

## Looking for Bhairava: Exploring the Circulation of Esoteric Texts Produced by the Song Institute for Canonical Translation

Charles D. Orzech

University of North Carolina, Greensboro

“Then one should, in accord with the method of Mahiṣa mukha (摩睺沙目佉) . . . go to the cemetery at night, naked and with disheveled hair, and take up ash to draw a square mandala.”<sup>1</sup>

IN HIS INFLUENTIAL STUDY of the Tachikawa-ryū's (立川流) notorious skull ritual, James H. Sanford drew attention to the stubborn persistence of “practices and imagery that open the suggestive possibility of unfamiliar, but perhaps fairly direct, links between Japanese *mikkyō* and late tantric developments in India and Central Asia.”<sup>2</sup> As in Japan, in China esoteric Buddhism and the Buddhist tantras had significant and long-lasting impact, particularly during the Tang, but also under the Yuan and following dynasties. The Tang transmission predates the rise to prominence of the cemetery cult, and transmissions following Kublai's conquest of the Song in 1279 rely heavily on imports from Tibet. But during the Song we are faced with the obverse of the Japanese situation explored by Sanford. Translations of the later tantras characterized by the cult of the cemetery (*śmaśāna*, 寒林; *śītavana*, 尸陀林) were produced under imperial patronage. Yet, even though such texts were translated, the prevailing scholarly opinion is that they had no impact in China and disappeared with little trace.<sup>3</sup> Examining evidence in Song catalogues, the diary of the Japanese pilgrim Jōjin, and still extant sculpture from both the Northern and the Southern Song, I argue that the scriptures translated under imperial patronage in the Northern Song did have an impact in China. Indeed, I will show that while some of the translated scriptures were officially logged into the canon and put into circulation, other translations were kept “off the books” and, contrary to prevailing scholarly opinion, there is evidence for the impact of *both* sorts of scriptures.<sup>4</sup>

## COLLECTING

We begin with what was at once a truly visionary and a truly grandiose undertaking at the beginning of the Northern Song (960–1127). After a hiatus of more than a century and a half, the newly ensconced Song regime renewed efforts to translate Buddhist texts into Chinese.<sup>5</sup> Supported by an immense infusion of imperial prestige, cash, and institutional infrastructure, four Song emperors pursued what was to be the last major effort of its kind until the modern period. For one hundred years the Institute for Canonical Translation (譯經院, *Yijing yuan*, soon renamed the Institute for the Propagation of the Teaching, *Chuanfa yuan*, 傳法院) turned out new translations of recently imported Indic works.<sup>6</sup>

The acquisition of the Buddhist scriptures was an integral part of a vision of a great continental empire centered on the Song. Apparently seeking to displace India as the font of the dharma on the continent, the first two Song emperors set out to procure, translate, and distribute *all* the Buddha's teachings.<sup>7</sup> Thus Taizu (太祖, r. 960–976) sent missions to South and Central Asia. Initial feelers led to the dispatch of 157 monks to collect texts—texts that would become the fuel for the imperially sponsored translation institute and for the first full *printing* of the Buddhist scriptures. Shortly thereafter the Court received four Indian monks who came to form the core of the translation team. They were Devaśāntika (天息災, from 978 called 法賢, d. 1000), Dānapāla (施護, d. 1018), Dharmadeva (法天, d. 1001), and Fahu (法護).<sup>8</sup> The first two are among the most prolific translators in Chinese history. For the purposes of the translation project the second emperor Taizong (太宗) in 982 constructed a special building comprising three offices and support structures in the western sector of the Taiping xingguo (太平興國) temple.

In addition to translating newly imported scriptures, an imperially authorized dragnet scoured monastery libraries for Sanskrit manuscripts that had not yet been translated.<sup>9</sup> Taking advantage of new technology, the distribution of the newly translated scriptures went beyond hand copying. For the first time the canon would be printed. A special building, the Institute for Printing the Canon (印經院, *Yinjing yuan*), was erected on the same grounds and dedicated to the printing of a complete edition of the Buddhist scriptures and to issuing periodic updates as new translations became available. Referred to as

the Kaibao canon (first edition, Chengdu, 983) after the reign period in which it appeared, it comprised some 130,000 woodblocks.<sup>10</sup>

Although translation by committee was common in Chinese Buddhist history,<sup>11</sup> the circumstances of translation in the *Yijing yuan* were remarkable:

In the Eastern Hall facing West, powder is used to set out an altar to the sages with openings [consisting of] four gates, each with an Indian monk presiding over it and reciting esoteric spells for seven days and nights. Then, a wooden altar is set up and surmounted with a circle having the syllables of the sages and worthies. [This is] called the Mahādharmā Mandala (大法曼荼羅). The sages and worthies are invoked and ablutions are performed using the *agha* [vessel]. Incense, flowers, lamps, water, and fruits are presented as offerings. Bowing and circumambulating [take place]. Prayers for protection from evil are offered in order to extirpate demons and obstructions.<sup>12</sup>

The process of translation itself was highly structured and proceeded in nine stages:

**First**, the *yizhu* (譯主, Chief Translator), [sitting] on the head-seat and facing outwards, expounds the Sanskrit text.

**Second**, the *zhengyi* (證譯, Philological Assistant), sitting on the left of the head-seat, reviews and evaluates the Sanskrit text with the Chief Translator.

**Third**, the *zhengwen* (證文, Text Appraiser), sitting on the right of the head-seat, listens to the oral reading of the Sanskrit text by the Chief Translator in order to check for defects and errors.

**Fourth**, the *shuzi fanxueseng* (書字梵學僧, Transcriber-monk-student of Sanskrit) listens to the Sanskrit text [recited by the Chief Translator] and transcribes it into Chinese characters. This is a transliteration.

**Fifth**, the *bishou* (筆受, Translator Scribe) translates Sanskrit sounds into Chinese language.

**Sixth**, the *zhuiwen* (綴文, Text Composer) links up the characters and turns them into meaningful sentences.

**Seventh**, the *canyi* (參譯, Proofreader) proofreads the words of the two lands so that there are no errors.

**Eighth**, the *kanding* (刊定, Editor) edits and deletes unnecessarily long expressions and fixes the meaning of phrases.

**Ninth**, the *ruwen* (潤文, Stylist) administers the monks and occupies the seat facing south. [He also] participates in giving style [to the translations].<sup>13</sup>

Records of the ongoing work of the Institute are contained in a variety of sources, but none conveys the flavor and atmosphere of the undertaking better than the *Catalogue of the Dharma Treasure Compiled in the Dazhong Xiangfu Period* (大中祥符法寶錄, hereafter *Catalogue of the Dharma Treasure*).<sup>14</sup> The bulk of the work, presented in 1013 and covering the first prolific decades of the Institute, consists of periodic dated reports of translations completed, summaries of contents of the works, names of members of the translation teams, and requests for entry into the canon and circulation. It reads much like any bureaucratic progress report. Indeed, this should be borne in mind as we consider the distinctiveness of this enterprise.

