

# On the Emendation of the *Datang Xiyuji* during Gaozong's Reign

An Examination Based on Ancient Japanese Manuscripts

TAKATA TOKIO

## Introduction

The Buddhist monk Xuanzang 玄奘 returned to Chang'an in the spring of the nineteenth year of the Zhenguan 貞觀 period (645), after spending 17 years in India. On his arrival, he was taken immediately for an audience with the Emperor Taizong 太宗 (r. 626–649) in Luoyang. Taizong was so impressed by Xuanzang's journey that he commended him highly, rewarded him with treats and requested that he write a detailed account of India and Central Asia, based on his personal experiences and knowledge.<sup>1</sup> By the next year, the twentieth year of the Zhenguan period (646), Xuanzang had completed his account, and on July 13 he presented it to the throne.<sup>2</sup> It is this account – the *Datang Xiyuji* 大唐西域記 – that will be discussed in this essay.

It is probable that Xuanzang's most pressing concern, after his return to China, would have been undertaking the translation of the 657 Buddhist scriptures – all stored in 520 boxes – that he had taken great pains to bring back. However, due to the fact that the completion of the account of his journey was an earnest request of the emperor, it was imperative that he finish compiling this before embarking on anything else. This account was intended to be part of the wider project of extending the influence of the Tang dynasty into Central Asia. Xuanzang gave the *Datang Xiyuji* to the throne on the very same day that the translations of five scriptures in

<sup>1</sup> *Da Ci'ensi sanzang fashi zhuan* 大慈恩寺三藏法師傳, juan 6. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983, 129.

<sup>2</sup> *Jin Xiyuji biao* 進西域記表 included in the *Sanzang fashi biaoqi* 三藏法師表啓, manuscript kept in Chion'in 知恩院 temple, Kyoto. The *Ci'en zhuan* puts the date as the day *yiwei* 乙未, i.e. July 5, but I do not accept that here.

58 juan, including the *Da pusazang jing*<sup>3</sup> 大菩薩藏經 in 20 juan, were also presented. It seems clear that the compilation of the account was executed very hurriedly between his translation works. It is well known that Xuanzang did not write the *Datang Xiyuji* by himself but that he had help from Bianji 辯機, a talented young priest who participated in the translation of the scriptures and who later died a tragic death at the hand of the emperor.<sup>4</sup> While it is impossible to know the details of the participation of Bianji, the postface of the *Datang Xiyuji* leaves us in no doubt that he prepared the original draft, based on the material and dictation offered by Xuanzang. Nonetheless, it is not clear whether Xuanzang made any corrections to Bianji's text, and if did, to what extent. This situation of unclear authorship casts a considerable shadow on the textual tradition of the *Datang Xiyuji* in the Tang period. In order to seriously assess the historical value of the *Datang Xiyuji* it is crucial that the original text be identified. However, no serious attempt has yet been made because, until the modern period, this work has received little attention. In this context, it is no exaggeration to say that the Kyoto University edition<sup>5</sup> was an unprecedented work, in that it gathered many old manuscripts that had been kept in Japan together with all the previous known versions of the Tripitaka. At present we have an excellent new Chinese edition of the *Datang Xiyuji* by Ji Xianlin 季羨林 *et al.*<sup>6</sup> However, excellent as this edition is, it still fails to offer an improvement in terms of assessing the original text of the *Datang Xiyuji*. Indeed, it is one hundred years since the publication of the Kyoto edition of the *Datang Xiyuji* and already there has been a remarkable change in the resources and techniques available to scholars. In recent years, we have been able to gain more and more ready access to ancient Japanese manuscript texts of the *Datang Xiyuji*. In addition, we also have the Dunhuang manuscripts for reference. These developments mean that, to a certain extent, we can attempt to recover the original Tang text. This paper discusses the emendation that the *Datang Xiyuji* underwent during Gaozong's 高宗 (r. 649–683) reign, on the basis of evidence garnered from Japanese manuscript texts.

<sup>3</sup> 大菩薩藏經 *Mahāboddhisattvasūtra*, later incorporated by 菩提留支 (Bodhiruci) into *Da baoji jing* 大寶積經 as its 12th *hui* (pitaka), 大菩薩會.

<sup>4</sup> *Xu gaoseng zhuan* 續高僧傳, juan 4, Xuanzang zhuan 玄奘傳; Bianji's postface to the *Datang Xiyuji*.

