

## The Taoist Elements in the Buddhist *Great Bear Sūtra* (*Pei-tou ching*)

The *Great Bear Sūtra* (*Pei-tou ching* 北斗經) is a non-canonical Buddhist text that invokes the gods of the seven stars of Ursa Maior. Modern scholars have been interested in it because during the Yüan dynasty (1271–1368) it was translated not only into Mongolian and Tibetan but also into Uighur. Large parts of the Uighur text, preserved among the Turfan finds, were edited and translated over fifty years ago, and now several competent studies of the Uighur colophons are available. Less attention has been paid to the Mongolian and Tibetan versions and the Chinese version on which the Uighur, Mongolian, and Tibetan translations are partially based. Because the Chinese version is so little studied, the Taoist elements in the text have gone unnoticed. This article makes preliminary remarks on the Chinese text and its Taoist parallels and contains notes on the three translations.

### THE UIGHUR *YITIKĀN SUDUR*

Apparently Stanislas Julien in 1849 was the first Western scholar to notice that Buddhist scriptures had been translated into Uighur. His information was based on the colophon and the prefaces to the catalogue of the Chinese Tripitaka compiled under Qubilai Qa'an from 1285–1287 — the *Chih-yüan fa-pao k'an-l'ung tsung-lu* 至元法寶勘同總錄.<sup>1</sup> Julien had obtained a copy of this work from a correspondent in St. Petersburg in 1848 and in the following year published a list of the Chinese titles in the catalogue together with his conjectural reconstructions of the Sanskrit titles. He observed that Buddhist scriptures translated into Uighur were hitherto unknown.<sup>2</sup> Many years later Berthold Laufer claimed with uncontrovertible evidence that according to the colophon to the Tibetan version the *Great Bear Sūtra* had been translated into Uighur during the Yüan.<sup>3</sup> When Laufer

<sup>1</sup> See *Shōwa hōbō sōmōkuroku* 昭和法寶總目錄 (Tokyo: Taishō issaikyō kankōkai, 1929) 2, no. 25; this entire volume is published in *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經 (Tokyo: Taishō issaikyō kankōkai, 1924–32; hereafter *T*), vol. 99.

<sup>2</sup> Stanislas Julien, "Concordance sinico-sanskrite d'un nombre considérable de titres d'ouvrages bouddhiques recueillies dans un catalogue chinois de l'an 1306," *JA* [4th ser.] 14 (1849), pp. 353–446, esp. p. 366.

<sup>3</sup> Berthold Laufer, "Zur buddhistischen Literatur der Uiguren," *TPB* (1907), pp. 391–409.

wrote his seminal study he could not have known that fragments of the Uighur text had been recovered by the explorers of Turfan and were kept in Berlin at the Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften. His conclusion that the *sūtra* had been translated into Uighur was confirmed in 1937 by G. R. Rachmati, who edited and translated the Berlin fragments.<sup>4</sup>

Because of Rachmati's work we now know that the Uighur version had the title *Yitikan sudur*, where *Yitikan* derives from *yiti qan* ("seven rulers") and *sudur* is the standard Uighur rendering of the Sanskrit "*sūtra*."<sup>5</sup> The extant fragments of the book include two different colophons, which have been exhaustively studied since the publication of Rachmati's presentation.<sup>6</sup> The best modern study of the Uighur text and related problems is that of Peter Zieme.<sup>7</sup>

The extant Uighur fragments do not name a translator, and the so-called Colophon C is the only one that contains a date for the Uighur printing. This edition was sponsored by the lay sister Siliy Tigin in a *kuei* (-ox) year (Uigh.: *kui šibqan-liy ud yil*), which can be either 1313 or 1373. Louis Ligeti suggested 1373, but Zieme has demonstrated the probability of the 1313 date.<sup>8</sup> Precise information about these Great Bear translations can, however, be found in the colophons to the Mongolian and Tibetan versions; these are discussed below. The truncated Chinese version has no Yüan-period colophon. Zieme's results based on his study of the Tibetan and Mongolian colophons may be summarized as follows:

1. The *sūtra* was printed in either Mongolian, or perhaps Uighur, on the first day of the tenth month of the first year of T'ien-li (1328).
2. The *sūtra* was brought to China by Hsüan-tsang 玄奘 (596, 600, or 602-664).
3. A Yüan official, Üruk Buqa, sponsored a Mongolian translation that was entrusted to Prajñāsri and printed in 2,000 copies.

<sup>4</sup>G. R. Rachmati, with sinological annot. by Wolfram Eberhard, "Türkische Turfan-Texte VII," *Abhandlungen der Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften 1936*, Philosophisch-historische Klasse 12 (Berlin: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1937).

<sup>5</sup>Rachmati, "Turfan-Texte VII," p. 77, n. 40.  
<sup>6</sup>Marian Lewicki, "Turcica et Mongolica," *RO* 15 (1939-40), pp. 239-45; Louis Ligeti, "Notes sur le colophon du Yitikan Sudur," *Anatica: Festschrift Friedrich Weller* (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1954), pp. 397-404; Peter Zieme, *Buddhistische Stabreimdichtungen der Uiguren*, Berliner Turfantexte 13 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1985), pp. 160-62.

<sup>7</sup>Peter Zieme, "Bemerkungen zur Datierung uigurischer Blockdrucke," *JA* 269 (1981), pp. 389-96.

<sup>8</sup>Ligeti, "Notes sur le colophon," pp. 402-3. The date 1373 was also adopted by Annemarie v. Gabain, "Die alttürkische Literatur," in Louis Bazin et al., *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1964) 2, pp. 207-28; see p. 226.

4. The Uighur translation is the work of Alin Tämür and was printed in 1,000 copies.
5. The Tibetan translation was made in 1337.<sup>9</sup>

These data are basically correct with one exception, namely, the attribution of the *sūtra* to Hsüan-tsang and its origin in India. This problem is taken up below in my discussion of the surviving Chinese version. Otherwise the data in the Mongolian and Tibetan colophons have to be accepted at their face value; and as far as the studies by other scholars are concerned, only some minor corrections and additions can be made by adducing Yüan Chinese sources.

A hitherto unsolved question has been raised by Zieme: if one accepts 1313 as the date of the first Uighur version of the *sūtra*, then is the text identical with the translation by Alin Tämür printed probably in 1328? In other words, are the extant fragments of the *Yitikan sudur* the work of Alin Tämür?

The name of Alin Tämür occurs as A-lin T'i-mur ta'i se du in the Tibetan colophon,<sup>10</sup> and as Alin-di murdi-šidu in the Mongolian colophon.<sup>11</sup> Laufer discovered earlier that this man was identical with A-lin T'ieh-muerh 阿鄰帖木兒, who was given a short biography in the *Yüan Dynastic History* (*Yüan-shih*). This A-lin held the Chinese honorific title of *ta ssu-t'u* 大司徒, but the exact dates of his life are unknown.<sup>12</sup> The earliest biographical date for him is 1311, when he was a Han-lin expositor (*Han-lin shih-chiang* 翰林侍講). Emperor Jen-tsung had just read the *Chen-kuan cheng-yao* 貞觀政要 (a T'ang manual of statecraft) and was so impressed by it that he asked Alin Tämür to translate it into Mongolian.<sup>13</sup> In 1317 he was ordered by Jen-tsung to prepare a Mongolian translation of the *Ta-hsüeh yen-i* 大學衍義; at that time he held the office of *Han-lin hsüeh-shih* 翰林學士.<sup>14</sup> By 1326 Alin Tämür had risen in the Han-lin Academy to the rank of chancellor (*ch'eng-chih* 承旨),

<sup>9</sup>Zieme, "Bemerkungen zur Datierung," p. 390, where, however, 1336 should be 1337.

<sup>10</sup>Manfred Taube, *Tibetische Handschriften und Blockdrucke I*, Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland 11.1 (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1966), p. 227.

<sup>11</sup>Louis Ligeti, *Catalogue du Kanjur mongol imprimé: I. Catalogue*, Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica 3 (Budapest: Société Kőrösi-Csoma, 1942-44), no. 1123, p. 304.

<sup>12</sup>See *Yüan-shih* 元史 (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1976; hereafter *YS*) 124, p. 3047. He is frequently mentioned in the basic annals and elsewhere in *YS*.

<sup>13</sup>*YS* 24, p. 544. The translation was printed in 1332; see *YS* 36, p. 803. Zieme, "Bemerkungen zur Datierung," p. 392, makes a point of noting that Alin Tämür is attested in *YS* only from 1317 to 1330.

<sup>14</sup>*YS* 26, p. 578. Walter Fuchs, "Analecta zur mongolischen Übersetzungsliteratur der Yüan-Zeit," *MS* 11 (1946), pp. 33-64, reconstructs the name as \*Aerän temür (ibid., p. 49, n. 51), following Paul Pelliot, "A propos du Keng tche t'ou," in *Mémoires concernant l'Asie Orientale* (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1913) 1, p. 111, n. 1. This reconstruction is incorrect.

and in that capacity he was asked by the T'ai-ting emperor to organize a Mongolian translation of the precepts and admonitions of the early Yüan emperors that was printed as *Huang-t'u ta-hsün* 皇圖大訓.<sup>15</sup> Under emperor Wen-tsung, on June 4, 1330, Alin Tämür received the rank of *ta ssu-t'u*.<sup>16</sup> On September 1, in Shang-tu, he was formally invested with the seal of that office.<sup>17</sup> Later that year he and Qutluy Turmiš were ordered to organize a Mongolian translation of the basic precedents and statutes of the Yüan state.<sup>18</sup> All these passages confirm that he held high offices as an academician at the Mongol court from Jen-tsung's reign on and was a prominent supporter of emperor Wen-tsung.<sup>19</sup>

Alin Tämür's family came from Biš Baliq (Pei-t'ing 北庭). He was a fifth-generation descendant of Qara Yiyač Buiruq, who had been one of the earliest Uighur followers of Činggis Qan and had served as tutor of the imperial princes. During the thirteenth century members of Qara Yiyač Buiruq's family held the hereditary office of *daruyacı*, signifying a lasting and close relationship between this Uighur family and the Yüan court.<sup>20</sup> Alin Tämür himself must still have been alive under the last Mongol emperor Toyan Temür (Shun-ti) because he was in charge of court disputations on the Confucian classics (*ching-yen shih* 經筵事) in the second Chih-yüan reign period (1335-1340).<sup>21</sup> He had also been at some time the personal teacher of Qošila (the Kušala of the Uighur colophon of 1313), who in 1328 ruled briefly as emperor Ming-tsung.<sup>22</sup> Anecdotes involving Alin Tämür in the *Shan-chü hsün-hua* 山居新話 of Yang Yü 楊驥 (1285-1361) indicate that he had been aristocratically ennobled as Prince of Pei-t'ing 北庭王 and was

canonized as Wen-chen 文貞.<sup>23</sup> The *Yüan-shih* mentions only his activities as a translator from Chinese into Mongolian and remains silent on translations into Uighur, but there is no reason to doubt the information in the colophons of the Tibetan and Mongolian versions of the *Great Bear Sūtra*, according to which he translated the text into his native language probably in 1313.

The relationship between his family and the Yüan court did outlast Alin Tämür's life; one of his sons was Šes-rab dpal (Sha-la-pan 沙刺班), who not only rose to the rank of *ta ssu-t'u* already held by his father, but also was appointed as vice-chancellor (*p'ing-chang cheng-shih* 平章政事) in the Central Secretariat (Chung-shu sheng 中書省) and commissioner of the Bureau for Buddhist and Tibetan Affairs (Hsüan-cheng yüan 宣政院). In addition he served as tutor of the young emperor Shun-ti.<sup>24</sup>

After Rachmati's publication of the *Yitikän sudur* fragments in 1937 many more smaller passages from the text were discovered in Germany and Japan, so that now a much fuller edition of the *sūtra* is possible. Moreover, Zieme plans a revised edition and translation of the Uighur version.<sup>25</sup> Among his recent discoveries, of particular importance is the full title of the Uighur *Great Bear Sūtra*: "ngri ngri burxan yrli[ qami]š yitikän üzä öz uz[u]n qilmaq atly sudur nom bitig," or "sūtra on prolonging life through the Seven Rulers preached by the God of Gods Buddha."<sup>26</sup> This closely parallels the Mongolian full title "ngri-yin ngri burqan nomlaysan doluyan ebügen neretü sudur nom bitig"; the *yitikän* of the Uighur text is rendered as "doluyan ebügen neretü odun," or "the stars called the Seven Old Men."<sup>27</sup> The full title of the Chinese version is *Fo-shuo pei-tou ch'i-hsing yen-ming ching* 佛說北斗七星延命經 (*Sūtra Preached by the Buddha on Prolonging Life through the Seven Stars of the Great Bear*).<sup>28</sup> Further similarities and discrepancies between the four versions will emerge

<sup>15</sup> *YS* 30, p. 669; 34, p. 751; Fuchs, "Analecta," p. 51. <sup>16</sup> *YS* 34, p. 757.

<sup>17</sup> *YS* 34, p. 763. "Dasidu" in Zieme, "Bemerkungen zur Datierung," p. 390, should be *dasitu*.

<sup>18</sup> *YS* 34, p. 751; Fuchs, "Analecta," p. 52. See also *YS* 181, p. 4180.

<sup>19</sup> For a list of the mostly Turkish supporters of Wen-tsung, see John W. Dardess, *Conquerors and Confucians: Aspects of Political Change in Late Yüan China* (New York: Columbia U.P., 1973), p. 190, n. 54. This list includes Alin Tämür.

<sup>20</sup> On Qara Yiyač Buiruq and his descendants, see *YS* 124, pp. 3046-48. A genealogical table of the family is given in Ch'ien Ta-hsin 錢大昕, *Yüan-shih shih-tsu piao* 元史氏族表, in vol. 6 of *Erh-shih-wu shih pu-pien* 二十五史補編 (Shanghai: K'ai-ming shu-tien, 1937), p. 8338. On Alin Tämür, see also Igor de Rachewiltz, "Turks in China under the Mongols: A Preliminary Investigation of Turco-Mongol Relations in the 13th and 14th centuries," in Morris Rossabi, ed., *China among Equals* (Berkeley: U. of California P., 1983), p. 307, n. 72; and on Qara Yiyač Buiruq, see pp. 284-85.

<sup>21</sup> Herbert Franke, *Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte Chinas unter der Mongolenherrschaft: Das Shan-chü sin-hua des Yang Yü* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1956), p. 63. The form Arin should be replaced by the correct Alin.

<sup>22</sup> T'u Chi 屠寄, *Meng-wu-erh shih-chi* 蒙兀兒史記 (Taipei: Shih-chieh shu-chü, 1983), vol. 3, ch. 45, p. 2b.

