CHAPTER 12

Cultural Confluence during the Development of Buddhism: A Case Study of the *Liushi liwen* 劉師禮文 (*The Writ of Master Liu's Ritual*)

Fang Guangchang 方廣錩

1

Religion is a cultural form in a society. Each cultural form in a society is a historical phenomenon. History develops within the context of a specific time and space, and culture functions likewise. Like the Yangzi River, which originates in the Bayan Har mountains and enters the sea at Chongming island, history flows incessantly. It absorbs hundreds of smaller rivers and flows forwards. But, what do we mean by the Yangzi River? Does it refer to the limpid creek at the origin, the Jinsha River that roars through the mountains, giant waves that flow eastwards, accompanied by the chatter of monkeys alongside the Three Gorges, or the ripples that run smoothly through the fertile plains in the east? Like the Yangzi, Buddhism developed in relation to varying circumstances in the course of its dissemination from India to China, and other neighboring countries, until finally spreading throughout the world in more recent years. And like the Yangzi, Buddhism absorbed elements of these various cultures over the course of its journey. We do not agree with those in Japan who advocate for a 'Critical Buddhism' (Jp. *hihan bukkyō* 批判仏教), who deny that Buddhism was transformed as it absorbed the cultural attributes of non-Indian cultures. Nor do we agree with Buddhist monks who advocate a return to early Buddhism, ignoring the fact that Buddhism has been transformed by the cultures through which it passed. The present article aims at understanding the changes Buddhism underwent, the driving forces behind these changes and the impact of these changes on its later development.

Chinese Buddhism should be viewed as a product of Indian and Chinese cultures because it emerged ancient India and developed in China. The intriguing question we wish to broach here is whether or not Chinese culture ever influenced Buddhism as it developed in the Indian and Central Asian contexts.

* The article is funded by Shanghai important academic subjects, No. To406.

 | DOI 10.1163/9789047427971_014

We should understand the dissemination of religion across cultural lines not merely as a one-way street but as a dialogue or *exchange*. Did Chinese traditional culture ever influence Indian Buddhism in the manner that Indian culture altered Chinese culture? Or, to put this question more generally, how was Buddhism molded and developed by specific Asian cultures through which it passed?

There are various approaches to this question. One possibility which has been taken up by researchers is that Indian Esoteric Buddhism was influenced by the indigenous Chinese schools of thought such as Daoism. Another approach has been suggested by researchers who claim that the Pure Land concept in Indian Buddhism contains elements of Iranian culture. The fact that the twelve signs of the Chinese zodiac appear in the *Mahāsamghāta Sūtra* (Ch. *Daji jing* 大集經) is another example of indigenous Chinese thought making its way into the Indian Buddhist tradition.[1] This article attempts to investigate the cultural confluence during the development of Buddhism by taking *Liushi liwen*, a Dunhuang manuscript, as an example.

The manuscript is not complete. Its former part is lost. The extant texts are as follows: (All texts are in their original titles, except where noted otherwise.)

(1) *Fangguang jingdian chanhui wen*, 方廣經典懺悔文[2]
(2) *Qing guanyin zhou*, 請觀音咒
(3) *Chu dudu tuoluoni zhou*, 除度毒陀羅尼咒
(4) *Chu shuiyan tuoluoni*, 除睡眼陀羅尼
(5) *Guanshiyin pusa tuoluoni*, 觀世音菩薩陀羅尼
(6) *Zhouyan tuoluoni*, 咒眼陀羅尼
(7) *Fahua zhou yaowang pusa zhou*, 法華咒 藥王菩薩咒
(8) *Yongshi pusa zhou*, 勇施菩薩咒
(9) *Pishamen tianwang zhou*, 毗沙門天王咒
(11) *Chiguo tianwang zhou*, 持國天王咒
(12) *Shi luocha'nü zhou*, 十羅剎女咒
(13) *Puxian pusa zhou*, 普賢菩薩咒

1 The *Mahāsamghāta Sūtra* substituted tiger with lion, but otherwise maintained the sequence and position of Chinese zodiac animals.

2 The title of this text is unclear because the first part of the original version is lost. Judging from its contents, it must be a text for ritual and confession. A sentence is written as "*fuxing fangguang jingdian chanhui* 複行方廣經典懺悔." Therefore, this text is provisionally titled "*Fangguang jingdian chanhui wen*."

(14) *Fashu shi*, 法數釋[3]
(15) *Liushi liwen*, 劉師禮文
(16) *Shou baguanzhai wen*, 受八關齋文
(17) *Shishizhou yuanwen*, 施食咒願文

The colophon provides a certain level of basic historical data to the reader: "Finished on 27th day, the fifth month, the eleventh year of Datong (545 AD), owned by Daoyang 道養 in the Pingnan monastery." The scroll is found in Daoyang's personal collection.[4] Therefore it is also known as one of the "Daoyang manuscripts" (*Daoyang wenben* 道養文本) of the Western Wei of Northern and Southern Dynasties.

