

Prolegomena on the Study of the Controversies between Buddhists and Taoists in the Yüan Period

By Noritada KUBO

I

Regarding the controversies which are said to have been conducted between Buddhists and Taoists in the reign of Emperor Hsien-tsung 憲宗 of the Yüan 元 Dynasty, the views of some pioneer researchers have already been published, but in almost all of them, except those of Messrs. Shunjo Nogami 野上俊靜 and Ch'ên Yüan 陳垣 no reference is made to the Taoist materials and only a general survey of the matter based on the Buddhist materials is given.⁽¹⁾ Strange as it may seem, references to this matter can scarcely be found either in the history of the Yüan Dynasty or in the Taoist materials and the works of such Confucian scholars and men of letters as are recorded to have been connected with the controversies, but are only to be found in the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu* 至元辯僞錄, which is said to have been written by Shih Hsiang-mai 釋祥邁; in Nien-ch'ang 念常 *Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai* 佛祖歷代通載 which is believed to have been written on the authority of the above-mentioned work; in the *Hsü wên-hsien t'ung-k'ao* 續文獻通考, which is supposed to have been written by Wang Ch'i 王圻 in the Ming 明 period on the authority of Nien-ch'ang's work; and in a few monument-inscriptions, such as *Shêng-chih fên-hui chu-lu wei tao-ts'ang-ching chih pei* 聖旨焚毀諸路僞道藏經之碑.⁽²⁾ So perhaps it has been inevitable that the treatises heretofore pub-

(1) See Dr. Hirosato Iwai 岩井大慧: *Gen-sho ni okeru Teishitsu to Zensô tonô kankei ni tsuite* 元初に於ける帝室と禪僧との關係について (Regarding the Relationship between the Imperial Family and the Zen Priests in the Early Years of the Yüan Period) in 日支佛教史論攷 Some Historical Studies of Buddhism in China & Japan; Dr. Shunjô Nogami 野上俊靜: *Gen-dai Dô-Butsu nikyô no kakushitsu* 元代道・佛二教の確執 (Clash between Taoism and Buddhism in the Yüan Period) in *Otani Daigaku Kenkyû Nenpô* 大谷大學研究年報 Series 2; Dr. Yoshikata Takao 高雄義堅: *Gen-dai Dô-Butsu nikyô no ryûtai* 元代道佛二教の隆替 (Rise and Fall of Taoism and Buddhism in the Yüan Period) in *Tôhô Shûkyô* 東方宗教 No. 11. Further, the subject is touched on in the following works: Dr. Kôjun Fukui 福井康順, 道教の基礎的研究 (Basic Studies in Taoism) Book 2, Chap. 3; Dr. Yoshitoyo Yoshioka 吉岡義豊, 道教と佛教 (Taoism and Buddhism) Series 1, Book Chap. 6; Mr. Ch'ên Yüan 陳垣, 南宋初河北新道教考 (On Neo-Taoism in Ho-pei in the Early Years of Southern Sung) Vol. 2, Chap. 10; Mr. Ch'ên Kuo-fu 陳國符, *Tao-ts'ang yüan-liu k'ao* 道藏源流考 (On the Origin of Taoist Classics) pp. 176-179.

(2) There are two editions of the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu* 至元弁僞錄: 縮刷藏經 (Buddhist Books printed in Reduced Size) Edition and 大正藏經 (Buddhist Books printed

lished have been based solely on the Buddhist materials.

After Emperor Shih-tsu 世祖 of the Yüan Dynasty conquered Southern Sung 南宋 there came to be added two new orders, Chêng-i 正一 and Mao-shan 茅山 but during the reign of Emperor Hsien-tsung there were to be found in the territory under Yüan jurisdiction only three Taoist orders, named Ch'üan-chên 全真, T'ai-i 太一, and Chên-ta-tao 真大道, which had been newly formed about the middle of the twelfth century in the Hua-pei 華北 district, at that time subject to the authority of the Chin 金 Dynasty. The most dominant of these three orders was the Ch'üan-chên chiao-t'uan 全真教團, which was most closely connected with the Imperial court ever since the beginning of the Yüan Dynasty on account of the special favour conferred by Genghis Khan upon Ch'ang-ch'un chên-jên Ch'iu Ch'u-chi 長春真人丘處機, one of the Seven Wise Men of Ch'üan-chên chiao 全真教. As a result, at the time of the controversies in question between Buddhism and Taoism it was the Ch'üan-chên chiao-t'uan 全真教團 or Ch'üan-chên tao-shih 全真道士 that was made the chief object of attack by the Buddhist. The Ch'üan-chên chiao-t'uan having compiled its own *Tao-ts'ang* 道藏 in the reign of Emperor T'ai-tsung 太宗 of the Yüan Dynasty, the present *Tao-ts'ang* contains a considerable amount of materials and literature regarding the Ch'üan-chên chiao-t'uan. By comparing these materials with the accounts recorded in the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu* 至元辨僞錄 it can be seen that the latter contains not only so many obvious errors but also so many contradictory or questionable points in its description as to make it doubtful that the book is a document faithfully reflecting the true aspects of the controversies. This leads us to conclude that, to ascertain the true aspects of the controversies, it is absolutely necessary

in the Taishô period) Edition. It is said that between these two editions there are some differences in the order of chapters and wording. But there seem to be no great differences between the two, and we have used in the present paper the 大正藏教 (Buddhist Books printed in the Taishô Period) Edition. The same is the case with the *Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai* 佛祖歷代通載. According to Mr. Ch'ên Yüan, however, the edition printed in the Ming 明 period is in five volumes, and the edition printed in the Ch'ing 清 period is in six. Some references to the matter are to be found in the *Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai*, Vol. 21 and Vol. 22, and the *Hsü wên-hsien t'ung-k'ao* 續文獻通考, Vol. 240. As for the monument-inscriptions concerned, besides those contained in the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu* there are the *Shêng-chih pei* 聖旨碑 at the Yü-chou Yü-ch'uan 蔚州玉泉 Temple, (*Yüan-tai pai-hua pei* 元代白話碑, p. 22), the *Ling-hsien fei-hsien-kuan pei* 靈仙飛仙觀碑 and the *Shêng-peï* 聖碑 at the Ta-tu ch'ung-kuo 大都崇國 Temple (Collection of the *Yüan-tai pai-hua pei*). But all these are stone-monuments erected during the Chih-yüan years, and so they are of no direct use in treating of the controversies conducted during Hsien-tsung's reign. By the way, concerning the slovenliness of the *Collection of the Yüan-tai pai-hua pei*, a detailed treatment is to be found in Dr. Yoshitaka Iriya's 入矢義高 *Sai Bihyô shi hen Gen-dai Hakuwahi Shûroku o yomu* 蔡美彪氏編元代白話碑集錄之讀む (On Perusing the *Collection of the Yüan-tai pai-hua pei*, Compiled by Mr. Ts'ai Mei-piao) in the *Tôhô Gakuhô* 東方學報 (Kyoto), No. 26. We are much indebted to Dr. Iriya for our correct reading of the spoken Chinese in popular use in the Yüan period. It is our pleasant duty here to acknowledge and thank him for his kind guidance.

for us to carry out, before everything else, a very careful examination into the contents of the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu*, hitherto considered to contain the most basic materials regarding these controversies. So here I venture to point out briefly some points contradictory or erroneous, at least to my thinking, which are to be found in that book's accounts, and cordially invite the frank criticism of the world upon my humble effort. Thus, the present paper forms a preliminary to grasping the true aspects of the whole subjects, and that is why it is entitled *Prolegomena*.

Further, we ought to give a general survey of the relative position of Buddhism and Taoism which formed the background to the controversies at that time, and also a short description of Ch'iu Ch'ang-ch'un's 丘長春 *Hsi-yu* 西遊, which apparently became the remote cause for the controversies, and of the relations between the Yüan Dynasty and the Ch'üan-chên chiao-t'uan. But limitations of space have obliged us to refer the reader to the treatises of pioneer researches for all these matters.⁽³⁾ And yet, in regard to the course the controversies took and the result they reached there is a considerable discrepancy in description between the text of the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu* and the accounts given in the *Shêng-chih fên-hui chu-lu wei tao-ts'ang-ching chih pei* 聖旨焚毀諸路偽道藏經之碑, from which the treatises of pioneer researchers derived their chief materials, or in Chang Po-ch'un's 張伯淳 Preface to the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu*; here I shall give a very brief summary of the controversies, first of all, according to the description given in the text of the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu*, by way of clarifying these points of discrepancy.