<sup>23</sup> Franke, *Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte*, p. 43. The sources on Alin Tämür are conveniently assembled in Wang Te-i 王德毅 et al., *Yüan-jen chuan-chi tsu-liao so-yin* 元人傳記資料索引 (Taipei: Hsin wen-feng ch'u-pan kung-ssu, 1982) vol. 4, p. 2219.

<sup>24</sup> *YS* 124, p. 3048; T'u, *Meng-wu-erh*, vol. 3, ch. 45, pp. 2b-3a. See also Franke, *Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte*, pp. 33, 63, 66, esp. pp. 96, 114. Šes-rab dpal had inherited from his father the title of Pei-t'ing wang and was canonized as Wen-ting 文定.

<sup>25</sup> This information is based on Zieme's letter to me of December 22, 1988.

<sup>26</sup> Zieme, "Bemerkungen zur Datierung," p. 391.

<sup>27</sup> This form of the title appears in the middle of the Mongolian Kanjur, *eldeb* sect., no. 33, in vol. 92, Lokesh Chandra, ed. (Peking, 1717-20; facs. rpt. New Delhi: Sharadarani, 1973-79; hereafter called K. edn.), p. 381b.20-23. In the beginning of the text the title is abbreviated to "Doluyan ebügen neretü odun-u sudur" (p. 378b.27-28).

<sup>28</sup> T no. 1307.

below, through a close comparison of the Mongolian translation with the Chinese text.

### THE MONGOLIAN TEXT

Unlike the extant Uighur fragments, which date from the fourteenth century, for the *Doluyan ebügen sudur* we must rely on a very late edition in the Mongolian Kanjur printed under the K'ang-hsi emperor in Peking about 1720.<sup>29</sup> The text had already been included in a collection of Mongolian Buddhist scriptures printed in Peking in 1718.<sup>30</sup> In addition, manuscript versions are still extant in libraries throughout the world.<sup>31</sup> The following discussion is based on the Peking Kanjur edition.<sup>32</sup>

The Uighur text places the origin of the *sūtra* in India and claims that an Indian monk (*ānātkāk toyin*) brought the text to China.<sup>33</sup> This accords with the subtitle of the Chinese *Taishō* version, where similarly the text is said to have been brought to China during the T'ang by an Indian monk

<sup>29</sup> K. edn. pp. 378a.23–383a.28.

<sup>30</sup> Walther Heissig, *Die Peking'er lamaistischen Blockdrucke in mongolischer Sprache* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1954), p. 46.

<sup>31</sup> Some of the most relevant of these are catalogued in: Walther Heissig and Klaus Sagaster, *Mongolische Handschriften, Blockdrucke, Landkarten, Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland I* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1961), p. 168, no. 287; Walther Heissig and Charles Bawden, *Catalogue of Mongol Books, Manuscripts and Xylographs* (Copenhagen: The Royal Library, 1971), pp. 221–22. Also the ms. Mongolian Kanjur in Leningrad includes our text; see Louis Ligeti, "La collection mongole Schilling von Canstadt," *TP* 27 (1930), p. 168. A Ch'ing manuscript copy is listed in the catalogue *Bükü ulus-un mongyol qayučin nom-un yarlay* (n. pl.: Nei meng-ku jen-min ch'u-pan she, 1979), p. 129, no. 0429.

<sup>32</sup> A xerox copy of the Peking Kanjur text was kindly provided by Professor Klaus Sagaster of Bonn. The Kanjur version is now available in a careful transcription by Louis Ligeti [Ligeti Lajos], *Preklasszikus Emlékek 3; Jüan-és Ming-kori szövegek klasszikus átirásban*, *Mongol Nyelvelvéletár 5* (Budapest: Elte Belső-Azstai Intézet, 1967; hereafter called Lig. edn.), pp. 103–14. See Ligeti's earlier romanizations of all colophons in the Mongolian printed Kanjur (Ligeti, *Catalogue du Kanjur*). These colophons have been translated into German and annotated by Friedrich Bischoff, *Der Kanjur und seine Kolophone* (Bloomington, Ind.: The Selbstverlag Press, 1968) 2, pp. 548–51. Bischoff's translation of the *Doluyan ebügen sudur* colophon (Ligeti, *Catalogue du Kanjur*, entry 1123), however, is subject to correction in the light of a review by J. W. de Jong, "Notes à propos des colophons du Kanjur," *Zentralasiatische Studien* 6 (1972), pp. 545–49, who bases himself on the Tibetan parallel text.

The important anthology of the mongolist Ce. Damingürüing (1908–1986), *Mongyol uran jokiyal-un degeji jayun bitig orusbai*, *Corpus Scriptorum Mongolorum Instituti Linguae et Litterarum Comitetti Scientiarum et Educationis Altae Reipublicae Populi Mongoli* 14 (Ulan Bator, 1959), includes a rpt. in Mongolian script of the colophon, the hymn (*maytayal*) on the seven Great Bear stars, and a ritual (*takilya*) for the worship of the stars (ibid., pp. 131–36). The Buriyat ritual has no counterpart in the Kanjur version, but is evidence for the popularity of the Great Bear star cult among the Mongols (see Walther Heissig, "Die Religionen der Mongolei," in C. M. Schroeder, ed., *Die Religionen der Menschheit* [Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1970] 20, p. 389).

<sup>33</sup> Zieme, "Bemerkungen zur Datierung," p. 390, n. 36.

(*po-lo-men seng* 婆羅門僧).<sup>34</sup> The Mongolian and Tibetan versions are more specific. They state that the text was brought to China by Hsüan-tsang (also known as San-tsang 三藏). The Mongolian text has "San-tsang of the T'ang" (*Tang san-cang*),<sup>35</sup> and the Tibetan "T'hañ zam čhañ" (variant: čhañ).<sup>36</sup> This attribution to Hsüan-tsang was recognized long ago to be fictitious.<sup>37</sup> Apocryphal texts originating in China were commonly credited to either this famous T'ang pilgrim, who had brought to China many genuine Buddhist scriptures from India, or other Chinese pilgrims and translators. Indeed the *Pei-tou ching* is not included in the early catalogues of the Tripitaka, nor is this text anywhere mentioned in the biographies of Hsüan-tsang.

The Mongolian colophon identifies the initiator of the translation as *Ürüs böke neretü yeke sikür-tü*.<sup>38</sup> In this name the *-s* in *Ürüs* is certainly a misprint for *-y*; the letters *-s* and *-q/-y* can be easily confounded. The same person appears in the second part of the colophon as *gin-ki gong lu tai buu: giui siin tai buu Ürüy böke*.<sup>39</sup> *Böke*, which can be read *böge*, is probably Galik orthography, thus a reading as *boga* is equally plausible. The Tibetan parallel has *u rug bo ga'i miñ čan su gur čhe*<sup>40</sup> for the first occurrence and *gim rce goñ lu ta'i hu'i gy'i sri tha'i u rug bo [ga]* for the second. These official titles were correctly identified by Lewicki:<sup>41</sup> the Mongolian term *sügürči*, or "parasol keeper,"<sup>42</sup> a high court rank under the Yüan (*chin-tzu kuang-lu ta-fu* 金紫光祿大夫 — a civilian prestige title with rank A1),<sup>43</sup> and *yü-shih ta-fu* 御史大夫, or "chief censor." The various orthographies of the personal name have been quite plausibly interpreted as going back to the Uighur form *Örük Buqa*, or *Ürük Buqa*.<sup>44</sup> This person can be identified certainly, if variously transcribed, as *Yüeh-lu pu-hua* 瑠珞不花, *Yüeh-lu pu-hua*

<sup>34</sup> The term *po-lo-men seng* has nothing to do with Brahmanism and means no more than "a monk from India"; see Paul Demiéville, *Le concile de Lhasa* (Paris: Collège de France, 1987), p. 25, n. 3.

<sup>35</sup> K. edn., p. 383a.7; Lig. edn., p. 113.

<sup>36</sup> Taube, *Tibetische Handschriften*, pp. 225–26. The reading *čan* seems preferable.

<sup>37</sup> Paul Pelliot, "Notes à propos d'un catalogue du Kanjur," *JA*, 11th ser. 4 (1914), p. 146: "Il s'agit sûrement, ici encore, d'un apocryphe."

<sup>38</sup> K. edn., p. 382b.1–2; Lig. edn., p. 112, reads *Örüs* for *Ürüs*.

<sup>39</sup> K. edn., p. 383a.12–13; Lig. edn., p. 113.

<sup>40</sup> Taube, *Tibetische Handschriften*, p. 226. Taube's *bu* should read *su*.

<sup>41</sup> Lewicki, "Turca et Mongolica," pp. 240–41.

<sup>42</sup> On the parasol keepers (*sügürči*) see Ch'i-ch'ing Hsiao, *The Military Establishment of the Yuan Dynasty*, Harvard East Asian Monographs 77 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U.P., 1978), p. 218, n. 54.

<sup>43</sup> *YS* 91, p. 2319. Lewicki's assumption that the Chinese title *chin-tzu kuang-lu ta-fu* is an equivalent of Mongolian *sügürči* (*Turca et Mongolica*, p. 240, n. 6) must be rejected.

<sup>44</sup> This was done by Ligeti, "Notes sur le colophon," p. 400, n. 12.

月魯不花, and Yüeh-lo p'u-hua 瑯琊普華.<sup>45</sup> He was a pupil of the scholar Han Hsing 韓性 (1266–1341)<sup>46</sup> and is frequently mentioned during the reign of emperor Wen-tsung (1328–1332), and thus likely to have been a *se-mu* 色目 supporter of the emperor. In 1328 his name appears for the first time when he was promoted from associate censor (*shih yü-shih* 侍御史) to deputy censor (*chung-ch'eng* 中丞).<sup>47</sup> A month later he assumed concurrently the office of commissioner of the Bureau for Imperial Cults (T'ai-hsi tsung-yin yüan 太禧宗禋院), an agency for administering temples and places for Buddhist worship of deceased members of the imperial family that had been reorganized in 1328.<sup>48</sup>

For two months between 1328–1329 Üruk Buqa also served as vice-councillor in the Central Secretariat (*chung-shu yü-ch'eng* 中書右丞) but retained his function in the Bureau for Imperial Cults.<sup>49</sup> In the colophons Üruk Buqa is titled chief censor (*yü-shih ta-fu* 御史大夫), and indeed he had been promoted to this office on January 15, 1330. Concurrently he was made director-general for a richly endowed Buddhist temple.<sup>50</sup> This shows that the colophons must have been written in 1330 or later. Üruk Buqa formally requested to resign from his post in the Censorate in the spring of 1330 but was turned down,<sup>51</sup> only to be asked by the emperor to draft general outlines for government policy.<sup>52</sup> The following year Üruk Buqa continued to enjoy imperial favor. He was made a director of palace attendants (*shih-cheng* 侍正), and thus supervised the 400 valets (*sügürü*, or parasol keepers), who were responsible for the personal needs of the emperor.<sup>53</sup> In the spring of

1331 he was the organizer of Buddhist rituals in Te-hsing fu 德興府,<sup>54</sup> the location of which may mean that he was participating in preparations for the annual transfer of the court to its summer residence.<sup>55</sup> In the summer of 1331 Üruk Buqa again asked to resign the Censorate; his request was granted on June 26, 1331.<sup>56</sup> Afterward, he was employed in Hu-kuang, where he was ordered to quell disturbances among the aborigines of Hai-nan 海南.<sup>57</sup> From Hu-kuang he was transferred to Shensi as provincial censor.<sup>58</sup>

The *Yüan shih* subsequently says nothing of Üruk Buqa until 1336. On December 18, 1336, we learn that the provincial vice-chancellor of Ho-nan Üruk Buqa was "sent to Tibet to become a Buddhist monk."<sup>59</sup> This amounts to no less than a type of banishment and is evidence that for some unknown reason he had fallen into disgrace at a time when Bayan held supreme power under emperor Shun-ti. We may suppose that Üruk Buqa had been too involved with El Temür and the faction favoring emperor Wen-tsung. In 1340 the name Üruk Buqa is mentioned in the edict ordering the exile to Korea of Wen-tsung's second son El Tegüs.<sup>60</sup> This edict denounces the late emperor for having corrupted the government and plotted together with his officials Üruk Buqa, Yeh-li-ya 也里牙, and Ming-li tung-a 明里董阿.<sup>61</sup> It also says that Üruk Buqa and Yeh-li-ya were already dead, and that Ming-li tung-a was alive and should be dealt with according to the laws. Üruk Buqa and his associates are described as "rebellious officials" (*tsei-ch'en* 賊臣). Even as late as 1348 the anti-Wen-tsung propaganda had not yet disappeared: censor Chang Chen 張楨 (1305–1366) considered Üruk Buqa and the two others as archenemies of the ruling emperor Shun-ti.<sup>62</sup>

These facts show that after a brief but brilliant career between 1328 and 1332 Üruk Buqa became the victim of a political purge and must have died between 1336 and 1340. Unfortunately the *Yüan-shih* seldom, if ever, mentions religious affiliations, but even the scanty information available

<sup>45</sup> Wang, *Yüan-ien*, vol. 4, p. 2719, distinguishes six persons called Üruk Buqa, but all wrongly transcribed as Urlug Buqa. Ligeti, "Notes sur le colophon," p. 400, n. 12, called Üruk Buqa "un personnage fort bien connu," referring to the index in Louis Hambis, *Le chapitre CVII du Yuan che* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1945), and to Paul Pelliot and Louis Hambis, *Histoire des campagnes de Gengis Khan* (Leiden: Brill, 1951), p. 152. This Üruk Buqa is not the one of the colophons, but a Süldüs Mongol who lived 1308–1366 and had attained *chin-shih* status. He was, however, never employed in the Censorate. (See his biography in *YS* 145, pp. 3448–51; and also Dardess, *Conquerors and Confucians*, p. 199, n. 79.)

<sup>46</sup> *YS* 190, p. 4343, the biography of Han Hsing.

<sup>47</sup> *YS* 32, p. 716. The date corresponds to November 20, 1328.

<sup>48</sup> *YS* 32, p. 720; December 21, 1328. On the *T'ai-hsi tsung-yin yüan*, see *YS* 87, p. 2207.

<sup>49</sup> *YS* 32, p. 728; January 28, 1329. See also the table of members of the Central Secretariat in *YS* 112, p. 2829.

<sup>50</sup> *YS* 33, p. 746. The *Lung-hsiang tsung-kuan fu* 隆祥總管府 administered the Ta-ch'eng t'ien-hu sheng Temple 大承天護聖寺, which had been built in the palace precincts in 1329 (*YS* 87, p. 2211).

<sup>51</sup> *YS* 34, p. 752; March 10, 1330. <sup>52</sup> *YS* 34, p. 754; April 1, 1330.

<sup>53</sup> *YS* 35, p. 773; March 10, 1330. The local administration of Hsing-ho 興和 perhaps because of his office was ordered to prepare for him an enclosure, or tent, for falconers. See *ibid.*, p. 778; April 6, 1331. Hsing-ho is in modern Inner Mongolia, west of Kalgan (see P. J. M. Geelan and D. Twitchett, eds., *The Times Atlas of China* (London: Times Books, 1974), 27/E4.

