

Stories from the Life of Chi-tsang and Their Use in T'ien-t'ai Sectarian Historiography

The important Sung-era history titled *A Chronology of Buddhist Patriarchs* (*Fō-tsu t'ung-chi* 佛祖統紀) identifies the monk Chi-tsang 吉藏 (549–623) as a direct disciple of the equally prominent monk Kuan-ting 灌頂 (561–632).¹ Chi-tsang was one of the greatest textual exegetes of Chinese Buddhism and came to be considered as *de facto* founder of the San-lun 三論 Sect. Moreover, *Buddhist Patriarchs*, being a work of the T'ien-t'ai 天台 Sect, considered Kuan-ting to have been successor to the T'ien-t'ai patriarch Chih-i 智顛 (538–597). Because of the ideological entanglements of these Buddhist lineages, the account of Chi-tsang's relationship with Kuan-ting given in *Buddhist Patriarchs*, if true, might provide not only an important insight into the relationship between two major Buddhist figures; it would also help us to understand the early history of the San-lun and T'ien-t'ai Sects. As we evaluate Chi-tsang's putative discipleship under Kuan-ting, two facts immediately come to our attention. First of all, Kuan-ting was twelve years younger than Chi-tsang; and second, early accounts of Chi-tsang portray him as an extremely proud, or even arrogant, man, who rarely if ever showed respect to contemporaries and debated with nearly every Buddhist exegete whom he encountered during his lengthy teaching career.

Although biographical facts like the above may be adduced, it remains nonetheless true that any attempt to recover the personality of a monk from

THIS ARTICLE summarizes my forthcoming monograph, *Making and Remaking History: A Study of Tiantai Sectarian Historiography*, *Studia Philologica Buddhica Mon. Ser.* (Tokyo: Intl. College of Buddhist Studies). The latter is partially a result of my postdoctoral research, which has been supported by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS), and conducted at the Institute for Research in Humanities at Kyoto University under the supervision of Professor Aramaki Noritoshi 荒牧典俊. I am grateful to Koichi Shinohara and Robert Sharf for their advice on the writing of the monograph. My gratitude is also extended to Antonino Forte and Hubert Durt, whose comments have been of great help, and to Elizabeth Morrison, Linda Penkower, and Funayama Toru 船山暲, who made improvements in the argument and style of this article. John Kieschnick and *Asia Major's* anonymous reviewers were instrumental in helping me rewrite an earlier draft of the monograph into the present article.

¹ *Fō-tsu t'ung-chi* (hereafter *FTTC*), printed in Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡邊海旭 et al., eds., *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經 (Tokyo: Taishō issaikyō kankōkai 大正一切經刊刻會, 1924–1932; hereafter *T*), no. 2035, vol. 49, p. 201A.

medieval hagiography is a risky endeavor. Further, the textual support for the claim that Chi-tsang served under Kuan-ting is not limited to strongly sectarian T'ien-t'ai works like *Buddhist Patriarchs*. Authoritative monastic biographical literature supports the claim as well. Chi-tsang's discipleship under Kuan-ting, for instance, is clearly indicated in the earlier work *Further Biographies of Eminent Monks* (*Hsü kao-seng chuan* 續高僧傳), which is presumably less sectarian than *Buddhist Patriarchs*.² In addition, Chi-tsang's admiration for the T'ien-t'ai interpretation of the *Lotus Sutra* comes through in two of his four letters to Chih-i preserved in *A Hundred Records from Kuo-ch'ing* (*Kuo-ch'ing pai-lu* 國清百錄).³ In one, Chi-tsang respectfully addresses Chih-i as "teacher," while the other requests that Chih-i lecture on the *Lotus Sutra* for Chi-tsang's group.

The text of *Records from Kuo-ch'ing* was compiled shortly after Chih-i's death, when monks who associated themselves with Chih-i were not yet preoccupied with proving their superiority over other Buddhist sects, San-lun included. These two letters are evidence that Chi-tsang admired Chih-i (especially his expertise on the Lotus teachings), which in turn lends support to the claim that Chi-tsang was a disciple of Kuan-ting: if Chi-tsang admired T'ien-t'ai teachings as much as these two letters to Chih-i indicate, it would not be too surprising if, despite a reputation for arrogance and his considerable seniority, Chi-tsang had decided to become a disciple under Kuan-ting. Chi-tsang may

² For his central role in systematizing the *ssu-fen-lü* 四分律 tradition, Tao-hsüan 道宣 (596–667), who compiled *Hsü kao-seng chuan* (hereafter *HKSC*), has been identified as the founding patriarch of the so-called Lü School (Lü-tsung 律宗). However, despite deep involvement in *vinaya* texts, it is doubtful that Tao-hsüan regarded himself as the founder of a *vinaya* school, and even less so to assume that by his time, or by the end of the T'ang, an independent, full-fledged school by that name already existed. It was not until the twelfth century or even later that an established Lü-tsung school can be identified (Stanley Weinstein, "The Schools of Chinese Buddhism," in Mircea Eliade et al., eds., *The Encyclopedia of Religion* [New York: Macmillan, 1987] 2, pp. 482–87).

Tao-hsüan's interest in and possible sympathy for other Buddhist traditions, like T'ien-t'ai and Ch'an, are well documented. Compared with Sung sectarian historiographers, Tao-hsüan was more open-minded about writing a biography for a monk of any affiliation whose deeds could be commended. Sectarian consciousness was, by and large, relatively weak at Tao-hsüan's time. As a monastic historian, Tao-hsüan seems to have been driven by a strong sense of mission throughout his long intellectual career and guided by an "ecumenical" perspective that helped to shape his biographical anthology in a form acceptable to all Buddhist followers. There is no reason to assume that he was partial to or biased against a specific Buddhist tradition.

³ Hereafter referred to as *KCP* (T'no. 1934); compiled by Kuan-ting ca. 607, consisting mainly of correspondence between Chih-i and various members of the Ch'en and Sui imperial families who were patrons of Chih-i and his monastic order. Among these patrons was the prince of Chin 晉王 (Yang Kuang 楊廣), who became emperor Yang of the Sui 隋煬帝 (Sui Yang-ti; r. 604–16) seven years after Chih-i's death. The prince maintained an exceptionally close relationship with Chih-i and his group on Mount T'ien-t'ai, as evidenced in numerous *KCP* documents

have thought that Kuan-ting, as Chih-i's most capable student, represented his only hope of gaining access to the T'ien-t'ai teachings once the great master passed away.

In view of Chi-tsang's reputed personality and his seniority to Kuan-ting, some historians have tended to be skeptical about his discipleship under Kuan-ting. Yet the relatively neutral attitude of *Further Biographies* toward San-lun and T'ien-t'ai and the comparative earliness of the *Records from Kuo-ch'ing* have led other scholars to accept, although in a qualified way, this otherwise questionable account.⁴ It is only with the work of Hirai Shun'ei 平井俊榮 that the traditional account of Chi-tsang's relationship with Kuan-ting began to be seriously challenged. In his provocative study of Kuan-ting's *Textual Commentary to the Lotus [Sutra]* (*Fa-hua wen-chü* 法華文句), Hirai shows that in compiling Chih-i's lectures on the *Lotus Sutra* into a commentary, Kuan-ting repeatedly borrowed from Chi-tsang's commentaries on the same sutra.⁵

Hirai's study of Chi-tsang's T'ien-t'ai connections is comprehensive and

(among the 104 documents preserved in the present version of *KCP*, 34 are from him). For the prince of Chin's connection to T'ien-t'ai, see Tsukamoto Zenryū 塚本善隆, "Zui no Kōnan seifuko to Bukkyō" 隋の江南征服と佛教, in *Tsukamoto Zenryū chosaku shū* 塚本善隆著作集 (Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha, 1975) 3, pp. 145–91; Yamazaki Hiroshi 山崎宏, *Zui Tō Bukkyōshi no kenkyū* 隋唐佛教史の研究 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1967), pp. 117–23; Stanley Weinstein, "Imperial Patronage in the Formation of T'ang Buddhism," in Arthur Wright and Denis Twitchett, eds., *Perspectives on the Tang* (New Haven: Yale U.P., 1973), pp. 265–306; Arthur Wright, "Sui Yang-ti: Personality and Stereotype," in Arthur F. Wright, ed., *Confucianism and Chinese Civilization* (Stanford: Stanford U.P., 1964), pp. 158–87.

⁴ The account of Chi-tsang's admiration for Chih-i has been granted much more credibility by modern scholars than the story of Chi-tsang's becoming a student of Kuan-ting. As far as I know, a modern Chinese monk-scholar is the only one who takes seriously the account of Chi-tsang's discipleship under Kuan-ting: Chien-an 鑾安, "T'ien-t'ai yü Chia-hsiang" 天台與嘉祥, in Ch'ang Man-t'ao 張曼濤, ed., *Hsien-tai Fo-chiao hsieh-shu ts'ung-k'an* 現代佛教學術叢刊 (Taipei: Ta-ch'eng Fo-chiao ch'u-p'an-she, 1978) 49, pp. 233–47. Scholars who accept Chi-tsang's admiration for Chih-i include Satō Tetsuei 佐藤哲英, *Tendai daishi no kenkyū* 天台大師研究 (Kyoto: Hyakkaen, 1961), p. 321; Leon Hurvitz, *Chih-i (538-597): An Introduction to the Life and Ideas of a Chinese Buddhist Monk*, *Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques* 12 (Brussels: Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises, 1962), p. 163; T'ang Yung-t'ung 湯用彤, *T'ang Yung-t'ung hsieh-shu lun-wen-chi* 湯用彤學術論文集 (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1983), p. 384; and Paul Swanson, *Foundations of T'ien-t'ai Philosophy: The Flowering of the Two Truths Theory in Chinese Buddhism* (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1989), pp. 97–98.

See Hirai's rejection of the authenticity of the Chi-tsang/Kuan-ting account in *Hokke mongu no seiritsu ni kansuru kenkyū* 法華文句の成立に関する研究 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1985). Others who have doubted it include Hurvitz, *Chih-i*, p. 180; Linda Penkower, "T'ien-t'ai during the T'ang Dynasty: Chan-jan and the Sinification of Buddhism" (Ph.D. diss., Columbia U., 1993), p. 191; and Shimaji Daitō 島地大等, *Tendai kyōgaku shi* 天台教學史 (Tokyo: Meiji shoin, 1929), pp. 108–11. The renowned modern Chinese scholar T'ang Chün-i 唐君毅 also doubts its historical truth; "Chi-tsang p'o-jo ssu-hsiang chi shih-hsiang-i" 吉藏般若思想之實相義, in Ch'ang, ed., *Hsien-tai Fo-chiao* 39, pp. 349–78.

⁵ Hirai, *Hokke mongu*. Though formally presented in his 1985 book, Hirai's idea about the Chi-

insightful. It throws new light on this perplexing problem and provides a needed reevaluation of the relationship between early T'ien-t'ai and San-lun, and between Kuan-ting and Chi-tsang in particular. While the ingenuity with which Hirai approaches the problem is to be appreciated, and although his conclusion is, by and large, convincing, his study still leaves unresolved issues that require additional research.

First of all, a satisfactory explanation is needed for the appearance of the documents establishing Chi-tsang's T'ien-t'ai connections in *Records from Kuo-ch'ing*, a work that was prepared at a time when the T'ien-t'ai Sect, not yet sensitive to its relationship with Chi-tsang's San-lun Sect, apparently did not need to demonstrate its advantage. There is the further question of how and why Chi-tsang's discipleship under Kuan-ting came to be so unambiguously asserted in a non-T'ien-t'ai historical work like *Further Biographies*, which is, on the whole, neither particularly pro-T'ien-t'ai nor biased against San-lun.

One possible solution is simply to assume a disparity between the current versions of these compendia, which give us such unabashedly pro-T'ien-t'ai documents, and their original versions, which might not have contained the documents. Both *Records from Kuo-ch'ing* and *Further Biographies*, like many other important Buddhist texts, have been subjected to repeated revision. Not every document in the current versions of the two compendia necessarily dates to the time of original compilation. Is this the case regarding the documents supporting Chi-tsang's T'ien-t'ai connections? Is it possible that these documents did not originally appear in *Records from Kuo-ch'ing* or *Further Biographies* but were added in the course of their circulation?

The answer seems to be yes. As we see below, none of the documents or passages in *Records from Kuo-ch'ing* and *Further Biographies* that establish or support Chi-tsang's connections to T'ien-t'ai appeared in the original versions, but were added later. Thus we must ask: why did T'ien-t'ai followers take pains to create these distinct notions about Chi-tsang's life? Were they driven by sectarian purposes? If so, then what were they specifically, and why did Chi-tsang become the target of sectarian polemics?

Another point to be addressed is that while the theory of Chi-tsang's discipleship under Kuan-ting was no doubt of T'ien-t'ai origin, it was one of Tao-hsüan's disciples who included in *Further Biographies* a passage to that effect

tsang-T'ien-t'ai relationship was already taking shape in his early articles, esp. "Kichizō to Chigi: kyōten chūsho wo meguru shomondai" 吉藏と智顛經典註疏をめぐる諸問題, in *Tōyō gakujutsu kenkyū* 東洋學術研究 20.1 (1981), pp. 101–16. Hirai compares and analyzes the historical reliability of the differing accounts of Chi-tsang's relationship with Chih-i/Kuan-ting found in *KCPL*, *HKSC* and *FTTC*.

under the section on Kuan-ting. This fact might startle scholars accustomed to viewing early-T'ang T'ien-t'ai as "dormant." These scholars believe that at the dawn of the T'ang, T'ien-t'ai suffered because it had had excessively close connections to the Sui court, a fact that may have alerted the new rulers to the possible political threat from T'ien-t'ai. If there is any truth to this, Tao-hsüan and his group would surely have distanced themselves from T'ien-t'ai. How then are we to understand the fact that one of Tao-hsüan's disciples incorporated into his teacher's work a biographical anecdote that was apparently constructed in order to promote T'ien-t'ai?

Furthermore, the mere fact that one of Tao-hsüan's disciples had gone so far as to alter Tao-hsüan's work in this way is meaningful – whether or not it was of his own accord or under persuasion or even coercion by T'ien-t'ai followers. The fact that he did it at all suggests that T'ien-t'ai, at least in the period shortly after Tao-hsüan's death in 667, was much more dynamic and influential than traditional and scholarly accounts would have us believe. This new image of T'ien-t'ai necessitates a reappraisal of the traditional view that the successive deaths of Chih-i and Kuan-ting, coupled with the cold shoulder the early-T'ang rulers gave to Buddhism in general and T'ien-t'ai in particular, plunged T'ien-t'ai into a "dark age" (*ankoku jidai* 暗黒時代),⁶ from which it was rescued more than one century later by Chan-jan's 湛然 (711–782) heroic efforts.⁷

This article calls attention to these thorny problems and addresses some of them in detail. With Chi-tsang's T'ien-t'ai connections as a specific focus, I try to illustrate the formation, development, structure and nature of an important portion of T'ien-t'ai sectarian historico-biographical literature. We begin with documents contained in *Records from Kuo-ch'ing* that claim to be letters from Chi-tsang and establish Chi-tsang's admiration for, or even discipleship under, Chih-i.

⁶ The term *ankoku jidai*, used for T'ien-t'ai, can be traced to Shimaji's textbook-like history of Chinese T'ien-t'ai and Japanese Tendai published in 1929. The author was the first to theorize that T'ien-t'ai was plagued by two such "Dark Ages," the other identified as the period from Chan-jan's death to the T'ien-t'ai "revival" during Northern Sung (Shimaji, *Tendai kyōgaku shi*, pp. 115–22, 146–51). The theory was obviously inspired by Sung T'ien-t'ai historians like the *FTTC* author Chih-p'an 志磐, who emphasized the roles Chan-jan and Ssu-ming Chih-li 四明知禮 (960–1028) played in revitalizing T'ien-t'ai in the mid-T'ang and early-Sung. Despite its biased nature, this framework has met with widespread acceptance by Japanese T'ien-t'ai scholars. Penkower, by highlighting various problems of the framework, questions its validity ("T'ien-t'ai during the T'ang," esp. pp. 1–5, 142–51).

⁷ See biog. in *Biographies of Eminent Monks Compiled in the Sung* (*Sung kao-seng chuan* 宋高僧傳; hereafter *SKSC*), printed as *Ino*, 2061, vol. 50, pp. 739B–40A. Penkower's "T'ien-t'ai during the T'ang" represents the most recent and thorough study of Chan-jan's life and his theories of Buddha-nature.

CHI-TSANG AND CHIH-I: THE PURPORTED DISCIPLE-MASTER RELATIONSHIP

The two documents that constitute the principal source for supporting Chi-tsang's close relationship with Chih-i are numbered 102 and 103 in *Records from Kuo-ch'ing*.⁸ They include four letters purportedly from Chi-tsang to Chih-i. Number 102 is composed of three rather short and informal letters, while no. 103 consists of a relatively long letter formally inviting Chih-i to lecture on the *Lotus Sutra*. Before entering into an analysis of the nature and formation of the invitation letter, whose provenance and implications turn out to be rather complicated, let us investigate the nature of the three letters of document 102 and see how later T'ien-t'ai followers used them to depict Chi-tsang as an enthusiastic disciple of Chih-i.

