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Bibliographical Survey  

The earliest reference to Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi exists in a Buddhist book. In a preface to 'A General Record of Buddha and Patriarchs through the Ages' (Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai) dated 1341 A.D., Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi was noted as 'a recent work'. The next reference about this work is contained in The catalogue of Wên-yüan-ke Library compiled by Yang Shih-ch'i (1365-1444) and his Assistants, in which Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi was described as 'a work in one volume'. This is the first time that the title of this book has been included in the official catalogue of the Royal Library. In 'A Catalogue of the Green Bamboo Hall' compiled by Yeh Sheng (1420-1474), Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi was described as a work in five volumes. Another Ming bibliographer Tiao Hung (1541-1620) has also informed us that this work is 'a work in forty-five fascicles'. This number has been affirmed by two other Buddhist catalogues compiled during the early decades of the seventeenth century as they also repeated the number. In a preface to 'An Outline of Buddha and Patriarchs' (Fo-tsu kang-mu), Tung Chi-chang (1555-1636) stated: during the Sung period a monk Fa-p'an respected the sect of Lotus Sutra, thus compiled Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi. This is the earliest reference to the authorship of the work as found in other books.  

In the beginning of the seventeenth century, Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi had been included into two different editions of 'Tripitaka in Chinese', one of them was published from Nanking, and the other was printed by the Lêng-yên-

---

1 Cf. T. XLIX, 477a & b. Though this preface is stated to be written by Yü Can (1272-1348), it is excluded in the collection of Yü's work. Scholars like Ch'en Yuan have expressed their doubt about the authorship of the preface. Cf. FCSCL, p. 139. On the other hand, whoever might be the author, the preface itself should have been written during the fourteenth century, as it exists in all editions of that Buddhist history.  
2 The title of FTTC has been twice enlisted in Yang's catalogue. In both places, it was recorded that FTTC is 'A work in one volume'. Cf. Wên-yüan-ke shu-mu, ch. XVII, TSCC vol. XXX, p. 219a, 220b.  
3 See Lu-chu-t'ang shu-mu, ch. VI, TSCC vol. XXXIII, p. 146b.  
5 Original text of Tung's preface is contained in HTC IIB—XIX/3, p. 183a.
ssu of Chia-hsing district of present Chekiang province. This is the first time that Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi has entered into the Collections of Sacred Books of Chinese Buddhists.

In the 'Additional Bibliography to the history of the Liao-chin-yüan Dynasties' compiled by Lu Wên-shao (1717—1795), it was stated: 'CHIH-P'AN, Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi, in fifty-four fascicles'. Similarly CH'IENTA-HSIN (1728—1804) has also referred to Chih-p'An and his work. The 'General Catalogue of Four Libraries' (Ssu-k'u-ch'uan-shu tsung-mu) and 'A Catalogue of the Books preserved in Wên-shui-lo Library' (Wên-shui-lo ts'ang-shu mu-lu) compiled by CHIN HSING-HSUAN, both have mentioned that Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi is a work in fifty-four fascicles, and its author is Chih-p'An.

According to a statement by Chih-p'An himself, there was possibly still an older edition of this work, none the less, we have no actual knowledge about that edition at present. The early editions of this work which are still in existence today are dated in the early part of the seventeenth century. One of these is the edition attached to the Southern Collection of Ming Tripitaka. The second one exists in the collection of Tripitaka printed by Lêng-yên-ssu mentioned above. Besides these, another edition of this work printed in the Ming period was dated in 1614 A.D.

In the later editions of Tripitaka in Chinese, the Kokyōshōin (Tōkyō 1880—85), the Pin-chia edition (Shanghai 1913), the collection of Hsü-tsang-ching (Kyoto 1905—12 and Shanghai 1923) and Taishō edition of Tripitaka in Chinese are all including this work. Apart from those collective publications, there still remain other three separated versions of this work, one is published from Ning-po. The second version was published by the Chinese Institute of the Inner Learnings of Nanking in 1934, and the other one was the Japanese translation of Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi by SATÔ MRUSUO, published in 1938. The Nanking version though only an abridged edition

---

6 See two catalogues mentioned in No. 4 and contained in Shōwa hōbō sōmokuroku II.

7 See Pu liao-chin-yüan yi-wén-chih (Supplementary record to The Bibliography of the Liao, the Chin and the Yuan Dynasties) and Pu yün-shih yi-wén-chih (Supplementary record to the Bibliography of the Yuan-shih), both contained in Erh-shih-wu-shih pu-pien vol. VI, pp. 8509 & 8421b.

8 Ch'in-ting ssu-k'u-ch'uan-shu tsung-mu (compiled between 1773—85), ch. IV, TSCC vol. 38, p. 346. This catalogue contained a few more words on FTTC, such as: "Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi, fifty-four fascicles, by Monk CHIH-P'AN, a Sung monk of Szu-ming."

9 Cf. Ta-ming san-tsang sheng-chiao mu-lu IV, No. 1656 and Tsang-p'an-ching chih-hua-yi mu-lu, No. 1654. Both exist in Shōwa hōbō sōmokuroku II, 299a & 332b. Both of them have wrongly recorded FTTC as 'A work in 45 fasc'.

10 Ref. to Chén Chên-to: "Chieh-chung té-shu chi" (Notes on the Books secured during the war period), No. XXIII, p. 25 ff, Shanghai, 1956.


12 About Ning-po edition, see Ch'en Yüan, FCSCl, p. 120, which is not available in India.

13 i.e. Fa-yün chih-lueh, possibly edited by Ou-yang Ching-wu and his colleagues. Vol. III of this book is also being tr. and annotated by us, this forms the second part of this thesis.

of Fa-yün-t'ung-se chih, i.e. the thirty-fourth to forty-eighth fascicles of Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi, is actually the best part of Chih-p'an's work. Moreover, the abridgement made by the publisher is excellent.

From the bibliographical survey mentioned above, we find certain confusions about the author as well as the size or division of Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi. Regarding the authorship, it varies from Fa-p'an to Chih-p'an and some of them even did not mention the name of the author at all. When our attention is turned to the size of the work, it varies from one to five to ten volumes. Similarly, the division of the work also varies from forty-five to fifty-four or fifty-five fascicles. Under these circumstances, we have to enquire into the problems like authorship, place and date of compilation of Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi. Similarly we have also to investigate the structure and contribution of this work, to evaluate it from all aspects, and to re-examine the criticisms and appreciations on this outstanding Buddhist history.

**Author and Date**

Very little is known about Chih-p'an, because no other classical scholar discusses in detail the life of this eminent Buddhist historian of the T'ien-t'ai Sect. In the catalogues or reference books, we only find a very brief remark: "Chih-p'an, Literary title Ta-shih. A monk of T'ien-t'ai Sect and author of Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi." Except this, there is no other information.

After this investigation of Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi started, it was discovered that a few passages concerning his life did exist. These new extracts may add to our knowledge about Chih-p'an.

In the first extract, Chih-p'an has claimed Lu Chih (-192 A.D.) as his ancestor. Lu was a scholar, minister and a hermit of the later Han Dynasty. Chih-p'an moreover informs us that in his family register and record, this ancestral lineage has been clearly mentioned.

