

Another Look at Tang Zhongzong's (r. 684, 705-710) Preface
to Yijing's (635-713) Translations: With a Special Reference to Its Date

Jinhua CHEN

Yijing 義淨 (635-713) was the most important Buddhist translator during the last third of the decade and a half of Empress Wu's reign (690-705), and during the entirety of both reigns of her two successors Zhongzong (r. 705-710) and Ruizong (r. 710-712). The exceptional esteem that he received from these three Chinese sovereigns is shown, for example, by the fact that two of them, Empress Wu and Zhongzong, successively wrote two prefaces to some of his translations.¹ What concerns us here is Zhongzong's preface, entitled "Sanzang shengjiao xu" 三藏聖教序 (Preface to [the Translations of] Sacred Teachings [Prepared by] the Master of Three Canons), which is also known as "Da Tang Zhongxing Sanzang shengjiao xu" 大唐中興三藏聖教序 (Preface to [the Translations of] Sacred Teachings [Prepared by] the Master of Three Canons during the Period of Resurgence of the Great Tang) or "Da Tang Longxing Sanzang shengjiao xu" 大唐龍興三藏聖教序 (Preface to [the Translations of] Sacred Teachings [Prepared by] the Master of Three Canons during the Period of Dragon-like Rise of the Great Tang).

There are now extant at least five editions of this preface: (A) Kuhara bunko 久原文庫 edition, copied on behalf of Empress Gōmyō 光明皇后 (701-760) on Tempyō 12.5.1 (30 May 740) (it is partly reproduced in *Ko shakyō daikan* 古寫經大觀 published in 1920);² (B) the Dunhuang manuscript numbered S. 462 (date unknown);³ (C) carved on a stone slab currently preserved as a piece of the *Fangshan shijing* 房山石經 (Stone-tripitaka of Fangshan at the Yunjusi 雲居寺 in Beijing),⁴ date unknown, although the compilers of the *Fangshan Yunjusi shijing* suggest that it might have belonged to the late Tang period⁵; (D) the *Quan Tang wen* 全唐文 (Complete Collection of Tang Prose) edition;⁶ and (E) *Gyosei daizōkyō jobatsu shū* 御制大藏經序跋集, published by Shikikawa Seiichi 色川誠一 in Meiji 13 (1880).⁷

Although it is significant for many reasons, this preface is of particular relevance to scholars interested in the lives of three major Buddhist monks in this period, Fazang 法藏 (643-712), Fuli 復禮 (fl. 681-703) and Huibiao 惠表 (?- +703), whom Zhongzong refers to in the preface as the abbots of the Western Chongfusi 西崇福寺, Great Fuxiansi 大福先寺 and [Fo]shoujisi [佛]授記寺, arguably three of the most powerful monasteries under the Tang and Great Zhou dynasties.⁸ The Western Chongfusi and Great Fuxiansi, built in 670 and 675 (when they were called Taiyuansi 太原寺 and Eastern Taiyuansi 東太原寺)⁹ in Chang'an and Luoyang respectively, were actually two of the five monasteries that Empress Wu built for the posthumous welfare of her parents. The Great Foshoujisi developed from the Great Jing'ai 大敬愛寺. As a twin of the equally splendid Ximingsi 西明寺 in Chang'an, the Jing'ai 敬愛寺 was built in Luoyang in 658 or shortly afterwards on behalf of the then Heir Apparent Li Hong 李弘 (652-675) (who was only about six years old at the time) as an indication and reminder of his "respect and love" (*jing'ai* 敬愛) for his parents, Gaozong (r. 649-683) and Empress Wu.¹⁰

Zhisheng 智昇 (before 700 – after 786),¹¹ who began to be active as a brilliant Buddhist scholar a couple of decades after Yijing and these three of his contemporaries (Fazang, Fuli and Huibiao) died, dates this preface to Shenlong 1 (30 January 705 -18 January 706) in both of his Buddhist catalogues that have survived to the present, the *Xu Gujin yijing tuji* 續古今譯經圖紀 (A Continuation of the *Gujin yijing tuji* [An Illustrated Record of the Translations Made from the Past to the Present]) and *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄 (Record of [the Translations] of the Teachings of Śākya[muni], Prepared during the Kaiyuan Era [713-741]), both dated 730:

和帝心崇釋典，製序褒揚，號為“大唐龍興三藏聖教序”。帝御洛城西門，宣示群辟。淨所新翻，並令標引。二年丙午，隨駕歸京。¹²

Out of his heartfelt respect for the works of Śākya[muni], Hedi (Zhongzong)¹³ wrote a preface to praise and promote [Yijing's translations], and [the preface] is called "Da Tang Longxing sanjiao shengjiao xu." Ascending the western gate of the Luo[yang] [Capital] city, he announced and displayed the preface to various functionaries. [He ordered that the preface be] put at the top of all the texts that were newly translated by [Yi]jing. In the second year [of the Shenlong era], which corresponded to the cyclic year of *bingwu*, he followed the imperial carriages back to the capital (*jing* 京, Chang'an¹⁴).

Thus, the context in which Zhisheng has located Zhongzong's preface suggests that it was composed sometime after Zhongzong was enthroned (actually re-enthroned) in 705, and before Shenlong 2 (19 January 706 – 6 February 707). Since Yijing has here provided such a detailed description of the circumstance under which the preface was publicly announced, this record either represented an eye-witness on the part of Zhisheng himself, or he here just repeats what has been told to him by a third party with personal experience of the event. In this sense, Zhisheng's record seems quite reliable. Given that he introduces this preface right after four translations by Yijing, two of which (some lines earlier) he dates 8 August 705 (Shenlong 1.7.15),¹⁵ the preface seems to have been written shortly after - if not right on - the very day. By referring to Zhongzong's Basic Annals (*benji* 本紀) in the *Jiu Tang shu*, we find that throughout his five year reign, there are only two reports concerning his ascending a gate of the capital city Luoyang, the southern, rather than the western, gate. One is on 22 September 705 (Shenlong 1.8.22 [*dingchou*]), when Zhongzong ascended the Southern Gate of Luoyang to watch elephant-fight (*douxiang* 鬥象); and the other on 3 December 705 (Shenlong 1.11.13 [*yichou*]), for watching the "barbarian game" (*huxi* 胡戲) known as *pohan* 潑寒 (i.e. a kind of water-splashing game played in winter, originated from the Central Asian kingdom Samarqand [Kang 康]).¹⁶ We are not clear as to whether the preface was announced to the public on either of these two occasions, neither of which, as it is described in the secular sources, appears "religious" at all.

Furthermore, the appearance in the preface of a title that Empress Wu held in 705 also suggests that it was composed in the year. The title in question is "Zetian Dasheng Huangdi" 則天大聖皇帝 (Emperor Zetian of Great Sagaciousness), which was presented to Empress Wu on 25 February 705, after she was forced into retirement. On 16 December 705, when she died, a new title "Zetian Dasheng Huanghou" 則天大聖皇后 (Empress Zetian of Great Sagaciousness) was conferred on her spirit.¹⁷ Since the title "Zetian Dasheng Huangdi" was replaced (and therefore presumably superseded) by that of "Zetian Dasheng Huangdi," one might assume that Empress Wu was not supposed to be called so since 16 December 705, when the new title was introduced. If this is true, then the preface must have been written sometime between 25 February 705 and 16 December 705. To this interpretation, one might, however, object by referring to the subtle changes in attitude that Zhongzong had experienced toward his mother and her legacies in the course of his five-year rule. Significant changes are detectable right after the disgrace and subsequent murder of Zhang Jianzhi 張柬之 (725-706) and four of his main conspirators in the 705 court coup, which led to the abdication of Empress Wu and the re-enthronement of Zhongzong. Influenced by Zhang Jianzhi and his allies, Zhongzong at first tried to curb the growth of power that Empress Wu's kinsmen, led by her nephew Wu Sansi 武三思 (?-707), had grasped and wielded in the court. In parallel with this, he also abandoned a series of political and religious institutions that were introduced and promoted by the empress. However, with Zhang Jianzhi's group dismissed in 706, Zhongzong and his empress seem to have been increasingly under the manipulation of Wu Sansi and becoming more and more eager to reinstate Empress Wu's legacies. If compared with the title "Zetian Dasheng Huangdi," that of "Zetian Dasheng Huanghou" might represent a certain degree of lowering in honor, the decision must have been made on the part of Zhongzong as an effort to diminish the political impact of the newly deceased yet still formidable woman. As such political concerns and agenda rapidly evaporated as

Zhongzong became more and more re-identified with his mother in both politics and religion, we have reasons to believe that he would not have felt any constraint in reapplying the more honorific title (“Zetian Dasheng Huangdi”) to her, especially on the occasion of alluding to an event that happened under her reign (i.e. that of welcoming the newly returned Yijing into the capital city in 695). Thus, the appearance of the title “Zetian Dasheng Huangdi” in the preface does not necessarily present a compelling reason for us to confine its composition to the ten-month period from 25 February 705 to 16 December 705.

Be that as it may, there is, however, another piece of stronger internal evidence pointing to the preface’s being composed in 705. In the preface, Zhongzong alludes to Yijing with these titles: Da Fuxiansi fanjing sanzang fashi 大福先寺翻經三藏法師 (Dharma-master, Tripiṭaka and Translator[-bhadanta] of the Great Fuxiansi). It is not clear when Yijing was accorded the title of “Sanzang” 三藏 ([Master] Tripiṭaka), although according to the renowned bureaucrat-scholar Lu Can 盧粲 (?- +713), the author of Yijing’s stupa epitaph, this happened shortly after he came back from India and before he was lodged at the Fuxiansi and the Foshoujisi to engage in translation projects.¹⁸ At any rate, he had definitely come into possession of the title by 7 December 695, as is verified by the list of compilers (dated Tiancewansui 1.12.26 [7 December 695]) attached to the *Da Zhou kanding shijiao mulu* 大周刊定釋教目錄, in which he is identified as the “Chinese Tripiṭaka and a Translator-bhadanta of the Great Fuxiansi” (*Han Sanzang Fanjing dade Da Fuxiansi Yijing* 漢三藏翻經大德大福先寺義淨).¹⁹ As for Yijing’s affiliation with the Fuxiansi, this seems to have happened only during his stay in Luoyang, mainly in two periods: first, from sometime in Zhengsheng 1.5 (17 June 695 – 16 July 696), when he came back from India, to 7 November 701, when he followed Empress Wu to go back to Chang’an (where he stayed at the Ximingsi 西明寺); and second, from 10 December 703, when he came back to Luoyang from Chang’an following the empress, until 18 November 706, when he followed Zhongzong to go back to Chang’an. During his second stay in Chang’an, which lasted from 7 December 706 until his death on 18 January 713 (*Xiantian 2.zheng.17*),²⁰ he was lodged at the Great Jianfusi 大薦福寺.²¹ For this reason, this preface was composed when Yijing was in Luoyang and under the reign of Zhongzong, which fell within such a short period of time – from 23 February 705, when Zhongzong assumed supreme power once again, to 7 December 706, when he moved his court back to Chang’an.

Due to the good reputation of Zhisheng as a Buddhist historian and cataloguer and the clarity with which he has dated Zhongzong’s preface, the dating has been unanimously accepted by later Buddhist historical sources and modern scholars as well,²² to the extent that there seems to have no room to doubt it.

However, as soon as one looks more closely into the preface itself and the dates of Yijing’s translations (actually - as we will see later - the dates when they were canonized and published), one difficulty immediately emerges due to the different way that the preface is titled. Of the five editions of this preface mentioned above, editions (A) and (B) both have the title as “Da Tang Longxing Sanzang shengjiao xu,” Edition (C) has it as “Da Tang Longxing Sanzang shengjiao xu,” and editions (D) and (E) simply give it as “Sanzang shengjiao xu.” In addition, the scholar couple Zhao Mingcheng 趙明誠 (1081-1129) and Li Qingzhao 李清照 (1084-1151?) also record that they saw a stone stele bearing the preface, titled “Tang Zhongxing shengjiao xu” 唐中興聖教序, at a mountain monastery called Sichansi 四禪寺 in Changqing 長清 of Ji’nan 濟南.²³ However, it is noteworthy that three of the early sources, two of which are from Zhisheng himself, are unanimous in referring to Zhongzong’s preface as “Da Tang Longxing sanzang shengjiao xu.”²⁴ On the other hand, we know that Zhongzong did not decree the replacement of Zhongxing 中興 with Longxing 龍興, as a reference to the restoration of the Great Tang at the beginning of 705, until 29 March 707.²⁵ Of course, one might object that this evidence is not decisive given that sometime after 29 March 707, the word *zhongxing* in the title of the preface could have been easily changed to *longxing* in accordance with the decree. Another difficulty, which is more serious, is presented by the following observation that Zhongzong makes in the preface:

已翻諸雜經律二百餘卷，繕寫云畢，尋並進內。其餘戒律諸論，方俟後詮。²⁶

[He] has completed more than two hundred fascicles of translations, [which are] various *sūtras* and *vinaya*[-texts]. The translations have been copied and will be presented to the inner palace soon. The other texts about commandments (*jie* 戒) and *vinaya* (*lü* 律), and *sāstras* as well, still await interpretations [or editing?]²⁷.

