view about the use and changes in the employment of the *hu* and *fan*, see Daniel Boucher, "On *Hu* and *Fan* Again: The Transmission of 'Barbarian' Manuscripts to China," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 23.1 (2000): 7–28. Boucher argues that the use of word *hu* for Indic texts was purely for technical reasons and had no derogatory connotations to either the Buddhist adherents or their critics in China. From the statements of Yancong and Vajrabodhi it seems, however, that the Indians and Buddhist exegetes were cognizant about the pejorative implications of the word *hu*, and preferred to disassociate India from other non-Chinese states and tribes.

Chapter Two

1. The Three Jewels in China, as Stephen Teiser has explained, "did not simply represent a formulaic refuge of faith. In China the 'Three Jewels' also referred to the material objects that had value in the Buddhist religion: statues, halls, and reliquaries in temples constituted the Jewel of the Buddha; texts and divinatory instruments were Jewels of the Dharma; and temple lands, lodgings, and resident farmers constituted 'permanent property of the Sangha.'" See *The Ghost Festival in Medieval China*, 66.

2. See Liu, *Silk and Religion*, Chapter 1.

3. For an excellent study of relic veneration in southern Asia and its intended functions, see Kevin Trainor, *Relics, Rituals, and Representation in Buddhism: Rematerializing the Sri Lankan Theravāda Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

4. *Mahāparinibbāna Sutta* in Maurice Walshe trans., *The Long Discourses of the Buddha*, 275–276.

5. This argument is based on the reinterpretation of a section in the *Mahāparinibbāna Sutta* that precedes the account of Buddha's nirvāṇa. In responding to Ānanda's (one of the leading disciples of the Buddha) question to his master regarding what his followers are to do with his dead body, the Buddha is noted to have said that they need not bother with "*sarīra-pūjā*" and instead leave it to the laity. This response had been taken as Buddha's injunction prohibiting the members of the monastic community from venerating his remains. Rejecting the prohibition interpretation, Gregory Schopen has argued that the term *sarīra-pūjā* in this context means "funeral ceremony" and not the "veneration of the remains of the Buddha." It appears, Schopen writes, "that all those activities which we associate with an ongoing relic cult did not—for the author of our text (i.e., the *Mahāparinibbāna Sutta*)—form a part of *sarīra-pūjā*, and that *sarīra-pūjā* was used to refer only to funeral activities that began with the wrapping of the body and ended with cremation and constructing a *stūpa* and had—like the injunction as a whole—nothing to do with relics." See Gregory Schopen, "Monks and the Relic Cult in the *Mahāparinibbānasutta*: An Old Misunderstanding in Regard to Monastic Buddhism," in *From Benares to Beijing: Essays on Buddhism and Chinese Religion in Honour of Prof. Jan Yün-hua*, ed. Koichi Shinohara and Gregory Schopen (Oakville: Mosaic Press, 1991): 191. See also Trainor, *Relics, Rituals, and Representation*, Chapter 2.

6. Trainor, *Relics, Rituals, and Representation*, 62–63.

7. Trainor, *Relics, Rituals, and Representation*, Chapters 3 and 4. See also Alice Greenwald, "The Relic on the Spear: Historiography and the Saga of Duṭṭhagāmaṇī," in *Religion and Legitimization of Power in Sri Lanka*, ed. Bardwell L. Smith (Chambersburg: Anima Books, 1978): 15–16.

8. Zürcher, *Buddhist Conquest of China*, 1: 277.

9. *Chu sanzang ji ji*, T. 2145: 96a.1–29. The story is retold in Huijiao's *Gaoseng zhuan*, T. 2059: 325b.10–c.5. The latter record is translated in Robert Shih's *Biographies des moines éminents ("Kao seng tchouan") de Houei-kiao* (Louvain: Institut otientaliste, Bibliothèque de l'universite, 1968): 20–23.

10. Tsukamoto, *A History of Early Chinese Buddhism*, 1: 155. See also Zürcher, *The Buddhist Conquest of China*, 1: 52 and 278; and Koichi Shinohara, "Guanding's Biography of Zhiyi, the Fourth Patriarch of the Tiantai Tradition," in *Speaking of Monks: Religious Biography in India and China*, eds. Phyllis Granoff and Koichi Shinohara (Oakville: Mosaic Press, 1992), Appendix: Stories about Asoka images.

11. Zürcher has listed ten texts telling the story of King Aśoka that were circulating in China at this time; all but one have since been lost. The only extant translation of the Aśoka legend from this period is the *Ayu wang zhuan* (*Aśokarājāvadāna*, T.2042) attributed to the Parthian monk An Fajin. Another translation, a slightly longer version called *Ayu wang jing* (*Aśokarājā Sūtra*, T. 2043), was made by Sengjiapoluo (Saṃghabhara?) in 512. See Zürcher, *Buddhist Conquest of China*, 2: 423, n. 162. John Strong has pointed out that these two Chinese translations are versions of the second-century Aśoka legend found in *Divyāvadāna*. See Strong, *The Legend of King Aśoka*, 16.

12. The earliest surviving Chinese version of this famous text dates from 290, a translation made by Dharmarakṣa. One of the more popular renditions of the text was completed by Kumārajīva in 406. For an English translation of Kamārajīva's version, see Leon Hurvitz, *Scripture of the Lotus Blossom of the Fine Dharma (The Lotus Sūtra)* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1976).

13. *Jin'guangming jing*, T. 663: 353c.21–354a.17. Dharmakṣema is reported to have translated this work during the Northern Liang period.

14. S. 2051, attributed to monk Tanjing. This apocryphal text has been studied and partially translated by Whalen W. Lai in his "The Earliest Folk Buddhist Religion in China: T'i-wei Po-li Ching and Its Historical Significance," in *Buddhist and Taoist Practice in Medieval Chinese Society: Buddhist and Taoist Studies II*, ed. David W. Chappell (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1987): 11–35. The important function of apocryphal/indigenous texts in diffusing Buddhist doctrines into the Chinese society is discussed in *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*, ed. Robert E. Buswell (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1990). The role of such texts is also highlighted in Chün-Fang Yü's study of the transmission and subsequent popularity of the Avalokiteśvara (Ch. Guanyin) cult in China. See

Kuan-yin: The Chinese Transformation of Avalokiteśvara (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), Chapter 3.

15. Koichi Shinohara has done detailed research on the records of Aśoka images and *stūpa*s discovered in China. See the following articles by him: "Guanding's Biography of Zhiyi"; "Two Sources of Chinese Buddhist Biographies: Stupa Inscriptions and Miracle Stories," in *Monks and Magicians: Religious Biographies in Asia*, eds. Phyllis Granoff and Koichi Shinohara (Oakville: Mosaic Press, 1988): 119–228; "*Ji shenzhou sanbao gantonglu*: Some Exploratory Notes," in *Kalyana Mitta: Professor Hajime Nakamura Feliciation Volume*, ed. V. N. Jha (Delhi: Indian Book Center, 1991): 203–224; and "Changing Roles for Miraculous Images in Medieval Chinese Buddhism: A Study of the Miracle Image Section in Daoxuan's 'Collected Records,'" in *Images, Miracles, and Authority in Asian Religious Traditions*, ed. Richard H. Davis (Colorado: Westview Press, 1998): 141–188.