<sup>54</sup> *YS* 35, p. 780; April 25, 1331. Te-hsing is modern Cho-lu 涿鹿, northwest of Peking; see *Times Atlas*, 30/C3.

<sup>55</sup> Both Hsing-ho (see previous n.) and Te-hsing are located on the roads leading from Peking to the summer capital of Shang-tu in Inner Mongolia. See a study of these roads in Henry Serruys, "On the Road to Shang-tu," *AOASH* 33 (1979), pp. 153–75.

<sup>56</sup> *YS* 35, p. 785.

<sup>57</sup> *YS* 35, p. 793; December 11, 1331. These aborigines were suffering from the exactions required in building a temple on the island.

<sup>58</sup> *YS* 36, p. 801; March 3, 1332. <sup>59</sup> *YS* 39, p. 837.

<sup>60</sup> *YS* 40, pp. 856–57; July 9, 1340.

<sup>61</sup> Yeh-li-ya (Elijah) is treated below. Ming-li tung-a is an Uighur name rendering Minglig donga. The first part is derived from Uighur *ming*, "birthmark"; donga is a Mongolized form of Uighur *tonga*, "tiger, leopard."

<sup>62</sup> *YS* 41, p. 883. The text of Chang Chen's memorial is also printed in his biography, *YS* 186, p. 4266.

makes it clear that Ürük Buqa was officially engaged in the administration of Buddhist temples. We can deduce that he was a pious lay Buddhist and a worshipper of the *Pei-tou ching* based on the Mongolian and Tibetan colophons, which name him as the sponsor of the Mongolian translation. Perhaps his name may yet turn up in hitherto unpublished Uighur Buddhist texts from Central Asia.

Ürük Buqa was not the only chief censor by this name during the Yüan. Under the last emperor, Shun-ti, Ürük Buqa (Yüeh-lu pu-hua) was provincial vice-chancellor in Ho-nan and in 1349 a director of the Bureau for Buddhist and Tibetan Affairs.<sup>63</sup> Three years later he joined the Central Secretariat as vice-chancellor and was concurrently entrusted with organizing the court disputations on the Confucian classics.<sup>64</sup> He was still vice-chancellor in 1359<sup>65</sup> and became chief censor in 1367. In theory, this Ürük Buqa might have been the sponsor of the Mongolian translation of the *Pei-tou ching*. Like his namesake he was probably a Buddhist because of his affiliation with the Hsüan-cheng yüan, but it is more likely that the Ürük Buqa of the colophons was the friend and advisor of the fervently Buddhist emperor Wen-tsung, who ended up in Tibetan exile.

The remaining person to be identified is the translator himself. The Mongolian colophon of the *Pei-tou ching* calls him "lord of the religion of the Uighurs Bra-dir-a-siri" (*Uyyur-un sajin-u ejen Bra-dir-a-siri*).<sup>66</sup> The Tibetan version gives *yu-gur gyi bstan-pa'i bdag bo bra-jñü śrī*.<sup>67</sup> The name is a slightly garbled rendering of the Sanskrit name Prajñāsī, mentioned in the *Yüan-shih* as Pi-lan-na-shih-li 必蘭納識理 (the orthography varies within the *Yüan-shih*), a form that is reconstructed as Birannaśiri.<sup>68</sup> He was an Uighur from Qamul (modern Hami 哈密 in Sinkiang). The "Treatise on Buddhism and Taoism" in the *Yüan-shih* includes a short biography;<sup>69</sup> and he is mentioned in the basic annals of the *Yüan-shih* several times between 1302 and 1332. Accused of conspiring with Ürük Temür, the son of Ananda, Prince of An-hsi, he was executed May 21, 1332.<sup>70</sup> The *Yüan-shih* biography reports that he was not only familiar with Uighur and Mongolian, but also Chinese,

Tibetan, and Sanskrit. Titles of Buddhist scriptures that he translated into Mongolian are listed in the *Yüan-shih* but the *Pei-tou ching* is not mentioned.

As Ligeti has shown, the Mongolian office title *šajin-u ejen*, which the colophon gives for Prajñāsī, is the functional equivalent of his Uighur title, and the latter is reconstructed from the Chinese transcription in the *Yüan-shih* as *šazin aiyučī*, "speaker for the religious discipline."<sup>71</sup> Prajñāsī not only translated into Mongolian but also into his native language; and he composed religious poems in Uighur.<sup>72</sup> He had been a favorite of the Mongol court under several emperors beginning with Jen-tsung and reached the peak of his career under Wen-tsung, who conferred upon him the title of state preceptor (*kuo-shih* 國師) in 1331.<sup>73</sup>

The name Prajñāsī occurs also in connection with the Lamaist treatise *Arban buyan-tu nom-un layan teüke*, the so-called "White History." In a manuscript version of this text the compiler Qutuqtai sečen qung tayiji (1540–1586) says that he used an old copy of the work that formerly belonged to Branaśiri (*uyiyurčin branaśiri üšung guusi-yin qayučin sudur*).<sup>74</sup> The identity of this Branaśiri with the Uighur translator of the Yüan period is certain.<sup>75</sup>

#### THE AGE AND AUTHENTICITY OF THE MONGOLIAN TEXT

A good starting point for a comparative analysis of the four versions of the *Pei-tou ching* might be the Mongolian text, not only because it is fuller than the Chinese version and the older but incompletely transmitted Uighur

<sup>63</sup> This reconstruction of the Uighur title had already been proposed; see Franke, *Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte*, p. 90, n. 1.

<sup>64</sup> For some of his Uighur poems, see Zieme, "Bemerkungen zur Datierung," p. 390, n. 33.

<sup>65</sup> *YS* 35, p. 778. In 1323, under Ying-tsung, he had been appointed *šazin aiyučī*. On Prajñāsī, see Mochizuki Shinkō 室月信亨, *Bukkyō daijiten* 佛教大辭典 (Tokyo: Sekai shoten, 1958–63; hereafter *BDJ*) 8, pp. 218a–b; Louis Ligeti, "À propos de la version mongole des Douze Actes de Bouddha," *AOASH* 20 (1967), pp. 59–62; D. Kara, *Knigi mongol'skikh kochevnikov* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo nauka, 1972), p. 191; de Rachewiltz, "Turks in China," p. 292 and p. 308, n. 73.

<sup>66</sup> On the "White History," see Walther Heissig, *Die Familien- und Kirchengeschichtsschreibung der Mongolen: I. 16–18 Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1959), pp. 17–18; C. Z. Zamcarano, *The Mongol Chronicles of the Seventeenth Century*, trans. Rudolph Loewenthal (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1955), p. 50, n. 1; Ligeti, "Transcriptions sino-ouigoures," pp. 243–44.

<sup>67</sup> *Üšung* is undoubtedly a corruption of something like \**unšung* or \**wunšung*, a Mongolian transcription of "Wen-tsung," the emperor who had appointed Prajñāsī as *guusi*, i.e., *kuo-shih* (state preceptor).

The *Arban buyan-tu nom-un layan teüke* is competently edited and translated by Klaus Sagaster, *Die Weiße Geschichte* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1976). The author tentatively identifies Branaśiri with the *kuo-shih* under Wen-tsung; he reconstructs the name highly unusually as Vairocanaśī. This could have been avoided had he taken into account Ligeti, "Transcriptions sino-ouigoures."

<sup>68</sup> *YS* 42, p. 887; 113, p. 2851. <sup>69</sup> *YS* 42, pp. 894–95.

<sup>65</sup> *YS* 207, p. 4601. <sup>66</sup> K. edn., p. 383a.14; Lig. edn., p. 113.

<sup>67</sup> Taube, *Tibetische Handschriften*, p. 227; *jñü* is an obvious mistake for *jñā*.

<sup>68</sup> This philological fact is demonstrated by Louis Ligeti, "Sur quelques transcriptions sino-ouigoures des Yuan," *Ural-altaische Jahrbücher* 33 (1961), pp. 241–44.

<sup>69</sup> *YS* 202, pp. 4519–20; Japanese trans. in Nogami Shunjō 野上俊静 *Genshi Shakurō-den no kenkyū* 元史釋老傳の研究 (Kyoto: Otani Daigaku, 1978), pp. 28–35, 53. For Chinese sources on Prajñāsī, see Wang, *Yüan-jen*, vol. 4, p. 2179.

<sup>70</sup> *YS* 36, p. 803; French trans. by Louis Hambis, *Le chapitre CVIII du Yuan che*, T'oung Pao Monographie 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1954), p. 58.

text, but also because Ligeti's expert edition makes it more accessible than the unstudied but equally complete Tibetan version.

An initial scan of the Mongolian Kanjur text reveals several rather unrelated sections of probably different provenance. The text may be divided as follows (the lettered sections are used as references in the remainder of this study):

- A. Titles of the *sūtra* in Chinese, Mongolian, and Tibetan. The Buddha preaches the *sūtra* to the youthful Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī.<sup>76</sup> (K. edn., pp. 378b.26–379a.1; Lig. edn., p. 103).
- B. List of the seven stellar gods: their received food offerings, relations to cyclical birth signs, and amulets<sup>77</sup> that guarantee blessing to the bearer. (K. edn., pp. 379a.1–379b.21; Lig. edn., pp. 103–5).
- C. Invocation of the Buddhas that are associated with each star god; *dhāraṇīs* for each Buddha. (K. edn., pp. 379b.21–380a.31; Lig. edn., pp. 105–7).
- D. A sermon preached by the Buddha to Mañjuśrī on the benefits of worshipping the *sūtra* as a protection against all sorts of evil. (K. edn., pp. 380a.31–381b.23; Lig. edn., pp. 107–10).
- E. A short list of the relation between the color of a person and the element to which he or she belongs. (K. edn., pp. 381b.24–28; Lig. edn., p. 110).
- F. Hymn of praise (*mayṭayal*) for the seven gods. (K. edn., pp. 381b.28–382a.14; Lig. edn., pp. 110–11).
- G. A list of the days when lamps for worshipping the seven stars should be lighted. (K. edn., pp. 382a.15–28; Lig. edn., p. 111).
- H. Colophon. (K. edn., pp. 382a.29–383.28; Lig. edn., pp. 112–14).

The romanized text of the *Doluyan ebügen sudur* has been included by Ligeti in his series of editions of preclassical Mongolian texts; he was, however, aware that the printed Kanjur text is not preclassical according

<sup>76</sup>The bodhisattva Mañjuśrī is frequently represented in Mahāyāna texts as a youth. The Mongolian text has "*jalayu*" for "youthful," the Tibetan version "*gḥon-nu 'gyur-pa*." This is a rendering of Sanskrit Kumārabhūta, which describes the youthful princely appearance of Mañjuśrī. For an example of textual evidence, see *Chin-kang ting ching man-shu-shih-li p'u-sa wu-tzu hsin p'o-to-ni p'in* 金剛頂經曼殊室利菩薩五字心陀羅尼品, trans. 730 A.D. by Vajrabodhi (*T* no. 1173 [vol. 20], ch. 1, p. 710a). See also Chou Yi-liang, "Tantrism in China," *HJAS* 8 (1944–45), p. 282, n. 52.

<sup>77</sup>K. edn. does not show the amulets, but the wording makes it clear that in the prototype of the *sūtra* there must have been reproductions of amulets. In Lig. edn. the amulets have been supplemented after the amulets in the Uighur fragment T.III M.190 (in Rachmati, "Turfan-Texte VII," pp. 23–24).

to the usual criteria. We find, for example, in the Kanjur text no trace of the preclassical *qi-* for classical *ki-*, which is normal in the Mongolian printed fragments from Turfan. The only evidence of preclassical usage that I could find in the Kanjur text is the occasional plural after numerals: for example, *doluyan ebüged* (with a plural ending in *-d*) in section D and *yüün tümen költi toya-tan odud* ("stars numbered thirty [times] ten thousand [times] ten millions") in section F, where *odun* "star" has the plural *odud*.<sup>78</sup> The Mongolian *Great Bear Sūtra*, however, was translated and printed in 2,000 copies under emperor Wen-tsung. We should try to determine the extent to which the Kanjur version of 1720 follows the nonextant first Mongolian edition of the fourteenth century. To achieve that it is useful to investigate the Mongolian transcription of Chinese words and establish an approximate date through phonetic criteria.

The names of the seven star gods of Ursa Maior in fact Chinese,<sup>79</sup> and were first studied by Wolfram Eberhard in his sinological commentary to Rachmati's edition of the Uighur fragments. (These names in Buddhist and Taoist contexts are discussed below in dealing with the Chinese version of the *Pei-tou ching*.) In table 1 references are made to the Uighur transcription after Rachmati's edition, to the Mongolian version in the Kanjur, and to the Tibetan edition in the Peking Kanjur.<sup>80</sup> The Old Mandarin pronunciation of Chinese is based on Nakano's study of the *Meng-ku tzu-yün* 蒙古字韻,<sup>81</sup> and Ligeti's edition of the *Po-chia hsing* 百家姓 in 'Phags-pa script.<sup>82</sup>

Table 1 shows clearly differences in the transcriptions of fourteenth-century Chinese. In numbers 1 and 5 the Old Mandarin final *-m* has been preserved only in Uighur and Tibetan, whereas Mongolian has the more recent final *-n* in *tan* and *liyan*. Mongolian has retained the premodern unpalatalized initials *k-* and *g-* (nos. 2, 4, and 6), but not consistently: in no. 7 the initial *g/k* becomes palatalized as *j-*. In general the Tibetan transcriptions are quite close to the fourteenth-century Uighur forms and must therefore go back to a fourteenth-century original, despite the Tibetan

<sup>78</sup>See K. edn., p. 381b.7 and .12, and p. 382a.7, respectively. Nicholas Poppe, *Grammar of Written Mongolian* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1954), sect. 393b (p. 107), quotes as an example for preclassical usage of the plural after numerals *doluyan ebüged* ("Ursa Major," literally "seven old men"). See also *ibid.*, sect. 392c (p. 106).

<sup>79</sup>They have first been identified by Sylvain Lévi, "L'original du sūtra tibétain sur la grande ourse," *TP* 9 (1908), pp. 453–54.

<sup>80</sup>I am grateful to Dr. Helga Uebach for her kind assistance in tracing the Tibetan parallels.

<sup>81</sup>Miyoko Nakano, *A Phonological Study in the 'Phags-pa Script and the Meng-ku Tzu-yün* (Canberra: Australian National U.P., 1971).

<sup>82</sup>Louis Ligeti, "Le *Po Chia Sing* en écriture 'Phags-pa," *AOASH* 6 (1936), pp. 1–52.

