

Chapter One

A Short History of an Abbreviated Tang Tiantai Text

T. H. BARRETT

SOAS, University of London, London, UK

Abstract: The abbreviation of the *Mohe zhiguan* made by Liang Su in the late eighth century has come down to us as the result of a complex process of international transmission. First committed to print in the early eleventh century, a second edition was probably exported to Japan soon after its production at the start of the thirteenth, and reprinted in that country in the seventeenth century in an edition that was to be republished in a modern typeset edition at the start of the twentieth century, by which point any earlier Chinese edition had been long lost. Contemporary digitized editions in the Chinese world go back to this Japanese typeset edition, but now do not quite reflect in every particular the earliest complete surviving edition, which is that of seventeenth century Japan.

Keywords: Liang Su 梁肅 (753–793), *Shanding zhiguan* 刪定止觀, Hangzhou printing, Wu Keji 吳克己 (1140–1214), Sōshan Gensei 艸山元政 (1623–1668)

A NEGLECTED Tiantai Scholar

From Tiantai to Hieizan - and Back Again? The Double Journey
between China and Japan of an Outsider's Text

The complex interplay of forces between Chinese, Korean and Japanese Buddhism is probably nowhere more noteworthy than in the case of the cross-regional bibliographical interconnections of the Tiantai tradition. Many of the elements in this sustained narrative of historical interaction have already become familiar to those who read about East Asian Buddhism in English, thanks to the detailed scholarship of a number of experts writing in an Anglophone environment in recent years. The role of Japan as an early recipient of Tiantai works has for example been clarified by Paul Groner, following a path first pointed out by his teacher Stanley Weinstein (1929–2017).¹ Though traditional accounts have tended to assign an important role to Korea in the reintroduction of this Tiantai literature to China in the mid-tenth century, Benjamin Brose has used recent Japanese discoveries to establish that it was actually Japan that was the source of the re-imported texts.² This is, however, not to deny the signal contribution of monks from Korea to the later development of Tiantai Buddhism, which certainly included the contribution of works of Korean authorship to the Chinese mainstream.³

¹ Groner, *Saichō*, 46–47; Weinstein, ‘The Beginnings of Esoteric Buddhism in Japan’. Here and below the focus is on introducing an Anglophone perspective on the scholarship, rather than attempting to cover any of the extensive East Asian scholarship beyond the main topic of this study, on which relevant East Asian contributions are cited.

² Brose, ‘Crossing Thousands of *Li* of Waves’.

³ For an overview, see Chan, ‘The Korean Impact on T’ien-t’ai Buddhism in China’; for a Korean authored composition that is well regarded throughout East Asia, see Chappell, ed., *T’ien-t’ai Buddhism*, which is a collective translation carried out in Hawai’i of a work by the Korean master Ch’egwan 諦觀 (fl. 961–971).

It is just that in the case outlined below we deal with a book exported to Japan from China not once but twice in the course of its history, and re-imported once again in modern times long after it had been lost in its land of origin.

Yet the work that is examined below from the point of view of its transmission falls somewhat outside the cases covered by Paul Groner and Benjamin Brose. It is unusual, but not in its contents nor yet in its extended publication history—the contents are in a sense purely derivative, while in terms of interrupted patterns of transmission one thinks of other contrasting works such as the famous early biography of the Sixth Patriarch of Chan Buddhism, the *Sōkei daishi betsuden* 曹溪大師別傳, which arrived in Japan from China with the first importation of Tiantai texts and was not printed at all until a wood-block edition of the Edo period, having never been reintroduced to China.⁴ What is truly unusual, especially for a work of Tiantai scholarship, is its authorship, in that it was written by a lay person. This has always put it slightly outside the main focus of traditional Tiantai studies in East Asia, making it a worthy future object of research into what light it can throw on the tradition during the late eighth century, so while the following remarks are intended to provide something of the bibliographic groundwork that might be required by anyone willing to undertake such future research, in the first place a few words are necessary about its author, Liang Su 梁肅 (753–793), and about his more general efforts on behalf of the Tiantai tradition, before turning to the Tiantai work upon which he expended so much effort, now known both in print and online as the *Shanding zhiguan* 刪定止觀, or *Abbreviated and Edited Mohe zhiguan*.⁵

⁴ Jørgensen, *Inventing Hui-neng*, 4–5, summarizes the story of the transmission of this text and its printing in 1762; his study also includes plenty of information on the content and significance of the work.

⁵ Liang's work as reprinted in the Supplement to the Kyoto Canon (i.e. *Zoku zōkyō*) is very readily available now at http://tripitaka.cbeta.org/X55n0915_003.

A Tiantai Scholar Among the Literati

Liang Su's achievements during his relatively short life were considerable, so it is no surprise that his writings were in some part preserved, and that his name continued to be mentioned in later discussions of his age. Yet one feels that had he lived a couple of decades more and achieved over time the status of a younger contemporary like Quan Deyu 權德輿 (759–818) he would now be seen as a key to the understanding of his age, even if like Quan he may still have been destined in the eyes of posterity to be overshadowed by the next generation of yet greater writers.⁶ As it is, Liang is mentioned often enough, even in Anglophone publications about the period, but usually only as part of some other narrative, a situation that—with the exceptions duly noted below—obtains for the most part in East Asian scholarship also. His Buddhist interests have not gone unacknowledged: they are mentioned for example in a pioneering study of his times by E. G. Pulleyblank (1922–2013).⁷ They have even caused one of his shorter occasional pieces to be cited in a book on a purely Buddhist topic, unrelated to the particular doctrinal concerns with which he is generally associated.⁸ But he equally receives glancing mention in another monograph on Daoism.⁹ His literary ideas have also attracted attention beyond any reference to the religious elements in his writings.¹⁰ His appearance in a list of literary figures who interacted with a famous Buddhist poet-monk, Jiaoran 皎然 (730–799), has also seen another instance of his name in an English translation.¹¹ Even when

⁶ Quan's importance as a dominant force in the intellectual life of the end of the eighth century and the beginning of the next may be seen throughout DeBlasi, *Reform in the Balance*.

⁷ Pulleyblank, 'Neo-Confucianism and Neo-Legalism in T'ang Intellectual Life', 94–95.

⁸ Thus Zhiru, *The Making of a Savior Bodhisattva*, 204.

⁹ De Mayer, *Wu Yun's Way*, 82.

¹⁰ McMullen, *Statesmen and Scholars in T'ang China*, 246.

¹¹ Nielson, *The T'ang Poet-Monk Chiao-jan*, 61, translating Jiaoran's biography in *juan* 29 of *Song Gaoseng zhuan*.

one of his Tiantai doctrinal works was at an early stage in the modern study of Tang Buddhism quoted in English, by none other than the famous Chinese scholar Hu Shih 胡適 (1891–1962), the purpose of that noted author was not to explore Liang Su's thought as such, but to exemplify what he read as a critique of the emergence of Chan Buddhism, the area of Chinese Buddhism in which Hu Shi's primary interest lay.¹²

Unfortunately, too, in the case of the later figure who affirmed his admiration for Liang in the most unambiguous terms, the pivotal thinker and scholar Li Ao 李翱 (c. 772–836), the exploration of Liang's possible influence on him has of necessity only been discussed within the narrow compass of the evidence of Li's surviving writings, rather than through a broader evaluation of Liang's life and thought, so in this instance as well many important questions about Liang have been left unanswered, at least in English.¹³ Even the most helpful work on Liang produced in East Asia in some respects does no more than lay the groundwork for further study, since not all possible approaches to his legacy are fully explored. The publication in 1972 of a full chronology of Liang's life by the eminent Japanese sinologist Kanda Kiichirō 神田喜一郎 (1897–1984) certainly marked a major step forward in the study of his writings.¹⁴ But to the best of my knowledge this type of approach has only been taken further by the Taiwanese researcher Chung-han Kuo 郭中翰, in a study completed as an M.A. dissertation under the direction of Professor Jo-shui Chen 陳若水 at Tsing Hua University, Taiwan, in 1998. I am very grateful to Mr. Kuo, who subsequently undertook doctoral studies at the University of Washington but currently seems to work as a journalist and translator, for sending me a copy of his work, which to the best of my knowledge represents the most thorough attempt at delineating the full scope of Liang's life and thought in any language to date.¹⁵

¹² The quotation is from Hu, 'Ch'an (Zen) Buddhism in China', 13–14.

¹³ Barrett, *Li Ao*, 60–65.

¹⁴ Kanda, 'Ryō Shuku nempyō'.

¹⁵ Kuo, *Zhong-Tang Liang Su*.

This is not, however, to underestimate the high value of further research carried out in recent decades on Liang's continental homeland. Yu Xueming 俞學明 has in a research article of her own added much to our knowledge of Liang's Buddhism, whilst in another survey of recent Chinese scholarship on his teacher she has noted earlier disputes over the chronology of one of Liang's relevant prefaces.¹⁶ We will have occasion to refer to her findings below, but it should be stressed that my main aim, other than introducing English-language mentions of Liang as above, is to offer a brief biographical sketch sufficient to serve as the background to the narrative focus solely on the transmission of but one of the works under his name. This approach admittedly has some drawbacks: obviously the urge to transcribe or reprint Liang's composition at any point cannot be entirely disconnected from the popularity of his thought. To assess the larger environments within his work found meaning at any particular time would however be a fairly extensive enterprise, and one that I fear would be beyond my capacities; what is offered here is as already mentioned no more than some basic bibliographical information gathered from a number of sources, including one key source not in current circulation, that it is hoped may be of value in future research.