16. *Gaoseng zhuan*, T. 2059: 409b.17–25.

17. For a recent study of Emperor Wu's Buddhist activities, see Andreas Janousch, "The Emperor as Bodhisattva: The Bodhisattva Ordination and Ritual Assemblies of Emperor Wu of the Liang Dynasty," in *State and Court Ritual in China*, ed. Joseph P. McDermott (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999): 112–149.

18. For a detailed study of this episode, see Shinohara, "Two Sources," 154–181.

19. Zürcher, *The Buddhist Conquest of China*, 1: 280.

20. See Janousch, "The Emperor as Bodhisattva."

21. One of the most comprehensive studies on Emperor Wen's veneration and political use of Buddhist relics is Chen's *Śarīra, Sceptre, and Staff*.

22. See Kenneth Ch'en, *Buddhism in China: A Historical Survey* (repr., Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973): 196–201; Arthur F. Wright, *The Sui Dynasty: The Unification of China, A.D. 581–617* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978), Chapter 5; and Chen, *Śarīra, Sceptre, and Staff*.

23. Narendrayaśas's biography in *Xu gaoseng zhuan* notes that the monk was originally from a Kṣatriya family in Uḍḍiyāna. He is reported to have reached China in the seventh year of the Tianbao reign era (556) of the Northern Zhou dynasty. See Daoxuan, *Xu gaoseng zhuan* T. 2060: 432a–433b. Narendrayaśas's biography is also found in Fei Zhangfang's *Lidai sanbao ji* T. 2034: 102c.20–103a.8 On Narendrayaśas's role in interpolating the translations, see E. Zürcher, "'Prince Moonlight.' Messianism and Eschatology in Early Medieval Chinese Buddhism," *T'oung Pao* 68.1–3 (1982): 25–26; and Wright, *The Sui Dynasty*, 133.

24. *Bianzheng lun*, T. 2110: 509a.17–18.

25. *Zongjing mulu*, T. 2146: 149a.20–21.

26. The relic-distribution activities during the Renshou period seem to have been organized with the aim to strengthen Emperor Wen's image as an ideal Buddhist ruler, on par with King Aśoka. They may have been also linked to the emperor's ambition to expand his territories into central and eastern Asia. These three episodes of relic-distribution and the possible imperialistic motives associated with them are examined in detail by Chen Jinhua in *Śarīra, Sceptre, and Staff*, 63–71.

27. Wright, *The Sui Dynasty*, 135. The original instructions are included in Daoxuan's *Guang Hongming ji*, T. 2103: 213b.5–23.

28. See Chen, *Śarīra, Sceptre, and Staff*. Chen cites a passage from the preface to *Sheli Ganying ji*, found in Daoxuan's *Guang Hongming ji* (T. 2103: 213b.26–27), in which these relics are reported to have been presented to Emperor Wen by an Indian monk before the reunification of China in 589. Chen also points to a contradictory passage in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* (T.2060: 667c.25–28), where these relics are noted to have been miraculously obtained by the emperor, his empress, and other members of royal family. See *Śarīra, Sceptre, and Staff*, 53–54, and 181. Both these stories fit the general pattern in which the purported remains of the Buddha were authenticated in China.

29. *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, T. 2106: 408c.10–19.

30. *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, T. 2060: 668b.9–18. See also Chen, *Śarīra, Sceptre, and Staff*, 71.

31. *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, T. 2060: 437c.5–8. See also Forte, "Daiunkyō shō o megutte," 197–198; and Chen, *Śarīra, Sceptre, and Staff*, 70–71. Chen points out that the work *Sheli rui tu jing* may have been closely related to *Sheli ganying ji*. An English translation of the preface to the latter text can be found in Chen's *Śarīra, Sceptre, and Staff*, Appendix A.

32. *Guang Hongming ji*, T. 2103: 217a.17–19. Chen Jinhua observes that these Korean kingdoms may have been "encouraged or even coerced by the Sui government to 'request'" the relics as part of Emperor Wen's imperialistic goals. See *Śarīra, Sceptre, and Staff*, 70.

33. This point has been rightly noted by Benjamin I. Schwartz in his "The Chinese Perception of World Order, Past and Present," *The Chinese World Order* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968): 282.

34. Huang Chi-chiang, "Consecrating the Buddha: Legend, Lore, and History of the Imperial Relic-Veneration Ritual in the T'ang Dynasty," *Zhonghua foxue xuebao* 11 (1998): 483–533.

35. Huang, "Consecrating the Buddha," 502–503.

36. An inscription entitled "Da Tang shengchao Wuyouwangsi dasheng zhenshen baota beiming" (Inscription for the jeweled *stūpa* [containing the] true body of the Great Sage at the Aśoka Monastery of the Divine Dynasty of the Great Tang), bearing a date of the thirteenth year of the Dali reign period (778), contains a story about the origin of the Famen relic. According to the inscription, the relic suddenly appeared on the palm of a Chinese monk searching for Buddhist remains. Inscribed writings on the relic indicated that it was one of the bodily remains of the Buddha originally distributed by King Aśoka. The monk and his fellow brethren then enshrined the relic in what they called the Aśoka *stūpa*. This inscription is incorporated in the eighteenth-century collection of steles compiled by Wang Chang (1725–1806) called *Jinshi cuibian* 101: 1–7. It is

also found in Li Faliang's *Famensi zhi* (Xian: Shaanxi renmin chubanshe, 1995): 203–207.

37. A majority of sources name the governor as Zhang Liang. A few others, however, mention him as Zhang Deliang. This person seems to be the same one as the Minister of the Bureau of Punishments Zhang Liang whose biography appears in the *Jiu Tang shu* (69: 2514–2516) and the *Xin Tang shu* (94: 3828–3829). Zhang Liang is known to have had close associations with the first two Tang emperors (before he was executed for treason in 646) and Chinese monks Zhihui (560–638) and Jinglin (565–640), two eminent Buddhists whose biographies appear in Daoxuan's *Xu gaoseng zhuan* (T. 2060: 541.c17; 590c.12). Huang Chi-chiang suggests that Zhang, as a devout Buddhist, may have played an important role in convincing Emperor Taizong about relic veneration at Famen Monastery. Huang, "Consecrating the Buddha," 503–504; and n. 29. See also Chen, "Śarīra and Scepter: Empress Wu's Political Use of Buddhist Relics," n. 13.

38. *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, T. 2106: 406c.5–18.

39. Daoxuan reports that the public display of the relic was requested by monks Zhizong and Hongjing. The emperor accepted their petition and ordered the display of the relic only if there were appropriate auspicious signs at the site. Daoxuan notes that Zhizong, accompanied by an official from the court, arrived at the Monastery and waited five days before he finally witnessed auspicious lights emitting from the crypt. But, when the monk entered the crypt to retrieve the original relic, he miraculously obtained not one but a total of eight relics. One of these relics is supposed to have been shaped like a small finger, quadrangular, and about one-inch in length. See *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, T. 2106: 406c.23–407b.5.