According to Zhongzong, by the time he wrote this preface, Yijing had already succeeded in translating a considerable amount of Buddhist texts, resulting in over two hundred fascicles of Chinese texts. It is also important to note that these translations belonged to two of the three major genres of the Buddhist canon – *sūtrapiṭaka* (*jingzang* 經藏) and *vinayapiṭaka* (*lüzang* 律藏). Then, the problem is, when did the total of Yijing's translations reach such an impressive amount?

In his biography for Yijing, Zhisheng has surveyed his eleven-year career (700-711) as an independent translator in the following way:²⁸

First, under the reign of Empress Wu, his translation activities extended from Jiushi 1 (27 May 700 – 12 February 701) to Chang'an 3 (22 January 703 – 9 February 704), and produced twenty translations (in 115 fascicles). Zhisheng then concludes by remarking that Empress Wu wrote a preface for his translations, giving one the impression that the preface was written for all of his translations done during this period. This turns out to be untrue in the sense that the only extant preface that Empress Wu is known to have written for Yijing was actually specifically dedicated to his translation presented to the court on Jiushi 1.5.5 (20 April 698), the *Ru ding buding yinjing* 入定不定印經.²⁹

Second, under the reign of Zhongzong, Zhisheng narrates Zhisheng's translation activities in terms of two phases: first in Shenlong 1 (30 January 705 – 18 January 706), in which four texts in six fascicles were translated; second, from Shenlong 2 (19 January 706 – 6 February 707), when he followed Zhongzong back to Chang'an, where he was lodged at the Translation Cloister (Fanjing-yuan 翻經院) of Jianfusi, to Jinglong 4 (4 February 710 – 4 July 710), the year Zhongzong died, he succeeded in translating twenty-two texts in eighty-eight fascicles, bringing the total of the translations he made under the reign of Zhongzong up to ninety-four fascicles.

Finally, under the reign of Ruizong, the completion of all his translations, twelve texts in twenty-one fascicles, was officially announced in Jingyun 2 (24 January 711 – 11 February 712).

From Jiushi 1 (of Empress Wu) to Jingyun 2 (of Ruizong), Zhisheng concludes, Yijing translated fifty-six texts in 230 fascicles, which were in addition to five works (in nine fascicles) that he wrote and compiled. It seems that Zhisheng makes these estimations purely on the basis of the list that he provides before this biography for Yijing. Largely by a chronological order and partly by the different natures of the translations therein, this list can be broken into the following nine parts:

i) Jiushi 1 (27 May 700 – 12 February 701) = three texts in twenty-two fascicles: [i.1] *Ru ding buding yinjing* 入定不定印經 (1), [i.2] *Changzhao fanzhi qingwen jing* 長爪梵志請問經 (1), and [i.3] *Genben Sapoduo bu lüshe*³⁰ 根本薩婆多部律攝 (20).³¹

ii) Dazu 1 (15 February 701 - 26 November 701) = seven translations in seven fascicles: [ii.1] *Mile xiasheng chengfo jing* 彌勒下生成佛經 (1), [ii.2] *Zhuangyan-wang tuoluoni zhoujing* 莊嚴王陀羅尼咒經 (1), [ii.3] *Shanye jing* 善夜經 (1), [ii.4] *Dasheng liuzhuang zhuyou jing* 大乘流轉諸有經 (1), [ii.5] *Miaose-wang yinyuan jing* 妙色王因緣經 (1), [ii.6] *Wuchang jing* 無常經 (1)³², and [ii.7] *Ba wuxia youxia jing* 八無暇有暇經 (1).³³

iii) Chang'an 3 (22 January 703 – 9 February 704) = nine translations in eighty-five fascicles^{3,4}: [iii.1] *Jin guangming zuisheng wang jing* 金光明最勝王經 (10), [iii.2] *Manshushili pusa zhouzang zhong yizi zhouwang jing* 曼殊室利菩薩咒藏中一字咒王經 (1), [iii.3] *Zhangzhong lun* 掌中論 (1), [iii.4] *Genben Shuoyiqieyou bu binaiye* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶 (50), [iii.5] *Genben Shuoyiqieyou bu nituo mudejia* 根本說一切有部尼陀那目得迦 (10),^{3,5} [iii.6] *Genben Shuoyiqieyou bu baiyi jiemo* 根本說一切有部百一羯磨 (10); [iii.7] *Liumen jiaoshou xiding lun* 六門教授習定論 (1), [iii.8] *Quyin jiashe lun* 取因假設論 (1), and [iii.9] *Nengduan jin'gang bore boluomiduo jing* 能斷金剛般若波羅蜜多經 (1).^{3,6}

iv) Shenlong 1 (30 January 705 – 18 January 706) = four translations in six fascicles: [iv.1] *Fo wei Shengguang tianzi shuo wangfa jing* 佛為勝光天子說王法經 (1), [iv.2] *Yiqie gongde zhuangyan-wang jing* 一切功德莊嚴王經; [iv.3] *Da Kongque zhouwang jing* 大孔雀咒王經 (3), and [iv.4] *Xiangwang pusa tuoluoni zhoujing* 香王菩薩陀羅尼咒經 (1).^{3,7}

v) Shenlong 3 (7 February 707 – 4 October 707) = one text in two fascicles: [v.1] *Yueshi liuliguang qifo benyuan gongde jing* 藥師琉璃光七佛本願功德經 (2).^{3,8}

vi) Jinglong 4 (4 May 710 – 1 June 710) = nineteen texts in eighty-six fascicles: [vi.1] *Yuxiang gongde jing* 浴像功德經 (1), [vi.2] *Shuzhu gongde jing* 數珠功德經 (1), [vi.3] *Cheng weishi baosheng lun* 成唯識寶生論 (5), [vi.4] *Guan suoyuan lunshi* 觀所緣論釋 (1); [vi.5] *Fo wei Nantuo shuo chujia rutai jing* 佛為難陀說出家入胎經 (2),^{3,9} [vi.6] *Guanzizai pusa ruyi xin tuoluoni zhoujing* 觀自在菩薩如意心陀羅尼咒經 (1), [vi.7] *Foding zunsheng tuoluoni jing* 佛頂尊勝陀羅尼經 (1), [vi.8] *Bachu zuizhang zhouwang jing* 拔除罪障咒王經 (1), [vi.9] *Wuyun jiekong jing* 五蘊皆空經 (1), [vi.10] *Sanzhuang falun jing* 三轉法輪經 (1), [vi.11] *Biyu jing* 譬喻經 (1), [vi.12] *Liao zhi[lou]-bing jing* 療痔[廩]病經 (1), [vi.13] *Genben Shuoyiqieyou bu bichuni binaiye* 根本說一切有部苾芻尼毘奈耶 (20), [vi.14] *Genben Shuoyiqieyou bu binaiye zashi* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶雜事 (40), [vi.15] *Genben Shuoyiqieyou bu jiejing* 根本說一切有部戒經 (1), [vi.16] *Genben Shuoyiqieyou bu bichuni jiejing* 根本說一切有部苾芻尼戒經 (1), [vi.17] *Genben Shuoyiqieyou bu binaiye song* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶頌 (5),^{4,0} [vi.18] *Genben Shuoyiqieyou bu binaiye zashi shesong* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶雜事攝頌 (1), [vi.19] *Genben Shuoyiqieyou bu nituona mudejia shesong* 根本說一切有部尼陀那目得迦攝頌 (1).^{4,1}

vii) Jingyun 2 (24 January 711 – 11 February 711) = twelve texts in twenty-one fascicles: [vii.1] *Chengzan Rulai gongde shenzhou jing* 稱讚如來功德神咒經 (1), [vii.2] *Fo wei Hailongwang shuofa yinjing* 佛為海龍王說法印經 (1), [vii.3] *Lüe jiaojie jing* 略教誡經 (1), [vii.4] *Nengduan jin'gang bore boluomiduo jing lunsong* 能斷金剛般若波羅蜜多經論頌 (1), [vii.5] *Nengduan jin'gang bore boluomiduo jing lunshi* 能斷金剛般若波羅蜜多經論釋 (3), [vii.6] *Yinming zhengli men lun* 因明正理門論 (1), [vii.7] *Guan zongxiang lun song* 觀總相論頌 (1), [vii.8] *Zhiguan men lun song* 止觀門論頌 (1), [vii.9] *Shouzhang lun* 手杖論 (1), [vii.10] *Yibai wushi zan Fo song* 一百五十讚佛頌 (1),^{4,2} [vii.11] *Fahua lun* 法華論 (5), and [vii.12] *Jiliang lun* 集量論 (4).^{4,3}

viii) One text in one fascicle, which was translated under unspecified circumstance, but which was very likely translated in Luoyang, and therefore by 18 November 706,

when Yijing left Luoyang with Zhongzong for Chang'an: [viii.1] *Longshu pusa quanjie wang song* 龍樹菩薩勸誡王頌.⁴⁴ Zhisheng implicitly accepts that this text was actually translated under the reign of Empress Wu (either in 700, 701 or 703).⁴⁵

ix) five texts in nine fascicles written or compiled by Zhisheng himself: [ix.1] *Da Tang Xiyu qiufa gaoseng zhuan* 大唐西域求法高僧傳 (2),⁴⁶ [ix.2] *Da Tang Nanhai jigui neifa zhuan* 大唐南海寄歸內法傳 (4),⁴⁷ [ix.3] *Bieshuo zui yao[xing]fa* 別說罪要[行]法 (1), [ix.4] *Shouyong sanshui yao[xing]fa* 受用三水要[行]法 (1), and [ix.5] *Huming fangsheng yigui[fa]* 護命放生軌儀[法] (1).⁴⁸

To the end of this list, Zhisheng attaches two general comments on Yijing's translations. First, the completion dates of the above translations are given in accordance with the dates when they were presented to the court and were thereby officially canonized and published (*zouxing* 奏行). For this reason, many of these texts bore the same dates for their "issuing" (*chu* 出). Second, of the sixty-nine texts in 239 fascicles, two (the *Fahua lun* and *Jiliang lun*, in nine fascicles in total) had already been "lost."⁴⁹ In addition to giving us a general idea of Yijing's thirteen-year career as an independent translator (710-713), this list also establishes that during this period Yijing had closely followed the Great Zhou and Tang governments in moving between the two capitals – Chang'an and Luoyang and accordingly that in this period he had successively stayed at the Fuxiansi (700 - 7 November 701) -> Ximingsi (26 November 701- 21 November 703) -> Fuxiansi (10 December 703 - 18 November 706) -> Jianfusi (7 December 706 - 18 January 713).⁵⁰ As was already shown before, knowing these changes in Yijing's monastery affiliation is essential for us in deciding when Yijing could have been legitimately called "Translator[-bhadanta] and Tripiṭaka of the Fuxiansi." We will further show the usefulness of this itinerary of Yijing for us to understand other important issues, either directly related to Yijing or not. For now, let us see what the translation-list made by Zhisheng can tell us about Yijing's translation activities by Shenlong 1.

This list reveals that by the end of Shenlong 1, Yijing had only produced 121 fascicles of translations, a far cry from two hundred and more fascicles that Zhongzong claimed he had already finished by the time the preface was written. Furthermore, if we take Zhongzong's remark (i.e. that only *sūtras* and *vinaya* texts were counted) literally, we have to exclude from the list these four texts which are obviously commentaries: *Zhangzhong lun*, *Liumen jiaoshou xiding lun*, *Queyin jiashe lun* and *Longshu pusa quanjie wang song* (all in one fascicle), so reducing the number of fascicles to 117.

Thus, if we are to accept Zhisheng's cataloguing of Yijing's translations, there can be no room for the assumption that Zhongzong's preface was written in 705. The discrepancy is so large (and irreconcilable) that one might assume that the expression *erbai yu juan* 二百餘卷 ("over two hundred fascicles") in the current versions of Zhongzong's preface might have been an error for *yibai yu juan* 一百餘卷 ("over one hundred fascicles").⁵¹ Despite the advantage of this explanation in overcoming a puzzling discrepancy between the information Zhisheng, generally a very meticulous and reliable scholar, has provided regarding Yijing's translations and what Zhongzong's preface (at least in its current version) tells us, we have to abandon this possibility for one simple reason – in literary Chinese to express the meaning of "over one hundred fascicles," a writer would have used "baiyu juan" 百餘卷, rather than *yibai yu juan*. Then, is it possible that from the time Zhongzong wrote the preface to the time when Zhisheng catalogued Yijing's translations, a significant number of Yijing's translations were lost? This does not look so likely either given that Zhisheng's catalogue was completed only seventeen or twenty-five years after Yijing's death or the year in which Zhongzong was supposed to have written this preface (705), and given that there was no civil war or major disasters in this period, although Zhisheng does report in his list the loss of two translations by Yijing. Thus, the only plausible explanation is that Zhongzong and Zhisheng counted Yijing's translations in a different way.