Three Letters in Records from Kuo-ch'ing and T'ien-t'ai Accounts about the Relationship

The main body of the first letter included in document no. 102 expresses Chi-tsang's serious concern about Chih-i's health. More than one-third of this sixty-one-character letter is on that topic.⁹ The tone goes beyond the perfunctory and strongly suggests that Chih-i's health was then deteriorating rapidly.¹⁰ Further in the letter Chi-tsang confesses that ever since his group had visited Chih-i, his affection for him had increased daily,¹¹ suggesting that the letter was written shortly after the two had met for the first time. Finally, from the fact that there were then two emissaries going between Chih-i and Chi-tsang as representatives, we know that Chi-tsang was already an independent and prestigious master by that time. Since Chi-tsang must have achieved this status sometime after the death of his teacher Fa-lang 法朗 (507–581) of Hsing-huang Temple 興皇寺 in 581,¹² we may assume that the letter was written afterwards. Thus, we may conclude the following regarding the time-frame: presenting itself as Chi-tsang's first letter to Kuan-ting since their meeting, it was written sometime after 581 when Chih-i was seriously sick; in other words, it was written either sometime between 581 and 597, or around 597 (the sev-

⁸ The three letters can be found in *KCPL*; Tno. 1934, vol. 50, pp. 812c–22a.

⁹ Immediately after acknowledging receipt of Chih-i's message, Chi-tsang anxiously inquired about Chih-i's health problem, "As the weather is turning hot, how about your health?" This is followed by his wish that by the time he received his letter Chih-i's health would have improved and that his teaching responsibilities would not be impacting his health (*KCPL*; Tno. 1934, vol. 46, p. 821c).

¹⁰ Cf. Hurvitz, *Chih-i*, p. 163.

¹¹ *KCPL*; Tno. 1934, vol. 46, p. 821c.

¹² Also known as Hsüan lang; *HKSC* biog. at pp. 477b–78a.

enteenth year of K'ai-huang 開皇), when Chih-i fell victim to a fatal illness that eventually claimed his life in about December.¹³

The second letter, which is the longest of the three, is remarkable. At the beginning, Chi-tsang addresses Chih-i as *shih* 師 (master),¹⁴ a form of address used in neither of the other two letters. It seems that Chi-tsang used this form of address quite sincerely, since almost immediately afterwards he forthrightly expressed a desire to receive instruction from Chih-i: "It has long been my wish to kneel before you to receive the 'ambrosia' (Sanskrit: *amṛta*) [from you] and worship the 'Dharma-bridge' [built by you]."¹⁵ Immediately after this, Chi-tsang, on the grounds that Buddhism was then suffering an eclipse and that Chih-i was the only person capable of reversing this dangerous decline, strongly urges Chih-i to emerge from his hermitage at T'ien-t'ai and assume the formidable task of regenerating Buddhism. Finally, Chi-tsang enthusiastically reassures Chih-i of his steadfast intention to pursue Chih-i's instruction: "I will exhaust my efforts to receive your instruction. Until the end of my life, or even far into future *kalpas*, I will humbly beseech you, Great Master, to bestow your intensive instruction upon me."¹⁶

In the third letter (the shortest at thirty-nine characters), Chi-tsang reports to Chih-i that he had dreams before and after the arrival of Chih-i's messenger Ching-shang 景上 (n.d.). Chi-tsang says that if Chih-i wishes to know the details of the dreams, he may consult Ching-shang and Chih-chao 智照 (n.d.; Chi-tsang's emissary).

The three short letters, if authentic, attest to an association, or even a kind of master-disciple relationship, between Chih-i and Chi-tsang. However, a close reading reveals that not all of them can be accepted as authentic. At least two are of a dubious source.

As mentioned above, the first letter suggests that Chi-tsang's first meeting with Chih-i occurred after 581, perhaps just at the end of Chih-i's life. This contradicts what is implied in other sources, according to which Chi-tsang's first meeting with Chih-i was at some point in the eight-year period between 567 and 575,¹⁷ when Chih-i resided at Wa-kuan Temple 瓦官寺 in the Ch'endynasty capital of Chin-ling 金陵, where Chi-tsang was then studying under Fa-lang. According to a biography of Chih-i, Fa-lang sent "advanced disci-

¹³ Kuan-ting's *HKSC* biography reports that Chih-i became sick beginning in 597 (p. 584b).

¹⁴ Chi-tsang states at the beginning of the letter, "The affectionate message from you, Master, greatly delighted me" (*KCPL*; Tno. 1934, vol. 46, p. 821c).

¹⁵ *KCPL*; Tno. 1934, vol. 46, p. 821c.

¹⁶ *KCPL*; Tno. 1934, vol. 46, pp. 821c–22a.

¹⁷ *Separate Biography of the Sui-Dynasty Great Master Chih-che of Mount T'ien-t'ai* (*Sui T'ien-t'ai Chih-che Ta-shih pieh-chuan* 隋天台智者大師別傳; Tno. 2050), which Kuan-ting composed for

ples" (*kao-tsu* 高足) to debate Chih-i. This series of debates, which is said to have lasted for several tens of days, seems to have been quite fierce.¹⁸ Although the biography does not identify the advanced disciples, other sources imply that Chi-tsang must have been among them.¹⁹ Even if Chi-tsang was not among the disciples who went to challenge Chih-i on behalf of Hsing-huang Temple, it is very likely that he saw Chih-i at another time in Chin-ling. Even if we assume the unlikely case that Chi-tsang had not met Chih-i between 567 and 575, Chi-tsang nevertheless would have made, if not renewed, an acquaintance with Chih-i after the latter returned to Chin-ling in 585 from a decade of quiet life at Mount T'ien-t'ai.²⁰ Chih-i returned to the capital to find Chi-tsang in the prime of his life and career. By that time, Fa-lang had been dead for four

Chih-i ca. 605 (the latest year mentioned, p. 197A), and Chih-i's entry in *HKSC* are the two principal biographical sources for Chih-i. Neither dates Chih-i's first arrival in Chin-ling. The *Separate Biography of Chih-che* states, however, that Chih-i dwelt at Wa-kuan Temple in Chin-ling for eight years (*Tno.* 2050, vol. 50, p. 192C), and according to Kuan-ting's *KCPL* preface Chih-i first retired to Mount T'ien-t'ai in 575 (*Tno.* 1934, vol. 46, p. 793A). Since it was from Chin-ling that Chih-i left for T'ien-t'ai reclusion, then he must have arrived in Chin-ling eight years before 575, i.e., 567. This date of Chih-i's initial arrival at Chin-ling is verified in Chieh-ying's 戒應 (n.d.) *A Chronological Record of the Life of the Great Meditation Master Chih-che* (hereafter, "Chieh-ying's Chronology") (*Chih-che Ta Ch'an-shih men-p'u shih-chi* 智者大禪師年譜事跡; compiled in 1185 and attached to the Taishō version of *KCPL* [*Tno.* 1934, vol. 46, p. 823A-C]), which was probably constructed on the basis of *KCPL* and *Separate Biography of Chih-che*. According to "Chieh-ying's Chronology," Chih-i entered Chin-ling in 567 when he was 30 (*Tno.* 1934, vol. 46, p. 823B).

¹⁸ *Separate Biography of Chih-che* describes the debates between Fa-lang's group and Chih-i:

Fa-lang of Hsing-huang Temple was then widely spreading [the teachings of] Nāgārjuna. He successively sent his advanced disciples to debate [Chih-i] and the debates lasted for several tens of days. A mirror, when rubbed, becomes brighter; and polishing a piece of gold just makes it shinier. Those disciples, coming empty[-handed], became full [in mind] at the end. They all forgot to go back [to their old teacher]. One intent on outdoing others ends up being ashamed of himself. "A sage is capable of reforming others without resorting to arguments." Does not this saying apply to this situation perfectly? (*Tno.* 2050, vol. 50, p. 192C)

Kuan-ting claims here that Fa-lang's disciples who came to debate Chih-i were not only defeated by him but came to accept his teachings. This might be an exaggeration, but apparently Fa-lang did dispatch his disciples to engage Chih-i in controversies and some of them in fact stayed with him afterwards.

¹⁹ *HKSC* reports that when he was as young as nineteen, Chi-tsang had impressed Fa-lang enough to be made his assistant homilist and the one in charge of guests of Hsing-huang Temple (*Tno.* 2060, vol. 50, p. 514A; discussed below, under "The Further Biographies Account of Chi-tsang's Discipleship under Kuan-ting"). Since Chi-tsang was nineteen in 567, it seems that almost immediately following Chih-i's arrival at the capital Fa-lang was already relying heavily on Chi-tsang as an important disciple. Thus, Chi-tsang may well have been among those selected by Fa-lang to debate Chih-i, especially because his two duties under Fa-lang would have required eloquence.

²⁰ Chih-i did not agree to descend T'ien-t'ai until Ch'en emperor Hou-chu 後主 (r. 582-89) pressured him in five consecutive orders in 585 that are preserved in *KCPL* as doc. no. 11 (*KCPL*; *Tno.* 1934, vol. 46, p. 799B).

years, so Chi-tsang had been an independent dharma-master for several years. As two of the most famous monks in southern China, it seems extremely improbable that Chi-tsang and Chih-i would have avoided seeing each other during the four years they were in the same city. It was not until the Ch'en dynasty was overthrown by the Sui in 589 that Chih-i and Chi-tsang fled Chin-ling. In summary, the likelihood of Chi-tsang's meeting Chih-i during the two long periods that Chih-i spent in Chin-ling (567-575, 585-589) is so high that it is extremely improbable that they met only after 575, let alone 589. This renders it difficult to accept as authentic the first letter.

The authenticity of the second letter, which implies Chi-tsang's discipleship under Chih-i, is undermined by the fact that the San-lun group at Hsing-huang Temple with which Chi-tsang was so closely identified was obviously in competition with, if not hostile to, Chih-i. The latter point is corroborated by the fact that Fa-lang, the head of Hsing-huang Temple, sent several advanced disciples to debate Chih-i.²¹ It is highly unlikely that Chi-tsang, who claimed to be an heir of Fa-lang, had gone so far as to seek discipleship under Chih-i.

Reading the three letters more closely, we find that they display a drastic disparity in tone and style. In contrast to the profound admiration expressed in the second letter, a familiar and casual tone is discernible in the other two, which indicates that Chi-tsang respected Chih-i as a senior colleague, rather than a teacher.²² Since the three letters vary in tone, they must be scrutinized. The first two letters must be rejected as spurious, since one of them stands outside the scenario in which Chi-tsang would have first met Chih-i in a much

²¹ Here, on the basis of the claim Kuan-ting made in *Separate Biography of Chih-che* that Fa-lang's disciples were converted by Chih-i, one might deduce that Chi-tsang was among them. This assumption, if justified, would support Chi-tsang's discipleship under Chih-i. Several considerations, however, undermine the deduction. By the time *Separate Biography* was compiled, Chi-tsang was one of China's most accomplished monks. Kuan-ting wrote it in order to glorify his deceased master (for the complex agenda underlying the work, see Koichi Shinohara, "Kuan-ting's Biography of Chih-i, the Fourth Chinese Patriarch of the T'ien-t'ai Tradition," in Phyllis Granoff and Koichi Shinohara, eds., *Speaking of Monks* [Oakville, Ontario: Mosaic Press, 1992], pp. 97-232). Had Chi-tsang in fact submitted to Chih-i, *Separate Biography* would not have missed the opportunity to promote Chih-i's prestige. Moreover, no other historical or biographical source, including Chih-i and Chi-tsang's own accounts in *HKSC*, indicates or even suggests that Chi-tsang defected from Fa-lang to Chih-i. On the contrary, Chi-tsang's *HKSC* biography unambiguously identified his teacher as Fa-lang. In most of his works, Chi-tsang also repeatedly declares his allegiance to Fa-lang.

²² The first and third letters are written in a plain style, without the sort of excessive politeness seen in letters to a teacher. The third letter was written after the one in which Chi-tsang expressed willingness to receive instruction from Chih-i. In it, Chi-tsang chooses not to report directly to Chih-i the content of his dreams, but suggests that Chih-i consult their messengers for the details. The style and tone appear appropriate to that between friends or peers, rather than between student and teacher.

earlier time and the other implies an implausible relationship. As for the third letter, we find no decisive evidence against its authenticity. On the contrary, the letter displays a tone compatible with Chi-tsang's probable relationship with Chih-i as suggested by other sources. This has inclined me to accept it as authentic.²³

Finally, the location of the three letters in *Records from Kuo-ch'ing* suggests that they were not contained in the original version prepared by Kuan-ting, but were added by a later editor.²⁴ The items in that compendium are not necessarily in chronological order. In some cases, location of a document depends on the prominence of the author.²⁵ In the Taishō version the letters appear after those from such less prestigious monks as T'an-hsien 曇暹 (document no. 97), Hui-yen 惠岳 (no. 98) and Tung-yen 東嶽 (no. 99), a fact that also argues against authenticity: letters from Chi-tsang would more rightly have been placed elsewhere in the original version of *Records from Kuo-ch'ing*.

Individually, none of the above pieces of evidence proves conclusively the spurious nature of the three letters, but taken together they are enough to raise suspicion. Was there a reason for someone to forge the letters? Who would have benefited from documents that claim falsely that Chi-tsang was once a humble disciple of Chih-i?

The primary suspect is, of course, Kuan-ting, the compiler of *Records from Kuo-ch'ing*, who is believed to have heavily relied on Chi-tsang's works when he revised the lectures of his late master Chih-i. However, Kuan-ting and Chi-tsang lived so close in time that it seems unlikely that he would have been able

²³ Evidence from other sources supports the claim that Chi-tsang and Chih-i knew each other and that at times they maintained a communication, if not the friendship. Chan-jan's "Delineations for Supporting Practice and Broadly Disseminating the [Mo-he] chih-kuan" ("Chih-kuan fu-hsing chuan-hung chüeh" 止觀輔行傳弘決) refers to a letter from Chih-i to Chi-tsang: "A letter from Great Master (Chih-i) to Chi-tsang says, 'If one possesses understanding but [has not applied it in] practice, he will not be able to subdue the objects; if one [excels in] practice but is without understanding, he will be unable to proselytize'" (Tno. 1912, vol. 46, p. 279A). This shows that Chi-tsang and Chih-i were engaged in discussion, if not debate, about issues of Buddhist soteriology and that at least some parts of their discussion were carried out through correspondence.

²⁴ The current version of *KCPL*, which contains 104 documents, represents the result of a series of expansions of the original *KCPL* (see Ch'en, *Making and Remaking History*, chap. 5).

²⁵ For example, nos. 96, 97, and 99, written in the same year (593), are dated, respectively, ninth lunar mo., day 17 (ix/17); ix/13; and viii/10. This makes no. 99 earliest, next no. 97, and latest is no. 96. The compilation does not present them in chronological order, but priority apparently is given to the letter from the most eminent person. The author of no. 96, Ts'ai Cheng 蔡徵 (see Hurvitz, *Chih-i*, p. 156), was a high-ranked Ch'en bureaucrat and thus apparently more eminent than the monk T'an-hsien 曇暹 (n.d.; author of no. 97), who, being from a capital monastery, was regarded more highly than Tung-yen 東嶽 (n.d.; no. 99), a monk from a provincial temple.

successfully to forge letters under the name of a famous contemporary. The two letters must have been created after Kuan-ting.

Once we consider the possibility that the two letters did not appear in Kuan-ting's *Records from Kuo-ch'ing*, then we must consider the importance of Chan-jan's having been first to make reference to the second letter, in the context of asserting that Chi-tsang was Chih-i's disciple. In his *Notes on the Textual Commentary to the Lotus [Sutra]* (*Fa-hua wen-chü chi* 法華文句記),²⁶ Chan-jan asserts that Chi-tsang "received the wondrous transformation from Chih-i, with the essence of Chih-i's teachings penetrating his spirit."²⁷ Chan-jan further discussed an important intellectual problem in contemporary Buddhism in order to support the view that Chi-tsang had been enlightened by Chih-i. The plethora of different sects and schools were competing with each other for legitimacy, and in the process various of them would carefully synthesize the history of their own teachings so as to have it fall categorically into what was held to be the authentic line of teaching as promulgated by the historic Buddha. The "categorization of Buddhist teachings (*p'an-chiao* 判教)" became a tool of debate, and even of abuse, among the sects. Both Chih-i and Chi-tsang had contributed ideas to the struggle, and Chan-jan explains that the perverted views found in Chi-tsang's works predate his exposure to Chih-i's guidance. Chan-jan maintains that Chi-tsang gave up his previous views once he had received instruction from Chih-i, since it was only by holding identical views with Chih-i on such an important issue as the relative merits of different doctrines that Chi-tsang was able to live up to the standards set by his master. Here, Chan-jan makes a remarkable observation, "If Chi-tsang had clung to his previous views, his discipleship under Chih-i would not have been established. In that case, there would have been no basis for his claim that he wanted to kneel before Chih-i to receive [his teachings]; and what would have accounted for his saying that he worshipped [the Dharma-bridge built by Chih-i]?"²⁸ (a reference to Chi-tsang's second letter). Given the context within which Chan-jan makes this quotation, I propose that he advocated, if not created, the theory that Chi-tsang eventually became a disciple of Chih-i in order to explain away the differences in Chih-i's and Chi-tsang's schemes regarding the categorization of teachings.²⁹

²⁶ Hereafter *FHWCC*; Tno. 1719. ²⁷ Tno. 1719, vol. 34, p. 213A. ²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 213B.