2

According to the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu*, the direct cause of the controversies between Buddhism and Taoism in the Yüan period was the fact that Ch'üan-chên tao-shih 全真道士 drew up a *Hua-hu ching* 化胡經, entitled *T'ai-shang kun-yüan shang-tê huang-ti ming-wei hua-hu-ch'êng-fo ching* 太上混元上德皇帝明威化胡成佛經, and a diagram, entitled *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u* 八十一化圖 and based on Lao-tzŭ's 老子 *Hua-hu shuo* 化胡說. As Lao-tzŭ's *Hua-hu shuo* constituted one of the greatest problems upon which were centered the controversies between Buddhists and Taoists from the period of Liu-ch'ao 六朝 or Six Dynasties, the controversies in the Yüan period, too, must naturally be treated of as belonging to this category. The *Hua-hu ching* 化胡經 is a counterfeit classic, whose original author is said to have been Wang Fu 王浮 of Hsi Chin 西晉; as Dr. Kôjun Fukui 福井康順 pointed out long ago, a great variety of *Hua-hu ching* were afterwards produced, and often suppressed by

(3) See the treatises given under Note 1. Regarding Ch'iu Ch'ang-ch'un's 丘長春 travels to the West, however, please see our paper *Chô-shun Shinjin to sono Saiyû* 長春真人とその西遊 (Ch'ang-ch'un chên-jên and His Travels to the West) in the *Tôyô Bunka Kenkyu-sho Kiyô* 東洋文化研究所紀要 No. 29.

the succeeding Emperors.⁽⁴⁾

By the way, the Buddhists maintain that Lao-tzŭ hua-hu shuo 老子化胡說 was a fabrication by the Taoists, and this has been the established theory prevailing to this day. But it is impossible to accept the theory without question. As is universally known, the first reference to Lao-tzŭ hua-hu shuo in literature is to be found in the memorial presented by Hsiang K'ai 襄楷 to the Emperor Huan 桓 of Hou Han 後漢 in the 9th year of Yen-hsi 延熹. The reference runs: "Some say that Lao-tsŭ went into foreign countries and became the Buddha." But in his paper *Lao-tzŭ hua-hu shuo k'ao-chêng* 老子化胡說考證, Mr. Wang Wei-ch'êng 王維成 infers from the *Shu-p'u fu* 樗蒲賦, written by Ma Jung 馬融 who died in the 9th year of Yen-hsi, and the quotations from the *Chung-hsing shu* 中興書 given in the *Shih-shuo hsing-yü* 世說新語, Vol. 1, Part 2, that the theory was formed earlier than the presentation of Hsiang K'ai's memorial.⁽⁵⁾ From this presumption of Mr. Wang Wei-ch'êng and the date of the arrival of An Shih-kao 安世高 and his party in China, I conclude that the origin of this theory dates back to the reign of Emperor Shun 順 of Hou Han or even earlier. In the Hou Han period Taoism had two religious orders—T'ai-p'ing tao 太平道 and Wu-tou-mi tao 五斗米道. The origin of both these Taoist orders dates later than the reign of Emperor Shun; besides, they had no need to fabricate such a theory as Hua-hu shuo, judging from the character of their formation. Furthermore, the earliest Buddhism introduced into China was understood and accepted by the Chinese as something tinged with occult lore and magic, and in the quotation from the *Wei-lüeh* 魏略 in the notes appended to the end of the *Tung-i chuan* 東夷傳, contained in the *San-kuo-chih Wei-chih* 三國志魏志, Vol. 30, one finds the following paragraph: "What the Buddhists preach is much the same as the teachings of Lao-tzŭ of China. It is probable that Lao-tzŭ went westward beyond the Chinese borders, through the western countries, and reached India, where he prepagated his teachings among the natives. The Buddha was one of his disciples." From the above I conclude that the originators of the theory of Lao-tzŭ hua-hu shuo were the Buddhists themselves, who perhaps thought of making use of the *Shih-chi Lao-tzŭ chuan* 史記老子傳 as a means of propagating Buddhism among the people of China.⁽⁶⁾

Now, according to the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu* 至元辯僞錄, Vol. 3 and Vol. 4,

- (4) See Dr. Fukui's treatise given above, Book 2, Chap. 3. Dr. Yoshioka, uncritically accepting Dr. Fukui's theory, identifies the *T'ai-shang kun-yüan shang-tê huang-ti ming-wei hua-hu-ch'êng-fo ching* 太上混元上德皇帝明威化胡成佛經 with the *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u* 八十一化圖. But there being some doubt about the identity of the two, for the present we regard them as two different books.
- (5) See Mr. Wang Wei-ch'êng's 王維成 *Lao-tzŭ hua-hu shuo k'ao-chêng* 老子化胡說考證 in the *Kuo-hsüeh Chi-k'an* 國學季刊 Vol. 4, No. 2.
- (6) See for particulars our paper on the *Rô-shi Kako-setsu no seiritsu ni kansuru ichi okusetsu* 老子化胡說の成立に關する一臆說 (A Conjecture on the Formation of the Doctrine of Lao-tzŭ Turning Barbarian) in 石田博士頌壽記念東洋史論叢.

the controversies roughly took the following course:

In the year of Jên-ch'ên 壬辰 or the 4th year of Emperor T'ai-tsung's 太宗 reign in the Yüan 元 period, that is, in the year 1232 of the Christian Era, Tao-shih Li Chih-ch'ang 道士李志常, who succeeded Ch'iu Ch'ang-ch'un 丘長春 as superintendent priest of the Taoist order of Ch'üan-chên chiao 全真教, took advantage of the Emperor's being busily occupied with his great expeditions and indulged in a variety of rebellious sets in defiance of the Imperial authority by imposing upon the Buddhists; planning further to fabricate a counterfeit classic preaching a myth, he ordered Tao-shih Ling-hu Chang 道士令狐璋 to make a collection of mythical theories and Tao-shih Shih-chih ching 道士史志經 to disseminate a heretical book called *Hsieh-wên* 邪文. As for the content of this book, it is nothing but a narrative describing Lao-tzŭ's metamorphoses and metempsychoses, repeated as often as eighty-one times over, a narrative fabricated on the pattern of Wang Fu's *Kuei-shuo* 詭說 and Hsi Shêng-ching's 西昇經 *Pi-t'an* 鄙談 as well as on the Buddhists' *Pa-shih-êrh-k'an* 八十二龜. The aim of the narrative lies, in brief, in placing Lao-tzŭ above Sakya and K'ung-tzŭ 孔子 in rank. The printing-blocks of this *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u* 八十一化圖 were completed about the time when Emperor Hsien-tsung 憲宗 held a magnificent Buddhistic service at the Hao-t'ien 昊天 Temple.⁽⁷⁾ So Li Chih-ch'ang planned to disseminate this far and wide throughout the land, and thinking that the propagation of the narrative at the Imperial court would naturally accelerate its universal dissemination, sent Chin-p'o Wang 金坡王, the instructor, and Wên-ti-han 溫的罕, the Tao-jên 道人, to the Imperial court as missionaries among the courtiers.

Hsüeh-t'ing Fu-yü 雪庭福裕, the Buddhist superior (Chang-lao 長老) of the Shao-lin 少林 Temple of China, who happened to be staying in Kharakorum with a view to build a Buddhist temple there, came to know of the *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u* derogatory to Buddhism, ordered An-ts'ang 安藏, the scholar, to present it to Arikbüge, the Emperor's brothers, and complain to him of the flagrant fraudulency of the book. Arikbüge, finding the book so full of designed untruths, reported to Emperor Hsien-tsung in detail that the *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u* was a defamatory fabrication designed to destory Buddhism and injurious to morals. But the Emperor Hsien-tsung, unabale to decide the relative merits of the assertions, summoned Fu-yü 福裕 and Li Chih-ch'ang 李志常 to appear in the Wan-an ko 萬安閣 at the Imperial court, and made them debate in his presence on the merits and faults of their assertions with Prime Minister Po-la-hai 鉢剌海, Imperial princes, noble courtiers, Kharahasun, the interpreter, and An-ts'ang as witnesses in attendance.