Now Kuo's approach covers not simply a chronology of Liang's life as a scholar in government employ, for example as an examiner, and his literary activities and friendships, but also his more philosophical essays, which draw on Buddhist ideas but express them in a vocabulary drawn from pre-imperial writers. He also provides a chronology of Liang's compositions.¹⁷ But he does explicitly

¹⁶ Yu, 'Liang Su yu Tiantaizong'; idem, 'Dalu Zhanran yanjiu xianzhuang zongshu'.

¹⁷ Kuo, *Zhong-Tang Liang Su*, adds this as a separately paginated appendix following his page 127. This is cited below as 'Appendix'; the chronology is followed (12–19) by three uncollected pieces by Liang retrieved from various recently identified sources, plus a long quotation that survives from a lost piece and a reprinting of the two main sources on Liang written by his contemporar-

leave the *Shanding zhiguan* out of consideration, in part because he disclaims the technical knowledge of Tiantai thought required to assess its significance, but also because the text does not contain Liang's own words, but rather those of the author of the *Mohe zhiguan* 摩訶止觀, the *Great Treatise on Calming and Contemplation* stemming from the teachings of the great Tiantai systematizer Zhiyi 智顗 (538–597). This is undeniable, but at the same time we should perhaps bear in mind that in pre-modern China at least editorial work was assigned a certain prestige—Confucius himself, after all, had in the traditional view been seen as having played an important role in the editing of earlier texts. How such a task was carried out might leave behind important clues as to how a text was read, and in this case how the different sections of the original work were assigned differing relative levels of importance as part of the process of abbreviation surely counts as evidence. In other words, the *Shanding zhiguan* might one day be able to tell us something of how one layman at least of the late eighth century understood the Tiantai legacy.

For that reason, therefore, before turning to our main task of elucidating the transmission and impact of the *Shanding zhiguan* it is necessary to say a few words about its role within the context of what can be known about Liang Su's Tiantai studies in general. His writings in support of the school certainly had an impact that was as far as one can tell much more widespread than that of the *Shanding zhiguan* itself, though without the dedicated effort at understanding Zhiyi's writings to which the *Shanding zhiguan* attests it is unlikely that his various Buddhist compositions would have achieved the good reputation that they did both within and beyond Buddhist circles.

ies, namely the preface to his writings by Cui Gong 崔恭 (?- after 818) cited here and also the tomb inscription (*muzhiming* 墓志銘) written for him by another friend, Cui Yuanhan 崔元翰 (733–795), taken from the *Wenyuan yinghua* 文苑英華 944 and collated against the *Quan Tang wen* 全唐文 523.

Liang Su as a Student of Tiantai Buddhism

Though the preface to Liang's writings by his friend Cui Gong describes him as having been a follower of the Buddha from his early life (早從釋氏), Kuo suggests that from 771 if not earlier he became a lay follower of the illustrious Tiantai thinker Zhanran 湛然 (711–782).¹⁸ This would have given Liang from his teenage years an unparalleled opportunity to master the Tiantai tradition, at least as it was being reformulated by Zhanran, whose own contributions were at this point both enlarging and in some ways modifying the heritage of Zhiyi.¹⁹ Within a decade he had advanced to the point where he started to write specifically Tiantai essays, starting with one composed as an inscription in honour of Zhiyi in 781, to which he added a memorial inscription for Zhanran the following year; both of these pieces seem to have been highly regarded enough to have been taken to Japan by Saichō 最澄 (767–822) in 805.²⁰ Some time round about the following year, it seems, saw a further short essay written for Zhanran's successor Yuanhao 元浩 (d. 817).²¹ Next he must have started work on the *Shanding zhiguan*, since he himself dates the completion of his efforts after three years of work to 786. This date does not appear on the work itself, but at the end of an essay of his own that he appended to his condensed version of Zhiyi, as a summary of how he understood the practice of 'Cessation and Contempla-

¹⁸ Kuo, *Zhong-Tang Liang Su*, 'Appendix', 1 and 19, reprinting Cui from *Tang wencui* 唐文粹 92.

¹⁹ From the wealth of writings about Zhanran, one might for some indication of its scope point to the recent work of Tseng, *Buddha Nature and Dao Nature of Medieval China*, 189–194, which introduces one of his best known contributions to Tiantai doctrine and cites several of the scholars who have examined his work.

²⁰ Kuo, *Zhong-Tang Liang Su*, 'Appendix', 6–7, and also in the latter case, 16–17.

²¹ Kuo, *Zhong-Tang Liang Su*, 'Appendix', 7, gives reasons for assigning this piece preserved in *Tang wencui* 61, 'Xinyin ming' 心印銘, to this period; see also in his main dissertation, 91–94, for an analysis.

tion', that he entitled the *Zhiguan tongli yi* 止觀統例議 [Discussion of the General Principles of Cessation and Contemplation], though the final Chinese character of the title is often dropped.

This short work, it should be noted, was by far the most highly regarded piece that he ever wrote, to judge at any rate from its subsequent dissemination quite independently of its original context as an appendix to his editorial efforts. At what point his essay was excerpted from its original position and circulated on its own is not entirely clear. One would wish to know if this happened soon after its composition, since I have argued elsewhere that there are indications that Li Ao was familiar with the *Zhiguan tongli*, and this might be taken to imply that he had also read the larger work to which it was appended; unfortunately the first definite evidence that it also enjoyed an independent existence can only be found in a Japanese catalogue of 857.²² Thereafter, however, it enjoyed a certain measure of popularity, amongst connoisseurs of Tang prose, in the first instance through its incorporation in the sixty-first fascicle of the *Tang wen cui* anthology by Yao Xuan 姚鉉 (967–1020), which appeared in 1011. Buddhists of course were always glad to anthologise it as well: it is included for example together with a couple of Liang's other compositions in the literary section of *Zhipan* 志磐 (1220?–1275?), *Fozu tongji* 佛祖統紀 [General Account of the Buddha and Patriarchs], fascicle 49, as a result of which the text has been rendered into Japanese besides.²³ A modern Chinese translation is also available online.²⁴ According to one catalogue, Liang's short epitome of the practice of 'Cessation and Contemplation' was even printed separately with annotation by a monk named Ryōun 良運 in 1686, though whether this annotation was the posthumously published work of the monk of the same name who became the 209th abbot of

²² Barrett, *Li Ao*, 63–64.

²³ *Fozu tongji*, trans. Satō, *Kokuyaku issaikyō* 国訳一切経, *Shidenbu* 史伝部 5, 206–209.

²⁴ Accessed October 26, 2019 at <http://wenku.guanzizai.com/article/t2013101520485959.html>

Koyasan 高野山 in 1582 I do not know.²⁵

The most likely place for later readers to encounter Liang's thoughts on Zhiyi's meditational system was probably not in association with any version of the *Mohe zhiguan* but as a companion piece to a more elementary treatise on meditation deriving from the same master that has come to be known as the *Tiantai xiao zhiguan* 天台小止觀 [Tiantai Little Zhiguan]. The exhaustive researches of Sekiguchi Shindai 関口真大 (1907–1986) into the history of this immensely popular and influential beginner's manual of meditation has demonstrated that beginning with Southern Song times a large number of editions of this text added Liang's summary to the end of the work.²⁶ The continued popularity of this essay has in any case established that Liang's command of his subject was at the very least acceptable to later generations. Indeed, the same may be said of modern academic experts on the Tiantai tradition: Andō Toshio 安藤俊夫 (1909–1973) after an informed reading of his writings with particular attention on the *Zhiguan tongli* concludes that he had a good grasp of the essence of Tiantai thought, and compares his ability to express that in literary form to the brilliant Sengzhao 僧肇 (c. 374–414).²⁷

Now it is evident from the date of the *Shanding zhiguan* that it was compiled after the death of Zhanran, and though Liang was in contact with Yuanhao, the details of his life as reconstructed by Kanda and Kuo reveal a complex picture of movement between the capital and the lower Yangzi region, and do not suggest that he was in the immediate vicinity of Yuanhao for any length of time, if at all, though the latter, if normally associated with Suzhou 蘇州, is also described in one source as connected with Changzhou 常州, where

²⁵ Shibuya, *Shōwa genson Tendai shoseki*, 48. This entry notes the survival of a couple of copies at the time that this bibliography was first compiled in the 1930s, but I have found no indications that the publication was much read.

²⁶ Sekiguchi, *Tendai Shō shikan no kenkyū*, 3–4, 80. Shibuya, *Shōwa genson Tendai shoseki*, 44, mentions also a 1657 *Mohe zhiguan* with a 'preface' 序 by Liang at the end, though what work of his this was is unknown to me.

²⁷ Andō, *Tendai shōgu shisō no kenkyū*, 156–7.

Liang certainly spent some of this period.²⁸ But assessing the degree of independence of thought shown by Liang Su in his editorial work is further complicated by the fact that Zhanran too had both commented on the *Mohe zhiguan* and then produced an abbreviated version of his own work between 765 and 770, though this of course did allow further scope for him to modify his ideas towards the end of his life, and perhaps to communicate them to Liang. Not only that, but a comparison of the two works by Zhanran suggest that far from simply following a mechanical process of shortening his original writings he took the opportunity to rethink the balance of his approach, in the view of at least one researcher.²⁹

Though as Kuo suggests, anyone wishing to comment on the substantive achievement of the *Shanding zhiguan* without a thorough grounding in the writings of Zhiyi and Zhanran can only do so with the utmost diffidence, a cursory survey of Liang's work does suggest that he too did not lack for boldness in his editorial approach.³⁰ One can understand his policy of cutting down on the copious scriptural quotations with which Zhiyi buttresses his arguments, but the complete excision of the last six sections of the work does look somewhat drastic, though against this one should balance the insertion of some explanatory material. Rearrangement he undertakes without hesitation, for example in switching the list of Indian patriarchs upon whose authoritative transmission as resurrected in China Tiantai doctrine depended from the opening of the work to the very end.³¹

²⁸ For Yuanhao and the Suzhou area, see e.g. Nielsen, *The Poet-Monk Chiao-jan*, 57; the reference to Changzhou is Daobiao's 道標 (740–823) biography in *juan* 15 of *Song Gaoseng zhuan*, for which see Zanning 贊寧 (919–1001), *Song Gaoseng zhuan*, 375.