British Sinologist Lionel Giles labeled these texts "Daoyang manuscripts" in his *Descriptive Catalogue of the Chinese Manuscripts from Tunhuang in the British Museum*. However, no further research has been conducted on the manuscripts.[5] The Daoyang manuscripts contain over ten Buddhist documents. However, this article focuses only on the fifteenth text *Liushi liwen*. The content is as follows:

> *Liushi liwen*
> Between 3–5 a.m., on the 24th day of the first month, make obeisance 8 times toward the northeast, expiation of 21 sins.
> Between 1–3 a.m., on the 9th day of the second month, make obeisance 10 times toward the southeast, expiation of 31 sins.
> Between 9–11 p.m., on the 26th day of the third month, make obeisance 4 times toward the south, expiation of 400 sins.
> Between 11p.m–1 a.m., on the 7th day of the fourth month, make obeisance 4 times toward the north, expiation of 40,000 sins.
> Between 7–9 p.m., on the 6th day of the fifth month, make obeisance 6 times toward the northwest, expiation of 1,800 sins.

3 This text explains four Buddhist terms: eight filthy things, ten impure meats, thirty-six impurities, and fourteen tones. It is temporarily titled as *Fashu shi*.

4 In addition to the notes "owned by Daoyang" in the end of the roll, there are two other places stating "owned by yang": one is under *Qing guanyin zhou*, and the other is under *Liushi liwen*. Yang is the short name for Daoyang. The Chinese character "*xu* 許" means "possess" in this text.

5 French scholar Michel Soymié noticed in his work "Les dix jours de jeûne de Kṣitigarbha" that the *Shi'er yue lifo wen* 十二月禮佛文 was transcribed together with the *Dizang shizhai ri* 地藏十齋日. He mentioned the Dunhuang manuscripts S.2565, P.3588 and P.3809, etc., but he did further research on the *Shi'er yue lifo wen*, S.4494.

Between 7–9 a.m., on the 3rd day of the sixth month, make obeisance 6 times toward the south, expiation of 1,400 sins.
Between 3–5 p.m., on the 4th day of the seventh month, make obeisance 4 times toward the southeast, expiation of 2,800 sins.
Between 5–7 a.m., on the 8th day of the eighth month, make obeisance 9 times toward the south, expiation of 6,000 sins.
Between 7–9 a.m., on the 10th day of the ninth, make obeisance 9 times toward the southeast, expiation of 1,800 sins.
Between 9–11 a.m., on the 11th day of the tenth month, make obeisance 9 times toward the south, expiation of 6,000 sins.
Between 5–7 p.m., on the 11th day of the eleventh month, make obeisance 9 times toward the west, expiation of 6,000 sins.
Between 7–9 p.m., on the 2nd day of the twelfth month, make obeisance 30 times toward the east, expiation of 30,000 sins.

In the eleventh year of Xuanshi era, the year of Jimao in Chinese calendar,[6] Master Li followed these rules and taught his followers how to expiate their sins through this practice. Believers can attain enlightenment after three years if they conduct this practice without interruption. They will get what they wish. Nothing will go against their will. They will be reborn anywhere they wish, whether in the Realm of Maitreya or the Wonderful Land in the West, or in the 33th heaven. After the practice is completed, the practitioners will be like Buddhas of the Dharma realm as well as enlightened monks.

The *Gongde wen* 功德文 (*Document of Merit*) that circulated at a later time states, "The eleventh year of Xuanshi, the year of Jimao in Chinese calendar, Master Liu abided by the rules to teach the followers how to be exempt from their sins through the means of worship." From this evidence, it is clear that when Daoyang was transcribing the document in the Western Wei Dynasty (435–451 A.D.), it was generally presumed that the *Liushi liwen* was circulated by a certain Master Liu during the years of Xuanshi of the Northern Liang (412–427). Then, who is Master Liu exactly?

We suggest here that this Master Liu is Liu Sahe 劉薩訶, a significant representative of early Chinese Buddhism. Liu Sahe is the first monk who appears in the section of Xingfu 興福 biography in Huijiao's 慧皎 *Gaosengzhuan* 高僧傳 of the Liang Dynasty. Daoxuan's 道宣 *Xu gaosengzhuan* 續高僧傳 of the

6 Xuanshi is an era name of the Northern Liang Dynasty. Its eleventh year is 422 AD, which is the year of Renxu 壬戌, rather than year of Jimao in Chinese calendar.

Tang Dynasty also mentions him, where he appears as the third monk in the *Gantong* 感通 section. He also appears in Daoxuan's *Shijia fangzhi* 釋迦方志, *Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu* 集神州三寶感通錄, *Guang hongming ji* 廣弘明集, and then in the *Fayuan zhulin* 法苑珠林 written by Daoshi 道世 who lived in the same period as Daoxuan. Earlier records may also be found in the *Chu sanzang jiji* 出三藏記集, *Mingxiang ji* 冥祥記, *Foji* 佛記, and *Liangshu* 梁書 *zhuyizhuan* 諸夷傳. The Dunhuang manuscripts and the wall paintings in the Mogao Grottoes preserve quite a lot material about Liu Sahe. From these materials, we can confirm that Liu Sahe was active during the Eastern Jin Dynasty. Due to the significant literary license taken by Liu Sahe's biographers, the historian is left with images of this figure which are often contradictory.[7] It is likely that the story of Liu incorporates narratives from the hagiographies of several other individuals. The present article does not intend to sort out what is historical in each source, but seeks only to note that Liu was consistently depicted as being esteemed by the populace during period from the late Northern and Southern Dynasties to the early Tang Dynasty. Daoxuan wrote: "Liu's solemn icon is highly venerated by people. In the regions of Shizhou, Xizhou, Cizhou, Danzhou, Yanzhou, Suizhou, Weizhou and Lanzhou, people worshipped his portrait and called him 'Master Liu Buddha'."[8] Therefore, we can probably identify the Master Liu in the manuscript S4494 as the Liu Sahe who was highly esteemed by Chinese Buddhists at that time.