The debate began with Fu-yü making a scathing attack upon the *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u*, while Li Chih-ch'ang kept denying all knowledge with folded

(7) Dr. Fukui, passing over this passage in the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu*, dates the *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u* back to the 4th year of Tai-tsung's reign, but on this subject see the following passage.

arms. When criticized by Fu-yü for his irresponsible ignorance as superintendent priest, Li Chih-ch'ang remained mum. So Fu-yü pointed out: "Though your book says that Lao-tzū was born *wu-yün chih ch'ien* 五運之前, that is, before the creation of the five elements of the universe, it is an undeniable fact according to the *Shi-chi* 史記 and other historical works that he was a man belonging to the last days of the Chou 周 Dynasty." And he demanded: "How is it that you are so sacrilegious as to despise the sacred wisdom of our Emperor by breaching such an absurd myth and scattering it abroad?" To this Li Chih-ch'ang gave an evasive answer, saying: "I have nothing to do with the matter because all that was done by a *Hsia-mien tai-jên* 下面歹人或 worthless villain." Then Fu-yü said: "Don't you think it contrary to nature and reason that Lao-tzū, who held a position of responsibility for helping the government to maintain peace and order for the people, went alone westward to proselytize among the barbarians while witnessing under his nose the disorderly condition of his own country? Wouldn't that be as unnatural as a man who, with his own head of hair on fire, runs to help extinguish a fire burning other men's woods far away?" But Li Chih-ch'ang kept silent, with his face flushed and perspiring all over. So Fu-yü, turning to the Emperor, appealed to him: "Gangs of Tao-shih have amassed a huge hoard of wealth by cheating the Imperial court, and destroyed an immense number of Buddhist images and stone monuments by illegally occupying Buddhist temples. I beg your Majesty would deign to take steps to make them restore them." Even to this Li Chih-ch'ang gave no contradiction whatever, and instead positively offered to restore them. When in conclusion Fu-yü, denouncing the *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u* as a fabrication, argued that nothing short of a complete destruction of the printing blocks could effectively suppress the spread of this evil teaching, Li Chih-ch'ang on bended knees implored the Emperor for the destruction of the printing-blocks. So Emperor Hsien-tsung ruled: "Regarding the old regulations that had been laid down and enforced before my accession to the throne, I make a point of making no change in them, nor do I intend to make any new additions to them, either. Since this theory is a pure fabrication newly invented by the Tao-shih, it should not be allowed to be spread." Thereupon Shêng Chiang-chu 勝講主 or Instructor Shêng, who was present as a witness, glared at him and shouted: "Wretch!" But Li Chih-ch'ang, left friendless, could not utter a word in reply. So Emperor Hsien-tsung told all the courtiers present that the Tao-shih's silence was the proof of his being in the wrong.

The next day Fu-yü presented a memorial to the Emperor, giving a detailed explanation as to which of the two was born earlier, Sakya or Lao-tzū, how many acts of violence were committed by the Ch'üan-chên tao-shih 全真道士, how wicked their teachings were, what absurd nonsense was told in the *Hua-hu ching* and in the *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u*. It was in the year of I-mao 乙卯 or 5th year of Hsien-tsung's reign (1255). Thus awakened to the merits

and faults of the assertions of the Buddhists and of the Taoists, Emperor Hsien-tsung issued on the 29th of September, the same year, an edict ordering the printing-blocks of the *Hua-hu ching* and other counterfeit classic to be destroyed, the Tao-shih to restore such images of the Buddha or Kwan-yin as they had broken or recarved into Lao-tzū's images to their original shape and return them to the Buddhists, those Tao-shih who had destroyed the Buddhist images to be punished, and these Buddhists who had remodeled Lao-tzū's images into those of the Buddha to be punished likewise.⁽⁸⁾ Na-mo ta-shih 那摩大師 was appointed as supervisor over the enforcement of this edict. In this connection it is perhaps a matter of considerable importance to note that Na-mo ta-shih, presumably a lama, was chosen as supervisor, and that An-ts'ang, who first appealed to Arikbüge about the *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u* being a fabrication, was a Bishbalik man by descent. For it is to be surmised that in the controversies between Buddhism and Taoism in the Yüan period there were involved from the outset some people who belonged to Lamaism. But considering the fact that Na-mo ta-shih at that time was superintendent priest of all Buddhism in China, his appointment as supervisor over the enforcement of the Imperial edict may be said in that sense to have been natural and proper.

Na-mo ta-shih, thus appointed by Emperor Hsien-tsung, strove according to the edict to have the Buddhist temples, hitherto occupied by the Tao-shih, returned to the Buddhists. The Tao-shih, however, not only disobeyed his order, but obstinately maintained their old attitude, imploring the Emperor for another edict in a different key or circulating a falsified version of the edict. So there ensued a series of disputes and struggles, sometimes attended with a great deal of bloodshed. Accordingly, Na-mo ta-shih, together with Fu-yü and other Buddhist priests, visited Kharakhorum again in May, the next year, and, while waiting for the arrival of Li Chih-ch'ang, decided to hold another debate on the 16th of July at the temporary palace of Sira, situated south of Kharakhorum. The debaters representing the Buddhists this time were Na-mo ta-shih, Fu-yü, Superior Hêng 亨 of the Fêng-fu 奉福 Temple, Abbot (An chu 庵主) T'ung-shê Wên 統攝溫, Superior Mai 邁 or Hsiang-mai 詳邁 of the K'ai-chüeh 開覺 Temple, Superior Chin 津 of the Ta-ming 大明 Temple, Superior Yün 雲 of the Shang-fang 上方 Temple, Instructor Lang 朗 of the Tzū-fu 資福 Temple, T'a-pi-hsiao ta-shih Su-mo shih-li 塔必小大師蘇摩室利, Chung-shan t'i-ling Yao-a-shih 中山提領要阿失, and others. When they arrived

(8) The treatises hitherto published state that by this rescript the Tao-shih were ordered to restore the Buddhist temples and possessions they had illegally occupied, and to burn all their counterfeit Taoist classics. But this statement perhaps comes from misreading. Besides, judging from the concluding passage this rescript—"If the Buddhist priest should destroy the images of Lao-tzū and turn them into these of the Buddha, he shall be similarly punished according to the preceding examples"—it is evident that the account of the first debate given in the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu* is not always true to the actual facts of the case.

at the palace ardently eager for the debate, they were ushered into the presence of Emperor Hsien-tsung and were given a handsome gift of money and goods. Then they waited, talking with beaming faces, for the Tao-shih to appear in defence of the truth of their theory. But Li Chih-ch'ang, remembering his obstinate denial of all-knowledge last time and fearful of being put to shame by suffering another defeat in the debate, arranged things so that he would not meet the Buddhists, by intentionally delaying the arrival of Chang Chih-ching 張志敬 and other Tao-shih, not appearing at court at the appointed time, and finally arriving after the Buddhists had gone away. So Emperor Hsien-tsung and Arikbüge, convinced of the Taoists being in the wrong, disdained to reply to the Taoists' attempts at explanation. Thereupon Li Chih-ch'ang, catching sight of the Buddhists coming up again, was so filled with dismay and chagrin that he had an evil tumour grown in his brain. He later was struck dead by lightning in June, the year of Wu-wu 戊午 or the 8th year of Hsien-tsung's reign (1258) Further, on the 10th of September, the year of Ping-ch'ên 丙辰 or the 6th year of Hsien-tsung's reign (1256), another debate was scheduled to be held, but the Tao-shih again and delayed on the way so as not to be in time for the debate, and the Buddhists returned to Yen-ching 燕京, satisfied with Hsien-tsung's decision that the absence of the Tao-shih showed their being in the wrong and not fit to combat the Buddhists' criticism.⁽⁹⁾

When Fu-yü, accompanied by Superior Chin-têng 金燈, paid a visit to the Imperial court in August in the year of Ting-ssü 丁巳 or the 7th year of Hsien-tsung's reign (1257), he was told by Arikbüge that Emperor Hsien-tsung ordered a debate to be held on the *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u*. It was arranged to be held at the Hsin-ch'êng 新城 or New Castle of Khubilai or Kublai-Khan (who later came to the throne in 1260) at K'ai-p'ing-fu 開平府. This time the Buddhist party of debaters was composed of Fu-yü, the head of the party, Na-mo kuo-shih 那摩國師, Pagspa kuo-shih, Hsi-fan kuo-shih 西蕃國師, Ho-hsi-kuo sêng 河西國僧, Wai-wu-lu sêng 外五路僧, Ta-li-kuo sêng 大理國僧, Superior Ch'ao 超 of the Yüan-fu 圓福 Temple at Chung-tou 中都, Superior Hêng of the Fêng-fu Temple, Superior Mai of the K'ai-chüeh Temple at P'ing-luan-lu 平灤路, Superior Chin of the Ta-ming Temple, T'ai-pi-hsiao ta-shih T'i-tien Su-mo shih-li, Instructor Hsün 詢 of Pei-ching 北京, Instructor Kuei 珪 of Ta-ming 大名, Shou sêng-lu 壽僧錄 of Chung-tu, Instructor Lang of Tzù-fu, Instructor Yü 育 of Lung-mên 龍門, Liu Ping-chung 劉秉忠, and more than three hundred other priests. The Taoist party was composed of Chang chên-jên 張真人 or Chang Chih-ching, Doctor Man-tzù-wang 蠻子王, Tao-lu Fan Chih-ying 道錄樊志應, Tao-p'an Wei Chih-yang, 道判魏志陽, Chiang-shih 講師 or Instructor Chou Chih-li 周志立, and over two hundred other Tao-shih. Besides

(9) Regarding the decision given at the end of the debate held on the 10th of September in the year of Ping-ch'ên 丙辰, the manner of description is very vague and indistinct. The same is the case with the debate held on the 17th of July in the same year.

these two parties, there were present as jurymen more than two hundred Confucian scholars, including Tou Mo 饒默, Yao Shu 姚樞 and others. Though this debate was on such a large scale, its exact date is unknown, since the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu* has nothing to say on the subject.

