needed first. Secondly, when different or even contradictory explanations between these commentaries were found, the editors would have to decide which was the more appropriate explanation, and to omit contradictions or incorporate corrections as

deemed necessary. Therefore, the work of 'Corrector' was needed. Thirdly, after the abovementioned work was completed, the editors would have to re-organize the contents of these two commentaries before they were combined into one, and some rhetorical polishing would have to be given to the new version. As a result the labours of the 'Polisher'; 'Composition Composer' and 'Etymologist of Chinese Characters' were needed. Besides, the work of amalgamation would have been done during several meetings discussing the contents of the text, so the 'Receiver by Pen' had to be present to record the words of the meeting (cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Chi Liang-chung Yu Chung-kuo I-ch'ang Fang-shih P'ien-tsuan Ti Fei-fan-i Fo-tien' or 'Two Non-translated Buddhist Works Compiled under the Traditional Method and Procedure of the Buddhist Translation Centres in China', HYSYHSLK, Vol. 11, pp. 110-111, 1969).

471. Yüan-chao, Ta-t'ang Chên-yüan Hsü K'ai-yüan Shih-chao Lu, p.762a.

472. Ibid., p.761c.

473. Ibid., p.722c.

474. SKSC, p.741a. His work has long been lost.

475. Ibid., p.812a.

476. See Section III, Notes 301 and 323.

477. This Monastery in Lang-chou was one of the many monasteries in China bearing the name Lung-hsing. This name was first used by Emperor Chung-tsung of the T'ang Dynasty. During his first regency in 684, the throne of Emperor Chung-tsung was taken over by his mother Empress Wu Tsê-t'ien, later Empress Wu Chao, and the Chou Dynasty (684-704) was established thereafter. As in the Confucian system women were not permitted to assume political control of the state; for Empress Wu to take such power upon herself was a radical departure from normal practice. She consequently had to seek justification for her acts outside the Confucian classics. Among the Mahāyāna Sūtras there is the Ta-yün Ching ('The Great Cloud Sūtra' or Mahāmeghasūtra) translated by Dharmaraksa. In chapter Four of Dharmaraksa's translation there is a passage describing the Buddha's prediction to a female divinity named Ching-kuang that, having heard his profound teachings, she would become reborn as a universal monarch ruling a wide area. Learning of this, Empress Wu Chao immediately decreed that the Ta-yün Ching be circulated throughout the empire. In 690,

she also proclaimed that a Ta-yün Monastery be erected under official auspices in each of the two capitals (Ch'ang-an and Lo-yang) and in all the prefectures of the empire. In each of the Ta-yün Monasteries a monk-lecturer was posted to preach the Ta-yün Ching to the public. Both the circulation of that Sūtra and the establishment of those Monasteries were measures designed by the empress in order to capture the support of the people for her usurpation of the imperial throne (cf. Ch'en Yin-k'o, 'Wu Chao yü Fo-chao' or 'The Empress Wu Chao and Buddhism', CYYCYLSYYYCSCK, Vol.V, Part 2, pp. 144-147. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, pp. 220-221). After Empress Wu Chao's life came to an end and Emperor Chung-tsung mounted once again upon the throne in 705, he imitated the political measures of his mother by establishing the 'Ta-t'ang Chung-hsing Monastery' or 'Monastery for the Re-establishment of the Great T'ang Dynasty' in each prefecture of the empire (Wang P'u [922-982], T'ang Hui-yao or 'The Institutes of the T'ang Dynasty', Vol.2, p.847) as a way of propagating the orthodoxy of the T'ang Dynasty which he resuscitated. In 707, he changed the name of those monasteries into 'Lung-hsing Monastery' or 'Monastery for the Rising of the Dragon' (Idem. Also see Chiu T'ang Shu, Vol.1, p.102b). We now find a record of those Lung-hsing Monasteries in the SKSC. They were: one in the present Ningsia Province (p.806a and p.877a); one in the present Hopeh Province (p.828a); one in the present Shansi Province (p.764a); one in the present Honan Province (p.765c); three in the present Kiangsu Province (pp. 751c, 758c and 796b); two in the present Chekiang Province (pp. 747c, 750b and 758b); two in the present Kiangsi Province (pp.806b and 865c); one in the present Hupeh Province (p.897c) and one in the present Hainan Island of the Kwangtung Province (p.895c). Thus there is a total of thirteen such monasteries recorded.

478. 'Sīmābandha' or 'boundary fixing' is a procedure that had to be followed when a Buddhist assembly, like the assembly for preaching the Śīla in every half of a month, or for the practice of the Varsā, etc., was to be held in a certain place. For instance, if they decided to hold an assembly in an open place, they would first fix the four corners of the boundary of a chosen site. Then they appointed a priest to call out loudly: "Listen please, high monks ! Now I am proclaiming for the assembly the four boundaries of the site. From the jujube in the southeastern corner we go straight to the mulberry in the southwestern corner.From that point, we go northward to reach the willow in the northwestern corner. Then, from that point, we

walk eastward to meet the elm in the northeastern corner, and from there we turn southward back to the jujube in the southeastern corner. Within these boundaries is the site for our assembly (Tao-hsüan, Quotation, p.15b)'. After saying this three times he asks whether there are any objections. If all the other priests remain silent, it means that they are all in agreement (DRMGTV, p. 819b). If an assembly is to be held in a certain building of a monastery, this procedure is still to be practised first. The priests who attend this assembly will fix the pegs close to the foot of the four walls and send a priest to proclaim: "From this wall to that wall" is the site for the assembly (Tao-hsüan, Quotation, p.16b).

479. On p. 298a-b of the MHSGKV, it says that the Buddha once used a bow of 'five elbows' in length to measure the land. Then he planted seven Āmra trees, the distance between each tree was 'seven bows' in order to give enough space for these trees to stretch their branches. The Buddha then called this way of plantation the 'Sīmābandha for Āmra trees'. From the above description it is apparent that the distance between the seven trees has nothing to do with the 'Sīmā-bandha' for the other Buddhist ceremonies. According to p. 555b of the Mochizuki, one 'Hasta (elbow)' equals 1.8 feet, and four Hastas equal one Dhanus (bow). Therefore, the so-called 'five elbowed bow' is nine feet in length. As the distance between each Āmra tree is 'seven bows', it means that a space of sixty-three feet separated one tree from another.

480. According to the traditional Chinese reckoning, the 'P'u' or 'Step' normally means five 'Ch'ih' which is about six feet. As I-sung decided that each of the four boundaries of the Sīmā was to be 'sixty-three steps', they would then probably be as long as 378 feet on each side. But the term used by I-sung was taken from the description as given in the MHSGKV, and the so-called 'Step' here might only mean 'foot', especially when read in conjunction with the former Note.

481. SKSC, p. 804b.

482. Ibid., p. 804b. According to the Quotation, the Sīmā is divided into 'big' or 'small'. For instance, the site of the whole monastery would be regarded as a 'Big Sīmā' through the procedure of 'Sīmā-bandha'. Within that very monastery, the priests can choose a smaller space to prepare a 'Small Sīmā' for a particular use (for instance, for the assembly of conferring an ordination) through the same procedure (pp.14b-17a). It is difficult to decide upon the length and width

for a Sīmā unless the number of participants in a particular assembly was known. This is the most likely reason why in every Vinaya, the length of each boundary of a Sīmā is not prescribed.

483. SKSC, p.804b.

484. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p.255.

485. SKSC, p.804b.

486. Cf. Notes 479 and 480.

487. SKSC, p.804b.

488. I have perused the following Buddhist bibliographies:

(a) KYSCL (in twenty fascicles), compiled by Chih-shêng in 730.
(b) Ta-t'ang Chên-yüan Hsü K'ai-yüan Shih-chiao-Lu (in three fascicles), compiled by Yüan-chao in 794.
(c) CYHTSCML (in thirty fascicles), compiled also by Yüan-chao in 799.
(d) Hsü Chên-yüan Shih-chiao Lu (T.2158) or 'A Continuation to the CYHTSCML (in one fascicle)', compiled by Hêng-an (n.d.) in 945.
(e) Ta-tsang Ching Kang-mu Chih-yao (Shō-wa Hō-bō Sō-moku roku, No.37), or 'A Guide to the Tripitaka with Text and Commentary (in eight fascicles), compiled by the monk Wei-pai (n.d.) around 1103-1104.
(f) Ta-tsang Shêng-chiao Fa-pao Piao-mu (Ibid., No. 38) or 'A Guide to the Treasures of the Dharma in the Holy Tripitaka (in ten fascicles)', compiled by the Upāsaka Wang Ku (n.d.) in the period of Emperor Hui-tsung (R.1101-1125) of the Sung Dynasty.

I found that after 709 there is no record of any commentary on the SVSTVDV having been composed.

489. Even though the Dharmaguptavinaya School had monopolized the whole disciplinary field in the Chinese Monastic Order, other disciplinary sects were still able to survive in isolated pockets for some time after 709. The survival of the Mahīśāsakavinaya Sect is an example. See Section IV, Notes 371 and 372.

490. Gen-kai (n.d.), Tō Dai-wa-jō Tō-sei Den or 'The Account of the Campaign to the East of the Great Vandya from the T'ang Dynasty (T.2089)', p.992b. This book was composed in 779 in Japan (T.2089, p.994a).

491. SKSC, p.795a-b. According to the DRMGTV, the Buddha ordained Upāli and sixteen other boys, aged from twelve to seventeen, into the Order. These child-monks were too young to follow the rule of taking only one meal a day at noon, and they wept in the middle of the night

because of hunger. Then the Buddha said to Ānanda: "From this time on we will not ordain people who have not reached their twentieth year. You know the reason why ? The people under twenty are unable to put up with sufferings such as cold, heat, hunger and thirst, ... (p.808b-c)". Therefore, a person should normally receive his full ordination when he was an adult. Even though Hsüan-yen followed Tao-an in his teens, he would have had to wait till he was twenty to receive full ordination.

492. In view of the above discussion (Note 491), Hsüan-yen went to Ch'ang-an after his ordination, and would have met these two disciplinarians around the age of twenty, i.e. around 694-5.

493. SKSC, p.795b.

494. Idem.

495. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, pp.241-244.

496. SKSC, p.795c.

497. Idem.

498. Ibid., p.796a.

499. Ibid., p.795b. These two works have long been lost.

500. Idem.

501. Ibid., p.815b-c.

502. His Biography is in SKSC, pp.875b-876a, and FTTC, p.188. According to the SKSC, Hsüan-lang had followed Tao-an to learn the Vinaya (p.875c). Because he went over to the T'ien-t'ai School and became the 'Eighth Patriarch' of that School, I will not give any further description of him in this Chapter.

503. SKSC, p.815c.

504. Idem.

505. Gen-kai, p.988a. SKSC, p.797a-b, and E-ken, p.114b.

506. SKSC, p.797b. E-ken, p.114b.

507. E-ken, p.114b.

508. Gen-kai, p.988a. SKSC, p.797b. E-ken, p.114b. All these texts say that Chien-chên returned to the Huai-nan (the southern area of the Huai River Valley)' or 'Huai-hai (the Huai River Valley)' from Ch'ang-an. According to the Chiu T'ang Shu, Chiang-tu, the homeland

of Chien-chên, belonged to the 'Huai-nan Tao (the State in the South of the Haui River)' (Vol.2, p.799a). Therefore, the above descriptions only hint that he returned to his homeland.

509. Gen-kai, p.988b and p.989b-c.

510. Ibid., p.988b.

511. Ibid., p.989b.

512. Ibid.,pp.990b-991a.

513. Ibid., pp.991b-992c.

514. Ibid., pp.992c-994b.

515. Ibid., p.992b.

516. Idem.

517. Not to be confused with Shên-yung, the disciple of Hsüan-yen.

518. Gen-kai, p.992b-c.

519. See note 467.

520. In 1765, Hêng-shih (n.d.), a sectarian of the Dharmaguptavinaya School, compiled the Lü-tsung Têng-p'u or 'A Genealogy of the Transmission of the Lamp of the Dharmaguptavinaya School (Chin-ling Edition)' in two fascicles. This work was then revised and supplemented by Hsiang-chu (flor. 1753-1769), another sectarian of the same School (HHKSC [cf. note 538] Vol.3, p.9b). In Vol. I, pp.15-24 of this work, Hêng-shih and Hsiang-chu listed the patriarchs of the Dharmaguptavinaya School in China as follows:

(1) Dharmagupta, (2) Dharmakāla, (3) Fa-ts'ung, (4) Tao-fu. (5) Hui-kuang, (6) Tao-yün, (7) Tao-hung, (8) Chih-shou, (9) Tao-hsüan, (10) Wên-kang, (11) Man-i, (12) Ta-liang, (13) T'an-i, (14) Pien-hsiu, (15) Tao-ch'êng, (16) Ch'eng-ch'u, (17) Yün -k'an, (18) Yüan-chao, (19) Yüan-ming Kuang-chiao, (20) Wan-shou, (21) Ku-hsin (Ju-hsing).

From this list it can be seen that the authors chose Man-i as successor to Wên-kang, even though he was in fact not one of his disciples. According to the SKSC, Man-i was a specialist in Fa-li's Old Commentary, bur learned nothing of the Quotation (p.795a). The above discussion shows that the sectarians of the Dharmaguptavinaya School of the Ch'ing Dynasty (1644-1911) had forgotten the role played by Tao-an in their School.

521. A characteristic pointed out by Fr. Gilbert J. Garraghan in his work A Guide to Historical Method, p.43.

522. SKSC, p. 793c.

523. In the 'Lü-tsung Hsiang-kuan Tsai-chi' or 'The Account of the Disciplinary School Which has Some Relationship with the T'ien-t'ai School' of Tsung-chien's Shih-mên Ch'êng-t'ung, only Tao-hsüan and Yüan-chao are chosen as the representative sectarians of this School and one biography is prepared for each of them in this Account (pp.459-460). Also in the 'Nan-shan Li-chiao Chi' or 'The Treatise of the Establishment of the Nan-shan School (the Dharmaguptavinaya School)' of Chih-p'an's FTTC, there are the Biographies of Tao-hsüan, Yün-k'an and Yüan-chao only (pp.296c-297c). Yün-k'an (+1061) was another representative disciplinarian in the Sung Dynasty. He had debated with Yüan-chao whether a priest starts at the left side of an image of the Buddha or the right side when he begins to circumambulate it, and on the length of the Buddhist robe (FTTC, p.297b). Yün-k'an's works on the DRMGTV can be found in the Zokuzōkyō, vol.62, pp.79a-97b, Vol.64, pp.13a-25a, and pp.105a-219b.

524. These works can be found in the Zokuzōkyō, Vol.62, pp.95a-154b and pp.155a-513b, Vol.64, pp.1a-12a, pp.220a-259a and pp. 269a-510b, Vol.69, pp.1-68 and pp.69a-498b, Vol.70, pp.1a-89b, Vol.71, pp.12-29.

525. T.1805. Zokuzōkyō Vol.69, pp.69a-498b and Vol.70, pp.1a-89b. The second version was an amalgamation of Tao-hsüan's Quotation and Yüan-chao's A Guide to the Quotation amalgamated by the Japanese monk Zui-hō (n.d.) in 1686 (See Hung-i, Ssŭ-fên Lü Hsing-shih-chao Tzŭ-chih Chi Fu-sang Chi-shih or 'Collection of Interpretations of A Guide to the Quotation compiled in Japan', p. 1 of its 'Principles for Compilation'. This work is a modern guide book for the study of the DRMGTV).

526. See Section III, Note 251.

527. In Vol.105, pp.306-342 of the Zokuzōkyō there is Disciplinarian Hui-hsien's (n.d.) three fascicled Lü-tsung Hsin-hsüeh Ming-chü or 'A Dictionary of the Terms of the Dharmaguptavinaya School for Trainees (compiled in 1094)'. It records on p.342a that in the Sung Dynasty, there were six Buddhist masters who chose disciplinarians from the past and canonized them into the 'patriarchs' of the Dharmaguptavinaya School in China:

(a) Disciplinarian Fa-ming's (n.d.) canonization:
(1) Upāli, (2) Dharmagupta, (3) Buddhayaśas, (4) Chih-shou, (5) Nan-shan (Tao-hsüan).

(b) Master Jên-yo's (+ 1077) canonization:
(1) Dharmakāla (sic), (2) Dharmagupta (sic), (3) Buddhayaśas, (4) Fa-ts'ung, (5) Tao-fu, (6) Hui-kuang, (7) Tao-yün, (8) Tao-fa, (9) Chih-shou, (10) Nan-shan.

(c) Master Shou-jên's (+ 1179) canonization:
(1) Upāli, (2) Dharmagupta, (3) Buddhayaśas, (4) Fa-ts'ung, (5) Chih-shou, (6) Nan-shan, (7) Tseng-hui Chi-chü.

(d) Disciplinarian Yün-k'an's canonization:
(1) Upāli, (2) Dharmagupta, (3) Buddhayaśas, (4) T'an-ti (sic), (5) Fa-ts'ung, (6) Chih-shou, (7) Nan-shan.

(e) Disciplinarian Yüan-chao's canonization:
(1) Dharmagupta, (2) Dharmakāla, (3) Fa-ts'ung, (4) Tao-fu, (5) Hui-kuang, (6) Tao-yün, (7) Tao-hung, (8) Chih-shou, (9) Nan-shan.

(f) Disciplinarian Hui-hsien's own canonization:
(1) Dharmagupta, (2) Fa-ts'ung, (3) Tao-fu, (4) Chih-shou, (5) Nan-shan.

Among these canonizations, only Yüan-chao's list was adopted by FTTC and Gyō-nen (see Section III, Note 251) and gained widespread and lasting popularity among all Buddhists (cf. Shêng-yen's Chieh-lü-hsüeh Kang-yao or 'An Outline of the Knowledge of Śīla and Vinaya [hereafter referred to as Outline of Vinaya]', pp.18-19).

528. Tsung-chien, p.460a. FTTC, p.297c. The Buddhist tradition of begging for alms is recorded in the DRMGTV, p.659b-c, p.789 and pp.932c-933c. I cannot find any record in the DRMGTV that a priest should have to put on a robe made of cotton.

529. Tsung-chien, Idem.

530. See Note 532.

531. The Chinese characters of this title read: "Ch'ün-fu Yün-shih". As the date of this letter had already disappeared when it was edited in the collection of Yüan-chao's writings (see Note 532), we do not know when it was written, and the name of the official to whom it was

sent. According to the FTTC, p.297b-c, Yüan-chao held the appointment of abbot of the Ling-chih Monastery for thirty years until his death in 1116, meaning that he took up his abbotship in 1087. The above case was instituted on a date after the Hsi-ling Era (1068-1077) when Yüan-chao was staying in the Hsiang-fu Monastery, implying that it would have occurred sometime between 1078 and 1086. I read Wu Ting-hsieh's Pei-sung Ching-fu Nien-piao or 'The Calendar of the Governors-General of the Northern Sung Dynasty (compiled in 1911)' in order to search for the governors of Hang-chou who were appointed in the above-mentioned period and found that there are four men who were appointed one after the other between 1077 and 1086 (in Vol.6, p.7784b of Êrh-shih-wu-shih Pu-p'ien or 'The Supplements to the Twenty-five Standard Chinese Histories'). Then I checked the names of these four governors in T'oh-t'oh's (1314-1355) Sung Shih or 'The History of the Sung Dynasty' to find out whether it had a biography or an account in it. I found that among them Chao Pien (n.d.) had been appointed Director General of Transportation before he became Governor of Hang-chou (Vol.10, p.4033a), while Chang Hsin (n.d.) was previously a Deputy Director General of Transportation and then became governor of the same prefecture (Ibid., p.4191b). According to Wu Ting-hsieh, Chao Pien's appointment was from 1077 to 1079 and Chang Hsin's was from 1081 to 1085 (p.7884b). Therefore, the case of Yüan-chao would have been heard by either of these two governors, because Yüan-chao addressed his governor with the above-mentioned title as a way of flattering, hinting that the man was taking the post as a 'governor' temporarily and would soon be promoted back to his respectable position of 'director general'. Again, Wu Ting-hsieh says that the Governor of Hang-chou was not simply a prefectural governor but in fact the Governor-General of the Liang-chê Hsi-lu (its extent covers the southern parts of Kiangsu and the western parts of the Chekiang Province), a province of the Sung Dynasty (p.7881a). Probably Yüan-chao did not know the real political position of the Governor of Hang-chou and thought that the man was demoted from a high ranking position of 'director general'; therefore, he flattered him with such a strange address.

532. Yüan-chao, Chih-yüan Chi or 'The Collection of Writings of the Master of the Garden of Fungus (in three fascicles)', Zokuzōkyō, Vol.105, p.229a-b.

533. Tsung-chien, p.460a. FTTC, p.297c.

534. Zokuzōkyō, Vol.106, pp.1a-52b.

535. This is in praise of Yüan-chao, hinting that Tao-hsüan was the number one of the Dharmaguptavinaya School and Yüan-chao the number two.

536. Zokuzōkyō, Vol.106, p.1a-b.

537. In Ibid., p.3a, there is a section called 'Po-chang Kuei-sheng' or 'Master Po-chang's (Huai-hai) Rules of Conduct', in which Shêng-wu says: "Even though these five popular rules of Ch'an Buddhism are not derived from the Vinaya, I still quote them in order to introduce them to our disciplinarians for guidance." Again on pp.34a-36a, there is the 'Jih-yung Ch'ing-kuei' or 'The Pure Rule for Daily Life'. In the beginning of this section, Shêng-wu remarks: "..... without reference to the Vinaya, the rules of Ch'an Buddhism cannot be substantiated ... now I quote the rules of the 'Ch'ing-kuei' whose contents are in agreement with the codes of the Vinaya, for guidance as to the conduct of our daily life. Especially, it would be useful as a guide for our trainees (p.34a-b)". Furthermore, on p.29b, Shêng-wu instructs: "..... if there is a noble, a high ranking official or a wealthy donor coming to the monastery, we should strike our bell, gather all our monks and go together to the front gate to welcome him ....." In Tê-hui's (n.d.) Ch'ih-hsiu Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei or 'The Re-organized Master Po-chang's Pure Rule Under Imperial Decree (T.2025, this work was compiled in 1334 and is the authorized surviving version of Ch'ing-kuei. All the quotations of Ch'ing-kuei in the following chapters of this thesis are quoted from this version)', a statement like the above-mentioned instruction in Shêng-wu's work can also be found on p.1123a. From the above instances, we can see the close relationship between the Ch'ing-kuei and Shêng-wu's work.

538. In 1918, a Confucian Yü Ch'ien (n.d.) went to Peking from Hunan Province and stayed in the Fa-yün Monastery. Tao-chieh (n.d.), abbot of this monastery, paid Yü Ch'ien to read the historical materials that he collected and then to search for more materials in order to compile a new 'Biographies of Eminent Buddhist Monks'. Yü Ch'ien started this work in the same year, and in 1932, the sixty-six fascicled Hsin-hsü Kao-sêng Chuan (hereafter referred to as HHKSC) or 'A New Continuation of the Biographies of Eminent Buddhist Monks' was issued (see the preface of this work by Yü Ch'ien himself, pp.7-9. Also see Lung-hsien's [well-known as T'an-hsü, 1875-1963], Ying-ch'ên Hui-i Lu or 'Memoirs of My Shadowy and Dusty Human Life', vol.II, p.54).

Among the biographies of the 'Category of Disciplinarians' in HHKSC, there are the Biographies of the Ch'ing monks Hsing-ch'êng (1616-1684) and Chên-hsieng (n.d.), in which the monasteries under their administration are described as 'Ts'ung-lin' (pp. 947 and 953).

539. Chên-hua, pp.33-54.

540. Ibid., p.37. According to HHKSC, its 'Category of Disciplinarians' covers ninety-one people (sixty-two biographies and twenty-nine subordinate accounts), among them there are twenty-three monks belonging to or derived from the Lung-ch'ang Monastery. They are: Chih-kuang (1580-1645), pp.917-920 (he was the founder of this monastery); Tu-ti (1601-1679), pp.940-944; Shu-chên (n.d., a contemporary of Tu-ti), pp.936-939; Tê-chi (1634-1700), pp.945-947; Hsing-ch'êng (1616-1684), pp. 947-948; Shu-hsiu (1644-1699), pp.951-952; Chen-hsien (n.d.), pp.952-953; Shu-ching (1646-1705), pp.953-955; Chên-i (n.d.), pp.957-959; T'ung-ming (1661-1720), p.961; Shih-yung (1675-1722), pp.965-966; P'u-hsi (1677-1727), pp.966-968; Hsüeh-lun (1656-1728), pp. 968-970; Hsing-chêng (1659-1721), pp. 970-971; P'u-fan (n.d.), pp.973-974; Chi-yung (n.d., a disciple of Tu-ti), pp.977-978; Ch'ang-sung (1664-1718), pp.982-983; Chao-hung (n.d.), pp.990-991; T'ung-ho (1678-1732), p.1001; Hsiang-chu (flor. 1753-1769), pp. 1004-1006; Shih-ch'ang (1704-1754), pp.1007-1010; Fu-chü (1686-1765), pp.1013-1016; and Hsing-shih (1693-1774), pp. 1019-1021. This indicates that this monastery was an important basion of the Dharmaguptavinaya School in the Ming-ch'ing period. According to Chên-hua, the Pao-hua Hill is near Lung-t'ang, a town of the Chü-yung City and is very close to Nanking (pp.33-34).

541. Chên-hua, p.44.

542. Ibid., pp.42 and 52.

543. Ibid., p.101.

544. In the 'Category of Disciplinarians' of Ming-ho's (n.d.) Pu-hsü Kao-sêng Chuan or 'A Supplement to the Continuation of the Biographies of Eminent Buddhist Monks (Zokuzōkyō, Vol.134. This work was composed before 1641)', there are eleven disciplinarians (nine biographies and two subordinate accounts) of the Sung Dynasty (including those in the Liao [916-1123] and the Tartar Chin Dynasties). Among them the earliest one is Yüan-chioh (flor. 977-1022) and the latest is Hui-wên (+ 1553), thus covering a period of five hundred and seventy-six years (pp.144a-146b). Again, the earliest one among the ninety-one

disciplinarians in the HHKSC (cf. Note 540) is Yün-k'an (+ 1061) and the latest is Ch'ang-t'ao (1846-1906), thus covering a period of about eight hundred and forty-five years (pp.891-1028). The fellow monks of the Lung-ch'ang Monastery proclaim that their monastery is the 'First Leading' one of the 'Disciplinary School' (see Note 540), thus indicating that the Dharmaguptavinaya School has survived since the Sung Dynasty until now.

CHAPTER II

Struggles for the Establishment and Maintenance of the Vinaya in the Chinese Monastic Order.

Rule 121 of the Śīla says that if a monk came up and asked the lecturer during a sermon on the Śīla[1]: "Master, why should you have to lecture on these more subtle and trifling rules? They annoy and confuse us"; that monk would thereby commit the sin of Pātaka.[2] The existence of the above rule indicates that even in India Buddhist priests found it hard to tolerate the more fastidious rules. As Chinese Buddhism was a stronghold of Mahāyāna tradition, and strong Confucian influences were exerted upon its clergy,[3] the Chinese clergy felt less tolerant than the Indian monks in listening to rules which were all developed in an Indian cultural background with a Hīnayāna tradition.[4] Therefore, in establishing and maintaining the Vinaya in China, the Chinese disciplinarians had to fight many difficult battles. The first Section of this Chapter discusses how the disciplinarians interpreted the Vinaya and how they tried their best to make it acceptable in the Chinese religious environment. I have emphasised the role Tripiṭaka Master I-ching played in these battles. The second Section, however, discusses aspects of how the Chinese monks practised the rules of the Śīla, in order to show the fact that the Vinaya had been accepted by the native Chinese clergy to a considerable extent.

I. The Task of Interpreting the Vinaya

In the 'Conclusion to the Category of the Disciplinarians' in their works, the authors of the KSC, the HKSC and the SKSC all emphasise the

importance of the Vinaya in the Buddhist tradition as well as that of ritual in the Confucian tradition. Hui-chiao says that: "Honesty and fidelity are cultivated by practising the ritual (of Confucianism), while the Vinaya (of Buddhism) was also prepared for keeping the priests from wrongdoings".[5] He says also that: "One must regard the Vinaya as one's foundation when one enters the Order, and in the laity one must put the decorum in the first place".[6] Tao-hsüan points out that: "... a priest who dares to give lectures on the Vinaya after having simply browsed through a Vinaya scripture instead of having studied it intensively .... such a featherbrained attitude is in fact somewhat like a Confucian scholar who shows his arrogance to others as if he had already studied the three Books of Ritual ...."[7] Moreover, Tsan-ning remarks that: ".... the family members should listen to the family instructions that were given by the stern father[8] of this family, and likewise the priests should follow the rules that were established by the Buddha.... we all know that the Śīla and the Vinaya are in fact the 'family instructions' of our family of Buddhism...".[9]

Why did they emphasise the importance of the Vinaya in Buddhism in this way? In my opinion, it reflects the dilemma of practising the discipline of a Hīnayāna tradition in an Order of Mahāyāna adherents. First of all, students of Chinese Buddhist history all know that Chinese Buddhism is Mahāyāna Buddhism, and that the Chinese priests sometimes even despised Hīnayāna Buddhism.[10] Unfortunately, both the Sêng-chih Chieh-hsin and the T'an-wu-tê Chieh-mo, the Hīnayāna disciplinary scriptures, were introduced into China and put into practice by the Chinese Order during its embryonic period.[11] These Hīnayāna disciplinary scriptures were first put into practice probably before Chinese Buddhism gradually developed into a stronghold of the Mahāyāna tradition.[12] In other words, the adoption of the Hīnayāna Vinayas was an old tradition of the Chinese Order. Secondly, in every generation, many bad elements had penetrated into the

Monastic Order in all sorts of ways. Those elements always did bad deeds, and even committed crimes after having entered the Order.[13] Therefore, before the translation of the above-mentioned two Vinaya scriptures, the Chinese Order had already developed its own Chinese Monastic Rule, which included the harsh punishment of flogging transgressors, in order to govern the conduct of the priests.[14] As the Chinese Buddhist traditionally emphasised the orthodoxy of the 'Chên-ching (the real scriptures, i.e. the scriptures from India or the Western Regions)',[15] I believe that the Chinese priests would not have whole-heartedly respected the Chinese Monastic Rule, for it was not a sacred scripture from India but a local creation. In such circumstances, the Chinese Order probably had to adopt rules of Indian origin that were recorded in the Vinaya scriptures along with rules developed in China. This was probably the reason why the Vinayas were translated one after another into Chinese and why some of them became very popular in monastic circles.[16] Thirdly, as many of the Mahāyāna disciplinary scriptures were also translated into Chinese,[17] people would ask why the Chinese Order did not adopt the rules that are recorded in those scriptures, in place of the Hīnayāna ones. According to Buddhist tradition, the rules of the Mahāyāna Śīla (or Śīla of the Bodhisattva) were prepared mainly in order to discipline one's mind while the rules of the Hīnayāna Śīla regulated one's behaviour.[18] For instance, in the Fan-wang Ching (Brahmajālasūtra?),[19] which is said to have been translated by Kumārajīva[20] and is the most popular 'Śīla of the Bodhisattva' among the scriptures of this kind in China,[21] there are twenty-seven instructions recorded in its opening pages which emphasise twenty-seven different ways of disciplining one's mind in order to help one understand how good deeds could lead to salvation.[22] In the P'u-sa Chieh-pên or 'The Śīla of the Bodhisattva (T. 1500)', translated by Dharmarakṣa,[23] there are also twenty-seven rules that indicate the different kinds of evil mind that lead to

evil deeds.[24] In Tripiṭaka Master Hsüan-tsang's translation, which has the same title as the above-mentioned one (T. 1501),[25] there are also twenty-one rules that indicate the same thing.[26] In other words, the Mahāyāna rule disciplines one's mind to think no evil thoughts.[27] As the 'Śīla of the Bodhisattva' never specifies what punishment will be received when one breaks a rule,[28] it is only useful in helping high-minded persons to discipline their own morals accordingly. This kind of Śīla seems to lack the obligatory power needed to govern the conduct of the bad elements among the clergy. As the Hīnayāna rule disciplines one's behaviour, this was probably the reason why the Chinese Order kept on practising both the Hīnayāna Vinaya and the Chinese Monastic Rule. A transgressor could be expelled or forced to make a confession according to the Vinaya,[29] or he could receive corporal punishment according to the Chinese Monastic Rule if he broke a rule that deserved such punishment. But, as mentioned above, the Chinese Buddhists are Mahāyāna followers, and so the bad elements and even some of the 'eminent monks' of the Order made use of this as a pretext to resist the restrictions of the Vinaya.[30] As the Chinese priests understood that in China ".... the teaching of duty of others (propriety) prevails everywhere; the people respect and serve their sovereign and their parents ....",[31] therefore, the authors of the three 'Biographies of Eminent Buddhist Monks' expressed the vital importance of the Vinaya in Buddhism by comparing it with the importance of ritual in Confucianism. By alluding to the instruction of Confucius that said that if a Chinese does not ".... learn the rules of propriety, one's character cannot be established",[32] they implied that a Buddhist monk who is a 'Chinese' should have to learn the rule of the Vinaya. They advocated this not only because they were scholars of the Vinaya,[33] but also because according to the traditional Chinese historiography, historical works always have a didactic mission. These authors composed their 'Biographies' with the

purpose of prompting their contemporary monks to imitate the honourable behaviour of their eminent predecessors.[34] Before Hui-chiao and the other two voiced this view, the monk Hui-ch'ang (n.d.) had already said in 379 that: ".... the Śīla, as well as the ritual .... disciplines one's behaviour".[35] Again, the monk Ts'ung-li (847-925) used to instruct his disciples by saying: "We must see the Prātimokṣa as our master. Without the regulation of the Śīla, a monk would do anything at random just like an unchained monkey does".[36] This is another way of advocating the importance of the Vinaya.

In the previous Chapter, I found that many of the disciplinarians quoted from the Mahāyāna Sūtras and Śāstras in order to help interpret the Vinayas. According to what is said above, this was probably in order to make the Hīnayāna Vinayas more acceptable in the Mahāyāna religious environment. As the Chinese disciplinarians quoted so often from the Mahāyāna scriptures in their sermons on the Vinaya, these sermons probably had the unintended effect on their audiences of generating some interest in Mahāyāna Buddhism. Tao-p'ing, who attended Hui-kuang's lectures on the Dharmaguptaśīla and then also began to rely on the Mahāyāna doctrines,[37] is a good example. Furthermore, the Chinese disciplinarians who studied the Mahāyāna scriptures, did so not only for the reason given above, but also in order to demonstrate that they were followers of Mahāyānism. There are some instances I can give: Hsüan-yen (674-742) originally followed Tao-an and other disciplinarians in order to learn Tao-hsüan's Quotation. One day, Tao-an dreamed that a monk-saint instructed him that: "Hsüan-yen has a creative potential in Buddhism. Why should you teach him the Hīnayāna doctrines only?" After he woke up, Tao-an suggested to Hsüan-yen that he should study the Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra. The latter then composed the seven-fascicled commentary on the

Vajracchedikāprajñāpāramitāsūtra after having studied the Prajñāpāramitā scriptures,[38] Fa-shên (666-748) was a specialist in the 'Pagoda in the East (Fa-li's Old Commentary)', and he also recited the Vajracchedikā-prajñāpāramitāsūtra. He praised the 'Chih-kuan (Concentration and Insight) Practice' method of the T'ien-t'ai School highly for he thought it to be very helpful for understanding the doctrines of the Buddhist scriptures.[39] Ch'i-han (708-775) specialised in the commentaries of the DRMGTV on the one hand, and had a thorough understanding of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra on the other.[40] Shên-hao (716-790), a specialist in the Quotation, recited nine thousand times the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra in his last years, in order to gain enough merit to be reborn in the Western Paradise.[41] Wên-chü (760-842), after his ordination in 787, spent fifteen years studying the DRMGTV. After that, he read through the commentaries on the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra by Master Chih-i (538-597) of the T'ien-t'ai School[42] and grasped the key points of the latter's thought.[43]

The above instances are all quoted from the 'Category of the Disciplinarians' of the SKSC, and they indicate how the Chinese disciplinarians leaned towards Mahāyāna Buddhism.[44] In the previous Chapter, I have mentioned that Chien-chên received his 'Śīla of the Bodhisattva' from Tao-an.[45] As their Biographies are both listed in the 'Category of the Disciplinarians' of the SKSC, the above-mentioned investiture probably suggests that both master and disciple were strongly manifesting their Mahāyāna beliefs.

How did the Chinese disciplinarians make use of Mahāyāna materials for the interpretation of the Vinayas of the Hīnayāna tradition? Even though a great many of the commentaries on the Vinayas of different Buddhist Schools were compiled by the disciplinarians of the past whom I have discussed in Chapter I, the commentaries on the Vinayas other

than the DRMGTV have all vanished, since the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect became the only Disciplinary School in China.[46] Due to the eclipse of the Dharmaguptavinaya School after the tenth century A.D.,[47] only a few commentaries on this Vinaya that were compiled in the T'ang Dynasty (the hey-day of this School) have survived. They can be found in the Taishō and the Zokuzōkyō:

Chih-shou's Ssŭ-fên Lü Shu (Only Fascicle Nine survives. Zokuzōkyō Vol. 66, pp. 311a-332a).

Fa-li's Old Commentary (Zokuzōkyō Vol. 65, pp. 179a-488a).

Tao-hsüan's Quotation (T. 1084).

Huai-su's New Interpretation (Zokuzōkyō Vol. 66, pp.333a-495b; and Vol. 67, pp. 1a-108b).

I have found from the above commentaries that their compilers quoted from the Mahāyāna scriptures, not only in order to aid in the interpretation of the Vinaya, but also in order to show that the topics discussed in the Vinaya could also be found in the Mahāyāna scriptures, thereby demonstrating the connection between Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna tradition.

Here I should like to give some examples: They quoted from the Nirvāṇasūtra in order to show the importance of the Śīla, for the Sūtra says that if one desires to express one's own Buddhist-nature and attain Nirvāṇa, one should whole-heartedly observe the purified rules (the Śīla).[48] They also quoted extracts from the same sūtra in order to explain that the Śīla is divided into two parts, i.e. for governing behaviour and the mind; to explain the seriousness of the offence of a priest stealing the tributes that are offered to and are placed in front of the image of the Buddha;[49] to interpret what 'Buddha' means;[50] and to show the Buddhist point of view on 'heinous crime'.[51] Again, they quoted from the Mahāmeghasūtra to indicate which Pārājikas (adultery, stealing, killing and lying), the unpardonable sins in

Buddhism, are derived from Indian secular law.[52] From the Avataṁsakasūtra, they quoted passages to describe the joyful career of priesthood.[53] Moreover, they quoted from the Mahāprajñāpāramitôpadeśa, to point out that 'adultery' is also unpardonable from the Mahāyāna point of view; to show that the two hundred and fifty rules for monks and the five hundred rules for nuns are mentioned in a Mahāyāna scripture; to explain the definition of the so-called 'open place' in the Vinaya;[54] and to indicate that even in the Mahāyāna tradition, Bhikṣus are not allowed to mix drugs or to cultivate grain, etc.[55]

The above information indicates that the Chinese disciplinarians had done their best to woo the Mahāyāna Buddhists in China into considering the Vinaya an acceptable scripture despite the fact that it belonged to the Hīnayāna tradition. I believe that the compilers of the lost commentaries on the other Vinayas also did the same thing as the above-mentioned disciplinarians of the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect had done.

The above-mentioned 'use of Mahāyāna scriptures' was not directed to the task of interpreting the Vinaya. I have found from the above commentaries that their compilers had quoted a great deal from the other Vinayas. One can easily find such quotations in their opening pages.[56] This is because both the Śīla and the Vinaya were developed in an Indian environment. As I have shown in the previous Chapter, we know that most of the Chinese disciplinarians had never set foot in India or the Buddhist kingdoms of Central Asia in order to observe the way of life in a monastery and even less to participate in it. By reading only the Chinese version of the Vinaya, they probably would not have understood some of the descriptions in the Vinaya, especially some of the more subtle ones. Nevertheless, they sought clarification from the other Vinayas. Sêng-yu says that he learned a story about the Vinayapiṭaka

from a Sūtra. The story related that in the days when the Buddha was still alive, an aged high monk in a dream saw a white blanket automatically rent suddenly into five parts. When he woke up, he asked the Buddha what the dream meant. The Buddha said: "It predicts that the Vinayapiṭaka will be differentiated into five different branches after I have entered Nirvāṇa."[57] Since the Chinese Buddhists of Sêng-yu's time knew only of five Vinayas (the SVSTVDV, the DRMGTV, the MHSGKV, the MĪSSKV and the Kāśyapīyavinaya) in India,[58] and did not know of the existence of the Mūlasarvāstivādanikāyavinaya and the other Vinayas etc., I believe that the above story is only a fable composed by Sêng-yu. This fable was prepared for the purpose of suggesting that as the five Vinayas all derived from the same source, a Chinese disciplinarian could seek help from the other Vinayas in order to interpret the particular Vinaya that he was studying. Following Sêng-yu, both Hui-chiao and Tsan-ning repeated this story.[59] Huai-su says that the five Vinayas are "...like a golden rod that has been broken into five; each fragment is still a piece of the same gold."[60] Moreover, Tao-hsüan indicated clearly that:

> "Originally, the Vinayapiṭaka was only one set of rules. Due to the individual differences in their followers' natural qualities and perceptions, different points of view were voiced about the same rule. Gradually, different disciplinary schools were set up ... each of them having their own views as to whether a certain rule was 'light' or 'heavy'. One school takes a serious view of transgressing a certain rule, but another school considers the above transgression to be not so serious ....
>
> My work is based on the DRMGTV .... in case the information from this Vinaya is adequate and its rules are clear enough, why should I still seek help from the other Vinayas? But if I find that some of the verbal rules of this Vinaya are not clear ... I will quote from the other Vinayas in order to aid my interpretation of this Vinaya. Furthermore, the quotations that I have taken from the other Vinayas are only those passages which are useful to me in verifying the relevant discussions in the DRMGTV. Others are all excluded...."[61]

He also says that:

> "I have heard from my seniors that .... in cases where the DRMGTV has lost some of its formulations either of the rule or of the way of life, one can find the relevant details described clearly in the other Vinayas...."[62]

From Tao-hsüan's words, we see how the Chinese disciplinarians made use of the other Vinayas to assist in the interpretation of their own Vinaya. Here I shall give some examples from Tao-hsüan's Quotation: (1) He quoted from the SVSTVDV and the MĪŚSKV in order to help in the interpretation of the sin of 'stealing'.[63] (2) He quoted from the SVSTVDV and the MHSGKV to explain a topic that concerns the problem of restrictions on house-building.[64] (3) He quoted from the SMTPSDV and the SVSTVDV in order to explain the Buddhist concept of 'blood relative'.[65] (4) He quoted from the MHSGKV in order to point out that a monastery is not allowed to accept donations of slaves.[66] (5) He quoted from the SVSTVDV in order to show that with the exception of 'fried rice', all the other foods for the 'formal meal (lunch)' that are recorded in this Vinaya are the same as those listed in the DRMGTV.[67] (6) He quoted from the MHSGKV in order to show that it has a different view of the rule of 'not touching gold or silver with one's hand' from that in the DRMGTV.[68] (7) According to Buddhist tradition, one of the units of measurement is the 'Vitasti (span, i.e. about nine inches)'. He quoted from the SVSTVDV, the MĪŚSKV and the MHSKGV, indicating that the length of a robe in the Indian style is 'nine of the Buddha's Vitastis',[69] in order to prove that a version of the DRMGTV current in his time was wrong in saying that the length is 'ten of the Buddha's Vitastis'.[70] (8) He quoted from the SVSTVDV to show that it agreed with the DRMGTV in saying that according to the Vinaya, a monk's legacy belongs to the Sāṅgha.[71] (9) He quoted from the SVSTVDV, the MĪŚSKV, the MHSGKV and the DRMGTV itself, listing the different kinds of funerals recorded in the various Vinayas,[72] in order to inform the Chinese Buddhists that burial, cremation or the leaving of the corpse in the wilderness in order to feed the birds or the animals, were all in accordance with the Vinaya, etc.[73]

With the Śīla of the DRMGTV (T. 1429) as basis, I have compared and collated the Śīlas of the SVSTVDV (T. 1436) and the MHSGKV (T.1426).[74] Of the 256 rules of the Śīla of the SVSTVDV, 196 rules agree with the corresponding rules of the 242 rules of the Śīla of the DRMGTV. At the same time, of the 210 rules of the Śīla of the MHSGKV, 184 rules also agree with the corresponding set of rules in the DRMGTV's Śīla.[75] With such a high percentage of concordance among the rules of these three Śīlas, it is not remarkable that the Chinese disciplinarians believed that all the Vinayas were derived from the same source. Therefore, they considered it possible to quote from the other Vinayas in order to help them in their study of their own Vinaya. The Tripiṭaka Master I-ching's condemnation of the traditional method of interpreting the Vinaya in the disciplinary circles as: "... in keeping (interpreting or practising) the Vinaya, the Chinese priests who follow one Vinaya, always take extracts, no matter whether they are appropriate or not, from the other Vinayas for reference",[76] was a reflection of this situation.

In fact, as Tao-hsüan said, the differences between the various Vinayas are sometimes only a matter of differing points of view about the same rule. For instance, Huai-su indicates that according to the DRMGTV, a monk who slanders a nun, and a nun who replies in like terms, or a nun who slanders a monk, have all committed the grievous sin of Saṅghāvaśeṣa.[77] However, the SVSTVDV says that a monk who slanders a nun has only committed the venial sin of Duṣkṛta.[78] Such situations provided opportunities for any cunning disciplinarian who wanted to exploit the interpretation of a rule as 'light' in another Vinaya and apply it in interpreting a 'heavy' rule of his own Vinaya, so that he could rescue a monk from the predicament of having committed a grievous sin. I-ching says that: "... priests should follow the customs of their

respective schools, and not interchange the strict rules of their doctrine for the more lenient teaching of others."[79] Such was his condemnation of the above-mentioned phenomenon.

In order to obtain help in the interpretation of the Vinaya, the Chinese disciplinarians gathered as many materials as they could. Not only did they quote from the Mahāyāna scriptures and the Vinayas of the other disciplinary sects, they also quoted from the Hīnayāna scriptures.[80] If the Buddhist scriptures alone were unhelpful, they even sought assistance from native Chinese materials. For instance, the DRMGTV did not give a clear indication of the length of a 'Buddha's Vitasti', and the information about it in the other Vinayas was rather controversial. The MHSGKV indicates that it is 2.4 'Ch'ih' (2.489 ft) long,[81] while the SMTPSV says that one 'Buddha's Vitasti' is three times the span of an ordinary man, and the MĪŚSKV indicates that it is two 'Ch'ih' long.[82] In order to solve this problem, Tao-hsüan thought that as traditionally the Chinese had considered the measurements of the Chou Dynasty (1066?-481 B.C.) as the standard measurements, probably one of the translations of the length of a 'Buddha's Vitasti' would have been made in accordance with this measurement. Therefore, he examined the standard sample of the ruler of the Chou Dynasty (made by Emperor Yang of the Sui Dynasty) and using it to calculate the length of the 'Buddha's Vitasti', he found that the 'two Ch'ih' of the MĪŚSKV accorded with the Chou measurement, and that this is the correct translation (i.e. one 'Buddha's Vitasti' = 1.69 ft).[83] As Tao-hsüan had really investigated the matter, his interpretation of this topic is more useful than that in Fa-li's commentary.[84]

As the Vinayas were all developed in an Indian cultural environment some of their more subtle or even contradictive rules were difficult to understand for the Chinese monks. For instance, after he had listened to

the lectures on the DRMGTV given by the Disciplinarian Hung-tsun, the monk Hui-hsiu complained: "I have attended so many lectures on Buddhism. I can understand the Sūtras and Śāstras thoroughly after having listened to only one lecture on them. Since I began studying the Vinaya, I have found that the more I learn the more I don't understand. Is it that the doctrines of the other sacred scriptures are metaphysical and so can be understood by logical reasoning, while the discussions of the Vinaya are related to daily practice, and so one finds it hard to visualise what one should do?"[85] Moreover, because the entire original Tripiṭaka had never been rendered into Chinese, and because the translated versions were comparatively few, the information contained in them was not sufficient to provide all the necessary reference materials. For instance, the Vinaya gives different sets of words to be employed in different Karmas, each set of words to be said verbatim in a certain assembly.[86] Tao-hsüan considered that these sets of words should be recited in the assembly. He doubts as to whether holding the text and reading these words was permissible or not, as some of his contemporaries were doing. As he could not find any reference to this in the translated scriptures, he asked the Chinese Tripiṭaka Master Hsüan-tsang and the other foreign translators in Ch'ang-an what the Indian monks did.[87] He was told that to hold a Vinaya text and read the words in a Karma was not an Indian tradition.[88] The Tripiṭaka Master I-ching said: "When I was at home, I thought myself to be versed in the Vinaya, and little imagined that one day, coming here (India), I should find myself really ignorant (of the subject). Had I not come to the West, how could I ever have witnessed such correct manners as these?"[89] His words reflect the fact that without knowledge of religious life in India, one could never obtain a thorough understanding of the discussions on the Vinaya.

Therefore, some of the Chinese disciplinarians, like I-ching and others, made pilgrimages to India in order to advance their knowledge of the Vinaya. In I-ching's TTHYCFKSC, we can find accounts of the following pilgrims who went to India in search of this knowledge.

(1) Master Tao-hsi (n.d.), Sanskrit name Śrīdeva, was a native of Shantung. He went to India via Tibet and studied Mahāyāna Buddhism in Nālandā Monastery. Then he went to Shu-p'o-pan-no (Śubhaphala?) Monastery, an establishment built in the area where the Buddha had entered Nirvāṇa, where he concentrated his attention on the Vinayapiṭaka. I-ching never met him before he passed away in India.[90]

(2) Disciplinarian I-liang (n.d.), a native of Szechuan, was versed in Vinaya and Yoga. He departed from Ch'ang-an with two other monks to Kwang-tung, from where they sailed to Sri Lanka via Lankasuka. After that, no one knew their whereabouts. I-ching searched for them when he visited Sri Lanka and Central India, but obtained no news of them.[91]

(3) Disciplinarian Hui-ning (n.d.), a native of Szechuan, was versed in the Vinaya scriptures. He went to Java around 664-5 and stayed there for three years. In that period, Hui-ning cooperated with the Javanese monk Jñānabhadra in trying to extract the account of the Buddha's Nirvāṇa from the A-chi-mo Ching (Āgamasūtra?). Then he translated it into Chinese. The account of the Buddha's Nirvāṇa in this Sūtra was quite different from that in the Mahāyāna scriptures. Hui-ning then sent a monk to bring his translation back to China. After that Hui-ning went to India and I-ching had no further news of him.[92]

(4) Master Tao-lin (n.d.), Sanskrit name Śīlaprabhā, was a native of Hupeh. Ever since he entered the Order in his teens, he studied both the Vinaya and the Dhyāna very faithfully by taking only one meal a day, and by practising meditation instead of sleeping frequently. Later, thinking that the scriptures on Vinaya and on Dhyāna in China were still

comparatively few, he decided to go to India to obtain more texts. He spent years in sailing to Tāmralipti, where he remained for three years to learn Sanskrit. In this period, he abandoned the Śīla that he had received in China, was converted to the Sarvāstivādin School and was ordained according to the Śīla of this School. Of course, he learned the Sarvāstivāda doctrines, especially its Vinaya there. After that he toured the Indian sub-continent and spent twelve years in Western India. Finally, he went north in order to go home. I-ching heard that he was last seen in Northern India.[93]

(5) Disciplinarian T'an-kuang (n.d.), a native of Hupeh, was very diligent in practising the Vinaya before his pilgrimage to the State of Harikela in Eastern India. I-ching never met him. He was only told by a Harikelan monk that in Harikela a Chinese monk was appointed abbot by the king. The monk also said that this Chinese abbot had already died at the age of fifty, and that he always flogged the transgressors in his monastery[94] when he was alive.[95] I-ching mentions this in order to suggest that this 'Chinese abbot' was probably 'T'an-kuang'.[96]

(6) Disciplinarian Hsüan-k'uei (n.d.), a native of Kiangsu, kept the Buddhist practices so strictly that he always went barefooted in the monastery and begged food for survival. He tried to make a pilgrimage to India in his twenty-sixth year, but he remained in Canton because of sickness.[97]

(7) Disciplinarian Chih-hung (n.d.), a native of Lo-yang, was originally a meditator. As he desired to visit India, he went with Wu-hsing (n.d.) to sail from Kwangtung via Śrīvijaya. For two years they learned Sanskrit in the Mahābodhi Monastery in Eastern India. In this period, Chih-hung's interests turned towards the Vinaya. Later, he abandoned the ordination that he had received in China, and followed the leading disciplinarians of Central India in order to receive

a new one. After that, he paid much attention to the study of the Vinaya scriptures. Not only did he follow the rule strictly, but he also translated his own notes into Chinese after listening to lectures on the Vinaya. After staying in Central India for eight years, he went with Tao-lin to Kashmir. I-ching guessed that they probably planned to go home, but no more was heard of them.[98]

(8) Meditator Wu-hsing, Sanskrit name Prajñādeva, was a native of Hupeh. Before his departure with Chih-hung, he had visited the Buddhist centres in the Yangtzŭ Valley, and also had paid much attention to Tao-hsüan's disciplinary works. After his arrival in India, he studied the Vinaya and the Kośa in Nālandā Monastery. From this time on, he begged every day for food. He translated the A-chi-mo Ching into Chinese at his leisure, edited his translation into three fascicles and sent it back to China.[99] This scripture was formed by extracting materials concerning the Buddha's Nirvāṇa from the original text of the SVSTVDV.[100] Finally, he said farewell to I-ching and left Nālandā to go home via the northern route.[101]

(9) Disciplinarian Ta-tsin (flor. 683-691), a native of Hunan, had begged alms for survival before his pilgrimage. He followed an envoy of the T'ang Dynasty to Śrīvijaya in 683. After his arrival, Ta-tsin learned Sanskrit and Malay there. In 691, I-ching asked Ta-tsin to take to China the translations and works, including the NHCKNFC and the TTHYCFKSC, that I-ching had prepared in the Southern Sea.[102]

(10) Disciplinarian Ch‿ên-ku or Sālagupta (650-695?) was a native of Honan. After entering the Order in his fourteenth year, he travelled to both the Yellow River Valley and the Yangtzŭ River Valley in order to study Buddhism. Finally, he followed meditator Ch'êng in Chekiang and was ordained by him. As his master had a deep understanding of the Vinaya, Ch‿ên-ku also concentrated on the Vinaya scriptures. After he

had gained a general understanding of the Vinaya, he followed Disciplinarian Hsiu for three years to learn Tao-hsüan's Quotation. Then he travelled to Szechuan in order to obtain further disciplinary knowledge from Disciplinarian Hsing, Hsiu's master. After staying for four years, Ch‿ên-ku advanced north to Ch'ang-an in order to follow Tao-hsüan in person. He spent sixteen years with Tao-hsüan, and using Chih-shou's (Tao-hsüan's master) commentary as a basis, he compared and collated the other disciplinary commentaries. Then he went south to the Yangtzŭ Valley in order to promulgate the Vinaya.[103] In the seventh month (August) of 689, I-ching returned to Canton from Śrīvijaya for fresh ink and paper in order to copy out the original texts of the Tripiṭaka that he brought to the above-mentioned insular Buddhist Centre. I-ching told the Canton monks that he had already brought a great number of original texts with him to Śrīvijaya from India, and that he hoped to find a companion to go with him, one who would then carry those materials back to China for him. He also hoped that this companion would be a man who could assist him in his translation work in Śrīvijaya, and who would also note down some of his lectures on those texts during the period of translation. The Canton monks recommended Ch‿ên-ku to him, for the latter was versed in the Vinaya and happened to be in the area. After they met, Ch‿ên-ku brought his disciple Huai-yeh, and the monk Tao-hung with him to sail with I-ching in the eleventh month (December) of the same year (his fortieth year). After they landed in Śrīvijaya, Ch‿ên-ku and Huai-yeh assisted I-ching in translating the Vinaya scriptures, and they also learned the doctrines of those scriptures there. After staying in Śrīvijaya for three years, Ch‿ên-ku went home with Tao-hung.[104] After preaching the Vinaya in Canton for nearly three years,[105] Ch‿ên-ku passed away.[106]

(11) Huai-yeh (n.d.), Sanskrit name Saṅghadeva, studied Malay and Sanskrit in Śrīvijaya when he followed Ch‿ên-ku there. Not only did he

assist in I-ching's translation work, he also learned the Kośa.[107] After staying for three years, Huai-yeh decided to remain in Śrīvijaya in order to advance his Buddhist studies. Therefore, he dod not return with Ch‿ên-ku.[108]

(12) Bhikṣu Tao-hung (n.d.), Sanskrit name Buddhadeva, was originally a native of Honan. Before entering the Order, Tao-hung's father had brought him to Kwangtung where he was to run a trading enterprise. There, his fatther entered the monkhood and became a meditator. As Tao-hung was still a boy, his monk-father took his lay-son to visit the scenic spots of Kwangtung and Kwangsi. When he grew up he entered the Order, being ordained by his own father. When he was twenty-two, Tao-hung heard that I-ching wanted a companion to go with him to the Southern Sea, so he went to join him. After he had reached Śrīvijaya, Tao-hung began to concentrate on the study of the Vinayapiṭaka.[109] Since he went home with Ch‿ên-ku, I-ching only heard that he was in Kwangtung.[110]

Of the above twelve pilgrims, seven were disciplinarians and three had already learned the Vinaya before their pilgrimages. Only the two remaining pilgrims became interested in the Vinaya after their arrival in foreign lands. These facts suggest that the Chinese disciplinarians were eager to travel and personally observe the Indian monastic life, no matter whether they were from the Yellow River Valley or from the Yangtzŭ Valley. Disciplinarians like Ch‿ên-ku who had spent twenty-three years in China advancing his knowledge of the DRMGTV, still wanted to go abroad to study. This indicates that no matter how much disciplinary knowledge they gained in China by listening to lectures or by reading commentaries, it was not enough to satisfy the Chinese disciplinarians. Moreover, after they arrived in India, Tao-lin and Chih-hung requested a new ordination, abandoning the one they had received in China. Tao-lin

did so only because he was converted to another School. Chih-hung, on the other hand, was not a disciplinarian before he went to India. Did he regard his old ordination not in strict accordance with the accurate procedures of ordination that he saw in India ? As Chih-shou, the 'Eighth Patriarch' of the Dharmaguptavinaya School, had once begged for a Buddhist manifestation in order to prove the perfection of his ordination, because he was worried as to whether the ordination he had received was in conformity with the rule of the Vinaya or not,[111] I believe that Chih-hung's earlier ordination was not in conformity with the Vinaya rules in India.

Of the pilgrims who had reached Indian or Śrīvijaya, only four successfully returned home; and with the exception of Ch'ên-ku, nothing more was heard from the other three. In order words, their contributions to the Chinese knowledge of the Vinaya would have been very limited. However, there was one pilgrim in this line of study who had already made a unique contribution to the disciplinary lore in China through his work, the NHCKNFC. This pilgrim was the author of the TTHYCFKSC, Tripiṭaka Master I-ching.

I-ching was, after Fa-hsien and Hsüan-tsang, the third great Chinese traveller in India. His life and his travels are well known to the students of Buddhist history, As J. Takakusu has quoted from I-ching's NHCKNFC and TTHYCFKSC for his essay, 'The Life and Travels of I-tsing', in his 'General Introduction' to his translation, the Buddhist Practices,[112] it would be superfluous to repeat what he has written there. I would simply like to mention that the details of I-ching's glorious funeral which was sponsored by the retired Emperor Jui-tsung (R. 710-712) in 713, are recorded in the CYHTSCML .[113]

In the preface to his NHCKNFC, I-ching says that before his pilgrimage he observed the fact that "... even men of highest talent can only succeed in the study (of the commentaries on the Vinaya) after becoming grey-haired, while men of medium or little ability cannot accomplish their work even when their hair has turned perfectly white. Books on the Vinaya were gradually enlarged, but became obscure, so that their perusal is the task of the whole life ..."[114] In other words, even though they had devoted their entire life to the study of the commentaries on the Vinaya, the Chinese disciplinarians still found it difficult to obtain a thorough understanding. This was because the discussions in the above commentaries were compiled by senior disciplinarians who had never set foot in India. Moreover, "... on account of some misinterpretations handed down, the disciplinary rules have suffered, and errors constantly repeated have become customs which are contrary to the original principles."[115] Therefore, to take a real good look at the Indian way of religious life was probably the main motive for I-ching for embarking on his pilgrimage. When he was travelling in India and the Malay archipelago, I-ching observed the monastic life. Then, "... according to the noble teaching (the Vinaya) and the principal customs actually carried on in India ... [he] carefully [wrote] the following articles which are forty in number..."[116] to compose a reference book for the Chinese priests who had never "moving one step, travel[led] in all the five countries of India."[117] In this work, I-ching specially points out the practices of the Vinaya which were misinterpreted in China, and how they were carried out in India and in the Buddhist kingdoms of the Southern Sea.[118]

Thanks to the forty articles in I-ching's NHCKNFC, which was brought to China in 691,[119] the Chinese Buddhists began to obtain a correct knowledge of the Vinaya practices of Indian monks. Moreover, after his return

home in 695, I-ching was appointed Chief-Translator in Lo-yang and then in Ch'ang-an.[120] When he was not translating he gave lectures on the Vinaya to the disciples he received in both T'ang capitals.[121] In his instructions, he especially emphasised the way of cleansing and of straining drinking-water.[122] As I-ching translated a great many Vinaya scriptures of the Mūlasarvāstivāda School,[123] and as he said of his NHCKNFC that "all the things mentioned in this work are in accordance with the Āryamūlasarvāstivādanikāya, and should not be confused with the teaching of other schools...",[124] J. Takakusu considered that I-ching had "... founded a new school for the study of this branch of Buddhist literature in China".[125] As I have shown in Section IV of the previous Chapter, I-ching was not so ambitious as to establish a Mūlasarvāstivāda-nikāyavinaya School in China. As he was a sectarian of the Dharmagupta-vinaya Sect,[126] his lectures were probably still based on the DRMGTV, but were supplemented with the new knowledge that he had absorbed in the Indian regions. This additional knowledge was used to guide his disciples in practising the rules in the right manner.

Did I-ching induce a high tide of Vinaya study in Chinese Buddhist circles with the publication of his NHCKNFC and of his translations of the Vinaya scriptures ? My researches have not uncovered any trace of it. On the contrary, after the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect had reached its apogee, i.e. when the DRMGTV was chartered by emperor Chung-tsung as the only set of rules to be employed in the Monastic order, this sect then became the only Disciplinary School in China aroung 709,[127] the study of the Vinaya began to decline, and finally the Ch'ing-kuei replaced the Vinaya in the Monastic Order.[128] In my opinion, the publication of the NHCKNFC was probably a factor that made the Chinese Buddhist to tolerate the Vinaya no longer. Traditionally the Chinese have had a strong superiority

complex about their own way of life, especially in the dynastic periods.[129] However, I-ching tried to persuade the Chinese priests to lead a completely Indian mode of religious life. I assume that if a Chinese monk of I-ching's period was to read the Article in the NHCKNFC: 'Use of tooth-wood in the morning',[130] he would probably think: "Why should I have to clean my mouth by this peculiar method?" Reaching the paragraph: ".... use earthenware utensils once, if they have not been used before. When they have already been used, they should be thrown away into a ditch ... in India, at alms-giving places at the side of the road, there are heaps of discarded utensils which are never used again",[131] he would probably have sighed: "Oh, that is too extravagant!" Reading the paragraph on funerals,[132] he would have thought: "This strays somewhat from the norm of filial piety."[133] Reading the Article 'Concerning Evacuation',[134] he would probably have thought it ridiculous for him to follow the Indian practice in this regard.[135] And reading the prescription: "...bathing without any cloth[ing] is contrary to the teaching of the Buddha",[136] he would have thought it unnecessary to bath uncomfortably by wearing a cloth. Reading the formulations on the Indian monks who always compared their seniority so carefully and seriously that they asked the length of the shadow of the sun at the moment of each other's ordination in order to decide who was the senior,[137] he would probably have considered them too fastidious. Knowing that an Indian monk would be expelled if he was found eating after noon,[138] he would probably think it too harsh. Learning that the 'dragon Dedoction' that was used as a panacea, was in fact made out of the dung of pigs or cats,[139], he would have vomited immediately.[140] As traditionnally the Chinese emphasised that: "One's hair and skin, as well as the whole body, are obtained from one's parents, and that therefore a grateful child must not allow them to be harmed or destroyed",[141] some of the Chinese monks would have kept their hair after entering the Order. In

China, the connotation of the Sanskrit term 'Dhūta (Chinese translit. T'ou-t'o)' becomes 'a Buddhist ascetic who keeps long hair'.[142] I-ching's work indicates that in India, one "with long hair" was not allowed to "... receive the complete precepts",[143] which indicates that the Chinese Order had strayed from the Vinaya in customarily allowing some of the priests to keep their hair like a layman.[144] When reading this, the leaders of the Chinese Order of I-ching's time would probably not have agreed with him. That the Chinese Monastic Order allowed some of the priests to do so was probably a compromise in order to avoid challenging the hair-keeping tradition so strongly.[145] In short, the Chinese Buddhists found out through I-ching's work that some provisions of the Vinaya were inconvenient in the Chinese environment.

As Master Huai-hai, the founder of the primitive 'Ch'ing Kuei' had read through the entire Tripiṭaka before he established this new set of rules for the Ch'an Buddhists, I believe that the inspiration for creating new rules for the Chinese environment was probably sparked in him after having gained access to I-ching's work. For the NHCKNFC had already been available in most of the libraries of the Buddhist establishments in Huai-hai's time.[146] Besides, the study of Tao-hsüan's Quotation became the main stream in the disciplinary circles in the T'ang Dynasty and the later periods,[147] and the surviving commentaries of this kind rarely quoted from the NHCKNFC.[148] This suggests that the descriptions of the Indian religious life in I-ching's work were not very attractive to the Chinese disciplinarians.

Tao-hsüan's work, as its title declares, emphasises the interpretation of the daily practices of the Vinaya, rather than Buddhist doctrines.[149] Moreover, its discussion is also very fluent. In my opinion, the Quotation is more readable than Fa-li's Old Commentary and Huai-su's New Interpretation.

This is probably the reason why this work was so well received. For the convenience of the Chinese Buddhists, Tao-hsüan also compiled the three fascicled Ssŭ-fên Lü Pi-ch'iu Han-chu Chieh-pên or 'the Dharmaguptaśīla for Bhikṣus with an Annotation'[150] and the one fascicled Hsin Shan-ting Ssŭ-fên Sêng-chieh-pên or 'The Newly Abbreviated Dharmaguptaśīla for Monks'.[151] His former work, with the assistance of his annotations, makes it easier to understand the Śīla. The latter work, however, simplifies the descriptions of the Śīla in the verbose original text translated by Buddhayaśas.

II. The Aspects of Practising the Vinaya Rules Recorded in the Three 'Biographies of Eminent Buddhist Monks'.

From the discussions in the preceding Section, we know how the Chinese disciplinarians tried their best to make the Vinaya acceptable in a land of Mahāyāna adherents. Even though the Disciplinary School in China finally declined, the disciplinary circles in Chinese Buddhism had enjoyed their hey-day in the past.[152] Except for the disciplinarians who battled for their goal, other Chinese Buddhist priests also saw that to keep the rules of the Vinaya was a way of earning religious merit. After the Sogdian monk K'ang Sêng-hui (+ 280) had translated the Satpāramitāsūtra into the eight fascicled Liu-tu-chi Ching (or 'The Sūtra of Salvation in Six Ways', T. 152) ca. 244,[153] the Chinese Buddhists began to know that keeping the Buddhist discipline is one of the six ways that lead to salvation.[154] Therefore, many Chinese monks practised the Vinayas in order to gain religious merit.[155] According to the three 'Biographies of Eminent Buddhist Monks', those who kept the rules rigidly would have attainments such as longevity,[156] the Phala (fruit),[157] or supernatural power.[158] Besides, a disciplinarian's dignity of demeanour also won the respect of others.[159] For those reasons, some of the Chinese Buddhist minks, disciplinarians or non-disciplinarians, kept the Vinaya rules very strictly. In the above-mentioned three 'biographies' we can find some details of how a Chinese monks practised a certain rule or a group of rules in the Śīla:

(A) No Killing

'Killing' is one of the unpardonable sins among the four Pārājikas.[160] In China, one of the important reasons why the Buddhist priests are respected

by the lay-society is through their promulgation of love on account of the doctrine of 'no killing'. Therefore, I have put this topic first for discussion in this section. Sêng-ch'ün (n.d.) of the Chin Dynasty (265-420), lived in solitude on an island in the sea. A dangerous deep torrent blocked the way between his shrine and the source of his drinking-water. He therefore put a trunk across the torrent as his bridge. One day, a broken-winged wild goose lay at the end of the trunk facing Sêng-ch'ün's shrine. As he went to collect his drinking-water, Sêng-ch'ün saw that this wounded goose had blocked his way. First, he tried to move the bird aside with his staff, but considering that his action would probably hurt this poor badly wounded creature, he preferred to endure his thirst and went home. A few days later, Sêng-ch'ün died because he had lost his supply of drinking-water.[161] Sêng-wên (467-527) had never established any great vegetable festival in order to invite the lay-people along as his contemporary priests had done. His consideration was that: "... by doing this, my men must go to gather a great deal of vegetables and cut down many branches for fuel in the first place. Then they have to wash the food stuffs and pour the dirty water on the ground, and then during the cooking, a great amount of hot ashes will be scattered on the ground too. All the above actions would hurt or even destroy the very small insects that were living in the vegetables, in the branches and under the ground".[162] Sêng-hsi (578-641) had been on relief as the superintendent for cultivating the rice fields of the Pao-yen Monastery of Chin-chou (present Hsin-chiang City of Shansi Province). He realised that during the cultivation, many insects in the water and in the soil would be killed. He gave up his duty and ran away.[163] Hui-pin (574-645) considered that summer time is the generative season for the insect life cycle. Therefore, he brought a broom with him and swept the ground in order to brush away ants or other insects before stepping onto the road.[164]

Before constructing his shrine about 780-3, Sêng-chieh (n.d.) was afraid that the insects living in the soil of the site would probably be harmed when the construction was under way. Therefore, he cast spells for three days in order to warn those insects to move away. Then, even if the workers dug the earth to reach underground water, they met no stages of an insect's life cycle.[165] During the drought in 928, a gang of bandits broke into Hung-chü's (+ 933) shrine in the mountain. Hung-chü fed them with rice-gruel and said: "I know that a natural disaster makes you do this, so I will not report your intrusion to any official." Among his disciples, some of them planned to ambush those bandits on their return journey. Hung-chü said: "You are not my disciples if you dare to do this. I will abandon all of you and hide myself in the deep of the mountain." Then, his disciples cancelled their plan of attack.[166] When Tao-yü (+ 938) was on relief in his monastery for cooking tea, he put aside any firewood if he found worms in it.[167]

In keeping the precept of 'no killing', some of the Chinese monks even wore no silk products, as they considered that as the silk floss is collected by putting the cocoons into boiling water and then reeling the floss, the chrysalis in the cocoon would have died during this procedure. The monks Hui-ssŭ (515-577),[168] Chin-ai (534-578),[169], Tao-yüeh (died before 652),[170] and Hsüan-t'ai (n.d.),[171] are good examples. Besides, according to the Vinaya, monks are allowed to put on leather shoes or to use some accessories that were made out of the same material,[172] but Hui-ssŭ and Ching-ai never used any leather products in their whole life.[173] Moreover, Hsüan-lang (673-754) learned the Vinaya from Tao-an, and he did everything under the guidance of Vinaya and Śīla. He did not even use the glue made from cow-hide or horn.[174]

'No Killing' covers not only the fauna but also the flora. Rule 60 of the Śīla is "In the case of a Bhikṣu who destroys grass or woods,[175] he commits the sin of Pāṭaka".[176] In Chinese Buddhist records we can find two examples of monks who practised this rule. After the Taoist Fu Yi (555-639) presented a memorial to the court in order to attack Buddhism in 692,[177] a Szechuan monk, Ming-kai (n.d.) responded with a memorial for defence. Ming-kai said that: "... in following the teaching of the Tathāgata, we Buddhist monks eat only rice, noodles and vegetables ... not only have we never stepped on the insects, but also we have never cut any growing grass...."[178] Chih-pao (died 625-6) was a native of the Yellow River Valley and was a member of the Shêng-kuang Monastery in Ch'ang-an. Whatever fruits or vegetables he ate, Chih-pao kept the seeds in order to make creation of new life after replanting possible.[179] Probably this idea was derived from the above-mentioned instructions of the DRMGTV.

(B) No Lying

'Lying' is the last sin among the Pārājikas. In the HKSC, I found one example of how a Chinese monk stressed 'No Lying'. Wu -ming (flor. 567) wrote six 'prohibitions' as a regulation for disciplining himself. In Wu -ming's Biography, Tao-hsüan omitted the contents of these 'prohibitions' but quoted its conclusion only. In his conclusion, Wu -ming remarked: "In keeping the Śīla, a Śramaṇa should keep his words in accordance with his thoughts. I would be a liar if I could not fulfil even one among the above six 'prohibitions'. Then I will be damned by the good Lords in Heaven while I am alive, and my tongue will be extracted by iron tongs and melted copper will be poured into my throat when I die and fall into Hell".[180]

(C) No Intoxicating Liquors

According to the Śīlas of the DRMGTV, the SVSTVDV and the MHSGKV, the sin of 'taking intoxicating liquors' is pardonable and is listed in Rule 100, or Rule 126, or Rule 124.[181] In other words, this is not a grave sin, even though the Vinaya lists 'no drinking' as the tenth condition among the twenty-four conditions for a candidate who wants to enter the Order.[182] In China, the Buddhist priests take a serious view of this sin since the early period. The stories of Fa-yu[183] and Hui-yüan[184] are noted examples. In my opinion, this phenomenon is related to two factors. Firstly, the Confucian scholars traditionally see the 'Chiu-kao (The Announcement About Drunkenness)' in Shang-shu (Book of Documents)[185] as one of the instructions for human morality. This ancient document says that: "... to obey the lessons of King Wên and not to indulge in excess of spirits, and that I (King Ch'êng of the Chou Dynasty, R. 1194-1068 B.C.) have now received the appointment which belonged to Yin..."[186] and it also says that: "... in the exterior domains ... and in the interior domains ... all eschewed indulgence in spirits..."[187] Secondly, before the Vinaya scriptures were intorduced into China, the Chinese Buddhists of the early periods had already known the 'five precepts' of Buddhism.[188] For instance, students of Chinese Buddhist history all recognised that the 'Mou-tzŭ Li-hu[illegible] Lun (Mou-tzŭ on the Settling of Doubts)' was the first Chinese essay on Buddhism that was composed at the end of the later Han Dynasty (i.e. about 195-198).[189] The last sentence of this essay reads: "(After having listened to my interpretations on Buddhist doctrines), the person who previously doubted Buddhism then desires to become an Upāsaka and to keep the five precepts."[190] And the last precept among the five is, 'No Intoxicating Liquors'.[191] Even though this set of precepts is prepared for laymen only,[192] the contemporary priests of the above-mentioned period would consider it important for the votaries also, as

the secular society in China took a serious view of drunkenness. Therefore, they too kept the above-mentioned last precept and it became a tradition of Chinese Buddhism.

In addition to the examples of Hui-yüan and Fa-hui,[193] we can find other examples in the three 'Biographies': Hui-fên's (407-485) sickness had already reached a critical phase. Someone advised him to take pills with some wine in order to make the medicine more potent. Hui-fên said: "As I have kept the Vinaya for my whole life, why should I break it in my last moments?"[194] Yüan-t'ung (n.d.) was a monk of the Northern Ch'i Dynasty. In spring, a monk came to Yeh to stay in Yüan-t'ung's monastery. As this monk was sick and his perspiration became very smelly, only Yüan-t'ung among the monks of this monastery came to take care of him. One night, Yüan-t'ung brought one shallow cup of spring wine and persuaded the sick monk to take it as a remedy. Reluctantly the sick monk drank it, and he finally recovered at the end of the summer. Then before the monk left, he held Yüang-t'ung's hands and said: "... you, master, have given me wine ... this is not the right action. Please do not do it again to others who suffer the same condition as mine ..."[195] The above cases are somewhat like that of Hui-yüan's. Again, Hsüan-chien (aged eighty-three in 665), a monk of Tsê-chou (present Chin-ch'êng of the Shansi Province), hated drunkenness very much. Whenever he saw the local people drinking, Hsüan-chien would come forward and admonish them to stop this bad addiction. If the people did not listen to him, the monk immediately destroyed their facilities for drinking without paying them back for damages. On one occasion the people in the midst of a drunken party saw Hsüan-chien approaching and immediately scattered and ran away. Once, Hsüan-chien hired a great number of workers to repair his monastery. The local rich people, including the governor of this prefecture, contributed wine and food in order to comfort the workers, but Hsüan-chien smashed all the

wine jars and said: "I should never allow this thing that is prohibited by the Buddhist Law to enter my place. Even though my action would have so offended my workers that they would have probably refused to help me complete my merit of repairing my monastery."[196]

(D) Put on Robe in Indian Style

Rules 20 to 29, 42 to 44, 46 to 48 in the Śīla are all concerning the 'robe' of the priests.[197] In reading the previous Section, readers may be puzzled as to why the length of a robe in Indian style should be 'nine of the Buddha's Vitasti (i.e. 15.21 ft.)' long.[198] In fact, the robe of this type is a big sheet of linen.[199] The way of putting it on is recorded in the NHCKNFC.[200] In the HKSC, I found that Sêng-chiao (died ca. 503-4) 'covered his body with one linen'.[201] Hui-ssŭ (515-577) 'girded himself up (with linen)'.[202] Hui-i (died ca. 582) 'wore linen'.[203] Fa-lin (n.d.) of the Later Liang Dynasty (555-587) 'used a big sheet of linen as his garment',[204] and Ācārya Ch'ên (n.d.) of the Sui Dynasty 'put on the linen'.[205] Moreover, when Emperor Wu of the Liang Dynasty devoted himself temporarily to monkhood in 533,[206] he put on only 'a big sheet of linen'.[207]

According to the Vinaya, monks are allowed to put on the Pāṃśukūla (the cast-off rag that had been collected from the dust heap)[208] and the 'Na-i (the patched garment)'.[209] Both of them are rags. In the HKSC and the SKSC, I found that monks Fa-ling (438-506),[210] Tao-ch'an (458-527),[211], Sêng-wei (513-573),[212] T'an-ch'ien (546-607),[213] Tao-shun (542-610),[214] Chih-pao (died ca. 625-6),[215] T'an-yün (+ 642),[216], Yün-wên (805-882),[217], Disciplinarian Ch'üan (n.d.)[218] and Shên-ting (n.d.)[219] of the T'ang Dynasty and Ch'i-chi (flor. 921)[220] had all put on the Chinese Pāṃśukūla, or the 'patched garment'.

(E) Use of Mats made from Fleece for Sitting or Lying

Rules 31-34 of the Śīla concern the sitting or lying on mats made from fleece.[221] In China, we can find some monks who followed the above rules by using fleece of this kind. Prince Liu I-k'ang (409-451) of the Liu-Sung Dynasty once sent a sable cloth valued at three hundred thousand copper coins to the monk Hui-jui (died ca. 438) as a present. The monk did not put it on but used it as his sitting mat.[222] The monk did so because the Vinaya allows the priest to sit on a fleecy mat. Therefore, Hui-jui made use of this valuable fur for this purpose. At the end of Ta-yeh Era of the Sui Dynasty (ca. 616-7), Sêng-ting (545-624) was robbed by a gang of bandits. Except for his sitting blanket, all the other belongings of Sêng-ting were stolen.[223] In 601, Prince Chin (later Emperor Yang, R. 605-617) of the Sui Dynasty came to Mount T'ien-t'ai in order to visit the Kuo-ch'ing Monastery (the bastion of the T'ien-t'ai School) there. During his visit, the prince made a big donation, in which three hundred blankets were included.[224] These blankets could be used as sitting or lying mats. Before each winter, Chih-Kuan (566-643) stored a great number of sitting blankets in his monastery in order to supply the other monks who had no such supplies.[225] But on the other hand, some of the Chinese monks were also using mats that were made of floral material. In 573, two years before Master Chih-i went to Mount T'ien-t'ai (in Chekiang Province) and established his T'ien-t'ai School,[226] the monk Ting-kuang (n.d.), who had been living on this mountain for forty years, prophesied to the people of this area that: "You had better sow beans in order to make bean sauce; and to grow rushes for the production of mats right now .... as a way of welcoming a master who will come soon..."[227] Fa-k'uang (+ 633), a native of Shensi, planted a full grove of 'So (a species of sedge)' as material for mats. In his room, one could not find

even one sheet of sitting blanket.[228] I have observed that the 'rush mat' is still very popular among the Chinese Buddhist circles in modern times.[229]

(F) Do not Touch Any Kind of Money

Rule 37 of the Śīla is 'In case a Bhiksu takes coins, gold or silver with his own hand; or has told someone else to take them for him; or someone has put these materials on the ground and he accepts them, he commits the sin of Naihsargikapātayantika'.[230] As I have mentioned in Section I of the previous Chapter this rule is difficult for the Chinese monks to keep.[231] Nevertheless, we still can find seventy cases of how the Chinese monks kept this rule (see Appendix, Table IV). Here I should like to give some good examples: Pao-t'uan (512-561) collected herbal formulas on the one hand, and gave consultation to the sick people on the other. If some of his patients rewarded him in terms of money, he accepted nothing.[232] Hui-tsuan (536-607) once attended a lecture on the Vinaya in Ting-chou (present Ting City of the Hopeh Province). When the lecture reached the rules concerning wealth, the monk who gave this lecture said: "It is difficult for us to make a judgement whether the action is right or wrong (if one takes money with his hand)".[233] Hearing this, Hui-tsuan despised the lecturer's comment. There happened to be three hundred coins in Hui-tsuan's pocket, and immediately he threw them all away. Thereafter, he never mentioned money in his whole life.[234] Chih-shih (601-638) never set foot into a market or held money with his hand.[235] Chih-t'ung (553-649) kept the Vinaya so faithfully that none of the monks in his monastery dared to accumulate private wealth.[236]

(G) Use No Bronze Bowl

Rules 40 and 41 in the Śīla concern the begging bowl.[237] According to the Vinaya, the materials for a begging bowl are mainly of earthenware.[238] As the popularity of the SVSTVDV in China was earlier than that of the

DRMGTV,[239] and the former instructs that priests are not allowed to possess bowls made of bronze,[240] the Chinese monks kept this instruction very strictly. Hui-chiao, author of the KSC condemned very much Ch'u Fa-tu (n.d.), disciple of Dharmayaśas (flor. 339-414), for Ch'u Fa-tu persuaded the Chinese nuns in the Yangtzŭ Valley to use bronze bowls.[241] Hui-hsiu (aged ninety-eight in 665) learned the DRMGTV from Hung-tsun. As China had just suffered from a series of civil wars before 635, evidence for social customs had not yet been recovered. Consequently, the priests of Yeh began to use bronze bowls and to put on lay garments. Hui-hsiu considered that this tendency would lead to the decline of Buddhism, so he prepared models of earthenware bowls in accordance with the style that had been recorded in the Vinaya. There were dried in a kiln and sent to the local Yeh priests.[242] Hui-hsiu regarded the use of bronze bowls as a serious problem because Yeh was a stronghold of the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect since Hui-kuang.[243] According to the DRMGTV, there is no such instruction that priests are not allowed to use bronze bowls.[244] The activity of Hui-hsiu indicates that 'to use no bronze bowl' became a Chinese Buddhist tradition, no matter whether the sectarians of the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect or Sarvāstivādavinaya Sect did so or not. Moreover, dining room utensils made of bronze were also prohibited. Chih-shen(539-618) had once been invited to attend a vegetarian banquet in a monastery in Szechuan. When he saw bronze utensils on the table, he immediately threw the spoon down and said: "Even if I would swallow the food from a butcher (i.e. the meat), I will not eat out of these things containing bronze." Thousands of monks who also attended this banquet followed Chih-sen and left.[245]

(H) Collecting Alms for Survival. To take One Meal at Noon and Vegetarianism

Rules 80-85, 91-92, and 140-142 in the Śīla concern 'Begging for Survival' and 'One Meal'.[246] Rule 89 states that a Bhikṣu who was not ill but eats meat and fish will commit the sin of Pātaka,[247] indicating that a priest should have to keep vegetarianism. In China, there were many priests who kept the above-mentioned Indian Buddhist tradition, and I have listed these priests in Table I that is appended to this thesis. Here I should like to give some outstanding examples:

Since a kitchen existed in the Chinese Buddhist establishments,[248] it was not every Chinese monk who survived by begging. But some of them still kept this rule faithfully. According to Rule 41, a priest is not allowed to come to a layman's house with an invitation to collect food with his own hand.[249] In other words, the food must be put into the begging bowl by the lay donor. Tao-p'an (532-615) and his twenty-one Buddhist comrades joined together to make a pilgrimage to India in 565. As they entered the domain of the Turks in Central Asia in 569, they were detained. The Turks supplied them with four sheep a day for food, but they released the sheep in the wilderness and preferred to cook wild vegetables. When the Turks praised them for their insistence on 'No Killing' and sent them back to China. When he returned to Ch'ang-an, Tao-p'an considered that by his action of collecting food by himself he had already broken the rule of begging in past times. Then he abandoned his old orders of ordination and asked the Order to reordain him.[250] Tao-chê (564-635), a student of the DRMGTV, spent a period of solitude on Mount Chung-nan. The layman Chang Hui followed Tao-chê for years and supplied food for his master. Once Chang went down the mountain and was blocked by heavy snow when he returned. Before he left, Chang had already prepared food in Tao-chê's shrine. While it was snowing, Tao-chê considered that even if the food was placed in front of him, and there was not a

layman who could hand it to him, would it be against the rule or not, if he took the food by his own hand? On account of this dilemma, Tao-chê preferred not to touch the food and he practised meditation in order to resist the hunger. Seven days later, Chang returned and woke him up.[251] Tao-hsüan praised Tao-chê's behaviour because he was so careful to keep the Vinaya.[252]

The tradition of 'taking One Meal before Noon' is not so suitable for the Chinese environment, especially in the Yellow River Valley.[253] But some of the Chinese monks kept it very faithfully. For instance, Sêng-hou would never take any food if the shadow of the sun on the sundial showed that the time had just passed noon. In 500, he felt hungry at the very moment before his death. As this happened after noon, Sêng-hou just gargled with water but took no food.[254] Hui-yün (564-637) did the same thing as Sêng-hou had done before his life came to an end.[255] During the persecution of Buddhism in 574 to 577 by Emperor Wu (R. 561-578) of the Northern Chou Dynasty, P'u-ch'i (died after 625) wandered around the mountains in order to escape. Even as a fugitive, P'u-ch'i ate grass at the right time (i.e. before noon).[256] The monks Chih-fêng (flor. 727),[257] Tzŭ-chioh (+ 795)[258] and Hsiang-yü of the T'ang Dynasty[259] were all taking one meal on or before the Chinese hour 'Mao (i.e. 6.00 to 8.00 a.m.)'.

According to the Vinaya, a priest is allowed to eat the so-called 'clean flesh' which is produced with three conditions, i.e. a monk has not seen the creature killed; has not heard of its being killed for him, and has no doubt on this point, if he was in an environment where no grains were obtainable.[260] Even though the religion had already suggested such an alternative, the Chinese priests still kept their vegetarianism very strictly. For instance, before the downfall of the State of Northern Liang in 439, the monk Chih-sung (n.d.) of this State considered that there would soon be war. He took with him several of his disciples to go to the land

of the barbarians. On the way there was famine, and they were without grain for many days. Chih-sung's disciples sought and found the flesh of birds or beasts, and begged their master to eat it even against his will. But since Chih-sung had vowed to keep the Vinaya, he finally died of hunger on the mountain west of Chiu-ch'üan City (in Kansu Province).[261] Fa-yüan (414-510) had once been forced to eat meat by Emperor Hsiao-wu (R. 414-464) of the Liu-Sung Dynasty. Even though the knight of the court stuffed the meat into the monk's mouth and broke his two incisors, Fa-yüan still resisted swallowing it.[262] Hui-pu (+ 587) suffered from starvation for three days during the civil war in the Yangtzŭ Valley about 458-9. On the fourth day, someone gave him a bowl of cooked rice. As this bowl of rice was covered by a piece of pork, Hui-pu insisted on not eating it, even though his hunger was extreme.[262A] Chih-to Pa-mo (Guptavarman? n.d.) was originally a Chinese who followed the envoy of the T'ang Dynasty to Balkh. After having arrived there, he followed a master of Hīnayāna Buddhism, entered the Order and received the above-mentioned religious name. As he considered that he was a lay-Buddhist of the Mahāyāna tradition before entering the Order, Chih-to Pa-mo refused to eat the 'clean flesh' at the moment when he was about to receive his full ordination. His master told him that to eat 'clean flesh' is in accordance with the Vinaya and that he had heard nothing about the Mahāyāna doctrines before. He also told his disciple that if Chih-to Pa-mo insisted on his own wish, then no ordination would be conferred. Nevertheless, Chih-to Pa-mo swallowed the 'clean flesh' with tears. After being ordained, Chih-to Pa-mo stayed there for only a short time and went back to China.[263] Probably he could not stand meat in every meal.[264]

Again, the Vinaya allows a sick priest to eat fish and meat in order to gain nourishment,[265] but the Chinese priests refrained from making use of these rules and adhered strictly to vegetarianism. For instance,

before Chih-shun's (447-507) death, he told his disciples to bring him some vegetarian food. His disciple T'an-ho (n.d.) considering that his master had not been taking food for days, mixed some meat into the rice to cook in order to give his sick master some nourishment. As Chih-shun swallowed the food, he immediately vomited it out and asked for water to gargle. Then he scolded T'an-ho by saying: "You get out of my door and never come back again!"[266] When Fa-k'an's (551-623) illness had reached a critical stage, his doctor told him that as the power of the herbal medication this time was too strong, it had to be simmered with a piece of pork in order to help diminish its potency. Fa-k'an said: "As everyone's life has to come to an end, why should I break my rule for a cure?" Then he let his illness be, until the arrival of his final hours.[267]

(I) No Involvement in Military Affairs

Rules 97 to 99 of the Śīla indicate that priests are not allowed to go and watch the practice of military exercises, and are not allowed to stay in a military camp for more than three days.[268] In other words, priests are not allowed to involve themselves in any military affairs. In imperial China, even though the monks would sometimes be drafted as soldiers and forced to participate in combat missions,[269] I still can find two examples of Chinese monks who kept these rules.