The format of *Liushi liwen* is rather straightforward. It simply asked followers to bow a specific number of times in certain directions at the indicated times and on certain dates. It was believed that this practice could expiate sin. Followers who persisted in their practice for three years would attain enlightenment and get what they wished.

The first question which arises when examining this text is whether this kind of practice is consistent with any traditions within Indian Buddhism. The *Śīgalovāda Sūtra* (Ch. *Shijialuoyue liufang li jing* 屍迦羅越六方禮經), translated by An Shijao 安世高 in the Han Dynasty is part of the *Taishō* canon. This scripture is traditionally classified as a Hīnayāna Buddhist scripture in the Āgama section of the canon. There are three different translations of this text, including that which appears in the *Chang ahan jing's* 長阿含經 (Skt. *Dīrgha-āgama*) *shansheng jing* 善生經, translated in the later Qin Dynasty, the *Shanshengzi jing* 善生子經, translated in the Western Jin Dynasty, and the *Zhong ahan jing's* 中阿含經 (Skt. *Madhyama-āgama*) *shansheng jing* 善生經,

7 See also articles by Shi Weixiang 史葦湘, Sun Xiushen 孫修身, Chen Zuolong 陳祚龍, Helene Vetch, and Rao Zongyi 饒宗頤.

8 T 50: 645a.

translated in the Eastern Jin Dynasty. The *Śīgalovāda Sūtra* is a scripture from the early stage of Indian Buddhism, judging from the date at which it was translated. The contents of these four scriptures differ only slightly.

The basic story is that Śīgalovāda's father asked him to bow toward the six directions of east, south, west, north, heaven, and earth everyday. Śākyamuni Buddha asked him why he did so and he replied that he was following his father's instructions. The Buddha said, "Your father told you to worship the six directions, not just with your physical body."[9] Then the Buddha explained to him the ethical norms about the relationship between parents and children, mentors and disciples, husbands and wives, relatives and friends, masters and slaves, ordinary people and monks. This scripture became an important reference point for our understanding of Hīnayāna ethics.

One particular passage from the *Śīgalovāda Sūtra* is rendered differently in each version of the translation. In the *Shansheng jing* section of the *Chang ahan jing*, the text runs as follows: "At that time, Śākyamuni Buddha said that this kind of worship did exist. However, we cannot find a source of this worship of the six directions in our tradition.[10]

In the version of *Shansheng zi jing*, the paragraph is as follows: "Śākyamuni Buddha replied: "Son, what your father told you does not mean the six directions. Sitting in front of the desires from the six sides, if one commits filthy sins from four sides without remorse, his soul will be reborn in the hell after the body is dead."[11]

The version of *Zhong ahan jing: shansheng jing*, states: "Śākyamuni Buddha told him, 'Son, I do not deny the six directions. Son, if one can clearly distinguish the six directions, and keep away from four kinds of sins, he is respectable in this phenomenal world. After the body is decayed, and life ended, he will be reborn in the heaven.'"[12]

These different narratives convey the same meaning. Śākyamuni Buddha was not in favor of this kind of practice. In fact, one cannot find any mention of such practice in early Indian Buddhism. Then, where did this kind of worship in *Liushi liwen* come from? If we read *Baihu tongyi* 白虎通義 and *Lunheng* 論衡 by Wang Chong 王充, or early Daoist scriptures, it becomes clear that assigning directions with mysterious meaning comes from indigenous Chinese culture.

9 T 1: 250c.

10 T 1:70b.

11 T 1: 252b.

12 T 1: 639a.

Let us turn to the temporal frame, which is so important for this practice. *Liushi liwen* requires the followers to carry out this practice on a specific date at a specific time. Can we find any sources from Indian Buddhism for similar practices?

Firstly, with regard to the timing of this practice of worship, the ancient Indians divided a month into two parts—the white and black moon—according to the lunar calendar. The six fasting days in the *Foshuo sitianwang jing* 佛說四天王經 are distributed evenly, with three days taken during white moon and three during the black moon. In contrast, in the *Liushi liwen*, only in January and March, the worship was in the 24th and the 26th days of month. The worship during the other ten months fell in the first half month.[13] In Chinese tradition, the fist half of month belongs to *Yang*, and the later half belongs to *Yin*. Carrying out this practice during the *Yang* months brings more benefits. Hence it is obvious that the choice of dates in *Liushi liwen* was deeply influenced by Chinese traditional culture.