Before the opening of the debate it was decided at the suggestions of Khubilai that if the Buddhists be defeated they should grow hair and wear Taoists' head-gear, and that in case the Tao-shih be beaten they should shave their heads and turn Buddhists. Thus the debate was commenced, and the argumentation proceeded with the Buddhists taking the initiative and asking critical questions on the following items: the contents of the *T'ai-shang hun-yüan shang-tê huang-ti ming-wei hua-hu-ch'êng-fo ching* 太上混元上德皇帝明威化胡成佛經, the regular rites of receiving the Buddhistic commandments, the meaning of the word *Buddha*, the meaning of humanity and justice, the truth or falsity of the *Hua-hu ching*, the contents and character of the *Shih-chi*, the expression *hua-hu* and the fact it represents, the books containing Lao-tzŭ's teachings, and so on. On none of these items could the Taoists give a satisfactory answer to the Buddhists' scathing questions. Finally Khubilai asked Chang-chên-jên if he had anything to say, and the latter replied he had nothing to say. So Khubilai asked him, saying: "You are in the habit of boasting of the Tao-shih's being so proficient in the art of conjuration as to be invulnerable to fire, to ascend to Heaven in broad daylight, to call a dead man's soul back to the world, to exercise an evil spirit, and to be able to preserve eternal youth and life by practising the secret art of deep respiration and the preservation of energy. Can you demonstrate the truth of your claim by actually performing all these arts in our presence here now?" But Chang-chên-jên could make no answer. As it was nearing sundown and it grew dark in the hall, Khubilai gave a decision, declaring, "The Tao-shih's claim is stuff and nonsense and has no ground or authority. So in accordance with the promise given prior to the opening of the debate, let the Tao-shih take off their Tao-shih's head-gear and dress and shave their heads."

As a result of this complete defeat, the seventeen Tao-shih who took part in the debate were ordered by Na-mo ta-shih after the conclusion of the debate to be sent to Yen-ching under the guard and escort of Ming t'i-ling 明提領 of Hsi-ching 西京, Ting sêng-p'an 定僧判 of Yen-ching 燕京, Chang t'i-tien 張提點 of Yü-t'ien 玉田, Pang sêng-lu 龐僧錄 of Tê-hsing-fu 德興府, and other priestly officers on the way. When they entered the castle-gate of Yen-ching, T'a-pi-hsiao ta-shih Su-mo shih-li proclaimed to the whole nation the victory gained by the Buddhists at the debate, on long poles exposing to public ridicule the Taoist head-gears and robes stripped off the Tao-shih. At the same time he ordered the Tao-shih to restore to the Buddhists the 482 Buddhist temples, together with the woods and fields, that they had been occupying, and to hand over to Superior Chin-têng 金燈, the great pagoda of the Fêng-fu Temple illegally occupied by Ch'ang-ch'un kung 長春宮. He

also ordered the burning of the *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u* and all other counterfeit classics, along with their printing-blocks, and the sweeping destruction of all the Taoist monuments, statues, and portraits not founded on legitimate tradition. Thereupon Fu-yü, consulting many of his colleagues, decided that out of the 482 temples occupied by the Taoists only 202 should be returned to the Buddhists, and the other 280 be left in the hands of the Taoists. That was because they thought that if they accepted the restoration of all these 482 temples, they would incur the blame of resorting to power, but that if they thus accepted only a portion, they would surely be praised for their Fo-mên chih to-jang 佛門之多讓 or modesty and charity as Buddhists.

On the other hand, Khubilai issued an edict dated July 11th, the year of Wu-wu 戊午 or the 8th year of Hsien-tsung's reign (1258), ordering that within two months of the issuance of the edict the *Hua-hu ching* 化胡經, *Fu ch'un-hua lun* 復淳化論, *Shih-i chiu-mi lun* 十異九迷論, *Ming-chên pien-wei lun* 明真辯僞論, *Pien-chêng pang tao-shih-ching* 辯正謗道釋經, *P'i-hsieh kui-chêng i* 辟邪歸正議, *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u* 八十一化圖, and all other counterfeit classics, together with their printing-blocks, should be collected at the hands of the messengers sent by Chang chêng-jên himself and brought to Yen-ching, all to be burnt there; that the Taoist documents, monument-inscriptions, statue, portraits, and frescoes not founded on legitimate tradition should all be destroyed; and that those Tao-shih who kept any of these in secret possession should suffer heavy penalties.⁽¹⁰⁾ On reading this edict, Chang chêng-jên sent messengers to the Yün-t'ai kuan 雲臺觀 to gather the printing-blocks of the *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u*, the *Hua-hu ching*, and other counterfeit classics yet left uncollected, and they brought them back to Yen-ching along with the counter-

(10) This Imperial order is not to be found except in the text of Volume Four, it seems. At the end of Volume Two there is given an Imperial order dated the 11th of July in the year of Wu-wu 戊午 in the Chih-yüan period. But its content is entirely different. Properly, this being an order issued by Khubilai prior to his accession to the throne, it ought to have been called a "princely" order, but here the expression "Imperial" order is used according to the text of the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu*. Further, it is strange that neither in this Imperial order nor in the order issued by Su-mo shih-li 蘇摩室利 can we find any record describing the concrete circumstance of the Tao-shih having their hands shaved. By the way, it has hitherto been generally accepted that, since the Imperial order which we find appended to Volume Two was dated the 11th of July in the year of Wu-wu in the Chih-yüan period, but was in reality issued in the year of Wu-wu in Emperor Hsien-tsung's reign, the phrase "in the Chih-yüan period" has mistakenly been added by some later writer. But seeing that in this Imperial order the title "Emperor Pi-ch'an 薛禪" is used, we are obliged to conclude that this order was issued by Khubilai after his accession to the throne. And yet its content tells us that the affair apparently belongs to Hsien-tsung's time. How strange and incomprehensible this Imperial order! Judging from the similarity of its content to the account given in Volume Three after the description of the Imperial order issued on the 29th of September, the year of I-mao 乙卯, some error may have been committed in the calendar signs. We should like to wait for the result of further detailed study.

feit classics found uncollected in the possession of the Kung-kuan 宮觀 throughout the country. Then, in the southwestern court of the Main Building of the Ta-min-chung 大憫忠 Temple, all these counterfeit classics and their printing-blocks were burnt in the presence of the government officials. On that occasion it was Priest or Ho-shang 和尚 Chien 諫 of the Wan-shou 萬壽 Temple who was the first to set fire to the pile.

The foregoing is in broad outline the description given in the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu* 至元辯偽錄, volumes 3 and 4, course and outcome of the controversies conducted between Buddhists and Taoists in the reign of Emperor Hsien-tsung of the Yüan Dynasty.

In addition, we can find in a few monument-inscriptions and paragraphs contained in the fifth volume of the same book some accounts regarding the controversies carried on between the two religious groups subsequent to those described above, and the burning of the counterfeit Taoist classics in the reign of Emperor Shih-tsu 世祖. But Dr. Nogami-Shunjo has already so expatiated on these matters as to make it superfluous to add any further treatment here.⁽¹¹⁾

3

Now, there is great doubt as to the truth of the account outlined above regarding the controversies between Buddhists and Taoists described in the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu*. Emperor Shih-tsu's burning of all Taoist books except the *Tao-tê ching* 道德經 in the 18th year of Chih-yüan 至元 (1281) is a fact clearly recorded in authentic histories and other materials.⁽¹²⁾ Accordingly, if the Buddhist-Taoist controversies were really conducted in Hsien-tsung's

(11) See Dr. Nogami's treatise mentioned in Note 1. By the way, Dr. Yoshioka covers the controversies conducted in Hsien-tsung's reign and the destruction of Taoist books executed in Shih-tsu's reign under a single title: "the Controversies between Buddhism and Taoism in the Chih-yüan Period" (Dr. Yoshitoyo Yoshioka, *Taoism and Buddhism*, Series 1, p. 174). But this is wrong, as there were no controversies conducted in the Chih-yüan period.