In the second extract, while discussing about the clergy life of Liang-nan (present S. China), Chih-p'an mentioned his personal experiences about clergyhood. He states: "In my younger days, I was once a sojourner at Nan-kai. I met the monks in the rural area of that locality ... "

In the other extracts, Chih-p'an sheds more light on his life. He says: "When I was attending my teacher Master Yüan during my childhood, I once saw him reading out the 'Book of Military Tactics' by Sun Wu to the villagers ... " When Chih-p'an discusses etymological problems, he again

---

15 For instances see Hob. p. 148a under the spelling of Shiban, Nj. p. 446, No. 68, Mochiuuki, S. Bukkyō daijiten p. 1975c.
17 Chih-p'an says: T. XLIX, 412a. According to Chih-p'an, his teacher was named Yüan Chi, a nephew of Yüan Hsieh, who was an eminent Confucian scholar (see Sung-shih ch. 400). We further learn from Chin-chih kao, XIII (Draft of a local history of Chin district), that Yüan's family was one of the most influential houses which had a strong belief in Confucianism.
states: "I, Chih-p’an, learnt this subject from my teacher in my childhood days. But after my 50th year, I began to realise that my knowledge of certain words is still inadequate ... " 19. Similarly, in the preface and bibliographical references of his Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi, Chih-p’an shows that he really possesses an extensive knowledge of Chinese history, philosophy and literature. His knowledge of non-Buddhist subjects definitely helped him a great deal in his compilation of Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi, specially in the part concerning chronicles.

Regarding the exact date of Chih-p’an, our sources do not give adequate information, yet we can trace something from the statement by Chih-p’an himself. Since Chih-p’an said, during the later part of the sixties of the thirteenth century, when he was compiling the forty-five fascicles of his work, his age has already passed fifty. Again, in the colophon of Fo-tsu-t’ung-chi written in 1271, Chih-p’an said that he is old and sick. These lights indicated that he was possibly born during the first or second decade of the thirteenth century. His activities had continued up to the seventies of the same century.

Chih-p’an drew an illustrated table about lineage of his sect in the twenty-fourth fascicle of Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi. This table informs us that Chih-p’an himself was a tenth monastic descendant after Chih-li (1028), who was the seventeenth patriarch of the T’ien-t’ai Sect. Another Master of the orthodox branch of T’ien-t’ai named Tsung-ching was mentioned as the teacher of Chih-p’an.

According to the remarks in Fo-tsu-t’ung-chi, the compilation of this work started in 1258 A.D. and was completed in 1269. During these eleven years, Chih-p’an revised his manuscripts on many occasions. Even the drafts of the complete work had to be revised five times.

At the beginning of each fascicle of Fo-tsu-t’ung-chi, the author himself notes the dates and places where he worked. From these notes we know that the first thirty-three fascicles were compiled at the Eastern Lake of Szu-ming (in present E. Chekiang), during the age of Ching-ting (1260–64) of the Sung Dynasty. From the thirty-fourth to the fiftieth fascicle, he worked in the same place, but they were dated in the era of Hsien-shun (1265–74). The last four fascicles of his work were compiled at a monastery called Fu-ch’uan, also situated in the Szu-ming region.

Chih-p’an further informs us that since he started his work on Fo-tsu-t’ung-chi in 1258, he continuously worked for a period of ten years. After he finished the drafts, he carried the manuscript to Hang-chou, placed it before the Master Fo-kuang (named Fa-chao) and sought his approval. At the same time, his colleagues started the preparation for the printing and publishing of this book, because all of them desired to have a copy of this work in their own respective monasteries 20.

19 CHIH-P’AN SAYS:
He also gave a good number of words he thought were etymological mistakes.
20 T. XLIX, 129c.
In a colophon to *Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi*, Chih-p'an states: "During the first year of the Hsien-shun era (or 1065 A.D.), Yi-ch'iu (in cycle), I resided at the Yüeh-p'o hill of the Eastern Lake and engaged the block engravers to carve the printing blocks for *Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi*. From then on till the winter of the sixth year (i.e. 1270), Kêng-wu (in cycle), I suffered from asthmatic cough. At that time, an ecclesiastical relative of mine named Chia-lin kindly extended an invitation to me and sent his boat for the journey. I therefore returned to my old residence at Fu-ch'uan monastery on the twenty-first of the twelfth month (i.e. 2nd Febry. 1271) ..." 21. Here, in this passage, Chih-p'an called Fu-ch'uan monastery his 'Old Residence', this shows that he once was a monk in this monastery. It is only later that he shifted to the Eastern Lake. This was probably after he became a disciple of Tsung-ching, then the abbot of the Eastern Lake.

After his return to Fu-ch'uan monastery, Chih-p'an states that the last four fascicles of his work were yet without their printing blocks. Therefore, he wrote down the block-makers' copy for these four fascicles, and thus enabled the engravers to finish the rest of the work in the seventh month. Though the blocks were ready for printing, the fund to meet the expenses for printing was still insufficient. Chih-p'an, therefore, appealed to officials and rich people to donate money for printing charges and paper. In the colophon, Chih-p'an states "I am sick in bed for long. I am afraid that if I die, my wish (publication of my book) may remain unfulfilled. As I am afraid of this eventuality, I record about my work at the end of the book. I hope and beg that the virtuous youth of future will continue and finish the publication." 22

From the information mentioned above, it is clear that the preparations of printing-blocks of *Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi* were completed during the year 1271. We further learn from the preface of Nien-ch'ang's *Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai* that during the year 1341 A.D. *Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi* was referred to as a 'Recent publication' 23. This shows that there possibly was an older edition of his work besides the editions that we have already discussed. Nevertheless that edition is not available.

Chih-p'an acknowledges that Master Fo-kuang (Fa-chao), Master Pé-sheng of Pao-kuo monastery and other Masters, namely Shan-liang, Hui-chou and Tsung-ching, also assisted him in compiling *Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi* 24.

Besides *Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi*, Chih-p'an wrote another work called 'Rules of Confessional Ceremonies on Water and Land for All Beings of Dharma-hatu' 25. An abridged edition of this work is included in *Hsü-tsang-ching*. Though the author indicates the place and date in a rough note, the exact date and monastery where he compiled this work is not mentioned. Some

---

21 *Ibidem*, p. 475b.
22 *Ibidem*, p. 475b & c.
24 Full list of these monks and their designations found in T. XLIX, 130a.
25 i.e. *Fo-chai sheng-pan shui-lu sheng-hui hsiu-chai yi-kuei*, this was originally written by Chih-p'an and then revised by Chu Hung (1535—1615), contained in the collection of *HTC* II/11/3—4.
years back, Prof. Mochizuki Shinko, an eminent Buddhist scholar dated this work as being composed in 1274 A.D. or about five years after the compilation of *Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi*. But this date is not true. In the 33rd fascicle of *Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi*, the author himself writes some words about his work on 'Rules of Confessional Ceremonies'. There, Chih-p'an informs us that while he was compiling *Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi*, his book on confessional rules was not only finished, but even the printing blocks of that work were ready. From this passage, we must conclude that the rules on confessional ceremonies framed by Chih-p'an were earlier than 1258 A.D. In the same place, Chih-p'an also informs us that during his compilation of *Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi*, the printed copy of his 'Rules on Confessional Ceremonies' was not yet out. This shows that the work had been completed not long before 1258. Therefore, it would be safe if we date this work between 1250—1257.