40. See Chen, "Śarīra," 5.

41. *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, T. 2106: 407b.10–c.11.

42. There are very few Tang records from the Monastery itself that offer clear description of the Famen relic. I know of only one Tang-dynasty inscription that seems to suggest that the relic housed at Famen Monastery was a finger bone. This inscription entitled "Fogu bei" (Inscription [on] the Buddha's Bone) was authored by Zhang Zhongsu of the Hanlin Academy in the early ninth century and is no longer extant. The content of the inscription, however, has survived in Zhipan's *Fozu tongji* (T. 2035: 382a.4–9). Zhang lists the names of Tang rulers who venerated what he calls "the Buddha's phalanx" (*fo zhijie*) housed at Famen Monastery. Some of the Song authors, when detailing the events surrounding the fourth and fifth episodes of relic veneration by the Tang rulers (in 790 and 819 respectively), also use the term Buddha's finger bone (*fo zhigu*), but without much consistency. The commonly used words to describe the Famen relic during the Tang period were *fogu* (bone of the Buddha), *sheli* (relic [of the Buddha]), and *zhenshen* (true body [relic]). In other words, if the Tang rulers were indeed following a preexisting tradition of finger-bone veneration or expressed special interest in a specific type of relic, then contemporary sources fail to reflect the imperial preference.

43. *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, T. 2106: 404a–410a.

44. Edwin O. Reischauer, *Ennin's Diary: The Record of a Pilgrimage to China in Search of the Law* (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1955): 300–303. The four monasteries housing teeth relics were Xiangfu, Dazhongyan, Jianfu, and Chongsheng. The origin of some of these relics is also narrated by Ennin, "The Buddha's tooth at the Ch'ung-sheng-ssu (Chongshengsi) was brought from heaven by Prince Nata and given to the Preceptor [Tao]-hsüan (Daoxuan) of the Chung-nan (Zhongnan) Mountains. The Buddha's tooth at the Chuang-yen-ssu (Zhuangyansi) was brought from India in the flesh of a [person's] thigh. The Protector of the Law, the deity Kabira, was able to bring it. Another was brought by Fa-chieh (Fajie) Ho-shang (Heshang) from the land of Khotan, and another was brought from Tibet. So has run the tradition since early times, and at present in the city the four monasteries make offerings [to the teeth]." *Ennin's Diary*, 302.

45. These four monasteries were respectively located in Dai and Su prefectures, Zhongnan Mountain near Chang'an, and Fufeng (i.e., the Famen Monastery). Reischauer, *Ennin's Diary*, 340.

46. *Jiu Tang shu*, 2: 21.

47. *Zizhi tongjian*, 184: 5766.

48. *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, T. 2106: 406b.26–c.5.

49. Daoxuan reports that the Qi prefecture, the site of the Famen Monastery, was one of many prefectures where Emperor Wen of the Sui dynasty had had *stūpa*s erected in 601. It was also the place where the Renshou Palace, one of the favorite palaces of Emperor Wen, was located. The monastery in the Qi prefecture where the Sui relic was housed was called Fengquansi, located about fifteen miles from the Famen Monastery. See *Guang Hongming ji*, T. 2103: 214b.23–c.4. The absence of a reliquary *stūpa* at the Famen Monastery before Zhang Liang's appearance on the scene has also been observed by Han Jinke in his *Famensi wenhua shi*, 2 vols. (Qishan: Wuzhou chuanbo chubanshe, 1998), 1: 190–191. On the establishment of the reliquary *stūpa* at Fengquansi and importance of Qi prefecture in the Sui context, especially the construction of the Renshou Palace, see Chen, *Śarīra, Sceptre, and Staff*.

50. See Weinstein, *Buddhism under the Tang*, 14–15.

51. It must be noted here that Zhang's visit to the Famen Monastery happened to be exactly thirty years from the time the Sui emperor had first ordered the establishment of *stūpa* at Qi and other prefectures. It is not clear if this fact played any role in formulating the practice of venerating the relic every thirty years.

52. *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, T. 2106: 406c.8–12.

53. The contents of both these inscriptions can be found in Li's *Famensi zhi*, 195, and 203–207. See also note 36 above. Tuoba Yu was originally known as Yuan Yu. See Kegasawa Yasunori, "Famensi de qiyuan yu Tuoba Yu: Cong Famensi Bei Zhou beiwen lai fenxi," translated by Wang Weikun, *Wenbo* 2 (1997): 43–46; and 95.

54. Li Mu's biography can be found in the *Sui shu* 37: 1115–1121. Also included in this chapter are the biographies of Li Min and his father Li Chong. During the Northern Zhou period Li Mu was bestowed the suname Toba. See Kegasawa, "Famensi." The bestowal of the surname Toba to the leading officials was fairly common during the Western Wei and Northern Zhou periods. See Albert E. Dien, "The Bestowal of Surnames under the Western Wei-Northern Chou: A Case of Counter-Acculturation," *T'oung Pao* 63.2–3 (1977): 137–177.

55. Kegasawa, "Famensi." For a detailed examinations of the activites of Li Min and Li Mu at the Famen Monastery, see Chen, "*Śarīra*."

56. The Tang rulers descended from the non-Chinese Xianbei tribe from the steppe region. In order to legitimize their mandate to rule China, they altered their genealogy and claimed themselves as descendants of the legendary Daoist master Laozi and belonging to the Li clan of the Longxi region. On the political reasons behind the fabrication of Tang imperial genealogy, see Chen Yinque, "Tangdai zhengzhi shi shulun gao," in *Chen Yinque shixue lunwen xuanji*, ed. Chen Yinque (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1992), 551–599.

57. The Japanese text *Eichi ni'nen Shingon'in mishihōki* points out that the goal of venerating the Buddha relics inside the imperial palace was to regenerate the health of the emperor. This idea of venerating the relics inside the palace, the text suggests, was devised by the famous Japanese monk Kūkai (774–835). In another work, the Japanese monk Kanjin (1084–1153) propounds that an increase of life span was one of the main merits a patron could attain from venerating the relics of the Buddha. Clearly, the idea of venerating the relics of the Buddha inside the palace and the implied potency of these remains in promoting the health of the emperor were transmitted from China to Japan by Kūkai in the early ninth century. The Japanese monk must have done so after learning about the relic-veneration activities at the Famen Monastery during his one-and-half year stay (c. 803–805) at the Chinese capital. On the veneration of relic in Japan and its use in promoting the emperor's health, see Brian D. Ruppert, *Jewel in the Ashes: Buddha Relics and Power in Early Medieval Japan* (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2000), esp. Chapter 4.

58. See Granoff, "Cures and Karma II."

59. *Zizhi tongjian* 200: 6322; and Denis Twitchett and Howard J. Wechsler, "Kao-tsung (reign 649–83) and Empress Wu: The Inheritor and the Usurper," in *The Cambridge History of China: Volume 3*, ed. Twitchett and Fairbank, 255.

60. Empress Wu, by this time, seems to have taken a more keener interest in a relic discovered at the Guangzhai Quarter of the Tang capital. On the building of a reliquary *stūpa* at the site of discovery and the veneration activities surrounding this relic, see Chen, "Śarīra," 6–13.