Table 1. A Phonetic Comparison of the Names of the Star Gods

| STAR | STANDARD CHINESE | OLD MANDARIN                           | UIGHUR                         | MONGOLIAN                          | TIBETAN              |
|------|------------------|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1    | T'an-lang<br>貪狼  | t'am-lang<br>(N: 683, 125)             | [t]amlang<br>(23.4)            | tan lang<br>(379a.2)               | tam-lañ<br>(371b.2)  |
| 2    | Chü-men<br>巨門    | Keu/g'iu-mun<br>(N: 266, 369)          | kumun<br>(23.13; 23.66, n. 14) | giyu men <sup>a</sup><br>(379a.9)  | ku-men<br>(371b.3)   |
| 3    | Lu-ts'un<br>祿存   | Lu-tsun<br>(L: 396; N: 375)            | liusun <sup>b</sup><br>(23.24) | lu cun<br>(379a.16)                | lu-sun<br>(371b.5)   |
| 4    | Wen-ch'ü<br>文曲   | wun-k'eu/k'iu<br>(N: 372, 265; L: 149) | yunkiu <sup>c</sup><br>(24.35) | uen <sup>d</sup> kiuu<br>(379a.24) | vun-khu<br>(371b.6)  |
| 5    | Lien-chen<br>廉貞  | lem-dzing<br>(N: 692, 51; L: 89)       | limčin<br>(24.45)              | liyan-cim<br>(379a.31)             | lim-čhen<br>(371b.7) |
| 6    | Wu-ch'ü<br>武曲    | wu-k'eu/k'iu<br>(N: 254, 265; L: 315)  | vukuu<br>(24.55)               | vuu kiuu<br>(379b.7)               | hu-kha<br>(371b.8)   |
| 7    | P'o-chüin<br>破軍  | p'uo-geun/k'iun<br>(N: 753, 381)       | pakun<br>(24.65)               | bô-jiün<br>(379.14)                | phu-gun<br>(371c.2)  |

KEY TO REFERENCES: Old Mand. cites Nakano (N) item nos. (see n. 81) and Ligeti (L) (see n. 82)

Uighur cites page nos. of Rachmati's edn. (see n. 4)

Mongolian cites page nos. of K. edn.

Tibetan cites Peking Kanjur, rpt. 1955, ed. Suzuki (see n. 90)

NOTES: <sup>a</sup>L reads *giuu-min*.

<sup>b</sup>Uighur fragment T III M.244 has *luusun* (Rachmati, "Turfan-Texte VII," p. 67, n. 14), closer to the Chinese original.

<sup>c</sup>Possibly *yunkiu* must be read *vunkiu*. The Uighur *v-* and *y-* look similar. (See *ibid.*)

<sup>d</sup>L reads *uen kiuu* as *ün kiuu*.

Kanjur printing's early eighteenth-century date. We can assume consequently that the Mongolian Kanjur version is relatively late and that the original Mongolian translation of about 1328 must have gone through a later revision. To substantiate this there is further linguistic evidence for the hypothesis that the Mongolian text retains relatively late pronunciations —

much later than those of the Tibetan.<sup>83</sup> Furthermore, in Tibetan the Middle Mongolian form of the title of the *sūtra* has been preserved, namely, *Do-lo-an e-bu-gan ne-re-thu ho-dun-nu su-dur*.<sup>84</sup>

The provenance of the Mongolian Kanjur version can be convincingly reconstructed in the light of the date of the colophon to the Mongolian scripture *Arban qoyar nidü-tü neretü sudur*, which contains a list of works translated from Tibetan into Mongolian by Kun-dga' 'od-zer. The text reads "qous kelen-ü činegen-ber [sic] Kun-dga' 'od-zer kelemürči: qurdun-a orčiyulju" ("through his competence in two languages the translator Kun-dga' 'od-zer has quickly translated and published [altogether thirteen *sūtra*]"). This list of thirteen *sūtra* includes *Doluyan ebügen*, that is, our text.<sup>85</sup> The year of Kun-dga' 'od-zer's translations is given as *ulayan nidülü*, a cyclical date corresponding to the first year of the sexagenary cycle.<sup>86</sup> This could be 1324, 1384, and so forth; but more probable is the year 1624. Under Ligdan Khan's reign (1604–1634) Kun-dga' 'od-zer had directed a project to translate the Kanjur from Tibetan into Mongolian from 1628 to 1629.<sup>87</sup> In other words, it is very likely that the Mongolian text of the *Doluyan ebügen sudur* extant in the Peking printed Kanjur of 1717 is identical with or based

<sup>83</sup>The Mongolian colophon has "Tang san-cang" and the Tibetan has "Than sam than" (or *chan*, see n. 36, above) for "T'ang San-tsang" 唐三藏. "San" had a final *-m* in Old Mandarin (Nakano, *Phags-pa Script*, no. 665: *san*). Here the Mongolian version has the current standard pronunciation and the Tibetan has retained the Old Mandarin phonetics.

<sup>84</sup>See, e.g., the Berlin ms. and the Peking Kanjur. This renders Mongolian "Dolo'an ebügen neretü hodun-u sudur." Mongolian "odun," for "star," here is in Middle Mongolian, with an initial *h-*. (See Ligeti, "La collection mongole," p. 168.) *Hodun* for classical *odun* in the title of the *sūtra* is explained in one of two ways. First, the author of the Tibetan version heard the word for star pronounced as *hodun* by his 14th-c. informant. More plausibly, the author saw the written Mongolian "hodun," perhaps in the Mongolian printed edn. of 1328. Logically, then, this edn. must have been in 'Phags-pa and not in Uighur-Mongol script: only 'Phags-pa can note an initial *h-*.

<sup>85</sup>K. edn., p. 389a.10–13. See also Ligeti, *Catalogue du Kanjur*, p. 305. The colophon has been translated into German by Bischoff, *Der Kanjur 2*, pp. 552–53. The sixteen *sūtra* are nos. 1111–24 in vol. 92 of the Kanjur.

<sup>86</sup>Bischoff has not proposed a Western year for *ulayan nidü-tü fil* in his translation (see preceding n.). He seems to have misunderstood the beginning of the last sentence. The text has "ulayan nidü-tü fil-un üjügergeči eke: edüge sar-a-yin titim-iyer čimeged," which he translates as "Jetzt hat sich Üjügergeči eke (Lakṣmī?) des Jahres Ulayan nidü-tü (Raktākṣa = Holz-Ratte) mit der Mondkrone geschmückt." This cryptic passage has nothing to do with the Hindu goddess Lakṣmī because it is a chronological expression. *Üjügergeči eke* is the name of a constellation (*nakṣatra*) corresponding to Tibetan "bra-ñe" and Sanskrit "bharaṇi"; see the Tibeto-Mongolian dictionary *Sumatiratna*, Corpus Scriptorum Mongolorum 6 (Ulan Bator: State Printing Office, 1959) 2, p. 247. The Chinese equivalent is *wei* 胃. The names of *nakṣatra* can also designate months in Lamaist chronology; see Dieter Schuh, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der tibetischen Kalenderrrechnung* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1973), table on p. 146.

<sup>87</sup>Heissig, *Lamaistische Blockdrucke*, pp. 40–41.



on the translation by Kun-dga' 'od-zer written in 1624 and used in the project. This would also explain the relatively modern transcriptions.<sup>88</sup>

## THE TIBETAN TEXT

A critical edition of the *sMe-bdun Ḥes-bya skar-ma'i mdo* has not as yet been compiled. At present I can only direct attention to Western studies concerning this not particularly rare text.<sup>89</sup> For its date, place, and the names of the translators we might start with the Mongolian colophon, which reads "qoyin-a deng ūker jil-tur Mati-bala kelemürči kiged Siri ananda bajir-sa [sic] Gung-tang-un sūme-dür töbed-ün kelen kiged töbed üsüg-iyer orčiylulju orosiylubai." ("Later in the *deng-ūker* year the translator Mati-bala and Śrī Ānandavajra in the temple of Gung-tang translated into Tibetan language with Tibetan characters [the *sūtra*] and published it.") The *deng-ūker* year is a *ting-ox* year and corresponds to 1337. The colophon in the Tibetan Kanjur similarly says "me-mo glañ gi lo" ("female fire-ox year"), also referring to 1337. The names of the translators are the same (Ma-ti pha-la and Śrī Ānandavajra).<sup>90</sup> The two translators are otherwise unknown. The place, however, is unambiguous: Guñ-thaṅ is the name of a monastery founded in 1175 southeast of Lhasa that in the fourteenth century was a seat of the Chal-pa line of abbots and had enjoyed the patronage of Qubilai Qa'an.<sup>91</sup>

<sup>88</sup> If the Tibetan original from which Kun-dga' 'od-zer translated was identical with the version of the Peking Kanjur, then he would have modernized the transcription of Chinese words following current 17th-c. pronunciation. An alternative explanation is that his Tibetan original differed from the Peking Kanjur and that he encountered the forms on -n instead of -m. The solution to these problems must wait for further study of the Tibetan version of the *Pei-tou ching*.

<sup>89</sup> Laufer, "Zur buddhistischen Literatur," could consult three editions of the text. The Tibetan version is also included in the Berlin manuscript Kanjur; see Hermann Beckh, *Verzeichnis der Tibetischen Handschriften: Erste Abteilung, Handschriftenverzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin* 24 (Berlin: Behrend, 1914), p. 70b, no. 13. For a modern description of *sMe-bdun* texts in German libraries, see Taube, *Tibetische Handschriften*, nos. 716-18, pp. 225-27.

<sup>90</sup> In the Peking printed Kanjur, rpt. in Daisetz Suzuki, ed., *The Tibetan Tripitaka Peking Edition: Kept in the Library of Otani University, Kyoto* (Tokyo: Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute, 1955-58), vol. 40, p. 372b.7-8. Another Tibetan version of the *sMe-bdun sūtra* has Mahā-pha-la for Mati-phala; Taube, *Tibetische Handschriften*, no. 718, p. 227. The reading Mati makes good sense (Sanskrit: *mati*, "intellect, understanding"; Tibetan: *blo gros*). *Blo-gros* is a frequent part of monastic personal names.

<sup>91</sup> On the monastery Guñ-thaṅ see Alfonso Ferrari, *mKyen brtse's Guide to the Holy Places of Central Tibet: Completed and Edited by Luciano Petech with the Collaboration of Hugh Richardson*, Serie Orientale Roma 16 (Roma: Istituto per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1958), p. 105, n. 105. One resident of the Guñ-thaṅ monastery in the first half of the 14th century was the learned monk Kun-dga' rdo-rje, who in 1346 completed the "Red Annals" (*Deb-ther dmar-po*). His religious name was dGe-ba'i blo-gros. Tibetan "Kun-dga' rdo-rje" is a translation of Sanskrit

The colophons do not specify from which language the translation of 1337 was made. The Yüan-period versions in Uighur and Mongolian pre-date the Tibetan translation of 1337, but we do not know if the extant Tibetan versions are in fact verbatim recensions of the 1337 text. Because the Peking Kanjur text has preserved the Old Mandarin names of the seven star gods (see table 1) there is a chance that this text is relatively close to the lost Yüan translation, which in turn was probably based on a Chinese original.

Tibetan monks who compiled Kanjurs rejected the *sMe-bdun sūtra* as apocryphal. Neither the Narthang, Derge and Cone, nor the Lhasa Kanjur include this text, which appears only in the Peking Kanjur. The situation is not much different for the Chinese version of the *Pei-tou ching*.

## THE CHINESE BUDDHIST PEI-TOU CHING

The existence of a Chinese Buddhist *Pei-tou ching* was first noticed by Sylvain Lévi.<sup>92</sup> There cannot be the slightest doubt that this text is apocryphal. None of the tables of contents of the Buddhist canon from the Five Dynasties to the Ming lists a *Pei-tou ching*. As far as I know it has never been found, even as a fragment, among the discoveries in Tun-huang, Turfan, and Khara-khoto. The first indirect evidence comes from early in the fourteenth century. But this Yüan text, which must have served directly or indirectly as a basis for the Uighur, Mongolian, and Tibetan translations, has not yet come to light. What we have today are only the Japanese editions. The version in the Tokyo, Kyoto, and Taishō canons is very late because it is a reprint of a Japanese edition printed in the summer of 1802

"Ānandavajra," thus perhaps the 1337 translator of the *sMe-bdun sūtra*, Ānandavajra, and the pre-1347 author of the *Deb-ther dmar-po*, Kun-dga' rdo-rje, were one and the same. Unfortunately this must remain as speculation.

<sup>92</sup> Sylvain Lévi, "Sūtra tibétain," cites the Tokyo Tripitaka supplement of 1905-12; this became T no. 1307, vol. 21, pp. 425b-426b.

On the Buddhist *Pei-tou ching*, see, e.g., *Mikkyō Daijiten* 密教大辭典 (Kyōto: Hōzōkan, 1983), p. 2042c; and for ritual and scriptural aspects of the Great Bear cult chiefly in Japan, *BDJ* 5, pp. 4657b-4658b, under *hokuto hō* 北斗法. Pl. 270, no. 1382, after p. 4674, shows a *Pei-tou mandala*. On a talismanic wheel connected with Kuan-yin worship, see *BDJ* 2, p. 1904a-c, under *Shichishō nyōirin* 七星如慈輪 (with illustration). "Great Bear" also is used in names of Buddhist temples, i.e., Hokotoseiji 北斗星寺 (Dietrich Seckel, *Buddhistische Tempelnamen in Japan* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1985), pp. 67-68). For a recent succinct survey of the Buddhist Great Bear worship in China, see Franz Josef Meier, "Mythologie des chinesischen Buddhismus," in E. Schmalzriedt and Hans Wilhelm Haussig, eds., *Wörterbuch der Mythologie* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1988), p. 358, under "Großer Bär." For a brief description of the *Pei-tou ching*, see also the bibliography *Bussho kaisetsu daijiten* 佛書解説大辭典 (Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, 1972) 10, p. 164a.

by the monk Kaidō 快道 (1751–1810).<sup>93</sup> In other words, a Chinese prototype of the *Pei-tou ching* appeared seemingly out of nowhere about 1300.