<sup>5</sup> *Daitō saiiiki, fu kōi sakuin* 大唐西域記考異索引, 2 vols. (Kyoto Imperial University, Faculty of Letters Collection Vol. 1.) Tokyo, Dainippon Tosho Co., 1901. It was Haneda Tōru 羽田亨 who was in charge of the collation work.

<sup>6</sup> *Datang xiyuji jiaozhu* 大唐西域記校注. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1985.

## Fan Xiangyong's Theory on the Two Different Versions

Fan Xiangyong 范祥雍 first proposed the possibility of the circulation of two different versions of the *Datang Xiyuji* in the Tang period. He proposed this new theory in his 1982 article,<sup>7</sup> on the basis of the considerable amount of passages that are cited in Tang works but do not appear in the present editions. In addition, the *Ci'en zhuan* 慈恩傳 tells us that, in the first year of the Xianqing 顯慶 period (656), the Emperor Gaozong 高宗 ordered Yu Zhining 于志寧, among others, to revise or improve the texts of Xuanzang's translation. According to this theory, the first of the two versions would have been the text that Xuanzang submitted to the throne in 646 and the second would be the final version revised by Yu Zhining and others in the early years of the Xianqing period. This is not the only evidence that supports the two version hypothesis, indeed, there are obvious differences between the prefaces of the present editions. Some editions have the preface composed by Jing Bo 敬播 and others have that composed by Yu Zhining. Theoretically, these two prefaces should correspond to the two above-mentioned versions. However, the texts of the two versions are, in fact, identical. How can this be explained? Fan postulates that the first version was circulated only in a limited group because after it had been submitted to the emperor, its reproduction was not permitted. In contrast, the revised version was recognized as authoritative and, accordingly, copying was freely permitted. As a result, only the revised version was circulated. Yu Zhining's preface was not completed in time for the publication of the revised version and so the first preface – written by Jing Bo – was used at the beginning of the revised version to serve the purpose temporarily.<sup>8</sup> In other words, the text of the *Datang Xiyuji* as we have it today is only the revised version published during the Gaozong reign, the first version having been lost in the early stages. Passages cited in the Tang editions that do not appear in the present edition are the fortunate examples of remnants that were handed down from the first version. Herein is a broad outline of Fan's theory.

Fan's theory is very interesting. There is no doubt that, from the passages cited in the Tang works, two different versions of the *Datang Xiyuji*

<sup>7</sup> "Datang Xiyuji quewen kaobian" 《大唐西域記》闕文考辨. *Wenshi* 文史 Vol. 23, 1982: 73–97.

<sup>8</sup> Originally Yu Zhining's preface was not accompanied by his name but only with his title: *shangshu zuopuye Yanguogong* 尚書左僕射燕國公. Somebody replaced later Jing Bo's preface with this much more attractive title.

existed during the Tang period. Nonetheless, if Fan's theory is to be accepted completely then further evidence, which was not given sufficient attention by Fan, will need to be assessed, evidence that includes the Japanese and Dunhuang manuscripts.

## Ancient Japanese Manuscripts and the Dunhuang Manuscripts

In order to restore the original Tang text of the *Datang Xiyuji*, the best approach at present is to begin by investigating the ancient Japanese and Dunhuang manuscripts. The first printed Chinese Tripitaka, the so-called *Kaibaozang* 開寶藏, was printed far from the capital, in Sichuan province, a fact that casts significant doubt upon the authenticity of the text; the same questionable authenticity can be seen in the Korean Tripitaka and the Jin Tripitaka – both of which are based on the *Kaibaozang*. The southern tradition that emerged after the Fuzhou edition exhibits significant differences to the Tang original.

The compilers of the Kyoto University edition of the *Datang Xiyuji* also made use of some of the ancient Japanese manuscripts. However, as the edition selected the Korean Tripitaka as its base text, it focused only on presenting the Japanese manuscripts as variants. Recognition has not yet been made of real value of the ancient Japanese manuscripts. Now that we are aware of the full potential of the Japanese manuscripts, we are able to conduct a fuller investigation into the Tang original by making full use of them.

The ancient Japanese manuscripts we used are as follows:

(1) *Datang Xiyuji*, juan 1, manuscript of the fourth year of the Enryaku 延曆 era (1102), now kept in Kōshōji 興聖寺 temple, Kyoto.

(2) *Datang Xiyuji*, juan 1, manuscript of the fourth year of the Kōwa 康和 era (1102), now kept in the Kyoto National Museum.