61. On Wu Zetian's interest in Daoist longevity techniques and her attitude toward Buddhism during the later stages of her life, see Rao Zongyi (Jao Tsung-i), "Cong shike lun Wuhou zhi zongjiao xinyang," *Zhongyang yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiusuo jikan* 45 (1974): 397–412. See also Barrett, *Taoism*, 44.

62. *Tang Tae Ch'ŏnboksa kosaju pŏn'gyŏng taedŏk Pŏpchang hwasang chŏn*, T. 2054:284a.1–11. In 705, the *mingtang* in Luoyang, as Antonino Forte has pointed out, was not the famous Wanxiang shenggong (Divine Palace of the Myriad Images), the site of great Buddhist ceremonies conducted under the auspices of Wu Zetian and connected to the prophecy of the advent of the future Buddha Maitreya (see later in this chapter). Rather, it was Tongtian gong (Palace to Communicate with Heaven), which was constructed at the same location in 695–696 after a fire accident destroyed the former in 694. See Forte, *Mingtang and Buddhist Utopia*, Chapter 3. For a detailed study of the veneration of Famen relic in 704–705, see Chen, "Śarīra," 19–25.

63. Forte, *Mingtang and Buddhist Utopia*, 161–163.

64. This can be discerned from two inscriptions found at the Famen Monastery. The first one is titled "Tang Zhongzong xiafa ruta ming" ([Imperial] Orders Issued by the Tang [Emperor] Zhongzong to Place [the *Śarīra*] Inside the *Stūpa*) was excavated in 1978. The second called "Da Tang Xiantong qisong Qiyang zhenshen zhiwen" (Stele Inscription on the Reception and Restoration of the True Body from Qiyang [during] the Xiantong [Reign Period] of the Great Tang [Dynasty]) was found in 1987. See Li, *Famensi zhi* for the contents of these inscriptions.

65. Yan Chaoyin, "Da Tang da Jianfusi gu dade Kang Fazang dashi zhi bei," T. 2054: 280b.11–12; *Tang Tae Ch'ŏnboksa kosaju pŏn'gyŏng taedŏk Pŏpchang hwasang chŏn*, T. 2054: 283b.10–11; and *Fajiezong fuzu lüeji*, *Xuzang jing* 134: 545c. See also Kamata Shigeo, "Xianshou dashi Fazang yu Famensi," in *Shoujie guoji Famensi lishi wenhua xueshu yantaohui lunwen xuanji*, ed. Zhang Qizhi and Han Jinke (Xian: Shaanxi renmin jiaoyu chubanshe, 1992): 122–127. The Japanese version of this essay appears as "Genjū Daishi Hōjō to Hōmonji," *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 38.1 (1988): 232–237.

66. *Tang Tae Ch'ŏnboksa kosaju pŏn'gyŏng taedŏk Pŏpchang hwasang chŏn*, T. 2054: 284a.2. The destruction of liver mentioned here should not be, as Chen Jinhua in a personal communication has cautioned me, taken in the literal sense. Instead, it was probably a rumor which spread among the relic worshipers and onlookers.

67. *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, T. 2106: 406c.21–22.

68. Relic veneration in 819 and 873, for example, are reported to have prompted episodes of the laity mutilating their body parts, including fingers, as offerings to the Buddha. For reports of self-mutilations in 819, see *Tang hui yao* 47: 981–984. The account in *Tang hui yao* also includes Han Yu's criticism of relic veneration by Tang rulers and the practice of self-mutilation. See Homer H. Dubs's translation in "Han Yü and the Buddha's Relic: An Episode in Medieval Chinese Religion," *Review of Religion* 11 (1946): 11–12. For accounts of relic veneration in 873, see *Xin Tang shu* 181: 5354; and *Zizhi tongjian* 252: 8165. *Song gaoseng zhuan* (T. 2061: 857.a16–18) reports that during the Xiantong reign era (860–873) a monk called Yuanhui (819–896) burned his left thumb as an offering to the relic at the Famen Monastery. The same work (T. 2061: 858.a.16–19)

also notes that during the reign of Emperor Gaozu (936–942) of the Jin dynasty (936–946) a monk called Xichen (875?–937?) burned one of his fingers at the Monastery. These episodes at the Famen Monastery and their relevance to the practice of self-mutilation in medieval China are aptly discussed in James A. Benn's "Where Text Meets Flesh: Burning the Body as an Apocryphal Practice in Chinese Buddhism," *History of Religions* 37.4 (May 1998): 296–321; and in his "Burning for the Buddha: Self-immolation in Chinese Buddhism," (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2001). An earlier study of self-immolation in China is Jan Yün-hua's "Buddhist Self-Immolation in Medieval China," *History of Religions* 4.2 (1965): 243–268.

69. Benn, "Where Text Meets Flesh." See also Jacques Gernet, "Les suicides par le feu chez les bouddhistes chinoises du Ve au Xe siècle," *Mélanges publiés par l'Institut des Hautes Études chinoises* 2 (1959): 528–558.

70. *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, T. 2106: 406c.18–23.

71. Kieschnick, *The Eminent Monk*, 44.

72. Cui Xuanwei, who held the title of *Fengge shilang* (Attendant Gentleman of the Phoenix Hall) and oversaw the Empress' health, is reported to have accompanied monk Fazang to the Famen Monastery with orders to "welcome" the relic to the imperial palace. See *Zizhi tongjian* 207: 6575. Cui Xuanwei's involvement in the process of retrieving the relic seems to be a clear indication of the connection between Wu Zetian's poor health and decision to bring the Famen relic into the palace.

73. Birnbaum, *The Healing Buddha*, 31–33.

74. Emperor Xuanzong's opposition to Buddhist ceremonies and his antipathy toward Buddhist support for Empress Wu may have been responsible for the absence of relic-veneration activities at the Famen Monastery between 704 and 760.

75. *Fozu tongji*, T. 2035: 376a.16–20. See also the inscription "Da Tang shengchao Wuyouwangsi." The latter record suggests that the veneration of the relic at the Tang palace took place in 760.

76. Weinstein, *Buddhism under the T'ang*, 58.

77. On the contributions of these three monks to the spread of esoteric Buddhism during the Tang dyansty, see Chou, "Tantrism in China."

78. Reports on the 1987 excavation of objects from the Famen Monastery crypt include, Shaanxi sheng Famensi kaocha dui, "Fufeng Famensi ta Tangdai digong fajue jianbao," *Wenwu* 10 (1988): 1–28; Su Bai et al., "Famensi ta digong chutu wenwu bitan," *Wenwu* 10 (1988): 29–43; Kegasawa Yasunori, "Fufu Hōmonji no rekishi to genzu—Butsusai no kita dera," *Bukkyō Geijutsu* 179 (1988): 87–105. Detailed discussions on the objects, their origins, and relevance to contemporary Buddhism can be found among the essays included in *Shoujie guoji Famensi lishi wenhua* edited by Zhang Qizhi and Han Jinke.