As the monk Fa-ya (n.d.) had already become a close friend of Emperor Kao-tsu (R.618-626) of the T'ang Dynasty before the latter ascended the throne, he was allowed, as the emperor's courtier, to keep wives. The other monks dared not report this to the Order. In 624, the northern territories of China were threatened by the Turks. Fa-ya presented a memorial to the court and suggested that they should recruit one thousand monks who were physically strong from the monasteries of the capital (Ch'ang-an), to train as soldiers in order to aid the military power.

The court then appointed him to take up the whole duty of recruiting and training. On hearing this, Chih-shih (601-638) wrote to Fa-ya to admonish him not to do such a thing as it was contrary to the Buddhist tradition. After having received this letter, Fa-ya was very angry and insisted more strictly on his policy. When this troop of monk-soldiers was trained and about to march to the front, Chih-shih came to the troops and spoke with tears of the evil deed of participating in military affairs. All thousand monk-soldiers were moved and wept loudly. Then, Chih-shih caught Fa-ya, beat him with several blows from his fist and said: "Now I am exorcising this demon!" Even though Chih-shih was put in the cangue afterwards and then expelled from the Order, these thousand monk-soldiers were nevertheless discharged from the army and returned to monkhood.[270]

When Tripiṭaka Master Hsüan-tsang returned from India in 645, he was granted an audience by Emperor T'ai-tsung of the T'ang Dynasty in Ch'ang-an. The emperor was very interested in his pilgrimage. As Emperor T'ai-tsung was on the eve of launching his campaign to Korea and was very busy making arrangements to travel to Lo-yang in order to give his final instructions to his generals there, he invited Hsüan-tsang to go with him so that they could continue their conversation on the road. The Tripiṭaka Master protested that his presence would contribute nothing towards the success of the campaign on the one hand, and that, on the other, his monastic vows also forbade him to witness battle-scenes. Then the emperor gave way.[271]

(J) No Trifling or Joking

Rules 101, 104 and 107 in the Śīla are concerned with priests not being allowed to trifle in water, to scare others, or to hide the belongings of others for a joke.[272] In other words, priests must make themselves respectable to the laity. In Chinese Buddhist history, I found some examples

of how the monks kept these rules. When Ching-ai went into solitude on Mount Chung-nan before the persecution in 574, the monk Chih-tsang (n.d.) went there to ask him questions on the Dharma. One day, Ching-ai saw that Chih-tsang was holding a branch of a tree with his two arms and that he upheld his whole body from the ground for fun. He called on his disciple, scolded him as "a two-legged dog" and expelled him from the mountain.[273] Hui-min (573-649?)[274] lived in Wu Prefecture (present Soochow) for seventeen years, and during that period he accepted no invitations and never told a joke to the others.[275] When Tripiṭaka Master Hsüan-tsang was an eleven year old Śrāmaṇera in 612, he was discontented with his fellow-Śrāmaṇeras of the same monastery for they were still chatting and trifling all the time like lay-children even after they had entered the Order.[276] Ch'ên-ch'u (889-959) entered the Order in his tenth year. After he had become a Śrāmaṇera, one day the children gathered together to play a game and they tempted Ch'ên-ch'u to join in. But this young Śrāmaṇera scolded them: "How foolish you kinds are ! All of you only know how to play !"[277] The descriptions of Hsüan-tsang's and Ch'ên-ch'u's childhood seem to be rather exaggerated. As Tao-hsüan and Tsan-ning, authors of these two Biographies, were both disciplinarians, probably the above descriptions reflected the fact that these two disciplinarians taught 'No trifling' in their works.

(K) No Expectorating in the Monastery

Rules 223 to 225 of the Śīla state that priests are not allowed to blow their nose or expectorate on a Stūpa or in its surrounding areas.[278] As the monastery is also a holy place from a religious point of view, some of the Chinese monks extended the above rules to cover the entire monastic area. T'ung-yu (549-605) was so strict about hygiene that he would never blow his nose or expectorate in the monastery.[279] In his whole life, Ching-lin (565-640) had visited many monasteries. He never blew his nose or expectorated wherever he went.[280]

(L) Practising the Summer Retreat

'Varṣā' or 'Summer-Retreat' is not recorded in the Śīla. On the one hand the Vinaya has many pages of discussion on this topic,[281] and on the other the Quotation[282] and NHCKNFC[283] also emphasise the importance of this practice. Therefore I treat this topic here. In the previous Chapter I have mentioned many disciplinarians who practised the Varṣā. Here I would like to give some additional notes: Before Master Fa-hsien and his companions entered the Western Regions, they made two summer retreats in China proper. The first one was practised in 400 in the State of Western Ch'in and the second one in 401 in the State of Northern Liang (both these states were in the present Kansu Province).[284] Chên-hui (569-615) practised his Varṣā in 598 and then in 605. He practised his second retreat in a tiger's cave and the tiger went away until the autumn came.[285] During his whole life Ling-i (728-762) practised fifteen Varṣās.[286]

(M) Use of the Jar for 'Clean Water'

The two jars for 'clean water' and 'touch water', one for drinking and one for cleansing, are also not recorded in the Śīla. As the NHCKNFC emphasises that keeping two jars is important in the Indian Buddhist tradition,[287] I discuss this here. In Section I of the previous Chapter, I mentioned that the monk Tzŭ-tsang was taking a serious view of the monk-transgressors who did not bring with them the two jars.[288] Monk Shan-hui (587-635) also kept this tradition. During the turmoil around 616-7, Shan-hui was robbed by bandits on the road. Even though all his belongings, including his robe, were stolen and he had to put on a rag, he still found a broken jar as the container for the 'clean water' in order to keep the Buddhist rule.[289]

(N) Eat None of the Five Parivayayas

Priests are not allowed to eat the five Parivayayas (the five forbidden pungent roots), i.e. Laśuna (garlic), Gṛñjana (leek), Latārka (onion), Palāṇḍa (scallion) and Hiṅgu (ferula asa foetida),[290] none of which is recorded in the Śīla. As the Fan-wang Ching, so influential in the past and at present,[291] indicates that a Buddhist is not allowed to eat the above-mentioned five pungent roots,[292] the Chinese priests also kept this as their rule.

For instance, Sêng-hou,[293] Fa-ling[294] and Hui-ch'êng (+ 527)[295] had never eaten anything pungent in their whole lives. As Sêng-miao (flor. 535-551) was so influential in the upper reaches of the Yellow River, people in the villages where he visited no longer took flesh or wine. Even if there were wild onions or leeks to be found in these areas, automatically the people would cover them with soil.[296] Once, Ling-yu was invited by a landlord to give a lecture on Buddhism. During a break in the lecture, Ling-yu went out to view the surroundings and found that there was a leek grove near his lecture place. As he learnt that this grove belonged to his host, Ling-yu refused to continue his lecture. However, his host borrowed a plough from the countrymen in order to plough and destroy the entire forty 'mou'[296A] of leeks and promised Ling-yu that he would cultivate grain on these lands, so the monk continued with his lecture.[297] Before Hui-jih's (680-748) return from his pilgrimage in 719, the Chinese Buddhists did not know what Hiṅgu was. They thought that it was coriander or the 'Yün-t'ai (Brassica Campestris)'. Hui-jih told his people that he only saw Hiṅgu in Khotan, and both coriander and 'Yün-t'ai' were not recognised as 'pungent roots' in the Indian Buddhist tradition.[298]

(0) No Adultery

'Adultery' is the first unpardonable sin among the four Pārājikas. Rules 1, 18-19, 23-27, 36, 53, 58, 70-77, 79, 94, 108, 117-119 and 140 in the Śīla all indicate that monks are not allowed to involve themselves with women, including the Bhikṣuṇīs.[299] The Vinaya also devotes many pages to record discussions on this topic.[300] In China, the Buddhist priests traditionally take a serious view on this sin. The Tripiṭaka Master I-ching condemned the Chinese priests by saying that: "... some [by] observing one single precept on adultery say that they are free from sin, and do not at all care for the study of the Vinaya rules ..... (they) never look at those books of precepts ...."[301] I-ching's words indicate how seriously the Chinese priests viewed the sin of 'Adultery'. In the three 'Biographies', I found many examples of how monks kept the rules concerning this sin. Therefore, I have put the discussion of this topic here at the end of the Section.

Why the Chinese monks view this sin so seriously is related to the Chinese cultural background. Confucius says: "I have not seen one who loves virtue as he loves beauty..."[302] His words hint that he persuaded people not to involve themselves with the beauties. Mencius indicates that according to Chinese traditional rule, male and female "are not to allow their hands to touch in giving or receiving".[303] Only in the situation of a man's "sister-in-law drowning" is he allowed to "rescue her with his hand."[304] His words reflect the serious view of 'adultery' taken in the Chinese tradition. Mencius also indicates that the "general rule" is that men and women are not allowed to touch each other. The case of a man who gives his hand to rescue a female relative thus is regarded as a 'particular exigence'.[305] In the DRMGTV there is an instruction for allowing a monk to rescue a drowning young girl with his hands,[306] something like the above-mentioned Confucian rule. Moreover, in his majesty's last

imperial tour in 210 B.C., Emperor Shih-Huang-ti (R. 246-210 B.C.) of the Ch'in Dynasty engraved an edict on a rock of the Kuei-chi Prefecture (present Shao-hsing City of the Chekiang Province), in which he ordered that: " ... adultery must be stopped .... in the case of a man who cohabits with married women at random, like a boar does, anyone who kills this man at the scene of adultery, will not be charged by the law ..."[307] The Chinese historians praise this act of the emperor highly as he legally supported the Confucian rule of 'No Adultery'.[308]

As the Chinese morally and legally view 'adultery' so seriously, the monks of this country also keep away from women. I would like to give some examples here: Fa-ch'ung (died ca. 600) was a monk of Hua-ch'êng Monastery in Mount Lu. He always persuaded the other members of the same monastery not to allow women to enter their place in order to remain pure. As some of the monks considered that to mingle with women was a basic business of the religion and they did not listen to him, Fa-ch'ung was very upset and ran to the mountain peak and jumped down in order to commit suicide. Even though he fell into a deep valley, Fa-ch'ung was uninjured and came back. The other monks were moved by his violent action and by this miracle; they stopped mingling with females.[309] Ling-yu would never confer ordination on a nun or a lay-women. He also would not allow females to enter his apartment to ask him religious questions. They were only allowed to come to his monastery when Ling-yu was giving a lecture. But it was still arranged that they came to the lecture hall after the male audience had entered, and that they left after the males had left when the lecture was finished.[310] Tao-lin (+ 624) would never collect food from the hands of women. Even when his life came to an end, Tao-lin refused female believers to visit and inquire after his illness.[311] Since he had entered the Order in his seventh year, Chih-man (551-628) had never looked at beautiful women.[312] Fa-hsiang (553-630) had never in his whole life

talked to the nuns or aged ladies who came to visit him.[313] Tao-chi (568-636) was very careful about his behaviour in order to avoid any rumour against him. Not only would he never confer an ordination on any nun, but he would also not allow nuns to come to inquire about him, or to ask him questions. He told his disciples that: "Woman is the dirt that will pollute one who practises the Vinaya."[314] Chih-lang (871-947) vowed that in his whole life, his soiled clothes would never be washed by the hands of women, and he kept this vow.[315] Wu-tso (died ca. 910-11) had never entered into any nunnery in his whole career.[316] In his whole life Yen-ch'iu (died ca. 960-3) would never accept any nun who came to ask questions or have discussions with him.[317]

Readers would wonder why, as the above examples show, the Chinese monks not only avoided communication with lay-women, including aged ladies, but also shunned seeing the nuns. According to the Vinaya, there are many regulations that limit communication between monks and nuns. For instance, a monk is not allowed to ask a nun who is not his secular relative to wash his clothes,[318] or to dye the fleece for him.[319] A monk is not allowed to make a dress for a nun, or to give his used clothes to her unless this nun is his secular relative.[320] Also, a monk is not allowed to take food from the begging bowl of a nun if she is not his relative.[321] Again, a monk is not allowed to sleep with a nun in the same place;[322] to sit with her in a protected place[323] or to walk together on the road.[324] And again, a monk is not allowed to ride on the same boat with a nun unless this ride is only for crossing water.[325]. Moreover, according to the Buddhist tradition, a nun should have to follow a monk as her master.[326] Therefore, a nun must pay respect to every monk;[327] even though she has already reached the venerable age of one hundred years, even then she was still not exempted.[328] The Order only sends a monk who has been ordained for over twenty years and who has kept the Śīla strictly during these years to give

lectures on Buddhism to the nuns.[329] Rumours will arise if a monk visits the nunnery or the nuns' shrine frequently.[330] From the above-mentioned regulations, readers will probably understand why the Chinese monk kept away from nuns. Furthermore, even the monk-historians could not deny the fact that evil members, both male and female, of the Order frequently cohabited with each other and gave birth to illegitimates.[331] This would also be the reason why the Chinese monks do not even talk with the nuns.

The above examples all concern monks who restricted themselves by obeying the rules of 'No Adultery'. But what should a monk do if he were chased by a woman? Here I should like to give three good examples in this respect. Before entering the Order, Chu Sêng-tu (n.d.) of the Chin Dynasty was engaged to a young lady, and both of them were in their sixteenth year. As they were about to marry, suddenly the parents of both families passed away. Due to this emotional impact, Chu Sêng-tu understood the Buddhist truth of the nature of human life, and devoted himself to the monkhood. After mourning the deaths for three years, Chu Sêng-tu's fiancée wrote him a letter with a poem, persuading him that, as they were the only survivors of their families, they had to take up their duty of generating descendants. All this was said in order to persuade him to return to lay-life and to marry her. Chu Sêng-tu replied to his fiancée in the same vein and explained that his religious duty was more important than that of increasing the offspring of two families. His fiancée was moved and became a faithful Buddhist believer.[332]

In 669 when he arrived from Silla in China, the Korean monk Ûi-sang (n.d.) went to beg for food in Têng-chou (present Yen-t'ai City of Shantung Province). As he was very handsome, Ûi-sang was persuaded by his hostess, a beautiful lass, to make love with her. But Ûi-sang resisted so strongly that the girl failed in her temptations, and changed her mind and turned to Buddhism.[333] As a youth of eighteen years Kuang-i (+ 735) was sexually

attacked by a group of women, his female cousin and her maids. They tried everything to force Kuang-i to have sex with his cousin. As Kuang-i failed to explain his religious rules of 'No Adultery' to her, this handsome Buddhist monk, then coaxed her into believing that his body was dirty and he asked her to prepare warm water for bathing before making love. After a basin of bathing water was placed in his room and these women went out, Kuang shut the door immediately and locked it. Then, his castrated his own virile member in order to eliminate this sexual threat.[334] Their responses were praiseworthy, for both Chu Sêng-tu and Kuang-i were in the prime of their youth.

Finally, I should like to give one more example. Around 905-7,[335] one day Wu-ming (n.d.) found a female infant at the side of the road on his way back from collecting alms.[336] Knowing that this infant was abandoned by her parents who were among the starving masses, Wu-ming brought her back to the ruins of a kiln in the southern suburb of the Yu-chou (present Chi City of Hopeh Province) where he went into solitude. Then he begged for milk to feed her every day from the cowherd. When she was around seven or eight years old, Wu-ming brought her to the city and begged colourful silk from the people to dress her. After reaching the age of fifteen her astonishingly beautiful looks began to attract publicity and rumours against them followed. But Wu-ming did not care. One day, Liu Jen-kung (+ 914), Commissioner of Yu-chou, went to hunt, and one of his soldiers entered the kiln where Wu-ming lived, to look for an escaped rabit. As he found unexpectedly that a monk and a beauty were living together, the soldier reported this to Liu. Then Liu went to the kiln to inquire how they happened to be together, and Wu-ming told him the whole true story. Liu still tried to test the monk by asking: "I, your disciple, like this girl. Would you give her to me to be one of my consorts?" Wu-ming promised him without any sign of unwillingness.

As the girl was a great beauty, Liu himself helped her to mount the horse. When he brought her to bed, Liu discovered that she was still a virgin. Then he knew that Wu-ming was a real sage. Therefore, Liu built Wu-ming a new shrine and he came to inquire about the monk twice a week. When Wu-ming's obituary was written, Liu's beautiful concubine followed his way with deep distress.[337]

From the above description it is obvious that Wu-ming had in fact offended against the rules concering 'No Adultery'. According to the Śīla, a monk is not allowed to sit with a women alone in a sheltered place which is convenient for them to make love (Rule 18).[338] A monk is not allowed to sit with a woman in an open place, even though they could not have sex there (Rule 19).[339] A monk is not allowed to sleep with a woman in the same room (Rule 53).[340] A monk is not allowed to walk together with a woman on the road, even over a short distance between two villages (Rule 79).[341] A monk is not allowed to give sermons of more than five or six words to a woman, unless he is well learned (Rule 53).[342] A monk is not allowed to sit with a woman alone in a public place (Rule 94).[343] As Wang-ming had lived together with a growing beautiful girl, he had already broken the above-mentioned six rules every day. Since it was discovered that he had never touched the young beauty, Wu-ming was recognised as an 'eminent Buddhist monk' and his Biography is listed in the SKSC. I believe that Wu-ming and his beautiful disciple had already developed an emotional tie of step-father and adopted daughter since they had spent fifteen years with each other.

In comparing the ways of practising the rules concerning 'No Adultery', I found that the attitudes of Wu-ming and of the others (like Fa-ch'ung, Tao-chi, Yen-ch'iu, etc) were very different. The other monks were so scared of rumours that they would never chat with a woman or a nun in order to avoid offending any relevant rule. Wu-ming, on the other hand,

not only despised the rumours that were against him, but he also ignored the details of the rules. He just kept on thinking no evil thoughts towards the beauty and allowed the facts to speak for themselves.

Chapter II: Notes

1. According to the Vinaya, a monastery had to hold an assembly in order to preach the Śīla to its members once every fifteen days (DRMGTV, p. 821b).

2. See Appendix, Table VIII. See also DRMGTV, pp. 685C - 686A.

3. See Chapter III, Section II, Notes 171 to 230.

4. For instance, even though there were thousands of priests or laymen who received ordination from Tao-ch'an (458-527) in Nanking, his sermons on the SVSTVDV attracted an audience of no more than one hundred auditors in each assembly (HKSC, p. 607B). Sêng-yün (555-582) was very influential in the Pao-ming Monastery of Yeh (the capital of the Northern Ch'i Dynasty). On the fifteenth day of the fourth month of a certain year, a routine congregation for the preaching of the Śīla (Cf. Note 1) was held in that monastery. Sêng-yün told his fellow monks in this congregation that: "As all of us already know and bear in mind the rules in order to keep from wrongdoing, why should we vex ourselves by listening to them time and time again every fortnight? I suggest that if we just find one monk among us to preach the rules to the novice it is sufficient." The other monks did not dare object to his suggestion, and so all of them agreed. They gave up the routine preaching of the Śīla for the whole summer retreat. This continued to the fifteenth day of the seventh month, when Sêng-yün was found slashed in an old tomb three miles from his monastery. He told the others that he had been punished by a deity with a sabre for changing the custom of the Poṣadha by his own authority. After that Sêng-yün was very faithful to the duty of preaching the Śīla (Ibid, p. 649b). After he was ordained in 719, Hui-ming (696-780) began to learn the Vinaya-piṭaka. After that, he told the others: "..... even though I will not give up the practice of the Vinaya, I don't like the contents of the Vinaya rules for they are so confusing, always creating many arguments among the disciplinarians....." Then, Hui-ming diverted his attention to the study of the Ch'an Buddhism (SKSC, p. 876b).

5. KSC, p. 403a.

6. Ibid., p. 403b-c.

7. HKSC, p. 622b.

8. The word 'stern father' in chinese, hints at a man who govererns his family according to the Confucian ritual and norms.

9. SKSC, p. 81la. Besides, the Confucian scholar Yen Chih-t'ui (died ca. 590-2) held the same opinion as these monk-historians. In his Yen-shih Chia-hsün, Yen Chih-t'ui says that: "How does the study of Sūtra and discipline texts by ordinary monks differ from studying the Book of Odes and the Book of Rites by scholar students (Vol. 2, p. 132. Teng Ssu-yü, tr., Family Instructions for the Yen Clan, [This work is recommended to me by Mr John Jorgensen] p. 146)?"

10. How the Chinese priests looked down upon Hīnayāna Buddhism will be discussed in the next Chapter.

11. See Section I of Chapter I, Notes 6-14.

12. In the Seiiki no Bukkyō or 'Buddhism in the Western Regions (Central Asia)', Hatani Ryōtai says that the State of Khotan was the 'Motherland of the Mahāyāna Buddhism in China (p.323)'. His argument is based on the fact that many of the Mahāyāna scriptures that are influential in Chinese Buddhist circles were originally introduced from this State (pp. 324-346). Following Hatani, I consider the first Sino-Khotanese Buddhist encounter recorded in the Buddhist historical works to be the pilgrimage of the Chinese monk Chu Shih-hsing (flor. 260-282) who departed for Khotan in 260 (CSTCC, p.47c and p. 97a KSC, p. 346b. Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol. I, pp. 109-110. Hatani, pp. 275-6). The date when the above-mentioned two Vinaya scriptures began to prevail in China was after 250 (Cf. Note 11). In other words, Chu departed ten years later in 260. Again, Chu sent his disciple to bring an original text of Mahāyāna Buddhism into China from Khotan before 296 (CSTCC, p. 47a. Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, Idem. Hatani, Idem.), some forty-six years after 250. Therefore, I conclude that the Hīnayāna disciplinary scriptures were practised before Mahāyānism gained influences in China.

13. See next Chapter. See also Appendix, Table VII. I think that this could be the reason why the Chinese Order retained the tradition of flogging transgressors even after the Vinaya gained prevalence (Cf. Note 11).

14. Cf. Note 7.

15. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Bio. & Biblio.' Part 1, pp. 436-438. In this article, I have indicated that the original text of a translated version was brought into China from India or Central Asia, was recognized as 'real scripture'

and respected by the Chinese Buddhists. On the contrary, a scripture that was composed in China and disguised as a translation, of course was condemned as a 'forgery' when the fact was discovered (Ibid., p. 438).

16. See Chapter I, Section II, Notes 119-139; Section III, Notes 230 to 241; Section IV, Notes 344 to 347, 362 to 366, 375 to 375A, 378 to 381, and 384 to 394.

17. Those translated works can be found in the Taishō as T. 1484, 1485, 1486, 1487, 1488, 1489, 1490, 1491, 1493, 1494, 1495, 1496, 1497, 1499, 1500, 1501, 1502 and 1504. Chih-hsu's (1599-1655) Yüeh-tsang Chih-tsin or 'A Guide to the Tripiṭaka' says that all the above mentioned works are Mahāyāna disciplinary scriptures (Shōwa Hōbō Sōmokuroku, Vol. III, pp. 1200a-1203a).

18. KYSCL, p. 605c. Shêng-yen, Outline of Vinaya, p. 261.

19. This work can be found in T. 1484. In his Jōdokyō no Kigen oyobi Hattatsu or 'The Origin of the Pure Land School and Its Development' Mochizuki Shinkō (L869-1948) indicates that this work is not a translation but a forgery compiled in China (pp. 155-184).

20. LTSPC, p. 78a. TTNTL, p. 252c. KYSCL, pp. 512c-513a. T. 1484, p. 997a. This work is not listed in the CSTCC.

21. Most of the commentaries of the Buddhist disciplinary scriptures have long been lost, but we can still find many commentaries on the Fan-wang Ching at present. In the Taishō, there are two of them, i.e. T. 1813 and T.1815. In the Zokuzōkyō, there are seven of them in Vol. 59, pp. 192a-463a; eleven of them in Vol. 60, pp. la-121a; four of them in vol. 61, pp.la-182b. and two of them in vol. 95, pp. la-121a. Again in the Zoku Daizōkhō, there are two of them in ZD 2246 and ZD 2247. Most of the authors of the above-mentioned works were Chinese monks and a few of them were Korean or Japanese priests. The dates when these works were compiled cover a long period from about 597 to 1699. The survival of these twenty-eight commentaries on the Fan-wang Ching indicates that this scripture was in the past very popular in China and her neighbouring areas. It also confirms my former finding that the false scriptures were welcomed by the Chinese Buddhists (Cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Bio. & Biblio.', Part 1, p 437).

22. T. 1484, pp. 998a-1000b.

23. The Taishō (T. 1500, p. 1107a) says that the present copy of this is to be differentiated from the P'u-sa Ti-ch'ih Ching, another translation

by Dharmarakṣa. The portion that is quoted from the latter can be found in T. 1581, pp. 913-917.

24. These rules can be found serially in T. 1500 as Rules 2, 7, 8, 9, 11 (p. 1107b-c); 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 (p. 1180); 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40 (p. 1109) and 41 (pp. 1109c-1110a).

25. The KYSCL says that this work was translated from the same original text as Dharmarakṣa's translation (p. 556b). I have compared these two translations and have found that their contents are quite different from each other.

26. Those rules can be found serially in T. 1501 as Rules 6, 7, 8 (p. 1111b-c); 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17 (p. 1112b-c); 21, 27 (p. 1113a-b); 37, 40, 42, 43, 44 (p. 1114); 45, 46, 47, 48 (p. 1115a-b).

27. According to the Mahāyāna tradition, even an evil idea arising in one's mind is regarded as a serious transgression of the relevant rule (See Rhys Davids and Stede, Pali-English Dictionary, 'Cetanā', p.271b [This book is recommended to me by Dr T. Rajapatirana]. Shêng-yen, Outline of Vinaya, p. 272).

28. Of the above-mentioned three works of the 'Śīla of the Bodhisattva', only the Fan-wang Ching records specific sins for breaking specific rules (pp. 1004b-1009b. Also see J.J.M. de Groot [1854-1921], tr., 'Sūtra du filet de Brahma [in Le Code du Mahāyāna en Chine]', pp. 32-53). As Mochizuki has already proved that this work is a forgery (see Note 19), we cannot accept that the Mahāyāna Śīla also records the degree of sins.

29. In the opening pages of all the Vinayas, one can find discussions of the four Pārājikas. A priest involved in these four unpardonable sins, i.e. adultry, stealing, killing and lying purposely, must be expelled from the Order permanently. Then, the other parts of the Vinayas discuss how one should confess after having broken the rules that are not as serious as the Pārājika.

30. Will be discussed in the next Chapter.

31. NHCKNFC, p. 206a. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, p. 16.

32. Confucius (552-497 B.C.?) Lun-yü, SSCCS, Vol. 8, p. 105a. James Legge, tr., Confucian Analects, CC, Vol. 1-2, p. 316.

33. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Bio. & Biblio.', Part 1, pp. 473-477; Part 2, pp. 307-311 and Part 3, pp. 122-124.

34. Ibid., Part 1, pp. 428-433.

35. CSTCC, p. 80b (the quotation of Master Tao-an's Pi-ch'iu Ta-chieh Hsü or 'The Preface to the Śīla of the Great Bhikṣus'). Cf. Ōchō Enichi, pp. 234-235.

36. SKSC, p. 809c.

37. HKSC, p. 484c.

38. SKSC, p. 795b.

39. Ibid., p. 796b.

40. Ibid., p. 799c.

41. Ibid., p. 803a.

42. These commentaries can be found in T. 1716 and T. 1718 (both in twenty fascicles).

43. SKSC, p. 808b.

44. Students of Buddhist studies all know that the theory of the 'Pure-land' or the 'Western Paradise' is a Mahāyāna tradition only (Cf. Mochizuki, pp. 450-463. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, pp. 15-16 and 338-340).

45. See Chapter I, Section V, Note 505.

46. Ibid., Notes 467-489.

47. Ibid., Notes 525-544.

48. Tao-hsüan, Quotation, p. 5a.

49. Ibid., p. 52a and p. 55b.

50. Huai-su, New Interpretation, p. 356b.

51. Fa-li, Old Commentary, p. 236b.

52. Huai-su, New Interpretation, pp. 361b-362a.

53. Tao-hsüan, Quotation, p. 148c.

54. Ibid., p.54c, p. 48c, and p. 130c.

55. Huai-su, New Interpretation, p. 349b.

56. The table below shows the materials quoted from the other Vinayas in the opening pages of the commentaries on the DRMGTV

Materials from	Chih-shou	Quotation	Old Commentary	New Interpretation
SVSTVDV	p. 311a, p. 313b.	p. 3a, p. 3b, p. 5b, p. 6a, p. 6b.	p. 184a, p. 219b, p. 228b, p. 376a.	p. 362a, p. 367a, p. 368a.
MHSGKV	p. 311b, p. 312a, p. 312b, p. 313a.	p. 3b, p. 7a.	p. 185a, p. 228b.	p. 362a, p. 369a.
MĪŚSKV	p. 312b, p. 313a.	p. 3b, p. 5c, p. 6c.	p. 288b.	
SMTPSV	p. 311b.	p. 7a.	p. 186a, p. 202a.	

57. CSTCC, pp. 19c-20a.

58. Ibid., pp. 19c-21b.

59. KSC, p. 403a. SKSC, p. 811b.

60. Huai-su, New Interpretation, p.345b. Stories of the dream of the white blanket and the golden rod are also mentioned in I-ching's NHCKNFC, p. 205c, and J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, pp. 13-14. There, the numbers of fragments of the blanket and the rod are increased to eighteen. As I-ching did not give the source of these stories and J. Takakusu could not find them either, I believe that these two are only fables.

61. Tao-hsüan, Quotation, p. 2b-c.

62. Ibid., p. 155b.

63. Ibid., p. 55c.

64. Ibid., p. 62c.

65. Ibid., p. 67c.

66. Ibid., p. 70a.

67. Ibid., p. 81c.

68. Ibid., p. 88b-c.

69. For the length of a 'Buddha's Vitasti' see Note 83.

70. Tao-hsüan, Quotation, p. 89c.

71. Ibid., p. 113c.

72. Ibid., p. 145b. This page indicates that the MĪŚSKV emphasizes burial in its description, while the MHSGKV approves cremation and the SVSTVDV describes putting the body in a forest in order to let the birds peck at it. The DRMGTV itself approves cremation, but Tao-hsüan considered cremation to be an inhuman way of disposing of the corpse. Therefore when his life came to an end, his disciples hid his body in an artificial rock-cave and sealed the entrance (SKSC, p. 791a).

73. I have found that of the funerals of Chinese monks recorded in the KSC, the HKSC and the SKSC, 105 were by creamation, 121 by burial, 58 by sealing up the body in an artificial cave, 32 by abandoning the corpse in a wilderness in order to let the birds and animals consume it, 2 by burying the body first and then exhuming it and cremating it, 2 by sealing the body up in a cave first and then exhuming it for cremation, 2 by leaving the body in a wilderness and then taking it back for cremation, 1 by leaving it in a wilderness and then collecting the decomposed body and burying it. As the above-mentioned affairs are not germane to my discussion, I will not enter into details. However, I hope to write a short essay on Buddhist funerals on some other occasion.

74. As I have shown in Chapter I, the third Vinaya prevalent in China after the DRMGTV and SVSTVDV was the MHSGKV. Therefore, I have included the Śīla of the MHSGKV in my discussion.

75. See Appendix, Table VIII. I consider that the SVSTVDV has sometimes subdivided its rules too pedantically. For instance, the twelve rules from Rule 144 to Rule 155 inclusive (in serial order), are in fact equivalent to the instructions of Rule 143 in the Śīla of the DRMGTV. In such cases in the two above-mentioned Vinayas, I consider that there is only one rule that is in agreement.

76. NHCKNFC, p. 205c. The original text reads: "Shên-chou Ch'ih Lü Chu Pu Hu Ch'ien". In J. Takakusu's translation, he inaccurately rendered this as: "In China, the schools of all Vinayadhara are also prejudiced (Buddhist Practices, p. 15)".

77. Huai-su, New Interpretation, p. 343a. A monk who has committed the sin of Saṅghāvaśeṣa, is required to make an open confession before the assembly in order to be absolved (see DRMGTV, p. 579b. MHSGKV, p. 262c).

78. Huai-su, Idem. A monk who has committed a sin of Duṣkṛta, is only required to make a confession in front of one monk in order to gain his redemption (see DRMGTV, pp. 692c-693a).

79. NHCKNFC, p. 205c. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, p. 13.

80. For instance, Tao-hsüan, Quotation, p. 52c and p. 70a, and Huai-su, New Interpretation, p. 368a, etc.

81. Tao-hsüan, Ibid., p. 62a. The MHSGKV was translated in 418 (see Chapter I, Section IV, Notes 344 to 347). According to Wu Ch'êng-lo's Chung-kuo Tu-liang-hêng Shih or 'A History of the Chinese Measurements of Length and Weight', one Chinese Ch'ih in the mentioned period was about 0.7353 of the length of the modern Chinese foot (Table 5, appended to its p. 54). The ratio between one modern Chinese foot (10 inches) and the English measurement is 10 inches to 14.1 inches. My reckoning is based on the above ratio.

82. Tao-hsüan, Idem.

83. Tao-hsüan, Ibid., p. 62b-c., Hung-i indicates that the measurements that appear in the Quotation are all according to the measurements of the Chou Dynasty (Hung-i, Nan-shan Lü-yüan Wên-chi, pp. 110-111). According to Wu Ch'êng-lo, the ratio between the Ch'ih of the Chou Dynasty and the modern Chinese foot is 0.5973 to 1.0000 (p. 54).

84. See Fa-li, Old Commetary, p. 247a-b.

85. HKSC, p. 554c.

86. The contents of the DRMGTV are a good example. In the Karma of the ordination of a candidate into the monkhood, the candidate would be asked the following questions before the ceremony: (1) Would you commit the sin that merits expulsion from the Order? (2) Would you dally with a Bhikṣuṇī? (3) Are you entering the Order with an evil purpose? (4) are your virile member and rectum unspoiled?

(5) Are you a eunuch? (6) Have you killed your parents? (7) Have you killed an Arhant? (8) Would you make mischief among the monks? (9) Will you shed the blood of a Buddha's body purposely? (10) Are you a non-human being? (11) Are you an animal? (12) Are you a hermaphrodite? If all the answers are negative, the candidate is allowed to receive his ordination. During the ordination, he will be once again asked: (1) What is your religious name? (2) Who is your master? (3) Have you reached the age of twenty? (4) Have you brought enough robes and bowls with you? (5) Have you been granted the permission of your parents? (6) Are you in debt? (7) Are you a slave? (8) Are you an on-duty official? (9) Are you a man? (10) Are you suffering from the diseases of scabies, ulcers, white blotches, diabetes or madness? The above questions would be asked twice by his master and then by the assembly; and the answers should be all negative (pp. 814c-815a). In the case of a monk who has committed a grievous sin and was about to be expelled by the Order, he could beg to hold a Karma of confession in front of an assembly. In his confession, the monk would have to bare his right shoulder, take off his leather shoes, kneel with his right knee on the ground, bring his palms together and say three times: "Please listen to me, venerable masters. I, the Bhikṣu so and so have been sentenced to expulsion by the assembly through a Karma. Now I have decided to follow any instruction the Saṅgha may make without any objection. Therefore, I beg that you be merciful and cancel my expulsion". Then the assembly would send a monk forward to say three times: "Please listen to me, venerable masters. This Bhikṣu so and so has been sentenced to expulsion by the assembly through a Karma. Now he has promised to follow any instruction the Saṅgha may make without any objection, and has therefore required the cancellation of his Karma of expulsion. Therefore, I declare on behalf of the assembly that the assembly agrees to discharge this Bhikṣu so and so from his Karma of expulsion. I would like to ask those masters who have forgiven him to keep silent, and those who have reasons for not forgiving him to announce it". The Karma of expulsion is then cancelled if all monks in the assembly kept silent (p. 891b). This set of words can be employed in the confession of other sins, with only the subject of confession being changed (see p. 890b and p. 892a).

87. Tao-hsüan came to ask Hsüan-tsang because the latter had spent seventeen years in India and the Buddhist kingdoms in Central Asia (HKSC, p. 456b. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p. 237). Of the other translators, the next one Tao-hsüan questioned on this topic was probably the Central Indian Monk Punyopāya (flor. 655-663). Punyopāya won Tao-hsüan's sympathy when he was oppressed by Hsüan-tsang in 663 (HKSC, p. 459a. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Chung-kuo Fo-chiao I-ching-shih Yen-chiu Yu-shên' or 'Desultory Notes on the History of Buddhist Translations in China', Shu-mu Chi-k'an or 'Bibliography Quarterly', Vol. 8, No.2, Taiwan, 1974, p. 9).

88. Tao-hsüan, Quotations, p. 13c.

89. NHCKNFC, pp. 213c-214a. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, p. 65.

90. TTHYCFKSC, p.2a-b.

91. Ibid. pp. 3c-4a.

92. Ibid., p. 4a. I cannot find this so-called A-chi-mo Ching in any Chinese Buddhist bibliographical work.

93. Ibid., pp. 6c-7a.

94. Flogging the transgressors in a monastery is only a Chinese Buddhist tradition (see Chapter I, Section I, Notes 38 to 52, and Section V, Note 542). Therefore, what this Chinese abbot did was to carry out Chinese punishment in an Indian monastery.

95. TTHYCFKSC, p. 7a.

96. Idem.

97. Ibid., p. 7b

98. Ibid., pp. 8c-9a.

99. Ibid., p. 9.

100. Ibid., p. 9a.

101. Idem.

102. Ibid., p. 10a-b.

103. Ibid., pp. 10b-11b.

104. Ibid., p. 11a-b.

105. Ch'ên-ku returned home in about 692, long before Emperor Chung-tsung gave the DRMGTV a charter to be the only Vinaya employed in the Chinese Monastic Order (see Chapter I, Section V, Notes 455 to 458). In this period, the

Yangtzŭ Valley was still a stronghold of the Sarvāstivādavinaya Sect. Even though Ch^ên-ku was a sectarian of the Dharmagupta-vinaya Sect, he probably learned the Mūlasarvāstivādanikāyavinaya for he had assisted I-ching's translation work in Śrīvijaya. The Mūlasarvāstivādanikāyavinaya scriptures, however, are considered to generally resemble the SVSTVDV (see NHCKNFC, p. 206b-c. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, p. 20). Therefore, the Vinaya that Ch^ên-ku preached in Canton was probably the SVSTVDV.

106. TTHYCFKSC, p. 12b.

107. Ibid., p. 11c. His account is appended to the Biography of Ch'ên-ku.

108. Ibid., p. 12b.

109. Ibid., pp. 11c-12a.

110. Ibid., p. 12b.

111. See Chapter I, Section III, Note 304.

112. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, pp. xxv-xxxviii. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, pp. 238-240. I am puzzled as to why Ch'en rendered the title of I-ching's NHCKNFC as 'A Record of the Buddhist Kingdoms in the Southern Archipelago (Survey, p.239)', for I-ching's work has nothing to do with the above 'Buddhist kingdoms'. Besides, Takakusu had already translated above title faithfully and correctly as 'Record of the Inner Law Sent Home From the Southern Sea (Buddhist Practices,p. xviii)' some sixty-nine years before Ch'en's Survey.

113. CYHTSCML, pp. 871a-872a.

114. NHCKNFC, p. 205c. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, pp. 15-16.

115. Ibid., p. 206a. Takakusu, tr., Ibid., p.18.

116. Idem.

117. Ibid., p. 206b. Takakusu, tr., Ibid., p. 19.

118. See Ibid., p. 207b, p. 211a, p. 216b-c, p. 219b, p. 220b, p. 221a-b, p. 222c, p.223a and p. 229c, etc. J. Takakusu, tr., Ibid., p. 26 (on the custom of cleansing after meals), p. 47 (on the custom of whether a lay-host allows his monk guests to take their food away or not), pp. 81-82 (on the funeral for a monk's secular parents or for

his religious masters), p. 99 (on the traditional way of following a master to enter the Order), p. 112 (on the sleeping facilities on the bed), pp. 112-3 (on the way of sitting or kneeling), p. 124 (on the problem of how to use a 'suare-kneed') and p. 185 (on the rule as to hair), etc.

119. Cf. Note 102.

120. KYSCL, pp. 568b-569a. CYHTSCML, p. 869. SKSC, pp. 710b-711a.

121. KYSCL, p. 569a-b. CYHTSCML. p.870, SKSC, p. 711a.

122. Idem. On the way of cleansing, see NHCKNFC, p. 207b-c, pp. 208c-209a and P. 218. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, pp. 26-27, pp. 30-35 and pp. 91-95. And on the straining of the drinking-water, see Ibid., p.208a-b and p.212.b. J. Takakusu, tr., Ibid., pp. 33-35 and p. 54.

123. See Chapter I, Section IV, Sub-Section E, Notes 383 to 394.

124. NHCKNFC, p. 206b. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, p.20.

125. J. Takakusu, Ibid., p. xxxviii.

126. See Chapter I, Section III, Note 431.

127. See Ibid., Section V, Notes 455-458.

128. See Idem. And see the further discussion in the final Chapter.

129. Mencius (flor. 371-309 B.C.) says that: "I have heard of men using the doctrines of our great land to change barbarians, but I have never yet heard of any being changed by the barbarians (Mêng-tzŭ, SSCCS, Vol. 8, p. 98b. James Legge, tr., The Works of Mencius, CC, Vol. 1-2, p. 253)". His words then became an important guide for the Chinese in resisting foreign influences, especially as to their way of life.

130. NHCKNFC, pp. 208c-209a. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, pp. 33-35.

131. Ibid., p.209a. Takakusu, tr., Ibid., p. 36.

132. Ibid., p.216b-c. Takakusu, tr., Ibid., pp. 81-82. Cf. Chapter I, Section I, Note 61.

133. The emotional ties between a Buddhist monk and his secular family in China are very close, both in the past and at present. This phenomenon will be discussed further in the next Chapter.

134. NHCKNFC, p. 218a-b. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, pp. 91-95.

135. Even the modern Chinese historian Fan Wên-lan (1892-1969) condemned I-ching for trying to persuade the Chinese monks ".....to become Indianized, even to the extent of persuading them to follow the strange and trifling procedures of the Indian way of going to stool. Indeed he (I-ching) has a servile complex (see his Chung-kuo T'ung-shih Chien-p'ien or 'A Simplified General Chinese History', Vol. III, No. 2, p. 576)".

136. NHCKNFC, p. 221a. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, p. 110.

137. Ibid., pp. 219c-220a. Takakusu, tr., Ibid., pp. 101-102.

138. Ibid., p. 226a. Takakusu, tr., Ibid., p. 145.

139. Ibid., p. 225a. Takakusu, tr., Ibid., p. 138.

140. Fan Wên-lan condemns the 'Dragon Decoction (Fan Wên-lan, p. 567)'. He also indicates that in China, there was also a 'Yellow Dragon Decoction' made out of human evacuations which was used as a panacea in some of the Chinese Buddhist monasteries from about the fourth to the sixth centuries (Ibid., p.588).

141. Hsiao-ching or 'Book of Filial Piety', SSCCS, Vol. 8, p. 11a.

142. Yüan-chao, A Guide to the Quotation, p. 390b. In China, the term 'T'ou-T'o (Dhūta)', on the other hand, also retains the original meaning of 'a monk who leads a harsh livelihood in order to get rid of the trials of life'. I have met such a T'ou-t'o in Hong Kong. This T'ou-t'o's name was Hsin-yüan (well-known as Yüeh-hsi, 1879-1965), and he was the ex-abbot of the Wan-fo Monastery in Shatin (a district of the New Territory of Hong Kong). Even though he was the leader of his monastery, this long haired T'ou-t'o lived a very simple and frugal life. He even shared the heavy labours of the workers by working with them during the construction of his monastery.

143. NHCKNFC, p. 229c-230a. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, p. 185.

144. Idem.

145. In the anti-Buddhist movements, the 'Foreign customs of cutting off the hair' was one of the usual pretexts for attacking Buddhism. For instance, in 621, the Taoist priest Fu Yi presented a memorial to the court in order to attack Buddhism on nationalistic, intellectual and economic grounds (Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p. 215). Emperor Kao-tsu of the T'ang Dynasty then issued an edict to ask the members of the Monastic Order: "What is the advantage that tempted all of you to abandon your hair and beards that are obtained from your parents, and to take off your clothes in secular styles that are regulated by the emperor in order to classify one's social position?" When this edict was circulated to him, the monk Fa-lin (571-639) was angry. Then he came to the court to defend. Fa-lin said: ".....in fact we are whole-heartedly grateful to the benevolence of our parents, even though our appearance looks spoiled by losing the hair and the beard that are bequeathed by them. Also, though it seems we disobey our emperor by wearing no secular clothes that are regulated by him, in fact we bear in mind his benevolent patronage to our Order (HKSC, pp. 636c-637a)." This story indicates how serious is the Chinese point of view regarding hair. An attack of this kind had also been made in the pre-T'ang periods. Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol. II, p. 35. Kenneth Ch'en, Ibid., p. 137.

146. Will be discussed further in Chapter V.

147. Cf. the discussion of Chapter I, Section V. Notes 435-437, and Note 468.

148. For instance, I can only find one quote from the NHCKNFC in Yüan-chao's A Guide to the Quotation (p. 414c), which was the leading disciplinary commentary in the post-T'ang period. In the version of the Ch'ing-keui that was revised in the Yüan (Mogol) Dynasty (T 2025), I can find only two quotations from I-ching's work (p. 1132 and p. 1139).

149. In browsing through Yüan-chao's work, I have found that yüan-chao adds many doctrinal discussions (for instance, the discussions of pp. 311a-349a) in order to enrich the contents of the Quotation.

150. In T. 1806, and Zokuzōkyō, Vol. 62, pp. 32-78.

151. In Zokuzōkyō, Vol. 61, pp. 267a-279a.

152. See Chapter I, Notes 119 to 544.

153. CSTCC, p. 7a & p. 97a. LTSPC, p. 59a. TTNTL, p. 230a. KYSCL, p. 409b.

154. See pp. 16c-24a, where there are fifteen tales which tell how the Buddha practised morality, such as refraining from adultery; refraining from killing ..... in his previous lives. As a result of these accumulated merits, he became a Buddha in this life.

155. In addition to the disciplinarians who are discussed in the previous Chapter and the former Section of this Chapter, we can also find many examples in the three 'Biographies of Eminent Buddhist Monks'. One tells of a monk who is simply mentioned as 'keeping the Śīla'. In order to save time and space, I will not give details of those monks here, unless the materials in their biographies or accounts are useful to the discussions in this Section.

156. In the KSC, we find Tao-ying (396-478) in p.401c, Hui-fên (407-485) in p.416c, Sêng-hou (412-500) in p.408c and Sêng-yu (444-518) in p. 402c. In the HKSC, we have An-lin (507-584) in p.480b, Ling-yü (519-605) in p.497a, Hui-tsang (522-605) in p.498c, Hung-tsung (530-608) in p. 621a, Chên-kuan (535-611) in p.702c, Hung-lin (died ca. 622 over eighty years of age) in pp. 578c-579a, Hui-chu (541-629) in p. 612c, Hsüan-wan (562-636) in p. 617b, Tao-liang (569-645) in p. 619b and Hui-p'u 579-658) in p.600a-b. In the SKSC, we came across Huai-su (624-697) in p. 792c, Chien-chên (687-763) in p. 797a-b, T'an-i (692-711) in p. 796, Ta-i (691-779) in p. 800b, Shên-hao (716-790) in p. 803a, Wên-chih (778-861) in p. 881c, Yün-wên (805-882) in p.808 and Wu-ên (912-986) in p. 752a, etc.

157 For instance, the monk Fa-hui (died ca. 500) of the State of Kao-ch'ang (Turfan) who practised both the Vinaya and the Dhyāna. Once, he was forced to drink some grape-wine in Kucha, and he got drunk. After his recovery from drunkenness, Fa-hui found that he had already broken the rule. Then he beat his body as a

punishment for his own transgression. As he thought that the beating was not punishment enough, he tried to commit suicide in order to redeem himself. Just at this very moment, he suddenly understood the Buddhist nature of truth and attained the Phala of the third degree. As his life came to an end some years later, he bent down four fingers in order to show the people that he had already attained the Phala of the fourth degree (Gyō-nen, Mei-sō-denShō or 'Materials Quoted from Pao-ch'ang's Ming-sêng Chuan [Biographies of the Famous Buddhist Monks]' in Zokuzōkyō, Vol. 134, p. 13a. For Pao-ch'ang's [flor. 495-515] Biography see HKSC, pp. 426b-427c.). Hui-fên (died ca. 563) used to give lectures on the SVSTVDV. After he had passed away, Hui-fên bent down one finger. The other people stretched this finger straight for him, but it bent down once again. Then people said that this was a proof that the monk had already attained the Phala of the first degree (HKSC, p. 651c) Chên-kuan (535-611) was a specialist on the SVSTVDV. He bent down three fingers of his right hand after he had died (Ibid., p. 703a). Yün-wên (805-882) always instructed his disciples that a Bhiksu would have to keep the Vinaya in order to find a short cut for attaining the Phala (SKSC, p. 808c). It indicates that the Chinese Buddhists believed that keeping the Vinaya is a way which leads to perfection.

158. For instance, Hui-yung (333-415) kept the Vinaya strictly and had the supernatural power to subdue a tiger. He believed that he was protected by a 'patron-saint of the Śīla' (KSC, p.326a-b). Fa-an, disciple of Master Hui-yüan (334-416), was faithful to the Vinaya. He had the same power as Hui-yung (Ibid., p. 362). When Tao-lin (437-509), the monk who kept the Vinaya, moved to a monastery which was previously haunted by demons and ghosts, these evil spirits went away (Ibid., p. 409a). Chih-hsien (flor. 616-618) who behaved himself strictly according to the Vinaya, had the power of making himself invisible and he had performed this power on an occasion of meeting a gang of Turkish bandits (HKSC, p. 664b). Disciplinarian Tao-hsing (593-659) had once been exorcised from a ghost. Then he conferred ordination on this ghost and instructed the ghost to take refuge in the Buddha, the Dharma and the Saṅgha (Ibid., p. 623b-c). Disciplinarian Ch'üan (n.d.) of the T'ang Dynastly, had the power of universal perception

in that he could know the thoughts of others. Ch'üan always gave prediction before an affair happened (SKSC, p. 796b), etc.

159. For instance, the monk Tao-hui (n.d.) was very aggressive and cruel. Only he ran away when he saw Disciplinarian Chih-hsin (539-618) coming from the opposite direction. People puzzled about this and they asked Tao-hui that, as he had never been scared of anybody, why should he be afraid of only this disciplinarian? Tao-hui replied: "He is as majestic as a king in our Buddhist circle, why should I not be afraid of him?" People continued to ask: "In our observation, Master Hui, your strong arms can defeat one hundred people like this disciplinarian, can't you?" Tao-hui replied: "Even if I were strong enough to fight one thousand people like this disciplinarian, all my power would disappear and my limbs would weaken if I saw him from afar. How could I still have a fight with him?" (HKSC, p. 613b). In other words, this Buddhist rogue was subdued by the disciplinarian's dignity of demeanour. Chih-hsin's noble character would have been cultivated by leading a strict life according to the rules of the Vinaya.

160. See Appendix. Table VIII. The other pardonable rules concerning 'No Killing' are listed in it as Rules 110, 111 and 133.

161. KSC, p. 404a. According to the Śīla, the sin of 'killing creatures on purpose' is recorded in Rule 110 and is a pardonable sin (see Appendix, Table VIII).

162. HKSC, p. 463b. According to the Śīla, the sins of 'watering the lawn even though one knows that insects live in the water', and 'to drink the water even though one knows that insects live in it', are recorded in Rules 68 and 111 (see Appendix, Table VIII).

163. Ibid., p. 569b. His account is appended to the Biography of Sêng-shan, his master.

164. Ibid., p. 591c.

165. SKSC, p. 787b.

166. Ibid., p. 870b-c.

167. Ibid., p.858b.

168. HKSC, p. 564a. Tao-hsüan says that he had asked the translators who came from the Western Regions, and learned that there was not a single priest in the above regions who wore silk. Even though the

silk-worm was raised in the States of Kucha and Khotan, people of these States just collected the cocoons that were bitten through by the moths (Ibid., p. 684b-c). Tao-hsüan also examined the robes of the above-mentioned translators and found that all were not silk products (Ibid., p. 564a). According to the Śīla, monks are not allowed to fill a mattress with wastes of a silk-worm's cocoon (see Appendix, Table VIII, Rule 133. Also see DMRGTV, pp. 613c-614a).

169. Ibid., p. 627b.

170. Ibid., p. 662a.

171. SKSC, p. 818a. Hsüan-t'ai was a monk of the T'ang Dynasty.

172. See DRMGTV, p. 607, p. 845a, pp. 845c-846a, p. 846b, p. 846c, p. 847c, p. 848a and 848b.

173. HKSC, p. 564a and p. 627b.

174. SKSC, pp. 875c-876a.

175. The words of this rule are quoted from the Pratimokṣa for Bhikṣus, p. 474b. It is because the verbal formulation here is more clear than in the Śīlas of the DRMGTV and of the MHSGKV. The former says that: "In the case of a Bhikṣu who destroys the village of the spirits or ghosts, he commits the sin of Pātaka (p. 1018b)", while the latter says that: "In the case of a Bhikṣu who spoils seeds or destroys the village of the ghosts, he commits the sin of Pātaka (p. 552b)". According to the DRMGTV, ghosts and spirits are adhering to the flora, therefore, woods and grass are their 'village' (p. 641c). I have consulted with Dr T. Rajapatirana, and he suggested that an error has been committed by the Chinese translators of these two Vinayas; for they probably rendered the term 'Bhūta' as meaning 'ghost' (see T.W. Rhys Davids and William Stede edit. The Pāli Text Society's Pàli-English Dictionary, p. 507b) and 'Gāma' as meaning a collection of houses' (see Ibid., p. 249a), whereas they should have understood the compound 'Bhūta-gāma', to mean, 'vegetation' (see Ibid., p. 507b). He thinks that the above-mentioned error would have occurred if the Chinese translators did not know the meaning of 'Bhūta-gāma' and interpreted the two words of this compound separately as 'Bhūta' and 'Gāma'. Such a misinterpretation would account for the phrases of 'village of the

spirits or ghosts' or 'the village of the ghosts' which appear in the Śīlas of the DRMGTV and the MHSGKV (Cf. Sakaki Ryōzaburō edit. Mahāvyutpatti, No. 8431).

176. Appendix, Table VIII. See also DRMGTV, p. 641c, p. 639b-c and p. 960a.

177. See Note 145 of the previous Section.

178. KHMC, p. 169c.

179. HKSC, p. 613a.

180. Ibid., p. 481c.

181. See Appendix, Table VIII.

182. DRMGTV, p. 962c.

183. See Note 41 of Section I, Chapter I.

184. See Notes 140 to 144 of Section II, Ibid.

185. SSCCS, Vol. I, pp. 206b-221a. J. Legge, tr., CC Vol.3, pp.399-412.

186. Ibid., p. 208a. Legge, tr., Ibid., p.406.

187. Ibid., p. 209a. Legge, tr., Ibid., p. 407.

188 See Note 194 of Section II, Chapter I.

189. Cf. Yu Chia-hsi, Yu's Works, Vol. I, pp.120-122. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, pp. 36-40.

190. HMC (T. 2102), p. 7a.

191. Cf. Note 188.

192. Idem.

193. See Note 157.

194. KSC, p. 416c.

195. HKSC, p. 647c-648a.

196. Ibid., p. 542a.

197. See Appendix, Table VIII. See Also DRMGTV, pp. 601-3, 605-6, 608b, 609b, 610a, 620-621, 624a-b, 626a, 629-631, 694c, 695a-b, 699a, 849b, 849c, 850, 855, 857a, 858b, 858c, 860b, 862c, 863a, 863c, 864a, 864c, 865b, 866b, and 878a.

198. See Section I, Note 69.

199. NHCKNFC, p. 214b. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, p. 67.

200. Ibid., p. 215a-b. Takakusu, tr., Ibid., pp. 72-73.

201. HKSC, p. 472c.

202. Ibid., p. 563a.

203. Ibid., p. 560b.

204. Ibid., p. 556c.

205. Ibid., p. 560b. His account is appended to the Biography of Hui-i.

206. KHMC, p. 236c.

207. Ibid., p. 237b.

208. DRMGTV, p. 603b and p. 850a. Cf. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, p. 56.

209. Ibid., p. 863a. Customarily, a Chinese monk speaks of himself as 'Lao-na (The aged man who wears a patched garment)' or 'Na-tzŭ (One who wears a patched garment)'. Both are derived from this.

210. HKSC, p. 465c.

211. Ibid., p. 607b.

212 Ibid., p. 558a-b.

213. Ibid., p. 572a,

214. Ibid. p. 577a.

215. Ibid. p. 696b.

216. Ibid., p. 593a.

217. SKSC, p. 808c.

218. Ibid., p. 796b.

219. Ibid., p. 889c.

220. Ibid., p. 897c.

221. See Appendix, Table VIII. Also see DRMGTV, p. 614b-c and p. 615.

222. KSC, p. 367b.

223. HKSC, p. 579b-c.

224. Ibid., p. 584b-c.

225. Ibid., p. 543c.

226. At the end of Kuan-ting's (561-632) four fascicled Kuo-ch'ing Pai-lu or 'One Hundred Notes on the Kuo-ch'ing Monastery (T.1934)', there is a Nien-p'u of Master Chih-i. The Nien-p'u says that Chih-i entered Mount T'ien-t'ai in 575 (p. 823b).

227. HKSC, p. 564c.

228. Ibid., p. 683c.

229. The Chinese Buddhist circles that I have gained access to are only those of Hong Kong, Singapore, Malaysia, Indonesia and Taiwan. In fact, most of the sitting materials are not mats but cushions. The Chinese Buddhists call it 'P'u-t'uan (Rush Cushion)'. The 'Pu-t'uan' is covered by the bark of the palm tree and rushes are stuffed inside.

230. See Appendix, Table VIII. See also DRMGTV, pp. 618-9. Naihsargikapātayantika is a sin than can be forgiven if a transgressor confesses his transgression and makes his restoration, and it cannot be forgiven if the man refuses to do so.

231. The reason for it will be discussed in the following Chapters.

232. HKSC, p. 486c.

233. Ibid., p. 575a. Why this lecturer made such a comment is due to the 'personal wealth' which became a tradition among the Chinese clergy (Cf. Note 67 of Section I, Chapter I).

234. HKSC., p. 486C.

235. Ibid., p. 636a.

236. Ibid., p. 698a.

237. See Appendix, Table VIII.

238. DRMGTV, p. 621c. SVSTVDV, p. 416a.

239. See Sections II, Notes 145 to 226 and III, Notes 241A to 342 of Chapter I.

240. SVSTVDV, p. 273c and p. 416a. In the latter page, the Vinaya also instructs that gold, silver, Vaidūrya, wood, stone, etc.; are not allowed as materials for making bowls. There is some instruction given on page 952a of the DRMGTV, but only the 'bronze' is excluded.

241. KSC, p. 329c and p. 346a. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Bio & Biblio.' Part I, pp. 473-474.

242. HKSC, p. 545c.

243. See Chapter I, Section III, Notes 252 to 320.

244. See Note 217.

245. HKSC, p. 613b.

246. See Appendix, Table VIII. See also DRMGTV, p. 659b-c, p. 660c, p. 789, pp. 932c-933c.

247. See Ibid., See also Ibid., pp. 654c-655a, p.660a, p. 662. The last page of this Vinaya indicates that one who eats just past noon has offended the rule. Cf. the previous Section, Notes 135.

248. See Chapter I, Section I, Note 55.

249. See Appendix, Table VIII.

250. HKSC, pp. 516c-517a.

251. Ibid., p.588c-589a.

252. Ibid., p. 589a.

253. This will be discussed in the following Chapters.

254. KSC, p. 408c.

255. HKSC, p. 534a.

256. Ibid., p. 680c.

257. SKSC, 759c. His account is appended to the Biography of Chü-fang (647-727).

258. Ibid., p. 874a.

259. Ibid., p. 759c.

260. DRMGTV, p. 872a. SVSTVDV, p. 190b and 265a. But, according to the former, the flesh of the living creatures listed below are note allowed to be eaten. Nāga. (p. 865b), elephant, horse, human, dog, poisonous insect or animal, lion, tiger, panther and bear (p. 1006a). Also see the latter, p. 186.

261. Wei Shou, Treatise, p. 1442b. Leon Hurvitz, tr., p. 60, Cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Ho-hsi', p. 154.

262. KSC, p. 417a.

262A. HKSC, p. 481a.

263. TTHYCFKSC, p. 3b.

264. Cf. Tzo Sze-bong 'Chung-kuo Fo-chiao Ch'iu-fa-shih Tsa-k'ao' or 'Desultory Notes on the Chinese Buddhist Pilgrims', Fokuang Hsüeh-pao (Fukuang Buddhist Journal), No.2, (Taiwan, 1977), p. 70-71.

265. DRMGTV, p. 657a and p. 660b. See also Appendix, Table VIII, Rule 89.

266. KSC, p. 381b.

267. HKSC, p. 513c.

268. See Appendix, Table VIII. See also DRMGTV, p. 669b, 670a and p. 671.

269. Cf. J.J.M. de Groot, 'Militant Spirit of the Buddhist Clergy in China', T'oung-pao, Vol. II, pp. 127-139, (1891, Leiden), Tso Sze-bong, 'Ho-hsi', p. 146.

270. HKSC, pp. 634c-635a.

271. TTTTÊTSTFSC, p. 253b. Arthur Waley's paraphrase, pp. 83-84.

272. See Appendix, Table VIII. See also DRMGTV, p. 672c, pp. 675c-676a and p. 890c.

273. HKSC, p. 626b.

274. Ibid. p. 620. His Biography says that he passed away at the end of the Chên-kuan Era (ca. 648-9) of the T'ang Dynasty aged seventy-seven.

275. Ibid., p. 619c.

276. Ibid., p. 446c.

277. SKSC, p. 811a.

278. See Appendix, Table VIII.

279. HKSC, p. 610c.

280. Ibid., p. 591a.

281. DRMGTV, pp. 830b, 831a, 832a, 832c, 832c-833a, 833a, 833b-c, 834, 835a, and 835b-c.

282. Tao-hsüan, Quotation, pp. 38a-42b.

283. NHCKNFC, p. 206c, and p. 217a-b. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, p. 21 and pp. 85-86.

284. Fa-hsien, p. 857a. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Ho-hsi', pp. 134-136.

285. HKSC, p. 575a.

286. SKSC, p. 799b.

287. NHCKNFC, pp. 207c-208a. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, pp. 27- 30.

288. See Notes 44 and 45 of Section I, Chapter I.

289. HKSC, p. 688b.

290. Cf. SKSC, p. 890b-c.

291. See previous Section, Note 21.

292. Fang-wang Ching, p. 1005b.

293. KSC, p. 408c.

294. HKSC, p. 465c.

295. Ibid., p. 465a.

296. Ibid., p. 486b.

296A. 'Mou' is a Chinese land-measure of area. One Mou is roughly equivalent to one sixth of an acre.

297. HKSC, p. 478a.

298. SKSC, p. 890b-c.

299. See Appendix, Table VIII.

300. For instance, in the DRMGTV, pp. 570b, 571c, 572a, 585c, 579, 580b, 581b, 582a, 582c, 596c, 600b, 601a, 607a-b, 614b-c, 629-630, 638a, 640a-b, 666, 667, 683c, 689a-b, 895, 955a-b, 961b, 962a, 973a-975b, 985c, 986, 986, 987, 988, 990a, 996a, 1004a, 1005a, 1007b and 1010c all discuss the different circumstances of 'Adultery' and the degrees of their sins. The discussions in pp. 928b, 928c, 929c and 930a relate only to the nuns.

301. NHCKNFC, p. 211c. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, p. 51.

302. Lun-yü, SSCCS, Vol. 8, p. 80a and p. 139a. J. Legge, tr., Confucian Analects, CC, Vol. 1-2, p. 222 and p. 298.

303. Mên-tzŭ, SSCCS, Vol. 8, p. 134b. J. Legge, tr., The Works of Mencius, CC, Vol. 1-2, p. 307.

304. Idem.

305. Idem.

306. DRMGTV, p. 987a.

307. Ssŭ-ma Ch'ien (145?-90? B.C.), Shih-chi or 'Records of the Grand Historian', Vol. 1, p. 128a.

308. See Ku Yen-wu (1613-1682) Jih-chih Lu (Notes from Daily Studies), F.13, p.2. Chang Yin-lin (1905-1942), Chung-kuo Shih-kang (An Outline of Chinese history), p. 160. Fan Wên-lan, Vol. 2, p. 16. Ch'ien Mu, Kuo-shih Ta-kang (An Outline to the History of My Nation), Vol. I, p. 87.

309. HKSC, p. 559c.

310. Ibid., p. 479b.

311. Ibid., p. 279c.

312. Ibid., p. 583c.

313. Ibid., p. 605.

314. Ibid., p. 696a.

315. SKSC, p. 885a.

316. Ibid., p. 897a.

317. Ibid., p. 884c. His Subordinate Biography is appended to the Biography of Tsun-hui.

318. DRMGTV, p. 607a-b.

319. Ibid., p. 618a-b.

320. Ibid., p. 651.

321. Ibid., pp. 695c-696a.

322. Ibid., p. 649c.

323. Ibid., p. 651c-652a.

324. Ibid., p. 652b-c.

325. Ibid., p. 652c-653a.

326. Ibid., p. 923b.

327. Ibid., p. 649a.

328. Ibid., p. 923a-b.

329. Ibid., p. 1006b and pp. 1008c-1009a.

330. Ibid., p. 1007a.

331. Will be discussed further in the following Chapters.

332. KSC, p. 351a-b.

333. SKSC, p. 479a-b.

334. Ibid., p.873b. Kuang-i's whole story is very touching. I have translated his Biography into English and published it in Nan-yang Fo chiao, No.116, pp.33-35. In order to save time and space, I will not quote my whole translation in this Section.

335. SKSC, p. 896a. As the whole story happened at the time when Commissioner Liu Jen-kung was still in power, I think that the above-mentioned date is not correct. According to Ou-yang Hsiu (1007-1072) and Sung Ch'i (Died ca. 1038), Hsin T'ang Shu, or 'The New History of the T'ang Dynasty', Liu occupied Yu-chou in 844 (Vol. 1, p. 146a and Vol. 5, p. 2412a). In 907, Liu was imprisoned by his second son Liu Shou-kuang (+914) after a coup d'etat brought about by the latter (Ibid., Vol. 1, p. 151c). If Liu Jen-kung met this beauty in her fifteenth year, it would probably have been around 920-1. As Liu was killed in 914 (Ssŭ-ma Kuang, Chronicle, p. 8782), he would not have met the beauty in her fifteenth year in the above mentioned date. Therefore, I think that the year when Wang-ming adopted this female infant would be around 890-3.

336. SKSC, p. 896a.

337. Idem.

338. See Appendix, Table VIII. See also DRMGTV, p. 600b and p. 667.

339. See Idem. See also Ibid., p. 601a and 667.

340. See Idem. See also Ibid., p. 638a.

341. See Idem. See also Ibid., p. 987b.

342. See Idem. See also Ibid., p. 640a-b.

343. See Idem. See also Ibid., p. 990a.

CHAPTER III

Buddhist Priests Who Strayed From the Vinaya - Internal Factors -

Even though in the previous Chapter I have already found many examples of how the Chinese Buddhist monks practised the rules of the Śīla or how theyfollowed the instructions of the Vinaya in order to protect their faithfulness to the religion,[1] more examples showing how the priests strayed from the Vinaya are to be discovered in both Buddhist and non-Buddhist records. The KSC records a conversation between the Indian monk Jīvaka (flor. 305-6) and the Chinese monk Chu Fa-hsing (n.d.). Their conversation came to the conclusion that even though an eight year old novice could know how to say that one must discipline one's own morality by doing good deeds and keeping from evil, it was probable that a Buddhist monk who had already reached the venerable age of one hundred years would not have observed the above instruction strictly throughout his career.[2] The above conversation indicates that even an Indian monk recognised that the regulations of the Vinaya cannot be faithfully observed by every Buddhist priest. Due to the cultural and environmental background, the Vinaya in China was found to be more difficult to put into practice than in India. Before his death in 697 Huai-su told his disciples: "I failed in practising the Vinaya for I have not observed so many rules....".[3] As Huai-su was the author of the New Interpretation, one of the important commentaries to the DRMGTV,[4] this indicates the fact that many of the Vinaya rules were not suitable for priests in a Chinese environment.

This Chapter will discuss from the cultural point of view why the Chinese priests would have strayed from the Vinaya. As Chinese Buddhism

is Mahāyāna and the Vinaya derives from the Hīnayāna tradition, I will consider why some of the Chinese Mahāyānists felt contempt for the Vinaya.

I. The Conflict Between the Cultures of India and China

T'ang Yung-t'ung says that the acceptance of Buddhism in China has been fought as a cultural battle. From conflict it turned into the harmonisation of the cultures of India and China.[5] In this Section I would like to give an account of the cultural differences that relate to the above-mentioned conflict which in turn points to the difficulties of operating the Vinaya in China.

(A) The Relationship between Priest and Prince

According to Tripiṭaka Master I-ching's observation, in India the names of the priests were registered in the records of the monasteries where they lived,[6] but had no concern with the register of the state.[7] Therefore, he condemned the situation of "....the ordinary officials [who] have a special sitting at the court, and all the priests concerned in the matter attend there in a row, shouting and disputing, or cheating and despising one another, just like ordinary people" in China.[8] The different attitudes of these two nations toward the Buddhist priests relates to the different cultural backgrounds.

In India, the Buddhist priests recognised no distinction of caste within its own ranks,[9] and they also considered that monks were not of this world, hence, not bound by the ties that bind a layman to society.[10] The Indian kings, at the same time, seem to have looked upon the Buddhist monks as another species of 'holy men' rather like the Brahmins, and to have treated them accordingly.[11] In China, on the other hand, the Chinese society regarded itself not merely as one nation inhabiting one plot of

earth and living by one set of manners. It regarded itself as the only civilized society on earth, the only one living by a set of rules that matched the Macrocosmic Order. The Chinese emperor, according to the same view, was not merely a chief of state among chiefs of states, but the Vicar of Heaven on Earth, the rightful source of all temporal authority.[12] Therefore, everyone was his subject and no person, including the Buddhist priests, might be exempted from paying respect and homage to him.[13] Emperor Hsüan-tsung of the T'ang Dynasty issued an edict in 731 in order to instruct that ".... from now on, monks and nuns should have to obey the secular regulation by not wandering around after midnight. Whoever disobeys this will be expelled from the Order..."[14] Besides, in an undated edict issued in the Tai-ho Era (827-835) of Emperor Wên-tsung (R. 827-840) of the same dynasty, there is a paragraph which reads: ".... recently there have been issued regulations for prohibiting monks and nuns from wandering around after midnight. For these black-robed priests are not different from the other plebeians...."[15] These two edicts show clearly the Chinese emperor's point of view on the Buddhist priests. Therefore, the emperors frequently required the priests to observe the civil etiquette, i.e. to salute them, their officials and the priests' own parents. According to Yen-chung's (flor. 648-662)[16] Chi Sha-men Pu-ying Pai-su Teng-shih or 'Collection of Essays Concerning the Debates on the Issues that Śramaṇas should not Salute to the Laymen and the Like (T. 2108)', such instructions had been issued in 330,[17] in 402,[18], about 412,[19] in 609[20] and in 662.[21] The Buddhist priests, on the other hand, considered that as they sought to extricate themselves from the vicious circle of life-and-death, there is no reason for them to be grateful to the life-givers (Heaven and its Vicar). Therefor, the priests are not obliged to bow down before the sovereign.[22] In order to resist the emperors' order, the Chinese monks and their lay-supporters wrote essays to defend themselves.[23]

As Master Tao-an had indicated, the Dharma enterprise could not be established without the protection of the prince.[24] Even though the Chinese priests tried their best to resist the above-mentioned imperial order, they were in fact under the rules of the officially appointed 'Controller of the Buddhist Priests' since 405.[25] In other words, they had already accepted the sovereign power of the Chinese emperor. Their resistance was only a spiritual battle in order to show that they were still not of this world. Unfortunately, this battle was finally lost completely. According to the TSSSL, from the third century to the sixth century A.D., a Chinese priest designated himself as 'P'in-tao (the poor priest)' or mentioned his own religious name to the ruler when granted an audience or when writing to the latter.[26] From the seventh century to the first half of the eighth century, a priest designated himself as 'Śramaṇa so and so' in these circumstances.[27] After 760, a priest began to designate himself as 'Ch'ên (your subject)' to the emperor.[28] And Tsan-ning, author of the TSSSL, designated himself as 'your subject' to Emperor T'ai-tsung (R. 977-997) of the Sung Dynasty when he submitted his SKSC to the latter in 988.[29] From the changes in designating themselves, one can see that the Chinese priests finally gave up their spiritual weapon and surrendered themselves to the sovereign. Of course, it reflects the fact that the sovereignty of the Chinese emperor invested in him by the Chinese tradition overwhelmed the transplanted foreign religion.[30] In my opinion, one of the reasons why the Chinese priests finally recognised themselves as the 'subjects' of the emperor was related to the Confucian curriculum that they received in their Śramaṇerahood.[31] The Confucian norms they learned from that curriculum reminded them of the sovereignty of the emperor in China.

(B) The Problem of Taking One Meal a Day

According to the Vinaya, a priest is allowed to take only one meal a day before noon.[32] In a tropical area like India, it is possible because the people living there do not need so many calories to survive. As China is located in a Northern Temperate Zone, the priests living there, especially in the Yellow River Valley, found it difficult to observe this rule, for more calories are needed in the winter. For instance, Li Tao-yüan's (+ 527) Shui-ching Chu or 'The Commentary to the Book of Waters' records that in the Valley of the P'ao-ch'iu River (present Ch'ao River, near Peking), there was the Kuan-chi Monastery in the Kuan-chi Mountain. In that monastery, a tall and wide hall was built and it would accommodate one thousand monks. The structure of this great hall was as follows: The whole foundation, including the plastered ground of the hall, was paved with slabs of stone. In the foundation there were many tunnels scattered like the branches of a tree or the veins of a leaf and the exits of these tunnels were all designed like stoves. When all those stoves were lighted, the hot air flowed in and remained in the tunnels, so it made the whole great hall warm up. The design, mentioned above, was due to the fact that the weather of this mountain was very cold, while the monks' physiques were not so strong and their financial condition was not easy. In such circumstances, the sponsors of this monastery were afraid that the monks could not perform their Buddhist practices because they were suffering from frost. Therefore, the sponsors reconstructed the building in this way in order to keep the monks from suffering.[33] The above-mentioned fantastic installations reflect the fact that people living in the Yellow River Valley needed more calories to survive.

According to the Vinaya, the priests are allowed to eat 'clean meat'.[34] If the Chinese priests would take this as an alternative in

order to gain more calories, they would probably be free from frost. As the Chinese monks regarded themselves as Mahāyānists,[35] the followed the tradition of Mahāyāna monks by insisting on vegetarianism.[36] Nevertheless, in the afternoon, some of the monks took, on their own authority, a concoction of apricots or dates, and the thick fluid of fruit. Or they took the wine that had simmered with the powder made out of 'Ou (the root-stock of lotus)'; or rice, or dry-foxglove; or Chinese Root (a fungus-like substance found on the root of fir), in order to satisfy their hunger.[37] Tao-hsüan ridiculed these practices by saying: "Why don't they just eat rice directly?"[38] In my opinion, one of the reasons why the Ch'ing-kuei was welcomed by the Chinese clergy is due to the fact that it allows the priests to take two meals a day.[39]

(C) The Problem of Begging for Survival

According to the Vinaya, the collecting of alms is the only way for the priests to survive.[40] In case a lay donor has done something harmful to the Bhikṣus,[41] the Monastic Order should despatch a monk as their representative to ask that donor to come out of his door. Then the Bhikṣu would put a begging bowl on the ground, turn it upside down in front of this donor and tell him that the Bhikṣus will never talk to him and come to collect his alms again.[42] When that donor comes to the Order to confess his evil and promises that he will listen to the Bhikṣus without any defiance thereafter, the Order resumes communication with him and once again accepts the man's alms.[43] As the Indian society viewed the Buddhist Bhikṣus as one of the species of 'holy men'[44] and they desired to have their blessing,[45] a lay donor would probably come to the Order to make a confession for his evil behaviour toward the Bhikṣus if he had received the said ultimatum. This shows that to invite holy men to come to collect alms and so gain their blessing is a tradition of Indian society. The monks happily survived in this way.

In China, on the other hand, people traditionally looked down on beggars. For instance, the Li-chi or 'Treatises on the Ritual' records an account concerning a conflict between a rich man and a starveling. The account tells that during the period of Spring and Autumn (722-481 B.C.), the State of Ch'i once suffered from famine and a rich man named Ch'ien-ao prepared food at the roadside to feed the starvelings. As he saw a starveling embarrassedly approaching, Ch'ien-ao held food and drink in his hand and yelled: "Hey you! Come here and eat!" The starveling replied with a keen glance and said: "You know something? Why I remain starving is because I would never accept any invitation that invited me by yelling!" Then Ch'ien-ao apologised to the man and courteously invited him once again, but the starveling still refused to accept Ch'ien-ao's invitation even when he was dying from hunger.[46] Why would this starveling have been so upset and so stubborn? In my opinion he probably thought that he had been despised as a professional beggar by the rich man. Therefore he refused to eat Ch'ien-ao's food in order to defend his own dignity. Again, Mencius tells a fable in his work that in the above-mentioned state, there was a professional beggar who kept a wife and a concubine. He told his women that all his friends were wealthy and honourable people. Finally his wife discovered the beggar's real identity and ran home to inform the concubine, they wept together for their marital destiny.[47] This fable shows that Mencius viewed the begging career with contempt. Moreover, Ssŭ-ma Ch'ien's Shih-chi says that when Han Hsin (+ 197 B.C.), the most meritorious military general during the establishment of the Han Dynasty between 206 and 202 B.C., was young and unemployed, he met some old women at the riverside who were washing coarse silk to bleach. One of the old women noticed that Han Hsin was almost starved and she fed him, and continued to do so for twenty or thirty days until the bleaching was

finished. Han Hsin was very grateful and told the old woman that he would pay her back handsomely some day. But the old woman was offended and replied: "I can tell you that as you are a man and found no way of getting food for yourself, young gentleman, I felt sorry for you and gave you something to eat. What makes you think I was looking for any reward?"[48] The old woman's words reflect a Chinese point of view that a man should have to stand on his own feet to survive. The society would feel contempt for one who led a beggar's parasitic life.[49]

Since Buddhism was introduced into China, the Chinese laymen believed that giving alms in order to support the priests' livelihood was a way of accumulating one's religious merits for salvation.[50] But as mentioned above, a secular donor would not tolerate that a monk whom he paid respect to would come to his door and collect alms every day as a beggar. Therefore, this donor would make his donation in the form of an amount of money or some farming land to an individual priest or even to the Monastic Order, in order to let the priests have some property as their financial source of survival. The economic structure of a monastery in China was therefore different from that in India.[51] Besides, in every Chinese monastery, there is a permanent kitchen prepared for its members.[52] In my observation, this phenomenon is related to two factors. Firstly, according to the above discussion, most of the Chinese priests would feel embarrassed to go out begging for food in a Chinese milieu.[53] Secondly, some of the Indian Mahāyānists were not going to collect alms every day. For instance, when he was a nine to twelve year old Śrāmaṇera (352-355), Kumārajīva was respected by the king of Kashmir and the latter offered him first-class vegetarian food every day.[54] When Tripiṭaka Master Hsüan-tsang entered Nālandā around 633, he learned that the king had remitted the revenues of about one hundred villages for the endowment of this

monastery. Two hundred householders in each of these villages, day by day, contributed several hundred piculs of rice, and several hundred catties in weight of butter and milk. Therefore, no one among the members of this monastery ever went out to beg.[65] As the Chinese priests recognised themselves as Mahāyānists,[56] they preferred not to go to collect alms.[57]

(D) The Problem of No Involvement in Physical Labour

The Vinaya has several contradictory instructions for the Bhikṣus. For instance, it allows the Bhikṣus to cultivate fruits and vegetables for their own supplies, but does not allow them to carry and to wash the vegetables,[58] or to pick up by their own hands fruits that have already fallen on the ground.[59] The Bhikṣus are also not allowed to keep instruments for plowing the land.[60] Again, in building a house in the monastery, the Bhikṣus are allowed to remove the timbers and rocks for the construction by carrying them on their backs,[61] or to dig out the trees or rocks; to fill up the ditches with soil that is found in the foundation prepared for the house.[62] But they are not allowed to dig the ground if there are none of the above-mentioned obstacles,[63] or to chop down trees in order to collect timber for building.[64]

In my opinion, the above-mentioned contradictory instructions reflect the fact that Bhikṣus are not allowed to involve themselves in the heavy labour of cultivation, like plowing the land; or of house-building like digging the ground and collecting materials for the construction. But growing vegetables, or occasionally cleaning up obstacles in a building site are not regarded as heavy labour. The Vinaya also says that to carry and then to wash vegetables or to pick up fruits for the monks, are part of the jobs for the lay attendants of the monastery.[65] Probably the Vinaya made such arrangements as a way of maintaining the dignity of the priests. As 'begging for survival' was a basic tradition of Buddhist

priests (the Sanskrit term 'Bhikṣu' simply means 'beggar'), and they were regarded as 'another species of holy men' in India,[66] I believe that the Vinaya prohibits the Bhikṣus from involving themselves in heavy labour in order to differentiate them from laymen. If the lay donors learnt that the monks were cultivating their own grain, they would probably no longer recognise the priests as holy men and offer them no alms.

In China, the situation was very different. As I have already discussed in the previous sub-section, the Chinese society traditionally looked down on the beggars' parasitic career. Besides, the Chinese priests had been strongly influenced by the Confucian norms.[67] Therefore, some of the Chinese monks preferred to participate in productive activities in order to show that they were not parasites:

(1) Agricultural Involvements: T'an-hsün (515-599) cultivated vegetables in the valley where he practised Dhyāna.[68] Since he moved to the mountain in 795, the Ch'an Master P'u-yüan (748-834) chopped down trees in order to collect materials for establishing his shrine, and to claim enough farming lands. After that he pastured a cow in order to use it for his cultivation. As the grains that he planted afforded his survival, P'u-yüan had never gone down from his solitary place for thirty years.[69] In 817, Hui-p'u (+ 849) began to farm in Ch'i-chou (present Ch'i-ch'un City of Hupeh Province) in order to sustain himself. He pursued his agricultural career for thirty years and won the respect of the people, including the Confucian scholars, of his prefecture.[70] Kuo-tao-chê, a monk of the Later Liang Dynasty (907-923), grew vegetables in Mount Lu.[71] As I have mentioned before, the Vinaya permits the monks to raise vegetables, but does not allow them to cultivate grains,[72] so P'u-yüan and Hui-p'u had broken the rules of the Vinaya. But T'an-hsüan and Kuo-tao-chê had not strayed. Since Hui-p'u won respect from the Confucianists of

Ch'i-chou, it indicates that Hui-p'u's activity had gratified them.

(2) House Building Involvements: After the Sui Dynasty was established in 581, Sêng-hsin (flor. 574-607) went to Ch'ang-an and lived in the Ta-hsing-shan Monastery. If there was any construction or repair to be made in this monastery, Sêng-hsin was always the first one among the monk-members to come to participate in the heavy labours like transporting materials with a carrying pole, etc.[73] In the year 597, Chu-li (544-623) was appointed abbot of the Ch'ang-lo Monastery in Chiang-tu City. After taking up his appointment, Chu-li led two hundred fellow-monks of his monastery to march to Yü-chang Prefecture (present Nan-ch'ang City of Kiangsi Province) to chop trees in the mountain area there, in order to collect timbers for the enlargement of his monastery.[74] Since Emperor Hsüan-tsung (R. 847-859) who ascended the throne in 874, and cancelled the policy of suppressing Buddhism by Emperor Wu-tsung (R. 841-846) in 845, Jih-ch'ao (died ca. 866) and his sixty monk-disciples came out from the mountain where they were in hiding and went back to Mount Hêng (both in Hunan Province). They collected wood with their own hands in order to rebuild their shrine upon the old foundation, and they lived there for fifteen years.[75] As I have mentioned before, the Vinaya allows the monks to remove the materials for construction by carrying them on their backs,[76] but does not permit them to chop down trees for timber.[77] Therefore, Sêng-hsin had not strayed from the Vinaya, but Chu-li and Jih-ch'ao had. But both the authors of HKSC and SKSC did not condemn the latter two's behaviour, hinting that Tao-hsüan and Tsan-ning were conniving for what they had done.

(3) Other Labouring Involvements: Fa-chün (519-603) was very enthusiastic in helping people. He understood that during the rainy season in autumn people felt bored to work in wet weather. Therefore, he took off his robe and disguised as a layman, went to the market in order to

share the labour of the workers. When he finished his work and was being paid, Fa-ch'un either accepted nothing or he would hand his payment to the poor people in order to help them financially. Sometimes, he collected the robes of monks or laymen, then patched and washed them secretly. Occasionally, he even went to cleanse the public lavatory and transported the excrements out with his carrying pole. If there was someone who recognised him at the scene of work, Fa-ch'un would say to that man: "If you think that this is good for the public, then come and join me!" In his own monastery, Fa-ch'un was always chopping firewood or drawing water for his fellow-monks. In case there were holes or ditches to be found on the road built by the government, Fa-ch'un voluntarily came forward to fill them up. Therefore, people were moved and came to participate in his activity of repairing roads.[78] After he had been ordained for some days, Shên-hsiu (+ 706) met the Ch'an Master Hung-jên (the Fifth Patriarch of the Ch'an School, 602-675) and followed the latter to learn meditation. In Hung-jên's monastery in Ch'i-chou, Shên-hsiu had taken up the duties of collecting firewood and drawing water for the fellow-monks of this monastery.[79] Since he went to Pañcaśīrṣa (or Wu-t'ai Shan, a mountain located near the north-eastern border of Shansi Province) in 791, Wu-jan (died ca. 838) collected firewood for the monasteries of this mountain in the winter for twenty years.[80] Sêng-tsang (n.d.), of the T'ang Dynasty, always came to share the labours of the lay attendants in his monastery. If he found someone's robe was dirty, secretly Sêng-tsang washed it and then patched it up for that person.[81]

According to the Vinaya, monks are allowed only to patch their own robes,[82] but never mention that they are allowed to do the same thing for others. The above-mentioned labours undertaken by Fa-ch'un and others are not recorded in the Buddhist discipline. As Confucius says: "To see what is right and to do it is want of courage",[83] probably the above

monks considered that to serve the people in different labours was 'right' and with 'courage' they strayed from the Vinaya. As Fa-ch'un was successfully disguised as a layman and mingled with the workers, I believe that he kept his hair as a 'T'ou-t'o'[84] after entering the Order.

Gradually, the monk-members of a Chinese monastery would be told to share in labours for the monastery. For instance, when he was in Mount Hêng, Ming-tsan (flor. 742-3) participated in no labour among the labours assigned to the monks by the establishment there. Even though the other monks condemned him or even scolded him, he still did not care. Therefore, the monks called him "Lazy Tsan".[85] After 726, Tao-i (flor. 726-766) was told by the verger[86] of the Ch'ing-liang Monastery of Wu-t'ai Shan to take up the duty of transporting firewood by carrying them to a height. As Tao-i found that his physique could not sustain it, he hired someone to carry the firewood on the two ends of a carrying pole for him.[87] These examples show that whether he willingly did it or not, a monk-member of a monastery should have to share in the work of his institution.

(E) The Different Ways of Making a Donation

This problem will be discussed further in Section III of this Chapter.

II. The Influence of Chinese Tradition on the Individual Priest

As the Chinese priests were living in China and fulfilling their missions in a Chinese cultural milieu, the influence of the Chinese tradition on the priests would be a compelling reason why many of them would stray from the Vinaya. In this situation, the curricula for the novices that was given by the monasteries in the early period played an important role.

With regard to the curriculum for novices, one could possibly think that they must have consisted of some essays on Buddhism or some easily learnt scriptures. But in the early period, the Buddhist novices received a training in the Confucian classics before they learned the Buddhist scriptures. For instance, T'an-hui (323-395) followed Master Tao-an in his twelfth year. As Tao-an found that his disciple was very clever, he gave him lectures on the Confucian classics and histories for some years. It was not until T'an-hui reached the age of sixteen, that he was allowed to shave his hair and begin to learn Buddhism.[88] Tao-yung, a contemporary of Kumārajīva, entered the Order in his twelfth year. As his master discovered his cleverness, he told him to go and borrow a copy of the Lun-yü (Confucian Analects) from a village in order to use it as a textbook to teach him. When Tao-yung returned, he told his master that he did not bring the book with him for he had already recited it all in the village. Then his master came to the village for the text, brought it back and, holding the text, told Tao-yung to recite it by memory. As Tao-yung did not miss even one word in his recitation, his master knew that his disciple's word was true.[89] Sêng-min (467-527) followed Sêng-hui (n.d.) to enter the Order in his seventh year. Sêng-hui taught him the Five Confucian Classics (i.e. the Book of Odes, Book of Documents, Book of Changes, Book of Ritual and Annals of Spring and Autumn) in the first place.[90] Hai-shun (589-618) followed Tao-sun (556-630), a famous monk-scholar of Confucian studies,[91] and entered the Order in his fifteenth year.[92] Tao-sun taught Hai-shun the Book of Ritual[93] in the day-time, and coached him in the Buddhist scriptures in the evening.[94] The Tripiṭaka Master I-ching followed Master Shan-yü (584-646)[95] as a novice in his seventh year.[96] Before Shan-yü passed away, he told all his disciples: "When you have done a rough study of the Chinese classics and history, and have acquired a vague knowledge of the characters, you should turn

your attention to the Excellent Buddhist Canon. You must not let this snare prove too great an attraction."[97] Then I-ching laid aside his study of secular literature and began to devote himself to the sacred scriptures.[98] This passage indicates that before his twelfth year, I-ching had been under Shan-yü's supervision in studying the secular learnings for six years.

Besides the above-mentioned examples, many others of learned monks becoming well-versed in secular scholarship after having entered the Order, can be found in the KSC, the HKSC and the SKSC. I have already listed all of them, including the monks given in the above examples, in Table V which is appended to this thesis (I extracted from this table the above examples because evidently these monks received courses on secular knowledge when they were novices).