(3) *Datang Xiyuji*, juan 1, juan 3 through juan 11, manuscript of the first year of the Daichi 大治 era (1126),<sup>9</sup> kept in Hōryūji 法隆寺 temple, Nara.

(4) *Datang Xiyuji*, juan 1 through juan 8, manuscript of the first year of the Chōkan 長寛 era (1163), kept in Ishiyama-dera 石山寺 temple, Otsu city, Shiga prefecture.

<sup>9</sup> Juan 2, formerly owned by the late professor Kanda Kiichirō, fell to the Library of Otani University, Kyoto. I could not access it but utilized the collation of the Kyoto University edition.

(5) *Datang Xiyuji*, juan 2 through juan 9, juan 11 and 12, manuscript of the fifth year of the Ho'en 保延 era (1139), kept in Kongōji 金剛寺 temple, Kawachi-nagano city, Osaka.

(6) *Datang Xiyuji*, juan 1 through juan 3, juan 5 through juan 8, manuscript of the second year of the Chishō 治承 era (1179), kept in Nanatsudera 七寺 temple, Nagoya.

(7) *Datang Xiyuji*, juan 1 through juan 12, complete. Manuscript of the late Heian or the first Kamakura period (corresponding to the 12th and early 13th centuries). Ancient property of Tachibana-dera 橘寺 temple, Nara, and once owned by the late professor Matsumoto Bunzaburō 松本文三郎, now kept in the Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University.

In addition to these Japanese manuscripts, the following Dunhuang manuscript fragments were consulted:

(1) S.2659Va: *Datang Xiyuji*, juan 1 (lacks the beginning)

(2) P.3814: *Datang Xiyuji*, juan 2 (lacks the beginning)

(3) S.958: *Datang Xiyuji*, juan 3 (only 16 lines preserved)

(4) P.2700bis: *Datang Xiyuji*, juan 1 (small fragment of the table of contents, which can be united with S.2659Va)

Among these, from evidence gleaned from the fragments, we can approximately date S.2659Va to the early 10th century. We can say this with a relative degree of certainty as we know that it was a possession of the monk Zhiyan 智嚴 who returned from India and arrived at Dunhuang in the third month of the second year of the Tongguang 同光 era (924). Therefore, it is of a much later date than the Japanese Kōshōji manuscript.

If we compare the texts of the ancient Japanese manuscripts and the Dunhuang manuscripts on the one hand and the text of the Korean Tripitaka on the other hand, there are no significant differences between them, although there are minor discrepancies between some characters forms. On the whole, while we can safely say that both versions are essentially the same, and neither version includes the lost passages which are cited in the Tang works, nevertheless, it is true that there is a systematic difference between them, which cannot be overlooked. The difference in question is that the phrase “wen zhu xianzhi” 聞諸先志 (to hear from old records) in the Korean Tripitaka and other editions is replaced by “wen zhu qijiu (wen zhi qijiu)” 聞諸耆舊 / 聞之耆舊 (to hear from old men) or “wen zhu tusu” 聞諸土俗 (hear from local tradition) in all the ancient Japanese manuscripts. It is an astonishing and remarkable fact that there is no exception in this phrase pattern. In other words, the words “qijiu” and “tusu” in the ancient texts were rewritten as “xianzhi” in the Korean Tripitaka and later editions of the Tripitaka. This can be clearly seen in Table 1.

	Korean Tripitaka	Kōshōjī	Kyoto Museum	Tachibana-dera
01-14	聞諸先志	聞之耆舊	聞之耆舊	聞之耆舊
01-15	聞諸先志	聞之耆舊	聞之耆舊	聞之耆舊
01-36	聞諸先志	聞之耆舊	聞之耆舊	聞之耆舊
01-38	聞諸先志	聞諸耆舊	聞諸耆舊	聞諸耆舊
01-40	聞諸先志	聞之耆舊	聞之耆舊	聞之耆舊
01-43	聞諸先志	聞諸土俗	聞諸土俗	聞諸土俗
02-21	聞諸先志			聞諸土俗
02-29	聞諸先志			聞之耆舊
03-15	聞諸先志			聞之土俗
03-16	聞諸先志			聞諸土俗
04-16	聞諸先志			聞諸耆舊
06-24	聞諸先志			聞諸耆舊
07-11	聞諸先志			聞諸土俗
07-16	聞諸先志			聞諸耆舊
08-37	聞諸先志			聞之土俗
10-27	聞諸先志			聞諸先志
11-17	聞諸先志			聞諸耆舊
11-20	聞諸先志			聞之耆舊
11-23	聞諸先志			聞之耆舊
11-32	聞諸先志			聞之耆舊

Table 1. Comparison table of the phrase “聞諸先志” etc. which appear in the Japanese manuscript texts and Dunhuang manuscripts. Each number refers to the volume and the page of the Kyoto University edition. For example, 01-14 means the page 14 of the *juan* 1.