²⁹ Hibi, *Tō Tendai-gaku josetsu*, 257–289. Hibi's summary of his arguments on the dating of Zhanran's second, abbreviated analysis of the *Mohe zhiguan* are given on 287–289.

³⁰ The following first impressions draw on my remarks in Barrett, *Thought of Li Ao*, 175–176.

³¹ The establishment of the notion of a succession of Indian patriarchs in China in the background to Zhiyi's teachings and the formulation of the succes-

His principles of selectivity are not immediately obvious: he does not, for example, focus particularly on those passages in Zhiyi's legacy that address non-Buddhist aspects of Chinese thought.³² Some reader's reactions to his editorial role will be considered below, as we now turn to the substantive question of the transmission of his work.

THE TRANSMISSION OF A NEGLECTED TEXT

From Manuscript to Print: The Early Stages of Transmission

Though as we have seen the author gives us precise information as to the completion of his work, the earliest stages in its subsequent transmission during the Tang dynasty are as far as I am aware not covered at all in any Chinese sources. We are fortunate therefore that evidence survives in Japanese sources allowing us to trace something of its transmission from China to Japan. Japanese monks visiting China in search of Buddhist literature would have been familiar with Liang's name from the time of Saichō, who certainly brought back some of his writings.³³ But it was not until half a century later with the visit to China of Enchin 圓珍 (814–891), which took place in 853 to 858, that a copy of the *Shanding zhiguan* was exported, after the text had evidently survived the uncertain times of the Huichang Persecution.³⁴ In the catalogues of his acquisitions compiled by Enchin as a result of his China excursion Liang's work is listed as the *Summarized Zhiguan*, using the titles *Mohe zhiguan lüeben* 摩

sion now included in the opening of the *Mohe zhiguan* is the topic of Young, *Conceiving the Indian Buddhist Patriarchs in China*, 124–130.

³² Barrett, *Li Ao*, 62. On these passages see Hoshimiya, 'Chūgoku bukkyō ni okeru dentō shisō'.

³³ *Dengyō daishi shōrai Daishū roku*, T no. 2159, 55: 1056b1–2.

³⁴ For Enchin's visit to China, see the summary in von Verschuer, *Les relations officielles du Japon avec la Chine*, 498–500.

訶止觀略本 or *Lüe zhiguan* 略止觀, in six fascicles.³⁵ It would seem that this manuscript version remained in Japan, either in its Chinese original form or as a later copy, but in any case as before listed in six fascicles as the *Lüe zhiguan*, at least into the late eleventh century, since it is listed in a union catalogue of 1094 compiled by the Hossō school monk Eichō 永超 (1014–1095).³⁶

But by this point it was also turning up elsewhere under the name by which it is best known, *Shanding zhiguan*, though still in six fascicles. This we know from the entry on Liang's work in a comprehensive catalogue compiled by the Korean Ŭich'ŏn 義天 (1055–1101).³⁷ What is impossible to tell from this record, however, is whether it represents a manuscript or a new printed edition. But the *Shanding zhiguan* had certainly been printed in China already by this point, in the very city that the Korean monk used as an important base during his visit to the Song empire.³⁸ This is made quite clear by the names of those responsible for this development, still today preserved even at the head of the digital edition of Liang's work in CBETA, who both appear to have flourished early in the eleventh century.³⁹ The person responsible for providing the necessary finances from his salary (捨俸金) has not left much of an impact on the historical record, but there is a strong possibility that he was responsible for a preface of 1020 launching another Buddhist compilation on the

³⁵ *Nihon biku Enchin Nittō gubō mokuroku*, T no. 2172, 55: 1099a19; and *Chishō Daishi shōrai mokuroku*, T no. 2173, 55: 1104b18, respectively.

³⁶ Eichō, *Tōiki dentō mokuroku*, T no. 2183, 55: 1162b. Shibuya, *Shōwa genson Tendai shoseki*, 44, also mentions the appearance of Liang's work in other catalogues, but in the case of Ŭich'ŏn's catalogue (mentioned immediately below) his account appears to be inaccurate, so I am not listing records of the *Shanding zhiguan* from his entry that I have not verified myself.

³⁷ *Sinp'yŏn chejong kyochang ch'ongnok*, T no. 2184, 55: 1177c26. On the background to this work, see Chan, 'Korean impact', 231–233.

³⁸ On this visit, see Huang, 'Ŭich'ŏn's Pilgrimage'.

³⁹ The names and titles of those responsible are given as 中散大夫右諫議大夫知杭州軍州兼勸農市舶使上柱國賜紫金魚袋胡(則) and 朝奉郎尚書職方員外郎分司南京護軍崔(育材).

world, namely the *Shishi yaolan* 釋氏要覽, an encyclopedia compiled by the monk Daocheng 道誠. The connection with the man mentioned in the *Shanting zhiguan* is not immediately apparent, since many editions of Daocheng's work in fact give the author of this preface as Cui Yulin 崔育林, a person supposedly independently attested elsewhere.⁴⁰ But Japanese scholarship has against this determined that some early editions of the preface do in fact give the same name as that recorded in the *Shanding zhiguan*, namely Cui Yucai 崔育才.⁴¹ He seems to have been an associate of Zunshi 遵式 (963–1032), whom we will meet again below as a critic of Liang: a piece on the feeding of hungry ghosts that concludes the second fascicle of Zunshi's collected essays, the *Jinyuan ji* 金園集, was written for him, using the same form of the name and the same rank as provided in the preface to Liang's text.⁴² The likelihood is in any case that whatever the correct form of his name, this man was associated with the Hangzhou area.⁴³

With the name in the *Shanding zhiguan* of the chief promoter of the publication we are on much firmer ground, since Hu Ze 胡則 (963–1039) pursued an official career important enough not simply to have secured him a biography in the dynastic history, the

⁴⁰ Fu Shiping 富世平, in his edition of Daocheng, *Shishi yaolan jiaozhu* 釋氏要覽校注, preface, 2, n. 1, cites the Ming (Jiajing) *Renhe xianzhi* 仁和縣志, 9, giving the same highest title for this Cui Yulin as is given for the donor responsible for the *Shanding zhiguan*—hence the possibility that despite the occurrence of a slightly different name there and in some editions of Daocheng's work, the form listed by Fu Shiping is correct.

⁴¹ Thus Yamaji, 'Nikan-bon *Shakushi yōran ni tsuite*', 209, n. 8. One thinks of the possibility of two brothers with similar names, but the appearance of the same official title in different sources suggests that whatever the correct form of the name we are dealing with one individual.

⁴² *Jinyuan ji*, X no. 950, 57: 2.11c15: 施食觀想答崔(育才)職方所問.

⁴³ Fu, *Shishi yaolan jiaozhu*, preface p. 2, notes that Cui's domicile of Renhe was in the Hangzhou area—this would presumably have been the location also of any brother with a similar name, if indeed we are dealing with more than one person.

Song shi 宋史, but also a modern biography first published in 1932, though this despite its recent republication has not been available to me.⁴⁴ The mention of Hangzhou in his title again suggests a connection with the area, which he governed with the title given (右諫議大夫) between the fourth month of 1026 and the start of 1028, though as yet I do not know exactly when he might have been prompted with Cui's financial help to sponsor the woodblock production of Liang's work.⁴⁵

The establishment of the precise date of the publication of the *Shanding zhiguan* in the 1020s is probably of less importance than the clear signs of the location of the event. Hangzhou was not simply an area with a strong record of Buddhist publication dating back well into the tenth century.⁴⁶ It was also exceptionally strong in the study of Tiantai Buddhism, with firm ties between the clergy and the elite during the early eleventh century.⁴⁷ This raises some important questions, for example the possibility that Liang's work was not re-imported from elsewhere, but that it had been preserved on the Tiantai mountains during the late Tang and Five Dynasties, and appeared in Hangzhou due to these renewed links. There is evidence, for example, that the Tiantai mountains proved to be a good source of Tang period Taoist manuscript material for publication even in the second half of the eleventh century.⁴⁸

There is in fact good evidence too that Liang's work was circulating in Hangzhou Tiantai Buddhist circles before it was printed, in that one of the most eminent Hangzhou clerics in this period of the school's existence, Zhiyuan 智圓 (976–1022) cites Liang's practice of marking excisions from his source text in the opening words of his

⁴⁴ Hu, *Hu Zhenghui gong nianpu*, has apparently been republished in Wu et al., eds., *Songren nianpu congkan*, but I have seen neither this nor the original 1932 publication.

⁴⁵ Wu, *Bei Song jingfu nianbiao* 4: 257.

⁴⁶ See for example the summary in Brose, *Patrons and Patriarchs*, 106–108.

⁴⁷ See for example Huang, 'Elite and Clergy in Northern Sung Hang-chou', 299–304.