Secondly, the *Foshuo sitianwang jing* states: "On Mount Sumeru, which is to say the Trayastriṃśa Heaven, the ruler is Śakra. With majestic fortune and virtue, he leads the four heavenly kings, who are in charge of the four directions of Śakra. Generally, they send agents down on the 8th day of the month to patrol the territory. These agents have to check on the good and evil thoughts, words, and behaviors of various species including emperors, ministers, peoples, dragons, ghosts, worms, etc. The four heavenly kings send their sons down on the 14th day and they go down themselves on the 15th day. On the 23rd day, the kings go down again. On the 29th day, their sons down again. On the 30th day, they go down themselves again. When all four heavenly kings go down together, all the divinities of the sun, moon, five stars, and the twenty-eight mansions all go down to the world.[14]

In other words, the four heavenly kings will send agents, their sons, or even themselves down to the land on the 8th, 14th, 15th, 23rd, 29th, and 30th day of each month. The *Foshuo sitianwang jing* states: "When they see all the living beings doing good, they will each report to Śakra . . . Then Śakra will confer his decision, such as prolonging the life of living beings, increasing their fortune and sending heavenly kings to protect them.[15] Otherwise, Śakra will darken the sun and moon, and disrupt the order of the stars and climate, in order to warn the people. Hopefully people will change their behavior from bad to good."[16]

---

13 *Shi'er yue lifo wen* is the variation of *Liushi liwen* in the Tang Dynasty, which set the dates of worship in the first half month, namely, the *Yang* moon.

14 T 15: 118b.

15 T 15: 118b.

16 T 15: 118b–c.

The *Foshuo sitianwang jing* was introduced by its author as an Indian Buddhist sūtra. According to the record, it was translated by Zhiyan 智嚴 and Baoyun 寶雲 from Liangzhou in the Liu Song Dynasty. This text discussed the idea of heavenly kings' inspection (*tianshen sicha* 天神伺察) of men's acts. For those who are good, the heavenly kings reward them with longevity and good fortune. However, for those who do bad deeds, the heavenly kings do not punish them by sending them to hell as in the Indian tradition; rather, the heavenly kings urge them to examine themselves. This approach to punishment corresponds the idea of cosmic resonance (*tianren ganying* 天人感應), which is a Chinese cultural concept. So, we may wonder, is *Foshuo sitianwang jing* an Indian Buddhist scripture?

How do we treat this text? Of course, the idea of heavenly king's inspection may have exist in ancient India. In fact, this idea of heavenly king's inspection appears in the Vedas scriptures. However, the concept of the heavenly king's inspection in the Vedas is completely different from that of the *Foshuo sitianwang jing*. There was no narrative in the early period of India Buddhism which is similar to that of the latter scripture. At least we do not find this kind of account in other early Indian Buddhist scriptures, such as the *Faju jing* 法句經 or the *Jingji* 經集.[17] If we put the idea of heavenly king's inspection aside and focus on the cosmic resonance advocated in the *Foshuo sitianwang jing*, we can comfortably suggest this scripture was deeply influenced by traditional Chinese culture.

Since the *Foshuo sitianwang jing* is a translated scripture from a Sanskrit original, how could it be influenced by indigenous Chinese culture? The question involves another question, which I have discussed in recent years: the development of Buddhism. The development of Buddhism involves not only Indian culture, but also the outcome of cultural confluences from China, western India and broader Asia. It is very likely that the *Foshuo sitianwang jing* was composed in China and then sent back to India, and then translated back into Chinese; this text is a typical example of indigenous Chinese cultural elements spreading to Central Asia, and then to India. This cultural product was later transmitted back to China, and then re-translated into Chinese. As I suggested elsewhere: "Buddhism was nurtured mainly by Indian culture, but the

17 The third part of the twenty-four section in chapter *Gaochuang* 高幢 of *Zengyi ahan jing* 增一阿含經 (Skt. *Ekottara-āgama*) and *Za ahan jing* 雜阿含經 (Skt. *Saṃyukta-āgama*) (No. 1117) contain similar texts. The former was noted as translated in the Eastern Jin Dynasty. But the current circulated version is the one in the Southern and Northern Dynasties, translated by Gunabhadra. These two scriptures were in the same era with the *Foshuo sitianwang jing*.

development of Buddhism benefited from its exposure to Chinese and other Asian influences. In other words, China is the second home of Buddhism, a fact made clear through an examination of its cultural products and the historical process through which they emerged."[18]

2

The *Jingdu sanmei jing* 淨度三昧經 is another similar example.

The *Jingdu sanmei jing* was translated by Baoyun 寶雲 in the Liu Song Dynasty. It was initially kept in Chinese canons until Zhisheng 智升 expressed his doubt about its authenticity in his canonical catalogue *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄 of the eighth century. Even though there was no hard evidence to reject the authenticity of this text, he put it in the appendix at the end of the catalogue, stating the following:

> The ten scriptures in fifteen scrolls following the *Jing du sanmei jing* are all "suspicious" texts as recorded in previous catalogues. Although the *Jingdu sanmei jing* was listed as "authentic" in the catalogue of *Zhou lu* 周錄 (*Da Zhou kanding zhongjing mulu* 大周刊定衆經目錄), it obviously contains certain agendas. Therefore, it is excluded in this catalogue.[19]