The organizing structure of the official government monastery and more particularly the edifice built for the production of translations reflects Song imperial ambitions. I was prompted to reflect on these situations—particularly with regard to the translation of the tantras—by my reading of anthropologist James Clifford’s *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*.<sup>15</sup> In this book Clifford uses Mary Louise Pratt’s notion of a “contact zone” to explore the function and dynamics of museums and the cultural encounters that sometimes take place there. Pratt’s “contact zone” is a “space of colonial encounters, the space in which peoples geographically and historically separated come into contact with each other and establish ongoing relations, usually involving conditions of coercion, radical inequality, and intractable conflict.”<sup>16</sup> Clifford turns these observations to museums:

When museums are seen as contact zones, their organizing structure as a *collection* becomes an ongoing historical, political, moral *relationship*—a power-charged set of exchanges, of push and pull. The organizing structure of the museum-as-collection functions like Pratt’s frontier. A center and a periphery are assumed: the center a point of gathering, the periphery an area of discovery. The museum,

usually located in a metropolitan city, is the historical destination for the cultural productions it lovingly and authoritatively salvages, cares for, and interprets.<sup>17</sup>

Broadly speaking, official monasteries in the Tang and Song can be seen as vehicles for the domestication and display of the foreign or strange, and they served some of the traditional functions of a museum/library.<sup>18</sup> Much like a modern museum, the Institute was located at the metropolitan center and served as the repository and destination for a collection of manuscripts. The processing of texts at the Institute resembled a production line more than a monastery. Indeed, although the translation process is framed by esoteric ritual it nonetheless looks remarkably like the situations described by Clifford in encounters between Native Americans and museum officials in majority museums.<sup>19</sup> There too, objects in the possession of the museum are brought out and Native American ritual specialists engage in appropriate ritual and interpretive behavior. The presence of esoteric ritual is overshadowed by the entire building and government presence of the *Yijing yuan* itself. This monastery was simultaneously a museum and a factory for the production of the Buddhist dharma, a place for the collection, selection, and translation of texts that were then enshrined in the newly printed Canon and disseminated to official government monastic libraries and given as prestations to other states.<sup>20</sup>

The translations produced at the Institute came from all periods and schools of Buddhism in India, but it is no surprise—given the time period—that much of what was translated in the *Yijing yuan* we today classify as “esoteric.” The range of such texts included major works such as the new full translation of the *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha* (Dānapāla, T. 882), the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* (Devaśāntika, T. 1191), the *Guhyasamāja-tantra* (Dānapāla, T. 885), and the *Hevajra ḍākinī-jala-saṃvara-tantra* (Dharmapāla, T. 892). But it also included substantial ritual manuals for the worship of the likes of Vināyaka (Dharmabhadra, T. 1272) and Mārīcī (Devaśāntika, T. 1257) as well as numerous short *dhāraṇī* texts.<sup>21</sup> In the sheer number of texts produced the Song Institute approached the Tang dynasty output, though on average the length of scriptures translated was shorter.<sup>22</sup> Although both Dharmabhadra and Dānapāla produced numerous short transliterated *dhāraṇī* these account for a fraction of the translation output. With the exception of Dharmapāla, whose efforts were focused mainly on Mahayana texts (though he translated the *Hevajra-tantra*), esoteric texts accounted

for roughly half of the output. Further, while most of these were previously untranslated, a significant portion of the translators' work involved retranslation. The Institute continued to put out translations for another six decades after Dharmadeva, Dānapāla, and Devaśāntika left the scene. Even excluding the shorter *dhāraṇī* texts, over half of the translations of these four monks were of "esoteric" materials—including considerable material related to the *siddha* movement and the cult of the cemetery. How were these texts received? What became of them?

Jan Yün-hua's pioneering "Buddhist Relations between India and Sung China" (1966) argued that the Song translations failed to make an impact and offered a variety of reasons, including Chinese Buddhism's own "sectarian growth," government control of translation, and changes affecting Buddhism elsewhere in Asia—particularly "the rise of Tantrism and the general deterioration of the religion in India and Centra Asia due to the spread of Islam."<sup>23</sup> Building on Jan's work, Tansen Sen has problematized and updated some of these conclusions in "The Revival and Failure of Buddhist Translations during the Song Dynasty."<sup>24</sup> Sen questions the utility of the decline narrative (both for India and for Song China) and focuses on the importance of the Song translations in state-to-state relations on the continent. On the question of their internal impact Sen argues that "shifting doctrinal interest among the members of the Chinese Buddhist community toward indigenous schools and practices rendered most of the new translations and their contents obsolete in China."<sup>25</sup> There is much to recommend this thesis and overall I am in agreement with it, but there are still some unresolved issues. The dismissal of the Song translations as a "failure" begs the question while overlooking important evidence concerning the internal impact of the products of the Institute.

Sen, like Jan, points out that the new Song translations appeared to have stimulated little or no exegetical work, and he argues that the lack of commentary is evidence that the new translations had no impact.<sup>26</sup> Indeed, the issue of commentary is an important albeit complicated one, as commentaries sometimes play a role in lineage formation. Many commentaries in Chinese Buddhism are philosophically or doctrinally oriented expositions of the meaning of a text. Thus, for instance, the great *Commentary on the Mahāvairocana-sūtra* produced by Śubhākarasiṃha and Yixing in the mid-Tang has considerable interest in doctrinal or metaphysical topics and may have been related to efforts at lineage

formation.<sup>27</sup> However, despite the overtly doctrinal opening chapter of the *Mahāvairocana-sūtra*, the scripture and its *Commentary* are deeply enmeshed in the construction of altars and the performance of ritual. During the late Tang the performance of ritual and the production of ritual manuals dominates esoteric Buddhist literature. These manuals, I argue, should be seen as another sort of “commentary,” one that is often overlooked. Further, while I agree that Chinese Buddhism was, by the Song, dominated by its own discourses, we should not lose sight of the fact that many of the texts translated at the Institute were ritual manuals or *dhāraṇīs* intended for recitation and not doctrinal treatises. Holding up typical commentarial activity as an indice of the impact and circulation of Buddhist texts and teachings will skew our vision in favor of a certain kind of intellectual tradition, and this may lead us to miss the impact of esoteric Buddhism in ritual and iconography. To complicate matters further, much commentary on esoteric ritual during the Tang was given orally by the *ācārya*. Ironically, we know of this “secret” oral commentary and of some of its contents because of the written records of it linked with various lineages in Japan.<sup>28</sup> Alas, we are not so fortunate for the Song. What we seem to be lacking in the Song are commentaries on key texts such as the *Guhyasamāja* and the *Hevajra*. It is likely that the lack of such commentaries indicates a lack of *ācāryas* disseminating these teachings. But this does not rule out limited circulation of some texts while others we now deem “important” were ignored. I explore evidence of such circulation below.

The work of the Institute was ostensibly to translate and disseminate the Buddhist teaching—this was, after all, the point of renaming it the Institution for the Propagation of the Teaching. But despite imperial leadership the Institute faced a variety of challenges during its century of operation, including repeated requests by monks at the Institute to shut down the project, calls from members of the court and bureaucracy to shut it down on ideological and financial grounds, a shortage of Sanskrit manuscripts and a shortage of trained Sanskritists.<sup>29</sup> The lack of trained Sanskrit scholars was an issue, though attempts were made to deal with this problem, and while it is true that the period of the most prolific output was during the tenure of Devaśāntika, Dānapāla, and Dharmadeva, Jōjin reports the presence of a number of South Asian and Central Asian monks at the Institute in 1073.