⁴⁸ On this see Barrett, 'Reading the *Liezi*', 20–21.

own condensation of a key Tiantai commentary on the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* that was completed in 1014 in a monastery on the West Lake there.⁴⁹ Whether in print or in manuscript, it is clear that Liang's abbreviation of Zhiyi was among the works by him well known to the great Tiantai masters of the Northern Song period, and to the educated laity, too.⁵⁰ Not all were as positive as Zhiyuan, a great reconciler of Buddhist and literati culture, with Zunshi 遵式 (963–1032) dismissing Liang's efforts in a survey by him of Tiantai sources with the words 'though its wording is concise, in the aspect of practice there is much left out, as the reader will realise' 文雖簡要, 而修習之相多有疎闕, 如覽者知之.⁵¹ This work by Zunshi was also composed in Hangzhou, during the time when Liang's writings were moving from manuscript to woodblock, but since Zunshi's bibliographic overview has been dated to 1029 it is unclear what version he saw.⁵² As we shall discover in due course, Liang did not in fact cut out all of the practical information to be found in the *Mohe zhiguan*, even if one hesitates to dispute the judgment of a Tiantai scholar as eminent as this, and in fact Yu Xueming points to the evidence in a preface by Zunshi that would seem to suggest that he made considerable use of Liang's *Zhiguan tongli* even so.⁵³ But perhaps inevitably the negative verdict by the great master is also cited in the Southern Song in slightly abbreviated form in Liang's biography in the thirteenth century masterwork of Tiantai history by Zhipan, the *Fozu tongji*.⁵⁴

⁴⁹ *Niepan xuanyi fayuan jiyao*, preface, *T* no. 1766, 38: 1.15c. For the position of this work in the chronology of Zhiyuan's Tiantai writings, see Tam, *Zhiyuan*, 186.

⁵⁰ Liang's abbreviation of the *Mohe zhiguan* is also cited several times by the Buddhist layman and bibliophile Chao Jiong 晁迥 (948–1031), e.g. *Daoyuan jiyao* 道院集要 3.9a, *Fazang suijin* 法藏碎金 3.2b (*Siku quanshu* 四庫全書 editions).

⁵¹ *Tianzhu bieji*, *X* no. 951, 57: 1.25a.

⁵² See the date assigned on p. 148 of Shi, 'Zunshi yu Tianzhusi', a very useful account of Zunshi's connections with Hangzhou.

⁵³ See Yu, 'Liang Su yu Tiantaizong', 55, n. 3. The preface, 'Nanyue zhiguan houxu' 南岳止觀後序, may be found in *juan* 50 of *Fozu tongji*, *T* no. 2035, 49: 15.447b–c.

⁵⁴ *Fozu tongji*, *T* no. 2035, 49: 10.203c15.

We have already noted the presence in this compilation of several other pieces by Liang, but it also gives us important information indicating that within a couple of centuries of the first publication in woodblock of his longest Buddhist work, it was reprinted once more in an edition that was to have a considerable influence on the ones that we use today. The *Fozu tongji* in fact includes the preface to this Southern Song edition among its literary selections. This takes us into the process of compilation of the *Fozu tongji* and on to the eventual export of this edition to Japan. But before turning to these new developments it is worth presenting in translation the preface singled out for separate preservation by Zhipan, which like the other literary pieces already mentioned was in the twentieth century rendered into a Japanese reading. It is, to be sure, more of an exercise in rhetoric than a source of useful bibliographic information, but even so it does afford some evidence of the continued esteem in which Liang's work was held, notwithstanding the reservations of Zunshi.

A Preface to a Reprinted Abbreviated and Edited *Mohe Zhiguan*
(‘Chongkan Shanding Zhiguan Xu’ 重刊刪定止觀序), by Wu Keji
吳克己 (1140–1214) of Kai'an 鎧庵

‘How outstanding it is that a book to save the world and make bright the Way should against expectations be once again in circulation in the present! Once princes, lords and notables realise that there is this book they will certainly not be brought to giving credit to slander so as to cause ruination. Once the gentry realise that there is this book they will not be setting up arguments so as to cause conflict. Once those who open the gates to meditation are able to read this book, will they be willing to deceive themselves, with their ‘special transmission beyond the written teachings’ (教外別傳)? Once those who hunt through doctrinal treatises are able to read this book, will they be willing to tie themselves up in knots, analysing names and characteristics? How much less in future once everyone in the whole wide world owns this book, peruses and gains an understanding of its meaning so that they seek enlightenment will anyone besides be willing to feel any covetousness towards the coarse destructiveness

of the Five Desires (arising from the Five Senses) and not as soon as possible seek liberation? Such will be the grand strategy of the disciples of Buddhism in support of the teachings. Zigong 子貢 was fond of disputation and the great Way was thereby clarified; Mencius was imposing and so a worthy successor to the sage king Yu 禹. This sums it up, and who is to say it is not so?' 奇哉! 救世明道之書, 不圖復行於今也。使王公大人知有此書, 必不至信讒以廢毀; 使縉紳先生知有此書, 必不至立論以觝排; 使啟禪關者能讀此書, 其肯以教外別傳自欺乎? 使尋經論者能讀此書, 其肯以分別名相自困乎? 矧欲使薄海內外家藏此書, 展轉開導, 了達此義。又孰肯貪於粗弊五欲, 而不早求解脫者乎? 是皆內教弟子, 護持教法之大略也。子貢好辨, 孔道以明; 孟子巖巖, 功堪繼禹。斯言概之, 誰曰不信?⁵⁵

From Southern Song China to Japan

Despite the complete lack of concrete information about Liang's book and its second edition provided by Wu's preface, it does at least establish that the work was reprinted at some point during Wu's lifetime. Since as we shall see a considerable portion of a Southern Song edition of the *Shanding zhiguan* survives to this day in Japan, and the strong possibility exists that these materials represent the same product that elicited Wu's laudatory remarks, some comments on his role in the Tiantai tradition may be helpful. Wu Keji in fact played an important part not simply as a lay supporter with—like Liang—useful literary gifts but also as a developer of the historical writings of the school that eventually produced the *Fozu tongji*. In this regard his contribution has been noted by Koichi Shinohara.⁵⁶ But if we look at the biography of Liang that he seems to have contributed to the Tiantai work that he initiated, the *Shimen zhengtong* 釋門正統 [Orthodox Account of the Śākya's Gate (Buddhism)], in the second fascicle, we discover that Wu was very well informed about Liang's writings, in that he says that he regretted the fact that the blocks of

⁵⁵ 'Chongkan Shanding zhiguan xu', *Fozu tongji*, T no. 2035, 49: 50.445c11–21; cf. Satō, *Kokuyaku issaikyō*, *Shiden bu* 5, p. 225.

⁵⁶ Shinohara, 'From Local History to Universal History', 526.

his literary collection were now worn beyond recovery, but he had seen a manuscript copy of these collected works with a postscript by the eleventh century scholar-official and eminent lay Buddhist Yang Jie 楊傑 (*jinsbi* of 1059) at the monastery of his teacher, Beifeng Zongyin 北峰宗印 (1148–1213).⁵⁷ Now this Zongyin was evidently a great promoter of Liang's digest of the *Mohe zhiguan*, since he is said to have taught it also to another layman, Wu's fellow student Zhao Yansu 趙彦肅 (d.u.), stimulating in Zhao too an entirely enthusiastic response.⁵⁸ Though in his early career this Tiantai monk did spend time in Hangzhou, he eventually settled a little way to the north-east, in Jiaxing 嘉興.⁵⁹

But beyond Wu's evident interest in getting hold of Liang's works with a view to publishing them, a further important clue in this passage is the mention of his visiting his teacher Zongyin at his monastery, since as the contemporary scholar-monk Dingyuan 定源 has pointed out, from this we can deduce that Wu must have had a chance to become acquainted with one of Zongyin's most unusual students, the Japanese visitor Shunjō 俊苒 (1166–1227).⁶⁰ Shunjō is a figure of some importance in the Japanese Buddhist environment of his time, and his interests are known to have extended well beyond Tiantai Buddhism. But on his return to Japan he included amongst the vast number of books he collected during his time in China from 1199 to 1210 no less than seven hundred and seventeen fascicles of Tiantai texts, and these constituted almost a third of his total acqui-

⁵⁷ *Tiantai Zhizhe daishi zhuanlun*, X no. 1513, 75.277b: 公有文集二十卷, 惜其板本磨滅, 無與再刊者。鎧菴曾於北峰 (=峰) 處觀寫本, 無為子楊傑親題其後。On Yang Jie, see Huang, 'Bei Song jushi Yang Jie yu Fojiao'. Wu's remarks would incidentally appear to constitute yet one more demonstration of the continued existence of manuscript copies after the introduction of printing.

⁵⁸ *Fozu tongji*, T no. 2035, 49: 17.236c12.

⁵⁹ Ōmatsu, 'Hoppō Shūin no kyōgaku to sono haikei', provides a brief critical account of Zongyin's biography.

⁶⁰ Dingyuan, 'Riseng Junreng', 46–47. Dingyuan has also reaffirmed this deduction in more recent research.

sitions.⁶¹ Although this does not amount to proof positive of the origins of the Southern Song text of the *Shanding zhiguan* now held by the Kanazawa Bunko 金澤文庫 in Japan, the provisional assumption must be that the partial exemplar they now hold probably derived from the reprint associated with Wu Keji. That exemplar has, however, not been consulted in writing this preliminary survey of the transmission of Liang's work, since its catalogue listing shows that it lacks quite a few pages from the first fascicle that might have made clear through the existence of a preface or at least the name of an editor the circumstances of its production. Indeed, the relevant catalogue record, compiled under the editorship of the head of the library, Seki Yasushi 関靖 (1877–1958), shows that all but four pages of the first fascicle out of the three into which it is divided had disappeared by the time of the publication of the catalogue in 1939; it gives forty-one leaves for the second fascicle and thirty-four for the third, though whether these figures suggest losses from these fascicles too is unclear. Unfortunately, no other exemplar of this edition is known, since even the seven pages from the second fascicle, drawn from another exemplar owned in 1939 by the collector Yanase Fukuichi 柳瀬福市 (1887–1939) and listed here by Seki, are no longer traceable.⁶² Under such circumstances the earliest complete surviving edition assumes a more considerable importance, and it is to this edition that we should now turn.