²⁹ In Japanese Tendai Buddhism, the *KCPL* letters attributed to Chi-tsang (especially the second one) were also used as proof of Chi-tsang's discipleship under Chih-i. E.g., in his *Collection of Similarities and Differences in Teachings and Forms* {Displayed in} *Various Schools* (*Shoke kyōsō dōi shū* 諸家教相同異集), the Tendai master Enchin 圓珍 (815–911) referred to the *KCPL* letters when discussing the historicity of Chi-tsang's discipleship under Chih-i (Tno. 2368, vol. 74, p. 312B; see Ch'en, *Making and Remaking History*, chap. 7).

Further Developments in the Story of Chi-tsang's Discipleship

Later T'ien-t'ai (Tendai) monks went further than Chan-jan. They tried to present Chi-tsang as a devout and unusually humble admirer and disciple of Chih-i. A prime example is provided by the work titled *Supplementary and Corrective Notes to the Commentary on the Lotus Sutra* (*Hokkekyō mongu fushōki* [Chinese: *Fa-hua-ching wen-chū fu-cheng-chū* 法華經文句輔正記] attributed to Tao-hsien 道暹 (n.d.), who is believed to have been Chan-jan's contemporary and disciple.³⁰ *Supplementary Notes* contains a story about the way in which Chih-i's youngest disciples Fa-sheng 法盛 (n.d.) succeeded in taming Chi-tsang. After a few brief remarks about Chi-tsang's background and status, this story sets out to describe a debate between Chi-tsang and Fa-sheng supposedly just after Chih-i arrived in Chin-ling. In the debate, Chi-tsang was rendered speechless by Fa-sheng's wit. In the end, the astounded Chi-tsang asks Fa-sheng who his teacher is. In learning that Fa-sheng's teacher was Chih-i, Chi-tsang immediately paid respect to Chih-i by presenting him a "mountain and water robe" (*shan-shui-na* 山水納). Afterwards, he felt deeply convinced of Chih-i's expertise and sought the Lotus lectures from him. He even went so far as to volunteer to be a "flesh-stool" (*jou-teng* 肉蹬) from which Chih-i ascended to the high lecture-platform to preach the *Lotus Sutra*.³¹

This dramatic story highlights the great disparity of spiritual strength between Chih-i and Chi-tsang by presenting Fa-sheng, a seventeen-year-old *śrāmaṇera* and one of Chih-i's youngest disciples, as powerful enough to convert the proud Chi-tsang to T'ien-t'ai. However, it is difficult to accept this story as true. First, it dates the encounter to sometime shortly after Chih-i's first arrival in Chin-ling in 567, when Chih-i and Chi-tsang were thirty and nineteen years old, respectively, and yet it describes Chi-tsang as an influential Buddhist expounder surrounded by many followers. His extraordinary precocity notwithstanding, at nineteen Chi-tsang would have been too young to

³⁰ This commentary can be found in vol. 45 of Nakano Tatsue 中野達慧, ed., *Dai Nihon zokuzōkyō* 大日本續藏經 (Kyoto: Zōkyō shoin, 1905–12); hereafter ZZ). Since I argue that this text was composed in Japan, I hereafter refer to it as *FSK* (viz., *fushōki* 輔正記).

Tao-hsien's status as a disciple of Chan-jan is deduced from the fact that a biographical source refers to him as a junior fellow-disciple of Yüan-hao 元皓 (?-817 [or 818]), a chief disciple of Chan-jan (*SKSC*; Tno. 2061, vol. 50, p. 740B-C). A leading Sung T'ien-t'ai monk Ku-shan Chih-yuan 孤山智圓 (976–1022) identified Tao-hsien as a direct disciple of Chan-jan, without providing any source for making such an identification (Tno. 1779, vol. 38, p. 711B). Tao-hsien's three-line biography in *FTIC* informs us that he went to Ch'ang-an sometime during the Ta-li 大歷 era (766–79) to promulgate T'ien-t'ai teachings. He was also believed to have written extensively. *FTIC* also attributes to him a magic power (*abhijñā*) that enabled him to roam freely in space (p. 246A).

³¹ ZZ, vol. 45, p. 55A-B.

run a lecture center both independently and successfully, especially since, according to Chi-tsang's biography in *Further Biographies*, he was still studying under Fa-lang.

Second, Chih-i's student Fa-sheng could not have met Chi-tsang in Chin-ling as early as 567. According to a brief entry in *Buddhist Patriarchs*, Fa-sheng met Chih-i in person for the first time at Yü-chüan Temple 玉泉寺. Since Chih-i built the temple in 593 and stayed until 595 when he left for Yang-chou 揚州 at the urging of the prince of Chin, Fa-sheng must have been introduced to him between 593 and 595. Furthermore, *Buddhist Patriarchs* reports that after Chih-i left the temple, Fa-sheng stayed on, probably until the beginning of the T'ang, when he moved to Ch'ang-an.³² Thus, we can exclude the possibility that Fa-sheng met Chi-tsang in Chin-ling shortly after 567.

Third, the questions Fa-sheng is said to have posed to Chi-tsang do not ring true. For instance, one of Fa-sheng's questions, "what is the textual support for a barbarian acting as an *ācārya*?" sounds nonsensical. We have many examples of respected foreign Buddhist monks in China, and a monk of Chi-tsang's stature and reputation for eloquence would not likely have been impressed, much less rendered speechless, by such questions.

Finally, it is anachronistic to have Chi-tsang present a "mountain and water robe" to Chih-i, since we know from another source that this type of robe first appeared in the Sung.³³ These points might suggest that the story of Chi-tsang's losing a debate to one of Chi-tsang's disciples is spurious. In addition to the anachronistic term "mountain and water robe," two more pieces of evidence call in question this ascription: one suggests that *Supplementary Notes* was written sometime after the founding of the Sung, while the other points to the possibility that the *Supplementary Notes* was in fact written in Japan. Let us begin with the evidence indicating its Japanese origin.

A *vinaya* work (that is, a work dealing with monastic regulations), *Commentary on the Sutra of the Dignified Departments and Ten Commands for śrāmaṇera* (*Shami [jikkai narabini] igi kyō sho*; Chin.: *Sha-mi [shih-chieh p'ing] wei-i ching shu* 沙彌 [十戒並] 威儀經疏) by Fa-chin 法進 (698 [or 709]–778), also contains the "flesh-stool" story.³⁴ A comparison of the two accounts of Chi-tsang's conversion reveals that they are virtually identical except for the fact that in Fa-

³² The *FTIC*; Tno. 2035, vol. 49, p. 199C.

³³ See Yüan-chao 元照 (1048–1116), *Su-fen-lü hsing-shih-ch'ao tzu-ch'ih-chi* 四分律行事抄資持記; Tno. 1805, vol. 40, p. 391B-C.

³⁴ This commentary, preserved in vol. 21 of Suzuki gakujutsu zaidan 鈴木學術財團, eds., *Mihon daizōkyō* 日本大藏經 (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1973–78; hereafter *ND*), treats the *vinaya* text *Shami shih-chieh ping wei-i ching* (*Sutra of Ten Precepts and [Various] Dignified Departments for a śrāmaṇera*; Tno. 1472; trans. Gunabhadra [376–431]). The author Fa-chin was a disciple of Chien-chen 鑑

chin's account Fa-sheng's role is played by Kuan-ting. Although we cannot categorically deny that the two accounts might have originated from a common source, the wording and structure are so close that one must have been based on the other. Since the *Supplementary Notes* cannot have appeared before 761 when the work of Fa-chin was completed, we have to admit that the account in *Supplementary Notes* was based on Fa-chin's story, and not vice versa.³⁵ On the other hand, Fa-chin's work was written and circulated in Japan, and there is no evidence to demonstrate that it was ever transmitted to China. This means that *Supplementary Notes* contains some material available only in Japan, a fact that leads to two possibilities regarding *Supplementary Notes*: either it was written *in toto* in Japan, or its main body was written in China and tampered with in Japan in such a way as to have included Fa-chin's story. Which assumption is more plausible? The story of Chi-tsang and Chih-i (or Fa-sheng) does not create contextual discrepancies in *Supplementary Notes*. On the contrary, it seems to fit in with the whole text quite well. For this reason, not only did *Supplementary Notes* appear long after its putative author Tao-hsien, it was moreover prepared in Japan.

At the beginning of the text, Tao-hsien, the purported author, is said to be from Wu-hsing (chün) 吳興 [郡],³⁶ a name not in use late in the T'ang, but only beginning in the Sung.³⁷ In fact, the earliest reliable reference we have to

Supplementary Notes is in a Japanese Buddhist catalog completed in 1094.³⁸ Thus, *Supplementary Notes* was prepared in Japan sometime between 960, when the Northern Sung 北宋 dynasty (960–1127) was established, and 1094, when, as mentioned, it was recorded in the catalog. It was wrongly attributed to Tao-hsien, either by accident or on purpose. Given his special status in the Sung-era T'ien-t'ai community, I am inclined to believe that a Tendai monk forged the work *Supplementary Notes* under Tao-hsien's name.

Chi-tsang's Purported Invitation to Chih-i

Like two of the three "Chi-tsang letters" discussed above, the fourth letter in *Records from Kuo-ch'ing*, which has been regarded as Chi-tsang's request that Chih-i lecture on the *Lotus Sutra*, appears to be spurious: it is doubtful that Chi-tsang ever invited Chih-i to lecture.³⁹

The letter in question is named "Chi-tsang Fa-shih ch'ing-chiang Fa-hua-ching shu" 吉藏法師請講法華經疏 ("A Statement from Dharma Master Chi-tsang, Requesting Lectures on the *Lotus Sutra*")⁴⁰ and begins by showering praise on the beauty of Mount T'ien-t'ai, where Chih-i was then dwelling with his disciples. Chi-tsang then extends a warm invitation to Chih-i, requesting that he lecture on the *Lotus Sutra* for Chi-tsang and his disciples who were then based at Chia-hsiang Temple 嘉祥寺.⁴¹

Given that Chi-tsang claimed to be the legitimate Chinese successor to an Indian Mahāyāna school created by Nāgārjuna, what appears particularly strange in the letter is its straightforward identification of Chih-i as the Nāgārjuna of China.⁴² This would have constituted Chi-tsang's self-abasement as a disci-

淺真 (J.: Ganjin; 688–763), whose Buddhist missionary entourage in Japan (arriving 754) included Fa-chin. Fa-chin's own postscript at the end of the work dates it to 761 (*ND*, vol. 21, p. 321A). The story in question is located in *ND*, vol. 21, p. 304A. See Ch'en, *Making and Remaking History*, chap. 6, for details about the story and its relationship to that contained in *FSK*.

The "flesh-stool" story also appears in a strongly polemic work entitled *Treatise on Determining the Differences among Schools* (*Jōshūron* 定宗論; Tno. 2369, vol. 74, p. 320A) by the Tendai priest-scholar Renkō 蓮駒 (815?–880?), who was probably one of Enchin's contemporaries (Paul Groner, *Saichō: The Establishment of the Japanese Tendai School*, Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series 7 [Seoul: Po Chin Chai Ltd., 1984], p. 41).

³⁵ As a commentary on Chan-jan's *FHWCC*, the *FSK* came after Chan-jan's text dating to the 770s; see Hibi Senshō 日比宣正, *Tōdai Tendai-gaku josetsu Yannen no choshaku ni kansuru kenkyū* 唐代天台學序說湛然の著作に関する研究 (Tokyo: Sankibō busshorin, 1975), p. 322, and Penkower, "T'ien-t'ai during the T'ang," pp. 108–9. Also, the very title of *FSK* ["to supplement and rectify" 轉正 *fushū*] Chan-jan's *FHWCC* suggests that *FSK* was written after Chan-jan's death, since "supplement and rectify" would have been impertinent otherwise. Moreover, because Fa-chin's *vinaya* work was done long before Chan-jan's death, we may conclude that *FSK*'s version of the "flesh-stool" was a later revision of Fa-chin's, a point that becomes clearer when the two are compared.

³⁶ *ZZ*, vol. 45, p. 1A.

³⁷ As stated in n. 35, above, *FSK* must have been written after Chan-jan's death in 782, over two decades after Wu-hsing ceased to be a prefecture; see *Chiu-t'ang-shu* 舊唐書 (*Old History of the T'ang* [Peking: Chung-hua shu-chū, 1974]) 40, p. 1059.

³⁸ *Catalogue of the Transmission of the Lamp in the Eastern Area* (i.e., Japan) (*Toiki dentō mokuroku* 東域傳燈目錄); compiled by Eichō 永超 (n.d.); see Tno. 2183, vol. 55, p. 1149A.

³⁹ Because *The Lotus Sutra* was a fundamental text for Chih-i's group, he presumably had some special understanding of it that would have interested Chi-tsang; thus one may argue that it is difficult to reject categorically the possibility that Chi-tsang ever invited Chih-i to lecture on it. However, absence of any mention in *Separate Biography of Chih-i* argues negatively: had Chi-tsang ever extended the invitation, Kuan-ting would not have omitted it from his propagandistic work. Long before the completion in 605 of *Separate Biography*, Chi-tsang had established himself as a powerful Buddhist exegete, and the inclusion in *Separate Biography* of an invitation from him would have boosted Chih-i's prestige, particularly his expertise in the Lotus teachings.

⁴⁰ *KCPL*; Tno. 1934, vol. 46, p. 822A–B.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 822A.

⁴² "You are like Nāgārjuna, who carried on [the Buddhist cause] after Āśvaghosa transformed [into *nirvāṇa*] (馬鳴化終, 龍樹繼後; p. 822A)." In a letter empress Wu was said to have sent to Te-kan 德感 (fl. 690–728), the empress made a similar comparison: "You are next to Nāgārjuna, you are equal to Āśvaghosa 式亞龍樹, 爰齊馬鳴 (*SKSC*; Tno. 2061, vol. 50, p. 731C; 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. 101). However, two differences warrant notice here. First, Te-kan is presented as equalling Āśvaghosa, but still

ple of Chih-i and would have subjected his Buddhist belief (San-lun) to T'ien-t'ai dominance. What perhaps struck readers most strongly, however, was the virtual identification of Chih-i with the Buddha: Chih-i's understanding was of no lesser value than the Buddha's, and he was able to give lectures that would attract the bodhisattvas of the three thousand worlds to listen and all future sentient beings to revere and practice.⁴³ Even among the most zealous and sectarian-minded of his later followers, Chih-i was hardly able to provoke that sort of respect.

When compared with two other similar letters in *Records from Kuo-ch'ing*, this invitation becomes even less credible. These other letters, numbered 98 and 99, are also requests for Chih-i to lecture, and their authors also ask favors of Chih-i. As might be expected, especially when directed to a monk of Chih-i's stature, both authors shower compliments on his personality and Buddhist expertise.⁴⁴ But these compliments, though significant, pale in comparison with those proffered by Chi-tsang. If the other authors, who appear to have been much less prestigious than Chi-tsang, failed to extol Chih-i to an unusual level, why would Chi-tsang have had gone so much further?

In addition, we must examine why Hui-ssu and Chih-i are unambiguously identified in Chi-tsang's letter as two successive patriarchs 兩尊紹係 rather than as mere master and disciple.⁴⁵ The identification conveys a preoccupation with the T'ien-t'ai notion of lineage and strengthens suspicions of the lateness of the letter. As far as we know, the T'ien-t'ai notion of lineage was first fully announced in Kuan-ting's introduction to *The Great Calming and Contem-*

being inferior to 亞 Nāgārjuna. Second, the extraordinary extent to which Chi-tsang identified himself with Nāgārjuna might have made him much more cautious than empress Wu in comparing one of his peers with Nāgārjuna.

⁴³ *KCPL*; Tno. 1934, vol. 46, p. 822A.

⁴⁴ The letter from Hui-yen 惠善 (n.d.) praises Chih-i: "You, Meditation Master, have been bestowed with rich virtues which are pure and exalted, enabling you to surpass all the other sects; you were also gifted with extraordinary [literary] abilities, which, penetrating every part of your heart, allow you to outdo all men of letters" (*KCPL*; Tno. 1934, vol. 46, p. 821A).

The letter from Tung-yen praises Chih-i thus, "You, Meditation Master, dwell in the 'unfathomable' stage, and cherish a desire to benefit all sentient beings. Your way covers the 'Three Emptinesses,' and your wisdom ascends to the 'one hundred dharmas'" (*KCPL*; Tno. 1934, vol. 46, p. 821B); "You have received in person the three points [of *dharmakāya*, *prajñā* and *mukti*], and have advanced far in the cultivation of six *pāramitā*" (*KCPL*; Tno. 1934, vol. 46, p. 821B).