But we should not let these very real difficulties distract us from the question of what, if any, impact the large number of works translated



in the first two decades of the Institute's operation had on Song Buddhism. Both Jan and Sen—following earlier Chinese scholars—also raise the possibility that the new texts were suppressed because they offended Chinese moral sensibilities. I will address this thesis below, but the evidence is scant and equivocal. As Huang Qijiang has shown, successive Northern Song emperors spent a great deal of money and personal prestige on these efforts in the face of mounting criticism from nativistic members of the *Guwen* (“ancient literature”) movement. The printed Chinese translations *certainly* circulated outside of the Song—and new teachings and deities were prominent in Liao and Xixia, and in Tibet and Nanzhao of the time. Indeed, as new translations were produced, new blocks were cut and new scriptures printed and the printed canon and its “updates” figured importantly in state-to-state diplomacy in the late tenth and the first half of the eleventh century.<sup>30</sup> Can we accept that these texts were thoroughly suppressed within the Song borders while being promoted and coveted outside of them? Finally, I argue much of what we call “esoteric Buddhism” found a home in the interstices of already present Chinese Buddhist ideologies and practices and was thus rendered “invisible.”<sup>31</sup>

### NAMING

Before examining these issues in detail it is helpful to consider how modern scholarship understands esoteric Buddhism and how that might differ from Tang and Song understandings of esoteric literature and the religious practices it reflects. Much of the confusion surrounding the topic of esoteric Buddhism stems from a failure to recognize that “esoteric Buddhism” is “the creation of the scholar’s study.”<sup>32</sup> Simply put, the English category esoteric Buddhism came into being in the early twentieth century as a part of the rise of the study of religion, and of Asian religions in particular. It represents a synthesis based upon a wide range of data (South Asian, Central Asian, East Asian) and has its own history and agendas that are distinct from various traditional discourses involving *mantrayāna*, *vajrayāna*, *mijiao*, *mikkyō*, etc. Contemporary scholarship has often treated “esoteric Buddhism,” “tantric Buddhism,” the fourfold doxology of *kriyā*, *caryā*, *yoga*, and *annutarayoga tantra*, as well as other more specialized terms like *Yoginī tantra* as unproblematic, natural, and universal categories. But all of these terms have specific histories.<sup>33</sup> The term “esoteric Buddhism”



as it is now widely used (let alone “tantric Buddhism”) cannot in any unproblematic way be equated with the terms *mijiao* or *mikkyō*.<sup>34</sup> To understand Song reception of the newly translated works requires not only historical research, but also research guided by an awareness of the indigenous taxonomies of the time. These taxonomies dictated what could be easily seen and assimilated and what posed problems, went unnoticed, or went unreported. In short, the question is whether anyone at the time regarded these texts as distinctive, if so, in what ways, and consequently how their circulation was handled. As we will see, different types of texts were handled in different ways.

Much of what modern scholars now classify as esoteric or tantric Buddhism fell into a variety of other indigenous taxonomies. For example, the eighth-century monk Amoghavajra (不空金剛) labeled his Buddhism variously as “the Yoga of the Five Families” (五部瑜伽), “the Yoga of the Eighteen Assemblies” (十八會瑜伽), “the Great Teaching of Yoga” (瑜伽大教), “the Adamantine Vehicle of Yoga” (瑜伽金剛乘), and even “the Esoteric Wheel of Teaching and Command” (祕密教令輪). But, in his own words, much of what he taught was “Mahayana” and the “Yoga” was in no way incompatible with that teaching.<sup>35</sup> These Tang dynasty distinctions are the foundation for Song taxonomies.

A search for Song understandings of the new works being translated leads us first to Zanning (贊寧, 919–1001).<sup>36</sup> The great exegete and monastic leader, writing in the early Northern Song in his *Lives of Eminent Monks Composed in the Song* (宋高僧傳, *Song gaoseng zhuan*), distinguished three kinds of Buddhist teaching, Exoteric (顯教, which he characterizes as “the Vinaya, Sutra, and Abhidharma of all the vehicles”), Esoteric (密教, “which is the method of Yoga: the *abhiṣeka* of the five divisions, the *homa*, the three secrets, and the methods for the mandala”), and Mind (心教, “which is the method of Chan”). He associates the esoteric teaching with the Tang masters Vajrabodhi (金剛智) and Amoghavajra and places them in a taxonomy of “wheels,” calling this one the “Wheel of Instruction and Command” (教令輪, *jiaoling lun*). Elsewhere, in the “Transmission of the Esoteric Basket” (傳密藏, *Chuan mi zang*) found in *Outline of Clerical History* (大宋僧史略, *Da Song Seng shi lue*, T. 2126, commissioned in 998), Zanning presents another taxonomy based on the technology of *dhāraṇīs*, the use of powder mandalas, and Amoghavajra’s introduction of altars for *abhiṣeka* (灌頂).<sup>37</sup>

Despite Zanning's enthusiastic promotion of and intimate connection with the efforts of the Song to translate newly imported Buddhist scriptures, I find in his work no mention of any of these new scriptures being distinctive. Indeed, Zanning's pronouncements appear to be entirely retrospective. While Zanning's "wheel" scheme is innovative his interest in *dhāraṇī* technology and in the taxonomic use of *Mijiao* and *Xianjiao* appear to be in the mainstream. Such *xian/mi* (顯/密, i.e., esoteric/exoteric) distinctions are also found in the work of the eleventh-century Liao dynasty (遼) cleric Daoshen (道殷), who promoted Huayan/*Mijiao* syntheses during the reign of the emperor Daozong (道宗, 1055–1101). Daoshen's *Xianmi yuantong chengfo xinyao ji* (顯密圓通成佛心要集) clearly demonstrates the currency of the *xian/mi* binary distinction during the eleventh century.<sup>38</sup>

Perhaps most helpful in this regard are the records produced by the officials of the Institute for Canonical Translation itself in the *Catalogue of the Dharma Treasure*. Despite recent scholarly wrangling concerning the term "esoteric Buddhism," the bibliographical taxonomy of the *Catalogue of the Dharma Treasure* is stunningly simple. All texts are classified as either Mahayana or Hinayana, sutra, *vinaya*, or *śāstra*. Each entry reports out a title, its classification, where it was preached, and a summary of its contents. All texts are classified as belonging to the "Hinayana Scriptural Collection" (小乘經藏), "Mahayana Scriptural Collection" (大乘經藏), or "esoteric portion of the Mahayana Scriptural Collection" (大乘經藏秘密部).<sup>39</sup> There are also occasional uses of other subsidiary classifiers, such as "Yoga" (瑜伽), "Lineage/School of the Five Secrets" (五密宗), and even the "Section on Subjugation" (降伏部).<sup>40</sup> Contrary to some scholars who have questioned the existence of "esoteric" (秘密) as a category in Song Buddhism, this evidence makes it plain that "esoteric" was a well-understood and frequently employed taxonomic term and a distinct subdivision within the Mahayana. What's more, when we examine what the *Catalogue of the Dharma Treasure* dumps into the "esoteric" box we find there everything from simple *dhāraṇī* texts to the *Guhyasamāja*. Apparently the compilers of the *Catalogue of the Dharma Treasure* regarded all *dhāraṇī* as "esoteric."

While this information allows us to see certain continuities between the Tang and the Song, it gives us little purchase on Song perceptions of some of the more provocative texts being rendered into Chinese. Doxological categories that would signal the distinctiveness of the cult of the cremation ground, of texts of the *Anuttarayogatantra* or *Yoginī*

tantra, are almost entirely absent. Of course the term *yoginī* (明妃 or 瑜疑尼<sup>41</sup>) appears frequently in a range of material dating back to the *Mahāvairocana-tantra*, but it is not used as a taxonomic category. Further, I have thus far found only a single instance of the term “Highest Yoga” (無上瑜伽, *Anuttarayoga*) in the canon.<sup>42</sup> This occurs in the *Scripture on Safeguarding the Great-thousand Kingdoms* (*Shouhu da qian guo tu jing*, 守護大千國土經, *Mahāsahasrapramardana-sūtra*, T. 999) translated by Dānapāla in 983. I say more about this scripture below. The *Catalogue of the Dharma Treasure* records Dānapāla’s 1002 translation of the *Guhyasamāja-tantra* (佛說一切如來金剛三業最上祕密大教王經, T. 885) and summarizes its contents. But aside from a mention of *yoginī* (明妃) it says nothing about its iconography.<sup>43</sup> Also dutifully catalogued is Devaśāntika’s 986–987 translation of the *Great Mārīcī Bodhisattva Sūtra* (大摩里支菩薩經, T. 1257). It contains considerable cemetery imagery, but even in this case the *Catalogue of the Dharma Treasure* mentions nothing out of the ordinary.<sup>44</sup>