Ishiyama-dera	Horyuji	Nanatsu-dera	Kongo-ji	Dunhuang
聞之耆舊	聞之耆舊	聞之耆舊	(缺)	聞之耆舊
聞之耆舊	聞之耆舊	聞之耆舊	(缺)	聞之耆舊
聞之耆舊	聞之耆舊	聞之耆舊	(缺)	文之耆舊
聞諸耆舊	聞諸耆舊	聞諸耆舊	(缺)	聞之其舊
聞之耆舊	聞之耆舊	聞之耆舊	(缺)	聞之耆舊
聞諸土俗	聞諸土俗	聞諸土俗	(缺)	聞諸土俗
聞諸土俗	聞諸土俗	聞諸土俗	聞諸土俗	
聞之耆舊	聞之耆舊	聞之耆舊	聞之耆舊	聞諸先志
聞之土俗	聞之土俗	聞之土俗	聞之土俗	
聞諸土俗	聞諸土俗	聞諸土俗	聞諸土俗	
聞諸耆舊	聞諸耆舊		聞諸耆舊	
聞諸耆舊	聞諸耆舊	聞諸耆舊	聞諸耆舊	
聞諸土俗	聞諸土俗	聞諸土俗	聞諸土俗	
聞諸耆舊	聞諸耆舊	聞諸耆舊	聞諸耆舊	
聞之土俗	聞之土俗	聞之土俗	聞之土俗	
	聞諸先志	聞諸先志		
	聞諸耆舊	聞諸耆舊	聞諸耆舊	
	聞之耆舊	聞之耆舊	聞之耆舊	
	聞之耆舊	聞之耆舊	聞之耆舊	
	聞之耆舊	聞之耆舊	聞之耆舊	

The same may be said of *juan* 1 of the Dunhuang manuscript. Apart from a few anomalous use of characters such as: “wen zhi” 文之 for “wen zhi” 聞之 and “qijiu” 其舊 for “qijiu” 耆舊, the text is identical to that of the ancient Japanese manuscripts. In fact, the difference between “zhu” 諸 and “zhi” 之 is not rigid; they are free variations. We can conclude that *juan* 1 of the Dunhuang manuscript and the ancient Japanese manuscripts can be traced back to one and the same text. As for *juan* 2 of the Dunhuang manuscript, there is only one example that can be compared, due to defects in the manuscript. In the Dunhuang manuscript “xianzhi” is written, as it is in the Korean Tripitaka, but the ancient Japanese manuscripts have “qijiu” instead. It therefore must mean that *juan* 1 and *juan* 2 of the Dunhuang manuscripts belong to a different tradition.

### What was the Nature of the Emendation during the Gaozong’s Reign?

According to Fan Xiangyong’s theory outlined above, the first version of the *Datang Xiyuji* must have included passages that are cited in Tang works, passages that were eliminated completely in the revised version. Was the revision of the *Datang Xiyuji* during Gaozong’s reign really on such a large scale? Indeed, Gaozong’s imperial order “you bu wenbian chu, ji suishi runse” 有不穩便處, 即隨時潤色 (if there is any passages that are improper, embellish them) does not seem to require any addition or elimination of passages in the original text. In the *Yiqiejing yinyi* (*Zhongjing yinyi*) 一切經音義 (衆經音義) of Xuanying 玄應 – a specialist in philology who joined Xuanzang’s translation team – there are nine passages cited in total from the *Datang Xiyuji*, but only three appear in the present edition. How can this be explained? Xuanying died between the first year of the Longshuo 龍朔 era (661) and the third year of the Longshuo era (663),<sup>10</sup> and the last five *juan* of his *Yinyi* were spent solely working on the scriptures that had been newly translated by Xuanzang between the nineteenth year of the Zhenguan era (645) and the fifth year of the Yonghui 永徽 era (654). In other words, the *Yiqiejing yinyi* was completed before the fifth year of the Yonghui era. It is therefore clear that the *Datang Xiyuji* cited in his *Yinyi* was an edition from before the imperial

<sup>10</sup> Kanda Kiichirō 神田喜一郎. 1933. “Shiryū no nidai shōgakuka” 繙流の二大小學家. *Shinagaku* 支那學 7-1.



emendation order executed by Yu Zhining *et al.* in the first year of the Xianqing era.