This assumption looks likely in view of the fact that according to a source supposedly even

earlier than Zhisheng's - no less than Yijing's *stupa* epitaph - over the course of his life Yijing translated 107 texts in 428 fascicles.⁵² Even Zhisheng himself, in the same biography that he wrote for Yijing, also explicitly tells us that he did not count two groups of translations by Yijing. First, seventy to eighty fascicles of draft regarding the *bachudu* 跋拏堵⁵³ in the *Shuoyiqieyou bu* 說一切有部 (Sarvāstivāda section) were left intact since he had no chance to “cut and patch up” (*shanzhui* 刪綴; that is, “edit”) them before he died.⁵⁴ Second, from the vinaya sections of the Sarvāstivāda materials, he also made some extracts (*chao* 抄) regarding the origins [of the commandments and regulations], which, according to Zhisheng, cannot be regarded as “real translations” (*fanyi zhengshu* 翻譯正數) given that they were merely extracts from already extant translations. Zhisheng also observes that these extracts, which comprised forty-two scriptures (of forty-nine fascicles in total), are catalogued under “Biesheng lu” 別生錄 (Record of translations reproduced in other sources) in his catalogue.⁵⁵ Thus, these two groups of translation in total would make 119 to 129 fascicles. Adding them to those reported by Zhisheng as Yijing's translations (230 fascicles), we get 349 to 359. If we further include the nine fascicles of work that Zhisheng identifies as Yijing's own writings, we get 358 to 368, still about sixty to seventy fascicles short of what Lu Can had attributed to Yijing (428), which would mean that of all the texts that Lu Can had regarded as Yijing's translations, Zhisheng did not see - or refused to identify as Zhisheng's translations - sixty to seventy fascicles. In other words, there are only two possible explanations for the discrepancies between Lu Can and Zhisheng's counting Yijing's translations: either (1) sixty to seventy fascicles of Yijing's translations had somehow gotten lost between 713 and 730; or (2) Lu Can had ascribed to Yijing the same amount of texts that Zhisheng did not agree to do so. Let us start with the first possibility.

In view of the fact that only seventeen years elapsed from 713, when Lu Can wrote his epitaph for Zhisheng's *stupa*, to 730, when Zhisheng published his catalogue, such a huge number is striking, which might appear even more if we consider that given the size of the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* (twenty fascicles) and its generally very high quality, it might have taken Zhisheng at least three to five years to prepare, which would mean that it was only slightly over one decade apart that Zhisheng and Lu Can had counted the bulk of translations attributed to Yijing. Finally, in taking into consideration the fact that the couple of decades from 710 to 730 have been widely regarded as one of most prosperous and stable periods in the history of Medieval China (that is, a part of the so-called “Kaibao shengshi” 開寶盛世 - the “Prosperous Time during the Kaiyuan and Tianbao Eras [712-756]), there will be little room for the idea that such a large amount of translations by a translator of Yijing's reputation and importance could somehow have got lost within a brief period of one and a half decades.

At any rate, let us consider such a possibility – no matter how remote – that sixty to seventy fascicles of Yijing's translations did get lost from 713 to 730, and accordingly that in addition to what is reported in Zhisheng's list, there also existed three more groups of works derived from Yijing: (A) 49 fascicles of extracts, (B) 70-80 fascicles of draft translations, and (C) 60 to 70 currently unaccountable fascicles. Let us see if it is possible for Zhongzong, as early as 705, to take any of works in any of these three groups as Yijing's translations. Since we know nothing about Group C, it was possible for it to be included as Yijing's translations, which means that by 705 Zhongzong might have been able to count 177 (117 + 60) or 187 (117 + 70) fascicles as Yijing's translations (of scriptures and vinaya texts). The same cannot be said, however, of the other two groups. For Group B, this is self-evident given that these 70-80 fascicles were only in draft, which Yijing could definitely have not presented to the throne for circulation. Furthermore, Yijing seems to have produced these drafts in his last years to judge from the fact that he died without having time to edit them. Yuanzhao's 圓照 (? - +800) comment on some of these draft translations that he proposed to the court for inclusion in the canon also suggests that they had not become canonical by that time, about ninety years after Yijing's death.⁵⁶ This means that even though as Lu Can reports, Yijing's translations were catalogued in the canon by imperial order, not all of them were entered into it. As for Group A, the chance for its being counted as Yijing's translation is also extremely slight given that Zhisheng has so unambiguously and emphatically excluded it from the category of “real translations.” Even we assume that Yijing did

present this group of translations to the court and that the court did recognize them as real translations, at least forty of them (the last thirty-three texts that Zhisheng mentions) could not have been presented to the court by 705 since they were from a vinaya text that was not translated until 710.⁵⁷ This means that even though we go so far as to assume that Yijing took such a liberal attitude towards his own translations that he presented to the throne nine fascicles of translations which a later cataloguer like Zhisheng squarely excluded from the category, Yijing's translations still did not exceed 186 (=177+9) or 196 (=187+9) fascicles by 705, still falling short of providing a solid basis for Zhongzong to declare that Yijing had succeeded in translating over two hundred fascicles of texts. Then, is it possible that Yijing's translations were actually even more than what was reported by Lu Can (428 fascicles)? Although it cannot be dismissed categorically, such a possibility seems negligible when we consider that Lu Can very likely wrote immediately after Yijing's death and as the author of his stūpa epitaph must have been rather exhaustive in listing his translations.

We are thus left with only one option to explain the puzzlingly different way that Lu Can and Zhisheng had counted the number of Yijing's translations: the former seems to have ascribed to Yijing sixty to seventy fascicles of translations that the latter did not believe rightly belonged to Yijing. They were, in all likelihood, the eighty fascicle *Huayan jing* 華嚴經 (the so-called "Bashi Huayan" 八十華嚴), although it was translated by a team headed by Śikṣānanda in which Yijing also played a key role (like Śikṣānanda and Bodhiruci [d. 727] he was another Tripiṭaka [Master of Three Canons] on the team).⁵⁸ Yijing's central position in this translation project might have misled Lu Can to count the *Huayan jing* as one of his translations. In the mean while, he might have excluded the nine fascicles composed and compiled by Yijing, which could have been regarded as Yijing's personal writings and not translations. He thus might have reached the number of 428 (=358+ 80-9).

If Lu Can could have done this to Yijing in 713, then can we also assume that Zhongzong, eight years earlier, made the same attribution? The following fact suggests that this was quite likely. In 713 (significantly, the same year that Yijing died) Zhongzong's brother Ruizong ascribed the same *Huayan jing* to Bodhiruci, another Tripiṭaka participating in Śikṣānanda's Avatamsaka translation project:

譯佛境界，寶雨，花嚴等經，一十一部。⁵⁹

He translated eleven works, the [*Wenshushili suo shuo busiyi*] *Fo jingjie [jing]* 文殊師利所說不思議佛境界經, the *Baoyu [jing]* 寶雨經, the *Huayan [jing]* [花嚴]經 and other *sūtras*.

We have already noted that according to Zhisheng, by 705 Yijing had finished 121 or 117 (with the exclusion of the four *śāstras*) fascicles of translations. If plus the eighty fascicles of the *Huayan jing*, the number would reach 201 or 197. If the nine fascicles of extracts from a vinaya text translated in 703 were furthermore included, the number would exceed 200. This would explain why Zhongzong claimed in 705 that Yijing had succeeded in translating over 200 fascicles of texts.

Thus, we can conclude from the foregoing discussion that Zhisheng's record that Zhongzong's preface was composed in 705 can only be maintained only on the assumption that in contrast with Zhisheng, Zhongzong (or to be more accurate, the courtier who wrote the preface on behalf of Zhongzong [he or she must have quite ample knowledge of Yijing's personal life and his translation activities judging by the highly informative way that s/he wrote]) had adopted a completely different way in counting Yijing's translations. This assumption seems well supported by the obvious differences that we have already noticed and observed between Zhisheng and Lu Can when they were up to count Yijing's translations.

If we can still follow Zhisheng in dating Zhongzong's preface to 705, what can we make of this preface in understanding Fuli, Huibiao and Fazang's relationship with the Great Fuxiansi, the

Foshoujisi and the Western Taiyuansi? As was already noted at the beginning of this article, Zhongzong in the preface mentions these three monks as the abbots of the three monasteries. Given that Zhongzong mentions their positions on the occasion of referring to the Avataṃsaka translation project whose completion was officially announced on 5 November 699, one might assume that the positions were those the three monks were holding when they participated in the project. This turns out to be untrue though, since we know for certain that two of them, Fuli and Fazang, were at the time no more than two monks (rather than abbots) who were each affiliated with the Fuxiansi and the Western Chongfusi.^{6 0} Thus, here Zhongzong mentions the two positions as those that the two monks took up after 699.

Was Fuli, then, stilling acting as the Fuxiansi abbot when Zhongzong wrote this preface – in 705? The answer primarily depends on whether or not he was still alive at the time. If yes, then we can be rather certain that he was still the Fuxiansi abbot. Otherwise, what we can assume is no more than that Fuli once used to be the Fuxiansi abbot (which was very likely the last position he held judging by the fact that it was the position by which Zhongzong refers to him on such an official occasion). When exactly he started to hold this position we do not know, although it seems that this happened sometime between 24 February 704 and 18 February 706. In order to better explain this assumption, let me here recount what we know about Fuli's activities since 5 November 699, on which the colophon identifying him as a Fuxiansi monk is dated:

- 1) a document dated 5 November 699: identifying him as a monk of the Fuxiansi in Luoyang;
- 2) 701 or 702: he was reported to be staying at (so probably being affiliated with) the Daxingshansi 大興善寺 in Chang'an;^{6 1}
- 3) a document dated 16 November 703 (i.e. S. 523): identifying him as a translator-monk (*fanjing shamen* 翻經沙門) of the Daxingshansi;
- 4) a document dated 24 February 704 (Chang'an 4.1.15): referring to him as a monk of the Fuxiansi on the occasion of the initiation of the retranslation of the *Laṅkāvatāra sūtra* in the summer of Jiushi 1 (27 May 700 – 12 February 701).^{6 2}

All these documents are rather clear and do not require further explanations, except for the last one, on the implications of which we have not yet got a chance to elaborate. This is no other than the famous preface that Empress Wu wrote for the new Chinese translation of the *Laṅkāvatāra sūtra*, which was first translated by Sikṣānada in 700 and 701 and later revised and polished by the Tokharian monk Mituošan 彌陀山 (a.k.a. Mituošan 彌陀仙) (Mitrāsena or Mitrāsanta?, ? - + 704) sometime between 702 and 704. On the ground that Fuli was the only monk besides Sikṣānada who is mentioned in the preface, Antonino Forte argues that he had, by 24 February 704, already been the abbot of the Fuxiansi.^{6 3} This reason does not seem sufficient to me. It is not so likely that at such a formal occasion Empress Wu would have referred to a monk simply as a Fuxiansi monk had he then really been its abbot (especially if we consider that the Fuxiansi was Empress Wu's clan monastery, whose leaders she definitely knew too well).^{6 4}

Empress Wu confines herself to the mention of Fuli as a collaborator of Sikṣānada when the translation was started in 700, without mentioning him again on the occasion at which the completion of the translation was officially announced on 24 February 704. Therefore, in theory, this preface does not guarantee that Fuli was still alive on 24 February 704. The following consideration has, however, inclined me to believe that Fuli lived beyond that date. As noted above, I am of the opinion that the way Empress Wu alludes to Fuli in this preface suggests that he had not yet been the Fuxiansi abbot by the time. On the other hand, Zhongzong refers to Fuli exactly this way in his 705 preface. This implies that Fuli must have lived beyond 24 February 704 in order to be appointed as the Fuxiansi abbot.^{6 5}

Correlating the above-constructed itinerary of Fuli with that of Empress Wu during the same period (see note 50), we get the impression that not unlike Yijing, Fuli seems to have also followed her in going to Chang'an on 26 November 701, where he was lodged at the

Daxingshansi - very likely his original temple given that he had already been affiliated with it as early as 681,^{6 6} and coming back from Chang'an to Luoyang on 10 December 703, where he re-affiliated himself with the Fuxiansi. If the way Empress Wu refers to Fuli in her preface means that he had not by the time been promoted as its abbot, we then can assume that he achieved this appointment sometime between 24 February 704 and 18 February 706, the last day of Shenlong 1 (accordingly the last possible day for Zhongzong to address Fuli as the Fuxiansi abbot in the preface now that we have reconfirmed its composition date as Shenlong 1).

In summary, we can say that supposing that Zhongzong's preface was written in 705, there are two possible ways to say about the end of Fuli's life and his Fuxiansi ties. First, he was not only still alive in 705 (or early 706), but he was also then acting as the abbot of the monastery. Second, he died sometime between 24 February 704, when he was still known as a Fuxiansi monk, and 18 February 706, the last possible date for him to be mentioned as a [former] abbot of the Fuxiansi. Limited by the scarcity of the available information on Fuli, we unfortunately cannot decide which possibility is more likely.

In the same vein, due to the lack in information on Huibiao's life after 16 November 703, on which day he was known as an administrator (*duweina* 都維那) of the Great Foshoujisi as is recorded by S. 523 too, we should for now content ourselves with two similarly uncertain possibilities concerning his life and his association with the Foshoujisi: either he was not only still alive in 705 (or early 706), but he was also then the abbot of the Foshoujisi, or becoming the Foshouji abbot some time after 16 November 703, he died some time after that date and before 18 February 706, the latest possible date for him to be mentioned as a [former] abbot of the Foshoujisi.