79. Most recent and detailed discussion of the esoteric influences on the relic veneration at the Famen Monastery is *Famensi digong Tang mi mantuluo zhi yanjiu*, ed. Wu Limin and Han Jinke (Hong Kong: Zhongguo fojiao wenhua chuban youxian gongsi, 1998). The topic is also discussed by Roderick Whitfield in his "Esoteric Buddhist Elements in the Famensi Reliquary Deposit," *Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques* 44.2 (1990): 247–257; and Patricia Eichenbaum Karetzky, "Esoteric Buddhism and the Famensi Finds," *Archives of Asian Art* 47 (1994): 78–85.

80. Dubs, "Han Yü and the Buddha's Relic," 12.

81. Reischauer, *Ennin's Diary*, 340.

82. *Jiu Tang shu*, 19: 683; and Dubs, "Han Yü and the Buddha's Relic," 16.

83. *Zizhi tongjian*, 252: 8165; and Dubs, "Han Yü and the Buddha's Relic," 16.

84. Chen Quanfang, Bo Ming, and Han Jinke, *Famensi yu fojiao* (Taibei: Shuiniu tushu chuban shiye youxian gongsi, 1992): 103–118.

85. *Ruyi baozhu zhanlun pimi xianshen chengfo jinlun zhou wang jing*, T. 961: 332c; and Liu, *Silk and Religion*, 43.

86. On the establishment of the Avalokiteśvara cult at Mount Putuo, see Chün-fang Yü, *Kuan-yin*, Chapter 9.

87. Useful discussion on the role of these bodhisattvas in Buddhist theology and their manifestations in China can be found in Paul Williams's *Mahāyāna Buddhism: The Doctrinal Foundations* (London: Routledge, 1989).

88. The obscure origins of Mañjuśrī and the possible association to Pañcaśikha were first proposed by Marcelle Lalou in *Iconographie des étoffes peintes (paṭa) dans le Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1930). It is also pointed out in Étienne Lamotte's "Mañjuśrī," *T'oung Pao* 48. 1–3 (1960): 1–96; and extensively discussed by Anthony Tribe in "Manjusri: Origins, Role And Significance (Parts I & II), *Western Buddhist Review* 2 (1994): 23–49. Tribe's two-part article is also available on the following website: www.westernbuddhistreview.com.

89. One of the best studies of this text is Étienne Lamotte's *The Teaching of Vimalakirti (Vimalakīrtinirdeśa)*, translated into English by Sara Boin (London: The Pali Text Society, 1976).

90. The functions and characteristics of Mañjuśrī are detailed in Lamotte, "Mañjuśrī," 23–31; and Tribe, "Manjusri: Origins, Role And Significance."

91. Lamotte, "Mañjuśrī," 5–6. On the early Chinese versions of this text, see Étienne Lamotte, *Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra: The Concentration of Heroic Progress*, translated by Sara Boin-Webb (Richmond: Curzon Press, 1998): 56–98.

92. The earliest extant translation of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa Sūtra* is by Zhi Qian, which he completed between 222 and 253. On Chinese translations of the text, see Lamotte, *The Teaching of Vimalakīrti*, xxvi–xxxvii.

93. Raoul Birnbaum has suggested that *Mañjuśrīparinirvāṇa Sūtra* may have been a work of the fifth or sixth century and deliberately attributed to an earlier translator. See "The Manifestation of a Monastery: Shen-Ying's Experiences on Mount Wu-T'ai in T'ang Context," *Journal of American Oriental Society* 106.1 (1986): 123–124.

94. For a complete translation of the text (into French), see Lamotte, "Mañjuśrī," 35–39. An English translation can be found in Mary Anne Cartelli, "The Poetry of Mount Wutai: Chinese Buddhist Verses from Dunhuang," (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1999): 40–46.

95. The analogies between the geographical setting of Mañjuśrī's future abode described in the prophecy and Mount Wutai are discussed in Lamotte's "Mañjuśrī," 34–35; and Cartelli's, "The Poetry of Mount Wutai," 36.

96. See Hajime Nakamura, *Indian Buddhism: A Survey with Bibliographical Notes* (repr., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1989): 197.

97. *Dafangguang fo huayan jing*, T. 278: 590a.3–5.

98. Lamotte, "Mañjuśrī," 73–84.

99. See, for example, Huixiang's seventh-century account of the Mountain entitled *Gu Qingliang zhuan* (Ancient Records of the Clear-and-Cold [Mountain], T. 2098).

100. *Ji Shenzhou sanbao gantong lu*, T. 2106: 424c.22–27. Daoxuan's complete notice is translated in Birnbaum's "The Manifestation of a Monastery," 120–121.

101. Cartelli, "The Poetry of Mount Wutai," 50.

102. Huixiang, *Gu Qingliang zhuan*, T. 2098: 1098c.18–1099b.9. Śākyamitra, as noted in the previous chapter, was also housed at the Penglai palace along with the longevity-physician Lokāditya.

103. Huiying and Hu Yaozheng, *Dafangguang fo huayan jing ganying zhuan*, T. 2074: 175b.7. The two monks are said to have lost their way on Mount Wutai, but, as Huiying and Hu Yaozheng tell us, Mañjuśrī manifested himself as a nun and came to their rescue.

104. *Song gaoseng zhuan*, T. 2061: 770b.6–11. The pilgrimages by Indian monks to Mount Wutai during the Tang dynasty are discussed by Lamotte, "Mañjuśrī," 84–91; and by Richard Schneider in "Un moine Indien au Wou-t'ai chan: relation d'un pèlerinage," *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 3 (1987): 27–43. The pilgrimages of the four Indian monks mentioned here are, however, not found in Lamotte and Schneider's articles. For an extensive list of monks, both Chinese and foreign, making pilgrimage to the Mountain from the Northern Wei period to the Ming dynasty, see Du Doucheng, *Dunhuang Wutai shan wenxian jiaolu yanjiu* (Taiyuan: Shanxi renmin chubanshe, 1991): 233–286.

105. *Nanhai jigui neifa zhuan*, T. 2125:228b.13–14.

106. The pouring of tears and the feeling of joy by Buddhapāli is similar to the expression of joy and grief expressed by Chinese pilgrims visiting sacred Buddhist sites in India (see Chapter 1, n.107). Here the same expression of grief and joy is employed not only to describe the common feelings of a pilgrim, but perhaps also to underscore the presence of legitimate sacred sites within China. For various versions of Buddhapāli's story, see n. 109 below.

107. This episode and the contents of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* (T. 967) are discussed in detail by Liu Shufen in "*Foding zunsheng tuoluoni jing* yu Tangdai zunsheng jingchuang de jianli—jingzhong yanjiu zhi yi," *Zhongyang yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiusuo jikan* 67.1 (1996): 145–193; and "Jingchuang de xingzhi, xingzhi he laiyuan zhi er," *Zhongyang yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiusuo jikan* 68.3 (1997): 643–786.

108. The dubious nature of the story is obvious here. The reigning ruler in 683 was still Emperor Gaozong, albeit nominally. The four versions of the text translated under the auspices of Empress Wu are discussed in Chen's "Śarīra," 25–32.