The Japanese Edition of 1661

Though the Japanese edition of 1661 was not the only one to be produced in Edo Japan, leaving open the possibility that modern, twentieth century versions of the *Shanding zhiguan* were influenced by another source with an independent filiation, the likelihood is that such was not the case, and that the survival of Liang's text into modern times was in the first instance due to the efforts of early Tokugawa Japanese. To date I have found no evidence of any Ming

⁶¹ Dingyuan, 'Riseng Junreng', 48.

⁶² Seki, ed., *Kanazawa bunko kosho mokuroku*, 38.

or early Qing printings of the *Shanding zhiguan*, nor, indeed, does there seem to be any indication that copies of the edition that was praised by Wu Wenji survived in China past the Mongol conquest. At the same time a close examination of the 1661 edition does not suggest that it drew on any manuscript source such as might have derived ultimately from Enchin's first imported copy, but rather that it represents the revival of a printed edition, most probably that of the Southern Song. It is a somewhat rare work. Shibuya's Tendai catalogue only mentions an exemplar held on Hieizan 比叡山, and though we shall in due course look at some evidence for a certain level of readership in Japan in the nineteenth century, I am not aware of any copies in the most well known rare book collections.⁶³

The following remarks concentrate on the major differences between the 1661 edition and the CBETA version that is presumably the one best known today, though the 1912 *Zoku Zōkyō* 續藏經 text underlying that version may not have been initially the best known twentieth century edition, or even the first to appear. The CBETA online version in fact removes all the information appended to the *Shanding zhiguan* that reveals the date and the name of the editor, and gives it instead only as following an essay originally incorporated as an appendix in the *Shanding zhiguan* that it presents as a separately listed work by Liang, the *Tiantai Zhizhe dashi zhuan lun* 天台智者大師傳論; even then it omits the name of the printer.⁶⁴ At the same time the *Zoku Zōkyō* text appears to add in the prefatory material an item that is certainly not in the exemplar of the *Shanding zhiguan* that I have been using, though it may be in the Hieizan exemplar, or perhaps in the second Tokugawa edition.⁶⁵ Certainly my 1661 *Shanding zhiguan* shows no trace whatsoever of that item, the preface to the Southern Song reprinting composed by Wu Keji, and this does not look like an omission due to a binding error. Since this piece was read-

⁶³ Shibuya, *Shōwa genson Tendai shoseki*, 48, and Addenda, 5, which specifies the location more exactly.

⁶⁴ Available at http://tripitaka.cbeta.org/X55n0916_001.

⁶⁵ It is listed in Shibuya, *Shōwa genson Tendai shoseki*, 47, implying that it was a feature of all the exemplars he consulted, though this may be misleading.

ily available in the *Fozu tongji*, it may well be that it has been added by a later editor after 1661, though at what point is unclear to me.

In fact, the 1661 exemplar in my possession starts with a single leaf without pagination giving a chart of the contents of the *Mohe zhiguan* and indicating where major excisions have been made, such as the whole of the last three sections. This is not entirely successfully converted into a Table of Contents in the CBETA version: the fourth major section (攝法) goes unlisted, while the excisions of the last three subsections of the seventh and the total excision of eighth, ninth and tenth main sections are run into one editorial notice. The Table of Contents, unlike the 1661 exemplar, also lists at the end the appended *Zhizhe dashi bianlun*, even though it is, as already stated, in CBETA removed from the end of the *Shanding zhiguan* and presented as a separate work.⁶⁶ The first leaf of the 1661 woodblock edition then lists the two Northern Song officials responsible for the first printing, followed by a note saying that since they were eminent officials their names have been reprinted to show that the origins (of the print versions) are not to be forgotten.⁶⁷ Leaves 1a to 5b in the first fascicle of the woodblock then print the *Zhiguan tongli*, followed by an editorial note explaining why this piece has been moved from the end of the work to the front; this too appears in CBETA.⁶⁸

But reading further into the first fascicle one comes across another type of editorial note that is also preserved by CBETA, following the *Zoku Zōkyō* edition it uses. The first fascicle is composed of sixty-one paginated leaves besides the initial one just mentioned carrying the chart of the overall contents, and on the verso of the thirty-second, at the end of the first section of the text (i.e., 大意) there is a note saying that the original (or perhaps less probably ‘Mongol-era’) first fascicle

⁶⁶ These criticisms do not apply to the *Zoku Zōkyō* edition, though this does omit the name of the Japanese printer at the end of the text.

⁶⁷ This editorial note is also preserved in the CBETA version: 二公乃中朝名賢, 今刊仍舊存之, 示不忘本.

⁶⁸ *Shanding zhiguan*, X no. 915, 55: 1.692a24–b1: 梁君刪定止觀, 撰統例以繫其後, 猶王輔嗣注易之有略例也. 今刊私擢於前, 欲披閱者預識綱紀, 臨文曉然, 修習無滯—here CBETA has in the penultimate phrase misprinted 曉.

ended at this point (元本第一卷終); the end of the second fascicle is likewise noted on the recto of the sixty-first leaf. The second current fascicle consists of fifty-five paginated leaves, and the end of the third original fascicle is noted at the top of the final column of the verso of leaf thirty-one, with the end of the fourth fascicle noted on the verso of the final leaf. The final current fascicle consists of forty-seven leaves covering the rest of the text and its addenda; the end of the original fifth fascicle is noted just after sub-section five (觀魔境), on the verso of the eighteenth leaf. The end of the sixth original fascicle was presumably taken to be self-evident, and is not marked. These indications plainly were inserted by an earlier editor at the time that the six fascicles established by Liang were redistributed into three, probably during the Southern Song, and suggest that the 1661 edition also reflects the same source in its other editorial remarks.

After four pages (43 verso to 45 recto) devoted to the *Tiantai Zhizhe dashi zhuan lun* the edition concludes with some editorial remarks constituting a sort of colophon extending from 45 verso to 47 verso. These start with an edited transcription of the *Shimen zhengtong* biography of Liang already mentioned above. Details of Liang's ancestry are expanded somewhat on the basis of a footnote found in printed editions of the writings of Liu Zongyuan 柳宗元 (773–819), who mentions Liang as a friend of his father.⁶⁹ Some supplementary remarks are also added on the basis of the *Fozu tongji*, but Zunshi's critical evaluation of Liang's work, which was already included in the *Shimen zhengtong*—apparently by Wu Keji, who as we have noted undertook the initial drafting of the history—is quietly dropped from the text. The editor then adds some further commendations from Cui Gong's preface to Liang's writings and from the 'literary rankings' (品論) of the early Song Chan monk and fluent defender of Buddhism Qisong 契嵩 (1007–1072), a man keen to find Buddhist roots for the prose style of his own day.⁷⁰ Finally the Japanese editor gives the date, in the fifth month of 1661 and his name, Sōshan

⁶⁹ This note is included for example in Liu, *Liu Hedong ji* 12.288.

⁷⁰ *Tanjin wenji*, T no. 2115, 55: 7.679a26–27. For Qisong, see Morrison, *The Power of Patriarchs*.

Gensei 艸山元政.

Gensei (1623–1668), as a child called Motomasa (i.e., 元政) and as a cleric properly known as Nissei 日政, was a Kyoto monk in the Nichiren tradition, distinguished by his productive scholarship, but also by his talents as a poet in both Chinese and most especially Japanese, with a good number of publications of every sort to his name.⁷¹ For this edition his publisher was another person of note, Nakano Gorōzaemon 中野五郎左衛門, a well established Kyoto printer responsible for a good number of editions of Chinese and Japanese works during the second half of the seventeenth century. Nakano Gorōzaemon was in particular responsible for the reprinting of some extremely important Chinese Buddhist works, including Chan works such as the *Sijia yulu* 四家語錄.⁷² Though the details of his life are not clear, he was evidently part of a large family of Nakano publishers whose products inspired emulation and indeed plagiarism on the part of others.⁷³ For this reason the 1719 printing of the *Shanding zhiguan* was quite possibly not in essence a new edition, though this remains to be determined.⁷⁴ What is clear is that Gensei's edition marked a major development in the circulation of Liang's work, even if the traces of this new readership in Japan that I have collected so far are as yet merely suggestive rather than definitive. They are given therefore simply as a coda to the foregoing discussion before turning to the developments of the late nineteenth to twentieth century.

⁷¹ For his literary work, see Watson, *Grass Hill*.

⁷² His name and a date equivalent to 1648 appear for example in Yanagida, ed., *Sijia yulu*, *Wujia yulu*, 70. The collection in question appears to go back ultimately to a collection of the time of Yang Jie, to judge from Yang's preface preserved on its opening page.

⁷³ Kashiwazaki, 'Edoban izen no shuppankai', 40.

⁷⁴ Shibuya, *Shōwa genson Tendai shoseki*, 44, suggests that at the time of the first compilation of his survey a copy of this 1719 edition existed at Taishō University, but I am not sure if that is still the case.