(12) The affair is recorded under the item Ping-ch'ên 丙辰, February, the 17th year of Chih-yüan, and Chi-yü 己酉, October, the 18th year of Chih-yüan, in the Yüan-shih 元史, Vol. 11; under the item Jên-tzū 壬子, October, the 18th year of Chih-yüan, in the Hsin Yüan-shih 新元史, Vol. 10; in the monument-inscription of the Palace of Ch'ang-ch'un, contained in the Mu-an chi 牧庵集, Vol. 11; and in the *Ta-Yüan ch'ih-tz'ü k'ai-fu-i-t'ung-san-ssü shang-hsiang fu-ch'êng tsan-hua pao-yün ch'ü-chiao ta-tsung-shih chih-tao hsüan-chiao ch'ung-hsüan jên-ching ta-chên-jên chih chi-hsien-yüan shih ling chu-tao-chiao-shih Chang-kung pei-ming ping hsü* 大元勅賜開府儀同三司上卿輔成贊化保運玄教大宗師志道玄教冲玄仁靖大真人知集賢事領諸道教事張公碑銘並序, written by Chao Mêng-t'iao 趙孟頫 and still existent in the precincts of the Tung-yüeh miao (東嶽廟) in Peking. (See Dr. Shigeta Koyanagi's 小柳司氣太 "白雲觀志", p. 203). It is not probable, however, that this destruction was strictly executed throughout the whole country. On this point see Mr. Ch'ên kuo-fu's 陳國符 *Tao-ts'ang yüan-liu K'ao* 道藏源流考, pp. 179 pp. 179 ff.

reign on such a large scale as is recorded in the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu*, they ought to have left traces in some form or other in authentic histories and other materials, such as the writings of those who personally took part in the debates and the records left by the intellectuals of the day. But we find not a word referring to the event, not even in Buddhist materials, except for the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu* and such other materials as were written on the basis of its accounts. For instance, even in the life of Fu-yü, who actively played a leading role in the controversies, no mention whatever is to be found of the event.⁽¹³⁾ Regarding the very accounts given in the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu* itself we find not a few self-contradictory or suspicious points. Though it is recorded that over three hundred Buddhist priests and over two hundred Tao-shih met in the debate, the appendix at the end of the fourth volume which lists the Buddhist debaters and the Tao-shih who shaved their heads gives only seventeen names respectively. This strikes us as a little strange. It may be that these seventeen priests were among the most important debaters, but the names of some of them are never mentioned in the text. Moreover, such titles as Hsi-fan kuo-shih 西蕃國師, Ho-hsi-kuo sêng 河西國僧, Wai-wu-lu sêng 外五路僧 sound very hollow and carry no conviction. Furthermore, we find much confusion in style, and many passages ambiguous in description and expression. In some sections we find the same matter repeated again and again. Summing up all these points, we naturally conclude that the whole question depends on the reliability of the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu* as authentic material.

On re-reading the accounts given in the book from this new point of view, we notice a considerable number of passages which leave us unconvinced. Deferring a fuller treatment to some future occasion, I must for the present content myself with pointing out only a few examples most worthy of note.

From the viewpoint of its contents, the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu* may be divided into three parts: Volumes One and Two, which critically examine how absurd a fabrication the *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u*⁽¹⁴⁾ is; Volumes Three and

(13) See the monument-inscription of Priest Yü 祐 of the Shao-lin 少林 Temple at Sung-shan 嵩山, contained in the *Ch'u-kuo wên-hsin-kung hsüeh-lou ch'êng-hsien-shêng wên-chi* 楚國文憲公雪樓程先生文集, Vol. 8. In the *Fo-kuo-p'u-an ta-ch'ang-shih t'a-ming* 佛國普安大禪師塔銘, contained in the *Tao-yüan hsüeh-hu lu* 道園學古錄, Vol. 48, however, the shaving of the Tao-shih's heads is recorded. But Yü Chi 虞集, its author, had his material supplied by Priest Fa-lin 法琳, and the date of its writing is the 2nd year of Chih-shun 至順 or AD 1331. Besides, it contains such erroneous records as that the debate was held at Kharakhorum and that the number of these Tao-shih who turned Buddhist priests was *I ch'ien pai chi* 以千百計, or "to be counted by hundreds and thousands." So we cannot regard its accounts as reliable records of actual facts. The same is the case with accounts given in the *Hung-chiao chi* 弘教集, quoted in the *Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai* 佛祖歷代通載, Vol. 22.

(14) At the end of Volume Two, however, there are appended the *Ch'in-fêng shêng-chih fên-tuan tao-ts'ang wei-ching hsia-hsiang* (欽奉聖旨焚斷道藏偽經下項) and three monument-inscriptions. Probably this part is an addition by same later writer.

Four, which enumerate the deeds of violence committed by the Taoists and narrate the whole course of the controversies conducted during Emperor Hsien-tsung's reign; and Volume Five, which contains the monument-inscription describing the burning of Taoist books during Emperor Shih-tsu's reign, and other documentary materials. These three parts are somewhat lacking in coherence among themselves. For while the first part concentrates on a critical attack upon the *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u*, the second part rather attaches weight to the attack upon the *Hua-hu ching*. And while the first part critically analyses in detail how much of an absurd fabrication the *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u* is, we find in Volume Three the following passage regarding Ch'üan-chên tao-shih's intention to fabricate the *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u* and its contents:

"The book tries to spread a false belief in Lao-tzû's priority to Sakya by assigning the birth of the former to the period prior to the creation of the universe and that of the latter to the Chou Dynasty of China. It also tries to show the superiority of Taoism to Buddhism by plagiarizing and amplifying many Buddhist ideas. In an attempt to prove Lao-tzû's superiority to Confucius, the book also claims that the former was born before the latter. Again committing a piracy on the Buddhist legend of a Buddha proselytizing the whole world over, the book has fabricated the legend that Lao-tzû travelled the world over, preaching his gospel. These and such like plagiarisms are too numerous to be mentioned."

This passage sounds as if the author had completely forgotten about the dissertations he wrote in the first part of his book. If the same author wrote this second part immediately after completing the first, which deals in detail with the falsity of the Taoist claims, it would be enough for him to refer the reader to his detailed investigation in the first part or in Volumes One and Two. This would seem the more natural and proper way of doing things. As it is, we cannot but feel a certain incongruity and inconsequence between the first and second parts.

In the third part or Volume Five we find only the text of the *Shên-chih fên-hui chu-lu wei tao-ts'ang-ching chih pei* 聖旨焚毀諸路偽道藏經之碑, the *Shih-tsu shêng-chih pei* 世祖聖旨碑 of Chien-shih 堅石, dated June, the 17th year of Chih-yüan 至元 and the record of *Wei tao-ts'ang-ching fên-hui* 偽道藏經焚毀, dated October 18th in the 18th year of Chih-yüan. We find no kind of writing whatever by Hsiang-mai 祥邁 on the controversies in question. According to the Preface, written by Chang Po-ch'un 張伯淳 and placed at the head of the book, Hsiang-mai is reported to have written the book in the Hsin-mao 辛卯 year of Chih-yüan (the 28th year of Chih-yüan) by Imperial order.⁽¹⁵⁾ If the

(15) Although the reason why Chang Po-ch'un dates the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu* back to the 28th year of Chih-yüan is not clear, he probably reached that conclusion from a phrase given at the end of Volume Two, which runs as follows: "Chih-yüan tan-ê chih sui mêng-ch'un 至元單闕之歲孟春" or "In early spring, the year of Tan-e in the Chih-yüan period". *Tan-ê* 單闕 means *mao* 卯, and so there are three cases of "Tan-ê in the Chih-yüan period"—the year of Ting-mao 丁卯 or the 4th year of

book were really written in the 28th year of Chih-yüan as Chang Po-ch'un reports, it would be a natural conclusion that Hsiang-mai took up his pen after he had witnessed the critical examination of the Taoist books and the burning of all the counterfeit Taoist classics which took place in the 18th year of Chih-yüan. The end and aim of the writing of this book is perhaps most clearly professed in the concluding passage of the General Introduction at the head of Volume One. It runs as follows:

“By referring to the orthodox doctrines preached by authentic Buddhist classics, we here intend to make a critical examination of the mad absurdities fabricated by the Taoists and block up the spread of their nonsensical theories at the very source, thus flabbergasting their Supreme God in the Highest Heaven and putting to shame the very founder of Taoism and all the Tao-shih in the world.”

From this point of view, the great debate meeting held in the reign of Emperor Hsien-tsung may be regarded as an instance of *Ch'ih-p'o k'uang-t'an* 斥破狂談, or the making of a critical examination of mad absurdities, and the destruction of the counterfeit Taoist classics carried out in the reign of the Emperor Shih-tsu as an instance of *Sai wang-shuo chih kên-yüan* 塞妄說之根源, or the blocking of the spread of their nonsensical theories at their very source. In other words, the burning of the Taoist books in the reign of Shih-tsu was the natural outcome of the debate held in the reign of Hsien-tsung. So we might say that Hsiang-mai's aim in writing this book was satisfactorily accomplished only when all the counterfeit Taoist classics were destroyed in Shih-tsu's reign. Then if Hsiang-mai really wrote this book in the 28th year of Chih-yüan, he ought to have exulted over the destruction of all the Taoist books and enlarged upon the subject at great length. It strikes us very unnatural that he contented himself with a description of the debate held in Hsien-tsung's reign. Here we find a little incongruity and inconsequence.