One indication that someone noted that some of the texts were distinctive appears in the *Chronicle of the Buddhas and Patriarchs* (*Fo zu tong ji*, 佛祖統記, compiled by Zhipan, 志磐, in 1269).<sup>45</sup> It claims to quote an imperial edict of 1017 that begins by defending translation subsidies, but continues with a warning that care must be taken else the “heterodox and orthodox” would get mixed up. It then states that “blood sacrifices are inimical to the True Vehicle and foul curses are contrary to the exquisite principle. This newly translated *Vināyaka-sūtra* in four *juan* is not permitted to be entered into the canon. From now on this [sort of] scripture will not be translated” (T. 2035 49.405c26–406a2).<sup>46</sup> Jan, Sen, and others have cited Zhipan’s comment as evidence that the later tantras offended Chinese sensibilities and were therefore suppressed. But we cannot assume that our own or even later Chinese attitudes and mores concerning what is or is not transgressive apply during the Song. Sex could be found in certain Buddhist ritual texts from at least the Tang (and this does not even broach the subject of sexuality in Daoist ritual), and though it is clear that certain passages were rendered obliquely, such obfuscation also occurred in South Asia and is one way to render passages meant for initiates.<sup>47</sup> So, too, ritual violence and its iconographic representation is not unknown in esoteric texts and practices, as is evident from the use of *homas* of subjugation.<sup>48</sup> Transgression, in short, is a “cultural system.”<sup>49</sup> Whether we take Zhipan’s comment as a genuine report of

the eleventh century (I have been unable to locate notice of such a proscription in contemporary sources) rather than of Zhipan's own time and concerns, it is nonetheless witness to familiarity with and rejection of certain of the texts produced at the Institute.<sup>50</sup>

But exactly what was so alarming? The objections cited here pertain to "blood sacrifices" (葷血之祀, literally "sacrifices of flesh and blood") and to "curses" (厭詛之辭, literally "abominable curses"), which are judged to be contrary to the "True Vehicle" (真乘) and to its "exquisite principle" (尤乖於妙理).<sup>51</sup> It seems likely that these are objections to common elements of the cemetery cult. And even this was not new. Elements of cemetery practice including the use of human bones in ferocious *homa* offerings and the revival of corpses dates at least as early as Śubhākarasimha's (善無畏, Shanwuwei, 637–735) 726 translation of the *Subāhuparipṛcchā* (蘇婆呼童子請問經).<sup>52</sup> However, unlike earlier translations where the import of the passages appear to have been rendered discretely, some Song translations were transparent and seem to revel in gory cemetery sorcery.<sup>53</sup>

In this regard the *Catalogue of the Dharma Treasure* may be as interesting for what it does not record as for what it does record. As the official gateway to the canon, the *Catalogue of the Dharma Treasure* took careful account of the work of the Institute between 983 and 1013. The precision of its entries coupled with records of canons produced from the Song printings in Liao, Korea, and elsewhere and the attribution of translators of texts highlights certain glaring omissions. The omissions include texts such as Devaśāntika's translation of the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* (大方廣菩薩藏文殊師利根本儀軌經, T. 1191 translated between 983 and 1000), and Dharmabhadra's translation of a text dedicated to Vajrabhairava (T. 1242 translated between 989 and 999 quoted at the head of this essay). Both should have appeared in the reports but do not. Intriguingly a four-volume text dedicated to Vināyaka (金剛薩埵說頻那夜迦天成就儀軌經, T. 1272) that might be the one cited in the *Chronicle* "proscription" was translated by Dharmabhadra sometime between 989 and 999, but it, too, is notably absent from the *Catalogue of the Dharma Treasure*. What are we to make of the omissions? Are these silences evidence that texts not mentioned in the *Catalogue of the Dharma Treasure* circulated only outside of the Song boundaries? How could such a prohibition be policed? Are they mere oversights, or does their omission reflect official suppression? Or perhaps the silence about their production should alert us to the fact that the distinctive

character of some of these texts was noted and resulted in their being given special attention.

### CONTROLLING

Although there was mounting opposition to the grand vision of the early Song emperors, the Institute remained in operation for a century. We are afforded a unique glimpse of the Institute for the Propagation of the Dharma near the end of its existence by the Japanese Tendai monk Jōjin (成尋, 1011–1081), who documented his journey to Tiantaishan and Wutaishan in 1072–1073 in *San Tendai Godai san ki* (參天台五臺山記).<sup>54</sup> Forced to take a route through the capital Bianliang (汴梁) to procure travel clearance for his pilgrimage to Wutaishan, Jōjin spent considerable time at the Institute and his record preserves information concerning the new translations and xylographic texts produced there.<sup>55</sup> Jōjin was well qualified to appreciate what he encountered as he had undergone esoteric initiations, and his diary includes, for instance, a discussion of the difference between rainmaking techniques transmitted through the lineage of Kūkai and that transmitted through Fachuan (and thus learned by Jōjin). While at the Institute Jōjin spent time with Tibetan, South Asian, and Central Asian monks examining recently translated scriptures, some Mahayana, some esoteric, and also discussing points in Sanskrit texts. Further, one can still feel the excitement he records when he unwraps and examines newly translated and printed volumes from the Institute.

The picture that emerges from Jōjin's account is a mixed one. Almost all of the texts mentioned by Jōjin were translated in the early Northern Song under the auspices of the Institute for Canonical Translation. About half of these are Mahayana or Mainstream Buddhist texts (the latter designated 小乘 or Hinayana in the terms used in the *Catalogue of the Dharma Treasure*), while half are loosely "esoteric" (designated 大乘秘密部). Most of the esoteric texts Jōjin mentions are short *dhāraṇīs*. However, T. 892 (佛說大悲空智金剛大教王儀軌) is the *Hevajra ḍākinījālasaṃvara-tantra* (translated by Dharmapāla in five *juan*, 1054–1055 CE, T. 892).<sup>56</sup>

Jōjin's diary discusses interesting temples, iconography, deities, altars, and so forth. Along with the humdrum temples with sixteen arhats, Kṣitigarbha, the Ten Kings, and so on, Jōjin mentions temples connected with eight *vidyārājas* and even individual deities such

as Trailokyavijaya. But the most striking account—and from the perspective of this inquiry the most important—describes a group of pavilions just beyond the Longru dian (隆儒殿) on the imperial palace grounds. Jōjin's morning visit to the complex was cut short and he made a special arrangement to return that afternoon. He observed that

all [the palaces] are elevated on stone mounds like mountains. Permission [to enter] is dependent on official authorization. Persons lacking such are stopped. . . . When one arrives at the environs of the imperial hall those lacking permits are stopped. All the great masters were individually screened. . . . The imperial palace hall is on the south side and not easily seen. Its halls and towers all have imperial thrones, day beds, etc. Each one has a guard. Who can venture to tell how many people are within the palace [compound]? Right in the middle is the Shangzao (賞棗) palace with unimaginably opulent paintings. Finally we saw Dalun mingwang (大輪明王, Mahācakra Vidyārāja). A snake coiled around each of his two forearms. His right hand grasped a cudgel and the cudgel was surmounted by a skull. A snake was coiled around the cudgel and the skull. On the buddha's uṣṇīṣa was a transformation buddha."