⁴⁵ "The 'wise saint of Nan-yüeh' and the 'bright sage on Mount T'ien-t'ai' in their past lives maintained the 'three kinds of good karmas' and in their present lives became two honored patriarchs, with one succeeding the other" 兩尊紹係, 天台明哲, 昔三業住持, 今兩尊紹係; *KCPL*; Tno. 1934, vol. 46, p. 822A. "Bright sage on Mount T'ien-t'ai" and "wise saint of Nan-yüeh" respectively refer to Chih-i and Hui-ssu 慧思 (515-68) (on whom, see Paul Magnin, *La vie et l'oeuvre de Huisi (515-577) [Les origines de la secte bouddhique chinoise du Tiantai]*, Publications de l'EFEO 116 [Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient, 1979]).

plation (*Mo-he chih-kuan* 摩訶止觀),⁴⁶ a work representing the result of Kuan-ting's continuous efforts to compile and revise his teacher's lectures on cessation and contemplation. Kuan-ting did not begin to write this introduction until he finished editing his teacher's *magnum opus* in about 632, thirty-five years after Chih-i's death and barely before Kuan-ting's own (which is dated to the same year). Of course, one cannot preclude the existence of the T'ien-t'ai notion of lineage prior to Kuan-ting's normative definition in the introduction. However, it also seems far from likely that the T'ien-t'ai group had already developed a clear notion of its lineage before Chih-i's death.⁴⁷

Another bit of evidence also indicates that the letter could not have been written by Chi-tsang. Talking about Chih-i's connection to Mount T'ien-t'ai, the letter states that up to the moment of writing Chih-i had dwelt at the mountain for over twenty years.⁴⁸ However, Chih-i's two periods of residence there total barely twelve years.⁴⁹ As a contemporary of Chih-i, Chi-tsang must have known this fact too well to contradict it so flatly.

The strongest evidence against the letter's authenticity, however, is its prediction that T'ien-t'ai teachings, although created in China and catering primarily to the needs of the Chinese people, were so powerful that they were to cause a wider spread of Buddhism in India itself.⁵⁰ The claim is an extremely unusual one. As far as I know, only one similar claim exists; it is found in a story that a leading disciple of Pu-k'ung 不空 (706-774) named

⁴⁶ Tno. 1911, vol. 46, p. 1A-B. Kuan-ting's introduction is translated into English by Neal Donner and Daniel B. Stevenson, *The Great Calming and Contemplation: A Study and Annotated Translation of the First Chapter of Chih-i's Mo-ho Chih-kuan* (Honolulu: U. Hawaii P., 1993), esp. pp. 22-24, 33-39, on Kuan-ting's ideas; and pp. 100-3, for Kuan-ting's definition of T'ien-t'ai lineage.

⁴⁷ Moreover, even in outlining the T'ien-t'ai lineage in his introduction to *Mo-ho Chih-kuan*, Kuan-ting appears to have made a remarkable distinction between the twenty-four Indian Buddhist patriarchs from Śākyamuni to Śimha Bhikṣu, on the one hand, and the three T'ien-t'ai masters including Hui-wen, Hui-ssu, and Chih-i, on the other. He unambiguously calls the Indians "patriarchs" (祖), while designating the Chinese T'ien-t'ai masters simply as *shih* 師 ("teacher") (Penkower, "T'ien-t'ai during the Tang," p. 168).

⁴⁸ *KCPL*; Tno. 1934, vol. 46, p. 822A.

⁴⁹ Chih-i first went to the Mount T'ien-t'ai hermitage when he was 38 (575). After ten years he returned to Chin-ling. He reentered Mount T'ien-t'ai in the spring of 596, at age 59. He died at Mount T'ien-t'ai in 597, eleventh lunar mo. His second residence at the mountain lasted less than two years (cf. "Chieh-ying's chronology," *KCPL* [Tno. 1934, vol. 46], p. 823B-C).

⁵⁰ "Not only have you two spread the sweet dew in China, also you are to beat the Dharmadrum in India" 豈止灑甘露於震旦, 亦當振法鼓於天竺; *KCPL*; Tno. 1934, vol. 46, p. 822A.

According to *Separate Biography of Chih-che*, Hui-ssu declared, upon seeing Chih-i, that in their past lives they attended together dharma lectures delivered by the Buddha on Vulture Peak (Tno. 2050, vol. 50, p. 191c; for a thorough study of this legend, see Taira Ryōshō 平了照, "Ryōzan dôchō ni suite" 靈山同聽について, *Tendai gakuho* 天台學報 14 [1971], pp. 1-11). It is probable that this story about Hui-ssu and Chih-i promoted the idea that T'ien-t'ai would regenerate Bud-

Han-kuang 舍光 (n.d) purportedly told to Chan-jan, and that was recorded in Chan-jan's *Notes on the Commentary*.

It just so happened that I was then paying a visit to Mount Wu-t'ai together with over forty monks from the Chiang and Huai areas. Thus, I met a disciple of Tripiṭaka Pu-k'ung, Han-kuang, who, by imperial command, was overseeing the construction [of the Chin-ko Temple 金剛寺]⁵¹ on the mountain. He told me, "While traveling in India with Tripiṭaka Pu-k'ung,⁵² I met a monk who asked me, '[I heard that] the teachings of T'ien-t'ai are circulating in the Great T'ang. They excel at distinguishing the heretical from the orthodox, differentiating the one-sided from the perfect and illumining cessation and contemplation. Could you have the T'ien-t'ai works translated into Sanskrit and bring the translations to this country?' Isn't this like what is said in the story that the law, having been lost to the central state 中國, had to be sought in the surrounding states?⁵³ However, few in this country are able to recognize [the value of the T'ien-t'ai teachings], just like the people of Lu (who failed to do justice to their rites).⁵⁴

Han-kuang's story about the monk in India implies that the reputation of T'ien-t'ai was strong in at least some areas of India at a period when it was ignored in China. Is this story plausible? I believe not, since evidence prevents us from accepting it as originating with Han-kuang or Chan-jan.

First of all, Han-kuang meets Chan-jan while Chin-ke Temple was under

construction in India. However, the story differs from the saying virtually in that the story is about Hui-szu's and Chih-t'ai's past lives; the anecdote here appears as a prediction about an important mission for Chinese T'ien-t'ai Buddhism. The story should not be taken as the main, much less the sole, source for this peculiar saying, which must have originated from another more direct source.

⁵¹ Although *FHWCC* fails to specify the name of the temple whose construction Han-kuang was then supervising, other reliable sources establish that it was the Chin-ke Temple. In 766 Pu-k'ung submitted a memorial to the court, recommending that Han-kuang be sent to Wu-t'ai-shan to oversee the construction of Chin-ke (*T'no.* 2120, vol. 52, p. 834A-B). Pu-k'ung's memorial was soon approved, and construction of the Chin-ke was begun in 766 under the supervision of Han-kuang. The huge project went smoothly, and it was finished one year later.

⁵² Han-kuang's traveling to India with Pu-k'ung is verified by both his and Pu-k'ung's *SKSC* biographies (see pp. 879B, 712B-C).

⁵³ Here, the fate of T'ien-t'ai in China was compared with that of the rites vis-à-vis their original place (i.e., Lu 魯國): rites were everywhere so neglected that those in Lu had to seek out rites in neighboring states; see *Iso-chuan* 左傳: "天子失官, 學之四夷" ("The Son of Heaven who lost the rites had to learn them from barbarians in the four directions."); Juan Yuan 阮元, ed., *Shih-san-ching chu-shu* 十三經注疏 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1980), p. 2084. Chan-jan thus can be said to have deplored the decline T'ien-t'ai suffered early in the T'ang.

⁵⁴ *T'no.* 1719, vol. 34, p. 389c. Han-kuang's story is repeated in his *SKSC* biography (p. 879B-C) and in Chan-jan's *FTIC* biography (p. 189A).

construction at Mount Wu-t'ai, which we know to have taken place between 766 and 767. But other sources place Chan-jan far away from Wu-t'ai at this time.⁵⁵ Furthermore, a close reading of the surrounding narrative in *Notes on the Commentary* reveals that the story is rather out of place and unrelated to the surrounding passages. This suggests that the story did not appear in Chan-jan's original text but was added by a later editor. In the passage preceding the story,⁵⁶ Chan-jan criticizes his contemporaries' lack of interest in the teachings of the *Lotus Sutra*, while in the passage following he contrasts this by describing how a virtuous person seeks the way: it is through respecting and assiduously practicing the Lotus teachings.⁵⁷ Given that the passages surrounding Han-kuang's story fit together so well and that neither is consistent with the Han-kuang story, it seems likely that the two passages were contiguous in Chan-jan's original text and only later separated by the Han-kuang story. Presumably, then, the story was composed and inserted into the text by a later editor of *Notes on the Commentary* after Chan-jan's death in 782.⁵⁸

On the other hand, a work attributed to the Japanese Tendai patriarch Saichō 最澄 (767-822), *A Collection [of Examples of Non-Tendai Monks] Relying on Tendai* (*Ehyō Tendai shū* 依憑天台集), quotes the *Notes on the Commentary* passage that records Han-kuang's story.⁵⁹ If the ascription to Saichō of the authorship of *Non-Tendai Monks Relying on Tendai* is correct, then we know that the Han-kuang/Chan-jan story had already been included in a somehow revised version of *Notes on the Commentary* that was available to Saichō. We are thus

⁵⁵ As is clear from Liang Su's 梁肅 (731-93) preface to Chan-jan's *Abridgement of the Wei-mo-ching shu* (*Wei-mo-ching lüeh-shu* 維摩經略疏; dated 764, at Fo-lung), Chan-jan returned to Fo-lung from his hometown of Pi-ling 毘陵 (in present-day Wu-ching 武進 district of Kiangsu) in the summer of 764 (*ZZ.* vol. 28, p. 387B). He stayed at Fo-lung until approximately 766 when he completed his *Inquiry of the Essentials of the Chih-kuan fu-hsing* [*fu-cheng chüeh*] (*Chih-kuan fu-hsing sou-yao chi* 止觀輔行搜要記); see Penkower, "T'ien-t'ai during the T'ang," p. 86. Other sources suggest that Chan-jan prolonged his stay at Fo-lung at least until 768 (*ibid.*, pp. 98, 109). Given this time frame, it is unlikely that in 766 or 767 Chan-jan made a pilgrimage to Wu-t'ai-shan.

⁵⁶ This passage is located in *T'no.* 1719, vol. 34, p. 339c, ll. 9-13 (beginning "故東京..."; ending with "... 教旨故也").

⁵⁷ This passage is found in *T'no.* 1719, vol. 34, p. 339c, ll. 19-24 (beginning "故厚德..."; ending with "... 聊爾").

⁵⁸ Here I assume that Chan-jan, as author of the *FHWCC*, must have understood the connection of the two passages too well to have inserted between them a story so irrelevant to both. It must have been a later editor who tampered with the text. It seems unlikely that the story, though not written by Chan-jan himself in *FHWCC*, was told by Chan-jan to his disciples, one of whom later happened to insert it into his teacher's text, because Chan-jan would not have dated his encounter with Han-kuang to a time when he was still living at Fo-lung (in present-day Chekiang), several thousand miles away from Wu-t'ai-shan, in present-day Shansi.

⁵⁹ *ND.* vol. 77, pp. 252B-53A. Another Tendai master, Annen 安然 (841-904?), used Han-kuang's story in one of his works (see *T'no.* 2397, vol. 74, p. 495B).

able to date the invention of the story and its insertion into *Notes on the Commentary* to sometime between 782, when Chan-jan died, and 804, when Saichō arrived in China.

Even if we assume that *Non-Tendai Monks Relying on Tendai* cannot be ascribed to Saichō with certainty,⁶⁰ there is still evidence to show that Saichō was not ignorant of the story about T'ien-t'ai and India. In his *Treatise on Protecting the State* (*Shugo kokukai shō* 守護國界章), Saichō claims that Chih-i "shook India from afar."⁶¹ Given the relatively short time (a mere twenty-two years) separating Chan-jan's death and Saichō's arrival in China, *Notes on the Commentary* was very probably the only source for Han-kuang's story while Saichō was in China. If the saying about Chih-i's "shaking India from far" can be taken as a reference to T'ien-t'ai's fame in India,⁶² it attests to Saichō's knowledge of the story and its existence in the *Notes on the Commentary* version available to him. If so, the story had already circulated in China by the time of Saichō's arrival at the beginning of the ninth century.

Now, we turn to consider whether or not there is any connection between the prediction in Chi-tsang's invitation letter and Han-kuang's story. The two fabrications both refer to the spread of T'ien-t'ai to India: one, in the form of a prediction, and the other, as an accomplished fact. One might have been based on the other. Since Han-kuang's story features T'ien-t'ai's fame in India, and Chi-tsang's letter predicts something to the same effect, it seems reasonable to assume that the "prediction" was made on the basis of the story. Furthermore, the fact that the *Notes on the Commentary* version of the story fails to refer to the invitation letter and in particular to its prediction suggests that the invitation letter did not exist when the story was invented. If it had, the inventor of the story would most likely have mentioned the prediction in a letter supposedly written by the greatest San-lun master to the founding patriarch of T'ien-t'ai. A statement from a personage of Chi-tsang's prestige would have been, without doubt, a strong support for the credibility of the story. This implies that the invitation letter appeared later than the *Notes on the Commentary* story about Han-kuang.

Chi-tsang's invitation letter postdated Han-kuang's story, but not by much. The letter was already included in Saichō's *Non-Tendai Monks Relying on Tendai*,

⁶⁰ Some scholars doubt that all of the work was written by Saichō (Tamura Akishike 田村晃祐, "Saichō Ehyō shū ni tsuite" 最澄依憑集について, *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛敎學研究 21.2 [1978], pp. 567-72). See also Ch'en, *Making and Remaking History*, chap. 7.

⁶¹ *Yōshin Tenjiku* 遙振天竺; *T*no. 2362, vol. 74, p. 145A-B.

⁶² This expression is also reminiscent of the statement in "Chi-tsang's letter": *chen fa-ku yū T'ien-chu* 振法鼓於天竺, suggesting that Saichō knew not only the Han-kuang story but also "Chi-tsang's letter."

and it was both referred to and quoted in Renkō's 蓮鋼 *Treatise on Determining the Differences among Schools*.⁶³

On the basis of the foregoing discussion, I conclude that the "invitation letter" was created between 782 and 804 by a T'ien-t'ai monk in Chan-jan's lineage who alluded to an already circulating story about T'ien-t'ai's popularity in India, a story which was also invented by Chan-jan's disciples.

Before turning to the other accounts that claim a close connection between Chi-tsang and early T'ien-t'ai figures, let us consider a point that discloses the spurious nature of the three letters ascribed to Chi-tsang. The three letters ascribed to Chi-tsang are found in documents 102 and 103 in the current Taishō edition of *A Hundred Records from Kuo-ch'ing*. But in spite of the phrase "a hundred records" in the title, the Taishō edition contains 104 documents. Strangely, however, this discrepancy seems never to have puzzled any T'ien-t'ai scholar.⁶⁴ I myself would not have given this discrepancy a second thought had not some remarkable points Kuan-ting made in his preface come to my attention. First, Kuan-ting says that his compilation was based on a draft

⁶³ The letter is quoted in Saichō's *Ehyō Tendai shū* and Renkō's *Jōshūron*, in full and in part respectively (*ND*, vol. 77, p. 253A-B; *T*no. 2369, vol. 74, p. 319B-C). In addition, near the beginning of Renkō's *Jōshūron* is found the following pair of sentences, "[Chih-i] brought forth his understanding and views to illumine the abysmal darkness of the Sui; he expounded the true way to lighten the deep night of Chia-hsiang" (*T*no. 2368, vol. 74, p. 313C). They are apparently based on "Chi-tsang's invitation letter," which contains similar sentences, "We beg you to bring forth your Buddha-like understanding and views to illumine the abysmal darkness [of this world] and elucidate the way of the truth to lighten the deep night" (*T*no. 1934, vol. 46, p. 822A).

⁶⁴ The problem is of considerable significance to T'ien-t'ai history in general and a fundamental Tiantai text in particular. In his comprehensive study of the *KCPL*, Ikeda was on the verge of noticing this discrepancy. He mentions a remark by the 17th-c. monk Chih-hsi 智旭 (1599-1655) that the *KCPL* edition available to him is composed of 100 documents. This might have led him to notice the discrepancy between what is indicated by the *KCPL* title and the actual number of documents contained in the Taishō version. Unfortunately, Ikeda limits himself to a simple explanation for Chih-hsi's unusual observation. Chih-hsi here might have misremembered, Ikeda explains, the number of documents in *KCPL* (Ikeda Rosan 池田魯參, *Kokusei hyakuroku no kenkyū* 國清百録の研究 [Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan, 1982], pp. 20-21). Ikeda's explanation might be correct, since Chih-hsi refers to the last document in his *KCPL* version as "Lun fang-sheng shu ti i-pai" 論放生書第一百 ("the 100th doc 100th - on [the meaning of] releasing creatures"; Ikeda, *Kokusei hyakuroku*, p. 21), but likely the 104th document contained in the Taishō version. This means that Chih-hsi's version consisted of 104, rather than 100, documents.