By the way, in his *Taoism and Buddhism*, Part One, Book One, Chapter Six, Dr. Yoshitoyo Yoshioka 吉岡義豊, touches upon this subject and calls the above-mentioned record of *Wei tao-ts'ang-ching fên-hui* 偽道藏經焚毀, dated October 20th in the 18th year of Chih-yüan, the *Lin-ch'üan-lun pei* 林泉倫碑, after the name of its writer. At first sight, the record certainly appears to be given as a monument-inscription, but on examination it is clear that its contents cannot possibly be accepted as such. Moreover, we find the same

Chih-yüan, the year of Chi-mao 己卯 or the 16th year of Chih-yüan, and the year of Hsin-mao 辛卯 or the 28th year of Chih-yüan. From the fact that in the first part of the book no reference is made to the destruction of Taoist books in Emperor Shih-tsu's reign, and considering the number of years the author must have spent in writing the book, we conclude tentatively that Hsiang-mai really wrote this book in the 4th year of Chih-yüan. In the *Shih-shih chi-ku lüeh hsü-chi* 釋氏稽古略續集 Vol. 1 (大正藏經, Vol. 49) we find that the book is stated to have been written in the 23rd year Chih-yüan. This perhaps comes from an error committed while the book was being copied.

record reproduced in the *Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai* 佛祖歷代通載, Volume Twenty-two, under the title *Fên tao-ts'ang-ching hsià-huo wên* 焚道藏經下火文. We have to conclude that Dr. Yoshioka's treatment of the record as an inscription is mistaken.

In addition to this record of *Wei tao-ts'ang-ching fên-hui*, Volume Five contains two other records—*Ju-i ta Shih Chieh kuai chi* 如意答石介怪記 and *Shêng-ch'ih t'é-chien shih chia shé-li ling-t'ung chih t'a pei-wên* 聖旨特建釋迦舍利靈通之塔碑文—under the one title *Hsu-chung shou-k'ou chi* 虛鐘受扣集. Both these records were undoubtedly written by Hsiang-mai 祥邁 since in both of them the following sentence is written: *Yüan ju-i chang-lao fêng-chao(-ch'ih) chuan* 元如意長老奉詔(勅)撰. But the former is a counter-attack upon the criticism levelled at Buddhism and Taoism by Shih Chieh 石介, a Confucian scholar of Sung 宋, and the latter a monument-inscription on the Buddhist tower Pao-t'a 寶塔 built in the 8th year of Chih-yüan. The contents of neither have anything to do with the controversies in question or with the *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u* 八十一化圖. Seeing that the aim of writing this book was as described above, it is utterly beyond comprehension what brought Hsiang-mai to incorporate them into the book, if indeed he himself did that.

The three parts are different from each other in their form and style of description, too. In the first part, Volume One begins with a General Introduction, and Volume Two ends with a Conclusion, each volume having respectively appended its postscript, announcing the date and place of writing as follows: "I here lay down my pen at the Wan-shou 萬壽 Temple this January, the 2nd year of Chih-yüan" and "I here lay down my pen this January, the 4th year of Chih-yüan. The writer is Hsiang-mai, a priest of the Ta-yün-fêng 大雲峯 Buddhist Temple." In the second part we find neither prologue nor epilogue, nor do we find either the date or place of writing. Further, the writer's way of self-designation differs from one part to another. In the first part, he simply calls himself Hsiang-mai without mentioning the temple he was living in. In the second part, on the other hand, the writer designates himself as "Superior Mai 邁 of the K'ai-chüeh 開覺 Temple" or "Superior Mai of the K'ai-chüeh Temple at P'ing-luan-lu 平灤路," as has already been mentioned above. This mode of designation closely resembles in form the writer's name in one of the "seventeen Buddhist debaters against the Tao-shih 對道士持論師德一十七名," a list appended to the end of Volume Four, where he is designated as "Superior Hsiang-mai of the K'ai-chüeh Temple at Luan-chou 灤州." It strikes us very strange to find the writer referring to himself in his own writing in just the same way as others call him. This seems even more strange because the writer simply calls himself 'Hsiang-mai' in the first part. We get the same impression when we find in Volume Three that, when he enumerates the Buddhist priests participating in the debate, he mentions himself among those of the higher rank instead of at the end of the list. Judging from customary procedures, the author's own name

ought to have been mentioned last. This manner of treatment seems to share something in common with the list of the "seventeen Buddhist priests taking part in the debate against the Tao-shih", as in the case of the above-mentioned mode of self-designation. From the date of the 2nd year of Chih-yüan, given at the end of the General Introduction, Volume One, we may conclude that Hsiang-mai probably began writing this book in the same year while still living at the Wan-shou Temple. Then, by rights, he ought to have written "Superior Hsiang-mai of the Wan-shou Temple" or more simply "Superior Mai of Wan-shou." Is it not illogical for him to call himself "Superior Mai of the *K'ai-chüeh* Temple"?

As to the life of Hsiang-mai, the author of this book, we have nothing to refer to except the Preface, written by Kuei Chi-hsiang 貴吉祥 of the Ta-yün-fêng-ch'an 大雲峯禪 Temple and inserted after Chang Po-ch'un's Preface, in which we are told that Hsiang-mai was called Hu-yen 乎延 before he became a priest, that he was born at T'ai-yüan 太原, took the tensure as a boy of nine, and became a Buddhist priest of great wisdom and learning. Judging from the accounts given in this book, it seems he was residing at the K'ai-chüeh Temple in the reign of Emperor Hsien-tsung when the controversies were conducted, and that he was staying at the Wan-shou Temple about the 2nd year of Chih-yüan, then removed to the Ta-yün-fêng-ch'an Temple. Judging from the general way of doing things, if he were dwelling at the K'ai-chüeh Temple when he finished writing this book, he ought to have written *Chüeh pi yü k'ai-chüeh lan-jo* 絕筆於開覺蘭若, "I lay down my pen at the K'ai-chüeh Temple", but not *Chüeh pi yü wan-shou lan-jo* 絕筆於萬壽蘭若, "I lay down my pen at the Wan-shou Temple." If he had intended to record actual conditions as they were at the time of the controversies by calling himself Hsiang-mai of the K'ai-chüeh Temple, where he was living at the time, he ought to have noted down in some form or other the name of the temple where he was staying while writing the book. In any case, I cannot but feel some contradiction arising from mention of the temple where he was dwelling. Furthermore, I also feel something amiss in the disagreement between the names of the priests participating in the debate listed at the end of Volume Three and those of the priests given in the list of the "seventeen Buddhist debaters against the Tao-shih". In particular, it is most incomprehensible to find absent from among the latter the name of Fu-yü 福裕, who played the leading part in the controversies.

Chang Po-ch'un 張伯淳 gives the date of the writing of the book as the 28th year of Chih-yüan, as has already been mentioned. But this statement is not to be credited. For, besides the above-mentioned question of the 2nd year of Chih-yüan and of the K'ai-chüeh Temple, we find in the second part a place-name that was not used in the 28th year of Chih-yüan.

Ts'ung-ch'ao 從超, the Superior of the Yüan-fu 圓福 Temple, was one of the Buddhist debaters at the meeting held in Khubilai's New Castle at K'ai-

p'ing-fu 開平府. Referring to the site of the Yüan-fu Temple, Volume Three records *Chung-tu yüan-fu Ch'ao chang-lao* 中都圓福超長老, "Superior Ch'ao of the Yüan-fu Temple at Chung-tu 中都", while in the list of the "seventeen Buddhist debaters against the Tao-shih" we find *Yen-ching □ yüan-fu chang-lao Ts'ung-ch'ao* 燕京□圓福長老從超, "Ts'ung-ch'ao, the Superior of the Yüan-Temple at Yen-ching 燕京". According to the records given under the item of Ta-tu-lu 大都路, History of the Yüan Dynasty, Volume 58 (Geography), Yen-ching was called Chung-tu 中都 in the 1st year of Chih-yüan, and was again renamed Ta-tu 大都 in the 9th year of Chih-yüan. So, properly, the city was supposed to be called Yen-ching before the 4th year of Chung-t'ung 中統, then Chung-tu from the 1st till the 8th year of Chih-yüan, and then Ta-tu from the 9th year of Chih-yüan onward. These names ought not to have been used either synonymously or promiscuously. Then controversies in question were conducted in the reign of the Emperor Hsien-tsung. Accordingly, properly speaking the Yüan-fu Temple ought to have been consistently placed at "Yen-ching", which was the correct way of calling the city in those days. Or, if the name customarily used at the time of the author's writing was to be used, the temple ought to have been described as the Yüan-fu Temple at "Chung-tu", while if the book was written in the 28th year of Chih-yüan, "the Yüan-fu Temple at Ta-tu" ought to have been used throughout. As a matter of fact, though, the name "Chung-tu" is used in Volume Three and "Yen-ching" in the list of the "seventeen Buddhist debaters against the Tao-shih", while the name "Ta-tu" is never used in conjunction with the Yüan-fu Temple.