Zhisheng's judgment is obviously not correct. Regarding this question, I wrote an article, "*Jingdu sanmei jing de muluxue kaocha*" 淨度三昧經的目錄學考察, to confirm that it was certainly a translated scripture.[20] Nevertheless, it is undeniable that the *Jingdu sanmei jing* contains a trace of Chinese culture, such as the following passage:

> The heavenly kings inspect and make a record of people's sins and merits, regardless of their status. They report six times each month, four replies a year. The four replies take place the "eight-kings" days. On these dates, the heavenly kings evaluate the deeds of devas, people, and animals. Those

18 Fang Guanzhang (2003), "*Menggu wen ganzhu'er danzhu'er mulu qianyan*" 蒙古文甘珠爾丹珠爾目錄前言 (Foreword in The Catalogue of Mongolia Kangyur and Tengyur), *Menggu wen ganzhu'er danzhu'er mulu* 蒙古甘珠爾丹珠爾目錄 (The Catalogue of Mongolia Kangyur and Tengyur), Menggu renmin chuban she.

19 T 55: 699c.

20 Fang Guanzhang, "*Jingdu sanmei jing de mulu xue kaocha*," in *Qisi guyi jingdian yanjiu congshu* 七寺古逸經典研究叢書, Vol. 2. Dadong chuban she, April, 1996.

who behave well will be given longevity, and those who behave badly will be deprived of longevity and fortunes.

The world is enormous and living beings are countless. The devas, the hell-beings, the Heavenly king of five realms, the Heavenly king in charge of life and death, the record-keepers, the five officials, the military commanders, the envoys for the four territory kings, *Chengtian*, and generals govern the four seasons, and they forbid and report unlawful behaviors. They keep the names and the records of all the living beings and decide their lives without any error. People are foolish so they do not know what the heavenly kings record. They do not know where they came from and where they are going after death. They do not know that their lifetime has been recorded by the five heavenly kings. They do not do good behaviors to pursue safety, and to expiate sins by making merits. They do not know how to save themselves in their next life by following the three honored ones. They do not know how to pass safely through the world by following those wise people who obey Buddhist disciplines. For example, a cow became too old and useless, and everyone said, "This cow is old and useless. Keeping it is a burden and has no benefits for me. I should kill it, so I can eat its meat and remove the burden." So is with ordinary people. If we do not obey the disciplines, do not do good deeds, we are just like the cow, which is useless and cannot survive. People live with and are nurtured by the energy of the *Dao*. People who do not follow the *Dao* cannot save themselves. After their lives are taken by the five officials, they will go into hell. All those governed by the thirty-three heavens are as such.

It is no wonder that Zhisheng judged this text to be apocryphal. When it comes to texts often regarded as apocryphal, the most controversial are the *Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna* and the *Renwang bore jing* 仁王般若經. Modern scholars have disputed their status for a hundred years. Many have pointed out that these two Buddhist scriptures were full of the concepts indigenous to pre-Buddhist Chinese culture and believe that they were not originally Indian Buddhist scriptures. That is to say, they were written by the Chinese. However, these two scriptures are surely translated works from Sanskrit.

How do we come to this conclusion? Here we must recognize the fact that the Buddhism of this stage was a product of the westward dissemination of Chinese culture to Central Asia and India. Indian and Central Asian elements were added to this Chinese cultural layer and the text was then once again disseminated in China.

The westward dissemination of Chinese culture can be defined in two ways. The first is that the concept of "Western Regions", defined in a narrow sense and the second is this notion taken more broadly.

In the narrow sense, the Western Regions refer to the Xinjiang area in present-day China. This area has been a place where various cultures met. Han culture has become more and more influential in the Western Regions since the time Zhang Qian 張騫 entered that region. Xinjiang is a place where a great number of Mahāyāna Buddhist scriptures were produced, disseminated, and preserved. And, indeed, Buddhist scriptures that were produced there must have been influenced by Chinese culture.

Then, how did Chinese culture influence Xinjiang? First of all, Han culture had a direct influence on the local people in Xinjiang. The Dunhuang manuscripts and the Turfan texts have demonstrated that Dunhuang and the Western Regions were places, where various ethnic groups lived together. Non-Han people were influenced by Han culture. Non-Han people used their own languages, while simultaneously using Chinese in various activities. The Qu's Dynasty in Gaochang, and the Li Dynasty in Yutian are two typical examples.

Although some researchers have noted the influence of the Han immigrants, in general, there have been very few publications on this topic. Let me take the example of Monk Fahai 法海 to illustrate the situation. There is a list of translators at the end of the fifth fascicle of the *Golden Light Sūtra*, the edition of the Beijing Library, number BD03339 (Yü 39). Eighteen monks participated in the translation at Yijing 義淨 translation team, as recorded below:

> On 4th day of the tenth month in the third year of Chang'an Era of the Great Zhou Dynasty, Year Guimao, Master Yijing, received the edict to translate Buddhist scriptures at the Ximing Monastery, Chang'an.
> Monk Baosiwei 寶思惟 clarified the meanings of Sanskrit.
> ....
> Monk Mingxiao 明曉 in the Tiangong monastery.
> Monk Fahai of the Beiting Longxing monastery.
> Verified by Hongjian 弘建.