The Chinese establishments had to prepare such curricula for the novices because Chinese 'Gentry Buddhism' was gradually formed at the very end of the third and the beginning of the fourth centuries,[99] when the Chinese priests had to mingle with the well-educated gentry in order to entice them to enter the door of Buddhism and to win their support for the religion. Therefore, it would be very helpful if a priest could fluently discuss the Confucian classics, or other Chinese philosophies and literature with the gentry. For instance, Chih-hsin (446-506) entered the Order in his twelfth year. As he was well-versed in secular learning and took notice of the news of the day, his sermons were welcomed by the people and they respected his scholarship.[100] As both Ling-yü's (518-605) inner (i.e. Buddhist) and secular learnings were excellent, people of Yeh used to say: "Master Yü subdues both the priests and the laymen".[101] Li-shên (died ca. 605-6) was very able in literary writing and in debating, so his sermons became very popular.[102] After entering the Order in his teens, Shên-ch'iung (566-630) studied both the Tripiṭaka

and Chinese philosophy. He also studied secular history and literature. Therefore, Shên-ch'iung could discuss with the intellectuals both Confucianism and Buddhism.[103] Ling-i (728-762) entered the Order in his ninth year. He studied literature because he wanted to gain access to the intellectuals in order to win them over to Buddhism.[104] In his sermons, Hêng-ch'ao (887-949) always quoted from the Chinese philosophies or histories, comparing them with Buddhist doctrines, in order to help his audiences understand Buddhism. If someone in the audience asked him a question, Hêng-ch'ao immediately answered with a poem, and this improvisation was so much to the point that it won the admiration of all his audiences.[105]

As the secular learnings were so useful in assisting the promulgation of Buddhism, the Buddhist pioneers in the embryonic period even found their own way to learn them before the above-mentioned curricula were established. For instance, K'ang Sêng-hui entered the Order in about his tenth year. He read the Chinese classics by himself and was versed in Chinese literature. Therefore, K'ang Sêng-hui came to be known to King Sun Ch'üan (R. 223-251) of the Wu State by his fame for Chinese scholarship, and was appointed one of the tutors to the crown prince.[106] Dharmarakṣa entered the Order in his eighth year. After having learned the Buddhist scriptures, he wandered around following Confucian scholars in order to learn the secular classics. Even though other monks criticised his behaviour, Dharmarakṣa did not care.[107] Therefore, one can well understand why the Chinese Order prepared some curricula of secular studies for the novice. Only those who had received a secular education before entering the Order were given the Buddhist courses immediately after they were enrobed. Master Tao-an was a good example.[108]

The above-mentioned curriculum would have been encouraged by the SVSTVDV. This Vinaya says that when the Buddha was in Śrāvastī, his

Bhikṣus began to stray from the Buddhist scriptures and planned to study non-Buddhist literature, such as the Brāhmaṇa scriptures, literary works and technical treatises. Therefore, the Buddha made a new rule that if a monk read the above-mentioned works, he would commit the sin of Duskṛta. After this rule was legitimated, the chief disciples Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana stopped teaching those works to the newly ordained Bhikṣus or Śrāmaṇeras. When the Brahmins heard this news, they came to see the lay-donors of the Buddhists and asked them to go together to visit the Buddhist Bhikṣus. Then, in front of the donors, the Brahmins asked the newly ordained Bhikṣus questions on Brāhmaṇism in order to start a debate. As these Bhikṣus knew nothing about the doctrines of their rivals, they could not reply with even one word. The Brahmins ridiculed the Buddhist donors: "How come? These masters that you are paying respect to and feeding cordially, are so useless!" Of course these donors were very upset and they reported all this to the Buddha. Therefore, the Buddha cancelled the above rule and said: "From now on, in order to defeat the heretics in debate, Bhikṣus are allowed to study non-Buddhist works."[109] As the popularity of the SVSTVDV was earlier than that of the DRMGTV,[110] the former easily exercised a great influence upon the Chinese establishments. The reason why Dharmarakṣa was criticised by his contemporaries was due to the fact that the SVSTVDV had not yet been introduced into China in that time.

Moreover, the above-mentioned three 'Biographies' also record many monks who had already received a Confucian education, or who had even already become cultivated scholars,[111] before entering the Order. I have also listed them in Table IV and appended it to this thesis. Probably this was the reason why the Chinese Monastic Order could find enough teaching staff from among its own members to teach the novices secular learning. As the knowledge that those monks brought with them from the

secular world was so useful in assisting their mission of promulgating Buddhism, they would have had to keep on practising them or even had to have found a way to advance them after entering the Order. For instance, Master Tao-an went to school in his seventh year and then entered the Order in his twelfth year.[112] After he had reached the age of forty-five years (i.e. 358), Tao-an was well-versed in secular learning. Therefore, he won the admiration and respect of the famous historian Hsi Tso-ch'ih (n.d.).[113] In particular, Tao-an was specialised in literature and archaeology. For this reason, not only did the young poets in Ch'ang-an attach themselves to him in order to gain his praise, but also the governmental scholars of the Former Ch'in State (351-394) used to come to question him about some academic problems.[114] One can see that Tao-an's versatility was probably based on the knowledge that he received in his childhood, and which was improved after he became a member of the Order.

As there were so many Buddhist monks who had received Confucian scholarship before or after entering the Order, they would have also been influenced by the basic Confucian ideas, such as showing loyalty to one's ruler, being filial to one's parents and that one should survive by hard work, etc. As I have already discussed in the previous Section how the Chinese monks paid homage to their rulers and how they engaged in farming by themselves instead of collecting alms, I should like to discuss the emotional ties between a Buddhist monk and his secular family and to point out how he protested his filial piety to his lay-parents, in order to show the Confucian influence on the individual priests.

Hui-chiao says that ".... to renounce wordly honour and cast off emotional ties...." is the basic spirit of monkhood.[115] To depart from the household life to become a monk, one should cut off all the ties with one's own family. Some of the monks literally did this. For instance,

Hui-yung (died ca. 585-6), after entering the Order, burned every letter from his parents in order to prevent any emotional agitation. He told his friends that he was in fact longing for his parents. He did so because it would disturb his Buddhist practice whenever good or bad news about his secular family would be brought to him through letters.[116] Before his mother's life came to an end, Ling-yü went home to see her. As he heard on the road that his mother had already passed away, Ling-yü halted and returned to his monastery.[117] Tao-hsüan praised Ling-yü for being able to cut off his emotional ties with his mother.[118] Fa-k'ung (flor. 617-8), after entering the Order refused to see his ex-wife and went into solitude on a mountain for thirty years.[119] Tê-shan (n.d.) of the Sui Dynasty suddenly abandoned his wife and son, and ran to a mountain in order to practise Buddhist meditation. Even though his son came to see him several times, each time Tê-shan drove his son out with a staff.[120] Even though Ling-jun's (aged 98 in 665) grandfather, grandfather-in-law, father and uncle-in-law were prefectural governors, he never visited them when passing through the cities that they governed. Tao-hsüan praised Ling-jun for having "cast off the emotional ties and followed the way of Buddhism".[121] When he was thirty years of age, Ts'ung-chien (+ 866) abandoned his wife and son in order to enter the Order. About 848, his son came to Lo-yang to look for his converted father and they met each other near the gate of Ts'ung-chien's monastery. As they had been separated for a long time, Ts'ung-chien's son could not recognise that the monk in front of him was his father and asked this 'monk' where he could find Master Ts'ung-chien. After Ts'ung-chien had convinced his son into believing that he should go south-eastward to find his father, he immediately ran back and hid himself in his own room.[122] Tsan-ning praised Ts'ung-chien for being able to eliminate emotional ties.[123]

With the exception of the above six examples, I cannot find any more in the three 'Biographies'. On the contrary, there are many records of how the Chinese monks protested their filial piety to their secular parents in the above-mentioned works. In a debate after the Northern Chou Dynasty conquered the Northern Ch'i Dynasty in 578, Emperor Wu of the Northern Chou Dynasty told the monks of the Northern Ch'i that as the Śramaṇas did not fulfil their duty of supporting their parents, this was one of the reasons why he ordered the Buddhists to return to lay life.[124] The monk Hui-yüan (523-592) came forward in defence: "... our Buddha instructed the monks to study Buddhism in summer and in winter, but allowed them to return home in spring and in autumn in order to take care of and to support their parents. For instance, Maudgalyāyana collected alms in order to feed his mother,[125] whereas the Tathāgata carried in the funeral the coffin that contained his father's body.[126] We Buddhists would never abandon our duty of filial piety..."[127] In regard to Hui-yüan's defence, I cannot discover in the Vinaya whether the priests were allowed by the Order to return home in the above-mentioned two seasons or not. In his defence Hui-yüan explained how the Chinese monks could fulfil their filial piety in two ways, i.e. by supporting their parents when they were alive and by mourning them after they had died. I should like to give some examples of each of these aspects.

Before he entered the Order, Sêng-ch'ien (435-513) was a grateful son to his parents. As he had suffered from poverty in his youth, Sêng-ch'ien supported his parents in luxuty after he had become a famous monk and had collected many donations.[128] Wherever he went to give sermons, Tao-chi (flor. 555-9) took his mother with him. He carried the scriptures and images on one end of his carrying pole, and his mother and a broom on the other. Not only did he serve his mother's meals and repair her clothes for her, he also nursed her when she went to stool. Tao-chi told

the people who tried to assist him: "This is my mother and not someone else's mother ... I can't render my duty to others. Please don't try to help me." Therefore, many people respected him and followed him as his disciples.[129] After his father's death, Fa-shang (500-585) brought his secular mother and sister to Yeh in order to settle them there, before he entered his Summer Retreat in Shao-lin Monastery.[130] Before he was about to deliver a sermon, Tao-an (died. ca. 599-600) had to do the cooking for his mother. Tao-an did everything in the kitchen and refused his attendants' assistance. He told the others: "As my mother gave birth to me, I am the only person who should take care of her."[131] Ching-t'o (555-617) did the same thing as Tao-chi had done, i.e. to carry in his wanderings his mother on one end of his carrying pole and his scriptures on the other. Before he went to collect alms, Ching-t'o first settled his mother under a tree.[132] In his nineteenth year (611), Tao-hsing (593-695) entered the Order in his homeland, Kansu, as a Śrāmaṇera.[133] In this year, due to the heavy duties that were placed upon the people by the Korean Campaign launched by Emperor Yang of the Sui Dynasty, many plebeians were forced to become outlaws in order to resist the unreasonable tax and draft.[134] After he had entered the Order, Tao-hsing's mother was captured by a gang of these outlaws from the town.[135] Tao-hsing traced the outlaws for sixty miles and found that his mother was being slashed by them. The outlaws said: "Indeed this monk is a grateful son. He traced us here in order to rescue his mother." Then they released her.[136] K'o-chih (860-934) collected alms in order to feed his widowed mother after he has become a monk.[137] In 907, the Ch'ang-an area suffered from turmoil. Tao-p'i (889-955) carried his mother on his back to take refuge in Mount Hua (in Shensi Province) and lived there in a cave. As the price of wheat had risen to ten thousand copper coins per peck, Tao-p'i found it difficult to collect alms from the villages.

Therefore, he told his mother that he had already eaten during his begging in order to coax her into eating the alms that he collected for her.[138]

Fa-hu's (439-507) father passed away the moment he was about to receive his full ordination. In order to mourn his father, Fa-hu hid himself in a room for four years without coming out to participate in any of the Buddhist activities of his monastery.[139] Fa-yün (467-529) refused to take any food during his mother's funeral. After the monk Sêng-min admonished him to give up his grief by telling him some Confucian and Buddhist theories, Fa-yün began to take some rice-gruel.[140] After his mother's death, Chên-yu of the Northern Ch'i Dynasty went home and built a hut near his mother's tomb. He lived in that hut for five years in order to mourn her and take care of her tomb. Therefore, he won the respect of his countrymen.[141] In 584, Chih-chü (538-609) was invited by Emperor Hou-chu of the Ch'en Dynasty to his palace to lecture on Buddhism. Next year, Chih-chü grieved extremely when he learned of his mother's death. Immediately he left the palace and went home.[142] After his parents' death, Ta-i (691-779) recited the Tripiṭaka in order to accumulate merit on their behalf.[143] Tsang-huan (790-866) built a hut near his mother's tomb and acted as Chên-yu had done. During his mourning, some miracles had been performed that made him famous among the people.[144] After Tao-p'i had settled his mother in the mountains,[145] he went to the battle field to search for his father's body. He built a hut there, and hired undertakers to collect skeletons for him. Then he recited scriptures day and night in front of these skeletons and prayed: ".... if my father's body is among these skeletons, please shake or turn around." After reciting for days, one of the skeletons jumped up in front of Tao-p'i and shook. That night his mother dreamed that his father had returned home.[146]

From the above discussion one can see how the Chinese Buddhist monks fulfilled their duty of filial piety. This phenomenon must be explained by the close relationship between a Śrāmaṇera and his secular family. For instance, when he was about ten, Fa-hsien's mother died. He went home to attend the funeral and then returned to his monastery.[147] A year after he had entered the Order as a novice, Fa-t'ung (died ca. 619-20) went home to see his mother.[148] K'o-chih entered the Order as a novice in his twelfth year and returned home for a visit to his parents three years later.[149] Moreover, Fa-k'ai (459-523) entered the Order in his childhood. As he was from a poor family and his parents could not afford to support him well, Fa-k'ai used to suffer from a shortage of clothing and ate only rough food. His fellow-novices Sêng-liu and T'an-tan (both n.d.), on the other hand, came from rich families, and they put on luxurious robes. Therefore they looked down on Fa-k'ai for his poverty.[150] Fa-k'ai's story shows that the 'social standing' of a novice in the monastery depended on the wealth of his secular family. From the close ties between novices and their families, one can understand why there were so many grateful sons in the Monastic Order. As mentioned before a Śrāmaṇera received a curriculum of Confucianist learning as soon as he entered the Order. Therefore a Śrāmaṇera would have been advised to care for his secular family, for the Confucians emphasise filial piety.

In clerical circles 'filial piety' was extended to the religious masters. For instance, after T'an-tsun (555-582) heard that his master Fa-Kuang (n.d.) had died, he was so sad that he fell from the bed and vomited blood from his mouth. Tao-hsüan praised T'an-tsun for being so moved by 'Hsiao (filial piety)'.[151] In 869, before Ch'an Master Liang-chieh's (well-known as Tung-shan, 807-869) life was about to come to an end, his disciples cried grievously in front of him. Suddenly, Liang-chieh opened his eyes, got up from his bed and said: "... this is

nothing to be grievous about, for dying is a way of liberating oneself from the suffering of human life." Then he told them to prepare a vegetarian banquet as a farewell for his departure from this world. He promised that he would depart after having enjoyed this banquet with them. As his disciples desired to prolong Liang-chief's life, they slowed down the preparations in the kitchen. After seven days, the banquet was finally cooked. During this banquet, Liang-chieh said that this vegetarian banquet was prepared by a team of fools, for his disciples were so foolish as to do their best to extend his life for only one week. The next day, he died.[152] After his master Ch'ang-yu's (816-888) death, T'ai-wên (n.d.), in order to protest his 'Hsiao', did his best to seek donations from the governors in order to build a Stūpa for Ch'ang-yu.[153] Three years after Hêng-ch'ao (877-949) had entered the Order in his fifteenth year, his master died. He strictly observed the Buddhist funeral[154] for his master and won fame for 'Hsiao' from the people.[155]

Tripiṭaka Master I-ching condemned the above-mentioned practices of mourning. He said: "At the time of their parents' death, Bhikṣus or Bhikṣuṇīs do not always use sufficient care in a funeral service or have the same mourning as common people ... waht one ought to do is ... [to] purify and decorate one room for the departed ... and offer perfumes and flowers, while reading Sūtras and meditating on the Buddha. One should wish that the departed spirit may be reborn in a good place. This is what makes one a dutiful child ... three years' mourning or seven days' fasting are not the only ways in which a benevolent person is served after death....."[156] In other words, I-ching considered that the ways of mourning that the Chinese priests used were too 'Chinese' and strayed from the Buddhist tradition. In fact, since Buddhism was transplanted into a Chinese cultural milieu and the Śrāmaṇeras had received a Confucian curriculum generation after generation, they were very influenced by

Chinese culture. Therefore, even the emotional ties between master and disciple among the clergy had gradually developed like those between father and son in the secular world. For instance, Yung-an (911-974) had once left his master Hui-chêng (n.d.) and followed other masters. Later, he returned to his original master and wanted to follow him again. Then Hui-chêng scolded Yung-an for "...abandoning the duty of filial piety".[157] In these circumstances, why would not a Chinese priest stray to some extent from the Vinaya and pay his piety to his parents or masters?

Besides protesting that they were grateful sons, the Chinese priests also promulgated to their lay believers stories of filial piety that were recorded in the scriptures. Michihata Ryōshū and Kenneth Ch'en have already discussed this topic in detail.[158]

III. The Economic Structure of the Monastic Order in China

The fact that the economic structure of the Monastic Order in China was different from that of the Monastic Order in India may be considered as one of the important factors explaining why Chinese priests strayed from the Vinaya. The monastic economy is a popular theme for modern scholars of Chinese Buddhism. Many of them have already studied different topics related to the economic structure or financial and commercial activities of the Chinese Monastic Order and published their results.[159] However, in my observation, they seem to have ignored the fact that the above-mentioned structures and consequent activities are contrary to Indian Buddhist tradition. Therefore, the discussion in this Section will be limited to topics concerning this point.

According to the Vinaya, not only are priests not allowed to touch any kind of money,[160] they also are not allowed to be involved in commercial transactions.[161] In discussing the Buddhist tradition of 'begging

for survival' in the first Section of this Chapter, I have pointed out that the Chinese people traditionally looked down on beggars.[162] Therefore, a secular donor would not tolerate that a monk to whom he paid respect should come to his door and collect alms every day just like a beggar. Instead of giving food, Chinese donors made their donations in money or farm-land to individual priests or even to monastic establishments, so that the priests would have some properties as a financial source for survival. I should like to give some examples for each of the two types of donation, i.e. money or land, below:

Before 379 when Master Tao-an was still in Hsiang-yang,[163] the noble Hsi Ch'ao (died before 384)[164] donated ten thousand pecks of rice to him, and Emperor Hsiao-wu (R. 373-396) of the Chin Dynasty also conferred on him a sum of money that equalled the annual salary of a prince.[165] After the Southern Yen State (400-409) was established in the lower reaches of the Yellow River, King Mu-yung Tê (R. 400-409) donated the taxes that he collected from two cities to the monk Sêng-lang (n.d.).[166] While Chih T'an-lan (died ca. 419-20) was in seclusion on a mountain, the god of this mountain came to pay respect to him and made a donation of ten thousand copper coins.[167] As Emperor Wu of the Liu-Sung Dynasty enjoyed the fluent preaching of Tao-chao (388-453), he donated thirty thousand copper coins to him.[168] Because Fa-yüan (414-500) received many disciples, including princes, princesses, royal consorts and nobles, he collected from them donations of ten thousand copper coins per day.[169] After 511, Emperor Hsüan-wu of the Northern Wei Dynasty conferred on the monk Tao-ch'ung (flor. 505-520) three taels of gold every day till the monk's death.[170] For each sermon given in his own monastery, Chih-ning (died ca. 611) received at least one thousand copper coins donated by the participants. If he was invited to preach in a layman's house, he probably collected gold or silk after the lecture.[171] Around 581-3,

Li Yüan (later Emperor Kao-tsu of the T'ang Dynasty) donated his house in Ch'ang-an to the Monastic Order for a new monastery, and Emperor Wên of the Sui Dynasty named this new establishment 'Ch'ing-ch'an Monastery'.[172] Thereupon the emperor donated fourteen thousand rolls of silk, five thousand rolls of cotton, one thousand bales of silk floss, two hundred rolls of thin silk and twenty sheets of figured satin accompanied by one thousand piculs of high grade rice to this monastery. The empress also donated five thousand strings of copper coins (one string comprised one thousand coins) to the same monastery.[173] In 602, after he had learned from the Indian monk Shê-t'i Ssŭ-ma (flor. 594-602) that his late empress was reborn in the Western Paradise, Emperor Wên of the Sui Dynasty conferred two thousand sheets of silk on that monk.[174] In 605, Emperor Yang, Emperor Wên's son, made a donation of materials to the value of two thousand sheets of silk, together with three thousand piculs of rice to Kuo-ch'ing Monastery.[175] Before 720, when the monk Tao-yin (668-740) outwitted the Taoist priest Yin Ch'ien (n.d.) in a debate, Emperor Hsüan-tsung of the T'ang Dynasty conferred five hundred rolls of silk on the monk.[176] The above-mentioned donations were mostly monetary. According to Li Chien-nung's Wei-Chin Nan-Pei-ch'ao Sui-T'ang Ching-chi Shih Kao or 'Economic History of the Ts'ao-Wei, the Chin, the Southern and the Northern Courts, the Sui and the T'ang Dynasties', silk had been used as one of the monetary units in these dynasties.[177]

After Hui-shou (n.d.) went to Nanking around 363-4, he received a donation of a grove from Wang T'an-chih (flor. 373-375).[178] As General Fan Tai (355-428)[179] has once scolded the powerful statesmen T'an Tao-chi (+ 436)[180] and Hsü Hsien-chih (364-426)[181] at court around 425, and the latter two bore hatred for him, the monk Hui-i (372-444) persuaded General Fan to donate his bamboo and fruit groves totalling sixty Mou to Chih-yüan Monastery as a way of winning the Buddha's protection and

blessing.[182] By obeying the monk, the general really won this blessing for he was saved from the revenge of his two political rivals.[183] After the above-mentioned Ch'ing-ch'an Monastery was established in the Sui Dynasty, Prince Chin (later Emperor Yang) remitted seventy house-holders as his endowment to his monastery[184] together with six sets of water-powered rolling mills.[185] After Ûi-sang (flor. 669) returned to Silla from China, the king of this country wished to donate farms and slaves to him. Ûi-sang declined them with thanks.[186] The above cases show that donations to a monastery were made in land or other properties. Ûi-sang's case especially shows that the Silla king was influenced by the Chinese customs of the same period.

What would the priests do after receiving a large monetary donation? In my observation, firstly they would hand in this money to the monastery they belonged to and turn it into common property of their establishment. The monks P'ien-chi (flor. 505)[187] and Ching-tuan (543-606)[188] acted in this way.

Secondly, they would use this money for the promotion of religious activities, such as building new monasteries, redecorating old establishments, preparing new images, hiring scribes to copy out new sets of scriptures, etc. The monks Sêng-lang,[189] Sêng-ch'üan (of the Liu-Sung Dynasty),[190],Chih-i,[191] Chih-shin (446-506),[192] Pao-liang (445-509),[193] Fa-lang (507-581),[194] Shê-t'i Szŭ-na,[195] Fa-ch'un (519-603)[196] and Fa-ch'êng (563-640)[197] had promoted their religion in these ways. Besides, Shao-k'ang (+ 805) enticed children to recite the name of 'Amitābhabuddha' with the money that the people had given to him. If a child recited the Buddha's name once in front of him, Shao-k'ang rewarded him with one copper coin. After doing this for one year, even the adults, no matter whether male or female, also recited 'Amitābhabhuddha' when they saw Shao-k'ang, in order to receive his coins.[198] This is also a

way of promulgating Buddhism by spending money collected by monks. Tsan-ning defended Shao-k'ang's behaviour by saying: "... this is somewhat like a good doctor who paints honey or syrup on a piece of bitter medication in order to woo his infant-patient to take it..."[199]

Thirdly, they would give away this money to poor people in order to help those in hardship; or spend this money to ransom prisoners from jail and free them, or buy captured birds and animals and set them free. The monks Sêng-yüan (414-484),[200] Sêng-ch'üan,[201] Fa-lang,[203], Narendrayaśas (490-589)[204] and Fa-ch'un[205] spent the money they collected in these charitable ways. Among them Fa-ch'un was in particular a popular 'philanthropist' to the poor plebeians. In 595, Fa-ch'un was invited to visit the royal palace of Emperor Wên of the Sui Dynasty. After he came out, Fa-ch'un immediately gave away all the donations that he had collected to the poor. When the poor people learned that Fa-shun was invited to the palace, they flocked to the neighbouring streets to wait for the monk and receive his money.[206] Furthermore, Chih-i used the donations people gave him to buy a bay along the coast of Chekiang Province and then he asked Emperor Hsüan of the Ch'en Dynasty to issue an edict prohibiting fishing in this bay,[207] as a way of protecting the aquatic animals in it.

Of the above-mentioned clerics who gave away the money that they received, with the sole exception of Sêng-lang, all the other Chinese monks lived after 413, by which time both the DRMGTV and the SVSTVDV had already been translated into Chinese and had been put into practice by the Chinese Monastic Order.[208] Evidently they learned from these Vinayas and their Śīlas that a priest is not allowed to touch any kind of money or to keep any personal wealth.[209] Thus they gave away the money that they had received from lay-donors.

However, I have mentioned in Chapter I that before any Vinaya was introduced into China, the dominant disciplinary scripture in China was the Śīla (the Sêng-chi Chieh-hsin) translated by Dharmakāla about 251.[210] Due to the fact that this Śīla was derived from the Mahāsāṅghikaśīla which does not contain the rules prohibiting one from taking gold or silver in one's hands or asking someone to take it for ony, or using gold or silver to buy supplies, the Chinese priests began to keep money and to manage it from about 278-280.[211] Some of them became very rich.[212] From this time on, gradually the tradition of 'keeping one's personal wealth' was established among Chinese priests. Even after the above-mentioned leading Vinayas in China were translated and being put into practice, this tradition was not altered.[213] This is the reason why a monk of the medieval period, in his lecture on the Vinaya would say: "It is difficult for us to make a judgment as to whether the action is right or wrong (if one takes money with his hand)".[214]

As the leading clerics were conniving with their preceptors to keep personal wealth, a custom of allowing a disciple to succeed to his master's legacy gradually developed. For instance, before 767, when a Buddhist priest passed away, his robes, wealth and other belongings should have been handed to the government treasury. After the monk Ch'êng-ju (n.d.) sent an appeal based on the Vinayas to the T'ang government in 767 requesting the cancellation of this legal act and its replacement with legislation that the legacy of a dead priest belonged to the Monastic Order, an edict was issued in the same year approving Ch'êng-ju's appeal.[215] However, the KSC says that Hui-chi (412-496)[216] was the favourite disciple of Hui-i (372-444) and that they lived together for years. As Hui-i was a spiritual leader of the capital territory (i.e. Nanking) and a great many gentry and ordinary laymen relied on him, he received many donations from his secular disciples.[217] When Hui-i's life

came to an end, he left a legacy that consisted of many valuable materials worth nearly one million copper coins.[218] According to the custom, Hui-chi had the right to succeed to a half of his master's bequest,[219] but he choose only his robe and bowl, and spent all the rest of the bequest for religious welfare.[220] Hui-chi'i case indicates that in his time, a favoured disciple would customarily have the right to succeed to a half of his master's legacy before it was handed to the government treasury.

This custom of property succession among the clergy suggested a way of making some of the priests richer.[221] Moreover, the HKSC says that as Hui-kuang's sermons were so fluent and philosophical when he was a Śrāmaṇera, people called him "Śrāmaṇera-sage". Therefore, Hui-kuang received a great many donations which he immediately gave away to the poor. His master Buddha took control of the donations that Hui-kuang collected in order to keep the money from his disciple. Even after that, Hui-kuang still asked the permission of his master to withdraw money from the account of his property in order to help poor people. So, Buddha gave in to his disciple and surrendered control to him.[222]

Hui-kuang's case explains two points regarding the possession of personal wealth by clerics. Firstly, a master had the right to save for his novice the donation that the latter collected, somewhat like a secular parent who keeps the fortune money his children collected during the Chinese lunar new year for them. In return, a monk-disciple would have the right to succeed to his master's legacy, just as a son inherits his late-father's property in the secular world. In Section II of this Chapter, I have mentioned that filial piety in clerical circles was extended to the religious masters.[223] I believe that the above-mentioned 'inheritance of property' among the clergy would have been helpful in fastening emotional ties between master and disciple like those between father and son. Secondly, as Hui-kuang withdrew money to help the poor

from the donations he collected which were kept by his master, we can imagine that a basic motivation for a Buddhist priest to keep the donations that he collected would have been to assist people in hardship financially. For instance, when Master Hui-yüan and his brother Hui-ch'ih (337-412) entered the Order as novices, they studied very hard day and night. As both of them were poor, they suffered from a shortage of clothing.[224] The monk T'an-i (died around 411)[225] supported them financially under the name of 'candle fee'.[226]

As so many unfaithful elements infiltrated into the Monastic Order,[227] these elements made use of the tradition of 'personal wealth' to obtain personal benefits. Therefore they became rather covetous. For instance, the monk Tao-an (flor. 569-574) composed nine precepts for his disciples, in which the second precept reads: "As you have already left your household ... you have to forget wealth and beauty ... gold and jade are no longer valuable to you, and only the Dharma is invaluable ... why should you have to go visiting here and there so busily (in order to receive donations)..."[228] His third precept says: "As you have already left your household ... why do you still involve yourself in affairs concerning pecks and piculs (i.e. buying and selling grains) and compete for wealth with the secular people...."[229] And his seventh precept remarks: "As you have already left your household ... you should not have to drink water from the Evil Fountain (i.e. donations from evil sources) or approach evil persons for contributions...."[230] Tao-an's words indicate that in his time, some of his contemporaries were eagerly involved in making money. Again the monk Chih-tsê (flor. 665)[231] kept only one bed, one mat, one wooden spoon and one earthenware bowl in his room, so he never locked his door.[232] As he would never accomulate wealth, monks of the same apartment called him 'a lunatic'. After hearing this, Chih-tsê laughted and said: "Those who call me 'a lunatic' do not know that they

themselves are in fact the real lunatics. For they left their households only for cloth and food. And they are so eager to accomulate money that they worry about their wealth. Therefore they spend more time checking the locks of their wardrobes and the doors of their rooms than in their Buddhist practice...."[233] Chih-tsê's words also indicate how covetous his fellow-monks were. In collecting money not only did such priests flatter and pay court to the nobles and the wealthy in order to receive donations,[234] they also engaged in usury.[235] In his NHCKNFC, Tripiṭaka Master I-ching criticises Chinese nuns who engaged in weaving and strayed from the tradition of collecting alms.[236] His words indicate that some Chinese nuns in his time were involved in the textile business. Monks even became sycophantic. The authors of the three 'Biographies of Eminent Buddhist Monks' praise highly monks who never visited the houses of rich men or nobles but treated the poor kindly. I have already listed these monks and those who despised wealth in Table VI and appended it to this thesis. This reflects the fact that there were also many clerics who were sycophants during the same time. For instance, in his Yu-yang Tsa-tsu or 'Desultory Notes Composed by a Resident of Yu-yang City (in Sc̆uchuan Province)' Tuan Ch'eng-shih (flor. 843-862)[237] says that around 801, a monk of Ting-sui Monastery invited the official Lu to a tea party, and Lu brought his friend Li with him.[238] The monk gave the official newly roasted good tea to drink. As Li was only a holder of the lowest degree from the Official Examination and had no government appointment, the monk looked down on him and gave him only cheap tea. Lu protested to the monk against this unfairness to Li, but the monk still showed his arrogance through his words. Li was very angry and used his magical powers to punish that monk harshly.[239] This story tells us that the monks of Tuan Ch'eng-shih's time even looked down on the social attainments of a secular person.

As the Buddhist priests possessed such personal wealth, the rulers during the period of disorder liked to extract money from them. For instance, in 450, officials of the Liu-Sung Dynasty persuaded Emperor Wên to borrow money from rich men and the Buddhist priests of the lower reaches of the Yangtzŭ River in order to meet increasing military expenses. They suggested that if a rich man's fortune was worth five hundred thousand copper coins, and if a monk's or a nun's personal wealth reached two hundred thousand coins, they should be asked to lend one fourth of their property to the government.[240] Around 531-2, the generals of the Êrh-chu family, the actual ruling group of the Northern Wei Dynasty at this time, planned to organise a campaign in order to cope with their rival Kao Huan (496-547)[241] to the north.[242] Therefore they ordered the monks and nuns to pay tax in order to meet military expenditure for this campaign.[243] When Hui-kuang, 'Deputy Controller of the Buddhist Priests', explained to Êrh-chu Shih-lung (+ 523),[244] leader of this family, that this taxation would offend against the clerical privilege of tax exemption[245] and that the Êrh-chu family would therefore lose the support of the clerics,[246] Êrh-chu Shih-lung cancelled this plan of taxation.[247] The rulers in the period of disorder even considered that there was nothing wrong with taxing monks and nuns, for their wealth was originally accumulated from the donations of the people. Moreover, they enjoyed parasitic unproductive lives.[248] In other words, the rulers thought that they were only indirectly taxing the ordinary people.

As I have mentioned in the opening pages of this Section, many donations made to the Buddhist establishments were in terms of farming land.[249] Especially from around 729 to 738, when the government of the T'ang Dynasty granted each Buddhist monk thirty Mou of farming land and each nun twenty Mou, the monastic estates of each establishment were considerably enlarged.[250] After having received these lands the authorities of the establishments

had to make them productive. In these circumstances, the abbots would have had to order their novices to cultivate these lands,[251] or to assign the agricultural work to fellow priests of their establishments,[252] or to instruct the male or female slaves[253] to take up this job,[254] or to rent out the lands to tenant farmers and then collect either a fixed rent or a share of crops,[255] or to hire some labourers for their cultivation.[256] As the above-mentioned monastic estates were exempted from paying tax,[257] all the harvests produced from these lands were monopolised by the establishments themselves. In other words, each establishment would have stocked enough food from each harvest. In this situation, the members of an establishment did not have to go out and collect alms of food to survive. Therefore, the establishments set up permanent kitchens.[258] Most of the Chinese priests had already abandoned the Buddhist tradition of begging for survival.[259] In Chapter II I have mentioned that the monk Sêng-wên would never prepare any great vegetarian feasts in his monastery, and the monk Tao-yü had been on tea-preparing relief,[260] indicating that in both monasteries where was a kitchen. Moreover, the monks Han-shan and Shih-tê (both flor. 710-712)[261] had served in the kitchen of Kuo-ch'ing Monastery washing utensils.[262] The latter was also assigned some duties in the dining hall of this establishment.[263] The HKSC says that in 586, the Ch'ang-an area suffered from drought and the rice stocks in Yen-hsing Monastery were only enough for two meals. Its abbot Tao-mu (n.d.) planned to close his monastery and disperse the monks. T'an-yen (516-588) suggested to his abbot that it would be better if the dispersion were proclaimed when the rice was really exhausted. The next morning, Emperor Wên of the Sui Dynasty sent this monastery twenty wagons of rice and this was followed by five hundred piculs some days later. Therefore, the fellow-monks of this establishment were not dispersed.[264] This story shows how dependent the Chinese monks were on the catering system of their own monasteries.

Since the monastic kitchens were set up, a Chinese establishment would have to prepare enough catering supplies for its members. Besides farming lands, an establishment would also receive donations of money.[265] But this money was not a fixed income. Besides, the land donated by secular people was sometimes rather barren.[266] Moreover, the KSC says that even though Chih-yüan Monastery had received sixty Mou of groves from General Fan T'ai,[267] these groves were then forcibly taken back by General Fan's third son after the death of the general.[268] Hui-i, the abbot of this monastery, presented the letter from General Fan concerning the above-mentioned donations as evidence in the trial with the general's son, but nevertheless he was unable to reclaim the groves.[269] This story shows that donated farming land was still not the permanent property of an establishment. It could probably be taken back by the donor's powerful heritors. In such circumstances, the abbot would have to spend donated money to buy some fertile fields or groves as permanent properties of his own establishment, in order to guarantee the financial balance and the catering supplies of his institute. Therefore, the purchase of fertile lands in order to establish monastic estates became a tendency among the Chinese monasteries and nunneries.[270]

In this situation, even a disciplinarian would be involved in this sort of business. For instance, Tao-piao's (740-823) Biography which is in the 'Category of Disciplinarians' of the SKSC,[271] says that within a period from around 756 to 777-8, Tao-piao gradually bought one rice field after another for his T'ien-chu Monastery in Hang-chou (in Chekiang Province).[272] Eventually these fields produced fifty thousand pecks of rice per year for the monastery.[273] As most of the Buddhist establishments were devloping their monastic estates, a monk who had economic talent would be respected by his fellow monks. For instance, after Hui-chou (died ca. 627-8) had held the abbotship of Ch'ing-ch'an Monastery for

forty years, he had developed his monastery into the richest of the establishments in Ch'ang-an. Its properties included estates, bamboo groves, water-powered rolling mills, etc. After he retired in his seventieth year, Hui-chou was still respected by members of this monastery as their economic advisor, and they did not do anything without consulting him.[274]

In this situation, conflicts concerning the boundaries of the monastic estates arose. For instance, after the mighty Ming-kung (539-623) had entered the monkhood in Hui-shan Monastery in Honan Province, his monastery became involved in a conflict with Chao-hua Monastery over the boundary between their estates. The monks of Chao-hua Monastery hired one hundred odd rascals to go and steal the autumn harvests in the estate of Hui-shan Monastery. Facing these rascals, Ming-kung held up a huge rock that would normally take thirty ordinary men to move, and threw it a long distance. The rascals were scared and ran away.[275] In 613, Tao-ying (557-636) was on duty as the superintendent of the estate of Ch'an-ting Monastery. During his one-year tenure of duty, he was involved in a boundary conflict between the monastic estate and the lands of some secular landlords.[276] These two stories show how important the monastic estates were for the survival of the Buddhist establishments.

After the system of monastic estates had been established, the Buddhist establishments enjoyed the harvests from their crop-fields and their catering supply was probably adequate. Besides, monetary donations were still coming in. Therefore, an establishment probably would have accumulated considerable wealth. Moreover, these monastic properties, as I have mentioned previously, were tax exempt. After having accumulated wealth, how would the members of an establishment manage them? According to the SVSTVDV, the tributes that people offered to a Stūpa in the precinct of an establishment could be traded in order to earn money. Then

the priests could use that money to buy some other articles as new tribute to be offered to the same Stūpa, or for repairing and decorating that Stūpa. The tributes of a Stūpa could be continually renewed through such a circulation. The whole business had to be done through the monastic lay-attendants.[277] The DRMGTV teaches that priests are allowed to exchange their surplus with other clerics or even with laymen in order to obtain useful materials.[278] And the MHSGKV remarks that in order to offer flowers to the Buddha and to his fellow priests, a cleric is allowed to grow flowers through his lay-attendant. If he had more than enough flowers for his offering, the rest of the flowers were allowed to be exchanged for garlands with garland-makers, or to be sold to them. After the flowers had been sold, the cleric was allowed to buy supplies with the money obtained from trading his flowers. In case some money remained after his purchase, he had to hand the rest of the money to the 'Wu-chin-ts'ai (Akṣayanidhi or Inexhaustible Wealth)' of his own establishment.[279] Moreover, if any flowers remained after the offerings and the trading or exchanging, they had to be handed in as 'Wu-chin-wu (Akṣayanikā or Inexhaustible Articles)' of the establishment.[280] The terms 'Inexhaustible Wealth' and 'Inexhaustible Articles' mean the materials kept in the storeroom of an establishment for the above-mentioned transactions.[281]

From the above discussions, we know that these three Vinayas all permitted the clergy to be involved to some extent in commercial affairs on occasions. While the DRMGTV does not mention money, the SVSTVDV permits clerics to manage money indirectly through the hands of their lay-attendants, and the MHSGKV even seems to encourage the priests to directly take part in trading for money.

Influenced by these Vinayas and some Mahāyāna scriptures,[282] the Chinese Monastic Order began to develop their storerooms[283] into the

'Wu-chin-tsang' or 'Inexhaustible Treasury', a financial foundation of the establishment. After this treasury was set up, the members of an establishment deposited money and other materials that people had donated to their institute, or the crops they had harvested from their monastic estates into it , and then withdrew money, whether from the above-mentioned sources or from trading their monastic crops, from it for religious and social welfare expenditures.[284] The religious welfare, of course, included the repair and decoration of their establishment, the advancement of the level of livelihood of the priests, and other Buddhist ceremonies.[285] The social welfare, however, consisted in assistance to the secular people as a means of attracting them to Buddhism.

Such assistance was of two kinds. Firstly, welfare activities such as giving away food or grain to the starving during natural disasters;[286] frequently supplying food, cloth or other material to poor individuals;[287] building roads, bridges and preparing ferries for the public;[288] planting trees on the roadside and the waterfront;[289] preparing free wells for the people;[290] setting up free clinics and hospitals;[291] providing free full board for poor intellectuals to live in the monastery,[292] etc. Secondly, assisting people financially by having the 'Inexhaustible Treasury' take part in pawnshop activities,[293] lending money or other materials to the people.[294]

After the above-mentioned social welfare activities had gradually developed into the traditional welfare activities of the Monastic Order, the Buddhist establishments would have to make their Inexhaustible Treasuries really 'inexhaustible'. In other words, they would have had to guarantee that they had adequate capital for their financial foundations. As the monastic estates were the basic source for the capital of the Inexhaustible Treasury and also the economic power of the Church,[295] the establishments had to buy more land in order to enlarge their estate.

Therefore they advanced their lending activities into the business of usury and then, using the interest collected, they bought more fertile land or annexed lands that people mortgaged to the establishment.[296] After that, they extended their commercial activities into the business of water-powered rolling mills,[297] oil presses,[298] and hostels,[299] and were even involved in some money-raising activities like organising mutual financial associations, auction sales and the sale of lottery tickets,[300] etc. In other words, they did everything they could to sustain their Inexhaustible Treasury in order to keep their religious and social activities going. Therefore, the Chinese establishments became very much involved in commercial activities. In this situation, besides discussing Buddhism and paying respect to the image of the Buddha, the assembly in an establishment in the T'ang Dynasty would have also had the commercial and financial reports read to them by the bursar of the monastery.[301] Moreover, with the flourishing development of the monastic estates, individual priests also added to their personal wealth by buying farming lands and becoming 'priest landlords'.[302] After having managed commercial and financial activities, some of the priests, especially the unfaithful elements, were tempted by the monastic wealth into committing crimes of corruption, stealing, and even murder.[303]

The phenomena discussed above are all deviations from the instructions of the Vinaya, even though the Inexhaustible Treasury was developed in close relationship with the teachings of the SVSTVDV and the MHSGKV.[304]

IV. The Mahāyānists' Contempt for Hīnayānism in China

As China was a stronghold of the Mahāyānists, the conflict between Mahāyānism and Hīnayānism was also a factor that related to the priests who strayed from the Vinaya. In the 'Conclusion of the Category of Disciplinarians' of his KSC, Hui-chao indicates that in his time there

were some monks who had strayed from the Vinaya and had done everything they wanted. These monks used to say: "The infernal flames will not cremate a wise man, while the caldron containing boiling water in hell is not prepared for cooking a man who had Prajñā (wisdom)."[305] In other words, these monks thought that as they were Mahāyānists, they would never fall into pergatory even if they had already strayed from the rules of the Hīnayāna Vinaya. In the KSC, the HKSC and the SKSC, there are many instances indicating how the Mahāyānists felt contempt for the Vinaya:

(1) Sêng-tsung (438-496) of the Southern Ch'i Dynasty was a specialist in the Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra and the Vimalakīrtinirdeśasūtra, and all his lectures on these two Mahāyāna scriptures always attracted thousands of people. Even though he was a monk, Sêng-tsung did everything he desired without considering the Vinaya rules.[306] As the monks in the capital area (Nanking), strongly condemned Sêng-tsung's behaviour, Crow Prince Wên-hui (Hsiao Ch'ang-mou, 458-493)[307] tried to expel him from the Order.[308] After being influenced by omens that he had received in a dream, the crown prince cancelled his intention of expelling Sêng-tsung.[309]

(2) After the Dhyāna Master Buddha had received Hui-kuang (the Fifth Patriarch of the Disciplinary School) as his disciple, he told him first to listen to the Vinaya. For Master Buddha considered that as this Śrāmaṇera was a gifted Buddhist, he would look down on the Vinaya if he received first lectures on the Sūtras and Śāstras.[310] The Dhyāna master's consideration implies that many Buddhists in his time probably felt contempt for the Vinaya.

(3) Hui-fêng (died ca. 563) was a specialist in the SVSTVDV in Chiang-tu. Even though Hui-fêng's fluence attracted many people to attend his lectures, they still asked him: "As Mahāyānism is now prevalent here,

why do you lecture to us on the Vinaya?" Hui-fêng replied: "I think that there is something that has been neglected by you all. As both Mahāyānism and Hīnayānism are derived from our Buddha, do you think that they contradict each other?"[311]

(4) Hui-hsiu (aged 98 in 665) came to listen to Fa-li's lecture on DRMGTV. Fa-li asked him: "As you, master, are a high monk and have already reached a venerable age, why do you still pay your diligence to the Vinaya?" Hui-hsiu replied: "I learnt the Śīla in the first place when I entered the Order, why should I stray from it because I am getting old?"[312] The conversation between them reflects that many of their contemporaries had strayed from the Vinaya.

Due to the contempt of Chinese Mahāyānists for the Vinaya, many records concerning how Buddhist priests strayed from the Vinaya and did evil deeds are to be found even in the three 'Biographies of Eminent Buddhist Monks'. I have already listed those monks in Table VII and appended it to this thesis. Of the monks listed in that table, one might wonder that half of them have their own biographies in the above-mentioned three 'Biographies'. This indicates that they were still recognised as 'eminent monks' by the authors.

In my observation, two reasons may be suggested why the above authors would write the biographies of such monks. Firstly, these monks had already made some contributions to Chinese Buddhism, even though they had strayed. For instance, Kumārajīva was forced to cohabit with the princess of the conquered Kucha State by General Lü Kuang (later king of the Later Liang State, R. 386-399) in that state about 382,[313] and then accepted the ten women who were conferred on him by King Yao Hsing in Ch'ang-an after 401.[314] And among his de-facto wives, one or two gave birth to two sons.[315] From the point of view of the Vinaya, Kumārajīva had already committed the unpardonable sin of adultery.

As he was one of the most important translators in Chinese Buddhist history,[316] Kumārajīva was still accepted as an 'eminent monk' in KSC.[317]

Tripiṭaka Master Hsüan-tsang was so eager to convince the son of General Yü-ch'ih Tsung (n.d.), the later Master Kuei-chi (632-682), to follow him and enter the Order that he agreed to Kuei-ch'is three conditions by allowing him to be involved with women, to eat meat and to have meals in the afternoon after entering the monkhood.[318] Master Kuei-chi was given the nickname of 'The Vandya with Three Wagons' by the people of the Ch'ang-an area.[319] This was because a legend said that once when he went to T'ai-yüan to give a sermon, Keui-chi brought three wagons with him, the one in front was loaded with chests containing the Buddhist scriptures, the one in the middle he rode himself and the one at the rear carried his singing girls, maids and delicacies.[320] Even though this legend hints that Kuei-chi was probably doing the same thing as Kumārajīva had done, he was still recognised as an 'eminent' one. I think this is because he was the successor of Hsüan-tsang in promulgating the Dharmalakṣaṇa philosophy.[321] Moreover, although Hui-k'ai (469-507) and Pao-yüan (466-526) were involved in drinking and gambling, they still have biographies in the HKSC, for both of them were specialists on the Satyasiddhiśāstra.[322]

Secondly, these monks were theurgists who had assisted people with their supernatural power. For instance, Pei-tu (+ 426) had committed the crime of stealing a golden image of the Buddha and had broken the rules by drinking, eating meat and pungent roots,[323] but he gave predictions to the people and cured some patients close to death by casting spells.[324] In 504, T'an-hsien (n.d.) defeated the Taoists in a trial of theurgy after having become drunk.[325] P'u-man (flor. 780-1) did everything he desired without considering the monastic rules, but his prophecies always came true.[326] Shih-chien, a monk of the Wu-yüeh State (908-931),

had never followed the Vinaya rules. He drank good wine and ate chicken and used to make predictions of fortune or disasters that were soon to happen in this State.[327]

Moreover, the performances of these theurgists were described as an illusion beyond reality. For instance, Disciplinarian Wu-min (flor. 674-6) once met a monk in an inn. As this monk took wine and meat, Wu-ming scolded him for his fault. In the evening Wu-ming found that there were two rays coming from the corners of that monk's mouth while he was reciting the Avatamsakasūtra in Sanskrit. Then he recognised that this monk was a saint and came to salute him and apologise.[328] Fa-chao (flor. 821) once entered an inn in order to escape the rain. After the rain had stopped, Fa-chao was blocked by the slushy mud caused by the rain, preventing him from going to beg for food. Then he told a boy in that inn to buy some pork for him to cook. As Fa-chao showed no embarrassment when he ate the pork, all the twenty-one guests in that inn scolded him and the youngsters among them even tried to beat him. In the evening these guests found that Fa-chao's room was bright and fragrant when the monk was reciting the Vajracchedikāprajñā-pāramitāsūtra , but no candle or perfume was in sight. Then they knew that Fa-chao was a saint and all of them came forward to apologise and pay their respects to him.[329] Tien-tien Shih (flor. ca. 943) was drinking and eating meat in the day time. In the evening someone found that he was a divine official, who was judging the ghosts' trials in his shrine.[330] Wang Lo-han (died ca. 968-9) enjoyed the taste of pork very much when he was alive. After his death, a Śarīra ball like a gem dropped from his corpse. Then the people believed that he was in fact a saint.[331]

The above examples indicate that even though a monk had done some bad deeds, he would be tolerated as a member of the Mahāyānist clergy

if he was a specialist in some branch of Buddhist scholarship (like Kumārajīiva and Kuei-chi) or if he manifested his supernatural power to help people (like Pei-tu and others). It also reflects the fact that the Chinese Mahāyānists would not take a serious view of one who had strayed from the Vinaya. They even considered that to recite the Buddha's name or a certain scripture diligently would probable redeem one's bad behaviour. For instance, Hsiung-chün (died ca. 772) had never obeyed the Vinaya. Not only had he spent the donations he collected from secular donors incorrectly, but also he had put off his robe in order to join the national service, and then returned to the Order again.[332] After his sudden death he debated with the king in Hell (Yama?) as the latter sentenced him to jail. Hsiung-chün said: "...I have read the scriptures and found that even a person of the lowest class who commits the Pañca-ānantaryakarmāṇi (the five rebellious acts)[333] would still be reborn in the Western Paradise if he recites the name of Amitābhabuddha ten times before his death. Even though I, Chün, have done so many bad deeds, I have never committed any acts which belong to the Pañca-ānantaryakarmāṇi. Besides, I have recited the Buddha's name numerous times. If the Buddha's words in the scriptures are correct, then I will be reborn in the Western Paradise." After saying this he really departed from Hell and proceeded to the Western Paradise.[334] Tsan-ning says that the words of the debate were transmitted to this world by a person who had died but whose soul had later returned to earth.[335] In the Fa-hsing Monastery of Ching-chou (present Chiang-ling City of Hupeh Province), the monks Wei-kung (+ 895)[336] and Ling-k'uei (n.d.) were always involved with drunkards and gamblers.[337] Therefore people called them 'the two rogues of the monastery'.[338] As Wei-kung was still reciting the Vajracchedikāprajñāpāramitāsūtra all the time, a divine orchestra came to accept him the moment before his death.

Then Ling-k'uei knew that merit can be obtained through recitation. Tsan-ning says that if one keeps on reciting a Sūtra frequently, one will accumulate merit enough to lead one to be reborn in the pure Kṣetra (the Buddha land).[339] Both these stories are rather legendary, but they suggest an alternative for one who had strayed from the Vinaya.

Furthermore, the Mahāyānists believed that to recite a certain Sūtra diligently was more effective for accumulating Buddhist merit than to keep the Vinaya. For instance, Ch'ing-hsü (flor. 702-706) was very diligent in reciting the Vajracchedikāprajñāpāramitasūtra. In 704, he went to Shao-lin Monastery and spent his summer-retreat in a shrine on the peak of Mount Sung. Before his arrival this shrine was haunted by evil spirits, so no one dared to come. Once there had been a disciplinarian who, believing that he had already accumulated enough merit through his practice of the Vinaya, went there in the evening to recite the Vinaya in order to exorcise these spirits. As he was doing so, the disciplinarian saw a giant come out and try to stab him with a spear. The disciplinarian was so scared that he immediately ran down the mountain and passed away en route. Even though he had heard this ghost story, Ch'ing-hsü still went there and recited the Sūtra that he used to recite. In the evening, Ch'ing-hsü heard many terrible voices outside his room. As he was not frightened and went on with his recitation, these voices gradually vanished. After that these spirits departed and no one was annoyed again.[340] This story also reflects the contempt the Mahāyānists felt for the disciplinarians.

After Ch'an Buddhism arose in the T'ang Dynasty, the Ch'an Buddhist began to stress the method of 'Tun-chiao (The Immediate Teaching of the Mahāyāna Doctrine)' for their practice, and considered that the usual method of 'Chien-chiao (The Gradual Method of Teaching By Beginning with Hīnayāna and Proceeding to Mahāyāna)' was a way that wasted time

and labour.[341] They thought that the way of keeping the Vinaya in order to accumulate Buddhist merit belonged to that of 'Chien-chiao'.[342] In the SKSC, I have found many Ch'an pioneers who were originally ordained by disciplinarians and had received lectures on the Vinaya. As they considered that the rules of the Vinaya were 'bondage or handcuffs to one's body', they were converted to Ch'an Buddhism. These pioneers were: Wei-yen (well known as Yao-shan, 759-828),[343] Tsang-i (798-879),[344] Ch'ing-chu (807-888),[345] Ch'u-nan (819-888),[346] Ts'ung-shên (well known as Chao-chou, 778-897),[347] Tao-ying (+ 902)[348] and Kuei-shên (well known as Lo-han, 867-928).[349] This tendency explains why Huai-hai decided to abandon the Vinaya and to establish a new set of monastic rules for the Ch'an Buddhists.[350]

CHAPTER III: Notes

1. See Chapter II, Section II, notes 161 to 337.
2. KSC, p. 388b.
3. HKSC, p. 792c.
4. See Chapter I, Section III, notes 330 to 337; and Section V, notes 469 to 475.

Notes to Section I

5. T'ang Yung-t'ung, Wang-jih Tsa-kao or 'Desultory Essays Composed in My Past (i.e. before the establishment of the People's Republic of China in 1949)', pp. 122-123.
6. NHCKNFC, p. 213c. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, p. 64.
7. Idem. J. Takakusu, tr., ibid., p. 65. TTHYCFKSC, p. 6a.
8. NHCKNFC, p. 214a. J. Takakusu, tr., ibid., p. 65.
9. Cf. Leon Hurvitz, 'Render Unto Ceasar in Early Chinese Buddhism ——— Hui-yüan's Treatise on Exemption of Buddhist Clergy from Requirement of Civil Etiquette', Sino-Indian Studies, Liebenthal Festschrift, Vol. 5, Parts 3 & 4 (1957, Santiniketan), p. 80.
10. Cf. ibid., p. 81.
11. Cf. ibid., p. 80.
12. Cf. ibid., p. 81.
13. Cf. ibid., p. 82. According to Hsü Foo-kuan's Chou Ch'in Han Chêng-chih Shê-hui Chieh-kuo Chih Yen-chiu or 'A Study on the Political and Social Structures of the Chou, the Ch'in and the Han Dynasties (1066 B.C.?-220 A.D.)', the Chinese emperor developed into somewhat of an 'Absolute Monarch' and all his subjects were situated in an obedient position. This was made concrete after Emperor Shih Huang-ti of the Ch'in Dynasty conquered all the other feudal kingdoms in China and united the whole nation under his sovereignty in 221 B.C. (pp. 132-143).
14. Sung Min-ch'iu (1019-1079) edit., T'ang Tao-chao-ling Chi or 'A Collection of the Important Imperial Edicts of the T'ang Dynasty', p. 588.
15. Ibid., p. 591.

16. According to his Biography in the SKSC, Yen-chung went to Ch'ang-an at the end of the Ch'ên-kuan Era (648-9) (p. 728c). And in his own work (T. 2108), the last affairs recorded are dated 662 (p.472b).
17. Yen-chung, p. 444a-b.
18. Ibid., pp. 444c-445a. The date of this instruction is according to Leon Hurvitz, p. 80.
19. Yen-chung, p. 452a.
20. Ibid., p. 452b.
21. Ibid., p. 455a-c. According to Sung Min-ch'iu, in 714 and 733 the Buddhist priests were required to salute their own parents (p.588 and p. 589).
22. Cf. Leon Hurvitz, p. 90.
23. In Yen-chung's work, for the essays favouring the imperial instruction in 330 and the essays in defence see p. 444. For the essays favouring the imperial instruction in 402 see pp. 444c-445a, 445b-c, 446b-c, 447b-c, 448b-c, and 451c; and for the essays in defence see pp. 445a-b, 446c-447b, 447c-448b, 449a-451b, 451c, 451c-452a and 452b. For the edict of 421 see p. 452a. For the edict of 609 see p. 452b; and for the essays in defence see p. 452b-c and pp.452c-454c. For the edict, and the essays that supported the edict of 662 see pp. 455, 456a-470b and 472a-b. And for the essays in defence see pp. 455c-456b, 456b-457c, 457c-464c, 470c-471c, 472a, 472b-c, 472c-473c and 473c-474a. Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol. I, p. 225. Michihata Ryōshū, Chūgoku Bukkyōshi or 'The Chinese Buddhist History', pp. 45-46. Also his Tōdai Bukkyōshi no Kenkyū or 'A Study of the Buddhist History in the T'ang Dynasty (hereafter referred to as T'ang History)', pp. 335-357. E. Zürcher, Conquest, pp. 156-163.
24. KSC, p. 352a.
25. Will be discussed further in the next Chapter.
26. TSSSL, p. 251b-c.
27. Ibid., p. 251c.
28. Ibid., pp. 251c-252a.
29. SKSC, p. 709a-b.
30. Cf. SKSC, p. 743a (Tsan-ning's comment on the Biography of Tsung-mi) and p. 800c (Tsang-ning's comment on the Biography of I-hsüan). Cf. also Tso Sze-bong, 'Bio.& Biblio.', Part 3, pp. 141-143.

31. See next Section, notes 1 to 11.
32. See Appendix, Table VIII, Rule 86. DRMGTV, pp. 654c-655a, 662c and 962c.
33. Li Tao-yüan, Vol. 3, f.14, p.35. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, tr., 'Some Source of Materials on Chinese Buddhist History (hereafter referred to as 'Materials'), Nan-yang Fo-chiao, Vol. 121 (1979), p. 62.
34. DRMGTV, p. 872b and p. 998b. Cf. Chapter II, Section II, Sub-section H , note 260.
35. See the discussion of Section IV, notes 305 to 312.
36. Tao-hsüan's Quotation says that the Mahāyāna monks of the 'Central Country (India)' ate no meat. And the Chinese monks who studied the Vinaya imitated the tradition of the Indian Mahāyāna monks by eating no flesh (p. 118a). Cf. also Chapter II, Section II, Sub-section H , notes 261 to 267.
37. Tao-hsüan, Quotation, p. 119a.
38. Idem.
39. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1131a, p. 1132c and p. 1156a all mention two meals a day. Chên-hua mentions in his work that he took up a post of kitchener in a monastery in Taiwan in 1953, and how he prepared three meals a day for the members of that monastery in this period (Chên-hua, pp. 341-342).
40. DRMGTV, pp. 659c, 660c, 789, 932c-933c and 1000a.
41. According to the DRMGTV, those harmful things are: (1) He scolded the Bhikṣus. (2) He slandered the Bhikṣus . (3) He did something that reduced the benefits of the Bhikṣus. (4) He did something that made the Bhikṣus lose their benefits. (5) He made the Bhikṣus lose their accommodation. (6) He made mischief among the Bhikṣus. (7) He vilified the Buddha as evil in front of the Bhikṣus. (8) He vilified the Dharma as evil in front of the Bhikṣus. (9) He vilified the Saṅgha as evil in front of the Bhikṣus. (10) He calumniated a Bhikṣu falsely for a sin, such as abusing the Bhikṣuṇī, etc. (p. 959b and p. 1009b).
42. Ibid., p. 959.
43. Ibid., pp.959c-960a.
44. Cf. note 11.
45. DRMGTV, p. 935c and p. 960b. NHCKNFC, p. 211b. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, p. 48.

46. Li-chi, SSCCS, Vol. 5, p. 196b. This account was given to me by Professor Liu Ts'un-yan.

47. Men-tzŭ, SSCCS, Vol. 8, p. 156a-b. James Legge, tr., The Works of Mencius, CC, Vol. 1-2, pp. 340-341.

48. Shih-chi, Vol. 3, p. 1058a. Burton Watson, tr., Records of the Grand Historian of China, Vol. I, p. 208.

49. In the Ku-chin Hsiao-shuo or 'Novels of the Past and the Present', edited by Fêng Mêng-lung(flor. 1624-1630), there is a short novel entitled 'Chin Yü-nu Pang-ta Po-ch'ing Lang (Madam Chin Yü-nu Beats her Jilted Husband with a Staff)'. The story of this novel tells that in a period between 1131 to 1162, Mo Chi, an intellectual, married Chin Yü-nu, a daughter of a beggars' chief, in order to win the financial support from his father-in-law. After he was sponsored by his wife to continue his study, had passed the Official Examination and was appointed official, Mo Chi felt contempt for the social hierarchy of his wife's family. Especially when he heard the urchins in the street still calling him "Beggar-chief Chin's son-in-law" after his appointment, he considered that his marital relationship would become an obstacle to his political prospects. Therefore he drowned his wife Chin Yü-nu, when he was sailing in order to take up his appointment, with the aim of eliminating his connection with a beggar's family and in the hope of marrying a real lady. Fortunately, his murder was not successful and the story finally ended in comedy (Vol. II, pp. 406-414). This novel strongly reflects how much contempt the Chinese society felt for beggars.

50. The Lu-tu-chi Ching (K'ang Sêng-hui, tr., T. 152) emphasises the religious merits of a layman who gives away food or other materials to support the Buddhist priests (pp. 11c-12a, 14 and 16b). The Tsêng-i A-han Ching or Ekottarāgamasūtra (Saṅghadeva [flor. 396-398], tr., T. 125) praises the merits of the charitable deeds of Anāthapiṇḍada (Sudatta) and stresses the importance of this kind of merit made by a layman (p. 565a-b). These two early translations would have exerted a strong influence on the Chinese Buddhist believers.

51. Will be discussed further in Section III.

52. See Appendix, Table II. Cf. Chapter I, Section V, note 532. See also note 39 of this Section.

53. Cf. Chapter I, Section V, note 532.
54. KSC, p. 330b.
55. TTTTESSTFSC, p. 237c. Samuel Beal, tr., pp. 112-113. Arthur Waley, paraphrased, p. 46.
56. See Section IV, notes 305 to 312.
57. For instance, even though Tao-hsüan was the 'Ninth Patriarch' of the Disciplinary School in China, and he stressed the Buddhist tradition of 'begging for survival' in his Quotation (pp.129c-130a), I cannot find any record that Tao-hsüan had gone out to collect alms.
58. DRMGTV, p. 875a-b.
59. Ibid., p. 876a.
60. Ibid., p. 954c.
61. Ibid., p. 956b.
62. Ibid., p. 940c.
63. Ibid., p. 641a-b. The Vinaya says that it would hurt the insects living in the soil.
64. Ibid., p. 641c. Cf. Chapter II, Section II, notes 175 and 176.
65. Ibid., p. 875b and p. 876a.
66. Cf. note 11.
67. Cf. Section II, notes 88 to 98. And notes 128 to 150.
68. HKSC, p. 559b.
69. SKSC, p. 775a.
70. Ibid., p. 869a.
71. Ibid., p. 897b.
72. Cf. notes 58 and 60.
73. HKSC, p. 673a-b.
74. Ibid., p. 695a.
75. SKSC, p. 778b.
76. Cf. note 61.
77. Cf. note 64.
78. HKSC, p. 575c.
79. Chiu T'ang Shu, Vol. 5, p. 2551b. SKSC, pp. 755c-756a.
80. SKSC, p. 855c.
81. Ibid., p. 855b.
82. DRMGTV, p. 863a.
83. Lun-yü, SSCCS, Vol. 8, p. 20b. James Legge, tr., Confucian Analects, CC, Vol. 1-2, p. 154.

84. Cf. Chapter II, Section I, note 142.
85. SKSC, p. 834a.
86. According to the DRMGTV, the duty of a verger in a monastery is in fact a 'bursar' of this institution (p. 686c).
87. SKSC, p. 843c.

Notes to Section II

88. KSC, p. 356b.
89. Ibid., p. 363b.
90. HKSC, p. 461c.
91. Ibid., p. 524b and pp. 532c-533a.
92. Ibid., p. 524b.
93. According to Mou Jun-sun's Lun Wei-chin I-lai Chih Ch'ung-shang T'an-pien Chih-chi Ying-hsiang or 'On the Indulgence in "Discourse and Polemics" by the Scholars of the Wei-chin Time and Its Influence in Subsequent Ages', the intellectuals of the Wei-chin time (i.e. from the Ts'ao-Wei Dynasty to the Chin Dynasty, third century to forth century A.D.) considered that to study the three Books of Ritual, especially the chapters concerning how to put on the different grades of mourning and to give lectures on them, was a good way for training one's capacity in logical reasoning and in debating. Therefore, even the Buddhist priests were involved in the study of this field (p. 28).
94. HKSC, p. 524b.
95. According to the NHCKNFC, p. 232b (see also J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, p. 204), in I-ching's (635-713) twelfth year (i.e. 646), his master Shan-yü died at the age of sixty-three.
96. NHCKNFC, p. 231c. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, p. 198.
97. Ibid., p. 232b. J. Takakusu, tr., ibid., pp. 203-204.
98. Idem. J. Takakusu, tr., ibid., p. 204.
99. Cf. E. Zürcher, Conquest, pp. 71-73. Also cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol. I, pp. 112-135.
100. HKSC, p. 460c.
101. Ibid., p. 497b.
102. Ibid., p. 704a.
103. Ibid., p. 526a.
104. SKSC, p. 799a.
105. Ibid., p. 749b.

106. KSC, p. 325a.
107. Ibid., p. 326c.
108. Ibid., p. 351c.
109. SVSTVDV, p. 274a-b. I should like to remark that among the Vinayas that were translated into Chinese, only this one allows the Bhikṣus to study non-Buddhist works. I cannot find the same statement in the others. The SKSC says that as the monk Chih-hui (flor. 911) heard that the Buddha allowed the Bhikṣus to spend some of their time to study the non-Buddhist works, he began to get involved in poetical composition, calligraphy, painting and medicine. He also studied Taoism (pp. 883-884a). In Chih-hui's time, the DRMGTV had long been adopted as the only discipline for the Chinese Monastic Order (see Chapter I, Section V, notes 455 to 489). As this Vinaya did not mention that the Buddha allowed his Bhikṣus to study non-Buddhist works, Chih-hui dared to do so only after having 'heard' that this did not offend the Buddha's law.
110. See Chapter I, Section II, notes 145 to 226, and Section III, notes 246 to 340.
111. Cf. E. Zürcher, Conquest, p. 74.
112. KSC, p. 351c.
113. Ibid., p. 352c. Hsi Ts_o-ch'ih's Biography see Chin Shu, Vol. 2, pp. 1054b-1057b.
114. Ibid., p. 353a.
115. KSC, p. 418c. Arthur F. Wright, pp. 404-405.
116. HKSC, p. 487c.
117. Ibid., p. 497a.
118. Idem.
119. Ibid., p. 665b.
120. Ibid., p. 661b-c.
121. Ibid., p. 545c.
122. SKSC, p. 779b.
123. Idem.
124. HKSC, p. 490b.
125. I have read the Fo-shuo Yü-lan-p'ên Ching or Ullambana Sūtra (T.685, Dharmarakṣa, tr.), and found that it only says that Maudgalyāyana brought a bowl of rice with him to go to hell to feed his mother's soul there (p. 779a-b). It does not mention that he fed his mother by begging when she was still alive. The Pao-ên Fêng-p'ên Ching (T.686, anon., tr.) also tells the same story (p. 780a).

126. This story is recorded in Sêng-yu's Shih-chia P'u or 'Notes on the Stories Concerning Śākyamuni Quoted from the Buddhist Scriptures' T. 2040), p. 54a-b. Sêng-yu says that this story is quoted from the Ching-fan Wang Po-ni-yüan Ching or 'King Śuddhodana's Nirvāṇa Sūtra'. According to the CSTCC, p. 25a, this Sūtra was in one fascicle (anon., tr.). It has long been lost.
127. HKSC, p. 490c.
128. Ibid., p. 476a.
129. Ibid., p. 701b.
130. Ibid., p. 485a.
131. Ibid., p. 629b.
132. Ibid., p. 519a.
133. Ibid., p. 623a.
134. Ssŭ-ma Kuang, Chronicle, pp. 5655-5658. See also HKSC, p. 623a.
135. HKSC, p. 623a.
136. Ibid., p. 623a-b.
137. SKSC, p. 748b.
138. SKSC, p. 818c.
139. HKSC, p. 460b.
140. Ibid., p. 464a.
141. Ibid., p. 475b.
142. Ibid., pp. 502c-503a.
143. SKSC, p. 800a.
144. Ibid., p. 778c.
145. Cf. note 138.
146. SKSC, p. 819a.
147. KSC, p. 337b.
148. HKSC, p. 663b.
149. SKSC, p. 748a-b.
150. HKSC, p. 474a.
151. Ibid., p. 484a-b.
152. SKSC, p. 780a.
153. Ibid., p. 845c.
154. In China a disciple mourns his master for seven days (cf. Section I of Chapter I, notes 61 to 65. See also note 156 of this Section). According to Tao-ch'êng's (flor. 1019) Shih-shih Yao-lan or 'The Institutes of Buddhism (T.2127)', a monk disciple, in mourning his master, should have to put on a robe made of rough cotton dyed yellow-ochre colour (p. 308a).

155. SKSC, p. 749b.
156. NHCKNFC, p. 216b-c. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, p. 81.
157. SKSC, p. 887a.
158. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, pp. 229-334. Kenneth Ch'en, 'Filial Piety in Chinese Buddhism', HJAS, Vol. 28 (1968, Cambridge, U.S.A.), pp. 81-97.

Notes to Section III

159. As these publications are too numerous, it is impossible to list all of them here. Therefore, only those works quoted in order to support my discussion will appear in this paper.
160. DRMGTV, pp. 618-619, 691b-c, 962. See also Appendix, Table VIII, Rule 37.
161. Ibid., pp. 617b-c, 619-620, 620-621. NHCKNFC, p. 220c. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, pp. 191-192. See also Appendix, Table VIII, Rules 38 and 39.
162. Cf. Section I, Sub-section C, notes 46 to 49.
163. Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ang, History, Vol. I, p. 142.
164. For his Biography see Chin Shu, Vol. 2, pp. 880b-881b (appended to the Biography of Hsi Chien, his grandfather).
165. KSC, p. 352c.
166. Ibid., p. 354b. HKSC, pp. 506c-507a (his account is appended to the Biography of Fa-tsan).
167. KSC, p. 396c.
168. Ibid., p. 415c.
169. Ibid., p. 417b.
170. HKSC, p. 482c.
171. Ibid., p. 505a.
172. Ibid., p. 568b (the Biography of T'an-ch'ung [515-594]. In the period of disorder it was common for a noble to donate his house to the Order in order to win the Buddha's blessing. Cf. LYCLC (T. 2092), pp. 1007b, 1009a, 1010a, 1013c, 1017a, 1017b and 1018a.
173. HKSC, p. 568b.
174. Ibid., p. 668c.
175. Ibid., pp. 585c-586a (the Biography of Chih-tsao [556-638]).
176. SKSC, p. 734c.
177. Li Chien-nung, pp. 75-79.

178. KSC, p. 410. For Wang T'an-chih's Biography see Chin Shu, Vol. 2, pp. 961b-964a.
179. For his Biography see Sung Shu, Vol. 2, pp. 784a-788a.
180. For his Biography see ibid., pp. 653b-655a.
181. For his Biography see ibid., pp. 647a-650b.
182. KSC, p. 368c.
183. Idem.
184. That the prince who remitted householders to a monastery as his endowment to that establishment was in conformity with Buddhist tradition, cf. Chapter I, Section II, notes 226;and note 55 of Section I, Sub-section C of this Chapter. Wei Shou says that the duty of a 'Sangha-Householder' in the Northern Wei Dyansty was to convey sixty 'Hu (600 pekcs)' of grain and present them to the clerical officials annually (Treatise, p. 1445a. Leon Hurvitz, tr., p. 73). I believe that the householders that Prince Chin remitted to this monastery would have fulfilled the same duty to the establishment (see note 185).
185. HKSC, p. 568b.
186. SKSC, p. 729b.
187. HKSC, p. 675b.
188. Ibid., p. 576c.
189. Ibid., p. 507a.
190. KSC, p. 369c.
191. HKSC, p. 568a.
192. Ibid., p. 460c.
193. KSC, p. 382a.
194. HKSC, p. 478a.
195. Ibid., p. 668c.
196. Ibid., p. 575c.
197. Ibid., p. 689a.
198. SKSC, p. 867c.
199. Idem,
200. KSC, p. 377c.
201. Ibid., p. 369c.
202. Ibid., p. 417b.
203. HKSC, p. 478a.
204. Ibid., p. 432c.
205. Ibid., p. 575c.
206. Idem.

207. Ibid., p. 567c.
208. See Chapter I, Section II, notes 127-288, and Section III, notes 230 to 342.
209. See Appendix, Table VIII, Rules 37 to 39. Cf. DRMGTV, pp.618-619, 619-620, 691b-c.
210. See Chapter I, Section I, notes 4 to 10.
211. See ibid., notes 68 to 72.
212. See ibid., notes 69 to 71.
213. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, pp. 503-513.
214. See Chapter II, Section II, note 233.
215. SKSC, p. 801c. For the legacy of a dead priest belonging to the Monastic Order, see DRMGTV, p. 859b-c.
216. For Hui-i's Biography see KSC, p. 368c-369a.
217. KSC, p. 379a.
218. Idem.
219. The original Chinese text reads: "Chi Fa Ying Hou Pan", in which the Chinese character 'Fa' here means 'in a way' or 'in a principle'. As I have mentioned in note 215 , before 767, the legacy of a monk belonged to the government, perhaps the right Hui-chi had to succeed to a half of his master's bequest was a custom among the clerical circiles of his period.
220. KSC, p. 379a. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, tr., 'Materials', pp. 61-62.
221. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Translation Centres', p. 304.
222. HKSC, p. 607b.
223. See Section II, notes 151 to 157 of this Chapter.
224. KSC, p. 358a.
225. T'an-i's Biography see ibid., pp. 355c-356b. His date, cf. Ch'en Yüan, Dates of Monks, p. 5.
226. KSC, p. 358a.
227. Will be discussed in Chapter IV, Section I.
228. HKSC, pp. 629c-630a.
229. Ibid., p. 630a.
230. Ibid., p. 630a-b.
231. He was a contemporary of Tao-hsüan.
232. HKSC, p. 655a.
233. Ibid., p. 655a-b.
234. Cf. Huang Min-chih, T'ang-tai Szŭ-yüan Ching-chi Ti Yen-chiu or 'A Study of the Monastic Economy of the T'ang Dynasty', p. 118.

235. Cf. ibid., p. 35.

236. NHCKNFC, p. 216. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, pp.79-80.

237. His account is appended to Chiu T'ang Shu, Vol. 5, p. 2185a (the Biography of Tuan Wên-Ch'ang, his father).

238. Yu-yang Tsa-tsu, p. 35b.

239. Idem.

240. Sung Shu, Vol. 2, p. 1135a. Chronicle, p. 3974. Cf. Huang Min-chih, p. 31.

241. For his Biography see Pei-ch'i Shu, pp. 8a-20a (the 'Basic-Annals of Emperor Shên-wu [Kao Huan's posthumous title]').

242. Wei Shu, Vol. 1, p. 151 and Vol. 2, p. 829. HKSC, p. 607c. Chronicle, pp. 4814-4818.

243. HKSC, pp. 607c-608a. Cf. Huang Min-chih, p. 35.

244. For his Biography see Pei Shih, Vol. 2, pp. 789b-790b. For his dates see Chronicle, p. 482c.

245. For this exemption see Chapter IV, Section I note 10 and notes 12 to 15.

246. HKSC, pp. 607c-608a.

247. Ibid., p. 608a.

248. Cf. Huang Min-chih, pp. 35-36.

249. See notes 178, 182, and 186. Cf. D.C. Twitchett, 'Monastic Estates in T'ang China', in Asia Major, Vol. V (1965), pp. 127-131. Huang Min-chih, pp. 52-54.

250. Cf. D.C. Twitchett, p. 133. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, pp. 497-502. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p. 251. Huang Min-chih, pp.55-56.

251. See Chapter I, Section I, note 59, and Appendix, Table III. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, ibid., p. 438. The HKSC says that when Ching-lin (565-640) entered the Order in his seventh year (in 571), he was told to cultivate the farming lands of his monastery every day. At the same time, his master would never lecture him on Buddhism. Therefore, Ching-lin sighed: "Oh, this is no different from my secular life, for I have not yet had a chance to abandon this work of farming." Then he left his master and looked for another one who would give him lessons on Buddhist doctrines (p. 590a). Ching-lin's story reflects that in his time, in some monasteries farming work assigned to the novices was compulsory.

252. Cf. Huang Min-chih, p. 22 and p. 60. For the agricultural involvement of the Chinese monks see also Section I, Sub-section D, notes 68 to 71 of this Chapter.

253. For the sources on these male or female slaves, cf. Jacques Gernet, Les aspects économiques du Bouddhisme; la société Chinoise du Ve au Xe siècle (this book was recommended to me by Dr. K.H.J.Gardiner), p. 68 and p. 123. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, pp. 484-485. Huang Min-chih, pp. 23-25. According to the MHSGKV, an establishment is not allowed to accept donations in terms of slaves. In case these slaves were donated under the name of 'lay-attendants', they become acceptable (p. 495b).
254. Cf. Jacques Gernet, pp. 123-124. Michihata Ryōshū, idem. Huang Min-chih, idem.
255. Cf. D.C. Twitchett, p. 140. Jacques Gernet, pp. 101-104. Michihata Ryōshū, ibid., pp. 486-488. Huang Min-chih, pp. 61-62.
256. Cf. D.C. Twitchett, idem. Huang Min-chih, pp. 60-61.
257. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, pp. 476-478. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, pp. 271-272.
258. See Appendix, Table II.
259. This is the reason why the authors of the three 'Biographies' always remark on those who insisted on observing the tradition of begging for survival. For instance, the HKSC specially stresses that Yu-hsi Monastery in Kiangsu Province was an establishment: "....without any food stuffs or kitchen dressings in it. All members of this monastery had to go out for Piṇḍapāta (collecting alms) (p. 550c, the Biography of Hui-shêng [457-524])". See Appendix, Table I.
260. See Chapter II, Section I, notes 162 and 167.
261. For their dates see SKSC, p. 832a-b.
262. SKSC, p. 831b.
263. Ibid., p. 831c and p. 832a.
264. HKSC, p. 489b (the Biography of T'an-yen).
265. Cf. note 173.
266. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p. 269. Huang Min-chih, p. 48.
267. See note 182.
268. KSC, p. 368c.
269. Idem.
270. Cf. Jacques Gernet, pp. 116-117. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, pp. 464-466. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, pp. 268-269. Huang Min-chih, pp. 56-65.
271. SKSC, pp. 803c-804a.

272. Ibid., p. 803c.
273. Idem.
274. HKSC, p. 697c.
275. Ibid., p. 659c.
276. Ibid., p. 654b.
277. SVSTVDV, p. 415c. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, p. 516. Huang Min-chih, p. 76.
278. DRMGTV, p. 857a.
279. MHSGKV, p. 496b. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, p. 516, Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p. 265.
280. Ibid., p. 498b. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, idem. Kenneth Ch'en, idem.
281. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, ibid., pp. 264-265.
282. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, pp. 515-517.
283. Kenneth Ch'en says that the storeroom in a Chinese establishment existed since the end of the fifth century A.D. (Survey, p. 264).
284. Cf. Yabuki Keiki, Sangaikyō no Kenkyū or 'A Study of the Sect of the Three Stages', pp. 115-118 and 501-510. Lien-shen Yang, 'Buddhist Monasteries and Four Money Raising Institutes in Chinese History', in HJAS, Vol. 13 (1950, Cambridge), pp. 176-177. Jacques Gernet, pp. 205-212. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, pp. 517-536. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, pp. 264-266. Huang Min-chih, pp. 76-81.
285. For instance, the SKSC says that after Chih-yün (777-853) took up the duty of Administrator of All Supplies of his Hua-yen Monastery, he kept the stocks of rice and noodles in the Inexhaustible Treasury of his monastery from becoming really exhausted. Therefore, during his appointment for over ten years, the one thousand fellow-monks of this monastery never suffered from a shortage of food. I-yüan (n.d.), a monk of a neighbouring shrine was jealous of Chih-yün's success and so spread rumours in order to attack him (p. 881a-b). This story tells how important the Inexhaustibe Treasury was to the livelihood of the priests. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, pp. 443-449.
286. Cf. Jacques Gernet, p. 217. Michihata Ryōshū, ibid., pp. 407-414, and his other work, Chūgoku Bukkyō to Shakai Fukushi Jigyō or 'Chinese Buddhism and Social Welfare (hereafter referred to as Welfare)', pp. 71-78. Huang Min-chih, pp. 37-38.
287. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, Welfare, pp. 88-93.
288. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, pp. 414-420. And his Welfare, pp. 415-416.

289. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, ibid., pp. 414, 416-417. And his ibid., p. 227.
290. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, ibid., p. 416. And his ibid., p. 228.
291. Cf. Jacques Gernet, pp. 215-216. Michihata Ryōshū, ibid., pp. 389-406, and his ibid., pp. 180-186. Huang Min-chih, pp. 132-134.
292. See Chapter IV, Section III, Sub-section C, notes 276 to 283. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, pp. 428-431. And his Welfare, pp. 225-226.
293. Cf. Lien-sheng Yang, pp. 177-178. Michihata Ryōshū, ibid., pp. 514-515, 527, 532 and 536. And his ibid., pp. 108-110. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p. 265.
294. Cf. Jacques Gernet, pp. 175-184. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, pp. 536-540. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p. 266. Huang Min-chih, pp. 81-98.
295. Cf. D.C. Twitchett, p. 123. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p. 267.
296. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, pp. 469-470. Huang Min-chih, pp. 54-55.
297. Cf. Jacques Gernet, pp. 138-149. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, pp. 450-453. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, pp. 261-266. Huang Min-chih, pp. 98-105.
298. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, ibid., pp. 262-263. Huang Min-chih, pp. 105-108.
299. Cf. Jacques Gernet, p. 164, pp. 220-221. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, pp. 420-439, and his Welfare, pp. 224-225. Kenneth Ch'en, ibid., pp. 263-264.
300. Lien-sheng Yang, pp. 179-191.
301. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, p. 103. Huang Min-chih, p.62.
302. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, pp. 504-508. Huang Min-chih, pp. 122-123.
303. See Appendix, Table VII. Cf. Huang Min-chih, pp. 50 and 54.
304. See notes 227, 279 and 280. Michihata Ryōshū says that the Mūla-sarvāstivādanikāyavinaya scriptures also exerted an influence on the development of the Inexhaustible Treasury in the Chinese Order (T'ang History, p. 522). As the above-mentioned Vinaya scriptures were translated in 700 (see Chapter I, Section IV, Sub-section E, notes 384 to 393) and the activities of the Inexhaustible Treasury had existed long before 700 (Michihata Ryōshū, ibid., pp. 526-527), I think that the Mūlasarvāstivādanikāyavinaya scriptures simply gave more doctrinal encouragement for maintaining the Inexhaustible Treasury.

Notes to Section IV

305. KSC, p. 403c.
306. Ibid., p. 379c.
307. For his Biography see Nan-ch'i Shu, pp. 196-199.
308. KSC, p. 379c.
309. Idem.
310. HKSC, p. 607b-c.
311. Ibid., p. 651c.
312. Ibid., p. 544c.
313. KSC, p. 331c. Chin Shu, Vol. 3, p. 1225b.
314. KSC, p. 332c.
315. Chin Shu, ibid., p. 1226b.
316. In the 'Conclusion of the Category of Translators' of his KSC, Hui-chiao praised Kumārajīva highly for his contributions to the translation of Buddhist scriptures in China (p. 345c). Cf. Itō Giken, Shina Bukkyō Seishi or 'The Standard History of Chinese Buddhism (published in 1922), pp. 293-306. Liang Ch'i-ch'ao (1873-1929), 'Fo-tien Chih Fan-i (On the Translation of the Buddhist Scriptures)', pp. 12-13 (in Liang's Fo-hsüeh Yen-ch'iu Shih-pa Pien or 'The Eighteen Articles on the Buddhist Studies'). Sakaino Kōyō (+ 1933), Shina Bukkyō Seishi or 'Essentialities of the Chinese Buddhist History', pp. 341-404. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol. I, pp. 203-222. Tokiwa Daijō, Shina Bukkyō no Kenkyū or 'A Study on Chinese Buddhism (published in 1938)', pp. 161-165. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, pp. 81-83.
317. Hui-chiao excused Kumārajīva because he was 'forced to live in a private bedroom (i.e. to live with women)', KSC, p. 345c).
318. SKSC, p. 725b-c.
319. Idem.
320. Ibid., p. 726a.
321. Ibid., p. 726b-c, the comments of Tsan-ning on Kuei-chi. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, pp. 320 and 325.
322. Ibid., pp. 473a and 474c. According to the DRMGTV, a priest is not allowed to engage in gambling (p. 692c and p. 693a).
323. KSC, p. 390c.
324. Ibid., p. 392a.
325. HKSC, p. 626b.
326. SKSC, p. 841b.

327. Ibid., p. 852a.
328. Ibid., p. 865b.
329. Ibid., pp. 868c-869a.
330. Ibid., p. 852c.
331. Ibid., p. 852b.
332. Ibid., p. 865c. According to the Vinaya a priest is not allowed to be involved in military affairs. See DRMGTV, p. 669b, 670a and 671. Also cf. Table VIII, Rules 97 to 99.
333. These 'Five Rebellious Acts are: Parricide, Matricide, Killing an Arhan, Shedding the blood of a Buddha and Destroying the harmony of the Saṅgha. See Mochizuki , p. 1124c.
334. SKSC, p. 865c.
335. Idem, Tsan-ning's comments on the Biography of Hsiung-chün.
336. His date is given according to Ch'en Yüan, Dates of Monks, p. 163.
337. SKSC, p. 869b.
338. Idem.
339. Idem.
340. Ibid., p. 867a-b.
341. Cf. Hu Shih, 'Lêng-chia Tsung K'ao (A Study of the Laṅkā School)', p. 231 and p. 234. (This article was composed in 1935); and his 'Ho-chê Ta-shih Shên-hui Chuan (The Biography of Shên-hui, Master of the Ho-chê Monastery)', pp. 260-273 (This article was composed in 1930). Both of these two works are listed in Hu-shih Wên-ts'un or 'Hu Shih's Registered Essays', Vol. IV. Ui Hakuju, Zenshūshi Kenkyū, pp. 19-20, 274-275 and 344-374. Jên Chi-yü, Han-t'ang Chung-kuo Fo-chiao Shih-hsiang Lun-chi or 'Collection of Articles on the Chinese Buddhist Thoughts in the Dynasties from Han to T'ang', pp. 101, 110, 113 and 125. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p. 356 and p. 360. Mochizuki, pp. 3967c-3969a.
342. Cf. notes 343 to 348.
343. SKSC, p. 816a.
344. Ibid., p. 780a.
345. Ibid., p. 780c.
346. Ibid., p. 817c.
347. Ibid., p. 775c. His date is given according to Ch'en Yüan, Dates of Monks, p. 154.
348. Ibid., p. 781b.
349. Ibid., p. 786c.
350. Huai-hai (720-814) was a contemporary of Wei-yen.

CHAPTER IV

Buddhist Priests Who Strayed from the Vinaya - External Factors -

Except from the internal factors that are given in the previous Chapter, there are also some external factors that led the Buddhist priests to stray from the Vinaya. These factors, generally speaking, can be divided mainly into three fields. Firstly, due to the reasons given in the previous Chapter[1] and this Chapter,[2] many unfaithful elements infiltrated the Monastic Order. After having taken refuge in Buddhism, they began to do bad deeds or even committed crimes for their own benefit.[3] Secondly, as the Chinese emperors considered the priests to be their subjects,[4] the imperial government applied many religious policies in order to put the Monastic Order under control of the imperial rule. In such circumstances, the Chinese priests would have to obey the secular law rather than the Buddhist Vinaya.[5] Thirdly, as the donations in the form of money or other materials donated by the secular donors were the main financial source of the Buddhist establishments,[6] monks and nuns in China did their best to woo the secular people to come to visit their monastery or nunnery in order to obtain their donations. Therefore, the priests would have to stray from the Vinaya to some extent in order to gratify their secular believers.

I. Unfaithful Elements Who Took Refuge in the Monastic Order.

From the time of the 'Troubles of the Yung-chia Era (307-312)' until the reunification of the whole country by the Sui Dynasty in 590, China had suffered from division and turmoil for nearly three hundred years. Firstly, she bore the pains of confrontations between the orthodox Eastern Chin

Dynasty in the Yangtzŭ River Valley and the usurping kingdoms established by alien groups in the Yellow River Valley (from 317 to 439). Later, this is followed by the antagonism among the Southern Dynasties and the Northern Dynasties (from 440 to 589). During this long period of disorder, there were numerous civil wars, both large and small. Besides, within the dominions of each of the above-mentioned political entities, there were frequent coups d'état, conspiracies and rebellions.[7] In order to cope with these situations, each of these states recuited more and more money and men for supplementing military expenditures. In such circumstances, the ordinary people began to devote themselves to the Monastic Order as one of the ways for escaping from heavy taxation and national service.[8] According to Indian Buddhist tradition, the priests' names of a Buddhist establishment were not recorded in the governmental register of population.[9] In other words, the monks were not regarded as the subjects of the Indian kings. Therefore, they were exempted from paying tax and taking part in national service. In China, before the down-fall of the Ch'ing (Manchu) Dynasty in 1911, the Buddhist priests had also enjoyed the same exemptions for a long, long time. When did these exemptions begin ? Scholars have recognised that these two exemptions began to be practised since around 193 to 194 when the notorious warlord Chai Jung exempted the Buddhist devotees from the other statutory labour duties in order to attract them.[10] Even though this religious policy was inaugurated by a local usurper like Chai Jung, we still ca find some comparatively early records of these exemptions in both orthodox or usurping political entities:

(1) Tao-hsüan's HKSC says that before the down-fall of the Northern Liang State in 439, its capital Ku-tsang (present Wu-wei City of Kansu Province) was besieged by the troops of the Northern Wei Dynasty. As the residents of this city were few, the authority of this State forced three thousand Buddhist monks in the city to join military service as combatants

in order to aid the resistance.[11] This story indicates that monks were originally exempted from participating in national service in this State.

(2) Hsiao Tzŭ-hsien's Nan-ch'i Shu says that in 480, Yü Wan-chi (died after 480) sent a memorial to Emperor Kao-ti (R. 479-482) of the Southern Ch'i Dynasty, in which he remarked: "..... those who are born bare-headed call themselves priests ..... even though they are in fact living together with their spouses and childern, their names are not recorded in the governmental register of population...."[12] Yü's words make it clear that these bare-headed people made use of their religious vocation as a pretext to evade the duties of citizens.

(3) Wei Shou's Treatise says that in 486, the officials memorialised Emperor Hsiao-wên of the Northern Wei Dynasty: "Formerly, we were advised in an Edict that at the beginning of census foolish people, trusting to chance, falsely called themselves religious and thereby evaded imposts, and that unregistered monks and nuns were to be unfrocked and returned to the laity ...."[13] The officials' words clearly show that monks and nuns in the Northern Wei were exempted from paying tax.