There are other works of Chih-p'an, which he wrote before the compilation of *Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi*. Later, these works were collected and became a part of this big work. And therefore, we cannot count them as separate works. For example, his essay *Tsung-men tsun-tsu yi* (A Proposal Regarding the Patriarchs of the sect) is a part of *Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi* (in 50th fasc.). Similarly, according to Chih-p'an's statement, he wrote biographies of followers of the Pure-land Sect before the compilation of *Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi*. Later on these biographies formed the twenty-sixth to twenty-eight fascicles of the latter.

From the information quoted above, one can conclude that the author of *Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi* was Chih-p'an. His surname was Lu, coming from the celebrated Confucian family. He once sojourned at Nan-nai. He learnt non-Buddhist subjects from the laymen-teachers during his childhood and youth. Later, he renounced his worldly life and resided at Fu-ch'uan monastery of Szu-ming in the present province of Chekiang. He was a disciple of Tsung-ching, who was the abbot of Yüeh-p'o monastery of the Eastern Lake. Chih-p'an was also an enthusiastic orthodox monk of the T'ien-t'ai Sect. He has written essays on the lineage of Buddhist patriarchs, appealed for removal of taxations imposed on monasteries and monks, and wrote a book on confessional ceremonies. Afterwards, he spent eleven years in compiling *Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi* from 1258 to 1269 A.D. which is the most comprehensive history of the T'ien-t'ai Sect and of Chinese Buddhism. The printing block of this work was engraved between 1265—71, it probably had printed copies. This book had also a wide circulation during the end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century of the Christian era.

**Geographical Background**

As regards the places and temples where Chih-p'an worked for *Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi*, it also requires a further identification. Originally, Szu-ming was

27 Cf. T. XLIX, 321c.
a mountain lying in the eastern part of the present Chekiang province. On the other hand, it never adopted the name of a political division of the state. The location of Tung-hu or East Lake of Szu-ming, was not mentioned in the standard geographical dictionaries of China.

But when we look into the local histories and literature, we come to know that Tung-hu was a name abridged from Tung-ch'ien-hu, a lake lying about twenty-five or thirty-five Līs east to Chin-hsien district, the former headquarters of a prefecture Ning-po-fu. This lake is a water reservoir, which occupied eighty Līs of area. This lake was originally constructed in the year 744 A.D. and played an important role in the irrigation of the eastern region of Chekiang province.

The identification of Tung-hu with Tung-ch'ien-hu is also supported by literary sources. In a poem entitled 'Tung-ch'ien-hu', Yüan Shih-yüan, a native scholar of Szu-ming who lived during the Yüan period (1271—1341) has clearly stated:

"Beside shadow of white birds is Hsia-yü temple,
in deep blue and green stands the Yüeh-po tower."

Again, we also find a poem written by an officer of the Ming Dynasty (1368—1648) named Hu Lien, another native of this region — He writes:

"Towers and pavilions like dense mountains stand by water,
Pulling oar and looking at Yüeh-po in autumn light."

From these verses, it is clearly indicated that Tung-hu is another name of Tung-ch'ien-hu. Yüeh-po monastery was by the side of the lake, where Chih-p'an once resided when he was compiling Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi.

According to the 'Local History of Ning-po-fu', this Yüeh-po monastery is lying thirty Lī east of Chin-hsien city. Both Tung-hu and this monastery were a place of beauty. Their names were continuously referred to in the writings of local literature throughout the Yuan and the Ming periods. The writers of these writings have unanimously praised that Yüeh-po was an extraordinary place of beauty. It was also a quiet place. It is also of interest to note that a Ming period writer even compared this place with T'ao-yüan, the wellknown Arcadia in early Chinese tradition.

In his own book, Chih-p'an informed us, this temple was established by Shih Hao (1106—1194), a top minister of the Southern Sung Dynasty. Chih-p'an further states that the date of this establishment is 1173.

---

29 According to "An outline of the local history of Ning-po-fu" (Ning-po-fu chien-yao-chih), ch. i, p. 136—142, the lake is lying 25 Lī east to the headquarters of Chin-hsien. While as in Ku-chin t'u-shu-chi-ch'eng, ch. 975, p. 15a, it was recorded that the distance between the lake and city is 35 Lī.
30 Original text of the poems on Tung-hu are contained in "A record on historical place of Szu-ming" (Szu-ming ku-chi-chih) ch. II, p. 12, III, p. 4—5. 12a & 15.
31 Cf. note No. 29.
32 Cf. T. XLIX 428c.
whilst the later records dated this in 1178. As Chih-p’an was a resident of the monastery and his work is much earlier than other sources, his statement on this temple should be more reliable. During the early decades of the thirteenth century, this Yüeh-po monastery had been already regarded as one of the strongholds of the T’ien-t’ai Sect. This tradition was continued for years, and the temple was once repaired in the year 1449.

Comparing with the Yüeh-po monastery, Fu-ch’uan was a less known place. For instance, in the ‘Local History of the Ning-po-fu’, only the name and tradition of the Fu-ch’uan hill was recorded with a brief note, from which we know that this hill was situated about fifty Lis southeast to the prefectorial city. Besides this, there are two other poems connected with this hill, but none of them referred to the monastery where Chih-p’an finished the later part of his Fo-tsu-t’ung-chi.

Compared with other places of Chekiang, Szu-ming was a developed region. Even long before the Sung epoch, Szu-ming and its neighbouring places were regarded as the cultural centres. Buddhist monasteries were established here since the fourth century A.D. and onwards. The mountain T’ien-t’ai, the celebrated centre of Buddhism in the whole of Far East, is situated in this region. Since the period of the Six Dynasties, till the epoch of the Sung empire, these cultural traditions of Szu-ming prevailed over there continuously. Especially, when Ming-chou (i.e. Ning-po-fu) was opened as one of the principal sea-ports for China’s international trade, economic abundance this place at once became the second place to Hang-chou in the Chekiang province.

Comparing with other provinces of the Northern and the Central China, the condition of Szu-ming was much better. First of all, it was less affected during the outrageous period of the ninth and tenth century when the united empire of the T’ang broke down. It also suffered less from the invasion of the Chin (the Golden) Tartars’ force during the cruel decades of the twelfth century. After the Sung rulers made Lin-an or Hang-chou the new capital of China, although war and fights continued in various states of China Chekiang, however, remained in a comparatively peaceful condition. Following a truce that patched up the Sung and the Chin governments in 1142 A.D., Chekiang even became more prosperous.

---

34 Cf. Szu-ming ku-chü chih, ch. III, 15a & 22a.
36 Though we learn from early tradition that this mountain was closely connected with Taoist legend, after Chih-yi made it a centre of the T’ien-t’ai Sect, the Mt. became a holy place to Buddhists. Several monks and pilgrims from China, Japan, Korea etc. used to go there for pilgrimage. Detailed description on this mountain, cf. D. TOKIWA and T. SEKINO: Shina bukkō shiseki hyōkai, vol. IV, p. 97 ff.
37 About Ming-chou’s position as an international trade port, Cf. FANG HAO: Tung-hsi chiao-t’ung shih, vol. II, p. 41 ff. Also see KUWABARA JITSUZO: P’u-shou-kēng K’ao (Chinese tr. of Fujiika no jiseki by CH’EN YÜ-CH’ING) p. 24.
38 About the campaign of Chin force attacking Ming-chou, see Hsü TCTC vol. III, p. 2812 ff.
than it was before. During the later half of the twelfth century until the fresh invasion of the Mongols, the military and financial difficulties once seriously affected the life of the common people, none the less, under the patronage of certain ministers and powerful families, the monks of big monasteries were not tressed at all. It was under such a partial peace, prosperous economy, generous support and long literary tradition of the monasteries, that Chih-p'an as well as other religious historians of the Southern Sung period could complete their works and finance the publication of those works from different monasteries.