Jōjin then describes Dali mingwang (大力明王). "The left and right of its terrifying three faces were red, while its primary body was black. On the top of its central face was a transformation buddha. There were two snakes, one coiled around his forearm."<sup>57</sup>

The first of these deities is a form of Vajrapāṇi (Mahācakra Vajrapāṇi) drawn from the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* (大方廣菩薩藏文殊師利根本儀軌經, T. 1191) translated by Devaśāntika sometime between 983 and 1000.<sup>58</sup> The second image is likely from the *Mahābala-sūtra* (佛說出生一切如來法眼遍照大力明王經, T. 1243) translated by Dharmapāla in 983. Asked whether there such deities are found in Japan Jōjin replied, "there are no [such images]."<sup>59</sup>

It is abundantly clear that the Institute was still a going concern during Jōjin's visit in 1073 with a contingent of foreign and indigenous monks on hand. Jōjin's description of the temple cited above should give us pause concerning the argument that the newly translated tantras were not instantiated in practice and remained hidden in a few scriptural repositories. At least one very elaborate temple on the palace grounds testifies to more than a textual existence. But I also call attention to the fact that access to *temples* in the capital enshrining deities connected with cemetery imagery was highly



restricted. Although some of the texts containing the trappings of the cemetery cult were included in the canon and sent both abroad and to major government monastic institutions, it appears that the active engagement of some of this material was reserved for a small number of initiates in the upper circles of the Song court. This would explain the fact that key texts were rendered and printed *but not reported out* in the normal workings of the Institute bureaucracy. In short, these were “off the books.” It would also explain what was obviously a well funded and carefully guarded temple complex on the imperial grounds replete with the trappings of iconography drawn from the later tantras. This pattern of controlled access is not extraordinary with regard to the tantras in South Asia, and Kublai put in place similar forms of controlled access when he came to power.

#### APPROPRIATING

But the life of a cult depends upon integration into a network of human social relations.<sup>60</sup> What of the “life” of those texts like that dedicated to Mārīcī that were “officially” printed, enshrined in the canon, and distributed—those texts with elements of the later tantras that were “on the books”? Is there any sign of *their* circulation and impact? In short, yes, there is. While there were certainly teachers with coteries of disciples at various points in time transmitting traditions that would have been recognized by South Asian *ācāryas*, it may well be that a major but largely unrecognized impact of esoteric Buddhism in China was in the new ways that these transmissions were assimilated to existing forms of Chinese Buddhism and the way that various ideological, iconographic, and ritual elements were incorporated into other traditions or took on a life of their own.<sup>61</sup> For instance, the *Kāraṇḍavyūha-sūtra* (大乘莊嚴寶王經, T. 1050 *Dacheng zhuangyan baowang jing*) translated by Devaśāntika (天息災) in 983 and the source of Avalokiteśvara’s famous mantra *oṃ maṇi padme hūṃ* gained wide influence in China.<sup>62</sup> Jōjin mentions looking at the Sanskrit manuscript of this text.<sup>63</sup> So, too, we find a cult to the goddess Cunti as the summation of the esoteric tradition promoted by the Liao cleric and Mi/Huayan synthesizer Daoshen.<sup>64</sup> There is also evidence of the spread of iconographic imagery from the *Māyājāla-tantra* (佛說瑜伽大教王經, T. 890), a text mentioned by Jōjin, as far afield as in Sichuan, Yunnan, and Dunhuang.<sup>65</sup>



Iconography can sometimes provide clues to the circulation of texts, and the presence and persistence of images of a deity can be an indication of its incorporation in a living cult. For instance, Baodingshan (寶頂山) and Beshan (北山) near the city of Dazu (大足) in Sichuan are among the best known for preserving *in situ* Song sculpture. Esoteric sculpture began to appear in the mid-Tang period (early 700s) in what are now Dazu and Anyue (安岳) in Sichuan.<sup>66</sup> Sculpture of Avalokiteśvara and Hārītī as well as the *vidyārājas* can be dated to the mid-Tang. Toward the end of the Tang the government ceded broad powers to provincial military leaders in an effort to stem the rising tide of chaos and banditry. One of these men was Wei Junjing (韋君靖). Wei had risen from the local militia and was put in charge of a large portion of central Sichuan. Over the next decade Wei commissioned the carving of the cliff-side ringing his Yongchang fortress on what is today called Beishan. The carving he began in 892 continued until 1162. The imagery is a mix of Mahayana and esoteric sculpture—depictions of the Pure Land, images of Avalokiteśvara, and also of protectors including Vaiśravaṇa (dressed in heavy armor of the period) Mahāmāyūrī Vidyārājñī (大孔雀明王), and Māricī (摩里支). Though the fortress is gone Beishan still dominates nearby Dazu city. Across central Sichuan other fortresses soon gained divine protection.

At roughly the same time that General Wei was building his fortress a charismatic lay teacher named Liu Benzun (柳本尊, his name identifies him as an incarnation of Mahāvairocana) was gaining a following not too far away. He was reputed to have focused on the mantra teaching promulgated by Amoghavajra's heirs and to have practiced a variety of austerities including various acts of self-mutilation.<sup>67</sup> His efforts resulted in a reputation for sanctity and for having mastered the supernormal powers. After his death well placed patrons continued to promote his cult.

During the Northern Song—precisely the period of the great translation activities at the court—local elites in Sichuan continued the tradition of monumental sculpture. Indeed, there was an increased pace of building, partly in response to more settled conditions. By the time of the collapse of the Northern Song in 1126 (the Song's old enemy the Liao, 遼, had been overrun by the Juchen *jušen* [?], 女真, in 1125, who in turn toppled the Northern Song), deities and practices classified as “Yoga” or “Esoteric” had been in circulation for at least



Fig. 1. Protectors of the Dharma at Baodingshan. Photo by author.

three centuries. The rump Song state (Southern Song) endured and indeed flourished until finally vanquished by Kublai.

In 1179 a layman named Zhao Zhifeng (趙智風, b. 1159) championed the deeds of Liu Benzun and promoted a synthetic Buddhism heavily colored by Huayan and esoteric influences. His efforts led to the carving of a vast new complex of grottos near Dazu. Over the next seventy years local artisans supported by the local elites produced images and tableau that illustrated popular scriptures and synthesized current Mahayana and esoteric imagery. Prominent among these are sculptures depicting Mahāvairocana, Liu Benzun's austerities, and stunning images of Mahāmāyūrī and other *vidyārājas*.

Although textual studies have formed the basis for the investigation of Buddhism during the Song and earlier periods, evidence from still extant artistic work can provide important clues to the dissemination of texts and practices. For instance, near the present-day entrance to the Baodingshan grotto is a tableau of nine fearsome (and rather comical) "Protectors of the Dharma" (figure 1). The same set of nine are also found at nearby Longtuoshan where they are identified with the inscribed title of the *Scripture for Safe-guarding the Great-thousand Kingdoms* (T. 999, *Shouhu dachian guotu jing*), translated by Dānapāla

in 983.<sup>68</sup> These images were completed between 1177 and 1249. Their presence demonstrates that texts translated and reported out of the Institute certainly circulated and that some of them apparently gained popular status.

A more intriguing example is the exquisite image of Mārīcī, goddess of the dawn and patroness of the military arts at Beishan (figure 2). This image is dated to the Northern Song period. Although texts concerning Mārīcī had long circulated in China (Amoghavajra translated one) her iconography in these early texts is decidedly vague.<sup>69</sup> The *Catalogue of the Dharma Treasure* records that in 986-987 Devaśāntika headed the team that translated the *Great Mārīcī Bodhisattva sūtra* 大摩里支菩薩經 (T 1257 Sanskrit: *Mārīcīdhāraṇī(sūtra)* which corresponds to an extant Sanskrit manuscript as well as to the description in the *Sādhanaṃālā*).<sup>70</sup> Her iconography there is very specific and corresponds at many points with the image seen here, including her faces, implements, smile, chariot, boar vehicle, and so forth. There is no other easy explanation for this image apart from the circulation of—and in some quarters the popularity of—the text translated by Devaśāntika, a text that contains a range of practices associated with the *śītavana* or cemetery.