(4) Tao-hsüan's KHMC says that before he fled to the Eastern Wei Dynasty (534-549), Hsün Chi (+ 547)[14] sent a memorial to Emperor Wu of the Liang Dynasty. Hsün's memorial attacked the Buddhist priests: "..... they were originally poor plebeians, and they entered the Order only to be exempted from paying tax and performing national service. Therefore, they would not strengthen themselves in Buddhist practices so as to win Buddhist enlightenment ....."[15]

The above four instances indicate the fact that both in the Yangtzŭ River Valley and in the Yellow River Valley, Buddhist priests were exempt from imposts and the draft. Moreover, according to Buddhist tradition, priests are not allowed to participate in any kind of physical labour

related to agricultural production.[16] Moreover, with the exception of some individual monks who were still observing the Indian tradition of collecting alms,[17] the Chinese Order had long strayed from this tradition.[18] They simply depended on monastic property and the donations from lay-followers.[19] Therefore, the 'peaceful and comfortable career'[20] of the priests became very attractive to the poor plebeians who were living in hardship. Due to the reasons given above, many people joined the Order in order to escape their secular predicaments. Furthermore, according to the Vinaya, in the case of ordination of criminals, slaves and people who were indebted, the Indian government and the masters of the slaves and the debtors were not allowed to come to the Order to charge them by law, or to claim them back, or ask them to pay debts.[21] This was despite the fact that the Buddha himself did not encourage the Order to confer ordination on persons from such backgrounds.[22] In China, as the Monastic Order follows this tradition by providing the same sanctuary, many criminals or those who were oppressed found ways to devote themselves to the Order in order to escape dangerous situations.[23] In other words, many unfaithful elements who had not vowed to serve the religion whole-heartedly, infiltrated into the Order. Due to the two reasons given above, the number of monks and nuns in each dynasty during this period of disorder became considerable.[24]

Of course we can find some examples of persons who entered the Order for a reason other than religious belief in the first place, but then advanced to become eminent monks. For instance, Wu -ming (flor. 572) joined the Order to escape the turmoil in the secular world.[25] As his father had passed away and his mother had re-married, Ch'êng-hsin (727-802) joined the Order in his childhood in order to avoid joining his mother's new home.[26] After having failed the Official Examination several times, Tsêng-jên (813-871) became a monk.[27] As Fu-chang's (910-9-4) mother became

pregnant with him after she dreamed that she had visited a monastery and held the implements used in worship, he was sent to enter the Order by his father when he was eleven.[28] These four monks have their Biographies in the HKSC and the SKSC.[29] However, we cannot expect that all the above-mentioned unfaithful elements would have transformed themselves into eminent priests after having entered the Order and being influenced by the religious environment.[30] For instance, around 540, as Emperor Wu of the Liang Dynasty saw that the shameless monks strayed from the conduct prescribed by the Vinaya and committed misdemeanours at will, while the 'Sêng-chêng' did not administer the discipline rigidly, he tried to take up the duty of 'Controller of the Buddhist Priests' himself in order to regulate the Buddhist priests directly. For this purpose, he invited all the Buddhist masters to come and attend a conference held in his palace. There he announced this proposal and asked these masters to approve his idea. After he debated this with the monk Chih-ts'ang (458-522) and understood that it would be very difficult to demand the monks to follow the Vinaya strictly in a 'degenerate period', the emperor withdraw his suggestion.[31] After the debate, Chih-ts'ang told his disciples: "....how could we expect the priests to obey the Vinaya thoroughly as they came originally from all walks of life. For instance, if there is a Confucian family with ten or more sons, you can't expect all of them to strictly observe the Confucian norms...."[32] Chih-ts'ang's words indicate that members of the Order recognised the fact that they were conniving at the misdemeanours of their fellow priests. Of his nine precepts for his disciples,[33] Tao-an's first precept reads: "As you have already left the household life ... why would you still ... hang around all the time without studying the scriptures..."[34], while his eighth precept remarks: "As you have already left the household life ... you should accumulate some merit. For instance, a priest with a capacity of a higher level will

practise meditation, while a priest of the middle level will recite the scriptures and a priest of the lower level will participate in the business of managing Stūpas and monasteries. How can you sit still all day long without doing a thing ..."[35] Tao-an's words reflect some of the attitudes of the unfaithful elements towards the religion. As it was very difficult to utilise the Vinaya for regulating priests, Pa-ch'iung (504-584) took a passive attitude towards the priests after he was appointed 'Controller of the Buddhist Priests' in the Capital Territory by the court of the Ch'en Dynasty around 560-561. As Pao-ch'iung would never enforce the Vinaya and the Chinese Monastic Rule strictly, monks and nuns in Nanking (the capital) gratefully respected him. They automatically disciplined themselves.[36] The story also suggests that the Order could not strictly apply the Vinaya.

Unfaithful elements kept on infiltrating into the Order after China was re-united by the Sui and the T'ang Dynasties.[37] Of course they would have committed the same sins and misdemeanours as those in the period of disorder. I should like to give some examples of the evils done by these elements in both the period of disorder and of re-unification:

(1) Murder

The HKSC says that after Ling-jui (564-646) returned from his study, he went back to Shêng-yeh Monastery (in Szŭchuan) around 621-2 in order to preach the Mahāyāna Buddhism that he had learned. As there were already some Hīnayānists preaching the Satyasiddhiśāstra in the monastery, they did not want a Mahāyānist to come and lecture on doctrines that were different from their own. Therefore they tried to kill Ling-jui by pushing a twenty feet long bamboo lance through the wall of the latter's bedroom in order to stab him on his bed. As Ling-jui dodged this murder attempt through his sixth sense, these monks paid an outlaw to come to assassinate him. After that outlaw had failed, Ling-jui left this monastery.[38]

(2) Robbery

The Persecution of 443-454 in the Northern Wei Dynasty was sparked off by the discovery of weapons in a monastery in Ch'ang-an in 444.[39] Since then, the authorities of this dynasty always thought that the Buddhist monks would be involved in outlawry.[40] Sêng-ming (n.d.), abbot of the Shih-k'u Monastery, and several hundred monks were arrested under suspicion of being bandits.[41] In 635, a rebellion led by a woman named Ch'en Shih-chên (+ 635) broke out in Mu-chou (the present southeastern part of Anhui Province and the western part of Chekiang Province).[42] As Ch'en rang a large bell in rallying her rebels and burnt incense before their campaign,[43] the local government officials suspected that they were Buddhist rebels. In order to prevent the unfaithful elements of the Monastic Order from joining this rebellion, the government forced all the monks in the neighbouring areas of the rebelling region to go to Nanking for supervision.[44]

Did Buddhist monks commit crimes like robbery just like outlaws ? In his Yu-yang Tsa-tsu, Tuan Ch'êng-shih says that once Prince Ling (675-737)[45] of the T'ang Dynasty discovered a locked wardrobe in the forest while hunting. After the prince's men broke the wardrobe open, they found that a beautiful lass was tied up in there. She told the prince that she was kidnapped by a gang of outlaws and among them there were two Buddhist monks. Before he took this lass away, the prince told his men to put a bear they had captured into the wardrobe and lock it again. Three days later, the Governor of the Capital Territory (Ch'ang-an and its neighbouring areas) reported to the court that there had been two monks who had a wardrobe brought with them into an inn. Next day, people saw a bear rushing out from their cabin and these two monks were found mauled to death.[46] Again, Tuan tells us that around 780-782, the intellectual Wei met a Buddhist monk on the highway and the latter invited him to go with

him to his shrine for a visit. After their arrival, the monk told Wei that he was in fact an outlaw and his motive for inviting Wei was to trap and rob him. While on their way home, he found that Wei was a skillful martial artist, so he changed his mind and treated Wei as a friend. After a barbecue dinner, Wei was asked to display his prowess by duelling with the monk's son, the bravest of the gangsters led by that monk. As both of them were unharmed after the duel, the monk respected Wei even more, and they spent the whole night discussing the arts of swordsmanship and marksmanship.[47] These two stories suggest that some of the monks in the T'ang Dynasty were involved in robbery.

(3) Sacrilege

According to Chang-sun Wu-chi's (+ 656) T'ang-lü Shu-i or 'An Interpretation of the Code of Law of the T'ang Dynasty', the Code of Law of the T'ang Dynasty contains an act on 'Sacrilege'. It says that anyone who was found guilty of stealing or destroying an image of the (Yüan-shih) T'ien-tsun (the Celestial Honoured Primordial) of Taoism[48] or of the Buddha should be sentenced to three years imprisonment. In case the criminal was a priest, whether male or female, Taoist or Buddhist, an additional penalty of expulsion to the frontiers for hard labour, was applied concurrently. In case the stolen or destroyed image was of a Taoist immortal or a Buddhist Bodhisattva, a penalty of one grade less than the above-mentioned penalty (Chang-sun's interpretation for this paragraph: two and a half years for laymen and three years for priests, i.e. the latter would not be expelled) was to be given. In case a person, priest or layman, stole an image for his own worship, he was to be flogged one hundred times with a staff.[49] As the T'ang Law contains such an act, it indicates how serious the sacrilegious crimes among the clerical circles of this dynasty were.

Crime of sacrilege had been committed long before the T'ang Dynasty. Ch'êng Shu-tê's Chiu-chao-lü Kao or 'A Study of the Legal Acts of the Nine Dynasties'[50] found that in 600 A.D., Emperor Wên of the Sui Dynasty issued an edict stating that Buddhist monks or Taoist priests who destroyed the image of the Buddha or of the Taoist T'ien-tsun, would be regarded as having committed a 'Heinous Crime'.[51] Moreover, in Tao-shih's (died after 668)[52] Fa-yüan Chu-lin or 'Forest of Gems in the Garden of Law (a Buddhist encyclopaedia, T. 2122)' there is a quotation from the lost Ming-hsiang Chi or 'Notes on Buddhist Miracles (compiled by Wang Yen [n.d.] of the Southern Ch'i Dynasty)'[53] that says that around 470-71, there was a monk Tao-chih who frequently stole the jewels used to decorate the chapel or the image of the Buddha from his own monastery. After he had committed this sacrilege for weeks, Tao-chih was found sick. Every day during his convalescence, Tao-chih saw a deity come and stab him with a spear, after which he was really bleeding. Before his death, Tao-chih confessed to his fellow-monks how he had stolen and sold the jewels.[54] This legend tells of sacrilege in this period.

(4) Drinking

I have already listed the drunken clerics recorded in the three 'Biographies' in Table VII and appended it to this thesis. Here I should like to pick one humorous case among those in that table as an example:

In the Biography of Hsüan-chien (n.d.) of the HKSC, there is recorded a story which says that in 623 a ghost told Yü Fa-shih (Master Yü, n.d.) that every Buddhist preaching would attract the heavenly deities to come and listen. When Yü Fa-shih was giving a lecture on Buddhist Sūtras, all the deities had to avert their faces in order to evade the alcoholic bad breath from Yü's mouth.[55]

(5) Meat Eating

The meat-eating monks recorded in the three 'Biographies' are listed in Table VII of this thesis. I shall also give one funny case here as an example:

The SKSC says that as the high-monk W u -ming (flor. ca. 838) of Liang-shan Monastery always took wine and meat, his fellow-monks in this monastery imitated him and did the same. Around 838, W u -ming prepared a big pastry, the size of a blanket, and brought his fellow-monks to visit the place where the poor people, who could not afford to pay the funeral expenses, discarded the corpses of their relatives. After their arrival, W u -ming laid his big sheet of pastry on one of the decayed corpses and rolled it up. Then, he held this pastry-roll to his mouth and bit the roll and its stuffing. Immediately, all the other monks covered their noses with their hands, ran away and spat. W u -ming yelled at them: "If you can eat this kind of meat, you are innocent in eating the other meats!"[56] After perpetrating this practical joke, the fellow-monks found that W u -ming was in fact a saint[57] and they did not dare follow his behaviour of meat eating.[58]

(6) Adultery

'Adultery' was a serious problem among the Chinese clerical circles in the past. Even some of the monks who were recognised as 'eminent monks' by the three 'Biographies', still committed this sin.[59] As I have mentioned before, one of the reasons for unfaithful elements entering the Order was to look for a more comfortable life. After these elements had already been ordained and were enjoying the comfortable livelihood supplied by their establishment, they probably began to think of sex, especially as they had not joined the Order for religious salvation in the first place. Sexual lust is a natural appetite of all mortal creatures. As the Vinaya spends many pages discussing different kinds

of adultery,[60] this suggests that sexual matters were a very serious problem among the clergy of the Indian Monastic Order. In China, the seriousness of adultery among the members of the Order is reflected in anti-Buddhist essays. KHMC says that in Hsün Chi's memorial to Emperor Wu of the Liang Dynasty, a paragraph reads: "...no matter whether monks or nuns, they commit adultery with each other or with the lay-people. And in case they give birth to bastards, they murder these babies in order to cover up their sins..."[61] It also says that in the Northern Ch'i Dynasty, Liu Chou (n.d.) sent a memorial to the court, in which he said: "... not only did they enter the Order to evade national duties, they also committed adultery. The nuns are in fact the monks' de-facto wives and the Upāsikās (Buddhist laywomen), their concubines. In order to cover up their sins, they committed criminal abortions or murdered the illegitimate children. Now we already have two million odd monks and nuns in our country. If we take those lay-concubines of the monks into account, the number of the clerical community increases to four million in total. If their performed criminal abortions every six months, we would probably lose two million of the newly-born in every year...."[62] Of course, the words of these two gentlemen would have been exaggerated. Tao-hsüan, compiler of the KHMC, contended that the degree of adultery would not have been so serious that every cleric was involved in this sin,[63] and protests that they had ignored the existence of millions of eminent Buddhist priests in their time.[64] However, the verbal attacks of these gentlemen on Buddhism reflect the fact that no matter whether in the Yangtzŭ River Valley or in the Yellow River Valley, there were numerous Buddhist monks and nuns who committed this sin in the period of disorder. Therefore, Tao-hsüan could not deny these facts and incorporated the two above-mentioned anti-Buddhist essays into his work.

Up to the T'ang Dynasty, we can still find monks who committed this sin. For instance, as the monk Fa-ya was a close friend of Emperor Kao-tsu before the latter came to the throne, Kao-tsu allowed his courtier to keep wives.[65] In 627, after Tu Chêng-lun (died around 658),[66] the 'Chih-shu Shih Yü-shih' or 'Imperial Secretary-cum-Censor' was appointed to conduct an examination into improper conduct in the Monastic Order, the monk Chih-shih (601-638) sent an appeal to Tu accusing Fa-ya of making use of a shrine in his Hua-tu Monastery as a butchery; and another shrine as his love-nest for keeping his de-facto wives.[67] In the period from the end of July 648 to the middle of June 694, the monk Pien-chi (flor. 645-649)[68] was found to have committed adultery with Princess Kao-yang (died around 652),[69] daughter of Emperor T'ai-tsung.[70] The monk was executed.[71] Ch'en Yüan says that the monk and the princess had fallen in love and continued this adulterous relationship for at least eight or nine years, i.e. from 640 to 649.[72] In 843, Tuan Ch'êng-shih visited Li-fa Monastery in Ch'ang-an. He found that this monastery was originally the house of the rich man Chang P'in. Before he donated his house to the Order to be turned into a monastery, Chang invited a monk, who was a recitor of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra, to live there. As one of Chang's attendants lied to his master that this monk was committing adultery with one of Chang's maids, Chang killed this monk on a pretext. After the monk had died through this false charge, the residents of this house always heard a voice ceaselessly reciting a Sūtra. Finally Chang found that the monk was innocent and felt deep remorse, and so he donated his house with one hundred thousand bronze images to the Order.[73] This story shows that there were many Buddhist monks who committed adultery with lay-women. Otherwise Chang would not so easily have been coaxed into believing that this monk had committed this sin.

(G) Other Misdemeanours

Besides the above-mentioned sins, Buddhist monks also committed other misdemeanours such as killing creatures, stealing, swindling, gambling, corruption, straying from the worship of the Buddha, straying from the Vinaya, and perversion, etc. All of these are listed in Table VII and appended to this thesis. I will not give details of them here.

II. Interference of the Imperial Government with the Monastic Order

I mentioned in the last Chapter that the Chinese emperors regarded themselves as the Vicars of Heaven on Earth, the rightful source of all temporal authority. Everyone was therefore their subject and nobody, including the Buddhist priests might be exempted from paying respect and homage to them.[74] For political and social reasons, they patronized Buddhism to some extent.[75] Seeing the Buddhist priests as their subjects,[76] they did their best to bring the Monastic Order under their control. The imperial power, therefore, constantly interfered with the Order. Not only did the priests have to obey the secular law, but their ordinations had to be registered with the imperial government. The Chinese Order had thus never been an independent entity like the Indian Order[77] and its members were not governed only by the Buddhist Vinaya. This Section will discuss the different ways in which the imperial government interfered with the Monastic Order.

(A) The Appointment of Monastic Officials

The appointment of monastic officials by the crown was inaugurated by the Late Ch'in State, an usurping kingdom in the periods of disorder. After Kūmārajīva came to Ch'ang-an, capital of this kingdom, in 401 and began his career as a chief translator, Buddhist priests from other usurping kingdoms in the Yellow River Valley or from the orthodox Chin

Dynasty in the Yangtzŭ River Valley flocked to this city to join his translation centre in order to learn Buddhism from his explanations of the Sanskrit texts during the congregations held to translate Indian texts.[78] As there were thousands of outsider-priests besides the local clerics living in his capital city, King Yao Hsing considered that there would be some transgressors who would commit misdemeanours. Therefore, he appointed the monk Sêng-lüeh (died around 414-5) as 'Sêng-chu' or 'Chief of Monks', the monk Sêng-ch'ien (n.d.) as 'Yüeh-chung' or 'One Who Gladdens the Multitude' and the monks Fa-ch'in and Hui-pin (both n.d.) as the 'Sêng-lu' or 'Monk Secretary' to cooperate in governing the conduct of the monks and nuns in his realm.[79] The king decreed that the rank of the Sêng-chu equalled that of a 'Shih-chung (Palace Attendant)'[80] and conferred on Sêng-lüeh two carts and four lay-assistants. In 405, the king issued an edict increasing Sêng-lüeh's assistants to sixty men. Half of these positions were filled by Buddhist monks.[81] In other words, the establishment of the monastic office grew within a few years. Hui-chiao says that the establishment of the 'Sêng-chêng's (Controller of the Buddhist Priests)' office was thereby inaugurated.[82]

According to the TSSSL, the 'Controller of the Buddhist Priests' in the Yangtzŭ River Valley was traditionally called 'Sêng-chêng' or 'Sêng-chu'.[83] In the Yellow River Valley this office was called 'Sêng-t'ung' or 'Sha-men Tu-t'ung',[84] and the 'Deputy Controller', 'Sêng-tu' or 'Sha-men Tu'.[85] However, the other source says that the deputy in the Yangtzŭ Valley was also called 'Sêng-tu'.[86] In the three 'Biographies', we find some records concerning these 'Controllers' both of the orthodox dynasties and the usurping kingdoms.[87] During the period of Northern Dynasties and Southern Dynasties (420-589), the monastic 'Controllers' were appointed to the capital territory,[88] the local

states[89] or even the prefectures[90] of each of these Dynasties. In the Southern Dynasties, a 'Controller of the Buddhist Priests of the Whole Nation' was occasionally appointed.[91] In the Northern Dynasties, however, since the 'Chao-hsüan Ssŭ (Office of Illuminator of Mysteries)' was established to administer the national monastic affairs around 396,[92] the office of 'Chao-hsüan T'ung' or 'Controller of the Office of Illuminator of Mysteries', was normally filled by a monk.[93] The 'Sêng-t'ung' of the local states[94] were under the command of this central 'Controller'.[95]

Every 'Controller of the Buddhist Priests' would, I believe, had occupied a luxurious office building[96] and drawn a considerable salary[97] like that of high ranking secular officials.

Only Emperor Ming of the Liu-Sung Dynasty once divided the controllership between monks and nuns by specially appointing the nun Pao-hsien (401-477) 'Tu-i Sêng-chêng (Controller of the Buddhist Nuns in the Capital Territory)' and the nun Fa-ching (409-473) 'Ching-i Tu Wei-na (Karmadāna [Duty-Distributor] General of the Capital Territory)' in 466;[98] otherwise, the other offices of 'Controller of the Buddhist Priests' were always filled by monks responsible for both monks and nuns.[99] The most suitable candidates for the office were the disciplinarians, but according to the three 'Biographies', some were disciplinarians,[100] some were not.[101] Sometimes the position was even held by a layman.[102] In fact a Buddhist monk (or even a layman) who won the emperor's favour could become a 'Controller' whether he was a disciplinarian or not.

After the T'ang Dynasty was established in 618, this system began to change. Firstly, Emperor Kao-tsu temporarily appointed the 'Shih Ta-tê (Ten High Monks)' around 618-20 to act as the central 'Controllers'.[103] Later, the imperial government took over direct control of the Monastic Order,[104] but the local 'Sêng-t'ung'[105] seem to have survived till around

838 or even later.[106] In 806, when the bureaus of the 'Sêng-lu of the Left Part of Ch'ang-an' and the 'Sêng-lu of the Right Part of Ch'ang-an' were set up,[107] the monk Tuan-fu (778-836) was appointed 'Sêng-lu' of the 'Left Part'[108] and the monk Ling-sui (n.d.) that of the 'Right Part'.[109] Even though the 'Sêng-lu' was originally the 'Monk Secretary'[110] to the 'Controller', this official now became the central 'Controller' of the Monastic Order.[111] From this time on, the central controllership was shared by two 'Sêng-lus', a system which survived till the Sung Dynasty.[112]

The 'Controller of the Buddhist Priests' kept the register of monks and nuns,[113] governed their conduct, punished transgressors,[114] administered the public affairs of the Monastic Order and undertook other necessary functions.[115] During the T'ang Dynasty, when something happened to the Order, the priest had first to report to the office of the 'Sêng-lu'; their reports were then repeated to the imperial government.[116]

(B) The Direct Control of the Monastic Order by the T'ang Government.

After the system of 'Controller' was set up, the emperors of the Southern and Northern Dynasties appointed monks to take up this duty in both the Capital Territory and the local areas.[117] In other words, the crown wanted to control the Order indirectly through its monk-agents. Even though the 'Chao-hsüan Ssŭ' of the Northern Ch'i Dynasty was in fact under the jurisdiction of the 'T'ai-ch'ang Ssŭ (Court of Imperial Sacrifices)', which, up to the Sui Dynasty was supervised by the 'Hung-lu Ssŭ (Court of State Ceremonial)',[118] this was still a way of indirect control. For the 'Chao-hsüan T'ung' was a Buddhist monk.[119]

During the T'ang Dynasty, however, the government ran a new policy of direct control. Except when Emperor Kao-tsu appointed the 'Ten High-Monks' to act as the central 'Controllers',[120] the controllership was

exercised by the Court of State Ceremonial.[121] In the year 694, Empress Wu Tsê-t'ien placed monks and nuns under the control of the 'Tz'u-pu (Bureau of National Sacrifices)'.[122] One 'Lang-chung (Gentleman of the Palace)' and one 'Yüan-wai Lang (Gentleman in Second-Class)' of this Bureau exercised responsibility.[123] Even though in 736, this controllership returned to the Court of State Ceremonial, Emperor Hsüan-tsung ordered the Bureau of National Sacrifices to take it back in the next year.[124] Around 744, a new office entitled 'Kung-tê Shih (Commissioner of Religious Merits)' was created.[125] In 788, this office was reinstated and divided into three positions; Commissioner for the left part of Ch'ang-an, for the right part, and for the eastern capital Lo-yang.[126] As the holders of these positions were the powerful eunuchs,[127] the Buddhist nuns were placed under their jurisdiction.[128] Around 806, the two Commissioners in Ch'ang-an began to control the clerical community, and the Bureau of National Sacrifices lost all functions[129] but the registry of priests and the granting of priests' certificates.[130] In the previous Sub-Section I mentioned that the office of 'Sêng-lu' was set up about the time of the establishment of the office of Commissioner.[131] The two 'Sêng-lus' in Ch'ang-an were responsible to the Commissioners for their respective divisions.[132] Apparently, as the Commissioners were eunuchs, who knew nothing about Buddhism, two monks were appointed to the post to deputise for them as Controllers. This is whey the actual controller was only entitled 'Monk Secretary'. The relationship between Commissioner and Monk Secretary was in fact rather like that of Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor of a British university. The office of the 'Kung-tê Shih' was retained during the period of the Five Dynasties (907-960) fulfilling the same duties as in the T'ang time.[133]

After the T'ang government took over direct control of the Monastic Order, monks and nuns had to renew their registration every three years.[134] When the census was completed, one copy of the register was kept by the local government of the city, the second copy was handed to the local government of the prefecture and the third was submitted to the Bureau of National Sacrifices.[135] A superintendent was appointed also to every religious establishment by the Court of State of Ceremonial.[136]

(C) The Buddhist Priests Under the Control of Secular Law

Besides observing the Vinaya and the Chinese Monastic Rule, Buddhist priests in China had to obey the secular law too. In Chapter III, I indicated that the Chinese emperor deemed everyone his subject, including the Buddhist priests.[137] Imperial law therefore covered even monks and nuns. Besides the examples that I have given in the previous Chapters of secular penalties for priests committing murder or sacrilege,[138] we can find more examples of how the monks suffered different penalties: Tao-liang (died ca. 468) was exiled to Canton from Nanking around 452-3 by the government of the Liu-Sung Dynasty.[139] Sêng-ta (n.d.) was exiled to Ch'ang-sha (in Hunan Province) from Nanking by the government of the Southern Ch'i Dynasty.[140] Hui-sung (flor. 601-2) was detained and then questioned and put on trial by the local government of the Sui Dynasty.[141] When Ling-jun and some other monks offended Emperor T'ai-tsung of the T'ang Dynasty around 634, they were exiled to Huan-chou (the area around Hue of Vietnam) from Ch'ang-an.[142] In 655, when Emperor Kao-tsung of the T'ang Dynasty issued an edict permitting officials to apply secular law to cleric transgressors, officials of the bordering prefectures always flogged Buddhist transgressors or put cangues on them.[143] Emperor Tai-tsung (R. 763-779) of the T'ang Dynasty once issued an edict to all his officials instructing them to stop flogging monks and nuns.[144] The above examples indicate that the Buddhist priests had suffered corporal

punishment from the government for a long time. Kuang-ling Ta-shih (Master Kuang-ling, flor. 799) always broke the Vinaya by drinking, eating meat, butchering dogs, fighting with rascals and even snatching money in the market. An aged monk warned him that one day he would be charged by the law if the government men caught him.[145] According to Tuan Ch'êng-shih, a prefectural commandant in the T'ang time would occasionally inspect the Buddhist establishments.[146] I think that his mission was to search for clerical criminals hiding there.

The above-mentioned examples show that Chinese priests were under the control of the secular law, while in India priests submitted only to their own Vinaya, without ever troubling the public court.[147] If a priest committed one of the four Pārājikas (adultery, stealing, killing and lying), he was expelled permanently from the Order.[148] In other words, a Buddhist transgressor would not be charged by the secular law while he remained in the Order. But in China, sometimes the above-mentioned circumstances would lead to oppression of priests by officials. In 629, for instance, when the governor-general learned that the Śrāmaṇera Shan-fu (+ 660) was very clever, he ordered him to rejoin the laity and enter the academy of the local prefecture.[149] In 664, during a quarrel, the official Han Hsiao-wei (n.d.) even tried to unfrock the monk Ming-tao (flor. 627-664) on his own authority.[150]

The imperial government did not rely only on secular law to control monks and nuns. In the Liang Dynasty, Disciplinarian T'an-yüan (died ca. 575)[151] wrote to the officials of the imperial court:

> ".....the law laid down by Confucius is for judging those who have already committed crimes, and the Karma, prepared by Śākya-muni is for expelling transgressors who have strayed seriously from the Vinaya. As the teachings of these two sages differ from each other, their followers would have to be governed by different rules. Recently, I saw monks and nuns, involved in

> internal conflicts, evading the Order and presending their cases to the secular government for trial. As a matter of fact, secular law and the rules of the Vinaya are derived from different traditions. Under the Vinaya, a clerical transgressor might have committed only a venial sin, but by the secular law, his crime could be grievous. Or vice versa. It would therefore be convenient for the secular judge to handle litigation between the priests. Whichever party the judge favoured, he could justify his judgment by citing a 'light' act from the secular law instead of a 'heavy' rule of the Vinaya. In the opposite case he would cite a 'heavy' act from the secular law to replace a 'light' rule of the Buddhist discipline....[152]

T'an-yüan's words show that in his time, the government used both the secular law and the Buddhist Vinaya to settle litigation among the Buddhist clerics.

In 636, before his death, Hsüan-wan (562-636)[153] presented a memorial to the court, in which he told Emperor T'ai-tsung that he felt sad because clerical transgressors were punished in accordance with the secular law.[154] Subsequently the emperor drew from the Vinaya a set of regulations to be used by the government in governing the Buddhist priests.[155] It has long been lost. In 1952, Akitsuki Kan'ei collected the fragmentary remains in six regulations in order to give the modern world some idea of this set of regulations.[156] Following the methods used by Akitsuki, in 1956, Michihata Ryōshū collected more of the above-mentioned fragmentary remains and arranged them in twenty-seven regulations in his T'ang History.[157] From Michihata's arrangement one can easily see how the T'ang government controlled monks and nuns through these regulations. I should like to discuss seven of the regulations to show how the government applied the Vinaya to the Monastic Order.

Regulation 2: Any monks or nuns involving themselves in the business of fortune-telling or curing disease with black magic, will be expelled. Only those who cast Buddhist spells against sickness are allowed.[158]

Note: According to the Vinaya, a priest is allowed neither to cure sickness with spells[159] nor to tell fortunes for laymen.[160] but there is no mention of expulsion.

Regulation 7: Monks or nuns who drink liquor, eat meat and the five forbidden pungent roots,[161] will be sentenced to thirty days penal servitude. ... if a priest fights with another person while drunk, he will be expelled.

Note: According to the Vinaya, a priest who drinks liquor commits only the venial sin of Duskrta,[163] while a priest who strikes another priest commits the pardonable sin of Pātaka.[164] The Vinaya too only encourages the priests not to eat meat in areas rich in vegetables,[165] without specifying any punishment for those who eat meat.

Regulation 9: Monks and nuns who play musical instruments or involve themselves in gambling and some other games, will be awarded one hundred days penal servitude. Only those who play the 'game of go' or the Chinese lute are exempted.[166]

Note: According to the Vinaya a gambler committed Pātaka.[167] The Vinaya never suggested that one who played a musical instrument committed any sin.

Regulation 11: If there is a monk in a Buddhist establishment who allows a female to stay in his apartment or a nun who allows a male to stay in her apartment for more than one night, both the transgressor and the guest will serve ten days penal servitude. If the transgressor allows his guest to stay for more than five days, he and his guest will be sentenced to thirty days penal servitutde. If more than ten days, their sentence was one hundred days penal servitude. If the three administrators (i.e. the abbot, the high-monk and the 'one who gladdens the multitude')[168] of the establishment connive at this crime, they will receive the same sentence.[169]

Note: According to the Vinaya, a monk who stays with a female in the same apartment commit the sin of Pātaka;[170] a nun who stays with a male commits the same sin.[171]

Regulation 12: Monks are not allowed to enter a nunnery without a reason: and nuns must not enter a monastery without a reason. They are only allowed to visit each other's establishments to enquire after their masters or senior priests, to comfort the sick, to mourn after a death, to attend the vegetable feast or the congregation of ordination, to participate in religious ceremonies and to listen to Buddhist lectures.[172]

Note: According to the Vinaya, a monk who frequently visits the nuns' house generates scandal among the lay-people.[173] It does not mention the sins that might be committed.

Regulation 18: Monks and nuns are not allowed to keep private property such as estates, houses and other valuables. Also they are not allowed to involve themselves in commercial transactions.[174]

Note: According to the Vinaya, a priest is neither allowed to touch any kind of money nor to become involved in commercial transactions,[175] but with Chinese priests the owning of personal wealth and involvement in commercial transactions had already become a tradition.[176]

Regulation 26: In any vegetable feast, if people make their donation in the form of male or female slaves, cows, horses and weapons, monks and nuns are not allowed to accept them.[177]

Note: According to the Vinaya, priests are allowed neither to touch any kind of weapon[178] nor to accept donation of slaves, unless these slaves are described as 'lay-attendants'.[179] Slave holding by Buddhist priests in China, however, had already become a tradition.[180]

It seems clear that the T'ang government used the Vinaya where appropriate as a source for its regulations governing Buddhist priests, then distorted the Vinaya by applying heavy secular penalties to transgressors. According to the Vinaya, a transgressor who committed the venial sin of Duṣkṛta would be forgiven after having made a confession in front of one priest, and thus gain his redemption.[181] One who committed the pardonable sin of Pātaka would only fall into purgatory if confession was neglected.[182] Neither of these sins warranted expulsion. Under the secular regulations, however, committing these sins meant penal servitude or even expulsion. Moreover, some activities like eating meat or playing musical instruments which did not transgress the monastic rules in the Vinaya, were subject to penal servitude under the regulations. It is clear that the imperial government interfered seriously with the Monastic Order.

(D) The Direct Control of Monastic Ordination by the T'ang Government

Because the office of the 'Controller of the Buddhist Priests' kept the register of monks and nuns,[183] it also assumed a responsibility for controlling the number of the clergy. This became necessary because the Buddhist priests in China were exempted from paying tax and performing

national service.[184] During the periods of disorder, the governments in both the Yellow River Valley and the Yangtzŭ River Valley had already taken several censuses of monastic population and had forced unregistered priests to return to the laity, in order to cut down the number of the clergy.[185] As in 339, the monk in the capital (Nanking) of the Chin Dynasty wrote a letter to Grand Commandant Huan Hsüan (369-404)[186] to complain that the local government was always copying down their names,[187] I believe that the register of monks and nuns kept by the 'Controller' was not detailed and accurate in the periods of disorder.

After the Sui Dynasty re-united China in 590, however, the central government began to take a serious look at the problem of people who disguised themselves as priests in order to escape from their civic duties. Emperor Wên took action in 579 by issuing an edict to search for the so-called 'Ssŭ-tu (privately ordained monks, i.e. the unregistered)'.[188] After T'ai-tsung of the T'ang Dynasty ascended the throne, he ordered another search in 629,[189] and those found unregistered were executed by decapitation.[190]

There are some cases of an emperor allowing the Monastic Order to ordain a number of people into the priesthood.[191] This was probably done to discourage people from becoming privately ordained priests and escaping their duties. As thousands of laymen would be ordained in such cases,[192] those who really wished to leave their homes could wait for these chances. To the unregistered priests, this kind of imperial favour would have acted as an amnesty.

When the T'ang government took over control of the Monastic Order directly,[193] however, the monastic ordination also was organised by the government. In his NHCKNFC, Tripiṭaka Master I-ching describes the ceremony for ordination in China before he went to the South Seas in 671:[194]

> "In China, admission to the priesthood is by public registeration. After having shaved one's hair, one takes refuge for a time with a teacher; the latter never holds himself responsible for imparting to one a single prohibitive rule, nor does the pupil himself ask to be instructed in the ten moral precepts. Before he proceeds to full ordination, he is doing wrong in [acting] according to his own wish. On the day on which he receives full ordination he is ordered to go into the Bodhimandala without any previous knowledge of the proceedings laid down in the Vinaya ....[195]

In other words, the relationship between the ordinand and the teacher was very loose in training for public registration. If a layman wanted to depart from his household, he would have to pass an examination involving recitation of a specified amount of Buddhist scripture.[196] Those who had already followed a master to enter the Order would also have to wait for the scripture reciting examination until the edict for public registration.[197] After the examination, some of the newly ordained priests would be assigned to live in the establishments provided by the government and their names were registered there.[198]

When the An Lu-shan Rebellion broke out in 755, the T'ang government did its best to find new sources of finance in order to meet the military expenditure for the civil war. In 756, therefore, P'ei Mien (+ 769)[199] advised Emperor Su-tsung (R. 756-762) to prepare more clerical certificates and to sell them to anyone who desired to enter the Order. The emperor accepted this suggestion and implemented this new religious policy in the same year.[200] Through the enthusiastic assistance of Ch'an Master Shên-hui (668-760), many such certificates were sold in the vicinity of Ch'ang-an and Lo-yang; the government thus collected a great deal of money.[201] This policy of selling clerical certificates to acquire revenue was of course a temporary economic expedient,[202] but it had already opened a gap in the old policy of restricting entry into the Order.[203] Even though this policy was apparently discontinued by the central government after the financial crisis was overcome, the local officials began selling certificates also to increase their private incomes.[204] The practice

continued, even though those officials would be fined a month's or even a season's salary by the central government if their activities were discovered.[205] The policy of selling clerical certificates would be employed, whenever the government was facing a financial crisis, up to the Sung Dynasty.[206] From the time that the T'ang government began to sell clerical certificates in 756, the imperial government maintained complete control of monastic ordination.

(E) Honouring Outstanding Priests as a Way of Imperial Control

As mentioned in the previous Chapter, the Chinese emperors viewed Buddhist priests as their subjects.[207] They could, therefore, honour outstanding priests or the clerics whom they favoured by granting them titles of various types. These imperial favours were a way of controlling the Monastic Order.

(1) Raising Monks to Peerage: Both the TSSSL and the FTTC say that the monk Fa-kuo (n.d.), the 'Sha-men T'ung' of the Northern Wei Dynasty, was raised by Emperor Ming-yüan (R. 409-423) from viscount to marquis and then to duke. He was the first monk to be ennobled.[208] Although this account is legendary,[209] we can find some other cases in SKSC. For instance, the monk Tê-kan (flor. 705),[210] after he had assisted in Tripiṭaka Master I-ching's translations, was granted an audience with Emperor Chung-tsung of the T'ang Dynasty together with the other assistants.[211] Because Tê-kan's speech of thanks was so fluent, the emperor was very pleased, and gave him a dukedom with three thousand householders.[212] In 744, Amoghavajra (705-744) was given a dukedom of three thousand householders by Emperor Tai-tsung of the T'ang Dynasty.[213] After serving Emperors Tai-tsung and Tê-tsung, Yüan-chao (flor. 729-780) received a feoff of one hundred householders.[214] Both the TSSSL and the FTTC give other examples of the ennobling of monks.[215]

(2) Honouring the Monks with Official Titles: The TSSSL says that the monk Hui-ch'ao (n.d.) was given the title 'Shou-kuang Tien Hsüeh-shih (Scholar of the Shou-kuang Palace)' by Emperor Wu of the Liang Dynasty. He was the first monk to receive an official title.[216] Two other examples from the sources will emphasise the point. In 758, Tripiṭaka Master Po-jo-li (Prajñā ?) came to T'ang China from Kashmir and Tripiṭaka Master Shan-p'u Moh-mo from Central India. As they brought with them some scriptures, Emperor Su-tsung conferred on Po-jo-li the title of 'Deputy Grand Master of Ceremonies'. Shan-p'u Moh-mo received the title of 'Deputy to the Court of State Ceremonial'.[217] After Wu-k'ung returned from India in 789,[218] he received the titles of 'Generalissimo' and 'Grand Master of Ceremonies' from Emperor Tê-tsung of the T'ang Dynasty.[219]

(3) The Title of 'Tripiṭaka Master' and Other Honorifics: 'Tripiṭaka Master' is the highest award possible to a Buddhist monk. Only those who had already read the three Piṭakas: Sūtra, Vinaya and Abhidharma, and were well versed in their doctrines, would be so addressed by the other priests.[220] In China, however, this title could be conferred on a monk by the emperor. For instance, the monk W u -ming (flor. 567) received the title of 'Tripiṭaka Master of Hsia-chou (the present Yü-lin City of Shensi Province)' from Emperor Wu of the Northern Chou Dynasty.[221] Even though Amoghavajra was an Indian, he received the title of 'Ta Kuang-chih San-tsang (Well Informed Tripiṭaka Master)' from Emperor Tai-tsung of the T'ang Dynasty in 765.[222] His title in fact was not conferred by the other priests but by the emperor.

The emperor conferred many other titles on outstanding monks. Before Amoghavajra received his title of 'Tripiṭaka Master', he was honoured with the title of 'Master Chih-tsang (Treasury of Wisdom)' by Emperor Hsüan-tsung of the T'ang Dynasty around 746.[223]

(4) The Granting of the Purple Robe: Since Empress Wu Tsê-t'ien granted the purple Kaṣāyas to her favourite monk Hsieh Huai-i (+ 695)[224] and the other eight monks who presented the Ta-yüan Ching to her in 690,[225] the T'ang emperors began to grant the purple robe as an imperial honour to monks whom they favoured.[226] When Amoghavajra used his magical power to bring rain in order to break the drought in the vicinity of Ch'ang-an in 772,[227] Emperor Tai-tsung granted him a purple robe and other privileges.[228] The TSSSL reports other examples of this grant from the T'ang Dynasty to the Sung Dynasty.[229]

(5) The Granting of the Monastic Year: Chapter II describes how seriously Indian monks viewed each other's seniority. If a monk entered the Order just one second earlier than another, he was the senior.[230] In the Chinese Order, seniority was also reckoned according to the number of summer retreats the monk had spent. Those who had spent one summer retreat, had accumulated one 'Na (Monastic Year)'. The TSSSL says that in Empress Wu Tsê-t'ien's regime, Taoist Priest Tu I (n.d.) applied for admission as a Buddhist monk. The empress was pleased and issued an edict granting him thirty 'monastic years' in order to make him a senior monk of the Order.[231] There were cases of granting fifty or thirty 'monastic years' to individual monks in the T'ang Dynasty and in the Five Dynasties.[232]

Sometimes, those who won imperial favour would become arrogant as in the following examples:

(1) After Tripiṭaka Master Hsüan-tsang had already translated many new Chinese versions from Sanskrit texts, he felt contempt for the old versions that were translated by the ancient translators of the pre-T'ang dynasties. Therefore, he instructed the Order that all the old translations of scriptures should not be used in worship.[233] As Hsüan-tsang's translation centre was sponsored by Emperors T'ai-tsung and Kao-tsung,[234]

the translations issued from his centre were the authorised versions. Favoured and respected by these two emperors,[235] he became very powerful. When Hsüan-tsang issued this instruction, the monk Fa-ch'ung (aged seventy around 665) came to the Tripiṭaka Master and said: "You are ordained according to the procedures laid down in the old translations. If you insist on prohibiting monks from preaching in accordance with the old translations, you should return to the laity and then once again be ordained in accordance with the procedures contained in the scriptured newly translated by you. Only by doing this, would people accept your idea!" Hsüan-tsang was embarrassed and cancelled his arrogant instruction.[236]

(2) The nun Hui-shang (n.d.) used to communicate with the Royal family of Emperor Kao-tsu of the T'ang Dynasty. When the emperor died in 635, the Royal family took Hui-shang's nunnery and made it into a memorial hall for the late emperor. Hui-shang, backed by an imperial edict, occupied another monastery as her new nunnery. When he heard of this, the monk Hui-man (589-642) invited two hundred eminent monks to hold a Saṅghāvaśeṣa in Ch'ang-an to expel Hui-shang for this act. At the meeting, Hui-man declared that "Even since the Buddha's doctrine was first preached in this world, there has never been a nun who had dared to occupy a monastery for monks by abusing her political connections. As her behaviour has transgressed the Vinaya, she must be expelled from the Order'."[237] When Hui-shang complained to the crown prince[238] and the ministers of the government, the court sent Tu Chêng-lun, the 'Imperial Superintendent of the Studies of the Heir-Apparent', to smooth over the argument.[239] The other monks participating in this Saṅghāvaśeṣa were inclined to accept Tu's attempt at reconciliation, but Hui-man said: "His highness's involvement in this religious affair should be aimed at restoring Buddhism to rightenousness. What I wish you to do is to judge right or wrong in accordance with the Vinaya. If I accept your reconciliation the Vinaya will

not be adhered to and the whole Order will be confused henceforth. I cannot obey you"! After saying this he took up his sitting mat and left. The expulsion of Hui-shang was cancelled, however, as the other monks were afraid of the crown prince's authority. The nun came to Hui-man to apologise but he refused to accept her apology.[240]

The above examples, especially the second one, demonstrate strongly how imperial favour tempted priests to stray from the Vinaya.

III. The Priests Gratified The Secular Society

As I have mentioned in Chapter III, Chinese monasteries were sustained mainly by donations.[241] Therefore, the priests had to make some compromises in order to gratify their secular believers. In this situation they sometimes even broke the code of the Vinaya. I will give some examples of how they satisfied their lay followers:

(A) Ostentatiously Decorating the Monastery.

In his Quotation, Tao-hsüan condemns his contemporaries who competed with each other in spending money to build taller and more glorious monasteries in order to make them superior to other monasteries.[242] He says that such behaviour was contrary to the description of the monasterial buildings in the Jetavana that are recorded in the Vinaya.[243] According to the three 'Biographies', there were many monks who constructed luxurious monasteries. For instance, after Hui-shou (n.d.) went to Nanking around 363-4, he received a donation of a grove from Wang T'an-chih (flor. 371-5),[244] An-lo Monastery was built in this grove.[245] Later, the two monks by the name Tao-ching (both n.d.) and others decorated this monastery so gloriously that the fame of its luxuriousness lasted until Hui-chiao's (497-554?, author of the KSC) time.[246] In the beginning of the Ch'en Dynasty (around 557-8), the monk Hui-ta (524-610) went to Nanking.

He discovered that all the seven hundred odd monasteries in this capital city were ruined.[247] Therefore he sought donations from the people in order to repair three hundred odd of these monasteries. After his repairs were completed, all these monasteries became ostentatious ones.[248] After Chu-li led two hundred monks to go to Yü-chang for timber,[249] he enlarged his Ch'ang-lo Monastery and made it into a tall and glorious one.[250] After Tê-mei (575-637) was invited to live in Hui-ch'ang Monastery in the beginning of the Wu-tê Era (around 618-21), he built a wide and glorious Confession Hall in the western wing of this monastery.[251] As Huai-yu (n.d.) paid much attention to supervising the decoration of the 'Chapel for Pure-Land Practice' in Ch'ung-fu Monastery in T'ai-yüan City, making it into a luxurious building, he won the praise of Emperor Tai-tsung (R. 762-779) of the T'ang Dynasty.[252]

Why did these monks stray from the description of the Vinaya by decorating their own monasteries so that they became luxurious buildings? Even though Tao-hsüan had condemned this behaviour,[253] he also recognised the fact that a tall and glorious establishment is very attractive to the people in inducing them to come to visit the eminent monks with a reverential mind.[254] Of course, we can imagine, donations from the lay visitors would then follow. The above cited examples are all from the 'Category of Promotors of the Works of Merit' of KSC, HKSC and SKSC; indicating that to build or to decorate a religious building gloriously is regarded as one of the Buddhist merits. For this reason some of the lay donors would do the same thing in order to win merit. For instance, according to Yang Hsüan-chih's (flor. 547) LYCLC (T. 2029), many glorious and luxurious monasteries and nunneries in Lo-yang were built by the nobles of the Northern Wei Dynasty, such as the Yung-ning Monastery and the Ch'in-t'ai-shang-chün Monastery by Empress Dowager Ling (née Hu, + 528),[255] the Chien-chung Monastery by Êrh-chu Shih-lung[256], the Yao-kuang

Nunnery and the Yung-ming Monastery by Emperor Hsüan-wu,[257] the Ching-lo Nunnery by Prince Ch'ing-ho (Yüan I, 487-520),[258] the Hu-t'ung Nunnery by Empress Dowager Ling's aunt,[259] and the Ning-yüan Monastery by the eunuch Chia Ts'an (flor. 487-525),[260] etc. Right up to the present, newly established monasteries in the Chinese residential areas always become sightseeing attractions because of their glorious decorations.[261]

(B) Opening the Monastery to the Secular Society As a Place of Amusement

According to the LYCLC, before 528 the monasteries in Lo-yang usually became amusement places for secular society. For instance, people used to bring liquor with them to Pao-kuang Monastery in order to hold drinking parties on the bank of the scenic pond in the garden of this monastery.[262] At every vegetarian feast, the nuns of Ching-lo Nunnery prepared music and dances performed by women in order to entertain their female visitors.[263] The nuns of Chao-li Nunnery did likewise.[264] After the death of Prince Ch'ing-ho, its sponsor, in 520, Ching-lo Nunnery even allowed male visitors to attend their feasts. Not only did the musicians and the dancers entertain as usual, but also magicians and circus entertainers were invited to perform.[265] The monks of Wang-tien-yü Monastery, also provided entertainments of singing, dancing and beating drums at a vegetarian feast.[266] Moreover, on every fourth day of the fourth month of the lunar year, the nuns of Ch'ang-chiu Nunnery organised a parade in order to carry their glorious image of the Buddha around the city. In the parade, a team of hired acrobats performed on both sides of the image. When the parade stopped in a certain place, the more attractive acrobatic feats like sword-swallowing, fire-eating, tight-rope walking, etc., were performed in order to please the people.[267] The monks of Tsung-shêng Monastery also arranged the same functions as these nuns.[268]

In the HKSC I have also found some relevant descriptions. In 500, when the monk Fa-shang (495-580) was six years old and still in the secular world, his uncle brought him to a monastery to enjoy the acrobatic performances there.[269] Hui-chou (died ca. 627-9) had chosen twenty men from the lay-attendants of his Ch'ing-ch'an Monastery, trained them in the art of the so-called 'Drum-beating Dance', and told them to perform in front of the image of the Buddha during festivals in order to entertain people. In each performance, the feats of these dancers attracted audiences from afar.[270] Moreover, in his Yu-yang Tsa-tsu, Tuan Ch'êng-shih says that in his time there were some officials always drinking in the Ch'an-ting Monastery in Ch'ang-an.[271]

According to the Vinaya, no liquor or any kind of fermented vegetable juices are allowed to be used in a monastery.[272] Moreover, Indian priests do not seem to have welcomed the laymen making frequent visits to them in the monastery.[273] Apparently the above-mentioned phenomena were concessions that the Chinese priests offered to lay people in order to induce them to come frequently. Such behaviour was already a deviation from the Vinaya.

In his Quotation, Tao-hsüan condemns his contemporaries for allowing laymen to come and use the bathroom of their monasteries.[274] I believe that this was one of the concessions the priests made for the laity.

(C) Allowing Poor Intellectuals to Live in the Monastery.

According to Yen Keng-wang's 'T'ang-jên Hsi-yeh Shan-lin Shih-yüan Chih Fêng-shang' or 'A Study on the milieu of the Intellectuals in the T'ang Dynasty Who Engaged Their Study in the Mountains, in the Forests and in the Religious Establishments',[275] since the Sui Dynasty, or even earlier, Chinese intellectuals began to seek for accommodation in Buddhist or Taoist establishments in order to concentrate on their studies there.[276] This then became a social tendency in the T'ang Dynasty.[277] Yen says that

the reasons the intellectuals lived in Buddhist monasteries were:[278] (1) They looked for a quiet and peaceful environment for study,[279] therefore, they paid the monastery,[280] or even acted as scribes for the establishment[281] in order to gain accommodation; (2) in case an intellectual was very poor, he would probably have won the sympathy of the monks and they would supply him with free full board;[282] (3) the monastic library collected not only the Buddhist scriptures, but also the Confucian classics, which was very convenient for the intellectuals.[283]

I read through the DRMGTV and have not been able to find out whether an Indian monastery would allow a layman, who was not an attendant of the monks,[284] to live. The TTHYCFKSC records that there were three lay pilgrims who went to India and lived in monasteries only after they had already entered the priesthood,[285] indicating that an Indian establishment would not accept lay strangers to live in. On the contrary, not only did the Chinese monks accept the lay-intellectuals living in their monastery, but sometimes they also financially supported the travel costs for the intellectuals when they were about to go to take the Official Examination.[286] In my opinion, the Buddhist monks probably supported the intellectuals for the reasons given below: Firstly, the monks probably considered that these intellectuals would be influenced by Buddhism after having lived in a religious environment which gave them a chance to chat with the monks or to browse over the Buddhist scriptures at their leisure. Secondly, according to Yen's research, among the two hundred odd T'ang intellectuals he mentions in his work, there were twenty who attained the high-ranking position of prime minister of the T'ang Empire.[287] Of these twenty prime ministers, there were seven men who had lived and studied in a Buddhist monastery before their appointments.[288] This would probably explain why the monks not only allowed the intellectuals to live and to eat in their monasteries

without any charge,[289] but also supplied the travel fee for them to attend the Official Examination.[290] It was probably a good investment for the religion if some of these lay-tenants could one day attain a high-ranking position, for they would probably become good donors or religious protectors in order to repay the monks for the favours given to them. On the other hand, if an intellectual was insulted by the monks in his time of hardship, this lay-tenant may have taken revenge on the monks when he came to power. Li Shên's (+ 846)[291] case is a good example.[292] Thirdly, as traditionally a monastery would prepare some secular curricula for the novices who had never entered a school before coming into the Order,[293] a learned lay-tenant would be very useful in acting as a tutor to the novices.

Yen found that the monks of the T'ang Dynasty also allowed the intellectuals to establish and to maintain primary schools in their monasteries.[294] In his essay, K'uo Mo-jo (1891-1978) made the same discovery.[295] I believe that such a favour was granted to the intellectuals by the monks probably for the same motivations as mentioned above.

(D) Allowing Females to Loiter Around the Monastery.

According to the Vinaya, if the convalescent ward in a monastery needed nursing help and there were no Bhikṣus, Bhikṣuṇīs, Śikṣamāṇas, Śrāmaṇeras, Śrāmaṇerikās, or Upāsakas (Buddhist laymen) who were free, an Upāsikā (Buddhist lay-women) would be summoned to come to the establishment in order to act as a nurse for the sick Bhikṣus in the ward.[296] However, her hands were not allowed to touch her patients.[297] I-ching says that according to his observations, whenever the Indian lay-women entered the monastery, they never proceeded to the apartments of the monks, but spoke with them in a corridor for a moment, and then retired.[298] The above instances hint that traditionally an Indian monastery did not

welcome female visitors. In China, the situation was much different. Since the monasteries were opened to the secular society as places of amusement,[299] women naturally had the right to come there for recreation. For instance, around 843, men and women in Ch'ang-an came to the Hua-yen Shrine of Chao-ching-kung Monastery in order to watch the Śarīras that were exhibited in this shrine.[300] In the Yüan-yu Era (1086-1094), a layman, Wang Tsai (n.d.) brought his wife and a servant with him to visit Wu-t'ai Shan. This family was accommodated for days in a monks' shrine, the Chên-yung Yüan.[301]

Moreover, in Chapter II, I have mentioned that some of the Chinese Buddhist monks refused their lay female believers to enter their apartments in order to ask them religious questions or to inquire about their illness.[302] As traditionally Chinese historical writings have had a didactic mission, and Tao-hsüan remarks on those monks' faithfulness to the Vinaya, it reflects the fact that other monks may not have refused permission to the laywomen to visit them. Why did the Chinese laywomen so desire to mingle with the monks and so eagerly want to have a private chat with them ? According to the Vinaya, Bhikṣuṇīs must receive their ordination from the hands of the Bhikṣus,[303] learn Buddhism from aged monks,[304] and pay their respects to the male priests of the same Order.[305] This indicates that the religious standing of the nuns was far below that of the monks. In mediaeval times, Chinese society was replete with a male chauvinist atmosphere.[306] As the female lay-Buddhists frequently saw how the nuns saluted the monks,[307] they probably considered that to take refuge in monks would be more effective than taking refuge in nuns. In two Buddhist histories that were composed by the monks of the T'ang Dynasty, Hui-hsiang's (n.d.) Hung-tsan Fa-hua Chuan or 'The Biographies of the Promulgators of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra (T.2067)' and Master

Hsiang's (n.d.) Fa-hua Ching Chuan-chi or 'The Biographies of the Preachers of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra (T.2068)', I found in both of them two accounts of the story of a woman who recited this Sūtra devoutly and periodically, and then in a predicament dreamed that a Buddhist monk came to her and gave her helpful instructions. Her predicament was solved after having followed that instruction.[308] As these women dreamed of a monk, not of a cleric of their own sex, who came to give aid, this reflects that in their minds monks were more prestigious and dependable. Especially of these four women, one in particular followed a nun to learn the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra but still dreamed of a monk who gave her instruction.[309] Therefore, the laywomen flocked to inquire of monks in order to get their blessing, or to pour out their own troubles, desiring to hear some comforting words from them.[310]

A Chinese monastery could not refuse the female visitors the right to come and tarry. This was not only because the monks had undertaken the religious mission of saving people from inner or outer difficulties, but also because the laywomen were good donors. For instance, the LYCLC records that several monasteries or nunneries in Lo-yang were built by royal ladies. Besides those built by Empress Dowager Ling and her aunt mentioned above,[311] the Empress Dowager also built Ch'in-tai-shang-chün Monastery,[312] the Pagoda in Ching-ming Monastery,[313] and the western wing of Shuang-nü Monastery.[314] The eastern wing of the same monastery was constructed by the royal aunt of Emperor Hsiao-ming (R. 516-528).[315] In other Buddhist histories I have also found that Kung-chu (Princess) Monastery on Wu-t'ai Shan was built by Princess Hsin-ch'êng (n.d.), daughter of Emperor Hsiao-wên of the Northern Wei Dynasty.[316] The five-stories Pagoda in Hsing-kua-ch'an Monastery in Nanking was donated in 514 by Princess Yung-ting (n.d.), daughter of Emperor Wu of the Liang Dynasty.[317] The laywomen Maiden T'ien-nü San-mei (+ 787) not only built a Buddhist

shrine on Wu-t'ai Shan, but also collected donations of rice or noodles in order to supply the monks and laymen who lived in that shrine.[318] In these circumstances, the more females came to visit the monastery, the more donations would be received. In Chapter II I have already mentioned that because the monks of Hua-ch'êng Monastery considered that to mingle with women was 'a basic business of the religion', they did not listen to Fa-ch'ung's persuasion to keep away from females.[319] The phrase 'basic business of religion' may have been related to the donations. In his Survey Kenneth Ch'en says that the Chinese establishments of the mediaeval period frequently prepared many festivals in order to woo the laity to come and participate.[320] Such festivals are still being held in the present day. In my observation, each of these festivals attracted a great many female participants and they made donations generously.

(E) Allowing the Laity to Hold Funerals in the Monastery.

In his Quotation, Tao-hsüan condemns his contemporaries for allowing the laity to lay corpses in the monastery in order to hold funerals there.[321] He also attacks the laymen who buried the dead in the grounds of the establishments.[322] In other words, Tao-hsüan was discontented that the monasteries of his time were involved in burials. Of course the laymen did so due to their idea of placing the dead closer to the Buddha in order to get more blessings. As the financial resources of a monastery mainly depended on donations from the secular world, the monks probably found it difficult to refuse their lay donors if the latter made such demands. For instance, after Emperor Kao-tsu of the T'ang Dynasty died in 635, the royal family took the nun Hui-shang's nunnery and made it into a memorial hall for the late emperor.[323] In my observation, even in the modern period, there are still people who beg permission in advance

from an abbot of a Buddhist monastery for their bodies to be buried in the grounds of that establishment when they die.[324]

CHAPTER IV: Notes

1. See Chapter III, Section II, notes 165 to 226, 228 to 234, and 302.
2. See Section I, notes 11 to 15, and note 23.
3. See ibid., notes 38 to 73.
4. See Chapter III, Section I, Sub-Section A, notes 6 to 24.
5. Will be discussed further in Section II of this Chapter.
6. See Chapter II, Section II, notes 165 to 176, 178, 182, 184 to 185, 187 to 188.

Notes to Section I

7. For the history of this long period of disorder see Ssŭ-ma Kuang, Chronicle, Vol. 4 to Vol. 6, pp. 2841-5526. Or, for a more simple impression of this period, cf. Wolfram Eberhard, A History of China, pp. 126-176. Fan Wên-lan, Vol. 2, pp. 268-544 and Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 3-16. J.Macgown, The Imperial History of China, pp. 160-259. As this is not germane to my thesis, I will give no further details.

8. See notes 11 to 13. The other ways the ordinary people evaded these two impositions were: (1) they sought shelter with the gentry houses and acted as tenants in the fields of the latter (cf. Li Chien-nung, pp. 29-35. Fan Wên-lan, Vol. 2, pp. 391-393. (2) The people of the Yangtzŭ Valley took refuge with the savage tribes in the mountains (cf. Li Chien-nung, ibid., p. 135). (3) They crippled themselves by inflicting injuries on their own limbs (cf. Li Chien-nung, p. 135. Fan Wên-lan, ibid., p. 393).

9. TTHYCFKSC, p. 6a.

10. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol. I, pp. 52-53. Jacques Gernet, p.26. E. Zürcher, Conquest, pp. 27-28.

11. HKSC, p. 646c (the Biography of Sêng-lang [flor. 439]. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Ho-hsi', p. 146.

12. Nan-ch'i Shu, p. 291a.
13. Treatise, p. 144b. Leon Hurvitz, tr., p. 79.
14. For Hsün Chi's Biography see Pei Shu, Vol. 3, p. 1239b. His date see Chronicle, p. 4960.
15. KHMC, p. 130c.
16. Cf. Chapter III, Section I, Sub-section D, notes 58 to 64.

17. See Appendix, Table I.
18. Cf. Chapter III, Section I, Sub-section C, notes 51 to 57.
19. Cf. Chapter III, Section III, notes 165 to 176, 228 to 234 and 259 to 264. The anti-Buddhist intellectuals always attacked the Buddhist priests for their parasitic career. For instance, Hsün Ch'i's memorial (cf. note 16) attacked the priests: "...they follow the instructions handed down by the Buddha of not cultivating farming lands and not collecting grains ... now we have several hundred thousands of such parasites who will never do any productive work on our land ... (KHMC, p. 130a)". Before 835, Li Hsün (+ 835) memorialised Emperor Wên-tsung (R. 827-840) of the T'ang Dynasty, that the Buddhist priests were: "...not only evading imposts and any kind of national service, but also snatching from the people their food and clothes... (Hsin T'ang Shu, Vol. 4, p. 2078a)". In 988, Wang Yü-ch'êng (954-1001) sent a memorial to the newly crowned Emperor Chên-tsung (R. 998-1022) of the Sung Dynasty, in which he remarked: "... as in every dynasty there were new monasteries to be constructed and new members who devoted themselves to the Monastic Order, the numbers of both of these have kept on increasing till now. The Buddhist priests would never participate in the labour of agricultural work like farming or raising silk worms, but their catering and clothing supplies would never be inadequate ... in minimum estimation, if there are ten thousand Buddhist monks in our country and the expenditure for each of them were one pint of rice a day for food and one roll of silk a year for cloth, totally they are consuming thirty thousand pecks of rice per months and ten thousand rolls of silk a year. In fact we already have fifty or even seventy thousand of them. How can we not call them pests who prey on the people ... (Sung Shih, Vol. 9, p. 3775a)". The anti-Buddhist words quoted above, reflect how serious the parasitism of the Buddhist priests in the dynastic period was. There were a few of them who had had to struggle for survival by cultivating with their own hands in order to erase the bad impression of monks being 'parasites' from the people's mind (cf. Chapter III, Section I, Sub-section D, notes 69 to 71).
20. For instance, when he was a fugitive for political reasons in his eighth year, Kuang-i (+ 735) met a monk-saint and the latter wooed

him to join the Monastic Order. The monk-saint told him: "A monk's career is very peaceful and comfortable... (SKSC, p. 873b. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, tr., 'The Biography of the Monk Kuang-i', Nan-yang Fo-chiao, Vol. 116, p. 34)".

21. DMRGTV, p. 807b-c.
22. Idem.
23. For instance, after he failed in a power struggle in the court of the T'ang Dynasty in 835, Li Hsün and his comrades fled from Ch'ang-an to Mount Chung-nan in order to seek sanctuary in the monastery of his friend, the monk Tsung-mi (780-841). Li Hsün suggested that it would be better for them to shave their hair off and join the Order. Even though Tsung-mi promised to ordain them, Li Hsün's comrades did not want to become priests. They forced Li Hsün to keep on fleeing, and finally all of them were arrested by their rivals, the eunuchs of the T'ang court, in a neighbouring city (Chiu T'ang Shu, Vol. 5, p. 2199b. SKSC, p. 742b-c. Hsin T'ang Shu, Vol. 4, p. 2079a). This story suggests that they probably would not have been arrested if the others had listened to Li Hsün and entered the Order. It also suggests that Buddhist sanctuary covers only those who have already become monks, and that the laity were not included. The Buddhist sanctuary is also mentioned in Chinese novels. For instance, the Shui-hu Chuan ('The Story of the Water Margin', assigned to Shih Nai-an [1296-1370?] and Lo Kuan-chung (n.d.), tells that after the military officer Lu Ta (later, the Tattooed Priest Lu Chih-shen) committed accidental homicide, assisted by a landlord, he fled to Wu-t'ai Shan and joined the Order to avoid seizure by the Sung government (see Shui-hu Ch'üan-chuan, pp. 62-65. Pearl S. Buck (1892-1973), tr., All Men Are Brothers, Vol. I, pp. 68-73. For Shih Nai-an's date and career, see Liu Tung, 'Shih Nai-an Shên-p'ing T'an-k'ao' or 'A Study of the Life of Shih Nai-an, the Author of Shui-hu (Water Margin)', in Chung-hua Wên-shih Lun-ts'ung or 'Collections of Essays on Chinese Literature and History', Vol. 16, pp. 283-289).
24. According to the LTSPC, during the Persecution of 574-577, there were almost three million Buddhist priests in the Yellow River Valley who returned to the laity (p. 94b. Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol.II, p. 92). In his Pien chêng Lun or 'The Arguments for the Righteousness of Buddhism (T.2110)', the monk Fa-lin(572-640) gives the following figures of monks and nuns:

Western Chin (265-317)	3,700	(p. 502c)
Eastern Chin (318-420)	24,000	(p. 503a)
Liu-Sung (420-479)	36,000	(p. 503a)
Southern Ch'i (479-502	32,500	(p. 503a)
Liang (502-557)	82,700	(p. 503b)
Later Liang (555-588)	3,200	(p. 503b)
Ch'en (557-589)	32,000	(p. 503c)
Northern Wei (396-554)	2,000,000	(p. 507c)

Of the above-mentioned dynasties, the realm of the Later Liang Dynasty occupied only three hundred square miles surrounding Chiang-ling City (Chou Shu, p. 356. Cf. Fan Wên-lan, Vol. II, p. 386), but there were nevertheless three thousand and two hundred priests living there. Besides, the HKSC says that Yeh, capital of the Northern Ch'i Dynasty (550-577) had accommodated eighty thousand monks and nuns around 556 (p. 501b, the Biography of Ching-sung [537-614]). It also says that in 609, half a million monks received ordination under the patronage of Emperor Wên of the Sui Dynasty (ibid., p. 501c).

25. HKSC, pp. 481c-482a.
26. SKSC, p. 893b.
27. ibid., p. 887a.
28. ibid., p. 751a.
29. Cf. notes 25 to 28.
30. This is probably related to the reasons for which the KSC, the HKSC and the SKSC were compiled. In my 'Bio.& Biblio.', I have indicated that as many of their fellow monks did not observe monastic rules but committed sins and misdemeanours, the authors of the above-mentioned three 'Biographies' wrote the biographies of monks of noble character and great contributions to Buddhism, eulogising them as paragons to all religious devotees (cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Bio. & Biblio.', Part I, pp. 428-433. Cf. also J.W. de Jong's review, T'oung Pao, Vol. LIV, 4-5 [1970, Leiden], p. 317).
31. HKSC, p. 466b-c. Tso Sze-bong, tr., 'The Biography of the Monk Chih-ts'ang', in 'Materials', p. 61.
32. ibid., p. 466c. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, tr., ibid., p. 60.
33. For the precepts by Tao-an, see Chapter III, Section III, notes 228 to 230.

34. HKSC, p. 629c.
35. ibid., p. 630b.
36. HKSC, p. 479a-b.
37. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, pp. 139, 144-145, 147, 149, 152 and 156. According to Michihata's research, the unfaithful elements who infiltrated into the Order had the same motive as those in the period of disorder, i.e. to escape any national duties, looking for a more comfortable parasitic life (cf. notes 11 to 15, and note 19).
38. HKSC, pp. 539c-540a. For the other cases of murder cf. Huang Min-chih, pp. 50 and 54.
39. Wei Shou, Treatise, p. 1443b. Leon Hurvitz, tr., p. 65. Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol. II, p. 57. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, pp. 149-150.
40. HKSC, p. 644c.
41. Idem. Sêng-min's account is appended to the Biography of Ch'ao-ta (n.d.) of the Northern Wei Dynasty.
42. ibid., p. 604c. Chiu T'ang Shu, Vol. 1, p. 70a, and Vol. 3, p. 1309.
43. Ssŭ-ma Kuang, Chronicle, p. 6282.
44. HKSC, p. 604c.
45. For his Biography see Chiu T'ang Shu, Vol. 3, pp. 1479a-1481b. Hsin T'ang Shu, Vol. 3, pp. 1202a-1203a.
46. Yu-yang Tsa-tsu, pp. 65b-66a.
47. ibid., p. 53.
48. For the 'Yüan-shih T'ien-tsun', cf. Liu Ts'un-yan, Buddhist and Taoist Influences on Chinese Novels, Vol. I, p. 129 and pp. 134-139.
49. T'ang lü Shu-i, fascicle 19, p. 61.
50. These 'Nine Dynasties' are: the Han, the Ts'ao-Wei, the Chin, the Liang, the Ch'en, the Northern Wei, the Northern Ch'i, the Northern Chou and the Sui Dynasties. This work was composed in 1926.
51. Cf. Ch'êng Shu-tê, p. 438.
52. For his date cf. Ch'en Yüan, Dates of Monks, p. 100.
53. Cf. Lu Hsün (1881-1936), Chung-kuo Hsiao-shuo Shih-lüeh or 'A Brief History of Chinese Novels', p. 58.
54. Fa-yüan Chu-lin, p. 874c. Cf. Lu Hsün, Ku Hsiao-shoh Kuo-ch'ên or 'A Recovery of Some Fragments of Lost Chinese Ancient Novels', pp. 447-448.
55. HKSC, p. 542b.
56. SKSC, p. 847b.

57. Cf. Chapter III, Section IV, notes 328 to 331. The performance of Wang-ming is very close to the Mahāyānist saints mentioned in this Chapter.
58. SKSC, p. 847b-c.
59. Cf. Chapter III, Section IV, notes 313 to 321.
60. See DRMGTV, pp. 571c, 572a, 575c, 579, 580b, 582a, 596c, 600b, 601a, 607a, 607a-b, 614b-c, 638a, 714b, 738a-b, 744b, 746c, 929c, 930a, 955b, 973a-975b, 985c, 986a, 986b and 986b-c, etc. The discussion in these pages contain cases of philandering, adultery, rape, incest, abortion, homosexuality, homosexual abuse, lesbianism, oral intercourse, oral abuse, masturbation, indecent assault, nocturnal emission and lewd thoughts that had been committed between monks and nuns, monks and monks, nuns and nuns, Śramaṇas and Śrāmaṇerikās (female novices), Śramaṇas and Śrāmaṇeras (male novices), nuns and Śrāmaṇeras, monks and laywomen, monks and laymen, nuns and laymen, nuns and laywomen, etc.
61. KHMC, p. 129c.
62. ibid., p. 128a-b.
63. ibid., p. 128b and p. 129c.
64. ibid., p. 128b.
65. HKSC, p. 634c.
66. For his Biography see Chiu T'ang Shu, Vol. 3, pp. 1233a-1234a. Hsin T'ang Shu, Vol. 3, pp. 1424a-1425a.
67. HKSC, p. 635b.
68. Cf. Ch'en Yüan, 'Ta-t'ang Hsi-yü Chi Tsuan-jên Pien-ch'i' or 'On P'ien-ki, Author of Ta-t'ang Hsi-yu Ki' in CYYCYLSYYYCSCK, Vol. II, No. 1 (1930, Nanking), p. 85.
69. Cf. ibid., p. 81. For her Biography see Hsin T'ang Shu, Vol. 3, p. 1225b.
70. Cf. Ch'en Yüan, ibid., pp. 81-84.
71. Cf. ibid., p. 86.
72. Cf. ibid., p. 84.
73. Yu-yang Tsa-tsu, p. 143b.

Notes to Section II

74. See Chapter III, Section I, Sub-section A, notes 12 to 15.

75. For instance, the monk Hui-yen (363-443) once suggested to Emperor Wên of the Liu-Sung Dynasty: "... if we could make every family keep the Buddhist precepts, criminal law would probably be no longer required in our country... (KSC, p. 367c)". While Ho Shang-chih (382-460, for his Biography see Sung Shu, Vol. 2, pp. 839b-843a) also told the same emperor: "... if there were ten men in a village of one hundred householders who kept the five Buddhist precepts (i.e. no killing, no stealing, no adultery, no lying and no intoxicating liquor), we would have ten well-behaved persons in that village. Again, if there were one hundred persons in a town of one thousand householders who observed the ten Buddhist virtues (i.e. the first four of the above-mentioned five precepts plus no double tongue, no coarse language, no filthy language, no covetousness, no anger and no perverted views), we would have one hundred peaceful people in that town. Therefore, if we promulgate Buddhist throughout the whole nation, we would establish one million good people among the ten million of our citizens ... if a man observes only one of the Buddhist precepts, he has at least kept himself from doing one evil ... (HMC, p. 69c. Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol. II, p. 21)". The monk argues that belief in Buddhism is a way of harmonising human relationships. The layman relates belief to the stability of the country. Both were good reasons why the Chinese emperors patronised Buddhism.

76. See Chapter III, Section I, Sub-section A, notes 6, 7, 9 and 10.

77. See ibid., notes 6 to 11.

78. KSC, p. 363b. Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol. I, pp. 214-215, 218-219. In the working procedure of a congregation in the translation centre, a chief-translator's duty was first to read the Sanskrit text, sentence by sentence or paragraph by paragraph. He then explained its meaning to the participants of the congregation. The participants not only wrote down his explanations, but also occasionally asked him questions or even discussed with him the content of the text. This procedure enabled the participants to learn new Buddhist doctrines from the chief-translator (cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Translation Centres', pp. 241-245, 249-254, and his 'A New Summary to Methods and Procedures Used in Translating Buddhist Sūtras at Translation Centres in China

during the Dynasties from Han to Sung', Nan-yang Fo-chiao, Vol. 109, p. 45. Cf. also J.W. de Jong, Buddha's Word in China, pp. 13-14).

79. KSC, p. 363b. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p. 254.
80. According to Chin Shu, 'Shih-chung' was a high ranking central official (Vol. 1, p. 344b). Therefore, King Yao Hsing raised the 'Sêng-chu' to the same rank to indicate the power he conferred on this monastic official.
81. KSC, p. 363b.
82. Idem.
83. TSSSL, pp. 242c-243a.
84. ibid., p. 243b-c.
85. ibid., p. 243b.
86. See HKSC, p. 565c (the Biography of Chih-i).
87. For these records that concern the 'Controllers' of the orthodox dynasties see: KSC, pp. 372b-c, 372c-373a, 373c, 376a and 402a. HKSC, pp. 427c, 433a, 462c, 468a-b, 468b, 478c-479a, 479b, 494b, 503c, 512c-513a, 515b-c, 556b, 565c and 609a. SKSC, pp. 749a, 749c and 751a-b. And for those of the usurping kingdoms see, KSC, p. 363b. HKSC, pp. 434c, 483a, 484a, 484b, 484c, 485a-b, 585c and 613b. SKSC, pp. 705b, 751, 787c and 879c. As these records are not germane to my thesis, I will not give more details here.
88. Cf. Chapter I, Section II, note 176 (the case of Fa-ying), note 186 (the case of Fa-hsien and Hsüan-ch'ang), Section III, note 278 (the case of Fa-shang) and Chapter IV, Section I, note 36 (the case of Pao-ch'iung), etc.
89. For instance, Sêng-hui (+ 486) was appointed 'Sêng-chêng' of the Ching State of the Southern Ch'i Dynasty around 479-81 (KSC, p. 378b). Tao-ta (flor. 488) was appointed 'Sêng-chêng' of the Southern Yen State (it was located in the bordering area between the Western part of the middle of the Kiangsu Province and the Northern part of the Anhui Province) of the Southern Ch'i Dynasty around 488 (HKSC, p.460a [the Biography of Fa-shên]). Ling-hsün (died around 550-1) was appointed 'Sêng-t'ung' of the Ping State (present Shansi Province) of the Eastern Wei Dynasty around 548-9 (ibid., p. 484c). Tzŭ-tsang was the 'Sêng-chêng' of the I State of the Sui Dynasty (cf. Chapter I, Section I, note 45), etc.

90. For instance, the monk Sêng-jo (451-520) was appointed 'Sêng-chêng' of the Wu Prefecture (present Soochow City and its vicinity) of the Liang Dynasty in 509 (HKSC, p. 461a).

91. For instance, the monk Sêng-chin (died ca. 475) was appointed 'T'ien-hsia Sêng-chu (Controller of the Buddhist Priests of the Whole Nation)' by Emperor Ming of the Liu-Sung Dynasty (KSC, p.373c).

92. Wei Shou, Treatise, p. 1447a. Leon Hurvitz, tr., pp. 83-84. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p. 253. According to the 'Po-kuan Chih' or 'Treatise on the Hundred Officials' of the Sui Shu, the organisation of the Chao-hsüan Ssŭ consisted of one 'Ta-t'ung (Chief Controller)', one 'T'ung (Controller)', three 'Tu Wei-na' and some assistant officials. This office was established for governing the Buddhist Śramaṇas in the cities, in the prefectures and in the states (Vol.1, p. 405).

93. For instance, the monk Fa-shang had taken up the duty of 'Chao-hsüan Ta-t'ung' for forty years from 535 to 575. During his appointment, Fa-shang led a team of fifty odd officials to assist him in governing the conduct of two millioen odd monks and nuns of the lower reaches of the Yellow River (HKSC, p. 485a-b. Cf. ibid., p. 432c [the Biography of Narendrayaśas] and p. 610a [the Biography of Fa-yüan]).

94. For the existence of these 'Sêng-t'ungs' of the local states after the office of the Chao-hsüan Ssŭ was established, see Treatise, p. 1488a. Leon Hurvitz, tr., p. 90.

95. Emperor Hsüan-wu of the Northern Wei Dynasty decreed that Buddhist priests who committed a crime less serious than homicide were to be sent to the Chao-hsüan Ssŭ for trial in accordance with the Vinaya and the Chinese Monastic Rule (Treatise, p. 1447a. Leon Hurvitz, tr., p. 84. Cf. Chapter I, Section I, note 75). In other words, all the monastic cases were finally sent to this office for judgment. Therefore, the local 'Sêng-t'ung' would have to accord with the 'Chao-hsüan Ta-t'ung'.

96. For instance, after Hui-ch'ao (+ 526) was appointed 'Sêng-chêng' by Emperor Wu of the Liang Dynasty, he established his office in Nan-chien Monastery. It was luxuriously redecorated. During his twenty-year appointment, Hui-ch'ao administered from there and enjoyed a bureaucratic style like that of a princes and marquises (HKSC, p. 468a-b). I believe that the other 'Controllers' worked in the same style.

97. For instance, Emperor Ming of the Liu-Sung Dynasty paid his 'Controller of the Buddhist Priests of the Whole Nation (filled by the monk Sêng-chin [cf. note 91]' a monthly salary of thirty thousand copper coins (KSC, p. 373c). Emperor Hsiao-wên of the Northern Wei Dynasty paid his 'Sêng-t'ung' eight hundred rolls of silk per annum (TSSSL, p. 243b). In 921. Kao Chi-hsing (858-928; for his Biography see Ou-yang Shiu's Wu-tai Shih-chi or 'The New History of the Five Dynasties', pp. 412a-413a), Governor-General of the Ching-nan State (in present Hupeh Province), appointed a monk Ch'i-chi (flor. 921) 'Sêng-chêng' of his state and paid him a monthly salary (SKSC, p. 897c).

98. Pa-ch'ang, Pi-ch'iu-ni chuan or 'Biographies of Bhikṣuṇīs (T. 2063)', p. 941a and p. 941b. TSSSL says that except for those mentioned above, no other appointments of nuns to official posts were made in the Liang, the Ch'en, the Sui and the T'ang Dynasties (p. 243a).

99. Cf. this Chapter, Section I, notes 36 and 79.

100. Cf. Chapter I, Section II, notes 176, 185, 186, 202, 206 and 208, and Section III, note 261. I will give no more details for this topic.

101. For instance, Tao-wên (died ca. 465-466) was appointed 'Sêng-chêng' by Emperor Hsiao-wu of the Liu-Sung Dynasty around 460 (KSC, p. 372b-c). Hui-ching (n.d.) was the 'Sêng-chêng' in 486 and held his post till the Sui Dynasty took over the Ch'en Dynasty in 589 (HKSC, p. 494b). The Biographies of these monks do not assert that they were disciplinarians.

102. In the regime of Emperor Wu of the Liang Dynasty, there was a 'white-garmented (i.e. layman)' appointed 'Sêng-chêng' around 540 who punished Buddhist transgressors with the secular law (HKSC, p. 466 [the Biography of Chih-tsang]. Cf. Tso Sze-bong, tr., 'Materials', p. 61). In the Northern Ch'i Dynasty, the Indian Upāsaka (layman) Gautamadharmaprajñā (n.d.) was appointed 'Deputy Controller of the Office of Illuminator of Mysteries'. After the Northern Chou Dynasty conquered the Northern Ch'i Dynasty in 577 and extended its policy of persecution toward Buddhism to the realm of this conquered dynasty, Gautamadharmaprajñā transferred to the post of prefectural governor from his original office (HKSC, p. 434c [the Biography of Jñānagupta]).

103. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, pp. 111-112.

104. Will be discussed further in the next Sub-section of this Section.

105. The title of 'Sêng-chêng' was no longer heard in the T'ang Dynasty. As the T'ang Dynasty was derived from the Northern Dynasties, the rulers of this Dynasty followed the tradition of the Yellow River Valley by addressing the local 'Controller' as 'Sêng-t'ung', I think.

106. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, pp. 109-111.

107. TSSSL, p. 243c-244a.

108. SKSC, p. 741b-c. TSSSL, p. 243c. FTTC , p. 380b. Jan Yün-hua, tr., A Chronicle of Buddhism in China, 581-960 A.D., p. 77

109. FTTC, p. 380b. Jan Yün-hua, tr., idem.

110. Cf. note 79.

111. TSSSL, pp. 243c-244a and p. 245a.

112. For instance, Tsan-ning, author of the SKSC and the TSSSL, was the 'Sêng-lu of the Right Part' from 998-1001 (cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Bio. & Biblio.', Part III, pp. 123 and 126). In the T'ang Dynasty, Ch'ang-an was divided into two halves, the left (east) and the right (west), with the Chu-ch'üeh Street as the dividing line. This is why the controllership was divided into the 'Left Part' and the 'Right Part' (cf. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p. 255). Up to the Northern Sung Dynasty, the 'Left Part' or the 'Right Part' that adhered to a 'Controller's' title was only a tradition.

113. TSSSL, p. 245a.

114. For instance, when Pao-ch'ang offended Emperor Wu of the Liang Dynasty in 510, the latter told the Monastic Order to punish him in accordance with the Vinaya. Because Hui-ch'ao, 'Controller of the Buddhist Priests' in the Capital Territory (cf. note 96)' wanted to flatter the emperor, he sentenced Pao-ch'ang to be exiled to Canton from Nanking. Fortunately, this exile was cancelled afterwards for the court wanted Pao-ch'ang to stay and join the translation centre (HKSC, p. 427c). Cf. also Chapter I, Section I, notes 43 and 45.

115. Cf. Treatise, pp. 1447a-1448a. Leon Hurvitz, tr., pp. 85-90.

116. TSSSL, p. 245a.

117. Cf. notes 87 to 95.

118. Cf. Kennth Ch'en, Survey, p. 254.

119. Cf. note 93.

120. Cf. note 103.

121. TSSSL, p. 234c. Hsin T'ang Shu, Vol. 2, p. 571a. Cf. Shizuka Shigenoi, 'Tōdai Zenhanki no sō dō shorei ni tsu i te' or 'On Administrative Agency for Monks and Taoist Priests in the first half of the T'ang

Dynasty (sic)' in Tōhō Shūkyō, No. 19 (1962, Kyoto), pp. 20-21.

122. TSSSL, p. 254c. Hsin T'ang Shu, Vol. 2, p. 571a. Shizuka Shigenoi, ibid., pp. 21-26.
123. Hsin T'ang Shu, Vol. 2, p. 548a. See also Chiu T'ang Shu, Vol. 2, p. 885a.
124. Cf. Shizuka Shigenoi, pp. 26-34.
125. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p. 255.
126. Cf. Tsukamoto Zenryū, 'Tō chūki Irai no Chōan no Kudokushi' or 'On the Commissioners of Religious Merits in Ch'ang-an Since the Second Half of the T'ang Dynasty', Tōhō Gakuhō, No. 4 (1933, Kyoto), pp. 368-406. Kenneth Ch'en, idem.
127. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, ibid., p. 256.
128. Cf. Tsukamoto Zenryū, pp. 368-406. Kenneth Ch'en, ibid., p. 255.
129. TSSSL, p. 245c.
130. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p. 256.
131. See notes 107 to 111.
132. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p. 256.
133. Cf. Shizuka Shigenoi, 'Godai no Kudokushi ni Kansurur Kanken' or 'On the System of Kung-tê-shih in the Wu-tai Dynasties', Tōhō Shūkyō, No. 16, pp. 68-81.
134. Chiu T'ang Shu, Vol. 2, p. 885b. Hsin T'ang Shu, Vol. 2, p. 571a.
135. Hsin T'ang Shu, idem.
136. Idem.
137. See Chapter III, Section I, Sub-section A, notes 12 to 15.
138. See Chapter I, Section I, note 75. And Section I, notes 49 and 51 of this Chapter.
139. KSC, p. 372b.
140. Ibid., p. 375c (the Biography of Tao-hui [451-481]).
141. HKSC, p. 653a (the Biography of Chia-i [n.d.]).
142. Ibid., p. 546b.
143. TTTTÊSSTFSC, p. 270a. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, p. 133.
144. TSSSL, p. 247c.
145. SKSC, p. 833c.
146. Yu-yang Tsa-tsu, p. 126a.
147. NHCKNFC, p. 213c. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, p. 63.
148. SVSTVDV, pp. 1a-13c. DRMGTV, pp. 568c-579a. MHSGKV, pp. 227a-262a.
149. HKSC, p. 602c.
150. Ibid., p. 624a.

151. For his Biography see HKSC, p. 608c-609a.
152. KHMC, p. 305a.
153. For his date see Ch'en Yüan, Dates of Monks, p. 80.
154. HKSC, p. 617a. FTTC, p. 364c. Jan Yün-hua, tr., p. 29. FTTC says that this Memorial was presented in 635. Cf. Akitsuki Kan'ei, 'Tōdai Shūkyō Keihō ni Kansuru kanken (A Personal View of the Religious Penal Code of the T'ang Dynasty)', Tōhō Shūkyō, No.4-5 (1954), p. 138.
155. Nien-ch'ang (cf. Chapter I, Section IV, note 414), p. 569c. Cf. Akitsuki Kan'ei, idem.
156. Akitsuki Kan'ei, 'Dōsōkaku no Fukkyū ni tsu i te' or 'A Restoration of the Regulations for Buddhist Monks and Taoist Priests' in Rekishi 4, (Tohoku Shigakuki Press, 1952, Sendai), pp. 55-61.
157. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, pp. 116-135.
158. Cf. ibid., p. 118.
159. DRMGTV, p. 963b.
160. Ibid., p. 963b-c.
161. For the five forbidden pungent roots, cf. Chapter II, Section II, notes 209 to 298.
162. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, p. 119.
163. DRMGTV, p. 672b.
164. Ibid., p. 688b.
165. Cf. ibid., pp. 657a, 868b, 868c, 993a and 1006a.
166. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, p. 119.
167. DRMGTV, p. 692c.
168. See TSSSL, p. 245a.
169. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, p. 122.
170. DRMGTV, p. 638a.
171. Ibid., pp. 742c-743a.
172. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, p. 122.
173. DRMGTV, p. 1007a.
174. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, p. 126.
175. DRMGTV, pp. 618-619, 619-621 and p. 691b-c.
176. See Chapter III, Section III, notes 211, 212, 214, 218 to 220, 221, 222, 233, 235, 302 and 303.
177. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, p. 131.
178. DRMGTV, p. 961a-b.
179. See Chapter III, Section III, note 253.
180. Idem.

181. DRMGTV, pp. 692c-693a.
182. SVSTVDV, p. 63c and p. 64b.
183. Cf. note 113.
184. Cf. Section I, notes 10 to 15.
185. For instance, in 402, Grand Commandant Huan Hsüan usurped the Eastern Chin Dynasty and declared himself Son of Heaven (Chin Shu, Vol. 3, pp. 1269b-1272b. Cf. Leon Hurvitz, 'Render Unto Caesar in Early Chinese Buddhism', p. 80). Desiring to check the growing power of the Buddhist clergy (cf. Leon Hurvitz, idem), he issued an edict to take a census of the Buddhist priests in the Yangtzŭ River Valley (HMC, p. 85a. Cf. T'ang Yung-t'ung, History, Vol. I, p. 256). In 472, Emperor Hsiao-wên of the Northern Wei Dynasty decreed that his subjects should not harbour unregistered monks, for whom a close search would be conducted (Treatise, p. 1445b. Leon Hurvitz, tr., p. 76). In 575, the government of the Ch'en Dynasty found ten thousand odd unregistered monks and nuns in the Yangtzŭ Valley. After the monk Chih-i presented a memorial to Emperor Hsüan begging for a favour, the emperor allowed all of them to register (HKSC, p. 565c [the Biography of Chih-i]).
186. For his Biography see Chin Shu, Vol. 3, pp. 1267a-1277a.
187. HMC, p. 85c.
188. SKSC, p. 823b (the Biography of Hui-an [582-709]).
189. HKSC, p. 606a (the Biography of Fa-hsiang [553-630]).
190. Idem. And ibid., p. 666a (the Biography of Fa-ch'ung [627-665]). Cf. ibid., p. 603a (the Biography of Shan-fu [+ 660]).
191. In 476, Emperor Hsiao-wên of the Northern Wei Dynasty allowed more than one hundred men and women of good family to be ordained as monks and nuns (Treatise, p. 1446a. Leon Hurvitz, tr., p. 78). In 492 the same emperor issued an edict permitting the great states to ordain one hundred persons, the middle states fifty persons, the inferior states twenty persons. This was to be made a fixed standard and published in law codes (ibid., p. 1446b. Leon Hurvitz, tr., p.80). In 607 Emperor Yang of the Sui Dynasty issued an edict permitting one thousand persons in all in the whole nation to be ordained as priests (KHMC, p. 328c). In 629 when the monk Ming-ching (n.d.) twice successfully demonstrated his supernatural power by praying for rain to break the drought in the Ch'ang-an area, Emperor T'ai-tsung of the T'ang Dynasty permitted the governments of the local prefectures to select

the faithful ones from among those privately-ordained priests and ordain them as monks and nuns. The privilege was restricted to only three thousand ordinands in the whole nation (HKSC, p. 594b-c. KHMC, p. 329b). See also Chapter I, Section IV, note 356, and Section V, notes 495 to 497. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, pp. 247-248.