**Sources of Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi**

There is an introduction at the beginning of Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi. This introduction explains the structure and method of this work and also author's opinion on Buddhist history. A bibliographical list is appended at the end of this introduction. There are many works mentioned in this bibliographical list, which forms the sources of Chih-p'an's work. Chih-p'an classified these sources into five categories, viz, Tripitaka (in Chinese), Sacred Books of the T'ien-t'ai Sect, Miscellaneous Collections of historical material of Chinese Buddhists, Confucian Classics and Taoist Scriptures.

Under the first category, most important canons like *Saddharmapundarika Sutra*, *Avalokitesvara Sutra*, *Nirvana Sutra*, *Prajnaparamita Sutra*, *Ratnakuta, Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and others are mentioned. Others like *Buddhacarita, Añgamas* are also referred to. Amongst the Vinaya texts *Sarvāstivādinavayya, Dharmaguptavinaya, Mahisāsakāvinaya* and *Mahāsāngkhāvinaya* are also mentioned. The important commentaries like *Mahāprajñāpāramitā Sūtra, Mahāvibhāṣa Sāstra, Sūtrakāra Sāstra, Abhidharmakośa Sāstra* etc., biography and bibliography of eminent monks, are also classified under this category. Fifty works on Sūtras, seven Vinaya texts, six works on Sāstras and eight Buddhist histories are found under this category.

The second category contains twenty works of the T'ien-t'ai Sect. These works include Commentaries, Prayers, Discourses and Biographies written by Master and Pundits of the T'ien-t'ai Sect. These works are regarded as Sacred Books by the followers of the T'ien-t'ai Sect.

The sectarian history of other sects forms the third category. This includes histories of the Pure-land Sect, Ch'an (Zen), Dharmalakshaṇa, Avalamśaka and other sects. Twenty-four works belong to this category.

---

39 There are many books which were the records on prosperity of Hangchou under the Southern Sung Dynasty. Of them, *Wu-lin chiu-shih* (Old Affairs of Wu-lin) by Chou Mi (1232-1298) and Wu Tsu-Mu's *Meng-liang-lu* are good examples.

40 Though our knowledge of relations between big families and monks in the region of Szu-ming during the S. Sung period is still incomplete, nevertheless, we know that there were powerful families which strongly patronized Buddhists, for instance, the families of Shih Hao (1106-1194), Ch’ien Hsiang-tsu (—1211), Lu Yuan (1110—1194) were all devoted Buddhists. Shih and Ch’ien were the prime ministers and Lu was also a high ranked officer in the Southern Sung Dynasty.

41 Cf. T. XLIX, p. 130 ff.
Some of these works are undoubtedly authentic histories. Nevertheless some works are definitely doubtful. For example, ‘An Additional Biography of Ou-yang Hsiu’ (Ou-yang wai-chuan) and ‘An Additional Record on the Book of Chou’ (Chou-shu yi-chi) have been rejected by scholars, and they can no longer be regarded as authentic.

Confucian works were classified in the fourth category of Chih-p’an’s sources. They include works like Confucian classics, ‘Historical Records’ by Szu-ma Ch’ien and other dynastic histories up to the ‘Old’ and ‘New History of the Five Dynasties’ by Ou-yang Hsiu and others. The collections of works done by Han Yü (768–824), Liu Tsung-yüan (773–819), Po Chü-yi (772–846), Su Tung-po (1036–1101), Hung Mai (1123–1202) and the famous collection of T’ai-p’ing kung-chi (An Extensive Record Compiled during T’ai-p’ing Hsing-kuo period) are also included. There are six Confucian classics, fourteen dynastic histories and twenty collections of literary works in this list. Although some important works like ‘The History of the Sui Dynasty’ ‘The History of the Wei Dynasty’ etc. do not find place in the bibliographical list of Chih-p’an, nevertheless, in the footnotes of the book, these works are referred to by the author. If we added these books, then the number of reference works in this category would increase.

The Taoist scriptures form the fifth category of the sources. Chih-p’an listed Tao-tè-ching, Chuang-tzu, Yün-chi ch’i-ch’ien (Seven Bamboo Tablets of the Cloudy Satchel, A great Taoist collection dated 1019), Lieu-hsien-chuan or ‘Biographies of Immortals’ and others in this section. There are twenty works mentioned here.

Apart from these general references mentioned above, Chih-p’an also mentioned a few more works which he used as the main sources of his compilation. He said his writing on the lives of Buddha and other Indian patriarchs are mainly based on information contained in Fo-ta-tsang-chuan. It is also clear that his chapters on early T’ien-t’ai patriarchs from Hui-wen to Ch’an-jan are based on biographies written by the previous sectarian historians, especially that by Shih-hêng. At the same time, his record on later patriarchs and outstanding personalities of his sect, took a great deal of material from two other sectarian histories written by Ching-ch’ien and Tsung-chien respectively. In the introduction to his work, Chih-p’an states:

“The account contained in the present book has utilized the books Tsung-yüan-lu and Shih-men-chêng-l’ung. I have compared the literary merit and the significance as shown in these two works, have abridged and added new material to it. Besides, I have also referred to the canons

42 Ou-yang Wai-chuan was written by Tsu-Hsiu of the Shu-state. Since the events and dates mentioned in this work are disapproved of the authentic sources concerned with Ou-yang Hsiu, we have reasons to believe that this work is a forgery. Detailed analysis of this problems has been mentioned in pt. II of our thesis.

43 Scholars agreed that this is another forgery. Cf. Zürcher, op. cit. p. 274, 286–87. TBM, p. 4.


45 Cf. ch. II, note No. 43 of this thesis.
contained in the Great Collection of Tripitaka, commentaries and records belonging to my sect, Confucian historical documents and biographical phrases as well as bibliographies. So, it is clear that Chih-p'an's work on T'ien-t'ai sectarian leaders to some extent is an enlarged and revised work from the two preceding works.

Similarly, when we go through other parts of Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi, there are also mentioned other sources which are the basic reference of certain chapters of Chih-p'an's writing. For instance, the chapters on biographies of Pure-land Buddhists contained in Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi is 'revised and abridged' from the work by Chieh-chu, Wang Ku, Lu Shih-shou and Hai-yin. His chapter on geographical record on China was mainly quoted from 'A Record of Nine Regions (of the Sung Empire)' (Chiu-yü-chih), while his record on India adopted the information originally contained in the works of Hsüan-tsang and his assistants.

Chih-p'an also admitted that when he was writing his chapters of the Buddhist chronicle, he received much help from the two Buddhist chronicles written by Tsu-hsiu and Tê-hsiu.