If the name "Ta-tu" were never found throughout the book, we should see therein a kind of consistency and allow its apparent reasonableness. But in the list of the "seventeen Buddhist debaters against the Tao-shih" we find the name "Yen-ching" used synonymously with "Ta-tu". For example, while we find in the text of Volume Three the name "Chung-tu Shou sêng-lu 中都壽僧錄", we find the same person designated in the above-mentioned list as "Ta-tu □ yen-shou chiang-chu Tao-shou 大都□延壽講主道壽 or Instructor Tao-shou of the Yen-shou Temple at Ta-tu 大都. Besides, as mentioned before, the site of the K'ai-chüeh Temple is designated in one part of the book as "P'ing-luan-lu 平灤路" and in another part as "Luan-chou 灤州". According to the accounts given under the item of Yung-p'ing-lu 永平州, History of the Yüan Dynasty, Volume 58, it was in the 1st year of Chung-t'ung 中統 that P'ing-luan-lu was first opened, and so this place-name did not exist in the reign of Emperor Hsien-tsung 憲宗. Judging from these instances, we have to conclude that the author of this book was entirely ignorant of or unconcerned about changes in place-names from age to age. In the Preface written by Kuei Chi-hsiang 貴吉祥, we find Hsiang-mai described as a scholar who was not only so conversant with Buddhist lore but also so versed in all the ramifications of knowledge, ancient and modern, that his name was widely known through-

out the land. How can a scholar of such learning have been so ignorant of or negligent in using the place-names of his own country?

As already mentioned, Fu-yü 福裕 presented a memorial to the Emperor the day after his first debate with Li Chih-ch'ang 李志常. At the head of this memorial we find him calling himself Hsüeh-t'ing, the Buddhist Superior of the Shao-lin Temple in the north of Shang-tu, Hê-lin 和林上都北少林寺嗣祖雪庭野人. Hê-lin 和林 means Kharakhorum, and Shang-tu 上都 means K'ai-p'ing-fu 開平府. So the phrase "Shang-tu, Hê-lin" makes no sense whatever, though "Hê-lin" might be made understandable by addition of the word "tsai 在", supposing the word to have been dropped by an oversight while being transcribed by some copyist. The name "Shang-tu", however, came into use for the first time in the 5th year of Chung-t'ung 中統, according to the accounts given under the item of Shang-tu-lu 上都路, History of the Yüan Dynasty, Volume 58, or in May Wu-tzū 戊子, the 4th year of Chung-t'ung, according to the accounts given in the *Shih-tsu pên-chi* 世祖本紀, History of the Yüan Dynasty, Volume 5. Accordingly, the name "Shang-tu" was non-existent in the 5th year of Hsien-tsung's reign, and so Fu-yü cannot possibly have used it in his memorial in August of that year. Thus the phrase "Shang-tu, Hê-lin" makes no sense. Moreover, it being an undoubted fact that the Shao-lin Temple Fu-yü lived in was situated in Sung-shan 嵩山, it seems strange to call it "the Shao-lin Temple in the north of Shang-tu 上都北少林寺". Without going to more trouble to cite other instances,⁽¹⁶⁾ suffice it to say that we find a considerable number of confusions and contradictions in the use of place-names in this book.

When we compare the accounts of this book with Taoist materials, we find many factual errors. But here we must content ourselves with pointing out only a few of them.

Volume Three tells us that Li Chih-ch'ang 李志常 succeeded Ch'iu Ch'ang-ch'un 丘長春 as superintendent priest of the Taoist order of Ch'üan-chên chiao 全真教. But in reality it was Yin Chih-p'ing 尹志平 that succeeded Ch'iu Ch'ang-ch'un when the latter died. And it was not until the 10th year of Tai-tsung's 太宗 reign (1238) that Yin Chih-p'ing resigned from the post of superintendent priest in favour of Li Chih-ch'ang.⁽¹⁷⁾ Further, the book tells us that Li Chih-ch'ang, afraid of making himself doubly ridiculous by suffering another humiliating defeat, was purposely late for the debate in July, the 6th year of Hsien-tsung's 憲宗 reign, and that he was struck dead by lightning in June, the 8th year of Hsien-tsung's reign. But according to his biographical sketch, entitled the *Hsüan-mên chang-chiao ta-tsung-shih chên-ch'ang chên-*

(16) In Volume Three we find the name of a *lu* 路 which was not in existence in the Yüan period, and even some errors committed in the names of *chou* 州 and *hsien* 縣.

(17) This statement is based on the *Ch'ing-hê miao-tao kuang-hua chên-jên Yin tsung-shih pei-ming ping hsü* 清和妙道廣化真人尹宗師碑銘並序 and the *Hsüan-mên chang-chiao ta-tsung-shih chên-ch'ang chên-jên tao-hsing pei-ming* 玄門掌教大宗師眞常真人道行碑銘, both contained in the *Kan-sui hsien-yüan lu* 甘水仙源錄, Vol. 3 ("道藏", No. 611.)

jên tao-hsing pei-ming 玄門掌教大宗師真常真人道行碑銘, which is to be found in the *Kan-shui hsien-yüan lu* 甘水仙源錄, Vol. 3, he died on the 19th of June, the 6th year of Hsien-tsung's reign, and so he cannot possibly have been able to participate in the debate which was held in July of the same year. Another questionable point is that among the Taoist debaters we do not find the name of Shih Chih-ching 史志經, who ought to have participated in the debate as the very person responsible for the drawing-up of *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u* 八十一化圖, the "heretical book" which he was accused of having disseminated.

Speaking of Shih Chih-ching, we can here touch upon the date of the writing of the *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u*, though it forms a slight digression from the subject. Dr. Kôjun Fukui 福井康順, basing his theory on the accounts given in Volume Three, beginning with the words *Jên-ch'ên chung* 壬辰中, tells us that the *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u* was written in the year of Jên-ch'ên (1232) during the reign of Emperor Tai-tsung 太宗 of the Yüan Dynasty.⁽¹⁸⁾ If Dr. Fukui's theory were right, Li Chih-ch'ang ought to have been intimately associated around that time with Ling-hu Chang 令狐璋, who collected for him "faked legends", and Shi Chih-ching 史志經, who disseminated "heretical books".

Since there are no extent biographical accounts of Ling-hu Chang, we know nothing more about his life and actions. But according to the life of Shih Chih-ching 史志經 entitled the *Tung-hsüan-tzû shih-kung tao-hsing lu* 洞玄子史公道行錄, which is to be found in the *Kan-shui hsien-yüan lu* 甘水仙源錄, Vol. 8, Shih Chih-ching was loitering about the provincial areas, Yü 蔚, Tai 代, Shuo 朔, and Ying 應, or the district spreading from the northern part of Shan-hsi 山西 to the northwestern part of Hê-pei 河北, making a strenuous study of the teachings of Ch'üan-chên chiao 全真教, during the period which began with the 18th year of Tai-tsu's 太祖 reign (1223)—when, accompanied by his teacher Liu Chên-ch'ang 劉真常, he had an interview with Ch'iu Ch'ang-ch'un 丘長春—until the 13th year of Tai-tsung's 太宗 reign (1241).⁽¹⁹⁾ Meanwhile, Li Chih-ch'ang 李志常, residing at the Ch'ang-ch'un Palace 長春宮 in Yen-ching 燕京, assisted Superintendent Priest Yin Chih-p'ing 尹志平 as his Tu-tao-lu 都道錄, and paid frequent visits to Kharakhorum. So around the year of Jên-ch'ên 壬辰 or the 4th year of Tai-tsung's reign, the two men Li Chih-ch'ang and Shih Chih-ching, who as yet had no chance to see each other, had nothing to do with each other. How then can Li Chih-ch'ang possibly have been able to order Shih Chih-ching to disseminate "heretical books"?

As has already been stated, Volume Three tells us that the printing-blocks of the *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u* 八十一化圖 were completed about the time, Emperor Hsien-tsung 憲宗 held a grand Buddhistic service at the Hao-t'ien Temple.

(18) See Dr. Fukui's above-mentioned work, p. 308.

(19) The *Kan-shui hsien-yüan lu* 甘水仙源錄, Vol. 8, is contained in the *Tao-ts'ang* 道藏, No. 613.

The date of this service is unknown, but if credit is to be given to the account that in August, the 5th year of Hsien-tsung's reign, Fu-yü 福裕 presented his memorial to the Emperor the day after the first debate meeting, we may safely conclude from the general progress of affairs that in the 4th or 5th year of Hsien-tsung's reign the printing-blocks of the *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u* were completed. For if they had been completed in the year of Jên-ch'ên 壬辰 or the 4th year of Tai-tsung's 太宗 reign, they could not have been kept unused under lock and key for more than two decades, and if they had been used immediately to disseminate the "heretical book" in that year of Jên-ch'ên or the 4th year of Tai-tsung's reign, the Buddhists could not have looked on indifferently without bestirring themselves to suppress it. On the other hand, the life of Shih Chih-ching 史志經 tells us that since the 2nd year of Hai-mi-shih chien kuo 海迷失監國 (1250), when he was summoned by Li Chih-ch'ang 李志常 to Yen-ching 燕京, he kept in close contact with Li and often accompanied him to Kharakhorum. So it may be surmised that during this period he undertook to disseminate the "heretical book" by Li Chih-ch'ang's order. Dr. Kôjun Fukui 福井康順 rejects as "confusion of diction" the following passage in the *Shên-chih fên-hui chu-lu wei tao-ts'ang-ching chih pei* 聖旨焚毀諸路偽道藏經之碑:

"In the reign of the Emperor Hsien-tsung the Taoists published a book entitled the *Lao-chün hua-hu ch'êng-fo ching* and the *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u* 老君化胡成佛經及八十一化圖. The book was printed and widely disseminated."