Fig. 2. Mārīcī, Beishan. Photo by author.

## NOTES

1. *The Scripture Containing the Buddha's Discourse on the Rites for Contemplation and Siddhi Pertaining to the Wheel of the Auspicious Yoga Tantra of Vajrabhairava*, T. 1242, 佛說妙吉祥瓔珞大教金剛陪囉俎輪觀想成就儀軌經 (trans. by Dharmabhadra between 989 and 999 CE), 203c9. Versions of parts of this essay were presented at the Buddhism Section of the 2006 Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Religion and as a Numata Lecture at The Institute for Buddhist Studies in Berkeley in April 2007. I would like to thank Mary Ellis Gibson and Tony K. Stewart for their suggestions.
2. James H. Sanford, "The Abominable Tachikawa Skull Ritual," *Monumenta Nipponica* 46, no. 1 (1991): 19–20.
3. The prevailing opinion is set out by Jan Yün-hua in a ground-breaking two-part article, "Buddhist Relations between India and Sung China," in *History of Religions* 6, no. 1 (August 1966): 24–42, and vol. 6, no. 2 (November 1966): 135–168. Despite the great detail in the account, the brief conclusion leaves many questions unanswered; see 139–144. Tansen Sen's important reexamination of the Song translation effort clears up many of the unanswered questions, but reiterates much of Jan's position on the internal impact. See "The Revival and Failure of Buddhist Translations During the Song Dynasty," *T'oung Pao* 88 (2002): 27–80.
4. Arguments from silence assuming that the tantras translated by the Song Institute found no audience and had no circulation in China beg the question. Not only were texts containing the panoply of practices connected with the *siddha* movement in India translated during the Song, but there is considerable evidence that some of this material did find an audience, though not the wide audience that many earlier translations found. A more nuanced view, based on a variety of circumstantial evidence (the great expense of these translation projects, their circulation outside of the Song, their distribution within the Song, and their differential treatment in Song reports) as well as direct evidence of their circulation and the evidence gleaned from Jōjin's iconographical descriptions points to a more complex situation with different levels of restricted access and circulation.
5. The last imperially sponsored translator of note was the monk Prāṇjñā 般若, who was active in the Tang court at the beginning of the ninth century. Yoritomi Motohiro's 頼富本宏 *Chūgoku mikkyō no kenkyū* 中国密教の研 (Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, 1979) has an extended treatment of his activities on pp. 5–109.
6. Founded in 982 the Institute was not disbanded until 1082.
7. This did not mean that patronage was limited to Buddhism. Indeed, the Song emperors seemed almost to anticipate the double-facing administration



and rhetorics of later dynasties, on the one hand promoting themselves as continent-wide Buddhist universal monarchs, on the other as great patrons of decidedly Chinese traditions of Daoism and Confucianism. For details see Huang Chi-chang 黃啟江, "Imperial Rulership and Buddhism in the Early Northern Sung," in *Imperial Rulership and Cultural Change in Traditional China*, ed. Frederick P. Brandauer and Chun-Chieh Huang (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1994), 144–187.

8. This Fahu returned to India in short order and is not to be confused with a second monk, Dharmapāla 法護 (963–1058), who translated the *Hevajratantra*. A solid account of the work of these translators was published by Jan in "Buddhist Relations between India and Sung China," 24–42. There is still confusion regarding the identity of two of the translators—specifically whether Faxian was renamed Faxian or whether Tianxizai was renamed Faxian. Jan takes up the issue on pp. 34–37. Although Sen, "The Revival and Failure of Buddhist Translations During the Song Dynasty," 43ff., treats the name confusion as solved, the confusion is early and is still puzzling.

9. As Sen points out ("The Revival and Failure of Buddhist Translations During the Song Dynasty," 41), in 1027 monks at the Institute requested the whole enterprise be closed down for lack of manuscripts. However, we also know that an order promulgated in 992 had required that all foreign monks surrender Indic manuscripts before being allowed a court audience (*Fozu tongji* 401a13–14). But by 1025 we find notice of an edict putting a stop to sending such to the capital (*Song hui yao* 197, fanyi 4: 7717b; 7: 7851a), and *Fozu tongji* (410a14–15) reports that by 1041 there were too many Sanskrit manuscripts. We need to be very careful interpreting these highly political documents.

10. Work on printing had begun in Chengdu in 972, and after completion of the new Institute and the building of the Yinjing yuan on its grounds in 982 work was transferred there. The next year the newly integrated projects were renamed the Institute for the Propagation of the Teaching (Chuanfa yuan, 傳法院). For these developments see *Fozu tongji*, T. 2035 49.398c17–20.

11. For a recent discussion of the process see Daniel Boucher, "Gāndhārī and Early Chinese Buddhist Translations Reconsidered: The Case of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 118, no. 4 (1998): 16–20.

12. I follow Sen's translation of *Fozu tongji*, T. 2035 49.398b2–b8, with minor emendations. The passage contains parenthetical remarks, most of which I left untranslated except for the comment on "vessel."

13. A description of the building and the process of translation can be found in *Fozu tongji*, juan 43–44, T. 2035. My translation follows and summarizes Sen, who presents a fine and full translation in "The Revival and Failure of Buddhist Translations During the Song Dynasty," 35–36. The original is 398b8–18.

14. This catalogue is an essential resource for the study of the period. Issued in 1013, the *Catalogue* was compiled under the leadership of Zhao Anren 趙安仁 (958–1018). It is found in *Zhonghua da zang jing* 中華大藏經, vol. 73 (H1675), pp. 414–523. It is now available in electronic facsimile at <http://www.fjdh.com/booklib/Index.html>.
15. James Clifford, *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997).
16. Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 6–7.
17. Clifford, *Routes*, 192–193.
18. Though museums today are distinguished from libraries, museums previously included libraries and served as repositories of both textual material and artifacts.
19. See esp. *ibid.*, 204–213. For Clifford, “majority museums” are museums constructed by the dominant culture.
20. As Huang notes, Taizong used the establishment of printing at the Institute to “circulate widely the work it had produced.” Indeed, Taizong began the practice of awarding printed canons to revered or important visitors. Such a set was given to the Japanese monk Chōnen 澄然 (938–1016) as well as Korean envoys on behalf of their king. See Huang, “Imperial Rulership and Buddhism in the Early Northern Sung,” 152 and n. 45. These events are related in *Fozu tongji*, T. 2035 49.399a16–400c. Sets of the Canon were requested by the Uigurs, the Vietnamese, and the Xi Xia. The Tanguts requested a sixth set in 1073, the Vietnamese requested another version in 1098–1099, and so on. See Sen, “The Revival and Failure of Buddhist Translations During the Song Dynasty,” 40–41. Both the Khitan and the Korean cut their own canons and were in competition with the Song in these inter-state prestations. On the development of the Canon see Lewis R. Lancaster, “The Rock Cut Canon in China: Findings at Fang-Shan,” in *The Buddhist Heritage*, ed. Tadeusz Skorupski (Tring, UK: The Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1989), 144–156, and Lewis R. Lancaster and Sung-Bae Park, *The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979). This latter with updates is available at [http://www.acmuller.net/descriptive\\_catalogue](http://www.acmuller.net/descriptive_catalogue).
21. Takeuchi Kōzan 武内孝善 has surveyed the evidence and puts the number of esoteric works translated as 123, totaling 228 *juan*, while 44 Mahayana works totaling 169 *juan* were translated. See “Sōdai honyaku kyōten no tokushoku nit suite” 宋代翻譯經典の特色について, *Mikkyō bunka* 密教文化 113 (February 1975): 35. In “The Revival and Failure of Buddhist Translations During the Song Dynasty,” Sen—like Jan—repeats the assertion that “a majority of Song translations are short esoteric *dhāraṇīs* that follow a fixed template” (p. 54). By my count, *excluding* short *dhāraṇī* texts, esoteric texts accounted for over



50 percent of the four major translators' output, and a number of these texts were quite substantial.