Meanwhile, a paragraph of *Huichao wang wutianzhu guo zhuan* 慧超往五天竺國傳 in the Dunhuang manuscripts, numbered P.3532, mentions Fahai differently:

> In Anxi, there are two Buddhist monasteries led by Han abbots. They practice Mahāyāna Buddhism and eat no meat... The abbot of the Longxing monastery Fahai is a Han born in Anxi. His knowledge and moral conduct are not different from those in China.

The above mentioned passages noted two Buddhist temples with Han abbots. One is the Longxin Monastery, led by Fahai, who was Han people born in Anxi.

In the third year of the Chang'an Era (703 A.D.), Monk Huichao arrived at Beiting Anxi. From the two pieces of information appearing above, we know that Fahai was born and became a monk in the Western Regions, and then went to Chang'an. In 703, he participated in Yijing's translation group as a rector of the Longxin monastery. Subsequently, he returned to the Western Regions. He became the abbot of the Longxin monastery around 727 AD. That Huichao's praise of Fahai's knowledge and moral conduct were comparable with those in central China must have something to do with his experience translating Buddhist scriptures. Examples such as these are extremely helpful for understanding the immigrant culture in the Western Regions at that time.

Now, we will turn to a discussion of the Chinese influence on the production of Buddhist scriptures. Most of the documents found at Dunhuang were written in Chinese or Tibetan. There are other documents, which were written in languages such as Old Uyghur, Sogdian, Khotanian, and Sanskrit. There were documents translated from Tibetan to Chinese, and documents, originally appearing in Chinese, which were then translated into other languages. For example, the *Liangchao Fudashi song Jingang jing* 梁朝傅大士頌金剛經 was translated into the old Uyghur, and the *Fo wei xinwang pusa shuo toutuo jing* 佛為心王菩薩說頭陀經 was translated into Sogdian.

It is worth discussing the *Fo wei xinwang pusa shuo toutuo jing* in some detail. It is a Buddhist scripture written in Chinese, typically categorized as an apocryphal document. This text indicates both the influence of Buddhist culture on Chinese thought, and some of the ways in which Buddhist thought was transformed by Chinese culture. Among the Dunhuang manuscripts, there is an incomplete Sogdian version.[21] There are also five Chinese versions are preserved in Dunhuang collections in the British library, the French library,

21 The document number of that manuscript is B.M.Or.8212(160)/Stein Ch00353. "B.M.Or.8212" is the number that the British Museum assigned to Aurel Stein's collection in his third exploration in central Asia. The "Ch" in the document number refers to the pinyin of Chianfodong 千佛洞, which tells that the manuscript was acquired in the Mogao Caves, Dunhuang. Judging from the number, Aurel Stein found this manuscript at his third exploration of Dunhuang in 1914.

When Stein conducted his third exploration, the rest of the manuscripts have been transported to Beijing. These Dunhuang manuscripts came from Daoist Priest Wang's private collection, including 500 larger scrolls and about 1000 fragment pieces. In addition, he also excavated some ancient documents in the Xingjiang.

According to the records of Stein and Pelliot, Wang spoke only Chinese, and did not pay attention to manuscripts in other languages. Wang's collection must be Chinese documents that he regarded valuable. If the above speculation stands, then it is doubtful that the Sogdian version of the *Fo wei xinwang pusa shuo toutuo jing* was from Wang. Here are two possibilities. Firstly, the manuscript is acquired from other cave in the Mogao

the National Library of China, Tianjin Museum, and the Mitsui Bunko. The Sogdian version preserved in the British Library attracted the attention of researchers, but, for some time, no one was able to determine which scriptural tradition it belonged to. Finally, in 1933, French scholar P. Demieville identified it as *Fo wei xinwang pusa shuo toutuo jing* according to the fragments of Chinese version in the Taishō Tripitaka Vol. 85. More recently, Japanese scholar Ibuki Atsushi 伊吹敦 translated the Sogdian version into Chinese.

According to Chinese catalogues, whatever was written by Chinese authors were regarded "apocryphal," while anything translated from foreign originals are "authentic." Those texts which could not be identified were classified as "suspicious" scriptures. Imagine, for example, the following situation. The *Fo wei xinwang pusa shuo toutuo jing* was not recorded as a apocryphal scripture in any Buddhist catalogues (many cases are like this in the Chinese catalogues), and all of its Chinese originals were lost. And then, imagine Prof. Ibuki Atsushi lived in the ancient period, found the Sogdian version and translated it into Chinese. Then his activity of translation was recorded by the Buddhist catalogues in the ancient times. What can we learn from this thought experiment?

Various cultures (including both Indian and Chinese) lived together in the Western Regions. It is impossible that these cultures could have no influence on the Buddhism that existed in the western regions. These Buddhist scriptures were might then be disseminated in China once again and further interact with Chinese culture. This is an important possibility for those in Buddhist Studies to consider.

Investigating the confluence of cultures in the western region presents the researcher with a set of complex questions. A single article cannot present comprehensive answers. This is a question worthy of study and I have proposed several stepping-stones here for further academic research. Numerous apocryphal scriptures preserved in the Dunhuang manuscripts are potential resources for those interested in these questions.