192. Idem.

193. See notes 121 to 130.

194. TTHYCFKSC, p. 7c. Cf. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, p.xxviii.

195. NHCKNFC, p. 219b. J. Takakusu, tr., ibid., pp. 98-99.

196. For instance, Shên-ch'ing (died ca. 813) was told to recite one thousand pages of quotations from the Buddhist scriptures before he entered the Order (SKSC, p. 740c). While Tao-p'iao (740-823) was told to recite seven hundred pages (ibid., p. 803c) and Wên-hsi (821-900) ten fascicles of scriptures (ibid., p. 783c). Besides, the monks Hui-k'ung (died before 773, ibid., p. 765), Tao-t'ung (731-813, ibid., p. 767) and Chih-yün (777-853, ibid., p. 881a) had to pass an examination in scripture reciting. Shêng-ts'ou (744-817) in particular passed the examination for his knowledge of the Sūtra, the Vinaya and the Śāstra in 773 and entered the Order (ibid., p. 807a).

197. The monks Hsüan-lan (+ 644, HKSC, p. 683a-b), Chih-wei (646-722, SKSC, p. 758b), Hsüan-yen (675-742, ibid., p. 795a), Tai-chia (+ 766, ibid., p. 834b), T'an-i (692-771, ibid., p. 798b), Hui-k'ung (ibid., p. 765b), Ta-i (691-779, ibid., p. 800a), Shên-hao (716-790, ibid., p. 802c), Ch'êng-kuan (died about 812, ibid., p. 737a), Shên-ch'ing (ibid., p. 740c), Shên-ts'ou (ibid., p. 807a-b), Chên-ch'êng (+ 820, ibid., p. 803b), Tao-p'iao (ibid., p. 803c), Chih-yün (ibid., p.881a), Wên-hsi (ibid., p. 783c), Hêng-t'ung (834-905, ibid., p. 783a) and Hui-tsê (835-908, ibid., p. 809a) all joined the Order in this way.

198. The monks Yüan-kuei (644-716, SKSC, p. 828b), Hsüan-su (668-752, ibid., p. 761c), Hsüan-lang (673-754, ibid., p. 875b), Shou-chih (697-767, ibid., p. 797c), Hui-k'ung (ibid., p. 765b), Ch'i-han (708-775, ibid., p. 799c), Ta-i (ibid., p. 800a), Ch'ien-chên (718-788, ibid., p. 736b), Shên-hao (ibid., p. 802c), Shang-hêng (739-815, ibid., p. 806c), Yüan-hao (+ 817, ibid., p. 740a) and Chên-ch'êng (ibid., p. 803b) all lived in an appointed monastery under this arrangement.

199. For his Biography see Chiu T'ang Shu, Vol. 4, p. 1660.

200. Chiu T'ang Shu, Vol. 1, p. 149b and Vol.4, p. 1660b. TSSSL, p.252b. Hsin T'ang Shu, Vol. 1, p. 94b. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, pp. 50-53. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p. 243.

201. SKSC, pp. 756c-757a. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, ibid., pp. 243-244, 248, 354-355. Why were the people of this time so eager to purchase such certificates ? As I have discussed previously, besides exemption from tax and from national service (cf. Section I, notes 10 to 15), the Order also offered religious sanctuary for criminals and the oppressed (cf. ibid., note 91). People suffering from civil war would therefore like to take refuge in Buddhism for safety.

202. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, ibid., p. 243.

203. In 747, Emperor Hsüan-tsung decreed that in each of the local prefectures only three people, strictly selected, were to be allowed to receive ordination and enter the Order (SKSC, p. 802 [the Biography of Shên-hao]). This indicates that just nine years before the An Lu-shan Rebellion, the T'ang government still kept a rigid control over the certification of monks.

204. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, T'ang History, pp. 53-59. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p. 243.

205. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, ibid., pp. 57-59.

206. FTTC, p. 453a-b. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p. 248 and pp. 391-393.

207. See Chapter III, Section I, Sub-section A, notes 12 to 16.

208. TSSSL, p. 250a. FTTC, p. 453c.

209. In the first place, this grant is not recorded in Wei Shou's Treatise. Secondly, Tsan-ning composed his TSSSL about the same time as his SKSC, i.e. around 893 (TSSSL, p. 235a). Cf. Tso Sze-bong, 'Bio. & Biblio.', Part III, p. 123) and Chih-p'an composed his FTTC in 1269 (see Chapter I, Section III, note 246). These two works were prepared nearly five hundred or even nine hundred years after the rule of Emperor Ming-yüan.

210. His biography says that he worked with the monks Ta-i and Shêng-chuang in I-ching's translation centre (SKSC, p. 731c). According to I-ching's biography, in 705 Emperor Chung-tsung told I-ching to organise a translation centre in Lo-yang. Among his assistants in the centre, Ta-i was his 'Literal Examiner' and Shêng-chuang was his 'Doctrinal Examiner' (ibid., p. 710c). From this we know the date of Tê-kan.

211. SKSC, p. 731c.
212. Idem.
213. Chao Chien (n.d.), Ta-t'ang Ku Ta-tê Tsêng Ssŭ-k'ung Ta-pien-chêng Kuang-chih Pu-k'ung San-tsang Hsing-chuang pr 'The Obituary of the Late Tripiṭaka Master Pu-k'ung (Amoghavajra) On Whom was Conferred the Official Title of Ssŭ-k'ung (Minister of Works) and the Religious Title of "The Well-Informed Grand Distinguisher of the Truth" (T.2056, hereafter referred to as Amoghavajra's Obituary)', p. 293. SKSC, p. 713b.
214. SKSC, p. 805c.
215. TSSSL, p. 250a-b. FTTC, p. 453c.
216. TSSSL, p. 250a-b.
217. SKSC, p. 720c (the Biography of Huai-ti).
218. See Chapter I, Section IV, notes 409-410.
219. Ta-T'ang Chên-yüan Hsin-i Shih-ti-ching-têng Chi (cf. Chapter I, Section IV, note 408), p. 715c. SKSC, p. 722c.
220. For instance, I-ching won this title because "... even though I-ching read through the Tripiṭaka, he paid particular attention to the Vinayapiṭaka (SKSC, p. 711a)". Tripiṭaka Master Vajrabodhi (669-741) had spent "....more than ten years in reading through the entire Tripiṭaka (ibid., p. 711b)".
221. HKSC, p. 481b.
222. Amoghavajra's Obituary, p. 293b. SKSC, p. 713a. TSSSL, p. 250b.
223. Amoghavajra's Obituary, p. 293b. SKSC, p. 713c.
224. For his life see Chiu T'ang Shu, Vol. 5, pp. 2374a-2375a (the Biography of Wu Ch'êng-sŭ). For his date see Chronicle, p. 6502. According to his account, Hsieh Huai-i was in fact a secret lover of the empress (p. 2374a. See also Chronicle, pp. 6436-6437, 6441).
225. Cf. Chapter I, Section V, note 477.
226. Chiu T'ang Shu, Vol. 1, p. 91 and Vol. 5, p. 2347b. TSSSL, p. 248c. Chronicle, p. 6469. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, p. 393.
227. Amoghavajra's Obituary, p. 293c. SKSC, p. 713b.
228. SKSC, p. 713b.
229. TSSSL, pp. 248c-249a. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, pp. 393-394.
230. See Chapter II, Section I, note 137.
231. TSSSL, p. 251a.
232. Idem.
233. HKSC, p. 666c.

234. TTTTÊSSTFSC, pp. 253c-254a, 259a-b, 266a-b, 275c-276c. Samuel Beal, tr., pp. 215, 216-217. Arthur Waley, paraphrased, pp. 84-89.
235. Ibid., pp. 253, 256a-257a, 258c-260a, 269a-270b, 273a-b, 274c, 275b-c, 277c-278b. Samuel Beal, tr., pp. 214-215. Arthur Waley, paraphrased, pp. 82-84 and 86.
236. HKSC, p. 666c.
237. Ibid., p. 618b-c.
238. According to Chiu T'ang Shu, Emperor Kao-tsu abdicated his throne to his second son Li Shih-min, later Emperor T'ai-tsung, after a coup d'état in 625. Then Emperor Kao-tsu became the Shang-huang (Retired Emperor). He died in 635 (Vol. 1, p. 43 and p. 58b). In 643 Emperor Kao-tsung was created crown prince by his father Emperor T'ai-tsung after Li Ch'êng-ch'ien (+ 645, for his Biography see ibid., Vol. 3, pp. 1289a-1290a), the former crown prince, was dismissed from office (ibid., Vol. 1, pp. 62b, 67a and Vol. 3, p. 1290a). Therefore the 'crown prince' mentioned above is Li Ch'êng-ch'ien.
239. HKSC, p. 618c.
240. Idem.

Notes to Section III

241. See the discussion of Chapter III, Section III, notes 173, 178 to 185, and 270.
242. Quotation, pp. 134c-135a.
243. Ibid., p. 134c. For the description of the monasterial buildings of Jetavana see DRMGTV, pp. 941c-942c.
244. Cf. Chapter III, Section III, note 178.
245. KSC, p. 410b.
246. Idem.
247. HKSC, p. 694a. These monasteries were probably in decay because of a lack of maintenance after the civil war in the last period of the Liang Dynasty (around 548-556, cf. Chronicle, Vol. 6, pp.4981-5164).
248. HKSC, p. 694a.
249. Cf. Chapter III, Section I, note 74.
250. HKSC, p. 695a.
251. Ibid., p. 697b.
252. SKSC, p. 877c.
253. Cf. notes 242 and 243.
254. HKSC, p. 699c (the 'Conclusion to the Category of Promotors of Works of Merit').

255. LYCLC, pp. 999c-1000c and p. 1006b. For the Empress Dowager's Biography see Li Yen-shou (died ca. 676-679), Pei Shih or 'The History of the Northern Dynasties', Vol. 1, pp. 227b-229a.
256. LYCLC, p. 1002b-c.
257. LYCLC, p. 1003a and p. 1017b-c.
258. Ibid., p. 1003a-b. For Prince Ch'ing-ho's Biography see Wei Shu, Vol. 1, p. 298.
259. LYCLC, p. 1004a.
260. Ibid., p. 1018b. For Chia Ts'an's Biography see Wei Shu, Vol. 3, p. 1006b.
261. This is based on my observations when I was living in Hong Kong and in Singapore and when I toured Western Malaysia and Taiwan, before 1977.
262. LYCLC, p. 1015a.
263. Ibid., p. 1003b.
264. Idem.
265. Idem.
266. Ibid., p. 1014b.
267. Ibid., p. 1002b.
268. Ibid., p. 1005b.
269. HKSC, p. 485a.
270. Ibid., p. 697c.
271. Yu-yang Tsa-tsu, p. 33a.
272. DRMGTV, pp. 672a, 870b, 873, 876c and 962c.
273. I read through the DRMGTV, and found that the Vinaya only instructs the priests how to behave when visiting the king's palace or a layman's house (see pp. 935b-c, 953b-c, 955b, 960c, 1005c, 1007a and 1012a-b). It never tells priests how to welcome a lay donor when he or she visits the establishment.
274. Quotation, p. 135a.
275. In his T'ang-shih Yen-chiu Ts'ung-kao or 'Miscellaneous Articles on the Study of the History of the T'ang Dynasty', pp. 367-424.
276. Cf. Yen Keng-wang, pp. 268-369.
277. Cf. ibid., pp. 414-415, and p. 418.
278. The discussions in Yen's work concerning the T'ang intellectuals who lived in Buddhist monasteries are to be found on pp. 371-374, 377-380, 382-384, 386, 388, 392, 396, 399-404, 406-411 and 414-415.
279. Cf. Yen-keng-wang, p. 379 and p. 418.

280. Cf. ibid., p. 379 and 396.
281. Cf. ibid., p. 401.
282. Cf. ibid., pp. 371-372, 379 and 402.
283. Cf. ibid., pp. 402, 407 and 419.
284. For the lay attendants in an Indian establishment see DRMGTV, pp. 875b, 876a and 956a. See also TTTTÊSSTFSC, p. 237a and p. 245a. Samuel Beal, tr., pp. 109-110 and p. 161. Arthur Waley, paraphrased, p. 45 and p. 54. NHCKNFC, p. 213c. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, p. 64.
285. TTHYCFKSC, p. 3b.
286. Cf. Yen Keng-wang, p. 373 and p. 392.
287. Cf. ibid., p. 415.
288. Idem. Cf. also ibid., pp. 371-372, 388, 396, 403 and 410.
289. Cf. note 282.
290. Cf. note 286.
291. For Li Shên's Biography see Chiu T'ang Shu, Vol. 5, pp. 2250a-2251b. Hsin T'ang Shu, Vol. 4, pp. 2098a-2099a.
292. Cf. Yen Keng-wang, pp. 373, 403 and 413. Yen says that after Li Shên was appointed prefectural governor, he always handed down the heaviest penalty to Buddhist monks who had committed a crime in his prefecture.
293. Cf. Chapter III, Section II, notes 88 to 98.
294. Cf. Yen Keng-wang, pp. 374-376, and p. 409.
295. Cf. K uo Mo-jo, 'Pu T'ien-shou Lun-yü Ch'ao-pên Hou Ti Shih-tzŭ Tsa-lu (A Note on the Poems and Sketches Appended to a Copy of Lun-yü [Confucian Analects] that were penned by a Primary School Boy Pu T'ien-shou)', K'ao-ku (Archaeology), Vol. 1 (1972, Peking), pp. 6-7.
296. DRMGTV, p. 861c.
297. Idem.
298. NHCKNFC, p. 213c. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, p. 63.
299. Cf. Sub-section (B) of this Section, notes 263 to 270.
300. Tuan Ch'êng-shih, T'a-szŭ Chi or 'An Account of the Pagodas and Monasteries in Ch'ang-an (T. 2093)', p. 1023a.
301. Ming-ch'ung (n.d.), the Hsu-i (A Supplementary Continuation) to the Kuang-Ch'ing-liang Chuan (T. 2099), pp. 1125c-1126a.
302. Cf. Chapter II, Section II, notes 153 to 157.
303. DRMGTV, p. 923b.
304. Ibid., p. 1006b and pp. 1008c-1009b.

305. Ibid., p. 923a-b. The Vinaya instructs that even a Bhikṣuṇī who has reached the venerable age of one hundred years, should still salute a newly ordained young Bhikṣu.

306. Traditionally, the Confucianists felt contempt for women. Confucius says: "Of all people, girls and servants are the most difficult to behave towards. If you are familiar with them, they lose their humility. If you maintain a reserve towards them, they are discontended (Lun-yü, SSCCS, Vol. 8, p. 159a. James Legge, tr., Confucian Analects, CC, Vol. 1-2, p. 330)". Mencius remarks: "At the marrying away of a young woman, her mother admonishes her, accompanying her to the door on her leaving, and cautioning her with these words: "You are going to your home. You must be respectful. You must be careful. Do not disobey your husband." Thus to look upon compliance as their correct course is the rule for women (Meng-tzŭ, SSCCS, Vol. 8, p. 108b. James Legge, tr., The Works of Mencius, CC, Vol. 1-2, p. 265). Following the expansion of Confucianism in Chinese society, the contemptuous attitude towards women advocated by these two sages spread. According to Chinese Buddhist legends, the sexual discrimination of feeling contempt for females was even reflected by the women themselves. The Fa-hua Ching Chuan-chi says that there were two women who felt disturbed at their fate of being born women. After having recited the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra day and night for years, one woman was reborn in the Western Paradise (p.76b) and the other's female genitalia gradually transformed into male genitalia (p. 79c). The Wang-shêng Hsi-fang Ching-t'u Shui-ying Chuan or 'The Account on the Rebirth in the Western Pure Land (T. 2070, according to its p. 108b, this work was introduced into Japan from China in 958)' says that even Empress Tu-ku (553-602, for her Biography see Sui Shu, Vol. 2, pp. 541b-542b) who was the spouse of Emperor Wên of the Sui Dynasty, still could not tolerate that she was born as a woman. Therefore she recited the name of Amitābha Buddha every day in order to accumulate enough merit to be reborn in the Western Paradise. When her life came to an end, her bedroom filled with a mysterious fragrancy (p. 107a). The above instances indicate that in this male-chauvinist atmosphere, Chinese women, no matter whether they were nobles or ordinary people, were desirous of finding a way to enable them to make a change in their condition as a woman in this world.

307. Cf. note 305. Even today I have observed Chinese Buddhist nuns saluting monks when they meet each other.
308. T. 2067, p. 32b and p. 38c. T. 2068, p. 79c and p. 81c.
309. T. 2068, p. 79c.
310. From my own observations, even today Chinese laywomen still do the same. In his work, Chên-hua mentions how he was entangled by his female believers and suffered from their ear-bashings (Chên-hua, p. 348).
311. Cf. notes 255 and 259.
312. LYCLC, p. 1006b.
313. Ibid., p. 1010a-b.
314. Ibid., p. 1010c.
315. Idem.
316. Kuang Ch'ing-liang Chuan or 'An Enlarged Account of Wu-tai Shan (T. 2099)', p. 1107b. This book was composed by the monk Hui-hsiang (n.d.) of the T'ang Dynasty and revised by the monk Yen-i (n.d.) before 1060 (T. 2099, p. 1101a-b).
317. Liang-ching Szŭ-chi or 'A Record of the Establishments in the Capital of the Liang Dynasty (anon., T. 2094)', p. 1024b.
318. Kuang Ch'ing-liang Chuan, pp. 1109c-1110a.
319. Cf. Chapter II, Section II, note 153.
320. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, pp. 275-285.
321. Quotation, p. 135.
322. Idem. In Fêng Mêng-lung's Ku-chin Hsiao-shuo, there is a short novel entitled 'Wu An-pao Ch'i-chia Shu Yu' or 'Wu An-pao Contributed his Whole Property for Ransoming his Friend from the Savages'. This novel tells that after Wu ransomed his friend K'uo Chung-hsiang around 731, both himself and his wife passed away six years later and they were buried in the Huang-lung Monastery (Vol. I, p. 130). In 753, K'uo Chung-hsiang sent a memorial to the court in order to report the whole story and to recommend Wu's son to join the government as a public servant (ibid., p. 132). This story hints that in the T'ang Dynasty there had been some laymen whose bodies were buried in a Buddhist monastery.
323. HKSC, p. 618b.
324. I remember that in the sixties there was a third-class movie-star in Hong Kong who obtained permission from the abbot of Ch'ing-shan Monastery on Castle Peak (in the New Territories of Hong Kong). After she committed suicide, her body was then buried there.

CHAPTER V

Revolution in the Field of Monastic Discipline - The Formation of the Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei and Its Popularity

Due to the internal and external factors described in Chapters III[1] and IV[2], the Chinese clerics found it difficult to observe strictly the rules of the Vinaya in a Chinese environment. They discovered the inconvenience of the Indian rules by consulting I-ch'ing's NHCKNFC.[3] In order to save themselves from the dilemma of 'reluctantly observing the inconvenient Vinaya', Master Huai-hai of Ch'an Buddhism decided to abandon the Vinaya and to replace it with a set of new monastic rules.[4] Even though this set of rules, the so-called 'Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei', was originally very simple and was put into practice only in Huai-hai's establishment in Po-chang Shan,[5] it spread rapidly to the whole of China because it had been drafted with an eye to the Chinese environment. Not only did the whole Ch'an Buddhist establishments adopt Huai-hai's 'Ch'ing-kuei' but they enlarged its contents time and again after the Sung Dynasty.[6] Even Shên-wu, sectarian of the Dharmaguptavinaya School in the Yüan Dynasty, quoted from the different versions of the 'Ch'ing-kuei' that were compiled in the Dynasties of Sung and Yüan to organise a set of monastic rules for the administration of the establishments of his own School.[7] Even though the different versions of 'Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei' still instruct the authorities of a Ch'an establishment to teach Vinaya rules to the novice after they enter the Order,[8] I found no evidence of a Ch'an establishment still observing the Vinaya at the same time.

I venture to say, therefore, that a revolution in the field of monastic discipline was initiated by Huai-hai and the new system of monastic rule set up by him was stabilised by the Ch'an Buddhists of later generations.

I. Master Huai-hai and the Earliest Aspect of His Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei.

Master Huai-hai (720-814)[9] was a native of Ch'ang-lo City (present Min-hou [i.e. Fu-chou] City of the Fukien Province)[10] of Fu-chou Prefecture (present Fu-chou City and its surrounding areas).[11] He entered the Monastic Order in his childhood[12] and had his ceremony of tonsure performed by Vandya Hui-chao (n.d.).[13] In his nineteenth year, Huai-hai received his full ordination from Disciplinarian Fa-ch'ao (n.d.) in 738.[14] After he was ordained, Master Huai-hai went to Lu-chiang (in Anhui Province) and stayed in the Fou-ch'a Monastery. There he spent years in reading the entire Chinese Tripiṭaka.[15] I believe that he was inspired during this period to create a new set of monastic rules.

My assumption is based on the following points: Firstly, the holdings of the library of Fou-ch'a Monastery would have been very rich. Besides Master Huai-hai, Ling-t'an (709-816) had also come to this monastery to read the entire Tripiṭaka around 742-3.[16] Secondly, after Huai-hai had read through (or even just browsed over) the entire Tripiṭaka, he must have gained access to the contents of the translated Vinayapiṭaka (like the SVSTVDV, the DRMGTV, etc.). From it, he would have acquired a closer understanding of the rules in the Vinaya which are all based on the social and religious environment of India. Therefore, he would have doubted whether these rules were suitable for Chinese priests. Thirdly, after I-ching's NHCKNFC was brought back to China in 691,[17] Chih-shêng listed this work in the 'Ju-tsang Lu (Category of Scriptures for Shelving)' of his KYSCL,[18] meaning that the NHCKNFC is to be recommended to the libraries of Buddhist establishments. As the KYSCL is highly praised by scholars past[19] and present[20] as the 'incomparable achievement in Chinese Buddhist bibliography', I believe that the monks of the Fou-ch'a Monastery

would have followed the recommendation of KYSCL and shelved the NHCKNFC in the library of their establishment. In 945, the monk Hêng-an says that after the KYSCL was published in 730, people called it 'K'ai-yüan Lu Tsang (KYSCL, a Guide for Monastic Library).'[21] It implies that the shelving system of the monastic libraries in the T'ang Dynasty was influenced by Chih-shêng's work. Fourthly, I pointed out in Chapter II that the NHCKNFC made Chinese Buddhists intolerant of the Vinaya.[22] If the NHCKNFC was in the library of the Fou-ch'a Monastery and Huai-hai gained access to it during his reading of the Tripiṭaka, he would also have become intolerant of the Vinaya after having learned from I-ching's work how the Indian monks applied it. This would have given him the idea of establishing a new set of monastic rules.

After his study in Fou-ch'a Monastery, Huai-hai followed Master Tao-i (well-known as Ma-tsu, 709-788),[29] the pioneer of Ch'an Buddhism, in Nan-k'ang (located in Lin-chuan City of Kiangsi Province).[24] He stayed with Tao-i till the latter's death in 788.[25] In mourning for his master, Huai-hai built a hut near Master Tao-i's Śarīrastūpa and lived there for many years.[26] Sometime afterwards, Huai-hai's disciples and supporters persuaded him to move to the Po-chang Shan (Mount Po-chang) in Hung-chou (present Nan-ch'ang City, or Kiangsi Province).[27]

When Master Huai-hai was settled in Po-chang Shan, monks who were interested in meditative practices flocked to him.[28] As these followers were so numerous and Huai-hai's shrine was unable to accommodate so many residents,[29] he planned to enlarge it in order to house more people. During his planning, Master Huai-hai thought that as the practices of Ch'an Buddhism followed by him and his disciples, were derived from a Mahāyāna tradition, there seemed to be no reason for his group to obey the Vinaya of the Hīnayāna tradition.[30] He observed, too, the fact that since Ch'an Buddhism began to bloom after Master Hui-nêng (well known as

Liu-tsu [the Sixth Patriarch of Ch'an Buddhism], 638-713)[31] started his sermons in Ts'ao-ch'i (in Ch'ü-chiang City of Kuangtung Province), most of the Ch'an clerics were still living in establishments observing the Vinaya.[32] Even though these Ch'an Buddhists were assigned to live in an apartment that was separated from the other apartments of the establishment, they still felt uncomfortable as their practices differed from those of the other monks.[33] Master Huai-hai decided, therefore, to abandon the Vinaya and to organise his own new set of rules for the establishment.[34] After Huai-hai's decision was made, someone came to ask him why, as there were translations of Mahāyānaśīlas, he did not simply use them to govern the conduct of his Ch'an disciples ? Master Huai-hai replied that he had already taken references from both the Śīlas of Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna Buddhism to form his rules.[35] As this new set of rules was used first in Huai-hai's Po-chang Shan, people called it 'Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei' or 'The Pure Rule by the Master of Po-chang Shan'.

The original 'Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei' by Huai-hai has long been lost. Only some descriptions of these rules are contained in the Biography of Huai-hai in both the SKSC and in Tao-yüan's (flor. 1004-1007) CTCTL (T. 2076).[36] In 1939, after having compared the 'Ch'an-man Kuei-shih (The Rules for the Ch'an Buddhists)' that is appended to the Biography of Huai-hai in CTCTL,[37] with other materials, Kimura Shizuo decided that these 'Rules' are the embryonic version of the Ch'ing-kuei.[38] Two years later, when Ui Hakuju compared the 'Ch'an-man Kuai-shih' with the description in SKSC, he found that the contents of both agreed with each other, and determined that both were derived from the same fountainhead, i.e. the 'Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei' by Huai-hai himself.[39] As the description in SKSC is simpler than that in the CTCTL, Ui Hakuju's work agrees with the conclusion of Kimura Shizuo.

Versions of the earliest redaction of the Ch'ing-kuei in both the SKSC and CTCTL show that the primitive 'Ch'ing-kuei' contained the following rules:

(1) In the establishment of Po-chang Shan no main chapel for the Buddha's image as in the other monasteries is to be prepared. There is to be a 'Fa-t'ang (Dharma Hall)' for assembly.[40]

(2) The high-monk (i.e. the abbot) is required to live in the 'Fang-chang (Ten-foot Cubicle).[41]

(3) The other monks of this establishment, whether junior or senior, are all required to live in the 'Sêng-t'ang (Apartment for Monks)'. The beds therein are linked together and are occupied in accordance with the monks' seniority. There are also frames for them to hand up their belongings.[43]

(4) As they are meditators, they are only allowed to lean on the frame of their beds for rest when feeling tired during the practice of meditation on their own beds. This way of resting is called 'Tai-tao Shui (Sleeping like One Who Carries a Sabre on his Waist)'.[43]

(5) There are two assemblies to be held daily, one in the morning and one in the evening. In each of the assemblies all members of the establishment are gathered together in the Dharma Hall. After the abbot has arrived and sat down, the other monks line up at his two sides, standing and listen to his sermon or instruction. At the same time they could ask him questions on Buddhism.[44]

(6) The authority of the establishment does not watch closely whether the monks are diligent or lazy in their practices. They are instructed only to consult the abbot in his 'Fang-chang' occasionally and ask him religious questions.[45]

(7) The establishment supplies daily one vegetarian meal and one meal of cooked rice-gruel for its members.[46]

(8) Every monk, no matter whether senior or junior, of the establishment is invited to take up some duties and works for the maintenance of his institution.[47]

(9) In administering the monastic affairs, the abbot appoints ten officers, each of whom has an office entitled 'Liao-shê (Office-hut)'.

An administrator is appointed to each office and some of the members are assigned to work under him. (A note by Tao-yüan: "For instance, the superintendent of the monastic kitchen is called 'Fan-t'ou [Head of the Rice-cooking]'; the superintendent of the vegetable grove is called 'Ts'ai-t'ou [Head of the Production of Vegetables]', etc.").[48]

(10) A Karmadāna (Duty-distributor) is appointed to the establishment. If someone, disguised as a monk, infiltrates into the establishment and creates trouble or quarrels among the clergy, the Karmadāna investigates the case. After the troublemaker is found, the Karmadāna immediately collects the belongings from the man's bed, returns them to him and expels him. If this transgressor has also committed some sins, he will receive a corporal punishment of flogging with a staff, and will then be sentenced in an assembly to expulsiton. Before this transgressor is expelled, his robe, his bowl and other religious equipment is to be burnt in front of the assembly. After that, he is told to leave through the side door as a way of insulting him. Cases of this sort will not be presented to the secular magistrate's court for trial.[49]

From the above quotations, we know that the embryonic 'Ch'ing-kuei' was prepared for three purposes: firstly, Master Huai-hai aimed at confirming the practices that were customary among the Chinese Buddhist establishments in his time. Rule 10, for instance, confirms the practices of corporal punishment.[50] Rules 8 and 9 confirm the duty of physical labour.[51] In particular, 'Fan-t'ou' in Rule 9 permits the establishment of a permanent kitchen.[52] Secondly. Master Huai-hai aimed at eliminating the inconveniences of following the Indian monastic tradition in China. For instance, Rule 7 is designed to eliminate the problems arising out of taking two meals a day.[53] As the Vinaya establishes two hundred odd rules for governing the conduct of the priests,[54] Rule 6 of Huai-hai's primitive 'Ch'ing-kuei' seems to have been designed to release the Chinese monks from the harsh government of the more subtle Vinaya rules. Thirdly, Master Huai-hai aimed at reviving the religious unity of the Order. As

the Buddhist priests frequently presented their internal conflicts to the secular magistrate's court for judgement,[55] the last paragraph of Rule 10 stresses that monastic troubles must be solved internally and should not go to trial under the secular law.

Even though this primitive 'Ch'ing-kuei' authorises flogging or expulsion of transgressors, it never defines the sins. As the Chinese Buddhist priests traditionally took the five precepts (i.e. no killing, no stealing, no adultery, no lying and no intoxicating liquors) seriously,[56] I believe that Huai-hai would have defined a 'transgressor' as 'one who breaches one of the five precepts in my establishment'.[57]

Tsang-ning says of Huai-hai's primitive 'Ch'ing-kuei': "...his rules are completely contrary to the rules promulgated by the Vinaya masters. The Ch'an Buddhists in the whole of China bow down to his rules like grass-blades blown by the strong wind. Owing to the work of Hai, the Ch'an Buddhists are released from the teaching of the Vinaya...."[58] Tsan-ning's words show how the primitive 'Ch'ing-kuei' was welcomed by the Ch'an Buddhists. His last words show why. The two hundred odd Vinaya rules are restrictive and annoying to Chinese. For instance, the Chinese Order could not ban female visitors from the monasteries,[59] and thereby breached the Vinaya.[60] In accordance with Master Huai-hai's new rules, Chinese monks no longer felt guilty in allowing females to loiter around their establishment. In the primitive 'Ch'ing-kuei' there is no prohibition of women entering the monasteries.

As I mentioned in Chapter IV, a Chinese monastery could not prohibit women partly because they were good donors.[61] Did Master Huai-hai's establishment survive on the donations made by laymen and laywomen? Huai-hai always told his disciples that: "If one day I do not work, then I will not take any food on that same day."[62] Since Huai-hai's epitaph

says also that he shared physical labour with his disciples,[63] Ui Hakuju believes that Master Huai-hai was a man of his word.[64] In the primitive 'Ch'ing-kuei', there is a position of 'Head of the Production of Vegetables';[65] I believe that the 'work' that Huai-hai mentions is a productive one. Moreover, in I-tsang's Ku Tsun-su Yü-lu or 'The Analects of the Ancient Pioneers of Ch'an Buddhism',[66] there is the 'Analects of Po-chang Huai-hai'.[67] In these Analects there are three dialogues between Huai-hai and his disciples about: (1) inviting members of the establishment to open up waste lands and turn them into fields;[68] (2) collecting mushrooms on the slope of the mountain;[69] and (3) instructing members to dig the farming land.[70] The document also mentions that at lunchtime, a drum will beat to notify the monks farming in the field to return.[71] Evidently, Master Huai-hai's establishment survived mainly on the harvest of its monastic farming lands.

After Master Huai-hai's death in 814, the monastic members of the establishment met in assembly to find ways of maintaining the establishment. Eventually, they drafted five permanent rules for its maintenance:

(1) A high monk is invited to take up the abbotship of the establishment. A Śrāmaṇera is told to do cleaning work for the establishment and for the Stūpas.

(2) No nunnery or nun's tomb and Stūpa is allowed to be built in the confines of the monastery. Laymen too are not allowed to live in this territory.

(3) If a monk wants to become a disciple of the establishment, or if a child enters into the Order, only the abbot has the right to receive them. The other monks are not allowed to receive personal disciples.

(4) No monastic estates are to be developed outside the territory of the establishment.

(5) The monks who are living in the mountain (i.e. the establishment) are not allowed to accumulate personal wealth, whether money or grains.

These five new rules were engraved on a stone tablet and placed in the memorial hall of Master Huai-hai.[72]

In my opinion, these five new rules were aimed at making basic changes in the Chinese establishments. For instance, as the Chinese monasteries traditionally welcomed lay-intellectuals coming to live within the premises,[73] Rule 2 is designed to eliminate this tradition. Again, traditionally the Chinese establishments were eager to develop their monastic estates,[74] and the priests were eager to accomulate personal wealth.[75] Rules 4 and 5 were designed to prohibit such developments.

These five new rules had considerable influence on the different versions of the 'Ch'ing-kuei' compiled after the T'ang Dynasty.[76]

II. The Ch'ih-hsiu Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei and Preceding Versions.

In the year 1335, Emperor Shun-ti (Oukhagatou Khan, R. 1334-1368)[77] of the Yüan (Mongol) Dynasty appointed Tê-hui (n.d.), abbot of the Ta-chih Shên-shou Monastery of Ch'an Buddhism in Po-chang Shan,[78] to codify the different versions of the 'Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei.[79] The emperor took this step because of the popularity of Ch'an Buddhism in China. Although Buddhists throughout China suffered from persecution by the T'ang government in 845, Ch'an Buddhism alone regained its prosperity.[80] Up to the Five Dynasties and the Sung Dynasty, clerical and lay sectarians of the Ch'an School almost monopolised the teaching given up by other declining Buddhist schools.[81] Before the Mongols conquered the whole of China, the first Chinese Buddhist they encountered was the Ch'an Buddhist monk Yin-chien (well-known as Hai-yün, 1201-1256);[82] he won the respect of Gengjis Khan (R. 1206-1228) and his successors.[83]

Because of this good beginning,[84] the Ch'an sectarians maintained their position under Mongolian rule.[85] Due to the popularity of Ch'an Buddhism, the 'Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei' predominated throughout China.[86] This created a problem.

Traditionally Chinese Buddhists revered the scriptures that were translated from Sanskrit or the languages of the Western Regions and considered them sacred.[87] The addition of words not included in the original text was forbidden.[88] Therefore, even though Tao-hsüan had simplified the formulations of the Dharmaguptaśīla in the verbose translation of the original text by Buddhayaśas,[89] he did not dare to change its rules by adding to or subtracting from them.[90] As the 'Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei' was not translated from an Indian text but was only a set of monastic rules compiled in China, its rules could be changed by monastic authorities to suit different circumstances. From the T'ang Dynasty up to the moment when Tê-hui began his revision, there had been many additions to and subtractions from the rules of the 'Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei'.[91] Emperor Shun-ti appointed Tê-hui to collate the versions of the 'Pure Rule' used in the various Chinese monasteries and to edit them into a single text.[92] Ta-hsin (n.d.), abbot of the Ta Lung-hsiang Chi -ch'ing Monastery, and his assistants were ordered to help.[93] When the task was completed in 1336, the text was entitled Ch'ih-hsiu Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei or 'Master Po-chang's Pure Rules Re-organised Under Imperial Decree'.[94] In the same year, Emperor Shun-ti issued an edict to all Chinese Buddhist establishment, instructing them to observe this text. In accordance with this set of rules, he said, their monastic properties were still under the protection of the government.[95] Emperor Tai-tsu (R. 1367-1398) of the Ming Dynasty ordered in 1382 that a Buddhist monk who did not observe the Ch'ing-kuei would be punished under the secular law.[96] In 1441, Emperor Ch'êng-tsu (R. 1403-1424) once again exhorted the Buddhist monks to observe the Ch'ing-kuei.[97] In the

last year of his regime, the 'Sêng-lu' suggested to the emperor that the Ch'ing-kuei should not be applied to clerics committing serious crimes, as its penalties were not heavy enough, but the emperor insisted that it should continue to be used.[98] In 1442, Chung-chih (n.d.), abbot of the Ta-chih Shên-shou Monastery in Po-chang Shan, presented a memorial to Emperor Ying-tsung (R. 1436-1449, and 1457-1464) of the Ming Dynasty, reporting that the monks were beginning to stray from the Ch'ing-kuei.[99] The emperor then ordered Hu Ying (1376-1464),[100] his Minister of Ritual, to print new copies and issued them to all Buddhist establishments in China through Hu's ministry.[101] In the preface of this newly issued copy,[102] Hu Yung transmits the order of Emperor Ying-tsung that abbots should have to expound the Ch'ing-huei to their monastic members in order to maintain the tradition of Ch'an Buddhism.[103]

Under the patronage of the above-mentioned Ming emperors, the text of the Ch'ing-kuei prepared under Oukhagatou Khan's orders became the accepted monastic rule in China. Why were these Ming emperors so anxious for the adoption of the Ch'ing-kuei ? The most obvious motive was the simplification and systematization of the rules contained in the other versions.[104] What was perhaps more important, in the opening pages, the Ching-kuei instructs the monks to bear in mind the benevolences the emperor has conferred on them, such as exemption from tax and national service, and the provision of a peaceful and comfortable monastic environment for living and practising their vocation. They should therefore pray every morning and evening for the Buddha's blessing on the emperor.[105] In other words, the Ch'ing-kuei confirms the longstanding imperial authority over the Monastic Order.

Pages 1157c to 1159a of the Ch'ing-kuei contains four prefaces from other versions of the Ch'ing-kuei. They are:

(1) 'Ku Ch'ing-kuei Hsü' or 'The Preface of the Ancient Ch'ing-kuei'. This preface is composed by Yang-I (n.d.) in 1004.[106]

(2) 'Ch'ung-ning Ch'ing-kuei Hsü' or 'The Preface of the Ch'ing-kuei Compiled in the Ch'ung-Ning Era'.[107] This is the preface to the monk Tsung-i's (n.d.) ten fascicled Ch'an-yüan Ch'ing-kuei or 'The Pure Rule for the Ch'an Buddhist (hereafter referred to as Ch'an-yüan)',[108] and is composed by the author himself in Ch'ung-Ning 2 (1103) of Emperor Hui-tsung (R. 1101-1125) of the Northern Sung Dynasty.[109] In it, Tsung-i says that as the Buddhist establishments in this time began to increase or decrease the rules of the 'Ch'ing-kuei' at their own will, he consulted all the applicable rules and re-organised them in his work to offer his fellow Ch'an Buddhists a standard practice.[110]

(3) 'Hsien-ch'un Ch'ing-kuei Hsü' or 'The Preface of the Ch'ing-kuei Compiled in the Hsien-ch'un Era'.[111] This is the preface to the monk Wei-mien's (n.d.) two fascicled Ts'ung-lin Chiao-ting Ch'ing-kuei Tsung-yao or 'The Concise Pure Rule Prepared for the Groves of Ch'an Buddhism (hereafter referred to as Tsung-yao)',[112] and is composed by the author himself in Hsien-ch'un 10 (1274) of Emperor Tu-tsung (R. 1265-1274) of the Southern Sung Dynasty.[113] Wei-mien says that as the 'Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei' had been long in use, some of the rules had been distorted. He therefore compared and collated the different versions and condensed their rules for the convenience of his fellow Ch'an Buddhists.[114]

(4) 'Chih-ta Ch'ing-kuei Hsü' or 'The Preface of the Ch'ing-kuei Compiled in the Chih-ta Era'.[115] This is the preface to the monk I-hsien's (flor. 1278-1311)[116] ten fascicled Ch'an-lin Pei-yung Ch'ing-kuei or 'The Pure Rule Applicable to the Ch'an Buddhists (hereafter referred to as Pei-yung),[117] and is composed by the author himself in Chih-ta 4 (1311) of Emperor Wu-tsung (Kuluk Khan, R. 1308-1311) of the Yüan (Mongol) Dynasty.[118] I-hsien says that as the 'Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei' was five hundred years old, the social customs and the living environments had kept changing from time to time during this long period. The rules had therefore kept on changing too.[119] Some versions, he said, began with the rule of 'Ordination of Monks', and others with the rule of 'Inauguration of the Abbot'.[120] After discussions with his master Chüeh-an (n.d.) in 1281, I-hsien compiled this ten fascicled

version designated to compromise the differences among these versions and create a uniform text. It started with the rules of 'Praying for the Buddha's Blessing upon the Emperor on his Royal Birthday' and 'The Ceremony on the day of Buddha's Incarnation'.[121] In 1286 to 1287, I-hsien visited the other high monks, bringing his rules for critical discussion.[122] Before the appearance of his work, he said, administrators in a monastery always argued over their precedence in the 'Small Soup Party' given by the abbot.[123] When some of the leading abbots of the Ch'an establishments adopted his Pei-yung and put its rules into practice, this problem was solved in 1292, 1300 and 1305.[124] He therefore published his work in 1311.[125]

As Tê-hui's work is mainly quoted from Tsung-i, Wei-mien and I-hsien, all of whose works are derived from the ancient 'Ch'ing-kuei',[126] he lists their prefaces to show his sources.[127] The relationship between Ch'ing-kuei and Ch'an-yüan has already been pointed out by Ryōichi Kondō.[128] I believe the Ch'ing-kuei quotes a great deal from the Pei-yung.[129]

Besides the Ch'an-yüan, the Tsung-yao and the Pei-yung,[130] there are also two works of this type listed in the Zokuzōkyō. The first one is the monk Ming-pên's (n.d.) one fascicled Huan-chu An Ch'ing-kuei or 'The Pure Rule for the Huan-chu Shrine (hereafter referred to as Huan-chu)'.[131] This is a set of monastic rules prepared by Ming-pên for the members of his Huan-chu An[132] in Hu-chou[133] (present Wu-hsing City of Chekiang Province) in 1317.[134] The second one is Disciplinarian Shêng-wu's (n.d.) ten fascicled Lü-yüan Shih-kuei or 'The Regulation of the Vinaya Field (hereafter referred to as Lü-yüan)'.[135] This work was compiled in 1325.[136] As the reason why Shêng-wu had to quote from the 'Ch'ing-kuei'[137] to form his Lü-yüan for the sectarians of the Dharmaguptavinaya School has been given in Chapter I,[138] I will not repeat it here. The appearance of the

Lü-yüan also demonstrates that the 'Ch'ing-kuei' had already conquered the whole of the Monastic Order in China. As Shêng-wu's work is but a branch of the 'Ch'ing-kuei', Tê-hui has also quoted a great deal from it in his Ch'ing-kuei.[139]

III. The Differences and Agreements Between the Vinaya and the Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei.

There are great differences between the Indian Vinaya and the Chinese 'Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei'. The Vinaya is a 'code of law', its contents consist of: (1) the origin of each of the rules,[140] (2) the origin of each of the monastic ceremonies,[141] (3) the details of each of the rules of personal conduct for individual priests,[142] (4) the different degrees of sins and the penalties for rule-breakers,[143] (5) the procedures of confession after the discovery of sins,[144] (6) the different ways for mediating in quarrels among priests,[145] (7) the details of each of the rules for priests when visiting the house of a laymen in a group,[146] (8) the sins that priests could commit in contact with laymen,[147] (9) the details of different monastic ceremonies,[148] (10) the administrative structure of the establishment,[149] (11) medical care for the monastic members,[150] (12) the design of the clerical apparal, accessories and implements for the priests,[151] (13) discussion on the doctrine of important rules, etc.[152] For convenience in observation and practice, the compilers of the Vinaya quoted the rules from the body of the Vinaya and arranged them in the Śīla.[153] They also quoted from the Vinaya the procedure of different ceremonies to form the Karma.[154] In other words, a Vinaya is always accompanied by the above-mentioned two accessories. I found that the Vinaya emphasises the personal conduct of an individual priest and the behaviour of the community. There is not a word about the management of the monastery.

The 'Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei', on the other hand, is only a set of monastic rules for administration. It does not have extra material like the Vinaya. Occasionally, the Ch'ing-kuei and its preceding versions mention the origin of some of the rules,[155] but not of every rule. Their rules, however, are less concerned with the personal conduct of individual priests. As the Ch'ing-kuei developed into something like a 'fixed pattern' after the Ming Dynasty,[156] I cite the contents of it only.

Rules 1 to 6[157] cover the ceremonies for praying twice daily to invoke the Buddha's blessing upon the emperor,[158] for the same blessing on the birthday of the emperor[159] and the crown prince.[160] for praying on the good days[161] and, in the good months.[162]

Rule 7 is for the ceremonies mourning emperors on the anniversary of their deaths.[163]

Rule 8 covers the prayers for rain, snow, and sunshine or for expelling locusts and saving the sun and the moon from eclipse.[164]

Rule 9 is for the ceremony of the Buddha's incarnation.[165]

Rules 10 to 15 cover the ceremonies of mourning on the anniversary of the death of the Buddha,[166] hPags-Pa,[167] Bodhidharma,[168] Huai-hai,[169] the founder of the monastery[170] and the patriarchs of Ch'an Buddhism.[171]

Rules 16 to 20 cover the duties of an abbot,[172] the ritual for welcoming the new abbot,[173] the ritual for the inauguration of a new abbot,[174] the retirement of the abbot,[175] the funeral of the late abbot[176] and the procedure for nominating a new abbot.[177]

Rules 22 to 24 prescribe the duties of the administrators of the establishment and their executives.[178]

Rules 25 to 39 concern the nomination of candidates among the monastic members for the directorship of the two Wings,[179] their inauguration,[180] the nomination of the superintendents for assisting in the

administration of the two Wings; their inauguration and retirement,[181] the appointment of the executives,[182] the appointment of the monk-attendants and their retirement,[183] the handing over between the retired and newly appointed administrators,[184] the different soup or tea parties given by the abbot to the retired and newly appointed directors and superintendents[185] and by the superintendents to their retired and newly appointed executives or monk-attendants,[186] and the invitations between the above-mentioned administrators.[187]

Rules 40 to 44 concern the ceremonies for ordaining the Śrāmaṇeras,[188] the ceremonies for receiving the full ordination of the monks,[189] the preparation of their implements,[190] etc.

Rules 45 to 46 are the rituals for a monk to go visiting other monasteries, including the contents of his simple baggage,[191] the ritual for him to salute another wandering monk on the road,[192] and for entering another monastery.[193]

Rules 47 to 51 prescribe how to accept a wandering monk to live in. including the arrangements for visitors to meet each other and the members of the monastery,[194] the details for arranging their accommodation in different circumstances,[195] the rituals by which the visitors thank the authorities of the monastery[196] and the tea party that is given by the abbot and the other administrators to the visitors.[197]

Rules 52 to 53 concern the methods of the practice of meditation.[198]

Rules 54 to 61 cover the daily life of the monastic members, including the obligation to congregate every evening in order to salute the abbot and listen to his sermon or instruction,[199] the procedure of applying to the abbot for a personal interview to discuss Buddhism,[200] and the procedures for the rituals in the dining room[201] and in the tea or soup party,[202] for inviting monastic members to take up different duties in the monastery (especially the productive ones),[203] and for ruling the personal conduct

of the monastic members[204] and reminding them to bear in mind the essay composed by Master Huai-hai on behaving oneself in clerical life.[205]

Rules 62 to 64 concern the funeral of an ordinary monk, including the recitation of the sacred scriptures for a very sick monk before his death,[206] the details of his funeral, and the form of the account for recording the expenses of the funeral,[207] given him by his colleagues.[208]

Rules 65 to 70 refer to the Summer Retreat, and include registration of the names of the monastic members, limiting the number of participants and refusing wandering monks the right to live in,[209] the tea party prepared for visitors who had come before the proper date;[210] the preparation of a chart showing the seating of the monastic members, in accordance with their monastic year, in the bedroom, in the diningroom and in the assembly for reciting the scripture during the Retreat;[211] the tea party held before the beginning[212] and the end[213] of the Retreat;[214] the assembly held on the thirteenth day of the fourth month of the lunar calendar for reciting the Śūraṅgamasūtra;[215] the board that lists each member's monastic years shown in the Dharma-Hall,[216] etc.

Rules 71 to 80 concern the functions in the festivals of the four seasons,[217] including the 'Small Soup Party'[218] given to the monastic administrators by the abbot,[219] the recitation of the Parināmanā charms in the Gnome Hall,[220] the ceremonial ritual,[221] the sermon by the abbot,[222] the different tea or soup parties given to the monastic members as well as to the administrators by the abbot,[223] by the Treasurer[224] and by the superintendents,[225] etc.

Rule 81 is a time-table for the ceremonies in each month of the lunar calendar.[226]

Rules 82 to 88 are in fact a list of the implements used in worship, and prescriptions for their use. These implements include the bell, the wooden board, the wooden fish, the hammer, the bowl-shaped gong, the cymbal and the drum.[227]

Among the above-mentioned rules of the Ch'ing-kuei we cannot find any rule concerning the personal conduct of an individual priest, and penalties for a breach of a rule. One wonders how the monastic authorities punished transgressors in accordance with this set of rules. Emperor Ch'êng-tsu in particular insisted on the use of these rules for dealing with the monastic transgressors.[228] The Ch'ing-kuei twice quoted Yang I's 'The Preface to the Ancient Ch'ing-kuei',[229] which mentions Master Huai-hai's prescription of flogging or even expelling a transgressor in accordance with the degree of transgression.[230] It suggests that the Ch'ing-kuei follows this tradition. In other words, a monastic member who breached one of the above-mentioned rules (for instance, one who did not follow the ritual in a tea party) would probably be punished (perhaps flogged).

In Section I of this Chapter, I mentioned that Master Huai-hai had abandoned the Vinaya and organised his own new set of rules for his establishment.[231] Even though he also said that he had taken excerpts from the Śīlas of both Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna Buddhism,[232] we cannot find any trace of the Vinaya in his primitive 'Ch'ing-kuei'.[233] Is there any relationship between the 'Ch'ing-kuei' and the Vinaya? The Ch'ing-kuei and its preceding versions had also taken some excerpts from the Vinaya. Firstly, both the Ch'an-yüan and the Ch'ing-kuei emphasise the text: ".... wealth and sex are more dangerous than a poisonous snake ....".[234] While the DRMGTV says: "...a Bhikṣu should bear in mind that one ought to prefer putting one's virile member into the mouth of a poisonous snake, rather than into a female's sexual organ ...."[235] and ".... one who takes away an object valued at five copper coins from its original position on one's own authority, commits the sin of Pārājika....".[236] Secondly, the Ch'an-yüan, the Pei-yung and the Ch'ing-kuei mention that when a Śrāmaṇera

was ordained, he was told to observe the five precepts (i.e. no killing, no stealing, no adultery, no lying and no intoxicating liquor)[237] and also the ten precepts (the above-mentioned five plus not to sit on high or broad beds, not to use garlands or perfumes, not to take part in singing, dancing, or musical or theatrical performances and not to see or listen to such, not to touch uncoined or coined gold, or silver, or jewels and not to eat food outside regular hours).[238] These precepts derive from the Vinaya.[239] Thirdly, both the Ch'an-yüan and the Ch'ing-kuei mention that monastic novices are instructed to read the Śīla and bear in mind the sins of the four Pārājikas, the thirteen Saṅghāvaśeṣas, the thirty Naiḥsargika-prāyāścittikas, the ninety Pātakas,[240] etc. This shows that after the Sung Dynasty, the establishments of Ch'an Buddhism were still teaching the rules of the Śīla to their Śrāmaṇeras. Fourthly, the Ch'ing-kuei and its preceding versions still follow the Buddhist tradition of spending Summer Retreat,[241] even though their prescriptions about it differ from those of the Vinaya.[242] Finally, Rule 48 of the Tsung-yao, Rule 161 of the Pei-yung, Rule 78 of the Lü-yüan and Rule 60 of the Ch'ing-kuei all concern clerical behaviour.[243] In fact, these rules are all the same thing, for they quote the monk Tsung-shou's (well-known as Wu-liang Shou, the Master of Ch'an Buddhis, flor. 1209)[244] Ju-chung Jih-yung or 'The Daily Practices for Clerical Life (hereafter referred to as Ju-chung)'.[245] In his work, Tsung-shou exposes that after entering the Order, one should refrain from annoying others when getting up in the morning, washing the face and gargling,[246] dining,[247], reading scriptures[248] and practising meditation.[249] He instructs the monks on the postures to be adopted in sleeping,[250] how to fold their quilts,[251] how to put on the Kaṣāya,[252] how to go to bath[253] and stool,[254] etc. Among his instructions, Tsung-shou told the monks that in the diningroom, one should not chew rice or sip soup loudly, choose rice from the centre of his full bowl of rice, seize food,

open one's mouth in order to wait for somebody else to put food in, drop rice to the ground or scatter rice in one's mouth by hand.[255] These instructions, however, are exactly the same as Rules 184, 173, 178, 179, 182 and 188 of the DRMGTV.[256] The only difference between them is that the rules of the Vinaya are prepared for priests visiting a layman's house but the instructions by Tsung-shou relate to the clerical life in the monastery. Again, Tsung-shou instructs the monks that they should not joke and chat with each other when participating in a tea party,[257] going to bath[258] and to stool.[259] 'No Trifling or Joking' is an old tradition in the Vinaya.[260]

The above instances indicate strongly that after Master Huai-hai, the compilers of the different versions of the 'Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei' quoted from the Vinaya in order to enrich the contents of their rules.

IV. Monastic Administration Under the Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei.

In Section II of this Chapter, I indicated that because of the popularity of Ch'an Buddhism, the 'Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei' predominated throughout China.[261] Therefore, the administrative methods laid down in the different versions of the 'Ch'ing-kuei' would have been reflected in other aspects of clerical life after the Sung Dynasty. After the patronage of the Ming emperors, the Ch'ing-kuei became something like a fixed pattern of Chinese monastic rule.[262] Let us consider, for example, its rules on monastic administration and the sources from which they emanate.

According to Rule 16 of the Ch'ing-kuei, an abbot is appointed to direct the administration.[263] His duties comprise: (1) directing the assemblies for praying for the blessing of the Buddha upon the emperor on the first and fifteenth day of a month,[264] (2) lecturing to the monastic

members in a regular series of twilight lectures,[265] (3) occasionally giving a special lecture in the evening,[266] (4) meeting wandering monks, who arrived recently, in an assembly,[267] (5) ordering all the monastic members to come to his 'Fang-chang ('Ten-foot Cubicle' or 'Abbot's Office')[268] to see him from time to time,[269] (6) directing his monastic members to recite scriptures in an assembly,[270] (7) inspecting the monastic apartments, seeing what is needed and enquiring after the sick monks,[271] (8) correcting the clerical behaviour of the monastic members and punishing transgressors,[272] (9) giving instruction to child-novices,[273] (10) giving instruction to the monk-members,[274] (11) receiving visiting high monks or abbots from other establishments,[275] (12) welcoming donors, nobles and officials; arranging for them the vegetable banquet for monastic members for which they paid[276] and (13) attending the tea party given by his disciples,[277] etc.

Some additional notes concerning the abbotship under the Ch'ing-kuei can be found in the publication of a contemporary Chinese monk. In 1934, the monk Tung-chu spent his Summer Retreat in the T'ien-ning Monastery in Ch'ang-chou (Wu-chin) City of Kiangsu Province. During his retreat, he saw that in this leading monastery of Ch'an Buddhism, the abbot enjoyed no privileges and declared that the abbot should have the same living standard as that of his six or seven hundred monastic members. He could not escape from any monastic practices unless he was sick or had to go out visiting. Even then he should still apply for leave from the monastic members. Although the monastic property was under his control, the monastic budget and all documents about expenditure signed by him should have to be countersigned by the Supervisor of Monastic Administration and the Treasurer. If, after the meal-time, he asked for a bowl of rice and some vegetable from the Treasurer, the latter should reply: "Why don't you join the meal in the diningroom?"[278]

To assist the abbot in administering the monastic affairs, the Ch'ing-kuei also recommends the appointment of some assistant administrators. Selected from the monastic members[279] they are divided into three groups:

A. The Administrators of the Western Wing

Rule 22 of the Ch'ing-kuei lists the titles and duties of the so-called 'Hsi-hsü (Western Wing) Administrators'.[280] They are:

(1) 'Ch'ien-t'ang Shou-tso' or 'Director of the Front Area'. His duties include directing the monks to practise meditation or preaching to them.[281] This post is derived from the post of 'Shou-tso (Director)' of the Ch'an-yüan.[282] The Rule says that a 'Shou-tso' should set a moral standard for the monastic members to follow.[283] This post can also be found in the Huan-chu[284] and the Lü-yüan.[285] Since the Lü-yüan, this post is divided into 'Ch'ien-t'ang Shou-tso' and 'Hou-t'ang Shou-tso'.

(2) 'Hou-t'ang Shou-tso' or 'Director of the Rear Area'. His duties are: presenting himself as a model of personal conduct for the monastic members; deputising for the 'Director of the Front Area' when the latter is absent,[286] etc. This post is derived from the Lü-yüan which says that the duties of this director include teaching the rules of Vinaya and the 'monastic rules of the Grove (i.e. the 'Ch'ing-kuei')' to the monks.[287]

(3) 'Shu-chi' or 'Monastic Secretary'. He is responsible for the literary work of the establishment, including writing official letters, preparing the prayers and administrative notices, composing memorials or appeals for the monastery to the government or even to the court.[288] This post is derived from the post of 'Shu-chuang (Petition Preparer)' of the Ch'an-yüan.[289] In the Pei-yung, this post is called 'Shu-chi'.[290] In the Lü-yüan this post is once again called 'Shu-chuang'.[291] Therefore we know that the title of this post in the Ch'ing-kuei is taken from the Pei-yung.

(4) 'Chih-tsang' or 'Superintendent to the Tripiṭaka', i.e. the Monastic Librarian. He not only managed the monastic library, but also guided the members in reading the scriptures.[292] The candidate for this post should therefore have been a priest well-versed in Buddhist doctrines.[293]

This post is derived from the 'Tsang-chu (Master of the Tripitaka, i.e. Monastic Librarian)' of the Ch'an-yüan,[294] while the Pei-yung has the same post with the same title as that of the Ch'an-yüan.[295]

(5) 'Chih-k'ê' or 'Monastic Receptionist'. He welcomed visiting nobles, officials, donors and the high monks of other establishments, introduced them to the abbot, accepted ordinary lay-visitors and wandering monks and arranged their accommodation. When the Karmadāna was absent, 'Chih-k'ê' was his deputy. If a monk died, he collaborated with the monk-attendants in compiling the account of the funeral. Moreover, if a wandering monk died in his establishment, the 'Chih-k'ê' arranged the funeral.[296] This post is derived from the Ch'an-yüan,[297] the Pei-yung[298] and the Lü-yüan.[299]

(6) 'Chih-yü' or 'Superintendent of Bathing'. The Ch'ing-kuei says that the monks should bathe every fifth day but every day in the hot season.[300] It was Chih-yü's duty to instruct members to bathe by a notice on the notice board. Then he arranged the towels, basins and other bathing facilities (but did not prepare hot water) in the public bathroom, and posted a list of the members in order of seniority to indicate their order of precedence in the bath. He then beat a drum to call them to the bath.[301] This post is derived from the 'Yü-chu (Master of Bathing)' of the Ch'an-yüan,[302] while both the Pei-yung[303] and the Lü-yüan[304] call it 'Chih-yü'. As the description of this post in the Pei-yung is so close to that in the Ch'ing-kuei, we know that the latter derives from the former.[305]

(7) 'Chih-tien' or 'Superintendent of Chapel Cleaning'. His duties include cleaning the chapels in the establishment, taking care of the fire in the censers, preparing warm water on the Buddha's birthday for people to bathe the image of the Buddha,[306] etc. This post is derived from the 'Tien-chu (Master of the Chapel)' of the Ch'an-yüan.[307] In the Pei-yung[308] and in the Lü-yüan,[309] it is also called 'Chih-tien'.

(8) 'Shih-che' or 'Monk-attendants'. These monk-attendants were the 'adjutants' to the abbot. They were divided into:

(a) Monk-attendant for Incense Burning. He assisted the abbot in monastic ceremonies and transcribed the abbot's words in the sermon.[310]

(b) Monk-attendant for the Secretary's Work. His duty was to draft letters for the abbot. If the office of Monastic Secretary was

vacated, this monk-attendant temporarily performed his duties.[311]

(c) Monk-attendant for the Guests. He assisted the abbot in receiving visitors. If their the Karmadāna or the Monastic Receptionist were absent this monk-attendant acted for them temporarily.[312]

(d) Monk-attendant for the Transmission of Robe and Bowl. He watched for creative potential among the monastic members and recommended worthy candidates to the aboot.[313]

(e) Monk-attendant for Medical Nursing. He was responsible for the protection of the abbot's health. He also assisted the attendant for 'Transmission of Robe and Bowl' and helped the other attendants.[314]

(f) Monk-attendant to the Abbot. He was actually the abbot's valet and assisted the Karmadāna in managing the funerals of monastic members. He also controlled the expenditure on the abbot's funeral and helped the directors in preparing their sermons,[315] etc.

The Ch'ing-kuei says that if the abbot was away for a long period, the above-mentioned attendants were told to retire. If the abbot was on a short leave, however, they remained on duty.[316]

The Ch'an-yüan lists only the 'Monk-attendant to the Abbot'.[317] The Pei-yung increases the posts of 'Incense Burning', 'Secretarial Work', 'Guests' and 'Transmission of Robe and Bowl'.[318] The Lü-yüan lists the same posts as that of the Pei-yung.[319]

B. The Administrators of the Eastern Wing.

Rule 23 of the Ch'ing-kuei lists the titles and duties of the so-called 'Tung-hsü (Eastern Wing) Administrators'.[320] They are:

(1) 'Tu Chien-ssŭ' or 'Supervisor of Monastic Administration'. His duty was to look after all monastic administration for the abbot, including (a) welcoming officials and donors, (b) keeping the accounts and controlling the budget of the monastery, (c) discussing the plans of

monastic projects with the other administrators and reporting their conclusion to the abbot for approval, (d) governing the lay-attendants and ordering the flogging of transgressors, (e) appointing executives for the monastic estates and treasury, etc.[321] The Ch'ing-kuei says that in ancient times, this post was taken up by the Monastic Secretary of the Western Wing, or by an aged monastic member experienced in monastic administration.[322]

The Ch'an-yüan lists the post of 'Chien-yüan' or 'Supervisor of the Shrine', his duty covered the same area as that of the 'Tu Chien-ssŭ'.[323] The title of 'Tu Chien-ssŭ' appears firstly in the Pei-yung and was then adopted by the Lü-yüan.[325]

(2) 'Wei-na' or 'Karmadāna (Duty-distributor)'. He was responsible for (a) supervising the conduct of monastic members, (b) examining the clerical certificates presented by wandering monks to decide whether they were genuine or forged, (c) mediating quarrels among the monastic members and investigating transgressions by the priests, (d) registering the monastic year of each of the monastic members in order to arrange their beds in accordance with the order of seniority, (e) preparing charts to show the above-mentioned seniority and the position of these beds, (f) leading the recitation in the assembly, (g) attending to the sick monks, (h) arranging funerals for the dead monks, etc.[326] This post is derived from the primitive 'Ch'ing-kuei',[327] the Ch'an-yüan,[328] the Pei-yung[329] and the Lü-yüan.[330]

(3) 'Fu-ssŭ' or 'Treasurer'.[331] He shared the work of the 'Supervisor of Monastic Administration' in managing the monastic treasury. He therefore controlled the balance of the monastic finance, working with his treasury clerks to prepare the financial reports and presenting them to the abbot. These reports were compiled daily, every ten days, monthly and annually. His duties included management of the food stuffs in the monastic treasury.[332]

The Ch'an-yüan calls it 'K'u-t'ou' or 'Head of the Treasury',[333] while the Huan-chu entitles it 'Chih-k'u' or 'Superintendent of the Treasury'.[334] Since the Pei-yung addresses this post as 'Fu-ssŭ',[335] it is adopted by the Lü-yüan[336] and the Ch'ing-kuei.[337]

(4) 'Tien-tso' or 'Catering Manager', He was responsible for the food supply of the monastery, including: (a) managing in kindness the

workers in the monastic groves in order to guarantee the vegetable supply of the monastic kitchen, (b) preparing the other food stuffs, (c) preparing the two meals for the monastic members.[338] This post is derived from the Ch'an-yüan,[339] the Pei-yung,[340] the Huan-chu[341] and the Lü-yüan.[342] The Huan-chu in particular calls this post the 'Fan-t'ou' or 'Head of Rice Cooking'.[343]

(5) 'Chih-sui' or 'Supervisor of Works'.[344] His duties cover: (a) inspecting all leaks in or damages to the monastic building, (b) hiring workers to repair the above-mentioned buildings and supervising their work, (c) inspecting the monastic estates, groves, mills, grain hullers, working animals, boats and wagons and supervising repairs to them, (d) protecting the monastery and the above-mentioned monastic properties from fire and theft, by arranging patrols, etc.[345] This post is derived from the Ch'an-yüan,[346] the Pei-yung,[347] and the Lü-yüan.[348] Even though the Huan-chu has no such post, it still stresses the importance of repairing the monastic buildings.[349]

C. The Other Administrators.

Rule 24 of the Ch'ing-kuei lists the titles and duties of the monastic administrators who did not belong to the above-mentioned two 'Wings'.[350] They are:

(1) 'Liao-yüan' or 'Warden-in-Chief of the Monastic Apartments'. His duties covered (a) control of the administrative and moral affairs in the monastic apartments, (b) taking care of the property in these apartments, (c) preparing supplies for the residents of the apartments. Several 'Liao-chus' and 'Fu-liaos' were appointed to assist him.[351]

(2) 'Liao-chu' or 'Warden of the Monastic Apartment'. A warden was appointed for each of the monastic apartments. The post was filled from the residents of the apartment who held it in turn for ten days. His duties included (a) assisting the 'Liao-yüan', (b) removing the outsiders, who had not received a permit to stay from the abbot, (c) preventing any commercial transactions in his apartment. When his tour of duty was concluded, he reported to the Karmadāna for handing over.[352] This post is derived from the Ch'an-yüan[353] and

the Pei-yung.[354] The Ch'an-yüan says that the warden's tours of duty were of one month, half a month and ten days duration.[355]

(3) 'Fu-liao' or 'Deputy Warden of the Monastic Apartment'. His duty was to assist the 'Liao-chu' in governing the apartment; his appointment lasted the same time (ten days) as that of the warden.[356] This post is derived from the 'Liao Shou-tso' or 'High Monk of the Apartment' of the Ch'an-yüan[357] and the 'Fu-liao' of the Pei-yung.[358]

(4) 'Yen-shou-t'ang Chu' or 'Master of the Hall for Extension of Life'. He is the superintendent of the monastic sickbay. His duties included (a) nursing the sick monks in his sickbay, (b) preparing medications and other hospital supplies, (c) maintaining a hygienic environment for his bay, (d) seeking donations to maitain his bay if his monastery was facing financial difficulties.[359] This post is derived from the Ch'an-yüan[360] and the Pei-yung.[361]

(5) 'Ching-t'ou' or 'Head of Cleansing'. His duties comprised (a) sweeping the monastic grounds, (b) putting incense in the incense-stoves, (c) cleaning the monastic toilets, (d) preparing supplies of fresh and hot water for the monastic members.[362] The Ch'ing-kuei says that the monastery would have to advertise for a volunteer to take it up.[363] This post is derived from the Ch'an-yüan,[364] the Pei-yung[365] and the Lü-yüan.[366]

(6) 'Hua-chu' or 'Master of Begging'. His duty was to contact donors for financial or material support when the monastic estates were not productive.[367]

The Ch'an-yüan provided many posts for this duty. They are:

(a) 'Hua-chu'. His duties covered (1) contacting officials and donors frequently by visiting them or writing to them, (2) bringing officials or donors to see the abbot, (3) doing small favours for them, (4) keeping account of the collected donations, etc.[368]

(b) 'Chieh-fang' or 'Communicators with the Neighbours'. They were sub-divided into 'Communicator for Rice Gruel', 'Communicator for Rice and Wheat', 'Communicator for Vegetables' and 'Communicator for Condiments'. They sought donations in the form of the above-mentioned materials from the ordinary people.[369]

(c) 'Têng-t'ou' or 'Head of the Lamps'. His duty was to seek subscriptions for the expenditure of the lamps in the monastery.[370]

(d) 'Po-jo T'ou' or 'Head for the Recitation of the Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra'.

(e) 'Hua-yen T'ou' or 'Head for the Recitation of the Avataṁsaka-sūtra'.

(f) 'Mi-t'o T'ou' or 'Head for the Recitation of the Name of the Amitābhabuddha'. The above-mentioned three 'Heads' recited the above-mentioned Sūtras or the name of that Buddha on behalf of the donors and collected donations in return.[371]

The Pei-yung and the Lü-yüan included only the post of 'Chieh-fang' whose duty was to solicit donations.[372] From the above discussion we can see that in the period when the Ch'ing-kuei was compiled, the survival of the Chinese establishments depended more on the income of their monastic estates than on donations.

(7) 'Yüan-chu' or 'Master of the Grove'. He managed the monastic grove and worked with his men to guarantee the vegetable supply of the monastic kitchen.[373] This post is derived from the 'Yüan-t'ou' or 'Head of the Grove' of the Ch'an-yüan,[374] the Pei-yung[375] and the Lü-yüan.[376]

(8) 'Mo-chu' or 'Master of the Mill'. His duty was to manage the monastic mill and rice huller to provide flour and hulled rice for the food supply of the monastery.[377] This post was derived from the 'Mo-t'ou' or 'Head of the Mill' of the Ch'an-yüan,[378] the Pei-yung[379] and the Lü-yüan.[380]

(9) 'Shui-t'ou' or 'Head of Water Supply'. His duty was to heat water in the morning and prepare facilities for the monastic members to wash their faces and clean their mouths.[381] This post is derived from the Ch'an-yüan,[382] the Pei-yung[383] and the Lü-yüan.[384] The Ch'an-yüan in particular says that the occupant of this post would have to participate in the work of seeking donations.[385]

(10) 'T'an-t'ou' or 'Head of the Charcoal Supply'. As provider of fuel for the monastery, he would have to collect firewood from the forest in the monastic territory and turn part of it into charcoal,[386] and seek donations of fuel from donors.[387] This post is derived from the

Ch'an-yüan,[388] the Pei-yung[389] and the Lü-yüan.[390]

(11) 'Chuang-chu' or 'Master of the Monastic Estate'. Each monastic estate had such an official. His duties comprised (a) watching the boundaries of the monastic fields, (b) repairing the buildings on his estate, (c) guiding the so-called 'Chia-kans (Tithing Cadres)' on the estate in directing the monastic tenants, (d) pacifying discontent among the tenants, (e) collecting rents from the tenants,[391] etc. The Ch'ing-kuei says that as the one who took up this post would gain access to many benefits, therefore the monastic members always struggled for these appointments and the failures would then hate the abbot.[392] This post is derived from the Ch'an-yüan,[393] the Pei-yung[394] and the Lü-yüan.[395]

(12) 'Chu-chuang Chien-shou' or 'Supervisor for the Harvest of the Monastic Estates'. He had to oversee the monastic estate during the harvest season.[396] The Ch'ing-kuei says that there was much corruption among the monastic members in the struggle for this post and the appointee was liable to extort from the tenants or prey on the income from the monastic estate to compensate for the bribe he had already paid.[397] This post is derived from the Pei-yung.[398]

Besides the above-mentioned posts, there are some recorded in the Ch'an-yüan, most of which do not appear in the other surviving versions of the Ch'ing-kuei. They are:

(1) 'Chieh-yüan Chu' or 'Master of the Front Office of the Monastery'. His duties covered (a) purchasing food stuffs for the monastic members, (b) managing the transmission of monastic official letters and documents, (c) accepting donations by the people paid at the entrance of the monastery, (d) welcoming donors from afar.[399]

(2) 'Ko-chu' or 'Master of the Pavillion'.

(3) 'T'a-chu' or 'Master of the Pagoda'.

(4) 'Lo-han t'ang Chu' or 'Master of the Arhat Hall'.

(5) 'Shui-lu-t'ang Chu' or 'Master of the Water-Earth Hall'.

(6) 'Chên-t'ang Chu' or 'Master of the Hall for Portraits (of the Ch'an Patriarchs?)'.

These masters took care of the departments to which they were appointed.[400]

(7) 'Chung-t'ou' or 'Head of the Bells'. His duty was to sound the bells for the monastery.[401]

(8) 'Lu-t'ou' or 'Head of the Stoves'. His duty was to prepare heaters for the monastic members in the cold seasons.[402]

(9) 'Chih-t'ang' or 'Monitor of the Hall'. His duty was to keep the Dharma-Hall in good order when he was on duty.[403] This post is adopted by the Lü-yüan and given the title of 'Chih-jih' or 'Monitor of the Day'.[404]

Again, the Pei-yung provides a post of 'Shu-t'ou' or 'Head of the Trees'. His duty is to take care of the forest of wood or bamboo in the monastic territories and plant new trees.[405] This post is adopted by the Lü-yüan.[406]

Notes to Chapter V

1. Cf. Chapter III, notes 5 to 340.
2. Cf. Chapter IV, notes 7 to 324.
3. Cf. Chapter II, Section I, notes 130 to 145.
4. Will be discussed further in Section I.
5. Idem.
6. Will be discussed further in Section II.
7. Idem.
8. Will be discussed further in Section III.

Notes to Section I

9. For his date see Ch'en Yüan, Dates of Monks, p. 131.
10. Cf. Ui Hakuju, Daini Zenshūshi Kenkyū or 'The Second Study of the History of Zen Buddhism (hereafter referred to as Zen History II)', p. 328.
11. Ch'en Hsü (flor. 818), 'T'ang Hung-chou Po-chang Shan Ku Huai-hai Ch'an-shih T'a-ming' or 'The Epitaph to the Stūpa of the Late Master Huai-hai of Ch'an Buddhism of the T'ang Dynasty who had lived in Mount Po-chang of Hung-chou (hereafter referred to as 'Huai-hai's Epitaph')', in Chüan T'ang Wên or 'A Collection of Essays Composed in the Pan-T'ang Dynasty', Vol. 10, p. 5755a. CTCTL, p. 249b.
12. Ch'en Hsü, 'Huai-hai's Epitaph', idem. CTCTL, idem.
13. 'Huai-hai's Epitaph', idem.
14. Idem. Cf. Ui Hakuju, Zen History II, p. 331.
15. Idem, cf. Ui Hakuju, ibid., pp. 331-332.
16. SKSC, p. 767a-b. Cf. Ui Hakuju, ibid., p. 331.
17. See Chapter II, Section I, note 102.
18. KYSCL, p. 697c.

19. For instance, Yüan-chao is condemned by scholars for he had quoted the entire KYSCL, without changing a single word, in his CYHTSCML in order to make it the dominating part of his own work (cf. Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, 'Fo-chia Ching-lu Tsai Chung-kuo Mu-lu-hsüeh Chi Wei-chi^h [The Position of the Buddhist Bibliographical Works in Chinese Bibliography', pp. 26-27 in Liang's Fo-hsüeh Yen-ch'iu Shih-pa Pien]. Yao Ming-ta, Chung-kuo Mu-lu-hsüeh Shih or 'A History of Chinese Bibliography', p. 285. Tso Sze-bong, 'Bio. & Biblio.', part III, pp. 116-119). But in the preface of CYHTSCML, Yüan-chao states clearly: ".... I observe that the composition of my senior (i.e. Chih-shêng) is incomparable among the works in this field .... I, Yüan-chao, am a man of weak intellectual ability. I did this (i.e. compiled the CYHTSCML) only because the emperor so decreed ..." (p.771a). Therefore, he quoted the entire KYSCL and sent a memorial to the court appealing for: "....the change of the old title (of the KYSCL) into CYHTSCML.... (p.773c)". Besides, Tsan-ning praised the KYSCL highly by saying: "....Yüan-chao's CYHTSCML is but nothing in comparison with Chih-shêng's work .... (the latter's) work is incomparable" (SKSC, p. 734a [the Biography of Chih-shêng]).

20. Cf. Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, p. 26. Yao Ming-ta, pp. 275-283.

21. Hêng-an (cf. Chapter I, Section V, note 488), p. 1048a.

22. See Chapter II, Section I, notes 129-145.

23. For his Biography see SKSC, p. 766. CTCTL, pp. 245c-246c.

24. 'Huai-hai's Epitaph', p. 5755a. SKSC, p. 770c. CTCTL, p. 249b. Ui Hakuju says that the exact date when Huai-hai began to follow Tao-i is unknown (cf. Zen History II, pp. 333-357), but he believes that it would have been in a period around 767 to 786 (cf. ibid., p. 358).

25. 'Huai-hai's Epitaph', p. 5755a-b. SKSC, idem. CTCTL, p. 249a-b. Ui Hakuju believes that Huai-hai had spent twenty years with Tao-i (cf. idem).

26. In the Ku Tsun-su Yü-lu or 'The Analects of the Ancient Pioneers of Ch'an Buddhism (edited by the monk I-tsang in the Sung Dynasty before 1267, in Zokuzōkyō, Vol. 118, pp.79b-418a [hereafter referred to as Pioneers' Analects)', there is the 'Analects of Huang-po (pp.90b-93a). These 'Analects' say that Hsi-yün (well-known as Huang-nieh,

died ca. 853. For his biography see SKSC, p. 842b-c, CTCTL, p.266), advised by an aged lady in Lo-yang, went to Kiangsi to follow Master Tao-i. After his arrival, Hsi-yün found that Tao-i had already passed away and Huai-hai was living in a hut near his master's Śarīrastūpa. Nevertheless, Hsi-yün followed Huai-hai to learn the philosophy of Tao-i (p. 90b; cf. Ui Hakuju, Zen History II, pp. 375-376). Ui Hakuju believes that Huai-hai had spent eleven years living near his master's Śarīrastūpa (cf. ibid., p. 930). Obviously, this is a performance of 'Hsiao' of a disciple to his late Master (cf. Chapter III, Section II, notes 151 to 157.

27. SKSC, p. 770c. CTCTL, p. 249c.

28. Idem.

29. SKSC, idem.

30. SKSC, idem. CTCTL, p. 251a.

31. For his biography see SKSC, pp. 754c-755c. CTCTL, pp. 222c-223b, 235b-237a.

32. CTCTL, p. 250c. Cf. Kōyū Shiina, 'Shōtō-zensha no Ritsuin-kyojū ni tsuite' or 'Zen Monks living in the Vinaya Temples in Early T'ang Dynasty (sic)', in IDGBKGKK, Vol. XVII, no. 2 (1969, Tokyo), pp. 770a-771a.

33. CTCTL, pp. 250c-251a. Cf. Kōyū Shiina, p. 771b.

34. SKSC, p. 770c. CTCTL, p. 251a.

35. Idem. I have mentioned in Chapter II that the Mahāyāna rules lack in the obligatory power needed to govern the conduct of the bad elements among the clergy (see its Section II, notes 18 to 28). This would probably be the reason why Huai-hai did not quote only the Mahāyānaśīla to rule his Ch'an disciples.

36. See SKSC, pp. 770c-771a. CTCTL, p. 251a.

37. See CTCTL, idem.

38. Cf. Kimura Shizuo, 'Ku Ch'ing-kuei Kō' or 'A Research for the Earliest Ch'ing-Kuei', in Zengaku Kenkyū, No. 31 (1939, Kyoto), pp. 36-46.

39. Cf. Ui Hakuju, Zen History II, p. 375.

40. SKSC, p. 771a. CTCTL, p. 251a.

41. Idem.

42. SKSC, p. 770c. CTCTL, idem.

43. Idem.

44. Idem.

45. CTCTL, p. 251a.

46. Idem. Traditionally, Buddhist priests are allowed to take one meal only before noon. Since, therefore, the 'vegetarian meal' comes first in the embryonic 'Ch'ing-kuei', it suggests that Master Huai-hai still saw lunch as the main meal in his establishment, although he allowed his disciples to take two meals a day.

47. SKSC, p. 770c. CTCTL, idem.

48. CTCTL, idem.

49. Idem. I observe that the description of this rule is in fact prepared for the transgressors among Master Huai-hai's establishment. As he was embarrassed in mentioning that there would probably be a transgressor-to-be among his disciples, so he describes how this 'transgressor' would be an outsider disguised as a monk who infiltrated into his establishment.

50. For 'corporal punsihment' see Chapter I, Section I, notes 42 to 49.

51. For 'involvement in physical labour' see Chapter III, Section I, sub-section D, notes 69 to 72, 79 to 81 and 85 to 87.

52. For the 'permanent kitchen' see Appendix, Table II.

53. For the problem of 'taking two meals a day' see Chapter I, Section V, note 543; Chapter III, Section I, sub-section B, notes 37 and 38. For the inconvenience of taking one meal a day only, cf. Chapter III, ibid., note 33.

54. See Appendix, Table VIII.

55. See Chapter IV, Section II, note 152.

56. Cf. Chapter II, Section II, notes 188 to 191. Cf. also ibid., notes 161 to 179, 180, 193 to 196, 309 to 317 and 332 to 337.

57. Will be discussed further in the following Sections.

58. SKSC, p. 771a.

59. See Chapter IV, Section III, notes 263 to 270, 307 to 310, 311 to 319.

60. See ibid, notes 296 to 298.

61. See ibid., notes 255, 259, and 312 to 318.

62. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1119b.

63. 'Huai-hai's Epitaph', p. 5755a.

64. Cf. Ui Hakuju, Zen History II, p. 370.

65. See note 48.

66. Cf. note 26.

67. I-tsang, Pioneers' Analects, pp. 81a-90b.

68. Ibid., p. 82a.

69. Idem.

70. Ibid., p. 82b.

71. Idem.

72. Ch'ing-kuei, p.1157a.

73. See Chapter IV, Section III, notes 276 to 283, 286 to 293.

74. See Chapter III, Section III, notes 267 to 269, 270 to 276.

75. See Chapter I, Section I, notes 68 to 71; Chapter III, Section III, notes 222, 228 to 230, 233 to 235, 240 and 248.

76. Will be discussed further in the following Sections.

Notes to Section II

77. According to Sung Lien's Yüan Shih (cf. Chapter I, Section IV, note 411), vol. 2, p. 532a, and K'o Shao-wên's (1850-1933) Hsin Yüan Shih or 'The New History of the Yüan Dynasty', vol. 1, p. 189, the Mongol rule in China was taken over by the Ming Dynasty in 1368. Oukhagatou Khan then returned to Mongolia and continued to rule the rest of his khanate till his death in 1370.

78. According to the SKSC, Emperor Mu-tsung (R. 821-824) of the T'ang Dynasty conferred on Master Huai-hai a posthumous title of 'Ta-chih Ch'an-shih (The Master of Ch'an Buddhism Who Has a Great Wisdom)' in 821 (p. 71a). The first two characters of the title of Tê-hui's monastery, 'Ta-chih', are identical with the first two characters in Huai-hai's posthumous title. This implies that the monastery was developed from Huai-hai's establishment.

79. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1159a.

80. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, pp. 363-364.

81. Cf. Abe Joichi, Chūgoku Zenshūshi Kenkyū or 'A Study of the History of the Chinese Zen Buddhism', pp. 66-70, 183-498. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, pp. 402-405. Michihata Ryōshū, Chūgoku Bukkyōshi, pp.165-166.

82. For his biography see Nien-ch'ang (cf. Chapter I, Section IV, subsection E, note 414), pp. 702b-704c. Ming-ho (cf. ibid., section V, note 544), pp. 109a-110a. Cf. Ch'en Yüan, 'T'an Pei-ching Shuang-t'a Sšu Hai-yün Pei (A Note on the Inscription of the Monk Hai-yün's Career that is Engraved on a Stone Tablet and Placed in the Shuang-t'a Monastery of Peking)', edited in Ch'en Yüan Hsien-sheng Chin Nien-lien Shih-hsüeh Lun-wên Chi (cf. ibid., note 449), pp. 19, 22-29.

83. Nien-ch'ang, pp. 703a-704c. Ming-ho, pp. 109a-110a. Cf. Hirosato Iwai, 'Gen-sho niokeru teishitsu to zensō tono kankei ni tsuite' (On the Relations between the Imperial Household and the Zen Sect Priests at the beginning of the Yüan Dynasty)', in his Nisshi-bukkyōshi Ronkō or 'Some Historical Studies of Buddhism in China and Japan', pp. 462-493, 513-534. Kenneth Ch'en, Survey, pp. 414-415. Ch'en Yüan, ibid., pp. 22-29.

84. Cf. Kenneth Ch'en, ibid., pp. 415-416.

85. Cf. Michihata Ryōshū, Chūgoku Bukkyōshi, p. 204.

86. SKSC, p. 771a (Tsang-ning's comment to the Biography of Huai-hai).

87. Cf. Chapter II, Section I, note 15.

88. For instance, after Tripitaka Master Hsüan-tsang had completed his translation of the Abhidharma-mahāvibhāsā-śāstra (T. 1545), his

disciple Fa-pao (n.d.) could not understand an idea in a certain paragraph of his master's translation. Therefore, Hsüan-tsang inserted sixteen Chinese characters into this paragraph in order to make his translation clearer. When Fa-pao found that these characters were not translated from the original text but were only his master's own words, he protested, saying: "Master, it would be evil for us to insert a secular person's own words into the sacred scripture.' Then Hsüan-tsang deleted this insertion (SKSC, p. 727a [the Biography of Fa-pao]). This story shows how seriously the Chinese Buddhists viewed the distortion of their sacred scriptures.

89. Cf. Chapter II, Section I, note 151.

90. I have compared the simplification by Tao-hsüan (in Zokuzōkyō, Vol. 61, pp. 267a-279a) and the translation by Buddhayaśas (in T. 1430), and have come to the above-mentioned conclusion.

91. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1159a (Tê-hui's comment).

92. Ibid., p. 1110b (the edict that was issued in 1336).

93. Ibid., p. 1110b and p. 1159a.

94. Ibid., p. 1159a. Cf. Chapter I, Section V, note 537.

95. Ibid., pp. 1110b-1111a.

96. Ibid., p. 1109c. This is quoted from the preface of a version of the Ch'ing-kuei published in 1442. This preface is composed by Hu Yung (see note 100) and is appended to pp. 1109c-1110a of the Ch'ing-kuei in Taishō.

97. Idem.

98. Ibid., pp. 1109c-1110a.

99. Idem.

100. For his Biography see Chang T'ing-yu (1672-1755) and others, Ming Shih or 'The History of the Ming Dynasty', Vol. 4, pp. 1799b-1801a.

101. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1110a.

102. Cf. note 96.

103. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1110a.

104. For instance, in the Ch'an-yüan there are only seventy-seven rules (see p. 438a-b, its table of contents). After the appearance of the Pei-yung, its rules increased to one hundred and sixty-five (see pp. 29a-30b, its table of contents). And the Lü-yüan has one hundred and forty-one rules (see pp. 1b-2b, its table of contents). The Ch'ing-kuei reduces the above-mentioned rules to only eighty-eight (see pp. 1111b-1112c, its table of contents). I would like to give one example of how the compilers of the Ch'ing-kuei simplified and systematized the rules. In a monastic funeral, the Pei-yung lays down thirty-eight rules on the procedure of the ceremony (Rules 119 to 155, pp. 60a-68b), and the Lü-yüan, forty rules (Rules 80 to 118, pp. 36b-43a). In the Ch'ing-kuei, there are only two rules for the funerals of the abbot (Rule 6, pp. 1127b-1130b) and of an ordinary monk (Rule 25, pp. 1147c-1149a). All the rules in the Pei-yung and the Lü-yüan concerning funerals are turned into the subdivided clauses of these two rules (Rule 6 has fifteen clauses and Rule 25 has eight clauses).

105. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1112c and p.1114b. These instructions cannot be found in the other versions of the 'Ch'ing-kuei'. Obviously, they were added at the suggestion of Oukhagatou Khan.

106. Ibid., pp. 157c-1158b.

107. Ibid., p. 1158b.

108. In Zokuzōkyō, Vol. 111, pp. 438a-471b.

109. Ch'an-yüan, p. 438a. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1158b.

110. Idem.

111. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1158b-c.

112. In Zokuzōkyō, Vol. 112, pp. 1a-28a.

113. Tsung-yao, p. 1a. Ch'ing-kuei, pp. 1158c.

114. Idem.

115. Ch'ing-kuei, pp. 1158c-1159a.

116. Idem.

117. In Zokuzōkyō, Vol. 112, pp. 28b-75a.

118. Pei-yung, pp. 28b-29a. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1159a.

119. Pei-yung, p. 28b. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1158c.

120. Idem. From the surviving versions of the preceding 'Ch'ing-kuei' we know that the Ch'an-yüan starts with the 'Ordination of the Monk' (p. 439a), and the Tsung-yao starts with the 'Inauguration of the Abbot' (p. 3b).

121. Pei-yung, p. 28b. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1158c. For the first rule of the Pei-yung see its pp. 30b-32a, and for the second rule, p.32a-b.

122. Pei-yung, p. 28b. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1158c.

123. Idem. The above-mentioned 'Small Soup Party' appeared first in the Tsung-yao. Before an assembly for reciting the scriptures in each of the four seasons takes place, the abbot invites the monastic administrators to take soup. The administrators of the Western Wing enter and sit down first. Then come the superintendents of the other monastic officers, and then the retired administrators (p.10b). I will discuss the above-mentioned administrators and superintendents in the last section of this Chapter.

124. Pei-yung, p. 28b. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1158c. In his work, I-hsien arranges for the directors of the Western and Eastern Wings to come to the party first. Then come the superintendents and the retired superintendents and then the other administrators (pp. 40b-41a). He also prepares a chart to show the seats in the party (p. 41a). This arrangement is also adopted by the Lü-yüan (pp. 27b-28a) and the Ch'ing-kuei (p. 1152b).

125. Pei-yung, p. 28b. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1159a.

126. In both the Ch'an-yüan (pp. 465b-466b) and the Pei-yung (pp. 57b-58a), there are the 'Po-chang Kuei-sheng' or 'Master Po-chang's Rules of Conduct'. Even though their contents are rather different from each other, both of them are in essence the primitive 'Ch'ing-kuei' by Master Huai-hai. The content of the so-called 'Po-chang Kuei-sheng' quoted in the Ch'an-yüan is exactly the same as the primitive 'Ch'ing-kuei' by Huai-hai (cf. Section I, notes 40 to 49). This shows that the authors of the two above-mentioned works wish to express in this way that their works are derived from Master Huai-hai's 'Pure Rule'.

127. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1159b.

128. Cf. Ryōichi Kondō, 'Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei to Ch'an-yüan Ch'ing-kuei' or 'The Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei and the Ch'an-yüan Ch'ing-kuei' in IDGBKGKK, Vol. XVII, No. 2 (1969, Tokyo), pp. 773a-775b.

129. Will be discussed further in the next two Sections.

130. Cf. notes 108, 112, and 117.

131. In Zokuzōkyō, Vol. 111, pp. 486b-506b.

132. The modern Chinese character 'An' stands for 'nunnery'. This 'Huan-chu An' was only a shrine for monks.

133. Huan-chu, p. 489b, p. 506a and p. 506b show that this Huan-chu An was located in Hu-chou.

134. Ibid., p. 486b.

135. In Zokuzōkyō, Vol. 106, pp. 1a-25b.

136. Lü-yüan, p. 1b

137. The Lü-yüan has been quoted a great deal from the Pei-yung. This will be discussed further in the next two Sections.