Explaining the complicated relationship between the four versions and their dates is difficult because the Japanese *Taishō* text is both late and less complete than the Uighur, Mongolian, and Tibetan versions. Based on the enumeration of the sections of the Chinese version as given above, *Taishō* no. 1307 lacks sections A, E, F, and G. Furthermore, section B contains portraits of the seven star gods that do not appear in the other versions; and the section C *dhāraṇī* attested in Mongolian, Tibetan, and partly in Uighur is missing. Section D is printed.<sup>94</sup>

The version of *Taishō* no. 1307 has only seven star gods, but it is clear that the Chinese text used for the Uighur translation had more than seven deities imagined as governing individuals' cyclical signs.<sup>95</sup> In Uighur the relations between the star gods and their signs are the same as those in section B of *Taishō* no. 1307, except that the Uighur text has an additional star god (no. 8) by the name of Tso-fu 左輔 and a no. 9 that is reconstructed as Yu-pi 右弼. The Chinese original from which the Uighur translation was made therefore had nine star gods.<sup>96</sup>

The strange names of the Ursa Maior stars have been studied frequently. Sylvain Lévi believed in a non-Chinese origin of the *Pei-tou ching* but did not decide from which language the Chinese text had been translated.<sup>97</sup> Paul Pelliot wrote in 1914: "Sur les noms bizarres donnés par ce texte aux étoiles, j'ai réuni pas mal de textes, mais leur mise en oeuvre exigerait tout un exposé de l'histoire de l'astrologie avant les T'ang et sous les T'ang; je ne puis aborder ce sujet ici."<sup>98</sup> To my knowledge Pelliot did not publish his notes on the star names. This subject was taken up later by Wolfram Eberhard in his sinological commentary to Rachmati's edition and translation of Uighur calendar and divination texts.<sup>99</sup> Eberhard's table 4, "Die 9

<sup>93</sup> See the colophon in *T* no. 1307, vol. 21, p. 426b, regarded by Lévi, "Sūtra tibétain," p. 454, as "très obscur." This is not surprising because all names in this text are Japanese. On Kaidō, who was a very prolific author and editor, see *BDJ* 1, p. 744a–b, and Washio Junkei 鷲尾順敬, *Nihon bukke jimmei jisho* 日本佛家人名辭書 (Tokyo: Tōkyō bijutsu, 1974), p. 242a–b. In 1801 he had been appointed as prefect of the Chōkokuji 長谷寺 (Hasedera).

<sup>94</sup> Sect. B is in *T* no. 1307, p. 425b–c; sect. C in *ibid.*, p. 426a; and D (complete) in *ibid.*, p. 426a–b.

<sup>95</sup> T. III M. 190: cf. Rachmati, "Turfan-Texte VII," no. 14, pp. 23–25.

<sup>96</sup> This is not surprising since most of the astrological *sūtra* in the *Taishō* canon are composed of heterogeneous elements. The two additional stars that increase the Ursa Maior to nine are not real and visible, but can be regarded as a Chinese parallel to the pseudo-planets Rāhu and Ketu in Indian astronomy.

<sup>97</sup> Lévi, "Sūtra tibétain," p. 454.

<sup>98</sup> Pelliot, "Catalogue du Kanjur," p. 145.

<sup>99</sup> Rachmati, "Turfan-Texte VII," pp. 82–99.

Gestirne 九星," lists the star names from T'an-lang to Yo-pi (that is, Yu-pi), with the Uighur names in column 3. His column 2 lists the attribution of the Five Elements to each of the stars, column 4 the corresponding *l-ching* trigrams, column 5 the directions of the trigrams, and column 6 the pertinent cyclical signs. Column 7 is a list of nine Sanskrit names of deities that purportedly corresponded to all nine in the T'an-lang series.<sup>100</sup>

Joseph Needham has hypothesized that the Buddhist *Pei-tou ching* was written by the monk-astronomer I-hsing 一行 (683–727). Despite a T'ang legend in which I-hsing appears as a miracle worker in connection with the Great Bear stars, there is nothing to support this attribution.<sup>101</sup>

In India the seven stars of Ursa Maior were called the seven genii (*ṛṣi*), but their names can in no way be connected with those in the *Pei-tou ching*.<sup>102</sup> We must therefore assume that the "noms bizarres" of the seven star gods are not Indian at all but Chinese and that the Buddhist *Pei-tou ching* is of Chinese origin. Indeed the star names cannot be phonetic transcriptions of Indian names because they make perfectly good, though obscure, sense in Chinese. They can be translated approximately as follows:

|              |                       |
|--------------|-----------------------|
| 1. T'an-lang | Greedy Wolf           |
| 2. Chū-men   | Huge Gate             |
| 3. Lu-ts'un  | Happiness Retained    |
| 4. Wen-ch'ü  | Civilian Corner       |
| 5. Lien-chen | Pure Virtue           |
| 6. Wu-ch'ü   | Military Corner       |
| 7. P'o-chün  | Destroyer of the Army |

The only reason why the Buddhist *Pei-tou ching* has in the past been regarded as coming from India is the fictitious "Indian monk" (*ānātkāk toyin*) in the Uighur version and the equally fictitious attribution of the work to

<sup>100</sup> Wolfram Eberhard, "Untersuchungen an astronomischen Texten des chinesischen Tripitaka," *MS* 5 (1940), p. 261, reprints this as table 18, minus the Sanskrit names, which he regards as "das indische Vorbild für die Ausdrücke." Like Lévi, Eberhard believed in an Indian origin of the T'an-lang series, although his supposed Sanskrit correspondences do not show the slightest similarity, either in sound or meaning.

On the *Pei-tou ching*, see *ibid.*, p. 210, and Eberhard, "Chinesische Volkskalender und buddhistisches Tripitaka," *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 40 (1937), col. 347.

<sup>101</sup> See Joseph Needham, *Science and Civilisation in China* (Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1959) 3, p. 283, n. B, in which *T* no. 1305 is wrongly attributed to I-hsing. It has been ascribed to Vajrabodhi (Chin-kang chih 金剛智); see *T*, vol. 21, p. 423c.

<sup>102</sup> The names of the seven *ṛṣi* are given as Kutsa, Atri, Rebha, Agastya, Kusika, Vasiṣṭha, and Vyaśva in Sir Monier-Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1899; rpt. 1956), p. 226c. V. S. Apte, *A Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Poona: 1959) 3, p. 1626a, lists the following *saptarṣi*: Marīci, Atri, Aṅgiras, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu, and Vasiṣṭha.

Hsüan-tsang in the Mongolian and Tibetan versions. In my opinion this theory has to be abandoned; below I try to demonstrate that at least some sections of the Chinese text are derived from Taoist literature.

The Buddhist cult of the Great Bear stars is well attested, particularly for Japan,<sup>103</sup> and it is certainly no coincidence that the Buddhist texts where our star names appear (*Taishō* nos. 1305, 1306, 1307, 1310, and 1311) have been reprinted from Japanese manuscripts and printed editions. None of these texts is, according to the colophons, attested earlier than the twelfth-century manuscripts found in Japanese monasteries. Some of them include elements borrowed from Chinese Taoism. For example *Taishō* no. 1306 quotes a *Book of Destiny* (*Lu-ming shu* 祿命書), which shows some relationship with the description in *chüan* 6 of the *Pao-p'u tzu* 抱朴子<sup>104</sup> of the gods of destiny and methods to prolong life and obtain protection from dangers — themes consonant with the star gods of the *Pei-tou ching*.<sup>105</sup> The borrowing from Taoism is even more obvious in *Taishō* no. 1311, a text attributed to I-hsing. It quotes at length “Ko Hsien-kung’s method of worshipping the Great Bear” (*Ko Hsien-kung li pei-tou fa* 葛仙公禮北斗法).<sup>106</sup>

Section B of the *Pei-tou ching* consists exclusively of non-Buddhist elements. It gives a picture of each star god. The figures are long-haired and bear scepters. Each star is named together with an amulet.<sup>107</sup> Under each amulet is a short text proclaiming the relationship between the star and persons born under a certain cyclical sign, and the pertaining food offering required for obtaining luck. For example, the text for Chü-men (no. 2) reads “Persons born in *ch’ou* 丑 and *hai* 亥 are both born under this star. The food offering is millet. In case of danger one should worship this *sūtra* and carry the amulet of one’s life star. Great luck.” The six other texts are identical, differing only in the cyclical signs and food offerings, which are grains, seeds, or pulse cultivated in China. In table 2 Uighur forms and their German translations are those in Rachmati’s edition; the Tibetan equivalents and the Mongolian parallels are taken from the Tibetan and Mongolian Peking editions of the Kanjur.

The correspondences between star gods, cyclical signs, and offerings are non-Buddhist and can be traced to Taoist literature. The same is true for the amulets. Section C of the *Pei-tou ching* may be termed Buddhized. Here each of the seven gods is equated with a Buddha and the world where

<sup>103</sup> See n. 92. <sup>104</sup> *Pao-p'u-tzu nei-pien* (SPTK ch'u-pien edn.) 6, pp. 1a–4b.

<sup>105</sup> *BDJ* 5, p. 4658a.

<sup>106</sup> See *T* no. 1311, p. 462a–b. Ko Hsien-kung is Ko Hsüan 葛玄, a Taoist of the 3d century A.D. who figured in early Chinese star worship. He is discussed below.

<sup>107</sup> The amulets are similar to those in the Uighur printed fragment T.III M.190 that were (appropriately) smuggled into the edn. of *Doluyan ebügen sudur* by Ligeti, *Preklasszikus Emlékek*.

Table 2. A Comparison of the Terms Used for Food Offerings

| CHINESE                                      | UIGHUR  | MONGOLIAN   | TIBETAN   |
|--|---|---|---|
| 1. <i>shu</i> 黍<br>glutinous<br>millet       | <i>gyür tukisi</i> <sup>a</sup><br>geschälte Hirse  | <i>mongyol amun</i> <sup>b</sup><br>big-grained<br>millet | <i>grus-ma sbom-po</i> <sup>c</sup><br>big millet               |
| 2. <i>su</i> 粟<br>millet                     | <i>qonaq tükisi</i> <sup>a</sup><br>geschälte Hirse | <i>qonuy amun</i> <sup>d</sup><br>pearl millet            | <i>grus-ma phra-mo</i><br>small millet                          |
| 3. <i>keng-mi</i> 粳米<br>nonglutinous<br>rice | <i>tuturqan</i><br>Reis                             | <i>tutury-a</i><br>rice                                   | <i>'bras</i><br>rice  |
| 4. <i>hsiao-mai</i> 小麥 <sup>e</sup><br>wheat | <i>buydai</i><br>Weizen                             | <i>buyudai</i><br>wheat                                   | <i>gro</i><br>wheat   |
| 5. <i>ma-tzu</i> 麻子<br>hemp seeds            | <i>kántir uruy</i><br>Leinsamen                     | <i>olusun-u ür-e</i><br>hemp seeds                        | <i>bčam-li 'bras-bu</i> <sup>f</sup><br>seeds of <i>bčam-li</i> |
| 6. <i>ta-tou</i> 大豆<br>soybeans              | <i>qara burčaq</i><br>schwarze Bohne                | <i>qar-a burčay</i><br>black beans                        | <i>sran-ma nag-po</i><br>black beans                            |
| 7. <i>hsiao-tou</i> 小豆<br>peas               | <i>yakıl burčaq</i><br>grüne Bohne                  | <i>noyuyan burčay</i><br>green beans                      | <i>sran-čhuñ</i><br>small beans                                 |

NOTES: <sup>a</sup> *gyür* and *qonaq* are two different kinds of millet. The *Dreometiurkskii Slovar'* (Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo nauka, 1969) has Russ.: *proso* (millet) for Uigh.: *ijür* (p. 623/b) and for *qonaq tükisi* Russ.: *psheno* (genuine millet) (p. 455/b).

<sup>b</sup> See Kovalevski, *Dict. Mongol-Russe-Français*, p. 107/a, under *mongyol amun*: “millet mongol à gros grains dont on fait du pain.”

<sup>c</sup> The orthography *grus-ma* is a variant of Tib.: *drus-ma* (millet) in the dictionaries.

<sup>d</sup> For *qonuy amun* see Kovalevski, p. 107/b: “millet perlé.”

<sup>e</sup> The text incorrectly has *hsiao-tou* 小豆 for *hsiao-mai* (see n. 16 in *T* no. 1307, p. 425).

<sup>f</sup> *bčam-li* (reading uncertain) could not be found in Tibetan dictionaries. It could be the transcription of a Chinese word.

the Buddha resides. It is a litany; each of the seven incantations begins with *na-mo* 南無 (Sanskrit: *namaḥ*). For example, the invocation for star no. 3 reads “Homage to the star Lu-ts'un. This is the Tathāgata Buddha (*ju-lai Fo* 如來佛) in the eastern world of completeness (*tung-fang yüan-man shih-chieh* 東方圓滿世界) who has become fully gold-colored (*chin-se ch'eng-chiu* 金色成就).”<sup>108</sup>

<sup>108</sup> See *T* no. 1307, p. 426a.5. This passage has also been preserved in Uighur, fragment T.III M.244 (Rachmati, “Turfan-Texte VII,” p. 66, n. 3). Chinese “*yüan-man shih-chieh*” in Uighur is “*tolu takirmi yirtinlü* (ibid.: “ganze umgebende Welt”). The Chinese name is a translation of Sanskrit *paripūrṇa* (*BDJ* 1, p. 322a–b). The Buddha’s name in Uighur is *altun öng öz-ä tükällig alı burqan* (Rachmati, “Turfan-Texte VII,” p. 66: “Buddha namens 'der mit Goldfarbe Ausgestattete' Erschaffene”). This is one of the seven Medicine Buddhas.

This passage, as well as the other six invocations identically structured, shows that a Buddha is addressed only *after* the non-Buddhist star god. The assignment of the seven Buddhas to the stars is not just gratuitous: no less than five Buddhas (those for stars nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7) figure among the seven hypostases of the Buddha Bhaiṣajyaguru (*yao-shih* 藥師 "Master of Medicine"). The seven Medicine Buddhas were popular in Mahāyāna Buddhism and were worshiped for such things as healing of maladies and liberation from demonic possession.<sup>109</sup> Section D of the *Pei-tou ching* ascribes supernatural powers collectively to the seven star gods and to the worship of the *sūtra* itself. This brief sermon preached by the Buddha to Mañjuśrī mainly follows a pattern in apocryphal *dhāraṇī sūtra*. To own the *sūtra* and to worship it ritually were thought to be guarantees for the fulfilment of prayers and protection from evils.<sup>110</sup>

To describe here the role of star worship in Chinese Buddhism would stray too far. In fact the Great Bear cult has survived until present times. One example of it is a text called *Pei-tou hsiao-tsai yen-shou miao-ching* 北斗消災延壽妙經 (*Miraculous Sūtra of the Great Bear That Dispels Calamities and Prolongs Life*) in thirty-three lithographed folios. It includes several *dhāraṇī*, hymns in praise of the Great Bear gods, and detailed ritual instructions.<sup>111</sup> As in *Taishō* no. 1307, the gods are identified with Buddhas residing in a mythical world of their own. There are nine stars, like the Chinese prototype on which the Uighur translation was based, but with Wai-fu 外輔 and Nei-pi 內弼 for nos. 8 and 9. It seems safe to assume that in the past many similar prayers to the Great Bear stars were current among lay Buddhists, but since such popular treatises were seldom if ever collected and included in library catalogues they are difficult to trace.