The Woodblock *Shanding Zhiguan* in Japan

The massive upsurge in Japanese publishing of the seventeenth century would not have taken place without a market for the products turned out by Nakano Gorōsaemon and his kin, so it would be surprising if no use whatsoever was made of Liang's 'Reader's Digest' version of the *Mohe zhiguan*. In particular, all writings deriving from this meditational tradition recognise the possible health problems that may befall those who meditate and prescribe ways of overcoming them. The most common source today for such information is the 'Little Zhiguan', but because the topic is treated in the *Mohe zhiguan* itself, as a result Liang's summary also reproduces the same material in condensed form.⁷⁵ So it is no surprise that Kyoto University holds, and has generously made available online, a manuscript copy of the second part of the *Shanding zhiguan* made in 1863 by a monk named Nikkai 日海, which he entitled *Santei byōchū kyō* 刪定病忠鏡, 'Abbreviated Mirror of Illness and Loyalty', evidently intending it to be used as a medical aid, though his preface turns out to be derived straightforwardly from Gensei's final remarks.⁷⁶ So Liang's efforts turned out to have some practical value at least to this one nineteenth century Japanese monk.

But there are other signs too that Liang was being read in nineteenth century Japan. Soon after Nikkai made his copy, the great late nineteenth century Zen master Imakita Kōsen 今北洪川 (1816–1892) wished to introduce his beliefs to his lord, the Confucian Kikkawa Tsunemasa 吉川経幹 (1829–1867). He therefore mentioned Liang as a Confucian supporter of Buddhism, and this mention was eventually published in his classic presentation of the harmony of Confucianism and Chan, *Zenkai ichiran* 禅海一瀾, *One*

⁷⁵ For a contemporary approach, see Huang, *Xiao zhiguan 'zhibing di jiu' zhang zhi yanjiu*.

⁷⁶ Remarks based on <https://rmda.kulib.kyoto-u.ac.jp/en/item/rb00002806>, accessed November 2, 2019.

Roller on the Ocean of Zen.⁷⁷ This does not indicate that Imakita read Liang's work, since it is much more likely that he simply picked up the name from earlier Chinese Buddhist polemics with Confucians, which we know he read. But when Imakita's heir, Shaku Soyen 釈宗演 (1860–1919), was expanding on his master's work in 1918, in lectures that were published in a book form that has now become a classic in its turn, he does offer some remarks that suggest that Imakita could at least have known more than this. His description of the *Shanding zhiguan* as 'widely circulated at present' 今多く世に行われておる might conceivably only be referring to its presence in the *Zoku Zōkyō*, but since he is discussing the formation of a pre-Meiji text and the *Zoku Zōkyō* had only just been published, the likelihood is that he was aware of woodblock copies that had been readily available in Imakita's time, and that this is the reference he intended.⁷⁸

But as it happens, by the time that these lectures were delivered, the *Shanding zhiguan* had become available not only in Japan, but once again in China too. For the final chapter in this story we must turn once again to the world of late Qing Chinese Buddhism, and to the outcome of the renewed contacts with Japan brought about by the inception of modern diplomacy, especially since it has long been recognised that these contacts entailed a bibliographic element.

The Return of the *Shanding Zhiguan* to China

The return to China from Japan of books whose transmission had been interrupted on the continent itself already had accumulated a certain history during early modern times.⁷⁹ But initially these contacts depended on merchants as intermediaries whereas once diplomats who were themselves bibliophiles were able to meet

⁷⁷ On Imakita and the composition of his famous work, see Sawada, 'Religious Conflict in Bakumatsu Japan'.

⁷⁸ Ogawa, *Zenkai ichiran kōwa*, 103. I am grateful to Professor Ogawa for presenting me with a copy of his scrupulously edited version of Shaku Soyen's lectures very shortly after it was published.

⁷⁹ Kornicki, *The Book in Japan*, 309–311.

Japanese scholars in person, better informed direct communication on bibliographic matters became possible as a consequence. For Buddhist materials the most significant of these contacts was that between Yang Wenhui 楊文會 (1837–1911) and Nanjio Bunyiu 南條文雄 (1849–1927), whose friendship was actually formed in England in 1878, where Yang was on a diplomatic mission, but Nanjio was studying at Oxford.⁸⁰ The extraordinary wealth of Buddhist literature that Nanjio was able to provide for Yang has been analysed in detail by Chen Jidong 陳繼東, who shows that the *Shanding zhiguan* first shows up as a three fascicle printed item sent to China in an 1896 list, responding to a request from Yang based on his having found mention of it in a Japanese union catalogue of Buddhist bibliographic records that listed Liang's work under its Heian period title of *Lüe zhiguan* in six fascicles.⁸¹

The texts provided by Nanjio were subsequently published from woodblock by Yang through his Jinling Kejing chu 金陵刻經處 in Nanjing, where by using the blocks his successors were able to keep his titles, including this one, theoretically in print indefinitely throughout the twentieth century, even if it Liang's work does not seem to have been always available from this source. Yang himself was enthusiastic enough about the text to put it in the upper level of his Buddhist college curriculum, after the third year.⁸² And book seller's lists suggest that the century and more since Nanjio sent the *Shanding zhiguan* back to China has seen a proliferation of editions and reprints, especially in recent years, since by 1911 a Chinese reprinting of the *Zoku Zōkyō* seems already to have appeared.⁸³ But I have not

⁸⁰ Welch, *The Buddhist Revival in China*, 4.

⁸¹ Chen, *Shinmatsu Bukkyō no kenkyū*, 542, 544. Yang's request was ultimately based on an entry in Gennichi 玄日 (846–922), *Tendai shū shōsho* 天台宗章疏, T no. 2178, 55.1135c22.

⁸² Huang, ed., *Yang Renshan ji*, 19.

⁸³ In November 2019 a copy of this edition, identical with that of the *Zoku Zōkyō* save for a final note giving the date 宣統三年五月 and stating that the text, lost in China, had been excerpted from that Japanese source, was listed as for sale by the Fengxi shudian 葑溪書店 on the bookselling website Kongfuzi

made it my business to investigate all these manifestations of Liang's digest of the *Mohe zhiguan*, since in any case all the crucial stages in its transmission have now been covered, at least in provisional form, and so I draw these observations to a close.

CONCLUSIONS

It will have been noted that the account presented above remains no more than a rough sketch, and furthermore no substantive comments are ventured here on the *Shanding zhiguan* itself, the text of which has not been investigated. But it has been argued even so that such an investigation would be of considerable value to the study of the Tiantai tradition. The *Mohe zhiguan* is, after all, a work of considerable complexity, for which introductory guides continue to be produced even to this day.⁸⁴ Liang Su's abbreviation of the original can usefully be treated as a reading of the Tiantai classic, as understood by a Chinese layman of the late eighth century. Though there are plenty of remarks by educated lay people about Buddhist doctrines that have been preserved in various sources, this text provides a very unusual example of a lay Buddhist engaging at length with a difficult treatise, and reveals to what extent understanding such a treatise might or might not have been strictly the province of the Buddhist clergy. In addition Genkei's version, since it is liberally furnished with Japanese reading marks (*kaeriten* 返り点) affords for its part an opportunity to check his understanding of the text also against the Japanese readings conventionally followed for the *Mohe zhiguan* itself.

But Genkei's version exemplifies but one point in the transmission of the text, which has extended over more than two centuries of initial manuscript existence alone, followed by almost a millennium

jiushu wang 孔夫子舊書網: <http://book.kongfz.com/25171/1245511936/>.

⁸⁴ For one recent example, see Ikeda, *Maka shikan o yomu* (I am grateful to the author for a copy).

of woodblock, sometimes coexisting with manuscript, and eventually movable type. The outline of this process provided above is only tentative, in that it has been carried out without reference to materials in East Asian libraries that doubtless could clarify many points that remain at present obscure. One hopes that those better placed than the present author will be able to carry forward further investigations in future. Even within readily available published materials, moreover, no attempt has been made to trace the possible transmission of the *Shanding zhiguan* in Korea, though there is no indication known to me that this may have in the long run influenced events elsewhere. For the moment, however the following observations seem worth making. First, though Liang's work was exported to Japan in the middle of the ninth century, when it would seem that it was not known as the *Shanding zhiguan* but as the *Lüe Zhiguan*, there is no sign that this manuscript tradition in Japan had any influence on later developments, though it may of course be that a manuscript copy deriving from this first import is discovered in future.

Secondly, no matter how Liang's work survived the fall of the Tang dynasty, it was plainly in circulation in manuscript in eleventh century Song China. This resulted in its printing in woodblock, most probably in Hangzhou, at some point in 1026 to 1028. There are however as yet no signs that any actual exemplar from this printing survives anywhere; the existence of this edition can only be deduced from the preservation in later materials of the names of the two persons responsible. Thirdly, this edition seems to have formed the basis at some time round about 1200 for a new edition produced in a place unknown by persons unknown, but evidently in association with the Tiantai monk Zongyin and his circle. It may be that the removal of the *Zhiguan tongli* from the status of an appendix to that of an initial introductory essay was carried out at this time; some other editorial remarks preserved in more recent editions do seem to date back to this point, including perhaps the indications of how a text in six fascicles was redistributed into three. This edition would seem to be the origin of an exemplar much but not all of which survives to this day in the Kanazawa bunko, Japan, and the possibility is that this exemplar arrived in Japan very soon after it was printed.