But it seems to me that this passage serves as subsidiary evidence to confirm the view that the *Pa-shih-i-hua t'u* was completed in the 4th or 5th year of Hsien-tsung's reign. (By the way, Dr. Yoshitoyo Yoshioka 吉岡義豊 uncritically accepts Dr. Fukui's theory and presumes that the book in question ought to have been included among the Taoist classics which had been in the process of compilation by the Ch'üan-chên tao-shih 全真道士 since the 9th year of Tai-tsung's reign (1237), but this is a mere groundless conjecture.)⁽²⁰⁾

Now, following the above-mentioned list of the "seventeen Buddhist debaters against the Tao-shih" we find the list of the "seventeen Taoist debaters who had their heads shaved", and at its beginning the following phrase: *Ta-tu T'ien-ch'ang kuan* 大都天長觀, "the Tower of T'ien-ch'ang at Ta-tu". As stated before, Ta-tu is Yen-ching 燕京. The Tower of T'ien-ch'ang at Yen-ching was the former name of the Pai-yün kuan 白雲觀, or Tower of White Clouds, at Peking, still known today as the general head-temple of the Ch'üan-chên chiao-t'uan 全真教團. It is a high-ranking Taoist temple which was renamed the Palace of Ch'ang-ch'un when it was given by Emperor T'ai-tsu 太祖 to Ch'iu Ch'ang-ch'un 丘長春 in the 22nd year of Tai-tsu's reign

(20) See Dr. Yoshioka's above-mentioned work, p. 189.

(1227) in the Yüan period.⁽²¹⁾ So the correct way of designating it ought to have been: “the Tower of T’ien-ch’ang at Yen-ching”, until the 22nd year of T’ai-tsu’s reign; “the Palace of Ch’ang-ch’un at Yen-ching”, until the 4th year of Chung-t’ung 中統; “the Palace of Ch’ang-ch’un at Chung-tu” 中都, until the 8th year of Chih-yüan 至元; thereafter, “the Palace of Ch’ang-ch’un at Ta-tu”. It was a careless mistake to call it “Ta-tu T’ien-ch’ang-kuan 大都天長觀” or “Tower of T’ien-ch’ang at Ta-tu”. The error is more obvious because the text clearly states that it was called the Palace of Ch’ang-ch’un at Ta-tu. It is also very strange that in the list of the *Ch’in-fêng shêng-chih fên-tuan tao-ts’ang wei ching hsia-hsiang* 欽奉聖旨焚斷道藏偽經下項 appended at the end of Volume Two, we cannot find the names of the *T’ai-shang kun-yüan shang-tê huang-ti ming-wei hua-hu-ch’êng-fo ching* 太上混元上德皇帝明威化胡成佛經 and the *Pa-shih-i-hua t’u* 八十一化圖, which sparked the controversies in question, and that in the text we can find no detailed description of the Tao-shih’s having their heads shaved. Further, we can find no reference whatever to these controversies either in the life of Wang Chin-p’o 王金坡, who is said to have disseminated the *Pa-shih-i-hua t’u* among the courtiers, or in the lives of Fan Chih-ying 樊志應, Shên Chih-chên 申志貞, and Li Chih-ch’üan 李志全, the Tao-shih who are recorded to have had their heads shaved. We shall leave the matter untouched here, though, as it is not impossible to surmise that the whole affair was kept a secret because it reflected no great credit on the Taoists.⁽²²⁾

4

To sum up, after giving a very brief account, according to the descriptions given in the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu* 至元辯偽錄 Volumes 3 and 4, of the controversies conducted between Buddhists and Taoists in the reign of Emperor Hsien-tsung 憲宗 of the Yüan 元 Dynasty, we have examined both the form

(21) How the T’ien-ch’ang kuan 天長觀 was remained the Ch’ang-ch’un kung 長春宮 is recorded in the account given under the item Ch’ang-ch’un-tzü 長春子 in the *Chin-lien chêng-tsung hsien-yüan hsian-ch’uan* 金蓮正宗仙源像傳 (‘道藏’ No. 76), under the item of the year Ting-hai (丁亥) in the *Ch’i-chên nien-p’u* 七真年譜 (‘道藏’ No. 76), and in the *Ch’ang-ch’un chên-jên pên-hang pei* 長春真人本行碑 in the *Kan-shui hsien-yüan lu* 甘水仙源錄, Vol. 2 (‘道藏’ No. 611).

(22) The life of Wang Chin-p’o (王金坡) is recorded in the *Ch’ung-chên kuang-chiao ch’un-hê chên-jên tao-hang chih pei* (崇真光教淳和真人道行之碑), contained in the *Kan-shui hsien-yüan lu* (甘水仙源錄), Vol. 7 (‘道藏’ No. 612); the life of Fan Chih-ying (樊志應) in the *Chên-ch’ang kuan chi* (真常觀記) in the *Ch’iu-chien hsien-shêng ta-ch’üan wên-chi* (秋澗先生大全文集), Vol. 40; the life of Shên Chih-chên (申志貞) in the *Tung-yüan hu-ching ta-shih Shên-kung t’i-tien mu-chih-ming* (洞元虛靜大師申公提点墓誌銘) in the *Kan-shui hsien-yüan lu*, Vol. 8; and the life of Li Chih-ch’üan 李志全 in the *Chun-ch’êng-tzü Li chün mu-chih-ming* (純成子李君墓誌銘) in the same volume of the same book. In the life of Shên Chih-chên 申志貞 it is recorded that in the year of Wu-wu 戊午 in Hsien-tsung’s reign he was not living in the Palace of Ch’ang-ch’un.

and matter of the whole description given in the book, and, pointing out a few apparent contradictions and errors found therein, raised some questions. As a result, we hope it is understood this has no meaning here that the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu*, in its present text at least, raises some questions as to its authoritativeness, and, accordingly that the accounts given in the book presumably do not represent the whole truth of the affair. However, we nevertheless have no intention whatever to deny that some controversies were actually conducted between Buddhists and Taoists during the reign of Emperor Hsien-tsung. In his treatise *Nan-Sung ch'u hê-pei hsin tao-chiao k'ao* 南宋初河北新道教考, Mr. Ch'ên Yüan 陳垣 expresses his doubts that the Tao-shih had their heads shaved after the debate, on the ground that there is no account of the affair to be found in the lives of the Tao-shih concerned, and is inclined to be negative about the controversies themselves, too. But to our thinking, as vague as the accounts given in the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu* are the Tao-shih probably had their heads shaved temporarily at least. For at the close of the debate Khubilai ordered them to have their heads shaved for a while. Besides, in spite of the fact that there is no account of the controversies to be found in the Taoist materials, it is probable that the controversies were actually conducted. However, their scale was perhaps not as big as described in the *Pien-wei lu*, nor was the progress of the whole affair probably quite the same as recorded there.

In short, what we would say is only that the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu* 至元辯僞錄, in its present text, is not trustworthy as a basic source for clearing up the truth about the controversies in question, or, in other words, that we cannot grasp the truth of the affair on the sole authority of that single book. As has already been stated, the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu*, as it stands now, can be divided into three parts on the basis of its form and matter. In the first part we find the date of writing clearly recorded, the customary way of referring to oneself is used by the author, and the account given is connected and consistent. For these reasons grounds—though this is a very bold presumption—I am at present of the opinion that the first part of the book is the only part that Hsiang-mai 祥邁 himself wrote. Whereas in the first part the spoken Chinese popularly used in the Yüan period is but seldom employed, we find it used so often in the second part that this part strikes us as the work of another man. And in the *Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai* 佛祖歷代通載 we find quotations made only from the first part, though the author says that his quotations are not exhaustive. Such points as are mentioned above may serve to confirm my view. Thus I regard the second and the third parts as later additions by another writer. Since we find in the second part many passages presumably founded on the *Hsi-yu lu* 西遊錄 written by Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai 耶律楚材, this writer probably employed the *Hsi-yu lu* as one of his chief source-materials.

In the excess of my eagerness to point out the contradictions and errors contained in the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu*, I am afraid I have committed many

errors in this paper—grave oversights and misinterpretations, errors arising from the very limited range of materials covered, and misconceptions due to my misreading of the spoken Chinese popularly used in the Yüan period. Deeply interested in the history of the Ch'üan-chên chiao-t'uan and of the interactions between Buddhism and Taoism, I regard the Buddhist-Taoist controversies and the writing of the *Chih-yüan pien-wei lu* as problems of great consequence, and am ready to strive to correct those errors and imperfections which may be found in these humble efforts. I should feel most highly obliged to have them pointed out and corrected by the kind reader.

(Completed Jan. 28, 1963)

(Revised Nov. 7, 1966)

P.S. The present paper is a part of the result achieved by a group-study conducted under the title of the "Interactions between Buddhism and Taoism in China" at the Tôyô-bunka Kenkyûjo, Tôkyô University.