Compared with what we encountered with Fuli and Huibiao, we have better luck with Fazang. The simple mention that Zhongzong makes of him in the preface throws important light on an aspect of his career which would have otherwise remained obscure and misunderstood. Since we know that Fazang did not die until 16 December 712 (Xiantian 1.11.14), Zhongzong's preface establishes Fazang's abbotship of the Chongfusi in 705 (or in early 706). We know that Fazang was still a monk (and not abbot) of the Western Chongfusi as of 5 November 699. On the other hand, he had already been its abbot by 16 November 703, as is verified by S. 523. Then, it must have been sometime between 5 November 699 and 16 November 703 that he achieved this position, which he was still holding at the turn of 705, when he led a team to fetch the Famensi relic to Luoyang at the order of Empress Wu.^{6 7} This was the delicate moment when political infighting in the court was intensifying to a point of breakthrough – the *coup d'état* on 20 February 705 (Shenlong 1.1.22 [*guimao*]), which resulted in Empress Wu's forced abdication and Zhongzong's re-enthronization. As I have shown elsewhere, in this series of bitter court struggles, Fazang seems to have sided with some Pro-Tang court officials who conspired to the removal of Empress Wu's two favourites Zhang Yizhi 張易之 (?-705) and his brother Zhang Changzong 張昌宗 (?-705). At least in one sense or another, Fazang ended up being a betrayer of Empress Wu.^{6 8} This has in turn presented to us such a problem – was Fazang, after the 705 coup, allowed to maintain his position as the abbot of the Western Chongfusi, which was one of Empress Wu's clan temples before she founded her own dynasty on 16 October 690 and one of her dynastic monasteries afterwards? Now, Zhongzong's preface verifies that Fazang's abbotship of the Chongfusi did indeed continue at least several months after the coup. It thus seems that as she was forced into political backstage, Empress Wu even became unable to decide the appointment and dismissal of the abbot of one of her own monasteries. Then, can we know how Fazang related to the Chongfusi after Zhongzong reconfirmed his abbotship when he wrote the preface?

Although Ch'ŏe Ch'iwŏn, Fazang's Korean biographer, was right about Fazang's role at the Chongfusi at the cross of 704 and 705, he does not seem so in his observation on Fazang's relationship with another important monastery at the time, the Great Jianfusi. Both in the title of his funeral epitaph by Yan Chaoyin and that of his biography by Ch'ŏe Ch'iwŏn, Fazang's monastery affiliation is given as the Great Jianfusi. While Yan Chaoyin merely identifies him as a *bhadanta*-monk (*dade-seng* 大德僧) of the monastery, Ch'ŏe Ch'iwŏn identifies him as its abbot.^{6 9} Such an identification of Fazang in terms of the Jianfusi has led modern scholars to

assume that in addition to the Western Chongfusi the Jianfusi was another monastery at which Fazang had often stayed.⁷⁰ Recently, a scholar has even claimed that at least by the eve of the 705 coup, Fazang had been the abbot of the Jainfusi.⁷¹

When did he then transfer to the Jianfusi (apparently from the Chongfusi)? In my attempts to look into this matter, I have found to my surprise that despite his alleged status of the Jianfusi abbot, Fazang's relationship with the monastery is only mentioned at two occasions – his direction of a rain-praying ritual at the monastery in the mid-summer (that is, the fifth month) of Jinglong 2 (24 May 708 – 22 June 708),⁷² and his death there on 16 December 712. Furthermore, it is particularly striking that Zhisheng makes no mention whatsoever of his participation in Yijing's translation projects in Chang'an since December 706, which were all carried out at the Jianfusi, although Zhisheng confirms his participation in Yijing's translation projects at the Fuxiansi in Luoyang (700 – 7 November 701, and 10 December 703 – 18 November 706) and at the Ximingsi in Chang'an (26 November 701- 21 November 703).⁷³ One might wonder whether or not Zhisheng forgot to include Fazang as a collaborator of Yijing at the Jianfusi. In order to ascertain the credibility of this possibility, we need to closely analyze Zhisheng's list of Yijing's Jianfusi collaborators, who can be divided into the following ten groups in terms of their functions:

- i) *du-fanben* 讀梵本 (Enouncers of the Sanskrit Originals) – *śrāmana* Huiji 慧積 (d.u.), and two Buddhist laymen from Central India, Li Shijia 李釋迦 (d.u.), Dupoduo 度頗多 (d.u.), and others;
- ii) *zheng-fanben* 證梵本 (Verifiers of the Sanskrit Originals) – Yisheluo 伊舍羅 (d.u.), a “Tribal Chief” (*shouling* 首領) of East India, and others;
- iii) *zheng-fanwen* 證梵文 (Verifiers of the Sanskrit Words) – the Khotanese *śrāmana* Damonantuo 達磨難陀 (d.u.);
- iv) *zheng-fanyi* 證梵義 (Verifiers of the Sanskrit Meanings) – the Tokharian *śrāmana* Damomomo 達磨末磨 (d.u.) and Central Indian *śrāmana* Banu 拔弩 (d.u.);
- v) *zhengyi* 證義 (Verifiers of Meanings) – *śrāmanas* Wengang 文綱 (636-727), Huizhao 慧沼 (651-714), Lizhen 利貞 (d.u.), Sūngjiang (Ch. Shengzhuang) 勝莊 (a Korean monk, d.u.), Aitong 愛同 (d.u.),⁷⁴ Siheng 思恒 (653-726) and others;
- vi) *bishou* 筆受 (Scribes) – *śrāmanas* Xuansha 玄傘 (d.u.), Zhiji 智積 (d.u.) and others;
- vii) *ciwen runse* 次文潤色 (Composers and Polishers) – more than twenty lay scholars including Li Jiao 李嶠 (ca. 645 – ca. 714), Wei Sili 韋嗣立 (660-719), Zhao Yanzhao 趙彥昭 (?- +710), Lu Cangyong 盧藏用 (?-713), Zhang Yue 張說 (667-731), Li Yi 李义 (649-716),⁷⁵ Su Ting 蘇頌 (670-727) and others;
- viii) *zhengyi* 證譯 (Verifies of the Translations) – two Buddhist laymen the Eastern Indian Qutan Jin'gang 瞿曇金剛 (d.u.) and a Kashmiri prince Ashun 阿順 (d.u.), and others;
- ix) *jianyi* 監譯 (Supervisors of the Translations) – Wei Juyuan 韋巨源 (?-710) (Duke of Shuguo 舒國公), Su Gui 蘇瑰 (639-710) (Duke of Xuguo 許國公), and others;
- (x) *jianhu* 監護 (Supervisors and Protectors of the Translations) – [Li] Yong [李]邕 (?-727), Prince Siguo 嗣虢.⁷⁶

On the other hand, a colophon attached to the first fascicle of [*Genben shuo*]/*yiqieyou bu bichuni binaiye*, one of the nineteen translations whose publication was officially announced in Jinglong 4 (4 February 710 – 4 July 710), contains a much longer list of Yijing's colleagues:⁷⁷

- i) *du-fanben* (or *xuanshi fanben* 宣釋梵本 [“enouncing and explaining the Sanskrit

- originals”]): Yijing, Huiji, Li Shijia, and Dupoduo;^{7 8}
- ii) *zheng-fanwen*: Damonantuo, and Yisheluo;^{7 9}
- iii) *zheng-fanyi*: Damomomo and Banu;^{8 0}
- iv) *zhuiwen zhengzi* 綴文正字 (or *zhengzi* 正字): Yijing, Zhiji (Bhadanta-preceptor of the Jianfusi) (also concurrently acting as a Verifier of Meanings – see below), Aitong (Preceptor and Elder of the Wangjisi 岡極寺^{8 1}) (also concurrently acting as a Verifier of Meanings – see below);^{8 2}
- v) *bishou*: Xuanshan (Bhadanta of the Chanhesi 禪河寺 in Xiangzhou 相州) (also concurrently acting as a Verifier of Meanings – see below), Li Jiao (also concurrently acting as a polisher – see below);^{8 3}
- vi) *zhengyi*: (1) Wengang^{8 4} (Bhadanta-preceptor [*dade lushi* 大德律師] of the Great Chongshengsi 大崇聖寺), (2) Huizhao, (3) Daolin 道琳 (d.u.) (Bhadanta-preceptor of the Chongxiansi 崇先寺^{8 5} in Luoyang), (4) Liming 利明 (Abbot of the Fushousi 福壽寺), (5) Siheng (Bhadanta-preceptor of the Great Jianfusi), (6) Xuanshan, (7) Sūngjiang (Bhadanta of the Great Jianfusi), (8) Aitong, (9) Huaizhi 懷志 (d.u.) (Bhadanta-preceptor of the Zhaofusi 招福寺), (10) Tanbiao 曇表 (d.u.) (Bhadanta-preceptor of the Western Chongfusi), (11) Chongye 崇業 (d.u.) (Bhadanta-preceptor of the Ximingsi), (12) Huilang 惠朗 (d.u.) (Bhadanta-preceptor of the Xindusi 新都寺), (13) Daliang 大亮 (d.u.) (Bhadanta-preceptor of the Guanyinsi 觀音寺), (14) Zhiji, (15) Yunbian 雲辨 (d.u.) (Bhadanta of the Great Bosesi 大般若寺), (16) Huishan 慧傘 (d.u.) (Abbot of the Dayunsi in Dezhou 德州), (17) Duozi 多子 (d.u.) (Bhadanta of the Great Anguosi 大安國寺), (18) Daogui 道珪 (d.u.) (Bhadanta-preceptor of the Longxingsi 龍興寺), (19) Bi'an 彼岸 (d.u.) (Bhadanta-preceptor of the Western Chongfusi), and (20) Xiuzhang 秀璋 (d.u.) (Bhadanta-preceptor of the Western Chongfusi).^{8 6}
- vii) *runse* 潤色 (Polishers): 1. Li Jiao, 2. Wei Sili, 3. Zhao Yanzhao, 4. Li Xian 劉憲 (?-711?), 5. Cen Xi 岑羲 (?-713), 6. Cui Shi 崔湜 (?-713), 7. Zhang Yue, 8. Cui Riyong 崔日用 (673?-722?), 9. Lu Cangyong, 10. Xu Jianzhen 徐堅貞 (probably an error for Xu Jian 徐堅, 659?-729), 11. Guo Shanhun 郭山暉 (?-713?), 12. Xue Ji 薛稷 (?-713), 13. Xu Yanbo 徐彥伯 (?-714), 14. Li Yi, 15. Wei Yuandan 韋元旦 (d.u.), 16. Ma Huaisu 馬懷素 (before 657 – after 716), 17. Li Shi 李適 (663?-711?), 18. Su Ting, 19. Zheng Yin 鄭愔 (?-710), 20. Sheng Quanqi 沈佺期 (?-713?), 21. Wu Pingyi 武平一 (?-741?), 22. Yan Chaoyin, and 23. Fu Feng 符鳳 (d.u.).^{8 7}
- viii) *zhengyi*: Qutan Jin'gang, Ashun, and Li Shuluo 李輸羅 (d.u.) (of the Longbo Kingdom);^{8 8}
- ix) *jianyi*: 1. Wei Juyuan, 2. Su Gui,^{8 9} 3. Tang Xiujing 唐休璟 (627-712), 4. Wei Wen 韋溫 (?-710), 5. Wei Anshi 韋安石 (651-714), 6. Ji Chu'ne 紀處訥 (?-710), 7. Zong Chuke 宗楚客 (?-710), 8. Xiao Zhizhong 蕭至忠 (?-713);^{9 0}
- x) *shushou* 書手 (copyists): Zhao Xiling 趙希令 (d.u.), Yin Tinggui 殷庭龜 (d.u.);^{9 1}
- xi) *jianhu*: 1. Pan Jiaji 潘嘉寂 (d.u.), 2. Liu Lingzhi 劉令植 (d.u.), and 3. Li Yong.^{9 2}

A comparison of this list with Zhisheng's reveals that the latter was no more than a shortened version of the former given that all members in the latter can be found in the former. Like Zhisheng's list, this far longer list also proves Fazang's absence. This list is particularly noteworthy in that it contains the names of twenty-three letters of men, almost all of the major scholar-bureaucrats who were then in Chang'an, as the polishers for Yijing's translations, in addition to those of eight high-ranking court officials (all of them were enfeoffed as Dukes) as the "Supervisors of the translations." This fact, in combination with another one that nineteen of

Yijing's translations were published in 710, suggests that this list cannot be taken as merely for the members involved in the vinaya text alone; but rather that it lists most, if not all, chief members participating in Yijing's translation activities since last occasion at which Yijing's translation was published (that is, in 707, when his two-fascicle translation, the *Yueshi liuliguang qifo gongde jing*, was published), till 710. In view of Fazang's exceptional prestige at the time and that he was then definitely still alive, we have to conclude from the absence of his name on such an apparently exhaustive list that he had nothing to do with Yijing's translation activities since 707 to 710. Moreover, if we consider that had Fazang been at the Jianfusi during this period, there would have been unimaginable for him not to get involved in any part of Yijing's translation activities, we have to further read the lack of his role in Yijing's Jianfusi translation bureau from 707 to 710 simply as his absence from the monastery in this period.

In contrast to the lack of any documentation of Fazang's involvement in Yijing's Jianfusi translation center, we have evidence, provided by Zhisheng himself, that Fazang was a member of the translation team based at the Chongfusi that was headed by Bodhiruci.⁹³ It then must be that although since 706 when the Tang capital was moved back to Chang'an until Fazang's death in 712, there existed two translation centers in Chang'an, at the Western Chongfusi and the Great Jianfusi, and under the leadership of Bodhiruci and Yijing respectively, Fazang seems to have mainly worked at the Chongfusi center, both as a translator-*bhadanta* and as its host. We are then presented with the puzzling issue, when and how did he come into connection with the Jianfusi, apparently so closely that he was eventually identified as a monk belonging to the monastery? At this juncture, the case of the Buddhist thaumaturge Sengqie 僧伽 (Samgha?, 628-710) takes my attention. We know from one of his biographies that he was transferred (from the inner palace) to the Jianfusi only shortly before his death, at a moment when his health was starting to deteriorate so drastically that the imminence of his death became clear to the court attendants (and Zhongzong also).⁹⁴ Then, can the same be spoken of Fazang and the Jianfusi? This appears rather likely to me when I consider the fact that as noted above Fazang is known to have been connected with the monastery only on two occasions.