## TAOIST TEXTS ON THE GREAT BEAR CULT

Western scholars have failed to notice both the existence of a Taoist *Pei-tou ching* and the close similarity of section B of the Buddhist text to Taoist scriptures for the cult of the Great Bear stars. The question is whether in this case Buddhists have borrowed from Taoists or vice versa.

Even a glance at the Buddhist *Pei-tou ching* (*Taishō* no. 1307) easily

<sup>109</sup> *BDJ* 2, pp. 1917a–19c.

<sup>110</sup> For an example of a Chinese apocryphal *dhāraṇī-sūtra*, see Herbert Franke, "Zu einem apokryphen Dhāraṇī-sūtra aus China," *ZDMG* 134 (1984), pp. 318–36. This article reproduces a part of the Chinese text from a 1441 printed version.

<sup>111</sup> This is published by the Ta-kuang Fo-t'ang 大光佛堂 and printed by I-wen kung-su in Singapore 皇洲 around 1960. Invocations of the gods are on pp. 4a–5a.

shows that the amulets in section B are not Buddhist. Such amulets, common among even modern religious paraphernalia for protection against evils, combine Chinese script in a fanciful way. A closer study of Taoist scriptures shows their frequent references to the Great Bear stars as rulers of human destiny. Also the "noms bizarres" of the stars occur with great regularity in Taoist texts.

The following is a list of the most important scriptures in the Taoist canon relating to the Great Bear cult. The numbering system is that of Kristofer Schipper's *Concordance du Tao-tsang*.<sup>112</sup>

No. 45 (vol. 29). *Yü-ch'ing wu-shang ling-pao tzu-jan pei-tou pen-sheng chen-ching* 玉清无上靈寶自然北斗本生真經, 1 ch. Describes the transcendental existence of the star gods.

No. 199 (vol. 83). *Pei-tou ch'i-yüan hsing teng-i* 北斗七元星燈儀, 1 ch. Ritual pertaining to the seven Great Bear stars.

No. 200 (vol. 83). *Pei-tou pen-ming yen-shou teng-i* 北斗本命延壽燈儀, 1 ch. Another ritual independent from no. 199. The star names of no. 199 are not mentioned.

No. 622 (vol. 341). *T'ai-shang hsüan-ling pei-tou pen-ming yen-sheng chen-ching* 太上玄靈北斗本命延生真經, 1 ch. This is the standard basic text.

No. 623 (vol. 341). *T'ai-shang hsüan-ling pei-tou pen-ming ch'ang-sheng miao-ching* 太上玄靈北斗本命長生妙經, 1 ch. In spite of its title, different from no. 622 and much shorter.

No. 629 (vol. 341). *T'ai-shang pei-tou erh-shih-pa chang* 太上北斗二十八章, 1 ch. Miscellaneous matter on the stars in 28 sections; liturgical instructions.

No. 750 (vols. 527–528). *T'ai-shang hsüan-ling pei-tou pen-ming yen-sheng chen-ching chu* 註, 5 ch. A commentary by Hsü Tao-ling 徐道齡 to *Tao-tsang* no. 622.

No. 751 (vol. 528). *T'ai-shang hsüan-ling pei-tou pen-ming yen-sheng chen-ching chu-chieh* 註解, 3 ch. Another commentary to no. 622, by Hsüan-yüan chen-jen 玄元真人.

No. 752 (vol. 529). *T'ai-shang hsüan-ling pei-tou pen-ming yen-sheng ching chu* 註, 3 ch. Commentary by Fu Tung-chen 傅洞真.

No. 753 (vol. 529). *Pei-tou ch'i-yüan chin-hsüan yü-chang* 北斗七元

<sup>112</sup> *Concordance du Tao-tsang* (Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient, 1975). Here and following, all references to the *Tao-tsang* will use the numbers in *Concordance*. References to *Tao-tsang* 道藏 are as rpt. in Taipei (I-wen shu-chü, 1962; hereafter *TT*).

金玄羽章, 1 ch. Hymns in praise of the seven star gods; amulets; rules for recitation.

No. 975 (vol. 614). *Pei-tou ch'i-yüan chin-hsüan yü-chang*, 1 ch. Nine hymns on the star gods; hymns 1 to 7 identical with those in no. 753, plus hymns to Tso-fu and Yu-pi.

No. 1032 (vols. 677-702, rpt. in SPTK). *Yün-chi ch'i-ch'ien* 雲笈七籤, 122 ch. The Taoist encyclopedia, compiled in 1028-1029.

No. 1265 (vol. 1002). *Pei-ti ch'i-yüan tzu-l'ing yen-sheng pi-chüeh* 北帝七元紫庭延生秘訣, 1 ch. Ritual for the worship of the seven Great Bear stars with amulets.

The dates of the Taoist *Pei-tou ching* and related texts are difficult to establish because most Taoist scriptures are undated, many are anonymous, and when named the author frequently uses a pseudonym. For the basic text of *Tao-tsang* no. 622 only a rough approximation is possible. The Sung bibliographies, which have been masterfully studied by Piet van der Loon, do not list a *Pei-tou ching*. The existence of a text with that name is, however, indirectly attested for the Chih-p'ing reign period (1064-1067).<sup>113</sup> The catalogue *Wen-yüan ko shu-mu* 文淵閣書目, submitted to the throne in 1441, lists the *Pei-tou ching* in the section devoted to Taoist books (*Tao-shu* 道書); and two Ming printed editions are included in the catalogue of rare books in Taiwan public libraries.<sup>114</sup> Both editions apparently are undated; I have not personally inspected them. The modern bibliographer Chang Hsin-ch'eng 張心徵 rejects the *Pei-tou ching* as spurious because of the legend attributing the revelation to the Heavenly Master Chang Tao-ling 張道陵 (mid-second century A.D.).<sup>115</sup> The title is mentioned only in passing in the *T'ai-chen yü-ti ssu-chü ming-k'o ching* 太真玉帝四極明科經, but the text cannot be dated.<sup>116</sup> Early Taoist encyclopedias have preserved many titles of and quotations from other books, yet the huge compilation *Wu-shang pi-yao* 無上祕要 of the sixth century (*Tao-tsang* no. 1138) does not quote a *Pei-tou ching* although the Great Bear stars and their cult are repeatedly men-

tioned.<sup>117</sup> All this allows only an approximation of the date of the standard text, *Tao-tsang* no. 622, that is, about the tenth or early eleventh century. In any case the *Pei-tou ching* has maintained great popularity among Taoists and has been described by Schipper as the most frequently recited text in Taoist liturgies of the mid-twentieth century. The seven or nine stars of the Great Bear are thought to rule over human destiny, and their worship is believed to vitalize the forces of life.<sup>118</sup>

Some of the commentaries can be dated, thus providing a *terminus ante quem*. *Tao-tsang* no. 750 is a work by Hsü Tao-ling 徐道齡 (Hsüan-yang tzu 玄陽子). The revision of this commentary was made by Hsü Tao-hsüan 徐道玄 (Ch'ien-yang tzu 乾陽子), who must have been a brother or cousin of Hsü Tao-ling. The postface, dated October 7, 1334,<sup>119</sup> informs us that Hsü Tao-ling had from his childhood studied the *Pei-tou ching* and served for some time as a clerk (*li* 吏). When his term of office expired he found the leisure time to write his commentary and have it printed. He prays that through the supernatural power of the book long life and prosperity will be granted to the emperor and his family, his officials, and the empire as a whole.

The commentary comprising *Tao-tsang* no. 751 bears no date. The author styles himself as K'ung-t'ung Hsüan-yüan chen-jen 崑崙玄元真人. K'ung-t'ung is here probably not the name of a geographic locality (there are at least half a dozen mountains of that name throughout China) but a Taoist allusion. According to *chüan* eleven of the *Chuang-tzu* the sage Kuang-ch'eng tzu 廣成子 lived on Mt. K'ung-t'ung where he was visited by the Yellow Emperor. Astrally, K'ung-t'ung was regarded as the mountain below the Great Bear.<sup>120</sup> A rough date can, however, be assigned to no. 751.

<sup>113</sup> John Lagerwey, *Wu-shang pi-yao: Somme taoïste du VI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Publications de l'EFEO 124 (Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient, 1981), pp. 66 (where nine stars of Ursa Major are mentioned), 73-74 (seven stars of Ursa Major and nine hidden stars), 209-11 (the adept visualizes seven stars and the gods connected with the stars), and 228.

<sup>114</sup> Kristofer Schipper, *Le corps taoïste: Corps physique — corps social* (Paris: Fayard, 1982), treats with detail the Taoist star cult. He describes the *Pei-tou ching* as the most frequently recited text in Taoist liturgies (ibid., pp. 94, 116; 291, n. 54; 295, n. 40). The recitation of the *Pei-tou ching* is a standard element of the communal rites (*chiao* 醮). Ibid., p. 104, reproduces a diagram of the Great Bear stars represented by twelve lamps, of which seven are assigned to the main stars, two to the invisible stars, and the remaining three to the "flowery estrade" (*san-t'ai hua-kai* 三台華蓋), regarded as the roof of Heaven and symbolizing the three primeval ethers. On the Great Bear cult, see also John Lagerwey, *Taoist Ritual in Chinese Society and History* (New York: Macmillan, 1987), p. 56 (recitation of the *Pei-tou ching*), and p. 156 (visualizing the star gods of the Great Bear).

<sup>115</sup> See *TT* no. 750, *hou-hsü*, pp. 2b-3b.

<sup>116</sup> Morohashi Tetsuji 諸橋徹次, *Dai Kanwa jiten* 大漢和辭典 (Tokyo: Daishūkan shoten, 1955-60) 8, p. 650d, where the *Shih-wen* 釋文 is quoted.

<sup>113</sup> Piet van der Loon, *Taoist Books in the Libraries of the Sung Period: A Critical Study and Index* (London: Ithaca Press, 1984), p. 116.

<sup>114</sup> *Wen-yüan ko shu-mu* (Kuo-hsüeh chi-pen ts'ung-shu edn.) 16, p. 204; *T'ai-wan kung-ts'ang shan-pen shu-mu shu-ming so-yin* 臺灣公藏善本書目書名索引 (Taipei: National Central Library, 1971) 1, p. 328. One text is titled *Pei-tou ching*, the other *Pei-tou chen-ching* 北斗真經.

<sup>115</sup> Chang Hsin-ch'eng, ed., *Wei-shu l'ung-k'ao* 偽書通考 (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1954), pp. 1042-43. The biography of Chang Tao-ling in *Shen-hsien chuan* 神仙傳 (Shuo-k'u edn.), fasc. 4, ch. 4, pp. 3b-5a, does not mention the revelation of the *Pei-tou ching*.

<sup>116</sup> *TT* no. 184 (vol. 77), ch. 2, p. 7b.

The text has a preface attributed to Li Po 李白 (701–762); it claims he was initiated into the secrets of the *Pei-tou ching* by Hsüan-yüan chen-jen. The standard editions of Li Po's works do not include this preface but the anthology *Ch'üan T'ang wen* does.<sup>121</sup> A postface to no. 751 is attributed to another famous literary figure, Su Shih 蘇軾 (1036–1101). I was unable to find the text of the postface in the editions of Su Shih's collected works. It is a text praising the supernatural virtues of the *Pei-tou ching*. The fact that the name of Su Shih is mentioned shows that the compilation of the text can hardly be earlier than the twelfth or thirteenth century.

The commentary comprising *Tao-tsang* no. 752 is by Fu Tung-chen 傅洞真, who cannot otherwise be identified. His preface is undated. Fu considers the *Pei-tou ching* to be a text revealed to and afterwards written by Chang Tao-ling. He also quotes an imaginary "stupid person" (*yü-che* 愚者), who implies that the *Pei-tou ching* was written by either Chang Tao-ling himself or Tu Kuang-t'ing 杜光庭 (850–933), a famous Taoist author. Fu rejects this as unfounded slander; in other words, he insists that the *Pei-tou ching* was not written by either Chang or Tu but was revealed to Chang by T'ai-shang lao-chün 太上老君.<sup>122</sup> Fu's preface is further evidence that nobody knew then if the *Pei-tou ching* had a human author and that Taoist believers regarded it as a text revealed to but not authored by Chang Tao-ling. The basic text of *Tao-tsang* no. 622 and all the commentaries to it date the revelation to 155 A.D., the seventh day of the first lunar month.

Of the two ritual hymnals *Tao-tsang* nos. 629 and 975, only the latter can be dated. The author was Liu T'ung-wei 劉通微 (*t. Yüeh-tao* 悅道, also Mo-jan tzu 默然子). He lived as a hermit during the Chin 金 dynasty and died March 16, 1196.<sup>123</sup> Neither of the two hymnals is directly related to the *Pei-tou ching*, and neither mentions it by name. The same is true for the two rituals instructing the believer to worship the Great Bear stars by lighting lamps (*Tao-tsang* nos. 198 and 199). They, too, illustrate the star cult but have nothing to do with the *Pei-tou ching* itself.

In conclusion, the *Pei-tou ching* probably existed in the eleventh century, repeatedly received commentaries in the twelfth to fourteenth centuries, and

<sup>121</sup> *Ch'in-ting Ch'üan T'ang wen* 欽定全唐文 (Taipei: Hua-lien ch'u-pan she, 1965), vol. 8, ch. 349, pp. 9a–10a (p. 4477). The anthology does not indicate from which source the "Li Po" text has been copied.

<sup>122</sup> On this passage, see also Judith M. Boltz, *A Survey of Taoist Literature: Tenth to Seventeenth Centuries*, China Research Monograph 32 (Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, U. of California, 1987), p. 247.

<sup>123</sup> See Liu T'ung-wei's biography in Li Tao-ch'ien 李道謙 *Chung-nan shan tsu-t'ing hsien-chen nei-chuan* 終南山祖庭仙真內傳 (in *TT* no. 955) A, pp. 4a–5b. The biography does not, however, mention Liu T'ung-wei's authorship of *TT* no. 975.

has continued to be popular among Taoists ever since. It was most likely composed between 900 and 1100 A.D.

## THE STEIN FRAGMENT FROM KHARA-KHOTO

We have now seen that there is little bibliographic information on the early history of the Taoist *Pei-tou ching*. A tiny fragment of a printed Yüan edition discovered by Sir Aurel Stein in Khara-khoto may, however, be a part of the Taoist scripture.<sup>124</sup> The late Henri Maspero edited it and correctly called it a "livre taoïste," although he could not identify the fragment as belonging to the *Tao-tsang*. But there can be no doubt that this mere upper half of a printed page belongs to a *Pei-tou ching* edition. Maspero correctly assumed that a *nien-hao* given in the fragment is Yung-shou 永壽, but explains this as "un *nien-hao* céleste qui n'a rien à faire avec le *nien-hao* de ce nom de l'époque des Han" — a rare slip of the great French scholar. It is certainly the Han *nien-hao*, particularly since the Khara-khoto fragment says "Yung-shou 1, first month, seventh day" — exactly the date when the *Pei-tou ching* was purportedly revealed to Chang Tao-ling.<sup>125</sup>

The Khara-khoto fragment begins with a "mystical incantation before opening the holy book" 開經玄蘊呪. The lacunae in this five-word poem of twelve lines can be filled because a complete version of the poem exists in Ming editions of other Taoist texts, namely, the 1439 edition of the *Tou-mu ching* 斗母經 and the 1450 edition of the *San-kuan ching* 三官經. In these the incantation precedes the text proper.