22. Sen, in "The Revival and Failure of Buddhist Translations During the Song Dynasty," conveniently summarizes the data on translation output at the Institute between 982 and 1037 found in Song bibliographies as some "two hundred sixty three translations."

23. Jan, "Buddhist Relations between India and Sung China," 139.

24. Sen, in "The Revival and Failure of Buddhist Translations During the Song Dynasty," rightly underscores the centralized and political role of the Institute and its projects, especially as these relate to diplomacy (see esp. pp. 38–43). Huang Chi-chang's "Imperial Rulership and Buddhism in the Early Northern Sung" is especially good on this; see pp. 149–158.

25. Sen, "The Revival and Failure of Buddhist Translations During the Song Dynasty," 31.

26. Though some of the translations did stimulate considerable Imperial preface-writing and some commentary, the newer cemetery texts apparently did not.

27. The Liao dynasty monk Jueyuan 覺苑 (fl. 1055–1100) wrote a sub-commentary on the Śubhākarasiṃha and *Yixing Commentary*. It is in the *Taishō* supplement 新纂續藏經 439.

28. Records purporting to record oral transmissions are found in such collections as the Byakuhōkushō 白寶口抄 (compiled by Ryōson 亮尊, c. 1287, *Taishō* supplement vol. 6), Kakuzenshō 覺禪鈔 (compiled by Kakuzen 覺禪, 1143–ca. 1219, *Taishō* supplement vol. 3), and Bessonzakki 別尊雜記 (compiled by Shinkaku 心覺, 1171–1175, *Taishō* supplement vol. 3).

29. See Sen, "The Revival and Failure of Buddhist Translations During the Song Dynasty," 41. The initial shortage of Indic manuscripts prompted a further scouring of monastic libraries that resulted in a surfeit of texts. For this situation see *Fozu tongji*, T. 2035 49.410a15–17. Soon the problem was a lack of experienced translators.

30. See note 19 above for state-to-state exchanges. Lewis Lancaster has written on the production of various canons and their relationships to each other. Again see note 19 above. For the purposes of this essay, the production of blocks was as follows: The first printing of 983 comprised what are now numbered K1–1087 in the Korean canon. Around the year 1000 a "second Song canon was cut to include texts translated up to that time. These are K1088–1256. Sometime later a third set of blocks was cut for what is now K1257–1407. Finally, around 1083 another set was cut to include the rest of the post-1000 translations, now numbers K1408–1497." Personal communication from Lewis Lancaster, January 2007.

31. I make this argument in "The 'Great Teaching of Yoga,' the Chinese Appropriation of the Tantras, and the Question of Esoteric Buddhism," *Journal of Chinese Religions*, 34 (2006): 68–71.
32. Paraphrasing Jonathan Z. Smith's observation concerning the term "religion": "Religion is solely the creation of the scholar's study." *Imagining Religion: From Babylon to Jonestown* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), xi.
33. See, for instance, Jacob Dalton's recent analysis, "A Crisis of Doxography: How Tibetans Organized Tantra During the 8<sup>th</sup>–12<sup>th</sup> Centuries," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 28 (2005): 115–181.
34. Nor can Chinese *mijiao* simply be equated with Japanese *mikkyō*. What's more, such categories should be distinguished from analytic definitions as, for instance, one that defines esoteric Buddhism as religious systems originating in medieval Indian Samanta feudalism, organized around metaphors of kingship and characterized by transmission through a series of progressively restricted consecrations (*abhiṣeka*) at the hands of an *ācārya*.
35. For a full discussion see Richard K. Payne's introduction to *Tantric Buddhism in East Asia* (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2006), 1–31, and my discussion of Amoghavajra in "The 'Great Teaching of Yoga,'" 45–52.
36. Albert Welter's "A Buddhist Response to the Confucian Revival: Tsan-ning and the Debate Over *Wen* in the Early Sung" sets Zanning in the context of the issues he cared about most and is written with exceptional clarity. It is in Peter Gregory and Daniel Getz, eds., *Buddhism in the Sung* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002), 21–61.
37. I have treated Zanning's "wheel" taxonomy in "The 'Great Teaching of Yoga,'" 61–68. Robert Sharf has a treatment of Zanning's "Transmission of the Esoteric Basket" in "On Esoteric Buddhism," which appears as appendix A of *Coming to Terms with Chinese Buddhism: A Reading of the Treasure Store Treatise* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002), 272–273.
38. T. 1955. The question of whether a viable esoteric/exoteric taxonomy existed in the Song-Liao period has been challenged by Robert Sharf, who briefly examines Daoshen's work in *Coming to Terms*, 273–274. Richard McBride, in "Is There Really 'Esoteric' Buddhism?" *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 27, no. 2 (2004): 329–356 follows Sharf's lead in his suspicions of the esoteric/exoteric taxonomy. However, Robert M. Gimello has recently explored the importance of this distinction in Daoshen's work, decisively refuting readings by Sharf and McBride in "Manifest Mysteries: The Nature of the Exoteric/Esoteric (*Xian* 顯 / *Mi* 密) Distinction in Later Chinese Buddhism," unpublished paper, presented at the American Academy of Religion, Washington, D.C., November 21, 2006. This plus the evidence from

the *Catalogue of the Dharma Treasure* examined below should lay the issue to rest.

39. See, for example, *Zhonghua da zang jing*, volume 73, p. 420, which has all three classifications.

40. *Ibid.*, 456.

41. This second transliterated form occurs only in the *Hevajra*.

42. The term *zuishang yuqie* 最上瑜伽 occurs frequently but does not seem to function doxologically.

43. *Zhonghua da zang jing*, volume 73, p. 472. Indeed, the *Guhyasamāja* is rendered in a way that without a mandala for reference and the explanation of an *ācārya* there is little that would set it apart from previously translated works.

44. The translation was logged in *Catalogue of the Dharma Treasure*, *Zhonghau dazing jing* 73 434a. For a sample of various spells and mundane operations see T. 1257 21.264b. The same catalogue notes the translation of the *Mahādaṇḍa dhāraṇī-sūtra* 大寒林聖難拏陀羅尼經 (T. 1392, translated by Fatian in 984), but this is really a *dhāraṇī* text and the *śmaśāna* (寒林 indicated in the Chinese title) is little more than window dressing.

45. For Zhipan see Jan Yun-hua, “Buddhist Historiography in Sung China,” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 114 (1964): 371–372.

46. A *Vināyaka-sūtra* (T. 1272) in four *juan* is indeed found in the Canon. It was translated by Dharmabhadra.

47. Charles Willemen notes in his translation and study of the Chinese *Hevajratāntra* that Dharmapāla “rendered the Indian original in a very tactful, deliberately abstruse way, but remaining true to the actual proceedings of the Indian original.” Indeed, the translation appears to be a very sophisticated effort that negotiated both the linguistic peculiarities of the original and the moral limitations of the audience. See *The Chinese Hevajratāntra*, *Orientalia Gandensia* VIII (Ghent: Rijksuniversiteit Te Gent, 1983), 29. Secrecy and its opposite—deliberate and flagrant transgressiveness—are well-known tropes in the tantras. As Ronald M. Davidson has observed, secrecy coupled with titillation may have been the most effective strategy for the propagation of a religious system. *Indian Esoteric Buddhism: A Social History of the Tantric Movement* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 245–247.