From the above discussions, one can conclude that the sources of the Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi cover a good many works. Both Buddhist and non-Buddhist, religious and secular books were included. Special mention must be made of the sectarian histories written by the T'ien-t'ai Buddhist historians who worked before the age of Chih-p'an. Similarly, two earlier Buddhist chronicles also occupied most important places amongst the sources. It is from this tradition and foundation that the author of Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi collected material and data, learned the method and avoided mistakes, imitated and systematized the historiographic styles, revised and enlarged the history of his religion. Chih-p'an was very proud about his writing as well as the sources of his work. In one place of his book, he states: "Among the writings contained in this book, some are abridged and revised from previous collections, some have come from (information) of different writings, some are quoted from the essays and book by the teachers and friends, some are taken from epigraphic works. Though these are not indicated in each case, yet it is the proper method for the writing of history. Moreover, Buddhist and sectarian literary documents which are quoted in this work are not so easy for Confucianists and lay devotees to understand." As a junior monk-writer, although Chih-p'an did not obviously show such an arrogant attitude to his brethren, the fact that he
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46 See note No. 41.
47 Cf. ch. II, section of "The effort of ching-t'u Sect."
48 The full title of this book is Yüan-têng chiu-yü-chih, being an imperial record for the Sung government reference. The work was edited by Wang Ts'un (1023-1101) and others, which was complete in the year 1030 A.D. This work is contained in TSCC, vols. 3099-3103. Also see Wang Yung: Chung-kuo II-II hsüeh-shih (A history of Chinese geography), 1955, p. 76 ff. & 206 ff. About Hsüan-tsang's record, see ch. I, note No. 49 of this thesis.
49 Cf. ch. II, section on "Buddhist chronicle".
50 Original text of this passage contained in T. XLIX, p. 131b.
criticised the works of his predecessors nevertheless means that he possessed much confidence about his own work. His work proves that he had succeeded to a large extent in his writing of the Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi. The rich sources and better selection made his work more comprehensive, systematic and well-balanced than the works compiled before him.

The Structure of the Text

The structure of Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi is rather curious. It is a combination of historiographic styles which prevailed both in the dynastic histories and the chronicles. Neither does this combination exist amongst secular historical writings, nor is it found in the religious histories except Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi.

In the preface of his work, Chih-p' an informs us:

"On the fascicles of Basic Annals, biographies and the Memoirs of Princes, I followed the model of the Grand Historian (i.e. Szu-ma Ch'i'en). As regards the chronicles, I followed that of Duke Szu-ma (Kuang) . . . " 51

As we have discussed in previous chapters, the styles of the dynastic histories and the style of chronicles are two of the important traditions to Chinese historiographers. We have also noted that the Buddhist historians had constantly endeavoured to adopt these styles in writing religious histories 52. On the other hand, we never find any other work except Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi which has adopted these two traditions in a single book.

The styles existing in Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi include those of the Basic Annals (Pen-chi), the Memoirs of Princes (Shih-chia), biographies, the Tables (Piao) and treatise of Record (Chih). According to Ch'en Yüan, the arrangement of these styles in Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi was actually an imitation of The History of the Wei Dynasty (Wei-shu), which contained the same number of styles as found in Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi 53. But when we look deeper into the matter, we find that both the style and contents of the latter were very much different from those of the former. For instance, the section of Chih contained in The History of Wei Dynasty contains neither chronicle nor the Collection of Important Documents (Hui-yao) 54, while in Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi these two styles occupy a large space and form the most important part of the section.

In the dynastic histories, 'Basic Annal' is a special form to record the life of the emperors. In Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi, Chih-p' an used it for the life of Buddha, Mahākāśyapa and other patriarchs up to Āryasimha. These are the twenty-four Indian patriarchs of Buddhism. The records on Chinese Masters of the T'ien-t'ai Sect from Hui-szu to Chih-li are also recorded in this form. Chih-p' an explains that since Buddha attained the Buddhahood, other patriarchs of India and China have persevered and developed the

51 Ibidem, p. 129c.
52 Cf. ch. I & II of this thesis.
53 Cf. CH'IAN YÜAN, PEGSCL, p. 114.
54 Cf. PULLEYBLANK'S contribution to Historians of China & Japan, p. 152.
religion. This lineage is without break, and so their position in the religious circle is similar to that of the kings in the political circle. There are eight fascicles of this 'Basic Annal' in Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi (These are from the first to the eight fascicles).

Shih-chia is a special form to record the lives of feudal princes in dynastic histories. Chih-p'an adopted this form to record the lives of non-patriarchal masters of the T'ien-t'ai Sect, as he compares these masters with feudal princes of the past. The ninth and tenth fascicles of Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi are written in this form.

The eleventh to the twenty-second fascicle of Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi contain biographies of eminent monks of the T'ien-t'ai Sect. The arrangement of these biographies is in accordance with clerical genealogy. In this aspect, Chih-p'an seems to have been influenced by Ch'anist historians.

The twenty-third and twenty-fourth fascicle of Chih-p'an's book contain the tables. The first part of the table deals with dates and events relating to the patriarchs of the T'ien-t'ai Sect. The later part is a detailed table of genealogy of the same sect.

From the twenty-fifth fascicle onwards, Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi contains the Records (Chih) of different aspects of the Chinese Buddhist history: viz, bibliographical record on T'ien-t'ai sectarian Canons (25th fasc.), records on masters and devotees of the Pure-land Sect (26th of 28th fasc.), brief records on other Buddhist sects of China, including Ch'an (Zen), Hua-yen, Fa-hsiang, Tantric and Nan-shan Branch of Vinaya Sect (29th fasc.), Records on the Buddhas of the past, present and future (30th fasc.). Records of legendary worlds, mountains, seas, places and heavens as mentioned in Buddhist texts (31th fasc.), geographical records of China, the Western world, five Indies and different hells (32nd fasc.).

Records of Buddhist monuments, images, pictures, relics, festivals and ceremonies are provided in the thirty-third fascicle of Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi. The fascicles 34-48 are a chronicle of Buddhism. Of these fascicles the first one is concentrated on the life of Buddha and Buddhism in India. From the thirty-fifth fascicle up to the forty-eight are a chronicle of Buddhism in China. This record begins from the earliest epoch of Chinese Buddhist history till the middle of the thirteenth century of the Christian era.

The next part of Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi is the collection of prefaces of Buddhist texts, essays, texts of inscriptions, monastic records, letters, and other material relating to the T'ien-t'ai Sect. These are arranged in the forty-ceremonies are provided in the thirty-third fascicle of Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi.

The last four fascicles of Chih-p'an's work are an outline of the Buddhist institutions in China. The material in this part related the historical background of the official position held by monks, the struggle between Sanghas and the other religions, examination systems of the monks, relationship between Sanghas and the Government and so forth. This section is more or less an adoption of the Hui-yao style, which was very much developed during the Sung period.
The précis given above shows clearly that *Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi* is a synthetic history of Buddhism. This work touches upon almost all aspects of Buddhism also from the sociological points of view. It serves as a comprehensive sectarian history of the T'ien-t'ai Sect and it once had a strong reaction on the sectarian Buddhist society, specially antagonistic to the monks of the Ch'an sect. Though, according to early bibliographical records as well as the *Hsü-tsang-ching* collection of *Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi*, the fascicles of this book were varying in number, none the less, from the contents of this work itself, it is clearly proved that the book consists of fifty-four fascicles only.

