

The Changes in the system of the Imperial Ancestral Shrines (Zongmiao 宗廟) during the Late Former Han Period

MEGURO Kyoko

This paper clarified the changing process of the system of the Imperial Ancestral Shrines during the Late Former Han Period, and pointed out the origin of the system in the Latter Han dynasty.

Until the reign of yuan-di (元帝), the Ancestral Shrines of the emperors and their relatives' fathers were set apart in the metropolitan area, and no Confucian order was given to them. In the reign of yuan-di and cheng-di (成帝), by giving Confucian-based titles (昭・穆) to the ancestral shrines of the emperors, the system was reformed to clarify the order of succession to the throne. As a result, it was decided that the ancestral shrines of Gao-su (高祖) and Tai-zong (太宗) should be preserved permanently, and that only the ancestral shrines of the five emperors who were closely related to the current emperor should be given titles and preserved. The absolute standard at this time was the kinship distance—「親」.

In the next reign of Ai-di (哀帝) and Ping-di (平帝), as a result of discussions that began with the question of how to deal with Wu-di's Ancestral Shrine (孝武廟), a theory that emphasizes the achievements of the emperor as a standard was introduced into the system of the Ancestral Shrines. In other words, all the ancestral shrines of the emperors who made great achievements were given the title of zong (宗) and preserved permanently, and the number of ancestral shrines with the title of zong was not limited. Changes at this time are one of the origins of the system of the Imperial Ancestral Shrines in the Latter Han dynasty.

When the Xin dynasty began with the destruction of the Former Han dynasty, Wang Mang (王莽) adopted a method of temporarily gathering his ancestors in Ming-tang (明堂) of the Former Han dynasty and enshrining them without building a new central ancestral shrine at first.

This is considered to be another source of the system of the Ancestral Shrines system of the Latter Han dynasty.

The Emperors who accepted Bodhisattva Precepts in the Decadent Age : On the Royal Authority and Buddhism in the Chen Dynasty

KOGACHI Ryuichi

To examine the theory of royal authority in the medieval China, the element of religion cannot be ignored. The extreme manifestation of an emperor's belief in Buddhism is seen in the case of Liang Wu-di 梁武帝. He received the Bodhisattva precepts, a new and emerging precept, and became a follower of Buddhism, even more gave himself a servant of a Buddhist temple. These actions of Wu-di show important links of the royal authority to Buddhism.

The worship of Buddhism by the emperor cannot be seen as a matter of his personal and specific faith alone. Before Wu-di, Xiao-wu-di of the Song Dynasty had already received the Bodhisattva precept. It is therefore necessary to consider the continuity from Song and Southern Qi. Furthermore, after Wu-di, the emperors of Chen, Sui and Tang also received the Bodhisattva precepts, as did Wu-di.

This article discusses how the emperors of Chen dynasty adopted the Bodhisattva precepts, and the meaning of their *sheshen* (捨身, sacrificing body). Their actions clearly followed those of Liang Wu-di. However, from a microscopic point of view, the actions of the Chen emperors are different from that of Liang Wu. In some cases, the Chen emperors sacrificed their body in the Great Hall of the Imperial Palace instead of doing so in a temple. In the larger historical context, the Northern Zhou and Sui dynasties were growing in the north, and Chen was losing their ruling power. Under such circumstance, the meaning of sacrificing was naturally different from those in Liang. In order to understand such sacrificing body of the emperors in Chen, I analyze some documents and discuss the meaning of the emperor's sacrificing, thereby examine the relationship between the royal authority and Buddhism in the last Southern Dynasty.

The Rump of “Byeokpa” in the Late Joseon Dynasty

YAGI Takeshi

The rule of the Joseon court by “Byeokpa,” a faction of Gyeongju Gim clan, collapsed with the death of Grand Queen Dowager Gim. However, the lasting power of “Byeokpa” cannot be neglected in the political history of the 19th Joseon dynasty.

In 1801, Gwon Yu, the Censor General, issued a memorandum to King Sunjo, wherein he indirectly offended Gim Josun of Andong Gim clan, whose daughter was engaged to King Sunjo. Gwon Yu was regarded as a member of “Byeokpa,” and he allegedly obstructed the royal marriage with a family of “Sipa,” a faction of Andong Gim clan. Gwon Yu was charged with high treason and died in the middle of the prison examination.

In 1805, Grand Queen Dowager Gim died, which was the funeral bell for “Byeokpa.” Key members of “Byeokpa” were punished and killed the following year, while “Sipa” monopolized the political scene for a while.