109. The earliest version of this story seems to have appeared in the preface attached to the translation of the *Buddha uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* (T. 967: 349b.1–c.5). The episode is also reported in Yanyi's *Guang Qingliang zhuan* (T. 2099: 1111a–b), compiled in 1060; and Buddhapāli's biography in *Song gaoseng zhuan*, T. 2061: 717c.15–718b.7. The popularity of this story among the pilgrims visiting the mountain during later periods is discussed in Birnbaum's "The Caves of Wu-t'ai Shan," 130–131.

110. See, for example, *Ennin's Diary*, 217 and 246; and *Guang Qingliang zhuan*, T. 2099: 1114a–1115a. Yanyi's version has been translated into English by Daniel Stevenson in "Visions of Mañjuśrī on Mount Wutai," in *Religions of China in Practice*, ed. Donald S. Lopez, Jr. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996): 212–220.

111. The preface, which seems to be the original source of the Buddhapāli story, was written sometime after three other versions of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* had appeared in Chinese. The first version, *Foding zunsheng tuoluoni* (T. 968), attributed to Du Xingyi, was completed in 679; and the other two translations were rendered by the Indian monk Dipokeluo (Divākara?) in 682 (*Foding zunsheng tuoluoni jing*, T. 969) and 687 (*Zuisheng foding tuoluoni jing chu ye zhang chou jing*, T. 970), respectively. Not only were Du Xingyi and Divākara closely associated with the monks attempting to advance Empress Wu political agenda, the three texts, which contain an incantation to escape the realm of purgatory, may have been apocryphal. Thus, the section of the preface narrating Buddhapāli's introduction of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* text from India, and indeed the validity of the entire episode of the Kaśmīri monk's pilgrimage to Mount Wutai is questionable. For a detailed examination of the translation of these versions of *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī*, see Chen, "Śarīra," 25–32.

112. Forte, "Hui-chih," 118.

113. See Forte, *Political Propaganda*; and Weinstein, *Buddhism under the T'ang*, 44–45.

114. *Dafangguang fo huayan jing*, T. 279: 241b.20–23.

115. *Ennin's Diary*, 237; and Cartelli, "The Poetry of Mount Wutai," 27.

116. See Weinstein, *Buddhism under the T'ang*, 177, n. 20.

117. Birnbaum, "The Manifestation of a Monastery," 124. The original passage is from T. 1185A: 791b.24–c.19. Translation of the text is also given in Birnbaum, *Studies on the Mysteries of Mañjuśrī: A Group of East Asian Maṇḍalas and Their Traditional Symbolism* (Boulder: Society for the Study of Chinese Religions, 1983): 11–13.

118. Lamotte, "Mañjuśrī," 90–91.

119. *Ennin's Diary*, 240, 266, and 268. Ennin also reports that he had learned about three Indian monks from the Nālandā Monastery who had visited the Mountain in 839. See *Ennin's Diary*, 217–218, and 228.

120. *Guang Qingliang zhuan*, T. 2099: 1109a.29.

121. See Birnbaum, *Studies on the Mysteries of Mañjuśrī*, 30. Orlando Raffaello has explained that Amoghavajra chose to highlight the importance of Mañjuśrī "in order to emphasize the fact that the Tantric school shared a common philosophical heritage with the other, older Mahāyāna schools in China, thus making Tantrism seem less alien and remote to Chinese Buddhism." See Raffaello, "A Study of Chinese Documents Concerning the Life of the Tantric Buddhist Patriarch Amoghavajra (A.D. 705–774)," (Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 1981): 27, n. 43.

122. On Amoghavajra's memorial to Emperor Daizong seeking funds to (re-)construct this temple, see Raffaello, "A Study of Chinese Documents," 56–61. Raffaello's work includes translations of other memorials from Amoghavajra and related Imperial edicts concerning the veneration of Mañjuśrī.

123. Birnbaum, *Studies on the Mysteries of Mañjuśrī*, 30–38.

124. Yuanzhao, *Taizong chao zeng sigong dabian zheng guangzhi sanzang heshang shang biaozhi ji*, T. 2120: 841c.8–19. Raffaello, "A Study of Chinese Documents," 73.

125. Birnbaum, *Studies on the Mysteries of Mañjuśrī*, 34.

126. It must be noted here that Amoghavajra's teacher Vajrabodhi, as pointed out in the previous chapter, is reported to have come to China especially to pay obeisance to Mañjuśrī. See *Zhenyuan xinding shijiao mulu*, T. 2157: 876a.13–22.

127. Chen, *Making and Remaking History*, 27–28, n. 12.

128. Birnbaum, *Studies on the Mysteries of Mañjuśrī*, 31.

129. An excellent study of Hanguang's activities at Mount Wutai and his role in the tale of reverse transmission of Buddhist doctrines is Jinhua Chen's *Making and Remaking History*, Chapter 2. Although Hanguang's biography in the *Song gaoseng zhuan* fails to give his place of birth and essentially describes him as a Chinese native (T. 2061: 879b.14), other sources list him as an Indian monk. The reason for this confusion in the nationality of Hanguang may have resulted from the fact that he had accompanied Amoghavajra to India and then returned to China. The sources that list him as an Indian apparently failed to take into account the monk's departure from China in 741.

130. Zhanran, *Fahua wenju ji*, T. 1719: 359c.13–17. The translation here is by Jinhua Chen in *Making and Remaking History*, 26.

131. Chen, *Making and Remaking History*, 26–39.

132. *Fayuan zhulin*, T. 2122: 1012.c16–27.

133. See Liu Shufen, "'*Foding zunsheng tuoluoni jing*,'" 166.

134. *Jiu Tang shu*, 196b: 5266. See also Paul Demiéville, *Le concile de Lhasa: une controverse sur le quiétisme entre bouddhistes de l'Inde et de la Chine au VIIIe siècle de l'ère chrétienne* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale de France, 1952): 188, n.1; and 376–377.

135. On the late development of the Mañjuśrī imagery in India, see David Snellgrove, *Indo-Tibetan Buddhism: Indian Buddhists and Their Tibetan Successors*, 2 vols. (Boston: Shambhala, 1987), 1: 314; and Williams, *Mahāyāna Buddhism*, 240–241.

136. A. Foucher, *Étude l'iconographie Bouddhique de l'Inde*, 2 vols. (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1900), 2:114–115. See also S. K. Saraswati, *Tantrayāna Art: An Album* (Calcutta: The Asiatic Society, 1977): 79–80, 85.

137. See Takata Tokio, "Multilingualism in Tun-huang," *Acta Asiatica: Bulletin of the Institute of Eastern Culture* 78 (2000): 53 and 57. The Indian monk who participated in the writing of this formulary was called Devaputra. See Joseph Hackin in *Formulaire Sanscrit-Tibétain du Xe siècle* (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1924). For the Sanskrit-Khotanese text, see H. W. Bailey, "Hvatanica III," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies* 9.3 (1938): 521–543; and Kumamoto Hiroshi, "Saiiki ryokōshayō Sansukuritto-Kōtango kaiwa renshūchō," *Seinan Ajia kenkyū* 28 (1988): 52–82. See also Rong Xinjiang, "Dunhuang wenxian suojian wan Tang, Wudai, Song chu de Zhong-Yin wenhua jiaowang," in *Ji Xianlin jiaoshou bashi huadan jinian lunwen ji*, 2 vols. ed. Li Zheng et al., (Nanchang: Jiangxi renmin chubanshe, 1991), 2: 955–968.