*Fa-yün t'ung-sê chih*

*Fa-yün t'ung-sê chih* or 'A Record on Vicissitudes of Dharma's Fate' is the chronological part of *Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi*, which consists of fifteen fascicles. The first part of this chronicle records the religious events from the Chou to the Ch'in dynasties. The next fascicle provides the record on periods of the Han and the Three Kingdoms. The religious events of the Chin and the Southern Dynasties occupy the third and the fourth fascicle, while the fifth is the religious chronicle of the Northern Dynasties. The sixth to the ninth fascicle are the history of Buddhism during the ages of the Sui, the T'ang and the Five Dynasties, and the rest part of the chronicle records the events of the Buddhist religion during the Sung period.

We have already noted that in this chronicle, the author had utilized a good number of sources. When we compare the quotations used in *Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi* with the original passages, one would find Chih-p'ān's quotation not only concise but also faithful to the original.

There is an addenda at the end of the chronicle. Since this addenda is connected with the text of *Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi*, and as there is no information given about its authorship, thus it remains a part of the chronicle as if written by Chih-p'ān himself.

But when we investigate this addenda, we find that this extra work is quite different in quality from the original work of Chih-p'ān. From the contents of this part, one can collect evidences to show that this part was not written by Chih-p'ān himself nor by his contemporaries. It is probably written by some historian-monk of the Yüan and the Ming period, because this addenda records religious events up to the end of the year 1368 A. D. or about one hundred years after the completion of *Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi*. On the other hand, as we have shown that Chih-p'ān possibly lived between the first or second decades to the seventies of the thirteenth century A. D. During the year 1271, he was already old and sick, nearing his death. Therefore, it was not possible for him to write history of hundred years after 1271 A. D.

Moreover, the text of this addenda is full of mistakes. For example, the author placed the religious events of Shao-ting period (1228–33) after the

---

55 Cf. chs. I & II of this thesis.
56 This addenda exists in T. XLIX, p. 432–438a.
Shun-yu period (1241—53)

This is not only against the chronological order, but also reveals the author's poor knowledge of history. In another place, the author wrongly surnamed Queen Yang of Emperor Ning-tsung as Wang, and dated her death in 1237 A.D. But in other authentic sources, this has been dated 1232 and her surname was Yang. Another serious mistake regarding this Queen is the author of this addenda has confused Queen's title Kung-sheng jen-lieh as a posthumous title of her husband. Similarly the author of this addenda informs us that during the year 1250, there was a monk of T'ien-t'ai Sect, who sent a letter to the Duke Tu Fan (1181—1244). But we find from other reliable records, that Tu died in 1244 or six years before this event occurred. All these mistakes show that the author was quite ignorant about historical facts pertaining to the Chekiang region during the XIIIth century of the Christian era, where and when Chih-p'an was living and working.

When the author of the addenda records religious affairs of the Yuan and the Ming dynasty, he called these two dynasties as the 'Great Yuan' and the 'Great Ming'. This indicates that the author must have been a monk or a group of monks who lived during the later part of the Yuan and the beginning of the Ming dynasty.

The passages and phrases of this addenda are almost similar to the text of Hsi fo-tsu-lung-chi which is a continuation of Chih-p'an's work. What is more interesting is that both of these two texts are to be found only in the collection of Hsü-tsang-ching and not in any other edition. Therefore, the author of these two works is probably the same, or they might be closely related. Since there is also no information about the authorship of Hsü Fo-tsu-lung-chi, the authorship of this addenda becomes more mysterious. More study and evidences are required before one can come to any definite conclusion on this point.

**Criticisms and appreciations**

About seventy years after the compilation of Fo-tsu-lung-chi, monks and devotees of the Ch'an Sect also prepared more chronicles and criticised Chih-p'an's work as it had by then become a representative work of the T'ien-t'ai sectarian history. In the preface of Fo-tsu-lü-tai T'ung-tsai, Yü Chi (1272—1348) an outstanding scholar and minister of the Yuan Dynasty, criticised the work of Chih-p'an with the following remarks:

"In recent years, there is a book called Fo-tsu-lung-chi written after the model of the dynastic histories, but the events recorded (in that

58 Ibidem, About Empress Yang and other consorts of Emperor Ning-tsung, see Sung-shih ch. 234, p. 196.
60 For instance, see T. XLIX, 433c, 434b, 435b, 437b.
61 Moreover, the author of this addenda has also called Mongolian as his "National Language", see T. XLIX, 435b & c, 436a.
62 Hsü FTTC is contained in HTC IIB-iv/4, p. 356 ff.
book) are not systematic. This defect has been noticed by learned persons...

According to a remark written by Tung Chi-ch'ang (1555—1636) dated 1634, Tung wrote following words on Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi:

"Till the Sung Dynasty, Monk Fa-p'an established (the historiographic tradition to) the Sect of Teaching (Chiao-tsung). He respected the Lotus Sūtra as the canon, T'ien-t'ai (Sect) as the Chief Bond (T'ung), the Cessation and Contemplation (Chih-kuan) as the entrance (Mên or method). This is how Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi was compiled..."

Though Tung did not obviously praise or criticise the work by Chih-p'an, but since he had strongly criticised the 'omissions and mistakes' of Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai, a work which was regarded as a rival to Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi, thus Tung's remark was indirectly an admiration of Chih-p'an. This view just opposed the remark made by Yü Chi which we have already quoted.

Similarly, another minister of the Ming Dynasty named Yang Ho, who had expressed a stronger appreciation of Fu-tsu-t'ung-chi. He stated that Chih-p'an's narration of Buddhist history "is very detailed and clear". He also evaluated the fascicles of Fa-yün t'ung-sè chih as the part which was written "very carefully and attentively..." According to his opinion, Chih-p'an's "motive was good and his work was a hard task..."

In the General catalogue of Szu-k'ü ch'uan-shu or the 'Collections of Four Royal Libraries', though the editors enlisted the title of Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi, yet the text of this work was actually excluded from the collection. The editors of Szu-k'ü ch'uan-shu explained the reason of this exclusion as follows:

"Though the system and literary forms of this work (Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi) follows the dynastic histories, the real intention of the author was to perpetuate his sect and patriarchs as the rightful lineage and successor of Buddha. The patriarchs of the other sects like Pure-land of Lotus society, and the sects founded by Bodhidharma, Master Hsien-shou (i.e. Fa-tsang), Master of Tzu'u-en (i.e. Hsüan-tsang), Tantric and Nan-shan branch of the Vinaya sect have been all underestimated in the part of Records (Chih). This work clearly classified Buddhists into various sects and distinguished them from each other. Such sectarian attitude (towards Buddhists) is nothing less than the factional struggle between Neo-Confucianists belonging to rival schools, one founded by Chu (Hsi, 1130—1200) and the other by Lu (Chiu-yüan, 1139—1192).

'It has been stated that the lives of twenty-nine patriarchs from Buddha to Fa-chih have been recorded in the style of Pen-chi (Basic Annal). This
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63 T. XLIX, 477a & b. Cf. note No. 1.
64 Tung's statement mentioned in op. cit. note No. 5.
66 Cf. T. XLIX, p. 129b.
is because the author wanted to show that his succession line is the only right lineage. The respectable lineage of these patriarchs is similar to the succession-line of the emperors.