However, the Crown Prince’s Regency under King Sunjo in 1827 changed the situation. The disgruntled gathered around the Crown Prince and plotted to deprive “Sipa” of their powers. The memorandum issued by Sim Uihak to the Crown Prince was allegedly a plot by the rump of “Byeokpa.” Sim was beheaded in 1829 under the name of an offense to the sovereign, and the parties involved were punished.

The Crown Prince died in 1830, and suddenly, the inner circle around him lost their positions. They were accused as the rump of “Byeokpa.” A key member among them was Gim Nogyeong of Gyeongju Gim clan, who was the father of Gim Jeonghui, a famous scholar and artist.

Subsequently, Gim Jeonghui appealed the innocence of his father and was sent in exile to the frontier in 1840. The Gyeongju Gim clan, to which the father and son belonged, maintained a hostile relationship with the Andong Gim clan; thus, they were targeted as the rump of “Byeokpa” and removed from the political scene of the Joseon court.

Did they really belong to “Byeokpa?” We do not really know. However, we are sure that they were the victims of factional conflicts, and the “Sipa” oppressed all kinds of anti-

“Sipa” movements under the name of the rump of “Byeokpa.”

Originally, Andong Gim clan was one of the representative families who were respected and supported by the society of scholar-officials. However, the long-termed monopoly of the political scene by Andong Gim clan in the 19th Jeoson dynasty suppressed the variety of opinions, traditionally regarded as the source of the vitality of politics in Korea.

The Tōhō Gakuhō Journal of Oriental Studies (Kyoto) No. 95 (2020) 189~226

A Critical Edition and an Annotated Japanese Translation
of the *Life of the Nun Jingxiu of the Grove of Meditation Monastery*
in the *Southern Qi Dynasty* Compiled by Shen Yue

by the Collaborative Research Project
“Buddhist Sutras and Doctrines for Chinese Laity”

This is a critical edition and an annotated Japanese translation of the *Life of the Nun Jingxiu of the Grove of Meditation Monastery* (*Chanlin si ni Jingxiu xingzhuang* 禪林寺尼淨秀行狀) Compiled by Shen Yue 沈約 (441–513 CE) included in the fascicle 23 of the *Expanded Collection of the Propagation of Light* (*Guang hongming ji* 廣弘明集) compiled by Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667 CE). The critical edition of the original Chinese text is made through a close examination of black-and-white graphs of the six kinds of woodblock Chinese Buddhist Canons. It is noteworthy that the number of typographical errors of the text in question in the Taisho Canon are as many as thirty-seven for only two pages of the Taisho Canon. It is a part of the research report of the the Collaborative Research Project “Buddhist Sutras and Doctrines for Chinese Laity” conducted during April 2016 and March 2020.

The Year of Śākyamuni's Death : Correlative Analysis of Historical Information on Śākyamuni, King Aśoka and King Kanishka

SOTOMURA Ataru

Regarding the chronology of Early Buddhism, many researchers have been discussing which to take, the “long” or the “short” chronology, in order to pinpoint the year of Śākyamuni's death. In this article, the author advocates the possibility to accept both chronologies, because they were apparently based on and developed from the same original information. It appears that the history of “118 years” after the death of Śākyamuni was intentionally extended to that of “236 (=118 x 2) years” in the long chronology, and that in it the year of Aśoka's accession was accordingly set as the 219th year, when “218 (=118+100) years” had elapsed. This point seems to have been overlooked in previous studies, but should be taken into account.

(1) The year of Aśoka's accession is around 268 BCE. (2) The year of Kanishka's accession, or the 1st year of a Kuṣāṇa century, is around 127 CE. (3) Xuanzang's narrative about King Kanishka is reliable. If these three points can be accepted, the above “236 (=118 x 2) years” theory should be adopted as the most likely explanation. As a result, the chronology can be read as following: The year of Śākyamuni's death is around 368 BCE. The date of his death is the autumnal equinox day, the 22nd day of the eighth month of the year in the Indian calendar. Around 268 BCE, the 101st year, when “100 years” had elapsed since Śākyamuni's death, Aśoka acceded to the throne. In the same year, Mahādeva started five modifications of the Buddhist teachings. Around 258 BCE, the 111th year, when “110 years” had elapsed, a group of monks in Vaishālī started ten unlawful matters. Around 252 BCE, the 117th year, when “116 years” had elapsed, the fundamental schism took place. The original Buddhist group was split into two, the Sthaviravāda and the Mahāsāṃghika schools. Around 250 BCE, the 119th year, when “118 years” had elapsed, Mahinda arrived in Sri Lanka and introduced Buddhism. In the same year, the Vibhajjavāda school separated from the Sthaviravāda school.