Hirai has proffered important evidence for questioning the authenticity of some *KCPL* documents (Hirai, *Hokke mongu*, pp. 49-50, 67-71). However, he does not raise the question of the number of documents and never considers the possibility that *KCPL* had been expanded to 104 documents. Silence on the matter, however, may be due to phraseology in Chinese classics, where numbers were not necessarily used literally. Rather, under certain circumstances, some numbers (particularly 3, 9, 10, 100, etc.) were used loosely or symbolically. In accordance with this practice, phrases like *pai-pu* 百部 or *ch'ien-jen* 千人 do not necessarily mean exactly 100 books or 1,000 persons, but instead, usually, somewhere around those numbers. It is not surprising when a bit more than 100 documents are seen in a collection whose title states "a hundred."

the biographical material about Kuan-ting, the account in the former is perhaps the best known and most often used. This is despite the fact that Kuan-ting's autobiography is at least twenty-six years earlier than *Further Biographies*, the first version of which was not officially completed until 645.⁶⁹ For this reason, Kuan-ting's autobiography deserves much more attention than it has been given.

Important discrepancies crop up right away. In general, the account in *Further Biographies* tends, consistently, to glorify Kuan-ting's career. This is understandable when we recognize that the account there was based on an earlier account of Kuan-ting's life prepared by his disciples soon after their master's death.⁷⁰ A number of passages in the account of Kuan-ting's biography in the *Further Biographies* show clearly that Kuan-ting's disciples tried to heighten Kuan-ting's status by means of two strategies.

First, they attempted to strengthen Kuan-ting's ties with Chih-i by casting that relationship in terms of the exemplary master-disciple relationship between Śākyamuni and Ānanda. Kuan-ting was depicted as a "constant attendant" 常侍 of Chih-i. Not only was his understanding of Buddhism frequently approved by Chih-i, he was also entrusted with the responsibility of caring for his master on his deathbed, which suggests also an emotional reliance on Kuan-ting. Presented this way in *Further Biographies*, Kuan-ting, like Ānanda, stood beside his master year round, taking care of his daily needs and noting, in this case in writing, what his master preached. The fact that Kuan-ting was responsible for editing and publishing the principal T'ien-t'ai texts attributed to Chih-i and completing some works left unfinished by Chih-i has bolstered this

⁶⁹ Kuan-ting's autobiography appears at the end of his *Ta-pan nieh-p'an-ching hsüan-i* 大般涅槃玄義 (*Mysterious Meanings of the Mahāparinirvāna Sūtra*; T no. 1765, vol. 38, pp. 148–15A) and was probably written shortly after Kuan-ting's commentary on the *Nirvana Sūtra* (i.e., *Ta-pan nieh-p'an-ching shu* 大般涅槃經疏 [T no. 1767; *Commentary on the Mahāparinirvāna Sūtra*]) in 619.

⁷⁰ As a general rule, the authors of the three major collections of monastic biographies in medieval China based their biographies mainly on inscriptions dedicated to the subjects of their biographies (Koichi Shinohara, "Two Sources of Chinese Buddhist Biographies: Stupa Inscriptions and Miracle Stories," in Phyllis Granoff and Koichi Shinohara, eds., *Monks and Magicians: Religious Biographies in Asia* [Oakville: Mosaic Press, 1988], pp. 119–229; Arthur Wright, "Biography and Hagiography: Hui-chiao's Lives of Eminent Monks," in *Silver Jubilee Volume of the Zinbun Kagaku Kenkyūsho, Kyoto University* [Kyoto: Jimbun kagaku kenkyūsho 1954], pp. 427–28). This seems to be particularly true of the account of Kuan-ting's biography in *HKSC*. As suggested towards its end, the account was mainly, if not exclusively, based on the inscription carved in a stele that his immediate disciples, led by a monk called Kuang-ying 光英 (n.d.), erected for him in front of the Kuo-ch'ing-ssu (p. 585B). As we will see, profound sectarian concerns and propagandistic efforts underlie Kuan-ting's biography. Since no evidence suggests that Tao-hsüan, compiler of *HKSC*, had any particular connection to Kuan-ting's lineage, we have to assume that these propagandistic efforts did not derive from Tao-hsüan or his disciples, but from Kuan-ting's immediate disciples.

perception. What is most noteworthy is that, in defiance of the fixed status of the monk Chih-yüeh 智越 as the heir of Chih-i,⁷¹ Kuan-ting's disciples claimed that their teacher was the only disciple of Chih-i who was capable of understanding Chih-i's profound teachings;⁷² in other words, Kuan-ting was the only qualified successor to Chih-i.

The autobiography, however, calls into question this conventional view. Far from being a constant attendant of Chih-i, Kuan-ting was absent from Chih-i's side for at least two lengthy periods.⁷³ Although *Further Biographies* tries to impress the reader that Kuan-ting was the closest disciple of Chih-i as the latter approached the end of his life in 597, Kuan-ting's autobiography intimates that he was not actually with his master for much of that time.⁷⁴ It is even doubtful that Kuan-ting and Chih-i maintained a particularly close relation-

⁷¹ The person who succeeded Chih-i in administering the T'ien-t'ai group at Kuo-ch'ing-ssu was Chih-yüeh (543–616; *HKSC* biog. at pp. 5700–71A), rather than Kuan-ting. Probably shortly before his death, Chih-i appointed Chih-yüeh as his successor, entrusting him with the responsibility of leading the T'ien-t'ai community (p. 570C).

⁷² The following comment on Kuan-ting's outstanding capacity is found to the end of his *HKSC* biography: "Furthermore, the eloquence of Chih-che, flowing like the clouds and pouring like the rain, was likened to the heavenly net or a necklace of precious stones. It was only Kuan-ting who was able to uphold and comprehend [what was preached by him]" (p. 585B). This reflects the efforts Kuan-ting's disciples made to promote Kuan-ting to the status of Chih-i's sole qualified successor.

⁷³ The autobiography explicitly states that Kuan-ting was separated from Chih-i when they left Chin-ling in 589, then already occupied by the Sui army. The master and disciple were apart until Kuan-ting joined Chih-i at Lu-shan 廬山 (T no. 1765, vol. 38, p. 14B). Chih-i visited Lu-shan twice after 589 (The first visit was in 589 after he fled Chin-ling. Chih-i stayed there until the tenth month of 592. Four months later, he came back to Lu-shan for summer retreat; cf. Hurvitz, *Chih-i*, pp. 139–53). Thus, it is unclear when Kuan-ting met again with Chih-i. However, according to the autobiography, after Kuan-ting was reunited with his master, the disorder in the neighboring areas of Lu-shan forced them to move on to Ching-chou (p. 14B). This suggests that the reunion occurred during Chih-i's later visit to Lu-shan around the third month of 592, since it was after his second trip to Lu-shan that Chih-i took a long journey which led him back to his hometown Ching-chou. If this was the case, then Kuan-ting was separated from his master for almost three years (see Ch'en, *Making and Remaking History*, chap. 3).

Another separation befell them when Chih-i, urged by the prince of Chin, left Ching-chou for Yang-chou in 595. Kuan-ting accompanied him as far as Yü-chang 豫章 (in present-day Nanch'ang 南昌, Kiangsi province), where he then became so sick that he had to stop to recuperate. After he recovered, Kuan-ting tried to rejoin his master in Yang-chou. But unexpectedly, halfway there (at Nan-hu 南湖 in present-day Chekiang province), he was told that Chih-i had already left Yang-chou for T'ien-t'ai. Thus, Kuan-ting rejoined Chih-i not in Yang-chou but at T'ien-t'ai in the fall of 597, shortly before Chih-i died in the early winter of the same year (T no. 1765, vol. 38, p. 14B). This time, the separation lasted at least one year.

⁷⁴ Since Chih-i died early in the winter (11th lunar mo.) of 597, and Kuan-ting, according to his autobiography, did not return to Fo-lung until the fall of 597, we can assume that before Chih-i breathed his last Kuan-ting had very limited time to care for him. In all likelihood, Chih-i fell sick before Kuan-ting's return. There must have been someone else who attended him on his deathbed. Kuan-ting's actual role in Chih-i's final days is still obscure, but it was apparently much less important than the *HKSC* account would have us believe.

ship.⁷⁵ It seems that Kuan-ting's prominence in T'ien-t'ai derived not so much from a personal connection to Chih-i, which was probably not even very close, as from his undeniable accomplishments in systematizing T'ien-t'ai doctrines after Chih-i's death.

The second strategy used by his disciples was to play up, or even invent, his connection to the Sui court. The account of Kuan-ting in *Further Biographies* reports, in total, three positive events involving him with the Sui court. The first was his audience in 601 with the prince of Chin during which Kuan-ting was said to have delighted the prince with his eloquence. The second was his trip in 602 to the capital, where he is believed to have lectured for three consecutive months in response to the prince's invitation. The third event was an audience with emperor Yang while the latter was on a military expedition in northern China from 611 to 612. These accounts turn out to be either aggrandizements of Kuan-ting's ordinary and routine missions, or deliberate misrepresentations of relatively negative experiences in Kuan-ting's life. To be specific, the account in *Further Biographies* of the 601 audience emphasizes Kuan-ting's eloquence and his amiable relationship with the prince of Chin. Yet we know from relevant documents in *Records from Kuo-ch'ing* merely that Kuan-ting discussed miracle stories about Chih-i.⁷⁶ The account in *Further Biographies* of his 602 trip to the capital turns out to be a fiction concocted on the basis of an ordinary mission the T'ien-t'ai monastic order entrusted to Kuan-ting that year.⁷⁷ Further, the story given in *Further Biographies* of Kuan-ting's meeting with the emperor in Cho-chün 涿郡 is clearly a purposeful distortion

⁷⁵ It is surprising to read in the autobiography that when Kuan-ting fell sick while he was accompanying Chih-i back to Yang-chou, not only did Chih-i go ahead without waiting for him to recover, but no arrangement was made to transfer the sick Kuan-ting to Yang-chou where he, presumably, would have received better treatment than in Yü-chang.

⁷⁶ On the emphasis on eloquence, see *Hsü kao-seng chuan*; Tno. 2060, vol. 50, p. 581c. On the documents (nos. 73-77) in the *KCPL*, see Shinohara, "Kuan-ting's Biography of Chih-i," pp. 100-3.

⁷⁷ As for Kuan-ting's Ch'ang-an trip of 602, a *KCPL* document tells us that the Kuo-ch'ing-ssu group entrusted him to send Chih-i's Lotus commentary to the prince of Chin at the latter's request. After arriving at the capital, Kuan-ting was asked to check the copies of the commentary newly made by the government. As soon as he finished proof-reading, the prince dispatched him back to Kuo-ch'ing-ssu, exhorting him not to be afraid of the fatigue caused by the long journey to and from Ch'ang-an. He even patronizingly instructed Kuan-ting to continue the religious cause initiated by his late master, so that the T'ien-t'ai group could live up to the expectations of lay people (p. 814c). However, what *KCPL* describes as a routine trip to the capital becomes in *HKSC* a splendid religious event sure to impress readers with Kuan-ting's lofty reputation at court. The *HKSC* biography reports that in 602 the prince of Chin, with a respectfully termed edict, summoned Kuan-ting to the capital to preach the *Vimalakirti-nirveda-sūtra*. Kuan-ting's lectures won deep respect from the future emperor (p. 584c), who afterwards made donations and had an envoy escort Kuan-ting back to T'ien-t'ai (p. 584c) (cf. Ch'en, *Making and Remaking History*, chap. 3).

of a humiliating experience in which Kuan-ting was accused of sorcery.⁷⁸ In view of these unusual measures his disciples had to take in order to strengthen his ties to the Sui rulers, it is doubtful that Kuan-ting himself ever received extraordinary imperial recognition under the Sui.

This is true not only for Kuan-ting, but also for Kuan-ting's senior fellow-disciple Chih-yüeh, Chih-i's appointed heir. Even a hasty reading of the brief account of him in *Further Biographies* is sufficient to convince one that Chih-yüeh, not unlike his posthumously more renowned colleague, rarely if ever attracted any imperial attention or patronage. His biography only reports one instance of a connection to the Sui court: he was once invited to participate in a vegetarian feast held in the capital in memory of emperor Wen's just deceased empress. Since this imperial recognition happened merely four years after Chih-i's demise,⁷⁹ and a second instance is not reported, it appears that it was due not so much to Chih-yüeh's own prestige as to the remnants of the Sui rulers' respect for his late master. As a matter of fact, the sources for promoting Chih-yüeh's reputation were so scarce that his biographer had to resort to reference to the respect reportedly paid to Chih-yüeh by two insignificant local officials.⁸⁰

⁷⁸ The autobiography informs us that Kuan-ting, while participating in a controversy at the capital, was once accused of sorcery. He was then sent under escort to the Yu 婁 and Chi 冀 areas (in present-day Hopei province) (Tno. 1765, vol. 38, p. 14c). Although the autobiography fails to date the debate, Kuan-ting's observation that he met with a flood in T'ao-lin 桃林 on his way to the capital establishes that the controversy happened in 611: *Sui-shu* 隋書 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1974; hereafter *SS*) reports a great flood in T'ao-lin in that year (*SS* 3, p. 76). It is strange that Kuan-ting, as a suspect of sorcery, was taken north to Yu and Chi, a journey that almost claimed his life. However, at the time the emperor Yang, waging a war against Koryō, was in Cho-yeh 涿野 (i.e., Cho-chün), the administrative center of Yu and Chi (Yamazaki, *Zui Tō Bukkyōshi*, pp. 131-43). Thus, it seems reasonable to assume that Kuan-ting was sent to the emperor for judgment and that he was granted a pardon and released and sent back to T'ien-t'ai.

No trace of these hardships and humiliations appears in Kuan-ting's *HKSC* entry. Instead, it reports an important recognition Kuan-ting received from the emperor Yang in the same year. It says that the emperor, while engaged in the war against Koryō in Cho-yeh, was once extremely moved by a memory of Chih-i (p. 584c). This reportedly led him to order Kuan-ting sent to Cho-yeh for an audience. After enjoying Kuan-ting's company (p. 584c), the emperor had Kuan-ting escorted back to the temple at T'ien-t'ai (p. 584c). Thus, Kuan-ting's *HKSC* biography has recast Kuan-ting's humiliating and trying deportation northward as a special audience with the emperor. The possibility that Kuan-ting had an audience in Cho-yeh cannot be entirely ruled out. However, as strongly suggested by the autobiography, any such meeting would have been brought about by reasons and under circumstances totally different from those given in the *HKSC*.

⁷⁹ Chih-yüeh's *HKSC* biography fails to date this event. However, since empress Hsien 獻后 died in 602 (*SS* 36, p. 1099), the religious activities held for her spirit, including the vegetarian feast, must have been carried out in that year.

⁸⁰ See p. 570c. The two officials mentioned are Cheng Hsi-po 鄭係伯 (n.d.), the prefect of K'uo-chou 括州, and Yang Shen-kui 楊神貴 (n.d.), the commanding general (*chen-chiang* 鎮將) of Lin-hai 臨海 district. Neither is mentioned in other sources.

The following fact also confirms T'ien-t'ai's loss of imperial favor at this time. None of Chih-i's disciples, including Chih-yüeh and Kuan-ting, is known to have been invited to reside at Jih-yen Temple 日嚴寺, which the prince of Chin built to attract and lodge celebrated monks from all over the country.⁸¹ Obviously, the prince had already lost interest in T'ien-t'ai a few years after Chih-i's death. At least, it can be said that the post-Chih-i order failed to produce a representative who appealed to the prince.

Moreover, Kuan-ting's biography suggests that the post-Chih-i T'ien-t'ai community even (at least once) had troubles with the Sui rulers. In fact, Kuan-ting's defeat in the "Jih-yen Temple Controversy" may have been due mainly to political, rather than religious, reasons. Little is known about the controversy: Jih-yen monks raised questions about Buddhist teaching and in doing so targeted the T'ien-t'ai Sect. The Sui court tried to quell the dispute by having Kuan-ting sent to debate the Jih-yen monks, but he was defeated and subsequently accused. It is fairly certain that the accusations he suffered at the capital were of political origin. It is hard to imagine that the association of sorcery with such an eminent cleric could have been free from political and factional overtones. Similarly, even given emperor Yang's absence from the capital at the time, the authorities in Ch'ang-an would not have been so bold as to jail a disciple of a late Buddhist leader who was known to have maintained a special relationship with the emperor if the political tide had not turned against T'ien-t'ai and the emperor himself had not tolerated (if not encouraged) the case against Kuan-ting.

This new understanding of the relationship between the Sui rulers and the post-Chih-i T'ien-t'ai community calls for a reappraisal of the influential view, initially proposed by Tsukamoto Zenryū 塚本善隆 and still broadly accepted by most T'ien-t'ai scholars, attributing the "dramatic decline" of T'ien-t'ai early in the T'ang to T'ien-t'ai's unusually close ties with the Sui ruling house.⁸² Tsukamoto's thesis takes for granted two suppositions – that the establishment of T'ang rule precipitated a meteoric decline in T'ien-t'ai from which it did not recover until Chan-jan and that this decline was triggered by the T'ang rulers' displeasure over T'ien-t'ai's unusually close connection to the Sui imperial house. Neither supposition can be justified. It is untenable to assume that T'ien-t'ai enjoyed continuous success under the Sui, and that this abruptly ended with the fall of the Sui. Evidence examined in this article shows that just several years after Chih-i's death T'ien-t'ai had lost imperial favor.

⁸¹ Yamazaki, *Zui Tō Bukkyōshi*, pp. 100–4.