138. Translated in Bailey, "Hvatanica III," 528–529.

139. For urban decay in northern India and its consequences, see Chapter 4.

140. Étienne Lamotte, *History of Indian Buddhism: From the Origins to the Śaka Era*, translated by Sara Boin-Webb (Louvain: Institut Orientaliste, 1988): 192.

141. One of the best studies on the Buddhist prophecy of the disappearance of the doctrine is Jan Nattier's *Once Upon a Future Time: Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline* (Asian Humanities Press, 1991). Mainstream (non-Mahāyāna) views on the topic are discussed in Steven Collins, *Nirvana and other Buddhist Felicities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), Chapter 5. See also Lamotte, *History of Indian Buddhism*, 191–202; David W. Chappell, "Early Forebodings of the Death of Buddhism." *Numen* 27 (1980): 122–153; and more recently Jamie Hubbard, *Absolute Delusion, Perfect Buddhahood: The Rise and Fall of a Chinese Heresy* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2001): 36–54.

142. On the concept of seven jewels, see Chapter 4, n.10.

143. Nattier, *Once Upon a Future Time*, 14; and Collins, *Nirvana and Other Buddhist Felicities*, 361–373.

144. Hubbard, *Absolute Delusion*, Chapter 2.

145. Nattier, *Once Upon a Future Time*, 28–29.

146. *Vinaya, Cullavagga* X: 1.6. Translated by Henry Clarke Warren, *Buddhism in Translations* (repr. New York: Atheneum, 1968): 447; cited in Nattier, *Once Upon a Future Time*, 28–29. See also Michel Strickmann, *Mantras et mandarins: Le bouddhisme tantrique en Chine* (Paris: Gallimard, 1996): 97.

147. For a detailed study of various versions of the Kauśāmbī prophecy, see Nattier, *Once Upon a Future Time*, Chapters 7–10.

148. See Nattier, *Once Upon a Future Time*, 150–157.

149. Lamotte notes that some of these events transpired in the last two centuries before the Common Era, starting with Demetrius's conquest of Gandhāra, Punjab, and the Indus Valley in 189, followed by the two invasions of central India by Greek armies led by Apollodotus and Menander in 189 and 169 resepectively, and the entry of Śaka forces of Maues into Taxila in the year 90. See *History of Indian Buddhism*, 201.

150. Nattier, *Once Upon a Future Time*, 155–156.

151. See A. L. Basham, *The Wonder That Was India: A Survey of the Culture of the Indian Sub-Continent before the Coming of the Muslims* (New York: Grove Press, 1959): 274; Joseph M. Kitagawa, "The Many Faces of Maitreya: A Historian of Religions' Reflections," in *Maitreya, the Future Buddha*, eds. Alan Sponberg and Helen Hardacre (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988): 10; and Padmanabh S. Jaini, "Stages in the Bodhisattva Career of the Thatāgata Maitreya," in *Maitreya*, 3 and 80, n.2.

152. Personal communication, April 10, 2001. For the general Indo-Iranian background of the Mithra and Maitreya cults as well as their developments elsewhere in Eurasia, see Soho Machida, "Life and Light, the Infinite: A Historical and Philological Analysis of the Amida Cult," *Sino-Platonic Papers* 9 (December 1988): 1–46.

153. Romila Thapar, "Millenarianism and Religion in Early India," in *Cultural Pasts: Essays in Early Indian History*, ed. Romila Thapar (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2000): 955.

154. The name Ajita ("unconquerable") is equated by Lamotte as Invictus, indicating again the possible Persian-Greek influence on the concept of Maitreya. See *History of Indian Buddhism*, 705.

155. See Jaini, "Stages in the Bodhisattva." Early Buddhist texts, however, report that Ajita and Maitreya were co-disciples of a Brahman ascetic called Bāvari and were later converted by the Buddha. Others note of Buddha's prediction that Ajita would be reborn as the *cakravartin* King Śaṅkha before the arrival of Maitreya. See Lamotte, *History of Indian Buddhism*, 699–710.

156. Jan Nattier, "The Meanings of the Maitreya Myth: a Typological Analysis," in *Maitreya*, 25–32.

157. There is a vast amount of literature on the topic of messianic movements associated with Buddhist prophecies regarding Maitreya's imminent advent. See, for example, E. Zürcher, "Eschatology and Messianism in Early Chinese Buddhism," in *Leyden Studies in Sinology: Papers Presented at the Conference Held in Celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Sinological Institute of Leyden University, December 8–12, 1980*, ed. W. L. Idema (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981): 34–56; and Zürcher, "'Prince Moonlight.'" For later episodes, see Daniel L. Overmyer, *Folk Buddhist Religion: Dissenting Sects in Late Traditional China* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976); and B. J. ter Haar, *The White Lotus Teachings in Chinese Religious History* (repr., Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999).

158. For Daoist messianic views and rebellions during the Han dynasty, see Anna K. Seidel, "The Image of the Perfect Ruler in Early Taoist Messianism: Laotzu and Li Hung," *History of Religions* 9.2–3 (1969–1970): 216–247; and Zürcher, "'Prince Moonlight,'" 2–6.

159. See David Ownby, "Chinese Millenarian Traditions: The Formative Age," *The American Historical Review* 104.2 (December 1999): 1513–1530; and Strickmann, *Mantras et mandarins*, 100–110.

160. Maitreya cult in the oasis states of Central Asia is discussed by Yu Min Lee in "The Maitreya Cult and Its Art in Early China," (Ph.D. diss., The Ohio State University, 1983).

161. One such text, called *Guan Mile Pusa shangsheng doushuaitian jing* (Visualization of the Maitreya Buddha Ascending the Tuṣita Heaven, T. 452) was translated in the mid-fifth century by Juqu Jingsheng, a prince of the Northern Liang kingdom. *Gaoseng zhuan* (T. 2059: 37a.4–15) reports that Juqu Jingsheng was a younger brother of Juqu Mengxun, the founder of the Northern Liang kingdom and an avid supporter of Buddhist doctrines. Juqu Jingsheng in his youth is known to have traveled to Khotan to study Buddhism. On his way back to China, he obtained texts on visualizing Maitreya and Mañjuśrī from the Turfan region. See also Lee, "The Maitreya Cult," 45–47, 243.

162. Lee, "Maitreya Cult," Chapters 3 and 4.

163. Zürcher, "'Prince Moonlight,'" 13–14.

164. See Tsukamoto Zenryū, *Shina bukkyō shi kenkyū* (Tokyo: Kōbundō shobō, 1944): 247–285.

165. Ownby, "Chinese Millenarian Traditions," 1526.

166. T. 535: 819b.1–5. See also Zürcher, *The Buddhist Conquest*, 1: 315 and 2: 437–438, n. 130; and Zürcher, "'Prince Moonlight,'" 23–24.