"But we know that Buddhists renounced their worldly life. Therefore they should not follow the historiographical forms of the dynastic histories in their works. And if they still retain their worldly status, then they should not compare their patriarchs with the status of Emperors and princes. Though the author might have only intended to show his respect and high positions occupied by masters of his sect, nevertheless, this is an arrogant action." 67

Yang Wén-hui (1837—1911), a celebrated Chinese Buddhist leader and scholar, also made a review of Fo-tsu-t’ung-chi. In that review, Yang stated:

"Lord Buddha renounced the Throne and became a monk. He also left the palace and the worldly glories. He went to the forest for peace. The preachers of this religion should follow the great path shown by Lord Buddha.

"Chih-p’an held that his sect was the only rightful school. He compared his patriarchs with emperors and recorded their lives in a historiographic style of Pên-ch’i. Similarly, he also recorded the lives of other leaders of his sect in the literary form of Shih-ch’iin, thus he compared the status of these masters with that of the feudal Princes. He adopted the historiographic style of Chuan or biography for recording the lives of the T’ien-t’ai monks. This means that they were comparable with gentles. On the other hand, the position of the Fourteenth patriarch and his successors were underestimated by Chih-p’an. He merely treated them as a collateral branch.

"All the defects mentioned above, tally with the observations of laymen. This proves that the author’s understanding was much influenced by worldly consideration." 68

When the Buddhists of the other sects attached Chih-p’an’s Fo-tsu-t’ung-chi, the monks and supporters of the T’ien-t’ai Sect sided with Chih-p’an. They held that Fo-tsu-t’ung-chi was an excellent work, and gave a clear record of the history of Buddhist patriarchs. They also believed that without such a valuable work, the succession lineage of Buddhist patriarchs would be confused. Though the object of this work was mainly to compile a history of the T’ien-t’ai Sect, nevertheless, it also mentioned the events pertaining to other sects. Moreover, the fascicles of Fa-yün t’ung-sè chih or "A Record on Vicissitudes of Dharma’s Fate" in Fo-tsu-t’ung-chi was really a brilliant work. 69

Fo-tsu-t’ung-chi is appreciated not only by the enthusiastic supporters of the T’ien-t’ai Sect of the olden times, but also by modern scholars.

68 Yang Jen-shan châ-shih yi-chu vol. 8, Têng-pu-têng-chai tsa-lu ch. 4 p. 3, Nanking ed.
69 This appreciation is found in a preface to FTTC by MÎng-yü, Cf. T. XLIX, 129a.
Messrs. E. Chavannes and P. Pelliot said that the information found in Chih-p'an's work is valuable. Prof. P. Demiéville also made the following remark: "Les mémoirs des genereux sur le Buddha et patriarches (Fo-tsun t'ong-ki), de Tche-p'an (1269—1271), sont une grande histoire générale du bouddhisme ... " In his monumental work Bukkyō Daijiten, Prof. S. Mochizuki, the celebrated Japanese scholar in Buddhist history, mentions the contents of Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi in detail and specially appreciates the fascicles on chronicle. He states: "(Fa-yün) t'ung-sè chih is a chronicle of Buddhism. The scholars of past and present put much reliance on it." Prof. Ch'an Yüan also appreciates the comprehensive contents of Chih-p'an's work. In a recent study, Dr. H. Franke draw more attention on Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi. He appreciated Chih-p'an and the work with following remarks: "The author shows evidence of considerable scholarship in this extensive history." "It will be seen that the work is a mine of information, but which is extremely difficult to locate the person of event one os look for." From criticisms and appreciations mentioned above, we may say that Chih-p'an's imitation of literary form of dynastic histories in Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi is unnecessary and improper. His records on T'ien-t'ai as well as other sects are strongly influenced by sectarianism. Despite these criticism, his supporters and other scholars are satisfied with his work regarding records (Chih), even his opponents are silent as regards the chronological part of his work.

**Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi, Re-Examined**

In the previous paragraphs, we have seen the outline of sources and structure of Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi. We have also discussed controversial criticisms and appreciations of this work. What is the actual contribution of Chih-p'an to the Buddhist historiography? Whether he has some creative contributions or he has merely re-written and compiled his book from the early works? Before we come to any conclusion on this question, we have to re-examine his work once more and to compare it with other works done before him.

As far as the adoption of historiographical styles is concerned, Tsung-chien has already written his book Shih-mén chêng-t'ung in the styles of Basical Annal, Memoirs of the Princes, Treatise or records and biographies. In the Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi, all of these styles were also adopted. Beside those, Chih-p'an has further enriched the styles of Buddhist historiography by adopting the styles of Introductory Chapter (T'ung-li), Tables, Bibliographies, Chronicles and Collections of Important Documents (Hui-yao). Although most of these styles already existed in the individual Buddhist historical writings, nevertheless, this is for the first time that all of them
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70 "Un Traité Manichéen Retrouvé en Chine", JA, 1le Sr. T. 1, 146—147.
72 Bukkyō Daijiten, p. 4467a.
73 FCSCL, p. 114.
74 Historians of China & Japan, p. 130 & 131.
75 Cf. ch. II, the section on "The reaction of the T'ien-t'ai historians".
were compiled in a single work. This made his work more comprehensive and recorded many aspects of Buddhist history.

Moreover, the Basic Annals, Memoirs of the Princes, Record and biographies contained in Fo-tsu-l'ung-chi are much more than those contained in Shih-mên chêng-l'ung and other works. For instance, Fo-tsu-l'ung-chi contained four Basic Annals against two as found in Shih-mên chêng-l'ung. Similarly, there are ten facicles of biographies contained in the former against three and a half as found in the latter.

In the section of Basic Annals, Chih-p'an wrote an account of Buddha in five fascicles comprising about forty-seven thousand words, this is nearly eight or nine times bigger than that contained in Shih-mên chêng-l'ung. Similarly, Chih-p'an's record on Chih-li is also longer than the latter. From the doctrinal viewpoint, Fo-tsu-l'ung-chi is also worth nothing: in the previous works, only accounts of Buddha and Indian patriarch were written in the style of Basic Annals, while as in Fo-tsu-l'ung-chi, Chih-p'an showed no hesitation to use this style for the lives of Chinese patriarchs. His account of the patriarchs of the T'ien-t'ai Sect who lived during the later part of the Tang period, had also added more material on the subject.

As regards the section of biographies, Fo-tsu-l'ung-chi contained nearly six hundred biographies of the T'ien-t'ai monks. While as in Shih-mên chêng-l'ung, there are only one hundred and odd biographies. There is the possibility that apart from Shih-mên chêng-l'ung, Chih-p'an had also collected the stories from another source entitled Tsung-yüan-lu, which was said to have contained more biographies, but since that work is not in existence at present, we cannot say anything definite about it. Moreover, those two works were compiled earlier than that of Chih-p'an, therefore, the biographies of later monks should be a new contribution by Chih-p'an. From the comprehensive reference cited in Fo-tsu-l'ung-chi, we have good reasons to believe that Chih-p'an should also have written more biographies even on early monks of his sect.