⁸² Tsukamoto, "Kōnan seifuku," especially, pp. 172–73; Hurvitz, *Chih-i*, pp. 129–30, 177; Weinstein, "Imperial Patronage."

Moreover, at least from the middle of the Ta-yeh era (604–616), the T'ien-t'ai community's relationship with the Sui court was gradually deteriorating, to the degree that one of its main leaders (Kuan-ting) was not impervious to religious and political in-fighting.

In view of the Sui emperor Yang's (formerly the prince of Chin's) enthusiasm for Chih-i and his sect, the disregard that the emperor showed for T'ien-t'ai during the later half of his reign is puzzling. However, when we take into account the political factors that had driven him to Chih-i and other Buddhist monks in southern China, and the disappearance of these political factors around the time of Chih-i's death, the inconsistency becomes understandable. It is probable that not only was the prince drawn to Chih-i, but also that his association with Chih-i and other Buddhist monks was at least partially driven by genuine religious passion. However, it is also certain that he, like his father, tolerated and patronized Buddhism in the southern areas with a view to using prestigious monks to help pacify the newly conquered people of the south.⁸³ As Sui rule in southern China gradually solidified, southern Buddhist monks became less and less important, at least politically, for the rulers. Consequently, the court began to focus patronage on the Buddhist community in the capital areas. This was probably an important reason why T'ien-t'ai, which was based in the coastal areas, was eventually ignored by the Sui. Furthermore, T'ien-t'ai failed to produce a charismatic and creative leader after Chih-i's death. Kuan-ting may have been spiritually powerful, but he was apparently unable to muster sufficient support within the T'ien-t'ai group to challenge Chih-yüeh's leadership. The post-Chih-i community remained under Chih-yüeh's control until he died in 616, almost simultaneously with the fall of the Sui. Thus, T'ien-t'ai's honeymoon with the Sui leaders was already long over before the Sui came to an end in 616. It seems that T'ien-t'ai, as a Buddhist group, began to decline even under the Sui. It had already been ousted from the religious center as Ch'ang-an, rather than Chin-ling, became the new political center of the reunified empire.

The second supposition underlying and supporting Tsukamoto's thesis seems to be ill-founded as well. My analysis of the sources and composition of the account of Kuan-ting in *Further Biographies* indicates that his immediate disciples in the early-T'ang period did not conceal or play down T'ien-t'ai's

⁸³ Tsukamoto, "Kōnan seifuku," esp. pp. 160–68. As summarized by Hurvitz, Tsukamoto assumes that Yang Kuang's "punctilious lay discipleship" under Chih-i was motivated by the following three considerations: 1) the "value to the Sui government of having on its side one of the most important clerics of south China, whose name [Sui] Wen-ti must have heard frequently from the Ch'en nobility whom he had brought with him to Ch'ang-an"; 2) the "approbation of his devoutly Buddhist parents"; 3) "his own personal faith" (Hurvitz, *Chih-i*, p. 142).

connection to the Sui rulers. On the contrary, they highlighted it. They even went so far as to represent the painful persecution Kuan-ting suffered at the hands of the Sui government as an episode in which the emperor showed extraordinary affection towards Kuan-ting. This demonstrates that Chih-i's special relationship with the emperor caused no political pressure or embarrassment for the T'ien-t'ai group later on during T'ang. On the contrary, it seems that at least for Kuan-ting's disciples based at Kuo-ch'ing Temple, to establish Kuan-ting's close connection to the Sui emperor was an important strategy early in the T'ang for promoting the prestige of T'ien-t'ai in general and Kuan-ting's status in particular. This will frustrate any effort to link T'ien-t'ai's "decline" in the T'ang with its ties to the Sui.

The Further Biographies Account of Chi-tsang's Discipleship under Kuan-ting

The preceding discussion shows that Kuan-ting's followers attempted to promote their lineage by distorting the biographical record. Thus, we can better understand the account of Chi-tsang's discipleship, as carried in *Further Biographies*:

In his later years, [Kuan-ting] dwelled at Ch'eng-hsin Temple,⁸⁴ delivering lectures on the *Lotus Sutra*. His lectures went far beyond those of [Fa-]Lang and included [the ideas of] those by [Hui-]chi 慧基 (412-496); they surpassed those by [Fa-]yün 法雲 (467-529) and Seng-yin 僧印 (435-499). He attracted a huge following, with many admirers flocking to him with their book-cases. There was a Dharma Master called Chi-tsang, who was the leading disciple of Hsing-huang (that is, Fa-lang). He ran a lecture center at Chia-hsiang Temple, which became the most respected among the temples in the Che-tung area. Although having heard that the way of the Ch'eng-hsin Temple was superb, Chi-tsang initially refused to believe it. He borrowed a copy of a commentary 義記⁸⁵ by Kuan-ting and was thereby able to tell the profound from the shallow. Then he felt that his body was melting and his mind intoxicated [with ecstasy]. He had finally found something [worthy of] following. Therefore, he gave up lecturing, dispersed his disciples, and submitted to T'ien-t'ai. He received the Lotus teachings [from Kuan-ting] and vowed to proclaim [the *Lotus Sutra*].⁸⁶

This account in *Further Biographies* stands out for its description of Chi-tsang's

⁸⁴ According to *FTTC*, Ch'eng-hsin Temple was located in K'uai-chi 會稽 (present-day Chekiang province) (p. 187A).

⁸⁵ Neither Kuan-ting nor Chih-i left any Lotus commentary with the term *i-chi* in its title. Therefore, "*i-chi*" here probably refers to a Lotus commentary by Chih-i/Kuan-ting.

⁸⁶ *HKSC*; *Tno.* 2060, vol. 50, p. 584B.

dramatic conversion to T'ien-t'ai. But can we accept it? We have already seen that Kuan-ting's biography in *Further Biographies* was partly the product of efforts by Kuan-ting's disciples to glorify their master. Consequently, we are led to consider whether the conversion story about Chi-tsang, which undoubtedly boosted Kuan-ting's prestige, was contained as well in the original text of *Further Biographies*. However, by comparing this passage with the two surrounding ones, we conclude that the conversion story did not appear in the initial version of Kuan-ting's biography, but was added into it.

As given in all the versions of *Further Biographies* known to me (including the earliest known Kōshōji 興聖寺 version), the account that Chi-tsang became a disciple of Kuan-ting is located between two passages: the first mentions Kuan-ting's activities during the six-year period from 591 to 596,⁸⁷ and the second mentions the two-year period from 597 to 598.⁸⁸ Such temporal continuity strongly suggests that they originally were two adjacent passages in Tao-hsüan's text. The passage relating Chi-tsang's alleged conversion to T'ien-t'ai, by contrast, describes an event occurring during Kuan-ting's later years. Given Kuan-ting's relative youth at the time of Chih-i's death,⁸⁹ it seems rather out of place to refer to the time as Kuan-ting's "later years." Therefore, it was almost certainly not part of the same text by the same author.

Scholars have already delineated the long and intricate history of the transmission of the text of *Further Biographies*.⁹⁰ Tao-hsüan revised and expanded

⁸⁷ Found at p. 584B (beginning "開皇十一年 ..." and ending with "... 止於台活"), this narrates two of Kuan-ting's major activities from 591 to 596. First, he acted as Chih-i's important assistant in expounding the dharma at Ch'an-chung-ssu; and afterward, he accompanied Chih-i back to Mount T'ien-t'ai, at the end of 595 or at the beginning of 596 (according to "Chieh-ying's chronology" [p. 823C], Chih-i returned to Mount T'ien-t'ai in the spring of the year when he was 59 years old [596, one year before his death]).

⁸⁸ The second passage, located at p. 584B, ll. 18-23 (beginning "至十七年 ..." and ending with "... 千僧齋"), features Kuan-ting's role during Chih-i's incapacitation in 597 and subsequent death in the same year. Kuan-ting devoted himself to caring for his moribund teacher and was then entrusted by the T'ien-t'ai order to convey their late master's testament and religious paraphernalia to the prince of Chin. The passage also describes an event at the beginning of 598: at the request of the prince, a senior official in the Yang-chou area command (*tsung-kuan-fu* 總管府) called Wang Hung 王弘 (n.d., otherwise unknown) escorted Kuan-ting back to Mount T'ien-t'ai in order to sponsor a large-scale "vegetarian feast for one thousand monks" in memory of Chih-i (for a related record of these two events in *KGPL*, see no. 66 [pp. 810C-11B]).

⁸⁹ Kuan-ting was only thirty-seven when Chih-i died in 597. Since Kuan-ting died at seventy-two, he could not have been considered to be in his later years until a decade or more later.

⁹⁰ During this prolonged history of transmission, the text was subjected to repeated revisions and alterations. Although *HKSC* was officially finished in 645, Tao-hsüan seems to have written more biographies, some of which he added to his 645 draft. The other new biographies, which Tao-hsüan had neither the time nor desire to include in *HKSC*, were later collected, either by Tao-hsüan himself or more likely by his disciples, into a new work called "Hou-chi Hsü kao-seng chuan 後集續高僧傳" ("Supplement to the Further Biographies of Eminent Monks") (see Ibuli

his work towards the end of his life, and an entirely new work titled *Supplement to Further Biographies of Eminent Monks* was created. *Supplement to Further Biographies* circulated as an independent work along with *Further Biographies* until it was incorporated into the Fu-chou 福州 version of *Further Biographies* during the Southern Sung period. This incorporation not only lengthened *Further Biographies* considerably, but it is generally believed that it created numerous inconsistencies, even contradictions, as is inevitable in the mating of two originally separate works on the same topic. This might provide an explanation for the inconsistency between the account of Chi-tsang's relationship with Kuan-ting and its surrounding text passages. The story of Chi-tsang's conversion to Kuan-ting's teachings, which might have existed in the *Supplement to Further Biographies*, may have been inserted into *Further Biographies* so unskillfully that an inconsistency was produced. But is this hypothesis plausible? Very probably not. The contradiction between the biography of Chi-tsang in *Further Biographies* and the account in the same compendium of his relation with Kuan-ting under the latter's biography makes it very difficult to accept it. First of all, it is not likely that such a close association existed between Chi-tsang and Kuan-ting historically at the place and time given.⁹¹ Moreover, it seems that almost at every point of his career, Chi-tsang was more famous and more highly respected than Kuan-ting. Long before Kuan-ting emerged as the chief speaker for the T'ien-t'ai movement, which did not happen until after Chih-yüeh, the second T'ien-t'ai head after Chih-i, died in 616, Chi-tsang was already surrounded by a huge mass of followers. Chih-i's death in 597 contributed to the diffusion of the court patronage, which had been up to that point focused on Chih-i and his group based at Mount T'ien-t'ai. This helped Chi-tsang and his group attract court attention, as witnessed by his successive positions in two important government-sponsored monasteries – the Hui-jih and Jih-yen Temples. Despite close connections to members of the Sui imperial family, Chi-tsang's fortune seems not to have been unfavorably affected by the transition

Atsushi 伊吹敦, "Zoku kōsōden no zōkō ni kansuru kenkyū" 續高僧傳の増廣に関する研究, *Tōyō no shisō to shūkyō 東洋の思想と宗教* 7 [1990], pp. 58–74.

⁹¹ Chi-tsang states in one of his commentaries that he accompanied the prince of Chin to Ch'ang-an, where he settled down at the Jih-yen-ssu (Tno. 1780, vol. 38, p. 853A). According to *SS*, the prince entered Ch'ang-an in the second month of Kai-huang 19 (599) (*SS* 2, p. 44; cf. Hirai Shun'ei, *Chūgoku hannya shisōshi kenkyū* 中國般若思想史研究 [Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1976], pp. 318–49). According to the account of Chi-tsang in *HKSC*, after his arrival in Ch'ang-an, Chi-tsang spent the remainder of his life at the capital, where he busied himself associating with nobles and debating monk-scholars. On the other hand, Kuan-ting's entry in *HKSC* says that it was in his late years while lecturing at Ch'eng-hsin Temple that he won Chi-tsang's conversion. Since Kuan-ting was not in his "late years" in 599 (see n. 89), thus it is fairly unlikely that the two monks met after 599 at Ch'eng-hsin Temple.

from the Sui to the T'ang. Chi-tsang's success as a Buddhist activist under the new reign culminated with his promotion to the board of the "Ten Great Virtues" 十大德 at the beginning of the T'ang,⁹² which made him one of the chiefs of the Buddhist church in China. In contrast, Kuan-ting rarely if ever enjoyed such prestige during his similarly long career. It was not until Chih-yüeh died that Kuan-ting rose to lead T'ien-t'ai.

Having rejected the stories in *Further Biographies* about Kuan-ting's glorious experiences as a Buddhist expounder in the capital and other northern areas, we can assume that his religious activity was confined to the coastal area, far from the capital, which was then the center of religious activity. Further, as discussed above, Kuan-ting actually did not receive any significant recognition from Sui rulers, supposedly T'ien-t'ai's most enthusiastic and generous patrons. But also, it seems that Kuan-ting did not fare well under the T'ang. Although his last fourteen years were lived under that dynasty, he was never offered a position on the powerful board of Ten Great Virtues. As a matter of fact, he remained so obscure under the T'ang that *Further Biographies* found nothing worthy to record about him during that period.

We must not exclude categorically the possibility that a monk might study under a younger colleague who, though less prominent, was believed to be more advanced in religious cultivation. As a matter of fact, Chih-i was said to have had some students who were much older than he.⁹³ However, Chi-tsang's personality, as reflected in biographical sources, seems to have been the type not to have allowed for a discipleship under Kuan-ting. Chi-tsang was notoriously arrogant. *Further Biographies* says that he "was proud and aloof in manner; when he spoke, his voice reverberated aloud, resembling a bell or thunder."⁹⁴ Given his precocity and exceptionally smooth and successful career, such claims are believable. After the celebrated San-lun master Fa-lang accepted him as a disciple, Chi-tsang rapidly distinguished himself by his pen-

⁹² The *shih ta te* (lit., "ten great virtues [*bhadanta*]") refers to a board of ten prestigious monks, an institution established by T'ang rulers for the control of the Buddhist church (see Antonino Forte, "Daitoku 大德 [Great Virtue]," in *Hōbōgirin* 法寶義林 [*Dictionnaire encyclopédique du bouddhisme d'après les sources chinoises et japonaises*] [Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve] 8, forthcoming).

⁹³ Chih-i was apparently younger than his student P'u-ming 普明 (*HKSC* biog. at pp. 584A–85B). In addition, according to *Separate Biography*, one of Chih-i's disciples Fa-hsi 法喜 (n.d.) once made a brilliant reply to the question of why he studied under Chih-i, who was so much younger than himself. Fa-hsi's reply later become famous among contemporaries (p. 197B).

⁹⁴ *HKSC*, Tno. 2060, vol. 50, p. 514A. Chi-tsang's arrogance and argumentativeness are corroborated not only by his own entry in *HKSC*, but also by *HKSC* biographies of other monks. For instances, apart from Seng-ts'an's biography, discussed below, the biographies of Hui-tse 慧蹟 (580–636) and Chih-t'o 智脫 (539–605) describe the two monks' debates with Chi-tsang (pp. 441A, 499A).

etrating understanding of the Mādhyamika doctrines and his brilliant writing. By the age of nineteen, he had already been entrusted by Fa-lang with the responsibility of repeating the latter's lectures for his fellow-disciples. At almost the same time, Fa-lang asked him to take charge of receiving his guests, usually admirers seeking instruction or rivals coming to debate. The entry for Chi-tsang in *Further Biographies* reports that despite his youth, he handled the job with great ease and that all of the guests, both friendly and hostile, were profoundly impressed by his erudition and way with words.⁹⁵

After his arrival in Ch'ang-an in 603, Chi-tsang engaged in almost endless debates before large audiences.⁹⁶ Among the debates in which he was involved, the one with Seng-ts'an 僧粲 (529–613) is the best known and earned him the greatest reputation.⁹⁷ Chi-tsang was already in his fifties when he arrived at the capital, where his seemingly unrivaled eloquence and wit won him an even greater reputation than the one he had developed in the coastal areas. It seems that immediate success at the capital did not significantly change his temperament. Rather, the evidence suggests that he remained proud, sharp-tongued, and intractable throughout his life.

Even if we question the historical accuracy of this characterization, the passage in which Chi-tsang submits to Kuan-ting's doctrinal superiority contrasts sharply with the characterization of Chi-tsang's personality in the rest of the biography. Further, Tao-hsüan is unlikely to have written or accepted an account according to which Chi-tsang was in the Che-tung area and became the humble disciple of Kuan-ting after 607 (that is, when Chi-tsang was over fifty-eight and Kuan-ting forty-seven), since this goes directly against Tao-hsüan's own biography of Chi-tsang, which claims that Chi-tsang spent this period enjoying widespread admiration in the capital. Therefore, as long as we regard Chi-tsang's biography as the work of Tao-hsüan (and so far there is no evidence to the contrary), we have no reason to assume the existence of an ac-

⁹⁵ *HKSC*, Tno. 2060, vol. 50, pp. 513C–514A.

⁹⁶ The *HKSC* biography says that after arriving at the capital, “Chi-tsang visited all the renowned lecture centers, where his eloquence baffled the masters, bringing them to silence. Few were able to respond to his questions” (p. 514A).