If this is true, then how to explain the fact that Yan Chaoyin in the title of the epitaph identifies his late friend as a *bhadanta*-monk of the Jianfusi, rather than that of the Chongfusi, with which he obviously have been affiliated for the most parts, if not the whole, of his career as a monk? I think such an identification was made not only due to the Jianfusi being the place of Fazang's death, but also because it happened to be a "principality monastery" (therefore one of the most prestigious monasteries) of the Great Tang, a monastery originally named Great Xianfusi 大獻福寺, which was converted from an old mansion of Zhongzong for the posthumous benefit of his father Gaozong.⁹⁵ At any rate, it is probably not far from the truth if we assume that even though Fazang was eventually affiliated with the Jianfusi (more than the fact his last days [weeks, or months] were spent there), the affiliation would not have lasted long. Further, given that Yan Chaoyin identifies Fazang as the Jianfusi abbot neither in the title of the epitaph, nor in the epitaph per se, I am inclined to believe that Fazang was probably never the Jianfusi abbot (I here assume that on such an official occasion like that of writing the funeral epitaph for Fazang, Yan Chaoyin would not have merely identified him as a *bhadanta*-monk of the Jianfusi had he really been its abbot).

Be that as it may, how to explain that in four of Fazang's extant works, at least according to several of their editions, Fazang as their author is identified as a monk of the Jianfusi? These four works are (1) *Huayan yisheng jiaoyi fenqi zhang* 華嚴一乘教義分齊章 (better known as *Huayan Wujiao zhang* 華嚴五教章), (2) *Huayan jing Yihai baimen* 華嚴經義海百門 (better known as "Yihai baimen" 義海百門), (3) *Xiu Huayan aozhi wangjing huanyuan guan* 修華嚴奧旨妄盡還源章 (better known as "Wangjing huanyuan guan" 妄盡還源章) and (4) "Jinshizi zhang" 金師子章.⁹⁶ About this, I think it is important to note that more often than not this kind of identification was added by later editors and must not necessarily have derived from Fazang himself, as is correctly pointed out by the learned Japanese scholar-monk Sōshun 僧潛 (1659-1736), who testifies that in all the Song dynasty editions of the *Wujiao zhang*, Fazang as the author was identified as a monk of Chongfusi, rather than the Jianfusi:

又宋本俱云：京大崇福寺沙門法藏述。<<義苑>>，<<復古>>等作“大薦福寺”者，皆後人之改添耳。⁹⁷

Further, all the Song dynasty editions contain “Jing Da Chongfusi shamen Fazang shu” (“narrated by *śramaṇa* Fazang of the Great Jingfusi in the capital [Chang’an]”). [The identification of Fazang by] the Great Jianfusi [as seen] in the [*Huayan yisheng-jiao fenqizhang*] *Yiyuan [shu]* [華嚴一乘教分齊章]義苑[疏] [by Daoting 道亭, d.u.] and the [*Huayan yisheng-jiao fenqizhang*] *Fugu [ji]* [華嚴一乘教分齊章]復古[記] [by Shihui 師會, ? - +1165], and other [editions], all resulted from the alterations and additions made by people of later generations.

To sum up: either Fazang was not transferred to the Jianfusi until he was on his deathbed, or he was affiliated with the monastery for a very short period of time (otherwise he must have left behind him some evidence pointing to his connections with the monastery more than the simple fact that he died there), during which he was probably only a *bhadanta*-monk, rather than the abbot, of the monastery.

NOTES

¹ Empress Wu’s preface for Yijing’s translations, also titled “Sanzang shengjiao xu” 三藏聖教序, is included in *Quan Tang wen* 全唐文 (Tai-pei: Hualian chubanshe, 1965) 97: 7b-8b.

² I wish to thank Professor Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士, Ms. Chi Limei 池麗梅 and Ms. Wang Fang 王芳 for helping me in different ways to get access to this precious Kuhara Bunko manuscript, which I had the pleasure to check on 20 February 2004 (Friday) at the company of Ms. Chi, who graciously assisted me in collating the *Quan Tang wen* version on the basis of the Kuhara manuscript.

Wada Mikio 和田幹男 (ed), *Ko shakyō daikan* (Tokyo: Seigei shuppan 精藝出版, 1920), plates 32-36. Cf. Ochiai Toshinori 落合俊典, “Dai Tō chūgō Sanzō shōkyō jo ni suite - Gijō shusseichi saikō 大唐中興三藏聖教序について - 義淨出生地再考 - , *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 27 (2) (1979), pp. 624-625.

³ *Dunhuang baozang* 敦煌寶藏 (ed. Huang Yongwu 黃永武, Tai-pei: Xinwenfeng, 1984), 4: 6-8.

⁴ Zhongguo fojiao xiehui 中國佛教協會 (ed.), *Fangshan Yunjusi shijing* 房山雲居寺石經 (Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 1976), plate no. 39.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 91.

⁶ “Sanzang shengzang xu” 三藏聖教序, *Quan Tang wen* 17: 17b-21a.

⁷ *Shōwa hōbō sō mokuroku* 昭和法寶總目錄 3: 1421b-1422b.

⁸ *Quan Tang wen* 17: 20b1-3.

⁹ The Taiyuansi in Luoyang was called Eastern Taiyuansi obviously in distinction to its counterpart in Chang’an, which was built five years earlier and which was subsequently called Western Taiyuansi because of the existence of its twin in Luoyang, until it was renamed Weiguo xisi 魏國西寺 on 9 February 687 (Chuangong 3.1.2). For the complicated history of the foundation and repeated renaming of the Eastern and Western Taiyuansi, and their other counterparts, see Antonino Forte, “The Chongfusi 崇福寺 in Chang’an: Foundation and Name Changes,” *L’inscription nestorienne de Si-ngan-fou: A Posthumous Work by Paul Pelliot* (ed. Antonino Forte, Kyoto and Paris: Scuola di Studi sull’Asia Orientale and College de France, Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises, 1996), pp. 429-472.

¹⁰ Although the completion of the Jing’aisi has generally been dated to 657, I have argued elsewhere that this might not have happened before 17 July 658, when the completion of the

Ximingsi, on which the Jing'aisi was said to have been modelled, was officially announced. See Chen Jinhua, *Collusion and Collision: Buddhism and Taoism's Politico-economic Roles in the Tang Restoration (704-713)*, Chapt. 3.

¹ For these rough dates that I suggested for Zhisheng, see my article, "Neidaochang: Buddhist Chapels within the Imperial Palaces of the Great Tang (618-907)," *Monasticism: Asian Perspectives* (eds. James Benn, Jinhua Chen, Phyllis Granoff, Lori Meeks and James Robson, Boston: Wisdom Publication), forthcoming.

² *Xu Gujin yijing tuji*, *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經 (hereafter *T*), no. 2151, vol. 55, 370b19-21; *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 9, *T* 2154, vol. 55, 568c14-16; cf. *Zhenyuan xinding shijiao mulu* 貞元新定釋教目錄 13, *T* 2157, vol. 55, 869b18-21, which is completely based on these two works by Zhisheng.

³ Hedi 和帝, or Xiaohe 孝和, was Zhongzong's posthumous title, which was proposed by his officials to honour his spirit on 16 October 710 (Jingyun 1.9.19 [*dingmao*]). See *Jiu Tang shu* 舊唐書 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1975) 7: 180, *Xin Tang shu* 新唐書 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1975) 4: 112, and *Zizhi tongjian* 資治通鑑 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1976) 207: 6578.

⁴ In the Tang (618-690, 705-907) and Great Zhou (690-705) dynasty, which had two capitals Chang'an (Western Capital) and Luoyang (Eastern Capital), *jing* 京 usually indicated Chang'an, in contrast with *du* 都, which usually referred to Luoyang.

⁵ *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 9, vol. 50, no. 2054, p. 285a16-b3. 2154, vol. 55, 567b4-5, 567b26; cf. *Zhenyuan xinding shijiao mulu* 13, *T* 2157, vol. 55, 867c16-18, 868a1. These dates are not provided in the *Xu Gujin yijing tuji*. Cf. note 37.

⁶ *Jiu Tang shu* 7: 140, 141; *Xin Tang shu* 4: 107, 108; cf. *Zizhi tongjian* 208: 6596.

⁷ *Jiu Tang shu* 6: 132, *Xin Tang shu* 4: 105, *Tang huiyao* 3: 34, and *Zizhi tongjian* 207: 6582.

⁸ The inscription itself is not included in the *Quan Tang wen*, and is fortunately quoted in the *Zhenyuan xinding shijiao mulu* 13, *T* no. 2157, vol. 55, 871c5-872a9, according to which the inscription was titled "Da Tang Longxing Fanjing sanzang Yijing fashi zhi taming bing xu" 大唐龍興翻經三藏義淨法師之塔銘並序 and a monk of the Kaiyesi 開業寺 named Zhixiang 智詳 (otherwise unknown) executed the calligraphy for it. The bestowal of the title of Tripitaka is mentioned in 871c15-16. Lu Can's official biographies, located at *Jiu Tang shu* 189: 4972ff, *Xin Tang shu* 199: 5670ff, reveal him as a staunch critic of Zhongzong's Empress Wei 韋后 (?-710) and her group.

⁹ *Da Zhou kanding shijiao mulu* 15, *T* no. 2153, vol. 55, 476a4.

²⁰ The date of Yijing's death is given in the epitaph of his stupa written by Lu Can; see "Da Tang Longxing Fanjing sanzang Yijing fashi zhi taming bing xu," *Zhenyuan xinding shijiao mulu* 13, *T* no. 2157, vol. 55, 871c20-21.

²¹ See below for this itinerary of Yijing from 700 to 713 and the changes of his monastery affiliation in the same period.

²² For the Buddhist biographical and historical sources, see, for examples, *Song gaoseng zhuan* 宋高僧傳 (completed 988) 1, *T* vol. 2061, vol. 50, 710c5-12; *Shishi tongjian* 釋氏通鑿 (completed sometime between 1084 and 1270) VIII, *Wan xuzang jing* 卍續藏經 131.463b16-18, *Fozu tongji* 佛祖統記 (completed 1269) 40, *T* no. 2035, vol. 49, 371b12-13; *Shishi jigu lue* 釋氏稽古略 (published 1355) 3, *T* no. 2037, vol. 49, 820b28-29.

For modern scholarship, see Wang Bangwei 王邦維 (annotated and edited), *Da Tang xiyu qiufa gaoseng zhuan jiaozhu* 大唐西域求法高僧傳校註 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1988), p. 264; *idem* (annotated and edited), *Nanhai jigui neifa zhuan jiaozhu* 南海寄歸內法傳校註 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1995), p. 23; *idem*, *Tang gaoseng Yijing shengping jiqi zhuzuo lunkao* 唐高僧義淨生平及其著作論考 (Chongqing: Chongqing chubanshe, 1996), p. 18.

²³ *Jinshi lu* 金石錄 25: 9a-b.

²⁴ *Xu Gujin yijing tuji*, *T* no. 2151, vol. 55, 370b19; *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* IX, *T* 2154, vol. 55,

568c14; *Zhenyuan xinding shijiao mulu*, T 2157, vol. 55, 869b18; see also *Shishi jigu lue* III, T vol. 49, 820b.

²⁵ On 25 March 705 (Shenlong 1.2.26 [*bingzi*]), Zhongzong issued an edict ordering that a Buddhist monastery and a Taoist abbacy be set up and named “Zhongxing” in each of the two capitals (Luoyang and Chang’an) and all the prefectures throughout the empire in order to celebrate the “restoration” of the Great Tang on 24 February 705 (*Jiu Tang shu* 7: 137). However, two years later, on 29 March 707, at the instigation of a court official called Zhang Jingyuan 張景源 (? - +710) he decreed to substitute *zhongxing* with *longxing* as an expression of respect for the political legacies left by Empress Wu. See *Jiu Tang shu* 7: 143-144, *Xin Tang shu* 4: 109, *Zizhi tongjian* 208: 6609-6610.

²⁶ *Quan Tang wen* 17: 20b6-8.

²⁷ The character *quan* 詮 usually means “explanations,” “interpretation,” or “commentaries.” Here it seems to mean “editing,” or “polishing.” If this understanding is correct, Zhongzong also believed that in addition to the over two hundred fascicles that Yijing had thoroughly edited and polished before they were ready to be presented to the court for publication, he had also finished some draft translations by this time.

²⁸ From 695, when he came back to China from his protracted pilgrimage to India and some neighbouring areas, to 699, Yijing mainly engaged in the Avatamsaka translation project that was headed by the Khotanese monk Śikṣānanda (652-710).

²⁹ See “Sanzang shengjiao xu,” *Quan Tang wen* 97: 7b-8b, the *Ru ding buding yin jing* and the date of its presentation to the court are mentioned in the preface at 8a8-8b4.

³⁰ According to Zhisheng, this text also circulated in fourteen fascicles.