The Western Regions, in the broadest sense, refer to Central Asia and South Asia. Li Bai 李白, a famous Tang poet was born in Suyab (nowadays Kazakhstan), and it is not difficult to imagine the strong influence of Chinese culture in Central Asia during the Tang period. The limitations of the historical record in India make it difficult to determine the extent to which indigenous Chinese culture may have determined the development of Buddhism in India. However, Chinese sources record the presence of numerous merchants, diplomatic envoys, and monks travelling between India and China. These

---

Caves. Or, the manuscript did not belong to the Dunhuang manuscripts, and the document number is wrong.

figures were bearers of their respective cultures and played a vital role in the dissemination of their cultures abroad. We must pay attention to those Indian monks who came to China for the dissemination of Buddhism as well as to those Chinese monks who went to India. A widely circulated poem runs a follows:

> In the Liu Song, Qi, Liang, and Tang Dynasties, eminent monks left Chang'an to pursue Buddhism. (看宋齊梁唐代間，高僧求法別長安)
>
> Hundreds of them departed, less than ten of them returned. The successors knew nothing about the difficulty that their predecessors experienced. (去人成百歸無十，後輩馬（焉）知前者難)
>
> The road in the mountains with snow was rough, the cold penetrated to their bones. (雪嶺崎嶇侵骨冷)
>
> The waves of sands were so chilling that their hearts almost froze (流沙波浪徹心寒)
>
> The descendants did not understand what happened at that time, and took the acquirement of Buddhist scriptures for granted. (後流不辯當時事，往往將經容易看)[22]

Based on the line which states that "hundreds of them departed, less than ten of them returned," we know that some monks died on the way. However, many of them stayed in India. Yijing's *Da Tang xiyu qiufa gaoseng zhuan* 大唐西域求法高僧傳 preserved important information regarding this phenomenon.

Those Chinese monks who returned from India also left the mark of Chinese culture on Indian society. For example, corresponding to the political situation

---

22 The poem might be written by Yijing. See the *Dazang jing zongmu* 大藏經總目. The same poem with a little difference in the wording is to be found in *Issaikyō no yurai* 一切経の由来 compiled by Murakami Senjō 村上專精:

> In the Jin, Song, Qi, Liang, and Tang Dynasties, Eminent monks left Chang'an to pursue Buddhism. (晉宋齊梁唐代間，高僧求法離長安)
>
> Hundred of them departed, less than ten of them returned. The successors knew nothing about the difficulty their predecessors experienced. (去人成百歸無十，後者安知前者難)
>
> The Destination is far away, accompanied by blue sky and coldness. The sands cover the sun and make people exhausted. (路遠碧天唯冷結，沙河遮日力疲殫)
>
> If the descendants did not know what happened at that time, they usually took the acquirement of Buddhist scriptures as an easy task. (後賢如未諳斯旨，往往將經容易看)

(Dazheng *xinxiu dazang jing huiyuan tongxun* 大正新修大藏經會員通訊, no. 16, November 1961).

in India, the factions of India Buddhism were never unified. Indian tends to believe that the existence of factions, or the existence of heterodox is normal. An Indian monk during the period of Buddhist schism said that although a golden stick was broken into eighteen pieces, each piece is still made of pure gold. Following this logic, all these factions at that time belonged to orthodoxy and their existence was legitimate—the Indians had no intention to unify these factions. The situation in China was different. Basically, China has been united politically in the history. When China was in the situation of temporary separation, some fragmented parts considered themselves as the orthodoxy, and took the reunification as their goal. The others esteemed the other country as the orthodoxy and treated themselves as the vassal states. As a result, unification is normal and fragmentation is abnormal from the perspective of Chinese. Therefore, within the cultural sphere, Chinese tends to build up a harmonious system by integrating various contradictory elements. The classification of Buddha teachings done by Chinese monks during the Northern and Southern Dynasties was out of this purpose. For example, Xuanzang 玄奘 wrote the *Huizong lun* 會宗論 to integrate Madyamaka and Yogācāra. In the *Da Tang Daci'en si sanzang fashi zhuan* 大唐大慈恩寺三藏法師傳, Fascicle 4, it writes: "When *Huizong lun* was completed and presented to Jiexian 戒賢 and the assemblies, everyone praised it and applauded."[23] Xuanzang's perspective must have influenced Jiexian and other monks. It is noteworthy that an Indian school that integrated Madyamaka and Yogācāra did emerge in a later period, even if there is no evidence to assert that Xuanzang's *Huizong lun* directly influenced this Indian sect.

3

At the end of fascicle 2 of *the Golden Light Sūtra*, Dunhuang manuscript S.06884, a passage states:

> Transcribing the *Golden Light Sūtra* with respect, ten fascicles. On the right part, the above merit of transcribing the sutra is also adornment. The Lord of Mt. Tai, the Great King of Equality, the Deities of Five Realms, the Officials in the Heaven and the Hell, the Deities of Life and the Record-keepers, the Deities of of the Earth and Water, the Ghost King that Spreads Diseases and all attendants, all Lords and Good Friends, Hu envoys, Calendar Officials, my Aunt, Guan Officer, Guarantee Kehan,

23 T 50: 244c.

> and two new envoys, Divinities of Wind and Rain, and so on, [I] sincerely beseech for your mercy to grant me merits and longevity.