⁹⁷ For his renown during three successive dynasties (Ch'en, Northern Ch'i and Sui), Seng-ts'an won the epithet “san-kuo lun-shih” 三國論師 (“Buddhist expounder of three dynasties”). This Seng-ts'an is unrelated to the famous third Ch'an patriarch Seng-ts'an 僧粲, despite the attempts of some Ch'an scholars to identify them (John R. McRae, *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch'an Buddhism*, Kuroda Institute, Studies in East Asian Buddhism 3 [Honolulu: U. Hawaii P., 1986], pp. 280–81). For a discussion of this problem, see my forthcoming article, “Story and History: The Evolution of Legends Related to the Third Ch'an Patriarch Seng-ts'an.” Chi-tsang's *HKSC* biography fails to specify when this famous debate was held. According to Seng-ts'an's *HKSC* biography, it occurred in 609 (p. 500C, l. 21).

count that contradicts it either in his biography of Kuan-ting or in his *Supplement to Further Biographies*.

Hence, someone else must have deliberately tampered with the account of Kuan-ting by inserting into it a passage narrating Chi-tsang's conversion as a disciple of Kuan-ting. The passage may have been invented by the tamperer himself or borrowed by him from another source. This presents us with three more problems: who tampered with *Further Biographies*, who created the anecdote itself, and what was the motive?

TWO VERSIONS: DISCIPLESHIP UNDER KUAN-TING AND UNDER CHIH-I

Since the version of Kuan-ting's biography containing the Chi-tsang/Kuan-ting story was apparently not that compiled by Tao-hsüan, then we should pinpoint the earliest version of *Further Biographies* that contained the story. Our attention turns, first of all, to the edition of the Buddhist canon on which *chüan* nineteen (the *chüan* containing Kuan-ting's biography) of the Taishō version of *Further Biographies* is based. Since this particular edition of the *Tripitaka* was compiled and edited in the years between 1078 and 1104, the anecdote in *Further Biographies* thus existed before 1104.⁹⁸ It seems certain at least that the anecdote in *Further Biographies* appeared before 1094, since a similar account of Chi-tsang's becoming a disciple appears in *Supplementary Notes*, which was circulating in Japan by 1094.⁹⁹ However, another Buddhist biographical work with a Chi-tsang/Kuan-ting account entirely identical to that in *Further Biographies* encourages us to assume that the anecdote appeared much earlier – near the beginning of the eighth century.¹⁰⁰ The earliest known edition of *Further*

⁹⁸ Eight *chüan* (nos. 16–23) of the Taishō version of *HKSC* were based on the Buddhist *Tripitaka* printed in the Tung-ch'an teng-chüeh yüan monastery 東禪等覺院; see Kunaishō toshoryō 宮内省圖書寮, *Toshoryōkanseki zenpon shomoku (furoku)* 圖書寮漢籍善本書目 (附錄) (Tokyo: Tsukiji kappan seizōsho, 1930), p. 90. The Tung-ch'an teng-chüeh yüan in Fu-chou printed a Buddhist *tripitaka* in a long process from 1078 to 1104; see Tung Wei 童偉, “Han-wen ta-tsang-ching” 漢文大藏經, in Lo Chu-feng 羅竹風 et al., eds., *Chung-kuo ta-pai-k'o ch'üan-shu tsung-chiao chüan* 中國大百科全書宗教卷 (Shanghai: Chung-kuo ta-pai-k'o ch'üan-shu ch'u-pan-she, 1988), pp. 151–56; and Lü Ch'eng 呂徵, *Chung-kuo Fo-hsüeh yüan-liu lüeh-chiang* 中國佛學源流略講 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1979), p. 387. In the Taishō version, Kuan-ting's *HKSC* biography is in *chüan* 19. Considering that the complex process of printing a Buddhist *tripitaka* would have required such basic texts as *HKSC* to be available *in toto* to the monastery's *tripitaka* project leaders before actual printing began, then one may assume that the *HKSC* anecdote in question existed even before 1078.

⁹⁹ See Ch'en, *Making and Remaking History*, chap. 6.

¹⁰⁰ See *An Account of the Promulgation and Recitation of the Lotus Sutra (Hung-tsan fa-hua chuan)* 弘法華傳 (the Chi-tsang/Kuan-ting account is in Tno. 2067, vol. 51, p. 18B). This text is attributed to “the monk Hui-hsiang 惠祥 (n.d.) of the Lan-ku-su 藍谷沙門.” We know virtually nothing more of him (see the only study by Ogasawara Senshū 小笠原宣秀, “Nantō Shamon Eshō ni

Biographies, the Kōshōji version, which derives from and is presumably fairly close to the *Further Biographies* edition Tao-hsüan finished in 649 (eighteen years before his death),¹⁰¹ also attests to an early appearance of the Chi-tsang/Kuan-ting account.

We now have to consider the problem of who added the anecdote to *Further Biographies*. The interpolation might have been made by a T'ien-t'ai monk or a monk in Tao-hsüan's lineage. Since it is hard to imagine that a version of *Further Biographies* blatantly altered by a T'ien-t'ai monk would have been accepted by the whole monastic community and survived to the present, I am inclined to believe that it was a member of Tao-hsüan's group who added in the Chi-tsang conversion anecdote. If this is true, T'ang-era T'ien-t'ai monks appear to have been much more active and successful in promoting their teachings (at least in the capital areas where the Tao-hsüan group was based) than previously believed.

We recall the young disciple of Chih-i named Fa-sheng (mentioned above), who, according to an account in *Buddhist Patriarchs*, early in the T'ang period traveled to the capital, where he performed so well as a T'ien-t'ai expounder that the government conferred on him the honorific title "Wu-chen Ch'an-shih" 悟真禪師 ("Ch'an Master Enlightened to the Truth").¹⁰² Heng-ching 恆景 (634–712), another monk closely connected to the Yü-ch'üan Temple lineage of T'ien-t'ai, was also mentioned in *Further Biographies* as having been successful at the capital.¹⁰³ Heng-ching studied "cessation and contemplation" at the temple, and sometime between the reigns of empress Wu 武則天 (r. 685–704) and Chung-tsung 中宗 (second reign 705–709), was summoned to the capital and frequently acted as preceptor during esoteric services in the court. He also participated in the translation of a number of important Buddhist scriptures.¹⁰⁴ Te-kan was yet another important T'ien-t'ai representative

tsuite" 藍谷沙門惠祥に就いて, in *Ryūkoku gakuō* 龍谷學報 315 [1936]). The text itself is also undated. But the latest date mentioned is 706 (Tno. 2067, vol. 51, 47c, l. 1), and we can deduce that it was composed probably not too long afterwards. This suggests that the Chi-tsang/Kuan-ting account appeared around 706.

¹⁰¹ Ibuki, "Zoku kōsōden." From its having included the Chi-tsang/Kuan-ting account, we know that the Kōshōji version actually represents a *HKSC* version in which Kuan-ting's biography had already been altered, although this does not necessarily detract from its comparative earliness. (I am grateful to Mr. Ogata Kōshū 緒方香州 of the Ginkakuji 銀閣寺 in Kyoto for providing a photocopy of this version of Kuan-ting's biography.)

¹⁰² *FTIC*; Tno. 1934, vol. 49, p. 199c.

¹⁰³ *HKSC*; Tno. 2060, vol. 50, p. 732b–c.

¹⁰⁴ Among the foreign Buddhist monks with whom Heng-ching worked on the translation were Devaprajñā, Śikṣānanda (652–710), and the Buddhist texts he assisted in translating into Chinese include *Hua-yen ching fa-chieh wu-ch'a-pieh lun* 華嚴經法界無差別論, *Chü-she lun* 俱舍論 (*Abhidharma-kośa-sāstra*), and *Ta-ch'eng ju leng-chia ching* 大乘入楞伽經 (*Lankavatāra-sūtra*).

active under the reign of empress Wu.¹⁰⁵ We may assume that the latter monk enjoyed some influence in his day, since the empress once sent him a highly complimentary letter.¹⁰⁶

The careers of these three monks can be read as a reflection of T'ien-t'ai's growing influence at the capital early in the T'ang and provide us a context by which we may understand why and how a notion presumably based in the T'ien-t'ai community was interpolated into *Further Biographies* despite the discrepancies and contradictions it raised. This alteration was committed either as a result of solicitation (and/or coercion) by a certain T'ien-t'ai group or as a response of the interpolator to the prestige T'ien-t'ai was then enjoying within the Buddhist community.

Although its inclusion in *Further Biographies* was probably accomplished by a disciple of Tao-hsüan, it is fairly certain that the story itself, like other accounts in that work that promoted Kuan-ting's status, originated with T'ien-t'ai. Why then did T'ien-t'ai monks find it necessary and profitable to paint such a picture of Chi-tsang? Kuan-ting's humiliating failure arising from the 611 Jih-yen Temple Controversy provides us with an important clue. Although we do not know for certain whom Kuan-ting debated and by whom he was defeated, Chi-tsang's prominence among the Jih-yen priests suggests that he may have played an important role.¹⁰⁷ After the controversy, in both the commentaries he compiled on the basis of Chih-i's lectures and his own Nirvana commentary, Kuan-ting grasped almost every chance to criticize Chi-tsang, to whom he referred as "yu- jen 有人" or "huo 或," both meaning "so-and-so."¹⁰⁸ This shows how hostile he was to Chi-tsang. Very likely, the ingrained hostility began with Chi-tsang's role in his defeat. In view of such an aggressive disposition, Chi-tsang's discipleship under Kuan-ting was probably invented to vent T'ien-t'ai anger over Chi-tsang.

Furthermore, in spite of (or because of?) the animosity he harbored to-

¹⁰⁵ The best study of Te-kan remains Forte, *Political Propaganda and Ideology* (esp. pp. 100–8; for Te-kan's T'ien-t'ai background, see pp. 106–7). I discuss this monk, particularly his connection with a northern Ch'an master Chan-jan who has been confused with the T'ien-t'ai patriarch Chan-jan, in a forthcoming article, "One Name, Three Monks: Two Eighth-Century Northern Chan (Ch'an) Masters Emerge from the Shadow of Their Tiantai (T'ien-t'ai) Contemporary Zhan-ran (Chan-jan) 湛然 (711–782)," *Journal of the Intl. Assoc. of Buddhist Studies* 21.2 (1999).

¹⁰⁶ See n. 42.

¹⁰⁷ Chih-to's *HKSC* biography reports that Chi-tsang, at least once, acted as the principal lecturer at the Jih-yen-ssu (p. 499A). Presumably, the "principal lecturer" was responsible for naming a topic for discussion (debate) and acted as a judge when the debate led to a deadlock.

¹⁰⁸ Kawamura Kōshō 河村孝照, "Kanjo sen Nehankyō gengi ni okeru aruhito to wa dare wo sasuka" 灌頂撰涅槃經玄義における有る人とは誰れを指すか, in *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 67 (1985), pp. 218–25.

wards Chi-tsang, Kuan-ting added many passages from Chi-tsang's works to his at least partly original commentaries. Kuan-ting's followers must have been shocked by the numerous parallels between Chi-tsang's works and those attributed to Chih-i (the implicit source of the exegesis). Their natural reaction might have been to explain them as Chi-tsang's own reliance on Chih-i/Kuan-ting. Hence, the necessity of Chi-tsang's discipleship under Kuan-ting.

At this juncture, we have to consider the relationship between the story of Chi-tsang's discipleship under Kuan-ting and that of his discipleship under Chih-i, an idea found in the two letters created under Chi-tsang's name.

Chih-i was not only Kuan-ting's teacher but also Chi-tsang's senior. Furthermore, *Records from Kuo-ch'ing*, in which the documents supporting Chi-tsang's admiration for and even discipleship under Chih-i are found, was finished before *Further Biographies*. All this may suggest that the Chi-tsang/Chih-i story preceded that concerning Chi-tsang and Kuan-ting. However, the reverse may be true. It might be the Chi-tsang/Kuan-ting story that preceded and probably prompted the appearance of the other, and not vice versa. This is supported by the dates of the two stories. The Chi-tsang/Kuan-ting story was advanced about seventy years after Kuan-ting's death in 632 and was incorporated into Kuan-ting's biography in Tao-hsüan's (d. 667) *Further Biographies* around the beginning of the eighth century. The Chi-tsang/Chih-i story was, on the other hand, invented shortly before Chan-jan began to promote it enthusiastically in his *Notes on the Commentary of the Lotus [Sutra]*, completed in the 770s. A comparison of Fa-chin's story about Chi-tsang in his *vinaya* commentary (see above) with the story in *Further Biographies* sheds new light on the question of priority.

While *Further Biographies* unambiguously claims Chi-tsang's discipleship under Kuan-ting, Fa-chin's story avoids doing so. It features Kuan-ting's role in converting Chi-tsang, on the one hand, and, on the other, underscores that it was Chih-i, rather than Kuan-ting (we must keep in mind that Kuan-ting was then, Fa-chin told us, still a *śrāmanera!*) under whom Chi-tsang actually became a disciple.¹⁰⁹ Thus, Fa-chin's story establishes Kuan-ting's and Chih-i's superiority over Chi-tsang but avoids describing any submission by Chi-tsang.

Fa-chin wrote the Chi-tsang/Chih-i(Kuan-ting) account in 761, while that of *Further Biographies* appeared over half a century earlier and thus was known to Fa-chin. Fa-chin's handling of the important Buddhist anecdote betrays the real relationship between the two versions: Chi-tsang's discipleship under Chih-i was invented afterwards, and as a substitute for, the Chi-tsang/Kuan-ting

story in *Further Biographies*. We know this because Fa-chin arrived in Japan in 754 and wrote his commentary there, thus establishing the Chi-tsang/Kuan-ting story's existence in China previously. If we can accept the Chi-tsang/Chih-i story as a strategy to forestall the debunking of the Chi-tsang/Kuan-ting story, it then provides a reasonable explanation for Chan-jan's curious silence on the Chi-tsang/Kuan-ting story.

No mention is made in Chan-jan's works of the Chi-tsang/Kuan-ting version. Chan-jan obviously had the chance to read it in *Further Biographies*, which would have dispensed with any need to forge and promote Chi-tsang's discipleship under Chih-i, himself the teacher of Kuan-ting. In fact, it would have neatly served Chan-jan's need to erase from historical view the significance of the contradiction between Chih-i's and Chi-tsang's controversial categorizations of Buddhist thought. Thus it is possible to explain Chan-jan's silence by assuming that he himself did not find the Chi-tsang/Kuan-ting anecdote credible.

Such an explanation is supported by evidence. The *Further Biographies* version of Chi-tsang's discipleship is referred to in a work titled *Account of the Lotus Sutra (Fa-hua chuan-chi 法華傳記)* by an obscure author Seng-hsiang 僧詳 (n.d.), who wrote it perhaps between 810 and 988.¹¹⁰ The relevant passage is as follows:

In his late years, Kuan-ting dwelt at Ch'eng-hsin Temple. When he preached the *Lotus Sutra*, flowers rained [from the sky]. They looked like lotus flowers in shape, falling down like snow and with unusual fragrance. His lectures surpassed those by [Fa-]lang, included those by [Hui-]jih; and exceeded those of [Fa-]yun, Seng-yin and Liu.¹¹¹ As an advanced disciple of Chih-che (this being another name used for Chih-i), he recorded the [Fa-hua] *hsüan-wen*¹¹² and [Mo-he] *chih-kuan* preached by his mas-

¹¹⁰ See T no. 2068, vol. 51, p. 58A-B. Since this work mentions Fa-lang, who died in 754, it must have been compiled afterwards. Furthermore, for its possible reference to T'ien-t'ai's transmission to Japan in 805 by Saichō (see below), we can further date the text to after 805. That this text, extensively quoting from *HKSC*, makes no reference to *SKSC* suggests that it appeared before the *SKSC* (completed 988). Thus, its date can be roughly placed between 810 and 988. Nonetheless, it must also be noted that a remark in *ch.* 3 refers to the ninth *ch.* of the *l'ung-chi* 統記 (i.e., *FTTC*) for the source of a monk called Fa-yen 法彦 (d. 611) (Fa-yen's *FTTC* biog. at p. 197B, which is entirely identical with the quotation in this text [p. 59C]). This suggests that this text was compiled after *FTTC*. Had that been the case, this text would not have failed to refer to the *SKSC* as one of its main sources (just as it does with *HKSC*). Thus, the text's failure to do so tends to deny the possibility that it appeared after *FTTC*. In view of this, I am inclined to accept the remark about the *FTTC* as an interpolation.

¹¹¹ It is unclear to whom this Liu, a name not appearing in the *HKSC* account, refers. Perhaps, the character is redundant.

¹¹² *Hsüan-wen* must refer to *hsüan-i* 玄義, i.e., the work *Fa-hua hsüan-i* 法華玄義, one of Chih-i's Lotus commentaries.