138. See Chapter I, Section V, notes 536 to 537.

139. Will be discussed further in the next two Sections.

Notes to Section III

140. For instance, DRMGTV, pp. 570a-571a; SVSTVDV, p. 1a-b and MHSGKV, pp. 229a-231b all concern the origin of the rule of 'No Adultery'. I only give the above-mentioned three Vinayas for examples here and in the following notes because they were the most popular Vinayas in China from the fifth century to the eighth century A.D. The DRMGVT in particular enjoyed its heyday till the tenth century A.D. (see Chapter I, Section II, notes 140 to 228; Section III, notes 245 to 342; Section IV, notes 349 to 361 and Section V, notes 434 to 520).

141. For instance, DRMGTV, pp. 787c-789a; SVSTVDV, pp. 148a-149a and MHSGKV, pp. 412b-413c all concern the origin of 'Ordination'.

142. DRMGTV, pp. 568-695c (for monk) and 714a-778c (for nun). SVSTVDV, pp. 1a-130c (for monk) and 302c-331a (for nun). MHSGKV, pp. 227a-369b (for monk) and 514a-549a (for nun).

143. Idem.

144. DRMGTV, pp. 904a-906a. SVSTVDV, pp. 228b-238b.

145. DRMGTV, pp. 913c-922c. SVSTVDV, pp. 221a-228b. MHSGKV, pp. 332a-335b.

146. DRMGTV, pp. 698a-713a. SVSTVDV, pp. 133b-141b. MHSGKV, pp. 399b-412a. Among them only the DRMGTV indicates that these rules are prepared for both monks and nuns (p. 778b).

147. DRMGTV, pp. 695c-698a. SVSTVDV, pp. 131a-133b. MHSGKV, pp.396b-399b.

148. DRMGTV, pp. 779a-843b. SVSTVDV, pp. 148a-178a. MHSKGV, pp.412b-444a.

149. DRMGTV, pp. 936b-945a. MHSGKV, pp. 44a-445a.

150. DRMGTV, pp. 866c-877c. SVSTVDV, pp. 184b-194b. MHSGKV, pp. 455a-457b.

151. DRMGTV, pp. 843b-866b, 877c-879b. SVSTVDV, pp. 178a-184b, 194b-214a, 242a-251a. MHSGKV, pp. 445b-446a, 452a-454a, 480c-483b, 484b-c.

152. DRMGTV, pp. 971c-990b. SVSTVDV, pp. 379a-409c. In both, all the discussions are ascribed to Upāli who asked questions which were answered by the Buddha.

153. For the Śīlas of the DRMGTV, the SVSTVDV and the MHSGKV, see Chapter I, Section II, note 132; Section III, notes 241 and 339; Section IV, note 347. Cf. also Appendix, Table VIII.

154. For the Karmas of the DRMGTV and the SVSTVDV, see Chapter I, note 12; Section II, notes 168 and 169. The Karma of the MHSGKV had never been introduced into China.

155. The origin of some of the rules mentioned in the Ch'ing-kuei and its preceding versions are: The Tsung-yao says that the appointment of the 'Shih-chê (Monk-attendant)' originated in Master Wên-yen's (well-known as Yün-mên, 864-949) establishment (pp. 12b-13a). It also says that the funeral for the abbot imitates the funeral of the Buddha (ibid., p. 19b. Cf. Pei-yung, p. 61a). The Pei-yung says that the tea party for all monastic members is derived from an old tradition of the 'Grove (establishment)' of Ch'an Buddhism (p. 43b). It also says that the mourning of Bodhidharma (+ 536. For his date see Ch'en Yüan,

Dates of Monks, p. 38), of Huai-hai and of the founder of a monastery on the anniversary of their death and the placing of their ancestral tablets in the Dharma-Hall (Bodhidharma's ancestral tablet lies in the centre, with Huai-hai's on the right and the founder's on the left) was initiated at Shou-tuan's (well-known as Pai-yün, 1025-1072. For his Biography see Chêng-shou's [1146-1208] thirty fascicled Chia-t'ai P'u-têng-lu or 'A Universal Record of the Transmission of the Lamp Compiled During the Chia-t'ai Era [1201-1204]', in Zoku-zōkyō, Vol. 137, pp. 47a-48a. For Chêng-shou's work, cf. Jan Yün-hua, 'Buddhist Historiography in Sung China', in Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Band 114, Heft 2 [1964, Wiesbaden], p. 366) suggestion (ibid., p. 33a-b. See also Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1117c). Again, it says that the procedure for accepting a wandering monk to stay for a period, originated in Master Huai-hai's establishment (p. 58b). The Huan-chu says that 'begging' is an old tradition since the Buddha (p. 497a). The Ch'ing-kuei says that the 'Ceremonies for the Good Months (i.e. the first, the fifth and the ninth month in the lunar calendar) is an old tradition in China according to an imperial edict that was issued in 583 (p. 1114c). It also says that a tradition of hanging up the portraits of the emperors in the monastery originated in the regime of Emperor Shih-tsu (Setsen Khan) of the Yüan (Mongol) Dynasty (idem). Again, it says that the appointment of the monastic administrators in the two 'Wings' for assisting the abbot was arranged by Master Huai-hai (ibid., p. 1119-ab. It also indicates that the title of 'Chu-ch'ih' for the abbot was conferred at the same time), etc.

156. Cf. notes 96 to 103 of the previous Section.

157. The serial number of the tules of the Ch'ing-kuei accords with the serial order of the rules shown in the table of contents in its pp. 1111b-1112c.

158. Cf. Section II, note 105.

159. Ch'ing-kuei, pp. 1112c-1114a. This is derived from Tsung-yao, p. 18a-b. Pei-yung, pp. 30b-31b. Huan-chu, p. 488b. Lü-yüan, pp. 18b-19b. In particular, the Lü-yüan says that this rule is initiated after the Pei-yung.

160. Ibid., p. 1114c. This is derived from Lü-yüan, pp. 20b-21a.

161. Ibid., p. 1114b (the so-called 'four good days' are the first, the eighth, the fifteenth and the twenty-third day of the month). This derives from Lü-yüan, pp. 21a-22a.

162. Cf. note 155.

163. Ch'ing-kuei, pp. 1114c-1115a.

164. Ibid., p. 1115a-b. This derives from Lü-yüan, p. 21a-b.

165. Ibid., pp. 1115c-1116a. This derives from Tsung-yao, p. 32a-b. Lü-yüan, p. 22a-b.

166. Ibid., pp. 1116a-1117a. This derives from Pei-yung, p. 32b. Lü-yüan p. 22b.

167. Ibid., p. 1117. It is because hPhags-Pa was the 'Imperial Preceptor' to Setsen Khan (cf. Chapter I, Section IV, note 413).

168. Ibid., pp. 1117c-1118b. This derives from Tsung-yao, pp. 23b-24a. Pei-yung, pp. 32b-33a.

169. Ibid., p. 1118b-c. This derives from Pei-yung, p. 33a-b.

170. Ibid., pp. 1118c-1119a. This derives from Pei-yung, p. 33b. Lü-yüan, p. 23b.

171. Ibid., p. 1119a. This derives from Tsung-yao, p. 23a-b. Pei-yung, pp. 33b-34a. Lü-yüan, pp. 23b-24a.

172. Ibid., pp. 1119b-1123c. These duties derive from Ch'an-yüan, pp.442b. 443a-b, 444a, 444b, 464a-465a. Tsung-yao, pp. 17a-18a. Pei-yung, pp. 35a-b, 35b-36a, 36b-37a, 46a-b, 48a, 48b and 74a. Lü-yüan, p. 29a-b.

173. Ibid., pp. 1123c-1125b. This derives from Ch'an-yüan, p. 445a. Pei-yung, pp. 43b-44a. Lü-yüan, pp. 24a-25b.

174. Ibid., pp. 1125b-1127a. This derives from Ch'an-yüan, p. 457a. Tsung-yao, pp. 5b-7a. Pei-yung, pp. 45b, 46b-47a. Lü-yüan, pp. 25a-27b. This rule (Rule 18) was laid down for inviting a high monk from outside to take up the abbotship (cf. Section I, note 72 [the first rule among the five permanent rules drafted by the monastic members of Huai-hai's establishment after Huai-hai's death]).

175. Ibid., p. 1127a. This derives from Ch'an-yüan, p. 459a.

176. Ibid., pp. 1127b-1130b. This derives from Ch'an-yüan, pp. 458b-459a. Tsung-yao, pp. 19b-22a. Pei-yung, pp. 61a, 61b-62a, 62b-63a, 64a-b. Lü-yüan, pp. 36b-37a, 38a-b, 38b-39a, 42b-43a.

177. Ibid., p. 1130b-c. The candidate for the position of abbot should be an eminent monk from outside. The abbotship should also have to be approved by the government (ibid., p. 1130b).

178. Will be discussed further in the next Section.

179. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1133c. This derives from Pei-yung, p. 49a-b.

180. Ibid., pp. 1133c-1134a. This derives from Pei-yung, p. 49b.

181. Ibid., p. 1134. These derive from Pei-yung, pp. 49b-50a. Lü-yüan, p. 30a.

182. Ibid., p. 1134c. This derives from Pei-yung, p. 50b. Lü-yüan, p.30b. Since the Pei-yung, the appointment would have to be proclaimed by the abbot after breakfast.

183. Ibid., pp. 1134c-1135a. This derives from Pei-yung, p. 50b. Lü-yüan, p. 30b.

184. Ibid., p. 1135a. This derives from Pei-yung, p. 53a. Lü-yüan, p.31b.

185. Ibid., pp.1135a and 1135b-c. These derive from Pei-yung, pp.50b-51a, 51a-b, 51b-52a. Lü-yüan, p. 30b.

186. Ibid., p. 1135a-b. These derive from Pei-yung, p. 51a.

187. Ibid., pp. 1135c-1136b.

188. Ibid., pp. 1136c-1138c. These derive from Ch'an-yüan, p. 463a. Pei-yung, pp. 72a-74a.

189. Ibid., p. 1138c. These derive from Ch'an-yüan, p. 439a.

190. Ibid., pp. 1139a-1140a. This derives from Ch'an-yüan, pp. 469a-471b.

191. Ibid., pp. 1140a. This derives from Ch'an-yüan, p. 439a-b.

192. Idem.

193. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1140. This derives from Pei-yung, p. 58a-b.

194. Ibid., p. 1140c. This derives from Pei-yung, p. 59a. Lü-yüan, p.44b.

195. Ibid., pp.1140c-1141c. These arrangements derive from Pei-yung, pp. 59a-60a. Lü-yüan, pp. 44b-45a. The above-mentioned sources say

that a wandering monk should have to seek the permission of the abbot for his accommodation.

196. Ibid., p. 1141c-1142b. This derives from Pei-yung, p. 60a-b. Huan-chu, p. 496a. Lü-yüan, p. 46a. The Pei-yung says that a group of visitors should have to pay one hundred copper coins to the abbot under the name of 'incense fee' (p. 60b. See also Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1141c, but it does not mention how much the visitors should have to pay).

197. Ibid., p. 1142b-c.

198. Ibid., pp. 1142c-1143b. These derive from Ch'an-yüan, pp.460b-461b. Pei-yung, p. 34a-b.

199. Ibid., pp. 1143b-c. This derives from the primitive 'Ch'ing-kuei' (see Section I, note 44), Pei-yung, pp. 34b-35a.

200. Ibid., pp. 1143c-1144a. This derives from Lü-yüan, p. 46a-b.

201. Ibid., p. 1144a (cf. Chapter III, Section I, sub-section B, note 39). This derives from the primitive 'Ch'ing-kuei' (see Section I, note 46). Ch'an-yüan, pp. 440b-442a.

202. Ibid., p. 1144a. This derives from Ch'an-yüan, p. 442a.

203. Ibid., p. 1144a-b. This derives from the primitive 'Ch'ing-kuai' (see Section I, note 47). Huan-chu, p. 497a-b.

204. Ibid., pp. 1144b-1146b. This derives from Tsung-yao, pp. 25b-27b. Pei-yung, pp. 68b-70b. Lü-yüan, pp. 34a-36a.

205. Ibid., pp. 1146b-1147b. This derives from Ch'an-yüan, pp. 459a-460b. Pei-yung, pp. 53a-54b.

206. Ibid., pp. 1147b-c. This derives from Tsung-yao, p. 19b. Lü-yüan, p. 42b.

207. Ibid., pp. 1147c-1149a (cf. Section II, note 104). These details derive from Ch'an-yüan, pp. 456b-457b. Tsung-yao, pp. 22a-23a. Pei-yung, pp. 65a-66b. Huan-chu, pp. 500b-506b. Lü-yüan, pp.40b-42a.

208. Ibid., pp. 1149b-1150a. This derives from Tsung-yao, p. 23a. Pei-yung, pp. 67b-68b. Huan-chu, p. 502a-b. Lü-yüan, pp. 43b-44a.

209. Ibid., p. 1150b. The names of the monastic members are registered on the first day of the third month of the lunar calendar. This derives from Pei-yung, p. 40b.

210. Ibid., p. 1150b-c. This derives from Ch'an-yüan, p. 444a. Tsung-yao, pp. 10b-11a. Pei-yung, pp. 39b-40a.

211. Ibid., p. 1150c. This derives from Pei-yung, p. 40a.

212. Ibid., p. 1150c. The date for this party is the twelfth day of the fourth month of the lunar calendar. For the date of the beginning of the Retreat see note 214.

213. Ibid., p. 1151a. The date for this party is the twelfth day of the seventh month of the lunar calendar. For the final date of the Retreat see also note 214.

214. Ibid., pp. 1150c-1151a. The Retreat begins on the sixteenth day of the fourth month and ends on the sixteenth day of the seventh month of the lunar calendar. This derives from Ch'an-yüan, p. 444a-b. Tsung-yao, pp. 9a-10b. Pei-yung, p. 40a.

215. Ibid., pp.1151b-1152a. This derives from Tsung-yao, p. 18b. Pei-yung, pp. 38b-39a. Both the Pei-yung and the Ch'ing-kuei provide a chart to show the position of each of the monastic members in the assembly.

216. Ibid., p. 1152a. This derives from Pei-yung, p. 40b.

217. For the 'festivals of the four seasons', the Ch'ing-kuei says that the summer festival is on the date when the Summer Retreat begins (i.e. the sixteenth day of the fourth month) and the autumn festival is on the date when this Retreat ends (i.e. the sixteenth day of the seventh month). The winter festival is in the winter solstice and the spring festival is in the new year of the lunar calendar (p. 1150b).

218. See Section II, note 123.

219. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1152b. This derives from Tsung-yao, pp. 1ob-11a. Pei-yung, pp. 40b-41a. Lü-yüan, pp. 27b-28b.

220. Ibid., p. 1152b-c. This derives from Tsung-yao, pp. 18b-19a. Lü-yüan, p. 47b.

221. Ibid., p. 1153.

222. Ibid., pp. 1153c-1154a. This derives from Pei-yung, p. 38a-b.

223. Ibid., p. 1154a-b and p. 1154b-c. These parties derive from Ch'an-yüan, p. 444b. Pei-yung, p. 43a-b.

224. Ibid., pp. 1152c-1153a, 1154a and 1154c. These parties derive from Pei-yung, p. 43a-b.

225. Ibid., p. 1154c. This party derives from Pei-yung, p. 43b.

226. Ibid., pp. 1154c-1155a. This derives from Tsung-yao, pp. 24a-25b. Pei-yung, pp. 71b-72a. Huan-chu, pp. 487a-488a. Lü-yüan, pp.51b-52a.

227. Ibid., pp. 1155b-1156b. This list derives from Pei-yung, p. 74a-b. Lü-yüan, p. 51a-b.

228. See Section II, note 98.

229. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1121c and p. 1158a. Cf. Section II, note 106.

230. Idem. This is in fact the tenth rule of the primitive 'Ch'ing-kuei' (see Section I, note 49).

231. See Section I, note 34.

232. See ibid., note 35.

233. See ibid., notes 40 to 49.

234. Ch'an-yüan, p. 439a. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1138c.

235. DRMGTV, p. 570b.

236. Ibid., p. 975c.

237. Ch'an-yüan, p. 463a. Pei-yung, p. 73a. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1137c.

238. Ch'an-yüan, p. 463a. Pei-yung, p. 73a-b. Ch'ing-kuei, pp.1137c-1138a.

239. DRMGTV, p. 810b.

240. Ch'an-yüan, p. 439a. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1138c.

241. See notes 209 to 216.

242. Idem. See also DRMGTV, pp. 830b-835c.

243. Tsung-yao, pp. 25b-27b. Pei-yung, pp. 68b-70b. Lü-yüan, pp.34a-36a and Ch'ing-kuei, pp. 1144b-1146b.

244. Ju-chung, p. 474a.

245. In Zokuzōkyō, Vol. III, pp. 472a-474a.

246. Ju-chung, p. 472a. See also Tsung-yao, p. 25b. Pei-yung, p. 69a. Lü-yüan, p. 34b. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1144b.

247. Ibid., p. 473a. See also Tsung-yao, p. 20b. Pei-yung, p. 69b. Lü-yüan, p. 35a. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1145a-b.

248. Ibid., p. 473a. See also Tsung-yao, p. 26b. Pei-yung, p. 70a. Lü-yüan, p. 35a-b. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1145b.

249. Ibid., p. 474a. See also Tsung-yao, p. 27a. Pei-yung, p. 70b. Lü-yüan, p. 35b. Ch'ing-kuei , p. 1146a.

250. Idem. See also Tsung-yao, p. 27a-b. Pei-yung, p. 70b. Lü-yüan, p. 36a. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1146a.

251. Ibid., p. 472a-b. See also Tsung-yao, p. 26a. Pei-yung, p. 69a. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1144c.

252. Ibid., p. 472a. See also Tsung-yao, p. 26a. Pei-yung, p. 69a. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1144c.

253. Ibid., p. 474a. See also Tsung-yao, p. 27a-b. Pei-yung, p. 70b. Lü-yüan, pp. 35b-36a. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1146a.

254. Ibid., p. 473b. See also Tsung-yao, p. 27a. Pei-yung, p. 70a. Lü-yüan, p. 35b. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1145b-c.

255. Ibid., p. 473a. See also Tsung-yao, p. 26b. Pei-yung, p. 69b. Lü-yüan, p. 35a. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1145a.

256. See Appendix, Table VIII.

257. Ju-chung, p. 473a. See also Tsung-yao, p. 26b. Pei-yung, p. 70a. Lü-yüan, p.35a. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1145b.

258. Ibid., p. 474a. See also Tsung-yao, p. 27b. Pei-yung, p. 70b. Lü-yüan, p. 36a. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1146a.

259. Ibid., p. 473a-b. See also Tsung-yao, p. 26b. Pei-yung, p. 70a. Lü-yüan, p. 35b. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1145b.

260. Cf. Chapter II, Section II, sub-section J, notes 272 to 277.

Notes to Section IV

261. Cf. Section II, notes 86, 110, 114 and 119 to 124.

262. Cf. ibid, notes 96 to 103.

263. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1119a-b. Cf. Section III, note 174.

264. Ibid., p. 1119b. This derives from Ch'an-yüan, p. 443a. Pei-yung, p. 35a.

265. Ibid., p. 1119b-c.

266. Ibid., p. 1119c. This derives from Ch'an-yüan, pp. 443b-444a. Pei-yung, p. 35a-b.

267. Ibid., pp. 1119c-1120c. This derives from Pei-yung, pp. 35b-36a. Both of them provide a chart to show the position of each of the participants in this assembly (Pei-yung, p. 36b. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1120a-b).

268. Cf. Section I, note 41.

269. Ch'ing-kuei, pp. 1120c-1121a. This derives from Ch'an-yüan, p. 442b. Pei-yung, p. 35b. The Ch'ing-kuei says that, at any time, the abbot would tell someone to beat the drum slowly three times to call the monastic members to see him (p. 1120c). I believe this was a way of showing the authority of the abbot.

270. Ibid., p. 1121a-b. This derives from Ch'an-yüan, p. 443a-b, Pei-yung, pp. 36b-37b. Both the Pei-yung (p. 37b) and the Ch'ing-kuei (p.1121b-c) provide a chart to show the position of each of the monastic members in this assembly. The Ch'ing-kuei says that in ancient times such an assembly would be held on the third, the eighth, the thirteenth, the eighteenth, the twenty-third and the twenty-eighth day of a month of the lunar year. The contemporaries of the Yüan Dynasty only held this assembly on the eight, the eighteenth and the twenty-eighth day of a month (p. 1121a).

271. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1121b-c. These derive from Ch'an-yüan, p. 444b. Pei-yung, p. 46a-b.

272. Ibid., pp. 1121c-1122a.

273. Ibid., p. 1122a. This derives from Ch'an-yüan, pp. 464a-465a. Pei-yung, p.74a. Huan-chu, pp. 499b-500a. I have mentioned that after Master Huai-hai's death, his disciples in Po-chang Shan drafted five permanent rules for the maintenance. Among them the third rule says that only the abbot has the right to receive disciples for the establishment (cf. Section I, note 72). I think this is the reason why the instruction should have to be given to the novices by the abbot.

274. Ibid., p. 1122a-b. This derives from Pei-yung, p. 36b.

275. Ibid., pp.1122b-1123a. This derives from Tsung-yan, pp.17a-18a. Pei-yung, p. 48a. Lü-yüan, p. 29a.

276. Ibid., p. 1123a-b. These derive from Pei-yung, p. 48b. Lü-yüan, p.29b. On how the abbot and his monastic members flocked together to welcome the nobles or officials, see Chapter I, Section V, note 537.

277. Ibid., p. 1123b-c.

278. Cf. Tung-chu, 'Ts'ung-lin Chih-tu Yü Ch'an-tsung Chiao-yü' or 'Monastic System and Education of Zen School (sic)', in Fokuang Hsüeh-pao, No. 1 (1976), p. 13. For the above-mentioned Buddhist journal see Chapter II, Section II, note 264.

279. Cf. Section III, notes 179 to 181.

280. Ch'ing-kuei, pp.1130c-1136b.

281. Ibid., p. 1130c.

282. Ch'an-yüan, p. 447a-b.

283. Ibid., p. 447b.

284. Huan-chu, p. 497b.

285. Lü-yüan, pp. 31b-32a.

286. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1131a.

287. Lü-yüan, p. 32a. As this work is prepared for establishments of the Dharmaguptavinaya School, it emphasizes the teaching of the Vinaya.

288. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1131a.

289. Ch'an-yüan, p. 447b.

290. Pei-yung, p. 55a.

291. Lü-yüan, pp. 32b-33a.

292. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1131a-b.

293. Ibid., p. 1131a.

294. Ch'an-yüan, pp. 447b-448a.

295. Pei-yung, p.55a.

296. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1131b.

297. Ch'an-yüan, p. 448a.

298. Pei-yung, p. 55b.

299. Lü-yüan, p. 32a-b.

300. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1131b.

301. Idem. In this page, the Ch'ing-kuei says that the 'Chih-yü' will beat the drum three times and then the board three times to indicate that everything is ready. He then gives a first drum-beat to notify the ordinary monks to enter the bathroom. His second drum-beat is for the directors and supervisors. While his third beat is for the wandering monks and the abbot. His fourth beat calls the superintendents and the productive monk-workers.

302. Ch'an-yüan, p. 448b.

303. Pei-yung, p. 55b.

304. Lü-yüan, p. 32b.

305. Cf. notes 301 and 303.

306. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1131c.

307. Ch'an-yüan, p. 449b.

308. Pei-yung, p. 55b.

309. Lü-yüan, p. 32b.

310. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1131c.

311. Idem.

312. Idem.

313. Idem. The title of the attendant is derives from a story which tells that after Hung-jen, the Fifth Patriarch of Ch'an Buddhism, found that Hui-nêng was his desired successor, he transmitted the legendary robe and bowl that were said to have been used by the Buddha, to him (see Fa-hai's [of the T'ang Dynasty] Nan-tsung Tun-chiao Tsui-shang Ta-ch'êng Mo-ho Po-jo Po-lo-mi Ching Lu-tsu Hui-nêng Ta-shih Yü Shao-chou Ta-fan Ssŭ Shih-fa T'an-ching or 'The Analects that Recorded the Doctrines on Sudden Enlightenment by Master Hui-nêng, the Sixth Patriarch of the Southern Sect of Ch'an Buddhis, Taught in the Ta-fan Monastery in Shao-chou City [the present Ch'ü-chiang City of Kwantung Province] after his Sermon on the Mahāyānist Prajñā-pāramitāsūtra [T. 2007]', p. 338a. SKSC, pp. 754c-755a [the Biography of Hui-nêng]. Tsung-pa'o [of the Yüan Dynasty] Lu-tsu Ta-shih Fa-pao T'an-ching or 'The Treasury Analects of the Master Sixth Patriarch of Ch'an Buddhism [T. 2008]', p. 349a-b). The story has given rise

to an old saying among the Ch'an Buddhists: "To find someone and transmit my robe and bowl to him" means "to look for a creative disciple for myself".

314. Ibid., pp. 1131c-1132a.

315. Ibid., p. 1132a.

316. Ibid., p. 1131c.

317. Ch'an-yüan, p. 449b.

318. Pei-yung, p. 56a.

319. Lü-yüan, pp. 32b-33a.

320. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1132.

321. Ibid., p. 1132a.

322. Idem.

323. Ch'an-yüan, pp. 445b-446a.

324. Pei-yung, p. 55a.

325. Lü-yüan, p. 32a.

326. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1132b. Cf. Section I, note 49.

327. Cf. Section I, note 49.

328. Ch'an-yüan, p. 446a-b.

329. Pei-yung, p. 55a-b.

330. Lü-yüan, p. 32a.

331. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1132b. The title of 'Fu-ssŭ' in Chinese stands for 'Deputy to the Supervisor of Monastic Administration'. As his duty concerns only the monastic treasury I simply translate it as 'Treasurer'. The Ch'ing-kuei also says that this post was previously called 'K'u-t'ou' (cf. note 333), and the contemporaries of its editors called this post idiomatically 'Kuei-t'ou (Head of the Counter)' or 'Ts'ai-po (Wealth Keeper)' (idem).

332. Ibid., pp. 1132c.

333. Ch'an-yüan, p. 448b.

334. Huan-chu, p. 498a.

335. Pei-yung, p. 56b.

336. Lü-yüan, p. 33a.

337. Cf. note 332.

338. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1132c. According to the DRMGTV, the 'Tien-tso' is the 'Verger' and the 'Bursar' of the establishment (p. 686c). Here, he merely manages the monastic supplies.

339. Ch'an-yüan, p. 446b. It says that the 'Tien-tso' also covers the making of bean-sauce and vinegar, collecting vegetables and pickling some of them with salt or vinegar.

340. Pei-yung, p. 56b.

341. Huan-chu, p. 498a.

342. Lü-yüan, p. 33a-b.

343. Huan-chu, p. 498a.

344. As the title of this post bears the Chinese character 'Sui (Year)', it indicates that this is a one-year duty.

345. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1132c.

346. Ch'an-yüan, p. 447a.

347. Pei-yung, p. 56b.

348. Lü-yüan, p. 33b.

349. Huan-chu, pp. 495b-496a.

350. Ch'ing-kuei, pp. 1132c-1133c.

351. Idem.

352. Ibid., p. 1133a.

353. Ch'an-yüan, p. 450a.

354. Pei-yung, p. 57a.

355. Ch'an-yüan, p. 450a.

356. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1133a.

357. Ch'an-yüan, p. 450a.

358. Pei-yung, p. 57a.

359. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1133a.

360. Ch'an-yüan, p. 440a-b.

361. Pei-yung, p. 57a.

362. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1133a.

363. Idem.

364. Ch'an-yüan, p. 449b.

365. Pei-yung, p. 57b.

366. Lü-yüan, p. 34a. It says that one of the duties of the 'Ching-t'ou' is to light the lamps.

367. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1131a.

368. Ch'an-yüan, pp. 450b-451b.

369. Ibid., p. 448b.

370. Idem.

371. Idem.

372. Pei-yung, p. 57a. Lü-yüan, p. 33b.

373. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1133a.

374. Ch'an-yüan, pp. 448b-449a.

375. Pei-yung, p. 57a-b.

376. Lü-yüan, pp. 33b-34a.

377. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1133a.

378. Ch'an-yüan, pp. 448b-449a.

379. Pei-yung, p. 57a.

380. Lü-yüan, p. 33b.

381. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1133a.

382. Ch'an-yüan, p. 448b.

383. Pei-yung, p. 57a.

384. Lü-yüan, p. 33b.

385. Ch'an-yüan, p. 448b.

386. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1133b. Cf. Pei-yung, p. 57a. Lü-yüan, p. 33b.

387. Ibid., p. 1133a.

388. Ch'an-yüan, p. 448b. It says that the duty for this post is only to beg fuel from the donors.

389. Pei-yung, p. 57a.

390. Lü-yüan, p. 33b.

391. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1133c.

392. Idem.

393. Ch'an-yüan, pp. 448b-449a.

394. Pei-yung, pp. 56b-57a.

395. Lü-yüan, p. 33b.

396. Ch'ing-kuei, p. 1133b.

397. Ibid., p. 1133b-c.

398. Pei-yung, pp. 52b-53a.

399. Ch'an-yüan, p. 449a.

400. Ibid., p. 449b.

401. Idem.

402. Ibid., pp. 449b-450a.

403. Ibid., p. 450a.

404. Lü-yüan, p. 33a.

405. Pei-yung, p. 57b.

406. Lü-yüan, p. 34a.

CONCLUSION

Li Tan (n.d.), an intellectual of the T'ang Dynasty, says: "If Śākya-muni was born in China, the doctrines that he created would have been somewhat like those by the Duke of the Chou Dynasty and by Confucius, or vice versa."[1] His words help to explain why the Chinese Buddhist clergy found difficulty in observing an Indian Vinaya in a Chinese milieu. Eventually they created the so-called 'Pure Rule' as a replacement for the Vinaya. In the first chapter of this thesis, I have already discussed how, after the Vinayas were introduced into China and translated into Chinese, many local Buddhist monks flocked to study them and became disciplinarians. Disciplinarians who studied different Vinayas even formed different disciplinary sects, such as the Sarvāstivādavinaya Sect, the Dharmagupta-vinaya Sect, the Mahāsāṅghikavinaya Sect, the Mahīśāsakavinaya Sect, etc.[2] After a power struggle around 709, the Dharmaguptavinaya Sect annexed all other disciplinary sects and became the only Disciplinary School in China.[3] This shows that some members of the Monastic Order in China were eager to promulgate the Buddhist Vinaya amongst their clerics. Beside the disciplinarians, I also found that many Chinese monks faithfully observed the important rules, such as no adultery, no killing, etc.; or even some of the more subtle rules of the Vinaya, such as no trifling or joking, no expectorating, etc. I quoted these facts in the second section of Chapter II. This indicates their readiness to follow a monastic life of Indian origin.

Unfortunately, the Vinaya rules developed in an Indian cultural and social background. Except for those who had visited India, the Chinese Buddhist clerics could not understand the contents of most of the rules

simply by reading the Chinese versions. Almost none of the Chinese disciplinarians had ever set foot in India. In order to interpret the particular Vinaya that they were studying, they could only quote material from the other Vinaya, the Sūtras, the Śāstras and even the Confucian classics. As these materials could not solve all the doctrinal and practical problems which they faced and as they had to question foreign monks or Chinese pilgrims who had returned home, Chinese disciplinarians, like Tripiṭaka Master I-ching and others, preferred to make pilgrimages to India to observe the Vinaya rules in practice. After the publication of I-ching's work, the famous NHCKNFC, the Chinese clerics began to understand that the Vinaya rules could only be observed in an Indian milieu. Gradually the Disciplinary School in China was doomed. The details of discussions on these points can be found in the first section of Chapter II.

Apart from those mentioned above, other factors, perhaps more important, that relate to the decline of the Vinaya in China are as follows:

Firstly, long before the first Śīla (the Śīla of the MHSGKV) was translated ca. 251, and the first Vinaya (the DRMGTV), in 421, Buddhism had been introduced into China and the existence of Chinese clerics can be traced back to ca. 165. In order to control the conduct of its monastic members, the Chinese Order in its embryonic period had to make some monastic rules, such as corporal punishment for transgressors, labour for novices, catering supplies for monastic members, etc. Even though this set of locally developed rules (I call it 'Chinese Monastic Rule') were in fact contrary to the Vinaya rules, the Chinese clerics kept on practising them after the Vinayas had already been translated into Chinese and their rules were being observed by the Chinese Monastic Order. This explains how, before the translation of the first Vinaya, the Chinese Monastic Rule had

already been practised for more than two hundred years. The Chinese Order considered this set of rules to be somewhat like consuetudinary law in secular law. As the Chinese clerics observed both the Vinaya and the Chinese Monastic Rule at the same time, a transgressor would sometimes find in the latter an excuse for breaking a rule of the former. In other words, the controlling power of the Vinaya was weakened by the Chinese Monastic Rule. Details of discussions on this point are to be found in the first sections of Chapters I and II.

Secondly, according to the tradition of the Chinese Order, a novice should have received a training in Confucian classics before learning the Buddhist scriptures. Only he who had already received a secular education before entering the Order, was given Buddhist instruction immediately after entering the Order. This was considered important because a learned monk mingled more easily with the members of the well-educated Chinese gentry class, enticing them to become Buddhists and winning their support for his religion. Therefore, the basic Confucian ideas, such as showing loyalty to one's ruler, being filial to one's parents and earning one's living by hard work, etc., would have influenced individual clerics. Even though the Vinaya instructs monks to survive by collecting alms, and some of the Chinese monks were faithful to this instruction, other Chinese monks preferred to participate in productive activities in order to show that they were not parasites. They won the respect of the secular population.

Thirdly, since Chinese society traditionally looked down upon beggars, a Chinese donor would not tolerate a monk whom he respected coming to his door collecting alms every day like a beggar. Such a donor would make his donation in the form of an amount of money or some farming lands to an individual priest or even to the Monastic Order, in order to let the

priests have some property as their financial base for survival. The economic structure of a Chinese monastery was therefore different from that in India. As the authorities of a Chinese establishment had to manage their monastic finance and as an individual had to manage his private money, they were unable to keep the Vinaya rule of 'touching no money'. Moreover, since an establishment accepted donations of farming lands, monastic estates gradually developed. In order to consume agricultural products from monastic estates, the monastic authorities established a catering system for their members. Since then, except for a few clerics who were faithful to the Indian tradition of collecting alms, most Chinese monks never begged for food. Even Tao-hsüan, the most outstanding Chinese disciplinarian, never begged for a living. A monk who insisted on begging would sometimes embarrass his fellow monks. Yüan-chao is a good example of this.

Fourthly, according to the Vinaya, a cleric is allowed to eat only one meal a day before noon, and water is the only substance to be taken in the afternoon. As China is located in a Northern Temperate Zone and the residents of this zone need more calories to survive, Chinese clerics found it difficult to keep the rule of eating one vegetarian meal a day. Nevertheless, in order to survive, some Chinese monks drank thick fluids made from fruit, or from other plant materials in the afternoons in the period before the formation of the 'Pure Rule'.

Fifthly, as the Chinese Buddhists were Mahāyāna adherents but the translated Vinayas belonged to a Hīnayāna tradition, some Chinese monks felt contempt for the Hīnayāna Vinaya and broke the rules purposely. Many legends are told about a monk who disobeyed the Vinaya and was at first considered to have committed transgressions; later the people discovered that he was in fact a Buddhist saint. Details of discussions can be found

in Chapter III (cf. also Chapter I, Sections I and V). I regard the above-mentioned factors as the 'Internal Factors' that made Chinese monks stray from the Vinaya.

Besides the 'Internal Factors' there are also the 'External Factors'. These are as follows:

Firstly, according to the Indian tradition, the Buddhist priests were not of this world, therefore the Indian kings looked upon the Buddhists as one of the species of 'holy men' and expected no obedience from them. In China, on the other hand, as society traditionally accepted that everyone was a subject of the emperor and no person might be exempted from paying respect and homage to him, the Chinese emperors considered that the Buddhist clerics were no different from the rest of the population. Therefore, they established the office of 'Controller of the Buddhist Priests', both in the capital and the local provinces, and appointed monks to fill these posts as their agents. After the Monastic Order came under government control, a Buddhist transgressor would receive punishment not only in accordance with the Vinaya or the Chinese Monastic Rule, but also in accordance with the secular law. From the time that imperial power interfered with the Monastic Order, the controlling power of the Vinaya was weakened.

Secondly, in China as well as in India, Buddhist monks and nuns were exempt from taxes and national service. Besides, the Monastic Order of both countries provided religious sanctuary for wanted criminals. Therefore Chinese plebeians and criminals tried to enter the Order to obtain these advantages. As the people entered the Order for reasons unconnected with religious belief, they began to commit transgressions after having enjoyed the peaceful and comfortable livelihood provided by their establishments. This is the reason why the Mahāyānist Chinese Order had to use the

Hīnayānist Vinaya to govern the conduct of its monastic members. Even though Mahāyāna Buddhism had its own Śīlas and some of these works had been translated into Chinese, they could not cope with transgressors because their rules emphasised disciplining one's mind to think no evil thoughts and stated that no punishment would be inflicted for breaking a rule. Nevertheless, the authorities of the Chinese Order adopted the Hīnayānist Vinaya and the Chinese Monastic Rule for governing. Under this system, a transgressor could be expelled or forced to make a confession in accordance with the Vinaya, or he could receive corporal punishment in accordance with the Chinese Monastic Rule if he broke a rule that deserved such punishment. As the transgressions being committed by unfaithful members of the Order included serious crimes like adultery, murder, robbery, etc., an opportunity was created for the government to interfere with monastic affairs. I have mentioned before that the Chinese emperors considered the Buddhist clerics to be their subjects; therefore, a Buddhist criminal would be punished in accordance with the secular law. In this situation, a monk-transgressor would be sentenced to imprisonment or even death by the secular magistrate's court while he was still a monk. In the T'ang Dynasty, a monk or a nun who broke a Vinaya rule would be harshly punished in accordance with the secular law rather than in accordance with the Vinaya rule itself. Therefore, the controlling power of the Vinaya was once again weakened.

Thirdly, donations made by laymen provide an important income for every religious organisation. To encourage lay people to visit Buddhist establishments and bring donations, Chinese monasteries or nunneries prepared many attractive functions for the laity. As the authorities of a monastery could not refuse female visitors to come and loiter around, so neither could a nunnery refuse male visitors. In this situation, Buddhist

priests were unable to keep the Vinaya rules concerning 'no mingling with the opposite sex'. Details of the discussion can be found in Chapter IV (cf. also Section I of Chapters II and III).

In such circumstances the Chinese Buddhist clerics had long suffered the dilemma of whether to observe the inconvenient Indian Vinaya or not. In order to release themselves from this dilemma, Master Huai-hai of Ch'an Buddhism decided to abandon the Vinaya and organise a new set of monastic rules, the so-called 'Pure Rule' for governing his monastic members in the Po-chang Shan. From the surviving version of the primitive 'Pure Rule', we know that its rules were prepared for the purposes of (1) confirming the practices that were customary among the Chinese Buddhist establishments in Huai-hai's time, such as corporal punishment, physical labour, the monastic kitchen, etc.; (2) eliminating the inconveniences of following the Indian monastic tradition in China, such as taking only one meal a day, obeying the more subtle Vinaya rules, etc.; (3) reviving the religious unity of the Order so that internal conflicts did not have to be settled in the secular magistrate's court, etc.

The publication of Huai-hai's 'Pure Rule' was warmly welcomed by the Ch'an Buddhists at first, not only because it was organised in accordance with the Chinese environment, but also because it freed the clerics from feeling guilty when offending the inconvenient Vinaya. Moreover, as the Vinaya was recognized as sacred scripture, its rules were not allowed to be increased or decreased by the Chinese priests' own authority and this caused great inconvenience when its rules were put into practice in China. The Chinese 'Pure Rule', on the other hand, was not recognized as a sacred one so its rules could be increased or decreased by the monastic authorities to suit different circumstances. Therefore, not only did the establishments of Ch'an Buddhism observe the 'Pure Rule', but Shêng-wu, a sectarian

of the Disciplinary School of the Yüan Dynasty, also quoted from these Ch'an monastic rules to form a set of rules for the establishments of his own school. In 1335, Emperor Shun-ti of the Yüan Dynasty appointed the monk Tê-hui to revise the different versions of the 'Pure Rule', including those compiled by Disciplinarian Shêng-wu, and to codify them into one set of rules. The following year the task was completed and Tê-hui's compilation, the Ch'ing-kuei was published. Through the patronage of the emperors of the Ming Dynasty, the Ch'ing-kuei predominated throughout China and became something like a fixed pattern of the Chinese monastic rule. From the rules of the Ch'ing-kuei and of its preceding versions, we find that this set of rules is a combination of the Vinaya and the Chinese Monastic Rule, even though they quote very few rules from the Vinaya. According to the rules of the Ch'ing-kuei, every monastic member should take up at least one duty to assist the monastic administration of their establishment, but the Vinaya did not know such arrangements. After the 'Pure Rule' had become popular, the DRMGTV and the other Vinayas were all put aside by the Chinese clergy, even though these Indian disciplinary scriptures were still recognized as sacred. Details of discussions are given in Chapter V, in which a comparative survey on the differences and agreements between the Vinaya and the 'Pure Rule' is given.

In the year 1823, the monk I-jun (n.d.) published his revised version of the Ch'ing-kuei, the Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei Chêng-i Chi or 'An Interpretation of the Ch'ing-kuei'.[4] Except for a few changes, the rules in this version are almost the same as that of the Ch'ing-kuei.[5] In his preface, I-jun indicates that his motive for revising the Ch'ing-kuei was that even in his own time the Buddhist clergy had already strayed from the 'Pure Rule'. Therefore he made some changes to its rules in order to suit the contemporary circumstances and moreover explained the contents of

all the rules, in order to make the Ch'ing-kuei acceptable to his contemporaries.[6] In 1878, I-jun's work was reprinted and the monk Ch'ien-t'o (n.d.) wrote a preface. In this preface Ch'ien-t'o comments that in his time, some of the monks knew nothing of the existence of the Ch'ing-kuei.[7] Both prefaces show that the Ch'ing-kuei was declining in this period. Therefore I cannot tell, without investigatory fieldwork, whether the contemporary Buddhist clerics were still observing the Ch'ing-kuei strictly or not.

Even though the Vinaya declined earlier than the Ch'ing-kuei and the sectarians of the Disciplinary School also lived a monastic life in accordance with the rules borrowed from the 'Pure Rule' in the Yüan Dynasty, the modern monk Hung-i (1880-1942) once tried energetically to revive the Indian disciplinary tradition. Disciplinarian Hung-i's battles are recorded in the Hung-i Ta-shih Nien-p'u.[8] From this work I learnt that Hung-i only kept the rule of 'taking no food in the afternoon',[9] but I did not find that he had been going out to collect alms. Besides, he enjoyed his breakfast and lunch,[10] meaning that he could not keep the Vinaya rule of 'only one meal'. As he had been participating in physical labour[11] and had brought pocket-money with him,[12] he could not escape from the influence of the monastic customs of his contemporaries that are derived from both the Chinese Monastic Rule and the Ch'ing-kuei. I believe that he had suffered the same dilemma as Tao-hsüan[13] had experienced by living in a Chinese environment.

Except for Pao-ch'ang's Pi-ch'iu-ni Chuan, a work containing biographies of Buddhist nuns,[14] other Buddhist biographical works such as the KSC, HKSC and SKSC, etc. contain only biographies of monks. Other Chinese Buddhist materials I gained access to also concerned activities of male clerics rather than of female clerics. Consequently I concentrated on the disciplinary activities of the monks only. However, I am not a male chauvinist.

Notes to the Conclusion

1. Li Chao (n.d.), T'ang Kuo-shih Pu or 'Some Additional Notes to the Official History of the T'ang Dynasty', p. 24. As Li Chao's work covers the period from about 713 to 820 (ibid., p. 3, Li Chao's preface), Li Tan must have been an intellectual of this period.

2. I should like to indicate that the sectarians of the disciplinary sect, for instance, the Sarvāstivādavinaya Sect, were studying and interpretating the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivāda School. It does not mean that this Indian Buddhist school was also transplanted into China.

3. In his Survey, Kenneth Ch'en spends only half a page (p. 301) to discuss the 'Disciplinary School' in China. This implies that he could not find helpful references concerning the activities of this school in 1964 when he wrote his work. I hope that the discussion in my first chapter will suggest some useful references for a future revision of Ch'en's work.

4. In Zokuzōkyō, Vol. 111, pp. 290a-437b.

5. For instance, the Ch'ing-kuei instructs the monastic members to pray on the birthday of the crown prince in order to invoke the Buddha's blessing upon the prince (see Chapter V, Section III, note 160). In I-jun's work the 'crown prince' is replaced by the 'empress' (p. 299a). Again, the Ch'ing-kuei orders that ceremonies of mourning be held on the anniversary of the death of the Buddha, hPhags-Pa, Bodhidharma, Huai-hai, the founder of the monastery and the patriarchs of Ch'an Buddhism (see Chapter V, Section III, notes 166 to 171). I-jun cancels the ceremony for hPhags-Pa but inserts similar ceremonies for Chi-i (the outstanding patriarch of the T'ien-t'ai School), Fa-tsang (643-712, the founder of the Hua-yenSchool), Tao-hsüan (the oustanding patriarch of the Disciplinary School) and Hui-yüan (founder of the Pure Land School) (pp. 321b-324b). As tobacco had already been introduced into China in his time, I-jun told the monastic members not to smoke (p. 295a) etc. As the changes made by I-jun are very few, I will not give more detail. Probably one wonders why I-jun should have to change the prayer for the 'crown prince' into the prayer for the 'empress'. Chao Erh-hsün's (1844-1927) Ch'ing-shih Kao or 'A Draft to the History of the Ch'ing Dynasty' says that when Emperor Mu-tsung (R. 1860-1874) succeeded to the throne in his sixth year (1862), both

his blood mother, Royal Concubine Hsiao-ch'in (well-known as Tzŭ-hsi, 1815-1908) and his lawful royal mother, Empress Hsiao-chên (well-known as Tzŭ-an, 1837-1881) acted as regents and both held the title of 'Empress Dowager' (Vol. 4, pp. 711, 769, 711; Vol. 30, pp. 8529, 8925-8926). After the death of the Empress Dowager Tzŭ-an in 1881 (ibid., Vol. 30, p. 8529). Empress Dowager Tzŭ-hsi continued to exercise full power and acted once again as regent to Emperor Tê-tsung (R. 1875-1908) till her death in 1908 (ibid., Vol. 4, pp. 851-852 and 965; Vol. 30, pp. 8926-8929). Even though I-jun's work was first published before the rule of these two female regents, it has been reprinted several times (cf. note 7). In the version found in the Zokuzōkyō, there is a preface composed by the monk P'u-chao (n.d.) for the reprinted version of 1871. This reprint was therefore published in the regime of Emperor Mu-tsung, i.e. the period when the two Empress Dowagers mentioned above held full power. Therefore I venture to say that the above-mentioned change, i.e. from 'crown prince' to 'empress' had been made by the publisher of this reprinted version in order to flatter these two empress dowagers.

6. I-jun, p. 290.

7. This preface cannot be found in the Zokuzōkyō version but is recorded in Vol. 1, p. 5, of the version published in Taipei by Fo-Chiao Ch'u-pan Shê in 1974.

8. Cf. Chapter I, Section IV, note 424A.

9. Hung-i Ta-shih Nien-p'u, pp. 82, 150, 225-227.

10. Ibid., p. 157.

11. Ibid., p. 158.

12. Ibid., p. 178.

13. Cf. Chapter III, Section I, Sub-section C, note 57.

14. Cf. Chapter IV, Section II, Sub-section A, note 98.

TABLE I

Buddhist Monks who are recorded in KSC, HKSC and SKSC, as having
(1) begged for survival;
(2) taken one meal a day before noon; and
(3) who were vegetarians for their entire ordained life.

Abbreviations: B. Begging for survival
M. One meal per day taken before noon.
V. Vegetarians for their ordained life.

This table indicates that of the total of 1845 monks who are recorded in the three 'Biographies of Eminent Buddhist Monks' (1265 biographies and 580 subordinary biographies), there were only 197 people who were described as remaining faithful to the above-mentioned three basic Buddhist ways of livelihood. The total for each of these items is as follows:

B. 46

M. 59

V. 121

Those items are distributed amongst the 197 monks as follows:

B, M, V.	together	1
B, M,	"	6
M, V.	"	19
B, V.	"	5
B.	only	33
M.	"	35
V.	"	95

Name	Date	B	M	V	Text	Page	Note
Chu Sêng-hsien	Died ca. 321			o	KSC	395a	
Hui-li	Flor. 349	o		o	"	410a	
Hui-shou	Flor. 364			o	"	410b	
Chih-tun	314-366			o	"	348c	
Hui-yüan	+ 389			o	"	410a	
Chu Sêng-fu	Flor. 389-92		o	o	"	355b	1
T'an-huo	Flor. 401-7			o	"	389c	
Buddhayaśas	Flor. 410-12	o	o		"	334b	2
T'an-shun	Flor. 419			o	"	363a	3
Chih T'an-lan	Died ca. 419-20			o	"	396c	
Fa-hsü	Eastern Chin (317-420)			o	"	396c	
Sêng-chün	"			o	"	404a	
T'an-sui	"			o	"	406b	
Chih-yen	Died after 427	o		o	"	339b	
Buddhabhadra	359-429	o			"	355b	
Tao-shêng	355-434		o		"	366c	
Fa-yeh	Flor. 438			o	"	368b	4
Hui-an	Died ca. 438			o	"	370a	
Sêng-tsun	Flor. 446			o	"	404b	5
T'an-i	381-450			o	"	410c	
Hui-shou	425-451			o	"	404c	
P'u-ming	Died ca. 455			o	"	407b	
Hui-hsün	375-458			o	"	401a	
Tao-wang	+ 465			o	"	371c	
P'u-ming	Flor. 465			o	"	372a	6
Tao-yin	"			o	"	372a	7
Fa-kung	Flor. 468			o	"	407c	
Hui-kuo	395-470			o	"	407b-c	
Sêng-fu	Died ca. 471			o	"	407c	
Tao-fa	+ 474	o			"	399b	
Tao-ying	396-478			o	"	401c	
T'an-chien	Liu-sung (425-479)			o	"	370a	
Ching-tu	"			o	"	398c	
Hui-t'ung	"			o	"	398c	
Hui-yu	"			o	"	400c	

Name	Date	B	M	V	Text	Page	Note
Sêng-yin	Liu-sung (425-479)			o	KSC	401b	
Fa-tsung	"	o	o	o	"	407a	
Chih-tao	412-484			o	"	401c	
Sêng-yüan	414-484			o	"	378a	
Hui-chin	401-485			o	"	407c	
Sêng-nien	flor. 485			o	"	408a	8
Hui-chung	415-487			o	"	416c	
Fa-wu	411-489		o	o	"	399c	
Sêng-chung	430-489		o		"	375c	
Hui-yü	433-489		o	o	"	408a	
Chih T'an-yüen	410-490			o	"	413c	
Tao-ju	+ 490			o	"	416c	
T'an-ch'ao	419-492		o	o	"	400a	
Fa-ming	flor. 492			o	"	408b	9
Sêng-chih	"			o	"	408b	10
Fa-ting	"			o	"	408b	11
Fa-hui	411-495			o	"	408b	
T'an-yu	flor. 495			o	"	408c	12
Sêng-hou	412-500		o	o	"	408c	
Fa-yüan	414-500			o	"	417a	
Hui-wên	flor. 500			o	"	408c	13
Sêng-chiao	died ca. 503-4			o	HKSC	472c	
Fa-ling	438-506			o	"	465c	
Chih-shun	447-507			o	KSC	381b	
Hui-shao	455-508			o	HKSC	471a	
Hui-shêng	died ca. 510			o	"	472c	
Hui-shêng	"	o			"	550c	
Ming-ta	462-516		o	o	"	691b	
Hui-mi	400-518			o	KSC	408c	
Sêng-jo	451-520			o	HKSC	460c	
Fa-ch'ao	456-526	o			"	607a	
Tao-ch'an	458-527	o		o	"	607b	
Hui-ch'êng	+ 527			o	"	465a	
Ming-shên	flor. 516-528	o			"	656b	14
Chih-hsiang	died ca. 540		o		"	646a	
Hui-shêng	flor. 554			o	KSC	367a	15

Name	Date	B	M	V	Text	Page	Note
Fa-ts'ung	468-559			o	HKSC	555b	16
Tao-p'ing	493-564	o			"	484c	
P'u-yüan	flor. 564-565	o			"	680c	
Sêng-wei	513-573			o	"	558b	
Sêng-chên	flor. 575		o	o	"	653b	17
Hui-ssŭ	515-577		o		"	562c	
Fa-ch'ang	Northern Ch'i (550-577)	o			"	556b	
Fa-shang	495-580			o	"	485a	
T'an-yen	503-581			o	"	487c	
Hui-i	died ca. 582	o			"	560b	
Fa-lin	Later Liang (555-587)	o	o		"	556c	
Narendra-rayaśas	490-589			o	"	432c	
Fa-chin	died. ca. 590		o	o	"	660a	
Na Ch'an-shih	flor. 593		o		"	552c	18
Chih-i	538-597			o	"	564c	
Hui-pi	538-599			o	"	494c	
Ching-tuan	died ca. 606	o	o		"	576c	
T'an-ch'ien	546-607	o		o	"	572a	
Tao-shun	542-610		o		"	577a	
Chên-kuan	538-611			o	"	701c	
Chih-lin	544-613			o	"	503c	
Ch'ing-t'o	555-617	o			"	519a	
Hui-hsiang	died ca. 616-7	o	o		"	597c	
Tao-chêng	Sui (582-617)	o			"	558c	
Ācārya Ch'ên	"	o			"	560b	19
Hai-shun	589-628	o			"	524b	
Dharmagupta	+ 619	o			"	435a	
Chi-tsang	549-623	o			"	513c	
Fa-k'an	551-623			o	"	513c	
Chih-tsang	541-625	o			"	587a	
P'u-chi	died after 625		o		"	680c	20
Chih-pao	died ca. 625-6		o		"	613a	
Tao-chi	died ca. 627-8			o	"	696b	
Fa-tsang	546-629		o	o	"	580a & 581c	

Name	Date	B	M	V	Text	Page	Note
Tao-hsiu	+ 629	o			HKSC	684b	
Hui-sung	547-633		o		"	522c	
Fa-kuang	+ 633	o	o		"	683c	
Ling-chih	560-634	o			"	588c	
Chih-yen	564-634		o	o	"	532a	
Tao-chê	+ 635	o	o		"	589a	
Hui-yün	564-637		o		"	534a	
Hui-ch'ih	572-642			o	"	538a	
Hui-man	589-642			o	"	618a	
Sêng-ting	+ 642		o		"	579a	
T'an-yün	+ 642		o		"	593a	
Hui-man	flor. 642		o		"	552c	
Chih-kuan	566-643			o	"	543c	
Shih-yü	flor. 616-645		o		"	595a	
Hui-hsiu	flor. 618-645			o	"	545b	
T'an-yüan	flor. 645	o			"	545b	21
Hui-pi	died ca. 648-9			o	"	531a-b	
Hui-min	573-649?			o	"	619c	
Fa-hsien	577-653		o		"	559c	
Tao-hsing	593-659	o			"	623b	
Ācārya T'ung	571-660	o			"	661a	
Shan-fu	flor. 660			o	"	602c	
Hui-hsi	died ca. 665		o		"	595a	
Ming-ching	flor. 629-665	o			"	594b	
Ming-tao	flor. 662-665		o		"	624a	
Hsüan-chien	flor. 665			o	"	542a	
T'ung-ta	flor. 665			o	"	543c	
Tao-hsüan	596-667		o	o	SKSC	790c	
Û-sang	flor. 669	o			"	729a	
Tao-liang	died ca. 705			o	"	757c	
Hui-an	582-709	o			"	823b	
Yin-tsung	627-713			o	"	731b	
Wên-kang	636-727		o		"	791c	
Chih-fêng	flor. 727		o	o	"	759c	22
Huai-yü	+ 742		o		"	865a	
Hsüan-lang	673-754			o	"	875c	

Name	Date	B	M	V	Text	Page	Note
San-tao Fa-shih	died ca. 767			o	SKSC	865c	
Hui-chung	683-769		o	o	"	834c-835a	
Hui-chung	+ 775	o			"	767b	
Pien-ts'ai	723-778		o	o	"	806a	
Hui-ming	697-780			o	"	876a	
Hsi-ch'ien	700-790			o	"	763c	
Fa-ch'in	714-792	o		o	"	764b-c	
Wu-ming	727-793			o	"	817a	
Tzŭ-chioh	+ 795		o	o	"	874a	
Chih-têng	flor. 785-804		o		"	866c	
Ta-kuang	+ 805			o	"	866a	
Tao-wu	748-807		o		"	769a	
Shên-ch'ing	died ca. 813			o	"	740c	
Hui-chao	+ 815	o			"	825c	
Fa-chao	flor. 821	o			"	868c	
P'u-yüan	748-834			o	"	775a	
Chien-k'ung	flor. 834-5		o		"	840b	
Hao-chih	784-839			o	"	894c	
P'u-an	770-843			o	"	880a	
Pao-an	died before 845	o			"	896b	
Ting-kuang	flor. 845		o		"	878c	
Chih-yün	777-853			o	"	881a	
Huan-chung	780-862		o		"	778a	
Hsüan-chien	782-865			o	"	778b	
Yün-wên	805-882	o			"	808c	
Chih-hsüan	811-883		o	o	"	744b	
Shên-chih	819-886		o		"	869c	
Ling-shih	flor. 889-90		o	o	"	849b	
Yüan-hui	819-896			o	"	857a	
Wên-hsi	821-900			o	"	783c	
Ch'i-tz'ŭ	died ca. 901-4		o		"	848b	
Wang-ming	died before 907	o			"	896a	23
Hsiang-yü	T'ang (618-907)		o		"	759c	
Chüan Lü-shih	"		o		"	796c	
Wên-shuang	"		o		"	847c	

Name	Date	B	M	V	Text	Page	Note
Ta-hsing	T'ang (618-907)			o	SKSC	865a	
Shên-ting	"	o			"	889c	
Ch'üan-tz'ŭ	"			o	"	895c	
Wo-tso	died ca. 907-11			o	"	896c	
Wang-ming	flor. 891-918	o			"	851c	24
Ts'ung-li	847-925		o		"	810a	
Kuei-shên	867-928		o	o	"	786c	
Ch'üan-tsai	died ca. 930			o	"	850a	
K'o-chih	860-934	o			"	748b	
Tao-fu	868-937			o	"	787b	
Tao-p'i	flor. 944	o		o	"	818c	
Meng-chiang	+ 953		o		"	750a-b	
Hsing-t'ao	895-956			o	"	871a-b	
Yen-chün	882-966		o		"	886a-b	
K'uang-shih	flor. 973			o	"	853b	25
Yen-shou	904-975		o	o	"	887b	
Wu-ên	912-986		o		"	752a.	

Notes to Table I

1. He moved to the southern part of the Yangtzŭ River Valley at the end of the Western Chin Dynasty (ca. 389-392).
2. Cf. Chapter I, S-ction III, notes 237 and 240.
3. His account is appended to the Biography of Tao-tsu (+ 419).
4. His account is appended to the Biography of Hui-kuan (died ca. 438).
5. Cf. Chapter I, Section II, note 221.
6. He was a contemporary of the monk Tao-wang (+ 465), to whose biography his account is appended.
7. Idem.
8. He was a contemporary of the monk Hui-chin (401-485), to whose biography his account is appended.
9. He was a contemporary of the monk Ch'ao-pien (420-492), to whose biography his account is appended.
10. Idem.
11. Idem.
12. He was a contemporary of the monk Fa-hui (411-495), to whose biography his account is appended.
13. He was a contemporary of the monk Sêng-hou (412-500), to whose biography his account is appended.
14. He was a monk in the period of Emperor Ming (R. 516-528) of the Northern Wei Dynasty.
15. His account is appended to the Biography of Tao-shêng. Hui-chiao (497-554?), author of KSC, stated in his account: "..... at present we have Hui-shêng....."
16. His date is not stated in the Taishō version, but it can be found on p. 4 of his Biography in fascicle 5 of the Chin-ling Edition.
17. His account is appended to the Biography of Fa-shun (577-640), his disciple. The account says that when Fa-shun was in his eighteenth year (575), he followed Sêng-chên. At this time Sêng-chên was keeping a yellow dog. Not only did the dog eat the same food as the

monks ate, but it also drank nothing in the afternoon. This story hints that Sêng-chên himself was faithful to the Buddhist tradition of taking one vegetarian meal a day before noon.

18. His biography is appended to the Biography of Sêng-k'o, his master. According to Ch'en Yüan, Dates of Monks, Sêng-k'o's dates are 478-593 (p. 42).

19. His biography is appended to the Biography of Hui-i, a monk of the Sui Dynasty.

20. Cf. Chapter II, Section II, note 256.

21. He was a contemporary of Tao-hsüan and his biography is appended to the Biography of his master Hui-hsiu.

22. His biography is appended to the Biography of Chü-fang (+ 727).

23. Cf. Chapter II, Section II, note 335.

24. His biography is appended to the Biography of Sêng-chien. Sêng-chien's last appearance was in the Ta-chung Era (892-918) of Emperor Hsüan-tsung of the T'ang Dynasty.

25. His biography is appended to the Biography of Fa-yüan (+ 973).

TABLE II

Kitchens in Monasteries or Shrines that are recorded in HKSC and SKSC.

This table of 27 cases shows that the Chinese Monastic Order had already set up their own kitchens before 513. This would probably be one of the reasons why the Chinese Buddhist monks could not retain their original religious tradition of begging for survival.

Establishment	Location	Existed	Text	Page	Note
Ta-chioh	Yeh (in Honan Province)	before 513	HKSC	608b	1
Lin-yen Shan	Soochow	before 516	SKSC	825a	2
Fêng-lung Shan	Chao-chou (in Hopeh Province)	before 555	HKSC	619b	3
T'ien-p'ing	Yeh	since 556	"	434c	4
Yü-mên	Yeh	flor. 550-560	"	555a-b	5
Ch'ing-ch'i Shan	Ching-chou (in Hupeh Province)	before 565	"	587a	6
Hoh-shui	Yeh	before 577	"	486a	7
Yen-hsing	Lo-yang	flor. 581-3	"	489b	8
Fa-chu	Lu-chou (in Shansi Province)	before 595	"	589c	9
Kuo-ch'ing	Mt. T'ien-t'ai (in Chekiang Province)	after 601	"	567c	10
Wu-tê	Ping-chou (Shansi Province)	flor. 612	"	641a	11
Lung-ch'ih Tao-ch'ang	Mt. Chung-nan (in Shansi Province)	before 615	"	518b	12
Kuo-hsing	Ping-chou	flor. 616-7	"	641b	13
Chung-hsüan	Soochow	after 618	"	651c	14

Establishment	Location	Existed	Text	Page	Note
Kan-hua	Lan-tien (in Shensi)	ca. 617-9	HKSC	546a	15
Hung-fa	Ch'ang-an	since 620	"	591b	16
P'u-kuang	Ch'ang-an	before 621	"	617b	17
Hui-i	Chêng-chou (in Honan Province)	before 622	"	660a	18
Niu-t'ou Shan	Jun-chou (in Kiangsu Province)	since 643	"	604a	19
Shêng-kuang	Ch'ang-an	flor. 645	"	613b	20
Ch'an-chü	Hsiang-chou (Hsiang-yang of Hupei Province)	before 652	"	661a	21
Hua-yen	Wu-tai Shan	before 685	SKSC	843b	22
Fa-hua Yüan	"	before 716	"	843a	23
Ch'ing-liang	"	before 726	"	843c	24
Ching-chung Pên-yüan	Ch'êng-tu (in Szechuan Province)	after 728	"	832c	25
Hêng-shan	Mt. Nan-yo (in Hunan Province)	since 764	"	773b	26
Lu-shan Hsin-yüan	Mt. Lu	before 972	"	789a	27

Notes to Table II

1. The kitchen of this monastery is recorded in the Biography of Hui-kuang. It mentions the campaign by Êrh-chu Shih-lung to the north (cf. Chapter III section III, note 242). According to Pei Shih, Êrh-chu Shih-lung was in power from 513 to 530 (p. 789). Therefore, I assume that the kitchen would have been established before 513.

2. The kitchen of this monastery is mentioned in the Biography of Tao-chien, of the T'ang Dynasty.

3. The Biography of Tao-liang (596-645) says that he entered the Order in his fifteenth year. His master instructed him to go to Fêng-lung Mountain to follows the monks there in order to learn reciting the Sūtras. As he was a novice, the thirty monks of that mountain told him to hull five 'Tou (pecks)' of millet a day for them. Millet, as well as wheat, is one of the main items of food in Northern China, so I assume that there probably was a kitchen in that nameless monastery or shrine of Fêng-lung Mountain.

4. This kitchen is recorded in the Biography of Narendrayaśas, which says that this kitchen was specially prepared for the private use of this Indian monk. I assume that there would also have been another kitchen for common use in that monastery.

5. This kitchen is recorded in the Biography of Sêng-ch'ou (480-560). The Biography says that Sêng-ch'ou knew, through his power of prediction, that Emperor Wên-hsüan (R. 550-560) of the Northern Ch'i Dynasty, would come to kill him very shortly, for the emperor had listened to a denunciation of him. Then he came to the kitchen of his monastery, told the monk in charge there to prepare a great many vegetable dishes in order to welcome an honourable guest and his men, who would arrive the next day. So I assume that this monastic kitchen probably existed during or before the regime of the above-mentioned emperor.

6. The existence of this monastic kitchen is mentioned indirectly in the Biography of Fa-hsi (571-631). It says that after Fa-hsi entered the Order in his seventh year, he served the forty monks of this monastery by cooking in day-time. I assume that the kitchen existed before 565, the date when Fa-hsi became a Śrāmaṇera.

7. The Biography of Fa-shang (495-580) says that in the hey-day of the Northern Ch'i Dynasty, the kitchen of this monastery had three times supplied the meals for all the soldiers led by the emperor (whose name is unknown), when he came to worship the Buddha. When the Northern Ch'i was conquered by the Northern Chou Dynasty in 577, this monastery was exempted from the persecution by Emperor Wu of this Dynasty.

8. Cf. Chapter III, Section III, note 264.

9. The Biography of T'an-yung (555-639) says that T'an-yung arrived at Lu-chou in his fortieth year (595), so I assume that the kitchen of this monastery existed before 595.

10. The Biography of Chih-i says that Chih-i planned a new hall, shrine and kitchen for this monastery and told his monastic members that the crown prince of the Sui Dynasty would reconstruct the monastery in accordance with his plan. Later this project was completed as he predicted. According to the Sui Shu, Prince Yang Kuang (later Emperor Yang) was appointed crown prince in 601 (Vol. I, p. 33a). Therefore I suppose that the kitchen would have existed after 601.

11. The Biography of T'an-hsüen (flor. 612-7) says that when Prince Yang Liang (+ 618) rebelled in the Sui Dynasty, this monastery had been used as the kitchen of the prince's army for the preparation of rations. According to the Sui Shu, the rebellion arose after the death of Emperor Wên in 612 (Vol. II, p. 612).

12. The existence of the kitchen is alluded to in the Biography of Tao-p'an (532-615). It says that Tao-p'an used to go to the village to beg for millet and wheat, storing them in Mt. Chung-nan, where he lived. When the road of this mountain was sealed off by heavy snow, the ascetics who were trapped on the mountain were fed by Tao-p'an. I assume that there was a kitchen in his establishment.

13. The kitchen is mentioned in the Biography of T'an-hsüen. It says that at the end of the Ta-yeh Era (ca. 615-7) of Emperor Yang of the Sui, China fell into disorder once again. This monastery guarded the monastic gates at lunch time in order to keep homeless Buddhist ascetics from coming for a meal.

14. The Biography of Hui-yen (590-618) says that before Hui-yen's death he predicted that his monastery would be reconstructed, and pointed out where the new hall, the new storeroom, the new kitchen, etc.,

would be in the future. After his death, some laymen donated money to reconstruct the monastery exactly as he had predicted.

15. The kitchen of this monastery is indirectly recorded in the Biography of Ling-jun (n.d.). It says that at the end of the Sui Dynasty (ca. 617-9), China once again suffered from disorder and starvation. In this perilous period, Ling-jun accepted monks from elsewhere into his monastery and shared the cooked rice, beans and wheat equally with them.

16. The Biography of Ching-lin (565-640) says that this monastery was built in 620.

17. The Biography of Hsüan-wan says that Hsüan-wan went to the kitchen every day in the early period of the Wu-tê Era (ca. 619-621) to ask whether there was sufficient food for the whole monastery or not.

18. The kitchen of this monastery is recorded in the Biography of Ming-kung (538-622).

19. The Biography of Fa-jung (594-657) says that Fa-yung came to Niu-t'ou Hall to set up his shrine in 643.

20. The kitchen of this monastery is recorded indirectly in the Biography of Chih-pao (flor. 665). It says that Chih-pao kept the leftovers of each meal. When the leftovers amounted to one pint he watched his attendant to cook them and then told him to eat them.

21. The Biography of Ācārya Ch'ên (n.d.) says that once, when this monastery faced difficulties, Ācārya Ch'ên went to the White Horse Spring, stood on the bank of the spring and pointing at the water, predicted that: "The kitchen will be here, the treasury there ..." Overnight, the water of the spring subsides leaving the desired land for the enlargement 'project'. The monastic members followed the Ācārya's words and constructed the said buildings, and the monastery gradually prospered. The Ācārya also made another prediction: "Sixteen years from now, there will be a fool who will build a two-story pavilion to the south of our monastery and that building will give rise to a lot of litigation." This prediction came true in the middle of the Yung-hui Era (ca. 652).

22. The kitchen is indirectly recorded in the Biography of Niu-yün (673-735). It says that Niu-yün became a novice in his twelfth year,

and he was told to collect water and firewood by his master. Apparently this was for use in the kitchen.

23. The Biography of Shên-ying (n.d.) says that Shên-ying went to this monastery in 716 and settled in its kitchen.

24. The existence of the kitchen in this monastery is alluded to in the Biography of Tai-i (flor. 766). It says that Tao-i went to this monastery in the middle of K'ai-yüan Era (ca. 726), and lived in the Dining Hall for Rice-gruel Eating. He was told to carry firewood by the Tien-tso (bursar) of this monastery. I suppose the firewood was used for boiling the rice-gruel or for other cooking.

25. The kitchen of this shrine is recorded in the Biography of Mu-sang (n.d.). It says that Mu-sang came to China from Silla in 728. Later he went to Ch'êng-tu from Ch'ang-an and stayed in this shrine.

26. This kitchen is indirectly recorded in the Biography of T'ien-jen (739-824). It says that T'ien-jen entered the Order when he was a teenager and served Master Hsi-ch'ien (well known as Shih-t'ou, 700-790) as a cook for three years. According to the Biography of Hsi-ch'ien, the Hêng-shan Monastery was established at about 764 and Hsi-ch'ien made a shrine on a rocky terrace that was nearby (SKSC, p. 764a). If the monks of Hêng-shan Monastery had to survive by begging every day and kept no kitchen in their establishment, they probably would not have tolerated a neighbouring monk to cook near them for three years. Therefore I assume that there would also have been a kitchen in Hêng-shan Monastery.

27. The kitchen of this shrine is recorded in the Biography of Yün-tê (died ca. 972).

TABLE III

The Labours of the Śrāmaṇera in the Chinese Monastic Order that are recorded in the KSC, HKSC and SKSC

There are twenty-nine cases of Śrāmaṇera doing manual labour found in the three 'Biographies of Eminent Buddhist Monks'.

Abbreviations:			
	AE.	Age of Entering the Order	
	Ch.	Childhood	
	Te.	Teenage	
	C.	Cultivating the Farming Lands of the Establishment	3 cases
	K.	Kitchen Duties	3
	F.	Collecting Firewood	4
	W.	Drawing Water	4
	S.	Serving the Saṅgha	3
	A.	Attending his Master	11
	L.	Hard Labour	7

Among them are:			
	K, L.	together	1 case
	F, W.	"	4
	C.	only	3
	K.	"	2
	S.	"	3
	A.	"	11
	L.	"	5

Name	AE	Date	Labours							Text	Page	Note
			C	K	F	W	S	A	L			
Tao-an	12	314-385	o							KSC	351c	
Fa-hsien	3	died before 423	o							"	337b	
P'u-an	Ch.	530-609					o			HKSC	681a	
Fa-t'ung	Ch.	died ca.620							o	"	663a-b	1
Fa-hsi	7	571-631		o						"	587a	
Ching-lin	7	565-640	o							"	590a	
Chih-ch'ao	27	571-641		o					o	"	592a	
Tao-liang	15	flor.645							o	"	619b	2
Hsiu Lü-shih	Ch.	flor.667						o		SKSC	794c	3
Chiang-mo-tsang Shih	Ch.	flor. 706					o			"	760a	4
Chih-hsien	Ch.	flor. 742			o	o				"	763b	
Niu-yün	12	673-735			o	o				"	843b	
Chên-liang	Te.	701-788			o	o				"	771a	
Yin-fêng	Ch.	flor. 810						o		"	847a	
Hui-lin		737-820						o		"	738a-b	
T'ien-jan	Te.	739-824		o						"	773b	
Tao-hsing	Te.	731-825?			o	o				"	841a	5
Fa-hsing	7	+ 828						o		"	882c	
P'u-yüan	10	748-834							o	"	775a	
Ch'i-an	Ch.	+ 841							o	"	776a-b	
Ling-yu	Te.	771-853							o	"	777b	
Hsüan-chien	Te.	782-865						o		"	778b	
Ch'u-nan	Ch.	819-888					o			"	817c	
Hui-kung	17	820-903					o			"	783b	
Hêng-t'ung	13	834-905						o		"	783a	
Wei-ching	30	flor.909						o		"	784a	
Wu-chi	13	+ 925						o		"	898a	
Kuang-yü		895-960						o		"	885c	
Yung-an	Te.	911-974						o		"	887a	

Notes to Table III

1. His Biography says that he was physically very weak and was looked down upon by his fellow novices. One day he prayed in front of the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara to beg for release from this contempt. Then he recited the Avalokiteśvarasūtra day and night continuously. A year later, he dreamed that three donkeys, each of them carrying a full load of noddles, came to him. He ate one load of noodles in the dream and when he awoke he found that he was very strong. This story indicates the fact that a novice in an establishment probably had to participate in some manual labour for which strong muscle was needed.

2. In his Biography, Tao-hsüan, author of HKSC, states: "... now in the nineteenth year of Chên-kuan Era (645) he is aged seventy-seven ...."

3. His Biography says that he had been a guest of Tao-hsüan (596-667).

4. His Biography says that he visited Master Shên-hsiu of the Northern Sect of Ch'an Buddhism and debated with him. According to Ch'en Yüan's Dates of Monks, Shên-hsiu died in 706 (p. 101).

5. For his date see Ch'en Yüan, Dates of Monks, p. 134.

TABLE IV

Buddhist Monks who received a good education before entering the Order as recorded in the KSC, HKSC and SKSC.

This table consists of 119 people. It and Table V may reflect the fact that the Chinese tradition had already to a considerable extent infiltrated into the Monastic Order in China through the hands of those monks. The way of life and the way of thinking, etc. of the Buddhist priests would therefore have been influenced by the native Chinese traditions.

Monks who are described as being learned in the secular studies, but of whom it is not mentioned whether they became men of letters before or after entering the monkhood, are excluded from these two tables.

Abbreviations:
- C. Classics
- H. History
- P. Philosophy
- L. Literature
- O. Others (like painting, music, medicine, etc.)
- W. Without specialisation

(For the other abbreviations see Table III).

The totals for each of the branches of knowledge are as follows:

C.	65 cases
H.	20
P.	14
L.	15
O.	17
W.	35

These branches of learning are distributed amongst the 119 monks as follows:

C. only	32 cases	C, O.	together 2 cases
H.	nil	C, H, P.	" 3
P. "	11	C, H, L.	" 1
L. "	5	C, H, O.	" 1
O. "	8	C, H, P, O.	" 1
C, H.	together 11 cases	C, H, L, O.	" 1
C, P.	" 9	H, P, L.	" 1
C, L.	" 4	H, L.	" 1
		H, O.	" 1
		L, O.	" 2

Name	AE	Date	Specialisation						Text	Page	Note
			C	H	P	L	O	W			
Pai-yüan	Te.	flor.304-6	o						KSC	327a	1
Chu Tao-chien	18	306-374			o				"	347c	2
Tao-an	12	314-385						o	"	351c	3
Fa-yü	ca.16	flor. 385	o						"	356a	
Chu Fa-ya		flor. 385						o	"	347a	4
Sêng-fu	Te.	flor. 385	o	o					"	404b	5
Hui-ch'ih	18	337-412		o		o			"	361b	
Sêng-chao	ca.16	384-414	o	o	o				"	365a	
Hui-yüan	21	334-416	o		o				"	357c	
Chu Tao-shêng	ca.15	+ 434						o	"	366b	6
Hui-yen	16	363-443	o						"	367b	
Tao-chao	18	388-453	o	o		o			"	415c	
Sêng-chin	ca.Te.	died ca.475	o		o				"	373c	
Tao-wên	16	died ca.475					o		"	372b-c	
Sêng-ch'üan	16	Liu-Sung (421-479)						o	"	369c	
Sêng-yüan	Te.	414-481						o	"	375a	7
Sêng-hui	Te.	408-486						o	"	378b	8
Fa-yüan		414-500					o		"	417a	
Tao-ch'ung	ca.30	flor.500-12	o						HKSC	482b	9
Fa-lang	21	+ 513					o		"	477b	
Pao-ch'ang	18	flor.495-515						o	"	426b	10
Hui-yüeh	17	459-542	o	o					"	468b	
Sêng-ch'ou	28	480-560	o	o					"	553b-c	
Pao-t'uan	24	492-561					o		"	486c	
Hung-yen	ca.Te.	504-564	o	o					"	476b	
Hui-ming	ca.15	513-568	o						"	561a	
Hui-shun	25	550-577	o						"	484b	11
Ching-ai	17	534-578	o	o					"	625c	
Fa-shang	12	495-58o						o	"	485a	12
T'an-yen	23	503-581						o	"	487b	13
An-lin	25	507-583	o	o	o		o		"	480b	
Pao-ch'iung	Ch.	504-584						o	"	478c	14
Hui-pu	21	518-587					o		"	480c	15
T'an-yen	16	+ 588				o			"	488a	
Hui-kêng	ca.18	515-589	o						"	494a-b	

Name	AE	Date	Specialisation						Text	Page	Note
			C	H	P	L	O	W			
Hui-yüan	13	523-592						o	HKSC	490a	16
Na Ch'an-shih	ca. 21	flor. 593	o						"	552c	
Hui-pi	22	537-599						o	"	494c	17
Chih-shun	After 20	533-604	o				o		"	569c	
Ling-yü	15	518-605	o						"	495b	
Hui-hai	14	541-606						o	"	509c	18
T'an-ch'ien	21	542-607	o		o				"	571b-c	
Ling-ta		died ca. 605-7	o	o					"	672c	
Hsüan-ching	27	+ 610						o	"	569b	
Chên-kuan	ca.16	538-611	o			o			"	701c	
Ching-hsüan		569-611	o		o				"	502a	
Chih-lin	16	544-613	o		o				"	503c	
Tao-p'an	19	532-615	o	o					"	516c	
Pên-chi	16	562-615	o	o					"	578a	
Ching-pien	Te.	died ca. 616-7	o		o				"	676c	
Sêng-kuang	ca.15	died ca 619-20						o	"	694c	
Sêng-luan		flor.618-21	o						"	501a	19
Hui-ch'uan	after 16	flor.619-21				o	o		"	689c	20
Fa-yüan		died ca.622					o		"	664a	
Tao-chieh	16	573-627					o		"	529a	
Ming-chan	ca.17	559-628	o	o					"	632c	
Wŏn-gwang	25	532-630		o	o	o			"	523c	
Sêng-yung	13	543-631						o	"	583c	21
Shan-hui		587-635				o	o		"	688b	
Tao-chi	20	568-636	o						"	696a	
Hui-yün		564-637	o		o		o		"	533c	
Tao-yüeh	15	570-638	o						"	527a	
T'ang-yung	after 19	555-639						o	"	589a	
Hui-hsiao	after 18	568-640	o						"	618a	
Chih-ch'ao	27	571-641	o						"	592a	

Name	AE	Date	Specialisation						Text	Page	Note
			C	H	P	L	O	W			
Sêng-pien	ca.18	568-642						o	HKSC	540a-b	22
Hui-szŭ	after 15	588-642	o	o		o	o		"	593b	
Shên-su		571-643	o			o			"	530a	23
Fa-ch'ang	19	566-644						o	"	540c	
Hui-pin	23	574-645	o				o		"	591b	
Hui-ching	14	578-645	o			o			"	442a	
Fa-yung	ca.19	594-657	o						"	603c	
Hsüan-tsang	ca.11	602-664						o	"	446c	24
Tao-hsüan	16	596-667				o			SKSC	790b	25
Shên-hsiu	ca.Te.	+ 706	o	o					"	755c	
Bodhiruci	16	+ 777					o		"	720b	
I-hsing	Te.	+ 727						o	"	732c	26
Tao-yin	ca.Te.	668-740						o	"	734b	27
Fa-wan	Ch.	679-743	o		o				"	761b-c	28
Shên-wu		688-751						o	"	814a	29
Shên-hui	ca.Te.	668-760	o	o	o				"	765c	
Yen-chün	ca.19	died after 767						o	"	798a	30
T'an-i	ca.16	692-771	o						"	798a	
Liang-pên	ca.30	717-777	o						"	735a	31
Ta-i	12	691-779	o						"	800a	
Chan-jan	ca.20	711-782						o	"	739b	32
Chên-liang		701-778						o	"	771a	33
Chien-chên	16	718-788	o						"	736b	
Yüan-chên	Te.	705-790	o						"	838c	
Fa-ch'in	28	714-792	o	o					"	764b	
Ling-t'an	ca.22	709-816						o	"	767a	34
Tao-shu	ca.40	died ca.825	o						"	765a	
Tao-hsing	ca.16	731-825						o	"	841a	
Fa-tsang		died ca. 825-6		o			o		"	840b	
Chên-kung	ca.Te.	740-829	o						"	775b	
I-tsê		751-830	o	o			o		"	768b	
Ming-chioh		+ 831						o	"	774b	35
Chien-k'ung		flor.834-5				o			"	840b	
Tsung-mi	ca.28	780-841	o						"	741c	

Name	AE	Date	Specialisation						Text	Page	Note
			C	H	P	L	O	W			
Hêng-chêng		died before 842						o	SKSC	777a	
Hsing-yen	ca.Te.	+ 849	o						"	883a	
Huan-chung	ca.25	780-862						o	"	778a	
Jih-chao	ca.Te.	died ca.866	o		o				"	778b	
Ts'êng-jên	ca.28	813-871				o			"	877a	
Yüan-ch'êng	ca.Te.	+ 887						o	"	883a	
Hui-mu	22	811-898	o						"	895c	
Pên-chi	19	804-901	o						"	786b	
Hui-kung	ca.20	820-903	o						"	783b	
Hêng-t'ung	13	834-905	o						"	783a	
Kuei-yü	19	862-936	o						"	746c	
Tao-chou	ca.Te.	864-941	o						"	859a	
Shan-ching	27	858-946				o			"	786c	
Hsi-chioh	25	864-948	o						"	810b	36
Hêng-ch'ao	37	877-949	o			o			"	749a	
Sêng-chien	ca.50	828-958?						o	"	851b	37
Kuang-yü	ca.19	895-960						o	"	885c	
Ch'ang-chioh	19	916-971	o						"	886c	
Yen-shou	44	904-975						o	"	887b	38
Hsiao Tsung-yüan	ca.Te.	898-980	o						"	899a	

Notes to Table IV

1. His father, Wan Ta-wei, was famous for his Confucianism.
2. He was from the Wang Clan and Generalissimo Wang Tun (266-324) was his elder brother. For Wang Tun's Biography see Chin Shu, Vol. 3, pp. 1251a-1258a.
3. He was from a family with a Confucian tradition and he started to undertake secular studies at the age of seven.
4. He was well versed in secular learning when young and he only understood the Buddhist doctrines when he grew up. I believe that he received his secular education before entering the Order. He was a contemporary of Master Tao-an.
5. He was very poor before he entered the Order. He used to burn firewood in place of candles in order to read books and therefore became well versed in the classics and histories by the age of sixteen, before he became a disciple of Master Tao-an.
6. He was from a gentry family.
7. He was a descendant of Chao Yen (171-245), the Szŭ-k'ung (Master of Works) of the Ts'ao-Wei Dynasty. Sêng-yüan was very fond of reading when he was young, before he entered the Order. For Chao Yen's Biography see Ch'en Shou's San-kuo Chi or 'The History of the Three Kingdoms', Vol. 1, pp. 334b-339a.
8. He was from a Confucian family, that of Huang-fu Mi (215-282), one of the leading Confucians of the Chin Dynasty. For Huang-fu Mi's Biography see Chin Shu, Vol. 2, pp. 682a-686b.
9. He was one of the students of Hsiung An-shêng (+ 578), a leading Confucian scholar of the Northern Ch'i Dynasty (for Hsiung's Biography see Pei Shih, Vol. 3, pp. 1220a-1221a). Tao-ch'ung had already become a teacher of the classics in his thirtieth year before he entered the Order.
10. He was a scribe before his eighteenth year, the year he entered the Order. He had copied books for others in order to gain access to the books he could not afford to buy.
11. He was from the Ts'ui Clan, the leading gentry house of the Northern

Dynasties. He himself was interested in the Confucian traditions when he was a teenager before he entered the Order.

12. He received a Confucian education from the age of five.

13. He had demonstrated his intelligence in his seventh year when he had entered the secular school. He was recommended as a 'Hsiu-ts'ai' or 'Cultivated Talent' by the governor of his own prefecture (the name of that place is not given) at the age of eighteen.

14. He was from an official family. Both Hsü Yung, his grandfather, and Hsü Sêng-ta, his father, were Confucians.

15. He was from a military family and he himself was experienced in military matters.

16. He entered school in his seventh year.

17. He was from an official family. All his relatives had expected that he would become a high-ranking official before he decided to enter the Order.

18. Before entering the Order, he had browsed through the Confucian scriptures since his childhood.

19. His biography is appended to the Biography of Sêng-ts'an, his master. Sêng-luan was already well versed in the Li (Book of Ritual) and Tso Chuan (Tso's Interpretation to the Annals of Spring and Autumn) by his tenth year.

20. He was from the royal family of the Liang Dynasty and entered the Order after his wife had passed away.

21. He was from a Confucian family. Both his grandfather and father were local governors.

22. He received a primary education in his seventh year.

23. He was from the Wang Clan of T'ai-yüan, so his specialisation in the Li and I (The Book of Changes) and his knowledge of literature was probably due to the traditions of his family.

24. Ch'en K'ang, his grandfather, was a professor of the National Academy of the Northern Ch'i Dynasty, and Ch'en Hui, his father, was well versed in Confucian studies.

25. He was from a family of a high-ranking official (Cf. Chapter I, Section V, note 427). Tao-hsüan had composed poems since he was nine.

26. He had demonstrated his cleverness in reciting books before entering the Order.

27. Before entering the Order, he had participated in the Official Examination and attained the degree of Chin-shih.

28. His biography is appended to the Biography of Ling-chu. He was from a Confucian family and Fêng Tzŭ-t'ung, his father, was well versed in the philosophies of other Chinese schools.

29. He was from a Confucian family and he had been a student of the National Academy.

30. He had attended the Official Examination for the degree of Chin-shih in his nineteenth year.

31. He was from a Confucian family.

32. Idem.

33. His biography is appended to the Biography of Hêng-yüeh. Chên-liang was from a Confucian family and his own literary abilities were considerable.

34. He was from an official family. He attended the primary Official Examination in his seventh year and was then appointed to the post of one of the Crown Prince's Assistants in his thirteenth year.

35. He was from a Confucian family.

36. He was from a Confucian family. In the latter period of the T'ang Dynasty, his family was impoverished by being robbed many times and he had to serve as a scribe for a livelihood before he entered the Order.

37. He was an official before he entered the Order.

38. He was a military officer charged with providing military supplies before he entered the Order.

TABLE V

Buddhist monks who became men of secular education after having entered the Order recorded in the KSC, HKSC and SKSC

Abbreviations: the same as in Table IV.