³¹ The first two translations are in two fascicles, while the third is in twenty. The first was completed on Jiushi 1.5.5 (27 May 700) and the latter two on Jiushi 1.12.23 (5 February 701). All were translated at the Fuxiansi, except for the *Ru ding buding yin jing*, whose translation location is not specified (but according to Empress Wu’s preface, this translation was also made at the same monastery; see “Sanzang shengjiao xu,” *Quan Tang wen* 97: 8a8ff).

³² Zhisheng notes that this text was alternately titled “Sanqi jing” 三啟經.

³³ All of the translations, done at the Fuxiansi, were officially announced to be completed on Dazu 1.9.23 (28 October 701).

³⁴ The total number could also have been eighty-three since one translation was also circulated in eight, rather than ten, fascicles (see the next note).

³⁵ Zhisheng records that this translation was also circulated in eight fascicles.

³⁶ Five of them (iii.2, iii.3, iii.7, iii.8, and iii.9) are in one fascicle, three (iii.1, iii.5, and iii.6) in ten and one [iii.4] in fifty, all completed on Chang’an 3.10.4 (17 November 703) at the Ximingsi.

According to the Korean edition of the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu*, one of the nine translations, the *Quyin jiashe lun*, was published on Chang’an 3.10.14 (27 November 703), while the Song, Yuan and Ming editions unanimously have the date as Chang’an 3.10.4. In late 703 Empress Wu moved her court to Luoyang from Chang’an (she left Chang’an on 21 November 703, and did not arrive in Luoyang until 10 December – see note 50). She – and her court too – was right on the trip on 27 November 703 and it is obviously unlikely for her government to issue an edict to proclaim the publication (and also canonization) of Yijing’s translation. Thus, the date Chang’an 3.10.14 must be dismissed as an error for Chang’an 3.10.4 – such an error would have been rather likely given that a Classical Chinese text was written vertically, making the character *shi* 十 in the phrase <長安三年十月四日> only one character above another character *si* 四.

³⁷ All of them are in one fascicle except for [iv.3], which is in three fascicles. The first two were completed on Shenlong 1.7.15 (8 August 705), while the latter two only roughly dated in Shenlong 1 (30 January 705 – 18 January 706). All were translated at the Fuxiansi, except for the *Da Kongque zhouwang jing*, which was done at a palace chapel in Luoyang, probably the

Biankongsi 遍空寺 (for this tentative identification, see my above-mentioned article on the *neidaochang*).

³⁸ The translation was done in the Foguang Basilica 佛光殿 (that is, Foguangsi 佛光寺, a palace chapel of Zhongzong in Chang'an) in the summer (i.e. 4-6th months) of Shenlong 3 (6 May 707 – 1 August 707), with the participation of Zhongzong, who acted (symbolically) acted a scribe (*bishou* 筆受).

³⁹ Zhisheng here adds an interlinear note: These two fascicles are extracted from Fascicles 11 and 12 of the *Genben Shuoyiqieyou bu binaiye zashi* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶雜事; now it is included in the *baoji* 寶積 division, equal to the fourteenth *hui* 會, and renamed “Ru taizang hui” 入胎藏會.

⁴⁰ Zhisheng’s interlinear note: this text was first translated in Nālanda, and was revised in the capital (*du* 都, Luoyang), before it was presented to the court and subsequently was ordered into circulation during the Jinglong era.

⁴¹ Fourteen of them (vi.1-2, vi.4, vi.6-12, vi.15-16, vi.18-19) are in one fascicle, two (vi.3, and vi.17) in five fascicles, and the other three in two (vi.5), twenty (vi.13) and forty (vi.14) fascicles respectively. All translated at the Jianfusi, with the first four dated Jinglong 4.4.15 (18 May 710), and the rest roughly in Jinglong 4 (4 February 710 - 4 July 710).

⁴² Zhisheng interlinear note: it was first translated in Nālanda, and revised in Jingyun 2 (24 January 711 – 11 February 712) (another version has it as Jinglong 2 [28 January 708 – 14 February 709]) at the Jianfusi.

⁴³ Nine of them (vii.1-4, 6-10) are in one fascicle, with the remaining three (vii.5, 12, 11) in three, four and five fascicles respectively. The first three were completed on Jingyun 2.6 [run 閏].23 (10 August 711), while the rest merely roughly dated Jingyun 2 (24 January 711 – 11 February 712). All were translated at the Jianfusi, except for *Fahua lun* and *Jiliang lun*, whose translation location(s) is/are not specified.

⁴⁴ Zhisheng interlinear note: this text was translated in the state of Danmoli[di] 耽摩立[底] (Tāmralipti), East India, and was revised in the capital (*du* 都; i.e. Luoyang).

⁴⁵ We know this since Zhisheng claims that Yijing translated 115 fascicles under the reign of Empress Wu. His list, however, only contains 114 fascicles which he dates to 700, 701 or 703. Only with the addition of the *Longshu pusa quanjie wang song* can we reach the number 115.

⁴⁶ Zhisheng interlinear note: the text was sent from Shilifoshi 室利佛逝 (Śrīvijaya) in the Southern Seas (Nanhai 南海) on his way home from the West [India].

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ The first two are in two and four fascicles respectively, while the remaining three texts are all in one.

⁴⁹ Depending on different connotations of the character *ben* 本, the expression *shiben* 失本 can be understood in two different ways: it could refer to the loss of the “original manuscript” (*gaoben* 稿本) of the translation, or the Sanskrit original (*yuaben* 原本) of the Chinese translation. Towards the end of this biography, Zhisheng refers to a part of Yijing’s translations, which were only some manuscripts that Yijing had not had the chance to edit (但出其本, 未遑刪綴; see note 54). Given that here Zhisheng obviously uses *ben* in the sense of “original manuscript,” and not the “Sanskrit original,” it seems more likely that *ben* in the *shiben* was also used in the same sense. Thus, it seems that by 730 two of Yijing’s translations had been lost, although Zhisheng somehow knew that they were both translated in 711.

⁵⁰ Yijing’s biographical sources do not explicitly tell us that between November 701 and December 706 he had followed Empress Wu and Zhongzong in moving to and fro between the two capitals. This can be, however, deduced from the changes of his monastery affiliation during this period:

- 1) Jiushi 1.5.5 (27 May 700): published one text translated at the Fuxiansi;
- 2) Jiushi 1.12.23 (5 February 701): published two texts translated at the Fuxiansi;

- 3) Dazu 1.9.23 (28 October 701): published seven texts translated at the Fuxiansi;
- 4) Chang'an 3.10.4 (17 November 703): published nine texts translated at the Ximingsi;
- 5) Shenlong 1 (30 January 705 – 18 January 706): published four texts (all, except for one which was translated at a palace chapel in Luoyang, were translated at the Fuxiansi);
- 6) Shenlong 3 (7 February 707 – 4 October 707): published a text translated at a palace chapel in Chang'an.
- 7) Jinglong 4 (4 February 710 - 4 July 710): published nineteen texts translated at the Jianfusi;
- 8) Jingyun 2 (24 January 711 – 11 February 712): published twelve texts translated at the Jianfusi;

Just as the dates given here were those in which these translations were published, rather than those in which they were actually made, the temples noted here were Yijing's when the translations were published, not when the translations were made. Thus, the above list establishes these changes in his location during this period (700-712):

- 1) 27 May 700 - 28 October 701: in Luoyang (Fuxiansi)
- 2) 17-27 November 703: in Chang'an (Ximingsi)
- 3) Sometime between 30 January 705 – 18 January 706: in Luoyang (Fuxiansi)
- 4) Sometime between 7 February 707 – 4 October 707: in Chang'an (a palace chapel)
- 5) 710 – 712: in Chang'an (Jianfusi)

On the other hand, Empress Wu and Zhongzong had left to us the following itineraries in this period:

- 1) Empress Wu departed Luoyang on 7 November 701 (Chang'an 1.10.3 [*renyin*]) and arrived in Chang'an twenty days later, on 26 November (Chang'an 1.10.22 [*xinyou*]). See *Jiu Tang shu* 6: 130, *Xin Tang shu* 4: 102, *Zizhi tongjian* 207: 6557 (only *Zizhi tongjian* gives the dates of her departure and arrival as well, while the *Jiu Tang shu* merely tells us the month of her departure, and *Xin Tang shu* providing the specific date of her arrival, but not her arrival date).
- 2) She departed Chang'an on 21 November 703 (Chang'an 3.10.8 [*bingyin*]) and arrived in Luoyang twenty days later, on 10 December (Chang'an 3.10.27 [*yiyou*]). See *Jiu Tang shu* 6: 131, *Xin Tang shu* 4: 104, *Zizhi tongjian* 207: 6567 (both the *Jiu Tang shu* and *Zizhi tongjian* give the dates of her departure and arrival as well, while the *Xin Tang shu* merely tells us the date of her departure).
- 3) Zhongzong left Luoyang on 18 November 706 (Shenlong 2.10.9 [*yimao*]) and arrived in Luoyang twenty days later, on 7 December (Shenlong 2.10.28 [*wuxu*]). See *Jiu Tang shu* 7: 142, *Xin Tang shu* 4: 109, *Zizhi tongjian* 208: 6606 (both the *Jiu Tang shu* and *Zizhi tongjian* give the dates of his departure and arrival as well, while the *Xin Tang shu* merely tells us the date of his arrival).

On the basis of the above information, and the fact that since he moved his court from Luoyang to Chang'an, Zhongzong had never moved it back to Luoyang and that Ruizong's court had always remained in Chang'an, we arrive at such a list:

- I) Empress Wu (r. 16 October 690 - 22 February 705):
 - I.1) 16 October 690 - 7 November 701: Luoyang;
 - I.2) 26 November 701 - 21 November 703: Chang'an;
 - I.3) 10 December 703 - 22 February 705: Luoyang.

- II) Zhongzong (r. 23 February 705 - 3 July 710):
 - II.1) 23 February 705 - 18 November 706: Luoyang;
 - II.2) 7 December 706 – 3 July 710: Chang'an.

- III) Ruizong (r. 25 July 710 – 7 September 712): Chang'an

Comparing this list with Yijing's itinerary between 700 and 713, we get the impression that he had followed Empress Wu and Zhongzong's carriages in moving between the two capitals (twice for Empress Wu [701 and 703] and once for Zhongzong [706]).

⁵¹ In addition, all the extant versions that I have checked do not support this emendation: all of them have *erbai yu juan*, rather than *[yi]bai yu juan*.

⁵² “Da Tang Longxing Fanjing sanzang Yijing fashi zhi taming bing xu,” *Zhenyuan xinding shijiao mulu* 13, T no. 2157, vol. 55, 871c18. Lu Can also claimed that all these translations were decreed to be catalogued in the *Tripitaka* (並敕編入一切經目).

⁵³ In his interlinear note attached to this sentence Zhisheng explains that the *bachudu* means *baqu* 跋渠 (Ch. *pin* 品; Skt. *varga*) of *qiandu* 捷度 (*skandha*; collections of rules) (i.e. rules regarding ritual performance, the handling of utensils, and daily activities) in various vinaya texts (*zhulü* 諸律). See *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 9, T no. 2154, vol. 55, 569a23-24.

⁵⁴ 但出其本 未遑刪綴 遽入泥洹 其文遂寢: *Xu Gujin yijing tuji*, T 2152, vol. 55, 371a7-8; *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 9, T 2154, vol. 55, 569a24-25; *Zhenyuan xinding shijiao mulu* 13, T 2157, vol. 55, 870a1-2.

⁵⁵ *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 9, T 2154, vol. 55, 569a23-28. These forty-two “translations” are indeed catalogued in the section of “Beixing jing” of the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 16, T no. 2154, vol. 55, 659b-660a, in which Zhisheng also tells us that nine of them (all in one fascicle) were extracted from the *Genben Shuoyiqieyou bu binaiye* (translated in 703), and the remaining thirty-three (in forty fascicles) from the *Genben Shuoyiqieyou bu binaiye zashi*, which was not translated until 710.

⁵⁶ *Zhenyuan xinding shijiao mulu* 13, T no. 2157, vol. 55, 869a1-6. After repeating the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* list of Yijing's translation, Yuanzhao follows it up with seven texts in fifty fascicles, which are, respectively, about the matters of “medicinal herbs” (*yao* 藥) (in twenty fascicles), “breaking the *saṃgha*” (Ch. *poseng* 破僧; Skt. *saṃgha-bheda*) (in twenty fascicles, two of which were lacking), “renouncing the secular life” (Ch. *chujia* 出家, Skt. *pravrajyā*) (in five fascicles, one of which was lacking), “peaceful dwellings” (i.e. meditation retreats) (Ch. *anju* 安居, Skt. *vāṛṣika*) (in one fascicle), “following one's own wishes” (Ch. *suiyi* 隨意, Skt. *yathēccham*) (in twenty fascicles), “use of leather goods” (*pige* 皮革) (in two fascicles), “dog-cookers” (Ch. Jiechina 羯恥那, Skt. *khattika*) (“butchers, hunters, those who live by killing and selling animals, persons of very low caste”) (in one fascicle). Judging by the way they were titled: “Genben Shuoyiqieyou bu pinaiye xxx shi” 根本說一切有部毗奈耶 xxx 事, these texts were obviously some extracts from the Mūla-Sarvāstivādin vinaya texts concerning these seven matters and they must have been almost the same amount (according to Zhisheng, they were fifty, rather than forty-nine fascicles as Yuanzhao reports here) of what Zhisheng deems to have been Yijing's extracts from the same kind of sources.