¹⁰⁹ Ch'en, *Making and Remaking History*, chap. 6, provides a detailed explanation of Fa-chin's version of the Chi-tsang - Chih-i/Kuan-ting relationship.

ter. It was mainly thanks to the efforts of Dharma Master Kuan-ting that the “doctrinal traces” (*chiao-chi* 教跡) of the mountain (i.e., T’ien-t’ai) became so pervasive in the world that an Indian monk requested that [T’ien-t’ai texts be] translated [into Sanskrit], while the “country in the east”¹¹³ (*tung-i* 東夷) (Japan) benefited [from T’ien-t’ai teachings].¹¹⁴

It is on the basis of *Further Biographies* that *Account of the Lotus Sutra* claims that Kuan-ting dwelt at the Ch’eng-hsin Temple where he preached the *Lotus Sutra*. The comments about Kuan-ting’s superiority over his four predecessors, famous for their Lotus lectures, is also plucked from the *Further Biographies*. However, what is striking is that while apparently referring to some parts of the *Further Biographies* account about Kuan-ting’s Lotus lectures at Ch’eng-hsin, *Account of the Lotus Sutra* omits the story of Chi-tsang’s discipleship under Kuan-ting. This might have been due to Seng-hsiang’s suspicion of its historical truth. We might say that by the time of Seng-hsiang the reliability of the account of Kuan-ting’s discipleship under Kuan-ting was already problematic.

Furthermore, turning to a work called *The Correct [Line of] Transmission of the Buddhist Teachings* (*Shih-men cheng-t’ung* 釋門正統),¹¹⁵ which was completed by Tsung-chien 宗鑑 (n.d.) in 1237, it becomes clear that even within some Sung-era T’ien-t’ai groups the notion of Chi-tsang’s discipleship under Kuan-ting was not taken very seriously. Finished thirty-two years before the *Buddhist Patriarchs*,¹¹⁶ the compilation of *The Correct [Line of] Transmission* was also driv-

¹¹³ In Chinese classical texts, *tung-hsia* 東夏 means the southeastern part of China, while *tung-i* 東夷 (lit., the eastern barbarians) refers to Japan or Korea, both of which are situated east of China. I suspect that here *i* was miswritten as the somewhat similar *hsia*. The phrase “*tung-i huo-li*” 東夷獲利 (“The Eastern Barbarian country benefited [from the T’ien-t’ai teachings]”) refers to the transmission of T’ien-t’ai to Japan by Saichō in 805.

My opinion derives from the following three considerations. First, as was observed above, by the time *Fa-hua chuan-chi* was written, T’ien-t’ai had long since extended its influence far beyond southeastern China. For instance, the Yü-ch’üan-ssu in Ching-chou, which is in central China, became another important center for T’ien-t’ai Buddhism soon after Chih-i’s death in 597. In addition, T’ien-t’ai must have attracted quite a few followers in the north if the *FTTC* account of Fa-sheng’s success in the capital can be taken seriously. Second, that the southeastern part of China benefited from T’ien-t’ai would have been a well-known fact. It is quite unlikely that the author deemed it necessary to emphasize it side by side with T’ien-t’ai’s alleged fame in India, which was apparently quite unusual. Only an exceptional event like T’ien-t’ai’s transmission to Japan was comparable with the admiration of T’ien-t’ai in India and therefore was worthy of special mention. Third, it appears that the author refers to “T’ien-chu ch’ing-i 天竺請譯” (“An Indian monk asked for the Sanskrit translations of T’ien-t’ai texts”) and “*tung-hsia huo-li* 東夷獲利” (“Southeastern China or Japan [depending on the reading] was benefited”) as two supports for his claim that T’ien-t’ai’s influences pervade the world 流化世間. Obviously, “Japan” (*tung-i*), rather than “southeastern China” (*tung-hsia*), fits the context better, the implication being that T’ien-t’ai’s transmission to Japan lends stronger support to its “international” influence.

¹¹⁴ *Tno*, 2068, vol. 51, p. 578.

¹¹⁵ *ZZ* vol. 130, pp. 713 ff.

¹¹⁶ Actually, *Shih-men cheng-t’ung* was one main source for the *FTTC*.

en by pronounced sectarian purposes. Surprisingly, its biography of Kuan-ting, which was based on his biography in *Further Biographies*, excludes the account of Chi-tsang’s discipleship. In another section of *The Correct [Line of] Transmission*, where Chi-tsang’s appearance would be apropos if Tsung-chien had accepted the traditional views about his connection to T’ien-t’ai, Chi-tsang’s name is, once again, conspicuously absent.¹¹⁷

Given that Tsung-chien and Seng-hsiang lived after Chan-jan, it does not follow that Chan-jan was *a priori* also skeptical of the Chi-tsang/Kuan-ting story. However, given the anecdote’s spurious nature,¹¹⁸ Tsung-chien’s and Seng-hsiang’s attitude toward it must be taken as the reflection of long and widespread doubts. Chan-jan must have been one of many who were suspicious, and this must have driven him to forsake the notion of Chi-tsang’s discipleship under Kuan-ting. Instead, he advocated the idea that Chi-tsang was a disciple under Chih-i, which, in comparison sounded plausible and has, in fact, met with significant acceptance since then, even on the part of modern historians.

CONCLUSION

This article has discussed certain pieces of sectarian apologetics advanced by monks who traced their lineage back to the figures Chih-i and Kuan-ting. In order to glorify these two figures, the monks fabricated documents. Shortly after Kuan-ting’s death his disciples began to promote T’ien-t’ai’s prestige and Kuan-ting’s status in particular. In front of Kuo-ch’ing Temple a stele was erected, on which was elegantly carved an inscription prepared by Kuan-ting’s disciples. The inscription as such has not survived, but fortunately, its main points have been preserved by Tao-hsüan – writing the entry on Kuan-ting in *Further Biographies*.

A critical comparison of that entry on Kuan-ting with Kuan-ting’s own autobiography and other relevant materials uncovers some profound sectarian concerns and propagandistic efforts on the part of his disciples. This sectarian apologetics had two parts. One was to highlight or even fabricate Kuan-ting’s

¹¹⁷ The last *chüan* (no. 8) of *Shih-men cheng-t’ung*, entitled “Hu-fa wai-chuan 護法外傳” (“Biographies of the external dharma-defenders”), is devoted to the monks who, nominally not belonging to T’ien-t’ai, nonetheless defended its interests or whose teachings and/or activities, in Tsung-chien’s judgment, contributed to the spread of T’ien-t’ai. The monks recorded in this *chüan* include prestigious monks from such sects as Ch’an, Hsien-shou 賢首 (i.e., Hua-yen 華嚴), Fa-hsiang 法相, Lü-tsung, and Mi-tsung 密宗, but not San-lun – Chi-tsang’s sect.

¹¹⁸ Chi-tsang’s personality and his seniority to Kuan-ting, the hostility between them, etc., might have made the Chi-tsang/Kuan-ting account less than credible to Chan-jan.

connection to the Sui emperor. The other was to strengthen Kuan-ting's ties to Chih-i, to the extent that he was depicted as Chih-i's "constant attendant," most beloved disciple, and the sole qualified successor to the great T'ien-t'ai patriarch. This is despite the fact that during his decade-long discipleship Kuan-ting was separated from Chih-i for two lengthy periods, that he was probably never unusually close to Chih-i, and finally that another one of Chih-i's disciples (Chih-yüeh) was Chih-i's appointed heir.

Subsequently, Kuan-ting's immediate or second-generation disciples advanced the idea of Chi-tsang's discipleship under Kuan-ting. This was attempted partially as a response to the humiliating defeat Kuan-ting suffered in the Jih-yen Temple controversy, a defeat perhaps mainly if not exclusively brought about by Chi-tsang. Such an account of T'ien-t'ai making was incorporated into Kuan-ting's biography later, as part of a new edition of *Further Biographies*.

Sometime after the appearance of this curious anecdote about Chi-tsang's discipleship, T'ien-t'ai monks began to promote the notion that Chi-tsang was a disciple of Chih-i. This was done apparently to forestall negative reaction to the Chi-tsang/Kuan-ting story, which appeared so historically implausible. In order to establish a master-disciple relationship between Chih-i and Chi-tsang, T'ien-t'ai monks created two letters in Chi-tsang's name that emphasized Chi-tsang's unusual respect for Chih-i. One of them, in particular, suggested the existence of a kind of master-disciple relationship.

The propaganda initiated by Kuan-ting's disciples was continued by Chan-jan, the most important representative of T'ien-t'ai after Chih-i and Kuan-ting. Chan-jan promoted the idea of Chi-tsang's discipleship under Chih-i in order to explain away the crucial difference in their categorizations of Buddhist teaching. He adopted a two-part strategy. First, he strongly affirmed that Chi-tsang eventually became a disciple of Chih-i. Next, he argued that Chi-tsang's views on categorization predated the discipleship. In other words, Chan-jan argued, Chi-tsang discarded his "perverted" categorization doctrine after he went to study under Chih-i.

Another stage of the T'ien-t'ai propaganda was carried out by Chan-jan's disciples shortly after his death in 782. At this time, they began to propagate the extraordinary idea that T'ien-t'ai, despite the cold shoulder it unfairly received in China from time to time, had won widespread admiration in India. In order to substantiate this, a story was forged in the name of Pu-k'ung's disciple Han-kuang. Apparently taking advantage of the fact that Han-kuang was known to have accompanied his master on a journey to India in the 740s, the inventor of this story adroitly used him as a witness to T'ien-t'ai's supposed fame in India. The story was then inserted into one of Chan-jan's three major

exegeses, *Notes on the Commentary*. Shortly after the invention of the Han-kuang story, a letter was fabricated in Chi-tsang's name in which he humbly and emotionally beseeched Chih-i to lecture on the Lotus Sutra. It is worth stressing that the idea of T'ien-t'ai's reputation in India was written into this letter in the form of a prediction by Chi-tsang: T'ien-t'ai was destined to regenerate Buddhism in India.

This whole course of T'ien-t'ai sectarian apologetics seems to have been closely focused on a single theme – Chi-tsang's admiration for the T'ien-t'ai Lotus teachings. What is said to have convinced Chi-tsang of Chih-i's Buddhist teachings, or what Chi-tsang supposedly requested from Chih-i in excessively humble terms, was nothing other than Chih-i's superb understanding of the *Lotus Sutra*. In the same vein, according to the Chi-tsang/Kuan-ting story, it was by means of his brilliant exposition of the Lotus doctrines that Kuan-ting succeeded in taming the conceited Chi-tsang, so that Chi-tsang became his student. Of course, this emphasis on the Lotus teachings may be easily ascribed to the fact that T'ien-t'ai claimed to be a Buddhist tradition based on the *Lotus Sutra*. However, it seems that there are more profound and complicated reasons underlying this Lotus-centered fabrication.

We would not be able to do full justice to the complex historical implications of these efforts without understanding the context of the relationship between Chi-tsang and his followers, on one hand, and Chih-i and his followers, on the other. Thanks to Hirai's research on Chi-tsang and Chih-i [-Kuan-ting]'s Lotus commentaries, we can see past the distortions of these stories and gain a glimpse of the connections between these two groups. Hirai argues that the numerous textual and doctrinal parallels between Chi-tsang and Chih-i/Kuan-ting's Lotus commentaries are to be explained by Kuan-ting's extensive borrowing from Chi-tsang's commentaries. If this is true, the Lotus-centered fabrication about the relationships of Chi-tsang, Chih-i, and Kuan-ting must be understood as a deliberate and elaborate strategy on part of T'ien-t'ai followers to conceal the true circumstance of the relationship between these monks with respect to their commentaries. At the least, it was a defense against any charges that a revered T'ien-t'ai master (that is, Kuan-ting) had drawn his ideas from a contemporary (Chi-tsang). On the basis of stories of Chi-tsang's discipleship under Kuan-ting and his admiration for Chih-i, the T'ien-t'ai monks were able to reverse the relationship with regards to the *Lotus Sutra*: the numerous overlappings of passages and ideas between Chi-tsang's and Chih-i/Kuan-ting's commentaries could be attributed, they might argue, to the influences Chi-tsang received from his two T'ien-t'ai masters.

This article also has questioned the validity of an influential view of the connections of the post-Chih-i T'ien-t'ai movement with the Sui imperial house on the one hand, and the T'ang rulers, on the other. A close reading of Kuan-ting's autobiographical and biographical materials suggests that the Sui-period T'ien-t'ai (at least its Kuo-ching Temple community) was much less successful in attracting imperial patronage and holding together after Chih-i's death than is usually thought. Merely several years after Chih-i's death, the Sui rulers began gradually to withdraw support from T'ien-t'ai and concentrate instead on Buddhist communities at the capital and northern areas. As a result, the T'ien-t'ai order, which was based in Chiang-nan, was greatly ignored. Shortly following his enthronement in 604, the second Sui emperor Yang Kuang (the former prince of Chin, a patron of Chih-i), along with other Sui rulers, began to force T'ien-t'ai aside. The relationship between the post-Chih-i movement and the Sui rulership eventually deteriorated to the extent that Kuan-ting himself was subjected to an apparently political persecution.

For the most part, Kuan-ting's biography in *Further Biographies*, which contains deliberately distorted or even utterly spurious accounts of Kuan-ting's prominence under the Sui, must be blamed for the misguided impression that T'ien-t'ai had enjoyed continuing success throughout the Sui, even after Chih-i's death. However, the fact that Kuan-ting's disciples played up or even fabricated Kuan-ting's connections to the Sui imperial family reveals that the T'ien-t'ai movement during T'ang was not embarrassed by the patronage the Sui rulers had earlier bestowed. Kuan-ting's disciples would not have ventured to promote their late master's Sui connections had a political discrimination been carried out against T'ien-t'ai on grounds of its ties to the former dynasty. It is untenable to interpret T'ien-t'ai's failure under the T'ang in terms of its "overwhelmingly intimate connection" to the Sui: such a connection is far from the truth; to conceive that there was later political discrimination on the basis of such a dubious connection is unfounded.

While T'ien-t'ai might not have been as prosperous during the last decade of the Sui as tradition would have us believe, evidence shows that T'ien-t'ai in the early T'ang was much more active and influential than scholars have been able and willing to imagine. A passage, apparently of T'ien-t'ai origin, establishing Chi-tsang's discipleship under Kuan-ting was included in the *Further Biographies* in defiance of the discrepancies and contradictions the inclusion incurred. In addition, some Buddhist monks with strong T'ien-t'ai background performed extraordinarily well at the capital. All this must be taken as a testimony of the continuous success and remarkable clout T'ien-t'ai made and gained in the early T'ang (although as a Buddhist community T'ien-

t'ai at this period was no longer as coherent and well-organized as it was at Chih-i's time).

We have examined an extraordinary case of sectarian apologetics (polemics) that originated in China and continued in Japan. The formal introduction to Japan of these T'ien-t'ai sectarian legends can be traced back to the 750s, when the heroic Chinese Buddhist missionary Chien-chen (Ganjin) arrived in Japan with, among others, Fa-chin, who promoted before a Japanese audience a story of Chi-tsang's discipleship under Kuan-ting/Chih-i. Japanese Tendai monks (including Saichō, Enchin, Renkō, and Annen) availed themselves of such ideology (the discipleship stories, the fable of T'ien-t'ai's fame in India, and others) when they defended the legitimacy and superiority of their school. What surprises us most is, however, that a Japanese Tendai monk even went so far as to forge a subcommentary to the *Lotus Sutra* in the name of Tao-hsien (a T'ang monk regarded as a disciple of Chan-jan) and to add to it Fa-chin's story featuring T'ien-t'ai's aolute advantage over San-lun. It seems that these T'ien-t'ai sectarian and polemic legends served Japanese Tendai monks very well when they competed with rival schools, in particular Sanronshū 三論宗, which was much more powerful and coherent in Japan than its counterpart in China had ever been.

Finally, the research undertaken here underscores the need for greater caution in reading and using basic Chinese monastic historico-biographical works, as well as Buddhist sectarian works. Scholars must be critical not only of sectarian works, but also of the monastic historical works that have usually been thought of as less biased in a sectarian sense. The nature of the two sources (stupa inscriptions and miracle stories) on which monastic biographers relied caused their works to incorporate, albeit sometimes inadvertently and innocently, the inherent sectarian biases. These sectarian accounts are, more often than not, misrepresentations of historical facts, and sometimes sheer fabrication with little if any historical basis. For this reason, not every part of the monastic biographies can be taken at its face value. On the other hand, sectarian accounts also express sectarian ideologies driving the evolution of Chinese Buddhism. To decipher them may prove unexpectedly rewarding in furthering our understanding of Chinese Buddhism. In this sense, the Chinese monastic historico-biographical literature is revealing even when it is not accurate.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>FHWCC</i>	<i>Fa-hua wen-chü chi (Notes on the Commentary)</i> 法華文句記
<i>FSK</i>	<i>Hokke mongu fushôki (Supplementary Notes)</i> 法華經文句輔 正記
<i>FTTC</i>	<i>Fo-tsu t'ung-chi (Buddhist Patriarchs)</i> 佛祖統紀
<i>HKSC</i>	<i>Hsü kao-seng chuan (Further Biographies)</i> 續高僧傳
<i>KCPL</i>	<i>Kuo-ch'ing pai-lu (Records from Kuo-ch'ing)</i> 國清百錄
<i>ND</i>	<i>Nihon daizôkyô</i> 日本大藏經
<i>SKSC</i>	<i>Sung kao-seng chuan</i> 宋高僧傳
<i>SS</i>	<i>Sui shu</i> 隋書
<i>T</i>	<i>Taishô shinshû daizôkyô (Taishô)</i> 大正新修大藏經
<i>ZZ</i>	<i>Dai Nihon zokuzôkyô</i> 大日本續藏經