Chinese Buddhist Phonetic Transcriptions during
the Liang Dynasty Depicted in the Fragmentary Quotations of
the *Chu yao lü yi*

FUNAYAMA Toru

This is the world's first attempt to explore the significance of the lost Chinese Buddhist text entitled *Chu yao lü yi* 出要律儀 “Clarification of the Essence of Regulations in the Buddhist Monastic Code,” by exhaustively collecting its fragmentary quotations in later times (ninety-five passages in all) accompanied by Japanese translation and philological notes, and by comprehensive evaluation of the *Chu yao lü yi* as well. The present article has reached the following conclusions :

The *Chu yao lü yi* was compiled in the early sixth century in the Liang dynasty 梁, and immediately cited in the fascicle three of the *Fan fanyü* 翻梵語 “Translations of Indic Terms” arguably ascribed to the monk Baochang 寶唱 (d. u.) in the Liang. The *Chu yao lü yi* was most probably consists of the two sections ; namely, literal quotations of the Chinese Buddhist translations of the monastic code (*vinaya*) as Major Section and the explanation of Buddhist terms which is called “*Yin yi* 音義 (Pronunciations and Meanings of Words)” as Minor Section. All the fragmentary quotations recorded in the present article belong to the “*Yin yi*” section.

The *Yin yi* section includes five kinds of information : 1 entry word ; 2 old translations and phonetic transcription prior to Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什 (ca. 350–409) ; 3 explanation by “specialist of monastic code (*chi lü zhe* 持律者)” ; 4 explanation by “linguist (*sheng lun zhe* 聲論者, i. e., Chinese scholar-monk on the Sanskrit)” ; and explanation by “foreign monk (*hu seng* 胡僧).” It is noteworthy that phonetic transcriptions of Sanskrit words shown by the linguist are sometimes incorrect.

The *Yin yi* section is highly valued as the linguistic explanation of Buddhist terms in the early sixth century prior to what is called *Yiqie jing yin yi* 一切經音義 “Pronunciations and Meanings [of Buddhist terms] in the Whole Canon” such as that of Xuan'ying 玄應 (the mid-sixth century). The *Yin yi* of the *Chu yao lü yi* are not free from ambiguity about

the exact correspondence between Sanskrit and Chinese phonemes, and about the distinction between short and long vowels in Sanskrit, as well as other points. Further, the text is not equipped with systematic treatment regarding the notation of Skt. consonant cluster such as *pra-*, *-tra*, and *sma*.

It is indeed true that the linguistic aspect of the *Chu yao lü yi* is far from satisfactory, but the composition of the *Yin yi* in a transitional period brought Chinese Buddhist linguistics to the ground-breaking production of comprehensive *Yin yi* texts called *Yiqie jing yin yi* in the late sixth century and thereafter.

The Tōhō Gakuhō Journal of Oriental Studies (Kyoto) No. 95 (2020) 400~375

A New Probe into Kitaoni Saburo's *The Draft of Constitution of Great Qing*

PENG Jian

After the publication in 1909, *The Draft of Constitution of Great Qing* received little response in Japan, while great attention in China, among both the folk and the government. The evidence has shown that the establishment of the constitution in the late Qing Dynasty as well as the early Republic of China had both referred to this book. The constitutional plan, a separation of legislative, judicial, administrative and supervisory powers, was supplied in the book, which was similar to that of Sun Yat-sen. Kitaoni Saburo, the author of the book, was born in Toyama County, Japan, who got his bachelor of law degree in 1904, completed the first draft of the book in early 1908, and finished the manuscript of *Explanation about The Draft of Constitution of Great Qing* in the autumn of the same year. Some notable changes could be found from the first draft to the manuscript and then to the official publication. Although Kitaoni claimed that the target of this book was purely for academic research, he seemed meant to be drawing the attention of China's top executives from the existence of the Explanation itself, especially the statement—"respect" to some "lord" in the introduction. After publishing the book, Kitaoni also wrote several articles, including some continuous concern of the book.

Keywords: *The Draft of Constitution of Great Qing*; *Explanation about The Draft of Constitution of Great Qing*; The preparation for constitutionalism ; Kitaoni Saburo ; Wang RongBao ; Sun Yat-sen ; Duchayuan ; Supervisory Power