The *Tao-tsang* editions of these two scriptures, nos. 621 and 1442 respectively, omit the ritualistic front matter that we find in the Ming editions and that figures in the Yüan printed fragment of the *Pei-tou ching*.<sup>126</sup> This incantation was therefore multifunctional and not limited to a specific scripture; it seems to have been a text recited prior to opening any holy

<sup>124</sup> The fragment is registered as KK.IV.04(b).

<sup>125</sup> Henri Maspero, *Les documents chinois de la troisième expédition de Sir Aurel Stein en Asie Centrale* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1953), p. 225, n. 571. The characters in l. 3 as printed in *ibid.*, 太上北斗本命延壽 [延 being a mistake for 延], are certainly the beginning of the title and should be supplemented by 妙經, 真經, or just 經. The text proper begins with 爾時; the preserved part of this line ends with 老君. The next line begins with 壽元年正月七日.

It is also possible to restore missing portions of the fragment. The last characters of the text are 在太清 and refer to the appearance of the deified Lao-tzu. The whole sentence can be reconstructed as follows: 在太清[境上太極宮中] in accordance with *TT* no. 622, p. 1a.3 (with 泰 for 太), and Hsü Tao-ling's text, *TT* no. 750, ch. 1, p. 4b.7.

<sup>126</sup> On these 15th-c. printed edns., see Herbert Franke, "Einige Drucke und Handschriften der frühen Ming-Zeit," *OE* 19 (1972), pp. 61–64.



"The Seven Original Star Lords" (*ch'i-yüan hsing-chün* 七元皇君). Frontispiece of the 1439 edition of the *You-mu ching*. (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München [4° L. Sin. C 229]).

book. In the *San-kuan ching* the title is shorter than in the Khara-khoto text: "gāthā for opening the holy book" 開經偈. The following, the first four lines of the poem, exemplifies the way the mutilated text of the Khara-khoto fragment can be restored. The rest follows suit.<sup>127</sup>

寂寂至無宗  
虛〈峙劫閃阿〉  
豁落洞玄文  
〈誰測此幽遐〉

#### GREAT BEAR WORSHIP IN TAOISM

A full analysis of the *Pei-tou ching* and a comparison of the versions appearing in the three commentaries is evidently out of the question in this article.<sup>128</sup> Instead this section investigates the Taoist worship of the Great Bear stars, beginning with their curious names. It is obvious that the names do not have an Indian origin, contrary to Eberhard's supposition. But it is likely that his dating them to the Six Dynasties (317–589) is correct.<sup>129</sup>

The locus classicus seems to be the astrological and chronomantic treatise *Wu-hsing ta-i* 五行大義 by Hsiao Chi 蕭吉 (d. 614), in which the names from T'an-lang to P'o-chün are assigned to the seven Great Bear stars following the *Huang-ti tou-t'u* 黃帝斗圖.<sup>130</sup> This work might be identical with

<sup>127</sup> On l. 9 of the incantation the character 徙 in Maspero's edn. (see n. 125, above) is a misprint for 徒.

<sup>128</sup> Modern Japanese studies frequently mention the *Pei-tou ching*. See, e.g., Yoshioka Yoshitoyo 吉岡義豊, *Dōkyō keitenshi ron* 道教經典史論 (Tokyo: Dōkyō kankōkai, 1955), p. 450; Fukui Kōjun 福井康順, *Dōkyō no kisateki kenkyū* 道教の基礎的研究, 3d edn. (Tokyo: Shoseki bumbutsu ryūtsūkai, 1965), pp. 12–13; p. 26, n. 17; Ishii Masako 石井昌子, *Dōkyōgaku no kenkyū* 道教學の研究 (Tokyo: Kokusho kankōkai, 1980), p. 237; Matsumoto Kōichi 松本浩一, in Fukui Kōjun, ed., *Dōkyō* 道教 (Tokyo: Hirakawa, 1983) 1, p. 203. On the relation between Buddhist and Taoist star cults see Yoshioka Yoshitoyo, *Dōkyō to Bukkyō* 道教と佛教 (Tokyo: Kokusho kankōkai, 1976) 2, pp. 189–96; and 3, pp. 113, 308. Contemporary Taoist star worship is studied in Sawada Mizuho 澤田瑞穂, *Chūgoku no minkan shinkō* 中國の民間信仰 (Tokyo: Kosakushu, 1982), pp. 52–53, 320, 329. Taoist religion in Japan has been studied by Fukunaga Mitsuji 福永光司, *Dōkyō to Nihon shisō* 道教と日本思想 (Tokyo: Tokuma shoten, 1983); idem, *Dōkyō to kodai Nihon* 道教と古代日本 (Kyoto: Jimbun shoin, 1987); and Nakamura Shōhachi 中村璋八, in Fukui, ed., *Dōkyō* 3, pp. 29, 36 (on the *Pei-tou ching*).

<sup>129</sup> See Eberhard's annotation in Rachmati, "Turfan-Texte VII," pp. 89–90.

<sup>130</sup> Hsiao Chi, *Wu-hsing ta-i* (Chih-pu-tsu chai ts'ung-shu edn.) 4, pp. 15a–b. On the authenticity of this work, see Juan Yüan 阮元, *Ssu-k'u wei-shou shu-mu t'i-yao* 四庫未收書目提要 (Kuo-hsüeh chi-pen ts'ung-shu edn.) 2, p. 25. An excellent contemporary edition of the text is Nakamura Shōhachi 中村璋八, *Gogyō daigi kōchū* 五行大義校註 (Tokyo: Kyūko shoin, 1984). For the list of star names see pp. 140–41, and for the attribution of cosmological elements and deities to the stars see pp. 173–74. Also see idem, *Gogyō daigi* (Tokyo: Meitoku, 1973), where the star list is on p. 232. Pp. 172–75 contain a table of correspondences between the gods of the five elements, the trigrams of the *I-ching*, and the star names according to the T'an-lang series.

the *Huang-ti tou-li* 黃帝斗歷, which is listed in the bibliographical chapters of the *Sui-shu* and the *Hsin T'ang-shu*.<sup>131</sup> The *Huang-ti tou-t'u*, perhaps a sixth-century work, has the same correlation between the twelve cyclical signs and the seven stars that found its way into the Buddhist *Pei-tou ching*. Furthermore, the *Wu-hsing ta-i* has a different list of star names, taken from the *K'ung-tzu yüan-ch'en ching* 孔子元辰經, a work of uncertain date attributed to Confucius.<sup>132</sup> This list of the seven star names is as follows:

1. Yang-ming 陽明
2. Yin-ching 陰精
3. Chen-jen 真人
4. Hsüan-ming 玄冥
5. Tan-yüan 丹元
6. Pei-chi 北極
7. T'ien-kuan 天關

Like the names in the T'an-lang series (see table 1) they have nothing to do with the star names in astronomical literature but were current in the cults of destiny stars in Chinese religions.<sup>133</sup>

Consequently, we have two sets of names for the Great Bear stars attested about 600 A.D., at the latest. These two sets later were conflated so that each star had two religious names — for example, T'an-lang and Yang-ming for the first star. Twin names occur in the basic text of the *Pei-tou ching* and its commentaries.<sup>134</sup> These texts have not only seven, but two additional stars that are in principle visible only to adepts. Their names are Wai-fu 外輔 (alternative name, Tung-ming 洞明) and Nei-pi 內弼 (alternative name, Yin-kuang 隱光). Because the stars were perceived as persons

<sup>131</sup> *Sui-shu* 隋書 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1973) 34, p. 1026; *Hsin T'ang-shu* 新唐書 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1975) 59, p. 1555. That the *Huang-ti tou-t'u* is identical with the *Huang-ti tou-li* has already been conjectured by Yao Chen-tung 姚振宗, *Sui-shu ching-chi chih K'ao-cheng* 隋書經籍志考證, in *Erh-shih wu shih pu-pien* 二十五史補編 (Shanghai: K'ai-ming shu-tien, 1937), vol. 4, ch. 36, p. 5590c.

<sup>132</sup> This was one of many books on "lucky stars" (*yüan-ch'en* 元辰) current in the Sui era. The *Sui-shu* alone lists ten works on it; Yao Chen-tung (see previous n.) has four more (p. 5615c).

<sup>133</sup> The names of the Great Bear stars in Gustave Schlegel, *Uranographie chinoise* (Leiden: Brill, 1875; rpt. Taipei: Ch'eng-wen shu-chü, 1967), pp. 171-77 and 502-6, are entirely different from the names given in the *Wu-hsing ta-i*. The names on this list also figure in Six Dynasties treatises on mystical visits to the stars that have been studied by Isabelle Robinet, "Randonnées extatiques des Taoïstes dans les astres," *MS* 32 (1976), pp. 159-273. On mystical visits to the *Pei-tou*, see pp. 222-73. In n. 306 (p. 223) the star names according to the Yang-ming sequence are listed.

<sup>134</sup> For the basic text: *TT* no. 622, pp. 4b-5a. For the commentaries: *TT* no. 750, ch. 3, pp. 1a-9b; no. 751, ch. B, pp. 11b-14b; and no. 752, ch. B, pp. 9a-16b.

they were also provided with family names, tabooed personal names, and courtesy names. As a rule the names of the T'an-lang series figure as courtesy names of the respective astral god, but family and personal names sometimes differ widely in the texts.

The Buddhist *Pei-tou ching* in section B uses only the names of the T'an-lang series, together with the ritual food to be offered to the star gods (see tables 1 and 2). The correlation between certain kinds of grain or pulse and the stars that we find in the Buddhist text does not occur in the basic Taoist text of the *Pei-tou ching* or its commentaries, but it can be found in other Taoist literature. A list of seven stars named according to the Yang-ming series is included in the text of *Tao-tsang* no. 1265. Each star's pertinent cyclical sign is listed together with the instruction for the food offering. The text (*Tao-tsang* no. 1265) must be earlier than 1028-1029, perhaps from the ninth or tenth century.<sup>135</sup>

The T'an-lang series of names appears separately in an incantation portion of the text.<sup>136</sup> Double names for the stars seem, however, to have been used first in slightly later texts, such as the *Pei-tou ching* and its commentaries. This version of the star gods belongs to a Taoist tradition different from that of the *Pei-tou ching*, which was held to have been revealed to Chang Tao-ling. Instead, its opening page claims that it was revealed to Ko Hsien-weng 葛仙翁 (Ko Hsüan) in the second year of Ch'ih-wu 赤烏 (239 A.D.). Ko Hsüan was a master of the Ling-pao school and instrumental in the movement that culminated in the divinization of Lao-tzu.<sup>137</sup> These two traditions have merged in the *Pei-tou ching* commentaries of the Sung period and later. The ritual grain offerings probably originated in the Ling-pao school and then were adopted into the *Pei-tou ching* tradition together with the amulets, which are absent in the basic *Pei-tou ching* text but included in some of its commentaries.

The food offerings associated with the stars in the *Tao-tsang* no. 1265 and *Yün-chi ch'i-ch'ien* 雲笈七籤 texts are different from those in the Buddhist *Pei-tou ching* (for a tetraglot list see table 2). For stars nos. 1 and 2 the food

<sup>135</sup> See *TT* no. 1265, p. 4a. A *terminus post quem* for this work is determinable because it is a large part of ch. 25 of *Yün-chi ch'i-ch'ien* 雲笈七籤 (compiled ca. 1028-1029), in which its title is given as "Pei-chi ch'i-yüan tzu-t'ing pi-chüeh" 北極七元紫庭秘訣. See *Yün-chi ch'i-ch'ien* (SPTK edn.) 25, pp. 1a-10b; a list of the offerings is on p. 4b.

<sup>136</sup> *TT* no. 1265, p. 8b.

<sup>137</sup> On Ko Hsüan, see *Yün-chi ch'i-ch'ien* 3, pp. 11b-12a; 4, p. 15a. See also *San-kuo chih* 三國志 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1973) 63, p. 1416; *Shen-hsien chuan* 神仙傳 7, pp. 3b-5b; *Pao-p'u-tzu nei-chuan* 18, pp. 4a-b. Of particular importance are the remarks about him in Anna K. Seidel, *La divination de Lao Tseu dans le Taoïsme des Han*, Publications de l'EFEO 71 (Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient, 1969), pp. 76, 84-85.



is the same (glutinous millet and millet). For star no. 3 the Buddhist version has *keng-mi* 粳米 "non-glutinous rice" but the Taoist text has instead *no-mi* 糯米, "glutinous rice." It seems that the complicated character *no* has been misread or misspelled as *keng* by the Buddhist author. The offering for star no. 4 in the Taoist texts is *hsiao-tou* 小豆, "peas," which must be a lapsus because *hsiao-tou* appears again for star no. 7. This mistake was later copied into the Buddhist version (*Taishō* no. 1307), where the correct reading *hsiao-mai*, "wheat," has been relegated to a variorum footnote. That *hsiao-mai* belongs to star no. 4, Wen-ch'ü, is perfectly clear, because the Uighur, Mongolian, and Tibetan translations all have the respective word for "wheat."

Another Taoist correspondence between grains and Great Bear stars appears in *Tao-tsang* no. 753.<sup>138</sup> Furthermore, this text instructs the believer to carry as a protection against danger not only a copy of the amulet (*fu* 符) pertaining to both his cyclical birth sign and a star, but also seven grains of the prescribed food. The amulets of the seven stars are closely similar to those in *Taishō* no. 1307 and in the Uighur printed version. It is almost certain that the anonymous author of the Buddhist text used a Taoist source closely resembling the one of *Tao-tsang* no. 753. The whole of section B of the Buddhist *Pei-tou ching* must therefore have been borrowed from Taoist sources.