After listing these seven “translations,” Yuanzhao makes a short review of how they were found and why he believes they should be included in the canon:

右此上從藥事下七部，共五十卷。並從大周證聖元年至大唐景雲二年以來，兩京翻譯，未入開元釋教錄。今搜檢，乞入貞元目錄。於內由欠三卷，為訪本未獲。且附闕本錄中收切。依[an error for 因?]前遺[an error for 遺]失，兼誤為別生，故重標於此耳。

The seven texts listed above, starting from that on medical matters, were translated in the two capitals from Zhengsheng 1 (23 November 694 – 21 October 695) of the Great Zhou to Jingyun 2 (24 January 711 – 11 February 712) of the Great Tang. As they have not been included in the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu*, now, after searching for and inspecting on them, we petition that they be included in the *Zhenyuan [xinding shijiao mu]lu*. Among these texts are three fascicles whose original manuscripts have not been found although

a search was made. We just have them [their titles] attached to the “Queben lu” (Record of the Lost Texts). Since they were lost before and also because they were mistaken as “biesheng” (translations reproduced in other places), we have them re-listed here.

⁵⁷ See note 55.

⁵⁸ Yijing’s role in Śikṣānanda’s Avataṃsaka translation project is unanimously confirmed by a number of Buddhist sources. See, for examples, “Da Zhou xinyi Dafanguangfo huayan jing zongmu” 大周新譯大方廣佛華嚴經總目 compiled by Fuli as a content table for the new Chinese translation of the *Avataṃsaka sūtra* when its completion was officially announced on 5 November 699 (this was also the day the document is dated), P. 2314, *Dunhuang baozang* 119: 126 (cf. Naba Toshisada 那波利貞, “Tō shōhon Tōryō no ichi ibun” 唐鈔本唐令の一遺文, *Shirin* 史林 21 [1936], pp. 84-85; Ikeda On 池田濶, *Chūgoku kodai shahon shikigo shūroku* 中國古代寫本識語集錄 [Tokyo: Tokyo daigaku Tōyō bunka kenkyūjo, 1990], pp. 246-47); Zhonzong, “Sanzang shengjiao xu,” *Quan Tang wen* 17: 20a9-b2; Fazang, *Huayanjing zhuanji* 華嚴經傳記 1, *T* vol. 51, no. 2073, p.155a17-18; Huiyuan 慧苑 (673? – 743?), *Xu Huayanjing lüeshu kandingji* 續華嚴經略疏刊定記, *Wan xu zangjing* 5.24d14-18; Ch’ōe Ch’iwōn (Ch. Cui Zhiyuan 崔致遠, 857 - after 904), *Tang Tae Ch’ōnboksa kosaju pōn’gyōng taedōk Pōpchang hwasang chōn* (Ch. *Tang Da Jianfusi gu sizhu fanjing dade Fazang heshang zhuan*) 唐大薦福寺故寺主翻經大德法藏和尚傳 (Biography for Upādhyāya Fazang, the Late Bhadanta-translator and Abbot of the Great Jianfusi of the Tang) (composed 904), *T* vol. 50, no. 2054, p. 282 a16-21. Yijing arrived in Luoyang from India in Zhengsheng 1.5 (17 June 695 – 16 July 696), about two months after the translation project was started on 2 May 695. He seems to have participated in the project right after his return.

⁵⁹ Ruizong makes this ascription in the preface that he wrote for the *Da Baoji jing* 大寶積經 (Skt. *Maharatnakuta sūtra*; *Great Gem-heap sūtra*), “Da Baoji jing xu” 大寶積經序, sometime between 5 July and 15 September 713 when Bodhiruci officially finished the voluminous translation. In the Taishō edition of the *Da Baoji jing*, this preface is placed at the very beginning of that *sūtra* (*T* no. 310, vol. 11, 1a-b). The sentence containing this ascription is found at *T* no. 310, vol. 11, 1b5-6 (cf. *Song gaoseng zhuan* 3: 720b12-13), translated in Forte, “The South Indian Monk Bodhiruci (d. 727), Biographical Evidence,” in *A Life Journey to the East: Sinological Studies in Memory of Giuliano Bertuccioli* (1923-2001) (eds. Antonino Forte and Federico Masini, Kyoto: Scuola Italiana di Studi sull’Asia Orientale, 2002), p. 93.

⁶⁰ This is verified by Fuli’s “Da Zhou xinyi Dafanguangfo huayan jing zongmu,” in which Fazang and Fuli are respectively identified as a monk (*sen* 僧) of the Great Fuxiansi and the Western Monastery of the Great Zhou (Da Zhou xisi 大周西寺), as the Western Chongfusi was then known. See P. 2314, *Dunhuang baozang* 119: 126; Ikeda, *Chūgoku kodai shahon shikigo shūroku*, pp. 246-247. Since most of the other translators on the list are identified by their monastic positions, like *duweina* 都維那 (Administrator), *shangzuo* 上座 (Elder), and *sizhu* 寺主 (Abbot), Fuli and Fazang must have been done so had they at the time held any of these three major positions at their monasteries. As a matter of fact, as of 7 December 695, on which the *Da Zhou kanding shijiao mulu* was completed, the Fuxiansi abbot was a monk called Huicheng 慧澄; see *Da Zhou kanding shijiao mulu* 15, *T*. no. 2153, vol. 55, 475c14; Antonino Forte, *Political Propaganda and Ideology in China at the End of the Seventh Century: Inquiry into the Nature, Author, and Function of the Tunhuang Document S. 6502. Followed by an Annotated Translation* (Napoli: Istituto Universitario Orientale, Seminario di Studi Asiatici, 1976), p. 118; see also the second edition of this book that is now forthcoming from Università degli Studi di Napoli “L’Orientale” (Napoli) and Scuola di Studi sull’Asia Orientale (Kyoto), p. 178.

Furthermore, in a colophon (dated 28 October 701 [Dazu 1.9.23]) of Yijing’s translation *Genben sapoduobu lüshe* 根本薩婆多部律攝 (*T*. no. 1458, vol. 24), the Fuxiansi abbot is

identified as Fazang (Ikeda, *Chūgoku kodai shahon shikigo shūroku*, p. 258). Scholars debate on the identity of this Fazang, since between 692 and sometime in the Chang'an era (26 January 701 - 29 January 705), another Fazang (637-714), who was a six year senior of the Avatamsaka Fazang but outlived him by two years and who has been famous for his connections with the Buddhist cult Sanjiejiao 三階教 (Teaching of the Three Levels), was affiliated with the Fuxiansi as the supervisor of the Sanjiejiao banking-welfare system headquartered there, the *wujingzang* 無盡藏 (Inexhaustible Store) (see his funeral epitaph written by Tian Xiuguang 田休光, "Fazang Chanshi taming bing xu" 法藏禪師塔銘, *Quan Tang wen* 328: 14b4-6). Fujiyoshi Masumi 藤吉真澄 maintains that this could not have been the Sanjiejiao Fazang on the grounds that as a "practitioner" (*jiken-ka* 實踐家) this Fazang could not have been a "translator-bhadanta" (*Fanjing dade* 翻經大德), as this Fazang is here identified; see Fujiyoshi, "Kegonkyō denki no kanta: Hōzō to Taigenji" 華嚴經傳記の彼方 - 法藏と太原寺 -, *Kegongaku ronshū* 華嚴學論集 (ed. Kamata Shigeo hakushi koki kinenkai 鎌田茂雄博士古稀紀念會, Tokyo: Daizō shuppan, 1997), pp. 311-333. Forte, on the other hand, suggests that here Fazang might have been an error for Faming 法明, another key monk under the reign of Empress Wu whose abbotship of the Fuxiansi is verified by a colophon of Yijing's *Jin guangming jing* (S. 523, dated 17 November 703 [Chang'an 3.10.4]; reproduced in Forte, *Political Propaganda* [1st edition], Plate XXXIII; and edited in Ikeda, *Chūgoku kodai shahon shikigo shūroku*, p. 263); see Forte, *Political Propaganda* (2nd edition), p. 180, n. 40. However, given his long affiliation with the Fuxiansi and the importance of the *wujingzang* for the monastery, I feel it hard to exclude the possibility that the Fazang who was the abbot of the Fuxiansi on 28 October 701 was actually the Sanjiejiao Fazang (there is just no point to assume, as does Fujiyoshi, that a Buddhist practitioner could not have been a translator).

⁶¹ I have elsewhere discussed a piece of evidence pointing to Fuli's affiliation with the Daxingshansi in 701 or 702; see Jinhua Chen, *Collusion and Collision*, Appendix 2.

⁶² See "Xinyi Dasheng ru Lengqie jing xu" 新譯入楞伽經序, *T* no. 672, vol. 16, 587a25; *Quan Tang wen* 97: 10a9. Empress Wu here refers to Fuli as a monk (not the abbot yet) of the Fuxiansi (*Da Fuxiansi seng Fuli* 大福先寺僧復禮).

⁶³ Forte, *Political Propaganda* (2nd edition), p. 181, n. 44.

⁶⁴ We should also note that in the preface Empress Wu seems quite meticulous in identifying Sikṣānada: "Sanzang shamen Yutian guo seng Shichanantuo dade" 三藏沙門于闐國僧實叉難陀大德 (Tripiṭaka-śramaṇa, the monk from the Kingdom of Khotan, Bhadanta Shicha'nantuo [Sikṣānada]). See "Xinyi Dasheng ru Lengqie jing xu," *T* no. 672, vol. 16, 587a24-25; *Quan Tang wen* 97: 10a8-9. The degree of care with which the empress has identified Sikṣānada suggests that had Fuli - the only collaborator of Sikṣānada she has here taken the trouble to mention - been the abbot of Fuxiansi at the time, she would very likely have identified him so.

⁶⁵ In theory we here should also consider the possibility that before transferring to the Daxingshansi (very likely shortly after 26 November 701 when he followed Empress Wu back to Chang'an), Fuli had already served as the Fuxiansi abbot for a while (starting from some time between 5 November 699 and 26 November 701). However, given that the Fuxiansi was such an important monastery at the time that it seems extremely unlikely for its abbot to be relocated at another less prestigious monastery as an ordinary monk (we should note that the Daxingshansi was a "principality monastery" [*guosi* 國寺] of the Sui dynasty, not that of the Great Zhou or Tang). For this reason, I assume that Fuli's ascendance to the Fuxiansi abbotship must have occurred sometime after 16 November 703 (the date on which he was still affiliated with the Daxingshansi as a "translator-monk").

⁶⁶ A letter from a court official, Quan Wuer 權無二 (? - + 681), addresses Fuli as a monk of the Daxingshansi. Although undated, this letter was very likely written shortly after 18 September 681 (Yonglong 2.8.1) given that it appears to be a thank-you note to Fuli for receiving from him a

copy of his work entitled “Shimen bianhuo lun” 十門辯惑論 (On Dispelling perplexity in ten theories) (in two or three fascicles), which Fuli wrote as an effort to solve Quan Wuer’s doubts about some Buddhist teachings. The *Shimen bianhuo lun* is still extant (in three fascicles) (*T* no. 2111); for the date of its completion, see *T* no. 2111, vol. 52, 559b10-11; and Quan Wuer’s letter is attached to the work (559b12-24, the addressing of Fuli as a monk of the Daxingshansi is found at the very beginning of the letter).

⁶⁷ See *Tang Tae Ch’ōnboksa kosaju pōn’gyōng taedōk Pōpchang hwasang chōn*, *T* no. 2054, vol. 50, 283c25-284a14, with Fazang’s abbotship of the Western Chongfusi mentioned at 283c28-29.

⁶⁸ Chen, “More than a Philosopher,” pp. 341-352.

⁶⁹ The funeral epitaph that Yan Chaoyin wrote for Fangzang shortly after his death is titled “Da Tang Da Jianfusi gu dade Kang Zang fashi zhi bei” 大唐大薦福寺故大德康藏法師之碑 (A [Funeral] Epitaph for Dharma Master Kang [Fa]zang, the Late *Bhadanta* of the Great Jianfusi of the Great Tang), *T* no. 2054, vol. 50, 280b-c. Ch’ōe Ch’iwōn’s famous biography for Fazqang carries a title which can be translated as “Biography for Upādhyāya Fazang, the Late *Bhadanta*-translator and Abbot of the Great Jianfusi of the Tang,” *T* no. 2054, vol. 50, 280c-285c.

⁷⁰ See, for examples, Tang Yongtong 湯用彤, *Sui Tang fojiao shigao* 隋唐佛教史稿 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1982 [rept.]), p. 156; Fang Litian 方立天, *Fazang* 法藏 (Taipei: Dongda tushu gonsi, 1991), p. 29.