Fourthly, there is a strong possibility that this edition of circa

1200 formed the basis for a new Japanese edition published in 1661 under the editorship of Genkei. The pagination of Genkei's edition is not the same as that recorded for the apparently complete surviving middle fascicle of the exemplar in the Kanazawa bunko, so unless there are in fact leaves missing from that part of that copy also we must assume that Gensei established the text anew. It will be necessary to check his text against the Kanazawa bunko materials, though for the moment we can rest assured that at least he was an experienced editor. Fifthly, this edition was the one used in the *Zoku Zōkyō* collection, to judge from the colophon bearing Gensei's name included there. Again it will be necessary in future to check the *Zoku Zōkyō* text against Gensei's edition and also against the 1719 Japanese edition, which may for example have been the first to affix the preface by Wu Keji to the beginning of the text. But finally, and most importantly, the invaluable work carried out by the editors of the CBETA digital version has inadvertently created a problem in assigning a separate existence to Liang's final essay on Zhiyi, so that Gensei's colophon is now located in a separate work. Other than this, one or two other minor slips also appear to have been made. For the moment, therefore, scholars who have access to the print edition underlying this CBETA text would do well to consult it, despite the undoubted advantages of dealing with digitized text.

Limited as they are, I hope that the foregoing remarks may be of some utility to other researchers, though they are inevitably confined to points that can be roughly established by an outsider to Tiantai Buddhism. But the author of the *Shanding zhiguan*, though a supporter of the Tiantai tradition, was not a Tiantai monk, nor, for that matter, was Shunjō, who probably took his work to Japan, nor was Gensei, who certainly edited and published it there, and nor indeed was Nanjio Bunyiu, who reintroduced it to Liang's homeland. So perhaps that is appropriate.

Bibliography

Abbreviation

- T* *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經 [Buddhist Canon Compiled during the Taishō Era (1912–1926)]. See Bibliography, Secondary Sources, Takakusu & Watanabe et al., eds.
- X* (*Wan*) *Xuzang jing* 卅字續藏經 (Man Extended Buddhist Canon). See Bibliography, Secondary Sources, Xin wenfeng chuban gongsi, comp.

Primary Sources

- Bei Song jingfu nianbiao* 北宋經撫年表 [Chronological tables of Northern Song civil and military intendants]. 5 *juan*. By Wu Tingxie 吳廷燮 (1865–1947). References made to Zhang (punctuated and collated), *Bei Song jingfu nianbiao Nan Song zhifu nianbiao* (see Secondary Sources).
- Chishō Daishi shōrai mokuroku* 智證大師請來目錄 [Catalogue of materials imported by Enchin]. 1 *kan*. By Enchin 圓珍 (814–891). CBETA, *T* no. 2173, vol. 55.
- Daoyuan jiyao* 道院集要 [Essentials of the Court of the Dao Collection]. 3 *juan*. By Chao Jiong 晁迥 (948–1031). Reference made to *Siku quanshu* 四庫全書 edition.
- Dengyō daishi shōrai Daishū roku* 伝教大師将来台州録 [Record of materials imported from Taizhou by Saichō]. 1 *kan*. By Saichō 最澄 (767–822). CBETA *T* no. 2159, vol. 55.
- Fazang suijin* 法藏碎金 [Golden Fragments from the Dharma Treasury]. 10 *juan*. By Chao Jiong 晁迥 (948–1031). Reference made to *Siku quanshu* 四庫全書 edition.
- Fozu tongji* 佛祖統紀 [General Account of Buddhas and Patriarchs]. 54 *juan*. Comp. Zhipan 志磐 (1220?–1275?) between 1258 and 1269. *T* no. 2035, vol. 49.
- Jinyuan ji* 金園集 [Collection of the Golden Garden]. 3 *juan*. By Zunshi 遵式 (963–1032). CBETA, *X* no. 0950, vol. 57.
- Liu Hedong ji* 柳河東集 [Collected Works of Liu Zongyuan], 45

- juan*. By Liu Zongyuan 柳宗元 (773–819). Reference made to edition of Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1960.
- Niepan xuanyi fayuan jiyao* 涅槃玄義發源機要 [Key to Sources for the *Mysterious Meaning of the Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*]. By Zhiyuan 智圓 (976–1022). CBETA *T* no. 1766, vol. 38.
- Nihon biku Enchin Nittō gubō mokuroku* 日本比丘圓珍入唐求法目錄 [Catalogue by Japanese Monk Enchin Who Entered Tang China to Seek the Dharma]. 1 *kan*. By Enchin 圓珍 (814–891). CBETA *T* no. 2172, vol. 55.
- Santei shikan jō shōkan no mi* 刪定止觀 上(正觀)のみ (alternatively titled ‘Santei byōkan kyō’ 刪定病患境) [Abbreviated Mirror of Illness and Loyalty], 1863. Manuscript by Nikkai 日海. Accessed November 2, 2019. <https://rmda.kulib.kyoto-u.ac.jp/en/item/rb00002806>.
- Shanding zhiguan* 刪定止觀 [Abbreviated and Finalized *Zhiguan*]. By Liang Su 梁肅 (752–793) in 786. *X* no. 915, vol. 55.
- Shimen zhengtong* 釋門正統 [Correct lineage of Buddhism], 1234. 8 *juan*. By Zongjian 宗鑑 (12th c.). CBETA, *X* no. 1513, vol. 75.
- Shishi yaolan* 釋氏要覽 [Concise Encyclopedia of Buddhism]. 3 *juan*. By Daocheng 道誠 (d.u.), 1019. Reference made to edition of Fu Shiping 富世平, *Shishi yaolan jiaozhu* 釋氏要覽校注. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 中華書局, 2014.
- Sinp’yōn chejong kyochang ch’ōngnok* 新編諸宗教藏總錄 [Newly Compiled Comprehensive List of the Teachings of All Schools]. 3 *kwōn*. By Ŭich’ōn 義天 (1055–1101). CBETA, *T* no. 2184, vol. 55.
- Song Gaoseng zhuan* [Biographies of Eminent Monks, Song compilation]. 30 *juan*. By Zanning 贊寧 (919–1001), 988. Reference made to edition of Fan Xiangyong 范祥雍. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 1987.
- Tanjin wenji* 鐔津文集 [Collected Works from Tanjin]. 19 *juan*. By Qisong 契嵩 (1007–1072). CBETA, *T* no. 2115, vol. 55.
- Tendai shū shōsho* 天台宗章疏 [Documents and Commentaries of the Tendai School]. 1 *juan*. By Gennichi 玄日 (846–922). CBETA, *T* no. 2178, vol. 55.
- Tianzhu bieji* 天竺別集 [Supplementary Collection from Tianzhu Monastery]. 3 *juan*. By Zunshi 遵式 (963–1032). CBETA,

X no. 0951, vol. 57.

Tōiki dentō mokuroku 東域伝灯目録 [Catalogue of the Torch of the Dharma for Eastern Regions]. 1 kan. By Eichō 永超 (1014–1095). T no. 2183, vol. 55.

Secondary Sources

Andō Toshio 安藤俊夫. *Tendai shōgu shisō no kenkyū* 天台性具思想の研究 [Tiantai ‘Nature Complete’ Thought]. Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法藏館, 1973.

Barrett, T. H. *Buddhism, Taoism and Confucianism in the Thought of Li Ao*. Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, December 1978.

———. *Li Ao: Buddhist, Taoist or Neo-Confucian?* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

———. ‘Reading the *Liezi*: The First Thousand Years’. In *Riding the Wind with Liezi: New Perspectives on the Daoist Classic*, edited by Ronnie Littlejohn and Jeffrey Dippman, 15–30. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2011.

Brose, Benjamin. ‘Crossing Thousands of *Li* of Waves: The Return of China’s Lost Tiantai Texts’. *Journal of International Association of Buddhist Studies* 29, no. 1 (2006/2008): 21–62.

Chan Chi-wah. ‘The Korean Impact on T’ien-t’ai Buddhism in China: A Historical Analysis’. In *Currents and Counter-currents: Korean Influences on the East Asian Buddhist Traditions*, edited by Robert E. Buswell, Jr., 217–241. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2005.

Chappell, David, ed. *T’ien-t’ai Buddhism: An Outline of the Fourfold Teachings*. Tokyo: Daiichi Shobō 第一書房, 1983.

Chen Jidong 陳繼東. *Shinmatsu Bukkyō no kenkyū* 清末仏教の研究 [Research into Buddhism at the End of the Qing Dynasty]. Tokyo: Sankibō 山喜房, 2003.

DeBlasi, Anthony. *Reform in the Balance: The Defense of Literary Culture in Mid-Tang China*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2002.