The same is also true for the pictures of the gods in the Buddhist text. The deities are all long-haired, carry official insignia, and wear loose robes. Almost identical representations are in *Tao-tsang* no. 751,<sup>139</sup> whose illustrations are of course those of the *Tao-tsang* edition of 1444-1445, whereas the Buddhist ones are very late (1802) and not Chinese but Japanese. The continuity in the pictorial tradition is nonetheless remarkable.<sup>140</sup>

Another early illustration of the seven star gods appears on the frontispiece woodcut of a rare Taoist print, the 1439 edition of the *Tou-mu ching*.<sup>141</sup> A cartouche gives their collective name as *ch'i-yüan hsing-chün* 七元星君. The figures resemble those in *Tao-tsang* no. 751 with the only difference that they

are wearing a small crown whereas the figures in *Tao-tsang* no. 751 and *Taishō* no. 1307 are bare-headed. This woodcut is even a few years older than the *Tao-tsang* edition. Behind the seven gods are two more figures wearing an ornate headdress. They are the two astral emperors T'ien-huang shang-ti 天皇上帝 and Tzu-wei ta-ti 紫微大帝, who bring the total number of the star gods up to nine, the *chiu-hsing* 九星 mentioned in the *Tou-mu ching*.<sup>142</sup>

#### GREAT BEAR CULT UNDER THE YÜAN

The worship of the Great Bear was always an element of the state cult in imperial China, the Yüan dynasty being no exception. In Qubilai's reign rituals in honor of the Great Bear stars were performed by Taoist masters. The biography of the fifth patriarch of the Tai-i 太一 sect Li Chü-shou 李居壽 (1221-1280) reports that Li was ordered in 1278 to perform a ritual for the "seven original star lords" (*ch'i-yüan hsing-chün*) in a palace hall and in 1279 to change the place of the seven star lords on the altar.<sup>143</sup> Chü-shou's younger brother Ch'üan-yu 全祐 succeeded him to become sixth patriarch, and on the occasion of his investiture (February 10, 1281) the emperor requested him to worship the Great Bear.<sup>144</sup>

Like other rituals for deities, those for the Great Bear stars were regarded as a duty of the state. On the first day of the new moon in the eighth lunar month of 1285 (September 1, 1285) the responsible officials were ordered to worship the Great Bear for three full days.<sup>145</sup> A similar edict was issued at the end of the lunar year (January 25, 1286), presumably to pray for upcoming good luck and prosperity.<sup>146</sup> Interestingly the annals of emperor Wen-tsung show that on July 18, 1330, the emperor ordered Tibetan Buddhist monks (*hsi-seng* 西僧) to worship the stars (*jung-hsing* 祭星).<sup>147</sup> The text does not say for which stars the ritual was performed, but the entry also indicates that Tibetan monks occasionally took part in the star cult — not just Confucian and Taoist officials. The reign of Wen-tsung was exactly at

<sup>138</sup> *TT* no. 753, pp. 2b-4b. Here *hsiao-mai* for star no. 4 is correct, but the offerings for stars nos. 1 and 2 are exchanged, so that *su* 粟 is attributed to star no. 1 and *shu* 黍 to no. 2. In no. 3 we find for "rice" neither *no* nor *keng* but *'ao* 稻.

<sup>139</sup> *TT* no. 751, pp. 11b-14a; this is a text from the 12th or 13th century, as shown above.

<sup>140</sup> In contrast to the Chinese prototype the Japanese edns. and *T* no. 1307 show an additional, tiny figure next to star god no. 5 (Wu-ch'ü). It wears a two-winged official's hat and looks up to the star god. Perhaps this is a Japanese addition depicting Alcor, a small star hardly visible and close to Zeta Ursae Maioris (Mizar), the middle star of the handle of the Dipper. Mizar and Alcor are known in the West as Horse and Rider. I could not find textual evidence in Taoist scriptures for the inclusion of Alcor among the Great Bear stars.

<sup>141</sup> See n. 126, above.

<sup>142</sup> See *TT* no. 621, p. 2b; see also plate 1.

<sup>143</sup> Wang Yün 王惲, *Ch'iu-ch'ien hsien-sheng ta-ch'üan wen-chi* 秋澗先生大全文集 (SPTK edn.) 47, p. 16b. Among the 54 tablets on the second tier of the altar was also that of the *Pei-tou*; see *YS* 72, p. 179a. A good account of the Tai-i sect is given in Ch'en Yüan 陳垣, *Nan-Sung ch'u Ho-pei hsin tao-chiao k'ao* 南宋初河北新道教考 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1962), pp. 110-15, 129-34.

<sup>144</sup> *YS* 11, p. 229. <sup>145</sup> *YS* 13, p. 278.

<sup>146</sup> *YS* 13, p. 282. The Chung-hua compilers (*ibid.*, n. 12, p. 284) correct the cyclical date from *hsin-mao* to *ting-mao*.

<sup>147</sup> *YS* 34, p. 759.

a time when high officials at court were active in sponsoring and translating the Buddhist *Pei-tou ching*.

It was also under Wen-tsung that a trial was held in which the list of alleged crimes included worship of the Great Bear. The case involved surviving family members and relatives of the late chancellor Temüder (T'ieh-mu-tieh-erh 鐵木迭兒; d. 1322), whose faction had engineered the murder of emperor Ying-tsung (Šidebala) and the accession of the T'ai-ting emperor Yesün Temür in 1323. It was only natural that the group that put Wen-tsung on the throne in 1328, and thus restored the line of Qaišan, considered the former supporters of Yesün Temür as their enemies.<sup>148</sup> The trial and subsequent execution in 1330 of Temüder's group was thus a political purge, not a normal case in the justice system.<sup>149</sup> The group was executed together with another that included the elder sister of Yeh-li-ya. One wonders why in 1330 the worship of the Great Bear was considered a crime. Possibly any sacrifice other than the officially recognized rituals was considered illegal. It is also possible that the defendants had fabricated Taoist secret texts (the text has 造符錄) with a negative, black magic purpose in mind, praying not for long life but for the shortened lifespan of unknown persons.

One of the victims of the purge was Yeh-li-ya 也里牙 (variant: 野理牙). The name is the Christian "Elijah," going back to the Syriac form "Eli-yā."<sup>150</sup> He was the eldest son of the Syrian Ai-hsieh 愛薛 ('Isa, 1227-1308), who has a biography in the *Yüan-shih*.<sup>151</sup> 'Isa was versed in astronomy and astrology: after the death of emperor Ch'eng-tsung in 1307 the empress "ordered him to consult the secret courses of the stars."<sup>152</sup> Probably 'Isa's son had at some time prior to 1330 practiced astrology in connection with the Great Bear owing to his family background. But perhaps there is more to it. We have seen above that the name of the sponsor of the Mongolian

translation of the *Pei-tou ching*, Ürük Buqa, is mentioned together with Yeh-li-ya (Elijah) as his fellow-conspirator. Are both — the Elijah executed in 1330 and his namesake, who allegedly plotted with Ürük Buqa in favor of Wen-tsung — one and the same person? The compilers of the *Yüan* biographical index think that the Elijah executed in 1330 is not identical with the eldest son of 'Isa.<sup>153</sup> The compiler of the index to personal names in the *Yüan-shih*, however, has assembled all references to Yeh-li-ya under one heading, thereby implying that the persons were identical and that there was only one Elijah.<sup>154</sup> If we adopt the hypothesis of identity we might also speculate that Elijah, in spite of his being a Nestorian Christian, believed in the supernatural powers of the Great Bear stars and was at the same time an associate of the man who had the Buddhist *Pei-tou ching* translated into Mongolian. We can perceive, however dimly, a circle of courtiers under Wen-tsung in which the cult of the Great Bear was practiced as a means to influence human destiny.

If, as demonstrated above, the existence of a printed *Yüan* edition of the Taoist *Pei-tou ching* is absolutely certain, then the proscription of Taoist books under Qubilai from 1280 to 1281 takes on significance for this study. The emperor had all Taoist scriptures destroyed with the exception of the *Tao-te ching*.

A list of proscribed books is given in the *Chih-yüan Pien-wei lu* 至元辯偽錄, which, in spite of inconsistencies and unclear authorship, is our most important source of Buddhist-Taoist controversies in the *Yüan* era. We find in it a "Holy Book of the Southern Dipper" ("Nan-tou ching" 南斗經).<sup>155</sup> The "Nan-tou ching" thus attested in 1281 was probably either identical with or closely related to a short text (similar in content to the *Pei-tou ching*) on prolonging life by worshipping the Southern Dipper that was included in the *Tao-tsang*.<sup>156</sup> The text proclaims the transcendental influence of the

<sup>148</sup> Dardess, *Conquerors and Confucians*, p. 52.

<sup>149</sup> The relevant passages in *YS* 34, p. 761, were translated long ago in A. C. Moule, *Christians in China before the Year 1550* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1930), p. 231: "So-chu, President of the Chiang tso yüan and son of the late ch'eng-hsiang T'ieh-mu-tieh-erh, with his younger brother Kuan-yin-nu and his elder sister's husband Yeh-li-ya, President of the T'ai i yüan, were guilty of sedition, practising magic, sacrificing to the Great Bear, and using incantations." (Italics are mine.)

<sup>150</sup> Paul Pelliot, *Recherches sur les chrétiens d'Asie Centrale et d'Extrême-Orient* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1973), p. 10; p. 9, n. 1; and p. 280, n. 4.

<sup>151</sup> The biography of 'Isa in *YS* 134, pp. 3249-50, has been translated into English in Moule, *Christians*, pp. 228-29. On 'Isa, see also Paul Pelliot, *Notes on Marco Polo* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1959) 1, p. 23. For a biography of Elijah see T'u, *Meng-wu-erh*, vol. 6, ch. 117, pp. 2a-b.

<sup>152</sup> 內旨崇星歷祕文; trans. Moule, *Christians*, p. 229.

<sup>153</sup> Wang, *Yüan-jen*, vol. 4, p. 2404.

<sup>154</sup> Yao Ching-an 姚景安, *Yüan-shih jen-ming so-yin* 元史人名索引 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1982), pp. 303-4.

<sup>155</sup> T no. 2116, vol. 52, ch. 2, p. 764a. This passage has been copied into Nien-ch'ang's 念常 *Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai* 佛祖歷代通載 (T no. 2036, vol. 49), ch. 22, p. 719, and Huan-lun's 幻輪 *Shih-chien chi-ku lüeh hsü-chi* 釋鑑稽古略續集 (T no. 2038, vol. 49), ch. 1, 906c. On the controversies between Buddhists and Taoists under the *Yüan*, see, e.g., Joseph Thiel, "Der Streit der Buddhisten und Taoisten zur Mongolenzeit," *MS* 20 (1962), pp. 1-81; Kubo Noritada, "Prolegomena on the Study of the Controversies between Buddhists and Taoists in the *Yüan* Period," *MTB* 26 (1968), pp. 39-61 (with a discussion of the authorship of the *Pien-wei lu*); Sechin Jagchid, "Chinese Buddhism and Taoism during the Mongolian Rule of China," *Mongolian Studies: Journal of the Mongolia Society* 6 (1980), pp. 61-98.

<sup>156</sup> *TT* no. 624, vol. 341; the title there is "T'ai-shang shuo Nan-tou liu-szu yen-shou tu-jen miao-ching" 太上說南斗六司延壽度人妙經.

six stars of the Southern Dipper on the lives of human beings and instructs the adept how to worship the star gods. For each of the gods, the *Tao-tsang* text reproduces amulets. These should be written in red ink and carried by both men and women as a protection against dangers. The *Nan-tou ching* pretends to have been revealed by the deified Lao-tzu to Chang Tao-ling in the first year of Yung-shou, fifteenth day of the first lunar month, that is, eight days after the purported revelation of the *Pei-tou ching*. Both books were therefore believed to have the same supernatural origin. If the *Nan-tou ching* figures expressly in the proscription list of 1281, it is very probable that the *Pei-tou ching* also was banned. Indeed, we learn from another passage in the *Pien-wei lu* that Buddhists regarded the *Pei-tou ching* as obnoxious. The passage — a rhymed jingle — reads: 家有北斗經。枉教人口不安寧 (“If a family has the *Pei-tou ching* it is a perverse teaching for the people and they will not live in peace.”)<sup>157</sup> This looks exactly like a parody on a litany in the *Pei-tou ching* consisting of fifteen verses, each beginning with 家有北斗經. The second verse tells us that “if a family has the *Pei-tou ching* their house and abode will enjoy peace” 宅舍得安寧.<sup>158</sup> Certainly the Buddhist author who wrote that parody was familiar with the Taoist prototype in praise of the holy book's efficacy. The parallelism is absolutely clear.

Although we have no direct evidence that the Taoist *Pei-tou ching* was banned in 1281, nevertheless we can assume that it was. Of course, the imperial order that Qubilai issued on the instigation of Buddhist monks was not thoroughly and uniformly followed throughout the empire. Many Taoist scriptures must have survived somewhere in the provinces, such as the printed edition found in Khara-khoto. The fact that Hsü Tao-ling had his *Pei-tou ching* commentary printed in 1334 also points to a relaxation of Qubilai's prohibition under later Yüan emperors. It is also certain that the Great Bear cult was widely practiced during the Yüan.<sup>159</sup> The earliest evidence for the existence of a Chinese Buddhist *Pei-tou ching* is, as we have seen, its translation into Uighur in 1313, a date roughly thirty years later than the ban on Taoist scriptures.

I therefore venture to suggest that a Buddhist *Pei-tou ching*, a prototype of *Taishō* no. 1307, was composed after 1281 but prior to 1313. Its compiler

adopted elements of the Great Bear cult as found in Taoist texts and gave it the Buddhist form of a pseudo-sūtra purportedly preached by the Buddha himself; in this way the worship of the gods of Ursa Maior would then have become acceptable to Buddhists and to the imperial court and its Buddhist clerics.<sup>160</sup> This hypothesis agrees with the recent observation that at the level of popular religiosity, the border between Buddhism and Taoism tends to become blurred.<sup>161</sup> Both religions may have borrowed from each other, but in the case of the *Pei-tou ching* a Taoist priority cannot be doubted in view of the long and well-attested history of the Great Bear cult in China.

<sup>160</sup> A Japanese scholar has shown that we find also in Japan a Buddhization of originally Chinese Taoist elements in Japan in the Kamakura (1192-1333) and Muromachi (1336-1573) periods; see Nakamura Shōhachi, in Fukui, *Dōkyō* 3, pp. 32-34.

<sup>161</sup> Erik Zürcher, “Perspectives in the Study of Chinese Buddhism,” *JRAS* 1982, p. 173.

#### LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

|           |  |
|-----------|--|
| BDJ       | <i>Bukkyō daijiten</i> 佛教大辭典           |
| K. edn.   | Kanjur edition                         |
| Lig. edn. | Ligeti edition                         |
| T         | <i>Taishō shinshū daizōkyō</i> 太正新修大藏經 |
| TT        | <i>Tao-tsang</i> 道藏                    |
| YS        | <i>Yüan-shih</i> 元史                    |

<sup>157</sup> *Pien-wei lu* 5, p. 778b; Nien-ch'ang, *Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai* 22, p. 719c; and Huan-lun, *Shih-chien chi-ku lüeh hsü-chi* 1, p. 907a.

<sup>158</sup> See TT no. 622, pp. 8b-9a. For a similar litany of seven verses, see TT no. 629, pp. 27a-b.

<sup>159</sup> I have culled not a few passages in Chinese texts concerning legends in which the star gods T'an-lang and others figure, but have not used them for this article. The earliest texts date from the T'ang.