⁷¹ See Sun Yinggang’s 孫英剛 otherwise excellent article: “Chang’an yu Jingzhou zhijian: Tang Zhongzong yu fojiao” 長安與荊州之間唐中宗與佛教, in *Tangdai Zongjiao xinyang yu shehui* 唐代宗教信仰與社會 (ed. Rong Xinjiang 榮新江, Shanghai: Shanghai cishu chubanshe, 2003), pp. 137-138 (the article itself at pp. 125-150). Sun has not mentioned the source for this claim. Given that right before this, he mentions a rain-praying ritual that Fazang supervised at the Jianfusi in the mid-summer of Jinglong 2 (708) (see note 72 for this ritual), which is quoted from Ch’ōe Ch’iwōn’s biography, I assume that he has come to this conclusion on the basis of the same source. However, although in the title of the biography Ch’ōe Ch’iwōn identifies Fazang as the abbot of the Jianfusi, throughout the biography itself, he never makes the same identification, let alone tells us when he started to serve this position. On the contrary, on the occasion of narrating Fazang’s role in the Famensi relic veneration in the turn of 705 (also the eve of the 705 coup mentioned by Sun), Ch’ōe Ch’iwōn refers to Fazang as the abbot of the Great Chongfusi: 時藏為大崇福寺寺主 (*T* no. 2054, vol. 50, 283c28-29). Did Sun Yinggan misread the 大崇福寺 here as 大薦福寺?

⁷² *Tang Tae Ch’ōnboksa kosaju pōn’gyōng taedōk Pōpchang hwasang chōn*, *T* no. 2054, vol. 50, 284a29-b5; discussed in Chen Jinhua, “More Than a Philosopher: Fazang (643-712) as a Politician and Miracle-worker.” *History of Religion* 42.4 (May 2003), p. 354; a more detailed discussion of this episode can be found in my book on Fazang, *History and His Stories: Some New Perspectives on the Intellectual Life of the Avataṃsaka Master Fazang* (forthcoming), Chapter 4.

⁷³ See *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 9, *T* no. 2154, vol. 55, 568c5, for Fazang’s participation in Yijing’s translation center at the Fuxiansi in Luoyang and the Ximingsi in Chang’an. Fazang’s role in Yijing’s Ximingsi translation bureau is verified by several colophons to several translations that Yijing made in this period; see, for examples, a colophon (dated Chang’an 3.10.4 [17 November 703]) to Yijing’s translation of *Jin guangming jing* (made at the Ximingsi), in which Fazang is identified as the abbot of the Western Monastery of the Great Zhou (i.e. Western Chongfusi); see Ikeda, *Chūgoku kodai shahon shikigo shūroku*, pp. 260-264; Forte, *Political Propaganda* (1st edition), Plate XXXIII. See also a colophon (dated to the same day) to the *Genben Shuoyiqieyou bu pinaiye* (in which Fazang is identified by the same capacity); see Ikeda, *Chūgoku kodai shahon shikigo shūroku*, p. 264.

Regarding Fazang’s absence in Yijing’s activities in Chang’an (at the Jianfusi), see

568c29-569a11, 569a16-18. Fazang's absence in Yijing's Jianfusi translation bureau is also corroborated by four colophons to four translations that Yijing completed in Jinglong 4.4 (4 May 710 – 1 June 710), including (1) *Genben Shuoyiqieyou bu nituona*, (2) *Genben Shuoyiqieyou bu nituona mudējia*, (3) *Yiqieyoubu bichuni binaiye*, (4) *Yuxiang gongde jing*, in none of which Fazang is listed as a translator; see Ikeda, *Chūgoku kodai shahon shikigo shūroku*, pp. 272-279.

⁷⁴ A short biographical note of this monk is found at *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 9, T no. 2154, vol. 55, 571a6-11. A member of the prestigious Tianshui Zhao 天水趙 family, he abandoned his household life when he was twenty and gradually distinguished himself as a vinaya expert.

⁷⁵ The original has Li You 李又, which was obviously an error for Li Yi 李义.

⁷⁶ The original has Sihao 嗣號, an error for Siguo 嗣號.

⁷⁷ Ikeda, *Chūgoku kodai shahon shikigo shūroku*, pp. 276-279.

⁷⁸ At the top of this list, Yijing's functions are given as *xuanshi fanben* 宣釋梵本 ("enouncing and explaining the Sanskrit originals") and *zhuiwen zhengzi* 綴文正字 (Patching up the compositions and correcting the words). These two functions probably roughly matched those of *du-fanben* 讀梵本 and *zhengzi* 正字. They were, of course, in addition to his overall role as the "Translation-director" (*yizhu* 譯主).

⁷⁹ Zhisheng's list has assigned two different functions, *zheng-fanben* and *zheng-fanwen*, to Damonantuo and Yisheluo respectively.

⁸⁰ Zhisheng's list completely accords with this list in this regard.

⁸¹ The original has 反極寺, which was obviously an error for 罔極寺. The Wangjisi was built by Princess Taiping in the Taining 太寧 (i.e. Daning 大寧) Ward in Chang'an for the posthumous welfare of her mother Empress Wu, in accordance with a decree that Zhongzong issued on 9 April 705 (Shenlong 1.3.12, only a few months after the empress's death). Its name was changed to Xingtangsi 興唐寺 on 3 July 732 (Kaiyuan 20.6.7). See *Tang huiyao* 48: 846.

⁸² Zhisheng's list does not include the function of *zhengzi*.

⁸³ Under the category of *bishou*, Zhisheng gives Zhiji and Xuanshan, in contrast to this list, which under this category includes Xuanshan and Li Qiao, but not Zhiji, whom it includes in the category of *zhengzi*. Thus, it seems that Zhisheng might have understood *zhengzi* as a part of *bishou*.

⁸⁴ The original has Wengang 文剛, which was obviously an error for Wengang 文綱, whose *Song gaoseng zhuan* biography identifies him as a monk of the Chongshengsi 崇聖寺 in Chang'an (see *Song gaoseng zhuan* 14, T no. 2061, vol. 50, 791c15).

⁸⁵ The original has 崇光寺, which was obviously an error for 崇先寺.

⁸⁶ All of the six Scribes mentioned by Zhisheng - Wengang, Huizhao, Lizhen, Sūngjiang, Aitong, Siheng - except for Lizhen, can be found in this list. Lizhen 利貞 was very likely Liming 利明 in the list. When the list was prepared in 710, the character *zhen* 貞, being a part of the personal name of Empress Wei's father Wei Xuanzhen 韋玄貞 (?- ca. 684), was tabooed so that Lizhen had to be written as Liming. The taboo was abolished after Empress Wei was executed and disgraced in 710, making it possible for Zhisheng to restore the original form of Lizhen's name when he compiled his list in 730.

⁸⁷ All of the seven famous scholars - Li Jiao, Wei Sili, Zhao Yanzhao, Lu Cangyong, Zhang Yue, Li Yi, Su Ting - that Zhisheng mentions as "Composers and Polishers" are found in this list.

⁸⁸ Both of the Verifiers of the Translations that Zhisheng mentions in his list, Qutan Jin'gang and Ashun, are found here.

⁸⁹ The original has 環, an error for 瑰.

⁹⁰ Both of the Supervisors of the Translations that Zhisheng mentions in his list, Wei Juyuan and Su Gui, are found here.

⁹¹ Zhisheng's list excludes people of this function.

⁹² In our list Li Yong and the other two persons are not clearly indicated as "Supervisors and Protectors of the Translations." Thanks to Zhisheng, we know this status of Li Yong. Furthermore,

since on the list the names of Pan Jiaji and Liu Lingzhi are presented in the same way as is that of Li Yong (they are two characters closer to the top of the document), I assume that they belonged to the same group and had served Yijing's translation bureau in the same capacity.

⁹³ *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 9, T no. 2154, vol. 55, 570c4.

⁹⁴ *Song gaoseng zhuan* 18, T vol. 50, n. 2061, 822a19-23; cf. Li Yong, "Da Tang Sizhou Linhuai xian Puguangwang si bei" 大唐泗州臨淮縣普光王寺碑, *Quan Tang wen* 263: 12a1-2. Although clearly telling us that Sengqie died at the Jianfusi, Li Yong does not say that he was transferred to there from the palace right before his death. See also *Shenseng zhuan* 神僧傳 7, T no. 2064, vol. 50, 992b-c, according to which he was transferred to the Jianfusi after briefly staying in the palace chapel (*neidaochang* 內道場) in Jinlong 2 (708).

⁹⁵ For the history of this important monastery, see *Tang huiyao* 唐會要 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1991) 48: 991, *Tang liangjing chengfang kao* 唐兩京城坊考 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1985) 2: 35-37; cf. Ono Katsutoshi 小野勝年, *Chūgoku Zui Tō Chōan jūin shiryō shūsei* 中國隋唐長安寺院史料集成 (2 vols., Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1989), 1: 3-10, 2: 3-8. Originally belonging to Yang Guang 楊廣 (589-618) (Sui Ynagdi 隋煬帝, r. 604-617). During the Wude era (18 June 618 – 22 January 627), it was bestowed to Xiao Yu 蕭瑀 (574-647) as his "western garden" (*xiyuan* 西園), in which a mansion was built when Xiao Yu's son Xiao Rui 蕭銳 (d.u.) married Taizong's daughter Princess Xiangcheng 襄城 (?-651). After she died, the government purchased the mansion and assigned it to Prince Ying 英, the future Zhongzong. On the one hundredth days after Gaozong died on 27 December 683 (Yongchun 2.12.4 [*dingsi*]) (that is, Wenming 1.3.9 [*xinmao*] [29 March 684]; *Tang huiyao* [48: 991] gives it as Wenming 1.3.12 [2 April 684], which was actually the 103rd day after Gaozong's death), the mansion was turned into a monastery named Great Xianfusi (Zhongzong had then been deposed and exiled to Fangzhou 房州 thirty-five days ago, on Sisheng 1.2.6 [*xuwu*] [26 February 684]). In Tianshou 1 (16 October 690 – 5 December 690), it was renamed Great Jianfusi. After Zhongzong ascended to the throne once again in 705, the monastery was renovated and started to assume increasing importance.

⁹⁶ The Taishō edition of the *Huayan wujiao zhang* is based on the edition of the Baoen Canon 報恩藏 (of the Zengshansi 增上寺, printed in Kangxi 2 [1663]), in collation with three more editions, the Shūkyō 宗教 University edition (printed in Hōei 寶永 3 [1706]), the Otani University edition printed in Keichō 慶長 17 (1612), and the Otani University edition of Shōō 正應 3 (1290). Of these four editions, only the 1290 and 1663 editions contain the identification of Fazang in terms of his affiliation with the Jianfusi. See T no. 1866, vol. 45, editorial notes 1, 3 in p. 477.

As for the *Yihai baimen*, the Taishō edition is based on the Otani University edition printed during the Tokugawa period, collated with the *Zoku zōkyō* 續藏經 edition. Both editions contain an identification of Fazang by his Jianfusi affiliation – "Jing Da Jianfusi Fanjing shamen Fazang" 京大薦福寺翻經沙門 (a Translator-Śramaṇa of the Great Jianfusi in the Capital [*jing* 京, that is, Chang'an]). See T no. 1878, vol. 45, editorial notes 1 in p. 627.

The Taishō edition of the *Wangjin huanyuan guan* is based on the Baoen edition (printed in Kangxi 3 [1664]), collated with an Heian period manuscript (in the possession of Ono Genmyō 小野玄妙), and the Otani University edition dating from the Tokugawa period. The Baoen edition has the identification as "Tang Da Jianfusi Fanjing shamen Fazang" 唐大薦福寺翻經沙門, while the other two have *jing* 京 instead of Tang 唐. See T no. 1880, vol. 45, editorial notes 1, 3 in p. 637.

As for the "Jingshizi zhang" included in the *Jinshizi zhang Yunjian leijie* 金師子章雲間類解 by the Song dynasty Avatamsaka master Jingyuan 淨源 (1011-1088), the Taishō editor relied on the Baoen edition printed in Wanli 20 (1592). However, given that Jingyuan comments on the

expression “Tang Da Jianfusi shamen Fazang” 唐大薦福寺沙門, we know that at least by his time some editions of the “Jingshizi zhang” had already contained such an identification. See *T* no. 1880, vol. 45, 663a29-b7

⁹⁷ This passage is from Sōshun’s *Kegong ichijō kyō bunki fushū kyōshinshō* 華嚴一乘教分記輔宗匡真鈔 1, *T* no. 2344, vol. 73, 304a15-17; mentioned and discussed in Yoshizu Yoshihide 吉津宜英, *Kegon ichijō shisō no kenkyū* 華嚴一乘教思想の研究 (Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, 1991), p. 148, n. 27.

Jinhua CHEN, Associate Professor, Tokyo University

Another Look at Tang Zhongzong's (r. 684, 705-710) Preface
to Yijing's (635-713) Translations: With a Special Reference to Its Date

Jinhua CHEN

The Tang emperor Zhongzong (r. 684, 705-710) wrote a preface for some translations made by the prestigious Buddhist translator Yijing 義淨 (635-713). The great Buddhist cataloguer Zhishen 智昇 (before 700 – after 786) dates this preface to 705 (or early 706) in his catalogue, the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄. However, according to the list of Yijing's translations that the same Zhisheng provides in the *Kaiyuan shijiao*, Yijing had only completed barely one hundred fascicles of translations by 705 (or early 706), squarely contrary to what Zhongzong tells us in the preface - that is, that by the time this preface was written Yijing had finished translating over two hundred fascicles. Scholars have unanimously accepted the date that Zhisheng gives for Zhongzong's preface and never noticed this puzzling contradiction implied between the composition date and Yijing's translation list, both derived from the same Yijing. This article suggests a solution to this apparent contradiction. In addition, it has also culled from the preface some important information which sheds light on some aspects of the careers of Yijing's three contemporary co-religionists - Fuli 復禮 (fl. 681-703), Huibiao 惠表 (?- +703) and the renowned Avatamsak master Fazang 法藏 (643-712).