This table consists of 78 people. The total of the branches of knowledge is as follows:

C.	39 cases
H.	23
P.	19
L.	36
O.	26
W.	1

These branches of learning are distributed amongst the 78 monks as follows:

C.	only	11 cases
H.	"	1
P.		nil
L.	"	11
O.	"	9
C, H.	together	4
C, P.	"	5
C, L.	"	6
C, H, P.	"	2
C, H. O.	"	1
C, P. O.	"	2
C, L. O.	"	2
C, H, P, L.	"	1
C, H, P, O.	"	1
C, H, P. L, O.	"	1
H, P.	"	3
H, L.	"	2
H, O.	"	1
H, P. L.	"	3
H, L. O.	"	1
P, O.	"	1
L, O.	"	6

Name	AE	Date	Specialisation C	H	P	L	O	W	Text	Page	Note
K'ang Sêng-hui	ca.10	died ca. 280	o			o	o		KSC	325a	
Dharmarakṣa	8	died ca. 304	o						"	326c	
Yu Tao-sui	16	flor. 307					o		"	350b	1
Sêng-chi		flor. 385-6						o	"	362b	
T'an-hui	12	323-395	o	o					"	356b	
Tao-yung	12	flor.401-13	o						"	363b	2
Sêng-lüeh	Te.	died ca.414-5	o						"	363b	
Sêng-han	Ch.	died after 453	o	o			o		"	370b	3
Hui-ch'ü		died ca.363-4		o			o		"	416a	
Sêng-ch'ü		flor. 465		o		o			"	401a	4
T'an-kuang		flor.465-472	o			o	o		"	416b	5
Hsüan-ch'ang	Te.	416-484	o		o		o		"	377a	
Hui-fên	12	407-485	o		o				"	416b-c	
T'an-chih		409-487	o	o	o				"	414b	
Fa-yüan		409-489	o						"	376c	
Fa-kuei	Te.	+ 489	o	o					"	393b	
Fa-an	7	454-498					o		"	380a	
T'an-fei	Te.	433-508	o		o				"	382c	
Sêng-shêng	Te.	died ca.510	o						"	381a	6
T'an-wu Tsui		flor. 517	o						HKSC	624b	7
Hui-ch'ao	8	+ 526					o		"	468a	
Sêng-min	7	467-527	o						"	461c	
Ling-hsün	Te.	died ca.550-2				o	o		"	484c	
T'an-yüan	Ch.	died ca.575		o	o	o			"	608c	8
Sêng-mêng	Ch.	507-588	o						"	631a	
Tao-ch'êng	Te.	532-599		o		o			"	611a	
Fa-yün		570-604				o			"	703c	
Hui-chioh	8	554-606				o			"	516c	
Fa-ch'êng	Te.	+ 606		o		o			"	499c	
Yen-tsung	10	557-610		o	o	o			"	463c	
Ching-yeh	Te.	564-616					o		"	517c	
Ching-t'oh	Te.	555-617				o	o		"	519a	
Hai-shun	15	589-618	o						"	524b	9
Ming-ts'an	10	died ca.621	o	o					"	669a	
Chih-chou	8	556-662		o		o	o		"	580b	

Name	AE	Date	Specialisation C	H	P	L	O	W	Text	Page	Note
Chih-k'ai	15	549-623		o	o				HKSC	705a	
Chih-pao	Te.	died ca.625-6	o						"	613a	
Shên-ch'iung	Te.	566-630	o	o	o		o		"	526b	
Kuan-ting	7	561-632	o			o			"	584b	
Hui-tsin	7	+ 634					o		"	615b	
Ching-tao		flor. 624	o	o					"	615c	
Hui-tsê	9	580-636	o			o	o		"	440c & 441c	
Tao-sun		died ca. 637		o	o				"	532c	
Fa-kung	Ch.	568-640				o			"	536a	
Fa-lin	Te.	572-642	o			o			"	636b	
Hui-ch'ih	Te.	572-642	o	o	o				"	537c	
Fa-hu	15	384-643					o		"	530c	10
Hsüan-hsü		died ca.643				o	o		"	531a	
Hui-hsi	Ch.	flor. 645				o			"	594c	11
Hui-hsüan		571-649		o	o	o			"	539a	
Tao-yin	ca.10	587-658		o	o				SKSC	717b	12
Yüan-hsiang	7	+ 661				o			"	889b	
Tao-shih	12	died after 668		o					"	726c	13
Yin-tsung	Te.	627-713	o		o				"	731b	
Hsüan-lang	9	673-754	o		o				"	875c	
I-hsüan	Ch.	flor.755-6	o			o			"	800b	
Ling-i	9	728-762				o			"	799b	
Ch'ing-chiang	Te.	flor. 773				o			"	802a	
Ju-ching		flor. 778-81	o			o			"	801a	14
Shên-yung	12	710-788	o			o			"	815b-c	
Chiao-jan	Te.	died before 792	o	o	o	o			"	891c	15
Hsüan-yen	Ch.	743-800				o			"	893b	
Hui-lin		737-820	o	o			o		"	738a	
Tao-piao	9	740-823				o			"	803c-804a	
Ch'êng-kuan	11	738-839	o	o	o	o	o		"	737a	16
Sêng-ch'eh	Ch.	flor.870				o			"	744c	
Ch'ang-ta		801-874			o		o		"	807c	
Yün-wên	ca.19	805-882	o			o			"	809a	

Name	AE	Date	Specialisation C	H	P	L	O	W	Text	Page	Note
Chih-hsüan	11	811-883	o		o				SKSC	743c	17
Wu-tso	18	died ca. 907-11	o		o		o		"	896c-897a	18
Kuan-hsiu	7	832-912				o	o		"	897a-b	
T'an-yü		flor.912	o			o			"	897b	
Chih-kui	ca.18	flor. 914				o	o		"	883c	
Wu-chi	13	+ 925					o		"	898a	
Hsi-yin	Ch.	died ca. 926-30				o	o		"	896b	
Hsing-t'ao	ca.12	895-956	o						"	871b	
Chih-chüan	9	876-958					o		"	750c	
Wên-i	7	885-958				o			"	788b	

Notes to Table V

1. His Biography says: ".....(he) entered the Order and followed Lan-kung (i.e. Yu Fa-lan, n.d.) as a disciple. He was well versed both in the inner (Buddhist) and outer (secular) studies ....". I assume, therefore, that he probably obtained his secular knowledge after entering the Order.

2. See Chapter III, Section II, note 89.

3. His Biography neither mentions his social status before entering the Order, nor when he entered it, but just says: "....he was diligent in his childhood, paid attention to the Classics, history, astronomy and mathematics. When he grew up, he grasped the Buddhist doctrines ....." This is followed by a description of his religious career. Extrapolating from the example that is given in note 2, I assume that he entered the Order in his childhood and received his secular education in the Order.

4. His Biography says: ".....(he) excelled in the SVSTVDV, and he was well versed in history and literature ...." From the structure of the sentence, I assume the author of the KSC to imply that Sêng-ch'ü received his secular education after having entered the Order.

5. His Biography says: ".....(he) followed his master to stay in Ch'ang-sha Monastery of the Chiang-ling Prefecture. He was fond of the Classics and poetry....." From the structure of these two sentences I assume that he probably received his secular education after having entered the Order.

6. His Biography does not say when he entered the Order, but simply says: ".....(he was) witty and clever when young, and he studied industriously. Therefore, he had a thorough grasp of the Sāṅkhya philosophy and was also well versed in other scriptures ..... he was venerated by the Confucians for he had a particularly thorough grasp of the secular classics....". I assume his achievements in secular learnings would have been established by the time he entered the Order.

7. His Biography does not mention when he entered the Order, but simply says: "He had a thorough grasp both of the Abstruse (i.e. Buddhist)

and Confucian learning ...." I assume that he probably received his Confucian education when he became a Buddhist monk.

8. His Biography mentions that T'an-yüan was well versed in both history and secular philosophies in the first place. It also says that since his childhood, T'an-yüan was very famous for his debating skill in the lecturing assemblies on Buddhist doctrines. It never indicates when he entered the Order. From the above-mentioned context I assume that he received his secular education after having entered the Order.

9, He was from a poor family. In his fifteenth year he found that there seemed to be no chance for him to receive an education in the secular world, so he had himself ordained as a monk in order to find such a chance.

10. He was from an official family, and his father Chao Hêng was one of the famous 'Wise Four'. Soon after having lost his father when he was twelve and his mother shortly afterwards, Fa-hu tried to go to the northern area of the Yellow River Valley to study Confucianism. Due to chance circumstances, he entered the Order. Therefore, I suppose that his scholarship advanced after he had become a monk.

11. He entered the Order in his childhood and he was famous for his poetry and prose. Evidently his secular knowledge was gained while he was in the Order.

12. First of all, his Biography mentions that he entered the Order in his seventh year, and then mentions how he studied the histories, the philosophies of Lao-tzŭ and Chuang-tzŭ. From the above context, it would appear that he received his secular education after he had entered the Order.

13. Tao-shih entered the Order in his twelfth year and was the author of the Fa-yüan Chu-lin (Forest of Gems in the Garden of Law), the famous Buddhist encyclopedia. I assume that his secular scholarship was gained after he had entered the Order. According to traditional Chinese bibliographies, encyclopedias belong to the category of 'History'.

14. His Biography says that "....(he) had a thorough grasp of the Vinaya ....", and then says that he was also ".... well versed in Confucian scriptures...." From the above, I suppose that Ju-ching had learnt his secular knowledge after having entered the Order.

15. Even though his Biography says that he was a lineal descendant in the tenth generation from Hsieh Ling-yün (385-443), the famous poet, it continues to say that: "..... he heard of the rules of Vinaya under Disciplinarian Shou-chih, but he paid most of his attention to the poetry ...." From the context I suppose that he found his chance to exert his talent for poetry after he had entered the Order. His forebear Hsieh Ling-yün could have had no direct influence on his scholarship.

16. His Biography says that he entered the Order in his eleventh year, and then mentions that he was very learned in the classics, philosophy, history, etymology, etc. Evidently, these various secular disciplines were learnt after he had entered the Order.

17. Even though his Biography says that he had composed a poem on the topic of flowers in his fifth year, it also says that "... (he) also studied the secular scriptures and had a thorough grasp of the Confucian classics and the philosophies of the non-Confucian schools..." in the days after he had entered the Order. Therefore, his secular education was probably gained mainly during his monkhood.

18. His Biography says that his own mother acted as his tutor in his childhood. After entering the Order he browsed through the scriptures of Confucianism and Taoism. Notwithstanding the primary education he had received from his mother, his scholarship in secular studies would have been mainly gained after he had entered the Order.

TABLE VI

Monks who despised wealth recorded in the KSC, HKSC and SKSC

There are one hundred and seven cases to be found in these 'Biographies of Eminent Buddhist Monks'. In the table the serial numbers showing the eminent activities are as follows:

1.	Who led a life of integrity (including not visiting high-ranking officials and members of the wealthy clans	30 cases
2.	Who refused donations.	8
3.	Who handed in all his received donations to the Monastic Order	2
4.	Who handed in all received donations to his own establishment	5
5.	Who made use of the donations he received to establish religious merits; such as copying out a new set of Chinese Tripitaka, casting images of the Buddha, organising an inexhaustible treasury in order to leng money to the poor, etc.	15
6.	Who built a new monastery or re-decorated his own monastery with the donations he received	7
7.	Who shared the donations he received with his fellow monks or novices and kept nothing for himself	15
8.	Who exhausted the donations he received to help the poor and the sick	25

These items are distributed as follows:

1, 2	together	2 cases
1, 2, 7	"	1
1, 3	"	1
1, 4	"	2
1, 5	"	1
1, 5, 8	"	2
1, 6	"	1
1, 7	"	1

1, 7, 8	together	2 cases
1, 8	"	2
2, 8	"	1
4, 8	"	1
5, 6	"	2
6, 8	"	2
7, 8	"	6

And also there are:

1	only	14 cases
2	"	4
3	"	1
4	"	2
5	"	5
6	"	2
7	"	6
8	"	5

Name	Date	Items								Text	Page	Note
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8			
Tao-mêng	411-475						o		o	KSC	374a	
Tao-sung	flor. 475								o	"	408b	
Sêng-chin	died ca.475						o			"	373c	
Chih-tao	412-484	o								"	401c	
Sêng-yüan	414-484		o						o	"	377c	
Hui-chin	401-485					o				"	407c	
Tao-ta	flor. 488	o								HKSC	460a	
Fa-ching	437-500					o				KSC	417b	
Fa-ch'ang	flor. 503-4	o								HKSC	474a-b	
Chih-hsin	446-506					o	o			"	460c	
Hui-k'ai	469-507							o	o	"	473a	
Hui-shao	455-508							o		"	471a	
Hui-kuang	flor. 508	o						o	o	"	607b	1
Chih-tsang	458-522							o	o	"	466c	
Saṅghapala	460-524	o					o			"	426a	
Tao-ch'an	458-527								o	"	607b	
Sêng-fan	476-555							o		"	484a	
Pao-t'uan	512-561		o							"	486c	
Sêng-shih	476-563							o	o	"	558a	
Tao-p'ing	493-564	o								"	484c	
Hui-shun	N.Chi (550-577)	o						o	o	"	484b	
T'an-yin	" "	o								"	608c	
P'ien-chi	flor. 581				o					"	675b	
Narendrayaśas	490-589					o			o	"	432c	
Hui-yüan	523-592							o		"	492a	
T'an-ch'ung	515-594			o						"	568c	
Sêng-yüan	519-602	o							o	"	574b	
Shê-ti Szŭ-na	flor. 602					o				"	668c	2
Chih-k'uei	flor. 602	o								"	673c	
T'an-kuan	flor. 602-3	o		o						"	672c	
Fa-shun	519-603							o		"	575c	
Ling-yü	518-605	o	o					o		"	497b-c	
Ching-tuan	543-606	o	o					o		"	576c	
Hui-tsan	536-607		o							"	575a	3
T'an-ch'ien	542-607				o				o	"	574a	
Ching-yüan	flor.605-7	o								"	547a	

Name	Date	Items								Text	Page	Note
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8			
Sêng-chao	529-611		o							HKSC	578c	
Chih-t'ung	548-611						o		o	"	577b	
Fa-yün	died ca.622					o			o	"	664a	
Chi-tsang	549-623					o			o	"	514a	
P'u-chi	died after 625	o	o							"	680c-681a	4
Fa-yen	546-636	o				o			o	"	704c	
Hsüan-wan	562-636	o				o				"	616b	
Ching-lin	564-640	o				o			o	"	591a	
P'u-ming	died ca.641					o			o	"	586	5
Chih-kuan	566-643	o						o	o	"	543b-c	
Fa-hu	584-643								o	"	530c	
Fa-ch'ang	+ 644					o			o	"	541b	
Chih-t'ung	553-649	o								"	698a	6
Tao-yüeh	died ca.652	o								"	661c	
Ācārya T'ung	died ca.659							o		"	661a	7
Fa-lang	flor.662							o		SKSC	863b	
Kung-ch'ung	flor.665							o	o	HKSC	528c	8
T'ung-ta	flor.665					o				"	655c	9
Chih-t'se	flor.665	o								"	665a-b	10
Pao-hsiang	flor.665	o								"	690b	11
Û-sang	flor.669		o							SKSC	729b	12
Fa-shên	666-748	o			o					"	796b	
Tao-ch'eng	+ 803								o	"	806b	
Shên-ts'ou	744-817				o					"	807b	
Chih-yün	777-853	o							o	"	881a	
Ch'ing-kuan	flor.853	o			o					"	842b	
Chih-kuang	flor.898							o		"	882b	
Disciplinarian Ch'uan	T'ang (618-907)	o								"	796b	
T'ou-t'o	"	o	o							"	895c	
Ts'ung-li	847-925	o						o		"	809c-810a	
Hêng-chao	877-949	o								"	749b	
Hsing-t'ao	895-956	o								"	871b	
Yen-ch'ou	died ca.961-3					o				"	884c	
Yung-an	911-974								o	"	887a	

Notes to Table VI

1. See Chapter I, Section III, note 252.

2. His Biography says that after he had entered the Order he kept only a big sheet of cotton as garment, a water-jar and a bowl, even though he came from a very rich family.

3. See Chapter II, Section II, notes 210-211.

4. His Biography is appended to the Biography of P'u-chi, a senior priest of the Sui Dynasty who has the same name. It says that when he went to the Ch'ang-an area in the eighteenth year of the Wu-tê Era. The so-called Wu-tê Era has only nine years, so I suppose that he went to Ch'ang-an in the eighth year of this Era (625) and passed away after that year.

5. His Biography says that in his childhood he went to Mt. T'ien-t'ai to follow Master Chih-i as a novice in 582, and died in his eighty-sixth year. I assume that he entered the Order in his tenth year, so he would have passed away ca. 641.

6. See Chapter II, Section II, note 236.

7. He reached the age of eighty at the end of the Ch'ên-kuan Era (641-2), and died when he was over ninety years old. Therefore, I assume that he passed away about 659.

8. He was a contemporary of Tao-hsüan, author of the HKSC. Tao-hsüan's work was completed by 665.

9. A contemporary of Tao-hsüan.

10. A contemporary of Tao-hsüan.

11. A contemporary of Tao-hsüan.

12. See Chapter III, Section III, note 186.

TABLE VII

The Buddhist transgressors and their transgressions recorded in the KSC, HKSC and SKSC

There are sixty-one cases of transgressions found in the three 'Biographies of Eminent Buddhist Monks'. The serial number that shows the type of transgression in the table is as follows:

1.	De facto marriage	3 cases
2.	Stealing	2
3.	Robbery	1
4.	Murder attempt	1
5.	Killing creatures	2
6.	Swindling	1
7.	Drinking	16
8.	Meat eating	13
9.	Gambling	4
10.	Corruption	2
11.	Strayed from the worship of the Buddha	3
12.	Strayed from the Vinaya	7
13.	Perversion	6

The cases are distributed as follows:

1.	only	1 case
2.	"	1
7.	"	4
8.	"	2
11.	"	2
12.	"	2
13.	"	3
1, 5, 8	together	1
1, 8.	"	1
2, 7, 8.	"	1
3, 5, 7, 8, 9.	"	1
6, 10	"	1

7, 8.	together	7 cases
7, 9.	"	3
10, 12.	"	1
11, 12	"	1
12, 13.	"	3

The above-mentioned cases reveal the fact that even the authors of the 'Biographies of Eminent Buddhist Monks' could not deny the existence of transgressions amongst the members of the Order.

Transgressor	Date	Transgression 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Text	Page	Note
Kumārajīva	344-413	o	KSC	332c	
The two monks in the Western Ch'in State	flor.421	o o	"	397a-b	1
Pei-tu	+ 426	o o o	"	390a-b	
The monks and nuns in Pêng-ch'êng	flor. before 466	o	"	412b	2
The late Karmadāna of the Wa-kuan Monastery	Before 470	o o	"	407b-c	3
A late Śrāmaṇera of the Yün-mên Monastery in Shan-yin	Before 486	o	"	408a	4
Sêng-tsung	438-496	o	"	379c	
T'an-hsien	flor.504	o	HKSC	628b	
Hui-k'ai	469-507	o o	"	473a	
Tao-hêng	flor.512	o o	SKSC	889a-b	5
Pao-yüan	466-526	o o	HKSC	474c	
The fellow monks in the monastery where Hui-szŭ was ordained as a novice	before 535	o	"	562c	6
The contemporary priests of Chih-tsang	flor. 540	o	"	466b-c	
Fo-yü	flor. 559	o o	"	679b	7
Sêng-yüan	flor. 577	o o	"	649b-c	
Tao-hui	flor.581-2	o	"	613b	8
The first teacher of Tao-hsin	flor. 586	o	"	613b	9
Some monks contemporary with T'an-yen	flor.before 588	o o	"	489b	10
Sêng-kang	flor. 594	o	"	649c	11
Some monks contemporary with Hui-hsiang	flor.before 616-7	o	"	598a	12
The monks of the Ta Ch'an-ting Tao-ch'ang	flor.616-7	o o	"	612b	13

Transgessor	Date	Transgression 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Text	Page	Note
Some monastic members of the Shêng-yeh monastery	flor.around 621-2	o	HKSC	539c-540a	14
Yü-Fa-shih	flor.623	o	"	542b	15
The fellow-monks of the Shêng-kuang monastery in Ch'ang-an	flor.626	o o	"	613a	16
Fa-ya	flor.627	o o o	"	635a-b	17
The nun Hui-shang	flor.635	o o	"	618b-c	18
Ācārya Ch'ên	flor.around 638-9	o	"	660c	19
Kuei-chi	632-682	o o	SKSC	725c & 726a	
Kuang-ling Ta-shih	flor.799	o o o o o	"	833c	
Fa-chao	flor.821	o	"	868c	
Tung-ching K'ê-sêng	flor.821-4	o	"	869a	
Wang-ming and his fellow-monks of the Liang-shan monastery	flor.838	o o	"	847b	
Wei-kung	+ 895	o o	"	869b	
Ling-k'uei	n.d.	o o	"	869b	20
Shih-chien	Wu-yüeh (908-931)	o o	"	852a	
Tien-tien Shih	flor.943	o o	"	852c	
Wang Lo-han	died ca. 968-9	o o	"	852b	

Notes to Table VII

1. The account of these two monks is recorded in the Biography of Hsüan-kao (402-444). The Biography says that these two monks were so influential in the court of the Western Ch'in State, and that they strayed from the Vinaya and did everything they wanted to do. After Hsüan-kao was ordained into the Order in his twentieth year (421), he went to Western Ch'in from the Later Ch'in State. As Hsüan-kao was a learned monk, these two monks were jealous of him and vilified him to the king of this state. Hsüan-kao was then exiled.

2. The Biography of Fa-yüeh (n.d.) says that there was an eighteen 'Chih (about 14 feet)' high golden image of the Buddha in the Sung-wang Monastery of Pêng-ch'êng. If there was a disaster coming or if the monks and nuns of this area misbehaved, the image would perspire. The quantity of perspiration exuded from the image indicated how serious the disaster would be or how perverse the clergy were. Around 466, Pêng-ch'êng was occupied by the Northern Wei Dynasty. The northerners tried to remove the image to their own dominations, but failed, for even the ten thousand labourers they sent could not move it.

3. The account of this late Karmadāna is recorded in the Biography of Hui-kuo (395-470). The account says that once a ghost made a confession to Hui-kuo. The ghost confessed that he had been a Karmadāna of thisWa-kuan Monastery, and had fallen into the shape of an excrement-eating ghost for not having governed the conduct of the monastic members strictly in accordance with the Vinaya. The ghost also confessed that he had buried three thousand bronze coins under a persimmon tree and he asked Hui-kuo to uncover that money and use it for some religious purpose. As the late Karmadāna had hidden his money under a tree, I assume that this money had come from corruption.

4. The account of the late Śrāmaṇera is recorded in the Biography of Hung-ming (403-486). The account says that a boy-ghost confessed that he had been a Śrāmaṇera of this Yün-men Monastery, who had fallen into the privy (i.e. became an excrement-eating ghost) for committing the crime of stealing some food that people had placed in front of the image of the Buddha.

5. His account is recorded in the Biography of Hui-ning (n.d.). The account says that once Hui-ning died suddenly but he revived seven days later. Then Hui-ning told the people what he had seen in hell. Among the stories he told, one was about the late Tao-hêng of the Ch'an-lin Monastery. He said that he saw a jailer take Tao-hêng to Yama (God of the Dead) and say: "(This monk) persuaded the four classes (intellectual, farmer, artisan and merchant, i.e. people of all walks) to make all manner of scriptures (i.e. to copy out a new set of Chinese Tripiṭaka) and to prepare ten man-size images of the Buddha." Yama deliberated: ".... even though you pretended to prepare the Tripiṭaka and images, your aim was to obtain by swindle the people's money ..... I sentence you to be sent through the Gate of Darkness...." When Empress Dowager Ling née Hu (+ 528) heard this story, she issued an edict that monks and nuns were not allowed to hold scriptures and images and go wandering through the streets to beg for donations. According to Pei Shih, this empress dowager came to power in 512 (Vol. 1, pp. 82a and 228a).

6. This account is found in the Biography of Hui-szŭ (515-577). The Biography says that Hui-szŭ entered the Order as a novice in his teens. The monastery he entered was not a strict one. Once he dreamed that a monk-saint instructed him to be a strict vegetarian and to adhere to the rules of the Vinaya. Several years later, Hui-szŭ dreamed again that there were several hundred Indian monks in front of him and that the highest monk among them indicated that the Upasampada that Hui-szu received was not in accordance with the Vinaya. Then that eminent monk and thirty-two other Indian monks re-conferred him as an Upasampada according to the right procedure of the Karma in the dream. This story indicates that this monastery had strayed somewhat from the religious discipline. As a monk normally received his ordination into the Order in his twentieth year, I assume that the above-mentioned affair probably occurred around Hui-szŭ's twentieth year (535).

7. His account is appended to the Biography of Sêng-ai. Sêng-ai burned himself to death in 559.

8. His account is appended to the Biography of Chih-hsien (609-702). The Biography says that Chih-hsien returned to Shu (present Szechuan Province) soon after Prince Hsiu of the Shu State was enfeoffed and appointed governor-general of his own state in the Sui Dynasty.

According to Sui Shu, Prince Hsiu governed his State from 581 to 583 (Vol. 2, p. 610b). For Chih-hsien's dates see Li-t'ai Fa-pao Chi or 'The Biographies of the Pioneers of Ch'an Buddhism (anon. T. 2075)', p. 184b-c (this material was suggested to me by Mr. John Jorgensen).

9. This account is recorded in the Biography of Tao-hsin (580-651). The Biography says that Tao-hsin entered the Order in his seventh year (586). The master whom Tao-hsin followed was not so faithful to the Vinaya. Even though Tao-hsin remonstrated with him several times about this, the master did not listen. Nevertheless, Tao-hsin covertly behaved himself in accordance with the Vinaya.

10. This account is recorded in the Biography of T'an-yen (516-588). The Biography says that if any Śrāmaṇera committed a crime, T'an-yen would come to him in tears whilst counselling him in order to move that Śrāmaṇera to stop doing wrong.

11. This is recorded in the Biography of Hung-hsien (n.d.). The Biography says that in 594, Sêng-kang, a fellow monk of Hung-hsien, was haunted by a 'deity'. The deity scattered clothing, the quilt and the desk in Sêng-kang's room all over the place, and broke a bamboo stick, a fan and a ruler in the room into pieces. Then the voice of the invisible deity roared: "If you, Sêng-kang, do not prepare a good vegetable festival to offer to the Buddha, the Saṅgha and the Dharma, I will give you never-ending trouble." So Sêng-kang spent his own money to prepare the festival. This legend suggests that Sêng-kang probably did not often worship the Buddha.

12. The Biography of Hui-hsiang (died ca. 616-7) says that although Hui-hsiang only took one vegetarian meal a day, he still grew chubby and white throughout his eight 'Ch'ih (about six feet)' tall figure. One day Governor Li Shêng-ming of the Têng Prefecture came with his officials to the monastery of Hui-hsiang. When the governor saw Hui-hsiang's figure, he said to his men: "I suppose this monk eats one lamb a day. You see, he is so white and chubby." After making this derogatory comment, suddenly the governor lost control of his limbs so that he was unable to control his horse. Since the governor made the supposition that a chubby monk was probably a meat-eater, it hints that some of the monks of this period probably ate meat secretly.

13. The Biography of Ch h-lang (n.d.) says that from the time Chüeh-lang was appointed abbot of the Ta Ch'an-ting Tao-ch'ang (Bodhimandala) by an imperial edict around 616-7, he brought the ill-behaved members of this monastery to order.

14. See Chapter IV, Section I, note 38.

15. See ibid., note 48.

16. The Biography of Chih-pao (died ca. 626) says that after Chih-pao's death, he became the patron saint of his Shêng-kuang Monastery. One hundred days after his death, an old woman was smuggling wine and food (made of meat) in for the monks. When entering the gate, she was suddenly harmed by the patron saint of this monastery (i.e. the late Chih-pao), thereupon the old woman collapsed to the ground and died instantly. This legend suggests that some of the monks in this establishment did not strictly adhere to the Vinaya or vegetarianism.

17. See Chapter IV, Section I, note 60.

18. See Chapter IV, Section II, notes 237 to 240.

19. See Table II, note 21.

20. See Chapter III, Section IV, notes 336 to 339. He was a good friend of Wei-kung.

TABLE VIII

Agreement amongst the Rules in the Śīlas for Monks of the DRMGTV, SVSTVDV and MHSGKV

The SVSTVDV, DRMGTV and MHSGKV had been the most popular Vinaya in China before 709. After that year, the DRMGTV ousted all competitors. This table based therefore on the rules of the Śīla for Monks of this Vinaya is designed to show how many rules of the Śīlas of the above-mentioned two other Vinayas are in agreement with them. The number for each rule that is shown in this table accords with the serial order of the rules in the original texts.

Abbreviations

Ś, DRMGTV	Ssŭ-fên Sêng Chieh-pên or 'The Śīla of the DRMGTV for Monks (T. 1430)'.
P, SVSTVDV	Prātimokṣa for Bhikṣus (T. 1436).
Ś, MHSGKV	Mo-ho Sêng-chih Lü Ta-Pi-ch'iu Chieh-pên or 'The Śīla for Bhikṣus of the MHSGKV (T.1426)'.

Of the Rules of these three Śīlas, there are 180 Rules agreeing with each other in contents (Note: Rules 180 to 183 of the P, SVSTVDV and Rule 158 of the Ś, MHSGKV are in agreement with Rules 160 and 161 of the Ś, DRMGTV), while 16 Rules in agreement between the Ś, DRMGTV and P, SVSTVDV; and 4 Rules between the Ś, DRMGTV and the Ś, MHSGKV. Moreover, there are 42 Rules which can only be found in the Ś, DRMGTV.

Ś, DRMGTV	page	P, SVSTVDV	page	Ś, MSHGKV	page	Note
Rule 1	1023c	Rule 1	471a	Rule 1	549b	1
2	"	2	"	2	549c	2
3	"	3	"	3	"	3
4	"	4	"	4	"	4
5	"	5	471b	5	550a	5
6	"	6	"	6	"	6
7	"	7	"	7	"	7
8	"	8	"	8	"	8
9	1024a	9	"	9	"	9
10	"	10	"	10	"	10
11	"	11	"	11	"	11
12	"	12	"	12	"	12
13	"	13	471c	13	550a-b	13
14	"	14	"	14	550b	14
15	1024b	15	"	15	"	15
16	"	16	472a	17	550c	16
17	1024c	17	"	16	550c	17
18	"	18	472b	18	"	18
19	"	19	"	19	551a	19
20	1025a	20	472c	20	"	20
21	"	21	"	21	"	21
22	"	22	"	22	"	22
23	"	23	"	23	"	23
24	"	24	"	24	"	24
25	"	25	"	25	"	25
26	"	26	"	26	"	26
27	"	27	473a	27	551a-b	27
28	1025b	28	"	28	551b	28
29	"	29	473a-b	29	"	29
30	"	30	473b	30	"	30
31	"	31	"	32	"	31
32	1025b-c	32	"	31	"	32
33	1025c	33	"	33	551c	33
34	"	34	"	34	"	34
35	"	35	"	35	"	35
36	"	36	"			36

Ś, DRMGTV	page	P, SVSTVDV	page	Ś, MSHGKV	page	Note
Rule 37	1025c	Rule 37	473b-c	Rule 36	551c	37
38	"	38	473c	38	"	38
39	"	39	"	37	"	39
40	"	40	"	39	"	40
41	"	41	"	40	"	41
42	"	42	"	44	551c-552a	42
43	1025c-1026a	43	"	45	552a	43
44	1026a	44	"	42	551c	44
45	"	49	474a	41	"	45
46	"	47	"	43	"	46
47	"	45	473c	46	552a	47
48	"	46	"	47	"	48
49	"	48	474a	48	"	49
50	"	50	"	49	"	50
51	"	51	"	50	"	51
52	"	52	"	51	"	52
53	"	114	475c	117	553b	53
54	"	103	475b	89	552c	54
55	1026a	55	474a	54	552a	55
56	1026b	57	"	56	"	56
57	"	56	"	55	"	57
58	"	54	"	53	"	58
59	"	122	476a	121	553c	59
60	"	60	474b	59	552b	60
61	"	62	"	60	"	61
62	"	61	"	61	"	62
63	"	63	"	62	"	63
64	"	64	"	63	"	64
65	"	66	"	65	"	65
66	"	65	"	64	"	66
67	"	67	"			67
68	"	68	"	67	"	68
69	"	69	"	68	"	69
70	"	70	"	69	"	70
71	"	71	474c	70	"	71
72	1026c	72	"	72	"	72

Ś, DRMGTV	page	P, SVSTVDV	page	Ś, MSHGKV	page	Note
Rule 73	1026c	Rule 75	474c	Rule 76	552c	73
74	"	76	"	77	"	74
75	"	77	"	73	552b	75
76	"	73	"	74	552c	76
77	"	74	"	75	"	77
78	"	79	"	78	"	78
79	"	119	476a	116	553b	79
80	"	81	474c	79	552c	80
81	"	80	"	80	"	81
82	"	85	474c–475a	88	"	82
83	"	82	474c	86	552c	83
84	"	83	"	81	"	84
85	"	84	"	82	"	85
86	1027a	86	475a	84	"	86
87	"	87	"	85	"	87
88	"	88	"	83	"	88
89	"	87	"	87	"	89
90	"	93	"	100	553b	90
91	"	130	476a	129	553c	91
92	"			101	553b	92
93	"			102	"	93
94	"	78	474c			94
95	"	100	475a	92	553a	95
96	"					96
97	"	94	"	103	553b	97
98	"	95	"	104	"	98
99	"	96	"	105	"	99
100	"	126	476a	124	553c	100
101	"	113	475c	114	553b	101
102	"	112	"	115	"	102
103	"					103
104	1027b	115	475c	113	"	104
105	"	109	"	98	553a	105
106	"	101	475b	89	552c	106
107	"	116	475c	112	553b	107
108	"	117	"	111	"	108

Ś, DRMGTV	page	P, SVSTVDV	page	Ś, MSHGKV	page	Note
Rule 109	1027b	Rule 108	475c	Rule 96	553a	109
110	"	110	"	109	553b	110
111	"	90	475a	99	"	111
112	"	111	475c	110	"	112
113	"	99	475a	108	"	113
114	"	121	476a	119	"	114
115	"	102	475b			115
116	"	120	476a	120	553b-c	116
117	1027c	104	475b	93	553a	117
118	"	105	"	94	"	118
119	"	106	"	95	"	119
120	"	124	476a	123	553c	120
121	"	59	474b	58	552b	121
122	"	132	476a-b	140	554a	122
123	1027c-1028a					123
124	1028a	126	476a	127	553c	124
125	"					125
126	"					126
127	"	97	475a	106	553b	127
128	"	98	"	107	"	128
129	"	118	476a	138	554a	129
130	"	129	"	130	553c	130
131	"	107	475c	97	553a	131
132	"	134	476b	132	553c	132
133	"	135	"	133	"	133
134	"	133	"	131	"	134
135	"	138	"	134	"	135
136	"	137	"	135	553c-554a	136
137	"	136	"	136	554a	137
138	1028a-b	139	"	137	"	138
139	1028b	140	476b-c	142	"	139
140	"	141	476c	143	"	140
141	"	142	"	144	554b	141
142	"	143	"	141	554a	142
143	1028c	144 to 155	476c-477a	145	554b	143

Ś, DRMGTV	page	P, SVSTVDV	page	Ś, MSHGKV	page	Note
Rule 144	1028b	Rule 156-159	477a	Rule 146	554b	144
145	"	160	"	152	"	145
146	"	161	"	163	554c	146
147	"	176	447b			147
148	"	177	"			148
149	"	174	477a	151	554b	149
150	"	175	"	162	"	150
151	"	200	477b	153	"	151
152	"	201	"			152
153	"					153
154	"	178	"	154	"	154
155	"	179	"	166	554c	155
156	"	196	"	155	554b	156
157	"	197	"			157
158	"	190	"	157	"	158
159	"	191	"			159
160	"	180-183	"	158	"	160
161	"	180-183	"	158	"	161
162	"	164	447a	159	"	162
163	"	165	"	159	"	163
164	"	170	"	160	"	164
165	"	171	"	161	"	165
166	"	168	"	150	"	166
167	"	169	"	161	"	167
168	"	205-206	477c	168	554c	168
169	"	207	"			169
170	"					170
171	1029a	208	"	169	"	171
172	"	230	"	170	"	172
173	"	210	"			173
174	"	227	"	188	"	174
175	"	226	"	189	"	175
176	"	228	"	186	"	176
177	"	229	"	168	"	177
178	"	211	"	173	"	178
179	"	213	"	174	"	179
180	"	214	"	177	"	180

Ś, DRMGTV	page	P, SVSTVDV	page	Ś, MSHGKV	page	Note
Rule 181	1029a	Rule		Rule 175	554c	181
182	"	223	477c	184	"	182
183	"			171	"	183
184	"	216	"	181	"	184
185	"					185
186	"	219	"	172	"	186
187	"	224	"	185	"	187
188	"					188
189	"	225	"	190	"	189
190	"	231	"			190
191	"	253	478a	208	555a	191
192	"	254	"	209	"	192
193	"	255	"	210	"	193
194	"	243-244	478a			194
195	"					195
196	"	238	"	197	"	196
197	"	239	"	198	"	197
198	"	240	"			198
199	1029b	247	"	195	"	199
200	"	246	"	196	"	200
201	"	232	477c	206	"	201
202	"					202
203	"					203
204	"					204
205	"					205
206	"					206
207	"					207
208	"					208
209	"					209
210	"					210
211	"					211
212	"					212
213	"					213
214	"					214
215	"					215
216	"					216
217	"					217

Ś, DRMGTV	page	P, SVSTVDV	page	Ś, MSHGKV	page	Note
Rule 218	1029b					218
219	"					219
220	"					220
221	"					221
222	"					222
223	"					223
224	"					224
225	"					225
226	"					226
227	1029c					227
228	"	Rule 236	478a	Rule 192	555a	228
229	"	237	"	193	"	229
230	"					230
231	"	235	"	194	"	231
232	"	233	"	205	"	232
233	"					233
234	"	234	"	207	"	234
235	"					235
236	"	256	"			236
237	"					237
238	"	248	"	203	"	238
239	"	250	"			239
240	"					240
241	"	251	"	201	"	241
242	"	249	"	204	"	242.

Notes to Table VIII

These notes are prepared to show the contents of the rules in this table. I have not attempted a detailed translation but have paraphrased the central idea in single rules or groups of rules, as follows:

1. Do not have sex either with human beings or with animals.
2. Do not steal.
3. Do not kill either personally or by persuading others to do so. Do not persuade anyone to commit suicide.
4. Do not lie to others by claiming to have already reached the spiritual plane of a Buddhist sage.
5. Do not masturbate.
6. Do not touch any part of a woman's body.
7. Do not speak lewd words to a woman with lust in your mind.
8. Do not verbally persuade a woman to have sex.
9. Do not involve yourself in any form of match making.
10. If you try to build a dwelling (in the territory of your monastery), you should ask other monks whether the site was already claimed by others, and whether when built it would interfere with the structure of the establishment. The occupation of this house is limited to twelve 'Buddha's Vitasti (i.e. 20.28 ft. For the length of one 'Buddha's Vitasti' see Chapter II, Section I, note 83)' in length and seven Vitasti (6.3 ft. - one Vitasti = 9 inches) in width.
11. If you build a house after being told that the site was already claimed by others or that it would interfere with the structure of the establishment, you become a transgressor.
12. Do not because of anger slander another monk by asserting that the latter committed a sin of Pārājika.
13. Do not because of anger pick a small fault in the behaviour of another and exaggerate it into a rumour that the man had committed a sin of Pārājika.

14. If you try to spoil the harmony of the Order and keep on doing so after three remonstrances by others, you become a transgressor.

15. If a group of monks tries to stop the monk who is remonstrating with the above-mentioned transgressor, they become transgressors too.

16. If a monk has committed transgression in a layman's house, and has kept on doing so after three remonstrances by other monks, he becomes a transgressor.

17. If a monk who has already received three remonstrances for his wrong-doings, replies: "I would never comment on the behaviour of another whether right or wrong. Please do not make comments on my behaviour." He then becomes a transgressor.

18. Do not sit with a woman in a hidden place convenient for adultery, and do not talk to her on non-Buddhist subjects.

19. Even in an open place where no one can commit adultery, you are still not allowed to sit with a woman and talk to her on sexual affairs.

20. After the Summer Retreat, monks are allowed to beg for robes in the Kaṭhina-māsa (a month in October-November). If you receive more than three robes from the donors, and keep them for more than ten days before handing the surplus to the Order, you become a transgressor.

21. Anyone who leaves one of the above-mentioned three robes, received in the Kaṭhina-māsa, in a place outside his accommodation, becomes a transgressor.

22. Do not accept donations of robes after the above-mentioned month.

23. Do not collect robes from a nun who is not your secular relative, unless you exchange the same materials with her.

24. Do not ask a nun, who is not your secular relative, to wash or dye robes for you.

25. Do not beg for robes from a Buddhist layman or laywoman who is not your secular relative, unless you have lost your own robes.

26. You should not beg for more robes than you really need (i.e. more than three robes).

27. Do not persuade a married couple to buy a good robe for you.

28. Do not persuade two married couples to share the cost of a good robe and buy it for you.

29. Do not accept money from noble or common donors to help buy your robes.

30. Do not collect wide silkworm-floss for preparing your new sleeping mat.

31. Do not use newly shorn black wool to make your new sleeping mat.

32. Do not stray from the ratio of half black wool, one third white wool and one quarter grey wool to make your new sleeping mat.

33. After getting a new sleeping mat, you must keep on using it for at least six years.

34. If you try to make a new sitting mat, you must cut out from the old mat one Vitasti (nine inches) square, put this piece on the new mat, and sew them together,

35. If you pick up pieces of wool from the road, you must ask a layman to hold them for you. If there is no layman available, you are allowed to hold the pieces for a distance of three Yojanas (about twenty-seven miles).

36. Do not ask a nun, who is not your secular relative, to dye wool for you.

37. Do not receive gold and silver coins with your own hand; do not tell someone else to take them for you or suggest that the money be put on the ground for you.

38. Do not involve yourself in the business of jewel trading.

39. Do not involve yourself in any trading.

40. Do not keep more begging bowls than are necessary (i.e. more than one bowl).

41. Do not discard a begging bowl if the leak in it is not serious.

42. Do not beg for cotton thread, take it to a weaver and ask the latter to weave your robe.

43. Do not pay the weaver and ask him to make cotton cloth for you.

44. Do not give away your robe to another monk and then demand it back.

45. If you are sick, do not take either medicaments, milk, butter, or honey that has been kept for seven days.

46. If you have received a bathing cloth in the first month in spring, do not take a bath until a half-month after receiving it.

47. In the third month of the lunar calendar, you will receive a lot of donated robes. You must not collect more robes than you really need (cf. notes 20 and 25).

48. Do not leave your robes in one place and sleep in another place for more than six nights.

49. Do not corrupt materials that belong to the establishment.

50. Do not tell lies.

51. Do not slander others.

52. Do not speak in double tongue.

53. Do not sleep with a woman in the same apartment.

54. Do not sleep with someone not-yet-ordained in the same apartment for two or three nights.

55. Do not recite scriptures with someone not-yet-ordained.

56. Do not discuss another monk's faults with someone not-yet-ordained.

57. Do not exaggerate your own Buddhist knowledge to someone not-yet-ordained.

58. Do not preach more than five or six words to a woman unless you are a well-informed Buddhist monk.

59. Do not dig the ground or ask someone to dig it for you.

60. Do not kill grass or woods (cf. Chapter II, Section II, note 175).

61. Do not annoy the others with strange words.

62. Do not scold the others.

63. Do not take a string bed, wooden bed, sleeping mat, etc., belonging to the establishment for your private use.

64. Do not leave your own sleeping mat in the monastic apartment before your departure.

65. Do not claim the sleeping place of another monk.

66. Do not move out of the monastic apartment because you do not like another monk who shares the apartment.

67. Do not sit or sleep on a bed if some of its legs are broken.

68. If you know that there are small insects in the water, do not use it to water the grass.

69. Do not upholster your room with straw mats more than three finger-joints high.

70. Do not teach nuns Buddhism without the permission of the Order.

71. If you are told by the Order to teach the nuns Buddhism, do not stay in the nunnery until twilight.

72. Do not slander the other monks by saying: "They teach the nuns Buddhism only in return for food."

73. Do not give away your robe to a nun who is not your secular relative, unless you receive something in exchange.

74. Do not tailor robes for a nun who is not your secular relative.

75. Do not sit with a nun in a hidden place.

76. Do not walk with a nun from one village to another, unless there are other secular persons on the road, or unless the nun is afraid to walk alone.

77. Do not sail in the same boat with a nun, unless the voyage is necessary to cross water.

78. Do not accept food from a donor who has been persuaded by a nun.

79. Do not walk with lay-women from one village to another.

80. Do not accept more than one meal a day, unless you are sick.

81. Do not eat one meal after another, unless you are sick or unless it is the season for lay-people to make donations in the form of robes to the Order.

82. Do not take a private meal, unless you are on a journey, sailing in a boat, etc.

83. You are allowed to accept donations in the form of cooked rice, noodles and pastry up to two or three full bowls, but you must take them back to the establishment and share them with your fellow-monks. If you are sick, you are allowed to keep all foods collected.

84. If you receive much donated food, you must separate your own share from it first, then deliver the rest to the Order. If you eat the food first and hand in the remnants to the Order, you become a transgressor.

85. If you retain the above-mentioned remnants to persuade other monks to eat, you become a transgressor (for you trap the others to break Rule 87).

86. Do not accept food and eat it in the afternoon.

87. Do not eat food-remnants and overnight broken victuals.

88. You must not accept food if you are holding medicaments in the mouth. If the materials in your mouth are water or the tooth-wood (for the latter see NHCKNFC, pp. 208c-209a. J. Takakusu, tr., Buddhist Practices, pp. 33-35), you are allowed to receive food.

89. Do not eat meat or fish unless you are sick.

90. Do not give away food to non-Buddhist male or female priests (The Ś, MHSGKV specially instructs not to give away food to the priests of Nirgranthajñātiputra [the nude priests]).

90. Do not accept more than one invitation a day to eat in a layman's house. If you receive many invitations in the same day, you must accept only one and invite the other monks to accept the others.

92. If there are jewels displayed in the donor's house, you should not stay after having received the meal.

93. In the above-mentioned situation, do not sit in a hidden place in that house.

94. Do not sit alone with a woman in an open place.

95. Do not ask another monk to go with you to a village, promise to share the collected alms with him, and then fail to keep your word.

96. In the fourth month of the lunar calendar, a healthy monk is allowed to beg medicaments from the laymen in order to meet possible accidents, but he is not allowed to collect more than he really needs.

97. Do not watch military exercise.

98. Do not stay in a military camp for more than two or three nights.

99. If staying in a military camp, you must not watch the exercises.

100. Do not drink intoxicating liquor.

101. Do not play with each other in the water.

102. Do not hit each other with fingers.

103. Do not refuse remonstrance from others.

104. Do not scare other monks.

105. You are not allowed to take more than one bath every fortnight, unless you are sick, or the weather is too hot, etc.

106. Do not cauterise your body with fire unless you are sick.

107. Do not hide the belongings of another for a joke.

108. Do not give away your robes to another, and then reclaim them on your own authority.

109. Dye your new robe only with the colours of blue, black and of the deciduous magnolias.

110. Do not kill any animal purposely.

111. Do not drink water if you know that there are small insects in it.

112. Do not provoke another monk and make him unhappy even for a short while.

113. Do not gloss over the transgressions committed by another monk.

114. Do not ordain a person who has yet to reach his twentieth year.

115. Do not mention a bygone transgression after the transgressor has confessed to it.

116. Do not travel with a thief from one village to another.

117. If a monk slanders the Buddha by saying that the latter's doctrines encourage adultery, and keeps on saying so after three remonstrances by another monk, he becomes a transgressor.

118. Anyone who contacts the above-mentioned transgressor and provides his livelihood, becomes a transgressor.

119. If a Śrāmaṇera commits the same transgression as that in Rule 117, he is expelled. Any monk who contacts him and supplies him with accommodation, becomes a transgressor.

120. If, when some monks are remonstrating with the above-mentioned transgressor, a monk by their side says: "I am not going to listen to this remonstrance", he becomes a transgressor.

121. If during a sermon on the Śīla, a monk comes up and asks the lecturer: "Master, why should you have to lecture on these more subtle and trifling rules? They annoy and confuse us", he becomes a transgressor.

122. If, when a monk who has already listened to two or three sermons on the Śīla, can still not understand the rules, and another monk accuses the lecturer of neglecting his class and fostering ignorance, the monk who accused the lecturer becomes a transgressor.

123. If in the above-mentioned situation, others praise the monk who accused the lecturer, and give him materials belonging to the establishment as an encouragement, they become transgressors.

124. Do not depart from an assembly while a meeting is in progress.

125. Do not break your word after having made a promise.

126. If, when you know that two other monks have quarrelled, you tell monk A's words against monk B, to monk B, and then vice versa you become a transgressor.

127. Do not hit another monk in anger.

128. Do not beat another monk in anger.

129. Do not slander another by saying that the latter has committed a sin of Saṅghāvaśeṣa, in anger.

130. Do not enter the gate of the royal palace if the prince has gone out and his jewels are displayed in the palace.

131. Do not touch any jewel in the royal palace or in an ordinary person's house. Only the jewels that belong to the establishment are exempted.

132. If you make a wooden bed or a string bed, its legs are limited to eight 'Tathāgata's fingers (i.e. 1.8 ft. I estimate this measurement as follows: Mochizuki says that every twelve fingers are equal to one Vitasti [p. 1859c]. In other words, one finger is 0.75 inches in length. As one "Buddha's Vitasti" is three times an ordinary Vitasti [see Chapter II, Section I, note 82], and the "Tathāgata's [Buddha's] finger" would also be three times the length of an ordinary finger. In other words, it is 2.25 inches. Therefore, eight "Tathāgata's fingers" would be 1.8 ft.)'.

133. Do not use Tūla (kapok) to fill the mattress of your bed.

134. Do not use a tube for containing sewing needles made of bone, tusk or animal horn.

135. In making your Niṣīdana (wool mat), its size should be two 'Buddha's Vitasti (3.38 ft.)' in length and one and a half Vitasti (1.35 ft.) in width. It is allowed to extend its length and width for only half a Vitasti (4.5 inches).

136. In making a robe to protect your body when suffering from a boil or ulcer, its size is to be limited to four 'Buddha's Vitasti (6.76 ft.)' in length and two Vitasti (1.8 ft.) in width only.

137. In making a robe for bathing as well as for wearing in the rain, its size is limited to six 'Buddha's Vitasti (10.14 ft.)' in length and two and a half Vitasti (2.25 ft.) in width only.

138. The size for a robe of an ordinary monk must follow the size of that of the Buddha, i.e. nine 'Buddha's Vitasti (15.21 ft.)' in length and six Vitasti (5.4 ft.) in width.

139. If you come to a village and take food from a nun, who is not your secular relative, you must confess to other monks, unless you were sick.

140. If, when a monk visits a layman's house by invitation, and sees that there are many monks before him, enjoying their meals, and if he sees that a nun is instructing the host by saying: "Give some soup to this monk and give some rice to that monk", he must stop her by saying: "Dear sister, please tell our host to add food to the bowls of these masters after they have already finished their bowls and want more. Don't add food to their bowls before they are empty". If he does not do so, he must make a confession in front of the other monks.

141. When accepting a layman's invitation to a meal, if you take food with your own hand on your own authority, you must make a confession in front of the other monks, unless you are sick.

142. If a monk who lives in the Āranya (forest) returns to the establishment and takes food that belongs to the Order on his own authority, he must make a confession in front of the other monks, unless he is sick.

143. You must put on your underwear formally (cf. Chapter II, Section I, note 75).

144. You must put on your three robes formally.

145 to 167 are concerned with behaviour when entering a layman's house, such as "Do not hop into a layman's house (Rule 151)", "Do not squat down in a layman's house (Rule 153)", "Do not joke or trifle when entering a layman's house (Rule 166)", "Do not make jokes after sitting down in a layman's house (Rule 167)", etc.

168 to 190 are concerned with behaviour when accepting an invitation to eat in a layman's house, such as "Do not choose rice from the centre of your full bowl of rice (Rule 173)", "Do not seize rice (Rule 178)", "Do not open your mouth and wait for others to put food in (Rule 179)", "Do not drop rice to the ground (Rule 182)", "Do not chew rice loudly (Rule 184)", "Do not scatter rice into your mouth by hand (Rule 188)", etc. Cf. Chapter V, Section IV, notes 255 and 256.

191. Do not ease nature in the grass unless you are sick.

192. Do not ease nature into water unless you are sick.

193. Do not ease nature standing unless you are sick.

194 to 201. These rules instruct the monks not to preach to a layman who does not show respect during a sermon e.g. by putting on his turban (Rule 197), putting on his shoes (Rule 199), or riding on his horse (Rule 201), etc. A concession would be made if that layman was sick.

202 to 218. These rules instruct the monks to respect a Buddhist Stūpa, e.g. "Do not sleep in a Stūpa unless you are guarding it (Rule 202)", "Do not put on leather shoes and walk around the Stūpa (Rule 206)", "Do not bury a corpse under a Stūpa (Rule 211)", "Do not face a Stūpa to ease nature (Rule 217)", etc.

219. Do not bring an image of the Buddha to the place for stooling.

220 to 226. These rules too instruct the monks to respect a Buddhist Stūpa, e.g. "Do not blow your nose or expectorate on a Stūpa (Rule 224) or on its surrounding areas (Rule 225)", etc.

227. Do not place the Buddha's image on the floor below that on which you live.

228 to 234. These rules concern the treatment of laymen who do not respect the preacher during the sermon, such as sitting (Rule 228), or lying (Rule 229) while the preacher stands, walking in front

while the preacher follows (Rule 232), etc. A concession would be made if these laymen were sick.

235. Do not hold each other's hands when walking on the road.

236. Do not climb into a tree higher than a man.

237. Do not put your begging bowl in a net, hang it on one end of a staff and carry that staff on your shoulder while travelling.

238 to 242. These rules forbid monks to preach to a layman who is holding a weapon such as a sword (Rule 239), or sabre (Rule 241), etc. A concession would be made if that layman were sick.

NOTE: According to the Ś. DRMGTV, a transgressor who breaks any one of Rules 1 to 4 commits the unpardonable sin of Pārājika and will be expelled from the Order permanently. He who breaks any one of Rules 5 to 17 commits the sin of Saṅghāvaśeṣa and is required to make an open confession before the assembly for absolution, or riddance. He who breaks any one of Rules 18 to 19 commits the sin of either Pārājika, Saṅghāvaśeṣa or Pātaka in accordance with the degree of the transgression.

He who breaks any one of Rules 20 to 49 commits the sin of Naiḥsargika-prāyaścittika and would be forgiven on confession and restoration being made, or not forgiven because of refusal to confess and restore. He who breaks any of Rules 50 to 138 commits the sin of Pātaka which causes one to fall into purgatory.

He who breaks any of Rules 139 to 142 commits no sin, but the transgressor should have to make a confession in front of a group of monks. No sin is committed either, in breaking any one of Rules 143 to 242, but one must endeavour not to break them.

According to the P. SVSTVDV, the sins for Rules 1 to 139 are exactly the same as Rules 1 to 138 in the Ś. DRMGTV. He who breaks one of the rules 140 to 144 must make a confession in front of the other monks. He must not try to break one of the rules amongst Rules 144 to 256.

According to the Ś. MHSGKV, the sins for Rules 1 to 140 are exactly

the same as Rules 1 to 138 of the Ś. DRMGTV, and one who breaks any one of the Rules 141 to 144 must make a confession in front of other monks. One should endeavour not to break any one of the rules amongst Rules 145 to 210.

GLOSSARY

This glossary gives the names and titles in Chinese, Japanese and Korean. The names or titles of the latter two languages are marked with 'J' or 'K'. As most these names and titles are in Chinese, I give no indicative marks.

Abe Joichi (J) 阿部肇一

A-chih-mo Ching 阿笈摩經

Adachi Kiroku (J) 足立喜六

Ai-t'ung 愛同

Akitsuki Kan'ei (J) 秋月觀暎

Anhwei (Anhui) 安徽

An-lin 安廩

An-lo 安樂

An Lu-shan 安祿山

Bonogo butten no Shobunken (J) 梵語佛典の諸文獻

Bushō Kaisetsu Daijiten (J) 佛書解說大辭典

Chan-jan 湛然

Chan-san 湛山

Ch'an 禪

Ch'an-chü 禪居

Ch'an-lin Pei-yung Ch'ing-kuei 禪林備用清規

Ch'an-man Kuei-shih 禪門規式

Ch'an-p'u Yüan 蘆葡院

Ch'an-ting 禪定

Ch'an-yüan Ch'ing-kuei 禪苑清規

Chang 漳

Chang Hsin 張說

Chang P'in 張頻

Chang Shêng-yen 張聖嚴

Chang-sun Wu-chi 長孫無忌

Chang Yin-lin 張蔭麟

Chang T'ing-yu 張廷玉

Ch'ang 場

Ch'ang A-han Ching-hsü 長阿含經

Ch'ang-an 長安

Ch'ang-chioh 常覺

Ch'ang-chou 常州

Ch'ang-lo 長樂

Ch'ang-sa 長沙

Ch'ang-sung 常松

Ch'ang-ta 常達

Ch'ang-t'ao 昌濤
Ch'ang-yu 常遇
Chao Chêng 趙正
Chao-ch'êng 趙城
Chao-ching-kung 趙景公
Chao Êrh-sun 趙爾巽
Chao-hung 照宏
Chao-i 昭儀
Chao-jan 皎然
Chao Pien 趙抃
Ch'ao 鈔
Ch'ao 超
Ch'ao 潮
Ch'ao-hsüan 昭玄
Ch'ao-hsüan Ssŭ 昭玄寺
Ch'ao-hsüan Ta-t'ung 昭玄大統
Ch'ao-hsüan T'ung 昭玄統
Ch'ao-hua 超化
Ch'ao-tu 超度
Chekiang (Chêchiang) 浙江
Chê-chou 澤州
Chên-ch'êng 真乘
Chên-chiang 鎮江
Chên-i 真義
Chên-ching 真經
Chên-hsien 真賢
Chên-hua 真華
Chên-hui 真慧
Chên-kuan 真觀
Chên-kung 甄公
Chên-liang 真亮
Chên-t'ang Chu 真堂主
Chên-tsung 真宗
Ch'en 陳
Ch'en Hsü 陳詡
Ch'en Shih-chên 陳碩真
Ch'en Shou 陳壽
Ch'en Shu 陳書
Ch'en Yin-k'o 陳寅恪
Ch'en Yüan 陳垣
Ch'ên 岑
Ch'ên 臣
Ch'ên-chün 貞峻
Ch'ên-ku 貞固
Chêng-i Ch'ien-ting 證義簽定
Chêng-yüan Hsin-ting Shih-chiao Mu-lu 貞元新定釋教目錄
Ch'êng-ch'u 澄楚
Ch'êng-chü 成具
Ch'êng-hsin 澄心
Ch'êng-ju 乘如
Ch'êng-kuan 澄觀
Ch'êng Shu-tê 程樹德
Ch'êng-tsu 成祖
Ch'êng-tsung 成宗
Ch'êng-tu 成都

Chi 薊

Chi-ên 志,恩,

Chi Fa Ying Hou Pan 基法應,獲半

Chi Hsien-lin 季羨林

Chi-hsüan 知玄

Chi Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu Fan-wên Yüan-pên Ti Fa-hsien 記根本說一切有部律梵文原本的發現

Chi-kuang 寂光

Chi Liang-chung Yu Chung-kuo I-ch'ang Fang-shih P'ien-tsuan Ti Fei-fan-i Fo-tien 記兩種由中國譯場方式編纂的非翻譯佛典

Chi-nan 濟南

Chi-t'ang Shih 寂堂思,

Chi-tsang 吉藏

Chi-yung 寂融

Ch'i 齊

Ch'i-an 齊安

Ch'i-chi 齊己

Ch'i-chou 齊州

Ch'i-chou 蘄州

Ch'i-ch'un 蘄春

Ch'i-han 齊翰

Ch'i-sha 磧砂

Chih-shu Shih Yü-shih 治書侍御史

Ch'i-tz'ŭ 契此

Chia-i 賈逸

Chia-kan 甲幹

Chia Ts'an 賈璨

Chia Yung 答融

Chiang 羌

Chiang-chi 羌籍

Chiang-ling 江陵

Chiang-lü Chung-chu 講律衆主

Chiang-mo-tsang Shih 降魔藏師

Ch'iang-tu 江都

Chiao-chih 交阯

Chiao-jan 皎然,

Chieh-fang 街坊

Chieh-lü-hsüeh Kang-yao 戒律學綱要

Chieh-mo Shu 羯磨疏

Chieh-mo Shu-chang 羯磨疏章

Chieh-t'o Chieh-pên Ching 解脫戒本經

Chieh-yüan Chu 廨院主

Chien-chiao 漸教

Chien-chên 鑒真

Chien-chung 建中

Chien-k'ung 鑑空

Chien-yüan 監院

Ch'ien-ao 黔敖

Ch'ien-chên 鑒真

Ch'ien-mu 錢穆

Ch'ien-t'ang Shou-tso 前堂首座

Ch'ien-ting 僉定

Ch'ien-t'o 乾陀

Ch'ien-yin 乾印
Chih 志,
Chih-chao 志,超
Chih-ch'êng 智稱
Chih-ch'ien 支謙
Chih-chou 智周
Chih-chü 智聚
Chih-chüan 智詮
Chih-fêng 智封
Chih-hsiang 植相
Chih-hsin 智欣
Chieh-hsien 志,賢
Chih-hsü 智旭
Chih-hui 智暉
Chih-hung 智弘
Chih-hung 志,鴻
Chih-i 智顗
Chih-kai 智凱
Chih-k'ê 知客
Chih-kuan 志,寬
Chih-kuang 智廣
Chih-k'u 知庫
Chih-k'uei 智揆
Chih-lang 智朗
Chih-lin 智琳
Chih-man 智滿
Chih-min 智敏
Chih-min 智旻
Chih-ning 智凝
Chih-pao 智保
Chih-p'an 志,磐
Chih-shen 智詵
Chih-shêng 智昇
Chih-shih 智實
Chih-shou 智首
Chih-shun 智舜
Chih-sui 直歲
Chih-sun 智順
Chih-sung 智嵩
Chih-ta 至大
Chih-ta Ch'ing-kuei Hsü 至大清規序
Chih T'an-lan 支曇蘭
Chih T'an-yüeh 支曇籥
Chih-t'ang 直堂
Chih-tao 志,道
Chih-têng 智燈
Chih-tien 知殿
Chih-to Pa-mo 質多跋摩
Chih-tsang 知藏
Chih-tsang 智藏
Chih-tsao 智璪
Chih-tsê 智則
Chih-tun 支遁
Chih-t'ung 智通
Chih-wei 智威
Chih-wên 智文
Chih-yen 智琰

Chih-yen 智嚴

Chih-yü 知浴

Chih-yüan 祇桓

Chih-yüan Chi 芝園集

Chih-yün 智韻

Ch'ih 尺

Ch'ih-hsiu Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei 勅修百丈清規

Chin 金

Chin 晉

Chin-an 晉安

Chin-ch'êng 晉城

Chin-hsüeh 進學

Chin Shu 晉書

Chin Yü-nu Pang-ta Po-ch'ing Lang 金玉奴棒打薄情郎

Ch'in 秦

Ch'in-t'ai-shang-chün 秦太上君

Ching 靜

Ching 荊

Ching-ai 靜藹

Ching-chou 荊州

Ching-chung Pên-yüan 淨衆本院

Ching-fan Wang Po-ni-yüan Ching 淨飯王般泥洹經

Ching-hsiao 景霄

Ching-hung 靜洪

Ching-i Tu Wei-na 京邑都維那

Ching-lin 靜琳

Ching-ling 竟陵

Ching-lo 景樂

Ching-nan 荊南

Ching-pien 淨辯

Ching-sung 靖嵩

Ching-tao 敬道

Ching-t'o 敬脫

Ching-t'ou 淨頭

Ching-tuan 淨靖

Ching-yeh 淨業

Ching-yüan 淨元

Ch'ing 青

Ch'ing 清

Ch'ing-ch'an 清禪

Ch'ing-ch'ê 清徹

Ch'ing-chiang 清江

Ch'ing-chu 慶諸

Ch'ing-ho 清河

Ch'ing-hsü 清虛

Ch'ing-kuan 清觀

Ch'ing-kuei 清規

Ch'ing-liang 清涼

Ch'ing-shih Kao 清史稿

Chüeh-an 覺岸

Chüeh-an 覺菴

Chüeh-kuang 覺光

Chüeh-lang 覺朗

Chüeh-shih Hsün-k'an Shê 覺世旬刊社

Chiu-chao Lü-k'ao 九朝律考

Chiu-shu 舊疏

Chiu T'ang Shu 舊唐書

Chou Ch'in Han Chêng-chih Shê-hui Chieh-kuo Chih Yen-chiu 周秦漢政治社會結構之研究

Chou I-liang 周一良

Chou Shu 周書

Chou Shu-t'ao Hsien-sheng Liu-shi Sheng-jih Chi-t'ien Lun-wên Chi 周叔弢先生六十生日紀念論文集

Chu-chuang Chien-shou 諸莊鑑收

Chu-ch'üeh 朱雀

Chu Fa-hsing 竺法行

Chu Fa-tu 竺法度

Chu Fa-ya 竺法雅

Chu Fo-l'ien 竺佛念

Chu-li 住力

Chu Sêng-fu 竺僧敷

Chu Sêng-hsien 竺僧顯

Chu Sêng-tu 竺僧度

Chu Tao-ch'ien 竺道潛

Chu Tao-shêng 竺道生

Chu-yüan 竹園

Ch'u 楚

Ch'u-nan 楚南

Ch'u San-tsang Chi-chi 出三藏記集

Ch'u-yao Lü-i 出要律儀

Ch'uan-shoh Yü Shih-shih Kuan-hsi I Li-chêng --- Lu-shan Kuei-tsung Szŭ Chung chu Ch'uan-shoh So T'ou-lu Chih Chung-kuo Lü-tsung Hsiao-chang Shih 傳說與史實關係一例證——廬山歸宗寺中諸傳說所透露之中國律宗消長史

Chuang-chu 莊主

Chung-chih 忠智

Chung-hsüan 重玄

Chung-hua 中華

Chung-kuo Fo-chiao Ch'iu-fa-shih Tsa-k'ao 中國佛教求法史雜考

Chung-kuo Fo-chiao I-ching-shih Yen-chiu Yu-sh'ên 中國佛教譯經史研究餘瀋

Chung-kuo Fo-chiao Shih-chi Kai-lün 中國佛教史籍概論

Chung-kuo Fo-chiao Shih-chuan Yü Mu-lu Yüan-ch'u Lü-hsüeh Sa-mên Chih T'an-t'ao 中國佛教史傳與目錄源出律學沙門之探討

Chung-kuo Hsiao-shoh Shih Lüeh 中國小說史略

Chung-kuo Mu-lu-hsüeh Shih 中國目錄學史

Chung-kuo Shih-kang 中國史綱

Chung-kuo Tu-liang Hêng Shih 中國度量衡史

Chung-kuo T'ung-shih Chien-p'ien 中國通史簡編

Chung-kuo Wên-hsüeh Ts'an-k'ao tzŭ-liao Hsiao Ts'ung-shu
中國文學參攷資料小叢書

Chung-hua Wên-shih Lun-ts'ung
中華文史論叢

Chung-nan 終南

Chung-nan Shih-ch'ao 終南事鈔

Chung-t'ou 鐘頭

Chung-yan Yen-chiu Yüan Li-shih Yü-yen Yen-chiu-so Chi-k'an
中央研究院歷史語言研究所集刊

Chung-yin Wên-hua Kuan-hsi-shih Lun-ts'ung
中印文化關係史論叢

Chūgoku Bukkyōshi (J) 中國佛教史

Chūgaku Bukkyōshi no Kenkyū(J)
中國佛教史の研究

Chūgako Bukkyō to Shakai Fukushi Jigyō (J)
中國佛教と社會福祉事業

Chūgoku Zenshūshi Kenkyū (J)
中國禪宗史研究

Chūgoku Zenshūshi no Kenkyū (J)
中國禪宗史の研究

Ch'ung-fu 崇福

Ch'ung-ling 崇寧

Ch'ung-ling Ch'ing-kuei Hsü
崇寧清規序

Ch'ung-shêng 崇聖

Ch'ung-yeh 崇業

Chü-ch'ü An-chou 沮渠安周

Chü-fang 巨方

Chü-yung 句容

Ch'ü-chih Tsung 尉遲宗

Ch'ü-chiang 曲江

Ch'üan 詮

Ch'üan-fu Yun-shih 權府運使

Ch'üan Lü-shih 詮律師

Ch'üan-t'ang Wên 全唐文

Ch'üan-tsai 全宰

Ch'üan-tz'ŭ 全玼

Chün-tu 君度

Dai Nihon Bukkyō Zensho (J)
大日本佛教全書

Daini Zenshūshi Kenkyū (J)
第二禪宗史研究

Daizo Schuppan (J) 大藏出版

Daitō Shuppan Sha Zōpan (J)
大東出版社藏版

Dōsōkaku no Fukkyūni Tsu i te
道僧格の復舊について

E-ken (J) 慧堅

Êrh-chu 爾朱

Êrh-chu Shih-lung 爾朱世隆

Êrh-shih-wu-shih Pu-p'ien
二十五史補篇

Fa-an 法安
Fa-chao 法照
Fa-ch'ang 法敞
Fa-ch'ang 法常
Fa-ch'ao 法超
Fa-ch'êng 法成
Fa-ch'êng 法乘
Fa-ch'êng 法澄
Fa-ch'ao 法潮
Fa-ch'in 法欽
Fa-chin 法進
Fa-ching 法鏡
Fa-ching 法淨
Fa-chu 法住
Fa-chun 法准
Fa-ch'ung 法充
Fa-ch'ung 法冲
Fa-hai 法海
Fa-hsi 法喜
Fa-hsiang 法香
Fa-hsiang 法響
Fa-hsien 法顯
Fa-hsien 法獻
Fa-hsing 法興
Fa-hu 法護
Fa-hua 法華
Fa-hua Ching Chuan-chi 法華經傳記
Fa-hui 法慧
Fa-hui 法惠

Fa-k'ai 法楷
Fa-k'ai 法開
Fa-k'an 法侃
Fa-kuang 法光
Fa-kuo 法果
Fa-k'uang 法曠
Fa-kuei 法瓌
Fa-kung 法空
Fa-kung 法恭
Fa-lang 法朗
Fa-li 法力
Fa-li 法勵
Fa-lin 法琳
Fa-lin 法廩
Fa-ling 法令
Fa-ming 法明
Fa-pao 法寶
Fa-shang 法上
Fa-shên 法愼
Fa-shêng 法勝
Fa-ch'un 法純
Fa-t'ang 法堂
Fa-ting 法定
Fa-tsan 法贊
Fa-tsang 法藏
Fa-tsung 法宗
Fa-ts'ung 法聰
Fa-t'ung 法通

Fa-wan 法翫

Fa-wu 法悟

Fa-ya 法雅

Fa-yeh 法業

Fa-yen 法琰

Fa-yung 法鏞

Fa-yüan 法瑗

Fa-yüan 法源

Fa-yüan 法園

Fa-yüan Chu-lin 法苑珠林

Fa-ying 法穎

Fa-yü 法遇

Fa-yüan 法願

Fa-yün 法雲

Fa-yün 法運

Fa-yün 法韻

Fan-shui 汎水

Fan Tai 范泰

Fan-t'ou 飯頭

Fan-wang Ching 梵網經

Fan Wên-lan 范文瀾

FanYeh 范曄

Fang-chang 方丈

Fang Hsüan-ling 房玄齡

Fêng-lung Shan 封龍山

Fêng Mêng-lung 馮夢龍

Fo-chia Ching-lu Tsai Chung-kuo Mu-lu-hsüeh Chih Wei-chih
佛家經錄在中國目錄學之位置

Fo-chiao Ch'u-pan Shê
佛教出版社

Fo-hsüeh Yen-ch'iu Shih-pa Pien
佛學研究十八篇

Fokuang Hsüeh-pao 佛光學報

Fo-shou Chai-ching Chu-k'o
佛說齋經註科

Fo-shou Yü-lang-p'ên Ching
佛說盂蘭盆經

Fo-tien Chih Fan-i
佛典之翻譯

Fo-tsu Li-t'ai T'ung-ts'ai
佛祖歷代通載

Fo-tsu T'ung-chi 佛祖統紀

Fo-wei Nan-t'o Shou Ch'u-chia Ju t'ai Ching 佛為難陀說出家入胎經

Fou-ch'a 浮槎

Fu-chang 傅章

Fu Chien 苻堅

Fu-chou 福州

Fu-chō (J) 普照

Fu-chü 福聚

Fukien (Fuchien) 福建

Fu-liao 副寮

Fu-p'ien Chi 輔篇記

Fu-Ssŭ 副寺

Gen-kai (J) 元開

Gen-sho niokeru Teishitsu to Zensō to no Kankei nitsuite (J)
元初に於ける帝室と禪僧との關係について

Godai no Kudokushi ni Kansurur Kanken (J)
五代の功德使に關する管見

Gyō-nen (J) 凝然

Hai-nan 海南

Hai-shun 海順

Hai-yu 海虞

Hai-yün 海雲

Hakken Den Chū-a Indo Nankai Kikō no Kenkyū (J)
法顯傳中亞印度南海紀行の研究

Han 漢

Han Hsin 韓信

Han-shan 寒山

Han-shih-san Kao 寒食散考

Han Shu 漢書

Han-t'ang Chung-kuo Fo-chiao Ssŭ-hsiang Lun-chi
漢唐中國佛教思想論集

Han-wei Liang-chin Nan-pei-ch'ao Fo-chiao Shih
漢魏兩晉南北朝佛教史

Hang-chou 杭州

Hao-chih 好直

Hao-tuan 皓端

Hatani Ryōtai (J) 羽溪了諦

Heirakuji Shoten (J) 平樂寺書店

Hêng 衡

Hêng-an 衡安

Hêng-ch'ao 恒超

Hêng-chêng 恒政

Hêng-ching 恒景

Hêng-shan 衡山

Hêng-shih 恒實

Hêng-t'ung 恒通

Hirakawa, Akira (J) 平川彰

Ho-chê Ta-shih Shên-hui Chuan
荷澤大師神會傳

Ho-hsi 河西

Honan 河南

Ho-nei 河內

Hopeh (Hopei) 河北

Ho Shang-chih 何尚之

Hoh-shui 合水

Hon-chō Kō-sō Den (J)
本朝高僧傳

Hou-chu 後主

Ho-han Shu 後漢書

Hou-t'ang Shou-tso 後堂首座

Hōzōkan (J) 法藏館

Hsi Ch'ao 郗超

Hsi-chiang Chuan 西羌傳

Hsi-ch'ien 希遷

Hsi-chüeh 希覺

Hsi-ling 熙寧

Hsi-t'a Lü-tsung 西塔律宗

Hsi Tso-ch'ih 習鑿齒

Hsi-yin 樓隱

Hsi-yü 希瑜

Hsi-yün 希運

Hsiang 祥

Hsiang-fu 祥符

Hsiang-chou 襄州

Hsiang-chu 祥珠

Hsiang-yang 襄陽

Hsiang-yen 祥彥

Hsiang-yü 香育

Hsiao Ch'ang-mou 蕭長懋

Hsiao Chên 孝貞

Hsiao-ching 孝經

Hsiao Ch'in 孝欽

Hsiao-ming 孝明

Hsiao Tsung-yüan 小宗淵

Hsiao Tzŭ-hsien 蕭子顯

Hsiao Tzŭ-liang 蕭子良

Hsiao-wên 孝文

Hsiao-wu 孝武

Hsien-hsin 閑心

Hsien-hu 賢護

Hsien-ch'un 咸淳

Hsien-shun Ch'ing-kuei Hsü 咸淳清規序

Hsin 莘

Hsin-chang 新章

Hsin-ch'êng 信誠

Hsin-chiang 新絳

Hsin Hsü Kao-sêng Chuan 新續高僧傳

Hsin-ya Hsüeh-pao 新亞學報

Hsin-ya Shu-yüan Hsüeh-shu Lien-k'an 新亞書院學術年刊

Hsin-ya yen-ch'iu So 新亞研究所

Hsin Yüan Shih 新元史

Hsing-chêng 性證

Hsing-ch'êng 性澄

Hsing-shih 性實

Hsing-shih Ch'ao 行事鈔

Hsing-shih Ch'ao Chu-chia Piao-mu 行事鈔諸家標目

Hsing-tao 行瑤

Hsing-yen 行嚴

Hsiu 秀

Hsiu Lü-shih 秀律師

Hsiung-chün 雄俊

Hsü Chên-yüan Shih-chiao Lu 續貞元釋教錄

Hsü Foo-kuan 徐復觀
Hsü Hsien-chih 徐羨之
Hsü-i 續遺
Hsü Kao-sêng Chuan 續高僧傳
Hsüan 宣
Hsüan-ch'ang 玄暢
Hsüan-chêng Yüan 宣政院
Hsüan-chien 玄鑒
Hsüan-Ching 玄景
Hsüan-ching 玄鏡
Hsüan-k'uei 玄逵
Hsüan-lan 玄覽
Hsüan-lang 玄朗
Hsüan-shuang 玄爽
Hsüan-su 玄素
Hsüan-tsang 玄奘
Hsüan-tsung 宣宗
Hsüan-wan 玄琬
Hsüan-wu 宣武
Hsüan-yen 玄晏
Hsüan-yen 玄儼
Hsüeh-lun 學倫
Hsün Chi 荀濟
Hu 胡
Hu-chou 湖州
Hu-lao 虎牢
Hunan 湖南
Hupeh (Hupei) 湖北
Hu Shih 胡適
Hu-shih Wên-ts'un 胡適文存
Hu-t'ung 胡統
Hu Yung 胡瑩
Hua 華
Hua-nan Fo-hsüeh Yüan 華南佛學院
Hua-tu 化度
Hua-yen 華嚴
Hua-yen T'ou 華嚴頭
Huai 淮
Huai-hai 淮海
Huai-hai 懷海
Hui-hsien 懷顯
Huai-nan 淮南
Huai-nan Tao 淮南道
Huai-su 懷素
Huai-ti 懷迪
Huai-yeh 懷業
Huan-chou 驩州
Huan-chu An 幻住菴
Huan-chu An Ch'ing-kuei 幻住菴清規
Huan-chung 寰中
Huan-lun 幻輪
Huang Min-chih 黃敏枝
Huang-nieh 黃蘗
Hui-an 慧安
Hui-chao 慧昭

Hui-shao 慧,韶
Hui-ch'ang 慧,常
Hui-chêng 彙征
Hui-ch'êng 慧,澄
Hui-chi 慧,基
Hui-chiao 慧,皎
Hui-ch'ih 慧,持
Hui-chin 慧,進
Hui-chin 惠,瑾
Hui-ching 慧,敬
Hui-ching 慧,淨
Hui-chou 慧,胄
Hui-chung 惠,琮
Hui-chung 慧,忠,
Hui-chung 惠,忠,
Hui-chung 慧,重
Hui-ch'ü 慧,璩
Hui-ch'üan 慧,銓
Hui-fên 慧,
Hui-fêng 慧,峯
Hui-hai 慧,海
Hui-hêng 慧,暅
Hui-hsi 慧,熙
Hui-hsiang 慧,祥
Hui-hsiang 惠,祥
Hui-shiao 慧,蕭
Hui-hsien 慧,顯
Hui-hsiu 慧,休

Hui-hsün 慧,詢
Hui-i 慧,意,
Hui-i 慧,義
Hui-i 會義
Hui-jih 慧,日
Hui-jui 慧,叡
Hui-luan 會鸞
Hui-k'ai 慧,開
Hui-kuan 慧,觀
Hui-kuang 慧,光
Hui-kung 慧,恭
Hui-kuo 慧,果
Hui-k'ung 慧,空
Hui-li 慧,力
Hui-man 慧,滿
Hui-mi 慧,彌
Hui-min 慧,旻
Hui-ming 慧,命
Hui-ming 慧,明
Hui-mu 慧,沐
Hui-nêng 慧,能
Hui-ning 會寧
Hui-pi 慧,弼
Hui-pi 慧,壁
Hui-pin 慧,斌
Hui-pu 慧,布
Hui-p'u 慧,普
Hui-shan 會善

Hui-shang 慧尚
Hui-shêng 惠生
Hui-shêng 慧生
Hui-shêng 慧勝

Hui-shou 慧受
Hui-shao 慧紹
Hui-shun 慧順
Hui-shün 慧詢
Hui-ssŭ 慧思

Hui-sung 慧嵩
Hui-ta 慧達
Hui-têng 慧登
Hui-tsan 慧讚
Hui-tsang 慧藏
Hui-tse 慧賾
Hui-tsê 慧則
Hui-tsang 惠藏
Hui-tsung 徽宗
Hui-t'ung 慧通
Hui-wên 惠文
Hui-wên 慧溫
Hui-yu 慧猷
Hui-yung 慧永
Hui-yung 慧榮
Hui-yü 慧祐
Hui-yü 慧豫
Hui-yüan 慧元

Hui-yüan 慧遠
Hui-yüeh 慧約
Hung-chou 洪州
Hung-chü 鴻苣
Hung-fa 弘法
Hung-fu 弘福
Hung-hua Yüan 弘化苑
Hung-i 弘一
Hung-i Ta-shih Lien-p'u 弘一大師年譜
Hung-jên 弘忍
Hung-lin 洪林
Hung-lu Ssŭ 鴻臚寺
Hung-tsan Fa-hua Chuan 弘讚法華傳
Hung-tsun 洪遵
Hung-yen 洪偃
Hung-yüan 洪淵

I 意
I-chi 義寂
I-ching 義淨
I-ching Yüan-ch'i 譯經緣起
I-chung 義忠
I-hsien 义咸
I-hsing 一行
I-hsüan 義宣
I-jun 儀潤
I-lang 義朗

I Nei Lü Sêng Chi Chih Chih 以內律僧制治之

I-sung 義嵩

I-tsê 遺則

I-tsang 頤藏

I-wei 義威

I-wên 藝文

I-yang 弋陽

I-yüan 義園

In-fêng 隱峯

Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū (J) 印度學佛教學研究

Itō Giken (J) 伊藤義賢

Iwanami Shoten (J) 岩波書店

Jan Yün-hua 冉雲華

Jên Chi-yü 任繼愈

Jên-min Ch'u-pan Shê 人民出版社

Jên-min Wên-hsüeh Ch'u-pan Shê 人民文學出版社

Jên-min Wei-sêng Ch'u-pan Shê 人民衛生出版社

Jên-yo 仁岳

Jih-ch'ao 日照

Jih-chih Lu 日知錄

Jih-yung Ch'ing-kuei 日用清規

Jōdokyō no Kigen oyabi Hattatsu (J) 淨土教の起源及發達

Ju-ching 如淨

Ju-hsing 如馨

Ju-tsang Lu 入藏錄

Jui-chên 瑞睿真

Jui-kuang 瑞光

Jui-tsung 瑞宗

Jun-chou 潤州

Kabushiki gaisha Sansei Dō (J) 株式會社三省堂

Kai-gestu (J) 戒月

Kan-hua 感化

Kansu 甘肅

K'ang Sêng-hui 康僧會

Kao-ch'ang 高昌

Kao-ch'ang-kuo Mo-shih Lun-yü Hsiao-ching Li Hsüeh-kuan Ti Yüan-yin Shih-shih 高昌國毛詩論語孝經立學官的原因試釋

Kao-ch'êng 高澄

Kao Chi-hsing 高季興

Kao Huan 高歡

Kao-lung-chih 高隆之

Kao-sêng Chuan 高僧傳

Kao-sêng Fa-hsien Chuan 高僧法顯傳

Kao-ti 高帝

Kao-tsu 高祖

Kao-yang 高陽

K'ao-ku 考古

Kên-pên Sa-p'o-to-pu Lü-shê
根本薩婆多部律攝

Kên-pên-shuo I-ch'ieh-yu-pu
Chieh-ching
根本說一切有部戒經

Kên-pên-shuo I-ch'ieh-yu-pu
Ch'u-chia Shou-chin-yüan Chieh-mo
根本說一切有部出家授近
圓羯磨

Kên-pên-shuo I-ch'ieh Yu-pu
Ni-t'o-na-mu-tê-chia
根本說一切有部尼陀
那目得迦

Kên-pên-shuo I-ch'ieh-yu-pu
Ni-t'o-na-mu-tê-chia Shê-sung
根本說一切有部尼陀
那目得迦攝頌

Kên-pên-shuo I-ch'ieh-yu-pu
Pi-ch'iu-ni Chieh-ching
根本說一切有部比丘
尼戒經

Kên-pên-shuo I-ch'ieh-yu-pu
Pi-ch'iu-ni P'i-na-yeh
根本說一切有部比丘
尼毘奈耶

Kên-pên-shuo I-ch'ieh-yu-pu
Pi-ch'u Hsi-hsüeh Lioh-fa
根本說一切有部苾
芻習學略法

Kên-pên-shuo I-ch'ieh-yu-pu P'i-
na-yeh
根本說一切有部毘奈耶

Kên-pên-shuo I-ch'ieh-yu-pu
P'i-na-yeh An-chü Shih
根本說一切有部毘奈
耶安居事

Kên-pên-shuo I-ch'ieh-yu-pu P'i-na-
yeh Ch'ieh-chih-na-i-shih
根本說一切有部毘奈耶羯
恥那衣事

Kên-pên-shuo I-ch'ieh-yu-pu
P'i-na-yeh Ch'u-chia-shih
根本說一切有部毘奈
耶出家事

Kên-pên-shuo I-ch'ieh-yu-pu
P'i-na-yeh Pi-k'o-shih
根本說一切有部毘奈耶
皮革事

Kên-pên-shuo I-ch'ieh-yu-pu
P'i-na-yeh P'o-sêng-shih
根本說一切有部毘奈耶
破僧事

Kên-pên-shuo I-ch'ieh-yu-pu
P'i-na-yeh Sui-i-shih
根本說一切有部毘奈
耶隨意事

Kên-pên-shuo I-ch'ieh-yu-pu
P'i-na-yeh Sung
根本說一切有部毘奈
耶頌

Kên-pên-shuo I-ch'ieh-yu-pu
P'i-na-yeh Tsa-shih Shê-sung
根本說一切有部毘奈耶
雜事攝頌

Kên-pên-shuo '-ch'ieh-yu-pu
P'i-na-yeh Tsa-sung
根本說一切有部毘奈
耶雜頌

Kên-pên-shuo I-ch'ieh-yu-pu
Po-i Chieh-mo
根本說一切有部百一
羯磨

Kiangsi (Chianghsi) 江西

Kiangsu (Chiangsu) 江蘇

Kimura Shizuo (J) 木村靜雄

K'o-chih 可止

K'o Shao-wên 柯劭忞

K'o-wên 科文

Kōbundō Shobō (J) 弘文堂書房

Kōshō Hokken Den (J) 考證法顯傳

Ku-chin Hsiao Shuo 古今小說

Ku Ch'ing-kuei Hsü 古清規序

Ku Ch'ing-kuei kō (J) 古清規考

Ku Hsiao-shoh Kuo-ch'ên 古小說句沉

Ku-hsin 古心

Ku-tien Wên-hsüeh Ch'u-pan Shê 古典文學出版社

Ku-ts'ang 姑藏

Ku-tsi Ch'u-pan Shê 古籍出版社

Ku Tsun-su Yü-lu 古尊宿語錄

Ku Yen-wu 顧炎武

K'u-t'ou 庫頭

Kuan-chi 觀鷄

Kuan-chung Chin-ch'u Ni Êrh-chung T'an-wên Hsia-tso Tsa-shih-êrh-shih Ping Tsa-shih Kung-chuan Ch'ien-chung-hou San Chi 關中近出尼二種壇文夏坐雜十二事並雜事共卷前中後三記

Kuan-hsiu 貫休

Kuan-ting 灌頂

Kuang-chia 廣洽

Kuang Ch'ing-liang Chuan 廣清涼傳

Kuang-hsiu 廣修

Kuang Hung-ming Chi 廣弘明集

Kuang-i 光儀

Kuang-kung 光公

Kuang-ling 廣陵

Kuang-ling Ta-shih 廣陵大師

Kuang Lü-shih 光律師

Kuang-shih 光師

Kuang-yeh 光業

Kuang-yü 光嶼

K'uang-shih 鑛師

Kuei-chi 窺基

Kuei-shên 桂琛

Kuei-t'ou 櫃頭

Kuo-ch'ing 國清

Kuo-ch'ing Po-lu 國清百錄

Kuo-hsing 國興

Kuo-shih Ta-kang 國史大綱

Kuo-t'ao-chê 國道者

Kuo-t'ung 國統

K'ou Ch'ien-chih 寇謙之

Kuo Mo-jo 郭沫若

K'ung-ying-ta 孔穎達

Kwangtung (Kuangtung) 廣東

Kwangsi (Kuanhsi) 廣西

Lang-chung 郎中

Lang-jan 朗然

Lao-na 老衲

Lêng-chia-tsung K'ao 楞伽宗考

Li 李

Li Chao 李肇

Li-chi 禮記

Li Ch'êng-ch'ien 李承乾

Li Chien-nung 李劍農
Li-fa 立法
Li Hsün 李訓
Li Po-yao 李伯藥
Li Shên 李紳
Li-shên 立身
Li Shih-min 李世民
Li-tai San-pao Chi 歷代三寶記
Li Tan 李丹
Li Tao-yüan 酈道元
Li Yen-shou 李延壽
Li Yüan 李淵
Liang 梁
Liang 涼
Liang-chê Hsi-lu 兩浙西路
Liang-chieh 良价
Liang-ching Ssŭ-chi 梁京寺記
Liang Ch'i-ch'ao 梁啟超
Liang-pên 良賁
Liao-chu 寮主
Liao-shê 寮舍
Liao Shou-tso 寮首座
Lia-yüan 寮元

Lin Tzŭ-ch'ing 林子青
Lin-chuan 臨川
Lin-hai 臨海
Ling 靈
Ling-ch'ê 靈澈
Ling-chih 靈芝
Ling-chih 靈智
Ling-hu Tê-fên 令狐德棻
Ling-i 靈一
Ling-jui 靈睿
Ling-jun 靈潤
Ling-k'uei 靈歸
Ling-nan Hsüeh-pao 嶺南學報
Ling-shün 靈詢
Ling-sui 靈遂
Ling-t'an 靈坦
Ling-tsang 靈藏
Ling-wei 靈味
Ling-yu 靈祐
Ling-yü 靈裕
Liu Chou 劉晝
Liu-li Ching-fang 琉璃經房
Liu Hsiu-jo 劉休若
Liu Hsü 劉昫
Liu I-k'ang 劉義康
Liu Hsiu-yu 劉休佑
Liu Jen-kung 劉仁恭
Liu Shao-kuang 劉守光
Liu-Sung 劉宋
Liu Ts'un-yan 柳存仁
Liu Tung 劉冬
Lo-han-t'ang Chu 羅漢堂主
Lo Kuan-chung 羅貫中
Lu 陸

Lu 廬

Lu Chih-shen 魯志深

Lu Hsin 魯迅

Lu-shan Hsin-yüan 廬山新院

Lu Ta 魯達

Lu-tsu 六祖

Lu-tsu Ta-shih Fa-pao T'an-ching
六祖大師法寶壇經

Lu-t'ou 爐頭

Lu-tu-chi Ching 六度集經

Lun Chung-kuo Fo-chiao I-ch'ang Chih I-ching Fang-shih Yü Ch'êng-hsu
論中國佛教譯場之譯經方式與程序

Lun Liang-han Tsi Nan-pei Ch'ao Ho-hsi Chih K'ai-fa Yü Ju-hsüeh Shih-chiao Chih Chin-chan
論兩漢迄南北朝河西之開發與儒學釋教之進展

Lun Wei-chin I-lai Chih Ch'ung-shang T'an-pien Chih-Chi Ying-hsiang
論魏晉以來之崇尚談辯及其影響