167. For a detailed study of rebellions associated with the Maitreya/Chandraprabha cult during the Tang and Song periods, see Shigematsu Toshiaki, "Tō-Sō jidai no Miroku kyōhi," *Shien* 3 (1931): 68–103. See also, Forte, *Mingtang and Buddhist Utopias*, 24–36.

168. Messianic movements from Song through to the Qing periods and the formation of the White Lotus Society are discussed in Overmyer, *Folk Buddhist Religion*; ter Haar, *The White Lotus Teachings*; and Susan Naquin, *Millenarian Rebellion in China: The Eight Trigrams Uprising of 1813* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976).

169. Kenneth Ch'en, *Buddhism in China: A Historical Survey* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964): 178.

170. *Foshuo Dehu zhangzhe jing*, T. 545: 849b.22–c.4. See also Zürcher, 'Prince Moonlight,' 25–26.

171. On the significance of the Alms-bowl and its connection to Chinese veneration of Buddhist relics, see Kuwayama Shōshin, "The Buddha's Bowl in Gandhāra and Relevant Problems," in *South Asian Archaeology 1987: Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference of the Association of South Asian Archaeologists in Western Europe, held in the Foundazione Giorgio Cini, Island of San Giorgio Maggiore,*

Venice, ed. Maurizio Taddei (Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1990): 2: 945–978; and the excellent study by Françoise Wang-Toutain entitled "Le bol du Buddha: Propagation du bouddhisme et légitimité politique," *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 81 (1994): 59–82.

172. Zürcher, "'Prince Moonlight,'" 26. See also Wang-Toutain, "Le bol du Buddha," 75–78.

173. Empress Wu's mother was the granddaughter of Yang Da, a paternal cousin of Emperor Wen. The parallels in the use of Buddhism for political goals by these two Chinese rulers are outlined in Chen's *Sarīra, Sceptre, and Staff*, 71–80.

174. On Wu Zetian's rise to power, see R.W.L. Guisso, *Wu Tse-T'ien*, Chapter 3. An overview of the role of Maitreya veneration in Tang politics can be found in Wang Juan's "Tangdai Mile xinyang yu zhengzhi guanxi de yi cemian: Tangchao huangshi dui Mile xinyang de taitu," *Zhonghua foxue xuebao* 4 (1991): 288–296.

175. Guisso, *Wu Tse-T'ien*, 20.

176. Richard W. L. Guisso, "The Reigns of the Empress Wu, Chung-tsung and Jui-tsung (684–712)," in *Cambridge History of China, Volume 3*, eds. Twitchett and Fairbank, 291–292.

177. Weinstein, *Buddhism under the T'ang*, 41. On Wu Zetian's use of Buddhism in legitimizing her reign, see Forte, *Political Propaganda*; Guisso, *Wu Tse-T'ien*, and Chen Yinque, "Wuzhao yu fojiao," *Zhongyang yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiusuo jikan* 5 (1932): 137–147.

178. Guisso, "The Reigns of Empress Wu," 300.

179. A summary of this text is given in Forte's *Political Propaganda*, 271–280. See also Forte's recent article "The Maitreyist Huaiyi (D. 695) and Taoism," *Tang yanjiu* 4 (1998): 15–29.

180. Forte, *Mingtang and Buddhist Utopias*, 32–36.

181. Forte, *Mingtang and Buddhist Utopias*, 253–254.

182. An excellent study of the Dunhuang manuscript of the text (S. 6502) and the monks who compiled it is Forte's *Political Propaganda*. A shorter version of the text (S. 2658) is translated in Guisso's *Wu Tse-T'ien*.

183. In the Taishō edition, the title of this text appears as *Dafangdeng wuxiang jing* (*Mahāvaipulya asaṃjña/alakṣaṇa Sūtra?*). It is summarized in Forte's *Political Propaganda*, Appendix A.

184. A summary of the text translated by Dharmakṣema is given in Forte's *Political Propaganda*, 253–270.

185. *Zizhi tongjian*, 204: 6466.

186. *Zizhi tongjian*, 205: 6497.

187. *Baoyu jing*, T. 660:284b.17–22, translated in Forte's *Political Propaganda*, 130.

188. Forte, *Mingtang and Buddhist Utopias*, 18.

189. *Xin Tang shu*, 4: 95; and *Zizhi tongjian*, 205: 6502.

190. The complete translation of the colophon can be found in Forte's *Political Propaganda*, 171–176.

191. Forte, "Hui-Chih," 125.

192. Antonino Forte, "The Activities in China of the Tantric Master Manicintana (Pao-ssu-wei:?–721 A.D.) from Kashmir and of his Northern Indian Collaborators," *East and West* 34.1–3 (1984): 301–347.

193. A list of Indian nationals present in Chang'an during the Tang period can be found in Ge Chengyong's "Tang Chang'an Yindu ren zhi yanjiu," *Tang yanjiu* 6 (2000): 303–320.

194. *Xin Tang shu*, 26: 559.

195. Forte, *Mingtang and Buddhist Uthopias*, 24–36.

196. Forte, "Hui-chih," 127.

Chapter Three

1. See, for example, R. C. Mitra, *The Decline of Buddhism in India* (Santiniketan: Visva Bharati Press, 1954); and Kanai Lal Hazra, *The Rise and Decline of Buddhism in India* (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 1995).

2. See Kenneth Ch'en, "The Sale of Monk Certificates during the Sung Dynasty: A Factor in the Decline of Buddhism in China," *Harvard Theological Review* 49 (1956): 307–327.

3. Ch'en's *Buddhism in China*, for example, devotes only twenty pages, in a section titled "Decline," to Buddhism during the Song dynasty.

4. *Fozu tongji*, T. 2035: 409c.28–410a.3.

5. *Fozu tongji*, T. 2035: 406c.15–16.

6. See Jan Yün-hua, "Buddhist Historiography in Sung China," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellscharft* 114 (1964): 360–381.

7. Peter N. Gregory, "The Vitality of Buddhism in the Sung," in *Buddhism in the Sung*, eds. Peter N. Gregory and Daniel A. Gertz, Jr. (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999): 2. See also T. Griffith Foulk, "Myth, Ritual, and Monastic Practice in Sung Ch'an Buddhism," in *Religion and Society in T'ang and Sung China*, eds. Patricia Buckley Ebrey and Peter N. Gregory (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1993): 147–197.

8. Some of the recent studies that have demonstrated the prevalence of Buddhist doctrines in the Song society include Mark Robert Halperin's "Pieties and Responsibilities: Buddhism and the Chinese Literati, 780–1280," (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1997); and Edward L. Davis's *Society and the Supernatural in Song China* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2001). While the former work examines the popularity of Buddhist doctrines among the Song literati, the latter study illustrates the frequent use of esoteric Buddhist therapeutic rites and funerary rituals by the laity.

9. Jan Yün-hua, "Buddhist Relations between India and Sung China," *History of Religions* 6.2 (1966): 135–144.

10. Jan, "Buddhist Relations," 6.2: 139.

11. Jan, "Buddhist Relations," 6.2: 136–138.