The sections of tables and treatise or records are the new enclosures to Buddhist historical works. However, his collection of institutional history of the Buddhists was neither so detailed nor well-arranged as that by Tsan-nung, but at the same time, he also made the subject more up to date to his time.
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78 It is worthy to note that the style and contents of this Introductory chapter are very similar to the research works published in present time. The development of this arrangement requires further study.
79 Ibidem, 134c—169a against p. 358—362.
80 Ibidem, 191c—194b against p. 382—384.
81 HTC IIB-III/5, p. 365—384, T. XLIX, 177c—194.
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Special mention should be made of the fascicles of chronicle contained in Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi. Though there were two Buddhist chronicles which were compiled before the work of Chih-p'än, both of these early chronicles only covered the events to 960 A.D. This means that the Buddhist chronicle of the Sung period written in six fascicles are all new contributions. Even the fascicles of his work concerning the early period, i.e. pre-Sung period, are far better than that of his predecessors. For instance, the account recorded in Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi of nearly sixty events under the epoch of the (Liu) Sung kingdom of the Southern Dynasties is two times and more extensive compared to the work by Tsu-hsiu. Chih-p'än has provided one chapter exclusively for the chronicle of Buddhism in the Northern Dynasties, while the latter only incorporated a few of the events in the chapter of the Southern Dynasties. Similarly, Chih-p'än recorded forty-seven events under the Sui period, while in Tsu-hsiu's work, there were only nineteen events recorded. The additional material made by Chih-p'än is very valuable. In this connection, we may recall an interesting example, that is, the mission of Wang Hsüan-ts'e to India. In the chronicle compiled by Tsu-hsiu, this event was omitted, and this omission was repeated once more when Nien-ch'ang copied the work of Tsu-hsiu in the fourteenth century. On the other hand, Chih-p'än carefully referred to this event in his chronicle.

Beside its rich contents as a Buddhist history, Chih-p'än had also appended the events of other religions at the end of some fascicles of his work. This appendix not only made us know easily the historical background of Buddhist development, but also preserved valuable material for the history of Chinese culture.

Of course, this does not mean that Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi is perfect and scientific. On the other hand, this work contains many mistakes and defects. Like most of the monk-historians of the medieval age, Chih-p'än regarded religious legends and mysterious stories as actual events and confused them with historical facts. Like many Buddhists, Chih-p'än also tried to push back the date of the introduction of Buddhism in China to the dim past. With this aim, he quoted evidences from Lieh-tzu, Chou-shu yi-chi and other sources, but the dates of compilation of these books are much later than claimed. Most of these books had been re-dated by scholars, and they even proved that some of them were trash. Like many Buddhists, Chih-p'än frequently attached other religions like Taoism, 'White-cloud' religions etc. On the other hand, he tried to screen faults of the Buddhists.

---

84 Cf. T. XLIX, 343b—346c as against HTC IIB-III/4, 234—238. Chih-p'än's writing of Buddhist chronicles of the Northern Dynasty forms 38th chapter of his FTTC.
85 Ibidem, 359b—362a as against 258—260.
86 Chih-p'än's record on this event is contained in T. XLIX, 365c, 367c, About Wang's mission, Cf. S. LEVI: "Les missions de Wang Hsiian-ts'e dans l'Inde", JA, 1900.
87 This appendix is separately arranged in dynastic order at the end of chapter XXXV—XXXVI, XXXIX—XLI, XLII—XLVII of FTTC.
88 About the book Lieh-tzu, Cf. a recent study: "The date and composition of Lieh-tzu" by A.C. GRAHAM, Asia Major, VIII, 2 (1961), pp. 139—198. For Chou-shou-yi-chi see note No. 43.
This made his narration of certain events very subjective. His attitude towards other Buddhist sects is also unfair.

Certain dates of events mentioned in Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi seem to be doubtful. Chih-p' an dates each historical event in a certain year, but he fails to give any reason or source of these irregular dates. Therefore, when we examine these events with other earlier works, we find that some of the dates given by Chih-p' an are not reliable. From his record it seems that his knowledge about India was very poor. For example, he dated Buddha between 1025—949 B.C. which it is impossible for scholars to accept. Moreover, this date is also not even in accordance with the dates of the Chou Dynasty as mentioned by modern scholars, which Chih-p' an referred to in this connection.

Historiographic defects of Chih-p' an's work are also obvious. He adopted the form of Pen-chi (Basic Annal) for the records of patriarchs which is a failure. Since the nature of the daily lives of kings and religious masters are so very different, the literary form of Pen-chi, therefore is not suited for recording lives of the patriarchs. On the other hand, Chih-p' an succeeded in writing his chronicle. Of the many reasons for this success, one is certainly the literary form of Chih which is very suitable for recording the religious affairs from year to year. This proves that one cannot force the subject to suit a literary form, but have to choose the right form for the subject.

In his book, Chih-p' an recorded the movements of other religions in China, viz, Taoism, Zoroastrianism, Manicheism, 'White-lotus' religion, 'White-cloud' religion as well as other minor religions. This historical material is very few and precious, but at the same time, some of them are rather redundant as they are not directly connected with Buddhist history. As a result of this wide approach, Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi has become bulkier in size.

Like other Chinese classical historians, Chih-p' an wrote many long commentaries on historical events in his book. These comments are written in the style of Su-yüeh (Explained), Tsan-yüeh (Appreciated), Yi-yüeh (Commented and An (Referred to). These comments and appreciations are his personal opinions, which frequently interrupted the continuous narration of history. Chih-p' an not only wrote the comments by himself, but also quoted passages from books written by others. These quotations

---

88 Some examples are found in Pt. II of this thesis.
91 These are the traditional styles of Chinese historiography. Cf. Shih-t'ung-shih by P'U CH'I-LUNG. Also see PULLEYBLANK, op. cit. Historians of China and Japan, p. 135 ff.
are mentioned in his book under the heading of 'Tung-p’o said . . .' and so on. Amongst these, there are long quotations from the words of Su Tung-po, Liang-chu (i.e. Tsung-chien) and Wu K’e-chi. As a result of these quotations, Fo-tsu-t’ung-chi became more voluminous and sectarian.

The literary ability of Chih-p’an seems not to be so high. His exposition of writing is clear and fluent, but his inspiring force is not so strong as those of Tao-hsuan and some others. Comparing his writings and his compilations, it appears that his capacity as an editor is far better than as a writer. His compilation of chronicle shows that his selection of material and other methods of editing is excellent.

Also like other monk-historians of the Sung period, Chih-p’an in his book has carefully shown his respect for the emperors. But his attitude is, however, not so flattery as that held by Tsan-ning. This is of course the general tendency of the age, Chih-p’an as an individual historian can not be free from this bondage. 92

Despite the defects mentioned above, Fo-tsu-t’ung-chi is still an excellent work. The value of this work should not be underestimated because of its defects. Such mistakes and defects are common in the histories written by medieval Buddhist historians of China. Moreover, when we compare Chih-p’an’s work with those of his contemporaries, we find that his defects and mistakes are few and not so important. Anyway, one cannot criticise a medieval work from the standpoint of modern scholarship.

---

92 About the relationship between Sung Emperors and Minister with Buddhist community, see CH’EN YUAN’s FCSCSL pp. 38 ff. Also MAKITA TAIRYO: Shina kinsei bukkyo-shi kenkyu, pp. 96 ff.