48. The iconography of the *vidyārājas* and their role in *homas* for subjugation was a prominent selling point of Tang esoteric Buddhism. For this see Orzech, *Politics and Transcendent Wisdom*, 160–162, and chap. 6, “Lords of Light,” 169–205.

49. Though in some cases texts proclaim and perform their own transgressiveness. A good example is the opening scene of the *Buddhakapālayoginī-tantra-rāja*, during which the Buddha dies during intercourse with his consort, scandalizing and confounding the assembled audience. For a discussion of this text see Davidson, *Indian Esoteric Buddhism*, 247–252.

50. Perhaps we should read the *Chronicle* as a reflection of attitudes among some members of the sangha in the late Southern Song, or even as reflecting certain Tiantai positions of the time.

51. The language used here appears nowhere else in the Chinese Buddhist canon, and while I can find neither four-character phrase elsewhere in Chinese literature, both phrases have echos in classical texts.

52. See for instance *T.* 895, *juan* seven from 18.726c29–727c22, or Ratnacinta's late seventh-century translation of the *Scripture of the Amoghapāśa dhāraṇī* 不空罽索陀羅尼自在王咒經, *T.* 20.1097, which includes straightforward instructions for spells for resurrecting corpses to help find buried treasure (425b22) and spells for entering the bedchambers of *asura* women (425c24–426b1).

53. This is certainly the case for the Vajrabhairava text (*T.* 1242) cited at the head of this article. See for instance 21.204a23ff, 207a18ff, etc.

54. It is found in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 大日本佛教全書 (Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai hensan, Fukkokuban, 1978–1983), 15:321–490. The record—replete with daily weather reports—runs to some 169 double pages. Much scholarly interest has focused on the anthology of poems written by Jōjin's mother titled *Jōjin Azari no Haha no Shū* 成尋阿闍梨母集. For a treatment see Robert Borgen's "Jōjin Azari no Haha no Shū, A Poetic Reading," in *The Distant Isle: Studies and Translations of Japanese Literature in Memory of Robert Brower*, ed. Thomas Blenman Hare, Robert Borgen, and Sharalyn Orbaugh (Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 1997), 1–34. Borgen also has a useful introduction to Jōjin's diary in "San Tendai Godai san ki as a Source for the Study of Sung History," *Bulletin of Sung Yuan Studies* 19 (1987): 1–16. Charlotte von Verschuer has an excellent treatment in "Le voyage de Jōjin au mont Tiantai," *T'oung Pao* 77, nos. 1–3 (1991): 1–48.

55. Jōjin's home monastery was Enryakuji 延暦寺 on Mt. Hiei. He arrived in 1072 and sent a cache of printed texts back to Japan in 1073 covering translations made since Chōnen's 涯然 mission in 984. Unfortunately, the list of the texts he sent back to Japan is no longer extant.

56. The translation was presented to the emperor Renzong 仁宗 at the end of Zhihe 至和 1 (February 1054–January 1055). For a valiant effort at trying to identify all of the texts mentioned by Jōjin see Fujiyoshi Masumi, "Jōjin no motarashita higa no tenseki: Nissō bunka kōryū no hitokusari," *Bukkyōshi gaku kenkyū* 23, no. 1 (January 1981): 33–70.

57. *San Tendai Godai san ki*, 137a.

58. T. 1191 is Devaśāntika's translation of the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa*. The deity is described at 876b4–c01. Mention of a similar deity also occurs in T. 1169 and T. 890 translated by Dharmabhadra. T. 890 is Dharmabhadra's translation of the *Māyājālamahātantra*. T. 1243 is the *Mahābala-sūtra*. It is notable that snake iconography also plays a prominent part in the iconography of Kuṇḍali Vidyārāja, who sometimes holds a *cakra*.

59. *San Tendai Godai san ki*, 137a.

60. See Gregory P. Grieve, *Retheorizing Religion in Nepal* (New York: Palgrave, 2006), 92–95.

61. See my discussion of the use of the term “esoteric Buddhism” in “The Great Teaching of Yoga.”

62. The mantra is found at T. 1050 20.61b14 唵(引)麼拏鉢 訥銘(二合)吽(引).

63. *San Tendai Godai san ki*, 118b.

64. For a discussion see the unpublished paper by Robert Gimello, “Manifest Mysteries: The Nature of the Exoteric/Esoteric (Xian 顯 / Mi 密) Distinction in Later Chinese Buddhism,” presented at the American Academy of Religion, November 2006. The relevant texts are *Foshuo qijudi fomuxin da zhunti tuoluoni jing* (T. 1007), translated in 685 or 686; *Foshuo qijudi fomu zhunti daming tuoluoni jing* (T. 1075), translated in 723; *Qijudi fomu suoshuo zhunti tuoluoni jing* (T. 1077), translated between 742 and 774; and *Qifo judi fomu xin da zhunti tuoluoni fa* (T. 1078) and *Qijudi dubu fa* (T. 1079)—two different redactions of the same work by Śubhākarasiṃha.

65. The translation is by Dharmabhadra, was executed between 889 and 899, and is noted by Jōjin in *San Tendai Godai san ki*, 153b. *Foshuo yuqie dajiaowang jing*. See the discussion in Gimello, “Manifest Mysteries,” 4.

66. English sources for Buddhist sculpture in Sichuan are limited, but see Angela Falco Howard, *Summit of Treasures: Buddhist Cave Art of Dazu, China* (Trumbull, CT: Weatherhill, 2001). Sources in Chinese, in turn are many, but a good place to start is Chen Mingguan's *Dazu shike kaocha yu yanjiu*, *Zhongguo sanxia chubanshe*, 2001.

67. For Liu Benzun see Howard, *Summit of Treasures*, 100–103 and 170–177, and Chen Mingguan, “Sichuan moyai zao xiang ‘Tang yuqie bu zhu zong te wang’ Liu Benzun hua dao ‘shi lian tu’ diaocha bao ji caiyi,” in *Dazu shike kaocha yu yanjiu* (Chongqing: Congqing chubanshe, 2001), 205–237.

68. See Howard, *Summit of Treasures*, 90–91.

69. The texts include the Liang period T. 1256, three Tang texts attributed to Amoghavajra (T. 1254, 1255, and 1258), and the section of Atigupta's *dharanī*

collection (T. 901, 869–874). For a treatment of these earlier texts see David Avalon Hall, “Marishiten: Buddhism and the Warrior Goddess” (PhD diss., University of California at Berkeley, 1990), chaps. 3 and 4.

70. The extant Sanskrit is *Māyāmarīcījātatantrād uddhṛtakalparājaccīmaṇḍalav idhimarīcījātdvādaśasahasrād uddhṛtakalpahrdayasaptaśata*. See “Taishō Index to the Descriptive Catalogue of the Korean Canon” at [http://www.hm.tyg.jp/~acmuller/descriptive\\_catalogue/indexes/index-taisho.html](http://www.hm.tyg.jp/~acmuller/descriptive_catalogue/indexes/index-taisho.html). Mārīcī’s iconography is discussed in Benoytosh Bhattacharyya, *The Indian Buddhist Iconography: Mainly Based on the Sādhnamālā and Other Cognate Tāntric Texts of Rituals* (New Delhi: Asian Educational Services, 1993; repr. of Oxford University Press, 1924), 93–100.