However, if we accept Fan Xiangyong's theory that all six passages from the first version were eliminated during the emendation, the revision would be on a far greater scale than has yet been suggested. Nonetheless, I propose that the changes made to the original text were limited to an "embellishment of the passage" and the theory that such a large-scale alteration of the text occurred cannot be accepted. I suggest that the changes that did take place would have been in the manner of the example above, i.e. from "qijiu" to "xianzhi." If this is the case, then the evidence seems in tune with the scholarly consensus about the compilation of the *Datang Xiyuji*.

Xuanzang provided Bianji with not only his travel diary but also with an Indian source book. The latter is referred to as "zhiji" 志記 in Bianji's postface. In the revised and authoritative edition, it was necessary to mention this "zhiji." This is exactly why "qijiu" and "tusu" in the ancient Japanese manuscripts and Dunhuang manuscript (*juan* 1) were systematically replaced with "xianzhi" or "xianji" 先記. Besides this, we find "Yinduji" 印度記 four times in the present edition, of which two examples are written as "xianxianji" 先賢記 in the ancient manuscripts; one example of "xianxianji" in the present edition is written as "tusuji" 土俗記 in the ancient manuscripts. It may be helpful to point out that "tusuji" is given the Japanese reading "dozoku no shirushi-te" (local tradition says) in the Tachibana-dera manuscript. If we use this analogy, it seems quite likely that "xianxianji" was also read as "senken no shirushi-te" (old sage says). On the other hand, it is impossible for "Yinduji" to be read as "Indo no shirushite" and therefore it must be interpreted as a rewrite, executed in order to stake a claim for the existence of such a book. If these changes were executed at the time of the revisions by Yu Zhining *et al.* during Gaozong's reign, then we can conclude that there was just such a purpose behind the amendments.

If the amendments made during Gaozong's reign were confined to the above-mentioned examples, then how can we explain the fact that there are quite a few missing passages that are cited in Tang works, passages such as Xuanying's *Yiqiejing yinyi*? It is impossible to regard these passages as originating from works other than the *Datang Xiyuji*. If this were the case, we would be obliged to suppose that there had been another draft of the *Datang Xiyuji*, which was prepared by Bianji. Xuanzang, eliminating those parts he deemed unnecessary, hastily compiled a temporary fixed version and presented it to the throne. Bianji, having already predicted beforehand that Xuanzang would make deletions, made the draft copy much

longer than usual. Bianji's draft copy was useful because it contained an abundance of content that was circulated among the members of the translation team. This can explain why missing passages often appear in editions by monks such as Xuanying and Daoxuan 道宣. There is even a possibility that the draft copy was known as "Bianji's Xiyuji" among his fellow monks. Indeed, many people felt sympathy for him.

## References

- Da Ci'ensi sanzang fashi zhuan* 大慈恩寺三藏法師傳. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983.
- Daitō saiikiki, fu kōi sakuin* 大唐西域記埵考異索引. 2 vols. (Kyoto Imperial University, Faculty of Letters Collection Vol. 1.) Tokyo: Dainippon Tosho Co., 1901.
- Datang Sanzang fashi biaoqi* 大唐三藏法師表啓, first facsimile edition of the Chion-in 知恩院 manuscript. Kyoto, 1910; another facsimile edition published by Kicho kotenseki kanko-kai 貴重古典籍刊行會. Tokyo, 1960.
- Datang xiyuji jiaozhu* 大唐西域記校注. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1985.
- Fan Xiangyong 范祥雍. 1982. "Datang Xiyuji quewen kaobian" 《大唐西域記》闕文考辨. *Wenshi* 文史 Vol. 23: 73-97.
- Kanda Kiichirō 神田喜一郎. 1933. "Shiryū no nidai shōgakuka" 緇流の二大小學家. *Shinagaku* 支那學 7-1: 25-48.

STUDIES IN CHINESE MANUSCRIPTS:  
FROM THE WARRING STATES PERIOD  
TO THE 20TH CENTURY

EDITED BY  
IMRE GALAMBOS

INSTITUTE OF EAST ASIAN STUDIES, EÖTVÖS LORÁND UNIVERSITY  
BUDAPEST 2013