This *Golden Light Sūtra* was transcribed in the Guiyijun period in Dunghuang, during the 9th or 10th century. If we compare the above passage with the *Jingdu sanmei jing* that was translated in the Northern and Southern Dynasties, we will see many similarities. These similarities remind us that we have to pay attention not only to the doctrinal elements in culture but also to the devotional elements in culture, when considering the issue of cultural confluence. However, it is a rather complicated question and I shall discuss it in detail in another article.

Bibliography

Primary Sources by Title

Baihu tongyi 白虎通義, Ban Gu 班固, *Siku quanshu* 四庫全書, Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1987.

Chang ahan jing 長阿含經, Buddhayaśas and Zhu Fonian 竺佛念 trans., T 1, No. 2153.

Chu sanzang jiji 出三藏記集, Sengyou 僧祐, T 55, No. 2145.

Daji jing 大集經, Dharmakṣema trans., T 13, No. 397.

Dasheng qixin lun 大乘起信論 (*Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna*), Paramārtha trans., T 32 No. 1666.

Da Tang Daci'en si sanzang fashi zhuan 大唐大慈恩寺三藏法師傳, T 50, No. 2053.

Da Tang xiyu qiufa gaoseng zhuan 大唐西域求法高僧傳, Yijing 義淨, T 51, No. 2066.

Da Zhou kanding zhongjing mulu 大周刊定衆經目錄, Mingquan 明佺, T 55, No. 2153.

Fayuan zhulin 法苑珠林, Daoshi 道世, T 53, No. 2122.

Fo shuo sitianwang jing 佛說四天王經, Zhiyan 智嚴 and Baoyun 寶雲 trans., T 15, No. 590.

Fo wei xinwang pusa shuo toutuo jing 佛為心王菩薩說頭陀經, Dunhuang manuscript, B.M.Or.8212(160)/Stein Ch00353.

Gaoseng zhuan 高僧傳, Huijiao 慧皎, T 50, No. 2059.

Guang hongming ji 廣弘明集, Daoxuan 道宣, T 52, No. 2103.

Huichao wang wutianzhu guo zhuan 慧超往五天竺國傳, Dunhuang manuscript. P.3532.

Ji shenzhou sanbao gantong lu 集神州三寶感通錄, Daoxuan, T 52, No. 2106.

Jin guangming jing 金光明經 (*Golden Light Sūtra*), Dunhuang manuscript, S.06884.

Jingdu sanmei jing 淨度三昧經, Baoyun 寶雲 trans., X. 01, No. 15.

Kaiyuan shijiao lu 開元釋教錄, Zhisheng 智升, T 55.

Liang chao Fu dashi song Jingang jing 梁朝傅大士頌金剛經, T 85, No. 2732.

Liangshu 梁書, Yao Silian 姚思廉, Beijing: Zhonghua shuji, 1998.
Lunheng 論衡, Wang Chong 王充, *Siku quanshu* 四庫全書, Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1987.
Renwang bore jing 仁王般若經, Kumārajīva trans., T 8, No. 245.
Shanshengzi jing 善生子經, Zhi Fadu 支法度 trans., T 1, No. 17.
Shijia fangzhi 釋迦方志, Daoxuan 道宣, T 51, No. 2088.
Shijialuoyue liufang li jing 屍迦羅越六方禮經, An Shijao 安世高 trans., T 1, No. 16.
Xu gaosengzhuan 續高僧傳, Daoxuan, T 50, No. 2060.
Za ahan jing 雜阿含經, Guṇabhadra trans., T 2, No. 99.
Zengyi ahan jing 增一阿含經, Saṃghadeva trans., T 2, No. 125.
Zhong ahan jing 中阿含經, Saṃghadeva trans., T 1. No. 26.

Secondary Sources

Dazheng xinxiu dazang jing huiyuan tongxun 大正新修大藏經會員通訊, no. 16, November 1961.
Fang Guangchang (1996), "*Jingdu sanmei jing de muluxue kaocha*" 淨度三昧經的目錄學考察, in *Qisi guyi jingdian yanjiu congshu* 七寺古逸經典研究叢書, vol. 2. Dadong chuban she.
——— (2003), "*Menggu wen ganzhu'er danzhu'er mulu qianyan*" 蒙古文甘珠爾丹珠爾目錄前言 (Foreword in The Catalogue of Mongolia Kangyur and Tengyur), *Menggu wen ganzhu'er danzhu'er mulu* 蒙古甘珠爾丹珠爾目錄 (The Catalogue of Mongolia Kangyur and Tengyur), Menggu renmin chuban she.
Giles, Lionel et al. (1957), eds., *Descriptive Catalogue of the Chinese Manuscripts from Tunhuang in the British Museum*, London, Trustees of the British Museum.
Murakami Senjō 村上專精 (1915), ed. *Issaikyō no yurai* 一切経の由来 (Chinese title cited by the original author: *Yiqie jing zhi youlai* 一切經之由來), Tokyo: Jindō kōwakai.
Soymié, Michel (1979), "Les dix jours de jeûne de Kṣitigarbha" (Chinese title cited by the original author: *Dunhuang xieben zhong de dizang shizhai ri* 敦煌寫本中的地藏十齋日), in *Contributions aux études sur Touen-houang*, ed. Michel Soymié. Geneva: Droz, pp. 135–59.