De Mayer, Jan. *Wu Yun’s Way: Life and Works of an Eighth-century Daoist Master*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Dingyuan 定源. ‘Ri seng Junreng yu Nan Song wenren shidafu de

- jiaowang' 日僧俊苾與南宋文人士大夫的交往 [The Japanese Monk Shunjō's Dealings with Southern Song Scholar Gentry]. *Taida Foxue yanjiu* 臺大佛學研究 [Taiwan University Journal of Buddhist Studies] 22 (2011): 33–58.
- Groner, Paul. *Saichō: The Establishment of the Japanese Tendai School*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2000.
- Hibi Senshō 日比宣正. *Tō Tendaigaku josetsu* 唐天台學序說 [Prolegomena to the Study of Tang Tiantai Buddhism]. Tokyo: Sankibō 山喜房, 1966.
- Hoshimiya Chikō 星宮智光. 'Chūgoku Bukkyō ni okeru dentō shisō hōsetsu no isseki' 中国仏教における伝統思想包摂の一齣 [An Episode in the Subsumption of Traditional Thought in Chinese Buddhism]. *Tendai gakuhō* 天台學報 [Journal of Tendai Buddhist Studies] 11 (1969): 84–95.
- Hu Shih. 'Ch'an (Zen) Buddhism in China: Its History and Method'. *Philosophy East and West* 3, no. 1 (January, 1953): 3–24.
- Huang, Chi-chiang. 'Üich'ōn's Pilgrimage and the Rising Prominence of the Korean Monastery in Hang-chou in the Sung and Yuan Periods'. In *Currents and Counter-currents: Korean Influences on the East Asian Buddhist Traditions*, edited by Robert E. Buswell, Jr., 242–273. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005.
- . 'Bei Song jushi Yang Jie yu Fojiao: Jianbu Song shi Yang Jie benzhuān zhi que' 北宋居士楊傑與佛教——兼補《宋史》楊傑本傳之缺 [The Northern Song Layman Yang Jie and Buddhism, plus Supplementing the Missing Information in Yang Jie's Official Biography in the *Song History*]. *Hanxue yanjiu* 漢學研究 [Chinese Studies] 21.1 (2003): 253–277.
- . 'Elite and Clergy in Northern Sung Hang-chou: A Convergence of Interest'. In *Buddhism in the Sung*, edited by Peter N. Gregory and Daniel Getz, Jr., 295–339. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999.
- Huang Xianian 黃夏年, ed. *Yang Renshan ji* 楊仁山集 [Collected Works of Yang Wenhui]. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe 中國社會科學出版社, 1995.
- Huang Xinwang 黃信旺. *Xiao zhiguan 'zhibing di jiu' zhang zhi*

- yanjiu 小止觀「治病第九」章之研究 [Research into the Lesser Cessation and Contemplation's Ninth Chapter on Treating Disease]. Taipei: Lingshan jiangtang 靈山講堂, 1985.
- Ikeda Rosan 池田魯參. *Maka shikan o yomu* 摩訶止觀を読む [Reading the Greater Cessation and Contemplation]. Tokyo: Shunjusha 春秋社, 2017.
- Jørgensen, John. *Inventing Hui-neng, the Sixth Patriarch: Hagiography and Biography in Early Ch'an*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Kanda Kiichirō 神田喜一郎. 'Ryō Shuku nempyō' 梁肅年譜 [Chronology of Liang Su]. In *Tōhō gakkai sōritsu nijūgo shūnen kinen Tōhōgaku ronshū* 東方学会創立25周年記念東方学論集 [Collected Essays on Eastern Culture in Celebration of the 25th Anniversary of the Tōhō Gakkai], edited by the Tōhō Gakkai, 259–274. Tokyo: The Tōhō Gakkai, 1972.
- Kashiwazaki Junko 柏崎順子. 'Edoban izen no shuppankai' 江戸版以前の出版界 [The World of Publishing before Edo Editions]. *Gengo bunka* 言語文化 [Culture of Languages] 53 (2017): 35–51.
- Kornicki, Peter. *The Book in Japan: A Cultural History from the Beginnings to the Nineteenth Century*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Kuo Chung-han 郭中翰. *Zhong-Tang Liang Su (753–793): Dali, Zhenyuan de Wenxue zhongxing he Xingming zhi xue* 中唐梁肅 (753–793) —— 大曆、貞元的文學中興和性命之學 [Liang Su of the mid-Tang (753–793): The Literary Revival of the Dali and Zhenyuan Eras and the Study of Human Nature and Destiny]. M.A. dissertation, Tsing Hua University, Taiwan, 1998.
- McMullen, David. *Statesmen and Scholars in T'ang China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Morrison, Elizabeth. *The Power of Patriarchs: Qisong and Lineage in Chinese Buddhism*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010.
- Nielson, Thomas P. *The T'ang Poet-Monk Chiao-jan*. Tempe, Arizona: Center for Asian Studies, Arizona State University, 1972.
- Ogawa Takashi 小川隆, ed. *Zenkai ichiran kōwa* 禅海一瀾講話 [Lectures on One Roller on the Ocean of Zen]. Tokyo: Iwanami bunko 岩波文庫, 2018.
- Ōmatsu Hironori 大松博典. 'Hoppō Shūin no kyōgaku to sono haikai' 北峰宗印の教學とその背景 [Beifeng Zongyin's Teachings and Their Background]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學

- 佛教學研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies] 28, no. 1 (1979): 382–384
- Pulleyblank, E. G. ‘Neo-Confucianism and Neo-Legalism in T’ang Intellectual Life, 755–805’. In *The Confucian Persuasion*, edited by Arthur F. Wright, 77–114. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1960.
- Sawada, Janine A. ‘Religious Conflict in Bakumatsu Japan: Zen Master Imakita Kōsen and Confucian Scholar Higashi Takusha’. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 21, no. 2/3 (1994): 211–230.
- Seki Yasushi 関靖, ed., *Kanazawa bunko kosho mokuroku* 金澤文庫古書目録 [Catalogue of Premodern Books in the Kanazawa Library]. Tokyo: Ganshōdō shoten 巖松堂書店, 1939.
- Sekiguchi Shindai 関口真大. *Tendai Shō shikan no kenkyū* 天台小止観の研究 [Research into the Lesser Cessation and Contemplation]. Tokyo: Sankibō 山喜房, 1974.
- Shi Guojing 釋果鏡. ‘Zunshi yu Tianzhusi’ 慈雲遵式與天竺寺 [Zunshi and the Tianzhu Monastery]. *Fagu Foxue xuebao* 法鼓佛學學報 [Dharma-drum Journal of Buddhist Studies] 1 (2007): 103–175.
- Shibuya Ryōtai 渋谷亮泰, ed. *Shōwa genson Tendai shoseki sōgō mokuroku* 昭和現存天台書籍綜合目録 [Union Catalogue of Tendai Literature Extant in the Showa Era]. Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法藏館, 1978.
- Shinohara, Koichi. ‘From Local History to Universal History: The Construction of the Sung T’ien-t’ai Lineage’. In *Buddhism in the Sung*, edited by Peter N. Gregory and Daniel Getz, Jr., 524–576. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1999.
- Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎, and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡邊海旭 et al., eds.. *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經 [Buddhist Canon Compiled during the Taishō Era (1912–1926)]. 100 vols. Tokyo: Taishō issaikyō kankōkai 大正一切經刊行會, 1924–1932. Digitized in CBETA (v. 5.2) (<https://www.cbeta.org>) and SAT Daizōkyō Text Database (<https://21dzk.l.u-tokyo.ac.jp/SAT/satdb2015.php>).
- Tam, Wai-Lun. *The Life and Thought of a Chinese Buddhist Monk: Zhiyuan (976–1022 CE)*. Ph.D. dissertation, McMaster University, Ontario, Canada 1996.

- Tseng, Chih-mien Adrian. *Buddha Nature and Dao Nature of Medieval China*. Ph.D. dissertation, McMaster University, Ontario, Canada, 2014.
- Verschuier, Charlotte von. *Les relations officielles du Japon avec la Chine aux VIII^e et IX^e siècles* [Japan's Official Relation to 8th–9th Century China]. Genève-Paris: Librairie Droz, 1985.
- Watson, Burton. *Grass Hill: Poems and Prose by the Japanese Monk Gensei*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.
- Weinstein, Stanley. 'The Beginnings of Esoteric Buddhism in Japan'. *Journal of Asian Studies* 34 (1974): 177–191.
- Welch, Holmes. *The Buddhist Revival in China*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Xinwenfeng chuban gongsi 新文豐出版公司, comp. (*Wan*) *Xuzang jing* (卅) 續藏經 [Man Extended Buddhist Canon]. 150 vols. Taibei: Xinwenfeng, 1968–1970. Reprint of Nakano Tatsue 中野達慧 et al., comps. *Dai Nihon zoku zōkyō* 大日本續藏經 [Extended Buddhist Canon of Great Japan], 120 cases. Kyoto: Zōkyō shoin 藏經書院, 1905–1912.
- Yamaji Yoshinori 山路芳範. 'Nikan-bon Shakushi yōran ni tsuite' 二卷本『釈氏要覽』について [On the Two Fascicle Edition of the *Shishi Yaolan*]. *Bukkyō ronsō* 仏教論叢 [Review of Buddhism] 61 (2017): 207–214.
- Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, ed. *Sijia yulu, Wujia yulu* 四家語錄, 五家語錄 [Recorded Sayings of Four Masters, Recorded Sayings of Five Masters]. Kyoto: Chubun shuppansha 中文出版社, 1974.
- Young, Stuart H. *Conceiving the Indian Buddhist Patriarchs in China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2015.
- Yu Xueming 俞學明. 'Liang Su yu Tiantai zong: Tangdai Ru-Shi jiaoyou de yige fanli' 梁肅與天台宗—唐代儒釋交遊的一個範例 [Liang Su and the Tiantai Lineage: A Tang Dynasty Example of Friendship between the Buddhist and Confucian Traditions]. *Fojiao wenhua* 佛教文化 [Buddhist Culture] 78 (2005): 49–55.
- . 'Dalu Zhanran yanjiu xianzhuang zongshu' 大陸湛然研究現狀綜述 [Summary of the Current State of Research on Zhanran in Mainland of China], *Zhejiang xuekan* 浙江學刊 [Academic Journal of Zhejiang], 2004.1. Consulted March 23, 2021. http://www.fjnet.com/fjlw/200909/t20090928_137191.htm.

- Zhang Chenshi 張忱石, punct. and colla. *Bei Song jingfu nianbiao*,
Nan Song zhifu nianbiao 北宋經撫年表 南宋制撫年表
 [Chronological Tables of Northern Song Civil and Military
 Intendants; Chronological Tables of Southern Song Civil
 Intendants]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 中華書局, 1984.
- Zhiru. *The Making of a Savior Bodhisattva: Dizang in Medieval
 China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2007.