Lun-yü 論語

Lung-ch'ih Tao-ch'iang 龍池道場

Lung-hsien 隆街

Lung-hsing 龍興

Lung-hsing Fo-chiao P'ien-nien T'ung-lun
隆興佛教編年通論

Lung-mên 龍門

Lung-t'an 龍潭

Lü-hu 律虎

Lü-li 律例

Lü-tsung Hsiang-kuan Tsai-chi
律宗相關載記

Lü-tsung Hsin-hsüeh Ming-chü
律宗新學名句

Lü-tsung Têng-p'u 律宗燈譜

Lü-yüan Shih-kuei 律苑事規

Lüeh-yao Chieh-mo 略要羯磨

Ma-tsu 馬祖

Man-i 滿意

Mei-sō-den Shō (J) 名僧傳抄

Meng-tzŭ 孟子

Mi-sha-sê Chieh-mo Pên 彌沙塞羯磨本

Mi-sha-sê Pu Ho-hsi Wu-fên Lü
彌沙塞部和醯五分律

Mi-sha-sê Wu-fên Chieh-pên
彌沙塞五分戒本

Mi-t'o T'ou 彌陀頭

Michihata Ryōshū (J) 道端良秀

Min 閩

Min-chi 民籍

Min-hou 閩侯

Ming 明

Ming-chai 明債

Ming-chan 明瞻

Ming-ching 明淨
Ming-ch'ung 明崇
Ming-ho 明河
Ming-hui 明徽
Ming-hsiang Chi 冥祥記
Ming-kai 明楷
Ming-k'o 明恪
Ming-kung 名恭
Ming-k'uang 明曠
Ming-lieh 明烈
Ming-lü P'ien-Lun 明律篇論
Ming-pên 明本
Ming-sêng Chuan 名僧傳
Ming-shên 明琛
Ming Shih 明史
Ming-tao 明導
Ming-ts'an 明璨
Mo Chi 莫稽
Mochizuki Shinkō (J) 望月信亨
Mochizuki Bukkyō Daijiten (J) 望月佛教大辭典
Mo-chu 摩主
Mo-ho Sêng-chih Lü 摩訶僧祇律
Mo-ho Sêng-chih Pi-ch'iu-ni Chieh-pên 摩訶僧祇比丘尼戒本
Morie Shoten (J) 森江書店
Mou Jun-sun 牟潤孫
Mu-tsung 穆宗
Mu-yung Tê 慕容德
Mu-sang (K) 無相
Mung-chiang 夢江

Na 納
Na Ch'an-shih 那禪師
Nakano Miyoko (J) 中野美代子
Na-tzŭ 衲子
Nan-ch'ang 南昌
Nan-ch'i Shu 南齊書
Nan-chien 南澗
Nan-hai Chi-kuei Nei-fa Chuan 南海寄歸內法傳
Nan-k'ang 南康
Nan-shan 南山
Nan-shan Ch'ao 南山鈔
Nan-shan Chung 南山宗
Nan-shan Li-chiao Chi 南山立教志
Nan-shan Lü-ch'ao 南山律鈔
Nan-shan Lü-yüan Wên-chi 南山律苑文集
Nan-shan Shih-ch'ao 南山事鈔
Nan Shih 南史
Nan-tsung Tun-chiao Tsui-shang Ta-ch'êng Mo-ho Po-jo Po-lo-mi Ching Lu-tsu Hui-nêng Ta-shih Yü Shao-chou Ta-fan Ssŭ Shih-fa T'an-ching 南宗頓教最上大乘摩訶般若波羅蜜經六祖慧能大師於韶州大梵寺施法壇經

Nan-yo 南嶽

Nei-lü 內律

Ni-chung Chieh-mo 尼衆羯磨

Nien-ch'ang 念常

Ning-yüan 凝圓

Nishimoto Ryūzan (J) 西本龍山

Nisshi-Bukkyōshi Ronkō (J) 日支佛教史論考

Niu-yün 牛雲

Ono Genmyō (J) 小野玄妙

Ou-yang Hsiu 歐陽脩

Ōchō Enichi (J) 橫超慧日

Po-yüan 帛遠

Pang-k'o 棒喝

P'an Ku 班固

Pao-ch'ang 寶唱

Pao-ch'iung 寶瓊

Pao-ên Fêng-p'ên Ching 報恩奉盆經

Pao-hsiang 寶相

Pao-hsien 寶賢

Pao-hua 寶華

Pao-kuang 寶光

Pao-liang 寶亮

Pao-ming 寶明

Pao-t'uan 寶象

Pao-yen 寶嚴

P'ao-ch'iu 鮑丘

Pên-chi 本際

Pên-chioh 本覺

Pei-chi Ch'ien-chin Yao-fang 備急千金要方

Pei-ch'i Shu 北齊書

Pei Shih 北史

Pei-sung Ching-fu Lien-piao 北宋經撫年表

Pei-tu 杯渡

P'ei Mien 裴冕

Pi-ch'iu Chu-chin Lü 比丘諸禁律

Pi-ch'iu-ni Chuan 比丘尼傳

Pi-ch'iu-ni Ta-chieh 比丘尼大戒

Pi-ch'iu-ni Ta-chieh Hsü 比丘尼大戒序

Pi-shou Chêng-i Ch'ien-ting 筆受證義僉定

Pi-shou Chêng-tzŭ Ch'ien-ting 筆受正字僉定

Pi-hsüeh Jun-seh Ch'ien-ting 筆受潤色僉定

Pi-shou Tsuan-wên Ch'ien-ting 筆受纂文僉定

Pien-chi 辯機

Pien-chi 辯寂

Pien-chêng Lun 辯正論

Pien-hsiu 辯秀

Pien-ts'ai 辯才

P'in-tao 貧道

Ping 并

Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei 百丈清規

Po-chang Kuei-sheng 百丈規繩

Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei Chêng-i Chi
百丈清規證義記

Po-chang Shan 百丈山

Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei to Ch'an-yüan Ch'ing-kuei (J)
百丈清規と禪苑清規

Po-jo-li 般若力

Po-kuan Chih 百官志,

Pu-hsü Kao-sêng Chuan
補續高僧傳

Pu T'ien-shou Lun-yü Ch'ao-pên Hou Ti Shih-tz'ŭ Tsa-lu
卜天壽論語抄本後的詩詞雜錄

P'a-an 普安

P'u-an 普岸

P'u-chao 普照

P'u-chi 普濟

P'u-fan 普範

P'u-hsi 普璽

P'u-kuang 普光

P'u-sa Chieh-pên 菩薩戒本

P'u-t'uan 蒲團

P'u-yüan 普願

Rekishi (J) 歷史

Ritsushō no Kenkyū (J)
律藏の研究

Ritsushū Kōyō (J) 律宗綱要

Ruh 入

Ryōichi Kondō (J) 近藤良一

Sa-man Tu 沙門都

Sa-man Tu-t'ung 沙門都統

Sa-p'o-to-pu Chi 薩婆多部記

Sakaino Kōyō (J) 境野黃洋

Sakaino Kōyō Hakushi ikō Kankōhai (J)
境野黃洋博士遺稿刊行會

San-kuo Chih 三國志,

San-lien 三聯

San-tao Fa-shih 三刀法師

Sankibo Busshorin (J) 山喜房佛書林

Sangaikyō no Kenkyū (J) 三階教の研究

Seiki no Bukkyō (J) 西域の佛教

Seishin Shobō (J) 誠信書房

Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai (J)
世界聖典刊行協會

Sendai (J) 仙台

Sêng Ch'ang K'ai 僧常凱

Sêng-chao 僧照,

Sêng-chao 僧肇

Sêng-chieh 僧竭
Sêng-ch'eh 僧徹
Sêng-chên 僧珍
Sêng-chêng 僧正
Sêng-chi 僧志,
Sêng-chi 僧制
Sêng-chi 僧濟
Sêng-ch'ien 僧遷
Sêng-ch'ien 僧織
Sêng-chin 僧謹
Sêng-ch'iao 僧喬
Sêng-ch'ou 僧稠
Sêng-chu 僧主
Sêng-chung 僧鍾
Sêng-chün 僧群
Sêng-ch'ü 僧璩
Sêng-ch'üan 僧銓
Sêng-fan 僧範
Sêng-fang 僧昉
Sêng-fu 僧覆
Sêng-han 僧含
Sêng-hou 僧侯
Sêng-hsi 僧襲
Sêng-hsin 僧昕
Sêng-huang 僧晃
Sêng-hui 僧回
Sêng-hui 僧慧,
Sêng-i 僧猗

Sêng-jo 僧若
Sêng-kang 僧綱
Sêng-kung 省躬
Sêng-liu 僧流
Sêng-lang 僧朗
Sêng-lu 僧錄
Sêng-Lüeh 僧智
Sêng-mêng 僧猛
Sêng-miao 僧妙
Sêng-ming 僧明
Sêng-ni Hsing-shih 僧尼行事
Sêng-ni Yao-shih 僧尼要事
Sêng-nien 僧念,
Sêng-pien 僧辯
Sêng-shan 僧善
Sêng-shêng 僧盛
Sêng-shih 僧實
Sêng-shun 僧純
Sêng-ta 僧達
Sêng-t'ang 僧堂
Sêng-ting 僧定
Sêng-tsun 僧遵
Sêng-tsung 僧宗
Sêng-tu 僧都
Sêng-wei 僧瑋
Sêng-wên 僧文
Sêng-yeh 僧業,
Sêng-yin 僧隱

Sêng-yung 僧鄘
Sêng-yu 僧祐
Sêng-yüan 僧遠
Sêng-yüan 僧淵
Sêng-yün 僧雲
Shan-chien Pi-p'o sha Lü 善見毘婆沙律
Shan-ching 善靜
Shan-fu 善伏
Shan-hui 善慧
Shan-pu Moh-mo 善部末摩
Shansi (Shanshi) 山西
Shantung 山東
Shan-yü 善遇
Shanghai Ku-chi Ch'u-pan Shê 上海古籍出版社
Shang-hêng 上恒
Shang-huang 上皇
Shang-ming 尚明
Shang-shu 尚書
Shang-wu 商務
Shao-k'ang 少康
Shao-lin 少林
Shen Yüeh 沈約
Shensi (Shanhsi) 陝西
Shê-t'i Ssŭ-ma 闍提斯那
Shên-chih 神智
Shên-ch'ing 神清
Shên-chou Ch'ih-lü Chu-pu Hu-ch'ien 神州持律諸部互
Shên-ch'iung 神迥
Shên-hao 神皓
Shên-hsiu 神秀
Shên-hui 神會
Shên-su 神素
Shên-ts'ou 神湊
Shên-ting 神鼎
Shên-wu 神悟
Shên-wu 神武
Shên-yung 神鄘
Shêng-chuang. 勝莊
Shêng-kuang 勝光
Shêng-wu 省悟
Shi-ban (J) 師蠻
Shih-ch'ang 實長
Shih-che 侍者
Shih Ch'êng-chên 釋澄真
Shih-chi 史記
Shih-chia P'u 釋迦譜
Shih-chieh Shu-chü 世界書局
Shih-chien 石澗
Shih-chien 師簡
Shih-chung 侍中
Shih-chung Shang-shu Ling 侍中尚書令
Shih Huang-ti 始皇帝

Shih-k'u 石窟

Shih-mên Chêng-t'ung 釋門正統

Shih Nai-an 施耐菴

Shih Nai-an Shêng-p'ing T'an-k'ao 施耐菴生平探考

Shih-san Ching Chu-shu 十三經注疏

Shih-shih Chi-ku Lüeh 釋氏稽古略

Shih-shih Chi-ku Lüeh Hsü-chi 釋氏稽古略續集

Shih-shih I-lien Lu 釋氏疑年錄

Shih-shih T'ung-chien 釋氏通鑑

Shih-sung Chieh-mo 十誦羯磨

Shih-sung Chieh-mo Pi-ch'iu Yao-yung 十誦羯磨比丘要用

Shih-sung I-chi 十誦義記

Shih-sung Lü 十誦律

Shih-sung Lü Po-lo-ti-mu-ch'a Ta Pi-ch'iu Chieh-pên 十誦律波羅提木叉大比丘戒本

Shih-sung Pi-ch'iu Chieh-pên 十誦比丘戒本

Shih-sung Pi-ch'iu-ni Po-lo-ti-mu-ch'a Chieh-pên 十誦比丘尼波羅提木叉戒本

Shih-sung Sêng-ni Yao-shih chieh-mo 十誦僧尼要事羯磨

Shih-sung Shu 十誦疏

Shih-sung Szŭ-chi 十誦私記

Shih Ta-tê 十大德,

Shih-tê 拾得

Shih-tsung Chi 飾宗記

Shih-yung 實玉永

Shih-yü 世瑜

Shina Bukkyōshi Kenkyū Hokugi-hen (J) 支那佛教史研究北魏篇

Shina Bukkyō no Kenkyū (J) 支那佛教史の研究

Shina Bukkyō Seishi (J) 支那佛教正史

Shina Bukkyō Seishi (J) 支那佛教精史

Shizuka Shigenoi (J) 滋野井恬

Shotō-zensha no Ritsuin-kyōjū nitsuite (J) 初唐禪者の律院居住について

Shou 受

Shou-chih 守直

Shou-ch'un 壽春

Shou-jên 守仁

Shou-kuang Tien Hsüeh-shih 壽光殿學士

Shou-tso 首座

Shōwa Hōbō Sō Mokuroku (J) 昭和法寶總目錄

Shu-chi 書記

Shu-chên 書禎

Shu-ching 書淨

Shu-chuang 書狀

Shu-hsiu 書秀

Shu-mu Chi-k'an 書目季刊

Shu-t'ou 樹頭

Shuang-nü 雙女

Shui-ching Chu 水經注

Shui-hu Chuan 水滸傳

Shui-hu Ch'üan-chuan
水滸全傳

Shui-t'ou 水頭

Shun-ti 順帝

Shunyūsha (J) 春秋社

Silla (K) 新羅

Singkiang (Hsinchiang) 新疆

So 莎

Soochow 蘇州

Szŭ 司

Ssŭ-fên Lü 四分律

Ssŭ-fên Lü Ch'ao 四分律鈔

Ssŭ-fên Lü Han-chu Chieh-pên-shu K'o
四分律含注戒本疏科

Ssŭ-fên Lü Hsing-shih-ch'ao Chien-chêng Chi
四分律行事鈔簡正記

Ssŭ-fên Lü Hsing-shih-ch'ao K'o
四分律行事鈔科

Ssŭ-fên Lü Hsing-shih-ch'ao P'i
四分律行事鈔批

Ssŭ-fên Lü Hsing-shih-ch'ao Tzŭ-ch'ih Chi
四分律行事鈔資持記

Ssŭ-fên Lü Hsing-shih-ch'ao Tzŭ-chih-chi Fu-sang Chi-shih
四分律行事鈔資持記扶桑集釋

Ssŭ-fên Lü K'ai-tsung Chi
四分律開宗記

Ssŭ-fên Lü Pi-ch'iu Chieh-pên
四分律比丘戒本

Ssŭ-fên Lü Shan-pu Sui-chi Chieh-mo
四分律刪補隨機羯磨

Ssŭ-fên Lü Shih Pi-ni-i Ch'ao-k'o
四分律拾毘尼義抄科

Ssŭ-fên Lü Shan-fan Pu-chüeh Hsing-shih Ch'ao
四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔

Ssŭ-fên-Lü-shu Shih-tsung-chi
四分律疏飾宗記

Ssŭ-fên Pi-ch'iu-ni Chieh-pên
四分比丘尼戒本

Ssŭ-fên Pi-ch'iu-ni Ch'ao K'o-wên
四分比丘尼抄科文

Ssŭ-fên Pi-ch'iu-ni Chieh-mo Fa
四分比丘尼羯磨法

Ssŭ-fên Sêng Chieh-pên
四分僧戒本

Ssŭ-li Hsiao-wei 司隸校尉

Ssŭ-ma Ch'ien 司馬遷

Ssŭ-ma Kuang 司馬光

Ssŭ-pu Pei-yao 四部備要

Ssŭ-pu Ts'ung-k'an Ch'u-pien Tzŭ-pu 四部叢刊初編子部

Ssŭ-tu 私度

Su-chou 蘇州

Su-tsung 肅宗

Sui 隋

Sui 歲

Sui Shu 隋書

Sun Ch'üan 孫權

Sun Szu-mo 孫思邈

Sung 宋

Sung 嵩

Sung-ch'i 宋祁

Sung Lien 宋濂

Sung Min-ch'iu 宋敏求

Sung Shih 宋史

Sung Shu 宋書

Szechwan (Szuchuan) 四川

Ta-ch'êng Lü I-chang 大乘律義章

Ta-chih Ch'an-shih 大智禪師

Ta-chih Shêng-shou 大智聖壽

Ta-chioh 大覺

Ta-hsin 大訢

Ta-hsing 大行

Ta-hsing-shan 大興善

Ta-i 大義

Ta-kuang 大光

Ta Kuang-chih San-tsang 大廣智三藏

Ta-liang 大亮

Ta Lung-hsiang Chi -ch'ing 大龍翔集慶

Ta Lü-tu 大律都

Ta Pao-chi Ching 大寶積經

Ta-ch'un Ch'ao 大純鈔

Ta-sung Sêng-shih Lioh 大宋僧史略

Ta-t'ang Chên-yüan Hsin-i Shih-ti-ching-têng Chi 大唐貞元新譯十地經等記

Ta-t'ang Chên-yüan Hsü K'ai-yüan Shih-chiao Lu 大唐貞元續開元釋教錄

Ta-t'ang Chung-hsing 大唐中興

Ta-t'ang Chung-hsing San-tsang Shêng-chiao Hsü 大唐中興三藏聖教序

Ta-t'ang Hsi-yü Chi Tsuan-jên P'ien-ch'i 大唐西域記撰人辯機

Ta-t'ang Hsi-yü Ch'iu-fa Kao-sêng Chuan 大唐西域求法高僧傳

Ta-t'ang Ku Ta-tê Tsêng Ssŭ-k'ung Ta-pien-chêng Kuang-chih Pu-k'ung San-tsang Hsing-chuang 大唐故大德贈司空大辨正廣智不空三藏行狀

Ta-t'ang Nei-tien Lu 大唐內典錄

Ta-t'ang Ta-tz'ŭ-ên Ssŭ San-tsang Fa-shih Chuan
大唐大慈恩寺三藏法師傳

Ta-tsang Ching Kang-mu Chih-yao
大藏經綱目指要

Ta-tsang Shêng-chiao Fa-pao Piao-mu
大藏聖教法寶標目

Ta-tsin 大津

Ta-t'ung 大同

Ta-t'ung 大統

T'a-chu 塔主

T'a-ssŭ Chi 塔寺記

Tai-ch'ang-Ssŭ 太常寺

Tai-chia 待駕

Tai-shih 泰始

Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai (J)
大正一切經刊行會

Tai-tao Shui 帶刀睡

Tai-tsung 太宗

Tai-wên 太文

T'ai-chou 台州

Takeshitaryō (J) 竹下寮

Tan-yang 丹陽

T'an-ch'ao 曇超

T'an-chien 曇鑒

T'an-ch'ien 曇遷

T'an-chih 曇智

T'an-ching 曇景

T'an-ch'ung 曇崇

T'an-fei 曇斐

T'an-hsien 曇顯

T'an-hsün 曇詢

T'an-hsü 倓虛

T'an-hui 曇徽

T'an-huo 曇霍

T'an-i 曇翼

T'an-i 曇一

T'an-kuan 曇觀

T'an-kuang 曇光

T'an Mo-ch'ih 曇摩持

T'an Pei-ching Shuang-t'a Szŭ Hai-yün Pei
談北京雙塔寺海雲碑

T'an-shun 曇順

T'an-sui 曇邃

T'an-tan 曇誕

T'an Tao-chi 檀道濟

T'an-ti 曇諦

T'an-t'ou 炭頭

T'an-tsun 曇遵

T'an-wu-tê Chieh-mo 曇無德羯磨

T'an Wu-tsui 曇無最

T'an-yüan 曇瑗

T'an-yen 曇衍

T'an-yen 曇延

T'an-yu 曇遊

T'an-yung 曇邕

T'an-yung 曇榮
T'an-yü 曇域
T'an-yüan 曇元
T'an-yüan 曇垣
T'an-yün 曇韻
T'ang 唐
T'ang Hui-yao 唐會要
T'ang Hung-chou Po-chang Shan Ku Huai-hai Ch'an-shih T'a-ming
唐洪州百丈山故懷海禪師塔銘
T'ang-jên Shih-yeh Shan-lin Ssŭ-yüan Chih Fêng-shang
唐人習業山林寺院之風尚
T'ang Kuo-shih Pu 唐國史補
T'ang-lü Shu-i 唐律疏義
T'ang-shih Yen-chiu Ts'ung-kao
唐史研究叢稿
T'ang Ta-chao-ling Chih
唐大詔令集
T'ang-tai Ssŭ-yüan Ching-chi Ti Yen-chiu
唐代寺院經濟的研究
T'ang Yung-t'ung 湯用彤
Tao-an 道安
Tao-an 道岸
Tao-chao 道照
Tao-ch'an 道禪
Tao-ch'ang 道場
Tao-chê 道哲
Tao-chêng 道正
Tao-chêng 道整
Tao-ch'êng 道成
Tao-ch'êng 道澄
Tao-chi 道紀
Tao-chi 道積
Tao-chieh 道傑
Tao-chieh 道階
Tao-chih 道志
Tao-chin 道金
Tao-ching 道靖
Tao-ching 道敬
T'an-ch'ing 曇清
Tao-chou 道舟
Tao-ch'ung 道寵
Tao-fa 道法
Tao-fu 道俯
Tao-fu 道覆
Tao-fang 道房
Tao-hsi 道希
Tao-hsin 道信
Tao-hsing 道行
Tao-hsing 道興
Tao-hsiu 道休
Tao-hsüan 道宣
Tao-hui 道恢
Tao-hui 道暉

Tao-hui 道會
Tao-hung 道洪
Tao-hung 道宏
Tao-ju 道儒
Tao-i 道一
Tao-kuang 道光
Tao-liang 道亮
Tao-lin 道琳
Tao-mêng 道猛
Tao-mu 道睦
Tao-p'an 道判
Tao-p'iao 道標
Tao-p'i 道丕
Tao-p'ing 道憑
Tao-shih 道世
Tao-shou 道爍
Tao-shu 道樹
Tao-shun 道舜
Tao-suen 道愻
Tao-sung 道嵩
Tao-ta 道達
Tao-tsun 道遵
Tao-t'ung 道通
Tao-wang 道汪
Tao-wên 道温
Tao-wu 道悟
Tao-yen 道顏
Tao-yin 道因
Tao-yin 道氤
Tao-yin 道閏
Tao-ying 道瑩
Tao-ying 道膺
Tao-yung 道榮
Tao-yung 道融
Tao-Yü 道育
Tao-yüan 道源
Tao-yüeh 道悅
Tao-yün 道雲
Tê-chi 德基
Tê-hui 德煇
Tê-kan 德感
Tê-mei 德美
Tê-shan 德山
Tê-tsung 德宗
Têng-chou 登州
Têng-t'ou 燈頭
Ti-shih Pa-ssŭ-pa Hsing-chuang Chiao-chêng 帝師八思巴行狀校證
Tien-chu 殿主
Tien-tien Shih 點點師
Tien-tso 典座
T'ien-chu 天竺
T'ien-hsia Sêng-chu 天下僧主
T'ien-hua Ch'u-pan Shih-yeh Kung-ssŭ 天華出版事業公司
T'ien-i 天一

T'ien-jan 天然

T'ien-ning 天寧

T'ien-nü San-mei 天女三昧

T'ien-p'ing 天平

T'ien-t'ai 天台

Ting-kuang 定光

Ting-lin 定林

Ting-pin 定賓

Ting-sui 定水

Tohoku Shigakuki (J)
東北史學會

Tokiwa Daijō (J) 常盤大定

T'oh-t'oh 脫脫

T'ou-t'o 頭陀

Tō Chūki Irai no Chōan no Kudakushi (J)
唐代中期以来の長安の功德使

Tōdai Bukkyōshi no Kenkyū (J)
唐代佛教史の研究

Tō Dai-wa-jō Tō-sei Den
唐大和上東征傳

Tōdai Zenhanki no Sōdō Shorei ni tsuite (J)
唐代前半期の僧道所轄について

Tōhō Gakuhō (J) 東方學報

Tōhō Shūkyō (J) 東方宗教

Tsa-wên Lü-shih 雜問律事

Tsan-hsüeh So-t'an 參學瑣談

Tsan-ning 贊寧

Tsang-chu 藏主

Tsang-huan 藏奐

Tsang-i 藏廙

Ts'ai-po 財帛

Ts'ai-t'ou 菜頭

Ts'ao-ch'i 曹溪

Ts'ao-Wei 曹魏

Ts'ê-fu Yüan-kuei 冊府元龜

Tsêng-hui Chi-chü 增光輝記主

Tsêng-i A-han Ching 增一阿含經

Tsêng-jen 增忍

Ts'in-yang 沁陽

Tso Chuan 左傳

Tso Sze-bong (Ts'ao Shih-p'ang)
曹仕邦

Tsu-hsiu 祖秀

Tsukamoto Zenryū (J) 塚本善隆

Tsun-hui 遵誨

Tsung-chih Yüan 總制院

Tsung-chien 宗鑑

Tsung-i 宗頤

Tsung-liang 宗亮

Tsung-mi 宗密

Tsung-pao 宗寶

Tsung-yin 宗印

Ts'ui Hao Yü K'ou Ch'ien-chih
崔浩與寇謙之

Ts'ui Kuang 崔光

Ts'ung 聰,

Ts'ung-chên 崇真

Ts'ung-chien 從諫

Ts'ung-li 從禮

Ts'ung-lin 叢林

Ts'ung-lin Chih-tu Yü Ch'an-tsung Chiao-yü
叢林制度與禪宗教育

Ts'ung-lin Chiao-ting Ch'ing-kuei Tsung-yao
叢林校定清規總要

Ts'ung-shên 從諗,

Tu Chêng-lun 杜正倫

Tu Chien-ssŭ 都監寺

Tu I 杜乂

Tu-i Sêng-chêng 都邑僧正

Tu-ku 獨孤

Tu-ti 讀體

Tu-tsung 度宗

Tu Wei-na 都維那

Tuan Chih-hsüan 段志玄

Tuan Ch'êng-shih 段成式

Tuan-fu 端甫

Tuan-shih Sa-mên 斷事沙門

Tuan Wên-ch'ang 段文昌

Tun-chiao 頓教

Tung-ching K'ê-sêng 東京客僧

Tung-chu 東初

Tung-hsü 東序

Tung-lin 東林

Tung-lin Shih-pa Kao-hsien Chuan
東林十八高賢傳

Tung-san 動散

Tung-shan 洞山

Tung-t'a Lü-tsung 東塔律宗

T'ung 統

T'ung-ho 通和

T'ung-ming 通明

T'ung-ta 通達

Tzŭ-chioh 自覺

Tzŭ-ch'ih T'ung-chien 資治通鑑

Tz'ŭ-an 慈安

Tz'ŭ-hsi 慈禧

Tz'u-pu 祠部

Û-sang (K) 義湘

Ui Hakuju (J) 宇井伯壽

Wa-kuan 瓦官

Wan-shou 萬壽

Wan-yu Wên-k'u 萬有文庫

Wang Ku 王古

Wang Lo-han 王羅漢

Wang-ming 亡名

Wang P'u 王溥

Wang-shêng Hsi-fang Ching-t'u Shui-ying Chuan
往生西方淨土瑞應傳

Wang T'an-chih 王坦之
Wang-tien-yü 王典遇
Wang Tsai 王在
Wang Yen 王琰
Wang Yü-ch'êng 王禹偁
Wên-chih 文質
Wên-chou 溫州
Wên-chü 文舉
Wên-hsi 文喜
Wên-hui 文惠
Wên-i 文益
Wên-kang 文綱
Wên-tsung 文宗
Wei 魏
Wei Chêng 魏徵
Wei-chin Nan-pei Ch'ao Sui T'ang Ching-chi Shih-kao 魏晉南北朝隋唐經濟史稿
Wei-ching 惟靖
Wei-chou 衛州
Wei-kung 惟恭
Wei-mien 惟勉
Wei-na 維那
Wei-pai 惟白
Wei Shou 魏收
Wei-yen 惟儼
Wŏn-gwang (K) 圓光
Wu 吳
Wu 武
Wu Chao 武曌
Wu Chao Yü Fo-chiao 武曌與佛教
Wu Ch'êng-lo 吳承洛
Wu Ch'êng-sŭ 武承嗣
Wu-chi 無迹
Wu-chin 武進
Wu-chin-tsang 無盡藏
Wu-chin-ts'ai 無盡財
Wu-chin-wu 無盡物
Wu-ên 晤恩
Wu-fên Pi-ch'iu-ni Chieh-pên 五分比丘尼戒本
Wu-hsing 無行
Wu-hsing 吳興
Wu-jan 無染
Wu-k'ung 悟空
Wu-ming 無名
Wu-pu Ch'ü-fên Ch'ao 五部區分鈔
Wu-tai Shih-chi 五代史記
Wu-t'ai Shan 五臺山
Wu-tê 武德
Wu Ting-hsieh 吳廷燮
Wu Tsê-t'ien 武則天
Wu-tso 無作
Wu-tsung 武宗
Wu-wei 武威
Wu-yeh 無業
Wu-ying 武英

Yabuki Keiki (J) 矢吹慶輝
Yamaguchi Ken (J) 山口縣
Yana Ryūjō (J) 山田龍城
Yang 煬
Yang Hsüan-chih 楊衒之
Yang I 楊億
Yang, Lien-sheng 楊聯陞
Yao Hsing 姚興
Yao-kuang 瑤光
Yao Ming-ta 姚名達
Yao Szu-L'ien 姚思廉
Yeh 鄴
Yeh-shê 耶舍
Yen 兗
Yen-ch'êng 彥稱
Yen Chih-t'ui 顏之推
Yen-ch'iu 彥求
Yen-chün 嚴俊
Yen-hsing 延興
Yen-i 延一
Yen Keng-wang 嚴耕望
Yen-shih Chia-hsün 顏氏家訓
Yen-shou 延壽
Yen-shou-t'ang Chu 延壽堂主
Yen-yin 演音
Yen 燕
Yin-chien 印簡
Yin Ch'ien 尹謙
Yin-shui 引水
Ying-ch'ên Hui-i Lu 影塵回憶錄
Ying-tsung 英宗
Yō-ei (J) 榮叡
Yu 幽
Yu Chia-hsi 余嘉錫
Yu-chia-hsi Lun-hsüeh Tsa-chu 余嘉錫論學雜著
Yu-i Wu-pên Lu 有譯無本錄
Yu Tao-sui 于道邃
Yu-yang 酉陽
Yu-yang Tsa-tsu 酉陽雜俎
Yung 容
Yung 融
Yung-an 永安
Yung-chi 融濟
Yung-chia 永嘉
Yung-ling 永寧
Yung-ming 永明
Yung-ting 永定
Yü Ch'ien 喻謙
Yü-chu 浴主
Yü Fa-shih 餘法師
Yü-hang 餘杭
Yü-lin 榆林
Yü Wan-chih 虞玩之
Yüan-chao 元照
Yüan-chao 圓照

Yüan-chên 圓震
Yüan-ch'êng 願誠
Yüan-chioh 圓覺
Yüan-chu 園主
Yüan-hao 元浩
Yüan-hsiang 員相
Yüan I 元懌
Yüan-kuei 元珪
Yüan-ming Kuang-chiao 圓明光教
Yüan-piao 元表
Yüan Shih 元史
Yüan-shih T'ien-tsun 元始天尊
Yüan-t'ung 圓通
Yüan-wai Lang 員外郎
Yüan-yu 元祐
Yüeh-ch'i 月溪
Yüeh-chung 悅衆
Yüeh-tsang Chih-tsin 閱藏知津
Yün-chung Yin-sung Hsin-k'o Chih-chieh 雲中音誦新科之誡
Yün-k'an 允堪
Yün-mên 雲門
Yün-wên 允文
Yün-t'ai 雲臺
Yüan Yüan 阮元
Zengaku Kenkyū (J) 禪學研究
Zenshūshi Kenkyū (J) 禪宗史研究
Zoku Daizōkō (J) 續大藏經
Zui-hō (J) 瑞芳

ADDENDUM

Chan-shih 詹事
Chao Yen 趙儼
Ch'en Hui 陳慧
Ch'en K'ang 陳康
Ch'ên-kuan 貞觀
Chih-yüan I-p'ien 芝園遺編
Chin-shih 進士
Ching-tu 淨度
Êrh-chu Yung 爾朱榮
Fa-yüeh 法悅
Fêng-kan 封干
Fêng Tzŭ-t'ung 馮子通
Fu I 傅奕
Hêng-yüeh 恒月
Hsiu-ts'ai 秀才
Hsiung An-shêng 熊安生
Hsü Sêng-ta 徐僧達
Hsü Yung 徐邕
Hsüan-kao 玄高

Huang-fu Mi 皇甫謐

Hui-li 慧立

Hui-ning 慧凝

Hung-hsien 洪獻

I 易

Lan kung 蘭公

Li 禮

Li Shêng-ming 李昇明

Ling-chu 靈著

Li-ta Fa-pao Chi 歷代法寶記

Ningsia (Ninghsia) 寧夏

Pêng-ch'êng 彭城

P'u-sa Ti-ch'ih Ching 菩薩地持經

Sakaki Ryōzaburō (J) 榊亮三郎

Sêng-ai 僧崖

Sêng-min 僧旻

Shan-yin 山陰

Shih-shih-êrh-chang Ching
四十二章經

Shih-t'ou 石頭

Shu 蜀

Ssŭ-jên Liang 庶人諒

Sui-t'ang Chih-tu Yüan-yüan Lüeh-lun Kao
隋唐制度淵源略論稿

Sung-wang 宋王

Suzuki-gakujustu Zaiden (J)
鈴木學術財團

Szŭ-k'ung 司空

Ta-yeh 大業

T'ai-yüan 太原

Tao-ang 道昂

Têng 鄧

Tou 斗

Wan Ta-wei 萬達威

Wang Tun 王敦

Wei Shu 魏書

Wên-hsüan 文宣

Wu-yüeh 吳越

Yang Kuang 楊廣

Yang Liang 楊諒

Yu Fa-lan 于法蘭

Yung-hui 永徽

Chih-yüan Chi 芝園集

Chih-yüan I-p'ien 芝園遺編

Mao 卯

Nien-p'u 年譜

Shih-lao Chih 釋老志

Ts'ao-chou 曹州

ABBREVIATIONS

CC	The Chinese Classics
CSTCC	Ch'u San-tsang Chi-chi
CTCTL	Ching-tê Ch'uan-têng Lu
CYHTSCML	Chên-yüan Hsin-ting Shih-chiao Mu-lu
CYYCYLSYYYCSCK	Chung-yang Yen-chiu-yüan Li-shih-yü-yen Yen-chiu-so Chi-k'an
DNBKZS	Dai Nihon Bukkyō Zensho
DRMGTV	Dharmaguptavinaya
FTTC	Fo-tsu T'ung-chi
HJAS	Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies
HKSC	Hsü Kao-sêng Chuan
HMC	Hung-ming Chi
HYHP	Hsin-ya Hsüeh-pao
HYSYHSLK	Hsin-ya Shu-yüan Hsüeh-shu Lien-k'an
IDGBKGKK	Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū
KHMC	Kuang Hung-ming Chi
KSC	Kao-sêng Chuan
KYSCL	K'ai-yüan Shih-chiao Lu
LTSPC	Li-tai San-pao Chi
LYCLC	Lo-yang Chia-lan Chi
MHSGKV	Mahāsaṅghikavinaya
MĪŚSKV	Mahīśāsakāvinaya
NHCKNFC	Nan-hai Chi-kuei Nei-fa Chuan
SKSC	Sung Kao-sêng Chuan
SMTPSDV	Samantapāsādika
SVSTVDV	Sarvāstivādavinaya
TSSSL	Ta-sung Sêng-shih Lüeh
TTHYCFKSC	Ta-t'ang Hsi-yü Ch'iu-fa Kao-sêng Chuan
TTNTL	Ta-t'ang Nei-tien Lu
TTTTÊSSTFSC	Ta-t'ang Ta Tzŭ-ên Ssŭ San-tsang Fa-shih Chuan
WYPE	Wu-ying Palace Edition.
ZD	Zoku Daizōkō.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abe, Joichi, Chūgoku Zenshūshi Kenkyū (A Study of the History of Chinese Zen Buddhism), Seishin Shobō Press, Tokyo 1962.

Adachi Kiroku, Kōshō Hokken Den (A Study of Hokken's Record of the Buddhistic Kingdoms), Kabushiki-gaisha Sanseidō Press, Tokyo 1936.

---, Hokken Den -- Chū-a Indo Nankaii Kikō no Kenkyū (A Study of Hokken's Record on His Travels in Central Asia, India and the South Seas), Hōzōkan Press, Tokyo 1940.

Ai-t'ung, compiler, Mi-sha-sê Chieh-mo Pên (The Karma of the MĪŚSKV), Taishō 1424, Tokyo 1928.

Akitsuki Kan'ei, 'Dōsō kaku no Fukkyū ni tsuite (A Restoration of the Regulations for Buddhist Monks and Taoist Priests)', Rekishi 4, Tōhoku Shigakuki Press, Sendai 1952.

---, 'Tōdai Shūkyō Keihō ni Kansuru Kanken (A Personal View of the Religious Penal Code of the T'ang Dynasty), Tōhō Shūkyō, No. 4-5, Tokyo 1954.

Anon., tr., Pao-ên Fêng-p'ên Ching (Ullambana Sūtra ?), Taishō 686, Tokyo 1928.

Anon., Wang-shêng Hsi-fang Ching-t'u Shui-ying Chuan (The Accounts of the Rebirth in the Western Pure Land), Taishō 2070, Tokyo 1928.

Anon., Liang-ching Ssŭ-chi (A Record of the Establishments in the Capital of the Liang Dynasty), Taishō 2094, Tokyo 1928.

Anon., Tung-lin Shih-pa Kao-hsien Chuan (The Biographies of the Eighteen Eminent Personalities of the Tung-lin Monastery), Zokuzōkyō, Vol. 135, Hongkong (reprint) 1967.

Banerjee, S.C., 'The Vinaya Texts in China', in Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. XXV, no. 2, Calcutta 1949.

Bapat, P.V. and Hirakawa, tr., Shan Chien P'i-p'o-sha, A Chinese Version by Saṅghabhadra of Samantapāsādika, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute Press, Poona 1970.

Beal, Samuel, tr., The Life of Hiuen-tsiang, Kegan Paul-French, Trübner and Co. Ltd Press, London 1914 (re-issue).

Buck, Pearl S., tr. All Men are Brothers, reprinted by Pei-i Press, Taiwan, 1967

Buddhabhadra, tr., Mo-ho Sêng-chih Lü (Mahāsaṅghikavinaya), Taishō 1425, Tokyo 1928.

Buddhabhadra, tr., Mo-ho Sêng-chih Lü Ta Pi-ch'iu Chieh-pên (The Śīla for the Great Bhikṣus of the Mahāsaṅghikavinaya), Taishō 1426, Tokyo 1928.

---, Mo-ho Sêng-chih Pi-ch'iu-ni Chieh-pên (The Śīla for Bhikṣuṇīs of the MHSGKV), Taishō 1427, Tokyo 1928.

Buddhajīva, tr., Mi-sha-sê Pu Ho-hsi Wu-fên Lü (The Vinaya of the Mahīśāsaka School in Five Parts), Taishō 1421, Tokyo 1928.

---, Mi-sha-sê Wu-fên Chieh-pên (The Śīla for Monks of the Mahāśāsakavinaya in Five Parts), Taishō 1422, Tokyo 1928.

Buddhayaśas, tr., Ssŭ-fên Lü (The Vinaya in Four Parts or Dharmaguptavinaya), Taishō 1428, Tokyo 1928.

---, Ssŭ-fên Sêng Chieh-pên (The Śīla of the DRMGTV for Monks), Taishō 1430, Tokyo 1928.

Chang-sun Wu-chi, T'ang-lü Shu-i (Commentaries to the Acts of Law of the T'ang Dynasty), Shangwu Press, Taiwan 1969.

Chang T'ing-yu and others, Ming Shih (The History of the Ming Dynasty), WYPE, I-wên Press, Taipei ca. 1959-61.

Chang Yin-lin, Chung-kuo Shih-kang (An Outline of Chinese History), San-lien Press, Peking 1962.

Chao Chien, Ta-t'ang Ku Ta-tê Tsêng Ssŭ-k'ung Ta-pien-chêng Kuang-chih Pu-k'ung San-tsang Hsing-chuang (The Obituary of the Late Tripiṭaka Master Pu-k'ung [Amoghavajra] on whom was conferred the official title of Ssŭ-k'ung [Minister of Works] and the religious title of 'The Well-informed Grand Distinguisher of the Truth'), Taishō 2056, Tokyo 1928.

Chao Êrh-sun, Ch'ing-shih Kao (A Draft of the History of the Ch'ing Dynasty), Chung-hua Press, Peking 1976.

Ch'en Hsü, 'T'ang Hung-chou Po-chang Shan Ku Huai-hai Ch'an-shih T'a-ming (The Epitaph to the Stūpa of the Late Master Huai-hai of Ch'an Buddhism of the T'ang Dynasty who had lived in Mount Po-chang of Hung-chou)' in Chüan T'ang Wên (A Collection of Essays composed in the Pan-T'ang Dynasty), Hua-lien Ch'u-pan Shê Press, Taipei 1965.

Ch'en, Kenneth, Buddhism in China - A Historical Survey, Princeton University Press, Princeton 1964.

---, 'Filial Piety in Chinese Buddhism', HJAS, Vol. 28, Cambridge, Mass., 1968.

Ch'en Yin-k'o, 'Wu Chao yu Fo-chiao (The Empress Wu Chao and Buddhism)', CYYCYLSYYYCSCK (The Academia Sinica Bulletin of National Research Institute of History and Philology), Vol. V, part 2, Nanking 1935.

---, 'Ts'ui Hao yü K'ou Ch'ien-Chih (Ts'ui Hao the Confucianist and K'ou Ch'ien-chih the Taoist of the Northern Wei Dynasty)', Ling-nan Hsüeh-pao, Vol. 11, Canton, 1957.

---, Sui-t'ang Chih-tu Yüan-yüan Lioh-lun Kao (A Survey of the Sources of the Political System of the Successive Dynasties Sui and T'ang), Chung-hua Press, Peking 1963.

Ch'en Yüan, 'Ta-t'ang Hsi-yü Chi Chuan-jên Pien-ch'i (On P'ien-ki, author of Ta-T'ang Hsi-yu Ki), CYYCYLSYYYCSCK (The Academia Sinica Bulletin of National Research Institute of History and Philology), Vol. II, no. 1, Nanking 1930.

---, Chung-kuo Fo-chiao Shih-chi Kai-lun (An Outline of the Chinese Buddhist Historical Works), Chung-hua Press, Peking 1962.

---, Shih-shih I-nien Lu (A Survey of the Dates of Buddhist Monks in China), Chung-hua Press, Peking 1964.

---, 'Fo-ya Ku-shih (The Stories of the Buddha's Tooth Relic)', in Ch'en Yüan Hsien-shêng Chin Nien-lien Shih-hsüeh Lun-wên Chi Ch'ung-wên Press, Hong Kong 1971.

---, 'T'an Pei-ching Shuang-t'a Ssŭ Hai-yün Pei (A Note on the Inscription of the Monk Hai-yün's Career that is engraved on a stone tablet and placed in the Shuang-t'a Monastery of Peking)', ibid.

Chên-hua, Tsan-hsüeh So-t'an (Rambling Remarks on my wandering career), Chioh-shih Hsün-k'an Shê Press, Taiwan, 1965.

Chêng-shou, Chia-t'ai P'u-têng Lu (A Universal Record of the Transmission of the Lamp compiled during the Chia-t'ai Era [1201-1204]), Zokuzōkyō Vol. 137, Hong Kong (reprint) 1967.

Ch'êng Shu-tê, Chiu Ch'ao Lü-k'ao (A Study of the Legal Acts of the Nine Dynasties), Chung-hua Press, Peking 1963.

Chi Hsien-lin, Chung-yin Wên-hua Kuan-hsi-shih Lun-ts'ung (Miscellaneous notes on the History of Sino-Indian Cultural Relationships), Jên-min Ch'u-pan Shê Press, Peking 1952.

---, 'Chi Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu Fan-wên Yüan-pên Ti Fa-hsien (A Note on the Discovery of the Sanskrit Texts of a Mūla-sarvāstivādavinaya Scripture)', in Chou Shu-t'ao Hsien-shêng Liu-shih Shêng-jih Chi-nien Lun-wên Chi (see Chou I-liang), 1967.

Ch'ien Mu, Kuo-shih Ta-kang (An Outline to the History of My Nation), Shang-wu Press, Shanghai 1940.

Chih-hsü, Yüeh-tsang Chih-tsin (A Guide to the Tripitaka), Shō-wa Hō-bō Sō-moku-roku, No. 74 (Vol. III), Tokyo 1934.

Chih-hsü, Fo-shou Chai-ching Chu-k'o (The Systematization of the Uposatha-sūtra with Commentary), Zokuzōkyō Vol. 71, Hong Kong (reprint), 1967.

Chih-p'an, Fo-tsu T'ung-chi (The Record of the Orthodox Line of Succession of the Patriarchs descending from the Buddha), Taishō 2035, Tokyo 1928.

Chih-shêng, K'ai-yüan Shih-chiao Lu (Catalogue of the K'ai-yüan Era on Buddhism), Taishō 2154, Tokyo 1928.

Chih-shou, Ssŭ-fên Lü Shu (The Commentary of the DRMGTV), Zokuzōkyō Vol. 66, Hong Kong (reprint) 1967.

Ching-hsiao, Ssŭ-fên Lü Hsing-shih-ch'ao Chien Chêng Chi (A Revision of the Quotation), Zokuzōkyō vol. 68, Hong Kong (reprint) 1967.

Chioh-an, Shih-shih Chi-ku Lüeh (A Survey of the Historical Affairs on Buddhism), Taishō 2037, Tokyo 1928.

Chou I-liang and others, Chou Shu-t'ao Hsien-shêng Liu-shih Sheng-jih Chi-nien Lun-wên Chi (Studies presented to Mr. Chou Shu-t'ao on his Sixtieth Birthday), Lun-mên Press (reprint), Hong Kong 1967.

Chu Ch'an, tr., The Sūtra of 42 Sections, The Buddhist Society Press, London 1947.

Chu Fo-l'ien, tr., P'i-na-yeh (Vinaya), Taishō 1464, Tokyo 1928.

Chung-tsung, 'Ta-t'ang Chung-hsing San-tsang Shêng-chiao Hsü (A foreword to the Buddhist Scriptures translated in the Period after the Great T'ang Dynasty resumed her regime)', Ch'i-sha Tripiṭaka, Copy 136' Ch'ang', Shanghai 1935.

Davids, T.W. Rhys, and William Stede, The Pāli Text Society's Pāli-English Dictionary, Luzac & Company, London 1959.

de Crespigny, Rafe R.C. (see Dubs, H.H.).

de Groot, J.J.M., 'Militant Spirit of the Buddhist Clergy in China', T'oung-pao, Vol. II, Leiden 1891.

---, Le Code du Mahāyāna en Chine -- son Influence sur la vie Monacale et sur le Monde Laïque, Johannes Müller Press, Amsterdam 1893.

de Jong, J.W., Buddha's Word in China. 28th George Ernest Morrison Lecture, The Australian National University Press, Canberra, 1967.

---, 'Review of Tso Sze-bong, Chung-kuo Fo-chiao Shih-chuan Yü Mu-lu Yüan-ch'u Lü-hsüeh Sha-men Chih T'an-t'ao (A Study of Chinese Buddhist Biographies and Bibliographies derived from the Vinaya Sect)', T'oung-pao, Vol. LIV, 4-5, Leiden 1970.

Demiéville, P., 'A propos du concile de Vaiśālī', T'oung Pao, 40, Leiden 1951.

Dharmarakṣa, tr., Fo-shou Yü-lan-p'ên Ching (Ullambana Sūtra), Taishō 685, Tokyo 1928.

Dharmarakṣa, tr., Yu-p'o-sê Chieh Ching (Upāsakaśīla Sūtra), Taishō 1488, Tokyo 1928.

---, P'u-sa Chieh-pên (The Śīla of the Bodhisattva), Taishō 1500, Tokyo 1928.

Dharmaruci (see Puṇyatara).

Dubs, H.H. and Rafe R.C. de Crespigny, Official Titles of the Former Han Dynasty, The Australian National University Press, Canberra 1967.

Dutt, Nalinaksha, Gilgit Manuscripts, in The Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies, No. LIXX(E), Srinagar-Kashmir 1974.

E-ken, Ritsu no Sōbō Den (The Biographies of the Treasonous Buddhist Monks in the Garden of Vinaya), DNBKZS (The Entire Collection of Works on Buddhism composed in the Great Japan), Vol. 105, Tokyo 1921.

Fa-hai, Nan-tsung Tun-chiao Tsui-shang Ta-ch'êng Mo-ho Po-jo Po-lo-mi Ching Lu-tsu Hui-nêng Ta-shih Yü Shao-chou Ta-fan Ssŭ Shih-fa T'an-ching (The Analects recording the Doctrines on sudden Enlightenment by Master Hui-nêng, the Sixth Patriarch of the Southern Sect of Ch'an Buddhism taught in the Ta-fan Monastery in Shao-chou City after his Sermon on the Mahāyānist Prajñā-pāramitāsūtra), Taishō 2007, Tokyo 1928.

Fa-hsien, Kao-sêng Fa-hsien Chuan (The Eminent Monk Fa-hsien's Record of the Buddhist Kingdoms), Taishō 2085, Tokyo 1928.

Fa-li, Ssŭ-fên Lü Shu (The Commentary on the DRMGTV), Zokuzōkyō Vol. 65, Hong Kong (reprint) 1967.

Fa-lin, P'ien-chêng Lun (The Arguments for the Rightenousness of Buddhism), Taishō 2110, Tokyo 1928.

Fa-ying, Shih-sung Pi-ch'iu-ni Po-lo-ti-mu-ch'a Chieh pên (The Prātimokṣa of the SVSTVDV for Bhikṣuṇīs), Taishō 1437, Tokyo 1928.

Fan Wên-lan, Chung-kuo T'ung-shih Chien P'ien (A Simplified General Chinese History), Jên-min Ch'u-pan Shê Press, Peking 1965.

Fan Yeh, Hou-Han Shu (The History of the Later Han Dynasty), WYPE, I-wên Press, Taipei, ca. 1959-61.

Fang Hsüan-ling and others, Chin Shu (The History of the Chin Dynasty), WYPE, I-wên Press, Taipei, ca. 1959-61.

Fei Ch'ang-fang, Li-tai San-pao Chi (A Record of the Three Treasures of Buddhism in each Chinese Dynasty), Taishō 2034, Tokyo 1928.

Fêng Mêng-lung (ed.), Ku-chin Hsaio-shoh (Novels of the Past and the Present Days), Jên-min Wên-hsüeh Ch'u-pan Shê Press, Peking 1958.

Garrahan, Gilbert J., A Guide to Historical Method, Fordham University Press, New York 1975.

Gautama Prajñāruci, tr., Chieh-t'o Chieh-pên Ching (The Śīla for Salvation), Taishō 1460, Tokyo 1928.

Gen-kai, Tō Dai-wa-jō Tō-sei Den (The Account of the Campaign to the East of the Great Vandya from the T'ang Dynasty), Taishō 2089, Tokyo 1928.

Gernet, Jacques, Les aspects économiques du Bouddhisme de la Société Chinoise du Ve au Xe siècle, École Française d'Extrême-Orient, Saigon 1956.

Giles, H.A., tr., The Travels of Fa-hien, Routledge and Kegan Ltd Press, London 1956.

Gnoli, Raniero, ed., The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu, Istituto Italiano per il medio ed Estremo Oriente, Roma 1976.

Guṇavarman, tr., Ssŭ-fên Pi-ch'iu-ni Chieh-mo Fa (The Way of Karma of the DRMGTV for Bhikṣuṇīs), Taishō 1434, Tokyo 1928.

Gyō-nen, Ritsu-shū Kō-yō (An Outline of the Vinaya School), ZD (A continuation of the Taishō) 2384, Tokyo 1931.

---, Mei-sō-den Shō (Materials quoted from Pao-ch'ang's Ming-sêng Chuan [Biographies of famous Buddhist monks]), Zokuzōkyō, Vol. 134, Hong Kong (reprint) 1967.

Hatani Ryōtai, Seiiki no Bukkyō (Buddhism in the Western Regions), Morie Shoten press, Tokyo 1922.

Hêng-an, Hsü Chên-yüan Shih-chiao Lu (A continuation of the CYHTSCML), Taishō 2158, Tokyo 1928.

Hêng-shih, Lü-tsung Têng-p'u (A genealogy of the transmission of the Lamp of the Dharmaguptavinaya School), Chin-ling Edition, Nanking 1866 ?

Hirakawa, see Bapat, P.V.

Hirakawa, Akira, Ritsuzō no Kenkyū (A study of the Vinayapiṭaka), Sankibo Busshorin Press, Tokyo 1960.

Hirosato Iwai, Nisshi-bukkyōshi-ronkō (Some historical studies on Buddhism in China and Japan), Toyo Bunko Press, Tokyo 1957.

hPhags-Pa, compiler, Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu Ch'u-chia Shou-chin-yüan Chieh-mo (The procedure of the Karma for Ordination of the Mūlasarvāstivāda School), Taishō 1904.

---, Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu Pi-ch'iu Hsi-hsüeh Laio-fa (A brief Introduction of the Śīla for Bhikṣus of the Mūlasarvāstivāda School), Taishō 1905, Tokyo 1928.

Hsiang, Master, Fa-hua Ching Chuan-chi (The Biographies of the Preachers of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra), Taishō 2068, Tokyo 1928.

Hsiao Tzŭ-hsien, Nan-Ch'i Shu (The History of the Southern Ch'i Dynasty) WYPE, I-wên Press, Taipei, ca. 1959-61.

Hsü Foo-kuan, Chou Ch'in Han Chêng-chih Shê-hui Chieh-kuo Chih Yen-chiu (A study of the political and social structures of the Chou, the Ch'in and the Han Dynasties), Hsin-ya Yen-chiu So (New Asia Research Institute) Press, Hong Kong 1972.

Hsüan-tsang, tr., P'u-sa Chieh-pên (The Śīla of Bodhisattva), Taishō 1501, Tokyo 1928.

Hu Shih, Hu Shih Wên-ts'un (Hu Shih's registered essays), Yüan-tung Press, Taipei 1953.

Huai-su, compiler, Ssŭ-fên Lü Pi-ch'iu Chieh-pên (The Śīla for Bhikṣus of the DRMGTV), Taishō 1429, Tokyo 1928.

---, Ssŭ-fên Pi-ch'iu-ni Chieh-pên (The Śīla for the Bhikṣuṇīs of the DRMGTV), Taishō 1431, Tokyo 1928.

---, Ssŭ-fên Sêng Chieh-mo (Karma of the DRMGTV for Monks), Ch'i-sha Tripiṭaka, Copy 341' Ruh', Shanghai 1935.

---, Ni Chieh-mo (Karma for the Nuns), Ch'i-sha Tripiṭaka, Copy 341' Ruh', Shanghai 1935.

---, Ssŭ-fên Lü K'ai-tsung Chi (An introduction to the doctrines of the DRMGTV), Zokuzōkyō vol. 66 and vol. 67, Hong Kong (reprint) 1967.

Huan-lun, Shih-shih Chi-ku Lüeh Hsü-chi (A continuation of the abstract of Historical Researches of Buddhism), Taishō 2038, Tokyo 1928.

Huang Min-chih, T'ang-tai Szŭ-yüan Ching-chi Ti Yen-chiu (A Study on the monastic economy of the T'ang Dynasty), [T'ien I Press, Taipei 1970].

Hui-chiao, Kao-sêng Chuan (Biographies of Eminent Buddhist Monks), Taishō 2059, Tokyo 1928.

Hui-hsiang, Hung-tsan Fa-hua Chuan (The Biographies of the Promulgators of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra), Taishō 2067, Tokyo 1928.

Hui-hsiang and Yen-i, Kuang Ch'ing-liang Chuan (An enlarged account of Wu-tai Shan), Taishō 2099, Tokyo 1928.

Hui-hsien, compiler and Kai-getsu, rev., Hsing-shih Ch'ao Chu-chia Piao-mu (A catalogue on the interpretation of the Quotation), Zokuzōkyō, vol. 70, Hong Kong (reprint) 1967.

Hui-hsien, Lü-tsung Hsin-hsüeh Ming-chü (A Dictionary of the terms of the Dharmaguptavinaya School for trainees), Zokuzōkyō Vol.105, Hong Kong (reprint) 1967.

Hui-li, Ta-T'ang Ta-tz'ŭ-ên Ssŭ San-tsang Fa-szŭ Chuan (The Biography of the Tripiṭaka Master of the Great Tz'ŭ-ên Monastery of the Great T'ang Dynasty), Taishō 2053, Tokyo 1928.

Hung-i, Nan-shan Lü-yüan Wên-chi (Collection of essays concerning the study of Tao-hsüan's Quotation) Ch'an-p'u Yüan Press, Singapore 1964.

Hung-i, Ssŭ-fên Lü Hsing-shih-ch'ao Tzŭ-chih Chi Fu-sang Chi-shih (an Interpretation of A Guide to the Quotation as interpreted in Japan), Ch'an-p'u Yüan Press, Singapore 1966.

Hurvitz, Leon, 'Render Unto Ceasar in Early Chinese Buddhism - Hui-yüan's Treatise on Exemption of Buddhist Clergy from requirement of civil etiquette, Sino-Indian Studies, Liebenthal Festschrift, Vol. 5, Parts 3 and 4, Santiniketan 1957.

---, tr., 'Wei Shu, Treatise on Buddhism and Taoism', in Yun-kuang, Supplement and Index (see Seiichi Misuno), Kyoto 1965.

I-ching, compiler, Fo-wei Nan-t'o Shou Ch'u-chia Ju-t'ai Ching (The Buddha preaches to Nanda on the topic of devoting oneself to the Monastic Order and taking possession of a Foetus Sūtra), in Ta-pao-chi Ching (Mahāratnakūṭa), Taishō 310.

---, tr., Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu P'i-na-yeh (Mūlasarvāstivādanikāya-vinaya), Taishō 1442.

---, tr., Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu Pi-ch'iu-ni P'i-na-yeh (Mūlasarvāstivāda Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya), Taishō 1443.

---, tr., Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu P'i-na-yeh Ch'u-chia-shih (Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya Pravtajyāvastu), Taishō 1444.

---, tr., Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu P'i-na-yeh An-chü-shih (Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya Varsāvastu), Taishō 1445.

---, tr., Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu P'i-na-yeh Sui-i-shih (Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya Pravāraṇāvastu), Taishō 1446.

---, tr., Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu P'i-na-yeh Pi-k'o-shih (Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya Carmavastu), Taishō 1447.

---, tr., Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu P'i-na-yeh Yao-shih (Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya Bhaiṣajyavastu), Taishō 1448.

---, tr., Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu P'i-na-yeh Ch'ieh-chih-na-i-shih (Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya Kaṭhinavastu), Taishō 1449.

---, tr., Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu P'i-na-yeh P'o-sêng-shih (Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya Saṅghabhedavastu), Taishō 1450.

---, tr., Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu P'i-na-yeh Tsa-shih (Vinayaksudravastu Mūlasarvāstivāda), Taishō 1451.

---, tr., Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu Ni-t'o-na-mu-tê-chia (Mūlasarvāstivādanikāyamātrkānidāna), Taishō 1452.

---, tr., Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu Pai-i Chieh-mo (Mūlasarvāstivādaikaśatakarman), Taishō 1453.

---, tr., Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu Chieh-ching (Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya Sūtra), Taishō 1454.

I-ching, tr., , Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu Pi-ch'iu-ni Chieh-ching (Mūlasarvāstivāda-bhiksunīprātimoksa Sūtra) Taishō 1455.

---, Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu Ni-t'o-na-mu-tê-chia Shê-sung (Mūlasarvāstivādanikāyavinayanidānāmātṛkāgāthā), Taishō 1456.

---, Kên-pên-shou I-ch'ieh-yu-pu P'i-na-yeh Tsa-shih Shê-sung (Mūlasarvāstivādavinayaksudrakavastūddāna), Taishō 1457.

---, Kên-pên Sa-p'o-to-pu Lü-shê (Mūlasarvāstivādavinayasaṁgraha), Taishō 1458.

---, Kên-pên-shou I'ch'ieh-yu-pu P'i-na-yeh Sung (Mūlasarvāstivadanikāya-vinayagāthā), Taishō 1459.

---, Ta-t'ang Hsi-yü Ch'iu-fa Kao-sêng Chuan (The Biographies of the Pilgrims of the Great T'ang Dynasty to the Western Countries in search of the Law), Taishō 2066.

---, Nan-hai Chi-kuei Nei-fa Chuan (Record of the Inner Law sent home from the Southern Sea), Taishō 2125, Tokyo 1928.

I-hsien, Ch'an-lin Pei-yung Ch'ing-kuei (The Pure Rule applicable to the Ch'an Buddhists), Zokuzōkyō Vol. 112, Hong Kong (reprint), 1967.

I-jun, Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei Chêng-i Chi (An interpretation of the Ch'ing-kuei), Zokuzōkyō, vol. 111, Hong Kong (reprint), 1967. Also the version published by Fo-chiao Ch'u-pan Shê, Taipei, 1974.

Itō Giken, Shina Bukkyō Seishi (The standard history of Chinese Buddhism), Takeshitaryō Press, Yamaguchin Ken, Japan, 1922.

I-tsang, ed., Ku Tsun-su Yü-lu (The analects of the ancient pioneers of Ch'an Buddhism), Zokuzōkyō vol. 118, Hong Kong (reprint), 1967.

Jan Yün-hua, 'Buddhist Historiography in Sung China', Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Band 114, Heft 2, Wiesbaden 1964.

---, (tr.), A Chronicle of Buddhism in China, Vishva-Bharati Press, Santiniketan 1966.

Jên Chi-yü, Han-T'ang Chung-kuo Fo-chiao Shih-hsiang Lun-chih (Collection of articles on the Chinese Buddhist thoughts in the Dynasties from Han to T'ang), San-lien Press, Peking 1963.

Kai-getsu, (see Hui-hsien).

Kāśyapa Mātanga and Dharmāraṇya, tr. (ascribed to), Shih-shih-êrh-chang Ching (The Sūtra of forty-two sections), Taishō 784, Tokyo 1928.

K'ang Sêng-hui, tr., Lu-tu-chi Ching (Ṣatpāramitāsūtra or The Sūtra of Salvation in Six Ways), Taishō 152, Tokyo 1928.

Kimura Shizuo, 'Ku Ch'ing-kuei Kō (A Research for the Earliest Ch'ing-kuei', Zengaku Kenkyū, No. 31, Kyoto 1939.

Kondō Ryōichi, 'Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei to Ch'an-yüan Ch'ing-kuei (The Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei and the Ch'an-yüan Ch'ing-kuei), IDGBKGKK (Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies), Vol. XVII, no. 2, Tokyo 1969.

K'o Shao-wên, Hsin Yüan Shih (The New History of the Yüan Dynasty), WYPE, I-wên Press, Taipei ca. 1959-61.

Kōyō, Sakaino, Shina Bukkyō Seishi (The essentialities of the Chinese Buddhist History), Sakaino Kōyō hakushi Ikōkankōkai Press, Tokyo 1935.

Kōyū Shiina, 'Shōtō-zensha no Ritsuin-kyojū ni tsuite (Zen monks living in the Vinaya Temples in early T'ang Dynasty [sic]), IDGBKGKK (Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies), Vol. XVII, no. 2, Tokyo 1969.

Ku Yen-wu, Jih-chih Lu (Notes from daily studies), in Ssu-p'u Pei-yao, vol. 1484, Ching-hua Press, Shanghai 1936.

Kuan-ting, Kuo-ch'ing Pai-lu (One hundred notes on the Kuo-ch'ing Monastery), Taishō 1934, Tokyo 1928.

Kumārajīva, tr., Shih-sung Lü Po-lo-ti-mu-ch'a Ta Pi-ch'iu Chieh-pên (Prātimokṣa of the Sarvāstivādavinaya for the Great Bhikṣus), Taishō 1436, Tokyo 1928.

---, tr., (ascribed to), Fan-wang Ching (Brāhmayālasūtra?), Taishō 1484, Tokyo 1928.

K'uo Mo-jo, 'Pu T'ien-shou Lun-yü Ch'ao-pên Hou Ti Shih-tzŭ Tsa-lu (A note on the Poems and Sketches appended to a copy of Lun-yü [Confucian Analects] that were penned by a primary school boy Pu T'ien-shou)', K'ao-ku (Archaeology), vol. 1, Peking 1972.

Legge, James, tr., The Travels of Fa Hien, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1886.

---, tr., The Chinese Classics (among these translations, this thesis cites only The Book of Historical Documents, Confucian Analects and The Works of Mencius), Chin-hsüeh Bookshop, reprint, Taipei 1968.

Li Chao, T'ang Kuo-shih Pu (Some additional notes to the official history of the T'ang Dynasty), in Chung-kuo Wên-hsüeh Ts'an-k'ao Tzŭ-liao Hsiao Ts'ung-shu (The materials on Chinese literature for reference), Ku-tien Wên-hsüeh Ch'u-pan Shê Press, Shanghai 1957.

Li Chien-nung, Wei-chin Nan-pei Ch'ao Sui T'ang Ching-chi Shih-kao (A history of economy of the Ts'ao-Wei, the Chin, the Southern, the Northern, the Sui and the T'ang Dynasties), Chung-hua Press, Peking 1963.

Li Tao-yüan, Shui-ching Chu (The commentary to the Book of Waters), Shangwu Press, Peking 1958.

Li Yen-shou, Pei Shih (The history of the Northern Dynasties), WYPE, I-wên Press, Taipei ca. 1959-61.

Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, Fo-hsüeh Yen-chiu Shih-pa Pien (The eighteen articles on Buddhist studies), Chung-hua Press, Taiwan 1956.

Lin Tzŭ-ch'ing, Hung-i Ta-shih Nien-p'u (Nien-p'u [biography arranged according to the successive stage of one's career] of Master Hung-i), Hung-hua Yüan Press (reprint), Hong Kong 1960.

Ling-hu Tê-fê, Chou Shu (The history of the Northern Chou Dynasty), WYPE, I-wên Press, Taipei ca. 1959-61.

Liu Hsü, Chiu T'ang Shu (The old history of the T'ang Dynasty), WYPE, I-wên Press, Taipei ca. 1959-61.

Liu Ts'un-yan, Buddhist and Taoist Influences on Chinese Novels, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 1962.

Liu Tung, 'Shih Nai-an Shêng-p'ing T'an-k'ao (A study of the life of Shih Nai-an, the author of Shui-hu [Water Margin])', in Chung-hua Wên-shih Lun-ts'ung (Collection of essays on the Literature and History), vol. 16, Shanghai Ku-chi Ch'u-pan Shê Press, Shanghai 1980.

Lo Kuan-chung (see Shih Nai-an).

Lu Hsin, Ku-hsiao shou Kuo-ch'ên (A recovery of some fragments of the lost Chinese ancient novels), Jên-min Wên-hsüeh Ch'u-pan Shê Press, Peking 1951.

Lu Hsin, Chung-kuo Hsiao-shou Shih-lüeh (A brief history of the Chinese novels), Jên-min Wên-hsüeh Ch'u-pan Shê Press, Peking 1952.

Lung-hsien (T'an-hsü), Ying-ch'ên Hui-i Lu (Memoirs of my shadowy and dusty human life), Hua-nan Fo-hsüeh Yüan Press, Hong Kong 1964.

Macgowan, J., The Imperial History of China, Curzon Press, London 1973.

Michihata Ryōshū, Tōdai Bukkyōshi no Kenkyū (A study of the Buddhist history in the T'ang Dynasty), Hōzoken Press, Kyoto 1956.

---, Chugoku Bukkōshi (The Chinese Buddhist History), Hōzōkan Press, Kyoto 1964 (fourth reprint).

---, Chūgoku Bukkyō to Shakai Fukushi Jigyō (Chinese Buddhism and Social Welfare), Hōzōkan Press, Kyoto 1966.

Ming-ch'ung, Hsu-i (A supplementary continuation) to the Kuang Ch'ing-liang Chuan, Taishō 2099, Tokyo 1928.

Ming-ho, Pu-hsü Kao-sêng Chuan (A supplement to the continuation of the biographies of Eminent Buddhist Monks), Zokuzōkyō, vol. 134, Hong Kong (reprint) 1967.

Ming-hui, compiler, Wu-fên Pi-ch'iu-ni Chieh-pên (The Śīla for the Bhikṣuṇīs of the Vinaya in Five Parts), Taishō 1423, Tokyo 1928.

Ming-pên, Huan-chu An Ch'ing-kuei (The Pure Rule for the Huan-chu Shrine), Zokuzōkyō, Vol. 111, Hong Kong (reprint) 1967.

Mochizuki Shinkō, Jōdokyō no Kigen oyabi Hattatsu (The origin of the Pure Land school and its development), Kyōritsusha Press Tokyo 1930.

---, Mochizuki Bukkyō Daijiten (The great Dictionary on Buddhism edited by Mochizuki), Sekai Siiten Kankō Kyōkai Press, Kyoto 1957 (2nd issue).

Mou Jun-sun, Lun Wei-chin I-lai Chih Ch'ung-shang T'an-pien Chih-Chi Ying-hsiang (On the indulgende in 'Discourse and Polemics' by scholars of the Wei-chin time and its influence in subsequent ages [an inaugural address for his professorship in Chinese History]), The Chinese University of Hong Kong Press, Hong Kong 1966.

Nakano, Miyoko, 'Ti-shih Pa-ssŭ-pa Hsing-chuang Chiao-chêng (An annotation on the Tishih Pa-Pa Hsing-chuang [A Conduct (sic) of Bla-ma Phags-Pa] by Wang P'an), HYHP (New Asia Journal), Vol. 9, no. 1, Hong kong 1969.

Nien-ch'ang, Fo-tsu Li-tai T'ung-ts'ai (General chronicle of Buddha and the Patriarchs under successive Dynasties), Taishō 2036, Tokyo 1928.

Ono Genmyō, ed., Busshu Kaisetsu Daijiten (The great Dictionary of Buddhist Bibliography), Daitō Shuppansha Press, Tokyo 1932.

Ou-yang Hsiu and Sung Ch'i, Hsin T'an Shu (The new History of the T'ang Dynasty), WYPE, I-wên Press.

Ou-yang Hsiu, Wu-tai Shih-chi (The new History of the five Dynasties), WYPE, I-wên Press, Taipei, ca. 1959-61.

Ōchō Enichi, Chūgoku Bukkyōshi no Kenkyū (A study of the Chinese Buddhist History), Hōzōkan Press, Kyoto 1957.

Pao-ch'ang, Pi-ch'iu-ni Chuan (Biographies of Bhikṣuṇīs), Taishō 2063, Tokyo 1928.

Pên-chioh, Shih-shih T'ung-chien (A comprehensive Buddhist Chronicle), Zokuzōkyō, vol. 131, Hong kong (reprint) 1967.

Puṇyatara, Kumārajīva and Dharmaruci, trs, Shih-sung Lü ('Recitable Vinaya in Ten Parts' or Sarvāstivādavinaya), Taishō 1435, Tokyo 1928.

Sakaki Ryōzaburō, ed., Mahāvyutpatti, Suzuki-gakujutsu Zaiden Press, Tokyo 1964 (3rd issue).

Saṅghabhadra and Sêng-i, trs., Shan-chien Pi-p'o-sha Lü (Samantapāsādika), Taishō 1426, Tokyo 1928.

Saṅghadeva, tr., Tsêng-i A-han Ching (Ekottarāgamasūtra), Taishō 125, Tokyo 1928.

Saṅghavarman, tr., T'an-wu-tê-pu Tsa Chieh-mo (The miscellaneous karma of the Dharmagupta School), Taishō 1432, Tokyo 1928.

Seiichi Misuno and Toshio Nagahiro, eds., Yun-kang, Supplement and Index, Vol. XVI, Jimbunkagaku Kenkyūsho, MCMLVI, Kyoto University Press, Kyoto 1965.

Sêng-i (see Saṅghabhadra).

Sêng-yu, Shih-chia P'u (notes on the stories concerning Śākyamuni quoted from the Buddhist Scriptures), Taishō 2040.

---, Hung-ming Chi (Collections of the Pro-Buddhist and Anti-Buddhist Essays), Taishō 2102.

---, Ch'u San-tsang Chi-chi (Collection of notes concerning the translation of the Tripiṭaka), Taishō 2145, Tokyo 1928.

Sheng-yen, Chieh-lü Hsüeh Kang-yao (An outline of the Śīla and Vinaya), T'ien-hua Press, Taiwan 1978 (2nd issue).

Shêng-wu, Lü-yüan Shih-kuei (The regulation of the Vinaya field), Zoku-zōkyō, vol. 106, Hong Kong (reprint) 1967.

Shi-ban, Honchō Kōsō Den (The Biographies of Eminent Buddhist Monks in Japan compiled in this Dynasty [compiled ca. 1702]), DNBKZS (The entire collection of works on Buddhist composed in Great Japan), vol. 102, Tokyo 1921.

Shih Nai-an and Lo Kuan-chung, Shui-hu Ch'üan-chuan (The whole story of the Water Margins), Jên-min Wên-hsüeh Press, Peking 1954.

Shizuka Shigenoi, 'Godai no Kudokushi ni Kansurur Kanken (On the system of Kung-tê-shih in the Wu-tai Dynasties [sic])', Tōhō Shūkyō, no. 16.

---, 'Tōdai Zenhanki no Sōdō Shorei ni tsuite (An administrative agency for Monks and Taoist Priests in the first half of the T'ang Dynasty)', Tōhō Shūkyō, No. 19, Kyoto 1962.

Shun Yüeh, Sung Shu (The history of the Liu-Sung Dynasty), WYPE, I-wên Press, Taipei, ca. 1959-61.

Ssŭ-ma Ch'ien, Shih-chi (Records of the Grand Historian of China), WYPE, I-wên Press, Taipai ca. 1959-61.

Ssŭ-ma Kuang, Tzŭ-ch'ih T'ung-chien (The comprehensive Chinese Chronicle), Ku-tsi Ch'u-pan Shê Press, Shanghai 1956.

Stede, William (see Davids, T.W. Rhys)

Sun Szŭ-mo, Pei-chi Ch'ien-chin Yao-fang (The effective herbal prescriptions for preparedness and emergency), Jên-min Wei-shêng Ch'u-pan Shê Press, Peking 1955.

Sung Ch'i, (see Ou-yang Hsiu).

Sung Lien and others, Yüan Shih (The history of the Yüan Dynasty), WYPE, I-wên Press, Taipei ca. 1959-61.

Sung Min-ch'iu, ed., T'ang Ta-chao-ling Chi (A collection of the important Imperial Edicts of the T'ang Dynasty), Shang-wu Press, Shanghai 1959.

Ta-chioh, Ssŭ-fên Lü Hsing-shih-ch'ao P'i (The Comments on the Quotation), Zokuzōkyō Vol. 67, Hong Kong (reprint) 1967.

Takakusu, J., tr., A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago, Ch'eng Wen Publishing Company (reprint), Taipei 1970.

T'an-ngo, Hsin-hsiu K'o-fên Liu-hsüeh Sêng-chuan (The newly compiled classified Biographies of Buddhist Monks according to their Merits in the practice of the six Pāramitās), Zokuzōkyō Vol. 133, Hong Kong (reprint) 1967.

T'an-ti, Chieh-mo (Karma), Taishō 1433, Tokyo 1928.

T'ang Yung-t'ung, Han Wei Liang-Chin Nan-pei-ch'ao Fo-chiao Shih (The Chinese Buddhist History of the Han, the Wei, the Two Chins and the Northern and Southern Dynasties), Shang-wu Press, Taiwan (reprint) 1962.

---, Wang-jih Tsa-kao (Desultory essays composed in my past), Chung-hua Press, Peking 1962.

Tao-ch'êng, Shih-shih Yao-lan (The Institutes of Buddhism), Taishō 2127, Tokyo 1928.

Tao-hsüan, Ssŭ-fên Lü Shan-fen Pu-chüeh Hsing-shih Ch'ao (Quotations from the Dharmaguptavinaya with abbreviations and supplements), Taishō 1804.

---, Hsü Kao-sêng Chuan (A continuation of the Biographies of Eminent Buddhist Monks), Taishō 2060.

---, Kuang Hung-ming Chi (The enlarged collection of the Pro-Buddhist and Anti-Buddhist Essays), Taishō 2103.

---, Ta-t'ang Nei-tien Lu (Catalogue of Buddhism compiled in the Great T'ang Dynasty), Taishō 2149, Tokyo 1928.

---, Hsin Shan-ting Ssŭ-fên Sêng-chieh-pên (The newly abbreviated Dharmaguptaśīla for Monks), Zokuzōkyō Vol. 61.

---, Ssŭ-fên Lü Pi-ch'iu Han-chu Chieh-pên (The Dharmaguptaśīla for Bhikṣus with an Annotation), Zokuzōkyō vol. 62, Hong Kong (reprint) 1967.

Tao-shih, Fa-yüan Chu-lin (Forest of Gems in the Garden of Law), Taishō 2122, Tokyo 1928.

Tao-yüan, Ching-tê Ch'uan-têng Lu (A record of the transmission of the Lamp compiled in the Chingtê Era [1004-1007]), Taishō 2076, Tokyo 1928.

Teng Ssu-yü, tr., and annotated, Family Instructions for the Yen Clan, Monographies du T'oung Pao, Vol. IV, E.J. Brill, Leiden 1968.

Tê-hui, Ch'ih-hsiu Po-chang Ch'ing-kuei (The re-organized Master Po-ch'ang's Pure Rule under Imperial Decree), Taishō 2025, Tokyo 1928.

Ting-pin, Ssŭ-fên Lü-shu Shih-tsung I-chi (Some refinements to the Commentary of the DRMGTV), Zokuzōkyō Vol. 66, Hong Kong (reprint) 1967.

Tokiwo Daijō, Shina Bukkyō no Kenkyū (A study on the Chinese Buddhist History), Shunjūsha Press, Tokyo 1938.

Toshio Nagahiro, (see Seiichi Mizuno).

T'oh-t'oh, Sung Shih (The History of the Sung Dynasty), WYPE, I-wên Press, Taipei, ca. 1959-61.

Tsan-ning, Sung Kao-sêng Chuan (Biographies of Eminent Buddhist Monks compiled in the Sung Dynasty), Taishō 2061.

---, Ta-Sung Sêng-shih Lioh (An outline on Buddhist affairs compiled in the Sung Dynasty), Taishō 2126, Tokyo 1928.

Tso Sze-bong, 'Lun Liang-han Ts'i Nan-pei-ch'ao Ho-hsi Chih K'ai-fa Yü Jü-hsüeh Shih-chiao Chih Chin-chan (The Cultivation of Ho-hsi [Regions West of the Yellow River] as from the Han Dynasty to the Epoch of the division between North and South and its relation to the propagation of both Confucianism and Buddhism in these regions)', HYHP (New Asia Journal), Vol. 5, No. 1, Hong Kong 1960.

---, 'Lun Chung-kuo Fo-chiao I-ch'ang Chih I-ching Fang-shih Yü Ch'êng-hsu (Methods and procedures used in translating Buddhist Sūtras at Translations Centres in China during the Dynasties from Han to Sung)', HYHP, vol. 5, No. 2, Hong Kong 1963.

---, 'Chung-kuo Fo-chiao Shih-chuan Yü Mu-lu Yüan-ch'u Lü-hsüeh-sha-mên Chih T'an-t'ao (A study of the Chinese Buddhist biographies and bibliographies derived from the Vinaya Sect)', HYHP, Vol. 6, No. 1, Hong Kong 1964 (Part 1), vol. 7, no. 1, Hong Kong 1965 (Part 2) and vol. 7, no. 2, Hong Kong 1966 (Part 3).

---, 'Kao-ch'ang Kuo Mo-shih Lun-yü Hsiao-ching Li Hsüeh-kuan Ti Yüan-yin Shih-shih (A preliminary explanation of the reason why courses on the Mao-shih [Mao Tradition on the Book of Odes], Lun-yü [Analects of Confucius] and Hsiao-ching [Book of Filial Piety] were established in the National Academy of the State of Kao-ch'ang)', HYSYHSLK (New Asia College Academic Annual), Vol. VIII, Hong Kong 1966.

Tso Sze-bong, 'Chi Liang-chung Yu Chung-kuo I-ch'ang Fang-shih Pien-tsuan Ti Fei-fan-i Fo-tien (Two non-translated Buddhist works compiled under the traditional method and procedure of the Buddhist Translation Centres in China), HYSYHSLK, Vol. 11, Hong Kong 1969.

---, 'Ch'uan-shoh Yü Shih-shih Kuan-hsi I Li-chêng --- Lu Shan Kuei-tsung Ssŭ Chu Ch'uan-shôh so T'aou-lu Chih Chung-kuo Lü-tsung Hsiao-chang Shih (A case study of the relationship between legends and historical facts -- The vicissitude of two sects of the Chinese Buddhist Disciplinary School as revealed in some legends of the Kuei-tsung temple on Mount Lu), Nanyang University Journal, Vol. VI, Part I, Humanities, Singapore 1972.

---, 'Chung-kuo Fo-chiao I-ching-shih Yen-chiu Yu-shên (Desultory notes on the history of Buddhist translations in China)', Shu-mu Chi-k'an (Bibliography Quarterly), Vol. 8, No. 2, Taiwan, 1974.

---, 'Chung-kuo Fo-chiao Ch'iu-fa-shih Tsa-k'ao (Desultory notes on the Chinese Buddhist Pilgrims), Fokuang Hsüeh-pao (Fukuang Buddhist Journal), No. 2, Taiwan 1977.

---, 'A New Summary to "Methods and Procedures Used in Translating Buddhist Sūtras at Translation Centres in China during the Dynasties from Han to Sung",' Nan-yang Fo-chiao (Nanyang Buddhist), Vol. 109, Singapore 1978.

---, tr., 'The Biography of the Monk Kuang-i', Nan-yang Fo-chiao, Vol. 116, Singapore 1978.

---, tr., 'Some Source of Materials on Chinese Buddhist History', Nan-yang Fo-chiao, Vol. 121, Singapore 1979.

Tsu-hsiu, Lung-hsing Fo-chiao Pien-nien T'ung-lun (A Buddhist Chronicle with Text and Commentary compiled in the Lung-hsing Era [1163-4]), Zokuzōkyō, Vol. 130, Hong Kong (reprint) 1967.

Tsukamoto Zenryū, 'Tō chūki Irai no Chōan no Kudokushi (On the Commissioners of religious merits in Ch'ang-an since the second half of the T'ang Dynasty)', Tōhō Gakuhō, No. 4, Kyoto 1933.

---, Shina Bukkyōshi Kenkyū, Hokugihen (A Study of the history of Buddhism in China, the Northern Wei Dynasty Section), Kōbundō Shobō Press, Tokyo 1942.

Tsung-chien, Shih-mên Chêng-t'ung (The Buddhist Orthodoxy), Zokuzōkyō Vol. 130, Hong Kong (reprint) 1967.

Tsung-i, Ch'an-yüan Ch'ing-kuei (The Pure Rule for the Ch'an Buddhists), Zokuzōkyō Vol. 111, Hong Kong (reprint) 1967.

Tsung-pao, Lu-tsu Ta-shih Fa-pao T'an-ching (The Treasury Analects of the Master Sixth Patriarch of Ch'an Buddhism), Taishō 2008, Tokyo 1928.

Tsung-shou, Ju-chung Jih-yung (The daily practices for clerical life), Zokuzōkyō Vol. 111, Hong Kong (reprint) 1967.

Tuan Ch'êng-shih, T'a-ssŭ Chi (An account of the Pagodas and Monasteries in Ch'ang-an), Taishō 2093, Tokyo 1928.

---, Yu-yang Tsa-tsu (Desultory notes composed by a resident of Yu-yang City), in Ssŭ-pu Ts'ung-k'an Ch'u-pien Tzŭ-pu (The first edition of the selected works from the Ssŭ-ku Ch'üan Shu, the category of 'Miscellany'), No. 027, Shangwu Press, Shanghai 1935-36.

Tung-chu, 'Ts'ung-lin Chih-tu Yü Ch'an-tsung Chiao-yü (Monastic system and education of Zen School [sic])', Fokuang Hsüeh-pso (Fukuang Buddhist Journal), No. 1, Taiwan 1976.

Twitchett, D.C., ' Monastic Estates in T'ang China', Asia Major, Vol. V, London 1965.

Ui Hakuju, Zenshūshi Kenkyū (A study of the history of Zen Buddhism), Iwanami Shoten Press, Tokyo 1939.

---, Daini Zenshūshi Kenkyū (The second study of the history of Zen Buddhism), Iwanami Shoten Press, Tokyo 1941.

Waley, Arthur, tr., The Real Tripiṭaka, George Allen and Uwnin Ltd. Press, London 1952.

Wang Ku, Ta-tsang Shêng-chiao Fa-pao Piao-mu (A guide to the treasures of the Dharma in the Holy Tripiṭaka), Shō-wa Hō-bō Sō-moku roku, No. 38, Tokyo 1934.

Wang P'u, T'ang Hui-yao (The Institute of the T'ang Dynasty), Shih-chieh Shu-chü Press, Taipei 1960.

Watson, Burton, tr., Records of the Grand Historian of China, Columbia University Press, New York and London 1961.

Wei Chêng, Sui Shu (The History of the Sui Dynasty), WYPE, I-wên, Taipei, ca. 1959-61.

Wei Hsiu, Wei Shu (The History of the Northern Wei Dynasty), WYPE, I-wên Press, Taipei, ca. 1959-61. Also Chung-hua Bookshop edition, Chung-hua Press, Peking 1974.

Wei-mien, Ts'ung-lin Chiao-ting Ch'ing-kuei Tsung-yao (The concise Pure Rule prepared for the Grove of Ch'an Buddhism), Zokuzōkyō Vol. 112, Hong Kong (reprint) 1967.

Wei-pai, Ta-tsang Ching Kang-mu Chih-yao (A guide to the Tripiṭaka with Text and Commentary), Shō-wa Hō-bō Sō-moku roku, No. 37, Tokyo 1934.

Wright, Arthur F., 'Biography and Hagiography, Hui-chiao's Lives of Eminent Monks', Silver Jubilee Volume of the Zimbun Kagaku-Kenkyūsyo, Kyoto University Press, Kyoto 1954.

Wu-Ch'êng-lo, Chung-kuo Tu-liang-hêng Shih (A History of the Chinese measurements of length and weight), Shang-wu Press, Shanghai 1937.

Wu Ting-hsieh, Pei-sung Ching-fu Nien-piao (The Calendar of the Governors-General of the Northern Sung Dynasty), in Êrh-shih-wu-shih Pu-p'ien (The Supplements to the twenty-five standard Chinese Histories), Chung-hua Press, Peking 1965.

Yabuki Keiki, Sangaikyō no Kenkyū (A Study of the Sect of the Three Stages), Iwanami Shoten Press, Tokyo 1927.

Yamada Ryūjō, Bongo-butten no Shabunken (On the documents of Sanskrit Buddhist Texts), Heirakuji Shoten Press, Kyōto 1959.

Yang Hsüan-chih, Lo-yang Chia-lan Chi (A record of the Saṅghārāmas in Lo-yang during the Northern Wei Dynasty), Taishō 2029, Tokyo 1928.

Yang, Lien-sheng, 'Buddhist Monasteries and Four Money Raising Institutes in Chinese History', HJAS, Cambridge, Mass., 1950.

Yao Ming-ta, Chung-kuo Mu-lu-hsüeh Shih (The History of Chinese Bibliography), Shang-wu Press, Shanghai 1957.

Yao Szŭ-l'ien, Ch'en Shu (The History of the Ch'en Dynasty), WYPE, I-wên Press, Taipei ca. 1959-61.

Yen Chih-t'ui, Yen-shih Chia-hsün (Family instructions for the Yens), Wan-yu Wên-k'u Edition, Shangwu Press, Shanghai 1937.

Yen-chung, Chi Sha-mên Pu-ying Pai-su Teng-shih (Collection of essays concerning the debates on the issue that Śramaṇas should not salute laymen and the like), Taishō 2108, Tokyo 1928.

Yen-i, (see Hui-hsiang).

Yen Keng-wang, T'ang-shih Yen-chiu Ts'ung-kao (Miscellaneous articles on the study of the history of the T'ang Dynasty), Hsin-ya Yen-chiu So (New Asia Research Institute) Press, Hong Kong 1969.

Yüan-chao, 'Ta-t'ang Chên-yüan Hsin-i Shih-ti-ching-têng Chi (The account of the Daśabhūmikasūtra and other scriptures, translated in the Chên-yüan Era [785-804] of the Great T'ang Dynasty), Taishō 780, Tokyo 1928.

Yüan-chao, Ssŭ-fên Lü Hsing-shih-ch'ao Tzŭ-ch'ih Chi (A Guide to the practice of the Quotation), Taishō 1805, Tokyo 1928.

Yüan-chao, Ta-t'ang Chên-yüan Hsü K'ai-yüan Shih-chiao Lu (A continuation of the catalogue of K'ai-yüan era compiled in the Chên-yüan era of the Great T'ang Dynasty), Taishō 2156, Tokyo 1928.

---, Chên-yüan Hsin-ting Shih-chiao Mu-lu (Newly edited catalogue on Buddhism compiled in the Chên-yüan era), Taishō 2157, Tokyo 1928.

Yüan-chao, Ssŭ-fên Lü Chieh-pên-shu K'o (The systematized commentary of Tao-hsüan's 'Annotated Dharmaguptaśīla'), Zokuzōkyō Vol. 62.

Yüan-chao, Ssŭ-fên Lü Shan-pu Sui-chi Chieh-mo K'o (The Systematization of Tao-hsüan's 'The Applied Karma of the DRMGTV with Abridgements and Supplements), Zokuzōkyō Vol. 64.

---, Ssŭ-fên Lü Hsing-shih-ch'ao K'o (The systematization of Tao-hsüan's Quotation); Zokuzōkyō vol. 69.

---, Ssŭ-fên Lü Shih-pi-ni Ch'ao K'o (The systematization of Tao-hsüan's 'The Vinaya Doctrines quoted from the non-Dharmaguptavinaya scriptures'), Zokuzōkyō Vol. 71.

---, Chih-yüan Chi (The collection of writings of the Master of the Garden of Fungus), Zokuzōkyō Vol. 105.

---, Chih-yüan I-p'ien (Manuscripts left by the late Master of the Garden of Fungus), Zokuzōkyō Vol. 105, Hong Kong (reprint) 1967.

Yu Chia-hsi, Yu Chia-hsi Lun-hsüeh Tsa-chu (The miscellaneous works of Yu Chia-hsi), Chung-hua Press, Peking 1963.

Yü Ch'ien, Hsin-hsü Kao-sêng Chuan (A new continuation of the Biographies of Eminent Buddhist Monks), Liu-li Ching-fang Press, Taiwan 1967.

Yüan Yüan (collated and edited), Shih-san Ching Chu-shu ('The Thirteen Chinese Classics with Text and Commentary'. Among these classics, this thesis cites only the Shang Shu [Book of Documents], Li-chi [Treatises on the Ritual], Hsiao Ching [Book of Filial Piety], Confucius' Lun-yü [Confucian Analects] and Mencius' Mêng-tzŭ [The Works of Mencius]), I-wên Press, Taipei 1965.

Yün-k'an, Ssŭ-fên Pi-ch'iu-ni Ch'ao K'o-wên (The systematization of Tao-hsüan's 'The Practices for Bhikṣuṇīs quoted from the DRMGTV), Zokuzōkyō Vol. 64, Hong Kong (reprint) 1967.

Zürcher, E., Buddhist Conquest of China, Leiden 1959 (reprinted by the Cave Book Co., Taiwan).